

BENCE FEHÉR

## CULT AND ITS STATE FINANCING – IN AN ETRUSCAN *RES PUBLICA*

**Summary:** The gold sheets from Pyrgi are mostly interpreted as a testimony of Carthaginian political influence on the city of Caere. We need not interpret the Etruscan–Punic bilingual text inevitably so, because its dates are obscure, but seemingly each text is dated in the manner of the actual party, and they are roughly corresponding. The only important difference shows that the leader of Caere, Ti. Velianas held his sway as a monarch in foreign affairs, but he retained the appearance of the *libera res publica* in internal policy. The unparalleled Etruscan text, according to a new interpretation of the first sentence, says that Ti. Velianas maintained the rites of the Juno–Astarte sanctuary out of his private property with a temple foundation. It says also that the performance of the cult was connected with a vaticination. These facts show that the cult was more independent from the Carthaginians than it was supposed and we may guess by which means the autocrat of Caere used his power.

**Key words:** Pyrgi, Juno sanctuary, foundation, omen.

It is infrequent that events of Etruscan history are enlightened by internal sources even in a reduced measure. The inscriptions I investigate now are considered to be among those rare ones which are extremely important as historical sources of Etruria. I mean the CIE 6314–6316. golden sheets that were found in the Uni sanctuary of Pyrgi.<sup>1</sup> The first of the two sheets written in Etruscan is to be regarded virtually bilingual with the Punic, the text of which is easy to understand (except for two debated readings). The general opinion is that the Etruscan text is a not perfectly faithful translation of the Punic one, defective in essential points. Far-fetched conclusions are drawn from this fact, concerning the question how strong a political influence Carthage had upon the city of Caere, which maintained the Uni sanctuary, in the age of the writing of the sheets, cca. 480–470 B.C.<sup>2</sup> So it is said that Carthage could obtain not only that a sacred place (אשר קרש) was erected for her own deity in the temple of the Etruscan goddess, in a syncretistic way, but even the wording of the offering text was made according to the wishes of the Carthaginians.

<sup>1</sup> G. COLONNA: L'identificazione del tempio di Astarte e la questione dello 'ŠR QDŠ, *Studi Etruschi* 33, 1965, 201–209, M. PALLOTTINO: Le iscrizioni etrusche, in: Scavi nel santuario etrusco di Pyrgi, *Archeologia Classica* 16, 1964, 76–103.

<sup>2</sup> The most lucid explication of these hypotheses see J. HEURGON: The Inscriptions of Pyrgi, *The Journal of Roman Studies* 56, 1966, 9–15, but it was said already by PALLOTTINO 1964, or G. DEVOTO: Considerazioni sulle lamine auree di Pyrgi, *Studi Etruschi* 34, 1966, 211–220.

Disregarding the inscription written only in Etruscan, which is sometimes omitted from the interpretation, doubtless because it seems hard to interpret without translation (though it is more intelligible in itself, than the inscription CIE 6314. based on a comparatively good Punic equivalent!), even the collating of the parallel texts will disprove such a statement.

The first sentence of Nr. 6314 is very closely corresponding with the Punic text:

· VEM · ASAIMAΘ · 2AD2AJAINV · 2V2I2A2 · 2AMAMAD2H · 2ACI · AIM2 · 22I  
· 2AMAI222 · 2I2D282Θ · 22VΘ  
לרבת לאשתרת אשר קדש אז אש פעל ואש יתנ תבריא ולנש מלכ אל כישריא

“This sacred place (is) for the Lady Astarte, which Tiberiya VLNS, king of Kisriya (=Caere) has made and given.”<sup>3</sup>

An approximate translation of the Etruscan text is:

“This sanctuary and this ensemble of cultic idols (?), (which) the *Res Publica* (*meχ θuta*) made, placing it for Uni-Astre, through Ti. Velianas.”

(*ita*, *ica* are demonstrative pronouns; several reasons can be proposed why they do not show the pronominal accusative form, the most simple of them being that the column beginning with *vatieχe* is an unsigned relative clause (in which case it corresponds with the Punic text literally). *Tmia* ‘sanctuary’ is a well-known word, *herma-sva* is not, but it contains surely the denomination of the cultic object, connected with the word *herma* ‘statue’;<sup>4</sup> I propose that it would be accepted as its *collectivum*. *Vatieχe* is the verb of the clause in the perfect, (with a *-χe* ending instead of *-ce*, which is perhaps only some peculiarity of the writing),<sup>5</sup> a word unknown to this time, but we can deduce doubtless from the meaning of the sentence and the Punic version that the meaning of the root *vati(e)-* is ‘to make’ (some object).<sup>6</sup> *Unial-astres* is unambiguously the denomination of the deity in genitive (with the sense of dative), usually interpreted as *Iuno-Astarte*, but a translation ‘*Iuno Regina*’ would be more in accordance with the Punic text, and the problem becomes even more difficult regarding the fact that in the *Liber Linteus* there are frequent compounds with a *-stre* second part, with debated meaning, but these are certainly common nouns.<sup>7</sup> Therefore at the present state I do not dare to form an opinion. *θemiasa* is presumably *part. aor.*

<sup>3</sup> For the translation of the Punic text see note 33, or concludingly G. PUGLIESE CARATELLI: *Intorno alle lamine di Pyrgi. Studi Etruschi* 33, 1965, 221–235.

<sup>4</sup> It was proposed also by M. Pallottino (PALLOTTINO 1964, 84), and mostly accepted, while A. J. Pfiffig maintained an idea that it was specially the word for a Juno-statue, being a loaning from the Greek *Ἡρα*. (A. J. PFIFFIG: *Uni-Hera-Astarte, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Kl. Denkschriften* 88, 2. Wien 1965, 25–26) It differs virtually nothing as for the whole context, the only problematic point is the *-sva* affix, which he thinks an independant but undecipherable adjective.

<sup>5</sup> There are some reasons that suggest it is a *passive* past tense, cf. C. DE SIMONE: *I morfemi etruschi -ce (-ke) e (-χe)*, *Studi Etruschi* 38, 1970, 115–139, but this interpretation has some problems in itself; anyway, the translation suggested by de Simone, *sacratus*, is evidently mistaken. The conclusion drawn by M. Cristofani (M. CRISTOFANI: *Ancora sui morfemi etruschi -ke: -khe*, *Studi Etruschi* 41, 1973, 181–191) is even less acceptable: *θefariei velianas* cannot be the *nomen agentis* referring to the passive voice, because, disregarding any other questions, how could we count with *meχ θuta*?

<sup>6</sup> Any other interpretation (PFIFFIG 1965, 26 etc.) is unreasonable.

<sup>7</sup> *Liber Linteus* 3, 21., 5, 3., 8, 14., 8γ, 5., 9, 2–3 etc.

The last sentence of both texts seems again accurately the same:

ITANIM : HEDAMEE : AEIL : ENIACA : TVLVVAVT : AOAINE : JIEA : EAMADAH : MINAKI

Acta Ant. Hung. 43, 2003

The translation of the intermediate clauses cannot be regarded as accomplished in spite of several attempts;<sup>13</sup> but at least it seems certain that it is not quite identical with the Punic text.<sup>14</sup> Yet the opinion that the Punic text was diplomatically authentic, is disproved on one hand by the fact that the Etruscan text is somewhat longer, on the other hand that it is worded in its 3rd–4th syntactical units with a strict word parallelism.<sup>15</sup> The first syntactical unit (*sal cluvenias*) is mostly interpreted ‘as a gift’, and most likely it is the equivalent of the Punic words ‘as a donation in the temple’.<sup>16</sup> The meaning of *cluvenias* can possibly be ‘of the temple’, though we do not know this word, but we can assume, according to the Punic version, that they had to use a word different from *tmia*. The predicate of the second syntactical unit (*turuce munistas ōuvas tamerescā*) is clear (he gave...), the subject is not unambiguous, the words *munistas ōuvas* seem to be a *nomen infinitum* construction, so it is not impossible that it can be the parallel of the words “I built it because Astarte ...ed” of the Punic version,<sup>17</sup> but instead of ‘I built’ in the 3rd person ‘he gave’ (i.e. Ti. Velianas). The word *tamerescā*, surely connected with the office-name *tamera*, seems to refer to the same person as ‘tutor’, either in political or in religious terms. The greatest problem is still in the 3rd–4th syntactical units, though the general assumption is that it contains the date. The 3rd unit would be identified with the expression “in the 3rd year of his kingdom in the month of KRR” by the aid of the words *nac ci avil* ‘because three years’,<sup>18</sup> but its syntax is obscure, there is no trace of the explicative clause in the Punic text, and the equivalent of ‘kingdom’ seems to be placed in the Etruscan (naturally with a republican term) in the 4th unit (*zilacal*);<sup>19</sup> on the contrary,

<sup>13</sup> PALLOTTINO 1964, 90–95, HEURGON 1966, 13–14 made great efforts for explaining the dates of this section, but recognizing the fact the Punic and Etruscan texts slightly differ, did not ‘translate’ them literally, but mostly remain by explaining word roots. PFIFFIG 1965, 29–32 gives a translation: »als Weihegabe für Cluvenia (?) gab er (sie), des hiesigen ortes Vorsteher, im Opfermonat (?) *tulerase*, weil drei Jahre (im dritten Jahre?) *χurvar* im *tešamiei* sie gab (?), im Opfermonat *alōuse*, nachdem von dem (für das?) Haus des Fürsten *itala* er weihte (?)«. Yet in the following page he admits the text is not quite intelligible. For the translation of *atranes zilacal*, see also DEVOTO 1966, 218.

<sup>14</sup> K. Olzscha in his interpretation, now mostly out of date, (K. OLZSCHA: Die punisch-etruskischen Inschriften von Pyrgi, *Glotta* 44, 1966, 60–109) tries to conduct a word-by-word equivalency of the Punic and Etruscan texts, finding even the expressions ‘the burial of the Lord’ (*ibid.* 85–86). But he is almost alone with his hopes concerning the identities of the texts.

<sup>15</sup> According to PALLOTTINO 1964, 91 there is rhyming, and therefore it is actually a verse, but I think it a too audacious idea. It is a methodical mistake to use recent poetry categories for an antique culture, and the conscious use of rhyme is not characteristic for the whole classical antiquity, nor is there any reason for the text of a contract, to be versified, and anyway we know yet no other Etruscan text in verse – despite all attempts we cannot trustworthily prove it even in the *Liber Linteus*. At the most we can say it is a double homoeoteleuton, which was more determined by the contents (very likely datation), than intention.

<sup>16</sup> *Cluvenias* being *hapax legomenon*, Pallottino states only that it is in S.G., Piffig supposes it is a proper noun, epithet of the goddess Uni. (PFIFFIG 1965, 29) I think they despaired too soon about the equivalencies of the two texts, because of the differences before mentioned. There is no reason enough for rejecting the resemblances of this section.

<sup>17</sup> It is debated whether *ordered* or *raised him with her hands* is written here. Quite otherwise: PFIFFIG 1965, 29–30.

<sup>18</sup> Heurgon tried to identify the word *χurvar* with the name of the month כרר : HEURGON 1966, 14.

<sup>19</sup> Olzscha sees the word *χurvar* as ‘leadership’ (OLZSCHA 1966, 83), but the etymologies he gives are not convincing; still in the terms of grammatics he seems right, *χurvar* is more an object of the

we cannot find in the 4th unit the corresponding words to those of the Punic “in the day of the burial of the god”. Nevertheless, the word *ilacve*, known also from the Capuan brick, where it is probably a date as well,<sup>20</sup> points to a day counting proper to the Etruscan religious ideas. Moreover, the reason for the word parallelism of this expression is not clear at all, nor the meaning of the word *ilacve*, in spite of the parallels in the Capuan brick, and the long, seemingly verbal words of both units are ununderstandable for us, even in the terms of morphology.

At any rate, the Carthaginian dating of the Punic version would be an argument for the precedence of the Punic party only if one could prove that the Etruscan text adopted it, but there is not much chance for such an adoption as far as we understand the Etruscan wording. If both parties dated according to their own customs, it shows more their equality.

And now let us see the exclusively Etruscan text (CIE 6315). It is the continuation of the other inscription, because it begins with an explicative clause, but it is a clear unit intelligible in itself. The crucial point is its first clause, for which I propose now a completely new interpretation.

First clause. Conjunction: *nac* ‘because’ + ind.

Predicate: *ϑamuce* archaic perf. with the affix *-uce* – *ϑam* ‘to found’

Subject: *ϑefarie* ‘Tiberius’ praen. with the affix *-e*, *veliunas* (a misspelling instead of *velianas*) n. gent. with the affix *-na*, S.N., *-s* is an affix for male personal names.

Object: *cleva* S.Acc. ‘a kind of offer’<sup>21</sup>

It means “Because Ti. Velianas founded an offer”. Being this certainly a new rite in that place, the act of ‘founding’ must refer to that he guaranteed its regular performance in the future, that is, Velianas made a temple foundation. This is what we cannot know from any other source! Consequently (at least one kind of) the cult of the Uni sanctuary was financed by a permanent foundation, which was ensured by the autocrat of the city as supreme authority. It is not contradictory in itself to the assumption that the Etruscans organized the cult dependant on the Carthaginians, but it does not refer to this either. The reason for the undertaking of the finances may be simply that the sacrifice, which the offer was made for, requested a regularity the Punic party was not able to maintain, or even that thus the cult was made financially independent from the Carthaginians! Moreover, while the consecration of the sanctuary and the cultic idol was acted *sub auspiciis rei publicae*, according to the Etruscan

sentence, than a date. I take it for certain that the text says either Velianas or the goddess *did* something *χurvar* after three years (of domination)

<sup>20</sup> *TLE* 2, 8, 18; Olzscha interprets it as ‘at Kalendae’ (K. OLZSCHA: Götterformeln und Monatsdaten in den grossen etruskischen Inschrift von Capua, *Glotta* 34, 1954, 83), Pfiffig as a sacrificing day of the month (not defined more precisely; PFIFFIG 1965, 30–31), but the *Liber Linteus* shows the Etruscan day counting *different* from the Roman one – this question is not solved at all at the moment.

<sup>21</sup> Sometimes connected with other offering rites, cf. *TLE* 2, 3–4. Yet the precise definition of it seems hard, Olzscha’s attempt with the meaning ‘sheep offering’ (OLZSCHA 1966, 98) is far-fetched.

text, Ti. Velianas being only the actual performing person, now the head of state himself is the founder, the *mex θuta* is excluded. It is an important clue to the question which techniques the head of state of Caere exercised his powers by, in the early 5th century B.C., being formally or in the internal policy a republican leader, in the diplomacy treated as king: he used (partially) his private estate, or such public estates he administered openly as his own, for it.<sup>22</sup>

The 2nd clause is presumably a temporal expression.

The words *masan tiur-unias* refer to a month probably together,<sup>23</sup> because we read a pretty good equivalent of it among the dates of the *Liber Linteus*: LL 12, 10.  $\text{JAHM}\theta\text{DV IHJAHNV H\theta AM MVWJAH\text{C} MH-HV\text{C}$ . This line is the introduction of the last short unit of the *Liber Linteus*, the proper text of which speaks about temple rites hard to identify (*ceχa*),<sup>24</sup> the date is usually interpreted as the 29th of the month *Masn*, but really the traditional dissecting of line 12, 10. into words is obviously erroneous,<sup>25</sup> *masn unialtiur(s)* is the same unit of meaning as in the Pyrgi sheet, only in a different word order,<sup>26</sup> it can be translated as “the month *masan* of Uni (Juno)”.<sup>27</sup> The declension form of the *Liber Linteus* is quite regular, *unial* being a genitive, and afterwards *tiurs* a *gen. temporis*, too, while *masn* agrees not with it being a projected attribute; the word *tiur-unia* of the golden sheet (presumably an archaic form with the shorter variation of the *-al* suffix of the genitive, or maybe it is simply assimilated

<sup>22</sup> Here some roughly contemporary events occur inevitably from the Roman historical legendary: was not the use of private property for the public health the base for the charge of *regnum* against Sp. Maelius? (*Liv.* IV 13.)

<sup>23</sup> The assumption that *masan* were not a word for a month, but for a ritual act, was sufficiently refuted by M. DURANTE: *Masan, Studi Etruschi* 26, 1968, 67–69.

<sup>24</sup>

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 10 | $\text{JAHM}\theta\text{DV IHJAHNV H\theta AM MVWJAH\text{C} MH-HV\text{C}$  |
| 11 | $\text{JH\theta AH\theta\text{C} \theta\text{JIC} H\text{C}H\text{C}AM HA JIC\theta A \theta\text{C}\theta A$                        |
| 12 | $\text{H\theta MHV\text{C} MH-H\theta\theta : \text{C}H\theta MA\theta I\theta\theta\text{C} \theta\text{C}V\text{C} \theta\text{C}$ |
| 13 | $\text{C}AH\theta H MA\theta\text{C}V\text{C} HA\theta AM$   |

“29th of the month *Masn Unialtiurs*. The building (??) must  $\text{JAHM}$ , which (is a) *Cilθ*-sanctuary (that) *ceχa*-rite (and) gift (??)  $\text{VJC} \theta\text{VC}$  -ed (it) with vessels (??) and  $\text{H\theta MA\theta}$ ; and finally over the  $\text{MA\theta\theta}V\text{C}$  –  $\text{C}AH\theta H$  (one has to *hila* ?), afterwards it was  $\text{H\theta VC}$ -ed.”

<sup>25</sup> The spaces between words are generally defectively signed in the *Liber Linteus*, the dissecting points do not sensibly enlarge the distance between two letters. The actual letters *unial tiursmnal* are written quite at the same distance from one another, surely after the second I one can see a point but it is so near the I it is unlikely it had any role of grammatical articulation: in the next line a closely similar point is seen before the letter *A* in the words *ceχa* : *sal*, but with slightly bigger distances between the letters *A* and *θ*. Probably sometimes points are written in the text as mistakes, which they never attempted to emend.

<sup>26</sup> The word order of the Etruscan language is generally not strict, though it was never criticized in details. A. J. Piffiffig’s analysis of it (A. J. PIFFIFFIG: *Die etruskische Sprache*, Graz 1969, 214–226) is not reliable enough.

<sup>27</sup> The word *mnal* (a form defectively written) is most likely governed by *acil* (LL 12, 11), because the word between them, *aθre*, is not enough for to complete a sentence (whether it means ‘building’, as Pallottino says, or the predicate of a subordinate clause, as OLZSCHA 1966. 88. asserts), but afterwards it follows with a related sentence. Naturally there are many defective writings, that drop out the unstressed vocals, in the late Etruscan *Liber Linteus*: it is the reason why *masn* is written instead of *masan*.

before the suffix *-s*), which was originally a possessive construction in direct order, is suffixed in the end like a coalesced word; naturally it is in the *gen. temporis* here, too.

Regrettably the month *masan tiur-unia* cannot be identified exactly, because the order of the *Liber Linteus* is probably not in a strict temporal sequence, there is no evidence of that the sacrifice in the very end of the book belonged to the last month(s) of the year.

The name of the day must be in the word *etanal*, but it is no ordinal number, as in the dates of the *Liber Linteus*. We can suppose it is dated to appointed days in Roman manner. Perhaps it is a possible hypothesis that it is connected with the word *\*itu* ‘idus’, reconstructed from a *glossa*:<sup>28</sup> maybe an adjective *eta-na* from a corresponding *\*eta* form with the *-l* suffix of the S.G.: “in the (interval) belonging to the Idus”.<sup>29</sup>

Since the mark of the date is not given with the number of days, it is quite possible that on the other inscription the Etruscan equivalent of the Carthaginian date is placed in the unintelligible part.

3rd clause. No conjunction, it is probably an unmarked relative clause.<sup>30</sup>

Predicate: *œelace* perfectum with an usual affix *-ce*. The meaning of it, based on the context, is cca. ‘offer’.<sup>31</sup>

Object: *vacal* ‘*libatio*’ in its archaic, completely spelled form.

Possessive: *tmial* S.G. with the suffix *-l*, *tmia* ‘sanctuary’ > of the, belonging to the (or perhaps for the) sanctuary.

Adverb of time: *avilχval* S.G. with the suffix *-l*, the root is a *collectivum* with the affix *-χva*: *avil* ‘year’ > in the ensemble of the years, every year.

The meaning of it is: “(By which) one offered(?) the *libation* of the sanctuary every year.”

4th clause. There is no conjunction (unmarked relative clause subordinate to the word *avilχva*: ‘in which, when’).

Predicate: *amuce* perfect with the archaic affix *-uce*, *am* ‘to be’.

Subject: *pulumχva* S.N., *collectivum* with the affix *-χva*, *pulum* ‘star’ (known from the other sheet) > ensemble of the stars. It is evident that the stars are here seen as determining with their characters the yearly sacrifice, i.e., seen as *omina*. The meaning of the *Nom. Praed.* (or maybe attribute?) *snuiaφ* is unknown.<sup>32</sup> It must

<sup>28</sup> Varro, *De lingua latina* 6, 28, 7. Itus.

<sup>29</sup> This hypothesis emerged already in the interpretation of the Capuan brick, see OLZSCHA 1966, 83.

<sup>30</sup> It is a phenomenon proved by the *Liber Linteus* that in the Etruscan the relative clauses are constructed asyndetically, without pronouns. By my opinion the clause is subordinate to *cleva* (with a connexion ‘by which, through which’), and the temporal section can be linked hereto.

<sup>31</sup> Several reliable linguists do not number this word among those that are surely well interpreted; Pfiffig says it is the same root as *sal* ‘donation’ (PFIFFIG 1965, 32, 38), and translates it ‘stiftete’, but I doubt the identity of roots with *ś* and with *M* in the same archaic text. H. Stoltenberg ascribes a meaning *Totenopfern* to it, and he seems to be roughly right, save for it is obvious from the text and circumstances, that the meaning is not restricted for funeral rites. (H. L. STOLTENBERG: *Etruskische Sprachlehre*, Leverkusen 1950, 26)

<sup>32</sup> It occurs in the *Liber Linteus* too, LL 6, 2. 4. The mostly accepted  $\Phi\alpha\uparrow\vee\uparrow\eta\eta$  reading of the text is uncertain, it is reasonable to emend it based on the Pyrgi golden sheet (contrary to the opinion of Pfiffig,

contain the estimation of the stars, but we cannot unambiguously say whether it is said of a positive or a negative position. Theoretically, referring to a sacrifice, an *omen* can be favourable, allowing it, or even prescribing, admonishing (in order that some danger may be avoided); we can exclude only its prohibiting nature. So the meaning of the clause is “(when) the stars (evidently as *omina*) were ?allowing / admonishing / favourable / foretelling danger?”

Therefore it is likely that they vaticinated every time before the (however habitual) sacrifice described in the “foundation charter”. Regrettably we do not know its technical arrangement, not even which priest college was in charge of it, but since we know the importance of vaticination in Etruscan life, we can assume this event did not reflect the customs or wishes of the Carthaginian party either, but the Etruscan methods.

To summarize our statements, we can say that, disregarding their formerly accepted importance, the sheets of Pyrgi give us some new specific knowledge about the financing and maintaining of the rites of the Juno temple, the connection of the head of the Caere *civitas* and the temple, and maybe the date can be more accurately read from them, too. We can state that the respects of the Etruscan party were more effective in the contract put down in the sheets, than it was supposed until now, and probably a vaticination procedure belonged to the rites in the Etruscan manner.

## TEXTS OF THE DISCUSSED INSCRIPTIONS

### A) CIE 6314

|    |                           |
|----|---------------------------|
|    | -AH · CAOI · AHMĦ · AH    |
|    | AVĦĦĦĦ · AHMAHĦ           |
|    | -AHMĦO · SĦĦSĦJĦHV        |
|    | -A8ĦO · AHVO · VĦM · A2   |
| 5  | · JĦ2 · SĦHĦJĦĦ · JĦD     |
|    | -VDVĦ · SĦHĦĦVJ           |
|    | SĦĦVO · SĦĦHVM · ĦO       |
|    | · ĦĦCAJĦ · AOSĦĦMĦĦ       |
|    | -JĦĦ · IO · CAH · SĦĦJĦVĦ |
| 10 | ĦĦMAHĦĦ · DĦĦDV · J       |
|    | SĦMJĦ · ĦĦCAJĦ · JĦĦ      |
|    | CAJĦĦ · SĦHĦĦĦ · CAH      |
|    | ĦMAHĦA · AJĦĦĦĦ2 · JĦ     |

who thinks it misspelled in the sheet, and reads it based on the *Liber Linteus* Φ47V12, but does not dare to translate it (PFIFFIG 1965, 39). Unfortunately these lines of the *Liber Linteus* firmly resist to all translation, some efforts on it see A. J. PFIFFIG: *Studien zu den Agramer Mumienbinden*, Wien 1963, 66.





This sacred place (is) for the Lady Astarte, which Tiberiya VLNS, king of Caere has made and given in the month of the sacrifice of the sun (ZBH ŠMŠ) as a donation (?) in the temple. And (in the surroundings? / I built it?), because Astarte (raised him with her hand? / ordered through him?) in the 3rd year of his kingdom in the month of KRR in the day of the burial of the god. The years of the god statue in the temple (are so many) years as these stars.<sup>33</sup>

Károli Gáspár University of the Hungarian  
Reformed Church  
Dept. of Ancient History  
H-1088 Budapest  
Reviczky u. 4/c

<sup>33</sup> Based on the interpretations of G. GARBINI: L'iscrizione punica, in: Scavi nel santuario etrusco di Pyrgi, *Archeologia Classica* 16, 1964, 66–75, G. GARBINI–G. LEVI DELLA VIDA: Considerazioni sull'iscrizione punica de Pyrgi, *Oriens Antiquus* 4, 1965, 35–52 (though Levi della Vida proposes a *lectio varia* for the words זבח שמש), S. MOSCATI: Osservazioni sull'iscrizione fenicio-punica di Pyrgi, *Rivista degli studi orientali* 39, 1964, 257–260 and HEURGON 1966, 9–11. Pfiffig's version 'at his expense' of the words ובנתו (PFIFFIG 1965, 15) is the only major difference accepted by several scholars today.