

File ID 123786
Filename Chapter 9. Language contact

SOURCE (OR PART OF THE FOLLOWING SOURCE):

Type Dissertation
Title The Latin dialect of the Ager Faliscus : 150 years of scholarship
Author G.C.L.M. Bakkum
Faculty Faculty of Humanities
Year 2009
Pages LII, 678 (2 delen)
ISBN 9789056295622

FULL BIBLIOGRAPHIC DETAILS:

<http://dare.uva.nl/record/292896>

Copyright

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use.

Chapter 9

Language contact

As said in §1.1, one of the interesting features of Faliscan is the fact that it is found between areas where Etruscan, Sabellic languages and Latin were spoken. Language contact must have been frequent, and it can sometimes be traced in the texts by features occurring in Faliscan inscriptions that can be ascribed to influence from these languages. This chapter opens with a number of methodological observations on the problems of observing language contact from texts such as we have for Faliscan (§9.1). In the next sections I discuss the features in the Faliscan inscriptions that can be ascribed to language contact with speakers of Etruscan (§9.2), Sabellic languages (§9.3), and Latin (§9.4). A short conclusion is drawn in §9.5.

9.1. Language contact in the ager Faliscus: methodological issues

In the following sections, I have tried to map which features can be ascribed to language contact between Faliscan on the one hand and Etruscan, Sabellic languages, and Latin on the other. The study of language contact involving fragmentarily documented languages such as Faliscan involves a number of problems, and can only result in the most tentative of conclusions. Therefore, in spite of excellent discussions of the problems involved by Adams & Swain (2002), Adams (2003:1-29, 2007:1-36), and especially Langslow (2002), my remarks on the methodological issues will be longer than usual. They are largely meant to adapt the framework used by these authors (which is also based on literary texts, sometimes even texts pretending to represent spoken language, e.g. comedy) to the conditions of the material on which this study is based.

This material is, in the first place, fragmentary in the sense that it does not even allow drawing a complete picture of the languages involved in the contact. Worse, epigraphic material is fragmentary also in another sense, namely in the sense that an inscription normally represents an individual ‘utterance’, generated as a kind of ‘one-sided interaction’ directed towards a (conceived) reader. This is a great disadvantage when studying language contact, for language contact presupposes a spoken interaction between at least two speakers involving more than one language. Therefore, an epigraphic source that is not consciously conceived as a bilingual text but does show features of code-switching should be regarded as representing the mental choices of one bilingual individual for one code or another. Unfortunately, there is no possibility to check to what degree that individual was bilingual, or in how far the choices from his or her bilingualism represent those made by the language community as a whole.

An even more structural problem with regard to the description of language contact on the basis of material such as the Faliscan corpus is that all the material used as data in this study is *written*, and that written language is only an indirect or derived form of language use. Writing is always an *acquired* process, and does not necessarily reflect spoken language at every turn. Acquiring the art of writing a specific language involves mastering a set of rules associated with the writing of that language and its written tradition. These rules concern not just the alphabet and its related orthographic conventions (including e.g. historically motivated spelling) but also conventions about what is allowed in spoken but not in written language (in effect, level-distinction), and the construction of certain types of texts, including the formulas belonging to each type. Each written language therefore has its own individual set of consciously acquired prescriptions that tell the individual how he or she should ‘translate’ a mentally conceived or spoken utterance into one that is acceptable within the written form of that language. The process of this ‘translation’ is a *conscious* application of these rules, although ‘conscious’ is of course a relative concept here: depending on how well-versed the writer is in writing a specific language, it may be a process that will be regarded as hardly conscious at all by the individual in question.

As any user of both spoken and written language can testify, there is often a vast gap between how we speak and how we write, even if this speaking and writing concerns the same utterance. Some features of spoken language (such as repetition and other forms of over-marking that are necessary to compensate for the ‘loss’ in the transmission of a spoken utterance) simply do not enter written language because they are unnecessary, but others are not used because the rules tell us so, often because the written language, which is taught and learned, is necessarily more conservative than the spoken language, and therefore by its very existence produces a level-distinction between spoken and written language.¹⁶⁶ In how far a written speech utterance resembles this desired standard or, on the other hand, the language as it is actually spoken, therefore depends (*a*) on the width of the gap between written and spoken language in the framework of the writing of that specific language, (*b*) the degree of knowledge that the writer has of that framework, and (*c*) his or her ability to apply these rules.

As an acquired form of language that requires a conscious effort to use, written language is by its nature more formal than spoken language. Language contact, on the other hand, is first of all a matter of the spoken language, of the *interaction* between speakers of two different languages, and phenomena such as interference and code-switching are normally the result of *unconscious* psycholinguistic processes. Before a

¹⁶⁶ This does not mean that I assume a Faliscan *diglossia*, as does R. Giacomelli (1978 *passim*) unless this term is (in my view wrongly) applied to the level-distinction between written and spoken language: see §1.3.2. Since the Faliscan inscriptions are not only written language but also highly formulaic, I find it difficult to assume that they could represent ‘informal speech’, as does R. Giacomelli (2006 *passim*).

feature of language *x* can occur in a *written* text of language *y*, it must therefore not only pass the threshold into a different language: it must also cross the *additional* threshold of the formalization of the speech utterances of language *y* into the written form of language *y*, and therefore either fit in with or in some way circumvent the rules of writing language *y*.

This means that observing phenomena that can be classed under the headings of ‘interference’, ‘borrowing’, ‘code switching’ etc. in written material such as the epigraphic material on which this study is based can imply (a) that that specific feature was accepted as permissible in the written form of language *y* (and that recurrent occurrence therefore represents borrowing rather than interference), (b) that the writer was uncertain or non-cognizant of (certain aspects of) the rules governing the written form of language *y* (probably implying that he or she had another language as his or her first language) and/or (c) that in spite of the writer’s knowledge of the rules of the written form of language *y*, language *x* was what has been called ‘psychologically dominant’ (cf. e.g. Muysken 1995), i.e., that in the mind of the bilingual individual it dominated the decisions with regard to the use of the codes of either language to such an extent as to overrule the rules of the written form of language *y*.

To be able to assess phenomena that can be ascribed to language contact, it is also necessary to establish the *nature* of these language contacts. Unfortunately, for the period and the material under discussion here, this can only be done in the most general way: in effect, little more can be done than to refer in very general terms to such forms of contact as trade, transhumance, war, colonization, immigration, and inter-marriage. Any details that can be added to this are finds derived from the archaeological and historical sources, for which see §2.1-7. There is usually no way in which these can be quantified or specified, or connected with specific features of language contact that might be observable in the texts.

Establishing the nature of the language contact, even in these general terms, also shows on which *level* such contact took place. In the case of Faliscan, much of the contact will have been *informal*, e.g. with Etruscan-speaking neighbours and in-laws, with Latin-speaking tradesmen from the colonies at Sutrium, Nepete, and Capena, or with herdsmen from the Sabellic-speaking interior. Yet there must also have been language contact on a more formal level, especially at the level of the governing bodies: during the period before the war of 241-240, Falerii was allied with the South Etruscan city-states, and, if we are to believe Livy (4.23.4-24.2, 4.25.7-8, 5.17.6-10), even attended the meetings of the Etruscan League at Fanum Voltumnae, while during the period after 240, there will have been frequent contact with Roman officials, even if the magistrates themselves were from local families (§2.6.2). Of the former contact, no trace remains: of the latter, evidence can be seen in a number of official and sepulchral inscriptions from the period after 240 (see §9.4.2).

A last remark should be made with regard to onomastic borrowing, a point that has already been touched upon in §1.3.2.2 and discussed in more detail in §7.1.1. The existence of the individual *per se* entails the use of his or her name, not only within the language community where that name originated, but also in another language community, where it automatically generates a situation where his or her name becomes an interferential form. This onomastic borrowing is both vastly more frequent than the borrowing of other elements of speech, and cannot be treated in the same way as other observable features of language contact.

9.2. Faliscan and Etruscan

9.2.1. The nature of Faliscan-Etruscan language contact. Generally speaking, the inhabitants of the *ager Faliscus* may be assumed to have been in quite regular contact with speakers of Etruscan: indeed, especially in view of the onomastic material and of the number of Etruscan inscriptions from the area, it is not unreasonable to assume that a number of autochthonous inhabitants of the *ager Faliscus* were speakers of Etruscan as a first language: the presence of such Etruscan-speaking individuals and groups in the *ager Faliscus* has been discussed by Cristofani (1988): see also §9.2.3.

Of those individuals that had Faliscan as their first language and those that had Etruscan as their first language, a reasonable proportion must have been bilingual, although it cannot be ascertained to what extent, and whether they acquired both languages at an early age or were bilingual due to later acquisition of a second language. In any case, interaction between autochthonous speakers of Faliscan and autochthonous speakers of Etruscan must have been an everyday occurrence.

This interaction between Faliscan and Etruscan did not only take place on the level of individual speakers. If the roadside inscriptions Etr **XXXVIII** and **XXXIX** can indeed be classed as inscriptions on public works (§11.1.4.5), they show that in the *ager Faliscus* Etruscan could be used for an official inscription, even if this may have been possible only on a local level. The Roman and Greek historical sources (quoted in §2.5-6) report unanimously that the Faliscans as a city-state were allied with the Etruscans: as a community, the *ager Faliscus* had its political roots in the Etruscan world, which must have meant that speakers of Etruscan must have been common at government level. When Livy (9.36) describes Fabius' *incognito* journey through the *silva Cimina* in 310, he even envisages him as a man who was suited for the job because of his proficiency in speaking Etruscan.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁷ Livy's portrayal presents him as a typical 'elite bilingual': "Caere educatus apud hospites, Etruscis inde litteris eruditus erat linguamque Etruscam probe nouerat. habeo auctores uulgo tum Romanos pueros, sicut nunc Graecis, ita Etruscis litteris erudiri solitos".

Yet the epigraphic material indicates that the (written) language of the ager Faliscus was in the first place Faliscan, not Etruscan. This can be observed first of all from the number of inscriptions. During the Early Faliscan period, the Etruscan inscriptions are in the majority: there are 19-20 early Etruscan inscriptions from the ager Faliscus, 18 of which are from Narce (which appears to have been an Etruscan-speaking town and has yielded no Faliscan inscriptions) and the south-west (Etr **I-XV** and **XVIII-XX**: only Etr **XXXII** is from Corchiano), against only 9-12 Early Faliscan inscriptions (EF **1-4**, **6-10**, **467***, EF/Etr **5** and **385**). During the Middle and Late Faliscan periods however, the Faliscan material far outnumbers the Etruscan inscriptions even in the most generous count: Civita Castellana yields only 7-16 Etruscan or possibly Etruscan texts (Etr **XXV-XXXI**, MF/Etr **37**, **61**, **64**, **66-67**, **77**, **199**, MLF/Etr **208-209**), Corchiano 10-16 (Etr **XXXII-XLI**, MF/Etr **256**, **264**, **267**, **279-280**, MLF/Etr **289**), the remainder of the ager Faliscus only 2-4 (Etr **XLII-XLIII** MLF/Etr **356-357**), and the ager Capenas only 2 (Etr **XLIV-XLV**). Another point that shows that Faliscan was the first language of the area rather than Etruscan is that although many gentilicia are undoubtedly of Etruscan origin, these names were very often adapted to Faliscan: see §7.8.2.2,5 and §7.10.3.

9.2.2. Etruscan features in Faliscan inscriptions. During the 150 years of Faliscan studies (§1.5), a number of features have with more or less justification been ascribed to Etruscan influence, especially by Herbig and those who closely followed his publication of the Faliscan material in the *CIE* (!):

(1) Phonological features. I can see no phonological features that have to be ascribed to Etruscan. The monophthongization of the Faliscan diphthongs more or less coincides with similar processes in Etruscan (§3.7), but it is very unclear whether this can (or must) be due to contact with Etruscan. Monophthongization of diphthongs affected most of the Italic languages at one time or other, and can be described as a ‘natural’ phenomenon. Those who wish to do so can regard this as an attestation of a *Sprachbund* (§1.3.1.1): if there were any relationship between the developments in both languages, it would be an attestation of the frequency of language contact. The Middle Faliscan realisation of /#fV/ as [h] has been ascribed to Etruscan influence (§3.5.2), but as the Faliscan development *preceded* the Etruscan development, and the Etruscan development was restricted to the north and north-east of the Etruscan-speaking area, this is altogether unlikely.

One feature that may perhaps be observable in the inscriptions is that the Etruscan realization of /s#/ may have been ‘stronger’ than in Faliscan, i.e., [s] rather than the Faliscan [h] or [ʔ] (§3.5.7d). Arguments for this may be the following forms: (a) the Etruscoid forms in *-(i)es*, where omission of *-s* is notably less frequent than in the Faliscan forms in /s#/ (§3.5.7d); (b) *morenez* MF **269** and perhaps *acrez* MF/Etr **67**,

which have *-ez* instead of *-es*, perhaps representing a ‘strongly’ realized /s#/ (§3.5.3), although I doubt whether this can be maintained; (c) *larise* MF 270, MLF 371-372, reflecting Etruscan *Laris*, which has been explained by Vetter (1953:317, 325) and Peruzzi (1990:281 n.9) as a form with an epenthetic [-e] or [-ə] following a ‘strongly realized’ /s#, although I would rather regard this form as an accusative *larise(m)* used instead of the nominative (see below).¹⁶⁸

(2) **Morphological features.** On the morphological level, there are several features that have been regarded as Etruscan:

(a) **nominatives in -i.** A number of forms in *-i* have been interpreted as Etruscan feminine forms. In several cases this interpretation is at least possible:

(1) *ca uipi : leueli | filea* MF 14 (Thulin (1907:281-2 (*Cauipi*), Herbig *CIE* 8075, Morandi 1982:58-9): here the interpretation *ca uipi* = *Gauia Uibia* is plausible, also because, if *uipi leueli* is interpreted as a Faliscan genitive, the father is referred to with PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM, which is unique in FILIATION (§7.5 with figs.7.3-4).

(2) *[---]o cicio · cicoi : cupat : ifra* MF 40, where *cicoi* was interpreted as a rendering of an Etruscan feminine **cicui* by G. Giacomelli (1963:84, 1965a): this appears to be a way of avoiding having to assume a genitive in *-oi*, however, since she did not propose this interpretation for any of the other forms *-oi*. I would rather interpret this form as a second-declension genitive (a dative is impossible here): see §4.4.4.

(3) *larise : mar|cna : citiai* MF 270, where *citiai* is regarded as a Faliscan nominative recharacterized with the Etruscan feminine *-i* by Cristofani (1988:18) and Peruzzi (1990:278-81): it can also be interpreted as a dative, or possibly a genitive (§8.10.2).

(4) *[---]qaltai* MF 109, read as *ven]eltvi* by Colonna (1986:172-3) and as *?]eltvi* by Rix (*ET Fa* 2.19).

An Etruscan interpretation is unlikely in the following cases: (1) *titoi |mercui |efiles* MF 113-117 and *titoi : mercui* MF 118-122 (Herbig 1914, 1923); (2) *uolti : catinei* MF 469* (Froehner in Lejeune 1952b:115-6); (3) *caui : tertinei : | posticnu* MLF/Cap 474* (Herbig *CIE* 8339, Vetter 1953:308, Pisani 1964:345); (4) *uolta | ne-roni | ca fi* MF 15 (Pisani 1964 335-6); (5) *serui* MF 34-36 (Herbig *CIE* 814-8016).

(b) **nominatives in -u.** There are also cases where forms in *-u* have been interpreted as Etruscan nominatives in *-u*: in every case, I think that another interpretation or reading is more likely: (1) *[fel]icinatiu* LF 384 (Renzetti Marra 1974:351, Briquel 1972:820, 826, Rix *ET Fa* 2.17), rather a Faliscan genitive plural; (2) *posticnu* MLF 474† (Lejeune 1952b :114-20), rather a Sabellic first-declension nominative; (3) *tuconu* MF 85 (Garucci 1860:270 etc., Vetter 1953:300), but here the Etruscan interpretation appears to be

¹⁶⁸ The forms quoted under (b) and (c) would represent a conscious effort to express in written Faliscan texts a different phonetic realization in spoken Etruscan, which I find hard to believe.

a case of ‘inexplicable, therefore Etruscan’; (4) the *uaria lectio fafariu* in MF 136 (Lejeune (1952b:120 n.1), which is rather to be read as *fafariŋ*, and (5) *ueiŋeto* MLF 464 (reflecting an Etruscan **uei uetu* according to Herbig (CIE 8465)).

(c) *Etruscoid forms in -(i)es/-(i)e*. I have called these forms ‘Etruscoid’ rather than Etruscan since they appear to be Etruscan nominatives that originally arose from Italic forms, those in *-(i)es* perhaps from Italic nominatives in */-os/ and */-ios/ (with a weakening of the vowel within Etruscan itself?),¹⁶⁹ and are therefore the result of a much older contact between Etruscan and the Italic languages: note that they are used indiscriminately for the masculine as well as the feminine. These forms are used as the nominative of women’s names in *fasies* MF 41, *satelie* MF 42, *calitenes* MF 265, *morenez* MF 269, *petrunes* LF 226, *plenes* LtF 231 (and hence apparently used as the basis of a dative in *plenese* Lat 251), and as the nominative of men’s names in *cesi e* MF 257 and *ueneljes* MF 258 (in [---]*ueneljes sapnonia*, where *uenelies* is probably a patronymic adjective ‘son of Venel’ following a man’s name). In other inscriptions, they occur where a genitive of a man’s name is expected in *![[oc]jes* MF 12, *cesies* MF 265: see below under (4) on confusion of cases in Etruscan-Faliscan contact. Form in *-ie(s)* that can be either nominative or genitive occur in *ulties* MF/Etr 64 (without context) and *eco tulie* LF 383 (which can be either *ego* OWNER_{NOM} or *ego* OWNER_{GEN}, see §8.8.2.). Probably a genitive is *açrež* MF 67 if this can in fact be read at all. In Etruscan inscriptions from the area nominatives in *-(i)es* occur in Etr XI-XV, XXVI, XXIX, XXXIV, XXXIX, XLIII, XLV, XLVIII.

In all these cases of ‘Etruscan morphology in Faliscan inscriptions’, it should be noted that the Etruscan form is always the (unmarked) nominative: these forms are therefore not so much instances of morphological interference, but rather of onomastic borrowing, the morpheme being borrowed as part of the form of the name, not as a morpheme. There is no indication that Etruscan morphemes were borrowed into Faliscan: in fact, Etruscan names in *-a* are regularly declined according to the Faliscan first declension, and names such as *Arnθ* and *Larθ* according to the Faliscan third declension (§4.1), as might be expected. If *larise* MF 270, MLF 371-372 is an accusative *larise(m)* (see below under (4)), Etruscan *Laris* appears to have been declined as a consonant-stem¹⁷⁰ instead of being declined according to the Faliscan *i*-stems, which had a nominative in *-is* (§4.5.1.5). Similarly, an Etruscoid form in *-es* apparently constitutes the basis for the dative *plenese* in *[.] · uecilio · l · f · et · plenese | lectu · i* Lat 251.

¹⁶⁹ I doubt whether they can be explained as going back to a Italic *vocatives* in */-(i)e/ (thus Adams 2007:97-100, with literature): this would explain the co-occurrence of *-ie*, *-e*, and *-i* in Etruscan, but does not explain the *-s* unless this is regarded as a subsequent recharacterization of these forms within Etruscan (after the Italic nominative?).

¹⁷⁰ Note that the Latin gentilicium *Larisius* is apparently derived in the same way.

(3) *Lexical features.* Lexically, there is very little that can be ascribed to Etruscan. A possible interferential form is Etruscan *puia* read by Vetter (1953:305) in MF 144, [.?]a*ia | *lepuia* | *uoltilia*. Although difficult for other reasons, this interpretation is not unlikely in view of the great number of Etruscan sepulchral inscriptions where the woman is designated with the word *puia*: the inscription may have been written by an Etruscan who thought in the terms of the Etruscan sepulchral formula (a case of Etruscan being ‘psychologically dominant’). Its occurrence within a formula might imply that the word is interferential and not a borrowing. Perhaps Etruscan, but unexplained, is *eitam* EF/Etr 5 (cf. below under (4)).

Possibly a borrowing rather than an inferential form (judging by the fact that the word also occurs in Latin) is the word *clipeus/clipeum* that underlies the *Berufsgentiliz Clipearius*, occurring in *clipeaio* (*clipea<v>io?*) MF 470*, *clipiar[io]* LF 230, *clipear[io]* LtF 231, and *cl[i]peario* LtF 233. Pace Bréyer (1993:341-2), Faliscan *cela* in MF 12, 83, 84, and MLF 285 = Latin *cella* is in my view not a borrowing from Etruscan, but rather a Latin-Faliscan word that occurs as an interferential form in two Etruscan inscriptions *vel : aties : velθurus : lemnioa : celati : ceṣu* Ta 1.66 and *cela : sal : θn* Vc 0.40 instead of the normal word *suθi/suθi/suθi*.

To these instances must be added Radke’s (1965:138) hybrid *huti[p]ilom* ‘four-fold’ in EF 1, from Etruscan *huθ* + Latin *-plum* (?), and Pisani’s (1964:341) verb *ipice* in MLF 309 and 315, from an Etruscan *ipi* ‘urn’ + Etruscan third singular active past tense *-ce*. Neither of these is acceptable, especially the former: cf. §1.3.1.2.

(4) *Syntactic features: confusion of the cases.* A syntactic feature that may be ascribed to Faliscan-Etruscan contacts is that in several inscriptions there appears to be a confusion of the cases. The clearest instance, in my view, is the use of the accusative for the nominative. I have assumed this in the cases of *arute* in *arute macena* | *morenez* MF 269 and of *larise* in *larise : mar||cna : citiai* MF 270, and *larise uicina* MLF 371 and *larise* | *uicina* MLF 372. These forms have been explained by Vetter (1953:316-7, 325) as containing an epenthetic *-e* [-e] or [-ə] marking a ‘strong’ pronunciation of a word-final consonant that in Faliscan was pronounced so weakly that it could be omitted in writing: in the case of *arute*, the cluster /nt#/, in the case of *larise*, a ‘strongly realized’ /s#/. In my view these forms are better explained as *aru(n)te(m)* and *larise(m)*, that is, as third-declension accusatives with omission of *-m* that also occurred in the accusative of the second declension, *uino* MF 59-60 (§3.5.7a). Since in the nominal forms Etruscan made no morphological distinction between the nominative and the accusative (Rix 1984:211, Steinbauer 1999:167-70), it is quite possible that these forms were confused in the contact with an Italic language where this distinction was made. Such a confusion might also underly the ‘isolated accusative’ *eitam* EF/Etr 5 and other such isolated accusatives occurring in Latin *mirquios alixentrom* CIL I².553 and *diouem prosepnai* CIL I².558 from Praeneste, in

Praesamnitic *te·cliia·m* Ps 16-17, and in Oscan *spuriieis culcfnam* Cm 27. All these forms can be ascribed to Etruscan influence, although other explanations, such as elipsis of a verb, have been proposed (see §8.2.3). If this is the correct explanation, the writers of these inscriptions may be assumed to have been bilinguals with Etruscan as their first language: see also §9.2.4 for other indications for this.

In two other instances, there appears to have been a confusion of nominative and genitive, namely *cauio : pauiceo* | *[[oc]ies : cela* MF 12, apparently ‘the tomb of Gavius Pavicius, son of Lucius’, and *poplia : calitenes* | *aronto : cesies* | *lartio : uxor* MF 265, apparently ‘Publia Calidenia, wife of Arruns Caesius son of Lars’. In the latter case, Peruzzi (1964c:337) suggested that the confusion is due to the Etruscoid form *cesies*, as such forms can be used both for the nominative and for the genitive (see above under (2c)); Pisani’s (1964:337) suggested that it might have arisen from the fact that in FILIATION both the genitive and the patronymic adjective could be used. An additional factor may be Unfortunately, neither solution explains MF 12, where the fault lies not so much in *[[oc]ies* as in *cauio : pauiceo*. It is possible, however, that the two lines of this inscription in fact belong to separate inscriptions. These cases show writers who were uncertain of the use of the cases, which implies that they were bilinguals with Etruscan as first language and an incomplete command of Faliscan.

Related to this point might be the use of dedications where the name of the deity is expressed in the genitive (*apolonos* EF 10, *loifirtato* MF 31, *loifirtato* MF 32): the relative frequency of this type of dedication might be due to the way the genitive was used in Etruscan: see §8.11.1.

(5) *Textual/formulaic features.* A feature of Faliscan inscriptions that is clearly of Etruscan origin are the *iscrizioni parlanti*-formulas, which reflect Etruscan models both in the *Besitzerinschriften*-formulas *ego* OWNER_{GEN} *eko lartos* EF 6 and *eko kaisiosio* EF 7, OWNER_{GEN} *ego* in *aḡmiosio eqo* EF? 467*, *ego* POSSESSION_{GEN} OWNER_{GEN} in *eco quto *e uotenosio* EF 3, *ego* OWNER_{NOM} in *eco tulie* LF 383, OWNER_{NOM} *ego* in *m adicio eco* LF 378 (§8.8.2), and in the signature-formula MAKER_{NOM} *me* MAKE_{3RD PF} in *tele*[1-2] med fīfiked* EF 9 and *oufīlo : clipeaio : letei : fileo : met : facet* MF 470* and *mama z[e]xtos : med f[.f]iqod* EF 1 (§8.9.2). However, the Faliscan adaptations of these formulas show that, where necessary, Etruscan models with a word order that was alien to Faliscan were either remodelled to suit the Faliscan word order, or that a choice was made for the Etruscan variant that most closely resembled Faliscan word order (see §8.8.2 and §8.9.2). Yet the Etruscan formulas form a feature that could be regarded as an Etruscan borrowing in Faliscan.

Apart from the formulas, most of the Etruscan influence in the Faliscan inscriptions appears to be connected with onomastic borrowing. The same is true the other way round: although Faliscan in all probability was the ‘standard language’ (or even the ‘dominant language’) of the area (§9.1), there are virtually no Faliscan features in the

Etruscan inscriptions from the area, apart from onomastic borrowing: *lar*s ruvries* Etr **XIX** from Narce, *anae lauvcies* Etr **XXIX** and perhaps *cnav**es* (?) Etr **XXVI** from Civita Castellana, *vultasi* Etr **XLII** from Vignanello, *hvulve:s* Etr **XLVIII** perhaps from Mazzano Romano, *cavies : uhtav[---]* Etr **XLV** from Lucus Feroniae. Apart from this, I argued (§6.2.8) that the occasional occurrence of *cela* in Etruscan inscriptions may be explained as an interferential form due to Etruscan-Latin or Etruscan-Faliscan contact in South Etruria or even the ager Faliscus itself.

9.2.3. Etruscan-speaking groups in the ager Faliscus. As discussed in §9.2.2, the Faliscan inscriptions contain several linguistic features that can be ascribed to Etruscan, and to these can be added many onomastic features (§7.10.3). There are, however, two groups of inscriptions that contain more than the usual number of Etruscan features and can be said to be more ‘Etruscan’ than other inscriptions.

The first of these groups has been treated by Peruzzi (1964c, 1990) and consists of the sepulchral inscriptions from Corchiano. Since Corchiano was deserted as a result of the war of 241-240 (§2.6.2), these inscriptions are probably from before this date.¹⁷¹ The inscriptions are presented together here. With each inscription I have also indicated whether it was scratched or painted: as said in §11.1.4. *Ic*, scratching instead of painting occurs in only 17 inscriptions, appears to have been limited to the northern ager Faliscus, and is in many cases connected with Etruscan linguistic features.

(a) from tomb 11 of the second necropolis of Il Vallone:

aruz : cesje : aruto MF **257** (scratched)

[---] *ueneljes : sapnonia* MF **258** (scratched)

Aruz and *aruto* represent *aru(n)s* and *aru(n)to(s)*, where the Etruscan praenomen clearly shows adaptation to Faliscan morphology (§4.5.1, §4.5.3): note that both the father and the son have the same Etruscan praenomen (§7.10.4-5). The gentilicium *cesje* has an Etruscoid ending in *-ie(s)* and recurs in two inscriptions from tomb 11 (below). The interpretation of *ueneljes* is unclear (see §9.2.2.2c): it is an Etruscoid form in *-ies* that appears to have been used as a patronymic adjective. *Sapnonia* is a name that has no parallels elsewhere, but looks as if it is adapted from an Etruscan name **Sap()nu*.

(b) from tomb 7 of the first necropolis of S. Antonio:

poplia : calitenes | aronto : cesies | lartio : uxor MF **265** (painted)

ueltur · tetena | aruto MF **266** (scratched)

larθ : ceises | velusa Etr **XXXIV** (scratched)

¹⁷¹ Peruzzi (1990) used the gentilicia to trace several of the *gentes* whose members were buried at Corchiano to the area around Chiusi. I have voiced some general misgivings against this method in §7.1.1: note that several of the individuals have typically Faliscan praenomina.

Calitenes, *cesies*, and *ceises* are ‘Etruscoid’ nominatives. The gentilicium *calitenes* may be derived from an Etruscan toponymic adjective **Calite*, but the (Etruscan?) toponym **Cali/Cale* from which this is derived may be local, if it is in fact the old name of modern Gallese (§7.8.1.35, §6.5.7). With the exception of *poplia*, all the praenomina are Etruscan (§7.7.2), although *aronto* and *aruto* show adaptation to Faliscan morphology (§4.1). The first inscription shows a man’s name with FILIATION added, which in the marital formula HUSBAND_{GEN} UXOR is unique (§7.4.2). The use of the nominative *lartio* instead of the genitive may be due to these unique circumstances, or it may reflect a confusion over the cases (§9.2.3.4). The writer shows a lack of knowledge both of the correct use of the Faliscan formulas and of the cases, implying that Faliscan may not have been his or her first language. For the gentilicium *Tettena*, see below under (f).

(c) from tomb 28 of the second necropolis of S. Antonio:

arute macena | *morenez* MF 269 (scratched).

larise : *mar*||*cna* : *citiai* MF 270 (scratched).

poplia | *zuconia* MF 271 (scratched)

Arute and *larise* are probably accusatives *arute(m)* and *larise(m)* used as a nominative (§9.2.2.4). *Macena* and *mar*||*cna* both represent *Marcena*: the omission of syllable-final *r* in *macena* also occurs in several Faliscan inscriptions (§3.5.7b); the form *mar*||*cna* may be due to syncopation (§3.6.6) or a graphic shortening. *Morenez* is an Etruscoid form in *-es*: the *-z* may indicate the ‘strong’ realization of /s#/ in Etruscan (§9.2.2.1). *Citiai* is in my view a dative or a genitive (§8.10.2): both Cristofani (1988:18) and Pisani (1990:280) regard it as a Faliscan nominative *citia* recharacterized with the Etruscan ending *-i*, however. *Zuconia* is an adaptation of the Etruscan gentilicium *Zuxu* according to the usual pattern *-u* → *-onius* (§7.8.2.4). The Etruscan gentilicium also occurs at Corchiano, in *larisa zuxus* Etr XXXII (late sixth century): the Faliscan form is found at Civita Castellana in *uel zu[con]||eo* MF 56.

(d) found on the site of the Rio Fratta necropolis:

cauio : *nomes*||*ina* : *maxomo* | *zeruatronia* MF 272 (scratched)

Nomesina is Etruscan and has a non-rhotacized *s* (§3.5.3), but the *o* is a (graphical or phonological) adaptation to Faliscan. The praenomen *cauio* is the most frequently used praenomen in the Faliscan inscriptions (§7.7.2.1): the cognomen, too, is Faliscan, and recurs in several Faliscan inscriptions (§7.9.1). *Zeruatronia* is also Etruscan, but is adapted according to the usual pattern *-u* → *-onius* (§7.8.2.4) This name shows the use of *z-* that may be due to Etruscan influence (§3.5.3).

(e) from Corchiano, details unknown:

cauio : *oufilio* | *uolteo* MF 275 (scratched)

ceisio : *oufilio* | *uoltheo* MF 276 (scratched)

These inscriptions are the most ‘Faliscan’ of the sepulchral inscriptions from Corchiano. The only Etruscan feature is the use of θ in MF 276, for which see §3.5.3.

A similar group can be found in the inscriptions from Civita Castellana. This group, too, has been the subject of a publication by Peruzzi (1964b).

(f) from a tomb in the Valsiarosa necropolis:

fas[i]es : c[ai]sia || louci : teti : uxor and louria || [l]oifirta MF 41

cauia : satelie | caui : felicinate | uxor MF 42

In MF 41 the woman has a gentilicium *fas[i]es* with an Etruscoid ending (§9.2.2.2c): the gentilicium *precedes* the praenomen, an order that is unique for the Faliscan onomasticon. The names of the husband are Italic, unless *Tettius* is an adaptation of *Tetena*, which occurs in the group from Corchiano (above). In the second inscription, too, the woman has a gentilicium with an Etruscoid ending, *satelie*. The gentilicium of her husband is of Etruscan origin, *felicinate* = *Feliginatis*, derived from a toponym **Feligin-* that may well be identical with Umbrian *Fulginium/Fulginiae*, modern Foligno (§7.8.1.59, §6.5.9). Both have the praenomen *Gauia/Gaius*, which is the most frequent praenomen in the Faliscan inscriptions (§7.7.2.1).

The third inscription from this tomb is very damaged. If the two tiles are to be read as belonging together, it may read *uene[---]na · ux[or ---]* MF 43, which could show an attestation of an Etruscan praenomen *Venel*, although the *ux[* seems to point to the sepulchral inscription of a woman buried without her husband (§7.4.2.).

Taken together, these inscriptions show a number of Etruscan features, some even unique, probably pointing to writers whose first language was Etruscan and whose command of Faliscan was not perfect, as is shown by uncertainties about the use of cases and of formulas. Whether they were in fact (recent) immigrants is in my view unclear: although the gentilicia of the people appearing in the texts are mostly Etruscan, and the proportion of Etruscan praenomina is unusually high, especially among the group from Corchiano (cf. §7.10.5), the inscriptions also contain Faliscan praenomina, and the general tendency to adapt Etruscan gentilicia to Faliscan morphology.¹⁷²

9.3. Faliscan and the Sabellic languages

9.3.1. The nature of Faliscan-Sabellic contact. Contact between the agri Faliscus and Capenas on the west bank of the Tiber and the Sabellic-speaking areas on the east bank may well have been regular, and certainly involved contact connected with trade

¹⁷² Peruzzi (1964b-c, 1990) repeatedly points to the unadapted gentilicia in *-na*, but although these *could* be adapted, they very often were not: see §7.8.2.2.

and transhumance pasture, as can be established by archaeological evidence (§2.1.3). The shrine of Lucus Feroniae in the ager Capenas may have drawn worshippers from Sabellic-speaking areas (§9.3.2), although Feronia seems to have been a mainly Latin deity. The story of the *Hirpi Sorani* (§2.3.4) may even reflect small-scale migrations from these Sabellic-speaking areas: I cannot see any evidence of large-scale migrations, certainly not during the historic period (§2.4.2, §2.8.2). Neither are there any indications of conflict between the ager Faliscus and Sabellic-speaking areas on the east bank or signs of mutual cooperation in the wars against Rome. Although Sabellic-speaking peoples figure prominently in the Roman and Greek historians' accounts of Roman history, they play no role in the history of South Etruria. As said in §2.1.1, the Tiber constituted not only a geographical boundary, but also a boundary between the political networks on either bank.

Yet the Faliscan and Capenate inscriptions show gentilicia of Sabellic origin, either recognizable by their derivation or assumed to be Sabellic because they have parallels only in Sabellic texts. Examples are *Aiedius*, *Alliuaeus*, *Battius*, *Blaesius*, *Clanidius*, *Didius*, *Fertorius*, *Hirpius*, *Marhius*, *Neronius*, *Pacius*, *Pescennius*, *Petronius*, *Plarius*, *Pumponius* (?), *Sedius*/*Saedius*/*Saidius*, and perhaps also *Tettius* and *Vinucius* (?): cf. §7.8.1-2. Other gentilicia refer to geographical features that belong to the east bank of the Tiber (cf. §7.8.2.5 and §6.5): *Feliginas* (probably derived from the Umbrian town *Fulginium/Fulginiae*), *Umbricius* and *Umbricianus*, *Fa(r)farn...* (perhaps connected with the name of the Sabine-Latin *Farfarus/Fabaris*), and *Narionius* (possibly connected with the name of the Sabine *Nar*). Taken together, these onomastic data could indicate that the Faliscan-Capenate area contained a number of families that originated in the Sabellic-speaking areas.

Sabellic epigraphic and linguistic features in inscriptions from the agri Faliscus and Capenas (§9.3.3) are found predominantly in the ager Capenas. This may be due to any of the following: (a) travel between the Sabellic-speaking area and the agri Faliscus and Capenas may have used the Tiber-crossing near Lucus Feroniae rather than the one near Grotta Porciosa; (b) trade routes may originally have followed the old Via Tiberina, which may have run *east* of Mount Soracte rather than entering the ager Faliscus proper (cf. G. Jones 1962:201), a situation that changed only with the construction of the Via Flaminia in 220; (c) the network of ancient transhumance routes (*tratturi*) may have passed through the ager Capenas and the area south of the Lago di Bracciano rather than through the ager Faliscus with its steep gorges.

9.3.2. Sabellic features in Faliscan and Capenate inscriptions. In a previous publication, I summarized the Sabellic features in the Capenate inscriptions in one footnote (Bakkum 1996:4 n.4), and although the discussion here can be allowed some more space, it is still true that the Faliscan and Capenate texts in fact contain little that can be ascribed to the Sabellic languages. I concentrate on the linguistic features: the epi-

graphical features have been discussed extensively by Briquel (1972:813-45) and Marinetti (1982b), both of whom have shown that the writing especially in the ager Capenas shows a number of features that can only be ascribed to Sabellic background.

Two inscriptions in my *corpus* can be regarded as entirely Sabellic, showing Sabellic features in the shape and type of the letters used (cf. Rix 1992a, Briquel 1972:831-3), as well as in their onomastic and linguistic features. The first is *setoms : miom | face* Sab 480†, showing the Sabellic development of the cluster /pt/ in *setoms* (* /sehtomo- / ← Proto-Italic * /septomo- /, cf. Meiser 1986:93), in the *Endsilbensynkope* in *setoms*, and in the forms *miom* (cf. §4.7.2) and *face* (cf. §5.2.1.6): not surprisingly, it is classed as *paläoumbrisch* in *ST* (Um 4). The second is *paqwis blaisiis* Sab 468*, with the Sabellic names *paqwis* (§7.7.1.47) and *blaisiis* (§7.8.1.29) and *Endsilbenkürzung* in *paqwis* and *blaisiis*. Strangely, this inscription has not been included in *ST*. However, it is far from certain that these two inscriptions reflect Faliscan-Sabellic language contact: the first is from the La Tolfa area and was connected with Faliscan because it contains the ‘arrow-*f*’, ↑, which may not have been exclusively Faliscan (§11.2.2.2), while the latter, ascribed by Buonamici (1928:605-6) to South Etruria, is *originis incertae* or *ignotae*. However, both inscriptions *do* illustrate the early Sabellic linguistic presence in the larger area of South Etruria.

Other inscriptions, whose provenance is more certain, are not wholly Sabellic, and may reflect Faliscan-Sabellic language contact. Epigraphically, this is reflected e.g. by the use of *i* in *atnuiplau...* Cap 423 (Briquel 1972:833 n.2) and in *a · irpios · esú* Cap 389 (Briquel 1972:833-7). In the former inscription, it is apparently used as the second element of a diphthong, in the latter, it represents (Sabellic?) /e/. The *ú* appears in *a · irpios · esú* Cap 389, in *k · sares · esú* Cap 404, and in *açiuaiom* or *aliuaiom esú* Cap 465, where it represents (Sabellic?) /o/ (cf. Briquel 1972:833-7). Of the names in these inscriptions, *irpios* is clearly Sabellic (§7.8.1.74), while *sares* has parallels in Latin and in Vestinian (§7.8.1.137): *aliuaiom* may be derived from the Sabellic gentilicium *Allis* (§7.8.1.11).

Linguistic features that can be linked with Sabellic languages are few. Faliscan had some phonological developments that have parallels in the Sabellic languages, such as the word-internal development of the voiced aspirates (§3.3.3) and monophthongization of the diphthongs (§3.7), but these can hardly be ascribed as due to contacts with speakers of Sabellic languages: note that the monophthongization of the diphthongs in Umbrian and Volscian may not have been contemporary with the developments in Faliscan.

Morphophonologically, there are a few forms that *can* conceivably be described as Sabellic. A first-declension nominative with the Sabellic rounding of /-ā/ to /-ō/ (§4.2.1) may be attested in *posticnu* MLF/Cap 474*, which has a parallel only in South Picene *postiknam* CH.2, and possibly also in *sta sediu* Cap 466, if this is a

woman's name corresponding to Latin *Sedia/Saedia/Saidia*: note that the name *Saedi-us/Saidius* has a parallel in Oscan *saidiieis* Cp 9. Similarly, *k · sares · esú* Cap 404 may contain a second-declension nominative singular in *-es*, reflecting an ending **/-ios/ → /-is/* with the Sabellic *Endsilbensynkope*. It could also be an Etruscoid nominative in *-es*, however (cf. §9.2.2). The same interpretation can be given to *aiedies* in *k · pa · aiedies · Cap 390*. The *Endsilbensynkope* has also been read in *partis* MF 79, but this may be a case of incidental syncopation, which occurs also in Latin (*uibis pilipus* CIL I².552, *mirquris* CIL I².563, *caecilis* CIL I².1028).

Morphologically, there is the form *esú* that occurs in *a · irpios · esú* Cap 389, *k · sares · esú* Cap 404, and *açiuaiom* (or *açiuaiom*) *esú* Cap 465. This form corresponds to South Picene *esom* TE.4 and Praesamnitic *esum* Ps 4, 5, Hernician *esu* He 3, and Umbrian *esu* Um 18, but it also occurs in *pari med esom kom meois sokiois* in the Garigliano inscription and in *morai ešo[m]* from the ager Signinus. In §5.2.1.5 it is assumed that it may have existed in Latin as well as in the Sabellic languages, and that its occurrence in the ager Capenas can therefore be ascribed to either language: on the other hand, the Capenate inscriptions where this form occurs show other Sabellic features as well. If the form is purely Sabellic, it is an important indication for the presence of speakers of Sabellic, as the form for 'I am' may be regarded as standing on a far deeper level of the language than the other features discussed here, implying interference and borrowing also on other levels (cf. §1.3.2.2).

There may, however, be another reason for the occurrence of *esú(m)* in these inscriptions: in all three instances, this form occurs in *iscrizioni parlanti*-formulas: *açiuaiom* (or *açiuaiom*) *esú* Cap 465 in OWNER_{GEN} *esúm*, *a · irpios · esú* Cap 389 in OWNER_{NOM} *esúm*, and *k · sares · esú* Cap 404 either in OWNER_{GEN} *esúm* or in OWNER_{NOM} *esúm*, depending on the interpretation of *sares*. The type OWNER_{GEN} *esúm* is probably of Sabellic origin (Agostiniani 1982:261-2): the type OWNER_{NOM} *esúm* I ascribed to the replacement of the formulas by this type by a new type of Latin *sum*-formulas (§8.8.2). The verb form *esú(m)* may therefore be present in these Capenate inscriptions because it was (at least in the mind of the individuals who wrote these inscriptions) the form that was the proper one to use in this formula.

Syntactically, there are very few data apart from these formulaic texts with *esú(m)*. The Faliscan sepulchral formula *hec cupat/cupant* has some indirect parallels in the Sabellic inscriptions (§8.10.1), but can certainly not be regarded as due to linguistic influence from Sabellic-speaking areas: if anything, it is due to the Etruscan formula *θui cesu*, but even that is uncertain. In the area of filiation formulas there is *k · pa · aiedies · Cap 390*, which may reflect the Umbrian-Volscian filiation formula where the father's name is placed after the praenomen instead of after the gentilicium, 'K. Aiedius son of Pa.' (cf. §7.5). Note that both the gentilicium *aiedies* and the praenomen *pa* = *Pacius* are Sabellic.

On the lexical level, the words *posticnu* in MLF/Cap 474*, allegedly from Falerii Novi, and *pesco(m)* in Torelli's (1974:741-6) reading of Cap 431 from Lucus Feroniae (see below for the complete texts) can be regarded as forms that are probably due to interference from a Sabellic language, for these words have parallels only in South Picene *postiknam* CH.2 and in Marsian *pesco* VM 5 respectively and show Sabellic phonological features (*-/ā/ rounded to -u in *posticnu*, *pesco(m)* ← */perk-sk-om/?). If the interpretations *posticnu* 'statue' and *pesco(m)* = 'votive offering' are correct, the words denote the inscribed objects themselves, and are the central 'theme' of their respective inscriptions; also, in both cases the inscription may be thought of as having been phrased carefully.

I would say that, although Faliscan-Sabellic language contact may well have been frequent, the linguistic data point to a discernible Sabellic presence but to little actual 'influence'. A number of families in the area may have been of Sabellic descent, but Sabellic languages do not appear to have entered the area with any great effect. This may imply that speakers of Sabellic languages who settled in the area did so as individuals or in small groups, not in large-scale migrations. The linguistic features that can be ascribed to Sabellic languages are all from a few inscriptions: *a · irpios · esú* Cap 389, *k · sares · esú* Cap 404, *atnuiplau...* Cap 423, *açiuaiom* (or *alïuaiom*) *esú* Cap 465, *sta sediu* Cap 466, and these may reflect *individuals* of Sabellic origin rather than an overall 'Sabellic presence'. However, there are two exceptions to this picture:

(a) *caui : tertinei : | posticnu* MLF 474† (reputedly from Falerii Novi, and therefore most likely dating from after 240): the inscription is written in the Latin alphabet, the praenomen is the most frequently occurring Faliscan praenomen, the gentilicium has a parallel in *tertineo* LF 213 but is not attested elsewhere, but the word *posticnu* is paralleled only by the much earlier South Picene *postiknam* CH.2.

(b) *pesco şal | plaria · t · l | feron · dono || [q]uod · a[fluc] | dedet · libes | m · mereto* Cap 431 in Torelli's (1974:741-6) reading (from Lucus Feroniae, second half of the third century): the inscription is Latin both in the epigraphic and in the linguistic features, the gentilicium *plaria* may be Sabellic or Latin, but the word *pesco* has a parallel only in Marsian *pesco* VM 5.

9.4. Faliscan and Latin

9.4.1. The nature of Faliscan-Latin contact. The contact between Faliscan and Latin must of course be divided into two periods: (1) the period before 240, when the ager Faliscus was an independent geopolitical unit belonging to Etruria, and (2) the period after 240, when the area came under Roman rule as a consequence of the disastrous war of 241 (§2.6).

Establishing the nature of the Faliscan-Latin contacts *before* 241 is difficult. The Roman and Greek sources concentrate almost exclusively on the wars that Rome fought with the Faliscans from the late fifth century onwards (§2.5). These wars must of course have involved contacts in the form of envoys, truces, treaties, etc. (Livy (5.27) even portrays Faliscan envoys as speaking before the Roman senate), but will not have been influential in bringing Roman Latin to the area: on the contrary, they may have strengthened Faliscan ethnic identity and perhaps even have incited ‘anti-Roman’ or ‘anti-Latin’ feelings, especially as during this period the Faliscans always sided with their Etruscan allies. Other forms of contact must have existed, however. It can be assumed that there was contact in the form of trade up and down the course of the Lower Tiber along the ancient Via Tiberina, as well as along the precursor of the Via Amerina (§2.1.3); also, from the early fourth century onward, there were Roman colonies at nearby Sutrium, Nepete, and Capena (§2.5.2). Several inscriptions in the Latin alphabet have been found at Civita Castellana and Corchiano (see §9.4.2), towns that were wholly or partly abandoned after the war of 241-240, and these inscriptions may therefore well belong to the period before 240. Interesting in this respect is the fourth-century strigilis with *med · loucilios · feced* Lat **268** from Corchiano, which is clearly Latin, but contains a unique word order that must be due to the Etruscan model *mini zinace* MAKER_{NOM} (cf. §8.9.2), perhaps implying that it was made in a largely Etruscan-speaking environment, even though the name of the craftsman is Latin.

Traffic from Rome and Latium may have passed through the ager Faliscus and thence to the Sabine and Umbrian interior long before the Romans gained control of the Tiber-crossing near the Grotta Porciosa site after the war of 241. The Roman adoption of the *carmina Fescennina* may also have belonged to this period, especially if Fescennium is identified with Narce, as Narce ceased to exist shortly after the war of 241 (§2.1.2). Other allegedly Faliscan features in Roman society, such as the *ius fetiale* and the additions to the *lex XII Tabularum* (§2.3.3, §2.3.1), if not fictitious, may have been adopted during the same period: even if this attribution is entirely fictitious, it reflects at least a memory of contacts between Rome and the ager Faliscus.

Contact with Latium and Rome, although hard to pin down, may well have been quite frequent. This is implied by the fact that during the fifth, fourth and early third centuries several important morphological changes took place that affected both Latin and Faliscan: the replacement of *-osio* by *-i* (§4.4.9) and probably also the replacement of *-as* by *-ai* (§4.2.2), and the replacement of the old third singular perfect ending *-ed* by a new ending *-et* (§5.2.4e). The spread of such replacements, whether originating from Latium, Rome, or the ager Faliscus, cannot have been accomplished without fairly frequent contacts. It may even have been the case that parts of South Etruria were originally Latin-speaking, and by and large remained so even though the written language of the area was Etruscan (cf. §2.4.2) during the earlier centuries of this period.

The contact during the period *after* 240 is a different question. I have already pointed at the changes that affected the area in §2.6.2, whereby the area was ‘ruralized’ and its main site replaced by a new Roman settlement. It can be assumed that there was a substantial Roman or Latin presence in the area from shortly after this war onward. If, as the sources imply, a large part of the male indigenous Faliscan population had perished in the war (§2.6.1), and were in effect replaced by the speakers of Latin that now *settled* in the area, not only in the new Roman Falerii, but also on the lands that had been ceded to the Romans, this must have changed the proportion of speakers of Faliscan vs. speakers of Latin substantially. If I assume a population for the area of perhaps 20,000-22,500 people at best, of which several thousands (hardly the 15,000 named in the sources, but, say, 5,000) die in the war, and an influx of perhaps 6,000 immigrants (for these numbers see §2.7*e-f* with notes 30-31), this means that over a quarter of the population of the area was in effect replaced by speakers of Latin.

Even more importantly, the administration of the area and especially of its main site now came in Roman hands. In how far this meant that Roman Latin became the ‘standard language’ is unclear: although it will have become the language of the administration of the Roman parts of the area, the Romans, especially at this period, nowhere seem to have exercised a ‘language policy’ of forcing people to adopt Latin (Bakkum 1985). The inscriptions on public works from Falerii Novi offer a rather confused picture: one, LF **213**, is in the Faliscan alphabet and shows Faliscan features, but another, LtF **215**, which may likewise have been a public inscription, is in the Latin alphabet. The second-century public dedications Lat **216-217** are Latin. In LF/Lat **214** the alphabet is Faliscan, but the language can be Latin as well as Faliscan.

The ruling class of Falerii Novi may have consisted of local families who could be trusted not to work against the interests of Rome (§2.6.2), and the inscriptions show that the members of the new upper class assumed e.g. the Roman use of the *cur-sus honorum* in their sepulchral inscriptions (§9.4.2), dropped the use of the patronymic gentilicium in favour of the alternative FATHER_{GEN} [SON/DAUGHTER] which was the formula used in Latium (§7.5), and started to give their children Latin praenomina that soon replaced the old Faliscan ones (§7.10.5).

All in all, the contacts with (Roman) Latin during the period after 240 lead to a quite speedy disappearance of Faliscan as a written language. The reasons for this have been discussed in §2.8.3, and more will be said on the subject in the next section.

9.4.2. Latin features in Faliscan inscriptions. For the purposes of this study I have divided the inscriptions in the Latin alphabet from the area into three groups: Latino-Faliscan, Capenate, and Latin, the first two defined as still containing dialect features that are in accordance with the linguistic features of the Faliscan inscriptions, the last term used to denote the inscriptions that show no such features (§11.1.3). The only author to treat these inscriptions together is Safarewicz (1955:184-90).

Inscriptions in the Latin alphabet have been found throughout the area. From Civita Castellana are LtF **63**, **140**, **170-174**, **205**, and perhaps also MF/LtF **21**, and from Corchiano and surroundings LtF **277-278**, **288**, **290**, **292**, **294**, **299-301**. Of these, LtF **140**, **170-174**, **288**, and **299-301** are sepulchral inscriptions and therefore not likely to have been written anywhere else. Some may even predate the war of 241, as Civita Castellana and Corchiano were abandoned not long after that date (§2.6.2). From (near) S. Maria di Falleri (Falerii Novi) are MLF/LtF **241**, LtF **215**, **231-233** (sepulchral), **239**, and MF? **254**, and from the site at Grotta Porciosa, which survived into the Roman period, LtF **340-345**. Other inscriptions in the Latin alphabet are LtF **325-327** from Carbognano-Vallerano and LtF **328** from Fabbri di Roma, settlements that may have been located in the part of the ager Faliscus that was not ceded to the Romans. Inscriptions in the Latin alphabet are therefore found both in the Roman-administrated part and in the part that was still nominally independent.

Apart from the alphabet, the inscriptions show several other features that do not occur in the contemporary Faliscan inscriptions. On the phonological level, the diphthongs usually show non-monophthongized spelling: beside the already mentioned *loucilios* Lat **268** there is *fourios* Lat **216**, *claudia* Lat **393** (but *polae* Lat **251**), *heic* LtF **231**, *eidus* Lat **393** (beside the late *idem* Lat **456** and the obviously historically motivated spellings *loidos* Lat **217**, *coiraueront* Lat **218**, *coer* Lat **456**): the old diphthong /ai/ is spelled as *e* in *pretod* LF/Lat **214** and *leuia* LtF **327**, however.

A morphophonological feature is the form of the ending of second-declension nominative singular. Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions almost universally show this ending as *-o* (§4.3.1, §3.5.7d) and the Latino-Faliscan and Capenate inscriptions likewise have *-o* in [---]ilio LtF **215**, *cl[i]peario* LtF **233**, *coņeo* LtF **290**, *munio* LtF **377**, and *genucilio* Cap **434** (§4.3.1). The oldest Latin inscriptions from the area have *-os* in *loucilios* Lat **268** and *fourios* Lat **216**, but from the late third century onwards, they generally have *-us*: *spurilius* Lat **237**, *spurilius* Lat **238**, *calpurnius* Cap **432**, [---]rcius Lat **436**, *egnatius* Lat **291**, *latrius* Lat **218**, *u]mpricius* and [?]aburcus Lat **219**, *fuluius* Lat **250** (106), *didius* and *uettius* Lat **456** (c.100-50). Lat **251** has *lectu(s)* (twice). The change of /o/ to /u/ in closed final syllables (§3.6.6) is attested for the area only in the inscriptions in the Latin alphabet¹⁷³ and in [fel]jcinatiu LF **384**, but not in the Late Faliscan inscriptions. With regard to the writing or omission of *-s*, I have assumed in §3.5.7d that this may represent different orthographical conventions rather than different realizations of /s#: in Faliscan as well as in third- and second-century Latin, /s#/ was ‘weakly’ realized as [h] or [ʔ], but whereas in Latin the rule seems to have been to write the *-s*, its omission in Faliscan may have been due to a convention *not* to write it (§3.5.7d).

¹⁷³ Cf. also *donom* Cap **431** and *esú* Cap **389**, **404**, **464**, vs. *sacru(m)* and *cuncaptum* LF/Lat **214**, *gonlegium*, *aciptum*, and *opiparum* Lat **217**, and *donum* Lat **218**.

In other respects, such as morphology, lexicon, and syntax, there are very few points of comparison between the inscriptions that can be thought of as representing Latin and the Faliscan inscriptions. This is due to the fact that the Latin presence in the area brought with it whole new ways of phrasing specific types of inscriptions. Thus, public dedications on bronze now appear, such Lat **217**, Lat **218**, and the curious Late Faliscan or Latin text *menerua · sacru | la · cotena · la · f · pretod · de | zenatuo · sententiad · uootum | dedet · cuando · datu · rected | cuncaptum* LF/Lat **214**. The same change can be observed in the roadside inscriptions that (presumably) mention magistrates responsible for their construction or maintenance: the Faliscan type consisted exclusively of names (MLF **207**, **210**, Etr **XXXVIII**, **XXXIX**), and this is reflected in the Latino-Faliscan *c**(*)coṇeo · l***(*) · ce · pau[ceo · ru?]so* LtF **290**. A more Latin type appears in *c · egnatius · s[ex ·]fprata | faciunda · coirauit* Lat **291**.

This same change in repertoire shows up in the Faliscan sepulchral inscriptions, that now start to contain *cursus honorum* in LF **242**, **243**, **245**, **247**, **248**, **249**, LtF **231**, **232**, (and perhaps LtF **233**), Lat **237**, **238**, **239** (and Lat **219**?) which is a feature that properly belongs to the roadside tombs and monuments of Latium, but quite inappropriate for the sealed-off Faliscan family tombs (§11.1.4.1). These inscriptions show words like *quaestor*, *praetor*, *ensor*, and formulas like *magistratum gero* that have parallels in Latin. As was said in §6.3.6, the lexical subset pertaining to public office and the like is entirely Latin. This is of course not because Faliscan did not have words for magistracies or formulas for official expressions, but because the words and formulas involved occur only in inscriptions that show Latin influence in the way in which they are phrased: the extant Faliscan inscriptions are simply not of the type where such words and formulas were used. It has been assumed that Latin influence in the ‘official’ vocabulary is also visible in the word *efiles* in MF **113-117**, which may have been a calque on Latin *aediles* (G. Giacomelli 1963:243-4): as argued in §6.2.1, I do not think that it is necessary to assume this.

I already pointed to the change in the formula of filiation, where the use of the patronymic adjective is associated exclusively with Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions, while Latino-Faliscan, Capenate, and Latin inscriptions from the area always have the formula FATHER_{GEN} [SON/DAUGHTER] (§7.5 with figs.7.3-4). Although the patronymic adjective was still used in Late Faliscan inscriptions (LF **220**, **222**, **332**, **336**), it clearly belonged to the texts written according to the Faliscan rule-set, and disappeared when these ceased to be produced.

The changes in the texts during the period after 240 therefore concern not so much individual features of Faliscan, but the entire way which texts were expressed. The coming of Latin to the ager Faliscus brought with it a different set of rules for the production of written texts, and the rule-set of written Faliscan was not so much influenced as replaced by this new set. This was probably made easier by the fact that Fal-

iscan and Latin were very much alike, so that the rules for written Latin could be applied to Faliscan without too much difficulty. All in all, this sea-change appears to have been quite quick, which might be due to the replacement of part of the population by speakers of Latin as described above. The Late Faliscan inscriptions are far fewer in number than the Middle Faliscan inscriptions, and there appears to be no material that can be dated to after *c.* 150: I would not be surprised if it could be shown that Faliscan inscriptions disappeared a generation earlier, between 200 and 175.

This, of course, does not mean that Faliscan itself disappeared around that date: however, the written form of the language that is spoken in the area is the one associated with Roman Latin. This comes close to the idea of formal = Roman vs. informal = Faliscan advocated by R. Giacomelli (2006 *passim*): although I contest that this distinction existed before 241, it may be quite applicable to the Late Faliscan period.

9.5. Summary of §§9.2-4

All in all, the Faliscan material shows some very interesting points with regard to language contact and bilingualism, even though the material is limited. As might be expected, there is a high degree of onomastic borrowing (cf. chapter 7 *passim*), especially from Etruscan. On other levels, interference and borrowing is rather limited, as might be expected on the basis of what has been said in §9.1.

Etruscan interference shows up most clearly in the ‘Etruscoid’ forms: these are part of a larger set of interference phenomena where morphemes of the nominative appear due to onomastic borrowing. There appears to be no interference of borrowing on deeper levels of the language, and this is not surprising in view of the very different grammatical structures of Etruscan and Faliscan. A very interesting feature, which allows us to draw some conclusions about the degree of bilingualism of some of the writers, is the uncertainty with regard to the use of cases. This can only be ascribed to the different use of the cases in Etruscan. The use, in Faliscan texts, of formulas that are modelled on Etruscan shows that these formulas were not just borrowed, but also adapted to the structure of Faliscan: this is a case of ‘true’ borrowing by speakers of Faliscan, not interference by speakers of Etruscan.

Sabellic interference is observable, but limited, not only in a numerical, but also in a geographical sense, as it shows up mainly in inscriptions from the *ager Capenas*.

The influence from Latin in the period before 240 is not so much absent as very hard to detect. In the period after 240, there is a quite rapid change in the written language from Faliscan to Latin, indicating that new rules for writing had entered the area together with the probably quite substantial influx of speakers of Latin. This led to a rapid disappearance of Faliscan as a written language: if it was still spoken after 150, it was no longer written and therefore is not accessible to us.

Resuming what was said in §9.1, the epigraphic material from the ager Faliscus and Capenas thus shows the co-existence of several sets of rules for the writing of the languages occurring in the area: a set for writing Faliscan, a set for writing Etruscan, a set for writing Latin, and perhaps also a set for Sabellic. On the whole, there is remarkably little cross-over between these rule-sets. Writing in language x entails a different set of rules and conventions from writing in language y , and the individuals that wrote the inscriptions were apparently well aware of this: perhaps because writing was probably not an everyday process for everybody, and therefore required a more conscious effort on the part of the writer, or because the texts that we have are often very formulaic in nature, obeying even more specific rules than a text that is freely composed.

The rule-sets of Etruscan and Faliscan were so different that there is hardly any spread of features apart from onomastic features. In the case of Sabellic features in Faliscan inscriptions, it is clear that most inscriptions that show Sabellic influence are Sabellic in more ways than one, and reflect writers that probably had a Sabellic language as their first language. The rule-set of Latin on the other hand quickly replaced the rule-set of Faliscan, and could do so not only because of sociolinguistic factors as discussed in §2.7, but also because of the close resemblance between the two.

9.5. A note on Faliscan outside the ager Faliscus

In view of the extensive language contacts with Etruscan, Latin, and the Sabellic languages, it might be expected that, just as *their* presence may be observed in inscriptions from the ager Faliscus and Capenas, so Faliscan presence might be observed in inscriptions from areas other than the ager Faliscus and Capenas. There are several inscriptions where this has been assumed: in the first place, *eqo kaṇaios* 482†, *titoio* 483† and *neuen deiuo* 484†, all from Ardea: this is discussed in §18.3.2. I likewise do not adopt Lucchesi's (2005) suggestion that the Satricum-inscription, *CIL* I².2832a, is Faliscan: this is discussed in §18.3. On the other hand, Poccetti (forthcoming) convincingly shows Faliscan influence in inscriptions from the area of Magliano Sabino, on the east bank of the Tiber opposite the ager Faliscus and Capenas.