

MÍR CURAD

STUDIES IN HONOR OF
CALVERT WATKINS

Edited by
Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert
and Lisi Olivier

SONDERDRUCK

Innsbruck 1998

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Françoise Bader: La Mémoire du Poète et l'Oubli du guerrier	1
Robert S. P. Beekes: <i>Hades</i> and <i>Elysiön</i>	17
Liam Breathnach: <i>Cáin Ónaic</i> : An Old Irish Law Text on Lending	29
Andrea Calabrese and Morris Halle: Grimm's and Verner's Laws: a New Perspective	47
George Cardona: On <i>kinī tarhi</i> in the Mahābhāṣya	63
Onofrio Carruba: Etymologica anatolica minora	75
George Dunkel: On the "Thematization" of Latin <i>sumi, volo, eo</i> and <i>edo</i> and the System of Endings in the IE Subjunctive Active	83
Michael Flier: Now You See It, Now You Don't	101
The Ukrainian Phoneme <i>j</i> in Context	115
Bernhard Forssman: Vedisch <i>áritihpati-</i> , lateinisch <i>hospes</i>	115
Benjamin W. Fortson IV: Some New Observations on an Old Topic: <i>návazhi vácali</i> in the Rigveda	127
J. L. García-Ramón: Indogermanisch *g ^h er- ('wiederholt) schlagen', 'töten'	139
Andrew Garrett: Remarks on the Old Hittite Split Genitive	155
Jost Gippert: How to Kill a Cow in Avestan	165
Ives Goddard: Recovering Avarpatho Etymologies by Reconstructing Forwards	183
Hans G. Güttlerbock: Notes on Some Luwian Hieroglyphs	201
Roberto Gusmani: Romanischer Einfluß in den "Alteutschen Gesprächen"	205
Mark Halle: Post-Lexical RUKI and the <i>isvá</i> -Rule	213
Morris Halle and Bert Vaux: Theoretical Aspects of Indo-European Nominal Morphology: The Nominal Declensions of Latin and Armenian	223
Eric P. Hamp: Two Regular Milk Products	241
J. D. Hawkins and A. Morpurgo Davies: Of Donkeys, Mules and Tarkondemos	243
Heinrich Hettrich: Die Entstehung des homerischen Irrealis der Vergangenheit	261
Henry M. Hoenigswald: Èv, èv and the Accent of Non-thematic Neuters	271
Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.: On the Denominative Verb <i>arāwe-</i>	275
Stanley Insler: <i>mitrāvāruuā</i> or <i>mitrā vāruuā</i> ?	285
Stephanie W. Jamison: Rigvedic <i>vśvātah sīm</i>	291
Jay H. Jasanoff: The Thematic Conjugation Revisited	301
Joshua Katz: How to be a Dragon in Indo-European: Hittite <i>illayanzakā</i> and its Linguistic and Cultural Congeners in Latin, Greek, and Germanic	317
Sara Kimball: On the Origins of Hittite Verbs of the Type <i>tēlūti, dāi</i>	335
Paul Kiparsky: Sievers' Law as Prosodic Optimization	345
Jared Klein: Rigvedic <i>śyātītyā-</i>	361

Fortsetzung auf 3. Umschlagseite

On Some Problems of Final Syllables in South Picene

MICHAEL WEISS

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Ἰακκίνοι βρακτίης δοταῖς

Calvert Watkins has made many brilliant contributions to the study of the Sabellic languages.¹ I hope my small offering in this field will be a fitting honor for him.

The development of final syllables in South Picene presents some surprisingly complex problems. I will deal with two of these problems here: the development of the long diphthong *-ōy in final position and the development of long and short *ō before a final nasal.

1. The Fate of Final *-ōy in South Picene

There are at least five different spellings for the dative singular of *o*-stem nouns and pronouns in South Picene, an ending which we know on comparative grounds reflects PIE *-ōy. Cf Greek *ὄε-ῶ*, Avestan *ahar-āi* etc. The spellings that have been claimed to represent this ending are:²

- a. -āi: mefistrūi (TE 5), ttiūi (TE 5), brinēqūi (TE 7), qdūfeniūi (TE 7)
- b. -ō: erimīnū (BO 1)
- c. -ōi: posimūi (TE 5, TE 7)
- d. -oh: dūnoh (CH 2),³ puqloh (AQ 1), petroh (TE 1)
- e. -ch: kjaūteh (AQ 1)

But this list requires, in my opinion, two initial adjustments. In the first place the form erimīnū, taken as a dative by Meiser,⁴ should probably be struck from the list. The form occurs in a two-word inscription inscribed on a helmet found at Bologna: erimīnū spollitū. In the light of parallel helmet inscriptions Meiser has made a very plausible case that spollitū should be taken as the ablative of the

¹ For example, Watkins (1975) and (1995, esp. 214-231). All South Picene forms are quoted from Marinetti (1985) unless otherwise noted.

² mefistrūi (TE 5), ttiūi (TE 5), and posimūi (TE 5) are all correctly taken as datives by Eichner (1992b:199) and Marinetti (1985:118, 127). brinēqūi and qdūfeniūi are identified as datives by Marinetti (1985:138). posimūi (TE 7), erimīnū (BO 1), puqloh (AQ 1), and kjaūteh (AQ 1) are taken as datives by Meiser (1987:116-117). petroh is presumably taken as a dative by Klingenschmitt (1992:89) since he posits a thematic stem *petro-.

³ See Adiego-Lajara (1990:259) for the justification of this reading.

⁴ Meiser (1987:116)

makupri /makuprē/ is best taken, in my opinion, as a compound adverb made up of /kuprē/ < *kuprē(d), the adverb derived from *kupro-, the pan-Sabellian adjective for 'good' (Umbrian cupras [Pocetti 2], *Dea Cupra* [CIL IX 5294], Sicel κυραρός),¹¹ and /mag(a)/ < *meǵh₂, a nearly exact match for Greek ὀψα- 'very'.¹² *mag(a)ku prē(d) would regularly have become /makuprē/ which would have been written makupri.¹⁴ makupri is in Petronius' words *valde bene*.¹⁵ Finally, we come to the problematic rakinēvi. Clearly what is needed and expected is a dative.¹⁶ The dative could be interpreted as the name of the patron or the name of the divine recipient of the dedication. Yet rakinēvi cannot be the dative of any known declension. The spelling *fi* cannot represent a long diphthong /-ēy/. For, with the single and only apparent exception of *posmūi*,¹⁷ the /y/ of any diphthong in final position, long or short, is always written with the sign transcribed as *i*.¹⁸ Cf. *meistrūf* (TE 5), *itūf* (TE 5), *q̄ntfeniūf* (TE 7) *hrimeq̄iūf* (TE 7) *neimūf* (TE 5) *materēf* (AP 2). Therefore I suggest that we are dealing with a simple spelling metathesis and that what the inscriber intended to write was *rakinēvi.¹⁹ Although one might be tempted to take rakinēvi as a fifth declension dative singular, it would be very difficult to justify such a form.²⁰ It is more plausible to see this as a variant of the 2nd

toponym *Spolētīyom (= Latin *Spolethium*), indicating the place of origin of the helmet. Meiser takes *erimīni* as the dative of the name of the divinity to whom the helmet was dedicated, and, admittedly, this makes excellent sense. But the name of the recipient of the dedication is not an obligatory part of helmet inscriptions from ancient Italy. Compare, for example, the South Picene inscription BA I *itūfβerna* 'from Ulverna'.⁵ Further, *erimīni* would be the sole example of the development of *-ōy to /ō/ in South Picene. Finally, it is also possible to take *erimīni* as another ablative. Formally, this is unproblematic.⁶ An ablative *erimīni* could be interpreted either as another toponym, e.g., as some district of *Spolethium* or perhaps as the gentile of the individual from whom the booty was taken.⁷

On the other hand, a good case can be made for yet another outcome of the thematic dative ending which has not been hitherto recognized: -ī in *rakinēvi (AQ 2 = the Warrior of Capestrano).⁸ The Warrior of Capestrano text written in *scriptio continua* is transliterated by Marinetti as follows:

makuprikoramopsūi;animisrakinēviſp/hompp/ī{---}ſ⁹

I would segment and phonologize this as

makkuprē korām opsūt animis rakinēviſ pomp{---}

The core analysis is 'Animus (animis) made (opsūt) a statue (vel sūti; koram).'¹⁰ I think all scholars would agree on this. The initial segment

South Picene form should not have undergone any such degeneration. Thus I have given the form as /animis/.

¹¹ See Antonaccio and Neils (1995:270).

¹² ὀψα- is commonly an element in adjectives of praise like ὀψακλειός, ὀψακλειτός etc. The zero-grade *mǵh₂ may have been replaced by *m₂ǵh₂. Alternatively, *mag- may be compared more directly with Hitite *mēk* 'much' < *meǵh₂. For the Hitite phonology cf. Melchert (1994: 87). In either case compare the vocalism of the first syllable of Latin *magnum*.

¹³ If the final laryngeal of *m₂ǵh₂ became *a, as one would expect, it would have been syncope in a non-initial open syllable.

¹⁴ Double consonants are not written in South Picene. Cf. *apaitis* (AP 2) *Appari*.

¹⁵ Petronius 50.5. This seems preferable to the only alternative suggestion that I am aware of, that of Marinetti, who, following La Regina, interprets *ma* as the accusative of the 1st singular pronoun. Marinetti (1985:104). But we really would expect *mifom* as in Umbrian (see Rix 1992) and the initial position of the personal pronoun would in any case be strange although not impossible. Finally the supposed *a*-vocalism of the first person pronoun would be hard to explain in Latin terms.

¹⁶ The form is taken as a dative by Marinetti (1985:104). Cf. also the closely parallel TE 7: *opsūq̄ qoras q̄ntfeniūf fecit statuas Cijq̄cunio*.

¹⁷ See below on *posmūi*.

¹⁸ More precisely, the final element of anything that in historical terms was a /y/ diphthong is written with the sign *f* when in absolute *Auslaut*. The use of the *f* sign suggests in fact that the final glide of the front diphthong was lowered to a degree as in Latin *ae*.

¹⁹ See Kent (1926:73) for a few examples of metathesis. A similar example of spelling metathesis is claimed by Eichner (1992b:200) following Meiser who reads *paniūv *quandūm* for *paniūv* (TE 5). Henceforth, I will omit the asterisk from *rakinēvi.

²⁰ The fifth declension is not productive in Sabellian.

⁵ See Janda (1993:150) and Nedoma (1995:39)

⁶ Eichner (1992a:196) takes the form as the ablative of *Ariminium*. For the loss of /h/ < *d at the end of a word in South Picene cf. *ehneif* (TE 1) < *ehweleđ, which, as I hope to show elsewhere, is the perfect subjunctive of a verb cognate not with Latin *volo* but with Latin *evella*.

⁷ For the naming of the individual of the record of the *spolia opima* won by C. Claudius Marcellus, consult of 222 B.C.E.: *is spolia opima retrahit duce hostium Viridmaro... interfecto*. (Act. *Triumph*, 21, *CIL* I p. 477).

⁸ For the justification of the emendation for the stone's *rakinēvi*, see below.

⁹ Adiego-Lajara (1992:127) reads the letter before the *p* of *pomp* as *s*, but I think the photos in Marinetti's edition clearly show that she is right in transcribing the sign as an *i*. The angle of the surviving bottom of the letter is perpendicular to the base line. This angle does not agree with the tail of an *s*. All previous transcribers except Ribezzo have taken the sign as an *i*. See Marinetti (1985:241). I have only been able to see pp. 54-64 and 90-132 of Adiego-Lajara's important monograph.

¹⁰ The name *Animus* is attested with an *I longa* in the second syllable at *CIL* VI 11660 etc. See Schulze (1904:114). The stem of this gentile cannot be separated from that of *Animus*. Therefore it is likely that the single /h/ of *Animus* is the result of the *mama=namilla* rule. See Leumann (1977:184). Since the *mamilla* rule is a Latin-only phenomenon, dependent upon the position of the Latin accent, it follows that the

declension dative singular. This allows us to have a perfectly garden-variety name **rakinevīs* with the well-established suffix **-evīs*, later **-ovīs*, found in both divine epithets and human names. Cf Umbrian *Krap-ivl/Grab-ovie* (Vlb 19, Ia 3 etc.), an epithet of various divinities, and the Marsian gentile *Cant-ovius* (Vetter 228 a = *CIL* 12 5).²¹ The interpretation of *rakinevīs* as a variant of the thematic dative singular finds support in the close parallel of the form *kaūteh* (AQ 1) which is the dative of the name **Gāvis*.²²

It seems, then, that we must recognize five different spellings for the dative singular. How can we explain this multiplicity of forms? To begin with *-ōi* (*mečstrūi*, *iūiōi*, *brīmečlūi*, *qdufeniūi*), these forms clearly are the most archaic of the spellings and represent the unchanged, fully intact long diphthong.²³ But these long diphthongs did not stay intact for long. As in Oscan, it seems that the diphthong */ōy/* was shortened to */oy/*. Subsequently, this short diphthong */oy/* became */ō/* by the general monophthongization of short diphthongs which, as we know on independent grounds, was occurring in South Picene.²⁴ This new long vowel, i.e., */ō/*, was lower in height than the old long */ōy/* and was of the same quality as old short */ō/*. Therefore it was written with the sign *o* to which *h* was added as a marker of length.²⁵ This is the explanation for the spelling of the dative singular as *-oh* in *dūnoh*, *puqloh*, *petroh*. Note the form *dūnoh* with the expected use of *ū* to express */ōy/*, showing that we are not dealing just with different spelling traditions.²⁶

How can the two dative singulars with *e*-vocalism, *rakinevī* and *kaūteh*, be integrated into this scheme? There can be little doubt that both these forms are dative singulars of *o*-stems. I believe I have established this for *rakinevī* above; the case is if anything clearer for *kaūteh*, which is in apposition to an indubitable dative *puqloh* and is dependent upon the verb *praistatī*, which

²¹ For the spelling of */w/* with the sign *v*, cf *viam vīam* and *videtas videtis* from TE 2. It seems probable to me that **-ev-* in *rakinevī* has been preserved. On the other hand, it is also possible that **-ev-* has become **-ov-* and reverted to **-ev-* after a dental, as is sometimes supposed for Andealine *Neuia* (*ILLRP* 11). Latin *Leucæse* (*Carmen Salitare* 2.1) etc. See Leumann (1977:71) and Meiser (1986:37).

²² So Adiego-Lajara (1992:130) and Meiser (1987:116). Eichner (1992a:196) takes the form as a vocative. But see below fn. 27. The immediate context is *kaūteh kaūteis puqloh*.

²³ *ū* is the regular spelling for long */ōy/* in South Picene. See part 2 below. Thus the match with the Oscan dative singular *-iūi* (*dēketasiūi* (Vetter 1.5) etc.) is only apparent. The latter reflects the Oscan shortening of a long diphthong.

²⁴ Cf gen. sg. *-es* < **-eis* (= Oscan *-eis*) in CH 1 *uclatimes* staties etc. Cf Meiser (1987:115) and Adiego-Lajara (1990:259).

²⁵ Final */h/* is etymological in many cases from **-d*. The use of the letter *h* as a marker of length may mean that */h/* had already been lost with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel, if short.

²⁶ Contrast also the ablative singular *fīūih* in the same inscription CH 2.

elsewhere takes a dative.²⁷ Marinetti has taken the form *kaūteh* as a nominative, which is impossible, since final **-s* does not become */h/*, as Meiser has shown.²⁸ Meiser suggests that *kaūteh* is the dative of a gentile of the type which has a nominative in *-īs/-tes* in Oscan.²⁹ But even granting that *kaūteh* is a gentile and not a praenomen, which is uncertain, there would have been no compelling reason to replace the original thematic dative with the athematic dative. Oscan, for example, was perfectly happy to retain expected *-tī* in these forms, e.g., *Vestrikiūiūi* (Vetter 1), etc. Instead, I think there must be a phonological explanation for *kaūteh*. It is clear that *-h* cannot simply be the regular outcome of **-ōy* since *kaūteh* occurs in apposition to *puqloh* which shows the expected shortening and monophthongization treatment. Instead, *kaūteh* must owe its *e* to the fronting and surrounding effects of the preceding *yod*. Thus, **gāviyōy* > **gāviyōy* by post-yod fronting, whence **gāviyey* by shortening of final long diphthongs and */gāviyē/* by monophthongization of final short diphthongs. The spelling *-eh* indicates an open long */ē/* identical or similar in quality to short */e/*, but distinct from the close long */ē̄/* which was the outcome of Proto-Italic **ē̄*, written *ī*.³⁰

In the case of *rakinevī*, we must start with **rakineviyōy*. This form underwent the same post-yod fronting rule to become **rakineviyey*. But since the */y/* of a final diphthong was consistently written with the sign transcribed as *ī*, and since there are no double spellings in the South Picene orthographic tradition, if the form **rakineviyōy* were to be committed to writing at this stage the only possible spelling would have been *rakineviī* standing for **rakinevīī*. Thus, *rakinevī* represents the pre-shortening and pre-monophthongization stage of development and *kaūteh* reflects the results of shortening and monophthongi-

²⁷ The interpretable string of four words in AQ 1 is *kaūteh kaūteis puqloh praistatī*. For *praistatī* with a dative cf TE 5 *mečstrūi nemūneč praistatī*. Eichner (1992a:196) takes the form *kaūteh* as a vocative with a hypercorrect *h*. But although there are instances of *h* which are non-etymological, these cases are limited to marking secondary long vowels in final position or to spellings of final diphthongs like *materēh paterēh* which combine the pre- and post-monophthongization spellings in one. Cf Latin spellings like *vivous CIL* 12 2123. Aside from the alleged instance of *kaūteh*, there is no case where a non-etymological *h* is added to an etymological short vowel. Furthermore, I believe *puqloh* cannot be an ablative since, as I am seeking to show, the use of the signs *o* and *ū* is not inconsistent. Thus the supposed parallel cited by Eichner, i.e., *Publi prognatum Publio CIL* 12 10, is less striking. Vine (1993:120) also endorses Meiser's interpretation. On the locative *tuūtaih* (RI 1) see fn. 40.

²⁸ Marinetti (1985:152) and Meiser (1987:119).

²⁹ For the forms of this paradigm see Buck (1928:121).

³⁰ For example in the perfect subjunctive ending *f* in etuēh (TE 1) < **-ēd* or in the gentile *noūiūs* (AP 5) **Novēiūs*. There are, however, some inscriptions which do not have the sign *ī* and use the sign *e* to spell the reflexes of both long and short **ē̄*, e.g., the first inscription of CH 1 with the forms *adstaeoms* and *esmen* for **adstaeoms* and *esmīh* (attested on MC 1 and MC 2).

that might be depends upon the the morphological interpretation of the form. Adiego-Lajara, following Untermaier, has suggested tentatively that this form, contrary to the *communis opinio*, is not the dative singular of the relative-interrogative stem, but rather the South Picene equivalent of Latin *postumus*.³⁷ But this suggestion would probably cut off any avenue of explanation since there are never any differences in declension between thematic nouns and adjectives in Italic. So we should stick to the widespread and convincing analysis of this form as the dative singular of the relative stem equivalent to Skt. *kāśmāi* < *k^hwāśmāy.

If one compares the pronominal forms of Umbrian, some interesting potential comparanda emerge. The nominative masculine singular of the relative pronoun is spelled *poi*, *poē*, *poēi* in the Latin alphabet. This form cannot, however, be directly compared with Latin *qui* < Old Latin *quai*, because the diphthong *oy regularly monophthongizes to /j/ except in final syllables where it gave a long close /ē/.³⁸ Therefore Proto-Umbrian *poy would have given *pō. To this *pō a particle *-i, probably from earlier *id has been added giving the attested forms. This same particle is also probably seen in the neuter nominative accusative of the relative, *pure/porst*.³⁹ Similarly, I believe an added particle is the explanation for the aberrant spelling of South Picene *posmūi*. In the case of *posmūi* we do not have a final long diphthong but rather a final long diphthong plus *ʔ.⁴⁰

Was this **posmōy* disyllabic or trisyllabic? South Picene metrics are not yet well enough established to allow a decision. If *posmūi* is taken as trisyllabic in TE 5, this would perhaps have the advantage of making the sequence from *tūtū praistaklasa posmūi* isosyllabic with the preceding *safinas tūtas trebegies*, both with nine syllables. In TE 7 *toutū tefet posmūi* read as seven syllables would be an exact match in word division, syllable count, and alliterative pattern for *posmūi vīam videtas* (TE 2).

³⁷ Adiego-Lajara (1992:91).

³⁸ See Buck (1928:45-46) and Meiser (1986:123)

³⁹ In the Umbrian dative singular form corresponding exactly to South Picene *posmūi* we find the form *pusme* which doesn't show any clear evidence for the addition of a particle. But this is not surprising, since it is likely that the long /ē/ resulting from the diphthong *oy contracted with /-i/.

⁴⁰ If the particle added to the relative stem in South Picene was identical to the *id added in Umbrian one might have expected **posmūit* < **posmōy-id*. Although the lack of *h* would not be surprising, since final /h/ was probably already not pronounced at the time of at least some of the South Picene inscriptions (cf. abl. *spolūtūi* < **spolūtīyōid* on the fairly late inscription BO 1 and *ehueit* < **ehueitōid* (TE 1)), it is possible that we are dealing with a slightly different particle for South Picene, i.e. **ī* with no final consonant. This particle may be compared with the *ī* of Latin **uīa-ī* > *uīi* and the /i/ of Greek *οὔτω-ι*. See Leumann (1977:476, 482) and Vine (1993:94). The 1st declension locative **ōy* may also have been recharacterized as a locative with a particle *-id or *-i to distinguish it from the dative. Thus the spelling *toutūth* (RJ 1). For the identification of *toutūth* as a locative see Klingenschmitt (1992:91).

zation.³¹ A very similar change to the one I have posited for *rakinevīf* and *kañēth* took place in Proto-Slavic where the fronting effects of yod led to the development of the so-called soft declension.³²

If we recognize this post-yod fronting rule, we also need to account for some apparent exceptions. For in fact we do find *qdufeniūi* (TE 7) *Citfeniō*³³ and *tūtūth* (CH 2) *Tūtū* abl. sg.. One is first tempted to think about a historical explanation, e.g., that the fronted forms represent later stages, and one recalls that the outcome of final *oy in Umbrian is in fact a close, long /ē/.³⁴ But this explanation is rather unlikely, since the Warrior of Capestrano is generally considered to be one of the oldest South Picene monuments.³⁵

More plausibly, we need to recognize a dialect boundary within the South Picene speech area. For both the post-yod-fronted datives singular are from the district of L'Aquila, the Warrior of Capestrano being from Capestrano, and AQ 1 being from Casteldelci. They therefore constitute the most southerly South Picene inscriptions found *in situ*. There is one other inscription from Casteldelci, AQ 3, which unfortunately does not contain any datives. It does, however, contain two yod plus back vowel sequences: *lotūis* and *profose*. But these yods are intervocalic and etymologically opaque. Thus, nothing stands in the way of supposing that the southernmost tip of the South-Picene speech community was characterized by a post-yod fronting rule.

This brings us finally to the problem of *posmūi*, which, as far as I know, has not hitherto been recognized as a problem. The problem is that, whereas internal /Vy/ diphthongs are without exception spelled <Vi>, final diphthongs are, when preserved, consistently spelled <Vi>.³⁶ For example on TE 5, where we find one of our two examples of *posmūi* clearly and indubitably spelled with *i*, we also find *mefistūi*, *nemūnet* and *tūtūi*, and on TE 7 where we find our second example of *posmūi*, we also find *brimecūi*, *okref* and *tefet*. One example might be explained as a mistake. But two cannot be so explained. Nor can these spellings be interpreted as orthographic variation. Why do we find no other examples of this supposed alternative spelling of final diphthongs in other *o*-stem dative singulars? The only plausible solution is that the spelling *ūi* is being used to represent something other than a simple long diphthong. What

³¹ That the Warrior of Capestrano inscription should contain relatively archaic forms is not surprising since it is generally regarded to be one of the earliest, if not the earliest, South Picene inscription. See Marinetti (1985:239).

³² See Bräuner (1961:101).

³³ See Rix (1994:117) for this interpretation.

³⁴ See Meiser (1986:123).

³⁵ See fn. 31 above.

³⁶ Internal /Vy/ diphthongs in inscriptions possessing the sign *f*: *brimecūthats* (TE 7), *dūkecūm* (AP 3), *kanūis* (AQ 1), *metūms* (TE 5), *metūmūm* (AP 2), *mūreūis* (CH 1), *prāitūpas* (TE 5), *puvāis* (TE 5), *prāistat* (TE 5, AQ 1), *prāistatūi* (TE 7), *praistaklasa* (TE 5), *irāitēimūm* (AP 1), *suatūis* (TE 1), *uclatūms* (CH 1). The one exception is *suāis* (AP 2).

2. The Development of *-ǫm# in South Picene

Another problem of final syllables involves the development of long and short **ō* before a final /m/. On the one hand, it seems probable that long /*ō*/ remained unchanged in many final syllables.⁴¹ For example, the nominative plural ending *-*ōs* appears spelled as -*ūs*, e.g., *apaiūs Appaet* (AP 2). The first person pronoun nominative singular /*egō*/ is spelled *ekū* (CH 1). The first singular verb corresponding to Latin *clueō* is *kdutū* (CH 1).⁴² The ablative singular ending from *-*ōd* is -*ū(h)* in *stūhūh suo* (TE 1) and *spolūtū Spolētio* (BO 1).

But the case of short /*o*/ in final syllables is different.⁴³ First, one must remember that one good source of short /*o*/ in final syllables has been entirely eliminated, i.e., the nominative singular of thematic nouns which was reduced to -*s* by the Proto-Sabellic final syllable syncope. The accusative singular of C-*īyo*-stems would also have been eliminated. This leaves only two sources: the accusative singular of *o*-stems and perhaps some particles. But in fact, when one collects the thematic accusative singular forms, one finds that the vowel is written not *o* but *ū*. Unfortunately, there are only two certain examples: *mūfūm* (TE 5) *mōmmentum* and *multimūm* (AP 2) *munus*. Two more possible examples may be found in AP 1: *anaiūm Annaeum* and *raetūm* (unknown meaning). There are no certain examples of the spelling -*om*.

The likeliest explanation for these forms is that a short **ō* before final /m/ was raised to become identical, or nearly identical, in quality with /*ō*/, the reflex of Proto-Italic long **ō*. This raising in final syllables is also found before final /t/, to judge from the case of *qolōfūtūr* (AP 2) < **kolfētūr*, a third singular dependent-passive verb form. The development posited for South Picene is similar to what one finds in Oscan, where the infinitive ending deriving from the thematic accusative singular ending *-*om* is consistently written -*um* in the native alphabet and -*im* in the Latin alphabet.⁴⁴ So far so good. But the question arises: what happened to long **ō* before a final /m/? The best evidence for sequences of this sort is the genitive plural ending where much evidence from various Indo-European languages points to a long vowel.⁴⁵ The supposed evidence for an ending short *-*om* has been adequately disposed of by Jasanoff.⁴⁶ If nothing special happened to *-*ōm*, one would expect the regular South Picene spelling to be -*im*.

⁴¹ Proto-Italic **ō* > **ū* in Proto-Sabellic.

⁴² See Rix (1994:119).

⁴³ /*o*/ is regularly spelled with the letter *o*, e.g., *tokam* (TE 2) < **rogām* (= formally Latin *rogam*), *qora* (CH 1) *stataia* (vel *sim*), etc.

⁴⁴ See Buck (1928:37).

⁴⁵ Cf. Greek *ποδ-ῶν*, Skt. *padān* etc. all presumably from *-*ollam*.

⁴⁶ See Jasanoff (1983).

In fact, the clearest examples of the genitive plural are spelled not -*im* but -*om*. One genitive plural that is universally recognized is the form *fitasom factorum* on TE 5, the genitive plural of a first declension noun with an ending corresponding to Latin -*arum* < *-*āsōm*. Eichner explains this as a mistake for -*asūm*, and undoubtedly, one example could be explained away in this fashion.⁴⁷ But a good case can be made for three other examples of the same spelling.

The next example is the form *alintion* on TE 7 from Penna Saut' Andrea in the land that in later times belonged to the *Præutiatica Regio*. It occurs in the sequence -*rtūr brūneqtūt alintion okref safinal*. The interpretation of this form as a neuter -*īyo*-stem or as the accusative of an animate -*īyo*-stem is excluded by the fact that these sequences of *-*īyom* would have been syncopeated in Proto-Sabellic.⁴⁸ But the word is also susceptible to a plausible analysis as a genitive plural. The following word *okref* can only be the dative or possibly locative of the Pan-Sabellic word for mountain top, *arx*. Cf. Umbrian *ukar/ocar* < **okris*. Thus it is possible to construe *alintion okref* as 'for/on the mount of the *Al(l)entes* parallel to Umbrian *ukripter Fisin* (T.I. Ia 5 etc.) 'for the Fisian mount'. *alintion* would be the genitive plural of an -*i*-stem ethnic name as the ethnic *Picentes* was derived from *Picēnum*, so we may infer that the land of the **Al(l)entes* was once called **Al(l)ēnom*, a form which may also be at the base of the Latin gentile *Alentius* found, for example, at the nearby *Ascudum Picenum*.⁴⁹ Perhaps we may be justified in supposing that the inhabitants of this area called themselves the **Al(l)entes* before they adopted the name *Præutiiti* which must have been given to them by their neighbors since *Præutiiti* clearly means 'those who are outside of the nation' ← **praitiitiyo*.⁵¹

Another probable example may be found in CH 1 from Crecchio. There we find *ekūsim raetionm*, which I think can best be interpreted as 'I am of the Raetii'.⁵² Cf. the gentile *Raetius* *CH* XII 218. For the deletion of a yod before /*e*/ cf. *apaces* (MC 1) < **apayes* < **apayyas*. For the syntax cf. Oscan *Herentateis sūm Veneris sūm* (Vetter 107) and Capenatic *alcaionm esū*

⁴⁷ See Eichner (1992b:200) and (1993:55) for a plausible connection with Latin *fitialis*.

⁴⁸ Meiser (1986:61-62) and Marinetti (1985:135).

⁴⁹ See Szemerényi (1971). Cf. also for the case and suffix *tiatium Teatium* (Vetter 200 E 1).

⁵⁰ See Schulze (1904:71). Cf. also the form *Alentis* *AE* (1978:337) from *Mutina*.

⁵¹ See Rix (1955).

⁵² For the interpretation of *ekūsim* as *ego sūm* see Eichner (1993:62). It is also possible to construe *raetionm* with the following *rufrastim* 'I am the red one of the Raetii'.

**Allicaeorum sum*.⁵³ Finally, from CH 2 we may cite *aniom ombrijen akren* 'in the Umbrian land of the *Anii*'.⁵⁴

Against these examples, there is one certain example of a genitive plural written not with *ū* but just with *u*: *pūpūnūm* (AP 2). *pūpūnūm* is probably best explained as an error for **pūpūnūm* with the central bar of the modified *ū* being left off. Cf the thematic or consonant-stem accusative singular *andaqum* for **andaqūm* (AP 1). Further, the form *safinūm* (TE 6) is also best interpreted as a genitive plural. The context, *jis safinūm nerf persakant pl*, although ambiguous, is certainly amenable to the interpretation '(they) proclaim the heroes of the Sabines'. These two forms are easily explained as the result of a graphic analogy to the stem vowel -*ti* seen in the nominative plural **pūpūnātis*.⁵⁵ A closely parallel orthographic practice is known from Oscan. In Oscan the ablative singular (*/ōd/* < **-ōd*) and the nominative plural (*/ōs/* < **-ōs*) are written in the native alphabet not with the expected sign, *u*, which normally spells */ō/*, but with the sign *ū*, which has obviously been generalized graphically from other case forms, viz., the accusative singular and plural and the dative singular and plural.⁵⁶ The South Picene graphic analogy could not have taken place in the forms *alfinūm* and *flinūm* since these were not *ō*-stems. In the case of *racūm* and *aniom* the analogy did not take place because the singular forms of the paradigm must have been dominant in these personal names.

In the light of this clear pattern (**-omh* > */ōm/*, written <*-ūm*>, but **-ōm*h > */om-ōm/*, written <*om*>), it is worth reconsidering the cases of the pronominal forms *sidom hoc* and *tom te* or *tu*.⁵⁷ Eichner has plausibly analysed the form *sidom* as a neuter nominative/accusative singular demonstrative pronoun **kid* to which the particle **-om* has been added.⁵⁸ In fact, if we search the neighboring languages for a suitable comparandum, our attention soon falls on Gothic *hita* 'now', attested in the idiom *und hita* 'until now'. *Hita*, however, cannot go back to **kidom*, since final short **-om* would simply have been lost in Gothic, as happened in the case of thematic neuter nouns in **-om*, e.g., *waitūd*

'word' < **wyrdthom*. It can, on the other hand, go back to **kidōm*. If the particle added to the neuter nominative/accusative demonstrative pronoun forms in Gothic (cf *hit-a*) was identical to the particle added to the masculine accusative demonstratives in Gothic (*hōn-a*) and West Germanic (OE */on-e*), then the evidence of West Germanic would prove definitively that the particle was **-ōm*, since only **-ōm* would adequately account for the correspondence Gothic *-a* = OE *-e*. Cf the *-elz*-stem accusative singular Gothic *giba* = OE *gife* < PGmc. **geōm* < PIE **g^hep^heh^hm*. Thus there is reason to think that the particle added to **kid* in Germanic was not **-om* but **-ōm*. South Picene *sidom* and Gothic *hita* could be an exact match, and South Picene *sidom*, and presumably *tom* as well, would be two more examples of the development of PIE **-ōm*h to what is spelled *-om* in South Picene.⁵⁹

So the evidence points to a seemingly paradoxical set of developments: a short **ō* in a final syllable was raised before */m/*, but a long **ō* was lowered, and quite probably shortened before final */m/*. If **ō* was both shortened and lowered before a final */m/*, it would be necessary to assume that the short **ō* raising rule was prior to the shortening and lowering rule, because, if the ordering were reversed, then all short **ō*'s before final */m/* would have been raised. But if the ordering is: 1. Short **ō* Raising Rule (SORR), 2. Shortening and Lowering Rule (SLR), then the shortening of long vowels before final */m/* cannot be a Proto-Italic rule, since Old Latin has no trace of SORR. If, on the other hand, the *-om* spelling of the genitive plural merely indicates that long **ō* was lowered but not shortened before final */m/* (LR), one would not be compelled to order SORR before LR, for the obvious reason that SORR would not affect long **ō*. But this scenario, too, would require that the shortening of long vowels before final */m/* not be Proto-Italic, since otherwise the Proto-Sabellic and South Picene sequence */-ōm*h/ would have been impossible. Either way we look at it, long vowels before final */m/* must have been preserved in Proto-Italic.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ The particle *-om* added to the accusative singular of personal pronouns in Sabellic is usually compared to the *-am* of Skt. *ahīm* 'I', *tvām* 'you', etc. But there is nothing particularly compelling about this supposed match. The *-om* particle could not even have been obligatory in Proto-Indo-Iranian since Avestan has *īā* besides *tvān*. Furthermore, the disagreement between Old Latin *meū* etc. and Old Umbrian *miom* etc. (see Rix 1992) suggests that the particle **-om*, whatever its ultimate origin, could not have been in place in Proto-Italic.

⁶⁰ It is difficult to judge from the evidence of Oscan and Umbrian whether a long vowel, outside of monosyllables, was preserved before a final */m/*. In Umbrian the facts are obscured by the general lowering of the high back vowels before nasals both word-internally and word-finally. See Meiser (1986:121). In Central Oscan inscriptions we find for the genitive plural both *-im*, *-um* and *-om*. The South Oscan inscriptions in the Greek alphabet have examples of both *-it* and *-oyt* for this case. The latter forms suggest that the vowel was still long, since there is no evidence for the raising of **-ōm*h in these inscriptions, but the whole subject requires a fresh investigation.

⁵³ See Colonna (1989-1990 462-464). Note in particular the Capenatic spelling of the genitive plural with *-om* vs. the 1st singular of the verb with *-ō(m)*. This might be another example of a South Picene-Capenatic continuity.

⁵⁴ The form *flinūm*, the only word surviving from TE 3, cannot be securely interpreted from the syntactic point of view. Needless to say, I think it is a genitive plural of the genitive **flinūm*. Cf *Titimus CIL III 3112* etc. The form *marotum* from CH 2 can only be made into a genitive plural of *maro* with emendation (Marinetti 1985 111). If it is, in fact, a form of *maro* it could just as easily be restored to **marūnūm* as to **marūnūm*.

⁵⁵ The South Picene thematic accusative plural is not attested, but Umbrian suggests a long */ō/* preceded the ending in this case too. Cf the Umbrian accusatives plural *toru* and *rajtu* in the Latin alphabet.

⁵⁶ Buck (1928:38).

⁵⁷ See Eichner (1993:52).

⁵⁸ Eichner (1992b:199).

Addendum: Christian Seidl's 1994 article "Gemeinsabellisch und Vulgärlateinisch: Der Vokalismus" in *Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch, Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 5. bis 9. Oktober 1992 in Zürich*, edited by George Dunkel et alii (Wiesbaden: Reichert), 349-370, reached me only at the proof stage. Therefore I was not able to give the author's views on South Picene phonology and orthography the attention they deserve.

References

- Adiego-Lajara, Ignacio-Javier. 1990. *Sobre la inscripción sudpicenica* CH. 2. *Aion* 12.257-260.
- . 1992. *Protosabello, osco-umbr, sudpiceno*. Barcelona: Promociones y Publicaciones Universitarias, S. A. *Vidi ff. 54-64 et ff. 90-132 soluti*.
- Antonaccio, Carla M. and Neils, Jennifer. 1995. A New Graffito from Archaic Morgantina. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 105.261-277.
- Bräuer, Herbert. 1961. *Slavische Sprachwissenschaft I. Einleitung, Lautlehre*. Berlin: Sammlung Gösschen.
- Buck, Carl Darling. 1928. *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*.² Boston: Ginn & Co.
- Colonna, Giovanni. 1989-1990. Nuovi graffiti capenati. *Studi etruschi* 56.462-464.
- Eichler, Heiner. 1992a. Pikensische Pietas: Das Zeugnis des süd-pikenischen Cippus von Castagnano. *Die Sprache* 34.195-197.
- . 1992b. Ein Heldendenkmal der Sabiner mit trochäischem Epigramm eines pikensischen Plautus des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts v. Chr. *Die Sprache* 34.198-207.
- . 1993. 1919 oder 1991? Zur Entwicklung der oskisch-umbrischen Studien nebst einer neuen Interpretation des Textes von *Fonte Romito* (Vetter Nr. 147). In *Oskisch-Umbrisch. Texte und Grammatik. Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft und der Società Italiana di Glottologia vom 25. bis 28. September 1991 in Freiburg*, ed. Helmut Rix, 46-95. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert.
- Janda, Michael. 1993. Die Inschrift des Helms von Canosa und der Buchstabe B des Süd-pikenischen. In *Oskisch-Umbrisch. Texte und Grammatik. Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft und der Società Italiana di Glottologia vom 25. bis 28. September 1991 in Freiburg*, ed. Helmut Rix, 147-154. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert.
- Jasanoff, Jay H. 1983. A Rule of Final Syllables in Slavic. *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 11.139-149.
- Kent, Roland. 1926. *The Textual Criticism of Inscriptions*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.
- Klingenschmitt, Gerit. 1992. Die lateinische Nominalflexion. In *Late Indogermanisch. Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Salzburg, 23.-26. September 1986*, ed. Oswald Panagl und T. Krisch, 89-135. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Leumann, Mann. 1977. *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. Munich: B. Minetti, Anna. 1985. *Le iscrizioni sudpicene. I testi*. Florence: L. S. Olsc Meiser, Gerhard. 1986. *Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- . 1987. Pälignisch, Latein und Süd-pikenisch. *Glotta* 65.104-125.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amst. Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Nedonca, Robert. 1995. *Die Inschrift auf dem Helm B von Negau. Meilen und Grenzen der Deutung norditalischer epigraphischer Denkmäler*. Vienna: Fassbinder.
- Pocetti, Paolo. 1979. *Nuovi Documenti Italici*. Pisa: Giardini.
- Rix, Helmut. 1955. Zwei Völkernamen aus dem alten Italien. *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 6.14-26.
- . 1992. Una firma paleo-umbr. *Archivio glottologico italiano* 77.24.
- . 1994. Süd-pikenisch kdnuf. *Historische Sprachforschung* 107.105.
- Schulze, Wilhelm. 1904. *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigenamen*. Göttingen: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Szemerényi, Oswald J. L. 1971. The Name of the Picentes. In *Sprache und Geschichte: Festschrift für Harri Meier zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. E. Coseriu and Wolf-Dieter Stempel, 531-544. Munich: Fink.
- Vetter, Emil. 1953. *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*. Heidelberg: C. W. Vögel, Brent. 1993. *Studies in Archaic Latin Inscriptions*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1975. La désignation indo-européenne du 'tabou'. *L'Épigraphie mérovingienne*, ed. by J. Kristeva et al. Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne.
- . 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

INNSBRUCKER BEITRÄGE ZUR SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

Veröffentlichungen 1993–97 und Vorschau 1998

- 76: Wolfgang Meid. Die erste Botorrita-Inschrift. Interpretation eines keltiberischen Sprachdenkmals. 1993. 140 S. öS 480,-. ISBN 3-85124-639-X.
- 77: Günter Neumann. Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften. 1994. 700 S. öS 1.960,-. ISBN 3-85124-640-3.
- 78: Sprachen und Schriften des antiken Mittelmeerraumes. Festschrift für Jürgen Untermann zum 65. Geburtstag. Herausgegeben von Frank Heidermanns, Helmut Rix und Elmar Seebold. 1993. X, 512 S. öS 1.760,-. ISBN 3-85124-643-8.
- 79: J. Botley. The Hittite Particle *-/za*. 1993. 262 S. öS 640,-. ISBN 3-85124-644-6
- 80: Calvert Watkins. Selected Writings. Edited by Lisi Oliver. 2 Volumes: I: Language and Linguistics. II: Culture and Poetics. 1994. XX, 771 S. öS 2.400,-. ISBN 3-85124-645-1.
- 81: Dagmar S. Wodtko. Sekundäradjektive in den altirischen Glossen. Untersuchungen zur präfixalen und suffixalen Wortbildung. 1995. VIII, 357 S. öS 840,-. ISBN 3-85124-650-0.
- 82: Wolfgang Griepentrog. Die Wurzelnomina im Germanischen und ihre Vorgesichte. 1995. 540 S. öS 1.400,-. ISBN 3-85124-651-9.
- 83: VERBA ET STRUCTURAE. Festschrift für Klaus Strunk zum 65. Geburtstag. Herausgegeben von Heinrich Heitrich u. a. VIII, 372 S. öS 1.200,-. ISBN 3-85124-653-5.
- 84: Karl Hoffmann – Bernhard Forssman. Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre. 1996. 330 S. öS 760,-. ISBN 3-85124-652-7
- 85: Karin Stüber. Zur dialektalen Einheit des Ostionischen. 1996. 175 S. öS 400,-. ISBN 3-85124-657-8.
- 86: Aspects of Latin. Papers from the Seventh International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics. Jerusalem, April 1993. Edited by Hannah Rosén. 1996. 735 S. öS 1.920,-. ISBN 3-85124-659-4.
- 87: Thomas Krisch. Zur Genese und Funktion der altindischen Perfekta mit langem Reduplikationsvokal. MH kommentierter Materialsammlung. 1996. 111 S. öS 320,-. ISBN 3-85124-660-8.
- 88: Anne Broger. Das Epitheton bei Sappho und Alkaios. Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung. 1996. 331 S. öS 760,-. ISBN 3-85124-661-6.
- 89: Thomas Lindner. Lateinische Komposita. Ein Glossar, vornehmlich zum Wortschatz der Dichtersprache. 1996. 224 S. öS 560,-. ISBN 3-85124-662-4.
- 90: Georgios K. Giannakis. Studies in the Syntax and the Semantics of the Reduplicated Presents of Homeric Greek and Indo-European. 1997. 317 S. öS 640,-. ISBN 3-85124-665-9.

Fortsetzung Table of contents

- Charles de Lambertière: Langues de feu. Grec hésiodique
 Ἀελλυγίρες: sanskrit védique *rīrhivā*.....
- Winfred Lehmann: Explanation of Syntactic Changes in
 Late Indo-European by Use of Universals.....
- Fredrik Otto Lindeman: On the Origin of the Present Subjunctive
 of the Substantive Verb in Old Irish.....
- A. L. Irbotsky: New Phrygian Metrics and the δεός ζειελαός Formula
 Horace Lunt: What Makes Slavic Slavic?
 Protristas Mac Cana: Complex Adjectival Predicates in Insular Celtic
 J. P. Mallory: The Old Irish Chariot.....
- Kim McConne: "Double Nasal" Presents in Celtic, and Old Irish
léicid 'leaves'.....
- Wolfgang Meid: Zum Ruhm des Namens im Altirischen.....
- H. Craig Melchert: Poetic Meter and Phrasal Stress in Hittite
 Gregory Nagy: Is There an Etymology for the Dactylic Hexameter?
 Erich Neu: Hebräisch *ḥardant* 'verletzt, angeschlagen, erschöpft'
 vs. hebräisch *ḥardant* 'verflucht'.....
- Günter Neumann: Zur Trilingue vom Letoon. Der letzte Satz
 der lykischen Verston.....
- Alan Nussbaum: Severe Problems.....
- Norbert Oettinger: Semantisches zu Pan, Pusan und Hermes.....
- Lisi Oliver: Towards Freeing a Slave in Germanic Law.....
- Hayden Pelliccia: The Transposition of Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*
 1203–1204, and the Uses of *μῶν*.....
- Steve Peter: Healdene's Honey: A Bear Beam in *Beowulf*
 Martin Peters: Homerisches und Unhomerisches bei Homer
 und auf dem Nestorbecher.....
- Edgar C. Polomé: Some Considerations on Dutch *erg*, etc.....
- Jaán Puhvel: Latin *furor*: Help from Hittite.....
- Donald Ringe: Schwa-rounding and the Chronology
 of Sound Changes in Tocharian.....
- Helmut Rix: Bemerkungen zu den lateinischen Verbformen
 des Typs *faxo faxim*.....
- Rüdiger Schmitt: Tradition und Innovation. Zu indoiranischen
 Formeln und Fügungen im Altperischen.....
- P. O. Skjærvel: Eastern Iranian Epic Traditions I: Siyāvaš and Kunāla
 Klaus Strunk: Lateinisches Gerundium / Gerundivum
 und Vergleichbares.....
- Richard Thomas: Voice, Poetics and Virgil's Sixth *Eclogue*
 Johann Tischler: Calque-Erscheinungen im Anatolischen.....
- Brent Vine: The Etymology of Greek *κόρη* and Related Problems.....
- Michael Weiss: On Some Problems of Final Syllables in South Picene.....