

File ID 123787
Filename Chapter 10. Conclusion: Faliscan as a Latin dialect

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 10

Conclusion: Faliscan as a Latin dialect

10.1. Language or dialect?

10.1.1. Drawing conclusions. As said in §1.1, it was the aim of this study to show that Faliscan is a dialect of Latin, not an independent language closely related to Latin. This, of course, depends on the definition of dialect that is used, and in §1.2 I therefore described three possible approaches to this subject: the *sociolinguistic* approach, where only extralinguistic factors are taken into account, and the *structural* approach, where only intralinguistic factors are taken into account, the latter subdivided in a *synchronic* approach, which is the one best applicable to living languages and dialects, and the *diachronic* approach, which is the one better applicable to fragmentarily preserved dead languages and dialects whose general position within a well-studied language-family is known. In the following sections, I shall look at each approach in succession and assess the linguistic position of Faliscan according to definitions of each of these approaches.

As has repeatedly been stated, the major difficulty in assessing the Faliscan material is the fragmentary state of the material, not only the Faliscan material itself, but also the Latin and Sabellic material required for a valid comparison. This applies *a fortiori* to the Early Faliscan period. Yet in spite of this fragmentary state, I hope to have shown that a remarkable amount of linguistic data can in fact be derived from this material, allowing an assessment to be made both from a synchronic and a diachronic perspective. Other sources, mainly historical, make it possible to draw the outlines of a very general sociolinguistic assessment. It is therefore possible, in my view, to draw valid conclusions on Faliscan and the people that spoke it on the basis of the epigraphic, historical, and archaeological material that we now possess.

10.1.2. The sociolinguistic definition. According to the exclusively sociolinguistic definition, Faliscan can most definitely be described as a language in its own right, and not as a dialect. As I have shown in §§2.2-3, the *ager Faliscus* can be assumed to have had an identity of its own, recognized as such probably both by the inhabitants of the area themselves and by the peoples with which they came into contact, as is shown for instance by the existence of an ethnonym (§2.2.2). This identity manifested itself most clearly in the independence of the area, both from Rome and from the Etruscan cities (§2.4.2), but also in a number of local customs and peculiarities (§2.3),

some of which semi-linguistic, such as the use of its own alphabet (§11.2) and of its own praenomina (§7.7.2), or linguistic, such as the use of its own formulas for specific types of texts (§8.10.1). Each of these features may or may not have been regarded as relevant to that identity by the inhabitants of the ager Faliscus and those that came into contact with them. It is noteworthy that this Faliscan identity may not have been connected with one specific ‘ethnic’ background: the onomasticon shows that the inhabitants of the ager Faliscus have gentilicia that were Italic as well as Etruscan in origin (§7.10.3), and the data on language contact of Faliscan with Etruscan show that a number were probably bilinguals whose first language was not Faliscan, but Etruscan (§9.2). The same may have been true for the ager Capenas and the Sabellic languages (§9.3).

The linguistic aspect of this identity must have been expressed most clearly with regard to the speakers of Etruscan: if the Faliscans were indeed members of the Etruscan League at the beginning of the fourth century (as Livy presents them, see §2.5.1), they were in all probability the only member of the League whose first or main language was not Etruscan. In view of what can be glimpsed of the ‘Faliscan identity’, I am reasonably sure that if it were possible to explain the modern concepts of ‘dialect’ and ‘language’ to fourth- or third-century inhabitants of the ager Faliscus, they would regard what we call Faliscan as a *language*, and that this conclusion would be based not so much on an assessment of the structural correspondences and differences between Faliscan and the languages of Latium or of Umbria, but on a gut feeling that what they spoke was part of their identity as a Faliscan, especially in their probably frequent contacts with speakers of Etruscan (§9.2.1), Sabellic languages (§9.3.1), and Latin (§9.4.1).

Even the facetious wisecrack about ‘language being a dialect with an army’ (§1.2) is true to the extent that the independence, linguistic or otherwise, of the ager Faliscus was maintained by a number of armed conflicts with Rome during the late fifth, fourth, and third centuries (§§2.5-6), possibly preceded by similar conflicts with Veii during the sixth and early fifth centuries (§2.4.2), and that the disappearance of Faliscan at least as a written language was accelerated by the loss of its army and its political independence in the war of 241 (§2.6). After this war, there are few signs of an independent identity, and the area seems to have been Romanized in many respects, including linguistically, in a relatively short time (§2.8.3, §9.4.2): assuming that Falerii Novi was founded somewhere between 240 and 220, no more than two generations appear to have passed before Faliscan disappeared as a *written* language (possibly with a brief revival in LF/Lat **214**). If it lingered on as a local *patois*, it was not what within the sociolinguistic definition must have been a dialect, for during the second century, Faliscan was no longer an independent variant in its own right, but a variant that was becoming substandard beside a standard that came to be based on or to be identical with Roman Latin (§1.2, §2.8.3).

10.2.2. Synchronic comparison. Whatever the conclusions that can be drawn from the sociolinguistic perspective, what interests me more is whether Faliscan is also a dialect from what I have called the ‘structural’ perspective. According to the *synchronic* approach, Faliscan can be compared on a number of points with the surrounding languages. For the approach to be as synchronic as the fragmentary material allows, however, this comparison should be made for *one* point in time.

A synchronic comparison for the Early Faliscan period is very difficult, since there are only 10-12 Early Faliscan inscriptions (EF 1-4, 6-10, 467*, and EF/Etr 5 and 385) and the contemporary Latin and Sabellic epigraphic material is likewise scarce. This has caused many problems in the assessment of the position of Faliscan, for it has often forced scholars to compare Early Faliscan forms with much later Latin or Sabellic ones. Three vexed forms in this respect are *fifiked* EF 9, *ff.fjiqod* EF 1, and *ues* EF 4. *Fifiked* and *ff.fjiqod* show that Early Faliscan had a reduplicative perfect of *fin-go*, and this is contrasted with Latin *finxi*: but *finxi* is much later, and it is very well possible to assume that Faliscan dropped the reduplicative perfect of *fin-go* after the Early Faliscan period, while on the other hand Latin *finxi*, which is an old aorist, not a perfect, had replaced an earlier reduplicative perfect (cf. the replacement of *vhe:vhaked* CIL I².3 by *feced* CIL I².4). Likewise, *ff.fjiqod* shows an aorist ending being used in the third plural perfect, while the reconstructed Latin perfect ending is **-ēri/*, first attested as *steterai* CIL I².2832a. Yet the material does not allow us to say with any degree of certainty whether *ff.fjiqod* represents the standard Early Faliscan form in this respect, or was an occasionally recurring analogical creation beside a regular perfect ending. The pronoun *ues* can only be compared to Latin *uos*, but neither *uos* nor *ues* is attested for the early Latin inscriptions, and the same dichotomy can be observed in the Sabellic languages, where Umbrian *uestra* TI VIb.61 shows the e-vocalism of the Early Faliscan form, but Paelignian *uus* Pg 9 the o-vocalism of the Latin form (§4.7.3). It will be clear that the Early Faliscan material is just too little and too lacunary to allow a comparison with contemporary Latin and Sabellic material: what, for instance, of *douiad* EF 1, which can be compared only to much later Latin *duam* and Umbrian *purtuvitu* TI IIa.24, or of *umom* EF 2 which has a parallel only in ‘Old Hernician’ *udmom* He 2, but shows an assimilation /dm/ → /mm/ that is paralleled in Latin?

If the position of Faliscan is to be judged by a synchronic comparison, this comparison is best made on the basis of the material from the first half of the middle of the third century, that is, Middle Faliscan, and *only* on the basis of this material, without the admixture of Early Faliscan, tempting though it is to fill the gaps in the data. The Middle Faliscan period provides enough material, and, as it precedes the period after 240 during which Rome took over the ager Faliscus, may be assumed to be relatively free from Latin influence. Such a comparison shows that Faliscan is on most points identical with Latin, and differs greatly from the Sabellic languages.

If we look at the Middle Faliscan material from the perspective of a synchronic comparison *both* with Latin *and* with the Sabellic languages, there are different conclusions on different levels.

From a morphological point of view, I can see no other conclusion than that Faliscan is a Latin dialect, or, alternatively, that it split off only at a very recent date. The nominal morphology is remarkably similar (§4.10). Points of difference are perhaps

(1) the Faliscan first-declension genitive singular (§4.2.2), where I assume that the ending was changing from *-as* to *-ai* at this time, just as it was in Latin, but the material is ambiguous, as all forms in *-ai* that can be interpreted as genitives can also be interpreted as datives. If Faliscan only had *-as*, this provides a parallel with the Sabellic languages.

(2) the Faliscan second-declension dative singular, which was still *-oi* (§4.3.2): it is unclear whether the Latin ending was already *-o*, or still *-oi*. The Sabellic ending was certainly */-ōj̄/* at the time.

(3) the ending of the third-declension genitive singular, which was *-os* (§4.5.2), which, however, may have been the contemporary Latin form as well; it was most certainly not the Sabellic form at the time, which was a reflex of */-ejs/* (e.g. *-e(r)* in Umbrian, but still *-eīs* in Oscan).

On every other point of nominal morphology where a difference can be established between Latin and the Sabellic languages, Faliscan sides with Latin (§4.10). Significantly, Faliscan shows a second-declension nominative plural ending *-e* in *lete* MLF 285, while contemporary Sabellic languages show a reflex of **/-ōs/* (§4.3.6), and of course the ending of the genitive singular, */-ī/* (§4.4.3), where the Sabellic languages had */-ēs/*.

In the personal pronouns, Middle Faliscan shows both *ego* (*eco* LF 378, 383) and *met* (MF 470*), the latter probably showing signs of a change to *me* at this time, which are the same forms (and the same change) as in contemporary Latin (§4.7.1-2): at least in the case of *me* the Sabellic languages may have differed, but the only form to show this is much older.

In the Middle Faliscan verbal morphology, a significant point is the ending of the third singular perfect *-et* (*facet* MF 470*, *keset* LF 242), as in Latin, in contrast with the Sabellic languages, which have *-ed* (§5.2.4.5). A difference, however, is Faliscan *facet* MF 471* vs. Latin *fecit*, where it should be noted that a comparison with the Sabellic languages shows that Umbrian likewise had a perfect stem */fak-/*: the Latin form */fēk-/* is unique in the Italic languages (§5.3.6). Another interesting form is *esú(m)* Cap 389, 404, 465: this form is attested with certainty for the Sabellic languages, but may have existed in (dialectal) Latin as well, and may therefore have occurred in Faliscan or Capenate (§5.3.5).

From a lexical point of view, too, Middle Faliscan shows no discernible differences from Latin, and where there are differences between Latin and the Sabellic languages, Faliscan sides with Latin (§6.2 *passim*, §6.3). It should be noted that due to the available data, the lexicon is extremely limited: yet note, for instance, that Faliscan has *filios/filia*, as does Latin, while the Sabellic languages show reflexes of *puclom/fu(h)tēr* (§6.2.24-25).

A synchronic comparison of the syntax of Middle and Late Faliscan is very difficult. The morphosyntactic data are too few, the data on word order too much depending on purely formulaic texts, and the phrasing of the varying types of inscription too different to allow valid conclusions to be drawn. In my view, no real synchronic comparison can be made between Middle Faliscan and contemporary Latin or Sabellic languages on the points of syntax.

Apart from the already mentioned *facet* MF 470*, the main *differences* between Middle Faliscan and Latin that can be observed in a synchronic comparison are phonological and phonetic. The phonemic system of Middle Faliscan differed from that of Latin in one significant respect, namely that third century Faliscan had no short diphthongs (and long diphthongs perhaps only as the case-endings for the dative singular of the first and second declensions), while it had more degrees of openness in the front vowels (§3.6.1, §3.7). In mid-third-century Latin, this may have been the case in some local variants, but certainly not in all, and certainly not in the dialect of Rome. In a synchronic comparison, this monophthongization and the regular occurrence of word-internal /f/ are features that Faliscan shared with the Sabellic languages, the former feature with Umbrian and Volscian especially, the latter with the Sabellic languages in general. On the other hand, the Middle Faliscan phonemic system certainly differed from the Sabellic languages in having a labiovelar occlusive series, as did Latin (§3.4, §3.5.1). Beside this, there is a phonotactic difference: in Faliscan, /f/ could regularly occur word-internally, as in the Sabellic languages, while in Latin a word-internal /f/ must have been rare at least in Roman Latin, if perhaps not in all Latin dialects (§3.3.3).

Differences that were phonetic rather than phonemic were the tendency to realize word-initial /f/ before a vowel as [h], although it is very probable that this tendency also occurred in Latin or at least in some local variants of Latin, as is shown by several epigraphic instances from Praeneste and the forms quoted by the Latin grammarians (§3.5.2), but not in the Sabellic languages. Another tendency is the one to drop syllable-final nasals, a tendency that sometimes is observed in Latin inscriptions, but is more frequent in the Faliscan inscriptions (§3.5.7a). The tendency to omit word-final -s when it was preceded by a (short) vowel is not so much a difference with Latin, but occurs in Faliscan with a far greater frequency, perhaps implying that it may well have been regular in the sense that it was an orthographic rule (§3.5.7c).

Are these synchronic differences enough to regard Faliscan either as Latin or as non-Latin? This is a difficult question to answer, as in the case of dead languages verdicts of this kind are hardly ever purely based on synchronic comparison. I would say that the phonemic differences, which are not just a difference in individual phonemes but in the phonemic *structure* are certainly a point that divides Middle Faliscan from contemporary Latin, but that on the other hand this must be set off against the vastly greater number of correspondences between the two, not just on the phonological level, but on other levels as well. In my view, these differences still fall within the limits of variation that can be observed among the dialect variants of one and the same language.

Interestingly, the synchronic differences between Middle Faliscan and contemporary Latin are all points where Faliscan sides with the Sabellic languages, both in the phonological differences and in the perfect stem /fak-/. Yet on the other hand the number of differences between Middle Faliscan and the contemporary Sabellic languages is so great, especially on the morphological and the lexical level, that the gap between Middle Faliscan and the Sabellic languages is far greater than that between Middle Faliscan and contemporary Latin.

Would a mid-third century inhabitant of the *ager Faliscus*, if asked, have regarded Faliscan as substantially different from Latin? It seems very likely that inhabitants of the *ager Faliscus* and *Latium* would have understood each other without too much trouble. Such a mutual understanding, however, may be based more on similarity of the lexicon, which in this case appears to have been very great, and on a number of known phonological differences that could easily be ‘mentally transposed’ in a language contact situation: a Faliscan might well have known that a medial *-f-* usually corresponded to a Latin *-b-* or *-d-*.

10.1.3. The diachronic perspective. The diachronic perspective affords us a look not only at the Middle Faliscan forms, but also at the Early Faliscan forms and even at the reconstructed forms and developments, for these can be used to fill in gaps in the attested material and place it in a wider perspective. This means that we can look at a larger amount of data, and can place these data against the larger background of the developments as they are reconstructed for Proto-Italic, Proto-Latin, and Proto-Sabellic. As said in §1.2, most scholars use a combination of the diachronic and the synchronic perspective in any case.

In the *diachronic* approach, it is quite clear that Faliscan belonged to the Latin branch of the Italic family of PIE. There are *no* indications of separate developments at the Proto-Italic stage, as is to be expected if Faliscan is assumed to be an Italic language, and during the post-Proto-Italic period, Faliscan shares most features of preservation and innovation with Proto-Latin, not with Proto-Sabellic. The clearest cases are:

common Proto-Latin preservations:

- (1) *phonological*: preservation of the labiovelar occlusive series, which in the Sabellic languages merged with the labial series (§3.4);
- (2) *morphological*: the second-declension genitive singular ending **-/os̄jo/*, preserved in Proto-Latin (§4.4.3, §4.4.6), but replaced in Proto-Sabellic by */-ējs/* (§4.4.7);
- (3) *morphological*: the consonant-stem genitive singular ending **-/os/*, which is in all probability original, which in Sabellic was replaced by */-ējs/* (§4.5.2);
- (4) *morphological*: preservation of the Proto-Italic secondary third plural ending **/-nd/* (§5.2.4.2), which in Proto-Sabellic was reformed to **/-ns/*;

common Proto-Latin innovations:

- (5) *morphological*: transfer of the pronominal nominative plural endings **/-aj̄/* and **/-oj̄/* to the first and second nominal declensions (§4.2.6, §4.3.6), while in Proto-Sabellic the nominal endings were extended to the pronominal declensions;
- (6) *lexical*: the innovations **/φ̄l̄ios/* and **/φ̄l̄iā/*, while Proto-Sabellic preserved **/puklom/* and **/φ̄uγ(i)tēr/*, reflecting PIE **/putlom/* and **/d^hug^hitēr/* (§6.2.24-25);

either common preservation or common innovation:

- (5) *morphological*: the accusative **/mēd/* of the personal pronoun of the first person singular, where Proto-Sabellic had **/mēom/*: depending on which form is reconstructed for Proto-Italic, this is either a case of common preservation or of common innovation (§4.7.2).

The only clear instance of a significant and early feature that separates Faliscan from Latin must also be dated to the period preceding the earliest inscription:

separate Latin and Faliscan innovations:

- (6) *phonological*: the development of the word-internal reflexes of the PIE voiced aspirates, where the Faliscan reflexes of **/b^h d^h g^{uh}/* are */f/*, as in the Sabellic languages, while Latin has */b d ŷ/* (§3.3.3). The reflex of **/g^h/* is in my view unclear: if it is taken to be */g/*, this reflects a uniquely Faliscan development: however, it shows more similarity with the Latin occlusive reflexes than with the Sabellic spirant reflex.

It is in this phonological development that Faliscan shows the clearest early difference from Latin. This difference cannot be recent and apparently did not have any parallel developments in Latin. (As said in §3.3.3, the evidence for a similar development in ‘rural Latin’ is slight to the point of being non-existent).

During the historical period, the following shared features can be distinguished:

common Latin-Faliscan innovations:

- (7) *morphological*: the replacement of the second-declension genitive ending */-os̄jo/* by */-ī/* (§4.4.9), although the significance of this feature has been played down due to a tendency to regard the genitive in */-os̄jo/* as exclusively Faliscan (cf. §18.3.3);

(8) *morphological*: probably also the replacement of the first-declension genitive singular ending /-ās/ by /-āī/, although the evidence for this is ambiguous (§4.2.2);

(9) *morphological*: the replacement of the ending /-ed/, used in the third singular perfect, by /-eīt/ or possibly by /-it/ (§5.2.4.5).

It should be noted that I regard features that Faliscan shares with Latin as *ipso facto* due to Latin or Roman influence in the ager Faliscus. Granted, every development must start somewhere, but in the case of these developments or replacements there is no indication where in the Latin-speaking area (which in my view included the ager Faliscus) they originated. In any case, there is no evidence that any of these features necessarily originated at Rome, as is sometimes assumed.

Beside these points, there are a number of phonological features of recent date that Faliscan shares with at least some of the Latin dialects. These are of minor significance, not *per se* because they are more recent, but rather (a) because they are in some cases synchronic phonetic tendencies rather than full-blown phonemic changes, and (b) because in some cases they also occur in one or more Sabellic languages.

common recent innovations (some also occurring in Umbrian):

(10) *phonological*: intervocalic rhotacism (§3.5.3), which is found both in Latin and in Umbrian: note that Umbrian also had word-final rhotacism, which Latin and Faliscan did not;

(11) *phonological*: a development /#fV/ → /#hV/, which is attested also for some Latin dialects, but not for the Sabellic languages (§3.5.2);

(12) *phonological*: monophthongization of the diphthongs, which is found both in Latin and in Umbrian and Volscian: the Faliscan monophthongizations took place slightly earlier than in Latin, and probably at around the same time as in Umbrian (§3.7), and affected *all* diphthongs, again as in Umbrian, while the Latin monophthongizations show local (and social?) differences in which diphthongs were monophthongized and at what date.

(13) *phonetic realization*: a tendency to ‘drop’ (or realize very weakly) syllable-final nasals and liquids and word-final nasals, liquids, and the sibilant /s/ (§3.5.7): similar tendencies can be observed in Latin and in Umbrian (where the word-final /s/ had been rhotacized to /r/, however).

On the morphological level, there are two or three forms that can and often have been regarded as separating Faliscan and Latin, namely *fifiked* EF 9 and *ff[.f]iqod* EF 1: to these forms must now be added *faced* MF 471* and *facet* MF 470*.

Fifiked and *ff[.f]iqod* have been discussed only shortly in the section on the synchronic perspective since from a strictly synchronic viewpoint these forms *cannot* be evaluated due to a lack of comparable forms from contemporary Latin. From a

diachronic perspective, however, they can be described as instances of preservation of a reduplicative perfect that is found also in Oscan and is therefore probably Proto-Italic: note the probably Proto-Italic perfect reduplication with /i/ as the reduplicative vowel of a root containing /i/. That later Latin had *finxi* is no argument against this assumption, for *finxi* goes back to an aorist that may at some point have replaced a reduplicative perfect **fifigi*, especially if reduplicative perfects of roots beginning in an original voiced aspirate disappeared in Latin (§5.3.7-8). From this perspective, the Faliscan forms can therefore not be considered a feature that separates Faliscan from Latin, unless it is argued that Latin never had this reduplicative perfect. However, in view of the Faliscan form, which reflects a Proto-Italic formation, the reduplicative perfect must have existed in Proto-Latin as well.

The same explanation can be applied to *faced/facet*. *Faced* MF 471* and *facet* MF 470* contrast with Latin *fecit* on a synchronic level: the Latin form is first attested in *feced* CIL I².4. Leaving aside the endings and concentrating on the perfect stems, Faliscan has /fak-/ and Latin /fēk-/, which is a clear difference. Both perfects, however, reflect old *Ablaut* forms of the aorist stem, which apparently replaced an older reduplicative perfect of a root starting in an original voiced aspirate (§5.3.6): in this case, however, this perfect is actually attested for Latin in *vhe:vhaked* CIL I².3 (unless the authenticity of the fibula Praenestina is again called into question).

This replacement of reduplicative perfects would therefore be a comparatively recent innovation, occurring *after* the time of the earliest inscriptions, and therefore not indicative of an early split between Faliscan and Latin. Of course, Faliscan and Latin made different choices in the replacement of the reduplicative perfect /fak-/, possibly because both areas were isolated at the time, or, if one wishes to stress the influence of the Sabellic languages on Faliscan, because Umbrian had /fak-/ as the perfect stem: it is noteworthy that it was Latin that chose /fēk-/, the only Italic language to do so.

The ending of *ff[i]qod* EF 1 was likewise not discussed from a synchronic perspective. It reflects an aorist ending where Latin shows an old perfect ending, but as I suggested, it is not clear from the Faliscan material whether it was regular in Faliscan. The form is in itself unique and we simply cannot judge whether in Faliscan or in Latin third plural perfect forms with aorist endings may have existed either as regular forms or as occasional by-forms due to analogy with the aoristic third singular ending. The only attestation of a third plural perfect ending that comes close in time to *ff[i]qod* is Latin *steterai* CIL I².2832a, a form that is likewise not without difficulties, as it is not a direct reflex of **-ēri/* but probably shows analogical evidence from the endings of the first and second singular. If *ff[i]qod* is regarded as significant evidence for a separation of Faliscan from Latin, it should be noted that the form likewise separates Faliscan from the Sabellic languages, where the corresponding ending was a Proto-Sabellic innovation **-ens/*.

10.2. Recent views on the position of Faliscan

10.2.1. Recent views. In §1.5, I named several scholars that have given explicit views on the status of Faliscan since the appearance of G. Giacomelli's *La lingua falisca* (1963). In the following sections I shall review their arguments and conclusions briefly, to see where and how these differ from my own. I have not discussed the statements by earlier authors (cf., however, §1.5), among whom I should name Beeler (1956:48), who regarded Faliscan as an Italic language independent from both Latin and the Sabellic languages, a position that I regard as entirely untenable in view especially of the Proto-Italic and Proto-Latin phonological and morphological developments (§§3.2-3), and which Beeler (1966:57) himself eventually abandoned.

10.2.2. Campanile: an independent Faliscan. Campanile first gave attention to the phenomena of Faliscan in 'Elementi dialettali nella fonetica e nella morfologia del latino' (*SSL* 1 (1961), pp.1-21), where he used the Faliscan data like those of other Latin dialects, such as Praenestine. In his later monograph, *Studi sulla posizione dialettale del latino* (1969), however, he devoted seven pages (pp.85-92) to the position of Faliscan, where he made his views on the matter more explicit and came to a different conclusion, questioning the idea that Faliscan is (closely) related to Latin.

First, he admitted that there are a number of features that are common to both Faliscan and Latin, pointing e.g. to the lexical correspondences *cra* MF 59-60 and *foied* MF 50-60 (both forms, by the way, where a comparison with the Sabellic languages is impossible as the corresponding Sabellic forms are lacking), *uxor* MF 17 etc., *saluete* EF 4, *peparai* [*sic*] EF 1, and the morphological correspondences *med* EF 1, 9, and the future suffix */-bh-/ in *carefo* MF 59 and *pipafo* MF 59. He then named a number of differences: the phonological difference in the development of the voiced aspirates, the morphological differences in the ending of *fifikod* [*sic*] EF 1 and the formation of *douiad* EF 1, which compares only to Umbrian *purdouitu* TI VIa.56 etc., finally pointing to the isolated Faliscan lexemes *lecet* MF 88, *lepe* in Pisani's interpretation of EF 4, and *ues* EF 4. As unusable for comparison he named the monophthongization of the diphthongs (§3.7), rhotacism (§3.5.3), which in his view could both be ascribed to Umbrian influence, and the *f-/h-* variation (§3.5.2), which he ascribes to 'a peripheral band of Latin', and Bonfante's (1966) idea that *z-* represents a *sandhi* voicing of /#sV-/ (§3.5.3). He concluded:

"Se scartiamo, quindi, i fenomeni che rappresentano innovazioni proprie del falisco o prestiti più o meno tardi, si resterà piuttosto perplessi innanzi alla conclamata strettissima parentela fra il latino e il falisco. Una lingua che conosce *ues* e non *uos*, *douiad* e non *det*, *fifikod* [*sic*] e non *finxerunt* (o *finxere*), *lecet* e non *iacet*, *lepe* e non *uiue*, mal può, a nostro giudizio, essere valutata come una mera variante locale del latino; e non possiamo sottrarci all'impressione che gli studiosi, nello stabilire la

posizione linguistica del falisco, abbiano attribuito, forse inconsciamente, peso eccessivo alle caratteristiche meramente conservatrici che esso condivide col latino, senza valutarne adeguatamente gli aspetti innovatori. Con ciò, naturalmente, non concludiamo che falisco e latino siano lingue *toto caelo* distanti; al contrario, esse presentano varie innovazioni comuni. Ma ciò non dovrà farci dimenticare le innovazioni che il falisco condivide con altre tradizioni linguistiche e che gli conferiscono, pur con le doverose riserve che c'impone la povertà delle attestazioni, una sua precisa anche se modesta autonomia non solo nei confronti dei dialetti italici, ma anche del latino.” (p.92)

As Campanile on this basis explicitly *rejected* that Faliscan is a local variant of Latin, it is worth looking at his arguments. First of all, the argument that Faliscan did not have *uos*, *det*, *finxerunt* or *finxere*, *iacet*, or *uiue*, is an *argumentum e silentio* that cannot be substantiated: all the more so as several of these forms are Early Faliscan, which, as said in §10.1.3, makes comparison even more difficult. As a result, Campanile ends up comparing Early Faliscan forms with forms from much later Latin. I agree that *ues* beside Latin *uos* is problematic, but so is Umbrian *uestra TI VIb.61* (which together with *ues* may point to an earlier e-vocalism) beside Paelignian *uus* Pg 9: the division occurs in *both* branches of the Italic languages, and which of these languages is conservative and which is innovative on this point cannot be established on the basis of the present data (§4.7.3). With regard to *ff.f]iqod*, this form does indeed differ from Latin *finxi*, but as I have argued in §10.1.4, a reduplicative perfect from *finxo* may eventually have disappeared in Faliscan as well, just as the much later Latin form *finxi* may well have replaced an older reduplicative perfect **fifigi*. The form *lepe* (in EF 4) is uncertain and assumes the occurrence of a root that is not attested in either Latin or the Sabellic languages: if only for that reason, I cannot regard it as attested until it can be substantiated in other ways.

Lecet, the only Middle Faliscan form in Campanile's list, may very well have existed in Latin, in view of the nouns *lectus* and *lectica*. It is therefore not an innovation but rather a case of preservation of a verb that had disappeared in Latin: note also South Picene *veia|t* MC.1. Moreover, comparing *lecet* to *iacet* is an arbitrary choice: as the inscriptions show, the regular and formulaic Faliscan verb was *cupat/cupant*, and this is of course well-attested for Latin.

I certainly agree with Campanile that in order to establish the position of Faliscan with regard to Latin and the Sabellic languages, one should look at the innovations as much as at the preservations: in fact, I hope to have done so in the preceding chapters and especially in section §10.1.4. My conclusion, however, is that with the exception of the developments of the word-internal voiced aspirates, any development that can be called a 'Faliscan innovation', whether phonological, morphological, lexical, or syntactic, is either of early date and shared with Latin, or is of recent, often even Middle Faliscan, date, and in most cases is paralleled by developments that took place in other local variants of Latin.

10.2.3. Solta: convergence with the Sabellic languages? In *Zur Stellung der lateinischen Sprache* (1974), pp.45-47, Solta also briefly discussed the position of Faliscan, from a mainly synchronic perspective. He stressed the correspondences between Faliscan and Latin, naming especially the preservation of the labiovelars (cf. §3.4), the perfect *pepara/ī* EF 1 (cf. §5.3.1.12), which, however, cannot be compared with a corresponding Sabellic form, and the *b*-future (cf. §5.2.2.2), and also remarked on the second-declension genitive singular, noting that Faliscan had an older ending in *-osio* and a later ending *-i* that is the same as in Latin (§4.4.3, §4.4.6), without drawing any conclusion from this: a point he could have elaborated had he known the *popliosio ualesiosio* of *CIL* I².2832a at the time. As his general conclusion, however, Solta also saw a *convergence* of Faliscan with the Sabellic languages:

“Die adäquateste Deutung des faliskischen Sprachhabitus ist wohl die dynamische Auffassung, wonach sich dieser vom Lateinischen weg zum Umbrischen hinentwickelte. Die stimmhaften Aspiraten *bh*, *dh* sind im Falisk. im Inlaut wie in den ‚ital.‘ Dialekten entwickelt, nicht wie im Lat. Der vielbehandelte Rhotazismus scheint in Falerii älter zu sein als in Rom und stellt vielleicht das Zwischenglied in der vom Umbrischen ausgehenden Lauttendenz bei ihrem Vordringen nach Rom dar.” (p.46)

Note that Solta’s conclusion that Faliscan was ‘developing away from Latin towards Umbrian’ adds a diachronic dimension to his largely synchronic comparison. The first point that he named was the development of the word-internal reflexes of the voiced aspirates, where the Faliscan reflexes point to a development that must have been similar, or identical, to the one in Proto-Sabellic, but that was clearly different from Roman Latin (§3.3.3). This must have taken place at a prehistoric stage, but cannot be dated more precisely. The second of the points named by Solta, intervocalic rhotacism, took place also in Latin and in Umbrian, and as far as this can be established, during the same period, namely the fourth century (§3.5.3): it can therefore not be treated on a par with the development of the word-internal reflexes of the voiced aspirates, unless both are assumed to illustrate a convergence of Faliscan with the Sabellic languages that went back to a very early period. Solta could have pointed to the monophthongization of the diphthongs as well (§3.7), for in Faliscan this took place at an earlier date than in Latin, and the reflexes of the old diphthongs are similar to those in Umbrian. All these points, however, are phonological, while the points that connect Faliscan and Latin are also morphological and lexical (see §10.1.3): on these levels, there is no indication that Faliscan was in any way developing towards Umbrian or any other Sabellic language. The only morphological development where Faliscan shows a difference with Latin and a similarity with Umbrian is the perfect /fak-/ in *faced* MF 471*, *facet* MF 470*.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷⁴ Solta’s perspective almost begs the question whether from a synchronic perspective Faliscan could eventually have become a Sabellic language altogether, just like Trubetzkoy suggested that non-Indo-European languages could eventually *become* Indo-European (e.g. Trubetzkoy 1939). At least from a morphological perspective, this seems unlikely.

10.2.4. G. Giacomelli: a Latin Faliscan with Sabellic influence. I did intentionally not start this discussion with G. Giacomelli's own conclusion in *La lingua falisca* (1963). There, she discussed the position of Faliscan only in the most percursor way, stating her conclusion most clearly as follows:

“Credo invece che non si debba deflettere dalla posizione tradizionale, che distingue il falisco dal latino, pur tenendo fermi gli stretti legami d'affinità fra i due popoli e le due lingue: senza negare, d'altra parte, la penetrazione di elementi esterni sia italici sia etruschi” (p.21)

This conclusion was unfortunately not argued for by a systematic comparison (whether synchronic or diachronic), although in the linguistic part of the work she pointed out differences and similarities here and there.

Her conclusion in the article ‘Il falisco’ (in *Lingue e dialetti dell'Italia antica* (1978), pp.509-535) was different, and made some finer distinctions:

“Gli elementi che sembrano collegare alla base il latino e il falisco sono veramente significativi: si riscontrano non solo nel lessico – che manca, si può dire, di elementi non latini – ma anche nella grammatica: la conservazione della labiovelare [...], i plurali dei temi in *-a* (e probabilmente quelli in *-o*) con desinenza di origine pronominale [...], l'accusativo del pronome di 1a persona *med* [...], il futuro in *-fo* [...]” (p.522)

Here G. Giacomelli rightly pointed to a number of older developments: common preservation in the case of the labiovelars (§3.4), common Proto-Latin innovation in the cases of the first and second-declension nominative plural endings (*sociai* EF 4, *lete* MLF 285: see §4.2.6, §4.3.6), and the future in *-fo/-bo* (*carefo* MF 59, *pipafo* MF 59: see §5.2.2.2). The form *med* EF 1, 9 can be ascribed either to common preservation of a Proto-Italic innovation, or to common Proto-Latin innovation, depending on how the Proto-Italic form is reconstructed (§4.7.2).

Yet G. Giacomelli also assumed a convergence with the Sabellic languages:

“Accanto agli elementi che associano la nostra lingua al latino non vanno però sottovalutati quelli che rivelano un'impronta, sia pure secondaria, delle lingue italiche, riportandosi alla fonetica e alla morfologia osco-umbra: per la seconda si notano il tipo di perfetto raddoppiato *ffiked* [...], forse il genitivo in *-osio*, certo il dativo in *-oi* [...]; per la prima citiamo la tendenza a una monottongazione precoce secondo il tipo che si riscontra nell'umbro (ma anche in parte nel latino rustico e nell'etrusco [...]), la caduta di consonanti finali [...] e la mancata differenziazione tra posizione iniziale e posizione interna per quanto riguarda i risultati di BH en DH indoeuropei – ma non di GH, che dà /h/ all'iniziale e /g/ all'interno [...], in modo probabilmente affine a quello latino. Quest'ultimo fatto è particolarmente importante per mostrarci la lingua protostorica nel suo avvicinamento a parlate osco-umbre (probabilmente al sabino): infatti, in qualunque modo si interpretino questi fenomeni, è certo che almeno per la fonetica non si sono avuti svolgimenti paralleli e indipendenti, ma un'influenza italica la quale ha avuto presa fin dal momento in cui le sonore aspirate si sono ridotte a spiranti sonore, ma non ancora a occlusive sonore, difficilmente reversibili (e non ha avuto presa, per ragioni che ci sfuggono, nel caso del gutturale)” (p.522-523)

With this part of her conclusions I cannot agree at all. The genitive ending *-osio* and the dative in *-oi* are clearly cases of common preservation: even before the publication of the Satricum inscription's *popliosio ualesiosio* CIL I².2832a, there was more (presumed) evidence for the existence of an original */-osio/ in Latin than there was for its existence in any of the Sabellic languages (§4.4.6), while it is clear from *numasioi* CIL I².1, *duenoi* CIL I².4 and Marius Victorinus' remark "*populoi Romanoī pro populo Romano scito priores scribere*" (CGL 6.17.20), that Latin, too, had a dative in /-ōi/, although this appeared somewhere after the period of the earliest inscriptions, perhaps earlier than in Faliscan (§4.3.2).

The fact that *fifiked* EF 9 has a parallel only in Oscan *fifikus* Cp 37,5 does not automatically mean that it is a borrowing, even when the form is contrasted with Latin *finxerunt*: see §5.3.2.7-8. Note that *fifiked* EF 9 and *fl.f]iqod* EF 1 are used in a formula that was taken over from Etruscan and that the use of a verb 'to knead' in this formula is unique: Oscan used *úpsed/úpsens* in such formulas, not *fifikus* (§8.9.2).

The early monophthongization (§3.7) and the 'drop' of word- and syllable-final consonants (§3.5.7) are phenomena of Middle Faliscan that cannot be treated on a par with the much earlier development of the word-internal reflexes of the voiced aspirates (§3.3.3). In the case of the latter, I agree that the Faliscan reflexes point to a development that was probably similar, if not identical with the Proto-Sabellic development, and that this is the most important point of separation between Faliscan and Latin. Monophthongization and omission of word- and syllable-final consonants also occur in Latin dialects, however, although the monophthongization, especially of *all* diphthongs, is nowhere documented as early as in Faliscan.

I find G. Giacomelli's *en masse* attribution of Faliscan features to influence from Sabellic languages very difficult. This virtually denies the possibility of independent parallel development, attributing similar features to language contact apparently *only* because they occur in a nearby language as well. Transfers on the scale that G. Giacomelli envisaged are impossible without intense language contact, especially as the influence affects both the phonology and the declensional morphology (§1.3.2.2). Of such intensive language contact between Faliscan and the Sabellic languages, the inscriptions show little or no trace: in fact, the epigraphic and linguistic features in inscriptions from the agri Faliscus and Capenas that can be ascribed to contact with the Sabellic features are few (§9.3). Furthermore, if the morphology and phonology of Faliscan are as heavily influenced by the Sabellic languages as G. Giacomelli suggested, why is there no trace of this influence in the lexicon, which would be the first level on which such influence would manifest itself, or in the formulaic texts? The Faliscan lexicon is Latin (§6.3), with only *posticnu* MLF/Cap 474* and *pesco(m)* Cap 431 as possibly Sabellic words, both of which are interferential forms rather than borrowings (§9.3.2), and traces of Sabellic influence in the formulaic texts are minimal and limited to the ager Capenas (§8.8.2).

10.2.5. Joseph & Wallace: not a Latin dialect. The most influential and best-argued verdict on the position of Faliscan is surely Joseph & Wallace's article 'Is Faliscan a local Latin *patois*?' (*Diachronica* 8 (1991), pp.159-186). Their conclusions are adopted by Baldi (*The foundations of Latin* (1999), pp.170-4), and apparently also by Meiser (*Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (1998), p.9-10).

Contrary to most authors on the subject, they make it quite clear what they mean by the term 'Latin', which they limit to the language of Latium and the colonies sponsored by Rome, thus in effect already ruling out that Faliscan was a Latin dialect. The term 'dialect' they reserve for non-Roman Latin. They also challenge the notion that shared innovation is necessarily indicative of an original linguistic unity, assuming that it can also "reflect the areal spread of changes after considerable divergence of the two languages had taken place" (p.163). I would like to point out that this is exactly the problem discussed in §1.2: from a purely *synchronic* perspective, the result of shared innovation is indistinguishable from unilateral innovation with subsequent spread of the innovative feature. Therefore, the diachronic perspective should be taken into account wherever possible in judging such features. Also, Joseph & Wallace indicate nowhere under which circumstances such a spread could happen or how far the languages can have diverged for such a spread still to be possible, and this makes it difficult to see whether or not this is applicable to Faliscan. If this could happen unconditionally, the value of the diachronic method would in effect be denied.

Joseph & Wallace then point to a number of features that Faliscan shared with dialect Latin: the monophthongization of the diphthongs (§3.7), the representation of antevocalic /i/ by *e* (§3.6.2), the loss of word-final /t/ (§3.5.7c), the loss of word-final /s/ after *long* vowels (§3.5.7d), the realisation of /#fV-/ as [h] (§3.5.2), the third-declension genitive in *-os* (§4.5.2), /e/ represented as *i* before /rC/ (§3.6.2), the second-declension genitive in *-osio* (§4.4.2), and *f* as a reflex of */b^h d^h/ in medial position (§3.3.3).¹⁷⁵ They conclude that with the exception of the genitives in *-osio* and *-os* and the development of *f* as a reflex of */b^h d^h/ these features are all recent and can therefore not be considered significant for establishing the position of Faliscan, all the more so as several of these features also show up in the Sabellic languages.

Quite rightly, they attach more value to the older features that bind or separate Latin and Faliscan: as such, they name the f-future in *carefo* MF 59, *pipafo* MF 59 (§5.2.2.2) and the accusative *med* EF 1, 9 of the pronoun of the first person singular (§4.7.2) as shared innovations (which were not shared by the Sabellic languages), and the development of the word-internal reflexes of the original voiced aspirates (§3.3.3) as a feature that definitely separates the two. They admit that other connecting features

¹⁷⁵ I leave out their first-declension dative singular in *-a*: this is found only in LF/Lat 214, which may be Latin rather than Faliscan, and which is a feature that, as said in §3.7.6, seems to have spread through Latin colonies. It may be regarded as Latin rather than Faliscan.

may exist, but point rather to two other separating features, namely the third plural perfect endings, where they see a separation, and to the fact that Faliscan shows a *lece* MF 88 that in Latin was replaced by the new formation *iaceo*. The former point I regard as un-evaluable (§10.1.4 and §5.2.4.5), while the latter must have been a relatively recent and at least post-Proto-Italic innovation in Latin. Their conclusion is:

“The overall force of the evidence brought forth here points towards the conclusion that Faliscan is not a dialect of Latin. Not only are the features typically adduced in support of the view of Faliscan as dialectal Latin inadmissible once well-established principles for sub-grouping of dialects are brought into play, but there are as well significant innovations that separate Faliscan and Latin off from each other. Some unite all Latin dialects but exclude Faliscan and others are found only in Faliscan to the exclusion of all of Latinity. These facts therefore confirm the traditional view that Latin and Faliscan are distinct languages, though closely related to one another as immediate siblings.” (p.182)

This implies that from a *synchronic* perspective Faliscan may give the impression of being a Latin dialect due to a number of shared features, but that these features are due to recent developments, sometimes shared with (or due to?) the Sabellic languages, notably Umbrian, while from a *diachronic* perspective, Faliscan has several older features that separate it from Latin.

In my view, this conclusion gives too much value to the one phonological feature that separates Faliscan and Latin, namely the development of the word-internal reflexes of the voiced aspirates (§3.3.3) and leaves undiscussed a number of morphological innovations (§10.1.4) shared by Latin and Faliscan, but not by the Sabellic languages, as well as the fact that the lexicon is overwhelmingly Latin (§10.1.3). These features cannot be explained by just assuming that spread of an innovation can take place even if the languages have diverged significantly, without discussing at least the conditions under which such a transfer can take place, and an attempt to show that these conditions were fulfilled to some extent. Apart from that, I find it hard to assume that these features could be ascribed to Latin influence on a (closely related but still quite distinct) language. All the features named by Joseph & Wallace, recent or not, can be dated to the period *before* the war of 241, and there is hardly a trace of Latin having been such a strong influence before 240.

Also, if Faliscan belongs to the Latin branch of the Italic languages, as Joseph & Wallace assume and apparently even defend, but is not a Latin dialect, what is it then? If it is a distinct language, it is surely a language that (as far as can be judged on the basis of a diachronic analysis of the material) is separated from Latin by one or two features at best, and that from a synchronic perspective is quite similar to Latin dialects. Some of these features, but surely not all, can be ascribed to recent developments, and not necessarily to influence from Latin. In my view, this is not enough to declare Faliscan an independent language. Among the various local variants of Latin, Faliscan may well be the one that is most separated from Latin, but the degree of separation still remains inside the limits of dialect variation.

10.2.6. R. Giacomelli: level-distinction. R. Giacomelli, in *Ricerche falische* (1978), extensively discussed a number of Faliscan linguistic phenomena, drawing the following conclusion:

“Dall’analisi della fonetica e della morfologia falische che abbiamo condotta sia pur senza pretesa di completezza nelle pagine di questo lavoro, risulta evidente la gran quantità di fatti che *ab antiquo* il falisco mostra di condividere con il latino.

In tale contesto è possibile bensì rilevare la presenza di alcuni fenomeni tipicamente falischi, accanto ad altri che pur trovando riscontro in osco-umbro, possono tuttavia agevolmente essere classificati come propri di un ambiente dialettale cui è possibile, a buon diritto, ascrivere il falisco.

Tuttavia anche fenomeni come gli esiti italice delle medie aspirate ie. ovvero la generale monotongazione dei dittonghi, che parrebbero con sicurezza avvicinare il falisco all’umbro, se osservati in una prospettiva geo-linguistica più ampia, inducono a ridimensionare l’incidenza, nella loro determinazione, della generica soluzione degli influssi italice di Faleri.

Infine, gli evidenti influssi etruschi ce si palesano nel campo dell’onomastica falisca sono cronologicamente recenti ed in pratica vengono a sovrapporsi, senza modificarne minimamente la configurazione dell’insieme, al quadro generale della latinità del falisco.” (p.67)

As an overall conclusion, I think this is a fair assessment of the data, even without going into all the data as discussed by R. Giacomelli, where I do not always share his views. He does not adopt G. Giacomelli’s idea of a Faliscan that is heavily influenced by the Sabellic languages (cf. §10.2.4), but does not deny that some Faliscan features, such as the development of the word-internal reflexes of the voiced aspirates, appear to be Sabellic rather than Latin and can apparently be ascribed to a shared development of related, but different, languages, in the line of Pisani’s Italic *Sprachbund* (§1.3.2.1).

In his recent *Nuove ricerche falische* (2006), the most recent contribution to the field of Faliscan studies, he by and large draws similar conclusions, but now places the data in the perspective of level-distinction, a point that had been prominent in his earlier study as well. In chapters VI (*Volgarismi*, pp.73-107) and VII (*Il falisco, un substandard latino*, pp.108-119), he makes a synchronic comparison between Faliscan and ‘vulgar’ Latin, and rightly shows the many similarities between the two. What I cannot accept is his idea that this non-Roman Latin represents a substandard form of Latin, if only because I very much doubt if, during the Middle Faliscan period, there was already a standard of Roman Latin, let alone that this Roman standard was already regarded as the standard for all Latinity. Roman Latin was itself still very much finding its ground in establishing a standard, and I wonder if even Romans themselves would have thought in terms of ‘higher level’ and ‘lower level’ Latin in the third century: if they did so, it was perhaps as a social, but hardly as a geolinguistic distinction. From the perspective of ethnic identity, of course, Faliscan was the local standard in the area and will hardly have been regarded as ‘substandard’ by its speakers, at least before the process of Romanization was well under way, that is, by the end of the third century.

10.3. Faliscan, a Latin dialect

Above, I have discussed several approaches to the question of the position of Faliscan, and several recent views on the subject. Then what, finally, is my own verdict? I shall discuss this mainly from the diachronic, but partly also from the synchronic perspective. I shall take no recourse to the possibility of extensive language contacts and influence from other Italic languages on the deeper levels of language, even though these might be adduced: in my view, these are not necessary to explain the features of Faliscan, although they in no way contradict my conclusion and could even be used to explain those features that can be regarded as contradicting it.

First, I think that this study once more shows that from a diachronic perspective Faliscan clearly belongs to the Latin branch of the Italic family: this is shown by a number of diachronic developments of Proto-Latin date operating on the phonological, morphological, lexical, and perhaps even syntactic levels where Faliscan sides with Latin, which have been enumerated in §10.1.4. These developments consist both of common Proto-Latin innovations and of common preservation of features that in the Sabellic languages were replaced by Proto-Sabellic innovations. The one great exception is the development of the word-internal reflexes of the voiced aspirates, where the development of Faliscan reflects a development similar to that of the Sabellic languages: this is discussed below.

Second, Faliscan shared with Latin a number of developments that took place at a more recent date, that is, during the historic period. Notably, Faliscan and Latin shared several important morphological innovations that did not occur in the Sabellic languages, namely the replacement of the *-osio* by *-i* during the fifth and fourth centuries, the replacement of *-ed* by *-et* during the late fourth century, and probably also that of *-as* by *-ai* during the third century. A shared phonological innovation is the intervocalic rhotacism during the fourth century: although rhotacism also occurs in Umbrian, in Latin and Faliscan it was limited to intervocalic position, while in Umbrian, rhotacism took place also in word-final position.

To the historic period should probably also be ascribed the innovation of the perfect, in Faliscan to *faced/facet* /fak-/ and in Latin as *feced* /fĕk-/: in view of Latin *vhe:vhaked*, these were both recent replacements of the reduplicative perfect by stems that originally belonged to the aorist. Both languages differ in how they reformed the perfect, Faliscan generalizing /fak-/ (which is also the perfect stem used in Umbrian), and Latin, /fĕk-/. If this replacement was due to a general tendency to replace reduplicative perfects from verbs with a root in /f-/ that operated in both Faliscan and Latin, this opens the possibility that Early Faliscan *fifiked/f[.f]iqod* was also replaced by an unattested form of aorist origin: note the original aorist used as a perfect in Latin *finxi*. This removes a point of difference between Faliscan and Latin.

The more recent developments and tendencies in Middle Faliscan, e.g. the weak realization of word- and syllable-final nasals and of the word-final sibilant /s/, and the realisation of /#fV/ as [h], also occurred in other variants of Latin, even if they are more frequently or better attested for Faliscan. In the case of the monophthongization of the diphthongs during the Middle Faliscan period, the Faliscan development was slightly earlier than in Latin. Note that several of these tendencies also occur in Umbrian.

From a synchronic perspective, I could add that the lexicon of Middle Faliscan is very much the same as that of Latin, and that in all instances where there is a clear difference between the Latin and the Sabellic lexicon, Faliscan sides with Latin. I can see no reason to ascribe this to Latin influence, certainly not for the period before 240.

The only older development that separates Faliscan from Latin is the development of the word-internal reflexes of the voiced aspirates, which unfortunately can be dated only relatively as predating the earliest texts. Here, Faliscan and Latin are clearly different, and the difference is ‘old’: as said, I think it at best unproven and at worst unlikely that there were other Latin dialects that showed the same development and that what we call the ‘Latin’ development was originally limited to Roman Latin. A far more recent development is the innovation of the perfect of *facio*, where Faliscan chose for /fak-/ and Latin generalized /fĕk-/. Are these two differences enough to say that Faliscan is not Latin? This depends on how far dialects are allowed to vary before they can be said that they constitute a language of their own. With regard to the ‘grammar’ and the lexicon, Faliscan is Latin. The differences are mainly matters of phonology, or even phonetics, most of them of recent or even very recent date. If these developments are regarded as ‘acceptable’ within the degree of variation that can be expected within the local variants of one language, Faliscan is, indeed, a Latin dialect.

As the only local variant of the Latin language outside Latium, Faliscan may at times have been isolated to a varying degree from the remainder of the Latin-speaking area, and such a period of isolation might explain the separate development of the word-internal reflexes of the voiced aspirates, and perhaps even the comparatively recent generalization of /fak-/ as a perfect stem. Yet, if there were such periods of isolation, Faliscan would be expected to have diverged from Latin to a far greater extent than appears to be the case. That the divergence remained limited may be due to fairly frequent contacts with the remainder of the Latin-speaking community. The problem with Faliscan seems to be that there is a large number of respects in which Faliscan is, for all intents and purposes, Latin, while there are a small number of features in which Faliscan is not Latin at all, and that these separating features are separated from each other in time and are not *either* all recent *or* all old, implying that they are not due to one continuous process of divergence or convergence. Some of these could of course have arisen due to local variation, as can be expected in a dialect, and especially one both physically and historically at the periphery of the language of which it was a part.

CHAPTER 10

In §2.4.2. I mentioned the possibility that the area where Latin was spoken extended to the north of the Tiber as well, and disappeared or shrank with the growth and emergence of Etruscan culture and language. The area in between Latium and the ager Faliscus remained, to some extent, an area where Latin continued to be spoken until the Roman conquest made it 'officially' Latin again. Perhaps the differences and correspondences between Faliscan and Latin are to be ascribed to such alternating stages when Faliscan was now the northernmost exponent of a Latin-speaking continuum stretching southward all the way to Latium Adiectum, and now separated from that continuum and in more frequent contact with speakers of the greatly different Etruscan and the not-so-different Sabellic languages. It might be this now closer, now looser bond of Faliscan with the rest of Latin to which its many similarities, but its few but significant dissimilarities with Latin may have to be ascribed.