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11 The Italic Languages

Domenico Silvestri

Introduction
The label ‘Italic languages’ is nowadays used to refer collectively to a group of IE languages, which does not include Latin (cf. Jones 1950; Beeler 1952, 1966; Jeffers 1973) which are attested exclusively – apart from a restricted handful of glosses and place-names (cf. Pellegrini 1978; Silvestri 1982, 1985, 1986) transmitted via Greek and Latin – in epigraphic corpora from ancient Italy which vary considerably with respect to the extent and nature of the texts. The philological and linguistic study of these corpora, as well as the need to place them in a historical framework, requires a great deal of caution regarding the adoption of earlier language-name labels based on the ancient names of tribes whose territory corresponds roughly to that of the epigraphic documentation. Moreover, ‘Italic’ is also clearly more a political (Social War) concept than a linguistic one, but it is in fact the linguistic evidence which leads us to use this simple term – for want of anything better – to refer collectively to Oscan, Umbrian, South Picene (the latter more closely related to Umbrian) and some minor languages, inappropriately termed ‘dialects’ in handbook practice, and which are identifiable as being located in the territories of the Paeligni, the Vestini, the Marrucini, the Marsi, the Volsci and, perhaps of the Aequi, territories to which the umbrella term ‘Central Italic linguistic area’ might be applied (for collections of tests and for handbooks, cf., in general, Vetter 1953, Bottiglioni 1954; Pisani 1964 (2nd edn); Poccetti 1979; on South Picene in particular, cf. Marinetti 1985).

However, the languages in this brief list do not exhaustively cover the complex linguistic mosaic of ancient Italy, although they do constitute an essential and pre-eminent part of its make-up. If we leave aside the two major dominant languages, Latin and Greek, and the many important influences they had on the Italic languages (cf. Lazzeroni 1965, 1972; Campanile 1976; Prosdocimi 1976) – yet bear in mind the Latin of ancient Rome and its extra-urban form – and also leave aside a few languages which were certainly imported, but did not undergo a period of prolonged naturalization (Mycenaean Greek in early Latium, according to Peruzzi 1980; Punic in Sardinia and Sicily, cf. Guzzo Amadasi 1978), we find that the linguistic ‘stage’ becomes crowded, with a number of ‘extras’ circling round a few undisputed ‘leading lights’. Foremost among the latter, Etruscan, with a large number of inscriptions, is the most important of the non-IE languages of ancient Italy.
Prominent among the IE languages, are Venetic in north-east Italy (cf. Pellegrini and Prosdocimi 1967; Lejeune 1974) and Messapian in the south-east (present-day Puglia) (cf. De Simone 1972; Santoro 1982–4), both of which are richly attested. Here, too, the picture may be completed with a list of the ‘minor’ languages: in northern Italy we have attestations of ‘Ligurian’, ‘Lepontic’ and ‘Gaulish’ (mainly or wholly Indo-European), ‘Camunian’ and ‘Rhaetic’ (mainly or wholly non-Indo-European) (cf. Tibiletti Bruno 1978a, 1978b); in central Italy the language of the inscription of Novilara (‘North Picene’) only vaguely resembles Etruscan (cf. Durante 1978), while Faliscan is a Latin idiom with strong ‘rustic’ connotations (due to Umbrian influence; cf. Giaconelli 1963, 1978); in Sicily, finally, we can recognize the independence of Sicel (cf. Zamboni 1978) and, perhaps, of Elymian (cf. Ambrosini 1968, 1970, 1971; Agostiniani 1987), both IE languages (the latter tentatively compared with the Anatolian languages), while other epigraphic attestations seem to suggest elements that are Italic (Mendolito; cf. Prosdocimi 1979) and positively Latin (Montagna di Marzo; cf. Ambrosini 1984).

Phonetic Development

In order to pinpoint the prehistoric and proto-historic situation of the Italic languages within the IE language family, it will be useful to stress that the undisputed (and numerous) connections with Latin are largely the result of late processes of convergence and do not therefore bear witness to the existence of any ‘intermediate unity’ at the prehistoric level. Moreover, certain similar phonetic developments in Latin and Goidelic on the one hand, and Italic and British on the other, invalidate the equally mechanistic theory of a broader intermediate ‘Italo-Celtic’ unity. In fact all those languages that are related genetically (which do not converge solely by virtue of linguistic ‘leagues’) may be compared without adopting rigid evolutionary schemes of the vertical type (cf. Silvestri 1981: 165–7). In this sense the Italic IE entity is, primarily, of the Western (more precisely North-western) type, and here we may talk of a ‘Old-European’ formative phase, certainly earlier than the second millennium. Second, and at a more recent prehistoric level, we must take account of isoglosses with the Germanic languages and with Greek (particularly significant are those of the lexical type, which reflect the rise and spread of definite cultural concepts (cf. Pisani 1952; Delfino 1958)); third and finally, it will be necessary to position the subsequent formative processes of the proto-historical period within the framework (and diverse configuration) of the ‘linguistic league of ancient Italy’ (cf. Pisani 1978), in which Latin, Greek (of the colonies) and Etruscan play a full part, and with which Messapian, Venetic and other minor languages are by no means unconnected.
The Italic Languages

It is clear that Oscan and Umbrian, that is, the two Italic languages with the most consistent epigraphic corpora, although closely related, cannot be reduced to diatopic varieties of a single historical language. More difficult (or perhaps simply less clearly defined) is the discussion of the so-called ‘minor’ languages, which some sort of mental indolence has often led scholars to measure in terms of greater or lesser ‘distance’ from the two major linguistic poles, in certain cases with theories of the superimposition of the one over the other (and consequent stratification), as if Oscan and Umbrian could be taken to exist out of their historical context and used in dangerous inter-linguistic alchemies, while in fact they represent phenomenologically quite distinct realities. Umbrian, in fact, is principally the language of one text (the famous seven tables of Gubbio, which contain around 4,500 words): Oscan, on the other hand (and we should not forget that since antiquity the term has been used to refer only to the language) is the gradual result of a process of linguistic homogenization starting from various autonomous languages of central-southern Italy, and is therefore not the language of a single text, but rather that of a complex multipolar process of textual production. We may suppose that the scribes possessed specific awareness of this, as shown by certain Paelignian inscriptions. Anything that falls outside these two different emerging forms and so appears as an idiosyncratic Italic entity is thus very interesting. In such cases it is not by chance that attestations go further back in time, that is to before the processes just referred to as in the case of South Picene, which appears to be Italic and which introduces the ‘Sabine’ dimension into Italic (cf. Marinetti 1981, 1985), a dimension which is neither monocentric, as in Umbrian, nor polycentric, as in Oscan, but which in recent studies has come to be viewed increasingly as thoroughly ‘national’, that is, corresponding more closely to the oldest form of Italic ethnic self-identification.

Vestinian, Marrucinian and above all Paelignian are not just direct continuations or localized fragmentations of this ‘national’ dimension, but later ‘replicas’ of it, in some cases with archaizing ‘temptations’, having an ‘anti-Latin’ function and easily realizable with Oscan linguistic ingredients.

Documentation

The oldest stage of textual documentation in Italic languages (seventh to sixth centuries BC) can be seen in the inscription from Poggio Sommavilla (in the area of ancient Capena), in two ‘Proto-Campanian’ inscriptions from Nocera and Vico Equense (sixth century BC), and in three South Picene inscriptions from Penna S. Andrea (Teramo). In these we can see the outline of a pre-Oscan, pre-Umbrian Italic entity which it is perhaps not too far-fetched to define as ‘Proto-Sabine’, when we consider, too, the fact that this ethnic
name, which probably represents the ‘national’ Italic name, indeed appears in first direct attestation in the South Picene inscriptions.

The main documentation of Oscan extends from Messina (where it had been imported by the Mamertini, mercenaries in the service of Agathocles), through Bruttium and Lucania and part of the Apulian area (excluding ancient Calabria, corresponding to the Salentine peninsula), to Campania, Samnium and the territory of the Frentani (South Adriatic Abruzzo). The documentation is substantially uniform, with obvious dialectal features. Amongst the documents or the major groups of inscriptions one might mention the following: the inscriptions of the Lucanian sanctuary at Rossano di Vaglio, the Tabula Bantina (Apulia, beginning of the first century BC, the most extensive Oscan document hitherto discovered), the inscriptions of Pompeii (including the ‘eituns’ inscriptions), the Cippus Abellanus, the so-called iuvilas from Capua, the texts from Agnone and from Pietrabbondante, and so on. In the Central Italic linguistic area we should mention the Tabula Veliterna (Volscian), the Bronze of Rapino (Marrucinian) and the Herentas inscription (Paelignian). Finally it will be useful to stress once more the great importance of the South Picene corpus, both from a purely linguistic point of view and for its historico-cultural implications, and, passing over some minor inscriptions, to recognize in the Tables of Gubbio (produced between the second and first centuries BC) the most important epigraphic monument not only of Umbrian but of the whole of ancient Italy (cf. Prodocimi 1984). The content of the seven tables concerns a complex ritual which includes ceremonies with sacrifices and offerings to various deities as well as rules relating to the running of the college of the Atiedian brethren, who are appointed to perform the ceremonies. Texts may be written either in an epichoric alphabet, derived like the Latin one from Etruscan, or in Latin alphabet, or in the ‘Magna Graecia’ in an ionic-tarantine Greek alphabet.

Common Italic

With the reservations just expressed in relation to a different arrangement of the historical and institutional contexts of the documentation (on these ideas cf. Silvestri 1987), it seems possible to pose here the problem of a Common Italic. However, this is certainly not to be seen as a prehistoric language that can largely be reconstructed, but rather as a set of pre-documentation linguistic features characterized by an undisputed degree of cohesion, to be seen not in a genealogical framework, but as the result of prehistoric and proto-historic processes of convergence. These convergences are exemplified by a number of sound laws, that also occur in Latino-Faliscan, and seem very early. Among these we should mention the development of the diphthong -eu- to -ou-, the vocalization to or, ol of the sonants r and l, the formation of a class of voiced fricatives as reflexes of original voiced aspirates (following the traditional formulation of the IE consonant system, but see below), the change...
of the cluster -tl- into -kl- word-internally, the assimilation of the sequence p ... kω to kω ... kω, the voicing of intervocalic -s-, etc. It should be made clear that the phenomena mentioned here have later, specific historical developments in the individual languages. In order to produce an outline of commonItalic (excluding Latin) let us now examine some morphological features,
which will also be useful for a more detailed characterization, although again without any claim to completeness. In the noun we may note the endings *-rs, *-ns (> -rr -f) in the nominative singular of -r and -n stems, the genitive singular ending -eis of the o-stems and consonant stems (following the i-stem paradigm), the accusative singular ending -om in the consonant stems (following the o-stem paradigm). Also notable are the conservation of the endings *-ös, *-äs in the nominative plural of the o- and a-stems respectively, and the analogical diffusion of these endings in the pronominal declension. Striking features of the pronoun system are the presence of the stem ek(s)o- as against Lat. hic and the accusative ending -om in Umbro tiom 'you', Osc. siom 'oneself'. In the verb, finally, we may note the secondary third-person plural active ending in -ns, the passive forms in -r of the type Osc. loufir, Umbr. ier, ferar, the infinitive ending in -om in the active, Umbr. -fi, Osc. -fīr in the mediopassive and the formation of the future with the suffix -s- (and of the future perfect with the suffix -us-). However, Oscan and Umbrian differ, for example, in the formation of the dative plural of the consonant stems (in Oscan there is levelling on the basis of the i-stems, in Umbrian on the basis of the u-stems) and in the formation of different types of the perfect of the 'weak' verbs. The features mentioned here show a marked tendency to analogical innovation in the Italic languages and together pose the problem of whether the reconstruction of a Common Italic ('Proto-Osco-Umbrian' as Rix 1983 calls it) is possible. The answer to this question is only partially positive: such a reconstruction is possible only as long as the documented data coincide; otherwise, if we wish to pursue this end, we must have recourse to other IE languages or to reconstructed Indo-European itself, following a procedure which will then no longer consist merely of reconstruction, but also of meta-historical 'integration'.

Also Rix notes the problematical nature of a similar procedure, on defining his Proto-Italic alias 'Proto-Osco-Umbrian',

the chronological distance between Proto-Osco-Umbrian and Proto-Indo-European is great, around two and a half millennia; equally the grammatical difference is marked. The distance would decrease, and our knowledge of the pre-history of the 'Italic' languages increase, if Proto-Italic had existed and could be reconstructed. This Proto-Italic would have to satisfy two conditions: (a) it would have to be compatible both with Latin and with Osco-Umbrian and (b) it would have to be different from Proto-Indo-European. The decision as to whether such a proto-language can be reconstructed or not depends not on opinions but on the results of a long series of detailed attempts at reconstruction.

(Rix 1983: 104)

The phenomena described here and, in more general terms, the description of the most important phonological, morphological, lexical and syntactic features
of the Italic languages present the problem of their periodization or, at least, of the establishment of their relative chronology. Here, too, we must state that opinions (genetic relationship vs affinity through contact) count for less than facts, depending in particular on the amount of documentary evidence there is to support them. For example, some Umbrian phonetic features (palatalization of $k$ to $\check{s}$ [ʃ], $l$- becoming $v$-, monophthongizations, the change of $d$ to $\check{r}$ [r], etc.) certainly belong to an early chronological stage (by virtue of their presence in Umbrian names which passed into Etruscan at an early point; cf. Meiser 1986: 10), but, being innovations exclusive to Umbrian, they cannot be taken back to a very old prehistoric phase: conversely, the creation of a class of voiced fricatives certainly belongs to such a phase, since the original existence of these may be inferred not only from the common Osco-Umbrian developments, but also from the developments peculiar to Latin. Here we shall therefore refrain from using diachronic labels (of the type ‘old’, ‘middle’, ‘new/modern/late’ and so on) and by refraining from structuring divisions of history in terms of a proto-history and a history that are inevitably incomplete on the documentary level, we shall attempt to introduce such depths of perspective into a comprehensive framework as seem appropriate and possible.

**General Phonological Features**

Among these, the *accent* is worthy of particular mention, with regard to its nature and its position. It tends to fall on the initial syllable of a word and is always strongly dynamic, as is clear, on the one hand, from the preservation of the long vowel quantity in initial syllables or, indeed, from lengthening phenomena in this position; and, on the other hand, from extensive instances of *syncope* which, in contrast with Latin, involve not only the antepenultimate and the penultimate, but also the final syllables of words: Thus we have, on the one hand, Oscan *faamai fluusai* (transcription in bold indicates a form written in the epichoric alphabet; $i = [e]$) with the vowel of the initial syllable written twice and an etymological long vowel, a phenomenon which is not encountered in other syllabic positions, the exceptions being Osc. *tristaamentud* and ãFãωapetð (both compounds showing the analysis of the second element) and Osc. *diiviai* with short $i$. On the other hand we have forms such as Oscan nominative plural *akkatus* (cf. Lat. *advocatus*), Umbr. *perca* (cf. Lat. *pertica*), Osc. *hûrz* (cf. Lat. *hortus*; $u = [o]$, $z = [ts]$). In reality the three instance of syncope mentioned here cannot all be conditioned by the same initial position; hence the syllabic reduction ‘rule’ can be reformulated thus: the syllable immediately following the accent is deleted, according to two different manifestations, of which the first – of earlier relative chronology – allows for accent on the penultimate and apocope in the final syllable (of the type *hûrz* < *hûrtos*, cf. also *tuvtikos* < *toulikos* and, for a later reduction, Umbr. *todco*, *toce*), while the second, linked to the initial accent, exclusively affects vowels in medial syllables (cf. Prosdocimi 1986: 611–12). Largely connected with these
processes of syncope are cases of vocalic *epenthesis* (or anaptyxis), very rare in Umbrian but well represented in Oscan, where they occur mainly in consonant groups containing a liquid or nasal. It does not seem possible, though, to establish any greater or lesser incidence of the phenomenon according to the relative position of the liquid/nasal with respect to the stop (or other articulation) of the consonant cluster. However, it can be stated that the epenthesis occurs regularly only after a short open syllable and that the quality of the epenthetic vowel is the same as that of the vowel of the preceding or following syllable (cf. Schmid 1954). Examples of this are: Osc. *paterei* 'father (dat. sg.)', (but *maatreis* 'mother (gen. sg.)', Osc. *aragetud* 'silver (abl. sg.)', *salavs* 'safe (nom. sg.)', etc. There is no doubt that accentual and related phenomena have specific culminative and delimiting functions in the Italic languages; in more general terms, on the behaviour of phonemes in word-initial and final position, see Untermann (1968) (who is very enlightening on this).

**Vowels**

The IE vowels, at least those in tonic syllables, tend to be preserved intact in Osco-Umbrian, if we disregard a phenomenon whereby € < [i] and ō < [u]. This phenomenon, which is not conditioned by the position of the accent, is evident in cases such as Osc. *patir* > *pätér* (note, incidentally, the development of € to a, as in Latin) and Osc. *dunum* (beside Lat. *donum*). However, the variation between ā and o (for example in Umbr. *Tesenocirle*/*Tesenakes*, dat. pl., with old ā in the penultimate syllable) is conditioned by the accent (not exclusively the initial accent, see above). One consequence of the initial accent is the Pan-Italic development of -ā to open -o (spellings: Osc. ú, o; Umbr. a, u, o). We can perhaps place the uncertainty between o and a in initial syllables within the same interpretative framework, if we assume that the quality a is tonic and o atonic (e.g. Osc. *kahad* beside Lat. *incohäre*, but Umbr. *hostatu* beside Lat. *hastätus*; uncertain – and suspect – is Pael. *hanustu* beside Lat. *honesta*, which could be the result of ethnolinguistic hyper-characterization). A special development of ā (from the third century BC onwards) after a dental consonant (t, d, n, s) is to be seen as a combinatory variant of this phoneme and consists in a process of palatalization (e.g. Osc. *tiurri* beside Lat. *turrim*). Taking these factors into account, although they do not exhaust the whole range of the vowel phonemes, the Italic vowel system may be represented as a system with seven members.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
 i & u \\
 [e] & [o] \\
 [e] & [o]
\end{array}
\]

in which quality (the correlation of openness) is clearly more important than quantity (and this seems to fit in with the various vowel phenomena...
Sonants
The development of the IE sonants (*r, *l, *m, *ŋ-) poses no particular problems, in that it is broadly similar to what happens in Latin. We thus have the reflexes or, ol of *r, *l (see above) and em, en of *m, *ŋ (am, an in initial syllables) while the reflexes of the long sonants are different: they develop into ra, la, ma, na.

Diphthongs
The treatment of the original diphthongs, which are by no means negligible as regards vowels and connected phenomena, merits a brief mention, partly for its implications in Romance. Here we note a marked difference between Oscan and Umbrian, apart from the case of the shared early development of ew into ow which, as we have already seen, also affects Latin. Oscan in fact preserves the old diphthongs (e.g. kyaistur, deikum, múñikú, etc.), while Umbrian systematically shows monophthongization, by which even ou, the reflex of eu, becomes o, u (in both cases with the value of [o]). The languages of the Middle Italic area occupy a special position: Volscian, for example, exhibits monophthongization of ai- in esaristrom (from *aisaristrom ‘sacrifice’), while a Marsian form (i)ouies.pucle(s) (dat. pl.) ‘to the sons of Jupiter, i.e. the Dioscuri’, with monophthongization, contrasts with the Paelignian iouiois.puclois ‘id.’ with preserved diphthong. The South Picene (Penna S. Andrea) attestations are interesting: they show the coexistence of touta- and túta-, with undisputed monophthongization in the second case and probably [o].

Consonants
With respect to the traditional framework of IE consonants the most obvious Italic innovation consists in the special development of the voiced aspirate stops (*bh, *dh > f, *gh > h) in all positions. In this case the innovation is shared only in part by Latin, that shows the same development only in initial positions. There has also been much discussion as to whether this development presupposes an intermediate phase with voiceless aspirate stops (the Greek model) or with voiced fricatives as well as in connection with the resolution of problems of linguistic attribution for glosses or isolated forms or, in more general terms, within the context of more or less shared etymological hypotheses (cf. above all Martinet 1950; Szemerényi 1952–3). Less attention has been paid, however, to the fact that here, as also in the case of the vowels, we have a merger phenomenon, perhaps even more extensive if we consider that the phonemes that result (f, h) are phonetically similar and in some languages tend to become even closer and sometimes reach the stage of becoming interchangeable (as in the Faliscan and rustic Latin area, perhaps through Etruscan influence); in any case, the manner of production clearly
prevails over the place of articulation. Another considerable feature is the shift
of the IE labiovelars to labials: hence we have, for example, Oscan pis beside
Latin quis or, with the regressive assimilation already mentioned, Oscan
*pompe (recoverable from the derived form pumperia-) beside Latin
quinque. The other consonants tend to remain unchanged, apart from some
very specific cases of conditioned phonetic changes (on these, see below). On
the whole (and leaving aside the special case of the labiovelars) the primary
Italic developments (the creation of a class of voiceless fricatives alongside
the voiceless and voiced stops) are very similar to those of ‘Common
Germanic’ which obviously presuppose a completely different process of
development (cf. Chapter 13, Consonants, pp. 391–5).

Consonant System

Obviously, it is possible to restate the development of the Italic consonant
system (as far as the category of stops is concerned) in terms of the ‘New
Sound of Indo-European’ (cf. Baldi and Johnston-Staver 1989: 97–8). First,
this is a question of accepting the notion that the IE consonant system
contained glottalic consonants ( /p/, /t/, /k/ instead of /b/, /d/, /g/), voiced
consonants (possibly aspirated: /bh/, /dh/, /gh/ instead of /b/, /d/, /g/), and
voiceless consonants (possibly aspirated: /p/, /t/, /k/ instead of /l/,
/j/, /k/), following what is considered to be a more plausible typological
framework (Chapter 2, The Glottalic Theory, p. 38). Second, it is necessary
to take the Italic reflexes back to a scheme of development which may be
represented as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
p^\text{[h]} & t^\text{[h]} & k^\text{[h]} \quad > \quad p & t & k \\
b^\text{[h]} & d^\text{[h]} & g^\text{[h]} \quad > \quad f & h \\
\end{array}
\]

With this new approach to the problem of reconstructing the IE consonant
system, it now seems preferable to abandon once and for all the theory of an
intermediate ‘voiceless aspirate’ stage (which as such would have yielded p,
t, k) as a precursor of the articulations f, h. On the other hand, the idea of
intermediate voiced fricatives, which might also be (re)converted into voiced
stops, finds support not only in some Umbrian reflexes and in some regular
Latin developments, but also in the allophonic status of the Germanic voiced
fricatives beside the voiced stops deriving from the IE voiced aspirates
(according, of course, to the traditional framework).

Phonetic Development in Consonants

Other consonantal phenomena worthy of mention are a number of unusual
conditioned phonetic developments. Most notable are cases of palatalization
under the influence of a following j, attested above all in the Tabula Bantina,
by which l, r, t, d, k become ll, rr, s, z, x ( = ʃ); the spelling with double
consonant, in the case of the liquids, may be taken to indicate a phenomenon
already realized or, at least, in the process of development. Moreover, the phenomenon spreads throughout the entire Italic area (starting from an undoubtedly southern focal point) and is certainly old, because there are already traces of it in the South Picene texts: hence, for example, in Umbrian k and g (followed by e, i and j) palatalize to ĝ, ș ( = [ʃ]) and j respectively; something similar is probably suggested by the Paelignian spelling pellegie ‘read through’ (if it is correctly read); more obscure, at first sight, is Umbr. iiuvinas, iouina beside ikuvina (cf. Lat. Iguvium), but perhaps here the cause lies in the influence of the preceding i, rather than in any para-etymological assimilation to the name of Jove. The list could be extended (cf. Pisani 1954, Orioles 1972). Another conditioned phenomenon is the voicing of intervocalic s in Oscan, while in Umbrian (as in Latin) this combinatory variant is rephonologized to r (even in word-final position in the latter period). The intervocalic position is, moreover, the cause of a shift of -d- to -r-, to -rs- ( = [r]) in Umbrian, while an earlier stage of this process is no doubt represented by a special fricative d which can be seen in the Paelignian documentation. Finally we should mention some processes of assimilation (nd < nn, pan-Italic; mb < m, confined to Umbrian) which, together with the cases examined previously, clearly show how the necessary preconditions of various historical sound changes in the Italo-Romance dialect area are clearly present in Italic.

**Morphology**

In the Italic noun declension we see a simplification of the IE morphology, but this is not as radical as in other languages (e.g. Germanic). In fact, in the singular at least, the nominative, accusative, genitive, dative, ablative, locative and vocative survive (with only the instrumental being lost). Moreover, the tripartite gender distinction (masculine, feminine and neuter) is preserved, while the tripartite number distinction is reduced to the opposition of singular and plural through the almost total elimination of the dual.

**Nouns**

The IE stem classes (at least those of the older period) must all have had distinct semantic functions and we can still perceive traces of this at the level attained by comparison and reconstruction. However, these functional distinctions must already have been on the point of collapse in late IE and appear almost totally obscured in the Italic languages. Here we speak – as in Latin – of five declensions, but it should be made clear that the fourth (-u-stems) and above all the fifth (-ē-stems) are sparsely attested, while in the third, as in Latin, -i- stems and consonant stems fall together, although they preserve a greater independence. Table 11.1 gives some inflectional paradigms. Note that these show the presumed (later) IE antecedents, beside which the inflected Italic forms with their special phonetic developments are shown (note the rhotacism of Umbrian final -s ).
Table 11.1  First declension: -ä- stems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IE -ä</td>
<td>Osc. viú.</td>
<td>Nom. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE -ä</td>
<td>Osc. viú.</td>
<td>Nom. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE -ä</td>
<td>Osc. viú.</td>
<td>Nom. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
<td>Osc. -ä mutated to -ä mutu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plural

Nom. -äs - Osc. aasas, - Sertas - Umbr. iuengar
Acc. -äns - Osc. aass, - Serfis - Umbr. iuengar
Dat. -äis - Osc. aass, - Tefis - Umbr. iuengar
Abl. -äid - Osc. eitiuad, - Sertis - Umbr. iuengar
Gen. -äsöm - Osc. eitiuás, - Tefis - Umbr. iuengar
Loc. -äis - Osc. eitiuás, - Tefis - Umbr. iuengar

We should also mention the Paelignian dative singular in -ä, probably influenced by Latin (cf. Lazzeroni 1965).

Note that the genitive singular ending Osc. -eis, Umbr. -es, -er is formed analogically on that of the -/-stems of the third declension. This phenomenon could have been favoured by the reflexes of nominative -is and accusative -im of original -jo-stems. The second declension also includes neuter words with predictable reflexes (Osc. nom. acc. sg. sakaraklum from -om, pl. prúftü from -ä, cf. Umbr. persklum and vesklu, vesklu, uatu). In the third declension (-i-stems and consonant stems) one final analogical phenomenon should be mentioned: the inflection of the accusative singular of the consonantal stems has been re-formed on that of the -o-stems (hence Osc. aitalatum, leginum, Umbr. erietu, abrunu). Notable, finally, is the change of -u- stems to -i- stems in some forms of the fourth declension (e.g. Osc. acc. sg. manim, abl. sg. castrid, Umb. abl. sg. mani, although in the case of the
ablative forms we cannot preclude the possibility of a regular phonetic development; cf., for a reconstruction of the oldest phase of this declension, Lejeune 1972).

**Adjectives**

From a purely formal point of view, it is possible to take the Italic adjective back on the one hand to the first and second declensions (e.g. Osc. túvtiks 'publicus (nom. sg.)', and on the other hand to the third declension -i- stems e.g. Osc. sakrivm, m. and f. acc. sg.; but cf. also Umbr. sakra, f. acc. pl., Osc. sakrivist 'sacra est', etc.). The formation of the comparative and superlative does not differ greatly from familiar Latin-morphological processes (cf. Chapter 10, Degrees of Comparison of the Adjective, pp. 291–3). We note, however, in some cases, the accumulation of two suffixes: e.g. Osc. minstreis 'minoris', Umbr. mestru 'maior' from *min-is-tero- and *ma(g)-is-tero- respectively. In the superlative there occur almost exclusively terms denoting place or time, starting from pre- and postpositional elements (e.g. *pos-: Osc. pús-tr-eí 'in postero', pús-tm-as 'postremae'; *sub-: Osc. sup-r-uis 'superi', Umbr. sub-r-a 'supra', Umbr. somo from *sup-m-o 'summum').

**Determiners**

Of the IE deictic elements used either purely as determiners or as anaphoric pronouns, the best represented in the Italic languages is i-, e-, eo-leä- (corresponding to Latin is), which in the oblique cases exhibits various consonantal extensions (-s-, -sm-), and is in some cases redetermined, as a deictic, by the enclitic particle -k, -c (similar cases exist in Latin). The extended form Umbrian -ont -unt (and variants), marking identity, is also very interesting, while Oscan isidum (from *is-id-um; on this last morph cf. Umbr. on-t, un-t, mentioned above) shows the same semantic specialization; cf. also Lat. idem. Table 11.3 shows the paradigm of the attested forms, with the caveat that this reductio ad unum does not exclude the possibility that the speakers may have been conscious of a sort of pronominal ‘family’ with distinct semantic specializations by virtue of specific morphological arrangements.

We may note, amongst other features, the thematization in -i-/i- in the Oscan masculine and neuter nominative forms, in -e- in the corresponding Umbrian forms, with non-homogeneous extension to the other forms of the paradigm, where it competes with the thematization in -o- (in -a- in the feminine). This fact is worthy of attention since we have already noted other cases in which the second and third declension stems exhibit inter-paradigmatic interference. It will suffice here to give a mere indication of the other demonstrative pronouns (all with stems in -o, -a-): we have Osc. eko- (redetermined from ekso-, cf. Umbr. eso, Marrucinian esu-c) with the meaning ‘hic’; Umbr. uru, abl. sg., Osco. ūleis, gen. sg., cf. OLat olle (of identical etymological origin, if we accept that -l > -r- in Umbrian, cf. Pael. firata ‘line, row’) with the meaning ‘ille’; Umbr. esto-, with the meaning
Table 11.3 Determiners/anaphoric pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oscan</th>
<th></th>
<th>Umbrian</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>Neuter</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>iż-i-k</td>
<td>id-i-k</td>
<td>iż-u-k</td>
<td>er, ere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>id-i-k</td>
<td>iż-i-c</td>
<td>iż-i-c</td>
<td>er-e-k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iż-i-c</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>er-e-c</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>ion-c</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>fa-k</td>
<td>esmei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>eisúd</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>er-e-k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eizuc</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>er-e-k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eizeis</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>er-e-k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eizei</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>er-e-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eizei-c</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>er-e-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>eiseis</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>er-e-k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eizeis</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>er-e-k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eizei</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>er-e-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eizai</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eizai-c</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>ius-su</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>eur-ont</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iusu)</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ius-c</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>ioc</td>
<td>(Marrucinian)</td>
<td>eu, eo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>eizois</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>elsun-k</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>eizazun-c</td>
<td>er, ero(m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(on this summary, cf. Pisani 1964: 18–19)

‘iste’; Osc.—Umbr. esso- (cf. Osc. essuf, Umbr. esuf) with the meaning ‘ipse’. It should be understood that the meanings assigned here are based on the etymological evidence and in every case require precise textual verification.

**Interrogative, Relative and Indefinite**

The single morph *pi, po-lpa-* unites the IE functions of interrogative and indefinite, to which theItalic languages (like Latin and—among the Germanic languages—English and German) add the function of a relative. It is probable, however, that the ability to merge these functions goes back to IE times, since it is also reflected in some Sanskrit pronoun forms (e.g. *kas-cid* from *-kʷid* with the meaning ‘quisque’). Also notable in this context is Osc. *pútrús-pid* ‘utrique (nom. pl.),’ in which *-pid* (from *-kʷid*) appears as a form in competition with *-pe* (from *keʷe*) in Umbr. *putres-pe* ‘utriusque gen. sg.’. For the formation of the indefinite the Italic languages have recourse to the addition of *-um* (Osc. *pis-um, píd-um*, cf. Osc. *isidum* and see above) or to the particle *-i*. As in Latin, finally, the interrogative function in the nominative singular is covered by the form Osc. *pis, pis, píd* ‘quis, quid’, while the relative function competes with the form Osc. *pui, m., pai, f., púd, pod*, nt., corresponding exactly to Lat. *qui, quae, quod*. 
**Numerals**

The cardinal numerals from one to four are declinable (with some uncertainty in the case of four, unless we are willing to accept the idea that the form *petora* in Fest. 226 L (206 M.) is neuter, contrasting with Osc. *pettitur* (‘quattuor’, m. and f.)). In this case Italic would be, like Greek and Germanic, more conservative than Latin. ‘One’ is not continued directly in the cardinals (Umbr. *unu* has been wrongly taken to be ‘one’ since it means ‘ovinum, ovillum’); the attested ordinal form is Umbr. *prumum*, *promom* (but cf. also Pael. *prismu*, a feminine forename, in reality an adjective in the superlative degree meaning ‘first’). As regards ‘two’, as well as the obvious suppletion in the form of the ordinal (cf. Umbr. *etru*), it will suffice to cite the Umbrian forms nominative *dur*, accusative *tuf*, neuter *tuva* and to note the alternative forms *uli* in the compounds Umbr. *du-pursus*, dative plural ‘bipedibus’ and *di-fue*, neuter accusative singular ‘bifidum’. For ‘three’ the situation is as in Latin (cf. Osc. *tris*, Umbr. acc. *trif*, n. *tria* and the Umbr n. abl. sg. ordinal *tertiu*). ‘Four’ has already been discussed. We do not have direct attestation of the numerals from five to ten: ‘five’ is *pompe*, cf. the derivatives Osc. *pümperia*-*, Umbr. *pumpešias*; ‘six’ is in the derivative Umbr. *sestentasiaru* (gen. pl.); ‘seven’ does not appear to be attested even indirectly; ‘eight’ is, as an ordinal, in Uhtavis; ‘nine’ is, as a cardinal, in the Marsian *novesede* ‘Novensides’ cf. the ordinal Umbr. *nuvim*); ‘ten’ is in the compound Umbr. *desen-duf* ‘twelve’, as well as in the derivatives Osc. *dekkviarim*, Umbr. *tekvias*, etc. (Osc. *dekmanniús* seems to be derived from the ordinal form.) We have no attestation of ‘eleven’, while ‘twelve’ is Umbr. *desen-duf* with significant reversal of the order of constituents with respect to the Greek and Latin models. Other forms of numerals are not attested.

**Personal Pronouns**

The documentation is sparse, in that it is limited to the first two persons singular (1 sg.: Osc. *ív* ‘ego’; Umbr. *mehe* ‘mihi’; 2 sg.: Osc. *tiium, tíu* (nom. sg.) ‘tu’, Umbr. *tiom, tio, tiu* acc. sg.) ‘te’, as well as Osc. *tfei*, Umbr. *tefe*, *tefe* (dat. sg.) ‘tibi’, while the third-person singular, in its function as a reflexive pronoun, is attested in Osc. *sífei* ‘sibi’, Pael. *sefei*; Osc. *siom* ‘se’; Umbr. *seso* ‘sibi’. We note in *tiom* etc. and in *siom* the recurrence of the ubiquitous accusative singular reflex of the -o- stems. Paelignian *uus* ‘vos’ or ‘vobis’ is an isolated form. On the forms of the possessive pronouns, which are derived from personal pronouns, it is enough to say that they do not differ significantly from the morphological situation in Latin.

**Verb Conjugation**

In the Italic languages the IE system of verb morphology appears greatly simplified and is on the whole very similar to that of Latin. On the temporal axis there is a present tense, from which the future is formed by means of the morpheme -*s(e)-* and a perfect (formed in a variety of ways, see below), from
which the future perfect is derived by means of the morpheme -us(e)-. However, controversy surrounds the possible existence of an imperfect, since the form Oscan futans (attested in the Cippus Abellanus) is still a matter for debate (cf. Pisani 1963) and could in fact be a pluperfect (cf. Lejeune 1964). On the axis of mood the opposition is between the indicative, with zero morpheme, and the subjunctive (with the morpheme -a- in the present in all conjugations other than the first, where -e- occurs, as in Latin; the morpheme -se- in the imperfect; and the morpheme -e- in the perfect). Umbrian si, sins, and so on, forms of the verb ‘to be’ show the use of ancient optative in the function of subjunctive. The imperative, which has the same endings as Latin (apart from Umbr. 2 pl. and 3 pl. -tuta, -tutu, -tuto where -ta is morphologically difficult to interpret), is based on the present stem. Finally, there are two voices, active and mediopassive (the latter not corresponding exactly to the situation found in Latin).

In the active conjugation we have to distinguish between primary endings (1 sg. -o, 2 sg. -s, 3 sg. -t; 3 pl. -nt), used in the present, future and future perfect indicative; and secondary endings (1 sg. -m, 2 sg. -s, 3 sg. -d; 3 pl. -ns), used in the imperfect (or pluperfect, see above) and perfect indicative, as well as in all the tenses of the subjunctive. In the mediopassive conjugation we see the morpheme with -r- typical of ‘peripheral’ Indo-European Tocharian, Indo-Iranian, Armenian, Hittite, Celtic and Latin; this occurs in the present forms and, in part, those of the perfect (e.g. 3 sg. pres. -nter; also notable are the Umbrian forms in -ntur, restricted to the subjunctive only). Compare also forms such as Oscan sakrafir ‘to be consecrated’, Umbrian ferar ‘may it be carried’, etc.

Something must also be said about the substantival forms of the verb. The active infinitive is formed with the morpheme -om (markedly different from Latin and comparable specifically with some Greek endings of the Doric type); moreover, in Umbrian the forms pihaft, herifi, cehefl are very notable; these represent old prehistoric middle infinitives (cf. Gusmani 1966; Rix 1977), starting from an ending *-dhjöj, which is also continued in Sanskrit and Avestan. The gerundive (with -nn- from -nd-) is borrowed from Latin. The supine, present participle active (on the inflection of this cf. Lejeune 1986) and past participle passive do not differ from the Latin processes of formation. Finally, the two forms Oscan sipus ‘sciens’ and facus ‘factus’, rather than being perfect participles with active value, go back to the category of IE adjectives with ‘participial’ value (derived, by means of the suffix -u-, from verbal roots, cf. Gusmani 1970).

A separate discussion is necessary for the various forms of the perfect, which for good reason represents the best-attested verbal form (we must remember that our knowledge of forms is determined by the nature of the epigraphic evidence and what typically occurs in these texts). Notwithstanding numerous detailed studies, it is still not possible to claim that absolute clarity has been reached on the question. (There is essentially no adequate
explanation of the multiplicity of forms alongside their presumed uniformity of function.) In any case, the forms of the Italic perfect are as follows: perfects with reduplication (Osc. deded, Umbr. dede, cf. Lat. dedit); perfects with lengthening of the root vowel (Osc. upsed ‘operavit’, uupsens ‘operaverunt’ from ḍps- beside Osc. upssannum ‘operandum’ from ḍps-, cf. Lat. uēni, fēci); perfects in -f (Osc. aikdafed, aamaanaffed, Umbr. a-tera-f-us-t ‘circumdederit’, fut. perf.); perfects in -tt-, typical of the Oscan first conjugation (e.g. prufatted ‘probavit’), but present also in Paelignian coisatens ‘curaverunt’, while absent from Umbrian; perfects in -nki, attested only in some Umbrian forms, with palatalization (cf. e.g. Umbr. purdinsiust ‘porrerxit’, fut. perf.); perhaps, similar to this, a perfect in -k- (Osc. lōka-k-er, kella-k-ed); finally, a presumed perfect in -s- (but Umbr. sesust ‘sederit’ is not decisive and Pael. lexe, rather than a past infinitive, could be a reduced form corresponding to Lat. legisitis). On the problems of interpretation relating to the various perfect forms cf. Olzscha 1958; Diels 1959; Olzscha 1963; Parlangeli 1972; Pisani 1975; Negri 1976; Markey 1985).

Invariable Parts of Speech
These are conjunctions, adverbs, pre- and postpositions, but note that in the case of the latter the prepositions function mainly as preverbs, while in the noun phrase the postpositions are undisputedly a special characteristic.

Conjunctions
We can enumerate about twenty forms, almost all of pronominal origin. The great majority of these are those connected with the interrogative-relative pronoun (compare, e.g. Osc. puf, Umbr. pufe ‘ubi’ with the adverbial ending -dhe or -dhi and apocope of the final vowel; the same morphological structure can be found in the Paelignian adverb ecuf ‘hic’, but this has a different pronominal stem; on the productivity of this formation compare the adverbial forms Umbrian esuf and South Picene estuf with further pronominal stems). Other interesting formations are those composed of fossilized verbal forms (of the type Umbr. heri ... heri ... ‘vel ... vel ...’ or Osc. loufır, 3 sg. passive, with the same impersonal value as Lat. libet. Belonging among well-known Latin and Greek features are Umbr. et ‘et’, Osc. ĭnim, etc.; Umbr. enem, etc., with the value of ‘et’, as well as Osc. avi, aut, avt, Umbr. ote, ute ‘aut’, etc. Finally Oscan svai, suae, Umbrian sve, sue ‘si’ is an old locative corresponding to Latin si (from *sei), which exhibits a different pronominal stem.

Adverbs
As well as the aforementioned adverbs formed with *-dhe/i with locative value, we should mention old ablative forms (with which the functions of the instrumental merge) with the reflexes -ēd, -ē (e.g. Osc. amprufid ‘improve’,
Umbr. prufe ‘probe’), -ōd, -ō (e.g. Pacl. ecu-c ‘huc?’ with enclitic -c, Umbr. supru ‘supra’), -ād, -ā (e.g. Umbr. subra and cf. Osc. ehtrad ‘extra’, with propositional value), and finally -īd (e.g. Osc. akrid, which may mean ‘acriter’, but also ‘a culmine’). Another morphological problem is posed by some cases of original neuter accusatives (e.g. Umbr. promom ‘primum’, tertim ‘tertium’). Notable, finally, are adverbial forms such as Umbrian akrutu ‘ab initio’, ‘de integro’, scalseto ‘ex patera’, which imply old ablatives with the postposition -tulo, -ta (perhaps from older -tā; for an alternative form in -tus cf. Lat. funditus and similar).

Prepositions and Postpositions
The former, when they are not functioning as preverbs (e.g. prai- in Umbr. prehabia, 3 sg. pres. subj. ‘praehi’beat’, pru- Umbr. pruhipid, 3 sg. perf. subj. ‘prohibuerit’, etc., in line with a well-known Latin system cf. also Untermann 1973), have a construction with the accusative (e.g. Osc. ant in ant püntram ‘usque ad pontem’, Osc.-Umb. pert in Osc. pert viam ‘trans viam’, Umbr. pert spinia ‘trans spinam’); with the ablative (e.g. Osc. up, up ‘apud’ in Osc. úp éisud sakaraklúd ‘apud id templum’) or with the locative (e.g. Umbr. super in Umbr. super kumne ‘super comitio’). Postpositions, much more frequent than in Latin, are represented in cases such as Oscan petiro-pert ‘quarter’ (with -pert from *per-ti just as Osc. post is from *pos-ti), Umbrian vuku-kum ‘ad lucum’, Umbrian tota-per ‘pro civitate’ and above all, in Oscan -en, Umbrian en, -e ‘in’, which can follow both forms of the accusative and forms of the locative (evidently with the same relationship that links Latin in with both the accusative and the ablative); hence, for example, Umbrian vukum-en ‘in lucum’, amglom-e ‘ad angulum’ (motion), but Oscan hurtín ‘in horto’, Umbrian arven ‘in arvo’ (rest). Notable are the expressions Oscan imad-en ‘ab imo’, eisuc-en ziculud ‘ab eo die’ with ablatival forms, which could be interpreted, by virtue of the first above-mentioned meaning of -en (namely, the idea of movement) as ‘starting from’, ‘from (a certain moment) onwards’.

Word Formation
On this important aspect, which is part of the morphosyntactic level, it can be said that the Italic languages do not differ greatly from Latin, with which they share the basic processes of derivation (but it is difficult to identify a typically Italic suffix or, at least, one which is typically productive in Italic), while nominal compounding is much less well represented (there are few examples and all can be taken back to Latin models, even as regards compounds with adverbs or prepositions in first position). In the case of root apophony, too, which is rightly part of the study of word formation and is a typical IE process, Italic is particularly lacking in documentary evidence. In any case, as in Latin – indeed more so – the phenomenon is residual (on quantitative apophony in one of the forms of the perfect, see above).
The Syntactic Type of the Italic Languages

As regards case syntax (see above for the purely morphological aspects and see also Berrettoni 1971), it can be said that the Italic languages are almost completely identical to Latin. In Umbrian, however, we do see an early and profound alteration of the case system at the morphological level as the result of syncope and weakening of final syllables (largely due to the accent) and of homophony (a result of individual phonetic developments, particularly instances of monophthongization). Cases of allomorphy consequently arise (many ‘signifiers’ for the same case morpheme) and, on the other hand, the same morph has to fulfil different functions (different case morphemes with a single form). Umbrian, unlike Oscan, which tends to strengthen the inflectional case system, with the influence of the -o stems on the other declension (cf. Gusmani 1965), thus undergoes an early topological change (cf. Porzio Gemia 1983) which takes it in the direction of ‘incipient’ agglutinization. Another aspect of this is the use of postpositions, which are much more vital and differentiated in Umbrian than in Oscan (remember that the latter only has the morpheme -in/-en which, in this sense, is clearly residual). It is difficult to say whether these typologically innovative impulses came into Umbrian from Etruscan by virtue of some ancient ethnolinguistic contiguity, but it is certainly true that in this central area of the peninsula, phenomena which are, broadly speaking, typological began to arise which come to fruition in late or pre-Romance Latin.

As regards Greenbergian typology of the basic ordering of elements (relative position of S = subject, O = object, V = verb and of N = noun, A = adjective, G = genitive; presence or absence of prepositions and postpositions, etc.), it can be said that Italic (and in particular Umbrian) is of the type SOV, which indeed predicts postpositions (on the relative position of A, N and G and, in more general terms, on word order in the Italic sentence, cf. Berrettoni 1967, 1969). The syntax of the moods, known to us mainly via the Umbrian documentation, exhibits a difference between indicative and infinitive on the one hand (‘affirmation’) and subjunctive on the other (‘command’, ‘doubt’), whenever the embedded clause acts as a subject or object complement clause (for further details, see Rix 1976; for a distinction between the use of the imperative and that of the ‘iussive’ subjunctive in Umbrian, cf. Jones 1962).

Finally, worthy of note is the fact that the Italic, especially in Umbrian (as at times in Latin), subordinate clauses can occur without a conjunction (e.g. Pael. upsaseter coisatens ‘operaretur curaverunt’, Umbr. esunu fuia herter ‘sacrificium fiat oportet’) and that in these cases, both in Umbrian and in Oscan, asyndeton is very common, probably under the pressure of official and formal situational contexts.
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