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Chapter 5

The verb

The verbal forms attested in the Faliscan inscriptions are few and limited in range, but they provide material of great interest for the study of the Italic verbs, since most Faliscan forms are of a relatively early date. They therefore figured prominently in the studies by Herbig (1913b) and Lejeune (1955). Recently, interest has been rekindled by the publication of the Middle Faliscan perfects faced MF 470* and facet MF 471*. The chapter opens with a short remark on the problems encountered in the study of the Faliscan verb (§5.1). The Faliscan verb is then discussed, first its general structure (§5.2), then the individual forms (§5.3). The chapter concludes with a short comparison of Faliscan with Latin and the Sabellic languages (§5.4) on the subject of the verbs.

5.1. The verb: methodological issues

Surprisingly perhaps, the main problem in the evaluation of the Faliscan verb is not the lack of material, nor the necessity to exclude the Latin material (cf. §4.1, §6.1, §8.1): in spite of the not overabundant data, the forms that are attested give a rather good general view of the Faliscan verb, even providing material for a comparison with Latin and the Sabellic languages. The problem is rather that much of the material is Early Faliscan, and that Early Faliscan forms are difficult to compare both to the later material and to the contemporary Latin or Sabellic material. This has led to comparisons between Early Faliscan and e.g. third-century Latin that sometimes resulted in an erroneous picture of how the Faliscan verb relates to the Latin verb. This is especially true in the cases of the forms fifiked EF 9 and fi.f$qiqod EF 1.

5.2. The Faliscan verb

5.2.1. Conjugational system. The overall structure of the Faliscan verb follows the four-conjugational system, as in Latin and in the Sabellic languages.

(a) first conjugation: cupat MF 40 etc. (for the attestations, see §5.3.1.2), perhaps also subj. pramed, pramed EF 3, and imp. (?) urate Etr/EF 385.

(b) athematic laryngeal verbs (probably included in the first conjugation): present not attested, but pipafo MF 59, paf = qipapafo MF 60 (stem in *-/h/) and pored EF 1 (stem in */-h/) belong in this category.
(c) second conjugation: saluete EF 4, salueto EF 3, salueto EF 4, tenet LF 361, and probably lecat MF 88 (if not a third-conjugation form), also careffo MF 59, careffo MF 60.

(d) third conjugation: present not attested, except possibly for lecat MF 88 (which is probably a second-conjugation form); fifiked EF 9, f[f]iqod EF 1, keset LF 242, and keсет LF 243 also belong in this category.

(e) mixed conjugation: probably douiad EF 1 (§5.3.1.4); the presents of faced MF 471*, facet MF 470*, and of peIParafi EF 1 are not attested, but will have belonged in this group as well.

(f) fourth conjugation: not attested: douiad EF 1 could be a fourth-declension form, but is probably rather of the mixed conjugation (§5.3.1.4).

Outside the conjugational system there is the verb ‘to be’, attested in esú Cap 389, 404, 465, zot MF 285 (and perhaps sot LtF 172?), and seite (=s{e}ite or s{e}ite) EF 4.

5.2.2. Formation of the tenses. The only tenses attested in the Faliscan material are present, perfect, and future: as might be expected from the nature of the material, imperfect, pluperfect, and future perfect are not attested.

(1) Present tense. See §5.2.1.

(2) Future tense. The future is attested only in pipafo MF 59, paho = qipaho MF, and careffo MF 59, careffo MF 60. These forms show a suffix -f-/-f-/ /g312 */-/g533-/: the same suffix occurs in Latin as -b-/-b-/, the productive suffix of the future of the first and second conjugations. Both suffixes reflect a Proto-Latin innovation */-/g533-/, modelled on the imperfect suffix */-/g312 Proto-Italic */-bh-/ (which also occurs once in the Oscan pluperfect fufans Cm 1A,10).

Beside this, Latin also had an ā-ē-future in the third and fourth conjugations, going back to the original subjunctive. Although not attested for Faliscan, it seems not unlikely that Faliscan likewise had this future (see §5.3.1.13). In the Sabellic languages, the future was formed with an s-suffix (probably a continuation of the PIE aorist subjunctive or desiderative): there is no trace of either the ā-ē-future or the b-future.

(3) Perfect tense. There are no attestations of Faliscan perfect forms with productive perfect suffixes such as Latin /-u- -u/- or Sabellic /-e/- and /-tt-/. The attested formations are:

(a) reduplicative perfect: fifiked EF 9, f[f]iqod EF 1 (/fifig/-, see §5.3.1.7-8) and probably peIPa.Parafi EF 1 (/pepar/- ← Proto-Italic */peprh3/-).

(b) either reduplicative perfects that lost their reduplicative syllable or old aorists: pored EF 1 (see §5.3.1.14) and faced MF 471*, facet MF 470* (see §5.3.1.6).
(c) sigmatic perfect: *keset* LF 242, *kese[t* LF 243. The sigmatic perfect, which continues the old sigmatic aorist, occurs in Latin but not in the Sabellic languages. Keset and kese[t occur in the formula *magistratum gero* that may have been borrowed from Latin, but it seems unlikely that this means that *keset* was Latin rather than Faliscan (cf. §9.4.2).

5.2.3. Formation of the subjunctive. Forms representing moods other than the indicative are attested only for Early Faliscan. The ā-subjunctive appears in *douiad* EF 1 and probably in *[3-4]*ad EF 1, *tulas* EF 385, and *tulate* EF 385 (*urate* in the same inscription is perhaps rather an imperative, see §5.3.1.23). The ē-subjunctive may be attested in *pramed, pramed* EF 2, if this is a verbal form. Both these old subjunctives are found in Latin as well as in the Sabellic languages. As in Latin and the Sabellic languages, the subjunctive of the verb ‘to be’, appearing in *seite* (= *s{e}ite* or *siete*, §5.3.1.18) EF 3 is a continuation of the old optative.

5.2.4. The endings. Note that the primary endings are all attested only for Middle and Late Faliscan, and the secondary and imperative endings only for Early Faliscan. Passive endings are not attested at all.

(1) **Primary endings** (attested for Middle and Late Faliscan only):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Endings</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-m /-m/</td>
<td>← Proto-Italic/PIE athem. */-mi/), in ind. pr. of ‘to be’, <em>esū = esū(m)</em> Cap 389, 404, 465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sg.</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg.</td>
<td>-t /-t/</td>
<td>← Proto-Italic/PIE */-ti/), in pr. ind. <em>cupat</em> MF 40, <em>cupat</em> MF 220, <em>cupat</em> LF 224, <em>lecat</em> MF 88; (with the -t omitted:) <em>cupa</em> MLF 305, <em>cupa</em> LF 221; (either singular or plural:) <em>[cuba</em> LtF/Lat 326]; (restored:) <em>cup[a]/t</em> MF 159, <em>cup[a]</em> MF 161, <em>cupa[t]</em> MF 95, <em>cupa[pa]</em> LF 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st pl.</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd pl.</td>
<td>-nt /-nt/</td>
<td>← Proto-Italic/PIE */-nti/), in pr. ind. <em>cupa[nt]</em> MF 80, <em>cupat</em> MF 146, <em>cupat</em> MF 158, <em>cupat</em> LF 223; (either singular or plural:) <em>cupa[t]</em> MF 95, <em>cupa[pa]</em> LF 226 [and <em>cuba</em> LtF 326].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These endings do not differ from the corresponding endings in Latin and the Sabellic

---

⁸¹ It has been suggested that the Umbrian future perfect *sesust TI* VIa.5 is a sigmatic perfect, but this seems unlikely (cf. WOU s.v. *sistu*).
languages. The endings of the third person reflect the Proto-Italic drop of */-i/ following the voicing of word-final occlusives (§3.2.4) that caused the contrast between the primary endings of the third person /-t -nt/ and the secondary endings (see below).

(2) **Secondary endings** (attested for Early Faliscan only):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st sg.</th>
<th>2nd sg.</th>
<th>3rd sg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st sg.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-s /-s/</td>
<td>-d /-d/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sg.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-s /-s/</td>
<td>-t /-t/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-d /-d/</td>
<td>-nt /-nt/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Secondary endings (attested for Early Faliscan only):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st sg.</th>
<th>2nd sg.</th>
<th>3rd sg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st sg.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sg.</td>
<td>-te /-te/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg.</td>
<td>-(n)d /-nd/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This ending is the same as the corresponding ending in Latin; the corresponding Sabellic ending is not attested.

Early Faliscan still shows a clear distinction between the primary and the secondary endings. So, in all probability, did early Latin, but there the primary endings were later generalized throughout (except in the first singular), and the distinction between primary and secondary endings thus largely disappeared (cf. Meiser 1998:216-7). The date of this replacement is unclear: judging by the few epigraphic attestations of Latin forms where secondary endings can be expected (e.g., 3rd sg. fut. esed CIL I.2.1, 3rd sg. pr. subj. sied CIL I.3.4, 3rd sg. pf. vheɪθaked CIL I.3.3, feced CIL I.3.4), the replacement seems to have started after the fifth century, and to have been completed by the third. In Faliscan, it was certainly under way by the late fourth century (see below under (e)). In the Sabellic languages, on the other hand, the distinction between the primary and secondary endings was preserved. It is therefore all the more unfortunate that the Faliscan secondary ending of the third plural can be regarded as dubiously attested at best, for this ending provides a clear contrast between Latin, where it was replaced by the primary ending /-nt/, and the Sabellic languages, where it was replaced at a Proto-Sabellic date by a new secondary ending /-ns/ (cf. Shields 1980).

(3) **Imperative endings** (attested for Early Faliscan only):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd sg.</th>
<th>3rd sg.</th>
<th>2nd pl.</th>
<th>3rd pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd sg.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-te /-te/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-te /-te/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>-te /-te/</td>
<td>-te /-te/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd pl.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-te /-te/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This ending is the same as the corresponding ending in Latin; the corresponding Sabellic ending is not attested.
(4) Future imperative endings (attested for Early Faliscan only):

2\textsuperscript{nd} sg.: \textit{-tod /-tōd/} (←Proto-Italic PIE \*/-tōd/), in \textit{salue[to]d} EF 3
3\textsuperscript{rd} sg.: —
2\textsuperscript{nd} pl.: \textit{-tod /-tōd/} (←Proto-Italic PIE \*/-tōd/), in \textit{salueto} EF 4 (see below)
3\textsuperscript{rd} pl.: —

The same ending is found in Latin (still archaising licet\textit{od} and dat\textit{od} beside exu\textit{ehito} and \textit{exferto} in \textit{CIL} I\textsuperscript{2}.366) as well as in the Sabellic languages (Oscan \textit{likitud} Cm 1B.10, Umbrian -\textit{tu}). In EF 4 the ending \textit{-to} = \textit{-to(d)} or \textit{-tōd} is used for the plural (see also §5.3.1.17). This may reflect an inherited paradigm where the future imperative either had only one ending /-tōd/ (or /-tō/), Prosdocimi 1990:304-5), or had a singular and second plural ending /-tōd/ beside a third plural ending */-ntōd/ (Szemerényi 1953:946): the endings of the second plural, Latin -\textit{-tōte/} (formed after the imperative) and Umbrian -\textit{tuta, -tutu, -tuto /-tōtō/ ← */-tōtā/, are post-Proto-Italic formations. The ending of the third plural, Latin -\textit{-ntō/ ← */-ntōd/} (the corresponding Sabellic ending is not attested),\textsuperscript{82} may be inherited or a new formation.

(5) Perfect endings. The endings of the perfect are attested for the Early, Middle and Late Faliscan periods, and thus offer some insight into the development of the perfect endings in the Italic languages.

1\textsuperscript{st} sg.: \textit{-ai /-aî/} (innovation on Proto-Italic */-a/ ← */-h\textalpha{a}- / → PIE */-h\textbeta{a}/), in \textit{pe\textipa{r}arai} EF 1
2\textsuperscript{nd} sg.: —
3\textsuperscript{rd} sg.: \textit{-e-d /-d/} (= them. secondary ending), in \textit{porded} EF 1, \textit{fifiked} EF 9; \textit{faced} MF 471*
\textit{-et /-tē/} (innovation containing the primary ending /-t/), in \textit{facet} MF 470*; \textit{kese} LF 242
(with missing or omitted ending:) \textit{kese[} LF 243 and possibly \textit{i*ice} LF 309, 315 (see §5.3.1.9)

1\textsuperscript{st} pl.: —
2\textsuperscript{nd} pl.: —
3\textsuperscript{rd} pl.: \textit{-o-nd /-nd/} (= them. secondary ending), in \textit{f[f]iqod} EF 1

The first singular ending is \textit{-a[i /-aî/}, a reformation of the original inherited perfect ending, Proto-Italic */-h\textalpha{a}/ ← PIE */-h\textbeta{a}/, with an /-i/ that may have been derived from the primary endings (Untermann 1968a:165-9): the same ending is found in Latin. The date of this reformation was either Proto-Italic */-h\textalpha{a}-i/ or */-a-î/) or Latin-Faliscan */-a-î/): as the Sabellic languages appear to show no sign of the old singular

\textsuperscript{82} It has been suggested that Oscan \textit{eîtuns} Po 27, 29, 31 etc. shows a third plural future imperative ending */-tuns/ (cf. \textit{WOU} s.v. \textit{eîtuns}): this ending would then be modelled on the secondary ending */-ns/ (a Proto-Sabellic innovation) and also be a recent formation.
perfective endings (cf. below, note 83), this cannot be established with certainty. The Faliscan form is the only attestation of the stage /-a/: the Latin attestations show only the later stages of its phonological development, -ei /-ej/ → -e /ẽ/ → -i /-ĩ/ (first ueixe CIL I².14 and petei beside accumulaui, genui, optimi CIL I².15, in the elogia Scipionum). In the Sabellic languages, there is only one attestation of the first singular perfect, in Oscan [man]afum Cp 37,1 manafum Cp 37,3, where the ending is /-o-m/, the (secondary) ending of the thematic aorist. Herbig (1914:238 n.1) interpreted tulom MF 68 as having this ending as well, but this is unlikely (see §5.3.1.22).

In the third singular perfect, there was a shift in the endings. Early and Middle Faliscan show forms that continue the (secondary) ending of the thematic aorist ending -e-d (← Proto-Italic/PIE */-t/) in Early Faliscan porded EF 1, fifiked EF 9, and Middle Faliscan faced MF 471*, but the Middle and Late Faliscan forms facet MF 470* and keset LF 242 show a different ending. A similar shift occurs in Latin. The early Latin attestations of the third singular perfect, vhechronked CIL I².3 and fece CIL I².4, also show -e-d, and this ending also shows up in a contaminated form -id in the much later fecid (beside dedit) in CIL I².561. The older -d, however, was replaced by -eit /-eiu/ → -et /-ẽtu/ → -it /-ĩtu/ → it /-ĩt/.

This ‘new’ ending represents the older perfect ending */-ej/, i.e., the inherited PIE */-e/ with a prehistoric addition of an /-i/, that was recharacterized with the primary ending /-t/ to /-e-t/: the Latin forms dede CIL I².47, 2438 and fece CIL I².416 may in fact reflect the ending /-ej/ (Untermann 1968a:169-70). The earliest Latin attestations of the new ending -et appear to be from the middle and the second half of the third century (cepet CIL I².25, dedet CIL I².48, CIL I².49; for other attestations of the variants, see the indices to CIL I²).

This situation differs from the one in the Sabellic languages. There, as in Early and Middle Faliscan and early Latin, the ending of the third singular perfect was the old aorist ending -e-d (in some languages, such as Umbrian, reduced to zero), but contrary to what happened in Latin and Faliscan, this ending was maintained and not replaced by a new ending. An exception to this is formed by a handful of southern Oscan forms, a[ma]matet Lu 18 (beside a[ma]mated Lu 6), dedet Lu 19, and a[ma]ket Lu 18. Since this -et cannot represent /-t/ or /-ẽt/ to /-e-t/, these forms must represent a replacement of the secondary ending -d by the primary ending -t, perhaps connected to a weakening or desonorization of word-final /-d/.

83 Like Wachter (1987:270), I do not think that in Latin this replacement was due to a weakening of word-final occlusives, although this may have contributed to the process.

84 The date of this addition is unknown: if Palaeoumbrian face Um 4=480† represents the inherited perfect ending /-e/ rather than /-e-d/ or /-ẽ/ ← */-ei/ and is representative of the Sabellic languages in general, then */-e/ must have been a post-Proto-Italic innovation. All other Sabellic attestations of the third singular perfect point to /-e-d/, however.

85 Note, however, the forms a[fk]ert (= a[n]af[k]ert?) Lu 13 and the unexplained loka[kei]t Lu 39, which apparently have an ending /-eit/.
The Middle Faliscan forms faced and facet are both from the late fourth century, showing that the replacement of -ed by -et was in progress by that time. The nature of the new ending is not clear: -et can represent either /-ét/, in which case the new ending is the same one as in Latin, or /-e-t/, with a replacement of the /-d/ by the primary ending /-t/ similar to the one in southern Oscan. In my view, the Faliscan replacement is best regarded as connected with the replacement of the ending in Latin, and -et is therefore probably /-éòt/. In Faliscan, the weakening of word-final occlusives (§3.5.7c) may have made this replacement easier, although it is unlikely to have caused it.

The Faliscan ending of the third plural perfect also shows an old thematic aorist ending, -o-(n)d /-o-nd/: in this respect Faliscan differs from both Latin and the Sabellic languages. In Latin, the ending was the inherited perfect ending */-/g413ri/ (= PIE */-e-h₁-r₁i/), first attested in steteral CIL I.2832a (with an -ai probably influenced by the endings of the first singular /-ai/ and the second singular, which was then either the inherited */-taj/ or the new formation */-is-taj/), and later as -ere /-ére/. Beside this, Latin later developed the endings /-eront/ and /-eront/, the latter apparently a contamination of /-ére/ × /-eront/, but there is no indication that in Latin the aorist ending was ever used for the third plural perfect. The Sabellic languages had a Proto-Sabellic innovation /-ns/: the original ending, whether */-nd/ or */-eri/, is unattested.

In view of this difference, it may be questioned whether Faliscan /f][f]iqod is representative of the standard Early Faliscan paradigm. Faliscan, early Latin, and the Sabellic languages all show the old aorist ending as the standard ending of the third singular of the perfect: Faliscan /f][f]iqod therefore represents a very obvious analogical extension of the aorist endings to the third plural of the perfect. This use of the aorist ending for the third plural of the perfect may have been incidental: the Faliscan material does not show whether *-o-nd ever was or became the standard ending, or coexisted alongside another ending (presumably */-eri/). Conversely, the Latin and Sabellic material only shows that there the aorist ending for the third plural perfect was never standardized, not that it never occurred there as well.

5.3. The attested Faliscan verbs.

5.3.1. Verb forms. The following list contains all the verb forms attested in the Faliscan material.

1. carefo MF 59, care[f]o MF 60, 1st sg. fut. ind. The /-é-/ continues the PIE stative suffix */-e-h₁-/ rather than */-eje-/ (cf. Meiser 2003:90-1).
2. cupat MF 40, cup[at] MF 159, cup[a] MF 161, cupat MF 220, cupa MLF 305, cupa LF 221, cupat LF 224, [also cubat LtF 231], 3rd sg. pr. ind.;
3. cupa[nt] MF 80, cupat MF 146, cupat MF 158, cupat LF 223, 3rd pl. pr. ind.;
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(either singular or plural:) cupa[?]t MF 95, cu[p]a LF 226, [cuba LtF 326]. In all Italic languages where the verb is attested (Latin cubo, South Picene qupat MC.1, AP.3, Marrucinian cibat MV 6, Paelignian incubat Pg 10) the verb belongs to the first declension: as it is hardly a causative or a denominative, this may be due to the laryngeal of the root, */keβh₂-/, affecting the suffix */kubh₂-e-/ → */kubh₂-iae-/, cf. Meiser 2003:66 n.112).

4. douiad EF 1 (also in Herbig’s (1913:75) restoration [dou]jad in EF 1), 3rd sg. pr. act. subj. Faliscan douiad has rightly been compared to the Latin subjunctive forms duam (cf. DÉ, LEW s.vv. dō, duam). The forms continue a root */deh₂-/- or */doh₂-/-, an extension of */deh₂-/- (see WOU s.v. pordōitu, Meiser 2003:182-3). The Faliscan form probably represents a third-conjugation /dō̯-i-ā-d/ based on an old aorist stem (thus Meiser 1987:189), cf. also the Latin subjunctive duim etc. from the same root; interpreting douiad as a fourth-conjugation form /dō̯-i-ā-d/ seems more difficult.

5. esū Cap 389, 404, 465 = esū(m) /esom/, 1st sg. pr. ind. The form esum is attested for several Sabellic languages: South Picene esom TE.4, Praesamnitic esum Ps 4, 5, Hernician esu He 3, and Umbrian esu Um 18. For Latin, it was already known from Varro (“sum quod nunc dicitur olim dicebatur esum, et in omnibus personis constabat, quod dicitur esum es est, eram eras erat, ero eris erit” L 9.57), and is now attested in the inscription morai e[m] from the ager Signinus (Colonna 1994). Esom also appears in the Garigliano inscription (early fifth century), pari med esom kom meois sokiois trivoiati deom duof[...i]nei (see M. Mancini 1997). Both branches of the Italic languages therefore show an /esom/ alongside /som/, although the epigraphically attested Latin and Capenate forms are all from areas where Sabellic influence is a distinct possibility. Since due to the constraints imposed by the borrowing hierarchy (§1.3.2.2) it is very unlikely that either branch borrowed the form from the other (cf. and also Joseph & Wallace 1987:680-1), /esom/ is in all probability a Proto-Italic form: it may, however, have been borrowed as part of a formula: see §9.3.2.

The usual explanation is that /som/, which cannot be derived regularly from PIE */h₁esmᵻ/, was a Proto-Italic innovation, and that /esom/ was an analogical creation after /som/ (in short, /som es est/ → /esom es est/). Joseph & Wallace (1987) argue against this, assuming that /esom/ was the original form, and that /som/ was a later development from /esom/. They propose that the development was in fact PIE */h₁esmᵻ/ → Proto-Italic */h₁esmᵻ/ → */esmᵻ/ → */esmᵻ/ → */esom/ → /esom/. This derivation follows regular phonological processes in all but the final two steps.

M. Mancini’s (1997:32-3) objection to */esm/ → */esom/, that Proto-Italic (word-internal) \( /\text{Vsm}/ \) was retained (and later developed to \( /\text{V}m/ \) in Latin), is irrelevant: in */esm/, the cluster is word-final and, moreover, contains a morpheme boundary. The development of */es-\( m/ \) can therefore be compared to that of the accusative singular of the consonant-stems, and the problem is rather why */es-\( m/ \) should develop to /esom/ while the accusative */-C-\( m/ \) developed to */-C-em/. Joseph & Wallace assume that the */-\( m/ \) in */es-\( m/ \) was secondary, and therefore did not develop like the accusative */-\( m/ \). For the final step, */esom/ → /esom/, they assume either a labialization of /\( o/ \) → /o/ due to the following /\( m/ \), or an analogy after the thematic secondary ending */-om/. It is unclear, however, why in that case the accusative in */-em/ did not also change to */-om/ at a Proto-Italic date under the influence of the second-declension accusative, especially since */-om/ later replaced */-em/ in the Sabellic languages.

More problematic, in my view, is the way in which Joseph & Wallace (1987:687, 689-90) derive /som/ from /esom/ by assuming that /esom/ lost its initial /e-/ in enclitic position (\( /\tilde{X}\text{-esom}/ \) → \( /\tilde{X}\text{-som}/ \)) separately in Latin and in the Sabellic languages. They are probably right in assuming that such a loss cannot have been a Proto-Italic process and therefore has to be ascribed to separate processes in Latin and Sabellic, but their explanation is slightly awkward in that it ascribes this loss to two processes that operated in dissimilar contexts: in Latin, the syncopation or reduction of medial syllables (including those in compounds like /necdum/ ← */nek\( ^3\text{-dum}/ \)), and in Sabellic, the syncopation processes that mainly affected final syllables. If correct, Joseph & Wallace’s explanation would place the emergence of /som/ somewhere in the fifth century for Latin (cf. §3.6.6) and perhaps also for the Sabellic languages, late enough for /esom/ to survive in the epigraphic record. I wonder, however, whether an accented /esom/ and an enclitic /som/ might not have existed side by side from a Proto-Italic date onwards (cf. also Meiser 1998:221-2).

The Latin and Capenate forms all preserve an unrhotacised */-s-/: except in the case of /esom/ in the Garigliano inscription, which predates rhotacism, this point, too, needs to be addressed. In the /esom/ quoted by Varro (assuming that he used a post-rhotacism source), this is probably due to analogy with the /s/ in the remainder of the paradigm: it is not necessary to assume that /esom/ was in fact rhotacised to */erom/ and that this hastened its disappearance, as Joseph & Wallace (1987:691-2) suggest. The Capenate forms can therefore represent both Latin and a Sabellic language: if they are Sabellic, they are most likely to be Sabine. However, the only evidence for the presence or absence of rhotacism in Sabine seems to be the forms quoted by Varro (L 5.74, Velius Longus CGL 7.69.7-9) and Festus (Paul. Fest. 8.14L), which seem to suggest that rhotacism did not occur there.
6. faced MF 471*, facet MF 470*, 3rd sg. pf. act. ind. The different endings are due to a replacement of the old aorist ending -d by a new perfect ending, see §5.2.4e.

The publication of these two Faliscan forms faced/facet has re-opened the discussion on the Italic perfects (and aorists) from the root */d(h)g72/g4271/-*. Starting with the non-reduplicative (aorist) forms from the root */d(h)g72/g4271/-/ in the Italic languages, these are as follows. Latin had fec-/f(g)413k/-/ at least from the fifth century onwards (first attested in duenos med feced CIL I2.4 and nouos · plautios · med romai · feced CIL I2.561). The Sabellic languages, on the other hand, have fak-/fac-/ in Paleoumbrian face Um 4=480† (c.560), and in Umbrian fut. pf. fakust TI IV.31, fakurent TI Ib.32, facurrent TI VIIa.43: Oscan aṣa[fak]- Lu 18, may be another instance (see below). Perhaps a similar form is Jface in an inscription from the Vestinian area (Mattiocco 1986:92, 95).

The easiest solution to explain this co-occurrence of /fek-/ and /fak-/ is to assume that both are derived from an Proto-Italic aorist that still showed paradigmatic Ablaut, with a singular */d(h)g72/g4271k/-/ → */f(h)ek/-/ and a plural */d(h)g72/g4271k/-/ → */f(h)ak-/-: in Faliscan and the Sabellic languages, the plural form of the root was generalized, in Latin, the singular form (thus Wallace 2004:179, Poccetti 2005:27-8). Such a paradigmatic Ablaut existed in the roots */d(h)g72/g4271- d/g4271-/ ‘to give’ and */h(es)- h1/- ‘to be’, but it must have been a very rare phenomenon in the Proto-Italic.

A similar co-occurrence of /fak-/ and /fei(ke)/ is apparently found within the Umbrian present: inf. façi(du) TI I1a.16, façu TI I1b.22; 3rd sg. subj. facia TI I1a.17 but also feia TI Va.23, Vb.3; fut. imp. fetu TI I1a.3 etc. (47 attestations), feitu TI VIa.22 (20 attestations), fetu TI VIa.22 etc. (53 attestations), feitu TI VIb.3 etc. (5 attestations). This alternation may reflect two different formations, */fak-i/- and */f(i)- (cf. WOU s.v. fakiiad), or fei-/fe- reflect a form that developed directly from */fak-i/- (cf. Meiser 1986:124 (/feitu/ ← */fakit/g448d/) and Berenguer & Luján 2005:198-202).

The alternative explanation is that /fak/- and /fek/- are reduplicative perfects that had lost their reduplicative syllable (thus e.g. Berenguer & Luján 2005:209-10, De Simone 2006:162-3, 172). In this explanation, two new problems present themselves: (a) why these reduplicative perfects should have lost their reduplication (and thus become identical with the old aorist), and (b) why there should have been two reduplicative perfects /fefak-/ and /fefek-/ in the first place, especially since /fefek/- has a full-grade root, whereas the reduplicative perfect normally has a zero-grade root. Also, the Latin data seem to argue against this, for in Latin the attested reduplicative perfect is vhe/vhaked CIL I2.3 /fefak-e-d/, but the later form is not /fak/- but fec-/fek-/. Before attempting to answer these two questions, however, a brief look at the material on the reduplicative perfects of the root */d(h)g72/g4271k/- is needed.
The attestations of */fefak-/ are the following. The two Latin attestations of this reduplicative perfect are the *vheivhaked* CIL I.2.3 on the *fibula Praenestina*, whose authenticity has been a point of debate, although most authors now accept its authenticity, and the *yhev* in the Vendia-inscription 479+, which can be restored both as *yhef/ked* and as *yhev/haked* (see §18.3.1). Oscars shows attestations of */fek/ked* in the perfect *fe[sac]id* TB 10 and the future perfect *fe[sacust] TB 11, 17, fe[sacust] TB 33. Another instance is perhaps Oscars *ana/fak-ke* Lu 18, which is either a reduplicative perfect with drop of the reduplicative syllable after a prefix (cf. *LHS* I p.587) or a form of the perfect */fak-*/.

The evidence for */fek/- consists in effect only of Praesamnitic *fekked* Ps 20 (with an early closing of /e/ → /i/). The other possible attestations, Palaeoumbrian *hehike* read by Firmani (1977) in Um 2, and South Picene *fekh* read by Marinetti (1999; still *tefei* 1985:233) in CH.2 are now read differently as *heruseh* or *heruses* and as *tefeh* respectively. Some authors, e.g. Poccetti (2005:28), also include Oscan *fifikus* Cp 37 and Faliscan *f[.f]iqod* EF 9 among the attestations of */fek/-, but I still prefer to regard these forms as perfects from the root */d[eig]h-/ (cf. below on *fifiked/[f.]iqod/*).

In my view, the explanation of these forms must start from the assumption that at least */fek/-, */fak/-, and */fefak/- reflect Proto-Italic forms: (a) */fak/- and */fek/- are both attested for both branches of the Italic languages (unless *vheivhaked* is discarded as evidence); (b) */fek/- can only be a aorist full-grade root (hardly a reduplicative perfect that lost its reduplicative syllable, see below); (c) */fefak/- is a reduplicative perfect, which ceased to be a productive category during the Proto-Italic period (although new reduplicative perfects may still have been formed later by creative analogy, as may be the case with */fek/-).

The only way in which */fek/- and */fak/- could be of a later date is by assuming that they were originally reduplicative perfects */fek/- and */fek/- that somehow lost their reduplicative syllable. This is a difficult assumption especially in the case of */fek/-, as the Italic reduplicative perfect had a zero-grade root, but there are also more general objections against this idea. Berenguer & Luján (2005:209-10) suggest that the reduplicative syllable could be dropped because it was regarded as more or less equivalent to a prefix. I find this idea unappealing, for three reasons: (a) unlike prefixes, reduplication only occurred in well-defined morphological categories; (b) if true, a far more widespread drop of reduplicative syllables would be expected; (c) this explanation reduces the reduplicative perfect to a non-category, since it assumes that the category’s distinctive feature could be more or less freely omitted.

---

87 Among the recent authors on the perfect of *facio*, Meiser (2003:178-80), Poccetti (2005: 30-2), and De Simone (2006) all assume the authenticity of *vheivhaked*.
A drop of reduplicative syllables certainly occurred in Latin (and perhaps also in the Sabellic languages, cf. e.g. Oscan awavēket Lu 18), but only in verbs with a prefix (cf. LHS I p.587): this was probably because forms in which the root was preceded by both a prefix and a reduplicative syllable did not conform to the desired bisyllabic structure (see Meiser 1998:210, 2003:160). De Simone (2006:162-3) explains the emergence of /fak-/ and /fak-/ by the attested drop of the reduplicative syllable in compounds (cf. LHS I p.587) spread to non-compounded verbs, but the arguments against this idea are mutatis mutandis much the same as the ones named above.

I would suggest that the various forms can more easily be explained by the assumption of a Proto-Italic confusion between an aorist and a reduplicative perfect. If this aorist still had functional vowel gradation (i.e., sg. */dʰh₁k-/ vs. pl. */dʰh₁k-/) in Proto-Italic, this must have been quite exceptional, and the expected development would be that either the root of the singular or the root of the plural would be generalized throughout the paradigm. The evidence seems to point to the existence of both these paradigms, one with */dʰh₁k-/ → */fēk-/# and one with */dʰh₁k-/ → */fāk-/. The co-existence of two variant roots in the aorist beside a reduplicative perfect */dʰedʰ₁k-/ → */fēdāk-/# may well have led to the analogical creation of a new reduplicative perfect */dʰedʰ₁k-/ → */fēdēk-/#.

The creation of */fēdēk-/# may have taken place after the Proto-Italic period: this limits the number of forms that has to be assumed for Proto-Italic, and the material allows it. In that case, however, it must be assumed that the languages where */fēdēk-/# was formed preserved */fāk-/#, */fēk-/#, and */fēdāk-/#.

The Sabellic languages then either preserved Proto-Italic */fāk-/#, */fēdāk-/# and */fēdēk-/# (all three of which are reflected in the epigraphic material) or preserved Proto-Italic */fāk-/#, */fēk-/#, and */fēdāk-/# (like Latin-Faliscan, see below) and formed a new perfect */fēdēk-/# → */fēβēk-#, with */fēk-/# subsequently vanishing, apparently without trace. The reduplicative perfects */fēdāk-/# → */fēfāk-/# and */fēdēk-/# → */fēβēk-# then survived in the south, and /fāk-/# in the north. These varying outcomes can be ascribed to different preferences: e.g. in the south, a desire to preserve a clearly marked perfect (pr. /fāk-i- : pf. /fēfāk-#) and in the north, a desire to preserve the perspicacity of the paradigm by generalization of just one form of the root (pr. /fāk-i- : pf. /fāk-us-).

Latin-Faliscan must have preserved Proto-Italic */fāk-/#, */fēk-/#, and */fēdāk-/#, but the distribution of these forms is surprising, since Latin uniquely shows both an (early) reduplicative perfect /fēfāk-/# (← */fēfāk-/# ← */fēdāk-/#) and a (later) non-reduplicative perfect /fēk-#/ Meiser (2003:160-1, 178-80)

88 Marrucinian (or Paelignian, cf. Jiménez Zamudio 1986:43) fec = fec(ed)? MV 3 may represent a survival of */fēk-/#. Fecront NDI 223=ILLRP 303 is Latin, not Marsian.
explains this on the basis of the distributional patterns of the perfect formations: “Das [reduplizierende Perfekt] findet sich nur bei Verben mit anlautender Okklusiva, Gruppe aus “s + Okklusiva“ und Nasal” (2003:160). In his view, the discrepancy between the word-initial and the word-internal reflexes of the voiced aspires caused an anomaly in the reduplicative perfect of the verbs with a root starting in an original voiced aspirate (see §3.3.3), and it was this anomaly which in Latin (and Faliscan?) \(^{89}\) eventually lead to the standardization of the non-reduplicative perfect in these verbs.

Taking into account that Proto-Latin must have had */fak-/ → */fak-/, */fēk-/ → */fēk-/, and */fēdak-/ → */fēdak-/* */fēfak-/, this means that if Meiser’s explanation is correct, it is in fact Faliscan that shows the more expected development, dropping */fēfak-/* in favour of */fak-/, while in Latin */fēfak-/* was for some reason replaced by */fēk-/. Meiser (2003:179-80) suggests that this may be due to dialect variation; De Simone (2006:173-4) in fact ascribes */fēk-/* to Roman Latin.

Assuming that k in fifiked and q in fifiqod represent /g/ (cf. §11.2.3), both forms can represent a reduplicative perfect */fifig-/. At least in fifiked, and probably also in fifiqod, the vowel of the reduplicative syllable was either assimilated to that of the root, or preserved a (Proto-Italic?) reduplication where the vowel of the reduplicative syllable followed that of the root, especially where this was /i/ or /u/ (cf. Meiser 2003:159-60). Since the PIE root was */dʰeigʰ-/ , the presence of an intervocalic /g/ must be due analogy with the /g/ in the present stem */fing-/ (as in Latin fingo) ← */dʰingʰ-/ , where it was the regular development of */gʰi/ (→ */gʰ/) after the nasal infix (§3.2.8), unless it is assumed that in Faliscan intervocalic */gʰ/ developed to /g/ (G. Giacomelli 1963:125, Stuart-Smith 2004:62) which would explain its occurrence here and in lecet MF 88: see §3.3.3.

The formation of the perfect was radically different from the one found in Latin, Early Faliscan having a reduplicative perfect with assimilation of the vowel in the reduplicative syllable, and Latin, an s-perfect finxi that reflects an aorist, with analogical extension of the nasal infix. In view of what was said under faced/facet (above) on the distribution of the reduplicative perfects with roots in /f-/, it is possible that the Faliscan reduplicative perfect /*fifig-/ later disappeared and/or that Latin originally also had a reduplicative perfect which was later dropped in favour of finxi.

\(^{89}\) Middle Faliscan faced MF 471* and facet MF 470*, published in 2003-2004, were of course unknown to Meiser when he formulated this theory.
The idea that *fifiked and *f[f]iqod (as well as Oscan *fifikuš Cup 37, and perhaps Samnitic *ff* (= *ff*ike?) in Sa 4) are in fact forms of *facio was rejected already by Lejeune (1955), but has been revived in the recent discussion on fanced/faceti (see above), e.g. by Poccetti (2005:32-4). To me, this idea remains unacceptable. The vowel of the root is spelled as *i both in *fifiked and in *f[f]iqod (where readings like *ff[eq]od or *ff[eq]od can certainly be excluded), and this *i must represent /i/, as in this interpretation the *i in the reduplicative syllable of *fifiked (and presumably in that of *f[f]iqod) can be explained only by assimilation to the vowel of the root. However, a Faliscan */-f k-/ cannot be derived by any regular process from either */-dhh/k-/ or */-dhh/k-/, and *fifiked and *f[f]iqod are far too early to ascribe it to a reduction of /a/ (← */h/), which cannot reasonably be placed before the fifth century (§3.6.6), let alone of /e/ (← */h/).90

9. *i*ice LF 309, *i*ice LF 315 (probably to be read either as *ipice or as *iddice). The word is usually explained as a verb because of the structure of the inscription *tito : uel|mineo : iun|ai *i*ice LF 315, where editors have interpreted iunai as a dative, being reluctant to assume a genitive in -ai for Faliscan (§4.2.2).

Herbig (1923:231-2) suggested that *ipice = impiggi ← */en-pepag/- (root */peh-g/-), a reduplicative perfect of an *impingo ‘to fasten upon’, with a reduction of the medial syllable as was then assumed for porded EF 1. Although the possibility of such a reduction is now rightly doubted in the case of porded, by the time of Late Faliscan *i*ice it may not have been impossible (cf. §3.6.6); in any case, the reduction might be due to the omission, found mainly in Latin, of reduplicative syllables when the verb carries a prefix (cf. below under porded). Since reduction of word-internal syllables was assumed to be entirely absent in Faliscan (cf. §3.6.6), this explanation was rejected by Stolte (1926:61), who revived the alternative rejected by Herbig, namely *ipice = impīggi ← */en-pīg/-, perfect of an *impingo ‘to paint upon’. Of such a perfect */pīg/- there appears to be no trace, however, nor does its existence seem likely (cf. Meiser 2003:152-8 on the distribution of the various perfect formations), except as an analogical creation. In my view, there can be reasonable doubt whether *i*ice is a verb at all: I would rather regard it as a cognomen (see §7.9.1.3).91

90 In Latin the assimilation of the vowel of the reduplicative syllable to that of the root did not take place if the root vowel was a secondary /i/ or /u/ due to weakening of /a/, /e/, or /o/ (LHS I p.586).

91 Because of the constraints of the borrowing hierarchy (§1.3.2.2) and the rarity of Etruscan lexical borrowings in Faliscan (§6.3, §9.2.2), I think it unlikely that *i*ice is an Etruscan verb in -ce, as was suggested by Ribezzo (1931b:192) from a Faliscan *ipi = Latin *ibi, which is impossible as the Faliscan form would have been *ifi) and Pisani (1964:341, from Etruscan *ipi ‘olla sepolcrale’, derived in the same way as turuce Cr 3.17 etc. was derived from δοσου).
10. *keset* LF 242, *kese[t* LF 243, 3rd sing. pf. ind. The verb shows an s-perfect as in Latin. Both Faliscan attestations occur in the formulaic phrase *magistratum gessit*, which is identical with the phrase used in Latin (*TLL* 6.2.1939,1-1940,56, cf. §6.2.30, §9.4.2) and may be either a copy or a calque (cf. Renzetti Marra 1990:339-40).

11. *lecet* MF 88, 3rd sing. pr. ind. As the PIE root is */leɡh-/*, the *c* is difficult: either the Faliscan development was (**/ɡh-/* → */ɡh/ → */ɡ/ (G. Giacomelli 1963:125, Stuart-Smith 2004:62), or *c* (still) represents */ɡ/ (Meiser 2003:68 n.118): cf. §3.3.3. Unlike the case of *fifiked* EF 9,*ʃʃʃʃiɡod* EF 1, it is not possible to ascribe the */ɡ/ to an analogy. Since *e* can represent both */ɛ/ and */ɛ/, -*et* may represent either third-conjugation [-*ɛ-t*] = */ɛ-t/ or */i-t/ (as appears to be implied by its IE cognates, cf. *DÉ, LEW, EDL* s.v. *lectus*) or second-conjugation */ɛ-t/ (thus Vetter 1953:301). The latter possibility may be the more likely one: Meiser (2003:68 n.118) points to the productivity of the stative suffix */-e/g4271-/* in verbs like Sabellic */st/g407/g413-/* underlying forms like e.g. Oscan *stahínt* Cp 25, *staíet* Cm 1B.31, Cp 24, Samnitic *stait* Sa 1B.22, and Latin *sedeo* beside *sido*.

12. *? peipara[i* EF 1, 1st sg. pf. act. ind. The use of punctuation to separate the reduplicative syllable from the root is paralleled only by the *vheɪvaked* of the *fibula Praenestina CIL I.2.3.* In spite of this curious division, *pe : paraf* has been read and interpreted as *peipara[i* = Latin *peperi* since Herbig (1913b:84-7), a reading that in my view is still not entirely certain. Other proposals have been made (e.g., Peruzzi’s (1964:160-4) *pe : par a[dke]douiad* ‘per par accedat’ and *pe : para[te ke]douiad* ‘per parate accedat’), but none of these have ever affected the accepted reading.

If *peipara[i* is read, this is a reduplicative perfect */pepar-* ← */peprh3-/*, the expected early form of the Latin perfect *peperi*. The ending -*a[i -*/*-aj* represents an innovation by the addition of */-i/ to the Proto-Italic ending */-a/a/ ← PIE */-a/e/, although it cannot be said whether this addition was Proto-Italic or Latin-Faliscan only (see §5.2.3e). The form is the only instance of the ending of the first singular perfect that still shows the stage */-ai/.

13. *pipafo* MF 59, *pafo=qi-pipafo* MF 60, 1st sg. fut. act. ind. Editors have questioned whether *pipafo* and *pafo* represent two different formations or if one is simply an error for the other. Since the two kylikes on which these forms occur were obviously meant as a pair (or even as part of a series), I assume that *pafo* is a graphical error for *qi-pipafo*.

---

92 Campanile (1986), in the discussion on the authenticity of the *fibula Praenestina*, has shown convincingly that *peipara[i* cannot have been the alleged faker’s model for *vheɪvaked*, as the Ceres-inscription was still unknown when the *fibula Praenestina* first appeared.
Whether Faliscan *pip-* represents /pib-/ (← PIE */pi-ph₃/- ← */pi-bh₃-/) or the later /bib-/ found in Latin (cf. §5.2.2.13, §6.2.3) cannot be established. The -a-represents either /ä/ or /a/, according to how the form is analysed:

(a) *pipafo* represents /pipa-f-ö/, /piba-f-ö/ or /bib-f-ö/ from an original athematic */pi-ph₃/- or */pi-bh₃/-, the -a- continuing the laryngeal: Latin *bibo* would then show a regular reduction of the medial vowel (Schrijver 1991:413). If *pafo* is a different formation, /ba-f-ö/ ← */bh₃/- would then have a direct parallel in Latin *dabo* /da-b-ö/ ← */dh₃/- (thus, e.g., LEW s.v. *bibō*, Schrijver 1991:412-3).

(b) *pipafo* represents /pipā-f-ö/, /pibā-f-ö/ or /bibā-f-ö/, assuming that the verb in Faliscan belonged in the first conjugation (thus G. Giacomelli 1963:152, 238-9, pointing to pairs like *cumbere : cubare*). In this case, it remains unexplained why the verb belonged in the first conjugation, however.

(c) *pipafo* represents /pip-ā-fō/, /pib-ā-fō/, or /bib-ā-fō/, assuming that an (unattested) /ā/-future */pipam /pip-ā-m/, /pib-ā-m/, or /bib-ā-m/ etc. was reformed to an /f/-future with retention of the /ā/, after other /f/-futures (cf. *carefo*), especially the /f/-future of the first conjugation, which would have had /-ā-f-ö/.

14. *porded* EF 1, 3rd sg. pf. act. ind. The form is often regarded as an originally reduplicative perfect */por-ded-e-d/ with loss of the medial syllable: a reduplicative perfect from the root */dhe₃/- is found both in Latin (*dedi*) and in the Sabellic languages (Umbrian *teřust* TI Ib.34, *dirsust* TI VIIa.43, and Oscan *dedens* Cm 2, 4, 9, *ded[ens* Sa 24, *dedevć* Lu 2). As the reduction or loss of a medial syllable is difficult to maintain at this date, Meiser (2003:106 n.31) and Wallace (2004:179 n.24) argue that the form is rather a continuation of an old aorist. Alternatively, the form could in my view still be explained as a reduplicative perfect, with the loss of the reduplicative syllable due to the tendency, observable at least in Latin, to drop the reduplicative syllable if the verb carries a prefix (cf. above under *faced/facet*).

15. *? pramed, pramed* EF 2, possibly 3rd sg. pr. act. subj. /präm-ē-d/. Although the word is often interpreted as an adverb derived from a */prH-mo-/ that also underlies Latin *prandum* (see §6.2.59), Pisani (first 1937:233) observed that *pramed* could well be a subjunctive, deriving it from a */prämere* or a */prämāre* that would correspond to Latin *promo*. The form would be the only instance of an /ē/-subjunctive in Faliscan. (Note that interpreting *pramed* in this way appears to be the only feasible possibility of finding a verb in this inscription.)


17. *salueto* EF 4, 3rd sg. fut. imp. *Salueto* shows an omission of -d that may represent a very early weakening of /d#/ (§3.5.7c), or may be a simple graphical error (*salueto‹d›*).
The form *salueto* is apparently used as a plural: *ofetios kaios uelos amanos* [all probably men’s names, cf. §7.2.1] *salueto salues seite* EF 4. The possibility that the verb takes the number of the last (singular) name is excluded by the immediately following plural *salues seite (=s{e}ite or scieite)*. This may reflect an inherited paradigm where the future imperative still had only one (singular) ending */-tōd/.* The attested Italic future imperative plural endings were all post-Proto-Italic formations: see §5.2.4d. Prosdocimi (1990:304-5) explains this plural use of *salueto* (with */-to/, not */-tod/) as due to a different paradigm, comparing Umbrian, where */-to/ is used indiscriminately for the singular and the plural, in spite of the existence of a plural forms */-tuta/, */-tuto/ but the phonological context in the much later Umbrian texts is quite different, and his comparison of the future imperative endings */-tod/ and */-to/ with the co-occurrence of an ablative in */-od/ and an instrumental in */-o/ (Prosdocimi 1990:320-1) goes rather far.

Interestingly from a syntactic (rather than a morphological) perspective is the side-by-side occurrence, in EF 4, of the imperative, the future imperative, and the subjunctive, as *ues saluete sociai ofetios kaios uelos amanos salueto salues seite (=s{e}ite or scieite).*

18. *seite (=s{e}ite or scieite?)* EF 4, 2nd pl. pr. subj. Since in Early Faliscan *ei* cannot represent */-i/, the form must be an error or an alternative spelling for either *site (s{e}ite)/ or *siete (scieite).* To confuse matters further, the word could also be read as *seiei.*

If *seite* is to be read as */-i-te/ (PIE */h₁s-i₁h₁-te/), it is the direct continuation of the old optative, PIE */h₁s-i₁h₁-te/ (used as subjunctive; if it is to be read as *scieite (/s-ī-ē-te/ or */-i-ē-te/?)), it is apparently influenced by the singular forms */-i-ē-m/ s-ē-s s-ē-d/ ← PIE */h₁s-i₁h₁-m h₁s-i₁h₁-s h₁s-i₁h₁-t/ (cf. Latin *siem sies sied*) or by the */-ē-/ of the *ē*-subjunctive. The ending is still the original secondary ending: the corresponding Latin form *sitis* is attested only from the time after the generalization of the primary endings to the subjunctive. Comparable forms are found in Umbrian: 2nd sg. *sir TI Vb.7, 26, sei TI Vla.23, si TI Vlb.26, 3rd sg. *si TI Va.6, 24, 27, Vb.3, 7, 3rd pl. *sis TI Va.6, sins TI VIIb.4.

19. ? *tenet in [---] cuitenet[---]---]* lef MLF 361 = */tenē-t/, 3rd sg. pr. act. ind. I regard the attestation as uncertain, and even if the word *tenet* is regarded as attested, the (syntactic) context as well as the specific meaning of the word here is unclear (cf. Renzetti Marra 1990:336-7).


Both forms appear side by side in the Etruscan or Early Faliscan inscription *tulate tulas urate* Etr/EF 385. Pisani (1943:262-3, 1964:347) quite plausibly connected *tulate* and *tulas* with Latin *tollo* (“sopportate - sopporta!”) as a
‘congiuntivo radicale’, i.e., a zero-grade root */tʰ₂-/ + subjunctive suffix */-ā-/,
corresponding to Latin forms like attolat Pac. 42R, 228R etc. In tulate, the ending
used for this subjunctive is the secondary ending, as might be expected in an early
subjunctive (see §5.2.4b).

22. ?? tulom MF 68, 1st sg. pf. act. ind.? Herbig (1914:238 n.1) tentatively interpreted
this form as an (originally reduplicative) perfect */tetul-/ with the old thematic
aorist ending */-o-/m/, which clashes with Herbig’s own interpretation of Early
Faliscan pe : paraf EF 1 as a first singular perfect pe:paraf[i with the ending -afi
(cf. §5.2.4e), although admittedly it would agree with the aorist endings in the
third singular pored EF 1, fiftik EF 9 and the third plural fಐfiqo(n)d EF 1. For a
Middle Faliscan inscription, however, assuming an aorist ending in the first
singular perfect is extremely doubtful, unless it is assumed that the Faliscan
paradigm was radically different from that of contemporary Latin: the only
parallel would be Oscan manjafum Cp 37,1, manafum Cp 37,3, itself unique in
being the only attestation of a first singular perfect from the Sabellic languages.
For tulom, an interpretation from the onomasticon (‘Tullorum’) is more probable.

23. urate EF/Etr 385 /örā-te/, 2nd pl. pr. act. imp.? (The alphabet of the inscription is
Etruscan rather than Faliscan, and u- may therefore represent /ū-/ as well as /ū-/.)

Urate occurs in the Etruscan or Early Faliscan inscription tulate tulas urate
Etr/EF 385. These three forms were all explained as ‘coniuntivi radicali’ by
Pisani (1943:262-3, 1964:347, translating urate as “chiacchierate!”), and although
this is plausible in the case of tulate and tulas (see above), it is difficult in the case
of urate. Pisani connected this form with Oscan urust TB 14, 16, which is derived
from */h₂e-/r-, probably through a reduplicated */h₂e-h₂or-/ (cf. WOU s.v. urust).
The ‘coniuntivo radicale’, however, requires a zero-grade root (cf. Meiser
2003:41-2), and this */h₂r-/ would be expected to develop into */ar-/ rather than
into */or-/ or */ur-/ (cf. Schrijver 1991:56-73, and §3.2.3). Pisani’s explanation
can therefore only be maintained if the vocalism of urate is explained, e.g., by an
analogical extension of the vocalism of the o-grade. Furthermore, explaining
urate as a subjunctive */ōr-a-te/ requires that the Faliscan (and Oscan) verb was
(thematic) */ōr-/t, not /ōrā-/ as in Latin. It is in my view easier to assume that
urate is an imperative: co-occurrence of the imperative, the future imperative, and
the subjunctive is also found in EF 4, saluete ... salueto salues seitei (=s’ite or
s‘ite?): see §8.3.

24. zot MLF 285 [and sot LtF 172?], 3rd pl. pr. ind. (For z- = /s/, see §3.5.3). The form
corresponds to Latin sunt, older sont CIL I.1529, which is assumed to be a Latin
innovation on Proto-Italic */sent/ ← PIE */h₁s-ēnti/, with the vocalism influenced

---

93 This in turn implies that Latin oro was not a Proto-Italic formation with /-aie-/ but a Latin
denominative verb derived from os, not connected with Oscan and Faliscan */ōr-/.
by the thematic endings. In the Sabellic languages on the other hand, the original vocalism was preserved (Oscan *sent* Po 32, Si 4, 5, 6, *set* Cm 1A.16, Po 32, Cp 24, 29, 30, Samnitic Sa 1A.1; Umbrian *sent* TI V1a 15, 27, 36, 46, V1b 29).  


5.3.2. Nominal forms. Two Early Faliscan forms have with some likelihood been interpreted as past participles formed with the common Italic participial suffix /-to-/:  

26. *? fita* or *fitai* EF I. The letters *fitaidupes* have often been divided either as *fita idupes* or *fitai dupes*, with *fita* or *fitai* explained in one of the following ways:  
   (a) connected with Latin *fingo* and its derivations in fict- (e.g. Thulin 1908:259, Herbig CIE 8079, G. Giacomelli 1963:41-3, Peruzzi 1964a:161-2): This presupposes a very early omission of -c- (*fita* = [fïta]?), or even a development */kt/ /xt/ (*fita* = [fïxta]?): see §3.5.7c. *Fita = fi(c)ta* would have a parallel in Middle or Late Faliscan *lete* MLF 285, corresponding to Latin lecti.  
   (b) connected to Latin *fitum* est Andr. 29L (Stolte 1929:107, Vetter 1953:280), Umbrian *fito* TI V1b.11 (Herbig CIE 8079): This is not impossible, although the parallels are not equivalent: the /u/ in Latin *fitum* can only be due to influence from the present *fi-o* (← */b’u-i-*/), whereas the /u/ in Umbrian *fito* can also be due to the Umbrian development */u/ → /i/. A Faliscan *fita* could therefore reflect both a common (Proto-Italic) innovation and a Latin innovation.  
   (c) connected to Latin *fetus* (Pisani 1946:53): As there appears to be no way in which Faliscan *i* can be derived from /ë/, this would appear to be impossible.


---

94 M. Mancini (1997:36-8) assumes that the Latin vocalism was original and the Sabellic vocalism an innovation. Note that Rix (1993:338) read an isolated Samnitic instance of the o-vocalism *sůn* in Sa 17, although he did not maintain this reading in ST, which has *sul f*.

95 Martzloff (2006:67-75) in fact divides *fitaidupes* as *fit idupes*, but as I find his interpretation of *aidupes* is not convincing, I have not included his form *fit* here.
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5.4. Summary of §§5.2-3

The discussion of the attested Faliscan forms in §5.3 illustrates the major difficulty in the evaluation of these forms: not only is the Faliscan material itself lacunary, but so is the contemporary material in the other Italic languages, especially as many of the Faliscan verb forms are from comparatively early inscriptions. Insofar as a consistent picture of the Faliscan verb can be drawn on the basis of this material, it is quite clear that Faliscan participated in all the changes of the Proto-Italic period, such as the formation of the four-conjunctival system, the merger of the aorist into the perfect, and the development of the endings (most notably the development of primary */-ti/ and secondary */-t/ to primary */-t/ and secondary */-d/). Interestingly, in the morphology of the verb (as in the morphology of the noun, see §4.10), there appear to be no instances where Faliscan sides with Sabellic as opposed to Latin (but see below on the ending of $ff\_jigod$ EF 1). Where morphological differences can be established between Latin and the Sabellic languages, Faliscan sides with Latin in the following cases:

1. **the $f$-future** (§5.2.2.2): The Faliscan suffix */-f/ in Middle Faliscan pipafo MF 59, pipafo MF 60 carefo MF 59, careffjo MF 60 corresponds to the Latin suffix */-b/ in the formation of future of the first and the second conjugation (common innovation based on the suffix of the imperfect), while the Sabellic languages had an $s$-future throughout. It is quite possible that Faliscan, like Latin, had an $\ddot{a}$/e-future in the third and fourth conjugation.

2. **the $s$-perfect** (§5.2.2.3c, §5.3.1.10): The Late Faliscan s-perfect in keset LF 242, keset LF 243 occurs also in Latin (common retention of the suffix of the old sigmatic aorist), but not in the Sabellic languages.

3. **the perfect endings** (§5.2.4e): The Early Faliscan perfect peiparai EF 1 and the Middle and Late Faliscan perfect ending -et (probably representing */-t/ ↔ */-e-t/) both point to perfect endings */-a/ in the first singular and */-i/ in the third singular. These forms represent innovations of the inherited endings Proto-Italic */-a/ ↔ */-ha/ ↔ PIE */-h2e/ and Proto-Italic/PIE */-e/ by the addition of */-i/. This addition may have been Proto-Italic (*/-a/ → */-a-i/ or even */-ha/ → */-ha-i/) or Latin-Faliscan (*/-a/ → */-a-i/). In the Sabellic languages, there appear to be no attestations of these endings (cf. note 83 on face Um 4=480†). In Early and Middle Faliscan, the ending of the third singular perfect was the old thematic aorist ending */-a-d/ ↔ */-e-d/). During the Middle Faliscan period, this was replaced by a new ending -et, which probably represents */-\acute{e}t/ ↔ */-e-t/, an innovation based on an older perfect ending */-ei/. The same shift occurs in Latin, apparently at the same time as in Faliscan, that is, between the fifth and the third centuries. There are indications of a shift of */-e-d/ to */-e-t/ in southern Oscan, but this shift is different in nature and unrelated to the one in Latin and Faliscan.
(4) the vocalism of third plural present of ‘to be’ (§5.3.1.24): The vocalism of Middle Faliscan zot MLF 285 (and perhaps also sot LtF 172) corresponds to that of Latin sunt CIL 1.1529, later sunt, representing a common innovation after the /-o-nt/ of the thematic verbs, whereas Sabellic preserved the old e-vocalism. There are, however, several points on which Faliscan (apparently) differed from Latin. In some cases, these differences are apparent only and due to the limitations of the available material (the comparison of Early Faliscan to later Latin forms as described above). Where differences can be established, these are of a later date.

(5) the perfect of ‘to make’ (§5.3.1.6): The Middle Faliscan perfect forms faced MF 471*, facet MF 470* differ from the attested Latin perfects vhevhaked CIL 1.3, later feci. Even this difference, however, to some degree shows a common factor in Faliscan and Latin, for both agree in substituting an aorist for an older reduplicative perfect (a common innovation, shared by Umbrian and perhaps Vestinian, but not by Oscan); if in Faliscan and in Latin this replacement can be ascribed to the fact that reduplicative perfects from roots in a voiced aspirate had become an anomaly, Faliscan and Latin also agree in the application of this morphophonological rule, which did not apply in the Sabellic languages (Meiser 2003:173-4). On the other hand, Faliscan and Latin differ in that Faliscan then generalized the root /fak-/ (originally the root of the aorist plural) while Latin generalized the root /fek-/ (originally the root of the aorist singular), with Faliscan perhaps showing the more expected replacement of /fek-/ by /fak-/: Latin is in fact the only Italic language to generalize /fek-/'. This difference may be due to dialect differences within Latin-Faliscan: Faliscan may not have been the only Latin dialect to have had /fak-/.

(6) the perfect of ‘to knead’ (§5.3.1.7-8): The Early Faliscan reduplicative perfect fifiked EF 9, ff/fiqod EF 1 corresponds to Oscan fifikus Cp 37 rather than to the later Latin finxi, which continued an old sigmaic aorist. In view of what was said on faced/facet and the anomaly in the reduplicative perfect of verbs with a root in an original voiced aspirate (§5.3.1.6), Latin finxi may have replaced an earlier Latin reduplicative perfect, and in Faliscan the reduplicative perfect may have disappeared in favour of a non-reduplicative type. (Cf. Meiser 2003:171-2 on such replacements.)

(7) the perfect of ‘to give’ (§5.3.1.14): Early Faliscan porded EF 1 can be explained either as a reduplicative perfect that lost its reduplication (not due to syncopation, but due to loss of the (Latin?) reduplication in compounds, see §5.3.1.6) or as an old aorist form (Meiser 2003:106 n.31). Such an aorist may also have existed in Latin: Meiser (2003:105-6) suggests that the non-reduplicative Latin present of dare may be due to influence from the old aorist.

(8) the root of ‘to drink’ (§5.3.1.13): The Middle Faliscan forms pipafo MF 59, <pipafo MF 60 can be explained in several ways: (a) if the -a- represents /-a-/ ←
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*/-h₁-/, Faliscan differs from Latin in that the medial vowel in athematic laryngeal verbs was apparently not reduced, as it was in Latin (separate retention of a phonological feature); (b) if the -a- represents an /-ā-/ belonging to the stem, Middle Faliscan pipa- somehow belongs to the first conjugation (separate innovation of a morphological feature); (c) if the -a- represents an /-ā-/ belonging to the suffix, Faliscan differs from Latin in that the future of these verbs was apparently formed in a different way, perhaps as a recent analogical formation (separate innovation of a morphological feature). In each of these explanations, Faliscan differs from Latin: in the first and last explanation, this difference would appear to be of fairly recent date.

(9) the ending of the third plural perfect: One of the more vexing differences between Faliscan and the other Italic languages is the ending of */-e-nd/ EF 1. This form shows an old thematic aorist ending -o(n)d /-o-nd/ that is incompatible with both the Latin ending */-ē-ri/ → /-ēre/ (inherited from Proto-Italic/PIE */-e-ri/) and the Sabellic ending /-ns/. The Sabellic ending is a (Sabellic) innovation on an older */-nd/, and Faliscan would therefore in this respect stand closer to the Sabellic languages than to Latin. However, in view of the fact that Faliscan, Latin and the Sabellic languages all used the corresponding third singular aorist ending -e'd /-e-d/ in the perfect, Faliscan -o(n)d may represent an analogical extension of the aorist endings to the third plural of the perfect. In that case, -o(n)d coexisted with an inherited perfect ending (probably */-ēri/) and may never even have been the standard ending. (Cf. also Meiser 2003:89 n.41 on the merging of the aorist endings with the perfect.)

(10) /esom/ ‘I am’ (§ 5.3.1.5): Capenate esú Cap 389, 404, 464 has parallels both in Latin and in the Sabellic languages (common retention rather than common innovation): the lack of rhotacism can be explained as due to Sabellic influence, but can also be due to an analogical preservation of the intervocalic /s/ within Capenate (or within Capenate and other Latin dialects).

In several of these cases (certainly 10, probably also 5-7, perhaps also 9) therefore, the differences between Faliscan and Latin can be explained as apparent rather than real, and as partly due to the lacunary state of the extant material: such differences as there are can be ascribed to recent developments (usually dating from between the Early Faliscan period and the Latin inscriptions of the third century and later). The real differences are in the formation of pip- or pipa- (8) and in the ending -ond (9). The former may never be decisively explained, as it depends on the phonological interpretations of the written form. The latter may be regarded as an apparent difference only, due to a lack of contemporary material for comparison, and although this is not a satisfying explanation, it may at least be tested as more material (both Faliscan and Latin) becomes available in the future. What can be said with certainty is that there are no cases of differences between Faliscan and Latin where the solution has to be sought outside the framework of Latin-Faliscan.