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Chapter 8
Syntax and text structure

Although some attention has been paid to it in the past (e.g. Stolte 1926:22-7, G. Giacomelli 1963:155-68), the syntax of Faliscan is on the whole a rather neglected subject. This is not surprising, for from a traditional, morphology-based syntactic perspective the data provided by the Faliscan texts can be described in fairly brief terms and provide little that is of interest (§8.2-3). There are, however, two other and more promising approaches to the subject. The first is what can broadly be called the ‘word order’ approach, where it is the order of the constituents of sentences and word groups that is the subject of study: on this point, Faliscan appears to align with early Latin (§8.4-7). The second approach is the study of the way in which types of texts, especially formulaic texts, are constructed. This provides some interesting insights into the relation between the textual types found in the Faliscan material and comparable material from the surrounding areas (§8.8-13).

8.1. Syntax and text structure: methodological issues

The major problem in the description of Faliscan syntax is that the data are extremely limited. This is mainly due to the contents of the inscriptions, which in many cases consist entirely of names. More elaborate texts containing verb phrases are few, apart from the formulaic type hec cupat/cupant (cf. §8.10.1).

The only longer inscriptions that show verb phrases and even sentences are the Early Faliscan inscriptions EF 1-4 on the one hand, and the second-century Latin inscriptions on the other. Although I have used the former group, I found that trying to use the latter group as a source of data for a description of a Faliscan syntax severely biased the outcome and I have therefore excluded this group on methodological grounds, as it cannot be ascertained whether these, in fact, represent Faliscan syntax. Not only are these inscriptions in most cases very different from the Faliscan inscriptions with regard to their type and contents, they are also usually of a very late date. Especially note Lat 217 (c.125), 218 (c.125), 219 (c.120-50), 237 and 238, 240, 250 (106), 251 (late second century), 268 (fourth century, but probably imported), 291 (second century), 296 (an import), 377, 393, Cap 386, 421 (c.150), Cap 431-437, Lat 438 (all from before 211), and 456 (c.100-50). I have likewise excluded Late Faliscan or Latin 214 (c.150?), not because it is necessarily non-Faliscan, but because it is a unique text even among the Latin inscriptions and can therefore not be used as data for a consistent picture of Faliscan syntax.
8.2. Nominal morphosyntax

8.2.1. Cases and numbers. As appeared from Chapter 4, the Faliscan material shows six cases in productive use, namely the nominative (§4.2.1, §4.2.6, §4.3.1, §4.3.6, §4.5.1, §4.5.3.2), the genitive (§4.2.2, §4.3.6, §4.4, §4.5.2, §4.5.3.3, §4.6.1), the dative (§4.2.3, §4.3.2, §4.6.2), the accusative (§4.2.4, §4.3.3, §4.5.3.1, §4.6.3), and, attested only for Early Faliscan, the ablative (§4.3.4) and the vocative (§4.3.5). The ablative occurs in fossilized form in the adverbs *foied* MF 59-60 (← Proto-Latin */hō+diē(d)/ or */ho-diē(d)/, cf. §6.2.34) and *ifra* MF 40 (← Proto-Latin */enō(e)rā(d)/). The locative likewise occurs only in fossilized form in the adverb *hec* ← (Proto-Latin */hej+ke/ (attestations in §4.8, §6.2.33). Unfortunately, it cannot be ascertained whether in (Middle) Faliscan the locative had ceased to be productive, as in Latin (cf. LHS I pp.148-51, Meiser 1998:129), or remained a productive case, as in the Sabellic languages (cf. Von Planta 1897:415, Buck 1928:199-200).146

The numbers are two, namely singular and plural: as in the other Italic languages, there is no dual. In Latin inscriptions, the singular could be used for the plural in the case of a gentilicium preceded by more than one praenomen, as in m · c · pompilio · no · f CIL 1^2.30 and q · k · cestio · q · f CIL 1^2.61, and perhaps also q · a · aidicio CIL 1^2.2442 (cf. Wachter 1987:390-1).147 An Early Faliscan instance of this usage has been read in *euios : mama zextos* EF 1, which was interpreted as ‘Mama (et) Sextus Euius’ by Herbig (CIE 8079), but this is uncertain at best: a clearer instance seems to be m · itio · tulio · uoltilio · hescuna MLF 346, although the m may be a later addition.

Agreement is as rigidly observed as in every Italic language, with the exception of two problematic instances. The first is *poplia : calitenes | aronto : cesies | lartio : uxor* MF 265, where even in the least strained interpretation, ‘Publia Calitenes, wife to Arruns Caesius Lars’ son’, the patronymic adjective would be expected to show the genitive *larti* instead of the nominative *lartio*. The second is *cau‹i›o : pauiceo : | [loc]ies : cela* MF 12, for which the most probable interpretation seems to be ‘the tomb of Gavius Pavicius, Lucius’ son’, which would be *caui : pauici : | [loc]ies : cela*. In both cases, the confusion in the use of the cases has been ascribed to Faliscan-Etruscan language contacts, which is probable at least in the case of MF 265 (see §9.2.2-3). The possibility of an epigraphic error cannot be excluded, however: MF 265 is known only from apographs, while the lines of MF 12 may in fact belong to separate inscriptions.

146 M. Mancini’s (2002:28-33) interpretation of *lete* MLF 285 as a locative /lētē/ ← */lōṭāj/ would presuppose that the locative still was productive in Faliscan.

147 Early authors interpreted these forms in -o as duals, but in view of the complete absence of traces of a productive Italic dual, it is extremely unlikely that the dual.
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8.2.2. Syntactic functions of the cases. The use of the cases expressing the arguments is without surprises: the nominative is used to mark the subject, the accusative to mark the object, and the dative to mark the indirect object. The instances are:

(intransitive verb, with nominative subject only:)

uel zu[con]eo : [fe] cupa] MF 56

[intransitive verb, with nominative subject only:]

uel zu[con]eo : [fe] cupa] MF 56

(transitive verb, with both nominative subject and accusative object:)

ceres : far *[0-2]e[1-3]tom ... *[3-4]*ad EF 1
mama z[e]xtos med ff[j]iqod EF 1
eqo urnel[a ti?]tela ... arcente [c?][ilom peipara[i] EF 1
tele*[1-2?] med fi fi[ked EF 9
oufilo : clipeaio : letei : fileo : met : facet MF 470*

(perhaps precono | cui tenet | let MF 361 (if ‘Praeconus qui tenet lect(um)’)
CHAPTER 8

(transitive verb, with only the nominative subject expressed; the object (the inscribed object itself) can be inferred from the context:)

cauios frenaios faced MF 471*

(transitive verbs, with only the accusative object expressed; the subject is present in the verb form:)

foied · uino · pipafo · cra · carefo · MF 59 = foied · uino · pipafo · cra · carefo · MF 59

(transitive verb, with nominative subject, accusative object, and indirect dative object expressed:)

pra[u]tos urnam : soc[iai] porded karai EF 1

There are no instances of other uses of the cases than nominative subject - accusative object - indirect dative object. Carefo in foied · uino · pipafo · cra · carefo · MF 59 = foied · uino · pipafo · cra · carefo · MF 50 may have had an ablative complement as in Latin, but in early Latin this verb is also used with the genitive and the accusative (see LHS II p.83). I do not adopt Renzetti Marra’s (1990:336-7) interpretation of precono | cui tenet | let MLF 361 as ‘Preconio cui (al quale) tocca il letto’: this requires a construction for teneo that is to my knowledge entirely without parallels in Latin or any Italic language.

Due to the lack of longer texts, there are hardly any instances of the use of cases in satellites. Ablatives pramod (and propramod?) occur in propramom : pramed [u]mom pramod pramed umom : pramod : propramod : pramod umom[me] EF 2, and possibly in [--- p]rotacio[---]stro - pro[---] LF 244 and [---]*[---]cues[tor---]str[o] LF 245 (cf. Renzetti Marra 1990:338), but in all these texts the function of these forms is entirely unclear. The vocative occurs in the pseudo-subjects salueto[d] uoltene EF 3 and ues saluete social EF 4.

On the word level, the only case attested with any frequency is the possessive genitive (for which see §8.1.3), which can also be combined with esú ‘I am’, as in aciuaiom esú Cap 465, and possibly also in k · sares · esú Cap 404 (cf. §9.3.2). In a prepositional phrase, the ablative is attested in pro pramod in EF 2 (see §8.4.4).

8.2.3. The nominative and the genitive in isolation. In the epigraphic material, case-forms regularly occur in isolation. In the case of the nominative and the genitive, this can be ascribed to the semantic functions of these cases, and does not require the assumption of ellipsis of a verb, which I think is necessary in the case of the dative and the accusative (for which see §8.2.4).

The nominative can of course occur in isolation because it is semantically ‘unmarked’: in inscriptions, its use in isolation serves as a very explicit and specific identification mark, used to identify:
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(a) the deceased, in sepulchral inscriptions: the instances are too numerous to enumerate (c. 184 instances: for the attestations, see §11.1.4.1).

(b) the owner of the object, in Besitzerinschriften where the possessive relationship between owner and object is not expressed by the genitive (for attestations see §8.8.1).

(c) the maker of the object, in signatures (see §8.9.1 and §11.1.4.2a), but also in inscriptions naming the magistrate responsible for the execution of a public work as the ‘maker-by-proxy’ (see §8.11 and §11.1.4.5).

(d) the inscribed object itself: in inscriptions where the object is the Topic and the Focus consists of the attribute of the object, as in caui/io : pauiceo | [foc]ies : cela MF 12, *[..]pi : ues[i] : cela MF 83, caui[ : ]**(*)[i ] : cela MF 84, [---]fate cela MLF 285 (see §8.9.3).

(e) an attribute of the inscribed object: mention of the inscribed object (the Topic) is omitted, and the text consists only of the attribute of the inscribed object (the Focus), as in sacra MF 127 and the labels canumede [die]s pater cupi‹d›o menerua MF 62.

The isolated genitive involves a different syntactic and semantic perspective. It is in fact an attributive (possessive) genitive denoting the possessor (the Focus), with an ellipsis of a noun that designates the inscribed object itself (the Topic), which can be inferred from the context. Undisputed instances are the Besitzerinschriften in the genitive:

\[
\begin{align*}
titias & \text{ MF 201} \\
pupiias & \text{ MF 305} \\
tulom & \text{ MF 80} \\
fel\text{cinatiu} & \text{ LF 384}
\end{align*}
\]

and the dedications in the form of a Besitzerinschrift with a divine owner (the use of the genitive here may be modelled on Etruscan, see §8.10.1):

\[
\begin{align*}
apolinos & \text{ EF 10} \\
loi\text{firtato} & \text{ MF 31, loi\text{firtato} MF 32 (probably likewise dedicatory)}
\end{align*}
\]

Ambiguous are the isolated io-stem forms in -i, which can be either genitives or abbreviated nominatives, serui MF 34-36, anni MF 45, uli MF? 261-262, caui : turi MF 273, uolt : catinei MF 469*, marci : anel[i] MF 472*, anni LtF 63, c : pscni Cap 387, c : aci Cap 395, sex | senti Cap 399, sex : sen-ti Cap 430.148 see also §9.2.2. In the signatures ç cutri MF 200 (and in the (partly imported) Latin signatures ç : popil[i] Lat 295, ç : popili Lat 296, [ç : ]popili Lat 478*, l : quinti Lat 477*), such ambiguous forms in -i mark the maker of the object, not the owner: if interpreted as a genitive, this must denote a very loosely possessive sense: see §8.9.1.

---

148 For a similar ambiguity in the Etruscoid forms in -es, where nominative and genitive were apparently homomorphemic, see §9.2.2.4.
The isolated first-declension forms in -ai, iunai MF 74, 112, MLF/Cap 475*, uoltai MLF 367-370, sceiuai LF 379, and perhaps [---]altai / MF 109, and the isolated second-declension forms in -oi, caistoi MF 20, tiroi · colanoi MF 69-71 can be either genitives or datives: I prefer to interpret them as genitives (see §4.4.4 and §8.8.1).

8.2.4. Elliptic sentences, isolated datives, and isolated accusatives. In addition to the nominal phrases described in the preceding section, there are a number of texts that can be interpreted as verb phrases with an ellipsis of the verb that shifts the emphasis onto the semantic functions of the arguments. The clearest instances of this are those texts that consist of a subject in the nominative and an indirect object in the dative: the object (identical with the inscribed object itself) is always implicit as it can be inferred from the context. The ellipsis can even include the subject, leaving the emphasis wholly on the recipient. The instances of this are as follows:

(a) dedications:

\[\text{titoi | mercui | efiles MF 113}\]
\[\text{titoi | mercui | efile MF 114}\]
\[\text{[ti][to][i] | mercui[i] | efiles MF 115}\]
\[\text{titoi | mercui[i] | efil[es] MF 116}\]
\[\text{[titoi | mercui | efil]es MF 117}\]

(with ellipsis of the nominative subject:)

\[\text{titoi : mercui[i] MF 118}\]
\[\text{[ti][to][i] : mercui[i] MF 119}\]
\[\text{[ti][to][i] : mercui MF 120}\]
\[\text{[ti][to][i] : mercui MF 121}\]
\[\text{titoi : [m][ercui MF 122}\]
\[\text{[titoi : ?][mercui] MF 123}\]
\[\text{[m][ercui MF 124}\]
\[\text{mercui MF 125}\]
\[\text{mercui MF 126}\]

and possibly [---]altai / MF 109

(b) Geschenkinschriften (the forms in -ai and -oi can also be genitives, see §8.2.3):

\[\text{locia eimoi MF 293}\]

(with ellipsis of the nominative subject:)

\[\text{iunai MF 74, LF 112, Cap 475*}\]
\[\text{caisioi MF 20}\]
\[\text{tiroi · colanoi MF 69-71}\]
\[\text{uoltai MLF 367-370}\]
\[\text{sceiuai LF 379}\]
(c) sepulchral inscriptions of the type ‘X [made this grave] for Y’ (see §8.9.2):

```
larise : mar[|]ena : citiai MF 270
cauio uelmineo | popliai file MLF 308
perhaps uoltio | folcozeo | zextoi | fi LF 330
perhaps [..] folcosio | *****oi LF 333
possibly [---]: zaconiai MF 154
possibly cuicto uelmineo | [---?]uoxie[.]ai MLF 310
```

A similar ellipsis has been invoked to explain the problematic isolated accusative eitam EF 5. (Middle Faliscan tulom MF 72 is more likely to be a genitive plural.) Similar accusatives occur in Latin mirquriros alixentrom CIL I².553 and uenos diouem prose-pnai CIL I².558, and in Praesamnitic te-clitia-m Ps 16-17 and Oscan spurieis culefnam Cm 27. In these cases, too, ellipsis has been assumed, e.g. by Wachter (1987:111) for the Latin instances, and by Colonna (1980d) for te-clitia-m. I would rather explain eitam as due to a confusion in the use of the cases in Etruscan-Italic language contact: see §9.2.2.

### 8.3. Verbal morphosyntax

As said in Chapter 5, there are few verb forms, and consequently, little can be said about the morphosyntax of the Faliscan verb. The only tenses that are attested are present, perfect, and future, and the majority of the forms are indicative.

The attestations of the present indicative are all of durative verbs (‘to lie’, ‘to be’, and perhaps ‘to hold’):

```
uel zu[con]eo : fe[ cupa] MF 56
..... : hec : cupa]nt MF 80
[uo]ltio[ :] jucicono : lecet : hec MF 88
[---]elicio : cesi : fi | [---]: cauia * * | [he cup?]a MF 94
[---]elicio[ ---]hec : cupa[t] MF 95
[--- pu]pel[i---]a hef cupa[ ] MF 150
[uo][ta : ]**[---] | iataeue : [f[---] | hec : cupat MF 158
[polpsia[ : ---] : hec ]: cup[a] MF 161
uoltio : uecineo | maxomo | iuneo : he : cupat LF 220
```

149 Colonna referred to te-clitia-m as an exclamatory accusative, but his discussion shows that he means an accusative object in an elliptic invocation ‘(Behold,) a teclitia (I dedicate to thee)!’. 


The instances of the perfect indicative all refer to an act in the past:

\[\text{mama z[e]xtos med f[.f]i[g]od} \text{ EF 1}\]
\[\text{tele*[1-2] med fifiked} \text{ EF 9}\]
\[\text{prau[i]os urnam : soc[iai] porde karai} \text{ EF 1}\]
\[\text{eqo [n]el[a ti?]tela ... arcetelom gut[i]f[olf]om pe[parai}\text{ EF 1}\]
\[\text{[.]a| protacio} \text{ m \cdot f \cdot macisratu | keset \cdot cuestod \cdot pi \cdot pre|tmod \cdot pis} \text{ LF 242}\]
\[\text{[---|--- ma|cistratu} | kese[t duum|uiru \cdot [preto]|r cues|tor]} \text{ LF 243}\]

Of the instances of the future tense, one (\text{pipafo/piipafo}) refers to a future act, the other (\text{carefo/care\textsf{f}o}) to a future state:

\[\text{foied \cdot uino \cdot pipafo \cdot cra \cdot carefo} \text{ MF 59 = foied \cdot uino \cdot piipafo \cdot cra \cdot care\textsf{f}o} \cdot \text{ MF 60}\]

The present subjunctive, imperative, and future imperative are attested only for Early Faliscan. The instances of the subjunctive are mostly from an unclear context, but are generally interpreted as having adhortative or injunctive force:

\[\text{ceres : far *[0-2]e[1-3]tom : *[3-5]u[i][1-4]ui[.].m} \text{ *[3-4]*ad} \text{ EF 1} \text{ (injunction as part of a prayer?)}\]
\[\text{douiad} \text{ EF 1} \text{ (context unclear: a loose addition to the text that constitutes an additional injunction?)}\]
\[\text{ofetios kaios uelos amanos salueto salues seite} (= \text{s\{e\}ite or s\{ie\}te}) \text{ EF 4} \text{ (subjunctive joined to the imperative, see below)}\]
\[\text{tulate tulas urate} \text{ EF/Etr 385} \text{ (interpretation unclear: tulate and tulas are subjunctives, while urate may be an imperative (§5.1.2.23), see below)}\]
\[\text{perhaps also pramed in propramom : pramed [u]mom pramed umom : pramod : propramod pramod umo[m]} \text{ EF 2} \text{ (context unclear, cf. §5.2.1.15).}\]

The instances of the imperative and the future imperative are the following:
SYNTAX AND TEXT STRUCTURE

Although morphologically imperatives, *salue[to]d, saluete, and salueto* do not have real imperative force: they belong rather in the category of the ‘non-characteristic use of the imperative in curses, maledictions, and well-wishes’ (see Bolkestein 1980:43-7). It is perhaps for this reason that in EF 4 the future imperative *salueto* and the adhortative subjunctive *salues seite (= s{e}ite or s‹ie›te)* are apparently equivalent. The only ‘real’ Faliscan imperative would then be *urate* Etr/EF 385 (if that is not a subjunctive as well, cf. §5.1.2.23): this imperative, too, is apparently equivalent in sense to the adhortative subjunctives *tulate* and *tulas*. For a functional overlap or equivalence of the adhortative subjunctive and the imperative in early and vernacular Latin, cf. LHS II p.385.

8.4. Constituent order

8.4.1 The order of the arguments. In the Faliscan inscriptions, the order of the arguments is consistently SV in phrases with verbs with one argument like *cupat* and *lecet* and the forms of ‘to be’ (for instances, see §8.1.2), and SOV in phrases with verbs with two or three arguments. The instances of the latter are:

(transitive verb, with both nominative subject and accusative object:)

- ceres\[
  \]S/g2639*[far *
  *[0-2]e*[1-3]tom ]O ... *[3-4]*ad\[V \]EF 1
- [ mamas z[e]xtos ]S med\[\[f][f]iqod\]V EF 1
- [ eqo urnel*[a ti?]*tela ]S ... [ arcentelom hut[c?]ilom ]O pe\[para[iv \]EF 1
- tele*[1-2?]\[s medo fijiked\]V EF 9
- prau*[i]os\[s urnam\]O : soc[iai] porded\[v karai EF 1
- [ oufilo : clipeaio ]S : letei : fileo : meta[\v MF 470*
  (a similar text, but damaged, is LF 243)
  (with only the nominative subject expressed:)
- [cawios frenaios]S, S\[aced\]V MF 471*
  (with only the accusative object expressed:)
- foied \[uinoO : pipafo\[v : cra : carefo\[v \]MF 59 = foied \[uinoO : pipafo\[v : cra : caref[lo\[v \]MF 60

Several of these phrases are formulaic and may therefore not represent the unmarked word order. Yet an important argument in favour of SOV being the usual Faliscan order
is in fact furnished by just such formulaic phrases as [mama z[e]xtos]$_s$ medo[f]ijodv$_E$F 1 and tele*[1-2]$_S$ medo,fijikedv$_E$F 9, for these have an SOV-order even though they reflect an Etruscan model minio zinacev MAKERS where the order is consistently OVS (§8.9.1). The only exceptions would be the SVO-order of Renzetti Marra’s (1990:336-7) interpretation of precono | cui tenet | let MLF 361 as ‘Praeconus qui tenet lect(um)’, and the OVS-order of Vetter’s (1953:301) impossible reading of MF 89 as ------a hac ---a : (-)r--t : maximo ‘...a(m) ha(n)c ...a(m) ...t Maximus’.

In the few instances of nominal sentences with more than one constituent (cf. §8.1.3), the order of the core constituents is nominative subject - dative complement in

locias eimoic MLF 293

and in the sepulcral inscriptions of the type ‘X [made this grave] for Y’ (cf. §8.9.2):

[ larise : mar|cna ]$_S$ : citiaic MF 270
[c auio uelmineo ]$_S$ | [ popliai file ]$_C$ MLF 308
possibly [ ---]$_S$ : zaconiaic MF 154
possibly [ cuicto uelmineo ]$_S$ | [---]uoxieaic MF 310
perhaps [ uoltio | folcozeo ]$_S$ | [ zextoi | fi ]$_C$ LF 330
perhaps [ ..]folcosio ]$_S$ | *****oi$_C$ LF 333

(I reject this interpretation in the cases of [---]ronio : uol[t---]a*ome MF 156, tito : uelmineo : iun|ai i*ice MF 315, and tito i uelmineo | iu i*ice MF 309.)

In the few Faliscan dedications that consist of RECIPIENT$_{DAT}$ DEDICANT$_{NOM}$, on the other hand, this order is reversed:

[ titoi | mercui ]$_C$ | efies$_S$ MF 113
[titoi | mercui ]$_C$ | efies MF 114
[ titoi | mercui[i] ]$_C$ | efies$_S$ MF 116
[ [titoi | mercui ]$_C$ | efies$_S$ MF 117

Comparable Latin inscriptions, too, show a slight tendency to place the name of the deity first (see §8.10.1), perhaps to give the deity ‘pride of place’.

8.4.2. The position of adjuncts. The location adjunct precedes the verb in the sepulchral inscriptions with the formulaic phrase hec cupat/cupant (for which see §8.9.1). In these phrases, the place of the adjunct is therefore, as in Latin, “somewhere between the first argument and the finite verb” (Pinkster 1990:181).  

Interestingly, the only exceptions to this order are the two instances where the formula is also varied in other ways:

150 Note nouios · plautios · med · romai · fecid CIL I 2.561, where a formulaic phrase (cf. §8.9.2) is broken up to insert the adjunct in its correct place.
The former can be explained by assuming extra stress on the adjunct, or by assuming a contrast (either ‘[here lies Y,] below lies X’ or ‘[not here, but] below lies X’). For the unusual order of MF 88 I have no explanation. The exceptional placement of the time position adjuncts in foied · uino · pipafo · cra · carefo MF 59 = foied · uino · pi·pafo · cra · care[ff]o MF 60, is due to pragmatic reasons, namely the contrast foied : cra.

8.5. Word order within word groups

8.5.1. The position of the adjective. Given the nature of the Faliscan material, the number of noun phrases containing adjectives is limited. Adjectives only occur in the more elaborate Early Faliscan texts:

- soc[iai] ... karai EF 1
- urnel[a ti ?]tela EF 1
- arcentelom hut[c?]ilom EF 1
- quto ... duenom EF 3
- titias duenas EF 3

In all these instances, the order is noun - adjective, which seems to be in accordance with the order in Latin and the Sabellic languages. The only adjectives in the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions are the patronymic adjectives, which always follow the name (attestations in fig.7.3), but this is due to pragmatic and formulaic reasons.

8.5.2. The position of the attributive genitive. In attributive groups, where one noun stands in the genitive, the attributive genitive generally precedes the head (genitive - noun or GN), but the problem is that such groups are virtually always formulaic:

(a) the Middle and Late Faliscan filiation formula FATHER\_GEN SON/DAUGHTER (36-41 attestations, see fig.7.3);
(b) the Middle and Late Faliscan marital formula HUSBAND\_GEN WIFE (4-8 instances, see §7.4.2), with 1-4 counterexamples of WIFE HUSBAND\_GEN with noun - genitive or NG, the clearest of which is tanacu[il] | anelia · · | uxor · ia MF 101;
(c) the Middle Faliscan designations of freedmen and -women FORMER MASTER\_GEN FREEDMAN/FREEDWOMAN in ti [ ] tidria [?++][l[e]a : f MF 155 and [ --- ]*i : u[fo]ltiae lo MF 165;

---

(d) the Late Faliscan ‘reversed filiation’, *marci : acarcelini | mate* LF 221;

(e) the Middle Faliscan *ius sepulcrale*-formula *OWNER Gen cela in caui xo : pauiceo :* [l]ocjes : cela MF 12, *[.]*pi : ues8i : cela MF 83, caui [*]t **(*)[i] : cela MF 84, and [---]fate cela MLF 285;

(f) comparable to (e) is Middle or Late Faliscan *caui : tertinei : | posticnu* MLF/Cap 474* (*a statue of Gavius Tertineius’);

(g) *titias duenom duenas* EF 2.

The reverse, where the attributive genitive follows the head (noun - genitive or NG) appears only in the Middle Faliscan filiation formula *FATHER Gen* (attestations in fig.7.3), which in my view is a shortened form of the formula *FATHER Gen SON/DAUGHTER* rather than as a distinct formula in its own right: see §7.5.2.1.

From these instances, it would appear that in Faliscan the attributive genitive regularly preceded the noun (genitive - noun or GN). Yet the placing of the genitive in these groups may be due to pragmatic considerations (giving pre-eminence to the Focus), and therefore not be unmarked: the limited corpus, too, makes it difficult to draw valid conclusions. A GN order is in accordance with the other Italic languages: according to Adams’s (1976:74-7) analysis, which includes early Latin formulaic material, GN was the predominant order in early Latin (although it later changed to NG), and Rosenkranz (1933) concluded the same for the Sabellic languages. In Etruscan, the genitive appears to follow the Head: cf. e.g. the predominance of *mi OWNER Gen* over *OWNER Gen mi* (268 and 19 attestations respectively, see §8.8.2), and the counterpart of the Faliscan formula *OWNER Gen cela, eca ou8i//ou8i [ne8l] OWNER Gen* (12 instances, §8.9.3).

8.5.3. The position of appositions. Contrary to the position of the attributive genitive (§8.5.2), in appositional groups where both nouns are in the same case, the apposition always follows the head. Examples of this are:

(a) the Middle and Late Faliscan filiation formula *FATHER Gen SON/DAUGHTER* following the name (36-41 attestations, see fig.7.3);

(b) the Middle and Late Faliscan marital formula *HUSBAND Gen WIFE* and *WIFE HUSBAND Gen* following the name (5-12 instances, see §7.4.2),

(c) the Middle and Late Faliscan designations of freedwomen in *louria | [l]oifirta* MF 41 and *uipia : zertenea : loferta* LF 221, and in the *MASTER Gen FREEDMAN/FREEDWOMAN* in *ti [7] tiiria lo[?---]|l[e]a : cs : f MF 155 and [---]*i : u[ol]tiai lo MF 165;

(d) the Late Faliscan ‘reversed filiation’, *uipia : zertenea : loferta | marci : acarcelini | mate* LF 221;

(e) Middle and Late Faliscan titles and *cursus honorum* (instances in fig.2.2).

This usage does not differ from that of Latin, the Sabellic languages, or Etruscan.
8.5.4. Prepositional phrases. Due to the nature of the material, there are hardly any examples of prepositional groups. *Propramod* in EF 2 can be read as *pro pramod*, but in view of the *propramom* in the same text, it can also be read as *propramod*. If read as *pro pramod* it is the oldest attestation of *pro* + ablative (and not *pro fileod* in *CIL* I.2.2658, cf. Vine 1993:195-6). All other attestations of prepositions are from Latin inscriptions (LF/Lat 214, Cap 433, Lat 217-218). There are no attestations of postpositions, although it is possible that Faliscan had postpositions at a prehistoric date: see §8.6.

8.6. Coordination and subordination

On the level of the noun phrase, two or more entities are usually placed in asyndetic parataxis. Here two groups can be distinguished. The first consists of collegiate magistrates, which are named asyndetically in *a[.]osa nae narionio MF 206*, and *c**(*)coneio ∙ l**(*)ce ∙ pau[ico 1-2]so MLF 290, [1-2] ∙ hirio ∙ m[ ∙ f ∙ ]ecer ∙ tertineo ∙ c ∙ f ∙ pref[ores ?] ∙ LF 213* (cf. also Lat 250 from near S. Maria di Falleri). The second group consists of sepulchral inscriptions pertaining to more than one person. The majority of these inscriptions have asyndetic coordination (which in a number of cases may be due to the fact that burials and inscriptions were added later), but there are a few instances where the names are connected with each other by means of -*cue*:

```plaintext
uolta : f**[---] | iatacu : l/*[---] | hec : cupat MF 158
[---]**[---] ∙ [---]ocue | [---]o MF 170

The use of -*que* in sepulchral inscriptions can be compared to the Etruscan use of -*c*: in Latin sepulchral inscriptions, -*que* is rarely used. This may be due to different methods of burial: the Etruscan and Faliscan family tombs were more suited for joined burials.

There are no other instances of coordinators, whether on the phrase or on the sentence level. Coordinators *l[o]uir = ‘or’ (cf. Oscan loutir TB 8) and *u[el]* have been read by Olzscha in *ceres farne(n)tom l[o]uir u[in] x-kad euios* (1965:123) and *ceres far d[el]e[ci]tom* (cf. also Lat 250 from near S. Maria di Falleri). Of these readings, at least the former is epigraphically impossible. Vetter (1953:283) proposed to restore a hypotactic coordinator in *pepara[i .. ]douiad EF 1. Although

---

152 I do not adopt Pisani’s (1964:349-51) *pramoe* = *pramoi-e(n)* in EF 2 or Rix’s (1993a:86) suggestion *bei-e(n)* in EF 4.
s syntactically attractive, such a restoration appears to be epigraphically impossible: *douiad* is either an asyndetic hypotaxis or a loose addition to the text. I do not adopt the *sei ... sei* in Pisani’s (1964:349) interpretation of EF 4 (§12.3).

8.7. Word order typology

It is rewarding to place the results of sections §§8.4-6 in a typological perspective, not only because in the diachronic definition of dialect (§1.2) language typology could be expected to provide important arguments (cf. e.g. Cowrie 1981:204-9), but also because the point is of some importance for the discussion of formulaic texts (§8.13). Reviewing the preceding sections according to the major typological criteria first established by Greenberg (1966), the Faliscan material could be said to show:

(a) SOV-order, both in formulas (even where borrowed from SVO-languages) and in non-formulaic sentences (§8.5.1);
(b) prepositions (Pr), with no indication of postpositions (§8.5.4);
(c) attributive genitives preceding the head of the noun phrase (GN), except in several instances of a formula adopted from Etruscan (§8.5.2);
(d) adjectives following the noun (NA) (§8.5.1).

In other words, Faliscan is SOV/Pr/GN/NA and in this respect appears to align with contemporary Latin as described by Adams (1976): a significant point, for Faliscan and Latin are slightly unusual in that languages with SOV-order tend to have postpositions and languages with prepositions tend to have a VSO- or SVO-order. However, in view both of the fairly slight Faliscan material on which this SOV/Pr/GN/NA is based and of the general questions about the validity of correlation between these word order parameters (see e.g. Cowrie 1981:86-93), this conclusion should be regarded with even more than the usual caution.

If it is felt that there is an ‘SOV - Pr discrepancy’ in Latin and Faliscan that needs to be explained, this may be done by assuming a shift either in the constituent order or in the use of pre- and postpositions. In my view, arguments for the latter possibility can be found more easily, since Latin preserves postpositions such as *-cum* and *tenus* (Adams 1976:88) also pointed to *ted endo CIL I.2.4 = in te*) and also had the genitive preceding the noun (GN), which is also assumed to be more in accordance with the use of postpositions. The Sabellic languages, especially Umbrian (*-a(r), -e(n)/-em, -ku(m)/-co(m), -pe(r), -ta/-tu/-to*), but also South Picene (*-in*) and Oscan (*-en*), offer even more material testifying to the existence of postpositions in the Italic languages: if this material is indeed indicative of a Latin shift from postpositions to prepositions, it would therefore appear to be of Proto-Latin date. The alternative, that Latin would originally have had an SVO-order, is more difficult: see also Adams 1976.
Insofar as the material presents a usable picture, Faliscan appears to align with Latin on the point of word order typology, while it appears to differ from the Sabellic languages, irrespective of whether the documents on which this picture is based date from before or after the period of Roman expansion into the area.

8.8. Besitzerinschriften

8.8.1. OWNER_NOM, OWNER_GEN, RECIPIENT_DAT. The simplest type of Besitzerinschrift consists of a name in isolation, either as OWNER_NOM or as OWNER_GEN (cf. §8.2.2). These types are so common that it is not necessary to adduce instances from other languages. The semantic difference between the two is that in the case of the nominative the owner is named as such, the inscription serving as a very explicit identification mark, while the use of the genitive points to the existence of a possessive relationship between the person and the object. The word describing the inscribed object itself is omitted as being inferable from the context. In the Faliscan inscriptions (as in those in Latin), the forms in -i that are derived from io-stems can be nominatives as well as abbreviated genitives (attestations in fig. 8.1): see also §9.2.2.

Several Faliscan Besitzerinschriften have isolated forms in -ai and -oi: iunai MF 71, LF 112, MLF/Cap 475*, uoltai MLF 367-370, sceiuai LF 379 and caiioi MF 20, tiroi · colanoi MF 69-71. These are usually interpreted as datives, but this seems to be due in part to a reluctance to assume a first-declension genitive in -ai for Faliscan (cf. §4.2.2). There are no attestations of such isolated datives for Latin: the isolated Latin forms in -ai, -ae, and -o have to my knowledge always been interpreted as first-declension genitives and as second-declension nominatives in -o(s) respectively. The Sabellic Besitzerinschriften (primarily Um 31-41, Ps 4-20, Fr 7-8, He 3, Si 14-22, Cp 38-40, Po 86-92, Cm 32-37) are all in the nominative or in the genitive, never in the dative.

The only indications that the isolated Faliscan forms in -ai and -oi can be datives are: (1) the general similarity of this use of the dative to that in the dedicatory inscriptions in Faliscan, Latin, or the Sabellic languages (cf. §8.10.1); (2) the inscription locia eimo MLF 293 from near Corchiano, which can be interpreted as an elliptic sentence with the name of a giver in the nominative (locia) and a recipient in the dative (eimo), but which can equally well be interpreted as ‘Lucia Aemi (f.)’ with a genitive in -oi (cf. §4.4.4); and (3) the Etruscan inscription vultasi Etr XLII=Fa 3.4 from Vignanello, an Etruscan form in -si of the Faliscan name Volta. The Etruscan forms in -si and -(a)le can be used to designate both by whom and for whom the object was made (Steinbauer 1999:174-6): the latter use corresponds to that of the Indo-European dative. Problematic, however, is the fact that this inscription is to my knowledge the only one where a
form in -si or -(a)le occurs in isolation in a Besitzerinschrift or a Geschenkinschrift: in most other cases, the use of the -si or -(a)le form is due to a verb, usually mulu-.153

All in all, I regard the evidence in favour of a dative-interpretation of the isolated forms in -ai and -oi in Faliscan Besitzerinschriften as very slight indeed. If these forms are datives, they would appear to record a gift, presenting the person named as the recipient rather than as just the owner: the formula for these inscriptions is therefore RECIEPIENTDAT rather than OWNERDAT, and they should properly be classed as Geschenkinschriften rather than as Besitzerinschriften.

8.8.2. Besitzerinschriften of the iscrizioni parlanti-type. The Faliscan Besitzerinschriften also comprise several types of iscrizioni parlanti. The simplest types are ego OWNERGEN (Agostiniani’s type L1) and OWNERGEN ego (Agostiniani’s type L2), attested for Faliscan in:

\[
\begin{align*}
  \text{eko lartos } & \text{EF 6} \\
  \text{eko kaisiosio } & \text{EF 7} \\
  \text{a\text{\textendash}miosio ego } & \text{EF? 467*}
\end{align*}
\]

Both types have parallels in the Etruscan formulas mi OWNERGEN (Agostiniani’s type E1, 268 attestations) and OWNERGEN mi (Agostiniani’s type E2, 19 attestations). The difference between the types lies in the order in which Topic and Focus are presented.

An extension of the former formula ego OWNERGEN (Agostiniani’s type L1) is the type ego POSSESSIONGEN OWNERGEN (Agostiniani’s type L5), attested for Faliscan in:

\[
\begin{align*}
  \text{eco quto } & \text{*e uotenosio } \text{EF 3}
\end{align*}
\]

This formula, too, is modeled on an Etruscan type, namely mi POSSSESSIONGEN OWNERGEN (Agostiniani’s type E5, c.28 attestations). In this extended form of the formula both Faliscan and Latin (in eco urna tita uendias Lat 479†) use the variant where genitive follows the head: Faliscan and Latin counterparts of the Etruscan type mi OWNERGEN POSSSESSIONNOM (Agostiniani’s type E6, c.20 attestations) are not attested. The counterpart with the nominative, ego OWNERNOM and OWNERNOM ego (Agostiniani’s types L3 and L4) is attested only in Latium, namely ego kanaios CIL 1.2.474=482†, ego pulpios CIL 1.2.479, and eco · c · antonios CIL 1.2.462, and in the ager Capenas, namely

\[
\begin{align*}
  \text{eco tulie } & \text{LF 383} \\
  \text{madicio eco } & \text{LF 378}
\end{align*}
\]

Eco tulie is admittedly ambiguous: tulie can be either an Etruscoid nominative/genitive tulie(s) or a monophthongized genitive in -ie /-i/: probably the former, as there are no (other) instances of a monophthongized genitive ending (§3.7.7, §4.2.2) from the area.

---

153 The Geschenkinschriften with forms in -si and -(a)le are: (with mulu-) OA 3.1, La 3.1, Fa 3.2, Cr 3.10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, AT 3.1, 2, Vc 3.2, AS 3.1, 2; (other:) OA 3.9, Ve 3.1, Fa 3.1, Cr 3.4, 5, 6, 7, 8, Ta 3.1, Vc 3.6, AH 3.4 (with menage).
### Syntax and Text Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Declension</th>
<th>Second Declension</th>
<th>Third Declension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nominative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>turia MF 22-27</td>
<td>licinio MF 259-260</td>
<td>larise uicina MF 371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iuna MF 73</td>
<td>statio capio MF 376</td>
<td>larise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>latria MF 74</td>
<td>cauiuos LF 382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>larise uicina MF 371</td>
<td>setorio MLF/Cap 476*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>larise</td>
<td>uicina MF 372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hermana MF/Etr 264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>? rica MF/LtF 21</td>
<td>k · womanio Cap 388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>? aie* (aiea ?) MF 107</td>
<td>at · fertrio Cap 391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ueliatia MLF 463</td>
<td>f · pacios Cap 392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>seralia LF 380</td>
<td>st · claindio Cap 394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>? apa Cap 457</td>
<td>p · iunio Cap 462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dedication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>apolo MF 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k · p · aiedies · Cap 390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nominative or Genitive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative or Genitive</td>
<td>serui MF 34-36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ani MF 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voltai catinei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>marci : anei[i] MF 472*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uli MF? 261-262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>caui : turi MF 273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anni LF 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c · psceni Cap 387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c · aci Cap 395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sex</td>
<td>senti Cap 399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sex · senti Cap 430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signature</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ç cutri MF 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive</strong></td>
<td>titias MLF 201</td>
<td>tulom MF 72</td>
<td>[fell]jcinaiiu LF 384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pupiias MLF 304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dedication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>apolono EF 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>loifirtato MF 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>loifirtato MF 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive or Dative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive or Dative</td>
<td>iunai MF 74</td>
<td>caiuso MF 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iunai LF 112</td>
<td>tiroi · colainoi MF 69-71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voltai MF 367-370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sceiuai LF 379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iunai MLF/Cap 475*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dedication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>? [---]altai MF 109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 8.1. Isolated cases in Besitzerinschriften, dedications, and signatures.**
These types correspond to the Etruscan formulae mi OWNERNOM and OWNERNom mi (Agostiniani’s types E3 and E4, 8 attestations). It is, in fact, surprising that these formulas should exist at all, for they are in a sense ‘illogical’, as the inscribed object claims to be a certain person rather than claiming to belong to a certain person (cf. Colonna 1975:165).

Beside these nominal formulas with ‘I’, there is a second group of iscrizioni parlanti where a verbal formula with ‘I am’ is used. Two types of this group, OWNERGen esíum and OWNERNom esúm, are attested from the ager Capenas in

$$\text{acíuaiom esú Cap 465 (OWNERGen esúm)}$$
$$a \cdot \text{írpios} \cdot \text{esú Cap 389 (OWNERNOM esúm)}$$
$$k \cdot \text{sares} \cdot \text{esú Cap 404 (either OWNERGen esúm or OWNERNOM esúm)}$$

These types are not modeled on Etruscan formulas, for in the Etruscan formulaic repertoire the verbal formulas of the Greek models were replaced by pronominal formulas with mi/mini. Agostiniani (1982:245, 261-2) distinguished two groups of these verbal formulas: (1) an old tradition of Sabellic formulas derived directly from Greek models with e"m…, and (2) a new repertoire of Latin sum-formulas, which, from the third century onwards, replaced the ego-formulas derived from Etruscan models. The type OWNERGen esúm, attested in acíuaiom esú Cap 465 (and in k \cdot sares \cdot esú Cap 404, if sares is interpreted as a Sabellic genitive in -es, cf. §9.3.2) is comparable to the Sabellic type OWNERGen súm (Agostiniani’s types I1-2,12 attestations)\(^{154}\).

More problematic is OWNERNOM esúm in a \cdot írpios \cdot esú Cap 389 and k \cdot sares \cdot esú Cap 404, for this type has no Sabellic counterpart in Besitzerinschriften.\(^{155}\) Therefore, the Capenate formula OWNERNOM esúm may well be connected to the earliest phase of the Latin replacement of the ego-formulas by the sum-formulas as envisaged by Agostiniani (1982:245): the occurrence of OWNERNOM esúm could then be ascribed to the persistence of OWNERNOM ego in the area, attested in m adicio eco LF 378 (cf. Bakkum 1996:3-4).

### 8.9. Signatures

#### 8.9.1. MAKERNOM, MAKERGEN

The main problem in describing signatures is that when they consist only of the maker’s name, they take the form of MAKERNOM or MAKERGEN, and are therefore formally indistinguishable from Besitzerinschriften of the type

---

\(^{154}\) I have merged Agostiniani’s types I1 and I2, for the distinction between these two is not based on difference in word order, but on the use of súm/sum in I1 vs. sim in I2. The order is always OWNERGen súm/sum/sim: in Latin both sum OWNERGen and OWNERGen sum occur.

\(^{155}\) The only Sabellic instance of OWNERNOM sum (Agostiniani’s type I3) is the Oscan sepulchral inscription vibis : smintiis : vibi[s] : smintiis : sum Cp 4.
OWNERNOM and OWNERNOM. They can only be identified as signatures on epigraphic grounds, usually because they were written on the object before its completion (§11.1.4.2a). Examples of MAKERNOM are pleina MF/Etr 199, arth[3-5]re MF/Etr 267, k · p · aiedies · Cap 390, and the Latin inscription t · fourios · *f · *f Lat 216. The type MAKERGEN (‘[the work] of ...’?, ‘[from the workshop] of ...’?, ‘[by the hand] of ...’?), is represented only by forms in -i that can also be abbreviated nominatives: c cutri MF 200, and the imports c · popili[i] Lat 295, c · popili meuanie Lat 296, [c · ]popili Lat 478*, and l · quinti Lat 477*. Note that with the exception of MF 200, none of these inscriptions is certainly Faliscan. Comparable to the type MAKERNOM are the official inscriptions with the names of the responsible magistrates (§8.12).

8.9.2. Signatures of the iscrizioni parlanti type. Like the Besitzerinschriften, the signatures, too, occur in an iscrizione parlante-variant MAKERNOM me MAKE3RD PF (Agostiniani’s type L12), attested in Faliscan both in the singular and in the plural:

*tele*[1-2] med fifiked EF 9
*outilo : clipeaio : letei : fileo : met : facet MF 470*
?
also cauios frenaios faced MF 471* (with omission of med?)

*mama z[e]xtos : med[f,f]iqod EF 1

For Latin, there is one attestation, nouios · plautios · med · romai · fecid CIL I².561. The type is derived from the Etruscan type mini zinace MAKERNOM (Agostiniani E7.3, 2-3 attestations)156, but with an adaptation of the word order of the Etruscan model. There is one instance where a Latin inscription retains the Etruscan word order (Agostiniani’s type L9) is med · loucillos · fecid Lat 268 from Corchiano (cf. §9.4.2).

In the original Greek model for such signature formulas the all-purpose verb ἔποιησε was used, and this is reflected by the corresponding formulas in Etruscan (zinace), Latin (feced, fecid), Middle Faliscan (faced, facet), Oscan (upsediþens, cf. Rix 1993b), and Venetic (vha-g-s-to Le 128, hva-g-s-to Le 127). The Early Faliscan instances are exceptional in that fifiked and f[f]iqod are forms of fingo, which would have had a specific meaning applicable only to pottery, which makes the Early Faliscan formula unique among the signature formulas used in ancient Italy: note that the Middle Faliscan formula with faced/facet is different in this respect. This oddity is in fact one of the main arguments adduced in favour of interpreting fifiked and f[f]iqod as forms of facio (Poccetti 2005:21-3): see §5.1.2.7-8.157

---

156 To the two attestations quoted by Agostiniani’s (1982:202) add mi(m) mamarce zinace Ve 6.2, unless this is read as a unique (?) type mi mamarce zinace ‘I, Mamarce, made this’.

157 Perhaps this use of fingo is due to a (dialectal?) development in the meaning of the verb, from specific ‘knead’ → general ‘make’, cf. Greek μάσσω ‘to knead’ : Proto-Germanic */makōn/ ‘to make’, both from PIE */meh₂gʷ/ or */meh₂gʷ/.
8.10. Sepulcral inscriptions

8.10.1. DECEASEDNOM and DECEASEDNOM *hec cupat*. The vast majority of the Faliscan sepulchral inscriptions are of the type DECEASEDNOM. In these inscriptions it is usually the formal form of the name that is used, PRAENOMEN GENTILICUM [FILIATION] [COGNOMEN] for men (§7.3) and PRAENOMEN GENTILICUM [FILIATION] for women (§7.4.1). This type of sepulchral inscription is so common, not only in Faliscan, but also in Etruscan, Latin, and the Sabellic languages, that I refrain from giving examples, as these can be found without much trouble. In the case of married women buried without their husband, the name could be extended with [HUSBANDGEN *uxor*] or [*uxor* HUSBANDGEN] (§7.4.2). This addition has parallels in Etruscan and Latin: there are no attestations for the Sabellic languages, perhaps because the number of Sabellic sepulchral inscriptions of women is limited (§7.4.1 with note 115).

Although this nominal type is the most common among the Faliscan sepulchral inscriptions, there is also a fairly frequently used verbal type DECEASEDNOM [FILIATION] *hec cupat*/*cupant*. The instances of this type are:

```
uel zu[con]eo : fe[ cupa] MF 56
uentare[i] : ...... : hec : cupa]nt MF 80
[--- ce]lio : cesi : fi | [---]: cauia * * | [he cup?]a MF 94
[--- ce]lio[---]* : hec : cupa[i] MF 95
[--- pu]el[i---]a he[ cupat] MF 150
vol[t-a] : f**[---] | iatacue : [f[---] | hec : cupat MF 158
[po]lia[---] : hec : cu[pa] MF 161
uollio : uecineo | maxomo | iuno : he : cupat LF 220
uipia : zertenea : loferta | marci : acarcelino | mate : he : cupa LF 221
marcio : acarcelino | cauija : uecineo | hcc cupat LF 223
ca : uecineof : juolti : he : cupat LF 224
tito : uelmneo | titio : fe cupa LF 307
```

(with variations:)

```
[---]o cicio : cicoi : cupat : ifra MF 40
[uollio]: [uoi]econco : lecut : hec MF 88
```

This formula can be compared, first of all, to the Etruscan formula DECEASEDNOM *thi cesu/cešu* ‘... lies here’ or ‘... is buried here(in)’ (Steinbauer’s type G7), which is found


Even within this small number of instances, these formulas show a high rate of variation, both in the order of the constituents and in the words themselves: thus beside *hec cupat/cupant*-, Faliscan has *cupat* : *ifra* MF 40 and *lecet* : *hec* MF 88, South Picene has both *qupat* [e]sm|ín and *mefiín* : *veia|t* : *vepetí* in MC.1, Marrucinian and Paelignian use *ecuf* : *incubat* MV 8 / *ecuf* : *incubat* Pg 10, with a compound transitive verb, and Etruscan once has *celati* : *cesu* Ta 1.66. This suggests that this type was either not rigidly formulaic, or perhaps that its variation was due to variations in the burial ritual.159

It should be noted that the Faliscan instances of the *hec cupat/cupant*-type are (a) more frequent than the instances of all comparable Etruscan and Italic types put together, and (b) far more frequent among the Faliscan sepulchral inscriptions than the *θui cesu/cesu*-type among the vastly greater number of Etruscan sepulchral inscriptions. The Faliscan *hec cupat/cupant*-type can therefore be said to constitute a truly ‘Faliscan’ type of sepulchral inscription, irrespective of whether or not it was derived from the Etruscan *θui cesu/cesu*-type or from a common Italic model.

The Late Faliscan, Latino-Faliscan, and Latin sepulchral inscriptions also furnish several instances of *cursus honorum* in LF 242-244, 245, 247-249, LtF 231-232, Lat 219, 237-239 (see §2.3.3). As is explained in §11.1.4.1, these were appropriate to the

158 Cf. further Lucr. RN 3.892, and, with *ossa* as the subject, in CIL I².1312 and Ovid. Am. 1.8.108 = Ep. 7.162 = Tr. 3.3.76 (a mock-epitaph).

159 For such local variation, cf., e.g., how the habit of marking grave-goods with the word *sati̱nα* is very frequent at Volsinii (126 instances), but virtually non-existent elsewhere.
roadside burials of Latium rather than to the closed rock-tombs of the ager Faliscus: they are almost certainly an imitation of Roman burial features after the war of 241.

8.10.2. ‘X [made this grave] for Y’. A different type of sepulchral inscription is PROCURATORNOM DECEASEDDAT, where the inscription records that one person (whom Lejeune (1974) labeled the ‘procurateur’) made or prepared a tomb for the deceased:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{larise} : & \text{mar} | \text{e}na : \text{cit}i\text{ai} \quad \text{MF 270} \\
\text{cau}io \text{uel}\text{mine}o & \text{ | popli}i\text{ai file} \quad \text{MLF 308} \\
\text{possibly } & [--- ]: \text{zaconita} \quad \text{MF 154 (unclear)} \\
\text{possibly } & \text{cuicto} \text{uel}\text{mine}o | [--- ?] \text{juoxie} .jai \quad \text{MLF 310 (unclear)} \\
\text{perhaps } & \text{uoltio} \text{ | folcozeo} \text{ | zextoi} \quad \text{fi LF 330 (see below)} \\
\text{perhaps } & [.] \text{ folcosio} | \text{*****oi} \quad \text{LF 333 (see below)} \\
\text{[rejected: } & \text{[--- ]ronio} \text{ | uol[t---|---]a*ome} \quad \text{MF 156 (unclear)} \\
\text{PROCURATORNOM DECEASEDDAT and DECEASEDDAT PROCURATORNOM are, of course, well-known from the Latin sepulchral inscriptions (where the dative could also be expressed by dis manibus DECEASEDGEN).}^{160} \text{ The type is notably absent, however, in the Sabellic languages, where only South Picene ma kupri koram opsùt ani[ni]s rakinelis pomp[ânej]} \text{i AQ.2 shows a comparable formula, and in Etruscan, as a scrutiny of the forms with -si/-le in the categories Grabinschriften and Bau- und Grabstifterinschriften of ET shows. In the case of Etruscan, this may be because the language lacked a ‘true’ dative (cf. Steinbauer 1999:170-5). More or less comparable is eca : anthic : velus : expus | clensi : cerine Vc 1.87 (Steinbauer’s type G4).} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The problem with the occurrence of the PROCURATORNOM DECEASEDDAT type in Faliscan is twofold: (a) inscriptions of this type do not appear to fit in with the Faliscan burials in closed family tombs and the function of the sepulchral inscriptions within this type of burial (§11.1.4.), and (b) the interpretation of these texts depends on whether the Faliscan forms in -ai and -oi can be genitives or must always be datives: a discussion, where, as said, there is an unwillingness to accept the existence of the genitive in -ai, and consequently, of that in -oi (§4.4.4).

In my view, Faliscan forms in -ai and in -oi can very well be genitives, and the forms -oi in LF 330 and 333 certainly give the impression of being genitives in filiations of the type FATHERGEN [SON/DAUGHTER] (cf. [--- ]o cicio - cicioi : cupat : ifra MF

\[160\] It also occurs frequently in Venetic (Le 63, Le 77-79, Le 102, Le 109, Le 226, and Le 110bis), where formulas with DECEASEDDAT were popular: cf. DECEASEDDAT (over 20 instances), ego DECEASEDDAT (Le 75ter), TOMBNOM DECEASEDDAT (5 instances), ego TOMBNOM DECEASEDDAT (2 instances), PROCURATORGEN TOMBNOM DECEASEDDAT (Le 130).
40 and *tito : uelmineo | *titoi : *fe *cupa MLF 305). On the other hand, it is likely that the forms in *ai in MF 270 and MLF 308, and possibly also those in MF 154 and MLF 310 are datives. In the case of *popliai file MLF 308, there is some external evidence for a dative *popliai file(ai), for the grave-gifts found in the undisturbed loculus to which the inscription belonged show that the deceased was a woman rather than a man (Giglioli 1916:68-72), which precludes interpreting *popliai file as a metronymic filiation *popliai file(o). Such an interpretation is of course still possible in the cases of *larise : mar[|]ena : citiai MF 270 and [---] : zaconiai MF 154.161 Note, however, that although metronymic formulas are well-attested for Etruscan, there is no (other) trace of them in inscriptions from the agri Faliscus and Capenas: neither Cristofani (1988:18) nor Peruzzi (1990:280) even consider this interpretation for MF 270. They also tend to follow patronymic formulas, which is not the case here.

8.10.3. OWNERGEN cella and the ius sepulcrale. Another type of sepulchral inscriptions occurs on the outside of the tombs, namely OWNERGEN cella in cauvio : pauiceo : | [o]cjes : cella MF 12. *[.]pi : *nesoi : cella MF 83, caui [:]t **(*)[i] : cella MF 84, and [---]fate cella MLF 285. As is argued in §11.1.4.1a, these inscriptions refer to the owner of the tomb, and designate the right to a place of burial rather than the burial itself, even though the owner will of course have been buried there as well.

The formula OWNERGEN cella is not found in Latin or Sabellic inscriptions, and is clearly an adaptation of Etruscan formulas like eca authi/aut[io] [node] OWNERGEN (Steinbauer’s type G3).162 Interestingly, this formula is relatively frequent in the nearby areas of Tarquinii (17 instances: Ta 1.31, 45, AT 1.11, 159, 177, 178 (with ca), 192 (with ta); with node AT 1.30, 70, 138, 140, 141, 148, 188; unclear AT 1.146, 149, 163), of Vulci (14 instances: Vc 1.1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 16, 45, 69, 77, 102, AV 1.5, 8, 14; OWNERGEN aut[io] Vc. 1.102), and of Horta (only AH 1.81): elsewhere, it occurs only sporadically (4 instances: without eca Pe 1.168, 328; OWNERGEN ta auti AS 1.9; fragmentary Pe 1.688). The Faliscan adaptation, with OWNERGEN preceding cella (cf. §8.4.2), closely resembles, not the most common Etruscan type eca aut[io] OWNERGEN from Tarquinii and Vulci, but the unique OWNERGEN auti of Vc 1.102, lar[ioa] | lar[ioa] : anienas : auti.

Since the Faliscan formula contains no equivalent of the deictic element eca/ca/ta in the Etruscan formula, it is perhaps not surprising that there are likewise no instances of a Faliscan adaptation of the Etruscan iscrizione parlante-type mi OWNERGEN

161 In MF 270, the woman is designated by GENTILICIUM, which appears to be the normal form of the mother’s name in Etruscan metronymic filiations: on the other hand, Etruscan metronymic filiations are usually added after patronymic filiations, which is not the case here.

162 Steinbauer (1999:472, 473) translates auti as “Grab(stelle)” because of its connection to aut(“viell. „legen, stellen”)”, and tamera as “(Grab-)kammer”. For cella as a Latin-Faliscan rather than an Etruscan word, see §6.2.8.
\\and\(\sigma\upsilon\theta\iota/\sigma\upsilon\theta\iota\) (Steinbauer’s type G1), found mostly at Volsinii (Vs 1.43, 54, 73, 86, 98, 136, Fe 1.7), and \(mi \sigma\upsilon\theta\iota/\sigma\upsilon\theta\iota\) OWNER\_GEN (Ve 1.78, Cl 1.946, Fe 1.2, 9, Li 1.1).\(^{163}\)

Related inscriptions are those that state the number of \textit{loculi} in the tomb, as in \([---]fate cela \cdot lete zot xxiii\) MLF 285, or the right to burial there, as in \([---]flet [......]na\) (if = ‘the third lectus ... for ...na’ or ‘three lecti ... for ...na’), and perhaps \textit{precono | cuitenet | let} MLF 361 (if = ‘Praeconus here (?) keeps (?) a lectus’), and most clearly in the Latin inscription \(l \cdot ucil\)lo \\(\cdot uobo f \cdot e t \cdot po[I]ae \cdot abelese \cdot lectu \cdot i \cdot datu s | [. \cdot ]ucil\)lo \(\cdot l \cdot f \cdot e t \cdot plene se | lectu \cdot i \cdot amplius \cdot nihil | inuitei s \cdot l \cdot c \cdot leu i eis \cdot l \cdot f | e t \cdot quei \cdot eos \cdot parentaret | ne \cdot anteponat\) Lat 251. These instances show that \textit{lectus} was a \textit{terminus technicus} for ‘(place in a) loculus’.\(^{164}\)

### 8.11. Dedications

#### 8.11.1. \textbf{OWNER\_NOM, OWNER\_GEN, RECIPIENT\_DAT.} As in the case of the \textit{Besitzerinschriften} (§8.7.1), there are three basic types of dedicatory inscriptions, the first just naming the divine owner (\textit{OWNER\_NOM}), the second stressing the possessive relationship between the inscribed object and the divine owner (\textit{OWNER\_GEN}), the third stressing the act of the dedication itself (\textit{DEDICANT\_NOM RECIPIENT\_DAT}).

The only example of \textit{OWNER\_NOM} is

\textit{apolo} MF 65

Since this inscription was found in a tomb, it has been interpreted as an abbreviated human name \textit{Apollo(...)}. Dedicatory inscriptions of the type \textit{OWNER\_NOM} occur in Etruscan, however, although infrequently (Steinbauer’s types S1-2, e.g. \textit{flere} Ar 3.1, \textit{fuflunz} Um 4.1-2, \textit{tiniia} Ta 4.2, \textit{tina} AH 4.1, \textit{tina} calu\(\upsilon\)na Vs 4.7, \textit{turan} Li 4.1, \textit{uni} Ta 4.12), and rarely also in Latin (only \textit{iuno \cdot loucina} CIL I2.375, \textit{marspiter} CIL I2.970, \textit{diana} CIL I2.1435, \textit{diana af louco} CIL I2.2444, although the last two may be instances of a dative in -\textit{a}, cf. §4.2.3) and in the Sabellic languages (Marsian \textit{esos} \cdot \textit{nouesed} | \textit{pesco \cdot pacrē} VM 5 and Oscar \textit{dī{\textipa{1j}pā{\textipa{1j}tīr \cdot pū{l}}ie{\textipa{1j}}}s} Po 22).

The second type is \textit{OWNER\_GEN}, attested for Faliscan in

\textit{apolonos} EF 10

\textit{loifirtato} MF 31

\textit{loifirtato} MF 32

\(^{163}\)This type is not discussed by Agostiniani, but is comparable to Agostiniani’s types E6 (Agostiniani 1982:187-97) and E21 (Agostiniani 1982:221-3).

\(^{164}\)M.Mancini (2002:28-33) argues against interpreting \textit{let} and \textit{lete} as forms of \textit{lectus}, and suggests instead that they represent a */lɔît̥/\, which, however, has the same meaning. The corresponding word in Etruscan may have been \textit{tumu-} or \textit{tusu-} (cf. Steinbauer 1999:483, 484).
As this type is comparable to the Besitzerinschriften in the genitive (but with a divine owner), there is no need to assume that a word like sacrum was to be understood: something that is questionable in any case, as sacer appears to be more frequently used with the dative than with the genitive at least in Latin (cf. e.g. the instances quoted below). OWNERGEN occurs in Latin, although rarely: a contextless genitive of the deity’s name occurs only in salutis CIL I.2.1626a, deum | maantium CIL I.2.2117, and uenerus · heruc CIL I.2.2297. In the Sabellian languages, the type is found in Praesamnitić τοντικες δπτυτες Ps 1, Marsian apols VM 7, and Oscan fatuveis Hi 6, iüveis · lüvfres Fr 5.

A deity’s name in a genitive is not uncommon in Etruscan dedications (Steinbauer’s types S3-9), e.g. artmsl Ru 4.3, fuflunsl paœ(ies) Vc 4.3, [fuflunsl p]azies Vc 4.4, fuflunl paœies velcldi Vc 4.1-2, menerva·· Ve 4.1, mene·v·a·s· Cr 4.1, [m]enrua[s] Cr 4.17, men[vas] Cr 4.18, tur[n]s Ta 4.9, turn[s] Ta 4.10, turns Ta 4.11, 13, : unial : Cr 4.8, unial : Cr 4.9. According to Steinbauer (1999:170-1), in Etruscan, where a ‘true dative’ was lacking, the genitive could fulfill functions that in an Italic language would have been fulfilled by a dative: the Etruscan type OWNERGEN could therefore also be described as RECIPIENTGEN. This may explain why three Faliscan dedicatory inscriptions are of the type OWNERGEN, which is a relatively large number.

In dedications, however, the dedicant wants to stress, not just that the dedicated object belongs to the deity, but that it was given, by using the elliptic verb phrase RECIPIENTDAT DEDICANTNOM or even just RECIPIENTDAT (cf. §8.7.1).

\[
\begin{align*}
titoi & | mercui | efles MF 113 \\
titoi & | mercui | efile MF 114 \\
[t]ito[i] & | mercui[i] | efles MF 115 \\
titoi & | mercui[i] | ef[i]es MF 116 \\
[titoi & | mercui | ef[i]es MF 117 \\
\end{align*}
\]

(with ellipsis of the name of the dedicant:)

\[
\begin{align*}
titoi : mercui[i] MF 118 \\
[t]itoi : mercui[i] MF 119 \\
[t]itoi : mercui[i] MF 120 \\
[t]itoi : mercui MF 121 \\
titoi : m[e]rcui MF 122 \\
[titoi : ?]mercui[i] MF 123 \\
[m]ercui MF 124 \\
mercu MF 125 \\
merçui MF 126 \\
\end{align*}
\]

and possibly [---]altai / MF 109 (if this is a dedication)

Both variants of this type are common in Latin and in the Sabellian languages. In Latin, RECIPIENTDAT DEDICANTNOM occurs in nine instances (diana mereto | noutrix paperia CIL I.2.45, apoline | l · carnius · c · f CIL I.2.2219, dianai · opifer | nemorese | l ·
apuleius · l · l · antio CIL I.2.1480, fortunae · opse[q] | p · peiliius · l · f · c · caluuis · p · f | cens CIL I.2.1509, dieui | ardeates CIL I.2.39, uedieui | patrei | gentieles ilieie CIL I.2.1439, [iuno]ne · regina | [. an]toni · p · f · l · uirginis · l · f | mag · pag CIL I.2.1993, hercolei | tesorus CIL I.2.2220, ueneri uificirici | l · bombius · m · f · pro · i CIL I.2.2246), and DEDICANTNOM RECIPIENTDAT in six instances (l · mr four[- ---]menerua[i lindiai] CIL I.2.404, q · caecilius · cn · a · q · flavini · leibertus · iunone · seispitei · matri · reginae CIL I.2.1430, [---]Js · m · f · hercolei CIL I.2.1579, [---] | tampia · l · f | dieui CIL I.2.2171, c nrius eros apolline · et iouei · et neptumo · minerua · et sis mircurio CIL I.2.2233, p · laeuius · fortunae primig] CIL I.2.2531). In the Sabellic languages, RECIPIENTDAT DEDICANTNOM occurs in διος ηι | [---] Lu 27, and DEDICANTNOM RECIPIENTDAT in tanas : niumeriis : | frunter[eí] Sa 27, λύκι · yeileis | meftei | gravinaí Hi 3, and siivi μαγιύ | mefiet(eí) Hi 4. In the Latin instances, the order RECIPIENTDAT DEDICANTNOM, which is the order of the Faliscan dedications of this type, is slightly more frequent.


In Etruscan, this type is completely absent, probably because of the lack of a ‘true’ dative (see above). The only text that resembles DEDICANTNOM RECIPIENTDAT is uras · arnθ · θυφ(θ)as] · συ(υ)/ris (Cristofani 1990b, Steinbauer 1999:288).

8.11.2. Other types of dedicatory inscriptions. Another type of dedication stresses the relation between the inscribed object and the deity by the word sacer. For Faliscan, this type is attested in sacra MF 127, and perhaps in abbreviated form in sa MF? 131 (and perhaps sa MF? 76, from a tomb). The type occurs with some frequency in Latin, e.g. fortunai | publicai | sacra CIL I.2.397, sacro · matri mursina CIL I.2.580, deusas | cornicas | sacrum CIL I.2.975, iunone | loucina | tuscolana | sacra CIL I.2.1581, [---]ole | [tusc]olana | sacra CIL I.2.1582, sautai | sacrum CIL I.1.626, iouei · libero · s[acr-] CIL I.2.1838, sacra · lanui CIL I.2.2296, saturno | sacro CIL I.2.3375, diouei | mourc | sacr CIL I.2.3171, cerer · sac CIL I.2.3471, herc · sa CIL I.2.3472a, her · sac · ad laue CIL I.2.3472b, and uen · sac CIL I.2.3474.165 In the Sabellic languages the type is

---

165 These are the fourteen Latin instances of dedications consisting only of the word sacer and the name of the deity, without any mention of the dedicant.
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attested for Umbrian in [cupr]as matres pletinas sacru esu Um 17 (the same text in Um 16, 18-19, where sacru is restored) and supunne sacru Um 24, and for Oscan in ἀπελ-λαννή σακορ Me 1-3 and ἰεσκελεὺς σ(α)κ(οφο) Lu 26. Leaving aside Umbrian sacre stahu Um 10 (a boundary stone, not a temple dedication), Faliscan sacra MF 127 is unique among these inscriptions in omitting the name of the deity: within the sanctuary where the object was dedicated, it was of course clear which deity was meant.

More or less comparable Etruscan types, where the name of the deity is also often omitted, are the shorter dedicatory inscriptions consisting only of suris or tinscvil ‘dedication’, e.g. suris Pe 0.6, ðiùs Ar 4.2, sauvcnes : suris AT 4.1, mi : ðiùs : ca[ Cr 4.12, and tinscvil Co 4.7-9, Ar 3.2, tinia | tinscvil Vs 4.10, tinia : ti[nscvil] Vs 4.11, tinia : tinscvil Vs 4.13, [--- tinscvil Vs 4.14, ešta zinu herma tinscvil Vs 4.12. A more direct parallel might be mi cipax Etr XVIII from Narce, if Briquel (in Gran-Aymérich & Briquel 1997) is right in suggesting that cipax may mean ‘sacred, consecrated’.

There are no Faliscan dedicatory inscriptions where verb phrases are used. Thulin (1907:304) interpreted sta MF? 128 (and sta MF? 28) as sta(t) ‘stands as a sacred object’, but sto by itself cannot be used in this sense: in the text quoted by Thulin as a parallel, Umbrian sacre stahu Um 10, the ‘sacral sense’ is due to sacre, not to stahu. The only dedications with a verbal structure from the area are the Latin inscriptions from S. Maria di Falleri (LF/Lat 214, Lat 217-218, 219) and the ager Capenas (Lat 377 from Ponzano, Cap 421 from Capena, and Cap 431, 433, and 435 and Lat 432 and 434 from Lucus Feroniae), with Latin formulas. The many Etruscan types of dedicatory inscriptions with verbs like turuce, alice (e.g. Etr VIII = Fa 3.1, Etr IX = Fa 3.3) or muluvanice (e.g. mulu in Etr XIX = Fa 3.2) have no parallels in Faliscan: note that the only Etruscan dedication from a temple in Falerii Veteres, anae lauv|cies Etr XXIX = Fa 0.6 from the Tempio Maggiore at Colle di Vignale, apparently only names the dedicant.

8.12. Official inscriptions

Official inscriptions are scarce. Usually, they consist only of the names of the magistrates responsible, as in cauiu lullio MF 207, cauiu latiniaio MF 210, a [.].osaøa we narioio MF 206, and c**(*)conøo · l***(*) · ce · pau[i]cio 1-2]so MLF 290. These can in fact be considered comparable to signatures of the type MAKERNom (see §8.8.1). A magistracy is named only [1-2] · hirmio · m[ · f · ]ce · tertineo · c · f · prê[ores ?---] LF 213: it is possible that [---]ilio · cf · f ---] LF 215 also contained a magistracy. As in the case of dedications, the more explicit verbal formulas occur only in the Latin inscriptions from the area (Lat 291 from near Corchiano, Lat 456 from Lucus Feroniae).

As an expression from the official language should also be mentioned macistra- tu | kèsæt LF 242, ma[cistratu?] || kèsæt LF 243). This corresponds to the Latin formulaic official expression magistratum gerere (for instances, see TLL 6.2
1939.1-1940.56), and the formula may well have been taken over from Rome or Latium, as was the use of the *cursus honorum* itself (§11.1.4.1), and most of the official vocabulary (§6.3.6).

8.13. Summary of §§8.8-12

When we look at the textual types and the formulas discussed in §8.8-12, the following tendencies emerge:

(a) General textual types such as OWNER NOM and OWNER GEN in the *Besitzerinschriften* (§8.8.1), MAKER NOM and MAKER GEN in the signatures (§8.9.1) and the official inscriptions (§8.12), DECEASED NOM in the sepulchral inscriptions (§8.10.1), and OWNER NOM and OWNER GEN in the dedications (§8.11.1) have parallels in Latin, Etruscan and the Sabellic languages. However, OWNER GEN in the dedications appears to be relatively frequent in comparison to the occurrence of this type in Latin and the Sabellic languages: this may be due to Etruscan, where the type had a function equal to that of RECIPIENT DAT in Latin and the Sabellic languages (§8.11.1). The dedicatory type using *sacer* has parallels in Latin and Sabellic, but not in Etruscan, and may be considered Italic (§8.11.2).

(b) The Early Faliscan *iscrizioni parlanti* generally follow Etruscan models, e.g. in the case of the *Besitzerinschriften* of the type ego OWNER GEN, ego POSSESSION NOM OWNER GEN and ego OWNER NOM (§8.8.2), although they tend to be adapted to the Faliscan word order, e.g. in the *Besitzerinschriften* of the type OWNERNOM ego (§8.8.2). Alternatively, the Faliscan type reflects an Etruscan variant with a word order that is closer to the Faliscan one, as in the *Besitzerinschrift* of the type OWNERNOM ego (§8.8.2) and the signature formula MAKERNOM me MAKER 3RD PF (§8.9.2). The Capenate *Besitzerinschriften* with OWNER GEN sum, on the other hand, appear to be of Sabellic rather than of Etruscan origin (§8.8.2). The uniquely Capenate type OWNERNOM sum may be due to third-century Latin replacement of the Etruscan type OWNERNOM ego (§8.8.2).

(c) The Middle Faliscan sepulchral type DECEASED NOM *hec cupat/cupant* has parallels both in Etruscan and in the Sabellic languages, but is used in Faliscan with a frequency that far exceeds that of its parallels, and can therefore at least in this respect be regarded as Faliscan (§8.10.1). Another sepulchral type, OWNER GEN *cela*, is probably modeled on the South Etruscan inscriptions with *eca sīubī/sīubī* OWNER GEN (§8.10.3), but the word order is again that of Faliscan rather than that of the most common Etruscan model.

(d) The Latin dedicatory and official inscriptions show textual types with verbal formulas that do not appear in the Middle or Late Faliscan inscriptions (§§8.11.2, §8.12): they also appear to have influenced the Late Faliscan sepulchral inscriptions (§8.10.2).