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ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF PIE *gh/gh IN FALISCAN:
A RESPONSE TO PICARD

REX E. WALLACE & BRIAN D. JOSEPH
University of Massachusetts & Ohio State University

1. Introductory remarks

In an article published recently in this journal (Joseph & Wallace 1991), we examined the relationship between Latin and Faliscan, ultimately arguing that even though Faliscan and Latin are closely related, forming a Latino-Faliscan (LF) subgroup within Ietic, there are innovations — in the form of various sound changes affecting the Proto-Indo-European (PIE) palatal and velar voiced aspirates *gh/gh — that separate the two and require that Faliscan be considered a separate language from Latin, and in particular not just a dialect of Latin. Our main interest was in the outcome of these sound changes — in initial position, /h/ in both Latin and Faliscan, but in medial position /h/ in Latin and /g/ (or /k/, on which see below and n.13) in Faliscan — and the correspondences between Faliscan and Latin that resulted from them. Our claim was that the evidence of these correspondences, once one accepts the assumption of a common starting point for Latin and Faliscan (i.e., that they are indeed closely related), leads inevitably to the conclusion that there has been an innovation that separates the two languages.

Picard (1993), hereafter P, criticises our view of the development of the PIE aspirates *gh/gh in Faliscan (Joseph & Wallace, pp.177-179) on the grounds that the sound changes implied in our discussion are ones that cannot plausibly be reconstructed for Faliscan or, for that matter, any language. While

we do not agree with P’s critique of our discussion, and so offer a rebuttal in the section which follows, we point out here at the start that even if his criticism is accepted in toto, it in no way affects the thesis of our paper, with which he himself is in agreement (p.142).

2. Noch einmal PIE *gh/gh in Faliscan

Let us start our rebuttal by reviewing the Faliscan facts, for they are most at issue. PIE *gh/gh is attested three times in Faliscan in intervocalic position, once in the verb lecet 3SG PRES “lies” GG 85 and twice in the verb corresponding to Latin fingit “fashions”, namely fifiket 3SG PERF GG 11 and fififiqed 3PL PERF GG 1. To represent the sound that corresponds to Latin h < *gh/gh in intervocalic position the Faliscan writing system utilizes three letters, c k q. The most reasonable phonetic interpretation of these letters (c k q) in this context is in our opinion [g] (so also Lejeune 1955:147:n.19), though an interpretation as a voiceless velar [k] cannot in principle be ruled out (see n.13 for discussion).4 We assume then that the Faliscan verbs fifiket/ fififiqed and lecet, whose velars derive from ultimately from PIE voiced aspirates, show /g/ (c k q) as the regular outcome of PIE *gh/gh in intervocalic position.

In our earlier paper (see pp.177-179 and n.31), we noted that it was possible to derive the Faliscan reflex of PIE *gh/gh by allowing one of two hypotheses (see (1) and (2)),6 though for expository purposes we adopted the traditional view ((1) below) in the body of our text.

According to that view, which is sketched out in (1), Faliscan /g/ in intervocalic position is derived from a Proto-Italic (PI) voiceless velar fricative, presumably via an intermediate stage in which the sound became voiced. Faliscan /g/ is then the result of changes whereby PI *g > *γ > /g/.

---

4 The problem is that /g/ and /k/ are graphemically undifferentiated in the Faliscan writing system, the letters c k q serving to represent both phonemes. For additional facts see Joseph & Wallace (1991:177).

6 Although /k/ cannot be excluded as the regular development from PIE *gh/gh in intervocalic position, arguments for /g/ as the regular reflex are discussed in detail in Joseph & Wallace (1991:178-179).

---

* The following abbreviations are employed in this paper: AHD = The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (3rd ed., 1992); CIL = Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum Vol. I 2.1-4; GG = Giacomelli 1963; VE = Vetter 1953.

1 P’s critique of our presentation of PIE *gh/gh in Faliscan is grounded in his beliefs about the fundamental principles of sound change, namely naturalness and minimality. However, since a discussion of what we believe to be problems with P’s principles would require a longish response and would detract from the issue at hand, namely the Faliscan developments, we have decided to forgo debate here specifically on this issue (but see our remarks in §2 below and in notes 9, 10, and 11); we hope to respond elsewhere more fully to the significant questions raised by P’s principles of sound change.

2 P cites the PIE root *dhig- “form, fashion” as *dhig- (p.139) and *wegh- “transport” as *wegh- (ibid.).

3 For the developments in word-initial position, see Wallace & Joseph (1991).
(1) PIE \( \ast gh/gh > \ast h^h > \text{PI} \ast x > \text{LF} \ast x > \text{pre-Faliscan} \ast \gamma > \text{Faliscan} /g/ \)

Following the second hypothesis (2), in which the PIE aspirates develop directly to spirants in PI, Faliscan /g/ derives from an inherited PI voiced velar \( \ast \gamma \).

(2) PIE \( \ast gh/gh > \text{PI} \ast \gamma > \text{LF} \ast \gamma > \text{Faliscan} /g/ \)

In P’s view it is unlikely that the Faliscan sound /g/ at issue here is a regular development from either PI \( \ast x \) (1) or PI \( \ast \gamma \) (2), since derivation from either one of these proto-segments in intervocalic position would entail for him the ‘unnatural’ \(^7\) because otherwise unattested (in his view), change of a velar fricative becoming a stop intervocally.\(^10\) For P then the issue is one of nat-

\( \text{Latin} \ast \text{h} \rightarrow h \)

\( \text{Latin} \ast \text{h} \rightarrow h \)

\( \text{Latin} \ast \text{h} \rightarrow h \)

If one assumes that the voicing of the PI intervocalic spirants is an LF innovation, then it is possible to project \( \ast h \) back into LF. The revised scenario would be that given in (1).

(1) PIE \( \ast gh/gh > \ast h^h > \text{PI} \ast x > \text{LF} \ast \gamma > \text{Faliscan} /g/ \)

For P, a natural sound change is one for which there is “a plausible (articulatory or acoustic) phonetic explanation” and one “which can be shown to have taken place in some (per-

If, P, in his brief discussion of Latin h, cites the scenario for the development of all the PIE voiced aspirates presented in Baldi & Johnston-Staver (1989) as a more plausible derivation. It should be noted that this scenario, which is basically that of Ascoli (1968), is valid only for Classical Latin in word-initial position, except perhaps for the velar and then only under the assumption that PI \( \ast x \) did not undergo medial voicing along with PI \( \ast f \) and \( \ast s \).

For P, a natural sound change is one for which there is “a plausible (articulatory or acous-

P, in his brief discussion of Latin h, cites the scenario for the development of all the PIE voiced aspirates presented in Baldi & Johnston-Staver (1989) as a more plausible derivation. It should be noted that this scenario, which is basically that of Ascoli (1968), is valid only for Classical Latin in word-initial position, except perhaps for the velar and then only under the assumption that PI \( \ast x \) did not undergo medial voicing along with PI \( \ast f \) and \( \ast s \).

For P, a natural sound change is one for which there is “a plausible (articulatory or acous-

Difficulties in dealing in hard and fast absolutes with regard to a principle of directionality we cite the following case. According to P, obstructive voicing in word-final position is constrained by directionality: voicing of voiced stops is acceptable in word-final position but the voicing of voiceless stops is not. But it turns out that just such a change involving \( \ast t > d \) is in fact well-documented word-finally for the languages of the Italic branch of Indo-European (on which see Meier 1986:101). The PI 3SG secondary verbal ending deriving from PIE \( \ast *-t \) (which is clearly \( \ast t \) due to the occurrence of the same morpheme in the primary ending \( \ast *-ti \) (thus \( \ast *-ti \), cf. Sanskrit \( \text{abhara}-t-i \) “(s)he carried” / \text{bhara}-t-i “(s)he carries”), in word-final position is written as \( \text{d} \) in the daughter languages, thus indicating a merger with the original PI voiced dental \( \text{d} \) which was preserved as such, e.g., Oscan deded 3SG PERF “gave” VE 11 < \( * \text{dedet} \), Faliscan pored 3SG PERF “presented” GG 1 < \( * \text{por-dedet} \), Latin sted 3SG PRES SUBJ “be” CIL 4 < *\text{siet}.

\( \text{P} \) also is concerned with ‘minimalism’, a principle by which sound changes ‘modify only one primary phonetic feature at a time’ (p.140). While we sympathize with this view, we feel that, minimally, it runs afoul of various well-attested changes; even the \( \ast f \) to \( \ast t \) change that P endorses for Latin (in his note 2) requires changes in both manner, in this case stri-

\( \text{P} \) also is concerned with ‘minimalism’, a principle by which sound changes ‘modify only one primary phonetic feature at a time’ (p.140). While we sympathize with this view, we feel that, minimally, it runs afoul of various well-attested changes; even the \( \ast f \) to \( \ast t \) change that P endorses for Latin (in his note 2) requires changes in both manner, in this case stri-

Regardless of P’s views on the naturalness of the change \( \ast \gamma > g \), we can point to a well-documented and widely accepted instance of a parallel to this change, thereby placing the change in question here within the scope of attested sound changes. Such a parallel legitimizes the use of this path of development for the Faliscan developments. The parallel comes from Germanic, and concerns various changes undergone by the Proto-Germanic (PGmc) voiced velar spirant \( \ast \gamma \), the medial allophone, under most interpretations, of the PGmc voiced velar stop phoneme.

PGmc \( \ast \gamma \) in medial position had two sources: it developed from the PIE velar (and palatal) voiced aspirated stop \( \ast gh/gh \), and it developed from the PIE velar (and palatal, and in some instances labio-velar) voiceless unaspirated stop \( \ast k(k/kw) \) by the combination of Grimm’s Law, by which the voiceless stops were spirantized, and Verner’s Law by which PGmc voiceless spirants were voiced intervocally when not preceded by an accented syllable. Relevant examples include Gothic steigan, Old English stigan “to go up, rise” (both phonetically [stijan]), from a PIE root *steigh- (cf. Greek στηθή‘ “proceeds, marches”, Old Church Slavic stignti “to hasten”), and Gothic fuglis, Old English fugol ‘bird’ from PGmc *fuguaz (phonemically *fuglaz), apparently a dissimilation from an earlier *pleu-k-lo- (as suggested, for instance, in AHD, p.2121).

Later developments in various continental dialects of West Germanic, i.e., those of High German, as noted already by Allen (1958:104-105), provide the parallel to our Faliscan developments. In particular, even though many dialects retain the spirantic pronunciation of PGmc \( \ast \gamma \), Prokosch (1938:77-78) notes that “a detached territory in the Northeast has the stop g for Gmc. \( \gamma \) [Pro-

Prokosch’s symbol for \( \ast \gamma \) (REW/BDJ) both initially and medially: Initially, \( g \) is
spoken in Schleswig-Holstein, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Pommern; medially, in Mecklenburg-Schwerin”. What is significant for our purposes here is that there were OHG dialects in which the voiced velar spirant ultimately yielded a velar stop, not only word-initially, but also in intervocalic position. These dialects, therefore, in which PGmc intervocalic *γ* developed to g, show a path of change that is counter to P’s claims about “natural” and attested sound changes. But since *γ* is widely accepted as the reconstructed starting point for PGmc, it would seem that the burden of proof is on P to show that this development is not as it appears to be.

The change of *γ* > g, therefore, though admittedly not as common as the developments assumed for Latin (PI *x* > h or PI *γ* > *h* > h), indeed finds a parallel in these Germanic developments and so fits P’s definition of a natural change (with the additional assumption that the change can be phonetically motivated). Given then that a change from *γ* > g is found in Germanic, we see no reason not to accept it for Faliscan and no reason to reject either of the scenarios described in our paper. In sum, we stand by the view presented in Joseph & Wallace (1991) whereby Faliscan /g/ is the regular development of PI *x* (via (1)) or PI *γ* (via (2)) < PIE *gh/*gh in intervocalic position.13

3. Concluding remarks

We readily admit that the development of the PIE aspirated palatal and velar stops (*gh/*gh) in intervocalic position in Faliscan is a matter of some controversy because, as is so often the case with languages that are poorly attested, there is very little evidence to work with, and further, the evidence that is available may not lend itself to unambiguous analyses. Be this as it may, we think that intervocalic c k q in the Faliscan verbs fifiked/fifilikod and lecit can be explained by “natural” changes within either of the frameworks currently available (presented in (1) and (2)) to describe the development of the PIE aspi-

---

13 Note that even if it is assumed that the Faliscan letters c k q represent a voiceless velar stop /k/, there are Germanic dialects that provide parallels for the derivation of this sound from an earlier velar fricative. As part of the High German sound shift, the PGmc phoneme *d* was devoiced to t; not only initially, as in OHG trinkhan “drink” (cf. Gothic dirikan), but also medially, as in OHG fater “father” (cf. Gothic fadar); presumably, then, the medial dental spirant allophone became a stop, and then was devoiced, just like the word-initial stop allophone. But the important fact for us is that there were OHG dialects in which the voiced velar phoneme also underwent devoicing, and ultimately yielded a voiceless velar stop, both word-initially and in intervocalic position. Thus in Upper OHG, focal is found for “bird” (Prokosch 1939:82) and atclcan for “rise” (Braune 1906:19), where the orthographic < c > stands for a voiceless velar stop. In these dialects, then, PGmc intervocalic *γ* became k, either via *γ* > *x* > k, or, more likely, via *γ* > *g* > k, this latter path providing yet another example then of the development of [g] from [γ] intervocalically. Thus, under the assumption that Faliscan c k q represents a voiceless velar stop, it is possible to derive this sound by either scenario (1) (*x* > k) or (2) (*γ* > *g* > k), both of which are rejected as unnatural by P.

---

14 Even though we believe that either of the two views of the development of PIE *gh/*gh to Faliscan /g/ presented in §2 are acceptable ones (see above (1) and (2)), we note here that the alternative presented by P, in which Faliscan c k q = /k/ (though possibly /g/) is derived directly from *kʰ*, is also possible, though not, at least in our opinion, more plausible than the scenarios cited above. For P, fricativization of the velar stop *kʰ* is not a change shared by all members of the Italic branch. Instead, *kʰ* is reconstructed for LF and the change of *kʰ* to *k*’, which is found in Latin and the Sabellian languages (= Oscean, Umbrian and South Picene), is considered to be an independent innovation (see (i)).

(i) PIE *gh/*gh > PI *kʰ* > LF *kʰ* > Faliscan k

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sabellian <em>x</em> &gt; Oscean / Umbrian h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Finally, note that P’s assumption of *kʰ* in LF does not really push back the date at which Latin and Faliscan separated as he claims; what it does is push forward the date for the survival of the voiceless aspirated stop in the languages of the LF branch of Italic (see diagram (i)).
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