

Chapter II

The Languages of Italy

2.1 Latin and the Languages of Italy

Italy was once peopled by speakers of many different languages, but the only variety other than Latin and its descendants to survive into the modern period is Greek, originally brought by colonists, and still spoken in remote parts of Calabria and Apulia. All the other ancient languages of Italy disappeared in the early years of the Roman Empire, leaving only epigraphic remains and occasional words in Roman and Greek literary and sub-literary sources. Even so, enough remains of these languages to piece together much of their grammar and many items of vocabulary, and new discoveries in recent years have resulted in substantial progress in some areas. The South Picene inscriptions, written in an IE language closely related to Umbrian and Oscan, have only been fully deciphered for 20 years, and our understanding of Etruscan has been advanced by the publication of the Pyrgi gold tablets, discovered in 1964, and the Tabula Cortonensis in 2000 (Agostiniani and Nicosia 2000). The importance of the non-Latin languages of Italy for the study of Latin has long been recognized. Ever since antiquity, changes in Latin have been explained as the effect of contact with native speakers of non-Latin languages. The Roman scholar Varro (in the *de lingua Latina*) attempted to explain the meaning and history of a number of Latin words through comparisons with Sabine and Oscan vocabulary, and Cicero's friend Atticus lamented the decline of Latin purity through the influx of speakers from outside Rome (*Brutus* 258, see 6.3). In more recent years, influence from

neighbouring languages has been seen as the root of a number of Latin changes, principally in phonology and lexis, and the other IE languages spoken in Italy have been used to help explain Latin morphological and syntactic developments. In order to understand the early history of Latin it is consequently vital to have a good understanding of these languages of Italy, and the nature of the relationship between them and Latin.

The eventual dominance of the Latin language can be seen in the epigraphic record. There are well over 130,000 Latin inscriptions which survive from antiquity, found not just in the Italian peninsular and islands, but throughout the Roman Empire. No other language of Italy can match this number of texts or geographical spread. However, if we take a cut-off point of 100 BC and look at the inscriptions that survive before that date, the picture looks very different. There are over 9,000 Etruscan texts surviving before this date but only around 3,000 in Latin. If we go further back in time the importance of Latin diminishes further. There are only four or five Latin inscriptions datable to before 600 BC and over 150 Etruscan ones in the same period. Etruscan is a non-IE language; there are also IE languages which are better attested than Latin in the early period. South Picene, one of a group of IE languages known as 'Sabellian', is recorded in over 20 inscriptions from a wide area in east central Italy before 300 BC, 19 of them on stone. In the same period there are fewer Latin texts of more than a single word in length, and only six inscriptions on stone. We also have substantial amounts of evidence for other IE languages from before the Roman expansion: Oscan (over 300 texts) spoken over a wide area of southern Italy, Umbrian (attested in the lengthy Iguvine Tables) from central Italy north of Rome, Venetic (around 300 texts) from the north-east and Messapic (around 600 texts) from the 'heel' of Italy.

A number of other languages are known from Italy in the first millennium BC: both IE (Faliscan; minor languages of the 'Sabellian' group such as Marrucinian, Paelignian, Volscian etc.; Gaulish, Lepontic) and non-IE (Etruscan, Raetic, North Picene) – and there are doubtless others which have left no trace. Some linguistic varieties from ancient Italy are attested in such small quantities that it becomes difficult to ascertain whether they are separate languages. Thus the indigenous language spoken in Bruttium, the toe of Italy, before the southward expansion of Oscan speakers in the fourth/third century BC, is known from just a single inscription, of less than 20 letters in length, which is most plausibly interpreted as containing a personal name (Ps 2 in Rix 2002). There are also two inscriptions from Nerulum (Ps 1, Ps 20) which have been taken in modern times to be the language of the Oenotri (see further Poccetti 1988 and Bugno et al. 2001).

It is not just the number of languages in this period which is remarkable, but also the intermixture of different languages within fairly

restricted areas, particularly in central Italy. An impression of the geographical proximity of a number of different languages can be gained from examining the finds of inscriptions from an area within a 100 km radius of Rome. Of course, the presence of an inscription, particularly one on a portable object such as a jug or a fibula, is no guarantee that the language was spoken in the area, but the cumulative picture from the epigraphic finds must bear some relation to the speaker profile of the area. From within Rome itself Etruscan inscriptions have been found on vases and on an ivory token, and important Etruscan cities lie in the immediate vicinity to the north (Veii) and west (Caere) of Rome. There is evidence for a Greek presence in Rome and the vicinity from the eighth century on; the earliest inscription from Italy in any language, and one of the earliest alphabetic Greek inscriptions found anywhere, is the single word, read as *eulin* and interpreted as *eúlinos* ‘spinning well’, scratched on a pot found in the burial of a woman at Osteria dell’ Osa, 20 km east of Rome, dated to around 770 BC (*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 42 899). Greek inscriptions have also been found at Rome and throughout Latium and southern Etruria, and there are likely to have been Greek merchant communities at the ports, as we know there were at Graviscae and Pyrgi in southern Etruria, and elsewhere. At Pyrgi there was also a community of Punic traders, as evidenced from the discovery of the famous gold tablets with Punic and Etruscan texts recording a religious donation in around 500 BC. Faliscan, the language of Italy which has the closest affinity to Latin, was also spoken in Etruria in the towns of Falerii and Capena 45 km and 30 km north of Rome with texts surviving from the seventh to the third century BC.

To the north and east of Rome we have evidence for a number of different IE languages of the Sabellian group. These all share distinctive features of phonology and innovations in morphology, which we shall discuss later in the chapter. Umbrian, the variety for which we have the longest text, was spoken principally in the area east of the Tiber, and survives in inscriptions from the fourth to first century BC. Particular Umbrian linguistic features include a reduction of inherited diphthongs and the loss of final consonants. There are very few contemporary inscriptions from the territory of the Sabines, the Aequi and the Marsi, whose territories lay south of Umbria, but those that do survive show similar features to Umbrian, and share the same characteristic onomastic system (see further below). We also have evidence of an earlier Sabellian linguistic stratum in the South Picene texts, most of which were found east of the Apennines, except for one text discovered at Cures, 20 km N of Rome (Sp RI 1 in Rix 2002). South Picene shares some linguistic features with the later languages, for example, the South Picene word **kuprí/qupíríh**, plausibly interpreted as an adverb ‘well’, only has equivalents in

the Sabine word for ‘good’ *ciprum* (glossed by Varro *de Lingua Latina* V. 159) and Umbrian, *cubra-* / **kupra-** ‘good’ (note that, conventionally, texts in the Sabellian languages in native alphabets are transcribed in **bold**, texts in the Latin alphabet are transcribed in *italic*). In other respects, however, South Picene is so divergent from Umbrian that it must be taken as a separate language: the 3rd person singular perfect verb form *-út* (as **opsút** ‘he made’) shows an ending completely at odds with the Umbrian ending *-e* (**dede** ‘he gave’) etc.

The Hernici and the Volsci are known from Greek and Latin historical sources to have occupied an area just east and south of Rome, which was later to become part of Latium. Both peoples fought for and against the Romans at different times from the fifth century BC until they the late fourth century BC when the Hernicians were granted Roman citizenship and Roman colonies were established in the Volscian area. Our knowledge of the Hernician and Volscian language is scant, although Latin and inscriptional sources suggest that they were separate. The emperor Marcus Aurelius refers to the *lingua Hernica* in a letter to Fronto (Fronto I. p. 174), and the playwright Titinius writes *uolsce fabulantur* ‘they speak in Volscian’ (*com.* 104). From Hernician territory there are only two readable inscriptions (He 2 and He 3 in Rix 2002), both short vase inscriptions from Anagnia, one from the sixth and one the third century. The language is clearly Sabellian, although neither inscription shows any particular affinity with Umbrian or South Picene. From the area inhabited by the Volscians there are also only two texts: a three-word inscription from Satricum which dates from the fifth century BC (VM 1 in Rix 2002), and a bronze tablet with four lines of text in the Latin alphabet associated with Velitrae (VM 2 in Rix 2002), although not certainly from there, which is dated to the third century BC. The language of the text from Satricum may be close to Umbrian, but the bronze tablet supposedly from Velitrae shows some important divergences from all other contemporary Sabellian languages; for example, it shows no unambiguous example of the merger of inherited long **e* and short **i* (see further below).

Speakers of the most widespread Sabellian language, Oscan, and the closely related variety Paelignian also came into close contact with the inhabitants of Latium. We do not have evidence for Oscan earlier than the fourth century. Despite this Oscan is phonologically more conservative than South Picene and Umbrian, since all inherited Sabellian diphthongs are preserved. Early Latin texts have also been found in areas within close range of major Oscan settlements, for example a fifth-century Latin inscription, the ‘Garigliano Bowl’, has recently been found in the vicinity of Minturnae, in the south of Latium and less than 40 km from the major Oscan settlement of Capua, and another inscription (CIL I²

5) comes from near Alba Fucens in Marsian territory just 20 km west of Corfinum where Paelignian was in use until the first century BC.

2.2 The Central-Italian *Koiné*, 700–400 BC

Numa Pompilius had a great reputation for justice and piety. He lived in the Sabine town of Cures, and was, by the standards of antiquity, deeply learned in all the laws of God and man. It has been said that he owed his learning to Pythagoras of Samos; but this is a mere shot in the dark, and is obviously untrue as it is not until a hundred years later, in the reign of Servius Tullius, that Pythagoras is known to have settled in southern Italy . . . But even if the dates fitted, how could Pythagoras' fame have reached the Sabines all the way from the south? What mutually intelligible language could he have used to awaken amongst them the desire for learning? Under whose protection could a man have travelled alone through so many people differing in language and manner of life? (Livy 1.18, translated by Aubrey de Sélincourt)

In the previous section we saw how diverse the linguistic map of central Italy was, but how much interaction was there between different speech communities? We shall look in the next chapter at the effect of the spread of Roman power in the peninsula on the other languages of Italy, and analyse there the historical sources which relate to the spread of Latin and the motivations for speakers to switch languages. For the period before the first inscriptions in Italy, there is no way of knowing exactly which language was spoken where and by whom. But in the period between the introduction of writing and the rise of Rome we do have some evidence, although meagre, which can help us to build up a picture of linguistic contact.

To the later Romans, such as Livy in the passage cited at the beginning of this section, it seemed inconceivable that Greek learning could have penetrated into Sabine territory, or that there could be any mutual understanding between Greek settlers and the indigenous inhabitants of Italy. But the earliest epigraphic texts tell a different story (see in general, Cristofani 1996). Texts in two (or more) different languages have been found in the same area, even in the same archaeological context. For example, in Capua an early Sabellian inscription recording the gift of a bronze stamnos (Rix 2002 Ps 3) was found in the same tomb as a cup with *mi racus* 'I belong to Racu' in Etruscan written on it (CIE 8680, Rix et al. 1991 Cm 2.67); in another sixth-century tomb, from nearby Pontecagnano, a vase inscribed *mi araθnas* 'I belong to Arathna' in Etruscan (CIE 8843, Rix et al. 1991 Cm 2.19) was found alongside a kylix vase with a Greek inscription (*SEG* 34 1019, Bailo Modesti 1984), and

contemporary Sabellian inscriptions have been found in the same burial area. Of course, the presence of texts in different languages side by side does not necessarily mean that both were spoken by the same individual. The Greek vase inscription mentioned above records the Greek owners' names and an injunction not to steal the vase, a message which was presumably either ignored or not understood. True 'bilingual' inscriptions, i.e. those with the same message expressed in two different languages, are uncommon at all periods and usually the product of special circumstances.

Although direct evidence is rare, there is indirect evidence for bilingualism, and language shift. Particularly noteworthy in this regard is onomastic evidence, since the same onomastic system is found in Etruscan, Latin, Faliscan and the Sabellian languages (most likely including South Picene, although the evidence here is not clear-cut). As the onomastic system evolved in Latin, personal names could become quite complex, so that an individual such as Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus might be identified by a concatenation of five names. However, at the basis of the Latin system is the use of a family name, termed the *gentile*, such as *Cornelius*, *Iulius* or *Claudius*, and specification of an individual through a *praenomen*, such as *Publius*, *Lucius* or *Aulus*, of which there were a limited number in the late Republic and Empire. An individual was further specified through mention of his father's praenomen, and the possible addition of one or more *cognomina*. The cognomen originated as a nickname or honorary title for an individual (as *Africanus*, commemorating an African triumph), but then could be developed to specify a branch of a family (as *Cornelius Scipio*), or a special association (as *Aemilianus* which reflects the fact that Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus was the blood-son of Lucius Aemilius Paulus). As the Roman onomastic system developed in the late Republic and Empire, the cognomen increased in importance, and the praenomen became all but insignificant (see the survey of Roman onomastic practice by Salway 1994 for an overview).

Name formulae in the other languages of central Italy show some variations from the Latin system: in Umbrian, Volscian, Sabine and Marsian texts the indication of the father's name comes before the family name, and it is common in late Etruscan texts to include some indication of the mother's name; but all the languages share the same system of family names combined with a restricted set of praenomina. The use of cognomina is also found in the neighbours of Latin, although their use is never as widespread as in the Latin of the Roman imperial period. The system whereby all citizens have a *gentile* name as well as a praenomen is unique among the older IE languages of Europe. In Greece a (male) individual will be denoted by a single name, frequently a compound, which may be

extended by the addition of his father's name, and the same system is found among the Celts and Germans.

It was once assumed that the *gentile* system must reflect an Etruscan practice which was spread through Etruscan cultural dominance (see for example, Whatmough 1937: 275). However, this theory is no longer tenable, since the earliest Etruscan inscriptions precede the introduction of the gentile system, and there too individuals are denoted by a single name. In some early Etruscan inscriptions individuals exist who have two names, the second of which may be a derived form of another name. For example, a seventh-century dedication from Caere (Rix et al. 1991 Cr. 3.11) reads *mini mulvanice mamarce velxanas* 'Mamarce Velkhana dedicated me'. Mamarce occurs elsewhere as an individual name, and Velkhana is formed from the name Velkha (or Velkhe) with the addition of a suffix *-na*, used elsewhere in Etruscan to denote appurtenance, as *suθi* 'tomb', *suθina* 'of/for the tomb' (note that *σ* is used to denote a sibilant, probably [ʃ] in Etruscan). It seems most likely that in this Etruscan text Velkhana, which later occurs as a gentile name, is used to designate the fact that Mamarce belongs to a family of which Velkha is the head (hence the word Velkhana is written in the genitive). In Latin and in Sabellian many *gentilia* derive from old patronymic adjectives: thus *Marcus* is formed from the addition of a suffix **-io-* to the praenomen which becomes Classical Latin *Marcus*. The same suffix, **-io-*, is used to form patronymics in several IE languages both within Italy (Faliscan, Umbrian and in Sabellian texts from south Italy which predate Oscan) and elsewhere (for example, Homeric Greek *Aías Telamōnios* Ajax, son of Telamon; Mycenaean Greek *a-re-ku-tu-ru-wo e-te-wo-ke-re-we-i-jo* Alektruon son of Etewoklewes). There may even be examples of two-member names where the second is actually a patronymic formed in *-ius*, although taken as a *gentile* by later Romans, in some of the names handed down relating to the period of the Roman Kings: thus Livy (1.20.5) mentions a pontifex *Numa Marcius Marci filius* – Numa Marcius, son of Marcus. The origin of the *gentile* system may therefore reflect the extension of a patronymic adjective to denote the *pater familias*, the name of the head of the family, not the blood-father, and the consequent adoption of this name as the family name (this account follows Rix 1972).

Not only is the onomastic system the same, but the same names occur throughout central Italy. Thus for example the praenomen *Titus* occurs in Latin, Etruscan (*Tite*), South Picene (*Titúm*) and Umbrian (patronymic adjective *Titis*); the praenomen *Numerius* is found in one of the earliest Etruscan inscriptions (*numesie ET* Ta 3.1), Oscan *nium-sis*, Umbrian *numesier* and the Early Latin Praenestine fibula (*Numasioi*); the praenomen *Aulus* occurs in Latin, Etruscan (*Avile/Aple*) and Oscan (*Avl.*); a gentile name *Tatai-* is found in Etruscan *Tataie*, Oscan *Taties*,

the name of the early ‘Sabine’ king at Rome, Titus Tatius, and in the feminine name *Tataie* on a very early Greek inscription from Cumae, suggesting that the Greek colonists intermarried with locals. Although the etymology of some of these names is disputed (thus *Aulus* is normally reckoned to be of Etruscan origin, connected with the word for ‘year’ *avil*, but it could also be from IE **awelo-*, a suffixed form of the word for ‘grandfather’ (Latin *avus*)), there is clear evidence in the early period of Latin and Sabellian names and ethnics used in Etruscan texts: note, for the seventh-century inscription from Veii, *mi tites latines* (Ve 2.4) ‘I belong to Tite Latine.’ Furthermore, many Etruscan cognomina appear to be formed from Latin/Sabellian appellatives: *Sceva* is clearly connected with Latin *Scaeva* ‘Leftie’; *clauce* ‘Blue-eyes’ is probably connected with Latin *glaucus* or Greek *glaukós*; *pacre* ‘kindly’ with a Sabellian adjective *pacri-*; and *raufe* with Latin *Rufus* ‘Ginger’ (note that the medial *-f-* shows that *Rufus* must itself be a borrowing into Latin from a Sabellian language – as we saw in 1.4.1, the original voiced aspirate **dʰ* develops to a stop in the middle of the word in Latin; in Sabellian it develops to *f*, as we shall see below). These, and the appearance of Etruscan *gentilia* which seem to derive from non-Etruscan praenomina, as *Cae* (= *Gaius*), *Tite* (= *Titus*) and *Vipi* (= (Oscan) *Vibius*) suggest that these names were borne by Latins and Sabellians who had been incorporated into Etruscan citizenship and retained some part of their old appellation in their new name (the classic study of these names is Rix 1963).

The onomastic evidence therefore points to a considerable amount of interaction between the speakers of different languages in central Italy. The cultural practice of naming through *gentilia*, and the association of names with citizenship that we find in Etruria and Rome, may be connected with the introduction of writing to the area. Literacy allows the zealous bureaucrat to keep records of the citizenry, which motivates the need to develop more specific names than just *Titus* or *Marcus* (although the Roman census is traditionally associated with the reforms of Servius Tullius of 509 BC, the practice may be much older). The adoption of writing from the Greek colonists and its spread across central Italy also implies interaction between different communities. Etruscan appears to have been the medium for the transmission of the alphabet from Greek colonists to most of the other languages of Italy, although there is some evidence to suggest that the traffic may not have been entirely one way, since the distinctive form of the letter representing /f/, <8>, occurs earlier in South Picene (where it is reduced to two dots <:;>) and an early Sabellian inscription found at Poggio Sommavilla than in Etruscan (Stuart-Smith 2004: 37). With writing there also came shared ways of constructing texts: ‘speaking inscriptions’ of the type ‘I belong to X’ or ‘Y made me’ are found in the archaic period in most of the languages

spoken in Italy (Greek, Etruscan, Latin, Faliscan, Venetic, South Picene, and the pre-Oscan language of southern Italy, see Agostiniani 1982).

These shared developments in onomastics and literacy are not the only evidence for closer interaction among the peoples of Italy between 700 and 500 BC. There are common developments of material culture, certainly to the west of the Apennines, in the same period. Archaeological excavations have shown that at this time in Etruria, Latium and Campania there is an increase in the number of urban centres, with shared architectural and artistic styles which reflect the incorporation or adoption of Greek models (see Cornell 1995: 163f., Smith 1996: 84–97, 224–7). Historians of early Rome now refer to a cultural *koiné* to describe these shared developments in central Italy. However, it is important to remember that the term *koiné* is used here in a non-linguistic sense. There was no single shared language, and despite the linguistic interaction that the onomastic evidence suggests, there is a low level of lexical borrowing between Sabellian languages, Latin and Etruscan at this period.

Indeed, the only lexical field where there is convergence comparable to the onomastic developments is religious vocabulary. Here again, Greek influence is of importance. Greek is the source of two divine names which are borrowed across languages: *Apóllōn*, borrowed in Latin (*Apollo*), Marsian (*Apols*), Etruscan (*Apulu*, *Aplu*, the loss of final *-n* may suggest a borrowing via another language), and, with different vocalism representing a loan from Doric, rather than Ionic Greek, in Vestinian (*Apellune*, dative) and Oscan (**Appelluneí** dative); and *Hēracles* in Latin (*Hercules*), Etruscan (*Hercle*), Oscan (**Herekleis**), Paelignian (*Herclei*) and Vestinian (*Herclō*). In both Latin and Etruscan religion there is a regularization of the divine ‘pantheon’ based on a Greek model; in order to make up the numbers of the Etruscan gods the divine names *Iuno*, *Minerua* and *Neptunus* are borrowed from Latin or a Sabellian language to give Etruscan *Uni*, *Menerva*, *Neθuns* (the last is likely to have entered Etruscan from Umbrian, or a closely related variety). Other interactions concern religious vocabulary. The root **ais-* ‘god’ is found in Etruscan, Oscan, Umbrian, Paelignian, Volscian, Marsian and Marrucian, and it is not certain whether it originated from Etruscan or IE (for arguments in favour of an IE etymology, see Steinbauer 1993: 298f.). The Umbrian term for an object connected with animal sacrifice **kletram** (accusative), perhaps ‘bier’, seems to have been borrowed as Etruscan *cletram*, although the meaning is uncertain. Latin and Sabellian also share a number of lexical items connected with religion not found in IE languages outside Italy. Sometimes these may reflect a common inheritance/innovation during an Italic period (on this notion see further below): **sak-ro-* ‘sacred, consecrated to a god’ in Latin *sacer* ‘sacred’, Umbrian **sakru**, Oscan (in Greek script) *sakoro*, with further derivatives including

Oscan **sakaraklúm** ‘sanctuary’, Paelignian *sacaracirix* ‘priestess’; **sank-to-* in Latin *sanctus*, Oscan **saahtúm** and possibly Paelignian *sato* (unfortunately, we do not know the exact meaning of Etruscan terms which may be connected, such as *sacni-* and *σans-*); the adjective **p̥yos* ‘pious’ is only found in IE languages in Italy (Latin *pius*, Volscian *pihom*, Oscan **piíhiúi**, Marrucinian *peai*, etc.). In other cases differences in the process of word-formation make it clear that the lexemes show parallel but independent derivations; hence the word for ‘temple’ Latin *fanum* < **dʰas-nom* and Sabellian **fēsna* < **dʰēs-na* (Oscan **físnu**, Umbrian **fesnafe**, Paelignian *fēsna*). The language of prayer and ritual also shows similarities across Latin and Sabellian. Here it will be sufficient to note the similarity between one archaic Latin prayer formula preserved in Cato (*De Agri Cultura* 141.4) and the prayer used in the Umbrian Iguvine tables (VIa 25 et al., the interpretation of the two passages given here follows Watkins 1995: 218):

Latin:	te	hoc	porco	piaculo	
	you-ACC	this-ABL	pig-ABL	propitiation-ABL	
	‘(I present) you with this pig as propitiation.’				
Umbrian:	tiom	esu	bue	peracrei	pihaclu
	you-ACC	this-ABL	bull-ABL	yearling-ABL	propitiation-ABL
	‘(I present) you with this yearling bull as propitiation.’				

The exact agreement in word order, lexis and syntax, with omission of the main verb, is striking. Of course, the shared religious vocabulary and phraseology between Latin and Sabellian is not necessarily assigned to the same period as when the Greek loans of divine names entered the languages, and these agreements could reflect much earlier developments – as we shall see later in this chapter.

Most of the other lexical borrowings that take place reflect the adoption of cultural items. All languages of central Italy participate in borrowing words for material artefacts from Greek. Often we may be unable to tell whether a word came directly from Greek or via the medium of another language: Greek *kulík^hna* ‘cup’ borrowed as Latin *culigna*, Etruscan *culicna*, Oscan *culchna/culcfna*. And Etruscan is the source of a number of words in Latin, particularly relating to the Etruscan cultural spheres of stage performance or certain professions: for example the terms *subulo* ‘flautist’, *persona*, ‘mask’, *satelles* ‘bodyguard’ are all demonstrably loaned from Etruscan (see Watmough 1997). There are also a few early Latin borrowings from Sabellian languages. Striking is the Latin adoption of colour terms from a Sabellian language: *beluus* ‘yellow’, *rufus* ‘red’ and *rauius* ‘grey’, all show aberrant phonological developments in Latin

(in *heluus* **e* remains before velar *l*, rather than developing to *o*, in *rufus* original **d^b* develops to *f* intervocalically, and in *rauus* original **g^b* is lost before *r*) which can be explained if they are loaned from Sabellian. The adoption of colour vocabulary need not reflect a high level of contact; it is possible (as Meiser has argued, 1996: 190 fn. 16) that these were introduced into Latin through the language of traders in animal hides and furs.

Although the level of lexical interchange outside religious language in Italy is generally low, there are other linguistic features that suggest some convergence between the different languages in the period immediately after the introduction of literacy. Most important is the adoption of an initial stress accent and the changes which took place concomitant with this. The accent of Classical Latin followed the so-called 'Law of the Penultimate': in polysyllabic words the penultimate syllable was stressed, unless this syllable was metrically light, in which case the antepenultimate was stressed. In pre-classical Latin, however, the word stress appears to have been placed on the initial syllable. The evidence for this is based principally on the behaviour of vowels in medial syllables: short vowels in open medial syllables are prone to syncope, and low and mid vowels in medial syllables are subject to processes of raising known collectively as 'vowel weakening' (see the fuller discussion of this process in Chapter IV). The effects of these changes can be seen most clearly in compound words and univerbations; for syncope, note *rettuli* 'I brought back' < **retetulai*; for vowel weakening, *reficio* 'I restore' a compound of *re-* and the verb *facio* and its passive participle *refectus* < *re-* and *factus*; and *ilico* 'on the spot' a reduction of the Early Latin phrase *in stloco* 'in place-ABL'. In Latin the processes of syncope and vowel weakening do not appear to have taken place at the time of the earliest Latin texts. Thus the *Lapis Satricanus* from around 500 BC shows unweakened forms such as *Mamartei*, which are matched by the evidence of the other seventh- and sixth-century Latin inscriptions.

Etruscan and Sabellian languages also show an initial stress accent, which caused the syncope of short vowels in later syllables. In Etruscan, where we have the greatest amount of documentation for the seventh to fourth century BC, the period at which syncope is reflected in the script can be pinpointed to the first half of the fifth century: in Etruscan texts earlier than this date the name *Aulus* is written *Avile* or *Avele*; in later texts *Avle*. In Sabellian we have direct evidence for the existence of an initial word accent from the writing practice of the Oscans. In texts written in the Oscan script long vowels are sometimes written with a doubled vowel sign; this doubling is only found (with one exception) in word-initial syllables, suggesting a maintenance of vowel length under the word accent, but loss elsewhere. In Sabellian languages syncope of short medial vowels also takes place some time between the sixth and fourth

century. For example, the gentile name *Peracis* which is found in a Sabellian inscription from Capua of around 500 BC appears as **perkium** (genitive plural) on a later Oscan text from the same area. Inherited terms in Sabellian and Latin may consequently end up with a similar shape; for example, the word meaning ‘right’ has a stem **destr-** in Oscan, *destr-* in Umbrian and *dextr-* in Latin, but the form must originally have been more like Greek *dexíteros*.

In this case, we are fortunate enough to have sufficient evidence to be able to assign a likely date to a sound change which affected many of the languages of central Italy. Consequently, we can know that the change which led to the similarity between Latin *dextr-* and Sabellian *destr-* took place when they were separate languages. More often we cannot date a linguistic change, and we may not be able to assess whether a particular development results from contact, or in the case of Latin and the Sabellian languages, reflects an earlier period of unity. We have already seen how some of the agreements in the religious vocabulary can be assigned to a date after contact with Greek speakers, but other changes may be much earlier. Our uncertainty over the chronology of sound changes and other innovations has led to a situation where the same linguistic innovations have been variously accounted as either contact phenomena or evidence that Latin and Sabellian derive from the same subgroup of IE. In section 2.4 we shall assess the arguments on both sides, but before answering this question we need to give a short linguistic account of the Sabellian languages, detailing their salient features, which we shall do through the analysis of text samples.

2.3 The Sabellian Languages

The term ‘Sabellian’ is now used to refer to the largest group of languages from ancient Italy. Sabellian languages are attested from as far north as the source of the Tiber in Umbria, to as far south as Bruttium. Texts date from the seventh to the first century BC. The languages are IE, and are written in a variety of scripts. As we have seen, the Sabellian group encompasses a number of different varieties, and the assessment of which varieties constitute a separate language is impossible given the evidence we have. Various attempts have been made to position the different varieties within a Sabellian family tree, but again we do not have sufficient data to be able to do this with any certainty. In the most recent edition of the Sabellian texts (Rix 2002), Rix constructs three groups. The first comprises northern varieties: Umbrian, Sabine, Marsian and Volscian; another texts from the centre and south of Italy: Oscan, Paelignian,

Vestinian, Marrucian, Hernician; another group comprises South Picene and texts from Campania and Lucanian from before 400 BC, which are supposed to predate the expansion of the Oscan tribes to the south. It will be convenient to reproduce that division here, although this does not mean that Rix's alignment of the Sabellian varieties is unproblematic. We remind the reader that Oscan and Umbrian texts are usually reproduced in **bold** if they are written in the native script, and *italic* if written in Latin script. South Picene is written in a unique script, derived from the Etruscan alphabet, and is here reproduced in **bold**.

2.3.1 *South Picene*

The language of the South Picene texts has come under close scrutiny following the full publication in 1985 of three new texts and with them the confirmation that the sign <.> represented /o/, and <:> represented /f/ (Marinetti 1985). Most of the texts are markers of graves or tombs of chiefs, but the language used upon them seems to be highly stylized, incorporating alliteration and marked word order with discontinuous phrasing or interlacing syntax (an example is text (2) below). The interpretation of a number of forms in the small corpus is still uncertain, and we reproduce here four short texts and selections from texts, the meaning of which is generally agreed. We have given Latin equivalents to the first two, complete, texts.

Text (1) below is written on an imposing mid-sixth-century statue of a man, sometimes called 'The Warrior of Capestrano'. The text is unusual among South Picene inscriptions in that it has no indication of word-breaks (which elsewhere we have indicated by a colon), and the division into words here follows that of the editor. South Picene has a much fuller repertoire of signs for vowels than any other language of ancient Italy; unlike Etruscan and the other Sabellian languages it uses the vowel sign <o> and it has innovated new signs for other high vowels alongside /i/ and /u/ which are here transcribed by **í** and **ú**. (Note that in reproducing texts we follow the editorial conventions whereby square brackets enclose text which is missing through damage to the original inscription, but restored on the basis of parallels elsewhere.)

(1) Sp AQ 2 (as read by Rix 2002, as are all the texts given here).

ma kuprí koram opsút aninis rakinelís pomp[úne]i

? well memorial-ACC.sg he-made Aninis-NOM.sg Rakinelis-NOM.sg Pompo-DAT.sg.

'Aninis Rakinelis made this memorial well for Pompo.'

(Latin equivalent: *bene *koram fecit Annius Racinelius Pomponi.*)

- (2) Sp MC 1. A funerary inscription written on a large stone, which probably dates from the sixth or fifth century.

apaes: qumat [: e]smin : púpúnis : nír : mefín :

Apaes-NOM he-lies this-LOC.sg=in Púpúnis-NOM chief-NOM middle-LOC.sg=in

veiat : vepetí

he-lies stone-LOC.sg=in

‘Apaes Púpúnis/the Picene lies in this; the chief lies in the middle of the stone.’

(Latin equivalent: *Apaeus cubat in hoc Pomponius *ner in medio *lebit lapide*).

The presence of two verbs in this short inscription is troubling; most commentators explain the inscription as the amalgamation for ‘poetic’ effect of two separate sentences interlaced by a single prepositional phrase.

- (3) Sp TE 1. A fragmentary stone cippus of the same date:

petroh : púpún[is : ní]r: e: súhúh: suaipis :

Petro-NOM Púpúnis-NOM chief.NOM from his-own-ABL.sg. if-anyone-NOM

chuelí : . . .

he-?wants-OPT

‘Petro Púpúnis/the Picene, the chief, from his own resources, if anyone wants . . .’

- (4) Sp TE 6. A fragmentary stone stela of the late sixth century:

safinúm : nerf : persukant

Sabine-GEN.pl chief-NOM.pl they-call

‘The chiefs of the Sabines call . . .’

Even from these short fragments, we can gather enough information to show that these texts are distinctively ‘Sabellian’; all of the following phonological developments (a)–(e) are also found in other Sabellian texts:

- (a) Inherited labio-velar consonants have lost the velar element of the articulation and merged with labial consonants; thus the indefinite pronoun **k^wis* > appears as **pis** (cf. **suaipis** in (3)), compare Latin *quis*.

- (b) Inherited voiced aspirates **d^b* and **b^b* have merged and developed to fricatives in all positions: note **med^byo-* ‘middle’ > **mefín** (in (2)), compare Latin *medius*; and the ethnic adjective **Sab^bino-* > **safinúm** (in (4)) compare Latin *Sabinus* (and *Samnium*). The South Picene

alphabet, like the Oscan and Umbrian alphabet, uses the same sign to denote a fricative in initial and medial position, but there is reason to believe that the Sabellian *f* was actually voiced between two vowels; note that in Oscan written in Greek letters, the Greek letter is sometimes used in place of <f> as in the divine name *mefitis* written both <mefitei> and <mebitei>, probably representing [meβit-] (Stuart-Smith 2004: 90f.).

The Sabellian development recalls the Latin treatment of original ‘voiced aspirates’. As we saw in Chapter I, their outcome in Latin is as fricatives in initial position, but voiced stops in medial position. The picture is complicated by the fact that in Faliscan, the sister language to Latin, the same development as in Sabellian is found: note Faliscan *carefo* = Latin *carebo*, *efiles* = Latin *aediles*. There are also Early Latin examples of *f* < medial **b^h*, as, for example the ‘Garigliano Bowl’ (see 1.4.5) if *trifos* = *tribus* three-ABL.PL is correctly read and interpreted (see Vine 1998). (Note that most Classical Latin words with medial *-f-* can be explained as later loanwords from Sabellian languages, as *rufus* ‘red’ besides inherited *ruber* ‘red’.) This suggests that at an earlier period in Latin the word-internal reflexes of voiced aspirates were also fricatives which were then merged with voiced stops. Such a merger of fricatives with voiced stops also helps explain other Latin sound changes, such as the development of **-sr-* > *-br-* (e.g. *funeris* < **funes-ri-*) which presumably took place via **-ðr-* and **-βr-*.

The Latin and Sabellian sound changes consequently appear similar – but how should we reconstruct the changes from PIE to the historically attested forms? This is still a matter of dispute, and there are several possible answers to this question. The account given here follows the work of Stuart-Smith (1996 and 2004) and works on the assumption that the reconstructed ‘voiced aspirates’ were in fact breathy voiced stops (see 1.4.1). In initial position the voiced aspirates were first realized as voiceless aspirates, and subsequently developed to voiceless fricatives. In medial position, voicing was retained, and the sounds developed to voiced fricatives. In Sabellian all fricatives with any front articulation (i.e. labial, dental and labio-velar) merged as /f/, in Latin this merger only affected word-initial forms. Word-internally the fricatives were kept separate, although /ð/ (the reflex of **d^h*) merged with /β/ < **b^h* when in the context of lip-rounding. The developments in tabular form are set out below:

Word-initial position:

PIE	<i>*b^h</i>	<i>*d^h</i>	<i>*g^{wh}</i>	<i>*g^h</i> / <i>*g^h</i>
Stage I	f	θ	χ ^w	χ
Sabellian	f	f	f	h
Latin	f	f	f	h

Word-internal position;

PIE	*b ^h	*d ^h	*g ^{wh}	*g ^h / *g' ^h
Stage I	β	ð	ɣ ^w	ɣ
Sabellian	β	β	β	h
Latin	b	d	u	h

The first step of these developments, labelled Stage I in the above tables, may have been shared by Latin and Sabellian.

(c) Inherited long **e* and long **o* vowels raised. The outcome of long **e* is usually written in South Picene with the letter *í*, for example nominative singular **nír** < **nēr* (in (2)), nominative plural **nerf** < **ner-* (in (4)). Cognate words meaning ‘man’ or ‘hero’ in Greek and Vedic show the same alternation between a long and short vowel in the paradigm of this word.

(d) Syncope of short vowels occurred before final **-s* in polysyllabic words, as probably in **púpúnis** **-ios* (in (2)), and found also in other South Picene texts, for example in a nominative singular **meitims**, perhaps meaning ‘gift’ with final syllable derived from < **-mos*. This loss of short vowel before final **-s* also occurs in Early Latin following *-r-*, as in *sacer* < **sakros* and also following a cluster of consonant and *-t-* (as in *mens* < **mentis*), although paradigmatic analogy has led to restitutions of the lost vowel in many cases. The Latin change, which occurs in a much more restricted set of phonological environments, must, however, be separate, since an Early Latin inscription (the fragmentary ‘forum inscription,’ CIL I² 1, dated to the sixth century) shows the unsyncopeated form *sakros*.

(e) Final **i* was lost, as in the 3rd person verbal forms in **-at** and **-ant** which derive from original forms in **-ti* and **-nti*. This change has also occurred early in the history of Latin (see 1.4.4), although in Latin some instances of final **-i* appear to have been retained, as in the locative singular ending of consonant stems *-e* < **-i*, and in some neuter nouns and adjectives such as *mare* ‘sea’ < **mori*, *omne* ‘everything’. The reason for the double development of **-i* in Latin is not known for certain, but Rix (1996: 158 n.7 followed by Meiser 1998: 74) has suggested that final **-i* was retained if it bore the original accent, as **ped-í* the original locative of the PIE word for ‘foot’, which may lie behind the Latin ablative *pede*. Since not all locatives in **-i* carried the accent, and it is unlikely that the final *-i* of neuter nouns in the nominative singular ever did, this explanation relies heavily on the operation of analogy across nominal declensions to restore final **-i* in these nominal paradigms. A further difficulty

with this explanation is that the inherited PIE accent seems to have been replaced early in Latin; otherwise it has not had any effect on phonological developments.

2.3.2 *Umbrian*

Our text samples for Umbrian come from the Iguvine tables, the term used to designate seven large bronze tablets discovered in Gubbio in the fifteenth century. The tables detail the ritual procedure of a college of priests, with some portions written in the native Umbrian alphabet (derived from Etruscan with the addition of two extra letters) and others in the Latin alphabet. The passages in the Latin script show the effects of sound changes which are not found in the portions written in Umbrian script, and must consequently be written later. The first selection is taken from Table Ib line 16–19 (one of the earlier portions written in the Umbrian alphabet, and probably datable to before the second century BC):

(5) Um 1 Ib 1–19

pune : menes : akeṛuniamem : enumek : etuṛstamu :

when come-2sg.FUT Acedonia-ACC.sg=in then expel-IMPER

tuta : taṛinate : trifu : taṛinate : turskum :

people-ACC.sg of Tadinæ-ACC.sg tribe-ACC.sg of Tadinæ-ACC.sg Etruscan-ACC.sg

naharkum : numem : iapuzkum : numem : svepis :

Narcan-ACC.sg people-ACC.sg Iapudican-ACC.sg people-ACC.sg if=anyone-NOM.sg

habe : purtatu (u)lu : pue : meṛs : est : feitu : uru :

he-stays carry-IMPER to there where right-NOM.sg is make-IMPER. there

peṛe : meṛs : est

what right-NOM.sg is

‘When you come to Acedonia, then they are to expel the people of Tadinæ, the tribe of Tardinæ, the Etruscan, the Narcan people, the Iapudican people. If anyone stays/is caught, bring him to that place, where it is right, do to him there what is right.’

The second passage of Umbrian is written in Latin Script and comes from Table Vb 8–10; it does not date later than the beginning of the first century BC:

(6) Um 1 Vb 8–10

clauerniur dirsas herti fratrus atiersir posti

Clavernii-NOM.pl give-3pl.SUBJ want-3sg.PASS brother-DAT.pl Atiedi-DAT.pl per

acnu farer opeter p. IIII agre tlatie

year-ACC.sg spelt-GEN.sg choice-GEN.sg 4 lb land-GEN.sg Latin-GEN.sg

piquier martier et śesna homonus duir
 of-Picus-GEN.sg Martius-GEN.sg and dinner-ACC.sg man.-DAT.pl two.DAT.pl
 puri far eiscurent ote a. VI
 who-NOM.pl spelt-ACC.sg ask-3pl.FUT.PERF or asses 6

‘It is required that the Clavernii give the Atiedian brothers 4lb. of choice spelt of the Latin land of Picus Martius per year, and dinner to the two men who will have asked for the spelt or 6 asses.’

Some of the Sabellian features of Umbrian are immediately obvious. Note, for example, the univerbation **svepis** ‘if anyone’ which corresponds exactly with South Picene **suaipis** in TE 1 (text (3) above). However, Umbrian has undergone a large number of complex sound changes in comparison with most other Sabellian languages, which makes some Umbrian forms difficult to assess at first glance. Some of the Umbrian sound changes are analogous to changes found in Latin, note in particular the following:

- 1 Rhotacism: intervocalic **-s-* changed to *-r-* as in *puri* ‘who’ < **k^wōs-i*, an extended form of the nominative plural of the pronoun **k^wo-/*k^wi-*. In the later portions of the text written in Latin script, final **-s* underwent the same change if it occurred after a vowel, so **svepis**, for example, appears as *sopir*.
- 2 Loss of final consonants: all final consonants are prone to loss, although morphological pressures may lead to some restitution of consonants. The writing system is however inconsistent in the representation of final consonants, note **tuta** : **tařinate** : **trifu** : **tařinate** : with loss of final *-m* in every word, immediately followed by **turskum** : **naharkum** : **numem** : **iapuzkum** : with retention of the final consonant. It is likely that these writings represent different strategies for conveying a nasalized final vowel; note that the original final sound of **numem** was **-n*, and the writing with **-m** is best explained as a representation of nasalization.
- 3 Palatalization: **k* was palatalized in Umbrian before a front vowel to a sound represented by a special letter **ç** in the Umbrian alphabet, and a modified form of *s* (transcribed *ś*) in the Latin alphabet. Hence *śesna* is an exact cognate to Latin *cena* ‘dinner’ (< **kesna*); **ğ* is also palatalized to *i* before a front vowel.
- 4 Monophthongization of diphthongs; all inherited diphthongs in Umbrian undergo a process of monophthongization. Diphthongs with second member *u* merge as a back vowel (**u/o**), those with second member *i* merge as a front vowel (**e/ε**), except for **oi* which follows the pattern of the *u*-diphthongs.

There are also a number of phonological developments which affect Umbrian alone, such as the passage of an intervocalic **d* to a sound written with the sign *ř* in the Umbrian alphabet but by the digraph *rs* in the Latin alphabet, as **peře** ‘what’ < **k^wid-i*, an extended form of the neuter singular of the relative pronoun **k^wo-* / **k^wi-*.

The length of the Iguvine tables means that we know a lot more about Umbrian morphology and syntax than we do about South Picene, and several morphosyntactic features found in Umbrian appear to be as characteristic of Sabellian languages as the phonological developments which we found in the South Picene texts:

- 1 Genitive singular in **-eis* for consonant stems and **o*-stem nouns. This ending is not directly evidenced in Umbrian – but lies behind the ending **-es/-er** (for example *farer opeter* < **b^hars-eis opet-eis*, note that **b^hars-* is a consonant stem (cf. Latin *far*) and **opet-* an *o*-stem participle formed with the suffix **-to-* (cf. Latin *-tus*). A genitive singular in **-es** is found in South Picene and Oscan **-eīs** preserves the original diphthong. The Umbrian and South Picene forms must derive from **-eis* and not **-es*, since a short vowel would be lost by syncope before final **-s* in Sabellian. The ending has usually been explained as a borrowing of the *i*-stem genitive singular **-eis*, which spread to consonant stems and *o*-stems after syncope of short vowels before final *-s* had made the nominative singulars of these three declensions identical.
- 2 Nominative plural of *o*-stem and *a*-stem nouns and pronouns in **-ōs* and **-ās* respectively. These endings are inherited from IE for the nominal stems, but (as we saw in section 1.4.3) in Latin they have been replaced by the endings **-oi* and **-ai* which originally were restricted to the pronominal declensions. The Sabellian languages have levelled the different endings of the pronouns and nouns, but in the opposite direction to that taken by Latin. They have retained the original nominal ending and transferred them to the pronouns, as nominative plural *puri* ‘who’ < **k^wōs-i*.
- 3 Imperative medio-passive ending **-mo* as in the deponent **etuřstamu** ‘expel’, which is matched in Oscan *censamur* (with added ‘passive’ *-r*) but in no other IE language, although it is possible that the Latin 2nd person plural medio-passive *-mini* may be connected in some way (see Meiser 1998: 219).
- 4 Remodelling of the verbal system with the creation of new paradigms. These include the ‘future’ formed with a suffix **-s-* and the ‘future perfect’. The ‘future perfect’ is the name given to a formation which denotes the priority of a future action in a subordinate clause against another future event in the main clause. In Sabellian,

and no other IE language, the future perfect is formed with a suffix **-us-* (compare the Latin marker *-is-*, see 1.4.4). In the second Umbrian passage there is an example of such a verb form in a relative clause: *eiscurent* ‘they will have asked’ which is used in order to specify that it must take place before the action of the matrix clause verb *dirsas* ‘they should give’.

The remodelling of the verbal system can be seen to proceed along similar lines to those detailed for Latin in 1.4.4. In Sabellian, as in Latin, the aspect-centred verbal system as reconstructed for PIE, appears to have been given up in favour of a paradigm with a basic split between a *perfectum* stem and an *infectum* stem. The two future formations are associated with different stems, as in Latin: the **-s-* future is attached to the *infectum* and the **-us-* ‘future perfect’ is formed on the *infectum* stem, as can be seen from the following (Oscan) examples:

Infectum	<i>*-s-</i> Future	Perfectum	<i>*-us-</i> Future Perfect
<i>deiua-</i>	<i>deiuas-</i>		
tríbaraka-		tríbarakatt-	tríbarakattus-

Note that although the **s*-future has clear cognates elsewhere in IE, the Sabellian languages have innovated in attaching the marker **-s-* to a stem form (that of the *infectum*). Thus the Umbrian future **menes** given in text (5) above is derived not from the root **ǵ^wem-* + suffix **-s-* (+ ending **s*) but from *infectum* stem **ǵ^wemye-* > **benie-* + suffix **-s-*, just as the Latin futures *amabo*, *habebo*, etc. show the *infectum* stems with a further marker (the initial *m-* instead of *b-* in **menes** is unexplained, see Untermann 2000: 144 for various theories). Structurally, then, the Sabellian future and future perfect are formed in an exactly analogous way to the Latin future and future perfect, even though the actual morphs used differ. The significance of the structural similarity of the reshaped Sabellian verbal system to the Latin verb will be further examined in the next section.

Umbrian also shares some morphological developments with other Sabellian languages which are now recognized to be the result of parallel changes after the separation of the different Sabellian languages. A particularly striking example of such a development is the secondary 3rd person plural verbal ending *-ns*. We have an example of this form in text (6): *dirsas* (elsewhere written *dirsans*) is the 3rd person plural of the subjunctive, which, in Sabellian as in Latin, regularly takes secondary endings. The ending *-ns* is found in all the Sabellian languages later than the fourth century BC for which we have the appropriate material: Umbrian, Volscian, Paelignian and Oscan. It was assumed to be a common

Sabellian innovation before the decipherment of South Picene and the discovery of an early Sabellian text from southern Italy (Ps 20 in Rix 2002) which show secondary 3rd person plural endings **-úh** and **-od** respectively, representing direct continuations of PIE ***(o)nt** (via a form **-ōd** with nasalized vowel). The replacement of this ending by **-ns**, which must ultimately derive from a remarked **-n < *-nt**, must have taken place once the different Sabellian languages had already diversified and spread over a large area of Italy. Developments such as this make it extremely difficult to ascertain what the ‘proto-Sabellian’ language must have looked like, and leave open the possibility that other Sabellian similarities are also the result of some sort of convergence.

2.3.3 *Oscan*

There is a greater number of texts written in Oscan than any other Sabellian language, and, if we are to believe Strabo’s account, plays in Oscan were performed in Rome (Strabo 5.3.6, see however Adams 2003: 119f. for serious doubt cast on this claim). Speakers of Oscan spread throughout southern Italy in the fourth century BC, and Oscan replaced the former languages spoken in this area. Oscan is far more transparent than the other languages we have considered, since it is generally conservative in phonology, and has a consistent orthography with signs for the two extra vowels written in the native script **í** (the outcome of original ***i** and long ***ē**) and **ú** (the outcome of original ***u** and long ***ō**). This linguistic conservatism makes it much easier to apply comparative methods to Oscan vocabulary.

The following text records an agreement between two communities in Campania about the use of a sanctuary of Hercules (Cm 1 in Rix 2002).

(7) Cm 1 A 1–18

maiíúí. vestirikiíúí. mai(ieís). síl(úí) / prupukid.

Maius-DAT.sg Vestricius-DAT.sg Maius-GEN.sg. Silus-DAT.sg ?

sverrunceí. kvaistu/reí. abellanúí. íním. maiíúí / lúvkíúí.

? quaestor-DAT.sg of-Abella-DAT.sg and Maius-DAT.sg Lucius-DAT.sg

mai(ieís). pukalatúí / medíkeí. deketasiúí. núvla/núí.

Maius-GEN.sg Puclatus-DAT.sg magistrate-DAT.sg ?-DAT.sg of-Nola-DAT.sg

íním. lígatúís. abellan[úís] / íním. lígatúís. núvlanúís /

and legates-DAT.pl of-Abella-DAT.sg and legates-DAT.pl of-Nola-DAT.pl

pús. senateís. tanginúd / suveís. pútúrúspíd.

who-NOM.pl senate-GEN.sg decision-ABL.sg each-GEN.sg whichever

lígat[úís] / fufans. ekss. kúmbened. / sakaraklúm.

legates-NOM.pl be(come)-3pl.PAST so agreed-3sg.PERF sanctuary-NOM.sg

herekleís. [ú]p/ **slaagid.** **púd.** **íst.** **íním.**
 Hercules-GEN.sg in ?-ABL.sg which-NOM.sg is-3sg.PRES and
teer[úm] / púd. **úp.** **éisúd.** **sakaraklúd** [**. íst**] /
 land-NOM.sg which-NOM.sg in this-ABL.sg sanctuary-ABL.sg is-3sg.PRES
púd. **anter.** **teremniss.** **eh[trúis] / íst.** **paí.**
 which-NOM.sg between boundaries-ABL.pl. outer.ABL.pl is-3sg.PRES which-NOM.pl
teremenniú. **mú[íníkad] / tanginúd.** **prúftú.** **set.**
 boundaries-NOM.pl mutual-ABL.sg decision-ABL.sg approved are-3pl.PRES
r[ehtúd] / amnúd. **puz.** **ídík.** **sakara[klúm] / íním.** **ídík.**
 right-ABL.sg ?-ABL.sg that this-NOM.sg sanctuary-NOM.sg and this-NOM.sg
terúm. **múíník[úm].** **múíníkeí.** **tereí.** **fusíd.**
 land.NOM.sg mutual-NOM.sg mutual-LOC.sg land-LOC.sg be-3sg.IMPERF.SUBJ

‘Maius Vestricius Silus, son of Maius [two words of unclear sense], Quaestor of Abella, and Maius Lucius Puclatus, son of Maius, *med-dix degetasis* [?] of Nola, and the legates of Abella and Nola, whoever have become legates by the decision of their respective senates, have agreed as follows: the Sanctuary of Hercules which is on the [word of uncertain sense] and the land which is within this Sanctuary, and which is within the outer boundaries which have been approved by mutual agreement [two words of uncertain reading and sense], [they agreed] that this Sanctuary and this land should be mutual on mutual territory.’

This official record smacks of the language of bureaucracy. However this short text contains two of the most important verbal forms in the whole of Sabellian for the historian of the Latin language. Firstly, the last verb of the text as reproduced above, **fusíd**, shows that the Sabellian languages had undergone the same restructuring of the morphosyntax of dependent clauses that took place in Latin. In Greek and Indo-Iranian, as we saw in 1.4.4, there are two non-indicative modal forms, which are used in a variety of clause types, and there was originally no restriction in using either mood in embedded clauses. By the fifth century BC Greek had developed a rule, termed ‘sequence of mood’ in traditional grammar, which favoured the optative in subordinate clauses where the verb in the matrix sentence refers to the past. In the Sabellian languages, as in Latin, the difference between two separate modal formations was lost, and only one non-indicative modal category remains. However, Latin and Sabellian have both evolved tense-marked subjunctives, as part of a syntactic process generally termed ‘sequence of tenses’: a subjunctive in an embedded clause is obligatorily marked also for the tense of the verb in the matrix clause. In Latin the sequence of tense rules are as follows:

*Time reference
of matrix clause verb*

Non-past time

Past time

Marking of subordinate clause verb

present subjunctive/perfect subjunctive

imperfect subjunctive/pluperfect subjunctive

The ‘imperfect’ and ‘pluperfect’ subjunctives are new modal formations marked as ‘past’, which do not have any analogue in the older IE languages. The imperfect subjunctive is formed from the *infectum* stem and the pluperfect from the *perfectum* stem. We have only a few examples of complex sentence structures in Sabellian which show a subjunctive used in an embedded clause, yet examples such as the Oscan text given above (7) show that the same sequence of tense rules appear to apply in Sabellian as apply in Latin. Thus in the above text:

ekss kúmbened . . .	puz . . .	fusíd
(Perfect Indic.)	conjunction	(Subjunctive formed with * <i>-sē-</i>)
<i>ita conuenit</i>	<i>ut</i>	<i>esset</i>

‘It was agreed . . . that . . . it should be . . .’

Compare the construction with a non-past verb in the matrix clause in the *Tabula Bantina* (Lu 1 in Rix 2002), an Oscan text, written in the Latin script:

<i>factud</i>	<i>pous . . .</i>	<i>deicans</i>
(Imperative)	conjunction	(Subjunctive formed with * <i>-ā-</i>)
<i>facito</i>	<i>ut</i>	<i>dicant</i>

‘See that they say . . .’

The subjunctive used in the first example, **fusíd**, is marked with a morph *-sí-* which distinguishes it from present subjunctives, marked with a long **ē* or long **ā*. Since the morph *-sí-* is exactly cognate to the Latin morph used to mark the imperfect subjunctive (as in *esset*, or *amaret*), both can be derived from **-sē-*, it is reasonable to assume that they represent a common innovation of a new subjunctive formation. However, this innovation is difficult to date. If we see it as part of the evolution of a more ‘bureaucratic’ prose style which took place in the period of the first-millennium Italian *koiné*, it must have spread across the language of central Italy when they were distinct idioms.

The origin of the marker **sē* of this new tense-marked subjunctive is uncertain, and thus offers little help on the date of its innovation. One theory is that it originates as a modal formation of a future stem (Meiser 1993b). In IE, subjunctives could be formed with a suffix **-ē-*, and such formations are widespread in Sabellian. The regular means of forming a

subjunctive for the *perfectum* stem, for example, is through the suffix **ē*; thus the Oscan perfect subjunctive **tríbarakatt-í-ns** < perfect stem (**tríbarakatt-**) + **ē* (í) + personal ending (**-ns**). A ‘future subjunctive’ would thus be formed by addition of **ē* to the future stem, formed in **-s-* as we have already seen. But how does a ‘future subjunctive’ become used as a subjunctive form which reflects the past tense of a verb in a higher clause? The answer may be through use in conditional clauses. In Latin the imperfect subjunctive is used in counterfactual conditional clauses, as in the following example:

Plautus *Casina* 811:

si equus esses, esses indomitabilis
if horse you-were-IMP.SUBJ. you were-IMP.SUBJ. untameable
‘If you were a horse, you’d be untameable.’

Unfortunately, the scanty Sabellian texts do not contain an example of a counterfactual condition, but if we hypothesize that the Sabellian languages also used the imperfect subjunctive, as Latin does, then we may be able to find a way to explain how a future modal tense may become reinterpreted as a past-marked modal. The development might be thought of as proceeding in three stages:

- 1 If **fusēt* X, **fusēt* Y ‘If he were to be X (in the future), he would be Y’:
**fusēt* = FUT. + MODAL.
- 2 If **fusēt* X, **fusēt* Y ‘If he were X (now), he would be Y’:
**fusēt* = PRES. + MODAL.
- 3 **fusēt* re-interpreted, in the protasis, as preceding the apodosis and thus located in the past ‘If he had been X, he would be Y’:
**fusēt* now has the value PAST + MODAL.

In stage (1) the formation in **-sē-* has the original meaning of a future modal formation, and its presence in protasis and apodosis indicates a remote possibility in the future. In stage (2) this remote possibility is re-interpreted as a counterfactual. The re-interpretation may have arisen when the present subjunctive (which in Latin and Sabellian languages derives from the earlier PIE optative) started to be used to refer to remote future events even in conditional clauses (Coleman 1996: 405) and encroached on the original meaning of the **-sē-* formation. Once the shift in stage (2) has been made, the verb in the apodosis may be replaced by other verbal forms, perhaps to denote a counterfactual in the past (‘if he were X, he would have been Y’). In stage (3) the **-sē-* form in the protasis, since it

is logically antecedent to the apodosis, is reinterpreted as also chronologically antecedent, and comes to be felt as having a past sense as well as a modal sense. It is in this function that it is extended to use in embedded clauses.

This chain of events constitutes a significant linguistic innovation, and it is striking that the same formation is found in Latin as well as the Sabellian languages. Another linguistic innovation which appears to be shared by Latin and Sabellian is the creation of a new imperfect tense. That is, a tense which belongs to the *infectum* stem but which refers to action in the past. In Latin, as we have seen in Chapter I, this tense is formed in all verbs except the copula with the morph *-bā-*. There is one formation in Sabellian which appears to show the same development, and that is the verb **fufans** which occurs only in the text sample given in (7) above. The form **fufans** taken at face value appears to show a cognate to the Latin morph *-bā-*, Oscan *-fa-* (both can be directly derived from a pre-form **-b^hā-*), attached to the stem **fu-** which we have also seen in the verb **fusíd**. The context of the verb supports an interpretation as an imperfect tense verb as well:

pús . . .	lígat[ús]	fufans.
who	legates	were

‘who(ever) were legates’

However, since this is the *only* example of this formation in Sabellian we must be careful that we do not build too much on this one form. Note that there is also no Latin equivalent to this verbal form; an imperfect stem **fubam* is nowhere attested. An alternative explanation for the Oscan verb is also available. In Sabellian, there is evidence for a *perfectum* stem **fuf-* from the root **fu-**, which derives from a reduplicated PIE stative perfect form (Meiser 2003: 201). Thus a 3rd person plural perfect **fufens** is attested twice in Oscan and an earlier 3rd person plural form *fufuod* in an early Sabellian text from the far south of Italy (Ps 20 in Rix 2002). The form **fufans** could consequently be explained differently; not as the imperfect of the verb ‘to be’ but as the pluperfect, formed, like the Latin pluperfect, with a morph **ā-*, marking ‘past’, to a verb meaning ‘become’, which we know to have been the original meaning of this root (this explanation was put forward by Rix 1983: 102 fn. 15). And this interpretation is also supported by the context:

pús . . .	lígat[ús]	fufans.
who	legates	had become

‘who(ever) had become legates’

It is of course possible to imagine that **fufans** has become re-interpreted as an imperfect, particularly since most other derivatives of this root have

come to be incorporated into the paradigm of the verb ‘to be’ in Sabellian (as have the *fu-* forms in Latin), and it is possible that the re-interpretation of forms such as **fufans** has led to the spread of a morph **-fa-** to mark the imperfect. However, this question cannot be settled without further evidence from the Sabellian languages of imperfect formations, which is at present lacking.

The second Oscan text that we shall consider (Po 3 in Rix 2002) is a much shorter stone tablet found near a palaestra in Pompeii, recording the donor of building funds and the magistrate responsible for the construction. The original text may date to the second century BC, but was later re-copied in the imperial period (see Poccetti 1982). It is possible to give an exact Latin equivalent for every word in this inscription, which we have included beneath the morphological analysis:

(8) Po 3

v(íibis).	aadirans.	v(íibieís).	éitiuvam.	paam /
Vibius	Adiranus	Vibii filius	pecuniam	quam
Vibius-NOM.sg	Adiranus-NOM.sg	Vibius-GEN.sg	money-ACC.sg	which-ACC.sg
vereiiaí.	púmpaiianái.	trístaa/mentud.	deded.	éisak.
reipublicae	Pompeianae	(ex) testamento	dedit	(ex) ea
state-DAT.sg	Pompeian-DAT.sg	will-ABL.sg		gave-3.PERF this-ABL.sg
éitiuvad / v(íibis).	viínikiís	mr.	kvaísstur.	
pecunia	Vibius	Vinicius	Mr. filius	quaestor
money-ABL.sg	Vibius-NOM.sg	Vinicius-NOM.sg	Mr-GEN.sg	quaestor-NOM.sg
púmp/aiians.	triíbúm.	ekak.	kúmben/nieís.	tanginud.
Pompeianus	domum	hanc	(de) conuentus	sententia
Pompeian-NOM.sg	house-ACC.sg	this-ABL.sg	senate-GEN.sg	decision-ABL.sg
úpsannam./	deded.	ísídum.	prúfatted	
faciendam	dedit	idem	probauit	
make-FUT.PASS.PART.ACC.sg	gave-3.PERF	same-NOM.sg	approved-3.PERF	

‘The money which Vibius Adiranus son of Vibius gave to the Pompeian state in his will, from this money Vibius Vinicius son of Mr., the Pompeian quaestor, arranged for this house to be built by the decision of the senate and the same man approved it.’

This inscription has been taken to show the degree of assimilation between Oscan and Latin in the context of advancing Roman hegemony in the last centuries of the Roman republic. There are clear examples of lexical borrowings for terms relating to law and governance: **kvaísstur** is a loan from Latin *quaestor*, and **trístaamentud** is probably a loan from Latin *testamentum* ‘will’, although adapted in the first syllable to the

native word for ‘witness’ **tr(i)stus**. The phrase **kúmbennieís tanginud** is equivalent to the Latin formula *de senatus sententia*, and may show the same specialization in meaning of the noun **tanginud** from ‘thought’ to ‘decision’ which Latin *sententia* underwent. Note that Oscan here retains the original use of the bare ablative to mark origin or source, whereas Latin has a prepositional phrase; since Oscan still has a fully functioning locative case, there is not the same need to reinforce the ablative meaning with a preposition, as there is in Latin. The closing phrase of the text (which reoccurs in other Oscan building inscriptions) has a close analogy to a common Latin formula: Latin *faciendum curauit eidemque probauit* (CIL I² *passim*). Note also the variant formula *portas faciendas dederunt eidemque probauerunt* from an inscription from Formiae (CIL I² 1563).

There is also some syntactic congruence with Latin. The subject and object of the initial relative clause, the name **v(íibis)**, **aadirans**, **v(íibieís)** and the word for ‘money’, **éitiuvam**, are fronted to initial position in the sentence, and the word for money is repeated again in the matrix clause in a different case. The inclusion of an antecedent to a relative in both the matrix clause and the relative clause is a feature of archaic IE syntax, and may have been inherited in Oscan, but it is perhaps preferable to see the construction here as influenced by Latin legal language, which shows a predilection for topicalizing antecedents and other nouns before preposed relative clauses (see Adams 2003: 137). Compare, for example the *Lex Cornelia de XX questoribus* (CIL I² 587) II 31f. (from 81 BC): *uiatores praecones, qui ex hac lege lectei sublectei erunt, eis uiatoribus praeconibus magistratus proue magistratu mercedis item tantundem dato* . . . In this Latin law, as in the Oscan text, we find the antecedent to the relative fronted before the relative clause (*uiatores praecones*), and then picked up in the matrix clause in a different case (*eis uiatoribus praeconibus*).

This Oscan text also shows an equivalent to the Latin gerundive construction. However, here the similarity is not just in the syntactic equivalence of the construction, i.e. the use of a quasi-participle (termed ‘the gerundive’ in Latin grammar) **úpsannam** in agreement with the object of the verb in order to designate the purpose of the gift, but also in the formation of the gerundive. Oscan **úpsannam** is formed through the addition of a suffix **-nn-** to the present stem of the verb. The only possible cognate for this suffix in any IE language is the Latin suffix **-nd-** used to form the gerundive in Latin (in Oscan ***-nd-** becomes **-nn-**, and Oscan **-nn-** and Latin **-nd-** could also both derive from ***-dn-**). It is very unlikely that the suffix is borrowed from Latin, since it is also found in Umbrian and in Oscan names, such as **Heírens** (gen. *Herenneis*) lit. ‘the wished for one’ and **Perkens** ‘the prayed for one’ (see Meiser 1993a). In these cases a calque from Latin is unlikely, and these names are in any case attested from well before the spread of Roman influence (note

that *herine*, an Etruscanized form of **Heirens**, is attested already in fifth-century Etruscan sources). The formation of the gerundive is consequently another area where Latin and Sabellian may have made a common morphological innovation, not shared by other IE languages.

Finally, we shall consider an important area where Latin and the Sabellian languages differ: the formation of the perfect. The last word in the text **prúfatted** is an exact semantic match for Latin *probauit*, a verb which also occurs at the end of many building inscriptions to signify that the person responsible for the building inspected the completed work and was satisfied. Oscan **prúfatted** is also formed in exactly the same way as Latin; both derive most probably from an earlier adverb. In Sabellian the adverb is attested in Umbrian **prufe** meaning ‘in order’, in Latin as *probe* ‘satisfactorily’. Oscan **prúfatted** and Latin *probo* probably originally arose as delocutives from the utterances indicating official approval **prufe!** or *probe!* ‘OK!’ (Campanile 1993: 31f.). Although **prúfatted** is an exact morpheme-by-morpheme match for *probauit*, there is a different choice of marker for the perfect stem: **-tt-** in Oscan, the productive marker for perfects from denominative verbs, but **-u-** in Latin, again, the productive marker of the perfect. This discrepancy between the languages may not seem that important in itself, particularly since the Oscan **-tt-** perfect is not even found in all Sabellian languages, being absent in Umbrian and South Picene. Yet it gains in significance when we start comparing other means of forming the perfect stem in Latin and Sabellian. Both language groups show a variety of different stem-forming types, some inherited from PIE (in both Latin and Sabellian the ‘perfect’ represents an amalgamation of the PIE aorist and the PIE perfect, see Chapter I), some innovative. However, none of the innovative formations are the same in Sabellian and Latin, and where cognate verbs use inherited formations for the perfect, in the majority of cases they choose a different option from those available (Meiser 1993b: 170f. and 2003 *passim*). Compare the following cases:

1 Latin chooses the aorist stem, Sabellian the Perfect stem:

Latin <i>feci</i> (pres. <i>facio</i>) ‘make’	: Oscan <i>fefacid</i> (pres. fakiiad)
Latin <i>fui</i> ‘be’	: Oscan fufens
Latin <i>dixi</i> (pres. <i>dico</i>) ‘say’	: Umbrian <i>dersicurent</i> < * <i>dedik-</i> (pres. < * <i>deik-e-</i>)
Latin <i>fi(n)xi</i> ‘make’	: Oscan fifikus

2 Latin chooses a perfect stem, but Sabellian the aorist stem:

Latin <i>pepuli</i> (pres. <i>pello</i> < <i>pel-ne-</i>) ‘push’	: Umbrian apelust (pres. apentu < * <i>pel-ne-</i>)
--	---

Latin <i>tetuli</i> (pres. <i>tollo</i> < <i>tl-ne-</i>) 'raise'	: Umbrian entelust (pres. ententu < * <i>-tel-ne-</i>)
Latin <i>legi</i> 'read'	: Paelignian <i>lexe</i> < <i>leg-s-</i>

3 Latin and Sabellian agree on the formation:

Latin <i>dedit</i> 'give'	: Oscan deded
---------------------------	----------------------

2.4 Sabellian and Latin

We have already discussed two significant morphological innovations which may have been made both in Sabellian and in Latin, and this naturally leads to the question of the nature of the relationship between Latin and the Sabellian group. Latin and the Sabellian languages all belong to the IE family, and they all share the same confined geographical space and they have all been in contact with Etruscan, Greek and other Mediterranean languages as we have already seen. It is not surprising, therefore, that there should be many similarities between them. But these similarities have been explained in two different ways by linguists in the last century. The earlier model of their relationship, which was put forward by German scholars in the nineteenth century, and is still held by the majority of scholars today, is that Latin and the Sabellian languages all form a sub-group of IE which has been named 'Italic'. A rival theory, proposed by Devoto and followed largely in Italy in the twentieth century, denies any earlier genetic unity between Sabellian and Latin other than their shared development from PIE and explains the similarities between the languages as the result of later convergence within the Italian peninsula.

It is worth here grouping together the arguments for the opposing theories, in list form.

2.4.1 *Arguments for the Italic theory*

Firstly, in support of the Italic theory there are a number of linguistic changes which have been argued to have been made in a period of common unity (the following list follows Heidermanns 2002: 186–9 with some modifications and additions):

Phonology

- 1 'Thurneysen's Law', long **ū* > **ī* before a following **y*:

Latin *pius*, Sabellian **pīo-* (Oscan dative singular **pīihúí**, Volscian *pīhom*)
< **pū-yo-* 'pious'

The number of etymologies in support of this change is small, and forms in Celtic and Germanic make it uncertain whether this change actually had more general application in western IE languages.

- 2 Loss of intervocalic **y*. This change must post-date Thurneysen's Law. The same change is found in other IE languages, such as Greek and Celtic.

Latin *tres* 'three', Sabellian **trēs* (Oscan nominative plural **trís**) < **treyes* '3'

- 3 PIE vocalic **r* and **l* > **or* and **ol*. These changes are well attested for Latin, but there are few watertight examples in Sabellian.
- 4 PIE **-tl-* > **-kl-* in the middle of a word:

**-tlom* (PIE suffix) > Latin *pia-culum*; Umbrian *piha-clu*

The change here is not startlingly unusual across the world's languages. In clusters of stops and laterals (as *tl* and *kl*), the stop consonants may be released laterally, leading to merger of the dental and velar in this environment (as happens frequently in spoken English). The cluster **-tl-* is not frequent in reconstructed PIE, and the significance of this change is small.

- 5 Merger of PIE **b^h-* and **d^h-* as *f-* at the beginning of a word:

**b^her-* > Latin *fero*, Marrucinian *feret*

d^hh₁k-* > Latin *facio*, Oscan **fakiad

- 6 Loss of original final **-i* in verbal primary endings:

esmi* > Early Latin *esom*, South Picene **esum

esti* > Latin *est*, Oscan **íst

Morphology

- 1 The spread of the ablative singular marker with long vowel followed by *-d*, originally limited to the *o*-stem declension, to the *ā*- (1st) declension (ablative singular **-āḍ*), *i*-declension (ablative singular **-īḍ*), and to the *u*- (4th) declension (ablative singular **-ūḍ*). The treatment of ablative singulars in the consonantal (3rd) declension is various: in Early Latin there is inscriptional evidence for the endings *-ed* and *-id* (*leged*, *loucarid*), presumably with long vowels, but the Classical Latin ending *-e* (a short vowel) is not derivable from either of these, but from the original locative ending (see 1.4.3). In Oscan the consonant stems sometimes borrow the ending *-ud* of the *o*-stems wholesale, as in *ligud*. The same spread of the ablative singular marker and case is also found in Celtiberian, the early form of Celtic attested in inscriptions from Spain, and in later forms of the Iranian language Avestan.

- 2 The spread of a marker **-ēd* on adverbs: Latin *-ēd*, Oscan *-íd* and possibly South Picene *-ih*. This change has been explained as the re-marking of an original instrumental ending **-ē* with final *-d* transferred from the ablative ending, and representing the outcome of a merger of the ablative and instrumental in proto-Italic. The competing endings **-ēd* and **-ōd* were then refunctionalized with **-ēd* used as the adverbial marker (Meiser 1992: 201). However, it is possible that the appearance of forms with *-d* could result from later interaction between ablatives in *-d* used adverbially and original instrumentals in *-ē*, together with the archaizing tendency in Latin inscriptions to write in *-d*, even when etymologically incorrect. Note also that the South Picene form **kuprí** ‘well’, given in text (1) above shows no trace of a original final **-d* (the South Picene form **qupíríh** in SP AP 2 (in Rix 2002), is taken as equivalent to **kuprí** with final *-h* < **-d*, but it occurs in a text in which every word ending in a vowel has the letter *-h* added). In Germanic also adverbs are found in both **-ēd* and **-ōd* (Old English *lange* but Old High German *lango* (Klingenschmitt 1992: 94)).
- 3 The remodelling of the plural of the **ā-* (1st) declension through the extension of the genitive plural in **-āsom* from pronominal declensions and the creation of a dative/ablative plural in **-āis* on the model of the *o*-stem ending **-ois*:

	Old Latin	Oscan
Genitive plural	<i>ros-arum</i>	<i>egm-azum</i>
Dative/Ablative plural	<i>colon-eis</i>	<i>kerssn-aís</i>

We have already discussed some of the innovations in the verbal systems above. Innovations here include:

- 4 The common use of a suffix **-sē-* to form a new ‘imperfect subjunctive’. See discussion above at 2.3.3.
- 5 The use of a suffix **-bʰā-* to form the imperfect indicative. We have seen in our discussion at 2.3.3 that the interpretation of the one relevant Oscan form is open to question.
- 6 The creation of verbal adjectives from the present stem (termed gerundives). In Latin these are formed with a suffix *-ndus*, in Oscan with a suffix *-nn-* as in **úpsannam** (equivalent to Latin *faciendam*). These two suffixes can both be traced back to a common origin, although the exact formation (and origin) of the forebear of the Oscan and Latin forms remains open to doubt. As we have seen in our discussion of the formation of the imperfect subjunctive, morphological innovations also entail syntactic innovations; the development of new gerundive formations also involves the development of gerundive syntax.

- 7 The remodelling of the paradigm of the copula verb, in particular the formation of a 1st person singular form **esom* where other Indo-European languages have **esmi*.

Word-formation

Heidermanns argues that word-formation is also a fertile field for Italic innovations, and gives the following specific innovations which have only been made in this branch of Indo-European:

- 8 a diminutive suffix **-kelo-*;
- 9 a suffix **-āno-* used to form secondary adjectives;
- 10 a suffix **-āli-* used to form secondary adjectives;
- 11 a suffix **-āsio-* used to form secondary adjectives;
- 12 a parallel restriction of the inherited types of compound formation.

Vocabulary

We have also discussed some of the shared vocabulary unique to languages of Italy earlier in this chapter, and we list here some further vocabulary items, with relevant cognates in other IE languages where they exist:

'earth'	Latin <i>terra</i>	Sabellian Oscan terúm specialization of the root <i>*ters-</i> 'dry' also found in Celtic (Old Irish <i>tír</i> 'land')
'hand'	<i>manus</i>	Oscan <i>manim</i> (accusative) possibly related form <i>*munt-</i> found in Germanic (Old Norse <i>mund</i> 'hand')
'lie, recline'	<i>cubare</i>	South Picene qupāt , Marrucinian <i>cibat</i>
'other'	<i>alter</i>	Oscan alttram (feminine accusative) suffixed form of widespread root <i>*al-</i> (Greek <i>állos</i> etc.)
'road'	<i>uia</i>	Oscan víú , Umbrian via , South Picene viam (accusative) may be related to forms in Germanic (Gothic <i>wigs</i> , German <i>Weg</i> , and English <i>way</i>)
'say'	<i>dico</i>	Oscan <i>deicum</i> , Umbrian <i>deitu</i> specialization of widespread root <i>*deik'-</i> meaning elsewhere 'show'

‘sing’	<i>cano</i>	Umbrian kanetu root <i>*kan-</i> which is also used as a verb in Celtic (Old Irish <i>canim</i>)
‘stone’	<i>lapis</i>	Umbrian vapeře (locative)
‘year’	<i>annus</i>	Oscan <i>aceneis</i> (genitive), Umbrian <i>acnu</i> (accusative) the same form occurs in Gothic <i>aþna-</i> ‘year’, from <i>*atno-</i>

2.4.2 Arguments against the Italic theory

Alongside this list of features which could represent innovations made at a period of common unity, there are also a number of features which separate Latin from the Sabellian languages, which have been emphasized by Devoto (1944: 59f.) and others. Again, for ease of reference and exposition we shall give these in list form.

Phonology

- 1 Development of labio-velar consonants, which are partly retained in Latin but which become labials in Sabellian:

k^w* > Latin *qu* but Sabellian **p* Latin *quid* Oscan **píd
g^w* > Latin *u* but Sabellian **b* Latin *uiuus* Oscan **bivus
(nom. pl.).

- 2 Development of vocalic **ŋ*, which gives **en* in Latin initial syllables (raised to *in* before velars), but **an* in Sabellian:

dŋg^huā*/d^hŋg^huā* ‘tongue’ > Latin *dīngua/lingua*, Oscan **fangvam**.

Morphology

- 3 The formation of the nominative plural of *ā-* and *o-*stems. Latin has generalized the pronominal endings **-ai* and **-oi* to nouns and pronouns; Sabellian has generalized the nominal endings **-ās* and **-ōs* to nouns and pronouns.
- 4 The formation of the genitive singular of *o-*stems. Latin (and Faliscan) shows two alternative endings, long *ī* and *-osio*. The Sabellian languages have all extended the original *i*-stem genitive ending *-eis* (which is lost in Latin) to the *o*-stem declension.
- 5 The future tense is formed differently in Latin from Sabellian. In Latin, and in Faliscan, the future is formed with a suffix **-b-* or with **ē*, whereas Sabellian languages employ the suffix **-s-*: Umbrian *habiest* ‘he will have’, **ferest** ‘he will carry’.

- 6 The formation of the verbal ‘infinitive’. Latin forms infinitives with a suffix **-si*, Sabellian with a suffix **-om*. Compare the different infinitives formed for the verb ‘to be’ (stem *es-* (**h₁es-*)), and ‘to fine’ (stem *moltā-*):
- Latin *esse* < **es-si* Sabellian **esom* > Oscan *ezum*, Umbrian **eru**
 Latin *multare* < **moltāsi* Sabellian **moltāom* > Oscan *moltaum*
- 7 Although Latin and Sabellian share the creation of a *perfectum* stem through the amalgamation of PIE perfect and aorist stems, the actual creation of individual stems is at variance for most verbs for which we have both Latin and Sabellian examples (see 2.3.3 above).

Vocabulary

Finally, the difference between Latin and Sabellian is most marked in the choice of vocabulary. The following list presents some of the differences the two groups show in their basic vocabulary items:

	Latin	Sabellian
‘son’	<i>filius</i>	Oscan puklum (accusative), Paelignian <i>puclois</i> (dative plural)
‘daughter’	<i>filia</i>	Oscan futír
‘man’	<i>uir</i>	South Picene nír , Oscan niir , Umbrian <i>nerf</i> (accusative plural)
‘fire’	<i>ignis</i>	Umbrian pir , Oscan pur-asiaí
‘water’	<i>aqua</i>	Umbrian utur
‘all’	<i>omnis</i>	Oscan sullus (nominative plural), Paelignian <i>solois</i> (dative plural)
‘house’	<i>domus</i>	Oscan tríibúm
‘people’	<i>populus</i>	South Picene toúta , Umbrian <i>tot-</i> , Oscan túvt-
‘justice, judge’	<i>ius, iudex</i>	Umbrian <i>mers</i> , Oscan meddíss , Volscian <i>medix</i> , Marsian <i>medis</i>

The choice between the two rival theories has generated much discussion among linguists, and it has been held to have important ramifications for the historian of the Latin language. For if Latin and Sabellian were once united as ‘Italic’ languages then we should be careful that any explanations of Latin phenomena pay due attention to Sabellian phenomena, whereas if the similarities between them are secondary, then we should seek to avoid following an explanation which uses Sabellian data which may in fact be misleading. The explanation of the Latin imperfect ending *-bā-* is a case in point. Should we attempt to use Oscan **fufans**

as a means to arriving at the origin of this formation, or should we be wary of seeing a similarity between the forms?

We have already seen in this chapter that there are reasons for supposing that Latin and the Sabellian languages shared some common phonological developments around the middle of the first millennium BC, including the syncope of short vowels owing to a word-initial stress accent, and phenomena such as the change of intervocalic **s > r* in Latin and the north Sabellian language Umbrian (but not in the southern Oscan) may also be related. We have also seen how the spread of Roman power led to the borrowing of some Latin vocabulary and may have also contributed to the creation of Oscan formulae and syntactic structures towards the end of the Republican period. There are therefore some developments that can be explained through contact. Is it possible, however, to explain all the similarities between Latin and Sabellian as convergence phenomena? Could the shared innovation of morphological markers, such as the new past-marked subjunctive formant **-sē-*, have arisen through contact and bilingualism? We suggested above at 2.3.3 that the creation of a past-marked subjunctive accords well with the shared development of a legalistic, bureaucratic and religious idiom which took place in the cultural contact of the first millennium BC. Does the linguistic evidence support this hypothesis?

Comparative linguistic studies on living languages have shown that inflectional markers are only borrowed between languages where there is a prolonged period of bilingualism or extraordinary social conditions. Well-known cases of morphological borrowing include those of Asia Minor Greek which borrowed Turkish morphemes through centuries of bilingualism, and mixed languages such as Menyĵ Aleut (Copper Island Aleut) or Mitchif which both originated as the language spoken by the offspring of fathers speaking a common language (respectively Russian and French) and mothers speaking another (Aleut and Cree) (see Thomason and Kaufman 1988 for these examples). The periods of linguistic contact that we know about between the speakers of Latin and Sabellian language do not seem to have been of this intensity. We have seen already that onomastic evidence suggests that from the seventh century onwards, speakers of languages other than Etruscan adopted Etruscan citizenship and, presumably, they or their descendants also switched to speaking Etruscan. It is possible that such 'sideways mobility' also took place among the other communities of Italy. However, in the case of Etruscan, the influence of non-native speakers on the language seems not to have been profound. There is no evidence for any morphological borrowing between Etruscan and any other language of Italy that we know about, except in the case of some derivational suffixes. Rix (1994) has argued that the absence of any morphological borrowing between Etruscan and Latin or Etruscan

and Sabellian makes it more difficult to accept that the Latin and Sabellian agreements arise through contact. This is a valid point, but we should note that morphological borrowing takes place more easily among closely related languages, as Latin and the Sabellian varieties were. Moreover, closely related languages in contact may also extend the use of shared inherited material in similar ways. We might also question the assumption that the level of contact between Etruscan and Latin was similar to that between Latin and Sabellian. In the absence of concrete data, we may consider the picture of the origin of Rome as presented by the Romans themselves. The Roman sources for the history of early Rome are nowadays considered with a healthy scepticism, and their value as evidence has been largely discredited by methodologically unsound attempts to relate them to archaeological findings. However, the treatment of Etruscan and Sabellian in the Roman tradition is of interest. Prominent Etruscans, such as Lucumo and Mastarna, do feature in the traditional stories of early Rome, but the Sabines play a much more important role, and the story of the rape of the Sabine women is indicative that the Romans themselves thought that there had once been an especially intense interaction between the Romans and a Sabellian people (and may recall to us the scenarios sketched out above for the creation of ‘mixed languages’).

The conclusion to these arguments must therefore remain disappointingly vague. On the available evidence, it is possible that at some point in their prehistory Latin and Sabellian did form a subgroup of Indo-European, but this cannot be the only explanation for all the similarities between them, since some developments, such as the adoption of an initial stress accent and concomitant vowel weakening or syncope, clearly reflect more recent phenomena. Every shared feature found in Latin and Sabellian must be examined closely to see whether it is better explained as the result of contact or earlier genetic unity – or indeed, whether it does reflect a shared feature at all. As we have seen, some of the phonological agreements between the languages could in fact be independent developments.

Most of the discussion of the relationship between Latin and Sabellian concentrates on explaining their similarities. But since all the varieties are descended from PIE, and none has features which are at odds with other western IE languages, and they are attested at around the same point in time in close proximity, the similarities perhaps do not so much require an explanation as the dissimilarities. This is especially the case if Latin and Sabellian derive from Proto-Italic. In order to answer the question of how the divergences between the languages evolved one must first ask how old the divergences are. Devoto’s famous dictum (1944: 67) ‘*le affinità fra latino e osco-umbro sono recenti, le diversità sono antiche*’ (‘the affinities

between Latin and Osco-Umbrian are recent, the divergences are old') cannot tell the whole story. We have seen that one of the principal areas of divergence is in the formation of the *perfectum* stem; Latin generally chooses a different stem form for the *perfectum* than Sabellian, even when they share the same inherited verb. We argued in the last chapter that the merger of the aorist and the perfect as the new *perfectum* in Latin was likely to be late, since there were still survivals of aorist stems alongside perfect stems in Early Latin. There is nothing to suggest that the formation of the future is not a late divergence either, particularly if we follow the explanation for the Latin imperfect subjunctive marker *-sē- sketched out above, which entails that Latin at one time also had futures formed with *-s- (these may survive in an altered form as the *faxo* formations of Early Latin). None of the other divergences listed above is easily dated with any confidence, but there is no need to see any of them as extremely old either.

If the differences between Latin and Sabellian are in fact relatively recent, how should we explain this? Rix (1994) sets up a complex model of pre-history. By this theory, both Latin and Sabellian derive from Proto-Italic, but this language was spoken not in Italy, but in southern Austria. Three subsequent waves of migration, each separated by a century or more from the last, led to the separate branches Latin, Venetic and Sabellian entering Italy. It is not clear, however, that the data really justify such a radical hypothesis of migration, with each language group patiently waiting its turn to move into Italy. Recent studies of ancient Italy have tried to explain ethnic diversity in ways other than through 'waves of invaders', a model which itself derives from ancient accounts of prehistory (Dench 1995: 186f.). An alternative explanation for the Latin/Sabellian differences could be based on sociolinguistics. In Roman accounts of their own history there is a self-conscious distancing from the peoples who lived in and beyond the Apennines, who are generally portrayed as wild men of the mountains, or inhabitants of an Arcadian idyll (Dench 1995: 67–108). We cannot say how ancient this tradition is, but it may have its origins in the eighth century BC. Urban settlements arose earlier in Latium than in the central Apennines, and the inhabitants of Rome came into very early contact with the Etruscans and Greeks and with them a very different cultural environment from that of the peoples to the east. The earliest Greek accounts of the inhabitants of Italy occurs in Hesiod (*Theogony* 1010f.), who names the two sons of Odysseus and Circe who ruled over the 'Tyrrhenians' as *Latīnos* and *Ágrīos*. These lines may be a post-Hesiodic interpolation (West 1966: 436 judges them to be sixth century BC on the basis that this is when the Mainland Greeks are likely to have known about the Etruscans), but it is significant that the names of the kings translate as 'Latin' and 'wild man' reflecting a

perceived deviation between the Latins (and/or Etruscans) and their neighbours. If the notion that the speakers of Sabellian languages were wild and uncivilized goes back as far as the eighth century, it could help explain some of the linguistic divergences between Latin and Sabellian. A Roman desire to differentiate themselves from their neighbours may have led to their choice of linguistic forms which were not found in Sabellian, and the innovation of new linguistic features.

The above account must be treated with caution. As we have already seen, there are also many areas of linguistic convergence in central Italy from the seventh–fifth century BC, and not all the divergences between Latin and Sabellian can be dated as late as the beginnings of Greek contact and the rise of urbanism in Latium in the eighth century. Some features may well be explained in this way – the development of voiced stops from voiced aspirates in medial position in Latin, for example; we have already noted the presence of medial *-ʃ* in Faliscan texts from the seventh century on and in Latin dialects outside Rome (see also Devoto 1944: 97f. on ‘anti-Sabine’ developments in archaic Latin). But for other features, we do not have sufficient evidence to judge. It is possible that we are projecting back into the archaic period a dichotomy between *urbanitas* and *rusticitas*, which, as we shall see in the following chapters, was to become of importance in the definition of Latin in the last centuries of the Republic.

References

- Adams, J. N. (2003) *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Agostiniani, L. (1982) *Le ‘Iscrizioni Parlanti’ dell’Italia Antica*. Florence: Olschki.
- Agostiniani, L. and F. Nicosia (2000) *Tabula Cortonensis*. Roma: Bretschneider.
- Bailo Modesti, G. (1984) ‘Lo scavo nell’abitato antico di Pontecagnano e la coppa con l’iscrizione *amina[. . .]*’. *AION-ArchStAnt* 6, 215–45.
- Bugno, M., C. Masseria and P. Poccetti, (2001) *Il Mondo Enotrio Tra VI e V Secolo a.C.: Atti dei Seminari Napoletani (1996–1998)*. Napoli: Loffredo.
- Campanile, E. (1993) ‘L’uso storico della linguistica italiana: l’osco nel quadro della koiné mediterranea e della koiné italiana’ in Helmut Rix (ed.) *Oskisch-Umbrisch: Texte und Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 26–35.
- Coleman, R. G. G. (1996) ‘Conditional clauses in the Twelve Tables’ in H. Rosén (ed.), *Aspects of Latin: Papers from the Seventh International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Jerusalem, April 1993*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität, 403–21.
- Cornell, T. J. (1995) *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c.1000–264 BC)*. London: Routledge.
- Cristofani, M. (1996) *Etruschi e Altre Genti nell’Italia Preromana: Mobilità in Età Arcaica*. Roma: Bretschneider.

- Dench, E. (1995) *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of Peoples from the Central Apennines*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Devoto, G. (1944) *Storia della Lingua di Roma* (2nd edn.). Bologna: Capelli. (Reprinted with new introduction by A. L. Prosdocimi, 1983, Bologna: Capelli.)
- Heidermanns, F. (2002) 'Nominal composition in Sabellic and proto-Italic'. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 100.2, 185–202.
- Klingenschmitt, G. (1992) 'Das lateinische Nominalflexion' in O. Panagl and T. Krisch (eds.), *Latein und Indogermanisch: Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Salzburg, 23–26 September 1986*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität, 89–135.
- Marinetti, Anna (1985) *Le Iscrizioni Sudpiceni I*. Florence: Olschki.
- Meiser, G. (1992) 'Syncretism in Indo-European languages: Motives, process and results'. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 90, 187–218.
- Meiser, G. (1993a) 'Das Gerundivum im Spiegel der italischen Onomastik' in F. Heidermanns, H. Rix and E. Seebold (eds.), *Sprachen und Schriften des antiken Mittelmeerraums: Festschrift für Jürgen Untermann zum 65 Geburtstag*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität, 255–68.
- Meiser, G. (1993b) 'Uralische Modussyntax: zur Genese des Konjunktiv Imperfekt' in Helmut Rix (ed.), *Oskisch-Umbrisch: Texte und Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 167–95.
- Meiser, G. (1996) 'Accessi alla protostoria delle lingue sabelliche' in *La Tavola di Agnone nel Contesto Italiano: Convegno di Studi, Agnone, 13–15 aprile 1994*. Firenze: Olschki, 187–209.
- Meiser, G. (1998) *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Meiser, G. (2003) *Veni Vidi Vici: Die Vorgeschichte des lateinischen Perfektsystems*. Zetemata Monographien zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Heft 113. München: Beck.
- Poccetti, P. (1982) 'Il testamento di Vibio Adirano'. *RAAN* 57, 237–45.
- Poccetti, P. (1988) 'Lingua e cultura dei Brettii' in P. Poccetti (ed.), *Per un'Identità Culturale dei Brettii*. Napoli: Istituto universitario orientale, Dipartimento di studi del mondo classico e del Mediterraneo antico, 11–158.
- Rix, H. (1963) *Das Etruskische Cognomen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Rix, H. (1972) 'Zum Ursprung des römisch-mittelitalischen Gentilnamensystems' in H. Temporini et al. (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* I, 2. Berlin/New York, 700–58.
- Rix, H. (1983) 'Umbro e Proto-Osco-Umbro' in Edoardo Vineis (ed.), *Le Lingue Indoeuropee di Frammentaria Attestazione = Die indogermanischen Restsprachen: atti del Convegno della Società italiana di glottologia e della Indogermanische Gesellschaft, Udine, 22–24 settembre 1981*. Pisa: Giardini, 91–107.
- Rix, H. et al. (1991) *Etruskische Texte: Editio Minor*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Rix, H. (1994) 'Latein und Sabellich: Stammbaum und/oder Sprachbund'. *Incontri Linguistici* 17, 13–29.

- Rix, H. (1996) Review of P. Schrijver (1991) *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*, *Kratylos* 41, 153–63.
- Rix, H. (2002) *Sabellische Texte: Die Texte des Oskischen, Umbrischen und Südpikenischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Salway, B. (1994) 'What's in a name? A survey of Roman Onomastic Practice from c.700 B.C. to c.700 A.D.' *Journal of Roman Studies* 84, 124–45.
- Smith, C. J. (1996) *Early Rome and Latium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Steinbauer, D. (1993) 'Etruskisch-ostitalische Lehnbeziehungen' in H. Rix (ed.), *Oskisch-Umbrisch: Texte und Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 287–306.
- Stuart-Smith, J. (1996) 'Phonetic constraints on breathy voiced stops as a cause of their development'. *Oxford University Working Papers in Linguistics, Philology and Phonetics* 1, 100–110.
- Stuart-Smith, J. (2004) *Phonetics and Phonology: Sound Change in Italic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thomason, S. G. and T. Kaufman (1988) *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. University of California Press: Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Untermann, J. (2000) *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Vine, B. (1998) 'Remarks on the archaic Latin "Garigliano Bowl" inscription'. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 121, 257–262.
- Watkins, C. (1995) *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Watmough, M. M. T. (1997) *Studies in the Etruscan Loanwords in Latin*. Florence: Olschki.
- Whatmough, J. (1937) *The Foundations of Roman Italy*. London: Methuen.
- West, M. L. (1966) *Hesiod Theogony, Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.