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Chapter 15

The inscriptions from S. Maria di Falleri (Falerii Novi)

15.1. Falerii Novi

After the war of 241 BC, a new Falerii, probably a Roman colony (cf. §2.6.2), was built in the open tableland c.3 miles to the west of Civita Castellana, where the buildings of the medieval abbey of S. Maria di Falleri and the hamlet of Faleri still preserve the ancient name. The new town was fortified with heavy walls that to a large extent are still standing today. Part of the area was excavated in the nineteenth century by the proprietor of the terrain, Sebastiani. See Ward Perkins & Frederiksen 1957:155-62 with map p.156 fig.26 and aerial photograph pl. XXVI, De Lucia Brolli 1991a:48-63 with map p.49 fig.35, and especially Di Stefano Manzella 1979.

As the founding of Falerii Novi can be dated to the period shortly after 241 BC, perhaps the decade 230-220 BC (§2.6.2-3), the Faliscan inscriptions from the town and its surroundings are all classed as Late Faliscan or Latino-Faliscan, and there are indeed indications that immigrants from Latium may have settled at the new town. The town itself has yielded one Late Faliscan inscription (LF 213), one Latino-Faliscan inscription (LtF 215), four Latin ones (Lat 216-219), as well as LF/Lat 214, which appears to be a Latin inscription in the Faliscan alphabet: with the exception of Lat 216, these are all official inscriptions. The tombs from the neighbourhood of the town provide a number of Late Faliscan, Latino-Faliscan, and Latin sepulchral inscriptions (220-251). Two inscriptions of unknown origin, caui : tertinei : | posticnu MLF/Cap 474* and l : quinti Lat 477*, may also be from Falerii Novi: see §18.2.

15.2. Inscriptions from the town

213. In a mosaic across the entrance of a small building “litteris fere palmaribus” (Garrucci 1877:199). The inscription was discovered shortly before 1870 but apparently destroyed soon afterwards (cf. Garrucci 1870:33, SIL 808).

[...]/hirmio-m/f]ce-tertineo-c-f/pretores ?—–/

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The [f] may have disappeared during an ancient repair (“post praenomen patris nullum indicium apparuit litterae deperditae, nisi quod tessellae ibi erant temere positae”, Garrucci SIL 808). Of the t in pretf, only the upper
part was preserved. Pret has been read as an abbreviation (Garrucci SIL, Deecke, Jacobsohn), but may well be restored to pretores (Bormann, Vetter, G. Giacomelli). The language of this text shows Faliscan features in the omission of word-final -s in hirmeo and tertineo and in the monophthongization of /ai/ to /e/ in ce and pretores, and the antevocalic e in hirmeo: see §3.6.2. (The antevocalic e in tertineo probably represents /e/, cf. the genitive tertinei MLF/Cap 474*.)

Bibliography: Garrucci 1870:33 (autopsy); Garrucci SIL 808; Zvetaieff IIM 67; Zvetaieff III 69; Schneider 1886:106 (24); Bormann CIL XI.3156a; Deecke 1888:162-3 (38); Conway 1897:377 (323); Jacobsohn 1910:4 (24); Herbig CIE 8343; Vetter 1953:307 (317); G. Giacomelli 1963:69 (61). Drawing: Garrucci 1870 tav. nr.6 (reproduced in IIM tab.VII.3 (whence CIE 8343), Deecke 1888 Taf.II).257

214. Engraved on a bronze tablet (52×18 cm, letters 2 cm high), originally fastened with rivets, from which it would appear to have been torn or broken. The right half was found in 1860 near the Porta Cimina. Garrucci, in whose possession it came, showed it to Henzen, from whose notes it was then published by Mommsen without Garrucci’s consent. The other half was found in 1870, reputedly together with 215 and 217-218, after which the inscription was published in its entirety by Garrucci. Date: c. 150.

menerua· sacru
la·cotena·la·f·pretod· de
zenatuo·sententiad·wootum
dedet· cuando·datu·rected
cuncaptum

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The space between menerua- and sacru is intentional. The l in la·cotena and the r in pretod are damaged but certain. Bréal (whence Dessau) read the second la as lr, but this cannot be justified.

Menerua is dative, the usual construction with sacer in both Latin and Sabellic, not a genitive menerua(s) (thus Deecke, Herbig 1910, and G. Giacomelli). These datives in -a seem to have spread from Latium and the Latin-speaking colonies (see Villar 1986). If in these forms the -a represents /-e/, as has been proposed (see §3.7.5), their spread is not due to morphophonological interference, but only to the spread of a different and specific spelling. The -d in pretod has been regarded as an erroneous use of the Etruscan r (Bréal, Schneider, Bormann, Dessau, Buonamici, R.Bloch, Ernout, Degrassi, De Rosalia) and as a sandhi with the following d- (Deecke, Herbig CIE, Lommatzsch, Warmington, Vetter, G. Giacomelli, Pisani), but the new attestations of the same spelling in cuestod · pi · pretod · pis LF 242 show that it may rather represent a weakened /-r/, probably a weak alveolar flap [r] (Peruzzi 1997), although M. Mancini suggests it may be an attempt to render the Latin realization or /k#/ː see §3.5.7b. The formula de | zenatuo · sententiad may well be Latin.

257 G. Giacomelli erroneously ascribes the apograph to Zvetaieff.
The interpretation of quando · datu · rected | cuncaptum is debated. Many editors (e.g. Deecke 1888, Herbig CIE, Buonamici, Warmington, and G. Giacomelli) have followed Bréal in assuming that datu has the sense of uootum (“quand il a été fait, il a été correctement conçu”, 1881:492). Cuncaptum is usually taken in a similar sense as in the expression concipere uerba ‘to phrase a vow’ (see Norden 1939:92-6). The phrase as a whole has been compared to Liv. 36.2.3 (first Dessau), where M’ Atilius, vowing to institute the ludi magni, is represented as saying “quisquis magistratus eos ludos quando ubique faxit, hi ludi recte facti, donaque data recte sunto”. Wachter discussed the text in the light of this passage. First, he rightly dismissed Vetter’s datu(r), for if the phrase from Livy indeed constitutes a parallel, the only possibility with datu(r) would be quando datur, recte conceptum esto, with a future sense that is impossible in the light of uootum dedet in the previous sentence. According to Wachter, cuncaptum refers not only to the phrasing of the vow but also to the actual dedication of what was vowed (as in sacrum and sacrificium concipere): the phrase would then mean ‘es ist aufgrund eines seinerzeit gebilligten Gelübdes dargebracht worden’ as well as ‘es ist richtig und mit den richtigen Worten dargebracht worden’. Together, this would be more or less ‘es ist unter in jeder Hinsicht richtigen Voraussetzungen dargebracht worden’. I find this strained: if cuncaptum can refer to the dedication itself, I do not see any reason to assume that it refers to the phrasing of the vow at the same time.

This is apparently the youngest inscription in the Faliscan alphabet, and the main subject of discussion is in how far the inscription was, in fact, still Faliscan. This is all the more interesting as it is a public dedication, and therefore apparently reflects the language used by local magistrates. The inscription cannot be much older than c. 150 BCE, as is shown both by the double oo in uootum and by the u’s in sacru, uootu, datu, and cuncaptum also point to the second century. Orthographically, it is almost entirely Faliscan: note the alphabet, the ductus, and the use of z- in zenatuo (cf. §11.2.5.2, §3.5.3):258 the only non-Faliscan features are the double o in uootum, and perhaps the -a for /-ʔ/ in menerua. Linguistically, the matter is more difficult.

The following linguistic features could potentially be regarded as Faliscan (arranged in decreasing order of likelihood):

1. the -d in pretod, cf. cuestod · pi · pretod · pis LF 242, although there is a Latin parallel in opeinod deuincam · ted CIL I 1.547: related to this are the cases where -r was omitted in Faliscan and in Latin (as Peruzzi (1997:63) rightly notes);

2. the omission of -s in zenatuo, which is in accordance with Faliscan custom of omitting -s after a short vowel virtually without exception, although there are of course abundant parallels for this in Latin inscriptions (see §3.5.7d);

258 The use of cu rather than qu cannot be regarded as a separate Faliscan feature (as does Freeman 2002:252), as the Faliscan alphabet did not have a q: the use of cu is therefore a corollary of the use of the Faliscan alphabet.
(3) the monophthongization of /aɪ/ in pretod, which is regular in Faliscan, although there are instances of this in contemporary Latin inscriptions (see §3.7.6);

(4) the omission of -m in sacru and datu, which occurs in Faliscan, but of course in Latin as well (§3.5.7a);

(5) the fourth-declension genitive ending -uo(s) in zenatuo, which is attested only from Latin, but may have existed in Faliscan, where the consonant-stem genitive ending was -os (§4.5.2);

(6) the u in sacru, uootum, datu, and cuncaptum appears to be Latin, but could conceivably be second-century Faliscan (§3.6.6.1): note [fel]cinatiu MLF 384;

(7) the lack of vowel raising in cuncaptum (see §3.6.6.1), although cuncaptum is rather a re-analysis of conceptum after the simple verb (perhaps intended as an archaism);

(8) the -d in sententiad and rected is unexpected at this date both in Faliscan (cf. ifra MF 40) and Latin, and may be an archaism (§3.5.7c): as the -d occurred originally in Faliscan as well as in Latin, it could be an archaism in either.

As is clear from this list, most of these features occur in Latin as well, and could without problems be regarded as dialect Latin. The only exception seems to be the -d in pretod, although here too, the Faliscan parallels are limited to one inscription. (Adams (2007:106-7) also points to cuando used in a temporal sense as a lexical regionalism.) How can it be decided what the language of this inscription actually is?

In many cases, this discussion has been obscured by too much attention being given to the fact that the inscription is written in the Faliscan alphabet. As Adams rightly notes in the case of this inscription, one cannot argue for the language of a text on the basis of the alphabet it was written in. Yet the fact that the inscription was written in the Faliscan alphabet reflects a choice made by those who had it engraved, a choice to present the text as Faliscan or rather, in a Faliscan context, whether this choice was made out of local patriotism or, as I suspect, out of a sense of tradition. It could even be regarded as an expression of ethnic identity, in which case, as noted, it is very interesting to find this in an official inscription.259

The question can therefore be posed differently: if the inscription was not written in Faliscan alphabet and the origin was not known, would it have been regarded as Faliscan? I greatly doubt this: if the inscription were even ascribed to Etruria, this would probably be on account of the name cotena rather than on the basis of its linguistic features. It is possible, however, that in this inscription the influence from Latin is relatively great due to its being an official text of a type that is unattested for Faliscan and may be Latin in origin (§9.4.1-2).

259 I wonder if the inscription was perhaps intended to replace an older Faliscan inscription, the replacement being drafted in more contemporary language, as in the case of the Umbrian Tabulae Iguinae.
In my view, the difficulty underlying the recent discussions on the language of this inscription is at least partly due to the fact that the difference between Faliscan and Latin was *gradual*, especially in this later period, when the language that was spoken in the ager Faliscus was a mixture of a more general ‘rural Latin’ and features derived from Faliscan. Any text from this period is not *either* Latin or Faliscan, but *both* Faliscan and Latin to a certain degree. Calling this text Faliscan (as do Peruzzi, Mancini, and Freeman) or Latin (as do Wachter, Vine (?), and Adams) means nothing more than to give more relative weight to either ‘side’ of the text. If anything, this inscription shows that the language of local public inscriptions in the ager Faliscus was becoming more and more indistinguishable from a more general ‘rural Latin’.

*From autopsy* in the Museo dell’Agro Falisco, Civita Castellana (inv. 24425). **Bibliography:**


215. Engraved on a strip of bronze from S. Maria di Falleri, reputedly found together with LF/Lat 214 and Lat 217-218.

[--jilio-c[f?---]

Dextroverse, Latin alphabet. Cf. *m·spurilius·c·f* | *bis·qf·Iduo·uir* Lat 238 from a tomb near the town. The absence of word-final -s may be a Faliscan feature. **Bibliography:**

Garrucci *SIL* 810 (*autopsy*); Zvetaiief *IHM* 69; Zvetaiief *III* 71; Bormann *CIL XI* under 3081; Deecke 1888:161 (37); Conway 1897:377 (322); Herbig *CIE* 8342; Vetter 1953:308 (318); G. Giacomelli 1963:69 (60). **Drawing:** Garrucci *SIL* 810.

216. Scratched before firing on the back of the right half of a mold for a woman’s head of terracotta.²⁶⁰ *C* 240-220 (Di Stefano Manzella).

*tfourios.*²⁶⁰

Dextroverse, Latin alphabet. Only the bottom parts of the last letters remain; the father’s name may either *t* or *p* (*II* Safarewicz; the shafts are omitted by G. Giacomelli). The

²⁶⁰ Deecke erroneously describes it as a ‘Thonschale mit Junokopf’. It is unclear whether the woman represents Juno (as was surmised by Garrucci, Fabretti, Zvetaiief, and Deecke).
presence of -s and ou are Latin rather than Faliscan (cf. Latin medi·lucilios·feced Lat 268 from Corchiano): T. Furius may have been a recent immigrant from Latium (Di Stefano Manzella).

**Bibliography:** Garrucci 1864:69 (autopsy); Fabretti CIL 2440bis; Garrucci SIL 512; Zvetaieff IIM sub 70; Zvetaieff III sub 72; Bormann CIL XI.6708,26; Deecke 1888:217 (101); Lommatzsch CIL I.473; Safarewicz 1955:186 (3); G. Giacomelli 1963:263 (XII); Di Stefano Manzella 1979:72; Degrassi & Krummrey CIL I.473 add. Drawings: Garrucci 1864 tav.VII.1a-c (reproduced in CIL tab. XLIII, Di Stefano Manzella 1979:72 fig. 27).

### 217-218. Engraved on a bronze table (28×9 cm), reputedly found together with 214-215 (letters 9-12 mm high). Minasi suggested that 217 was part of an inscription that was originally larger but was recut when the bronze was reused for 218. There seems to be no reason to assume this: both inscriptions appears to be complete. Courtney, too, argued for re-use, noting that the table must have been fastened against a wall, so that it would never have been possible to read both sides at once.

```plaintext
gonlegium-quod-est-aciptum-aetatei-aged[ai]
opiparum-ad-uiitam-quolunda-festosque-dies
quei-souei-aastuties-opidque-wo
gondecorant-saip][fsome-comuuiia-loidosque
ququei-huc-dederun[r-i]perat-oriibus-summeis
utei-sesed-lubent[is-bejneiouent-optants
```

On the other side is engraved 218 (letters 9 mm high).

```plaintext
[djouei-unonei-mineruai
falesce-quei-in-sardinia-sunt
donum-dederunt-magistreis
1-latris-k-f-c-saluf[ef-nauo-ltai-f
coiraueront
```

Dextroverse, Latin alphabet. My text follows Wachter, who in 217 read uiitam where all other editors have read ueitam (except Minasi (from autopsy) and recent editors like Vine, Courtney, and Kruschwitz), and who in 218 restored [dj]ouei rather than [i]ouei. The *nt* of sunt are written as a ligature N, and in 218, the *nt* of dederunt are assumed to be a similar ligature. Noteworthy is the odd use of *g* in gonlegium and gondecorant (but *c* in comuuiia and *q* in quolundam and ququei), and wolgani. Girard ascribes this to an uncertainty of the Faliscans, when using the Latin alphabet, where to use *g*, which was absent from their own alphabet, but this is implausible, especially during the Late Faliscan period, the Faliscans seem, on occasion to have used *k* to render /g/: see §11.2.4.2.

---

261 For Minasi’s publication, I have had to rely on the ample quotations in Peruzzi 1966a.
I discuss these texts only briefly, as the language is Latin without specifically Faliscan dialect features: for detailed discussions, see Kruschwitz 2002:127-38, Wachter 1987:441-8 and Peruzzi 1966a. Both inscriptions can be dated to the second half or even the last quarter of the second century. Wachter names the following orthographical criteria for this: (1) the double-spelling in *uui*itam and *aa*stuitieis, first attested c.140; (2) the use of *q* before *u* in *ququei*, first attested (apart from the archaic inscriptions) c.125; (3) the use of ligatures in *su*nt and *de*derun[t, first attested c.150. Except for a few features that can easily be explained as archaisms (e.g. *oi* in *coirau-*eront and *loidosque, -d* in *opidque* and *sesed*), the linguistic features of the inscriptions are compatible with this: note e.g. *u* in closed word-final syllables and *ae* in *aetatei*; see also Peruzzi 1966a:135-50. Arguments for the relative dating of the two inscriptions are derived from the fact that one of the rivet-holes was placed lower in order to avoid *minervai*, suggesting that 217 was written before 218 (see also Wachter 1987:441-2).

A debated question is the identity of the *falesce · quei · in · sardinia · su*nt, and, if the inscriptions are (more or less) contemporaneous, whether they were identical with the *ququei*. Peruzzi (1966a:127-8, 160) rightly compared the dedication by the *ququei* to the dedications of other ‘guilds’ from Praeneste, where in fact we find a dedication by the *coques atriensis* (*CIL* I².1447); on the other hand, he compared the *falesce · quei · in · sardinia · su*nt to the *Italici qui Deli negotiantur* in the Latin inscriptions from Delos (*CIL* I².2232-2259). In spite of these parallels, the identity of both our groups remains obscure. Peruzzi (1966a:161-2) hesitatingly suggests that these Faliscans may have been inhabitants of a Sardinian colony founded under the Gracchi. Wachter (1987:443) suggests that a group of cooks, forced by (Greek?) competition to emigrate to Sardinia (why?), made the first dedication to invoke the gods’ blessing on their enterprise, and the second when they had succeeded in building up new and prosperous existences a few months (why?) later. As some had been forced to find other employment, by that time they no longer referred to themselves as the *ququei*, but as the *falesce · quei · in · sardinia · su*nt. Girard suggests that these *falesce* were clients of the Sp. Carvilius Maximus who campaigned Sardinia in 234 and who may have been a son or a grandson of the Sp. Carvilius Roga who subdued Falerii in 293. Although this is based more on facts than Wachter’s implausible suggestions, it would appear to be impossible in view of the date of the inscriptions. From the point of view of ethnic identity, it is worth noting that this is the only certain instance of the use of the ethnonym *Faliscus* by Faliscans, and that it occurs in the context where this would be expected, namely a group of Faliscans outside their own territory (§2.2.2).

Further points of interest in this inscription are, in 217, the possible use of Saturnians, although these seem to be so freely used that a metrical interpretation is difficult (Massaro in fact called the metrical liberties ‘anarchic’), the elevated poetic language (see Peruzzi 1966a:128-35), and the identity of the *inperat-oribus · summeis*, who may be the same as the Capitoline triad in 218 (see Peruzzi 1966a:124-5).
219. Incised on a travertin base (25×34.5 (incomplete)× 6 cm; letters 4.5 cm high), recut on the left, probably as a result of ancient reuse. The first editions were based on the apographs made in 1822 by Amati, and in 1865 by Mommsen: only in 1979 was the text published with a photograph, by Di Stefano Manzella. c.120-50.

\[\text{-u}m\text{pricius-cf}\]
\[\text{/af}aburcus-q\]
\[\text{/ap}olinei-dat\]

Dextroverse, Latin alphabet. As Deecke suggested, it is not necessary to restore \textit{aburcus} (\textit{aburcus} Bormann, Conway, Lommatzsch, Degrassi, G. Giacomelli). The \textit{p} in \textit{umpricius} may be a reminiscence of the Faliscan spelling. For the gentilicium, cf. \textit{upreciano} in MLF 363 and MLF 364, and \textit{umrie} Etr XLIII, all from the same tomb near Rignano Flaminio, and a \textit{P. Umbricius Rufus} in CIL XI.3254 from Sutri.


15.3. Inscriptions from tombs near the town

220-233 (the ‘tombe Guidi’). The following inscriptions were discovered \textit{in situ} in 1851 in two tombs near Falerii Novi, by Guidi, who copied them and then removed them to ransack the graves, leaving the tiles in the tomb. From his apographs the inscriptions were published by Orioli, the first Faliscan inscriptions to be published as such.\textsuperscript{262} The tomb was visited in 1856 by Garrucci, who salvaged what was left and

\textsuperscript{262} An unpublished apograph of 205-210 had already been made in or shortly before 1676; MF 79 had already been published in 1726, but as Etruscan.
republished the inscriptions from autopsy (1860); only later did he discover the tituli priores and published these as well (1864). After his death the tiles disappeared until 1912, when they were found by Nogara “in horreis musei Vaticani di Scultura” (Herbig CIE 8344-8353 add.) and relocated to the Museo Gregoriano Etrusco Profano.

220. Painted in red on white stucco over three tiles, the third of which is known only through Guidi’s apograph (the remaining tiles measure 58×41 cm and 65×45 cm; letters 10-13 cm high). The loculus was reopened for the burial of Gavia Aconia: afterwards, the letters on the juncture of the tiles were repainted, and the fourth line added. Having been painted on dry plaster, these additions have largely disappeared.

\[1^{\text{uo}}/tio/uec^{\text{ineo}}\]
\[1^{\text{ma}}/xomo\]
\[1^{\text{iu}}/he-ce^{\text{pat}}\]
\[1^{\text{caq}}/conia\]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. Pace Garrucci (1864:65, SIL 800), Orioli’s ca aconia and Detlefsen’s (1861b:205) ca aconia deserve the benefit of the doubt over Garrucci’s carconia ‘Gargonia’ (adopted by all editors after him) even if there is no interpunct between the words. The gentilicum Aconius, attested from Latin inscriptions from the ager Faliscus may also be read in *(*)co/g 341: see §7.8.1.5. The placing of the patronymic adjective after the cognomen is exceptional, and probably due to the fact that the cognomen was not yet a fixed element in the onomastic formula: see §7.9.

From autopsy in the Museo Gregoriano Etrusco Profano, Città del Vaticano (inv. 20814+ 20816); the tiles, especially the second, are now much damaged, and parts are missing. Bibliography: (I) Orioli 1854:XXII (10). – (II) Garrucci 1860:273 (7) (autopsy); Detlefsen 1861a; Detlefsen 1861b (autopsy); Garrucci 1864:65; Fabretti CII 2451; Garrucci SIL 800; Zvetaieff IIM 58 (autopsy); Zvetaieff III 60; Schneider 1886:106 (20); Bormann CIL XI.3159,8; Deecke 1888:170-1 (42); Conway 1897:378 (327); Jacobsohn 1910:5 (29); Herbig CIE 8347; Nogara in Herbig CIE 8347 add. (autopsy); Buonamici 1913:65 (25); Vetter 1953:311 (322d); G. Giacomelli 1963:94-6 (121,IV); Peruzzi 1963b:440-1, 445; Pisani 1964:339 (144D)); G. Giacomelli 1978:534-5 (12,IV). Drawings: Garrucci 1860 tav. G.7; Garrucci 1864 tav. V.3 (reproduced in CII tab.XLIII, IIM tab. IX.2a, Deecke 1888 Taf.11, CIE 8347); Zvetaieff IIM tab.IX.2 (reproduced in CIE 8347).

221. Painted in red on plaster along the back of part of a tile and two complete tiles. Nogara, in 1912, found only fragments of the first and second tiles, which was indeed all I could find (max. 34×25 cm, max. 28-37×20-26 cm; letters c. 10 cm high).

\[1^{\text{ui}}/p^2/ia/zertene^3/a/loferta\]
\[1^{\text{ma}}/rei:acar^3/celini\]
\[1^{\text{ma}^2/te:he:cupa}\]

263 “Extant adhuc omnes tegulae (m. 0,64 a.); secunda in quinque partes diffraecta est” (Nogara in Herbig CIE 8347 add.). This apparently refers to the two tiles salvaged by Garrucci rather than to the three tiles of the original inscription.
Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. Schulze, Vetter, and Knobloch maintained that *zertenea* is an adjective with *loferta*, ‘a Sertinian freedwoman’, but I doubt very much whether at this date the gentilicium could still be used in this way: cf. §4.4.11. The normal word-order in both Faliscan and Latin is *nomen* - *adjective* (§8.5.1), and in Latin this order is maintained when the gentilicium is used adjectivally, as in *uia Appia* or *pons Aemilius*. An instance of adjective - noun would be *noutrix papedia* CIL I.1.45, if interpreted as ‘a nurse of the gens Papiria’. *Zertenea* is either Vibia’s original gentilicium, or the gentilicium of the *gens* where she was a slave and which she adopted as a freedwoman.

*From autopsy* in the Museo Gregoriano Etrusco Profano, Città del Vaticano (inv. 20818+20819).


222-223. The *titulus prior* was painted in red on plaster across the backs of four tiles. I was able to find only the first tile (67×47.5 cm; letters c.10 cm high): Nogara, in 1912, still found all four, although apparently in a severely damaged condition. All that I could read on the tile was *ca*, the first letters of 222.

\[1 \text{caufl}^2\text{a} - \text{juecin}^3\text{e} - \text{a-outil}^4\text{t} \]
\[1 \text{mac}^2\text{i} - \text{acace}^3\text{lini}^3\text{u} - \text{x}o^4 \]

The *titulus prior* was later washed over and repainted with the *titulus posterior*, inside a crude decorative border.

\[1 \text{mar}^2\text{cio}^3\text{ae} - \text{arceli}^4\text{n} \]
\[1 \text{cau}^2\text{a} - \text{ecine}^3\text{a} \]
\[1 \text{hec}^2 - \text{cupat}^3 \]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The third line is written small. Early editors read *hiu*; others conjectured *hi[c]* (Fabretti), *hec* (Zvetaieff, Conway, Pisani), *hec* (Herbig, Vetter), or *hec* (G. Giacomelli). The word is now illegible. Gavia Vicinia died first, and a new inscription was made when her husband was interred: *cupat* is a plural, *cupat(n)it*.

*From autopsy* in the Museo Gregoriano Etrusco Profano, Città del Vaticano (inv. 20800).

**Bibliography:** (I) Orioli 1854:XXI (5). – (II) Garrucci 1860:274-5 (11) (*autopsy*); Detlefsen 1861a. *Drawing:* Garrucci 1860 tav.H.11; – (III) Garrucci 1864:66 (*autopsy*); Fabretti CII 2446; Garrucci SIL 803a-b; Zvetaieff *IIM* 61 (*autopsy*); Zvetaieff *III* 63; Schneider 1886:106-7 (23a-b); Bormann *CIL* XL.3159,2a-b; Deecke 1888:167-8 (40); Conway 1897:377-8 (325a-b); Jacobsohn 1910:5 (26-27); Herbig *CIE* 8345a-b; Nogara in Herbig *CIE* 8345a-b *add. (*autopsy*); Buonamici 1913:64 (23); Vetter 1953:311 (322A-A-B); G. Giacomelli 1963:94-6 (121a-b); Peruzzi 1963b:435-40; Pisani 1964:338-9 (144a-b); G. Giacomelli 1978:534-5 (12,1a-b); Mancini 1981. *Drawing:* Garrucci 1864 tav.VL2 (reproduced in *CIL* tab.XLII, *IIM* tab.IX.5a, Deecke 1888 Taf.II, *CIE* 8345a-b); Zvetaieff 1885 tab.IX.5 (reproduced in *CIE* 8345a-b).
224-225. The *titulus prior* was painted in red on plaster (letters c. 8-10 cm high) across the backs of three tiles (69×48 cm, 47×66 cm, and 49×68.5 cm). The tiles were then washed over and repainted with the *titulus posterior* (letters 9-12 cm high). In the process, the tiles were rearranged and what was originally the third tile placed in front, so that the *titulus prior*, when discovered, appeared as *uolti ca-uecineo | ania he-cupatma* (cf. Garrucci 1864). Why the inscription was repainted is unclear, as both inscriptions appear to refer to the same persons. The *titulus prior* is

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{1a} & \text{-u'e\text{c}ineo} \text{1-} uoltio \\
\text{1he} & \text{cu'2patl} \text{-m\{e\}3ania}
\end{align*}
\]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. At the end of the first line a trace is clearly visible after *uolti*, as the drawing by Garrucci (1964) shows, and several scholars have therefore read *uolti* (Garrucci 1864, Fabretti, Zvetaieff, Deecke, Bormann, Jacobsohn, Herbig). The tile shows , however, and reading *uoltio* is justified. In the second line, there is a letter on the edge of the second tile after the *m*: editors have read *miania* (Orioli) or *meania* (Garrucci 1864 and all later editors). The letter does not appear to be part of the repainted inscription (as in MF 220), and is probably an error.

The *titulus posterior* is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{1ca} & \text{-uecineo} \\
\text{1ca-m\{e\}nia}
\end{align*}
\]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet with cursive *e* (II). The *c* of *ca · mania* is reversed, indicating a woman’s name (§11.2.5.9).

*From autopsy* in the Museo Gregoriano Etrusco Profano, Città del Vaticano (inv. 20793+20789+26794). 

**Bibliography:**
- (III) Garrucci 1864:65-6 (*autopsy*); Fabretti CII 2449; Garrucci SII 801; Zvetaieff IIM 59a-b (*autopsy*); Zvetaieff III 61a-b; Schneider 1886:106 (21a-b); Bormann CIL XI.3159,7a-b; Deecke 1888:171-3 (43a-b); Conway 1897:322e,A-B; G. Giacomelli 1963:94-6 (121,Va-b); Peruzzi 1963b:445; G. Giacomelli 1978:534-5 (12, Va-b). 

**Drawing:**
- Garrucci 1864 tav.V.4 (reproduced in CII tab. XLIII, IIM tab. IX.3a, Deecke 1888 Taf. II, CIE 8348); Zvetaieff 1885 tab. IX.3 (reproduced in CIE 8348).

226. Painted in red on plaster across the backs of four tiles, the fourth of which was missing already when Zvetaieff saw the tiles in 1880 (the remaining three measure 63×48.5 cm, 65×48 cm, and 68×47.5 cm; letters 8-15 cm high, but slightly less high in the second line, and only c.5 cm high in the third line).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{1titol} & \text{-f} acar\text{celini o:} \\
\text{1ma} & \text{-fi\{p\}op} \text{-petrune} \text{3s-cef} \\
\text{1[he]ucu\{pa\}} & \text{2} \text{3} \text{4}
\end{align*}
\]

264 Fabretti’s *uolti ca-uecineo | ania ca-uecineo | ca-mania* is a curious mixture of the *titulus posterior* and the rearranged *titulus prior*.
Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The \( n \) is reversed. Garrucci read \( pop \) as part of the first name (\textit{Maci. Pop} Garrucci 1860, \( Pop = \) ‘Pop(lilia tribu)’\textsuperscript{265} Garrucci 1864), but it is clearly part of the second, as was seen already by Mommsen and Detlefsen. This second name is a later addition: the letters are smaller, the interpunct is single instead of double, and the \( e \)’s in \textit{petrunes} and \textit{ce} are cursive. (The ‘sagging’ of the line after \textit{pop} in Garrucci’s and Zvetaieff’s drawings is non-existent.) The initials of \textit{pop} and \textit{petrunes} are reversed, indicating a woman’s name (§11.2.5.9), but \( pop \cdot petrunes \) was first interpreted as such only by Herbig. The last line, written in small letters and with a non-cursive \( e \), seems to belong to both inscriptions. Pisani read \( e \) instead of \([h]e\), but there are no certain parallels for the omission of \( h \)- in Faliscan (§3.5.2).


227. Painted in red on plaster along the backs of three tiles. Of the third tile, the left half, with the letters \( us \), is known only through Guidi’s apograph, and the right half had disappeared when Zvetaieff saw the inscription in 1880. The first tile is still intact (69×47.5 cm; letters 13-17 cm high): the second (54×40 cm) is broken in many pieces.

\( ^1 \text{pola}^2 \text{marc}^3 \text{ia:sus?} \ldots \)

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet with reversed \( s \). The \( l \) is \( \lambda \). The \( p \) is reversed to indicate a woman’s name (§11.2.5.9). \( Sus \) was explained by Garrucci as a cognomen ‘ SUS’, but later editors rightly assumed that letters were missing (Herbig 1910 (cognomen?); Jacobsohn, Vetter (cognomen), G. Giacomelli (husband’s name)). Perhaps \( s \) \( ux[or] \) ‘S(exti) uxor’ could be read, with the second \( s \), \( \delta \), read as \( x \), cf. the \( x \) in \textit{LtF 301}. \textit{From autopsy} in the Museo Gregoriano Etrusco Profano, Città del Vaticano (inv. 20804+20817); I was unable to find the upper left-hand and the lower left- and right-hand corner of the second tile. \textit{Bibliography:} (I) Orioli 1854:XXII (6). – (II) Garrucci 1860:274 (9) (autopsy); Detlefsen 1861a; Garrucci 1864:65; Fabretti \textit{CIL} 2447; Garrucci \textit{SIL} 799; Zvetaieff \textit{IIM} 57 (autopsy); Zvetaieff \textit{III} 59; Schneider 1886:106 (19); Bormann \textit{CIL} XI.3159,4; Dechee 1888:174-5 (45); Conway 1897:379 (330); Herbig 1910:187-8 (26); Jacobsohn 1910:5 (32); Herbig \textit{CIE} 8350; Nogara in Herbig \textit{CIE} 8350 \textit{add. (autopsy)}; Buonamici 1913:67 (28); Vetter 1953:312 (322e); G. Giacomelli 1963:94-6 (121,II); Peruzzi 1963b:435-40; G. Giacomelli 1978:534-5 (12,II). \textit{Drawings:} Garrucci 1860 tav.H.9 (reproduced in Garrucci 1864 tav.V.2, \textit{CII} tab.XLIII, \textit{IIM} tab. IX.1a, Dechee 1888 Tab.II, \textit{CIE} 8350); Zvetaieff \textit{IIM} tab.IX.1.

\textsuperscript{265} Faleritii belonged to the \textit{Horatia} (§2.6.2); until the Social War the \textit{Poplilia} comprised only Anagnia and the Hernici (Taylor 1960:49-52). If the citizenship was an individual grant, one would expect one of the South Etrurian tribes (\textit{Arnensis, Sabatina, Stellatina, or Tromentina}).
228-229. The *titulus prior* (letters 14-17 cm high) was painted on plaster across the backs of four tiles (65×47.5 cm, 65.5×47 cm, 64×47.5 cm, 64×44 cm).

\[
\text{1st line: } \indic{} \text{ arc } \indic{} \text{ io}
\]

The first line is completely covered by the plaster on which is written the *titulus posterior*. The first legible letter in the second line is \( \cdot \), probably an \( m \) (cf. *marcia* 227): there is no reason to read \( \text{larcio} \) (Deecke 1888, Conway, Herbig, Pisani, G. Giacomelli). 266

The *titulus prior* was later covered with plaster on which was painted the *titulus posterior* in red (letters 15-19 cm high).

\[
\text{cesu } \indic{} \text{lati } \indic{} \text{perili } \indic{} \text{a]ef}
\]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet with cursive \( e \) (II). The \( c \) is reversed to indicate a woman’s name (§11.2.4). *Tiperilia* renders Latin *Tiberilia* in Faliscan alphabet: the Faliscan form would have been *Tiferilia* (cf. *tif* MLF 459?). The \( f \), was read as a ligature *fe(lia)* or *fe(ilia)* by Garrucci (1864), but the ‘sidebars’ appear to be nothing more than random slips of the brush.


230. Painted in red on plaster along the back of two tiles, the second known only through Guidi’s apograph (the other one measures 66×46.5 cm; letters 9-12 cm high).

\[
\text{1st line: } \indic{} \text{clipea[io]} [32] [io]
\]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The \( l \) is \( \cdot \). The \( p \) is followed by the lower half of a shaft at the edge of the tile: in spite of Garrucci’s drawings, nothing more can be read or restored on this tile, as Zvetaieff’s drawing shows. After this, Garrucci restored an \( a \) from Guidi’s apograph; in view of *clipea[io]* LtF 231 and *cl[i]paerio* LtF 232 and *clipearcio* MF 470* I wonder whether a second shaft might have been overlooked, in which case *clipea[io]* with a cursive \( e \) would be possible (thus Vetter). Following the \( r \), Garrucci restored a vertical shaft from Guidi’s apograph. The early editors read *clipiai*: Deecke was the first to read *clipiar* ‘Clipia(ius)’, a solution hinted at already by

\[\text{266} \text{Pisani’s description shows that he was unaware that the line belongs to a *titulus prior*.}\]
Detlefsen (1861b). Herbig read \{clipe\}ip*(--), which suggests that letters were missing after the ones restored from Guidi’s apograph.

**From autopsy** in the Museo Gregoriano Etrusco Profano, Città del Vaticano (inv. 20788). **Bibliography:** (I) Orioli 1854:XXII (7). – (II) Garrucci 1860:274 (10) (autopsy); Detlefsen 1861a; – (II) Garrucci 1864:67-8 (new autopsy); Fabretti CII 2448; Garrucci SIL 805; Zvetaieff IIM 63 (autopsy); Zvetaieff III 65; Schneider 1886:106 (25); Deecke 1886:201-2; Bormann CIL XI.3159,3; Deecke 1888:1756 (46); Conway 1897:379 (331); Herbig CIE 8351; Nogara in Herbig CIE 8351 add. (autopsy); Vetter 1953:312 (322h); G. Giacomelli 1963:94-6 (121, VIII); Peruzzi 1963b:435; G. Giacomelli 1978:534-5 (12, VIII). **Drawings:** Garrucci 1860 tav.H.10 (reproduced in Garrucci tav.1864 VI.4, CII tab.XLIII, IIM tab.X.2, Deecke 1888 Taf.II, CIE 8351); Zvetaieff IIM tab.X.2; Nogara in CIE 8351 add.

231. Painted on plaster along the backs of two tiles and across a half-tile. Nogara, in 1912, found only the first two tiles, the second of which was broken in two; I was able to find only a half-tile whose form corresponds to that of the half-tile of this inscription (68.5 × max. 41 cm), but which no longer contains any legible letters. I present this inscription in two ways, as I think the text as presented in previous editions is based on an erroneous rearrangement of the tiles in antiquity.

---

**Arrangement of the tiles as found, as in Garrucci’s apograph:**

\begin{tabular}{ccc}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tile A</th>
<th>tile C</th>
<th>tile D (=B?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 \textit{c}clipea &amp; 2 \textit{heic} &amp; 3 \textit{plenes-q-f}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 \textit{m-f-hari}sp &amp; 2 \textit{cubat} &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 \textit{sorex} q.*(*e) &amp; 2 &amp; \textit{---}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\end{tabular}

**Suggested original arrangement of the tiles before the interment of Plenes:**

\begin{tabular}{ccc}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tile A</th>
<th>tile B</th>
<th>tile C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 \textit{c}clipea &amp; 2 \textit{[io]} &amp; 3 \textit{heic}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 \textit{m-f-hari}sp &amp; 2 \textit{[ex-ce]} &amp; 3 \textit{cubat}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 \textit{sorex} q.*(*e) &amp; 2 \textit{---} &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\end{tabular}

Dextroverse, Latin alphabet. The third tile, which is painted in a different way and in a different hand, is clearly a later addition that should be read separately: it is useless to try to read all three tiles as one text, as did many of the earliest editors.

The arrangement of the tiles in all editions except mine follows Guidi’s apogaph, which depicted the tiles \textit{in situ}. I believe that it is necessary to assume that this was \textit{not} the original arrangement, but that the inscription originally consisted of a tile (A), a half-tile (B), and another tile (C), with an inscription pertaining to C. Clipearius alone. When these tiles were removed for the interment of Plenes, the first tile (A) and the
third (C) were replaced as the first and the second of ‘new’ inscription, and a half-tile with the epitaph of Plenes was added at the end (D): this may have been same as the half-tile from the original inscription (B). Irrespective of whether my suggestion is adopted, the inscription occupied three lines on two (or one) tiles, and was then continued by two lines on another: a similar arrangement as in LF 243 and LF 247.

The first line on the first tile consists of /g2637 clipea (with /g2278), followed by the lower half of a shaft. The earliest editors read a dative or a nominative plural clipeai. This has rightly been abandoned in favour of clipear[io] (thus first Herbig), but in that case a tile must be missing between the first and the second tile, as Garrucci’s drawings show that it is impossible to restore [io] either on the first or on the second tile.

The second line is /g2637 f/g2637 hara, followed by traces of what are apparently two letters, given by Garrucci as [ ] (Zvetaieff’s and Nogara’s drawings show only vague traces at the point of te second letter). After this, Garrucci restored an a from Guidi’s apograph, which in his drawing he places between the first and the second tile; Orioli placed it on the second tile (acubat), which is impossible. The earliest editors read harai, but already Garrucci (1864) read haracna. The interpretations of this were mainly based on the interpretation of the erroneous clipeai in the first line. If we read clipear[io], haracna can only be a second gentilicium, but this appears to be indicative of the libertus (Rix 1963:376-8) and would be incompatible with the fact that the man was cen|sor (as I read the sor in the third line).267 Editors pointed to harisp in LtF 232: Deecke (1886) interpreted haracna as hara-gn/g407 ‘haruspex’, and Nogara in fact read harasp ‘harasp(ex)’, which has since then become the accepted reading. Since there are no parallels for the abbreviated honores in (Latino-)Faliscan inscriptions apart from the q in Lat 237-238, it is preferable to read harasp[ex], which, again, requires a second tile.

This assumption has interesting repercussions for the third line. This starts with sorex, which Garrucci at first interpreted as a cognomen Sorex (cf. his Locerta in LF 221 and Sus in LF 227). Detlefsen, however, extended Garrucci’s interpretation of harisp | sor in LtF 232 as ‘harisp(ex) Sor(rinus)’ to this inscription, comparing the augur Soranus mentioned by Cicero (Div. 1.47.105). Deecke (1886) connected sorex to the name of Soracte, which was also known as Sorax (Porph. in Hor. Carm. 1.9.1-2) and its priesthood of the Hirpi Sorani (for which cf. §2.3.4). The very doubtfully attested (to say the least) Faliscan sorex now became a standard ingredient of the Faliscan vocabulary: so much so that Peruzzi even proposed an etymology for it that was not connected to the one on which the word was based in the first place (namely */sor-ag-s/ ‘lot-shaker, cleromantis’, adducing Liv. 22.1.11 for Faliscan cleromancy). If the existence of an original second tile is assumed, however, the second line could easily be read as cen|so rex. Instead of a hypothetical sorex paralleled only by the

267 I have considered reading a woman’s name h (?) arati[a] (cf. MLF 348-351). The order, man’s name – woman’s name – man’s cursus honorum, would be paralleled by LF 249.
fragmentary sor in LtF 232, we would then have cenf[so, an office attested without ambiguities in censo in LtF 232, and a rex as in MF 88 and perhaps in MF 249 (ref[x]). The letters following sorex- were given by Garrucci first (1860) as Q, but later (1864) as Q. The q is often interpreted as q(uaestor) (as in Lat 237-238), but what follows is unclear: Vetter read c(ensor) VII, but it is unlikely that a man could be censor seven times unless the office was quite different from its Roman counterpart (Peruzzi).

From autopsy in the Museo Gregoriano Etrusco Profano, Città del Vaticano (inv. 20792). Bibliography:  (I) Orioli 1854:XXI (1). – (II) Garrucci 1860:277-9 (14) (autopsy); Detlefsen 1861a; Detlefsen 1861b (autopsy); Ritschl 1862:96-8; Mommsen & Henzen CIL I.1311; Garrucci 1864:67-8 (autopsy); Fabretti CII 2442; Garrucci SIL 806; Zvetatich IIM 64 (autopsy); Zvetatich III 66; Schneider 1866:107 (26); Deecke 1886:201-2; Bormann CIL 11.3159; Deecke 1888:191-2 (61); Conway 1897:379 (33); Herbig CIE 8352; Nogara in Herbig CIE 8352 add.; Buonomici 1913:67-9 (29); Lommatzsch CIL f1:1988-9; Vetter 1953:312-3 (322); Saiferezicz 1955:186 (2); G. Giacomelli 1963:94-6 (121,IX); Peruzzi 1963b:435-40; G. Giacomelli 1978:534-5 (12,IX). Drawings: Garrucci 1860 tav.H.14 (reproduced in Ritschl 1862:97-8 fig.L); Garrucci 1864 tav.VI.5 (reproduced in CII tab.XLIII, IIM tab.X.3a, Deecke 1888 Taf.III, CIE 8352); Zvetatich IIM tab.X.3 (reproduced in CIE 8352); Nogara in CIE 8352 add.

From these inscriptions, the following family tree has been reconstructed (reading the first line of LF 224 as ca · uecineof · jovolti · rather than as ca · uecineof · jovoltio):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Voltius Vicinius Iunae f. Maxumus} \\
\times \text{Gavia Aconia} \\
\text{Marcus Acarcelinius} \times \text{Gavia Vicinia} \\
\text{Gavius Vicinius} \times \text{Gavia Mania} \\
\text{Titus Acarcelinius} \times \text{Publia Petrones Caesii f.}
\end{align*}
\]

The pola marcia in LF 227 and the marcio in LF 228 are sometimes grafted onto this stemma as descendants of Marcus Acarcelinius, but the patronym from Marcus would be *Marcilius, not Marcus (§7.5.2.2). Both may have belonged to a gens Marcia, or may have been children of a Marcus of whom we have no record. Perhaps this Marcus was the father of the slave-born Marcus Acarcelinius, who would then have received the patronym Marcius as his praenomen: note that a praenomen Marcus is not attested elsewhere. Peruzzi (1963b:441-6) pointed out how the stemma illustrates the social climbing of the Acarcelini: Marcus, the son of a freedwoman, perhaps born while she was still a slave, since no mention is made of his father, marries the daughter of a pater familias whose imposing nomenclature and cognomen Maxumus clearly mark him as special. Their son marries a daughter of the Petronii, a gentilicium repeatedly encountered in the names of magistrates in inscriptions from Central Italy. The gentilicium Acarcelinius is a new formation, and Peruzzi suggested that it was derived from a toponym; A. Mancini (1981) derived it from an */akarkelom/ that would be equivalent to (but not necessarily identical with) the */okrikelom/ reflected by Latin Ocrriculum and Umbrian */okrilom/ implied by Etruscan ucristane Cl 1.2609, 2611-2613 etc.
The family relations of the L. Clipearius in LF 230 and the C. Clipearius in LtF 233 cannot be reconstructed. Peruzzi (1963b:435) claims that the L. Clipearius in LF 230 died before the C. Clipearius M. f. in LtF 231, because the epitaph of the former is written in Faliscan and that of the latter in Latin alphabet, but the use of the two alphabets is not so strictly chronologically distributed that it can be used as an argument in this way. Deecke (1888:177) in fact used the argument in the reversed direction, as an illustration of how, over the generations, the originally Latin Clipearii became successively more Faliscanized. The family appears to have been Faliscan, however: an older member of the gens, oufiolo : clipeaio : letei : fileo, now appears in MF 470*.

232-233. The following inscriptions were from a tomb adjacent to the one that yielded 215-231. The titulus posterior, 233, was painted in red on plaster along the back of two tiles. Where the plaster has crumbled away, traces of several previous inscriptions can be read, painted directly on the tile surface. These tituli priores are presented here as 232. Nogara, in 1912, found both tiles, broken but still complete: I was unable to find the bottom left corner of the first extant part (38×37 cm) and the right part of the second tile (extant part 50×48 cm).

Fig.15.1. Garrucci’s drawing of LF/LtF 232 and LF 233.
(From Herbig CIE 8353)

```
/?--------?  2/?--------?
harisp     2 anco ma
sor   *  2 censo
m-cl[il{]peario-m{]}f
[---------- 2 ----------]
[---------- 2 ----------]or /
```

The titulus posterior, 233, was written dextroverse in the Latin alphabet with cursive a (A) and e (I). The last word for may be quaestor, praetor, censior, or uxor. Nothing now remains of this inscription, the plaster on which it was written having crumbled away apparently already in 1864 (“Ho cercato di sotto all’intonico sul quale si legge M-Clipeario, se si fosse un anterior leggenda, ma di essa ivi non vi ha vestigio alcuno”,
Garrucci 1864:62) and certainly by 1880, when Zvetaieff drew the tiles. The *tituli priores* and the *titulus postumus* were read together by the earlier editors (thus still Deecke); the first to separate them clearly is Conway. Whether the *tituli priores* belong together is a different question.

The *tituli priores* on the first tile are dextroverse in the Latin alphabet with a curious *h*, which has no parallels in other inscriptions from the area. *Harisp* is written against the edge of the tile: reading *harisp[fex]* would require another tile. The next line contains only *sor* (probably *cen*sor, as in LtF 231: reading this would also require a second tile): Garrucci (1864) also read two shafts near the edge of the tile, which have been interpreted as a cursive *e* or as a numeral *II* (Vetter, who took them together with *censo* on the second tile), but neither Zvetaieff nor Nogara saw these shafts, and from what remains of this part of the tile it appears that they are drip-marks. Of the *tituli priores* on the second tile, *anco* and *ma* are sinistroverse, *ma* being written lower and smaller (the early editors erroneously read dextroverse *umbr*), while *censo* is dextroverse. The disappearance of the plaster that originally covered the space after the last letter shows that *censo*, not *censor*, is to be read. In my view, *harisp* and *sor* belong to the same text, while *censo*, *anco*, and *ma* belong to (three?) different inscriptions.

From autopsy in the Museo Gregoriano Etrusco Profano, Città del Vaticano (inv. 20815+ 20813). Bibliography: (I) Orioli 1854:XXII (9). – (II) Garrucci 1860:277-9 (autopsy); Detlefsen 1861a; Ritschl 1862:96-8; Mommsen & Henzen CIL I.1312. Drawing: Garrucci 1860 tav.H.15 (reproduced in Ritschl 1862:97-8 fig.M). – (III) Garrucci 1864:63 (autopsy); Fabretti CII 2450; Garrucci SIL 807; Zvetaieff IMM 65 (autopsy); Zvetaieff III 67; Schneider 1886:106-7 (27); Deecke 1886:201-2; Bormann CIL XI.3518; Deecke 1888:190-1 (60); Conway 1897:379 (332); Herbig CIE 8353; Nogara in Herbig CIE 8353 add. (autopsy); Buonamici 1913:69 (30); Lommatzsch CIL I.7188-9; Vetter 1953:313-4 (323,A-B); Safarewicz 1955:185 (1); G. Giacomelli 1963:93-4 (120,I). Transcription: Gamurrini 1864 tav.IV.3 (reproduced in CIL tab.XLIII, IMM tab. VIII.10a, Deecke 1888 Taf.III, CIE 8353); Zvetaieff IMM tab.VIII.10 (reproduced in CIE 8353).}

234-241 (‘tomba degli Spurilii’). In 1891, several inscriptions in Faliscan and Latin alphabet were discovered in one of three third- or second-century tombs in Contrada Regoletti, c.1 km to the south of S. Maria di Falleri. Gamurrini’s apographs contain some peculiar letter forms, which may at least partly be due to the severe damage sustained by the plaster on which the inscriptions were painted (cf. Gamurrini 1891:49). Vetter (1953:310) in fact called the apographs useless.

234. Painted in red on plaster on two tiles.

\[\text{T} \cdot \text{ARP} \cdot \text{V} | \text{RIH} \text{XAR} \text{W}\]

\[\text{[---?]}^*a^*\text{k}^*i^*{\text{e}*a*f}\]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The *k* is unexpected: assuming that it represents */g/ (§11.2.4.2) does not provide a better text. A tile is probably missing at the beginning.

Bibliography: Gamurrini 1891 (1) (autopsy); Herbig CIE 8335; Bormann CIL XI.7500a; G. Giacomelli 1963:93-4 (120,I). Transcription: Gamurrini 1891:49 (reproduced in CIE 8335, CIL XI.7500a).
235. Painted in red on plaster on two tiles.
\[1\text{ceisǐa}^\text{e}^2[0-4?]i^*ia-ce\]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet with cursive e (II). Gamurrini’s ĉ on the place of the third and the fifth letters are perhaps to be read as i’s. The size of the lacuna is not indicated, but can apparently be anything between zero and four letters. The second sign after the lacuna is perhaps i or n. According to Gamurrini, no tiles are missing.

**Bibliography:** Gamurrini 1891 (2) (autopsy); Herbig CIE 8336; Bormann CIL XI.7500b; G. Giacomelli 1963:93-4 (120,II). **Transcription:** Gamurrini 1891:49 (reproduced in CIE 8336, CIL XI.7500b).

236. Painted in red on two tiles.
\[1\text{si}\] \[\text{VŘ •}\]
\[1\text{c-qu}^2[---]\text{isi}\]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet? The gentilicium is ru[---] or au[---]. The size of the lacuna is not indicated. The last word is ca[isi], ce[isi], or c[esi] (with a cursive e).

**Bibliography:** Gamurrini 1891 (3) (autopsy); Herbig CIE 8337; Bormann CIL XI.7500c (autopsy); G. Giacomelli 1963:93-4 (120,III). **Transcription:** Gamurrini 1891:49 (reproduced in CIE 8337, CIL XI.7500c).

237. Painted over two tiles “con belle e grandi lettere” (Gamurrini 1891:49)
\[1\text{m-spù rilius-ce-f}\] \[\text{bis-qf]f-duo-aür}\]

Dextroverse, Latin alphabet. For the *cursus honorum*, cf. §2.3.3.

**Bibliography:** Gamurrini 1891 (4) (autopsy); Bormann CIL XI.7501 (autopsy); Vetter 1953:310. **Transcriptions:** Gamurrini 1891:49; Bormann CIL XI.7501.

238. Painted on one tile is
\[c\text{-}spurilius\]
\[m\text{-}f\text{-iiiq-ii}\]

Dextroverse, Latin alphabet. Gamurrini’s transcription (but not Bormann’s) shows the second i of *spurilius* as small and written within the angle of the l. The second line was read by Gamurrini as ‘Marci filius et quaestor iterum’, but a filiation and a honor are hardly connected by et. Vetter read III [sic] q(uaestor) II [uir] (which requires a third tile). According to Bormann, the i’s are drip-marks rather than letters.

**Bibliography:** Gamurrini 1891:49 (5) (autopsy); Bormann CIL XI.7502 (autopsy); Vetter 1953:310. **Transcriptions:** Gamurrini 1891:49; Bormann CIL XI.7502.

239. Painted in red on a tile.
\[m\text{-}pani[---]\]

Dextroverse, Latin alphabet. The gentilicium may have been *Panicius* (cf. Schulze
or pani[---] may be a misreading for pau[---], cf. pauiceo 12, pauicio 290.

Bibliography: Gamurrini 1891:49 (6) (autopsy); Bormann CIL XI.7503 (autopsy). Transcriptions: Gamurrini 1891:49; Bormann CIL XI.7503.

240. Painted in red on a tile (the second line in smaller letters according to Bormann).

---praetor ?---
---? duumuir?---

Dextroverse, Latin alphabet. The second line, given as HR/// by Gamurrini, was read as uir by Bormann. For the cursus honorum, cf. §2.3.3.

Bibliography: Gamurrini 1891:50 (7) (autopsy); Bormann CIL XI.7504 (autopsy). Transcriptions: Gamurrini 1891:50; Bormann CIL XI.7504.

241. Scratched on a small Etrusco-Campanian cup.

up

Dextroverse, with 


242-249 (‘tomba dei Protacii’ and ‘tomba dei Tertinei’). The following inscriptions are from two tombs in the necropolis at località Pratoro, to the southeast of S. Maria di Falleri (see Renzetti Marra 1990:328). The first was discovered in April 1971, when it was blown open with dynamite by clandestine excavators: it yielded 72 tiles, 44 of which contained inscriptions. From this tomb, the ‘tomba dei Protaci’, are LF 242-246.

A second tomb, discovered in September 1973, when it was likewise opened by clandestine excavators, appears to have contained c.35 tiles, inscribed in the Faliscan and the Latin alphabet: five of these were stolen on the day the tomb was discovered. From this second tomb, the ‘tomba dei Tertinei’, are LF 247-249.

The publication of the material from these tombs has to my knowledge not progressed beyond the inscriptions presented here.

242. Painted in red on plaster across the backs of four tiles (each c.58×47 cm; letters c.7.5 cm high, but those of the third line are larger, c.7.5-12 cm).

1/[.]/a-pr'otacio3-myf-mq'cistruat
1/keset-c'u'estod-pi3-petod-pis
1/cau2-ia-ux0-oaf

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet with reversed s. The praenomen can be restored as the

268 Reputedly from the same tomb (Renzetti Marra 1990:329) is a much later Latin inscription, which I quote here from AE 1982 (no.292): D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). | Pisiuanae (mulieres) l(ibertae) Vitalini, | uix(it) annis XXX m(ensibus) II, C(aius) Luta(rius C(aii) f(ilius) Hor(atia tribu) Velitius lanu(arius, Pisiuana (mulieres) l(iberta) Felicula | patrona, C(aius) Caesonius C(aii) f(ilius) | Priscus uir coniugi dulcissimae fec(erunt).

512
very frequent [c]a or the less frequent [l]a (probably not as [m]a, as Marcus is here abbreviated as m). Keset shows the use of k to represent /g/ (§11.2.4.2). The formula ma cistratu | keset corresponds to the Latin expression magistratum gerere (cf. TLL 6.2 1939.1-1940.56): Renzetti Marra notes that this need not imply that it was taken over from Latin (and certainly not that the words or the perfect formation of keset did not pre-exist in Faliscan): on the other hand, the lexicon pertaining to officials and magistrates is virtually completely Latin (§6.3.6). The -d in /g70/g877estod and pretod is found also in pret od LF 214 and probably renders a weakened /-r/, an alveolar flap [r]: see §3.5.7b. The third line, which is slightly larger, may have been added later: it provides the only instance of a woman being described as uxor instead of as HUSBANDGEN uxor, since the husband had already been named in the other Faliscan inscriptions, HUSBANDGEN WIFE is used only when the woman was not buried together with her husband: see §7.4.2.


243. Painted in red on plaster across the back of a damaged tile (63×43 cm; letters c. 8 cm high).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kese} & \quad \text{probably:} \\
\text{uirup} & \quad 1^{\text{st}} \text{protac} \\
\text{rcues} & \quad 3^{\text{rd}} \text{kese} \text{duum}
\end{align*}
\]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet with reversed s. The r has the form ⱱ, which is normally used for a (§11.2.4.2). The word kese[t and the elements of the cursus honorum show that the text was similar to that of LF 242, but with the honores arranged in decreasing order of importance. The arrangement of the text is peculiar. The position of kese[t in the first line precludes the restoration [..protacio-.f].macistratu-kese[t, as this would require an inscription of five or six tiles, which would be too large to fit the loculus, and too large for even the most extensive cursus to fill the other lines: comparison with the other cursus (see §2.3.3) shows that before duum/uiru one can expect at most rex and censor (and perhaps a priesthood, as in LtF 231), and between duum/uiru and cuesfor only pretor, while some of the honores may have been followed by a numeral or words like pis. Assuming a reversed formula kese[t - macistratu leaves similar gaps in the cursus, whether a tile is assumed to be missing at the end or not:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[..protacio-.f]kese[t-macis]} & \quad \text{or} \quad \text{[..protacio-.f]kese[t]}\\
\text{[tratu.....duum]uiru[p]reto] & \quad \text{[macistratu-duum]uiru.*}\\
\text{[---------------rcues[tor]} & \quad \text{[---------------rcues}}
\end{align*}
\]

It would therefore appear that the inscription ran for three lines across two tiles and then for another three across two other ones. I have assumed similar arrangements in LF 247 and LtF 231. For the cursus honorum, see §2.3.3.

244. Painted in red on plaster along the length of the back of a tile (67×47 cm; letters c.12 cm high).

[--->[rota]cio[---]
[--->[st]ro-pro[---]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet with reversed s. The use of - as an interpunct is unique. For o[st]ro cf. Jostro in LF 245. Renzetti Marra reads po[stro] prof' with a po[stro] ‘dietro’, referring to a double interment, followed by “un prof' elemento architettonico di cui è data la localizzazione”. I doubt whether this is possible. The syncopation in po[stro] is not a regular in Faliscan phonology (§3.6.6.2): also, pro[---] would apparently refer to (the place in) the loculus, while placing a body before another is described by anteponat in Lat 251. There appears to be no Latin word that fits the text except no[stro] or uo[stro],269 the occurrence of ostr[o] after the cursus honorum in LF 245 shows that it is not a cognomen. Prof[---] may be part of a woman’s name, e.g. pro[tacia].


245. Painted in red on plaster on a tile fragment (max. 30×26 cm; letters c.8-9 cm high).

[--->[*][---]
[--->[c]ues[tor---]
[--->[ostr[o---]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet with reversed s. For the cursus honorum, see §2.3.3. For the interpretation of [--]ostr[o---], see LF 244.


246. Renzetti Marra mentions an “Ek[... ] testimoniata nella tegola P 19” (1990:339), which provides another instance of the Late Faliscan use of k to render /g/ (cf. §11.2.5.2). 269 The only candidates from a formal point of view are austrum/ostrum, claustrum/clostrum, plaustrum/plostrum, and rostrum.

247. Painted in red on plaster across the back of a tile (68×47 cm; letters 13 cm high).

[1][---]f[cue][stor]
[1][---]f[pret][or]
[1][---]f[duum][uir]
[1][---]f*ar[---]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The arrangement of the cursus honorum seems to indicate that the man’s praenomen and gentilicium followed by the filiation, occupied three or four lines on a missing tile, after which the text continued with three more lines on two more tiles. I have assumed a similar arrangement for LtF 231 and LF 242. The last line may have contained the name of a woman. For the cursus honorum, see §2.3.3.
THE INSCRIPTIONS FROM S. MARIA DI FALLERI (FALERII NOVI)


248. Painted in red on plaster across the back of a tile (70×48 cm; letters c.8-9 cm, those of the third and fourth line being smaller).

[--------]er[---]  
[---]of[·]sp[u][ilio]  
[·]f[p]re[t]or[ii-duu[m]uiru]  
[--------]****[--------]  

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet with reversed s and cursive e. The contents of the first line are unclear: the main epitaph seems to have started in the second line, which is slightly larger than the others. It contained the name of a man [---]of[·]sp[u][ilio] with a gentilicium occurring also in Lat 237-238. The size of the letters suggests that if only one tile is missing at the end, the filiation must have stood at the beginning of the third line. The cursus honorum then consisted only of pre[t]or : ii and duu[m]uiru: see §2.3.3.


249. Painted in red on plaster across the back of a tile (58×55 cm; letters c.13-14 cm high, but those of the third line only c.6 cm).

[---]*o-c[f  
[---]*liac[f  
[duu[m]uiru-re[f|x]  

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet with cursive e (Il). The arrangement of the text, with apparently a man’s name in the first line, a woman’s name in the second, and a cursus honorum in the third, is unique. Of great importance is the word re[f|x] (of the e only the upper parts of the shafts are preserved), which has also been read in MF 90, and can in my view also be read in LtF 231. For the cursus honorum, see §2.3.3.


250. Also from Pratoro (‘tenuta De Ferro’) is a Latin inscription painted on a tile. AÉ 1982 (no.286) gives the text as Pu(blius) Fuluius C(aii) f(ilius) | C(aii) n(epos) Suto(r) diem | suo obiet a(n)te d(iem) X k(alendas) Dec(embres), | C(aii) Atilio (et) Q(uinto) Seruio (pour Seruilio?) co(n)s(ulibus). The omission of -r in Suto and -m in suo, and the e in obiet are in accordance with Faliscan as well as with ‘rustic Latin’. Servio for seruilio is an error rather than a palatalization /li/ → /i/ (as Renzetti Marra explains it): see §3.5.5.3. The consuls are those of 106 BCE.


251. Cut in the back wall of the portico of a tomb (height c.110 cm; letters 12-14 cm high) along the ancient road between Falerii Novi and Falerii Veteres near the Fosso dei Tre Camini, i.e. also from Pratoro. The inscription was detached and brought to the
Museo di Villa Giulia somewhere between 1878 (when Bormann saw it in situ) and 1898 (when, according to Herbig, Pauli saw it in the museum).

Dextroverse, Latin alphabet. The first four letters of *amplius* are written as ligatures $\Delta\Lambda$ and $\Pi$. Henzen’s reading (used by Dennis and Noël des Vergers),$^{270}$ was substantially improved upon by autopsies by Garrucci (for which cf. also Michaelis) and Ritschl. (Safarewicz erroneously has e$^{[-]}$ in the first line and *polae* in the second.). – Lectus is apparently the *terminus technicus* for the loculus (§6.3.39): cf. *lete* 285, *let* 361, and perhaps $l[......]$. MF 17. *Plenese* is the dative of the Etruscoid feminine *plenes* found in LtF 231 from near S. Maria di Falleri: see §9.2.2.2.d. *Abelese*, on the other hand, rather represents *Abelle(n)sei*. *Parentaret* is *parentarit* = *parentauerit*. The phrase *amplius ... anteponat* can only be interpreted as a prohibition against unauthorized burials in the reserved loculi (Henzen, Garrucci 1860:280-1), although the syntax is obscure due to the double negation *nihil ... ne* (for which cf. *LHS* II pp.802-5), and by the absence of a subject for *anteponat*, probably to be solved by assuming an implicit *nemo* as the subject. Warmington, the only editor who provides a translation, increased the difficulties by reading *Amplius nihil | inviteis L. C. Levi(iii) f. | et quei eos parentaret; | ne anteponat* ‘Nothing further may be done against the wish of Lucius Levius and Gaius Levius, sons of Lucius, and of him whose duty it is to make sacrifices to their souls. Let no one place a body in front of these dead’. The language is (late) second-century Latin without specifically Faliscan dialect features, except perhaps for the omission of *s* in *lectu*, which would fit Faliscan well (§3.5.7.d).

*Bibliography:* [Dennis 1844 (*autopsy*)]; Henzen 1844 (*autopsy*); Dennis 1847:132 (*autopsy*); Garrucci 1860:279-81 (16); Michaelis 1862:346* (*autopsy*); Ritschl 1862:52; Noël des Vergers 1864:144 n.1; Garrucci 1864:73-4 (*autopsy*); Mommsen & Henzen *CIL* I.1313; Garrucci *SIL* 1880; Dennis 1878:99-100; Schneider 1886:107 (29); Bormann *CIL* XI.3160 (*autopsy*); Deecke 1888:211-2 (81); $\dagger$Lattes 1895:242; Conway 1897:381 (336); Herbig *CIE* 8334 (*autopsy*); [Weege in Helbig 1913:381]; Buonamici 1913:84-5 (54); Lommatzsch *CIL* I.1.1990; Warmington 1940:44-5 (94); Vetter 1953:310; Safarewicz 1955:186 (4); G. Giacomelli 1963:263-4 (XIII). *Photograph:* Herbig *CIE* 8334; *FI* II.1 p.397 fig.238. *Drawing:* Brunn in Ritschl 1862 tab.LIX,B.

---

252. Scratched in a bucchero plate (⌀ 9 cm) found “prope Falerios novos (strada provinciale Nog.)” (Herbig CIE 8354).

Ductus and alphabet are not given.

THE WALLS OF PALERMO, FROM THE EAST.