8 Conclusion

8.1 Summary

On the basis of positive evidence—irregular phonological alternations and to a certain extent non-IE morphophonology—I have compiled a list of Latin lexemes that are likely not inherited but have instead originated from or have been mediated by non-IE languages with which Italic (and its changing neighbors) came into contact on its migrations from the steppe to the Italian peninsula.

The phonological alternations on their own, while indicators of non-native origin, are poorly diagnostic of stratigraphy. They become more informative when considered alongside distributional details. In cases of alternation between what can be artificially reconstructed to voicedness and/or aspiration of plosives, Latin tends to attest to the plain, unvoiced variant. Some of the substrate languages with which Italic was in contact left traces of palatalization and labialization in the IE branches that borrowed from them. Other alternations include those between labial plosives and labial nasals as well as between labial plosives and labial approximants. A case can be made for an intrusive nasal before labial plosives being particular to Latin reflexes of some loanwords. Another class of alternation involves the vacillating presence of a sibilant at the beginning of words, word-internally, and especially in interaction with **k*. Other alternations include those between *l* and *r*, a dental and a velar, and several vocalic alternations. Gemination sometimes appears in alternation between Classical Latin and Romance descendants, suggesting that it represents a recent stratum. Morphological features of substrate origin include the phenomenon of *a*-prefixation and concomitant root vocalic reduction and an *n*-suffix; both features are potentially attested across Europe and into the Mediterranean. In a small group of Latin words ending in *-ix*/*-ex*, the suffix can be shown to be of non-native origin. In other cases it is from different sources, some of which may be inherited. That any of the substrate languages with which Latin was in contact had reduplication as a feature is difficult to confirm.

Distributionally, the non-inherited lexicon of Latin attests to a large group of loanwords acquired in the Mediterranean region as well as a smaller group that must represent earlier contact phenomena. The latter are much more difficult to stratify. There is possible evidence of a velar ~ dental alternation in a contact situation in which Greek did not participate. Considerations on a stage of Italo-Celtic unity lead to different stratigraphic interpretations. Otherwise, comparanda for Latin lexemes of non-IE origin are found (in limited numbers) in languages as far away as the Caucasus, Uralic, Sumerian, and Indo-Iranian. The Uralic case (comparandum to *avēna* ‘oats’) may attest to a Wanderwort or an Eastern substrate language. Certain Indo-Iranian comparanda likely attest to Wanderwörter, although the Iranian comparanda of Lat. *ervum* ‘bitter vetch’ are relevant to the discussion surrounding the descent of individuals of the Sintashta Culture from Corded Ware (cf. Allentoft et al. 2015). As to Caucasian and

Sumerian, both the latter (Schrijver 2017: 362) and the former (Schrijver fthc.) have been suggested as possible points of origin for the *a*-prefix phenomenon.

In any case, I have found very few certain cases of Caucasian comparanda for Latin words of non-IE origin (*ferrum* 'iron', *fungus* 'mushroom, sponge', and *plumbum* 'lead' are probably in Kartvelian and NE Caucasian; *sabulum* 'sand' perhaps in NW Caucasian). The metallurgical words are Wanderwörter, though *fungus* may be the result of a very old, widespread word. Similarly, Basque plays a very small role in the data. Both aspects are surprising, given some proposals of a Euskaro-Caucasian substrate in Europe (cf. early on Trombetti 1927: 220, recently Bengtson & Leschber 2021; also Bossong 2017: 859 on Vasconic) for which I find no evidence as concerns what Latin preserves.

Of the non-inherited lexemes in Latin presented here, 40% refer to plants and 20% to animals. All 3 words for vessels, all 3 culinary terms, and 3 of 4 textile terms are shared with Greek and/or attest to a Mediterranean distribution. This is undoubtedly the result of large cultural changes that occurred upon and after settling in the Mediterranean region. On the other hand, the 6 Italo-Celto-Germanic isoglosses lack domesticated species and include *corbis* 'basket' and *hasta* 'spear', hinting at the much earlier cultural contexts in which they were borrowed. Several (11) non-native words for domesticated plants seem to suggest that at least a portion of the borrowed vocabulary originated in an agricultural substrate. The possibility of a single agricultural substrate language family distributed throughout Europe, in both Mediterranean and non-Mediterranean regions, provides a layer of difficulty in determining where and when agricultural terminology was acquired and therefore where the ancestors of the Italic languages were at various periods of prehistory.

Ancient DNA analyses provide strong support for the steppe hypothesis of Indo-European origins. Steppe ancestry first appears in Northern Italy ca. 2000 BCE, increasing gradually and spreading southwards. Large amounts of admixture with non-steppe-derived populations occurred, resulting in a genetic cline from North to South. The spread of Indo-European languages into Southern Italy seems to have involved much less population replacement than in the North. Archaeologically, there are several possibilities of identifying the arrival of the Italic language branch in the Italian peninsula. With the following combination of the most recent archaeological, genetic, and linguistic data, we can make the most accurate assessment so far.

8.2 Discussion: Triangulating Italic Prehistory

Given that some of the earliest human remains with steppe ancestry were found in Bell Beaker contexts dating to ca. 2000 BCE in Northern Italy (Saupe et al. 2021), the appearance of the Bell Beaker material in Italy marks the earliest point at which Italic languages could have entered Italy. The technology of halberds and their ritual elite use spread to El Argar in Spain ca. 2100-2075 BCE, in some cases in Bell Beaker contexts,

from where they seem to have directly influenced the development of halberd technology in western Central Italy by ca. 2050 BCE (Schuhmacher 2002: 282-4). Given that steppe ancestry appeared on the Iberian peninsula by 2500 BCE and had begun to spread by 2000 BCE (Olalde et al. 2019), the clear communication of these areas in association with their attestation of Bell Beaker materials could be further evidence of the Indo-Europeanization of Italy through the Bell Beaker Culture. However the influence seems to have come from Southeast Spain (Schuhmacher 2002: 282), and it is in the South that steppe ancestry had less of an impact (Olalde et al. 2019). Furthermore, the influence is on the Italian Rinaldone Culture which, despite a very small sample size having been sequenced, has not yet provided evidence of individuals with steppe ancestry (Antonio et al. 2019); in fact steppe ancestry does not seem to appear in Central Italy until ca. 1600 BCE (Saupe et al. 2021). Thus it seems clear that not all Bell Beaker material in Italy marks the arrival of individuals with steppe ancestry. While the Bell Beaker grave that does attest to an individual with steppe ancestry in Northern Italy is found close to a Remedello Culture cemetery (a Copper Age culture roughly contemporary with Rinaldone), it seems possible that any migrations of individuals associated with the diffusion of Bell Beaker Culture may have been too small to have introduced major language shift. Harrison and Heyd (2007: 206-7) note that only a few individuals are needed to "proselytize" the solar cult and specific outwards displays that the Bell Beaker package represented.

A more likely scenario for the Italicization of Italy hearkens in part back to Pigorini. Firstly, the analysis of the linguistic data has shown that loanwords with a Mediterranean distribution (plausibly *ālium*, *faber*, *fīcus*, *hirundō*, and *laurus*, cf. §4.3.2.1) entered still-intact Proto-Italic. This means, in other words, that Proto-Italic did not split up until after it entered the Mediterranean zone. On this alone, we cannot rule out a situation whereby, for instance, Proto-Italic was spoken across the Adriatic, still in Mediterranean territory, and multiple waves of migration brought the separate Italic daughter languages to the peninsula. But we also have the evidence of the North-to-South genetic cline as well as the position of the Italic languages themselves. Besides Latin and Sabellic, Venetic, which was spoken mainly in what is now Veneto and Fruili, is most likely to be classified as an Italic language (Weiss 2022b, or at least intermediate to Italic and Celtic, cf. Schrijver 2016). Ancient personal names attested in the area around the Slovenian town of Ig show some similarities with those of Venetic (cautiously, Stifter 2012: 255, 260). All of this points to a(n interim) Proto-Italic homeland in Northeast Italy, placing it within the realm of the Terramare Culture.

The Terramare civilization collapsed around 1150 BCE, perhaps over the course of a few decades, after which site numbers fell to less than a quarter North of the Po River and most settlements were abandoned completely South of it (Moloy, Bruyère, & Jovanović 2023: 148), leading to a diaspora of its inhabitants (Cardarelli 2009, Iacono et al. 2021: 384). The widespread presence of Terramare style pottery in northern Tuscany, Romagna, Umbria, and the Marches (as opposed to its infrequency in southern Etruria

and Latium) and Terramare-style elements in the pottery of some Campanian settlements suggests that some of these areas received significant numbers of Terramare groups (Cardarelli 2009: 507). Additionally, cremation and subsequent interment in Urnfields had begun to be widely adopted at Terramare sites by ca. 1450 BCE (Iacono et al. 2021: 385-6; Moloy, Bruyère, & Jovanović 2023: 149). The diffusion of this rite throughout the Italian peninsula coincides with the diaspora (Cavazzuti et al. 2022: 74), ushering in the era of the Urnfield horizon in Italy. Cremation was not adopted with equal acceptance everywhere (Iacono et al. 2021: 386, Cavazzuti et al. 2022), implying an important ideological component to its spread (cf. Cavazzuti et al. 2021). Note that, instead of a subsequent invasion of 'inhuming Italici' (cf. §7.2), the inhuming areas were instead the inhabitants of the peninsula that did not adopt the new burial ritual.[576] In any case, the collapse of the Terramare settlement region seems to provide evidence of a sizable population movement that could certainly have had a linguistic impact on the Italian peninsula. But the story of course does not begin with Terramare, and events before its collapse provide further support of its role as a potential bearer of the Italic languages.

The first Urnfields actually appeared ca. 2000 BCE amongst the Tell cultures in Hungary. It is from the Pannonian/Hungarian Plain that they would spread into the Po Valley (Trump 1966: 137, Cavazzuti et al. 2022). Contact between these two regions from ca. 1600 BCE onwards was extensive. Both areas' metalwork evolved in tandem and there are similarities in their development timelines across all levels of society and, as mentioned, all aspects of their mortuary practice (Moloy, Bruyère, & Jovanović 2023: 150-60). It is to such an extent that Moloy, Bruyère, and Jovanović (2023: 158) suggest that "people moving between these regions was predictable and normal in this linked-up social world and it included people settling in communities that were distant from those into which they were born." Around 1550 BCE, Terramare sites began to see a substantial population increase, difficult to explain in terms of natural population growth, leading Cardarelli (2009: 450) to use the term "colonization" of the Po Plain. While it is likely that an amount of this increase was due to inward migration from surrounding regions (Cardarelli 2018: 362), it is precisely around this time (ca. 1600-1450 BCE) that the Koszider Period on the Pannonian Plain saw a drastic change in settlement patterns concomitant with contact with the Tumulus Culture from the West. While it was formerly thought that the flourishing Tell civilization in Hungary collapsed under an onslaught of pastoralist warriors, the absence of drastic depopulation suggests more modern interpretations involving demographic decline and the simplification of social structures (Fischl et al. 2013: 355, 360-4), perhaps the toppling of elite systems upon the

[576] What had been seen as evidence of the trans-Adriatic movement of Sabellic is the Cetina phenomenon, in which ca. 2500 BCE Cetina pottery from Dalmatia appears in Italy in the Northern and Western Adriatic, and crossing the Apennines into Campania (at three sites). This seems to have been brought to Italy by the movement of small groups with an interest in occupying inland areas (Recchia 2020). I consider the possibility of these migrants having been speakers of an Italic language highly unlikely in light of the argumentation here for Proto-Italic from the North.

establishment of new trade connections (Moloy, Bruyère, & Jovanović 2023: 160). It seems likely that some amount of the population, perhaps those disenfranchised by the societal changes (Moloy, Bruyère, & Jovanović 2023: 153) migrated along the previously established corridors into "homophilous" communities, especially the Po Valley (Kristiansen 2018: 118). It is almost certain the that the ensuing period of similarity between the Hungarian Plain, especially the Tisza Site Group of the South and the Po Plain, especially the Terramare, between 1500 and 1200 BCE (Moloy, Bruyère, & Jovanović 2023: 157) established an amount of homophily that allowed Urnfield burial customs to spread so rapidly into Italy (Cavazzuti 2022: 74). Moloy, Bruyère, and Jovanović (2023: 161-2) further suggest, given that the megasites of the Tisza Site Group entered a period of crisis and depopulation ca. 1200 BCE, that a migration of inhabitants southwards could have stressed the already ecologically strained Terramare society (cf. Cardarelli 2009: 459, 468), precipitating its ca. 1150 BCE collapse.

The concept of homophily also seems applicable to the Terramare diaspora southwards into central Italian regions. Beside the cultural technology of the halberd, the production, use, and circulation of copper and bronze daggers became an important symbolic phenomenon (van Rossenberg 2013). Of the solid-hilted dagger (*Vollgriffdolch*) there were several regional types. The Italian peninsula was home to two significant categories. One, the "Baltisch-Padanisch" type, is interesting because it is found from the Po Valley over the Bohemian Basin (including in the Únětice Culture) up to the Baltic. But even more interesting are the "Italian types" from Central and Southern Italy (beginning ca. 2000 BCE), because these may in fact be the oldest in Europe, with their technology spreading North in part via their influence on the Baltisch-Padanisch type (Schwenzer 2004: 240-3).

Amongst these Italian types, van Rossenberg (2013) focuses on unique super-sized full-hilted daggers, the earliest of which are from central East Italy on the Adriatic. Amongst their circulation, he located two separate cross-Apennine trading networks with a cultural boundary between them: one to the South amongst the southern Proto-Apennine facies and one to the North amongst the Grotta Nuova facies (both precursors of the Apennine Culture, cf. §7.1.4). The sites on the northern margins of the Grotta Nuova group were integrated into the Terramare. From the other side of things, Cardarelli (2009: 487) notes that, beginning around 1350 BCE, during the formation of the Sub-Apennine facies in northern Central Italy, "a more than marginal role was played by the adoption and reworking of styles and tastes deriving from the Terramare." Thus, communication between the Terramare Culture and the parts of Italy into which its inhabitants would migrate was relatively long-standing. Perhaps the Italicization of those regions had begun even before the collapse of the Terramare.

Up to now, it seems that a case can be made that the Terramare Culture represents at least in part a Proto-Italic speaking population, and that the Proto-Italic element reached Northern Italy via intensive contact with and possible migrations from the area of the Hungarian Plain. A further consideration is the fact that the Urnfield burial rite spread

from Hungary not only to the Po Valley but from ca. the 14th c. BCE onwards also westward (e.g. Cavazzuti et al. 2022: 74), becoming the Hallstatt Culture in areas that would come to be Celtic-speaking. It seems quite possible then that the homeland of Proto-Italo-Celtic could have been in this region. How can this area be connected to the steppe however? Part of the Yamnaya expansion saw it reach up to the Carpathian Basin (cf. Harrison & Heyd 2007: 194). Anthony (2007: 305) suggests that this could have "incubated the ancestral dialects for several western Indo-European language branches, including Pre-Italic and Pre-Celtic."

Unless Proto-Germanic was also incubated in that wave of Yamnaya, then the wave of steppe migrants into the Carpathian Basin could not have been speakers of Proto-Italo-Celtic. As the linguistic data in this work shows, the non-native vocabulary of Latin requires it to have been in contact with a substrate language shared with Germanic. Interestingly, this has also been proposed from the perspective of inherited linguistic data (Polomé 1972, 1974, 1981; Bossong 2017: 859). Ideally, such an area would also exclude Greek (cf. already Devoto 1936: 535). Steppe ancestry entered North/Central Europe as the Corded Ware Culture (cf. Haak et al. 2015) beginning around 2900 BCE (Papac et al. 2021). On the other hand, it reached Northern Greece between 2600 and 2000 BCE (Clemente et al. 2021) appearing in reduced proportion in Mycenaean individuals (cf. also Lazaridis et al. 2022). It thus seems likely that the ancestors of Greek- and Armenian-speakers were not a part of the Corded Ware horizon.[577] The ancestors of Italic-speakers may well have been.

The subsistence strategies of the Corded Ware Culture were diverse, differing between sites and sexes and correlating to mobility. A dietary shift from earlier Neolithic periods is visible in the isotopic data; while it can have several causes, one likely reason is an increased reliance on milk products, suggesting an increasing importance of pastoralism. At the same time, it is clear from especially non-local women that some groups were practicing intensive agriculture (Sjögren, Price & Kristiansen 2016). This has a good parallel in the genetic data, where it is clear that during the Corded Ware period, intrusive males with steppe ancestry were marrying non-local females without steppe ancestry, leading to a period of assimilation whereby Neolithic ancestry components increased into the Bell Beaker period (Papac et al. 2021). It seems plausible that, given such a mosaic of economies in this time and place, the non-domesticated vocabulary shared by Italic, Celtic, and Germanic not present in Greek (and words attesting to the dental ~ velar alternation lacking attestation in Greek) may have entered at this period alongside vocabulary from the more widespread agricultural substrate with which Greek did have contact. Being one of the oldest strata, it makes sense that so few lexemes can be traced back to it with certainty.

---

[577] Papac et al. 2021 note that the Y-chromosomal haplogroups of Yamnaya, Corded Ware, and Bell Beaker are different, suggesting that the Yamnaya were not the direct source of the steppe ancestry in Corded Ware or Bell Beaker. Larzaridis et al. 2022 do not agree. In any case, improved resolution of sequences from Italy might allow similar conclusions to be made.

If Italic speakers were indeed descended from Corded Ware individuals, we would need a way to link Corded Ware (ca. 3000-2350 BCE) to the second millennium Hungarian Plain. Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1995 I: 845, cf. also Gimbutas 1963: 828) for instance suspected that the Únětice Culture (2300-1600 BCE) might represent a time and place in which at least Italic, Celtic, and Germanic would have (still) been in contact.[578] Furthermore, Únětice developed out of a region in the Bell Beaker horizon upon the addition of population influx from a more Northeastern source, while there is some evidence that the preceding Bell Beaker horizon may have developed locally with some genetic continuity from earlier Corded Ware (Papac et al. 2021). The Tumulus Culture (1600-1300 BCE) subsequently developed in Únětice areas. It spread into the Hungarian Plain after (perhaps helping to precipitate) the collapse of the Tell cultures, remaining during the period of extensive contact between the Hungarian and Po Plains (e.g. Fischl et al. 2013; Moloy, Bruyère, & Jovanović 2023). It was also present in some areas in Italy North of the Po as indicated by e.g. prestige goods in inhumation graves at Olmo di Nogara (Iacono et al. 2021: 385-6). Like for the spread of the Urnfield horizon into Italy (e.g. Cavazzuti 2022 et al.), an aspect of homophily may have been involved in the spread of the Urnfield horizon into areas previously home to the Tumulus Culture. A small amount of cremation had begun to be practiced in the late phases of the Tumulus Culture, gradually growing to put inhumation burials into the minority; and this already before the Urnfield style of cremation ritual rapidly spread westwards, superseding the previous style of cremation (Falkenstein 2012).

Additional support for such a scenario comes in the form of the word for iron. Lat. *ferrum* is plausibly a Wanderwort with its source in Luw. **parza-*. Compelling comparanda include PGm. **brasa-* 'brass', Svan *berež* 'iron', and Ingush/Chechen *borza* 'bronze' (cf. Thorsø et al. 2023: 111-12). Especially the Germanic form suggests that the *f* of *ferrum* could be the result of a borrowing into the chain of developments from PIE $*b^h$, i.e. into Proto-Italic. But despite the lexeme's non-Mediterranean distribution, it is unlikely to have entered Proto-Italic outside of the Mediterranean zone. The earliest certain evidence for iron smelting dates to ca. 1800 BCE in Central Anatolia (Thorsø et al. 2023: 120 with lit.), and iron objects begin to appear in mainland Italy during the Late and Final Bronze Age, including Proto-Villanova contexts (Giardino 2005). But the technology did not reach Western Europe until the Late Hallstatt and La Tène periods in the early first millennium BCE (Thorsø et al. 2023: 120 with lit.). Thus, in order for Italic to have acquired its word for iron from contact with the same substrate as Germanic,[579] it probably could not have done so before the first century BCE. And there is no plausible archaeological proxy for the arrival of Proto-Italic speakers in Italy at

[578] Additionally, the Únětice and Nordic Bronze Age cultures were also in extensive contact with the Carpathian Basin (Kristiansen and Larsson 2005: 128-86, Vandkilde 2014).

[579] This also assumes that PGm. **brasa-* 'brass' is not the original meaning of the source lexeme from which Italic and Germanic could have borrowed. But this is a justifiable assumption if Luwian is the closest to the origin of the word. It is uneconomical to assume that Latin later, independently, changed the meaning "back" to iron.

such a late date. Instead, *ferrum* must have reached the Italian peninsula independently of Germanic, as a Wanderwort. The possibility remains that it was borrowed into the chain of Proto-Italic developments from PIE *b^h, and it can thus be placed alongside e.g. *fīcus* as one of the earliest loanwords taken up on the Italian peninsula. This would further point to the presence of Italic in Italy at the boundary of the Bronze and Iron Ages.

Thus an argument can be made for the origin of Proto-Italic ultimately amongst the inhabitants of the Corded Ware Culture, through the Únětice and Tumulus Cultures, into the Hungarian Plain and its extensive population contact with, most proximally, the Terramare Culture. The actual spread of the Proto-Italic and Proto-Celtic languages seems like it can be associated with the dispersion of the Urnfield Horizon (due at least in part to human migrations, cf. Kristiansen 1998: 385-6). Given the possibility of the transmission of new regional developments back into homophilous adjacent areas, it is not easy to rule out that perhaps an earlier stage, like the Tumulus Culture itself, could have been home to Proto-Italo-Celtic. Perhaps this is more likely, given that the expansion of the Urnfield horizon was not limited to Italic and Celtic areas (continuing into Northern Europe and the Balkans). As the resolution of ancient genome analysis increases, an alternative scenario may present itself: The Tell Cultures of the Hungarian Plain seem to have developed from the contact of a Balkan and a Central/Northwestern European Bell Beaker network ca. 2500/2400-2000/1900 BCE (Fischl et al. 256). If future analyses exclude the descent of Proto-Italic speakers from individuals of the Corded Ware Culture, then perhaps the Hungarian Plain served as more ultimate rather than proximal intermediate homeland of Proto-Italic.

The Mediterranean stratum visible in the Latin words of non-inherited origin is almost certainly composed of material that was present on the peninsula before the arrival of (Proto-)Italic speakers. Apulia, the Eastern Adriatic, and Sicily had been pulled into the periphery of the Mesopotamian Uruk Civilization between ca. 2600-2200 BCE, which at that point already included Anatolia, the Levant, and the Aegean (Harrison & Heyd 2007: 193), probably spurring e.g. the development of the symbology and technology of the full-hilted dagger (Schwenzer 2004: 245). But there were plenty of interactions with Mediterranean societies after the arrival of Italic yet still before the dawn of the historic era. Mycenaeans would eventually play an important role in transmitting influences between East and West (Kristiansen 1998: 360). The Adriatic coast of Italy was importing Greek pottery by the Middle Bronze Age and imitating it locally by the Late Bronze Age (Iacono et al. 2021: 386-7). (Recall how in two cases of Mediterranean words, *cupressus* and *hedera*, it seems that the lexemes originated in Pre-Geek and were transmitted to Latin.) Later, contact with Phoenicians and Greeks starting around the 9th c. BCE seems to have had a crucial influence on the economic and political development of central and northern Italy (Kristiansen 1998: 136). In the middle of the first millennium BCE, emporia were established to assist the import of products from across the Mediterranean, from Greece to Egypt. Cultural hybridizations began to occur, visible in e.g. the Greek and local kitchenware of the emporium of Spina (Zamboni 2021: 394).

This relatively late period still seems early enough for Mediterranean terminology to have been available to enter the Italic languages before the widespread occurrence of written texts.

The role of trade networks on the transmission of vocabulary is an important consideration in general. The sort of intensive and shifting trade relationships of the Bronze Age means in theory that words can have been exchanged over long distances without the borrowing languages having ever been spoken near each other. Both Únětice and Nordic Bronze Age Cultures were already in extensive contact with the Carpathian Basin, for example (Kristiansen and Larsson 2005: 128-86, Vandkilde 2014). While trade networks between Northern Europe and the Mediterranean may have led to the exchange of some words for cultural items (*corbis*, *hasta*), it is difficult to imagine that this could be the explanation for e.g. wild animals (*fulica*, *merula*).

In §1.2.2.3, I noted the difficulty of confirming the Etruscan origin of Latin lexemes. This is an unfortunate result of the paucity of well understood Etruscan lexical items. Roman sources attest to the political importance of Etruscan, and Etruscan prestige goods were traded deep into Central Europe (cf. Kristiansen 1998: 322 3). Etruscan even seems to have contributed personal names and morphological elements to (at least Cisalpine) Celtic (cf. McCone 2005: 396). Thus the lack of ample Etruscan influence on Latin is conspicuous. A new perspective on research of this sort, including other poorly understood *Kleinkorpussprachen* of Italy like Rhaetic and North Picene and perhaps with wider implications for languages of the Mediterranean (like Linear A), could include a search for the substrate features attested in the Latin and Greek lexicons (cf. the discussion under §3.3.4 on the potential relationship of the Etruscan and European substrate *n*-suffixes).

I have argued that the **Italicization** of Italy must have occurred from a single Proto-Italic kernel in Northeast Italy. But archaeological and especially genetic studies have made it very likely that the **Indo-Europeanization** of Italy may have occurred in several waves. Could there have been other IE languages spoken in Italy that disappeared? There is no reason why not (cf. Stifter's proposal of a "Bell Beakerish" on the British Isles before Celtic). But so far, it seems they have disappeared without a trace, at least given the current study's methodology. Forthcoming genetic studies on Mediterranean populations will surely help further contextualize the linguistic results of this dissertation (and vice versa). Thus we are growing nearer and nearer to an answer to the question: Latin, *unde vēnistī*?