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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 Sabellian 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.

1. aedilis n. ‘edile’. Nom. pl. efíles MF 113, efíles MF 115, efíles MF 117, efíle MF 114, efíles/ 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 aidiles MV 2, Oscan aidil Po 11, Po 16, aidilis Po 1, Po 15, aidilis Po 2, and Samnitic aidilis Sa 14, are borrowed from Latin (see WOU s.v. aidil, Camporeale 1956:44-50 and La Regina 1968:436-46). Etruscan origin of the word is rightly rejected by Bréyer (1993:137). Faliscan efíles has been regarded both as an adaptation of Latin aedilis and as a calque on a Middle Faliscan *efis 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 aedíles derived their name from the Roman temple of Vesta or of Ceres, and (2) that quaestor, praetor, duóvir, and censor are probably Latin borrowings. The former is a spurious argument, for the fact that Roman tradition connected the origin of their aedíles 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, duóvir, and censor are all attested from public inscriptions and cursus honorum from Roman Falerii Novi, whereas the efíles 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 (?) efíest or efíest in iúkíh 1 ko i efíest VM 1. Cf. WOU s.v. aidil.
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 ἄδεηθάθρακον.] – Direct Latin equivalent argentum: Oscan has a formal equivalent aragetud Cm 7, 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 ἄγαργα, there is no direct Sabellic equivalent at all.

3. bibo vb. ‘to drink’. 1st sg. fut. act. pipafo MF 59, pi[p]afo 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 pi[p]afo. – Since Latin bibo is due to an assimilation of */pib-/ → /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-), but also /pibä-/ or /bibä-/ 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, duri). 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 qupirih AP.2 (adv.), and in Umbrian cubrar Um 7, cupras Um 17, cupr[a]s Um 20; cf. also “ciprum Sabine bonum”, Var. L. 5.159.

6. careo vb. ‘to lack’: 1st sg. fut. act. carefo MF 59, care[?]fo MF 60. – Direct Latin equivalent careo. No Sabellic equivalents, but perhaps remote cognates in Umbrian kastruwiTI Va.13 etc., castru TI VIa.30 etc., and Oscan castrid TB 8, castrous TB 13 (cf. WOU s.v. castrous), and perhaps Oscan kasit Cp 33, Cp 34, kas[f]it Cp 33 (cf. WOU s.v. kasit), if these are derived from the same */kas-/ ← */kh₂s-/ that underlies Latin careo, castus, and castra.
7. **carus** adj. ‘dear, beloved’. Dat. sg. f. karai EF 1. – Direct Latin equivalent *carus*. Probably derived from an Italic */kärə-* ← PIE */kʰerə-/*. No known Sabellic equivalent or cognate.

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 a* : *velthurus : lemmisa : celati : cesu* Ta 1.66 and *cela : sal : ōn* 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 *siodi/siodi* (*ET* lists at least 60 instances, not counting the numerous instances of the derivations in *siodin-*)

9. *[censor* n. ‘censor’. Latino-Faliscan attestations only. Nom. sg. *cen]*so LtF 231, *censo* LtF 232, [---]so LtF 232; probably also [--- ce(n)s]*or LtF 233 (or is this [--- uto]*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 *kenszur* Sa 4 are borrowings from Latin (*WOU* s.v. *kenzsur*) that formed the basis for *kɛnɔɾstɔtɛːɾi* Lu 5.]
10. *clipeus/clupeum* n. ‘(round) shield, buckler’. Attested in the gentilicum *Clipearius* (‘Shieldmaker’) in *clipeaio* (clipearo?) MF 470*, clipiario LF 230 [and *clipeario* LtF 231, cl[topeario 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, *cup[at]* MF 159, *cup[a]t* MF 161, *cupa* 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, *cupa*t MF 158, *cupat* LF 223; (3) either sg. or pl. *cupa[t]?* MF 95, *cupa[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* I.1259, 1638 and 2135 (quoted in §8.10.1) and Lucr. 3.892,97 cf. *TLL* 4.1278,82-1279,9); direct Sabellic 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*. 56.26.L. See also 40. *lego* or *legeo*.

14. *cupido* n. ‘(sexual) desire’. Attested as as theonym *Cupido* ‘Desire’ in *cupid(o) 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 */gʰer-/ (cf. *WOU* s.vv. *herentas, heriadi*).

*With ossa as subject, *cubo* occurs in *CIL* I.1312 from Rome and in Ovid. Am. 1.8.108 = *Ep.* 7.162 = *Tr.* 3.3.76 (a mock-epitaph).*
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 pored EF 1 [and 3rd sg. pf. act. ind. dedet LF/Lat 214]; (2) nom. sg. n. pf. ptc. datu LF/Lat 214]. Pored 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 */dēh3/- 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 pertuvitu TI Iia.24 etc., which has a different stem. See also 17. *duo or *duio.

17. *duo or *duio vb. ‘to give’. 3rd sg. pr. act. subj. doui-ad 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 */dēh3/- or */doh3/- (/*/do(u)h3/- Meiser 1986:186-91) that occurs also in Umbrian pertuvitu TI Iia.24 etc., (cf. WOU s.v. pordouitu, Meiser 2003:182-3), related to the root of Latin do (/*/dēh3/-). See also §5.3.1.4. – Direct Latin equivalent in duam etc., and in Umbrian pertuvitu TI Iia.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- ← *dūi- (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[uiru LF 243, duum[uir LF 247, duu[uiru LF 248, [duu]uiru 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. duouir, 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. 1\textsuperscript{st} 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 /egɷ/, but it is possible (although unlikely) that this was shortened to /ego/ as in Latin. See §4.7.1. – Direct Latin equivalent *ego* /egɷ/ /g314/ /ego/, first attested as *eco* in 479†: Sabellic equivalents are South Picene ekū- in ekūsim CH.1, and perhaps Samnitic *iīv* Sa 31: see §4.7.1 and *WOU* s.vv. ekūsim, *iīv*. 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 *eītuvam* 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’. 3\textsuperscript{rd} 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. *fakiiad*). 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 *fēci*, Umbrian fut. pf. *fakust* TI IV.31, *fakurent* TI Ib.32, *facurent* TI VIIa.43, but also reduplicative perfects like Latin *vhe* /g2639/ *vhaked* CIL I2.3, Oscan *fefacid* TB 10, fut. pf. *fefacust* TB 11, 17 and *fes[acust]* TB 33, and Praesamnitic *fesakid* Ps 20. For a discussion of these forms, see §5.3.1.6. – Some authors have interpreted *fifiked* EF 9 and *f[.f]* /g851qod* 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 *farm[e]* [ŋ]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 *farsiou* TI Vlb.2, *fasiu* TI Iia.12, *fasiou* TI VIIb.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* [le] 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 [fiō], see §3.5.5c.]
THE LEXICON

Direct Latin equivalents filia and filius. These words are Latin-Faliscan innovations (cf. Lejeune 1967, Hamp 1972): The corresponding Sabelic words are *puclom ‘son’ in South pogloh AQ.1, Mararian pucle[s] VM 4, Paelignian puclois Pg 5, Oscan puklum Cp 37,4 etc., and Oscan futir ‘daughter’ Si 8, 9, Samnitic fiutrei Sa 1B.5, futre[i] Sa 1A.4, and futre[is] Sa 30, which continues PIE */puclom/ and */dʰugh₂tʰer/.

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 */dʰ/heig₁/io-/ or */dʰ/heig₁/io-/ (cf. Schrijver 1991:242), not formations based on Proto-Italic */f/g₁g₇₉/g₁/g₄₀₇/ ‘breast’ /g₁/ PIE */dʰ/heig₁/leig₂/ that underlies the Latin verb felo/fello, and its Umbrian cognate felīuf TII 1a.14, feliu TII Vlb.3 (cf. DÉ, LEW s.v. filius, IEW s.v. dhe(i)-, and WOU s.v. feliu).

26. fingo vb. ‘to form, to knead’. (1) 3rd sg. pf. act. ind. fifiked EF 9; (2) 3rd pl. pf. act. ind. ff[f]iqod (=ff[f]iqo(n)d) EF 1 (usually read as ff[f]iqod, although it is also possible to read ff[f]iqod. 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[f]iqod, 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 spoopondi, tutdul etc.). Since the root underlying the word was */dʰ/eigʰ-h/- (DÉ, LEW s.v. fingō), the presence of an intervocalic /g/ must be due to analogy after the present stem */dʰ/ingʰ-h/- (DÉ, LEW s.v. fingō), where */gʰ/ 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 feiühúss CA B.5, feiühús CA B.19 (cf. WOU s.v. feiühúss).

98 DÉ s.v. filius erroneously stated: “L’italo-celtique a perdu les noms indo-européens du «fils» (got. sumus, etc.) et de la «fille» (got. dauhtar, etc.). Ces noms ont été remplacés par des noms nouveaux, familiers, ou fabriqués.”
27. *firmus*. The name Firmius/Hirmius in hirmeo MF 19, firmio MF 54, hirmio LF 213; f. hirmia MF 18, fir-mia MLF 302 has been connected with the adjective *firmus* (← PIE */dʰermo-/*) e.g. by Campanile (1961:5-6), although the connection was rejected by G. Giacomelli (1963:193).

28. *fit/fitai/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 VIIb.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. frénum). No known Sabellic equivalents or cognates.


31. *gutto/*guttum/guttur n. ‘pitcher’. Nom. sg. quto EF 3. (The word is often read as qoton, 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’ κῶθον (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 /ʊ/, 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 cutturnium, 209-10 on gūtus/guttus). Reading the ending -o as an ōn-stem nominative -/ō/ or as an o-stem masculine nominative -o(s) /-os/ is impossible as the word appears to be qualified by the neuter adjective duenom (eco quto *e uotenosiot tittas 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 κοῠδων or κοῠδὸν, but (through a hypothetical Etruscan intermediary *qutur?) from a Greek *κοὗτως, 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: haris[ex LTF 231, haris[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( all) MF 56, fe MF 305. [I do not adopted the haec ‘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/g2951 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 /hojēd/ with a short /o/ as in Latin, either reflecting a compound form */ho-dē(d)/, or the result of a shortening of an earlier */hō+dē(d)/, 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- ablative 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. hutif/jilom EF 1. Most modern editors have adopted Vetter’s (1953:280) restoration hut[w]jilom: this has been interpreted in various ways (see §12.2), most of which involve a derivation from PIE */g^h eu-/ ‘to pour’. If that derivation
is correct, Faliscan would apparently differ from Latin, where the derivations from this root (fundo 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 hutθ ‘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- praeff. ‘in, within’. G. Giacomelli (first 1963:41, 43) and Peruzzi (1964a:163-4) divided fitaidupes EF 1 as fita idupes, interpreting idupes as containing a praeffix 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 12:4: 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 cupat ifra ‘lies below’, a variation on the usual sepolchral formula hic cuba(n)t ‘lie(s) here’. – Direct Latin equivalent infra, with a lengthened /i/: whether Faliscan had /i/ or /i/ cannot be ascertained (§3.5.6.1). The etymology of the Latin form is difficult, for in Roman Latin an original Proto-Italic */nd(e)r/ → Proto-Latin */nd(e)r/ would have become †en(d)e/ → †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. in­ferus) or by assuming that, when the form was still */nd(e)r/, it was re-analysed as a compound */en+nd(e)r/, so that the */d/ developed to /f/, the regular word-initial development (LEW, EDL s.v. in­ferus). 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 : we[l]mineo : 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 · iiii ./ l/ .......... {[ .......... ]mai?——} io iux 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 72.1099.18-20) occurs only in CIL 1.1990=Lat 251. M. Mancini (2002:...
28-33) therefore explains *lete as */lִאָטְעַ/ (letē, the monophthongized form of the locative of */lִאָטַ/ 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 /kl (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 */leg̣h-/, 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 */g̣h//g̣314/ 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. DÉ, LEW s.v. lectus) or /legē-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 veiaût /ˌjeiːˈat/ MC.1 ← Proto-Sabellic */leiyāt/ occurs side by side with qupat in apaes: qupat [: e]smín: púpúnis: níːr : mefín : veiaût: vepeít MC.1. (See also DÉ, LEW s.v. lectus, WOU s.v. veiat).

41. liberta n. ‘freedwoman’ and libertus n. ‘freedman’: Nom. sg. f. lóifirta MF 41, loferta LF 221, perhaps abbreviated in ṭi [ʔ] tīria lo[ʔ---]l[e]a : cs : f MF 155. Another attestation (masc. or fem?) perhaps in [---]‘i : u[ʔ]ltiai lo MF 165 [and perhaps l 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 lautnītā, 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 6.2.1939.1-1940.56) 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 max]om[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 onomasticon (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 maatius Sa 1A.10, B.13 (WOU s.v. maatius, DÉ, LEW s.v. mânis, -e).

45. mater n. ‘mother’. Nom. sg. mate LF 221. – Direct Latin equivalent mater; direct Sabellic equivalents in South Picene materēih AP.2, Umbrian matres Um 17, 19, 18, mater Um 7, Samnite maatrais Sa 30 (cultic epithet of a deity).

46. maxumus irregular superl. adj. ‘greatest’. Attested as a cognomen Maxumus/Maximus in maximo MF 88, maxom[o] MF 98, maţxomo MF 162, maxomo LF 220 and maxjom[o or manjom[o MF 89, probably not [--- mJa*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/- → */maţimo/- → */maţimo/- attested in Oscan maîmus TB 3, 7 (DÉ, LEW s.v. magnus, WOU s.v. maîmas).

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)
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 /mēd/ → me /mē/. The only certain instance of a Sabellic semantic equivalent is Palaeoumbrian mion 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 tium Cp 37 and siom TB 5, 6, 9 respectively (cf. WOU s.vv. mion, 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 minoLtF 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 *nutrix or *noutrix (cf. Latin noutrix CIL I2.45): 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-/ ← /āukt-/ (§3.7.4). If attested, there are direct equivalents in Latin octo, octauus etc., as well as close cognates in the Oscan names ūhtavis Cp 36, ọtāziς 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. *pe̱parai 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, *pe̱parai (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 la.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 *jouijš pater or *[jouo]*s pater, or as *diejš pater. – Direct Latin equivalent pater, direct Sabellic equivalent Oscan patir Cp 2, di{̣}pa{̣}tír Po 22, etc.


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. púsitn, 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, *pretor* LF 248, *prector* LF 243, 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 *zilath*, 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 *purθ* (doubtful, as the Etruscan magistrate equated with the *praetor* was not the *purθ*, but the *zilath*).

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 */prH-mo-/101 that also underlies Latin *prandium* (< */präm(o)+edjom/, cf. DÉ, LEW s.v. *prändium*, IEW s.v. *per 2.A,g*). Since *prandium* is usually interpreted as ‘early meal’ (like German *Frühstück*, or Greek *ψυρίτων*), */präm(o)+edjom/ has been credited with a meaning ‘early’, even though the reflexes of */prH-mo-/ in Germanic (Old Saxon *formo*, Old English *furma*) and Baltic (Lithuanian *pirmas*, 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 *prämëre or *prämëre*) 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 localizzazione”. 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 *profetia*, the gentilicium attested from the same tomb in LF 242, 244.

61. **† puia** (Etr.) n. ‘wife’. Although the possibility of reading *puia* in [.?]ay|*ia | lepuia | voltilia MF 144 was rejected already by Herbig (CIE 8243a), this reading is still
adopted by Vetter (1953:305). It would be the only sepulchral inscription where
[HUSBAND\text{gen} WIFE] precedes [FILIA\text{tion}] (attestations in §7.4.2). Note also that
[HUSBAND\text{gen} WIFE] or [WIFE HUSBAND\text{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. † \textit{*putellius/*putellium} n. ‘infant’; \textit{*putellus} adj. ‘little’. Vetter (1953:303-4, 80)
interpreted putellio in uolti[−]o : marc[−−−] | putellio MF 152 as ‘infant’ and on this
basis restored putela ‘parvula’ in EF 1. The main problem is that the noun
\textit{*putellius/*putellium} and the adjective \textit{*putellus} are to be derived from PIE */pu-
\textit{tlom/}, but that the suffix */-tlom/ was continued in Italic as */-klom/; */putlom/ in
fact occurs in the Sabellic languages as *puclum in South Picene poglo\text{h} AQ.1, Marsian pucle\text{fs} VM 4, Paelignian puclois Pg 5, Oscar puklum 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 oc-
curs 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 ce\textit{\textbar}š[i.]/ holc[osi] | ar
\textit{p...} MF 140 (or is this another case of puia?).

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

64. \textit{quaestor} n. ‘a magistracy, quaestor’. Nom. sg. c\textit{uestod} LF 242, c\textit{ues}\text{tor} LF
243, c\textit{ues}\text{tor} LF 245, c\textit{ues}\text{tor} LF 247 [and possibly also [---\text{for} LtF 233; q LtF
231 is probably not an attestation.] Probably (but not necessarily) a borrowing
from Latin. – Direct Latin equivalent \textit{quaestor}: the Sabellic counterparts,
Umbrian kvestur TI Va.23, Vb.2 cvestur Um 9, and its derivative kvestretie TI
Ib.45, Ila.44, Oscarn kvaísstur Po 3, Po 4, k\textit{vaísstur} Po 9, Po 10, k\textit{vaísstur} Po 14,
k\textit{vaísstur} Lu 6, Lu 7, k\textit{vaísstur} Lu 10, k\textit{vaísstur}. Lu 8, k\textit{vaíssturei} Cm 1A.2, k\textit{vaísstur}
Po 8 are borrowings from Latin (\textit{WOU} s.v. k\textit{vaísstur}).

65. -\textit{que} encl. conj. ‘and’. -\textit{cue} MF 80, -\textit{cue} MF 158, -\textit{cue} MLF 313, probably also -
\textit{c\text{ue} MF 170}, possibly also -\textit{c\text{ue} MF 108}. All attestations are from names joined
in sepulchral inscriptions. – Direct Latin equivalent -\textit{que}. In the Sabellic lan-
guages, the formal equivalent -\textit{pe} is often assumed to occur as a suffix (as e.g. in
Latin \textit{uterque} in Umbrian putrespe TI IV.14 and seipodruhpei TI VIa.11, but this
view has convincingly been challenged (cf. \textit{WOU} s.v. p\textit{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 (f---?] precono[---|---] let) 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. (defined) and poi Ti Va.5, Vb.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 */k*/*v/ 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(c)tus, both in the lexicon and the onomasticon. The Sabellic equivalent, attested only in the onomasticon (Paelignian ponties Pg 5, Oscan puntis Po 1, puntigis Cm 28, pumtipies Me 1, pumtipoies Me 3, abbreviated pompti Sta 9, 11), shows an o-vocalism that probably originated in the cardinal (cf. §3.2.10.1 and WOU s.vv. pomtis and púmperiais).

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 I.1, rex CIL I.2.2830) and probably in Oscan reγo Lu 5 (but cf. WOU s.v. reγo): a close cognate is Marrucinian recen[ai MV 1.

69. ? °russus adj. ‘reddish’. If the cognomen Ruso is read in cauio[---|ruso[?] MLF 318 [and perhaps in ce · pauif[ceo ru?] so LtF 290], this might be connected to the adjective that appears in Latin as *russus (note the unrhonitized 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 sacrur Uml2, Um 13, adv. sacr Um 6, sacr Um 19, and Oscan σακαρο 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]EF 3, salueto EF 4; 2nd pl. pr. imp. salute 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. saluv.
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 *saluis* and Sabellic *saluos* in Umbrian *saltet* MV 7, *salas* MV 6, Oscan *salavas* Cm 18, 38, 39, σαλαζές 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 σκαί(ς)ıs 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, zextoi 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 *sehsík*[ ] Po 19 (WOU s.v. *sehsík*[ ]) and indirectly in the gentilicium *sehsimbri̇j̄s* Po 36.


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. † **statuo** 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 ἀνατιθήμι. 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[m] 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; and

(b) 3rd pl. pr. ind. zot MLF 285 [and sot LtF 172?], which corresponds to Latin sunt, older sont CIL 1.1529, 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 Va.15 etc.: see §5.3.1.18; and

(c) 2nd pl. pr. subj. seite = s[e]ite or sице EF 4, which has comparable forms in Umbrian (2nd sg. sir TI V1b.7, 26, set TI V1a.23, si TI V1b.26, 3rd sg. si TI Va.6, 24, 27, Vb.3, 7, 3rd pl. sis TI Va.6, sins TI VIIb.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 us[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 V1b.25.

82. ? titus (adj. ‘prosperous, propitious’?): dat. sg. m. titoi MF 113, titoi MF 116, [t]itoi[i] MF 115, titoi MF 118, [t]itoi MF 119, [t]itoi MF 120, [t]itoi 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 aves 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 *tituí* TE.5, *titum* AP.1 and *titiuá* CH.2, *titienom* TE.3 is unclear (cf. *WOU* s.v. *titienum, tituí, titiuá*).

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 *tolló* (“sopportate - sopporta!”), in which case it is a subjunctive based on a zero-grade root */t̪̊lh2-/; see §5.3.1.20-21. The verb has direct parallels in Latin *tolló* from the zero-grade root */t̪̊lh2-/ and in Umbrian *antentu* TI Ia.20 etc., *ententu* TI Ib.12 etc., *pertentu* TI Ia.31, *suntentu* TI Ia.23 (for all attestations, see *WOU* s.v. *-tentu*) from the full-grade root */teln/-. 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* EF 2 as a noun related to the burial (*ulna* ‘loculus’ Garrucci, *ulna* ‘pulvinus’ Vetter 1953:299). It is rather a second gentiliciun, as was first proposed by Schulze (1904:73 n.3).

85. ? *umom* n. ‘type of vase’. Early Faliscan attestation only. [u]mom, *umom, umom* 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 */ed-/, comparing Latin *unda* ← */ud-ná/. The Faliscan word probably represents */umom*/ ← */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 *urnella* 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, *[ux]or* 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-
og (Dé, Lew s.v. uxor); possible direct Sabellic equivalents in Paelignian usur Pg 9 (uncertain) and Oscan usur s Cp 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. uin[jo]m EF 1 (revived by Radke 1994). – Direct Latin equivalent uinum; direct Sabellic equivalents in Umbrian vinu TI 4a.4, 22, Ib.6 etc. and Volscian uimu VM 2. The i in the Early Faliscan, Umbrian, and Volscian forms points to an original */uih1nom/: for this form and its relation to its IE cognates such as Greek (*φινος), cf. Beekes 1987:22-3.

89. uir n. ‘man’. Late Faliscan attestations only. Attested indirectly in (gen.pl?) duum|uir LF 243, duum[uir LF 247, duu|muiru LF 248, and [duu]mufiru 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 4a.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 4a.42, 50 etc., although the meaning of this word might differ slightly from that of its Latin equivalent (cf. WOU s.v. uiero).


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. [---]ostro, 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 poestro, but the syncopation required for this is irregular in Faliscan (§3.6.6.2).102 For the Sabellic languages, *post(e)ros is attested for Umbrian (postra TI VIb.13) and Oscan (püstrei 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 interferential 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 nostr(o) or uostro, oстро = austro, cloстро = clauстро, plostro = plaustro, or oстро.
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 *Quinctus*; ‘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: *coniunx*, 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 *lautni/ga*.

(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 *audii* 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).
**6.4. 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 'Ἀπόλλων, while Vestinian appellune MV 10 and Oscan appellumeis Po 14, appellumei Si 20, [a]πεπελλαυνηι Me 1, απεπελλαυνηι Me 2, απεπελλαυνηι Me 3, and απεπελλαυνηις Me 5 show the e-vocalism of West Greek 'Ἀπελλαυνηις.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 'Ἀπόλλων and 'Ἀπελλαυνηις in the Greek dialects, see Buck 1955:46.
2. **Ceres.** Nom. *ceres* EF 1 (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.) *ceres* CIL I.2.973?) was an s-stem */keres-/ → /kerer-/ (nom. /kerēs/), while in Oscan *kerī* Cp 37 and Samnitic *kerri* Sa 1.A 3, B 7, it became an e-stem /ker(e)sē-/ (cf. WOU s.v. kerī). The Sabellic languages also have derivations such as *Cerrio* in Umbrian, Paelignian, Marrucinian, and Oscan (see WOU s.vv. kerriii and certum).

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 Πότερ. 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 ꞌcatmite 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 *κατατμήτης* ‘gelding, catamite’.105

6. † **Euius.** Based on the reading [l]o]/g877fir in EF 1 (see 8. †Liber), G. Giacomelli (first 1963:41-2) and Peruzzi (1964a:166) interpreted euios EF 1 as Ἑυῖος = 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 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 I.2.564, diespater CIL I.2.568, while a [iou]s or [iouo]s (or [iou]s?) would be have equivalents in Latin *Iupiter* and in the Sabellic languages in Umbrian *iupater TI* IIb.24, *iuepatre TI* IIa.5, IIb.17, IIb.22, IIb.26, III.22, and *iue patre TI* IIb.7, 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 loifirtato MF 31 and loifirtato MF 32 as loifir tato ‘Liber pater’, which was rejected by Herbig (CIE 8011); (2) by Vetter (first 1925:27-8), who read l[ojufir 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 leper ‘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 | mercui MF 113, tito | mercui MF 114, [t]i to[i] | mercu[i] MF 115, titoi | mercu[i] MF 116, titoi : mercu[i] MF 118, [t]i toi : mercu[i] MF 119, [t]i toi : mercu[i] MF 120, [t]i toi : mercu MF 121, titoi : m[e]rcui MF 122, [---?]mercuii MF 123, [m]ercui MF 124, mercui MF 125, mer[cuij 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. DÊ s.v. merx) and Oscan mirikui Cm 12 (either */merku- or */merko-/: the attestation predates the introduction of the sign ũ). 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) 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, DÊ s.v. Minerua, LEW s.v. Minerva), but may well have been Italic (*/menes-/) (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[erjavas Ve 3.29, menjerva|s Ve 3.33, and menjervas Cr 4.1). On the basis of Ovid. Fast. 3.383-4 it has been assumed that worship of Minerva reached Rome through evocatio 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 1\textsuperscript{a}.454=MF 62, Minerua first in CIL 1\textsuperscript{b}.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 Lehnbüersetzung of Greek Ἄρως 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.107 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 ethnonym 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.

107 The Etruscan labels in mythological scenes on mirrors, gems and vases also name the Etruscan acaviser Etr XLI, aχαιβισε Etr X, αδλανς Etr XLI, τινα Etr XXXI, τυραν Etr XLI, turna Etr XXXI, and uslanes or usle*es Etr XLI (cf. Ambrosini 1995, Maras 2002), and the Greek figures αλι Etr XXXII, atmite Etr XXVII, ανας Etr XXXII, алкести Etr XXVII, аріας Etr XXVIII, kukne Etr XXV, herkle Etr XXV, hercle Etr XXVIII, vile Etr XXVIII, mine Etr XXVIII, θενυρμινες Etr XXVIII, and ϕερε Etr XL.
POTAMONYMS

1. ?° Fa(r)farus. Perhaps attested indirectly in the gentilicium Fafarn- occurring in abbreviated form as *fafarn* MF 136 and perhaps also in *faf[---]* 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,108 so that the Faliscan name Fafarn-, if connected to the name of the river at all, may represent /fafarn-/ as well as [far-farn-] with omission of /r.C/ (§3.5.7b): perhaps rather /fafarn/-, 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.


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 abeles e 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 (abellanui 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.
necessarily identical with) Latin Oriculum and Umbrian *Ukriçlum/*ukrikêlom/ ← */okrikêlom/ implied by the Etruscan gentilicium ucrislâne 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 Gallese (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/Fulginiae). Indirectly attested in the gentilicium feliciane MF 42 (gen. sg.) and [fel]cianatu MLF 384 (gen. pl.). *Feliginas, occurring also as an Etruscan gentilicium (felicinâl Pe 1.485, 1.1235, and felicinâtâl Cl 1.2673) is derived from a toponym *Feliginum (*Felinum 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.°° 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,°° perhaps a contraction of an older *Orticulanum.

12. °°*Uei. Very uncertain. The name of the town has been read in furc · t · p · c · ef · i · uei · LiF 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).

°° 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).

°° “ORCHIANUM “forte Orchia Castellum, quod tamen in antiquis donationibus Monasterii Farfensis Orlanum 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 falesce·quei·inquardinia·sunt Lat 218, a rare example of an Italic ethnonym being used by the members of the group themselves. Faleskēs in [mi]a]yīleš feluskeš tušnut[a pa]panalaš Vn 1.1 may be an Etruscan rendering of *Falescos (Pocchetti 1997). The same may be true of feleşkenas in [mi] larisa feleşkenas am**[?]---] AS 1.40 (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 *Falsax or *Felsax.)

14. °Graecus. Attested in the praenomen kreco MF 150 (with k representing /g/, cf. §11.2.4) and perhaps also in the gentilicium Grae... (or Crae...?) in cr[a]---] 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, cre[ie]ce Cl 1.1514, creices Cl 1.1669, creicia Cl 1.352, 1513, creicta Cl 1.794, creicia Cl 1.1515, creicea Cl 1.1281, 1282, 1302, 1686, 1744) and Tarquinii (creice Ta 6.15, creices Ta 1.17, creic[a]l Ta 1.217), but also elsewhere (creici Cr 1.149, Vc 1.5, craica Vc 2.34, creice Pe 1.889, kraikalūs 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 Hīrpīni. 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 latinai̇o 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 *Saf-en- (from */saβēno-/, see Rix 1957). The Sabellic inscriptions yield both the ethnonym, in South Picene safinīs TE.5, safinīm TE.6, safinas TE.5 and safīnaTE.7, and the name of the region in Paelignian and Samnitic 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 Ὠμβρικός and Ὠμβρικός).} Attested indirectly in the gentilicia Umbrius in umrie Etr XLIII, and its derivations Umbricius in umpricius 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, umriasa Cl 1.1294, 1.1913) and Umrc- (umrce/g286 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 ombrienen 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 (Ocrickeyum 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 Falerni.
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)sn/ (cf. WOU s.v. *kerssnais*) rather than from */kersin/ (Schrijver 1991:432), corresponds to that of Latin rather than that of the Sabellic languages, which appear in Oscan *kersmu* Cm 14, *kerssnais* Cp 31 and Umbrian *šesna* Tl 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 idum est dies festus, ut apud Tuscananos *triatrus* et *sexatrus* et *septematrus* et Faliscos *decimatrus*.” (Fest. 304.33-306.2L); “*quinquatrus* festius dies dictus, quod post diem quintum idum celebraretur, ut *triatrus* et *sexatrus* et *septematrus* et *decimatrus*” (Paul. Fest. 305.10-2L).¹¹² – MS E of Paulus Diaconus has *decema-trus*. 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 *decimatrus* 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).
**THE LEXICON**

Hormiae fuerunt, ἀπὸ τῶν ὁμών: 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 /#FV/ → /#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 /#FV/ 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 lupi 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 */ĝ̬r-k̬̂o-/: horridus etc. are usually derived from */ĝ̬̄ŝ̄-/, 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. **Struppearia.** “stroppus est, ut Ateius Philologus existimat, quod Graece στρόφειον uocatur et quod sacerdotes pro insigni habent in capite. quidam coronam esse dicunt, aut quod pro corona insignie in caput inponatur; itaque apud Faliscos diem [Augustinus: idem MSS, Lindsay] festum esse qui uocetur Struppearia, quia coronati ambulent; et a Tusculanis quod in puluinari inponatur Castoris struppum uocari” (Fest. 410.6-9L). – Ateius’ derivation of the word from Greek στρόφειον 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 *gutto/*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 capitibus ponuntur” (Fest. 472.15-6L, restored from Paul. *Fest.* 473.4-5L)
“tumque remos iussit religare struppis” (Andr. 9L)
“ubi id audiuit, lecticam iussit deponi, struppis, quibus lectica delicata erat, usque adeo uerberari iussit, dum animam efflauit” (Gracch. *ORF* 49 = Gel. 10.3.5)

In the last instance, several MSS have *stroppos*, 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’ (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 festiue 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 *struppos* 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.* The exception is Sabellic *Hirpi*, which is probably a Transtiberine import.

---

113 OLD translates ‘a twisted cord’, but ‘a (plaited) leather strap’ is more appropriate: Andronicus’ *struppis* translates τσαπάις ἐν δεξιατίναις δέ 782 = 0 53 (Erasmii 1975:82-3), and in the passage from Gellius, the *struppi* are the shoulder-stra$p$ 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).