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13.1. Civita Castellana and its inscriptions

Like many South Etrurian towns, Falerii was situated on a spit of land enclosed by deep river-gorges. On the eastern side, a narrow saddle connects the site of the modern town with the Colle di Vignale, the place of the oldest settlement and probably of the Faliscan arx. Both hills are surrounded by the wide but steep valleys of the Rio Filetto to the south and of the Treia to the east, and by the sheer-sided ravine of the Rio Maggiore to the north. A short history of the town has been given in §2.4-6. The results of the many excavations at Civita Castellana have mostly been published in *FI* II.2: a more recent overview may be found in Moscati 1990.

Civita Castellana yields the great majority of the Faliscan inscriptions, even allowing for errors in the attribution (cf. §1.4.5). Most of the inscriptions are from the necropoles along the ancient roads radiating from the town. A smaller number comes from the various temple sites (§14.2). I have tied the dating of the inscriptions from Civita Castellana to the apparent desertion of the town after the war of 241 BC (§1.4.4, §11.1.3), classing all inscriptions from Civita Castellana as Middle Faliscan unless there are reasons to suppose otherwise. There are indications that some of the temples remained in use until the second century, and at least two inscriptions from the temple sites (LF 112 and LtF 131) appear to belong to this period. Families owning tombs near the old town may also have continued to use these: the sepulchral inscriptions in the Latin alphabet, LtF 140 and 171-174, may belong to such late burials. Another inscription apparently in the Latin alphabet is MF/LtF 21.

13.2. The necropolis of Contrada Le Colonnette

Contrada Le Colonnette lies to the northeast of Civita Castellana, on the other side of the Rio Maggiore, a little to the north of the station of the Roma-Viterbo railway line. From there, an ancient hollow road leads down to the Fossa dei Cappuccini and the temple of Contrada Celle. The discovery of Faliscan remains in this area by Count Feroldi de Rosa (cf. Del Frate 1898:72-3), including the discovery, in 1873, of the small fourth- to second-century temple known as the ‘Ninfeo Rosa’ (cf. Eroli 1875, Pasqui 1887:93 n.1, and Blanck 1990), led to an excavation in the necropolis in 1890. This
excavation, published in *FI* II.2 pp.206-10, yielded the ‘Ceres-inscription’ EF 1 (§12.2) and MF 14; MF 15-19 were discovered by Mengarelli during the 1880s and 1890s (cf. Thulin 1907:264).

11-12. Cut, 11 to the right (letters c.9 cm high) and 12 to the left (letters c.8 cm high) of the entrance to a tomb.

\[ uolti\text{teti} \]
\[ cauvio\text{pauiceo} \]
\[ [o]c\text{jes}\text{cela} \]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The interpunct in 11 consists of a vertical stroke: see §11.2.4. The first line of 12 turns around a corner in the rock-face after *paui*. Following the lacuna, Thulin’s drawing shows only a small part of a shaft. – *Uolti teti* may be an abbreviated nominative (Herbig) or a genitive (Vetter, G. Giacomelli): see §8.8.1. Both Thulin and Herbig asserted from autopsy that the first word of 12 is *cauio*. If this is not an error for the very frequent *cauo* (the same error of *J* for *l* occurs in MF 32), it can be compared to Etruscan *Caule*, Latin *Caulius* (Herbig); Thulin’s and Vetter’s Etruscan *Cavili*, and Latin *Cavilius, Gavilius, or Gavillus* assume a syncope that is not in accordance with Faliscan phonology (§3.6.6.2). The name *Pauicius* occurs also in *ce paui[ceo ru?]so* in LtF 290. The restoration *[[oc]jes]* goes back to Herbig (CIE), although similar restorations had been proposed earlier by Thulin and Herbig (1910).

The problem of this inscription is its awkward syntax. *[[oc]jes]*, probably a genitive (see §9.2.4.4), belongs with *caulo : pauiceo*, ‘Gavius Pavicius [son] of Lucius’: taking it with *cela* would give ‘Lucius’ tomb’, but when a person is designated as the owner of a tomb, the expected onomastic formula would be *PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM* (as in the other inscriptions of this type, MF 84-84 and MLF 285), not *PRAENOMEN*: cf. §7.3. Even more problematic is the syntactic relation between the nominatives *cauvio : pauiceo* and *cela* (unless Herbig’s and Buonamici’s very improbable interpretation of *cela* as a cognomen is adopted, cf. §7.9.1.5). Thulin pointed to the similar lack of congruence in *poplia : calitines aronto : cesies larto : uxor* MF 265 (cf. §9.2.4.4), but his alternative, taking *caulo : pauiceo* (as he read it) as a dative (‘C.P. Lucii [filio] cella’) is unattractive, as comparable inscriptions have either the nominative or the genitive (§8.8.1, §11.1.4,1.a). Vetter and G. Giacomelli adopted Thulin’s suggestion that the lines *cauvio : pauiceo : and [[oc]jes : cela* belonged to two different inscriptions. This is not impossible, in spite of the interpunt after *pauiceo*, but the second text, *[[oc]jes : cela*, can then hardly be complete.210

I have considered combining these inscriptions as

---

THE INSCRIPTIONS FROM CIVITA CASTELLANA (FALERII VETERES) I

13. Cut over the entrance of a tomb c.10 m to the right of the one of 11-12 is a badly legible inscription. My reading, which is in effect a guess rather than a certainty, is based on the drawings by Thulin and Herbig (reproduced in fig.13.1), and on G. Giacomelli’s photograph, which is unfortunately unclear.

---

**Fig. 13.1. Thulin’s and Herbig’s drawings and readings of MF 13.**

_left_: Thulin’s drawing and reading. (From Thulin 1907:275.)

_right_: Herbig’s drawing and reading. (From CIE 8078.)

---

**ohqotı**

**tetiatron (or tetiatronı ?)**

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. Thulin read a very narrow Ʌ before the first o, coincideing with a small edge in the stone, but Herbig’s drawing shows no such letter and he doubted its existence. The o’s are angular and pointed at the bottom, which led Thulin and Herbig to read the first o as a q in spite of the fact that the Middle Faliscan alphabet has no separate sign for q (§11.2.2-4). The third letter is ḫ, which Thulin interpreted as a ligature vi ( onViewCreated), adding a second non-Faliscan letter to the text. Thulin’s reading, with its many ligatures and qv instead of the usual Faliscan cu,211 is unaccept-

---

211 Vetter erroneously credited Thulin also with a ligature qv.
able to me. The third letter is either an \(n\) or an \(a\), but neither \(ohnoi\) nor \(ohaoi\) makes any sense. I therefore suggest that the second \(o\), and perhaps also the first, might be a \(\theta\). This letter occurs occasionally in Middle Faliscan inscriptions, and although it is virtually always written as \(\Theta\), there are parallels for the omission of the central point (see §11.2.4). This gives \(\phi\ ha\dot{b}i\) or \(\theta\ ha\dot{b}i\), with \(ha\dot{b}i\) a gentilicium comparable to Latin \(Fadius\), cf. \(cauia\ | hadenia\ MLF 360\). The second line is more legible, except for the last sign. I assume that this is \(n\); Herbig and G. Giacomelli took the elongated shaft of this letter as an \(i\) written over the \(n\), which would give the expected \(atroni\). If read in this way, the resulting \(ha\dot{b}i\) and \(teti\ atron\) are either genitives or abbreviated nominatives, perhaps rather the former, cf. \(uolti \ teti\ MF 11\), if that name is to be read in isolation.

**Bibliography:** Thulin 1907:274-5 (9) (autopsy); Herbig CIE 8078 (autopsy); Buonamici 1913:57 (10); Herbig 1914a:239 (6); Vetter 1953:296 (272); G. Giacomelli 1963:74-5 (69) (autopsy). **Photograph:** G. Giacomelli 1963 tav.VIII. **Drawings:** Thulin 1907:275 (reproduced in CIE 8078); Herbig CIE 8078.

14. Painted in red on a tile (66×40 cm, letters 7-10 cm high) from tomb CXXXVI.

\textit{cauipi:leueli}

\textit{fie\textit{la}}

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The first line bends downwards at the end, showing that the inscription occupied just one tile. Conway’s \textit{caui} is an error. Thulin interpreted the text as ‘Cauipi Leueli filia’, Herbig as ‘Gaia Vibia Levelii filia’, with \textit{uipi} as an Etruscan feminine: see §9.2.2.2a. Vetter took \textit{uipi} as the genitive of the father’s praenomen, and this has been adopted by all editors except Morandi (who followed Herbig). It is the only instance of Filiation added to of PRAENOMEN and the only instance of a Filiation consisting of PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM (§7.5.1).

**From autopsy** in the Museo di Villa Giulia, Rome (inv. 3733). **Bibliography:** Conway 1897:379 (334) (autopsy); Thulin 1907:281-2 (15) (autopsy); Herbig 1910:88-9 (8) (autopsy); Jacobsohn 1910:3 (8); Herbig CIE 8075; Buonamici 1913:58 (12); Bornmann CIL XI.7516; Vetter 1953:295 (270); G. Giacomelli 1963:73 (67) (autopsy); Pisani 1964:336 (143B); Dohrn in Helbig/Speier 1969:690 (2775) (autopsy); G. Giacomelli 1978:532 (9); FI II.2 p.207 (autopsy); Morandi 1982:58-9 (11). **Photograph:** G. Giacomelli 1963 tav.VII. **Drawings:** Herbig CIE 8075; Morandi 1982:59.

15-19. Painted\(^{212}\) inside a tomb discovered by Mengarelli “vor vielen Jahren” (Thulin 1907:264-5 with plan\(^{213}\)) but lost already in 1908 (Herbig CIE 8070-8074). The tomb belonged to the \textit{gentes Neronia} (15-16) and \textit{Firmia} (18-19): the former gentilicium also occurs at Fabbrica di Roma (LtF 325, 328) and the Grotta Porciosa site (LtF 340), the latter also at Falerii Novi (LF 213) and at Vignanello (MLF 302).

\(^{212}\) G. Giacomelli’s “scolpite nel sasso e dipinte” is a misinterpretation of Herbig’s “titulus qui a sinistra parte loculi inferioris [c.q. superiors], qui a latere dextro introitus [c.q. ingressus] ... rupi insculptus est, calce in saxo pictus”.

\(^{213}\) It is not clear how correct this plan is: the drawing of MF 15 shows two loculi to the right of the inscription, which is impossible if the plan is correct.
15. Painted in white beside a loculus.

_uolta
_ne-roni
_cafi

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The point in _ne-roni_ is accidental. _Neroni_ is an abbreviated nominative, not an Etruscan form (as Pisani suggested): see §9.2.2.2a.

_Bibliography:_ Thulin 1907:267-8 (4d,a); Herbig 1910:109 n.1; Jacobsobn 1910:3 (6); Herbig CIE 8070; Buonamici 1913:57-8 (11); Vetter 1953:294 (269a); G. Giacomelli 1963:73 (66,I); Pisani 1964:335-6 (143A). _Drawing:_ Mengarelli in Thulin 1907:267 (reproduced in CIE 8070).

16. Painted in red on plaster beside a loculus.

[......]
_ne[roni,]
_[i[......]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The second line probably consisted of a form of the gentilicium _Neronius_, although only a minimal trace of the _r_ is preserved. The third line will have contained the filiation; if the shaft that is all that is preserved of its first letter is an _i_, it may have been _i[uneo], i[unea], or i[unai · f].


17. Painted in red on plaster beside a loculus. The letters of the second line are smaller than those of the first and the third; perhaps the lines were written at different times.

-iii-[......]
_[..........]nai[?---]
_[......]ouxo

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The _l_ is _ł_, a rare form in the ager Faliscus, and associated rather with the Latin alphabet. Thulin rightly pointed to LtF 251, where _lectus_ is used in the sense ‘loculus’ or ‘place in a loculus’ (cf. §6.3.39): ‘_iii · [i[......]_ would then be ‘the third _lectus...’ or ‘three _lecti...’; cf. _lete zot xxiii ‘lecti sunt XXIII’_ MLF 285 and perhaps _let_ in MLF 361. The rest is difficult: [---]nai[ can be a dative or a genitive, but the space after _uxo_ in Mengarelli’s drawing shows that this word is apparently complete and therefore a nominative, implying that the woman’s name was likewise a nominative. (Herbig’s _uxo[rj] [sic] ignores this space.) The [....]o preceding _uxo_ is probably the genitive of the husband’s name, e.g. _f[arut]o_ or _l[art]o_ (Vetter).


18. Painted in red on plaster underneath a loculus.

_poplia
_ḥirmia_
Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The first letter of the second line is 里程. Thulin read this as a reversed n, but in view of the Faliscan attestations of Firmius (§7.8.1.62), Herbig’s ἱρμία has been adopted by all later editors. A similar h occurs in MF 88 (cf. §11.2.3).


19. Painted in white underneath a loculus.

---

Fig.13.2. Mengarelli’s drawing of MF 19.
(From Thulin 1907:266.)

---hirmeioiu.

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The letters given in Mengarelli’s drawing are meaningless (...ia II uɛθiui. Thulin, ðure uɛθiui. Herbig,  aliqua uɛθiui. Vetter, aliqua uɛθiui. G. Giacomelli). Taking VII as a damaged m, however, gives [---] ἱρμείοιu ; with a gentilicium as in ποπλία | ἱρμία MF 18 (or perhaps [---]**τίμεο) followed by a filiation iu.


13.3. The necropolis of Contrada Celle

Contrada Celle lies to the northeast of Civita Castellana, to the north of the Rio Maggiore. The necropolis spread to the southeast of the ancient road to the Tiber crossing near Borghese (Ward Perkins & Frederiksen 1957:152-3). With the exceptions of MF 39, a chance find, and MF 40, discovered in the 1950s, all inscriptions from this site were found during the excavation of the necropolis in 1888. These excavations have been published by Pasqui (1887) and in FI II.2 pp.99-143 with map p.100).

20. Scratched inside a red-varnished cup from tomb LXXVI/50. Known only through the apograph in FI II.2 and Nogara’s copy of the apograph in the Museo di Villa Giulia inventory.

caisioi
Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The o contains an accidental point. Caisioi is usually interpreted as a dative, but it is perhaps rather a genitive (Pisani): see §4.4.4.

Bibliography: Jacobsohn 1910:3 (1); Herbig CIE 8002; Herbig 1914a:239 (4); Lejeune 1952b:125; Vetter 1953:289 (251); G. Giacomelli 1963:57 (23); Pisani 1964:342-3 (146E); Devine 1970:17-9; FI II.2 p.126 (autopsy). Drawing: FI II.2 p.126.

21. Scratched near the rim inside a black-varnished plate (height 4.5 cm, Ø 18 cm; letters 4-7 mm) from tomb 94.

rica

Dextroverse: the r is Ⰽ. Lejeune regarded rica as a woman’s name, perhaps in the genitive, but this involves omission of -s after a long vowel, which is rare (§3.5.7d).


22-30. The following inscriptions are all from tomb CXIX/89.

22-27. Scratched on six similar red clay saucers (Ø 12 cm, let. 5-15 mm).

turia
turia
turia
turia
turia
turia

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The inscriptions do not appear to be all in the same hand, or even in the same alphabet: in 26, a is A, in the others A (of a more squarish shape in 24 and 27); in 25 and 26 the r is Ⰽ, in the others A. Turius is also attested in caui : turi MF 273, and probably also in ca : tu MF 38: it is unnecessary to assume a connection with Greek Τυριο (as did Herbig).


28. Scratched inside a cup (Ø 13 cm; letters 14-20 mm high) described as red-varnished in the Museo di Villa Giulia inventories quoted by Thulin, but as black-varnished in FI.

sta

Either sinistroverse with a reversed s and an upside-down t (FI) or dextroverse with an upside-down a (all other editors). For the interpretation, see MF 29.

29. Scratched inside a cup (height 4 cm, \( \varnothing \) 12.2 cm, letters 11-16 mm high) described as red-varnished in the inventory of the Museo di Villa Giulia (quoted by Thulin), but as black-varnished in \( FI \).

\textit{statuo}

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet with reversed s. Thulin compared \textit{sta} MF? 128, which he read as a verb \textit{stat(t)} ‘ist aufgestellt’ (in a sacral sense). \textit{Statuo} could then be “das Aktivum dazu” (Thulin 1907:307), apparently the equivalent of Greek \( \dot{\alpha}v\upsilon\upsi\upsilon\theta\iota\mu\upsilon \), while \textit{sta} MF? 28 could be either \textit{sta(t)} or \textit{sta(tuo)}. This was adopted by Herbig and G. Giacomelli, but I do not adopt Thulin’s interpretation of \textit{sta} MF? 128, and regard \textit{sta} and \textit{stat} with Vetter as abbreviations of \textit{Statius}, and \textit{uo} as an abbreviated gentilicium. 

\textbf{Bibliography:} Thulin 1907:307 (apology); Herbig \textit{CIE} 8012; Vetter 1953:290 (254a); G. Giacomelli 1963:58 (26); \textit{FI} II.2 p.137 (apology). \textbf{Drawing:} Thulin 1907:307 (reproduced in \textit{CIE} 8012).

30. Scratched inside a black-varnished Etrusco-Campanian cup named in \( FI \) among the finds from this tomb, but published by Herbig and G. Giacomelli as \textit{incertae originis}.

\textit{ce}

Sinistroverse.


31-32. Usually treated together because of their identical contents are two inscriptions on black-varnished cups from two different tombs of this necropolis.

31. Scratched on the bottom of a black-varnished cup (\( \varnothing \) 12.4 cm; letters 6-12 mm high) from tomb CXX/105.

\textit{loifirtato}

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The first \( i \) is either written as \( \mathcal{I} \) (as an error for \( l \)) or damaged by a scratch that makes it look like an \( \mathcal{I} \). The \( r \) is \( \mathcal{R} \), an example of the confusion of \( \mathfrak{R} \) (\( r \)) and \( \mathfrak{R} \) (\( a \)) rather than an example of \( \mathfrak{A} \): see §11.2.4. The reading \textit{loifirtato} goes back to Herbig (\textit{loifia tato} Thulin, \textit{loifirtatio} Nogara). See under 32.

\textbf{Bibliography:} Thulin 1907:306 (56) (apology); Jacobsohn 1910:3 (2a); Jacobsohn 1911:464; Herbig \textit{CIE} 8010 (apology); Buonamici 1913:53-4 (4); Vetter 1953:290 (253); G. Giacomelli 1963:57 (25,1); Pisani 1964:342 (146B,a); \textit{FI} II.2 p.134 (apology). \textbf{Drawings:} Thulin 1907:306 (reproduced in \textit{CIE} 8010); Herbig \textit{CIE} 8010.

32. Scratched inside a black-varnished cup (height 8.8 cm, \( \varnothing \) 13.2 cm; letters 5-8 mm high) from tomb CXXIII/92.

\textit{loifirtato}

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. Leaving aside Thulin’s interpretation (based on the misreading \textit{loifia tato}), all editors have interpreted \textit{loifirtato} as the genitive of a noun.
corresponding to Latin *libertas*. The meaning of the text is unclear. *Loifirtato* has been taken as ‘libertatis (ergo)’, a dedication made on the occasion of enfranchisement (thus Herbig and G. Giacomelli), or as ‘Libertatis’, the name of a deity (Herbig, Jacobsohn 1911:464, Buonamici, Vetter 1953:410), with a genitive as in *apolonos* EF 10 (cf. §8.11.1) Herbig notes that in the latter case *loifirtato* could also be a plural genitive. Problematic is that both interpretations presuppose the presence, in tombs, of dedications that are apparently not related to the funeral rites. Pisani tried to avoid this problem by interpreting *loifirtato* as the genitive of the woman’s name ‘Libertas’ read by him in MF 41 as *Iloifirta(s),* but the correct reading there is *Iloifirta* ‘liberta’. For the diphthong, see §3.7.3.

**Bibliography:** Thulin 1907:305 (autopsy); Jacobsohn 1910:3 (2b); Jacobsohn 1911:464; Herbig CIE 8011 (autopsy); Buonamici 1913:53-4 (5); Vetter 1953:290, 410 (253); G. Giacomelli 1963:57 (25,II); Pisani 1964:342 (146,B,b); *FI* II.2 p.132 (autopsy). **Drawing:** Thulin 1907:305 (reproduced in CIE 8011); Herbig CIE 8011.

33. Painted in ochre inside a black-varnished plate (Ø 16 cm, letters 8 mm high) from tomb CXXXIV/90.

**lo:cr**

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. *Lo* is ‘Lo(ci-)’ (Thulin), not Vetter’s ‘Lo(uci)’, nor Herbig’s *lo* ‘L(ar)0’. For *cr* cf. the gentilicium *Grae- in cr[---] MF 141, cre[---] MF 142, cr[---] MF 143 (Herbig); *kreco* MF 147, adduced by Thulin and G. Giacomelli, is a praenomen.

**Bibliography:** Thulin 1907:306 (57) (autopsy); Herbig CIE 8018 (autopsy); Vetter 1953:290 (256b); G. Giacomelli 1963:59 (30); *FI* II.2 p.111 (autopsy). **Drawing:** Thulin 1907:306 (reproduced in CIE 8018).

34-37. On four vessels from tomb CXXXV/98.

34-36. Scratched inside a black-varnished cup (Ø 13 cm; letters 8-11 mm high) and two black-varnished plates (Ø 17 cm, letters 7-15 mm high and Ø 18 cm, letters c.7 mm high respectively).

**serui**

**serui**

**serui**

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The *s* is reversed (†) in 34 and 36; in 35, it is ざ, but written so casually that it looks like an ¥. *Serui* is a genitive or perhaps an abbreviated

214 Herbig also discussed possible interpretations of his *loifir tato*, ‘Tatus liber’, ‘Tatus liber (=puer)’, and ‘Liber pater’.

215 Cf. (Latino-)Venetic [*---jifirtati*, published by Innocenti Prosdocimi (1976:269-72), perhaps connected to the enfranchisement of the Latin citizens by the *lex Iulia* in 90-89 BCE.

425
nominative: it is not necessary to assume that it is an Etruscan nominative (as Herbig proposed, cf. §9.2.2.2a). The name can be a praenomen or a gentilicium.


37. Scratched inside a small cup (⌀ 8.5 mm; letters 7-10 mm high).

\textit{a-r\textit{n}}

Sinistroverse. Etruscan alphabet. The \textit{a} is \(\nabla\); the \textit{r} is the Etruscan \(\varpi\). The points that between the letters (\textit{a-r\textit{n}}) are in all probability accidental or decorative. Herbig compared Etruscan \textit{Arn} and Latin \textit{Arnius}, Hirata Etruscan \textit{Arn\theta} and Latin \textit{Aruns}.


38. Scratched before firing inside a black-varnished saucer on a high foot (height 8.7 cm, ⌀ 12.3 cm, letters 5-6 mm high)

\textit{c\textit{a-t\textit{u}}}


39. Painted in red across a tile (letters 10-12 cm high) said to have been found “in sepulcreto di Celle multis annis ante \[sc. before 1912\]” (Herbig CIE 8566).

\textit{i\textit{una m\textit{a\textit{l\textit{i}}}}}

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The gentilicium is \textit{Mallius} or \textit{Ma(n)lius}: see §7.8.1.94.


40. Cut over a loculus.\footnote{Calzecchi-Onesti erroneously called the necropolis ‘Necropoli del Colle’.}

\textit{[---]o\textit{cicio-cicoicupati\textit{ifra}}}

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The first part of the text is to be read either as \textit{[---]o\textit{cicio} (G. Giacomelli 1963, 1978), either \textit{[---]jo cicio ‘…us Cincius’) for a \textit{Cincia} from Civita Castellana, cf. MF 135}, or \textit{[---]ocrio (with ic \(\varphi\) read as \(\textbf{r}\ \varphi\)) which gives a gentilicium \textit{Ocrius} (G. Giacomelli 1965, Calzecchi-Onesti). Rix’s \textit{u(m)p\textit{ricio} is impossible, see G. Giacomelli 1965. Cicio} is the only form in -\textit{oi} that cannot possibly}
be taken as a dative. G. Giacomelli interpreted it as a Faliscan transcription of an Etruscan feminine Cicui (§9.2.2.2a), but I think that it could better be interpreted as a genitive in -oi of a Cincus or Cicus, as was done by Pisani. For the genitive in -oi, see §4.4.4. The resulting ‘...us Cincius son of Cincus’ could perhaps be compared to the tul · tullius · tul · f in CIL I.2.1493 and 1497 from Tibur. Cupat : ifra is a unique adaptation of the normal formula hec cupat: see §8.10.1.


13.4. The Valsiarosa necropolis

The necropolis of Valsiarosa lies to the west of Civita Castellana, to the north of the modern road to Nepi, near the ancient road leading to the Ponte Terrano. Several tombs were excavated here between 1886 and 1889 (cf. Cozza & Pasqui 1887c, FI II.2 pp.187-204 with map p.188), but all the inscriptions from this site are from a tomb excavated in 1900 by Magliulo. Although it contained eighteen loculi, only three sepulchral inscriptions are recorded: it is not stated whether the other loculi had any inscriptions. The fact that two of the sepulchral inscriptions were still in situ and that some at least of the grave-goods were recovered (cf. Thulin 1907:257) seems to imply that the tomb was intact. Thulin (1907:257) dated the sepulchral inscriptions to the fourth rather than the third century. All pertain to apparently unrelated women: Peruzzi (1964b) assumed that they were women initiates of the Bacchic mysteries, partly because of the burial of a freeborn woman and a freedwoman in the same loculus (see MF 41), but there is no convincing argument for adopting this interpretation. The inscriptions contain several Etruscan features: see §9.2.3f and Peruzzi 1964b.

41. Painted in violet on plaster across four tiles (each c.60×c.49 cm; letters 13 cm high) found in situ. Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The last letters of each line (ria and irta) are written vertically downwards as there was no room to write the line in full on the last tile. Only

\[ \text{'fas}^2\text{iles}\text{c}^\text{aijsia}\text{dou}^\text{ria} \]
\[ \text{'lou}^\text{c}^\text{i}^\text{tet}^\text{i}\text{u}^\text{xor}\text{ili}\text{ofirta} \]

217 Several other inscriptions (347-355) ascribed to the Valsiarosa necropolis by Herbig have now been shown to come from the site at Grotta Porciosa (§16.6).

218 Peruzzi (1964b:142) assumed that the tomb was plundered because of the small number of grave-goods listed by Thulin: the latter, however, gave only a selection, not an exhaustive list.

219 Herbig (CIE 8190) gave the height of the letters as “m. c. 0,03 a.”, but from Thulin’s drawing it appears that this must be an error.
the bottom parts of the letters *ur* in *louria* remain: reading e.g. *loucia* would appear to be impossible, however. The *f* in *fasies*, the *e* and the *a* in *cf.* *lsia*, the *i* in *louci*, the interpunct between *louci* and *teti*, and the *x* of *uxor* had disappeared already by Thulin’s time and were restored by him from Magliulo’s apograph. The lacuna in the first line is large enough for *c[ai]sia* (which is more in keeping with the *ou* in *louci* and *louria*) or *c[ei]sia*: Thulin’s *c[e]sia* is too short, and Herbig’s *c[ae]si(a)* (1910:195) is untenable and was abandoned later. *Fasies* has been interpreted as the genitive of the father’s name (Thulin, Herbig, Buonamici, Pisani) used as the woman’s patronym (Vetter) or gentilicium (G. Giacomelli): rather, it is an Etruscoid form in *-es* (see §9.2.2.2) of the gentilicium Fassius (attested for Oscan in *fassii[s] ZO 1) and placed here before the praenomen as in Etruscan. Thulin took the inscription as pertaining to two daughters of Fasi-, namely *c[e]sia* *louria* and *l[oi]fia*. A different interpretation was proposed by Herbig (1910:196). From the triple interpunct that follows *c[ai]sia* in Thulin’s drawing and from the fact that *louria* and *l[oi]fia* (as he read the text) were not started on a third line but written at the end of the first two, he concluded that the fourth tile was added later. This interpretation became all the more attractive when the last word was read as *l[oi]firta* by Nogara (in *CIE* 8190).220 The inscription could then be read as pertaining to a *fasies*: *c[ai]sia* | *louci* : *teti* : *uxor* and to a *louria* | *l[oi]firta* interred in the same loculus. This interpretation was rightly adopted by most later authors. Pisani read *l[oi]firta(s)*, interpreting this as a woman’s name ‘Libertas’.

**Bibliography:** Thulin 1907:257-64 (1) (autopsy); Herbig 1910:195-8 (37); Jacobsohn 1910:4 (18); Herbig *CIE* 8190; Buonamici 1913:59 (14); Vetter 1953:297 (276a); Knobloch 1954:36; G. Giacomelli 1963:76-7 (73,l); Pisani 1964:337-8 (143G); Peruzzi 1964b. **Drawing:** Thulin 1907:258 (reproduced in *CIE* 8190); Herbig *CIE* 8190.

### 42. Painted in red on plaster on two tiles (60×44 cm, letters 10 cm high) found in situ.

1️⃣ *caui:a satelie*
2️⃣ *caui:feliciencies*
3️⃣ *uxor*

Sinistroverso, Faliscan alphabet. The *i* in *caui*a, the interpunct between *caui*a and *satelie*, the second *e* in *satelie*, the *i* in *caui*, the interpunct between *caui* and *feliciencies*, and the *r* in *uxor* were all restored by Thulin from Magliulo’s apograph. Magliulo’s *satelie* is probably to be preferred to the *satelie[s]* read by Herbig and all editors after him, for although Herbig (1910:199) asserts that in Nogara’s drawing there is space to restore *s*, this is not borne out by the drawing as published in *CIE*, and the possibility is expressly rejected from autopsy by Nogara himself.221 The form is an Etruscoid name in...

---

220 “Non si vede più il terzo punto dell’interpunzione in principio del tegolo IV, quello in basso, e probabilmente non esistette mai” (Nogara in Herbig *CIE* 8190).

221 The final *e* is based on Magliulo’s apograph: it is unlikely that misread a damaged *a* (♀) as an *e* (♀), as he read the damaged last letter of *caui*a, which in Nogara’s drawing is ♀, as *a*.
-ie(s), for which see §9.2.2.2d. In the second line, the drawings show the top parts of the letters i and c (or o, or θ) between fel an inate. Herbig’s felicinate (CIE), with a toponymic gentilicium that occurs also in Etruscan (felcinatiu Pe 1.485 and 1.1235) and Latin (Feliginas), has been adopted by all authors, and is now confirmed by [fel]icinatius LF 384. The genitive ending -e renders either /-es/ or /-ές/: see §4.5.2.

Bibliography: Thulin 1907:257-64 (2) (autopsy); Herbig 1910:198-9 (38); Jacobsohn 1910:4 (19); Herbig CIE 8191; Buonamici 1913:59 (15); Vetter 1953:297 (276b); G. Giacomelli 1963:76-7 (73,II); Peruzzi 1964b. Drawing: Thulin 1907:261 (reproduced in CIE 8191); Herbig CIE 8191.

43. Painted in red on plaster along the length of the backs of two tiles (max. 51?x44 and 66x44 cm; letters c.10 cm high).

\[\text{ue} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{ux}\]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The tiles, found and described separately by Magliulo, were joined by Thulin, who read Venena ux. (with the letters ne restored from Magliulo’s apograph?). A trace of a shaft after the letters ue was in fact seen by Nogara (in Herbig CIE 8192), who also read the interpunct at the end of the first line. Vetter emended Thulin’s Venena to ueljena, which was adopted by G. Giacomelli. Herbig interpreted ueljena either as a masculine genitive ueljena(s) preceded on a lost tile by a woman’s name in the nominative, or as a feminine nominative preceded on a lost tile by the woman’s praenomen in the first line, and by her husband’s praenomen in the genitive in the second line. The former interpretation was adopted by G. Giacomelli.

Both interpretations presuppose that a missing tile preceded the text, and this appears to be impossible in view of the amount of space before ueljena and uxor shown in Thulin’s drawing. Vetter (1953:443) took his ueljena as a masculine nominative, apparently reading the text as ‘Veliena (and) wife’ without any missing tiles, but there is no Faliscan parallel for a woman to be designated by the word uxor alone. I suspect that a tile is missing in the middle, in which case the text may be read as a woman’s name with in the second line uxor, followed by the husband’s name in the genitive. For ueljena, cf. perhaps ue in MLF 206 and the gentilicium nel[n---] LtF 299 and neln LtF 300? Uene[ ]na can be a man’s name, Venel...na, but in that case it is very difficult to explain what the remainder of the text (starting with uxor) may have looked like.

Bibliography: Thulin 1907:257-64 (3) (autopsy); Herbig 1910:189 (27); Herbig CIE 8192; Buonamici 1913:60 (16); Buonamici 1935:343; Vetter 1953:298 (276c); G. Giacomelli 1963:76-7 (73,III); Peruzzi 1964b:140. Drawing: Thulin 1907:264 (reproduced in CIE 8192).

44-46. From the same tomb are two or three inscribed vessels. Thulin (1907:307) spoke of “zwei [Gefässen] mit kleinen Graffiti”, but describes not two, but three. Editors have tacitly assumed that all these three vessels belonged to this tomb.
44. Scratched under a small black-varnished cup (⌀ 10 cm; letters 5-10 mm high).

**tur**


**Bibliography:** Thulin 1907:307-8 (61) (*autopsy*); Herbig CIE 8193; Vetter 1953:289 (247); G. Giacomelli 1963:50-1 (8). **Drawing:** Thulin 1907:308 (reproduced in CIE 8193).

45. Scratched inside a black-varnished cup (⌀ 12 cm; letters 6-12 mm high) similar to that of 44.

**ani**

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet? The *a* is written rather carelessly as ā. A genitive (Vetter and G. Giacomelli) rather than an abbreviated nominative (Thulin); see §8.8.1.

**Bibliography:** Thulin 1907:307-8 (62) (*autopsy*); Herbig CIE 8194; Vetter 1953:289 (247); G. Giacomelli 1963:50-1 (9). **Drawing:** Thulin 1907:308 (reproduced in CIE 8194).

46. Scratched under the foot of a small plate (⌀ 14 cm; let. 5-7 mm) is

**hap**

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet? The *h* is ħ. G. Giacomelli took the elongated *p*, ķ, as a ligature *pi* (considered also by Herbig), but this seems unnecessary. *Hap* may render *Fabius* (Herbig) with the Faliscan spelling *h-* for original /f-/ (§3.5.2).

**Bibliography:** Thulin 1907:308 (63) (*autopsy*); Herbig CIE 8195; Vetter 1953:289 (249); G. Giacomelli 1963:51 (10). **Drawing:** Thulin 1907:308 (reproduced in CIE 8195).

13.5. The La Penna necropolis

The La Penna necropolis is situated to the southwest of the city, south of the modern road to Nepi. Excavations were conducted at this site in 1886 and 1887, and several more tombs were excavated in 1888 and 1889 (see Cozza & Pasqui 1887a-b, *FI II.2* pp.144-86 with map p.145). Most of the inscriptions from this site, including the cup with *eko lartos* EF 6 and *eko kaisiosio* EF 7 (§12.3), were found during these excavations; only the discovery of MF 55 seem to be undocumented.

47. Cut over a loculus of Cozza & Pasqui’s tomb II.

**uol/jia**

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The third and fourth letters are ḫ. Most editors read *uol/jia*, but the rarity of the gminated spelling in Faliscan inscriptions (§11.2.4.3) lead Herbig to read *uol/jia* and Vetter to read *uol/jia*. The latter is attractive, but may not be necessary, cf. *uol[j]---j* MF 86. See also §3.5.5.3.

**Bibliography:** Cozza & Pasqui 1887b:263 (*autopsy*); Conway 1897:375 (xl.24); Herbig CIE 8164; Vetter 1953:296 (273); G. Giacomelli 1963:75 (70). **Transcription:** Cozza & Pasqui 1887b:263 (reproduced in CIE 8164).
48. Painted in red between two loculi (letters c. 7 cm high).

inau/oufilio-poplia

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The n is reversed. The first a seems to be damaged at the top. In Lignana’s transcription (from an apograph by Fiorelli), the first p is given as ἱ and the second as ι; in Cozza & Pasqui’s, both are ι; in Thulin’s, both are ι. Ribezzo impossibly regarded oufilio as a genitive in -io (§4.4.5).

Bibliography: Lignana 1887:202 (b); Cozza & Pasqui 1887b:267 (autopsy); Deecke 1888:151-2 (29); Conway 1897:375 (xl.19); Thulin 1907:271 (6a) (autopsy); Herbig 1910:85-8 (3) (autopsy); Herbig CIE 8167; Jacobsohn 1910:4 (13); Ribezzo 1930:99; Vetter 1953:296 (274a); G. Giacomelli 1963:75-6 (71.I) (autopsy); Pisani 1964:339 (144B); G. Giacomelli 1978:530-1 (7,1); R. Giacomelli 1978:74-5 (2,1). Drawing: Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I.

49. Painted in red between two loculi (letters c. 7 cm high).

cauio-oufilio-θanacuil

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. In Lignana’s and Cozza & Pasqui’s transcriptions (the former from an apograph by Fiorelli), the θ is θ (Danacvil Lignana); in Deecke’s drawing (and in Thulin’s?), it is θ. For the use of θ, see §3.5.4. Both transcriptions show a stroke after cauiο. Ribezzo took oufilio as a genitive in -io: see §4.4.5.

Bibliography: Lignana 1887:202 (d); Cozza & Pasqui 1887b:267 (autopsy); Deecke 1888:152 (30); Conway 1897:375 (xl.20); Thulin 1907:271 (6b) (autopsy); Herbig 1910:85-8 (4) (autopsy); Herbig CIE 8168; Jacobsohn 1910:4 (14); Buonamici 1913:58 (13); Ribezzo 1930:99; Vetter 1953:296 (274b); G. Giacomelli 1963:75-6 (71,II) (autopsy); Pisani 1964:339 (144C); G. Giacomelli 1978:530-1 (7,II); R. Giacomelli 1978:74-5 (2,II). Drawing: Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I.

50. Painted under a loculus (letters c. 7 cm high).

cauio/-aufilio-poplia

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. In Lignana’s transcription (from an apograph by Fiorelli), caui is followed by OIJL. VΘÚ; in Cozza & Pasqui’s, it is preceded by a space.

Bibliography: Lignana 1887:202 (c); Cozza & Pasqui 1887b:267 (autopsy); Deecke 1888:152-3 (31); Conway 1897:375 (xl.21); Thulin 1907:271 (6c) (autopsy); Herbig 1910:85-8 (5) (autopsy); Herbig CIE 8169; Jacobsohn 1910:4 (15); Ribezzo 1930:99; Vetter 1953:296 (274c); G. Giacomelli 1963:75-6 (71,III) (autopsy); G. Giacomelli 1978:530-1 (7,III). Drawing: Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I.

---

Lignana, Conway, and Deecke read -filio as ‘filius’ preceded by an abbreviated father’s praenomen, which is implausible; the correct interpretation goes back to Thulin.
51. Painted in red under a loculus (letters c.7 cm high).

\[ kai[s][i][o-\text{aufil}io-iun] \text{?eo] } \]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The first letter is very doubtful: Lignana’s transcription (from an apograph by Fiorelli) gives it as \( \mathcal{X} \), Cozza and Pasqui’s as \( \mathcal{X} \), which in a Middle Faliscan inscription may reflect a specific use of \( k \) to mark this name, as in Latin (§11.2.4.3).\(^{223}\) The letters \( iun \) were seen only by Herbig.

**Bibliography:** Lignana 1887:202 (a); Cozza & Pasqui 1887b:267 (autopsy); Deecke 1888:153 (32); Conway 1897:375 (xl.22); Thulin 1907:272 (6f) (autopsy); Herbig 1910:85-8 (6) (autopsy); Herbig CIE 8170; Vetter 1953:296 (274d); G. Giacomelli 1963:75-6 (71,IV) (autopsy); G. Giacomelli 1978:530-1 (7,IV). **Drawing:** Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I.

52. Painted in red between two loculi (letters c.7 cm high).

\[ \text{[---]}o[...o} *\text{g}**[---] \]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. Herbig’s drawing shows that only the top halves of the letters were preserved. Herbig read this as \( \text{ouf[i]lio caui [f], which has been adopted by the later authors, but I doubt very much whether this is possible.} \)

**Bibliography:** Cozza & Pasqui 1887b:267 (autopsy); Herbig CIE 8172; Vetter 1953:296 (274f); G. Giacomelli 1963:75-6 (71,VI) (autopsy); G. Giacomelli 1978:530-1 (7,VI). **Drawing:** Herbig CIE 8172.

53. Painted underneath a loculus (letters c.7 cm high). Seen only by Thulin.

\[ \text{[---]}a-\text{aufillo} \text{?---} \]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The praenomen may have been \( \text{[iun]}a \) or \( \text{[uol]}ta. \)

**Bibliography:** Thulin 1907:272 (6e) (autopsy); Herbig 1910:85-8 (7); Herbig CIE 8173; Vetter 1953:296 (274g); G. Giacomelli 1963:75-6 (71,VI); G. Giacomelli 1978:530-1 (7,VI).

54. Painted under a loculus (letters c.7 cm high). The part containing the letters \( \text{mio} \) had broken off (and disappeared?) when the inscription was seen by Thulin and Herbig.

\[ \text{puponio-fir mio} \]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. Both Lignana’s and Cozza & Pasqui’s transcriptions (the former from an apograph by Fiorelli) give the \( m \) and the \( n \) as \( \mathcal{M} \) and \( \mathcal{N} \) respectively. According to Cozza & Pasqui, the space between \( \text{fir} \) and \( \text{mio} \) is due to the ancient writer avoiding a ‘sfaldatura del tufo’: it is unnecessary to read \( \text{fia...mio} \) (Deecke, Conway) or \( \text{firemio} \) (Thulin). Lignana’s ‘Pomponio filio’ is impossible. *Puponius* appears to be a gentilicium used as a praenomen, see §7.7.1.52.

**Bibliography:** Lignana 1887:202 (ε); Cozza & Pasqui 1887b:267 (autopsy); Deecke 1888:153 (33); Conway 1897:375 (xl.23); Thulin 1907:271 (6d) (autopsy); Herbig CIE 8171; Vetter 1953:296 (274e); G. Giacomelli 1963:75-6 (71,V) (autopsy); G. Giacomelli 1978:530-1 (7,V). **Drawing:** Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I.

\(^{223}\) Note that Lignana had erroneously read \( k \) instead of \( c \) in MF 59-60.
55. On a tile fragment from a tomb “a parte sinistra prope sepulcrum gentis Oufiliae” (Herbig).

\[c[---]\]

Sinistroverse (or dextroverse if held the other way up). Herbig’s transcription, \(- - - \), appears to imply that the \(c\) stood close to the edge of the tile.

**Bibliography:** Herbig CIE 8175.

56-57. The following inscriptions are both from Cozza & Pasqui’s tomb X.

56. Painted in red on plaster on a tile fragment.

\[\text{uelzu}^{[2]}[con]\]
\[\text{eo}^{[2]}[\text{cupa}]\]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The \(o\) is \(\Diamond\). It is unclear whether the \(...\) preceding \textit{uelzu} in Cozza & Pasqui’s transcription indicate traces, vacant space, or a missing tile preceding the text. Herbig read \textit{uelzu} as a praenomen \textit{Volsa}, which was adopted by all other editors. I would rather restore the text as \textit{uel zu[con]}\textit{eo : fe[ cupa]}, or, assuming that more than one tile is missing at the end, as \textit{uel zu[cono ---]}\textit{eo : fe[ cupa ?---]}.

The praenomen \textit{uel} occurs e.g. in MF 82 (cf. also §7.7.1.80) and the gentilicium \textit{zu[con]}\textit{eo} in \textit{zuconia} MF 271: cf. also \textit{larisa zu/gus} Etr XXXII and §7.8.1.148. The use of the interpunct in Faliscan inscriptions is not so consistent that its absence after \textit{uel} and \textit{zu[---]} can constitute an argument against this. The hypercorrect spelling \textit{fe} for \textit{he(c)} occurs also in MLF 305: see §3.5.2.

**Bibliography:** Cozza & Pasqui 1887b:272 (autopsy); Conway 1897:375 (xl.25); Herbig 1910:187 (25); Herbig CIE 8176; Vetter 1953:297 (275a); G. Giacomelli 1963:76 (72,II). **Transcription:** Cozza & Pasqui 1 887b:272 (reproduced in CIE 8176).

57. Painted in red on plaster on a tile fragment.

\[\text{calin}[---]\]
\[\text{rezo}[---]\]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The \(r\) appears to be \(\mathfrak{R}\) rather than \(\mathfrak{R}\): see §11.2.4.2. Herbig restored the first line as \emph{calin/ia}, with \emph{rezo} as a genitive. I wonder whether the \emph{ca} is not rather the frequent abbreviation \emph{ca} = \emph{Gaius}. As \(z\) is more common at the beginning of words (§11.2.4.3; §3.5.3), \emph{rezo[---]} is probably to be divided as \(--/\emph{re zo}[---]\). \emph{zo[---]} could perhaps be \emph{zo[cono]} or \emph{zo[cono]}\textit{a}, a further adaptation to Faliscan of the gentilicium \emph{zuconia} MF 271 (and perhaps \emph{zu[con]}\textit{eo} in MF 56), which is itself an adaptation of the Etruscan gentilicium \emph{zu} in \emph{larisa zu/gus} Etr XXXII: see §7.8.1.148.

**Bibliography:** Cozza & Pasqui 1887b:272 (autopsy); Conway 1897:375 (xl.26); Herbig 1910:187 (25); Herbig CIE 8177; Vetter 1953:297 (275b); G. Giacomelli 1963:76 (72,II). **Transcription:** Cozza & Pasqui 1887b:272 (reproduced in CIE 8177).
58. Scratched in a small black-varnished cup (height 7.8 cm, \(\Phi\) rim 11.9 cm, \(\Phi\) foot 5.6 cm, letters 12-18 mm high), according to Schippa from tomb 10 of the La Penna necropolis. \(c.300\).

**fofiti**

Faliscan alphabet. Schippa (1980:48) described the inscription as “con andamento destrorso”, but his drawing shows the ductus as sinistroverse. The form is either a genitive or an abbreviated nominative (§8.8.1). Schippa compared the gentilicium *Fuficius*, but perhaps *f ofiti* could be read, with an abbreviated praenomen *f* (probably *Fertor*, see §7.7.1.23) as in *f aino* MLA 352 from the Grotta Porciosa site and *f · pacios* Cap 392 from Capena; a gentilicium *Aufitius* occurs in *CIL VI.6945* from Rome.

**Bibliography:** Schippa 1980:48 (50) (autopsy). **Drawing:** Schippa 1980 tav.LXI.

59-62. Tombs CXXVII and CXXVIII/86 were connected already in antiquity. From this double-tomb are the following inscriptions.

59-60. Painted around the central tondi of two almost identical late fourth-century kylikes, the name-pieces of the *Foied*-painter, cf. Beazley 1947:106-7.224 Deecke (in Lignana 1887a:443, 1888:154-5) regarded the inscriptions as falsifications, which led others to suspect them too (Lignana 1887b:199, Duvau 1889:10, Pauli in Herbig *CIE*).

The arguments on which this was based were rejected by Spinazzola.

224 A third example, without inscription, was published by Gabrici (1912a:73-4). The scene in the tondi is often described as ‘Dionysus with Semele’ (due to a similar scene on a mirror where the figures are labelled *guoplus* and *semola*, cf. Gerhard 1843:1.87-8 with Taf.LXXXIII): others regard it as ‘Dionysus with Ariadne’ (thus first Gabrici 1912a:73-4).

225 Conway (1897:372) notes that in MF 60 “the last word [...] seems to have been complete when Lignana sketched it”, which is probably due to the inaccuracy of Lignana’s drawings (or Conway’s misinterpretations of them).
The earliest interpretations koi (h)ed ‘qui hoc’ (Lignana 1887a), foied ‘favebit’ (Lignana 1887b), ‘foede’ Gamurrini (in Lignana 1887b:198) are partly based on misreadings and can be discarded: Cozza & Pasqui’s reading and interpretation has rightly been adopted by all editors. Foied, from a fossilized ablative phrase /hō(d)+diē(d)/: see §6.2.34 (for hypercorrect f- instead of h, cf. §3.5.2).

Whether the variation pipaf/o pafo is significant (reduplicated vs. non-reduplicated) is debated. Assuming that the painter had the intention of making two identical pieces, the form is an error at least from an epigraphical perspective, and I therefore regard pafo as an error for *pīpafo*. Pisani (and R. Giacomelli) took careo to mean ‘mancherò, sarò morto’: used in this sense, however, careo always has a complement like uita, sensu, die, luce, etc., showing that by itself the word could not carry this meaning (TLL 3 450.19-52). Friedrich regarded the phrase as a Saturnian, an idea adopted by Vetter and elaborated by Morelli and Poccetti. As Friedrich noted, it is interesting to find the Saturnian used in poetry of a less serious nature.


*Fig.13.3. Herbig’s tracing of MF/Etr 61.*

(From CIE 8178.)

61. Scratched inside a small plate (Ø 13.3 mm, let. 3-6 mm high) within a graffito of what appears to be a phallus with legs (thus Gamurrini 1887c:602) is an illegible

---

226 Cozza & Pasqui rather curiously described it as “rappresentante forse un animale quadrupede, di cui si espressero soltanto due gambe” (1888b:272). Danielsson (in Herbig CIE) compared a winged phallus in IG 13.1658 add.

435
sinistroverse graffito (see fig.13.3). Gamurrini read *udori.bonues* (with a cursive *e*), ‘odorari bonum est’ (1887c). Helbig (in Gamurrini 1887c:602) took *udori* as an ablative; Danielsson (in Herbig *CIE* 8178) compared Umbrian *utur* *TI* IIb.15. The text defies any attempt at interpretation: if the alphabet is Faliscan at all (which Herbig doubted), the drawings seem to show *u**al*onu*(*)s, which may be an Etruscan genitive *...al ...s*.

**Bibliography:** Gamurrini 1887b:151 (*autopsy*); Gamurrini 1887c:602; Cozza & Pasqui 1887b:272 (*autopsy*); Bormann *CIL* XI.6707,6; Herbig *CIE* 8178 (*autopsy*); Vetter 1953:294; G. Giacomelli 1963:263 (IX); *FI* II.2 p.148 (*autopsy*). **Drawings:** Cozza & Pasqui 1887b:272 (reproduced in *CIL* XI.6707,6, *CIE* 8178); Herbig *CIE* 8178.

62. Painted in the upper border of a scene on a stamnos227 (letters 3mm high) above the figures represented in the scene, the name-piece of the Diespiter-painter (Beazley 1947:73, Adembri 1990). c.380-370 (Colonna).228

*canumede [die]s pater cupi∂bo menerua*

Dextroverse, but apparently in Faliscan alphabet. *M* is ΝΝ, *r* is R, the *t* is Τ. The first and second *a* have rounded tops, the third is A. Degrassi’s *canumede[s]* (considered also by Wachter) is impossible, for the distance between the *e* and the edge of the lacuna is too great. The next name is usually restored as *[die]s pater*, but *[iou]s pater* (Lommatzsch) or *[iouo]s pater* are possible, pace Degrassi: according to Wachter (1987:150-3), however, the usual form of the nominative in the fourth century appears to have been *Diespater*. The third name is *cupico*, where the second *c* (C) is clearly an error for *d*: the text is *cupi∂bo*, not Girard’s *Cupigo*.

Although often regarded as Latin, the inscription is in fact Faliscan (as may be expected in the case of a local product). Wachter points to the co-occurrence of ΝΝ and R, which is normal in the Faliscan, but not in the Latin alphabet. The omission of *-s* in *canumede* is also more frequent in the ager Faliscus, although not after a long vowel (§3.5.7c). The *a* in *[die]s pater* cannot be regarded as an attestation of the Faliscan absence of vowel-raising in word-internal syllables, however, as *Diespater* may well have been regarded as separate words (§3.6.6.2). *Canumede* reflects Greek Γανυμήδης, not Etruscan *Catmite* or Latin *Catamitus* (§6.4.3).

**From autopsy** in the Museo dell’Agro Falisco, Civita Castellana (inv. 1599). **Bibliography:** Gamurrini 1887d:231-2 (*autopsy*); Cozza & Pasqui 1887a:175; Brizio 1889:439-40; †Dennis 1890; Bormann *CIL* XI.6708,13; Weege in Helbig 1913:370-1; Della Seta 1918:73; Lommatzsch *CIL* I.2.454; Ducati 1927:512; Diehl 1930:80 (778); Beazley 1947:73; Vetter 1953:288; Safarewicz 1955:186 (2); Degrassi *ILLRP* 1228; G. Giacomelli 1963:263 (XI); Torelli *RMR* pp.55-6 (*autopsy*); Colonna 1980a:46; *FI* II.2 p.154 (*autopsy*); Wachter 1987:367-9; Girard 1989:167; [Adembri 1990]. **Photograph:** Ducati 1927 vol.II tav.252, no.615. **Drawing:** Gamurrini 1887d tav.X.

---

227 Diehl and Vetter erroneously describe it as a ‘Schale’.

228 Safarewicz erroneously dated the vase to the third or second century.
63-64. Scratched inside a red-varnished saucer (Ø 17.5 mm, letters c.12 mm high in 63, and c.5-10 mm high in 64).

annis
ulties

63 is written dextroverse in uneven and straggling letters, apparently in the Latin alphabet: note the double n (§11.2.4.3); 64 is written sinistroverse in smaller and neater letters, with a Faliscan t (†). The e in 64 is 俟; a similar e occurs in MF 258 and MLF 285. Herbig connected both words as ‘Ultius Anni (servus)’, but both the difference in writing and the relative position of the words make this very unlikely. G. Giacomelli rightly takes the words as Besitzerinschriften written by successive owners (like EF 6 and EF 7). Ulties may stand for u(e)lties or u(o)lties (cf. Schulze 1904:252).

From autopsy in the Museo dell’Agro Falisco, Civita Castellana (inv. 1650). Bibliography: Herbig 1910:199-200 (39); Herbig CIE 8181; Vetter 1953:293-4; G. Giacomelli 1963:50 (6a-b); Rix ET Fa 2.20a-b. Drawing: Herbig CIE 8181.

65. Scratched on a patera. Known only through Nogara’s copy of the apograph in the Museo di Villa Giulia inventory.

apolo

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. According to Nogara’s transcript, the a is 俟. Vetter, apparently reluctant to assume a dedication in a tomb, proposed to take the form as an abbreviated slave-name Apollo..., but apolo is rather the name of the deity (cf. apolonos EF 10), in the nominative, as if it were a ‘divine Besitzerinschrift’ (cf. §8.11.1). For the cult of Apollo in the ager Faliscus, cf. §2.3.4.


13.6. The necropolis of Ponte Lepre

Two inscriptions (MF/Etr 66-67) were found in tombs at a locality known as Ponte Lepre, excavated in 1904 and 1906 by Feroldi di Rosa (cf. Herbig CIE p.111). Ponte Lepre was located to the west of Civita Castellana beyond the Valsiarosa necropolis, to the north of the modern road to Nepi. Also from the Ponte Lepre tombs are is the dolium with ud EF 8 and tele*[1-2?] med fiftiked EF 9, and probably also MF 68 and MF 69-72, which came to the Villa Giulia Museum from the Collezione Feroldi.

66. Scratched inside a saucer (height 4.5 cm, Ø 13 cm, letters 25-30 mm high) from tomb I, dated between the sixth and the fourth century.

namureţua
Sinistroverse. The \( r \) is the Etruscan \( µ \); the \( t \) is \( + \) (?). Rix reads namureška, with the \( + \) interpreted as \( ¼ \) and the \( u \) of Herbig’s drawing, \( \frac{1}{2} \), as \( k \), but the original shows that \( u \) is the correct reading. Editors generally regard the inscription as Etruscan because of the \( r \), but no satisfactory interpretation has been proposed.


67. Scratched on the bottom of a red-varnished saucer (height 6 cm, \( \varnothing \) 17 cm, letters c.15 mm high) is an inscription which Herbig hesitatingly read as acr\( \acute{e} \)z cat (dextroverse, with reversed \( e \) and \( z \)), comparing statia catino CIL I\( ^{2} \).480. G. Giacomelli adopted this reading, but interpreted the text as ‘Acrius Cat(ineius)’, comparing catinei MLF 469\( ^{*} \), but there are no Faliscan parallels for a praenomen written in full followed by an abbreviated gentilicium. Nogara’s drawing seems rather to show a sinistroverse text (\( ta*ec*a\) ?).


68-72. The following inscriptions, on plates originally from the Collezione Feroldi, were added to the inscriptions from Ponte Lepre by Herbig.

68. Scratched under the foot of a catillus (height 1.5 cm, \( \varnothing \) 11 cm, letters 20 mm high).

dextroverse.


69. Scratched on the rim of a small red-varnished plate (letters 6-10 mm high) and on the rim of a saucer of red clay (letters 5-10 mm high).

tiroi-colaniori
tiroi-colaniori

Sinistroverse. Presumably Faliscan alphabet. For interpretation and bibliography, see below under 71-72.
71-72. Scratched on a saucer of red clay, 71 on the rim (letters 4-6 mm high), 72 on the inside (letters c.8-12 cm high).

*tiroi-colanioi*

tulom

Sinistroverse, presumably Faliscan alphabet. *Tiroi·colanioi* is regarded as dative by all editors except Pisani (1964:343), who, probably rightly, regarded these forms as genitive: see §4.4.4. More problematic is *tulom*. The arrangement of the words and the difference in writing show that it is a separate text. Herbig (1914:238 n.1) interpreted it as */(te)tul-o-m/\', a first singular perfect from PIE */tel-/ (perhaps rather */telh2-/) with the aorist ending as in the Oscan perfect *manafum* Cp 37,6 *manjafum* Cp 37,1. This interpretation was adopted by G. Giacomelli, but cannot be maintained: assuming an aorist ending in a Middle Faliscan first singular perfect would at least require an explanation in view of the Early Faliscan first singular perfect *peparai* ‘peperi’, the accepted reading of *peparai* in EF I (which was proposed by Herbig himself). It would also be quite unexpected for a language or dialect belonging to the Latin branch of the Italic family, even if there is a parallel in Oscan. Herbig’s alternative, taking *tulom* as a noun ‘donum’, is equally problematic: at least in Latin the expected result of a PIE */tlom/ or */tlh2om/ would be */tulom/ or */tulom/ respectively. It is more likely that *tulom* is a name (cf. *tulo* in MF 151) as was suggested by Lejeune, who proposed *tulo m* ‘Tullus M(arci f.)’, and by Peruzzi, who proposed *tulom* ‘Tullum = Tullorum’. The latter interpretation is now supported by the genitive plural *[fel]cinatiu* LF 384 and *aciuaiom esú* Cap 465. The issue is made even more problematic by the possibility of a relation between *tulom* and *tulate tulas* EF/Etr 385.

**Bibliography:** Herbig 1914a:237-9 (1-2, 3a-b) (autopsy); Herbig 1923:231; Lejeune 1952b:125; Vetter 1953:291 (258, 259a-b); G. Giacomelli 1963:52 (12,1-IIIa-b) (autopsy); Peruzzi 1964a:167-9; Olzscha 1965:123-4.

73-78. The following inscriptions occur on plates originally from the Collezione Feroldi.

73. Scratched inside the rim of a small plate.

*iuna*

Sinistroverse, alphabet not indicated.

**Bibliography:** G. Giacomelli 1963:52-3 (13,II) (autopsy).

74. Scratched inside the rim of a small plate.

*iunai*

Sinistroverse, alphabet not indicated.

**Bibliography:** G. Giacomelli 1963:52-3 (13,1) (autopsy).
75. Scratched on the rim of a small plate.

*latría*

Sinistroverse, alphabet not indicated.

_Bibliography:_ G. Giacomelli 1963:52-3 (13,III) (*autopsy*).

76. Scratched in a saucer.

*sa*

Dextroverse. G. Giacomelli compared the equally dextroverse *sa* ‘sa(cra)’ MF? 131, although that is a dedication from a *stips*.

_Bibliography:_ G. Giacomelli 1963:52-3 (13,VI) (*autopsy*).

77. Scratched in a saucer.

*salàn*

Sinistroverse, Faliscan or Etruscan alphabet. G. Giacomelli read *calàn*, hesitatingly comparing *calitenes* MLF 265, but Colonna’s drawing shows that his *salàn* is the correct reading: as an interpretation, he points to *salôn* Co 3.1.


78. Scratched in a saucer.

*ipa*

Dextroverse. Cf. perhaps Etruscan *i-pa-s·i-ka-m· Etr X*?

_Bibliography:_ G. Giacomelli 1963:52-3 (13,V) (*autopsy*).

13.7. **The tombs near the Ponte Terrano**

Both the ancient and the modern road from Civita Castellana to S. Maria di Falleri and Fabbrica di Roma cross the gorge of the Rio Maggiore just to the west of the ancient town by means of the Ponte Terrano. This impressive bridge still conserves ancient masonry in its substructure (Dennis 1878:94-5) and may well go back to Faliscan times (Ward Perkins & Frederiksen 1957:143-5). Across the bridge, the road swings westwards, following the ridge between the Rio Maggiore to the south and the Torrente Purgatorio to the north.

The area on the north side of the gorge, known as Terrano, is riddled with tombs, especially in the cliff-side to the left of the Ponte Terrano, and on the spit of land between the Ponte Terrano and the junction of the Rio Maggiore and the Torrente Purgatorio. Most of these easily visible tombs have been known (and converted for modern re-use) for a long time, and the inscriptions from this location, especially those cut in the rock were among the first to be rediscovered in the previous centuries: MF 79
was in fact the first Faliscan inscription to be published (in 1726), although it was regarded as Etruscan for almost 150 years. Later epigraphical finds from these tombs are MF 88-89, discovered by Mengarelli, and MF 87, apparently found during the Second World War.

79. Cut over and beside the right-hand corner of an arcisolium-like niche (letters “about a foot in height” according to Dennis (1878:94), but 16-20 cm high according to Herbig) in a tomb on the right-hand side of the road, immediately to the north of the Ponte Terrano. Ainsley (in Dennis 1845:139) reported traces of red paint in the letters (cf. MF 83-85).

\textit{leiueliopartis uolti}

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet with reversed $s$. Lanzi erroneously gave the first word as \textit{leiulilio}. The first letters of the second word are a (damaged) $p$ followed by $v$ or $\bar{A}$.\textsuperscript{230} Garrucci took this as a $v$ used for /u/ (\textit{partis} 1860, \textit{SIL}; \textit{pfrtis} ‘Purte’ 1864), in which he was followed by Bormann, Herbig and Jacobsohn. The likelihood both of a $v$ in an inscription in Faliscan alphabet and of its being used for /u/ is very doubtful, however. \textit{Pace Herbig (CIE), Schneider’s \textit{partis}}\textsuperscript{231} (adopted by Deecke, Von Planta, and Conway) and Vetter’s \textit{partis} (adopted by G. Giacomelli) are both possible and more attractive: a similar \textit{a} appears in MF? 111. The ending of \textit{partis} is surprising, both in the absence of \textit{o} (§3.6.6.2) and in the presence of -\textit{s} (§3.5.7d): it is perhaps an adaptation of an Etruscan name. The shape of the niche makes it unlikely that it was closed with tiles, and the inscription therefore probably ended with \textit{uolti}, either an abbreviation of a patronymic adjective \textit{uolti(o)}, or the genitive of the father’s name (§7.5).

**Bibliography:** Buonarruoti 1726:35-6 (\textit{autopsy}); Gori 1733:77-8; \dagger Passeri 1740:444; Passeri 1767:130; Lanzi 1824:392 (466); Dennis 1845:139 (\textit{autopsy});\textsuperscript{232} [Dennis 1848:124-5]; Orioli 1854:XXII; Garrucci 1860:269-70 (\textit{autopsy}); Garrucci 1864:60; Fabretti \textit{CIL} 2441\textit{bis}, \textit{a}; Garrucci \textit{SIL} 793; [Dennis 1878:94]; Zvetaieff \textit{IIM} 52; Zvetaieff \textit{III} 54; Schneider 1886:105 (4); Bormann \textit{CIL} XI.3160 1,6; Deecke 1888:128-30 (1); Von Planta 1897:588 (317); Conway 1897:374-5 (xl.15); Herbig 1910:190-1 (30 (\textit{autopsy}); Jacobsohn 1910:3 (7); Herbig \textit{CIE} 8205; Buonamici 1913:60 (17); Vetter 1953:299 (279); [Ward Perkins & Frederiksen 1957:145 (\textit{autopsy})]; G. Giacomelli 1963:78-9 (77) (\textit{autopsy}); \textit{FI} II.1 pp.179, 236 (\textit{autopsy}). \textbf{Photograph of squeeze:} Herbig \textit{CIE} 8205. \textbf{Drawings:} Buonarruoti 1726 tab.LXXXII.1 (reproduced in Gori 1733 tab. III.1, \textit{CII} tab. XLIII); Garrucci 1860 tav.G.3; Garrucci 1864 tav. III.4 (reproduced in \textit{IIM} tab. VIII.6, Deecke 1888 Taf.I); Herbig \textit{CIE} 8205; \textit{FI} II.1 pp.179, 236.

\textsuperscript{229} This was the first Faliscan inscription to be published (in 1726), although it was not the first Faliscan inscription to be recorded: that honour was reserved (in 1676), for the group LtF 205, MLF 206-207, MLF/Etr 208-209, and MLF 210.

\textsuperscript{230} Buonarruoti, Gori, Lanzi, and Orioli gave these letters in reversed order. Buonarruoti, Gori, and Lanzi also read $i\acute{r}$ instead of $i$.

\textsuperscript{231} Schneider erroneously ascribed the same reading to Garrucci.

\textsuperscript{232} Dennis erroneously treated the inscription as if yet unpublished.
80-81. The following inscriptions were discovered by Garrucci and seen only by him ("frustra quaesivi", Herbig CIE 8207-8208).

80. Painted in black on a plaster over a loculus in a tomb on the right-hand side of the road. Underneath the text runs a decorative border.

/mar/[co]/pleinac/on/mo/[n]//o/mo/cauiacue

[u]ecul[ia]/uoltilia/uentarc]/.../hec/.../cupa/nt

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The size of the initial lacuna is nowhere indicated, but, judging from Garrucci’s drawing, was probably no more than two letters in the first line and one in the second, assuming that the inscription started at the end of the loculus: Bormann’s restoration [mar]co (adopted by all later editors except Deecke) is therefore preferable to Garrucci’s [uentar]co (adopted by all early editors). In Garrucci’s drawing, the lacuna between man and mo is rather large for a single o, but the restoration can hardly be anything else, whether one reads man[o]mo with Garrucci or emends to max[o]mo (Schneider, Deecke, Vetter, Pisani). The emendation is unnecessary, as the cognomen manomo is attested in MF 149 (see §7.9). In the second line, Jeculia was thought to be complete by the early editors (Garucci SIL, Schneider, Zvetaieff), but Bormann compared Jeculia to u[.....]a MF 81 and read [u]eculia, which was adopted by all later editors.

The restoration of the last lacuna is problematic. The text apparently ended with hec : cupa/nt, but what preceded this is less clear, especially as it cannot be ascertained how precise Garrucci’s drawing is with regard to the size of the lacuna. As the woman is already described with praenomen, gentilicum, and patronymic adjective, uentarc[ ] can hardly be part of her name as well unless it is either a cognomen (Herbig) or a second gentilicum (G. Giacomelli); on the other hand, uentarc[ia : hec : cupa/nt is certainly too short for the lacuna. Some of the earlier editors, who adopted Garrucci’s [uentar]co in the first line, restored uentarc[i : uxor (Garucci 1864, Zvetaieff, Vetter) or just uentarc[i (Garucci SIL, Zvetaieff, Schneider Bormann, uentarc[o Deecke). Apart from the fact that adopting Bormann’s [mar]co in the first line makes this virtually impossible, uentarc[i : uxor : hec : cupa/nt is probably too long for the lacuna, whereas uentarc[i : hec : cupa/nt is certainly too short. Uentarc[ was probably the name of a third person: perhaps it should be read as uen tarc[, with an abbreviated praenomen uen = Ven(el), followed by a gentilicum Tarc[ , e.g. tarc[oneo, tarc[uineo, or tarc[onteo (cf. Tarcontius in CIL XI.3370 from Tarquinii).233 The careful writing, the decoration, and the complete onomastic formula make this one of the most elaborate Faliscan sepulchral inscriptions.

81. Painted in red on plaster over a locusus.

\textit{ca:u[e]culi}a
\textit{ca: e[c]nata:dan}ia

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The \textit{c} of the first \textit{ca} is dextroverse, indicating a woman’s name (§11.2.4.3). The \textit{e} is cursive. The gentilicium has been restored as \textit{u[e]culi}a (Herbig \textit{CIE}, Vetter, G. Giacomelli) from comparison with MF 80. The restoration \textit{e[c]nata} was proposed already by Garrucci (1864), but taken up again only by Herbig. Deecke’s \textit{lu[uf]/nata} ‘liberta’ is impossible. The second letter of \textit{dana}ia is \textit{a}, a correction of \textit{n} to \textit{a} (Garrucci; Zvetaieff Vetter, G. Giacomelli), rather than a ligature \textit{an} (Bormann, Deecke, Conway, Herbig), which would give a geminated spelling \textit{danna}ia that is very rare in Middle Faliscan (§11.2.4.3). Garrucci took the inscription as pertaining to two women, interpreting \textit{dana}ia as a matronym. Other editors took \textit{ca} in the second line as a man’s praenomen, since, contrary to the \textit{ca} in the first line, the \textit{c} is not reversed here. Herbig thus took the inscription as pertaining to one woman, but his explanation of \textit{ca} : \textit{e[c]nata} as ‘Gai nata’ and of \textit{dana}ia (as he read it) as a cognomen are unconvincing. Vetter’s interpretation of the second line as containing the names of three slaves of Gavia Veclia, i.e., Gavius, Egnata, and Thannia, is certainly preferable to this, and was in fact adopted by G. Giacomelli. This is giving too much importance to the fact that the \textit{c} in \textit{ca} in the second line is not reversed. The use of the reversed initial to indicate a woman’s name is very rare and inconsistent (§11.2.4.3): apart from that, the second line may have been written at a different time than the first. \textit{Ca} in the second line may therefore be feminine and be taken together with \textit{e[c]nata} (for a gentilicium \textit{Egnatius}, see §7.8.1.50), followed by the name of a third woman.

\textbf{Bibliography:} Garrucci 1864:60-1 (autopsy); Fabretti CII 2441\textit{bis},\textit{e}; Garrucci \textit{SIL} 796; Zvetaieff \textit{IIM} 53; Zvetaieff \textit{III} 55; Schneider 1886:105 (7); Bormann \textit{CIL} XI.3160 II.1; Deecke 1888:135-9 (7); Conway 1897:372 (314); Herbig \textit{CIE} 8207; Vetter 1953:299-300 (281b); G. Giacomelli 1963:79-80 (79,II). \textbf{Drawing:} Garrucci 1864 tav.III.6 (reproduced in \textit{CII} tab.XLIII, \textit{IIM} tab.VIII.7, Deecke 1888 Taf.I, \textit{CIE} 8207).

82. Cut underneath a locusus in a tomb to the left of the Ponte Terrana.\textsuperscript{234} Letters c.10 cm high.

\textsuperscript{234} Garrucci described the location as “sulla rupe destra che domina il rio dell’acqua forte accanto al ponte Terrano” (1860:269, echoed in Deecke 1888:131) and as “nella rupe a sinistra del ponte Terrano” (1864:60, quoted in Zvetaieff 1884:46, 1886:22). The statements are not incompatible: leaving Civita Castellana and looking to the left from the Ponte Terrano, the tombs are on the right side of the gorge.
uel·luis ni·olna

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet with reversed s. Garrucci’s drawing shows an empty space between uis and ni, on which neither he nor any other editor remarks.

In view of *[.]pi : uesθi : cela MF 83 and caui[.]fj**(*)[i ]: cela MF 84, most editors take olna as a noun, with uel and uisni as genitives (in the case of uel, apparently an abbreviated genitive). Olna was explained by Garrucci as ‘ulna’ = ‘loculus’ (“misura corrispondente invero all’altezza dei loculi” 1860:269), which was apparently adopted by Zvetaieff and Schneider (as both print olna without a capital), by Deecke as ‘olla’, and by Vetter as ‘ulna’=‘pulvinus’ (“Übersetzung von etr. hupni”, 1953:299), which was adopted by G. Giacomelli. I find none of the explanations of olna as a noun convincing: rather, it is a second gentilicium (as Schulze and Herbig suggested), perhaps marking the name of a freedman (cf. Rix 1965:376-8). For other instances of a double gentilicium from the area, e.g. m · tito · tulio · uoltilio · hescuna MLF 346, see §7.6.

Bibliography: Garrucci 1860:269 (autopsy); Garrucci 1864:60; Fabretti CII 2441bis,b; Garrucci SIL 794; Zvetaieff IIM 51; Zvetaieff III 53; Schneider 1886:105 (3); Bormann CIL XI.3160 I.5; Deecke 1888:131-2 (2); Conway 1897:375 ⟨xl.16⟩; Schulze 1904:73 n.3; Herbig 1910:105 (autopsy); Herbig CIE 8206; Vetter 1953:299 ⟨280⟩; G. Giacomelli 1963:79 ⟨78⟩. Drawings: Garrucci 1860 tav.G.2; Garrucci 1864 tav.III.5 (reproduced in CII tab.XLIII, IIM tab.VIII.5, Deecke 1888 Taf.I, CIE 8206).

83. Cut over the entrance of a tomb (letters c.21 cm high) to the left of Ponte Terrano. “Rimae litterarum recentiore tempore gypsatae sunt” (Herbig CIE 8209): cf. MF 84 and 85.

*[.]pi:uesθi:cela

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet with reversed s. Garrucci’s drawing gives the praenomen as FillColor, Thulin’s as FillColor, and Herbig’s as FillColor. The first letter is usually read as t, but t[i]pi (Garrucci 1860, 1864, Fabretti, Zvetaieff, Schneider) or t[e]pi (Bormann Deecke, Conway) is not attested from the ager Faliscus or Capenas, while Herbig’s [tre]pi and Vetter’s and G. Giacomelli’s [ui]pi appear to be incompatible with the traces. The third letter of the gentilicium is the top half of a reversed s (Herbig): the earlier uetθi and uezθi (Deecke, Conway) can be disregarded. Cela is a noun ‘cella’, as in MF 12, 84, and MLF 285 (not, as Herbig had thought, a cognomen, cf. §7.9): cf. §8.10.3

Bibliography: Mommsen 1860:451; Garrucci 1860:270-1 (autopsy); Garrucci 1864:59; Fabretti CII 2441bis,c; Garrucci SIL 791; Zvetaieff IIM 48; Zvetaieff III 50; Schneider 1886:105 (2); Bormann CIL XI.3160 I.2; Deecke 1888:133-4 (4); Conway 1897:375 ⟨xl.18⟩; Thulin 1907:275-6 (10); Herbig 1910:101 ⟨14⟩; Jacobsohn 1910:3 ⟨10⟩; Herbig CIE 8209; Vetter 1953:300 ⟨282⟩; G. Giacomelli 1963:80 ⟨81⟩. Drawings: Garrucci 1860 tav.G.4; Garrucci 1864 tav.III.2 (reproduced in CII tab.XLIII, IIM tab.VIII.2, Deecke 1888 Taf.I); Thulin 1907:276 (reproduced in CIE 8209).
84. Cut over the entrance to a tomb to the left of the Ponte Terrano. Letters c.16 cm high: “sulci litterarum, olim rubro colore expiecti, a recentioribus gypsetaee sunt” (Herbig CIE 8210): cf. MF 83 and 85.

cauif:[t]**(*)[i]:cela

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The remains of the gentilicium are given by Garrucci as (five letters), and by Herbig as (four letters). It therefore started in Tal- or Tri- (Garrucci 1864): Garrucci’s t(i).pi.. (1877) and Deecke’s t[rep]i are impossible. Herbig, and after him Vetter and G. Giacomelli, read tali, but this leaves some space after the i. The text consists of a name in the genitive followed by cela ‘cella’, as in MF 12, 83, and MLF 285: cf. §8.10.3.

Bibliography: Mommsen 1860:451; Garrucci 1860:271 (autopsy); Garrucci 1864:59; Fabretti CII 2441bis,d; Garrucci SIL 790; Zvetaieff IIM 47; Zvetaieff III 49; Schneider 1886:105 (1); Bormann CIL XI.3160 1; Deecke 1888:132-3 (3); Conway 1897:375 (xL17); Herbig 1910:101 13 (autopsy); Herbig CIE 8210; Vetter 1953:300 (283); G. Giacomelli 1963:81 (82) (autopsy). Drawings: Garrucci 1860 tav.G.5; Garrucci 1864 tav.III.1 (reproduced in CII tab. XLIII, IIM tab.VIII.1, Deecke 1888 Taf.I); Herbig CIE 8210.

85. Cut to the left of the entrance of a tomb to the left of the Ponte Terrano. Dennis and Zvetaieff reported traces of red paint (cf. MF 83 and 84), which were probably ‘recent’ additions. Letters c.15 cm high.

tuconu

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. Early editors misread the inscription in various ways (ti[conu] Garrucci 1864, SIL; tu[dn]mu Dennis 1887; hu[come] Del Frate), but the text is certain, and, according to Herbig (from autopsy), complete. The form is usually interpreted as an Etruscan genitive in -u(s) (Garrucci, Deecke, Herbig, G. Giacomelli). Herbig’s alternative, interpreting it as a Faliscan genitive plural tuconu(m) (CIE), is unattractive, since the expected form would be tucono(m), unless the inscription is assumed to be Late Faliscan (cf. [fel]jcina[til] LF 384) Perhaps the text could be read as tu(e)conu, with a gentilicium as in u[ icons]o MF 88.

Bibliography: Dennis 1845:139 (autopsy); Dennis 1848:124; Garrucci 1860:270 (autopsy); Garrucci 1864:59-60; Fabretti CII 2453; Garrucci SIL 792; Zvetaieff IIM 49 (autopsy); Zvetaieff III 51; Schneider 1886:105 (6); Dennis 1878:94; Bormann CIL XI.3160 1; Deecke 1888:134-5 (5); Conway 1897:527 (27*); Del Frate 1898:77 (autopsy); Herbig 1910:186-7 (24); Herbig CIE 8211; Buonamici 1913:61-2 (19); Vetter 1953:300 (284); G. Giacomelli 1963:81 (83) (autopsy). Drawings: Garrucci 1864 tav.III.3 (reproduced in CII tab.XLIII; Zvetaieff IIM tab.VIII.3 (reproduced in Deecke 1888 Taf.I); Herbig CIE 8211.

86. Cut over a loculus in a tomb close to the tomb of MF 85.

uoll[---]/

235 G. Giacomelli erroneously has caui[i]t(ali) instead of caui[:]t(ali).
Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The last letters are \(\text{JJ}\). Although this can be read as \(\text{II}\), cf. \(\text{uolfia}\) MF 47, a geminated spelling is very rare (§11.2.4.3), and editors have therefore read \(\text{uolf[---]}\) (Zvetaieff, Bornmann, Deecke) or \(\text{uwol[---]}\) (Herbig), or emended to \(\text{uolt[---]}\) (Vetter).

**Bibliography:**

Zvetaieff IIM 50 (autopsy); Zvetaieff III 52; Bornmann CIL XI.3160 I.4; Deecke 1888:135 (6); Conway 1897:375 (xI.14); Del Frate 1898:77 (autopsy); Herbig CIE 8212; Vetter 1953:300 (285); G. Giacomelli 1963:81 (84). **Drawing:** Zvetaieff IIM tab.VIII.4 (reproduced in Deecke 1888 Taf.I, CIE 8212).

87. Cut underneath a loculus (length 78 cm, letters 18 cm high). Third century (G. Giacomelli).

\textit{mar\textasciitilde{e}ina}

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. Vetter’s proposal \(\text{ma pleina}\) (in G. Giacomelli 1965:551) is apparently impossible.

**Bibliography:**


88-89. The following inscriptions were painted within a coloured border around a loculus in a tomb “in Terrano” (Thulin 1907:268), 88 painted in red downwards along the left side of the loculus, and 89 downwards along the right side and under the same loculus. They are known only through Mengarelli’s apographs.

\(\text{[uo]l\textasciitilde{t}io\textasciitilde{c}uei\textasciitilde{c}no\textasciitilde{c}lecet\textasciitilde{c}hec}\)

\(\text{[4-5]\textasciitilde{q}hac****a[?]\textasciitilde{q}?n:maximo}\)

Sinistroverse Faliscan alphabet. Although the \(c\) in \(\text{lecet}\) is \(\text{\&}\) and the \(h\) in \(\text{hec}\) \(\text{\&}\), the last two words of 88 are certainly to be read as \(\text{lecet\textasciitilde{c}hec}\) (Thulin’s and Herbig’s \(\text{leset}\) : \(\text{leo}\) makes no sense): the form of the \(c\) may be due to the fact that the inscription was painted vertically, while a similar \(h\) occurs in MF 18. For \(\text{lecet}\) instead of the usual \(\text{cupat}\), cf. §5.3.1.2-3, §6.3.13: it is a form of the verbal root underlying the noun used to designate the loculus, \(\text{lectu}\) Lat 251, \(\text{le\textasciitilde{c}}\) MLF 285, and perhaps \(l[\ldots\ldots\ldots]\) MF 17 and \(\text{let}\) MLF 360. A Sabellic parallel, also occurring beside \(\text{cupat}\) :, is South Picene \(\text{vei\textasciitilde{a}}\text{t}\) in \(\text{apa\textasciitilde{e}}\)es : \(\text{qu\textasciitilde{p}at}\) [: \(\text{e\textasciitilde{m}}\text{\textasciitilde{n}}\text{\textasciitilde{s}}\text{\textasciitilde{i}}\text{\textasciitilde{n}}\text{\textasciitilde{s}}\text{\textasciitilde{n}}\text{\textasciitilde{i}}\text{\textasciitilde{m}}\text{\textasciitilde{e}}\text{\textasciitilde{f}}\text{\textasciitilde{i}}\text{\textasciitilde{n}}\text{\textasciitilde{t}}\) : \(\text{v\textasciitilde{e}}\text{\textasciitilde{p}}\text{\textasciitilde{e}}\text{\textasciitilde{t}}\) : \(\text{vep\textasciitilde{e}}\text{\textasciitilde{t}}\) MC.1.

In the gentillicium, Mengarelli’s drawing shows \(\&\) between \(ue\) and \(no\). The word has therefore been read as \(\text{uei\textasciitilde{c}no}\) (Thulin, Herbig), \(\text{uei\textasciitilde{c}no}\) (Herbig) and \(\text{uersno}\) (Vetter, G. Giacomelli). As the fourth letter is identical to the \(c\) in \(\text{lecet}\) (Thulin and Herbig in fact read both letters as \(s\)), and can hardly be taken together with the \(i\) as \(r\) (as does Vetter), \(\text{ueic}\) seems certain. The \(\&\), standing between \(ueic\) and \(no\), can hardly be anything other than a vowel; it is probably an \(o\), deformed, like the \(c\’s\), by the unusual way of writing.
In 89, the first legible letter is 'x', either an x (G. Giacomelli) or an a (Thulin, Herbig, Vetter). The traces of the next word are hac****a. The inscription then continues horizontally under the loculus with **f* that is, either r (Vetter) or a (Thulin), possibly preceded by one very small letter, and followed by an illegible trace and the upper part of an m. The last word is maximo, with only the lowest part of the i preserved (Thulin’s mammo is impossible). The interpretations by Thulin, who divides the inscription into two, reading ..a ha...a and ..a..t : mammo, and by Vetter, whose ----a hac****a : (-)r--t: maximo ‘...a(m) ha(n)c ..am ..t Maximus’ assumes a type of text that is completely without parallels in the Faliscan sepulchral inscriptions. The masculine cognomen maximo indicates that the preceding text consisted of a man’s praenomen, gentilicium, and a filiation. Dividing [4-5]a hac****a or [4-5]x hac****a before the h seems the obvious thing to do even though an inter-punct is absent. This gives a praenomen [4-5]a ([uolt]a or [iun]a) or [se]x, followed by a gentilicium hac****a ([uolt]a hac****a: Herbig). The filiation is almost illegible and is so short that it was probably abbreviated (q[i]m ‘Aem(ius)’?).

Bibliography: Thulin 1907:268-70 (5a-c); Herbig CIE 8213a-b; Vetter 1953:301 (286A-B); G. Giacomelli 1963:81-2 (85a-b); Pisani 1964:340 (144G).

13.8. The tomb near Torrente Purgatorio

Torrente Purgatorio flows along the northern side of Terrano, joining the Rio Maggiore just west of the Ponte Clementino. In 1881, a fourth- or third-century tomb with nineteen loculi was discovered on its left bank. It had been plundered in antiquity, during which the tiles with the inscriptions had been smashed. According to Lucidi, the discoverer of the tomb and owner of the terrain, the tiles belonging to the principal loculus were stolen shortly after its discovery (Gamurrini 1883:165). Most of the tiles pertain to a gens Caelia (MF 90-97, 104), whose parentage was tentatively reconstructed by Peruzzi (1964d), and a gens Raeclia (MF 99, 100). The latter name was read by earlier authors only in MF 99 (reic[lio]), but I read the same name also in MF 98 (re[lio]) and in MF 100 (rei[i]).

90-91. The titulus prior (90) was painted in a dark colour on plaster across the back of two tiles (70x47 cm, letters c.9 cm high). This inscription was later washed over with plaster, on which was then painted the titulus posterior (91). As this second coat of plaster has crumbled away almost completely, 91 is in a far worse state than 90.

---

236 Gamurrini (whence Bormann, Deecke, and Conway) erroneously placed the Torrente Purgatorio on the east side of Civita Castellana. This error was corrected by Herbig (CIE 8214-8231 p.39).

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The praenomen was restored as *leiu*elio by Thulin, and the second line as *max*om[o]*rex* by Thulin, and the second line as *max*om[o]. This was adopted by all later editors, except Vetter (and Peruzzi), who read the praenomen as *c*elio ‘Gellius’, with *max*om at the end of the line. This is impossible, both because there is not enough room for a c to precede *felio* on the same tile and because this restoration would leave no room for the filiation in the first line. The gentilicium is *cailio*; Deecke’s *ceilio* (adopted by Conway) is a misreading. The gentilicium was probably followed by an abbreviated filiation, of which nothing is left. In the second line, Thulin read *omo*rex, but in the other early autopsies the second o is invisible. The x of *rex* is now invisible, but was read in all early autopsies. This word, read with great uncertainty in 91, is now attested also in *refx* in 249 and perhaps also in my reading of LtF 231. Of the end of the line only some badly legible traces are preserved, which have been read as ...*iri* (Gamurrini, whence Bormann), ...*tai* (Conway, erroneously stating that the r and the a have the same form), ///r*iso* or ispriso (Thulin), ***re* (Herbig), and [:m]*aro* (Vetter). None of this can be sustained from the traces that are now left.

Below, I present my reading of 91 alongside the readings of the early autopsies. The tiles are presented in the order in which they were placed in 90, but the inscription is so damaged that it is impossible to say whether this is correct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>inv. 8154</th>
<th>inv. 8172</th>
<th>Herbig</th>
<th>Thulin</th>
<th>Gamurrini</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>oc</em>[..]</td>
<td>...]<em>[..]</em></td>
<td><em>icy</em></td>
<td>.......</td>
<td><em>eico.uoc</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uat[..]</td>
<td>...<em>[..]</em></td>
<td>uatr</td>
<td>uap/</td>
<td>...uatu..eco*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***xif</td>
<td>...]<em>[..]</em></td>
<td>**<em>x</em></td>
<td>.*rex:</td>
<td>...*.exi....238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ma</em>[..]</td>
<td>...<em>[..]</em></td>
<td>.<em>ma</em></td>
<td>aim</td>
<td>...pal....imr*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The reading is extremely uncertain. In the second line, the a may be followed by either a t or a p. In the third, the traces that precede the x could perhaps be an e, but Thulin’s *rex* (“zwar [ist] nur die linke Hälfte des r erhalten”, 1907:278) can no more be read; following the x is i, not Thulin’s . Gamurrini and Deecke saw traces on the second tile as well; although still visible, they are illegible, except for the last line, where an r or an a (.ima.? Deecke) can perhaps be recognized. The only attempt at interpretation is Peruzzi’s,239 who interpreted Gamurrini’s and Deecke’s readings as a *carmen epigraphicum*, reading *dfeico.uoc[e* ‘dico uoce’, *atr* (from Herbig) as a form of *ater, eco ‘ego’, *exif* as a form of *exire or exitus*, and *imr* as

238 Bormann erroneously rendered Gamurrini’s reading as //v.exci///.
239 Earlier editors limited themselves to names (Deecke: praenomen e.g. *num*elio, gentilicium e.g. *uoc*onio; Thulin: *uap*... cf. *Vapusius, aima* fem. of *Aemus*; Herbig: gentilicium *uatr*[io]).
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a form of imbrex or imber. Not all of this is plausible (the reference to an imbrex or an imber is unclear, and the parallel quoted for \textit{mr} = /m(b)r/, \textit{umrie} Etr \textit{XLIII}, is Etruscan rather than Faliscan) and the likelihood of such a carmen may be questioned in view of the function of Faliscan sepulchral inscriptions (§11.1.4.).

From autopsy in the Museo dell’Agro Falisco, Civita Castellana (inv. 8154+8173). Bibliography: Gamurrini 1883:166 (5) (autopsy); Bormann \textit{CIL} XI.3162c.4a-b; Deecke 1888:145-6 (14a-b); Conway 1897:373-4 (319a-b); Thulin 1907:277-8 (11a-b) (autopsy); Herbig \textit{CIE} 8214a-b (autopsy); Vetter 1953:301-2 (287a-A-B); G. Giacomelli 1963:82-4 (86,la-b); Peruzzi 1964d:310-1. Drawings: Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I (reproduced in \textit{CIE} 8214a-b); Thulin 1907:277, 278 (reproduced in \textit{CIE} 8216).

92. Painted in red on plaster along the length of a tile (60×47 cm, letters 10 cm high).

\textit{tan[---]/} \\
\textit{ca[---]} \\
\textit{lia[---]}

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. Herbig’s \textit{tan} is preferable to the \textit{pan} of the earlier editors. The \textit{a} in the second line is very damaged, but can hardly be anything else than \textit{ca[---]}. If the inscription occupied one tile, the first line was probably \textit{tan[a]} (Herbig) or \textit{tan[ja]}; otherwise, it can be read as e.g. \textit{tan[acuil]} with \textit{ca[---]} in the second line. Vetter’s \textit{tan[ca]il} is meaningless, Pauli’s \textit{tan[cyil]} (in Herbig \textit{CIE} 8216) impossible.

Bibliography: Gamurrini 1883:166 (9) (autopsy); Deecke 1888:147 (18); Conway 1897:374 (xl.4); Herbig \textit{CIE} 8216 (autopsy); Vetter 1953:301-3 (287c); G. Giacomelli 1963:82-4 (86,III); Peruzzi 1964d:310. Drawings: Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I (reproduced in \textit{CIE} 8214a-b); Herbig \textit{CIE} 8216.

93. Painted in red on plaster on a tile.

\textit{la[---]/} \\
\textit{ca[---]}

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The first line seems to have contained a man’s name with a gentilicium in \textit{le-} (for suggestions with regard to this name, cf. §7.8.1.75), followed in the second line by a woman’s name \textit{ca[---]} (not Deecke’s and Herbig’s \textit{ca[---]} ‘Gai’), either a praenomen or a gentilicium (thus Peruzzi).

Bibliography: Gamurrini 1883:166 (15) (autopsy); Deecke 1888:149 (24); Conway 1897:375 (xl.10); Herbig \textit{CIE} 8217 (autopsy); Vetter 1953:301-3 (287d); G. Giacomelli 1963:82-4 (86,IV); Peruzzi 1964d:311-2. Drawing: Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I (reproduced in \textit{CIE} 8217).

94. Painted in red on plaster across the back of a tile (67×46 cm, letters 10-15 cm high).

\textit{[---]/} \textit{g[---]} \textit{elu[---]} \\
\textit{[---]/} \textit{f[---]} \textit{ca[---]}/

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The \textit{e} in \textit{esi} is cursive (ll): the gentilicium can therefore be \textit{elio}, \textit{ca[---]} or \textit{e[---]}. In the second line, Herbig’s \textit{ca[---]} (read erroneously as \textit{icruir} by the earlier editors) is followed by two traces that may be the traces of
a titulus prior that were seen by Thulin (in Herbig CIE 8215). The last line, first read by Pauli (in CIE), is [---]a (Herbig), e.g. the formula [hec]up [a or the end of the woman’s gentilicium or patronym. Peruzzi, restoring the first line as ce.[c]elio.cesi.[f], regarded the text as a new epitaph for the deceased of MF 90, made after the death of his wife cauia. From autopsy in the Museo dell’Agro Falisco, Civita Castellana (inv. 8180). I succeeded only in finding the fragment containing the letters fi and several traces of the second line. Bibliography: Gamurrini 1883:166 (4) (autopsy); Bormann CIL XI.3162c,3; Deecke 1888:145 (13); Conway 1897:373 (318a); Herbig CIE 8215 (autopsy); Vetter 1953:302 (287b); G. Giacomelli 1963:82-4 (86,II); Peruzzi 1964d:310. Drawings: Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I; Herbig CIE 8215.

95. Painted in red on plaster along the length of the back of two damaged tiles (the first max. 30×45 cm, the second max. 30×45 cm; letters 13-15 cm high).

\[1\] [-[-] fcelio[--] \\
\[2\] [---] hecc\, upa[?] \\

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The earliest editors treated the tiles as separate inscriptions celio (or celioi) utpos and …upa. Thulin, however, rightly read hec:c instead of utpos (cf. Herbig’s drawings) and joined it to the tile with upa.\textsuperscript{240} The lost first line on the second tile probably contained the man’s filiation. At the beginning of the second line, Thulin read a trace , probably part of a, on a shard that I was unable to find. At the beginning of the text, one tile is missing, which contained the man’s praenomen in the first line, and in the second line perhaps a woman’s name (---]a). Cupa[?] is therefore perhaps plural rather than singular. From autopsy in the Museo dell’Agro Falisco, Civita Castellana (inv. 8162+8174). I did not succeed in finding the shard of the first tile with the trace at the beginning of the second line. Bibliography: Gamurrini 1883:166 (3+8) (autopsy); Bormann CIL XI.3162c,5; Deecke 1888:146-7 (15+17); Conway 1897:374 (xl.1); Thulin 1907:279 (12) (autopsy); Jacobsohn 1910:4 (21); Herbig CIE 8218 (autopsy); Vetter 1953:302 (287e); G. Giacomelli 1963:82-4 (86,V); Peruzzi 1964d:311. Drawings: Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I; Thulin 1907:279 (reproduced in CIE 8218); Herbig CIE 8218.

96. Painted in red on plaster along the length of the back of a tile (68×43 cm, letters c.15 cm high in the first line, the second line slightly smaller).

\[1\] iuna;ce\,[2]\, [lio---] \\
\[2\] arutiela\,[2]\, [?---] \\

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The gentilicium can be read as ce[lio or ce[ilio (Herbig; ce[ilio Jacobsohn, ce[lio Vetter, G. Giacomelli). In the second line, the u appears to have been corrected from a t, whose sidestroke, apparently obliterated on purpose, is still vaguely visible. Arutiela was first proposed by Pauli (in Herbig CIE 8221). A second tile will have contained, in the first line the remainder of the gentilicium and the man’s filiation, and in the second perhaps the woman’s filiation or -cue.

\textsuperscript{240} Thulin’s drawing gives a false impression of a great difference in size between the two tiles: in my measurements, the sizes come to 45 and 43 cm respectively.
From autopsy in the Museo dell’Agro Falisco, Civita Castellana (inv. 8176). Bibliography: Gamurrini 1883:166 (1) (autopsy); Bormann CIL XI.3162c,2; Deecke 1888:142-3 (10); Conway 1897:373 (316); Jacobsohn 1910:4 (22); Herbig CIE 8221 (autopsy); Vetter 1953:302 (287g); G. Giacomelli 1963:82-4 (86, VIII). Drawing: Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I; Herbig CIE 8221.

97. Painted in red on plaster on a tile fragment. Letters 11 cm high.

$[---c]\text{elio}[---]$

$[---]r*\text{[i]...[i]}*$

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The (cursive) e, ll, was seen only by Gamurrini ($c]\text{elio}$ Deecke, ...$\text{elio}$ Conway; $c]\text{elio}$ Herbig, G. Giacomelli). He read the second line as $rpi\ a$ (e.g. $t]\text{rpi[li][a}$ Deecke), but the letter following the $r$, which is $]\text{[i}$ in Deecke jr.’s drawing and $]\text{[i}$ in Herbig’s, has also been read as a $z$ ($\text{nobo[zi][ni][a}$ Deecke, $\text{he}[zi[ni][a$ Thulin in Herbig CIE 8220, $\text{no}[zi[ni][a$ Herbig). Gamurrini’s $a$ was not seen by Deecke jr.; Herbig’s drawing shows an (illegible) letter. Gamurrini and Pauli (in Herbig CIE) joined this tile to the one of 99, which is impossible.

Bibliography: Gamurrini 1883:166 (3) (autopsy); Deecke 1888:144 (12); Conway 1897:373 (318b); Herbig CIE 8220 (autopsy); G. Giacomelli 1963:82-4 (86, VII). Drawings: Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I; Herbig CIE 8220.

98. Painted in red along the length of the back of a damaged tile (41.5$\times$ 49 cm, letters of the first line 12-13 cm high, those of the second line c. 10 cm high).

$[1]\text{-}[r]\text{eic[l]io}$

$[1]\text{-}[m]\text{axom[o]}$

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The first line has been read as $reio$ by all editors ($ma]\text{reio}$ Deecke), but as only the right half of the $c$ is left, it is also possible to read $reic\ [l]io$ (cf. $reic\l i o$ in MF 99). In the second line, the first letter was virtually obliterated by the mortar used to keep the tile in place. The second letter is $a$, not $r$ (Gamurrini, Conway); of the last legible letter, only one vertical shaft is left. Thulin read $saxoi$, Herbig $saxola$ (adopted by Vetter and G. Giacomelli), but Deecke’s $m]\text{axom[o}$ is certainly not impossible: as there is not enough place for a (complete) $m$ on this tile, it will have been partly written on the tile missing at the beginning of the text. This tile will have contained the man’s praenomen in the first line and his filiation in the second. The missing letters of $reic[l]io$ and $\text{maxom[o]}$ were written on the missing part of the tile; it is not necessary to assume that another tile is missing at the end.

From autopsy in the Museo dell’Agro Falisco, Civita Castellana (inv. 8223). Bibliography: Gamurrini 1883:165-7 (7) (autopsy); Deecke 1888:147 (16); Conway 1897:374 (xl.2); Herbig CIE 8226 (autopsy); Vetter 1953:303 (287l); G. Giacomelli 1963:82-4 (86, XIII). Drawings: Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I; Herbig CIE 8226.

---

241 Herbig (from Pauli) gives the size of this fragment as “m. 0,45 a. x 0,695 l.”, which corresponds to the size of a complete tile (§11.1.4.1c).
99. Painted in red on plaster along the length of the back of a damaged tile (max. 46×42 cm, letters 10-14 cm high).


Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The text is largely that of Herbig (earlier editors read seiclio|icasilio). What remains of the second letter of the second line is and may be a damaged e, which would give cesili[a], rather than the damaged a (A) of the earlier editors: cf. the e or a in MF 109. The last letter of the second line, , was read as n by Herbig and Thulin (in Herbig CIE 8222), but is perhaps rather li (Pauli in Herbig CIE 8222). The last letter of cesili[a] will have stood on the missing part of the tile; it is not necessary to assume that another tile followed the text. A tile missing at the beginning will have contained the praenomen of the man in the first line and his filiation in the second. Torelli proposed to read (p)reiclio (cf. Praecilia Setoriana in CIL XI.3181 from near Fabbrica di Roma (?), but the fact that in MF 100 the gentilicium stands at the beginning of the line pleads against this. Gamurrini and Pauli (in Herbig CIE 8222) joined this tile to the one of MF 96, but that appears to be impossible.

Bibliography: Gamurrini 1883:166 (2) (autopsy); Bornmann CIL XI.3162c.1; Deecke 1888:143-4 (11); Conway 1897:373 (317); Herbig CIE 8222 (autopsy); Vetter 1953:302 (287h); G. Giacomelli 1963:82-4 (86,lX); Torelli 1967:536. Drawings: Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I; Herbig CIE 8222.

100. Painted in red on plaster across the back of a damaged tile (max. 48×19 cm, letters c.8 cm high).


Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. A trace of the first line was seen by Thulin (in Herbig CIE 8224) and Herbig. The second line is read as re/ by all editors, but part of a shaft is visible after the e, and in view of reiclìo in MF 99 and reic[lio] in MF 98, it is possible to read re[clìo] or re[clïa]. Of the last letter of the third line only a shaft is preserved. In the fourth line, the last letter (first read by Herbig) is certainly an s: it is impossible to read cu[pat]. The last line is ma[---] (Deecke) rather than mr... (Gamurrini) or mo[---] (Thulin in Herbig CIE 8224). The fact that the inscription (uniquely) consists of five lines implies that it probably occupied only one tile, e.g. [marco] | re[clìo] | ma[rcio], followed by a woman’s name cus[....] | ma[ : uxo]: alternatively, it would have been part of a very long text indeed.

From autopsy in the Museo dell’Agro Falisco, Civita Castellana (inv. 8216). Bibliography: Gamurrini 1883:166 (13) (autopsy); Deecke 1888:149 (22); Conway 1897:374 (x1.8); Herbig CIE 8224 (autopsy); G. Giacomelli 1963:83-4 (86,1X). Drawings: Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I; Herbig CIE 8224.
101. Painted in red on plaster along the length of the back of a tile (68.5 × 47 cm, let. 7-13 cm).

\[
\text{tanacu[il]}
\]
\[
\text{anelia}\
\]
\[
\text{uxoria}
\]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The first \(a\) is ARIABLE, the cross-over form between \(\text{\~r}\) and \(\text{\~r}\); the fourth and fifth \(a\) and the \(r\) are both AILABLE, an instance of the confusion of \(\text{\~r}\) (\(a\)) and \(\text{\~r}\) (\(r\)): see §11.2.4.2. Of the first letter, part of the top is missing, but Deecke’s \text{tanacu[il]} is certainly right (\text{panacu} Thulin). The two interpuncts at the end of the second line are unique. The third line was first seen by Thulin, who read \text{uxoria/}, which was adopted by G. Giacomelli. Herbig (whence Jacobsohn and Vetter) read \text{uxor.i/}, but an abbreviation \text{ia} of a man’s name occurs also in MLF 302 and LtF 341.

\textit{Bibliography:} Gamurrini 1883:166 (12) (autopsy); Borrmann CIL XI.3162c,6; Deecke 1888:148-9 (21); Conway 1897:374 (xl.7); Thulin 1907:280-1 (14) (autopsy); Jacobsohn 1910:4 (23); Herbig CIE 8223 (autopsy); Vetter 1953:302 (287i); G. Giacomelli 1963:82-4 (86,X). \textit{Drawings:} Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I; Thulin 1907:280 (reproduced in CIE 8223); Herbig CIE 8223.

102. Painted in red on plaster across the back of a tile (57 × 45 cm, let. 9-11 cm).

\[
[---][\text{iena:u}][---][---]
\]

\[
[---][\text{ono:ux}][---][or]
\]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan (?) alphabet. The \(u\) in the first line could also be a tilted \(i\). Deecke took \text{---iena} as an Etruscan gentilicium, \text{u[---]} as the beginning of the father’s name in the genitive (or of a patronym) and \text{---ono} as a cognomen, followed by \text{uxorcue}. This reading was adopted by Herbig and G. Giacomelli. There are no parallels in the Faliscan inscriptions for a woman to be designated by just the word \text{uxor}, instead of a name. Vetter’s interpretation, to take the whole inscription as referring to a woman, with \text{---ono} as the ending of genitive of the husband’s name (e.g. \text{petrjono}), is more attractive. In both interpretations it is assumed that the inscription occupied three tiles.

\textit{From autopsy} in the Museo dell’Agro Falisco, Civita Castellana (inv. 8145). \textit{Bibliography:} Gamurrini 1883:166 (11) (autopsy); Deecke 1888:148 (20); Conway 1897:374 (xl.6); Herbig CIE 8227 (autopsy); Vetter 1953:303 (287i); G. Giacomelli 1963:83-4 (86,XIV). \textit{Drawings:} Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I; Herbig CIE 8227.

103. Painted in red on plaster across the upper part of the back of a damaged tile (71×max. 41 cm, letters c.11 cm high).

\[
[---][\text{nur}][---][---]
\]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan (?) alphabet. The letters start close to the edge of the tile: it is unclear if another tile preceded it. The last letter has been read as \(r\) (Gamurrini) and as \(a\) (Deecke jr., Pauli and Thulin in Herbig CIE 8225): at present, little more than a vertical
shaft is left (*nut* Herbig). If the tile was of standard width, no more than two letters can have followed on the same tile. Herbig and Vetter considered interpreting the word as ‘nutrix’. G. Giacomelli rightly rejected this, as the Middle Faliscan equivalent of Latin *nutrix*, older *notrix* in CIL I.45, would have been *notrix* (§3.7.2). Peruzzi defended Herbig’s interpretation, regarding *nutrix* as a Roman *Luxuslehnwort*. It is not certain, however, if even in contemporary Roman Latin /o/ had already developed so far towards /o/ as to be written *u* (Wachter (1987:313-3) thinks it was possible). Furthermore, it would be the only Faliscan sepulchral inscription where an occupation is mentioned. I think it is safer to read *nut*[---] as a name, perhaps as *nut*[---] (cf. *nu* in MLF 309 and perhaps also in MF? 202).

From autopsy in the Museo dell’Agro Falisco, Civita Castellana (inv. 8164). Bibliography: Gamurrini 1883:166-7 (10) (autopsy); Deecke 1888:148 (19); Conway 1897:374 (xl.5); Herbig CIE 8225 (autopsy); Vetter 1953:302 (287k); G. Giacomelli 1963:82-4 (86,XII); Peruzzi 1964d:312. Drawings: Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I; Herbig CIE 8225.

104. Painted in red on plaster on a tile fragment.

[---*jila*---]

[---*jic*---]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan (?) alphabet. For the first line, Deecke proposed a connection with Etruscan *Veila*; Herbig considered dividing ---*i la*---. The second line could be *ralic[i-], rejic[i-], or perhaps r*e c[i-], if the shaft is half of a cursive *e* (II).


105-108. Four more fragmentary tiles were seen in 1887 by Deecke jr. in the Museo di Villa Giulia. Only two (MF 105 and 107) were later seen by others. It is not recorded on what grounds they were ascribed to the Torrente Purgatorio tomb, or why they did not appear in Gamurrini’s description: MF 105 is well legible even today, and if its state is representative of the whole group, Gamurrini could hardly have overlooked these fragments if they had been discovered together with those published by him in 1883.

105. Painted in red on plaster on a two fragments of a tile (total size 56 × 26 cm; letters c.10 cm high).

[---*jcelio*---]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan (?) alphabet.

From autopsy in the Museo dell’Agro Falisco, Civita Castellana (inv. 8219, olim 8199). Bibliography: Deecke 1888:150 (25); Conway 1897:374 (320); Thulin 1907:279 (13) (autopsy); Herbig CIE 8219 (autopsy); Vetter 1953:301-3 (287t); G. Giacomelli 1963:83-4 (86,VI). Drawings: Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I; Thulin 1907:279 (reproduced in CIE 8219); Herbig CIE 8219.

---242 Note, however, that shortly after 241, a T. Furius, perhaps an Latin immigrant craftsman at Falerii Novi, still spelled his name as *fourios* (Lat 215).
106. On a tile fragment (presumably painted in red on plaster).

[---]cisi[---]
[---]jipo[---]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet with reversed s: the sign for this letter is given as Ɵ, which is used for t in MLF 347, 350, and probably 351. Deecke compared Etruscan Cisie; Herbig considered dividing the second line as ---i po---. Perhaps cisi is an error (by the painter or by Deecke jr.) for cœsi with cursive e, ll.


107. Painted in red on plaster on a damaged tile (max. 50-38×47 cm).

[---]cflî[---]
[---]afc[---]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet: the a is Α. Deecke proposed to read ‘G(ai) f(ilius)’ in the first line and ‘A(uli) f(ilius)’ in the second. Pauli (in Herbig CIE 8230) read a[n]elio|i? apc, comparing anelia in MF 98, but it is impossible to see how this reading can be derived from his drawing, which appears to suggest that the reading is [---]*[e]ui*[---]i*[apc[---]].

_Bibliography:_ Deecke 1888:150 (27); Conway 1897:375 (x1.12); Herbig CIE 8230; G. Giacomelli 1963:83-4 (86,XVII). _Drawing:_ Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I (reproduced in CIE 8230); Pauli in Herbig CIE 8230.

108. On three tile fragments (presumably painted in red on plaster: an autoptic description is lacking).

[---]a[---]
[---]iac[---]
[---]call[---]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan (?) alphabet. Herbig’s suggestions [---]iaceue ‘...ia-que’ and cal infring ‘Calinia’ are possible, but hardly more than guesses.

_Bibliography:_ Deecke 1888:150 (28); Conway 1897:375 (x1.13); Herbig CIE 8231; G. Giacomelli 1963:83-4 (86,XVIII). _Drawings:_ Deecke jr. in Deecke 1888 Taf.I (reproduced in CIE 8231); Pauli in Herbig CIE 8231.
PORTICRED TOME WITH CORINCE OF MARSEY, TALERI.