III.—*On an Archaic Latin Inscription in the Faliscan Character : by Padre Raffaele Garrucci, Hon. F.S.A. Translated from the Italian by W. M. WYLIE, Esq., F.S.A., Local Secretary for Hampshire.*

Read December 23rd, 1869.

THE city which now bears the name of Santa Maria di Falleri—the ancient *Falerii*, *Municipium Faliscum*, and subsequently *Colonia Faliscorum*—has already supplied abundant material for two works which I published some time ago.^a I am now obliged to return to the same subject, for this city has furnished fresh bronze inscriptions, in archaic Latin, of no light importance to philology and history.

I shall select as the subject of the present paper a bronze, very unexpectedly recovered, completing an inscription to Minerva, hitherto only known in a fragmentary state. The bronze plate as restored is fifty-two centimètres long and eighteen wide. A reference to Plate V., which gives a reduced copy of the inscription, will show what portions of the tablet as we now have it are new, and the extent of the fragments formerly discovered. I here repeat the inscription in the common character for those who have had no opportunity of becoming acquainted with Faliscan palæography or orthography:—

MENERVA · SACRV
LA · COTENA · LA · F · PRETOD · DE
ZENATVO · SENTENTIAD · VOOTVM
DEDET · QVANDO · DATV · RECTED
CVNCAPTVM

Now that we are in possession of the entire inscription, we see that the fragments already published have not rendered its full meaning, and we are therefore obliged to interpret it afresh. Moreover, there are fresh archaisms that require a special comment.

I have no intention, however, of repeating what I have already established in the *Scoperte Falische* and the *Dissertazioni*, but I shall have occasion to refer to these works in order that what I am about to advance in their support and confirmation may be clearly understood.

^a The first of these, entitled *Scoperte Falische*, will be found in the *Annali dell' Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica*, 1860, pp. 211—281, where in plate F the portions of the tablet then discovered are engraved. The second forms part of Padre Garrucci's *Dissertazioni Archeologiche*, Roma, 1864.

In the first place it is necessary to explain who these Falisci that inhabited Falleri were; what their language was; and what alphabet they employed. We will then proceed to consider the Prætor's vow, and how he performed it, together with the other remarkable circumstances indicated in this bronze tablet.

Tradition, which even Cato accepted, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, at a later period, maintained, deduced the origin of the Falisci from Argos. Their leader was named *Halesus*, from whom they may have taken the name of *Halesici* or *Halesci*, and thence Falisci, by changing the aspiration H into the digamma F. This change of H into F was attributed by Varro^a to the Sabine dialect, in which *fasena* was used instead of *harena*. Another grammarian however affirms that, instead of this, the Falisci used *haba* and not *faba*,^b "*quam Falisci habam, nos fabam appellamus.*"

If this be true, the people were termed *Falisci* in the Sabine dialect, while they called themselves *Halesci*. Laying aside, however, this question of origin till we obtain better monumental evidence, we will assume the Falisci to have been of Sabine extraction, as attested by their solemn worship of Juno of Curi.^c They inhabited that tract of country beyond Curi and the Tiber, which extends from Soracte to the Lago di Vico, and Sutri, the key of Etruria. On the north was Fescennia, which also had the reputation of an Argive origin,^d while Nepi was on the south. In the territory within these limits there was once but a single city, called by the Latins Falerii, and by the Greeks Φαλέριον, situate on a mountain very difficult of access to an enemy, and strongly fortified. The Falisci were at war with the Romans from the middle of the fourth century U.C. to the beginning of the sixth. Always conquered and always revolting afresh, they lost successively a portion of territory, their arms, horses, and slaves, till at last, about the year 515 U.C., the Romans compelled them to establish themselves in a new city on the plain, which now bears the name of Santa Maria di Falleri, and dismantled the ancient city, the site of which is now occupied by Civit Castellana. The historian who furnishes the notice of this change is Zonaras,^e who has evidently copied from Dion Cassius.

We have monumental evidence that this new city had a constitution similar to the Latin, for the chief magistrates were the Prætors. The Faliscans were *socii* of the Romans, and afterwards *municipes*, for we find Falleri was called *Municipium Faliscum*. About the time of Gallienus it obtained the honourable title of *Colonia Faliscorum*—a fact we learn from the fragment of an inscription long

^a *Apud Velium Longum, Putsch, Gramm. Lat. Auct. Antiq.*, p. 2230.

^b Terentius Scaurus, p. 2258 of Putsch's Collection.

^c *Scoperte Falische*, pp. 222—224.

^d Dion. Hal. i. 21.

^e viii. 18.

INSCRIBED BRONZE PLATE FROM FALLERI.

Published by the Society of Antiquaries of London, 1870.

Fragments a & b were discovered prior to 1867.

SCNCRBJAM
DEDEJ. CNBIDO. DRJA. BECJED
TENBJAO. SENJENJIRD. NOOJAM
B. COJENB. T. B. J. UJ. E. J. OD. DE
MENEJAB. SRCRA

preserved in the Vatican, and finally published by Dr. Henzen,^a who at the same time also added a second fragment of the same inscription. The period of these two fragments is not known; neither do we know to which of the two cities the monument belonged, nor to what emperor it was dedicated. Gruter^b has been quoted, who, on the authority of Massa, has adduced another fragmentary inscription, with mention of the Falisci, as being at Orte. Having had occasion to visit Falleri several times, I made a point of transcribing all fragments of inscriptions, endeavouring to reunite them and ascertain their meaning. Two such fragments of large slabs, that had been used as the lining of a bath, proved to be the very ones that almost complete the ancient inscription set up by the *Colonia* of the Falisci, of which, as I have said, two small pieces had been found many years previously. Although I had not then seen the Vatican fragments, I felt assured I had found their place in the restoration proposed in my article on the subject in the *Dissertazioni*,^c which I will now reproduce—

<div style="text-align: center;">d</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 45%;"> RECTORI · ORBIS · TEGRATORI · C FELICI · INVIC P · P · PRO · COS · CONIVGI · D · N · ORDO · OB · INSIGNEM CVRANTE · DEVOTISSI </div> <div style="width: 45%;"> ET · DOMINO · TE OL · FALISCORVM TO · AVG · P · M · GERM et Corneliae P · Lic · Gallieni ET POPVLVS ERGA SE MVNI TYRIO · SEPTIMIO MO · NVMINI </div> </div> </div>		rrarum ac redin IMPC Gallieno Pio MAX P arthico max SALON inae Aug invicti Augusti Col. Faliscorum ficentiam Azizo v . p . cur . r . p . maiestatiq . eorum.
		<div style="text-align: center;">d</div>

The surname *Azizus* of this curator, *Tyrius Septimius*, I have supplied by the help of the inscription which Julius Roscius added to the little work *De Origine et Rebus Faliscorum*, by Massa, to whom the Appendix of Roscius has been wrongly attributed.

Meanwhile, though the Romans founded the new Falleri, the old quarters were not entirely abandoned. I even believe that the solemn worship of Juno of Curi continued there, because, when the Romans planted a colony there, it took the surname of Junonia. The period when this occurred is not known, and we are only aware that the spot where the colony was established before that time bore the name of *Æquum Faliscum*, but afterwards that of *Colonia Junonia*, from the

^a Henzen-Orelli, *Syll.*, n. 5132. a. b.

^b i. 288.

^c i. 46.

^d These two fragments published by Henzen, *loc. cit.*

still continued worship of Juno of Curi, whose temple and sacred grove were there.

But to return to Santa Maria di Falleri, and the Falisci of the *Municipium Faliscum*, it appears from monuments that the language spoken there was Latin, but of such kind as was spoken out of Rome, that is, mixed with local dialectic forms. The basis of the alphabet is that of the adjoining Etruscan people. I have given a very precise account of this alphabet in my two former works. The substance of it is that the Falisci made use of eighteen letters, and, when the inscriptions of the *hypogeum* of Falleri were written, they used sometimes a single, sometimes a double point, to separate the words. They further wrote in the Etruscan fashion, from right to left, as well as in the usual Latin fashion, and employed the Latin alphabet. The letters *b, g, k, q*, are wanting. Instead of *b* they used *p*, while the letter *c* was the sole equivalent of *g, k, q*. These two letters, *p, c*, turn to the right, as occasionally also does *n*; but the *s* almost invariably faces the right. Contemporarily with this system are found in Falleri bronze inscriptions, which I purpose publishing, in archaic Latin character. This shows that they retained their old customs, without, however, refusing to comply with those of the Romans, unless indeed we may suppose that many Latins had settled in the new city, and used their own alphabet.

Now that I have given some idea of what the Falisci were, as also of their city, language, and alphabet, I will proceed to explain the bronze inscription, the sense of which I will first attempt to determine, and, secondly, its period.

Lars Cotenæ the Prætor, or highest civil magistrate, of the Falisci, declares, by judgment of the senate, that he has performed his vow to Minerva, because it was judged that the vow had been made in due form. To those who made vows there was enjoined the observance of a certain series of minute ceremonies both in ascertaining that the vow was acceptable to the gods to whom it was offered, as also in the act of pronouncing the formula of the vow. Thus, if birds did not render a good augury—"aves non addixissent"—or, while the formula was pronounced, a shrew-mouse had raised its shrill cry—"sorex occinuisset"—or there was thunder, or any other indication to show the vow was not acceptable to the gods, it was not obligatory—even if it had been made. If the vow had been discharged, and an error discovered afterwards in the mode it had been contracted, it was pronounced wrongly discharged, because "vitio conceptum—parum recte conceptum."

If he that offered his vow did so, not in the name of the republic, but as a private person, and any doubts arose afterwards, he had to consult the college

whose province it was to determine questions of religion. But when the vow was in the name of the people the intervention was required of the senate, on whom it became incumbent to deliberate after consulting the College of Augurs, or of the Pontiffs.

To come to our case, if Larte Cotena discharges his vow “*de Senatus sententia*,” it is clear he had not made it in the quality of a private person, but in that of a public magistrate. The Prætors were the chiefs of the republic in peace, and of the army in war, but they could not make vows binding on the public treasury without taking the opinion of the senate;^a and, if any doubt should arise as to validity, they had to refer to the senate. In this present case the senate replied to the Prætor Cotena that his vow had been rightly pronounced, CVANDO · DATV · RECTED · CVNCAPTVM. Here the context shows the word *datum* has the sense of a vow paid, and hence we gather that the doubt had arisen when the vow was made, and it was asked whether any irregularity had occurred in enunciating it—“*rectene, an vitio conceptum?*” The senate considered, according to the opinion of the Augurs, that the vow—*votum datum*—had been regularly promised—*recte conceptum*.

We should be curious to know further what this vow of Cotena was that he consecrated to Minerva, but on this very point ancient inscriptions are generally silent, because the object vowed was placed above the pedestal to which the plate containing the inscription was affixed. We may conjecture it was a statue of the goddess or of some other divinity, for the custom is well known of dedicating to one deity the statue of another.

Having rendered this interpretation of the meaning of the Faliscan inscription we will proceed to comment on it, beginning at the word MENERVA, which is in the dative case, and not in the nominative, nor vocative, nor ablative, as the inexperienced would expect; for the ancient Latins, besides the common declension which possessed its own cases, made use of yet another which had none.^a The very word *Minerva* furnishes an example of the common archaic form. The genitive in the more recent tongue would be *Minervæ*, but in the older *Minervais*, and so *Minervai*, *Minervam*. In the like manner they declined *familia*, *familiais*, *familiai*, *familiam*, and so all nouns terminating in *a*. Afterwards as from *familiais* they made *familias*, and from *familiai*, *familia*; in like manner from *Minervais* they formed *Minervas*, and from *Minervai* *Minerva*. As further they used to suppress the sibilant *s* and the liquid *m*, an indeclinable form

^a Liv. xxxvi. 36.

necessarily arose in *a*, in the genitive, dative, and accusative cases. Examples of such datives and accusatives may be seen in the grammatical index of the *Inscriptiones Latinæ Antiquissimæ* compiled by Hübner, but an example of the genitive in *a* will not be found there. It will therefore be well to refer to one in the inscription I published in 1848 in the *History of Isernia*, p. 117, although of a period long posterior to the custom of suppressing the second vowel of the diphthong in the inflection. The inscription published by me runs thus :—

VIVA · FECIT
SVELLIA C · F
CONSANICA
SACERDOS · CERIALIS
DEIA · LIBERA
H · M · H · N · S

Suellia was a priestess of Proserpine, called here the *Dea Libera*. The words *Deia libera* are plainly in the genitive of the archaic form. Archaisms of this kind long survive in the language of the people, and hence they are occasionally revived in inscriptions. We have examples of accusatives in *o* and *om*, in the year 637 U.C. in the *Sententia Minuciorum*, and again, in the same century, in the stone of the Caucii of Beneventum, as also in that of the decemvirs Octavius and Obulcius at Rimini.

As to *SACRV* there is nothing to notice but the suppression of the liquid *m*, which is also suppressed in *DATV* in the fourth line of the inscription, but not in *VOOTVM*, nor in *CVNCAPTVM*. In like manner in the Falleri mural inscription put up to the Vecilii,^a the letter *s* is omitted in *LECTV*, but is expressed in *DATVS*, of which inconsistency archaic inscriptions furnish other examples. Thus the coins of Isernia, with the Vulcan type, read on the obverse *VOLCΛNOM* acc. sing. and on the reverse *ΛISERNINO* ordinarily, and sometimes *ΛISERNIO*; occasionally also, but rarely, *ΛISERNIM*, */ ISERNINOM*. In the same way the other coin of the same city with the type of Pallas, and ordinarily bearing the legend *ΛISERNIO*, furnishes two examples, which I have seen and published, of *ΛISERNIOM*; and a third, which M. Longperier has described,^b reads *ΛISERNNNIOM*. This third example being unknown to Mommsen, he risked the omission of the two former to which I have referred.

In Falleri moreover it was further the habit to suppress the *r* and *t*. Thus we read *mate* for *mater*, *uxo* for *uxor*, *juneo* for *junior*, *cupa* for *cubat*. They

^a *Dissert. Archeol.* i. 73.

^b *Cabinet Magnoncourt*, p. 140.

also suppressed the enclitic *c* in pronouns demonstrative, and wrote *he* for *hec* (*heic*), *hin* for *hinc*, *ecu* for *ecuk* (*hic*), the which last two forms belong also to the Oscans. Ritschl has remarked that the custom of omitting the *m* and *s* at the terminations of words began to cease towards 620—630 u.c.

The Prætor of Falleri was called *La Cotena*, certainly not according to Latin use, but Etruscan. I discussed this *La* in the *Scoperte Falische*^a and adduced examples from Etruscan inscriptions. The entire word in the language of this people is *Laris*, or *Larthis*, but our inscription is Latin, and we will therefore read *Lar*, or *Lars Cotena*. It would be *Lartis* after the teaching of the old grammarians, among whom are Carisius^b and Priscian,^c though they speak of it as peculiar to the King Tolumnius and the God *Lar*, κατοικίδιον θεόν.

As to the word *Pretod*, without the diphthong, Varro^d tells us it was the peculiar custom of the country people to write without diphthongs, and instances Lucilius, who alluded to this custom when he wrote “Cecilius pretor ne rusticus fiat.” He adds, the custom in Rome was quite contrary—that is, *a* was used before *e* in many words, though it was not adopted out of Rome.^e We have but one example of the change of *r* into *d*, which is *medidies* for *meridies*, quoted by Varro at Palestrina.^f *Ladinod* on the coins of Larino, as also *Loickdei* on those of Lucera, appear to be of a dialect which does not belong to Latin. So far from this at Rome, in very ancient times *r* took the place of *d* in certain words, and so they wrote *ar* instead of *ad*, as *arvorum*, *arferre*, *arcesso*.

DE · ZENATVO · SENTENTIAD. Here must first be noticed the substitution of *z* for *s*, which change is at the present day very usual in the Sabine country. There one hears words pronounced *zignore*, *zegno*, *zole*. Next must be observed the termination of *zenatuo* in *o*, and the omission of the *s* of the genitive. Nouns of the fourth declension, making *us* in the genitive, were once declined in *uos*, a form corresponding to the double *u* of the later Latin period. Special attention should be paid to the final *d* in SENTENTIAD, which can afford good evidence of the period to which this inscription must be assigned; for in the Senatusconsultum of 568 u.c., respecting the Bacchanalia, DE · SENATVOS · SENTENTIAD occurs four times. The addition of *d* to the ablative is an archaism of which we have scarcely two examples in this sixth century, besides the Senatusconsultum just mentioned; one at the beginning, and the other at the middle of the century. It

^a Pp. 261, 262. Fabretti, *Gloss. Ital.*

^b P. 110, ed. Par.

^c v. 645. Fabretti, *Gloss. Ital.* p. 1002.

^d De L. L. vii. 96.

^e Varro de Lingua Latina, v. 98

^f *Id.* vi. 4.

should therefore rather be said that this decree of the Senate revived an archaism which had become obsolete. Certain it is that in the inscription, placed by L. Mummius Achaicus in the Temple of Hercules, which he dedicated in the year 609, it is not once used, though there were six opportunities of doing so. Nor was it used afterwards, excepting only in the case of the legal bronzes, which use *d* in the one word *sed* alone, both in its employment as a pronoun, and in its sense of *sine*.^a But the Falleri bronze uses it just as it was used very anciently, that is in the ablative *sententiad*, and the adverb *rected*. According to this evidence, then, our inscription ought to belong to the fifth century, but certainly cannot be considered later than the sixth.

We will proceed to *voovm*, in which word the double *o* first appears in Latin monumental epigraphy.

Ritschl has laid down that the custom, originally peculiar to the Oscans, of doubling the long vowels—*a*, *e*, *u*,—for he knew of no examples of the *o*,^b was introduced into Rome by Accius; and this because he found the first example in *PAASTORES* on the stone of Pompilius, which dates from about the year 622. The Falleri bronze, therefore, which is already in many points of great importance, becomes still more remarkable for two reasons. It gives us the first example of the duplication of the *o*, and gives it moreover in such an inscription as, from its archaisms and palæography, cannot be brought down to the period of Accius. The language of the inscription is entirely Latin, and it would not be possible to consider the double *o* Etruscan, since the Etruscans never used this orthography. The circumstance, then, of the occurrence of the double *o* in Latin epigraphy of a period anterior to Accius is of a nature which renders it indispensable to re-examine what the old writers have transmitted to us on this point. I have no doubt that Professor Ritschl himself would have undertaken such an examination had it been imposed on him by the circumstances of a similar discovery.

I will begin with the text of Marius Victorinus, which has been examined by others, and by Ritschl himself after them. His words are, “Accius cum scriberet *anguis*, *angueis* imponebat. Idem nec *z* litteram, nec *y* in suo libro retulit. Quia, quæ ante fecerunt Naevius et Livius, cum longa syllaba scribenda esset, duas vocales ponebant, præterquam quæ in *i* litteram inciderant; hanc enim per *e* et *i* scribebant.”^c

This passage of Victorinus has been pronounced incorrect by Ritschl, precisely

^a Lex de Repetun. Ann. 631, 632. Lex Bantina, 621—636. Vide *Inscript. Lat. Antiquiss.* 197, 198.

^b Mon. ep. tria, p. 33.

^c *Ars Gramm.* i. 4, p. 2456, of Putsch's Collection.

because it makes the use of the duplicate long vowels go back to the time of Nævius and Livy, that is to the first half of the sixth century. If this were the case, how could the sixth century be wanting in a single example? He therefore attempts to correct the text thus: "Accius cum scriberet *anguis, aggueis* imponebat. Idem nec *z* litteram, nec *y*, in libro suo retulit, [quanquam id] ante fecerant Nævius et Livius. Cum longa syllaba scribenda esset duas vocales poneba[t,] præterquam quæ in *i* literam inciderant; hanc enim per *e* et *i* scribeba[t]."

It is therefore the opinion of Ritschl that Marius Victorinus has attributed to Accius the introduction of doubling the long vowels *a*, *e*, *u*, as well as the custom of writing *ei* where the *i* was long, instead of doubling it—a custom which commenced with the sixth century, but only commenced, and was perpetuated by Accius, and so remained.^a It seems to me that as much may be said of the duplication, and that there is no objection to such an opinion when treating of the introduction of a custom already observed by the Oscans. Ritschl in truth has limited himself to the period of Accius for no other reason than that at that time commence those examples in Latin inscriptions which have come down to us. I am however persuaded that he would have formed a different judgment had he been aware of anterior examples.

As far back as 1860, in the *Scoperte Falische*, I investigated the laws of orthography and palæography, which the learned Professor was attempting to fix by the aid of monuments. I had no further purpose than to show how great a difficulty exists in fixing the period of the various changes which occur, both in the shape of the letters and in grammatical forms. In things of this kind, which are partly arbitrary, it seems to me that no other epoch can be fixed than that of their greatest use; therefore the appearance of the inscription, and the local circumstances, considered together, are capable of furnishing reasonable grounds for induction. Hence it does not appear at all strange to me that Nævius and Livy employed duplications in their writings, and especially since Nævius was a Campanian, or rather Oscan: but I imagine this custom was not followed, unless it can be proved from examples that such was the case. The same thing may have occurred as regards the introduction of the *y*. Whether this letter may have been used by Nævius and Livy, as Victorinus should have written according to Ritschl's correction, or whether it may not have been used by Accius, as Ritter (who places this within a parenthesis)^b supposes, there is in fact no example of its occurrence throughout the whole of the sixth century, and a considerable portion of the seventh.

^a *Ars Gramm.* i. 4.

^b *Elem. Gramm. Latin.* p. 108.

For these reasons I prefer leaving the text of Marius Victorinus as it stands; and the more so because he was not the first to carry back the use of the duplication to times prior to Accius. On this point we have the grave authority of Quintilian. He writes: "Usque ad Accium, et ultra, porrectas syllabas geminis, ut dixi, (ante, *cap.* 4, § 10,) vocalibus scripserunt."^a I do not attribute to Accius the introduction of this orthography, but an especial use of it; and this seems to me to have been the opinion of the ancient grammarians. Among these is Velius Longus, who writes, with the original text of Accius before him, "Nam nec Accium secuti sumus semper vocales geminantem, ubicunque producitur syllaba."^b Terentius Scaurus also notices that Accius wished such syllables as were by nature long to be written with a double vowel: "Accius geminatis vocalibus scribi natura longas syllabas voluit."^c

The example and authority of Accius caused a less infrequent use of the duplication during his period, but it must not be believed that this orthography was widely diffused, for we can reckon up but very few examples. Certainly the Oscans, with whom this mode of writing is supposed to have originated, were themselves very sparing of it. So much so indeed, that the Cippus of Nola, for example, which contains the longest and fullest Oscan inscription extant, only furnishes one single instance of duplication in the word *teerrum* for *terra*, although the same word occurs sundry times in that inscription.

But to give a just idea of this duplication, it will be well to adduce at one view all the examples that have come down to us, when it will be seen that it never really had any great importance or was much used among the Latins.

I select the following examples from nine hundred and thirty-eight inscriptions in the *Corpus Inscript. Lat. Antiquiss.* from n. 551 to n. 1489.

Nomina Appellativa.

- 807. AARA.
- 199. ARBITRATVV.
- 1011. EE.
- 1011. FAATO.
- 197. HAACE.
- 202. IVVS.
- 197. LEEGEI.
- 807. LEEGE.
- 197. LVVCI.

Nomina Propria.

- 1234. CALAASI?
- 586. FEELICI.
- 462. FEELIX.
- 1406. FVVLI.
- 1455. IVVLIVS.
- 1407. } LVVCIVS.
- 1477. }
- 578. LVVCEIVS.
- 1181. MAAMIVS.

^a *Instit. Orat.* i. 7, 14.

^b p. 2220, ed. Putsch.

^c p. 2255, ed. cit.

Nomina Appellativa.

- 1410. MAANIVM.
- 1011. NAATAM.
- 551. PAASTORES.
- 202. PEQVLATVV.
- 1011. REE.
- 1006. SEEDES.
- 197. SEESE.
- 1292. SVVO.

Nomina Propria.

- 1006. MAARCO.
- 596. MAARCIVM.
- 200. MVVCIVS.
- 199. MVVCIO.
- 1126. PAACILI.
- 1167. PAAPIA.
- 1214. PAAPVS.
- 1477. PVVPIVS.
- 1087. RVVBIVS.
- 1304. STAATIVS.
- 516. SVVRA.
- 1251. VVLIVS ?
- 1052. } VAARVS.
- 1166. }
- 1489. } VAARIVS.
- } VAARIA.

When to the foregoing nouns we add two verbs, FVVEIT and VVTEI, the list of examples contained in the *Corpus* is exhausted. But, to leave nothing wanting that may illustrate the present state of the question, I will add from the coins of the Gens Numonia, which collectors have strangely neglected, the word VAALA ; and also an inscription in the museum of Avignon, which I copied there lately. It is bi-lingual, and reads thus :—

OTAAOC KαυINOC

XAIP ε

VAALVS · CAniNIus

HEIC · SITVS · EST

I can further enumerate another example of svvo from a Ferentine inscription :—

HIRTIA · A · L

AGATOCLIAE

MONVMENTVM

FECIT · SIBI · ET

CEPPIO · T · F · PVB

VIRO · SVVO

Since the examples of double letters prove to be so rare, there appears to me no cause for surprise that an example of the *oo* should be wanting, which we have now met with in the Falleri inscription. We will conclude conversely that the fashion of doubling the long vowels, which had come in before the time of Accius, was never widely diffused, nor in common use.

The Latins of the fifth century terminate the third person of their verbs both in *et* and *it*, but the declension in *it* was common in the sixth century, in which we still have some examples of *et*. As to the seventh century, in the rural epigraphy of Falleri PARENTARET occurs; and in the Canci stone, which I published and defended, we have CURAVET, and, in another place, POSET, FECET. The Faliscan slab uses the form in *et*, as DEDET, but with this also we see constant use made of the inflection in *u*, *um*, in the place of *o*, *om*, of which, though fallen into disuse after the first decades of the sixth century, some examples still remain in the seventh.

In CVNCAPTVM the *v* in CVN will be observed, and of this there are other ancient examples, as *cungrus*, *cumes*, which grammarians have already noticed. Also the form *cuncaptum* and not *conceptum*, in the same way that CONQVAEISIVEI occurs on the Polla stone of 622. In our Falleri instance *cuncaptum* is right, for in another Archaic bronze, which I hope to publish, ACIPTVM is read.

The object of these observations on grammatical forms is to open the way to a determination of the date of the inscription—but, taken by themselves, they will not do so. They must also, at least, be found in accordance with the alphabetical form, or palæography, of the inscription. For, as the Greek alphabet varied with the Greeks, and, as with every nation, the forms of letters become modified from time to time, so, and not otherwise, did the Italian alphabets undergo changes as years rolled on.

The Falisci had framed an alphabet of their own in which the Latin element prevailed, although its course was from right to left, according to the manner of the neighbouring Etruscans. In their first city they regularly used this alphabet, as appears from the monuments which I published in the *Dissertazioni Archeologiche*. But in their second city we see the Latin alphabet used as well as the Faliscan. They always wrote in the Latin language, and employ both alphabets alike. We are indebted for this discovery to the inscriptions of the Faliscan hypogeum of the new Falleri, which I have published. The matter did not, at that time, appear sufficiently demonstrated and certain, whereas it is now *most* certain, as I am able to show by an inscription, on bronze, in Latin letters, which it is my intention to publish. It is of the period to which the inscriptions in Faliscan character also belong.

It is important to know that the Falisci modified the form of the letter *l* in their alphabet to that of the Latin. This could not have been presumed *à priori*, seeing the neighbouring Etruscans never abandoned the primitive form of the *l* acute, for the purpose of changing it into a semi-acute. There is no reason, or fact, which would show that the semi-acute *l* continued to be

written after the sixth century; and when we see it appear in our plate, as well as in other writings, with the character and orthography in use at Rome at this period, it appears to me conclusive that this date is to be assigned to the bronze in question. This opinion is strongly supported by another not less weighty argument—that is, by the resemblance our inscription bears to archaisms in the epistle of the Roman Consuls, *De Bacchan.* 568 u. c., on which we can fully rely. Nor, as I have already shown, does the duplication of the long vowel in *vootum* cause an obstacle greater than other rules would do which are considered well-established. Experience shows this when we carefully regard such rules, and the contradictory deductions which would result from them, if we had to decide on each individually, rather than on the whole case together.

On the other hand, if we were willing to take our stand on the canon of duplication, and hold with Ritschl that such an introduction did not occur before 620, we should find ourselves obliged to maintain that the v semi-acute, the d final, with the suppression of the *s* and *m*, are found together at an advanced part of the seventh century. If this be once granted, the canons, taken all together, cannot serve us as a guide to determine the period.

Meanwhile we have seen that the ancient grammarians neither make Accius the inventor nor the propagator of the duplication of the long vowels, and, at the most, do no more than state that he made a more free use of them than his contemporaries. These are circumstances which, before the discovery of the Faliscan bronze, it was no more possible to maintain, than the fact of Municipal Consuls prior to the discovery of my archaic inscriptions of Beneventum.