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Inscriptions claimed as Faliscan or Capenate

18.1. The inscriptions claimed as Faliscan or Capenate

The inscriptions presented in this chapter constitute a mixed bag of texts that have for varying reasons been regarded as Faliscan or Capenate. I have divided them into three groups according to whether or not I consider this attribution valid; my criteria for this are discussed under each individual inscription.

The first group (§18.2, 467*-478*), are inscriptions that are originis incertae vel ignotae but possibly or probably Faliscan or Capenate: of these, 467* is very probably Early Faliscan, while 468* is an almost entirely Sabellic inscription, perhaps of Capenate origin; 469*-473* are in all probability Middle Faliscan, and 474* probably Middle or Late Faliscan; 475*-476* are either Middle or Late Faliscan or Capenate; 477*-478* are Latin inscriptions found, but probably not made, in the ager Faliscus.

The second group (§18.3, 479†-484†) consists of the inscriptions that are probably not Faliscan or Capenate. The first group (§18.3.1) are originis incertae vel ignotae: 479† is probably archaic Latin, 480† is Sabellic (‘Palaeoumbrian’), and 481† is unintelligible. The second group (§18.3.2), 482†-484†, are all from Ardea, and their association with Faliscan has given rise to a persistent idea that Ardeatine and Faliscan were in some way related. I do not believe that there are grounds to warrant this: the issue is discussed at the end of section §18.3.2. In the final section (§18.3.3) I discuss Lucchesi’s (2005) suggestion that the Satricum-inscription CIL I².2832a is Faliscan.

18.2. Inscriptions that are probably or possibly Faliscan or Capenate

467* (Early Faliscan?). Scratched on the bottom of a bucchero cup (height 5.2 cm, Ω rim 12.9 cm, foot 7 cm; letters 6-14 mm high) acquired in Rome in 1889 by Froehner. Sixth century.

\[\text{aiŋiosoeqo}\]

Sinistroverse. The second, third, and fourth letters are \(\text{N}\). Lejeune (1952:124) read \(a[im]iosio\), considering also \(anposio\) and \(aiŋiosio\) (with reversed \(n\)). Vetter proposed \(anqiosio\), which is adopted by Agostiniani. Lejeune and G. Giacomelli regarded the inscription as Faliscan, probably because of the genitive in \(-osio\), but this is now attested also from Latium (\(popliosio\) ualesiosio CIL I².2832a from Satricum): see §4.4. The
sinistroverse ductus is found in the ager Faliscus at this date (in EF 6-10), but not universally (sixth-century EF 1 is dextroverse). The formula ego O WNERGEN (here uniquely in the reversed order O WNERGEN ego) is as yet attested only from the ager Faliscus, Latin and Capenate inscriptions having ego O WNERNOM (§8.9.2). The name Aemius is known only from the ager Falicus (ei/g1768oi MLF 293, possibly/g809[i]/g1768 MF 89) and from Venetic (‘a·vimo·i: Le 26). Although the criteria are inconclusive, I give this inscription the benefit of the doubt and treat it as Early Faliscan.


468* (Sabellic, but of Capenate origin?). Scratched inside a black-varnished cup, according to Buonamici from South Etruria.

paquamblaisiis

Dextroverse. The third and fourth letters,  and  , have usually been read as  and  respectively, but they differ from the other  ( ) and  ( ), and Marinetti rightly reads them as an upside-down  (cf. the similar  in 477†) and a  (cf. the similar  in 482†). Since there are no names in Pauq-, Marinetti proposes to read  pauq- as an error for  paqu- (cf. Latin Paquius, Oscan pak#hij Lu 40); this attractive solution also accounts for the unexpected use of  before . The last letters of this word are  and have been read as  (G. Giacomelli, Arena, Briquel) or  (Colonna), or as  (palpe Vetter), which is impossible. The penultimate letter of the second word, , is usually read as an , but its square form is odd: Buonamici, comparing the  in EF 1, read blaisiis. Marinetti gave the sign the value  (cf. the similar  in 477† as i). Buffa, who read  pacanml aiisds, called the text Faliscan without giving any reasons for this attribution. Vetter, too, regarded the inscription as Faliscan, because of shape of the  in his untenable reading palpe,  , which he compared to the  in MF 146 and in Lat 482† from Ardea (but regarded as Faliscan, see §18.3.2). According to Arena, the inscription looked Faliscan or Greek “was die sprachliche Eigentümlichkeiten betrifft” (1967:115 n.1), unfortunately without elaborating this. Such arguments as there are seem to speak against a Faliscan connection. The shape of the ’s and the use of  are un-Faliscan, while the ‘square i’ is South Picene, although possibly originating in South Etruria or the ager Capenas (Briquel 1972:830-6, Rix 1992:249-51). The  Endsilbensynkope is likewise Sabellic, not Faliscan, and so are the names.

Bibliography: Buonamici 1928:605-6 (autopsy); Buffa NRIE 981; Vetter 1953:359 (513); G. Giacomelli 1963:262 (VI); Arena 1967:114-5; Briquel 1972:831-3; Colonna 1980b:67-8 (38) (autopsy); Marinetti 1982b; Degrassi & Krummrey CIL I 2917c. Photograph: Colonna 1980b pl. 18.4 (reproduced in Marinetti 1982 tav.LVIIIa). Drawings: Buonamici 1928:606 (reproduced in Briquel 1972:832 fig.10); Buffa NRIE tav.XII; Colonna 1980b:67 fig. 11 (reproduced in Marinetti 1982:365); Degrassi & Krummrey CIL I 2917c.
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469* (Middle Faliscan). Scratched inside a black-varnished cup (height 5.7 cm, Ø rim 11.3 cm, foot 5.6 cm; letters 12-20 mm) acquired in Naples in 1900 by Froehner.

**uolti:catinei**

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. Froehner (quoted in Lejeune 1952b:115-6) regarded the inscription as Etruscan, but in that case the use of o and of u instead of v would be surprising (cf. vultasi Etr XLII). Lejeune and G. Giacomelli both regard the inscription as Faliscan. This is probably correct, the arguments in favour being both epigraphical (the form of the t, r, and the sinistroverse ductus, which at this date is regular in the ager Faliscus), and onomastical (the praenomen Voltius, which occurs with some frequency in Faliscan inscriptions, but is very rare elsewhere). The form is probably a genitive, although the possibility of an abbreviated nominative cannot be excluded (§8.8.1).


470* (MiddleFaliscan). Painted carefully on the underside of the foot of a small vase in the shape of a rooster (height 20.5 cm, letters 0.5 cm high) in the Steinhardt Collection, New York. No information is provided about the provenance of the object, but in view of the fabric and the ornamentation, there can be no doubt that it is of Faliscan origin, as is the inscription. Mid- or late fourth century.

**oufilo:clipeaio:letei:fileo:met:facet**

Sinistroverse. The alphabet is the usual Faliscan alphabet of the period, except for the l in *oufilo*, which according to Wallace “appears to be a character in the shape of an upsilon; traces of a left oblique bar are visible.” (2005:176). *Clipeaio* is probably an error for *clipeario*, cf. *clipiar[io]* LF 230, *clipear[io]* LtF 231, and *cl[i]peario* LtF 233 from S. Maria di Falleri. The praenomen *oufilo* is attested from several sites in the ager Faliscus (see §7.7.1.12). The name of the father, in the genitive *letei*, is unattested elsewhere. Wallace hesitatingly compares Greek Νέταος and Etruscan lethae (2005:178), but I think *letei* may well be the Faliscan genitive of *Letaeus*, a Latinization of the Etruscan name lethae in Etr XLVIII from Mazzano Romano.

The inscription provides several points of linguistic interest. The perfect *facet*, paralleled in *faced* MF 471*, shows a perfect stem /fak-/: see §5.3.1.6. The third person singular perfect ending with -et instead of -ed (cf. *faced* MF 471*) was already known from *keset* in LF 242. *Met* is the only attestation of the accusative of the pronoun of the first person singular in Middle Faliscan (Lat 268 is an import), although *med* was known already from Early Faliscan EF 1 and 9. I am inclined to view the t in this form as an error due to the fact that -d was already disappearing in the nouns and pronouns, and was replaced in the verbal endings by -t: see §3.5.7c. For the formula, see §8.9.2.

471* (Middle Faliscan). Painted on the body of a small column crater (height 31.5 cm, Ø rim 21.5 cm, foot 12.5 cm; letters 1.5-3 cm high), acquired in 1997 in Basle by the Museo Arqueológico Nacional, Madrid. Late fourth to mid-third century.

cauiosfrenaiofaced

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The praenomen is undoubtedly Faliscan (§7.7.1.25); the gentilicium is not attested elsewhere. The only parallel for word-final -s after a short vowel being written is cauios Cap 382. Berenguer & Luján draw attention to the conservation of ai, for which cf. ulitaia MF 196 and latinaio MLF 210: see §3.7.6 and G. Giacomelli 1962. The Middle Faliscan perfect faced has a parallel in facet MF 470* (quo vide). Linguistically, it is interesting to find the ending -ed more or less contemporary with facet in MF 470*. For the formula, see §8.9.2.


472* (Middle Faliscan). Scratched on the outer side of a pottery fragment (letters 10-13 mm high) of Faliscan make (Stanco, with references). Late fourth or early third century.

marci:anell[i ?—]\n
Sinistroverse. The ductus, the shapes of the letters, and the names are in accordance with the Faliscan provenance of the piece. Marci is probably a genitive; alternatively, it could be an abbreviated nominative of Marcius. In both cases, the gentilicium is to be restored as anell[i. It seems unlikely that any more text followed this.


473* (Middle Faliscan). Painted in black under the foot of a Genucilia-plate (Ø 14.5 cm; letters c. 12 mm high), auctioned in 2002 in Paris. Late fourth or early third century.

cauio:petr[oneo]

Sinistroverse, Faliscan alphabet. The a is ñ for a, another instance of the confusion of ñ and ñ (§11.2.4).291 The gentilicium is so damaged as to have almost disappeared: Briquel restores pet[troneo], probably rightly.


474* (Middle or Late Faliscan or Capenate?). Engraved along two sides of the upper surface of a triangular bronze statuette base (length of the sides 9.7 cm, letters 13 mm high). Ritschl ascribed the inscription to Praeneste, but Mommsen & Henzen (CIL I
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p.255) claimed that “elementorum quorundam forma et interpunctio duplex a Latina consuetudine abhorrent”, and Garrucci ascribed it to Falerii, where it was reported to have been found by Sebastianiani. The object, lost after Garrucci’s death, was rediscovered by Lejeune in the Froehner Collection in Paris.

caui tertinei posticum

Dextroverse, Latin alphabet. In Ritschl’s and Garrucci’s drawing, the top of the o is interrupted for the foot of the statuette. Caui tertinei is genitive of Gavius Tertineius vel sim. (thus Lejeune, reviving the interpretation of Bronisch and Tambroni), not an Etruscan nominative (thus Herbig, Vetter, and Pisani292). Posticum has been interpreted variously as an Etruscan nominative or genitive (Lejeune): it is in fact a Sabellic first-declension nominative with a lexical parallel in South Picene ombrüen : akren : postiknam ... dúnoh : defta : CH.2. The meaning ‘statue’, which has been suggested for the South Picene word, would fit both contexts: see §6.3.57 and §9.3.2.

Bibliography: Ritschl 1859:382-3; Ritschl 1862:30; Mommsen & Hensen CIL I p.255; Garrucci 1864:69 (autopsy); Fabretti CIL 2440ter; Garrucci SIL 809; Zvetaiief IIIM 66; Zvetaiief III 68; Schneider 1886:107 (28); Bormann CIL XI.3157; Deecke 1888:197-8 (63); Bronisch 1892:85; Conway 1897:381-2 (xli.a); Von Planta 1897:588 (322); Tambroni 1903:217; Herbig 1910:105-10 (19); Jacobsohn 1910:5 (33); Herbig CIE 8339; Buonamici 1913:78-80 (50); Lejeune 1952b:114-20 (autopsy); Vetter 1953:308 (319); G. Giacomelli 1963:67-8 (58); Pisani 1964:345 (147). Photograph: Lejeune 1952b pl.XII. Drawings: Ritschl 1862 tab.XXXVI,B (whence CIL I p.255); Garrucci 1866 tav.IV.2 (reproduced CII tab.XLIII, IIM tab.VII.2, CIE 8339).

475* (possibly Middle Faliscan or Capenate?). Scratched on a small one-eared cup in the Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe (Hamburg). Vetter (1953) assumed Capenate provenance, as several pieces from the excavations at Contrada S. Martino had ended up in the Museum by way of the Sammlung Reimer (cf. Ballheimer 1909).

iunai

Dextroverse. The n is Ꞑ. Vetter’s reading iunae, on which he assigns the inscription to the second century, is a misreading of Von Mercklin’s drawing, which shows the last letter as Ꞑ. The dextroverse ductus is not Middle or Late Faliscan, but could be Capenate. The form iunai can be either genitive or dative (§8).


476* (possibly Middle or Late Faliscan or Capenate?). Scratched on a vessel bought in Rome by Garrucci. “Puto originis esse sabinae et fortasse Capenatem” (Garrucci SIL 817, without giving any reasons for this assumption).

setorio

292 Pisani erroneously rendered caui tertinei as ‘Vibia Tertinia’.
Sinistroverse. The $s$ is given by Garrucci as Ʒ, the $t$ as $\mathfrak{T}$, and the $r$ as $\mathfrak{R}$. Ductus and letter-shapes, as well as the omission of word-final -s (§3.5.7d) and syllable-final $r$ (§3.5.7b), are all compatible with a Capenate or Faliscan provenance; cf. Praecilia Setoriana in CIL XI.3181 from near Fabbrica di Roma (?).

**Bibliography:** Garrucci SIL 817 (autopsy); Gamurrini 1880 (828); Zvetaieff IIM p.66 ($h$); Deecke 1888:204 (70); Bormann CIL XI.6706,11a; Conway 1897:384; Herbig CIE 8462; Buonamici 1913:92 (63); Lommatzsch CIL I.476,11; Vetter 1953:329 (360a); G. Giacomelli 1963:269 (XXXIX); Briquel 1972:820-1. **Transcription:** Garrucci SIL 817 (reproduced in IIM p.66, CIE 8462, Deecke 1888 Taf.III, CIL XI.6706,11a, CIL I.476,11, Briquel 1972:820 fig. 7).

477* (Latin). Scratched before firing on a Megarian bowl. Late third or early second century (Siebourg).

**l/quoti**

Sinistroverse, Latin alphabet. The $l$ is Ʌ, the $t$ $\Gamma$. The form is either a genitive (Siebourg) or an abbreviated nominative (§8.8.1). Fiorelli and Bormann gave the provenance as Montefiascone, Contrada S. Lorenzo: Bormann, however, identified the bowl with one in the Museo Municipale in Arezzo, whose provenance is given as S. Maria di Falleri by Gamurrini293 (in CIL XI.6704,6), as Civita Castellana by Siebourg, and as Civita della Chiana by the inventory of the Museo (thus G. Giacomelli). They are clearly bowls from the same mould, as G. Giacomelli suggested: this would explain why Siebourg described ‘his’ bowl as unpublished. Whether this bowl is from the ager Faliscus is unclear. For an object at Arezzo, Civita della Chiana is a more likely provenance than the ager Faliscus. Even if the bowl is from the ager Faliscus it is not necessarily a local product. The sinistroverse ductus and the shape of the $n$ are Faliscan rather than Latin, but the alphabet, $qu$ and the rendering of /nt/ as $nt$ are non-Faliscan (cf. cuicto 310).

**Bibliography:** (I) Fiorelli 1883:434 (autopsy); – (II) Siebourg 1897:47-8 (13) (autopsy); – (III) Bormann CIL XI.6704,6 (autopsy); Lommatzsch CIL I.424; Safarewicz 1955:185; G. Giacomelli 1963:263 (VIII). **Photograph:** Siebourg 1897:46. **Drawing:** Siebourg 1897:46.

478* (Latin). Scratched before firing on a Megarian bowl. “Fundort nicht bekannt. Jetzt in Arezzo im Museo municipale” (Siebourg 1891); “ex Civita Castellana [comparavit GAMURRINIUS et collocavit in museo Arretino]” (Bormann CIL XI.6704,2e). Similar bowls from the same workshop were found near Corchiano (295-296). c.230-150 (Baudrillart 1889:288-9).

**[c/]-popili**

Dextroverse, Latin alphabet. The $p$ is $\mathfrak{P}$, the $l$ $\mathfrak{H}$; the $o$ is open at the bottom. Genitive or abbreviated nominative (thus Siebourg).

**Bibliography:** Siebourg 1897:44 (5) (autopsy); Lommatzsch CIL I.419e; Bormann CIL XI.6704,2e. **Drawing:** Siebourg 1897:42.

---

293 Lommatzsch and G. Giacomelli erroneously ascribed this autopsy to Garrucci.
18.3. Inscriptions that are probably not Faliscan or Capenate

18.3.1. *Inscriptiones originis incertae uel ignotae.* The following inscriptions are of unknown and uncertain origin and probably not Faliscan.

479† (the ‘Vendia-inscription’, probably early Latin). Scratched on the lower part of the body of an impasto pithos (height (incomplete) 35 cm, \(\varnothing\) shoulder 45 cm; letters 15-25 mm high). Late seventh to mid-sixth century.

\[\text{ecournitauendiasmama}/g1792[\cos 6-9 m]/g833/g1714/g1828/g1738e[\ked]\]

Dextroverse, with reversed \(s\) (\(\Xi\)). The alphabet shows no specifically Faliscan letter-forms; the use of \(vh\) rather than \(f\) is non-Faliscan. *Tita uendias* is often interpreted as a very early instance of a woman’s name consisting of praenomen and gentilicium (or patronym?), in which case the lack of an ending in *tita* presents a problem. Pallottino (1951:399) and Colonna (1980c:52) assumed a *Gruppenflexion*, the name being declined as a unit *tita-uendia*- (as happens in Etruscan) but if the text is some form of Latin, this is difficult. Lejeune took the words as a genitive, *tita(s) uendias*, but this assumes a very early omission of \(-s\), and after a long vowel, too (§3.5.7d).\(^{294}\) I am inclined to take *tita* as the adjective */tito-/ ‘propitious, prosperous’ posited by Combet Farnoux (1980:150-60),\(^{295}\) though perhaps in a less ponderous sense. I cannot take serious Pisani’s interpretation of the text as a jocular claim that the urn is a teat (*tita*) providing Vendia with wine, or Knobloch’s idea that an *urna tita* is a piggy-bank (with an onomatopoetic adjective *tita* – at a time when minted coin had yet to be invented). Following this, Pallottino read *mamarc* ‘Mamerci (filiae/uxoris)’ (erroneously *mamarc* 1951:398; *mamar*[c] first Pallottino in Pisani 1953b:425). The letter before the lacuna is similar to the \(d\) in *uendia*, which lead Pisani (1953b:425) to read *mamad[ed]e* ‘Mama dedit’ (adopted by Pallottino 1954; *mamad[*****]de** G. Giacomelli), but the \(r\), maintained by Peruzzi (*mamar[ce]*), is confirmed from autopsy by Colonna (*mamar[cos]*).

After a lacuna of ten to twelve letters, the text continues as *\('^[14]p\)l*\).. The first trace is the top of an \(e\) or a \(v\); if the appendage of the following letter also belongs to this letter, it can also be read as \(n\). The second letter is a \(d\) (Pisani, Peruzzi, G. Giacomelli) rather than an \(r\) (Pallottino), the third is an \(e\) (Pallottino, G. Giacomelli) or a \(v\) (Peruzzi, Colonna, Prosdocimi, Agostiniani; Pisani’s \(f\) is a different transcription of the same sign). This is followed by an \(h\) and a trace that is the upper left-hand corner of an \(a\), an \(e\), a \(d\), an \(m\), an \(n\), a \(v\), or perhaps an \(h\), a \(p\), or an \(r\). Pisani read *fisico]ndfei*[ ‘finixerunt

\(^{294}\) G. Giacomelli erroneously ascribes this interpretation to Pallottino (1951).

\(^{295}\) In *saluetod tita* from Osteria dell’Osa, *tita* is certainly a name (Colonna 1980c:52), but this does not constitute an argument against the simultaneous existence of an adjective */tito-/.
Fi...’, but this requires assuming a very early instance of $F$ for $f$ and the $ei$ being written as $\text{H} = \text{H}$, whereas all the other letters are written quite distinctly. Peruzzi’s $\text{m}\text{Jd} \text{y} \text{h} \text{ed} ‘\text{m} \text{e} \text{f} \text{c} \text{i} \text{t}’$ has rightly been adopted by all editors, although Hartmann is doubtful and considers also $\text{je} \text{r} \text{e} \text{h} \text{a} \text{l}$ or $\text{j} \text{u} \text{d} \text{f} \text{e} \text{i} \text{t}$ as possible alternatives. Combined with his $\text{m} \text{a} \text{m} \text{a} \text{r} \text{c} \text{e}$ or Colonna’s $\text{m} \text{a} \text{m} \text{a} \text{r} \text{c} \text{o} \text{s}$, this still leaves leaves six to nine letters to be restored, which perhaps constituted the name of a second potter, as in $\text{m} \text{a} \text{m} \text{a} \text{z} \text{x} \text{t} \text{o} \text{s}$ $\text{m} \text{e} \text{d} \text{f} \text{i} \text{s} \text{t} \text{i} \text{k} \text{e} \text{d}$, where all the other letters are written quite distinctly. $\text{m} \text{a} \text{m} \text{a} \text{r} \text{c} \text{e}$ or Colonna’s $\text{m} \text{a} \text{m} \text{a} \text{r} \text{c} \text{o} \text{s}$, this still leaves six to nine letters to be restored, which perhaps constituted the name of a second potter, as in $\text{m} \text{a} \text{m} \text{a} \text{z} \text{x} \text{t} \text{o} \text{s}$ $\text{m} \text{e} \text{d} \text{f} \text{i} \text{s} \text{t} \text{i} \text{k} \text{e} \text{d}$, but this would leave the following $\text{e} \text{h} * \text{---}$ or $\text{y} \text{h} * \text{---}$ unexplained. Hartmann notes that the $d$ in what is usually read as $\text{m} \text{a} \text{m} \text{a} \text{r} \text{c} \text{e}$ or $\text{m} \text{a} \text{m} \text{a} \text{r} \text{c} \text{o} \text{s}$ is in fact $\text{f}$ ($\text{d}$), although he rightly concludes that this does not mean that the inscription is Faliscan.

Since two of the shards were found by Mengarelli and were in the Museo di Villa Giulia before 1936 (the others were acquired independently by the Principe Massimo), Pallottino gave the provenance of the vase as Cerveteri, where Mengarelli had worked in the first quarter of the century. When Lejeune regarded the inscription as Faliscan, this attribution was adopted by Pisani (1953b) and Pallottino (1954), the latter now giving several arguments against his former attribution (the vase represented a type found throughout South Etruria; the clay was different from that used at Cerveteri) and in favour of the Faliscan attribution (Mengarelli had worked at Falerii as well; other pieces in the Principe Massimo’s collection were of Falisco-Capenate provenance). Not everyone adopted this attribution, however: Cerveteri is still the provenance given in Cristofani 1990, while for Colonna, both the vase and the inscription are from Latium.

Lejeune’s arguments for the attribution, namely the occurrence of $\text{t} \text{i} \text{t} \text{i} \text{a} \text{s}$ EF 2, and the omission of $-s$ in this word, are inconclusive: names of the $\text{ti} \text{t} \text{i} \text{a}$-group are widely attested, and the omission of $-s$ in Early Faliscan is uncertain, however frequent it may be in Middle and Late Faliscan (cf. §3.5.7d). Peruzzi, like Colonna, regarded the language of the inscription as South Etrurian Latin. The dextroverse ductus is, at this date, both Faliscan and Latin (§11.2.3); the form of the $s$, $\xi$, and the use of $c$ before $o$ are attested in Faliscan texts only from the fifth century onwards (cf. §11.2.3-4). Note that the recently published Middle Faliscan perfect forms $\text{f} \text{a} \text{c} \text{e} \text{t} \text{M} \text{F} 470^*$ and $\text{f} \text{a} \text{c} \text{e} \text{d} \text{M} \text{F} 471^*$ make it very unlikely that the Early Faliscan form was $\text{y} \text{h} \text{e} \text{k} \text{e} \text{d}$. All in all, the evidence for the inscription being from the ager Faliscus, let alone Faliscan, is very slight indeed.


480† (Sabellic, probably Palaeoumbrian?). Scratched on the handle of a bucchero krater (height 28 cm, $\Theta$ rim 24 cm, shoulder 27.5 cm; letter height 4-12 mm) from tomb
XVII of the II Ferrone necropolis in the La Tolfa area (cf. Colonna 1983:574 n.2, with literature). The inscription was added after firing, but appears to have been planned beforehand, as the other handle was decorated, while the one with the inscription was left blank. Date: c.560.

-setums | mìom | face

Dextroverse. Rix’s reading, which is followed here, is clearly preferable to Colonna’s mośm: smutes | face, and shows that the language of the inscription is undoubtedly Sabellic: in ST it is classed as a Palaeo-Umbrian text. Setums, reflecting Proto-Italic */septomo-/, shows the Sabellic Endsilbensynkope and a complete disappearance of /p/ before /t/, as occurred later in Umbrian (Rix 1992:247-8). Mìom, too, is clearly Sabellic: Faliscan has med or met, whereas mìom has similar formations only in the Sabellic languages: South Picene tiom TE.5 (nom.?), Umbrian tiu TI Iia.25 etc., and Oscan ðiú Sa 31 and siom TB I.5 etc. The perfect stem in face has parallels in the Sabellic languages in, among others, the Umbrian future perfects fakust TI IV.31, fakurent TI Ib.34, and facurent TI VIIa.43: it is now also attested for Faliscan in the recently published Middle Faliscan inscriptions oufilo / clieario : letei / fileo : met : facet 470* and cauios frenaios faced 471*: see §5.3.1.6. For the formula, see §8.9.2. The only reason for connecting this inscription with the Faliscan corpus is the shape of the f, ↑, but the use of this sign was not constricted to Faliscan: see §11.2.2-3.


481†. Cut in a strip of sandstone (letters c.3.5 cm high), originally probably part of the ledge between two loculi, now set in the wall of the church of S. Serena at Foglia, near Magliano Sabino. The use of local stone implies that the inscription was made locally.

[--jeiufahls?--]

Sinistroverse. The first letter is ⛼, probably a c, although an x does not seem impossible. According to Firmani, the letters iu (V1) could be read together as n (N). From his drawing it is not clear whether the inscription ended with the s. I doubt if the text is Faliscan, as Firmani suggested. The only Faliscan feature is the shape of the f, ↑, but the use of this sign was not limited to Faliscan: see §11.2.2-3. The sequence ah looks Umbrian rather than Faliscan: cf. cavies : uhtav[---] Etr XLV from Lucus Feroniae, but see also §3.5.7c.


18.3.2. The ‘Faliscan’ inscriptions from Ardea. The following inscriptions are from the necropoles of Ardea, but have, for various reasons, been regarded as Faliscan. This question is addressed at the end of this section.
CHAPTER 18

482†. Scratched under a bucchero vase (⌀ 9 cm; letters 5-15 mm) found on the site of Pasqui’s necropolis a (cf. Barnabei 1882:71, Pasqui 1900:54-6) at Ardea.²⁹⁶ Seventh or early sixth century according to Briquel and Colonna (1976a), although Colonna later (1980b) ascribed it to the second half of the sixth century.

eqo\text{ka}ñais

Dextroverse, with reversed s ( sucked, a very slender ). The n is \( \text{\text{\(\ell\)}} \). Prosdocimi (in Agostiniani) suggests \( \text{ka}ñais \) (with upside-down u). Wachter’s suggestion Cavidios (i.e., kauidios) is impossible: the letter following the n is certainly an a.

Dressel’s interpretation ‘ego K(aeso) Annaeus’ long remained unchallenged, although already Mommsen (in Dressel) and Gamurrini (1894) doubted the likelihood of such an abbreviated praenomen at this date. Since Colonna (1980b) raised this point again, \( \text{ka}ñais \) has become the established reading. For the Latin formula \( \text{ego OWNER_NOM} \) see below ad fin. and §8.8.2: Wachter’s interpretation of \( \text{ka}ñais \) as a possessive adjective (“ich (bin) ein zur Familie ... gehöriges Gefäß”) is interesting in the light of what has been said in §4.4.11: see Colonna 1983b:55-7.

Herbig regarded the ductus, the use of q to render /g/ , and the spelling of anais \((= ‘\text{Annaeus}’\) with a single n, as Faliscan elements. The dextroverse ductus occurs also in several early Latin graffiti (see below), q for /g/ is also found in eqo CIL I.2.479 and 2917c, and Colonna (1980b) has plausibly connected \( \text{ka}ñais \) with (Latin) names in Can-. There is no reason to assume that the inscription is Faliscan.


483†. Scratched under a red-varnished cup on a high foot (height 8.5 cm, ⌀ rim 10.5 cm) found together with 484† in the third-century tomb q of necropolis e (Pasqui 1900:54-6). Vetter (1955:3 n.3) dated the tomb one or two generations earlier, on the basis of his earlier dating of 484†.

titoiov

Sinistroverse. The t is \( \text{\text{\emph{\text{\(\ell\)}}}} \). The inscription was without argumentation regarded as Faliscan by Herbig (and Jacobsohn), presumably on account of the form of the t and the sinistroverse ductus, both normal in contemporary Faliscan inscriptions, but then unparalleled in Latin inscriptions apart from the occurrence of sinistroverse ductus in 484†. Herbig interpreted titoio as a nominative after Etruscan tituie in an inscription

²⁹⁶ Ernout (1957:53) erroneously gave the provenance as Falerii.
INSCRIPTIONS OF UNCERTAIN, UNKNOWN, OR NON-FALISCAN OR NON-CAPENATE ORIGIN

published by Buonamici (1931:410); cf. also Etruscan titui Pe 1.622-624, 627. Pisani and Dirichs interpreted titoio as a genitive in -oio /-oio/ ← -osio /-osio/ (§4.4.10). For those who (unlike Pisani) regarded the genitive in -osio as exclusively Faliscan, this interpretation provided an additional argument for a connection between Ardeatine and Faliscan, though not for regarding the inscription itself as Faliscan, as there the genitive was -i at this time (thus e.g. Safarewicz and Wachter). As discussed in §4.4.5, the possible existence of a genitive in -oio in Latin or Faliscan is at best extremely questionable, and in my view untenable. The possibility that titoio is a possessive adjective titoio(m) (as has been suggested by Vetter and Hamp) can be excluded at this date. Hamp in fact curiously suggests that Ardeatine preserved the genitive in -osio (an assumption based exclusively on the traditional interpretation of titoio as a genitive in -oio), but that under the influence of the surrounding areas where -i was used, this was adapted to “a less startling adjectival -o-io(m)” (Hamp 1981:231).


484†. Scratched on the bottom of a red-varnished plate (height 5 cm, Ø 15 cm; letter height 3-6 mm in Thulin’s drawing), found together with 483† in tomb q of necropolis c, dated to the third century by Pasqui (1900:54-6). Vetter (1955:3 n.3) dated the inscription one or two generations earlier because of the letters, the double interpunct, and the sinistroverse ductus.

neuen:deiuo

Sinistroverse; the first e is ęż, the others Ą (thus Thulin; Pasqui’s and Lommatzsch’s transcripts give all e’s as Ą). Thulin treated the inscription as Faliscan (with neuen as a form of Latin Naevenna = Etruscan Cnevne), probably on account of the form of the e, paralleled only in MF 146. The attribution was adopted by Herbig and Jacobsohn, and by Lommatzsch, who interpreted ‘ne ven(das); deivo(m)’. This interpretation was in turn adopted by Diehl and Warmington (who, however, translated ‘for a god’, apparently regarding deivo as a dative), and still considered by G. Giacomelli. Lommatzsch later even discarded the text from the CIL because it was Faliscan (CIL I.455 add.); later editors have regarded the inscription, with various degrees of hesitation, as Latin. Pisani’s interpretation (1943:259) of the text as a dedication to the di novensides has been adopted by virtually all later editors, especially when it was elaborated by Vetter (1956); only Weinstock still maintained Thulin’s interpretation.

Although the attribution of these three inscriptions to Faliscan has been rejected in each individual case by more than one author, the impression that Ardeatine and Faliscan are in some way related or ‘close’ seems to persist independently. I therefore review here again the possible arguments for an Ardeatine-Faliscan connection, mainly those proposed by Wachter (1987:99).

First, there are the epigraphical similarities between the inscriptions from Ardea and the Faliscan inscriptions. In the case of *eqo kanaios* 482†, Wachter noted that it has a dextroverse ductus, like the Early Faliscan inscriptions, whereas the contemporary Latian inscriptions are sinistroverse. His point of comparison, however, are the longer, partly ‘official’ early Latin inscriptions *CIL I* 2.1, 4, 2658, 2832a, 2833, and 2833a. Leaving aside the fact that even in this group there are two instances of dextroverse ductus (*CIL I* 2.2832a and 2833a), it seems to me that better material for comparison is provided by the contemporary Latin *Besitzerinschriften*, where dextroverse ductus is quite common (e.g. *CIL I* 2.479, 2830, 2832, 2916g, e, i, 2916k, a, c, d, 2917a, and 2917b). Another argument might be the shape of the *s*, which is 3 (Wachter gives it as 5) and seems to have parallels in the ager Faliscus (EF 1 and 4, cf. §12.2-3) but apparently not in Latium.

*Titoio* 483† and *neuen : deiuo* 484†, too, contain epigraphical features associated with the ager Faliscus rather than Latium. The most striking is probably the sinistroverse ductus, which is without clear parallels in contemporary Latin inscriptions, although it should be noted that among the Faliscan inscriptions themselves there is a small amount of inscriptions where the ductus is dextroverse instead of the usual sinistroverse (§11.1.5). Interesting, too, are the form of the *t* in 483†, r, which is the normal form in the contemporary Faliscan alphabet, but is rare or absent in the Latin alphabet, and the form of the first *e* in 484†, ɐ, paralleled only in MF 146. The epigraphical correspondences between the Ardeatine and the Faliscan inscriptions are therefore undeniable, but their implications are unclear: I rather suspect that if the inscriptions had surfaced without the circumstances of their finding being known, they would have been ascribed on epigraphical grounds to the ager Faliscus.

The linguistic arguments for a ‘Faliscan-Ardeatine connection’ are even fewer:

1. The occurrence of *eu* in *neuen* 484†. If the interpretation of *neuen* as a dialectal form of *nouem* is correct, this word would appear to show a retention of PIE */eu/*. This presupposes that the merging of PIE */eu/* with */ou/* did not occur at the Proto-Italic stage, as is usually assumed, but took place later and separately in the various Italic languages – or indeed dialects (§3.2.5). Wachter points out that *eu* is found also in Early Faliscan *euios* in 1 and *ieuotenosio* in 3 (as he reads it), while on the other hand early Roman has *ou* in *ioumen|ta* and *iouestod* in *CIL I* 2.1, and in *iouesat* in *CIL I* 2.4. Faliscan and Ardeatine, in his view, both retained /eu/ longer than Roman.297 Even if

297 Note that *iouestod* and *iouesat* may go back to an old o-grade */iuous-/ (DÉ s.v. *iūs*), and that in G. Giacomelli’s (1963:41-44) interpretation of EF 1, which Wachter appears to follow,
this were true, however, the comparison between the two is fairly slight, for even if in Early Faliscan /eu/ was retained until later than the Roman inscriptions CIL I².1 and 4, by the third century it had certainly merged with /ou/ and thence monophthongized to /ö/ (§3.7.2). Vetter (1953:333) in fact quoted the inscriptions neuna · fata CIL I².2846 and neuna · dono CIL I².2845 from Lavinium as parallels for the neuen, and not a Faliscan inscription. Wachter’s comparison would show nothing more than that /eu/ was rounded at different times in the different Latin dialects, but this is not an argument in favour of a specific connection between Faliscan and Ardeatine – rather the opposite.

(2) The possibility that titoio 483† is a genitive in /-oijo/ ← /-ošio/. This interpretation is extremely debatable, to say the least (§4.4.10); if it is adopted, it should be noted that in the contemporary Faliscan inscriptions the ending of the genitive is -i, and that any connection between Ardeatine and Faliscan based on an Ardeatine genitive titoio must therefore be diachronic. In that case, an Ardeatine genitive -oio /-oijo/ ← /-ošio/ is an argument for a specific connection between Ardeatine and Faliscan based on an Ardeatine genitive only if /-ošio/ is regarded as exclusively Faliscan, and the argument goes back to a time when this was the prevalent opinion (§4.4.1). If /-ošio/ was at any one time the (general) Latin ending, the fact that a reflex of this ending is found both in Ardeatine and in Faliscan cannot in any way constitute an argument for an Ardeatine-Faliscan connection: and the occurrence of -osio in the inscription from Satricum (CIL I².2832a) indicates precisely this.

(3) The omission of word-final consonants in titoio in 483† and deiuo in 484†. The omission of word-final -s and -m, although virtually universal in Middle Faliscan inscriptions (cf. §3.5.7d,a), occurs too often in Latin inscriptions from other locations to count as a criterion.

From an epigraphical point of view, there are similarities between these inscriptions from Ardea and those from the ager Faliscus. From a linguistic point of view, I see no indications for a specific connection between the two, apart from the general similarities between what are, in my view, dialects of the same language.

18.3.3. The Satricum-inscription as Faliscan. In a recent article, Lucchesi (2005) has suggested that the Satricum-inscription (CIL I².2832a) may itself be Faliscan. Her arguments (and my objections) are the following:

(1) Publius is attested in the form Poplios only in Faliscan inscriptions. This is true (except, of course, for the Satricum-inscription itself), but this is probably due to the fact that Faliscan is the only Latin dialect that provides a large number of relatively early inscriptions. The argument, of course, depends on the way the name is derived: if there was a (real or perceived) connection with populus, or a connection with Etruscan, euios is a Greek loan (Euíos) and therefore can provide no information about the Italic development of PIE */eu/.
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where the pronomen is attested as *puplies* Vs 1.29 etc. (§7.7.1.51), there is a very good chance that the contemporary Latin spelling of the name was likewise *Poplios*. Lucchesi makes no reference to the fact that in the ager Faliscus, the name is not attested for Early Faliscan and is in fact attested for men only in MLF 316 and perhaps in MLF 317, and in abbreviated form in LF 337, Lat 250, and Cap 409 and 462. Its popularity as a man’s name therefore appears to be late, and perhaps due to Latin influence. The name is certainly not a typical Faliscan name (cf. §7.7.2), and occurs also in Latin and Etruscan. Note that this is an onomastic argument rather than a linguistic one.

(2) The gens *Valeria*, or at least P. Valerius Publicola, is of Faliscan origin. This argument depends on the identification of the *popliosio ualesiosio* of the Satricum-inscription with P. Valerius Publicola, suggested by Versnel (1980) at a time when the genitive in *-osio* was still regarded as exclusively Faliscan by many scholars, as well as on the likelihood of P. Valerius Publicola being a Faliscan, for which Lucchesi only refers to very indirect evidence (the myth of ‘Valeria Luperca’ in [Plut.] Vit. Min. 35). Note that in spite of the large number of gentilicia attested for the ager Faliscus and Capenas, there is no attestation of *Valerius* or its pre-rhotacist predecessor *Valesios*. The argument is, again, not a linguistic one.

(3) The inscription is dextroverse, like the Early Faliscan inscriptions, while the early Latin inscriptions are sinistroverse. This, however, is true only for the earliest Early Faliscan inscriptions (EF 1-4): the others (EF 6-10, 467*, and EF/Etr 385) show that the change to a sinistroverse ductus was already under way during the sixth and early fifth centuries, not “perhaps in the 5th or at the beginning of the 4th” (p.263).

(4) *Steterai* is assumed to be Faliscan, apparently because it is a reduplicative perfect that is not attested for Latin. I do not quite understand why it would then be Faliscan, since this perfect is likewise unattested for Faliscan: this is in fact an illustration of the problems of synchronic comparison for the early periods discussed in §10.1.2. Or is it Faliscan because Faliscan had other reduplicative perfects that Latin did not have, such as *fefiked* EF 9 / *ffijqod* EF 1? Interestingly, Lucchesi does not discuss the ending of *steterai*, which is most certainly not attested for Faliscan, where only *ffijqod* EF 1 shows, not a perfect ending, but an aorist ending: a difference that is usually regarded as one of the major features separating Faliscan from Latin (§5.2.4.5, §10.1.2-3).

(5) *-osio* is not a possessive genitive: this harks back to the criticism of Untermann (1964) on the assumption that a genitive in *-osio* was replaced by a genitive in *-i*, which I discussed in §4.4.9. I do not see how this could be an argument for or against the Satricum-inscription being Faliscan.

(6) The greatest obstacle against a Faliscan attribution of the Satricum-inscription, is, of course *suodales*, since this is usually derived from PIE */suedʰh₁-/*, which would give *suofales* or *suofales* as the expected Early Faliscan form. Lucchesi shows that *suodales* can also be derived from PIE */sued-/*, which would remove this obstacle, and
I think that this is possible. In that case, however, the form *suodales* might just as well be Latin instead of Faliscan.

(7) The circumstances of the find show that the inscription may have come from another location. This, of course, is true: the stone of the Satricum-inscription was later reused in the Satrican temple of Mater Matuta, and its original location is unknown. Unless, of course, it is assumed that the stone was dragged all the way from Falerii (or any other location), I do not see how this could be an argument for the language of the Satricum-inscription being anything else than (local) Latin.

(8) The fictile decoration of the Satrican temple may be related stylistically to that of the Faliscan temples. I see no reason to doubt this, but all that this argument does is suggest contact between the Satrican and the Faliscan area. I am quite happy to assume that such contacts existed, but I can see no linguistic traces of it in the Satricum-inscription. In my view, all these arguments amount to very little more than a ‘it is possible that ...’. Unfortunately, so are a lot of things. If the Satricum-inscription is anything else than (local) Latin, there must be some positive, preferably linguistic, argument on which to base this assumption. In fact, if the inscription were anything else than local Latin, the first candidate would probably be Volscian, as was suggested by Coleman (1986:120-2): see note 67. It is unfortunate that Lucchesi’s suggestion has been embraced rather enthusiastically by R. Giacomelli (2006:25-7 et alibi).