

An outline of the South Picene language II: Morphology and syntax

Raoul Zamponi

Macerata, Italy <zamponi_raoul@libero.it>

This is the second of two articles devoted to the phonology, morphology, and syntax of the Italic language known as South Picene. The first part (sections 1 and 2) appeared in *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 31, 1, 2019. The purpose is (to attempt) to describe some aspects of the morphosyntactic structure of South Picene, as it appears in the extant texts, in a basically synchronic perspective. Prehistoric factors and/or data of other Italic languages are referred to only where it is felt that they help elucidate attested grammatical features of South Picene. The author expressly disavows any intent of systematic coverage in this regard.

KEYWORDS: South Picene language, South Picene inscriptions, Picentes/Piceni, Sabellic languages, Italic languages.

Citation criteria

As in the first part of this study, the South Picene material is cited from Crawford's (2011) edition of the South Picene corpus following his formatting conventions, unless otherwise noted. Square brackets [abc] enclose wholly or partially erased characters; a single square bracket [or] signals the beginning or the end of a sequence of erased characters that extends beyond the form within which it occurs; braces {abc} enclose letters engraved in error; less-than and greater-than signs <abc> enclose letters engraved in error and corrected by the editor; the underdot *a* indicates characters that, when taken in isolation, are uncertain; the slash / indicates a line break; the plus sign (+) indicates the trace of a letter. [-?-] signals a lacuna of unknown length, while [1-2] signals the number of missing characters. Square brackets [abc] also indicate a phonetic transcription and slashes /abc/ indicate a phonemic transcription. An asterisk (*) identifies a form that is reconstructed, not actually attested. Oscan and Umbrian forms in native alphabets are transcribed in boldface type; forms of the two languages in the Republican Latin alphabet are in italics; Oscan forms in Greek alphabet are transcribed in a Greek font.

3. Morphology

There are approximately 140 recognizable inflected forms in the South Picene corpus. They are nouns (3.1), pronouns (3.2), adjectives (3.3), and verbs (3.5), and they could also include a definite article (3.4). Some other forms appear as invariable words. These belong to the word classes of adpositions (3.6), adverbs (3.7), conjunctions (3.8), and particles (3.9). The morphological notes that follow, also including some observations on derivation (3.10), rely on these exiguous bases.

3.1. Nouns

Nouns are inflected for number and case and assigned to a gender class on the basis partly of sense and partly of form, as is typical in Italic. There are two numbers, singular and plural, and at least six paradigmatic cases: nominative, accusative, genitive, dative, ablative, and locative. There is no trace of vocative forms, particularly rare in the Sabellic corpus (Wallace 2007: 39), in the South Picene documents. Gender is systematically encoded in adjectives and partly in pronouns. In the attested head-modifier constructions, gender agreement reveals a distinction between masculine (1) and feminine (2-6). No neuter noun can be identified with certainty.¹

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| (1) | <i>púpún-i-s</i>
Poponius-ADJZ-NOM.SG.M
'the Poponian man' ² | <i>n/ír-Ø</i> (MC.1)
man-NOM.SG.M |
| (2) | <i>saf/in-as</i>
Sabine-GEN.SG.F
'of the Sabine community' | <i>tút-as</i> (TE.5)
community-GEN.SG.F |
| (3) | <i>pduf-em</i>
territory (?) -ACC.SG.F
'the territory (?) of the citadel (ACC)' | <i>ok[r]-ik-am</i> (CH.1)
citadel-ADJZ-ACC.SG.F |
| (4) | <i>esm-a = k</i>
this-LOC.SG.F = DEM
'in this community' | <i>toút-añ</i> (RI.1)
community-LOC.SG.F |
| (5) | <i>est-as</i>
this-NOM.PL.F
'these N (PL)' ³ | <i>amgen-a/s</i> (AP.3)
?-NOM.PL.F |
| (6) | <i>sú-aís</i>
their-ABL.PL.F
'with their hands' | <i>man-us</i> (AP.2)
hand-ABL.PL.F |

Case markers are fusional, signaling, besides case, the category of number, as is also typical of Italic languages.

(7) a.	NOM SG	<i>toút-a</i>	‘community’	(TE.7)
	GEN SG	<i>tút-as</i> ⁴		(TE.5)
	LOC SG	<i>toút-aíh</i>		(RI.1)
b.	NOM SG	<i>qor-a</i>	‘commemorative stone’	(CH.1)
	ACC SG	<i>kor-am</i>		(AQ.2)
	ACC PL	<i>qor-as</i>		(TE.7)
c.	NOM SG	<i>meitim-s</i>	‘gift, present (?)’ ⁵	(TE.5)
	ACC SG	<i>meitim-úm</i>		(AP.2)
d.	NOM SG	<i>apai-s</i>	‘Appaeus’ ⁶	(MC.2)
	NOM PL	<i>apai-ús</i>		(AP.2)
e.	NOM PL	<i>safín-ús</i>	‘Sabine’	(TE.5)
	GEN PL	<i>safín-úm</i>		(TE.6)
f.	NOM SG	<i>nír-∅</i>	‘man’	(MC.1)
	ACC PL	<i>ner-f’</i>		(TE.6)
g.	NOM PL	<i>fítí-as</i>	‘deed (?)’ ⁸	(AP.3)
	GEN PL	<i>fítí-asom</i>		(TE.5)
h.	DAT SG	<i>k]aúí-eh</i>	‘Gavius’	(AQ.1)
	GEN SG	<i>kaúí-eis</i>		(AQ.1)

Like the other Sabellic languages, South Picene presumably had six morphologically distinct declensions: 1. *ā*-stems, 2. *o*-stems, 3. *i*-stems, 4. *u*-stems, 5. *ē*-stems, and 6. consonant-stems. The *ē*-stem declension, sparsely attested in Sabellic (Silvestri 1998: 332; Tikkanen 2011: 42-43; Vine 2017: 761), is unattested in the surviving South Picene inscriptions. Examples (8-20) show the case markers that may be identified with (almost complete) confidence.

(i) nominative singular:

(8)	<i>ā</i> -stems (PI *-ā)	<i>toút-a</i>	‘community’	(TE.7)
		<i>qor-a</i>	‘commemorative stone’	(CH.1)
		<i>meitim-s</i>	‘gift, present (?)’	(TE.5)
	<i>o</i> -stems (PI *-os) ⁹	<i>apai-s</i>	‘Appaeus’	(MC.2)
		<i>petrúni-s</i>	‘Petronius’	(AP.4)
		<i>apúni-s</i>	‘Aponius’	(AP.3)
	<i>C</i> -stems (PI *-∅)	<i>nír-∅</i>	‘man’	(MC.1)

(ii) nominative plural:

(9)	o-stems (PI *-ōs)	<i>apai-ús</i>	‘Appaeus’	(AP.2)
		<i>safin-ús</i>	‘Sabine’	(TE.5)

(iii) accusative singular:

(10)	\bar{a} -stems (PI *-ām)	<i>kor-am</i>	‘commemorative stone’	(AQ.2)
		<i>tok-am</i>	‘memorial stele’	(TE.2)
		<i>postikn-am</i>	‘kind of votive object (?)’ ¹⁰	(CH.2)
		<i>vi-am</i>	‘road’	(TE.2)
o-stems (PI *-om) ¹¹		<i>t < i > t-úm</i>	‘Titus’	(AP.1)
		<i>meitim-úm</i>	‘gift, present (?)’	(AP.2)
		<i>anai-úm</i>	‘Annaeus’	(AP.1)
i-stems (PI *-im)		<i>oftor-im</i>	‘stele’ (vel sim.) ¹²	(CH.1)
C-stems (PI *-əm)		<i>pduf-em</i>	‘territory (?)’ ¹³	(CH.1)

(iv) accusative plural:

(11)	\bar{a} -stems (PI *-ans) ¹⁴	<i>qor-as</i>	‘commemorative stone’	(TE.7)
	C-stems (PI *-əns) ¹⁵	<i>ner-f</i>	‘man’	(TE.6)

(v) genitive singular:

(12)	\bar{a} -stems (PI *-ās)	<i>tút-as</i>	‘community’	(TE.5)		
		o-stems (PI *-osjo, *-ī) ¹⁶	<i>pu/púni-es</i>	‘Puponus’	(MC.2)	
			<i>trebegi-es</i>	‘Trebecius’	(TE.5)	
				<i>a[1]šī-es</i>	‘A[1]sius’	(TE.4)
				<i>ali-es</i>	‘Allius’	(TE.2)
				<i>t < i > t- < e > s</i> ¹⁷	‘Titus’	(TE.2)
				<i>uelaim-es</i>	‘Velamius’	(CH.1)
				<i>stati-es</i>	‘Statius’	(CH.1)
		<i>kaúi-eis</i>	‘Gavius’	(AQ.1)		

(vi) genitive plural:

(13)	\bar{a} -stems (PI *-āzōm) ¹⁸	<i>fiti-asom</i>	‘deed (?)’	(TE.5)	
		o-stems (PI *-ōm) ¹⁹	<i>safin-úm</i>	‘Sabine’	(TE.6)
			<i>maro-úm</i>	‘magistrate (?)’ ²⁰	(CH.1)
			<i>púpún-um</i>	‘Poponus’	(AP.2)
i-stems (PI *-jōm) ²¹		<i>alí/nt-iom</i>	‘Alentes’	(TE.7)	
		<i>rael-iom</i>	‘?’	(CH.1)	

(vii) dative singular:

(14)	o-stems (PI *-ōi) ²²	<i>tīt-úť</i>	‘Titus’	(TE.5)	
		<i>qđufeni-úť</i>	‘Clufennius’	(TE.7)	
		<i>brímeql-úť</i>	‘Brimeclum’ ²³	(TE.7)	
		<i>pu/ql-oh</i>	‘son’	(AQ.1)	
		<i>dún-oh</i>	‘gift’	(CH.2)	
		<i>petr-oh</i>	‘Petro’	(TE.1)	
		<i>titi-úh</i>	‘Titius’	(CH.2)	
		<i>k]aúi-eh</i>	‘Gavius’	(AQ.1)	
		C-stems (PI *-ei) ²⁴	<i>mater-eřh</i>	‘mother’	(AP.2)
			<i>pater-eřh</i>	‘father’	(AP.2)

(viii) ablative singular:

(15)	<i>ā</i> -stems (PI *-ād)	<i>sel-ah</i>	‘?’ ²⁵	(AQ.3)
	<i>i</i> -stems (PI *-īd)	<i>arít-ih</i>	‘art’	(AP.2)

(viii) dative/ablative plural:²⁶

(16)	<i>i</i> -stems (PI *-iβos) ²⁷	<i>iork-es</i>	‘?’	(CH.1)
	<i>u</i> -stems (PI *-uβos) ²⁸	<i>man-us</i>	‘hand’	(AP.2)

(ix) locative singular:

(17)	<i>ā</i> -stems (PI *-āī)	<i>toút-aīh</i>	‘community’	(RI.1)
	<i>i</i> -stems (PI *-eī)	<i>okr-eī</i>	‘citadel, (upper) town’	(TE.7)

Wallace (2007: 23) and Fortson (2010: 130) indicate that, in Oscan and South Picene, the Proto-Italic locative case marker *-ei of o-stems and i-stems and the adposition *en ‘in’ lead by jod-loss and contraction (*-ej = en > /-e:n/) to a new locative ending. This ending in the South Picene documents is written both -ín and -en.

(18)	o-stems	<i>ąkr-en</i>	‘land, territory’	(CH.2)
		<i>boúedi-ín</i>	‘pagus Boedinus’	(AQ.3)

Interestingly, the use of this locative ending was also extended to C-stems, as we may note in (19), with -en, and in (74), with -ín.²⁹ In both examples the locative ending is added to the noun *vepet-* ‘tomb’ from Proto-Italic *la/eped- ‘stone’ (see Zamponi 2019: 204).

- (19) C-stems *vepet-en* 'tomb' (TE.2)
 The argument that this formation /-e:n/ should be synchronically regarded as an unanalyzable element in South Picene is supported by five noun phrases, in as many inscriptions, in which it occurs not only on the head noun, but also on the word that modifies it, which is an adjective in (20) and (67) and a demonstrative pronoun in (22), (68), and (74).³⁰

- (20) *ombri-í-en* *akr-en* (CH.2)
 Umbrian-ADJZ-LOC.SG land-LOC.SG
 'in the Umbrian land'

As far as the functions of the six attested cases of South Picene are concerned, the documents of the language allow us to state what follows.

- (i) Nominative marks the subject of verbal clauses (54, 67, 69-70, 72, 74) and the complement in copular clauses (76).
- (ii) Accusative marks the object of transitive verbs (48, 51, 70-71, 77, 80).
- (iii) Genitive may indicate the possessor (51, 59, 61-62, 75, 79-80) as well as blood and family relationships (57, 60, 63-64, 77-78).³¹
- (iv) Dative marks a beneficiary (32, 54, 70, 73, 77-79).
- (v) Ablative expresses instrument (77).³²
- (vi) Locative signals stationary location (4, 20, 55-56, 58, 67-68, 74, 79-80).

3.2. Pronouns

Pronouns follow the same general inflectional patterns as nouns, though they have their own set of endings for certain case forms. The few attested pronominal forms distribute themselves over different classes.

(i) Personal pronouns. Only two forms of the second person singular personal pronoun may be recognized with certainty. As in Proto-Italic, these forms show different allomorphs for the root, as we may note in (21).

- (21) ACC *tí-om* (TE.5) (L *te*; PI **tē* or **te*³³)
 DAT *tef-ef*³⁴ (TE.7) (O *tíf[ef]*, U *tefe*, OL *tibeí*; PI **teβei*)

The identification of the nominative form of the first person singular personal pronoun (*ekú*), followed by a coreferential present active indicative form of the copula 'be' (*sim*) in an obscure passage of CH.1, is

particularly uncertain. The alleged sequence subject-copula lends itself well to be interpreted also as an accusative singular *i*-stem form with the same ending *-im* (cf. (10)) as the non-immediately contiguous *rufrasim* on the right.

- (22) ... -?-]orom iork-es iepet-en esm-en ekús-im³⁵ raeli-om
 ? ?-DAT.PL tomb-LOC.SG this-LOC.SG ?-ACC.SG (?) ?-GEN.PL
*rufras-im*³⁶ ... (CH.1)
 ?-ACC.SG (?)

The possibility of recognizing in AQ.2 the accusative form (*ma*) of the first person singular personal pronoun can be reasonably excluded, as indicated in note 68.

(ii) Possessive pronouns. Two ablative forms of the third person (singular/plural) possessive pronoun can be recognized.

- (23) ABL SG M (and N?) sáh-úh (TE.1) (L *suo*; PI **sowōd*)
 ABL PL F sí-aís (AP.2) (L *suis*; PI **sowais*)

The masculine (and probably neuter) singular form occurs headlessly in the idiomatic expression in (53). The feminine plural form occurs adnominally in the noun phrase in (6).

(iii) Demonstrative pronouns. There are various occurrences of the proximal spatial demonstrative pronoun *est-* ~ *esm-* ‘this’ in the South Picene documents.

- (24) NOM PL F est-as (AP.3)³⁷ (L *istae*; PI **estās*)
 LOC SG M (or N) esm-ín (AP.1, MC.2)³⁸

Morphologically, the distribution of the two variants of its root appears simple and the same as *est-* ~ *esm-* in Umbrian: the allomorph *est-* is used in the direct cases while the allomorph *esm-* is used in the remaining oblique cases (Dupraz 2012: 58).³⁹

Two further locative singular forms of the proximal spatial demonstrative pronoun are preserved in RI.1. Both forms occur with a final *k* in which we may recognize an (Italic) enclitic particle also occurring in AP.2 attached to the spatial adverb ‘here’ (77) (see 3.9).

- (25) LOC SG M (or N) esm-í=k (RI.1)
 LOC SG F esm-a=k (RI.1)

Although the case endings of these two locative forms (/ -e:/ and, presumably, / -a:/) appear as contractions of *-ej = en and *-aj = en, there is no trace in both of the nasal segment of the adposition *en (3.1).

Adnominal uses of est- ~ esm- ‘this’ can be observed in examples (4-5), (55-56), (68), (74), and (80). A peculiar headless use of the locative singular form esm-en ~ esm-ín is that as a proximal spatial adverbial ‘here’; see examples (51) and (67).⁴⁰

A second demonstrative pronoun might occur in RI.1.

(26) ACC SG M (?) im (RI.1)

It seems to be a reflex of the Sabellic anaphoric demonstrative pronoun *i- ~ *ejo- ~ *eiso- (well attested in Oscan and Umbrian; see Dupraz 2012: 129-238) and have arisen from *i-m, in parallel with Latin em ~ im. Given the fragmentary state of the inscription, this interpretation of the form in question must however be regarded as merely conjectural.

(27) [-?]-ms im ftti-as ú m[-?]- (RI.1)
 ?-1PL.ACT ? deed (?)-NOM.PL/ACC.SG ? ?

Moreover, the fact that in both Oscan and in Umbrian the accusative singular masculine/feminine of *i- ~ *ejo- ~ *eiso- contains the allomorph *ejo- (O ionc M, íak F, U eu M, eam F) makes the hypothesis of an accusative singular masculine im in South Picene scarcely probable, although this form would indeed be comparable to, as indicated above, Latin em ~ im (and also, perhaps, Sicel ù) (Dupraz 2012: 129, fn. 1).

(iv) Relative pronouns. As in Umbrian and Pre-Samnite, the root of the relative pronoun ‘who, which’ is a sm-form in the dative singular.

(28) NOM SG M pu-th (AP.2) (U poi, OL quoi; PI *k^woi)
 DAT SG M/F/N posm-úi (TE.5, TE.7) (U pusme, Pre-Samnite πυσμοι; PI *k^wosmoi⁴¹)

(v) Indefinite pronouns. These include pimph ‘whomever’ (AQ.3), accusative singular masculine (and feminine?) (O píspíd NOM SG M, L quidquid), and the pronoun ‘anyone, anything’, documented in three forms.⁴²

(29) NOM SG M/F pi-s (TE.1)⁴³ (O pis, U pis(i), Pre-Samnite πισ, L quis; PI *k^wis)
 ACC SG M/F pi-m (CH.1)⁴⁴ (L quem; PI *k^wim)
 ACC SG N pi-d (TE.5) (O píđ, U, piri, L quid; PI *k^wid)

Although *nemúneí* DAT SG, in TE.5, is commonly equated with the Latin indefinite pronoun *nēmō* ‘no one’, from **ne-hemon-*, the pronominal status of this form must be assumed as hypothetical (see Livingston 2004: 31-32). La Regina (2010: 259), not unconvincingly, sees in *nemúneí* an equivalent of the Latin nomen *Nemonius*, while Martzloff (2006: 83) suggests, with little caution in my opinion, that the etymon **ne-hemon-* may be saved providing that a common noun whose possible sense, judging from those of the Greek verb *νέμω*, would be ‘administrator’, ‘governor’, or even ‘inhabitant’ could be recognized. The only certain thing is that *nemúneí* is marked for the same case and number as a preceding *meít{t}istrúí*, also semantically obscure,⁴⁵ with which it likely forms a noun phrase; see example (32).

3.3. Adjectives

Adjectives agree with nouns in gender, number, and case. They broadly follow the same patterns of declension as nouns, as the forms in (30) and (31) indicate. There are no *u*-stem and *ē*-stem adjectives in Italic languages (Vine 2017: 763) and neither do the South Picene documents contain *i*-stem or consonant-stem adjectives that may be recognized with certainty. Only *ā*-stem adjectives (30) and, mainly, *o*-stem adjectives (31) may be identified with confidence.⁴⁶

(30)	ACC SG F	<i>ok[r]ík-am</i>	‘of the citadel’	(CH.1)
	GEN SG F	<i>safín-as</i>	‘Sabine’	(TE.5)
(31)	NOM SG M	<i>efidan-s</i>	‘from Offida (?)’	(AP.5)
	NOM SG M	<i>púpúni-s</i>	‘Poponian’	(MC.1)
	ACC SG M	<i>áú/daq-um</i> ⁴⁷	‘bold (?)’	(AP.1)
	LOC SG M	<i>ombrii-en</i>	‘Umbrian’	(CH.2)
	LOC SG M (or N)	<i>mefi-in</i>	‘placed in the middle’	(MC.1)

3.4. Definite article?

A bound element *-sa* occurs in the text of TE.5 attached to the (deverbal) noun *pra[i]staklasa* ‘standing object’ (an anthropomorphic stele in this specific case).

(32)	... <i>meít{t}istrúí</i>	<i>nemún-eí</i>	<i>prai-staí-Ø-t</i>	<i>panivú</i>
	?-DAT.SG	?-DAT.SG	PREV-stand-PRS.IND-3SG.ACT	? ⁴⁸
	<i>meitim-s</i>	<i>saf/in-as</i>	<i>tút-as</i>	<i>trebegi-es</i>
	gift (?)-NOM.SG	Sabine-GEN.SG	community-GEN.SG	Trebecius-GEN.SG
	<i>tít-úí</i>	<i>pra[i]-sta-kl-a=sa</i>		<i>posm-úí</i> (TE.5)
	Titus-DAT.SG	PREV-stand-NMLZ-NOM.SG = DEF.NOM.SG (?)		who-DAT.SG
	‘For [-?-], (the monument) stands out [-?-], the gift (?) of the Sabine community for Titus (son) of Trebecius, for whom the (?) stele (is)’			

Although it is impossible, of course, based on this single example, to determine exactly what the uses of this bound element may have been, Dupraz's (2012) analysis as a grammaticalized remnant of the Proto-Indo-European demonstrative **s-* ~ **t-* 'this, that' that may have been used to indicate definiteness (cf. also Martzloff 2006: 93), in my opinion, seems to be fully plausible.⁴⁹ As Dupraz (2012: 257-258) makes us note, "whatever the exact analysis of the previous context may be, due to the verbal form **praistaít** 'stands' and the noun **meitims** 'memorial'⁵⁰ and to the fact that the text is engraved on a stele, the referent of the noun **praistakla** 'standing object' is pragmatically definite. Thanks to these pragmatic factors, the hearer or reader is able to identify immediately the referent of **praistakla**. This identification is all the more obvious as **praistakla** is cognate with the verb **praistaít**. Thus **-sa** may be a definite article, used to indicate that the referent of **praistakla** is a definite one".

In South Picene, therefore, a kind of enclitic definite article may have existed, at least in certain uses that remain unknown to us. This element, judging from (32), agrees in number, gender, and case with the head noun. However, due to a lack of further occurrences, there is not any certainty about this either.⁵¹

3.5. Verbs

The verbal morphology of South Picene is overall similar to that of the other Sabellic languages and of Latin. A first distinction is between finite and non-finite verb forms. The former are characterized by subject personal endings for the singular and plural. The latter includes formations such as the participles that are marked by special suffixes and share with nominals the morphological property of being inflected for case.

Apart from 'to be' (*esu-m* 1SG PRS ACT IND; TE.4) and, presumably, some other exceptions, the verbs of South Picene can be assigned to structural groups called 'conjugations'. In Proto-Italic, there were four conjugations each of which had a characteristic stem vowel, as follows: I **-ā*, II **-ē*, III **-e*, IV **-ī*. In the South Picene documents, three of them seem to be attested.

- I *qumat* /kuba:-t/ 'to lie' 3SG PRS ACT IND (MC.1) (cf. L *cubā-re*)
- II *kduíú* /klue:-o/ 'to be called' 1SG PRS ACT IND (CH.1) (cf. L *cluē-re*)
- III *pepieí* /pe-pie-i/ 'to pay (?)' 3SG PRF ACT IND (TE.1)⁵²

3.5.1. Finite verbs

Besides person and number of the subject (3.5.1.1), the categories

for which finite verbs are inflected are voice (3.5.1.2), tense (3.5.1.3), and mood (3.5.1.4).

3.5.1.1. Person and number

The finite verb is characterized by a set of personal endings which simultaneously carry information about person (first, second, third), number (singular and plural), voice (active and passive; see below, for third person singular, a *-t/-Ø* (active) vs *-túr* (passive) contrast), and occasionally tense and mood (likely, there were a few endings which were peculiar to a present imperative and a future imperative; see 3.5.1.4).

Similar to the other Italic languages, the active verbs in the present indicative are inflected with personal endings that belong to a set of forms partially different from that used with the active verbs in the perfect indicative or in the subjunctive (see below, for third person plural, a *-nt* vs *-h* contrast).

The attested personal endings occurring in the present indicative, called primary endings in the Italic literature, are the following.⁵³

(i) first person singular (PI **-ō*):

- (33) 1SG PRS ACT IND *kduŭ-ú* 'to be called' (CH.1)

In addition, for the copula verb 'to be', we have:

- (34) 1SG PRS ACT IND *esu-m*⁵⁴ 'to be' (TE.4)

(ii) third person singular (PI **-t*):

- (35) 3SG PRS ACT IND *qupa-t* 'to lie' (MC.1)
 3SG PRS ACT IND *veia-t* 'to lie' (MC.1)
 3SG PRS ACT IND *ene-t* 'to enter' (CH.1)

(iii) second person plural (PI **-tes*):

- (36) 2PL PRS ACT IND *vide-tas* 'to see' (TE.2)

(iv) third person plural (PI **-nt*):

- (37) 3PL PRS ACT IND *praistaŭ-nt* 'to stand out' (TE.7)
 3PL PRS ACT IND *pe/rsuka-nt* 'to declare (?)' (TE.6)

It is unclear whether the nasal of *-nt* was not pronounced or not noted in the verb form in (38).

- (38) 3PL PRS ACT IND *eoelst-t* ‘to erect’⁵⁵ (TE.5)

The personal endings used with the active verbs in the perfect indicative tense and active verbs in the subjunctive, called secondary endings, that we may recognize in the South Picene inscriptions are given here below.

(i) second person singular (PI *-s):

- (39) 2SG PRF ACT SBJV *aitúpa-s* ‘to resolve, to decree, to enact (?)’ (TE.5)

(ii) third person singular (PI *-d):⁵⁶

- (40) 3SG PRF ACT IND *pepiei-∅* ‘to pay (?)’ (TE.1)
 3SG PRF ACT SBJV *ehueli-∅* ‘to tear down’ (TE.1)

The primary ending *-t* seems however to have been extended into perfect indicative verbs marked by the suffix *-o ~ -ú* (3.5.1.3), as we may note in (41).

- (41) 3SG PRF ACT IND *opsú-t* ‘to make, to construct’ (AQ.2)

(iii) first person plural (PI *-mos):

- (42) 1PL PRF ACT IND *adstaeo-ms* ‘to set up’ (CH.1)

(iv) third person plural (PI *-nd):

- (43) 3PL PRF ACT IND *adstaiú-h* ‘to set up’ (AP.2)
 3PL PRF ACT IND *praistaiú-h* ‘to stand out’ (RI.1)

Only two passive verb forms can be confidently identified in the entire South Picene documentation. Both forms are third person singular of the indicative present and contain the verbal ending *-túr* ([-tor] or, perhaps, [-to:r]) (PI *-tor or, perhaps, *-tōr; see Zamponi 2019: 201).

- (44) 3SG PRS PASS IND *qolofi-túr* ‘to erect’ (AP.2)
 3SG PRS PASS IND *[-?-]r-túr* ‘?’ (TE.7)

3.5.1.2. Voice

As we saw in the preceding subsection, the system of finite verbs is based on a two-way opposition between the active and passive voices. As also indicated there, the information of voice is fused with the information of person and number of the subject into one suffix. Like all other Italic languages, there are no separate voice markers in South Picene.

3.5.1.3. Tense

The clearly recognizable values of the category of tense, fusionally expressed with that of mood (indicative and subjunctive), are perfect and present. This short list appears just as a fragment of the list of the tense values recognized in the documentation of Oscan and Umbrian that also include the future (perhaps attested in an imperative verb of AQ.3; see below 3.5.1.4), the imperfect, the future imperfect, and probably the pluperfect, unattested both in Oscan and Umbrian, but hypothesizable given the overall similarity of the tense system of the two languages with that of Latin (Wallace 2007: 27).

Only the indicative verbs manifest both tense values of perfect and present in the South Picene corpus. Their markers of tense and mood, occurring before the personal ending, are the following.

(i) perfect indicative (suffixal): *-o* ~ *-ú*.⁵⁷

(45)	3SG PRF ACT IND	<i>ops-ú-t</i>	'to make, to construct'	(AQ.2)
	1PL PRF ACT IND	<i>adstae-o-ms</i>	'to set up'	(CH.1)
	3PL PRF ACT IND	<i>adstai-ú-h</i>	'to set up'	(AP.2)
	3PL PRF ACT IND	<i>praistaí-ú-h</i>	'to stand out'	(RI.1)

(ii) perfect indicative (reduplicated and suffixal): *Ce-* + *-l*.⁵⁸

(46)	3SG PRF ACT IND	<i>pe-pi/e-í-∅</i>	'to pay' (?)	(AQ.2)
------	-----------------	--------------------	--------------	--------

(iii) present indicative (PI **-∅*): *-∅*.

(47)	PRS ACT IND	<i>praistaí-∅-t</i>	'to stand out'	(AQ.1)
	PRS ACT IND	<i>ene-∅-t</i>	'to enter'	(CH.1)

The sole two verbs in the subjunctive that may be recognized for sure in the inscriptions are in the perfect: the above-mentioned *ehuelí* (3SG), marked by a suffix *-í* (PI **-ē*), and *aitúp-a-s* (2SG; TE.5), marked by a suffix *-a* that may be connected to the suffix *-ā* of the archaic Latin subjunctive *attig-a-t* (Martzloff 2006: 77).

3.5.1.4. Mood

Indicative mood is used for statements (32, 48, 51, 54, 67, 69-73, 75-77, 79-80). As indicated above, this mood is expressed by fusional affixes that also indicate tense.

- (48) ... *poiouéfa*⁵⁹ *iokipedu*⁶⁰ *pduf-em* *ok[r]-ik-am*
 ? ? territory (?) -ACC.SG citadel-ADJZ-ACC.SG
en-e-Ø-t ... (CH.1)
 PREV-go-PRS.IND-3SG.ACT
 '[-?-] (one) enters the territory (?) of the citadel'

Subjunctive mood is also marked together with tense by fusional suffixes. The perfect subjunctive is required by potential conditionals, as suggested by example (54).

A word in AQ.3 ends in a syllable *tú* that recalls the ending of certain second/third person singular active future imperative verbs of Umbrian (-**tu**) and Oscan (-**tud**) (PI **tōd*; cf. OL *-tod*). The meaning of this word is obscure as well as the context in which it occurs.⁶¹

- (49) ... [-?-] *ioiús* *boiēdi-ín* *haliga-tú* [-?-] (AQ.3)
 ? *pagus_Boedinus*-LOC.SG ?-2/3SG.FUT.ACT.IMP (?)

3.5.2. Non-finite verbs

Of this area of the South Picene verbal system only few traces remain.

d[i]kdeiñtem, in AP.3, lends itself to be interpreted as a present active participle marked as accusative singular: *d[i]kdei-ñt-em* (with *-nt* from PI **-nt*). The meaning of the entire formation is far from being clear. Marinetti (1985: 146) recognizes in it a compound of *dik-* (cf. L *dic-* in *dicis causa*) and a reflex of **deike-nt-* (cf. L *dicentem*) without intervocalic /k/. Rix (1994: 117), after a preverb *di-* from **dē-*, sees a root *kdei-* from **klei-* 'to lean'. The linguistic context of *d[i]kdeiñtem* is also unclear.

- (50) ... *adf[3]* *fti-as* *est-as* *amgen-a/s*
 ? deed (?) -NOM.PL this-NOM.PL ? -NOM.PL
d[i]kdei-ñt-em *atím eitipes* [-?-] (AP.3)
 ? -PRS.ACT.PTCP-ACC.SG ? ?

vepses, in TE.2 (see example (80)), was interpreted as the perfect

active participle in the genitive singular of a verb from Proto-Indo-European **leik^w* ‘to let (go), to leave’, according to Adiego Lajara (1995: 138), or **wl(e)k^w-us-eis* ‘prepared for the funeral’, according to Martzloff (2006: 85, 2007: 182). Following either Adiego Lajara’s and Martzloff’s view, *vepses* may be analyzed as the sequence of a verbal root *vep-*, a perfect active participle suffix *-s*, and the genitive singular ending *-es*.⁶² If this analysis is correct, either South Picene is the only known Italic language in which the Proto-Indo-European perfect active participle in **-uos/*-ues/*-us* survives as such or *vepses* is a lexicalized relic containing the suffix similar to Latin *apud* ‘among’ and *cadāver* ‘corpse’ and Oscan *sipus* / Volscian *sepu* ‘knowing’ (see Wallace 1985 and Vine 2017: 795).

deiktam, in CH.1, has been regarded as the (feminine) perfect passive participle in the accusative of the verb ‘to say’ (PI **deik-e-/o-*) since Radke (1962: 1774): *deik-t-am* (with *-t* from PI **-t* and unexpected full grade; Marinetti 1985: 115; Vine 1998: 21, fn. 46). Also this participle seems to have a nominal use in the sentence in which it occurs; probably, it has completely passed into the category of nouns. It appears modified by a following genitive whose etymology and meaning are unknown.

- (51) *vacat deik-t-am h[1-2]lp-as pi-m oftor-im*
 say-PRF.PASS.PTCP-ACC.SG ?-GEN.SG anyone-ACC.SG stele (?) -ACC.SG
esm-en ad-stae-o-ms upeke[-?]-orom ... (CH.1)
 this-LOC.SG PREV-stand-PRF.IND-1PL.ACT ? ?
 ‘The prescription (ACC) of the *N* (SG), anyone, we set up here (lit. in this) a stele (vel sim.) [-?]- ...’

opesa ^v *úom*,⁶³ in RI.1, has been regarded as a present active infinitive from the verbal stem **opes-ā-* ‘to work, to make’⁶⁴ (Untermann 2000: 801; Rix 2003: 156; Crawford 2011: 170). If this interpretation is correct, and if we consider *ú* to be an epenthetic [w]-glide inserted into a two-vowel sequence /aɔ/ (see Martzloff 2006: 76, fn. 58), the present active infinitive would be made, as Oscan and Umbrian, by means of a suffix *-om* (/ -ɔm/) that continues Proto-Sabellic **-om* (Wallace 2007: 33; Clackson 2015: 11).

3.6. Adpositions

The sole identified adpositions are the prepositions *postin* ‘along’ (from PI **posti* ‘after’ + **en* ‘in’) and *e* ‘from’ (PI **ex*, **eks*).⁶⁵ The former governs the accusative case (52), the latter the ablative (53).⁶⁶

- (52) *postin vi-am* (TE.2)
 along road-ACC.SG
 ‘along the road’
- (53) *e síh-úh* (TE.1)
 from his-ABL.SG
 ‘from his (own expenditure/money)’⁶⁷

3.7. Adverbs

The list of words that were recognized as adverbs is so short that it can be easily seen here.

- (i) manner: *kuprí* ‘well’ (AQ.2) (*qupríh* in AP.2.).
- (ii) intensifying (?): *ma* ‘very (?)’ (AQ.2).⁶⁸
- (iii) spatial: *estuf* ‘here’ (TE.5) (cf. *estuf-k*, in AP.2, with a bound morpheme *-k* attached to the right; see 3.9), *oidom* ‘on this side (?)’ (see Zamponi 2019: 201).

3.8. Conjunctions

There seems to be two subordinating conjunctions in the text of TE.1 (entirely reported in (54)): conditional *suai* ‘if’ (O *svaí*, U *sve*) and, probably, temporal *puíde* ‘until (?)’.⁶⁹ Like its Umbrian and Oscan cognates (see Untermann 2000: 726 and Wallace 2007: 47), *suai* appears to be used in combination with an indefinite pronominal form.

- (54) *petr-oh púpún-[i-s]/ [nf]r-Ø e síh-úh suai/*
 Petro-DAT.SG Poponius-ADJZ-NOM.SG man-NOM.SG from his-ABL.SG if
pí-s eh-uel-í-Ø de[c. 3]/ [c. 3]nu puíde
 anyone-NOM.SG PREV-tear-PRF.SBJV-3SG.ACT ? ? until (?)
pe-pi/e-í-Ø [vacat] (TE.1)
 RED-pay (?) -PRF.IND-3SG.ACT
 ‘For Petro, Poponian man, from his (own expenditure/money he set up this monument). If anyone tears down (this monument) [-?-] until (?) he has paid up (?)’

3.9. Particles

It was indicated in 3.7 that the spatial adverb *estuf* ‘here’ of TE.5 occurs in AP.2 followed by a bound morpheme *-k*. In this element, which we may also observe in (4) and (55) attached to the proximal demonstrative pronoun *est- ~ esm-*, we may recognize a cognate of the enclitic particle =*ke* used in Oscan, Umbrian, and Latin as a recharacterization for exophoric and endophoric forms to indicate that they are demonstrative elements (see Dupraz 2012: 288).

3.10. Derivation

Both class-maintaining and class-changing derivational affixes are attested. The class-maintaining derivational affixes we may recognize are all preverbs. As often happens in Indo-European languages, we may grasp that there was a systematic morphological relationship between preverbs and adpositions in South Picene. This is explicitly indicated by the correspondence between the preverb *eh-* and the preposition *e* ‘from’ (3.6) and suggested by the presence in Oscan, Umbrian, and/or Latin of adpositions identical or similar in form to the remaining four preverbs in the South Picene corpus.

- *ad-* (O **az** ‘at, (near)by’, U = **ař** ‘to, at, (near)by’, L *ad*): **ad-staeoms** ‘to set up’ 1PL PRF ACT IND (CH.1).
- *eh-* (O *eh* ‘according to’, U *ehe* ‘away from, out from’, L *ex*): **eh-uelí** ‘to tear down’ 3SG PRF ACT SBJV (TE.1).⁷⁰
- *en-* (O, U = **e(n)** ‘in’, L *in*): **en-et** ‘to enter’ 3SG PRS ACT IND (CH.1) (cf. L *in-ire*).
- *per-* (U = **per** ‘for the sake/benefit of’, L *prō*): **pe/r-sukant** ‘to declare (?)’ 3PL PRS ACT IND (TE.6).
- *prai-* (O **prai** ‘before’, U **pre**, L *prae*): **prai-stait** ‘to stand out’ 3SG PRS ACT IND (TE.5).

The class-changing derivational affixes we may recognize are the following suffixes.

- *-ak*, deverbal adjectivizer (PI **-āk*): **aú/d-aq-um** ‘bold (?)’ ACC SG M (AP.1), if etymologically related to Latin *audāx* (and the corresponding verb *audēre*).
- *-an*, denominal adjectivizer/nominalizer (PI **-ān*): **efid-an-s** NOM SG M (AP.5), if an adjective from the South Picene name of the town of Offida (**eφida*), in the southern Marches, as proposed by La Regina (2010: 251),⁷¹ or, in any case, a noun (see example (65)); **luf-an-jom** ‘?’ GEN PL (CH.2), if an ethnic, as suggested by Stuart-Smith (2000: 103) (see note 76).
- *-í, -i*, denominal adjectivizer (PI **-i*): **ombri-í-en** ‘Umbrian’ LOC SG (CH.2); **tit-í-úh** ‘Titius’ DAT SG (CH.2), cf. *t <i> t-úm* ‘Titus’ ACC SG (AP.1); **púpún-i-s** ‘Poponian’ NOM SG M (MC.1), cf. **púpún-um** ‘Poponius’ GEN PL (AP.2).⁷²
- *-í, -íh*, deadjectival adverbializer (PI **-ēd*): **kupr-í** ‘well’ (AQ.2) (**qupír-íh** in AP.2), with a root /kupr-/ that likely means ‘good’ (see Zamponi 2018: 215, n. 12).
- *-ik*, denominal adjectivizer (PI **-ik ~ *-īk*): **ok[r]-ik-am** ‘of the

- citadel' ACC SG F (CH.1); cf. *okref* 'citadel, (upper) town' LOC SG (TE.7).
- *-in*, denominal adjectivizer (PI **-in*): *brímeid-in-ais* '(daughters) of Brimeclus' or, perhaps, 'Brimecleans' DAT/ABL PL F (TE.7), emended to *brímekdinais* (/bre:mɛkl-in-ais/⁷³) by Clackson (2016: 59); cf. *brímeql-úi* /bre:mɛkl-o:i/ 'Brimeclum' DAT SG.
 - *-kl*, deverbal nominalizer (PI **-tl⁷⁴*): *pra[i]-sta-kl-a* 'stele, standing object' NOM SG (TE.5), cf. *prai-staí-t* 'to stand out' 3SG PRS ACT IND (TE.5).
 - */-skl/*, deverbal nominalizer (PI **-stl*): *múfql-úm* 'monument (?)' NOM or ACC SG (TE.5), if its Proto-Italic reconstruction **mon(e)-stl-om* (see Nishimura 2012: 389), from **mon(i)-/*mone-* 'to remind, to tell (of)', is correct. In this case, *múfqlúm* would show, word-internally (at morpheme boundary), the same change */-ns-/ > /-ϕ-/* we observed, word-finally, with the Proto-Italic accusative plural ending **-əns* (example (11) and note 15).
 - *-uf*, adverbializer used with the proximal spatial demonstrative pronoun (composed of /u/ from the stem-vowel **o* and /ϕ/ from the Proto-Indo-European locational particle **d^{he}* or **d^{hi}*): *est-uf* 'here' (with the root allomorph of the direct cases; see 3.2).⁷⁵
 - *-úni*, denominal adjectivizer (PI **-ōni*): *petr-úni-s* 'Petronius' NOM SG (AP.4), cf. *petr-oh* 'Petro' DAT SG (TE.1); *pu/u-úni-es* 'Puponius' GEN SG (MC.2), cf. Latin *Puponius*. Keep in mind that many Sabellic nomina were in origin adjectives derived from the base of an individual name (see Wallace 2007: 57).

4. Syntax

As indicated in Zamponi (2019: 197), the longest South Picene documents show extensive use of poetic features that, although of great interest in the study of Italic poetics (Janson 1993: 155-158; Watkins 1995: 126-134; Costa 2000: 85-100; Dupraz 2006; Martzloff 2018; Martzloff & Machajdíkóvá 2018), hinder our understanding of the syntactic organization of the language ordinarily used. In this section, I limit myself, therefore, to highlighting the word order met in sentences and other parts of inscriptions of which we can grasp the sense with the warning that these sentences and text fragments may be the result of a deliberate manipulation of the ordinary language for esthetic effect.

For our information, the basic orders of the major constituents in

the verbal clauses of Oscan and Umbrian are AOV and SV. Typically, adjectives and genitive noun phrases occupy post-nominal position in both languages, while pronominal modifiers appear almost invariably placed before the head noun (Berrettoni 1967; Wallace 2007: 48).

4.1. Noun phrase

A noun phrase consists of either a pronoun or a noun head and optional modifiers. The modifiers we may recognize in the attested noun phrases are adjectives, demonstrative pronouns, possessive pronouns, genitive noun phrases, relative clauses, appositions and, perhaps, a post-nominal definite article (3.4).

(i) Adjectives, demonstrative pronouns, and genitive noun phrases can be observed both before and after a noun head. The anteposition to the head of adjectives and demonstrative pronouns, however, is more robustly attested than their position after the head.

- Adjective-head noun order: examples (1-2) and (20).
- Head noun-adjective order: example (3).
- Demonstrative pronoun-head noun order: examples (4-5) and (55).

(55) *esm-í=k* *uepet-í[n]* (RI.1)
this-LOC.SG = DEM tomb-LOC.SG
'in this tomb'

- Head noun-demonstrative pronoun order: example (56).

(56) *iepet-en* *esm-en* (CH.1)
tomb-LOC.SG this-LOC.SG
'in this tomb'

- Genitive noun phrase-head noun order: examples (32), (57-61), (64), and (73).⁷⁶

(57) *safin-úm* *ner-f* (TE.6)
Sabine-GEN.PL man-ACC.PL
'the men (ACC) of the Sabines'

- (58) *alí/nt-íom* *okr-ef* (TE.7)
 Alentes-GEN.PL citadel-LOC.SG
 ‘in the citadel of the Alentes’
- (59) *uelaim-es* *stati-es* *qor-a* (CH.1)
 Velaimus-GEN.SG Staius-GEN.SG commemorative_stone-NOM.SG
 ‘Velaimus Staius’ commemorative stone’
- (60) *raieim-úm* *t < i > t-ú/m* *anai-úm* *aú/d-aq-um* (AP.1)
 Raieimus (?) -GEN.PL Titus-ACC.SG Annaeus-ACC.SG dare (?) -ADJZ (?) -ACC.SG
 ‘Titus Annaeus the bold (?) (ACC) belonging to the Raieimi (?)’
- (61) *fitias-om* *múfql-úm* (TE.5)
 deed (?) -GEN.PL remind + NMLZ (?) -NOM/ACC.SG⁷⁷
 ‘a monument (?) of (your) deeds (?)’

- Head noun-genitive noun phrase order: examples (51), (62-63), (74), and (79).

- (62) *meitim-s* *safin-as/* *tút-as* (TE.5)
 gift (?) -NOM.SG Sabine-GEN.SG community-GEN.SG
 ‘the gift (?) of the Sabine community’
- (63) *apai-s* *pu/púni-es* (MC.2)
 Appaeus-NOM.SG Puponius-GEN.SG
 ‘Appaeus (son) of Puponius’

(ii) In the single noun phrase with a possessive pronoun present in the South Picene corpus, the possessive pronoun precedes the noun it modifies (6).

(iii) Relative clauses follow the head in three cases out of four (77-80).

(iv) Appositions (noun phrases that serve as modifiers of nouns and have the same referent as the modified noun) also follow their head noun. The head noun of the apposition does not necessarily agree in case with the noun the apposition modifies, as we may note in (54).

- (64) *k]aúí-eh* *kaúí-eis* *pu/ql-oh* (AQ.1)
 Gavius-DAT.SG Gavius-GEN.SG son-DAT.SG
 ‘for Gavius son of Gavius’

As in the other Italic languages, a nomen is treated as an apposition of the praenomen in South Picene and therefore follows it.⁷⁸ (Note that the praenomen is also modified by a possible ethnic adjective in (65).)

- (65) *noútni-s* *pete/roni-s*⁷⁹ *efid-an-s* (AP.5)
 Nonius-NOM.SG Petronius-NOM.SG Offida (?) -ADJZ-NOM.SG
 ‘Nonius Petronius from Offida (?)’
- (66) [-?]-+ *talui-s* *petrúni-s* [-?]- (AP.4)
 ? Taluius (?) -NOM.SG⁸⁰ Petronius-NOM.SG ?
 ‘[-?]- Taluius (?) Petronius [-?]-’

Various noun phrases contained in the South Picene inscriptions are discontinuous constructions interrupted by words that belong to other syntactic constituents. In MC.1, whose entire text is reported in (67), the locative noun phrase *mefiún vepeťi[n]* ‘in the tomb in the middle’ is split by the co-clausal predicate *veiat* ‘X lies’.

- (67) *apae-s* *qupa-Ø-t*[*e]sm-í/n* *púpún-i-s*
 Appaeus-NOM.SG lie-PRS.IND-3SG.ACT this-LOC.SG Poponius-ADJZ-NOM.SG
n/ír-Ø *mefi-ín* *veia/-Ø-t*
 man-NOM.SG placed_in_the_middle-LOC.SG lie-PRS.IND-3SG.ACT
vepet-í[n] (MC.1)
 tomb-LOC.SG
 ‘Appaeus lies here (lit. in this). The Poponian man lies in the tomb in the middle’

In the text of AP.1, given in (68), the locative noun phrase *esmín uv[e]peti[n]* ‘in this tomb’ is interrupted by the obscure word *údiíns* (surely not a locative form).⁸¹

- (68) *raeim-úm* *t<i>t-ú/m* *anai-úm* *aú/d-aq-um*
 Raieimus (?) -GEN.PL Titus-ACC.SG Annaeus-ACC.SG dare (?) -ADJZ (?) -ACC.SG
esm/-ín *údiíns* *uv/[e]peť-í[n vacat]* (AP.1)
 this-LOC.SG ? tomb-LOC.SG
 ‘Titus Annaeus the bold (?) (ACC) belonging to the Raieimi (?) [-?]- in this tomb’

Similarly, in the monosentential text of MC.2, the two constituents of the locative noun phrase ‘in this tomb’ (written here *esmín uepeťín*) are disjoined, straddling the subject noun phrase of the construction (see example (74)). In (80), the same locative noun phrase (written *esmen vepeten*) is rendered discontinuous by an intervening verb. In the same example, a genitive noun phrase is made discontinuous by its head noun (see the comment in 4.4.1.2). Finally, in the possessive noun phrase *púpúnum apaiús* ‘the Appaei belonging to the Poponii’ in (77), the possessor constituent is separated from the possessed constituent by the adverbial expression *estufk* ‘here’.

The use of interrupted noun phrases is a typical feature of verse word order in highly inflected languages like Latin (Califf 2002: 168), Greek (Devine & Stephens 1994: 483), and Georgian (Boeder 1989: 160). The intuitive notion of phrasal category remains definable in terms of case marking, agreement, and semantics generally.

Adverbial coordination (coordination of adverbial noun phrases) is by juxtaposition in the text of AP.2: *matereþ patereþ* ‘for the mother (and) for the father’ (77). There are no recognizable coordinators (of any kind) in the inscriptions.

4.2. Adpositional phrase

Only two adpositional phrases governed by a preposition are clearly attested in the South Picene epigraphic material (52, 53).

4.3. Clause

With the possible exception of one or two imperatives (see 3.5.1.4 and note 61), only declarative clauses are attested in the South Picene documents.⁸² According to their basic constituents, declarative clauses can be classified as verbal (4.3.1) and copular (4.3.2). Clauses of both types are exclusively affirmative in the surviving inscriptions. No marker of clause negation is identifiable.

4.3.1. Verbal clause

The order of basic constituents in the verbal clause is variable. In the intransitive clauses in (67) and (69), the subject constituent occurs before the verb.

- (69) *apúni-s* *qupa-Ø-t* ... (AP.3)
 Aponius-NOM.SG lie-PRS.IND-3SG.ACT
 ‘Aponius lies ...’

In the transitive clause in (70), with the entire text of AQ.2, the subject constituent occurs after the verb that comes right after the object constituent.

- (70) *ma* *kupr-í* *kor-am* *ops-ú-t*
 very (?) good-ADVZ commemorative_stone-ACC.SG make-PRF.IND-3SG.ACT
anini-s *raki* *nev-ī⁸³* *pomp[ún-e]í* (AQ.2)
 Aninius-NOM.SG ? Naevius-DAT.SG (?) Pompo-DAT.SG
 ‘Aninius made the commemorative stone very (?) well [-?-] for Pompo Naevius (?)’

The anteposition of the object constituent to the verb can also be observed in examples (48) and (51), while examples (71) and (80) attest the inverse order of the two constituents.⁸⁴

- (71) [-?- o]ps-ú-q qor-as
 make-PRF.IND-3SG.ACT commemorative_stone-ACC.PL
qdufeni-úf^{85 vacat} (TE.7)
 Clufennius-DAT.SG
 ‘[-?-] made the commemorative stones for Clufennius’

Adverbials tend to come before the verb, as we may note in examples (32), (51), (67), and (70-73).

- (72) *oidom* *safin-ús* *est-uf* *eoelsf-Ø-t* ... (TE.5)
 on_this_side (?) Sabine-NOM.PL this-ADVZ erect (?) -PRS.IND-3PL.ACT
 ‘On this side (?), the Sabines erect (?) here ...’
- (73) [-?- k]aúí-eh *kaúí-eis* *pu/ql-oh* *prai-staf-Ø-t*
 Gavius-DAT.SG Gavius-GEN.SG son-DAT.SG PREV-stand-PRS.IND-3SG.ACT
pom[-?-] (AQ.1)
 ?
 ‘[-?-] (the monument) stands out for Gavius son of Gavius [-?-]’

Interestingly, the verb *qumat* of the formula ‘X lies in this tomb/here’ (67) has been omitted in (74) (with the entire text of MC.2). The verb must have been judged as uninformative in this context.

- (74) *esm-ín* *apai-s* *pu/púni-es* *uepet-ín* (MC.2)
 this-LOC.SG Appaeus-NOM.SG Puponius-GEN.SG tomb-LOC.SG
 ‘Appaeus (son) of Puponius (lies) in this tomb’⁸⁶

4.3.2. Copular clause

Like Old Latin (see Viparelli 2002), South Picene distinguishes lexically the level of ‘being something’ from that of ‘being that which one hears that something is said to be’. The clause in (75) shows an occurrence of the copula verb ‘to be’, cognate with Latin *esse* (PIE **h1es-/*h1s-* ‘to be’ PRS).

- (75) *a[1]sí-es* *esu-m* (TE.4)
 A[1]sius-GEN.SG be.PRS.IND-1SG.ACT
 ‘I am (the property) of A[1]sius’

The clause in (76) shows an occurrence of the copula verb ‘to be called, to be reckoned as’, cognate with Latin *cluēre* (PIE **kl(é)u-* ‘to hear’ AOR).

- (76) ... *uelaim-es* *stati-es* *qor-a*
 Velaimus-GEN.SG Statius-GEN.SG commemorative_stone-NOM.SG
kduf-Ø-ú (CH.1)
 be_called-PRS.IND-1SG.ACT
 ‘... I am called Velaimus Statius’ commemorative stone’

Both copular clauses, as we may note, involve a first person singular subject that is not expressed by a personal pronoun. The constituent order is complement-copula, in (75) as well as in (76).

4.4. Complex sentence

The South Picene corpus contains a few complex sentences including a relative (adjectival) clause (4.4.1) or an adverbial clause (4.4.2). Not even one instance of a complex sentence including a complement (nominal) clause can be recognized.

4.4.1. Relative clause

Two types of relative clause construction are employed in South Picene: finite and non-finite, participial relative clauses. The finite relative clauses maintain full sentence structure with subject-verb agreement. The participial relative clauses exhibit the non-finite, participial form of the verb (3.5.2), which agrees in case and number with the head like adjectives and pronominal modifiers. The former strategy is far more explicit than the latter one and thus provides greater accessibility to relativization (see Keenan & Comrie 1977).

All attested relative clauses of South Picene are non-restrictive relative clauses that give some extra, but relevant, information about a head noun phrase.

4.4.1.1. Finite relative clause

There are three finite relative clauses in the surviving South Picene inscriptions, all of which are formed with the relative pronoun ‘who, which’ (3.2). The constituent of the main clause that is relativized by the finite relative clause is the subject (the highest position on the Accessibility Hierarchy) in one case (77) and the beneficiary (a syntactic position with a medium ranking on the Accessibility Hierarchy) in the remaining two (78, 79).

- (77) *mater-ēth* *pater-ēth* *qolof/i-Ø-túr* *qupír-th*
 mother-DAT.SG father-DAT.SG erect-PRS.IND-3SG.PASS good-ADVZ
- arít-ih* *ím-ih* *pu-ih* *púpún-um* *est-uf=k*
 art-ABL.SG ?-ABL.SG⁸⁷ which-NOM.SG Poponius-GEN.PL this-ADVZ = DEM
- apai-ús/* *ad-staí-ú-h* *sú-aís* *man-us/*
 Appaeus-NOM.PL PREV-stand-PRF.IND-3PL.ACT their-ABL.PL hand-ABL.PL
- meitim-úm* ^{vocat} (AP.2)
 gift (?) -ACC.SG
- ‘The Appaei belonging to the Poponii have set up here with their hands the gift (?) which is erected well, with art [-?-] for the mother (and) for the father’
- (78) ... *trebegi-es* *tit-úí* *pra[i]-sta-kl-a = sa*
 Trebecius-GEN.SG Titus-DAT.SG PREV-stand-NMLZ-NOM.SG = DEF.NOM.SG (?)
- posm-úí* (TE.5)
 who-DAT.SG
- ‘... for Titus (son) of Trebecius, for whom the (?) stele (is)’
- (79) [-?-]r-Ø-túr *brímeql-úí* *alí/nt-iom* *okr-éí*
 ?-PRS.IND-3SG.PASS Brimeclum-DAT.SG Alentes-GEN.PL citadel-LOC.SG
- safin-a[s -?-]* [-?-]enips *toút-a* *tef-éí* *p/osm-úí*
 Sabine-GEN.SG ? community-NOM.SG you-DAT who-DAT.SG
- prai-staí-Ø-nt* *a[-?-]* (TE.7)
 PREV-stand-PRS.IND-3PL.ACT ?
- ‘V (is offered?) for (the town of?) Brimeclum, belonging to the Alentes, in the citadel of the Sabine [-?-], the community for you (SG), for whom (the commemorative stones) stand out [-?-]’

As we may note, the three attested finite relative clauses are externally headed, with the head noun phrase before the relative clause except in (77). In this example, the finite relative clause is extraposed: rather than directly following the head *meitimúm* ‘gift (?)’ (ACC), it occurs dislocated before the main clause. The relative pronoun is placed at the beginning (79) or at the end (77-78) of the relative clauses and marked for case (nominative in (77), dative in (78) and (79)) to indicate the syntactic role of the head noun phrase inside the relative clause (subject, beneficiary) and for number in agreement with the head noun phrase.⁸⁸

The clause-final position of the relative pronoun in (77) and (78) goes against the cross-linguistic tendency for postnominal relative clauses to have a relative pronoun in clause-initial position (Downing 1978: 390). It is particularly rare in the (Indo-)European languages that relative pronouns are not in clause-initial position. As Watkins (1995: 11) observes, this extreme position of the relative pronoun “is a surely conscious poetic figure of ‘non-configurational’ word order”.

4.4.1.2. Participial relative clause

There is only one (recognizable) instance of a participial relative clause in the South Picene corpus (80). Syntactically, it realizes the function of relativization of the subject. The relative clause (*esmen vepses vepeten*) modifies a preceding head consisting of a personal name (*t<i>t<e>s alies*) with which it forms the possessor constituent of a possessive noun phrase. For stylistic reasons (alliteration and isosyllabism; see Zamponi 2019: 208), the possessor constituent is split by the possessed constituent phrase (*tokam*) of the possessive noun phrase. The verb of the participial clause (*vepses*) agrees in number and case with its antecedent.

(80)	<i>postin</i>	<i>vi-am</i>	<i>vide-Ø-tas</i>	<i>t<i>t<e>s</i> ⁸⁹
	along	road-ACC.SG	see-PRS.IND-2PL.ACT	Titus-GEN.SG
	<i>tok-am</i>		<i>ali-es</i>	<i>esm-en</i>
	memorial_stele-ACC.SG	Allius-GEN.SG	this-LOC.SG	
	<i>vep-s-es</i>		<i>vepet-en</i> (TE.2)	
	leave-PRF.PASS.PTCP-GEN.SG	tomb-LOC.SG		
	'Along the road you (PL) see the memorial stele of Titus Allius (who has been) left in this tomb'			

Note that, again for stylistic reasons, the verb is interposed between the two components of the locative noun phrase (*esmen vepeten*) of the participial clause. We may exclude that the alliterating verb and noun in sequence (*vepses* 'left', from PIE **leǵkʷ-* 'to let (go), to leave' or **wl(e)kʷ-us-eis* 'prepared for the funeral' (3.5.2), and *vepeten* 'in the tomb', from PI **la/eped-* 'stone' (see Zamponi 2019: 204)) are also an etymological figure.

4.4.2. Adverbial clause

The only two identified adverbial clauses occurring in the South Picene corpus are contained in the text of TE.1 shown in (54). One of the two adverbial clauses is a potential conditional introduced by the conjunction *suai* 'if'. The other adverbial clause is perhaps a temporal clause introduced by the conjunction *puúde* 'until (?)'. In the conditional clause, the verb is in the perfect subjunctive. In the probable temporal clause, the verb is in the perfect indicative.

5. Conclusions

The aim of this article and the previous one in this journal (Zamponi 2019) has been to provide a first description of what we (may

think to) know about the structure of the Italic language conventionally called South Picene attested by about twenty inscriptions from the Adriatic slopes of the Italian peninsula (550-350/300 BCE). To give a sufficiently thorough picture of the structural organization of the language, it was described by paying equal attention to the phonology (section 2), the morphology (section 3), and the syntax (section 4). The picture of South Picene that emerges from the pages of the two articles is that of a language particularly close grammatically to the better-documented Oscan and Umbrian languages of central and southern Italy. Little of what has been observed in South Picene has no correspondence in the documentation of the two Sabellic languages: (i) the use of the locative ending /-e:n/, from the fusion of the Proto-Italic locative case marker *-ei of *o*-stems and *i*-stems with the adposition *en 'in' (also attested in Oscan: **húrt-ín** 'in the garden'), with *C*-stems (3.1); (ii) a bound element =*sa* originating from the Proto-Indo-European demonstrative *s- ~ *t- 'this, that' probably used to mark definiteness (3.4); (iii) a perfect indicative in /-o:/ (with a possible cognate in Pre-Samnite) (3.5.1.3) that implies the use of a primary ending at third person singular (3.5.1.1).

The copula verb meaning 'to be called, to be reckoned as', that in the Italic context is attested only in Latin, besides South Picene, is of particular interest on the lexical plane (4.3.2).

From the perspective of syntax, the final position of the relative pronoun in the finite relative clause observed in two inscriptions, unattested both in Latin and in the other Italic language, appears as an extremely rare phenomenon cross-linguistically (4.4.1.1). We should not forget, however, that this unexpected position of the relative pronoun is linked to a conscious manipulation of language for purely aesthetic purposes of which we have clear proof in various South Picene texts (see the several discontinuous noun phrases highlighted in 4.1).

Due to the narrowness of the South Picene documentary corpus, some aspects treated in this structural outline are perhaps destined to remain forever uncertain. I refer, in particular, to details of phonology (like the presence of a segment /u:/ in the vocalic inventory and the contrastive status of [ɛ:] and [ɔ:] in certain southern varieties of South Picene (2.1)) and verbal morphology (the presence of a second/third person singular active future imperative form in /-to:/ (3.5.1.4), a perfect active participial form in /-s/ (3.5.2), and a present active infinitival form in /-ɔm/ (*ibidem*)). To these, we may add further details of phonology for which a univocal analysis is impossible (e.g. the precise quality of its *r*-sound (1.3) and the phonetic/phonemic value of non-initial orthographic *CiV* sequences (2.3)).

The aim of providing a general structural overview of South Picene has inevitably led to neglecting both the study of its documents from the ‘external linguistics’ point of view (script, hermeneutic problems, poeticity of certain texts, etc.), and issues of ‘retrospective linguistics’ (e.g. the position of the language within the Sabellic subgroup of Italic). These aspects still deserve particular attention and, undoubtedly, new investigations.

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 = fir

st, second, third person; A = transitive subject; ABL = ablative; ACC = accusative; ACT = active; ADJZ = adjectivizer; ADVZ = adverbializer; AOR = aorist; C = consonant; DAT = dative; DEF = definite; DEM = demonstrative; F = feminine; FUT = future; GEN = genitive; IMP = imperative; IND = indicative; L = Latin; LOC = locative; M = masculine; N = neuter; N = noun; NMLZ = nominalizer; NOM = nominative; O = Oscan / object; OL = Old Latin; PASS = passive; PI = Proto-Italic; PIE = Proto-Indo-European; PL = plural; PREV = preverb; PRF = perfect; PRS = present; PS = Proto-Sabellic; PTCP = participle; RED = reduplication; S = intransitive subject; SBJV = subjunctive; SG = singular; U = Umbrian; V = verb.

In the examples and their glosses, the following symbols are used: a hyphen (-) marks a morpheme boundary, a double hyphen (=) marks a clitic boundary, a period (.) links glosses of a single morpheme, a plus sign (+) unites two separate glosses that correspond to morphemes that are ‘fused’ into one.

Note

¹ Since it is impossible to determine the gender of each noun occurring in examples (7-80) based on agreement, information of gender was omitted from the interlinear gloss line with which most of these examples are provided.

² The character of ethnic denomination of *púpún-* (also occurring in examples (54) and (78)), recognized by La Regina (1981: 132-133) and Marinetti (1981: 121-122, 1985: 37), appears today to be refuted by the majority of scholars. The current prevailing opinion seems to be recognizing in *púpún-* the root of a family name (equivalent to Latin *Poponius*) that designates a clan in the context of an unspecified ethnos that could be that of the so-called ‘Picentes/Piceni’.

³ Morphologically, the two forms of this example have been regarded either as genitive singular feminine (Marinetti 1985: 145-146; Untermann 2000: 92) or as probable nominative plural feminine (Untermann 2000: 236; Penney 2002: 135). Arguably, they could also be accusative plural feminine, since the accusative plural marker of **ā-*stems is also *-as* in South Picene (see example (11)). The allorph *est-* of the root of the demonstrative is a form of direct case in Umbrian and Pre-Samnite (Dupraz 2012: 43, 60) (cf. *esm-* in (4)) and this seems to exclude the possibility that *estas* and *amgena/s* are genitive singular feminine. The fact that the two words are followed by an accusative singular form (see example (50)) suggests that they are nominative plu-

ral and belong to the subject constituent of the clause in which they occur.

⁴ It is unclear whether this word reflects a monophthongization of *ou or is an error for *toútas* (PI **toutās*).

⁵ Adiego Lajara (1992: 30) compares this noun with Old Latin *mitat* (a verb form probably meaning ‘gives’, ‘sends’, or the like) and (like Eichner 1988-1990: 200) with Gothic *maíþms* ‘gift, present’. Pisani (1959: 87) connects *meitims* with Latin *mēta* ‘cone, small column’ compared to which it appears to be a diminutive. Although the two artifacts on which the words *meitims* and *meitimúm* were engraved actually have the shape of a small column, the unexpected sound correspondence South Picene *ei* : Latin *ē* rules out Pisani’s suggestion.

⁶ *apaes* in MC.1. This nomen can probably be traced to the Etruscan kinship term *apa* ‘father’. Similar names occur in Latin (*Ap(p)aeus*, *Appius*), Umbrian, Faliscan, and Venetic (see Middei 2015: 114-116).

⁷ The root suppletion /*ner-*/ ~ /*nēr-*/ goes back to Proto-Indo-European: **h₂nēr* NOM SG vs **h₂ner-* ACC SG/PL.

⁸ See Zamponi (2018: 215, n. 13).

⁹ Proto-Italic *-os > -s by apocope of the short vowel before final s (see Zamponi 2019: 207).

¹⁰ This word has been compared with Faliscan *posticnu* ‘likeness, statue (?)’ NOM SG (?) (with no known Latin cognate).

¹¹ The South Picene ending was probably pronounced [-om] (see Zamponi 2019: 201).

¹² See Zamponi (2018: 214, n. 10).

¹³ *pduf-* could be a syncopated reflex of **peduϕ-* (although the initial-syllable syncope is a bit peculiar) that, in turn, might be from the Proto-Indo-European root **pedo-* ‘place’ (cf. U *peŕume* ACC SG ‘ditch, pit’, with a particular meaning which must have developed within an Italic environment; see Ancillotti & Cerri 2015: 36-37) and the locational particle **d^he* or **d^hi* (which is probably also the source of the final -*f* of *estuf* ‘here’; 3.10). According to an alternative interpretation proposed by Rix (1994: 116-117), *pduf-* is from the root **pleu-* ‘to flow (the path?)’. The letter *d* would represent the voiced dental fricative [ð] as in, according to Rix, *kdu* and *qdu* (see Zamponi 2019: 198).

¹⁴ South Picene -*as* does not reflect the same development of final *-*ns* we may observe with the accusative plural ending of *C*-stems nouns; cf. Umbrian -*af* (*vitlaf* ‘calf’) and Oscan -*ass* [-as:] (*viass* ‘road’). Note that Oscan -*ass* probably contains an analogical -*s* copied from the vowel stems: -*ass* is from **aϕ-s* and **aϕ* is from *-*ans*, just like Umbrian -*af*; see Rix (1986), but also, for an alternative explanation, Tikkanen (2011: 33).

¹⁵ The development of final *-*n(t)s* > -*ϕ* is a Sabellic phonological isogloss (see Clackson 2015: 10). Note, however, that while for *C*-stem nouns Umbrian has the accusative plural ending /-*ϕ*/ (cf. *nerf* ‘men’), like South Picene, Oscan has /-*s*/ (cf. *malaks*, probably ‘evil-doing (men)’).

¹⁶ Proto-Italic *-*osjo* (cf. OL *popliosio valesiosio* (Lapis Satricanus)) from PIE *-*osjo* and *-*i* from PIE *-*iH*. For the genitive singular of *o*-stem nouns, Sabellic languages use *-*eis*, the Proto-Italic *i*-stem ending (Vine 2017: 755). As indicated in Zamponi (2019: 204), AQ.1 (from Castel di Ieri) is the only South Picene inscription in which *-*eis* is not monophthongized.

¹⁷ The original spelling *tetis* of this word does not lend itself well to interpretation as a genitive singular.

¹⁸ The South Picene ending was probably pronounced [-asɔ:m], with **ō* lowered before a final /m/ (see Zamponi 2019: 200).

¹⁹ The South Picene ending was likely pronounced [-ɔ:m]. -*um* in *púpún-um* is probably best explained as an error for -*úm* with the central bar of the modified *ú* being

left off. *-úm* (rather than *-om*) in *safin-úm* and *maro-úm* can be explained as the result of a graphic analogy to the *ú* seen in the nominative plural of *o*-stem nouns (*safin-ús* / *safin-úm*) (Weiss 1998: 712). If graphic analogy has not taken place in *fiti-asom*, *alínt-iom*, and *rael-iom*, this is due to the fact that the forms in question are not *o*-stem nouns.

²⁰ Perhaps with *nú* dropped by pseudo-haplography: *marú(nú)m*. The form in question may perhaps be compared with Umbrian *marone* ‘magistrate’ NOM PL (Rix 1994: 120), from Etruscan *maru*, with an analogous meaning (see Meiser 2009: 138).

²¹ The South Picene ending was probably pronounced [-i:om] or [-j:om].

²² The possibility of an *-úi/-úí* vs *-oh* contrast on dialectal bases was indicated in Zamponi (2019: 203). As far as the two spellings *-oh* and *-eh* are concerned, Nieto Ballester (1996: 78-79) signals that both could be approximate notations of the long close-mid front vowel [ø:] or that one of them, *-oh*, could represent a historical spelling, while the other is a transcription faithful to the phonetic shape of a dative singular ending by then pronounced [e:]. Weiss (1998: 706-707), more convincingly, explains *-oh* and *-eh* in purely phonological terms as follows. As in Oscan, the diphthong **ōi* was shortened to /oi/ and subsequently monophthongized as a long back vowel. This new vowel was more open than the old long /o:/ and was of the same quality as old short /ɔ/. Therefore, it was written with the letter *o* to which *h* was added to signal length. The final vowel of *k]aiúeh*, on the other hand, is the outcome of the fronting and unrounding effects of a preceding jod. Thus, **gāwīōi* > **gāwīēi*, by post-jod fronting, whence **gāwīei* by shortening of the final long diphthongs and, finally, /ga:wije:/ by monophthongization of the final diphthong. The spelling *-eh* indicates an open-long mid front unrounded [ɛ:] likely identical in quality to short [ɛ], but distinct from the long close-mid front unrounded [e:] which was the outcome of Proto-Italic **ē*, usually written *í*. The post-jod fronting rule would not have occurred in the variety of the Pescara Valley that attests *títúh*. Given that we have no orthographic evidence for the glide /j/ in /ga:wije:/ and that the Italic protoform ‘for Gavius’ can be more cautiously reconstructed as **gāwīōi*, as Adiego Lajara (1992: 130) did, we may alternatively suppose that **ō* was fronted to *ē* through the influence of the preceding front vowel /i/: **gāwīōi* > **gāwīēi* > **gāwīei* > /ga:wije:/.

²³ Likely to be a name, either of a person (Brimeclus) or, more likely, a place (Brimeclum) (see Clackson 2016: 60).

²⁴ Note that *matereih* and *patereih* occur in a text in which every word ending in a vowel might have the letter *h* at the end.

²⁵ This word is compared by Marinetti (1985: 100) with Old High German *sal* ‘house, hall’ and Old Church Slavonic *selo* ‘village’.

²⁶ In all Italic languages, the dative plural and the ablative plural are syncretic in all declensions.

²⁷ Proto-Italic **-īβos* > **-īφs* (by apocope of the short vowel before final *s*; see Zamponi 2019: 207) > /-is/ (by assimilation, but unexpectedly written *-es*).

²⁸ Proto-Italic **-uβos* > **-uφs* > /-us/.

²⁹ In place of /-en/ (with short vowel) from **-j-en* (< **-i* + **-en*).

³⁰ Unlike the Oscan corpus, that attests both the adposition (preposition) *en* (cf. *en eituas* ‘concerning the money’) and the locative ending *-ín* [-e:n] (cf. *húrtín kerríín* ‘in the enclosure of Ceres’), the South Picene corpus does not contain any occurrence of an adposition that continues **en*. It, however, attests the grammaticalization of the adposition *en* as a preverb (see 3.10). Apparently, Fortson’s (2010: 133) observation that, inside Italic, “[t]he original single-postposition grammar lived on everywhere; only the case-morphology had changed in some areas” may therefore be appropriately applied also to the specific case of South Picene.

³¹ In the copular clause with a genitive-marked complement in (75), the copula stresses the existential relation between the possessor and the object, as it happens

in similar constructions of Oscan (see Tikkanen 2011: 96) and other languages of ancient Italy.

³² There are no examples in which the ablative case expresses separation in the South Picene corpus. Keep in mind that the Proto-Indo-European instrumental case was lost early on in both Sabellic and Latin through functional syncretism with the ablative case.

³³ Proto-Sabellic **tē-om*.

³⁴ *tefeh* in CH.2. Probably, *tefeí* stands for /təφei/ and *tefeh* for /təφe:/.

³⁵ *ekú sim* in Crawford (2011: 1262) and Rix (2002: 69).

³⁶ *rufra sim* in Crawford (2011: 1262) and Rix (2002: 69); cf. *ruf[r]ahi* in the Sabine inscription from Colle del Giglio perhaps comparable to the series of Italic names based on the root **ruφr-* ‘red’ (Morandi 2017: 110).

³⁷ See note 3.

³⁸ See also [e]smín in MC.1 and *esmen* in CH.1, CH2, and TE.2.

³⁹ Dupraz (2012: 35-41) shows that the Umbrian data do not support Prosdocimi’s (1978: 742-743, 1979: 169) analysis of *est-* as a medial demonstrative which points to a referent near the hearer, and that the South Picene data do not require such an analysis either (proposed by Marinetti 1985: 67-74, 117-130). In both languages, *est-* ~ *esm-* may be regarded as a proximal demonstrative that points to a referent immediately close to the speaker within a demonstrative system characterized by a two-way proximal/distal opposition.

⁴⁰ Nocentini (1992: 209, fn. 15) regards the South Picene spatial demonstrative pronoun as having been grammaticalized into an adverb. Such an analysis, apparently, does not take into account that proximal spatial adverb *estuf* is attested in South Picene (see 3.7).

⁴¹ Cf. Oscan *puí* and Latin *cui*. Given that, like Umbrian, South Picene seems to monophthongize **oi* to /*o:*/, we may suppose that a particle *=*i*, probably from an earlier *=*id* (Meiser 1987: 121; Weiss 1998: 709) or *=*i* (Untermann 2000: 597), has been added to **k^woi* and **k^wosmoi* giving the attested forms *puíh* (perhaps an error for *puíh* /*po:i*/, with *-h* for [i] as in *matereth* and *toútath* (see Zamponi 2019: 199) and, in any case, directly comparable with U *poi* (< Proto-Umbrian **pō=i*) and *posmúí* (/pɔsmo:i/, with an otherwise unexplainable long /*o:*/). Note the vowel *u* in *puíh* appears to be paralleled by the *u* of in the Pre-Samnite form πουμοι, whatever the explanation for *u* and *u* in a form of **k^wo-* may be (Dupraz 2012: 39).

⁴² *pimpth* [-?]) occurs in an obscure syntactic context (the mutilated line [-?]-*ah selah pimpth* [-?]). It was identified as an indefinite pronoun essentially on the basis of etymological considerations (see Machajdíková & Martzloff 2016: 98-99).

⁴³ If the interpretation of the orthographic word *suaipis* as the juxtaposition of the conjunction *suaí* with an indefinite pronoun is correct (cf. U *svepis* ‘if anyone’ and L *sí quis*).

⁴⁴ The syntactic context in which this form occurs is unclear.

⁴⁵ The different readings of this word (*me[n/t]fistrúí* for Marinetti 1985: 217 and Adiego Lajara 1992: 127, *me{n}fistrúí* for Rix 2002: 68, *mentistrúí* for La Regina 2010: 258) make it too doubtful to recognize seriously in it an adjectival compound of **meφio-* ‘middle’ and **st(e)ro-* ‘to lay out, to strew’ (the root of Latin *sternere*; Martzloff 2006: 79) and to attribute to it, therefore, the meaning ‘lying in the middle’. The new reading of this word offered by Crawford (2011: 197) looks like a *magister*-type form **meit-is-ter-o-*. Could it be connected with *meitims* in the same inscription (see example (32)) and could that point to an analysis of *meitims* as a superlative (Fortson & Weiss 2013)?

⁴⁶ The form *lufanjom* GEN PL in CH.2 could be an ethnic name/adjective of the *i*-declension (see 3.10 and note 76).

⁴⁷ Probably, *-um* is an error for *-úm* (i.e. [-om] ‘ACCUSATIVE SINGULAR’) with the

central bar of *ú* being omitted. Two further possible instances of *u* for *ú* are signaled in notes 19 and 41.

⁴⁸ This word is compared to Latin *quamdiū* by Meiser (1987:1 18) and for it Martzloff (2009: 362) proposes this etymological progression from Proto-Italic: **k^wām-dieu* > **pāndiou* > **pandiou* (Osthoff's law; Osthoff's 1881: 1593) > **panniou* > /pan:io:/, which is phonetically [ˈpan:iwo:] (his reading of *panivú*) by a glide-insertion rule and not [ˈpan:io:] or [ˈpan:jo:], as we would expect to find together with *qdufeniúú* (/kluʔenio:i/ or /kluʔenjo:i/; TE.7) and *titiúh* (/titio:/ or /titjo:/; CH.2). The position of this word after *praistaút*, the only verb in this example, makes it difficult to interpret it as a temporal conjunction ('for as long as'), like Latin *quamdiū*, given that in Sabellic languages subordinating conjunctions occur at the beginning of subordinate clauses (see Wallace 2007: 42 and also the probable temporal clause introduced by the conjunction *puúde* in (54)).

⁴⁹ The connection of *-sa* to **s-* ~ **t-* was first proposed by Marinetti (1985: 81) who also signals the survival of the Proto-Indo-European demonstrative in Old Latin (Ennius: *sum* ACC SG M, *sas* ACC PL F, *sōs* ACC PL N).

⁵⁰ Or 'gift', as I doubtfully indicated in examples (32), (62), and (77) (see note 5).

⁵¹ The presence in Romanian of an enclitic definite article that continues a demonstrative pronoun (L *ille*) and is inflected for gender, number, and case, makes, however, this hypothesis at least likely.

⁵² The root *pie-* could be from Proto-Indo-European **k^wei-* 'to pay' (Weiss 2002: 364) (or, probably, 'to fine, to punish').

⁵³ The identification of a second person singular future active indicative form of the verb 'to want' in *heries*, in AP.6, based on Umbrian (cf. **pune heries** 'when you wish'), is uncertain. It is perhaps preferable to equate this word to the Oscan nomen **hereiis** NOM SG (Stuart-Smith 2004: 68).

⁵⁴ Proto-Italic **ezo-m* < Proto-Indo-European **h₂es-mi*.

⁵⁵ According to Martzloff (2006: 66) this form is from the past participle **ekskelssso-* (cf. L *excelsus*): **eks-kelss-ē-nti* > *eoelsít*; cf. an analogous interpretation in Eichner (1988-1990: 199).

⁵⁶ It is unclear how Proto-Italic **d* in word-final position is reflected in South Picene. In one or two cases, the reflex of **-d* seems to be \emptyset (*kuprī* 'well' (AQ.2), from **kupr-ēd*, and *haligatú* (AQ.)), if it is a second or third person singular active future imperative verb form with *-tú* from **-tōd*). In three other cases, the reflex of **-d* might be [h] or a similar sound (see Zamponi 2019: 199). Adiego Lajara (1992: 107-108) indicates the loss of word-final **-d* as a distinctive trait of the southern varieties of South Picene, but it should be recalled that all forms with *-h* from **-d* are contained in a single (northern) inscription (AP.2) in which every (orthographic) word ends in consonantal grapheme (including *matereih* 'mother' DAT SG, from **mātēr-ei* and *paterelh* 'father' DAT SG, from Proto-Italic **pater-ei*, as also indicated in Zamponi 2019: 199; see example (77)). In (40), the reflex of **-d* is tentatively indicated as *-ō*.

⁵⁷ Probably [-ɔ:] before *m* (written *-o*; see Zamponi 2019: 200) and [-o:] elsewhere (written *-úm*). This suffix has been seen as a specific innovation of South Picene. Its origins have no clear interpretations (Rix 1993: 337-339; Beckwith 2007: 85-86; Zair 2014: 380-382). It is possible that the form *fuf(v)foð* 'they were' on the Pre-Samnite Tortora stele might have the same origin as the South Picene \bar{o} -perfect, but the single attested third person singular form on the inscription, *fefukēð* 'he made', shows that the generalization of a back vowel throughout the perfect paradigm has not taken place in the language of the Tortora stele (Clackson 2015: 19).

⁵⁸ I.e. /-i/ (í being the second member of a diphthong; see Zamponi 2019: 199). This suffix is likely a reflex of the Proto-Indo-European deictic (*hic et nunc*) particle **=i* (Weiss 2002: 364). On the subject of the vowel quality of the CV reduplicant of the reduplicative perfect in Italic languages, see Lazzarini & Poccetti (2001: 78), Di

Giovine (1996: 116), and Marinetti & Prosdocimi (1994: 296).

⁵⁹ Two distinct lexemes (*poi ouefa*) for Rix (2002: 69) and Crawford (2011: 1262).

⁶⁰ Rix (2002: 69) and Crawford (2011: 1262) consider this orthographic word as a sequence of two distinct lexemes (*ioki pedu*).

⁶¹ Marinetti (1985: 114) suggests that (the obscure) *bie* in CH.1 might be the second person singular active present imperative form of the verb ‘to live’ (assumed to be an augural formula, like L *vale* and *salve*). If this interpretation of *bie* is correct, this word would consist of an uninflected stem, exactly like some of the second person singular active imperative forms of Oscan and Umbrian (see Wallace 2007: 31).

⁶² Dupraz (2012: 50, fn. 79) insightfully observes that the locative noun phrase *esmen vepeten* ‘in this tomb’ inside which *vepses* occurs makes Martzloff’s interpretation semantically unconvincing: the dead person has certainly not been prepared in the tomb itself.

⁶³ The gap occurs where the stone shows damage that may have been present before carving (Clackson 2015: 11, fn. 32). Note that this form was read *o[- -]esagium* by Marinetti (1985: 251) and *o[-]esagium* by La Regina (2010: 267). Rix (2002: 70) has *opeša[]úom*.

⁶⁴ Cf. the syncopated *opsút* in (45), apparently from the same stem (which is attested in syncopated form **opsa-* also in other Sabellic languages). Nishimura (2008: 180) suggests that the expected syncope has not taken place in *opesa* ^v *úom* due to the labial environment. Also note that a way out of assuming syncope in *opsút* would be to see it as going back to an old *s*-aorist **h₃eps* (root **h₃ep* ‘to make, to produce’; Rix 1993: 340); cf. Oscan **uupsens** ‘to make, to construct’ 3PL PRF ACT IND with generalization of the long vowel from the singular (**h₃ēps*).

⁶⁵ **x* represents a voiceless velar fricative. Crawford (2011: 170) hypothesizes that the text of RI.1 might contain a preposition *ú* ‘on account of’ (corresponding to L *ob* and O *úp*) and that the word *im* discussed in 3.2, occurring in the same text (see example (27)), might be a preposition meaning ‘in respect of’ or ‘as’.

⁶⁶ The same happens with the cognate forms **pústín** ‘along’ and *eh* ‘according to’ of Oscan and **pustin** ‘at each/every’ and *ehe* ‘away from, out from’ of Umbrian (see Tikkanen 2011: 68, 129-130).

⁶⁷ Cf. Latin *de suo*, *de sua pecunia*.

⁶⁸ Weiss (1998: 705) suggests that the *ma* that precedes **kuprí** ‘well’, in a sequence that he proposes to read /makkupre:/ (< **mag kuprēd*) (see example (70)), is a reflex of Proto-Indo-European **meǵh₂-* ‘great, much’ and nearly an exact match for Greek *άγα* ‘very’ (commonly an element in adjectives of praise). The accusative pronoun *míom* ‘me’ attested in a sixth century Sabellic (‘Palaeoumbrian’) inscription from Tolfa (southwestern Etruria) and the analogous accusative pronouns *tíom* ‘you (SG)’ of South Picene and *siom* ‘himself’ of Oscan, suggesting that Proto-Sabellic innovated an accusative case form of personal pronouns of the structure in **Cēom* (Clackson 2015: 11), render untenable La Regina’s (1978: 312) interpretation, hesitatingly adopted by Marinetti (1985: 104), of *ma* as the accusative form of the first person singular pronoun.

⁶⁹ According to Weiss (2002: 363) from *puú-* + *de*, i.e. the allative **pú* (/po:/) ‘where, to what place’ (< PI **k^wō*; cf. L *quō*) plus the enclitic particle **=de* found in Umbrian **pane** (probably [‘pan:e]) (< **pande* < PI **k^wam=de*; cf. L *quamde*). If this analysis is correct, the spelling of this word would not reflect the delabialization of **k^w* before a back vowel attested in the forms *puúh* (perhaps /poi:/) NOM SG M (< PI **k^woi* + **=i*; note 41) and *posmúi* (/pɔsmo:i/) DAT SG M/F/N (< PI **k^wosmoi* + **=i*) of the relative pronoun ‘who, which’ and typical of Sabellic languages in general. This sound change, according to Weiss (*ibidem*) could have occurred during the written history of South Picene and, for this reason, was not always accompanied by a change in the spelling.

⁷⁰ The root of this verb is probably a reflex of Proto-Indo-European *wel- ‘to tear’ (see Weiss 2002: 359-361); cf. Latin *ē-vellere*.

⁷¹ This hypothesis appears to me quite probable keeping in mind that Offida is a few miles away from the discovery location of AP.5 (Servigliano).

⁷² Likely, /-j/ intervocally (*ombri-i-en*) and /-i/ interconsonantly (*púpún-i-s*). The shape of the suffix between a consonant and a vowel (*tit-i-úh*) might be /-i/ as well /-j/ (see Zamponi 2018: 216, n. 30). This morpheme is rather common in the formation of Sabellic prae-nomina and nomina (see Wallace 2007: 52); cf. *kaúit-eis* ‘Gavius’ GEN SG (AQ.1) and *stati-es* ‘Statius’ GEN SG (CH.1) in South Picene and their Oscan equivalents *gavis* NOM SG and *statis* NOM SG.

⁷³ *kd* would render the probable phonemic sequence /kl/, as in *kduúu* and *qdufeniúú* (Zamponi 2019: 206).

⁷⁴ The sound change *tl > kl is common to all Italic languages, but it did not manifest itself yet at a Proto-Italic date (see Meiser 2017: 748).

⁷⁵ Cf. Paelignian *ecuf* ‘here’. The South Picene adverb derives from *est-o- (Umbrian *esto*) while the Paelignian adverb is from *ek-o-. It has been suggested that these two forms were affected by analogy with an unattested locational pronoun cognate with Oscan *puf* and Umbrian *pufe* ‘where’ (< PI *k^wu^hpei; cf. L. *-cubi* (in *alicubi* ‘anywhere’)) which has original *u*-vocalism in the stem. That is, the influence of the South Picene (and Paelignian) counterpart *pu ϕ (e) might have transformed *est-o- into *est-u-*. The relationship between *estuf* and the interrogative-relative pronoun does not seem, however, to be so close-knit and compelling, as Nishimura (2012: 384) notes, and the ascription of the vocalic change *o > u to prelabial (i.e., /_ ϕ) vowel reduction he proposed seems to be a more convincing hypothesis.

⁷⁶ Cf. also, probably, *lufaniom ombri \acute{e} n akren* ‘in the Umbrian land of the *N* (PL)’ in CH.2.

⁷⁷ As indicated in 3.10, *múfql-* is probably from Proto-Italic *mon(i)-/*mone- ‘to remind, to tell (of)’ (cf. L. *mōnstrum* < *mone-str-o-) plus a deverbal nominalizer /-skl/ from Proto-Italic *-stl. The ending *-úm* ([-om]) might be that of a nominative singular neuter *o*-stem noun (PI *-om), but also that of an accusative singular *o*-stem noun of any gender (PI *-om; see example (10)). The unclear context in which the word occurs leaves both interpretations open.

⁷⁸ Note, however, the probable transposition of nomen and praenomen in (70), which is not a unique case in the Sabellic context (see Crawford 2011: 227).

⁷⁹ A variant of *petrínis* in (66) with anaptyctic *e*.

⁸⁰ As Clackson (2015: 16) observes, there is no known Italic praenomen from which *taluis* (or *taruis*, the alternative reading) can be derived. This word could be a patronymic adjective with all but the final (illegible) letter of the praenomen lost.

⁸¹ This word has been considered a third person plural form of a transitive verb, but the available South Picene material does not otherwise supply evidence for a third person plural ending *-ns* (see examples (37) and (43)). Also note that the short text of MC.1 seems to lack a subject, which is rather improbable and indicates that its overall analysis must be considered uncertain: at least one form should be a nominative, if *údiúns* is a verb and some of the first forms are the object (Dupraz 2012: 53).

⁸² There is very little evidence for interrogatives in the Sabellic inscriptions; perhaps only two constituent questions in the entire corpus (Wallace 2007: 41).

⁸³ The *scriptio continua* of this text leaves open the possibility that *raki* and *nevfi* are part of a single (phonological/morphological) word.

⁸⁴ I have not been able to recognize any instance of a ditransitive clause in the South Picene corpus.

⁸⁵ This passage of TE.7 is arranged as in Rix (2002: 69). In Rix’s reading, what is given in Crawford (2011: 200) as line 4 (the sixth line of text on the stone) is understood to be the first line of a boustrophedon pair of which line 3 (the fifth line on the

stone) is the second half.

⁸⁶ Marinetti (2000: 138) reads *apais pom[—]pú-es lepetín* (or *uepetín*) *esmín* (cf. *apaes pom[]púnes uepetín esmín* in Marinetti 1985: 153), while La Regina (2010: 250) *apais pupúnies uepetín eksmín*. As this text is engraved in the form of a circle, it is difficult to determine where it starts. As the word *esmín* stands at the top of the stele, it should be the beginning, as Rix and Crawford suggest in their editions (Rix 2002: 67; Crawford 2011: 181).

⁸⁷ Martzloff (2005: 124-125) suggests for *ímih* the translation ‘with image’ based on the identification in this word of a stem *im-ī-* (< PIE **h₂im-i-*) etymologically related to Latin *imāgō*.

⁸⁸ The fact that the relative pronoun in (78) and (79) is dative like the head of the relative clause must be linked to the dedicatory character of the respective inscriptions. We are not dealing with the phenomenon of relative case attraction (*tractio relativi*, substantially absent in Old Latin and very rare in the classical period). Keep also in mind that, in Italic, the relative pronoun is gender-indifferent in the dative (singular and plural).

⁸⁹ See note 17.

Bibliographical references

- Adiego Lajara, Ignasi-Xavier 1992. *Protosabelio, osco-umbro, sudpiceno*. Barcelona: PPU.
- Adiego Lajara, Ignasi-Xavier 1995. *Sudpiceno vepses*. *La Parola del Passato* 50. 135-139.
- Ancillotti, Augusto & Cerri, Romolo 2015. *Il vocabolario dell’umbro delle tavole di Gubbio*. Gubbio: Istituto di Ricerche e Documentazione sugli Antichi Umbri. <http://www.tavoleugubine.it/LE_TAVOLE_DI_GUBBIO/La_ricerca/Il_vocabolario_delle_tavole.aspx>
- Beckwith, Miles 2007. The old Italic *ō*-perfect and the Tortora inscription. In Josen-Bley, Karlene; Huld, Martin E.; Della Volpe, Angela & Dexter, Miriam R. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, November 3-4 2006*. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man. 77-88.
- Berrettoni, Pierangiolo 1967. Ricerche sulla posizione delle parole nella frase italyca. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di Lettere e Filosofia* 36. 31-81.
- Boeder, Winfried 1989. Verbal person marking, noun phrase and word order in Georgian. In Marácz, László K. & Muysken, Pieter C. (eds.), *Configurationality: the typology of asymmetries*. Dordrecht: Foris. 159-184.
- Califf, David J. 2002. *A guide to Latin meter and verse composition*. London: Anthem Press.
- Clackson, James P. T. 2015. Subgrouping the Sabellian branch of Indo-European. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 113. 4-37.
- Clackson, James P. T. 2016. South Picene *brímeqlúí* and *brímeidinais*. *Incontri Linguistici* 39. 53-68.
- Costa, Gabriele 2000. *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica italyca*. Florence: Olschki.
- Crawford, Michael H. (ed.) 2011. *Imagines Italicae: A corpus of Italic inscriptions*.

- London: Institute for Classical Studies. 3 vols.
- Devine, Andrew M. & Stephens, Laurence D. 1994. *The prosody of Greek speech*. New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Di Giovine, Paolo 1996. *Studio sul perfetto indoeuropeo*. Vol. 2: *La posizione del perfetto all'interno del sistema verbale indoeuropeo*. Rome: Il Calamo.
- Downing, Bruce T. 1978. Some universals of relative clause structure. In Greenberg, Joseph H. (ed.), *Universals of human language*. Vol. 4: *Syntax*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. 357-418.
- Dupraz, Emmanuel 2006. De la poésie sud-picénienne à la poésie nord-osque. In Pinault, Georges-Jean & Petit, Daniel (eds.), *La langue poétique indo-européenne. Actes du colloque de travail de la Société des Études Indo-Européennes (Indogermanische Gesellschaft / Society for Indo-European Studies), Paris, 22-24 octobre 2003*. Leuven: Peeters. 63-78.
- Dupraz, Emmanuel 2012. *Sabellian demonstratives: forms and functions*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Eichner, Heiner 1988-1990. Ein Heldendenkmal der Sabiner mit trochäischem Epigramm eines pikenischen Plautus des fünften Jahrhunderts v. Chr. *Die Sprache* 34. 198-206.
- Fortson, Benjamin W. IV 2010. Reconsidering the history of Latin and Sabellic adpositional morphosyntax. *American Journal of Philology* 131. 121-154.
- Fortson, Benjamin W. IV & Weiss, Michael 2013. Review of M. H. Crawford, *Imagines Italicae: A corpus of Italic inscriptions*. *Bryn Mawr Classical Reviews* 2013.06.17. <<http://bmc.bryn.mawr.edu/2013/2013-06-17.html>>
- Janson, Berndt 1993. Bemerkungen zu den südpikenischen Inschriften. In Rix, Helmut (ed.), *Oskisch-Umbrisch. Texte und Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Reichert. 155-165.
- Keenan, Edward L. & Comrie, Bernard 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8. 63-99.
- La Regina, Adriano 1978. Capestrano. In Cianfarani, Valerio; Franchi Dall'Orto, Luisa & La Regina, Adriano, *Culture adriatiche antiche di Abruzzo e di Molise*. Rome: De Luca. 309-316.
- La Regina, Adriano 1981. Appunti sulle entità etniche e strutture istituzionali nel Sannio antico. *Annali del Seminario di Studi del mondo classico, Archeologia e Storia antica* 3. 129-137.
- La Regina, Adriano 2010. Il Guerriero di Capestrano e le iscrizioni paleo sabelliche. In Franchi Dall'Orto, Luisa (ed.), *Pinna Vestinorum e il popolo dei Vestini. I*. Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider. 230-273.
- Lazarini, Maria Letizia & Poccetti, Paolo 2001. *Il mondo enotrio tra VI e V secolo a.C. Atti dei seminari napoletani (1996-1998)*. *Enotrio e l'iscrizione paleoitalica da Tortora*. Naples: Loffredo Editore.
- Livingston, Ivy 2004. *A linguistic commentary on Livius Andronicus*. New York / London: Routledge.
- Machajdřková, Barbora & Martzloff, Vincent 2016. Le pronom indéfini osque *pit-pit* „quicquid“ de Paul Diaire à Jacob Balde: morphosyntaxe comparée des paradigmes *kʷi- kʷi- du latin et du sabellique. *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 21. 73-118.
- Marinetti, Anna 1981. Il sudpiceno come italico (e sabino?). *Studi Etruschi* 49. 114-131.

- Marinetti, Anna 1985. *Le iscrizioni sudpicene. I: Testi*. Florence: Olschki.
- Marinetti, Anna 2000. Le iscrizioni sudpicene. In Franchi dell'Orto, Luisa (ed.), *Piceni popolo d'Europa*. Rome: De Luca. 134-139.
- Marinetti, Anna & Prodocimi, Aldo L. 1994. Appunti sul verbo latino (e) italico. V. La vocale del raddoppiamento nel perfetto. In Cipriano, Palmira; Di Giovine, Paolo & Mancini, Marco (eds.), *Miscellanea di studi linguistici in onore di Walter Belardi*. Rome: Il Calamo. 283-304.
- Martzloff, Vincent 2005. Picénien *ímih puñh*. Contribution a l'interprétation des cippes paléo-sabelliques de Castignano (AP 2) et de Penna S. Andrea (TE 5). *Lalies* 26. 105-131.
- Martzloff, Vincent 2006. Les syntagmes picéniens *povaisis pidaitúpas, me{nt} fistrúú nemúneí, trebegies titúú*. Contribution à l'exégèse du cippe paléo-sabellique TE 5 (Penna S. Andrea) à la lumière de l'inscription falisque archaïque de Cérès. *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 80. 63-104.
- Martzloff, Vincent 2009. Questions d'exégèse picénienne. In Biville, Frédérique & Boehm, Isabelle (eds.), *Autour de Michel Lejeune: actes des journées d'études organisées à l'Université Lumière Lyon 2 – Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée, 2-3 février 2006*. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée Jean Pouilloux. 359-378.
- Martzloff, Vincent 2018. Métrique italique archaïque. Poésie sud-picénienne et inscription latine de Duenos. In Hackstein, Olav & Gunkel, Dieter (eds.), *Language and meter*. Leiden / Boston: Brill. 222-252.
- Martzloff, Vincent & Machajdíkóvá, Barbora 2018. Convergences métriques méconnues entre la poésie vénète et la poésie paléo-sabellique: inscriptions paléo-vénètes de Lozzo Atestino et de Pernumia / Cartura, stèles sud-picéniennes de Crecchio et de Bellante, guerrier de Capestrano. *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 23. 99-119.
- Meiser, Gerhard 1987. Pälignisch, Latein und Südpikenisch. *Glotta* 65. 104-125.
- Meiser, Gerhard 2009. Le relazioni fra la lingua umbra e la lingua etrusca. In Ancillotti, Augusto & Calderini, Alberto (eds.), *L'umbro e le altre lingue dell'Italia mediana antica. Atti del I Convegno Internazionale sugli Antichi Umbri. Gubbio, 20-22 settembre 2001*. Perugia: Jama. 137-164.
- Meiser, Gerhard 2017. The phonology of Italic. In Klein, Jared; Joseph, Brian & Fritz, Matthias (eds.), *Handbook of comparative and historical Indo-European linguistics: an international handbook*. Vol. 2. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter. 743-51.
- Middei, Edoardo 2015. Gli antroponimi sabellici in *-ajos e le basi onomastiche con morfo-struttura *acca-*. *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 20. 105-21.
- Morandi, Alessandro 2017. *Epigrafia italica 2*. Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider.
- Nieto Ballester, Emilio 1996. Remarques sur la monophthongaison de /oi/ en latin archaïque. In Rosén, Hannah (ed.), *Aspects of Latin: papers from the Seventh International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Jerusalem, April 1993*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. 75-89.
- Nishimura, Kanehiro 2008. *Vowel reduction and deletion in Italic: effects of stress*. PhD dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Nishimura, Kanehiro 2012. Vowel reduction and deletion in Sabellic: a synchronic and diachronic interface. In Whitehead, Benedicte N.; Olander,

- Thomas; Olsen, Birgit A. & Rasmussen, Jens E. (eds.), *The sound of Indo-European: phonetics, phonemics, and morphophonemics*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press. 381-398.
- Nocentini, Alberto 1992. Preposizioni e posposizioni in oscoumbro. *Archivio glottologico italiano* 77. 196-242.
- Osthoff, Hermann 1881. Rez. „Gustav Meyer, Griechische Grammatik“. *Philologische Rundschau* 1. 1588-1597.
- Penney, John H. W. 2002. Notes on some Sabellic demonstratives. *Oxford University Working Papers in Linguistics, Philology and Phonetics* 7. 131-142.
- Prodocimi, Aldo L. 1978. L'Umbro. In Prodocimi, Aldo L. (ed.), *Popoli e civiltà dell'Italia antica*. Vol. 6: *Lingue e dialetti*. Rome: Biblioteca di Storia Patria. 585-788.
- Prodocimi, Aldo L. 1979. Le iscrizioni italice. Acquisizioni, temi, problemi. In *Le iscrizioni pre-latine in Italia*. Rome: Accademia nazionale dei Lincei. 110-204.
- Radke, Gerhard 1962. Umbri. In *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Supplement IX*. Stuttgart: Druckenmüller. 1745-1827.
- Rix, Helmut 1986. Die Endung des Akkusativ Plural commune im Oskischen. In Etter, Annemarie (ed.), *o-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter. 583-597.
- Rix, Helmut 1993. Osk. *úpsannam - uupsens* und Zugehöriges. In Heidermanns, Frank; Rix, Helmut & Seebold, Elmar (eds.), *Sprachen und Schriften des antiken Mittelmeerraums: Festschrift für Jürgen Untermann zum 65. Geburtstag*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. 329-348.
- Rix, Helmut 1994. Südpikenische *kduúú*. *Historische Sprachforschung* 107. 105-122.
- Rix, Helmut 2002. *Sabellische Texte. Die Texte des Oskischen, Umbrischen und Südpikenischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Rix, Helmut 2003. Ausgliederung und Aufgliederung der italischen Sprachen. In Bammesberger, Alfred & Vennemann, Theo (eds.), *Languages in Prehistoric Europe*. Heidelberg: Winter. 147-172.
- Silvestri, Domenico 1998. The Italic languages. In Giacalone Ramat, Anna & Ramat, Paolo (eds.), *The Indo-European languages*. London / New York: Routledge. 322-344.
- Stuart-Smith, Jane 2000. Two South Picene inscriptions reread – CH.2 and AP.4. *Papers from the British School at Rome* 68. 95-109.
- Stuart-Smith, Jane 2004. *Phonetics and phonology: sound change in Italic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tikkanen, Karin 2011. *A Sabellian case grammar*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Untermann, Jürgen 2000. *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Vine, Brent 2017. The morphology of Italic. In Klein, Jared; Joseph, Brian & Fritz, Matthias (eds.), *Handbook of comparative and historical Indo-European linguistics: an international handbook*. Vol. 2. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter. 751-804.
- Viparelli, Valeria 2002. *Conveniunt rebus nomina saepe suis*: osservazioni sull'uso del verbo *clueo*. *Paideia* 57. 506-516.
- Wallace, Rex E. 1985. Volscian *sepú* / Oscan *sipus*. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 90. 123-128.

An outline of the South Picene language II: Morphology and syntax

- Wallace, Rex E. 2007. *The Sabellic languages of ancient Italy*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Watkins, Calvert 1995. *How to kill a dragon: aspects of Indo-European poetics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weiss, Michael 1998. On some problems of final syllables in South Picene. In Jasanoff, Jay; Melchert, H. Craig & Oliver, Lisi (eds.), *Mír curad: studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. 703-715.
- Weiss, Michael 2002. Observations on the South Picene inscription TE 1 (S. Omero). In Southern, Mark R. V. (ed.), *Indo-European perspectives*. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man. 351-366.
- Zair, Nicholas 2014. The future perfect in Oscan and Umbrian, and the \bar{o} -perfect in South Picene. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 112. 367-385.
- Zamponi, Raoul 2019. An outline of the South Picene language I: Introduction and phonology. *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 31. 193-222.

Corrigenda to Zamponi (2019)

Page 196, Table 1: for “Farfa, MAbb” read “Fara Sabina, Museo Civico Archeologico”; pages 200, line 13, 207, line 4, and 216, note 30: for “Alintius” read “Alentes”; page 199, lines 29 and 30: for “*titiúh* [praenomen] DAT SG (CH.2) (U *tītis* ‘of Titus’ NOM SG, L *titus*)” read “*titiúh* [nomen] DAT SG (CH.2) (U *tītis* NOM SG, L *Titius*)”; page 214, note 4: for “Colli” read “Colle del Giglio”; page 216, note 29: for “composed by” read “composed of”.

Printed in January 2020
by Industrie Grafiche Pacini Editore Srl
Via A. Gherardesca • 56121 Ospedaletto • Pisa • Italy
Tel. +39 050 313011 • Fax +39 050 3130300
www.pacineditore.it

