

ON DR. DONALDSON'S OPINION
OF THE
ORIGIN OF THE ETRUSCAN PEOPLE AND
LANGUAGE.

By DR. WILLIAM FREUND.

Read March 16, 1853.

THE ancient and well-known Roman tale, that the new-founded city of Romulus was an *asylum* for every kind of refugees, may be, in a wider sense, justly applicated to all *Italy*, respecting its earliest population. The peculiar geographical situation of the peninsula laid it open to all nations of the world as a sort of free port and universal retreat. On three sides encompassed by those seas which, as far as the earliest traditions reach, are known to have been crossed by sailors and adventurers of every sort, and on the fourth side close by that great highway on which races after races, for thousands of years, wandered from the east to the west, and pushed forward each other, Italy was, more than any other country, to be populated, in the remotest times, by sea and land, by the most various mixture of immigrants.

And, indeed, tradition as well as history names a great number of nations in Italy; and criticism has received no easy task to trace the origin, affinity, and succession of immigration of the Aborigines and Siculians, of the Ausonians and Pelasgians, of the Umbrians and Oscans, and Etruscans and Volscians, and so of twenty more tribes of ancient Italy.

It is well known how assiduously the greatest historians particularly those of the present century, have tried to explain this most complicated part of antiquity; but it is as well known that but little clear evidence has been hitherto obtained in the ancient history of Italy, and how much is still left to be done by continued inquiries of historians, ethnographers, and philologists.

Of all those nations of ancient Italy, none has hitherto given to criticism more trouble than the *Etruscans*, whose origin

and affinity, as well as language, are veiled in almost impenetrable darkness, but to remove which is the more important, the greater the influence has been that this once powerful people exercised on the political development and civilization of the Roman empire, and the more the successful results of this inquiry would contribute to enlarge our ethnological knowledge of Teutonic and Celtic Europe.

Dr. Donaldson, well known to the learned world by a series of publications, in which extensiveness of studies and the gift of scientific combination are proved in a very high degree, has been for many years occupied with the final solution of the difficult Etruscan problem. In 1851 he laid his new theory in short outlines before the British Association; and after having, with laudable perseverance, continued his inquiries, he has explained at full length his ideas on the great historical and philological problem—"The Origin of the Etruscans, and the Nature of their Language"—in the second edition of his "Varronianus," lately published; and introduced it with the hope "*that it may now claim formal recognition as a discovery resting on inductive evidence.*"

I have examined Dr. Donaldson's argumentation with due attention; and, honoured by the charge of a report on this matter, I believe the best way of performing my duty will be to display first Dr. Donaldson's theory uninterrupted by any critical remarks, and mostly in his own words, and then to subject it to a specified and scrupulous examination.

In the first chapter of his book, headed, "The Old Italian Tribes considered as related to each other," Dr. Donaldson makes the following statements as the general results of his inquiries, namely—

"That the Septimontium, or seven hills of Rome, contained a miniature representation of the ethnography of the whole peninsula. Leaving out of the question the Celtic substratum, which cannot be ascertained, but which was probably most pure in the mountaineers of the Apennines, the original population of Italy from the Po to the Straits of Rhegium was, like that of Ancient Greece, Pelasgo-Sclavonian. This population remained unadulterated up to the dawn of ancient history in the central plains to the west, namely, in Etruria and Latium; but in the rest of Italy it was superseded or ab-

sorbed, or qualified in different degrees of fusion by a population of Gothic or Low-German origin, which, although undoubtedly of later introduction in the peninsula, was so mixed up with the Celtic or primary tribes, that it claimed to be aboriginal. When this Low-German race remained tolerably pure, or at least only infected with Celtic ingredients, it bore the names of Umbrians or Ombricans in the north, and of Opicans or Oscans in the south. When it was intermixed with Slavonic elements to about the same extent as the Lithuanians or Old Prussians in the north of Europe, this Low-German population became known as Latins and Sabines. *And the Etruscans or Rasena were a later and uninfected importation of Low-Germans, fresh from the north, who conquered and were partly absorbed into the pure Tyrrhenians, or Pelasgo-Slavonians to the right of the Tiber.*"—(Varron., pp. 2 and 3.)

"From the time of Herodotus there has been no doubt that the Pelasgians in Greece and Italy were the same race, and that the so-called *Tyrrheni* or *Tyrserni* were the most civilized branch of that family. . . *Lepsius* 'Ueber die Tyrrhenischen Pelasger in Etrurien, (Leips. 1842,) has fully shewn that the name *Τυρρῆνός* or *Τυρσηνός* signifies 'tower-builder,' and that this term has been properly explained, even by Dionysius, as referring to the *τύρσεις*, or cyclopean fortifications which everywhere attest the presence of Pelasgian *tower-builders*. The word *τύρρῆς* or *τύρσις*,* which occurs in Pindar as the name of the great palace of the primeval god Saturn, is identical with the Latin *turris*; and the fact that the Pelasgians derived their distinguishing epithet from this word is remarkable, not only as shewing the affinity between the Greek and Latin languages on the one hand, and the Pelasgian in Etruria on the other hand, but also because these colossal structures are always found wherever the Pelasgians make their appearance in Greece."—(Pp. 11—13.)

"The fact that the distinctive name *Τυρρῆνός* admits of a Greek interpretation is sufficient to shew that the Tyrrhenians were not exclusively Italian, and therefore were

* The Umbrians are the *Ὀμβροί* of Polybius, the *Ὀμβρισκοί* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and the *Ὀμβρικοί* of Strabo.—EDITOR.

wrongly identified by the ancient writers with the singular and unaffiliated nation of the Etruscans. To determine the origin of this people and the nature of their language has been considered for many years as the most difficult problem in philology. And while Bonarota, in his supplement to Dempster, earnestly exhorts the learned, and especially orientalists, to labour at the discovery of this lost language, suggesting the hope of ultimate success, if a carefully edited collection of inscriptions can be procured to furnish materials for the work, Niebuhr remarks, in his lectures on Ancient Geography: 'People feel an extraordinary curiosity to discover the Etruscan language, and who would not entertain this sentiment? I would give a considerable part of my worldly means as a prize if it were discovered; for an entirely new light would then be spread over the ethnography of ancient Italy. But however desirable it may be, it does not follow that the thing is attainable.' And he proceeds to point out the inherent faultiness of some previous investigations. Whatever may be the value of the discovery, I cannot allow myself to doubt that the true theory is that which I have had the honour of submitting to the British Association. It has always appeared to me a very great reproach to modern philology, that while we can read the hieroglyphic literature of Egypt, and interpret the cuneiform inscriptions of Persia and Assyria, we should profess ourselves unable to deal scientifically with the remains of a language which flourished in the midst of Roman civilization. So far from regarding the problem as involved in hopeless difficulty, I have always felt that its solution was, sooner or later, inevitable: and as the present state of our ethnographic knowledge enables us to classify and discriminate all the different elements in the population of Europe, the identification of the ancient Etruscans must reduce itself to the alternative of exclusion from which there is no escape. Sir Thomas More came to the conviction that his unknown visitor was *aut Erasmus, aut Diabolus*, and we may now say in the same manner, that unless the Etruscans were old Low-Germans of the purest Gothic stock, there is no family of men to whom they could have belonged."—(Pp. 14—16.)

"We have already seen that the *Tyrsemi* or *Tyrrheni* in

Greece and Italy were a branch of the great Pelasgian race; and that although the ancients considered them identical with the Etruscans, the Greek explanation of which their name so readily admits is a proof that they could not have been the exclusively Italian tribe of the Etruscans. Modern scholars, who have adopted the ancient hypothesis of the identity of the *Tyrrheni* and *Etrusci*, have endeavoured, by a Procrustean method of etymology, to overcome the difficulties caused by the discrepancies of name. Thus the distinctive designation *Etruscus* or *Hetruscus* is clipped and transposed until it becomes identical with the Latin *Tuscus* for *Tursicus*, and synonymous with the Greek *Τυρσηνός*.—(Müller, *Etrusck.* I, 71, 72.) On the other hand, the *Ῥασέα* of Dionysius is pronounced a false reading and a mutilated representative of *Ῥαπασέα* or *Ῥαπσέα*, which bears the same relation to *Τυρσηνός* that *Porsëna* does to *Πορσηνός* or *Πορσήνας*—a view adopted by Lanzi, Gell, Cramer, and Lepsius, and formerly by Dr. Donaldson himself. There is no reason why the names *Et-rūria* = *Et-rusia*, *Et-rus-ci*, and *Ras-ena*, should not contain the same root; and we shall see that there are good grounds for retaining these words as the primitive and distinctive designation of a people who invaded and conquered the mixed Tyrrhenians and Umbrians of northern Italy.”—(Pp. 16, 17.)

“Livy, who, as a native of Padua, was likely to be well informed on the subject, has left us a statement respecting the Etruscans, which, so far from being hypothetical, is one of the most definite expressions of ethnological facts to be met with in ancient history. Speaking of the Gallic invasion and the attack upon Clusium, he says (v. 33.), ‘Nor were the people of Clusium the first of the Etruscans with whom armies of the Gauls fought; but long before this they frequently fought with the Etruscans who dwelt between the Apennines and the Alps. Before the Roman empire was established, the power of the Etruscans extended far by land and sea. . . . They overspread the whole territory beyond the Po, as far as the Alps, except the corner of the Veneti, who dwell round the extreme point of the Hadriatic. There is no doubt that the Alpine nations, especially the Raeti,

have the same origin, but these have lost their civilization from their climate and locality, so as to retain nothing of their original type, except their spoken language, and not even that without corruption.' This distinct and positive statement is repeated by Pliny (H. N. V. 20, 133) and Justin (xx. 5), and is confirmed by relics of art, names of places, and peculiarities of language in the Tyrol, to which the Raetians of Lombardy were driven by the Gauls, and from which they descended in the first instance. Moreover, Stephanus of Byzantium defines the *Raeti* as a Tyrrhenian, that is, in his sense, as an Etruscan race ('*Ραιτοί, Τυρρηνικὸν ἔθνος*); and it is quite in accordance with the laws of language to suppose that '*Ραιτοί*' and '*Πασένα*' are only modifications of the same word. It is scarcely necessary to remark, that Livy, like all the ancient writers, inverts the relation between the powerful colonists and their uncivilized mother-country;" (Pp. 17, 18.) that is to say, *that the Etruscans came from Raetia.*

"Now, if we are to adopt the old statement, that the Etruscans, properly so called, were the same stock with the Raetians—and if we reject it there is nothing in ancient history or geography which we can with confidence accept,—there will be no difficulty in understanding the relation between the Etruscans and the other Italian tribes. Long after the Tyrrheno-Pelasgians had established their civilization on both sides of the Tiber, and had conquered the Umbrian mountaineers in the north, but yielded to the Oscan or Sabine highlanders in the south—long after this time a Raetian tribe sallied forth from the plains of Lombardy, where it was settled in unbroken connexion with sister tribes in the Tyrol and south-western Germany, and not only effected a permanent conquest of Umbria, but also settled itself as a military aristocracy among the civilized Tyrrhenians on the right of the Tiber. These conquerors included in their progress the Tyrrheno-Latin city, Rome, which had just shaken off the influence of the Tarquini, but they lost this and their other acquisitions beyond the Tiber, in consequence of a defeat which the dominant Clusians sustained at Aricia."—(Pp. 18, 19.)

"This view with respect to the Raetian invasion of a country previously occupied by Tyrrheno-Umbrians is fully

supported by all the remains of their language, and by all that we know about this idiom. . . . The Etruscan language, as exhibited in the fragments which have come down to us, consists of three separate or separable elements. We have either words which admit of a direct comparison with Greek and Latin, and these we will call the Tyrrheno-Pelasgian element of the language; or words which present affinities to the Umbrian and Oscan dialects; or words which resemble neither of the other, but may be explained by the Gothic affinities, which, for other reasons, we should be led to seek in the language of the Raetians.”—(P. 19.)

“Now, the *Gothic* or *Low-German* affinities of the ancient Etruscans are shewn by their ethnographic opposition to the *Veneti*. Wherever the advancing tide of Slavonian emigration came to a check before the established settlements of a purely Gothic or Low-German tribe,—wherever, consequently, the Slavonians felt a need for a distinctive appellation,—we find that they called themselves *Serbs*, *Sorbs*, or *Servians*, a name apparently denoting their agricultural habits, or else *Slow-jane*, *Slow-jene*, or *Slavonian*, a name implying, according to the most recent interpretation, that they opposed their own language, as intelligible, to the foreign jargon of their neighbours. . . . But while these were the names which the Slavonians assumed on their own western boundary-lines, and by which they were known in foreign countries, they received the name of *Wends*, *Winiden*, O.H.G. *Winidâ*, A.S. *Veonodas*, from the Gothic tribes on whom they immediately abutted. By this name, or that of *Finns*, which is merely a different pronunciation, the Goths of the north designated their eastern neighbours, whether of Slavonian or Turanian race. By this name the Saxons distinguished the Slavonians in Lusatia. The Slavonians settled in Bavaria were called the *Vinde-lici*, or *Wineds* settled on the *Licus* or *Lech*. Farther east on the Danube the city of the Slavonians was called *Vind-o-bonum*. We must, of course, admit the same term in the name of the *Veneti*, at the head of the Adriatic. And thus we trace this distinctive appellation from Scandinavia to the north of Italy, in a line nearly corresponding to the parallel of longitude. The ethnographic importance

of the name *Wined* can scarcely be overrated: for it not only tells us that the tribes to the east of the line upon which it is found were generally pure Sclavonian, but it tells us as plainly that the tribes to the west, who imposed the name, were equally pure branches of the Gothic, Saxon, or Low-German race. Indeed, the latter fact is more certain than the former. For if, as I believe, the term *Wined* merely indicates, in the mouth of a Low-German, the *end* or *wend*-point of his distinctive territory, our inference must be, that whatever the *Wineds* were, they indicated the boundary-line of some branch of the Gothic race. "Now we have such a boundary-line in Bavaria; therefore the *Raetians* who faced the *Vindelici*, or *Lech-Wineds*, were Low-Germans. We have a similar line in the north of Italy; therefore there must have been Low-Germans in opposition and contiguity at the western frontier of the *Veneti*, or *Wineds*, on the Po. But we have seen that the Etruscans, properly so called, were *Raetians*, who at one time occupied a continuous area stretching from Western Germany across the Tyrol into the plains of Lombardy. It follows, therefore, as an ethnographical fact, that the Etruscans must have been a Low-German, Gothic, or Saxon tribe."—(Pp. 66, 67.)

"These combinations would be sufficient, if we had nothing else, to establish *prima facie* the Gothic affinities of the old Etruscans. But they are only the first steps in a cumulative argument, which, when complete, raises our conclusion to the rank of a philological demonstration. Some of the details must be reserved for the chapter on the Etruscan language; but the general effect of the reasoning shall be given here."

"If the ancient Etruscans were Low-Germans, they must present the most striking marks of resemblance when they are compared with the oldest and least alloyed branches of that family. In the centre of Europe the Low-German element was absorbed by the High-German, and the latter became a qualifying ingredient in all the Teutonic tribes of the mainland, who were not similarly affected by Sclavonism. As I have elsewhere suggested (New Crat. §. 78.) the Lithuanians were Low-Germans thoroughly Sclavonized; the Saxons or *Ingævones* were Low-Germans, untainted by Sla-

vonism, and but slightly influenced by High-Germanism; the Franks or *Iscaevones* were Low-Germans, over whom the High-Germans had exercised considerable control; and the Thuringians or *Herminones* were pure High-Germans, in the full vigour of their active opposition to the tribes among which they had settled. For Low-German, unaffected by any qualifying element, we must go to the Scandinavian or *Norse* branch of the race, which contains the Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, Faroic, and Icelandic tribes. The oldest, or standard form of the languages spoken by these tribes is the Old Norse or Icelandic, which not only exists as a spoken tongue, but is also found in a very flourishing and ancient literature. The present inhabitants of Iceland trace their descent from emigrants who settled there in the ninth century; and from circumstances connected with their isolated position, the language has remained the unaltered representative of the oldest known form of Scandinavian, or pure Gothic. It is therefore with this Old Norse, or Icelandic, the language of the Sagas and Runes, that we must compare the old Etruscan, if we wish to approximate to the common mother of both, on the hypothesis that they are both traceable to the same stock. But the reader must, from the first, be guarded against the ridiculous idea that I identify the Etruscan with the Icelandic. The proposition which I maintain is this: that the Icelandic in the uncultivated north represents, in the ninth century of our era, the language of a race of men, who might have claimed a common pedigree with those Raeto-Etruscans of the south, who became partakers in the Pelasgian civilization about 1600 years before that epoch. Moreover, the Icelandic or Old Norse, remains pure to the last, whereas the Etruscan is from the first alloyed by an interpenetration of Umbrian and Pelasgian ingredients. Consequently, it will justify all our reasonable expectations, if we find clear traces of the Old Norse in the distinctive designations of the Etruscans, that is, in those names which they imported into Italy; and if we can make the Scandinavian languages directly available for the explanation of such of their words and phrases as are clearly alien from the other old idioms of Italy. This, and more than this, I shall be able to do.—(Pp. 68, 69.)

“It has been shewn in the preceding chapter that the conquerors of the Umbrians and Tyrrheno-Pelasgians in Northern Italy called themselves *Ras-ena*. Niebuhr has suggested that this word contains the root *ras-* with the termination *-ena* found in *Pors-ena*, &c.; and I have hinted that the same root is found in the distinctive designation of this race, *Et-rus-ci* or *Het-rus-ci*, which presumes an original *Het-rusi*, whence *Het-rur-ia* for *Het-rus-ia*. The old Norse will tell us the meaning both of the root and of the prefix; for in Icelandic *hetia* is ‘a warrior, hero, or soldier,’ and in the same language *ras* implies rapidity of motion, as *at rasa*, ‘to run.’ So that *Ras-ena* and *Het-rusi* imply a warrior-tribe, distinguished by their sudden onset and rapid career. . . . This would be admitted as a reasonable conjecture even if it had nothing else to recommend it. However, it does so happen that we have a distinct record of a migratory conquest by the Scandinavians in the heart of Europe rather before the colonization of Iceland, in which they called themselves by the same name as these *Rasena* or *Het-rus-i*. It has been shewn by Zeuss (*die Deutschen*, pp. 547, seq.), that the language of these conquerors, who descended the Dnieper, the Volga, and the Don, was old Norse; . . . and Symeon Magister, who wrote A.D. 1140, has given the same Scandinavian explanation of their name *Ros*, which I have suggested for *Ras-ena*; for he says (*Scriptor. post Theophan.* ed. Paris, p. 490), οἱ Ῥῶς οἱ καὶ Δρομῖται λεγόμενοι, ‘the *Ros* who are called the racers or runners;’ and (p. 465), Ῥῶς δὲ οἱ Δρομῖται φερόννυμοι—δρομῖται δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ δξέως τρέχειν αὐτοῖς προσεγένετο, ‘the *Ros* are called the runners, and they are so called from the rapidity of their motion.’ Here the conjecture which I proposed to the British Association is confirmed by an authority subsequently observed; and no one will deny the obvious value of this corroboration. It may therefore be laid down as a matter of fact, that the distinctive ethnical designation of the old Etruscans is Scandinavian; and we shall see that their mythological or heroic names are explicable in the same way. Niebuhr remarked, without attaching any importance to the observation, that there was a singular resemblance between the Scandinavian mythology and that of

the Etruscans: 'according to their religion, as in that of the Scandinavians, a limit and end was fixed to the life even of the highest gods.' (H. R., I. note 421.) Now in the Scandinavian mythology there is no name more prominent than that of *Thor* or *Tor*, and this prefix is a certain indication of the presence of the Northmen in any country in which it is found; and when we find the name *Tar-chon* or *Tar-quin* among the mythical and local terms of the ancient Etruscans, we cannot but be struck by the old Norse character impressed upon them. The other mythical name of the old Etruscans, which comes in close connection with *Tar-quin*, is *Tana-quil*; and *Tar-quin*, or *Tor-quil*, and *Tana-quil* might represent a pair of deities worshipped at *Tarquinii*, the plural name of which indicates, like *Athenæ* and *Thebæ*, the union of two communities and two worships, the Pelasgian *Tina* or *Tana*, i. e. *Janus*, being placed on an equal footing with the Scandinavian *Thor*. This is inverted in the tradition which weds the Greek Demaratus to the indigenous *Tana-quil*. At any rate we cannot but be struck with the Scandinavian sound of *Tana-quil*, which reminds us of *Tana-quisl*, the old Norse name of the Tanais, which, although the name of a river, is feminine."—(Grimm, D. Gr. III., p. 385.)

"These coincidences become the more striking, when we remember that we are comparing the old Norse, of which we know nothing before the eighth century of our era, with the old Etruscan, which flourished nearly as many centuries before the birth of Christ. And when we add to all these evidences of direct history, ethnography, and mythology, the fact, which will be exhibited in a subsequent chapter, that the Scandinavian languages supply an immediate and consistent interpretation of those parts of the Etruscan inscriptions which are otherwise inexplicable, no reasonable man will refuse to admit that the linguistic and ethnological problem suggested by the old inhabitants of Etruria has at length received the only solution which is in accordance with all the data, and in harmony with the nature and extent of the materials, and with the other conditions of the case."—(Pp. 69—72.)

“The theory, that the Etruscan language, as we have it, is in part a Pelasgian idiom, more or less corrupted and deformed by contact with the Umbrian, and in part a relic of the oldest Low-German or Sclavonian dialects, is amply confirmed by an inspection of those remains which admit of approximate interpretation.”—(P. 139.)

“The materials which are at present available for an approximate philological interpretation of the Tuscan language may be divided into three classes:—1. The names of deities, &c., whose titles and attributes are familiar to us from the mythology of Greece and Rome; 2. The Tuscan words which have descended to us with an interpretation; and 3. The inscriptions, sepulchral or otherwise, of which we possess accurate transcripts.”—(P. 143.)

“1. The names of the Tuscan divinities shews them to be akin either to Greek or to Latin words, and not to Scandinavian ones, which, according to Dr. Donaldson, “is to be explained by the fact that they belonged to the religion of southern Etruria, which was *Pelasgian* rather than *Scandinavian*.”—(P. 151.)

2. The Tuscan common words, which have descended to us with an interpretation—such as *Aesar* = “deus;” *Aifl ril* = “vixit annos;” *Arse verse* = “averte ignem”—about *fifty* in number, present traces of affinity to the languages of the Indo-Germanic family; and *four* or *five* of them are supposed by Dr. Donaldson to be of a near affinity to the Icelandic.—(Pp. 151—164.)

“3. In passing to our third source of information respecting the Tuscan language—the inscriptions which have been preserved—we are at once thrown upon difficulties, which at present, perhaps, are not within the reach of a complete solution. We may, indeed, derive from them some fixed results with regard to the structure of the language, and here and there we may find it possible to offer an explanation of a few words of more frequent occurrence. In general, however, we want a more complete collection of these documents; one, too, in deciphering which the resources of palæography have been carefully and critically applied. *When we shall have obtained this, we shall at least know how far we*

can hope to penetrate into the hitherto unexplored arcana of the mysterious Etruscan language.”*—(P. 165.)

“Referring to the theory, that the Etruscan nation consisted of two main ingredients, namely, *Tyrrheno-Pelasgians*, more or less intermixed with *Umbrians*, and *Raetians* or *Low-Germans*—the former prevailing in the south, the latter in the north-western part of Etruria,—it is obvious that we cannot expect to find one uniform language in the inscriptions, which belong to different epochs, and are scattered over the territory occupied in different proportions, by branches of cognate tribes. Accordingly, we must, if possible, discriminate between those fragments which represent the language in its oldest or un-Rasenic form, and those which exhibit scarcely any traces of a Pelasgic character.”—(P. 166.)

“Of all the Etruscan cities, the least Rasenic, perhaps, is *Caere* or *Agylla*, the modern village *Cervetri*. We might expect to find some characteristics in the inscriptions of this city, by which they might be distinguished from the monuments of northern and eastern Etruria. There is at least one very striking justification of this supposition. On an ancient vase, dug up by General Galassi at Cervetri, the following inscription is traced in very clear and legible characters—

‘Mi ni keθuma, mi maθu maram lišiai θipurenai;
Eθe erai sie epana, mi neθu nastav heleφu.’

It is obvious that there is an heroic rhythm in these lines: the punctuation and division into words are of course conjectural. This inscription differs from those which are found in the Umbro-Etruscan or Rasenic districts, and especially from the Perusian cippus, in the much larger proportion of vowels, which are here expressed even before and after liquids, and in the absence of the mutilated terminations in *c*, *l*, *r*, which are so common in the other monuments. The meaning of this couplet seems, according to Dr. Donaldson, to be as follows—

‘I am not dust; I am ruddy wine on burnt ashes;
When (or If) there is burning heat under ground, I am water,
for thirsty lips.’

* DR. FREUND emphasizes this sentence of Dr. Donaldson’s by putting it in italics.—EDITOR.

"*Dr. Karl Meyer* (in the 'Gelehrter Anzeigen' of the Royal Academy at Munich for 1843, pp. 698—735) gives the following interpretation of the same inscription—

'I say that I praise the grace of Lisias Purenas,
And that of his lady consort I sing, praise, and proclaim.*

"There is another inscription in the Museum of Naples which runs thus in one hexameter line—

'Mi ni mulve neke velou ir pupliana.'

And is translated by Dr. Donaldson—

'I am not of Mulva nor Volsinii, but Populonia,'

While Dr. Meyer translated it—

'I anoint myself with oil of Populonia.†

"Besides these, we have a great number of inscriptions, beginning with the syllable *mi*, which Müller thinks to be all pure Pelasgian. Some of them, indeed, seem to be almost Greek; at least they are more nearly akin to Greek than to Latin. Take, for instance, that inscription, which has been adduced both by Müller and by Lepsius, and which runs thus—

'Mi kalairu fuus.'

"Surely this is little else than Archaic Greek, *εἰμὶ Καλαιροῦ Φυῖός.*"—(Pp. 166—170.)

"There is another inscription of this class which deserves particular notice, because, though it is singularly like Greek, it contains two words which are of constant occurrence in the least Pelasgian of the Etruscan monuments, and furnish us with the strongest evidence of Low-German or Scandinavian affinities of a portion at least of the Etruscan language. A bronze figure, representing Apollo crowned with laurel (Gori Mus. Etrusc. I. pl. 32), has the following inscription—

*'Mi phleres epul aphe aritimi
Phasti ruphrua turce clen ceca.'*

* Dr. Meyer's version is, "Ich sage dass ich rühme die Huld des Lisias Purenas und die seiner Frau Gemahlin singe, preise und verkündige ich," which Dr. Freund has rendered into the English of the text.—EDITOR.

† Dr. Meyer's version is, "Ich salbe mich mit populonischem Oele."

The first sentence must mean, according to Dr. Donaldson—

‘Sum donarium Apollini et Artemidi.’

The next words, ‘*Phasti rufhrua*,’ probably contain the name of the person who made the offering. The name seems to have been *Fastia Rufrunia* or *Rufria*. The next word, ‘*turce*,’ is supposed by Dr. Donaldson to be the genitive of the proper name *Turcus*. The word *clen*, one of the two to which I (Dr. Donaldson) have referred, is explained by its contrast to *eter*, *etera*, a word very often occurring in Etruscan inscriptions, and clearly expressing the Greek ἕτερος, Latin *alter* (*iterum*), and Umbrian *etre*. if *etera* means, as is most probable, the *second* in the family, *clen* must mean the *first* or *head* of the family. . . . The root, which in the Greek and Latin languages signifies *head*, *summit*, *top*, is Latin *cel-*, *cul-*, *clī-*, Greek *κολ-*, *κορ-*, or *κρα-*, &c.; and it is well known that words denoting height and elevation—or *head-ship*, in fact—are employed to signify *rank*. Now the transition from this to primogeniture—the being first in a family—is easy and natural: therefore, if *clen* or *clens* (in Latin *clanis* or *clanius*) is connected with the root of *celsus*, *cul-men*, *collis*, *clivus*, Greek, *κολοφών*, *κορυφή*, *κύριος*, *κόιρανος*, *κοῦρος*, *κόρος*, *κύρβας*, *κράνιον*, &c., it may well be used to signify the first in a family. . . . If we now pass on to the northern languages, we shall find some curious extensions of these results. For while the root *kl-* in *klif*, *kliffe*, *klejff*, signifies ‘altitude and climbing,’ and while *klacker*, in Icelandic, denotes ‘a rock,’ we find that, with the affix *n*, *klen* or *klien* in Icelandic, and in German *klein*, signify ‘little,’ but primarily in the sense of ‘a child,’ as opposed to ‘a man;’ and it may be a question whether the idea of derivation may be at the basis of the ordinary meaning of *klen* or *kleine*. And thus whether the Etruscan *clen* signifies ‘the eldest child,’ or simply ‘the child,’ with an implication of primogeniture, as indicating the first contrast with the parents, the Icelandic will help the explanation.

“The other of the two words in this inscription, to which I (Dr. Donaldson) have adverted, is *phleres* (*Mi phleres epul*, &c.), which clearly means *donarium*, or something of the kind. This word occurs on a number of small Etruscan objects,

which are of the nature of supplicatory gifts. And it would be only fair to conclude that the word denotes 'vow' or 'prayer,' as included in the donation. Now we know from Festus (p. 230, cf. 77, 109) that *ploro* and *imploro*, or *endoploro* in old Latin, signified *inclamo*, without any notion of lamentation or weeping. If, then, we compare the Icelandic *fleiri*, Suio-Gothic *flere* with the Latin *plures* = *ple-ores*, we shall easily see how *phleres* may contain the same root as *ploro* = *ple-oro*, especially since the Latin language recognises a similar change (of *p* and *f*) in *fleo* compared with *pluo*. The word (*phleres*) is then in effect equivalent to the Greek ἀνάθημα, and means a votive offering, like the *votiva tabella* of the ancient temples, or the *voto* of the modern churches of Italy; and it is easy to see how the ideas of 'vow, prayer, invocation, offering,' may be represented by such an object. Accordingly, the inscription of the laurel-crowned Apollo will signify: *Sum votivum donarium Apollini atque Artemidi; Fastia Rufria, Tusci filia, faciundum curavit.* For *ceca*, if compared with *cechaze* or *cechase* (of another inscription) may be rendered, with reference to the Icelandic *kasa*, Danish *kokase*, 'to heap up' or 'build.'—(Pp. 170—174.)

"In some of the Etruscan inscriptions on smaller or moveable objects the word *phleres* has appended to it the word *trce* or *thrcce*. If, then, *phleres* signifies a votive offering, the additional word *trce* or *thrcce* must (according to Dr. Donaldson) indicate 'mourning' or 'sorrow.' And here the northern languages at once come to our aid; for in Suio-Gothic *træga* = *dolere* and *træge* = *dolor*; and in Icelandic *at trega* = *angere* or *dolere*, and *tregi* = *dolor*; and to the same root we may refer the Icelandic *threk* = *gravis labor*, or *molestia*; for *tregi* also means *impedimentum*; *originitus forsan verbotenus*: 'onus,' moles, Germ. *tracht*, Dan. *draght*, Angl. *draught*, connected with Latin *traho*, which connection brings it into still greater affinity with the old languages of Italy; and the evidence from the context is conclusive for the meaning, *phleres trce* or *phler-thrcce* = 'a votive offering of sorrow.'—(Pp. 174, 175.)

"By the side of *cen phleres* (meaning 'this offering') we have, on larger monuments, *eca* or *cehen suthi* or *suthinesl*.

Here again the Icelandic comes to our aid, for *sut* is *dolor, maestitia, luctus*; and *nesla* or *hnesla* = *funis, laqueus*: so that we (Dr. Donaldson) may translate *eca-suthi*, ‘*this is the mourning*,’ and *eca-suthinesl*, ‘*this is the sorrowful inscription*.’—(P. 175.)

“The word *cover* or *sver*, in some inscriptions, for which in corresponding places of other inscriptions are *thavre, thurasl, thuras*, &c., are connected (according to Dr. Donaldson) with the Icelandic verb *thverra* = ‘*minui, disparere* ;’ and thus the inscription, *Mi suthi L. Felthuri thura*, is (according to him) to be rendered, ‘*I am the lamentation for L. Felthurius deceased*.’ He remarks that *suer* occurs in Runic inscriptions in the sense ‘*father-in-law*,’ but he does not regard this as more than an accidental coincidence with the expressions under consideration.”—(Pp. 176, 177.)

The next section is headed, “*Striking coincidence between Etruscan and Old Norse in the use of the auxiliary verb ‘LATA,’*” and contains the following explanation—

“Whatever may be thought of the verbal resemblances between the Old Norse and the language of the Etruscan fragments, it must be admitted by all sound philologists that we have an indisputable proof of the affinity of these idioms in the grammatical identity which I communicated to the British Association. Every reader of the Runic inscriptions must have noticed the constant occurrence of the auxiliary or causative verb *lata* = *facere in causa esse*, of which the *Eddas* give us the forms *ek laet, let, latinn*. Thus we find, *Lithsmother lit hakva stein aufti Julibirn fath*, i. e. ‘*Lithsmother let engrave a stone after (in memory of) his father Julibirn*,’ &c. . . . Now we have here, as part of a constantly recurring phraseology, an auxiliary verb, signifying ‘*to let*’ or ‘*cause*,’ followed by an infinitive in *-a*. On reading the first line of the longest Etruscan inscription, that of Perugia, we seem to stumble at once upon this identical phraseology, for we find, *eu lat tanna La Rezul amev achr lautn Velthinas*. If we had no other reason for supposing that there was some connection between the Scandinavians and Etruscans, we could not avoid being struck by this apparent identity of construction. As, however, we have every reason to

expect resemblances between the two languages, it becomes a matter of importance to inquire whether the grammatical identity can be established, and this amounts to the proof that *lat* and *tanna* are both verbs. Of course there is no *primâ facie* reason to conclude that *tanna* is a verb. On the contrary, Niebuhr (*Kleine Schriften* II. p. 40) thinks that *thana* is a noun signifying 'a lady,' and that *Tanaquil* is only a diminutive of it; and Passeri, whom he quotes, suggests that *Thana* is a title of honour, nearly equivalent in meaning, though not, of course, in origin, to the modern Italian *Donna* (from 'domina.'). Fortunately, however, about the time when this comparison between the Runic and Etruscan phraseology first occurred to me, Mr. J. H. Porteus Oakes returned from a tour in Italy, and presented to the Museum at Bury St. Edmund's a small patera, or saucer, which he had obtained at Chiusi, and which exhibits the following legend: *stem tenilaeth n̄fatia*. This at once furnished me with the means of proving that *lat tanna* in the Perugia inscription were two verbs, the latter being an infinitive, and the former an auxiliary on which it depends. For it is obvious that *tenilaeth* is the third person of a transitive verb, the nominative being *N̄fatia*, (probably the name of a woman,) and the accusative being *stem* for *istam*, Umbr. *est-*. The verb *tenilaeth* manifestly belongs to the same class of forms as the agglutinate or weak perfects in Gothic, which are formed by the affix of the causative *da*, as *soki-da*, 'I did seek,' (Gabelentz u. Löbe, Goth. Gramm. §. 127) . . . It is clear, then, that *lat tanna* represents as separate words what *tenilaeth* exhibits in an agglutinate form. In the latter case the auxiliary is in the present tense, which, in Gothic, is formed in *th*; and *lat* is a strong perfect. There is no difficulty about the meaning of *tanna*, *teni*, which are clearly identical with the Icelandic *thenia* = *tendere*, O. H. G. *danjan*, *denjan*, A. S. *dhenjan*, N. H. G. *dehnen*, Gr. *τείνω*, *τανύω*, Sanscrit *tan-*; and therefore signify 'to offer,' like the Latin *porrigo* or *porricio* As *lautn* and *lautnescle* occur together on another Etruscan sepulchre, there can be no objection to connect them with the Icelandic *laut* = *lacuna*, *locus depressus et defossus*; and *eu* from *is* is strictly analogous to

the Latin *ceu* from *ce, cis*; accordingly, comparing *amev* with the Icelandic *ama=ango*, the beginning of the Perugian inscription will be rendered as naturally and easily as one of the Runes: '*Here Lartius the son of Raesia let offer or give a field of mourning as or for the grave of Velthina.*'—(Pp. 177—179.)

In the following Section, headed, "The great Perugian Inscription critically examined—its Runic affinities," Dr. Donaldson says—

"The facility with which the philologist dissects the Etruscan words which have been transmitted to us, either with an interpretation, or in such collocation as to render their meaning nearly certain, and the striking and unmistakable coincidences between the most difficult fragments and the remains of the Old Norse language, might well occasion some surprise to those who are told that there exists a large collection of Etruscan inscriptions which cannot be satisfactorily explained. One cause of the unprofitableness of Tuscan inscriptions is to be attributed to the fact that these inscriptions, being mostly of a sepulchral or dedicatorial character, are generally made up of proper names and conventional expressions. Consequently they contribute very little to our knowledge of the Tuscan syntax, and furnish us with very few forms of inflexion. So far as I have heard, we have no historical or legal inscriptions. Those which I have inspected for myself are only monumental epitaphs and dedications of offerings.

"These observations might be justified by an examination of all the inscriptions which have been hitherto published. It will be sufficient, however, in this place, to shew how much or how little can be done by an analysis of the great inscription which was discovered in the neighbourhood of Perugia in the year 1822. This inscription is engraved on two sides of a block of stone, and consists of forty-five lines in the whole, being by far the most copious of all the extant monuments of the Tuscan language. The writing is singularly legible, and the letters were coloured with red paint.

"Now, if we go through this inscription, and compare the words of which it is composed, we shall find, that out of more

than eighty different words there are very few which are not obviously proper names, and some of these occur very frequently; so that this monument, comparatively copious as it is, furnishes, after all, only slender materials for a study of the Tuscan language.

“With regard to the general interpretation of the Perugian inscription, it seems idle to follow in the steps of the Italian scholars, Vermiglioli, Orioli, and Campanari, the last of whom has given us a Latin translation of the whole inscription It would, indeed, be easy to found a number of conjectures on the assonances which may be detected in almost every line; but until a complete collection of all the genuine Etruscan inscriptions shall have furnished us with a sufficiently wide field for our researches—until every extant Tuscan word has been brought within the reach of a philological comparison—we must be content to say of this great Perugian inscription, that it appears to be a *cippus* conveying some land for funereal purposes. The donor is Larthius, a member of the family of *Reza* (*Raesii*), who were distinguished people in the neighbourhood of Perusia; and *Rasne*, which occurs thrice in the inscription, seems to be a patronymic of the same family

“If I do not undertake to interpret all that Larthius, the son of Raesia, has thought fit to inscribe on this *cippus*, it must not be supposed that this in any way affects the results at which I have arrived respecting the ethnography of the Etruscans. That an inability to interpret Runic monuments may be perfectly consistent with a knowledge of the class of languages to which they belong, is shewn, not merely by the known relationship between the language of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and the Coptic dialects more recently spoken in that country, but still more strikingly by the fact, that although we have no doubt as to any of the idioms spoken in ancient Britain, no one has been able as yet to give a certain interpretation of the Runic inscriptions on the pillar at Bewcastle, and on the font at Bridekirk, which are both in Cumberland, and which both belong to the same dialect of the Low-German languages. The really important point is to determine the origin of the ancient Etruscans; and the Peru-

gian inscription, so far from throwing any difficulties in the way of the conclusion at which I have arrived, has furnished some of the strongest and most satisfactory confirmations of the old Norse affinity of the Rasena."—(Pp. 180—189.)

These, Sir, are the essential particulars of Dr. Donaldson's explanations on the Etruscan question, given, for the most part, in his own words.

Permit me now to examine the principal points on which the learned author establishes his claim "*to a formal recognition of his Etruscan discovery.*"

As Dr. Donaldson, in the second edition of his *Varronianus*, has kept almost all materials respecting the Etruscan question, which, in the first edition, he had borrowed from his predecessors, particularly from Otfried Müller, and Dr. Lepsius, it is obvious that his "*discovery*" must be sought in those *additional materials* which are exclusively and undoubtedly of his own inquiry. In the first edition, published in 1844, he declared verbotenus (Chap. I. § 10.), "that the most difficult problem in philology, the enigma of the origin of the Etruscans, and the nature of their language, seemed at last to have been solved by Dr. Richard Lepsius, who had advanced many *satisfactory reasons* in favour of his hypothesis, that the Etruscans were, after all, *only Tyrrhenians or Pelasgians*, who, invading Italy from the north-east, conquered the Umbrians, and took possession of the western part of the district formerly occupied by that people, but could not protect their own language from the modifying influence of the cognate Umbrian dialect." At present Dr. Donaldson cannot find Dr. Lepsius' reasons "*satisfactory.*" He says (p. 12), "Subsequent research has convinced me that we must recognise a *Raetian element* superinduced on the previously existing combination of Tyrrheno-Pelasgian and Umbrian ingredients." It is therefore *this additional third element, the Raetian or Low-German, or the Icelandic, in the Etruscan language*, for which, as not observed by his predecessors, he claims the acknowledgment of a scientific discovery. On the old and venerable Scandinavian ground, then, I must try to prove the strength or weakness of Dr. Donaldson's arguments.

1. The first use which Dr. Donaldson makes of the *Ice-*

landic, is to give a new explanation of the name *Etruscus*. In the first edition of the Varronianus he had, without any scruple, adopted the usual etymology. He said (p. 11): "The Greek word *Τυρρῆνός* is identical with the Latin *Tuscus* (for *Tursicus*), and *Etruscus*, and with the Umbrian *Turske*." At present he does not only reject this etymology, but censures, as we have seen, with a kind of triumphant scorn, the "Procrustean method of modern scholars, by which the words are clipt and transposed;" and believes it now to be a matter of fact, that the word *Etruscus*, or *Hetruscus*, is a compound of the Icelandic word *hetia* (which means "warrior, hero, or soldier"), and *ras* (from *at rasa*, which means to run). Now, Sir, it is obvious that Dr. Donaldson founded this new etymology on the presumption that there *was* an aspirate collateral form *Hetruscus* and *Hetruria*. But how is it that the learned author did not previously inquire into the correctness of this presumption? that he did not ask the classics, the manuscripts, the inscriptions, about this very essential point? that he did not ask, particularly the poet *Virgil* and the excellent *Codex Medicus* about this matter? If he had done so, he would have found, that in the best Latin manuscripts, inscriptions, and coins, *there were no aspirate forms Hetrusci and Hetruria at all*, and that already old Mantius said (in "Orthographia," s. v. Etruria): "*Omnem aspirationem omittunt veteres libri, lapides et nummi.*" In this regard *Virgil* is a witness of the highest evidence. He was not only a native of the *Etruscan city Mantua*, and therefore best acquainted with the usual form of his national name, but he had also made the most scrupulous studies about Italian antiquities on behalf of his immortal epic poem. Besides, there is still existing one of the oldest manuscripts of *Virgil*—the most celebrated *Codex Medicus*, written with the utmost accuracy and authenticity. Accordingly, sound criticism is obliged to refer to this oldest witness in matters of ancient Latin orthography. Now it happens that this very oldest manuscript of *Virgil* exhibits a great many *aspirate forms* contrary to the usual orthography; and we may, perhaps, be allowed to attribute this predilection of aspirated forms to the genius of the old Etruscan and Cisalpine dialects. So we find not only *Ha-*

driacus, but also *Hiberus*, *Hister*, *Halcyones*, *Harena*, *Harundo*, *Hebenum*, *Holus* (instead of Iberus, Ister, Alcyones, Arena, Arundo, Ebenum, Olus). Well, then, if, nevertheless, we find always *Etruscus* and *Etruria* in Virgil, as likewise in all correct manuscripts of the Latin classics, and in all genuine old inscriptions and coins, we are, methinks, obliged to abstain from the form *Heetruscus*, and, accordingly, from the *Hetia* of the Eddas altogether; and to let those old warriors and heroes of olden times enjoy their well-merited repose in Walhalla, without entangling them in the struggle of doubtful Etruscan etymology.

2. As for Dr. Donaldson's inference from the vicinity of *Wends* to the *Low-German* or *Gothic origin of their western neighbours*, there will be, I dare say, very few historians and ethnographers who will admit this kind of argumentation. History, as well as ethnography, would go on far better than they have gone hitherto, if they were enabled to fix the course of wandering tribes, as astronomy fixes the course of wandering planets and comets, by three or four points of their direction. To say nothing of Dr. Donaldson's etymological and ethnological identification of the *Wends*, and *Finns*, and *Veneti*, it is very hazardous to put it as an ethnological fact that the *Raetians*, and, of course, the *Etruscans* too, must have been a *Low-German*, or *Gothic*, or *Saxon* tribe, because their contiguous neighbours are supposed to have been of *Wendish-Sclavonian origin*, and because on three or four other parts of Europe the latter tribes are supposed to have had Gothic or Low-German neighbours.

Besides, Dr. Donaldson seems to have totally overlooked that the name *Vindi*—to which he ascribes so high an ethnographical value, is found also westward of that "parallel of longitude" which he presumes to be the boundary-line of *Low-German* and *Wendo-Sclavonian*. There is, for instance, *Vindomagus*, the well-known ancient city of *Gallia Narbonensis*, the modern *Vigan*; there is *Vindonissa*, the well-known city of *Gallia Belgica*, on the river Araris, the modern Swiss *Windisch*, on the route between Basle and Zürich. Will Dr. Donaldson suppose *Vindomagus* and *Vindonissa* to have been Wendo-Sclavonic cities like *Windobona* on the

Danube? and, moreover, *their western neighbours* to have been *Low-German, Gothic, or Saxon tribes?* I think not. Well, then, he will be obliged to give up the ethnographical inference founded on the occurrence of the name *Vindi* or *Wendi*.

3. After having established, as he believes, the *Scandinavian origin* of the *Raeti*, and of the name *Etruscus*, Dr. Donaldson asserts (p. 70), "that the *mythological or heroic names are explicable in the same way*," and seems to wonder that *Niebuhr* did not attach any importance to his own observation, "that there was a singular resemblance between the Scandinavian mythology and that of the Etruscans." But, in this point, we may rather admire the cautiousness of the great historian, not to go farther than the laws of sound criticism allowed. With the same cautiousness the great German linguist, *James Grimm*, remarked (in his "History of the German Language," p. 122), "that there was a great and striking original resemblance between the mythical ideas of the *Celts* and *Germans* in all points belonging to the relation of mild goddesses, wise women, and an inferior peaceful people to human beings," without attaching to this observation any *etymological inferences*. The best proof that *Niebuhr* was right is the most striking fact, that Dr. Donaldson himself, who promises in the second chapter of his *Varronianus*, to prove the *Scandinavian origin of the mythological or heroic Etruscan names*, and brings forth a few remarks on the probable connection of the Scandinavian god *Thor*, and the Etruscan name *Tarquin*, afterwards, when he has proceeded to the fifth chapter (§. 2.), where the names of *Etruscan divinities are derived and explained*, gives only the self-same *Pelasgian, Greek, and Latin* dates, which he had given in the first edition of the *Varronianus*, where he had followed the authority of *Müller* and *Lepsius* with regard to the exclusively *Pelasgian* origin of the Etruscans; and, as if he had felt the disagreement of these two parts of the same book, he adds, at the end of the chapter, that the parallelism between (the *Pelasgian*) *Tina* and (the *Scandinavian*) *Thor* is to be explained by the fact, that they belonged to the religion of southern Etruria, which was *Pelasgian* rather than *Scandi-*

navian. But this final remark cannot overthrow the fact, that the Etruscan mythology is now explained, by Dr. Donaldson, on the same *Pelasgian and Greek theory* as it was before his Scandinavian discovery.

4. Almost the same may be said of his actual explanation of the "common Etruscan words, which have descended to us with an interpretation:" again there is disagreement between the promise and the fulfilment: we expect *Scandinavian* etymology, but chiefly find *Pelasgian, Greek, and Latin*," brought from the first, as it were, *Pelasgian* edition of the Varronianus, with the exception, that a few words have now received some additional Scandinavian illustrations of the same Indo-Germanian root; for instance, the mysterious *ril* = "annus," which was, in the first edition, only derived from the root *ra* or *re*, implying "flux" and "motion," and compared with Greek *ῥεῖ-τον*, *ῥεῖθρον*, has now, immediately after this etymology, the words added, "If the *l* represents a more original *n*, *ril* comes into immediate contact with the Icelandic *renna*, to "run" or "flow;" on which we may be allowed to ask why we should be sent to the *Old Norse* for this German etymology, as we have the same verb *rinnen* and *rennen* in all dialects of German language. If, therefore, out of about *fifty* words of this kind only four or five can be brought, by changing their forms and meanings, to resemble certain *Icelandic*, ones, it seems preferable to abstain from using such kind of arguments for the solution of the Etruscan problem.

5. Proceeding to the interpretation of the *Etruscan inscriptions*, Dr. Donaldson gives at first, after Lepsius, those inscriptions, the language of which is supposed to be *Pelasgian*. Whether or not the translations of these *Pelasgian* inscriptions given by Dr. Donaldson are right is of no consequence for our actual question. His explanation of *clen* by the Greek and Latin roots *cel*, *cul*, *cli*, *κολ*, etc., and at the same time by the Icelandic *klen*, German *klein*, so that the meaning of Etruscan *clen* may be "head of the family," and at the same time "the little child," would be a matter of philological dispute. In every case there is no necessity of fetching the etymology from *Iceland*, as *klein*, like *rinnen* and *rennen*, is found as well in southern Germany, and even in the immediate neighbourhood of the ancient *Raetians*. In

the same way, *phleres* and *tra* may find their derivation from the Latin *ploro* and *traho*, without going to the Icelandic *fleiri* and *tregi*; but whether Etruscan *suthinesl* means *funis* or *laqueus doloris*, and whether this latter is identical with "sorrowful inscription," is a matter of dispute, and no evidence, such as sound criticism requires, is adduced in either case.

Dr. Donaldson himself seems to have felt that such separate verbal resemblances are of doubtful value. He attaches more importance to the *grammatical evidence*, which, according to him, is afforded by the causative verb *lata* of the Perugian inscription, compared with the Icelandic causative verb *at lata*, "to let;" and it was *this very grammatical evidence* which encouraged Dr. Donaldson to announce to the British Association that he had solved the Etruscan problem.

But permit me, Sir, to state, that, in this most important and decisive point, the learned author has been deceived, in a most unusual degree, by placing too great a dependence on the information of his predecessors. In all such inquiries we ought, if possible, to verify the statements which are made and quoted by our authorities, in order that our facts may be trustworthy data for our reasonings. When, many years ago, I first studied Otfried Müller's *Etrusker*, and read his lines on the Perugian inscription, I sought at once to see the facsimile of this inscription, as it was published by Vermiglioli in 1824, two years after its discovery, because, in matters of this kind, the slightest typographical mistake may be followed by erroneous consequences. If Dr. Donaldson had done the same, he would not, it is true, have made *his* discovery, but he would have found that the existence of the word *lat* in the first line of the Perugian inscription, is not exempt from doubt, as can be seen by a single glance at the present facsimile, taken from the two publications of Vermiglioli in 1824 and 1833: (both works are to be found in the British Museum).* On the very spot where the word *lat* is supposed to be found, *the stone is damaged*; it is so also at the end of the first line; and instead of the A (of *lat*), there are two little perpendicular lines, and a point between them,

* These facsimiles were exhibited to the Society.

nearer to the right line. These two lines may be part of A, but they may be part of an N, and we must read *eulnt*; or, if the point near the right line is not the mere consequence of the injury of the stone, the two lines may be two *i*'s (I·I), and we must read *euli*—*it*, in two separate words: or, finally, the first *i* may be the number *one*, and we must read *eul* (one). *it*. And even, in the best case, if the two perpendicular lines are parts of a mutilated A, we have not two words *eu lat*, but the single word *eulat*, and after it a point; for, as Otfried Müller rightly said (in the Perugian inscription), the division of the words, where there are no points, is almost arbitrary; but we are not allowed to leap over the existing points without satisfactory reasons, as Dr. Donaldson has done thrice in the two first lines of the inscription. Therefore the reading *eulat. tanna. can*, in no case, mean, “here let offer,” or “here let give.”*

7. As the reading *lat* has proved an *epigraphical mistake*, so the supposition of an Icelandic verbal form *tenilaeth* as meaning “he let offer,” and supporting the verbal form *lat*, is a *twofold grammatical error in a single word*. The learned author says—“It is obvious that *tenilaeth* is the third person of a transitive verb;” and “this verb *tenilaeth* manifestly belongs to the same class of forms as the agglutinate or weak perfects in Gothic, which are formed by the affix of the causative *da*, as *soki-da*, “I did seek;” and finally, “the auxiliary *tenilaeth* is the present tense, which in Gothic is formed in *th*.”

Now it is well known to every philologist, that in the *Icelandic* the third person of the present tense never ends in *th*, but always in *r*. The forms of the first three persons of the regular present tense in Icelandic are (as can be seen in every

* Dr. Donaldson, quoting the inscription from Vermiglioli, gives the first two lines,

“eu. lat. tanna. la. rezul.
amev. achr. lautn. velthinaš.e.”

Dr. Freund, quoting from the same authority, gives it, supposing with Müller the nearly-obliterated letter to be A,

“eulat tanna larexul
amefachr lautn felthinas e.”

EDITOR.

Icelandic grammar), *ek tel, þu telr, hann telr* (not *telth*); and, quite in the same way, the present tense of the very Icelandic verb *at lata*, "to let," is *ek lat, þu lætr, hann lætr*, (not *læth*). Certainly Dr. Donaldson says: "the present tense in GOTHIC is formed in *th*." he does not say "in ICELANDIC;" but I cannot believe that by the word "*Gothic*" he does *not* mean the SCANDINAVIAN *Gothic*, but the MOESO *Gothic*, the *Gothic* of ULPILAS, in which, indeed, the third person of the present tense ends in *th*. But I would not offend Dr. Donaldson by supposing that he thought of adding a MOESO-*Gothic* termination to a SCANDINAVIAN-*Gothic* verb, which would be quite the same as if one would add the Greek termination $\sigma\iota$ or $\epsilon\iota$ of the present tense to a Latin verb, and forge such forms as *ponsi* or *ponei* instead of *ponit*, *arcessi* or *arcessei* instead of *arcessit*, &c.

The second grammatical error consists in the supposing an Icelandic *auxiliary* or *causative* verb, formed by an affix *-lat*. Never, and in no dialect of the large family of Teutonic languages, has such a kind of causative verbs formed by *lat* or *let* existed. The Teutonic verb *lat* or *let* never became an *affix* for the formation of causative verbs: never did any dialect of the Teutonic language form such verbs as *Igivelet*, *Iofferlet*, for *I let give*, or *I let offer*. Verbs of such a kind are found, for instance, in the Magyar, Turkish, and Mandschu languages. The Magyar says, *hiattni*, "to let call," "to cause to call," from *hivni*, "to call," (adding the syllable *at* to the root): the Turk says, *sevdirmek*, "to cause to love," from *sevmek*, "to love," (adding the syllable *dur* to the root); the Mandschu says, *omibume*, "to let drink," from *omime*, "to drink," (adding the syllable *bu* to the root). But it is thoroughly inconsistent with the genius of the Teutonic languages to suppose them to have formed such causative or factitive verbs by affixing the verb *letan* or *lata*, "to let," as there is *not the least trace* of such grammatical forms.

8. In order to console himself and the learned on the impossibility of a satisfactory interpretation of the Perugian inscription, Dr. Donaldson says (p. 181 seq.) that "there are very few words in this inscription which are not obviously proper names, and some of these occur very frequently, so

that this monument, comparatively copious as it is, furnishes, after all, only slender materials for a study of the Tuscan language." Now, Sir, it seems to me, that as long as we do not understand the language nor the contents of a writing, we are not allowed to say what kind of words it contains, and how much or how little we can profit by a full understanding of it. Dr. Donaldson himself finds in the *Perugian inscription more than eighty words*, and some of them several times repeated. But this very repetition, which he seems to regard as a disadvantage, is obviously one of the greatest merits of this mysterious inscription, as every scholar who has attempted to decipher unknown monuments will confirm. As little as we know of this inscription, nevertheless we learn by the repetition of the words *velthina* and *afuna* the very important fact that three cases, *nominative, genitive, and accusative?* of the nouns ending in *a* have the Latin formation: *velthina, velthinas, velthinam; afuna, afunas, afunam, &c.*

I have now, Sir, examined all essential arguments of Dr. Donaldson's theory with accuracy and impartiality. It will be proved, I believe, by my eight remarks, that neither the historical and ethnographical, nor the linguistical part of his reasoning offer sufficient evidences for his assertions. The name Etruscus is *not* of Scandinavian origin; the Raetii are *not* proved as a Gothic or Low-German tribe; the Etruscan mythology is *not* proved as of Gothic or Low-German origin; the Etruscan language is *not* undoubtedly proved as intermixed or infected with Scandinavian words; and, after all, the shibboleth of the whole question, the Perugian inscription, remains as unintelligible *after* Dr. Donaldson's inquiries as it has been *before* them.

Notwithstanding his want of success, we must feel indebted to Dr. Donaldson for his perseverance and warmth in pursuing and developing his ideas. If we are convinced, as we must be, that the time will come, when, by indefatigable studies, we shall succeed in deciphering the monuments of *Etruscan antiquity* as well as we have succeeded in those of *Egypt* and *Assyria*, every attempt to arrive at that end is thank-worthy, because even a wrong course taken at first very often, *when proved wrong*, contributes to lead to another direction, where *the right way* is finally discovered.