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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.
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**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 ạ 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. púpún-i-s n/ír-Ø (MC.1)
   Poponius-ADJJZ-NOM.SG.M man-NOM.SG.M
   ‘the Poponian man’

2. saf/in-as tút-as (TE.5)
   Sabine-GEN.SG.F community-GEN.SG.F
   ‘of the Sabine community’

3. pduf-em ok[r]-ík-am (CH.1)
   territory (?)-ACC.SG.F citadel-ADJJZ-ACC.SG.F
   ‘the territory (?) of the citadel (ACC)’

4. esm-a=k toút-afh (RI.1)
   this-LOC.SG.F = DEM community-LOC.SG.F
   ‘in this community’

5. est-as amgen-a/s (AP.3)
   this-NOM.PL.F ?-NOM.PL.F
   ‘these N (PL)’

6. sú-áis man-us (AP.2)
   their-ABL.PL.F hand-ABL.PL.F
   ‘with their hands’
Case markers are fusional, signaling, besides case, the category of number, as is also typical of Italic languages.

(7) a. NOM SG  
\[\text{tuít-}a\]  
\[\text{tuít-as}^4\]  
\[\text{tuít-}aíh\]  
\[\text{nom sg} \quad \text{gen sg} \quad \text{loc sg}\]

b. NOM SG  
\[\text{qor-}a\]  
\[\text{kor-}am\]  
\[\text{qor-as}\]  
\[\text{nom sg} \quad \text{acc sg} \quad \text{acc pl}\]

c. NOM SG  
\[\text{meitim-}s\]  
\[\text{meitim-}ám\]  
\[\text{nom sg} \quad \text{acc sg}\]

d. NOM SG  
\[\text{apai-s}\]  
\[\text{apai-}ús\]  
\[\text{nom sg} \quad \text{nom pl}\]

e. NOM PL  
\[\text{safín-}ús\]  
\[\text{safín-}úm\]  
\[\text{gen pl} \quad \text{gen pl}\]

f. NOM SG  
\[\text{nír-Ø}\]  
\[\text{ner-}f\]  
\[\text{nom sg} \quad \text{acc pl}\]

g. NOM PL  
\[\text{fiti-}as\]  
\[\text{fiti-}asom\]  
\[\text{gen pl} \quad \text{gen pl}\]

h. DAT SG  
\[\text{kágúi-}eh\]  
\[\text{kaúi-}eis\]  
\[\text{dat sg} \quad \text{gen sg}\]

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) \(ā\)-stems (PI \(*\)-\(ā\))  
\[\text{tuít-}a\]  
\[\text{qor-}a\]  
\[\text{meitim-}s\]  
\[\text{apai-}s\]  
\[\text{petrúni-}s\]  
\[\text{apúni-}s\]  
\[\text{nom sg} \quad \text{nom sg} \quad \text{nom sg} \quad \text{nom sg} \quad \text{nom sg} \quad \text{nom sg}\]

\(o\)-stems (PI \(*\)-\(o\))  
\[\text{qor-}a\]  
\[\text{meitim-}s\]  
\[\text{apai-}s\]  
\[\text{petrúni-}s\]  
\[\text{apúni-}s\]  
\[\text{nom sg} \quad \text{nom sg} \quad \text{nom sg} \quad \text{nom sg} \quad \text{nom sg}\]

\(C\)-stems (PI \(*\)-Ø)  
\[\text{nír-Ø}\]  
\[\text{nom sg}\]
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(ii) nominative plural:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>o-stems (PI *-ōs)</td>
<td>apai-ūs</td>
<td>‘Appaeus’</td>
<td>(AP.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>safin-ūs</td>
<td>‘Sabine’</td>
<td>(TE.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) accusative singular:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>ā-stems (PI *-ām)</td>
<td>kor-ām</td>
<td>‘commemorative stone’</td>
<td>(AQ.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tok-ām</td>
<td>‘memorial stele’</td>
<td>(TE.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>postikn-ām</td>
<td>‘kind of votive object (?)’</td>
<td>(CH.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o-stems (PI *-om)¹¹</td>
<td>t &lt; i &gt; t-ūm</td>
<td>‘Titus’</td>
<td>(AP.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metitim-ūm</td>
<td>‘gift, present (?)’</td>
<td>(AP.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>anai-ūm</td>
<td>‘Annaeus’</td>
<td>(AP.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i-stems (PI *-im)</td>
<td>oftor-im</td>
<td>‘stele’ (vel sim.)¹²</td>
<td>(CH.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-stems (PI *-om)</td>
<td>pduf-em</td>
<td>‘territory (?)’¹³</td>
<td>(CH.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) accusative plural:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>ā-stems (PI *-ans)¹⁴</td>
<td>qor-ās</td>
<td>‘commemorative stone’</td>
<td>(TE.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-stems (PI *-ans)¹⁵</td>
<td>ner-f</td>
<td>‘man’</td>
<td>(TE.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(v) genitive singular:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>ā-stems (PI *-ās)</td>
<td>tūt-ās</td>
<td>‘community’</td>
<td>(TE.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o-stems (PI *-osjo, *-i)¹⁶</td>
<td>pu/pūni-ēs</td>
<td>‘Puponius’</td>
<td>(MC.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>trebegi-ēs</td>
<td>‘Trebecius’</td>
<td>(TE.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ali-ēs</td>
<td>‘Allius’</td>
<td>(TE.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t &lt; i &gt; t- &lt; e &gt; s¹⁷</td>
<td>‘Titus’</td>
<td>(TE.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uelaim-ēs</td>
<td>‘Velamius’</td>
<td>(CH.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stati-ēs</td>
<td>‘Statius’</td>
<td>(CH.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kaũi-eis</td>
<td>‘Gavius’</td>
<td>(AQ.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vi) genitive plural:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>ā-stems (PI *-āzōm)¹⁸</td>
<td>fiti-āsom</td>
<td>‘deed (?)’</td>
<td>(TE.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o-stems (PI *-ōm)¹⁹</td>
<td>safin-ūm</td>
<td>‘Sabine’</td>
<td>(TE.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maro-ūm</td>
<td>‘magistrate (?)’</td>
<td>(CH.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pūpūn-um</td>
<td>‘Poponius’</td>
<td>(AP.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i-stems (PI *-jōm)²¹</td>
<td>ali/nt-īom</td>
<td>‘Alentes’</td>
<td>(TE.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rael-īom</td>
<td>‘?’</td>
<td>(CH.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(vii) dative singular:

(14)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o-stems</td>
<td>tit-uí</td>
<td>‘Titus’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qdufeni-uí</td>
<td>‘Clufenius’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brimeql-uí</td>
<td>‘Brimeclum’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pu/qlo-h</td>
<td>‘son’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dún-oh</td>
<td>‘gift’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>petro-oh</td>
<td>‘Petro’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>titi-úh</td>
<td>‘Titius’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kluúi-eh</td>
<td>‘Gavius’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-stems</td>
<td>mater-ëh</td>
<td>‘mother’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pater-ëh</td>
<td>‘father’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(viii) ablative singular:

(15)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ā-stems</td>
<td>sel-ah</td>
<td>‘?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-stems</td>
<td>arit-ih</td>
<td>‘art’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(viii) dative/ablative plural:

(16)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i-stems</td>
<td>iork-es</td>
<td>‘?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u-stems</td>
<td>man-us</td>
<td>‘hand’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ix) locative singular:

(17)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ā-stems</td>
<td>toút-aih</td>
<td>‘community’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-stems</td>
<td>okr-ëi</td>
<td>‘citadel, (upper) town’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 > /-en/) to a new locative ending. This ending in the South Picene documents is written both -ín and -en.  

(18)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o-stems</td>
<td>akr-en</td>
<td>‘land, territory’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boiiedi-in</td>
<td>‘pagus Boedinus’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. In both examples the locative ending is added to the noun vepe- ‘tomb’ from Proto-Italic *la/eped- ‘stone’ (see Zamponi 2019: 204).
The argument that this formation /-eːn/ 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) onbri-ẹ-en ọkr-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

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 ẹt-om (TE.5) (L te; PI *tē or *te33)
DAT țef-ẹ́ (TE.7) (O tif[ei], U tefe, OL tibe; PI *tēβei)

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 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.

\[(22) \ldots \text{-?}\text{-} \text{orm iork-es iepet-en esm-en ekás-im}^{35} \text{raeli-om} \]
\[\text{?-DAT.PL tomb-LOC.SG this-LOC.SG ?-ACC.SG (?) ?-GEN.PL} \]
\[\text{rufras-im}^{36} \ldots \text{(CH.1)} \]
\[\text{?-ACC.SG (?)} \]

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.

\[(23) \text{ABL SG M (and N?) süh-úh (TE.1) (L suo; PI *sowōd)} \]
\[\text{ABL PL F sú-aís (AP.2) (L suis; PI *sowais)} \]

The masculine (and probably neuter) singular form occurs headless-ly 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.

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

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).

\[(25) \text{LOC SG M (or N) esm-í=k (RI.1)} \]
\[\text{LOC SG F esm-a=k (RI.1)} \]
Although the case endings of these two locative forms (/-/eː/ and, presumably, /-/aː/) appear as contractions of *-ej=en and *-aːj=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).

A second demonstrative pronoun might occur in RI.1.

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

It seems to be a reflex of the Sabellic anaphoric demonstrative pronoun *qi- ~ *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 fūti-as ú m[-?-] (RI.1)

Moreover, the fact that in both Oscan and in Umbrian the accusative singular masculine/feminine of *i- ~ *ejo- ~ *eiso- contains the allo-morph *ejo- (O ionc M, fak 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 ιμ) (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-ðh (AP.2) (U poi, OL quoi; PI *kʷoi)

DAT SG M/F/N posm-úi (TE.5, TE.7) (U pusme, Pre-Samnite πυσμοι; PI *kʷośmoi)

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

(29) NOM SG M/F pi-s (TE.1) (O pis, U pis(i), Pre-Samnite πια, L quis; PI *kʷis)

ACC SG M/F pi-m (CH.1) (L quem; PI *kʷim)

ACC SG N pi-d (TE.5) (O píð, U, pĩi, L quid; PI *kʷid)
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, 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.

(30) ACC SG F ok[r]ik-am ‘of the citadel’ (CH.1)
    GEN SG F safin-as ‘Sabine’ (TE.5)
    NOM SG M efidan-s ‘from Offida (?)’ (AP.5)
    ACC SG M aupúni-s ‘Poponian’ (MC.1)
    LOC SG M ombrí-en ‘Umbrian’ (CH.2)

(31) nom sg m efidan-s ‘from Offida (?)’ (AP.5)
    nom sg m púpúni-s ‘Poponian’ (MC.1)
    acc sg m aú/daq-um ‘bold (?)’ (AP.1)
    loc sg m (or N) mefi-in ‘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) … meít(t)istrúí nemúneí prai-stak-Ø-t panívú
    meítim-s saf/in-as tút-as trebegi-es
    gift (?)-NOM.SG Sabine-GEN.SG community-GEN.SG Trebecius-GEN.SG
    tit-úí pra[i]-sta-kl-a=sa posm-úí (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 prai\(\text{\textipa{st}}\)ait ‘stands’ and the noun meitims ‘memorial’\(^50\) and to the fact that the text is engraved on a stele, the referent of the noun prai\(\text{\textipa{st}}\)akla ‘standing object’ is pragmatically definite. Thanks to these pragmatic factors, the hearer or reader is able to identify immediately the referent of prai\(\text{\textipa{st}}\)akla. This identification is all the more obvious as prai\(\text{\textipa{st}}\)akla is cognate with the verb prai\(\text{\textipa{st}}\)ait. Thus -sa may be a definite article, used to indicate that the referent of prai\(\text{\textipa{st}}\)akla 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 *-i. In the South Picene documents, three of them seem to be attested.

I qupat /kubā-t/ ‘to lie’ 3SG PRS ACT IND (MC.1) (cf. L cubā-re)

II kduiū /klue-o/ ‘to be called’ 1SG PRS ACT IND (CH.1) (cf. L cluē-re)

III pepieī /pe-pei-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  *kdúi-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)

(36) 3SG PRS ACT IND  *veia-t*  ‘to lie’ (MC.1)

(37) 3SG PRS ACT IND  *ene-t*  ‘to enter’ (CH.1)

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

(38) 2PL PRS ACT IND  *vide-tas*  ‘to see’ (TE.2)

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

(39) 3PL PRS ACT IND  *praistai-nt*  ‘to stand out’ (TE.7)

(40) 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 eðel-t ‘to erect’

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 (?)’

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

(40) 3SG PRF ACT IND pepieí-Ø ‘to pay (?)’
3SG PRF ACT SBJV ehuelí-Ø ‘to tear down’

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

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

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

(42) 1PL PRF ACT IND adstæco-ms ‘to set up’

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

(43) 3PL PRF ACT IND adstaíú-h ‘to set up’
3PL PRF ACT IND praistaíú-h ‘to stand out’

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, [-toːr]) (PI *-tor or, perhaps, *-tőr; see Zamponi 2019: 201).

(44) 3SG PRS PASS IND qolofí-túr ‘to erect’
3SG PRS PASS IND [?-]-r-túr ‘?’
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 hypothesesizable 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 | ops-ú-t | ‘to make, to construct’ | (AQ.2) |
| 1PL PRF ACT IND | adstae-o-ms | ‘to set up’ | (CH.1) |
| 3PL PRF ACT IND | adstai-ú-h | ‘to set up’ | (AP.2) |
| 3PL PRF ACT IND | praistai-ú-h | ‘to stand out’ | (RI.1) |

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

| (46) | 3SG PRF ACT IND | pe-pi/e-ị-Ø | ‘to pay’ (?) | (AQ.2) |

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

| (47) | PRS ACT IND | praistai-Ø-t | ‘to stand out’ | (AQ.1) |
| PRS ACT IND | ene-Ø-t | ‘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 ehueli (3sg), marked by a suffix -i (PI *-ē), and aitúp-ạ-s (2sg; TE.5), marked by a suffix -a that may be connected to the suffix -ā of the archaic Latin subjunctive attig-ạ-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) ... poioúefa\textsuperscript{a9} iokipedu\textsuperscript{a9} pduf-em ok[r]-ik-am
?
\text{?}
\begin{tabular}{p{5cm}p{5cm}}
territory (?)-ACC.SG & citadel-ADJZ-ACC.SG \\
\end{tabular}
en-e-Ø-t ... (CH.1)
\begin{tabular}{p{5cm}p{5cm}}
PREV-go-PRS.IND-3SG.ACT & \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{p{10cm}}
‘[?¿-] (one) enters the territory (?) of the citadel’ \\
\end{tabular}

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.\textsuperscript{61}

(49) ... oius boiedi-ín haliga-tú [?¿-] (AQ.3)
?
\begin{tabular}{p{5cm}p{5cm}}
pagus_Boedinus-LOC.SG & ?-2/3SG.FUT.ACT.IMP (?) \\
\end{tabular}

3.5.2. Non-finite verbs

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

\textit{d[i]kdeintem}, in AP.3, lends itself to be interpreted as a present active participle marked as accusative singular: \textit{d[i]kdei-nt-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 *ḱlei- ‘to lean’. The linguistic context of \textit{d[i]kdeintem} is also unclear.

(50) ... adf[3] fiti-as est-as amgen-a/s
?
\begin{tabular}{p{5cm}p{5cm}p{5cm}p{5cm}}
deed (?)-NOM.PL & this-NOM.PL & ?-NOM.PL & \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{p{10cm}p{10cm}}
d[i]kdei-nt-em atim eitipes [?¿-] (AP.3)
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{p{2cm}p{2cm}}
?-PRS.ACT.PTCP-ACC.SG & ? \\
\end{tabular}

\textit{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 *lei̯kʷ- ‘to let (go), to leave’, according to Adiego Lajara (1995: 138), or *wl(e)kʷ-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 *-u̯os/*-u̯es/*-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) vəcər  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)

deiktam, 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*  y  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 û 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 (/-om/) 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
3.7. Adverbs

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

(i) manner: kupři ‘well’ (AQ.2) (qupřih 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), oidor ‘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 puúde ‘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.

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-uell** ‘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-staít** ‘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**, nominal 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 (*eɸida*), in the southern Marches, as proposed by La Regina (2010: 251),71 or, in any case, a noun (see example (65)); **ḷuf-an-iom** ‘?’ GEN PL (CH.2), if an ethnic, as suggested by Stuart-Smith (2000: 103) (see note 76).

- **-í, -i**, nominal adjectivizer (PI *-*i): **ombri-í-en** ‘Umbrian’ LOC SG (CH.2); **tit-i-ůh** ‘Titius’ DAT SG (CH.2), cf. t<i>t-ům ‘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) (qupir-īh in AP.2), with a root /kupr/- that likely means ‘good’ (see Zamponi 2018: 215, n. 12).

- **-ik**, nominal adjectivizer (PI *-*ik ~ *-*ik): **ok[r]-ik-am** ‘of the
citadel’ ACC SG F (CH.1); cf. okrei ‘citadel, (upper) town’ LOC SG (TE.7).

• -in, denominative adjectivizer (PI *-īn): brīmeid-in-ais ‘(daughters) of Brimeclus’ or, perhaps, ‘Brimecleans’ DAT/ABL PL F (TE.7), emended to brīmekdinais (/breːmekl-in-ais/73) by Clackson (2016: 59); cf. brīmeql-úl /breːmekl-oːi/ ‘Brimeclum’ DAT SG.

• -kl, deverbal nominalizer (PI *-tI?): pra[i]-sta-kl-a ‘stele, standing object’ NOM SG (TE.5), cf. prai-stái-t ‘to stand out’ 3SGPRS 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-/ > /-ɸ-/ we observed, word-finally, with the Proto-Italic accusative plural ending *-ans (example (11) and note 15).

• -uf, adverbializer used with the proximal spatial demonstrative pronoun (composed of /u/ from the stem-vowel *o and /ɸ/ from the Proto-Indo-European locational particle *dʰe or *dʰi): est-uf ‘here’ (with the root allomorph of the direct cases; see 3.2).75

• -úni, denominative 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 & Machajdíková 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
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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).

\[(55) \quad \text{esm}-i=k \quad \text{uepet-[n]} \quad (RI.1)\]
\[\text{this-LOC.SG} = \text{DEM} \quad \text{tomb-LOC.SG}\]
\[\text{‘in this tomb’}\]

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

\[(56) \quad \text{iepet-en} \quad \text{esm-en} \quad (CH.1)\]
\[\text{tomb-LOC.SG} \quad \text{this-LOC.SG}\]
\[\text{‘in this tomb’}\]

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

\[(57) \quad \text{safin-úm} \quad \text{ner-f} \quad (TE.6)\]
\[\text{Sabine-GEN.PL} \quad \text{man-ACC.PL}\]
\[\text{‘the men (ACC) of the Sabines’}\]
Raoul Zamponi

(58) álí/nt-íom  okr-eí (TE.7)
Alentes-GEN.PL  citadel-LOC.SG
‘in the citadel of the Alentes’

(59) velaim-es  statí-es  qor-a (CH.1)
Velaimus-GEN.SG  Statius-GEN.SG  commemorative_stone-NOM.SG
‘Velaimus Statius’ commemorative stone’

(60) raieim-úm  t < í > 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) fìtias-om  múfql-úm (TE.5)
deed (?)-GEN.PL  remind + NMLZ (?)-NOM/ACC.SG
‘a monument (?) of (your) deeds (?)’

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

(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) kaúi-eh  kaúi-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. Note that the praenomen is also modified by a possible ethnic adjective in (65).
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 mefiín vepetí[n] ‘in the tomb in the middle’ is split by the co-clausal predicate veiat ‘X lies’.

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

Similarly, in the monosentential text of MC.2, the two constituents of the locative noun phrase ‘in this tomb’ (written here esmín uepetín) 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’.
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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: materēth paterēth ‘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. 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-PRES.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-íí 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.\textsuperscript{84}

(71) \[?\- o]ps-ú-q \ qor-as
make-PRF.IND-3SG.ACT \ commemorative_stone-ACC.PL

\(qdufeni-úí\)\textsuperscript{85 \textit{voor}} (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-úš \ est-uf \ eœelsi-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]\aille-eh \ kaúi-eis \ pu/ql-oh \ prai-stai-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 \textit{qupat} 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\textsuperscript{86}’

\textbf{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 \textit{esse} (PIE *\textit{h1es-}/*\textit{h1s-} ‘to be’ PRS).

(75) a[1]si-\textit{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 *cluĕre* (PIE *ḱl(é)u*- ‘to hear’ AOR).

(76) ... velaim-es stati-es qor-a

Velaimus-GEN.SG Statius-GEN.SG commemorative_stone-NOM.SG

kdú-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).
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(77) mater-eíh  pater-eíh  qolof/í-Ø-túr  qupír-íh
mother-DAT.SG  father-DAT.SG  erect-PRS.IND-3SG.PASS  good-ADVZ
arít-íh  ím-íh  pu-íh  púpún-um  est-uf=k
art-ABL.SG  ?-ABL.SG  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 vox (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-úi (TE.5)
who-DAT.SG
‘... for Titus (son) of Trebecius, for whom the (?) stele (is)’

(79) [-?-]r-Ø-túr  brímeql-úí  ali/nt-iom  okr-eí
?-PRS.IND-3SG.PASS  Primeclum-DAT.SG  Alentes-GEN.PL  citadel-LOC.SG
safín-a[? s ?-]  [-?-]enips  tóút-a  tef-eí  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 meitímúm ‘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”.
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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<s allies) 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) postin vi-am vide-Ø-tas t<i>t<s> 
along road-ACC.SG see-PRS.IND-2PL.ACT Titus-GEN.SG 
tok-am ali-es esm-en 
memorial_stele-ACC.SG Allius-GEN.SG this-LOC.SG 
vep-s-es vepet-en (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 vepe-ten) of the participial clause. We may exclude that the alliterating verb and noun in sequence (vepses ‘left’, from PIE *lej<kʷ> ‘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 convention-
ally 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 lan-
guage, 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 correspond-
ence in the documentation of the two Sabellic languages: (i) the use of
the locative ending /-eːn/, 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 demon-
strative */s- ~ *t- ‘this, that’ probably used to mark definiteness (3.4);
(iii) a perfect indicative in /-oː/ (with a possible cognate in Pre-Samnite)
(3.5.1.3) that implies the use of a primary ending at third person singu-
lar (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, unat-
tested 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 /uː/ in the vocalic inventory and the
contrastive status of [ɛː] and [ɔː] 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 /-toː/ (3.5.1.4), a per-
fect 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 phonol-
ogy for which a univocal analysis is impossible (e.g. the precise qual-
ity 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 = first, 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 *touitas (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 maifms ‘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 artefacts on which the words meitims and meitimus 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-/ ~ /nér-/ goes back to Proto-Indo-European: *h₂nēr NOM SG vs *h₂ner- ACC SG/PL.


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).


13 pduf- could be a syncopated reflex of *peduɸ- (although the initial-syllable syncopation is a bit peculiar) that, in turn, might be from the Proto-Indo-European root *pedo- ‘place’ (cf. U peftime 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’e or *d’i (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 [-asː] (víass ‘road’). Note that Oscan -ass probably contains an analogical -s copied from the vowel stems: -ass is from *-aɸ-s and *-aɸ 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 > -ɸ is a Sabellian phonological isogloss (see Clackson 2015: 10). Note, however, that while for C-stem nouns Umbrían has the accusative plural ending /-ɸ/ (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, Sabellian 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 [-as:x:m], with *o lowered before a final /m/ (see Zamponi 2019: 200).

19 The South Picene ending was likely pronounced [-ɔːm]. -um in pipiun-um is probably best explained as an error for -ùm with the central bar of the modified u 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, alint-iom, and rael-iom, this is due to the fact that the forms in question are not o-stem nouns.

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).

The South Picene ending was probably pronounced [-iɔːm] or [-jɔːm].

The possibility of an -läuft-uitka 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 [øː] 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 [eː]. Weiss (1998: 706-707), more convincingly, explains -oh and -eh in purely phonological terms as follows. As in Oscan, the diphthong *ōi became shorted to /oi/ and subsequently monophthongized as a long back vowel. This new vowel was more open than the old long /oː/ 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]auieth, on the other hand, is the outcome of the fronting and unrounding effects of a preceding jod. Thus, *gāwjōi > *gāwjēi, by post-jod fronting, whence *gāwjiet by shortening of the final long diphthongs and, finally, /gaːwjɛː/ by monophthongization of the final diphthong. The spelling -eh indicates an open-long mid front unrounded [eː] likely identical in quality to short [e], but distinct from the long close-mid front unrounded [eː] which was the outcome of Proto-Italic *ē, usually written i. The post-jod fronting rule would not have occurred in the variety of the Pescara Valley that attests titiūh. Given that we have no orthographic evidence for the glide /j/ in /gaːwjɛː/ and that the Italic protoform ‘for Gavius’ can be more cautiously reconstructed as *gāwiōi, as Adiego Lajara (1992: 130) did, we may alternatively suppose that *ō was fronted to ē through the influence of the preceding front vowel /iː/: *gāwiōi > *gāwiēi > *gāwiei > /gaːwiɛː/.

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

Note that materēh and paterēh occur in a text in which every word ending in a vowel might have the letter h at the end.

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

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

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

Proto-Italic *-uβos > *-uφs > /-us/.

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

Unlike the Oscan corpus, that attests both the adposition (preposition) en (cf. en eituas ‘concerning the money’) and the locative ending -in [-en] (cf. húrtin kerriih 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.

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, tefe stands for /tefɛ/ and tefeh for /tefɛː/.
36 rufra sim in Crawford (2011: 1262) and Rix (2002: 69); cf. ruf[ri]áhi in the Sabine inscription from Colle del Giglio perhaps comparable to the series of Italic names based on the root *ruφɛr- '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 pui and Latin cui. Given that, like Umbrian, South Picene seems to monophthongize *oi to /oː/, 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‘oi and *k‘osmoi giving the attested forms puih (perhaps an error for puih /poi/, with -ih for [i] as in materēth and toutaθ (see Zamponi 2019: 199) and, in any case, directly comparable with U poi (< Proto-Umbrian *pō = i)) and posmūi (/psmoːi/, with an otherwise unexplainable long /oː/). Note the vowel u in puih appears to be paralleled by the v of in the Pre-Samnite form πυομι, whatever the explanation for u and v in a form of *k‘o- may be (Dupraz 2012: 39).
42 pimpīh occurs in an obscure syntactic context (the mutilated line [-?–] ah selah pimpīh [-?–]). 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 suai with an indefinite pronoun is correct (cf. U svepis ‘if anyone’ and L si quis).
44 The syntactic context in which this form occurs is unclear.
45 The different readings of this word (me[n/t]fistrūí for Marinetti 1985: 217 and Adiego Lajara 1992: 127, me(n)fistrūí for Rix 2002: 68, mentistrūí for La Regina 2010: 258) make it too doubtful to recognize seriously in it an adjectival compound of *meθio- ‘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 lufaniom 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 \( \ddot{u} \) being omitted. Two further possible instances of \( u \) for \( \ddot{u} \) 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: *kʷām-dieu > *pāndiu > *pandiu (Osthoff’s law; Osthoff’s 1881: 1593) > *panniu > /panːioː/, which is phonetically [ˈpanːiwoː] (his reading of panivú) by a glide-insertion rule and not [ˈpanːioː] or [ˈpanːjoː], as we would expect to find together with qdufeniúí (/kluɸɛnioːi/ or /kluɸɛnjoːi/; TE.7) and tītiū (/titioː or /titjoː/; CH.2). The position of this word after praistaít, 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 putei 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 *kʷei- ‘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 *h₁es-mi.


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 \( \emptyset \) (kupti ‘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 materēlēh ‘mother’ DAT SG, from *mātēr-ei and paterēlēh ‘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 -Ø.

57 Probably [-ɔː] before m (written -o; see Zamponi 2019: 200) and [-ɔː] elsewhere (written -um). 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(υ)roð ‘they were’ on the Pre-Samnite Tortora stele might have the same origin as the South Picene ð-perfect, but the single attested third person singular form on the inscription, fefk(es)δ ‘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/ (i 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
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59 Two distinct lexemes (poi oúefa) 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[-]esag̣ụom by Marinetti (1985: 251) and o[-]esagúom by La Regina (2010: 267). Rix (2002: 70) has opesa[ ]úom.

64 Cf. the syncopated opsút in (45), apparently from the same stem (which is attested in syncopated form *opsa- also in other Sabellian 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 going back to an old s-aorist *h3eps (root *h3,ep ‘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 (*h3,eps).

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 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 /makkupreː/ (< *mag kuprēd) (see example (70)), is a reflex of Proto-Indo-European *meğh2- ‘great, much’ and nearly an exact match for Greek ἀγα- ‘very’ (commonly an element in adjectives of praise). The accusative pronoun miom ‘me’ attested in a sixth century Sabellian (‘Palaeoumbrian’) inscription from Tolfá (southwestern Etruria) and the analogous accusative pronouns tím ‘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 *Cêom (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 puuí- + de, i.e. the allative *pú (/poː/) ‘where, to what place’ (< PI *kŵ6; cf. L quó) plus the enclitic particle *=de found in Umbrian pane (probably [ˈpanːe]) (< *pande < PI *kʷam=de; cf. L quamde). If this analysis is correct, the spelling of this word would not reflect the delabialization of *kʷ before a back vowel attested in the forms puuí (perhaps /pɔːi/) NOM SG M (< PI *kʷoi + *=i; note 41) and posmúi (/pɔsmoːi/) DAT SG M/F/N (< PI *kʷosmòi + *=i) of the relative pronoun ‘who, which’ and typical of Sabellian 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.
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.

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).

Likely, /-j/ intervocalically (ombri-í-en) and /-i/ interconsonantally (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 praenomina and nomina (see Wallace 2007: 52); cf. kài-eis ‘Gavius’ GEN SG (AQ.1) and stát-e-s ‘Statius’ GEN SG (CH.1) in South Picene and their Oscan equivalents gavis NOM SG and statis NOM SG.

*kl would render the probable phonemic sequence /kl/, as in kduíú and qdufeniúí (Zamponi 2019: 206).

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).

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 *kʷuβei; 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 *puɸ 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 vocative change *o > u to prelabial (i.e., /ɸ/) vowel reduction he proposed seems to be a more convincing hypothesis.

Cf. also, probably, Ṽufanịom ombriíen ạḳren ‘in the Umbrian land of the N (PL)’ in CH.2.

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 ([ ð-om]) might be that of a nominative singular 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.

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

A variant of petrúnis in (66) with anaptyctic e.

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.

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 údíns is a verb and some of the first forms are the object (Dupraz 2012: 53).

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

The scriptio continua of this text leaves open the possibility that rakí and nevíi are part of a single (phonological/morphological) word.

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

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 lepetín esmín in Marinetti 1985: 153), while La Regina (2010: 250) apais pupúnies uepetín esmín. 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 īmih the translation ‘with image’ based on the identification in this word of a stem im-i- (< PIE *h₂-im-) 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 (attractio 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.
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