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Chapter 6
The lexicon

In this chapter, the lexical elements attested in the Faliscan inscriptions are compared with the corresponding elements in Latin, the Sabellic languages, and, where necessary, Etruscan. The chapter opens with some remarks on methodological issues (§6.1). Following this, the lexical elements attested in the Early, Middle, and Late Faliscan inscriptions are discussed (§6.2) and compared with the lexica of Latin, the Sabellic languages, and Etruscan (§6.3). Appended to this discussion are separate lists of the theonyms (§6.4) and of the geographical names and ethnonyms (§6.5) that occur in the inscriptions from the area, and a brief discussion of the Faliscan glosses (§6.6).

6.1. The lexicon: methodological issues

For the purposes of this study, the most important aim in looking at the lexicon is to establish a list of more or less securely attested Faliscan words and other lexical elements and compare this ‘Faliscan lexicon’ with the equivalents, cognates, and corresponding words in Latin, the Sabellic languages, and Etruscan. This is necessary for two reasons: first, because in this way the similarities and differences between, on the one hand, Faliscan and Latin, and, on the other hand, Faliscan and the Sabellic languages can be established; second, because such a comparison of the lexicon is necessary if the issue of lexical borrowing is to be assessed in any systematic way. A largely synchronic comparison of the Faliscan lexicon is therefore in my view more important and more revealing about the status of Faliscan than is a diachronic derivation of the individual lexemes from their Indo-European roots, although etymological arguments must still play a part where it is necessary to explain connections with Latin or Sabellic cognates. Since Faliscan is not related to Etruscan in the sense that it is related to Latin or the Sabellic languages, comparison of the Faliscan lexicon with corresponding Etruscan words will serve mainly to establish their possible Etruscan origin.

There is of course always a risk of regarding only those inscriptions as Faliscan that fit one’s pre-conceived mental image of what Faliscan is, and exclude those that do not fit this image as being Etruscan, Sabellic, or Latin, which of course leads to a dangerous circular argument. This risk is, I think, especially great in establishing the lexicon, for the (consciously or subconsciously) conceived mental image of a fragmentarily preserved language such as Faliscan is of course likely to be based primarily on the few items of speech that can be ‘understood’ because they carry a meaning of their own, in other words, by what is known, or perceived as known, of its lexicon.
I have therefore used only those lexical elements that occur in Early, Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions, that is, the inscriptions that show morphological, phonological, or onomastic features that are consistent with Faliscan: in other words, the lexicon is based on the inscriptions that can be considered Faliscan on the basis of other criteria than the lexical elements they contain.

The lexical elements in the Etruscan inscriptions (Etr I-LI) have been excluded: the inscriptions that are Etruscan in their morphology, phonology, onomasticon, and alphabet also show a markedly different lexicon, and can safely be said to represent a different language. Possible interferential forms and borrowings from Etruscan and Sabellic in the Faliscan lexicon are, of course, remarked upon in the list in §6.2, and discussed in §9.2-3.

As it is assumed here that Faliscan is very closely related to Latin, the question arises whether and how Faliscan and Latin lexical elements can in effect be distinguished. I have used the material from the Latino-Faliscan inscriptions (since these show at least some features of having been written with Faliscan rather than Latin in mind. With the exception of esú Cap 389, 404, 465, which is clearly a dialect form (see §5.3.1.5), I have added the data from these inscriptions between [ ]. I have, however, excluded all Latin inscriptions, that is, the inscriptions in the Latin alphabet that show few or no Faliscan features. These are mostly late, and reflect a more general ‘rural Latin’: 217 (c.125), 218 (c.125), 219 (c.120-50), 237 and 238, 240, 250 (106), 251 (late 2nd century), 268 (4th century, but probably imported), 291 (2nd century), 296 (an import), 377, 386, 393, 420 (c.150), 431-438 (all from before 211), and 456 (c.100-50). With some hesitation, I have treated Late Faliscan or Latin 214 (c.150?) as an intermediate case: although the language of this inscription does not differ from contemporary Latin, it was obviously meant to give the impression of being a Faliscan inscription. I have therefore included f., pretod, and sacru, which also occur in Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions, and excluded words attested from this inscription alone.

I have been reluctant to include lexical elements that are attested only in the onomasticon, as it cannot be established whether these elements were also (still) in use as part of the lexicon. For instance, while the gentilicium Firmius may well be derived from the adjective firmus, this provides no information on whether or not the adjective was (still) used in Faliscan: names, being primarily referential elements of speech, may move between (language) communities with far greater ease than lexical elements, even if these names also have a lexical meaning. I have therefore included only those cases where it is probable that the onomasticon reflects words in current use, namely (a) numeric praenomina; (b) cognomina, since during the Middle Faliscan period these were still a new feature of the onomasticon (§7.9) and may therefore be expected to consist mainly of lexical elements, and (c) the gentilicia Clipearius and Frenaeus/Frenarius, which are probably new formations based on the nouns clipeus and frenum respectively.
6.2. The epigraphically attested lexicon

The following list contains all the lexical elements from the Early, Middle, and Late Faliscan inscriptions, with additions from the Latino-Faliscan or Latin inscriptions (cf. §6.1). In the cases of the obscure passages of the Early Faliscan inscriptions EF 1-4, I have on the whole not included words or interpretations that have been proposed only once or only by one author, but not adopted by other authors. For ease of reference only, the words have been placed under the nearest Latin equivalent (to ‘iron out’ the differences in spelling), according to the alphabetical order of the modern alphabet.

Symbols preceding the lemmata: † = rejected by me, but discussed here because of frequent mention in the literature on Faliscan; ? = attestation doubtful; ° = attested only in the onomasticon; * = reconstructed.

I. aedilis n. ‘edile’. Nom. pl. efiles MF 113, efiles MF 115, efîles MF 117, efîle MF 114, efîles/ MF 116 (dedications) [cf. also ef in LtF 205?]. The word was first interpreted as ‘aediles’ by Erman (1917). – Direct Latin equivalent aedilis: the Sabellic equivalents, Vestinian aidîles MV 2, Oscan aidîl Po 11, Po 16, aidîlis Po 1, Po 15, aidîlis Po 2, and Samnitic aidîļis Sa 14, are borrowed from Latin (see WOU s.v. aidîl, Camporeale 1956:44-50 and La Regina 1968:436-46). Etruscan origin of the word is rightly rejected by Bréyer (1993:137).

Faliscan efîles has been regarded both as an adaptation of Latin aedilis and as a calque on a Middle Faliscan *efîs after Latin aedis : aedilis (G. Giacomelli 1963:243-4, Rix 1994:96 n.36; cf. Campanile 1961:7). I doubt, however, whether Latin was already important enough in the ager Faliscus before the war of 241-240 to be used for the name of a Faliscan magistracy, and if it were, there seems to be no reason why Latin aedilis should be adapted and not just borrowed as it was, as happened in Vestinian and Oscan. Reasons for assuming a Latin origin for the word are apparently (1) that the aediles derived their name from the Roman temple of Vesta or of Ceres, and (2) that quaestor, praetor, duovir, and censor are probably Latin borrowings. The former is a spurious argument, for the fact that Roman tradition connected the origin of their aediles to a local temple does not exclude the possibility that the institution was more widespread and did not (everywhere) go back to the Roman institution; the latter is a false comparison, for quaestor, praetor, duovir, and censor are all attested from public inscriptions and cursus honorum from Roman Falerii Novi, whereas the efîles are named in connection with pre-Roman dedications at Falerii Veteres.

96 Indications for the existence of a Sabellic aif... /g314 ef... have been seen in (1) the Aequian toponym Aefula, (2) the Samnitic gentilicium aífineís Sa 31 (also read as ayfineís), and (3) Palaeovolscian (?) efie̯ or efie̯s in iukài̯h i ko i efie̯s VM 1. Cf. WOU s.v. aidîl.
2. argentum n. ‘silver’. Acc. sg. (n.) arcentelom EF 1, which is usually regarded as a diminutive either of the noun itself, or of the corresponding adjective (see §12.2). [I do not adopt Martzloff’s (2006:68-9) derivation of arcentelom from arceo (cf. adulesc-ent-ulus), similar in sense to Greek ἀδελφάκμακον.] – Direct Latin equivalent argentum: Oscan has a formal equivalent aragetud Cm 7, araget[ud] Cm 6, arage[?teis TB A.5, but the meaning here is ‘money’ rather than ‘silver’ (cf. WOU s.v. aragetud), which may be due to Greek influence. In the unlikely case that Pisani (1964:71) was right in connecting the n-less Oscan forms to Greek ἄγαργες, there is no direct Sabellic equivalent at all.

3. bibo vb. ‘to drink’. 1st sg. fut. act. pipafo MF 59, pijpafa MF 60. 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, I assume that pafo is an error for pijpafa. – Since Latin bibo is due to an assimilation of */pib-/ /b314/bib-/ after the reduplicative presents at an unknown date, Faliscan pip- may represent either /pib-/ or /bib-/. The -a- can be explained in various ways (see 3.2.1.13): the verb may have been an athematic laryngeal verb /piba-/ or /biba-/ (−− */pi-bh1-/ ← */pi-ph1-/)1, but also /piba-/ or /bib-/, assuming that it was included in the a-conjugation (thus e.g. G. Giacomelli 1963:152, 238-9). – Direct Latin equivalent or close cognate bibo. In Sabellic, there is only a very distant cognate in Umbrian puni TI Ia.4 etc., which has been explained differently (WOU s.v. poni.)

4. bis adv. ‘twice’: pis LF 242, pi LF 242. – Direct Latin equivalent bis ← duis (attested in Cic. Or. 153 and Paul. Fest. 58.17L). No direct Sabellic equivalent, although Umbrian duti TI VIb.63 corresponds in sense; Umbrian dupursus TI VIb.10, the equivalent of Latin bipes, shows a compound formed with du- rather than with dui- (WOU s.vv. dupursus, dur). See also 18. duo.

5. bonus adj. ‘good’. Gen. sg. f. duenas EF 2; nom. sg. n. duenom EF 2. The relation of this word to manus (below) is unclear. – Direct Lat equivalent duenos (already in CIL I.4) → bonus, of unclear etymology. Sabellic on the other hand has *cupros (see WOU s.v. cubrar) in South Picene kupri AQ.2 (adv.) and kupirih AP.2 (adv.), and in Umbrian cubrar Um 7, cupras Um 17, cupr[as Um 20; cf. also “ciprum Sabine bonum”, Var. L. 5.159.

6. careo vb. ‘to lack’: 1st sg. fut. act. carefo MF 59, care[ff]o MF 60. – Direct Latin equivalent careo. No Sabellic equivalents, but perhaps remote cognates in Umbrian kstrruf TI Va.13 etc., castru TI Vla.30 etc., and Oscan castrid TB 8, castrous TB 13 (cf. WOU s.v. castrous), and perhaps Oscan kasit Cp 33, Cp 34, kas[fit Cp 33 (cf. WOU s.v. kasit), if these are derived from the same */kas-/ ← */kh2s-/ that underlies Latin careo, castus, and castra.

8. **cella** n. ‘burial chamber, tomb’. Nom. sg. *cela* MF 12, *cela* MF 83, *cela* MF 84, *cela* MLF 285. (The uncertain [---]cela[---] in MF 166 occurs in an inscription on a tile and, if an attestation of *cela* at all, would refer to the *loculus* instead of to the burial chamber.) – Direct Latin equivalent *cella*, although this is never used for a tomb (TLL 3.759,19-761,80), perhaps because chamber tombs did not play a role in the burial ritual of Latium. Samnitic *kellaked* Sa 14, 15, referring to the construction of a cistern (?), may be influenced by or borrowed from Latin (WOU s.v. *kellaked*). The etymology of *cella* is unclear (cf. EDL s.v.). Bréyer (1993:341-2) assumes that Latin *cella* is a borrowing from Etruscan *cela* ‘burial chamber, tomb’, occurring in vel : aties : velbhurus : lemmisa : celati : cesu Ta 1.66 and cela : sal : θn Vc 0.40. This is based largely on the assumption that Latin *cella* did not have the meaning ‘burial chamber, tomb’: she does not mention the Faliscan attestations, in spite of the fact that these are the only contemporary instances of *cela*, clearly have the meaning ‘burial chamber, tomb’, and occur in precisely the same context as the Etruscan attestations. According to Bréyer, the original meaning was ‘Grabkammer’, which was then extended in Latin (apparently within Latium) to ‘enge Kammer, enger Raum’ and thence to ‘Vorratskammer’, whether underground or above ground. In my view, the material can be interpreted equally well, if not better, by assuming an original Latin-Faliscan word *cella* with the meaning ‘covered or enclosed room, chamber’ (whether underground or above ground), which could easily be applied to underground burial chambers in areas where these were used. (Faliscan *lectus* and *cubo* are also everyday Latin words with a secondary funerary meaning.) Its incidental occurrence in Etruscan texts would then have to be ascribed to interference from Faliscan or South Etrurian Latin. Bréyer’s point that Etruscan would have had no reason to borrow a word for a type of tomb that was (exclusively?) Etruscan is spurious, since *cela* is clearly not a borrowing, but an inferential form occurring in only two inscription in stead of the normal Etruscan word for ‘tomb’, namely *siūti* (ET lists at least 60 instances, not counting the numerous instances of the derivations in *siūtin-*).

9. [**censor** n. ‘censor’. Latino-Faliscan attestations only. Nom. sg. cen|so LtF 231, censo LtF 232, [---]sor LtF 232; probably also [--- ce(n)s]or LtF 233 (or is this [--- ux|or]?). The word may well be a borrowed Latin term for a Roman magistracy introduced after the war of 241. – Direct Latin equivalent *censor*: Oscan, *censtur* TB 27, 28 *kenzsur* Fr 1, *censtur* TB 8, 20 and Samnitic *keenstur* Sa 4 are borrowings from Latin (WOU s.v. *kenzsur*) that formed the basis for *kenσostatη* Lu 5.]
10. *clipeus/clipeum n. ‘(round) shield, buckler’. Attested in the gentilicium *Clipearius* (‘Shieldmaker’) in *clipeaio* (clipeario?) MF 470*, clipiari[o] LF 230 [and clipeari[o] LtF 231, cl[li]peario LtF 233]. – Direct Latin equivalent *clipeus/clupeus* or *clipeum/clupeum*, of unknown etymology. The variation clip-/clup- may point to a borrowing, but can also be explained within the phonology of Faliscan, see §3.6.4). The suffix -eus has been compared with borrowings from Etruscan (*DÉ, LEW* s.v. *clipeus*), and Etruscan origin of the word is assumed also by Bréyer (1993:291-2, adducing *Clipearius*). No known Sabellic equivalent or cognate.

11. *[coniunx n. ‘wife’. Latino-Faliscan and Latin attestations only. The attestations, con[---] LtF 174, and co* LtF/Lat 341, are very uncertain. Note that in Latin sepulchral inscriptions the word used is always *uxor*, never *coniunx* (cf. §7.4.2). See also 87. *uxor*.]


13. *cubo* vb ‘to lie’, spec. ‘to lie in a tomb or grave’. (1) 3rd sg. pr. act. ind. *cupat* MF 40, c[j]up[at] MF 159, cup[a] MF 161, cupat MF 220, cupa MLF 305, cupa LF 221, cupat LF 224, [also cubat LtF 231]; (2) 3rd pl. pr. ind. *cupa]nt* MF 80, cupat MF 146, cupat MF 158, cupat LF 223; (3) either sg. or pl. cupa[?]t* MF 95, cu[p[a] LF 226 [and cuba LtF 326]. The attestations are all from the sepulchral formula *hec cupat/cupant*, ‘lie(s) here’, where the verb has a secondary meaning within the lexical subset related to burial (§6.3.2.4). For the formula, which is nowhere attested with the frequency it has in the Faliscan sepulchral inscriptions, see §8.10.1. – Direct Latin equivalent *cubo* (used de mortuis in *CIL* I².1259, 1638 and 2135 (quoted in §8.10.1) and Lucr. 3.892,97 cf. *TLL* 4.1278,82-1279,9); direct Sabellian equivalents in South Picene *qupat* MC.1, *qupat* AP.3, Vestinian *cibat* MV 7, and, slightly differently (a transitive compound), Marrucinian *encubat* MV 8, Paelignian *incubat* Pg 10 (all from sepulchral inscriptions); cf. also “*cumbam Sabini uocant eam quam militares lecticam*” Paul. *Fest.* 56.26L. See also 40. *lego* or *legeo*.

14. *cupido* n. ‘(sexual) desire’. Attested as as theonym *Cupido* ‘Desire’ in *cupidio* MF 62. See also §6.4.3. – Direct Latin equivalent *cupido* (first attestation also in the theonym *cupido* *ILLRP* 1204). No known Sabellic equivalents; a remote cognate may be *cupros* ‘good’ (cf. *WOU* s.v. *cubrar*). The regular Sabellic root for ‘desire’ would appear to have been /her/- ← PIE */h₁r̥/-* (cf. *WOU* s.vv. *herentas*, *heriadi*).

---

15. *dies n. ‘day’. Attested indirectly in the adv. foied MF 59-60 (either from an ablative */hō+dīē(d)/ or from a compound */ho-dīē(d)/; see 34. hodie); [related is the theonym *[die]s pater MF 62, see §6.4.4.]. – Direct Latin equivalent dies: the Oscan semantic equivalent zicolom TB 14 etc. shows a different formation */dīē-k°lom/ (cf. WOU s.v. zicolom).

16. do vb. ‘to give’. (1) 3rd sg. pf. act. of a compound *por-do in porded EF 1 [and 3rd sg. pf. act. ind. dedet LF/Lat 214]; (2) nom. sg. n. pf. ptc. datu LF/Lat 214]. Porded has often been explained as a reduplicative perfect that lost its medial syllable, but it is probably rather an old aorist: see §5.3.1.4. – The simple verb from the root */de/- is well-attested both for Latin (do, reduplicative perfect dedi) and for the Sabellic languages (reduplicative present *did- in Umbrian, Vestinian, and Paelignian; reduplicative perfect *ded- in Umbrian, Marsian, Paelignian, and Oscan: for attestations see WOU s.v. didet). The compound with por- has a cognate only in Umbrian purtuvitu TI Ia.24 etc., which has a different stem. See also 17. *duo or *duo.

17. *duo or *duio vb. ‘to give’. 3rd sg. pr. act. subj. douiad EF 1, also restored by Herbig (1913:75) in the damaged first part of the same text as [dou]iad (the most widely adopted reading of this word, see also 93. *[3-4]*ad). Faliscan douiad has rightly been compared to the Latin subjunctive form duam (cf. DÉ, LEW s.vv. dō, duam, EDL s.v. do). It is derived from a verbal root */deh₂/- or */doh₂/- (/*do(ū)h₂/- Meiser 1986:186-91) that occurs also in Umbrian purtuvitu TI Ia.24 etc., (cf. WOU s.v. pordouitu, Meiser 2003:182-3), related to the root of Latin do (/*deh₁/). See also §5.3.1.4. – Direct Latin equivalent in duam etc., and in Umbrian purtuvitu TI Ia.24 etc. (for attestations, see WOU s.v. purdouitu). See also 16. do.

18. * duo card. ‘two’. Several editors have divided fitaidupes in EF 1 as fitai dupes, interpreting dupes either as an equivalent of Latin bipes (Thulin 1908:259), or as an equivalent of Latin dupondius (Vetter 1925:29-30). Note that in Latin, du- is used as the compound form only in the old formations ducenti, duplex, and dupondius: later formations have bi- ← *dui- (cf. above s.v. bis) or duo- (see 19. duouir). Direct Umbrian equivalent dupursus TI VIb.10 (the equivalent of Latin bipes). See also 4. bis.

19. duouir n. ‘member of the board of two’. Late Faliscan attestations only. Gen. pl.? duum[j]uiru LF 243, duam[n]uir LF 247, duu[m]uiru LF 248, [duu]mwiiru LF 249 (all from cursus honorum, cf. §2.3.3). (Duumuirum is an analogical formation after the genitive plural, cf. DÉ s.vv. duouir, uir, LEW s.vv. duomvir, vir; IEW s.v. uiro-s, EDL s.v. vir). The word is in all probability an imported Latin word duouir. No Sabellic equivalent. See also 89. uir.
20. *ego* pers. pron. 1st sg. ‘I’. Nom. sg. *ego* EF 1, 467*, *eco* EF 3, *eko* EF 6, EF 7; *eco* LF 378, 383. (The *eco* read in MF 91 by Peruzzi (1964d:310-1) is too uncertain.) The Faliscan forms probably represent /eg/⁴⁴⁸/, but it is possible (although unlikely) that this was shortened to /ego/ as in Latin. See §4.7.1. – Direct Latin equivalent *ego* /eg/⁴⁴⁸/ /g/⁴¹⁳/ *ego*, first attested as *eco* in 479†: Sabellic equivalents are South Picene ekú- in ekúsim CH.1, and perhaps Samnitic iïv Sa 31: see §4.7.1 and WOU s.vv. ekúsim, iïv. See also 47. me.

21. ? *eita-* (Etr.) n./adj. (?). *eitam* EF 5. Either a noun or an adjective with an Italic ending, or an (adaptation of) an Etruscan word (Bakkum 1991): Peruzzi (1964a: 169-70) compared Etruscan itan. R. Giacomelli’s (1978:78-82) comparison with the much later Oscan eitiuvam Po 3 etc. is unconvincing, both because it entails a different suffix and because it requires a concept of ‘money’ two centuries before the first Etruscan money was coined.

22. *facio* vb ‘to make’. 3rd sg. pf. act. ind. *facet* MF 471*, *faced* MF 470*. – The verb has direct parallels in Latin (*facio*) as well as in the Sabellic languages (present *fac-*/*faci-* attested for Umbrian and Oscan, for attestations see WOU s.v. fakiad). For the use of this verb in signatures, see §8.9.2. The formation of the perfect, however, was very different in the various languages: beside Faliscan faced/facet stand Latin fêci, Umbrian fut. pf. fakust TI IV.31, fakurent TI Ib.32, facurent TI VIIa.43, but also reduplicative perfects like Latin vhev+haked CIL I².3, Oscan fefacid TB 10, fut. pf. fefacust TB 11, 17 and fef[acust] TB 33, and Praesamnitic fefakid Ps 20. For a discussion of these forms, see §5.3.1.6. – Some authors have interpreted fifiked EF 9 and f[f]i[qi]od EF 1 as forms of the same verb: this was already rejected by Lejeune (1955): see §5.3.1.8.

23. *far* n. ‘emmer (Triticum dicoccum Schr)’. Acc. *far* EF 1. [I reject Pisani’s farme[n]tom (1946:54) for phonological reasons.] – Direct equivalents in Latin *far*, Umbrian far TI Vb.10, 15, farer TI Vb 9, 14 (and the derivations farariur Um 9 and farsiu TI Vb.2, fasiu TI Iia.12, fasio TI Vb.44) and Oscan far Cp 37. There are cognates in other IE languages (cf. Polomé 1992:69), but the word may ultimately be of non-IE origin (cf. Schrijver 1991:113-4, WOU s.v. far).

24. *filia* n. ‘daughter’. *filea* MF 14; abbreviated to *f* in MF 155, LF 229, 234?, 242, 249 [and LtF 231, LtF/Lat 300, 305];

25. *filius* n. ‘son’. *fileo* MF 470*, hileo MF 146; fragmentary fi[? leo MF 94; abbreviated to *file* MLF 308, abbreviated to *fi* MF 15, abbreviated to *f*|e LF 332, abbreviated to *f* LF 213, 234?, 242, 247, 249 [and LtF 171, 172, 174, 231, 327, LF/Lat 214, 325, Lat 216]. [I reject Herbig’s (1914b:251) interpretation of *tito pola fio* ‘Titus Pola filius’, with a fio as a palatalized [fiô], see §3.5.5c.]
Direct Latin equivalents *filia* and *filius*. These words are Latin-Faliscan innovations (cf. Lejeune 1967, Hamp 1972): The corresponding Sabellic words are *puclom* ‘son’ in South pogloh AQ.1, Marsian pulef/s VM 4, Paelignian puclois Pg 5, Oscan puklum Cp 37,4 etc., and Oscan futir ‘daughter’ Si 8, 9, Samnitic fittreī Sa 1B.5, futrei Sa 1A.4, and futre[s] Sa 30, which continues PIE */puclom/ and */dʰugʰšēr/.

Umbrian once has abbreviated *fel* ‘son’ Um 29, perhaps an interferential form from Latin or Faliscan (cf. WOU s.v. *fel*: the inscription shows both Latin and Etruscan features). *Puclom* has distant cognate in Latin *puer*, a Faliscan cognate *putellius* ‘infant’ was read by Vetter (1953:303-4) in MF 152 as ‘infant’, but I reject this for phonological reasons (see 62. † *putellius*).

Filius and filia reflect PIE */dʰugʰšiilo-/ or */dʰugʰšiilo-/ (cf. Schrijver 1991:242), not formations based on Proto-Italic */fugʰšiilo-/ that underlies the Latin verb *felo/fello*, and its Umbrian cognate *feliuf* TI a1a, *filiu* TI Vlb.3 (cf. DÉ, LEW s.v. *filius*, IEW s.v. *dhe(i)-*, and WOU s.v. *feliuf*).

26. *fingo* vb. ‘to form, to knead’. (1) 3rd sg. pf. act. ind. *fifiked* EF 9; (2) 3rd pl. pf. act. ind. *ff[i]qod (=ff[i]qo(n)d) EF 1 (usually read as ff[i]qod, although it is also possible to read f[i]qo(n)d). The attestations are both signatures of the iscrizione parlante-type ‘... made me’, where the use of this word may have been formulaic. [3] very uncertain is nom. or dat. sg. f. pf. ptc. *fita* or *fitai* read in in *fitaidupes* EF 1, cf. below s.v. *fita-/fitai-*. – The attestation of *fifiked* is beyond doubt (cf. now Gulinelli 1996), and on this basis *ff[i]qod*, which goes back to Herbig (1913:74-80) and Buonamici (1913:40), has become the accepted reading, probably rightly. Both forms show a reduplicative perfect with (at least in *fifiked*) assimilation of the vowel of the reduplicative syllable to that of the root (as happened e.g. in Latin *spopondi*, *tutudi* etc.).

Since the root underlying the word was */dʰeigʰh-/ (DÉ, LEW s.v. *fingō*), the presence of an intervocalic /g/ must be due to analogy after the present stem */dʰingʰh-*/ (DÉ, LEW s.v. *fingō*), where */gʰ/ → */g/ regularly developed to /g/ after the nasal infix. Alternatively, intervocalic */gʰ/ may have developed to /g/ instead of to /h/ in Faliscan: see §3.3.3. Although the verb is therefore the same as in Latin, the formation of the perfect was different, Faliscan having an old reduplicative perfect with assimilation of the vowel in the reduplicative syllable, and Latin having an s-perfect with analogical extension of the nasal infix *finxi*, perhaps, however, as a replacement of an earlier reduplicative perfect (§5.3.1.8) – Latin equivalent *fingo*; distant cognates in Oscan *feihúss* CA B.5, *feihúss* CA B.19 (cf. WOU s.v. *feihúss*).

---

27. **firmus.** The name Firmius/Hirmius in hirmojo MF 19, firmio MF 54, hirmio LF 213; f. hirmia MF 18, fir-mia MLF 302 has been connected with the adjective firmus (← PIE */dʰerme-/) e.g. by Campanile (1961:5-6), although the connection was rejected by G. Giacomelli (1963:193).

28. **fit/fita/fitai.** Editors have usually divided fitaidupes in EF 1 either as fita idupes or as fitai dupes (fit aidupes Martzloff 2006:66-74). The resulting fita or fitai is usually connected either (1) to Latin fingo and its derivations in fict- (e.g. Thulin 1908:259, Herbig CIE 8079, G. Giacomelli 1963:41-3, Peruzzi 1964a:161-2), (2) to Latin fio (Stolte 1929:107, Vetter 1953:280, Martzloff 2006:66-74) or Umbrian fitu TI VIb.11 (Herbig CIE 8079), and (3) to Latin fetus (Pisani 1946:53). For a discussion of these suggestions, all highly conjectural, see §5.3.2 and §12.2.

29. **frenum n.** 'rein': perhaps attested indirectly in the gentilicium Frenaius or Frenarius, in frenaios or frenarios MF 471*. Latin equivalent frenum (probably derived from frendo (DÉ, LEW, EDL s.v. frēnum). No known Sabellic equivalents or cognates.


31. **gutto/*guttum/guttur n.** ‘pitcher’. Nom. sg. quto EF 3. (The word is often read as quton, which I regard as impossible.) Quto is a rendering or adaptation of the Etruscan word that appears as qutum (e.g. in mi qutun lemausnas Etr III from Narce), qutum Cm 3.1, Cr 2.18, 19, 30, qutumuza Ve 2.1, and qutus Vs 1.116, qutus Vs 1.120. Whether in EF 3 it is a borrowing or an interferential form cannot be said: neither does the occurrence, in Latin, of borrowings such as guttus and guttur throw any light on this. The phonological form represented by quto is unclear. The q- can represent either /k-/, as in the Greek κόθων or Hesychius’ κοθ[ν] (k 4788 Latte) from which the word is ultimately derived (cf. Colonna 1974:140-2), or /g-/ as in Latin guttur, guttus etc. which are thought to have a similar origin. The -u- may represent either /ũ/, preserving the long vowel of the original Greek word, or /u/ as in Latin guttur, guttus etc.; the -t- may likewise represent /t/ or /tt/ (cf. Bréyer 1993:198-9 on cuturnium, 209-10 on gutus/guttus). Reading the ending -o as an ōn-stem nominative -o(s) or as an o-stem masculine nominative -o(s) is impossible as the word appears to be qualified by the neuter adjective duenom (eco quto *e uotenasio titas duenom duenas). The ending might represent a second-declension neuter nominative -o(m) /-om/, but
this requires that an omission of -m that is without parallels in Early Faliscan (§3.5.7a). Alternatively, the word might perhaps be derived, not from Greek κώδων or κώδον, but (through a hypothetical Etruscan intermediary *qutur?) from a Greek *χιτωρ, in which case the ending might represent -o(r) (cf. Latin guttur). This requires assuming an omission of -r that is unparallelled (although not impossible) in Early Faliscan, but makes it more probable that the word was neuter. – Possibly a direct Latin equivalent guttur and cognate in guttus. No Sabellic equivalents or cognates.

32. [haruspex n. ‘haruspex’. Latino-Faliscan attestations only: harisp[ex LtF 231, harisp[ex LtF 232. No known Sabellic equivalents. Bréyer (1993:351-4) rightly argues against an assumed Etruscan origin of the word, which was based on the older false readings of the Faliscan attestations such as haracna.]

33. hic adv. ‘here’. hec MF 88, hec MF 94, hef MF 149, hec MF 158, he LF 220, he LF 221, hec LF 223, he LF 224, [he]e LF 226; [and heic LtF 231]; hypercorrective spelling with f- for h- in fe[(c?) MLF 56, fe MF 305. [I do not adopt the hac ‘hanc’ read by Vetter (1953:301) in MF 89.) All attestations are from the sepulchral formula hec cupat/cupant ‘lie(s) here’. The adverb is a fossilized locative */he/ke/ of a demonstrative pronoun /ho-/. The same pronoun also underlies foied (see 34. hodie) – Direct Latin equivalent heic → hic. No cognate in Sabellic languages, where the pronominal root /ho-/ is absent and /eko-/ is used instead (cf. §4.8).

34. hodie adv. ‘today’. foied MF 59-60 (with hypercorrect f- for h-, see §3.5.2). It cannot be ascertained whether the Faliscan form represents /hōjēd/ from a fossilized ablative phrase /hō+dē(d)/, or /hōjēd/ with a short /o/ as in Latin, either reflecting a compound form */ho-dē(d)/, or the result of a shortening of an earlier */hōdīē/, but hardly a locative (as Meiser (1998:78) suggests). The /-d/ in foied may be due to its presence in the ablative underlying the word, but as in the fifth declension the d-ablatival was an analogical development after that of the o-stems and the a-stems, it may also have been added to an already existing adverb *hoie after analogy with those adverbs that had /-d/ because they where derived from o-stem or a-stem d-ablatives: see §4.6.4 and G. Giacomelli 1963:150. – Direct Latin equivalent hodie. No cognate in Sabellic languages: the existence of a direct formal equivalent in Sabellic is unlikely, as in Sabellic the pronominal root /ho-/ is not used, and the equivalent of dies, Oscan zicolom TB 14 etc., is derived differently.

35. hut[j]ilom EF 1. Most modern editors have adopted Vetter’s (1953:280) restoration hut[j]ilom: this has been interpreted in various ways (see §12.2), most of which involve a derivation from PIE */gʰeu-/ ‘to pour’. If that derivation
is correct, Faliscan would apparently differ from Latin, where the derivations from this root (fundō etc.) all have /#fV/ (DÉ, LEW, EDL s.v. fundō): see §3.3.3. The only author to have suggested a fundamentally different restoration is Radke (1965:138), restoring huti[p]ilom, but his derivation of this word as Etruscan huθ ‘four’ + a Latin suffix apparently related to -plus/-plum ‘-fold’ is unconvincing: there is no reason why Faliscan should derive such a word from an Etruscan numeral rather than from its word for ‘four’ (cf. also §1.3.2.2).

36. † indu- praeft. ‘in, within’. G. Giacomelli (first 1963:41, 43) and Peruzzi (1964a: 163-4) divided fitaidupes EF 1 as fīta idupes, interpreting idupes as containing a praeft i(n)du- equivalent to Latin indu- ← endo /endo/. It is is very unlikely, however, that Early Faliscan already had the form indu- when Latin still had endo in CIL 1 2.4: the closing of the vowels took place only at a later date (cf. §3.6.6.1).

37. infra adv. ‘below, underneath’. ifra MF 40, in caput ifra ‘lies below’, a variation on the usual sepulchral formula hic cuba(n)t ‘lie(s) here’. – Direct Latin equivalent infra, with a lengthened /i/: whether Faliscan had /i/ or /u/ cannot be ascertained (§3.5.6.1). The etymology of the Latin form is difficult, for in Roman Latin an original Proto-Italic */ndi(e)r/ would have become †end(e)rad /end(e)r/ → †indrad /indrā/ → †indra /indrā/ (§3.3.3). Infra is therefore explained either by assuming that it was originally a non-Roman form (DÉ s.v. īnferus) or by assuming that, when the form was still */nd(e)r/, it was re-analysed as a compound */en+ð(e)r/, so that the */ð/ developed to /f/, the regular word-initial development (LEW, EDL s.v. īnferus). Both are ad hoc solutions: the attestation of Faliscan ifra shows that the former is at least possible (G. Giacomelli 1963b). No known Sabellic equivalent.

38. ? i*ice (vb., n., or adj.?). i*ice LF 309, i*ice LF 315. The word is usually explained as a verb because of the structure of tito : nemineo : iunai 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). Suggestions have been ipice = impīgit pf. of *impingo ‘to fasten upon’ (Herbig (1923:231-2), ipice = impīgit pf. of *impingo ‘to paint upon’ (Stolte 1926:61), an Etruscan verbal form in -ce (Ribezzo 1931b:192, Pisani 1964:341): see also §5.3.1.9. I regard it rather as a noun or an adjective used as a cognomen, which fits the structure of both texts.

39. lectus n. ‘bed’, spec. ‘the burial place for the dead in a tomb or loculus’. Nom. pl. lete MLF 285, abbreviated (acc. sg.?) let MLF 361, probably to be restored in · iii · [f]........ [numaj?].....[jo uxo MF 17 (either ‘the third bed …’ or ‘three beds …’). [Also in lectu Lat 251 (twice), with the same meaning.] In Latin this specific meaning of lectus (de mortuis, peculiariter de loco, ubi cadaver conditur, TLL 7 2.1099.18-20) occurs only in CIL 1 2.1990=Lat 251. M. Mancini (2002: 
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28-33) therefore explains *lete as */lɛtɛ/, the monophthongized form of the locative of */lojɛ/t/ with the same meaning as lectus, unnecessarily introducing a hypothetical word to avoid giving *lete (and perhaps let) a meaning that is in fact attested in the area, and assuming that Faliscan had a functional locative (cf. §8.2.1) with an ending that could be monophthongized (§3.7.6). For the omission of the syllable-final /k/ (*lete = le(c)te), see §3.5.7c.

40. *lego or *legeo vb. *to lie*, spec. ‘to lie in a grave or tomb’: 3rd sg. pr. act. ind. lecet MF 88. Once in place of the usual cubat in the sepulchral formula hec cupat ‘lie(s) here’, cf. §8.10.1. The Faliscan form is not without problems, since, as the IE cognates point to an original */legɛ-/h-/, the expected Faliscan form would be */leh/- */leh-/- rather than */leg-/. The /g/ would therefore have to be due to an analogy, unless it is assumed that in Faliscan intervocalic (*/gɛh/) */gh/ developed to /g/ instead of to /h/: see §3.3.3. It is also unclear whether the Faliscan form represents */leg-e-t/ (as would be implied by its IE cognates, cf. DĒ, LEW s.v. lectus) or */legɛ-t/ (thus Vetter 1953:301): see §5.3.1.

11. The verb was apparently replaced by cubo both in Faliscan (where cubo is the formulaic verb in sepulchral inscriptions) and in Latin (where it is not attested at all, although its existence is implied by the derivations lectus and lectica), in which case its occurrence in Faliscan can be described as an archaism (R. Giacomelli 2006:42). Interestingly, the unique attestation of South Picene veia/t/ /vejɛ/t/ MC.1 ← Proto-Sabellic */lejɛ̌t/ occurs side by side with qupat in apaes : qupat [: e]smín : púpúnis : nír : mefiín : veia/t : vepejí MC.1. (See also DĒ, LEW s.v. lectus, WOU s.v. veiat).

41. liberta n. ‘freedwoman’ and libertus n. ‘freedman’: Nom. sg. f. 1loifirta MF 41, loferta LF 221, perhaps abbreviated in ti [ţ] ţiɾia lo[?---]|l[e]a : cs : f MF 155. Another attestation (masc. or fem?) perhaps in [---]*i : u[ɔ]ľiia lo MF 165 [and perhaps 1 LtF/Lat 292 (very uncertain)]. The word clearly designates the freedman and freedwoman, although it is unclear what the status of the freedman was in Faliscan society, and whether it differed from that of the Etruscan lautni and the Latin libertus: see §2.3.2 and Rix 1994:94-6. – Direct Latin equivalents libertus and liberta. No Sabellic equivalents or cognates. Liberta (and libertus!) has been explained as a calque on the Etruscan feminine form lautnì̄a, but this has rightly been rejected by Rix (1994:88-91).

42. libertas n. ‘freedom’. Gen. sg. loifirtato MF 31, loifirtato MF 32. – Direct Latin equivalent libertas. No attested Sabellic equivalent, although there is a close cognate in Paelignian loufir Pg 11 and abstract nouns derived by means of the suffix -tas are attested from the Sabellic languages.

43. magistratus n. ‘magistracy’. Acc. (sg.? ) macistratu LF 242 [and to be restored in LF 243]. The attestation is from a formula appearing in LF 242 as macistratu |
keset, which is directly equivalent to Latin *magistratum gessit* (TLL 6².1939,1-1940,56) and may have been borrowed from Latin as part of the vocabulary relating to public office (§6.3.6): this does not imply that the words themselves did not exist in Faliscan. – Direct Latin equivalent *magistratus*. No attested Sabellic equivalents or direct cognates.

44. *manus* adj. ‘good’. Attested in the superlative used as a cognomen *Manumus* ‘Most Good’ (rather than ‘Best’ in *man[o]mo* MF 80 and *[m]ano*[m]o* MF 149, and either *manjom[o] or maxjom[o] MF 89; indirectly also in the gentillicium *Manius* in *mania* LF 225, *m[e]ania* LF 224. In Latin, *manus* was ousted probably already at an early date by *bonus*: since the latter occurs also in Early Faliscan, it is interesting to find the superlative *manumus* as a cognomen in Middle Faliscan, for if cognomina were a new element in the Middle Faliscan onomastic (cf. §7.9.2), then the adjective *manus* must have been current recently enough to be remembered, especially as the form used for the cognomen is not the regular form but the superlative. – In Latin, the attestations of *manus* are all from glossographers (Var. L. 6.2.4, Fest. 112.24-5L, 132.3-7L, Paul. Fest. 109.4-7L, 133.10-2L, 151.6-7L, Macr. 1.3.13), where the word often has a sacral connotation, e.g. “*Matrem Matutam antiqui ob bonitatem appellabant, et maturum idoneum usui, et mane principium diei, et inferi di Manes, et subpliciter boni appellati essent, et in Carmine Saliiari *Cerus Manus* appellatur creator bonus” (Paul. Fest. 109.4-7). Apparently already by the time of the earliest attestations that could still be found or remembered, the word was associated with divine benevolence rather than human goodness, which may be why it disappeared from common use: even its onomastic derivation in Latin, the praenomen *Manius*, was not frequent. No Sabellic equivalent, although the stem *ma*- has been seen in Samnitic *maatiis* Sa 1A.10, B.13 (WOU s.v. maatiis, DÉ, LEW s.v. mānis, -e).


46. *maxumus* irregular superl. adj. ‘greatest’. Attested as a cognomen *Maxumus/Maximus in maximo* MF 88, *maxom[o]* MF 98, *majxomo* MF 162, *maxomo* LF 220 and *maxjom[o] or manjom[o] MF 89, probably not *[--- m]a*ome MF 156 (pace Colonna 1972c:446-7) – Direct Latin equivalent *maxumus/maximus* from */mag-isVmo-/* (see §3.6.6.1.2). The Sabellic languages had */mag-im-o-/* → */majimo-/* → */majimo-/* attested in Oscan *maimus* TB 3, 7 (DÉ, LEW s.v. magnus, WOU s.v. maimas).

47. *me* pers. pron. 1st sg. acc. ‘me’. Acc. sg. *med* EF 1, 9; *met* MF 470*. (The abl. sg. *[me]d* has been proposed as a reading by G. Giacomelli (1963:44, 46, 1978:527)
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in EF 3). For the various explanations of the Faliscan and Latin form *med, see §4.7.2. The *t in Middle Faliscan *met can be explained either as an indirect attestation of weakening of word-final consonants (§3.5.7c) and/or as a hyper-correct form copying the replacement of */-d/* by */-t/* in ending of the third singular perfect, cf. the facet that immediately follows *met: see also §5.2.4e – Direct Latin equivalent *med/*média/* → *me/*média/*. The only certain instance of a Sabellic semantic equivalent is Palaeoumbrian *mío/*Um 4=**480†, with a suffix */-om/* that also occurs in the personal pronouns of the second person and third person reflexive, attested in Oscan *tiium/*Cp 37 and *siom/*TB 5, 6, 9 respectively (cf. WOU s.vv. *mío/*, *siom/*, *tiom/*). See also §4.7.2. For the nominative *ego, see 20. *ego.

48. [minor irregular comp. adj. ‘smaller, younger’. Latino-Faliscan attestation only. Probably in *mino/*LtF 173, where its is apparently a woman’s name, although the lexeme itself is likely to have existed in Faliscan. See §7.7.1.43.]

49. † *nutrix n. ‘wet-nurse’. Herbig (CIE 8225) considered interpreting *nut*[---] MF 103 as *nutr[ix], which was adopted by Vetter (1953:302). G. Giacomelli (1963:82-4) rightly rejected this, as the Middle Faliscan form would have been *notrix or *noutrix (cf. Latin *noutrix CIL I.2:45): see §3.7.2. Peruzzi’s attempt (1964d:312) to uphold Herbig’s interpretation by assuming that *nutr[ix] was a Luxuslehnwort from Roman Latin is unconvincing: it would still be the oldest instance of the spelling *u for original */ou/, only then in Roman Latin instead of in Faliscan. (Note there are no attestations of ‘professional designations’ in the Faliscan sepulchral inscriptions.)

50. ? *oct*... ord. ‘eight’ or card. ‘eighth’. Perhaps attested in the praenomen *oct*[i[---] MLF 353, which Herbig (CIE 8204) in fact read as *octo. Most of the Latin names in Oct- discussed by Schulze (1904) and Kajanto (1965) are derived from the cardinal *octo* or the ordinal *octauus, although *oct*[i[---] could conceivably represent a name in */ōkt-/* ← */aukt-/* (§3.7.4). If attested, there are direct equivalents in Latin *octo, octauus* etc., as well as close cognates in the Oscan names *úhtavis/*Cp 36, *otazis/*Lu 36.

51. † *olla n. ‘urn, pot’. Olna in *uel [*] *uisni ∙ *olna MF 82 was interpreted by Deecke (1888:131-2) as *olla, but this is based on an erroneous etymology. It is rather a second gentilicium, as was first proposed by Schulze (1904:73 n.3).

52. ? *ora- (vb.?) in *tulate *tulas *urate EF/Etr 385. The text is regarded as Etruscan by most editors and (therefore?) left unexplained. Pisani (1964:347) suggested a connection with Oscan *urust TB 14, 16 (and thus indirectly with Latin *oro, cf. WOU s.v. *urust*), interpreting it as ‘chiacchierate’. Although this is not without difficulties (see §5.3.1.23), a connection between *urate, urust, and *oro is not impossible.
53. **pario** vb. ‘to bring forth, to give birth to’. 1st sg. pf. act. ind. *pe*para*j* EF 1 (context unclear). Notwithstanding the punctuation, this form has been read and interpreted thus since Herbig (1913:84-7), and although other proposals have been made (e.g. Peruzzi’s (1964a:160-4) *pe : par a[dke]douiad ‘per par accedat’and *pe : para[te ke]douiad ‘per parate accedat’), these are not improvements, nor generally accepted. Assuming that the text is indeed to be read thus, *pe*para*j* (cf. Untermann 1968a:166 n.5) shows a reduplicative perfect /pe-par-/ that would also have been the early form of Latin *peperi* (Dé, LEW s.v. pariō). Direct Latin equivalent *peperi*; no Sabellic equivalent, although the root may have distant Sabellic cognates (cf. *WOU* s.v. amparitu, perstu).

54. [*pescum* (Sab.) n. ‘votive offering’. Only in Torelli’s (1974:741-6) reading of Cap 431, which starts with the word *pesco*. This is a Sabellic word, cf. Marsian *pesco* VM 5: it is usually derived from */perk-sk-o-m/, and related to Umbrian *persklum* TI Ia.1 etc. (*→* /perk-sk-elo-m/): see *WOU* s.vv. *pesco*, *persklum*.99]

55. **pater** n. ‘father’. Only indirectly attested in the theonym [...]s pater MF 62, restorated either as *[iou]s pater or *[iou]s pater, or as *[die]s pater. – Direct Latin equivalent *pater*, direct Sabellic equivalent Oscan *patir* Cp 2, *di*{}/*pa*{}/*tír* Po 22, etc.

56. **por-** præfix. See 16. *do*. Occurring in *porded* EF 1. In Latin, *por-* occurs in the compounds *polliceor*, *porgo*, *porricio*, and *portendo*. (Cf. DE s.v. *por-* and *porrō* in *porod* CIL I2.560.)

57. **postigna** (Sab.) n. prob. ‘likeness, statue’?. Nom. sg. *posticnu* MLF 474*. The form may be a Sabellic first-declension nominative singular (§4.2.1, §9.3.2), for the only known equivalent or cognate is South Picene *postiknam* CH.2 (acc. sg.). The meaning ‘statue’ assumed for both words is a conjecture based on the fact that the Faliscan inscription, *caui : tertinei : | posticnu 474*, occurs on a bronze base which in the earliest drawings (Ritschl 1862 tab.XXXVI,B and Garrucci 1862 tav.IV.2) shows marks of the feet of a statuette.100 The etymology is unknown (*WOU* s.v. *postiknam*): the word is perhaps a compound of Sabellic *posti* (cf. *WOU* s.v. *püstin*, also La Regina 1981:132). No known Latin cognate.

---

99 Untermann (*WOU* s.v. *pesco*) refers to Cap 431 but erroneously describes this inscription as ‘aus dem Marsergebiet (Luco AQ)’.

100 Untermann (*WOU* s.v. *postiknam*) all but rejects this, stating “der Gegenstand zeigt jedoch keine Spur einer Statue (Lejeune).” Lejeune’s (1952:115) autopsy, however, is less decisive: “Dans l’état actuel de l’objet, il n’y a pas de moindre trace de soudure de la statuette jadis supportée par la base; à peine peut-on discerner l’emplacement du pied gauche à une légère différence de coloration de la patine, et il est difficile d’en affirmer seulement autant pour la pied droit; sans doute le bronze a-t-il subi un décapage?” (my italics throughout).
58. praetor n. ‘praetor’. Nom. sg. pretod LF 242, p[reto]|r LF 243, pretor LF 247, pretor LF 248 [and pretod Lf/Lat 214] (all from cursus honorum in sepulchral inscriptions); nom. pl. pretores LF 213 (public work). The word may well be a borrowed Latin term for a magistracy that was introduced in the ager Faliscus as part of the Roman presence there after the war of 241. Although Latin praetor was sometimes also used as a ‘translation’ or ‘equivalent’ of Etruscan zilæθ, it is unlikely that this is the case in the Faliscan attestations, as these all occur in the context of the Roman administration of Falerii Novi. – Direct Latin equivalent praetor; the Oscan equivalent in the abbreviated pr TB 23, 27, 28 may be a borrowing from Latin (cf. WOU s.v. pr). For the etymology, cf. also DÉ, LEW s.v. praetor: Bréyer (1993:378) discusses the possible derivation from or connection by popular etymology with Etruscan puṛθ (doubtful, as the Etruscan magistrate equated with the praetor was not the puṛθ, but the zilæθ).

59. ? pramo- and propramo-. (1) Abl. sg. pramod, pramod, pramod EF 2; perhaps also pro pramod EF 2, although this may also be a form of the compound propramo-; (2) adv. pramed, pramed EF 2; (3) compound nom. or acc. sg. propramom, and abl. sg. propramod EF 2, although this may also be read as also pro pramod. The repetition of these enigmatic words forms the core of EF 2. The words are in all probability derived from a */pr[H]-mo-/ that also underlies Latin prandium (← */präm(o)+edj̣m/, cf. DÉ, LEW s.v. prândium, IEW s.v. per 2.A,g). Since prandium is usually interpreted as ‘early meal’ (like German Frühstück, or Greek ¥riston), /pr[H]-mo- has been credited with a meaning ‘early’, even though the reflexes of */pr[H]-mo- in Germanic (Old Saxon formo, Old English furma) and Baltic (Lithuanian pìrmas, Old Prussian pirmas) mean ‘first’ in the sense of ‘foremost’ rather than ‘earliest’. Pisani (first 1937:233) observed that pramed could also be the subjunctive of a verb rather than an adverb, deriving it from a *pramo (either *prämãre or *prämãre) that would correspond to Latin promo.

60. ? pro... Unclear, occurring in prof---/ LF 244. Renzetti Marra (1990:338) interpreted prof--- as “un prof elemento architettonico di cui è data la localizzazi- one”. If I understand this correctly, it would refer to (a place in) the loculus, which is elsewhere referred to as lectus (MF 17, MLF 285, perhaps MLF 361, and Lat 251 (twice)); placing a body before another is described by anteponat in Lat 251. Prof--- may be part of a (woman’s) name, perhaps prof[tacia], the gentilicium attested from the same tomb in LF 242, 244.

61. † puia (Etr.) n. ‘wife’. Although the possibility of reading puia in [.?]α*ια | lepuia | uoltilia MF 144 was rejected already by Herbig (CIE 8243a), this reading is still

101 The nature of the laryngeal is uncertain in view of West Greek and Boeotian πρατος vs. Attic-Ionic πρωτος (cf. Beekes 1969:214-6, who seems to favour /h/).
CHAPTER 6

adopted by Vetter (1953:305). It would be the only sepulchral inscription where [HUSBAND\_GEN WIFE] precedes [FILIATION] (attestations in §7.4.2). Note also that [HUSBAND\_GEN WIFE] or [WIFE HUSBAND\_GEN] is part of an (onomastic) formula in which the word used for WIFE is always uxor (§7.4.2), which would make it even more unlikely that it would be replaced by puia. If in spite of these objections puia is still adopted, it is likely to be an interferential form, not a borrowing.

62. † *putellius/*putellium n. ‘infant’; *putellus adj. ‘little’. Vetter (1953:303-4, 80) interpreted putellio in uoltio: marc[---] | putellio MF 152 as ‘infant’ and on this basis restored putela ‘parvula’ in EF 1. The main problem is that the noun *putellius/*putellium and the adjective *putellus are to be derived from PIE */pu-tlom/, but that the suffix */-tlom/ was continued in Italic as */puĉlom/ in fact occurs in the Sabellic languages as *puĉlum in South Picene pogloh AQ.1, Marsian pucles VM 4, Paelignian pucoil PG 5, Oscan puĉlum CP 37,4 etc. (In spite of this, R. Giacomelli (2006:42) still considers putellio as a possible ‘sabinismo’.) A *putellius/*putellium and *putellus would therefore require a separate Faliscan development at the Proto-Italic stage, which is inadmissible (§3.1.2). *Putellius/ *putellium could be a later derivation from /pu-/ (which occurs also in Latin puer/puella), but in that case it is unclear what the origin of the suffix would be. It is easier to interpret putellio as an onomastic element. A better case for a p... ‘child’ could in fact be made on the basis of /g70/g833/g851/g1800[i.] | holc[osi] | ar... MF 140 (or is this another case of puia?).

63. ? °quartus ord. ‘fourth’: very dubiously attested[---]*/[5-7]: cuva MF? 129, which has been interpreted as an abbreviation of a name like Latin Quartus by Thulin (1907:305), an interpretation that has been rejected by later editors.

64. quaestor n. ‘a magistracy, quaestor’. Nom. sg. cuestod LF 242, cuestor LF 243, cues/tor LF 245, cue/stor LF 247 [and possibly also [---]or LtF 233; q LtF 231 is probably not an attestation.] Probably (but not necessarily) a borrowing from Latin. – Direct Latin equivalent quaestor: the Sabellic counterparts, Umbrian kvestur TI Va.23, Vb.2 cvestur Um 9, and its derivative kvestretie TI Ib.45, Ila.44, Oscan kwaissstur Po 3, Po 4, kϕaissstur Po 9, Po 10, κϕaissstur Po 14, κϕaistoc Lu 6, Lu 7, κϕaistoc Lu 10, κϕaio. Lu 8, kϕaisturei Cm 1A.2, kϕaistur Po 8 are borrowings from Latin (WOU s.v. kwaissstur).

65. -que encl. conj. ‘and’. -cue MF 80, -cve MF 158, -cve MLF 313, probably also -cue MF 170, possibly also -c\[ue \] MF 108. All attestations are from names joined in sepulchral inscriptions. – Direct Latin equivalent -que. In the Sabellic languages, the formal equivalent -\[pe \] is often assumed to occur as a suffix (as e.g. in Latin uterque) in Umbrian putrespe TI IV.14 and seipodruhpei TI VIa.11, but this view has convincingly been challenged (cf. WOU s.v. p\[utereipid, seipodruhpei\]).
66. **qui** (rel.?) pron. ‘who’. (Nom. sg.?) * cui* LF 352 (not a locative or a dative, as Renzetti Marra (1990:336-7) suggests: see §4.9). The context (*---?* preconon---*---* set) is unclear: I doubt whether the text in fact contains a pronoun at all. – If attested, there is a direct Latin equivalent *qui*, and Sabellic equivalents (with */k[v]*/ → */p*/ in e.g. Umbrian *pisi* Ti Va.3, 10 etc. (indef.) and *poi* Ti V1a.5, Vlb.24 etc. (rel.), Oscan *pis* Cp 32 etc. (rel.) and *pai* Cm 1B.8 etc. (rel.). (Cf. the indices to ST, and WOU s.vv. *pis*, *poi* for all Sabellic attestations).

67. ° *quinctus* ord. ‘fifth’. Attested only in the praenomen *cuicto* MLF 310. The Latin equivalent has */quntus*/ as a result of compensatory lengthening (cf. Pfister 1977:100, Meiser 1998:78-9, 81): it is unclear whether this can also be assumed for Faliscan (§3.5.6.1). – Direct Latin equivalent *quin(t)us*, both in the lexicon and the onomasticon. The Sabellic equivalent, attested only in the onomasticon (Paelignian *ponties* Pg 5, Oscan *púntijs* Po 1, *punti[S]eis* Cm 28, *pompi[S]eis* Me 1, *pompi[S]eis* Me 3, abbreviated *pompt* Sa 9, 11), shows an o-vocalism that probably originated in the cardinal (cf. §3.2.10.1 and WOU s.vv. *pomtis* and *púmpertais*).

68. *rex* n. ‘king’ (perhaps a sacral title). Nom. sg. *rex* MF 90, perhaps also *rex* MF 91 (very uncertain), *re*[x] LF 249 [and *rex* LtF 231]. The only title to occur both at Falerii Veteres and at Falerii Novi: it may have been a sacral function, like that of the Roman *rex sacrorum* (cf. §2.3.3). The title is found at the end of a *cursus honorum* in LF 249 and LtF 231, either because the status of the office was very high, or because the office fell outside the usual Latin *cursus*. – Direct equivalents in Latin *rex* (already recei CIL 1.1, *rex* CIL 1.2830) and probably in Oscan *reɡo* Lu 5 (but cf. WOU s.v. *reɡo*): a close cognate is Marrucinian *reca[ni] MV 1.

69. ° *russus* adj. ‘reddish’. If the cognomen *Ruso* is read in *cauio[---]*|*ruso[?---]* MLF 318 [and perhaps in *ce·pau[ceo ru?]so* LtF 290], this might be connected to the adjective that appears in Latin as *russus* (note the unrhotacized *s* = */ss*/).

70. *sacer* adj. ‘sacred’: nom. sg. f. *sacra* MF 127 (dedication) [and nom/acc. sg. n. *sacru* LtF/Lat 214 (dedication)]; possibly abbreviated to *sa* MF? 76, 131, although these are perhaps rather abbreviations of onomastic elements. – Direct Latin equivalent *sacer*; direct Sabellic equivalents Umbrian *sacr tu rum* Uml2, Um 13, adv. *sacr* Um 6, *sacr* Um 19, and Oscan *sakaro* Me 1, Me 2, Me 3. An i-stem *sacris* occurs both in the Sabellic languages (cf. WOU s.v. *sakrim*) and Latin (porci ... *sacres* Pl. Men. 289-90, *sacrem* Fest. 420.26ffL). Bréyer (1993:381-3) discusses a possible Etruscan origin of the word.

71. *salueo* vb. ‘to be healthy, to fare well’ (imp. used as a greeting). 3rd sg. pr. imp. *salue[to]d* EF 3, *salueto* EF 4; 2nd pl. pr. imp. *saluete* EF 4. – Direct Latin equivalent *salueo*; in the Sabellic languages, the only cognate is only the adjective *saluos*. Cf. DÉ s.v. *saluus*, LEW s.v. *salvus*, WOU s.v. *saluvs*. 195
72. *saluis* adj. ‘healthy, well’. Nom. pl. salues EF 4. The Faliscan form is surprising in that it apparently shows a *saluis* where Latin and the Sabellic languages have *saluos*. Perhaps this may be compared to the coexistence of *sacros* and *sacris* in Latin and the Sabellic languages (cf. 70. sacer). – Close cognate in Latin salus and Sabellic *saluos* in Umbrian saluom TI Vla.51 etc., Marrucinian salaus MV 7, salas MV 6, Oscan salavs Cm 18, 38, 39, σαλαζίς Lu 40.

73. °scaeuus adj. ‘(coming from the) left’ /g314 ‘propitious, well-omened’ (“scaeua, id est sinistra, quod quae sinistra sunt, bona auspicia existimantur” Var. L. 7.97). Attested only in the woman’s name Scaeua in sce/g877a MLF 312, sceiuai LF 379. – Direct Latin equivalent scaeuus, which also seems to have been used in the onomasticon rather than in the lexicon. No known Sabellic equivalent except for the Paelignian gentilicium scaifia Pg 14 (see also §7.7.1.57). Schulze (1904:369-419) assumed an Etruscan origin for the word, which in view of Greek σκαῖας is unnecessary. In Latin the word was also more common in the onomasticon (where it was perhaps, like manus, because of its sacral association), and that this is reflected in its use in Faliscan and Paelignian.

74. °sextus ord. ‘sixth’. Attested indirectly in the praenomina z[e]xtos EF 1, sesto LF 329, sextoi LF 330, and sextia LF 311. (For the abbreviated attestations of this praenomen, see §7.7.1.61.) In view of the uncertain quantity of the e of the corresponding Latin form (cf. Pfister 1977:190), Faliscan *septo-* may represent either /seksto-/* or /sęksto-/*, perhaps the latter (cf. §3.5.7c). – Direct Latin equivalent sextus; for the Sabellic languages only derivations of the cardinal are attested in Umbrian sestentasiaru TI III.2 (WOU s.v. sestentasiaru), and Oscan sehsik Po 19 (WOU s.v sehsik) and indirectly in the gentilicium sehsimbrijs Po 36.

75. socia n. ‘(female) companion, girlfriend’. Early Faliscan attestations only: dat. sg. sociai EF 1; nom./voc. pl sociai EF 2. – Direct Latin equivalent socia, of uncertain etymology (DÉ, LEW s.v. socius, Schrijver 1991:249, Meiser 1998:98). No known Sabellic equivalent or cognate.

76. †[*sorex* n. ‘a type of priest, sorex’. Many editors have read sorex in LtF 231 (in my view, this should be read as cen]/so rex) and restored it as sor[ex] in LtF 232. First interpreted as a cognomen Sorex (Garrucci 1860:277-9), it soon became entangled with the Hirpi Sorani and their cult of Apollo on Mount Soracte (§2.3.4), which was also known as Sorax (Porph. in Hor. Carm. 1.9). In spite of it being based on an assumption only, this interpretation began to lead an independent life to such an extent that Peruzzi (1963b:435-40) in fact re-analyzed the word as derived from a */sor-ag-s/ ‘lot-shaker, cleromantis’.]

77. † *stato* vb. ‘to place’, spec. ‘to place as a sacred object’. Thulin (1907:307) interpreted statuo MF? 29 as the active counterpart to the stat(t) read by him in
MF? 128 and MF? 28, presumably similar in meaning to Greek ἀνατίθημι. It is rather a Besitzerinschrift ‘Stat. Vo.’. See also 78. †sto.

78. †sto vb. ‘to stand’, spec. ‘to stand as a sacred object’. Thulin (1907:304, 307) interpreted [---]sta[?]--- MF? 128, from the temple ‘ai Sassi Caduti’ and sta MF 28, as verbal forms sta(t) meaning ‘to stand (as a sacred object)’. It is rather a Besitzerinschrift ‘Sta.’. See also 77. †statuo.

79. sum vb. ‘to be’. The verb is attested in three forms:
(a) 1st sg. pr. ind. esú Cap 389, 404, 465, a form occurring both in the Sabellic languages (South Picene esom TE.4, Praesamnitic esum PS 4, 5, Hernician esu He 3, and Umbrian esu Um 18) and in the border of the Latin-speaking area (morai eso[fm] from the ager Signinus (Colonna 1994) and pari med esom kom meois sokiois trivoiai in the Garigliano inscription): for a discussion, see §5.3.1.5;
(b) 3rd pl. pr. ind. zot MLF 285 [and sot LtF 172?], which corresponds to Latin sunt, older sont CIL I.1529, while the Sabellic languages preserved the vocalism of Proto-Italic */sent/ in Oscan sent Po 32 etc., set Cm 1A.16 etc. and Umbrian sent TI Vla.15 etc.: see §5.3.1.24; and
(c) 2nd pl. pr. subj. seite = s(é)ite or siete EF 4, which has comparable forms in Umbrian (2nd sg. sir TI Vlb.7, 26, set TI Vla.23, si TI Vlb.26, 3rd sg. si TI Va.6, 24, 27, Vb.3, 7, 3rd pl. sis TI Vla.6, sins TI Vlb.4): see §5.3.1.18.

The verb itself of course has direct equivalents in Latin sum etc. and in the Sabellic languages (for attestations, see WOU s.v. ezum).

80. ? sus... (n. or adj.?). The sus[---] in LF 227 is unclear: it may be part of a name, as many editors have suggested (but in that case it would appear to be the only instance of a woman’s cognomen); perhaps it is rather to be read as s us[or ?---] or s ux[or ?---].

81. teneo vb. ‘to hold, to occupy’. 3rd sg. pr. act. ind. tenet in [---] cuitenet[---]--- let MLF 361. Reading, context (‘qui tenet ...?’) and the specific meaning of the word here are unclear (cf. Renzetti Marra 1990:336-7) – Direct Latin equivalent teneo; direct Umbrian equivalent tenitu TI VIb.25.

82. ? °titus (adj. ‘prosperous, propitious?’): dat. sg. m. titori MF 113, titoi MF 114, titori MF 116, [ti]titi[i] MF 115, titori MF 118, [ti]titi MF 119, [ti]titi MF 120, [ti]titi MF 121, titoi MF 122. All the attestations are from the theonym Titus Mercus, where Titus is probably a cultic epithet, since Mercus occurs by itself in MF 124-126. It is unclear from these attestations whether the word may still have had a lexical function or was already restricted to the onomasticon: the praenomen Titus is not very frequent in the ager Faliscus (§7.7.1.74). – Latin equivalents in the praenomen Titus and also titius (in the name of the Tities and the aues titiae ‘birds
of good omen’, Var. L 5.81). The meaning of *titus* is debated: it is often explained as ‘genius’ or ‘phallus’ (cf. e.g. Bréyer 1993:398-400), but at least for Latin and Faliscan an adjective ‘propitious, well-omened’ is not unlikely (Combet Farnoux 1980:113-69). The interpretation of the South Picene equivalents *titúi* TE.5, *titum* AP.1 and *titíúh* CH.2, *titienom* TE.3 is unclear (cf. *WOU* s.v. *titienum, titúi, titíúh*).

83. ? *tol-/tul-* vb. *tulate* and *tulas* in *tulate tulas urate* Etr/EC 385 have been regarded by most editors as Etruscan and (therefore?) left unexplained: Pisani (1964:347) connected *tulate* and *tulas* with Latin *tollo* (‘sopportate - sopporta!’), in which case it is a subjunctive based on a zero-grade root */tllh2-/: see §5.3.1.20-21. The verb has direct parallels in Latin *tollo* from the zero-grade root */tlnh2-/* and in Umbrian *antentu* TI Ia.20 etc., *ententu* TI Ib.12 etc., *pertentu* TI Iia.31, *suentu* TI Iia.23 (for all attestations, see *WOU* s.v. *-tentu*) from the full-grade root */telnh2-/. I do not adopt Herbig’s (1914:238 n.1) interpretation of *tulom* MF 68 as a perfect: see §5.3.1.22.

84. † *ulna* n. Several editors have interpreted *olna* in uel [·] uisni · *olna* MF 82 as a noun related to the burial (*ulna* ‘loculus’ Garrucci, *ulna* ‘pulvinus’ Vetter 1953:299). It is rather a second gentilicium, as was first proposed by Schulze (1904:73 n.3).

85. ? *ummum* n. ‘type of vase’. Early Faliscan attestation only. [u]mom, *umom, umo[m]* EF 2. Apart from a connection with Latin *umidus* and *umor* that was rightly rejected already by Braun (in Giglioli 1935:241), there were no explanations of this *umom*. M. Mancini (2003:239-41, 2004:205-7) rightly compares *udmom* in the Hernician (?) inscription [---]matas udmom ni hvidas mi kait[sis ---] He 2, which is probably the name of a type of vase. Rix (1998a:250-1) explains the word as */ud-mom/ ← PIE */ud-n/, comparing Latin *unda* ← */ud-nā/. The Faliscan word probably represents */ummom/ ← */udmom/ (cf. §3.3.4.3).

86. *urna* n. ‘urn, vase’. Early Faliscan attestations only. Acc. sg. *urnam* EF 1; nom. sg. of the diminutive *urnelfa* EF 1. – Direct Latin equivalent *urna*, of unclear etymology, perhaps an adaptation of a borrowed word (see *DÉ, LEW* s.vv. *urceus, urna*); Umbrian cognates perhaps in *urnasier* TI Va.2, 15 and *urnasiaru* TI III.3, although other etymologies for this word have been proposed (see *WOU* s.v. *urnasier*).

87. *uxor* n. ‘wife’. Nom. sg. *uxo* MF 17, *uxor* MF 41, *uxor* MF 42, *ux[o(r)]* MF 43, *uxor* MF 101, *ux[o(r)]* MF 102, *uxo* LF 222, *uxo* LF 242, *uxor* MF 265 [and *uxo Ltf/Lat 300, [u]xor Ltf/Lat 301], perhaps *us[o(r)]* or *ux[o(r)]* in LF 227 (see also *sus...*). The usual word for ‘wife’, always in the female onomastic formula in sepulchral inscriptions (cf. §7.4.2). Direct Latin equivalent *uxor*, of unclear etymol-
ogy (Dé, LEW s.v. uxor); possible direct Sabellic equivalents in Paelignian usur Pg 9 (uncertain) and Oscan usur Cps 37 (uncertain), usurum TB 6 (the interpretation of these forms is debated, see WOU s.v. usur).

88. uinum n. ‘wine’. Acc. sg. uino MF 59-60; very doubtful is Herbig’s (CIE 8079) restoration acc. sg. u[ino]m EF 1 (revived by Radke 1994). – Direct Latin equivalent uinum; direct Sabellic equivalents in Umbrian vinu TI a.4, 22, lb.6 etc. and Volscian uimu VM 2. The i in the Early Faliscan, Umbrian, and Volscian forms points to an original */uĩnom/: for this form and its relation to its IE cognates such as Greek (φ)ωυς, cf. Beekes 1987:22-3.

89. uir n. ‘man’. Late Faliscan attestations only. Attested indirectly in (gen.pl?) duum[uiru] LF 243, duum[uir LF 247, duu[muiru] LF 248, and [duu]miuru LF 249, which is probably an imported Latin word. Although therefore it cannot be used as an argument that uir also occurred in Faliscan, this seems likely in view of its occurrence both in Latin uir and in Umbrian uiro TI Va.42, 50 etc., although the meaning of this word might differ slightly from that of its Latin equivalent (cf. WOU s.v. uiro).

90. uos pers. pron. ‘you (pl.)’. Early Faliscan attestation only. Nom/voc. pl. ues EF 4. The attestation is clear, but the vocalism is difficult to explain in view of that of the direct equivalents Latin uos and Paelignian uus Pg 9 (twice) vs. that of the possessive pronoun, Latin uoster/uester and Umbrian uestra TI Viab.61 (cf. Dé s.v. uōs, LEW s.v. vōs, WOU s.vv. uestra, uos): see §4.7.3.

91. *e[..]tom in EF 1 has been restored in various ways: de[lec]tom ‘delectum’ Olzscha in Radke 1965:136-7, Radke 1965:134), me[re]tom ‘meritum’ (Vetter 1953:280), me[lc]tom or me[lq]tom ‘mulctum’ (Vetter in Knobloch 1958:138), me[le]tom or me[lq]tom ‘molitum’ (Joseph & Klein 1981:294). [Pisani (1946:54), however, connected it with the preceding far/g1768/g833[on]om, a reading which I reject, mainly on phonological grounds.] For an extensive discussion of all restorations for this part of EF 1, see §12.2.


93. *[3-4]*ad in EF 1 has been restored in various ways, but always as a 3rd sg. pr. act. subj. (although it may also be a 3rd pl. pr. act. subj., cf. Peruzzi 1964:157). The only restoration that fits both the size of the lacuna and the traces surrounding it appears to be p[ore]kad ‘porrigat’ (Peruzzi 1964:157). Other proposals have

94. [---]estro, reconstructed from [---o]stro LF 244 and [---]ostr[o---] LF 245. Although the reading is certain, restoration and meaning are unclear. Renzetti Marra (1990:338) interprets LF 244 as referring to a double burial in one loculus, with po[stro], but the syncopation required for this is irregular in Faliscan (§3.6.6.2). For the Sabellic languages, *post(e)ros is attested for Umbrian (postra TI VIb.13) and Oscan (piüstræi Cp 33, abbreviated püstr Cp 34).

### 6.3. The Faliscan lexicon and its Latin and Sabellic equivalents

#### 6.3.1. The Faliscan lexicon in comparison. Comparison of the Faliscan lexical elements with the corresponding elements in Latin and the Sabellic languages show that the extant Faliscan lexicon is essentially Latin. The extant Faliscan lexicon is extremely limited, however: it is not even possible to construct a more or less complete Faliscan core vocabulary with words like ‘water’/‘fire’, ‘day’/‘night’ (although ‘father’/ ‘mother’ and ‘son’/‘daughter’ are attested). In the comparisons with Latin and the Sabellic languages, the picture may be influenced by the fact that far less is known of the Sabellic than of the Latin lexicon, as well as by the different nature of the Sabellic epigraphic material. Even with these restrictions, however, it is abundantly clear that the extant Faliscan lexicon is Italic, and that where Latin differs from the Sabellic languages, Faliscan sides with Latin (e.g. in the use of filius/filia for ‘son’/‘daughter’, and in the use of the indicative pronoun /ho-/ rather than /eko-/).

As far as lexical borrowing or interference is concerned, there is two instances of words that have only Sabellic parallels, namely pesco Cap 431 and posticnu MLF/Cap 474*. Since pesco apparently shows a Sabellic development of the internal cluster */rk-sk/ and posticnu appears to have a Sabellic ending, these words can be regarded as inferential forms from a Sabellic language: see §9.3.2. Umom EF 2 on the other hand also has only Sabellic parallels, but shows an assimilation */udmom/ → /ummom/ that is Latin rather than Sabellic (§3.3.4.3).

Borrowings from Etruscan are apparently limited to clipeus, *gutto/*guttum/ guttur, and possibly of cella, all of which also occur in Latin. This is all the more remarkable as the Faliscan area must have contained a sizeable number of native speakers of Etruscan and was presumably in far more frequent contact with Etruscan than Latium (§9.2.1). It might be objected that this absence of Etruscan influence in the

---

102 I admit, however, that I can think of no Latin word that fits the text apart from nostro or uostro, ostro = austro, clastro = clauastro, plostro = plauastro, or rostro.
Faliscan lexicon is a false picture, biased by the limited amount of attested Faliscan lexical elements, but when the same Faliscan lexicon is compared to the attested Sabellic lexicon, there are many direct equivalents or close cognates, even though there are far fewer Sabellic than Etruscan texts. Neither can this conclusion be regarded as biased by the different nature of the texts, for the typology of the Faliscan texts has more in common with that of the Etruscan texts than with that of the Sabellic texts.

6.3.2. Lexical subsets. Looking at several subsets of the lexicon reveals a picture that is in some respects more detailed:

(1) Numerals. Of the numerals from 1-10 the following are attested in some way: ‘two’ in the adverb bis, and possibly in du-; ‘four’ dubiously in Qua...; ‘five’ in the praenomen Quintus; ‘six’ in the praenomen Sextus; ‘eight’ dubiously in Oct...; ‘ten’ in the gloss decematus (§6.6.2). This entire subset appears to be common Italic.

(2) Family ties. As in all Italic languages, ‘father’ and ‘mother’ are pater and mater: ‘son’ and ‘daughter’, on the other hand, are filius and filia, new words that Faliscan shared with Latin, while the Sabellic languages continued PIE words, *puclom and *fu(h)t/g413r. ‘Wife’ is uxor, which may be attested also from Sabellic, but has no Indo-European cognates: coniumx, if attested at all, may be due to Latin interference.

(3) Social groups. The only words that belong under this heading are liberta and libertas. These correspond to Latin words, but it cannot be established whether the connotation of the words was identical. The word is not a calque on Etruscan lautniθa.

(4) Burial ritual. The word for ‘burial chamber, tomb’ is cella, which occurs also in Latin, but not in this meaning, and in Etruscan: I assume that cella is Latin rather than Etruscan. The word for ‘loculus’ or ‘place in the loculus’ is lectus, which also occurs in Latin.103 The formulaic verb for ‘to lie in a tomb’ is cubo, which is used in this sense also in Latin and in the Sabellic languages (cf. also §8.10.1). These all appear to be common words where the specialized sepulchral meaning is secondary. Faliscan also provides an instance of *lego or *legeo, which has an (indirect) parallel in South Picene, but must have occurred in Latin as well.

(5) Dedications and ritual. Here the only word that can be considered certain is sacer, which occurs both in Latin and the Sabellic languages. (The only attestations of longer texts of this type are the Latin dedications that have been excluded from the comparison, namely Latin 217-218, 219, 377, and Capenate 421 and 431-438.) Pesco Cap 431 is an interferential form.

103 Steinbauer (1999:472, 473) translates aubi as “Grab(stelle)” and tamera as “(Grab)kammer”. The Etruscan word corresponding to ‘loculus’ may have been tumu- or tusu-(cf. Steinbauer 1999:483, 484).
(6) Public office. The Middle Faliscan inscriptions only yield aedilis (perhaps a calque based on Latin), and rex, a ‘general Italic’ word. All other words for public offices or magistracies, quaestor, praetor, duumvir, and censor, are attested only from Late Faliscan, Latino-Faliscan, and Latin inscriptions, and reflect the structure of the Roman administration of Falerii Novi: it may be questioned whether these words were ever really part of the Faliscan lexicon (§9.4). The same applies to the Latin formula for functioning as a magistrate, magistratum gero.

6.4. Theonyms

I have included the theonyms in the chapter on the lexicon rather than in the chapter on the onomasticon, for although they are onomastic elements in the strict sense of the word and are therefore primarily referential, theonyms refer to individual entities that are thought of as having an everlasting lifespan, and can therefore not be bestowed upon newborn members of the group while others die. They are names that refer to specific individuals that are an enduring part of a group’s cultural heritage, and as such may be taken over, together with the deity to which they refer, by other groups, even those with altogether different languages (cf. below on Apollo and Ganymedes), or they may even be translated (cf. below on Cupido). Note that the list below contains only those deities that are in some way attested epigraphically: deities mentioned only in the literary sources are discussed in §2.3.4.

Symbols preceding the lemma: † = rejected by me, but discussed here because of frequent mention in the literature on Faliscan; ? = attestation doubtful; ° = attested only in the onomasticon; * = reconstructed.

1. Apollo. Nom. apolo LtF 63 (dedication, although also explained as an abbreviated human name); gen. apolonos EF 10 (dedication of c.500-475, the first attestation of the name in an Italic language); [dat. a]polinei Lat 219 (dedication). An early loan from Greek, the deity is attested all through Central and Southern Italy. The Faliscan forms, like Etruscan Apulu (first in the first half of the fifth century, cf. apulu Etr XXXI from Falerii Veteres, if not a falsum), Latin Apollo (first in the fourth- and third-century inscriptions from Praeneste, CIL I.5.563 and ILLRP 54?), and Marsian apols VM 7 (cf. also aplone VM 6), show the o-vocalism of Attic-Ionic ‘Apōllwn, while Vestinian appellune MV 10 and Oscan appelluneis Po 14, appellunei Si 20, [a]πεπελλαωνη Me 1, aππεπελλαωνη Me 2, aππεπελλαωνη Me 3, and a]πεπελλαωνης Me 5 show the e-vocalism of West Greek ‘Απεπελλαων.104 The difference is due to two separate borrowing processes. For the worship of Apollo in the ager Faliscus, see §2.3.4.

104 For the distribution of ‘Απεπελλαων and ‘Απεπελλαων in the Greek dialects, see Buck 1955:46.
2. **Ceres.** Nom. *ceres* EF I (context unclear, (sixth or seventh?) century) is the earliest attestation of the deity’s name: cf. Le Bonniec 1958:303-4). The equivalents in the Italic languages show slightly different formations: Latin *Ceres* (first in third- or second-century (gen.) *cereres* CIL I².973?) was an s-stem */keres/- → /kerer/- (nom. */kerēs/), while in Oscan *keri* Cp 37 and Samnitic *kerri* Sa 1.A 3, B 7, it became an e-stem */ker(e)s/- (cf. *WOU s.v. kerri*). The Sabellic languages also have derivations such as *Cerrio* in Umbrian, Paelignian, Marrucinian, and Oscan (see *WOU s.vv. kerriiiit* and *certium*).

3. **Cupido.** Nom. *cupido* MF 62 (label in mythological scene, the first attestation (c.380-370) of both the word and the theonym). – Direct Latin equivalent *Cupido*, epigraphically attested in *cupido* ILLRP 1204). The Latin and Faliscan forms are a *Lehnübersetzung* of Greek Ἑρώς or Πόταμος. In Latin, the noun is feminine, but the personification is masculine, probably due to its representation in art. (The figure on the Faliscan vase is also male.) No known Sabellic equivalents or cognates.

4. **Diespiter.** See 7. *Iupiter* or *Diespiter*.

5. **Ganymedes.** Nom. *canumede* MF 62 (label in mythological scene, the first attestation (c.380-370) of the theonym in an Italic language). It is surprising to find *Ganumede(s) = Greek Γανυμήδης* here, as in Latin the name encountered is usually *Catamitus* (first Pl. Men. 144; for other attestations, see TLL Onomasticon 2.255,20-60), a borrowing from Etruscan *Catmite* (catmite Ta S.12 and *catmite* OI S.46). *Catmite* is often derived from Γανυμήδης by the assumption of several *ad hoc* phonetic adaptations (cf. the critical discussion in Bréyer 1993:155-6): it is easier to derive it from a Greek *καταμήνητας* ‘gelding, catamite’.105

6. † **Euius.** Based on the reading [l[o]/g877fir in EF I (see 8. †*Liber*), G. Giacomelli (first 1963:41-2) and Peruzzi (1964a:166) interpreted *euios* EF I as Ευιός = *Liber*. If [l[o]/g877fir is rejected, there is no ground for this interpretation (which formed the basis for G. Giacomelli’s (1963:46) euotenosio EF 3 = ‘colui che tiene da Evio’).

7. **Iupiter** or **Diespiter.** Nom. *...s pater* MF 62 (label in mythological scene), variously restored as *[die]s pater, [iou]s pater, or [iouo]s pater. The various forms of are discussed by Wachter (1987:150-3), who notes that *dies pater* was the usual form of the nominative in the fourth century. *[Die]s pater has a direct Latin equivalent in Latin *diesptr* CIL I².564, *d]iespater* CIL I².568, while a *[iou]s or *[iouo]s (or *[iouo]s?) would be have equivalents in Latin *Iupiter* and in the Sabellic languages in Umbrian *iupater* TI IIb.24, *iupapatre* TI IIA.5, IIb.17, IIb.22, IIb.26, III.22, and Oscan *di{}/pa{-}tir* Po 22.

---

105 I wish to point out that this derivation, which in my view is the correct one, is not my own, but that I cannot recollect in which publication I first read it.
8. **Liber.** The name of *Liber* has been read (1) by Wissowa (1902:23), who in interpreted *loifiṟtato* MF 31 and *loifir tato* MF 32 as *loifir tato* ‘Liber pater’, which was rejected by Herbig (CIE 8011); (2) by Vetter (first 1925:27-8), who read *ḷoifiฑṭi̊f̣i̊ṛ* in the damaged first part of EF 1, which both Radke (1965:134-5, 1994) and my own autopsy have shown to be epigraphically impossible; (3) by AntFal (p.43), who read *lepẹṛ* ‘Liber’ in the unclear first part of EF 4, which is epigraphically difficult (the text probably reads *lepek*) and linguistically impossible.

9. **Mercus** or **Titus Mercus.** Dat. *titoi | merçıu MF 113, tito | merçi MF 114, [t]i to[i] | merç[i] MF 115, tito | merc[i] MF 116, tito : merc[i] MF 118, [t]i[i]o[i] : merc[i] MF 119, [t]i[i]o[i] : merc[i] MF 120, [t]i[i]o[i] : merc[i] MF 121, tito : m[e]rc[i] MF 122, [---?]merç[i] MF 123, [m]erc[i] MF 124, merc[i] MF 125, merç[i] MF 126 (all dedications). *Mercus* (a u-stem /merku-/, connected with the /merk-/ underlying Latin *merx* etc.) is undoubtedly connected with Latin *Mercurius* (derived from the same */merku-/* as the Faliscan name, cf. DÉ s.v. *merx*) and Oscan *mirikui* Cm 12 (either */merku-/* or */merko-/*: the attestation predates the introduction of the sign ū). *Titus* is clearly a (cultic) epithet, probably meaning ‘propitious, well-omened’ or ‘prosperous’ (see also §6.2.82, where Sabellic cognates are given). For an more extensive discussion of the name, see §14.1.2 and especially Combet Farnoux 1980:113-69.

10. **Menerua/Minerua.** Nom. *menerua* MF 62 (label in a mythological scene, the first attestation (c.380-370) in a non-Etruscan text) [and *menrva* Etr XXVIII, menerua LF/Lat 209 (dedication)]. The deity has been thought to have been of Etruscan origin (see REA s.v. *Minerva*, DÉ s.v. *Minerua*, LEW s.v. *Minerva*), but may well have been Italic (*/menes-ui/*, cf. Rix 1991:117-120, 1998b:209). Apart from labels in mythological scenes on mirrors (for which see ET), the name appears in Etruscan only in a few inscriptions from South Etruria (*menervas* Ve 3.10, *men[e]rjavas* Ve 3.29, *meni[v]as* Ve 3.33, and *meni[v]as* Cr 4.1). On the basis of Ovid. *Fast.* 3.383-4 it has been assumed that worship of Minerva reached Rome through *euocatio* of the Faliscan cult of Minerva (cf. §2.3.4), although it is not necessary to assume that this was the way in which the cult spread (thus Girard 1989). – Direct Latin equivalents *Menerua* and *Minerua*: Wachter (1987:448) notes that *Menerua* is both older and more frequent (10 instances including Lat 209) than *Minerua* (5 instances including Lat 218, three of which from the first century). Direct Sabellic equivalents in Paelignian *minerua* Pg 4, meneruai Pg 8, and Oscan menere(vas) Po 38.

---

106 Interesting but hardly significant is the fact that both forms are first attested from the ager Faliscus, *Menerua* first in CIL I.4.454=MF 62, *Minerua* first in CIL I.5.364=Lat 218.
Of the theonyms thus attested, *Ceres*, *Iupiter* or *Diespiter*, and *Mercus* have equivalents or close cognates both in Latin and in the Sabellic languages, while *Menerua/Minerua* is probably likewise of Italic origin as well. Greek loans are *Apollo* and *Ganumedes*, while *Cupido* is a *Lehnübersetzung* of Greek Ἀφρος or Πάθος: of these, *Apollo* also occurs in Etruscan and Latin, while the Sabellic languages have *Apello*; *Ganumedes* occurs also in Latin, although contemporary Latin and Etruscan rather used *Catamitus* and *Catmite* respectively. For other deities associated with the ager Faliscus see §2.3.4.

6.5. Toponyms, potamonyms, and ethnonyms

I have treated the category of geographical names and ethnonyms separately, as they differ in several respects from normal lexical items. Like anthroponyms, their function is primarily referential, although there is a greater possibility that a geographical name may consist of or contain lexical elements. Unlike anthroponyms, however, geographical names are connected to a (unique) geographic feature that exists within a specific language area and cannot normally be relocated elsewhere. Toponyms therefore often retain features of the language in which they originated even when the language of that area is replaced by a different one, or when they are borrowed into another language. Ethnonyms are another special case: these may originate either within the group they designate or among ‘outsiders’ that come in contact with this group (§2.2.2), so that several different ethnonyms may be used for the same group (thus e.g. *Tusci* and *Etrusci* beside *Rasenna*, if that is indeed an ethnonym). Both geographical names and ethnonyms may therefore reflect contact with other areas, including language contact (see §9.1).

In collecting the attestations of geographical name, I have therefore included the data from Latin and Etruscan inscriptions from the ager Faliscus and Capenas as a possible source-material. Note also that with the possible exception of the ethnynom *Faliscus* the data on geographical names are all derived from occurrences or derivations in the onomasticon: the same limitations on the use of such forms therefore apply as in the case of lexemes (cf.§6.1).

Symbols preceding the lemma: † = rejected by me, but discussed here because of frequent mention in the literature on Faliscan; ? = attestation doubtful; ° = attested only in the onomasticon; * = reconstructed.

---

CHAPTER 6

POTAMONYMS

1. **°Faf(r)farus.** Perhaps attested indirectly in the gentilicium *Fafarn-* occurring in abbreviated form as *fafarn* MF 136 and perhaps also in *faff[---]* MF 139. The gentilicium might be connected to the name of the river *Farfarus* (G. Giacomelli 1963:191) mentioned by Ovid (*Met.* 14.328-30). *Farfarus* is apparently a local form of the name, since Vergil (*A.* 7.716) mentions the same river under the Latin name *Fabaris*, with the Roman word-internal /b/ corresponding to a word internal /f/ in non-Roman Latin, Faliscan, and the Sabellic languages (cf. §3.3.3). The Latin form also has no *r* in the first syllable, so that the Faliscan name *Fafarn-*, if connected to the name of the river at all, may represent *fafarn-* as well as *far-farn-* (§3.5.7b): perhaps rather /favern-/, as in MF 136 /r.C/ is written out in the second syllable. The Farfarus/Fabaris, originating in the Sabine area near Reate (modern Rieti), flows into the Tiber close to Monte Soratte, near the border between the agri Faliscus and Capenas.

2. **°Nar.** Perhaps attested indirectly in the gentilicium *Narionius* in *narionio* MLF 206 (Schulze 1904:80).

3. **°Tiberis.** Attested indirectly in the gentilicium *Tiberilius* in *tiperilia* LF 229, and perhaps also in the abbreviated name *tif* MLF 460 from the ager Capenas. *Tiperilia* is clearly derived from the Latin form of the name, *Tiberius*, while *tif* may be an abbreviation of its Faliscan equivalent, which would have been *Tiferios*.

4. **°Vomanus.** Attested indirectly in the gentilicium *Vomanius* in *uomanio* Cap 388, if this is indeed derived from a potamonym *Vomanus*, as Schulze (1904:481) suggested: the nearest river of that name known from the sources was part of the Po estuary. Perhaps *Vomanus* was derived from another river of the same name closer to the agri Faliscus and Capenas.

TOPONYMS

5. **°Abella.** (Latin attestation only.) Indirectly attested in the gentilicium *abelese* Lat 251. It cannot be established whether this *Abellensis* refers to the Campanian town of *Abella* (modern Avellino). The adjective derived from this Abella was *Abellanus* in Latin and in Oscan (*abellanii* Cm 1.A3 etc.).

6. **°*Acarcelum (=Ocricum?).** Perhaps attested indirectly in the gentilicium *acarcelini* LF 221, *acarcelinio* LF 223, *acarcelinio* LF 226. Peruzzi (1963b:441-6) suggested that this name was derived from a toponym; A. Mancini (1981) plausibly derived it from an */akarkelom/ that would be equivalent to (but not

---

108 The scansion of Vergil’s words, *qui Tiberim Fābarimque bibunt*, shows that *Fabarim* cannot be a copist’s error for *Farbarim*. 

206
necessarily identical with) Latin Oriculum and Umbrian *Ukriçlum */okrikelom/ ← */okrielom/ implied by the Etruscan gentilicium ucrislane Cl 1.2609, 2611-2613 etc. The Oriculum that is known from the ancient sources is located on the east side of the Tiber close to the Tiber crossing near the Grotta Porciosa site (to which it was connected, from c.220 onwards, by the Via Flaminia), and thus the nearest town beyond the borders of the ager Faliscus in this direction.

7. °°*Cali-* or °°*Cale-. The name calitenes MF 265 may be derived from an Etruscan toponymic adjective *Calite, in turn derived from the name of an otherwise unknown town Cali- or Cale-. Cale has in fact been proposed as the original name of modern Gallesc (Cifani 2002:33) in the northern ager Faliscus.

8. °°Capena. Perhaps attested indirectly in the names kapena EF 4 (reading and context uncertain), and kape Cap 403 (or is this to be read as k ape?).

9. °°Feliginum (=Fulginium/Fulginae). Indirectly attested in the gentilicium felicinate MF 42 (gen. sg.) and [feljcinattiu MLF 384 (gen. pl.). °°Felinas, occuring also as an Etruscan gentilicium (felcinatial Pe 1.485, 1.1235, and feclinatal Cl 1.2673) is derived from a toponym °°Feliginum (*Feliginum Rix 1965:233 n.133), an older form of the Fulginium that occurs as an alternative name of the Umbrian town Fulginiae (modern Foligno) on the Via Flaminia.

10. °°Fescennium. Perhaps attested indirectly in the gentilicium hescuna MLF 346: Colonna (1990) suggests that this name may be derived from the Faliscan toponym Fescennium (with the Faliscan change of /#fV/ → /#hV/, §3.5.2). For the sources on Fescennium, perhaps the name of the site at Narce, see §2.1.2.

11. °°Ortica or °°Orticum. The gentilicium ortecese MLF 339 (probably connected with the Etruscan gentilicium urtcsnas Etr XXXV) may be read as Orticensis, a name that appears to be derived from an otherwise unknown toponym °°Ortica or °°Orticum.109 This (rather than Colonna’s (1990:118) xircule) may be related to the ancient name of modern Corchiano (older Orchiano), the earliest recorded form of which is Orclanum,110 perhaps a contraction of an older °°Orticulanum.

12. °°Veii. Very uncertain. The name of the town has been read in furc · t · p · c · ef · i · uei · LtF 205. Even if this uei is connected to the name of the town, it is perhaps rather an abbreviation of a (related) gentilicium like Veianius, attested in CIL XI.3805 from Veii and in Varro (“fratres Veianii ex agro Falisco” R 3.16.10).

109 Or, perhaps, *Hortica or *Horticum, but neither Faliscan ortecese nor Etruscan urtcsnas has h-, and there are no certain attestations of omission of h- in Faliscan (§3.5.2).

110 “ORCHIANUM “forte Orchia Castellum, quod tamen in antiquis donationibus Monasterii Farfensis Orclanum dicebatur” ” (De Italiae medii aevi dissertatio chorographica, c.CCXX, in Muratorius 1726 t. X): see also Gamurrini (1894b:146-7) on Corchiano and Vitorchiano.
ETHNONYMS

13. **Faliscus** (see §2.2.2). The ethnonym is attested in *falese · quei · in · sardinia · sunt* Lat 218, a rare example of an Italic ethnonym being used by the members of the group themselves. *Felleske* in *[mi a]uyileš feluskeš tušnuta[a pa]panalaš Vn 1.1 may be an Etruscan rendering of *Faliscos* (Pocchetti 1997). The same may be true of *feleškenas* in *[mi] larisa feleškenas am** [ perhaps a patronymic gentilicium ‘Faliscanson’, cf. *creicnal* Ar 1.4 ‘Greekson’ from *creice = Graecus*): see §2.2.2 and §2.4.2. (The corresponding Etruscan ethnonym may have been *Falsa* or *Felsa,* 

14. **Graecus.** Attested in the praenomen *kreco* MF 150 (with *k* representing /ɡ/, cf. §11.2.4) and perhaps also in the gentilicium *Grae*... (or *Crae...?)* in *cre[---]* MF MF 144, *cre[---]* MF 145, *cr[---]* MF 146 and in the abbreviated gentilicium *cr* MF? 33. The ethnonym is also found in Etruscan names, mainly from Clusium (*creice Cl 1.1280, 1510, 1511, 2466, 2467, crei[ce] Cl 1.1512, creices Cl 1.1669, creicia Cl 1.352, 1513, cr[ec]ia Cl 1.794, cr[ec]ia Cl 1.1515, crei[ce]a Cl 1.1281, 1282, 1302, 1686, 1744) and Tarquinii (*creice Ta 6.15, creices Ta 1.17, creic[ia]l Ta 1.217), but also elsewhere (*creici Cr 1.149, Vc 1.5, craica Vc 2.34, creice Pe 1.889, krai[al]us Fe 2.7): cf. Rix 1965:231. The ethnonym occurs in Sabellic texts only in *graex* Pg 40, where it is a cognomen.

15. **Hirpi and Hirpini.** Indirectly attested in the gentilicium *irpios* Cap 389, which is probably connected to the *Hirpi Sorani* mentioned in the Latin sources (most notably Serv. in Verg. A. 11.785 and Plin. NH 7.2.19). These were sometimes confused with the *Hirpini* (e.g. by Servius): see §2.3.4 for further sources. The name may well go back to the Sabellic word *hirpus* ‘wolf’, see §6.6.5.

16. **Latinus.** Attested indirectly in the gentilicium *latinaio* MF 135. The ethnonym is attested also from Etruscan inscriptions, most notably in *mi tites latines Ve 2.4 (c.600) and mi latines Cm 2.57 (fifth century?),* and has numerous derivations in the onomasticon (the indices of *ET* name 75 attestations of *latin-,* 69 of which are from Clusium). There appears to be no attestation of the ethnonym in Sabellic texts.

17. **Sabinus.** Probably indirectly attested in the abbreviated gentilicium *sab* Cap 400. Note that this is the Latin form with *b*, not the Faliscan form, which would have been *Safin-* (§3.3.3) or possibly *Safen-* (from */saβeno-/, see Rix 1957). The Sabellic inscriptions yield both the ethnonym, in South Picene *safinis* TE.5, *safinim* TE.6, *safinas* TE.5 and *safina[l] TE.7, and the name of the region in Paellignian and Sammitic *safinim* nPg 2, Sa 4. (Cf. Dench 1997:48-9). There are no Etruscan attestations of this ethnonym.
18. °Umber and °Umbricus.\footnote{Although in Latin the gentilicium is Umber, the Etruscan, Faliscan and Latin onomasticon also shows an Umbricus that may be derived from an alternative ethnonym *Umbricus (cf. the Greek Ὀμβρικός and Ὀμβρίκικος).} Attested indirectly in the gentilicia Umbrius in umrie Etr XLIII, and its derivations Umbricius in ujmpricius Lat 219, and Umbricianus in upreciano MF 363 and MF 364. (Note that Etr XLIII, MF 363, and MF 364 are all from the same tomb.) The ethnonym is attested from the Etruscan onomasticon in several forms, including Umr- (umres AH 1.74, umria Cl 1.2620, 1.2621, umriaś Cl 1.1294, 1.1913) and Umrc- (umrces AS 1.129, umrcial AS 1.395), corresponding to the Umbrius and Umbricius/Umbricianus of the ager Faliscus (cf. also Rix 1965:321). The ethnonym is attested from the Sabellic languages only in South Picene ombriien CH.2: there is no mention from the Umbrians themselves (cf. Bradley 1997:56).

Although with the exception of Faliscus all the potamonyms, toponyms, and ethnonyms are attested at best indirectly in the onomasticon, and often very dubiously, too, these draw a picture that encompasses all the surrounding areas and peoples. The Faliscans, Latins, Sabines, and Umbrians all make their appearance, as do the Greeks. Among the towns that may be attested are both those of the area itself (Fescennium, and perhaps Gallese and Capena), and those on the route of the Via Flaminia (Ocriculum and Fulginium), and there is reference to the rivers Tiber and perhaps Farfarus/Fabaris.

6.6. Faliscan glosses

Only a few glosses are ascribed by the ancient authors explicitly to the Faliscans or pertain to matters Faliscan, probably because the glossographers referred not so much to Faliscan as to the local Latin of the second century. The Faliscan glosses were first listed by Mommsen (1850:364): in later literature, they were increasingly ignored, apart from their occurrence in the lists by Deecke (1888:230-42), Conway (1897:324, 384), and Vetter (1953:362-78).

Glosses present several specific problems. Consisting of second-hand data whose primary source is unknown, their reliability is questionable, and their attribution to a specific language or dialect is at best unverifiable. This is particularly so in the case of Latin dialect glosses, not only because these are more difficult to recognize than glosses from other languages, but also because of the tendency to ascribe the differences from ‘standard’ urban Latin to unspecified antiqui or rustici (see also §3.5.2). A further problem is that it is usually impossible to establish to what stage of a language or dialect the author is referring: in the case of the Faliscan glosses, this is probably the ‘rustic Latin’ of Roman Falerii.
CHAPTER 6

1. cenaculum. “ubi cenabant, cenaculum uocitabant, ut etiam nunc Lanuui apud aedem Iunonis et in cetero Latio ac Faleris et Cordubae dicuntur” (Var. L 5.162). – Cenaculum is dialectal only in its meaning: the word existed in Roman Latin, but there meant ‘top-storey, garret, attic’ (OLD), the word for ‘dining room’ being cenatio. The form of the word, probably from */kert(e)snã/* (cf. WOU s.v. kerssnaís) rather than from */kersinã/* (Schrijver 1991:432), corresponds to that of Latin rather than that of the Sabellic languages, which appear in Oscan kersmu Cm 14, kerssnaís Cp 31 and Umbrian šesna TI Vb.9 etc. The suffix -culum shows an anaptyxis that is not attested in the Faliscan inscriptions: its presence here is probably due to the fact that in written Latin the anaptyctic form was the normal one.

2. decimatrus. “quinquatrus appellari quidam putant a numero dierum, qui feriis his [Scaliger: fere his MSS, Lindsay] celebrantur. quod scilicet errant tam hercule quam qui triduo Saturnalia et totidem diebus Competalia. nam omnibus his singulis diebus fiunt sacra. forma autem uocabuli eius exemplo multorum populorum Italicorum enuntiata est, quod post diem quintum iduum est dies festus, ut apud Tusculanos triatrus et sexatrus et septematrus et Faliscos decimatrus.” (Fest. 304.33-306.2L); “quinquatrus festiuus dies dictus, quod post diem quintum iduum celebraretur, ut triatrus et sexatrus et septematrus et decimatrus” (Paul. Fest. 305.10-2L).112 – MS E of Paulus Diaconus has decematus. If this is correct, the form could be regarded as an instance of the presumed Faliscan lack of weakening of short vowels in medial syllables (§3.6.6), but decematrus may just as well have been remodelled on septematrus, or either or both may be due to reanalysis after decem and septem (by anyone from the original source of the word to the copist of E).

3. haba. “quem antiqui fircum, nos hircum, et quam Falisci habam, nos fabam appellamus, et quem antiqui fariolum, nos hariolum” (Ter. Sc. CGL 7.13.8-9). – The attribution of haba to Faliscan is not implausible in view of the Middle Faliscan development /#hV/ → /#hV/, but cf. §3.5.2. Note that haba for faba is also ascribed to the antiqui, both by Terentius Scaurus himself (CGL 7.13.8) and by Velius Longus (CGL 7.69.10), echoing the passage quoted here.

4. Halaesus. “uenerat Atridae fatis agitatus Halaesus, a quo se dictam terra Falisca putat” (Ov. Fast. 4.73-4); “Faliscos Halaesus condidit: hi autem immutato in Falisci dicti sunt, sicut febris dicitur quae ante hebris dicebatur, Formiae quae

112 These words are often regarded as a compounds with ater ‘so-and-so-many days of the dark = waning moon’ (DÉ s.vv. ater, Quinquatrus, LEW s.v. quinquatrus); the element -atrus was in fact considered meaningless by Gellius (2.21.7). A discussion of the etymologies and their possible relation to Etruscan is given by Bréyer (1993:465-6).
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Hormiae fuerunt, ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρμῶν: nam posteritas in multis nominibus f pro h posuit” (Serv. in Verg. A. 7.695). (For other sources on Halaesus, see §2.4.1; for other grammarians on the variation of f- and h-, see §3.5.2.) – The derivation of Faliscus from Halaesus presupposes that the Middle Faliscan change */fhV/ → */hV/ (§3.5.2) was well under way; Servius’ remark apparently shows that the hypercorrect use of f for an */hV/ that did not reflect an original */fhV/ was also known. The oldest source for an Argive origin of Falerii is Cato (Plin. NH 3.51), but it is unknown whether he already made the link with Halaesus; the first author who certainly makes this connection is Ovid (both l.c. and Am. 3.13.31-5).

5. Hirpi. “Soractis mons est Hirpinorum in Flaminia conlocatus. in hoc autem monte cum aliquando Diti patri sacrum persolueretur (nam diis manibus consecratus est) subito uenientes lupi exta de igni rapuerunt. quos cum diu pastores sequerentur, delati sunt ad quandam speluncam, halitum ex se pestiferum emittentem, adeo ut iuxta stantes necaret: et exinde est orta pestilentia, quia fuerant lupos secuti. de qua responsum est, posse eam sedari, si lupos imitarentur, id est rapto uiuerent. quod postquam factum est, dicti sunt ipsi populi Hirpi Sorani: nam lupi Sabinorum lingua uocantur hirpi. Sorani uero a Dite: nam Ditis pater Soranus uocatur: quasi lupi Ditis patris” (Serv. in Verg. A. 11.785). (For other sources on the Hirpi Sorani, see §2.3.4). – Hirpus is referred to as Sabine (Servius) as well as Samnitic (Paul. Fest. 93.25-6L, Str. 5.4.12). The word is usually connected to Latin horridus, hirsutus etc., and originally meant ‘shaggy animal’ (apparently from a Proto-Italic */g*her-k*o-/: horridus etc. are usually derived from */g*ers-/, however): see EDL s.v. hircus. In the passage from Paulus Diaconus the word is given as irpus, with a dialectal omission of h-. This h-less form is attested in the gentilicium írpios Cap 389, although the omission of h- seems to have been non-Faliscan (§3.5.2).

6. Strupppearia. “stroppus est, ut Ateius Philologus existimat, quod Graece στρόφιον uocatur et quod sacerdotes pro insigni habent in capite. quidam coronam esse dicunt, aut quod pro corona insigne in caput inponatur; itaque apud Faliscos diem [Augustinus: idem MSS, Lindsay] festum esse qui uocetur Strupppearia, quia coronati ambulant; et a Tusculanis quod in puluinari inponatur Castoris struppum uocari” (Fest. 410.6-9L). – Ateius’ derivation of the word from Greek στροφείον or στρόφιον ‘headband worn by priests etc.’ (LSJ) seems to be correct. The Latin spelling with u and pp may be due either to an Etruscan intermediary (Bréyer 1993:227-8, cf. §6.2.31 on *gututo/*guttum/guttur) or to Latin developments (cf. Pfister 1977:155-6, Allen 1978:49 n.2). It seems likely that the word was quoted simply because the festival was unknown in Rome or in Latium, but there may have been a different reason, as appears from a comparison of the few instances of struppus and stroppus in Latin:
“struppi uocantur in puluinaribus (fasciculi de uerbenis facti, qui pro de)orum capitiibus ponuntur” (Fest. 472.15-6L, restored from Paul. Fest. 473.4-5L)
“tumque remos iussit religare struppis” (Andr. 9L)
“ubi id auduit, lecticam iussit deponi, struppis, quibus lectica deligata erat, usque adeo uerberari iussit, dum animam efflauit” (Gracch. ORF 49 = Gel. 10.3.5)
“tenuioribus [coronis] utebantur antiqui, stroppos appellantes: unde nata strophiola” (Plin. NH 21.2.3)

In the last instance, several MSS have struppos, a reading that cannot be rejected out of hand, since struppos may easily have been corrupted into stroppos under the influence of strophiola, while it is difficult to see how or why stroppos could have been corrupted into struppos. If stroppos is correct, it appears that there is a difference in meaning between struppus ‘a (plaited) leather strap’113 (Andronicus, Gellius) or ‘a bundle of twigs or herbs used in lectisternia’ (Festus) on the one hand and stroppus ‘a headband or ribbon worn on festive occasions’ (Pliny, Festus) on the other. If the two forms were distributed in this way, the original reason for quoting Faliscan Struppearia may have been that it implied a use of struppus as ‘headband’, which in Roman Latin would have been stroppus.

To sum up, it can be said that decimatrus, Hirpi, and Struppearia are quoted as words for local Faliscan institutions, cenaculum, and perhaps Struppearia, to illustrate a difference of meaning between the Faliscan and the Roman word, and haba and Halaesus to illustrate the Faliscan realisation of /#fV/ as [h], which was ascribed also to have existed also in ‘Old Latin’ and ‘Sabine’ (used in the sense of ‘marginal Latin’): for such attributions, see §3.5.2. Interestingly, in several instances forms labelled as Faliscan are quoted side by side with forms from other Latin dialects: with Lanuvian and Corduban (and indeed ‘Latian’) in the case of cenaculum, with Tusculan in the case of decimatrus and Struppearia, and with ‘Old Latin’ in the case of haba.114 The exception is Sabellian Hirpi, which is probably a Transtiberine import.

113 OLD translates ‘a twisted cord’, but ‘a (plaited) leather strap’ is more appropriate: Andronicus’ struppis translates τσωπαί εἰς δεξιατίνους δ 782 = 0 53 (Erasmi 1975:82-3), and in the passage from Gellius, the struppi are the shoulder-straps attached to the carrying-poles.
114 Similarly manus, attested in Faliscan in the cognomen Manumus (see §6.2.44) is ascribed both to the antiqui (Var. L 6.2.4) and to the Lanuvians (Macr. 1.3.13).