Rasenna: Journal of the Center for Etruscan Studies

Volume 2 | Issue 1 Article 3

2009

Review of Giovanni Colonna & Daniele F. Maras, Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum II, 1, 5 et addit. II, 2, 1

Rex E. Wallace
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.umass.edu/rasenna

Recommended Citation
Wallace, Rex E. (2009) "Review of Giovanni Colonna & Daniele F. Maras, Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum II, 1, 5 et addit. II, 2, 1," *Rasenna: Journal of the Center for Etruscan Studies*: Vol. 2: Iss. 1, Article 3.
Available at: http://scholarworks.umass.edu/rasenna/vol2/iss1/3

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the CES Electronic Resources at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Rasenna: Journal of the Center for Etruscan Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum. II, 1, 5 (Tituli 6325-6723), et addit. vol. II, 2, 1 (Tituli 8881-8927) (Inscriptiones Veiis et in agro veientano, nepesino sutrinoque repertae, additis illis in agro capenate et falisco inventis, quae in fasciculo CIE II, 2, 1 desunt, nec non illis perpaucis in finitimis sabinis repertis). Ed. by GIOVANNI COLONNA & DANIELE F. MARAS. Roma: Centro di Studio per l'Archeologia Etrusco-Italica, 2006. Pp. viii, 136, Tab. XXXVII. ISBN 10 88-8174-452-2, ISBN 13 978-88-8147-452-3.

Reviewed by REX WALLACE, *University of Massachusetts Amherst*

1. The most recent fascicles of the second volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum* (*CIE*) are devoted to the inscriptions, abecedaria, and sigla incised on artifacts recovered from sites located in southeast Etruria.[1] Fascicle 5 of section 1 (*CIE* II, 1, 5) covers Veii, the *Ager Veientanus*, Nepete and Sutrium. An addendum to the first fascicle of section 2 (*CIE* II, 2, 1 *additamentum*) includes the material from the *Ager Capenas* and the *Ager Faliscus* that was not published in *CIE* II, 2, 1. Two inscriptions recovered near Eretum, a site located on the south bank of the Tiber opposite the *Ager Capenas*, complete the addendum.

2. The format follows that elaborated in earlier volumes of *CIE*. According to custom, the text is composed in Latin.[2]

Both fascicles are divided into sections. Fascicle 5 has three: Veii and *Ager Veientanus*, Nepete and Sutrium. The addendum to fascicle 1 has five: Capena and the *Ager Capenas*, Falerii, Narce, Corchiano and Vignanello. Each section begins with a short introduction covering historical matters. In the case of Veii this includes discussion of topography, the history of the investigation of the site, and the distinctive paleographic characteristics of the inscriptions (for discussion, see section 6.). Maps of the sites, including detailed plans of the Portonaccio sanctuary at Veii, complement the introductory material. The entries for inscriptions, abecedaria, and sigla are organized into sub-sections based on the find spots of the artifacts on which they were incised, stamped or painted. For Veii this includes the Portonaccio sanctuary and areas located to the east and the north, including Campetti, Macchiagrande, Piano di Communità, and Piazza d'Armi.

---

[1] I use the Latin term sigla to refer to letters, signs, and numbers that are intended to convey information by non-linguistic means. I do not consider abbreviations for proper names sigla. See the discussion by de Grummond in de Grummond, Bare, and Meilleur 2000: 25–26.

[2] Marco Buonocore translated the major prose sections of the text from Italian into Latin.

Each entry includes a description of the artifact, its material composition, its size, and its date. Inscriptions, abecedaria, and sigla are described by their location on the artifact, by the direction of writing, and by the size of the letter(s). The descriptive section ends with references to the publications that bear on the readings and to the table of photographs located at the end of the volume. Inscriptions are transcribed using standard epigraphic notation.[3] Transcription is accompanied by a drawing, in most cases executed very capably by Daniele Maras.[4] Each entry concludes with an *apparatus criticus* providing alternative readings that have been proposed in the literature. In keeping with the practice of earlier volumes, commentary concerning the interpretation of the text is kept to a minimum. Secondary literature is cited sparingly, primarily in cases where it bears on the restoration of the text of an inscription.

The indices are very useful. Each fascicle has five: an *index verborum*, an *index editionum priorum*, an *index tabellarum* (photographs), an *index museorum* and an *index rerum* (types of artifacts). The photographs increase the volume's usefulness. In many cases the quality is such that it is possible to verify the accuracy of the transcription and the drawing.[5]

3. Of the 398 entries in fascicle 5 (6325–6723) all but eight cover inscriptions on artifacts recovered from Veii and the *Ager Veientanus*. Five entries are from Nepete, and three from Sutrium. The addendum to fascicle 1 of section 2 has 46 entries (8881–8927). They are distributed geographically as follows: Capena and

---

[3] The editors do not adhere to Leiden system of punctuation in all particulars. For example, letters erroneously incised by scribes are enclosed within angled brackets *(cnov<e>i̯es)* rather than curly brackets *(cnov{e}i̯es)*. Etruscologists have not developed a standard convention for the representation of syllabic punctuation. In these fascicles a distinction is made between punctuation with one point, e.g., *.c*, and punctuation with two or more points, e.g., *.a.* . In a few cases editors attempt to reproduce the form of the punctuation, e.g. ⁝⁝. The editors also adopt a conservative mode of transcription for the sibilant letters. Unfortunately, this system does not do justice to Etruscan phonology. For problems of transcription see Pallottino 1967, Rix 1991 (I): 21–22 and Wallace 1991.

[4] Although Giovanni Colonna and Daniele Maras are listed as co-editors, there seems to have been a clear division of labor. Colonna was responsible for proofreading and editing, and for the composition of the prose introduction to the inscriptions from Veii. Maras composed the entries and the other prose introductions.

[5] In a few cases better photographs might have been provided. For example, a photograph taken from a different angle would have made 6451 easier to see. For 6453, which was incised around the belly of a ceramic vessel, it would have been nice to have a series of photographs in order to display the entire inscription as was done for others in the corpus. The photograph of 8902 is very dark; it is difficult to make out the letters at the end of the inscription.

the *Ager Capenas* (7), Falerii (9), Narce (8), Corchiano (16), Vignanello (3), and Sabina (2).

The inscriptions cover a broad spectrum of epigraphic types. Votives from the Portonaccio sanctuary at Veii make up the lion's share, but there are, in addition, potters' inscriptions (6673d[2], 6675), funerary inscriptions (6661, 6719), proprietary inscriptions (6710, 6712b), dedicatory inscriptions (6713), anti-theft inscriptions (6409), and captions on mirrors (8886). The function of the inscription from la 'Cavetta' di Monte Santangelo (6707), which is a name (*larθ xθrisna*, possibly to be read as *ẹθrisna*) incised on the wall of a roadway excavated through tufa, cannot be determined with certainty. The name may be that of the administrator responsible for overseeing the project.

Among the artifacts recovered from Formello, a site located a few kilometers from Veii, is an amphora incised with two of the most notable abecedaria in the Etruscan corpus (6673b, 6673c = *Etruskische Texte* (*ET*) Ve 9.1, Ve 9.2). The alphabets are accompanied by a dedication (6673d[1] = *ET* Ve 3.1), an artisan's inscription (6673d[2] = *ET* Ve 6.1), and what may be magic incantations.[6]

Over half of the entries in fascicle 5 are sigla. 180 entries from Portonaccio consist of letters or numbers placed on roof tiles and *antepagamenta* by craftsmen in order to facilitate in their placement in the roofing system. (These items were recovered from the area of Temple A.) 94 sigla were incised on pieces of pottery recovered at other sites in Veii and environs. Eight entries in the addendum to fascicle 1 are sigla. They are from the site of Corchiano in the *Ager Faliscus*.

The breakdown by category for the entries in the two fascicles is as follows: 3 abecedaria vs. 121 inscriptions vs. 274 sigla for fascicle 5; 36 inscriptions vs. 8 sigla for the addendum to fascicle 1.[7]

4. The most significant inscriptions in these fascicles are the votives incised on kantharoi, kylikes, etc., recovered from the Portonaccio sanctuary at Veii (numbers 6397-6479, excluding sigla). Most of this material has been published in *editiones minores*.[8] And recently Daniele Maras re-edited the inscriptions and sigla recovered from the excavations conducted by Massimo Pallottino during the

---

[6] The incantations, if that is what they are, were placed after abecedarium 6673b and inscription 6674d[2], and both before and after abecedarium 6673c. For example, the phrase *azaru azaru azaruas* follows the artisan's signature in 6673d[2].

[7] Some entries contain multiple inscriptions. As a result the number of inscriptions is higher than the number of entries.

[8] See Pallottino 1968, Rix et al. 1991, and Wallace et al. 2004–present.

1939–1940 seasons.[9] Even so, for research purposes it is useful to have an *editio major* of the entire corpus of texts from Portonaccio together with drawings, photographs and essential bibliography.

5. The transcriptions provided for the inscriptions, abecedaria and sigla are accurate, as far as can be determined by checking against the photographs in the *tabulae*. Corrections to transcriptions printed in Rix's *Etruskische Texte* (*ET*), which serves as a major resource for those who investigate linguistic matters, are particularly welcome. The editors note that 6341 (*mi fx[*) appears twice in *ET*, once as Ve 4.2 (*mi fḷ[eres]*) and once as Ve 4.3 (*mi fụ[flunsl]*). They also point out that the find spot for 6356 is Macchiagrande rather than Portonaccio, as is printed in *ET* Ve 3.26. The final portion of 6409 is now more accurately read as *m[i] ṇ[u]ṇa.i.*. Earlier editors did not detect any of the letters following *m* because of damage to the wine vessel. In *ET* Ve 3.13 this portion of the inscription was restored as *m[i nunar]*. 6676 is transcribed as *mi larisaḷ pataraṣ*. The praenomen *larisaḷ* was printed without word-final *–l* in *ET* Ve 2.7. Finally, the family name *vel[– – –].n.ś.na.ś.* (6714) was mistakenly printed without the lambda in *ET* Ve 3.10.

A few transcriptions printed here differ in detail from those published in recent volumes of *Studi Etruschi*. For example, *SE* 65–68 (2002) REE 73 is printed as *mi zinace vel[θur a]ncinie[.]s.*; in *CIE* 6449b the same text is transcribed as *mi ziṇace velθ[ur ·]ncinie[.]s.*.[10]

The votive inscriptions incised on the pottery recovered from the Portonaccio sanctuary are in large part incomplete because of damage to the ceramic. The restorations endorsed by the editors are entirely appropriate. Most involve a first person object pronoun (*mini, mine, mene*) or a verb (*muluvanice, turuce*) in syntax that is rigidly structured.[11]

---

[9] The material is in an appendix (II) to Colonna's book on the Portonaccio sanctuary (Colonna 2002). The appendix has 11 inscriptions and 2 sigla.

[10] The difference is to be attributed to different editors. Colonna was responsible for the entry published in *Studi Etruschi*, Maras for the entry in *CIE*.

[11] Even so the restoration of the precise form of the pronoun and verb in so-called *muluvanice* inscriptions is not as straightforward as appears at first glance. For example, if the verb is spelled *muluvanice* then the first person pronominal object is always *mini*. However, if the verb is spelled *mulvanice*, then the pronominal form is *mini* or *mine*. If the verb is *muluvenice* or *mulvenece*, then the pronoun is *mine*. These spelling correspondences suggest a link between the weakening of the medial vowels in the verb form and the weakening of the final vowel of the pronoun. A third form of the pronoun, namely *mene*, is attested at Portonaccio. Unfortunately, the inscriptions in which the pronoun *mene* appears are incomplete and the verb forms are missing. Nevertheless, it

6. In terms of paleographic and orthographic features, the inscriptions from Veii, and in particular those from the sanctuary at Portonaccio, deserve special consideration.

The most notable feature is syllabic punctuation. Letters that close syllables and words, and vowel letters that stand in word-initial position, are sometimes set off from other letters by means of points or periods.[12] The placement of the points — in front, behind, on top, beneath the letters — and the number of points varied. The most common mode of punctuation was two points, but punctuation with one, three, and four points is also attested.[13] 25 of the 121 inscriptions from Veii have words with syllabic punctuation. 16 of the 25 inscriptions with this feature were recovered from the Portonaccio sanctuary, which provides support for the idea that scribes working there were responsible for implementing, if not developing, this orthographic feature.[14] The convention soon spread to other communities in the vicinity of Veii. Syllabic punctuation is found on two inscriptions from Narce (8902, 8906) and on one inscription from Capena (8882).[15]

In most areas of southern Etruria the two sibilant sounds (/s/ vs. /š/) in the Etruscan phonological inventory were spelled by three-bar sigma (for (/s/) and san (for /š/). At Veii, however, the sibilants were spelled by five sibilant-signs: ϟ ϟ ϟ M and +. ϟ is the most frequent. It is found in 30 inscriptions (4x retrograde). The 'sign of the cross' is found in 11 inscriptions. It has two forms, + (5x) and X

---

seems unlikely that *muluvanice* is an appropriate restoration when the verb is in construction with *mene*.

[12] In 6703 ·X· spells the first sound of the name **.š.etiu**. The initial letter here, although not in a position to be marked by syllabic punctuation, was so written by graphic analogy to the punctuated form found in syllable-final and word-final positions.

[13] Distinct styles of punctuation can be recognized based on the number of points that are employed. Some scribes use a single point, others two, three, or even four points. If a single point is used, the punctuation generally follows the letter. If two points are used, then the placement of the points is conditioned to some extent by the form of the letter. For example, the 'sign of the cross' was pointed in two ways: either above and below or in front and in back of the crossbars. Alpha was generally punctuated by placing points above and below the medial bar, but in one case the points were positioned before and behind the letter. 3-bar sigma was pointed in front of and behind the medial bar. Nu was generally pointed above and below the medial oblique bar. When 3-point punctuation was used, the third point was placed outside the letter, either before or in front. In 6409 and 6455, for example, alpha is punctuated with points above and below the medial crossbar and then a point following the letter. The 'sign of the cross' was sometimes punctuated with four points, one point placed above, below, in front, and behind.

[14] For discussion of syllabic punctuation in Etruscan see Rix 1968 and Wachter 1986.

[15] Syllabic punctuation is also found on a few inscriptions from Caere and from the *Ager Faliscus* as well as on a few inscriptions from Etruscan sites in Campania.

(6x), and they are in complementary distribution. When the letter is punctuated, it is written as X; when not punctuated it is written as +. ⵉ and ⵊ are found 6x (2x retrograde) and 4x respectively. The letter san M appears in two inscriptions (6410, 6714).

The quality of the sibilant sound represented by the 's'-letters is known in many instances because they are found in inflectional endings: 1st genitive /s/, 1st pertinentive /si/, and 1st ablative /las/. But when the 's'-letters are found in word-initial and word-medial positions it is more difficult to determine their quality without the comparative evidence of spellings in dialects where the dental and the palatal sibilants were consistently spelled by different letters. For example, comparison of *sucisnaia* (6712) with *sukisnas*, which is attested in an inscription from the *Ager Vulcentanus* (*ET* AV 2.1), proves that the phonological form of the stem had two dental sibilants, /sukisna-/. At Veii the use of different 's'-signs to spell sibilants in the same word or in the same inscription does not appear to have been motivated by a desire to indicate a phonological distinction (/s/ vs. /š/).[16] Rather, it appears to have been a stylistic feature, and one whose ultimate *raison d'etre* is not immediately clear.

A very unusual letterform appears in abecedarium 6670 and in inscription 8889. The letter is ⵔ (in 8889 the loop is angular).[17] The editors transcribe it by means of the letter *o* but a vowel sound with this quality does not belong in the Etruscan inventory. Despite the transcription, the sound represented by the letter is of uncertain quality.[18]

The spelling of the voiceless velar stop /k/ follows in most cases the so-called *c*/*k*/*q*-rule, which was a distinctly southern Etruscan feature of writing. The sign selected to spell the consonant /k/ is determined by the form of the following vowel sign. Gamma was written if the following vowel sign was epsilon or iota (*larice*, *[tu]ruce*, *muluvanice*); kappa if the vowel sign was alpha (*kapi, velkasnas*); and qoppa if the vowel sign was upsilon (*qurtinine*).

The final noteworthy feature of the inscriptions in these fascicles is the direction of writing. Although sinistroverse direction is the default for Etruscan writing in general, dextroverse direction is rather common at Veii. 22 inscriptions and 2 abecedaria were written in this manner. Letters on roof tiles and

---

[16] See, for example, inscriptions 6410, 6419, 6455, 6712, etc.

[17] A letter of similar shape also appears in *ET* Um 1.7 (*frontac*), but this inscription dates to ca. 100–50 BCE.

[18] In 8889 the sign appears in the name *cnov<e>i̯es*. This is the only inscription in which this name is found.

antepagmenta were occasionally written in dextroverse direction as well, e.g., 6480, 6616, 6627, 6630, etc.

7. The fascicles are refreshingly free of errors, typos, and other editorial lapses. I note two.

(1) 6445: There is a mismatch between facsimile and transcription in the restoration of the verb *muluvanice*. The inscription is pieced together from ceramic fragments that do not fit together. The facsimile indicates that the editor thinks there is space for four letters at beginning of the verb (*[mulu]vanice*). However, the transcription of the verb in this section of the inscription is *[mul]vanice*. The discrepancy might be resolved by transcribing *[mul(u)]vanice* and acknowledging that, given considerations of spacing, both are possible.[19]

(2) 6673: In the commentary on abecedarium b) the editors erroneously refer to a) when discussing the scribe's correction of ᒪ to ᚴ.

8. I quibble with a few editorial comments.

(1) 6352: The surviving portion of the inscription is *]a.n.sla*. According to Colonna *–sla* /-šla/ is the genitive singular of the enclitic article that is attached to a nominal stem (ending in *–ans* ?). If this were an appropriate interpretation, it would be significant because it would provide evidence for the spelling of the palatal sibilant by means of three-bar sigma. However, *]ans* is impossible as an archaic period genitive singular.

(2) 6414: The editors take the sign(s) ⁝⁝ as a form of syllabic punctuation marking the final sigma of *]niies* and the initial alpha of *aritimi*. It is worth noting that the punctuation of alpha attested elsewhere at Veii has the form of a dot either above and below the medial bar or of a dot before and after the letter. If there is a third point it stands outside the alpha to the left or to the right. I wonder then if this sign does not serve a different function, perhaps of dividing the text into syntactic constituents.

(3) 6414: The editors choose to restore the final portion of the inscription as *m[i nunar]* rather than *m[i nunai]*, which is attested 2x on Veientine inscriptions (6409, 6427). *mi nunar* appears in inscriptions from Volcii (ET Vc 2.3) and from Suessula in Campania (ET Cm 2.46), but not at Veii.

(4) 6436: The inscription was incised on the side of a votive container made of ceramic. The container was damaged in such a way as to leave the beginning and the end of the inscription intact: *laris velkasnạ*[– – –] *menervas*. In the gap there is room for a verb phrase. The editors suggest that the missing phrase is *mini*

[19] In Maras 2002: 264, no. 163, the verb is transcribed as *[mulu]vanice*.

muluvanice. But this proposal yields syntax that is unusual. When *muluvanice* governs a second complement, either an indirect object or a benefactive, that noun is in the pertinentive case.[20] The verb *turuce*, on the other hand, regularly combines with object pronoun and a genitive referring to the divinity to whom the inscribed artifact is offered (6418). Given the divine name *menervas* the verb *turuce* seems a better choice for this inscription.[21]

(5) The editors think that inscription 8883 from the *Ager Capenas* is Faliscan. While it is true that the alpha and tau of *ḷicinatiu* are written in forms that resemble Neo-Faliscan letters, *u* is not an appropriate ending for a Faliscan name in the nominative singular.

9. *CIE* is of incalculable value for the study of Etruscan paleography, epigraphy, and language. The volumes in the corpus are of special interest not only to linguists and epigraphers but also to those who work in areas of Etruscan studies informed by the language. It is heartening to see that fascicles are appearing with greater regularity and that the quality of the scholarship is at a consistently high level. Colonna and Maras are to be lauded for a fine contribution to this important area of the discipline.

Department of Classics
520 Herter Hall
University of Massachusetts Amherst
Amherst, MA 01003
[rwallace@classics.umass.edu]

REFERENCES

COLONNA, GIOVANNI. 2002. *Il santuario di Portonaccio a Veii*. Roma: Bretschneider.

DE GRUMMOND, NANCY T., CEIL BARE & AMY MEILLEUR. 2000. Etruscan sigla ("Graffiti"): Prolegomena and some cases studies. In R. Ross Holloway (ed.),

[20] For *muluvanice* + pertinentive see the following inscriptions, all from southern Etruria: 6421, 6713; ET Cr 3.15. 3.20; *Etruscan Texts Project* 269. It is unclear whether ET Cl 3.2 (*mine viku muluevneke* [correct to *muluvenke*] *arpaś kamaia*) is a counterexample. The name of the donor could be *viku arpaś; kamaia* could be a metronymic.

[21] Of course one cannot rule out syntactic interference. The verbs *muluvanice* and *turuce* were used in votive dedications at Veii and their meanings were in the same semantic sphere. It is possible that *muluvanice* was occasionally used with a *genetivus donandi* by contamination with the syntax of *turuce*.

Miscellanea Mediterranea. Archaeologica Transatlantica XVIII, 25–38. Providence, R.I.: Center for Old World Archaeology and Art, Brown University.

MARAS, DANIELE. 2002. Appendice II. Le iscrizioni. In Giovanni Colonna, *Il santuario di Portonaccio di Veii*, 262–273. Roma: Bretschneider.

PALLOTTINO, MASSIMO. 1967. Sul valore e sulla trascrizione del sigma a quattro tratti nell'alfabeto etrusco. *SE* 35. 161-173.

—. 1968. *Testimonia linguae etruscae*. 2nd edn. Firenze: Nuova Italia.

RIX, HELMUT. 1968. Zur Ursprung der etruskischen Silbenpunktierung. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 23. 85–105.

RIX, HELMUT *et al.* 1991. *Etruskische Texte. Editio minor. Bd. I. Einleitung, Konkordanz, Indices; II. Texte*. Tübingen: Narr.

WACHTER, RUDOLF. 1986. Die etruskische und venetische Silbenpunktierung. *Museum Helveticum* 43. 111–26.

WALLACE, REX. 1991. The transcription of sibilants in Etruscan: A new proposal. *Glotta* 69. 77–83.

WALLACE, REX, DAVID MIMNO, MICHAEL SHAMGOCHIAN, & JAMES PATTERSON. 2004–present. *Etruscan Texts Project Online*, etp.classics.umass.edu. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Amherst.