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Chapter 3
Phonology

Faliscan phonology presents some very interesting features. First of all, the Faliscan material is relatively old in comparison to the inscriptions of the Latin and most of the Sabellic languages: most of it dates from before the middle of the third century. Second, the Faliscan material shows some very interesting developments, especially in the voiced aspirates (§3.2.8, §3.3.3, §3.5.2) and the diphthongs (§3.7).

This chapter opens with a few methodological considerations on the limitations of the Faliscan material and the status of Proto-Italic (§3.1). The arrangement of the remainder is more or less chronological. It starts with the developments of the Proto-Italic period, which Faliscan shares with the other Latin dialects and the Sabellic languages (§3.2); continues with the Proto-Latin developments, where Faliscan should show the same developments as Latin, but different ones from the Sabellic languages (§3.3), and ends with the developments of the Early, Middle and Late Faliscan periods (§3.4-7). A short conclusion is drawn in §3.8.

3.1. Methodological issues

3.1.1. Method and material. The phonology of Faliscan stands, in a sense, on a different level from the parts of speech that I discuss in chapters 4-7.

On the one hand, phonological developments can often be observed and defined much more clearly than e.g. the developments in morphology, where analogy may play a much larger role: phonemes, after all, although by definition meaningful sounds, do not themselves convey a ‘meaningful concept’ in the sense morphemes and lexemes do. For the same reason, the influence from other languages as a factor in a phonological development is less and different than, e.g., in the lexicon and especially the onomasticon: see, however, §3.8.

A problem, on the other hand, is that in the case of fragmentarily preserved languages there is often too little material for a comprehensive interpretation, especially in the case of diachronic developments. The Faliscan material can therefore often only be interpreted clearly against the background of a picture of the larger developments as they are known from Latin and the Sabellic languages. Since this study starts from the assumption that Faliscan is a Latin dialect, I have chosen in several cases to present the Faliscan material against the larger background of the developments as they are known to have taken place in Latin. The aim is then to show that the few Faliscan data tie in with what is known about the much better documented Latin, and are nowhere at odds with it. Wherever this is possible, the relevant data from the Sabellic languages are then reviewed for comparison: these usually show a different picture.
Another problem which applies especially to the Middle and Late Faliscan developments is the question of which inscriptions represent what can be called Faliscan and which do not, e.g., because they represent the Latin of immigrants from Rome or Latium. I have excluded on principle all inscriptions that I regard as Latin (Lat 217, 218, 219, 237 and 238, 240, 250, 251, 268, 291, 296, 377, 393, 456 and the Late Faliscan or Latin 214), as well as those that I regard as Latino-Faliscan or Capenate, as sources for data on Faliscan phonology, and used these only as additional material or to highlight specific points, after the main developments of Faliscan have been made clear. The risk of a circular argument is great, however, for it is easy to exclude specific inscriptions as being Latin rather than Faliscan, and thus ending up using only those inscriptions that exactly confirm the preconceived idea about Faliscan that lead to the exclusion of the ‘non-Faliscan’ inscriptions in the first place: see §3.6.6.1 for an illustration of this point.

3.1.2. The concept of Proto-Italic. As has been said in §1.4.1, ‘Proto-Italic’ is defined here as a chronological stage during which a set of phonological and morphological developments took place that together set off theItalic languages from the other IE families, all of which developments are assumed to have preceded any developments that were limited to either the Latin or the Sabellic branch of the Italic languages. As soon as either branch of the Italic languages shows independent developments, the Proto-Italic period must be regarded as closed and the Proto-Latin and Proto-Sabellic stage must be assumed to have begun. The initial stage of Proto-Italic must therefore coincide with (late) PIE, whereas the final stage of Proto-Italic constitutes the initial stage of both Proto-Latin and of Proto-Sabellic.

Since Proto-Italic is defined as a chronological stage in the development of the Italic languages, it must have had an existence in time and in place. However, as the Proto-Italic period is a linguistically defined period but is also prehistoric, ascribing dates to such a remote period is extremely difficult, if not impossible. Meiser’s (1998:54) approximative dates of c.4000 to c.1800 BCE (apparently defined as starting with the breaking up of (Western) PIE and ending approximately 1100 years before the appearance of the first written documents) is as good a guess as anyone’s.

To the Proto-Italic stage can (or rather, must) be ascribed all developments that occur in both the Latin and the Sabellic branches of the Italic language family, unless these must be ascribed to separate parallel development, either because they can be dated absolutely (by written evidence) or because they can be dated later relatively as having taken place after a development that is demonstrably post-Proto-Italic. The explanation of any feature that is found in only one Italic language or in only one branch of the Italic languages by a Proto-Italic development therefore implies that either the explanation is unsound or that the language in question cannot be regarded as Italic.
3.1.3. The PIE phonemic inventory. I end this section with a few short notes on the phonemic inventory of PIE and Proto-Italic as presented in fig.3.2. Firstly, it will be clear that I approach PIE and the developments of the IE languages from a laryngealist perspective. As a consequence, I have been reluctant to include */a/ (cf. Lubotsky 1989), and have not included */i/ (cf. Beekes 1990:173-5). It goes beyond the scope of this study to review the whole laryngeal discussion: as far as the question of whether Faliscan is a Latin dialect or an independent Italic language is concerned, the laryngeals are of relatively minor importance, since they are assumed to have disappeared during the Proto-Italic period. Secondly, whether Proto-Italic had an inherited PIE phoneme */θ/ or the sound */[θ]/ (cf. Meiser 1998:29) is in my view unclear, but for the scope of this study, this is irrelevant, since it disappeared during the Proto-Italic period, and no reflexes of words where it presumably occurred are found in the Faliscan material.

The PIE occlusive series can and perhaps should be reconstructed in an entirely different way than is done here, namely according to the glottalic theory. I mention this especially in view of Baldi & Johnson-Staver’s (1989) glottalic reconstruction of the development of the voiced aspirates in the Italic languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIE</th>
<th>Proto-Latin</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pʰ tʰ kʰ</td>
<td>p t k</td>
<td>p t k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p t k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#bʰ #dʰ #gʰ</td>
<td>pʰ tʰ kʰ</td>
<td>φ θ X f f h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-b- -d- -g-</td>
<td>b d g</td>
<td>b d g(u)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>p’ t’ k’</td>
<td>b d g (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig.3.1. Glottalic reconstruction of the development of the voiced aspirates.*

(After Baldi & Johnson-Staver 1989:96.)

I have not adopted this perspective, not because I think the glottalic reconstruction is wrong in itself, but because I wonder whether the distinction between a voiceless/voiceless aspirated, voiced/voiced aspirated, and glottalized series was indeed preserved until the Proto-Italic, let alone the Proto-Latin period, and had not developed and/or merged into different series before that date, within PIE itself. Stuart-Smith (2004:17-8) in fact notes that in the course of the development it would in any case be necessary to assume a stage where the voiced occlusives would have become voiced aspirated occlusives.
### Chapter 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vowels</th>
<th>/a/ e o/</th>
<th>/ã/ ð ò/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>semivowels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laryngeals</td>
<td>/h₁ h₂ h₃/</td>
<td>/m n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resonants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Positional Variation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vocalic</th>
<th>/i u/</th>
<th>/h₁ h₂ h₃/</th>
<th>/m n/</th>
<th>/l r/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>consonantal</td>
<td>/i u/</td>
<td>/h₁ h₂ h₃/</td>
<td>/m n/</td>
<td>/l r/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sibilants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>labial</th>
<th>dental</th>
<th>(palato-velar?)</th>
<th>velar</th>
<th>labio-velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voiceless</td>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>(/k/?</td>
<td>/k/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced</td>
<td>/b/</td>
<td>/d/</td>
<td>(/g/?</td>
<td>/g/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced aspirated</td>
<td>/bʰ/</td>
<td>/dʰ/</td>
<td>(/gʰ/?</td>
<td>/gʰ/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Occlusives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>labial</th>
<th>dental</th>
<th>velar</th>
<th>labio-velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voiceless</td>
<td>/φ/</td>
<td>(/θ/?</td>
<td>/x/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced</td>
<td>/β/</td>
<td>/ð/</td>
<td>/γ/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Reconstructed phonemic inventory of PIE (final stage) =

Reconstructed phonemic inventory of Proto-Italic, initial stage

![](image)

#### Reconstructed phonemic inventory of Proto-Italic, final stage =

Reconstructed phonemic inventory of Proto-Latin and Proto-Sabellic, initial stage

---

**Fig. 3.2. Development of the phonemic inventory of Proto-Italic.**

---

56
3.2. Proto-Italic developments

3.2.1. From Proto-Italic to Proto-Latin. The phonological developments that can with reasonable certainty be ascribed to the Proto-Italic period have been summarized by Meiser (1986:37-8 from the perspective of the history of the Sabellic languages, 1998:54 from the perspective of the history of Latin). Of these, I discuss only those that are in some way relevant to the evaluation of the Faliscan material.34 Since there is no doubt among scholars that Faliscan is an Italic language, Faliscan should be expected to show the same Proto-Italic developments and the same outcomes of these developments as Latin and the Sabellic languages. The Proto-Italic developments are therefore of relatively minor relevance to the question of whether Faliscan is a Latin dialect or a separate Italic language.

3.2.2. Presumed merger of the palatal and the velar series. It is a debated and debatable point if, beside a labiovelar series */kʷ gʰ gʰh/, PIE had both a palatal or palato velar series */k  ɡ  ɡʰ/ and a ‘true velar’ series */k  g  gʰ/.35 Apart from the fact that such a triple-series system is debatable from a typological point of view, it is preserved in none of the IE languages: the distribution of palatals and velars throughout the IE languages appears to be complementary, the centum-languages (among which theItalic languages) having velars and labiovelars, the satem-languages, palato velars and labiovelars. For discussions of this point, see Steensland 1973 (extensive) and Baldi & Johnston-Staver 1989:88-97 (from a glottalist perspective).

The rather slight Latin evidence for a Proto-Italic distinction between a palato velar and a velar series is evaluated by Schrijver (1991:425-34). It consists of the fact that after a reconstructed velar */k/, but not after a reconstructed palato velar */kʰ/, PIE */c/ usually appears in Latin as /a/:

PIE */Ke/ → Latin /Ke/
PIE */ke/ → Latin /ka/

The instances where Schrijver (1991:434) deems this probable are calidus ← PIE */kel/-, candeo ← PIE */(s)kend/-, carpo ← PIE */(s)kerp/-, carro ← PIE */kers/-, scabo ← PIE */skebʰ/-, and scando ← PIE */skend/, to which Rix (1996:160 n.9) adds castrum ← PIE */keghʰ/-.

For the development of the accent, see §3.6.6.

34 Those discussed by Meiser, but not by me, are: (1) */ūi/ → /ūi/ (e.g., in pius), (2) */ūi/ → /ūi/ (e.g., in maius), (3) */mī/ → /mī/ (e.g., in uenio), and (4) the developments of */θ/, namely */kθ/ → */ks/ (→ /s/) and */#kθ/ → */#s/ (→ /s/). For the development of the accent, see §3.6.6.

35 Meillet (1894:294-9) suggested that the velars (in effect, /k/) developed from a positional variant of the palato velars that subsequently acquired phonemic status: PIE */#sk/ → */#sk/ (de-palatalization) → */#k/ (loss of movable */#s/).
PIE */keng-/, and, with velar */g/ and */gh/,
gemo ← PIE */gem-/ and hedera ← PIE */gʰed-/. The Italic evidence that can be added to this consists of the corresponding Sabellic forms, Oscan castrous TB 13 etc., Umbrian kastruvuf TI Va.13 etc., Oscan kersnu Cm 14 etc., Umbrian šesna TI Vb.9 etc., and Umbrian šihitu anšihitu TI Vlb.59. If these differences can indeed be attributed to an opposition of a palatovelar and a velar series, the development */ke/ → */ka/ must have taken place before a merger of both series in Proto-Italic, and such a merger must have taken place at a very early Proto-Italic date, since a palatovelar-velar opposition is not reflected in any other Italic development.

Although therefore apparently irrelevant to the study of Faliscan, this point is in fact relevant to the discussion on the development of the voiced aspirates. If (Western) PIE did not have a separate palatovelar series, or if the PIE palatovelar series disappeared due to a PIE or early Proto-Italic merger of the palatovelar and the velar series, the (presumed) PIE distinction between */gʰ/ and */gh/ is irrelevant to any further developments of the voiced aspirates. It is therefore impossible to ascribe the unexpected Faliscan reflexes fifiked EF 9, ffJJqod EF 1, and lecet MF 88 (§3.3.3.2) to the fact that these forms contained an original PIE */gʰ/ (PIE roots */dʰeigʰ-/ and */legʰ-/) as opposed to an original PIE */gh/.

### 3.2.3. Developments of the laryngeals.

A major development that can with certainty be ascribed to the Proto-Italic period is the disappearance of the laryngeals. For the Italic languages, the most detailed description of the way these phonemes disappeared and the traces they left behind is Schrijver 1991. Brief summaries of the major trends may be found in Meiser 1998:105-10, 1986:36. The list below is not a complete overview, but merely places the Faliscan lexemes and morphemes where a laryngeal may be reconstructed beside the reconstructed Proto-Italic developments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIE</th>
<th>Proto-Italic (final)</th>
<th>Faliscan reflexes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*/#h₁e/</td>
<td>*/#e/</td>
<td>ego EF 1, 467*, eco EF 3, eko EF 6, 7; eco LF 378, 383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/h₁eg-/</td>
<td>*/eg-/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/#h₂e/</td>
<td>*/#a/</td>
<td>efiles MF 113, 115, efle MF 114, ef[i]les] MF 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/h₂eidh-/</td>
<td>*/aið-/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/#h₃e/</td>
<td>*/#o/</td>
<td>? oct- MLF 353 (very dubious)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/h₃ekt-/</td>
<td>*/okt-/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/HRC/</td>
<td>*/#aRC/</td>
<td>arcentelon EF 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/h₂gントm/</td>
<td>*/argントm/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHONOLOGY

*/#HRV/ → */#RV/  med EF 1, 9; met MF 470*
*/h.me/ → */mē/ (cf. §4.7.2)  Iloifírta MF 41, loferta LF 221;
*/h.leudero/- → */louđero/-  loifírta MF 31, loifírta MF 32
*/h.reudo/- → */rūđo/-  ? rufia EF 4 (see §3.7.2)
*/h.rēg/- → */rēg/-  rex MF 90, perhaps also rex MF 91 (very uncertain), rē[x] LF 249

*/CHC/ → */CaC/  [and rex LtF 231]
*/d'h₁-k/- → */ďak/-  faced MF 471*, facet MF 470*
*/ph₂tēr/- → */patēr/  pater MF 62
*/sh₂kro/- → */sakro/-  sacra MF 127

*/Ceh₂C/ → */CāC/  karai EF 1
*/keh₂ro/- → */kāro/-  cognomen man[o]mo MF 80, [m]ano[m]o MF 149; gentilicium mania LF 225, m[e]ania LF 224.

? */meh₂tēr/ → */mātēr/  mate LF 222

The word may have been a non-IE borrowing in PIE (cf. Schrijver 1991:143).

? */meh₂tēr/ is often regarded as due to a PIE lengthened vowel (PIE */mātēr/ rather than */meh₂tēr/), but can also be ascribed to a laryngeal (cf. Schrijver 1991:341).

*/Ceh₂C/ → */CōC/  douiad EF 1 (see §5.3.1.4)
*/dēhu/- or */dōhu/- → */dōu/-

*/CiHC/ → */CīC/  uino MF 59-60
*/ui̞ros/ → */ūiros/ names: leivelio MF 79, [leu]elio MF 90, [leu]elio MF 159; leuieis Lat 251, leuia LtF 327, leueli MF 14, leu[i]o MF 146; leue[l]ia MF 147

*/Ch₂eişC/ → */CaišC/  The PIE form may have been either */lh₂eiuo/- or */le[h]iuo/- (EDL s.v. laevus).
*/lh₂eiuo/- → */laiuōo/- names: sceya MLF 312, sceiuai LF 379.

*/skh₂eiuo/- → */ski̞uōo/- names: sceya MLF 312, sceiuai LF 379.

The PIE form may have been either */skh₂eiuo/- or */ske[h]iuo/- (Schrijver 1991:270).
Schrijver (1991:242) and EDL (s.v. *filius*) suggest either */dʰiilo/* or */dʰiilio/* as the PIE form.

*/CRHC/ → */CaRC/
*/prh₁-mo-/ → */prámo-/ pramom EF 2 (a debated word, but probably related to Latin prāndium, §6.2.59)

*/dʰr₁-u-/* → */haru-/* harisp[ex LtF 231, harisp[ex LtF 232

The /a/ may be of non-IE origin and not due to a laryngeal (Schrijver 1991:113-4).

Unclear are */sok/* → *soc*[ai] EF 1, sociai EF 4, where the presence of the laryngeal is doubtful (cf. Schrijver 1991:249, De Vaan EDL s.v. socius), and prau[i]os EF 1 (if connected to Latin prāvus): EDL (s.v. prāvus) gives no etymology for this word, but it seems likely that the /ā/ is due to a laryngeal: perhaps */preh₁-u-o-/* → */prāo-/*?

The verbal roots reconstructed as ending in a laryngeal have not all been included in the list above, since their reflexes are sometimes different due to analogies or restructurings within the paradigms of the verb. They are: (1) */dʰi/ in porded EF 1, see §5.3.1.14 (and 2) in the extended form of this root */deh₁u/* or */doh₁u/* in douiād EF 1, see §5.3.1.4; (3) */kubh₁/* (or */kubh₂/*?) in cupat MF 40 etc. and cupa[nt] MF 80 etc., see §5.3.1.2-3; (4) */pi-ph₁/* in pipafo MF 59, ›pi›pafo MF 60, see §5.3.1.13; (5) */prh₁/* in peipara[i] EF 1, see §5.3.1.12.

Laryngeals in verbal suffixes and endings that are attested for Faliscan are reconstructed for: (1) seite EF 4 (either seite or sciote), reflecting the old PIE optative */h₁s-i₁-té/, used as subjunctive (cf. §5.3.1.18); (2) the primary ending of the first person singular PIE */-oH/* → Proto-Italic */-ā/*, attested for Faliscan in carefo MF 59, care[f]o MF 60, pipafo MF 59, ›pi›pafo MF 60 (see §5.2.4a); (3) the first person singular perfect ending PIE */-h₁eᵀ/, which developed either into Proto-Italic */-aᵀ/* → */-ai/* (innovation) or into Proto-Italic */-h₁eᵀ-i/* (innovation) → */-ai/* (see §5.3.1e): note that the stage -ai is reflected only by Faliscan peipara[i] EF 1 (cf. Untermann 1968a:165-9).
Laryngeals in nominal endings that are attested for Faliscan are reconstructed for the endings of the first declension: nominative singular */-eh/ → */-a/ (or */-h/ → */-a/, cf. §4.2.1), genitive singular */-ehs/ or */-eh,es/ → */-as/ (§4.2.2), dative singular */-eh,ei/ or */-h,ei/ → */-ai/ (§4.2.3), accusative singular */-eh,em/ → */-am/ (§4.2.2).

3.2.4. Voicing of */t#/ and subsequent drop of */i#/. The primary and secondary endings of the third person (see §5.2.4.1-2) show that these must have been subject to two successive developments, namely (1) voicing of */t#/ and (2) loss of */i#/ (cf. Meiser 1998:98, 73-4).

| sec. 3rd sg. | *-t/ → */-d/ → */-d/ |
| sec. 3rd pl. | *-nt/ → */-nd/ → */-nd/ |
| prim. 3rd sg. | */-ti/ → */-ti/ → */-t/ |
| prim. 3rd pl. | */-nti/ → */-nti/ → */-nt/ |

These endings are reflected in Early Faliscan fifiked EF 9, fifi qod = fifigo(n)d EF 1 vs. Middle Faliscan cupat MF 40 etc., cupajnt MF 80 etc. (For further attestations, see §5.2.4.1-b,e.)

This development must belong to a period where the PIE accent had not yet been replaced by the Italic initial accent (§3.6.6), as */i#/ was preserved where it carried the accent in PIE or where it occurred in alternation with an accented */i#/ within the same paradigm (Rix 1996:158 n.7, Meiser 1998:74). It may therefore belong to an early phase of Proto-Italic.

3.2.5. Merger of */eu/ with */ou/. According to the generally accepted view, the inherited diphthong */eu/ merged with */ou/ already during the Proto-Italic period (cf. Pfister 1977:55, 69-70, Meiser 1998:59; Von Planta 1892:157-8). There are, however, several instances of eu in Latin and Faliscan that have led a number of authors (e.g. Pisani 1943:259, 1964:346, LHS pp.70-1, Wachter 1987:99, 374) to doubt this view and assume that */eu/ was preserved until the third century BCE. The instances are as follows (mainly from Blümel 1972:29-30):

Latin:
- *neuen*: deiuo CIL I².455 (Ardea, third century: sometimes, but in my view erroneously, regarded as Faliscan, as is explained in §18.3.2);
- *neuna*: dono CIL I².2845 (Lavinium, early third century);
- *neuna*: fata CIL I².2846 (Lavinium, early third century);
- [*---*jeuam (beside ioumen|ta) CIL I².1 (Rome, sixth century?)];
- *cozeulodorieso* (also given as *cozeui oborieso*) quoted by Varro (L 7.26) and *leucesiae* (also given as *leuciesie*) quoted by Terentius Scaurus (CGL 7.28.11), both purportedly from the Carmen Saliare.
Faliscan:

- **euios EF 1**: There is general agreement among the editors that *euios* is onomastic: it is therefore quite possible that *euios* is from another language altogether (cf. §7.1.1), as G. Giacomelli’s (1963:41-2) interpretation of this form as Eũos shows, even if this interpretation may no longer be tenable (see §12.2).

- **euotenosio EF 3 in ecoquto*euotenosio**. In my view, this is to be read as *eco quto *e*? uotenosio, where *uotenosio* is the genitive of the name that appears in the vocative uoltene at the end of the text, and therefore to be read as uo(l)tenosio or uo(o)tenosio: see §12.3.

- Safarewicz (1954:101-3) also pointed to leueli MF 14 and heva EF 9, but in the former (as in le[ueli]o MF 146 and leue[lia] MF 147) *eu* represents /ɛi/ ← /ai/ui/, cf. leuelio MF 79 (see §3.7.6), while the latter is now read as tele*/l-2*.

As far as I know, there have been no suggestions that there are similar problematic cases of *eu* in the Sabellic languages: Umbrian sevakne TI IIa.21 etc. represents /sê-u-akni/), Oscar helleviis Cp 36 etc. and serevki̯d Po 1, σεβεκιδ̣ Lu 62A.3 represent /hel′u̯is/ and /ser'ukid/, Volscian deue VM 2 and Umbrian deuea TI VIa.9, 10 represent a monophthongized reflex of */de̯i̯u̯-/ Samnite evkḷu̯ Sa 1A.3, 25, B.4 is a borrowing from Greek Ἠκλαζ, in Paelignian peumpuni Pg 26 the *eu* is a rather curious spelling for /o̯/, and Praesamnitic evi̯es Ps 5 is now usually read as efies. The instances of *ev* and *eu* in Oscar neypus Po 68 (sometimes regarded as Etruscan, and not included in *WOU*), the name neui̯es Fr 16, and the abbreviation ev tPo 30, 32, 34, and perhaps also the Umbrian toponym Meuania, remain unexplained.

The only clear cases of a problematic *eu* are therefore neuen and neuna, equated with Latin nouem ← PIE */h₁neən/ and nōnus ← PIE */h₁neŋnəs/ ever since Pisani (1943:259) and Vetter (1953:332-3, 1956) interpreted neuen : deieuo CIL I ².455 as a dedication to the *dι nouensides*. (For other interpretations, see §18.3.2.) There appears to be no way in which these forms can be explained as ‘lawful exceptions’ to the rule */e/ → */o/, due e.g. to a specific phonological context that prevented the operation of this merger.36 There are therefore four possible solutions: (1) PIE */e*/ survived until the third century in (some dialects of) Latin (Pisani 1943:259; also Wachter 1987:99, 374); (2) *eu* is due to an analogical preservation (Safarewicz (1954:103), who suggested that neuen may have been preserved after decem); (3) *eu* is to be ascribed to an origin different from Proto-Italic */e*/ (Lipp (in Meiser 1998:59), who assumes that *eu* represents /ɛi/; (4) *eu* is due to a secondary development (Steinbauer (in Meiser 1986:37), who ascribed the *eu* to a dissimilation of */o̯*/.

---

36 The fact that in many of the forms quoted here *eu* may reflect /ei/ rather than /e̯i/ (Blümel 1972:30, R. Giacomelli 1978:26-7) cannot constitute a counter-argument, as Proto-Italic */e*/ merged with */o̯*/ also in antevocalic position, cf. e.g. nouus, and nouem and nōnus themselves.
A different solution has been proposed by Schrijver (1991:452), who suggests that */e/ and */o/ merged into a neutral diphthong that could be realized as [eu], [ou], or [ou], and rendered both as ou and as eu.\(^{37}\) I find this a rather sweeping assumption about the vowel system of the Italic languages just to explain three comparatively late forms of one word, but two points might be considered as evidence in its favour: (1) the earliest Etruscan rendering of this diphthong in onomastic borrowings from the Italic languages was av (cf. lauv|cies Etr XXIX), pointing to a central vowel as its first member: the spelling becomes uv only from c.500 onwards (Steinbauer 1999:37-9); (2) podloucei CIL I².2833 (sixth century) and polouces CIL I².548 (between 350 and 250?, cf. Wachter 1987:106-8), both from Greek Πολυθεύκης, may show that Greek eu and Latin ou were still seen as equivalents: cf. the Greek tendency to render Lucius as Λεύκις, although this could also be a ‘learned reconstruction’.\(^{38}\)

There is therefore in my view no compelling evidence that PIE */eu/ was preserved beyond the Proto-Italic period, let alone until the third century. Neuen and neuna, even taken together with the unclear [---]euam (beside iouxmen|ta), the quotations from the Carmen Saliare, and the unexplained Oscan forms, constitute too unreliable a basis for such an assumption in view of the overwhelming evidence in favour of a Proto-Italic merger */eu/ \(\rightarrow */ou/\).

### 3.2.6. Drop of intervocalic /i/ and subsequent contractions.

The loss of intervocalic /i/ and the subsequent contractions of the surrounding vowels lie at the base of the eventual form of the Italic conjugational system and must have been of Proto-Italic date. The developments insofar as they have reflexes in the Faliscan material are:

1st conj.  */-e/- */-æ/- */-/ */-/  
2nd conj.  */-h₁-i/- */-e-i/- */-e/- */-e/-

Faliscan forms that reflect these developments are cupat MF 40 etc. and cupajnt MF 80 etc. (first conjugation, but from */kubh₂-e/- */kubh₂-a/-, see §5.3.1.2-3), and second-conjugation saluete EF 4, saluetod EF 3, salueto EF 4, tenet MLF 361 (if indeed attested), and probably lecet MF 88 (see §5.3.1.11). (In carefo MF 59, care[f]fo MF 60, */-e/- probably reflects */-eh₁/- rather than */-eh₁-i/-, see §5.3.1.1.)

Loss of intervocalic /i/ and subsequent contraction also affected the ending of the third declension nominative plural */-e|es/ */-e|es/ */-e/ symlink="false" link_text="true" />, attested for Faliscan in ef|les MF 113, 115, ef|les MF 117, ef|le MF 114, and perhaps salues EF 3.

\(^{37}\) Thurneysen (1887), whence also Von Planta (1892:115-6), assumed that in some contexts */ou/ developed to */au/ at a Proto-Italic date, but this is rather an attempt to explain instances of /u/ that are now mostly ascribed to a laryngeal origin. Cf. also Rix 1996:158.

\(^{38}\) Pfister (1977:69), pointing to polouces, assumed that the merger of */eu/ with /ou/ took place “sehr frühe”, but so late that it could include early Greek borrowings containing /eu/.
3.2.7. The developments of */t/ r/. The reflexes of the sonantic liquids */t/ r/ are the same in Latin and in the Sabellic languages, and therefore the result of a Proto-Italic development. (The sonantic nasals */m n/ developed slightly differently in both branches, and their development must therefore be post-Proto-Italic: see §3.3.2.) The sonantic liquids developed as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
/t/ & \rightarrow /or/ \text{ (and } /ur/) / \_\text{C} \\
/l/ & \rightarrow /ol/ / \_\text{C} \\
/t/ & \rightarrow /ar/ / \_\text{V} \\
/l/ & \rightarrow /al/ / \_\text{V}
\end{align*}
\]

(Cf. Pfister 1977:44, 46-7, Meiser 1998:63-4 for Latin, and Von Planta 1892:31-5, Meiser 1986:37 for the Sabellic languages). Since these developments are Proto-Italic, the same developments can be assumed for Faliscan. In the Faliscan forms where sonantic liquids can be reconstructed, however, these occur side by side with a laryngeal, which influenced the outcome: PIE */h₁rgntom/ → */argntom/, whence arcente-lom EF 1 (cf. Latin argentum, Oscan aragetud Cm 7 etc.) and */prh₁-mo-/ → */prāmo-/ pramom etc. EF 2 (cf. Latin prandium).

3.2.8. Developments of the voiced aspirates (I): Proto-Italic. The developments of the PIE voiced aspirates, */bh dh gh g/ are probably the most debated and complex subject of Italic phonology. The discussion concerns not so much the general trends and outcomes of these developments, as these are sufficiently clear, but the way in which these developments took place. This discussion is of special relevance for this study, as Faliscan seems to show some unexpected reflexes: an important argument for those who assign to Faliscan a more independent status, either within the Italic languages or within the Latin branch. Recent overviews of the developments can be found in the following publications: for the Italic languages in general, Stuart-Smith 2004; for Latin, Pfister 1977:145-50, Meiser 1998:101-5, and Eichner 1992:73-6; for the Sabellic languages, Meiser 1986:73-8; for Faliscan, Wallace & Joseph 1993. Note that in this section I discuss only the Proto-Italic stages of the development, or rather, I try to establish which stages of the development belonged to the Proto-Italic period, as this is relevant to the question at what stage Faliscan started to develop independently. For the Proto-Latin and Faliscan developments, see §3.3.3 and §3.5.2.

Broadly speaking, the developments of */bh dh gh g/ are as follows:

(1) After a nasal, */bh dh gh g/ lost their aspiration and merged with the corresponding voiced occlusive (Nbh Ndh Ngh Ng/ → */Nb Nd Ng Ng/); the disappearance of the voiced aspirates in this position may have preceded all other developments, although this is not certain (cf. Stuart-Smith 2004:211, Meiser 1998:104).

39 As discussed in §3.2.2, if a separate aspirated palatovelar */g/ is assumed to have existed in PIE at all, it must have merged with the aspirated velar */gh/ during the (early) Proto-Italic period at the latest, as there is no evidence that */gh/ developed in a way different from */g/.
(2) Word-initially, the reflex of */bh dh gʰh/ is represented by *f- in Latin, Faliscan, and in the Sabellic languages: this *f- most likely represents a voiceless labiodental spirant /f/ (or perhaps a voiceless labial spirant /φ/: see §3.3.3).

(3) Word-initially, the reflex of */gʰh/ (as well as of */gʰh/ → */gʰh/) is represented by *h- in Latin, in Faliscan, and in the Sabellic languages: this *h- most likely represents a voiceless glottal spirant /h/ (or perhaps voiceless velar spirant /x/: see §3.3.3).

(4) Word-internally, the reflex of */b h dh gʰh/ is represented by *-f- in the Sabellic languages and in Faliscan: in the Sabellic languages, this *-f- most likely represents a voiced labial spirant //g533/ (or a voiceless spirant realized as /g533/, see below). In Latin, on the other hand, the word-internal reflexes of */b h dh gʰh/ are /b d u/ /b d u/, with /b/ in some environments also appearing as the reflex of */d h gʰh/ (see Meiser 1998:104, Stuart-Smith 2004:41-5).

(5) Word-internally, the reflex of */gʰh/ is represented both in Latin and in the Sabellic languages by *h-: Faliscan apparently had a different development (§3.3.3).

(6) In Latin at least, (*/#gʰR/ →) */#gʰR/ developed to /#gR/ (e.g. glaber ← PIE */gʰh₁₂-dʰ-ro-/s, gramen ← PIE */gʰh₁-(s)-mn/): see Stuart-Smith (2004:152-3). This development is only of indirect relevance to the subject of this study.

These on the whole very similar reflexes point to a development that was at least partly Proto-Italic: on the other hand, the different word-internal reflexes of */b h dh gʰh/ in Latin show that the process cannot have been completed during the Proto-Italic period.

The development, or rather, the series of developments, that has to be assumed is a complex one and requires at least two major stages (cf. Picard 1994, Stuart-Smith 2004:195-224), since from occlusives, these sounds became spirants, and from voiced, they became voiceless at least in word-initial position. The discussion centres on the order in which these developments took place, and on which stages of these developments can be ascribed to the Proto-Italic period and which to the post-Proto-Italic period. Further points that have to be taken into account are how far back the distinction between the initial and the internal developments goes, and when the reflexes of */b h dh gʰh/ merged into one sound represented by *f, a merger that in word-initial position took place in Latin, in Faliscan, and in the Sabellic languages, and in Faliscan and the Sabellic languages also in word-internal position.

The first stage in the development is usually assumed to be the change from voiced aspirated occlusives to spirants, and I see no reason to doubt this, since the Latin word-internal reflexes /b d u/ can be (and usually are) explained by successive Proto-Latin developments. In that case, it seems likely that they changed into voiced spirants */b δ γ ɣh/, if only as an intermediate stage: I greatly doubt whether they could have developed directly into voiceless spirants */φ ɣ x ɣ/ (as was first proposed by Ascoli (1868)).
The Latin word-internal reflexes /bd/ show that the distinction between word-internal */β δ γʰ/ and their reflexes was preserved until the post-Proto-Italic period. It seems likely that the voiced quality of these Latin reflexes is a continuation of the voiced quality inherited from the Proto-Italic reflex, especially as there does not appear to have been a Proto-Latin revoicing to which it can be ascribed.

This is all the more likely as Rix (1957) has shown that there is evidence that the Sabellic word-internal reflex of */bh dh gʰ/ represented by f-, was also voiced. This evidence consists in the first place of the relation between, on the one hand, Greek Σαινιον and Σαινιταί, and Latin Samnium, Sabini, and Sabelli, and on the other hand Paelignian and Samnitic safinim nPg 2, Sa 4, which together point to an original */sάβιν-/. Beside this, there is the variation of Samnitic αλλίβα nSa 1b (alliba ST) vs. allifα nSa 1c, of Oscan alaβατερνοm nCm 3a vs. alaβατερνοm nCm 3e and alaβατερνο nCm 3b-d,f-g, and of Oscan [ʃ]eβαναρυm nSi 2a (or [ʃ]eβαναρυm ST) vs. Latin Veβαναρυm.

To this, Meiser (1986:73-4) added the variation of Oscan μεβίττιο μLu 34 vs. με-βίττιο aLu 15, 33, [με]βίττιο Lu 32, μεβίτει Lu 16, μεβίτει Hi 3, 4, and of σταβλάνο μLu 5 vs. σταβλάτας Cp 24, as well as the fact that in the Pyrgi tablets the name θεβάριει Cr 4.4,4-5 is transcribed in Punic as ﬋eβάριει. Slightly less convincing, in my view, are his comparison of Mevania with Latin Mēfamus and Etruscan mefanatei Co 1.28, mefanate/g793/g286 Co 1.3, and mefanatial Cl 1.1428-1429, and of Scæua to Etruscan scefia Pe 1.630, 1.1211, scefia Pe 1.201 (cf. §7.7.57). The evidence is reviewed by Stuart-Smith (2004:84-91), who likewise decides in favour of -f- representing a voiced phoneme, namely a labial spirant /f/ with a realization [β] in voiced environments (i.e., in inter-vocalic position and adjacent to a liquid).

Taken by themselves, these instances do not prove that this voiced quality of word-internal -f- in the Sabellic languages was inherited from Proto-Italic. However, taken together with the reflexes of Latin, they are strong evidence that the reflexes of */bh dh gʰ/ and, by extension, of */#gʰR/ → */gʰ/, as they were inherited by Proto-Latin and Proto-Sabellic from Proto-Italic were voiced. On this basis, it can safely be assumed that these internal reflexes were voiced spirants */β δ γʰ/ by the end of the Proto-Italic period.

What happened in word-initial position, however, is more of a question. In Latin, Faliscan and the Sabellic languages the reflex of */#b h #d h #gʰ/ is represented by f-, and that of */#gʰ/ by h-. There is no evidence that f- ever represented a voiced phoneme in this position: also, there is no distinction between the reflexes of */#b h #d h #gʰ/ even in Latin. Therefore, at some point during the development of the voiced aspirates, a split between the developments in word-initial and in word-internal position must have occurred. The question is whether this split occurred already during the Proto-Italic stage or independently: since the reflexes in Latin, Faliscan, and the Sabellic languages are the same, the former possibility seems the more likely one.
If the reflexes of */#b/ #d/ #g/ #v/ were still *//#b/ #d/ #γ/ by the end of the Proto-Italic period (as they were in word-internal position), this would mean that the distinction between the word-initial and the word-internal developments, namely the devoicing and the merging of the reflexes of *//#b/ #d/ #γ/ into one sound that could be represented by *f, must be ascribed to independent parallel developments in Proto-Latin and Proto-Sabellic. Alternatively, there may already have been a merger of *//#b/ #d/ #γ/ by the end of the Proto-Italic period (either only *//#γ/ → *//#b/, but perhaps also a merger of *//#b/ and *//#d/), so that only the subsequent devoicing has to be ascribed to independent parallel developments in Proto-Latin and Proto-Sabellic. Although perhaps possible, I find this an uneconomic solution, and do therefore not adopt it. In my view, it is more economic to assume that the *//#b/ #d/ #γ/ were devoiced to */#/ by the end of the Proto-Italic period.

The next question is whether the merger of */#/ was also Proto-Italic. This merger probably had two stages, namely */#/ (a merger made possible by the labial element of labiovelar */#/), followed by */#θ/ (as in the word-internal merger in Proto-Sabellic). There seems to be no arguments either for or against this merger being of Proto-Italic date, although it affects the development of */#/ (observable in Latin, which must have predated it. (This development probably (but not necessarily) predated the Proto-Italic devoicing of */#/ to */#/ : see Stuart-Smith 2004:152-3.) Whether or not */#/ developed further to */f/ already during the Proto-Italic period cannot be ascertained. As the development produced similar reflexes in Latin and in the Sabellic languages, it is more economic to ascribe the entire development to the Proto-Italic period: however, this does require a repetition of the Proto-Italic merger of */#/ by the Proto-Sabellic word-internal merger of *//#. For this reason as well as for reasons of word-initial and word-internal parallelism, I prefer to assume that by the end of the Proto-Italic period the reflexes of */#b/ #d/ #g/ #v/ were word-initial */#/ beside word-internal *//#. The split between the word-initial and word-internal developments of the voiced aspirates caused a morphophonological anomaly in the reduplicative perfect of verbs with a root starting in an original voiced aspirate. Thus, e.g., by the end of the Proto-Italic period the present and the perfect of */#d/ must have been */#ak/- : */#eak-/, regular from a phonological, but irregular from a morphological point of view. Generalization of the word-initial reflex would have given */#ak/- : */#ak-/, preserving the perspicacity of the paradigm, but producing a (then) abnormal word-internal */#/ while generalization of the word-internal reflex would have given an even less appealing */#ak/- : */#ak-/. Meiser (2003:160-1, 178-80) sees this anomaly as the cause of the disappearance of the reduplicative perfect of roots starting in a voiced aspirate, at least in Latin: see §5.3.1.6-7.
In view of the voiceless quality of the reflexes in word-initial position, the question may be asked whether the voiced quality of word-internal */b\*d /g\*dh /g\*gh/g/ is a direct continuation of that of PIE */b\*d /g\*dh /g\*gh/g/ or the result of a Proto-Italic revoicing of an intermediate voiceless reflex (an idea going back to Ascoli 1868, cf. Eichner 1992:73 with n.54). The latter solution would mean that */b\*d /g\*dh /g\*gh/g/ or their reflexes */b\*d /g\*gh/g/ were devoiced in every position, the former, that they were devoiced in word-initial position only. Stuart-Smith (2004:195-224) is in favour of the former solution, noting that for phonetic reasons a devoicing is more likely to have taken place in word-initial position only. This would mean that the Proto-Italic developments of the voiced aspirates can be envisaged as represented in fig.3.3,A.

The latter solution, however, a devoicing in all positions followed by a voiceless stage and a later revoicing in word-internal positions, is invoked to provide an explanation for the development of the cluster */sdh/ e.g. in Latin uastus (← PIE */ueh2sdh\*o-/, for if the reflex of */d/ had remained voiced, the expected outcome would be PIE */ueh2sdh\*o-/ → Proto-Italic */u\*asdh\*o-/ → */\*u\*asdo-/*[\*u\*azdo-] → \*uadus \*uadus). (For a different solution */sdh/ → */st/ → */st/, see Stuart-Smith 2004:42-3.) Also, such a revoicing can be connected with the voicing of intervocalic /s/, which according to some authors (e.g. Meiser 1998:95-6) can be ascribed to the Proto-Italic period (cf. §3.2.9). If this solution is maintained, the Proto-Italic development of the voiced aspirates can be envisaged as represented in fig.3.3,B.

I should stress that for the purposes of this study the exact outcome of the development at the end of the Proto-Italic period is of minor importance from a practical point of view, but of some importance from a theoretical point of view. Assuming that Faliscan is a Latin dialect, the differences between Faliscan and Roman Latin should be traceable exclusively to post-Proto-Italic and preferably to post-Proto-Latin developments. It is therefore important to reconstruct the various stages of the development as exactly as possible.

3.2.9. Proto-Italic voicing of intervocalic /s/? The voicing of intervocalic /s/, i.e., the creation of a positionally conditioned realization [z] for intervocalic /s/, is sometimes assumed to have taken place during the Proto-Italic period. Other than the possibility to link this voicing to a revoicing of (internal or intervocalic) voiceless spirants (see §3.2.8), there appears to no be reason to assume that this voicing was Proto-Italic, however: the fact that both Latin-Faliscan and Umbrian must have had [z] as the first stage of intervocalic rhotacism and that there are Oscan inscriptions where z or ζ is used to represent intervocalic /s/ (§3.5.3) do not require that the realization [z] existed already in the Proto-Italic period. Intervocalic voicing is a widespread and ‘natural’ phenomenon, and may very well have occurred independently in both branches of the Italic languages.
A.  

\[
* /b^h \ d^h \ g^h \ g^h^h/ \\
\downarrow \\
\text{voiced aspirates become voiced spirants} \\
* /b \ d \ g^\prime/ \\
\downarrow \\
\text{initial:} \\
\text{voiced spirants are devoiced} \\
* /\phi \ 0 \ x^\prime/ \\
\downarrow \\
\text{merger of} \ * /\phi \ 0 \ x^\prime/ \\
* /\phi \ x/ \\
\text{internal:} \\
\text{voiced spirants are preserved} \\
* /b \ d \ g^\prime/ \\
\downarrow \\
\text{merger of} \ * /\phi \ 0 \ x^\prime/ \\
* /\phi \ x/ \\
\] 

B.  

\[
* /b^h \ d^h \ g^h \ g^h^h/ \\
\downarrow \\
\text{voiced aspirates become voiced spirants} \\
* /b \ d \ g^\prime/ \\
\downarrow \\
\text{voiced spirants are devoiced} \\
* /\phi \ 0 \ x^\prime/ \\
\downarrow \\
\text{initial:} \\
\text{voiceless spirants are preserved} \\
* /\phi \ 0 \ x^\prime/ \\
\downarrow \\
\text{merger of} \ * /\phi \ 0 \ x^\prime/ \\
* /\phi \ x/ \\
\text{internal:} \\
\text{voiceless spirants are revoiced} \\
* /b \ d \ g^\prime/ \\
\downarrow \\
\text{merger of} \ * /\phi \ 0 \ x^\prime/ \\
* /\phi \ x/ \\
\] 

Fig. 3.3. Two scenarios for the Proto-Italic development of the voiced aspirates.

3.2.10. */p...k/ \rightarrow */k^\prime...k^\prime/\). Another development that can be ascribed to the Proto-Italic period is the assimilation */p...k^\prime/ \rightarrow */k^\prime...k^\prime/. In Faliscan, this development is attested in *CUICTO MLF 310 (and perhaps in *CUITENE MLF 361), reflecting PIE */pnmk^\prime...kmk^\prime/. This development is observable also in Latin (quinque, coquus etc., Meiser 1998:97-8), and must be ascribed to the Proto-Italic period as it is the source of the o-vocalism of Sabellic */pompe/ (e.g. Oscan pomtis TB 14, púmperia(s) C Çp 28 etc., Umbrian pumperias TI IIb.2, and perhaps puntis TI III.4, puentes TI III.9, 10, and, in the onomasticon, in Paelignian ponties Pg 5, Oscan puntii s Po 1, punti e is Cm 28, παμπερίς Me 1, παμπερίς Me 3). In view of Oscan pettiur Sa 17, Umbrian petur- TI Vlb.11 (→ PIE */k^\prime(em) dür/), this vocalism can have developed only between labiovelars (Meiser 1986:41, cf. Untermann 1957a:187).
3.3. Proto-Latin developments

3.3.1. Proto-Latin. Like the concept of Proto-Italic discussed in §3.1.2, the concept of Proto-Latin assumes that there was a chronological stage in the development of the Italic languages during which a set of phonological and morphological developments took place that together set off Latin (in its broadest sense) from the Sabellic languages. Meiser (1998:54) suggests that this stage can be set, broadly, between c.1800 and c.700 BCE, i.e., during the last 1100 years before the earliest texts.

If Faliscan is a Latin dialect, as I assume, it should be expected that Faliscan shared all Proto-Latin developments, as well as the possible outcomes of these developments: where there are differences between Latin and the Sabellic languages, Faliscan should be expected to side with Latin. As said in §1.5, many scholars regard Faliscan as a language close to Latin. In the context of the successive stages of the Italic languages, I can interpret this only as meaning (1) that Faliscan is assumed to have shared some but not all developments of Proto-Latin, and (2) that the developments shared by Latin and Faliscan must be assumed to precede any developments that occur only in Latin or only in Faliscan.

3.3.2. The development of */m η/. As was said in §3.2.7, the developments of the sonantic liquids are the same in Latin and in the Sabellic languages and can therefore be ascribed to Proto-Italic, while the developments of the sonantic nasals are different in both branches and must therefore be ascribed to the post-Proto-Italic period. In Proto-Latin, the development was */m/ → */em/ and */η/ → */en/. In the Sabellic languages on the other hand the development was */η/ → /an/ in initial syllables and */η/ → /en/ elsewhere (Untermann 1957a:188): there are no certain instances of the Sabellic reflexes of */m/.

The Faliscan material shows the Proto-Latin development in initial syllables (1) in Proto-Italic */kθnktos/ (cf. §3.2.10.1) → Proto-Latin /kʰenkʰitos/, attested in cuicto MLF 310 (and perhaps in cuitenet MLF 361?), (2) in Proto-Italic */nð(e)ro-/ → Proto-Latin */enf(e)r/g407(d)/, attested in ifra MF 40, (3) in Proto-Italic */tn-ẽ-/ → Proto-Latin */ten/ LF 361, and (4) in Proto-Italic */knsōr/ → Proto-Latin */kensōr/ → cenjoLtF 231, censo LtF 232, [---]soLtF 232, ce(n)sor (?) LtF 233 (in Faliscan, the word is perhaps a Latin loan, cf. §6.3).

Attestations of the same development in medial and final syllables are (1) Proto-Italic */argntom/ → Proto-Latin */argentom/, whence arcentelom EF 1, and (2) the accusative of the consonantal stems Proto-Italic */-m/ → Proto-Latin */-em/, probably attested in arute MF 269 and larise MF 270, MF 371, 372, which I regard as accusatives in -e(m) used as nominatives in Etruscan-Faliscan languages contacts (see §4.5.3 and §9.2.2.4).
3.3.3. Developments of the voiced aspirates (II): Proto-Latin and Faliscan. As discussed in §3.2.8, I assume that by the end of the Proto-Italic period the reflexes of */bh/ dʰ gʰh/ were */ϕ/ in word-initial position and */β γh/ in word-internal position; the reflex of (*/ghγ/ →) */gh/ was /x/ in word-initial position and /γ/ in word-internal position. These reflexes therefore form the basis of the Proto-Latin and the Proto-Sabellic development.

(1) Development in word-initial position. Both in Proto-Latin and in Proto-Sabellic the labial spirant */#ϕ/ is assumed to have developed into a labiodental spirant /#f/, and the velar spirant */#x/, to have developed into a glottal spirant /#h/, but at what stage this should have happened is unclear. Stuart-Smith (2004:45-8, 59-61) leaves the possibility open that in Latin and Faliscan f- and h- may still have represented /#ϕ/ and /#x/ during the earlier stages at least, and there appears to be no evidence either for or against this assumption.

Since the development in Proto-Latin and Proto-Sabellic shows the same outcome, Faliscan should be assumed to show the same development and have f- and h- in initial position. This is indeed the case, but the picture is obscured by the fact that in Faliscan f- sometimes occurs where */#gʰh/ (or */#gʰ/) is reconstructed, and h-, where */#dʰ/ is reconstructed. This has lead to a number of sometimes very implausible suggestions with regard to the development of the voiced aspirates in Faliscan. In my view, the forms where h- occurs for an expected f- are due to a Middle and Late Faliscan development /#N/ → /#hN/, whereas the forms where f- occurs for an expected h- are hypercorrect forms due to the same development. This is discussed in §3.5.2.

The regular Faliscan development of the original voiced aspirates in word-initial position is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIE</th>
<th>Proto-Latin</th>
<th>Faliscan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*/#bʰ/</td>
<td>*/#ϕ/</td>
<td>/#f/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/bʰHrs/ or */bʰars/</td>
<td>*/ϕars/</td>
<td>possibly <em>fer</em>io Cap 391, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/bʰer-/</td>
<td>*/ϕer-/</td>
<td>f*apar MF 136, *ap MF 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? */ϕar/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/#dʰ/</td>
<td>*/#ϕ/</td>
<td>/#f/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/dʰeigʰ/</td>
<td>*/ϕeigʰ/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/dʰh₂k-/</td>
<td>*/ϕak-/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If this name is connected to the potamonym *Farfarus*, the Latin form of this name, *Fabaris*, shows that the f reflects an earlier */bʰ/ (cf. §6.5.1, §7.8.1.57).
It is not certain that the name Firmius is connected with firmus (cf. §6.3.27).

It is not certain that the name Frenaeus/Frenarius is connected with frenum (§7.8.1. 65, §6.2.29).

The following forms in f- have not been included: (1) the unclear fitaidupes EF 1 and (b) f- in fasies MF 41, felicinate MF 42, fulonia MLF 313, which are of Etruscan origin. Further instances of word-initial f- (and h-) are discussed in §3.5.2.

Slightly more complex is the development of */ghV/ (and */gh/). Word-initially, the expected reflex of these phonemes is h- /#h/, and this is found in:

It is not completely clear whether haruspex is in fact a Faliscan word, since it occurs in a context where Latin influence might already be assumed.

A case where the development is in accordance with the previous examples, but not in accordance with the Latin development, is

Since Herbig (CIE 8079), huti[/]ilom has usually been derived from (the zero-grade of) the root */ghj/ ‘to pour’. If this derivation is correct, Faliscan shows a different reflex from Latin, which has /#f/ in fundo ← */ghj/ and all other derivations from this root. This /#f/ is usually ascribed to a separate development (*/*ghj/ → */xu/40 which assumes that the development of */ghj/ was similar to that of */ghj/. Since there are no other words that go back to */ghj/ → */ghj/, it cannot be checked in how far this development was a ‘regular’ one. I doubt whether, as Stuart-Smith (2004:206) suggests, the Faliscan form can be interpreted as having had the same development as Latin, with a subsequent development /#fV/ → /#hV/: it would then be the earliest attestation of this development, for which see (see §3.5.2).

40 This idea is ascribed to Ernout, but I have not been able to trace it further than the short note in DE p.208 where he discussed the origins of Latin f-.
In word-initial position therefore Faliscan shows the same reflexes as Latin and the Sabellic languages, with the sole exception of *hutif_jilom, if this is indeed connected with */g^h\text{e}u-/ where the development differs from that of Latin.

(1) Development in word-internal position. In word-internal position, the developments of Faliscan and Latin were different. First, the reflexes of */\beta\delta/ normally appear as /b\ d\ u/ with a 'fortition'; on this subject, see Stuart-Smith (2004:203-6). In Faliscan, however, the reflex of */\beta\delta/ is always /f/, as it is in the Sabellic languages, and the Faliscan development will have been similar to the one in Proto-Sabellic (see Meiser 1986:73-8). There is good evidence, however, that the Sabellic reflex was voiced (see §3.2.8), while for Faliscan such evidence would consist entirely of the name *ruvries in Etr XIX = Fa 3.2 as a rendering ofItalic */ru^g\text{e}r-/ ← */ru^\text{d}r-/ (cf. Stuart-Smith 2004:60). In view of the fact that in Latin, word-internal -f- probably represented a voiceless sound (Stuart-Smith 2004:46), I do not think that the voiced or voiceless quality of the Faliscan reflex can be established.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIE</th>
<th>Proto-Latin</th>
<th>Faliscan reflex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*/b^h/</td>
<td>*/\beta/</td>
<td>/f/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/-b^h-/</td>
<td>*/-\beta-/</td>
<td>carefo MF 59, careoyo MF 60, pipapo MF 59, pipapo MF 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The future suffix -f- is an analogical Latin-Faliscan formation after the imperfect suffix */-\beta-/, cf. §5.2.1. The different reflexes in Latin and Faliscan show that its creation must precede the separate developments of */-\beta-/ in Latin and Faliscan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIE</th>
<th>Proto-Latin</th>
<th>Faliscan reflex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*/tib^h^eio-/</td>
<td>*/tiberios/</td>
<td>tif MLF 460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This assumes that tif reflects a name like Latin Tiberius (Faliscan *Tiferios). The Latin counterpart is attested in a Faliscan inscription as tiperilia LF 229.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIE</th>
<th>Proto-Latin</th>
<th>Faliscan reflex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*/d^h/</td>
<td>*/\delta/</td>
<td>/\delta/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/h^eidi^h^b-/</td>
<td>*/a^i\delta/-</td>
<td>efiles MF 113, 115, efile MF 114, eifiles] MF 116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efiles may be a calque on Latin aediles, but is in that case still illustrative of the development, as it represents an adaptation of the Latin form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIE</th>
<th>Proto-Latin</th>
<th>Faliscan reflex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*/h^leudhero-/</td>
<td>*/lou^\deltaero-/</td>
<td>loifirtato MF 31, loifirtato MF 32, ljoifirta MF 41, loferta MF 222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both words, Latin has a reflex \delta due to the Latin development of */\delta/ → /b/ after /u/ (Meiser 1998:104). The connection of rufia with */ru^\text{d}o-/ is not without problems: see §3.7.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIE</th>
<th>Proto-Latin</th>
<th>Faliscan reflex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*/\eta^d(e)ro-/</td>
<td>*/\eta^\text{d}(e)r\text{a}(d)/ (abl.)</td>
<td>ifra MF 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Latin, *infra* is problematic, as the expected form would be †*indra*, not *infra*. Latin *infra* has been explained both by assuming that the word was reanalyzed as a compound */en+ð(e)r/g407(d)/, so that /ð/ would develop as if it were in initial position, and by assuming that the word reflects dialect Latin: see §6.2.37.

In a number of other, mainly onomastic forms, the origin of the *f* is not clear: (a) fragmentary text: *[3-5]uf[1-4]ui[.]m EF 1 (often read after Vetter as *loufir*, *loufom*, or *roufom*), [---]cf[---]qcf[---] MF 107, abbreviated *ef* LtF 205 (ef(iles)? or *effodio*?); (b) of unknown (probably Italic) origin: ofetios EF 4, ofete EF 4, oufilio MF 48, aufilio MF 49, auffilio MF 50, auffilio MF 53, oufilio MF 275, oufilio MF 276, oufilio MLF 348, oufilio MF 470*; ofiti or fofiti MF 58; (c) of Etruscan origin: [---]fate MLF 285 (genitive of a toponymic name in *...fas*), polafio (=polfавio?) MLF 353.

Faliscan therefore has a different reflex than the one usually found in Latin. There is some evidence for the occurrence of *-f-* in Latin as well. The epigraphic evidence consists of *trifos* (or *tribos*, cf. Vine 1998:261) = *tribus* in the fifth-century Garigliano inscription, to which can be added the gloss “*rienes quos nunc uocamus antiqui nefrundines* appellabant quia Graeci *νεφρον* eos uocant” Fest. 341.35-343.1L = “*renes antiqui vocabant nefrundines*, quia Graeci *νεφρον* dicunt” Paul. Fest. 342.13-14L and the few words in the Latin vocabulary with *-f-* such as *af*, *bufo*, *furfur* (?), *rufus*, *scræfa*, and *uafer*. These words are often ascribed to ‘dialect influence’, although to which dialect in particular is hardly ever made clear: it is very well possible that they were borrowed from a Sabellian language (thus e.g. Coleman 1990).

On the basis of this evidence, the development of word-internal */β/ δ γν/ appears to be the most crucial phonological difference between Latin and Faliscan. The Faliscan development appears to have been very similar to the Proto-Sabellic one (see above): the voiced labiovelar spirant */β/ and the voiced dental spirant */ð/ merged with the bilabial spirant */β/; this bilabial spirant */β/* then may have developed into a labiodental spirant that was probably voiceless, /f/. I can see no evidence that there were any other dialects within the Latin group that shared this development: in Latin, the spirants underwent a ‘fortition’, */β/* and */ð/* merging with the corresponding occlusives /b/ and /d/, and */ŋ/* with /ŋ/.

There appears to be no way to date these different developments apart from the fact that they must have preceded the earliest epigraphic texts, where the reflexes of both developments are already present. If this difference in development is comparatively recent, it might point to a period where Faliscan was isolated from the rest of the Latin-speaking area, perhaps by the spread of Etruscan (cf. §2.4.2).

---

Note that such a re-analysis would appear to be possible only at a stage when the word-internal and word-initial reflexes of the voiced aspirates where still similar, i.e., at the latest at the Proto-Italic stage when word-initial */β/* corresponded to word-internal */ð/*.
The Faliscan development of */gʰ/ → */gʰ/ shows even more surprising reflexes. Whereas in Latin and in the Sabellic languages */gʰ/ → */gʰ/ developed to a spirant that could be represented by h (in Latin probably /h/, in the Sabellic languages perhaps voiced [γ]), the Faliscan reflex appears to be /g/:

PIE | Proto-Latin | Faliscan reflexes
---|---|---
(? */gʰ/ → */gʰ/) | */γl/ | 
*/dʰeigʰ-/ | */fɛiγ-/ | fifiked EF 9. f[f]iqod EF 1

The use of k and q points (at least at first sight) to an occlusive, /g /. This /g / can be explained through analogy with the present */dʰeigʰ-/ → Proto-Latin *//fing-/, where */g/ was the regular development of */gʰ/ after a nasal (§3.2.8). The use of k and q is therefore not necessarily a ground to regard fifiked and f[f]iqod as perfects of */dʰeigʰ-/, as the original form, which would have developed to */fʰiglos/ and thence, with anaptyxis, to */fʰig°los/. Figura and effigies have likewise been explained through analogy (see EDL s.v. fingo).

Here, too the evidence points to a reflex /g/. The verb is not attested elsewhere: Latin only preserve the related nouns lectus and lectica, and South Picene veia|t MC.1 represents a different formation */le/g534-|g2951-|g407-t/. Explaining /g/ by analogy seems to be impossible in this case: there does not appear to be any model for it. In Meiser’s view (2003:68 n.118) lecet still represents /leγt/: note that if in Middle Faliscan c could still represent /γl/, then it is logical to assume that Early Faliscan k in fifiked EF 9 and q in f[f]iqod EF 1 likewise represented /γl/. Yet I very much doubt whether this is feasible for an inscription dating from the late fourth or early third century at the earliest.

On the basis of these forms, G. Giacomelli (1963:125) assumed that PIE intervocalic */gʰ/ → */gʰ/ developed in Faliscan into /g/. The same conclusion is drawn by Stuart-Smith (2004:58, 62, 63-4) with barely a comment apart from noting that Faliscan is unique among the Italic languages in showing this reflex. I cannot convince myself that this is the right solution. Within ‘regular’ Latin, a development of word-internal */γl/ → /g/ would be understandable: it would be a ‘fortition’ like the one in the word-internal development of */b ɗ/ to /b d/. However, in Faliscan, word-internal */b ɗ/ did not develop into /b d/ but into /f/ (there is no instance of the reflex of word-internal */γl/), which would make a development */γl/ → /g/ even more irregular. Since fifiked and f[f]iqod can be explained by a very plausible analogy, this leaves only lecet as evidence: I find this a very narrow basis on which to assume a development that not only runs counter to the developments within Faliscan itself, but has no parallel in any of the Italic languages either.
An unexplained instance of word-internal \( h \) is the gentilicium *marhio* LF 336. This is in all probability an onomastic borrowing (G. Giacomelli 1963:204, Stuart-Smith 2004:58), cf. Campano-Etruscan *mar-hi-e-s* Cm 6.1 and Oscan *marahis* Cm 14.C6, *μαραχύς* Lu 2 etc.

### 3.3.4. Other possibly Proto-Latin developments

The following developments cannot be dated with certainty but may have taken place before the earliest inscriptions:

1. **/e/ → /o/ before velar /l/**. In Latin, /e/ regularly developed to /o/ before a velar /l/ (Pfister 1977:56, Meiser 1998:82). An example of this is the frequent Faliscan name *Volta* and its derivations (see §7.7.1.84-85), from Etruscan *Velte/*Velde. Early Faliscan *uol(l)tenosio* (or *uo(l)tenosio*) and *voldene* EF 3 show that this process was already under way by the time of the earliest inscriptions. On the other hand, *ueltr* MF 266, MLF 339 has an *e*, suggesting that this was a recent onomastic borrowing, or that the name was kept in its Etruscan form. In Latin, the /o/ developed further to /u/, but this is not observable in Faliscan: *Volta* still occurs as *uoltai* in LF/Lat 214 (probably c.150) and in the abbreviation *uo* Lat 251 (late second century). In *felicinate* MF 42, Faliscan reflects Etruscan *Felicinat-* , while Latin *Fulginas* and *Fulginiae/Fulginium* reflect the development /el.C/ → /ol.C/ → /ul.C/.

2. **/*ri*/ → /*i*/ → /er/ between dentals**. In Latin, /ri/ between dentals (in effect, in between /t/ and /s n/) developed to a secondary /*i*/ and thence to /er/ (Pfister 1977:57-8, Meiser 1998:80), cf. *tertius* as the reflex of PIE/Proto-Italic */tri-t(i)jo-/. The development may be attested for Faliscan in the name *Tertineius* (tertinei MLF/Cap 474*, tertineo LF 213), if this is connected with the ordinal. The development did not take place in the Sabellic languages, cf. Oscan *tristaamentud* Po 3 vs. Latin *testamentum* (← /*terstāmentom*/ ← Proto-Italic /*tristāmentom*/), and *trstus* (= *tristus*) Cm 14 vs. Latin *testis* (← /*terstas*/ ← Proto-Italian /*tristas*/).

3. **reduction of consonant groups**. Note the developments of the following consonant groups:

   - */nts#/ → /ns#/ in *aruz* MF 257. *Aruz* in all probability represents /arruns/ rather than /arrunts/, the name having been adapted to Faliscan morphology (cf. §9.2.2.1). If so, the name shows the Latin development of */nts#: in Umbrian, the cluster developed into /*f#*/ via */nss#/ (Meiser 1986:98-100).
   - */rs#/ → */rr#/ in *far* EF 1, as in Latin (Meiser 1998:116), and in the Sabellic languages (Umbrian *far TI* Vb.10, 15, Oscan *far* Cp 37).
   - */nkt/ → /nxt/? In Latin, the /k/ in this group may well have been reduced to /x/, as is shown by the frequency of *quintus/Quintus* (although *Quinctius* regularly keeps its c in the inscriptions in *CIL I²*). Faliscan, however, shows *cuicto* MF 310 (and *cuitene* MLF 361?), with omission of n: see §3.5.7a.
In view of Latin *cella* and Oscan *kellaked* Sa 10, 11, Faliscan * cela* MF 12, 83, 84, MLF 285 will have had /ll/, which is unexplained (cf. EDL s.v. for suggestions); for the *ll* in *putellio* see also §3.5.5.3.

### 3.4. The Faliscan phonemic system

The developments described in the preceding sections, which all precede the Early Faliscan inscriptions, resulted in a phonemic system as represented in fig.3.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vowels</th>
<th>/a/ /e/ /ɪ/ /o/ /u/</th>
<th>/ɑ/ /ɛ/ /ɪ/ /ɔ/ /ʊ/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘semivowels’</td>
<td>/ɣ/ /ɣ̞/</td>
<td>resonants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasal</td>
<td></td>
<td>coronal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/m/ /n/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/l/ /r/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fricatives</td>
<td>/s/</td>
<td>sibilants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirants</td>
<td>/ф/ /h̞/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labio-velar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occlusives</td>
<td>voiceless</td>
<td>/p/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced</td>
<td></td>
<td>/t/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/k/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/kʲ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/g/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/gʲ/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                   | a) Very rare, see §3.6.1. – b) Not attested.

**Fig. 3.4. The phonemic inventory of Early Faliscan.**

This system as a whole does not differ greatly from that of Latin (cf. Meiser 1998:52): the main difference from that of the Sabellic languages is the preservation of the labiovelar series, which in the Sabellic languages had merged with the labial series at the Proto-Sabellic stage (see Meiser 1986:79-92), and the structure of the vowel system, which in the Sabellic languages had undergone some major changes at the Proto-Sabellic stage (the ‘Proto-Sabellic vowel shift’, see Meiser 1986:39-54).
The phonemic differences between Faliscan and Latin lie mainly in the phonotactics, notably the occurrence of word-internal /f/ (§3.3.3). There may also have been phonetic differences in the realizations of some of the phonemes (see §3.5.1 and §3.6.1).

The system presented here underwent changes during the Middle Faliscan period in the vowels due to the monophthongization of the diphthongs (§3.6.1, §3.7).

3.5. The Faliscan consonants

3.5.1. The consonant system of Faliscan. After the changes brought about by the disappearance of the voiced aspirates and their subsequent changes to a labiodental spirant /f/ and a glottal spirant /h/, the consonant system of Faliscan must have been as represented above in fig.3.4. A few remarks with regard to individual consonants:

(a) Most consonants directly continue the corresponding consonants of PIE and Proto-Italic. The exceptions are, of course, /f/ from PIE */bh dh g/ (and */gh/), cf. §3.3.3.

(b) The Faliscan alphabet has no /b/ (§11.2.3-4) and /b/ must in fact have been one of the rarest phonemes in Faliscan. As PIE */bh dh g/ became /f/ in Faliscan (§3.3.2), Faliscan /b/ can only reflect PIE */b/ (which was itself very rare), as in cupat MF 40 etc. (← PIE */kubh2-/* or */kubh2-/) and probably in pipafo MF 59, ›pi ›p ›afo MF 60 (← PIE */pi-bh3-/* ← */pi-ph3-/*), or, in the onomasticon, a /b/ in (onomastic) borrowing, as in batio MLF/LtF 359 and blaisis Sab 468*, or a /b/ that was due to secondary developments, as in /g11/g312 PIE */d/ (cf. 3.5.6.2).

(c) The only labiovelar that is attested for Faliscan is /klu/, spelled as cu (§11.2.4.2), occurring (1) in -cue MF 80, -cœx MF 158, -cœx MF 170, -cœx MLF 313 = Latin -que, (2) in cuitco MLF 310 (and perhaps cuiinet MLF 361) = Latin Quinctus, and (3) in cuystod LF 242, cœstod LF 243, cœstod LF 245, cœstod LF 247 (perhaps a borrowing from Latin) = Latin quaestor: another instance, (4) cua MF? 129 = Latin quartus etc., is very doubtful (§6.3.63). Cu also occurs in the Etruscan name θανακιIL MF 49, tanacu[il] MF 101, tanacu[il] MLF 347. There is no Faliscan reflex of */g/; the aspirated labiovelar */g/ may be reflected in frenaios MF 471* (see §3.3.3.1). In spite of this, it is quite clear that Faliscan preserved the labiovelars, as opposed to the Sabellic languages, where the labiovelars merged with the labials */k g/ → */p b/.

(d) The realization of the consonantal phonemes can in many cases not be ascertained. I have assumed here that /f/ was realized as voiceless labiodental spirant, as in Latin (§3.5.8, §3.3.3). The /h/ may have been realized quite strongly, not as the weak Hauchlaut of Latin, since there are no Faliscan instances of omission of h- (§3.5.2).
Syllable-final nasals were often omitted in writing (§3.5.7a), indicating that they were realized as a nasalization of the preceding vowel (/Vn/ [Ṽ])/; similarly, /k/ was sometimes omitted in syllable-final position before a dental (§3.5.7c), which might point to a realization [x] in this position. The fairly frequent omission of /t/ and /d/ in word-final position (§3.5.7c) might point to a realization as a weak dental or alveolar tap [ɾ] in this position: the same may be true of /r/ in word-final position (§3.5.7b). Word-final /s/ is omitted in writing virtually everywhere, and may have been realized as a weak glottal sound, [h] or [h̥] (§3.5.7d).

3.5.2. The Middle Faliscan development /#fV/ → /#hV/. As mentioned in §3.3.3, Faliscan has several forms that do not show the regular reflexes of the voiced aspirates, but instead show f- where h- would be expected, or, conversely, h- where f- would be expected. This has been the subject of a number of discussions, especially as the Latin grammarians quote similar forms (see below), which suggests that this variation was not limited to Faliscan. A good summary of the difficulties involved is given by Wallace & Joseph (1991). Basically, four solutions have been proposed:

(1) separate development of Faliscan and rural Latin.42 Campanile (1961:3-9) rather vaguely regarded the f-/h- variation as an illustration of the differences between urban and rural Latin: his list shows that he equated the etymologically unexpected forms with rural Latin. More explicit is R. Giacomelli (1978:9-22, later (2006:99) abandoning the idea), who assumed a development whereby in rural Latin */#b h #d h/ developed into a sound represented by h-, while */#gh/ (and */#g h/, §3.2.1) developed into a sound represented by f-, i.e., the opposite situation of the one in Roman Latin. The confusion found in the Faliscan material (and presumably also in the forms quoted by the Latin grammarians) could then be interpreted as switching between informal and formal language. Although I agree that a geolinguistic distinction may be involved, which from a Roman point of view may have been regarded as a distinction between formal/informal language, this assumes that Faliscan was an ‘informal Latin’, which from the point of the Faliscans it clearly was not: furthermore, there appears to be no reason for a Faliscan to switch between an urban Roman and a local style before the war of 241 (§9.4). Wallace & Joseph (1991:88-9) point out that, if this variation is ascribed to an early different development of Faliscan, the Early Faliscan material would be expected to show this development, which in fact it does not (see §3.3.3).
(2) phonetic (?) confusion. Hiersche (1965) suggested that the variation was in fact due to a phonetic confusion between a voiceless bilabial spirant (\([g]\)) represented by \(f\)- and a voiceless velar spirant (\([x]\)) represented by \(h\)-. It is very questionable whether these were in fact the sounds represented by \(f\)- and \(h\)- in Middle Faliscan (Stuart-Smith 2004:60-1), and Hiersche’s arguments are not convincing. A similar suggestion was made by Stolte (1926:42).

(3) merger. Untermann (1964:178) suggested that the sounds represented by \(f\)- and \(h\)- merged, but did not elaborate this suggestion. It is apparently also the solution proposed by Wachter (1987:504-6), who assumes that both developed into “einen gerundeten Hauchlaut” (1987:505). This, too, had been suggested by Stolte (1926:42). It comes in fact close to the Hiersche’s idea, the difference being that the merger would operate on the phonemic level, and Hiersche’s confusion on the phonetic level.

(4) influence from Etruscan. G. Giacomelli (1963:126, 1978:515), Pfiffig (1969:44), Pisani (1978:45), and R. Giacomelli (1979:153) assumed that the Faliscan variation was due to a development /#fV/ → /#hV/ that is attested for Etruscan. This seems to be impossible, however: the attestations of the Etruscan variation \(f/-h\)- (including at least one hypercorrect form, \(ferclite\) Cl 1.835 = ‘\(H\)ρακλέεμεξς’) show that this variation was limited to the north and north-east of the Etruscan-speaking area, and occurred only from the third century onwards, later than the development started in Faliscan (cf. Rix 1984:221, Steinbauer 1999:63). The Etruscan inscriptions from the agri Faliscus and Capenas in fact show no trace of this variation, which would be expected if there were some connection between the Faliscan and the Etruscan developments. Note that this solution assumes an Etruscan influence that is close to Pisani’s Italic Sprachbund (cf. §1.3.2.1), for which I can see no evidence in Faliscan (§9.2.2).

By far the most satisfying solution is the one proposed by Wallace & Joseph (1991) and defended by Joseph & Wallace (1993), namely a development /#fV/ → /#hV/ that took place from the fourth century onward (the first instance that can be linked to this development is late fourth-century \(foied\) MF 59-60). As they note, such a development is ‘natural’, and quite common, occurring for instance in Spanish (\(ferrum → hierro, filius → hijo\), and, as said above, in Etruscan.

Such a development would lead to \(f\)- representing [h], an etymologically justified but phonetically anomalous spelling. The forms where \(h\)- occurs instead of an etymologically justified \(f\)- (ultimately going back to PIE */b\(\text{h}\) d\(\text{h}\) g\(\text{uh}\)/) would then be a ‘phonetic’ spelling. This ‘\(h\)- for \(f\)’ is in effect attested with certainty only in \(hileo\) MF 146 beside \(fileo\) MF 470*, \(filea\) MF 14 (and the abbreviated instances, all of which have \(f\)-: see §6.3.24-25). The forms with \(f\)- instead of an etymologically justified \(h\)- (ultimately going back to */g\(\text{h}\)/ or */g\(\text{h}\)/), would then be hypercorrect. This ‘\(h\)- for \(f\)’ is attested in \(fe\) MF 56, \(fe\) 305 beside \(hec\) MF 88, 95, 146, 158, LF 223, \(he\) MF 150, \(he\) LF 220, 221, 224. Another instance, where the form with the regular \(h\)- is not attested,
but which is derived from the same root as *hec*, is foied MF 59-60, corresponding to Latin *hodie*. Note that in both cases the etymologically correct form is better attested than the ‘unexpected’ form, indicating that the etymologically correct spelling was in fact ‘regular’ and the other ‘irregular’ (or, in the case of *f*– for *h*–, ‘wrong’ from an etymological point of view).

Beside these lexical forms, there are a number of onomastic instances with *f*–/h– variation where it cannot be established whether this variation represents ‘regular *f*– and secondary *h*–’ or ‘regular *h*– and hypercorrect *f*–’. Thus, there is firmio MF 54 and firmia 302 beside hiermia MF 18, hiermēo MF 19, hirmio MF 213. This name has been connected to the adjective firmus (Proto-Latin */hēmero-/ ← PIE */dʰerme-/): if this is the case, the forms with *f*– are regular and those with *h*– secondary. On the other hand, the name has also been connected with Etruscan Hermena (cf. hermana MF/Etr 264) in which case the *h*– may be regular and the *f*– hypercorrect.

Another instance is the name Folcosius/Holcosius, in the forms fulceo LF 329, folcozeo LF 330, folcuso LF 331 and folcosio LF 333 beside holc[osi] LF 140 and the unclear *olcuzeo LF 332. In this case, neither Folcosius nor Holcosius is attested elsewhere: the closest parallel is Latin Holconius.

Other onomastic forms with *h*– that may be illustrative of this development are hadenia MLF 360 (connected to Fadenius?), hap MF? 46 (an abbreviated form of Fabius?), ha[bi] MF 13 (connected to Fadius?), hescuna MLF 346 (connected to the toponym Fescennium?), and perhaps also hac****na MF 89.

The phonological development as described above is limited to word-initial antevo-calic position, but there are two hypercorrect instances where *h* is written for *f* in other positions, namely hlaulea LtF 325 = Latin Flauilia, and perhaps also in ohi*[---] LtF 300, if this is the praenomen Aufilus/Oufilus. Both these instances are probably erroneous extensions of the custom of writing *h* for *f* to positions where this was not due to a regular development: both instances are from Latino-Faliscan texts written in the Latin alphabet, perhaps by people not well acquainted with the rules of Faliscan orthography.

The only point on which I do not entirely agree with Wallace & Joseph is their explanation of how it was possible for the variation to occur: they assume that the variation reflects dialectal variants within Faliscan. Although possible, I do not altogether relish this idea. In my view, it may well be possible to ascribe the distribution of the two variants to the influence of the written form, where the spelling with *f*– was maintained even though the realization had changed from [f] to [h]: I already mentioned the fact that the etymologically correct forms outnumber the other forms. The spelling might further be influenced by the fact that the words always occur within well-established formulas (filius/filia in the formula of filiation, and *hec* in the formula *hec cupat/cupant*), which may further have influenced the spelling.
CHAPTER 3

There is some evidence for the same variation in Latin. The Praenestine inscriptions have \textit{f-} for \textit{h-} in \textit{foratia CIL I}².166, and, in Greek names, in \textit{felena CIL I}².1446 = \textit{Heliod(orus)}, and probably \textit{fercle CIL I}².564 (if to be read thus) = \textit{Hercules}. The Latin grammarians, too, mention a variation between \textit{f-} and \textit{h-}:

“nos non tam propter illas causas quas supra proposuimus (harenam dicimus), quam propter originem uocis, siquidem, ut testis est Varro, a Sabinis \textit{fasena} dicitur, et sicut \textit{s} familiariter in \textit{r} transit, \textit{f} in uicinam aspirationem mutatur. similiter ergo \textit{et haedos} dicimus cum aspiratione, quoniam \textit{faedi} dicebantur apud antiquos; \textit{item hircos}, quoniam eosdem aeque \textit{fircos} uocabant. nam et e contrario quam antiqui \textit{habam} dicebant nos \textit{fabam} dicimus” (Velius Longus \textit{CGL} 7.69.6-10)


“IRCUS quod Sabini \textit{fircus}; quod illic \textit{fedus}, in Latio \textit{rude} \textit{hedus}: qui in urbe, ut in multis a addito \textit{haedus}” (Varro \textit{L} 5.79)

“Faliscos Halaesus condidit: hi autem immutato \textit{h} in \textit{f} Falisci dicti sunt, sicut \textit{febris} dicebatur, \textit{Formiae} quae \textit{Hormiae} fuerunt, \textit{αντὶ τῆς λέξιν: nam postertas in multis nominibus \textit{f} pro \textit{h} posuit” (Serv. \textit{in} \textit{Verg. A. 7.695}), cf. “unferat Atridae fatis agitatus Halaesus, a quo se dictam terra Falisca putat” (Ov. \textit{Fast.} 4.73-4); “oppidum \textit{Formiae}, \textit{Hormiae} dictum, ut existimauere, antiqua Laestrygonum sedes” (Plin. \textit{NH} 3.59), and “\textit{Formium} oppidum appellatur ex Graeco, uelut \textit{Hormiae}, quod circa id crebrae stationes tutaeque erant, unde proficiscabantur nauigaturi.” (Paul. \textit{Fest.} 73.19-22L)

“\textit{faedum} antiqui dicebant pro \textit{haedo}, \textit{futilus} pro \textit{holere}, \textit{fostim} pro \textit{hoste}, \textit{fostiam} pro \textit{hostia}.” (Paul. \textit{Fest.} 74.9-10L)

“\textit{horreum} antiqui \textit{farreum} dicebant a \textit{farre}.” (Paul. \textit{Fest.} 91.6L)

“\textit{horctum} et \textit{forctum} pro \textit{bono} dicebant.” (Paul. \textit{Fest.} 91.14L); “\textit{forctes}, frugi et bonus, siue ualidus” (Paul. \textit{Fest.} 74.14L)

“\textit{Fordicidis} boves \textit{fordae}, id est grauidae, immolabantur, dictae a fetu.” (Paul. \textit{Fest.} 74.1-2L), vs. “\textit{horda} praegnans, unde dies, quo grauidae hostiae immolabantur, \textit{Hordicidia}.” (Paul. \textit{Fest.} 91.17-8L)

“\textit{hanula} parua delubra, quasi \textit{fanula}.” (Paul. \textit{Fest.} 91.25L)

In my view, this material is of some interest as a possible illustration of the development described above, but not of much practical use. The linguistic context in which these forms were found by the authors is unknown, and the attributions to the \textit{antiqui}, the Sabines, or the Faliscans, appear to be quite arbitrary. At best, it looks as if the grammarians and glossographers were aware of a (chronological and/or geographical?) variation between \textit{f-} and \textit{h-} within their Latin sources, and simply ascribed the variant that was not the usual one in Roman Latin to an (unspecified) older stage of Latin, or to dialects on its margin. Note, for instance, that where they describe this variation as a chronological development, Velius Longus, Terentius Scaurus, and Festus regard \textit{f-} as the older stage (although Terentianus also notes that the reverse is true in the case of \textit{haba}), while Servius clearly regards \textit{h-} as older, even stating that “pos-
teritas in multis nominibus *f pro *h posuit*: a difference that is clearly due to the fact that Velius, Terentianus Scaurus, and Festus try to explain forms with a non-standard *f*, while Servius tries to explain a non-standard *h*. It also explains why the Faliscans can be credited on the one hand with *haba* instead of *faba* (Terentianus Scaurus) but on the other hand are said to have derived *Faliscus* from *Halaesus* (Servius, Ovid).

Interestingly, in the cases where this can be established, the grammarians’ ‘standard form’ appears to be the etymologically correct one: in *fordus* and *for(c)tis*, the *f* goes back to */#b^h/*, while in *haedus, hariolus, holus*, and *hostis*, and perhaps also in *hircus* and *hostia*, *h* goes back to */#g^h/ or */#g^h/; *faba* may be an old borrowing (Proto-Italic */f∅a/, *EDL* s.v.). If due to a (dialectal) development */#fV//g314 /#hV/, *haba, hordus, horctus* would directly reflect this development, while *faedus, fariolus, fircus, folus, fostis*, and *fostia* would be hypercorrect. In none of these cases did the form that resulted from the development become standardized in Roman Latin, and they were therefore in effect ‘irregular’. The etymologies of *Formiae* and *harena* are unknown or unclear: *horreum* and *farreum* are unrelated, but show that a variation *f-/h-* was sufficiently well-known to allow Festus to use it as an ‘etymology’.

This material indicates that the development was not limited to Faliscan, but occurred in other Latin dialects as well, since it would hardly be feasible that all these forms were in some way derived from Faliscan sources. The fact that the Faliscans are singled out at all as a dialect in which the grammarians detected this variation may simply be due to the fact that in the case of the Faliscans the variation was better known, as it affected the names of the people itself (note the connection made between *Falisci* and *Halaesus*) and of their two main towns, *Falerii* and *Fescennium*.

### 3.5.3. Rhotacism and allophones of /s/.

Word-internal rhotacism took place in Latin somewhere before the end of the fourth century (Pfister 1977:145-7, Meiser 1998:95-6). In the Sabellic languages, word-internal rhotacism took place only in Umbrian, probably at the same time as in Latin (Meiser 1986:240-1). In a few southern Oscan inscriptions, intervocalic /s/ is rendered by *z*: the *Tabula Bantina* has *angetuzet, cen-sazet, egmazum, eizac, eizasc, eizazumc, eizeic, eizeis, eizc*), *eizuc, eizeis, eiz/g833[i]s, eizoic, eizuc, ezum*;

beside this, there is *eiz/dom* Lu 5, *#enzei* Lu 31 The first stage, voicing of intervocalic /s/ to [z], may go back to the Proto-Italic stage (§3.2.9).

If word-internal rhotacism took place in Faliscan at the same time as it did in Latin, Early Faliscan should be expected to show an unrhotacized /s/, but there are unfortunately no attestations of /s/ that do not remain unrhotacized later. (kaisiosio EF 7) or do not appear in post-rhotacism (the ending -*osio in kaisiosio EF 7 and aịmiosio EF 467*). In Middle and Late Faliscan, rhotacism might be expected, but the only

---

43 An exception might be *hilum* (cf. also *ni-hil*), if this is identical with *filum* (probably from Proto-Italic */fi(s)lom/ ← PIE */g^h(s)lom/ (*EDL* s.v. *filum*).
form that can be connected to rhotacism is carefo MF 59, care[f]o MF 60, probably from Proto-Italic */kas-/ ← PIE */kh₂s-/.

Since these attestations are from the late fourth century, it can on this basis be assumed that intervocalic rhotacism took place before that date in Faliscan, as it did in Latin.

This view has been attacked by Bonfante (1966), who assumed that Faliscan shows voicing of intervocalic /s/ to [z], but not a fully rhotacized /r/, regarding carefo as a calque on Latin carebo. This is largely based on the observation by Sittig (1932) and Belardi (1964) that the form of the r in carefo MF 59 and care[f]o MF 60, r, is not only different from the other r in these inscriptions (f), but unique and designed especially with the aim of representing [z]. Even apart from the general unlikelihood that a special sign would be developed to denote a positional variant of /s/ where the lettre morte z might have been used, this statement is erroneous: the shape of r occurs also e.g. in MF 101, where it is in fact used for a, r, just as the other type of r, r, could be (see §11.2.4.2). Unfortunately, this erroneous statement has been repeated by several authors, even R. Giacomelli (1978:44) and Stuart-Smith (2004:63 with n. 67).

The Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions also show a number of forms with an un-rhotacised s. In several other instances, s represents /ss/, as in keset LF 242 kese[f]t LF 243 = /gessët/, and probably in the names fasies MF 41 (cf. Latin Fassius), ruso MLF 318 (cf. Latin Russo), and perhaps in mesio MF 148 (cf. Latin Messius). Larise MF 270 represents the Etruscan name laris, either with an epenthetic [e] or used as the basis for an accusative larise(m), see §9.2.2. In the verbal form esi(m) Cap 389, 404, 465, the /s/ is preserved by analogy with the rest of the paradigm.

In several onomastic instances, the spelling s may indicate that the name was a recent onomastic borrowing, or it may have been preserved simply because it was the traditional way of spelling the name: note that for most Faliscan instances there is usually an unrhrotacized parallel from the Latin onomasticon. The spelling s is in fact standard in the name Caesius and its derivations (as it is in its Latin counterpart Kaeso), caisioi MF 20 etc. and cesie MF 257, cesies MF 265 (for all derivations, see §7.7.1.18 and §7.8.1.33). Other instances are uisi MF 82 (Latin Visinius), mesio MF 148 (if reflecting Maesius), folcuso LF 331, folcosio LF 333 (see below), and nomesina MF 272, MLF/Etr 289, numesio LtF 377, [.]osena MLF 206.

Already from the Early Faliscan period onward, there are instances where z is used instead of s. This usage has been discussed by Bonfante (1966), R. Giacomelli (1978:32-43), and Wachter (1987:43-50), while Van Heems (2002) discusses a very similar variation in the Etruscan inscriptions from Volsinii. Basically, there are three possibilities: (1) z is a lettre morte within the Faliscan alphabet that can be used indiscriminately instead of s; (2) z denotes one specific realization of /s/ and therefore represents the same phonetic value in every instance, and (3) z can denote various realization of /s/ and may therefore represent various phonetic values, depending on
the context. If \( z \) represents a realization of /s/ different from [s], the only ones that can be considered are [\( s \)] and [\( z \)], as appears from the values of \( z \) in the other languages of ancient Italy. The instances are the following:

(a) Word-initial: lexical or semi-lexical: \textit{zextos} EF 1 and \textit{zextoi} LF 330; \textit{zot} MLF 285; \textit{zenatu} LF/Lat 214; onomastical: \textit{zaconi} MF 153 and \textit{zaconi}ai MF 154; \textit{zuconia} MF 271 and perhaps \textit{zu[con]}eo MF 56; \textit{zeruatronia} MF 272; \textit{zertenea} LF 221. The idea that \( z \)- may have represented [\( s \)] is difficult: there are no other signs of affricates in Faliscan or Latin, and as a phonetic tendency such a ‘strengthening’ of /\#sV/ would be in contrast with the ‘weakening’ of /\#fV/ to /\#hV/ (§3.5.2). Bonfante (1966) suggested that \( z \) represented [\( z \)], attributing the instances in word-initial position to a voicing of /\#sV/ in \textit{sandhi} /\#sV/. This can apply only to the cases of \textit{mama zextos} EF 1, \textit{poplia} /\textit{zuconia} MF 271, \textit{lete zot} MLF 285; \textit{zertenea} LF 221, and \textit{de} | \textit{zenatu} LF/Lat 214; in the case of \textit{folcozeo} | \textit{zextoi} LF 330, it is possible only if it is assumed that in Faliscan /\#s#| was reduced completely to zero (which I do not, see §3.5.7d). For the cases where a \textit{sandhi} is impossible, namely \textit{uel zu[con]}eo MF 56, \textit{folcozeo} | \textit{zextoi} LF 330, and \textit{cauio} : \textit{nomes} | \textit{ina} : \textit{maxomo} | \textit{zeruatronia} MF 272 (where there must have been a ‘pause’ between the two names, ‘Gavius Nomesina Maxumus; Servatronia’), an analogical spread of either the realization [\( z \)] or of the spelling \( z- \) has to be assumed.44 (Van Heems (2006) notes the same problem in the Etruscan inscriptions from Volsinii.). It is possible that in some of the cases of \( z- \), it can be ascribed to Etruscan influence: note that in the cases of \textit{zuconia} MF 271, \textit{zu[con]}eo MF 56, and \textit{zertenea} LF 221 the \( z- \) is also found in the Etruscan form of the name (\textit{Zuw-}, \textit{Zertn-}).

(b) Word-internal: only onomastical: \textit{fulczeo} LF 329, \textit{folcozeo} LF 330, and \textit{*olczeo} LF 332 vs. \textit{folcuso} LF 331 and \textit{folcosio} LF 333. In these instances, it is not unreasonable to assume that \( -z- \) represents [\( z \)], as Bonfante (1966) proposed. After rhotacism, intervocalic /s/ in onomastic borrowings from a non-rhotacist language such as Etruscan may well have been realized as [\( z \)].

(c) Word-final: \textit{aruz} MF 257, \textit{morenez} MF 269, and perhaps \textit{acr\#z} MF/Etr 67. In \textit{aruz}, \( -z \) could potentially represent /-ts#/, with \textit{aruz} representing /arrunts/, but in view of the fact that the name is always adapted to Faliscan morphology (gen. \textit{arruto} MF 169, \textit{aruto} MF 257, 266, \textit{aronto} MF 265; acc. \textit{arute} MF 269?), it is more likely that the nominative was /arruns/. However, \( -z \) may have represented a realization of /s#/ that was ‘stronger’ than the weakened /\#s#/ of Faliscan (§3.5.7d), i.e., [\( s \)] instead of [\( s \)]: in the case of \textit{aruz}, because /s/ followed a consonant rather than a vowel, in the cases of \textit{morenez} MF 269 and \textit{acr\#z} MF/Etr 67, because these words are ‘Etruscoid’ forms in -(i)es (§9.2.2.2c), where -s was usually written rather than omitted (§3.5.7c).

---

44 In [---]: \textit{zaconi} MF 153 and [---]: \textit{zaconi}ai MF 154, the preceding word is missing.
(d) unclear cases of $z$ are: $e^*azieputilepe$ EF 4, probably calin[---]*rez[---] MF 57, me[.]uelau[.]suæ rfa zeuoc*na MLF/Etr 357.

All in all, I see no reason to question the idea that Faliscan had complete intervocalic rhotacism, probably at the same time as Latin and Umbrian. The use of $z$ instead of $s$ may have served to represent the realisation of intervocalic /s/ as [z]: in word-initial and word-final position, its use seems to be due to Etruscan orthographic influence and represents [s] rather than [z] or [ˈs].

3.5.4. /t/ realized as [d]? Just as $s$ is sometimes replaced by $z$, so $t$ is sometimes written as $\theta$. Since $\theta$ properly belongs to the Etruscan and not to the Faliscan alphabet (§11.2.4), this spelling can be regarded as influenced by Etruscan in every case. This is most clear in the cases of $\theta$mania MF 81, $\theta$anacuil MF 49, and $ar\theta/[3-5]r\theta$e MF/Etr 267, where the use of $\theta$ is in all probability due to the fact that in Etruscan these names were written with $\theta$. In the cases of [---]n$\theta$ia MF 212, sen$\theta$ia MF 362, $uol\theta$eo MF 276, and sal$\theta$an MF/Etr 77, however the /t/ could potentially represent a specific realization of /t/ after a nasal or a liquid. In that case, a voiced realization [d] seems the most likely possibility. The $\theta$ could then be regarded as a graphical variant of $d$: in fact, in MF 276, and perhaps also in MF 49 (which is known only from apographs), the $\theta$ has the shape $\Gamma$, and these instances have in fact been read as $uol\theta$eo and $danacuil$ by the earliest editors. Similarly, in my suggested reading $hq\theta$i MF 42 the $\theta$ could represent a [d] due to intervocalic voicing. On the other hand, a voiced realization [d] is hard to envisage in $ues\theta$i MF 83. I am inclined to regard all instances of $\theta$ as due to Etruscan orthographic influence.

3.5.5. Palatalizations. In a number of instances, palatalization of liquids and nasals has been proposed: the point is elaborated by R. Giacomelli (2006:91-3), who regards these palatalizations as one of the ‘volgarismi’ observable in Faliscan.

The data, unfortunately, are unclear. I regard a palatalization certain in the case of /d$\ddot{u}$/, where palatalization is well-attested especially for Latin: the other instances of palatalization are uncertain at best: note that they all involve cases of /CiV/, where the Faliscan spelling in such groups frequently employed $e$ instead of $i$, implying that the group was /CiV/ rather than /CiV/.

(1) Palatalization of /d$\ddot{u}$/ → /$\ddot{u}$/ or /$y$/: The only instance is $foied$ MF 59-60, which, seeing that it goes back to */h$\ddot{o}$(d)+$d$ē(d)/, may reflect either the palatalization of /Vd$\ddot{u}$/ or of /#d$\ddot{u}$/V/. The palatalization of /Vd$\ddot{u}$/ must have preceded the Latin development of /$\ddot{u}$/ → /$d$/ in view of the reflex medius (← PIE */mediəu/-) instead of †meius; the palatalization of /#d$\ddot{u}$/V/ can be placed in the late fourth century (Meiser 1998:111). This is the only palatalization observable in the Faliscan material that may be considered phonemic rather than phonetic.
(2) Palatalization of /s/ → /ʃ/. The palatalization of /s/ → /ʃ/ has been proposed by Pisani in the case of his development of /-osio/, and is apparently adopted by Meiser (1998:117). If occurring at all, which I doubt very much, it must have occurred later than the fourth-century word-internal rhotacism in Latin, which changed many of the names in /-Vsio-/ to /-Vrio-/ (cf. Papisius, Valesios, and Fousios as the older forms of Papirius, Valerius and Furius) but apparently spared the morpheme /-osio/ (or its reflex */-esio/). For more detailed discussion of this issue, see §4.10.

(3) Palatalization of /l/ (→ /ʃ/ or /ʃ/)? The idea of a Faliscan palatalization of /l/ goes back to Herbig (1914b:251), who interpreted tito polafio MLF 354 as tito pola fio (‘Titus Pola jr.’), with fio “wohl sicher über *fi juus aus *fiil’ius”: it was adopted by Pisani (1962:59), G. Giacomelli (1963:246) and Orioles (1972:78-9). In view of the fact that when the word is written in full, it is always spelled with e, fileo MF 470*, hileo MF 146, file (abbr.) MLF 308, as well as other instances of antevocalic e for i (§3.6.2) it is unlikely that the word was pronounced [filjo] at all: it was in all probability realized as [filo]. Hirata (1967:68) plausibly connected polafio to gentilicia in Polf-/Pulf-, in which case it could be an error for polsazio with a suffix as in latinaio MLF 210, veltaia MF 196, and açiuiaiom Cap 465. In any case, there is no evidence to assume a palatalization here.

Prosdocimi (in G. Giacomelli 1978:508) pointed to servuo Lat 250, which represents the name of the consul of 106 BCE, Q. Seruiarius Caepio, as a confirmation of Herbig’s idea, but in my view this is simply an error for servuidio, not an attestation of a palatalization, as M. Mancini (2002:27 with n.25) rightly notes. Even if it is regarded as a palatalization, it occurs in an inscription that is almost 50 years later than any datable inscription that is possibly Faliscan, and it cannot be assumed that it represents Faliscan, or even a Faliscan feature that entered local Latin. It can certainly not be used as an argument to assume a Faliscan feature that is not attested otherwise.

R. Giacomelli (2006:91-3), however, accepts the cases of polafio MF 354 and servuo Lat 250 as evidence. He also adduces lullio MF 207 and putellio MF 152 (cf. also uollaia MF 47) and regards these rare geminated spellings as indicative of a palatalization: note that these forms would point to [ʎi:] rather than to the [i] of polafio and servuo.45 He is certainly right in pointing out the rarity of such geminated spellings in Faliscan (§11.2.5.5), and palatalization may explain them, but it goes too far, in my view, to compare them to the Oscan spellings such as tti and mni representing palatalized /t/ and /n/ respectively, and to regard the Faliscan spelling as a ‘sabinismo-oschismo’.

45 Why he also adduces “malio [MF 39] ~ lat. Mal(l)ius”, “tali [MF 84, uncertain] ~ lat. Tallius”, and “tulo passim ~ lat. Tull(i)us” (2006:92) is unclear: Mallius and Tallius do not appear to be evidence for a palatalization, and Tullius is a patronymic derivation from Tullus (§7.5, §7.7.1.76, §7.8.1.156), not a different spelling that could represent a palatalized /l/.
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(4) **Palatalization of /r/ → /j/ or /y/?** The evidence for this consists of the gentilicium *clipea*io MF 470* beside *clipiari*io LF 230 (where the earliest editors read *clipiari*/) *clipea*ioLtF 231 and *cl[i]peario* LtF 233, and *frenai*o MF 471*, which would be expected to be formed with the same suffix /-ārjo-/ (Clipearius ‘Shieldmaker’, Frenarius ‘Bridler’). The forms in -aio could then point to a palatalization of /r/. On the other hand, either form could of course just be an error for *clipea*irio and *frena*irio: it is also possible that *frena*io was formed not with /-/or all, but with a suffix as in *latinaio* MLF 210, *uoltaia* LF 196, and *açituio* Cap 465.

(5) **Palatalization of /n/ → [ŋ]?** The evidence for this consists of two gentilicia of Etruscan origin ending in -no where Latin has -nius: *uicinai*o MF 88 (and perhaps also in *tuconai*o MF 85, if read as *t u(e)conai*) beside Latin *Veconius* and *Viconius* (§7.8.1.174) and *precono*— MLF 361 beside Latin *Praeconius* (§7.8.1.126). To this could be added *ainai*o MFL 352 (§7.8.1.8) if this is indeed an adaptation of an Etruscan name in -na (cf. *eina* MF 57), and *uelmi*no MLF 316 beside *uelmineai*o MLF 305, 307, 309, 310, 312, 313, and *uelmineai*o MLF 308, *uelmineai*o MLF 315. In these forms, -no could potentially represent [−[ŋo]] with a palatalized /n/, as is suggested by R. Giacomelli (2006:93). In my view it is more likely that *ainai*, *uicinai*, and *precono* were derived in another way than in Latin, i.e., not adapted as -na → -nius but simply thematized as -na → -nus (§7.8.2.2) and that *uelmi*no is an error for *uelmi*neio: the inscriptions of this group contain several errors.

3.5.6. Minor developments. Two other developments that appear to have taken place during the historic period are the following:

(1) **Closing (and lengthening?) of /e/ before /n/.** In Latin, /e/ was closed to /i/ before /n.s n.f n.x/, probably at least partly during the historical period (Pfister 1997:100, Meiser 1998:78-9, 81). The same development can also be observed in Faliscan (i) in *ifra* MF 40, representing */infra/ (or possibly /infra/) ← Proto-Latin */enð(e)r/and /n(e)r/ and (2) in *cuitco* MLF 318 (and perhaps in *cuitenai* MLF 361) representing */kinkto−/ (or */kinkto−/) ← Proto-Latin */k√en√to−/. In Latin, the vowel preceding the /n/ was lengthened as well as a compensatory lengthening due to drop of the nasal, followed by a restoration of the nasal /VN.C/ → /NV.C/ → /VN.C/ (Pfister 1997:100, Meiser 1998:78-9). As explained in §3.6.1, it cannot be established whether the vowel was lengthened in Faliscan as it was in Latin, although this does not seem unlikely if Latin lengthening was a compensatory lengthening due to the omission of the nasal (see §3.5.7a).

(2) **/#dY/ → #bY/.** In Latin, #dyi/ became #byi/ by the middle of the third century: *du-* still appears as an archaism in *duonoro* CIL I.2.9 and *duelonai* CIL I.581.2 and in Plautus, e.g. *arte dyllica* Epid. 450. In Early Faliscan, there are likewise instances of *du-* in *duenom* eninas EF 3. Although the reflex of /dueno-/ itself does not
appear in Middle or Late Faliscan, there are now two instances of *pi(s)* in LF 242 that correspond to Latin *bis* /bīs/ ← *duis* /dūis/ ("*duis ... pro δις ponebatur*, Paul. *Fest*. 58.17L). Assuming that these words reflect Faliscan and do not represent Roman Latin (and I see no reason why they should, cf. §1.3.2.2), they show that the same development took place in Faliscan.

3.5.7. Omission of syllable- and word-final consonants. The general tendency to drop of syllable- and word-final consonants reflects a tendency to form 'perfect syllables' of the type CV by a reduction of the elements of the coda (cf. Venneman 1988:21-27). The results of such a reduction can be phonemic, or be limited to the phonetic realization of the consonants involved (e.g., by weakening them or, in the case of nasals, by substituting a nasalized lengthened vowel for the consonant). In Faliscan, this reduction affected mainly nasals, and, to a degree, liquids, although reduction of other syllable- and word-final consonants, especially /s#/ is also well-attested. Note that I prefer to use the term 'omission' (which refers to the representation of a sound in writing) rather than 'drop' (which refers to the reduction of a phoneme to zero). In many cases, it may be assumed that the phoneme was not reduced to zero altogether, but still maintained some form of phonetic realization, and that there was a synchronic variation in its realization. In these cases it would be unjustified to speak of 'drop' of the consonant, only of its omission in writing.

(a) Nasals. The omission of a syllable-final nasal is especially frequent in Faliscan (for attestations, see fig.3.5): in fact, its omission is about as frequent as its being written out. The omission represents a reduction of the nasal consonant with a transfer of the nasal quality to the preceding vowel, which was in all probability lengthened. The frequency of the occurrence may also be illustrated by the fact that it may be found already in Early Faliscan, if *salue(to) EF 4* is read as *salue(n)to* or *salue(n)to(d)* (cf., however, §5.2.4b), or if *ofetios EF 4* is regarded as related to the potamonym *Ufens* (cf., however, §3.7.2 and §7.2.2).46

Omission of /m#/ may be related to the length of the preceding vowel. In the Early Faliscan period -m is written throughout, both where the ending is /Ñm#/ as in the first-declension accusative singular *urnam EF 1*, and probably also *eitam EF 5* (and in *arcentelom huti[j]ilom EF 1* if this is interpreted with Peruzzi (1964a:163-4) as a second-declension genitive plural), and where the ending is /Nm#/, as in the second-declension accusatives and neuter nominatives, *[0-2]e[1-3]tom EF 1, arcentelom huti[j]ilom EF 1, duenom EF 4, propramom EF 2, [u]mom, umom, umo[m] EF 2, and

46 A prehistoric phonemic drop of /n#/ occurred in the nominative singular of the ön-stems, as in *apolo MF 65, cupiddeo MF 62* and perhaps also in *quto EF 3*, if representing /gūtō/ or /gūtō/ (note, however, the *variae lectiones guto* and *gutone*). This development was of Proto-Latin date: in the Sabellic languages, these nominatives were recharacterized by the addition of /-s#/ with subsequent assimilations of the resulting cluster /-ns#/; see §4.5.1.3.
possibly ui[no]m EF 1 (if to be restored thus). However, in the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions -m is always omitted after a short vowel, in the accusatives uino MF 59-60, macistratu LF 242, and also in arute MF 269 and larise MF 270, MF 371, 372, which I regard as accusatives in -e(m) used as nominatives (§9.2.2). In the genitive plural, it is written in tulom MF 72 and açiuaim Cap 465*, but omitted in fel[j]cinatitu LF 384.

The /n/ can also be omitted in the word-final clusters /nd#/ and /nt#/ occurring in the secondary and primary endings of the third plural. This is already found in the Early Faliscan inscriptions, f[f]i[q]od EF 1 = f[f]i[q](n)d and possibly also in *[3-4]*ad EF 1, if this is a plural *[3-4]*a(n)d. For Middle and Late Faliscan there are the instances zot MLF 285, and cupat MF 146, cupat MF 158, cupat LF 223, and perhaps cupat[t] MF 95 (if this is indeed a plural), vs. cupa/nt MF 80. Latin parallels for such forms are dedrot CIL I.2.378, emerut CIL I.2.1513, and sut CIL I.2.1824. Omission of /in/ in the cluster /ns#/ occurs in aruz MF 257, cf. Latin aros CIL I.2.2081.

**b) Liquids.** The omission of syllable- and word-final liquids is rarer than the omission of syllable-and word-final nasals. However, as in the case of syllable-final nasals, omission of syllable-final /l/ is found already in Early Faliscan, namely in uotenosio EF 3, if, as seems likely, this is the same name as uolten in the same inscription. In Middle Faliscan, the omission is limited to a few cases of omission of syllable-final /r/, in mac(r)ena MF 269, acar(r)celini LF 222, ma(r)ci LF 222, and probably also se(r)torio MLF/Cap 476*, and of one instance of omission of syllable-final /l/, in uol(til)liaq LF 223, vs. an overwhelming number of instances where syllable-final /r/ and /l/ are written out. Further instances may be the names fafarn MF 136 and faf[---] MF 139, if they are related to the potamonym Farfarus. In view of the Latin form of the potamonym, Fabaris, this need not necessarily be an instance of the omission of a syllable-final liquid.


In word-final position, too, omission of a liquid is rare: uxo MF 17, mate LF 221, uxo LF 222, uxo LF 242, mino LtF 173, cen]so LtF 231, and censo LtF 232 vs. uxo or MF 41, uxor MF 42, pater MF 62, uxor MF 101, uxor MF 265, ueltur MF 266, [u]xor MLF 301, ueltur MLF 341, p[re]to]r LF/LtF 241, [pre]tor LF 247, [pre]tor LF 248, cen]so LtF 231, and cen]so LtF 232. It may already occur in Early Faliscan, if quto EF 3 represents /g thút/ or /g thút/ (§6.2.31). In Latin, too, the omission of word-final /r/- is rare, occurring only in marma CIL I.2.2 (vs. twice marmar in the same inscription), uxo CIL I.2.1829 (vs. 31 instances with /-r/), and in censento CIL I.2.583,77 and rogato CIL I.2.583,78; on the other hand, it appears to have been almost regular in the names Maior (maio CIL I.2.76, 161, 233, 329, 344, 347, 2471, 2482 vs. maior CIL I.2.1340) and Minor (mino CIL I.2.126, 139, 194, 197, 198, 330, mfino 77 vs. minor CIL I.2.271); cf. Latino-Faliscan mino LtF 173.
Fig. 3.5. Omission of syllable- and word-final nasals in Faliscan texts.
A special case are the instances where /r#/ is represented by -d. This occurs three times in Late Faliscan, twice in [.]a · protacio · m · f · macistru | keset · cuestod · pi · pretod · pis LF 242 and once in la · cotena · la · f · pretod · de | zenatuo · sententiad · nootum | dedet LF/Lat 214, while Latin has a parallel in opeinod deuincam ted CIL 12.547. In the cases of LF/Lat 214 and CIL 12.547, this was often ascribed to a sandhi development of /r#d/, but LF 242 (published in 1990) now shows that this explanation is difficult, if not impossible. Neither does it seem likely, as has sometimes been assumed, that it is simply an error.

Combined with the omission of /r#/ and /r.C/, I think it likely that /r/ was realized at least in word-final position, and probably also in syllable-final position as a rather weak sound, probably an alveolar flap [زا], as Peruzzi (1997:64-5) suggests (although I do not adopt his suggestion that this is due to Umbrian influence). In the written form of the word, this flap could then be represented by the etymologically justified -r, by the phonetically close -d, or be omitted entirely.

Another interesting solution has been proposed by M. Mancini (2002:40), who rejects Peruzzi’s idea of an alveolar flap, and suggests instead that the spelling with -d was meant to represent the Latin realization of /r#/ which presumably was ‘stronger’ than the Faliscan realization (although I cannot see why this spelling should be an instance of code-switching between Faliscan and Latin). This would tie in with the possibility that there were likewise attempts to render the realization of Etruscan /s#/ which was apparently stronger than the Faliscan realization (§3.5.7d): see §9.2.2.1.

(c) Occlusives. The omission of occlusives can be divided into two cases: omission of syllable-final /k/ before a dental and word-final /t/ and /d/.

Omission of syllable-final /k/ before a following dental can be observed in lete MLF 285, let MLF 361, and in sesto LF 329 (beside zextoi LF 330 from the same tomb), perhaps also in fita EF 1 (cf. §5.3.2.1) and possibly in cuitenet MLF 361, if this should be connected with the name Quinctus (which, however, appears in cuicto MLF 310). Omissions as in lete have only one parallel in Latin, uitoria CIL 12.550 from Praeneste, but on the other hand were common in Umbrian, where they were due to a development */kt/ → /xt/ (cf. Meiser 1986:92-3, 179). It seems not unlikely that a similar development was responsible for the Faliscan and Praenestine forms. In that case, cavies : uhtav[---] Etr XLV from Lucus Feroniae, which has been regarded as showing Sabellic influence in uhtav[---], may represent a local pronunciation.

Word-final occlusives were something of a rarity in the Italic languages: the only ones regularly encountered are /d#/ and /t#/: of these, /d#/ disappeared in Latin during the first half of the third century (after long vowels), and this disappearance is observable also in Faliscan. In the case of the ablative in -d and the adverbs derived from such ablatives, /-d#/ is written out in the Early Faliscan ablative pramod, pramod, pronomod EF 2 and in Middle Faliscan, foied MF 59-60, but ifra MF 40 → */enf(e)râ(d)/. The forms sententiad and rected in LF/Lat 214 are archaisms, compa-
rable to Latin sententiad, oqultod, poplicod CIL 1^2.581,8, 10, 15 (186). The secondary ending of the third singular was originally also /-d#/; but this was later replaced by /-t#/ (§5.2.4e). In Faliscan, this is attested in the Early Faliscan forms pored MF 1 and fistiked EF 9 and Middle Faliscan faced MF 470*, and on the other hand Middle Faliscan facet MF 471* and Late Faliscan keset LF 242. This replacement had been ascribed to the disappearance of /d#/; but this seems hardly likely, since its replacement, /t#/; could also be omitted: at best, the disappearance of /d#/ may have been a factor that contributed to the replacement. Latin forms that show omission of /-d#/ are kapia CIL 1^2.1, dede CIL 1^2.47b, 377, 380, 477, 2438 (although in some of these forms it may be /-t#/ rather than /-d#/ that is omitted). A special case is Middle Faliscan met MF 470* (cf. Early Faliscan med EF 1, 9). This form may point to a loss of voice in /d#/; but is in my view perhaps rather a (‘hypercorrect’) form influenced by the immediately following facet, which is the earliest Faliscan form that shows the replacement of the secondary ending /-d#/ in the third singular perfect, indicating that /d#/ in /med/ had already been weakened or dropped.

In the ending of the third singular, /-t#/; and of the third plural, /-nt#/; the /t#/ could regularly be dropped: (1) cupat MF 40, cupa MLF 305, capa LF 221, and probably cup[a] MF 161 vs. cupat MF 220, cupat LF 224, and probably c[up][a]t MF 159; this has also been suggested in the case of i*ice LF 309, 315, but I very much doubt that this is a verb. The forms cu[p][a] LF 226 and cuba LtF 326 show that in the ending of the third plural, both /n/ and /t#/ could be dropped. Such forms are also known from Latin: probauero CIL 1^2.22, dedero CIL 1^2.61, dedro CIL 1^2.379, probaru CIL 1^2.1635, courauro CIL 1^2.2542.47

(b) Sibilant. The omission of -s was a stock feature of Middle and Late Faliscan Faliscan, and can in fact be regarded as one of the better known features of Faliscan. As said in §1.4.4, however, it is also a feature of Latin in general, and cannot in itself be used as a certain sign that the inscription in which it occurs is Faliscan.

In the Early Faliscan inscriptions, -s is always written out and never omitted: zextos EF 1, praui/os EF 1, lartos EF 6 and apolonos EF 10, ceras EF 1, fitaidupes EF 1, and (after a long vowel) titias ... duenas EF 3. However, from the Middle Faliscan period onward, there is an overwhelming tendency to omit -s. The number of instances is so large, in fact, that it is not practical to present all instances in tabular form, as I have done in the other cases of omission that are discussed in this section. Omission of -s after a short vowel occurs in 107 inscriptions: MF 12, 19, 39, 40, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 56, 79, 80, 88, 89, 90, 94, 95, 97, 100, 105, 137, 141, 142, 143, 146, 147, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153, 159, 162, 164, 175, 178, 181, 193, 195, 197, 259-260, 265, 272, 275, 276, 376, 470*, 473*; MLF 206, 210, 211, 305, 307, 308, 309, 310, 312, 315, 316, 318, 319, 324, 346, 348, 349,

47 Latin also has forms of /nt#/ where the /t/ is dropped, but not the /n/: coraueron CIL 1^2.59, curaruon CIL 1^2.1616, dan CIL 1^2.1618, dedron CIL 1^2.30, tabificanque CIL 1^2.2540c.
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350, 351, 352, 354, 355, 358, 359, 360, 363, 364, 464, MLF/Cap 476*; LF 213, 220, 223, 224, 225, 226, 228, 231, 242, 244, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 335, 336, 378; LtF 171, 215, 223, 290, 341, 377; Cap 388, 391, 420, 433, 435, 462. These yield a total of 164 cases of omission in the second-declension nominative singular ending -o(s), 8 instances in the third-declension genitive singular ending -o(s), 2 instances in the third-declension genitive singular -e(s) (which could potentially represent /-s/ ← */-e/s/, see §4.5.2), and 1 instance in the third-declension nominative singular ending -e(s) (§4.5.1.5) or 175 instances in all. Against this, there are only a 3-6 instances from 2-5 inscriptions of -s being written out: cauios frenaios MF 471* and cauios LF 382, and perhaps also partis MF 79 (this may be an abbreviated or syncopated form, and occurs side by side with leituellio), and in two instances from the ager Capenas, írpios Cap 389 and pacios Cap 392, where Sabellic influence is clearly present (§9.3.2). This means omission of -s after a short vowel outnumbers the writing out of -s in the same position by 29 to 1: in other words, the cases where -s is written out after a short vowel are c.3% of the total. After a long vowel, however, the instances of omission are noticeably fewer: ca MF 59-60, and efíles MF 116 (if this is not simply an error for efíles), and probably canume de MF 62, vs. efíles MF 113, efíles MF 115, efíles MF 117, and aiedies Cap 390. A distinct category are the Etrusco forms in -(i)es (§9.2.2.2c), where the -s is usually written out: [foc]ies MF 12, fases MF 41, ulties MF/Etr 64, calitenes and cesies MF 265, uenelies MF 258, petrunes LF 226, plenes LtF 231 and morenez MF 269 and acrez MF/Etr 67, vs. satelie MF 42, cesie MF 257, and tulie LF 383, and perhaps acre MF/Etr 279, ame MF/Etr 280, ame MF/Etr 282. This may imply that in Etruscan forms and names the /s#/ was realized ‘more strongly’ than in Faliscan (§9.2.2.1).

Omission of word-final -s occurs with quite some frequency also in Latin, as the indices to the CIL I\(^2\) or to Wachter 1987 show: note also the weakness of /s#/ in Republican Latin quantitative poetry. There is no single area within Latin in its broadest sense where the frequency of the omission is as high as in Faliscan: even in the ager Capenas the frequency is much lower (omission in Cap 388, 391, 420, 433, 435, 462 vs. írpios Cap 389 and pacios Cap 392). In spite of this, I very much doubt whether the omission of -s was phonemic, that is, that e.g. the second-declension nominative singular ending had become -o(-)/ in Middle Faliscan: even during the Middle Faliscan period it was possible to write -os, as in cauios frenaios MF 471*. I assume that the omission of -s represents a realization as a weak glottal sound, [h] or [\], much like syllable- and word-final /s/ is realized in Andalusian Spanish (e.g. estamos /estamos/ [e\(^3\)tam\(^o1\)]). The great number of instances of omission of /s#/ may in fact have been due to an orthographic convention: it may have been the case that in the ager Faliscus, the convention was not to write this weak sound, while in Latium the rule appears to have been to write it as -s in spite of its weak realization. This is borne out by the fact that Latin inscriptions from the ager Faliscus generally have -us as the ending of the second declension nominative singular, with -u appearing only in Lat 251: see §3.6.6.1.
3.6. The Faliscan vowels

3.6.1. The vowel system of Faliscan. The vowels that Proto-Latin inherited from the final stage of Proto-Italic are /a e i o u/ and /ā ē ī ō ū/ (cf. Meiser 1998:55-7, 60-2). Of these, the short vowels /e i o u/, and in some cases /a/, were normally inherited from PIE: the Proto-Italic developments of the laryngeals added new /a/'s (§3.2.3), and the Proto-Italic developments of */h/ added new /e/'s, /o/'s and /u/'s (§3.2.7), and the Proto-Latin development of */r/ added new /e/'s (§3.3.2). The long vowels are generally due to Proto-Italic developments of */V/ and */R/ (§3.2.3) and early contractions after the loss of intervocalic /h/ (§3.2.6), although in a few cases the long vowel goes back to a lengthened PIE vowel, as in */ph₂tēr/, */mātēr/, */h₃tēg-s/.

Insofar as this can be ascertained, the vowel system described here was also the one found in Early Faliscan. It should be noted that in Faliscan and Capenate inscriptions the quantity of the vowel is not indicated anywhere: this is only done in uootum LF/Lat 214, and uitam and aastutiæis Lat 217 in two Latin inscriptions from Falerii Novi. The quantities of Faliscan vowels can therefore only be inferred (a) from etymologies, (b) from developments that affected only long or only short vowels, (b) from corresponding words or names in other Italic languages where the quantity of the vowel is known, either because it is expressed in writing or because it can be established in other ways (e.g., in the case of Latin, through quantitative verse).

During the Middle Faliscan period several changes took place that not only changed individual vowels, but also affected the Faliscan vowel system itself.

As a result of the Middle Faliscan monophthongization of the diphthongs (§3.7), three new long vowels were added: (1) /ē/, both from /ē/ and from /e̞/ (§3.7.5), (2) /ī/, both from /ī/ (§3.7.6), and (3) /ō/, both from /ō/ (including /ō/ ← Proto-Italic */e/, §3.2.5) and from /au/ (§3.7.2, §3.7.4). These new vowels must have had phonemic status, cf. such (unattested) pairs as */fīlē/'s sons’ and */fīlē/'s daughters’. The emergence of these long vowels also changed the vowel system as a whole by introducing more degrees in openness, especially in the front vowels.

Among the short vowels, a new sound /e̞/ appears (§3.6.2). This is most clearly observed in the tendency to spell antepenult /ī/ as e, and /e/ before /r.C/ as i. Although there are therefore two different spellings, these in all probability represent the same sound, antepenultic e expressing ‘an /ī/ that is more open than a normal /ī/’ and i before /r/, ‘an /e/ that is more closed than a normal /e/’. That this sound is not merely a positional variant, but must have had phonemic status is shown by the fact that there are instances of e for i and i for e in other positions as well, showing that in Faliscan /e/ and /ī/ were merging into /e̞/. There may have been similar merger of /o/ and /u/, but the indications for this are few (§3.6.3).
Fig. 3.6. The Middle and Late Faliscan vowel system.

The dotted circles accompanied by a vowel sign in bold case represent the letter by which the encircled sounds could be represented. For digrams to denote /œ/ and /œ/ into /e/, see §§3.7.2-6. For the merger of /i/ and /e/ into /e/, see §3.6.2; for the possible merger of /o/ and /u/ into /o/, see §3.6.3. For /a/, see §3.6.6.

The Faliscan vowels are represented by the signs a e i o u, as follows (cf. fig.3.6):

- a represents (1) /a/ as in far EF 1 (← PIE */a/?), pater MF 62 (← PIE */h₂/), arcentelom EF 1 (← PIE */h₂r/); (2) /ä/ as in mater LF 221 (← PIE */ā/*?), karai (← PIE */ch₂/), pramo- EF 2 (← PIE */rh*/).
- i represents (1) /i/, as in pipafo MF 59; (2) /e/ ← /e/ as in loifirtato MF 32 (see §3.6.2); (3) /i/ as in uino MF 59-60 (← PIE */iH/*);
- e represents (1) /e/ as in ego EF 1, arcentelom EF 1 (← PIE */ŋ/*); (2) /e/ ← /i/ as in fileo MF 471* (§3.6.2); (3) /e/ as in rex MF 90 (← PIE */ê/*); (4) /ê/ ← /e j oj/ (§3.7.5); (5) /ê/ ← /ai/ (§3.7.6);
- o represents (1) /o/ as in euios EF 1 (← PIE */o/*); (2) /o/ as in carefo MF 59 (← PIE */oH/*); and (3) /o/ ← /au oy/ (§3.7.2, §3.7.4);
- u represents (1) /u/ as in cupat MF 40 (← PIE */u/*); and (2) presumably /u/ (← PIE */uH/ (no attestations); (3) u is also used where o would be expected (§3.6.3)

The signs i and u are also used to denote the second element of the diphthongs ai ei (oi is not attested) and au ou respectively.

Beside these vowel notations, there are a few Capenate instances of the Sabellic signs i and ū, representing (Sabellic) /e/ and /o/ respectively: see §9.3.2.
3.6.2. Middle and Late Faliscan variation of \(i\) and \(e\). As said in §3.6.1, there are a number of instances where there is variation in the spelling between \(e\) and \(i\). The clearest instances are those where antevocalic \(i\) is written as \(e\). (For the cases where antevocalic \(e\) represents a monophthongized diphthong, see §3.7.7).

- **fileo** MF 471*, **hileo** MF 146, **filea** MF 14
- **fulceo** LF 329, **folcozeo** LF 330, **olcezeo** LF 332 vs. **folcosio** LF 333
- **hirmeo** MF 19 vs. **hirmia** MF 18, **firmia** MF 54, **firmia** MLF 302, **hirmio** LF 213
- **zu[con]eo** MF 56 vs. **zuconia** MF 271,
- ***(*)co** LtF 290 and **petr[on]eo** MF 473* (cf. the regular derivation of Etruscan gentilicia in -\(u\) : Latin -\(onius\))
- **zertenea** LF 221 (cf. Latin Sertinius)
- **uecineo** LF 220, 224, 225, **uecinea** LF 223, **uecin[e]a** LF 221 (cf. Latin Vicinius)
- **anileo** or **manileo** MLF 355 (cf. Latin Annilius or Manilius) and **hlau[elea** LtF 325 (cf. Latin Flauilia)
- **? pauiceo** MF 12
- unclear are [---]eo MF 153, [---]l[e]a MF 155, [---]oxie[.]eai MLF 310, [.....]nea LtF 301
- in the patronymic adjectives **iu[ne]o** MF 141, **juneo** MF 151, **iuneo** LF 220 and **uolteo** MF 275, **uol[le]o** MF 276, the \(e\) probably stands for [\(e\)] not for [\(\tilde{e}\)] (§7.5.2)
- the gloss **Struppearia** (§6.6.6) may represent the same tendency.

The, reverse, \(i\) for antevocalic \(e\), is found in

- **clip iar\[io** LF 230 (vs. **clipeai** (clipearr\[io?)** MF 470*, **clip iar\[io** LtF 231, and **cl[l]peario** LtF 233, cf. Latin clipesus/CLUPEUS).

The phenomenon thus occurs both during the Middle and Late Faliscan periods, and also occurs in Latino-Faliscan (hlau\[elea LtF 325, and probably **(\*)con[\(e\) LtF 290). Interestingly, there are no instances from the Capenate or Latin inscriptions, with one clear exception, namely the spelling **Feronea** for **Feronia** in all instances of this name in the dedications from the shrine at Lucus Feroniae: **feroneai** Cap 434, **fe\[r]oneai** Cap 434, **feronea** Cap 433, and **fero\[ne]a** Cap 437. This may have been a local custom, especially since antevocalic \(i\) is never written as \(e\) in other Latin inscriptions from the area.

Although these instances can be explained as /\(i/\) having a more open realization [\(i\)] before a vowel, comparable to e.g. Latin fileod CIL I\(^2\).2658 and fileai CIL I\(^2\).52, they may be part of a larger tendency, since there are instances where \(e\) occurs instead of an expected \(i\) in other positions than antevocalic, in **zertenea** LF 221 (instead of **zertiniae**) and **upreciano** MLF 363, **upreciano** MLF 364 vs. **u\[mpricius** Lat 219, and **f\[e** LF 332 = **fe\[leos. Wachter (1987:126, 488-9) regards such instances of \(e\) for \(i\) as indicative of a generally more open pronunciation of short /\(i/\) as opposed to /\(\tilde{u}/\).
The ‘reverse’, i for original /e/, is found, apart from the already named clipiar[io LF 230, only in loifirtato MF 31, loifirta MF 32, and loifirta MF 41. Here, however, the i represents a more closed /e/ before /r.C/, as in Latin stircus CIL I 7.401 and mirquiros CIL I 7.553 (cf. Meiser 1998:81): in these cases, therefore, the tendency to realize /e/ as [ι] is a conditioned variant and not free as in the cases described earlier in this section.

Another instance may be the name Firmius in hirmia MF 18, hirmeo MF 19, firmio MF 54, hirmio LF 213, firma MF 302. Although this name is consistently spelled with i, it may be related either to (a) the Etruscan gentilicium Hermana, occurring in the area in hermana MF 264 (cf. her Etr VI-VII) or (b) to the adjective firmus, where the i reflects an older /e/ (*/fermo/- ← Proto-Latin */fêrmo/- ← PIE */ðêrmo-/) and Latin apparently standardized the variant with the closed form of the /e/.48 Counterexamples are loferta LF 222, and mercui MF 113-126, zertenea LF 221, tertineo LF 213, tertine MF 473*, fertrio Cap 391, and se(r)torio MF/Cap 476*.

Other instances are hard to distinguish, in view of the fact that the material is onomastic rather than lexical: it is therefore hard to tell whether a name like pupelio MF 149 represents Pupilius (in which case it would be an instance of variation between e/i, but could also be interpreted as a case of a ‘non-reduced’ vowel, cf. §3.6.6.1) or Pupellius (in which case it is not an illustration of a variation between e/i).

Probably Sabellic rather than Latin-Faliscan is írpios Cap 389 and the name of the Hirpi Sorani known from literary sources (cf. §2.3.4, §6.6.5), probably derived from a Proto-Sabellic */hërpo-/ ← Proto-Italic /xerkʰo-/ (← PIE */gʰer(s)kʰo-/?). The instances where the variation e/i may be due to vowel-reduction in unstressed medial syllables are discussed in §3.6.6.

3.6.3. Middle and Late Faliscan variation of u and o. Beside the variation between e and i described in the preceding sections, there are cases of variation between o and u. This tendency, however, is much less clear: in a number of cases the variation is due to influence from Etruscan orthography, and it does not only involve /o/ but //g448/ as well. The instances where the variation o/u may be due to vowel-reduction in unstressed medial and final syllables are discussed in §3.6.6.

In some cases, the o is simply a preservation of the /o/ while in Latin this (later) changed into /u/. Examples are zot MLF 285 and perhaps sot LtF 172 vs. Latin sunt (still sunt CIL I 7.1529), and the name Publius/Publia, which in Faliscan is always written with o (13 attestations, see §7.7.1.50), as in older Latin, e.g. popliosio CIL I 7.2832a (cf. §18.3.3.1).

48 Cf. perhaps Umbrian ferim-e TI III.16 and Oscan fi][i]mens Po 2 (cf. WOU s.vv.).
The spelling *u* for */o/* mostly appears in contexts where orthographic influence from the o-less Etruscan alphabet can be assumed. Thus e.g. *cutri* MF 200 vs. Latin *Cotrius*, *puponio* MF 54 vs. *Pomponius* (but cf. §7.7.1.51) and on the other hand *ortesnas* Etr XXXV, *polafio* (=*pol[ei]atio*) MF 354 vs. Etruscan *Pulfna*. Etruscan gentilicia in -*u* are usually adapted to */u/*, as in Latin (§7.8.2.4), e.g. *zuconia* MF 271 and *zu[con]* eo MF 56 (and perhaps also *su[con ---]* MF 191) vs. Latin *larisa zu/g548us* Etr XXXII): for further instances, see §7.8.2.4. G. Giacomelli (1963:84) in fact interpreted *cicoi* MF 40 as a rendering of an Etruscan *Cicui*, the feminine form of *Cicu*.

The anaptyctic vowel in the Etruscan name *Arnθ* is once written as *o* in *aronto* MF 265: elsewhere it is always written as *u* in *aruz* MF 257, *aruto* MF 267, *arute* MF 269, and the derivations *arutielia* MF 96 and *arutlo* MF 195. The spelling elsewhere is also *u*, except in Oscan *αζωντιες* tLu 1. This may be due to words like *zo(n)t*, where */ont/* could be realized as */õt/* and perhaps even already as */ūt/*, but the correct (historical) spelling was */o(n)it/*: this spelling may have been transferred (as a hypercorrect spelling) to the */u/* in */arrunt/-/*, where *u* was the historically correct spelling.

The use of *u* for */o/* in *petrunes* LF 226 vs. *petrōneο* MF 473* is probably best explained by an Etruscan intermediary (cf. also the Etruscoid ending */es/*, see §9.2.2.2c). However, Wachter (1987:412-3) points to the fact that in Latin inscriptions from the area of the Lacus Fucinus, */o/* is represented by *u* several times: *dunom* VM 3, *semunu* Pg 9, *ptruna* Pg 52, *apunies* Pg 53, *peumpuni* Pg 26, *fadatruni* MV 2, *uic-turie* CIL I².2486. The origin of the *u* in these names may therefore go back further, to the original Sabellian form. Another such case is the exceptional Latin *terebuni* CIL I².312 vs. *Treboñius* (cf. Wachter 1987:187).

A difficult case is *fulczeo* LF 329, *folcuso* LF 331, and *olcuzeo* LF 332 vs. *folcozeo* LF 330, *folcosio* LF 333, and *holc[osi]LtF 140, where there is variation both in the first and in the second syllable, and there is no equivalent name in Etruscan or Latin: the only closely related names are Etruscan *Hulγena* and *Hulγnies*, and Latin *Holconius* (§7.8.1.64). Both *u*’s are probably best ascribed to Etruscan influence in spelling. The *u* in the first syllable could conceivably be ascribed to a Late Faliscan closing of */olC/* → */uIC/*, but this closing is not attested for Faliscan (§3.3.4.1). The *u* in the second syllable was in all probability long (cf. Latin names in */ösius/-örius* and */önius*), and can therefore not be ascribed to reduction of a medial vowel: its omission in *fulceo* LF 329 must therefore be due to an error (fulcozeo) or fulcozeo), not to syncopation.

Unclear is the relation of the Faliscan gentilicum *pupelio* MF 149, *pupel[i---]* MF 150, *pup[elio* MF 151 to Latin *popil[i]* Lat 295, *popili* Lat 296, *popili* Lat 478* (all imports): the *u* could be due to Etruscan influence, but at least in Latin there appears to have been a quantitative difference between the gentilicia in *Pōp-* and those in *Pūp-* (Schulze 1904:213), and the two gentilicia may therefore be unrelated. The same is
true in the case of *pupiias* MLF 304 (praenomen or gentilicium?) and the abbreviated gentilicium *popi* Cap 420.

Finally, *posticnu* MLF/Cap 474* may be a rendering of a Sabellic first-declension nominative singular *posticnō* (see §9.3.2).

### 3.6.4. Variation between *i* and *u*.

In Latin, there is a tendency to variation between *i* and *u* in pairs such as *libet/lubet*, *clipeus/clupeus* (in later centuries also spelled *clypeus*), probably pointing to a realization [ü] (Meiser 1998:80). There is no sign of this variation in Faliscan, where the gentilicium *Clipearius* (which apparently does not occur elsewhere, §7.8.1.42) is always spelled with *i* (*clipeaio (=clipearχio?)*) MF 470*, *clipiar[io]* LF 230, *clipear[io]* LtF 231, *cl[i]peario* LtF 233). Faliscan does show a related development, however, in the development of the diphthong /oʊ/ to /oʃ/ in *loifirtato* MF 31, *loifirtato* MF 32, and *Joifirta* MF 41 (see §3.7.3).

### 3.6.5. Anaptyaxis.

As in Latin, there are very few instances of anaptyxis: a difference from Sabellic languages like South Picene, Paelignian and Oscan, where its occurrence was regular. One instance is the Etruscan name *Arrnθ*. In Etruscan, this name is occasionally spelled with an anaptyctic *u*: *arunθ* Ar 1.7, *arunθia* Vt 1.73, Ar 1.53, *arunθial* AS 1.236, *arunθiaʃ* Ar 0.3, *arutia* Pe 1.846 (Latin alphabet), *aruzinale* OA 0.1, *arunzina* Cr 6.2. In the Italic languages, the name only occurs in its anaptyctic form, due to the phonotactic impossibility of a cluster /rnt#/ or /rnts#/ → /rns#/: in Latin, as *Arruns*, in Oscan in the gentilicium *arrauntiis* Po 58, αρραυτης tLu 1. In Faliscan, the name occurs as *aruz* MF 257, *aruto* MF 257, 267, *arute* MF 269, and the derivations *arutielia* MF 96 and *arutlo* MF 195, and once as *aronto* MF 265 (§3.6.3). Another instance may be Vetter’s interpretation of *putellio* MF 152 if this is derived from */pu-tlom/*: see §63.62. In the gloss *cenaculum* (§6.6.1) the spelling with an anaptyctic vowel probably reflects the regular Latin spelling of this word.

### 3.6.6. Developments of vowels due to stress.

The change from the PIE tonal accent to a (heavy) initial stress in all likelihood occurred during the Proto-Italic period (cf. Meiser 1998:66). The developments of the vowels due to this initial stress are of later date, however: both the weakening of vowels and the syncopation in medial and final syllables do not seem to have taken place before the sixth century and to have been completed by the fifth (Rix 1966, Meiser 1998:66-7).

There are hardly any indications of vowel-weakening or syncopation in Faliscan, and Faliscan is indeed notorious for *not* having vowel-weakening (a point that is repeated from author to author). This idea, however, is mainly based on the form *cun-captum* in LF/Lat 214: this inscription was discovered very early in the history of Faliscan studies and attracted considerable attention at the time, but it is unclear in how far it actually represents contemporary Faliscan. That there has never been a serious
attempt to contradict this view is due to the scarcity of material that could shed some light on the subject. Early Faliscan inscriptions pre-date the developments that can be ascribed to stress, and Early Faliscan forms like *pepārālī* EF 1 corresponding to Latin *peperi* are therefore in no sense an argument against (or for) Faliscan having ever had weakening. In view of the fact that both Latin and the Sabellic languages (and, for those willing to accept an Italic *Sprachbund*, Etruscan) show extensive evidence of various forms of weakening and syncopation in medial and final syllables, it would *a priori* be very surprising if Faliscan did not show features of such developments.

(1) *Weakening of vowels.* In the Middle Faliscan material, there are simply very few forms where weakening could be expected at all. Only a small part of the material is lexical, and here there are simply no the instances are:

(a) *maximo* MF 89 beside *maxōm[a]* MF 90, *maxom[a]* 98 and *[m]ano[m]o* MF 149 (*man[a]mo* MF 80 and *[---]a*ome MF 156 (if interpreted as *māxome*) cannot count as counterexamples). Unfortunately, *MF 89* is known only from an apograph: if it is indeed attested, it shows a reduction of the original medial vowel, as in Latin.

(b) *harīsp[ex]* LtF 231 and *harīsp[ex]* LtF 232: in this case, the form may be due to weakening /u/ → /i/ that is also found in open syllables in Latin (Meiser 1998:68). The form can also be explained as formed after compounds, e.g. the priestly title *pontifex*, especially as Latin *haruspex* shows no reduction of the vowel.

(c) *pipafo* MF 59, *qui-pafo* MF 60, an athematic laryngeal stem, would be expected to have /a/ as a result of the laryngeal developments: in Latin, this /a/ was this was reduced in medial syllables: cf. *bibère, dāre* and *dābo* beside *reddère*. If in the Faliscan forms the -a- represents /a/, it shows no reduction, having perhaps been preserved due to a paradigmatic analogy: there are other explanations of this form where the a is regard as /ā/ (§5.3.1.13).

The remainder of the material is onomastic, where it is difficult to establish whether the forms with medial i show a reduction of another vowel or not (cf., for instance, *pupelio* MF 149, which represents either *Pupellius* or an ‘unreduced’ *Pupilius*). Excluding these instances, as well as the instances where the name is patronymic and formed with a suffix -ilius or an Etruscan name adapted to a Latin-Faliscan -inius, this leaves only the possibility that *weicono* MF 88 is connected with *uecino* LF 220 etc. and with *[u]eculia* MF 88. It seems unlikely that such a connection existed, however.

In the Latin inscriptions, a lack of reduction appears to be attested in *cuncaptum* LF/Lat 214 (mid-second century) but this form may represent a learned reconstruction. The same can be true of *falesce* Lat 218 (late second century) which may be reconstructed after *Falerīt*, and of the e in the gloss *decimatrus* (§6.6), where some MSS have *decemmatrus*, which may have been reconstructed after *decem*. The only clear forms that can be interpreted as instances of vowel reduction in the area are Latin *aciptum, quolunda*, and *saipisume* in Lat 217 (late second century).
Weakening or reduction of vowels in final syllables, however, is well-documented, since it affected several nominal endings.

The best documented instances are those of /o/ in the endings of the second-declension nominative singular /-os#/ and the second declension accusative singular and neuter nominative singular /-om#/). Here, the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions generally have an unreduced -o, or, rarely -os. The exceptions are the genitive plural [fel]icinatiu LF 384 (beside aciuaiom Cap 465 and probably tulom MF 72), which shows that the /-om/ had been shortened to /-om/, and the unexplained tuconu MF 85. Beside the instances of /o/, Faliscan also has a genitive in -e(s) in [---]fate MLF 285, which may represent a non-reduced /-es/ (§4.5.2).

The Latino-Faliscan and Capenate inscriptions likewise generally have nominatives in -o: the instances are [---]ilio LtF 215, clipear[io LtF 231, c[i]peario LtF 233,*(*)coneо LtF 290, munio LtF 377, genucilio Cap 434 and donom Cap 430. The exceptions are the verbal form esú Cap 389, 404, 465, where ú probably represents the Sabellic vowel /o/, the unexplained cl · anu or clanu Cap 397, which may be an abbreviation, and the unclear muru[?]---] LtF 173.

The oldest Latin inscriptions from the area also still have -os in loucilios Lat 268 (fourth century) and fourios Lat 216 (c.220?). From the late third century onwards, however, they generally have -us: spurilius Lat 237 (after c.240), spurilius Lat 238 (after c.240), calpurnius Cap 432 (before 211), [---]rcius Cap 435 (before 211), egnatius Lat 291 (second century), lectu(s) (twice) and amplius Lat 251 (late second century), latrius Lat 218 (c.125), u[mpricius and ?]aburcus Lat 219 (c.120-50), fuluius Lat 250 (106), didius and uettius Lat 455 (c.100-50). Beside this there are the forms in -um in sacru(m) and cuncaptum LF/Lat 214 (mid-second century), gonlegium, aciptum, and opiparum Lat 217 and donum Lat 218. (Dono Cap 431 and dono[?] Cap 433 may be a datives in /-o/). The only exception is zenatuo LF/Lat 214, which may be illustrative of the tendency found in Latin to preserve /o/ after /u/, /u/, or /k/ longer than elsewhere (Meiser 1998:84).

This picture seems straightforward, but the problem is that this is a case of the problem that was touched upon in §3.1.1. The distinction between Latino-Faliscan and Capenate on the one hand and Latin on the other depends upon whether or not the inscriptions in question show dialect features that are compatible with those attested for Faliscan. In several cases, the ending of the second-declension nominative is in fact the only feature in the inscription on which this distinction is based.

(2) Syncopation. The only clear instance of syncopation in a Faliscan word is:

- maximo MF 89, maxjom[o] MF 90, maxom[o] 98, where the original form is probably */mag-isVmo-/ (cf. Cowgill 1970:125).

The other instances all appear to be irregular:
**PHONOLOGY**

- **arutlo** MF 195 must represent a syncopated form *aru(n)t(e)lo* of a name like *Ar-runtulus*: it may also represent an orthographic shortening.
- **reiclo** MF 99 (cf also *reic[i]lo* MF 98 and *re[i]cl[i]* MF 100) is most likely a syncopated form for *reic(i)lio* = *Raecilius* (§7.8.1.132).
- **uisni** MF 82 is a syncopated form for *uis(i)ni* or *uis(e)ni* if this name is connected to *Visinius* (§7.8.2.177).
- **neln** LtF 300 (and *nell[n---]* LtF 299) with the surprising cluster /ln/ is probably due to syncopation. What the non-syncopated form would have been is unclear.
- **[---]lnia** MF 146, although fragmentary, may be an instance of syncopation.
- **[---o]stro** LF 244 and **[---o]str[o** LF 245 may contain a syncopation and represent *...ost(e)ro*: see also §6.2.94.

There are two cases where a vowel is omitted that may have been long, namely *fertrio* Cap 391 for *Fertiōrius* and *fulczeo* LF 329 (beside *folcsoio* LF 333, *folcozeo* LF 330, *folcuso* LF 331, *olcuzeo* LF 332) for *Folcūsio*. In these cases the omission of the vowel may present a graphical contraction or an error rather than syncopation.

All in all, the instances of syncopation in internal syllables appear to show that the phenomenon *did* occur in Middle and Late Faliscan, but irregularly.49

Syncopation of short vowels in *final* syllables occurred as a regular development in Proto-Sabellic (Meiser 1986:59-60) but not in Latin or Faliscan. The one Faliscan instance is *partis* in *leiuelio partis | uolti* MF 79, where the ending appears to show not only a syncopation, but also combines this with a very rare preservation of -s (§3.5.7d). The gentilicium is without parallels, and it may be that the form is incomplete. This syncopation (if it is one) can be compared to the incidental Latin instances *uibis CIL I².552, mercuris CIL I².563* and *caecilis CIL I².1028.*50

Resuming the point that was made at the beginning of this section, I believe that there are indications that Faliscan *did* have stress-related treatment of vowels: if weakening is attested only dubiously, it is clear from the syncopation that stress did affect the vowels. Material for this in internal syllables is rare. The fact that the clearest instances of stress-related vowel-weakening occur in Latin inscriptions from the area is of course not a ground to assume that the phenomenon was due to Latin influence in the area, but rather to the fact that the Latin inscriptions contain more lexemes than the Faliscan inscriptions, which mainly consist of onomatropic data.

---

49 In *felicinate* MF 41 and *[fel]jcinatiu* LF 384, Faliscan has *Feliginas*, while Latin has *Fulginas* and the toponym *Fulginiae/Fulginium*, where the *u* shows that the syncopated form had existed early enough to have developed as */elC/ → /olC/ → /ulC/* (cf. §3.3.4.1).

50 Note that *far* EF 1 is not an instance of syncopation (which in a pre-fifth century text would have been surprising in any case): Umbrian *farsio* TT VIb.2 etc. points to a Proto-Italic */bars/* (Meiser 1986:154, 174), since */barVs-/ would have given */farfio* (Schrijver 1991:113-4).
3.7. The Faliscan diphthongs

3.7.1. General. At the end of the Proto-Italic period, the following diphthongs were present in Proto-Latin: */au/ ou ai ei oi/, and at least two long diphthongs, */ai/ oii/, which may already have been shortened everywhere except in the endings of the first- and second-declension dative singular (cf. Meiser 1998:60): for the possibility of a Faliscan diphthong /oii/, see §3.7.8. In Faliscan, the short diphthongs were all monophthongized during the Middle Faliscan period, earlier than in (Roman) Latin, where this happened during the late third and the first half of the second centuries.

A problem in the description of the Latin diphthongs is that there seems to have been a considerable difference between rural and urban Latin, or rather, a difference between rural and urbane Latin that was exaggerated by the Latin authors on language. These regarded a diphthongal pronunciation as ‘correct’ and belonging to the better layers of urban society, and associated the monophthongal pronunciation with rural or lower-class Latin (cf. R. Giacomelli 1978:25-31, 2006:75-7). The degree to which a monophthong was acceptable, however, appears to be very much connected to when that particular diphthong was monophthongized: authors do not comment on the monophthongization of /ou/ → /uu/, which was completed by the end of the third century, and hardly on the monophthongizations of /oi/ → /oe/ → /uu/ and /ei/ → /ee/, which belong to second century, but they do comment on /ai/ → /ae/ → /ee/ and /au/ → /oo/ (see Blümel 1972:10-4, 28-9, Pfister 1977:63-4, 68-9, also Rocher 1928): what they describe or prescribe is in fact the status quo of the early first century BCE.

3.7.2. The development of /ou/. The diphthong /ou/ had its origins both in PIE */ou/ as well as in PIE */eu/, which merged with */ou/ during the Proto-Italic period: as I said, I do not adopt Schrijver’s suggestion (1991:452) that Proto-Italic */eu/ and */ou/ merged into a neutral diphthong that could be realized as [eu], [au] or [ou] (§3.2.5).

In the Middle Faliscan inscriptions, /ou/ is spelled both as ou and as o (for attestations, see fig.3.7), which points to a monophthongization /ou/ → /uu/ during the Middle Faliscan period. The same monophthongization took place in Latin, where /uu/ had developed further to /uu/ at least in Roman Latin probably by the end of the third century: the earliest instance of the spelling u seems to be luciwm CIL I 2.9 (cf. Blümel 1972:32-3, Meiser 1998:59-60). There are no indications that /uu/ developed to /uu/ in Faliscan as well: Herbig’s (CIE 8225) and Vetter’s (1953:302) suggestion that Middle Faliscan nut*/---/ MF 103 was a form of nutrix was rightly rejected by G. Giacomelli (1963:82-4). Peruzzi (1964d:312) assumed that nutr[---] was a Luxuslehnwort from Roman Latin, but even in that case it would still be the earliest instance of u for original /ou/. Latino-Faliscan rufi in LtF 292 is uncertain, and if to be read thus, reflects second-century Latin.
Early Faliscan has no attestations of /ou/: Vetter’s /loʊʃfɪr/ (1925:27-8), /lʊʃfɪr/ (1939:156), and /lʊʃʃɪr/ (1952:280) in EF 1 are untenable (§12.2, see also §3.7.3). There appear to be two problematic instances of this diphthong in EF 4, namely the woman’s name /ruʃia/ (read by Vetter (1939:151, 1953:258) as /roʃia/) and the man’s name /oʃesium/ (cf. also /oʃetos/ in the same inscription?), connected with the potamonym /Ufens/ by Vetter (1953:286-7). These forms presuppose a monophthongization of /ou/ already during the Early Faliscan period, far earlier than the other Faliscan and Latin monophthongizations: note that this leaves unexplained why the diphthong could still be written as /ou/ in Middle Faliscan. Reading /ruʃia/ also requires a development /ʊ/ → /u/ that is not attested for Faliscan and even in Latin is not attested before c.200. If /ruʃia/ (or /roʃia/) is connected to /ruʃfʊs/ ← Proto-Italic */ruʃðʊ-/ ← PIE */ruʃrʊdʊ-/o-/) it can only be a misspelling for /ruʃfʊs/ (or /roʃfɪa/). The alternative is to connect /ruʃfʊs/ to the Proto-Italic */ruʃʊðʊ-/ ← PIE */ruʃrʊdʊ-ro-) that underlies Latin /rʊber/, but then the name would be */rʊfʊrə/ or */ruʃfɪa/ (or is /ruʃfɪa/ is an error for /ruʃrɪfɪa/?).51

In neighbouring languages, /ou/ was monophthongized even earlier than in Faliscan and Latin: South Picene has one instance of /tʊtas/ TE.5 (beside /tʊtə/ TE.7 and /tʊtaiḥ/ RI.1), which dates from the sixth or the first half of the fifth century. In Umbrian and Volscian, */ou/ had been monophthongized to /o/ /ʊ/ before the time of the earliest inscriptions (Meiser 1986:122-4). In Etruscan, where the diphthong occurs almost exclusively in (onomastic) borrowings from the Italic languages, it is first rendered as /au/ or /av/ (cf. /laʊv|cies/ Etr XXIX from Civita Castellana) and from the early fifth century onwards as /uv/ (Rix 1984:205-6, Steinbauer 1999:39).

3.7.3. The development */loʊβ-/ → */loʊβ-/. A different development of /ou/ is found in the word corresponding to Latin liber- (← PIE */leʊdβero-/) . There are three Faliscan attestations of the spelling /oi/, namely /loɪʃtato/ MF 31, /loɪʃtato/ MF 32, and /lɔɪʃtata/ MF 41. These correspond to the Latin forms “a loebeso, Liberum” (Varro L 6.1) and “loebesum et loebertatem antiqui dicebant liberum et libertatem” (Paul. Fest. 108.5-6L): although these may be learned reconstructions (thus Blümel 1972:25), an intermediate stage /oʃi/ is in any case likely to explain */oʃi/ → /ʊ/ in Latin /lɪber, lɪbertas/, etc. The development is assumed to have been */oʃi/ → /oʃi/ between /l/ and labial (Pfister 1977:70, Meiser 1998:87),52 in all probability related to the variation, in Latin, between /u/ and /i/ in pairs such as /lɪbet/lɪbet and /clɪpeus/clɪpeus (cf. §3.6.4).

---


52 There appear to be no other words that show this development, cf. /glʊbo/ ← Proto-Italic */ɡlʊβ-/ ← PIE */ɡlɪβ-/ and /lɪbrɪkus/ ← Proto-Italic */lɪbɾɪko-/ ← PIE */sleʊb-/: apparently the development did not take place when the /l/ was preceded by another consonant.
Interestingly, this development of */o/ appears to have been restricted to Latin and Faliscan: Paelignian has *lôfir Pg 11, and Oscan, lûvfreís Fr 5, and perhaps Samnitic *lôvfrîkîmiss Sa 4, all with /o/.\textsuperscript{53} Paelignian *lìفار Pg 9 is unclear (cf. WOU s.v.): it has been interpreted as a Latin borrowing 'Liber' (Vetter 1953:149), but more plausible is the interpretation as a Paelignian passive verb equivalent to Latin *libet/lubet (thus e.g. Jiménez-Zamudio 1986:43).

In view of this difference between Latin and Faliscan on the one hand and the Sabellic languages on the other hand, the spelling *o in Faliscan *loferta LF 221, and possibly also in *lof---] MF 155, and *lo MF 165 is surprising. R. Giacomelli’s hope (1978:29) that *loferta could be shown to be earlier than *lôifirt seems unlikely to be fulfilled, as *loifirtato, *loifirtato, and *lôifirta are from tombs at Falerii Vetere and *loferta from a tomb near Falerii Novi that also yielded several Latino-Faliscan inscriptions. Pisani (1964:337-8, 342) suggested that the two spellings distinguished a noun *loferta from a woman’s name *lôifirta = *lôifirta(s), gen. *loifirtato, *loifirtato, but this explains little, as both would still be derived from the same Proto-Italic */lôoðero-. He seems to suggest that *loferta is in fact a hypercorrect form due to confusion between the (exceptional) */o/ → /o/ and the (normal) development /oi/ → /ô/ → /ô/: unfortunately, there are no Faliscan attestations of the latter development, although it is very likely to have existed (cf. Blümel 1972:19).

3.7.4. The development of */au/. The diphthong */au/ occurs in Faliscan only in the name Paula, the Etruscan name Aulena (from the praenomen Aulus) and in names whose origin is unclear (see fig. 3.7). The Middle Faliscan co-occurrence of *Auflûs/Auflûs and Ouflûs/Ouflûs shows that */au/ could be confused with */o/, implying that, like */o/, */au/ was monophthongized to */ô/ (\textsuperscript{54}Note also polae in Lat 251 beside claudia in Lat 393.). In Latin, too, */au/ was monophthongized to */ô/, a change associated by both ancient and modern authors with rural or lower-class Latin. The date of this merger is unclear: the earliest instance seems to be *pola (!) in CIL I.2.379 from Pesaro,\textsuperscript{54} from the first half of the second century, and there appear to be indications for its presence in Plautus as well (see Pfister 1977:68-9, Meiser 1998:61-2). On the other hand, the Roman upper class still favoured the pronunciation [au] well into the first century CE, as the story of Vespasian’s plostrum (Suet. Vesp. 22) shows.

---

\textsuperscript{53} Umbrian vufiune TI Ia.20, uofione TI VIb.19 is sometimes also derived from this root, but the derivation is in my view too unclear to count as an example: see WOU s.v.

\textsuperscript{54} Beside *pola, the cippi Pisaurense also have pisaurese CIL I.2.378 and *lo|ucina CIL I.2.371.
Fig. 3.7. The spelling of /au/, /ou/, and /u/ in initial syllables.

3.7.5. The developments of /e̞i/ , /o̞i/ , and /u̞i/. There are comparatively few data on the developments of /e̞i/ , /o̞i/ , and /u̞i/ in Faliscan, as opposed to Latin (cf. Blümel 1972:15-28, Pfister 1977:64-8, Meiser 1998:58-9, 70-3). In Latin, monophthongization of */e̞i/ to /e̞/ took place during the third century: the resulting /e̞/ was then closed to /ae̞/ by the middle of the second century (Blümel 1972:15-6, Meiser 1998:58).

In Middle Faliscan, */e̞i/ was monophthongized to /e̞/, as is shown by hec /he̞k/ ← */he̞i-ke̞/, which is consistently spelled with e (for attestations, see fig.3.8). The other instances are from the onomasticon, and depend on the dubious connections between ueicno MF 88, [u]eculia MF 81, and uecneo LF 220 etc. (cf. §7.8.1.162, 172-174, and on the interpretation of forms that may show monophthongization of antevocalic /ai/ and /ei/ (see §3.7.6). There are no Faliscan texts that show a further closing of /e̞/ to /ae̞/ as in Latin this merger took place around the middle of the second century, even the Late Faliscan texts are simply too early for this.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$oi$ and $oe$</th>
<th>$ei$</th>
<th>$e$</th>
<th>$i$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with original $/ei/$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hec$</td>
<td>MF 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hec$</td>
<td>MF 146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hec$</td>
<td>MF 158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$fe$</td>
<td>MF 56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hec$</td>
<td>LF 223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$he$</td>
<td>LF 220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$he$</td>
<td>LF 221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$he$</td>
<td>LF 224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[h]e$</td>
<td>LF 226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pleina$</td>
<td>MF 80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pleina$</td>
<td>MF/Etr 199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ueicono$</td>
<td>MF 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$? [u]ecula$</td>
<td>MF 80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$? u[ecul]a$</td>
<td>MF 81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$? uecineo$</td>
<td>LF 220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$? uecineo$</td>
<td>LF 224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$? uecineo$</td>
<td>LF 225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$? uecin[e]a$</td>
<td>LF 222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$? uecinea$</td>
<td>LF 223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$? ueluatia$</td>
<td>MLF 462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$? uelueo$</td>
<td>MLF 463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$? uel$</td>
<td>LtF 205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**from Latino-Faliscan and Latin inscriptions:**

| with original $/ei/$ | | | |
| $heic$ | LtF 231 | | |
| $eidus$ | Lat 393 | | |
| $plenes$ | LtF 231 | | |
| $plenese$ | LtF 251 | | |

| with original $/oi/$ | | | |
| $loidos$ | Lat 217 | | |
| $coiraueront$ | Lat 218 | | |
| $coer$ | Lat 456 | | |
| $idem$ | Lat 456 | | |

**Fig. 3.8. The spelling of $/ei/$, $/oi/$, $/i/$, and $/u/$ in initial syllables.**

The development of $/oi/$ in Faliscan is likewise badly documented. In Latin, $/oi/$ generally merged with $/ei/$ in (closed) internal and final syllables, and subsequently shared the development $/ei/$ → $/i/$ → $/u/$ (Meiser 1998:70, 72). This implies that it had reached the stage $/ei/$ probably somewhere during the first half of the third century (see above). In initial syllables, however, $/oi/$ developed, through an intermediate stage $/oe/$ that was preserved in some words (cf. perhaps the unclear $poe/ MF? 130?$), to $/u/$ (for the material, see Blümel 1972:16-28).
The only Faliscan instances of *oi in initial syllables are secondary: *loifirtato MF 31, *loifirtat MF 32, *loifirta MF 41 with /oi/ ← /ou/ (§3.7.3) and *foied MF 59-60 with /oëi/ (/*o,diëi/ (§3.5.5.1)). I do not adopt M. Mancini’s idea (2002:28-33) that *lete MLF 285 represents /lëëi/, the monophthongized form of a locative */loïtäi/. Beside these instances, oi and oe appear only as archaisms in Latin inscriptions from Falerii Novi and Lucus Feroniae (see fig.3.9).

The other instances are all from case-endings. The second-declension nominative plural ending */-oi/ (§4.3.6) is found in monophthongized form */-ëi/ in *lete MLF 285: this can be compared to socie CIL I 1.5 (early third century) from the area of the Lacus Fucinus and ploirume CIL I 2.9 (c.200) from Rome.

The instances of a non-monophthongized -oi are usually interpreted as datives, but sometimes as genitives (§4.4.4). If these forms are datives, as seems likely in the case of *titoi MF 113, 116, 118, 122, *[t]itoi MF 119, *[t]toi MF 120, *[t]toi MF 121, *[t]itoi[i] MF 115, and *titoëi MF 114, -oi represents the long diphthong */-õi/ (§4.3.2). Where these forms can be interpreted as genitives, as seems possible or probable to me in the cases of *cici MF 40, *titi MF 305, *caisi MF 20, and tiroi · colanoi MF 69-71, and possibly also *****oi LF 333 and eimoi MF 293, -oi represents either the long diphthong */-õi/ or disyllabic */-õi/ or */-õi/ (§4.4.4). Note that these forms show that, unlike */-oi/, the long diphthong */-õi/ (like the long diphthong */-âi/ in the first-declension dative, cf. §3.7.6), was not monophthongized.

Of the neighbouring languages, South Picene shows preservation of -eí and -uí (-/õi/) in endings. Umbrian shows monophthongization of */eëi/ to /ëi/ and of */oëi/ to /õi/: in final syllables, however, both */øi/ and */õi/ were monophthongized to /õi/ (cf. Meiser 1986:122-3, and 66-68 on Proto-Sabellic */õi/). Monophthongization of */ëi/ in closed final syllables can also be observed in Volscian (*uescis VM 1) and in Marsian (*jouies · pucle[s] VM 4). All these monophthongizations took place before the time of the first inscriptions. For Etruscan ei and ui, see Steinbauer 1998:35-7.

3.7.6. The developments of */ai/ and */âi/. The Italic diphthong */ai/ developed during the Proto-Italic period from inherited */h2eëi/ (§3.2.3); under specific, morphologically conditioned circumstances, the long diphthong */-âi/ developed from */-eh2ëi/ (cf. §4.2.3.). Proto-Latin and Proto-Sabellic therefore inherited both */ai/ and */-âi/. The diphthong */ai/ also occurs in the onomasticon, where it can of course be of non-Italic (e.g., Etruscan or Greek) origin. In the Faliscan inscriptions, as in Latin, there are clear signs of monophthongization of */ai/ in initial syllables. As in the treatment of */ei/ and */oi/, I shall follow the relevant developments in Latin first, since these are better documented than the ones in Faliscan. (An overview of the relevant material may be found in Blümel 1972:9-13).
In initial syllables (which is virtually the only position where the diphthong is attested for Faliscan), Latin originally shows a spelling *ai*, with a new spelling *ae* appearing from the early second century onwards, first in *aedem CIL I^2.581.1* (186), and, from the first half of the second century onwards, a new spelling *e*, in *cedito* and *cedre CIL I^2.365* from Falerii Novi, and *fedra CIL I^2.1413* from Rome.

The problem lies in what phonemic or phonetic reality these various spellings represent. According to the usual interpretation (Pfister 1977:62-3, Meiser 1998:58, 61-2), *ai* represents the diphthong /ai/, *ae*, a more open diphthong /ae/, and *e*, a monophthong /e/. This monophthong is often regarded as dialectal and/or due to substratum influence, and not part of Roman Latin or upper-class Roman Latin, since Quintilian (*Inst.* 1.7.18), Terentianus Scaurus (*CGL* 7.16.5-6), and Marius Victorinus (*CGL* 6.32.4) apparently describe the sound as (still?) a diphthong.

Blümel (1972:9-15) argued at some length that already *ae* represents the monophthong /e/. There seems to be no compelling evidence for this, however: also, in a development /ai/ → /e/, an intermediate stage is thoroughly plausible, and it seems likely that the *ae* represents this stage at least in the earlier instances. On the other hand, the monophthongization to /e/ may have taken place quite early, depending also on the interpretation of the datives in -a as representing /-i/ (see below), of the cases where the form with *e* became the standard form (cf. Pfister 1977:62, Meiser 1998:62), and of the rendering of Latin words in Greek and Greek words in Latin (cf. Blümel 1972:11-2). The testimony of the ancient authors on the persistence of /ae/ cannot be decisive, except for what they regarded as standard Latin, and even then they may be describing a wished-for state based on the *status quo* of the second or first century BCE rather than the actual situation.

In Faliscan, there are likewise three ways of spelling this diphthong, namely *ai, ei* and *e* (for the instances, see fig.3.9.). The spelling *ai* clearly represents the diphthong /ai/, but already during the Middle Faliscan period the predominant spellings are *ei* and *e*, so that already in Middle Faliscan *ai* must have become a ‘historical’ spelling: there are in fact no instances of *ai* from inscriptions that are with certainty Late Faliscan. The Middle Faliscan spelling *ei* may represent a different diphthong, and the spelling *e*, a monophthong: this means that already during the Middle Faliscan period *ei* must also have become a ‘historical spelling’: it is in fact the spelling that is least used. As in the case of Latin, it is not clear which diphthong and which monophthong are represented by *ei* and *e*. In my view, there are two possibilities:

---

55 It is remarkable how soon the introductions of *ae* and of *e* follow each other: this either points to a quick development of /ae/ → /e/, or to the introduction of the monophthongized vowel from other languages or dialect, or, in case *ae* already represents /e/, of the spelling *e* from other orthographical traditions.
## PHONOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ai</th>
<th>ei</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aimiosio</td>
<td>EF 467*</td>
<td>eimosi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a[i?]m</td>
<td>MF 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aino</td>
<td>MLF 352</td>
<td>ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cailio</td>
<td>MF 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cailio</td>
<td>MLF 358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cailia</td>
<td>MF 376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cailiia</td>
<td>MF 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MF 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaisiosio</td>
<td>EF 7</td>
<td>eisio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kai[s]i[o]</td>
<td>MF 51</td>
<td>eisi[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cais[i]o]</td>
<td>MF 153</td>
<td>eisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caisio</td>
<td>MF 351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caisioi</td>
<td>MF 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c[ai]s[i]ta</td>
<td>MF 41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MF 141</td>
<td>leiuelio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reic[lio]</td>
<td>MF 98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reiclio</td>
<td>MF 99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rei[cli]</td>
<td>MF 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sceiuiai</td>
<td>LF 379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 3.9. The spelling of /ai/ and its reflexes in initial syllables.*
(1) The spelling *ei* represents essentially the same sound as Latin *ae*. Faliscan would then have indicated the changed quality of the diphthong by changing the first letter of the digram (*ai* → *ei*), and Latin, by changing the second (*ai* → *ae*): alternatively, the Latin diphthong may be thought of as */æ/ and the Faliscan diphthong, as */ei/*. The Faliscan spelling may have been influenced by the spelling of Etruscan, where *ai* was replaced by *ei* during the fourth century (Steinbauer 1999:34-5), but the use of *ei* to denote the reflex of */ai/* is also found in Latin *ceisia CIL I².559* from Praeneste and *queistores* (beside *uiicturie*) *CIL I².388* from Trasacco. If the Faliscan diphthong represented by *ei* was (approximately) the same as the one in Latin, the monophthong represented by *e* may well have been */e/*.

(2) The spelling *ei* represents a more closed diphthong than Latin *ae*. Since the spelling *ei* is also used for the diphthong */ei/* and *e* for its monophthongized reflex */e/*, it is possible on the basis of the spelling alone that */ai/* in fact merged with */ei/* and, like it, was monophthongized to */e /*.56 This seems to be the interpretation of Blümel (1972:13, 34-5), who represents the Latin monophthong as */e/* and the Faliscan and Praenestine monophthong as */e/*, and perhaps also of R. Giacomelli (1978:25).57

Which of these two interpretations is the correct one cannot be established: there is no way to show whether the *ei* and *e* that represented the reflex of */ai/* were phonemically or phonetically different from the *ei* and *e* that represented the reflex of */ei/*. Since for the purpose of this study I assume that Faliscan is a Latin dialect, I chose the first interpretation, being unwilling to assume different developments for the various Latin dialects unless there are positive arguments for doing so. Whether it represents */e/* or */ei/*, the spelling *e* for the reflex of */ai/* is already the predominant one during the Middle Faliscan period, indicating that the process of monophthongization was concluded by the middle of the third century. This is substantially earlier than Latin, where the first clear attestations of monophthongization are from the second century, and then from areas where substratum influence can be assumed.

In antevocalic position, the spelling *ai* occurs both in initial syllables, as in *kaios EF 4, aiedies Cap 390* (and perhaps *aiea MF 110*, if to be read thus), and in medial syllables, as in *uoltaia MF 196, latinaio MF 210, aiciuaim Cap 465* and perhaps also *clipeaio MF 470* and *frenaioi MF 471* (if these are not errors for *clipeaioi* and *frenaioi*, or due to palatalization of */ri/*, §3.5.5.). On the other hand, there appear to be several cases of gentilicia ending in the nominative in *-ieo/*-*iea* or, in the genitive, in *-ei*, which points to a name ending in *-aeus/-aea* or *-eius/-eia*:

56 This is in fact the Latin development of */ai/* in closed medial and final syllables, where */ai/* merged with */e/*, and thence with */u/* by the middle of the second century.

57 R. Giacomelli does not clearly differentiate between graphemes and phonemes at this point, which rather obscures his arguments.
PHONOLOGY

- *aiea* MF 110 (if to be read thus, which is very doubtful), can represent *Aieia* or possibly *Aiaea* (§7.8.1.9);
- *loria* MLF 314 (beside *louria* in MF 41) is clearly either *Luriaea* or *Lurieia* (§7.8.1.91);
- *letei* MF 470* can be derived from Etruscan *lethaie* Etr XLVIII and represent the genitive of an unattested *Letaeus*, or from Etruscan *Lebe* as the genitive of a likewise unattested *Leleius* (§7.8.1.85);
- *catinei* MF 469* is the genitive, either of *Catineius*, which occurs in Latin, or of an unattested *Catinaeus* (cf. §7.8.1.37);
- *tertinei* MLF 471* and *tertineo* LF 213 are forms of either *Tertineius* or *Tertinaeus* (Latin only has *Tertinius*, cf. §7.8.1.151);
- *uelcei* MLF 332 is probably a form of *Velceius*, but could conceivably be a form of *Velcaeus* (§7.7.1.81).

These forms are discussed by G. Giacomelli (1962:363), and point to a monophthongization of antevocalic /aiV/ → /eiV/ and /iV/. I do not adopt this interpretation in the cases of (1) *uecineo* LF 220, 224, 225, *uecineo* LF 223, *uecin[e]a* LF 221, which is consistently spelled with -e- and can be compared to Latin *Vicinius*; (2) *zertenea* LF 221, spelled with -e- but comparable with the Latin *Sertinius*; (3) the patronymic adjectives derived from *Iuna* and *Volta*, which are *iuneo* MF 151, *iuneo* LF 220, perhaps also *iu[n]e*o MF 141, and *uolteo* MF 275, *uolteo* MF 276, since I read *uoltio* in LF 224, and when the patronymic adjectives of *Iuna* and *Volta* are used as a praenomen or a gentilicium, they are always spelled with i (cf. §7.5.2).

In final syllables, -ai only occurs in endings. The Early Faliscan inscription have attestations both of the short diphthong /aiV/ → /eiV/ and /iV/. I do not adopt this interpretation in the cases of (1) *uecineo* LF 220, 224, 225, *uecineo* LF 223, *uecin[e]a* LF 221, which is consistently spelled with -e- and can be compared to Latin *Vicinius*; (2) *zertenea* LF 221, spelled with -e- but comparable with the Latin *Sertinius*; (3) the patronymic adjectives derived from *Iuna* and *Volta*, which are *iuneo* MF 151, *iuneo* LF 220, perhaps also *iu[n]e*o MF 141, and *uolteo* MF 275, *uolteo* MF 276, since I read *uoltio* in LF 224, and when the patronymic adjectives of *Iuna* and *Volta* are used as a praenomen or a gentilicium, they are always spelled with i (cf. §7.5.2).
There are two instances of -e that have been explained as monopthongized endings Colonna’s (1972:446-7) interpretation of [---]ronio : uol[---]a*ome MF 156 as a sepulchral inscription of the type ‘X [made this grave] for Y’ (§8.10.2), and M. Mancini’s (2002:28-33) interpretation of lete MLF 285 as a locative /loîtāj/. This is very doubtful on several grounds: note that the interpretation requires a productive locative for Faliscan (§8.2.1). To these two instances can be added eco tulie MLF 383 if tulie is a genitive /tulli/g413/; it is, however, rather an Etruscoid nominative in -e(s), for which cf. §9.2.2.2c.

Another group of instances, however, are the datives in -a in the Latin inscriptions from Lucus Feroniae, fejrona in Cap 431 and feronea Cap 433 (both before 211), and in menerua · sacru LF/Lat 214 (probably mid-second century). Such datives in -a appear to have spread from Latium and the Latin-speaking colonies, and are found in Southern Etruria from the fourth and third century onwards: the first instances in Etruria are mursina CIL I².580 from Cortona (?), and menerua CIL I².2909 from Veii. (Interestingly, the datives in -a from the agri Faliscus and Capenas are occur in Latin inscriptions.) Wachter (1987:483-4) suggests that in these forms -a represents /-/g413/: in other words, the monophthong reflex of the sound spelled -ae could be spelled both as -e and as -a. In that case, the spread of the dative in -a would be no more than the introduction of an alternative way of spelling /-ē/, which in my view is a more attractive solution than the morphophonological explanations that have until now been proposed for these forms (for which see Villar 1986).

With regard to the surrounding languages, the Faliscan monopthongization of /aɪ/ was therefore slightly earlier than the Latin one, but more or less contemporary with the Etruscan one, where the spelling ai was replaced by e during the fourth century (Rix 1984:205-6, Steinbauer 1999:34-5). As for the Sabellic languages, Umbrian, Volscan and Marsian show complete monopthongization of /aɪ/ (and /āɪ/) by the time of the oldest inscriptions, and it cannot be established at what time it occurred.

3.7.7. A diphthong /ų/? As said in the discussion on the forms (titoi) mercui (§14.1.3, §4.6.2), there is a reasonable possibility that a dative in -ui occurs in titoi | mercui MF 113, [tj[to][i] | mercui] MF 115, titoi | mercui MF 116, tito | mercui MF 114, titoi : mercui[i] MF 118, [tj]tioi : mercui[i] MF 119, [ti]tioi : mercui[i] MF 120, [ti]tioi : mercui MF 121, titoi : m[e]rcui MF 122, [m]ercui MF 124, and mercui MF 125 (the same ending is restored in MF 117 and 123). Although a diphthong /ų/ or /āų/ is admittedly alien to theItalic languages, it is hard to imagine that in this form, and probably also in its Oscan parallel mirikui Cm 12 (which, as it predates the introduction of ũ and ů, may be an o-stem dative in /-ōi/), -ui represents anything other than /-u/ or /-ū/, perhaps an analogical creation after the first-declension dative /-āi/ and the second-declension dative /-ōi/. Note that -ui cannot represent /-ui/ ← /-u/ ← */-uij/, as in Faliscan /ōi/ had not merged with /i/ (§3.7.5).
3.8. Summary of §§3.2-7

As was said at the beginning of this chapter, the phonological material in general allows to take a more structural look at the position of Faliscan, especially from a diachronic perspective (§1.2). If we working as strictly as possible from a theoretical development Proto-Italic > Proto-Latin > ..., the developments observable in Faliscan can be placed within this framework.

As was to be expected, Faliscan shows no reflexes of any individual developments at the Proto-Italic stage: from a theoretical perspective, this would have been mutually exclusive with the position of Faliscan as an Italic language. I point especially to the Proto-Italic merger of */e/ with */o/, where it has been suggested that Faliscan shows signs of the preservation of */e/ (§3.2.1): in my view, there is no evidence for this, and certainly not from Faliscan.

At the post-Proto-Italic stage, however, we find the first, and probably earliest, development where Faliscan develops differently, namely the Proto-Latin development of the word-internal reflexes of the original voiced aspirates, (§3.3.3). (Note that if Faliscan is regarded as a Latin dialect and shows a different development from the other Latin dialects, this development can of course no longer be called ‘Proto-Latin’.) However much I would see that things were otherwise, it cannot with reason be maintained that Faliscan in this respect resembles other Latin dialects where the development was the same as in Faliscan: there simply is no evidence for such dialects within Latin. The development in Faliscan appears to be similar to that in the Sabellic languages, and all the material from within Latin that reflects a similar development can without problems be ascribed to interference from a Sabellic language, presumably Sabine.

For Faliscan, this must imply a period of independent development, which can unfortunately not be dated either to a recent or to an early period. It should be noted, however, that the Faliscan development is completely in line with the general trend of the development of the voiced aspirates in the Italic languages, namely a development resulting in spirants both word-initially and word-internally, while it is the Latin development that is in fact the unique one, resulting in occlusives word-internally. This could potentially be taken as indicating that the traditional position, namely that this was a local Roman development that spread through the rest of the Latin-speaking area, is in fact correct, even though evidence is lacking.

This development is even stranger in view of the fact that Faliscan shows no other independent developments during the post-Proto-Italic period: in fact, all other Proto-Latin developments that can be traced in the Faliscan material show that Faliscan sided with Latin wherever there was a difference between the Proto-Latin and the Proto-Sabellic developments, such as e.g. the preservation of the labiovelars (§3.4) or the development of /er/ between dentals (§3.3.4). This remained so during the later periods, as is shown e.g. by the development of /o/ between labials (§3.7.3), and by fairly re-
cent developments such as rhotacism (§3.5.3), which in my view is attested for Faliscan, and the development /#fV/ → /#hV/, which probably operated in other Latin dialects as well (§3.5.2).

Faliscan is slightly earlier than most other Latin dialects, and certainly earlier than that of Rome, in the monophthongization of the diphthongs (§3.7), but the general tendency of these monophthongizations is the same as in Latin, and where the final result is different, this is because in Latin the monophthongization process reached its final stages only during the second century, when Faliscan texts were no longer produced. A similar picture can be drawn in the case of the second-declension nominative singular ending -os, both with regard to the omission of word-final -s, where Faliscan is so consistent in its omission that I have ventured to suggest that this might have been an orthographical rule (§3.5.7d), and with regard to the weakening of the vowel (§3.6.6.1), where our view of the situation is obscured by the fact that the second-century material from the area is Latin rather than Faliscan.

All in all, the only phonological feature that separates Faliscan from Latin are, as I said, the word-internal reflexes of the voiced aspirates, a feature that points to a significantly different development that was perhaps of reasonably early date. Yet this is the only phonological feature that separates Faliscan from Latin, while every other phonological development is either in agreement with the Latin development or is of very recent date. I shall return to this point in §10.1.2.