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Calvert Watkins has made many brilliant contributions to the study of the Sabellian 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 *-øy in final position and the development of long and short *ę before a final nasal.

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

There are at least five different spellings for the dative singular of a-stem nouns and pronouns in South Picene, an ending which we know on comparative grounds reflects PIE *-øy. Cf Greek ὀ-ό, Avestan ahur-āii etc. The spellings that have been claimed to represent this ending are:2

a. -ąt: nefstrūl (TE 5), títt (TE 5), brimeqtūl (TE 7), qdufriniū (TE 7)
b. -ò: emimū (BO 1)
c. -ū: pòsnūl (TE 5, TE 7)
d. -ūh: dūnh (CH 2),3 pqfloh (AQ 1), petroh (TE 1)
e. -ëh: klāljīh (AQ 1)

But this list requires, in my opinion, two initial adjustments. In the first place the form emimū, 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: emimū spōltīō. In the light of parallel helmet inscriptions Meiser has made a very plausible case that spōltīō 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 Marnetti (1983) unless otherwise noted.
2 nefstrūl (TE 5), títt (TE 5), and pqfloh (AQ 1) are all correctly taken as datives by Eichner (1992b:199) and Marnetti (1983:118), 127). brimeqtūl and qdufriniū are identified as datives by Marnetti (1983:138). posnu (TE 7), qdufriniū (BO 1), pqfloh (AQ 1), and klāljīh (AQ 1) are taken as datives by Meiser (1975:16-147). petroh is presumably taken as a dative by Klingschmidt (1992:89) since he posits a thematic stem *petra-
3 See Adiego-López (1990:259) for the justification of this reading.
4 Meiser (1975:116)
toponym *Spoleónym (= Latin Spoleatum), indicating the place of origin of the helmet. Meier takes erimnian 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 1 uleuroma "from Uleria." Further, erimnian would be the sole example of the development of *-ery to *-y in South Picene. Finally, it is also possible to take erimnian as another ablative. Formally, this is unproblematic. An ablative erimnian could be interpreted either as another toponym, e.g., as some district of Spoleatum or perhaps as the castric of the individual from whom the boot was taken.  

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: *-i in *rakinevē (AQ 2 = the Warrior of Capestrano). The Warrior of Capestrano text written in scriptio continua is transliterated by Marinietti as follows:

makuprihoarrumoposatninisrakinevēypum[pf[---]]

I would segment and phonologize this as

makupri[---]

The core analysis is 'Aninius (aninius) makes (opsit) a statue (vet sim.; koran). 5 I think all scholars would agree on this. The initial segment

makupri[pf[---]]
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declension dative singular. This allows us to have a perfectly garden-variety name *rokinewis with the well-established suffix *-evnis, later *-evnis, found in both divine epithets and human names. Cf. Umbrian *kr-a-ja (*kr-ja) avnis (Vib. 19, in 3 etc.), an epithet of various divinities, and the Marsian gentile *-Ovnis (Vet. 228 a = CIL 1, 5). The interpretation of rakinewis as a variant of the thematic dative singular finds support in the close parallel of the form kætìch (AQ 1) which is the dative of the name *Gætìmis. 

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 *-a (meistria, tifi, hrímqìti, òdunenìti), these forms clearly are the most archaic of the spellings and represent the unchanged, fully intact long diphthong. But these long diphthongs did not stay intact for long. As in Octan, it seems that the diphthong */oI/ was shortened to */oI/. Subsequently, this short diphthong */oI/ became */oI/ by the general monophthongization of short diphthongs which, as we know on independent grounds, was occurring in South Picene. This new long vowel, i.e., */oI/, was lower in height than the old long */oI/ and was by the same quality as old short */oI/. Therefore it was written with the sign ø to which it was added as a marker of length. This is the explanation for the spelling of the dative singular as øh in dùmitì, puñhò, petòho. Note the form dùmitì with the expected use of ø to express */oI/, showing that we are not dealing just with different spelling traditions.

How can the two dative singulars with e-vocalism, rakinewis and kætìch, be integrated into this scheme? There can be little doubt that both these forms are dative singulars of a-stems. I believe I have established this for rakinewis above; the case is if anything cleaner for kætìch, which is in opposition to an indubitable dative puñhò and is dependent upon the verb pràstitì, which elsewhere takes a dative.

Marinetti has taken the form kætìch as a nominative, which is impossible, since final *-d does not become */d/ as Meier has shown. Meier suggests that kætìch is the dative of a gentilic of the type which has a nominative in */-a/ in Octan. But even granting that kætìch is a gentilic and not a pronomen, which is uncertain, there would have been no compelling reasons to replace the original thematic dative with the athematic dative. Octan, for example, was perfectly happy to retain expected *-a in these forms, e.g., vestìrili (Vet. 1), etc. Indeed, I think there must be a phonological explanation for kætìch. It is clear that e cannot simply be the regular outcome of *-y since kætìch occurs in opposition to puñhò, which shows the expected shortening and monophthongization treatment. Instead, kætìch must owe its e to the fronting and rounding effects of the preceding yod. Thus, *gætìmis > *gætìmis by post-yod fronting, whence *gætìmis by shortening of final long diphthongs and *gætìmis by monophthongization of final short diphthongs. The spelling *-h indicates an open long */a/ identical or similar in quality to short */e/, but distinct from the close long */a/ which was the outcome of Proto-Italic */e/, written i.

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

---

24 For the spelling of */oI/ with the sign ø, cf viam viam and videtum marketis from TE 2. It seems probable to me that */-eI/ in rakinewis has been preserved. On the other hand, it is also possible that */-eI/ has become */-eI/ and reverted to */-eI/ after a dental, as is sometimes supposed for Aedilete Nerva (ILLRP 111), Latin Leucens (Carmen Saltane 2.1) etc. See Leumann (1972:71) and Meier (1986:76).


26 ø is the regular spelling for long */oI/ in South Picene. See part 2 below. Thus the match with the Octan dative singular øh (déckeretì (Vet. 1, 3) etc.) is only apparent. The latter reflects the Octan shortening of a long diphthong.

27 Cf gen. sp. *-eI (= Octan *-eI) in CH 1 achamine staties etc. Cf Meier (1987:115) and Adiego-Lajara (1990:259).

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

29 Contrast also the ablative singular tilhìh in the same inscription CH 2.

---

27 The interpretable string of four words in AQ 1 is kætìch kætìchis puñhò puñhòtis. For puñhòtis with a dative cf. TE 5 meistria nominem puñhòtis. Eichner (1992a:195) takes the form kætìch 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 materiae materli which combine the pre- and post-monophthongization spellings in one. Cf Latin spellings like vivos CIL 1, 2123. Aside from the alleged instance of kætìch, there is no case where a non-etymological h is added to an etymological short vowel. Furthermore, I believe puñhò cannot be an ablative since, as I am seeking to show, the use of the signs ø and ø is not inconsistent. Thus the supposed parallel cited by Eichner, i.e., puñhò praefation puñhò (CIL 1, 10), is less striking. Vine (1993:126) also endorses Meier's interpretation. On the locative totalis (RI 1) see fn. 40.


29 For the forms of this paradigm see Buck (1912:121).

30 For example in the perfect subjunctive ending in dudel in chelae (TE 1) < */-a/ or in the gentilic nàmis (AP 5) */Nàmisìè. There are, however, some inscriptions which do not have the sign ø and use the sign ø to spell the reflexes of both long and short */ø/, e.g., the first inscription of CH 1 with the forms nàmisìè and esmé (attributed on MC 1 and MC 2).
that might be depends upon the the morphological interpretation of the form. Adiego-Lajara, following Untermann, 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 pastuncus. 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 Latin. So we should stick to the widespread and convincing analysis of this form as the dative singular of the relative stem equivalent to Skt. kātunāt < *kātundhātya.

If one compares the pronominal forms of Umbrian, some interesting potential comparisons emerge. The nominative masculine singular of the relative pronoun is spelled pat, pae, paei in the Latin alphabet. This form cannot, however, be directly compared with Latin qui< Old Latin quo, because the diphthong oy regularly monophthongizes to o before final syllables where it gave a long close o. Therefore Proto-Umbrian *poj would have given *poj. To this *poj 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, purēpōsā. Similarly, I believe an added particle is the explanation for the abberant spelling of South Picene posināi. In the case of posināi we do not have a final long diphthong but rather a final long diphthong plus *-i.40

Was this *posināi disyllabic or trisyllabic? South Picene metrics are not yet well enough established to allow a decision. If posināi is taken as trisyllabic in TE 5, this would perhaps have the advantage of making the sequence from tūtā prastakulā in posināi isosyllabic with the preceding sullanas tattas trebeges, both with nine syllables. In TE 7 tūtā tīfālī posināi real as seven syllables would be an exact match in word division, syllable count, and alliterative pattern for posināi vīnam vidēnā (TE 2).

38 See Bick (1928:45-46) and Meister (1986:123).
39 In the Umbrian dative singular form corresponding exactly to South Picene posināi we find the form posināi which does show any clear evidence for the addition of a particle. But this is not surprising, since it is likely that the long o 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 *posināth < *posināyiid. Although the lack of h would not be surprising, since final o was probably already not pronounced at the time of at least some of the South Picene inscriptions (cf. abl. sploinī < *spoltrīvān on the fairly late inscription NT 1 and cneuell < *cnevelēd (TE 1)), it is possible that we are dealing with a slightly different particle for South Picene, i.e., *i with no final consonant. This particle may be compared with the *i of Latin *nārāt > nāt and the *i of Greek oöttou-i. See Leumann (1977:476, 482) and Vigne (1993:94). The 1st declension locative *-i may also have been recharacterized as a locative with a particle *-id or *i to distinguish it from the dative. Thus the spelling tōnāth (RT 1). For the identification of toōnāth as a locative see Klingenschmitt (1992:91).

31 That the Warrior of Capistrano inscriptions 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 Mariotti (1985:239).
32 See Bick (1961:104).
33 See Rix (1996:177) for this interpretation.
34 See Meister (1986:123).
35 See fn. 31 above.
36 Internal /oy/ diphthongs in inscriptions possess the sign (b) brīmeĩnās (TE 7), diklefimēn (AP 3), kānēis (AQ 1), mēlētin (TE 5), mēlētinām (AP 2), mūrēis (CH 1), pūdinās (TE 5), pravāls (TE 5), prastakulās (TE 5), prastakulās (AP 1), prastakulās (TE 1), uelēins (CH 1). The one exception is stokā (AP 2).
2. The Development of *-ānī in South Picene

Another problem of final syllables involves the development of long and short *ā before a final *āl. On the one hand, it seems probable that long *āl was retained unchanged in many final syllables. For example, the nominative plural ending *-ās appears spelled *-ās, e.g., apāulus Apasae (AP 2). The first person singular nominative singular *āgō is spelled ekō (CH 1). The first singular verb corresponding to Latin cīxē is kūdī (CH 1). The ablative singular ending *-ādī is *-ūdī in stilīth Annē (TE 1) and stipōlī Spoleto (BO 1).

But the case of short *āl in final syllables is different. First, one must remember that one good source of short *āl in final syllables has been entirely eliminated, i.e., the nominative singular of thematic nouns which was reduced to *ā by the Proto-Sabellic final syllable syncope. The accusative singular of C-words would also have been eliminated. This leaves only two sources: the accusative singular of -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 a. Unfortunately, there are only two certain examples: mittālīt (TE 5) Dominium and multātīm (AP 2) mutārīt. Two more possible examples may be found in AP 1: annātīm Annēcum and raclītīm (unknown meaning). There are no certain examples of the spelling *ām.

The likeliest explanation for these forms is that a short *o before final *āl was raised to become identical, or nearly identical, in quality with *āl, the reflex of Proto-Italic long *ō. This raising in final syllables is also found before final *l, to judge from the case of qolīltīr (AP 2) < *kōlītīs, a third singular deponent passive verb form. The development pointed for South Picene is similar to what one finds in Oscan, where the infinitive ending deriving from the thematic accusative singular ending -ōm is consistently written -om in the native alphabet and -um in the Latin alphabet. So far so good. But the question arises: what happened to long *ā before a final *āl? 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. The supposed evidence for an ending short *-um has been adequately disposed of by Jasanoff. If nothing special happened to *-om, one would expect the regular South Picene spelling to be *-um.

41 Proto-Italic *ā > *ō in Proto-Sabellic.
43 *āl is regularly spelled with the letter o, e.g., tokat (TE 2) < *tōgām (= formally Latin tōgam), quat (CH 1) stōna (vel sīna), etc.
44 See Buck (1928:37).
45 Cf Greek μῆν, Skt. puṣāna etc. all presumably from *-aumān.
46 See Jasanoff (1983).
Finally, from CH 2 we may cite *omai *epmar "in the Umayr land of the Ammar." 54

Against these examples, there is one certain example of a genitive plural written not with *i but just with *u: pāpūnum (AP 2). pāpūnum is probably best explained as an error for *pāpūnum with the central bar of the modified *u being left off. The thematic or consonantal-stem accusative singular *ondum for *uondum (AP 1). Further, the form *saffiun (TE 6) is also best interpreted as a genitive plural. The context, *saffiun nēf persūkum *pi, 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 *i seen in the nominative plural *pūnum. A closely parallel orthographic practice is known from Ocean. In Ocean the ablative singular *(f)ft < *-iôô and the nominative plural *(f)st < *-ôô are written in the native alphabet not with the expected sign, *u, which normally spells *f, but with the sign *ô, which has obviously been generalized graphically from other case forms, viz., the accusative singular and plural and the dative singular and plural. 55 The South Picene graphic analogy could not have taken place in the forms *ondum and *saffiun since these were not *-ôô stems. In the case of *ondum and *saffiun 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 (*-ôô > *ffôô, *ôô > *ôô, *ôô > *ôô), it is worth reconsidering the cases of the nominative forms *ifdom hoc and *i from TE or TL. 56 Eichner has plausibly analysed the form *ifdom as a neuter nominative/accusative singular demonstrative pronoun *idum to which the particle *om has been added. 57 In fact, if we search the neighboring languages for a suitable counterpart, our attention soon falls on Gothic *honica "now," attested in the idiom and *idle "until now." Historically, however, we cannot go back to *ifdom, since final short *om would simply have been lost in Gothic, as happened in the case of thematic neuter nouns in *om, e.g., waid

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

54 The form *ifdomm, the only word surviving from TE 3, cannot be securely interpreted from the synoptic point of view. Needless to say, I think it is a genitive plural of the genitive *itifama. Cf. Itifama CEL III 3112 etc. The form *ifdomm from CH 2 can only be made into a genitive plural of *marum with emendation (Marinetti 1985 I11). If it is, in fact, a form of *marum it could just as easily be restored to *maronom as to *marunom. 55

The South Picene thematic accusative plural is not attested, but Umayr suggests a long *fôô preserved the ending in this case too. Cf. the Umayr accusative plural toru and rina in the Latin alphabet.

56 Bock (1928:38).

57 See Eichner (1993:52).

58 Eichner (1952b:199).

'word' < *wordh. It can, on the other hand, go back to *sidam. If the particle added to the neuter nominative/accusative demonstrative pronoun forms in Gothic (cf. *fahôô) was identical to the particle added to the masculine accusative demonstratives in Gothic (*fahôô) and West Germanic (OE *fom-e), then the evidence of West Germanic would prove definitively that the particle was *-om, since only *-om would adequately account for the correspondence Gothic *-a = OE *e. Cf. the -ôô-stem accusative singular Gothic gida = OE *gida < *Pâôôm. *gedom < PIE *gâôôm. Thus there is reason to think that the particle added to *sidam in Germanic was not *-om but *-ôô. South Picene *ifdomm and Gothic *ihtia could be an exact match, and South Picene *ifdomm and presumably from *om would be two more examples of the development of PIE *-ôôm to what is spelled *am in South Picene. 59

So the evidence points to a seemingly paradoxical set of developments: a short *ôô in a final syllable was raised before *m, but a long *ôô was lowered, and quite probably shortened before final *m. If *ôô was both shortened and lowered before a final *m, it would be necessary to assume that the short *ôô raising rule was prior to the shortening and lowering rule, because, if the ordering were reversed, then all short *ôôs before final *m would have been raised. But if the ordering is 1. Short *ôô 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 *ôô 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 *ôô. 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 *fôô 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 Sabelllic is usually compared to the -om of Slav *ahôôm "I", tvôôm "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 *tâôôm besides *tûôôm. Furthermore, the disagreement between Old Latin miôôd etc. and Old Umbrian miôôm etc. (see Rix 1993) 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 Ocean and Umayr whether a long vowel, outside of monosyllables, was preserved before a final *m. In Umayr 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 Ocean inscriptions we find for the genitive plural both *om, *om, and *-om. The South Ocean inscriptions in the Greek alphabet have examples of both *om and *om for this case. The latter forms suggest that the vowel was still long, since there is no evidence for the raising of *-Ôô in these inscriptions, but the whole subject requires a fresh investigation.
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