

## CHAPTER FOUR

### *Inscriptions from Oscan- and Umbrian-Speaking Areas*

pp. 138-141 or Ve 124a-5 =  
Si 4-6

Interpunktion p. 124a-5 see notes!

or initials etc.

Ve 202, 203 > Pg 5, 4

Ve 222

Ve 86, 84 = Cp 31, 29

#### 4.1 On "Oscan Influence"

4.2 CIL 2489

4.3 Notes on the Paleography of Campanian Inscriptions

4.4 CIL 3121 nocerei

4.5 On Some Monophthongizations of \*ai and \*au in Inscriptions from Umbria and the North Coastal Area (CIL 3292a, 3374, 1899)

4.6 CIL 382

4.7 CIL 1926

Osc. writing traits in  
Lat. inscr.

#### 4.1 On "Oscan Influence"

4.1.a Wachter, in his treatment of the early inscriptions from Campania (*Altlat. Inschr.* §§183-5), insists on the absence of linguistic traits attributable to Oscan influence (cf. §2 of the "Introduction"). Thus for CIL 399 from Cales (§184a), and for the numerous inscribed pieces of "Cales ware" (§184b, see further 4.2 below), Wachter enumerates (p. 400) a series of forms and features linguistically inconsistent with Oscan: e.g. *fec-* (vs. Osc. *ops-*), dat./abl. pl. *-bus* (vs. Osc. *-ifs*, *-iss* etc.), CIL 2487 *serv* (cf. Pael. *famel*, Osc. *famel* P.F. 77.11 L), among others; and for CIL 1581 and 1582 from Capua (§185), Wachter observes (correctly) that "[d]ie sprachlichen Merkmale zeigen keinerlei oskische Einflüsse".

In a similar way, Eska's study of Pompeian Latin inscriptions leans toward the same conclusion: "...it is possible, if not probable, that the Pompeian features were inherent in the Latin language" ("Pompeii" 159).

4.1.b This conception of the generally non-Oscan linguistic behavior of Latin documents from this area is surely accurate in the main; but it should not be viewed in absolute terms. The appearance of a feature like *fec-* as opposed to *ops-*, while clearly indicative of something, is after all a crude index: there is not much reason to expect to find, for this early

*See 15*

period, an “Oscanized Latin” (with such typically lexical marks of “code-switching” as *ops-* for *fec-*), comparable to later (and sociolinguistically predictable) documents that can be described as “Latinized Oscan” (as in the Cumae defixio CIL 1614 = Ve 7).<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, this does not exclude the possibility that any number of relatively subtle “non-urban” features might still be traceable to Oscan influence in at least a few documents. These could include such features as an Oscan-style patronymic expression without *f.*, as in the interesting early Campanian inscription CIL 400, to be discussed in detail in Chapter 12 (12.2) in connection with the possible use therein of an unusual form of ligature. Indeed, in addition to certain facts about ligatures, there is a broad range of non-urban orthographic and paleographic features that might manifest themselves in otherwise Latin texts, several of which will require more extended discussion below (esp. Chapters 11-16). In allowing such data, then, to enter into consideration, we arrive at a more accurate and revealing (if sociolinguistically more complex) characterization of this linguistic area, beyond the monolithic Latinization implied by Wachter’s treatment. It is from this perspective that I address certain problems of interpretation in a piece of Campanian “Cales ware” (4.2), leading in turn to consideration of several points of Campanian paleography (4.3).

#### 4.2 CIL 2489

4.2.a The “titulus loquens” CIL 2489,<sup>2</sup> on an earthenware patera mold from Capua, belongs to the well-known set of inscriptions found on Campanian “Cales ware” (cf. 4.1.a). Like the other productions inscribed with the artisan’s name “L. Canoleios”, it appears to date from the late third century B.C.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Campanile “Latinizzazione” 120 on the difficulty of defining the precise dialectal mix in this text, and more generally (on “Latinized Oscan”) also 11.5.d below.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 721, 885; Wachter *Altlat. Inschr.* §184b, Agostiniani *Iscriz. parlanti* 598, Degrassi *ILLRP* 1220, Warmington *Remains* p. 202, Pagenstecher *Reliefkeramik* no. 133u.

<sup>3</sup> For the dating, see esp. Pagenstecher *Reliefkeramik* 165 on the L. Canoleius pieces, and more generally CIL p. 884; as for the lettering, note especially angled L and open A; the upright N printed in CIL is difficult to credit (cf., among many other examples that could be cited, the inclined N of CIL 406a *Canoleius* [Degrassi *Imagines* 372], and further

The CIL reading is as follows:

#### L Canolei.o.f.f.sum

This is an instance in which Degrassi’s and Warmington’s practice of systematically ignoring the facts of word-division is particularly unfortunate. As will become clearer below, a transcription like *L. Canolei off. sum* (Warmington, similarly Degrassi *ILLRP*) simply imposes a traditional (and problematic) interpretation on the sequence printed in CIL as **o.f.f.**; Agostiniani, in contrast, while opting for a similar interpretation, accurately reproduces the CIL transcription, and refers to Pagenstecher’s treatment, where it is stated that the object is considerably worn and the inscription difficult to read with complete accuracy.<sup>4</sup>

4.2.b The initial genitive **L Canolei** is unique for this series, as is the puzzling sequence **o.f.f.sum** itself, on which the genitive **L Canolei** must somehow depend. The inscription is generally interpreted as either *L. Canolei officina sum* “I am the workmanship of L.C.”,<sup>5</sup> or *L. Canolei officinae sum* “I am (a product) of the workshop of L.C.”<sup>6</sup> But Wachter has observed (n. 917) that an interpretation *officinae/ae* for **o.f.f.** is doubly problematic: first, it ignores the word-dividers, and second, it requires an unexpected (for this period) geminate spelling *ff*. To remedy these problems, Wachter suggests interpreting along the lines of *O(vi) f(ili) figlinā sum*.

4.2.c Wachter’s points are well-taken, but his solution introduces difficulties of its own. The most obvious is the new artisan “L. Canoleios O. f.”: by far the best-represented artisan of Cales ware is in fact “L. Canoleios L. f.”,<sup>7</sup> and there is no other evidence for a second L. Canoleios.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Degrassi “Latinizzazione” 120 for another such erroneous transcription of N in this set, and 4.7.b for another elsewhere); E and F are cursive (cf. 15.1.b-c).

<sup>5</sup> To the best of my knowledge, there is no published photograph of this inscription.

<sup>6</sup> CIL p. 721; similarly Warmington, cf. his n. 4, comparing *officina* in the rare sense “process of manufacture”, as at Plin. *Nat.* 11.2.

<sup>7</sup> CIL p. 885, Pagenstecher, Degrassi, Agostiniani.

<sup>7</sup> Thus CIL 406b *L. Canoleios.L.f.fecit.Calenos* et al., see esp. Pagenstecher 152ff. on “Die Fabriken von Cales”.

It would be preferable to assume that **L Canolei** is indeed “*L. Canoleios L. f.*”, and that therefore the sequence **o.f.f.** abbreviates three words in a phrase ending with **sum**, assuming the word-dividers are to be completely trusted (more on this point below).

The second problem is a syntactic/phraseological one, and is shared (in one form or another) by the traditional analyses as well. The elliptical expression with two genitives dependent on an implied term (*L. Canolei officinae*) **sum** “I am (a product) of the workshop of L.C.” is syntactically unappealing, as is Wachter’s ablative of source (*O(vi) f(ili) f(iglinā) sum*); and the CIL/Warmington version *L. Canolei officina* **sum** “I am the workmanship of L.C.” requires a rare (and perhaps late) sense of *officina*. Moreover, none of these interpretations provides an expression corresponding in any obvious way to the remarkably limited schemata described by Agostiniani in his comprehensive study of such “tituli loquentes” (*Iscriz. parlanti*). Even if the precise phrasing cannot be made to conform to any of the standard patterns for such inscriptions, one should at least be able to motivate it in a relatively natural way, on the basis of the few existing formulae.<sup>8</sup>

**4.2.d** In view of the above considerations, a more natural solution might begin with a statement like (*ego = patera*, or *forma paterae*) ... **f(acta).sum**, i.e. a passive version of the standard active formula ‘X me fecit’; if so, the preceding sequence would be likely to express a locative phrase equivalent to ‘in L. Canolei officina’.

A less attractive alternative could be based on the well-attested phrase *opus figlinum* (e.g. Plin. *Nat.* 31.11), which might suggest **L Canolei.o(pus).f(iglinum).f(actum).sum**, cf. (*opus*) *figl(inum)* with genitive in CIL 2351 **figl.L.Tetti.Balbi**. While the passive **f(actum).sum** could be interpreted (in terms of Agostiniani’s formulae) as above, the genitive expression is reminiscent of the other main class of formulae (of the general type ‘[gen.] sum’), except that these generally express the object’s possessor, and not the artisan.

<sup>8</sup> Significantly, despite Agostiniani’s inclusion of this inscription in his corpus, it is nowhere to be found in his structural analyses, where most other such inscriptions are appropriately catalogued according to their format.

**4.2.e** There are potentially interesting comparanda from Oscan that have been noticed only cursorily in terms of Cales ware, and not at all in terms of CIL 2489, but which may assist in choosing between these options and in specifying certain details of the analysis. Or more accurately: the Oscan and Latin inscriptions are mutually illuminating, since the Oscan texts have unresolved problems of their own which may become clearer when viewed in comparison with this Campanian Latin text.

Three black-glazed ornamented vessels (hence not unlike Cales ware), found not far from Capua (one in Suessula, the other two in Teano), were evidently made in the same workshop, and have been dated by Vetter to approximately 300 B.C. (note the absence of *i* and *u* in the inscriptions);<sup>9</sup> they bear the following texts (Ve 124a-c):<sup>10</sup>

- |         |  |
|---------|--|
| Ve 124a | <b>minis:beriis:anei:upsatuh:sent:tiianei:</b>       |
| Ve 124b | <b>vibieisen:beriieis:anei:upsatuh:sent:tiianei:</b> |
| Ve 124c | <b>beriiumen:anei:upsatuh:sent:tiianei:</b>          |

We have here two artisans “Minius Berius” (124a) and “Vibius Berius” (124b), perhaps brothers, and presumably the “Berii” referred to simply by a gen. pl. in 124c.<sup>11</sup> Note first that a correspondent to the final locative expression **tiianei** ‘Teani’, correlated with the verb ‘make’, is well represented in Latin Cales ware inscriptions (in the form loc. pl. **Calebus**, or abbreviation **Caleb**), beside the other common method using the nom. adj. **Calenos** (CIL 406f,i,k,q,r **L.Canoleios.L.f.fecit.Calenos** etc.):

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| CIL 412a                                  | <b>Retus.Gabinio.C.s.Calebus.fec.te</b>                       |
| 412b [R]etus.Gabinius.C.s   Calebus.fecit |   |
| 412c                                      | <b>Retus.Gabinio.C.s.Calebus.fecit.e</b>                      |
| 416                                       | <b>K.Serponio.Caleb.fece.veqo.Esqelino.COs.</b> <sup>12</sup> |

<sup>9</sup> Similarly Lejeune, *Anthrop. osque* 18, and P. Poccetti, in his detailed study of these texts, “Eine Spur des saturnischen Verses im Oskischen”, *Glotta* 61 (1983) 207ff. (208 for the dating), hereafter cited as “Saturn.”

<sup>10</sup> Buck *O-U Gramm.* p. 368 (correcting his inscription 44), Bottiglioni *Manuale* 24-6, Pisani *Lingue* 19a-c.

<sup>11</sup> On this plural usage see Lejeune *Anthrop. osque* 39. (I return to the problem of the case discrepancy — nom. in Ve 124a, gen. in the other two — at 4.2.h below.)

<sup>12</sup> The general comparison with Cales ware format is noted by Poccetti “Saturn.” 209.

Note further the initial genitives (at least in Ve 124b,c), cf. CIL 2489 L **Canolei**. To anticipate somewhat, I suggest that the Oscan sequence “(gen.) + **upsatuh:sent**” supports the interpretation proposed above ‘**L Canolei + f(act.).sum**’.<sup>13</sup> The most serious difficulty, then, is the precise interpretation of the genitive, which in turn depends on the intervening (Osc.) **anei** and (Lat.) **o.f.** (if that is the correct reading), which might well be semantically parallel.

**4.2.f** Very little about Osc. **anei** is clear beyond its loc. sg. form, but this fact is of some importance. Buck, Vetter and Bottiglioni follow Ribezzo's interpretation of **anei** (*RIGI* 8 [1924] 87) as a form identical to Lat. *ānus* ‘ring’, but here meaning a ‘(potter's) wheel’. According to Ribezzo, the locative is to be construed with the postposition **-en** in Ve 124b,c, thus the objects have been made ‘on the wheel’ of Vibius Berius/the Berii. But this is explicitly rejected by Buck (without explanation), who takes **anei** only with **upsatuh:sent**, i.e. the objects have been ‘wheel-made’, thereby requiring an elliptical expression for the initial locative **-en**: ‘In (officina) Vibii Berii/Beriorum’. This latter analysis appears in Vetter and Bottiglioni, who register some doubt only about the meaning of **anei**.

This interpretation, nevertheless, seems to me problematic. To begin with, there is no parallel in Oscan (or, for that matter, in Umbrian) for such an elliptical usage of **-en** (although, to be sure, one could allow for such a license in a relatively compressed space). In contrast, there is no difficulty with **-en** and locative beside the plain locative in **tiianei**: locative with **-en**, although rare, is evidently expanding in Oscan at the expense of the plain locative (thus Ve 2.25 [Tab. Bant.] *ex<.>aiscen.ligis* ‘hisce in legibus’, note also the double postposition in Ve 147.1-2 [Tab. Agn.] **húrtin. | Kerriín** ‘in luco Cereali’), while the plain locative might itself be expected to be retained precisely in a place-name. Moreover, it seems unlikely that a particular piece (or rather a set, or “service”, as Ribezzo plausibly interpreted the nom. pl. of **opsatuh:sent**) should need to be

<sup>13</sup> Despite Pisani (and others), **upsatuh** is more likely nom. pl. masc., not neut. (for this sandhi-treatment of **-us** see Buck *O-U Gramm.* p. 75).

specified as ‘wheel-made’, even if one grants that such an expression would be expressed with a locative phrase ‘on a wheel’ (and not, say, an instrumental ablative). On balance, then, it seems preferable to take **anei** (in Ve 124b,c) with the preceding **-en**, according to Ribezzo's original interpretation, although the meaning ‘wheel’ remains somewhat difficult.

Pisani's interpretation is syntactically similar, but he offers an entirely different etymology for **anei**, which nevertheless cannot be correct: even if, as Pisani believes, Ved. *ukhá-/ukhā-* ‘pot, cauldron’ and Go. *aúhns* ‘oven’ reflect zero grade versions (\**ukh-o-*, \**ukh-no-*) of a “long-diphthong” stem seen in Lat. *aul(l)a* ‘pot’, *auxilla* ‘olla parvula (P.F. 23.8 L),<sup>14</sup> no regular mechanisms, phonological or morphological, will produce therefrom the \**ākhno-* to which Pisani must appeal in order to explain Osc. **an-**. His *contextual* interpretation of the form, however, is surely the most appealing, i.e. ‘In Vibii Berii/Beriorum figulina’. Whatever the correct etymological analysis of **anei**, then, it is most naturally taken as a bona fide locative, expressing something like ‘in the workshop (of Vibius Berius/the Berii).<sup>15</sup>

**4.2.g** These considerations, applied to CIL 2489, suggest that the initial genitive **L Canolei** should depend in a natural way on the following sequence **o.f.**, which in turn might represent a locative expression meaning something like ‘in the workshop’ (cf. already **4.2.d** above). An attractive solution can be obtained, then, by reading **o(ficinai).f(iglinorum)** or **f(igulorum)**, with loc. sg. **o(ficinai)** (followed by gen. pl., in accord with the normal construction with *officina*).<sup>16</sup> Bearing in mind the actual uncertainty about the presence of each of the interpuncts in the reported transcription **o.f.f.** (cf. **4.2.a**, **4.2.c** above), the simpler phrase **L**

<sup>14</sup> On these comparisons see now Mayrhofer *EWAia* I.3 210 s.v. *ukhá-* and Schrijver *Laryngeals* 47.

<sup>15</sup> On the meaning ‘officina, fabrica’ for **anei** see also Poccetti “Saturn.” 212, emphasizing the phraseological parallel between the locatives **anei ... Tiianei**. Ribezzo's connection with Lat. *ānus* (on which see now Schrijver op. cit. 53) could be salvaged by claiming that an original meaning ‘circle’ developed in the derived sense of ‘circle of (like-minded, like-performing) followers’, hence ‘work group’ or the like, cf. Russ. *kružok*, Lat. *corōna* etc.

<sup>16</sup> E.g. *armorum officinas* (Caes. B.C. 1.34.5, Cic. *Phil.* 7.4.13), *tinguentium officinæ* (Plin. *Nat.* 9.133), *in aerariorum officinis* (ibid. 16.23), *in tonstrinarum officinis* (ibid. 36.165), *falsorum commentariorum et chirographorum officina* (Cic. *Phil.* 2.14.35), etc.

**Canolei.of(icinai)**, which would eliminate the double genitive construction, might also be possible, if not preferable.<sup>17</sup>

Thus, with regard to the Oscan series: apart from the person difference in the verb, and the absence of a final locative in the Latin inscription (but cf. 4.2.e above on such locatives in other examples of Cales ware), these approximately contemporaneous Campanian pieces would bear inscriptions with essentially the same structure:

Lat.: L **Canolei.of(icinai).f(acta).sum<sup>18</sup>**

'I was made / in the (potters?) pottery?) workshop of L.  
Canoleius / [in Cales]'

cf. Osc.: '(The dishes) were made / in the workshop of V. Berius  
(the Berii) / in Teanum'

If this is correct, the locative **o(ficinai)** (or **of(icinai)**) is noteworthy. Not much later than this time, the locative as such is moribund in literary Latin. While a late third-century or early second-century locative of this sort could in theory be simply a syntactic archaism, such a form could also be explained as a kind of syntactic borrowing, of a relatively trivial sort (i.e. the borrowing of a habit of case-usage), reflecting a somewhat more widespread use (or retention) of the locative in ("working-class?") Latin as spoken in Oscan territory, associated with the presence of this feature in Oscan.

**4.2.h** The strong resemblance between these Latin and Oscan vessel inscriptions from Campania may shed some light, finally, on the remaining problem shown by the Oscan set, namely the case-discrepancy between the first (Ve 124a), which appears to have a nom. sg. **minis:beriis** 'Minius Berius', and the genitives of the other two. Pisani (*Lingue ad loc.*) takes **minis:beriis** as "una scrittura inesatta per -eis -eis", thereby aligning it with the gen. forms of the other two. But this seems highly improbable. Apart from the sandhi-treatment of **upsatuh** (which has a good parallel in

Ve 102 **púieh.súm**, cf. n. 13 above), there is no other case of a "scrittura inesatta" in this set; and it is suspicious, moreover, that the two examples with genitive both have the locative particle **-en** (**vibieisen**, **beriument**), which is absent in the first. In short, **minis:beriis** is transparently a nom. sg., and should be explained as such.

Indeed, the other Oscan potter-inscriptions generally show nom. sg. of the potter's name; but insofar as these are seals (cf. Lejeune *Anthrop. osque* 17ff.), they are not strictly comparable to this more extended format. It is striking, however, that in the Latin Cales ware inscriptions, as already noted, the most common pattern is precisely 'X [nom.] fecit', while the genitive *cum* locative phraseology of CIL 2489 is altogether unique. It seems not impossible, then, that the engraver began with nom. **minis:beriis** as if to write **minis:beriis** (scil. **upsed**), according to the active version of the formula typical for a single item, as in (Campanian Lat.) 'L. Canoleios fecit', Osc. X **upsed**, etc. (see Poccetti "Saturn." 210 on this pattern). But the existence of a set of vessels<sup>19</sup> required a switch to the passive plural **upsatuh:sent** (as in the other two as well), and the opening nominative was left uncorrected.<sup>20</sup> The locative **anei** shows that the nominative is essentially anomalous, while Poccetti's phraseological analysis (with major break after **anei**) argues against an elliptical interpretation of the sort 'Minius Berius (fecit). In (eius) figurina facti sunt Teani'.<sup>21</sup> It seems to me, then, that Poccetti's attempts to find some further significance in the nominative expression (as opposed to the genitive ones)<sup>22</sup> are unnecessary.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. **of** = **of(ficina)** AE (1987) 166.

<sup>18</sup> Or **o(fic-).f(ig-)**, cf. above.

<sup>19</sup> Or, as Poccetti prefers (211), general reference to "alle Erzeugnisse der Berii-Werkstatt".

<sup>20</sup> Cf. similar lapses well-attested in "tituli loquentes", arising from interference between 'Ego [= artisan] feci' and 'X [= artisan] me [= object] fecit', e.g. E. Locr. (Hales, 6th c.) Διακρίσις μ' εποίησα [sic] (Duhoux *Introduction* 34, p. 87f.).

<sup>21</sup> Similarly Ribezzo (loc. cit.): **minis:beriis** "progettico ed indipendente da tutto il costrutto".

<sup>22</sup> "Saturn." 211: "die Unterscheidung in der Kasusverwendung ... entweder dem juristischen Verhältnis zum Firmeninhaber oder einer Verteilung der Arbeit innherhalb der Werkstatt zuzuschreiben ist", among other hypotheses.

#### 4.3 Notes on the Paleography of Campanian Inscriptions

**4.3.a** In view of the above comparison with Oscan phraseology, including the possible reflection of the frequency of independent locatives in Oscan, we are led to reconsider certain paleographical features found in Cales ware (and in other Campanian inscriptions), with regard to the question of “Oscan influence” (cf. 4.1).

As with the grammatical elements cited in 4.1.a, Wachter also rejects Oscan influence for certain orthographic features attested in Cales ware (*Altlat. Inschr.* §184b): “Nicht oskisch ist die Schrift (gewisse linksläufige einzelne Buchstaben und ganze Inschriften röhren davon her, dass der Hersteller beim Modellieren der Form mit der dafür nötigen spiegelschriftlichen Schreibweise Mühe hatte)”. But the attestation patterns of these right-to-left letters and inscriptions<sup>23</sup> do not support this analysis, and there is further evidence that can be brought to bear on the question as well. (It will be convenient, for the following discussion, to compare early examples of native Oscan lettering found in or near Campania, especially those roughly contemporaneous with Cales ware, as in the Capuan *iūvila*-inscriptions,<sup>24</sup> or the Agnone Tablet.<sup>25</sup>)

**4.3.b** For individual reversed letters in otherwise left-to-right inscriptions, Wachter cites, among others, the left-facing S's in CIL 416.<sup>26</sup> But this is a regular feature of this inscription: the text contains three S's, and each one is left-facing. Moreover, the first (in *Serponio*) is of the angular three-stroke type, while the second two (in *Esqelino* and the final abbreviation s.) are of the curved type — i.e., they are identical to the two types in use in the Oscan alphabet. Under these circumstances, it seems highly unlikely that these forms of S are here due to the production

<sup>23</sup> Cited by Wachter at n. 918, cf. also 4.3.b.

<sup>24</sup> Ve 74-94, cf. also Heurgon *Étude*, and esp. Franchi de Bellis *Iovile* (with extensive photographic documentation); two examples in Morandi *Epigrafia* (nos. 25 and 26; photographs Tavv. 21.3 and 22.1).

<sup>25</sup> Ve 147; good photographs of both sides of the inscription are now conveniently accessible in Bonfante *Etruscan* 55 and Morandi *Epigrafia* Tav. 24.

<sup>26</sup> In the discussions of paleography that follow, all cited Latin inscriptions belong to the set of Campanian “Cales ware”, unless otherwise noted.

difficulties hypothesized by Wachter. Moreover, the “notdürftig korrigierten L (L)” Wachter cites (CIL 4051, 409c) are not isolated: more significant (since they involve the older angled form) are the two other instances of reversed L (not mentioned by Wachter) in the series of *K.Atilio* inscriptions collected in CIL 405, namely 405f and 405i.<sup>27</sup>

As for the inscriptions entirely composed in a right-to-left direction (CIL 411b,c and 2492): this is again not an isolated fact related to the particular format of these productions, but is comparable with other instances of the same feature (in roughly the same area) on vessels where the production considerations Wachter suggests are less pertinent; note, for example, the series of amphora-handle inscriptions CIL 2878a-c (p. 887) from Minturnae (not far to the north), in which 2878a reads left-to-right, but 2878b and 2878c read right-to-left.<sup>28</sup> Also from Minturnae, note the right-to-left pottery shop identifications CIL 2880.6,7,9.

**4.3.c** Several other isolated facts of lettering and punctuation cannot be ascribed to the production difficulties Wachter assumes, but are more naturally taken to reflect habits associated with Oscan writing.

The most striking such feature concerns the form of “K”: in many of the inscriptions collected under CIL 405, all with the general form *K.Atilio* (cf. 4.3.b), the “K” is written quite clearly as if it consisted of a sequence of the two letters “IC” (thus 405c,d,e,f,<sup>29</sup> and the new examples 405m,n<sup>30</sup>). This somewhat unusual early stylization, for which no explanation, to my knowledge, has been offered, has a simple correspondent in both Oscan and Umbrian: documents in the native alphabets not uncommonly write “K” in precisely this fashion (except right-to-left), with the vertical stroke visibly separated from the following portion, which is

<sup>27</sup> I return to other features found in the CIL 405 series in 4.3.c and 4.3.e below.

<sup>28</sup> A problem with the actual reading of these inscriptions is discussed at 4.3.f below.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. CIL (p. 412) ad loc.: “IC littera K disiuncta”; see, for example, the photograph of CIL 405c in CIL I<sup>2</sup> (fasc. 4) tab. 11 fig. 3, or of 405d in Degrassi *Imagines* 371.

<sup>30</sup> P. 884f.; here note Krummrey’s comment rejecting the original editor’s “C in initio”, in favor of “IC. scil. K”. On a further feature of these inscriptions involving punctuation, see 4.3.e below.

itself identical to the usual (most often angled) form of "C"/"G" in the native alphabets.<sup>31</sup>

**4.3.d** A speculative (but suggestive) case concerning another letter form involves CIL 2488, which may be among the oldest of the Cales ware inscriptions (cf. Degrassi *ILLRP* 1219 ad loc. [= CIL p. 885]: "non multo post a. 278"). The inscription is traditionally read **L.Anici.feci**. The CIL rendering with upright N (p. 721) is simply incorrect: study of the photograph<sup>32</sup> shows what at first appears to be a clear inclined N. But close inspection shows (a) a relatively large space separating the A from the alleged N, and (b) two possible stroke traces not unlike an inverted V preceding the N, such that Bieńkowski's reading **Amici**, despite the rarity of this gentilicium (vis-à-vis the common *Anicius*),<sup>33</sup> seems to me still possible. If so, the M would be a five-stroke (left-to-right) M, whose otherwise unusually late appearance here could be explained on the basis of the similar native Oscan (except right-to-left) five-stroke M in regular use at this time.<sup>34</sup>

**4.3.e** The paleographic features reminiscent of Oscan include not only letter forms, but also punctuation. It is a remarkable fact, which I have not seen noted elsewhere, that Oscan inscriptions (in both alphabets) not uncommonly make use of a *line-final punct*, following both complete words and abbreviations — a practice (especially in the first case) generally alien to Roman Latin inscriptions. In addition to the Agnone

<sup>31</sup> This technique is quite clear (although not entirely consistent) on the Agnone Tablet, which has many examples of "K disiuncta". It is evident as well, closer to Cales, in the *iūvila*-inscriptions: note, for example, the K of *kluvatium* in Ve 77B.2 (photographs in Heurgon *Etude* plate II.1, Franchi de Bellis *Iovile* tab. 2), with not only "K disiuncta", but a relatively smooth version of the "C" portion, quite similar to the "IC" in the Latin K.Atilio series (for further examples see Franchi de Bellis tabb. 3, 11, 19). On the two forms of "K disiuncta" (i.e. both curved and angular) in Umbrian, see Prosdocimi *Tavole* 140 (and the table on 139).

<sup>32</sup> Pagenstecher *Reliefkeramik* 41b (p. 44 fig. 21).

<sup>33</sup> *Amicius*: Schulze *Eigennamen* 121, cf. also **L.Amio** (CIL 1731, Beneventum), **L.Amius** (1755, Aesernia).

<sup>34</sup> Note also, in this connection, the archaic inscription CIL 2491 (probably contemporary with 2488), with the odd sequence "NATMS". It has often been suggested, with some plausibility, that this reflects something like N.Atilio; but the final "-MS" seems to point rather to an Oscan-style nom. sg. *Atilis*.

Tablet, where this feature is perfectly regular, numerous isolated instances are quotable from both Vetter<sup>35</sup> and Poccetti.<sup>36</sup> The practice is also attested (as one might expect) in Paëlignian, at least to judge from standard transcriptions;<sup>37</sup> indeed, this fact has certain interesting consequences that cannot be pursued in detail here.<sup>38</sup> It is particularly interesting to note, moreover, that this practice is the norm in the Umbrian native alphabet, but never found in the parts of the Iguvine Tables written with Latin alphabet (cf. Hoenigswald "Punteggiatura" 215 n. 86, Prosdocimi *Tavole* 142). Nevertheless, this feature appears with marked frequency in both older and more recent Latin inscriptions from Marsian territory and Campania;<sup>39</sup> apart from line-final punctuation after names and (especially) onomastic and titular abbreviations (f., mag. etc.), this feature is not well-represented in Roman inscriptions (or in Latium generally), where "multi-line" examples are especially rare and seem restricted to late Republican times (see e.g. CIL 3004).<sup>40</sup>

<sup>35</sup> In the (Capuan) *iūvila*-inscriptions alone: Ve 81.6, 81.7, 83A.1, 84.4, 85.4, 86.10, 87.1, 87.4, 87.6, 87.8, 88B.2, 91.4, 91.5, 94A.1, 94B.1, plus several new examples appearing in Franchi de Bellis *Iovile* : 11.2 (cf. Ve 75), 14.1, 14.2 (cf. Ve 89B), 19.3, 19.5 (cf. Ve 83).

<sup>36</sup> For Campanian examples see Pocc 107, 119, 134, 137, 138.

<sup>37</sup> Ve 209.2, 215i, 215p, Pocc 209, 213, 216.1, 217, CIL 3259.1, 2, 3260.1; this feature is regularly ignored in the earlier transcriptions by von Planta and Conway (see also next fn.).

<sup>38</sup> I refer to the Paëlignian texts derived from copies found in Renaissance manuscripts, Ve 202 and 203: note especially the three occurrences (out of six lines) in 202. If the manuscript accurately reflects this typically Oscan/Paelignian feature, the internal puncts in the notorious form *ses.taplens*, which are generally dismissed as errors so as to identify the form with Volsc. *sistatiens* (Ve 222; for discussion see R. Wallace, *Glotta* 63 [1985] 93ff.), can perhaps not be so casually ignored (or converted into other characters: *ses.a->ses.tia-* etc.; cf. also the internal punctuation of Osc. *mamert.tjaſ* Ve 86, *mame.rttaſ* Ve 84, on which see Franchi de Bellis *Iovile* 177). It should be noted, however, that the standard transcriptions of Paëlignian reflect considerable confusion with respect to this feature, and deserve further study in this light: thus CIL 3259 and Jiménez Zamudio *Peligno* 45 both transcribe **Pa.Petroni. I Pom.f.bea.** for the first two lines (correctly, see the photo, CIL 1<sup>2</sup> [fasc. 4] tab. 86 fig. 3), vs. Pocc 206 and Pisani *Lingue* 49B with no line-final punctuation. (Such confusion is further compounded by Jiménez Zamudio's practice of closing many of his transcriptions with a period.)

<sup>39</sup> From CIL 1<sup>2</sup> (fasc. 1) alone: 386.2, 389.1, 391.2 (Marsian territory); 400 (bis; see further 12.2.c [with n. 17]), 1580, 1586.2, 1588 (4x out of 6 lines), 1591.3, 1592.4, 1593.2, 1596.5, 1597 (bis), 1604, 1605 (bis), 1618, 1623, 1633, 1635, 1637 (4x out of 7 lines) (Campania); cf. also 13.3.b n. 10 for CIL 388.

<sup>40</sup> See also 4.3.f below on the lantern inscriptions CIL 537 and 538; on line-end punctuation as essentially unsystematic: e.g. Gordon and Gordon *Contributions* 183.

In view of this practice, then, it may not be coincidental that one of the inscriptions in the **K.Atilio** series showing both “K disiuncta” and reversed (angled) L also shows a final punct (as well as an initial one), namely CIL 405f (.IC.ATI NIO.). Indeed, the odd opening punct so commonly found in this set (besides 405f, also 405a,c,d,e,n) is perhaps to be explained as a kind of Latinization of this Oscoid closing-punct format, with 405f (here both opening and closing punct) as a kind of transitional archaism in this process (here also, as noted, both “K disiuncta” and reversed [angled] L).

In this connection, note further Krummrey's suggestion (CIL p. 885) concerning the reading of CIL 2490a (from the same area): originally read as **Gabinio** (CIL p. 721), then as **H.A[...jini** (Degrassi *Imagines* 374a,b), it may conclude (as Krummrey notes) rather with **-ini**. (with final punct).

**4.3.f** These facts concerning line-final punctuation have a number of applications beyond the Cales ware inscriptions themselves, as in the problem concerning the reading of the Minturnae amphora-handle series referred to above (4.3.b). The last character of CIL 2878a (left-to-right) appears to be a very small O (at the mid-point of the letter space), which could be taken as a punct (thus either **[V]alerio** or **[V]aleri.**), and the corresponding character in 2878b and 2878c occupies a larger portion of the letter space (much like 2490a, 4.3.e above), thereby compounding the ambiguity: hence Lake (the original editor) preferred “*Valerio(s)*”, Degrassi preferred “*Valeri*”, and Krummrey (CIL p. 887) tentatively suggests “*Valeri officina*”; in view of the above observations, I suggest that **Valeri.** (with final punct) is an attractive possibility, if not actually preferable, at least for 2878a. The same feature is also attested on two Esquiline lamps (CIL 537 P.Ven., 538 Ti.Veturi.; see the facsimiles in CIL), where the correlation with cursive E in both cases is noteworthy (cf. also 5.3.e below for another vessel-inscription with line-final punct on an object found in Rome, but with suspected non-Roman provenience for independent reasons).

**4.3.g** These facts are also of interest in connection with the “Johns Hopkins” defixiones (CIL 2520, Ernout *Recueil* 140, Gager *Curse Tablets* 240ff.), where this feature is not only frequent (as noted by Fox *Tabellae*

54), but indeed almost regular. Fox argues for Roman provenience (55ff.), largely since the *gens Avonia* (appearing in two of the exemplars of these texts) is most frequently attested in Roman inscriptions. But on the other hand, the *gens Vesonia* (in another exemplar) “is found by far the most frequently in Central Italy” (Fox 55). Together with certain non-urban linguistic features in these texts,<sup>41</sup> as well as the detailed enumeration of body parts typical of other Campanian defixiones, this distinctive feature of punctuation might rather support a Campanian provenience.

Thus one can say that Wachter's assessment (“Nicht oskisch ist die Schrift”) is again accurate, *grosso modo*, but serves to obscure certain interesting (if subtle) minor features of orthography and paleography that may well be attributable to Oscan influence. Such features allow us to envision more accurately the complex sociolinguistic patterns likely to be at work in such a place and time, as is only to be expected in comparison with the full range of similar features of orthography and paleography to be examined in more detail in later chapters (cf. 4.1.b above).

#### 4.4 CIL 3121 *nocerei*

**4.4.a** The first-century Capuan cippus CIL 3121<sup>42</sup> reads as follows:

Fausti.N.N. Grani.deliciae.o.h.s.s N.Granius.Artemo pater.poseit.rogo.te
5 viator.nolei me.nocerei

Degrassi (in CIL) notes the unexpected *nocerei* in the last line (“*forma nocerei nova est*”), but disagrees with de Franciscis (the original editor),

<sup>41</sup> See Ernout *Recueil ad loc.* on *Avoniaes* (gen. sg.), *quas* (nom. pl.), *polliciarus* (2sg.; on such 2sg. forms see also Nussbaum, “*Benuso*” 368, and note *fruarus AE* [1983] 66), *oriculas*; for *Vesoniaes*, cf. *Fisiaes AE* (1983) 34, *Noniaes ibid.* 35.

<sup>42</sup> P. 1009, photo tab. 60 fig. 1.

who took the form to be merely a stonecutter's error. In the absence of further explanation by Degrassi, Krummrey adds the following comment: "recte putare videtur H. Solin deponens formatum esse ex studio q. d. *Hyperurbanismus*". Solin's idea is at first sight attractive; if it is correct, then the "hyperurban" deponent *noceor* makes an interesting addition to the ranks — not terribly large — of other such forms.<sup>43</sup>

**4.4.b** But the situation is perhaps not so simple. It seems distinctly odd for a "hyperurban" form like **nocerei** = *nocērī* (if that is what it is) to be provided with an accusative object **me**: apart from "cognate accusative" expressions (XII Tab. *noxiamve noxit* etc., Bennett *Syntax* 2.198) or (semi-adverbial) expressions with neuter accusative (Plt. *Pseud.* 137 *tibi plus noceas* etc., Bennett *ibid.* 2.200, 204), accusative government with *noceō* (probably analogical after *laedō* and *necō*, and in some contexts also after βλάπτειν τινά) is a very late development, otherwise not seen until the fourth century A.D. (Chiron, Vegetius, Vulgate, etc.; details in Szantyr *LSuS* 33, Ernout-Thomas *Syntaxe* 19). In contrast, a passive *noceor*, as if from a virtual transitive, is attested earlier — indeed, considerably earlier than (Hofmann-)Szantyr's single citation (Just. 44.4.6) seems to indicate.<sup>44</sup> It may be preferable, then, to view **nocerei** as somehow reflecting a real passive (as opposed to a hyperurban deponent.) It is difficult to decide, however, whether the phrase **nolei.me.nocerei** is an intentional variation ("do not consent to my being harmed") of similar active formulas,<sup>45</sup> or rather a syntactic error, presumably a kind of contamination between (imperat.) *noli mihi nocere* and (1 sg.) *nolo me noceri*; under the latter analysis, the error could either be a "performance" error at the stage of composition, or else could have entered during ordination or engraving, in view of the fact that **nolei** in line 5 (followed by **me**) is positioned directly beneath the phrase-initial 1 sg. **rogo** (followed by **te**) of line 4.

<sup>43</sup> See in general Flobert *Déponents* 195-215 for diverse types of "variantes déponentes" in Republican and Imperial Latin.

<sup>44</sup> In addition to the passage from Justinian (*Ofilius putat...non nocitram exceptionem dolim*), e.g. Vitruvius 2.9.14 (*larix...ab carie aut tinea non nocetur*), CIL VI 29947 *quod.sil[.]nocueris.noceberis.ab[.]jilio*.

<sup>45</sup> CIL 1368 **nolei.violare**, 1596 **ni.violato**, etc.

**4.4.c** It may be worthwhile to signal, in concluding, an interesting parallel favoring the assumption of an actual passive (whether directly via **nolei.me.nocerei** "do not consent to my being harmed", or an interfering *nolo me noceri*, cf. above). Such an expression would be strikingly similar to Trimalchio's phrasing *permittitis tamen finiri lusum* (Petr. *Sat.* 33.2), which itself is sometimes taken precisely as a passive-for-active lapsus (cf. Boyce *Freedmen* 100), but need be nothing of the kind. The same applies to a series of alleged Petronian hyperurban deponents, namely *rideor* (*qui rideatur alios* 57.3), *delector* (*cum dominam suam delectaretur* 45.7, *nihil nos delectaris?* 64.2), *fastidior* (*ne me putas studia fastiditum* 48.4), *pudeatur* (*non est quod illum pudeatur* 47.4), *somnior* (*hic ... aedes non somniatur* 74.14), cf. Smith *Cena* 222 and Boyce *Freedmen* 52. But these have all been more convincingly analyzed by Flobert (*Déponents* 210ff., 195 for *pudeatur*) as actual passives, in some cases also found (mostly later) in other authors. To these can be added, moreover, the interesting example CIL 1603 **te.deciuit.floreri** (from a sepulchral inscription in "Lucretian" hexameters, also from Capua), in which the standard correction to *florer<e>*<sup>46</sup> is unnecessary (cf. Flobert *Déponents* 197f.).<sup>47</sup> In view of the prominent attestation of such forms among Petronius' freedmen, together with Capuan **nocerei** and **floreri**, one wonders whether this spread of new passives is to some extent not merely "hyperurban" (or non-urban) but more specifically a Campanian feature.

<sup>46</sup> Thus Degrassi *ILLRP* 984, Warmington *Remains* p. 22, cf. already Garrucci *Sylloge* 1574 (printed simply as *florere*); more recently e.g. Wingo *Punctuation* 148, q.v. for the metrical space punctuation (cf. 16.2.b below) and the verse-initial "capitalizations": carefully-executed features that make an error still more unlikely. (The second "error" Wingo alleges — namely *iventa* — is simply an instance of a normal "economical" spelling (cf. CIL 2940 *Iventius* etc.), for which see Wachter *Altlat. Inschr.* §62k.)

<sup>47</sup> With line 2 in particular (*Eheu.heu.Taracei.ut.acerbo.es.deditus.fato*) and the entire sentimental composition in general, compare Trimalchio's similar poem "*Eheu nos miseris ...*" (Petr. *Sat.* 34.10).

#### 4.5 On Some Monophthongizations of \*ai and \*au in Inscriptions from Umbria and the North Coastal Area (CIL 3292a, 3374, 1899)

**4.5.a** Even Wachter, despite his pervasive and thoroughgoing skepticism concerning dialectal or other non-urban influences (cf. 4.1.a above), admits that the inconsistent monophthongization of \*ai and \*au seen in Latin inscriptions from Umbria and the north coastal area results from a “weak substratum influence” (*Altlat. Inschr.* §216i, cf. §218c), a view that is generally accepted and widely discussed.<sup>48</sup> The early examples cited, however, are extremely limited, being restricted to a few familiar forms from CIL 366 (Lex. Spolet.),<sup>49</sup> and from the *cippi Pisaurenses*.<sup>50</sup> There is some interest, then, in supplementing, if possible, this relatively meager material. The following examples, while partly uncertain and in most cases not necessarily earlier than the mid-second century, may still provide evidence of potential interest for the history of monophthongization in this area, which may be somewhat more complex than is generally thought.<sup>51</sup>

**4.5.b** CIL 3292a. Among later inscriptions from this area, the joined altar fragments CIL 3292a from Hadria,<sup>52</sup> first published in 1982, present two forms of some interest. The inscription reads:

Menerve..L..Rutilacius[..]<sup>53</sup>M..f..prator..is[(dem..prob)]<sup>54</sup>

<sup>48</sup> Recent treatments of interest, from various perspectives, include Blümel *Untersuch.* 11ff., 28f., 44f., X. Mignot in *Etrennes Lejeune* 130f., Coleman “Central Ital.” passim, Meiser “Pälignisch” 113ff., Joseph and Wallace “Patois” 165, 171.

<sup>49</sup> Here *cedito* (beside *caedito*) and *cedre*.

<sup>50</sup> CIL 376 *Cesula* and *Diane*, 379 *Pola* vs. 378 *Pisauense*; on the episodic character of *Diane* for this region see Cresci Marrone-Mennella *Pisaurum* 122 (ad loc.), and note Peruzzi’s doubts about the value of the latter pair for determining the local treatment of \*au (*Pesaro* 39).

<sup>51</sup> For a particularly detailed discussion, including Romance developments, see Sturtevant *Pronunciation* 125ff. (\*ai), 129ff. (\*au).

<sup>52</sup> P. 1050, photo tab. 139 fig. 1-2.

<sup>53</sup> The existence of punctuation here does not appear to be certain.

<sup>54</sup> The interpuncts are of the unusual double-horizontal type, found also in the similar (but perhaps slightly later) fragment CIL 3292b M..Aninius..M..f..I (cf. 16.2.c). The letter forms are consistent with Buonocore’s early-second-century dating; note especially

Apart from the new **Rutilacius** (beside well-attested *Rutilus*), the dative in -e **Menerve** can be added to the hitherto isolated (for this region) **Diane** of CIL 376; geographically, however, **Menerve** is not far removed from many of the other examples of dat. -e (see the listing in Blümel *Untersuch.* 44), a phenomenon which Blümel (45) takes to have a Marsian epicenter.<sup>55</sup>

Still more surprising is the unique spelling **prator** for *praetor*, cf. non-urban **pretod** in CIL 365 (“Faliscan-Latin”, cf. also Lucil. 1146 Krenkel = 1130 Marx *Cecilius pretor ne rusticus fiat*), and further (despite Schulze *Eigennamen* 350) perhaps CIL 1026 **Cacilia** (bis. olla ex vin. S. Caes., cf. Wachter *Altlat. Inschr.* n. 1051). It may, of course, be nothing but a crude mistake; but the simple formulaic nature of the text, together with the generally even and polished cutting style otherwise evident, do not favor such an assumption. If the form is real, it provides interesting evidence about the pronunciation of “medial -ae-” at this time and place, especially in view of its coupling with a “final -ae” spelled -e.

**4.5.c** CIL 3374. The first-century altar inscription from Spoleto CIL 3374<sup>56</sup> reads as follows:

[-----]rius  
Philoda  
Herculei  
Primigenio  
ed.d.l.m.

Aside from providing the first attestation of “Hercules Primigenius” (see Wachter *Altlat. Inschr.* §84i with n. 599, Dumézil *Mariages* 311ff.), this

inclined M and open square P, although N is upright; moreover, despite the CIL rendering with perpendicular L, the photographs seem to show a slight rise for the bottom strokes of both L’s, and despite the A’s with horizontal cross-strokes recorded in CIL for both **Rutilacius** and **prator**, the cross-stroke of the A of **prator** seems to show a slight rise.

<sup>55</sup> Another “border zone” case of interest in this connection (here involving Etruria/Umbria) is the roughly contemporaneous CIL 1998 (ca. mid-2nd c.) from Orvieto, with the sequence *Taniae.Petronie* (cf. 12.3.a-b on the ligature).

<sup>56</sup> P. 1079; Degrassi *ILLRP* 155a (*Imagines* 76).

inscription presents a problem of potential interest for the history of monophthongization in this area. While the first line can readily be completed (e.g. CIL and others [-Ruf]rius) and the second line expanded as **Philoda(mus)**, the initial member of the abbreviated phrase in line 5 has no easy solution. This would appear, at first sight, to be a variant of the frequent formula *donum dedit libens merito*, very similar to its common abbreviated form **d.d.l.m:** hence the resolution [**d**]ed(it).d(onus).l(ibens).m(erito) preferred in CIL, and apparently also by Wachter (n. 621, where this inscription is listed among others reflecting the banal formula just mentioned). The word order *dedit donum*, although unusual, can be paralleled;<sup>57</sup> more troubling are the facts that, first of all, this line is indented (cf. the transcription above, as well as the discussion of such patterns in 3.3.c-f); second, to judge from the photograph, the space before **ed** is intact (unlike the broken area in line 1), and (although somewhat worn) bears no clear trace of a missing character. This is all the more surprising in that the remaining letters all appear to be quite deeply cut.

It seems preferable, then, to accept in principle a variant of Rambaldi's original suggestion [**a**]ed(iculam).d(icavit), more recently seconded by J. Champeaux,<sup>58</sup> and slightly varied in Degrassi's *ILLRP* version [**a**]ed(em).d(edit).<sup>59</sup> If we assume that there was in fact no letter preceding **ed**, then we have in this **ed(em)** or **ed(iculam)** a further (and relatively late) instance of a non-final monophthongized **e- < ae-**, cf. the geographically proximate CIL 366 (Lex Spolet.) **cedre, cedito**.

#### 4.5.d CIL 1899. CIL 1899<sup>60</sup> reads as follows:

JienixTxfxPxBabidenixCxfxPxVetedixTxfxfocxdexqu[

<sup>57</sup> E.g. CIL 2645 (also from Spoleto) [He]rcolei.sacrum | [--]esus.C.l.Tertiu[s] | [decu]ma.facta[.]dedi[...] | [do]num.meret[o].

<sup>58</sup> *Latomus* 34 (1975) 955 n. 95.

<sup>59</sup> Indeed, the verb can just as well be **d(at)/d(edit)** or **d(edicat)/d(edicavit)**; cf. (for *aediculam*) CIL 1549 *aediculam...dant*, 1762 *aediculam...dedicavit*, and (for *aedem*) 9.6 *dedet...aide.mereto[d]*, 626 *aedem...dedicat*.

<sup>60</sup> Pp. 669, 1051; Ormano grande (earlier "Ornani"), ager Hadrianus.

Although N is apparently upright, the P, according to Mommsen (cf. CIL IX 5048), is "aperta et paene quadrata"; a second-century date is thus possible, if not probable (cf. also the use of **-i** vs. **-ius**, as in CIL 1898 from Picenum, and the rare cross-hatch word-dividers). As for the unclear phrase **foc.de.qu[**, Mommsen observes that **foc** is not likely to represent a cognomen,<sup>61</sup> and that a form of *focus* seems to be inappropriate; he therefore conjectures that the three magistrates in question might have constructed *fauc(es)* (i.e. an 'entrance-way' or 'passage'?) of some sort. The context cannot of course be reconstructed, but the phrasing with **de.qu[** seems consistent with a specification of location, to judge from possible parallels of the sort CIL 1529 **porticum.qua | in.arcem.eitur**, or (with **de**) 2197 **de.via.Pos[t]umia.in | forum.pequarium** and (somewhat differently) 638 **primus.fecei.ut.de.agro.poplico | aratoribus.cederent.paastores**.

Indeed, the Romance descendants of "faucēs" presuppose rather a monophthongized \*fōcēm/\*fōcēs, itself well-attested in literary sources,<sup>62</sup> with an adjectival \*fōcālis guaranteed at least for the first century B.C., cf. *fōcāle* 'neck-cloth, cravat' (Hor. +), similarly *fōcāneus* 'side-shoot (in the fork of a tree)' (Columella +). Of particular interest for the interpretation of **foc.** is the gloss *foces: ubi latrones insidiantur* (CGL 5.296.15). Thus, while the handbooks typically cite (late literary) *fōcēs* as a suspected case of "dialectal" monophthongization (see e.g. Leumann *LLuF* 72, Sommer-Pfister *Hdbch.* 68f., Ernout *Éléments* 162), Mommsen's interpretation of CIL 1899 **foc.** (if correct) would provide a welcome piece of inscriptional support that has otherwise, to my knowledge, gone virtually unnoticed in this connection.<sup>63</sup>

<sup>61</sup> Solin and Salomies *Repertorium* 333 list only *Focarius*, cf. Kajanto *Cognomina* 323.

<sup>62</sup> See Ernout-Meillet s.v. *faux* for Isidore's (*Diff.* 2.60) semantic distinction between *fauces* ('angustae fistulae') and *foces* ('per quas vocalis spiritus ... exsiliens sonum emittit'); compare Celsus' distinction in usage between *cāles* (botanical, 'stalk of a plant') and *cōlēs* (anatomical, 'penis'), discussed by H. von Staden, in *Latin médical* 281 with n. 45.

<sup>63</sup> Only *TLL* 6<sup>1</sup>.393.4 (s.v. *faux*): "CORP. IX 5048 ubi foc. obscurum".

## 4.6 CIL 382

**4.6.a** At the conclusion of his treatment of Umbrian, Vetter (240a) addressed three Latin inscriptions from Umbrian territory which in his view showed features attributable to dialectal influence: CIL 1898 (to be treated in Chapter 12 below in a discussion of non-Latin ligatures), 1926 (treated in 4.7 below), and 382,<sup>64</sup> from Massaccio (Picenum). This inscription (on a bronze patera, unfortunately now lost) poses difficult interpretive problems because of the obscure *veheia* of its concluding phrase (evidently the form which led Vetter to cite the inscription, since some scholars, as he notes, take *veheia* to be a “dialectal appellative”):

V.Avilio.V.f.V.Alfieno.Po.f.pagi.veheia

Before appending some observations on another point, it may be noted that the (more or less local) dossier of data potentially relevant for interpreting the phrase *pagi.veheia* should now include the archaic (3rd/2nd c.) fragments CIL 2897a *pagi.fid[* and 2897b *pa[gi]--]*, and perhaps also (ex coni.) 2898 *[pag]i.Vesuini*, all from Ariminum.

**4.6.b** As noted by Vetter and in CIL (p. 879), the second patronymic appears to read (*Po.*)*p.*, not (*Po.*)*f.*, which Vetter, like all other editors, nevertheless took to be a cursive F (cf. cursive F in *Alfieno*, beside three-stroke F in *V.f.*). The paleographic sources of the ambiguity emerge clearly from study of the facsimile (see e.g. CIL p. 407): (1) the engraving technique in question (“litteris punctum exaratis”) often leads to difficulties of interpretation, since individual characters may have an insufficient number (or an unorthodox positioning) of dots to achieve unambiguous definition (an analogous case is noted in 4.6.d below); and (2) the three nearly-contiguous similar characters (i.e. the P of *Po.*, the P or F in question immediately following, and the P beginning the next word *pagi*) all differ in shape: of the clear P’s (both “aperta”), the first is

<sup>64</sup> Pp. 407, 739, 879; Wachter *Altlat. Inschr.* §201a, Degrassi *ILLRP* 578, Ve 240a1, Ernout *Recueil* 77, Warmington *Remains* p. 206.

distinctly rounded, while the P of *pagi* is “quadrata”, and the ambiguous character between them has a slanting short vertical stroke on the right side and very little space at the top between the two strokes (thus *⋮*, vs. the cursive F in *Alfieno*). Under the circumstances, Vetter’s interpretation of this character as a cursive F (but with slanted right side, as not infrequently) seems attractive, and may well be correct.

**4.6.c** Nevertheless, the problem may be part of a broader network of facts, including the following:

(i) The archaic pedestal inscription CIL 3297 (p. 1052), also from Picenum (ager Truentinus, near Sant’Omero), is transcribed in CIL as “*V(ibius) Mum(ius)* | *C. f.*”; but the facsimile there reproduced clearly reads *V.Mum* | *C.p.*, i.e. with “P aperta et quadrata”.

(ii) A similar uncertainty surrounds the f in CIL 2874a = Ve 224a,b<sup>65</sup> (*Po.*)*f* or (with final punct) (*Po.*)*f.*<sup>66</sup> (followed in the next line by *Iovies.pucle[s]*), from Marruvium, in Marsian territory: although generally restored as (cursive) f (cf. consistent cursive E in this inscription, 3x), the right side of the character is damaged, as is the top of the letter space; thus open square P (which is otherwise constant in this inscription, 3x) remains a theoretical possibility, as Wachter notes: “Unsicher ist ferner, ob am Ende der Zeile f. steht: Möglich ist nämlich auch p., d.h. dasselbe Wort ‘Sohn’ wie bei den Göttern in Z. 2”.

Even if item (ii) is correctly read with f (and not p), this last observation of Wachter raises interesting possibilities for (i), together with the problem concerning CIL 382 (as just described), as well as the following fact: the native Umbrian P is precisely the angular type, with slanted short stroke (i.e. ⋮) — that is, it is identical (except for direction) to what Vetter took to be the “slanted” form of cursive F in CIL 382. Although various scenarios are possible, one can easily imagine, for example, local confusions between Umbrian (and also, in part, North Oscan/Paelignian)

<sup>65</sup> CIL p. 881; see now also Pocc 222, Letta-D’Amato *Epigrafia* 120 (photo tab. 40), Wachter *Altlat. Inschr.* §188 (with facsimile).

<sup>66</sup> CIL p. 881, following Letta-D’Amato, but see Wachter and the photograph.

angled P and cursive F, sometimes leading to Latin spellings like the "C.p" (with open square P) of CIL 3297. However one envisions the confluence and direction of such events, a non-Latin \**puklo*<sup>67</sup> is likely to play some role, at whatever remove, and so would be interesting for the dialectal profile of the area.

4.6.d With all due reserve, it is tempting to adduce, in this connection, a puzzling and hitherto isolated problem of Umbrian paleography, involving, once again, unexpected graphic alternants p/f: i.e., the alternation seen in (Tab. Ig.) Ib 3 **kutep** beside (expected) **kutef** (6x), and in the sequence **tref:vitlup:turup** in the next line (Ib 4), cf. (expected) **tref:vitluf:turuf** (Ib 1). To be sure, **kutep** directly precedes **pesnimu**; but the same sandhi explanation easily conjectured for that sequence cannot account for **vitlup:turup** (cf. Prosdocimi *Tavole* 177 ad loc.). The alternation remains obscure, especially since the native Umbrian f character bears no relation to any form of P, or to any form of Latin F; theoretically, however, a copy text (or perhaps rather some earlier version of the text) that used "slanted cursive F" (of the type seen in CIL 382) might help account for the appearance of these aberrant P's in the text tradition, although an appeal to such a scenario must remain entirely speculative.

Note finally yet another Umbrian P-/F- ambiguity, in the Umbrian portion of the Umbrian-Latin bilingual CIL 2873 (cf. 3.1.c), written in the Latin alphabet "litteris punctum incisis" (cf. CIL 382!): the character in question is either a cursive F (whence **Folenia**, cf. consistent cursive E), as generally preferred (thus Meiser and CIL, after Lejeune, *REL* 30 [1952] 98f.), or open square P (whence **Polenia**); see Lejeune for discussion of onomastic parallels for both possibilities.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. the Oscan abbreviation **puk** (Ve 6.9); for Picenum cf. also SPi. *kaúieis* : *puglo* (AQ 1).

#### 4.7 CIL 1926

4.7.a The fragmentary inscription CIL 1926<sup>68</sup> reflects dialectal features, according to Vetter, in that the forms **magisteri** and **Terebius** show "Sprossvokale vor r, wie sie dem Stadtrömischen fremd sind"; for the latter he compares CIL 312 (cipp. Praen.) **Terebuni** (= Ve 479), and for **magisteri** one may compare early Praen. **magistere** (CIL 59).<sup>69</sup> There are, however, several inaccuracies in the presentation of this inscription in CIL I<sup>2</sup> (fasc. 1), as can be seen by inspection of the photograph published in CIL I<sup>2</sup> (fasc. 4); one of these, in turn, leads to a revised reading of some interest for the first word, traditionally read as **magister i**.<sup>70</sup>

4.7.b Consider first the original CIL representation, reproduced as follows:

M	A	G	I	S	T	I	R		
I	.	T	H	I	I	B	V	S	
I	T	.	V	I	B	O	V	I	N
								VS	

Given the broken left edge, together with the apparently consistent use of cursive E (cf. Chapter 15), Mommsen plausibly conjectured a missing vertical stroke at the beginning of the third line, which would yield another cursive E and the word **et**, producing the following reading:

magister  
i.Terebius  
et.Vibolen  
us

<sup>68</sup> Pp. 671, 1053 (photo tab. 101 fig. 3), Cingulum; Ve 240a2.

<sup>69</sup> On anaptyxis (with special reference to the Praenestine cases) see also Campanile "Elementi" 15, and more recently (concerning Oscan, Paenitium and South Picene anaptyxis) Meiser "Päalignisch" 121f. (For the sequence -tr-/Tr- > -ter-/Ter- of **magisteri**, **magistere/Terebius**, cf. SPi. *materei*h.)

<sup>70</sup> See 13.6 on this word-division type.

This analysis is seconded ("IIT prorsus probabile") in CIL I<sup>2</sup> (fasc. 4); as far as the *et* of line 3 is concerned, it is very likely correct.

There are, however, three points of divergence worth noting between the CIL representation (above) and the photograph, of which two are quite straightforward. Relatively trivial is the fact that there is no apparent qualitative difference between the two B's, despite the CIL differentiation between curved and angular versions: both appear to have more or less the same angular quality, much like the angular R and S. Less trivial is the alleged upright N: this is simply incorrect, since the photograph reveals a markedly inclined N, which, together with the angled L, is significant in evaluating the relative date of such an inscription.

**4.7.c** The third problem is more complex, and attaches to what has been taken as the first character of line 1, namely a ligature of M plus open A. Combinations of M and *closed* A, of which two versions are listed, for example, by Cagnat (*Cours*, p. 25: cross-stroke on either right or left side), are attested with certainty for the (late) Republic;<sup>71</sup> but ligatures of M (and N) with *open* A are exceedingly rare, and in the early period seem to be restricted to the compressed genres where most early ligatures are found (apart from line-end), i.e. seals and other name-inscriptions on small areas or objects (lanterns, gemstones, election programmata, etc., cf. 12.1.b below): thus CIL 521 **L.M<sub>a</sub>nilio**, 519 **Lamia** (?), 544q **an/na** (all on lanterns).<sup>72</sup> Thus a ligature of this type in an early dedicatory inscription (and at *line-beginning*, where space-saving considerations leading to ligatured spellings are rarely operative) would be highly surprising (cf. 12.1.d on CIL 366 **malo** [M+closed A] at line-end). Moreover, inspection of the photograph reveals that the connection between the second and third strokes is not well made: rather, there is a slight but visible break between the two. All of this indicates that we have here not a ligature, but rather a complete open A, preceded by the *right half* of an incomplete four-stroke

<sup>71</sup> Recently-published examples include C.Mati (*Epigraphica* 49 [1987] 124f., seal no. 5), **Cam(ilia)** (*ibid.* 246ff.), **M<sub>a</sub>** (bis) AE (1989) 163.

<sup>72</sup> The vase-fragment inscriptions collected in CIL 2910b, found near a structure destroyed in the late third century B.C., contain two abbreviations with ligatured **M<sub>a</sub>** (both with closed A), i.e. **L(M<sub>a</sub>)** (no. 14) and **L.M<sub>a</sub>** (no. 15); but the perpendicular L and the closed-A ligature suggest a later period.

(slanted) M, the left half of which is missing, due to the broken left edge of the inscription: line 1 thus begins **ΛΜΑ**, not **ΜΛΑ**. Given the missing first stroke of a cursive E already apparent at the beginning of line 3 (cf. 4.7.b above), this new interpretation of line 1 — which also accounts more naturally for the probable vertical alignment of this simple two-term expression — suggests in turn that the beginning of line 2 is probably also short by a half character, which must again be taken as the missing first stroke of a cursive E. We have, then, line-initial sequences

**ΛΜΑ**  
**ΙΙ.Τ**  
**ΙΙΙΤ**

and the inscription can therefore be read as follows:

**]magister**  
**]e.Terebius**  
**]et.Vibolen**  
    **us**

The resulting **magister** **I** **ε** is thus directly comparable to the early Praen. **magistere** of CIL 59,<sup>73</sup> and provides an interesting new nom. pl. datum for this area.

<sup>73</sup> Not **magistere**(s), as traditionally (e.g. Ernout *Recueil* 33 ad loc.), see Wachter *Altlat. Inschr.* §§87a-b.