

Observations on the South Picene Inscription TE 1
(S. Omero)

Michael Weiss
Cornell University

This paper offers a new interpretation of the South Picene inscription TE 1 from S. Omero. It is argued that this funerary text contains a prohibition against the violation of the tomb site and a provision for making amends for at least some sorts of violations.

1. The inscription TE 1 from Santo Omero in the district of Teramo was first published in 1851 by D. de Guidubaldi. Many notable scholars, including Pauli, Lindsay, and von Planta have tried their hands at an interpretation, mostly with no profit, since the South Picene alphabet was not properly understood until the groundbreaking work of La Regina and Marinetti in the eighties.¹ Since Marinetti's book there has been, to my knowledge, no attempt to give an interpretation to the inscription as a whole. In this paper I will attempt to clarify some issues of detail and suggest an overall interpretation of this fragmentary text. The reading given by Marinetti is as follows:²

- (1) **petroh** : **púpún**/
 jr : **e** : **súhúh**: **suai**/pis : **ehuelí** de /
 Inu: **puúde** pepi/e -

2. The first word **petroh** is probably a name, as was already suggested by Deecke in 1886.³ On the one hand, some parallel texts might lead us to think that **petroh** is the nominative of a personal name. For example, MC 1 reads:

¹ See Marinetti 1985:199-121 for a history of the scholarship.

² All South Picene texts are cited after the edition of Marinetti 1985. Etruscan forms are cited from Rix 1991, Oscan forms from Vetter 1953 and a Venetic form from Lejeune 1974. I follow the well-established convention of transliterating Etruscan-derived Italic alphabets in bold and of transcribing Roman alphabet texts in *italics*.

³ Deecke 1886:192.

- (2) *apaes : qapat[: e]smín : púpúnis : nír : mefín : veiat :*
vepetí
 Appaies a Poponian man lies in the middle tomb.

Therefore one might consider for TE 1 the restoration *petroh : púpún[is n]r* 'Petro a Poponian man'.⁴ On the other hand, other inscriptions refer to the *apaiús púpúnnum* as the agents who set up monuments for others, e.g., AP 2:

- (3) *púpúnnum : estufk : apaiús : adstáfúh : súais : manus :*
meitimúm
 Here The Appaei of the Poponians set up a monument
 with their own hands.

In view of these parallels one might consider *petroh* to be a dative and one might restore instead *petroh: púpún[úm apaiús]r* 'The Appaei of the Poponians set up a monument for Petros'.⁵

Taking *Petroh* as a nominative has the immediate advantage of opening up the possibility of comparison with the well-attested Italic *n*-stem praenomen *Petro* which is found in later times. Dionysius 4.57.1 mentions an *Αντίστιος Πέτρων* of Gabii from the time of Tarquinius Superbus,⁶ and *Petro* and its abbreviation are also attested on a number of inscriptions from the north Oscan area, precisely in the area where South Picene was written several centuries earlier.⁷ Furthermore *Petro* is the undoubted source of the Etruscan *Petru*.⁸ Finally it is certain that a praenomen **petro* did exist among the South Picenes, since it is the source of the gentilic name *Petrúnis Petronius* attested in AP 4.

However, there are serious and, I would say, insuperable phonological difficulties with the nominative interpretation. I do not believe we know what the nominative singular of *n*-stem personal names in the Sabellic languages was. If the Proto-Italic nominative in *-ō* (cf. Latin *Catō*, *Catōnis*) was simply continued, we would expect South Picene to have a nominative singular **petrú*, since there

⁴ Given the general shape and layout of the inscription, Marinetti 1985:202 is probably correct in supposing a fairly long gap between *púpún[* and *]r*. However, this gap would not preclude the reconstruction of a discontinuous version of the noun phrase *púpúnis nír*, since hyperbaton is well-established and even expected in these poetic texts.

⁵ Klingenschmitt 1992:89 takes *petroh* as a dative with no argumentation.

⁶ With postposition of the praenomen as is also found in *Πομπίλιος Νόμας* (Dion. 3.14) = *Numa Pompilius*.

⁷ See Salomies 1987:85 for a listing of the evidence. The form *Petro* from near Lacus Fucinus (ILLRP 303) could theoretically also be read as *Petro(s)* with omission of final *s*.

⁸ See Rix 1991:152 for attestations.

can be no question of a general lowering of final $*-\bar{o}$ in view of *ekú* (CH 1) = *egō*, *kdufú* (CH 1) = *clueō* etc.⁹ On the other hand, the evidence of the other *n*-stem paradigms suggests that the nominative in $-\bar{o}$ was recharacterized by $*-ns$ which became $-f$ in Oscan and Umbrian.¹⁰ So a Proto-Sabellic $*petrōns$ would probably have come out as $*petrúf$ in South Picene, cf. *nerf* 'men, heroes' indirectly from $*h_2ner-ns$, and it is not likely that f was weakened to h postvocally as is shown by the form *estuf* (TE 5) 'here'.

In contrast, the dative theory is unproblematic phonologically. As I have sought to demonstrate elsewhere, the long diphthong $*-ōy$ of the thematic dative sg. was shortened and monophthongized within the historical period of the South Picene texts.¹¹ Thus the older texts preserve the long diphthong unchanged spelled $-úí$, but the later texts have examples of the spelling $-oh$, which is intended to represent a long open \bar{o} resulting from shortening and monophthongization, the h serving as a marker of length.

The problem here however is that there is no other direct evidence for a thematic form $*petros$ at such an early date. On the other hand, much indirect evidence does point to the one-time existence of a thematic stem $*petro-$. First, there is the praenomen *Petro* itself. *N*-stem personal names frequently cooccur beside thematic adjectives, e.g., *Cato* ~ *catus* 'sharp', *Lento* ~ *lentus* 'slow', *Lippo* ~ *lippus* 'having inflamed eyes', *Vetulo* ~ *vetulus* 'oldish', *Varro* ~ *vārus* 'bow-legged'.¹² Whether praenomina or cognomina these *n*-stem names are best explained as derivatives from thematic adjectives formed with the Italic reflex of the PIE individualizing suffix $*(h_1)on-$.¹³ Just as *Cato* is derived from *catus* 'sharp' so *Petro* implies a $*petros$.

Further indirect evidence for a thematic $petro-$ may be found in the name of the *vicus Petrinus* referred to by Horace (*Ep.* 1.1.5 with Porphyrio ad loc.) and the *Petrinum* mentioned by Cic. *ad. fam.* 6.19.1. These forms imply a gentilic $*Petrus$ which in turn implies a praenomen $*petro-$.¹⁴

⁹ See Weiss 1998 and Rix 1994:116.

¹⁰ Rix 1986:592-593. Just recently the expected reflex of a recharacterized nominative singular *n*-stem has turned up in the Oscan form *trībuf plīfriks* 'tribune of the people'. See De Caro 1999:457.

¹¹ Weiss 1998.

¹² Cf. also the case of *Volero* < $*welesōn-$ vs. *Volesus/Volusus* < $*weleso-$. From the form $*weleso-$, which was originally a praenomen, the gentilic *Valerius* (< $*walesiyo-$ < $*welesiyo-$) was derived. For the change from $*wel-$ to $*wal-$ cf. Oscan *valaimo-* 'best' vs. SP *velaimēs* and Latin *volaemum* 'a type of large pear' < $*welaimo-$.

¹³ See Kajanto 1965:105 for the forms, but the IE analysis of the suffix should not be attributed to Kajanto.

¹⁴ Schulze 1904:551.

Next, there is good, although not abundant, evidence for cognomen *Petra*.¹⁵ That the cognomen *Petra* may once have been a praenomen is suggested by the derived gentilic, originally a patronymic adjective *Petrei* < **petraios*.¹⁶ Cf. Etruscan *C. Petraes* (O B 2.18). *Petra* must be explained as a collective derivative of **petro-* just as *Numa* is derived from **numo-* (cf. Etruscan *Nume* and *Numulus*), *Pansa* from *pansus* 'splay-footed', and *Calva* from *calvus* 'bald' etc.¹⁷ Much evidence then points to the onetime existence of a thematic stem **petro-* and I would suggest that this form is attested for the first time here.

The name is connected with the Sabellic numeral for 'four' and probably is a reflex of the archaic ordinal **petro-* < **peturo-* 'fourth', formed from the cardinal with the suffix **(-h_x)o-*. **peturo-* was itself replaced in the history of Sabellic, in some dialects at least, by the form **peturto-* with the suffix *-to-* generalized from **penk^wto-* 'fifth' and **seksto-* 'sixth'. The form **peturto-* is reflected by the recently discovered gentilic *Peturto-ius* (AE 1990 297 Ascoli Piceno). From the existence of these two forms, we can probably draw the inference that the form *trutum* (Vetter 2.15) of the Tabula Bantina is not yet another form of the ordinal of four.¹⁸ Naturally this *petro-* has nothing or very little to do with the Πέτρος/*Petrus* (Simon) of the Christian Bible which is adequately explained as a Greek translation of Aramaic *kēfā* 'rock'. The existence, however, of an Italic Praenomen **petro-* may have made the adoption and spread of the Christian *Petrus* a little bit easier.

3. The second broken word *púpún-* is no doubt related to the unbroken forms *púpúnum* (AP 2) and *púpúnis* (MC 1). The former form is most naturally taken as a genitive plural of a thematic ethnic name dependent on *apaiús* the *Appaei* or 'the elders' of the *Poponi*. The latter form is an adjective derived from the ethnic name with the suffix *-iyo-*, thus *Poponius* 'Poponian'. These forms have been very plausibly interpreted as the self-designation of the ethnos that wrote the South Picene inscriptions.¹⁹ Thus we may translate *púpúnnum* as *Picentium* 'of the Picenes' and *púpúnis* as *Picentinus* 'Picenian'. As

¹⁵ Tacitus *Ann.* 11.4; *T. Pomponius T f. Petra* CIL XI 969 (Regium Lepidum); *M. Musidius Petra* CIL X 3387. Cf. also Etruscan *Petra* (Adria 2.23)

¹⁶ Schulze 1904:366.

¹⁷ Kajanto 1965:105 and Klingenschmitt 1992:90.

¹⁸ Buck 1928:237 argues for 'fourth'. Vetter 1953:21 argues for 'second'. The form *trutas* (Vetter 6), also occurs in the so-called Curse of Vibia in a fragmentary context. The connection with *quartus* goes back to Bugge 1878:54 and has been most recently argued for by Swiggers 1988.

¹⁹ Eichner 1993:61.

for the etymology of the stem little positive can be said. I would take issue with Eichner's tentative suggestion that *púpúno-* might be compared with Germanic **spehta-* 'woodpecker'. As Eichner admits this would involve separating **spehta-* from Latin *pīcus*, and the positing of an *s*-mobile.²⁰ These problems in themselves are not insuperable, but a more serious difficulty is the consistent spelling of this stem with two modified *ú*'s. The sign *ú* is regularly used, aside from some special cases in final syllables, to represent the reflex of Proto-Italic long **ō*. At any rate the South Picene forms cannot be separated from the gentilic *Poponius* attested a handful of times in Latin inscriptions through Italy.²¹

4. Next we have the phrase *e sūhūh* which I think most scholars would take as the equivalent of the Latin idiom *de suo, de sua pecunia* or Etruscan *mex θuta* (Cr 4.4) 'from his/her own money'.²²

4.1 The preposition *e* is written for **eh*. Final *h* was in the process of being eliminated in pronunciation. Thus we find a number of examples of omission of final *h* (*kuprī* 'well' < **kuprēh* < **kuprēd*,²³ (AQ 2), *spolítú* < **spolētiōh* < **spolētiōd* (BO 1), *ehuelí* < **eh-welēh* < **ehwelēd* (TE 1) and also a number of cases where *h* is used, when not etymologically justified, as a marker of length (especially in the datives singular *dúnoh*²⁴ (CH 2), *katúeh* (AQ 1), *materesh*, *patereh* (AP 2), *puqlōh* (AQ 1) and *petroh* (TE 1)).²⁵

It has sometimes been supposed that Oscan *ee-* and Umbrian *ehe* were generalized from the regular phonological development **ek-t* to **eh-t*.²⁶

²⁰ Eichner 1993:61.

²¹ *CIL* III s. 12031 4, VIII s. 15473, I² 1139 (Rome), IX 1261 (Aeclanum), X 5276 (Casinum), SI 5.20 (Forum Novum (restored)). Furthermore Etruscan has several examples of *Pupuni* (Pe. 1.1164), *Pupunial* (AH 1.16), *Pupunia*'s (AS 1.258) which could reflect Italic *Poponius* as well as the equally well-attested *Puponius*.

²² Marinetti 1985:99. Similarly Eichner 1993:62-63, and Adiego Lajara 1992:97.

²³ This example is not entirely secure since it is possible that the adverb in *-ē* is in fact of instrumental origin (< **eh*) and therefore did not originally have the **d* of the ablative.

²⁴ Reading of Adiego Lajara 1990b:260.

²⁵ On the phonological and syntactic interpretation of these forms as dative see Weiss 1998.

²⁶ Von Planta 1892:208. Buck 1928:49 found this account problematic, since an *h* of this origin was regularly preserved, whereas the *h* of **eh* seemed to have been lost in the examples *eehiianasúm* and *eestfnt*. Similarly Bottiglioni 1954:44. However, neither of these supposed examples are probative. *eehiianasúm* should be emended to *vehhiianasúm* (so Franchi de bellis 1981) and *eestfnt* could be a compound of **en* and *staē-*. Since Buck wrote, a new and indisputable examples of the omission of *h* has turned up in the form *emanafed* (Pocchetti 1979:14). However, this remains an isolated instance and we cannot exclude the possibility that *emanafed* is a simple spelling error. Incidentally, the Sabellic forms cannot

This generalization, given the South Picene evidence, would presumably have occurred in the Proto-Sabellic period. However, this account seems problematic to me. First it should be noted that South Picene does have at least one surface example of the sequence *kt* in the form *deiktam* (CH 1) 'display'(?). If this form shows that *kt* did not become *ht* in Proto-Sabellic, then the account of *eh* given above would have to be definitely excluded. However, a preform **deikVtam* cannot be eliminated with certainty.²⁷ But there is a more significant problem. The standard theory posits an *s*-less variant **ek* which in a very limited sandhi environment would perhaps have become **eh* in Proto-Sabellic and this sandhi variant would then have been generalized. But this seems a needless complication. In fact an *s*-less variant of **eks* would have been **eǵh*²⁸ not **ek* and **eǵh* would regularly have become Proto-Sabellic **eh*. An *s*-less form is confirmed by the evidence of the Oscan adjective *ehtrō-* and Umbrian *apehtre* < **ektero-* vs. Latin *exterus*.²⁹

4.2 *sūhūh* is the ablative singular of the possessive adjective, cf. OLatin *sova* (CIL I.1551), Oscan *sūvad*, Grk. *ἐ(ρ)ός*. Adiego Lajara has suggested that **so.wōd* has been resyllabified as **sow.ōd* which in turn underwent monophthongization to *ō* spelled *ú*, cf. *túta* < *toúta* with *h* marking a glottal stop.³⁰ But this account seems difficult. The supposed parallel of *túta* < *toúta* is quite different since the monophthongization in that case is in preconsonantal position.³¹ Further Adiego Lajara cites no typological parallels for such a resyllabification or for the monophthongization of diphthongs to long vowels in open syllables, nor do I know of any similar cases.

have the same explanation as Latin *ē* which arose from **eks* before *l* and the nasals, since post-consonantal *s* is retained before *l* and the nasals in Sabellic.

²⁷ Cf. for the morphology Latin *Genita Mana* = Osc. *genetaí* on the Tavole di Agnone.

²⁸ **eks* is by regressive voicing assimilation from **eǵh-s*. Cf. Old Lithuanian *iž*, Latvian *iz*, OCS *iz*. See Pokorny 1959:292-293 and Trubachev 1983:6. Grk. *ἔσχατος* 'farthest' probably ultimately reflects **eǵhz-kVtos*. For the phonology cf. *λέσχη* 'lounging place' < **lékʰskā* vs. *δίσκος* 'quoit' < **dikskos*.

²⁹ An *s*-less form is also continued by the Celtic forms OIr *echtar* 'outside' and MW *eithyr* < **ektVr-*. Similarly Sabellic has no trace of an *s*-extended form of the preposition **op/ob*, whereas Latin has both *ob* and **ops* (*ostendo* etc.) Meiser 1986:167. However, it should be noted that the case of *ob/*ops* is not exactly parallel since the *s*-extended form here is apparently a Latin innovation.

³⁰ Adiego Lajara 1992:97-98.

³¹ Of course, in Adiego Lajara's account the *ow* sequence has technically become preconsonantal by the insertion of the glottal stop, but this consonant exists only ex hypothesi.

More plausibly, Eichner has suggested that *sowōd has become *soōd by loss of *w* before a back vowel, with *h* marking the hiatus.³² The proposed sound-change is perfectly natural, having well-known parallels in Latin, Cretan, and Old Norse for starters.³³ Further, if our analysis of the form puúde is correct,³⁴ we have an instance of the insertion of a hypercorrect *w* before *ō* which necessarily presupposes the existence of a rule deleting *w* in this environment.

However, there still remains the problem of the vocalism of the first syllable. The South Picene alphabet possesses two letters to represent the back mid-vowels: *o* and *ú*. *o* is normally used to represent the reflex of Proto-Italic short **o* and *ú* is used to represent the reflex of Proto-Italic long **ō*, which by the Proto-Sabellic vowel shift was raised to *ō̄*. But in fact the distinction which was more crucial to the South Picene orthoepists was not length but vowel height. Thus there are some environments where short *o* was raised and consequently written with the sign *ú*, e.g., before final *r* or *m*: qolofútr < *-tor, meitímú < *meitmom. Conversely there are some environments where a lower long *ō̄* arose by monophthongization and was written with the sign *o* to which *h* was added as a marker of length, as in the datives mentioned above.³⁵ Thus the spelling súhúh for etymological *sowōd is probably meant to indicate that the first vowel has been raised. I would suggest that after **w* was lost before *ō̄* the lower *o* of the first syllable was raised or assimilated, perhaps as a first step to an ultimate contraction.³⁶ This sequence of events seems to me on the whole better supported than Adiego Lajara's account.

5. suaipis is clearly the conditional conjunction plus the nominative singular of indefinite pronoun and exactly matches Oscan *svaepis* (TB) and Umbrian

³² Eichner 1993:52.

³³ Cf. for Latin Leumann 1977:138, for Old Norse Noreen 1923:169, for Cretan Thumb-Kieckers 1932:155. But Eichner's other example of this sound change poiouéfa 'laubbe-grünt' < *poiwo-wnt-tā, cf. Grk. πῶα 'grass' < *poiwā, is not certain. Alan Nussbaum has pointed out to me that the apparent lack of medial syncope in the second syllable of this word is surprising. One would have expected *poiwowēfā to have become *poyuwēfā. Perhaps *poyuwēfā then became *poiowēfā by dissimilation. Cf. the development of *yuw- to *yow- in Celtic (Gaulish *Iovincillus*). If this account is correct, then Eichner's etymology may be saved, but the loss of *w* before a back vowel would still remain unparalleled.

³⁴ See below 7.1.

³⁵ There certainly could not have been any confusion between the signs at least on day one of the writing down of South Picene, since the Picenes clearly felt the need to invent or adopt two distinct signs to retrofit the Etruscan script to their phonological system.

³⁶ It is also possible that the vowel of the first syllable is the result of enclitic weakening, as Eichner 1993:52 has suggested. Cf. the account of Latin *suus* given by Leumann 1977:135.

svepis. suaipis illustrates the use of the letter *u* to represent a post-consonantal *w*. Other clear examples of this are the gentilic *Taruus* (AP 4 Falerone), which is probably identical to the name *Tarvius* CIL V 4092 ultimately of Celtic origin, and the next form in this very inscription the verb *ehuekf*. In fact to judge from the surviving evidence, the sign *u* was the only way to write a post-consonantal *w*.³⁷

6. *ehuekf* is quite probably a verb form. But from which verb and in what tense and mood? Meiser, following Marinetti, has suggested that *ehuekf* is the 3rd sing. present subjunctive < **welyēd*.³⁸ Although Meiser only mentions this analysis in passing and doesn't say which verb he takes this to be, Marinetti clearly connects this form with Latin *velo* and its subjunctive *velim*.³⁹ The same opinion is explicitly stated without argumentation by Bernd Janson and might be justly categorized as the *communis opinio*.⁴⁰ But, although a protasis with the subjunctive of a verb meaning 'wish' sounds quite plausible, I think this analysis is relatively unlikely.

First of all, the other Sabellic languages have the root **her(i)-* in the sense 'wish' not **wel-*. And the very suggestive sequence *heries* is attested in South Picene as well (AP 6). This is admittedly not a conclusive objection, and the root **wel-* and indeed a compound *ehvel-* do occur in Umbrian in the specialized meaning 'order'.⁴¹ But if one grants that **wel-* did survive into South Picene, it seems improbable that it would have given up its archaic "Narten" optative in *-ī-* as in Latin *velim*, in favor of a regular athematic optative suffix *-yē-* before being replaced by the simple thematic present **wele-* reflected by *ehveltu*

³⁷ For post-vocalic *w* the normal spelling is *ú* as in *boúediún* 'in Bouedium' (AQ 3), *kaúieis* 'Gavii' (AQ 1), *kaúieh* 'Gavio' dat. (AQ 1), *noúinis* 'Novenius' (AP 5) and *poiouéfa* 'laub-begrünt' (CH 1). But there are several examples of the use of the sign *v*: *panivú*, *povaisis*, (TE 5) and *rakineví* (AQ 2). In both of these cases there are independent reasons for thinking that AQ 2 and TE 5 are relatively old texts: AQ 2 is written in *scriptio continua* and TE 5 has a number of forms of the thematic dative singular which preserve an unmodified long diphthong. Thus it seems likely that the difference between the use of *v* and *ú* in this environment has a chronological explanation. For word initial *w* the usual spelling is *v*: *veiat* MC 1, *vepetín*, (TE 2), *vepses* (TE 2), *viam* (TE 2), *videtas* (TE 2), with one example of *u*: *uelaimes* (CH 1²). Cf. the account in Adiego Lajara 1992:82-88.

³⁸ Meiser 1987:119

³⁹ Marinetti 1985:98.

⁴⁰ Janson 1993:161.

⁴¹ *ehveltu* (VI a 2) 'order'. Cf. also *ehvelklu* V a 23, b 1 'vote'.

< *eh-weletōd.⁴² And even granting such an innovation were possible, there is no evidence that an *i* or *y* can simply be left out in South Picene spelling. For example *mefyo- 'middle' from PIE *med^hyo- is consistently written *mefi-* (MC 1, AP 3). The case of *mefyo- is particularly valuable since it contains the reflex of a PIE consonant plus *yod* sequence. There is not a single case in South Picene of the non-indication of *i/y*. Nor has any such case been alleged to my knowledge. Taken together these arguments militate against the *communis opinio*.

Conditional clauses in Sabellic of the ideal type have either a subjunctive or a future in the protasis. Given that this form clearly had a secondary ending, since *ehuelſ* must be from < *ehwelēh < *ehwelēd, we must be dealing with a subjunctive. In subjunctive protases both present and perfect subjunctives are found.⁴³ Since, to judge by the evidence of the other Sabellic languages, a first conjugation subjunctive added -ē- to the present stem vowel -ā- and the other conjugations added or substituted -ā-,⁴⁴ the form *ehuelſ* cannot be a present subjunctive. This leaves only the perfect subjunctive, which was formed by appending -ē- to the perfect stem. *ehuelſ* is therefore a well-formed perfect subjunctive built to the perfect stem *wel-.⁴⁵ But which of the many PIE roots *wel- are we dealing with? From the seven roots *wel(H)- reconstructed in the LIV we can eliminate five with some probability on the grounds that they do not occur in Italic at all or only in an extended form.⁴⁶ This leaves *wel₁- 'want, choose', *wel- 'tear'.⁴⁷

There is no morphological argument which can be decisive. The Proto-Italic stem formation of the perfect, or aorist of the root *wel- 'want, choose' is unknown. The -ui- perfect of Latin *volui* has no claim to antiquity and may even be a relatively recent *Reinwortbildung* on the model of *colo*, *colui*, or so *Leu-*

⁴² A simple thematic is the most straightforward reconstruction for *ehveltu*, since *l* was lost in original -*lt* sequences. See Meiser 1986:177.

⁴³ Buck 1928:220.

⁴⁴ Buck 1928:174

⁴⁵ Buck 1928:175.

⁴⁶ *wel- 'einschliessen' does not have an Italic reflex. *wel- 'drehen' occurs only in the *u*-extended form *volvo*. *wel- 'sehen' occurs only in the inherited nominal form *vultus* = Gothic *wulþus*; *welH- 'stark sein' has generalized *wal- in verbal forms in Italic. *welH- '(sich) wälzen' does not have an Italic reflex.

⁴⁷ The LIV classifies Latin *vello* under the root *wel₃- 'schlagen' with a fully justified question mark. None of the other avatars of *wel₃- has the sense 'tear'. It seems to me that the traditional connection with Gothic *wilwan* 'to rob', which the LIV616 classifies under *wel- 'drehen', is preferable. Cf. also the Hesychian gloss γέλλαυ · τελλαυ 'to pluck'. It seems best to classify these forms together under a root *wel- 'pluck'.

mann has suggested.⁴⁸ The Vedic evidence points to a garden variety root aorist.⁴⁹ The form *ehuel-* which may be interpreted as the reflex, probably thematized, of a PIE root aorist is thus perfectly consistent with the PIE facts. On the other hand, a form *ehuel-* is also perfectly consistent with what can be reasonably reconstructed about the stem formation of the root **wel-* 'tear'. Morphologically speaking, Latin *vello* is probably best taken from **welnō*. Cf. *tollo* < **t̥l̥nō*, if not also *pello*, Umb. *ampentu* < **pel-ne*.⁵⁰ To judge from the parallels of *tollo* and *pello* the expected perfect in Latin would probably have been a reduplicated form like *pepuli* or *tetuli*. This form **wewolai* should have become **ūli* by regular sound change.⁵¹ The *s*-aorist implied by the older perfect *velli* < **welsai* is probably an innovation and given the fact that the *s*-aorist, if it survived at all into Proto-Sabellic, was not productive, we would not be surprised to find an uncharacterized simple perfect **wel-*, deriving ultimately from a root aorist. Precisely this pattern of nasal suffix present and uncharacterized perfect < PIE root aorist is attested in the closely parallel case of Umbrian *ampentu* < **an-pelnetōd* vs. perfect stem *ampel-us*.⁵² Finally the root **wel-* 'tear' is attested in Sabellic in the Volscian form *velestrom* which Rix has convincingly interpreted as 'strapamento'.⁵³

Syntactic considerations are also not very helpful. It is true that if *wel-* means 'want' it would be surprising for an inherently atelic verb to occur in an anterior protasis of an ideal condition. Old Latin, at any rate, does not provide any parallels of the type **siquis voluerit*. But this argument could only have validity if *ehuel-* means 'want', since, if the form *ehuel-* does not mean 'want', but rather 'choose' or even 'order', an emphasis on completion would be perfectly understandable. Of course, this would hold just as well for the alternative **wel-* 'tear' hypothesis.

But to my mind the more weighty arguments are of a contextual and generic nature. Whatever the correct interpretation of *ehueli* it is clear that the monument TE 1 is of funerary nature. Cf. for similar phraseology in a funerary context *CIL* I.2.1751 (Bovianum):

⁴⁸ Leumann 1977:594.

⁴⁹ See *LIV*618.

⁵⁰ The *e*-grade of the present stem could best be explained on the analogy of a *e*-grade in the aorist.

⁵¹ Cf. *r̥irsus* 'backwards' < **reworsos*.

⁵² Meiser 1986:165.

⁵³ Rix 1993:47.

- (4) Helviae Mesi f. Sacerdot. vener. filiei de suo.

To Helvia, daughter of Mesius, priestess of Venus,
her sons from their own money.

Given this genre, what kind of anterior, ideal apodosis with an indefinite subject would make best sense?

Now Roman funerary monuments frequently include a conditional sentence threatening the one who dares to move the bones, steal the monument, sell the lot or use it as a latrine etc. with dire consequence or with a fine of money. For example, Dessau 8179 and 8184:

- (5) Quod si quis ossa eius preiecerit aut hanc aram
apstulerit...

But if someone throws away his bones or steals this altar...

- (6) Qua (sic) si violaverit aut inde exemerit, opto ei ut
cum dolore corporis longo tempore vivat, et cum
mortuus fuerit inferi eum non recipiant.

If someone desecrates these things or takes them away from here,
I pray that he may live a long time with bodily pain, and that the
infernal spirits not receive him when he is dead.

In the light of these parallels I believe South Picene *suaipis ehueli* should mean 'if anyone tears up this (monument)'. Cf. *si violaverit aut inde exemerit*. The use of the preposition *eh* is entirely justified in this sense, and one even finds Latin *evello* in precisely this sense, although admittedly not before Ulpian (2nd C.E.). But already in late republican Latin one finds a number of examples of *revello* in the sense of the sacrilegious uprooting of monuments. In the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* in the passage illustrating the proper use of the high style, which is peppered with tasteful archaisms, we find a reference to the *sepulcris maiorum revulsis* 'torn up tombs of the ancestors'. Horace *Odes* 2.18 23-28 paints the greedy man in decidedly sacrilegious terms:

- (7) quid quod usque proximos
 revellis agri terminos et ultra
 limites clientium
 salis avarus? Pellitur paternos
in sinu ferens deos
 et uxor et vir sordidosque natos

What, that thou tearest down each neighbouring post
 that marks thy farm, and in thy greed dost overleap
 the boundaries of thy tenants! Man and wife are driven forth
 bearing in their arms their household gods and ragged children.
 [Translation C. E. Bennett, Loeb edition]

and cf. Cic. *Verr.* II. ii. 158 where Cicero describes his surprise at seeing the hated statues of Verres torn up:

- (8) non crederem hoc de statu is nisi iacentes revolsasque
 vidissem quod apud graecos hic mos est, ut honorem
 hominibus habitum in monumentis eius modi non nulla religione
 deorum consecrari arbitrentur.

I should not believe this about the statues had I not seen them
 lying there, wrenched off their pedestals; for it is the way of all
 Greeks to fancy that, in memorials of this kind, the honour
 bestowed on men is hallowed with a measure of divine consecration.
 [Trans. L.H.G. Greenwood, Loeb edition]

7. In the lacuna one can imagine something suitable dreadful and when we can read the text again we read *puúde pepie-*.

7.1 In *puúde* both Meiser and Adiego Lajara have seen the ablative singular of the relative pronoun **k^wōd* followed by the postposition *e(h)*.⁴ There are two problems that arise with this analysis. First, one expects a long *ō* to be written *ú* not *uú*. Second, one must accept that the juncture **k^wōd-eh* was fixed early enough to prevent the regular development of **d* to *h* and then zero in final position. Adiego Lajara, in attempting to address the first of these problems, has suggested that *pu* represents the survival of a midstage between the labiovelar and the labial.⁵ But this seems dubious to me. First, how phonetically likely is a midstage **p^w*? Second, that the labial element should be preserved longer before back vowels than before front vowels seems improbable, since it is precisely before back vowels that the labial element of the labiovelar is lost in Latin and other languages.⁶

⁴ Meiser 1987:121 and Adiego Lajara 1990a:13-14.

⁵ Adiego Lajara 1990a:13-14 and 1992:91.

⁶ Cf. *colō* < **k^wolō* < **k^welō*. This is part of the more general rule deleting a labial element including *w* before a rounded vowel.

To my mind, it is much more plausible to suppose the spelling *puúde* is a false archaism. As mentioned above, Eichner has suggested that *w* was lost before a back vowel. If that sound change occurred during the written history of South Picene, it is obvious that later SP would have some examples of *Co-* corresponding to older SP *Cwo-*. Thus any later SP *Co-* sequence might be thought, rightly or wrongly, to correspond to an older *Cwo-* and hence the spelling *puúde*. The situation I have described for South Picene would be precisely parallel to that of Old Latin where as a result of an identical though independent sound change we find such false archaisms as *oquoltod* in the *SC de Bacchanalibus* (CIL I.581.15). The second problem, although small, might be avoided by analyzing *puúde* not as *puúde* + *e* but rather as *puú* + *de*, i.e. as the allative *pú* < **k^wō* = Latin *quō* plus the particle **de* found in Oscan *pan* (Vetter 2.4) Umbrian *pane* (I b 40) < **k^wamde* ~ Latin *quamde* (Andr. *poet.* 20(22).2 +).⁵⁷ The meaning would then be the same as Latin *quoad* 'until'.

7.2 The final group of readable letters *pepie* is followed by a diagonal line in the facsimile and photo of Morandi who was the last person actually to see the inscription in the 70's before it was misplaced. The most natural interpretation of this stroke is as the remains of a modified *f* a *farfalle*. Thus we may read *pepie(f)*. It is not clear whether any letters have been lost. Naturally, in view of these uncertainties, any interpretation of *pepie* will be speculative. Nevertheless, the fact that we have an apparently reduplicated form and that *pepie(f)* appears to follow a subordinating conjunction *puúde* make it probable that *pepie(f)* is a verb form or part of a verb form. In a temporal clause of this sort, Oscan and Umbrian generally use the future perfect. Unfortunately there isn't any obvious way that *pepie-* could be a future perfect of the regular Sabellic type. On the other hand, in Latin especially in the *Umgangssprache* the perfect does sometimes stand for the future perfect, e.g., Plaut. *Rudens* 342:

- (9) *quam mox coctum est prandium?*
How soon will lunch be cooked?⁵⁸

and Cassius apud Cic *Fam.* 15.19.4:

- (10) *Si Caesar vicit celeriter me exspecta*
If Caesar wins, expect me quickly.

⁵⁷ For the allative ptc. **de* cf. Grk. *oíkade*, Aves. *vaēsmān-da* 'to the house'. I should note that Adiego Lajara 1990a:13 quotes an unpublished lecture of J. Untermann's from 1989 in which the form *puúde* is taken from **k^wo-de*.

⁵⁸ Cf. also Plaut. *St.* 533 *quam mox coctast cena?*

just as more generally the present may stand for a future. A similar use of present for future and present perfect for future perfect is entirely natural in English.⁵⁹ Furthermore Oscan does have an example of the present for a future in a clause introduced by *adpúd*, the semantic of Latin *quoad* Vetter 88A:

- (11) *avt sakrím fakiäd kasit medikk túvtik kapv adpúd
fiēt*
But the meddix tuticus should sacrifice the victim
so long as they (the rites?) will be performed.

If we may permit ourselves this same liberty in syntax of South Picene, *pepie* or *pepief* would be susceptible to a reasonable formal and syntactic analysis: *pepie* could be the third person singular of the reduplicated perfect of a root **pi-*, **pepi-e*. If the diagonal line is in fact the trace of a modified í, then it would be necessary to assume that the 3rd singular of the perfect **pepie* was extended by the *hic et nunc* particle *i* as happened in the pre-history of Latin and Venetic.⁶⁰ The glide of a final *y*-diphthong is regularly written with modified í in South Picene. The verbal root **pi-* could be derived from PIE **k^wey-* 'pay'.⁶¹ *puúde pepie* might be translated 'until he has paid up', and one might imagine that the lacuna contained something like: Let him owe so much (or let that person be without rights etc.) until he has paid up. For this kind of provision I can cite a parallel from the Delphian Law of the Labyadai:

- (12) *ἄτιμος ἔστω ... ἕντε κ' ἀποτέσῃ*⁶²
Let him be without rights until he makes amends.

8. The whole inscription may be translated: 'For Petros the elders of the Poponians have set this up. If any one tears it down, let him owe such and such an amount / be without rights (vel sim.) until he has paid up.'

REFERENCES

- Adiego Lajara, Ignacio-Javier
1990a Sobre la notación de las vocales posteriores en sudpicénico. *Anuari de filologia* 18.1 Secció D:7-14.

⁵⁹ Cf. English (Poe): When you have signed it, I will hand you the letter.

⁶⁰ Cf. Latin *posedei-t* *CIL* 1.584.28, Venetic *atistei-t* Lejeune 75 *ter*.

⁶¹ *LIV* 339-340. Cf also Lycian *ti-* 'make pay' < **k^wik^wey-* (*TL* 94.3 etc.)

⁶² Buck 1955:241.

- 1990b Sobre la inscripcion sudpicenica CH. 2. *Aion* 12:257-260.
1992 *Protosabelio, osco-umbro, sudpiceno*. ed. Colección Universitat 20. Textos i estudis del G.L.L.U.B. Barcelona: PPU.
- Bottiglioni, Gino
1954 *Manuale dei dialetti italici*. Bologna: STEB.
- Buck, Carl Darling
1928 *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*². Boston: Ginn.
- Bugge, Sophus
1878 *Altitalische Studien*. Christiania: A.W. Brøgger.
- De Caro, Stefano
1999 Teano (CE) Iscrizione osca su una mensa d'altare. *Studi Etruschi* 63:456-458.
- Deecke, Wilhelm
1886 Beiträge zur Entzifferung der mittelitalischen Dialekte. *Rheinisches Museum* 40:191-198.
- Eichner, Heiner
1998 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*, hrsg. Helmut Rix. Pp. 46-95. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert.
- Franchi de bellis, Annalisa
1981 *Le iovile capuane*. Florence: L.S. Olschki.
- Kajanto, Iiro
1965 *The Latin Cognomina*. Commentationes humanarum litterarum 36, no. 2. Helsinki: Tammisaari Ekenäs.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert
1992 Die lateinische Nominalflexion. In: *Latein und Indogermanisch. Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Salzburg. September 1986*, hrsg. Oswald Panagl und Thomas Krisch. Pp. 89-135. Innsbruck: IBS 64. Innsbruck: IfS.
- Lejeune, Michel
1974 *Manuel de la langue vénète*. Indogermanische Bibliothek: Erste Reihe, Lehr- und Handbücher. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Marinetti, Anna
1985 *Le Iscrizioni Sudpicene*. Florence: L.S. Olschki.
- Meiser, Gerhard
1986 *Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache*. IBS 51. Innsbruck: IfS.
1987 Pälignisch, Latein und Südpikenisch. *Glotta* 65:104-125.
- von Planta, Robert
1892 *Grammatik der Oskisch-Umbrischen Dialekte*. Strassburg: K.J. Trübner.

- Pocetti, Paolo
1979 *Nuovi documenti Italici: a complemento del Manuale di E. Vetter*. Orientamenti linguistici 8. Pisa: Giardini.
- Pokorny, Julius
1959 *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern/Stuttgart: Francke.
- Rix, Helmut
1991 *Etruskische Texte: Editio minor*. Hrsg. Helmut Rix in Zusammenarbeit mit Gerhard Meiser, unter Mitwirkung von Fritz Kouba, Dieter Steinbauer, Ludwig Rübekeil und vielen anderen. Scripta Orlia 23-24. Reihe A, Altertumswissenschaftliche Reihe. Bd. 6-7. Tübingen: G. Narr.
1993 La lingua dei volsci: testi e parentela. *Quaderni di archeologia etrusco-italica* 20:37-49.
1994 Südpikenisch kdufú. *HS* 118:105-122.
- Salomies, Olli
1987 *Die römischen Vornamen. Studien zur römischen Namengebung*. Commentationes humanarum litterarum 82. Helsinki: Tammsaari Ekenäs.
- Schulze, Wilhelm
1904 *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*. Göttingen: Weidmannische Buchhandlung.
- Swiggers, Pierre
1988 Oscan trutum. In: *A Linguistic Happening in Memory of Ben Schwartz*, ed. Yoël L. Arbeitman. Pp. 373-381. Louvain-la-neuve: Peeters.
- Trubachev, Oleg N. (ed.)
1983 *Ětimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazыkov*. Vol. 9. Moscow: Nauka.
- Vetter, Emil
1953 *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Weiss, Michael
1998 On Some Problems of Final Syllables in South Picene. In: *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, eds. Jay H. Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert and Lisi Oliver. Pp. 703-715. IBS 92. Innsbruck: IfS.