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Chapter 11
The epigraphic material

This chapter constitutes the introduction to the presentation of the epigraphic material in chapters 12-19. In it, I discuss the nature of the epigraphic material, subdivided according to various criteria such as provenance, age, type, and alphabet (§11.1), the Faliscan alphabet and orthography (§11.2), and the organization of the way in which the material is presented in chapters 12-19 (§11.3).

11.1. The Faliscan epigraphic material

11.1.1. General. In the second part of this study, I present the epigraphic material on which the discussions and conclusions in chapters 2-10 are based. This edition is intended to show the reasons and motives behind my readings and interpretations of the individual texts, and hopefully to discard some of the impossible readings and interpretations that still crop up in the literature from time to time. Discussions other than those necessary to establish the correct or most plausible reading have therefore in many cases been replaced by a reference to the relevant section of chapters 3-9. The aim of the presentation was not to provide a fully-fledged epigraphic edition, as will be clear from the small number of drawings: the edition is intended as a means to an end rather than as an end in itself, and rather than expanding it even further, I have chosen to add references to all published photographs and drawings known to me.

The material presented in chapters 12-19 comprises 535 inscriptions from the ager Faliscus and Capenas, including several inscriptions from other locations or of uncertain or unknown origin which have been regarded as originating from the area, or as somehow connected with Faliscan or Capenate. As the material is intended to be the basis of a comparative study of dialect and language, I have chosen to include every inscription from the area known to me, whether it is Faliscan, Capenate, Latin, Etruscan, or Sabellic, which consists of more than one letter.176 In the following sections I have subdivided this material according to provenance (§11.1.2), period/alphabet group (§11.1.3), type (§11.1.4), and alphabet (§11.1.5), with a more detailed discussion of the criteria.

---

176 Inscriptions consisting of one letter are not only without linguistic value, it is also unclear whether they are in fact letters. A cross may be a Faliscan or Latin x (?), an Etruscan š (X), the number 10 (X), a Faliscan or Etruscan t (.topAnchor or ?), or a cross; an arrow may be a Faliscan f (탑), an Etruscan χ (?, or ?), a Sabellic ū (v or ?), the number 50 (v or ?), or an arrow.
Of the 535 inscriptions presented here, 18 are known only through apographs (MF 20, 65, 88-89, 138-139, 201, 211-212, 265-266, MLF 353-355, LF 335, and Etr XXXIV-XXXV, and XLIX). Of the remaining 517, I publish 125 from autopsy, namely EF 1-4, 6-7, 10, EF/Etr 5, MF 14, 35, 59-60, 62, 90-91, 94-96, 98, 100, 102-103, 105, 113-116, 118-127, 132, 136-137, 140-146, 148-154, 158-161, 163-164, 166-170, 175-190, 264, 269-272, 275-276, MF? 128-131, MF/Etr 37, 64, 66, MLF 320, 323-324, 360, LF 220-230, 329-334, 336, LF/Lat 214, LtF 63, 171, 174, 231-233, and 340. The others I have published e prioribus, working from all available photographs, drawings, and transcriptions of the text in typeset. The only cases in which neither of these were available are MF 135, LF 246, Lat 250, MLF 358-359, and Cap 394. The following 111 inscriptions were of little or no linguistic value:

(1) 19 inscriptions consisting only of abbreviations of a praenomen and a gentilicium: MF 29, 38, MF? 33, Cap 395-397, 400, 415, 419, 424-425, 427-429, 452-455, 461. These have been used in the chapter on the onomasticon (see §7.1.2), but not elsewhere. (2) 55 inscriptions consisting only of abbreviations of two or three letters: EF 8, MF 44, 46, 76, 209, 274, 281, 283-284, 294, 373-375, 460, MF? 28, 30, 68, 131, 133, 134, 203-204, 254-255, MF/Etr 37, 256, MLF 320-323, MF/LtF 241, 252-253, 277-278, LF? 381, LtF 286, Cap 398, 401-402, 405-414, 416-418, 426, 439-451, and Lat 386. Most of these have only been used in the chapter on the onomasticon (see §7.1.2). (3) 26 inscriptions consisting only of a few legible letters without word-divisions: MF 55, 104, 106-108, 132, 168, 176-177, 179, 182-190, 192-194, 319, MLF 342-345. (4) 7 inscriptions that are illegible or so disputed as to be functionally illegible: MF/Etr 287, LtF 288, MF/Etr 61, MLF 356-357, and Cap 422-423. (5) 4 inscriptions that may be falsifications: MF 335 (known only through an apograph, and perhaps genuine), MLF 464, Etr XXXI, and an inscription discussed under Etr XXXIX.

11.1.2. The material divided according to provenance. I have included all the epigraphic material from before c.100-50 BCE (see §11.1.3) from the ager Faliscus and the ager Capenas. The extent of these areas I have tried to establish in §2.1.2: broadly speaking, the ager Faliscus comprised the area enclosed by the Tiber, the Monti Cimini, the Monti Sabatini, the ridge connecting these to Monte Soratte, and Monte Soratte itself, while the ager Capenas comprised the area southward from Monte Soratte along the Tiber to Capena and the shrine of Lucus Feroniae to the crossing of the Tiber near Monterotondo.

The area therefore includes the towns of Narce, Nepi and Sutri, even though these towns became dependencies of Veii in the sixth or early fifth century (§2.4.2) and subsequently came under Roman rule from the early fourth century (§2.5.2). Although they thus ceased to be a part of the ager Faliscus at an early date, these towns and their
inscriptions could not be omitted: Narce was in fact one of the most important sites of the area during the Early Faliscan period (§2.4.2), perhaps the site of Fescennium, which is named as a Faliscan town by the ancient sources (§2.1.2). The area of these towns provides 24 Etruscan inscriptions (Etr I-XVIII from Narce, Etr XIX from Mazzano Romano, and Etr XX-XXIV from Nepi), nearly half of the 51 Etruscan inscriptions presented in chapter 19.

I have also included several inscriptions of uncertain or unknown origin that are ascribed to the ager Faliscus or Capenas, whether I support this attribution (as in the cases of 467*-478*) or not (as in the cases of 479†-481†), and three inscriptions from Ardea (482†-484†) that have for various reasons been ‘associated’ with Faliscan.

Apart from chapters 12 (the Early Faliscan inscriptions) and 19 (the Etruscan inscriptions), the presentation of the material is ordered by provenance:

**Chapters 13-14:** Civita Castellana (Falerii Veteres) and surroundings;

**Chapter 15:** S. Maria di Falleri (Falerii Novi) and surroundings;

**Chapter 16:** the sites of the northern ager Faliscus (Corchiano, Vignanello, Fabbrica di Roma, Carbognano-Vallerano, the site at Grotta Porciosa, and the area around Gallese and Borghetto);

**Chapter 17:** the sites of the south-eastern ager Faliscus and the ager Capenas (Rignano Flaminio, S. Oreste, Ponzano Romano, Civitella S. Paolo, Fiano Romano, Civitucola (ancient Capena), and the shrine at Lucus Feroniae);

**Chapter 18:** (1) inscriptions of unknown or disputed origin that may be from the ager Faliscus or Capenas; (2) inscriptions from other provenances that are or have been regarded as Faliscan.

A similar organization is used within chapter 19, where the Etruscan inscriptions are presented: these are divided into (1) inscriptions from Narce (perhaps the site of Fescennium) and the south-western ager Faliscus, (2) Civita Castellana (Falerii Veteres), (3) Corchiano and the northern ager Faliscus, (4) the south-eastern ager Faliscus and the ager Capenas, (5) and inscriptions of unknown or disputed origin that may be from the area.

Dividing the area in this way also serves another aim, as it divides the material into (a) Civita Castellana, the main site during the Middle Faliscan period (chapters 13-14); (b) S. Maria di Falleri, the main site during the Late Faliscan and subsequent periods; (c) the northern ager Faliscus, which on the one hand was probably divided up during the division of the ager Faliscus following the war of 241 (§2.6.2), but which also shows signs of Etruscan presence at its main site, Corchiano (§9.2.3); and (d) the south-eastern ager Faliscus and the ager Capenas, where Latin influence was far more pronounced due the Roman colonization of Capena in the early fourth century (§2.5.2), but which also shows signs of the presence of speakers of Sabellic languages (§9.3).
11.1.3. The material divided according to period/alphabet category. As explained in §1.4.3, the dating of the inscriptions is very difficult in most cases. This relative lack of securely dated Faliscan inscriptions also makes it impossible to provide dating criteria that rely on alphabet or orthography, except in the most general way.

An exception is constituted by the inscriptions on movable objects, especially pottery or mirrors, where the object itself can usually be dated more or less accurately on typological grounds. The inscriptions that were added by their makers at the time of the making itself (signatures) are of course from the same time as the object. Besitzerinschriften and other inscriptions on such objects are usually tacitly assumed to have been added soon after the object was made and therefore to have approximately the same date, although strictly speaking there is no a priori justification for this assumption.

Most of the Faliscan inscriptions are sepulchral, however, and these are unfortunately far more difficult to date. The sepulchral inscriptions are all from chamber tombs cut into the steep rock-faces of the area, or into the sides of hollow roads (§11.1.4.1). Here three main problems affect the dating:

(a) These tombs were often re-used for long periods of time, and when a loculus was emptied to make place for another burial, previous burials were inevitably disturbed, grave-goods becoming confused with those of later burials or just left lying around in the tomb. In a number of cases, even the inscribed tiles used to close the loculus were reused for other burials (§11.1.4). Inscriptions at the entrance of the tombs or on the walls of the chamber are virtually impossible to date, as it is unclear to which stage of the use of the tomb they belong.

(b) Over the centuries, many tombs were ransacked, and the chambers cleaned out and re-used as cattle-stalls, shepherds' shelters, tool-sheds, or cheese-cellars. Datable grave-goods thus became separated from the sepulchral inscriptions belonging to the same burial or tomb, and tiles or inscriptions on the walls of tombs are therefore often without any datable context.

(c) Most sepulchral inscriptions are written on tiles (cf. §11.1.4.1c), and although these could of course be dated by thermoluminescence dating, that would give only the date of the tile itself as a terminus post quem for the inscription: it is not clear if the tiles that were used to close the loculi were (always) new, or had (sometimes) already been in use as roof-tiles for, say, half a century.

Public inscriptions fall into two categories. The first group consists of the inscriptions cut into the rock-face of the side of hollow roads, which usually contain names, presumably those of magistrates that had the road constructed or maintained: these are without datable context at all apart from the roads themselves, which in most cases

---

177 A striking example is the tomb of the gens Velminae at Vignanello: although found apparently undisturbed and dating from the third century, it contained remains of a shield of a type that is associated with burials of the seventh century (Giglioli 1916:64-5).
cannot be dated with any accuracy. The public inscriptions on bronze on the other hand
can be dated quite accurately, but only because these are nearly all in Latin and can
therefore be dated according to the epigraphic and linguistic dating criteria used for the
Latin inscriptions.

As said in §1.4.3, I have therefore used a different method of dating, which is
basically an elaboration of the criteria suggested by G. Giacomelli (1978:510-1). In this
method, the inscriptions are divided into larger ‘period groups’ according to historical
and archaeological criteria. Although crude in both its methodology and its criteria, this
way of dating has turned out to be very workable, and the groups arrived at in this way
often coincide with groups that can be defined on the basis of linguistic features. In my
view, this classification can therefore be regarded as a valid tool to subdivide the
 corpus. In any case, it remains an open question whether more subtle dating criteria
would produce significantly better or different results. Inscriptions are unique objects,
and, from a linguistic perspective, they represent unique speech utterances: in a
linguistic study, placing them together into larger groups would have been necessary to
provide meaningful results in any case.

The ‘period groups’ into which the inscriptions are divided are the following:

(1) the Early Faliscan group (EF, 10-12 inscriptions) comprises all inscriptions from
before the fourth century. Since these are all inscriptions on pottery, they can be dated
quite well on typological grounds, and form a group that is quite distinct in several other
respects, such as the alphabet and the contents of the inscriptions. The Early Faliscan
inscriptions are EF 1-4 and 6-10 from Civita Castellana and EF 467* of unknown
origin: either Early Faliscan or Etruscan are EF/Etr 5 from Civita Castellana and EF/Etr
385 from Fiano Romano.

All inscriptions in the Faliscan alphabet from the fourth century and later are classed
either as Middle Faliscan or as Late Faliscan. The dividing line between the Middle
Faliscan and the Late Faliscan periods is the war of 241-240 BCE (§2.6), since as a
result of this war several of the more important sites were abandoned, and the influence
of (Roman) Latin can reasonably be assumed to have increased markedly, due to the
foundation of Falerii Novi and the division of the ager Faliscus into a Faliscan- and a
Roman-administrated part (§2.6.2).

(3) the Middle Faliscan group (MF, 185-228 inscriptions) comprises (a) all inscrip-
tions in the Faliscan alphabet from the fourth century or later that have been found at
sites that were abandoned after the war of 241, notably Civita Castellana (Falerii
Vetere) and Corchiano, and their direct surroundings, and are therefore assumed to
date from between the fourth century and c.240. Inscriptions from these sites in the
Faliscan alphabet have always been classed as Middle Faliscan unless there is a positive
reason not to do so. Middle Faliscan also comprises (b) all inscriptions in the Faliscan
alphabet from other sites that can reasonably be dated to the period between the fourth
century and c.240. The Middle Faliscan inscriptions are: (a) MF 11-20, 22-27, 31-32, 34-36, 39-43, 45, 47-60, 62, 65, 69-75, 79-110, 113-127, 132, 135-139, 141-170, 175-198, 200-201, probably also MF 202 (unclear), from Civita Castellana (Falerii Veteres), MF 257-260, 263, 265-266, 269-276, and probably also MF? 253-255, 261-262, 281, and 283-284, from Corchiano; (b) MF 367-375 from Rignano Flaminio, MF 376 from S. Oreste, and MF 469*-473* of unknown origin. Either Middle Faliscan or Etruscan are MF/Etr 37, 61 (illegible), 64, 66-67, 77, and 199, from Civita Castellana (Falerii Veteres), and MF/Etr 256, 264, 267, 279-280, 282, and 287, from Corchiano and surroundings. Either Middle Faliscan or Latino-Faliscan are MF/LtF 21 from Civita Castellana (Falerii Veteres) and MF/LtF 252, 277-278 from Corchiano.

(4) the Middle or Late Faliscan group (MLF, 57-66 inscriptions) comprises all inscriptions in the Faliscan alphabet from the fourth century or later that have been found at sites that continued to exist after the war of 241, and as a consequence cannot be dated with any kind of accuracy other than that they are from between the fourth and the second centuries. Inscriptions from these sites in the Faliscan alphabet have always been classed as Middle or Late Faliscan unless there is a positive reason not to do so. The Middle or Late Faliscan inscriptions are: MLF 206-207 and 210-212, from the wider surroundings of Civita Castellana (Falerii Veteres); MLF 285-286, 293, and 297-298, from the wider surroundings of Corchiano; MLF 302-323 from Vignanello; MLF 324 from Fabbrica di Roma; MLF 338-339 and 346-355 from Grotta Porciosa and the surrounding area; MLF 358-359 from the area near Gallese and Borghetto (although very little is known of these inscriptions, they appear to be in the Faliscan alphabet); MLF 360-362 of unknown northern Faliscan origin; MLF 363-366 from Rignano Flaminio; MLF 459-60 and 463-464 of unknown Capenate origin (MLF 464 may be a falsum), and probably also MLF/Cap 474*-476* of unknown origin. Either Middle or Late Faliscan or Etruscan are MLF/Etr 208-209 from the wider surroundings of Civita Castellana (Falerii Veteres), MLF/Etr 289 from the wider surroundings of Corchiano, and MLF/Etr 356-357 from the area between Gallese and Borghetto. Either Middle or Late Faliscan or Latino-Faliscan are MLF/LtF 241 and 252 from the surroundings of S. Maria di Falleri (Falerii Novi.).

(5) the Late Faliscan group (LF, 40-41 inscriptions) comprises (a) all inscriptions in the Faliscan alphabet that have been found at S. Maria di Falleri (Falerii Novi), as that site appears to have come into existence or prominence only after the war of 241-240 (§2.6.2). Inscriptions from this site in the Faliscan alphabet have always been classed as Late Faliscan unless there is a positive reason not to do so. Late Faliscan also comprises (b) all inscriptions in the Faliscan alphabet that can with reasonable certainty be dated to the period after the war of 241-240. These inscriptions are therefore assumed to date from between c.240-220 and the middle of the second century. The Late Faliscan
inscriptions are: (a) LF 213, 220-230, 232 (partly), 234-236, and 242-249 from S. Maria di Falleri (Falerii Novi); (b) LF 112 from Civita Castellana (Falerii Veteres), LF 329-337 from Carbognano-Vallerano (LF 335 may be a falsum), LF 378-380, 382-384, and probably also LF? 381, from Civitella S. Paolo.

The remaining inscriptions are either in the Latin or in the Etruscan alphabet. Those in the Latin alphabet are a priori more likely to date from the period after c.240, but in many cases this date cannot be positively established. Also, there are inscriptions in the Latin alphabet that are obviously earlier than c.240, such as Lat 268, on a fourth-century strigilis found at Corchiano, showing that it is dangerous to assume a priori a date after c.240. The inscriptions in the Latin alphabet have therefore been classed as follows:

(6) the Latino-Faliscan group (LtF, 33-38 inscriptions) comprises the inscriptions in the Latin alphabet from the ager Faliscus. Inscriptions in the Latin alphabet from the ager Faliscus have always been classed as Latino-Faliscan (and thus as representing a local form of Latin) unless they show linguistic features that are not in accordance with those encountered in the Faliscan inscriptions. The Latino-Faliscan inscriptions are: LtF 63, 140, 171-174, and 205, from Civita Castellana (Falerii Veteres) and surroundings, LtF 215, 231-233, 239, from S. Maria di Falleri (Falerii Novi) and surroundings, LtF 277-278, 288, 290, 292, 294 and 299-301 from Corchiano and surroundings, LtF 325-327 from Carbognano-Vallerano, LtF 328 from Fabbrica di Roma, LtF 340-345 from Grotta Porciosa, and LtF 377 from Ponzano. Either Middle Faliscan or Latino-Faliscan are MLF/LtF 21 from Civita Castellana (Falerii Veteres), and MLF/LtF 253, 277, and 278 from Corchiano. Either Middle or Late Faliscan or Latino-Faliscan are MLF/LtF 241 and 252 from the surroundings of S. Maria di Falleri (Falerii Novi). Several Latino-Faliscan inscriptions consist only of abbreviations (LtF 172, 174, 205, 241, 277-278, 294, 342-345, 12 inscriptions in all) and can therefore not be evaluated linguistically.

(7) the Capenate group (Cap, 72 inscriptions) comprises the inscriptions in the Latin alphabet from the ager Capenas. Inscriptions in the Latin alphabet from the ager Capenas have always been classed as Capenate unless they show linguistic features that are not in accordance with those encountered in the Faliscan inscriptions: ‘Capenate’ is therefore a counterpart to ‘Latino-Faliscan’. The Capenate inscriptions are: Cap 386-392 and 394-430 from Capena, Cap 431, 433, 435, 437, 439-455 from Lucus Feroniae, Cap 457-459 and 461-462 and 465-466 of unknown Capenate origin. Either Middle or Late Faliscan or Capenate are MLF/Cap 474*-476* of unknown origin. Most Capenate inscriptions only consist of abbreviations (Cap 386, 395-398, 400-403, 405-412, 414-419, 424-429, 437-457, 458-459, 53 inscriptions in all) and can therefore not be evaluated for linguistic features.

(8) the Latin group (Lat, 19 inscriptions) comprises the inscriptions in the Latin alphabet that show linguistic features that are not compatible with those found in the inscriptions in the Faliscan alphabet: many of these can be dated with some degree of
accuracy to the middle of the second century or later. The Latin inscriptions comprise: Lat 216-219, 237-238, 240, 250, and 251 from S. Maria di Falleri (Falerii Novi) and surroundings; Lat 268 (an import), Lat 291 and 295-296 (both imports) from Corchiano and surroundings; Lat 393 from Capena, Lat 432, 434, 436, 438, and 456 from Lucus Feroniae; and 477*-478* (both imports) of unknown origin.

It may be argued that the distinction between Latino-Faliscan and Capenate on the one hand and Latin on the other is too subtle. The distinction between the two groups is certainly not arbitrary, however, and allows, where necessary, to distinguish between the inscriptions that can be considered to show dialect features and those that do not.

(9) the Etruscan group (Etr, 51-72 inscriptions) comprises the inscriptions in the Etruscan alphabet that also show Etruscan features in the morphology, phonology, or lexicon. These inscriptions, presented separately in chapter 19, are: Etr I-XVIII from Narce, Etr XIX from Mazzano Romano, Etr XX-XXIV from Nepi and surroundings, Etr XXV-XXXI from Civita Castellana (Etr XXXI may be a falsum), Etr XXXII-XLI from Corchiano and surroundings, Etr XLII from Vignanello, Etr XLIII from Rignano Flaminio, Etr XLIV from Monte Laceto, Etr XLV from Lucus Feroniae, and Etr XLVI-LI of unknown origin. Either Middle Faliscan or Etruscan are MF/Etr 37, 61 (virtually illegible), 64, 66-67, 77, and 199, from Civita Castellana (Falerii Veteres), and MF/Etr 256, 264, 267, 279-280, 282, and 287 from Corchiano and surroundings. Either Middle or Late Faliscan or Etruscan are MLF/Etr 208-209 from the wider surroundings of Civita Castellana (Falerii Veteres) and MLF/Etr 289 from the wider surroundings of Corchiano, and MLF/Etr 356-357 from the Gallese-Borghetto area.

Two special cases are LF/Lat 214 and Sab 468*. In LF/Lat 214, the alphabet is Faliscan: the language, however, is Latin, without any dialect features that are specifically Faliscan, and the inscription has therefore been classed as LF/Lat. Sab 468* is of South Etrurian and perhaps Capenate origin, but shows so many Sabellic features that it can without problems be classed as a Sabellic, perhaps Sabine or Umbrian, inscription. Added to the edition only to reject their connection with Faliscan are 479† (early Latin, of unknown South Etrurian origin), 480† (early Sabellic, probably Palaeo-Umbrian, from the La Tolfa area), 481† (perhaps Sabellic, from Foglia, near Magliano Sabino), and 482†-484† (Latin, from Ardea).

11.1.4. The material divided according to type. The material can also be divided into groups according to the type of inscription: sepulchral inscriptions, inscriptions on moveable objects, dedications, and public inscriptions.

(1) Sepulchral inscriptions. By far the greatest group of Faliscan inscriptions is formed by the sepulchral inscriptions. These are all from the chamber-tombs cut into the relatively soft tuff of the steep rock-face of the gorges or the sides of the hollow roads of the area. These tombs were chambers of varying size, sometimes with a decorated
entrance or façade on the outside, or even a porticus or antechamber. Inside the tomb, the deceased were buried in loculi cut into the walls, which could number well over 30, after which the loculi were closed with vertically placed roof-tiles (see below under (c)). For descriptions of such tombs, see e.g. Ward-Perkins & Frederiksen 1957 passim, and Colonna 1990:127-35 (short overview and typology, with clear illustrations). The inscriptions show that the tomb or the chamber was designated with the word cela (MF 12, 83-84, MLF 285) = Latin cella, while the loculi or the places in the loculi were designated as leta (MF 285: the word probably also occurs in MF 17 and perhaps in MLF 361) = Latin lecti: see also §6.2.8,39.

(a) Inscriptions on the exterior of the tomb. The first type of sepulchral inscription encountered in these tombs consists of the inscriptions on the outside of the tomb, either over or beside the entrance, or in the porticus. Of this type, there are 10 instances: MF 11-12, 13, 79, 83-85 from Civita Castellana (Falerii Veteres), MLF 285 and LtF 288 from the surroundings of Corchiano, and LtF 251 from the surroundings of S. Maria di Falleri (Falerii Novi). The aim of these inscriptions was apparently to name the first or most important owner of the tomb, or perhaps more precisely, of its burial rights. They can consist of a name in the genitive (MF 11, 13) or of a name in the genitive followed by the word cela ‘the tomb of ...’ (MF 12, 83-84, MLF 285), and thus correspond to the Etruscan inscriptions with auti (see §8.10.3). A few simply consist of one name in the nominative (MF 79, and probably also LtF 288, possibly also MF 85). Two contain mention of burial rights: MLF 285 reads [---]fate cela · leta zot xxiiii ‘the tomb of ...f: there are 24 lecti’, while Lt 251 is even more elaborate, reading l · uccilio · uo · f · et | po[l]ae · abelese | lectu · i · datu [f] · uccilio · l · f · et · plenes | lectu · i · amplius · nihil | imiteis · l · c · leueis · l · f | et · quei · eos · parentaret | ne · anteponat ‘to Lucius Vecilius son of Volta and to Paula Abellensis, one lectus is given; to ... Vecilius son of Lucius and to Plenes, one lectus: let no one place anything in front against the wishes of Lucius and Gaius Laevius sons of Lucius, and those who venerate them as ancestors’.

The inscriptions inside the tomb were placed either on the wall (27 instances) or on the tiles that closed the loculus (181-184 instances). They had a function that was related to but slightly different from that of the inscriptions on the outside of the tombs: obvious though it may seem, they were there to indicate the identity of the deceased – and hardly anything else. The tombs were family tombs, re-used for generations, and the inscriptions had to make it clear who was buried were, with regard to burial rights, with regard to deciding which loculi could be cleared, and perhaps with regard to ancestor-sacrifices (cf. Lt 251, quoted above). The inscriptions therefore consist of little more than the names of the deceased (sometimes joined by -cue), often with their filiation,

Peruzzi (1967a) interpreted [---]fatecela in MF 285 (see below) as [---]f atecela, which would give a plausible word *at(e)cela = *antecella for the porticus, but the text is in my view to be read with Herbig (CIE 8391) as [---]fate cela ‘...fatis cella’.
and sometimes with the formula *hec cupa(n)t* ‘lie(s) here’ added at the end. In the case of married women not buried together with their husband, the name of the husband was often explicitly indicated (cf. §7.4.2).

These inscriptions therefore have a very different function from the roadside sepulchral inscriptions known e.g. from Latium. Although the Faliscan tombs were often conspicuous, with decorated façades cut into the rock-face, the inscriptions could be seen only by those who had business inside the tomb, and as a consequence they did not have the function of drawing the attention of passers-by. Decoration is therefore very scarce (occurring only in MF 80 and 89, and LF 223), *carmina epigraphica* are absent,\(^ {179} \) and the mention of *honores* in Middle Faliscan inscriptions is limited to MF 90 and perhaps MF 91. In the inscriptions from the period after c.240, there are *cursus honorum*, some quite elaborate, in LF 242-243, 245, 247-249, LtF 231 and 233, LtF 232 and 239, and Lat 219 and 237-238, all from S. Maria di Falleri and surroundings: these are in all probability due to Roman influence.

\( \text{(b) Inscriptions on the walls of the tombs.} \) The inscriptions on the walls of the tomb could either be cut or painted, over, under, or beside the loculi to which they belonged. Cut are MF 40, 47, 82, 86-87, 195-198 from Civita Castellana (Falerii Veteres), MLF 302-303 from Vignanello, and MLF 346 from the surroundings of Grotta Porciosa; painted are MF 15-19 (the tomb of the *gentes Neronia* and *Firmia*) 48-54 (the tomb of the *gens Aufilia*), 57, 80-81, and 88-89 from Civita Castellana (Falerii Veteres), and MF 347-353 (the tomb of *gens Ara(n)tia*) from Grotta Porciosa. Among these inscriptions, special mention should be made of MF 17, \( \cdot iii \cdot l[---]\{---\}naif?---\{---\}Jo uxo \), which apparently mentions burial rights (\( \cdot iii \cdot l[---] = \text{‘three beds ...’ or ‘the third bed ...’} \)), and of MF 40, \( \{---\}o cicio \cdot cicioi : cupat : ifra \), where the usual formula *hec cupat* has been adapted to make it clear that the inscription belongs to the loculus underneath.

\( \text{(c) Inscriptions on the tiles covering the loculi.} \) The majority of the sepulchral inscriptions (181-184 instances) is made up by the sepulchral inscriptions on one to four of the tiles that covered the loculus. These roof-tiles (*tegulae*)\(^ {180} \) were rectangular slabs of fired clay with flanges running along on the long sides. In the period of the Faliscan inscriptions, two main types of clay appear, one a hard reddish pink- to brown-firing clay, the other a friable yellow-firing one that is very liable to crumbling and flaking. The measures of these tiles vary from 40-48 cm in width with an average of c.45 cm (i.e., approximately a Roman *sesquipes*), by a length of 60-70 cm with an average c.68 cm (i.e., just over two Roman *pedes*). For descriptions of such tiles from South

\(^{179}\) Peruzzi (1964d:310-1) unconvincingly tried to interpret the very fragmentary MF 91 as a *carmen epigraphicum*.

\(^{180}\) Peruzzi (1964d:310-1), in his interpretation of MF 91 as a *carmen epigraphicum*, suggested interpreting the *imr* read by Gamurrini (1883:166) as *im(b)rf* = Latin *imbrex*, but the *imbrex* is not the tile, but the semi-circular cover laid over the joint between two tiles.

The inscriptions on these tiles are mostly on the back (non-flanged) side, especially when the inscription covered more than one tile. Most were inscribed lengthwise, i.e. with the text running between the flanges along the length of the tile: only a few were written across. Usually, these inscriptions are painted, either directly onto the tile, or on a layer of plaster covering the tiles. Of this type of inscription, there are 164-167 instances from all periods and localities: MF 14, 39, 41-43, 56, 90-108, 136-139, 141-170, 175-194, 211 from Civita Castellana and surroundings, 265, 297-298, 305-319, MLF 339, 358-360, 364-366, LF 220-230, 232, 234-236, 242-249, 329-337, LtF 140, 171, 173, 231-232, 233, 299-301, 325-328, 341, LtF 172, 174, 232, 239, 340, 342-345, Lat 237-238, Etr XLIII, and probably also MF 55, 135, and 212 (where complete descriptions are lacking). In only 17 instances, the inscriptions were scratched into the tile rather than painted, a custom limited to the northern ager Faliscus: MF 257-258, 266, 269-272, 275-276, and Etr XXXIV-XXXV from Corchiano, MLF 324 from Fabbrica di Roma, MLF 338 and 354-355 from Grotta Porciosa, MLF 361-362 of unknown northern Faliscan origin. With the possible exception of MLF 361, these scratched inscriptions all appear to have been written on one tile each. Interestingly, the inscriptions that were scratched are often associated with clearly Etruscan linguistic features (§9.2.3), whereas among the painted inscriptions there are few that show such features.

A complicating factor from an epigraphic point of view is that these tiles were sometimes re-used and can therefore have multiple inscriptions. In some cases, the tiles were re-used for the same loculus (as in LF 222-223 and LF 224-225), but apparently sometimes tiles were re-used for an altogether unrelated inscription. Re-use could take the form of (a) using the other side of the tile, as in MF 136-137, 138-139, 144-145, 156-157, and 297-298; (b) washing over the titulus prior with plaster and the painting the titulus posterior on this second layer, as in MF 90-91, LF 222-223, 224-225, and 228-229, or (c) just painting over the titulus prior, as in MLF 365-366. In the case of LF/LtF 232-233, the tiles were apparently re-used several times, with the titulus postumus painted on a coat of plaster that was washed over several tituli priores. This re-use makes the inscriptions unclear, especially when the titulus prior was washed over with a new coat of plaster: depending on the state of the plaster, it is either the titulus prior (as in LF 228-229) or the titulus posterior (as in MF 90-91) that is illegible. To complicate the matter even further, when the tiles were re-used for the same loculus, they could be placed back in a different order, as in LtF 231.

---

181 As many tiles are preserved only as fragments, and in some cases no data are given on the way the inscriptions were painted, the data are insufficient to specify the material accordingly: where known to me, such data are given under the individual inscriptions.
(d) Exceptional cases of sepulchral inscriptions are Lat 250, which also mentions the consuls of 106 BCE and Lat 393, which also mentions a date.

(2) Inscriptions on movable objects: The inscriptions on movable objects are mostly found on pottery. They fall into several categories:

(a) Signatures (19 instances). In some, the maker of the object is explicitly named as such, as in mama z[e]xtos med f[f]iqod in EF 1, tele*[1-2?] med f[if]ik[ed] EF 9, oufilo : clipeaio : letei : fileo : met : facet MF 470* (all three of the iscrizioni parlanti-type, for which see §8.9.2), cauios frenaios faced MF 471*, ranazu zinaqe Etr III and c[e]/ur : purpiunan Etr L.I. In other cases, the fact that the inscription is a signature is inferred from the fact that the inscription was added during the making of the object: ac MF? 111, c cutri MF 200, pleina MF/Etr 199, vce (?) MF/Etr 256 (a terracotta strigilis), cel Cap 386, and t · fourios · *[· If] Lat 216 (a terracotta mould), l · quinti Lat 477*, [c ·] popili Lat 478*, c · popii[l]i Lat 295, and c · popili meuanie Lat 296, and evrs · ci Etr XXX, all written on pottery objects before they were fired; art[3-5]re MF/Etr 267 (stamped on a bronze strigilis) and med · louciios · feced Lat 268 (engraved on a bronze strigilis), the latter another example of a signature of the iscrizioni parlanti-type.

(b) Besitzerinschriften (205 instances). This large group of inscriptions mainly consists of names scratched on pottery items. Such inscriptions have always been interpreted as Besitzerinschriften unless there are indications that they are to be interpreted otherwise. The name can be in the nominative, as in MF 22-27, 73-75, 259-260, 371-372, 376, 473*, MF/Etr 264, MLF 463-464, LF 380, 382, Cap 388, 390 (plural) 391-392, 420, 466, 458?, Sab 468*, and Etr V, XI-XV, and XXI-XXII; in the genitive, as in MF 20, 34-36, 45, 58, 69-71, 72? (plural), 109 (or a dedication?), 201, 273, 367-370, 472*, MF? 261-262, MF/Etr 67, MLF 304, 469*, LF 112, 379, 384 (plural), LtF 63, Cap 387, 399, 413?, 423?, 430, 465 (plural), MLF/Cap 475*, and Etr XVI, XXIII, XXXII, XXXVII, and probably Etr XXIV; (either nominative or genitive are MF/Etr 64, 279-280, 282, and Etr XLV), or abbreviated: MF 274, 373-375, MF? 28-30, 33, 38, 44, 46, 68, 76, 111, 131, 133-134, 203-204, 254, 255, 281, 283-284, MF/Etr 37, MF/LtF 253, 277-278, MLF 286, 320-323, 460, MLF? 474*, MLF/LtF 241, 252, LF? 381, Cap 395-398, 400-403, 405-412, 414-419, 424-429, 439-457, 459, 461, LtF 294, and Etr VI-VII, and possibly also Etr II. Special cases are locia eimoI MLF 293 and vultasi Etr XLII, both of which appear to contain datives: see §8.8.1. Possibly also Besitzerinschriften are MF 110, 263, MF? 78, 128-129, 130, 202, MF/Etr 62, 66, 77, 287, Cap 423, LtF 292.

A special group are the Besitzerinschriften of the iscrizione parlante-type, eco quto *e uotenosio MF 3, eko lartos EF 6, and eko kaisioio EF 7, aijniosio eqo EF 464*, m adicio eco LF 378, eco tulle LF 383, a · irtios · esê Cap 389, and k · sares · esê Cap 404, and açiuaioe esê Cap 465 (the last three with esû(m) = dialectal Latin esum ‘I am’): see §8.8.2. [The area has also yielded several Etruscan Besitzerinschriften of the iscrizioni parlanti-type: mi qutum lemausnas Etr III, enav**es mi Etr XXVI, mi alsi*is
mi Etr XL, velelias mi staslar {v?} Etr XLIX, and mlakas i se-la i aska mi eleivana Etr XLVI and mi tafina lazia vilianas Etr XVII, where the type of vase is named as well (cf. acréz cat MF/Etr 67 where cat may be an abbreviation of catinus).182

(c) Deductions. The dedicatory inscriptions (on movable objects or otherwise) are discussed under (3). Note that in some cases the only indication that an inscription is to be interpreted as dedicatory is the fact that it has been found in a stips or in the ruins of a temple or sanctuary.

(d) Part of the decoration (12 instances). In several cases, the inscriptions can be regarded as part of the decoration of the object. In this category come, first of all, the paired inscriptions foied · uino · pipafo · cra · carefo · MF 59 and foied · uino · pipafo · cra · careffo · MF 60. Other inscriptions that come into this category are the inscriptions that label mythological figures, canumede [die]s pater cupi‹d›o menerua MF 62. [Etruscan instances of such inscriptions are gersse Etr L (painted on vases), alcestei atmite Etr XXVII, ðevrumes hercle ariatba vile menrva mine Etr XXVIII, turnš tinia apulu XXXI, ayfle aivas Etr XXXIII, usle*es turan acaviser setlans XL1 (engraved on mirrors), and herkle kukne Etr XXV (engraved on a gem).] More or less into the same category falls caui : tertinei : | posticum MLF/Cap 474*, on a bronze statuette base.


(f) Alphabetaries. The area has yielded two early alphabetaries that are apparently neither Etruscan nor Latin or Faliscan (for their importance as data on the development of the Faliscan alphabet see §11.2.2): abcedezhθθik Etr I and abcédezžθθ̣iksi* p*gzfu Etr XLIV. MF/Etr 110 (aie*) has been read as acev by Colonna (1990:136) and has been classed by him and by Rix (ET Fa 9.3) as an Etruscan alphabetary.

182 Perhaps in some way related to this type are etiam EF 5 and tafina Etr XXXVI, both of which appear to consist only of a word denoting the type of vase.
(3) **Dedicated inscriptions.** Dedicated inscriptions from the periods before c.240 are few, and all from Civita Castellana. The only clear cases are from the temples of Civita Castellana (Falerii Veteres): *apolonos* EF 10 and *anae lauv|cies* Etr XXIX from the Tempio Maggiore at Colle di Vignale, and the Titus Marcus-dedications MF 113-126 and the cup inscribed *sacra* MF 127 from the temple at Contrada Celle. Another possible dedicatory inscription is *[---]/altai / MF 109 from the Tempio Maggiore at Colle di Vignale, and perhaps ace* (acey?) MF/Etr 110, if this is an alphabetary. From these temples are several cups inscribed with names that could be the names of dedicants but could also be *Besitzerinschriften* that predated the dedication of the object. They are LF 112 from the temples at Colle di Vignale, MF? 133-134 from the temple at Lo Scasato, and MF? 128-131 from the temple at Sassi Caduti.

Found in tombs at Civita Castellana, but also sometimes interpreted as dedications are *loifi/g1792tato* MF 31 and *loifirtato* MF 32, interpreted either as the genitive of the name of a deity Libertas or as dedications on the occasion of enfranchisement, and *apolo* MF 65, which has also been interpreted as a (abbreviated?) slave-name. Perhaps not dedicatory in the stricter sense, but apparently mentioning gods and perhaps calling on their benevolence are parts of EF 1. Perhaps dedicatory, too, is the Etruscan inscription *mi cipa/g548* Etr XVIII.

The later periods yield several Latin public dedications from S. Maria di Falleri (Falerii Novi): LF/Lat 214 to Minerva, Lat 217-218 to the Capitoline Triad, and Lat 219 to Apollo. Private dedications are from the ager Capenas: LtF 377 from Ponzano and Cap 421 from Capena, both to an otherwise unknown *Mars Numerius*, and the series of dedicatory inscriptions to Feronia from the shrine at Lucus Feroniae, Cap/Lat 431, Lat 432, Cap 433, Lat 434, Cap 435, Lat 436, Cap 437, and Lat 438, several of which (Cap/Lat 431, Cap 435, and Lat 436) were made by freedmen and freedwomen.

(4) **Inscriptions on public works.** Most of what can be classed as inscriptions on public works consists of names that are cut into the sides of the hollow roads of the area. These are probably the names of magistrates responsible for the construction or maintenance of these roads (cf. Ward Perkins & Frederiksen 1957:141-2), or of the surrounding fields: Lat 291, *c · egnatius · s/ex · f · prata | faciunda · coirauit*, in fact mentions the reclaiming of pasture-land. Some mentions only one name, like MLF 207 and 210, from the wider surroundings of Civita Castellana (Falerii Veteres), and Lat 291, and Etr XXXVIII and XXXIX, from the surroundings of Corchiano, others two, like MLF 206 from the surroundings of Civita Castellana and LtF 290 from the surroundings of Corchiano. Cristofani (1988:19), pointing to the care with which several of these inscriptions are written, also attributes a propaganda value to these texts. An interesting point is that two of these inscriptions, Etr XXXVIII and XXXIX, are written in the Etruscan alphabet, implying that using this in a public inscription in the ager Faliscus was, if not an everyday occurrence, at least a possibility. Unfortunately, none of these inscriptions can be dated with any accuracy. Several other roadside inscriptions are
unclear, and may not in fact belong in this group: LtF 205 (abbreviations only), MLF/Etr 208 and 209 (only two letters), from the surroundings of Civita Castellana, MLF/Etr 289 (at least one name) from Corchiano, and MLF/Etr 356 and 357 from between Gallese and Borghetto.

The only other clear instance of a building-inscription is [..] hirmio · m[ · f · ] ce · tertineo · c · f · pret[ore(s) ?]—LF 213, which according to Garrucci (1877:199) was written in mosaic across the entrance of a small building at S. Maria di Falleri (Falerii Novi): this recalls the Oscan inscription Po 14, cut across the entrance to the cella of the temple of Apollo at Pompeii. Two other possible building-inscriptions are [---] · l*[---] MF 132, the text in the terracotta frieze from the temple at Contrada Celle, which is unfortunately too damaged to give any clue to its contents, and [---] lilio · c[ · f ?]—LtF 215 from S. Maria di Falleri, which is written on a strip of bronze, a material that in the ager Faliscus is known only from official inscriptions. A much later building-inscription from the ager Capenas is first-century Lat 456 from Lucus Feroniae.

11.1.5. The material according to alphabet. The inscriptions from the area can also be divided according to alphabet. Note that a distinction according to alphabet is an epigraphic or orthographic distinction, not a linguistic one, although it can serve as such in an ancillary role to linguistic arguments. The Faliscan alphabet is discussed in detail in §11.2. The distinguishing features between the Faliscan and the Etruscan and Latin alphabets are as follows:

(1) Faliscan vs. Etruscan alphabet: The Faliscan alphabet is distinguished from the Etruscan alphabet (a) by the use of \( d \) and \( o \) in the Faliscan, but not in the Etruscan alphabet, (b) by the use of \( v \) and \( z \) in the Etruscan, but not in the Faliscan alphabet (\( \theta \) occasionally also occurs in the Faliscan alphabet); (c) by the differences in the shape of the \( f \) (Faliscan \( \Uparrow \) : Etruscan \( \mathbf{8} \)), and of the \( r \) (Early Faliscan \( \mathbf{P} \), Middle and Late Faliscan \( \mathbf{R} \) : Latin \( \mathbf{R} \)).

(2) Faliscan vs. Latin alphabet: The Faliscan alphabet is distinguished from the Latin alphabet (a) by the use of \( b \) in the Latin, but not in the Faliscan alphabet; (b) by the use of \( z \) in the Faliscan, but not in the Latin alphabet; (c) by the use of \( cu \) in the Faliscan, but of \( qu \) in the Latin alphabet to render \( /k^3/ \); (d) by the occasional use of \( \theta \) in the Faliscan, but not in the Latin alphabet, (e) by the difference in shape of the \( a \) (Early Faliscan \( \mathbf{A} \) or \( \mathbf{A} \), Middle and Late Faliscan \( \mathbf{A} \) or \( \mathbf{A} \) : Latin \( \mathbf{A} \)) and the \( f \) (Faliscan \( \Uparrow \) : Latin \( \mathbf{F} \)) and (f) finally by the ductus, which is normally sinistroverse in inscriptions in the Faliscan, but normally dextroverse in inscriptions in the Latin alphabet (although there are exceptions to this (see below), which is why this feature is placed last).

According to these criteria, the inscriptions can be divided as follows:

(1) Inscriptions in the Faliscan alphabet: (a) dextroverse ductus (normal in the earliest inscriptions): EF 1-4, MF? 129; (b) sinistroverse ductus: EF 6-10, EF? 4647; MF 11-20,
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(3) Inscriptions in the Etruscan alphabet: (a) dextrovers ductus: Etr I-VIII, X, XIX-XX, XLIV, XLVI-XLVI, MF/Etr 67, 256; (b) sinistrovers ductus: Etr IX, XI-XVIII, XXI-XLII, XV, XLVIII-XLI, MF/Etr 37, 66, 264, 267, 279, MLF/Etr 289, 357.

(4) Inscriptions that can be read as being in the Faliscan or the Latin (but not the Etruscan) alphabet: (a) dextrovers ductus: MF? 28, 68, 76, 78, 131, 283, MF 373-375, 470*; MF/LtF 21, 253, MLF/LtF 241; (b) sinistrovers ductus: MF? 202; MLF 463-464; MLF/CAp 474*.


(6) other: (a) Sabelliec alphabet 468*; (b) alphabet and/or ductus not reported: MF 135; MLF 358-359; MLF/LtF 252; MLF/CAp 394; LF 246; (c) illegible: MLF/Etr? 287.

11.2. Alphabet and orthography

11.2.1. The Faliscan alphabet. From the earliest inscriptions onwards, a distinct alphabet was used, which is found in inscriptions from the seventh century (EF 1-4) until the mid-second century BCE (LF/Lat 214). Although, like the other alphabets of ancient Italy, the Faliscan alphabet is derived from a West Greek alphabet, and is therefore what was once known as a ‘red alphabet’ (after the map at the end of
Kirchoff 1887), this alphabet differed both from the Etruscan and from the Latin alphabet in the letters it contained and in the shape of some of these letters, as has already been briefly described in the previous section. From the point of ethnic identity, this will have meant that a text written in the Faliscan alphabet may have been a marker of this identity: it may even have been regarded as such by its users, as may appear from its use in LF/Lat 214.

When the Faliscan inscriptions were discovered in the middle of the nineteenth century (Garrucci 1854, 1860) there was nothing short of marvel at the new orthography with its sinistroverse ductus and its until then unknown sign for \( f \), the ‘arrow-\( f \)’. Many of the early studies were preoccupied with the alphabet, as it had several features that were alien to the Latin and Etruscan alphabets. Interest in the alphabet largely ceased after the establishment of the Faliscan alphabet and its orthographic conventions in the studies of Thulin (1907) and Herbig (CIE). In the last decennia, much study has been devoted to the development of the earliest alphabets of Central Italy, which may shed new light on the development of the Faliscan alphabet and its relations to the other early alphabets of the surrounding areas: in view of the scope of this study, which is linguistic, I discuss the origin of the alphabet only briefly.

11.2.2. The origins of the Faliscan alphabet. The Faliscan alphabet, from its earliest occurrences onwards, differed markedly from the Etruscan, and, to a lesser degree, from the Latin alphabet, not just in the shape of the letters, but also in the letters that it consisted of. The discussion of the origins of the Faliscan and Latin alphabets has therefore concentrated on whether these alphabets were developed directly from a West Greek prototype, independently from the Etruscan adaptations of the Greek alphabet, or were derived from an early Etruscan alphabet that acted as an intermediary, and not directly from a Greek model. The differences between the Faliscan and on the Etruscan alphabets must therefore be taken into account.

(I) The occlusive series. The (West) Greek alphabet from which the Etruscan, Latin and Faliscan alphabets were all (ultimately) derived must had three sets of signs for three occlusive series, i.e., the voiceless \( \pi \tau \kappa \), the voiced series \( \beta \delta \gamma \), and the voiceless aspirated series \( \varphi \theta \chi \). In addition, it also contained \( \varphi \), which must already have been a lettre morte as the Greek dialects had by this time long lost the labiovelar occlusives.

The Etruscan, Latin, and Faliscan writing systems all adopted \( \gamma \) as \( c \), which became the regular sign for /\( k \)/ (see below). All three writing systems also adopted \( \kappa \) as \( k \) and \( \varphi \) as \( q \), and these signs were originally similarly used to denote /\( k \)/. Three signs for the same phoneme, however, proved to be an unsustainable degree of redundancy: in Etruscan, \( q \) disappeared after the earliest period, in Latin \( k \) disappeared apart from a few standardized abbreviations, while \( q \) was used only in the digram \( qu \) to denote /\( k^{\upsilon} \)/, while in Faliscan, \( q \) disappeared entirely and \( k \) was kept for onomastic abbreviations, and, later, to denote /\( g \)/ (§11.2.5.2).
The other two voiced occlusive signs, $\beta$ and $\delta$, were not adopted in the Etruscan alphabet, while in the Latin alphabet both signs were adopted as $b$ and $d$. In the Faliscan alphabet on the other hand, $d$ was retained but $b$ was not. The most important reason for this was probably phonological: /b/ must have been one of the rarest phonemes in Faliscan, for /b/ $\leftarrow$ PIE */b/ was very rare due to the rarity of PIE */b/ itself, while /b/ $\leftarrow$ PIE */b$^h$/ was absent in Faliscan, where */b$^h$/ developed into /f/ (§3.4). Another reason for the retention of $d$ and the discarding of $b$ may have been morphological: the difference between /b/ and /p/ was morphologically irrelevant, and one sign could therefore be used for both phonemes, whereas the difference between /t/ and /d/ was morphologically relevant, since it formed the distinction between the primary and secondary endings of the third singular, /-t/ and /-d/ (§5.2.4.1-2).

The signs $\varphi$ $\theta$ $\chi$ that were present in the Greek model were adopted in the Etruscan, but not in the Latin or the Faliscan alphabet: although $\theta$ occasionally occurs in inscriptions in the Faliscan alphabet, there is no indication that the Faliscan alphabet retained $\theta$ as a lettre morte or an alternative to $t$ or $d$ (§11.2.5.3, §3.5.4).

(2) The letters $u$ $v$ $f$. Another difference between the Etruscan, Latin, and Faliscan alphabet were the letters $u$, $v$ and $f$. Here, the model alphabet contained a sign $\upsilon$ and a sign $\tau$, and no sign for /f/. The Etruscan alphabet followed this model closely in using $\upsilon$ as $u$, and $\tau$ as $v$; beside these two, a separate sign was developed for /f/. Latin and Faliscan differed from Etruscan in that they used $\upsilon$ for both /u/ and /$\upsilon$/; they differed from each other in that Latin used $\tau$ as $f$ /$\upsilon$/, while Faliscan had a separate sign for $f$, the `arrow-$f$' $\uparrow$, probably developed from a variant of $\Phi$. This `arrow-$f$' has been regarded as emblematic of the Faliscan alphabet, so much so, in fact, that inscriptions that contain this sign have been regarded as Faliscan even when the language is clearly different (e.g. 480† and 481†; the sign has also been read in 479†). It would appear, however, that the sign was not limited to the Faliscan alphabet: the sign perhaps occurred already in the ‘Lower Tiber’ alphabet (see below), and may have been in more general use in the area of the Lower Tiber basin. The Faliscan alphabet, however, happens to be the only alphabet of which a sufficient number of documents is preserved to show that here, at least, it was the standard shape of the $f$.

In view of these differences, it seems almost impossible to assume that the Faliscans took over their alphabet from the Etruscans: as e.g. Cristofani (1972:478) concluded, they must have formed their alphabet separately from contacts with the Greeks.

Wachter (1987:14-22), however, convincingly argues against this on the basis of the so-called ‘C/K/Q-convention’, the orthographic$^{184}$ convention found in early

$^{183}$ Probably because the Latin and Faliscan alphabets retained $d$, the shape of the letter $r$ in these alphabets was never $\aleph$, as it was in Etruscan, but of always of the types $\aleph$ $\aleph$ $\aleph$.

$^{184}$ Wachter in my view rightly assumes that this convention was purely orthographical rather than due to a desire to render different phonetic realisations of /k/.
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Etruscan, Latin, and Faliscan inscriptions to use c before e and i, k before a, and q before o and u. According to him, this convention could only have arisen in Etruscan, and its occurrence in Latin and Faliscan presupposes that it was taken over, together with the alphabet, from Etruscan. In his treatment of this matter, the Greek model had π τ κ - β δ γ - φ θ χ, with θ as a lettre morte. These letters were all adopted by the Etruscans when they adopted the alphabet from the Greeks. Since the Etruscan language did not require β δ γ, these would have become additional lettres mortes. The Greek model would probably already have had a convention of using κ before α and β before o: in fact, the existence of such a convention in Greek seems to be the only clear reason why θ was preserved at all in the Greek writing system. This convention was not only adopted by the Etruscans, using k and q, but was actually expanded by using the lettre morte γ, which now became another (and in fact completely redundant) sign for /k/, namely c. This step is unlikely to have occurred in a language where β δ γ did not become lettres mortes: if the Latin and Faliscan alphabets had been derived directly from a Greek model with β δ γ, it is very difficult to see why only β δ would have been adopted and a redundant alternative sign c for /k/ created, while the obvious step would have been to employ γ as g for /g/. Note also that Latin as well as Faliscan had a phoneme /kʰ/, so that it would likewise have been a very obvious step to use the lettre morte θ to render it: something which Latin eventually did, but Faliscan did not.

A problem with Wachter’s theory is that if the Latin and Faliscan alphabets were to be derived from the (South) Etruscan alphabet in this way, there must have been a stage where the Etruscan alphabet had both the series p t c/k/q and φ θ χ, while it had not yet dropped the lettres mortes b and d. In addition to this, it must have had both u and v as well as the lettre morte o, as well as at least two signs for s, namely s and ś (X, which became the model for the Latin and Faliscan x). In short, the earliest Etruscan alphabet is assumed to have consisted of (at least) a e i o u - p t c/k/q - b d - φ θ χ - m n l r - s ś z - v, containing at least three lettres mortes, namely o b d, and two redundant letters, namely c and q.

Although this looks rather strained, there are two early alphabetaries from the Faliscan-Capenate area that appear to point to the existence of just such an alphabet:

ET Fa 9.1=Etr I from Narce (mid-seventh century)

dextroverse:  a b c d e v z h? θ i k

ET Fa 9.2=Etr XLIV from Capena (seventh century)

dextroverse:  a b c d e v z h θ i k s i * p? * q? χ f u

Neither the order of the signs nor the choice of signs is in accordance with the conventional Etruscan alphabet. Pandolfini (in Pandolfini & Prosdocimi 1990:90-4) in

---

185 According to Wachter (1987:17 n.33), even this part of the C/K/Q-convention may already have existed in the Greek model, as the oldest reported name of γ was γέμμα.
fact treats the second alphabetary separately as non-Etruscan, and the first as Etruscan
only because the same vase is inscribed with the Etruscan (?) word *ara*. Although
both alphabets appear to be incomplete and the second is damaged in the second half,
they give *p? k/c/q? bd θγ* (and perhaps *φ*): not only that, they also contain both *v* and
*u*, and in addition, an *f* that appears to be *↔*, an early form of the arrow-*f*. It is very
interesting to see that this *f* is added *at the end* of the alphabet (where new signs were
added), while the alphabet still contained *v* as well.

Signs similar to those appearing in these alphabetaries appear in the seventh-
century Sabellic (‘Palaeoumbrian’) inscriptions from Poggio Sommavilla, Um 2, and
Magliano Sabino, Um 3, and in the La Tolfia inscription Um 4=Sab 480† (c.530-525).
Together with the Narce and Capena alphabetaries, they point to an alphabet used in
the basin of the Lower Tiber which may have been the direct source of the Faliscan,
the Latin, and the early Sabellic alphabet, and which shows several of the features
required by Wachter’s reconstruction. Interestingly, the form of the *f* differs in these
three alphabets: Latin has a digram */FH* (perhaps indicating that this alphabet was
adapted at an earlier stage than the other two, when there was not yet a separate sign
for *f*), later switching to */F*, while Faliscan has */↔* from the earliest inscriptions onwards
and shows no traces of ever having had a digram. The early Sabellic inscriptions,
however, show */↔* in Um 4=Sab 480†, but (Etruscan?) 8 in Um 2. If the sign */↔*
remained in use in the not epigraphically attested Sabellic languages along the Lower
Tiber, this could explain its occurrence in the (much later) inscription Lat (?) 481†
from Foglia, near Magliano Sabino.

In view of the subject of this study, the importance of this section on the origin of the
Faliscan alphabet is relatively small. Yet the origins and adaptations of the early
alphabets of the Lower Tiber basin show that the ager Faliscus was independent
enough from the Etruscan cultural-linguistic influence to develop an alphabet of its
own, and was likewise independent enough from the remainder of the Latin-speaking
area to have done so separately.

11.2.3. Alphabet and orthography of the Early Faliscan inscriptions. The base
Faliscan alphabet of the archaic period therefore consisted of the letters *a c d e f h i k l
m n o p q r s t u x z*. 186 For the shape of these letters in the Early Faliscan inscrip-
tions, see fig.11.1. *B* and *θ* do not occur in the Early Faliscan texts, and, although they
occasionally occur in the Middle and Late Faliscan texts (§11.2.4, §11.2.5.3), I think
this was due to influence from other orthographic traditions, not because they were
*lettres mortes* in the Faliscan alphabet.

186 Note that I give the letters in the order of a modern Latin alphabet: there are no Faliscan
alphabetaries that show us whether Faliscan followed the Etruscan or the Latin alphabetical
order, or an order of its own.
The Early Faliscan texts show the following orthographic features:

1) **Ductus.** The ductus is dextroverse in the oldest inscriptions, but quite early on (already by the end of the sixth century) it changes to sinistroverse (see fig.11.1), as in the Etruscan inscriptions. The Latin alphabet made the reverse shift more or less during the same period.

2) **The C/K/Q-convention.** In EF 1 this convention is observed: this inscription has ceres, soçi[iai], arcentelom, karai, as well as f[f]iqod and eqo where q in all probability represents /g/. Similarly EF 467* has eqo. In EF 3, 4, and 7, the convention is partially observed: EF 3 has quto, but also eco; EF 4 has sociai, kapena, kaleptia, and kaios, but also qe in seiteiofetegemeneses*eie; EF 7 has both kaisiosio and eko. The convention is not observed in EF 6, which has eko, and in EF 9, which has fifiked. It is perhaps significant that in most cases where the C/K/Q-convention is not observed, this involves cases where the phoneme rendered is not /k/, but /g/. Apart from the unintelligible seiteiofetegemeneses*eie, all the ‘deviations’ are cases where /g/ has to be represented: eco EF 3, eko EF 6, 7, fifiked EF 9. This may be part of an early tendency to represent /g/ in some way. In the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions, there are occasional tendencies to use k for /g/ (§11.2.5.2).

3) **Double letters.** There is no indication that the double consonants or long vowels were expressed in writing. (Note that there are no words where this may be expected.)

4) **Word-division.** The use of interpunction in this period is irregular. EF/Etr 5, EF 8, and EF 10 consist of one word only; EF 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 467* consist of two or more words, but have no interpunction at all, although in EF 3 a double interpunct : was added to divide the beginning and the end of this circular inscription. EF 1 and EF 2 use a triple interpunct ;, but there appears to be no recognisable consistency in its use:

```
```

Interpunct 1 appears to separate the nomen divinum from the rest of the text, while interpuncts 4-5 and 5-7 appear to enclose sentences. Interpunct 9 on the other hand appears to separate the main verb from the rest of the sentence (?), while interpunct 10 appears to have been used to separate the reduplicative syllable from the root of the verb (cf. vhepréhk CIL I2.3). The aim of interpuncts 3, 6, and 8 is unclear. The interpunction in this inscription has also been explained as indicating metric cola (Radke 1994:106-8), but I do not find this convincing. The use of the interpunct in EF 3, propramom 1: pramed [u]mom pramed pramed umom 2: pramed propramod 3: pramod umof[m] is unclear.

5) **The use of z.** For the use of z in z[e]xtos EF 1, which may or may not render a specific allophone of /s/, see §3.5.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>dextroverse ductus</th>
<th>sinistroverse ductus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A     A   A   A   A</td>
<td>α    α    α    α   α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>c     c     c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>d     d     d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ε     ε     ε     ε</td>
<td>ε     ε     ε     ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I     I     I     I</td>
<td>I     I     I     I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Ϛ     Ϛ     Ϛ     Ϛ</td>
<td>Ϛ     Ϛ     Ϛ     Ϛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>λ     λ     λ     λ</td>
<td>λ     λ     λ     λ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>m     m     m     m</td>
<td>m     m     m     m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>m     m     m     m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>o     o     o     o</td>
<td>o     o     o     o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>ρ     ρ     ρ     ρ</td>
<td>ρ     ρ     ρ     ρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>θ     θ     θ     θ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>ρ     ρ     ρ     ρ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Σ     Σ     Σ     Σ</td>
<td>Σ     Σ     Σ     Σ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>τ     τ     τ     τ</td>
<td>τ     τ     τ     τ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>υ     υ     υ     υ</td>
<td>υ     υ     υ     υ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Χ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>ι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig.11.1. The alphabets of the Early Faliscan inscriptions.*
11.2.4. The alphabet of the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions. Between the Early Faliscan and the Middle Faliscan periods, the Faliscan alphabet undergoes several changes. Unfortunately, due to the lack of material from the fifth and early fourth centuries, the process of these changes itself cannot be documented.

(1) Ductus. The most obvious change is the change in ductus. Already during the Early Faliscan period there appears to be a change from dextroverse to sinistroverse, and in the Middle Faliscan inscriptions the normal ductus is sinistroverse. There are a few exceptions to this, most notably the late fourth-century MF 62, where the dextroverse ductus is regarded as an archaism by Wachter (1987:367-9). Since there change to sinistroverse ductus started in the sixth century, I doubt whether this is possible: it may be that the ductus ‘fluctuated’. Several other inscriptions of the Middle and Late Faliscan periods also show dextroverse ductus, most notably MF? 129 (in the Faliscan alphabet). Other examples are MF? 28, 68, 76, 78, 131, 283, MF 373-375, MF/LtF 21, 253, MLF/LtF 241, and MLF/Cap 474*; all written in what can be either the Faliscan or the Latin alphabet, although the assumption that the inscription might be in the Latin alphabet is in several cases based on the dextroverse ductus.

(2) Shapes of the letters. When compared with the Early Faliscan inscriptions, a few letters have quite different shapes in the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions, as is noted below. The general shape of the Faliscan letters appears to be more rounded, and not just in the inscriptions that are painted: those that are scratched in pottery items or cut into the rock, too, seem to emulate more rounded forms, perhaps implying that the normal way of writing was now the pen rather than the stylus (cf. Cencetti 1957:188). One inscription, LtF 140, in fact very much gives the impression of having been written with a reed-pen rather than having been painted with a brush. With regard to the shapes of the individual letters, the following can be said:

A. (The basic shape of the a evolved from Early Faliscan Α and ά, to Middle Faliscan Ά, usually written with a slightly convex left side as Ά. This in turn led to the variant Ά, with the transverse bar sticking out to the left: a very common, if not the commonest shape in the Middle Faliscan inscriptions. As this could also be written as Ά, the distinction between this letter and the r, ά, became less obvious, and there are several inscriptions where Ά and ά were confused (e.g. in MF 57). In a few inscriptions, such as MF 101, a new type of a appears, Ί, apparently not so much a correction of r to a but an independent variant, drawn, like ά, in two strokes, with a connecting bar. Interestingly, this sign, too, is used as r in MF 59-60, beside the normal ά. (2) A second development that affects the a is the occurrence of cursive forms like Α, Λ, Λ, Λ, and Λ. Although these have been ascribed to Latin influence, they appear in inscriptions that show no other signs of Latin influence, and Cencetti (1957:195-8) has shown that some of these forms may have originated at a very early date, when direct Latin influence in the ager Faliscus cannot have been very great. If
these forms did indeed develop within Faliscan, the development of the Faliscan a in fact provides another indication for their early date, since they can be derived much easier from the original ∂ than from ∂. MF 79 and MF 111 in fact show a peculiar form ∂, which may be an early Faliscan cursive form of the a derived from ∂.

B. As in the Early Faliscan inscriptions, there is no indication of the presence of b in the Faliscan writing system, with the exception of tito · batio MLF 359. Unfortunately, this inscription is very badly documented, and there are no reports of the shape of this b (or even whether the inscription is written in the Faliscan alphabet at all). On this basis, it cannot be assumed that Faliscan had preserved b as a lettre morte. The use of b was apparently so rare that even in the Latin inscription Lat 219 from between c. 120-50, the name Umbricius is spelled as umpricius, perhaps a deliberate archaism recalling the original Faliscan spelling of the name.

C. The C/K/Q-convention of the Early Faliscan inscriptions having disappeared, c is the standard sign both for the voiceless dorsal occlusive /k/ and the voiced dorsal occlusive /g/, and is used in the digram cu for the voiceless labiovelar occlusive /kтип/ (§11.2.5.1). The shape is always ∂, although in some scratched graffiti it is ∂.

D. No specific developments or features. The shape is ∂ (see also under Θ).

E. The normal e in the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions is either ∂ (as it had already been in the Early Faliscan inscriptions) or ∂. A few inscriptions have ∂, which could be a simple error were it not for the fact that it recurs several times (in MF/Etr 64, MF 258, MLF 285). Beside these shapes, however, there are three other types of e that are ‘cursive’. (1) The most numerous of these variants is the cursive e also known from Latin inscriptions, ll (see Cencetti 1957:190-3). (2) A probably Etruscan form ∂ occurs in MF/Etr 267 and Etr XXXIV (and also in Etr XLV?). Peruzzi (1964c:228) suggested that this may have formed the basis for ll. (3) A very rare form ∂ appears in MF 146 (which also has an h of the type ∂) and Lat 483† from Ardea, which on these grounds has been regarded as Faliscan.

F. The sign for f in the alphabet of the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions is always the ‘arrow-f’, ∂. This letter is in fact one of the distinguishing features between the Faliscan alphabet (where the f was ∂), the Etruscan alphabet (where it was 8), and the Latin alphabet (where it was F). The Etruscan type only occurs in Etruscan inscriptions, the Latin only in Latin inscriptions.

[G. Like the alphabet of the Early Faliscan inscriptions, the alphabet of the Middle Faliscan inscriptions shows no separate sign to render /g/, although there are several inscriptions where k is used in this way (see under K). Two points of note with regard to g are adduced by Girard (1989:169): (1) the curious spellings gonlegium, uolgani, gondecorant in Lat 217, explained by him as due to a Faliscan struggling with the correct use of an unfamiliar sign (which disregards the fact that in the Faliscan
alphabet /g/ could in fact be rendered by k), and (2) the fact that the introduction of g in the Latin alphabet was ascribed by Plutarch (Quaest. 54) to the same Sp. Caruilius Ruga who subjugated Falerii in 293 (§2.5.2).

**H.** The normal shape of the h in the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions is θ. There are a few variants, however: (1) some inscriptions show Ν or Ν, probably a simplification of θ (or perhaps inspired by the shape of the Latin H). It would be surprising if this sign was much used, however, as it had the same shape as the Faliscan sign for n. (2) A different (cursive?) h, τ, is found in MF 146: this is also the only Faliscan inscription that has an e of the type η (see under E).

**I.** In the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions, the sign for i is 1, as it had been in the Early Faliscan inscriptions.

**K.** The k returns in several inscriptions, now always as θ and no longer as θ. Since the c/k/q-convention has disappeared, its use is now special: see §11.2.5.2.

**L.** The sign for l is J keeps its old form, although J appears from time to time.

**M.** The basic shape of the m in the Faliscan alphabet is Μ, as opposed to the Μ and Μ of the alphabet of the Early Faliscan inscriptions. The shape Μ, although the usual shape in the contemporary Etruscan inscriptions, is quite rare, occurring in fact only in MF 269 and MF 272 from Corchiano. Both these inscriptions also show other Etruscan features: see §9.2.3c-d.

**N.** The shape of n in the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions is Ν, as opposed to the Ν or Ν of the Early Faliscan inscriptions. This Ν is always written upright: the slanting Ν only occurs in Latin inscriptions from the area.

**O.** The letter o is often painted or written in two strokes as O, which could be called ‘cursive’. Variants where the o is open at the bottom or the top are therefore found. In inscriptions that are scratched or cut into the rock, the o is often diamond-shaped or polygonal. Cencetti (1957:189) regarded this as a distinct cursive type, which is well possible especially in the more open variants.

**P.** The normal form of p is Π, beside rare occurrences of Π and Π.

[Q. The Faliscan alphabet as used in the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions did not contain a q. (As was the case also in the contemporary Etruscan alphabet, and in a sense also in the Latin alphabet where the q was restricted to the digram qu. The Faliscan orthography used cu, not qu, for /kw/.)]

**R.** In Middle Faliscan, the shape of r is Ρ, one of the differences between the Faliscan and the Etruscan alphabet (see note 183). The shape is very similar to that of a, which was Ρ or Ρ, and the two signs are sometimes confused (see under a). For the erroneous notion that in MF 59-60 Ρ represents [z] (Sittig 1932, Belardi 1964), see §3.5.3.
S. The s of the middle Faliscan alphabet is always ꞌz ꞌz ꞌz. Apparent instances of ꞌz in Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions are in every case due to accidents or careless writing: there is no indication that the sign continued to be used. A very common feature of Faliscan inscriptions is the reversal of the s to ꞌς ꞌς ꞌς: this in fact occurs so frequently that I do not enumerate the instances here, but only indicate it under the individual inscriptions. See also under Z.

T. The sign for t has three forms that all occur frequently, namely ꞌt ꞌt ꞌt. There does not appear to be a chronology in their use.

Θ. The instances of θ in Faliscan inscriptions are few, and probably due to orthographic influence from Etruscan. (For the discussion of the possibility that θ rendered an allophone of /t/, see §3.5.4.) The sign is usually θ with a central point, probably to avoid confusion with o (note that in the Etruscan inscriptions from the area, where this confusion could not arise, the sign usually appears as O), as in θanía MF 81, uesti MF 83, sáltan MF/Etr 77, and arθ[3-5]re MF/Etr 267, but θ without central point in uolθeo MF 276: I have suggested that this shape also appears in hθi MF 13. Three instances, known only from apographs, are unclear: θanacuil MF 49 (θ given both as Θ and as θ), [---]nθia MLF 212 (θ given as Ω), senθia MLF 362 (θ given as Ω). In two inscriptions (MF 49 and MF 276) the shape of θ resembles that of δ.

U. As in the Early Faliscan inscriptions, the sign for u in the Middle Faliscan alphabet is V. In careless writing, the two strokes may become separated, or they may be written too close together, so that confusion with x sometimes arises.

Z. The z is found in several inscriptions. Like s, it can be reversed. It is unclear whether or not the use of z denotes a different sound than [s], or whether the variation is merely orthographic: see §3.5.3.

11.2.5. Orthographic conventions in the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions. In the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions, the following orthographic conventions can be observed:

1) The use of cu. In the Middle and Late Faliscan periods, cu is used to render the labiovelar occlusive: -cue MF 80, -cœ MF 158, -cœ MF 170, -cœ MF 313; cuicto MLF 310 (and perhaps cuitenet MLF 361); (3) in cuestod LF 242, cues[tor] LF 243, cues[tor] LF 245, cues[tor] LF 247; θanacuil MF 49, tanacuil MF 101, θanacuil MLF 347; cuo MF 129.

2) The use of k. Whereas in the Early Faliscan inscriptions k was used in the C/K/Q-convention, its use in the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions appears to have been twofold:

(a) k was used to render /g/, as in kreco MF 147 = ‘Graecus’, kset LF 242 and kse[t LF 243 = ‘gessit’, and Ekn in LF 246, most likely a form of the name Egnati-.
(b) *k* was also used in the name *kaif[si]fo* MF 51, and as an abbreviation of a praenomen *k* Cap 388, 390, 404, Lat 218, and perhaps Cap 403. In both these cases the use of *k* is quite clearly a specific convention, the use of a sign that has no normal function as a letter.

(c) The use of *k* in *nuiku* MF? 202 and [--]*a* kitue*a* LF 234 is unclear.

(3) The use of θ. Although θ does not appear to have been a letter of the Faliscan alphabet, it occurs in several inscriptions: ᾱϑεθι (?) MF 42, ᾱθανακιί MF 49, ᾱθανία MF 81, ᾱεσθι MF 83, salθαν MF/Etr 77, [--]ν الصحيا MF 212, arθ[3-5]ře MF/Etr 267, uolθεο MF 276, and senthiia MF 362. I assume that this is an orthographic variation only: see, however, §3.5.4.

(4) The use of z. In a number of cases, z is used instead of s: word-initially in ze̅xtos EF 1 and zextoi LF 330; zot MF 285; zenatuo LF/Lat 214; in names: zaconio MF 153 and zaconiai MF 154; zuconia MF 271 and perhaps Zu[con]eo MF 56; zeruatronia MF 272; word-internally in zertenea LF 221; fulceo LF 329, folcozeo LF 330; and *olcezo LF 332 vs. folcosio LF 333; and word-finally in aruz MF 257, morenez MF 269, and perhaps acerz MF/Etr 67. There is a possibility that z represents [z] in at least some of these cases, although I tend to regard most of them as influenced by Etruscan orthography: this is discussed in §3.5.3.

(5) Doubling of vowel or consonant signs. The doubling of signs to express a long vowel or a long or double consonant is exceedingly rare. Doubling of vowels is in fact not attested for inscriptions in the Faliscan alphabet except for LF/Lat 214 (c.150?) which has wootum: this case can be ascribed to the orthographic influence of contemporary Latin. Doubling of consonants likewise appears to be connected with the Latin rather than the Faliscan alphabet, in cases such as an[ni] LF 63: the only exceptions are four cases of doubling of *l* in uollia MF 47, uoll[--] MF 86, putellio MF 156, and lullio MF 207. R. Giacomelli (2006:91-3) has suggested that this may represent palatalization: see §3.5.5.3.

(6) Interpunction. Word-division in the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions is by : or ;, and a few inscriptions also use ‘stroke-interpuncts’ ɿ and ꅱ (i.e., short or long vertical stroke used as an interpunct). Interpunction is not always used consistently: several types of interpunction may appear in one text, and interpunction may be used after one word but omitted after another within the same text. At the end of a line interpunction is usually omitted.

(7) Line ends. The Middle and Late Faliscan texts appear to avoid breaking off words at the end of the line, preferring either to start the next word on a new line, or to write the last letters downward, above or below the line as dictated by the available space. Words divided over more than one line are found in larise : mar||cna : citiai MF 270 (where the text then continues on the line above it), tito : uel|mioneo : iun|ai j*ice MLF
and popli[o] | uelm[ino MLF 316, and probably also in MF 56, LF 243, and LtF 231. An actual hyphen has erroneously been read in MF 336.

(8) **Graphic contraction.** There are a few instances of graphic contraction in the Middle Faliscan inscriptions. Most of these involve u, which could stand for u(o): utilities MF/Etr 64 (= u(o)lties?), tuconu MF 85 (= t u(e)conu?), uli MF? 261-262 (= u(e)li?) perhaps also mar||cna = marc(e)na MF 270 and fulczeo = fulc(o)zeo LF 329, if these are not a syncopated forms or simply errors. From the ager Capenas are pscni = p(e)sc(e)ni Cap 387 and fertrio = fert(o)rio Cap 391.

(9) **Reversed letters indicating women’s names.** In a few inscriptions, women’s names are marked by reversing the initial letter. The instances are: Σa : u[euli]a | ca : e[ca]nata : thania MF 81, ca · uncineo | Σa · mania LF 225, tito [:] acarcelnio : | ma : fi · θop · θetrumes · ce · f | [h]e cu[pa] LF 226, θoła marcia : sus[?---] LF 227, [---]rcius · J · l | [fer]oneae | [l] m Cap 436, and Σa · e**sa Cap 458. Note that with the exception of MF 81, this feature appear to be associated with the Late Faliscan period and with the ager Capenas: it may therefore be due to Latin influence.

### 11.3. The use of the Etruscan and Latin alphabets

In the ager Faliscus and Capenas, the Faliscan alphabet was not the only one in use (cf. §11.1.5): from the earliest period onward, inscriptions written in the Etruscan alphabet occur in the area, and it is likely that this was also the first writing system in the area (cf. §11.2.2).

However, although there are occasional indications of Etruscan orthographic interference in the use of θ and z in texts written in the Faliscan alphabet, on the whole both writing systems not only remained quite distinct, but they also appear to have been quite firmly associated with the languages for which they were developed. Although this cannot be used as an *a priori*, a study of the documents in this edition shows that where both the alphabet and the language of the inscription can be clearly distinguished, texts that show Faliscan phonological, morphological and lexical features are virtually always written in the Faliscan alphabet, using Faliscan orthographic conventions, while the texts that show Etruscan phonological, morphological and lexical features are virtually always written in the Etruscan alphabet, using Etruscan orthographic conventions. There are very few clear exceptions to this, the clearest being umrie Etr XLIII, where the alphabet is Faliscan but the phonology and the morphology Etruscan. However, this is an exception to the rule. The texts show that these two writing systems were quite firmly linked to their respective languages, more, perhaps, than would be expected in an area where contacts between speaker and writers of both languages must have been frequent (§9.2.1).
The situation is different where the Latin alphabet is concerned. The Latin writing system is not present from the earliest date, and neither can the frequent occurrence of cursive letters in Middle Faliscan inscriptions be counted as an indication of its presence in the area: these may have arisen independently within other orthographic traditions, as Cencetti (1957, cf. pp.190-2 on Faliscan) suggested. Exactly when the Latin writing system came to be used in the ager Faliscus is very hard to establish (as opposed to assuming that its introductions took place after, and as a consequence of, the war of 241). The first inscription in the Latin alphabet that can be dated is med · loulilios · feced Lat 268 on a fourth-century bronze strigilis found at Corchiano, but this was probably an import. Several Latin inscriptions appear on imports, and cannot be used to document the introduction of the Latin writing system, apart from the assumption that people were able to read these texts. The inscriptions in the Latin alphabet that were written within the ager Faliscus, i.e. sepulchral inscriptions and roadside inscriptions, cannot be dated with certainty. What, for instance, are the implications of LtF 140 and 171-174, sepulchral inscriptions written in the Latin alphabet found at Civita Castellana, a town assumed to have been (virtually?) abandoned after the war of 241-240? Do these inscriptions imply that the Latin writing system was used at Civita Castellana before c.240, or, conversely, that burials around the town continued in the period after c.240, when the introduction of the Latin alphabet can more easily be imagined? In any case, the Latin writing system was present in the new Roman Falerii (S. Maria di Falleri), where it was used by a craftsman signing his work (LtF 216), in public dedications (LtF 217-218), and in several undated sepulchral inscriptions (LtF 231-233). Exactly when the Latin writing system completely ousted the Faliscan one is a question that cannot be answered. The last datable inscription written in the Faliscan alphabet appears to be LF/LtF 214, which is usually dated to c.150 BCE, but in this inscription the use of the Faliscan alphabet may already have been an archaism.

11.4. A note on the presentation of the inscriptions

As has been said (§1.1), the present study is a linguistic one. The aim of the edition is therefore (a) to facilitate access to the material on which the linguistic discussions and conclusions are based, and (b) to justify and discuss the readings and interpretations that I have used. The aim has not been to present a fully epigraphic edition. For the commentary, this means that the discussion usually focuses on what can be read and what not and what can be used as data and what not.

The edition includes all inscriptions from the ager Faliscus and the ager Capenas that consist of more than one letter, whether in the Faliscan, Etruscan, or Latin alphabet, and whether assumed to be in the Faliscan, Etruscan or Latin language, from
the earliest documents to the early first century BCE, as well as a number of inscriptions of unknown or uncertain provenance that have been regarded as Faliscan. For the ordering of the inscriptions according to provenance, see §11.1.2; for the division in ‘period/alphabet groups’, see §11.1.3; for a division according to type of inscription, see §11.1.4; for a division according to alphabet, see §11.1.5.

The organization of the presentation in each case consists of the following five elements (sometimes very briefly, depending on the available data):

(1) **Introduction.** For each locality, and, in the cases of Civita Castellana and Corchiano, for each site, a brief overview of the location is given, with references to its excavation history where this is relevant. As explained in §1.4.5, in some cases the excavation history and the provenance of the inscriptions may not be beyond doubt.

(2) **Description of the object.** Each lemma starts with a description of the object and the way it has been written, where possible with measurements. Note the following:

(a) in the case of tiles, the *front* is the flanged side and the *back* the non-flanged side (cf. §11.1.4.1c). The length is given first, then the width, irrespective of whether the tile is inscribed across or lengthwise. *Across* means that the inscription is written from one flanged side to the other; *lengthwise*, that it is written between the flanges.

(b) in the case of tile fragments, the maximum height and width are given. If preceded by the word ‘total’, measures are taken across several adjoining fragments.

(c) in the case of pottery or pottery fragments, the measures given are height and diameter (⌀), the latter measured at the rim unless indicated otherwise.

(d) in the case of inscriptions painted on or cut in a rock-face, the height and length given are those of the inscribed surface.

These descriptions are followed, where possible, by an approximate dating, and remarks on the provenance, history, or authenticity of the item; if an inscription is known only through apographs, this is also noted here.

(3) **Text of the inscription**, using the following signs and conventions as given in *Conventions in the representation of epigraphic texts* (p.LII).

(4) **Discussion** of the reading of the text and/or its interpretation. As I said, the aim of this discussion is to establish the reading of the text and, where possible, enough of its interpretation to use the text as data in the linguistic discussions in part I (chapters 2-10). Note that when rendering letters of the inscription in the text, the use of printable *symbols* indicates that the letter is of a specific but recognizable type (e.g. 𐀌, 𐀍, or 𐀎 for א), while the use of a *drawing* indicates either (a) that the letter is either of a unique shape or variant, or (b) that I intend to render the drawing made by a specific editor of the text.
(5) References. Each inscription is followed by a bibliography that at least contains all editions, as well as publications where the object, the inscription, or its contents are discussed or referred to in a way that is considered relevant. In the reference section, the following elements and symbols are used:

A large number of inscriptions are published from autopsy. The year of the autopsy is given, followed by an abbreviation of the museum where the autopsy was done and the number or numbers of the inscribed objects in the inventory.

Bibliography: Bibliographical references are presented in chronological order. When at a certain point the data were substantially altered (e.g. by the discovery of a new part of the text), the bibliography has been divided into sections numbered (I), (II), etc. References to publications that I was unable to consult are preceded by †: if I had indirect access to these publications, e.g. because they are quoted or discussed by other authors, this is explained in the text. References between square brackets [ ] refer to publications where the inscription is mentioned but no text is given (e.g. in archaeological discussions of the inscribed object or in catalogues). The word (autopsy) following a reference indicates that the publication is based on an autopsy by the author: later publications by the same author are so marked only if a new autopsy took place, as explained in the text. Numbers between pointed brackets ⟨ ⟩ following a reference represent the number given to the text in that edition.

Since illustrations have been kept to a minimum, references are given to all published photographs or drawings that I was able to find. Only if to my knowledge no photographs or drawings have been published are references made to transcriptions, that is, reproductions of the text in appropriate font types, popular especially among earlier editors. If an illustration was reproduced in a later edition, this is referred to as (reproduced in ... ) following the reference to the original. In cases where authors have used a common source, such as the archive of the Soprintendenza, I have used the sign = to indicate that the photographs in these publications are identical.
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