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Chapter 1
Introduction to the Sabellian Languages

0. Introduction

The adjective 'Sabellian' is generally used as a cover term to refer to a group of contiguous languages spoken in the central portion of ancient Italy. The languages for which there is evidence, either in the form of epigraphical remains or glosses, are Volscian, Hernican, Marsian, Aequian, Sabine, Paelignian, Vestinian, and Marrucinian. At the beginning of the 5th century these languages occupied the narrow strip of central Italy between the Tyrrhenian and Adriatic seas, roughly the area lying between Etruria and Umbria on the north and Samnium on the south, including the central and southern portions of Latium (see Figure 1 at the end of this chapter). With a reasonable degree of certainty all of these languages, except for Hernican and perhaps Sabine, can be subgrouped within the Oscan-Umbrian branch of Italic (for discussion of the position of these languages within Italic see Chapter 4). ¹

1. The etymology of sabellus

The precise manner of the formation of the adjective sabellus remains somewhat controversial even though the word is clearly analyzable into a root sab- plus affixal material -ellus. The same root
occurs in the Latin words Sabi:ni:² and Samnium, and in the Oscan word safinim (Ve. 149 & 200 G2).³ The Oscan word shows that an aspirate consonant must be reconstructed as the root final consonant; the Latin words point to a consonant with labial point of articulation.⁴ Thus, the root can be reconstructed as *sabh-.

Outside of Italic the root *sabh- appears, according to Pokorny (1959:883) and Walde-Hofmann (1965:457), in Skt. sabha: 'assembly' and Gothic sibja, OHG sipp(e)a 'tribe, clan' (⟨ *sebya:⟩), Russian sob, OCS sobsto:vo 'peculiarity', though with e-grade vocalism in the root syllable, at least in the Germanic forms, and o-grade vocalism in the Slavic forms. The root form is ultimately connected, again according to Pokorny (op. cit.), with the possessive pronominal root *s(w)e- with the addition of a *-bho- extension, i.e. < *s(w)ebho- 'belonging to a particular type'.

The ultimate derivation of the root of these words from an extended pronominal form is problematic at least in terms of the semantics. The connection between the Italic forms and the Sanskrit, Germanic, and Slavic forms, though conceivable (assuming that the word Sabi:ni: originally meant something like 'belonging to the tribe, clan'), is problematic because of the root vocalism. The a-vocalism in the Italic forms suggests a zero grade form of the root with schwa, i.e. < *sabh-, or a root with original a-vocalism.⁵ However, the e-grade vocalism in the Germanic forms and the o-grade vocalism of the Slavic forms are inconsistent with either possibility. Pokorny's suggestion that the a-vocalism in the root is the result of Illyrian influence (presumably *o > a in Illyrian) is ad hoc. Still, the
possibility of deriving a from Indo-European (IE) *o cannot be
dismissed entirely. There are alternations between a and o in the
same morpheme in Italic which suggest some a's may be derivable from
*o, although the circumstances in which this change occurred are ob-
scure, e.g. Praenestine tongitionem vs. Oscan tanginom; Latin incoha:-
re vs. Oscan kahad, etc.

As far as the IE origins of the root are concerned, then, it is
impossible to establish a solid etymology for the root *sabh-. 6

According to Strabo (5/4/12) the word sabellus is a diminutive
formation from the noun sabijnus, i.e. < *sabi;n-lo-s. As has been
noted, however, this derivation is problematic in that it fails to
account for the shift in the quantity and quality of the suffixal
vocalism. *sabh-i:n-lo-s should give *sabi:llus in Latin with preser-
vation of the i;. 7 In order to account for the e- rather than
i:-vocalism in the medial syllable sabellus is generally derived from
a proto-form *sabh-no-lo-s (Sommer 1948:82). However, this analysis
of sabellus does not really alleviate the problem of the e-vocalism.
The analysis of this word as *sabh-no-lo-s is troublesome in the very
point it was intended to solve. Assuming the syncope of the medial
*-o- before the suffix *-lo-, the expected development of *-p-lo-
appears to be -illu- and not -ellu-, cf., for example, tigillum 'small
beam' < *tign(o)lom (tignum 'piece of timber') and pugillus 'a hand-
ful' < *pugn(o)los (pugnus 'fist'). Thus the e-vocalism in the affix
-ellus does not appear to be the regular phonological development. In
defense of this derivation, however, one could mention the following
datum: The word 'small stool', which appears in Cato (Agr. 10,4) with
the expected i-vocalism, i.e. as scabillum, is cited by Varro (L.L. 5, 168) as scabellum, cf. scamnum 'bench'. Thus one could claim that there was some fluctuation in the outcome of *g in this position or, perhaps more likely, that the i-vocalism in this affix was remade to e on the basis of other formations with e-vocalism, e.g. libellus 'small book', agellus 'small field'.

The analysis of sabellus as *sabh-en(o)-lo-s is a better analysis from both a phonological and a semantic point of view. Formations exist in Latin which show that *-en-lo-s developed regularly to -ellus, e.g. gemellus 'twin' < *gemen(o)-lo-, asellus 'ass' < *as-en(o)-lo-. The affixal material consists of two suffixes, -el- < *-en(o-) and -lu- < *-lo-. Formally, the suffix *-en(o)- is comparable to the *-eno- suffix which occurs in verbal adjectives in Baltic, Slavic, and Germanic. In Latin this suffix is found in words like geminus 'twin' and licinus 'bent, turned upward'. On the basis of these words, however, it is impossible to determine the function of this element in Latin (see Rix 1957:134). The *-lo- element is common in folk names with o-stems in Italic, cf. Graecus - Graeculus, Poenus - Poenulus.

2. Sabellus in antiquity

Sabellus does not appear in Latin literature before the time of the Augustan poets Virgil and Horace. To judge by the ancient historians', grammarians', and poets' use of this word, e.g. Plin. (H.N. 3,107), Str. (5,4,12), Liv. (8,1,7 and 10,19,20), Hor. (Sat. 1,9,29 and 2,1,36), and Serv. (ad Georg. 2,167), it refers primarily to the
Oscan speakers of Samnium proper, i.e. the Samnites. Salmon (1967:32) claims that sabellus was coined as a term for Oscan speakers in general because of the term samnites, which was a general term for Oscan speakers (see Str. (5,4,2, 5,4,3, 5,4,8, 6,1,3) and Liv. (4,52,6), had pejorative connotations associated with it. This is a possibility despite the fact that there is no clear use of sabellus to refer to Oscan speakers outside of Samnium.

A secondary use of the adjective sabellus, as a synonym for sabi:nus, may be found in the work of the Augustan poet Horace, i.e. Hor. (Ep. 1,16,47 and Od. 3,6,38). This use may have had its origin in the tradition, cited by Dionysius Halicarnassensis (2,49,4) and Strabo (5,4,12), which treated the Samnites as Sabines who migrated into Samnium.

3. Sabellus: in the 19th and 20th centuries

The first reference to the Sabelli in modern literature occurs in Niebuhr, Römische Geschichte, 1827. Niebuhr, following the belief of the ancients that the Sabini were the ancestors of all Oscan speaking tribes (see the references to Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Strabo above), used the term to refer to Oscan and all of the non-Latin language varieties of central Italy. The use of the word to refer to all Oscan varieties has not found widespread acceptance and can in fact be found in the work of only a few scholars in the 20th century, e.g. Ribezzo and Pallottino. In the rest of the literature the word acquires a more restricted sphere of reference in that it does not refer to Oscan proper.
Theodor Mommsen (1850:329) uses the word to refer only to the non-Latin tribes located in the central and east-central portions of Italy, i.e. to the Marsi, Marrucini, Sabini, and Picentes, but not the Samnites. This use is adopted by W. Corssen in his commentary on the Marrucinian, Sabine, and Marsian inscriptions published in 1860. In the work of Sophus Bugge (1878:83) sabellus has essentially the same referents as it does for Mommsen, with the exception that Vestinian is included and the language of the Picentes excluded. For Bugge, then, the word referred only to the languages occupying that narrow portion of central Italy between Latium and the Adriatic. In any case it was assumed by both that these were the central Italic languages that had close linguistic ties with Oscan. Volscian is excluded in both cases.

Von Planta (1892:18), following Deecke (1886), uses sabelli in a broader sense to designate the group of languages intermediate linguistically between Oscan and Umbrian but with closer affinities to Oscan, i.e. the word refers to the Marsi, Aequi, Marrucini, Paeligni, Sabini, Vestini, and apparently the Praetutti and Picentes also, but excludes the Volsci whom von Planta believed to be more closely related to Umbrian. Within the Sabellian languages Von Planta recognizes a further distinction. The phrase 'Old Sabellian' is used to refer to the inscriptions from central and south Picentum and northern Samnium. (For a discussion of these inscriptions, generally known now as South Picene inscriptions, and their position within Italic see the Appendix.) The adjective 'old' is particularly appropriate in this case because the inscriptions date from the 6th and 5th centuries B.C. (see Morandi 1974:79) and constitute some of the oldest
Italic linguistic evidence in existence. Von Planta's use of the word to refer to the Oscoid languages of central Italy is one which has found fairly widespread acceptance. Sommer (1948:7), Poultney (1959:9), and Salmon (1967:33) use the word in this sense, except that they exclude the reference to the Old Sabellian language.

As noted earlier, most Italic scholars, e.g. Buck (1928:3), Devoto (1931:141), Martinet (1956:26), Palmer (1954:6), and Pulgram (1958:218), use the term sabelli in a yet broader sense. It refers to all of the central Italic languages save Oscan and Umbrian, again with the exception of Old Sabellian.

Others have preferred to avoid use of the label sabelli entirely, obviously because of the varied and complex uses to which the word has been subject. Pisani (1964) and Bottiglioni (1953) select a term which refers to the paucity of linguistic evidence and refer to these languages simply as 'minor dialects'. Conway (1897) prefers to use labels which have reference to his schema for subgrouping: North Oscan for Paelignian, Marrucinian, and Vestinian; Latinian for the other languages except Volscian, which constitutes a branch in and of itself. Durante (1978) and Salmon (1982) prefer a purely geographic label and settle on the term mid-Italic.

3.1 The use of Sabellian in this work

In this work I follow Buck et al. and use Sabellian as a cover term for all of the central Italic languages regardless of their linguistic affiliations, within Oscan-Umbrian. For a number of reasons I exclude the inscriptions discovered in southern Picenum and northern Samnium, i.e. the so-called Old Sabellian inscriptions, from the label
Sabellian. First, they form a homogenous group apart from the rest of the Sabellian languages with respect to the alphabet used in their composition. Second, these inscriptions are approximately two to three centuries older than the Sabellian inscriptions composed in the Latin alphabet. Moreover, the degree to which these inscriptions can be comprehended is much less than that of the Sabellian inscriptions. And finally, it is all but impossible, despite recent attempts (see, for example, Morandi (1974)), to determine the position of the language of these inscriptions within Oscan-Umbrian.

Despite the fact that there is the potential for confusion, it is practical to have some term to refer to these languages as a whole, if only because they are often so treated in the literature. The term 'mid-Italic' must be rejected for two reasons. First, it leaves one without any ready label to characterize all of the varieties of central Italy, including the Latin varieties of Latium and the Faliscan varieties of southeastern Etruria. Second, the term Italic is, as pointed out in footnote 1, dangerously ambiguous. Italic has various and sundry uses, none of which is compatible with the others. As a result I wish to reserve all references for this word to that branch of Indo-European to which Oscan-Umbrian and Latin-Faliscan belong. (For discussion of my position on the question of Italic unity see footnote 1 at the end of this chapter.)

The label 'minor dialects' is disadvantageous also. It is used elsewhere in the literature in two ways: (1) to refer to all of the dialects of Italic for which there is scant evidence, including, for example, non-Roman varieties of Latin as well as Faliscan; (2) to
refer to any variety in ancient Italy except Oscan-Umbrian, Latin, and Etruscan, including by this definition languages like Messapic which are not Italic at all.

I do not adopt the term as used by Mommsen and followers since it implies ethnic and linguistic connections which can be shown to be inaccurate: Marsian and Aequian are probably not Oscan varieties and the position of Sabine within Oscan-Umbrian is not very clear. Of course there is no evidence that the migrations which covered the mountainous area of the central peninsula began in the territory of the Sabini as traditional accounts would have one believe. According to Salmon (1967:33) this fiction originated because of the linguistic similarities between some of the Sabellian varieties and Oscan, and was propagated by authors like Varro, a native of Sabine territory, who were eager to see the role of their birthplace assume prominence in the history of Italy. There is, furthermore, no evidence to indicate that the speakers of the Sabellian languages ever formed a unified political, military, or economic entity. In sum, Sabellian refers to a collection of heterogenous varieties which are linguistically related in the sense of belonging to the Oscan-Umbrian branch of Italic and are found in central Italy at the beginning of the 5th century.

4. The *ue:r sacrum*

During the Iron Age the speakers of Oscan-Umbrian languages spread over the mountainous core of peninsular Italy. The speakers of these languages probably spread from some area in north central Italy,
perhaps within Umbrian territory, and migrated south in a fanlike sweep (see Figure 1). By the 5th century most of the mountainous territory of central and southern Italy was covered with Oscan-Umbrian speakers.

Although ancient sources provide no evidence for the migrations of the speakers of the Sabellian languages, some accounts of the migrations of Oscan-Umbrian speakers are preserved, e.g. Strabo (5,4,12), Varro (3,16,29), D.H. (1,16 and 2,49), Fest. (158 M). From these accounts it is possible to visualize to some extent how the various Sabellian tribes came into existence.

Apparently the migrations were the result of a religious ritual known, at least to the Romans, as the *ue:r sacrum*, i.e. literally 'a sacred spring' or more idiomatically 'an offering of the firstlings'. According to most of the ancient sources the main motivation for the 'dedication of firstlings' was to ensure military success in war (Str. 5,4,12; Liv. 22,9,10; 22,10,1) and avert natural disasters such as draught (Str. 5,4,12). A *ue:r sacrum* entailed the sacrifice or dedication or everything born in a particular year to the god *Mairmers* (i.e. *Maires*), including children. But rather than actually immolate the children they were earmarked for migration when they reached adulthood. In the various descriptions offered by antiquity, these colonists would set out, led by the totemic animal of the tribe, in search of new settlements. Wherever the totemic animal indicated, there the migrating tribesman settled.

Of course the real motive behind the *ue:r sacrum* seems quite transparent and is in fact noted by Dionysius Halicarnassensis (1,16)
and Varro (R.R. 3,16,29): propter multitudinem liberorum 'due to the abundance of children'. It was simply a means by which segments of the population were selected for migration during periods of economic distress brought about by overpopulation.

The significance of the ue:r sacrum for the linguistic study of the Sabellian languages is obvious. The tradition points to a relatively homogenous homeland from which the speakers of the Sabellian languages (and the Oscan languages as well) must have migrated. This homogeneity should then be reflected linguistically by the fact that the Sabellian languages, Oscan, and Umbrian bear strong resemblances to one another.

5. The geographical position of the Sabellian languages

As noted above, the various Sabellian peoples were in possession of most of the mountainous interior of central Italy between Umbria and Samnium by the 5th century. It is not to be inferred from this that the movements of these peoples came to an end at the dawn of the historical period; in fact any history of Italy for the 5th and 4th centuries must be concerned precisely with discussions of the various attempts of these tribes, especially those in the western portions of central Italy, i.e. the Volsci, Marsi, and Aequi, to expand their territory. These attempts at expansion, of course, put them in contact with the various Latin cities and Rome.

5.1 The Volsci

By the beginning of the 5th century the Volsci occupied much of central and southern Latium. Their territory extended east as far as
the valley of the middle Liris and perhaps beyond; in the west they controlled the Tyrrhenian coast from Antium to Formiae (Salmon 1982:9). Shortly after 500 B.C. Volscian invaders appeared in the district south-east of the Alban Hills, where they either founded or occupied the city of Velitrae (CAH:498). Thus at one time Volscian speakers must have controlled most of the Monti Lepini. The northward Volscian advance was checked by the Latins and the appearance of numerous (Latin) colonies in central Latium (Cora 503 B.C.; Signia 495 B.C.; Velitrae 494 B.C.; Norba 492 B.C.; Antium 467 B.C.) indicates that Volscian control over central Latium was declining already in the early part of the 5th century. Although it is impossible to determine with any precision, the final attempt at expansion to the north probably ended in 431 B.C. when combined Aequian and Volscian forces were defeated at the battle of Algidus. For all intents and purposes the end of the Latin War (338 B.C.) spelled the end of Volscian power in Latium. Their territory was partitioned between Romans and Samnites (see Salmon 1967:187ff.). Nevertheless, Volscian-speaking communities must have survived into the third century in parts of central Latium. This is confirmed by the existence of the Volscian inscription from Velitrae, which can be dated no earlier than the middle of the third century.

5.2 The Hernici

The territory of the Hernici lay in the Trerus river valley (Salmon 1982:8). The river valley provided a natural boundary between them and the Volsci to the south and west and the Aequi and Marsi to the east. The amount of land occupied by the Hernici was small but it
proved to be significant in terms of north-south and east-west relations in Latium in the 5th century. In 486 B.C. the cities of the Hernici signed an alliance with Rome and the Latini, presumably the outcome of a conflict between the two (CAH:492). The alliance was undoubtedly advantageous for both the Hernici and the Latins. For the Hernici because they were hemmed in by hostile tribes to the east and south; for the Latini because this territory would serve as a buffer zone to impede the junction of Aequian and Volscian forces. They remained allies of Rome until the latter part of the fourth century, when they joined forces with the Samnites in the first and second Samnite Wars. Their chief city, Anagnia, was captured in 306 B.C. and reduced to a praefecture. The fact that the name of the Hernici is missing from Polybius' (2.24) list of peoples able to furnish troops in 225 B.C. indicates that their territory must have been indistinguishable from Latium in general at this time (Conway 1897:306). It appears that Hernican speakers were Latinized rather early because the earliest Latin inscriptions from this area bear no local peculiarities.

5.3 The Marsi

The territory of the Marsi lay to the north and east of the Volsci, outside of Latium but on the Roman side of the main crest of the Appennine mountains (Salmon 1982:23). The main settlements of the Marsi were on the southern and eastern shores of Lake Fucinus, at Lucus Angitiae, Supinum, and Marruvium. However, we do know of one settlement, Antinum, located approximately six miles southwest of the lake on the west side of the band of hills that surround the lake.
Livy (8,29) first mentions the Marsi as members of a confederacy with the Vestini, Paeligni, and Marrucini. In 308 B.C. they joined the Samnites and, when defeated, became allies of Rome in 304. In 303 B.C. a colony was established just to the west of Alba Fucens at Carsioli. They remained allies of Rome until the Social War of 89, their military contingents being famous, according to Horace (Od. 2,20,18), for their tenacity. From the end of the fourth century the Marsi were undoubtedly in contact with Latin speaking communities.

5.4 The Aequi

The original homeland of the Aequi is probably in the district immediately adjoining the northern and western fringes of Lake Fucinus. In the 5th century the Aequi, probably in concert with the Volsci, attempted to move into Latium and did in fact penetrate as far as Mount Algidus, at the eastern rim of the Alban hills. Combined Latin and Hernican forces drove the invaders back into the mountainous areas of the central Appennines in 431 B.C. (CAH:502). In the early part of the fourth century the Aequi were once again at odds with the Romans but were subdued in 390 and signed a treaty with them. By 300 there were strong Latin colonies on the northeast shore of Lake Fucinus and the area was under heavy Latinization. Aequian settlements probably survived only in the hill country behind Tibur and Praeneste in the upper valleys of the Himella and Tolenus rivers (Salmon 1982:9).

5.5 The Sabini

The territory of the Sabini stretched from Tiber river east as far as the valley of the upper Aternus, which they shared with the
Vestini and the Praetutti (CAH:493). On the south their territory abutted that of the Aequi; to the north lay Umbrian territory. The Sabini are famous primarily for the part they played or are presumed to have played in the early history of Rome.\textsuperscript{24} The veracity of this role aside, there can be no doubt that the Sabini were in contact with Latins and Romans by at least the 5th century. The Sabini were crushed by Roman forces in 449 B.C. and by early in the 3rd century the whole of their territory was under Roman occupation (CAH:494). By 240 B.C. the tribe Quirina was established which, embraced all Sabine communities, including those as far east as Amiternum (Conway 1897: 351).

5.6 The Vestini

The Vestini were the northern neighbors of the Paeligni and the Marrucini. They occupied the hilly territory north of the Aternus river from the Adriatic coast west to Aveia. In 304 B.C. the Vestini entered into an alliance with Rome; northern sections of their territory, i.e. Amiternum, received the franchise around 300 B.C.; and a Roman colony was established at Hadria in 290 B.C. (Conway 1897:258). These are all strong indications of the early Latinization of this territory. It appears however that the local dialect survived into the second century (Po. 207) and perhaps even until the Social War.

5.7 The Paeligni

The main territory of the Paeligni lay to the west of the Fucine lake area, in the Aternus river valley. To the north their territory stretched as far as the southwestern slopes of the Gran Sasso d'Italia (Salmon 1982:22) where they had a settlement known, at least under the
Romans, as Superaequum. However, their principal centers, Sulmo, birthplace of the Roman poet Ovid, and Corfinium, capital of rebel forces during the Social War lay to the south near the Montagna del Morrone. Festus (248 L) preserves one account of the Illyrian origins of the Paeligni, but Ovid (Fast. 3,95) claims Sabellian origin for this tribe, a more probable claim given that the dialect they spoke is demonstrably Italic. The Paeligni are first mentioned, along with other central Italic tribes; the Marrucini, Marsi, and Vestini, as members of a confederacy with which the Romans came into contact during the second Samnite war in 325 B.C. (Liv. 8,29). When the Samnites were finally subdued (circa 300 B.C.), the central Italic tribes all entered into an alliance with Rome (Liv. 9,45, 10,3; D.S. 20,101). The formation of this alliance signals the beginning of the Latinization of central Italy from Latium eastward. The process of Latinization, though ultimately thorough, must have been a slow one, and the Paelignian tribes in the more mountainous areas undoubtedly retained their native dialect into the first century B.C., if not longer.

5.8 The Marrucini

The Marrucini inhabited the mountainous territory just south of the Aternus river. On the west, their territory was bounded by that of the Paeligni; on the east their territory probably encompassed the coastal regions of the Adriatic. The southern boundary of this tribe is impossible to determine, although Strabo (5,4,2) has it far enough south to include Ortona in the region of the Frentani. The principal settlement of the Marrucini seems to have been in the hilly interior
of this region near Rapino. According to Salmon (1982:22) this hypothesis is supported by the discovery of a shrine to an unknown goddess. By late in the 4th century B.C. the Marrucini had contacts with the Romans, who used their territory, by virtue of a treaty, as an access to the Samnite territory during the second Samnite war. How long Marrucinian communities remained, especially in the rugged interior of this region, is difficult to say. The inscriptional evidence indicates that communities survived well into the second century.

6. **Problems and aims**

Latin and Oscan-Umbrian, and more recently Venetic (see Lejeune 1974), have received most of the scholarly attention, particularly in discussions of the genetic relationships of the languages of ancient Italy. The reasons are relatively obvious: the historical importance of Latin and Oscan-Umbrian vs. the relative unimportance of the Sabellian languages; the fact that there is ample documentation for Latin, Oscan, and Umbrian but little for the Sabellian languages; determining the relationship between Latin and Oscan-Umbrian is of greater importance for Indo-European studies in general than determining the relationships within Oscan-Umbrian itself.

While these are all legitimate reasons for focusing on Latin and Oscan-Umbrian there are in fact good reasons for investigating the Sabellian languages and their position within Oscan-Umbrian. First, investigation of the Sabellian languages yields some information about the dialect situation in prehistoric Italy prior to the migrations
which covered central and southern Italy with Oscan-Umbrian speakers (see Chapter 4). Second, since these languages were in contact with one another and with Latin and Faliscan speakers in the 5th century, it is possible to gain some insight into the geographical spread of linguistic features in the early historical period (see also Chapter 4). Evidence for the spread of innovations by contact is, of course, of utmost importance for those who wish to argue that the similarities among the Italic languages can be accounted for by means of contact during the prehistoric period. Moreover, since these languages were among the first to come into contact with Latin speakers, it is also possible to derive some information about the spread of Latin in central Italy from the 5th century. Third, the omission of 'minor dialect' data from consideration can lead to flawed analyses.

Consider the case of the development of the IE aspirate consonants in Italic. In a paper published in JIES in 1973 Robert Jeffers argues that the 'minor dialect' data are inconsequential for his discussion. In point of fact if he had carefully considered the 'minor' Italic dialects such as Faliscan he would have found that his argument against Italic unity based as it is only on the developments of the aspirates in Latin, Oscan, and Umbrian was flawed. Faliscan, a decidedly Latinesque Italic variety, shows exactly the same developments with respect to the IE aspirate consonants as Oscan-Umbrian. Thus Jeffers is forced to maintain that Faliscan does not share with Latin any of the innovations with respect to the aspirate consonants. This is a position which every Italicist would question.
Investigation of the Sabellian languages and their genetic affiliations presents a unique set of problems. There is, first of all, very little linguistic evidence for most of the languages. Paelignian, for example, which is the best attested Sabellian language, offers some 45 inscriptions and half of those are funerary inscriptions which contain only onomastic formulae. In large part the geographical location of these languages is responsible for the failure of these speakers to become literate earlier. They were not in a position to come into contact with the Etruscans or the Greeks, the peoples most responsible for the spread of literacy in ancient Italy. As a result these tribes became literate, if at all, only after contact with the Latins or Romans. Unfortunately, the circumstances were such politically and culturally that most of the tribes were Latinized so quickly and so thoroughly that they scarcely wrote in their native varieties. Moreover, in many cases it is difficult if not impossible to give a definitive interpretation to the texts that do survive (if one can be given at all). Often the meanings of words are obscure because they lack good etymologies or the contexts are so ambiguous that it is impossible to narrow down the possible range of meanings. Discussion of these problems is, of course, a prerequisite to discussion of genetic relationships.

Few in-depth investigations of the Sabellian languages and their genetic relationships exist, and all of these studies contain serious methodological errors which compromise the discussions of features which can be used to determine subgrouping. One of the more serious errors is the fact that most discussions fail to note the possibility
of areal developments. As shown in Chapter 4, a number of features commonly used for subgrouping, even in the most recent studies, can be reasonably attributed to geographical spread. Another serious problem concerns the unwillingness to recognize isoglosses which cross over the traditionally recognized dialect (language) boundaries. For example, Marrucinian is generally recognized to share affinities with Oscan. However, there is one important feature which Marrucinian shares with Umbrian, namely the development of \(-ns# > f\), which cannot in all probability be attributed to an areal development. In most discussions this shared characteristic is merely overlooked because it does not allow for clean distinctions between the Oscan and Umbrian subgroups. This view is rather naive and unrealistic. It is more often the case that the distinctions between subgroups are not black and white. As a result, one should be prepared to find linguistic features which cross over the boundaries between languages in different subgroups, even when there is a small amount of evidence available, as in the case of the Sabellian languages.

7. Format

This discussion of the Sabellian languages has as its goal primarily textual and linguistic analysis and interpretation. These analyses are based for the most part on the readings of the texts by Emil Vetter, *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte* (1953), and Paolo Poccetti, *Nuovi italicì documentì* (1979). However, since Vetter was unable to see a number of the texts firsthand I have relied on later rereadings of those texts when they exist. In many cases the textual
analyses are not novel ones, and they are not meant to be. Some texts have been discussed now for some 150 years and my debt to the scholarship which has preceded is immeasurable. What I hope to have provided is, in each case, the most sensible textual analysis available, i.e. one that is internally consistent, one that can be supported by parallels from elsewhere in the Italic literature where they exist, and one that is based on sound textual and etymological analysis.

The problems with interpretation based on etymological speculation are well known. It is often the case that parallels in closely related languages do not fit with the usage or with the syntax suggested by the context. In these cases I have hesitated to accept the etymological connection and have offered an interpretation which is consistent with syntax and context. In other cases etymologies which have been proposed can be dismissed because they are not consistent with sound laws found elsewhere in the data, or are morphologically or semantically odd. These cases need to be reexamined and wherever possible new etymologies offered or old ones refined so as to be consistent with sound laws, morphology, context, etc. This is one of the major aims of this work. Chapter 3 is concerned with textual and etymological analysis.

The second part of the linguistic analysis of the Sabellian languages concerns their position within Italic, specifically within Oscar-Umbrian. As is noted above (section 6), any attempt to discuss the genetic relationships of these languages must first concern itself with possible areal developments. It is, of course, impossible to determine with precision whether or not any given feature is an
example of an areal development. However, since these languages were
in contact with one another, and with other Oscan-Umbrian and Latin
varieties, the possibility of areal developments should not be
dismissed out of hand. Linguistic developments which have the
appearance of being areal should at least be given low priority when
considering features for determining subgrouping. Possible areal
developments among the Sabellian languages and others and the sub­
grouping of these languages are considered in Chapter 4.

No discussion of the Sabellian languages can be complete without
a survey of the history of the scholarship. This information is found
in Chapter 2.

Finally, since the Old Sabellian inscriptions have been inter­
preted recently as belonging to either the Oscan or Umbrian branch of
Oscan-Umbrian I briefly consider, in the Appendix, the textual
evidence and discuss the validity of the claims for the subgrouping of
this language.
Over the past few decades the term Italic has come to be used to indicate the Oscan-Umbrian languages to the exclusion of Latin. This use has been fostered primarily by those (see, for example, Jeffers 1973) who believe that Oscan-Umbrian forms a separate subgroup apart from Latin-Faliscan within Indo-European and that the similarities among these languages can be accounted for by means of language contact. (For discussion of the 'Italic' controversy the reader is referred to Beeler (1952, 1956, 1966), Devoto (1951), Diver (1953), Jones (1950), Lejeune (1943), Meillet (1948), Pisani (1954), etc.) Although this is not the place to discuss this issue or defend my position, I will say that I do not find the arguments against Italic unity particularly persuasive. As a result, I use the term Italic to refer to the subgroup of Indo-European which, in my opinion, includes at least Latino-Faliscan and Oscan-Umbrian, and perhaps Venetic as well (for discussion of the position of Venetic see Lejeune (1974: 163-73)).

Vowel length is noted by a colon :.

A majority of the references to the inscriptional evidence for the Sabellian languages was taken from Vetter (1953) and Poccetti (1979). Following the customary form of citation the references from Vetter are noted (Ve. XX), those from Poccetti (Po. YY).

The reflexes of the IE aspirate consonants in Oscan-Umbrian are fricatives in initial and medial position: *bh/*dh > f, *gh > h. In Latin the situation is actually more complex since some *dh > b in medial position (see Sommer 1948:178-79).

In antiquity the name of the progenitor and god of the Sabines, Sa:bus (Sil. 8,423), was presumed to contain the same root as that in sabelli:, sabi:ni:, etc. The difference in the length of the root vocalism makes the connection suspicious. The ancients undoubtedly made the connection because of phonological similarities.

Ernout-Meillet (1939:881) believe this root is found only in Italic. For an alternative analysis of the root sab- see R. Giacomelli (1978:17-18).

Since long vowels in medial syllables are not shortened in Latin any attempt to derive the e of sabellus from *i: are doomed to
failure. For discussion of vowel shortening in Latin see Sommer (1948:123-30).

8. The affix -ellus in words like agellus is from *agrolos historically by means of the following stages: *agrolos > *agrol > *agerlos > agellus.

9. According to Rix (1957:134) one can derive sabi:ni: and samnium (= Oscan safinim) from a prehistoric stem form *sabh-en-

10. The nouns asinus 'ass' and ricinus 'tick' are also offered as examples of this suffix by Rix (1957:134). However, if these words do contain the *-en(o)- suffix then it is clear that it no longer functioned to form verbal adjectives in Latin. These words can be related to no known verbal root (see Walde-Hofmann 1965:72ff. and Pokorny 1959:335).

11. By the classical period the *-lo- affix had pejorative connotations. However, its use by authors in the archaic period indicates that this was a secondary development, e.g Ennius (Ann. 162) Volscelus.

12. Salmon (1967:32), however, claims that sabellus is never a synonym for sabinus.

13. Of course they also refer to Oscan-Umbrian as Umbro-Sabellic.

14. Buck excludes the Old Sabellian inscriptions because he does not think they are Oscan-Umbrian. The evidence from these inscriptions does seem to point to the conclusion that the language of these inscriptions is Oscan-Umbrian.

15. If the Old Sabellian (South Picene) speakers were actually present when the eastern Sabellian speakers migrated south then these speakers may actually represent the oldest Oscan-Umbrian migration.

16. Devoto (1971) follows the traditional position and sees Reate as the source for the migrations southward.

17. This is not to say that there was a total lack of political and military cooperation. The Paeligni and Marsi apparently joined forces militarily against Rome in the Samnite Wars. Both signed a treaty with Rome in 304 B.C. During the Social War the Marsi, Paeligni, Vestini, and Marrucini were part of the same military coalition.

18. This has been pointed out numerous times in the literature.

19. This is the guess of Pulgram (1958:229) among others but it accounts well for the geographical position of Umbrian and the rest of the Sabellian and Oscan languages.
There is no good reason to be suspicious of the *ue:r sacrum* as historical fiction. Livy, for example, describes contemporary cases (see Salmon 1967:33).

Latin *Mārs* and Oscan *Ma:mers* are generally connected. For discussion of the various hypotheses on the etymology and development of these words see Walde-Hofmann (1965:43-45).

The totemic animal of the Samnites was the bull (Strabo 5,4,12). Wolves led the Hirpini and Lucani (Fest. 93L) and the Picenti were led by a woodpecker (Plin. *H.N.* 10,40).

There is no direct indication that the Volsci were involved in the battle of Algidus but it would go some way in explaining the lack of Volscian activity in this arena afterwards.

For a conservative assessment of the evidence presented in the ancient sources see *CAH* (493ff.).

For discussion of the relationship between Latin and Oscan-Umbrian see the sources cited in footnote 1 above.

In footnote 1 he says, 'I will not discuss the so-called minor dialects of ancient Italy in this paper, since their inclusion would add little to the general problems with which I am concerned.'

Only Beeler (1952) claims that Faliscan does not belong to the same subgroup as Latin. However, by the time of the publication of his article on the Italic controversy (1956) he has changed his opinion on this question. In this article, and in a later article on the same question (1966), he groups Faliscan with Latin. One of the more hotly debated questions in Faliscan studies today is whether or not Faliscan is to be considered merely a regional variety of Latin, with the same status genetically as Praenestine or Lanuvian Latin (see, for example, Campanile (1961) and (1968), G. Giacomelli (1978: 521-22), and R. Giacomelli (1978:67-72)).

There can be no doubt that the Etruscans and Greeks were the major transmitters of material culture in the early historical period. Nevertheless, it is impossible to detect any linguistic influences upon the Sabellian languages which must be attributed to direct Greek or Etruscan contact. As a result, it seems most natural to assume that those few features in the Sabellian languages which may derive from Greek or Etruscan influence were transmitted via contact with Latin speakers (see Chapter 3 for discussion).

Indo-European provides good examples of linguistic innovations which have spread across the boundaries of different dialects. For example the instrumental plural ending is *-mis* rather than *-bhis* in Baltic, Slavic, and Germanic while the ruki rule is shared, in part at least, by Indo-Iranian, Baltic, and Slavic.
Figure 1. Central Italy. (After Salmon 1967: 25)
Chapter 2
History of the Research

0. Introduction

The scholarship on the Sabellian languages is concerned for the most part with three general areas of study: (1) establishing the corpus of inscriptions and establishing the best readings for the inscriptions which belong to the corpus; (2) textual and linguistic interpretation; and (3) discussion of the subgrouping of the dialects within Italic. A majority of the scholarship are devoted to the first two areas.

In general the texts of and commentary on the Sabellian languages form a small part of larger works concerned with the Oscan-Umbrian languages as a whole (see for example the work of von Planta (1892-97)) or with the languages of ancient Italy, generally with the exception of Latin (see for example Conway (1897)). Although a few small studies of the individual Sabellian dialects do exist this work is the first, with the exception of M. Durante's brief discussion in Popoli e civiltà vol. VI, 1978, pp. 791-823, to be concerned solely with the Sabellian dialects.

1. The 19th century

In the middle of the 19th century the corpus of Sabellian
inscriptions consisted of the Volscian inscription from Velitrae (Ve. 222), two short Marsian inscriptions (Ve. 223 & 225), the Marrucinian inscription from Rapino (Ve. 218), the Sabine (?) inscription from Amiternum (Ve. 227), and two Paelignian inscriptions contained in 17th century manuscripts (Ve. 202 & 203). The first work to bring all of these inscriptions together was that of the German scholar Theodor Mommsen, *Die Unteritalischen Dialekte*, 1850. Mommsen's work consists essentially of discussions pertaining to the reading of the various texts although there is some textual analysis and brief discussion of problematic forms from a linguistic point of view. Another German scholar, P. E. Huschke, building on the readings given by Mommsen, published texts and commentary on the inscriptions cited above in 1856, *Die oskischen und sabellischen Sprachdenkmaler*.

The first in-depth linguistic discussion of the Sabellian texts is to be found in two publications of the German scholar W. Corssen, *De Volacorum Lingua*, 1858, and 'Zum sabellischen dialekt', *KZ* 29, 1860, pp. 133-170. Except for the brief discussion of Deecke (1886) these two works serve as the major offerings on these texts until the publications of Conway (1897) and von Planta (1892-1897) at the end of the 19th century. The rest of the work on the Sabellian languages in the 19th century is concerned with textual and linguistic analyses of inscriptions which were uncovered at various sites in central Italy.

Excavations of sites in Marsian and Paelignian territory in the last 25 years of the 19th century, specifically at Marruvium in Marsian territory and Corfinium and Sulmo in Paelignian territory, yielded a number of important dialect inscriptions (Ve. nos. 204-216 &
Ve. 224). All of these inscriptions were published by the archaeologist in charge of the excavations, A. De Nino, between the years of 1877 and 1895. The Paelignian texts in existence before 1884 were examined and published by Johannes Zvetaieff, *Inscriptiones Italiæ Mediae Dialecticae*, in 1884. The first textual and linguistic analyses of the newly found texts appear in 1877-79 with the publication of the work of Franz Bucheler and Sophus Bugge (F. Bucheler, 'Altitalische Inschrift', *RhM* 32, 1877, p. 640 (Ve. 216); F. Bucheler, 'Altitalisches Weihgedicht', *RhM* 33, 1878, pp. 271-290 (Ve. 213); S. Bugge, *Altitalische Studien: das Weihgedicht von Corfinium*, 1878, (Ve. 213); F. Bucheler, 'Fragment einer marsiischer Inschrift', *RhM* 34, 1879, pp. 639-40, (Ve. 224)). Approximately ten years later two collections of inscriptions were published. In 1886 Deecke published the texts and a brief commentary on three of the new Paelignian inscriptions (Ve. nos. 203, 212, 213) in addition to the Marsian, Sabine, and Volecian inscriptions. The next year Carl Pauli published texts and commentary for all of the Paelignian inscriptions in existence at the time as vol. 5 of his work, *Altitalische Studien*, 1887. This publication set the stage for the appearance of two of the most influential publications on the Sabellian languages in the 19th century.

All of the Paelignian texts, as well as the remaining inscriptive evidence for the Sabellian dialects, were independently reexamined and published along with commentary by two scholars in the final years of the 19th century. The most valuable of the two works, at least from an epigraphical standpoint, is the work of R. S. Conway, *The Italic Dialects I*, 1897. Conway personally examined the texts in
question, and his publication contains the most important discussion of the epigraphical evidence for the dating of the texts in existence. R. von Planta's reexamination of the texts is based for the most part on the various readings of the texts given by other scholars. As a result his textual readings cannot be preferred to those of Conway. The most valuable contribution of von Planta is to be found in the area of linguistic analysis. His work is the first to contain detailed discussions of a majority of the problematic forms encountered in the dialects, detailed summaries of the phonological and morphological characteristics of each dialect, and discussion of the position of each dialect within Italic.

Thus, by the turn of the century most of the Sabellian inscriptions in existence today had been found and there was a considerable amount of textual and linguistic analysis.

2. The 20th century

In the early years of the 20th century, before World War II, there was relatively little scholarly activity on the Sabellian languages. The Volscian text from Velitrae received most of the attention, and that consisted of three short discussions: F. Skutsch, 'Die volskische Lex sacra', Glotta 3, 1912, pp. 87-99; R. Thurneysen, 'Altitalisches. I. Vulsisch', Glotta 11, 1921, pp. 217-220; and T. Grienberger, 'Italica 7. Die Bronzetafel von Velletri', KZ 56, 1928, pp. 28-35. There were two short works on Paelignian, both by T. Grienberger: 'Italica 3. Die Herentasinschrift von Pentima (Corfinium)', KZ 54, 1927, pp. 57-69 and 'Italica 6. Der Stein von
Pratola Peligna', KZ 56, 1928, pp. 26-28. The remaining dialects fared even less well. There was a very small article on the Bronze of Rapino by R. Thurneysen, 'Altitalisches. 2. Marrukinisch', Glotta 11, 1921, p. 221. One paragraph was written on the Marsian word pacre by E. Hermann in 1918, 'Marsisch pacre', KZ 48, p. 120.

Interest in these dialects after World War II was undoubtedly spurred to some extent by the discovery of new inscriptions for three of the Sabellian languages, Paelignian, Vestinian, and Marrucinian. The new Paelignian inscriptions were presented in three articles: D. Silvestri, 'Due nuove iscrizioni peligne', SSL 8, 1968, pp. 198-206 (Po. 208 & 209); E. Mattiocco, 'Il culto di Ercole tra i Peligni', Abruzzo 8, 1973, pp. 13-21 (Po. 217); P. Poccetti, 'Una nuova iscrizione peligna e il problema di AN(A)C(E)TA', RAL 35, 1980, pp. 509-517. The Marrucinian inscriptions were first published by C. De Simone, 'Contributi peligni', AION-L 4, 1962, pp. 63-68, and La Regina in 1965, 'Sacracrix herentatia = CIL IX 3032, Atti Acc. Pont. 15, pp. 173-178. E. Mattiocco published the text and commentary on the new Vestinian inscription in 1964, 'Una nuova iscrizione vestina', ArCl 16, pp. 296-308. The inscriptions found after the publication of Vetter's Handbuch were collected and published by P. Poccetti in 1979, Nuovi documenti italici, as a supplement to the work of Vetter. Poccetti's contribution is valuable in one other respect also because he gives a number of new readings for the dialect texts as published by Vetter (1953) and some of these new readings force new analyses of the texts.

The interest in the 'Italic controversy' which came to the fore again in this period due to the publications on language contact has contributed in part at least to the reassessment of features used for determining the subgrouping of the Sabellian languages. J. Poultney, 'Volscians and Umbrians', AJPh 72, 1951, pp. 113-127, reexamined the evidence for aligning Volscian with Umbrian. Mosci Sassi (op. cit.)
and Tibiletti Bruno (op. cit.) considered the position of Paelignian with respect to Oscan. And finally, J. Whatmough, 'Italic,' Orbis 4, 1955, pp. 323-348, and Durante, 1978, provide some discussion for the position of all of the Sabellian languages within Oscan-Umbrian. Together with the discussion of von Planta (1892:12-26) these publications form the basis for reanalysis of the position of the various dialects within Oscan-Umbrian.

3. The state of Sabellian studies

Despite the nearly 150 years of scholarship on the Sabellian languages there are, as noted in chapter 1 section 6, numerous issues which are still in need of discussion. For example, there are several texts which are still in need of (re)interpretation, e.g. the Bronze of Rapino, the Bronze from Velletri, the Herentas inscription, etc. A considerable number of etymological analyses need to be revised or altered entirely so as to be consistent with the phonology and morphology of the dialects insofar as they can be ascertained. And finally, a detailed discussion of the characteristics which can be used for subgrouping needs to be presented. These are, of course, the very issues taken up in the remaining chapters of this work.
Footnotes—Chapter 2

1 All of the Sabellian inscriptions were published again in 1886, *Inscriptiones Italiae Inferiores*, Moscow.

2 In 1928 C. D. Buck published a grammar of Oscan-Umbrian but very little attention is given to the Sabellian languages. Nevertheless, there is a substantial amount of work on Oscan-Umbrian during this period.

3 De Simone (1962) treats these inscriptions as Paelignian and Pisani (1964) follows him in assigning these inscriptions to Paelignian. However, the general consensus is that Pescara is in Marrucinian territory and that these inscriptions are to be assigned to Marrucinian (see Poccetti 1979:151-153).
Chapter 3
Textual and Linguistic Analysis

0. Introduction

In this chapter the existing linguistic evidence for each Sabellian language is examined. Previous interpretations of the texts are evaluated and when necessary, and possible, new interpretations are offered or old ones revised. As they arise, problems with the phonology and/or morphology of individual lexical items are discussed. At the end of the discussion of the evidence for each language a summary of the characteristics of that language is presented. These characteristics play a prominent role in the discussion of the position of the Sabellian languages in Chapter 4.

1. The Volscian dialect
1.1 The Tabula Veliterna

The Volscian dialect is mentioned only once by the ancients. It is cited in a fragment of the comedian Titinius, who was himself, according to Mommsen (1850:319) a Volscian: qui obscet et volsce fabulantur nam latine nesciunt ('who speak Oscan and Volscian because they do not know Latin'). The linguistic evidence for the Volscian dialect consists of the citation of the word sublicium 'consisting of stakes' in an obscure passage of Festus (293 M) and a small bronze
tablet which was found at Velitrae, modern Velletri, a community about 25 miles southeast of Rome at the southern end of the Alban Hills (Conway 1897:267-268; Pulgram 1976:252). Alphabetic considerations indicate that the inscription belongs to the late 4th or early 3rd century (Conway 1897:268). This date is confirmed by historical considerations. Velitrae was granted full Roman citizenship sometime before 230 B.C. The fact that meddices are mentioned indicates that Velitrae must have had some self-government at the time the inscription was written. This would only make sense if the inscription was composed before full citizenship was granted.

(Ve. 223):

deue declune statom sepis atahus pis uelestrom
fajia esaristrom se bin asif uesclis uinu arpatitu
sepis toticu coushriu sepul ferom pihom estu
ec se cosuties ma ca tafanies medix sistiatiens

'(This object is) dedicated to the goddess Declona. If anyone will have laid hands on (this object) in order to make a velestrom (repair, restoration, cleaning ?), (then) let there be an expiatory sacrifice. Let (someone) offer a cow and an asif (money ?) along with vessels of wine. If anyone (will have laid hands on this object) with the consent of the assembly, then let the carrying (away) be lawful. Eg. Cossutius, son of Se., Ma. Tafanius, son of C., meddices, set up (this plaque/object)._1.2 Commentary

The Tabula Veliterna is a regulation regarding the property of the goddess Declona. The regulation consists of three sections: an introduction (deue to statom), a main text (sepis to estu) consisting of two conditional clauses, and a concluding statement which designates the donors of the plaque.
The meaning of sections one and three is fairly clear. Whether one considers deue . . . statom as an introductory statement or as the object of atahus depends mainly on the meaning assigned to statom. It is generally agreed that statom is a perfect passive participle (< *sta₂-to-*) with the meaning 'set up, erected, dedicated' and that it refers to the object to which the bronze plaque containing the inscription was attached (see Grienberger 1928:29; Sktusch 1912:88; Untermann 1956:124; Vetter 1953:156; etc.). However, Durante (1978:812) argues that statom = statuam (acc sg) and that deue decline statom is to be interpreted as part of the verb phrase with atahus. He gives two reasons to support his claim. First, he argues that if statom does not = statuam then the prohibition in the first two lines of the inscription has no referent. Second, he claims that there is no evidence that Oscan-Umbrian had a participle stato- with passive value. These claims provide little support for his contention that statom = statuam.

In Latin it is quite common to find that the reference to the object dedicated to a deity is omitted in the text of the inscription itself, e.g. CIL 1^2^ 360: P. Rutilius M. f./ Iunonei Lucina/ dedit meritod/ Diouos castud, 'Publius Rutilius, son of Marcus, gave (this bronze tablet) deservedly to Juno Lucina at Jupiter's festival-time'. The fact that the inscription is generally attached to the object dedicated makes the referent clear. Further, a parallel for the use of statom with passive value in Oscan-Umbrian may actually exist, despite the protest of Durante to the contrary. In the Agnone Tablet (Ve. 147 line 1) the past participle of sto: occurs, i.e.
status (nom pl masc), and it is generally interpreted as being passive in voice: status. pús. set. hurtín./ kerrilín. 'These are the instituted (cults) which are in the garden of Ceres' (Buck 1928:254; Grienberger 1928:29; Prosdocimi 1978:833). The comparative evidence also supports the view that this participle could have passive value, cf. Greek στάτος and Sanskrit sthita- 'placed'. Moreover, in terms of word order the introductory conditional particle occupies first position in clause two. If deue declare statom is introductory material then the conditional particle is in initial position in clause one also. Finally, Durante fails to provide any positive evidence that the past participle of sto: is ever used substantively in Italic with the meaning 'statua'. As a result, the customary interpretation of statom as 'set up, dedicated' is to be preferred to the proposal of Durante.

Although the main body of the inscription is difficult to analyze due to the lack of etymologies of some words, the structure does appear to consist of two periods, each beginning with a conditional particle sepis and ending in a verb in the imperative mood (Skutsch 1912:88; Thurneysen 1921:218). And again, although it is impossible to give a definitive interpretation of the main body of the text, it is certainly concerned with two statements concerning the 'handling' (atahus) of property belonging to the temple or precinct of the goddess Declona.

Numerous interpretations of the meaning of atahus (3rd sg fut perf act ind) can be found in the literature. Since the root of this word is undoubtedly to be connected with Latin tag- 'touch', tango:
archaic *tagō, tetigi* (see also 1.3.1), the basic meaning of the word is probably something like 'lay hands on'. However, since the Latin word developed pejorative connotations, i.e. could also be used to refer to 'stealing, pilfering, etc.', it is possible that this word could be used to indicate 'stealing' in Volscian also. The interpretations given in the literature fall somewhere in between these two extremes, with the latter interpretation having more support numerically.

I contend, however, that there is a good reason to believe that *atahus* should be given an interpretation more in line with the basic meaning of the root. If the two periods of the main body of the text are compared one can easily see that they are antithetical. In period two the protasis consists of four words: *sepis toticu couehriu sepu*. There is no main verb. Thus the verb of the protasis in the first period must be supplied as the main verb of the protasis in the second period. The verb to be supplied is *atahus*. With the addition of *atahus* the protasis of the second period may be provisionally translated as: 'If anyone *atahus* (the object dedicated to Declona) with the consent of the assembly, then . . .' . In this clause *atahus* cannot mean 'steal, pilfer' since the action specified by *atahus* is done with the consent of the assembly and it would, of course, be unlikely for the assembly to consent to the stealing of a dedicatory object. Thus, in period two, whatever act is designated by *atahus*, if it is done with the consent of the assembly (*couehriu*), then *ferom pihom estu*, literally 'let the carrying be lawful'. This is to be contrasted with period one where the action designated by *atahus* is
performed without consent of the couehriu and reparation must be made as a result. Since atahus cannot mean 'steal' in the second period, it must not mean 'steal' in the first.

Even if one adopts the meaning 'lay hands on' for atahus, which seems like the best alternative under the circumstances, it is still not clear what its direct object is. There are two possibilities. The direct object could be the object to which the inscription is attached, whatever that may have been, or it may refer generally to the property of the goddess located in her temple or precinct. I doubt there is any principled way to decide between these two interpretations. However, the first interpretation is the most straightforward and as a result should be preferred to the second if at all possible.

For the clause containing fa[jia] there are two reasonable syntactic analyses: (1) pis uelestrom fa[jia] is a purpose relative clause 'in order to make a (uelestrom)'; (2) pis uelestrom is in apposition to the subject of atahus, i.e. pis, while fa[jia] esaristrom is either (a) a subordinate purpose clause without a subordinating conjunction 'If anyone lays hands on (this object), anyone of the (uelestrom), so as to make a expiatory sacrifice' or (b) the apodosis 'let him make an expiatory sacrifice'.

It is difficult to decide among the three possible interpretations given above because of the word uelestrom, which, up to this point at least, lacks a secure etymology. Further, the inflectional ending on the word is ambiguous, it may be either acc pl or gen sg (see Meillet 1964:296). As a result it is impossible to determine
whether uelestrom depends on the pronoun pis ('anyone of the uelestrom', i.e., according to the usual interpretation, 'Veletrians') or is the direct object of the verb fa\textit{j}ia ('make a uelestrom', i.e. 'repair', according to one interpretation). The three possibilities mentioned above reflect the different interpretations which have been given to uelestrom in the literature.

In terms of Oscan-Umbrian syntax, which rarely allows subjunctives in relative clauses of any variety, the best interpretation of fa\textit{j}ia is as the main verb of a clause dependent on atahus (Buck 1928: 217-18; von Planta 1897 I:477-80). Under this interpretation uelestrom depends on the word pis which is in apposition with the pis of sepis, i.e. 'If anyone, i.e. anyone of the uelestrom (Veletrians)'. From the point of view of semantics, however, this analysis leaves something to be desired since esaristrom must then be the object of fa\textit{j}ia. The noun esaristrom probably refers to some sort of expiatory sacrifice. As a result one would expect this word to be connected with that part of period one which designates the reparation to be made for the act of atahus, and not form part of the act itself. Moreover, it is unlikely that the public assembly (couehriu) would have to be appealed to by temple priests in order to perform a sacrifice.\footnote{Compare, for example, the description of the reparation described in the Lex Spoleto, CIL I 366: \textit{sequis uiolasit (lucum)}, \textit{Jove bouid piaclum datod}: 'If anyone has violated (the grove), let that person give an expiatory sacrifice of a cow to Jove.' Interpretation (2a), which sees fa\textit{j}ia esaristrom as the apodosis, is difficult to accept on semantic grounds. Under this interpretation we
are left to imagine what the action is for which reparation must be made: 'If anyone has laid hands on (this object) (in order to ?), anyone of the Veletrians, (then) let him make a sacrifice'. Syntaxically, this interpretation is also problematic because the use of the subjunctive mood in commands in Italic, especially in proscriptions, is very rare (see Buck 1928:214-15; von Planta 1897 II:432-33).

From the point of view of syntax analysis (1) encounters difficulties similar to (2a), namely the use of a subjunctive in a command, i.e. esaristrom se 'let there be an expiatory sacrifice'. The fact that there is a subjunctive in the relative clause is a further problem (see above). Despite these syntactic problems it is possible to offer a reasonable interpretation of analysis (1).

The key to the interpretation of uelestrom may actually lie in the apodosis of the second conditional clause. According to the second sepis clause 'If anyone (lays hands on this object in order to make a uelestrom) with the consent of the assembly,' then ferom pihom estu: 'then let the carrying be lawful'. Presumably the 'carrying' (ferom) refers to the sacred object in question. In other words, if one gets the consent of the assembly then one can carry (away) the sacred object in order to make a uelestrom. The context suggests that a meaning such as 'repair', 'restoration', or 'cleaning' is the most appropriate (so Untermann 1956:133-34). And there are parallels in Latin inscriptions which indicate that objects dedicated to deities were repaired and/or restored to their pristine condition (see, e.g., CIL I 603, the Temple-regulation inscription from Furfo: . . . tangere sarcire tegere deuehere defigere . . . promouere referre
fasque esto 'let it be lawful to touch, repair, to cover (so as to protect), carry away, fasten, to move forth, and to restore (this object)'. CIL VIII 11796, regulation concerning a dedicatory object from Mactari: [ne ex] eo t[emplo ubi nunc est] exportetur neue ex eo loco in quo nunc est in alium transferatur . . . neue ab alio [quo nisi ab] . . . contingat[r contractetur nisi] ab eo sa[cerdot]e qui sacerdotum Apollinis primus erit . . . [siquid laesum de]labsumue erit uti ad pristinam for[mam reducatur . . .] 'let (this object) not be carried from the temple where it now stands; do not carry it from its present location to some other place; let no one but the chief priest of Apollo handle it . . . so that, in case it has been damaged or has fallen, it may be restored to its former state . . .'. CIL XII 4333, regulation for the altar at Narbo: siguis tergere ornare reificere uolet quod benificii causa fiat ius fasque esto 'it is right and proper if someone wishes, as a kindness, to clean up, embellish, or restore (this altar)'). Thus, a meaning like 'restoration' or 'cleaning up' makes good sense in the context of this inscription and has parallels elsewhere in the literature. As a result, with respect to meaning analysis (1) is also to be preferred to the others.

Ultimately, in order to decide between interpretations one is forced either to accept some semantic and contextual difficulties or some syntactic difficulty. At this point I am inclined to favor interpretation number one since, even though subjunctives are rare in relative clauses and command clauses, they are not unattested (see Buck (1928:214-15, 217-18) for examples). In fact it is possible to find examples of subjunctives in relative and imperative sentences
elsewhere among the Sabellian languages (e.g., the negative prohibition in Marrucinian (Ve. 218) and the indefinite relative clause with the subjunctive lifar in Paelignian (Ve. 213)). Also, one cannot overlook the fact that the existence of a subjunctive in a relative clause of purpose may be a Latinism. This could also be the case for the use of the subjunctive in the command clause rather than the imperative. Recall that Latin speakers were in control of most of Volscian territory by the 3rd century.

Under the interpretation adopted here the action for which one needs the permission of the couehriu (assembly) is specified by atahus pie uelestrom faлиa, i.e., 'lay hands on in order to make a restoration'. It seems reasonable then to interpret the Lex Veliterna as a sacred regulation indicating the reparations which are to be made in the case of violation of the statute which requires repair, restoration, cleaning, etc., on dedicatory objects to have the approval of the couehriu.

1.3 Lexical notes

1.3.1 atahus

With one dissenting opinion, that of Pisani (1964:123), atahus is considered to be a third sg. future perfect in -us-, the final -t having been lost, cf. faлиa in line 2. Generally this verb is translated 'attigerit' and connected with the Latin verb tango:, tangere, tetigi: 'lay hands on' < PIE *tag- (Pokorny 1959:1054). Formally, atahus is from *ad/a:+tetag-us-t, the form of the preverb being impossible to determine precisely (Untermann 1973). Semantically, such a connection is feasible. Morphologically, however, it
leaves something to be desired since one would expect IE *g to remain in Volscian and IE *gh to yield h, at least compared with the development of these consonants in Oscan and Umbrian (see Buck 1928:148-149). It does not appear possible to rule out a root final aspirate on the basis of IE root structure constraints either, since IE does have some roots with the shape TaDH-, cf. *kadh- 'protect' (Pokorny 1959:516) and *kagh- 'set' (Pokorny 1959:518). There are then three possibilities: (1) give up the connection between Latin tango: and Volscian atahus; (2) assume that IE or at least Italic had an alternate root with a final aspirate; (3) derive h from *g in Volscian by some other means. If at all possible, the last solution is to be preferred over the others.

Two possibilities present themselves for deriving h from *g. The allomorph tah-, having originated in the perfect passive participle *tahto- < *tagto-, may have been generalized into contexts where it was not to be expected on phonetic grounds. This suggestion is not very attractive, however, since it is difficult to suggest any motivation for the replacement of the morph tag- by tah-. A more attractive solution, and one that may derive some support because the same phenomenon is found in Umbrian, is the spirantization (and palatalization) of intervocalic *g. In Umbrian IE *g > y / [palatal], e.g. muieto < *muge:to:d, eveietu < *e:we:ge:to:d. In Volscian then IE *g may have been palatalized and spirantized before palatal sounds and then this allomorph generalized throughout the paradigm. It would be easier to accept this solution if the phonetic outcome of these processes was represented orthographically by <i> in
Volscian as it is in Umbrian. However, the fact that this phenomenon is not represented in a parallel fashion in the two languages need not count heavily against this interpretation. Recall that the palatalization of *k is indicated by a reversed c in Volscian, i.e. by γ, while in Umbrian palatalization of *k is represented by d. At any rate, one of the two solutions offered above seems preferable to giving up the connection with Latin tangor or to assuming alternate root shapes for this verb in Italic.

1.3.2 uelestrom

As noted in 1.2 this word has no clear etymology. It is connected with the root *ual- 'wish' by Pisani (1964:123), although the precise segmentation of the rest of the word is not clear (stem ueles + tro, or stem uele- + stro?). Corsson (1858:258ff.) was the first to suggest that this word was a genitive plural with the meaning 'of the Velitrians.' The word was analyzed as a stem ule-, cf. Greek helos 'marshland,' plus the place suffix -tro- and referred originally to the inhabitants of the low river ground, marshlands, etc. Untermann (1956:133-134) was the first to suggest the meaning 'repair' for uelestrom. He also argued that this word was of Etruscan origin because of the sequence -str-, which occurs quite frequently in Etruscan words. This is a possibility and could even be supported by the existence of esaristrom if this word is Etruscan. Note however that the -str- sequence is scarcely enough to warrant the assumption of Etruscan origin. This sequence arises independently in Latin for example (e.g. pedestris 'on foot' < *pedet-tri-s), and Lejeune (1972) makes a similar claim for esaristrom (see below). Similarly, Durante
(1963:252) argues for the Etruscan origins of this word. However, he suggests a genitive plural equivalent to Greek ιδίωτών. Once again, Etruscan origin is a possibility but cannot be proven. ulestorm remains a major crux in the interpretation of the inscription.

1.3.3 esaristrom

esaristrom is generally assumed to designate a 'expiatory sacrifice' and to be the Volscian equivalent to Umbrian esunu 'sacrifice' < *ays-no-. The root is undoubtedly *ays-, cf. Paelignian aisis, Oscan aisusis, Venetic aisus, etc. but the analysis of the rest of the word is not clear. Untermann (1956:133-134) and Pulgram (1970:256) assume that the root and the derivational morphemes are ultimately of Etruscan origin (for -str- see above under ulestorm), cf. Etruscan aesar, aiser, eiser, and note possible -str- suffix in spurestres, sacnicstres. Lejeune (1972:130-131), who favors an Italic origin for *ays-, sees in esaristrom an instrumental noun in *-s-tro- ultimately from a r/n noun. (For further discussion of the root *ays- and its Italic reflexes see below Marsian esos 3.1.1)

1.3.4 bim

Most authorities agree that bim means 'cow, ox' and is cognate with Umbrian bum, Latin bouem, etc. However, as was noted by von Planta (1892 I:131), Pisani (1964:123), and Radke (1961:782) the i-vocalism in this word is problematic. From PIE *gwo:m Volscian should show *bu:m, cf. Umbrian bum, and not bim since the regular outcome of PIE *o: in Volscian is u, e.g. uinu < *uino:d, arpatitu < *adpate:to:d, totici < *toutiko:d, estu < *esto:d. Since it is not obvious that the i-vocalism in bim can be the result of sound change,
scholars have generally opted for non-phonological solutions in order to explain the i-vocalism of bim.

Von Planta, Thurneysen, and Pisani, for example, propose to account for the i-vocalism by a combination of phonological and morphological change.

Von Planta (1892:131) supposes that the vocalism of the word 'cow' was altered because of paradigmatic similarities shared with the word 'pig' in oblique case forms. Von Planta sets up the following paradigms:

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{bo:s} & \text{bues} & \text{bue} & \text{bo:m} & \text{bue} \\
\text{suis} & \text{sues} & \text{sue} & \text{su:m} & \text{sue}.
\end{array}
\]

According to von Planta such paradigmatic similarities contributed to the reanalysis of the non-oblique stem of the word 'cow' as bu-. Note that for von Planta restructuring of the paradigm preceded the change *o: > u. As a result other lexical items with original *o: did not participate in this sound change. The i-vocalism in Volscian bim then resulted from the sound change *u: > i, cf. Umbrian sim < *su:m 'pig.'

Von Planta's assumption that paradigmatic similarities played a major role in the development of *bo:m to bim cannot be maintained however. The paradigm of bo:s cannot be reconstructed with an oblique stem *bu-. Latin bovis (gen sg), Skt. goh (gen sg), Greek βοός < *bowos, indicate that the oblique stem had full grade vocalism, i.e. *gwov-.

Thurneysen (1921:219), and Pisani after him, propose to account for the i-vocalism in bim by suggesting that *bo:m was altered to *bu:m by contamination with words like 'pig' *su:m and that *bu:m then underwent the sound change *u: > i together with other words with
original *u:. That the i-vocalism in bim can be accounted for by contamination and sound change is of course possible. However, once one introduces the notion of contamination it is simpler to assume that *bo:m was reshaped directly to bim after an i-stem like ovim 'sheep'. Thus, explaining the i-vocalism in bim by means of contamination is not very satisfying.

Pulgram (1976:257) appears to suggest that bim can be derived from *bo:m by means of sound change alone although he is not explicit about the derivation. However, if bim is to be derived by sound change from *bo:m then this explanation must take into account the fact that IE *o:, with the exception of bim, appears as u in Volscian.

Discussions of Volscian bim generally overlook one important fact about Oscan-Umbrian historical phonology, namely the fact that all the dialects show raising of IE *o:. As a result it is more likely that raising of *o: preceded the fronting of *u: and in fact was in some sense responsible for the movement of *u: to a front position in Umbrian and Volscian (i.e. a push chain). Thus, it does in fact appear possible to construct a scenario in which some original *o:’s were raised far enough in the direction of original *u: in order to participate in the change fronting *u: to i.

Since there are so little data in Volscian there is considerable room for speculation about the precise manner in which the change was implemented. The following scenario seems among the most reasonable.

IE *o: was probably raised to *o: in Oscan-Umbrian (otherwise we might expect all *o:’s to end up as i in Umbrian and Volscian). In Volscian, then, (raised) *o: may have become *u: in monosyllables, or
perhaps in accented syllables (i.e. bim as opposed to -u < *oid in estu, etc.), in time to participate in the change of *u: to i, but sooner than (raised) *o: in unaccented syllables or polysyllables. Since sound change, at least in some cases, appears to diffuse through the lexicon this scenario provides a perfectly reasonable explanation for the i-vocalism bim as opposed to the u-vocalism in other words. 17

1.3.5 asif

Previous suggestions concerning the case of asif are not very appealing. I cannot agree with Pulgram (1976:258) or Pisani (1964: 123) that asif is an abl pl in -f. The claim that the -f here is simply a different resolution of the dat/abl ending *-fs < *-bhos, cf. Oscan luisarifs (Ve. 74), is not very convincing since such an ending is nowhere else attested within Oscan-Umbrian or, for that matter, in Italic. In Oscan, Umbrian, and the other Sabellian languages where *-bhos is attested, the final result of the simplification of *-fs is s and not f. More likely is the assumption that -f is acc pl, cf. Umbrian acc pl in -f sif 'pigs' < *su:ns. Still, precisely what asif means is not clear though Vetters' suggestion (asses 'money') is a possibility. 18

1.3.6 arpatitu

arpatitu can be analyzed quite straightforwardly into affix ar-, stem pati-, and third singular imperative ending -tu. This verb is generally connected with Latin pateo: 'to be open,' cf. Oscan patensins 'they opened'. However, the meaning of the Volscian verb must be transitive since bim and asif appear to be objects (cf. Latin pandere 'throw open' < *pat-n- which is transitive). As a result, the com-
parison with Latin pateo: is questionable. Pokorny (1959:824) compares arpatitu with Latin pando: directly, analyzing the Volscian verb as *ad-pand-e-to:d. This analysis is problematic primarily because there is no reason to expect *d to be written t. In all other cases where *d occurs in this inscription it is written d. Von Planta (1897 II:652) and Pisani (1964:124) have suggested a connection with Greek πατούμενον and Latin quatio: < *k'at-. The etymology is acceptable on phonological and morphological grounds but the context seems to call for a word meaning 'sacrifice, offer' rather than 'shake' or 'brandish.' As a result, Untermann (1956:132) suggests that both connections be abandoned in favor of a meaning like 'to offer'.

I would like to suggest that the connection with the root *pet-/*petH (Pokorny 1959:824) be maintained. First, from a morphological point of view it is possible to offer a reasonable analysis of arpatitu. If the stem portion of the verb is analyzed straightforwardly, it appears to consist of a stem *pat- plus a simple theme vowel *e, i.e. < *pate-. I do not know of any reason not to analyze this verb as a simple thematic formation. This has the advantage of allowing one to assume that the verb is transitive in meaning and this is, of course, precisely what the context calls for. Phonologically, one must simply assume that unaccented *e was raised to i at some point in the prehistory of Volscian, as it was in Latin. Second, from the point of view of semantics the connection with the root *pet- is also advantageous. One can derive, it appears, the meaning 'offer, sacrifice' rather neatly from a basic meaning 'spread out'.
If one concedes that the verb arpatitu 'spread out' could have been used in the context of sacrifices, e.g. 'to spread out sacrificial offerings before the gods' or 'to spread out the offerings in sacrifice', then it is quite easy to imagine the verb coming to be used of the sacrifice or offering as a whole and not just the preparatory stages.

The relationship of this verb with the ablatives uinu uesclis appears to be the same as that found in Umbrian and Latin inscriptions, e.g. Umbrian (Tab. Ig. Ia 4): heris uinu heri poni . . . feitu 'sacrifice either with wine or with grain . . .' Latin (Narbo): thur:re et uino: supplicent et hosti:as singul(a:as) immolent 'Let them pray with incense and wine and let them sacrifice the victims one by one.' The prefix ar- is from *ad-; compare Umbrian arfertur.

1.3.7 couehriu

couehriu is generally compared to Latin cu:ria < *kowirya:, the only difference being the length of the vowel in uir-, and the fact that long *i: is represented by <eh> orthographically. Umbrian probably also has a long i:; at least the digraph <ei> veiro- would seem to indicate as much. Precisely what type of assembly couehriu refers to, and what its functions and jurisdiction were, is not clear. The functions of the cu:ria in Rome cannot be attributed to the Volsci and hence are of little help in illuminating this situation.

1.3.8 sepu

Volscian sepu is generally connected with Oscan sipus 'sciens' (nom sg: Tab. Bant. 5, 14) and both are related to the Latin word sapio: 'taste of'. According to Pokorny (1959:880) and Walde-Hofmann
the difference in root vocalism between the Volscian/Oscan and Latin forms is not original. Apparently the e:-vocalism in sepu and sipus owes its origin to the a/e: alternations which existed in verbs like facio:/fe:ci: 'make' and capio:/ce:pi: 'seize'.

Three basic interpretations of the morphological structure of sepu and sipus can be found in the literature:

1) primary *-wes/wos- formation (a perfect active participle formation), i.e. root *se:p- + *-wes/wos- suffix, either in full grade with syncope of the short vowel or in zero grade (e.g. Bottiglioni 1954:135, 430; Pisani 1964:55; Schmidt 1883:372ff; Untermann 1956:126; von Planta 1973 II:396);

2) primary *-wo- formation, i.e. root + *-wo- suffix with syncope of the short vowel (e.g. Bottiglioni 1954:107; Buck 1928:188-189; Bugge 1853:383; Grienberger 1928:34; Vetter 1953:18-19; von Planta 1973:396);


It is also possible to recognize two variations on these interpretations:

A) an original u-stem reanalyzed as a *wo-stem (Cowgill, personal communication);

B) perfect participle formation reanalyzed as either (1) a u-stem (Pisani 1964:55) or (2) a *o-stem (Untermann 1956:126).

Interpretation (1), after Schmidt (1883:372ff.), sees Volscian sepu and Oscan sipus as perfect active participles. There are two serious difficulties with this analysis.
First, while this analysis can account for the form of Oscan sipus, i.e. a preform *se:pwos will yield Oscan sipus directly, it cannot possibly account for Volscian sepu. It is simply not possible to derive sepu from the abl sg of a perfect active participle formation *se:puse. An abl sg like the aforementioned would appear in Volscian as *se:puse (note toticu, *se:pse, or something similar. As a result some scholars have argued that sepu was reanalyzed as a vocalic stem. Pisani (1964:55) suggests that sepu could be derived from zero grade of a perfect active participle *se:pus by misanalysis of the participial suffix -us as affix -u plus inflectional ending -s on the model of u-stems. Untermann (1956:126-7) argues against a u-stem analysis, for reasons to be discussed below, and proposes a reanalysis of sepu as an o-stem. Although Untermann himself provides no motivation for such a reanalysis one could easily assume that original *wo formations provided a model, i.e. *-wos > -us via syncope of final short vowels (see below). Thus, while these two proposals encounter no problems from a formal point of view there are problems with the semantics.

The perfect active participle analysis has difficulties accounting for the semantics of obviously related forms, namely Oscan facus and praefucus. In the Tabula Pantina facus and praefucus are used with distinctly passive meanings, e.g. facus estud = 'factus esto,' praefucus = 'praefectus.' It is difficult to reconcile the passive meanings of these words with the fact that perfect participial formations in *-wes/wos- are 'active' in voice in IE (Brugmann 1906:
Moreover, it is difficult to assume that participial formations in *-wes/wos- took over the function of *-to- participles since participles with this latter affix are present in the Italic dialects with their original passive value (see Buck 1928: 180; von Planta 1973 II: 397-401). For semantic reasons then the perfect active participle analysis as well as the two variations on this analysis are difficult to maintain.

In an article published in AGI in 1970 Roberto Gusmani (1970: 45-49) attempted to show that it was possible (on phonological, morphological, and semantic grounds) to analyze sepu and sipus as u-stems. The greatest problem with the u-stem analysis is that it fails to take into consideration the possibility that *u: was fronted to i in Volscian.

Although the evidence for this change in Volscian amounts to the word bim there appears to be no good reason to reject this word as evidence. And if bim is evidence for a change *o: > *u: > i then the u-stem analysis cannot stand. From an original u-stem formation *se:pu:d one would expect *se:pi:d with the fronting of *u: in the ablative.

In addition to the problem caused by the fact that *u: was probably fronted to i in Volscian, Untermann (1956:126) has argued that sipus cannot be a u-stem because the *u in the final syllable would have been syncopated. Indeed, since there is evidence for the syncopation of other short vowels in final syllables it is possible that *u was lost here also, e.g., Paelignian pes 'pius' < *pi:os, uus 'uobis' < *uobhos; Umbrian mers 'ius' < *medos, pacer 'propitius' <
*pakris, Oscar mins 'minus' < *minos, hurz 'hortus' < *hortos.

Unfortunately, since no examples of u-stem nom sgs have survived in Oscan-Umbrian it is impossible to substantiate this claim. However, it would be unwise to claim, as has Untermann (1956:126), that the syncopation of the other short vowels in Oscan-Umbrian necessitates the syncope of *u also. As Donegan-Miller (1972:484) has argued, labiality impedes the syncopation of vowels. In fact Gothic provides a perfect parallel; all short vowels in final syllables are syncopated except *u. Thus, while syncope provides a possible problem to the u-stem analysis it does not by any means rule out this analysis.

Warren Cowgill (personal communication) has pointed out to me that sepu and sipus may indeed be original u-stems but that they were reanalyzed as *wo formations. Since it is reasonable to assume that *wo formations underwent syncope, i.e. X-wo > X-us, formal parallels between the two stem types would have existed in the nom sg. This formal similarity provides a possible motivation for the transfer from u-stem to o-stem. In light of the fact that u-stem adjectives are not otherwise attested in Oscan-Umbrian, or for that matter in Latin, this shift in declensional type is not at all surprising. Thus, it appears possible to maintain the position that sipus and sepu were u-stems originally and that they were remade to *wo-stems due to formal similarities which existed in the nom sg.

While it is possible to maintain that sepu and sipus are transfers to *wo formations, it is also possible to maintain that they were *wo formations originally. Diachronically, Oscan sipus can be derived from *se:pwos via syncope of the final vowel (and raising of *e:):
Volscian **sepu** must be derived from an ablative formation *se:pwo:d* (see **toticu** < *touzikol:d*, **estu** < *esto:d*).²²

There are, despite Gusmani's protest to the contrary, no phonological or morphological problems with such an analysis. Primary *-wo-* formations are common in IE and frequent in Italic (see Brugmann 1906:199ff.). Phonologically, the syncope of the vowel in the final syllable after **u** can be supported by parallel cases of the syncope of *o* in disyllabic words. And there are no problems with the semantics of such a formation. Derivations exist which attest both passive and active meanings (see Brugmann 1906:202ff.): Skt. **yka:-** 'praising' to Skt. **ka:-** 'praise'; Latin **aruum**, Umbrian **aruam-en** 'cultivated land' to Latin **ara:re** 'plough'; Latin *fri:vos* (refri:ua) 'crushed, crumbled,' cf. OHG **briow**, Old English **briw** 'mash,' Latin **fria:re** 'crush, crumble'; Skt. **pakva:-** 'ripe' to Skt. **pa:-** 'cook.'

Of the morphological analyses of **sepu** and **sipus** in the literature it is possible to rule out all but two: original **u**-stem with transfer to *wo*-stem and original *wo*-stem. The perfect active participle analysis has problems with the semantics of these formations; the **u**-stem analysis cannot satisfactorily explain the **u**-vocalism of **sepu** in light of the fact that *ui* was fronted to **i** in Volscian. Only the analysis of these words as *wo-*suffixed forms, either original or secondary, does not encounter any such problems. As a result the analysis of **sepu** and **sipus** as *wo* formations is to be preferred over the others. It does not appear possible, however, to decide between the analysis of **sepu** and **sipus** as original or secondary *wo* formations. The use of heuristic devices such as 'select the simplest
analysis' can not really be at issue here. There is no evidence that the use of a simplicity criterion provides one with the 'correct' analysis of historical changes.

1.3.9 sistiatiens

While everyone agrees that sistiatiens is to be construed as a 3 pl perf ind with the meaning 'set up, erected', undoubtedly from the root *sta:-, there are considerable problems in analyzing this verb morphologically. Two possible analyses exist.

One analysis sees sistiatiens as a denominative verb to a stem *(si)statu:- with *u: > i, cf. Latin statuo:. A denominative stem ending in u: is preferred to an i-stem essentially because of the Latin connection, and because of Paelignian sestaplens (see below section 7.1) which, epigraphically, seems to call for a restoration *sesta-tuens. Nevertheless, there are problems with a denominative formation, namely the fact that the root shows reduplication and the fact we must suppose the nominal stem had a long u:. Durante (1978:812) suggests that the syllable of reduplication is the result of contamination with forms like Latin sisto/Umbrian sestu. However, the assumption of a long *u: in the stem remains unexplained. In fact it appears difficult to offer a reason for a long vowel here. The *-tu- suffix in IE contains a short vowel (see Buck 1933:338). The advantage of this analysis, however, is that one can provide some principled reason, anticipatory inscribing of <i>, for the existence of the i in the second syllable.

The second analysis of sistiatiens is as a -tt- perfect to a stem sesta-, cf. Umbrian sestu (see, for example, Untermann 1956:124-125).
One need only suppose the thematic stem *siste/o- was remade to sesta-
either through the influence of the past participle, i.e. stato-, or
more likely by the verbal affix -a-. Renewal of thematics by means
of this affix is common in Italic and in fact a reasonable parallel
exists in Faliscan. In Latin the verb 'drink' is a thematic formation
with reduplication, i.e. bibo, bibit < *pi-pH^-o/e-. This verb was
renewed in Faliscan by means of the affix -a-, i.e. pipafo < *p/bi-
p/b-a:-. If sistatiens is analyzed as an a: formation then one can
account rather neatly for the fact that past tense is marked by a
t(i). Compare, for example, the use of the -tt- pasts in Paelignian
(coisatens) and Oscan (prufatted) with stems in a:. The only serious
problem with this analysis is that it is difficult to explain the
existence of the i's following the t's in syllables two and three.

1.4 Characteristics of Volscian

Although there is only one Volscian inscription it is such that
we are able to discern a number of the salient characteristics of this
dialect. With respect to phonology we note the monophthongization of
diphthongs (deue < *deywa:y), the loss of word-final dentals after
long vowels (estu < *esto:d) and in clusters (atahas < *ad-tagust),
the palatalization (and spirantization) of velars before palatals
(fa\]ia < *fakya:t), the raising of *o: to u (toticu < *toutiko:d), the
fronting of *u: to i (bim < *bu:m < *bo:m), and the syncope of short
vowels in final syllables (medix < *meddikes). Among the salient
features of Volscian morphology one must mention the acc pl in -f
(asaf < *as(s)ines), the formation of gentilicia in -ies < *I+i (see
Nussbaum 1975: 135-36) (cosuties), the infinitive in -om (ferom), the
participial formation in *wo (sepu), the future perfect in -us- (atahus), the deverbal formation in *-a:- (sestiatiens), and t as marker of the simple past (sestiatiens). In terms of syntax it is important to note the following characteristics: (1) Volscian allows the use of subjunctives in commands in addition to imperatives; (2) subjunctives are used in relative clauses; (3) the order of the elements in onomastica follows the Umbrian rather than the Oscan/Latin system, i.e. praenomen, patronymic, gentilicum (ec se cosuties) rather than praenomen, gentilicum, patronymic; there is an ablative absolute (toticu couehriu sepu).

2. Hernican

According to the ancients (see Paul. Fest. 100 M.; Serv. ad Aen. 7,684) the Hernici were either an Umbrian, a Marsian, or a Sabine tribe. Paulus (Fest 89 L) derives their name from the Marsian word for stones, namely herma (neut pl). Whether the tradition is correct and the Hernici were indeed an Oscan-Umbrian tribe is impossible to tell since they were Latinized before they were literate and the surviving glosses, samentum 'pellicula de hostia' ('a small piece of skin from a sacrificial victim') and buttutti 'sonus in sacris Anagninorum' ('the noises (made) in the worship services of the citizens of Anagnia') provide little information about the nature of the language outside of lexical peculiarities. However, the Italic character of the language may be indicated by some toponomastic evidence. It appears likely that the Hernican city Verulae has as its base the Oscan-Umbrian word for 'gate,' uero-, cf. Oscan ueru acc pl.
neut (Vetter 24) and Umbrian pre-ueres dat-abl pl (Ia 2). Similarly, the Hernican city of Anagnia may have the same base as the Paelignian divine name anac-ta (Durante 1978:792). But these small indications are scarcely sufficient to consider the Oscan-Umbrian, or for that matter Italic, nature of the Hernici proven.

3. The Marsian Dialect.

Of the Marsian dialect itself there are scant remains. In toto there are five inscriptions which can with certainty be attributed to the Marsi, although they are not entirely free from Latin influence (see below for discussion). Of these five inscriptions, one (Ve. 224) is fragmentary, three are very short, and the remaining (Ve. 223) is controversial in that it is traditionally attributed to the Volsci.

In addition to these 'Marsian' inscriptions there are several inscriptions which are predominantly Latin but which contain some non-Latin features. Since these inscriptions originate in Marsian territory it is reasonable to assume that the non-Latin features are the result of a Marsian substratum influence. Still, possible substratal features are so slight as to provide little insight into the nature of the dialect in addition to the Marsian inscriptions themselves (but see discussion below, section 3.4).

3.1 Inscriptions from Marruvium

Two of the five Marsian inscriptions (Ve. 224, Po. 222) were found at Marruvium, one of the main settlements of the Marsi, located
on the eastern shore of Lake Fucinus. The first inscription consists of two fragmentary pieces of a stone plate:

pe. ui[p][i]o. po. f.[ . . .
ioue. iouies. pucle[s . . .

'Pe. Vipius, son of Po(plios), ...
... (offered/dedicated this plate)
to Jove and the sons of Jove.'

The plate was probably a gift for, or was used to hold offerings dedicated to, the sons of Jove. As a result one can be reasonably sure the inscription contained on the plate is dedicatory in nature.

Von Planta (1897 II:653) was apparently the first to suggest that these two fragments were part of the same inscription. He also noted correctly that the second line contained the name of the deities to whom the inscription was dedicated. The noun phrase iouies pucle[s] probably refers to the Dioscuri (Vetter 1953:141). Worship of these two deities may have been acquired through contact with Latin speakers because their worship is attested in Rome as early as the 5th century. Worship of the Dioscuri is also found among the Paeligni of Sulmo (see (Ve. 202)). Vetter (1953:159) suggested that line one contained the names of the donors of the plate and assumed that the formula in which the names were inscribed followed the pattern of Umbrian rather than Oscan/Latin. However, the latest reading of this inscription, Letta (1976:278), shows that Vetter's reconstruction of the onomastic formula was wrong. The name is in the Oscan/Latin order, not the Umbrian: 'Pe. Vipios, son of Poplios.'
The second inscription from Marruvium, (Ve. 225), is, like the preceding inscription, inscribed on a stone plate and was apparently a gift dedicated to the di nouensides:

```
esos nouesede pesco pacre
'(May the) di nouesedes propitiously (accept this) expiatory sacrifice (?).'
```

There are numerous interpretations of this small inscription but all have been rendered obsolete due to the discovery of a new Latin dialectal inscription (Po. 225) from Lucus Feroniae in which the word pesco is contained.

This newly discovered Latin inscription indicates that previous interpretations of Marsian pesco, namely as a first singular verb form from the root *prek-/*perk- (Bottiglioni 1954:411), as a neuter noun with a *-tlo- formation meaning 'templum' or 'sacrificium' (Lejeune 1972:188; Pisani 1964:125; Vetter 1953:159), as a nom/acc neuter noun < *perk-sko-m 'templum' (Durante 1978:809) (cf. Umbrian perstu 'place'), cannot be right. Rather the context in which pesco occurs in this inscription, as well as (Po. 225), seems to indicate a meaning more in line with Latin piaculum 'expiatory sacrifice' (Letta 1976: 277). Such a meaning makes excellent sense because the di nouensides were apparently gods of the dead who were thought to attend the dead person between death and burial. The plate then was probably set aside for them with an expiatory offering. Still, pesco is without a good etymology.
3.1.1 Lexical notes

`esos` has been variously interpreted, as a `dat/abl pl., nom pl` `o-stem`, `acc pl o-stem`, and `nom pl u-stem`. All but the last interpretation overlook the fact that the root `*ays-` 'god' occurs in almost all of the Italic languages. On the basis of this distribution Lejeune (1972) argues that this root is of ancient Italic origin and was borrowed by the Etruscans. Hypotheses which see `*ays-` as an Etruscan word (after Suet. Aug. 97) have problems explaining the widespread geographical distribution of the word as well as why the same word should be borrowed with such diverse stem forms.

If the Venetic form `aisus` is interpreted as containing the basic Italic stem form, as is argued by Lejeune (1972), then it is possible to explain all of the Italic forms as ultimately deriving from `u-stems`. According to this hypothesis `esos` is a `nom/voc pl` from `*aysowes` with syncope of the final `e` and monophthongization of the resulting `aw`. 31

`pace` is clearly an `(r)i-` stem from the root `paik-`. Morphologically, it is possible for `pace` to represent a neuter `nom/acc singular` with `*i > e/___##`, or a `nom pl` with `*eye > e:`, or `acc pl < *-ins`. If `acc pl` one might expect `-if;` however spellings in `-e(f)` do occur in Umbrian, so on phonological grounds it cannot be ruled out. A `nom pl` masc in agreement with `esos` probably makes the best sense for this inscription, since `pia` `cula` are not by nature either propitious or not propitious. However, one might expect the donors to ask the gods to accept the `pia` `culum` propitiously.
3.2 The inscriptions from Trasacco

SE 4 (Antonini 1981:312) was found in the vicinity of Trasacco. It is inscribed on limestone in characters which indicate it is to be dated to the second half of the third century (Antonini 1981:312; Letta 1979:406):

\[\text{gestur} \]
\[\text{u.salu[-} \]
\[\text{m.paci} \]
\[\text{pe.crui} \]

'During the quaestorship of V. Salv(ius) and M. Pacius Pe. Cervius (dedicated this).'

According to Letta's description (1979:406) of this inscription the first three lines are inscribed quite closely together and the fourth line is somewhat removed from the other three. Further, the size of the characters differs between lines 1-3 and line 4, the letters in lines 1-3 being larger than those in line 4.

The inscription is probably a dedicatory inscription to some unnamed deity. The two quaestors noted in lines 2 and 3 are probably not the dedicators, however. A Latin-Marsian inscription (CIL 1\(^2\) 388) from the same area indicates that the quaestors were listed as a means of dating the inscription the only difference being the position of onomastica (Letta 1979:408).\(^3\) In the Trasacco inscription the dating formula is preposed, whereas in CIL 1\(^2\) 388 it is postposed.\(^4\) The final name, then, probably represents the name of the person dedicating the inscription.

The word *gestur* is a loan from Latin although it is not possible to support this assumption simply on the basis of the initial letter.
There is some indication (see Chapter 4) that Marsian is an Oscan-Umbrian dialect and as a result one would expect the outcome of Italic *kw to be p, cf. Paelignian puvus < *kw'ons. Still this word does show some Marsian peculiarities, namely the monophthongization of the diphthong *ay, the raising of the long vowel *or, and the syncope of final short *e, i.e. from earlier *kwaysto:res accompanied by the reduction of final *rs to r; cf. Umbrian kvestur.

(Po. 224):

cdimi ioue sacri coste fert

'C. D. Imies offers a sacrificial victim to Jove with purity (?).'

This inscription, found near Ortona, is generally considered Latin due to the appearance of the verb fert and the interpretation of the word sacri as gen sg (see Durante 1978:810). However, the fact that a gen sg is syntactically unmotivated in this inscription and the fact that an i-stem sacri- with the meaning 'hostia,' i.e. 'sacrificial victim,' a meaning which fits well into the context of this inscription, is widespread in Oscan and Umbrian, indicate that this inscription is, for the most part, dialectal. The word coste is obscure. Durante (1978:810) has argued that it is cognate with Latin castus/-e 'with purity.' For the a-o alternation he cites Umbrian hostatu and Latin hasta: tus 'armed with a spear.' Poccetti (1979:170) suggests that coste is an abbreviation for *consentibus 'the 12 superior gods,' which is in asyndeton with ioue. Neither suggestion is satisfying. Identification of the proper name is equally vexing but Durante's suggestion that cdimi is to be analyzed as praenomen c,
patronymic d, and gentilicum imi = Imies finds some support because of
the existence of a gentilicium Imies on the defixio from Ciro (Poc-
cettì 1979:170).  

3.3 The Bronze of Antinum

(Ve. 223) from Antinum is inscribed on a thin bronze plate in
characters which indicate a date of about 150 B.C. (Conway 1897:269;
Morandi 1974:358):

\begin{verbatim}
pa.ui.pacuius.medis
uesune.dunom.ded
ca.cumnios.cetur
\end{verbatim}

'Pa. Pacuius, son of Vi(pius),
a medix, offered this gift to Vesona
during the censorship of Ca. Cuminios.'

This inscription is generally assumed to belong to the Volscian
dialect (Vetter 1953:158) since it was found at Antinum, which is on
the western side of the ring of hills that surrounds Lake Fucinus. As
a result it is assumed that this community interacted with the
Volscian speaking communities to the west, e.g. Sora. Still, in
ancient times this community was considered Marsian (cf. CIL IX 3839,
Marsi Antinum) and even if Marsian communities did have commercial
ties with Volscian communities to the west this is no reason to
suppose that they would trade their native dialect for another (there
is no evidence that Antinum ever came under Volscian influence).
Moreover, Kerlouegan (1958:280ff.) has argued that there were routes
by which Antinum could communicate with Marsian-speaking communities
to the east. As a result there is no reason to assume that this
inscription is anything but Marsian.
The inscription itself is dedicatory in nature, and almost surely shows some Latin influence in this respect. *dunom ded* is a typical Latin dedicatory formula (see Warmington 1935:60ff.) but the word *dunom* is itself dialectal since original *o:rem* remains in Latin. Moreover, the name *cumnios* must be Latin as the ending *-ios* rather than *-ies* indicates. *cetur* too is obviously a Latin loan though with at least one dialectal peculiarity. The suffix *-tur* is probably analogical after words like *getur* (SE 4) since Latin has *censor* (Szemerényi 1962:183; Untermann 1958:250ff.).

### 3.4 Latin–Marsian inscriptions

From the area of the Marsi there exist several inscriptions which are undoubtedly Latin but yet show some obviously non-Latin features. It is reasonable to assume that some of these features are due to Marsian substratum influence. Since, however, it is also possible that Latin dialects spoken in this region differed from those near Rome and those in Latium with respect to some features special care must be taken in determining what features may plausibly be the result of substratum influence. In fact the safest procedure is simply to exclude those features which appear in any Latin dialect. At least, in this way one can insure that no non-Marsian features will slip through undetected.

The following Marsian features can be ascertained from (Ve. 228a-g):

- **a)** *d > r/ labial*, e.g. *apurfinem*, cf. also Volscian *arpatitu* and Umbrian *arfertur* (Ve. 228a);
- **b)** *-ty- > -ts-*, e.g. *Martses*, cf. Paelignian *musesa* (Ve. 228a);
3.5 Characteristics of Marsian

Although we possess a number of Marsian inscriptions, including a fair number of Latin-Marsian inscriptions, we remain in the dark about most of the relevant characteristics of this dialect. As Bolelli has pointed out (1971:95), the Marsian inscriptions provide us with more information about onomastica than anything else. Nevertheless, we can attribute to the Marsi the following features: monophthongization of diphthongs (pucle[ə] < *putlois); syncope of final short vowels (gestur < *kwaysto:res); the raising of *o: to u (uesune < *ueso:na:y); assimilation of *ty (martses < *martya:is); rhotacization of *d before labials (apurfinem < *apud finem); the arrangement of onomastica in the order praenomen, patronymic, gentilicium (pa.ui.pacuies); and the formation of gentilicia in -ies < *i+i (pacuies).

4. Aequian

There is one Aequian inscription, the authenticity of which has been questioned by numerous scholars (see Vetter 1953:160). Vetter (1953:160) is probably right in assuming that a forger would not have invented the name of the person who dedicated the inscription in the rare onomastic order in which it occurs. The inscription was found in
the area of Circolano, at Collemaggiore, and is dated to the second century B.C. (Durante 1978:811):

\[
\text{pa.ui.pacies medix talii state m. dd}
\]

'Pa. Pacius, son of Vi., the meddix of Taliensis, gave this as a gift to Stata Mater.'

The inscription is a dedicatory offering \((d(\text{unom}) \, d(\text{eded}))\) to a goddess \text{Stata}.\textsuperscript{41} A cult in this area (Collemaggiore) survived into Roman times.\textsuperscript{42} The writing \text{talii} is, according to von Planta (1897 II:667), an abbreviation for the name \text{Taliensis} which refers to a place, probably ancient Talium, modern Torre di Taglio, a mere 2 kilometers northwest of Collemaggiore. For the formula \text{medix} + toponymic adjective see Oscan \text{meddis kapu(ans)}. The abbreviation \text{dd} is common in Latin inscriptions, cf. CIL 1\textsuperscript{2} 387.\textsuperscript{43}

5. \text{Sabine}

The fact that Sabine territory, especially the western portions, was Latinized at a very early date accounts for the almost complete absence of inscriptions evidence (but see below). In fact the language probably ceased to be spoken by the end of the Social War. At least there is very little in the writings of Varro, who was born in Sabine territory, that would lead one to believe that the language was spoken during his lifetime.\textsuperscript{44} Indeed, all of the glosses he cites have Latin inflectional endings, thus indicating that Sabine loans had been well adapted to the Latin morphological system (see Conway 1897: 352-363).
The Sabine glosses cited by Varro and others afford little insight into the nature of the language itself beyond the fact that it possesses some features not characteristic of Latino-Faliscan varieties, e.g. the preservation of -sn- in cesna = cena (Paul. Fest. 338 M). But even this feature is not very diagnostic since the elimination of -sn- occurred at the beginning of the historical period and is in fact found in some archaic words. To be honest, from the glosses it is not clear whether Sabine is Oscan-Umbrian since there appear to be a number of non-Oscan-Umbrian peculiarities as well, e.g. 1 < *d (nouensiles vs. Latin nouensides) (see Conway 1891:157ff.), f < *gh (fedus < *ghaydos) (see Conway 1897:352ff.), and *e > i/ rC (fircus < *gherkos). In fact these forms illustrate one of the greatest problems which one faces when interpreting the Sabine glosses. A number of the peculiarities attributed to Sabine are found in the non-urban varieties of Latin, e.g. *e > i/ rC (Praenestine mirqurios) and *gh > f (fostim (= hostim) cited by Paulus (Fest. 84 M) (see Campanile 1961:5, 13), and the glosses are not consistent in their representation of features, e.g. Varro lists fedus as Sabine without *d > 1. As a result, it is perfectly possible that the features characteristic of the glosses are not Sabine features at all but features of the Latin dialects spoken in Sabine territory (so Durante 1978:792-3). Still, even if this is true it in no way provides evidence for the claim of Conway (1897) that Sabine was a Latinian dialect. As Durante points out (op. cit.), the features the glosses share with non-urban varieties could be attributed to contact. Or, one might just as reasonably claim that Sabine speakers, at least
those in the eastern portions of Sabine territory, and rural Latin
speakers shared a number of common innovations, e.g. *d > l, etc.

Ancient tradition depicts the Sabini as Umbrian (Dion. Halic.
2.49) in origin, and hence Oscan-Umbrian. This seems to be supported
by the fact that there are numerous words in the Latin of Rome whose
phonology can best be explained by assuming they are of Oscan-Umbrian,
and probably of Sabine, provenance since they follow Oscan-Umbrian
sound changes rather than Latin, e.g. bo:s 'ox' < *gwows, lupus 'wolf'
< *lukwos, rufue 'ruddy' < *rowdhos, popina 'cook' < *pekwi:na:, etc.
(Pulgram 1958:250).

The lone Sabine inscription, if it is indeed Sabine, only
confirms the testimony of antiquity with respect to the Oscan-Umbrian
nature of the language (although the dative in -o in atrno may be a
Latin feature) and makes the Sabine glosses look even more like words
from rural Latin dialects. The inscription was found at Scoppito,
located southwest of Amiternum on the eastern boundary of Sabine
territory (Vetter 227):

mesene
flusare
polmunien
atrho
aunom
hiretum

'In the month Floralis (sacrifice) a ? ram ?
to the river god Aternus at the *Ponomium . . . . . .' }

The inscription appears to be concerned with the designation of a
specific time (mesene flusare) for making offerings to the river god
Aternus (atrho). Beyond this, it is impossible to give an accurate
interpretation of the inscription since the last two words are
obscure. Pisani (1964:122), Bruno (1969:74), and Knobloch (1978:161) have compared *aunom hiretum* to Umbrian *unu erietu* 'one ram,' cf. Latin *arie:s, arietis*. The *h* of *hiretum* must, according to the interpretation of Pisani et al., be due to contamination with animal names like Latin *haedus*, where the *h* is expected on etymological grounds. Still, the comparison of Latin *arie:t*-/Umbrian *eriet* leaves some of the finer points of this correspondence without an explanation. Where, for example, is the medial -i-? And how is one to explain the inflectional ending -um as a transfer from o-stems when short *o:*, to judge from *aunom*, appears to remain. Orthographic *u* must represent either original *o:*, or *u/*u*, e.g. *flusare* < *flo:s:-*. Thus, this correspondence must be regarded with suspicion. *hiretum* may actually be a u-stem, and possibly a supine depending on some verb which is unexpressed. Under this interpretation, *aunom* could be the object of the supine (indicating perhaps a victim sacrificed to the river god Aternum ?). The meanings of the two words remain without convincing interpretations. The locative *poimunien, poimuni* + postposition -en, cf. Umbrian *puemune* 'Pomonus', probably indicates some place (a sanctuary or grove ?) sacred to the god Pomona/-us (?) (see von Planta 1897 II:663). For the month name *Flusare*, compare *mense flusare* in the Latin inscription CIL I² 756 from Furfo.

5.1 Characteristics of Sabine

If the inscription from Scoppito is in fact a Sabine inscription then it is possible to attribute the following characteristics to the dialect: preservation of diphthongs (*aunom*): raising of *o:,* (*flusare*): preservation of medial *g* (*flusare*): preservation of consonant stem abl
sg -e (cf. Umbrian and note Oscan where o-stem -ud replace original -e): locative postposition -en (poimunien). Whether one can maintain that features found in the Sabine glosses are actually Sabine is probably impossible to say. Suffice it to say that the glosses themselves show the following characteristics: monophthongization of diphthongs (fedus), *d > l (nouensiles); preservation of medial s (fasena); preservation of -sn- (cesna); *e > i/ rC (fircus); and *gh > f (fedus).

6. Vestinian.

There are only two inscriptions which attest the local dialect. One (Po. 207) is clearly Vestinian, although there is one Latin loan word; the other (Ve. 220) contains a combination of Vestinian and Latin features with the non-Latin features predominating.

(Po. 207) is a building inscription which was found in S. Bendetto in Perillis. The inscription is in archaic Latin script and is probably to be dated to the end of the third century B.C. (Durante 1978:807):

```
aidiles.osens
Ob. Ebdies. L. Ma[....]
Sa. Pedlies. V. Ria[.....]
Ov. Fadatron[es .........]
ares

'The aediles Ob. Epidius Ma[...], son of L.,
Sa. Pedilius Ria[.....], son of V., Ov.
Fadatronius Arrius [...] had (this ?) built.'
```

Syntactically, this inscription bears similarities to Paelignian (Ve. 212) and Marrucinian (Po. 205 & 206) inscriptions in that the
title of the personages is separated from the onomastic formula. The word *aidiles* is the only evidence of Latin influence in this inscription. *osens* is interesting because the two letters for *s* are clearly distinguishable. Since the first *s* derives from a secondary *ps* cluster, < *opsens* < *opesens*, it is reasonable to suppose that the difference in writing is an attempt to represent some surface distinction between *ps > s* and *s > b*, though precisely what the distinction is cannot be determined.

(Ve. 220) is a dedicatory inscription inscribed on a stone stele in an archaic Latin alphabet. The characters indicate that this inscription is to be dated a few years earlier than the preceding inscription, circa 225 B.C. (Conway 1897:258). The inscription was found in Gerulis near Navelli:

```
t. uetio
duno
didet
herclo
diouio
brat
data
```

'T. Vetius gives a gift to Hercules in return for favors received.'

The loss of final *s* in *uetio*, the loss of final *m* in *duno*, and the dative singular in *o* are probably Latin features. The writing *u* for original *o* in *duno* is probably a Vestinian feature inasmuch as all of the Oscan-Umbrian dialects attest this change. Moreover, the proper name *Fadatruni[es]* (Po. 207) probably attests the same change. The reduplicated present of *do* is also dialectal. Reduplicated
presents are not attested in Latin but occur in Umbrian dirśa (pres subj), Paelignian didē (pres subj) < *di-da-e-ː-t, and Oscan didēst (fut) < *di-da-es-t. Similarly, the final formula, an abbreviation for brateis datas, is dialectal. For occurrences of this formula in dedicatory inscriptions compare Paelignian braiś datas (Ve. 203), Latin-Paelignian braṭ datas (Ve. 217), Oscan (in Greek orthography) brateis datas (Po. 152), etc.

7. The Paelignian dialect

There are 45 inscriptions written in the Paelignian dialect. Most were found in the vicinity of Sulmo or Corfinium. The inscriptions can be divided into three epigraphic types: 1) building inscriptions; 2) dedicatory inscriptions; and 3) epitaphs. Durante (1978:793, 797-98) argues that the epitaphs can be divided into two categories, prose and poetic (i.e. non-alliterative vs. alliterative). Whether one is entitled to describe the alliterative epitaphs as verse or not is a question which probably cannot be decided and for an answer depends to a certain extent on how one defines poetry. One should note, however, that in archaic Latin prose alliteration is common (see Durante 1958). Nevertheless, it does not appear to be employed as systematically as it is in these alliterative inscriptions.

With the exception of one inscription, an epitaph found near Sulmo (Ve. 210b), all of the Paelignian inscriptions can be dated within a hundred-year period, from approximately 150 B.C. to 50 B.C. (Conway 1897:234). And, with the exception of the so-called
Herentas inscription from Corfinium, the inscriptions show very little regional or chronological variation (Conway 1897:233).

7.1 Dedicatory inscriptions

(Ve. 202) was engraved on a bronze plate but the original has been lost. The inscription is preserved in a sixteenth century manuscript: 53

\textbf{st. ponties}  
\textbf{n. ponties}  
\textbf{v. alpis}  
\textbf{tr. apidis}  
\textbf{iouiois}  
\textbf{puclois sest.a.plens}  

'St. Pontius, N. Pontius, V. Alpius, Tr. Apidius set up (i.e. dedicated) (this plate) to the sons of Jove.'

The name of the divinities to whom the offering is dedicated is also found on a Marsian inscription (see Ve. 224). According to Vetter (1953:141) \textit{iouiois puclois} (dat pl) is a translation of the Greek \textit{Διός Κοινός} and the worship of these deities was imported from Rome or vicinity, where their worship is documented already in the early 5th century.

The verb \textit{sest.a.plens} is very problematic. Most authorities agree that the sequence <pl> must be emended in some way and that the result of this emendation should make it possible to connect \textit{sest.a.plens} with Volscian \textit{sistiatiens} (see above 2.9). Von Planta (1892 I:267, 273-74, 342) discusses the possible emendations (<ti>, <tu>, <tt>) in detail but does not voice his preference for any of the possibilities, except for mentioning that <tt> is least likely on epigraphical grounds. Durante (1978:795) offers two reasons for the
emendation <tu> over the others, in addition to the reason suggested by von Planta. First, in terms of context a meaning 'statue:runt' fits perfectly. Thus, an emendation <tu> would enable one to connect this verb with Latin statuo:, a denominative from a stem statu-. Second, if <pl> is emended to <tu>, then it is possible to connect this verb with the Volscian verb sistiatiens quite easily. The i of the second ti sequence can be derived from tu via the sound change *u: > i. The reasons offered by Durante are not convincing enough in my opinion to accept the emendation -tu-. First, if sesta- is a deverbative formation in *a: then the meaning is not likely to be radically different from the thematic formation which, in Latin and Umbrian at least, means 'to set up, erect', precisely the meaning called for in both inscriptions in question. Second, the interpretation of Volscian sistiatiens, and hence Paelignian sesta.plena, is problematic from two points of view: (1) the source of reduplication (but see Durante (1978:795), who claims that the reduplicative syllable results from contamination with verbs like Umbrian sestu and Latin sisto); (2) the source of the long *u:. Thus, despite the evidence of the orthography I am inclined to emend sesta.plena to *sestaytens and see this Paelignian verb also as a deverbative formation in *a: from a thematic *sisto/e-. There seem to be no phonological, morphological, or semantic problems with such a derivation.

Like the preceding inscription, (Ve. 203) is known only from a 16th century manuscript copy. Most authorities consider the inscription to be sepulchral (see, for example, Vetter 1953:141) in nature,
but Prosdocimi (1974), after having reexamined the manuscripts containing the inscription, has argued that it is a votive offering to Minerva. Prosdocimi's reading is given below:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{oivia.pacia.minerva} \\
\text{brais.datas.pid.sei.dd.i.} \\
\text{bratom.pam.ppceri} \\
\text{sefei.i.nom.suolis} \\
\text{cnatois}
\end{align*}
\]

'Ovia Pacia (offered this) to Minerva for the blessing that was given—whatever is given to a deity, that is pleasing—(a blessing) which she prayed for for herself and her children.'

Prosdocimi's interpretation of this inscription as dedicatory in nature seems certain due to the formula \text{brais.datas} 'for the blessing given' which is found on numerous dedicatory inscriptions not only in central Italy but also in Oscan speaking areas in southern Italy, e.g. Vestinian \text{brat/data} (Ve. 220), a Latin inscription found in Paelignian territory \text{brat/datas} (Ve. 217), Oscan \text{brateis datas} (Po. 152). Since this formula appears in abbreviated form in centralItalic inscriptions it is probably best to view \text{brais} as an abbreviation for *\text{bra:teys} (gen sg).

While Prosdocimi's interpretation is probably correct some details of his analysis are questionable. For example, Prosdocimi translates \text{pid.sei.dd.i.bratom} as '\text{pid sit deo donatum, id bratom}' ('whatever may be given to a god, let it be pleasing') and interprets the clause as proverbial in nature (i.e. an offering to deity, no matter how humble, is always pleasing). This interpretation requires reading \text{sei} as 'sit', and having \text{<ei>} represent \text{i}, a phenomenon which
occurs sporadically in Umbrian written in the Latin alphabet and in later Latin after *ey and *i: had merged, but occurs nowhere else among the Italic dialects. Thus the interpretation of sei as 'sit' (3 sg subj pres) is highly conjectural. Prosdocimi also encounters a problem with his identification of the verb form pperci (3 sg perf act). He connects this verb with Umbrian persnimu and Latin posco:/ precor, a reasonable enough connection since 'praying' does make good sense in this context. However, the final i is quite problematic. For third singular perfects one would expect, on the basis of Palelignian afded (Ve. 213), an inflectional ending -ed, not i. Moreover, pperci looks suspiciously like the perfect of Latin parco:, peperci:, although the meaning would not fit Prosdocimi's interpretation. In support of the claim that pperci is a Latinism one can point to at least one other Latinism in this same inscription, e.g. the root cnat- in cnatois. Thus the reading of pid . . . cnatois must be considered highly speculative.

If i.nom is a connective then it corresponds to Oscan inim in function but Umbrian enom 'then' in form, < *enom.

Tibeletti Bruno (1971:104-105) considers (Ve. 204-208, 211) to be funerary inscriptions containing the deceased's name plus a dedication to a goddess, Angitia. The deceased probably belonged, according to Tibeletti Bruno, to some sort of sacerdotal college. The evidence for the sepulchral nature of the inscriptions consists of the fact that three of the inscriptions (Ve. 204, 205 and 206) were found in graveyards near Sulmo. Despite their location, which is itself not always an indicator of the variety of inscription, there is some
reason to believe that they are simply dedicatory inscriptions. If, for example, (Ve. 206), were sepulchral one would expect the name of the deceased to be present (Vetter 1953:142). However, the inscription reads merely anaceta/ cerria 'for Angitia Cerialis'.

All of the inscriptions cited above, save for (Ve. 206), are organized in the following way: 1) onomastic formula of the dedicatrix consisting of praenomen and gentilicium in the nominative case; 2) divine name, anaceta (Ve. 204, 206), anac(ta) (Ve. 205, 207, 208), ancta(ta) (Ve. 211; Po. 211), ancta (Poccetti 1980:510) followed by an epithet cerr (Ve. 205), ceria (Ve. 204, 208), cerria (Ve. 206), ceri (Ve. 207), cerri (Ve. 211), criei (Poccetti 1980:510) in the dative case.

The name of the goddess Anagta, Anageta, Angeta must be considered a morphological variant of the name Angitia which is attested in the area of the Marsi on a Marsian-Latin inscription (Ve. 228a), actia, and in the area of the Samnites at Aesernia, (Ve. 140) anag-tiai, and possibly though the reading is difficult (see Vetter 1953: 128-29), in the area of the Bruttii at Crimisa ayy'jtw (Ve. 194). The formation appears to be an at-stem added to a consonant stem *anget- and is probably comparable to Latin types like sospita - sospes, and note the Paelignian proper name Saluta as compared with Latin salus. The consonantal stem of this divine name is attested on a Latin inscription from the area of the Vestini, Ancitibus CIL IX 3515, and perhaps also in Tabula Iguvina 2a 14 acetus (dat pl) (Durante 1978:795).
The epithet of Anagta appears to have two stem forms, an *a:-stem cer(r)ia and an *e:-stem cerr(r)i. The former corresponds to Oscan kerria (dat sg) (Ve. 147), the latter to Marrucinian eerie (dat sg) (Ve. 218), from *kersya: (< *keresya:-) and *kersye: (< *keresye:-) ('belonging to Ceres') respectively.\(^{57}\)

(Ve. 204) differs from the other dedicatory inscriptions in this group in that it has an additional phrase besides the onomastic formula and the name of the deity to whom the inscription was dedicated.

\[
\text{saluta musesa. pa} \\
\text{anaceta.ceria} \\
\text{et.aisis sato}
\]

'Saluta Mussidia, daughter of Pa., (dedicated this) sacred (object) to Anagta Cerialis and to the gods.'

The syntax of this inscription may be problematic since sato, which is interpreted as 'sanctum', does not commonly govern the dative in Italic (or Latin).\(^{58}\) Since these inscriptions are votive it is reasonable to interpret sato as the object of an unexpressed verb such as dat, cf. CIL I\(^2\) 1617 (Puteoli) Herculei sacrum C. Marci. C. l. Alex. dat 'Gaius Marcius Alexander gives this sacred (offering/gift) to Hercules.'

For the phonology of sato compare Oscan saahtum and Umbrian satam-e, with -kt- > -ht- > s (Poultney 1959:64) with prior loss of nasal in the cluster -VnC- (Poultney 1959:69).

The gentilicium musesa probably corresponds to the Latin gens name Mussidia from a Latin inscription from Sulmo (CIL IX 3114)
Presumably the correspondence Paelignian *s* - Latin *di* indicates some sort of palatalization of *dy* in Paelignian. Precisely what *s* indicates phonetically is not clear however.

### 7.2 Building inscriptions

(Ve. 212) is inscribed upon a base of travertine found near Pratola Peligna:

```
medixaticus
biamlocatin
pa.sadries
u.popdis.t
```

'The administrative (?) officers (meddices), P. Satrius, son of T., V. Popidius, son of T., contracted (for the building of this) cistern.'

The separation of the onomastic formula and the official designation of the contractors seems to be an east-central Italic phenomenon. It occurs on Marrucinian inscriptions (Po. 204, 205, 206) and a Vestinian inscription (Po. 207), but not on Oscan, Latin, Umbrian, or west-central Italic inscriptions.

The attribute of medix, aticus, has received dozens of interpretations but the precise meaning and etymology remain speculative. Commonly aticus is considered to be connected with the root *ag-* 'conduct, lead'. Grienberger (1928:27-28) argues that aticus is an -iko- adjective to an abstract noun *actus* 'conducting business' and that the adjective refers to officials who conduct various business transactions for the community, cf. the analysis of Durante (1978:794) and (Ve. 168) where an abbreviation of the same word may be found, aht.
There are two good indications that the Paelignian word *biam* cannot refer to 'running water, spring water', as is customarily believed. First, in the inscription in which this word occurs the predicate contains a verb of contracting for construction, i.e. *loca*- 'contract for (the building of)'. And, in the other inscriptions containing this word, i.e. the Umbrian and Marrucinian inscriptions, the predicate contains a verb of construction, some form of *o(p)sai*- 'construct' or *faci- 'build'. Thus, *biam* cannot refer to water but must refer to something which can be constructed. Second, the archaeological context in which the Umbrian inscription (Ve. 233) from Fossato di Vico was found provides substantial proof that *biam* refers to a fountain basin or receptacle. Clearly, both internal and external evidence point to the meaning of 'water basin' or 'receptacle' for *biam*.

Even though the referent for this word has finally become clear, most authorities have not changed their opinion of its etymology, but still accept the etymology first proposed by Pauli (1887:42-3). Pauli argued that *biam* was in origin an adjective formation derived from the zero grade of the Indo-European root *gʷeyH₀* 'live' with the addition of a suffix *-*wo/a*-, i.e. *biam* < Italic *gʷi:-wa*; < IE *gʷih₀*-wa*. Formally, then, *biam* is comparable to Latin *vi:vus*, Oscan *bivus* (nom. pl.), Sanskrit *ji:va- 'living', etc., which are derived from the zero grade of the same root *gʷeyH₀* with the addition of the same suffix. The substantive use of *biam*, its feminine gender, and the fact that it means 'running water' are, according to this account, explained by claiming that *biam* must once have modified a feminine
noun like (Oscan) *apa 'water'. The head noun *apa was then deleted, presumably because the syntagm *bio apa was common, leaving bio as the sole representative of the noun phrase, i.e. as a substantive. There are problems, however, not only with this etymology but also with the fact that biam is feminine in gender.

First, there is considerable discrepancy between the meaning of biam indicated by archaeological context (see above) and that suggested by the etymology. The shift from 'running water' to 'water receptacle' is not easily explained. A further problem is posed by the fact that the gender of the word biam is feminine. In Umbrian the word for 'water' is derived from the IE root *wed-, cf. Latin unda 'wave': utur (Tab. Ig. IIb 15). A feminine form for 'water', e.g. a form like Oscan apa (acc. sg.), is not attested in Umbrian. Since the word for 'water' is neuter in Umbrian, one might wonder how biam became feminine. Thus, the derivation from an Italic adjectival formation *wi:wa: does not have much to commend it from the point of view of semantics.

Phonologically, the connection with a prehistoric form *wi:wa: has even less to commend it. There is no evidence to support the claim that *w was lost intervocalically in Umbrian or Paelignian (Poccetti 1979:154). In fact, in Umbrian there is quite good evidence that intervocalic *w is preserved, e.g. avif 'birds' (Tab. Ig. Ib 8), uves 'sheep' (Tab. Ig. III 8). In Paelignian there is no evidence bearing on this issue one way or the other; however, in Oscan, a language which is closely related to Paelignian (see Chapter 4), intervocalic *w remains. In fact, *w remains in the very adjective
formation at issue, namely bivus < *gw iwos. Thus, on the basis of evidence from Oscan one can be reasonably sure that intervocalic *w remained also in Paelignian. The standard etymology, then, appears to be without phonological support.

While it is necessary, for the reasons outlined above, to abandon the connection with Latin vi:vis, etc., a plausible etymology does exist. Pokorny suggested that biam be connected with Old Norse kvi (plural kv iar) 'enclosure where sheep are assembled' and be taken to designate an 'enclosed precinct'. This connection is quite attractive phonologically. kvi is generally derived from zero grade of a root *gweyH - 'enclose, contain' with the addition of a *-ya suffix, i.e. < Germanic *kwii:yo: < IE *gwiH = ya:. The IE proto-form which is required to yield Old Norse kvi will yield the Paelignian, Marrucinian and Umbrian forms perfectly. IE labiovelar consonants are treated as labials in the Oscan-Umbrian languages (see Chapter 4). The etymology offered by Pokorny appears to suffer in terms of semantics, however, since the archaeological context indicates clearly that biam means 'water basin'. Still, I think that a plausible case can be made for that etymology, provided a different view is taken of the semantic development of the word.

Since the basic meaning of the IE root seems to be 'enclose, contain', one could reasonably argue that the IE noun *gwiH ya: originally referred to any object which enclosed or contained, literally an 'enclosure' or 'container' of some sort. If this assumption is granted then one need only claim that the sphere of reference was gradually narrowed so as to refer only to objects for
'containing' water, i.e. water basins or receptacles. Such a narrowing of the sphere of reference of a word is a perfectly ordinary variety of semantic change. And, given the basic meaning of the IE root, the narrowing suggested here appears quite plausible.

In summary, then, the etymology which connects *biam* with Old Norse *kvi* has a distinct advantage over the alleged connection with Latin *virus*, etc. Such a connection avoids the semantic and phonological problems encountered by the customary etymology and, at the same time, plausibly accounts for both the semantic and phonological developments of the Paelignian word.

*locatin*, in the specialized sense of 'contract for building', cf. CIL I² 24 (Velitrae), CIL I² 800 (Tibur), is probably a Latin loan. The perfect ending -t- and the third plural ending -in for *-ens*, however, are clearly Paelignian. The lack of final s is probably due to an error on the engraver's part. A final s is present at the end of the preceding line. The i for expected e remains unexplained however.

The second building inscription is engraved on a memorial stone found at Molina, near Superaequum (Ve. 216):

```
a[......]
t.nounis
l. alafis.c.
herec.fesn
upscateter coisatens
'

. . . T. Nonius, L. Alfius, son of C. superintended the building of this temple for Heracles.'
Line one probably contains the official title of the magistrates who superintended this work, perhaps at(ikos) med(ix) or a[idil] (Durante 1978:794). However, the possibility that line one contains another onomastic formula cannot be rejected since three officials are attested on a building inscription from S. Benedetto in Perillis in Vestinian territory (see below p. 58). The sequence upasater coisatens corresponds to Latin faciundu(m) coirauere (CIL I² 674), aedificandum coirauerunt (CIL I² 675) with the verb upsa- < *o(:)pesa- functioning in place of *fak- to designate the construction of a building, etc. The u for o is a bit disturbing since *o is generally represented by o in Paelignian. However, it is possible that u represents long *o: by contamination with the perfect, cf. Oscan uupsens (Ve. 8, 10) and upsens (Ve. 16), both written in the native alphabet.

7.3 Epitaphs

A majority of the extant Paelignian inscriptions belong to this category (Ve. 209, 210 a-1, 213, 214, 215 a-s, Po. 208-210, 212-213, and possibly 215, 216, and 217). However, almost all of these inscriptions, save (Ve. 209, 213, and 214), consist only of onomastic formulae: praenomen, gentilicum, patronymic. Some of these inscriptions follow Roman models, e.g. (Ve. 210 a and c) where the patronymic is followed by the Latin abbreviation f. (=filius) or (Po. 209) where the abbreviation l. (=libertus) occurs. The concept of libertus was alien to the Italici (Durante 1978:796).
There is only one non-alliterative epitaph of any substantive length, but it is badly mutilated on the lefthand side and very little of the inscription can be read (Ve. 209):

. . . hospus pelegie . . .
. . . xat.mat.m[ ]sicu
. . . men[ ]cua [hos]pus ual[e]
[im] famel.inim.loufir
. . . peo[i]s pac[ri]d

Despite the damage there are good indications that the structure and organization of this inscription is similar to, or more accurately was modeled on, the type found in Latin in which passers-by are entreated to read the inscription on the gravemarker of the deceased, e.g. CIL I² 1211, CIL I² 1202, CIL I² 1210, CIL I² 1209, etc. If pelegie, despite the appearance of the troublesome i (which could indicate palatalization), corresponds to Latin pellege (CIL I² 1211) then hospus pelegie quite clearly corresponds to the Latin invocations in which the traveller is invited to stop and read the inscription, e.g. hospes quod deico paullum est asta ac pellege CIL I² 1211. After the main body of text, which included the name of the deceased and other relevant details of his/her life (assuming that this inscription followed Latin models), there is generally a brief salutation in which the traveler is bid farewell, cf. CIL I² 2161 ualebis hospes. [hos-
]pus ual[e]/ [im] famel inim loufir probably forms the salutation. The phrase [im] . . . loufir is perhaps somewhat puzzling in this context. It is common in inscriptions of this variety for all passers-by to be entreated, regardless of social status. It is possible that [im] famel inim loufir is a local variant of the
'quisquis est' formula, i.e. 'whoever reads this, both slave and freeman' (Tibeletti Bruno 1971:111). *loufir* corresponds to Latin *liber* < *lowdheros*. The raising of *e* to *i* before *r* also occurs in dialectal Latin, cf. Praenestine *mirqurios*. *peo[i]s* (dat/abl pl masc) is cognate with Latin *pius*, Oscan *pihiui*, Volscian *pihom*. The *e* for *i* in hiatus is not uncommon in the Sabellian dialects, cf. Marrucinian *peai*.

(Ve. 214) is inscribed on a stone block which was found at a gravesite at Pentima, near Corfinium:

```
pes.pros.ecuf.incubat
casnar.oisa.aetate
c.anaes.solois.des.forte
faber
```

'A pious and upright man, C. Anaeus, lies here, an old man whose lifespan was used up. (He was) forger of his own fortune his whole life (?)'.

The alliterative structure of this inscription appears to be in the form of two-word blocks with word-initial alliteration (so Vetter 1953:150). Under this interpretation vowels of any quality count as alliterating, e.g. *oisa* and *aetate*. One must also assume that *ecuf* alliterates with the preverb *in*- while *-cubat* and *casnar* form an alliterative group. The only exceptions appear to be *C. anaes* and *solois des*. However, in order to insure that these two words form an alliterative group the initial sound in *des* has been interpreted by some as an alveo-palatal spirant (see below).

The use of *(in)cubat* in this inscription is perhaps a Latinism, cf. CIL I² 1259 . . . *heic/cuba* . . . 'lies here'. However, the use of *cubat* in funerary inscriptions does occur in some Old Sabellian
inscriptions (see Morandi 1974:27) and in Faliscan also (see G. Giacomelli 1963:94). As a result, this may well be a Proto-Italic phenomenon. The nouns aetate and faber are also Latin loans. The word des is generally interpreted as 'dives' but it makes little sense in this context. The interpretation suggested by Thurneysen, 'dies', is much more appropriate although it involves a phonological problem. If des is derived from *die:fos < *die:bhos one must assume that the result of the palatalization of *di is written as d rather than as D, as it is in (Ve. 213), or s, as it is in (Ve. 204). In support of this derivation Durante (1978:798) offers the alliterative structure of the epitaph (see above). According to him, solois des should form an alliterative block and can do so only if des begins with a fricative or affricate.

The proverb at the end of this inscription is to be compared with that of Appius Claudius, cited by Sallust (De republica I, 2): fabrum esse suae quisque fortunae. It is possible that the Paelignian version is modeled on the Latin, or that the proverb existed in various local versions. The numerous Latin influences in this inscription suggest that the former is more likely.

casnar is clearly a native Paelignian word. Preservation of the -sn- cluster points to as much. The root is the same as that attested in Latin canus < *kasnos 'grey.' According to Varro (L. L. 7, 29) this is the Oscan word for 'old man.' In Umbrian there is an i-stem noun okar/ukar 'mount' which also shows a nominative in -ar instead of the expected -er < *-C-ris. The ending probably reflects a stem in -ari- rather than -ri- (Poultey 1959:313; von Planta 1897 II:47). -ari-
does occur in Oscan in a secondary derivative luisarifs. Attempts to explain the a vowel as epenthetic are doomed to failure since e is the expected epenthetic vowel, cf. Umbrian pacer < *paikri.

The longest Paelignian inscription (Ve. 213), the so-called Herentas inscription, probably belongs to the same variety of sepulchral inscription as the preceding, at least to judge from the salutation and benediction contained in lines 6, 7, & 8.

... pracom... usur.pristafalacirix.prismu.petieDu.ip.uiBad
uibDu.omnitu.uranias.ecuc.empratois
clisuiat.cerfum.sacaracirix.semunu.sua[.]
actatu.firata.fertlild.praclime.perseponas
aebed.eite.uus.pritrome.pacris.puus.ecic
lexe.lifar.dida.uus.deti.hanustu.herentas

'... tomb... Prima Petedia, praestabulatrix, wife (of X), ip.uiDad/ uibDu.ommitu. She was laid to rest at the bidding of Urania. The priestess of the Cerfes departed for the abode of Persephone, her own life having been? copiously. May you go forward propitiously, you whom it is permitted to read this. May hanustu? Herentas give you wealth.'

Apparently the alliterative structure of this epitaph is different from that of the preceding. Not only are the alliterative blocks longer in some cases (blocks of 3 (3x), and (lx) a block of 4), but the blocks apparently recur in regular patterns (in stanzas ?). The organization is as follows, assuming that pristafalacirix begins a structural unit (C = consonant, V = vowel, and the numbers preceding indicate the number of words in an alliterative unit):

\[
\begin{align*}
3(C) & \ 1(V) \ 2(C) \ 4(V) \ 2(C) \\
3(C) & \ 1(V) \ 2(C) \ 2(V) \ 1(C) \\
3(C) & \ 1(V) \ 2(C) \ 1(C) \ 1(C) \ 1(C) \ 2(C)
\end{align*}
\]
Whether there is, indeed, a 'larger' overall alliterative schema to this text is difficult to say. However, the regular recurring pattern of \(3(C)\) \(1(V)\) \(2(C)\) suggests such an interpretation.

In one respect this inscription differs from all other Paelignian inscriptions: it contains a special sign \(\mathbb{D}\) with a horizontal bar. The sign apparently represents (phonetic) developments in two different contexts. On the one hand \(\mathbb{D}\) represents the outcome of \(*\text{dy}^\text{\text{*}}\), e.g. petiedu \(<\) *petiedya, and on the other, of \(\text{y}\) after a labial consonant, if aff\(\text{Bed}\) \(<\) *afy\(\text{ed}\) (for discussion of aff\(\text{Bed}\) see 5.3.1). The precise phonetic outcome is difficult to determine but it must have been a palatal or alveopalatal affricate or fricative, cf. *musesa (Ve. 204) \(<\) *Musedia. The affrication/fricativization of \(\text{y}\) after labial consonants is attested in southern Italian in words of the type raggia /raj\(\text{ja}\)/ 'rabbia' ('anger') (Durante 1978:799 and Lepschy and Lepschy 1977:54–55). It also appears to be attested in a fragment of the poet Lucilius (581 M) where the verb abzet is apparently equivalent to ab\(\text{bit}\) 'departed, perished'. It is possible that this is a north Oscanian and Paelignian isogloss since Lucilius was from the town of Suessa Aurunca in Northern Campania.

The structure of the beginning of the inscription is difficult to determine because the first line is so badly damaged. It appears, however, to contain the name and position of the deceased. Tibeletti Bruno's suggestion that usur = o:sor 'hater,' cf. Oscanian usure (Ve. 6) and Latin o:so:rem (Plaut. Asin 5,2,9), and that the beginning of the inscription contains an admonition against violating the tomb is difficult to maintain on syntactic grounds. According to the
reading of Bruno, where usur ends sentence 1, the name in line 2 is syntactically isolated.

The main body of this inscription poses many problems for interpretation. Assuming that the introductory portion of the inscription contains the name and rank of the deceased, and ends after petieDu, the second portion from ip thru omnitu is uninterpretable. The meaning of sentence three appears to be correct but there are problems with clisuist. All authorities agree that clisuist is to be analyzed into a fem nom sg clisu and 3rd sg of the verb be ist. (For the raising of *e to i in unaccented position see Oscan ist < *esti.)

clisu is usually derived from a preform *klawdta with the meaning 'enclosed, buried', cf. Latin inclusa. There are several problems with this connection. First, if the preform were derived directly from *klawdta then one would expect the diphthong to survive. One could get around this by arguing that the Paelignian form is a loan from Latin with a Paelignian change *u: > i. However, *au is monophthongized in Latin only in prefixed forms, so if clisu is a borrowing one would expect the diphthong to remain unchanged. There appears then to be no plausible way to maintain a connection with *klawdta.

Pisani (1964:115) derives clisu from the root *kley- 'incline', as an adjective in y to a stem *kli-, cf. Latin inclinare, Umbrian kletram < *kley-tra-. Pisani's suggestion is problematic since a fem u-stem should have a nom in -us. It would seem as reasonable, in light of this problem, to derive clisu from zero grade of the root *kley- with a d extension. The form would be a past participle < *klid-ta.
The precise meaning of *cerfum . . . aśBed is also problematic. Good etymologies do not exist for *firata and praicime. The salutation (line 6) is straightforward save for the interpretation of *lexe and *lifar. *lexe has been interpreted as a 2nd sg perfect form < *legiste (see e.g., Vetter 1953:145). There is, however, no evidence that the IE perfect endings survived into Oscan-Umbrian. All of the evidence in Oscan-Umbrian indicates that the aorist endings replaced the perfect. As a result *lexe is most likely a perfect infinitive *legisse borrowed from Latin with syncope of the medial vowel. The infinitive is then dependent on *lifar. *lifar cannot represent the god 'liber' as suggested by Vetter (1953:149) and Grienberger (1928:67). First, the word *laufir appears in (Ve. 204). It cannot be a loan from Latin, since the f and a would be unexplained. Most probably, *lifar is a present subjunctive passive like that found in Umbrian, e.g. ferar, and Oscan, e.g. sakrafir. The root is perhaps equivalent to Latin libet, i.e. < *呼bh- with dissimilation of u to i around labials, a process attested sporadically not only in Latin (Palmer 1954:216) but in other Sabellian languages as well, cf. Marrucinian cibat.

The benediction is interpretable except for hanustu. Generally this word is connected with Latin honesta but there is one problem. The o-a alternation is troublesome, even though some parallels exist, e.g. Oscan tanginom vs. Praenestine tonditionem, Oscan kahad vs. Latin incoha:re.

Pisani (1964:115) derives *Bed from zero grade of the root *ey 'go' which he argues was generalized into the singular on the basis of reduplicated perfects like deded. The problem with Pisani's sugges-
tion is that it isn't clear how reduplicated perfects could have provided a model for perfects of the unreduplicated type. It is possible that the zero grade was generalized as a result of internal paradigmatic pressures alone. If the perfect singular of this verb is to be reconstructed as follows: *eyom, *eyes, *eyed, i.e. with the regular Italic endings (see Watkins 1969:157), then the inherited singular forms, when compared with the plural forms, would have been quite opaque indeed, i.e. *eom, *e:s, *e:d vs. pl. *imos, *ites, *i(y)ens. It seems reasonable to suggest that these alternations were eliminated in favor of the zero grade form, thus regularizing the paradigm. In support of this analysis one may be able to cite Umbrian [just (3 sg fut pf) which could represent a similar phenomenon if the i here does not represent *e in hiatus (see Buck 1928:32).

The Herentas inscription does show a number of characteristics which distinguish it from the rest of the Paelignian inscriptions. Possible explanations for divergences are offered in the next section. At this point they can simply be enumerated: 1) The treatment of nom sg *a: as u rather than a. 2) The treatment of secondary rs clusters as rf rather than rr, e.g. cerfum vs. cerria (Ve. 208). 3) CR epenthesis, e.g. sacaracirix vs. puclois (Ve. 202). 4) The spirantization of *y after labials, e.g. afDed vs. scoifia (Ve. 211).

7.4 Characteristics of Paelignian

The features of Paelignian must be divided into two categories. This division is necessary because the Herentas inscription shows a number of developments which are found nowhere else in Paelignian. Although the number of deviations from the Paelignian norm is small,
only 4 in number, they turn out to be rather significant in terms of determining some of the 'original' characteristics of the dialect: 1) The Herentas inscription has *a:-stem nom singulars in -u while the rest of the inscriptions have -a. 2) The Angeta inscriptions from Sulmo, Molina, and Corfinium have -rr- for secondary *-rs- whereas the Herentas inscription has -rf-. 3) Only the Herentas inscription has epenthesis in RC clusters; the other inscriptions (and the Herentas inscription as well) have CR epenthesis. 4) Evidence for the spirantization of *y after labials is restricted to the Herentas inscription. Interestingly, these peculiarities cannot be attributed to regional dialect differences within Paelignian because other inscriptions from the same location, namely Corfinium, do not possess these features. Moreover, these features cannot be attributed to temporal differences between the Herentas inscription and the other Paelignian inscriptions since all of the inscriptions are roughly contemporaneous.

A number of scholars have speculated that these divergent features are actually among the 'original' characteristics of the dialect and that the features characteristic of the rest of the Paelignian inscriptions are features which resulted from contact with Latin speakers since in fact they all coincide, save for RC epenthesis, with the regular Latin development. In support of this hypothesis one can point to the religious, and hence linguistically conservative, nature of the text as well as the fact that all of the attested Paelignian inscriptions are to be dated well after Roman occupation of Paelignian territory. There are however additional facts which must be considered before this hypothesis is accepted.
At the outset it must be admitted that the treatment of secondary *-rs- as -rr- could be an 'original' feature of Paelignian. However, this treatment of *-rs- is attested in Umbrian also, and perhaps in Marsian if the name of the town Serfennia/Cerfinnia is derived from the stem *ker(e)s-. Thus it is just as likely that this pronunciation of the sequence *rs was the result of contact with speakers to the east and north of the Paeligni as it is that the pronunciation of this sequence as rr was the result of contact with Latin speakers.

*a:-stem nom singulars are attested in only two Sabellian dialects, Paelignian and Marrucinian. In both dialects, except for the Herentas inscription, these *a:-stems show -a in the nom sg. It is assumed on the basis of the evidence in Oscan and Umbrian that original *a: was rounded and raised in Proto-Oscan-Umbrian. Actually, the Oscan and Umbrian evidence points to no more than a rounding and perhaps slight raising of *a: for Oscan-Umbrian (Oscan represents *a: by u consistently but Umbrian shows fluctuation between a and u in the native alphabet and a and o in the Latin). As a result it may well be that, since the quality of *a: was different than that of short *o, Paelignian speakers chose to represent this sound by a rather than o in the Latin alphabet.

Although CR epenthesis is attested in Oscan it does not occur in the same contexts as it does in the Herentas inscription. In Oscan there is no epenthesis when the preceding vowel is long. Both examples of this variety of epenthesis in Paelignian occur in this very environment. Given this fact, and the fact that CR epenthesis does not occur in every case where it could have, it scarcely seems
reasonable to think that CR epenthesis is an 'original' feature of Paelignian. This feature may actually be the result of contact with some northern Oscan variety with CR epenthesis. It is not uncommon for the contexts of the application of a rule to be misanalyzed by borrowing speakers.

The spirantization of *ɣ after labials appears also to be a north Oscan feature, at least to judge from the existence of the form abzet in Lucilius.

All of the peculiarities found on the Herentas inscription cannot be 'original' features of the Paelignian dialect. CR epenthesis can be dismissed at the outset. The remaining features may well be original but it should be noted that they can reasonably be attributed to contact with Oscan-Umbrian speakers in adjacent areas.

The remaining inscriptions attest the following characteristics:

1) preservation of IE diphthongs (puclois); 2) syncope of short vowels in final syllables (pes < *pi:os); 3) preservation of -sn- clusters (fesn.); 4) raising of *or to u (aticus < *agtkos); 5) RC epenthesis (herec.); 6) assimilation of dentals (musesa < *musedya); 7) preservation of medial s (coisatens); 8) *a:-stem 3 sg in -a (anageta); 9) simple past tense in -t- (coisatens); 10) impf subj in -se:- (upsaseter); 11) 3 sg pass in -ter (upsaseter); 12) replacement of consonant stem ending with o-stem ending (aetatu); 13) acc pl *-ns > -s (puus); 14) the formation of gentilicia by ı+i (sadries); 15) separation of onomastica from official title (Ve. 212).
8. **Marrucinian**

There are only three inscriptions which can with certainty be attributed to the Marrucini. One inscription, the so-called Bronze of Rapino, is of moderate length and provides most of what can be learned about the dialect. The remaining inscriptions come from Teate. One is a short funerary inscription for a priestess (Po. 204); the other consists merely of the names of two individuals, presumably the individuals governing the tribe (so Salmon 1982:22 & Vetter 1953:219):

(Ve. 219):

\[u.alies.l\]
\[sa.alies.as\]

In addition to the inscriptions mentioned above there are three inscriptions (Po. 106, 205 & 206) whose dialectal affiliations are controversial. De Simone (1962) assumes that the territory around Interpromium is Paelignian and the inscriptions found in that region, (Po. 205 & 206) are to be assigned to the Paeligni. But La Regina (1965:176) has argued, on the basis of the historical and topographical studies of De Petra and P. Fraccaro that the territory is Marrucinian and that the inscription must be Marrucinian (see Mosci Sassi 1974:363). La Regina's arguments are generally accepted by most scholars and so are accepted here. The third inscription (Po. 106):

\[aicos pa(cris)\]

('May the gods (be) propitious') was found near Torino di Sangro in the Sangrus river valley in the territory of the Frentani. Carpineto (1970:464) has argued that this inscription is Marrucinian rather than Oscan. The Sangrus river valley is not far distant from Rapino, which
was probably the main settlement of the Marrucini. Moreover, the formula found in this inscription is precisely that found at the beginning of the Bronze of Rapino (see below 2.1). 74

8.1 The Bronze of Rapino

This inscription was found about a mile southeast of Rapino, approximately ten miles south of Teate, in what was apparently a graveyard of an ancient town (Conway 1897:253). The inscription was rather carelessly engraved in an early Latin alphabet. Coins which were found in neighboring graves point to a date somewhere in the vicinity of 250 B.C.

(Vetter 218):

aisos pacris totali
maroucai lixs
assignas ferenter
aulatas toutai
maroucai lioues
patres ocres tarin
cris iouias.agine
iafc esuc agine asum
babu apoleenis feret
regen[i] peai cerie iouia
pacsri.eituam amaten
s uenalinam.i ni ta[.]a nipsis.pedi suam

'(May) the gods (be) propitious. (A) regulation(s) for the Marrucinian community. The sacrificial flesh, judged propitious for the Marrucinian community by the oracle of Jove the father and of the Tarincrine mount, is brought forth. Babu (apoleenis) accepts the flesh from this oracle in order to burn (?) it for pia cerie iouia regina. May it be propitious. They have collected (?) the money received from the sale (of portions unused in sacrifice ?). Let no one touch any but his own.'

The text is clearly organized into three parts: an invocation (aisos pacris), a 'title' (totali . . . lixs), and the text proper
(asignas . . . suam). The text is essentially a sacred regulation concerning a sacrifice prescribed by the oracle (?) of Jove and proceeds from the sale of unused portions of flesh. 75 This interpretation assumes that there is some connection between the sentence beginning eitua am and the discussion of the sacrifice. 76 Otherwise one must assume the inscription is concerned with two regulations.

Durante (1978:804/805) has suggested that the two parts of the text are related in the following way: the entrails of the animals not used in sacrifice were sold and the money collected by the priests from the sale was divided among those priests according to the duties they performed in the sacrifice. According to this interpretation the verb amatens indicates the apportioning of proceeds from the sale. Durante offers Umbrian arsma - 'to organize into ranks', cf. arsmahamo (Tab. Ig. IB 19, Vib 56) as a correspondence. This interpretation is possible but it must be noted that the meaning attributed to the Umbrian word is speculative (see Poultney 1959:297). Moreover, it presupposes the simplification of the -dm- cluster despite the fact that consonant clusters are nowhere else reduced on this inscription.

While I am inclined to accept Durante's interpretation of the inscription as a whole, I doubt the connection between Umbrian arsmahamo and Marrucinian amatens. The root of the Marrucinian word can be connected with the root am- found in the Latin nouns ampla 'grip' and ansa 'handle'. 77 Thus the basic meaning appears to be something like 'take, grasp, collect', a perfectly reasonable meaning within the context of this inscription and within the outlines of Durante's interpretation.
The interpretation of the first half of the inscription depends heavily on the analysis of the noun agine. Formally, agine is a *-iyen-stem to a root *3g/e-g- 'to say' (Pokorny 1959:290). From the meaning of Umbrian aii 'oracular response' and Oscan aginse 'pronouncements (of a religious variety)' it appears that the meaning of the root in Oscan-Umbrian has something to do with making divine responses. agine may then correspond to the Latin formula secundum interpretationem oraculi.

The words babu apoleenis are obscure. babu probably refers to some sort of priest (priestess ?) responsible for accepting the sacrificial flesh and burning it. There is no satisfactory etymology but the word appears to be an *o:n stem. apoleenis is usually considered an epithet of babu. It is probably to be connected with Umbrian aplenies, aplenia in Tab. Iguv. IIa 23. Since the contexts of the Umbrian passage and the Lex Rapino are similar it is reasonable to assume that apoleenis is a technical term which refers to some aspect of the roasting of entrails.

There are two main interpretations for asignas. Pisani (1964: 120) assumes this word is equivalent to Latin prosiciae, i.e. that it represents the flesh of the sacrificial victim cut up and prepared for sacrifice. In support of this interpretation Pisani cites a Latin gloss of this word (which was apparently taken over in Latin cult speech) which translates asignas as κρέας μερίς σόμενα, i.e. the flesh which is to be cut up and distributed to the participants of the sacrifice. Etymologically Pisani derives asignas from *an-sek-na, cf. Latin seco, secare, Umbrian an-seriato, a-seriatu.
The second interpretation, e.g. Vetter (1953:154), sees the prefix as privative *a(n) < *g. Thus the interpretation is 'uncut,' i.e. the victim's flesh has not yet been carved up to be offered in the sacrifice.

Clearly, the meaning of the gloss points to the interpretation of asignas as the equivalent of Latin prosectiae rather than 'uncut' portions of sacrificial flesh.

Both ferenter and feret are present indicative formations, ferenter is 3rd pl mediopassive, feret is 3rd sg active. Pisani (1964:120) assumes that both verbs are subjunctive. However, e subjunctives to thematic verbs are simply never found in Oscan-Umbrian, cf. Umbrian férar, Paelignian lifar. a:-subjunctives are the rule. As a result Pisani's suggestion cannot be accepted.

The standard interpretation of auiatas is as a past participial formation from a denominative verb *awiia: 'to observe the birds'. The meaning of auiatas would then be something like 'auspicatae'. Note that under Vetter's interpretation this etymology is impossible since yet uncut portions of flesh can scarcely be 'auspicious'.

Various interpretations exist for the word asum. Vetter (1953:153) translates asum as 'assem'. Pisani (1964:120), Grienberger (1928:72), and Bottiglioni (1954:331) argue that this form is a supine to a verb ardeo: 'to burn', < *ard-tum. In the context of accepting sacrificial flesh the latter interpretation is probably best. Still, the fact that -rs- appears as s does not make this etymology very secure.
pacrisi probably represents the neuter nominative singular of the adjective *pekris 'propitious', i.e. *pekre, followed by the 3 sg pres subj of the verb be *si: < *si:d. The loss of the secondary ending is also attested in the subjunctive form ta[.]a < *taga:d 'lay hands on'.

If uenalicam refers to proceeds from a sale, then it is probably to be connected to the root *ues- 'buy', cf. Latin ue:num. Since -sn-sequences remain in other Oscan-Umbrian dialects, e.g. Oscan, Umbrian, Paelignian, this word is usually considered to be a loan from Latin.

Most authorities connect ta[.]a with Latin ta(n)go: 'touch' and Volscian atahas 'lay hands on'. Since the context favors a prohibition the connection seems assured. It is difficult to restore the medial consonant here since Volscian atahas shows h for expected g < *g. Either h or g is possible. The form is 3 sg pres subj, with the secondary ending d < *t lost, cf. *si: < *si:d.

8.2 Funerary inscriptions

Two of the remaining Marrucinian inscriptions, (Po. 204 & 205), are funerary inscriptions for priestesses. Both inscriptions appear to belong to the first half of the first century B.C. (Durante 1978:806) and thus are considerably younger than the bronze of Rapino. (Po. 204) was found at Teate, (Po. 205) at Torre dei Passeri.

(Po. 204):

sacracrix
herentatia.Vara
Sonti.salas.vali

'(Here lies) the priestess of Herentas,
Var(i)a Sonti(a). May you be well. Farewell.'
(Po. 205):

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{sacracrix} & \text{cibat. cerria} \\
\text{Licina. Saluta} & \text{salaus}
\end{array}
\]

'The priestess of Ceres, Licina Saluta, lies (here). May you be well.'

The word for priestess occurs also in Paelignian (Ve. 213), but here there is no CR epenthesis. Evidently Marrucinian does not share that feature with the Herentas inscription or with Oscan. However, RC epenthesis does occur in salas and salaus < *salwos, cf. Paelignian-Latin salauatur (Ve. 215 1) and Oscan σαλωτος (Ve. 185). Peculiar to the Sabellian dialects is the placement of the verb between the rank and the epithet of the deceased. So also is the use of an adjective in place of a genitive. The substitution of \( i \) for \( *u \) in cibat does not occur elsewhere in Marrucinian, cf. eituam in the bronze of Rapino and is probably to be interpreted as a dissimilation (see also 7.3). 79

8.3 The biam inscription

(Po. 206) was found at Tocco Casauria in the vicinity of Interpromium:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Pa. Petroni} & \text{Fom. f. bea} \\
\text{ecan. fec} & \text{medix}
\end{array}
\]

'Pa(cuvius) Petronius, medix, built this water basin.'

This inscription is to be compared with Paelignian inscription (Ve. 212) and the Umbrian inscriptions (Ve. 233 and 234) all of which
are concerned with the construction of a bea(m), biam, bia(m). This inscription is dated at the end of the second century B.C. and shows a considerable amount of Latin influence. The abbreviation f(ilius) and the verb fec(it) are obvious Latinisms. The lack of final m in bea(m) and the medial o in Petroni rather than u are probably also to be attributed to contact with Latin speakers. Note, however, the peculiarly Italic word order in which the verb phrase interrupts the onomastic formula and the rank of the builder. For the lowering of *iː in hiatus in bea(m) compare peai < *piːai in the bronze of Rapino.

ekan is to be derived from *ekamk(e) with n representing the assimilation of m to [ŋ] before k.

8.4 Features of Marrucinian

Although there are five (six if the inscription from Torino di Sangro is added) Marrucinian inscriptions most of the characteristics of this dialect are drawn from the Bronze of Rapino. The remaining inscriptions provide for the most part only onomastic information. The main characteristics of this dialect are: 1) the treatment of final *-ns as -f (iafc); 2) preservation of diphthongs though with monophthongization of *ey (complete) and *aw (variable) (aisos, toutai, ocres); 3) raising of *oi to u (babu); 4) raising of *ei (ni < *nei); 5) syncope of short vowels in final syllables (salaus < *salwos); 6) RC epenthesis (salaus < *salwos); 7) loss of final dentals after long vowels (ta[.]a < *taga:d < *taga:t); 8) nom sg *a:-stems in -a (saluta); *a:-stem dat singulars in -ai and -a (peai, cerria); 9) passive in -ter (ferenter); 10) formation of gentilicia by
1+1 (aliases); 11) separation of onomastica and official title (Po. 206); 12) preservation of consonant stem abl sg -e (agine).
Footnotes—Chapter 3

1. The bronze is 1 3/8 inches high and 9 1/8 inches long. The letters are 1/4 inch high.
   An inscription found at Antinum in the territory of the Marsi is generally attributed to the Volsci (Vetter 1953:158). Classifying this inscription as Volscian is, however, unjustified. For discussion of this problem see Kerlouegan (1958).

2. The term meddix is found in Oscan and the Sabellian languages but not in Umbrian. Festus (110 L) says that the term was equivalent to Latin magister. However, it occurs in numerous Oscan inscriptions with the modifier tuvtiks (e.g. Ve. 107 meddiss tuvtiks) and in one Paelignian inscription with the modifier aticus.
   In Oscan the meddiss tuvtiks was, according to the description of Ennius (summus . . . meddix) the chief magistrate in his touto. It is probable that a single meddix was the norm and that the pairs of meddices mentioned on inscriptions from Campanian Nola, Corfinium, Messana and the inscription under investigation are due to the influence of Rome (Salmon 1967:86).

3. The third character in falia is written >. This sign appears to be peculiar to this inscription although some have compared it to a sign occurring in the word se jura (Ve. 240; Mo. 17) in an inscription from Staffolo in Picenum. The inverted character in falia is interpreted as an indication of palatalization.

4. The goddess Declona is known only from this inscription. Worship of this deity must have remained tied to Velitrae and vicinity.

5. Some have claimed that additional support for this interpretation is provided by the punctuation of the text. In most cases the words are separated by two points :>. After statom, however, one finds three points. This has been interpreted as an indication of a sentence boundary. Little support can be given to this interpretation of the punctuation because toticu is separated from couehriu in line 3 by three points also. I have found no analysis of the text in which it is argued that toticu is separated from couehriu by a sentence boundary. Moreover, such an interpretation is unlikely on syntactic grounds. .toticu and .couehriu constitute the subject noun phrase of an ablative absolute.

6. For other examples see Warmington (1940:60ff.).
The absence of the referent is common on all inscriptions. One might compare, for example, the missing referents on signs and labels in English, e.g. 'Take $\emptyset$ only as directed.' For some discussion see Sadock (1974:599-607).

For discussion of *status* and the interpretation of the first line of the Agnone tablet see Prosdocimi (1978:833). Compare also the use of the participle *status* in Latin: Festus (466 L) *stata sacrifícia sunt quae certis dieibus fieri debent*. 'The *stata sacrifícia* are those which must be made on fixed days.'

I am not inclined to view the main portion of the text as consisting of three periods, as Bottiglioni (1954:338) and Grienberger (1928:31-2) do. This division of the text leads to serious problems semantically. The second clause must read: se bim 'If (he sacrifices) an ox', asif uescis uinu arpatitu 'then let him arpatitu with vessels of wine'. The problem with this interpretation is that it assumes there are alternative courses of action that can be taken if this regulation is violated. However, in all the cases I am aware of, this is not possible. If a regulation is violated, then specific reparation must be made.

At this point there is a fundamental split in terms of interpretation. Some scholars take toticu couehriu sepu with the following clause, i.e. 'let there be a lawful carrying with the consent of the assembly'. Untermann (1956:130) has objected to this interpretation on the grounds that it would be unlikely that the assembly would have had the power to determine whether a ferom was phom or not.

Unless, of course, there is some parallel for the use of dedicatory objects by individuals in the performance of expiatory sacrifices that I am unaware of.

It is possible to interpret falia as a main verb in the apodosis of a conditional clause, as Pulgram (1976) does for example: 'If anyone of the Veletrians lays hands on (the treasure of Declona), let him make a sacrifice...'. I find this a rather bizarre interpretation. Why would anyone steal a sacred object and then perform an expiatory sacrifice for the crime?

Pisani (1964:123) notes the problems with the Latin tango: connection and suggests that atahus is a verbal adjective in *-us* < *wos*, cf. Oscan sipus, Volscian sepu, to a verb in *ata*-. Orthographic h indicates the length of the stem vowel. *ata-* is to be segmented a+ta with a < *aq-, cf. Greek agos, Umbrian aiu, ahu 'to commit a religious transgression.' While it is difficult to decide whether the first possibility is correct it is clear that Pisani's hypothesis is problematic. Nowhere does Pisani explain the -ta- affix. Moreover this hypothesis dismisses the obvious connection between Volscian atahus and Marrucinian ta[g/h]a, which in its context cannot mean...
'commit a religious transgression,' and which Pisani (1964:120) in fact translates as 'tangat.'

14. The generalization of the allomorph of perfect passive participle at the expense of other allomorphs has been used to explain the shape of the root in Faliscan lecat 'lies'. The final consonant of this root must go back to an aspirate, i.e. *leqh-, and this should give h in Faliscan. A voiceless stop from *gh is possible only in the past participle, i.e. *lektos, cf. Latin lectus.

15. This process is different from and independent of the processes which spirantize and palatalize *g after j, e.g. iiouinar < *igouinas (gen sg) Poultney (1959:64-65).

16. Some scholars (see Grienberger 1928:32) have attempted to interpret bim as equivalent to Paelignian biam, Marrucinian bea (acc sg), Umbrian bio (nom sg)/bia (acc sg) 'water basin.' This interpretation is problematic on phonological and semantic grounds. First, *g in final syllables is not syncopated; in fact vowels are not syncopated before final m in general. Second, the meaning 'water basin' does not make much sense in a context which calls for an object which can be offered as part of an expiatory sacrifice.


18. The problem with this interpretation is that there is no number given in the text. It is customary for the amount of monetary reparation to be specified.

19. According to Gusmani (1970:146) Oscan praefucus is from earlier *prayfacu(o)s with syncopation of the medial vowel and epenthesis.

20. The only possible objection to syncopation of syllable final u is the Umbrian form erus (acc sg). But this form can hardly be used as evidence since its etymology and meaning are unknown (see Poultney 1959:304-305).

There is no positive evidence for the syncopation of short a in this context either.

21. Most u-stem adjectives are remade to i-stems in Latin, e.g. sua:uis 'sweet'. Compare Greek ηῦῦ and Sanskrit sva:duh.

22. The raising of PIE *e: to i is common in the Tabula Bantina, e.g. ni < *ne: 'not', hipid < *he:pe:d 'habuerit' (Vetter 1953:18).

23. For discussion of this Faliscan verb see G. Giacomelli (1963:51-2).

24. Servius cites the word as feminine, i.e. hernae. According to Walde-Hofmann (1965 I:643) and Pokorny (1959:445) herna is derived
from the root *ghers- 'stare'. Despite the difference in meaning between 'stare' and 'stone' this etymology may be plausible in terms of semantics. In English, for example, the adjective stony often has the meaning 'dumb, expressionless' and serves as an attribute to nouns such as face, eyes, gaze, appearance, etc., e.g. 'his ice-cold stony gaze'. The plausibility of this etymology is difficult to determine on phonological grounds, however, because it is impossible to determine the position of Hernican within Italic. However, if the language is Oscan-Umbrian then the development of *ghers-no- to hema is unexpected. Based on the evidence from Oscan, namely kersnu, one would expect the sequence -rsn- to survive in Hernican. Finally, note that the expected development of this sequence in Latin is -rn-, e.g. perna 'a ham', or Vin, e.g. ceina 'dinner' (see Buck 1933:154).

25 See Bücheler (1882:516) for discussion of the word samentum.

26 Mommsen (1850:348) and Bucheler (1882:516) claim that there is no reason to separate Hernican from Latin. Conway (1897:306) also claims that Hernican is a Latin dialect. Actually, if one does not take the toponomastic evidence into consideration then it is impossible to assign Hernican either to Latin or Oscan-Umbrian.

27 According to Letta (1976:278) iouies pucle[s] is a calque on the Greek Διόσκουροι with Etruscan tinas clinlaris as an intermediary.

28 For discussion of these deities see Vetter (1955).

29 For discussion of this inscription see Torelli (1973-4:741ff.).

30 The interpretation of pesco as either 1st sg verb or neuter noun derived from *ptxsk(t)lom is impossible to maintain on phonological grounds. If pesco were a 1st sg verb one would expect u for o since *o: is raised in Marsian. Similarly, if pesco were a *(t)lo-formation one would expect the -1- to remain, at least given Umbrian perscler. One might suggest, however, that pesco be derived from the root *prek/*perk- by means of a *-sko- suffix. Phonologically, one need only assume the reduction of the cluster *-rksk- to -sk-. Semantically, one may be able to obtain 'expiatory sacrifice' from a basic meaning 'pray' by means of the following semantic developments: prayer ===> ceremony (in which prayers are used) ===> particular type of ceremony, e.g. sacrificial ===> specific type of sacrificial ceremony, e.g. expiatory ===> the expiatory sacrifice itself.

31 An inscription found recently in the river valley of the Sangrus river (Po. 106) must, according to the theory of Lejeune (1972), be a Marrucinian form, not an Oscan one, since the form *aisows < *aisowes should survive into Oscan, cf. castrous.

32 crus is probably an abbreviation for Ceruius, a name which is attested at Supinum. Omission of e in the first syllable is not
uncommon in Italic. There are examples in Umbrian, South Picene, Faliscan, and Praenestine Latin.


This method of dating appears to be peculiar to the Sabellian languages. Recall that in Latin dating is indicated by an ablative absolute containing the names of the consuls.

Letta (1979:407) argues that questur could be an abbreviation for Latin q(ua)estur(es). This is unlikely because *o: does not appear as u in Latin. It does in Marsian.

The i-stem formation is not unattested in Latin, however, where it appears in the religious language (Ernout-Meillet 1939:882).

For discussion of the conse[n]: see Lempriere (1949:163).

Poccetti (1979:170) argues that binomina are more common and therefore that cdimi be analyzed as c dimi. Note, however, that praenomen, patronymic, and gentilicium occur on the Bronze of Antinum. Thus, Durante’s analysis cannot be dismissed on these grounds.


According to Mommsen and Conway this inscription is suspect because of the rather modern-looking appearance of some letters. Vetter (1953:160) suspects that the original forms of these letters were altered by the copyist Ricci, to whom we owe the surviving copy of this inscription. Vetter’s suspicion appears to be confirmed by the fact that the letters <a> and <l> are in an archaic Latin alphabet.

For the goddess Stata see Salmon (1967:159 footnote 4) and Cic. (De Leg. 2,28).

Stata is mentioned on CIL IX 4113.

Sa. Sta. Fl./ Vic. d. d. 1./ m. ‘Salvius Flavius and Statius Flavius gave this as a gift to Victory willingly and deservedly.’

Varro speaks of the Sabina lingua in only two cases, L. L. 5,66 and 5,74. As Conway (1897:351) points out, however, neither context need imply that the language was still spoken.
Conway (1897:354) suggests, on the basis of the comparison curis 'hasta' ('spear') - Latin quirites, that *k > ku in Sabine. Bruno (1969:10) compares curis with Oscan kuru 'projectile' (Ve. 161) and Sanskrit sari 'dart'.

(Ve. 227) may actually be a Vestinian inscription (Bruno 1969:3). Amiternum, where the inscription was found, is close to the western border of Vestinian territory. Moreover, the name of the month flusare occurs on an inscription from Furfo (CIL II 756) in Vestinian territory. However, since there are only a handful of Sabine glosses and a couple of small Vestinian inscriptions it is impossible to determine accurately what language this inscription belongs to.

If hiretum and Umbrian erietu are to be connected with Latin aries then one must assume an apophonic relationship e - a (see Poultney 1959:53).

Knobloch (1978:161) derives aunom from the root *awg- 'increase', i.e. from *awgsno- 'fattened'. The development of *awgsno- to aunom is unlikely for an Oscan-Umbrian language since -sn- sequences remain.

The locative poimunien is obviously to be connected with the Umbrian divinity Puemune, perhaps indicating a place sacred to Pomenus (the Latinized form of the Umbrian).

Mattiocco (1964:296) suggests a date early in the 2nd century.

Durante is not the first to suspect that these Paelignian inscriptions were in some type of verse. For example, Lindsay (1893) argues that these two inscriptions are in Saturnian meter.

(Ve. 210b) is written in an archaic Latin alphabet. According to Conway (1897:234) this inscription is to be dated no later than 180 B.C. and maybe even as much as a century earlier.

For a brief discussion of the manuscripts on which this inscription was copied (and (Ve. 203) also) see Conway (1897:237ff.).

It is questionable whether the orthography of the manuscript is to be given more weight than other considerations in deciding upon an emendation in this case. We do not know the state of the inscription when the copy was made. If there was some imperfection at this point in the text then the writing pl could represent a guess, and a particularly bad one, on the part of the person copying the text.

For an alternative interpretation of this inscription see Ribezzo (1928:9) and Bottiglioni (1954:335).

For an alternative explanation of anacta see Poccetti (1980).
The long eː vocalism in the stem of the Paelignian and Marrucinian adjectives cer(r)i and cerie respectively is difficult to explain and no solution is attempted here. It is sufficient to note that these long eː adjectives alternate with long aː stems and that this alternation is similar to the alternation found in Latin between long eː- and long aː-stem nouns, e.g. duːritieːs vs. duːritia 'hardness'. Thus, any attempt to explain the eː-vocalism in cer(r)i/cerie must take into consideration the origins of the Latin 5th declension, for which there is, at this point, no satisfactory solution (see Buck (1933:204-05), Ernout (1953:67), Kent (1946:52), Sommer (1948:394) for some discussion).

The -rr- sequences in cer(r)ia, etc. as well as the -rf- sequence in cerfum (Ve. 214) are generally derived from secondary *rs sequences via syncope (see Ernout Meillet (1939:180) and Walde-Hofmann 1965: 204)). The main motivation for such a derivation comes from the fact that primary and secondary *rs clusters receive different treatments in Umbrian. To judge from the Umbrian verbal form tusetu primary *rs clusters are simplified to r, accompanied perhaps by lengthening of the preceding vowel, cf. Latin terreo: < *terː-. The existence of the form tursitu can be explained by assuming it indicates some rhotic quality in the preceding vowel. At any rate, if the deity serfe is to be derived from the stem *ker(e)s-, as seems likely, then the development of the *rs cluster here is different than for original sequences.

There are, however, some Latin inscriptions which could be so interpreted, e.g. CIL I 1581 (Capua): Junone/ Lucina/ Tuscolana/ sacra 'An (alter) sacred to Tusculan Juno Lucina.'

Since -di- sequences survive in Paelignian in a number of cases it is probably the case that they were reintroduced under Latin influence.

Actually, it is possible that this peculiarity of word order is the result of a substratum influence. South Picene inscriptions found in this area appear to attest the same phenomenon (see Morandi 1978).

This fact is noted by Durante (1978:818), Lejeune (1976:561), and Vetter (1953:145, 167). Hence the translation of biam as 'fontana'.

The site of Fossato di Vico was first examined in 1868 by Marco Micheletti. Grienberger (1928:24) discusses Micheletti's report at some length; for a re-examination see Stefani (1940). Lejeune (1976:562) discusses the implications of Stefani's report of the interpretation of the biam inscriptions.

For the quality of the laryngeal in the root 'live' *gweːl see Hamp (1976:87).

For the collocation *bio aapo compare Latin uiːuiː: fonteːs, uiːua aqua, and uiːuum flumen. The Oscan word for 'water' is attested only in accusative singular and plural forms, e.g. aapam (see...
La Regina (1966:264-6)) and aapas (Pisani 1964:106). It should be noted that Oscan aapam/ aapas is not cognate with Latin aqua. Comparison with Latin aqua leaves the long vowel in the Oscan word without an explanation. A much better connection is that suggested by Pisani (1964:101-2), namely with Sanskrit aspir (nom pl).

For the IE root *wed- see Pokorny (1959:78-9). The Umbrian word utur originally belonged to the IE collective paradigm with holokinetia accentual pattern, i.e. strong *wed-o:r vs. weak *ud-n- (for which see Schindler (1975:5). The fact that Umbrian has zero grade vocalism in the root must be attributed to paradigmatic leveling, cf. Greek ἔθνος.

Since Paelignian is rather closely related to Oscan it is possible that the word *aapo existed in Paelignian. This need not be the case, however. Even if one grants the concept of a 'period of common development,' dialect difference will exist; and to prove this point there are isoglosses which cut across the customary subgrouping divisions established for Oscan-Umbrian (see Chapter 4). For example, some authorities consider Marrucinian a member of the Oscan branch of Oscan-Umbrian. Nevertheless, Marrucinian shares with Umbrian, but not with Oscan, the treatment of final *-ns as *f, e.g. iac < *eans-ke. Thus *aapo need not have existed in Paelignian. Still, even if *aapo did exist in Paelignian it will not account for the existence of the feminine bio in Umbrian. And the claim of Lejeune (1976:570), that the existence of Oscan *aapo proves the existence of this noun in Umbrian is subject to the same criticism.

The connection with Old Norse kvf was first suggested by Bugge (1878:45). This etymology was accepted by Muller (1926:210).

The raising of mid vowels to high before nasals is a common phonological process however, cf. American English dialects where pin and pen have merged as /pln/.

Vetter (1953:150) assumes that des represents 'di:ve:s' but contends, on the basis of the alliterative pattern of the epitaph, that the d must be a spirant of some sort.

For discussion of the origin of this sign and its interpretation see Grienberger (1928:60).

Vetter's interpretation of Oscan usurs as equivalent to Latin uxo:re:s leaves much to be desired semantically to judge from the context. The inscription is generally considered to be a des:fixio:, i.e. a curse. For the latest discussion of the Oscan inscription containing usurs see Prosdocimi (1978:885-886). For the interpretation of usurs as o:so:re:s see Pisani (1964:88).

Pisani (1964:115) assumes that ip uiDad.uiBu.omnitu = 'ibi via Vibia commonita.' That ip is equivalent semantically to the Latin adverb ibi (< *i-bheyn) is no problem since the word is attested in
Oscan ip (see Ve. 1B), probably from *i<k>e. Pisani's interpretation of uibDu as a praenomen of PetieDu, delayed for alliterative purposes, and uiDad as uia are not very credible. The praenomen is found in this position nowhere else in Italic. And if uiDad is interpreted as uia one must also assume the spirantization of intervocalic *y.

Moreover, this connection overlooks problems in the derivation of Latin uia. Syntactically, it is doubtful whether this phrase can, under the interpretation of Pisani, be part of the following phrase. The resumptive pronoun ecuc, referring to Prima PetieDu, indicates that the first onomastic formula is in a different clause. Durante (1978:800-801) interprets the Paelignian phrase as a separate sentence: 'ibi uideat Uibia obuenta.' It is doubtful whether uiDad can be derived from a preform *uidead, which is apparently what Durante wishes to suggest, although he is in no way explicit about this.

Moreover, his translation seems farfetched. He assumes that Uibia is a divine subordinate (basing this interpretation on his interpretation of the Capuan defixio), perhaps of Urania (?), and that it is her function to guide the anima of Prima PetieDu to Persephone. Thus, uiDad is interpreted as 'sees' in a metaphorical sense, i.e. 'comes to find.'

In Urban Latin the diphthong aw is monophthongized only in prefixed forms, e.g. claudio: 'shut close' vs. occludo: 'close up' < *ob-klawdo:.

Whether this inscription is assigned to Marrucinian or Oscan is also of great importance since there is found in this inscription the word aisos, which if assigned to Oscan, means that the stem class of *ays- must be o and not a u-stem.

The interpretation of this text as a sacred regulation concerning a sacrifice is the common one, although every authority varies in some details of interpretation (for which see Bottiglioni 1954:331; Pisani 1964:120; Vetter 1953:153).

This assumption is not made by all authorities. Bottiglioni (1954:331) apparently interprets the text as consisting of two regulations, hence his analysis of lixs as non pl < *le:ges.

Morphologically, amatens is to be analyzed into a stem ama-, a perfect ending -t-, cf. Oscan -tt- perfects, and a secondary ending -ens < *(e)nt. ama- appears to be a perfect match to the Latin stem ama:- 'love.' The object of amatens, the noun phrase eituam uenaliam 'money from a sale' would seem to require a verb with a meaning from some other semantic field. Accordingly, Knobloch (1956) has attempted to show that this word is connected with the root *em/-*e- 'take.' Knobloch suggests that amatens is an intensive formation from *mayo: and that it is to be compared with OCS imati 'have.' Due to the existence of words like ampla 'grip' < *am-la: and ansa 'handle' < *am-sa: there can be little doubt of the existence a root *am- in Italic with the meaning 'grasp.' But the relationship of this root to the root *em/*e- is not very clear.
If amatens is derived from a root *am-, it could be a denomina-
tive to an abstract noun *ama: 'grasping,' < *ama:-ye/o-. But it is
also possible that the stem ama:- could be derived from the root *am-
by means of an *-aye/o- suffix. Cases of the reanalysis of original
a:-stem denominatives have led to the creation of -aire verbs on stems
which did not originally end in *a, e.g. Latin no:mina:re to C-stem
no:men.

It is also possible that the connection between the Marrucinian
verb and the Latin verb is not as problematic as Knobloch believes.
The meaning 'love' can be derived from a basic meaning 'grasp, take'
quite straightforwardly. Consider, for example, use of the verb
'take' in American English: 'to take to someone', 'to take a loved
one', etc.

It is generally agreed that agine is formed by means of the
suffix *-yen/yon-. The precise form of the suffix is controversial
and most of the logical possibilities, i.e. < *-i:n-, *-in-, *-yen/
yon- via syncope, have been suggested by one source or another.
However, the fact that Umbrian consistently has i in the oblique cases
of *-yen/yon- nouns, and Oscan consistently has i (and never i), point
to an affix containing a long vowel *i:. Since *i: is not a possible
ablaute alternant of the suffix *-yen/yon- it is necessary to assume
that *-i:n- is from earlier *-iyen-, i.e. a Sievers' variant after
heavy bases (Nussbaum 1975:122). Thus, agine is to be derived from an
earlier *agiyene via *-iye- > i:, cf. fil: < *filiye. Presumably the
*-iyen- variant was generalized into contexts where it was not
expected on etymological grounds, as here where it occurs after a
short syllable.

In addition to the interpretation offered in section 8.1 at least
two others may be found in the literature. Vetter (1953:153) trans-
lates agine as 'causa,' i.e. 'for the sake of.' Other authorities,
e.g. von Planta 1897 II:177, Bottiglioni 1954:331, Grienberger
1928:71, and Pisani 1964:120, translate agine as 'pompa,' i.e.
'procession (in which the proseciae are accepted on behalf of the
Marrucinian people).'

Durante (1951:173) has argued that *u is dissimilated to i
around labials in the Old Sabellian (South Picene) text from Crecchio,
in the area of the Marrucini, kiperu < *kupra: (?). As a result,
Durante suggests the dissimilatory process in Marrucinian may be a
substratum feature. Apparently, however, Durante's reading kiperu is
questionable, and thus his identification with Umbrian cupra. Morandi

Durante (1978:807) thinks that petroni indicates that *o:
remains in Marrucinian. However, if babu (Lex Rapino) is an *o:n
stem, as is likely, then the raising of *o: to u must be recognized in
Marrucinian also. The o-vocalism in petroni could be a Latinism.
Chapter 4
Subgrouping the Sabellian Languages

0. Introduction

Three major problems face anyone who wishes to discuss the position of the Sabellian languages within Indo-European or, more specifically, within Italic. One problem is a familiar one. There are very few data to work with. Thus, one feature alone may have to serve as a criterion for subgrouping. From a methodological point of view this is not a very sound practice but under the circumstances it seems preferable to the alternative, namely giving up the investigation of subgrouping entirely. One must simply recognize that the bases for subgrouping are not very secure and keep this proviso in mind when considering the results.

The second problem concerns the nature of the evidence itself. The fact that most of the evidence for the Sabellian languages is attested after these languages had come into contact with Latin speakers and the fact that most of the Sabellian speakers were Latinized rather quickly and thoroughly means that Latin features may have infiltrated these inscriptions. As a result one must be careful to eliminate possible Latinisms before discussion of criteria for subgrouping. The features suspected of being Latinisms were considered for each Sabellian language in Chapter 3. Thus, the discussion
of features for subgrouping proceeds under the assumption that these features have been filtered out.

The final problem—one that has, unfortunately, received very little attention in the literature—concerns areal features. There are a number of features which have generally been considered important for the purposes of subgrouping that are not restricted to the Oscan-Umbrian languages. For example, the monophthongization of IE diphthongs, while common to Umbrian and the western Sabellian languages, i.e. Marsian, Aequian, and Volscian, is found also in rural Latin dialects and in Faliscan. As a result, one must at least consider the possibility that monophthongization of diphthongs originated in one of the languages and spread to the others. In such a case monophthongization would be of little value for determining the position of the western Sabellian languages. Thus, possible areal features must be discussed before one can determine the subgrouping of the Sabellian languages.

1. **Characteristics shared with Oscan-Umbrian**

Most Italicists subgroup the Sabellian languages within the Oscan-Umbrian branch of Italic. There are a few scholars, such as Conway and Schrijnen for example, who subgroup Sabine, Marsian, and Hernican with Latin-Faliscan rather than Oscan-Umbrian. As was noted in Chapter 3 there is no evidence, except for toponomastica, for determining the position of Hernican. As a result, the position of this language within Italic must remain a mystery. Contra Conway (1897:306), arguments *ex silentio* do not favor subgrouping Hernican
within Latin-Faliscan. With respect to Sabine and Marsian, however, there are features which point to an affiliation with Oscan-Umbrian rather than Latin-Faliscan.

The characteristics which the Sabellian languages share with Oscan-Umbrian have been organized into two categories: those that are common innovations and those that are shared retentions. For the purposes of subgrouping the former must be accorded the most weight; shared retentions are of considerably less value for determining genetic relationships. However, since there are so few data to begin with I follow the tradition of listing them as they may potentially prove helpful.

The following are the common innovations which the Sabellian languages share with Oscan-Umbrian: 1) The treatment of IE labiovelars are treated as plain labials, e.g. Volscian sepis < *sey-kwis, cf. Latin quis; Paelignian pid < *kwid, cf. Latin quid; Marrucinian nipis < *nei:kwis, cf. Latin quis; Vestinian brat(eis) < *qra:teis, cf. Latin grat(ut)s. For the treatment of IE labiovelars as labials compare Oscan pis < *kwis and Umbrian benus < *qem-. 2) The syncope of short vowels in non-initial syllables, e.g. Volscian medix < *meddikes; Paelignian pes < *pi:os, medix < *meddikes, rustix < *rustikos. Compare Oscan húrz < *ghortoe and Umbrian Ikuvins < *Iquvinos. 3) The treatment of final *-nt# as -ns, e.g. Paelignian coisatens; Marrucinian amatens; Vestinian osens; Volscian sistatiens. Compare Oscan dedens and Umbrian dirsans. 4) The formation of gentilicia in -ies < *I+i- (Nussbaum 1975:135-136), e.g. Paelignian ponties; Marrucinian alies; Vestinian ebdies; Volscian cosuties;
Aequian pomposities; Marsic pacuies. Compare Oscan afaries. 5) The generalization of i-stem genitive *-eys to consonant stems, e.g. Marrucinian päteres < *patrey, ioues < *iouey. Compare Oscan medikels and Umbrian nomner. 6) *-yon/yen- stems in -in-, e.g. Marrucinian agine. Compare Oscan tanginud and Umbrian natine. 7) The formation of future perfects in -us-, e.g. Volscian atahus. Compare Oscan dicust and Umbrian dersicust. 8) The formation of present active infinitives in -om, e.g. Volscian ferom. Compare Oscan ezum and Umbrian erom. 9) Third singular impersonal passives in -r, e.g. Paelignian lifar. Compare Umbrian ferar and Oscan sakrafir (perf subj). 10) Third person passive ending in -ter, e.g. Paelignian upsaeter, Marrucinian ferenter. Compare Oscan sakarater and Umbrian herter. 11) The rounding and raising of *-a:, e.g. Paelignian prismu. Compare Oscan fiismu and Umbrian mutu. 12) The raising of the long mid vowel *o:, e.g. Volscian declune, Sabine flusare, Paelignian upsaeter, Vestinian duno, Marsian gestur, Marrucinian babu. Compare Oscan Flusai and Umbrian etu.

There are two features which can be listed as shared retentions: 13) The treatment of IE voiced aspirates as fricatives in all positions, e.g. Paelignian loufir < *lowdheros, cf. Latin liber; sfei < *sebhey, cf. Latin sibi:. For the change of voiced aspirates to fricatives in medial position in Oscan-Umbrian see Oscan mefia < *medhya:y, and Umbrian tefe < *tebhey. Since Faliscan and, to judge from two glosses, some Latin rural dialects also share the development of the aspirates to fricatives in all positions this feature cannot be considered a common innovation.4 Apparently, most Latin dialects, at
least the variety of the city Rome, voiced and stopped the fricatives in medial position. 14) The preservation of s before nasals, e.g. Paelignian fesn. < *bhesn-, prismu < *prisma. Compare Oscan ffīsmu and Umbrian fesnafe. 5

2. Previous views of subgrouping within Oscan-Umbrian

Although it is evident from the data cited above that the Sabellian languages belong to the Oscan-Umbrian branch of Italic, numerous interpretations have been given for the precise position of these languages within Oscan-Umbrian itself.

A survey of the literature on the subject reveals three major varieties of subgrouping schemata: 4-, 3-, and 2-branched family trees. Those who (see, e.g., Krahe 1966:20; Sommer 1948:7; von Planta 1892 I:12ff.) divide Oscan-Umbrian into four sub-branches generally set up Oscan, Umbrian, and Volscian as separate branches and group the remainder of the languages together under a node labelled Sabellian (see Figure 2 at the end of this chapter). There are three variations on the tribracchic subdivision of Oscan-Umbrian. Buck (1928:3) and Kent (1945:37) divide Oscan-Umbrian into Oscan, Umbrian, and Sabellian (see Figure 3). All of the Sabellian languages are subgrouped together under this last node. Palmer (1954:6) divides Oscan-Umbrian into an Oscan branch, an Umbrian branch, and a Volscian branch. The Sabellian languages Vestinian, Marrucinian, and Paelignian are subgrouped together with Oscan under the Oscan node (see Figure 4). Finally, Conway (1897) has the same schemata as Palmer except for the fact that Oscan is subdivided into two branches, north Oscan and south
Oscan. South Oscan designates Oscan proper; north Oscan includes Paelignian, Vestinian, and Marrucinian (see Figure 5). The family trees consisting of two main sub-branches set up an Oscan and Umbrian branch (see Figure 6). The former contains Oscan and the Sabellian languages Paelignian, Marrucinian, and Vestinian; the latter contains Umbrian and the Sabellian languages Volscian, Aequian, and Marsian (see Durante 1978; Poultney 1951 and 1959:9). Sabine is subgrouped with Oscan by some, with Umbrian by others.

A couple of reasons suggest themselves as explanations for the diversity of the subgrouping schemata. First, one must take into consideration the fact that there are so few data. I suspect that this fact has led to 'impressionistic' subgrouping in some cases. At least this accounts for the fact that in many cases subgrouping schemata are offered without an attempt to support them empirically. Second, since there are so few data, subgrouping must be based on a small number of features. If a certain feature is subject to different interpretations then different schemata may arise depending on which interpretation is accepted. Consider, for example, the change *d > r/____[labial]. This change is found in Volscian and possibly in Marsian. It occurs on a Marsian-Latin inscription. Thus, there is some question as to whether this is a legitimate Marsian feature or not. The problem is complicated by the fact that this change exists in a few Latin words which are of dialectal origin (see Ernout 1909:112-13). But if one accepts this feature as a genuine Marsian feature of pronunciation, then there exists a linguistic feature which is shared by Marsian, Volscian, and Umbrian. If one does not except
it, there is little reason for grouping Marsian with Umbrian. Similarly, the Volscian word *asif* has been given various interpretations. Those who interpret the word as an acc pl find additional support for aligning Volscian with Umbrian. Others, who view this word as dat/abl pl, see this word as support for setting up Volscian as an independent branch within Oscan-Umbrian. Thus, subgrouping the Sabellian languages depends to a large extent on what features are accepted and what features are not accepted as criteria. As a result, since the subgrouping schemata may vary according to the interpretation, it is not surprising to find that a variety of subgrouping schemata exist.

Realistically, the best any discussion of subgrouping the Sabellian languages can hope to do is to be explicit about what features are used to determine the position of the languages and why these features are selected. This, of course, provided the main motivation for the discussion of the languages themselves in Chapter 3. Too often it is the case that features are used to subgroup the languages without any critical evaluation of their status, again presumably because there are so few data. But this is scarcely a good reason for offering a feature as a criterion for subgrouping. If the analysis of the position of the languages is explicit with respect to the criteria on which the analysis is based, at least it can be evaluated fairly.

3. **Possible areal features**

There are three phonological features which generally play a prominent role in determining the position of the western Sabellian
languages, Marsian, Aequian, and Volscian: (1) the monophthongization of diphthongs; (2) the treatment of *d as r before labials; and (3) the loss of word final dental stops, particularly the voiced stop d. All of these features occur among languages which are geographically contiguous, including Latin varieties, and thus must be suspected of being areal features. As a result, these features must receive careful consideration before they can serve as criteria for subgrouping.

In addition to the features mentioned above, there are two other phonological characteristics that are used as criteria for subgrouping the eastern Sabellian languages Paelignian and Vestinian. They also deserve consideration as possibly being areal features: (1) the assimilation of dentals; (2) the assimilation of secondary *ps-clusters.

3.1 Monophthongization

In an article published in AJPh in 1951 James Poultney claims that monophthongization is an important criterion for subgrouping Marsian, Aequian, and Volscian. Similarly, M. Durante (1978) considers monophthongization to be the primary linguistic feature for determining the position of these languages within Oscan-Umbrian. On the basis of this feature the Sabellian languages can be divided rather neatly into two groups. The languages that monophthongize align themselves with Umbrian; those that preserve the diphthongs align themselves with Oscan.

Unfortunately, the value of this feature as a criterion for subgrouping has probably been exaggerated. The monophthongization of short diphthongs is found in Umbrian and the western Sabellian
languages, in rural varieties of Latin, in Faliscan, and possibly in Sabine (see Table 1 at the end of this chapter). The status of monophthongization in Sabine is difficult to determine. On one hand, there are glosses attributed to the Sabines that show monophthongization. However, it is difficult to know whether this is a feature of rural Latin or a real Sabine feature since these glosses show Latin inflectional morphology and there is evidence for monophthongization in rural Latin dialects. On the other hand, the inscription from Amiternum contains the word aunom which may be considered evidence of the preservation of diphthongs. Unfortunately, there is no good etymology for this word. Moreover, there is some question about whether this inscription is in fact Sabine. Some claim that it is Vestinian. It is also possible that the monophthongization attested in the glosses reflect a western Sabine innovation. The Sabine inscription is from Amiternum which is located in the easternmost portion of Sabine territory.

Thus, there appears to be a geographical continuum for the monophthongization of short diphthongs which extends south from Umbria as far as southern Latium, east perhaps as far as the Aternus river valley, and west into the area surrounding Rome. This continuum encompasses the territory of the Umbri, the Falisci, the Sabini (to judge from the glosses), the Aequi, the Marsi, the Volsci, and the Latini (see Figure 7 at the end of this chapter).

The beginnings of monophthongization in Faliscan can be located temporally in the 4th century B.C. There is fluctuation in the representation of the inherited diphthongs until the second century. The
monophthongized pronunciations prevail only in the this period (see G. Giacomelli 1963:119ff. and R. Giacomelli 1978:25ff.). Similarly, in the rural Latin texts of the 3rd century there is considerable variation between diphthongal and monophthongal pronunciations. On the other hand, the Umbrian and Sabellian texts show no variation in pronunciation, only the simple vowels. Thus, this may be an indication that monophthongization originated in these Oscan-Umbrian languages and spread to the Latin dialects.

While the monophthongization of inherited short diphthongs is a feature common to many central Italic dialects this is not true of inherited long diphthongs, at least the diphthong for which evidence exists, i.e. *a:y. In Faliscan, for example, the *a:y diphthong is never monophthongized, even in the latest period for which evidence exists, i.e. 2nd century B.C. Similarly, for Latin varieties there is no evidence for the monophthongization of *a:y. The non-urban dialects show ai or a and Urban Latin shows ai/ae. Thus, the reflexes of *a:y in Latin and Faliscan are in sharp contrast to the reflex of this diphthong in the western Sabellian languages and Umbrian. In Umbrian, Volscian, Marsian, and Aequian *a:y is monophthongized to e (see Table 2). Thus, in these languages the monophthongization processes have affected inherited long diphthongs in addition to the short ones.

While monophthongization of short diphthongs appears to be a feature shared by most of the languages of central Italy, the monophthongization of long diphthongs is restricted to the western Sabellian
languages and Umbrian (see Figure 8). As a result this feature may be
of some value for subgrouping.

3.2 The loss of final dentals

The loss of dentals must be divided into numerous subtypes: (1)
loss of *d/V(:)__#; (2) loss of _d < *t/V(:)__; (3) loss of *t/C__#;
(4) loss of _t < *ti/V(:)__.

In Umbrian all four categories are attested: (1) tuta < *tow-
ta:d; (2) fapia < *fakya:d < *fakya:t; (3) fus < *bhust; (4) heri <
*gheryeti. The loss of original *d and _d < *t in final position is
categorical. The loss of *t/C__# is variable. Approximately 1/3 of
the examples, of which there are 30, attest the loss of *t. The loss
of _t < *ti is found only once. However, there is only a handful of 3
sg pres act verbs attested.

In the Sabellian languages there is no evidence for the loss of _t
< *ti. In every case attested _t remains. *t/C__# is attested only
in Volscian and final *t is lost (atahus). The loss of *d/V:__# is
attested only in Volscian (toticu) and Paelignian (aetatu) and the
loss is categorical. There are no examples for the other Sabellian
languages. Examples of the loss _d < *t/V:__# are found in Marru-
cinian (ta[g]a) and Paelignian (dida). Again, the loss of _d is
categorical.

Similarly, in Latin *d and _d < *t are lost after long vowels, at
least by the beginning of the second century (Kent 1945:116). There
are sporadic instances also of the loss of _d < *t after short vowels,
e.g. dede.
In Faliscan, as in Umbrian, there is a tendency for final dentals to be lost regardless of the source. From the 4th century onward there are examples of the loss of *d and t < *ti (salueto, ifra, cupa). 8

Thus, it seems possible to recognize a rather large area of central Italy in which dental stops are lost after long vowels (see Figure 9). This area includes the territory of the Paeligni, the Marrucini, the Volsci, the Falisci, and the Latini. So far as the data indicate, the loss of *d and d < *t after short vowels seems to be a marginal phenomenon. It is found sporadically only in Umbrian and Latin. The loss of t < *ti in final position is attested in Umbrian in a few cases and occurs on a number of Faliscan inscriptions from the third century. This may be only a characteristic shared only by Faliscan and Umbrian because it is not attested in Latin dialects, nor in any other Sabellian language for which there is evidence (see also footnote 8). The only Sabellian language for which *-st# is attested is Volscian. In Volscian final t is lost. Nevertheless this feature is of little value since the reduction of homorganic clusters is common in the languages of the world and in Umbrian final t is lost in only about 1/3 of the examples.

In sum, the variety of changes grouped under the heading loss of final dentals is not very valuable as evidence for subgrouping.

3.3 *d > r/ [labial]

This feature is a quite striking characteristic of pronunciation among the Italic languages and as a result is potentially important
for subgrouping. There are, however, some problems with an attempt to establish this feature as a criterion for subgrouping.

The first problem concerns determining precisely what languages attest the change. It is found in Volscian certainly (arpatitu). It may or may not occur in Marsian depending on whether one accepts apurfinem, found on a Marsian-Latin inscription, as a Marsian feature. There are also some Latin lexical items in which the prefix ad appears as ar, e.g. arfuisse (see Ernout 1909:112-13). Thus, it is at least possible that some non-urban varieties of Latin also attest this change (see Figure 10). In Umbrian the reflex of *d in medial position is distinguished orthographically from r < *r in most cases. In the native alphabet it has the form b (transcribed ß) and in the Latin alphabet it is usually represented by the sequence rs, though r does occur occasionally. Since this is the case it is not clear that the reflex in Umbrian is equivalent to that attested in Volscian, Marsian, and Latin. Recall that the reflex of *d before labials is represented by r categorically in Volscian, etc.

The second problem concerns the contexts in which the change has taken place. In Umbrian the shift of d to rs/ß/r is attested generally in medial position. This includes intervocalic position as well as preconsonantal position, e.g. dirsa (3 sg pres), adkani 'musical accompaniment (acc sg) < *adkanyom. In Volscian, Marsian-Latin, and Latin the change is attested only before labials and not intervocally. Thus, the contexts for the changes are on the surface at least quite different.
Buck (1928:83) maintains that the reflex of *d intervocalically is to be distinguished from the reflex of *d in preconsonantal position, in particular before labials. It is difficult to determine whether or not Buck is correct. Even though orthographic r (arpeltu) and rs (arsfertur) occur before labials in addition to r (arueitu) one could easily argue, as Buck in fact does, that these represent the intervocalic outcome of *d which has been generalized to preconsonantal contexts. On the other hand, it is perfectly reasonable to argue, as does Poulney (1959:59), that the Umbrian change is to be restricted to intervocalic position and that all attestations of r, rs, etc. in preconsonantal position are to be attributed to (1) the result of syncope (i.e., *VdVC > VrVC > VrC) or (2) analogy, i.e. the generalization of the prevocalic form into preconsonantal position. If this argument is accepted then the changes are quite independent of one another.

Of course a third alternative exists. The change in Umbrian may have affected any *d in medial position, i.e. in intervocalic or preconsonantal position. According to this position the Umbrian change may or may not be independent of the Volscian, etc. change. If one assumes that Umbrian r and rs are equivalent to the reflex of *d in Volscian, etc. then it is possible to argue that Umbrian shifted *d to rs, etc. originally only before labials. The situation existing in Umbrian in historical times would then be the result of the generalization of the change to other medial contexts, presumably after the speakers of Volscian, Marsian, etc. had migrated south.
For the reasons discussed above, the change of *d to r can at most be a weak form of evidence. One must arbitrarily select the analysis of Buck or the last analysis discussed above with the additional assumption that preconsonantal position before labials was the original locus of the change.

3.4 Secondary *ps > s

According to Mattiocco (1964:297) and Poccetti (1979:159) the Vestinian word osens, which shows assimilation of secondary ps, i.e. < *opsens < *opesens, illustrates an important innovation shared by Umbrian and Vestinian. For Poccetti, at least, this isogloss has important implications for determining the position of Vestinian. However, it is difficult to see how this feature could be of value for subgrouping. First, this change is not attested on all of the Umbrian inscriptions. On an inscription from Foligno one finds secondary *ps unassimilated, i.e. opset (Ve. 234). Second, the languages are contiguous. Thus the feature could be an areal one. And finally, since assimilations of this sort are relatively common it is perfectly possible that these are merely independent innovations. At any rate, it is clear that this assimilation is of no value for subgrouping.

3.5 Assibilation of dentals

Due to the fact that the Tabula Bantina shows assibilation of dentals, e.g. bansae < *bantya:y, zicolo < *dye:kolom, this Paelignian feature (musesa, petieBU) is offered as evidence for grouping Paelignian with Oscan (Durante 1978:802). The problem with this suggestion is that assibilation is restricted to one local dialect within Oscan. It is found only on the Tabula Bantina. Moreover,
this feature is found outside of Paelignian, on the Marsian-Latin text from the Fucine Lake area (Ve. 228a), e.g. martses < *martya:ys, and in the Sabine proper name Clausus < *klawdyos (see Conway 1897:369). Thus, assimilation appears to be a feature shared by the Sabellian languages located in the general vicinity of the Fucine lake (see Figure 11). It is impossible to say how far south this feature extended. But even if it did extend into Oscan territory, for example into the territory of the Frentani immediately south of the Paeligni and Marrucini, it is clear the feature did not cover all of Oscan territory and that its existence in the dialect of Bantia is an independent development. At any rate, this feature cannot be used as a criterion for subgrouping Paelignian with Oscan.

3.6 Conclusion

Of the five features which are commonly offered as criteria for subgrouping the Sabellian languages none appear to be solid features. The monophthongization of short diphthongs appears over the whole of central Italy. The same is true of the loss of primary and secondary *d after long vowels. With respect to the rhotacization of *d it is impossible to determine whether in fact the Umbrian change is similar to that attested in Volscian and Marsian-Latin. As a result these features are of little value for subgrouping. Rather, these features indicate a focal area for the spread of phonological changes in the early historical period.

The only feature which may be of value is the monophthongization of the long diphthong *a:y. This diphthong remains or is simplified to a in all but Umbrian and the western Sabellian languages. Thus,
this may be one feature indicating that these languages are to be grouped together.

4. The position of the Sabellian languages

In the final portion of this chapter the evidence for subgrouping the various Sabellian languages, with the exception of Hernican (for which there is no evidence (see Chapter 4, section 2)), is discussed and the position of each language is determined when that is feasible.

4.1 The position of Volscian

Although there is only one Volscian text, and some of the evidence is difficult to interpret, it is reasonably clear that Volscian is to be aligned closely with Umbrian. In fact there are only a few possible agreements with Oscan. The first concerns a lexical correspondence Volscian sepu and Oscan sipus. The significance of this correspondence is difficult to measure since Umbrian does have formations in *-wo-. Together with Oscan, Volscian also has a third singular imperative estu, cf. Oscan estud, as opposed to Umbrian futu. But again, if futu is equivalent to estu, and this is not clear since there may be some aspectual difference, the Umbrian form is obviously to be considered an innovation with respect to the other dialects. Thus the imperative estu may simply be a shared retention and its value as a diagnostic feature for subgrouping small. A final possible correspondence with Oscan could be the -tt- perfect formation, if sistiatien is analyzed as a -tt- perfect to a stem sesta:. The problems with this analysis were noted above, but it appears to be the best of the existing analyses. Thus, Volscian
shares with Oscan the formation of perfects in t to a-stem verbs. This is, however, the only correspondence Volscian shares with Oscan.

Although there is only one Volscian inscription, the number of features shared with Umbrian is substantial: 1) The monophthongization of the long diphthong *a:y, e.g. deue < *deyu:ya. 2) The palatalization of velars before yod, e.g. fa]ia < *fakya:d. 3) An accusative plural morpheme in -f < *-ns, e.g. asif. 4) The fronting of original long *u: to i, if bim is correctly analyzed, e.g. bim < *bu:m < *bo:m. 5) The lexical correspondences uesclis - Umbrian uesco:, couehriu - Umbrian ueiro. There is, in addition to the linguistic evidence, one non-linguistic correspondence of significance, namely the order of names in onomastic formulae. Volscian follows the Umbrian order of names: praenomen, patronymic, gentilicium.

In sum, then, despite the paucity of evidence for Volscian there are solid indications that Volscian is to be aligned closely with Umbrian.

4.2 The position of Marsian

It is impossible to determine precisely the position of Marsian within Oscan-Umbrian because the evidence is so meager. However, the evidence that does exist seems to point to a connection with Umbrian and Volscian. There is one innovation which supports this connection: the monophthongization of the long diphthong *a:y, e.g. *a:y > e (uesune < *ueso:na:y). This is the only linguistic evidence for subgrouping Marsian with Umbrian. There is, on the other hand, some
onomastic evidence and perhaps some toponymic evidence to support this conclusion.

As was noted earlier, Umbrian and Volscian have onomastic formulae which are distinct from Oscan and Latin in that the patronymic precedes the gentilicium. This innovative formula also appears in Marsian (Ve. 223). Two pieces of toponymy may support the hypothesis that Marsian belongs to the Umbrian-Volscian subgroup. The Marsic city Cerfennia contains the same root as the divine name cerr-ia/cerf-um < *kers-, thus indicating that the secondary *rs sequence was altered to rf. This city name may actually be a Latinization if the word (Gk) serfennia, cited by Diodorus (20.96), is equivalent to Cerfennia. If this is the true Marsian form of the city name then there is evidence that Marsian palatalized velars before front vowels. These suggestions are quite conjectural, however. Nevertheless, Marsian appears to align itself more closely Umbrian than with Oscan.

4.3 The position of Aequian

Linguistically, there is only one characteristic that can be used as a diagnostic feature for subgrouping, namely the monophthongization of the long diphthong *a:y. The word state < *statary indicates that Aequian treated the inherited long diphthongs like Marsian, Volscian, and Umbrian. In support of the assumption that Aequian is to be grouped with Umbrian one can cite the order of names in onomastic formulae. In the lone Aequian inscription the names are arranged in the order typical of Umbrian not Oscan/Latin.
4.4 The position of Sabine

The position of Sabine is probably impossible to determine. First, there is very little evidence. Moreover, the evidence which does exist is not securely established as Sabine. \(^{14}\) And more problematic is the fact that the evidence from the glosses and the inscription contradict each other in certain respects. For example, the glosses give some indication that Sabine monophthongized diphthongs. On the inscription from Amiternum the diphthong \(au\) remains. The glosses indicated that Sabine substituted \(f\) and not \(h\) for original \(*gh\). However, if the root \(hiretum\) is cognate with \(hircus\) then we possess an example of \(h\) for \(*gh\). It is all but impossible to resolve these contradictions.

Durante (1978:822 footnote 67) cites four pieces of evidence which indicate the Oscan nature of Sabine: 1) the raising of \(*o:\) to \(u\) (\(flusare\)); 2) the sacerdotal name \(Hirpi\); 3) the divine name \(Manners\); and 4) the assibilation of dentals (\(clausus\)). The evidence cited is not convincing. \(^{15}\) All of the Oscan-Umbrian languages, including Umbrian and those which are probably to be aligned with Umbrian, i.e. Volscian, Marsian, and Aequian, attest this change. The assibilation of dentals is probably also to be considered a feature of Marsian, a language which is not to be grouped closely with Oscan. Moreover, as was noted in section 3.5, the assibilation of dentals, while characteristic of Paelignian, a variety related to Oscan (see below), is characteristic only of the Oscan variety from Bantia. Thus, assibilation can scarcely be considered an important feature for subgrouping. In addition, in the inscription attributed to the Sabini there
is at least one non-Oscan feature, namely the preservation of the consonant stem abl sg ending, e.g. menese.

Thus, despite the claim of Durante, the position of Sabine remains a mystery.

4.5 The position of Vestinian

Since there are only scant remains of the Vestinian dialect it is all but impossible to determine the position of this dialect within Oscan-Umbrian. Despite the claim of Durante (1978:808) the raising of *or is of no use for determining subgrouping since it is shared by all of the Sabellian dialects, Oscan, and Umbrian. Poccetti (1979:155) thinks that the development of s from secondary *ps in osens has important implications for subgrouping. Indeed, in Umbrian secondary ps is generally written s, e.g. oseto (Ve. 233). However, as was noted above (section 3.4) this is not a feature of all Umbrian varieties. In (Ve. 234) secondary ps remains, i.e. opset. As a result, the assimilation of secondary *ps cannot be considered a reliable indication of an Vestinian-Umbrian connection. In fact the only indication of the position of Vestinian comes in the form of a shared retention, namely the preservation of original diphthongs, e.g. aidiles. Unfortunately this word is a Latin loan and as a result the diphthong could be a Latinism. At any rate it is scarcely enough to secure the position of Vestinian with Oscan as Mattiocco claims (1964:297).

4.6. The position of Paelignian

The position of Paelignian within Oscan-Umbrian is especially difficult due to the fact that Paelignian appears to share some
features with Umbrian to the exclusion of Oscan, and some features with Marrucinian to the exclusion of the rest of the Oscan-Umbrian languages. That Paelignian is to be aligned closely with Oscan cannot be doubted, however, since the two languages share a significant number of innovations (see below).

The following Umbrian-like features are found in Paelignian: 1) The treatment of secondary *rs clusters as rf, e.g. cerfum < *kersom (Ve. 213). 2) The existence of inom as a conjunction, cf. Umbrian temporal adverb enom, < *enom. 3) Retention of regular consonant stem ablative, e.g. aetate (Ve. 214). 4) The loss of final dentals after long vowels, e.g. dida < *dida:d (Ve. 213), aetatu < *ayta:to:d (Ve. 213).

Two of the features which Paelignian apparently shares with Umbrian can be dismissed from consideration immediately. aetate cannot be considered a Paelignian form. The diphthong in ae indicates that it is a loan from Latin. Thus the inflectional ending is conceivably Latin also, cf. aetatu where the stem is Latin but the inflectional ending Paelignian. As a result the retention of the regular consonant stem ending cannot be considered a shared feature. Similarly, the loss of final dentals after long vowels cannot be considered an Umbrian-like feature since this change is shared by all central Italic languages. The treatment of secondary *rs as rf and the existence of inom are more problematic. With respect to the conjunction inom it is unnecessary to consider it a common innovation with Umbrian enom. Since Paelignian also preserves a conjunction inim, cf. Oscan inim, it appears that apophonic variants were pre-
served in Paelignian. As a result both must be reconstructed for Oscan-Umbrian. One can easily assume that the variant inom was specialized for temporal function in Umbrian but became a connective in Oscan and Paelignian, with Oscan eliminating the variant inom in favor of inim. The outcome of secondary *rs as rf occurs only on the Herentas inscription from Corfinium. In all other inscriptions, including others from Corfinium, *rs is realized as r(r). As a result, it is unlikely that the rf treatment is a special regional variant. Though it is impossible to prove, it is conceivable that cerfum is a borrowing from a Marsian variety spoken on the east coast of the Fucine Lake. There can be no doubt that Marsian and Paelignian speakers were in contact since both belonged to the same confederacy, which was formed to fight the Romans during the second Samnite war. On the other hand, it is just as conceivable that rf represents the 'original' treatment of *rs in Paelignian and that rr is the result of contact with Latin speakers (Lazzeroni 1965). Thus, it is possible that Paelignian shares with Umbrian the treatment of secondary *rs.

The nom sg/dat sg in a which Paelignian shares with Marrucinian is more difficult. Since the Herentas inscription does have -u < *a; it is probably the case that Paelignian (and Marrucinian) have not retained *a; in word-final position (though it could be the case that *a; was rounded but not raised enough to warrant an o writing), cf. the fluctuation in Umbrian (see also Chapter 4, section 7.4). On the other hand both features could be the result of contact with Latin varieties with nom sg and dat sg in a (see Lazzeroni 1965). The Latin influences in Paelignian make this last hypothesis very plausible.
The most important features Paelignian shares with Oscan are: 1) The preservation of original diphthongs, e.g. oisa < *oysaːd, puclouis < *putloya, loufir < *lowdheros, eite < *eyte, peumperia, scaifia. 2) Epenthesis in RC clusters, e.g. anaceta, anacta < *angeta, alafis < *alfis, herec. < *herk-, calauan < *kalwanos. At this point it is convenient to note that the Herentas inscription also attests CR epenthesis although it is different from that attested in Oscan. In Oscan this variety of epenthesis occurs only after a short syllable, e.g. paterei (Ve. 147) but maatreis (Ve. 175). In the Paelignian words pristafalacirix and sacaracirix epenthesis occurs regardless of the length of the preceding syllable. However, epenthesis occurs only in these two words; pacris remains unaffected. The explanation of this oddity is problematic. It may be due to contact with north Oscan speakers, perhaps from the area of the Frentani. One could easily imagine that Paelignian speakers misinterpreted the contexts in which this phonological process occurred and generalized it to contexts where it did not occur in Oscan, namely in CR clusters after a long syllable. Overgeneralization of a feature is typical of contact-induced change. At any rate, as a diagnostic feature CR epenthesis is of little value since the process is not attested in all Oscan dialects, e.g. Capua puklum (Ve. 147). 3) Acc pl in s < *ns, e.g. puus < *kɔ̃ns. 4) the reflexive dat sg in sefei as opposed to Umbrian seso. 5) Denominative perfect formations in t, e.g. locatin, colisatens. 6) Secondary passive in -ter, e.g. upsaseter. 7) The extension of the o-stem endings into C-stems, e.g. aetatu. 8) The lack of palatalization of k before i/e, e.g. cerria. 9) and possibly
the treatment of secondary *rs clusters as rr, e.g. cerria < *ker-sva:y, though this may be a Latinism.

Due to the rather extensive similarities, both phonological and morphological, between Oscan and Paelignian there can be little doubt that Paelignian is to be subgrouped with Oscan. The similarities with Umbrian noted above are probably illusory, save perhaps for the change of secondary *rs to rf.

4.7 The position of Marrucinian

Of all of the Italic dialects Marrucinian is clearly the most difficult to subgroup. The main difficulty does not lie in the fact that there are few data to work with, but in the fact that the data lead to somewhat conflicting conclusions. Most of the data suggest a close connection with Oscan, but some data suggest a connection with Umbrian as well.

The most important features which Marrucinian shares with Oscan are: 1) Perfect formations in -t-, e.g. amatens. 2) The use of a pronominal stem *eko-, e.g. ecan. 3) RC epenthesis, e.g. salaus. 4) And possibly the treatment of secondary *rs as rr, e.g. ceria, though this may be a Latinism. In addition to these isoglosses it is probably fair to add the preservation of diphthongs. In the bronze of Rapino only the diphthong *ey is consistently monophthongized; *ow is variably monophthongized. The other diphthongs remain. As a result the tendency toward monophthongization is probably to be seen as a Marrucinian innovation. The tendency to monophthongize *ey may even be areal if the genitives in -es from the area of the Frentani, just south of Marrucinian territory, are from *ey (Ve. 172).
With Umbrian Marrucinian shares two features: the retention of C-stem ablatives in -e, e.g. agine, and the treatment of original *-ns as -f, e.g. iafc < *eansk(e). The significance of the first feature cannot be considered great because this is a shared retention rather than innovation. On the other hand, the treatment of original *-ns as -f is quite important and appears to be a legitimate shared innovation. Thus, Marrucinian appears to occupy a somewhat intermediate position between Oscan and Umbrian, sharing most features with Oscan and the treatment of original *ns with Umbrian.

5. Concluding observations

The survey of the epigraphic evidence for the Sabellian languages supports the conclusion that these languages do not form a genetic subgroup in and of themselves. In fact, the evidence appears to suggest that these languages are to be divided, albeit crudely speaking, into two subgroups: a western subgroup including Volscian and probably Marsian and Aequian, although the evidence supporting this hypothesis is extremely superficial, which has close ties with Umbrian; and an eastern group including Paelignian and Marrucinian which has close affinities with Oscan. Given the geographical position of Vestinian one might expect this language to share, along with Paelignian and Marrucinian, characteristics with Oscan. However, from the data which exist it is impossible to tell. Similarly, the geographical position of Sabine, sandwiched as it is between Umbrian to the north and Aequian to the south, suggests that it be aligned
with the Umbrian group. There is, however, no positive evidence for such a connection.

The Oscan-Umbrian languages cannot be divided into (two) separate and independent subgroups as is the general practice, however. There is evidence from two (or perhaps three, depending on how one treats the change of *rs in Paelignian) of the Sabellian languages for linguistic features which cross over the division between the Umbrian group and the Oscan group. In Marrucinian there is evidence that the outcome of original *ns# clusters is -f as in Umbrian. In Oscan final *-ns# appears simply as s. Similarly, Volscian agrees with Oscan in the formation of t perfects to long a: stems; t-perfects are unknown in Umbrian. As a result, it seems impossible to recognize a clearcut dialectal division. Rather, it appears that we must recognize, at least in the prehistoric period, a dialect continuum for the Oscan-Umbrian languages. Oscan may appear at one end of the continuum, and Umbrian at the other. In between the two we must recognize truly intermediate dialects: those sharing most features with Umbrian but a few with Oscan; and those that share most features with Oscan but a few with Umbrian. Thus, a rather more accurate 'tree' diagram for the Oscan-Umbrian languages is that given in Figure 12, which recognizes the fact the shared linguistic features cross over the general dialect boundaries that have been established.
Footnotes—Chapter 4

1 There are two articles which are concerned with Italic dialect geography, Porzig (1953) and Schrijnen (1918). For the most part, however, these papers are concerned with isoglosses which separate the Latin dialects from the Oscan-Umbrian dialects. Poultney (1951) briefly mentions a number of possible areal features when discussing the Volscian-Umbrian connection. Unfortunately, he does not consider how these features affect the subgrouping of Volscian or the Sabellian languages in general.

2 Schrijnen (1918) relies for the most part on the discussion of Sabine, Marsian, and Hernican provided by Conway (1891; 1897). Thus, the fact that he subgroups these languages with Latin should not be at all surprising.

3 It is not clear that shared retentions in general are totally valueless for determining genetic relationships. There may be some retentions which are so 'odd' or 'striking' as to be of value. A possible example comes to mind. In an article on the IE verb 'to be' Bader (1976) has argued that the Latin and Oscan 1st sg pres ind form sum/sun is actually an archaism, i.e. the 1st sg of an old semi-thematic paradigm, < *s-ō-m. Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that Bader's analysis is persuasive. The fact that only Latin and Oscan(-Umbrian) among all the IE languages have retained this form would surely be of value for subgrouping. The chances of two IE languages preserving such a form and then migrating to the same peninsula seems infinitesimally small. Thus, there may actually be cases where one could argue for a shared retention as evidence for subgrouping.

4 The Faliscan evidence, efiles, pafo, carefo is crucial since Faliscan is subgrouped with Latin. Of equal importance are two Latin glosses: nefrones 'testiculi' (Paul. Fest. 163M) and nefrundines 'rienes' (Fest. 277M). This evidence indicates that the steps in the development of the aspirates medially must have been *bh > *ph > f > v > b. Oscan-Umbrian, Faliscan, and some Latin dialects progressed only as far as stage 3.

5 The value of this feature is seriously questionable. In a Praenestine Latin inscription the sequence -en- is attested in the word loesa (Ve. 366b), albeit from an earlier *ken- < *lowkena:. It is at least possible that rural varieties of Latin maintained -en- clusters
and that the change of -sn- to V:in was a feature primarily of urban Latin.

6 Most historical Latin grammars assume that the IE long diphthongs disappeared in Italic, i.e. merged with the corresponding short diphthongs. If the a:/ay alternation which exists in Latin for the dative singular is in fact a Latin innovation then it appears that the long diphthongs remained in Italic. This would account rather nicely for the Faliscan facts also. The shortening of long diphthongs would then be an Oscan-Umbrian innovation.

7 See Chapter 4, footnote 43 for a brief discussion of this question.

8 In general Faliscan shares with Umbrian the tendency to lose all final consonants. For discussion see Diver (1953:174ff.) and R. Giacomelli (1978:22ff.).

9 For discussion of the evidence for *d > rs/r/r in Umbrian see Buck (1928:82-3) and Poulteny (1959:59).

10 The morphology of this Umbrian form is perplexing. Most analyze it as a 3 pl perf ind. The final -t makes this analysis problematic. For an alternative hypothesis see Lejeune (1976:564-65).

11 The *dy sequence in zicolom is probably not original. zi- is probably equivalent to Latin sler-. As a result the shift from £ to y is probably a local change, cf. Faliscan foled 'today' < *ghodie:d < *ghodie:d.

12 In initial position Oscap treats *dy in the same manner as Latin, i.e. *dy > y Oscap ìûvèl (Ve. 88b). However, the sequence dy is attested on some early inscriptions, e.g. diûvel (Ve. 147).

13 Convergences of this sort are precisely what one would expect in areas where languages are in contact with one another.

14 See Chapter 4, footnote 43.

15 According to Radke (1981:27ff., 99) Maimers is not a deity indigenous to the Sabines and Oscans but rather was borrowed from Latin speakers. If this was the case, then this correspondence can no longer be used as evidence for grouping Sabine and Oscan.
Table 1. Monophthogization of short diphthongs.

*aw > oi: Umbrian ute/ote
         non-Urban Latin plostrum
         Praenestine Latin Plotia/Plautia
         Faliscan Pola
         cf. Oscan auti, Urban Latin aut

*ow > o:  Umbrian tutas/totar (gen sg)
         Volscian toticu
         Marrucinian totai (but toutai)
         Faliscan loferta
         Praenestine Latin losna, Oufilio
         Norba locina
         cf. Oscan ttof/kis, Urban Latin lu:n

*ey > e:  Umbrian Iuwe
         Marsian Ioue
         Volscian sepis
         Praenestine Latin Hercole
         Tibur Marte
         Tusculum Maurte
         Alba patre
         Lanuvium Iunone
         Faliscan he
         cf. Oscan IuweI, Urban Latin patri:

*ay > e:  Umbrian esunu
         Volscian esaristrom
         Marsian esos
         Faliscan pretod, efes
         Praenestine Latin ce[sula], caici
         rural Latin pretor, cecilius
         Sabine fedus
         cf. Oscan prai, Urban Latin prae

Table 2. Monophthongization of *a:y.

*a:y > e: Umbrian tute
         Volscian declune
         Aequian state
         Marsian victorie
         cf. rural Latin loucina, Praenestine Latin primogenia,
         Romai, Marrucinian toutai, Urban Latin case, Faliscan
         lunai, Oscan deivai
Figure 2. **Subgrouping schema 1.**

Figure 3. **Subgrouping schema 2.**
Figure 4. **Subgrouping schema 3.**

Figure 5. **Subgrouping schema 4.**
Figure 6. Subgrouping schema 5.
Figure 7. Monophthongization of short diphthongs.
Figure 8. Monophthongization of *a:y.
Figure 9. Loss of word final d/ V: __ #.
Figure 10. *d > r/ [labial consonant].
Figure 11. Assibilation of dentals.
Oscan Paelignian Marrucinian Volscian (Marsian Aequian) Umbrian

**Shared Innovations:**

- **t-perfect:**
  
- **secondary *rs > rf:** <--------------

- ***ns# > f:** + + + + + +

- **C-stem abl sg in *u(d):** o o o o o o

- ***ui > i:** c c c c c c

- **a:yi > e** SSSSSSSSSSSSSS

*Figure 12. Modified Tree Diagram Illustrating The Subgrouping the Sabellian languages.*
Chapter 5
Conclusion

The principle aims of this work have been to describe the linguistic characteristics of the Sabellian languages and, based on these characteristics, to determine the relationships of these languages within Oscan-Umbrian. The success with which these aims have been achieved varies considerably depending, to a great degree, upon the Sabellian language in question. For example, in the case of Volscian it was possible to determine a number of linguistic features and describe with some certainty its position within Oscan-Umbrian. This situation is to be compared with that of the Hernican, Sabine, Marsian, and Aequian languages, about which it was possible to determine very little. The relationship of these languages to Oscan, Umbrian, and the other Sabellian languages remains relatively obscure.

The positive contributions of this work to Italic studies are to be found primarily in the areas of textual and linguistic analysis. This study is among the first to focus entirely on the linguistic evidence for the Sabellian languages. This work is also important for the light it sheds, or in some cases fails to shed, on the subgrouping within Oscan-Umbrian. But despite the fact that it was impossible to determine the relationship of every Sabellian language, it was possible to show that the subgrouping schemata described in the
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literature were inaccurate and to offer in their place what is, given
the evidence, a more reliable and realistic picture of the dialect
relationships.

The study of the Italic branch of IE is nearly synonymous with
the study of Latin. Latin is, of course, the most prominent language
of ancient Italy, from both a historical and linguistic point of view.
And yet relatively little is known about the diffusion of the language
throughout central Italy. As a modest contribution to this area of
study, a number of Latinisms have been described in the Sabellian
languages.

This work also contributes some much needed information toward a
dialect geography of central Italy in the 5th century. Previous
investigations of ancient Italic dialect geography focused primarily
on characteristics separating Latin from Oscan-Umbrian, e.g. the
labialization of IE labiovelars, the treatment of IE aspirates in
medial position, etc. Relatively little attention was given other
possible areal features. In Chapter 4 it was shown that a number of
linguistic features had diffused among contiguous dialects in central
Italy, particularly among Umbrian, Faliscan, rural Latin dialects, and
the western Sabellian languages.

The diffusion of linguistic features among contiguous dialects is
also important for those who wish to argue that the similarities
between Latin and Oscan-Umbrian are the result of contact. The major
problem for this hypothesis is the fact that it was heretofore
impossible to cite, except perhaps for the rhotacization of inter-
vocalic *s, a sufficient number of areal features to make the hypo-
thesis plausible (see Diver (1953)). Although the discovery of the
diffusion of features via contact during the historical period can be
no guarantee of the diffusion of features via contact during the
prehistoric period, it does suggest that this line of study merits
serious investigation and that the evidence for the 'Italic contro-
versy' needs to be reexamined.
Appendix—Old Sabellian

0. Introduction

The phrase Old Sabellian refers to the language of sixteen inscriptions which were found in the region of southern Picenum and northern Samnium. At the present time the phrase Old Sabellian is no longer in vogue. Most scholars prefer the phrase South Picene to refer to these inscriptions despite the geographical inaccuracy involved; the Italian scholar Alessandro Morandi has recently suggested the phrase Medio-Adriatic and it appears to have caught on, at least among Italian scholars.

In the phrase Old Sabellian the adjective 'old' refers specifically to the age of the inscriptions; it is not to be interpreted as referring to a stage of language development antedating that of the other Sabellian languages. According to Morandi (1974:79) these inscriptions are among the oldest linguistic evidence attested for an Italic language. The inscriptions are generally dated to the 6th and 5th centuries.

As noted above, the territory in which these inscriptions were found covers a rather extensive portion of the eastern coast of central Italy, from central Picenum to the Aternus river valley. Thus, the area in which the inscriptions were found corresponds to no
ethnogeographic division handed down by tradition (Durante 1951:164; Whatmough 1937:243). Inscriptions are found in the territory of the Picentes, Praetutti, Vestini, Paeligni, and Marrucini. Despite the fact that the area in which the inscriptions were found extends over five ethno-geographic divisions, at least according to tradition, the inscriptions themselves appear to be relatively homogenous. The alphabet employed in writing the inscriptions is essentially the same and the linguistic features, as far as they can be determined, appear similar.

All sixteen Old Sabellian inscriptions are written in an alphabet which appears to be a descendent of an Etrusco-Campanian model with direct East Greek influences (see Morandi 1974:74 and Whatmough 1933:530). Despite the overall similarities in the script, however, there are some peculiarities which are restricted geographically. Roughly speaking, the inscriptions can be divided into three groups on the basis of these differences: a northern group which corresponds to the area of the Picentes; a middle group which corresponds to Praetuttian territory; and a southern group which encompasses the territory of the eastern Sabellian languages (see Morandi 1974:25 and Whatmough 1933:222).

The dating of these inscriptions is based solely on epigraphic evidence. According to Morandi (1974:79) and Whatmough (1933:228, 530) the archaeological contexts in which they were found provide no data to independently establish dates for the inscriptions. They cite two good indications for dating the inscriptions to the 6th and 5th centuries. First, the interpunction agrees with that of Etruscan
inscriptions from the 6th and 5th centuries. Second, the writing is 
'serpentine', a style characteristic of Etruscan and Venetic inscrip-
tions of the 6th and 5th centuries.

Since most of the inscriptions were found in necropolises and 
since most contain onomastic formulae they are generally regarded as 
funerary inscriptions. This classification is probably accurate for 
two-thirds of the inscriptions. (Mo. 15) may actually be a building 
inscription, however. Unfortunately, this inscription is difficult 
to interpret. (Mo. 9) appears to be a private inscription indicating 
ownership. What variety of inscription (Mo. 12), (Mo. 13), and (Mo. 14) are cannot be determined with any probability.

Surely the feature which most characterizes the Old Sabellian 
inscriptions as a whole is their obscurity. Five of the fifteen 
inscriptions, (Mo. 7), (Mo. 12), (Mo. 13), (Mo. 14), and (Mo. 15), are 
for the most part unintelligible. Five inscriptions, (Mo. 1), (Mo. 4), (Mo. 6), (Mo. 9), (Mo. 10), and (Mo. 16) can be given credible 
interpretations at least in part. The remaining inscriptions, (Mo. 2), (Mo. 3), (Mo. 5), (Mo. 8), and (Mo. 11), consist only of onomastic 
formulae. There are a number of factors which contribute to the 
obscurity of these inscriptions. First, there are numerous words 
which are unanalyzable not only in terms of their meaning but also in 
terms of their inflectional morphology. As a result, in some cases it 
is impossible even to guess the function of the word in the inscrip-
tion. Second, there is some disagreement about what sounds are 
represented by some of the signs (see Whatmough (1933:224)). Gener-
ally, disagreements about what sound a sign represents leads to
disagreements about the interpretation of the inscriptions the signs are found in.

1. Commentary

Most of the features which are offered as evidence for determining the position of Old Sabellian are derived, as one would of course expect, from the inscriptions which can be interpreted, at least to some degree. As a result I have restricted my commentary to these inscriptions. (Mo. 15), while basically uninterpretable, does provide some information which may be of value for subgrouping. As a result I have included this inscription here also. For discussion of the remaining inscriptions the reader is referred to the works of Blumenthal (1929), Durante (1951), Morandi (1974, 1978), Pisani (1959), and Whatmough (1933).

1.1 The inscription from Loro Piceno

(Mo. 1):

\[
\text{apaes qupat[ e]sm} \\
\text{in pwpnjs n} \\
\text{fr me:ipn seia} \\
t \text{sep}i
\]

Most commentators are in agreement about five of the first six words of this inscription. \text{apaes} is nom sg of a praenomen equivalent to Latin \text{Appaeus}. The Old Sabellian form shows syncope of the vowel of the final syllable, i.e. \text{*appayos} > \text{*appays}. The representation of the diphthong resulting from syncope as \text{ae} is not totally unexpected. The \text{ae} spelling is attested in Paelignian under similar circumstances, e.g. \text{Anaes} (Ve. 214) < \text{*annayos}, cf. Latin \text{Annaeus}, and \text{Acaes} (Po.
209) < *akkayos. qupat (3 sg pres ind) quite obviously corresponds to Latin cubat 'lies' (CIL I² 1259), Faliscan cupa (Gi. 121), Marrucinian cibat (Po. 205), and Paelignian incubat (Ve. 214), all of which occur on funerary inscriptions. The funerary nature of this inscription is thus assured. The first letter of the third word is generally restored as e and this form is interpreted as a locative adverb indicating the place of burial, literally meaning 'in this (place)'. In function, then, this form is probably equivalent to Latin hic 'here', Faliscan he(c), both of which occur on funerary inscriptions. Formally, [e]smín consists of a pronominal stem *e- or *eks- (cf. Oscan exeic < *eksey-ke and (Mo. 16) eksmin < *eksmei-en (?) plus the pronominal inflectional ending *-smey/i to which is appended the locative affix *-en (Radke 1962:1768). [e]smín is thus comparable formally to the Umbrian forms esmei, esnik (dat sg) and esme (loc sg). nir is a nom sg noun in apposition to apaes. Formally this word corresponds perfectly to the Oscan nominative niir (Ve. 5) < *H₂-ne:r. Based on the use of the word in Oscan the meaning of nir is probably more on the order of 'magister' than 'vir' (see Vetter 1953:36). mei/n is generally analyzed as consisting of a stem me-, cf. the base of the first person possessive pronoun in Latin meus < *me-yo-s, and an affix -i/n which is interpreted as a combination of the locative case ending with the addition of the postpositional particle *-en, < *me-yey-en.

There are two fundamentally different interpretations for the fourth word in this inscription, pupunis. Some, e.g. De Simone (1969:227), Pisani (1964:228), Olzscha (1963:103), interpret this word
as a locative singular noun meaning 'grave, tomb'. Etymologically Pisani (op. cit.) has connected the root of this word with that found in Sanskrit *gabhī:-/gabhī:ra- 'deep', *gamban- 'depth', *pit, i.e. < *gʷo(m)b-. Others, e.g. Morandi (1974:81), assume that this word is a gentilicium corresponding to Latin pomponius, derived ultimately from the numeral five, i.e. < *pe₇n₇e.

The evidence appears to be evenly divided between the two hypotheses. In favor of the interpretation of *pupunis as 'grave, tomb' one can cite the fact that this word occurs in a number of funerary inscriptions. Further, the appearance of this word in (Mo. 6) does not seem to support an onomastic interpretation (see below section 2.3). In favor of the onomastic solution one can cite (Mo. 16) where the existence of *lepētīn 'stone, tomb' appears to rule out the interpretation of px( )puxes as 'grave, tomb'.

An additional problem with the interpretation of *pupunis is the fact that the reading of the final character is not clear. The form of the letter is >. A letter of this precise configuration is found in no other Old Sabellian inscription but the basic shape, save for the horizontal stroke, resembles an s. This is the interpretation adopted by Morandi. If this reading is correct then the analysis of Pisani et al., who read this letter as an n, loses some of its appeal. An s does not readily correspond to a locative singular ending.

The interpretations proposed for the final two forms in this inscription are very speculative.

Morandi (1974:82) suggests that seiat be analyzed as a 3rd singular active subjunctive of the verb 'be'. Within the context of
this inscription this connection appears quite attractive. However, there is some reason to regard this identification with suspicion. For Morandi *seiat* is to be parsed as *siti*, the weak stem of the subjunctive (i.e. $<*\text{sithi}>^6$, $+\text{a}$, subjunctive affix, cf. Latin *dicat*). The representation of *siti* by *sei* is problematic because there seems to be no reason to believe that the sequence *ei* can represent a long *iː* in Old Sabellian, beyond the fact, which in itself is irrelevant, that *ei* sometimes represents a long *iː* in Umbrian and Latin. Moreover, the Old Sabellian evidence, meagre though it is, seems to indicate that IE diphthongs were preserved, e.g. *suais* (Mo. 6), *materein* (Mo. 6), *deiktam* (Mo. 15), etc. The use of a digraph to represent a long vowel would be expected only if *sy* and *iː* had merged.

An alternative solution, though one encountering a difficulty similar to that of Morandi, is suggested by Brian Joseph (personal communication). *seiat* could be a direct reflex of IE *syət*. Such a proposal requires a sound change whereby *eː > aː* after palatals, a particularly common dissimilatory change. The difficulty with this solution is the fact that it is not easy to explain the correspondence between *sy* and *ei*. One could assume that Consonant/Glide sequences developed an epenthetic vowel, as happens in Latin, i.e. *syət > syət* (cf. Old Latin *sied*), and that the epenthetic vowel was written *e* so as to be distinguished from the following glide. It is also possible that the vowel here is the result of Lindeman’s Law, i.e. *y > iy* in original monosyllables. However, this analysis of *seiat < *syət* is extremely speculative.
sepeti is generally interpreted as a locative singular formation. Morandi (1974:83) connects the root of this word, i.e. sep-, with the root in the Umbrian word sepse, which is itself perhaps derived from *sayp-sei'd 'fenced off, in private' (see Poulterney 1959:323). The IE root would then be *sayp- 'fence in' (Pokorny 1959:878). Morandi suggests an abstract formation meaning 'protection'. Unfortunately he does not provide a more detailed analysis of the morphology of this word, i.e. the suffixal material -et-. At any rate, this analysis is problematic because the Old Sabellian evidence seems to indicate the preservation of IE diphthongs (see above).

In summary, the interpretation of the first part this inscription is secure except for the word popunis. The final part of the inscription is, in my opinion, without a convincing analysis. 'Appius (Pomponius ?), magister, lies here (in this tomb ?). May he be (?) in my (?)

1.2 The inscription from Belmonte

(Mo. 4):

apunis q[upa]t a[—] es[men—]
[—]xxi . . . litas estas amm
enas xkleixxx x[—]

If Radke's (1962:1767−68) restoration of the second word is accepted then this inscription, like (Mo. 1), is also a funerary inscription. The first word is probably a praenomen in *-yos with syncope of the vowel in the final syllable, cf. Latin Apo:nius. The restoration of the fourth word as a locative pronominal form is probable based on the existence of the locative form [e]sam in (Mo. 1). Since it is impossible to interpret any of the forms surrounding
estas identification of this word cannot be made with certainty. Formally, it appears to be a gen sg/nom pl pronominal form whose stem is est-. The same stem is found in the word estuk (Mo. 6), in Umbrian estu, and in Latin iste. 7

There have been various attempts to connect . fitas with Oscan eituas and Marrucinian eituam 'pecuniam' ('money') but the connection is difficult to maintain for a number of reasons. First, one would expect the diphthong *ey to be represented as <ei> based on its representation on other inscriptions, e.g. (Mo. 6). Second, this connection requires the ad hoc assumption of different stem types, a *-tu- stem for Oscan and Marrucinian and a *-ta:- (?) stem for Old Sabellian. Similarly, Old Sabellian amunias does not match up particularly well with Oscan amvianud despite the fact that both share the initial sequence am-. The Oscan word is, according to most authorities (see, for example, Pisani 1964:68 and Vetter 1953:55), a calque on the Greek ἡμιοστορ street, ward, district' and is to be analyzed as am-via:- (a:)no-. The Old Sabellian word cannot be given the same analysis without providing for a reasonable account of the correspondence between Old Sabellian -e- and Oscan ia. There is no easy explanation at hand. Moreover, this connection also requires the ad hoc assumption of different stem types, an o-stem for Oscan and an a:-stem for Old Sabellian. Unfortunately the state of this inscription is such that no support for this correspondence can be derived from the context. As a result, this correspondence cannot be considered secure, despite some superficial phonological similarities.
Only the basic elements of this funerary inscription are translatable: 'Apōnius ??? lies in this (place) . . .' .

1.3 The inscription from Montecalvo (Mo. 6) is a sandstone cippus with an inscription on each side.

Side A: pōpūnum estu:k apaiūs
adstaiūn suai:s manus
mei̇tim̄m̄

Side B: materēi̇n  materēi̇n  été:;
út  épir̄in  arit̄in  imi̇n  pu̇n̄

With the exception of the first and last word side A is interpretable even though the morphology of some of the words is not very clear. The form of pōpūnum here presents real problems for those who wish to see this word as an onomasticon. Morandi, who favors this interpretation, is at a loss to find a reasonable explanation for this form. In the end he suggests it is a gen pl and admits that the syntactic relationship between this word and the rest of the sentence is not clear. If pōpūnum is analyzed as an u-stem acc sg then it can be interpreted as the object of adstaiūn and in agreement with the demonstrative estu:k, which is itself generally interpreted as an acc sg form < *estom-ke. The only problem for the interpretation of estu:k as an acc sg form is the fact that *o is written u. One might have expected the sign ū, which generally represents the IE mid vowels on the inscriptions from the territory of the Picentes. apaiūs appears to be the nom pl of a gentilicium < *appayoa:s, cf. apaes (Mo. 1), and the subject of the verb adstaiūn.

It is unanimously agreed by commentators on Old Sabellian that adstaiūn is a verb form, cf. adstae:ms (Mo. 15). Morphologically,
adstafuh is analyzable into a preverb ad-, a root sta plus an affix ū, though what this corresponds to in IE terms is unclear. The final portion of this word is also obscure, in part because the final sign is impossible to interpret precisely. Despite this obstacle, most commentators see in -ūn a 3 pl past act ending *-ont with weakening of the final consonants (see Blumenthal 1929:55 and Pisani 1964:228).

This verb and adstaems in (Mo. 15) are generally compared to the Oscan forms stalet (3 pl pres act) (Ve. 81) and stahint (3 pl pres act) (Ve. 94A), both meaning 'stant'. Unfortunately this comparison is not as good as it appears on the surface. The Oscan verbs are intransitive in meaning while the Old Sabellian verbs, to judge at least from (Mo. 6), are transitive. Thus, attempts to derive the Old Sabellian forms from a stative formation *sta-e:- (Cowgill 1973) posited for the Oscan verbs encounters semantic difficulties.

Blumenthal (1929:55) and Radke (1962:1769) have analyzed the Old Sabellian verbs as -w- perfects built on a causitive stem *-ye-, i.e. < *ad-sta-ye-w-ont/-mos. There is little evidence to suggest that these verbs are -w- perfects. In fact there is no evidence from adstaems and the ū in adstafuh appears to be best analyzed as part of the inflectional ending. Furthermore, it is difficult to argue for a perfect indicative formation based on a causitive stem *-ye-. In Latin, for example, the causative affix is restricted to the present system, cf. Latin moneo: < *moneyo: but monui: < *mon-w-ai in the perfect.

At this point there appears to be no satisfactory analysis of the Old Sabellian verbs. One can only note that the verbs are probably
transitive and that the connection with Oscan stalet, etc. is, in terms of stem formation, illusory.

The interpretation of sualis manus seems straightforward: a noun phrase in dat/abl case. manus probably shows syncope of the vowel in the final syllable and then simplification of the resulting consonant cluster, i.e. < *manufs < *manubhos.

For the final word on side A there are two interpretations. According to Pisani (1964:228) meitiaun is an acc sg meaning 'monumentum' in apposition to pūpūnum estu:k. Pisani connects the root of this word to that found in Latin me:ta 'a conical or pyramid-shaped figure', i.e. from IE *me:y-t- 'to fix, build (fences)' (see Pokorny 1959:709). The suffix -im- can be compared to that found in Latin words such as sacrima, victima, etc.

Side A may then be translated as follows: 'The gens Appaius set up this tomb (???) with their own hands as a monument.'

Side B is for the most part incomprehensible. The meaning of the first two words is certain but it is not clear whether the inflectional ending -eih represents a gen sg or a dat sg. The final portion of the third word, i.e. -tur, seems to point to an agent noun in *-toir. It is conceivable that the stem is the same as that found in Latin tueor 'care for, protect, guard'. If this is the case then eu:itur can be analyzed as *tue:to:r 'protector, guardian'. No satisfactory analyses of the final four words exist.

1.4 The inscription from Campovalano

Of all of the Old Sabellian inscriptions this inscription (Mo. 9) is probably the most intriguing. The inscription is written on a cup
of clay and in all probability designates the owner of the cup (see below). The inscription reads:

\[ a()piesesum. \]

The fascinating aspect about this inscription concerns how it is to be broken up into words. Based on parallel inscriptions in other Italic languages, e.g. Oscan, we know that the formula is gen sg + 1 sg of the verb 'be', e.g. \[ veltineisim (= veltineis sim 'I belong to Veltinus'). \]

Thus, it would seem reasonable to divide between the final \( e \) and \( s \) yielding \[ a()piese sum \] since \( sum \) is the well-known 1 sg form of the verb 'be' in Italic. This is in fact the analysis accepted by Prosdocimi (1974:386). Unfortunately, it is not easy, despite the attempts of Prosdocimi and Pisani, to analyze the remaining portion of the inscription as a gen sg.

There are a number of Oscan inscriptions which have been discovered in Campania which seem in all respects similar to this inscription, e.g. (Ve. 117) \[ luvcies \cdot cnai.vlies . sum \] (Etruscan alphabet) 'I belong to Lucius Gnaivius.'; (Ve. 126) \[ kanutie assesim \] 'I belong to Canutius.' These inscriptions follow the same formula as noted above, i.e. gen plus 1 sg of verb 'be'. The genitives are in -\( es \). As a result, it is probable that the genitive is in -\( es \) and that the inscription should be divided between the first \( s \) and second \( e \), i.e. \[ a()pies esum. \] This leaves \( esum \) and the gen sg in -\( es \) to be explained.

The gen sg formations in -\( es \) are not native to Oscan, and probably not to Old Sabellian. It is unlikely that they are monophthongizations of *-\( eys \) genitives since *\( ey \) remains in Oscan and, to
judge from materem in (Mo. 6), in Old Sabellian also. A likely explanation for the -es genitives in Oscan appears when one considers the fact that they occur on vases produced in Etruscan pottery factories in Campania (see Conway 1897:94-95). Thus, it is at least possible that the -es genitives are due to Etruscan influence (so Conway 1897:95 and Vetter 1953:95). Whether this explanation is possible, or even likely, for the Old Sabellian inscription cannot be determined.

The verb form esum is cited by Varro (L.L. 9,100) as the form used by the 'antiqui'. Most commentators view this citation as an analogical creation on the part of Varro himself. The fact that the form is cited in the context of a discussion of analogy lends credence to this hypothesis. However, we should not be too quick to dismiss the possibility that Varro actually found the form esum in some of the rural dialects. Additional support for the analysis of esum as 1 sg of the verb 'be' is provided by the discovery of two inscriptions recently in Campania: fratiesum (Nocera), Iejesum (Vico Equense) (for discussion see Arena (1974), Colonna (1974), and Prosdocimi (1974). Although there are some problems interpreting these inscriptions a plausible analysis has been offered by Colonna (1974:383-84). Based on the Oscan inscriptions from Campania Colonna suggests that these inscriptions also be interpreted as containing genitives in -es plus the verb 'be' esum.

The origin of a verb form esum is more difficult. If this form is derived from a proto-form *esmi then it is conceivable that esum is the result of (1) syncope of final *i ( > *esm, cf. Latin est < *esti)
and (2) development of an epenthetic vowel with labial qualities due to the following m (≥ *esam > (*esom ?) > esum).

1.5 The inscription from Bellante

(Mo. 10):


Approximately half of this inscription can be analyzed. p.stin corresponds quite straightforwardly to the Oscan preposition pustin (Ve. 1) 'according to' < *posty-en. The Oscan word takes an accusative noun phrase complement. As a result, one can be reasonably sure that siam, even though it is without a good interpretation, depends on p.stin.15 sidetas may be a gen sg (a:-stem) depending upon siam. But beyond this guess at the inflectional morphology of the word it is unanalyzable. At least two of the next three words appear to be onomastica. t.kam is not at all clear. The gentilicium alies is attested on an inscription from Teate in Marrucinian territory, alies (Ve. 219).

The words esmen sepelen appear to form a locative phrase meaning 'in this grave/tomb'. For the locative esmen see above section 2.1. sepelen must be compared to the Latin verb form sepolio: 'bury', a -yo- denominative formation to a substantive *sepel(o)- which is apparently attested by the Old Sabellian form, i.e. < *sep-el-sy-en. sepes is more difficult. It is generally connected with the form sepé from Loro Piceno and the Umbrian word sepse. As noted earlier (section 1.1), the Umbrian form is probably to be derived from the root *sayp- 'fence in'. This derivation is problematic for the Old
Sabellian forms since the monophthongization of diphthongs seems to be unattested in Old Sabellian. This form remains without a good etymology. 16

(Mo. 10) may be translated as follows: 'According to ????
Tettius (t.kam) Allius ??? in this tomb.'.

1.6 The inscription of Crecchio

(No. 15):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{deiktam: hxxlpas: pim: t. rim: esmenad sta: e. ms: upeke[---]} \\
\text{[---] r. m: i. rkes: iepeten: esmen: ekuisin: rae: l. m: ru: rasim:}
\text{ p. i. de[---]ta:}
\text{i. kipedu: pdu: em: k.. kam: enet: bie:}
\text{mureis: mar. um: uelhum: uelaines: statices: 0. rl. : kduhu}
\end{align*}
\]

This inscription is the longest Old Sabellian inscription consisting, as it does, of three lines of text engraved in serpentine fashion and a fourth line of text inscribed horizontally below. Of the rather large number of words on this inscription only a handful is analyzable and this is scarcely enough to allow an interpretation of the text as a whole. The claim that this inscription is a building inscription is based on very slim evidence. The only piece of evidence consists of the word bie, which is compared to the Paelignian, Marrucinian, and Umbrian words discussed earlier, i.e. biam, etc. Unfortunately, the mere formal similarity between the Old Sabellian word and the Umbrian and Sabellian words is not enough to determine a correspondence. No word in line three of this inscription is analyzable. As a result, there is no meaningful context within which to place bie in order to determine if the meaning 'enclosure' or 'water
basin' is satisfactory. Thus, all one can say about this inscription is that it is unlike the funerary inscriptions discussed earlier.

Approximately two-thirds of the words in line one can be guessed at. deiktam is acc sg of the past participle of the root *deyk- 'say, declare,' cf. Umbrian deitu 3 sg impv < *deyketo:d and Oscan deikum inf. According to Morandi (1974:103) the -kt- sequence in this word results from the syncope of *e. However, since past participles were not remade to *-e-to- in Oscan-Umbrian, there seems to be no good reason for assuming that past participles were remade in this way in Old Sabellian. As a result, it seems most reasonable to interpret -kt- as a primary sequence. Interestingly, then, this word does not show the reduction of the primary -kt- sequence characteristic of Oscan and Umbrian (see Buck 1928:89). The third word in this line is generally interpreted as acc sg of the indefinite-relative pronoun, i.e. < *k'imi, cf. Latin quem. t.rim is clearly an abbreviation of some sort. Morandi (1974) suggests comparison with Oscan teremenniu (acc pl neut) and Umbrian termnom-ë 'boundary' but is not very specific concerning the precise correspondences between the Old Sabellian and the Oscan-Umbrian. Is -im an inflectional ending or does t.rim correspond directly to Oscan terem-? And if t.rim does correspond to the first two syllables of the Oscan word, how does one explain the i? Is it epenthetic, as the e is in Oscan? These problems make it difficult to accept Morandi's suggestion. The long sequence esmenadstae.ms is clearly divisible into esmen, the usual locative pronominal form, and adstae.ms, a form whose morphology is the subject of much debate.
As was noted earlier, in the discussion of adstaems (section 1.3), the morphology of adstaems is unclear. However, despite the problems determining the internal structure of this word, most scholars accept the interpretation of -ms as the first plural inflectional ending. If this analysis is correct, then it is the only first plural form in all of Oscan-Umbrian.

In line two only esmen and ekúsín are analyzable. ekúsín is perhaps from the pronominal stem *eko- which is found also in Oscan and Paelignian. However, the position of this word next to the well-attested pronominal form esmen may indicate that it is premature to accept a pronominal analysis for ekúsín.

In line three enet is interpreted by Morandi as a 3 sg verb form and compared to Umbrian enetu 'let (it) begin' < *en-ey-to:d. This analysis appears unlikely since it involves the monophthongization of *ey, a sound which appears unchanged in the first word of the inscription, deiktam. As was mentioned earlier, bie is generally compared to Paelignian biam, Marrucinian bia, and Umbrian bio. Since bie is isolated in terms of the context, the validity of this comparison remains unsubstantiated. For Morandi this word is either an abl/loc form or a dat sg. However, any attempt to argue that -e is from earlier *a:y encounters phonological difficulties. As far as can be determined diphthongs remain in Old Sabellian.

The final line of this inscription probably consists largely of onomastica. mireis appears to be a genitive singular form, and mariúm perhaps a genitive plural although it is not clear how the two forms
are organized syntactically, if indeed they are. *Statius* is a nom sg form corresponding to Latin *Statius*.

1.7 The inscription from Mogliano

(Mo. 16):

*apais px( )puxes lepeti̯n eksmin*

The fact that this inscription begins with a name, apparently a praenomen (compare (Mo. 1) and (Mo. 4)), is generally taken to indicate the sepulchral nature of this inscription. The first word is comparable to that in (Mo. 1), i.e. *apæs*. *px( )puxes* is impossible to analyze with any degree of certainty. However, the fact that the third word appears to be cognate with Latin *lapis* 'stone' would indicate an onomastic interpretation. Formally, one can compare it to *pupunis* on (Mo. 1).

*lepeti̯n* is generally compared to the Latin word for 'rock', i.e. *lapis, lapidis*. Umbrian *uáperi̯e* may also belong here if *l > w* in Umbrian (for which see Poultney 1959:71). Formally, *lepeti̯n* is a locative singular with the postpositional particle *-en*, i.e. < *lep-ed-ev-en*. In terms of meaning the context suggests 'tomb' or 'grave'. Such a meaning can be supported by a parallel development of the word *lapis* in Latin. In the elegaic poets Propertius (3,1,37) and Tibullus (1,3,54) *lapis* is used with the meaning of 'tomb'.

The final word is the pronominal form *eksmin*. The stem appears to be *ekso-*, a stem which is well-attested in Oscan. This form may also correspond to the locative formations *esmen/esmin* found on other Old Sabellian inscriptions, i.e. < *eks(o)-smey-en*, with the difference that they have assimilation of *ks* to *s*. 
2. The Oscan-Umbrian characteristics of Old Sabellian

Although there are relatively few data which can be used to determine the linguistic relationships of Old Sabellian, the evidence points to a connection with the Oscan-Umbrian languages. On the phonological side one can point to such characteristics as (1) the syncope of short vowels in final syllables, e.g. _apaes, apais, manus_, etc. and (2) the treatment of IE labiovelars as labials, e.g. _pim_.

With respect to morphology, Old Sabellian shares with Oscan and Umbrian (3) the generalization of the _i_-stem genitive *-eys to _o_-stems, e.g. _mureis_, (4) the formation of gentilicium in _i_ + _i_, e.g. _alies_, and (5) the postpositional locative particle *-en, esmen_.

Moreover, if the analysis of _apais_ (Mo. 6) is correct, then Old Sabellian has preserved, as have Oscan and Umbrian, (6) the IE _o_-stem nom pl in *-ois, cf. Latin nom pl in _i: uiri: 'men'. Similarly, if the analysis of _estas_ as a gen sg or nom pl is correct, then Old Sabellian sides once again with Oscan and Umbrian by having preserved (7) the IE formation in *-a:s, cf. Latin nom pl in _ae pernae 'hams'.

The evidence then, meagre though it is, is in favor of aligning Old Sabellian with the Oscan-Umbrian branch of Italic.

3. The position of Old Sabellian

Most authorities attempt to connect Old Sabellian with Umbrian (see, for example, Blumenthal (1929), Devoto (1967:18), Durante (1978:814), Olzscha (1963:102), and Radke (1962:1780). However, the amount of evidence for such a connection is extremely small. In fact, it consists primarily of the correspondence which exists between Old
Sabellian esmen and Umbrian esmei, etc. In other words, one points to the fact that both languages have the pronominal inflectional ending in -sm- which is added to the pronominal stem *e-, a non-existent formation in Oscan. Note, however, that this correspondence may not be as significant as first believed. First, it is not clear that the pronominal stem is *e-. In fact, based on the existence of the form eksmin from Mogliano, it appears that the inflectional ending -sm- is added to a stem *eks(o)-, which is, of course, well attested in Oscan. Only the form from Mogliano preserves *ks clusters. In the other words, *ks is reduced to s throughout most of Old Sabellian territory. And apparently the reduction of *ks to s is shared with Umbrian dialects to the west. Moreover, it is difficult to use the inflectional stem -sm- as a criterion for subgrouping because it is obviously a feature inherited from IE, cf. Sanskrit asmin. As a result, its existence in Umbrian and Old Sabellian is a shared retention and not an innovation.

Recently, Morandi (1974) has pointed to a number of similarities between Oscan and Old Sabellian and has suggested that Old Sabellian may actually align itself more closely with Oscan than with Umbrian. Morandi notes the preservation of diphthongs, e.g. paterei̱h, sua̱s, etc.; and the preservation of final consonants. Finally, the most striking similarity between Oscan and Old Sabellian is, according to Morandi, vowel epenthesis in CR clusters, e.g. matereti̱h.

While one cannot deny that the first three characteristics are common to Old Sabellian and Oscan one must also point out that they are common retentions, not innovations. As a result they are of
minimal diagnostic value for determining the position of Old Sabellian within Oscan-Umbrian. Further, the claim that Old Sabellian shares with Oscan vowel epenthesis in CR clusters can be disputed on a number of grounds. First, in Oscan epenthesis in CR clusters occurs, in most cases at least, only after short vowels, not after long ones, e.g. Oscan paterē with epenthesis but māterēs without epenthesis. If the medial e in māterēs is interpreted as being the result of epenthesis, then the contexts for epenthesis between the two languages are no longer identical. In fact, they would appear to resemble the two cases of epenthesis in Paelignian, i.e. sacaracirix and pristafalacirix (Ve. 213). Second, a plausible explanation for the medial e in both māterēs and paterēs can be offered. In IE the nouns *pāter- and *māter- had ablauting stems, i.e. lengthened/full grade in the strong cases, i.e. *pāte(:)r- (Latin pater), and zero grade in the weak cases, i.e. *pātr- (Latin patris). It is possible that these alternations were leveled out in Old Sabellian in favor of the strong case alternate, hence the stems mater- and pater-. Such cases of levelling in ablauting stems are common in IE languages and in fact a parallel case can be cited from Venetic where the dative singular of the noun 'brother' is written vhāterēs (Lejeune 1974:98) with full grade of the suffix rather than expected weak grade. As a result it is not possible to view these words as particularly strong evidence for vowel epenthesis. At any rate, it is doubtful that they are of any value for subgrouping Old Sabellian with Oscan.
In summary, the position of Old Sabellian within Oscan-Umbrian cannot be determined. The data are too few and the data that do exist do not allow us to make any positive conclusions.
Footnotes—Appendix

1. The inscription from Mogliano (Mo. 16) is not grouped with the Old Sabellian inscriptions by Morandi. However, this inscription has the same alphabet and similar linguistic features as the other inscriptions and so should be grouped with them (so R. Giacomelli (1976)).

There are three other inscriptions which are sometimes discussed with the Old Sabellian inscriptions. Even though they were found in southern Picenum these inscriptions should be kept distinct from the Old Sabellian inscriptions since they were inscribed in a different alphabet and appear to have features which are not characteristic of the Old Sabellian inscriptions (see Durante (1951:171-72); Morandi (1974:111-122); Pisani (1964:221-22); and Whatmough (1933:221)).

2. Actually the term Old Sabellian was current primarily in the late 19th century and early 20th century, although there are still a few scholars who employ it today (e.g. Olzscha and Radke). In the early part of the 20th century Old Sabellian was replaced by Picene (Blumenthal (1929)) or by East Italic (Conway (1897 II:528; Whatmough 1933)). South Picene was coined by those who were attempting to distinguish these inscriptions from the inscription found in Novilara (see Pisani (1964:222) and Poultey (1979:49)).

3. For local differences in the scripts see Morandi (1974:64ff.).

4. This is also supported by the fact that most of the inscriptions are engraved on square cippi, the shape of stones typically used as sepulchral monuments (Whatmough 1933:227).

5. All of the inscriptions used in this discussion of Old Sabellian can be found in Morandi (1974). The inscriptions are referred to by the abbreviation (Mo. ZZ).

6. The subjunctive of the verb 'be' in Italic is, from an IE point of view, an optative. The IE optative affix was *-yeH₂- and this affix abluted. The full grade form can be found in Old Latin, e.g. sied < *s-yeH₂-t. However, by the classical period the zero grade stem si:- < *siH₁- had been generalized throughout the paradigm, e.g. sit.

-184-
The pronominal stem *esto- is not attested in Oscan. In Latin the *i probably results from contamination with the form *is (Buck 1928: 143).

Forms based on the same stem occur also in Umbrian, e.g. stahituto 2/3 pl impv, staheren 3 pl fut.

More recently, however, Radke (1981:86) has compared the root in meitimum with that found in Latin mitat in the Duenos inscription, deriving both from the IE root *meyt(h)- 'to consecrate'. meitimum is analyzed as a loc sg, i.e. *meyt-imov-em 'in a consecrated place' (cf. Avestan maem 'place of residence for gods and men'), the inflectional ending and the postpositional particle contracting to -e. Interpretation of this form as a loc sg is hard to support because there is no evidence for the outcome of contraction of o and e. It is most assuredly an accusative singular.

Morandi (1974:87) suggests that *u:itur forms a perfect correspondence to Latin tu:tor, tuitor 'protector.' The *i in the medial syllable probably does not represent *i but rather *e:. As a result, *tue:tor is a better protoform.

This formula occurs in all of the Italic languages. For Latin examples see Warmington (1940:204ff.).

For discussion of the verb sim in Oscan see Szemerényi (1964: 193) and Joseph & Wallace (forthcoming).

Essentially, this genitive is viewed as an intermediate form of the IE o-stem genitive *-osyo. According to Pisani (1964:344-45) the final outcome is -i:, i.e. the well-known Latin o-stem genitive. This hypothesis can be attacked on various grounds (for discussion see Bonfante (1966:8 footnote 14)). In Faliscan, for example, genitives in -i:, e.g. serui, exist beside genitives in -osyo, kaisioso. One might expect some variation between intermediate forms in the process of reduction to i:; but it is unlikely that original -osio would survive alongside the final product i:. Further, in Faliscan there are but three centuries between the oldest attestation of -osio and the first attestation of i:. As a result, a very complex phonological change would have to have been completed in a relatively short period of time. Finally, the genitive morpheme i: exists elsewhere in IE, for example in Celtic, so there is little need to create i: by sound change in Italic, particularly when the changes themselves are suspect.

For discussion of the origin of Latin sum see Bader (1976), Bonfante (1932), Ernout (1953), Kent (1946), Nyman (1977), Sommer (1948), and Joseph and Wallace (forthcoming).

Brian Joseph (personal communication) has suggested that siam could be from *gve:m with the same sound change as seiat (Mo. 1). pustin would then mean something like 'accordingly' or 'thus'.
Could this be a u-stem form *sepus, i.e. *sep- 'bury' with the 3 sg form of the verb 'be', i.e. es < *est? Figurae etymolgicae are not uncommon. The translation would then be *(Tettius Allius) is buried in this grave'.

It is also possible to interpret es as a 2nd singular form, perhaps in contrast with siam, under the interpretation of this form as 1st singular subjunctive. One could then translate the inscription as: 'So, may I be . . . (otherwise) Tettius Allius, you (will) be buried in this tomb.' This interpretation was suggested by Brian Joseph (personal communication).

The a-vocalism in the Latin and Umbrian forms are generally assumed to be from the reduced grade of the root.

Blumenthal (1929:55) offers an alternative explanation of the e in matereih. According to Blumenthal patereih shows epenthesis in CR clusters. The e separating the CR cluster in matereih is derived by analogy from patereih.
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