

## THE *TABULA CORTONENSIS* AND LAND TRANSACTIONS

Recently R. A. Wallace has dedicated a chapter of his book ‘Zikh Rasna. *A Manual of Etruscan Language and Inscriptions*’ (2008) to the inscription of the bronze *Tabula Cortonensis*<sup>1</sup>. The Tablet of Cortona, hereafter TCo, was handed in by a carpenter to the Carabinieri at Camucia (Cortona) in 1992. The *editio princeps* was published by L. Agostiniani and F. Nicosia in 2000.

The text is extremely important since it is, after the *Liber linteus Zagrabiensis* and the *Tabula Capuana*, the third longest extant Etruscan text (206 words; 32 lines on side A and 8 lines on side B). It is, however, difficult to interpret and translate for lexical, morphological, grammatical, and syntactical reasons.

Wallace’s tentative translation of the text is based on interpretations and translations advanced by Agostiniani and Nicosia (2000), H. Rix (2000, 2002), G. M. Facchetti (2000, 2002b), A. Maggiani (2001, 2002b), V. Scarano Ussani and M. Torelli (2003), K. Wylín (2002a, 2006b) and I.-J. Adiego (2005). The publications of C. De Simone (1998-2007), P. Amann (2005), Wylín (2005) and Torelli (2005) were not used by Wallace. It appears that there is no consensus on the meaning(s) of about half of the sixty different non-onomastic lexical units, many of which are or look like *hapax legomena*.

This article aims to detect their semantic values from the textual context and with the use of the combinatory method, that is, by comparing words in the TCo text with those in the corpus of ca 11,000 Etruscan inscriptions. Some words and syntagmata will also be studied from a chrono-typological, interlinguistic, etymological, and contemporary, bicultural perspective (e.g. Cato’s *De agri cultura*). The approach is employed with the aim to translate the text completely in order to understand the juridical, societal, social, economic, agricultural, material and religious aspects of its content.

The text of TCo focuses on a land transaction between Pêtru Scêvaś and the Cusuthur, the Cusu family, in fact sons of Laris Cusu. The find spot near Cortona is unknown. Even if it were known, it may not have been the original context as the tablet was found in seven rectangular pieces. At an unknown moment the tablet was broken into eight rectangular pieces, one of which is missing. The fragmentation may, according

---

My thanks are due to Massimiliano Canuti, Armando Cherici, Andrea Ciacci, Heiner Eichner, Jean Hadas-Lebel, Luuk de Ligt, Saskia Stevens and especially to Luciano Agostiniani who showed me his forthcoming article, Koen Wylín and Daniele Maras for their precious criticism and to Jean MacIntosh Turfa and Kathy MacDonald for the correction of my English. All errors are my responsibility.

<sup>1</sup> Museo della Città Etrusca e Romana di Cortona, inv. 234.918; 28.5 × 45.8 × 0.2-0.27 cm; actual weight: 2295 g; original weight: ca 2581 g.

to Agnati, point to a ritual act, ‘a conservative destruction’<sup>2</sup>. It almost excludes the possibility that the fragments were destined for a crucible. Five incomplete bronze artifacts said to have been found together with the tablet – which is far from certain – are dated to the third and second centuries BC. They do not cast light on the most recent context<sup>3</sup>. The tablet may first have been inserted horizontally into a filing cabinet, in successive houses of the Cusu family (lines A18-20; B4-5).

#### THE DATE

The TCo is dated by Rix between ca 250 and 175 BC<sup>4</sup>, by Agostiniani & Nicosia to the end of the third and the first half of the second century BC<sup>5</sup>, and by Torelli to the second century BC and not earlier, because Cortona would have been booming from around 200 BC when the Porta Bifora was inserted in the western part of the city wall. The two bronze statuettes, dedicated by Velia Cvinti Arntias to the male gods Selans (Selvans) and Culsans, both protectors of boundaries and gates, found just outside the gate, would have been dedicated at the same time<sup>6</sup>. However, the statuettes are usually dated to ca 300-250 BC<sup>7</sup>, possibly even before ca 310 BC when the city wall was built in response to the Roman threat<sup>8</sup>. The Porta Bifora is usually dated to the second or first century BC<sup>9</sup>. We know from Livy that eight Etruscan *populi* (peoples of cities) promised to sustain Rome with all kinds of material support at the end of the Second Punic War, in 205 BC. He does not mention the people of Cortona<sup>10</sup>. This may mean that there was a local economic crisis, probably due to devastations of land during the battle to the south of Cortona along Lake Trasimene near Tuoro in 217 BC<sup>11</sup>. In addition, Torelli tentatively deduces from regional Etruscan bronze coins with the inscription *peiθesa* (probably *cognomen* of a military leader) and bronze coins showing a head of a

<sup>2</sup> AGNATI 2005. SERRA RIDGWAY 2001, p. 279 suggests that the *Tabula* fragments came from a tomb in view of the religious/funerary breaking and the state of preservation. However, artifacts like bronze mirrors in tombs are bent, mutilated or perforated, but not fragmented.

<sup>3</sup> NICOSIA 2002, pp. 17-25; MANCINI 2005.

<sup>4</sup> RIX 2000, p. 11.

<sup>5</sup> AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, pp. 45-46 (based on studies of Etruscan alphabets by A. Maggiani).

<sup>6</sup> SCARANO USSANI-TORELLI 2003, p. 13; RIX, *ET Co* 3.3 and 3.4.

<sup>7</sup> G. CAMPOREALE, in *AnnMuseoFaina* XIX, 2012, p. 337; BENTZ 1992, pp. 49-52; AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, p. 129.

<sup>8</sup> M. GIUMAN, in MASSERIA 2001, p. 15.

<sup>9</sup> C. PILO and M. MENICETTI, in FORTUNELLI 2005, pp. 335-342; 358 (second century BC); M. FABBRI, in MASSERIA 2001, p. 56 (Fabbri’s dating of the statuettes to the second century BC is too low).

<sup>10</sup> LIV. XXVIII 45, 14-21 mentions *Caerites*, *Populontenses*, *Tarquinienses*, *Volaterrani*, *Arretini*, *Perusini*, *Clusini* and *Rusellani*. For a positive view of the economic situation, see AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, p. 85, notes 136-137. The number of inscriptions from Cortona (ca 60), however, is extremely low, compared to the thousands from Chiusi and Perugia.

<sup>11</sup> LIV. XXII 4, 1 (*inter Cortonam urbem Trasumenumque lacum*).

black man and elephant that part of the Cortonese population assisted Hannibal against Rome<sup>12</sup>. It cannot be established whether the TCo was written before or after 205 BC. The battle of 217 BC may be the *terminus post quem*. As we will see, the contents of TCo may point to an economic crisis at the end of the third and the beginning of the second century BC.

Before analyzing the text there follow here the transcription and two recent translations, the minimalist one of Wallace (2008) and the maximalist of Torelli (2005).

#### TRANSCRIPTION

The text is that presented by L. Agostiniani (forthcoming) and A. Maggiani, with Agostiniani's reconstructions of the missing part of the tablet placed between brackets (A26-32)<sup>13</sup>. The spelling here is the conventional one. The typical Cortonese retrograde letter E, written *dextrorsus*, is rendered as *ê*<sup>14</sup>. The Greek letter *san* (M) is rendered as *ś*, the *sigma* as *s*, which in Northern Etruria was pronounced as *sh*, and the exceptional *s* which looks like the only *sigma* with four strokes as *ś* (mainly present in Caere, Veii, the *Ager Faliscus*, Latium and Campania). The latter is only used in the numeral *śIII*) in A5. The symbol *)* symbolizes the retrograde *gamma*, so written *dextrorsus*. The // symbol represents the *a capo* sign *-|-* and is a text division<sup>15</sup>. The space between [ ] indicates an unwritten space or a missing part of the tablet. Agostiniani reads tentatively in A4: *clθii*, and in B8: *pitlnal*. In A 5 he reads: *raśnaśIII)*.

#### Side A (recto)

- 1 e.t.pêtruiścê[ ]vêśêliuntś.v
- 2 inac.restmc.cen[ ]u.tênθursar.cus
- 3 uθuraś.larisal[i]svla.pesc.spante.tênθur.
- 4 sa.śran.śarc.clθiltêrsna.θui.spanθi.ml
- 5 eśiêθic.raśna śIII)[ ]inni.pes.pêtruś.pav
- 6 ac.traulac.tiur.tên[θ]urc.tênθa.zacinat.pr
- 7 iniserac.zal//cś.êśisvêrêcusuθursum.p
- 8 es.pêtruśta.scev[as]//nuθanatur.lartpêtr
- 9 uni.arnt.pini.lart.v[i]pi.lusce.laris.salini.v
- 10 êtnal.lart.vêlara.larθalisa.lart.vêlara
- 11 aulesa.vêl.pumpu.pruciu.aulecêlatina.sê

<sup>12</sup> SCARANO USSANI-TORELLI 2003, p. 20. CATALI 2000, p. 95 dates the coins to the First Punic War. GORINI 2005, pp. 363-372 dates them to 208-207 BC.

<sup>13</sup> AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, p. 55; MAGGIANI 2001, pp. 95-96; RIX 2000, p. 13. Except for A32 each lost line in the lost fragment 8 may have contained ca 14 letters.

<sup>14</sup> For the *ê* and the Etruscan phoneme system see EICHNER 2006; MARCHESI 2001, pp. 124-125.

<sup>15</sup> PERUZZI 2002, pp. 39-42; MARCHESI 2001, p. 124.

- 12 tmnal.arnza.fêl̥sni.vêl̥θinal.vêl̥.luisna  
 13 lusce.vêlusl̥na.nufresa.laru.slanzu.larz  
 14 alartlevêlavesarnt.pêtru.raufe//êpru  
 15 š.ame.vêl̥xe.cusularisal.cleniarc.laris  
 16 [c]usul[a]risalisalarizac.clan.larisal.pêtr  
 17 u.scê[va]šarntlei.pêtruš.puia  
 18 cên.zic.ziχux̥e.sparzêst̥iś.šazleis̥.in  
 19 θux̥ti.cusuθuraś.suθiu.ame.tal.suθive  
 20 naś.ratm.θux̥t.ceśu.tltel.têi.sianś.spa  
 21 rzête.θui.salt.zic.fratuce.cusuθuraś.la  
 22 risalisvla.pêtruśc.scêvas.pess̥.tarχian  
 23 êś//c̥nl.nuθe.malec.lart.cucrina.lausisa (a vertical line is added in //)  
 24 zilaθmex̥l.raśnal[la]ris.cêlatina.lau  
 25 sa[cl]anc.arnt.luscni.[a]rnθal.clanc.larz  
 26 a.lart.turmna.salina[l.lart.cêlatina.a]  
 27 pnal.cleniarc.vêl̥xe [- - 7/8 - - papal]  
 28 šerc.vêl̥xe.cusu aule[sa. - - 11/12 - -]  
 29 animalc.laris.fuln[i. - - 7/8 - - .clenia]  
 30 rc.lart.pêtce.uslnal [- - 13/14 - -]  
 31 inaθur.têcsinal.vêl̥[θur.titl̥ni.vêl̥θur]  
 32 uś.larisc.cusu.uslna[l.]

## Side B (verso)

- 1 aulesalini[ ]cusual  
 2 zilci.larθal.c[ ]usuś.titinal  
 3 larisalc.saliniśaulesla.celtinêitis  
 4 š.tarsminaśś.sparza.inθux̥tceśu  
 5 ratm.suθiu.suθiusvê.vêl̥xeś.cusuśa  
 6 ulesla.velθurus̥.titl̥niś.vêl̥θurusla.  
 7 larθalc.cêlatinaśapnal.larisalccê  
 8 latinaś.titlnal

## THE TEXT AND THE TRANSLATIONS OF WALLACE AND TORELLI

The translation by R. A. Wallace (2008, here in the first lines) and that of M. Torelli (2005, in the second lines), both of which are presented here word-for-word, read:

## Section I: A 1-7

<i>et</i>	<i>pêtruis̥ scêvêś</i>	<i>êliunt̥ś</i>	<i>vina-c</i>	<i>restm-c</i>
Thus	by Pêtru Scêvas,	the <i>êliun</i> , both the	<i>vina</i>	and the <i>restm</i> -
Thus	by Pêtru Scêva,	the oil-seller both the	<i>vina</i>	and the garden (?)

*cenu* *tênθur sar* *cusuθuras* *larisall[i]svla*  
 were sold/ceded (?) (in the amount of) *tênθur* 10 to the Cusu, (sons) of Laris. -  
 were ceded for *iugera* 10 against (of the *consortium*) of the Cusu, sons of  
 Laris.

*pes-c* *spante* *tênθur sa* *sran sar-c* *clθil*  
*têrsna*  
 and the *pes* on the plain (was sold by P. S.) (for) 4 *tênθur* and 10 *sran*, to the *clθ*. The  
*têrsna* -  
 and the estate of the plain and, for 4 *iugera* and 10 *actus* in the city  
*praedia*,

*θui* *spanθi* *mlesiêθi-c rasna* *sIII)*  
 here on the plain and in/on the *mlesia* (is) public (in the amount of) 14.5 (measures). -  
 here in the plain and on the slope in public (in silver) pounds 4.5.

*inni* *pes* *pêtrus* *pava-c* *traula-c* *tiur*  
 with respect to (?) the *pes* of Pêtru, and the *pava* and the *traula*, the *tiur* -  
 which terrain of Pêtru, as for fruits and gain, and the measures

*tên[θ]ur-c* *tênθa* *zacinat priniserac* *zal //*  
 and the *tênθur* (obj.) shall measure the *zacinat priniser* (subj.) two times (?) -  
 and the *iugera* (obj.) let measure the land surveyor and *prinisera* (heralds?) two.

## Section II: A7-8

*c̄s êsis* *vêrê* *cusuθursum*  
*pes pêtrušta scev[as] //*  
 From this point in time, in/on, by means of *vêra*, (and (-um)) to the Cusu (belongs)  
 the *pes*, that of Pêtru Scevas. -  
 For this pact (?) with good right (?) of the Cusu (is) the estate (that) of Petru Sceva.

## Section III: A8-14 (list of persons 1)

*nuθanatur*

The auditors (witnesses?): -  
 The "witnesses":

*lart pêtruni*. (Lart Pêtruni)  
*arnt . pini*. (Arnt Pini)  
*lart . v[î]pi . lusce*. (Lart Vipi Lusce)  
*laris . salini . vêtnal*. (Laris Salini, (son) of Vêtnai)  
*lart . vêlara . larθalisa*. (Lart Vêlara, the (son) of Larθ)  
*lart . vêlara aulesa*. (Lart Vêlara, the (son) of Aule)  
*vêl . pumpu . pruciu*. (Vêl Pumpu Pruciu)  
*aule cêlatina . sêtmnal*. (Aule Cêlatina, (son) of Sêtmnai)  
*arnza . fêlsni . vêlθinal*. (Arnza Fêlsni, (son) of Vêlθina)  
*vêl . luisna lusce*. (Vel Luisna Lusce)

*vêl uslna . nufresa.* (Vel Uslna, the (son) of Nufre)  
*laru . slanzu .* (Laru Slanzu)  
*larza lartle* (Larza Lartle)  
*vêlaves* (Vêl Aves)  
*arnt . pêtru . raufe //* (Arnt Pêtru Raufe)

Section IV: A14-17 (list of persons 2)

*êprus*                                      *ame vêlxe*   *cusu*                                      *larisal cleniar-c*  
 Of the (transaction?) (the parties) are Vêlche Cusu, (son) of Laris and his sons, -  
 Present                                      are (what follows is the same as Wallace's text)

*laris [c]usu l[a]risalisa*                                      *lariza-c clan larisal*  
 Laris Cusu, (son) of Laris, and Lariza, son of Laris,

*pêtru scê[va]s*                                      *arntlei pêtruš puia*  
 (and) Pêtru Scêvas, (and) Arntlei Pêtru's wife.

Section V: A18-23

*cên zic*                                      *ziçuxçe sparzêstis šazleis*  
 This document was written (= copied) from the tablet of bronze/wood (?) -  
 This writing has been written                                      in this tablet of bronze

*in*                                      *θuxti*                                      *cusuθuras*                                      *suθiu ame*                                      *tal*                                      *suθivena*  
 which in the house of the Cusu family is placed (stored). That (document), in t  
 repository -  
 which in the house of the Cusu                                      has been placed                                      in this                                      archive (

*ratm*                                      *θuxt*                                      *cešu*                                      *tlteitêi*                                      *sians*  
*ratm*                                      in the house resides in that place (?). The *sians* -  
 according to custom in house lies                                      in the *sacrarium* of the ancestors;

*sparzête*                                      *θui salt*                                      *zic*                                      *fratuce*                                      *cusuθuras*  
 on the tablet here this one                                      the document (obj.) incised (?) of the Cusu, -  
 in this tablet here is consecrated the writing                                      buy/sale of the Cusu

*larisalisvla*                                      *pêtruš-c scêvas*                                      *pesš tarxianês//*  
 the (sons) of Laris and of Pêtru Scêvas from the *pes tarxiane* (?) -  
 the family of Laris and of Pêtru Scêvas of the Tarquinian estate.

Section VI: A23-32/B1 (list of persons 3)

*cnl nuθe*                                      *male-c*                                      *lart cucrina lausisa*                                      *zilaθ mexl rašnal*  
 To this act listen and watch over Lart Cucrina Lausisa, governor of public territory,  
 This (obj.) has said and seen                                      Lart Cucrina Lausisa, praetor (of Cortona),  
*[la]ris . cêlatina lausa[cl]an-c.* (Laris Cêlatina Lausa and son)  
*arnt . luscni . [a]rnθal . clan-c . larza.* (Arnt Luscni, (son) of [A]rnθ, and son Larza)  
*lart . turmna . salina[l].* (Lart Turmna, (son) of Salinei)

- - -]pnal . cleniar-c. (- - - of A]pnei and sons)  
 vêlxe[- - -papa]šer-c. (Vêlche [- - -] and (his) grandchildren)  
 vêlxe . cusu aule[sa- - -] (Vêlche Cusu, son of Aule [- - -])  
 animalc . laris . fuln[i- - - clenia]  
 r-c. (of Aninei. Laris Fuln[i- - -] and sons)  
 lart . pêtce . uslna[l] (Lart Pêtce, (son) of Uslnei)  
 [- - -]inaθur . tēcsinal. (the [- - -]ina family, (sons) of Tecsinei)  
 vêl[θur . titlni . vêlθur]uš. (Vel[- - -Titlni, (son) of Vêl]thur)  
 laris-c . cusu . uslna[l- - -] (and Laris Cusu, son of Uslnei)  
 aule salini [- - -] cusual (Aule Salini, [- - -] (son) of Cusui)

Section VII: B2-8 (list of persons 4)

zilci larθal cusuš titinal larisal-c saliniš aulesla

During the governorship of Larth Cusu, (son) of Titinei and of Laris Salini, the (son) of Aule -

Being praetors Larth Cusu, (son) of Titlnei and of Laris Salini, the (son) of Aule

<i>celtinê</i>	<i>itiss</i>	<i>tarsminašš sparza</i>	<i>in</i>	<i>θuxt</i>
in the district	of the Lake (?)	Trasimene, the tablet,	which in the house (of	
of the lands of the Trasimene ( <i>celtinêitiss</i> )		the tablet, which in the house		

<i>cešu</i>	<i>ratm</i>
was stored,	<i>ratm</i> -
lies	according to ritual,

<i>suθiu</i>	<i>suθiusvê</i>	<i>vêlxeš cusuš</i>	<i>aulesla</i>
was placed	in the storehouses (?) of Vêlkhe Cusu, the (son) of Aule, -		
has been deposited	in the <i>tabularia</i> of	(what follows is the same as Wallace's text)	

<i>Velθurus</i>	<i>titlniš</i>	<i>vêlθurusla</i>	<i>larθal-c cêlatinaš</i>	<i>apnal</i>
and of Vêlthur	Titlni, the (son) of Vêlthur, and of Larth	Cêlatina, the (son) of Apnei		

<i>larisal-c</i>	<i>cêlatinaš</i>	<i>titlnal</i>
and of Laris	Cêlatina, (son) of Titlnei.	

ANALYSIS

Section I (A 1-7)

The first phrase reads: *e . t . pêtruiš scêvêš êliuntš . vinac . restmc . cenu têtθur šar . cusuθuraš . larisal[i]svla*

It starts with *e.t.*, which is usually interpreted like *eθ* in other inscriptions which means "thus"<sup>16</sup>. The syntagma *pêtruiš scêvêš êliuntš* is written in the ablative case ("from

<sup>16</sup> AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, pp. 96-98. Cf. RIX, *ET* Ta 5.6; 82; AV 4.1; WYLIN 2002b, p. 219; FACCHETTI 2000, p. 15. Different: PERUZZI 2001.

the side of" > "by") of *pêtru scêvas êliunta*<sup>17</sup>. *Pêtru Scêvas* is supposed to consist of a *nomen gentilicium*, and a *cognomen*, derived from Latin *scaeva*/*\*scaiva* ("left-handed man")<sup>18</sup>. Since *Pêtru*'s first name is missing and his family name is a so-called 'Vornamen-gentilicium', he would not belong to the old aristocracy. There is a funerary inscription from Trequanda, *località* Belsedere near Siena (ca 300-250 BC) with a first name, reading: *aule : petr(u) : sceva* (without final *ś*) who, however, for chronological reasons, is probably not our *Pêtru Scêvas*<sup>19</sup>. It should be noted that *Scevas* also occurs as *gentilicium*. However, because an *arnt pêtru raufe* is mentioned in A14, *Pêtru* must be a family name.

The word *\*êliunta* is a second *cognomen* or name of a profession<sup>20</sup>. The word *\*êliunta* (*êliun-ta* < *êliun-i/eta*: "the one of *êliun*")<sup>21</sup> has been translated as "the olive-farmer; oil-seller" since *êliun* would be comparable with *eleivana*<sup>22</sup>, an Etruscan adjective derived from Greek *elei(φ)ā* which means "olive". According to De Simone and Maggiani, however, the derivation is not possible since the letter *ê* originally derives from *ai*, *ei* or *ee* (cf. *cên* < *ceben* ("this"))<sup>23</sup>. However, the borrowing of *Pêtru* from Italic *Petrō* proves that an *e* can change into a Cortonese *ê*. Further, the derivation of Latin *oleum* from Greek *elaion* shows an even more rigorous change. In my view *êliun* is borrowed from Greek *elaion*. The *i* in *êliun* can be explained by the monophthongization of *ai* > *ei* > *ê* > *i* (e.g. *Paithe* > *Peithe* > *Pethna* > *Pitna*)<sup>24</sup>. As Torelli suggests, *Pêtru Scêvas* may have been successful since some Republican oil-sellers became very rich<sup>25</sup>.

The lexemes *vinac restmc* (*vina-c restm-c*) belong firmly together in view of the two enclitic particles *-c* ("and")<sup>26</sup>. The word *vina* is translated as "vineyard" as a derivation from *vinum*, in view of the locative *vinaiθ* (*vina-i-θ*) in the *Tabula Capuana*<sup>27</sup>. According to De Simone, however, the adjective of *vinum* would have been *\*vinumna* > *\*vinna*. This objection is not valid since *cognomina* like *vina*, *vinila*, and *vinei* are known<sup>28</sup> and

<sup>17</sup> The lexeme *êliunts* derives from *\*êliun-te-iś* < *êliun-ta-iś*. For ablatives, see RIX 2004, pp. 952-953; FACCHETTI 2002a, pp. 39-44; AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, p. 96, note 183.

<sup>18</sup> RIX, *Cognomen*, pp. 249-250; RIX 2000, p. 20. DE SIMONE 2009, p. 540 derives *Pêtru* from Italic *Petrō*.

<sup>19</sup> RIX, *ET AS* 1.179; MAGGIANI 2001, p. 13, note 99.

<sup>20</sup> *Cognomina* or titles of professions ending in *-ta* are *zarta* (RIX, *ET CI* 1.1763) and *tinuta* (AS 1.436). A derivation of Etruscan *\*êliun* from Greek *\*eilion*/*\*ailion* ("brother-in-law") seems less likely since it is unknown whether *Pêtru Scêvas* and one of the sons of Laris Cusu had sisters as wives. In addition, only the plural *eiliones* is known.

<sup>21</sup> For the enclitic use of *-ta* as article ("the"), see RIX 2004, pp. 955, 962; FACCHETTI 2002a, pp. 26-37.

<sup>22</sup> TLE 762; RIX, *ET Fa* 2.3; REE 2008 [2011], 172 (*elaivana*).

<sup>23</sup> DE SIMONE 2000, p. 78. MAGGIANI 2001, p. 97 suggests "debtor", "leaseholder", or "condemned".

<sup>24</sup> RIX 2004, p. 950; WALLACE 2008, p. 33.

<sup>25</sup> TORELLI 2002, p. 103.

<sup>26</sup> POCCHETTI 2011, p. 269.

<sup>27</sup> AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, pp. 98-99; RIX, *ET II*, p. 9, Capua tile, line 15; G. M. FACCHETTI, in *AION Ling* XXXI, 2009 [2012], p. 237.

<sup>28</sup> DE SIMONE 2003a, pp. 39-40; DE SIMONE 2007, pp. 2-3. See CIE 310 (*vina*), 3257 (*vinila*), and 3287 (*vinei*).



since in Italic languages derivations are also based on the stem *vin-* (e.g. Latin *vinea*, *vinetum*: “vineyard”; *vindemia*: “vintage”).

The noun *restm* is the syncopated form of *\*restum* judged from the family name *\*restum-na/nei*<sup>29</sup>. It must be a terrain with a function similar to a vineyard or a complex connected to one. There is a possible parallel: the inscription on a fragment of an architrave found between tomb 5 and 6 in the Crocifisso del Tufo necropolis at Orvieto reads: - - -]s *resθu mi* (“of - - - (a man) I (am) *resθu*”)<sup>30</sup>. Almost all Crocifisso tomb inscriptions start with *mi* followed by the first and family names of the deceased men in the genitive, sometimes followed by the nominative *suθi*, “tomb”. So, in principle *resθu*, if it is a nominative, may mean, like *suθi* (from *suθ-*, “to place”), “resting place” or “deposit”. The latter meaning is attractive since vineyards could have an adjacent service area, spaces for wine pressing and conservation like the Roman *lacus* and *cella vinaria*. However, if the Orvieto inscription was written in the nominative, for which there are no *comparanda* in situ, *resθu* is a *cognomen*.

According to M. Canuti *restm* may be akin to the Latin, probably non-Indo-European word *arista* (“beard, ear of grain”), Italian *resta*<sup>31</sup>. The initial *a-* in *arista* may have been added and disappeared in Italian by *aphaeresis* (compare Etruscan *puia* (“wife”) with the Greek, non-Indo-European verb *opuioo* (“I have as wife”). If this is correct, *restm* may mean “grain (land)”. Cato, however, who wrote his *De agri cultura* around 160-150 BC, ranks the best farm lands as follows: 1. a vineyard; 2. a watered garden, 3. an osier-bed, 4. an olive-yard, 5. a meadow, 6. grain land, 7. a wood lot, and 8. a mast grove<sup>32</sup>. The list shows that grain land was far less important than vine- and oliveyards. So we cannot rule out the possibility that *rest(u)m* means “watered garden”, or another terrain or construction.

The lexeme *cenu* is a preterite form of *cen-* which probably means “(is/are) ceded” because the Cusuthur, sons of Laris, are the receiving party in view of *cusuθuraś larisal[i]svla* which are genitives of destination meaning “to the Cusuthur, sons of Laris”<sup>33</sup>. Some scholars translate *cenu* as “acquired/acquisition”<sup>34</sup>. However, the lexeme *cenu* is also present on a black-gloss cup from a tomb at Pontecagnano where it means rather

<sup>29</sup> RIX, *ET* Cl 2333; *CIE* 828.

<sup>30</sup> RIX, *ET* Vs 1.21; *StEtr* XXX, 1962, p. 139, no. 6; RIX, *Cognomen*, p. 197, note 147. For inscriptions with *mi* followed by a nominative, see G. COLONNA, in *Epigraphica* XLIV, 1982, pp. 49-64.

<sup>31</sup> I am grateful to M. Canuti for his suggestion (e-mail of 08.01.2013). See also BREYER 1993, pp. 100-102.

<sup>32</sup> CATO, *agr.* I 7 (1. *vinea*, 2. *hortus inriguus*, 3. *salictum*, 4. *oletum*, 5. *pratium*, 6. *campus frumentarius*, 7. *silva caedua*, 8. *arbustum*, 9. *glandaria silva*).

<sup>33</sup> MAGGIANI 2001, pp. 97-98; SCARANO USSANI-TORELLI 2003, pp. 48, 56, 62 (who presume, however, an exchange); WALLACE 2003a and b. For *-svla*, see EICHNER 2002 and ADIEGO 2006.

<sup>34</sup> RIX 2000, p. 26; FACCHETTI 2000, pp. 18-20; FACCHETTI 2003, pp. 203-206; WYLYN 2006b, pp. 6-7. The meaning of *cenu* (“(is) acquired”) in the inscription of the Cippus of Perugia (RIX, *ET* Pe 8.4; *TLE* 570) is problematic since Facchetti’s translation of *θil scuna* (“let he concede (*scun-a*: subjunctive) (the use) of water (*θi-l*)”) may be incorrect. The syntagma can also mean “building/room of water” (for *scuna*, see WYLYN 2000, p. 241; WYLYN 2004, p. 112, note 13). Therefore, I do not exclude that (the use of) the water building was conceded (*cenu*) by Larth Afuna (*larθals afunes*: ablative) to Aule Velthina (*aulesi . velθinas*: pertinentive). MAGGIANI 2001, pp. 97-98 translates “drawing of water”. As for *cen-*, according to AGOSTINIANI (forthcoming) it is not yet possible to choose between “to give” or “to receive”.

“given/ gift” than “acquired/acquisition”<sup>35</sup>. The Cusu may have been the owners who had let a vineyard and *restm* to Pêtru. So, Pêtru, a non-local, non-elite man retroceded ground to a family, which was very rich judged by their two similar, monumental, round tombs just to the west of the city<sup>36</sup>.

Maggiani takes together *tênθur śar . cusuθuras̄ . larisal[i]svla* and translates “against ten *tênθur* of Cusu, those of Laris” assuming an exchange of lands<sup>37</sup>. Since *tênθur śar* are nominatives, the translation “against” (Latin *pro*) is impossible. Torelli takes together *cusuθuras̄ . larisal[i]svla . pesc* translating “against (in compensation for) the Cusu, sons of Laris and the estate” > “and against the estate of Cusu, sons of Laris”<sup>38</sup>. This is also impossible since *pes* is a nominative and *-c* refers to the preceding word *pes*.

The syntagma *tênθur śar* means “10 *tênθur*”. Agostiniani has shown that *tênθur* (like *naper*, see below) is an unanimate singular<sup>39</sup>, in all probability indicating a surface measure, used here in apposition to *vina* and *restm*. Only animate things or persons have a plural ending in *-ur*, *-r*, *-ar*, or *-er*<sup>40</sup>. In A6 occurs the syntagma *tênθur-c tênθa*. The latter (*tênθ-a*) is the subjunctive of *tênθ-* which means “let x measure (take) the measure”. In addition, the inscription on a cippus from Volterra, *località* Marmini, mentions the lexeme *θentmase* (stem: *θent-*), probably *θent mase*, in the context of measuring: *buθ naper* (“six *naper*” (a singular)), cf. Latin *napurae* (“straw ropes”)<sup>41</sup>.

As we saw, Torelli translates *tênθur* as Latin *iugera*, but without arguments. This is, however, possible since 10 *iugera*, the equivalent of 2.5 hectares (1 *iugerum* = 120 × 240 *pedes* (feet) of 29.6 cm = 2 square *actus* (*acnua*), each of 120 × 120 feet = ¼ ha, more precisely 0.252 ha), were sufficient for subsistence of a family, both in ancient and modern Italy<sup>42</sup>. Though Varro (ca 50 BC) states that every region in Italy had its own method of measuring land<sup>43</sup>, the Roman system was influenced by the Etruscan one. The Etruscans

<sup>35</sup> REE 2008 [2011], 87a and pp. 344-345, 354 (C. PELLEGRINO). For verbal nouns, see RIX 2004, p. 959; WYLIN 2000, pp. 134-138.

<sup>36</sup> For the rich Cusu, see RIX 2000, p. 19; BRUSCHETTI 2002, pp. 35-36; MAGGIANI 2002b, pp. 13-14; TORELLI 2004-2005, pp. 178-187. The inscription on a sandstone slab from the second century BC tomb called Tanella Angori reads: *lart : ku/su : markeal*. The tomb called Tanella di Pitagora, nearby, may have been property of the Cusu too. See RIX, *ET Co* 1.5: *v : cusu : cr : l : apa / petrual : clan*; M. MENICCHETTI, in MASSERIA 2001, p. 145 and in FORTUNELLI 2005, pp. 357-359 (second century BC); TORELLI 2004-2005, p. 178 (ca 150-100 BC).

<sup>37</sup> MAGGIANI 2001, p. 99.

<sup>38</sup> In SCARANO USSANI-TORELLI 2003, p. 76. Torelli’s translation in Latin reads: *pro Cossoniorum Laris filiorum fundo (qui est) in planitie*. See WALLACE 2003b, pp. 11-12. For the ending *-svla* in *larisal[i]svla*, see EICHNER 2002.

<sup>39</sup> AGOSTINIANI 2008, p. 175; FACCHETTI 2000, p. 61, note 343.

<sup>40</sup> ADIEGO 2006; RIX 2000, p. 25; AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, p. 91.

<sup>41</sup> *TLE* 381 (third/second century BC); RIX, *ET Vt* 8.1. FACCHETTI 2000, p. 14, note 36; 66, note 374; WYLIN 2000, pp. 262-265. The shift from *t > θ* and from *θ > t* at the beginning of words is rare but it occurs, cf. the female first name Thania, Tania (*CIE* 1741), and Tana (*CIE* 3499). For *napurae*, see FEST., pp. 160, 7; 168; 169 L.; BREYER 1993, p. 265.

<sup>42</sup> J. G. KRON, in DE LIGT-NORTHWOOD 2008, p. 105, note 203; D. RATHBONE, *ibidem*, pp. 307-309. Cf. LIV. XXXIV 55.

<sup>43</sup> VARRO, *rust.* I 10, 1.

used the Attic foot of 29.6 cm, which was later also used by the Romans. The Latin word *acnua* or *acna* has the same meaning as *actus*: 120 × 120 feet. Both *acnua* and *acna* may be of Etruscan origin<sup>44</sup>. The oldest orthogonal settlement at Marzabotto (ca 540 BC) shows *insula* parcels which have the same size as an *actus*. The length of the temple of Tina (ca 500 BC) in this city is 35.5 m, which is the equivalent of 120 feet of 29.6 cm<sup>45</sup>.

In Section III (list 1) fifteen male persons are mentioned, evidently staff-members or clients of Pêtru Scêvaš since no Cusu is present. The number is remarkable since Cato advises that the number of workers in a vineyard of 100 *iugera* should be sixteen, fifteen men and one woman, the wife of the *vilicus*<sup>46</sup>. As we will see, however, this *comparandum* does not prove that 10 *tênθur* are the equivalent of 100 *iugera* (25 ha).

The next phrase reads: *pesc . spante . tênθur . sa . šran . šarc . clθil tênsna . θui . spanθi . mlesîêθic . rašna šIII*).

Maggiani has shown that *pes* must mean “estate; farm land” (cf. Latin *fundus*; *praedium*)<sup>47</sup>. A strong argument is the syntagma *\*pes tarχiana* in A 22-23. The adjective *\*tarχiana*, an ethnicum, refers to a place called *\*Tarchia*, as has been shown by De Simone (2005).

The lexeme *spante* is the locative of *\*span-* (“plain (terrain)”) <sup>48</sup>, and *tênθur sa* means “4 *tênθur*”. The syntagma *šran šar-c* is usually translated as “and 10 *šran*”, which is supposed to be a smaller surface measure<sup>49</sup>. However, *šran* is singular. In addition, *šran* is not identical to *sren* (“representation; image”) in the *didaskalion* on a well known mirror<sup>50</sup>, in view of the plural *\*šrenχva*. J. Hadas-Lebel now suggests to interpret *šran* as “one-hundred”, a numeral possibly derived from *sar* (“ten”), like Indo-European *\*dekmtom* (“one-hundred”) from *\*dekm(t)*, cf. Latin *decem* (“ten”)<sup>51</sup>. In that case *tênθur . sa . šran . šar-c* would mean “*tênθur* four times hundred<sup>52</sup>, and ten” > “four hundred and ten *tênθur*” (410 *iugera* = 102.5 ha)<sup>53</sup>. In favour of Hadas-Lebel’s proposal are the measures in the Cippus

<sup>44</sup> G. COLONNA, in *ScAnt* III-IV, 1989-90, pp. 213-214. Not dealt with by BREYER (1993).

<sup>45</sup> SASSATELLI-GOVI 2005, pp. 150-153, figs. 4 and 5 (parcels); 27, fig. 29 (temple). See now also P. BARONIO, *Ocnus* XX, 2012, pp. 9-32 (temple).

<sup>46</sup> CATO, *agr.* 11. VARRO, *rust.* I 18, 1 mentions 15 slaves.

<sup>47</sup> MAGGIANI 2001, pp. 99-100; AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, p. 102.

<sup>48</sup> AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, pp. 92-93.

<sup>49</sup> MAGGIANI 2001, pp. 100; 112, note 34 hypothesizes that 1 *tênθur* = 20 *šran*.

<sup>50</sup> TLE 399; RIX, *ET* Vt S.2 (probably made in the *ager Volsiniensis*); DE GRUMMOND-SIMON 2006, p. 15, fig. II.8.

<sup>51</sup> The author kindly sent me his forthcoming colloquium paper “Étr. *šran*”. As for *sar* : *šran*, compare *mal-* : *mλαχ*, see D. F. MARAS, in *StEtr* LXIV, 1998 [2001], p. 187, note 41; ID., in *StEtr* LXXIII, 2007 [2009], p. 238.

<sup>52</sup> A parallel is missing. Wylin (personal communication) remarks that one would expect *\*saz* (*sa-z*: “four times”) like *eslz* and *ciz* (*esl-z*: “two times”; *ci-z*: “three times”).

<sup>53</sup> If one *tênθur* would be the equivalent of ten *iugera*, the total would be 4100 *iugera* which as property of a private person was rare in the Italic/Roman world. For comparison: the *Lex Licinia* (367 BC) and the *Lex Sempronia* (133 BC) declared it forbidden for anyone to hold more than 500 *iugera* (125 ha) in the *ager publicus*. See J. RICH, in DE LIGT-NORTHWOOD 2008, pp. 519-572. Cato (*agr.* 10 and 11) mentions vineyards of 100 and oliveyards of 240 *iugera*.

Perusinus inscription: in A5-6: *naper xu* (“12 *naper*”), A15: *naper šran*, A16: *but naper* (“six *naper*”), and A24: *naper ci* (“three *naper*”), so that *šran* must be a numeral too<sup>54</sup>.

Torelli incorrectly interprets *clθil* as an anaptyctic genitive of *cilθ* (“city”)<sup>55</sup>. This type of anaptyxis of *cilθ*, however, does not exist. The only known genitives of *cilθ* are *cilθ-l* and *cilθ-s*. Maggiani correctly interprets *clθil* as *cl-θi-l*, and translates “of these (which are) here”. The lexeme *cl* is the genitive plural of (*e*)*ca* (“this”), and *-θi-l* is the genitive of *-θi* (“here”)<sup>56</sup>. The lexeme refers to the 410 *tênθur*<sup>57</sup>.

The substantivised adjective *têrsna* (*têrs-na*) is a hapax; it may be, as Wylin suggests, a cover term for “property”, in the plain and on the hill<sup>58</sup>. I do not exclude that *têrs-* derives from the Indo-European stem *\*ters-*, which means “(a piece of) land”<sup>59</sup>.

The adverb *θui* means “here”, and *span-θi mlesîê-θi* (< *\*mlesîai-θi*) are both locatives in view of the suffix *-θi*. The lexeme *spanθi* means “in the plain”; therefore, the hapax *\*mlesîa* (nominative) may mean “hill”<sup>60</sup>.

The adjective *rašna* means “Etruscan” or “public”<sup>61</sup>, but in this context the latter. It is dependent on *têrsna* (“the property/land (is; let be) public”) though the copula is missing. The singular *rašna* is probably not a type of money<sup>62</sup>. It rather indicates the *ager publicus*, the public area belonging to the city, as may be deduced from the inscription of the well known, second century BC boundary stone from *località* Il Campaccio, ca 2 km from the city centre, which reads twice: *tular rašnal* (“boundary of the public (area)”)<sup>63</sup>.

Agostiniani interprets *šIIII* as ‘10 + 4 + ½’<sup>64</sup>. One would, however, expect the usual numeral X (“ten”) instead of the exceptional four-stroke *sigma* mentioned above<sup>65</sup>. The latter is not identical to the *š* (M) in *šran*, Hadas-Lebel’s hypothetical word for the numeral 100. One-hundred in numerals is among others rendered as C (*sinistrorsus*)<sup>66</sup>. So,

<sup>54</sup> TLE 570; RIX, ET Pe 8.4.

<sup>55</sup> SCARANO USSANI-TORELLI 2003, p. 74. However, *cilθ* means “city hilltop/citadel” (cf. Latin *arx*), and *meθlum* “city”; see VAN DER MEER 2007, pp. 51-54.

<sup>56</sup> MAGGIANI 2002b, pp. 65-66. Cf. RIX, ET Ta 1.81: *θui . clθi . mutnaiθi...* (“here, in this, in the sarcophagus...”).

<sup>57</sup> Wylin (personal communication), however, suggests that the lexemes *šarc clθil* (“and ten of these here”) belong together. In that case ten *tênθur* became public.

<sup>58</sup> WYLIN 2006b, pp. 6-7. Only DE SIMONE 2000, p. 84 and EICHNER 2006, p. 211, note 12 read *zêrsna* instead of *têrsna*. Eichner compares it with the Raetian adjective *zerisna* which may mean “belonging to everybody”, “public”.

<sup>59</sup> UNTERMANN 2000, pp. 736-737, 745.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. VARRO, *rust.* I 6, 2: [...] *tria genera* [...] *simplicia agrorum, campestre, collinum, montanum* [...].

<sup>61</sup> RIX 2000, p. 26.

<sup>62</sup> As is suggested by WYLIN 2006b, pp. 6-7.

<sup>63</sup> FORTUNELLI 2005, pp. 96-98; TLE 632; RIX, ET Co 8.1-2. In the *Liber linteus* (XI f5) *rašna hilar* means “public property”. For Roman *agri publici* in Etruria, see ROSELAAR 2008, pp. 41-44.

<sup>64</sup> AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, p. 89. In *TbLE* I<sup>2</sup>, 436 the *sigma* and *IIII* are incorrectly separated.

<sup>65</sup> FACCHETTI (2000) and TORELLI (2005) translate the *sigma* as “pound”, but without arguments.

<sup>66</sup> RIX, ET Cr 4.10; *TbLE* I<sup>2</sup>, 439; MARAS 2009, pp. 280-282 (Cr do.9). For other symbols of “one-hundred”, see *TbLE* I<sup>2</sup>, 580 and RIX 2004, p. 946.

š must indicate an unknown multiple, probably of hundreds, since the numeral 1000 may be rendered as φ.<sup>67</sup> It may mean “200” in view of the spellings of the numeral 2, *zal* and \**es(a)l*. It may be no coincidence that the Greek *sigma*, as numeral, means “200”. The symbol ) is present on Etruscan coins and means “½”. On a bronze weight with a lead core (ca 300 BC) from Cerveteri it indicates the value of 0.5 pound, that is the light Etruscan *libra*/pound of 286.5 g<sup>68</sup>. In sum, šIII) (“200 + 4 + 0.5”) is probably what Pêtru Scêvaš got in money or metal for his property in the plain and on the hill. The fact that 204.5 is almost half of 410 seems to confirm the interpretation of š (“200”) and viceversa the interpretation of *šran* as “one-hundred”. So, 410 *tênθur* may have equalled 204.5 coins, or, more probably, 204.5 units of silver or goods with the same value. In a very tentative way a bicultural comparison may shed light on the value. According to the calculations of D. Rathbone, 5 to 10 *iugera* in the Roman allotment system would be worth 4.000 sextantal asses or 400 *denarii*, which was the threshold to belong to the fifth fiscal *classis*, between 211-141 BC<sup>69</sup>. So, one *iugerum* was valued at 40-80 *denarii*. If one *tênθur* was one *iugerum*, 410 *tênθur* would have worth at least 16.400 *denarii*. From one Roman pound of silver 80 *denarii* could be coined between ca 211 and 188 BC<sup>70</sup>. So 16.400 *denarii* valued 210 pounds, which approximate the 204.5 units of silver mentioned. The difference may be explained by the fact that an Etruscan silver pound was lighter than the Roman one. Pêtru may have got part of the *ager publicus* as compensation for a loan to Cortona such as Roman citizens lent to Rome for the war in 210 BC. Since Rome could not repay in 200 BC, the citizens got *ager publicus* instead of a third part of their loan. They could resell the land later to the state. A similar compensation and reselling of public land may have taken place at Cortona<sup>71</sup>.

The next phrase reads: *inni . pes . pêtrus . pavac . traulac . tiur . tên[θ]urc . tênθα . zacinat . priniserac . zal//*

The relative pronoun *inni* is, compared with the accusative *mini* (“me”) of *mi* (“I”), the accusative of *in*, which means “which”<sup>72</sup>. The next words, however, are nominatives. Therefore, Maggiani proposes to translate *inni* “as for” like Latin *quod (attinet ad)*, by analogy with *-ni* which is present in the adverb *itanim (ita-ni-m: “in that way”)*, of which *ita* is a nominative<sup>73</sup>. Wylin translates *inni* as an adjectival relative pronoun belonging to *pes*<sup>74</sup>.

<sup>67</sup> The Greek φ, however, indicates 500.

<sup>68</sup> See AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, p. 89, note 146 (C as 0.5 on coins); MAGGIANI 2002a, pp. 167-168 (IIC = 2.5 on a weight); MARAS 2009, pp. 276-279 (RX, ET Cr do.6); G. M. FACCHETTI-K. WYLIN, in *ParPass* LIX, 2004, pp. 389-396.

<sup>69</sup> D. RATHBONE, in DE LIGT-NORTHWOOD 2008, p. 308.

<sup>70</sup> After ca 200 BC: 72 *denarii*, around 141 BC: 84 *denarii* (1 *denarius* = 3.9 g).

<sup>71</sup> I am grateful to L. de Ligt and Paul Beliën for their suggestions (personal communications). For *agri publici* and *agri in trientabulis*, see ROSELAAR 2008, pp. 42-44, 123-124.

<sup>72</sup> AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, pp. 99-100.

<sup>73</sup> See MAGGIANI 2001, p. 100.

<sup>74</sup> WYLIN 2002b, p. 220.

The “*pes* of Pêtru” must be his terrain in the plain (A3-4), and probably part of it, his property/land in the plain and on the hill (A4-5).

In theory *pavac* and *traulac* may be adjectives belonging to *pes*<sup>75</sup>, but more likely the two words are coupled: *pava-c traula-c*, “both *pava* and *traula*”, like *vina-c restm-c* in A1. The word *pava* (from Greek *παῖος* (“boy”)) occurs in the inscription *pavatarχies* (*pava tarχies*) on a mirror from Tuscania<sup>76</sup>. The usual translation is “boy Tarchies” or “boy of Tarchie”, probably the *pais* or *puer Tages* mentioned in ancient sources, who is, as *haruspex*, consulting a liver. The word *traula* consists of *trau* and *-la*. It is an adjective like *\*canla* (in: *mi selvansel canlas* (“I (am) of Selvans Canla”))<sup>77</sup>, *butila* (“sixth”) and *\*sarla* (“tenth”). In the *Liber linteus* the syntagmata *trau vinum pruxs* (IV 21) and *vinum trau prucuna* (IX f1) are translated as “poured out” or “pouring out wine, of the winejug” and “poured out/pouring out wine, belonging to/of the winejug”<sup>78</sup>. The *traula* may be “a person who is making a libation”<sup>79</sup>. The link between libation and divination is visible on the Chalchas mirror showing a bronze ‘Schnabelkanne’ standing on the ground behind the mythical *haruspex*<sup>80</sup>. Some handles of those vessels show *haruspices*<sup>81</sup>. Though a verb is missing, “(let be present) a haruspex and a libation-maker” makes a good translation, since the next syntagma mentions the subjunctive *tênθa*, “let they *tênθ*” (“measure”).

The word *tiur*, plural of *tiu* but also used as singular, probably means “Moon” or “month”, in this context the latter. Then follows the surface measure *tênθur*. Curiously, measures of time and space are combined by the enclitic *-c*<sup>82</sup>. The lexeme *tênθ-a* is the subjunctive of the verb *tênθ*, which, in view of *tênθur*, can be translated as “let him/ them measure”. The syntagma *tiur tênθur-c* may mean that the surface has to be measured “during”, in other words “within a month”<sup>83</sup>. Measuring of public land (*loca publica*) owned by but restituted by private persons is also known in the Roman world<sup>84</sup>.

<sup>75</sup> FACCHETTI 2000, pp. 61-62.

<sup>76</sup> RIX, *ET AT* S.11; G. M. FACCHETTI, in *ThesCRA VIII* (2012), p. 154, no. 20; TORELLI 2000, pp. 272, 636, no. 319; DE GRUMMOND-SIMON 2006, p. 30, fig. III.4.

<sup>77</sup> REE 1992 [1993], 32 (M. CRISTOFANI).

<sup>78</sup> VAN DER MEER 2007, pp. 91-92. The lexemes *pruxs* and *prucu-na* derive from the Greek vase name *prochous*. POCCHETTI 2011, p. 281 translates *trau* as “preserve” (imperative).

<sup>79</sup> Cf. DE SIMONE 2000, 29, p. 110; DE SIMONE 2003a, p. 41. MAGGIANI 2001, p. 112 suggests that the morpheme *-la* is the female form of the diminutive *-le* (cf. *fasle*, *zusle*). He translates *traula* as “well” by comparing *trau* : *traula* with Latin *fundere* : *fons*. However, since *pava* is a man, *traula* may be a person too. In addition, in RIX, *ET Pe* 1.202 (*au* : *pusla etera*) the *nomen gentilicium pusla* is male.

<sup>80</sup> RIX, *ET Vc* S.10; DE GRUMMOND-SIMON 2006, fig. III.8.

<sup>81</sup> TORELLI 2000, pp. 280, 592, no. 150-151.

<sup>82</sup> AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, p. 103: in theory *tiur* may be measure. Compare e.g. Dutch *morgen* which means “morning” or “a piece of land that could be ploughed in one morning” (ca 0.27 ha).

<sup>83</sup> FACCHETTI 2000, p. 71 and AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, p. 103, note 216 suggest that the vendor permitted the purchaser to measure the land within a month. They incorrectly equate a month with thirty days, since in the *Liber linteus* not one month has thirty days. They refer to IUSTIN., *Dig. XVIII* 1, 40 (PAUL., *epitomarum Alfeni dig. IV*): *pr.*: *Qui fundum vendebat, in lege ita dixerat, ut emptor in diebus triginta proximi fundum metiretur et [...]* («Who sells an estate, so he had said in the law that the purchaser should

The subject of *tênθa* can be found in the next syntagma: *zacinat priniserac zal*.

The first word is a *nomen agentis* in view of the ending in *-at*, *zacin-* being the stem of a verb (compare e.g. *mutin-*, *lectin-*), probably meaning “to measure; to control”. As for *priniserac* (*priniser-ac* or *prinisera-c*) there are two options: an adjective ending in *-ac* belonging to *zacinat*, or an archaic plural ending in *-a*<sup>85</sup>, followed by the enclitic *-c* (“and”). In view of the following numeral *zal* (“two”) the second option is the logical one<sup>86</sup>. The numeral cannot mean “twice”, since this reads in Etruscan: *eslz* (< \**esalz*). The *prinisera* are two colleagues of the *zacinat* who had to measure together. If *prin-* is akin to the stem of Latin *pinus* (Greek *pinos*) of non-Indo-European origin which means “holm-oak”, the functionaries used poles made of that tree to measure distances and mark limits<sup>87</sup>. Oaks were everywhere in Etruria, but the choice of the tree may have to do with the Etruscan Iupiter (*Tin(i)a*). The oak was Iupiter’s sacred tree. In the *Prophecy of Vegoia*, probably written around 91-90 BC, we read: «After Iupiter claimed the land of Aetrumia for himself, he decided and ordered that the fields (*campi*) be measured and the (crop)lands (*agri*) be marked out»<sup>88</sup>. Measuring and marking were sacred acts. According to Julius Frontinus’ *De Agrorum qualitate* «Varro ascribes the origins of *limites* (boundaries) to Etruscan learning (*disciplina*), in that *haruspices* divided the world in two parts [...]; from this basis our ancestors (Romans) seem to have worked out a method of land measurement»<sup>89</sup>. Varro’s statement (ca 50 BC) is confirmed by the sophisticated, urban layout of Marzabotto, founded around 500 BC, and the sacred character of measure stones (*loci gromarum*; *cruces*; *decusses*) at crossroads there, which were used and ritually preserved by *haruspices*<sup>90</sup>.

---

measure the estate in the next thirty days and [...]). The term is rather influenced by the Roman *Law of the Twelve Tables* III 1 (GELL. XV 13, 11; XX 1, 42-45): *aeris confessi rebusque iure iudicatis triginta dies iusti sunt* («For payment of an acknowledged debt or damages awarded by judgment thirty days (to pay his debt) shall be right»).

<sup>84</sup> CIL VI 919; X 1018 (thanks to Saskia Stevens).

<sup>85</sup> The anaptyctic form *prin-i-sera* may derive from \**prin-sera*. For the plural, see C. DE SIMONE, *AnnScAt* LXXXVIII, S. III 10, 2010 [2012], pp. 97-99 and ADIEGO 2006, pp. 1-5, 7.

<sup>86</sup> MAGGIANI 2001, p. 101; WALLACE 2000, p. 8; FACCHETTI 2000, p. 62 and WYLIN 2006b, p. 4 relate *zal* to *tênθur* which is syntactically impossible.

<sup>87</sup> FACCHETTI 2002a, p. 52; CAMPBELL 2000, pp. 256-257 (holm oak poles used instead of boundary stones). For a *palus* [...] a *quercu* as border stake, see CIL IX 2827.

<sup>88</sup> CAMPBELL 2000, pp. 257-259; DE GRUMMOND-SIMON 2006, pp. 191-192; A. VALVO, *Athenaeum* LXV, 1987, pp. 427-451; for Etruscan field boundaries, see also COLUM. X 337-347.

<sup>89</sup> CAMPBELL 2000, pp. 8-9 (Frontinus quoting Varro), 134-135 (Hyginus), 176-177 (*Liber coloniarum*) and 224-225 (Dolabella).

<sup>90</sup> BENTZ-REUSSER 2008, pp. 43-44, fig. 15. See now also G. DE MARINIS-C. NANNELLI, in *Ocnus* XIX, 2011, pp. 87-94 (on a *crux* at Piana di Sesto Fiorentino).

## Section II (A 7-8)

The only phrase reads: *cs̄ . ês̄is̄ vêrê cusuthurs̄um . pes . pêtrusta . scev[as̄]//* which literally means: “of this *ês̄i* in/with *\*vêra*, of the Cusuthur, however, the estate (is, let be), the one of Pêtru Scêvas̄”. It shows that the Cusu got the *pes* from Pêtru, and the *vina* and *restm* mentioned in A1-3<sup>91</sup>. No prize or compensation is mentioned so that Pêtru may have leased land from the Cusu. The enclitic particle *-um/-m* means “and” in enumerations. In other cases it is slightly adversative, meaning “but; however”<sup>92</sup>. Therefore it may be used to indicate that one part of the *pes* (A3-4) was for the Cusu but that another part of it became public land (A4-5).

The syntagma *cs̄ . ês̄is̄ vêrê* must refer to the foregoing ritual and measuring activities. The lexeme *vêrê* is a locative or instrumentalis of the hapax *\*vêra*. An attractive translation would be “in > as the result of this action”. The lexeme *cs̄* is the genitive of *ca* (“this”). The noun *ês̄i* (< *\*eisi* or *\*aisi*) is not identical with the adverb *esi* and *esic* in the *Liber linteus* which means “or” and “or also”<sup>93</sup>. The stem *eis-/ais-* means “god”<sup>94</sup>. Adjectives with the same stem, *aisia* and *esia*, mean “divine/sacred”. So *\*ês̄i* was a sacred action, as may be expected in view of the role of the Etruscan *agrimensores*, who were priests (*haruspices*) as mentioned above. The meaning of *\*vêra* is unknown. The syntagma *cs̄ . ês̄is̄ vêrê* means “in > by [...] of this divine action” > “by this sacred action”.

## Section III (A 8-14)

The text is a list without copula starting with *nuθanatur*, plural of the *nomen agentis* *\*nuθ-an-at*<sup>95</sup>. It has the same stem as the indicative *nuθe* in A23 which is usually translated as “he/they hear” or “observe”<sup>96</sup>. If correct, the *nuθanatur* are the witnesses<sup>97</sup>. What follows is a list of 15 male persons of mixed social status, probably all of civil status since the word *lautni* (Latin *libertus*) is absent. One member of the Pêtru family, Arnt Pêtru Raufe, is mentioned (A14), but no member of the Cusu family. Therefore the list must mention the staff-members or, more probably, clients of Pêtru Scêvas̄, who were prob-

<sup>91</sup> SCARANO USSANI-TORELLI 2003, p. 49. An additional argument is that in Section IV the Cusu are mentioned first.

<sup>92</sup> POCCHETTI 2011, pp. 264-267, 278-281; FACCHETTI 2000, p. 72, note 411.

<sup>93</sup> VAN DER MEER 2007, p. 86. The lexeme *es̄is̄* occurs, in an unclear context, on the contemporaneous, fragmentary bronze tablet from Tarquinia (RIX, *ET* Ta 8.1); PANDOLFINI ANGELETTI 2002, p. 54, fig. 1; 61, no. 1. As for *ês̄i*, see also WYLIN 2004, p. 121 («juridical term»); FACCHETTI 2000, p. 22, note 83 («part; division»), 89-94; WYLIN 2000, pp. 255-258.

<sup>94</sup> MARAS 2009, pp. 70-72.

<sup>95</sup> For *-(a)θ*, see WYLIN 2002a.

<sup>96</sup> MARAS 2009, p. 142, note 1 compares *nuθ* (“to observe”) to *kulsnuter* (*kuls-nut-er*: “gate watchers”), *trutnuθ* and *trutnvt* (“omen watcher”).

<sup>97</sup> MAGLIANI 2001, p. 101 observes that *auditores* were not present in Roman juridical processes but suggests that they might be judges or arbitrators appointed by the *zilath* (magistrate), mentioned in A23-24.



ably transferred to the Cusu. Interestingly, the Latin word *cliens* (from the verb *cluere*) originally means “hearing”.

#### Section IV (A 14-17)

Section IV has one phrase, reading: *êpruś . ame . vêlxe . cusu larisal . cleniar-c . laris [c]usu l[a]risalisa lariza-c . clan . larisal . pêtru . scê[va]ś arntlei . pêtruś . puia*. For the current translations I refer to those of Wallace and Torelli (see above). The only problem is *êpruś*, genitive of *êpru*. Wylin (2005) has compared it with *epri-*. He concludes that the stem *epr-* of the nouns *êpru* and *epri* means “part”<sup>98</sup>. Therefore *êpruś . ame* would mean “of the part are...”, that means “participants are...”. The word *êpru* does not have the same meaning as *vaxr* (“contract/compromise”) in the Cippus Perusinus inscription. It rather refers to the partnership between the tenant farmer Pêtru and the owners, the Cusu. Cato mentions *partiarii* (“share tenants”) who partly shared in the products of the land<sup>99</sup>.

The participants, Velche Cusu, son of Laris, his sons, another Laris Cusu, and the latter’s son Lariza are men, whilst, surprisingly, Pêtru Scêvaś is only accompanied by his wife Arntlei. Evidently, they were childless. Arntlei is the only woman in the document. She has no first name but only a family name, a ‘Vornamengentilicium’, like Pêtru. Maybe she and Pêtru were married on equal terms so that Arntlei would become the heir when Pêtru died.

#### Section V (A 18-23)

The first phrase reads: *cên . zic . zixuxe . sparzêstis . sazleis . in θuxti . cusuθuraś . suθiu . ame*. The first part has ingeniously and almost correctly been translated by Adiego as “this (*cên* < *ceben*) writing (*zic*) has been written (*zixuxe*) from the bronze/wood? (*sazle*) tablet (*sparza*)”<sup>100</sup>. He has compared *sparzêstis . sazleis* (ablatives) with *ex aenea tabella*, words used in the copying process of Roman military diplomas (*descriptum et recognitum ex tabella aenea; «copied and verified from the bronze tablet»*)<sup>101</sup>. The lexemes *sparzêstis . sazle-is* are separative ablatives of *sparzê-s-ta* (< *-i/eta*) and *sazle*<sup>102</sup>. The word *\*sazle* is a hapax, usually interpreted as an adjective.

The relative pronoun *in* means “which” and refers to *\*sparzêsta sazle*.

Maggiani has shown that *θux* means “house”, and *θux-ti* and *θux-t* “in house”<sup>103</sup>. The

<sup>98</sup> The lexeme *\*epru* may be akin to the Indo-European stem *pr* in Latin *pars* and in Greek *eporon; peprootai*.

<sup>99</sup> CATO, *agr.* 86-87.

<sup>100</sup> ADIEGO 2006, pp. 11-15; AGOSTINIANI 2008, p. 176; WYLIN 2006a, p. 37 translates *sazle* as “original”.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. *CIL* XVI 1.

<sup>102</sup> It is not a locative as is suggested by MAGGIANI 2001, p. 102. Cf. WALLACE 2003a.

<sup>103</sup> MAGGIANI 2001, p. 103; MAGGIANI 2002, p. 67.

lexeme *cusuθur-a-s* is the genitive of Cusuthur. The lexemes *suθiu ame* mean “deposited is; lying is”, *suθiu* being the participle of *suθ-* (“to place”).

The next syntagma reads: *tal suθivenas̄ . ratm . θuxt . cesu . tlteitēi*.

Problematic is the hapax *tal*, maybe, as Adiego suggests, it is a genitive of (*e*)*ta* (“this”) <sup>104</sup>.

The lexeme *suθivenas̄* is a participle like *zelarvenas* and *šarvenas*, meaning “having doubled” and “having quadrupled” <sup>105</sup>. If we translate *suθivenas̄* as “having deposited” the question arises: who deposited? There is no subject. So, more likely *tal suθivenas̄* means “having been done the deposit of this (copy)” <sup>106</sup>.

The syntagma *ratm . θuxt . cesu* is usually translated as “according to rite/law in the house (is) lying”. The lexeme *tltel . tēi* consists according to Maggiani of *tl-tel-tēi* (*-tēi* < locative of (*i*)*ta* (“that”); *tl-te*: “there” (cf. *cl-θi*: “here”), probably meaning “in that/those which is/are in that place”. In a similar vein Wylin translates “(in the house), in that of him there” <sup>107</sup>.

Maggiani translates *ratm*, the syncopated form of *ratum*, as “copy” which can hardly be correct since *ratum* in the *Liber linteus* probably means “according to rite” <sup>108</sup>.

The last phrase reads: *sians̄ . sparzête . θui . salt . zic . fratuce . cusuθuras̄ . larisalisvla . pētruśc . scēvas . pess̄ tarxianēs̄//*

It can be translated as “the father <sup>109</sup> on the tablet here - *salt* - the writing has incised... > the father has incised - *salt* - here on the tablet of/for the Cusuthur, sons of Laris, and of/for Pētru Scēvas from the Tarchianan estate”. The father cannot be Laris (A3) since nowhere is he mentioned separately. Therefore, a *pater familias*, maybe the oldest of the Cusu, or an official, the daily major-domo of the house, had the function of copying and archiving.

The lexeme *salt* is a problem, probably to be understood as *sal-t*, locative of *sal*. According to Wylin *sal* means “confirmation”, so that *salt* may mean “in confirmation; ratified” <sup>110</sup>.

The verb *fratu-* is a hapax; its meaning (*fratuce*: “has incised”) is based on the context <sup>111</sup>.

<sup>104</sup> ADIEGO 2006, p. 16. AGOSTINIANI (forthcoming).

<sup>105</sup> WYLIN 2000, pp. 162-164.

<sup>106</sup> MAGGIANI 2001, pp. 106-107 (“of that deposited *ratm* (a copy?)...”); WYLIN 2002b, pp. 221-222; FACCHETTI 2005, p. 62; WYLIN 2006a, p. 38.

<sup>107</sup> WYLIN 2006a, p. 38; MAGGIANI 2002b, p. 66; MAGGIANI 2001, pp. 106-107; AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, p. 109; FACCHETTI 2000, p. 79, note 464.

<sup>108</sup> VAN DER MEER 2007, pp. 132-133, 140. WYLIN 2004, p. 116 and 2006a, p. 38 translates *ratum* as “legally” or “also”, which is unlikely in view of the *nomen gentilicium ratum(s)na* (CIE 1421-1422).

<sup>109</sup> RIX, *ET* Pe 5.2. For *s(i)ans̄*, see REE 2007 [2009], 76 and G. COLONNA, in *StEtr* XLVIII, 1980, pp. 167-168. FACCHETTI 2002a, pp. 21-23 and WYLIN 2006a, p. 39 suggest that *sians̄* may be akin to Latin *sanus* (“honest”).

<sup>110</sup> WYLIN 2006a, pp. 40-43; DE SIMONE 2000, p. 39; DE SIMONE 2005, p. 231 (“double”); MAGGIANI 2001, pp. 104; 107; 112, note 69 (“in a consecrated place?”); ADIEGO 2005, p. 19: “the tablet, that (of) here”; FACCHETTI 2005, p. 62: “on it” (from \*(*i*)*sale-θi/te*).

<sup>111</sup> MAGGIANI 2001, p. 107 tentatively translates “has registered” (or similar).

The syntagma *peš tarxianêš* (< \*-neis/-nais) is written as separative ablative of *peš tarxiana*<sup>112</sup>. Roncalli (2002) and De Simone (2005/2007), however, reconstruct *tarxianêš-i* (in the pertinentive case: “of the estate by Tarchiane” or “for Tarchiane”) interpreting the vertical line in the *a capo* sign as a correction: the letter *i* should be added to *tarxianêš*<sup>113</sup>. The line, however, is rather a correction of the irregular *a capo* sign itself. In view of the ablative, “from the Tarchianan estate”, \**Tarchia* may have been Pêtru’s birth place far outside Cortona. A place called Tarciano still exists near Poggibonsi (not far from Siena).

### Section VI (A 23-B 1)

Its only phrase reads: *cnl . nuθe . malec . lart . cucrina . lausisa zilaθ mexl . rašnal...* (what follows is an incomplete list of male persons since fragment 8 is missing).

The meaning of *male* is certain: “he/they see” in view of the lexemes *malena*, *malna* and *malstria* which mean “mirror”<sup>114</sup>. Since the listed persons are witnesses like the *nuθanatur* in Section III *nuθe* may mean “they hear” or “observe”<sup>115</sup>.

According to Facchetti the lexeme *cn-l* is the plural accusative of (*e*)*ca* (“this”)<sup>116</sup>. So “these things hear and see Lart Cucrina... (and the other men of the list)”.

The syntagma *zilaθ mexl . rašnal* may according to Rix be translated as Latin *praetor rei publicae* (“praetor of the public (*rašna*) thing (*mex*; cf. Latin *res*), i.e. of the republic”), praetor who was the highest magistrate of a city, in this case Cortona<sup>117</sup>. His presence can be explained by the fact that Pêtru’s property (land) in the plain and on the hill became *rašna* (“public”, A4-5) and by the condition “let x + y measure” (A6). Interestingly, Cato (ca 160 BC) writes that in case of conflicts about land, «Rome had to judge»<sup>118</sup>. In Etruscan cities, which came under Roman supervision between 396 and 280 BC, this task was doubtless delegated to the highest Etruscan urban magistrate, the *zilaθ*.

The list of persons, all men, originally probably approximately 15, some with their son, sons or grandsons, has a high elite character which may indicate that they formed the advising, juridical counsel of the *zilaθ* (praetor)<sup>119</sup>, not necessarily the senate since

<sup>112</sup> RIX 2002, p. 85.

<sup>113</sup> RONCALLI 2002, pp. 48-50. There is no relation with \**tarxie* in *pavatarxies* as suggested by FACCHETTI 2000, p. 80; FACCHETTI 2002b, p. 89.

<sup>114</sup> D. MARAS, in *StEtr* LXXIII, 2007 [2009], pp. 237-239.

<sup>115</sup> WYLIN 2002b, pp. 217-218 translates “to guarantee” or “to approve”. AMANN 2005, p. 193 compares it with Latin *probare* (cf. *viderunt et probaverunt*: “they saw and approved”). Cf. AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, pp. 106-107. AGOSTINIANI (forthcoming) translates: “is/are present”.

<sup>116</sup> FACCHETTI 2000, p. 48, note 281; p. 82. Only RIX 2000, p. 17 interprets it as genitive of the plural accusative.

<sup>117</sup> According to WYLIN (2000, pp. 272-276) *mex* means “place”. For Etruscan magistrates, see MAGGIANI 1996.

<sup>118</sup> CATO, *agr.* 149, 2.

<sup>119</sup> SCARANO USSANI-TORELLI 2003, pp. 54-55.

in Etruscan this is called \**ceḡanar* (cf. Latin *superiores*), a translation which is based on the adverb *ceḡa* which means “above”<sup>120</sup>.

Of all men only Cucrina’s function is mentioned which is a clear indication that the transactions were not only private.

#### Section VII (B 2-8)

Its only phrase reads: *zilci . larḡal . cusuḡ . titinal larisal-c . saliniḡ aulesla . celtinêitissḡ . tarsminaḡḡ . sparza in ḡuḡt ceḡu ratm . suḡiu . suḡiusvê* ... (followed by the names of four male persons written in the genitive).

The syntagma *zilci . larḡal . cusuḡ . titinal larisal-c . saliniḡ aulesla* means “during the *zilaḡ*-ship of Larth Cusu, son of Titinei, and Laris Salini, son of Aule”, *zilci* being the temporal locative of \**zil(a)c* (“praetorship”). Usually an Etruscan city had one *zilaḡ*<sup>121</sup>. Maybe the two, probably annual magistrates, were chosen by analogy with Roman *duumviri*.

The syntagma *celtinêi tissḡ . tarsminaḡḡ* means “in this here area > in this area here of Lake Trasimene”. The lexeme *celtinêi* consists perhaps of *celti-nêi* (< \*-*na-i*), locative of the exceptional adjective *celti-na*<sup>122</sup>. The adverb *celḡi* (“here”) is present in four identical votive inscriptions from nearby Castiglione del Lago (Trasimeno) (Rix, *ET* Co 4.1-4) reading: *mi cels atial celḡi* (“I (am) of Cel Mother, here”). Objections have been made to the interpretation of *tissḡ* (genitive of *tis*) “lake”, since *ti* would not be identical with *ḡi* (“water”) mentioned in the *Liber linteus*<sup>123</sup>. Colonna derives the vase name *ḡina* (Latin *tina*) from Greek *dinos*<sup>124</sup>. However, we may not exclude the possibility that *ḡina* consists of *ḡi-* and *-na*, formed like *zavena* and *faḡena* (*faḡe-na*: probably “oil-vase”)<sup>125</sup>.

So *ti* may mean “water”, and *tis*, composed like *murs* (*mur-s*, “sarcophagus”, “object of stay” (cf. Latin *mora*))<sup>126</sup>, is an object of water, “lake”, also in view of the following adjective *tarsmi-na(s)* (“Trasimene”).

The next syntagma contains some lexemes which were dealt with before: *sparza in ḡuḡt ceḡu ratm . suḡiu . suḡiusvê* (< \*-*ai* (locative)) ... means “the tablet, which in the house (is) lying, according to the rite (is (now)) deposited in the \**suḡius-va* of...”. The latter lexeme is the plural of *suḡius*, which contains the stem *suḡi-*, the well known

<sup>120</sup> MAGGIANI 1996, p. 107. The syntagma *clen ceḡa* means “on behalf of the son”, cf. Greek *hyper* (“above, over, on behalf of”).

<sup>121</sup> The public bronze tablet (Rix, *ET* Ta 8.1), mentioned before, may have mentioned two *zilaḡ* if *estic* has to be read as [- -]/*esi-c*.

<sup>122</sup> AGOSTINIANI (forthcoming) does not exclude that *celtina* means “territory”.

<sup>123</sup> V. BELLELLI, in *Mediterranea* III, 2006 [2007], p. 206. FACCHETTI 2005, p. 62 divides *celtinêitissḡ* into *celtinê itissḡ* and translates *itiss* as “lake”.

<sup>124</sup> G. COLONNA, in *AC* XXV-XXVI, 1973-74, pp. 145-149.

<sup>125</sup> V. BELLELLI-E. BENELLI, in *Mediterranea* VI, 2009 [2010], pp. 139-152. Cf. FACCHETTI 2002a, p. 79.

<sup>126</sup> VAN DER MEER 2007, pp. 117-118.

word for “tomb” (from *suθ-* (“to place”)), but here used as “deposit”, “archive”, “filing cabinet” or “*tabularium*”<sup>127</sup>.

Then follow the names of Velche Cusu, son of Aule, Velthur Titlnei (or Titinei), Larth Cêlatina, and Laris Cêlatina. Praetor Larth Cusu and Velche Cusu are not sons of Laris which implies that the tablet or a copy of it which was first in the house of the Cusuthur, the house of Laris’ sons, Velche and Laris, and Lariza son of Laris, in an area near Lake Trasimene (A19), was transferred to one of the houses of the four men mentioned, most likely to that of Velche Cusu, son of Aule, who is mentioned before, in A28 (list 3). It must have happened at least one year later, after the praetorship of Lart Cucrina in Section VI, A24, and during that of the two praetors in Section VII, B2-3. The three families mentioned (Cusu, Titlnei and Cêlatina) were connected by intermarriage. They probably shared the land which they had, indirectly, got from Pêtru Scêvaș.

#### THE UPDATED, REVISED TRANSLATION

Based on the foregoing analysis I present a corrected and updated word-for-word translation:

Side A1-32; B1

Thus by Pêtru Scêvaș, the one of the oil/olives/oil-seller (?), both the vineyard and the deposit (or garden) (were) ceded, (being large) 10 *tênθur* (surface measure), to the Cusu family, and the farm land in the plain, being (large) 410 *tênθur*; of these (which are) in this (place), the property (land) in the plain and on the hill, (is; let be) public, (being worth) 204.5 units in metal (of silver?). As to the farm land of Pêtru, both the haruspex and the libation-maker (let be present), during/within a month the *tênθur* (“measure”; object) let measure the measurer and two *prinisera* (“bearers of oak poles”?) (subjects).

By... (?) of this sacred action, however, of the Cusu family (is) the farm land, the one of Pêtru Scêvaș.

Hearers (or observers) (are...) (the names of 15 male persons follow; list 1)

Of the part > participants are... (list 2)

This document has been written (copied) from the bronze (?) tablet, which in the house of the Cusuthur (is) placed; the deposited (item) of this (is) according to rite in the house lying, in this (house) (of) here. The “father” (master of the house), on the tablet here, ratified, the text has incised, for the Cusu, sons of Laris, and for Pêtru Scêvaș from the Tarchianan estate.

These things hear (or observe) and see Lart Cucrina, praetor of the city (republic) and ... (names of around 15 main male persons, some sons and grandsons follow; list 3)

<sup>127</sup> MAGGIANI 2001, p. 105. *Contra*: DE SIMONE 2007, pp. 3-4. FACCHETTI 2005, pp. 62-63 interprets the locative as an instrumentalis “by means of the acts of deposit”. WYLLIN 2004, p. 116 sees the -s as a morpheme of agency (“something which makes stay; residence”).

## Side B2-8

During the praetorship of Larth Cusu, son of Titinei, and Laris Salini, son of Aule, from the area here from/of Lake Trasimene the tablet, which (was) in the house lying, according to rite (is) [now] placed in the deposits of Velche Cusu, son of Aule, and.... (3 male persons follow; list 4).

## THE GENERAL SENSE OF THE CONTENT

The global evaluations advanced by Agostiniani and Nicosia, Rix<sup>128</sup>, Maggiani, and Scarano Ussani & Torelli<sup>129</sup>, De Simone<sup>130</sup> and Pittau have been analyzed and rejected by P. Amann (2005).

As for word interpretations she holds that the supposed stem *vina* in *vinac* (A1) does not mean “vineyard” since *vinac* is present in the family name *vinacna*<sup>131</sup>; she correctly rejects Rix’ interpretation of *tênθur* as “leaseholders”, and doubts whether *pes* means “estate; farm land”.

In Amann’s opinion TCo mentions a private juridical action between Pêtru Scêvaš and the Cusu family, suggesting that the second party bought from the first<sup>132</sup>. The transaction would not be about public law since no *zilaθ* is mentioned at the *beginning* of the text<sup>133</sup>. She suggests that there may have been a problem with the civil status of Pêtru Scêvaš since his *praenomen* is missing<sup>134</sup>. For that reason his wife Arntlei would be present. In Section III the neighbours of the transacted pieces of land would have been witnesses as happened later in Roman land transactions. She holds, like Scarano Ussani and Torelli, that comparisons with Roman law are legitimate, though we know hardly anything about Etruscan law. She acknowledges, however, the danger of circular reasoning when one uses written sources about Greek and Roman legal practices.

In view of my comments there is no reason to doubt the meaning of *vina*, *tênθur* and *pes*. The transactions were not only private but also public. The first lines refer to a private action (A1-3), but the next phrase (A3-5) is about public terrain in view of the word *rašna*. The latter is confirmed by the presence of a *zilaθ* in Section III, A23-24, accompanied by members of the high society of Cortona. It cannot be proven that these elite persons lived next to the transacted lands. The public or official status of the actions is also evident later on (B2-8), when during the governorship of two praetors a copy of the tablet which was first present in the house of the sons of Laris Cusu, was

<sup>128</sup> Also rejected by AGOSTINIANI 2008, p. 175.

<sup>129</sup> Also rejected by AGOSTINIANI 2008, p. 174, note 114.

<sup>130</sup> De Simone’s interpretation (2000) is based on an incorrect transcription.

<sup>131</sup> CIE 5340.

<sup>132</sup> AMANN 2005, p. 194, note 85.

<sup>133</sup> Cf. RIX, *ET* Ta 8.1 (fragmentary bronze plate). Amann’s argument is not strong since the *Tabula* is a copy (see A18) from a former, probably more provisional one.

<sup>134</sup> BENELLI (2002, p. 96), however, suggests that the first names of Pêtru and his wife are not mentioned because they were the main persons and therefore, everybody knew them.

transferred to and placed in the second house, probably that of Velche Cusu, who was a son of Aule.

One should evaluate the text from the emic view, that is from the Cortonese/Etruscan viewpoint without the comparison with Greek land transactions<sup>135</sup> and the use of later Roman laws. The reasons for the land transfers may have been simple:

1. Pêtru Scêvaś and Arntlei were childless and therefore eventually decided to return to their home place(s), probably in the *ager Saenensis*<sup>136</sup>, Chiusi or Perugia. Pêtru ceded land to the Cusu for ever, since in section VI three generations are mentioned.

2. The economic situation in or after the Second Punic War was so bad at Cortona that the local aristocracy and the city government needed farm land<sup>137</sup>.

3. Pêtru Scêvaś gave land, *vina* and *restm*, and part of the *pes* (A3-4) back to the Cusu from whom he had leased it. His property/land in the plain and on the hill became public land (*ager publicus*) for which he probably received a substantial financial compensation (A4-5).

The ceding was probably not due to a conflict between two families, since there was some intermarriage<sup>138</sup>.

To conclude, TCo is not only a legal document which casts light upon the society and economy of Cortona, but it also has a religious and ritual dimension in view of the sacred character of land measuring and the copying and archiving of transactions according to rite.

L. BOUKE VAN DER MEER

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### a. GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADIEGO I.-J. 2006, *Observaciones sobre la formación del plural en etrusco*, in *Studies Presented to Joaquín Sanmartín, Aula Orientalis Suppl. 22*, Sabadell, pp. 1-13 (also online).
- AGOSTINIANI L. 2008, *L'etrusco: panoramica degli studi (1979-2008)*, in *AION Ling XXX - III*, pp. 145-191.
- BENTZ M. 1992, *Etruskische Votivbronzen des Hellenismus*, Firenze.
- BENTZ M. - REUSSER C. 2008, *Marzabotto: Planstadt der Etrusker*, Mainz.
- BREYER G. 1993, *Etruskisches Sprachgut im Lateinischen unter Ausschluss des spezifisch onomastischen Bereiches*, Leuven.

<sup>135</sup> SCARANO USSANI-TORELLI 2003, pp. 49-50. No magistrates were involved in the Greek land transactions.

<sup>136</sup> See RIX, *ET AS 1.279: θana : petrui : cususa* ("Thana Petrui, wife of Cusu"); MAGGIANI 2002b, p. 13.

<sup>137</sup> Compare MAGGIANI 2001, p. 110.

<sup>138</sup> RIX 2000, p. 21. SCARANO USSANI-TORELLI 2003, pp. 108-110. AGOSTINIANI-NICOSIA 2000, p. 124: RIX, *ET Co 1.5 (CIE 441): v . cusu . cr. l . apa / pêtural . clan* ("Vel Cusu Cr(espe ?), father of L(aris ?), son of Pêturai"). MAGGIANI 2002b, pp. 12-14 mentions AS 1.279 (from S. Quirico d'Orcia): *θana : petrui : cususa* ("Thana Petrui, wife of Cusu"). Therefore, PERUZZI (2009) incorrectly suggests that even in the last centuries BC there was no intermarriage between elite and non elite families.

- CAMPBELL B. 2000, *The Writings of the Roman Land Surveyors. Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary*, London.
- CATALI F. 2000, *La moneta*, in TORELLI 2000, pp. 89-93.
- DE GRUMMOND N. T. - SIMON E. (eds.) 2006, *The Religion of the Etruscans*, Austin.
- DE LIGT L. - NORTHWOOD S. (eds.) 2008, *People, Land, and Politics. Demographic Developments and the Transformation of Roman Italy 300 BC-AD 14*, Leiden-Boston.
- FACCHETTI G. M. 2002a, *Appunti di morfologia etrusca. Con un'appendice sulla questione delle affinità genetiche dell'etrusco*, Firenze.
- FORTUNELLI S. (ed.) 2005, *Il Museo della Città Etrusca e Romana di Cortona. Catalogo delle collezioni*, Firenze.
- GORINI G. 2005, *La monetazione*, in FORTUNELLI 2005, pp. 363-372.
- MAGGIANI A. 1996, *Appunti sulle magistrature etrusche*, in *StEtr* LXII [1998], pp. 95-137.
- 2002a, *La libbra etrusca. Sistemi ponderali e monetazione*, in *StEtr* LXV-LXVIII, pp. 163-199.
- MARAS D. F. 2009, *Il dono votivo. Gli dei e il sacro nelle iscrizioni etrusche di culto*, Pisa-Roma.
- 2013, *Numbers and reckoning: a whole civilization founded upon divisions*, in J. MACINTOSH TURFA J. (ed.), *The Etruscan World*, London, pp. 478-491.
- MASSERIA C. (ed.) 2001, *10 anni di archeologia a Cortona*, Roma.
- POCETTI P. 2011, *Strutture della coordinazione in etrusco*, in 'Αλεξάνδρεια - Alexandria, *Rivista di Glottologia* V, pp. 243-287.
- RIX H. 2004, *Etruscan*, in R. D. WOODARD (ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Cambridge, pp. 943-966.
- ROSELAAR S. T. 2008, *Public Land in the Roman Republic: A Social and Economic History of the ager publicus*, PhD thesis Leiden.
- SASSELLI G. - GOVI E. (eds.) 2005, *Culti, forma urbana e artigianato a Marzabotto. Nuove prospettive di ricerca*, Bologna.
- TORELLI M. (ed.) 2000, *Gli Etruschi*, Catalogue of the exhibition (Venice 2000), Milano.
- UNTERMANN J. 2000, *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*, Heidelberg.
- VAN DER MEER L. B. 2007, *Liber linteus zagradiensis. The Linen Book of Zagreb. A Comment on the Longest Etruscan Text*, Louvain-Dudley (Mass.).
- WYLLIN K. 2000, *Il verbo etrusco. Ricerca morfosintattica delle forme usate in funzione verbale*, Roma.
- 2002a, *I morfemi -(a)θ e -(u)c/χ nei termini delle magistrature etrusche*, in *ArchGlottIt* LXXXVII, pp. 88-108.
- 2004, *Un morfema aggettivo etrusco*, in *ArchGlottIt* LXXXIX, pp. 11-127.

#### b. BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE *TABULA CORTONENSIS*

- ADIEGO I.-J. 2005, *The Etruscan Tabula Cortonensis: a tale of two tablets?*, in *Die Sprache* XLV [2006], pp. 3-20.
- AGNATI U. 2005, *La 'distruzione conservativa' della Tabula Cortonensis*, in *Athenaeum* XCIII, pp. 135-142.
- AGOSTINIANI L., forthcoming, *Dopo l'edizione della Tabula Cortonensis*, in *Studi in onore di Francesco Nicotri*.
- AGOSTINIANI L. - NICOSIA F. 2000, *Tabula Cortonensis*, *Studia Archaeologica* 105, Roma.
- AMANN P. 2005, *Die Tabula Cortonensis. Ein epigraphischer Neufund aus Etrurien und seine unterschiedlichen Interpretationen*, in F. BEUTLER - W. HAMETER (eds.), "Eine ganz normale Inschrift" und Ähnliches zum Geburtstag von Ekkehard Weber. *Festschrift zum 30. April 2005*, Wien, pp. 179-196.
- BENELLI E. 2002, *Le formule onomastiche della Tabula Cortonensis e il valore del metronimico*, in PANDOLFINI - MAGGIANI 2002, pp. 93-100.
- BOTTINI A. 1999, *Gentiluomini di Cortona*, in *Archeo* 174, pp. 6-7.
- BRUSCHETTI P. 2002, *Società e cultura a Cortona nel medio ellenismo*, in PANDOLFINI - MAGGIANI 2002, pp. 27-38.



- CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI L. 2002, *Saluto d'apertura*, in PANDOLFINI-MAGGIANI 2002, pp. 7-9.
- DE SIMONE C. 1998, *La Tabula Cortonensis: tra linguistica e storia*, in *AnnScPisa*, s. IV, III 1-2 [2000], pp. 1-122.
- 2001, Review of V. Scarano Ussani-M. Torelli, *La Tabula Cortonensis*, in *AION ArchStAnt* n.s. VIII [2003], pp. 223-246.
- 2001-2, *Il testo della Tabula Cortonensis: un primo bilancio critico*, in *Ocnus* IX-X, pp. 69-114.
- 2002, *Su due termini della Tabula Cortonensis*, in *Incontri Linguistici* XXV, pp. 77-85.
- 2003a, Review of L. Agostiniani-F. Nicosia, *Tabula Cortonensis*, in *Gnomon* LXXV, pp. 37-42.
- 2003b, *Etrusco šuθiušvê (Tabula Cortonensis): questioni morfologiche e semantico-lessicali*, in *AION Ling* XXIV, pp. 5-62.
- 2004, Review of G. M. Facchetti, *Appunti di morfologia etrusca*, in *Gnomon* LXXVI, pp. 496-500.
- 2005, *Sull'origine e funzione della voce Tarxianêsi della Tabula Cortonensis*, in *Mediterranea* [2006], pp. 219-242.
- 2007, *Alcuni termini chiave della Tabula Cortonensis*, in *Rasenna. Journal of the Center for Etruscan Studies* I 1, pp. 1-6 (also online).
- 2009, *L'onomastica personale della Tabula Cortonensis*, in P. POCETTI (ed.), *L'onomastica dell'Italia antica. Aspetti linguistici, storici, culturali, tipologici e classificatori*, Collection de l'École Française de Rome 413, Roma, pp. 535-550.
- EICHNER H. 2002, *Etruskisch -ovla auf der Bronze von Cortona*, in F. CAVOTO (ed.), *The Complete Linguist: A Collection of Papers in Honour of Alexis Manaster Ramer*, Munich, pp. 141-152.
- 2006, *Das ê von Cortona und das etruskische Phonemsystem*, in P. AMANN-M. PERAZZI-H. TAUBER (eds.), *Festschrift für Luciana Aigner Foresti*, Wien, pp. 209-220.
- FACCHETTI, G. M. 2000, *Frammenti di diritto privato etrusco*, Firenze.
- 2002b, *La Tabula Cortonensis come documento giuridico*, in PANDOLFINI-MAGGIANI 2002, pp. 87-99.
- 2003, *Note etrusche*, in *ArchGlottIt* LXXXVIII, pp. 203-219.
- 2005, *Some new remarks on the Tabula Cortonensis (= TCo)*, in *Lingua Posnaniensis* XLVII, pp. 59-63 (= *Miscellanea italica*, Milano 2005, pp. 71-80; also online).
- HADAS-LEBEL J. forthcoming, *Êtr. sran*, in *Actes du colloque "Du mot à l'inscription: recherches lexicales et lexicographiques sur les langues de l'Italie préromaine"* (Lyon 2012), Lyon.
- MAGGIANI A. 2001, *Dagli archivi dei Cusu. Considerazioni sulla tavola bronzea di Cortona*, in *RdA* XXV, pp. 94-114.
- 2002b, *Introduzione ai lavori. Riflessioni sulla Tavola di Cortona*, in PANDOLFINI-MAGGIANI 2002, pp. 11-15, 65-75.
- MANCINI A. 2005, *I materiali rinvenuti insieme alla Tabula Cortonensis*, in S. FORTUNELLI (ed.), *Il Museo della Città Etrusca e Romana di Cortona*, Firenze, pp. 332-334.
- MARCHESE M. P. 2001, Review of L. Agostiniani-F. Nicosia, *Tabula Cortonensis*, in *ArchGlottIt* LXXI, pp. 122-128.
- NICOSIA F. 2002, *Il 'contesto' archeologico della Tavola di Cortona*, in PANDOLFINI-MAGGIANI 2002, pp. 17-25.
- PANDOLFINI ANGELETTI M. 2002, *Le tavole di bronzo in Etruria*, in PANDOLFINI-MAGGIANI 2002, 53-64.
- PANDOLFINI M.-MAGGIANI A. (eds.) 2002, *La Tabula Cortonensis e il suo contesto storico-archeologico*, Atti dell'Incontro di studio (Roma 2001), *QuadAEI* 28, Roma.
- PERUZZI E. 2001, *Sulla tavola etrusca di Cortona*, in *ParPass* LVI, pp. 203-210.
- 2002, *Per l'edizione della Tavola*, in PANDOLFINI-MAGGIANI 2002, pp. 39-42.
- 2009, *Etruschi della Tavola di Cortona*, in *Studi Camporeale*, II, pp. 697-699.
- PITTAU M. 2000, *Tabula Cortonensis, Lamine di Pirgi e altri testi etruschi tradotti e commentati*, Sassari (<http://web.tiscali.it/pittau/Etrusco/Tabula/tabcort.html>).
- RIX H. 2000, *Osservazioni preliminari ad un'interpretazione dell'Aes Cortonense*, in *Incontri Linguistici* XXIII, pp. 11-31.
- 2002, *La seconda metà del nuovo testo di Cortona*, in PANDOLFINI-MAGGIANI 2002, pp. 77-86.

- RONCALLI F. 2002, *Aspetti redazionali della Tabula Cortonensis*, in PANDOLFINI-MAGGIANI 2002, pp. 43-52.
- SCARANO USSANI V. - TORELLI M. 2003, *La Tabula Cortonensis. Un documento giuridico, storico e sociale*, Napoli (extract from *Ostraka XI*, 2002, pp. 3-53).
- SERRA RIDGWAY F. R. 2001, *A new Etruscan text*, in *Classical Review* LI, pp. 278-279.
- TORELLI M. 2004-2005, *La "Tanella Angori", i Cusu e la Tabula Cortonensis*, in *RendPontAcc* LXXVII, pp. 163-187.
- 2005, *La Tabula Cortonensis*, in FORTUNELLI 2005, pp. 323-331.
- WALLACE R. 2000, Review of L. Agostiniani-F. Nicosia, *Tabula Cortonensis*, in *EtrSt* VII, pp. 5-10 (also online).
- 2003a, Review of M. Pandolfini - A. Maggiani, *La Tabula Cortonensis e il suo contesto storico-archeologico*, in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2003.11.11 (online).
- 2003b, Review of V. Ussani - M. Torelli, *La Tabula Cortonensis*, in *Etruscan News* 3, pp. 11-12 (also online).
- 2008, Zikh Rasna. *A Manual of Etruscan Language and Inscriptions*, Ann Arbor-New York.
- WYLIN K. 2002b, *Forme verbali nella Tabula Cortonensis*, in *StEtr* LXV-LXVIII, pp. 215-223.
- 2003, Review of G. M. Facchetti, *Frammenti di diritto privato etrusco*, in *Etruscan News* 3, pp. 11-12 (also online).
- 2005, *Venel Tamsnies, la tomba degli Scudi e gli epru di Cortona*, in *StEtr* LXXI [2007], pp. 111-125.
- 2006a, *Pyrgi B et la rédaction de la Tabula Cortonensis*, in *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* LXXXV 1, pp. 35-44.
- 2006b, *The first chapter of the Cortona inscription*, in *Etruscan News* 5, pp. 6-7 (also online).