

---

# CLERUCHY IN ETRUSCANS

**Abstract:** The author examines the inscription from *Montepulciano*, outskirts of Clusium (today Chiusi) (*cippus Bucellius*), where the Greek Dorian term was mentioned, which means a military colonist. Taking in consideration previous researches, the author tries to prove prescription of *cippus Bucellius* as a boundary; explain earlier date of the inscription (earlier 3rd, not 2nd centuries BC); represent own explanation of discussion terms, namely, *ser* is considered as reduction of the praenomen *servei*; *hilar* is determined as a plot of land; *claruxies* is seen as a genitive case of term which means a military colonist-mercenary, created like the personal Etruscan names.

**Keywords:** *Etruscans, Etruscan language, Etruscan inscriptions, onomastics, cleruchy.*

**Andrew YANKO**

Poltava basic medical college Ukraine  
andrewyanko223@gmail.com

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**C**leruchy is a phenomenon of ancient Greek civilization, which might have existed in Etruscan society. Sufficient information about cleruchy was not preserved, because the authentic narrative sources of the Etruscans, neither original, nor translated into Ancient Greek or Latin, were conserved. In fact, the study analyses the Etruscan inscription where perhaps the ancient Greek term for a military colonist is mentioned.

The problem is complicated by the fact that this inscription, which is known from a few assemblages of Etruscan inscriptions (*CII* 937 = *CIE* 886 = *TLE* 515 = *ET* Cl 8.5 = *ThLE*, p. 104, 110, 124, 177, 257, 347), was carved on a stone (*cippus*), today is considered lost<sup>1</sup>. Despite this fact, since the stone has been described, and the inscription has been copied and placed in five assemblages of Etruscan inscriptions, today it is possible to continue its study.

The greatest difficulty is the dating of the inscription and the purpose of the stone, because it was found and placed in front of the palace of P. Bucelli in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, i.e., ripped out of the archaeological context. Etruscologists worked in this area have different interpretations of the whole inscription, although all the words included into the text have their completely reasoned interpretations.

## 2. HISTORY OF STUDYING OF ETRUSCAN INSCRIPTION ON A STONE FROM MONTEPULCIANO

One of the first scientists who mentioned Etruscan inscription on a stone from Montepulciano (outskirts of ancient Clusium, now Chiusi) was S. Maffei<sup>2</sup>. He pointed out that the inscription was on three sides of the stone, noting that the words had one-half disappeared, and cited the beginning of the inscription: "Claruchiem Tular: Hil...". He made a mistake accepting the Etruscan letter *M* "san" borrowed from the Western Greek alphabet

<sup>1</sup> CANUTI 2015, 2, 4.

<sup>2</sup> MAFFEI 1740, 117.

DOI: 10.14795/j.v7i2.526

ISSN 2360 – 266X

ISSN–L 2360 – 266X

(Phoenician “*tsadi*” that rendered in the assemblage by the sign *ś* as opposed to Σ “*sigma*” denoted as *s*) for *M* (*μ*), rendered as *m*.

Mentioned inscription was included into the collection by A. Fabretti with an addition by S. Maffei (CII 937). L. Lanzi compared the *cippus Bucellius* with Roman tombstones, and did not present the inscription (under No. 458) completely (... *tular: hilar ... śserv*)<sup>3</sup>. The researcher suggested that *serv* is short for lat. *servos* (it's not clear why not *servus*? – the author), which he considered distorted as a result of the aspiration by the Greek Aeolian ὀ ἔρρος – “love”. However, he stated that this term was a designation of a slave. Also this author considered word *hilar* a personal name, namely a part of the cognitive of Roman “record holder” in the number of children C. Crispinius Hilarus from the Etruscan Faesulae (now Fiesole) in the reign of Emperor Augustus (Plin. NH. VII. 13. 60). Obviously, the Etruscan inscription should consist mostly from the Etruscan words, and the manipulations with the word *serv* are not clear.

W. Deecke suggested that the ending *-ar* in the words *tular* and *hilar* mean plural (for example, “clan” (son) and “clenar” (sons) from CIE 6213), but still translated *tular* as *cippus* in singular (more logical is *cippi* in plural and the correct translation is *limites* or *termini*)<sup>4</sup>. C. Pauli tried to outline the connection between *hilar* and *helu*, which known from other inscriptions (for example, on the Perusian stone CIE 4538, A, 20 = TLE 570, A, 20)<sup>5</sup>. He identified the social terms *hels(c) atr(ś)*, and considered that the first part of the phrase meant “property”, and the second part was equivalent to other social category – *etera* (“heir” in his translation).

Due to the efforts of O. A. Danielsson, the inscription at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was completely copied and included into the collection of Etruscan inscriptions as lines: a) <sup>1</sup>*ein. ser. vl. remzna. clanc* <sup>2</sup>*au. latini. cesu.* b) *tular. hilar. nesl.* c) *claruxies* (CIE 886). A. Torp claimed that combinatory *hilar. nesl* is the expression “home of the dead” based on the funeral nature of the inscription and the term *nesl*, which always means “dead” in other inscriptions<sup>6</sup>. E. Lattes reported that the inscription was somehow connected with Ptolemaic Egypt, considered *cesu* a cognomen and found that the term *claruxies* from the Latin epitaph of the freedman of the emperor Hadrian from Praeneste was equivalent to the cognomen *Clerucho* (CIL XIV 3433)<sup>7</sup>. At the same time, O. Schulthess refrained from judging the origin of the term *claruxies* in the Etruscans, although he recognized its derivation from the Greek language<sup>8</sup>.

M. Pallottino included the inscription in his collection TLE, reversing the first and second lines: a) *tular. hilar. nesl.* b) <sup>1</sup>*ein. ser. vl. remzna. clanc* <sup>2</sup>*au. latini. cesu.* c) *claruxies* (TLE 515). S. Mazzarino suggested that the words with the root *hil* mean territory, *ein* – *ain* (CIE 3 = TLE 675); this author translated *hilar* – *claruxies* as γῆ κληροῦχος and associated such Greekism with Egypt Ptolemaic era, supporting by references to the foreign slaves in Etruria mentioned

by Tiberius Gracchus (Plut. Ti. Gracch. 8) and Etruscan inscriptions with Hellenistic names of dependent people (*lautni*) Serapion and Cleopatra<sup>9</sup>. The author considered that the personal names of the Etruscans in the inscription were the names of the Clusium magistrates. It is worth noting that today the word *ain* (CIE 3 = TLE 675) is read as *hil*<sup>10</sup>.

J. Heurgon supported the point of view of S. Mazzarino, but he considered one of the characters of the inscription about Aulus Latinius, a supporter of Sulla, who received an allotment from him<sup>11</sup>. An attempt to decrypt the whole inscription was made by A. I. Kharsekin<sup>12</sup>, who rearranged the inscription lines: a) *tular. hilar. nesl;* b) *claruxies;* c) *ein. ser. vl. remzna. clanc / au. latini. cesu/*. After A. Torp, the researcher translated the term *hilar* as “dwelling place”<sup>13</sup>; “*cesu*” – resting, “*nesl*” – deceased were explained by a combinatory method before him, but he also suggested an etymological justification, converging these terms with similar Greek words<sup>14</sup>.

If A. I. Kharsekin was consistent, the term *hilar* would be compared with the Greek “ἰλᾶρός” (hilarious) and borrowed by the Romans with the same meaning *hilarus* (*hilaris*). Of course, this would not fit the supposed funeral context of the whole inscription. He later associated the word *hilar* with the pre-Greek-Aegean-Asian Minor language range<sup>15</sup>. Subsequently, the researcher refused the close rapprochement of Etruscan and Greek words (except the direct established borrowings) and didn't recognize Etruscan language as Indo-European<sup>16</sup>. The researcher supposed the term *claruxies* was a borrowing from the Greek Doric word which means “colonist, settler” (and not “colony, settlement”) in the genitive case (suffix *-ś*), noting that the endings of the masculine *-ie* are widespread in Etruscan inscriptions (personal names such as *spurie*, etc.)<sup>17</sup>. He translated the whole inscription like this: “The last abode of the deceased colonist Vel Remtsna in the coffin (grave) with his son Aulus Latini lies (rests)”<sup>18</sup>. We think that the researcher freely interpreted even the long-known Etruscan terms (for example, *tular* and *nesl*). So it remained unclear why father and son had different gentile names in the inscription.

A. I. Nemirovsky offered the translation of *hilar* which referring to the collection (TLE 515) as “soils” based that this word was one of the definitions for the well-known noun *tular* (border) along with words *spural* and *rasna*<sup>19</sup>. In the second case, obviously, it should be written *rasnal*.

G. Facchetti returned to the theory of C. Pauli about the proximity of *hels(c) atr(ś)* and *etera*, trying to support it with the phrases “*hilarθune etertic*”, “*hilarθuna tecum etrinθi*”, “*hilarθuna etertic*”, extracted from the XII column of the Zagreb text (Book of the mummy)<sup>20</sup>. Since *hil/hel* meant,

<sup>9</sup> MAZZARINO 1957, 105, 106, 110.

<sup>10</sup> BELFIORE/VAN HEEMS 2010, 114.

<sup>11</sup> HEURGON 2009, 131.

<sup>12</sup> KHARSEKIN 1963, 42-44.

<sup>13</sup> KHARSEKIN 1963, 42.

<sup>14</sup> KHARSEKIN 1963, 43-44.

<sup>15</sup> KHARSEKIN 1967a, 16.

<sup>16</sup> KHARSEKIN 1967b, passim; KHARSEKIN 1976, 347.

<sup>17</sup> KHARSEKIN 1963, 43; KHARSEKIN 1967, 16.

<sup>18</sup> KHARSEKIN 1963, 44.

<sup>19</sup> NEMIROVSKIY 1983, 92.

<sup>20</sup> FACCHETTI 2002, 232-233; FACCHETTI 2009/2012, 240-252.

<sup>3</sup> LANZI 1789, 460; LANZI 1824, 389.

<sup>4</sup> MÜLLER/DEECKE 1877b, 499-500.

<sup>5</sup> PAULI 1881, 59-60; 64-65.

<sup>6</sup> TORP 1903, 19.

<sup>7</sup> LATTES 1921, 277.

<sup>8</sup> SCHULTHESS 1921, 832.

according to his ideas, “his”, then *hilar* – property, and *hilarθ(u)* – owner, respectively, *etertic* – plebeians. The latter term, possibly, was associated with the designation of the Etruscan social group *etera*, because *etertic* is decomposed into *eter-ti-c*, where *-ti* is the suffix of the locative case<sup>21</sup>, and *c* is equivalent to lat. “-que” (and)<sup>22</sup>. Translation is possible “and in *etera* estate”, but not in the plural. The term *etrinθi* (also a locative) is less similar to *etera* as many Etruscan inscriptions where similar words are found not related to this social group. For example, *etra* (CIE 52), *etri* (CIE 3415), *etru* (CIE 3427-3428).

V. Belfiore and G. van Heems examined the inscription from Montepulciano presented in the CIE, but referring to ET by H. Rix, where the inscription was reproduced, like in the collection by M. Pallottino (TLE 515 = ET Cl 8.5)<sup>23</sup>. They considered that the inscription was funerary<sup>24</sup>. Comparing all existing cases of using words with the root *hil*, they chose translation for the expression *tular. hilar. nesl* as “the walled border of the deceased”<sup>25</sup>.

But the most interesting part of the inscription for us is the word *claruxieś*. S. A. Yatsemirsky unexpectedly offered a new version of the borrowing, not from Dorian term *ὁ κληροῦχος* (colonist, settler), but from *ἡ κληρουχία* (colony, settlement). Since this Etruscan term is in the genitive, its Greek Dorian version would look like *τῆς κλαρουχίας* (colonies, settlements), which is not very similar to the Etruscan *claruxieś*. The word stems of indirect cases were usually borrowed, therefore there should be *claruxias* (*κλαρουχία*- word stem) for *ἡ κλαρουχία* and *claruxus* for *ὁ κλαροῦχος* (*κλαροῦχο* - word stem; genitive *τοῦ κλαροῦχου*). Otherwise it should be recognized that borrowing obeyed other laws. G. and L. Bonfante assumed that personal names were borrowed from Latins to Etruscans: *spurie* from *Spurius*, *cae* from *Caius*, *laucie* from *Lucius*, *puplie* from *Publius*<sup>26</sup>. Obviously, the term became to be perceived as a personal name (which was later witnessed by the Latin inscription from Praeneste). We may assume that the borrowing appellatives obeyed same rules as the borrowing personal names. Therefore, we have a hypothetical nominative *claruxie* and from it the genitive *claruxieś* as A. I. Kharsekin suggested.

C. de Simone found the term *heloke* in recently discovered Tyrsenian inscription from Hephaistia (Lemnos Island), which he successfully compared with the verb *helu(ce)* from some Etruscan texts, and suggested the meaning “erected, reared”<sup>27</sup>. This interpretation is in some way connected with one of the interpretations of the term *hil* – “a fence, a palisade, a fenced area”<sup>28</sup>. However, since the inscription was found on the basis of a statue or column, the limitations of the combinatory method of interpretation become visible. A broad interpretation of the verb is also

quite appropriate: “introduced, created”.

M. Canuti claimed that the inscription was placed on the tombstone and had funeral content<sup>29</sup>. The researcher dated the inscription based on paleography of the first half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC<sup>30</sup>. He compared the text writing from Montepulciano with the writing of the famous Zagreb Mummy text, as suggested that the inscription from Clusium was somehow connected with the Ptolemaic Egypt where were also military settlements of the cleruchs. Since the Zagreb Mummy text (also known as Linen Book of Zagreb) was used as sheets for the Egyptian mummy of the Hellenistic era, and its alphabet was attributed to the late Etruscan northern area, Canuti dated inscription to the 3<sup>rd</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> centuries BC. Finding similarities in the texts, this author attributed the inscription on the stone from Montepulciano to the same period<sup>31</sup>. This author chose the line position adopted in the assemblage of M. Pallottino and H. Rix (TLE 515 = ET Cl 8.5), although he repeatedly noted that everything that remains from the inscription was known from S. Maffei and based on sketches of O. Danielsson (CIE 886)<sup>32</sup>.

Translation of the whole inscription: “The border of the property (possessions) of the deceased does not apply (for) Vel Remzna and her son, Aulus Latinius Cescius, of settler (colonist)”<sup>33</sup>. The researcher translated the word *tular* as “border”, joining the opinion of most of etruscologists, he took the meaning “private” for *hilar*, he interpreted *nesl*, like most, as the genitive of “dead”, *ein* became “not”, according to L. Agostiniani<sup>34</sup>, although there were other versions<sup>35</sup>. The term *cesu* was interpreted as *cognomen*, and *ser* was recognized as *hapax*<sup>36</sup>. Finally, an conventional interpretation was suggested for *claruxieś*, but the connection with Hellenistic Egypt did not seem clear for M. Canuti. He explained a Dorian character of the word, which was borrowed from the Greeks, by the possible influence of Syracuse, which were conquered by Rome, as Etruscan policies, during the century before dating of the inscription<sup>37</sup>. The author was noted this fact as a chronological marker for attributing the inscription to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC., and not earlier, when Syracuse was the worst enemy for the Etruscans.

M. Pittau placed the funeral inscription in the same order that A. I. Kharsekin, but the translation was as follows: “A private stone of a deceased colonist, not a slave, Vel Remnius and his son Aulus Latini (they are here ) lie”<sup>38</sup>. This etruscologist dealt with the *hapax*, considering it a reduction of the Latin term *servus* – “slave”. It is not clear why only one Latin word appeared in the whole Etruscan inscription, why the Etruscans could not use their terms to highlight the slaves (for example, *leθe*), finally, could *ser* be just the same abbreviation of a personal name as the following *vl*?

<sup>21</sup> TORP 1903, 17; KHARSEKIN 1969, 56; YATSEMIRSKIY 2011, 185-186, 188; WALLACE 2008, 101-103.

<sup>22</sup> KHARSEKIN 1963, 43; YATSEMIRSKIY 2011, 185-186, 188; PALLOTTINO 1988, 424; BONFANTE/BONFANTE 2002, 215.

<sup>23</sup> BELFIORE/VAN HEEMS 2010, 114.

<sup>24</sup> BELFIORE 2019.

<sup>25</sup> BELFIORE/VAN HEEMS 2010, 114.

<sup>26</sup> BONFANTE/BONFANTE 2002, 90.

<sup>27</sup> DE SIMONE 2011, 7-9, 10-13, 15.

<sup>28</sup> FACCHETTI 2009/2012, 252, n. 81.

<sup>29</sup> CANUTI 2015, 4.

<sup>30</sup> CANUTI 2015, 5.

<sup>31</sup> CANUTI 2015, 6.

<sup>32</sup> CANUTI 2015, 5, 9.

<sup>33</sup> CANUTI 2015, 9.

<sup>34</sup> AGOSTINIANI 2013, 465.

<sup>35</sup> CANUTI 2015, 10, cf. 10, 106; KHARSEKIN 1963, 44; PALLOTTINO 1988, 481.

<sup>36</sup> CANUTI 2015, 10.

<sup>37</sup> CANUTI 2015, 11-12.

<sup>38</sup> PITTAU 2018a, 126; PITTAU 2018b, 88.



Sum up, despite the long-term attempts to decipher the Etruscan language in general and this inscription in particular, etruscologists still have a lot of work to do. None of the interpretations of the inscription can be recognised satisfactory. Researchers failed to convincingly substantiate the purpose and dating of the stone, periodically arranged manipulations with text lines, and could not give an exhaustive interpretation for the terms *ein*, *hilar*, *ser*, *claruxjies*. In our opinion, we should try again, especially since understanding the meaning of the inscription mentioning *cleruch* is extremely important for studying the socio-political history of the Etruscans.

### 3. OWN EXAMINATION OF THE INSCRIPTION

First of all, we questioned the most unshakable attitude of all researchers, doubting the funeral character of the inscription. The fact is that most of the Etruscan *cipporum* (stones), which used known term *tular* – “border, boundary”, have no an afterlife, but quite terrastral content, meaning the boundary of the land, ex example *tular alfil* (Alfi’s (families) borders) (TLE 530, Castiglione del Lago); *tular larns* (border (of the family) of Larna) (TLE 692a, Wetttona); *tular raśnal* (community boundary) (CIE 439 a = TLE 632 a, Cortona); *tular śpural* ... (city border) (CIE 3 = TLE 675, Faesulae), etc. However, some funeral epitaphs include *tular* accompanied by the special term *tezan*: *tezan teta tular* (grave ground (family) Teta border) (CIE 3432 = TLE 571, Perugia); *tezan ... tularu* ... (CIE 4538, 4, 8 = TLE 570, 4, 8, Perugia; CIE 4541 = TLE 626, of unknown localization). Are Etruscan *cippi* and Greek ὄποι similar? Incidentally, the dimensions of the Bucelli stone known from CIE (1, 94 × 0, 38 × 0, 23) show that it was much bigger than the Greek boundary stones<sup>39</sup>.

If we focus on the dating of the inscription, we can only look at paleography, because the *cippus* has been lost, and it is not known where and under what circumstances it was discovered. M. Canuti noted the northern localization of the alphabet, which was used for the inscription from Montepulciano<sup>40</sup>. R. Wallace claimed that late alphabet of the 4<sup>th</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BC (so-called Neo-Etruscan) had the inscription for the letter “*heta*” (= / h /) in the form of a circle with one cross-beam in Asciano in the north of Etruria<sup>41</sup>, which we observe in the inscription from Montepulciano close to Asciano. It should also be emphasized that “*heta*” appears in the column under the heading of “until the middle of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC” in the table of Etruscan alphabets by E. Benelli<sup>42</sup>. There is letter τ (only in word “*latini*”) mentioned by M. Canuti<sup>43</sup> in this column, which has only the right shelf (resembling Cyrilic Γ) dated from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC, but found in the southern Neo-Etruscan alphabets<sup>44</sup>. In another case, the spelling of the letter τ (in the word *tular*) looks northern, and the southern variant of the letter can be explained from another table by borrowing the northern alphabets from the southern alphabets of Tarquinia and Vulci<sup>45</sup>. Spelling letters ε, ζ, μ, ν, ρ in the inscription looks like

letters from the column “from the middle of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC and further”<sup>46</sup>. At the same time, they are similar to those from the south (the alphabets of Tarquinia and Vulci, Caere and Volsinia)<sup>47</sup>. This is apparently explained by the fact that the second alphabet gradually became the most common by the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC. The chronology of the inscription was designated in the 3<sup>rd</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> centuries BC. Taking the Clusium series of alphabets into consideration, we see two forms of the *heta* (round and rectangular) and a mark that the second appeared later (the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC). Based on this, we can conclude that the round spelling was common before the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC and dating of the whole inscription might be similar.

We refused to rearrange the inscription lines. Since we exclusively know the inscription due to the memoirs by S. Maffei and the sketches by O. Danielsson, we accept it as: «a) <sup>1</sup>*ein. ser. vl. remzna. clanc*<sup>2</sup>*au. latini. cesu. b) tular. hilar. nesl. c) claruxjies* (CIE 886).

We must highlight clearly recognized words of the inscription. Among them, *vl.* – the generally accepted abbreviation of the Etruscan personal name *vel*<sup>48</sup>. Approval of this fact we can find in the Thesaurus (*ThLE*, p. 159-160). Examples can also be cited from the inscriptions from Clusium (CIE 1518; 2482; 2897). Finally, we can give not only a link to the collection, but also a drawing of the inscription which our one was contemporary with – the funeral epitaph from Rusellae (*ET Ru 5.1*)<sup>49</sup>. The personal name *au* is the abbreviation of the Etruscan and Latin names *aule* (Aulus) (*ThLE*, p. 78-79). Inscriptions from Clusium and the surrounding area (CIE 1651; 1801; 4053; 4338), and from the area not far from Clusium Perugia (CIE 3683; 3932; 3965; 3966; 3968; 3998) show this abbreviation.

Gentile names *remzna* and *latini* were well-known for the Montepulciano and Clusium. It is enough to look at the Thesaurus, where there are not only *remzna* and *latini*, but also their derivatives: 30 cases of *latini* and derivatives (*ThLE*, p. 216), a dozen of *remzna*, almost all with the name *vel* (*ThLE*, p. 302-303). Aulus Latini was found one, he wasn’t from Montepulciano, but from close Clusium: “*hasti: tutnei: aules: latini(al?)*” (Hasti Tutnei of Aulus Latini) (CIE 2981).

Word *clan* (son) was one of the first words, decrypted by etruscologists using the combinatory method, so it shouldn’t cause translation problems<sup>50</sup>. In word *clanc*, last «c» is understood as equivalent *que* (conjunction «and»)<sup>51</sup>.

Etruscologists often found word *cesu* in the funeral inscriptions, therefore, it was natural to assume meaning for *cesu/ceśu* as verb “lie, rest”<sup>52</sup>, participle “placed, laid,

<sup>46</sup> BENELLI 2017, 250.

<sup>47</sup> BENELLI 2017, 268-269.

<sup>48</sup> CANUTI 2015, 10; KHARSEKIN 1963, 43; WALLACE 2008, 5, 26.

<sup>49</sup> WALLACE 2008, 5, 26, fig. 2.7.

<sup>50</sup> MÜLLER/DEECKE 1877b, 363, 482, 490, 498, 499, 502, 503, 510; KHARSEKIN 1963, 43; YATSEMIKSIY 2011, 293; WALLACE 2008, 3, 123, 248; PALLOTTINO 1988, 386, 441, 481; BONFANTE/BONFANTE 2002, 70, 215; AGOSTINIANI 2013, 475; BENELLI 2017, 256; MÜLLER/DEECKE 1877a, 502; TORP 1902, 69, 81, 87, 88.

<sup>51</sup> KHARSEKIN 1963, 43; KHARSEKIN 1969, 56; YATSEMIKSIY 2011, 291; WALLACE 2008, 64, 114-115; PALLOTTINO 1988, 424; BONFANTE 2002, 215.

<sup>52</sup> KHARSEKIN 1963, 43-44; KHARSEKIN 1969, 56; YATSEMIKSIY 2011, 292.

<sup>39</sup> HARRIS 2012, 3305.

<sup>40</sup> CANUTI 2015, 5.

<sup>41</sup> BENELLI 2017, 250.

<sup>42</sup> BENELLI 2017, 250.

<sup>43</sup> CANUTI 2015, 5.

<sup>44</sup> BENELLI 2017, 250.

<sup>45</sup> BENELLI 2017, 268.

buried<sup>53</sup>, verb “lay, put”<sup>54</sup>, verb or participle “lies, lying”<sup>55</sup>, and verb “put, be placed, lie”<sup>56</sup>. It was noted that the verb was found in the phrases *thui cesu*, which may correspond to *hic cubat* in Latin and *he cupat* in Faliscan “lies here (resting)”<sup>57</sup>. M. Canuti noticed that in the word *cesu* the letter *s* is represented by a whistling sound and suggested that *cesu* doesn’t mean a verb or a participle in some inscriptions, but is an onomastic element, the cognomen of Aulus Latinus<sup>58</sup> [1, 10-11]. Indeed, this verb was written both as *s* and *ś* (the second is more often in the northern inscriptions), but it means the same action, since in both cases it was used in the expressions *thui ceśu* / *thui cesu* (*ThLE*, p. 103, 104-105)<sup>59</sup>. The term *cesu* was considered by E. Lattes a cognomen<sup>60</sup>, but, as aforementioned, most researchers considered this word a verb.

The term *tular* – “border, boundary” became clear later than the Etruscan terms of kinship<sup>61</sup>.

There are no problems with understanding of word *nesl*. Already the first researchers had interpreted it as something related to the grave, tomb, burial<sup>62</sup>. Later it was found that *-l* was a suffix-indicator of the so-called genitive II (*s* or *ś*, respectively, suffixes of genitive I); this word is most likely an adjective in the meaning of “dead, deceased”<sup>63</sup>.

Difficult to interpret the words *ein*, *ser*, *hilar*, and *claruxieś*. The word *ein* had been highlighted a long time ago, but its exact meaning hasn’t defined today. A. Torpe and E. Lattes tried to decipher the expression *ein ser* at the same time, comparing it with similar phrase *ein zeri* from the large inscription on the Perugia stone (*CIE* 4538, B, 17-18 = *TLE* 570, B, 17-18)<sup>64</sup>. A. Torp defined *ein* as a pronoun and they both translated this expression “*en sacra*” (here is the sacred).

S. Mazzarino translated *ein* (he considered it like *ain* (*CIE* 3 = *TLE* 675) with the Latin *sub* – “under”<sup>65</sup>. A. I. Kharsekin didn’t agree with him<sup>66</sup>, used etymological rapprochements, following his “complex” method, and mistakenly considered the Etruscan language Indo-European. Therefore, he translated this expression “in the grave”, ignoring the terms known to etruscologists for the grave and tomb, *suθi* and *θaura*, respectively. M. Pallottino had no doubt that *ein* was a pronoun<sup>67</sup>.

Later, other opinions appeared: most researchers considered *ein* a negation. G. and L. Bonfante translated *ei*

(*ein*) as “no” and A. Fournet joined them<sup>68</sup>. H. Rix, R. Wallace, L. Agostiniani, M. Pittau had same opinion<sup>69</sup>, M. Canuti and E. Benelli did as well<sup>70</sup>. Such unanimity is based on the conclusions of L. Agostiniani, obtained by interpreting one Etruscan inscription from Campania (*TLE* 12 = *ET* Cm 2.13). Moreover, it is unconditionally accepted that *ei* = *ein*. We do not have first publication of the decoding of this linguist, but used its summary from later study<sup>71</sup>. The linguist chose a well-known way, suggesting that the epigraphic “formulas” in the Etruscans weren’t different from the long-known similar expressions in the Greeks and Romans. Therefore, the inscription of the second half of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC from Suessula “*mi χulixna qupes alθrnas ei minipi capi*” (I’m the cup of Coupe Altrna, don’t take me) was translated by him, taking into account the fact that “*ei minipi capi*” is similar to the Latin “*ne atigas me*” (do not touch me); “*noli me tangere*” (do not touch me); «*noli me tollere*» (do not take me), and Greek, «*μὲ θίγεις*» (do not touch (me)); «*μὴ μὲ ἀνοίγεις*» (don’t take me). Explanations by researchers about *ser* were not so convincing. It was aforementioned that *ser* was considered a contraction of lat. *servus*, that is doubtful because the Etruscans had plenty of terms for slaves.

It has been suggested that *hilar* means “property”, “fence”, “land”. Moreover, this interpretation was exclusively combinatory. A. I. Kharsekin associated the word *hilar* with the pre-Greek-Aegean-Asia Minor language area<sup>72</sup>. The share of Luvian linguistic elements was noticeable in the pre-Greek substrate<sup>73</sup>. Some linguists directly associated with *hilar* a number of cognate Hittite words “*hila*” (courtyard), “*hilammar*” (gate), “*hilamna*” (portico)<sup>74</sup>. In this case, it would be necessary to recognize the Etruscan language as Indo-European, even the late Hittite dialect, as V. Georgiev did<sup>75</sup>. In point of fact, Etruscan language is agglutinative in morphology, which is one of the signs of non-Indo-European languages<sup>76</sup>; therefore, today only a few scientists support Indo-Europeanism of Etruscan language<sup>77</sup>. Anyway, it should be explained how this word was borrowed by the hypothetical ancestors of the Etruscans from the Hittite language and recognized the eastern origin of the Etruscans, that also encounters certain difficulties, for example, localizing the ancestral home or linking such a concept with modern views on ethnogenesis.

### 3. IMPACT OF OTHER LANGUAGES ON STUDIED INSCRIPTION

Some linguists allocate a small group of related languages, including Etruscan, Lemnian, Rhaetian, sometimes Linear A Minoan, Eteocypriot, South Lusitanian,

<sup>53</sup> WALLACE 2008, 102, 123, 143, 154, 200, 248.

<sup>54</sup> PALLOTTINO 1988, 481.

<sup>55</sup> BONFANTE 2002, 102, 172, 215.

<sup>56</sup> FOURNET 2012, 5.

<sup>57</sup> KHARSEKIN 1963, 43.

<sup>58</sup> CANUTI 2015, 10-11.

<sup>59</sup> YATSEMIIRSKIY 2011, 151; WALLACE 2008, 20; AGOSTINIANI 2013, 459, 460, 471; BENELLI 2017, 250-252.

<sup>60</sup> LATTES 1921, 277.

<sup>61</sup> MAZZARINO 1957, 101-102; HEURGON 2009, 129; KHARSEKIN 1963, 43; NEMIROVSKIY 1983, 91-92; KHARSEKIN 1969, 59; YATSEMIIRSKIY 2011, 297-298; WALLACE 2008, 50, 186, 253; PALLOTTINO 1988, 487; BONFANTE 2002, 23, 178, 219; FOURNET 2012, 10.

<sup>62</sup> MÜLLER/DEECKE 1877b, 511; TORP 1903, 19; LATTES 1921, 277; MAZZARINO 1957, 106; TORP 1902, 35.

<sup>63</sup> CANUTI 2015, 10; KHARSEKIN 1963, 42-43; YATSEMIIRSKIY 2011, 295; PALLOTTINO 1988, 484; BONFANTE/BONFANTE 2002, 217; FOURNET 2012, 7.

<sup>64</sup> TORP 1903, 11; LATTES 1921, 277.

<sup>65</sup> MAZZARINO 1957, 106.

<sup>66</sup> KHARSEKIN 1963, 44.

<sup>67</sup> PALLOTTINO 1988, 106.

<sup>68</sup> BONFANTE 2002, 215; FOURNET 2012, 6.

<sup>69</sup> WALLACE 2008, 65; AGOSTINIANI 2013, 465; PITTAU 2018a, 126; PITTAU 2018, 88; RIX 2004, 956, 958, 961, 964.

<sup>70</sup> CANUTI 2015, 10; BENELLI 2017, 258.

<sup>71</sup> AGOSTINIANI 2013, 465.

<sup>72</sup> KHARSEKIN 1967a, 17.

<sup>73</sup> GINDIN 1967, 25, 165, 169-170.

<sup>74</sup> PUHVEL 1991, 313.

<sup>75</sup> GEORGIYEV 1958, 186-191.

<sup>76</sup> WALLACE 2008, 43-44, 95, 119; PALLOTTINO 1988, 455; BONFANTE/BONFANTE 2002, 84; AGOSTINIANI 2013, 473; BENELLI 2017, 254-255; RIX 2004, 951.

<sup>77</sup> FORTSON IV 2004, 246.

calling them Tyrrhenian<sup>78</sup>. We have already mentioned the extensive and coherent “Etruscoid” inscription discovered in 1885 and the recently discovered brief inscription from Hephaestia on Lemnos<sup>79</sup>. However, a language similar to Etruscan wasn’t found in Asia Minor, the habitat of the Hittites.

Thucydides described policies on the Chalcidice peninsula, which inhabited mixed barbarian bilingual tribes. Few tribes were represented by the Chalcidians, several tribes were the Thracians: Bisaltians, Crestonians, and Edonians, but mostly they were Pelasgians descended from the Tyrsenians, once lived in Lemnos and Athens (*Thuc.* IV, 109, 4). Herodotus even earlier mentioned the Pelasgians, who lived north of the Tyrsenians (Τυρσηνῶν) in the city of Creston (ἡ Κρηστῶν) (obviously, from the mentioned ethnonym “Crestonians” – *the author*) (*Hdt.* I, 57). Dionysius of Halicarnassus interpreted this mention of the “father of history” as a memory about the “Crotonians”, i.e., the inhabitants of the Greek *polis* Croton (in fact, ἡ Κρότων – “Croton or Crotonia” is fixed historical tradition) from the southern Italy (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* I, 29, 3). Above the text, the ancient rhetor confused this city with the Etruscan Cortona (now Cortona in the Tuscany region of Italy) (*Ant. Rom.* I, 20, 4, 26, 1), which is incorrect if anyone looks at the Etruscan inscriptions, for example, *curtun* (TLE 644 = *ThLE*, p. 119).

We found an ethnonym Τυρσηνῶν (Tyrsenians’s) associated with the Pelasgians, the ancient inhabitants of Lemnos, Athens and Acte (the east part of the Chalcidice peninsula) at Thucydides (*Thuc.* IV, 109, 4). Herodotus didn’t know the Tyrsenians on Lemnos, but did the Pelasgians (*Hdt.* V, 26; VI, 140). Diodorus from Sicily reported about the Pelasgians under the guise of the Tyrrhenians (οἱ Τυρρηνοί) (X, 19, 6). Also few messages of ancient authors mixed the Pelasgians with the Tyrsenians (Tyrrhenians) (*Ap. Rhod.* IV, 1760; *Myrs.* Frg. 2-3. *FHG* IV = Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.*, I, 28, 3; *Strab.* V, 2, 4, C. 221; *Hesych.* p. 1296 π).

This information and Homer’s news about the Pelasgians from Troy with the “Etruscan” name “Λήθοϛ” (*Hom. Il.*, II, 843), and not very clearly proven parallels with the famous Egyptian texts about the “Sea peoples” Peleset and Teresh, gave the right to some historians and linguists to draw conclusions about the origin of the ancestors of the Etruscans from Troad and the northern Aegean<sup>80</sup>. In this linguistic area, the Indo-European, hypothetical Early Thracian language of the Trojans was supposed to be mixed with the non-Indo-European language of the alleged Etruscan ancestors. As already noted, C. de Simone compared the word *heloke* from the “Tyrsenian” inscription, which was discovered in Hephaestia on Lemnos in 2009, with the Etruscan verb *helu(ce)*, for example, from the inscription on the Perugia stone (*CIE* 4538, A, 20 = *TLE* 570, A, 20), assuming it meaning “has erected, has reared”. Changes in vowel could transferred *helu* into *hilar*.

Hittite and Luvian languages on other hand included the pre-Indo-European layer of the Hattic language, which were known from a few ritual texts from the Hattusa archive

(Boğazköy, now Boğazkale). We aren’t sure that the Hittite predecessors from central Anatolia unexpectedly became a “Sea people,” but linguistic contacts between the Hittites and the early Thracians and Phrygians with non-Indo-European peoples of Western Asia Minor were quite possible. The word *zilat* in Hittite language meant “seat” (version of *tittah-zilat* – “large seat, throne” or «royal residence»)<sup>81</sup>. Some authors tried to connect it with the Etruscan official title *zilaθ* (*zilat*)<sup>82</sup>. No other approximations were noticed. There was well-known Hittite verb *hil* – “pour”, which, however, was also understood as “wash”<sup>83</sup>. In those days people washed with water, sand or ash, so we may assume the meaning “earth” for hypothetical derivatives of nouns, and taking in consideration Hittite “courtyard, gate, portico”, interpret *hil* as “covered gallery”, “fenced place”, “limited space of the ground”, “piece of land”, “land plot”. Thus, *hilar* is a “piece of land, land plot”.

It is also noteworthy that V. L. Tsymbursky approached Luvian *hila* and Etruscan theonyms *tin cilen* and *cilensl* on a model of a sheep’s liver from Piacenza (TLE 719<sup>1,16</sup>) with the assumption that they correspond to the heavenly “houses” (places) of Jupiter and Janus, and the region governed by the “*Nocturnus Ianitoresque terrestres*” (God of the night and the gatekeepers of the earth) in the treatise by Marcian Capella (I, 45–46, 60)<sup>84</sup>. Fluctuations of *kilamni* and *hilamni* in the Hittite language were noted<sup>85</sup>. However, *cilθcveti hilare* in the text of the Zagreb mummy (TLE 1<sup>VII,14</sup>) shows that *cilθ* and *hil* are not quite the same thing. However, the term *cilθ* has common base with the numeral *ci* – “three” (decrypted due to the Etruscan-Punic bilingual inscription from Pyrgi<sup>86</sup>) and with theonym *cilen* on the “liver of Piacenza”, meaning Etruscan Janus, the god of all beginnings, entrances, doors and gates.

Also in the latter discovered table from Cortona, we found the phrase: “*celtinei tiśś tarśminass*” (TCo, B, 35–36) which is translated “in the territory (or “in the area») of Lake Trasimeno”<sup>87</sup>. There is a certain similarity between *cilθ* and *celtinei* (*θ* and *t* in many Etruscan inscriptions convey the same sound, moreover, the archaic “*i*”<sup>88</sup>, which is natural in a religious, conventional text, and could be replaced by “*e*” in routine text). In our opinion, *cilθ* should be considered a designation of a part of the territory of Etruscan city, corresponding to the Roman territorial tribe (cf. *etr. ci* – “three” and *cilθ* with Latin *tres* – “three” and its dative/ablative *tribus*)<sup>89</sup>. Obviously, the correctly planned rectangular quarters of Etruscan cities were called so, because the Book of the Mummy clearly reported about the rituals of the sanctuary of the city tribe *śacnicleri cilθl spureri meθlumeric* (TLE 1<sup>II4-5; 16-17; V3, 6, 24; VIII35; IX5-6; 12-13, 21</sup>); *śacnicśtres cilθś śpureśtres* (TLE 1<sup>II, 1-2, 12-13; IX, 2, 9-10</sup>).

<sup>81</sup> FRIEDRICH AT ALII 1969, 447, 473, 475, 507; KASIAN 2010, 175, 182.

<sup>82</sup> IVANOV 1983, 41–42; MOSENKIS 2014, 15, 17, 24.

<sup>83</sup> KASIAN 2010, 181.

<sup>84</sup> TSYMBURSKY 2006, 16.

<sup>85</sup> IVANOV 2001, 87.

<sup>86</sup> KHARSEKIN 1969, 56; YATSEMIKSKIY 2011, 195; WALLACE 2008, 54; PALLOTTINO 1988, 481; BONFANTE 2002, 215; AGOSTINIANI 2013, 461, 475; BENELLI 2017, 257; FOURNET 2012, 5; RIX 2004, 961.

<sup>87</sup> BONFANTE/BONFANTE 2002, 219; AGOSTINIANI/NICOSIA 2000, 112–114.

<sup>88</sup> KHARSEKIN 1969, 40.

<sup>89</sup> YANKO 2019, 211.

<sup>78</sup> YATSEMIKSKIY 2011, 15–16; BENELLI 2017, 264–265; RIX 2004, 944.

<sup>79</sup> BRANDENSTEIN 1948, 1991–1936.

<sup>80</sup> GINDIN/TSYMBURSKY 1996, 164–168; SAFRONOV 2015, 804, 806–808.



A. I. Nemirovsky hypothesized that theonyms on the rim of the “liver from Piacenza” represent the calendar system, and the first and last of these menonyms-theonyms (*tin cilen and cilensl*) constitute the “home” of the Etruscan god Kilen, with functions similar to the Roman Janus, who looks at the first and the last day of year, and is the god of gates and all entrances and exits<sup>90</sup>. Links with the goddesses Ceres, Tellus (Earth as “soil”), Earth Father Vulcanus and Genius from the fifth “house” at Marcian Capella (I, 49), and with the fifth cell of the model’s rim with the menonym *tecum* (*tekan*, gen. *taknaš* – “earth, soil” in Hittite<sup>91</sup> allowed us to consider the word *tecum* the designation of the soil<sup>92</sup>.

Roman Twelve Tables didn’t use the term *villa*, proposing instead “*hortus*” (courtyard, fenced place) which means estate (*Tab. Duod. VII, 3* = Plin. *NH, XIX, 50*). However, the Greek words ὁ κλήρος (lots, land plot made by lottery) and ἡ κληρουχία (colony) weren’t found in Etruscan inscriptions. The definition τό χωρίον was utilized in the official documents of Attica in the 5<sup>th</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> centuries BC, could be translated as “locality, country, land” and “fortified place”, instead of the term of the 7<sup>th</sup> century BC ὁ κλήρος (land determined by lot)<sup>93</sup>. It is unlikely that the property relations of the Etruscans at this time were significantly different from the Greeks and the Romans. Given the nature of the life of a military settler, the interpretation of the name of a piece of land as a fortified place is quite acceptable. Therefore, *tular hilar* in Etruscan inscriptions should be understood as a designation of the boundaries of the land allotment.

The term *claruxies* was formed as Etruscan personal names. In the nominative, it should look like *claruxie*; and the suffix *ś* was an indicator of genitive I. It has long been noted that this word is a borrowing from Greek ὁ κληροῦχος (colonist) with distinctive Dorian *α* instead of *η*. Where did the Etruscans borrow the Dorian letter, because they constantly fought with the Sicilian Syracuse, inhabited by native speakers of the Doric dialect of the ancient Greek language? M. Canuti suggested that borrowing came from the Syracusans to the Etruscans after the Roman conquest of both Etruscan policies and Sicily<sup>94</sup>. I disagree with this statement, because Etruscan inscriptions on the boundaries of land imply a legal system that protects the elite of the native speakers. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC, it could be assumed that borrowing was Latin, and not Greek Dorian, especially since the Greeks had started a war.

However, there is a reason for an earlier dating. Basing on the paleographic features, the inscriptions should be dated to some time earlier the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC. It could be suggested that borrowing wasn’t from Syracuse, but from some other Doric *police* of Magna Graecia (Great Greece). For example, such policies may be Gimera and Selinunt. The term ὁ κλήρος has early origin and therefore could have been introduced into the Etruscan language in the archaic era, i.e., before the defeat of these Dorian policies by the Punians at the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC (*Diod. Sic. XIII, 54-62*; *Xen. Hell. I, 1, 37*; *Cic. Verr. II, 2, 35, 86*). During that period, Himera

<sup>90</sup> NEMIROVSKIY 1986, 111.

<sup>91</sup> YATSEMIKSKIY 2011, 107; WEEKS 1985, 8, 9, 105, 109, 241.

<sup>92</sup> NEMIROVSKIY 1986, 113.

<sup>93</sup> ANDREEV 1983, 252, 272.

<sup>94</sup> CANUTI 2015, 12.

and Selinunt were known as transit points of the trade flow between Etruria and Carthage<sup>95</sup>. The allied relations between the Etruscans and the Carthaginians are well known not only from narrative sources (*Hdt. I, 166*; *Aristot. Pol. III, 5, 10, 1280a, 35*), but also from the inscription – the famous Etruscan-Punian bilingual inscription from Pyrgi (*CIE 6314-6315* = *TLE 874-875* = *ET Cr. 4.4-5*), which talks about an offering of the local leader Tefarius Veliana to the Phoenician goddess Astarte, named in the Etruscan texts as Uni<sup>96</sup>.

Borrowing *claruxies* could occur earlier the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC. Diodorus of Sicily described, basing on Timaeus from Tauromenium, as in 396 BC the mercenaries of Dionysius of Syracuse by his order κατακληρουχίσαντες (dividing by lot, dividing into plots) divided the *chora* of the Sicilian city of Leontina, receiving land allotments as payment for their service (*Diod. Sic. XIV, 78, 1-3*). The use of the cognate word with the designation of cleruch makes us suggest that such phrases were also used by Timaeus’ contemporaries who could hear phrases from their ancestors, eyewitnesses of the events. E. D. Frolov, describing this and other cases of payback by the land of the conquered Sicilian cities, named these territories as military agricultural colonies of Dionysius the Elder with his mercenaries<sup>97</sup>. It means that a phenomenon was same in Sicily and in Athens or later in the Hellenistic monarchies in the East.

Sources recorded Etruscan mercenaries in the troops of Agathocles of Syracuse in the 4<sup>th</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BC (*Diod. Sic. XX, 11, 1; 64, 2; XXI, 3, 1-2*). They could also bring home terms for hired warriors, plot holders in Sicily.

#### 4. INTERPRETATION OF THE WHOLE INSCRIPTION

Now let’s try to translate the whole inscription: “*a*) <sup>1</sup>*ein. ser. vl. remzna. clanc* <sup>2</sup>*au. latini. cesu. b) tular. hilar. nesl. c) claruxies*». The first word *ein* is offered to be considered a particle of negation. However, it is possible that *ein, ei, en, enas* are indicative or relative pronouns, similar to the pronoun *an* – “which, that” (*TLE 131; 321*)<sup>98</sup>.

A completely “key” inscription from Suesula looks like *mi xulixna qupes alθrnas ei minipi capi mini θanu* (*TLE 12* = *ET Cm 2.13*). The term *xulixna* is clearly a Greek borrowing ἡ κύλιχνη – «cup, bowl.» All etruscologists have agreed with this. But a part of the inscription *minipi capi* S. A. Yatsemirsky offered to translate “for myself” or “for me”<sup>99</sup>. The translation with the negation (taking into account the whole inscription) could be like this: «I’m a cup of Qupe Altrna, don’t take me, I am Tana’s.» Yatsemirsky’s translation without taking into account the final phrase “I’m a Cup of Qupe Altrna, which for me ...” wasn’t much different from the previous one, however, the linguist noted that the use of the pronoun was recorded

<sup>95</sup> DUNBABIN 1948, 300; VYSOKIY 2004, 274; ASHERI 1988, 756; ROSS HOLLOWAY 2004, 124.

<sup>96</sup> HEURGON 2009, 304; KHARSEKIN 1976, 344-346; NEMIROVSKIY 1983, 88-90; KHARSEKIN 1969, 51-52; YATSEMIKSKIY 2011, 54, 269-270; WALLACE 2008, 7-8; PALLOTTINO 1988, 149, 159, 160, 162, 177, 384, 400, 420-421; BONFANTE/BONFANTE 2002, 115; AGOSTINIANI 2013, 464; BENELLI 2017, 267.

<sup>97</sup> FROLOV 2001, 428-430.

<sup>98</sup> YATSEMIKSKIY 2011, 190-191.

<sup>99</sup> YATSEMIKSKIY 2011, 188-189.

only for animated subjects<sup>100</sup>. Further, he examined another similar inscription from Suesula, 5<sup>th</sup> century BC (*TLE* 13 = *ET Cm* 2.46)<sup>101</sup>. Here he was already more confident and translated the particle *ei* as “not”, adding another negation *nunar* to it, suggesting that there could be a contrast – “I’m the cup for (...), and not for (...)”. Obviously, the first word of our translation should be «not».

Next, *hapax* should be interpreted. In my opinion, *ser* was an abbreviation of the *praenomen*. In Bomarzo (outskirts of ancient Volsinia, near Orvieto), the inscription has long been discovered where the abbreviation of the *serv* praenomen is recognized (*CII* 2424 = *CIE* 5630). Also the prefix *servei* and the gentile name *servi* were found in the inscriptions from Perugia in Roman period (*CIE* 4462, 4463). Perhaps, this name could be *Servius* in Latin (associated with the social term *servus*). It is possible that we have the abbreviation of another name, *sertur* and similar personal names (*ThLE*, p. 318), but most likely, *sertur* was abbreviated to *se* (*CIE* 4054; 4135; 4143; 4213; 4220, Perugia), if it was not the name *seθre* (*CIE* 4336; 4381, Perugia). Thus, the second reduction of *vl* was, apparently, a patronymic, and translation of the first line of the inscription: “Not Servius, son of Vel, Remzna ...”.

Further, not everything is clear. It is possible to accept the translation for the phrase “... *clanc au. latini* ...” (and the son of Aulus Latinius), but following the grammar “... and the son, Aulus Latinius...”. Then the next verb *cesu* can be translated both “lies” and “lie”, taking in consideration that the inscription was not a grave epitaph (the word *θui* is not standard for this phrase – “here”; there are no grave and tomb designations, respectively, *suθi* and *θaura*) we may assume the translation “lies” or “paved”. However, there is no suffix *-ce* (-*χε*) known for the Etruscan past tense verb, so the first interpretation remains.

S. A. Yatsemirsky translated this part of the inscription as follows: “... *vl. remzna. clanc au. latini. cesu* ... “(Vel Remtsna led and his son, Aulus Latini, (here) rest”<sup>102</sup>. However, he did not deny that in the late period of the Etruscan language, the media passive forms of the verb with the ending *-u* were conserved as a formant of the actor name and the instrument of action, that is, transformed into *cognomen*<sup>103</sup>. But we accepted that this inscription may not be so late when cognomens appeared in Etruscan onomastics. It should also be accepted that this inscription was not funerary.

According to our assumptions, the last part of the inscription *tular. hilar. nesl. claruxies* is translated: «border (of the land, possessions, slot) of the deceased (dead) cleruch». In our opinion, it is a contrast: “Not Servius, the son of Vel, Remzna and the son of Aulus Latini (here) are resting, but the boundary of the land (possession, slot) of the deceased (dead) cleruch”.

Indirect evidence suggests that the Etruscans had alienation of land law. This can be found in the reports of the uprising in Volsinia in the 265-264 BC. Valerius Maximus pointed out that the rebels “*testamenta ad arbitrium suum*

*scribi iubebant*” (will to write down the property order) (*Val. Max.*, IX, 1, ext. 2). Therefore, before this they had a law that complicated alienation of land. In our inscription, possession is called the site of the deceased in the same way as it was done in Athens in the classical period, when the law of Solon in the beginning of the 6<sup>th</sup> century BC acted. Solon law allowed the childless Athenians to bequeath “*τὰ χρήματα καὶ τὸν οἶκον*” (property and household) to those whom they pleased, and did not leave property to their family (Plut., *Sol.*, 21). The words “*καὶ τὰ χρήματα κτήματα τῶν ἐχόντων ἐποίησεν*” (and property reasonably made property) also mean the right to alienate land ownerships (“*τό κτήμα*” can be translated as “land ownership”) if the person desired. However, in Athens, this became practically possible only at the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC<sup>104</sup>. We know that, according to Isaeus, it was possible to bequeath the land only by adoption (*Is.* VI, 10; VII, 1-4). Also Aristotle reported about the Theban adoption laws written to preserve land ownership (Aristot. *Pol.*, II, 9, 7, 1274b, 5). Even in the time of Demosthenes, a land allotment could also be bequeathed only by adoption, and at the same time the *claire* continued to be called by deceased name (*Demosth.* XLIV, 1-2)<sup>105</sup>. Perhaps the same order was in Etruscan policies which had close contacts with the Athenians and enmity with Syracuse, because they took the side of Athens during the Sicilian expedition of the late 5<sup>th</sup> century BC (*Thuc.* VI, 88, 6; VI, 103, 2; *Elogia Tarquiniensia*, tav. 1 / A, fr. 1; r. 3-6).

Different gentile names indicate that the characters of the inscription did not have consanguinity. The fact that a man with two abbreviated names and patronymics proved the father of a second person (he is called a son) suggests that Aulus Latini inherited the site due to adoption, but he was not an orphan, because he was named by a full two-part name, and the gentile name was quite famous for Clusium and Volsinia (Orvieto) (*CIE* 1758, 1759, 2357, 2373, 4988). It seems that the adopted son was among the ancestors of the Latins, because he had the family name Latini. Cleruch, obviously, was Servius Remzna, son of Vel. Perhaps his name meant the designation of mercenaries in the service of the Etruscan leaders, and the allotment had his name. This is the hereditary possession of Aulus Latini that the inscription reports.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

The inscription is not a funerary, but a boundary pillar with owner mark of the allotment. Dating according to the paleographic features of the letters is assumed to be earlier than the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC. We accept the word *ein* as a particle of negation “not”, we consider *ser* the abbreviation of the praenomen *servei*, define *hilar* as the designation of land. *Claruxies*, obviously, was the term in the genitive for military colonist formed as the personal names of the Etruscans. Full translation of the inscription: “a) <sup>1</sup>Not Servius, son of Vel, Remzna and son of <sup>2</sup>Aulus Latini (here) are resting; b) and the boundary of the land (possessions, slot) of the deceased (dead); c) cleruch.”

<sup>100</sup> YATSEMIKSIY 2011, 190-191.

<sup>101</sup> YATSEMIKSIY 2011, 232.

<sup>102</sup> YATSEMIKSIY 2011, 210.

<sup>103</sup> YATSEMIKSIY 2011, 215.

<sup>104</sup> FINE 1951, 190.

<sup>105</sup> LURIE 1993, 176, n. 4.



## ABBREVIATIONS

- CIE** - Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum  
**CII** - Corpus Inscriptionum Italicarum  
**CIL** - Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum  
**ET** - Etruskische Texte  
**TCo** - Tabula Cortonensis  
**TLE** - Testimonia Linguae Etruscae  
**ThLE** - Thesaurus Linguae Etruscae

## REFERENCES

- AGOSTINIANI 2013  
 Agostiniani, L., The Etruscan language. In: *The Etruscan world* / Ed. J. MacIntosh Turfa. (London; New York: Routledge), 457-477.
- AGOSTINIANI/NICOSIA 2000  
 Agostiniani L./Nicosia F., *Tabula Cortonensis*. (Roma: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider).
- ANDREEV 1983  
 Andreev, V. N., Agrarian relations in Attica in the 5-4 c. BC. In.: *Antique Greece. Polis Development Issues. Vol. 1*, 247-326.
- ASHERI 1988  
 Asheri, D., Carthaginians and Greeks. In.: *The Cambridge Ancient History. 2nd ed. Vol. 4*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 739-780.
- BELFIORE 2019  
 Belfiore, V., Definizioni locali di spazi tombali. In: *L'écriture et l'espace de la mort. épigraphie et nécropoles à l'époque préromaine* / Marie-Laurence Haack (dir.). *Collection de l'École française de Rome*. URL: <https://books.openedition.org/efr/2776?lang=fr#ftn87>
- BELFIORE/VAN HEEMS 2010  
 Belfiore, V./van Heems, G., Neue Betrachtungen zum Liber Linteus – Die Begriffe *hil* und *sacni*. Neue Forschungen zu den Etruskern: Beiträge der Tagung vom 07. bis 09. November 2008 am Archäologischen Institut der Universität Bonn. (Bonn: BAR International Series 2163), 113-121.
- BENELLI 2017  
 Benelli, E., Alphabets and language. In: *Etruscology Vol. 1.* / Ed. A. Naso. (Boston; Berlin: De Gruyter), 245-274.
- BONFANTE/BONFANTE 2002  
 Bonfante, G./ Bonfante, L., *Etruscan language. An introduction*. (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
- BRANDENSTEIN 1948  
 Brandenstein, W., s.v., Tyrrhener, *Real-Encyclopädie* vol. 7A, 1909-1938.
- CANUTI 2015  
 Canuti, M., Il cippo Bucelli (ET Cl 8.5 CIE 886) e alcune considerazioni sui limiti dell'interpretazione dell'etrusco con in appendice la presentazione di un'iscrizione latina inedita della collezione Santi Betti. Chiusi e il Mediterraneo Antico. Ciclo di conferenze (17 ottobre 2015). (Chiusi: Il Gruppo Archeologico "Città di Chiusi"), 1-26.
- DE SIMONE 2011  
 De Simone, C., La Nuova Iscrizione "Tirsénica" di Lemnos (Efestia, teatro): considerazioni generali, *Rasenna: Journal of the Center for Etruscan Studies*, 3, 1-34.
- DUNBABIN 1948  
 Dunbabin, T. J., *The Western Greeks: The History of Sicily and South Italy from the Foundation of the Greek Colonies to 480 B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- FACCHETTI 2002  
 Facchetti, G., L'Appellativo etrusco *etera*, *Studi Etruschi*, 65-68, 225-235.
- FACCHETTI 2009/2012  
 Facchetti, G., Note etrusche (II), "AIQN", 31, 223-267.
- FINE 1951  
 Fine, J. V. A., *Horoi studies in mortgage, real security, and land tenure in ancient Athens* (Princeton: American School of a classical studies at Athens).
- FORTSON IV 2004  
 Fortson, IV, B. W., *Indo-European language and culture. An introduction*. (Oxford: Blackwell).
- FOURNET 2012  
 Fournet, A., A Tentative Etymological Glossary of Etruscan, *The Macro-comparative journal*, 3, 2, 1-14.
- FRIEDRICH et alii 1969  
 Friedrich, J., Reiner, E., Kammenhuber, A., Neumann, G., Heubeck A., *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen [und Elamitisch]. Abt. 1. Bd. II. Abschn. 1/2. Lfg. 2*. (Leiden; Köln: E. J. Brill).
- FROLOV 2001  
 Frolov E. D. *Greece in the era of the late classics (Society. Personality. Authority)*. (St. Petersburg: Gumanitarnaya akademiya).
- GEORGIYEV 1958  
 Georgiyev, V. I. *Research on comparative historical linguistics. (Kinship of Indo-European languages)*. (Moscow: Publishing house of the USSR Academy of Sciences).
- GINDIN 1967  
 Gindin, L. A., *The language of the oldest population of the south of the Balkan Peninsula. Fragment of Indo-European onomastics* (Moscow: Nauka).
- GINDIN/TSYMBURSKY 1996  
 Gindin, L. A./Tsybursky, V. L., *Homer and the history of the Eastern Mediterranean*. (Moscow: Nauka).
- HARRIS 2012  
 Harris, E. M., Horoi. In.: *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, 3305–3306.
- HEURGON 2009  
 Heurgon, J., *Everyday life of the Etruscans* (Moscow: Molodaya Gvardiya).
- IVANOV 2001  
 Ivanov, V. V., *Hittite language* (Moscow: Editorial URSS).
- IVANOV 1983  
 Ivanov, V. V., To the interpretation of Etruscan texts based on comparative linguistics. In.: *Text: semantics and structure*. (Moscow: Nauka), 36-46.
- KASIAN 2010  
 Kasian, A. S., Hattic language. In.: *Languages of the World: Ancient Relict Languages of the Near East.* / N. N. Kazansky, A. A. Kibrik, Yu. B. Koryakov (eds.). (Moscow: Academia, 2010), 168-184.
- KHARSEKIN 1963  
 Kharsekin, A. I., *Issues of interpretation of the monuments of Etruscan writing* (Stavropol: Stavropol book publishing house).
- KHARSEKIN 1967a  
 Kharsekin, A. I., *Etruscan inscriptions as a historical source. PhD thesis* (Voronezh: Voronezh State University).
- KHARSEKIN 1967b  
 Kharsekin, A. I., To the question of the relationship of Etruscan and Greek languages. (Greek-Etruscan vocabulary matches). *Ancient society: proceedings of a conference on the study of the problems of antiquity* (Leningrad, April 9-14, 1964). (Moscow: Nauka), 208-219.
- KHARSEKIN 1969  
 Kharsekin, A. I., Etruscan epigraphy and Etruscan language. In: Nemirovskiy, A. I., Kharsekin, A. I., *Etruscans. Introduction to Etruscology*, (Voronezh: Voronezh State University), 26-67.
- KHARSEKIN 1976  
 Kharsekin, A. I., About the Etruscan language. In: *Secrets*

- of ancient writings. *Decryption problems*. (Moscow: Nauka), 339-348.
- LANZI 1789  
Lanzi, L., *Saggio di lingua etrusca: e di altre antiche d'Italia, per servire alla storia de' popoli, delle lingue, e delle belle arti*. T. II. (Roma: Nella Stamperia Pagliarini)
- LANZI 1824  
Lanzi, L., *Saggio di lingua etrusca e di altre antiche d'Italia: per servire alla storia de' popoli, delle lingue e delle belle arti*. 2 ed. T. II. (Firenze: Alla Tipografia di Attilio Tofawi).
- LATTES 1921  
Lattes, E., Ancora dei cleruchi etruschi in Egitto, *Aegyptus*, 3/4, 276-280.
- LURIE 1993  
Lurie, S. Y., *History of Greece* (St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State University).
- MAFFEI 1740  
*Osservazioni letterarie che possono servir di continuazione al Giornal de' letterati d'Italia / Ed. S. Maffei*. T. VI. (Verona: Nella Stamperia del Seminario).
- MAZZARINO 1957  
Mazzarino, S., Sociologia del mondo etrusco e problemi della tarda etruscità, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 6, 1, 98-122.
- MOSENKIS 2014  
Mosenkis, Yu. L. Tyrrhenian etymological lexicon: Lemnian and Etruscan. In: *Language and History: Collection of Scientific Papers*, 311. (Kyiv: Private Entrepreneur Zhovtyi), 4-29.
- MÜLLER/DEECKE 1877A  
müller, K. O./Deecke W., *Die Etrusker*. Bd. 1. (Stuttgart: Verlag von Albert Heitz).
- MÜLLER/DEECKE 1877B  
Müller, K. O., Deecke, W., *Die Etrusker*. Bd. 2. (Stuttgart: Verlag von Albert Heitz).
- NEMIROVSKIY 1986  
Nemirovskiy, A. I., The bronze model of the liver from Piacenza as a calendar system, *Vestnik Drevney Istorii*, 4, 109-118.
- NEMIROVSKIY 1983  
Nemirovskiy, A. I., *Etruscans: from myth to history* (Moscow: Nauka)
- PALLOTTINO 1988  
Pallottino, M., *Etruskologie: Geschichte und Kultur der Etrusker*. (Basel: Springer Basel AG).
- PAULI 1881  
Pauli, C., Noch einmal die lautni- und etera- Frage. In: *Etruskische Forschungen und Studien*. H. I. (Stuttgart: Verlag von Albert Heitz), 1-65.
- PITTAU 2018a  
Pittau, M., *Dizionario della lingua etrusca. Dictionary of The Etruscan Language*. (Dublin: Ipazia Books).
- PITTAU 2018b  
Pittau, M., *La lingua etrusca: Grammatica e Lessico*. (Dublin: Ipazia Books).
- PUHVEL 1991  
Puhvel, J., *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Vol. 3: *Words beginning with H*. (Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter).
- RIX 2004  
Rix, H., Etruscan. In: *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages / Ed. R. D. Woodard*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 943-966.
- ROSS HOLLOWAY 2004  
Ross Holloway, R., *The Archaeology of Ancient Sicily* (London; New York: Routledge).
- SCHULTHESS 1921  
Schulthess, O., Κληροῦχοι, *Real-Encyclopädie*, vol. 11, 814-832.
- SAFRONOV 2015  
Safronov, A. V., Greek sources of Pelasgians and Tyrsenians in Anatolia and its Egyptian correspondences. Indo-European linguistics and classical philology-XIX Proceedings of the 19th Conference in Memory of Professor Joseph M. Tronsky. June 22-24, 2015. (St. Petersburg: Nauka), 803-810.
- TORP 1902  
Torp, A., *Etruskische Beiträge*. H. I. (Leipzig: Johann Ambrosius Barth).
- TORP 1903  
Torp, A., *Etruskische Beiträge*. H. II. (Leipzig: Johann Ambrosius Barth).
- TSYMBURSKY 2006  
Tsybursky, V. L., Thracian-Hittite-Luvian formulaic correspondences: their types and possibilities of chronology. In: *Indo-Iranian Linguistics and the Typology of Linguistic Situations: a collection of articles on the 75th anniversary of Professor A. L. Grunberg*. (St. Petersburg: Nauka), 1-40.
- VYSOKIY 2004  
Vysokiy V. F. *The history of Sicily in the archaic era (Early Greek tyranny of the end of the 7th – the middle of the 5th century BC)*. (St. Petersburg: Gumanitarnaya akademiya).
- WALLACE 2008  
Wallace, R. E., *Zich Rasna. A manual of the Etruscan language and inscriptions*. (Ann Arbor; New York: Beech Stave Press).
- WEEKS 1985  
Weeks, D. M., *Hittite Vocabulary: An Anatolian Appendix to Buck's Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*. Diss. Doctor of Philosophy in Indo-European Studies. (Los Angeles: University of California).
- YANKO 2019  
Yanko, A. L., *Etruscans: social-political organization (c. 8-3 BCE)*. (Kharkiv: Maidan).
- YATSEMIIRSKIY 2011  
Yatsemirskiy, S. A., *The experience of a comparative description of the Minoan, Etruscan and related languages* (Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskoy kultury).