Chapter 4

The nominal and pronominal inflections

The study of Faliscan declensional morphology provides a number of interesting cases where Faliscan can be compared with both Latin and the Sabellic languages. Apart from this, the Faliscan data have played an important role in the discussions on the history of the second-declension genitive singular. After a short preliminary remark (§4.1), this chapter deals with the attested case endings of the first declension (§4.2), the second declension (§4.3), the second-declension genitive singular (§4.4), the third declension (§4.5), the fourth declension (§4.6), and the fifth declension (§4.6) respectively. The second part of the chapter is devoted to the personal pronouns (§4.7), the demonstrative pronoun (§4.8), and the relative pronoun (§4.9). The chapter concludes with a short evaluation of the position of Faliscan from a morphological perspective (§4.10).

4.1. The nominal and pronominal inflections: methodological issues

Studies on specific cases or endings apart, Faliscan nominal morphology has been treated comprehensively by Deecke (1888:262-6), Stolte (1926:48-58), and G. Giacomelli (1963:131-50). The studies on specific endings mostly concentrate on the history of the ending of the second-declension genitive singular (see §4.4), for in this case especially, the relative antiquity of the Faliscan material comes into its own.

As in the case of phonological data (§3.1.1), only the inscriptions classed as Faliscan have been used as a source for the primary data. The Latino-Faliscan, Capenate, and Latin inscriptions have only been used to provide additional material.

It may be asked to what extent names of Etruscan origin were adapted to the Italic paradigms of Faliscan, as they were in Latin. Where this can be ascertained, it appears that Etruscan names in -a were declined according to the Faliscan first declension, that Etruscan names like Larθ and Arnθ were declined according to the consonant-stems, and that Etruscan toponymic gentilicia formed with the suffix -te/-ti were declined according to the i-stems. These forms have therefore not been treated separately. An exceptional case are the ‘Etruscoid’ forms in -(i)es: these are discussed in §9.2.2.2d.

The main problem in the description of the Faliscan nominal declension is that a number of forms can be interpreted in several ways, especially those without context. The most notable examples of this are the first-declension forms in -ai and the second-declension forms in -oi, which can be interpreted both as genitives and as datives. The interpretation depends on syntactic and typological comparison with similar texts in the Italic languages and in Etruscan. This is discussed in §8.2.3-4 and §8.8.1.
4.2. The first nominal declension

4.2.1. The first-declension nominative singular. The clearest attestations of the nominative are those where it occurs as the subject of a verb phrase. The instances of the feminine nominative subjects are

\[ \text{oqo urnel[a ti?]tela fitaidupes : arcentelom hutik[c?]ilom : pepara[i?] EF 1} \]
\[ ..... : hec : cupa]nt MF 80 \]
\[ uolta : iatiaeuec | hec : cupa]nt MF 158 \]
\[ [po]pliaq[---] : hec : cupa]nt MF 161 \]
\[ uipia : zertenea | marci : acarcelini | mate : he : cupa]nt LF 221 \]
\[ marcio : acarcelinio | caui : uecinea | hec : cupa]nt LF 223 \]

In these and in all other instances, which are too numerous to enumerate here (for attestations see §7.4.1 with fig.7.2), the ending is -a. Faliscan therefore, like Latin, preserved the unrounded vowel /-a/ or /-a/ (see below), whereas in the Sabellic languages the vowel was rounded to /-u/ (Umbrian -a, -u, -o, Oscan -u, -ú, -o, -o) before the fifth century (Meiser 1986:44). The instances of a nominative with a rounded vowel in Faliscan, caui : terturei : | postienu MLF/Cap 474*, and perhaps sta sediu Cap 466, may be due to interference from a Sabellic language: see §9.3.2.

The masculine first-declension stem nominative subjects are

\[ mama z[e]xtos med f[if]iqod EF 1 \]
\[ ..... : hec : cupa]nt MF 80 \]


In all these cases the ending is -a, and Faliscan therefore had asigmatic first-declension masculine nominatives, as did the other Italic languages:60 note that Greek names in -a or -u were given a nominative in -a both in Latin (e.g. Anchisa Naev. Poen. 25.1S, Aeacida Enn. Ann. 273V; see LHS p.454) and in Oscan (arkiia Po 65, santia Cm 40, but arimmas Po 52).

---

60 The exceptions are Latin Graecisms like cottas CIL 1.2.877 from Sicily, hosticapas Paul. Fest. 91.15L and paricidas Paul. Fest. 247.24L, and Oscan praenomina like marcas Cm 14, markas Po 66 (from autopsy: margas ST), and tanas Sa 27 (originally indigenous second-declension names with -as /-as/ ← /-os/, as in Messapic?).
Although the quantity of the first-declension nominative -a in Faliscan cannot be established (cf. §3.6.1), it is worthwhile to devote a few words to the problem, as I shall have to return to it later (§4.4.11). The ending of the first-declension nominative singular (and of the neuter plural nominative-accusative, which was originally identical with it), is usually reconstructed as PIE */-/e/ → Proto-Italic */-/a/ → */-/ã/. In Latin, however, the ending is */-/a/ already at the earliest time the quantity of the vowel can be ascertained, namely the mid-third century, when the first quantitative verse appears. It is therefore assumed that in Latin */-/ã/ was shortened before the third century, and, as this shortening cannot be described as a regular phonological process, various analogical models have been proposed for it, but none of these is really convincing: for a discussion, see Beekes 1985:21-5. In the Sabellic languages, on the other hand, the vowel of the nominative ending was rounded, while the short vowel of the vocative, */-/a/ ← Proto-Italic */-/ã/ ← PIE */-/h2/, remained unrounded at least in Umbrian: the attestations of the vocative, all from the texts in the Latin alphabet, are always spelled -a, while in the Latin alphabet the nominative is always spelled -o. This implies that there was a quantitative difference between the Sabellic vocative and nominative endings at least at the time the vowel was rounded.

Lejeune (1949) suggested that in Oscan and Umbrian, the vowel of the nominative ending it was shortened after it was rounded, as it was also in Latin, and that in all three languages, this was due to a tendency to shorten the most open long vowel in word-final position. If this were correct, there would seem to be no reason why this shortening should not have taken place also in Faliscan, but as things stand, it is doubtful whether Lejeune’s theory can be accepted.

A radically different solution has been proposed by Beekes (1985:20-37). According to him the PIE ending was not */-/e/, but */-/h2/, which would be reflected by (among others) Latin */-/a/’. In some languages, among which Oscan and Umbrian, */-/h2/ would then have been replaced by */-/e/ or */-/h3/ after the accusative */-/e/ → */-/h3/. However, the assumption that Latin and the Sabellic languages had different morphophonological developments already before the Proto-Italic disappearance of the laryngeals is inadmissible (cf. §3.1.2). It is more likely that the remodelling of the nominative took place later, and that the PIE nominative */-/h2/ developed regularly to Proto-Italic */-/ã/. This is also implied by the fact that several of the inflectional types of the stems in */-/iH/ (e.g. the devi-type stems in */-/iH/) had a Proto-Italic nominative in */-/i/ that could only have developed from */-/iH/ (see

---

61 Et densis aquilã pennis obnixa uolabat Enn. Ann. 147V is a lengthening metri causa (Skutsch 1985:58), not a reminiscence of the older */-/ã/, as Steuart (1925:131) suggested.

62 Cf. the Oscan neuter accusative plural σεγνυν αἰξιω ... ὠστασαν ... σταβαλανο Lu 5. Lejeune later (1970:300) suggested that the shortening preceded the rounding, but this would leave the difference between the Umbrian nominative and vocative unexplained.
Schrijver 1991:363-90). It would then be possible to envisage a Proto-Italic remodelling of */-/i/* to */-ia -ia/ after the rest of the paradigm (and possibly after the second declension with */-ios -ios/), resulting in a Proto-Italic */-ia -ia/ that was preserved in Latin but remodelled in Proto-Sabellic to */-ia -ia/ after the /-a/ in the endings of the oblique cases.

4.2.2. The first-declension genitive singular. The first-declension genitive singular ending provides one of the presumed morphological differences between Faliscan and Latin.

The communis opinio on the development of the ending of this case in the Italic languages is that the Proto-Italic ending was */-ās/*, which either reflected the PIE proterodynamic ending */-e̞h₂s/* (or */-eh₂es/*) or was a replacement of PIE hysterodynamic ending */-h₂os/*. This */-ās/* was preserved in the Sabellic languages (South Picene itas : estas : amge|nas AP.3, saf|inas : titas TE.5, safina|s TE.7, h[1-2]pas CH.1, selah AQ.3², fītias RI.1, Umbrian -as → -ar, Oscan -as, -aç). In Latin, */-ās/*, epigraphically attested in late-seventh- or mid-sixth-century eco urna tita uendias Lat 479†, and in fourth- or third-century manias CIL 1².2917b and pias CIL 1² sub 479,63 was replaced by an */-āv/* created after the second-declension ending */-i/*, probably first in the masculine forms. The first attestations of -ai are from the early third-century pocula deorum (aecetiai CIL 1².439, belolai CIL 1².441, fortunai CIL 1².443, laueruai CIL 1².446, meneruai CIL 1².447, uestai CIL 1².452). In literary Latin, Andronicus and Naevius still have -as: Andronicus’ topper citi ad aedes uenimus Circae 27L is a modernization by a copyist, either of an original Circai or of an original Circas. In Ennius (who only once has -as in dux ipse uias Ann. 41V) and Plautus, the normal genitive is */-ai/* or */-āi/* (cf. Blümel 1972:39, Pfister 1977:118-9), */-āi/* being employed for metrical convenience at or near the line-end (Skutsch 1975). After this time the genitive in -as is found only in formulas like pater familias (first Cato Agr. 2.1).

This model has been challenged by Schrijver (1991:360-3), who raises the traditional objections (1) that it is hard to credit the relatively small number of masculine forms with being the origin of */-āv/*, and (2) that */-āv/* is not the expected result if the model were */-i/*. He proposes that during the Italo-Celtic period the PIE hysterodynamic genitive ending */-h₂os/* was replaced by the new second-declension genitive */-iH/*. In Latin, the resulting */-i/* was then remodelled to */-āv/* after the /-ā/* of the other endings, and this form was eventually generalized in favour of */-ās/*, the reflex of the PIE proterodynamic genitive */-e̞h₂s/*. In the Sabellic languages, on the other hand, the ending of the proterodynamic flexion was retained and the reflex of the hysterodynamic ending discarded. I find it very hard to accept this, not in the least because in the earliest Latin and Faliscan epigraphic material we find only -as, the forms in -ai appearing only

63 The forms in -as in deuas | corniscas | sacrum CIL 1².975 and anabestas CIL 1².969 may be plural datives with -as representing */-e̞s/* or */-εs/*: cf. §4.2.3.
from the early third century onwards. Schrijver in fact completely disregards the epigraphic evidence, stating that “the normal Gsg. of the Latin ā-stems from the earliest documents onwards is -āī (> -ae)” (1991:360). Neither do I find the assumption of a centuries-long coexistence of two apparently productive morphemes /-/g407s/ and /-/g431/ for the same category attractive. I therefore maintain the communis opinio as set out above.

The situation in Faliscan is less clear than in Latin. Faliscan certainly had a genitive in -as, which appears in

\[ \text{titias duenom duenas} \quad \text{EF 3} \]
\[ \text{titias} \quad \text{MF 201} \]
\[ \text{pupiaias} \quad \text{MLF 304} \]

Whether Faliscan, like the Sabellic languages, preserved the genitive in -as (thus e.g. G. Giacomelli 1963:139-40, 1978:517), or, like Latin, shifted to a genitive in -ai, is unclear. The evidence for a Faliscan genitive in -ai is inconclusive and consists of:

(a) Contextless forms in -ai in the pottery inscriptions:

\[ \text{iunai} \quad \text{MF 74, 107, Cap 475*} \]
\[ \text{uoltai} \quad \text{MLF 367-370} \]
\[ \text{sceiuai} \quad \text{LF 379} \]

These could be Besitzerinschriften consisting of genitives in -ai. They can also be interpreted, however, as Geschenkinschriften consisting of the name of the recipient in the dative, as is shown by vultasi Etr XLII and perhaps by the second-declension forms in -oi, which are generally interpreted as datives: see §8.2.3-4 and §8.8.1.

(b) Forms in -ai with a context, of which the following can be interpreted as genitives:

\[ \text{[---]*i : u[o]ltiai} \quad \text{lo} \quad \text{MF 165} \]
\[ \text{tito : uel|minoe} \quad \text{: iun|a} \quad \text{i*ice} \quad \text{MLF 315.} \]

The former could be translated as ‘..., a freedman/freedwoman of ... Volitia’ and the latter as ‘Titus Velminaeus ..., son of Luna’ (rather than ‘Titus Velminaeus [made this grave?] for Luna’). Possibly also genitives, but perhaps rather datives, are the forms in -ai (‘X [made this grave] for Y’) are larise : mar|\text{cna} :: c\text{itiae} \quad \text{MF 270} \quad \text{and caui\text{o} uelm\text{ineo} | popl\text{tiae} \text{file} \quad \text{MLF 308}: \text{see} \text{§8.10.2. Unclear are [--- J: za\text{coniai} \quad \text{MF 154 and cu\text{icto uelm\text{ineo | [--]uoxie[.]eai} \quad \text{MLF 310.}})\]

(c) Eco tulie LF 383, where tulie could be a genitive with a monophthongized ending, /tulli\text{e}/, but could also be a Etrusco nomine tulie(s) (see §9.2.2.2d). I tend towards the latter interpretation, as there is no other instance of a monophthongized ending in either the genitive or the dative of the first declension (§3.7.6).

---

64 The same is true for the second declension, which in this theory would have had a genitive in */-/\text{II} \rightarrow /-/\text{v}/ from the Italo-Celtic stage onwards: the early Latin and Faliscan epigraphic material shows only -osio, while the genitive in -i does not appear before the late fourth century.
(d) Some of the Faliscan forms in -oi that can be interpreted as genitives: the easiest explanation of these forms is that they are modelled on genitives in -ai: see §4.4.4.

This material is so ambiguous that whether or not Faliscan is assumed to have had a genitive in -ai is based mainly on a priori arguments. However, the reluctance of authors to accept a Faliscan genitive in -ai is probably partly due to the fact that this ending is supposed to be modelled on the second-declension genitive singular ending -i /-i/, which was long thought to be non-existent in Faliscan (§4.4.1). I myself am inclined to assume the existence of a Middle and Late Faliscan first-declension genitive in -ai, regarding the instances under (a) and at least the first two instances under (b) as attestations, with those referred to under (d) as supporting this assumption.

A few remarks with regard to the Faliscan genitive in -ai. (1) It seems likely that a Faliscan genitive in -ai is to be ascribed to the same shift as in Latin, taking place simultaneously also in the ager Faliscus and Capenas: there seems to be no reason to assume that it reached the area due to influence from Latin, as e.g. Devine (1970:20-1) assumed. (2) Devine’s (1970:20) suggestion that the Faliscan genitive in -ai is attested only from masculine forms and might not yet have penetrated the feminine forms, is now contradicted by sceiuai LF 379. (3) It cannot be ascertained whether, in the Faliscan genitives in -ai, this -ai represents /-aā/, or whether at some point this became a diphthong /-ā/ or /-ai/ as in Latin. If tulia in LF 383 is a monophthongized genitive (which I doubt), this would imply the latter.

4.2.3. The first-declension dative singular. The only incontrovertible attestation of the dative comes from Early Faliscan, in

prai[i]os urnam : soc[iai] pored karai EF 1

Most of the forms in -ai from the later periods appear in such a context that they can also be interpreted as genitives (see §4.2.2 and §8.8.1). Of these forms, those that can perhaps most plausibly be interpreted as datives are the sepulchral inscriptions of the type ‘X [made this grave] for Y’ (cf. §8.10.2):

larise : mar|ca : citiai MF 270
cauio uelmineo | popliai file LF 308

Perhaps datives too, but unclear, are · iii · l[--------][--------]nai[?---] MF 17 (‘the third bed (?) ... for ...na’) and [---]altai : MF 109 (a dedication?). Unclear, too, are [--- ]: zaconiai MF 154 and cuicto uelmineo | [---]uoxie|jeai LF 310. Of the remaining forms in -ai, I interpret the contextless forms in -ai in Besitzerinschriften, iunai MF 74, 107, Cap 475*, uoltai MLF 367-370, and sceiuai LF 379, as genitives rather than as datives. A dative interpretation is possible, however, in view of vultasi Etr XLII and perhaps also of the second-declension forms caiisoi MF 20 and tiroi · colaniou MF 66-68: see §8.8.1. I likewise regard the forms in -ai in [---]*i u[o]ltiai lo MF 165 and tito : uel|mineo : iun|aj i*ice MLF 315 as genitives rather than as datives.
Although ambiguous, the material shows that Faliscan in all probability had a dative in -ai reflecting Proto-Italic */-āi/ and the reflex of the PIE proterodynamic ending */-eh2ēi/ or a remodelling of the reflex of the PIE hysterodynamic ending */-h2ē/i/. The same ending is found in Latin (-ai, later -ae) and in the Sabellic languages (Umbrian -e /-ē/ > -ai, Oscan -ai, -ai). In both branches the long diphthong of the Proto-Italic ending may have been shortened: in Latin before c.250 (Blümel 1972:38-9), perhaps even at a prehistoric date (Villar 1987a:49, 1987b); for the shortening in the Sabellic languages, see Meiser 1986:66-8.

Monophthongization of the dative ending is regular in Umbrian and Volscian, and is found sporadically also in Latin inscriptions, often from areas where substratum influence can be assumed (e.g. victorie CIL I.388 from the Lacus Fucinus, supunne CIL I.2.2111 from Foligno, victorie CIL I.2.2631 from Veii). Although in Middle Faliscan Āi/ was monophthongized word-internally, there are no certain instances of monophthongization in the dative ending (§3.7.7): I therefore find it hard to adopt Colonna’s (1972c:446-7) interpretation of MF 156 as ‘...ronio : uol[--- m]axome ... Maxuma’.

Another group of instances, however, is constituted by the datives in -a in menerua · sacru LF/Lat 214 and in the Latin inscriptions from Lucus Feroniae, fe]ronea Cap 431, and feronea Cap 433. These datives in -a seem to have spread from Latium and the Latin-speaking colonies, and are found in Southern Etruria from the fourth and third century onwards: mursina CIL I.2.580 from Cortona (?), and menerua CIL I.2.2909 from Veii (the instances from Lucus Feroniae, too, are from the third century). Wachter (1987:483-4) suggests that in these forms -a represents /-ē/. In that case the spread of the dative in -a would be no more than the introduction of an alternative way of spelling /-ē/ (in other words, the sound spelled -ae could now be spelled both as -e and as -a).

4.2.4. The first-declension accusative singular. The accusative singular is attested only for Early Faliscan, in

pra[j]os urnam : soç[jai] pored karai EF 1
eitam EF 5

The Proto-Italic form was */-ām/, reflecting the PIE hysterodynamic ending */-eh2m/. In the Sabellic languages, where the regular spelling of the ending was -am (attested e.g. in South Picene viam, tokam TE.2, deiktam, ok[r]jikam, qora CH.1, postiknam CH.2, koram AQ.2, in Umbrian -am, Oscan -am), the long vowel appears to have been preserved, as is implied both by Oscan paam Po 3 and p]aam Sa 4, and by the fact that the ending of the ia-stems was not affected by the Sabellic Endsilbensynkope, as was its io-stem counterpart */-iom/. In Latin, */-ām/ was shorted to /-am/, but the date of this shortening is debated (cf. Blümel 1972:45). It is impossible to establish the quantity of the vowel in Faliscan: in Early Faliscan, it was in all probability still /-ām/, but it may later have been shorted to /-am/.
4.2.5. The first-declension ablative singular. The Proto-Italic ending was */-ād/,
formed after the inherited second-declension ablative */-ōd/, reflexes of which are
found both in Latin (-ad /-ād/ → -a /-ā/) and the Sabellic languages (Umbrian -a ←
*/-ād/, Oscan -ad). The Faliscan evidence for this ending is uncertain or indirect, but
points to the same form -ad /-ād/ → -a /-ā/ (cf. §3.5.7c):
(a) From the Early Faliscan period there is only a very faint possibility that *[3-4]*ad
in EF 1 may be an ablative.
(b) The Middle Faliscan adverb ifra MF 40 is of ablatival origin, reflecting Proto-Latin
*/enð(e)r/ with loss of /d#/.
(c) Late Faliscan de | zentuau · senteniatad LF/Lat 214 is the only direct attestation of the
ablative singular, but it is very questionable in how far this inscription (still) represents
Late Faliscan: the ablative in -ad will by this time (mid-second century) have been an
archaism in any case.

4.2.6. The first-declension nominative plural. The nominative plural is attested only
for Early Faliscan in
ues saluete sociai EF 4
This shows that in Faliscan the Proto-Italic nominal ending */-ās/ (← PIE */-ēh₂es/) had
been replaced by the pronominal ending */-āï/ during the Proto-Latin period. The
replacement of the inherited second-declension nominative plural ending */-ōs/ by the
pronominal ending */-ōï/ (§4.3.6) will have taken place at the same time. This shift
constitutes one of the stronger morphological links between Faliscan and Latin, since in
Sabellic the Proto-Italic endings */-ās/ and */-ōs/ were not only preserved (reflexes of
the first-declension ending are Umbrian -as → -ar and Oscan -as), but extended to the
pronouns by a Proto-Sabellic shift that took the opposite direction as the one in Faliscan

4.3. The second nominal declension

4.3.1. The second-declension masculine nominative singular. In Early Faliscan, the
second-declension nominative singular ending is -os, attested in
mama z[e]xtos med f[f]iqod EF 1
prau[i?]os urnam : soç[iai] pored karai EF 1
perhaps also euios EF 1 (context unclear)
probably ofetios kaios velos amanos EF 4 (context unclear)
In the later periods, the nominative ending is generally written as -o with omission of -s,
due to the weak realization of /Vs#/ to [ɻ] or [l] (§3.5.7d). I quote here only the
instances of the nominative subject:
THE NOMINAL AND PRONOMINAL INFLECTIONS

--]o cicio · cicii : cupat : ifra LF 40
uel zu[con]eo : fe [cupa] MF 56
..... : hec : cupa]nt MF 80
[---] celio [---] [---]* : hec : cupa[t] MF 95
[lei]uonio {---} [---] lonio · ca[--- | he · cup[at]} MF 159
ouflio : clipeaio : letai : fileo : met : facet MF 470*
preconof[?] | cui tenet[?] | let MLF 361
uoltio · uecino | maxomo | iuneo · he : cupat LF 221
marcio : acarcelnio | cauiia : uecinea | hec cupat LF 223
cuin· uecinoef · juollio | he · cupat LF 224
tiof : ]acarcelonio : | ma : fi · pop · petrunes · ce · f | [he cu[paf] LF 225
tito : uelmineo | titoi : fe cupa MLF 305
perhaps tito | uelmineo | mi i*ice MLF 309 (if i*ice is a verb)
perhaps tito : uelmineo | iumai | i*ice MLF 317 (if i*ice is a verb)
The remaining instances of -o can be found in §3.5.7d; it is also the normal form in the
Latino-Faliscan and Capenate inscriptions: [---]o LtF 173, [---]lio LtF 215, el[i]peario
LtF 233, *cono]e LtF 290, [---]nio LtF 341, munio LtF 377, uomanio Cap 388, fertrio
Cap 391, clanidio Cap 394, anio Cap 420, [---]no Cap 433, genucilio Cap 435.
The only instances of -os from the later periods in Faliscan inscriptions are
cauios frenaios faced MF 471*
cauios MLF 382
(These instances show that, even in Faliscan, /s#/ after a short vowel was only weakened,
probably to []* or ['], and not reduced to zero: see §3.5.7d.) The phonemic form of
the morpheme was therefore still /-os#/. Beside these two instances, there are the Latin
inscriptions med · loucilois · feced Lat 268 (probably an import) and t · fourios · *[ · ]f
Lat 216 (probably written by a Latin immigrant), and the Capenate inscriptions a ·
irpios · esù Cap 389 and f · pacios Cap 392. These attestations show that in the Middle
and Late Faliscan periods the ending -os was associated with Latin and Capenate rather
than with Faliscan. The nominative in -us is found only in purely Latin inscriptions:
latrius Lat 218, [ · ]mpricius ... aburcus Lat 219, spurilus Lat 237, 238, fulius Lat
250, lectu (twice) and datus Lat 251, all from near S. Maria di Falleri or its surroundings,
egnatius Lat 291 from near Corchiano, and calpurnius Lat 432, [---]rcius Lat 436,
and didius and uettius Lat 456, all from Lucus Feroniae.
Faliscan therefore, like Latin, preserved the Proto-Italic */-os/ which in the
Sabellic languages was syncopated to /-s/ by the Proto-Sabellic *Endsilbensynkope
(resulting, e.g, in Umbrian -s and -s → -r in io-stems, and Oscan -s, -z).
There is at least one instance, but possibly even three, of syncopated io-stem nominatives from the ager Capenas that can be ascribed to interference from Sabellic languages (see §9.3.2): pa quo bis blaisiis Sab 468*, in an inscription that is Sabellic rather than Faliscan or Latin, and possibly also k pa aiedies Cap 390, if interpreted as ‘K. Aiedius son of Pa.’, and perhaps k sares esú Cap 404 (but cf. §8.8.2). An isolated Middle Faliscan instance of a syncopated io-stem nominative may be partis in leuelio pa ritis | uolti MF 79. There is no reason to ascribe this instance, too, to interference from Sabellic languages: the form may be compared with the occasional instances of such syncopation in Latin inscriptions, e.g. ubis pilipus CIL I 2.552, mirquiris CIL I 2.563, and caecilis CIL I 2.1028.

In Latin, second-declension stem nominatives in */-Cros/ were syncopated to */-Crs/ (type ager) and those in */-Vros/ to */-Vrs/ (type puer). The Faliscan inscriptions provide no attestations of this syncopation (Vetter’s readings l[o]u[ir], luf[i]r, or luf[i]r in EF 1 are impossible): cf., however, ucro[---] MF 138, [---]ro : MF 175 and [---]ro : MF 178, all of which are unclear.

4.3.2. The second-declension dative singular. As explained in §4.4.4 and §8.8.1, many of the Faliscan forms in -oi can be interpreted both as datives and as genitives. In all probability datives are

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{titoi} \mid \text{mercu} \mid \text{efiles} \text{ MF 113, titoi} \mid \text{mercu[i]} \mid \text{efiles} \text{ MF 116, titoi} : \text{mercu[i]} \\
& \text{MF 118, [t]} \text{titoi} : \text{mercu[i]} \text{ MF 119, [t]} \text{titoi} : \text{mercu[i]} \text{ MF 120, [t]} \text{titoi} : \text{mercu} \text{ MF 121, titoi} : \text{mercu[i]} \text{ MF 122; with a damaged ending [t]} \text{tito[i]} \mid \text{mercu[i]} \mid \text{efiles} \text{ MF 115; also tito (probably = titoi) \mid mercu} \mid \text{efile MF 114} \\
& \text{possibly also locia ei/\text{noi} \text{ MF 293}
\end{align*}
\]

The contextless forms

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{caisioi} \text{ MF 20} \\
& \text{tiroi} : \text{colanioi} \text{ MF 69-71}
\end{align*}
\]

may well be datives too (cf. vultasi Etr XLII and §8.8.1), although they could also be interpreted as genitives. I regard rather as genitives the forms in -oi in tito : uelmineo | titoi : fe cupa MF 305, uoltio | folcozeo | zextoi | fi LF 330 and fi. Jfolcosio | ****ioi LF 333, The only form in -oi that is quite clearly not an second-declension dative is cicoi in f---jo cicio : cicio : cupat : ifra MF 40: see §4.4.4. Faliscan therefore had a dative in -oi that reflected Proto-Italic */-/g448/ ← PIE */-/g448/. In the Sabellic languages, */-/g448/ was preserved, and possibly (but not necessarily, cf. Meiser 1986:66-8) shortened to /-/g448/: South Picene titui AP.1, Umbrian -e /-/g448/, Oscan -ui, -u/i). In Latin, the dative in -oi, attested in numasioi CIL I 2.1, duenoi CIL I 2.4 and in Marius Victorinus’ remark “populo Romanoi pro populo Romano scito priores scribere” (CGL 6.17.20), was replaced by /-/g448/ at an uncertain date, probably not too long after the archaic period, either by a phonological or by a morphological development (see Villar 1987b). Tito in
tito | mercui | efile MF 114 has been regarded as an indication that the same replacement took place also in Middle Faliscan (Thulin 1907:303), but as long as there is no other evidence for this, I prefer to regard it as an error for tito/io. It cannot be ascertained whether Faliscan -oi represents */-oːi/* or the shortened */-oː/*.

4.3.3. The second-declension accusative and neuter nominative singular. The only form that may be interpreted as a second-declension masculine accusative is tulom MF 72, if interpreted as ‘Tullum’, but this is rather a genitive plural (§4.3.7). The remaining second-declension accusatives are all neuter, and occur in the following objects:

| ceres | far *[0-2]e[1-3]tom ... douiad EF 1 |
| eqo urnel[a ti?]tela ... arcentelom hut[i]lom : pepara[i] EF 1 |
| possibly ui[no]m EF 1 (context unclear) |
| (with omission of -m:) |

foied · uino · pipafo MF 59, foied · uino · *pipafo MF 60

The accusative therefore continues Plt. */-om/* ← PIE */-om/*, which was preserved both in Latin (-om → -um) and in the Sabellic languages, e.g. Umbrian -u(m), -o(m), Oscan -úm, -om, -əu/m.

The only certain attestation of the neuter nominative is from Early Faliscan:

goqo quto *e uotenosio titias duenom duenas EF 3

Either nominative or accusative are the forms in -om in

propramom : pramed [u]mom pramod pramed umom : pramod propramod (or pro pramod) : pramod umo[m] EF 2

Faliscan therefore preserved Proto-Italic */-om/*, as did Latin (-om → -um) and the Sabellic languages, e.g. Umbrian -um, -o(m), Oscan -úm, -om, -əu/m.

4.3.4. The second-declension ablative singular. The ablative singular is attested only for Early Faliscan, in

propramom : pramed [u]mom pramod pramed umom : pramod propramod (or pro pramod) : pramod umo[m] EF 2

This Early Faliscan ablative in -od */-oː/* reflects Proto-Italic */-oː/* ← PIE */-oː/* The same ending is found in Latin (-od → -o), and in the Sabellic languages, e.g. Umbrian -u ← */-oː/*, Oscan -úd, -ud. On this ablative and its syntactic functions, cf. the interesting notes by Vine (1993:191-213).

There are no attestations from the later periods, where from Middle Faliscan onwards onwards the expected forms would be -od */-oː/* → -o */-o/* (§3.5.7c): Renzetti Marra (1990:338) suggests that [--- os]tro LF 244 and [---]ostr[o LF 245 could be ablatives, but I hesitate to adopt this interpretation. For the ablative singular of the first declension, see §4.2.5.
4.3.5. The second-declension vocative singular. The vocative singular is attested once in Early Faliscan, as

\textit{salve[to]d uoltene} EF 2

The ending reflects Proto-Italic */-/e/ \textarrow{} PIE */-/e/. The same ending is found in Latin (-\textit{e}) and Umbrian (-\textit{e}).

4.3.6. The second-declension nominative plural. The only attestation of the nominative plural is the subject-nominative \textit{lete} in

\textit{lete zot xxi\textperiodcentered MLF 285}

where -\textit{e} renders /-\textipa{e}/, the result of the monophthongization of */-/oij/ \textarrow{} /-/eij/ (see §3.7.5).\textsuperscript{65} Faliscan therefore, like Latin, had a nominative reflecting */-/oij/, originally the ending of the pronouns, which had replaced the nominal ending */-/os/ during the Proto-Latin period: the first-declension nominative plural \textit{sociai} EF 4 shows that this replacement had also taken place in the first declension (cf. §4.2.6). In the Sabellic languages, the shift operated in the opposite direction, with the nominal endings /-/os/ and /-/oi/, replacing the pronominal endings /-/ai/ and /-/oi/.

Survivals of Proto-Italic */-/os/ have been read by Norden (1939:206-7) and Vetter (1953:280) in\textit{ euios : mama z[e]xtos} EF 1 (‘the Evii, Mama and Sextus’), and by Vetter (1925:26, 1953:284) in\textit{ ofetios kaios uelos amanos} EF 4 (‘the Ufentii, Gaius and Velus, Amanus’), but, if nominatives at all, these forms in -\textit{os} are rather a nominative singular /-/os/, not nominative plurals in /-/os/: see §8.2.1.

4.3.7. The second-declension genitive plural. The genitive plural is attested with certainty only in a Capenate inscription:

\textit{aciuat\textperiodcentered es\textperiodcentered Cap 465}

probably also \textit{tulo} MF 72

Peruzzi (1964a:166) interpreted also\textit{ arcentelom hut[i]lom} EF 1 as a genitive plural. The attestations\textit{ duum\textperiodcentered iiru} LF 243 and\textit{ duu\textperiodcentered iiru} LF 249 (and\textit{ duu\textperiodcentered iiru} LF 247,\textit{ duu\textperiodcentered iiru} LF 248, and\textit{ duum\textperiodcentered uiru}um Lat 240) are fossilized rather than paradigmatic forms, and were in all probability borrowed as such from Latin (§9.4.2).

Faliscan thus shows a form /-/om/ that reflects Proto-Italic */-/om/ \textarrow{} PIE */-/om/. In Latin, /-/om/ was gradually replaced by */-/osom/ \textarrow{} */-/oom/ (first\textit{ duonoro CIL I.2.9}) \textarrow{} */-/oom/ modelled on the first-declension genitive plural */-/osom/, which was in its turn modelled on the pronominal ending */-/som/. The Sabellic languages only show the innovation */-/osom/: in the second declension, the old ending */-/om/ was preserved (e.g. Umbrian -\textit{u(m)}, -\textit{o(m); Oscan -im, -om}.

\textsuperscript{65} I cannot agree with M. Mancini’s (2002:28-33) interpretation of these forms as reflecting a locative /-/lo\textperiodcentered i\textperiodcentered/.
4.4. The second-declension genitive singular

4.4.1. The problem. The second-declension genitive singular endings -osio and -i constitute without doubt the most debated problem of Faliscan and Latin historical morphology. Basically, the problem is that the Latin morpheme -i /-i/ was identified with Celtic -i (an identification that constituted one of the core arguments for the assumption of an Italo-Celtic stage) and therefore had to be of PIE origin. The Faliscan ending -osio on the other hand was clearly identical with, e.g. Sanskrit -asya and Homeric Greek -oio and therefore had to be of PIE origin as well. The obvious explanation for this was to assume that Faliscan and Latin were separate, though closely related languages, each preserving a different inherited variant. The occurrence of -i in Middle and Late Faliscan was ascribed to influence from Latium (thus e.g. Lejeune 1952b:125, Bonfante 1966:9, and Devine 1970:24).

This explanation was not without its critics, especially when scepticism with regard to an Italo-Celtic stage increased. Thus, G. Giacomelli (1963:142-4) suggested that Faliscan might have had both -osio and -i, the former as the nominal and the latter as the pronominal ending, with -i later being extended to the nouns and generalized. I might add that it is a priori very unattractive, as it would either assume that Italo-Celtic had two different morphemes or that Faliscan was not an Italic language, and that it is quite difficult to assume a spread of a morpheme. The publication, in 1978, of the archaic Latin inscription from Satricum in 1978 (now CIL 12.2832a) with its attestation of -osio, showed that the assumption that Latin had -i and Faliscan -osio could no longer be maintained without at least some modification. The ‘pre-Satricum’ scholarship has been extensively reviewed by Devine (1970), and I shall therefore limit myself to a discussion of the evidence and of the implications of the Satricum inscription for the relationship between Faliscan and Latin.

4.4.2. The Early Faliscan genitive in -osio. In the Early Faliscan inscriptions, the ending of the second-declension genitive singular is -osio throughout. The attestations are

- eco quto *e uotenosio EF 3
- eko kaisiosio EF 6
- aïmiosio eqo EF 467*

The first of these instances was published already in 1887, but it was not until 1912 that Herbig (CIE 8163) proposed to interpret this form as a genitive. Although at first not generally accepted, this interpretation was eventually vindicated by the publication of the other forms in 1933 and 1952 respectively. Even after the publication of the third instance, Knobloch (1954) interpreted the Faliscan forms in -osio as adjectives in -osio(s) that expressed a specific possessive relationship (i.e., a relationship of posses-
sion with one specific person rather than with a group like the *gens*). This has been rejected by Devine (1970:25-32), who argues that the existence of such adjectives in Italic cannot be demonstrated (a point with which I disagree, see §4.4.11), and that it is in any case unlikely that they would have been derived with the suffix */-osio*/. Apart from these objections, interpreting */-osio* as */-osio(s)* presupposes that omission of */-s* occurred already in Early Faliscan, which is not attested (§3.5.7d). Knobloch first (1954:38-9) ascribed this to dissimilation of the two */s*/’s in the ending */-osio/, but later (1966:48) discarded this explanation by reading *quton euotenosio[m]* with a similarly anachronistic omission of */-m*/. The Satricum inscription makes his theory even less tenable: it could now be maintained only if *popliosio ualesiosio | suodales* were to be read as *popliosio(s) ualesiosio(s) | suodales*, with a nominative plural ending */-os/ which in Latin had long been replaced by */-o/ (§4.3.6) and with omission of */-s* after a long vowel (§3.5.7d).

4.4.3. The Middle and Late Faliscan genitive in */-i*. The forms in */-osio* are all from the Early Faliscan inscriptions: in Middle and Late Faliscan the second-declension genitive ending is */-i*. The Middle and Late Faliscan instances are the following:

- *uipi : leueli | filea* MF 14
- *louci : teti : uxor* MF 41
- *caui : felicienate | uxor* MF 42
- *fipi : uesthi : cela* MF 83
- *caui[ : ]t**(*)[i] : cela* MF 84
- *cesi : fi* MF 94
- *marci : acarcelini | mate* LF 221
- *maci : acacelini : uxo* LF 222
- *uelcej || fe* LF 332
- *letei : fileo* MF 470*
- *caui : tertinei : || posticnu* MLF/Cap 474*
- probably also *leiuelio partis | uolti* MF 79

Ambiguous are the contextless forms in */-i* in the Besitzerinschriften, *serui* MF 34-36, *ani* MF 45, *fofiti* MF 58, *amni* LtF 63, *uli* MF? 261-262, *caui : turi* MF 273, *marci : anel[i]* MLF 472*, *uoliti : catinei* MLF 469*, and in the sepulchral inscriptions *uoliti* | *teti* MF 11 and *teti atron* or *teti atroni* MF 13. These forms can be genitives or abbreviated io-stem nominatives (§8.8.1). Similar forms are the potter’s signature *c cutri* MF 200, and the Capenate Besitzerinschriften *c : pscni* Cap 387, *c : aci* Cap 395, *sex | senti* Cap 399, and *sex : sen-ti* Cap 430. Uncertain with regard to reading or interpretation are the forms in */-i* are */---]*i : *u[o]ltiai lo* MF 165, *cesi t : fere* (?) MF 263.

---

66 Note that this instance can hardly be called ‘possessive’, unless this term is used in a very wide sense (‘référent d’une appartenance familiale ou sociale’, Lejeune 1990a:77).
4.4.4. The Middle and Late Faliscan genitive in -oi. As is argued in §8.8.1, a number of forms in -oi can be interpreted as genitives at least from a syntactical or contextual perspective. The most interesting case is

\[\ldots\]o cicio · cici : cupat : ifra MF 40

This is the only instance where it is impossible to interpret the form in -oi as a dative, and I regard it as a genitive. (G. Giacomelli (1963:84) interpreted cici as a Faliscan rendering of Etruscan cicui, cf. §9.2.2.2a) A genitive interpretation is also possible in

\[\ldots\]tito : uelmineo | tito : fe cupa MLF 305
\[\ldots\]voltito | folcozeo | zextoi | fi LF 330
\[\ldots\]folcosio | *****oi LF 333

although this would be the only instance of a filiation in a Faliscan Besitzerinschrift (§7.5.1). Ambiguous are the contextless forms in -oi:

\[\ldots\]caisioi MF 20
\[\ldots\]tiroi · colanioi MF 69-71

These two forms can be interpreted as genitives in Besitzerinschriften, but can as well be datives (cf. vultasi Etr XLII): see §8.8.1. In all probability datives are titoi MF 113, 116, 118, 122, [t]itoi MF 119, [ti]toi MF 120, 121, [t]it[i] MF 115.

Zextoi, the earliest Faliscan form in -oi to be published, was in fact interpreted as a genitive by Jordan (1881:511) and Deecke (1888:263). This was rejected by J. Schmidt (1905:31), however, and since Herbig’s discussion (1914) of the forms in -oi, they have generally been regarded as datives. The exception to this is Pisani (first 1933b:624 n.1), who regarded titoi | mercui | efles MF 113 etc., caisioi MF 20, and cici MF 40 as genitives in -o\(\ldots\)i, in his view a further development of the older -o\(\ldots\)o. I cannot agree with this (see §4.4.10): if the forms in -oi are genitives, they are analogical formations after the first-declension genitive -ai, and can be explained in three ways:

(a) -oi = -o\(\ldots\)i modelled on the first-declension genitive singular in -\(\ldots\)ai, but with retention of the short vowel (thus Devine 1970:20-1).

(b) -oi = -o\(\ldots\)i modelled on the first-declension genitive singular in -\(\ldots\)ai even in the length of the vowel preceding the ending, like the Latin second-declension genitive plural */-om\(\ldots\)* was modelled on the */-om\(\ldots\)/ of the first declension.
(c) -oi = /-ōi/ modelled on the dative /-ōi/ after the example of the first declension where, in the course of the process of the shortening of the original dative ending */-/āi/ and the genitive ending /-/āi/, both endings at a one point were both /-/āi/.

Note that all three analogies assume the existence of a Faliscan first-declension genitive singular in /-/āi/, which is not accepted by most authors: see §4.2.2. If the replacement of -osio by -i was due, as I think, to a morphological replacement in both the second and the first declension at the same time, the resulting dissimilarity between, in the second declension, old genitive -osio /-/osio/: new genitive -i /-/i/: dative -oi /-/oi/ (: genitive plural */-/ōsom/?), and, in the first declension, old genitive -as /-/ās/: new genitive -ai /-/āi/: old dative -ai /-/āi/ (: genitive plural */-/āsom/?) may have led to the emergence of such an analogical genitive in -oi.

4.4.5. The alleged Middle and Late Faliscan genitives in -io and -oio. A number of forms in -io and -oio were explained by Ribezzo (1930:98-9, 1931b:79, 1933:80, 1936:158) as second-declension genitives, due to a (PIE) confusion between the genitive /-ū/ and possessive adjectives in /-io/ [sic]. Attestations of these genitives he found in Faliscan, in Ardeatine (but supposedly Faliscan) titoio, and in Praenestine taseio CIL I.2.555. Not only is this derivation impossible, but this theory assumes a long coexistence of several productive morphemes for one category, in the case of the io-stems even of a genitive that was homomorphemic with the nominative. In spite of these objections, the interpretation of (some) forms in -io as genitives was adopted e.g. by Bolelli (1943:56), Campanile (1961:20 n.19), and Meiser (1998:117, 133). Of the instances listed by Ribezzo (1930:98-9), the only case where a genitive interpretation of a form in -io would be attractive is poplia: calitenes | aronto: cesies | lartio: uxor MF 265, but in Ribezzo’s translation, ‘Publia Calideni Arruntis filia, Caesii Lartis uxor’, lartio is the genitive of a consonant-stem. In the other cases the forms in -io are simply masculine praenomina and gentilicia, or are based on misreadings.

4.4.6. The second-declension genitive singular in Latin. The non-archaic second-declension genitive ending is /-/i/. The oldest epigraphic attestations are early third-century aesclapi CIL I.2.440, keri CIL I.2.445, saeturni CIL I.4.449, and uolcani CIL I.4.453. In literary Latin, /-/i/ is the normal ending already in Andronicus (Saturni 2L, 14L, uerbi 3L, Liberij 30R; Taenari 34R; Nerei 5L, Ulixi 16L). The /-/i/ spread also to the first declension, where /-/āi/ had replaced /-/ās/ probably c.300, so that by the end of the third century the normal form was /-/āi/, /-/āi/ being used only as metrical convenience (§4.2.2). The ending was extended to the fifth declension, where the oldest attestation of the genitive, from the second half of the third century, is rei dinai cau[s]a CIL I.2.366. The attestations from Ennius, magnam quom lassus diei | partem Ann. 236-7V and ille uir, haud magna cum re sed plenus fidei Ann. 338V, show the disyllabic form /-/ēu/ at the line end; monosyllabic /-/ēu/ is attested for Terence and Plautus (cf. LHS I pp.445-6).
It had long been assumed that Latin preserved traces of the ending */-osio/ (see below). The direct evidence for the existence of this ending -osio is the inscription found in 1977 at Satricum, [...]ei steterai popliosio ualesiosio | suodales mamartei CIL I2.2832a, dated to c.510-490 by Stibbe (1980a:36-8; it is impossible to agree with Ferenczy’s (1987) date of c.385). Although there is virtual consensus that the language of the inscription is Latin, it remains debated what form of Latin (Satrican? Roman? Latian?) it represents, and consequently how representative the attestation -osio is for Latin as a whole. However, even in the unlikely case that the Satricum inscription is Faliscan (thus Lucchesi 2005, see §18.3.3), there is no doubt that the forms in -osio represent an inherited form: unless it is assumed that Faliscan does not belong to the Latin branch of the Italic languages, the ending */-osio/ must therefore have existed in Proto-Latin even if by c.500 it did no longer exist in every Latin dialect.67

Apart from this direct attestation of -osio, Latin has long been regarded as originally having had a genitive ending */-osio/. The evidence is as follows:

(a) Two epigraphic forms are assumed to reflect later developments of */-osio/. Third-century Ardeatine titoio 4834 has been regarded as a genitive in */-oiio/ ← */-osio/ e.g. by Pisani (first 1933b:624 n.1; see §4.4.10), which was one of the grounds on which the inscription has been regarded as Faliscan. There seems to be nothing against taking titoio as a nominative, however. Late fourth-century Praenestine taseio CIL I2.555 has been regarded as a genitive by Ribezzo (first 1930:98) and Dirichs (1934:55, from */-esio/), but this difficult form can be interpreted more attractively as e.g. a patronymic adjective or as rendering of Greek Θαρείς (see Devine 1970:118-28).

(b) Cuius is usually derived from a PIE */kʰosio/ reconstructed on the basis of Sanskrit kasya. The assumption is that, in Latin, */kʰosio/ became */kʰoiio/ by palatalization of /VsV/, and that this */kʰoiio/ was then remodelled by addition of /s/ after the analogy of the nominal genitives in */-s//. The resulting /kʰoiios/ then developed regulary to quoios CIL I2.7, and thence to cuius. This derivation of cuius is not without problems, even apart from the possibility that Sanskrit kasya may not reflect a PIE */kʰosio/ but instead reflects a transfer of a nominal ending to the pronouns, and the debated issue of how cuius relates to huius, eius, etc. A Latin development */VsiV/ → /ViiV/ is unlikely (cf. §4.4.10), and, since in the Latin (and Faliscan) -osio is attested only in nominal forms, it is unclear why */-osio/ was replaced by */-i/ in the nouns while pronominal */kʰosio/ developed to cuius.

67 Coleman’s (1986:120-2) suggestion that the Satricum inscription is Volscian is untenable. Suodales (with /d/ ← */dʰ/) is Latin (but cf. Lucchesi 2005:166-7), and so is steterai: the Volscian form is sistiatiens VM 2 (=sist[i]atiens or sistiatiövens, cf. Wallace 1985). Alphabet and ductus are typical of the late archaic Latian inscriptions (Wachter 1987:76-7): contemporary Sabellic inscriptions are written in the Etruscan or South Picene alphabet (e.g. the fifth-century ‘Satricum hatchet’, see Colonna 1984, Rix 1992b:251).
It may be preferable to re-examine other derivations of *cuius*, especially the identification with Greek πῶς, since *cuius* was used as an adjective e.g. by Plautus (e.g. *nam haec litteratast, eapse cantat cuia sit Rud. 478*) and Terence (e.g. *virgo quoiast? Eun. 321*). The same adjective use is found in the case of the Oscan form *púiiu* Sa 31, *púiiëh* Cp 41, showing that it may have been original (“antiqui dicebant sicut meus mea meum sic *cuius cuia cuium*”, Serv. in Verg. E. 3.1) and have survived as a colloquial-ism, as appears from its use in comedy and its reflexes in the Romance languages (e.g. Spanish *cuyo*).68 If the adjectival use of *cuius* had been a later development, it is hard to explain why *eius*, with its adjective counterpart *suus*, did not share this development.

(c) Continuously quoted (and rejected) as evidence for the existence of a Latin genitive ending */-oio/ is Ennius’ *Mettoeo(que) Fuetioeo Ann. 126V*, quoted by Quintilian (Inst. 1.5.10-2). Pacie Meiser (1998:133), this is a Homerism, comparable to Lucilius’ *Ixonies alochoeo 25M* (based on Ζ 317), the *uinoeo bonoeo* ascribed by Quintilian (Inst. 8.6.33) to Ovid, and Ausonius’ *ovioeo žoñeo Ep. 6.42 Prete*. As such, this form does not require an existing or remembered Latin genitive ending */-oio/.

4.4.7. The second-declension genitive singular in the Sabellic languages. The Sabellic languages all show second-declension genitive endings that reflect */-eiš/ (e.g. Umbrian -es → -er; Oscan -eis, -eiš, -eiς), the genitive ending of the i-stems that spread to the second declension and the consonant-stems (§4.5.2) probably already during the Proto-Sabellic period. There are no traces of the inherited second-declension genitive ending, but as the Faliscan and Latin attestations of -osio show that this ending must have been present in Proto-Italic, */-osio/ may have been the form that was replaced by */-eiš/. The relation of (Proto?-)Sabellic */-eiš/ to the -es found in Praesamnitic (sixth-century || bruties (or fracties) || esum || Ps 4, | iefies (or ieyies) || esum : p[.]les : adaries Ps 5, fifth-century luvcies cna-ivieš su-m Ps 13, cnaives flavies p Ps 14, (Etruscan) mame-rces huasinieš Ps 11), in South Picene (sixth century a*pies esum TE.4, possibly also in postin : viam : videtas : | tetis (for tetiveš?) : tokam : alies : e[s]men : | vepses : vepeœten TE.2) is debated. I prefer to regard -es as */-eiš/, a monophthongized form of */-eiš/ (thus also Meiser 1986:20), rather than as due to interference from Etruscan (see Devine 1970:38-40, Agostiniani 1982:253-8, Joseph & Wallace 1987:683 n.23).70

---

68 Numitorius’ “*die mihi, Damaota: ‘cuium pecus’ anne Latinum? non, uerum Aegonis nostri; sic rure loquuntur*” (Don. *Vita* 17), a quip on Vergil’s “*die mihi, Damaota: cuium pecus? an Meliboci?*” (E. 3.1), shows that the adjectival use of *cuius* was not regarded as *comme il faut.*

69 Ennius may have chosen *-oeo* for metric reasons, as *Mëttii(que) Füfeii* would not have fitted the metre. Note that the text of this passage is quite corrupt: see Devine 1970:12-4.

70 Colonna (1975:165 n.3bis) interpreted the Praesamnitic forms as nominatives where “*il personale dovrebbe fungere grammaticalmente da aggettivo*”. A genitive in */-es* occurs also in Oscan (*herettates : sum Fr 4, kamuties sim Cm 42*).
A different explanation of Sabellic /-/es/ was proposed by Arena (1974), Prosdocimi (1974, 1979:142-4), and Agostiniani (1982:259-60), who regarded /-/es/ as a reflex of /-/os/. In their view, the inherited */-/os/ was first frontalized to */-/esi/, an ending read in Ps 4 and Ps 5, which they read as -esiie sum rather than as -es || esum. This frontalization of */-/os/ would have taken place under the influence of the /-/: for this, Prosdocimi adduced the Praesamnitic forms in -ies quoted above, which he regards as nominatives in /-/es/ ← */jos/. Even assuming that these forms are nominatives, I am not convinced that a /-/ could cause such frontalization in Italic, and it remains unexplained how it could affect the /o/ in the preceding syllable. From this /-/os/, the */-/es/ of the remaining Sabellic languages is derived, either through */-/esi/ (loss of /-/e/ followed by metathesis) or through */-/e/ (metathesis followed by loss of /-/e/). Like the frontalization, the metathesis of /-/i/ or /-/i/ is without parallel in the Italic languages, however, and the loss of /-/e/ is difficult: note that it apparently did not affect the Umbrian second-declension vocative ending /-/e/. The same authors also read South Picene TE.4 as a pieis sum, with an -ese whose place in this development is unclear (*/-/es/ ← */-/e/?). All in all, I do not think that this theory constitutes a convincing alternative to the communis opinio that the Sabellic second-declension genitive ending */-/es/ is in fact due to an extension of the i-stem genitive ending.

4.4.8. The second-declension genitive in other languages of ancient Italy. Although the data provided by the non-Italic languages are irrelevant unless one assumes the existence of a Sprachbund (cf. §1.3.2.1) that operated also on the morphological level, I briefly discuss them here because of the evidence that Venetic and Lepontic also shifted from a reflex of */-/os/ to /-/i/. The genitive in -i has long been recognized in Venetic, in ego u-rkli Le 60, [e-go -o]n[t]i [vh]rema-i-s-ti Le 65, e-n-to-l-lo-uki Le 148, Veneto-Latin ostinobos friui Le 110bis, ceutini | keutini Le 150A-B, and enoni ... ecupetaris Le 236 (cf. Lejeune 1974:84-95, 1989:72), and is also often read in the Lepontic inscriptions alkovinos | askoneti PID 274, atekua | ašoun̂ PID 302, and [---?]raneni | [---?]uualnul PID 255 (see Devine 1970:54-63). Evidence for an older genitive in */-/os/ is provided by four archaic forms in -oiso from the Venetic and Lepontic areas (see Lejeune 1989). Possibly Venetic is the early- to mid-fifth-century gravestone inscribed padros pompeteguaios and kaialoiso, the latter probably a genitive (“nom du curateur”, Lejeune 1989:71). Lepontic are an early-sixth-century Besitzerinschrift josioiso, and a fifth-century potter’s stamp and a Besitzerinschrift that both read

71 A similar explanation (/-/es/ derived by metathesis from */-/esi/ ← */-/esja/) had in fact been proposed long ago by Bopp (1857:386).

72 Prosdocimi and Arena adduced the (questionable) metathesis of */-/Vsi/ to /-/Vši/ proposed by Kiparsky (1967) for a number of Greek endings, but this is irrelevant as long as it is not shown that such a palatalization could also occur in Italic.
plioiso. Venetic and Lepontic therefore show a replacement of an archaic -oiso, clearly reflecting an older */-o$i$/o, by a genitive in -i-/i/. At least in Venetic this replacement can be dated to between the (mid)-fifth century, the date of the kaialoiso-inscription, and the third century, the date of the oldest Venetic attestations of -i.

The evidence from the other languages is unclear. The Messapic forms in -aihi have long been recognized as second-declension genitives, but it is unclear whether this ending represents /-a$\tilde{\text{i}}$/ ← */-o$\tilde{\text{i}}$/ or something else, e.g. Pisani's /-aihi/ ← */-osio/ (see Devine 1970:42-53). The evidence from the Sicilian languages consists of sixth-century adiomis | raroio and adaioi, both of which were interpreted by Pâno (1958:168) as genitives in -oio in accordance with Pisani’s theory (for which see §4.4.10), and of Lejeune’s (1989:73) reading of the late-sixth- or early-fifth-century Ve 186 as touti kemai poterem ‘vase de Toutios pour Kema’.

4.4.9. The relation between */-osio/ and */-i/. Resuming the sections §4.4.2-8, I conclude that Early Faliscan and archaic Latin show a genitive in -osio/-osio/ reflecting a PIE */-osio/, but from the late fourth century onwards in Faliscan and from the third century onwards in Latin the ending of the genitive singular is -i-/i/, and that this ending therefore replaced the ending */-osio/ somewhere in the fifth or fourth centuries. In the Sabellic languages, the unattested inherited second-declension ending (perhaps */-osio/?)) was replaced by the i-stem ending */-eis/ probably already during the Proto-Sabellic period. The significance of this chronological sequence -osio ... -i in Faliscan and Latin was called into question by Untermann (1964:178-9). He assumed that already in Early Faliscan the genitive was */-i/, and that */-osio/ was no longer a case-ending but an isolated and eventually disappearing form used exclusively in Besitzerinschriften to express possessive relationship. As */-osio/ was even in his view originally undoubtedly a genitive ending, however, this amounts to saying that the original ending */-osio/ was replaced by */-i/, not between c.450 and c.350, but at some earlier (prehistoric) date. Neither is this theory supported by the popliosio ualesiosio | suodales of the Satricum inscription, which can hardly be called possessive in the sense this word has when applied to a Besitzerinschrift. De Simone (1980:82-3) therefore suggested a syncretism of a possessive in -osio and a genitive in -i (the latter ending, having the wider scope, eventually prevailing), which requires a period during which both endings could be used for both categories. This, however, assumes the existence of a separate possessive form in early Latin, something I at least am unwilling to accept.

The replacement of -osio by -i has been interpreted both as a phonological development and as a morphological replacement: this is discussed in §4.4.10.

73 Note that Ve 186 is from the area traditionally referred to as Elymian, whereas the other two are from the area traditionally ascribed to the Sicels. It is therefore uncertain whether the two inscriptions represent the same or two different languages or dialects.
4.4.10. The ending /-i/ as a phonological development of /-osio/. The idea that /-i/ directly reflects /-osio/ goes back to the early nineteenth century. In recent times it has been maintained by Pisani (1933b:620-4, 1934, 1935:167, 1937:235-6, 1955, 1964:344-5, 1981), whose theory is adopted e.g. by Safarewicz (1955:103-5) and Wachter (1987), and independently by Must (1953:303-4, from */-esio/). Pisani’s theory has been formulated in several ways. The earliest formulation runs as follows:


For Faliscan, Pisani (first 1933b:624 n.1) assumed a slightly different development in which the thematic vowel was retained, and this version of the theory was later applied also to Latin. In this variant, the stages of the development are as follows (after Pisani 1964:344-5): */-osio/, attested in Faliscan euotenosio EF 3, kaisiosio EF 7, and aimiosio EF 467* becomes */-oio/, attested in Ardeatine titoio 483† and required by the derivation of cuius from */kusio/ (see §4.4.6), and /-oio/ in its turn becomes /-oi/, attested e.g. in Faliscan caisioi MF 20, tiroi colanioi MF 69-71, and titoi | mercui | efiles MF 113 etc., which is then contracted to -i/-i/.

This idea has been rejected so often that I shall only briefly touch on the most difficult points: an extensive discussion may be found in Devine 1970:93-105.

(a) A development /-osio/ → /-oio/ is not in line with the attested Italic or Latin palatalizations, which involve mainly dental and velar occlusives, e.g. peius ← */pedjos/ and maius ← */magios/. Meiser (1998:117) likewise does not quote any examples of this palatalization other than cuius and titoio. The usual Latin development of /VsV/ (and the comparable /VsV/) however, appears to be rhotacism, not palatalization, cf. Venerius ← */vensesio/- (Devine 1970:98) and haurio ← */hauji/- (Meiser 1998:117, explaining it as due to analogy with hausi haustum).

(b) Titoio as an attestation of /-oio/ is questionable, since the word occurs in isolation, and although isolated dialects may of course preserve older stages of a development, it would be surprising to find -oio in third-century Ardeatine if the replacement of -osio by -i is assumed to have taken place (as Pisani (1981:139) suggested) in a Sprachbund embracing not only Latin and Faliscan, but also Messapic, South Picene and Venetic.

(c) Cuius cannot constitute an additional argument for a development /s/ → /i/, since in Pisani’s theory it involves the same morpheme: it rather requires an explanation why the phonological development of /-osio/ had different outcomes in the nouns and in the pronouns.
(d) The steps */-ojo/ → */-eije/ → */-iije/ → */-ii̯i/ are questionable, and the contraction of */-eije/ or */-iije/ cannot be paralleled by *fili /fi języ/ → *fili /fię/; the alternative */-ojo/ → */-oii/ is even more unlikely. Meiser (1998:72) in fact suggests that */-ojo/ wold have developed to */-esie/ due to vowel weakening (quoting *ęteo : sequere).74

(e) Although some of the Faliscan forms in -oi can in my view be interpreted as genitives (§4.4.4, §8.8.1, §8.10.2), this is difficult in the case of titoi | mercui in MF 113 etc.: all the more as in Pisani’s interpretation this is a genitive of Titus Mercuuius, which requires the assumption of different endings for the second-declensions and the io-stems (whereas in tiroi · colanioi MF 69-71 both have the ending -oi).

(f) It is unclear whether */-ei̯i/, */-ii̯i/, or */-oi̯i/, could in fact be contracted to */-i̯/ without an intermediate diphthongal stage, whereas the genitive ending */-i̯/ cannot go back to a diphthong: see §4.4.11.

4.4.11. The ending */-i̯/ as a reflex of PIE */-iH/ (*/-ih2/?). It has long been realized that the genitive ending */-i̯/ cannot go back to a diphthong. Broadly speaking, */oi̯/ and */ei̯/ were monophthongized in Latin as /oi̯/ → /ei̯/ → /i̯/ → /i̯/, a process that seems to have started at least in some dialects already in the fourth century (e.g. socie CIL I².5 from the Lacus Fucinus). The last stage, the merger of /i̯/ with /i̯/, took place only c. 150, and neither the spelling i for original */ei̯/ or */oi̯/ nor the hypercorrect spelling ei for original */i̯/ are found before this date. Whereas e.g. the second-declension nominative plural (originally */-oi̯/ or the consonant/i-stem dative singular (originally */-ei̯/) are normally written as -ei and -e, there is not one instance from before c. 150 of the genitive ending being written as -ei or -e. Also, in the io-stems the endings containing an original diphthong, e.g. the locative singular and the nominative plural, are virtually always found uncontracted as -iei, -ie, or -ii, whereas before the first century the genitive of these words is always found as -i (for an analysis of the material, see Devine 1970:5-9). Note also that in Faliscan the merger of /i̯/ with /i̯/ never took place at all (§3.7.5), but that the genitive ending is always spelled as -i.

If */-i̯/ cannot go back to a diphthong, or to a form that was contracted during the historic period, it may well reflect */-ih/. As the development */VH/ → */V̯/ is to be dated to the Proto-Italic period (§3.2.3), this */-i̯/ must have been present already in Proto-Italic in some form or other. It can hardly already have been a second-declension genitive ending, as is assumed e.g. by Schrijver (1991:361-2), for this would require that Proto-Italic and Proto-Latin preserved two apparently productive morphemes within one and the same category and declension for a very long time (millennia, perhaps). There are no indications that the ending */-i̯/ belonged to a different inflection and/or that it was originally the ending of another case than the genitive. The possibility

74 Note the leucesie in Terentius Scaurus’ (CGL 7.28.11) unfortunately garbled quotation from the Carmen Saliare.
that /-osio/ was the Latin ending and /-/g2951/ an ending that belonged to another language and was borrowed into Latin (as well as Faliscan) by the end of the sixth century can also be excluded, both because of the a priori unlikelihood of such a borrowing due to the borrowing hierarchy constraint (§1.3.2.2) and because there are no parallels for Latin borrowing a declensional morpheme from another language. Apart from that, there appears to be no language that could have been the source for this borrowing.

The two main theories with regard to the original morphological category of /-/g431/ are those proposed long ago by Wackernagel and by Sommer. Wackernagel (1908) proposed that the origin of /-/g431/ was to be found in the Indo-Iranian adverbial forms in -i (cvi-forms) occurring in compounds with the roots kr ‘to make’, bhu ‘to become’, and as ‘to be’ with the meaning ‘to make/become/be what is expressed in the first member of the compound’ (abhūtatadbhāve krūbhavastiyoge sampadyakartari cviḥ, Pāṇini 5.4.50). According to Wackernagel, the original use of /-/g431/ in Latin was in expressions like lucri facere, which he assumed to have originally meant ‘zum Gewinn machen’. The form was then at a certain point regarded as a genitive and /-/g431/ as a genitive ending. Although popular for a long time, this theory succumbed under A. Bloch’s (1960) critical review, although a variant was still defended by Blümel (1970:109). Not only were the functions and the syntactic contexts in which the cvi-forms operated such that they could never have developed into expressions like lucri facere (for which a meaning ‘zum Gewinn machen’ is in any case doubtful), but it is likely that the Indo-Iranian forms in -i had emerged within in Indo-Iranian, if not within Vedic itself.

Today, the most popular theory still seems to be the one proposed originally by Sommer (1902:371 n.3), who equated the genitive in /-/g431/ with the Indo-Iranian feminine nominative singular in -i in the declensional type dev/g431/. Here, too, the main problem is how to come from a nominative to a genitive. It is not necessary to go back to “an early IE where there was no opposition between a derivational and an inflexional suffix” (Devine 1970:109): both devī and the Latin genitive in /-/g431/ can be derived from an feminine adjective in */-i'/. If, as Beekes suggested, the PIE nominative of this type was */-ih2/ and this developed to */-/g431/ in Proto-Italic (see §4.2.1), this provides the only possible instance of an Italic morpheme */-/g431/ that could be in some way responsible for the genitive in -i. The two main problems of the transfer of this /-/g431/ to the second-declension genitive are that it is necessary to assume the existence (1) of ‘specific’ possessive adjectives and (2) of a category were */-/g431/ was preserved and developed into a genitive, while in the nominative it was reformed to /-/ia iva/.

The problem of the existence of ‘specific possessive adjectives’, that is, adjectives used to denote a possessive relationship with a specific individual rather than with a group or class, has been discussed by Devine (1970:24-34), who concluded that such adjectives are not attested at all in Italic. Most or even all Italic languages, however, appear to have had patronymic adjectives, either still productive, as in Faliscan, or fossilized as gentilicia. I find it difficult to agree with Devine’s assumption that these
patronymic adjectives were not possessive: in a society where children were in the 
manus of the pater familias to the extent that they could legally be sold or executed, the 
relationship of a father to his son or daughter can hardly be given any other semantic 
label than ‘possessive’. Neither can it be maintained that in e.g. Seruios Tulios the 
adjective Tulios expressed generic possession (‘a Tullan Servius’): the essence of a 
patronym is that it denotes someone as the child of a specific father (‘Servius son of 
Tullus’, that Tullus we all know). The problem is a different one, namely that there are 
no indications that one could say equos Tulios as easily as Seruios Tulios: in all Italic 
instances of ‘possessive relationships’ dating from before the fourth century, this 
relationship is expressed by the genitive, e.g. Early Faliscan 2, 6, and 467*, archaic 
Latin 479†, CIL I.2.2832a, Praesammitic Ps 4 and Ps 5, South Picene TE.2 and perhaps 
TE.4, and possibly also Palaeovolscan VM 1. This, however, is partly a problem of 
interpretation, for a sixth-century Besitzerinschrift Tulios or Tulia would a priori be 
more likely to be interpreted as a nominative ‘Tullius’ or ‘Tullia’ than as an adjective 
‘Tullian = belonging to Tullus’: note that kanaios in eqo kanaios 482†=CIL I.2.474 has 
been interpreted as a possessive adjective by Wachter (1987:92-3).

The second problem, the assumption that in certain contexts what was in fact an 
ia-stem nominative in */-/v/ was preserved instead of being remodelled to */-ia/ia/ is even 
graver. With great hesitation, I venture to suggest that a likely candidate would be the 
neuter plural nominative-accusative collective, which was homomorphemic with the 
feminine nominative singular described above, in such phrases as

*/tulli esti/ (← */tullih₂h₁esti/) ‘it’s Tullus’s things’ (lit. ‘it’s Tullian stuff’)
*/tullošio esti/ ‘it’s Tullus’s’

It is then necessary to assume that these forms in */-v/ were for some reason no longer 
regarded as paradigmatic before the Proto-Italic remodelling of the feminine nominative 
singular and the neuter nominative-accusative plural */-v/ to */-ia/ia/ and survived in 
some very specific niche of the morphological system until they replaced the genitive 
ending in the fifth and fourth centuries.

In every theory (including my own suggestion) it remains in any case unclear why 
-/v/ replaced */-ošio/, for in both theories the morpheme */v/ originally only played a very 
minor role in the morphological system. The only one to address this problem recently 
is Peruzzi (1978b:346-7), who suggested that when */-ošio/ had become */-orio/ by 
rhotacism (cf. what was said in §4.4.10 on the development of */Vs/!), it became less 
distinguishable from the adjective ending */-orios/ which by this time was realized as 
[ʔrio]. I do not think that this can be upheld: even if */š/ was completely reduced to 
zero, which I doubt very much (the realization was rather [ʔrioʰ] or [ʔrioʰ], see 
§3.7.5d), */orio/ and [ʔrio] or */orio/ would (pace Peruzzi) still be distinguished by the 
difference in vocalic quantity, which is a phonemic difference, not ‘just’ a difference in 
phonetic realization.
4.5. The third nominal declension

4.5.1. The nominative singular of the consonant- and i-stems. There are few attestations of the third-declension nominative singular, but enough to show that Faliscan in this form corresponded to Latin.

(1) Stems in occlusives. The attestations of occlusive-stem nominatives are limited. First, there is the dental-stem Arruns:

\[ \text{aruz MF 257; arute MF 269} \]

The form \text{aruz} probably represents [arrūs] = /arruns/, although it could also represent [arrūts] = /arrunts/ (cf. §3.3.4, §9.2.2.1). \text{Arute MF 269} is either an Etruscan nominative with an epenthetic [-e] or [-a] or an accusative \text{arute(m)} used as a nominative, probably the latter (§9.2.2.4). Apart from \text{Arruns}, there is the velar stem rex:

\[ \text{rex MF 90, řex MF 91, rex LtF 231} \]

As in all Italic languages, these occlusive stems had a sigmatic nominative. From a morphophonological perspective, the Faliscan forms, with /-ns/ ← */-nts/ and /-ks/, correspond to those of Latin: in the Sabellic languages, these nominatives were assimilated differently (Umbrian -f and -s, Oscan -s and -ss).

(2) Stems in liquids. The only attestations of stems in /l/ are the Etruscan names Tanaquil and Vel:

\[ \text{θanacuil MF 49, tancuil MLF 347, uel MF 56, 82, and perhaps uel/l MF 191} \]

Stems in /r/ are more frequently attested, and apart from the Etruscan name Veltur consist of words of IE origin:


(with omission of -r:)

\[ \text{mate MF 220, uxo MF 17, LF 221, 242, LtF 300, ce]so LtF 230, censo LtF 232, perhaps also quto EF 3, if this represents /gūtor/ or /gūttor/ (see §6.2.31)} \]

75 Paelignian pristafalacirix and sacaracirix Pg 9, and Marrucinian lixs MV 1 may represent developments where these languages differed from Oscan and Umbrian.
Both the stems in /l/ and the stems in /r/ appear to have had an asigmatic nominative in Faliscan, as in the other Italic languages. The omission of -r and its spelling as -d are phonological, not morphological, variants: see §3.5.7b.

(3) Stems in nasals. More interesting is the nominative of the nasal stems, which shows a clear contrast between Latin and the Sabellic languages. The only certain attestations are òn-stems:

- apolo MF 65
- cupido MF 62

perhaps also quto EF 3, if this represents /gūtō/ or /gūttō/ (see §6.2.31)

Apolo (adapted either from Etruscan Apulu or from Greek Ἀρεία or Ἀπόλλων), and cupido MF 62 both show a nominative in -a /-ōx/. Although MF 62 has been regarded as Latin inscription (in which case there would be no purely Faliscan attestations of the òn-stem nominative), in my view the inscription can be counted as Faliscan: see also Wachter 1987:367-9. Faliscan therefore had an asigmatic nominative */-ōns/ /-ōx/ (Umbrian -u(f), Oscan -iff).

(4) Stems in /s/. Of the attestations of the nominative singular of the stems in /s/, neither appears to be completely representative of this group. The first attestation are the theonym Ceres in

\[ \text{ceres far *[0-2]e[1-3]tom i *[3-5]u[1-4]ui[.m i *[3-4]*ad EF 1} \]

The nominative ceres was originally */keres/, but in Latin this appears to have had an irregular lengthening of the vowel in the last syllable /kerès/ (§6.4.2), probably as it was a personification. Whether this lengthening took place in Faliscan as well cannot be established.

Another attestation of an s-stem is

\[ \text{mino LiF 173} \]

which can represent either /minōs/, with omission of the original /s#/ (§3.5.7d), or /minor/ with omission of an /r#/ (§3.5.7b) that had replaced the /s#/ after the oblique cases where the intervocalic /s/ had been rhotacized, as in Latin honos → honor after honoris etc. Note that, in Latin, in the case of the name Minor the spelling Mino is the rule rather than the exception: see §3.5.7b.

(5) Stems in /i/. The i-stem nominative is attested in

- ortecese MF 339
- larise MF 270, 371, 372
Although ortece	<
<
<
<
s may well be connected to Etruscan urtcsnas Etr XXXV, it apparently represents /ortikensis/, with an ending -e [-ɛ²] or [-ɛ²] /-is/ (§3.6.2), a reflex of Proto-Italic */-i-s/. Latin had the same -is, occasionally also spelled as -e(s) (e.g. militare CIL Ι.48, militare CIL Ι.49, aediles CIL Ι.5.8); in the Sabellic languages, */-is/ was syncopated to /-s/ by the Endsilbensynkope, with various assimilations of the resulting /-Cs/. Larise is either an Etruscan nominative with an epenthetic [-e] or [-a] after an /s#/ that was realized more strongly than in Faliscan, or an accusative larise(m) used as a nominative (§9.2.2.4). If the latter, it shows an Etruscan name in -is apparently being declined according to the consonant-stems, not according to the i-stems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>genitives in -os or -us</th>
<th>genitives in -es or -is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>early third century</td>
<td>[---]erus CIL Ι.2.2885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iunone(nej)s CIL Ι.4.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>salutes CIL Ι.4.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ueneres CIL Ι.4.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]es CIL Ι.2.2884b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third century</td>
<td>nationus CIL Ι.6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dioo CIL Ι.6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third/second century</td>
<td>salutus CIL Ι.6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dioos CIL Ι.3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>? artoro CIL Ι.1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>? usoro CIL Ι.3.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cereres CIL Ι.3.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dioius CIL Ι.3.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second century</td>
<td>nominus CIL Ι.5.581,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kastorus CIL Ι.5.589,1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig.4.1. Third-declension genitive endings in Latin before c.150.

4.5.2. The third-declension genitive singular. In Faliscan, the consonant-stem genitive ending is -os throughout:

  lartos EF 6
  apolonos EF 10

loifirtato MF 31, loifirtato MF 32,
aruto MF 257, 266, [--- a]ruto MF 169, aronto MF 265

perhaps also [---]o MF 17, and [---]ono MF 102

G. Giacomelli (1963:148) recognized only loifirtato MF 31 and loifirtato MF 32 as genuine attestations, regarding the other forms as transcriptions of Greek and Etruscan forms. She first (1963:147) regarded the Faliscan genitive in -o(s) as one of the main morphological differences between Faliscan and Latin, but later (1978:517-8) compared the Faliscan forms with the Latin genitives in -os/-us. These are not as sporadic as they
are sometimes made out to be: before c.150, they occur as frequently in the epigraphic material as the forms in -es/-is: see fig.4.1. Both -os and -is are also found in the fourth declension, -uos in early second-century senatuos in CIL I\(^2\).581,8, 17, 21, 23 (cf. also zenatuo LF/Lat 214), and -uis in Terence (Haut. 287), and, according to Gellius (4.16), in Nigidius and Varro.

It is usually assumed that Latin -/os/ and -/es/ reflected different PIE forms */-os/ and */-es/. If this was the case, the attestations would imply that in Faliscan -/os/ was standardized, while in Latin both forms were preserved side by side for several centuries longer, -/es/ eventually becoming the standard form. The assumption that Proto-Latin had two productive morphemes for the same category, which were preserved for at least several centuries in Faliscan and even longer in Latin, is unattractive, however. Neither are there any indications that the two were (originally) dialectal, let alone diglossic, variants, as R. Giacomelli (1978:57-9) suggested.

Various solutions have been proposed to this problem: for a discussion, see Wachter 1987:492-3. In my view, the easiest solution is to assume that -/os/ reflects Proto-Italic */-os/ and that -/es/ was a Latin innovation. This was first suggested by Szemerényi (1969:977-8, later (1989:173) abandoning the idea), and independently by Beekes (1986:176-80, altogether rejecting a PIE */-es/) and Wachter (1987:492-5). The last two assume that -/es/ was an analogical creation of the early third century: “neben den mutmasslichen Paradigmata -ād/-am/-ai/-ās (neben -āī), -ūd/-um/-ūē/-ōs, -īd/-im/-ē /-is (bzw. *-ēs?) nahm sich -e/-em/-ē/-os m.E. so merkwürdig aus, dass ein Ersatz des -os durch -es regelrecht nahelag!” (Wachter 1987:495).\(^76\) Assuming that until the third century Latin had only -/os/ does away with the coexistence of -/os/ and -/es/, and also removes a morphological difference between Faliscan and Latin. In any case, Faliscan aligns with Latin here, for in the Sabellic languages the inherited consonant-stem ending was replaced by the i-stem ending */-eis/, probably already in Proto-Sabellic.\(^77\)

There are also two attestations of the i-stem genitive singular:

\[
\text{felicinate MF 42}
\]
\[
\text{[---]fate MF 285}
\]

It could be argued that felicinate and [---]fate are not representative of Faliscan, as both forms end in an Etruscan suffix, but in view of the ending of [fel]jcinatitiu LF 384 (§4.5.3.3) and the way such forms were declined in Latin, I think it is safe to regard them as Faliscan. The ending -e can of course stand for [-\(^e\)h] /-/e\(^s/\), the expected reflex of Proto-Italic */-eis/ found in Latin (-eis, -es /-/e\(^s/\) → -is /-/īs/) and the Sabellic languages

\(^76\) The frequent use of the ending -/os/-/us in official documents and in the names of gods implies that speakers of Latin regarded it as more traditional and associated it with an earlier period.

\(^77\) If South Picene [−]nips TE.7 is a syncopated consonant-stem (Marinetti 1985:133), the transfer of */-eis/ to the consonant-stems could be dated to the sixth or fifth century.
(Umbrian -es/-ës/ → -er/-ër/, Oscan -eis, -eis, -ης), but as omission of -s after a long vowel is rare in Faliscan (§3.5.7d), it is more likely that -e represents either [-eʰ] or [-eʰ] /-es/ or [-eʰ] or [-eʰ] /-is/ (§3.6.2). In that case, /-es/ or /-is/ may originally have been an i-stem ending which at some point was transferred to the consonant-stems (perhaps first at Rome, see Wachter 1987:495).

As far as can be ascertained from these few instances, the distinction between the consonant- and the i-stem genitives was still quite clear in Middle Faliscan.

4.5.3. Other consonant- and i-stem endings. Of the other third-declension endings, there are few and sometimes dubious attestations:

(1) The consonant-stem accusative singular. There only uncertain attestations of the consonant-stem accusative, namely

   arute MF 269
   larise MF 270, 371, 372

These forms have been interpreted as nominatives with an epenthetic [-e] or [-ʔ], but may be accusatives in -e(m) used as nominatives: see §9.2.2.1.4. In that case, Faliscan would align with Latin in having an ending /-em/ ← */-m/, for in the Sabellic languages the consonant-stem accusative ending had been replaced by the second-declension ending /-om/ (e.g. Umbrian -um, -om, Oscan -om).

   The only Faliscan attestation of a neuter consonant-stem accusative is far EF 1, reflecting Proto-Italic */bʰars/ (← PIE */bʰḤrs/ or */bʰars/, see §6.2.23) with an assimilation */rs#/ → */rr#/ → /r#/ (§3.3.4).

(2) The i-stem nominative plural. The i-stem nominative plural is attested in

   efîles MF 113, 115, efîles MF 117
   perhaps salues EF 3, if from an i-stem adjective */salu-i-/ (§6.2.71)
   (with omission of -s:)
   efîle MF 114

Since omission of -s after a long vowel is fairly rare in Faliscan (§3.5.7d), efîle MF 114 is probably an error rather than an omission on phonological grounds: the inscription contains another irregularity in the ending second-declension dative singular (§4.2.3). The ending -es /-ës/ reflects Proto-Italic */-ës/ ← PIE */-ejes/ (§3.2.6), found also in Latin (-es) and the Sabellic languages (Umbrian -es → -er; Oscan -is).

(3) The i-stem genitive plural. The i-stem genitive plural is attested in

   [fel]icinatiiu LF 384

The form reflects the PIE ending /-i-om/ with the closing of /o/ → /u/ in closed final syllable (§3.6.6.1), as attested also for Latin (-iom → -ium). The same ending appears in the Sabellic languages (Umbrian -io(m), Oscan -iium).
4.6. The fourth and fifth nominal declensions

4.6.1. The fourth-declension genitive singular. The only instance of a fourth-declension genitive singular is *de | zenatuo - sententiad LF/Lat 214. The ending -uo(s) [-uo3] or [-uo7] /-uos/, formed after the consonant-stem genitive ending /-os/ (see §4.5.2) is also found in early second-century Latin senatuos CIL I2.581, 18, 21, 23. It is an analogical innovation existing alongside the usual Italic genitive */-oʃs/ (Plt. */-oʃs/ ← PIE */-oʃs/) that is reflected both in Latin (senatus CIL I2.2197, -us) and in the Sabellic languages (Umbrian trifor TI VIIa.54 etc., Oscan castrous TB 13). In the case of zenatuo, it cannot be ascertained whether the ending -uo(s) was the standard Faliscan ending or an alternative existing beside an unattested */-/g448/g1173s/ */-oʃs/. It is not even clear whether -uo(s) is a Faliscan form at all: the language of LF/Lat 214 can equally well be regarded as Latin, In view of the consonant-stem /-os/ it is not unlikely that the ending /-uos/ occurred in Faliscan, but the ending occurs here in a formula that may be of Latin origin, in which case it may have been taken over as part of the formula (note that the Latin instances of the genitive senatuos also occur exclusively in this formula) and need not have occurred in Faliscan outside this formula.

4.6.2. The fourth-declension dative singular. The development of the Italic dative singular endings is debated: I follow here mainly Lejeune’s (1944:99-102) account (for other theories, see LHS I pp.442-3). The Proto-Italic form was probably */-oʃ/ an analogical creation beside the genitive */-oʃs/ (Lejeune 1944:92-101):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{i-stems} & \text{u-stems} \\
*/-oʃs/ & */-oʃs/
\end{array}
\]

Reflexes of this */-oʃ/ are Latin -ui /-ū/ and Umbrian trifor TI VIIa.11, manuve TI IIb.23, and perhaps ahtu TI Ila.10, 11. The Latin ending -ui /-ū/ goes back through /-uʃ/ to an */-eʃ/ (cf. senattuei CIL I2.586,11) which was an analogical formation after the consonant-stem dative */-eʃ/ (Lejeune 1944:100).

The only Faliscan forms that have plausibly been interpreted as fourth-declension datives are the forms in -ui in

merciu MF 113, 114, 121, m[e]rcui MF 122, [m]ercui MF 124, mercui MF 125

damaged: mercuij MF 115, mercuij MF 116, 118, mercuij MF 119, 120

Although a diphthong /-ū/ is admittedly alien to Italic, 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 Ŷ, may represent an second-declension dative in /-ōį/), -ui represents anything other than /-uį/ or /-ūį/, an ending created after the first-declension dative /-āį/ and the second-declension dative /-ōį/. The ending does not reflect Proto-Italic */-ou/, nor can it be equated with Latin -ui /-uś/ ← */-ueį/, as in Faliscan /e/ had not (yet) merged with /u/ (§3.7.5).

4.6.3. The fourth-declension accusative singular. The fourth-declension accusative singular is attested only in

maćistratu LF 242

The form occurs as part of the formulaic expression maćistratu | keset, which is directly equivalent to the Latin formula magistratum gessit (TLL 6:1.1939,1-1940,56). On the one hand, this makes it quite certain that maćistratu is indeed an accusative singular maćistratu(m) and not an accusative plural maćistratu(s) [-u] or [-ū] /-ūś/ (which would have been difficult in any case, as omission of -s after a long vowel is fairly rare in Faliscan, §3.5.7d): on the other hand, it opens up the possibility that the entire formula was adopted from Latin and that the word and its ending may therefore not reflect Faliscan. The same ending is found in Latin and in the Sabellian languages (e.g. Umbrian trifo TI VIb.58, VIIa.47).

4.6.4. The fifth declension. The only Faliscan forms that can be associated with the fifth declension do not reflect the original *eh₁-stems, but the paradigm of dies that was formed analogically after that of these *eh₁-stems (Schrijver 1991:366).

The nominative is attested in [3-4]s pater 62. The text can be restored as [die]s pater, [iουou]s pater, or [iουi]s pater: if restored as [die]s, the form would correspond to Latin dies /dīēs/, a Proto-Italic formation with an /e/ that was either due to the accusative */dēm/ ← Proto-Italic */diēm/, or to preservation of a PIE */dēs/ (cf. Wachter 1987:151-2, Waanders 1988:57). No Sabellian counterpart is attested, although Oscan zicolom TB 14 etc. appears to have been derived from */dē-kelom/, which likewise had /e/. Note that MF 62 has been regarded as Latin, although it is in my view Faliscan: see also Wachter 1987:367-9.

The ablative singular is attested in foied MF 59-60. This adverb goes back either to a fossilized ablative */hōd+dīē(d)/ or */ho-dīēd/ (cf. §6.2.34). This */dīēd/ is also found in third-century Latin efod · died CIL 1.2.2872 (vs. die in CIL 1.2.366, the other version of this text) and Umbrian ri TI Va.5, re TI VIib.2 ← */rēd/. It reflects a (Proto-Italic?) */rēd/ formed after the second-declension ablative */-ōd/ and/or the first-declension ablative */-ād/. In view of the other attestations of this ablative in */-ād/, it is not necessary to assume that the */-d/ was not part of the ending of the ablative on which the adverb was based, but was added only when the ablative */-ē/ had been fossilized into an adverb, by analogy with the adverbs in */-ōd/ and */-ād/ that derived their -d from a second- or first-declension ablative (cf. G. Giacomelli 1963:150).
4.7. The personal pronouns

4.7.1. The nominative of the first person singular. The nominative of the pronoun of the first person singular is attested in the Faliscan ‘iscrizioni parlanti’ as ego/eko/eco:78

> ego urnel[a ..]telaitaidupes : arcentelom hut[i] ilom : pe : para[i]? EF 1
> eco quto *e uotenosio EF 3
> eko lartos EF 6
> eko kaisiosio EF 7
> ajmiosio ego EF 467*
> m adicio eco MLF 378
> eco tulie MLF 383

The Faliscan form therefore corresponds to Latin ego (first seventh- or sixth-century ego 482† and eco 479†, then sixth century CIL I2.479 and 2917c), which represents an /egō/ that later became /ego/. If this is due to iambic shortening, which is attested for Latin only from the late third century onwards (Pfister 1977:104, Meiser 1998:76-7), it seems unlikely that such a shortening can be assumed for Middle or Late Faliscan. The same */egō/ occurs also in the Sabellic languages. The evidence for this is as follows:

(a) South Picene ekūsim CH.1. As ekūsim corresponds to rufrasim in the same text, it is clearly an enclitic -sim ‘I am’ preceded by an ekū that may represent */egō/, but could conceivably be a form of the demonstrative pronoun */eko-/ (cf. WOU s.v. ekūsim).

(b) Samnitic īīv Sa 31. The unique īīv occurs in pis : tīū : īīv : kūru Sa 31, usually interpreted as ‘Who [are] you? – I [am] a kūra’, but īīv representing /egō/ is very difficult to explain on the basis of an original */egō/ (see WOU s.v. īīv).

(c) Umbrian ef TI Vla.4. This has unconvincingly been interpreted as equal to īīv (above) by Vetter (1935:188, 1942:60-1, 1953:231). Untermann (WOU s.v. eite) rightly rejects this explanation.

(d) The nominative of the pronoun of the second person singular attested as /tēom/ in Samnitic tīū Sa 31 and Oscan tīum Cp 37. On the assumption that /-om/ in continues a PIE suffix */-om/, W. Petersen (1930:168 n.13) and Bonfante (1935:183) suggested that the nominative of the first person may have been */egōm/ (cf. WOU s.v. tīum).

4.7.2. The accusative of the first person singular. The accusative singular is attested in the Early and Middle Faliscan ‘iscrizioni parlanti’ as med/met:

> med EF 1, EF 9
> met MF 470*

78 I do not adopt Peruzzi’s (1964d:310-1) interpretation of the ...uat..eco... read by Gamurrini (1883:166) and Deecke (1888:145-6) in MF 91 as containing an eco.
(Latin rather than Faliscan is med · loucilios · feced Lat 268.) The form med is also found in Latin (first probably seventh- or sixth century med in CIL I.4, 2658). In Latin, it coexisted with the similar accusatives of the second person singular ted /tēd/ (first sixth-century ted in CIL I.4) and the third person reflexive sed /sēd/, and with the homomorphemic ablatives med ted sed /mēd tēd sēd/. The unattested Faliscan accusatives of the second person singular and the third person reflexive may therefore likewise have been */tēd sēd/, and, depending on the view of how these forms arose, the Faliscan ablatives may have been */mēd tēd sēd/ (which would fit in with other Faliscan ablatives in -d, for which see §4.2.5, §4.3.3).

In Latin, both the accusatives and the ablatives lost the /-d/: from the third century onward, me te se */mē tē sē/ were the normal forms both in the epigraphic (first me CIL I.500, 501, te CIL I.412a,c, 547) and in the literary attestations (from Andronicus onwards), although med, ted, and sed occasionally occur in second-century inscriptions (e.g. sed CIL I.581,13, 14, CIL I.582,21) and for metrical convenience in the works of Naevius, Ennius, and Plautus. A similar loss of /-d/ may also be assumed to have taken place in the Middle Faliscan period: the occurrence of met MF 470* may well be a sign of this weakening (see §3.5.7c), the spelling with -t perhaps influenced by the facet that immediately follows it, where -t was a recent replacement of -d.

As the corresponding PIE accusatives are usually reconstructed as */h₁mē tē sē/, the Latin and Faliscan forms require some explanation with regard to the origin of the /-d/ and of the long vowel. Various explanations have been proposed:

In the explanation proposed by Meillet (1922:50, whence e.g. DÉ s.v. mē), the /-d/ was an inherited PIE suffix with parallels in Vedic mād and tvād: this presupposes a Proto-Italic */med ted sed/ that was lengthened to /mēd tēd sēd/, although it is not made clear when and why this lengthening would have taken place. The explanation is difficult to maintain if the suffix */om/ in the corresponding Sabellic accusatives (see below) is also assumed to be of PIE origin, for this presupposes that Proto-Italic preserved two different morphemes for the accusative of the personal pronouns.

The Latin forms have also been explained as analogical creations after the ablatives /mēd tēd sēd/ (that probably were analogical creations themselves, after the ablatives of the first and second nominal declensions). In the traditional version of this explanation (e.g. Osthoff 1884:127, W. Petersen 1930:185), the accusatives are explained as hypercorrective forms of */mē tē sē/ that emerged when the ablatives /mēd tēd sēd/ were losing their /-d/: this, however, is impossible in view of the Early Faliscan and early Latin accusatives with -d, which precede the disappearance of /-d/ by several centuries (cf. §3.5.7c). If this explanation is to be maintained, the accusatives can only be analogical creations after /mēd tēd sēd/ themselves: this would also explain the /ē/.

Szemerényi (1973:58, 1989:226) derived the accusatives /mēd tēd sēd/ in an altogether different way, by assuming that /mēd/ and /sēd/ were analogical creations after /tēd/, which, through */tē/, was the regular phonological outcome of a redupli-
cated */tēt̪e/ (described awkwardly (1973:58) as “the sequence of emphatic tē and unemphatic te”). There are several reasons why I find this solution unappealing, the most important being (1) that it does not explain the origin of the /tē/; (2) that the later attestations of tete imply that the word had always been analyzed as a reduplicated form, which would have prevented it from becoming */tēt̪t̪/; (3) that */tēt̪t̪/ could have become /tēd̪/ by a regular process only if this happened at the same time that the secondary ending of the 3rd person singular */-t̪/ became /-d̪/: this process, however, must have preceded the drop of the word-final short vowel by which */tēt̪e/ became */tēt̪/, or the primary ending of the 3rd person singular, */-t̪/, would also have become /-d̪/, which it did not; (4) that there is no reason why the pronoun of the second person, let alone the reduplicated form, should be the model for an analogical creation.

Whatever their origin, the Faliscan and Latin accusatives */mēd̪ tēd̪ sēd̪/ clearly differ from the corresponding forms in the Sabellic languages. The accusative of the first person singular is attested in Palaeoumbrian setum /mīom | face Um 4=480†,79 of the second person singular in South Picene tiom TE.5, Umbrian tiom TI VIa.43 etc. (more than 40 attestations), and of the third person reflexive in Oscan siom TB 5, 6, 9. These accusatives /mēom tēom sēom/ are usually regarded as accusatives /mē tē sē/ (→ PIE */h1me tue se/), with an /-om/ that is either an inherited PIE suffix */-(/g426)om/ (cf. e.g. Vedic ahām) or taken over from the second-declension accusative singular ending /-om/ (cf. WOU s.vv. miom, siom, tiium).

4.7.3. The nominative of the second person plural. The second person nominative/ vocative plural is attested once from Early Faliscan as

ues EF 4

This form represents either /qēs/, with a short vowel as in the possessive pronoun, or /qēs/, with a long vowel as in Latin uos /ūōs/. It presents a considerable problem, for although it corresponds to later Latin uester and Umbrian uestra TI VIb.61, it clearly differs from the earlier Latin uoster and from Paelignian uus Pg 9 (twice), which seem to point to a Proto-Italic */qōs/ and a possessive */qōstero-/. Vetter (1939a:153, 1953:287) explained ues as an ‘incidental’ form, formed with the nominative plural ending of the i-stems /-ēs/ ← */-ejes/. The use, even incidental, of i-stem endings in the personal pronouns is unparalleled, however.80

79 This renders untenable La Regina’s interpretation, hesitatingly adopted by Marinetti (1985: 104), of South Picene ma in ma kupri koram opsutta ninis rakinevii pomp[4-5]i AQ.2 as a first person accusative singular.

80 Latin ques CIL 1.581.3, 24 adduced by Vetter is not a valid parallel as qui actually is at least partly an i-stem. The (second- and first-century) nominatives heis, his etc. are regular o-stem nominatives with an added -s, maybe a graphical convention only (Bakkum 1994).
Others have pointed to non-Italic parallels for *ues. Campanile (1968:90) adduced Old Irish *sí, Welsh *chwí, derived from */swès/; R. Giacomelli (1978:65-6) compared Pisani’s derivation of Gothic *izwis from */eswes/.

These parallels are debatable, however, and, more importantly, they are irrelevant unless either Faliscan is treated as a non-Italic language or the relation of these forms to the forms in the other Italic languages is made clear.

A solution from within the Italic languages has been proposed by Ribezzo (1936:166-7) and Peruzzi (1967b:118-9), who pointed to Umbrian *uesta TI VIb.61. Pace R. Giacomelli (1978:65), this cannot reflect an earlier */ůostrād/, as there is no evidence that the development */ůo-/* */ůe-/* that was responsible for Latin *uoster → uester* occurred also in Umbrian: cf. e.g. early *ku-vurtus TI lb.11* and late co-wurtus TI VIIa.39 etc. The possibility that *uesta* is a Latin loan (*LHS* I p.466) can be excluded, for a borrowing at the level of the pronominal system would imply language contact on a scale unattested by the Umbrian texts (cf. §1.3.2.2). Umbrian *uesta*, therefore, like Faliscan *ues*, would seem to point to an earlier */ůěs uesto-/*.

The problem, however, is greater than Faliscan *ues*: the evidence points to the existence of both an early */ůěs uesto-/* in Faliscan and Umbrian and to an early */ůěs uesto-/* in Latin and Paelignian, i.e., both vocalisms are attested for both branches of Italic: since neither can convincingly be explained as a borrowing from the other, both would therefore presumably going back to Proto-Italic, as neither form can convincingly be connected to corresponding forms in other IE languages. A way out of this dilemma would be if it could be demonstrated that the one of the two vocalisms (probably the */o-/*vocalism of the Latin and Paelignian forms, both of which are later than Faliscan *ues*) is due to a later development. Perhaps one vocalism originally belonged to the personal pronouns and the other to the possessive pronouns, and this anomaly was equalled out in various ways in the various languages; or was an original */ůěs uesto-/* changed due to influence from */ňěs nosto-/*?

### 4.8. The demonstrative pronoun

There are no direct attestations of demonstrative pronouns. However, there are two important indirect attestations in the adverbs:

(a) *hec* ‘here’: *hec* MF 94, 146, 158, *hec* MF 88, *hec* LF 223, [and *hec* LF 231]; *he* LF 220, 221, 224, *[h]e* LF 226; *hef* MF 149; (with hypercorrect *f- for *h-*) *fe[cf?]* MLF 56, *fe* MF 305 derived from a pronominal locative */heį-ke/;

(b) *hoied* ‘today’: (with hypercorrect *f- for *h-*) *foied* MF 59-60, probably derived from a fossilized ablative phrase */hō(d)+ďe(d)/, or, alternatively from a compound */ho-diė(d)/ (cf. §6.2.34).
These attestations show that Faliscan had a demonstrative pronoun corresponding to Latin *hic* instead of to its Sabellic counterparts */eko-/ and */ekso-/ . With regard to the declension, *hec* and *hoied* point to an old locative */hej-ke/ and perhaps to an old ablative */hō(d)/, while the pronominal origin of the nominative plural ending */-aī/ of the first nominal declension (cf. §4.2.6) makes it likely that the feminine and masculine nominative plurals of this demonstrative pronoun were */haī/ */hoī/ in Early Faliscan, and probably */hē/ and */hē/ in the later periods.

### 4.9. The relative pronoun

A relative pronoun *cui* is read by Renzetti Marra (1990:337) in [---?] *precono[?-----?] cuitenet[?-----?] let* MLF 361. I very much doubt whether *cui* is indeed a relative pronoun. If it is, the following tenet seems to suggest that *cui* is a nominative nominative */kō/ (ultimately from */kō/): I cannot accept Renzetti Marra’s suggestion that the form can be a locative */kō/ (ultimately from */kō/ or a dative */kū/ (ultimately from */kō/). Note, however, that all these interpretations presuppose a merger of */oi/ → */ē/ → */ē/ with */ē/ that is not attested in Faliscan (§3.7.5) and would be very early even in Latin, where this merger operated c. 150.

### 4.10. Summary of §§4.2-9

If the preceding sections are resumed with regard to the question of whether Faliscan should be classed with Latin or with the Sabellic languages, the result is the following.

(a) Faliscan participated in the common Proto-Italic innovations of the first- and the fifth-declension ablatives */-ād/ (§4.2.5) and */-ēd/ (§4.6.4), modelled on the second-declension ablative */-ōd/.

(b) Of the phonological changes that affected the endings, typical Sabellic developments like the rounding of word-final */-ā/ (§4.2.1) or the *Endsilbensynkope* (§4.3.1) are not found. Faliscan also aligns with Latin with regard to the results of the assimilations of */-Cs/ in the consonant-stem nominatives (§4.5.1). As in Latin, monophthongization of */āi/ does not seem to have affected the first-declension dative and genitive singular endings, unlike Umbrian and Volscian (§4.2.2-3). Loss of */-d/ affected the ending of the ablative singular from the mid-third century onwards, as in Latin, but unlike the Sabellic languages that either preserved it or lost it much earlier (§4.2.5, §4.3.4, §4.6.4).
THE NOMINAL AND PRONOMINAL INFLECTIONS

It is more interesting to look at the morphological innovations. The following innovations are prehistoric, and, as they are shared with Latin but not with the Sabellic languages, probably Proto-Latin:

(c) As in Latin, the first- and second-declension nominative plural endings */-ās/ and */-ōs/ were replaced by the pronominal endings */-ā/ and */-ō/, whereas in the Sabellic languages the opposite transfer took place, the endings */-ās/ and */-ōs/ being extended to the pronouns (§4.2.6, §4.3.6).

(d) As in Latin, the nominative singular of the ōn-stems was asigmatic and lost its /n#/, whereas in the Sabellic languages the nominative of these stems was sigmatic */-ōns/ (§4.5.1).

The other significant differences can be ascribed to the historical period, and therefore definitely to the period where Latin and the Sabellic languages were separated.

(e) As in Latin, the second-declension genitive singular */-osjo/ was replaced by an */-ī/ that reflected PIE */-ih/ (perhaps */-ih2/) between the first half of the fifth century and the second half of the fourth century, whereas in the Sabellic languages the unattested inherited form */-osjo/* was replaced by the i-stem genitive ending */-eis/ probably already during the Proto-Sabellic period, and at the latest in the sixth century (§4.4.2-7).

(f) As in Latin, the first-declension genitive singular */-ās/ was probably replaced by */-ā/ during the late fourth and early third century, whereas in the Sabellic languages */-ās/ was preserved (§4.2.2).

(g) The consonant-stem genitive singular was */-os/, which was probably the original form also in Latin, whereas in the Sabellic languages the unattested inherited form was replaced at an early date by the i-stem genitive in */-eis/ (§4.5.2).

(h) The i-stem genitive singular reflected either Proto-Italic */-eis/, as in Latin and the Sabellic languages, or was */-es/ or */-is/, an innovation that is found also in Latin (§4.5.2).

(i) The fourth-declension genitive singular shows an innovative form */-uos/ that is known also from Latin: it is unclear whether this form was the standard Faliscan ending (§4.6.1).

The only differences between Latin and Faliscan are in the second- and fourth-declension dative singular:

(j) The inherited diphthongal second-declension dative singular was preserved in Faliscan, either as */-ōi/ or as */-oi/, as in the Sabellic languages, whereas in Latin it was replaced by */-ō/ after the archaic period (§4.3.2).

(k) The fourth-declension dative singular appears as */-ūi/, which may have a parallel in Oscan; there are no attestations of */-ou/ or */-uei/ (§4.6.2).
The only significant difference between Latin and Faliscan in the nominal declensions is therefore the preservation of the diphthongal second-declension dative /-ōi/ or /-oɪ/, which is of historic date and which, contrary to the Latin innovation /-ōi/, left the ‘horizontal’ perspicuity of the first- and second-declension paradigms intact. The different formations in the fourth-declension dative cannot, I think, count very heavily, although this is admittedly partly due to the lack of data. In my view, the conclusion can only be that as far as can be established from the lacunary material, Faliscan aligns closely with Latin on virtually every significant morphological opposition between Latin and the Sabellic languages.

The only regular point of comparison provided by the personal pronouns is the first person singular accusative med, which clearly links Faliscan to Latin med ted sed /mēd tēd sēd/, as opposed to the very different Sabellic /mōm tōm sēom/ (§4.7.2). The Latin-Faliscan forms either preserved a PIE suffix */-d/ (common retention) or may have been new formations after the ablative (common innovation). The indirect data on the demonstrative pronouns shows that Faliscan had a pronoun with the same stem as Latin hic, where the Sabellic languages used */eko-/, */ekso-/, etc. (§4.8). The relation of Faliscan ues to Latin uos and uoster/uester, Paelignian uus, and Umbrian uestra and its implications for the position of Faliscan remains unexplained: the vocalism of these forms poses a problem that comprises both branches of the Italic languages and cannot be solved satisfactorily due to a lack of data (§4.9).