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Abstract This paper aims at providing a detailed analysis of two epigraphic forgeries transcribed by Pirro Ligorio under the lemma “Accursia” in his Enciclopedia del mondo antico: CIL VI 990* and CIL VI 991*. In particular, we make an attempt to identify the genuine inscriptions that might have provided Ligorio with the necessary inspiration to compose these two forgeries and to shed new light on the curious choice of the nomen ‘Accursius’, which appears in both texts.
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Summary 1 CIL VI 991*. – 2 CIL VI 990*.

1 CIL VI 991*
Pirro Ligorio (Naples 1512-Ferrara 1583), under the lemma “Accursia” in his Enciclopedia del mondo antico, transcribes an inscription that he claims to have found “nella via Appia, per la via a destra uscendo dalla porta di San Sebastiano”:

1 The manuscript is currently housed in the Archivio di Stato di Torino. For a detailed overview on Pirro Ligorio, see Coffin 2004; Occhipinti 2007; Loffredo, Vagenheim 2018.
CIL VI 991*: DI manibus, / M. Accursius M. l(ibertus) Plocamus Aug. nn. ab argento / scaenico ministr(ator) fec(it) se vivo, et Accurtiae / Omollae, (!) coniugi suae / castissimae fidelissim(ae) / bene de se merito (!), / urn(am) marmor(eam) d(onum) d(edit).

The inscription would have appeared on the gravestone of the freedman M. Accursius Plocamus, ministrator ab argento scaenico, who also claims to have dedicated a marble ossuary to his wife Accurtia Omolla (see below).

This inscription should be regarded as a forgery for several reasons. First, barring Pirro Ligorio, no other Renaissance (or Early Modern) author seems to have ever seen this text. Second, the nomen Accursius is attested neither in the epigraphic record from Rome nor from the rest of the Empire.

On the contrary, the two cognomina Plocamus and Omolla (a variant of the customary spelling Homulla) are quite widespread among Roman slaves and freedmen, although with a different frequency. Finally, even the expression ab argento scaenico ministrator is not entirely above suspicion, as the particular office ab argento scaenico, which seems to refer to the people responsible for the silver objects used by the imperial court in the theatre scenes, was usually held by imperial freedmen, under the supervision of a praepositus argenti scaenici.

Indeed, Titus Aelius Augustorum lib. Ameptus is named as the holder of the office ab argento scaenico in the only Latin inscription which mentions this role to date, precisely an imperial freedman. In other words, no ministrator seems to have ever been employed as ab argento scaenico. On the contrary, it is possible that the ministrator was a sort of ‘attendant’ of servile rank, whose main task seems to have been that of serving food and wine during the banquets organized by his master, as is inferable from several passages in Latin literary sources. It would therefore seem that, in creating this particular

---

2 This particular office is unattested in the epigraphic record (see below).
3 In this case, we searched the EDCS database for both the lemmata "Accursi*" and "Accurti*". Cf. also Solin, Salomies 1994.
4 The cognomen Plocamus is attested 16 times and Homulla once in Roman inscriptions that can be dated from the 1st cent. BC to the mid-1st cent. AD: CIL VI 35808, Marcia ((mulieris)) l(libertus) / Homulla / vix(it) ann(os) XXXI; // M(arcius) Laelius / M(arci) l(libertus) Lezbius. Cf. Solin 1996, 122, 537.
5 Gregori 2011, 174-5. As the author points out, this particular interpretation seems to find further confirmation in Dig. 34.2.28.
6 DE, I, 1895, 663.
7 CIL VI 8731.
8 See Gregori 2011, 171-7.
9 Sen. epist. 95.24 e Petron. 31.2. Cf. ThIL, VIII, 1016. See also OLD, 1112.
forgery, Pirro Ligorio happened to merge two different figures (*min-istrator* and *ab argento scaenico*), the second of which is also hardly attested within both Latin literary and epigraphic sources.

For all the aforementioned reasons, almost all ancient and modern scholars have ignored this text, as (with the exclusion of Ligorio) the inscription appears to be reported only by the German humanist Marquard Gude (Rendsburg 1635- Glückstadt 1689). After that, Theodor Mommsen definitively relegated it to the *pars V* of *CIL VI*, together with all the other non-genuine inscriptions.

Interestingly, the forgery also attests some linguistic forms which deviate from the standard ‘norm’ codified by the so-called ‘Classical’ Latin. For example, the spelling *<Omolla>* instead of the correct and customary form *<Homulla>* (l. 6), shows both the dropping of the initial /h/ and the use of the grapheme *<o>* instead of *<u>*. Moreover, there is a gender confusion between the masculine and the feminine in the sentence *bene de se merito* (instead of *bene de se merita*) in line 8, as the expression surely refers to Accurtia Omolla, wife of the freedman Accursius Plocamus, that is, the presumed owner of the grave. To conclude, the same *nomen Accurtius* is spelled both with the digraph *<ti>* (cf. *<Accurtia>*; l. 5) and with the simple grapheme *<s>* (cf. *<Accursius>*; l. 2).

It is worth underlining that these kind of ‘misspellings’ are extensively attested within Latin imperial inscriptions; therefore, it seems possible that Ligorio (perhaps unwittingly) ‘copied’ these forms from those genuine texts that often provided him with the necessary ‘inspiration’ to create his forgeries.

As is well known, one of the main ‘strategies’ used by Ligorio was precisely creating “fake but (at least in part) plausible epigraphic texts, reconstructed on the basis of information from literary sourc-

---

10 Gude 1731, 188, no. 2. As Vagenheim 2004, 115-17 highlights, this scholar has transmitted several Ligorian forgeries.

11 Cf. Orlandi et al. 2014.

12 Cf. Herman 2000, 43-5; Barbato 2017, 78-80.

13 For the use of /h/ in Latin see, among others, Leumann 1977, 159-63; Weiss 2011, 62-3; Adams 2013, 125-7. For the gender confusion between masculine and feminine see Adams 2013, 409-13. For an overview concerning the *<o>/<u>* graphemic oscillation in Latin epigraphic and other non-literary sources see Adams 2013, 62-7. For inscriptions in particular see, among others, Galdi 2004.

14 It is not rare to find such ‘misspellings’ within a false inscriphonal text. To give some examples, we could quote: 1) the form *<emptus>* (pro *emptus*) in the ligorian forgery *CIL VI 937* or 2) the systematic spelling *<e>* for *<ae>* and the single consonant (within the lexeme *Collatinus*) in *CIL VI 13*. See, respectively, Orlandi et al. 2014, 50 and 56. Ligorio might have used misspellings of this kind within his forgeries in order to “imitate the illiterates” (Abbott 1908, 28). Nevertheless, this particular topic does not seem to have been studied in detail. It is therefore our intention to address the problem in a future contribution.
es, coin legends, or genuine inscriptions”. In particular, he is likely to have often used epigraphic texts “which did not” necessarily “deal with important historical figures or events”, which seems to be the case in our inscription. Indeed, considering both the mention of a freedman who served under more than one emperor, and (above all) the mention of the office ab argento scaenico, which is scarcely attested in Latin inscriptions from the city of Rome (and from the Empire), it seems reasonable to suggest that the specimen (or one of the specimens) used by Ligorio to create CIL VI 991* might have been CIL VI 8731, which is the only genuine inscription known to refer to this particular office.

CIL VI 8731 is a marble slab with an epigraphic field bordered by a frame; 36 × 65.5 × 6 cm; lett. 2-2.5.

*D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / T(itus) Aelius Augustorum lib(ertus) A/memptus ab argento scaeni/co fecit se vivo et Pomponiae / Cleopatrae coniugi suae et T(itus) Ae/elio Aug(usto) lib(erto) Niceti (!) fratri suo et / lib(ertis) libertausq(ue) posterisq(ue) eo/rum et Ulpio Alypo suo.

The inscription refers to the grave set up by the freedman Titus Aelius Ameptus, ab argento scaenico (see above) for himself and for his family. On account of its palaeographical features, its typology and the formulas, the text is likely to date to the second half of the 2nd cent. AD.

Interestingly, the elements mentioned above do not seem to be the only textual analogies between CIL VI 991* and CIL VI 8731. First, the ‘structure’ of the two texts appears to be suspiciously similar, as both the inscriptions refer to a freedman of more than one emperor and to his coniux, respectively: M. Accursius Plocamus and Accurtia Homulla (CIL VI 991*), T(itus) Aelius Ameptus and Pomponia Cleopatra (CIL VI 8731). Moreover, the two female characters are preceded by the same formula fecit se vivo of the two inscriptions. Here we see, yet again, the use of an expression that is not particularly common in Latin epigraphy, as the verb fecit usually appears after, and not be-

15 Orlandi et al. 2014, 45. Cf. also Abbott 1908, 27-8.
16 Orlandi et al. 2014, 60. Cf. also Vagenheim, 2011.
17 Cf. the expression Augg, nn. (scil. Augustorum nostrorum) in CIL VI 991* (l. 3) with the similar titling Augustorum lib(ertus) in CIL VI 8731 (l. 2).
18 Cf. Kivimäki 2000.
19 On the contrary, both the mention of two other characters (Ameptus’ brother Niceta and his friend Alypus) and the expression lib(ertis) libertausq(ue) posterisq(ue) eo/rum are omitted in CIL VI 991*.
fore (as in our case), this peculiar ‘ablative absolute’ construction.\(^{20}\)

Apart from the evident textual similarities between the two inscriptions, the proposed hypothesis, according to which \textit{CIL VI 8731} may have been used by Pirro Ligorio as the ‘template’ for the realization of \textit{CIL VI 991*}, seems to find further confirmation in the peculiar ‘story’ of the genuine inscription, currently in the ‘Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli’ (inv. No. 2811).

The inscription was part of the rich epigraphic collection hosted by the Cardinal Rodolfo Pio di Carpi (Carpi 1500-Rome 1564) in his ‘vigna’, which was located on the ‘Quirinale’ hill.\(^{21}\) As H. Solin rightly states,\(^{22}\) the Cardinal Rodolfo Pio was a major figure in the ecclesiastic and pontifical environment of the 16th century-Rome, and he was also one of the greatest collectors of classical antiquities of his time. Indeed, his research of classical antiquities was continuously inspired by a genuine ‘scientific’ interest towards the ‘Classical world’. For this reason, he became patron to some of the main ‘scholars’ of his time, including Pirro Ligorio, who “senza dubbio studiò spesso le sue collezioni”.\(^{23}\) In particular, it seems that Ligorio had the opportunity to see \textit{CIL VI 8731} during one of his visits to the \textit{vigna Carpensis}, as is testified by the fact that he registered this particular inscription in the quire 79r of the manuscript \textit{Neapolitanus XIII B 8},\(^{24}\) which contains the so-called \textit{Libro XXXIX dell’antichità di Pyrrho Ligorio napolitano nel quale sono raccolti alcuni epitafi dell’antiche memorie de’ sepulcri}.

Considering this information alongside the above discussion of textual similarities between \textit{CIL VI 991*} and \textit{CIL VI 8731}, it seems probable that the genuine inscription was used as a the ‘template’ for the creation of the Ligorian forgery.

\(^{20}\) In particular, the expression \textit{se vivo fecit} (instead of \textit{fecit se vivo}) and its variants seem to occur in more than 80% of Roman Latin inscriptions registered in the ECDS database. On this particular formula see Galdi, 2004, 464-71 and Zelenai 2018. Cf. also Friggeri, Pelli 1980.

\(^{21}\) Solin 2009, 140.

\(^{22}\) Solin 2009, 116-17.

\(^{23}\) Solin 2009, 151. As this same scholar also points out, the acquaintance between Pirro Ligorio and Rodolfo Pio di Carpi is further confirmed by a letter signed by Averardo Serristori and dated to March 15, 1554. Cf. Vagenheim 2004.

\(^{24}\) Cf. Orlandi 2009, 74.
One might wonder why Pirro Ligorio chose the curious name *M. Accursius* for this specific forgery. As is well known, most of the non-genuine inscriptions (both on paper and on stone) produced between the 16th and the 17th century happen to refer (more or less explicitly) to some of the most outstanding personalities of the time, one of the main reasons for this fact being the ‘counterfeiter’s’ will to heighten the prestige of a particular noble family or personality. One could, for instance, refer to the forgeries on stone invented by the Italian humanist Girolamo Falletti in order to ‘prove’ the descendence of the house Este (whose members often carried the name ‘Azzo’) from the Roman *gens Atia*, also celebrated by the Latin poet Vergil as the family of *Atia*, mother of the Emperor Augustus. Along the same lines, the members of the Roman family of the ‘Porcari’ used to exhibit a false epitaph celebrating Marcus Porcius Cato by the entrance of their residence in Rome, with the clear intention of suggesting that the famous Latin statesman and *censor* was one of their ancestors.

As far as our particular forgery is concerned, one might therefore ask whether Pirro Ligorio wanted to ‘pay some tribute’ to a specific contemporary personality (or family) by creating *CIL VI 991*.

In order to answer this question, we might refer to a statement made by the same Neapolitan epigraphist and ‘counterfeiter’. As is well known, Pirro Ligorio hardly ever makes a direct reference to those ‘modern’ contributions that represented the ‘source’ for the inscriptions registered within his two main works which deal with antiquities and Latin epigraphy (the book *Delle Antichità di Roma* and the *Enciclopedia del mondo antico*). Nevertheless, an explicit reference seems to be found in the initial (and unnumbered) pages of the Ligorian work on the Antiquities, as the author states that the ‘lost’ inscriptions collected in this particular manuscript could be found “‘in quel libro delli epigrammi’ (c. 17v), in cui è forse possibile riconoscere gli *Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis* stampati a Roma nel 1521 dall’editore Mazzocchi”.

---

25 These two categories are addressed individually in Orlandi et al. 2014.
26 Billanovich 1967, 29.
27 *CIL XI 848*: *Ti. Atius C. f. ((quattuovir)) i(ure) d(icundo) v(ivus) f(ecit). Atia, L. Q. f. sibi et L. Oresto et L. Flavio.
28 Cf. Gregori 1990.
29 *CIL VI 3*g: *Ille ego sum nostrae subolis Cato Porcius auctor / nobile quoi nomen os dedit arma toga*.
30 Cf. Orlandi et al. 2014, 57.
31 Cf. Orlandi 2009.
32 Orlandi 2009, XI-XII.
This work, which represents the starting point for the creation of epigraphic collections in Italy, was published only after long and difficult vicissitudes, as is well testified by the fact that four full years passed between the concession of a seven-years privilege (to print) by Pope Leo X (1517) and the publication of the book (1521). In particular, while the first edition of the manuscript was being entirely revisited and corrected, Giacomo Mazzocchi devoted himself to the publication of the *De notis antiquarum litterarum* of the Latin grammarian Marcus Valerius Probus, whose critical edition, edited by the Italian humanist Mariangelo Accursio, was eventually added at the beginning of the very same *Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis*, as the editor considered this book as a necessary contribution “per poter accedere alla lettura delle stesse epigrafi”. Moreover, it is not impossible to suppose that the same Mariangelo Accursio was one of the main scholars involved in the re-edition of this specific epigraphic collection (from which, as mentioned earlier, Ligorio seems to have copied several inscriptions later included in his books *Delle Antichità di Roma*). In particular, this fact seems to be further confirmed by an annotation that the very same Mariangelo Accursio wrote about one of the inscriptions included in the collection edited by Giacomo Mazzocchi.

Mariangelo Accursio was one of the greatest humanists and scholars of Latin epigraphy and classical antiquities during the 16th century. As A. Campana points out, not only his involvement in the re-edition of the *Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis*, but also the fact that he was planning to publish a new, more ‘scientific’, edition of the so-called *Inscriptiones Sacrosanctae Vetustatis* (published in 1534 by P. Apianus and B. Amantius), clearly indicates his innovative desire for a methodological renewal of Italian classical studies which, in his time, could already boast of a more than secular tradition. In particular, Mariangelo Accursio was the first ‘epigraphist’ to stress the importance of respecting the division into lines when transcribing the inscriptions and to understand the necessity of comparing the texts that were known from the manuscript tradition with the origi-
nal exemplars on stone. Moreover, even though other scholars (like, for instance, Andrea Alciato) undoubtedly a better use of the epigraphic records for the study of classical history, Accursio extended the research for epigraphic texts to several, still largely unexplored regions, such as Spain and Hungary. In particular, he was the very first *corporis conditor* to look at the inscripational material from his homeland, Abruzzo.  

Given the importance of Mariangelo Accursio in the context of the Renaissance studies on Latin epigraphy, it could be hypothesized that, in creating *CIL VI 991*, Ligorio might have intended to ‘pay some tribute’ to the figure of the other illustrious Italian epigraphist. Moreover, it is not impossible that these two personalities might also have had the occasion to meet each other in Rome, where they both lived for a certain period.

Indeed, Mariangelo Accursio (1489-1546), born in L’Aquila, was already in Rome in 1513, when he published his first literary work, entitled *Osci et Volsci dialogus ludis Romanis actus*. He remained in this city until 1533, when he went back to his hometown. Moreover, from the year 1520 onwards, he also had the opportunity to travel across Europe serving, at first, under the marquises Giovanni Alberto and Gumberto of Hohenzollern, and after that under the wealthy banker Antony Fugger. Nevertheless, Accursio continued to visit Rome even after his eventual return to L’Aquila. For example, in the decade 1535-45, he took part in a series of diplomatic missions that brought him back to Rome (among other places) and that constituted an important phase “della lunga vicenda delle trattative condotte dalla sua città per ottenere dalla corte imperiale la reintegrazione dei diritti sui castelli, che erano stati tolti al comune ed assegnati ai baroni del principe d’Orange dopo la rivolta del 1528”. Moreover, as highlighted by A. Campana, during this period Accursio also had the occasion to come back to Rome in order to follow his own epigraphic and antiquarian interests. Therefore, he might have had the opportunity to meet Pirro Ligorio in the decade 1535-45, since the Neapolitan humanist was also in Rome from 1534 to 1568, and shared Accursio’s erudite interests.

Moreover, although it is impossible to find definitive proof for both a personal acquaintance between the two Renaissance humanists and (above all) for the fact that Pirro Ligorio might have had the occasion

---

39 Campana 1960, 130.
40 The *Dialogus*, in particular, seems to have been composed in occasion of the so-called *Ludi Romani*, the celebration following the acquired Roman citizenship of Giuliano and Lorenzo de Medici, respectively, Pope Leo X’s brother and nephew. Campana 1960, 126.
41 Campana 1960, 129.
42 Cf. Bortolotti 2005.
to read (at least in part) some of Accursio’s works dealing with Latin inscriptions (such as his re-edition of the *Epigrarmmata Antiquae Urbis*), the same thing cannot be said for Accursio’s literary work, since Ligorio himself directly praises the poetic talent of his illustrious ‘colleague’ from L’Aquila in the 14th volume of his work *Delle Antichità di Roma*.³³

When this last piece of information is added to what we have already said about the (possible) direct acquaintance between Pirro Ligorio and Mariangelo Accursio, and (above all) about the latter’s likely involvement in the re-edition of the *Epigrarmmata Antiquae Urbis*, it is possible to hypothesise that, behind the fictional character invented by Ligorio for *CIL VI 991*, may be hidden the figure of the great Italian humanist Mariangelo Accursio. In particular, this would also permit us to clarify why the Neapolitan ‘counterfeiter’ decided to choose such a scarcely attested function like *ab argento scaenico* for his forgery. In fact, by using this particular expression, Ligorio may have intended to allude to Accursio, who had served under the wealthy banker Antony Fugger.

To conclude, a similar rapprochement between the name *M. Accursius* invented by Ligorio for *CIL VI 991* and the actual Italian Renaissance humanist Mariangelo Accursio might also permit us to shed new light on the ‘identity’ of a second *Accursius*, which is ‘quoted’ by Ligorio in another forgery, also ‘transcribed’ by the Neapolitan writer under the very same *lemma* ‘Accursia’ of his *Enciclopedia del mondo antico*.

*CIL VI 990*: *(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). / C. Accursius C. l. Livinus, L. / T. Flavi Augusti cubicularius / et P. Accursius C. f. Albus / Aug(usti) n(ostr(i) ab argento / potorio / fecerunt; in fronte pedes XIII, in agr(o) pedes XVIII.*

The text (also reported by Gudius)⁴⁴ refers to the grave set up by two men: the freedman C. Accursius Livinus, the cubicularius of an impossible-to-identify Imperator Titus Flavius and P. Accursius Albus, a freeborn absurdly connected again with the office *ab argento* (in this case, not *scaenico* but *potorio*).

Like the office of *ab argento scaenico*, the office *ab argento potorio* was usually held by Imperial freedmen (and slaves) working under a *praepositus argenti potori*. Nonetheless, if the former were the

---

³³ *Delle Antichità di Roma*. ms. a.II.1 (Torino, vol. XIV [s. t.], c. 41r): "poeti sono detti tutti quei uomini dotti che hanno scritto istorie favolosamente sotto finzione e trasmutazione [c. 41v]: [...] non hanno imitato né li sudetti antichi né li moderni [...] Non hanno né anco imitato questi altri di grazioso ingegno e laudabili: Mariangelo Accursio, Iano Vitale Panormitano, Francisco Sperulo, Silvio Laureolo". URL http://ligorio.sns.it/ligorio.php (2019-04-29).

⁴⁴ Cf. Gude 1731, 188, no. 1.
'personnel' responsible for the silver objects used in the theatre, the latter had the task of taking care of the silver furnishings used in the context of the imperial banquets.\textsuperscript{45}

Interestingly, even the latter office \textit{ab argento potorio} appears to be hardly attested in the epigraphic records from Rome, as it is only quoted in two Roman inscriptions.\textsuperscript{46} Nonetheless, Ligorio happened to know directly (at least) one of these two epigraphic texts (\textit{CIL VI} 8730), as he had had the occasion to see it in person, probably in the ‘vigna’ of the Cardinal Rodolfo Pio di Carpi, where the inscription was seen by Martin Smetius.\textsuperscript{47} Therefore, just like \textit{CIL VI} 8731 is likely to have been used by the Neapolitan ‘counterfeiter’ as the ‘template’ to create \textit{CIL VI} 991*, it is not impossible to hypothesise that \textit{CIL VI} 8730 might have provided Pirro Ligorio with the necessary ‘inspiration’ to create \textit{CIL VI} 990*.

Along the same lines, if (as it seems very likely) the \textit{M. Accursius} quoted in the first Ligorian forgery might actually hide the figure of the great Italian humanist Mariangelo Accursio, it seems reasonable to identify the \textit{C. Accursius} in \textit{CIL VI} 990* with Casimiro Accursio, the son whom M. Accursio had had with Caterina Lucentini Piccolomini after his definitive return to L’Aquila in 1533.\textsuperscript{48}

To conclude, considering the fact that most of the inscriptions transcribed by Ligorio in the manuscript \textit{Taurinensis} “devono […] essere […] mere invenzioni sulla carta, perché l’edizione torinese fu redatta dopo la partenza da Roma di Ligorio”,\textsuperscript{49} it would seem reasonable to see in both \textit{CIL VI} 991* and \textit{CIL VI} 990* two forgeries created by Pirro Ligorio with the intention of paying tribute to the figure of his illustrious ‘colleague’ Mariangelo Accursio.

In fact, not only does Ligorio seem to have been acquainted with the literary (and, perhaps, also with the epigraphic) works of his illustrious contemporary poet, philologist and epigraphist Mariangelo Accursio, but it is not possible to exclude that the two humanists might have had the occasion to meet in person in Rome during the decade 1535-45.

\textsuperscript{45} Cf. \textit{DE}, I, 1895, 663.

\textsuperscript{46} \textit{CIL VI} 6716: \textit{Dis Manibus. / Ulpiae Vitali; v}(ixit) \textit{a}(nnos) \textit{LII}; \textit{Anthus Caesaris (scil. servus) ab arg(ento) / [pot]orio comiui optu[mae] (!) et sibi; CIL VI 8730: Anthus ad / argentum / pot(orio) L(uci) Caesaris (scil. servus); // Arche\l{}avos / M(arci) Considi et / Considiarum (scil. servus); / vix(it) annos) VI. CIL VI 8969 instead refers to an \textit{ab auro potorio}: Ti\textsuperscript{berio} Claudio Aug\textsuperscript{usti} (liberto) Eutycho / paeda\g{e}o pu\emph{erorum} / Ti\textsuperscript{berius} Claudius Aug\textsuperscript{usti} (libertus) Eunetes / frat\emph{ri} suo et T(itus) Flavius Aug\textsuperscript{usti} (libertus) / Venustus ab auro potorio / paeda\g{e}ogo suo fecerunt.

\textsuperscript{47} Cf. \textit{CIL VI} 8730, p. 1161 and Orlandi 2009, 83.

\textsuperscript{48} Campana 1960, 129. The young Casimiro seems to have been a particularly promising Classical student. Nevertheless, he died at an early age while he was studying medicine in Padova during the year 1563.

\textsuperscript{49} Solin 2009, 150.
Along the same lines, considering that the scarcely attested office ab argento (both scaenico and potorio) is quoted in both the investigated Ligorian forgeries *CIL* VI 990* and 991*, it seems reasonable to assume that he might have taken the necessary inspiration to create these fake epigraphic texts from the non-genuine inscriptions *CIL* VI 8730 and *CIL* VI 8731, that he had had the opportunity to see in the ‘vigna’ of the Cardinal Rodolfo Pio di Carpi. In this case, it would be possible to shed new light on both the evident textual similarities between *CIL* VI 991* and *CIL* VI 8731 and, above all, on the identity of the two Accursi (M. and C. Accursius), mentioned by Ligorio in his two forgeries, as these two fictional characters would hide the figures of the great Italian humanist and epigraphist Mariangelo Accursio (*CIL* VI 991*) and of his son Casimiro (*CIL* VI 990*).
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