

RELATIVE CLAUSES IN OSCAN AND LATIN: THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW SYNTACTIC STRUCTURES THROUGH LANGUAGE CONTACT

JAMES CLACKSON
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

ABSTRACT This paper takes as its starting point an Oscan inscription which shows several remarkable syntactic features: a relative-correlative order; repetition of the antecedent in the relative and the main clause; and fronting of two constituents out of the relative clause. This inscription has been cited by some scholars as an example of archaic Indo-European syntactic patterns but others view these features as the result of language contact with Latin. Through comparison of material both in Oscan and other languages in the Sabellic family, as well as consideration of the evolution and use of relative-correlative syntax in Latin, I show that the language contact explanation is to be preferred. I further argue that inherited Oscan syntax can help explain the repetition of the antecedent.

1 INTRODUCTION

In the past twenty years a number of scholars have examined the development of aspects of Latin and Sabellic verbal morphology: including Meiser (2003) on the merger of the PIE aorist and perfect, Willi (2010, 2016) on individual perfect formations in Sabellic, Zair (2014) on the future perfect and Clackson (2021) on the Oscan imperfect subjunctive. Together, these studies have shown how the verbal system of Oscan and Umbrian developed independently of Latin, but along similar lines. Speakers of Latin and the Sabellic languages innovated congruent verbal categories, but for the most part they have arrived at the formal expression of these categories by separate means, utilising different morphological material. Considering that Latin and the Sabellic languages were spoken in adjacent areas for a long period of time, and lexical borrowing, onomastic and other material suggest periods of bilingualism and language shift, it is appropriate to attribute the structural similarities between the verbal systems to language contact. There has been less

attention paid to the Latin and Sabellic syntax, and in this paper I intend to look at one aspect of syntax: relative clauses.

2 THE TESTAMENT OF VIBIS AADIRANS: ARCHAISM OR CONTACT?

My starting point is one particular relative clause in Oscan, which occurs in the Testament of Vibis Aadirans, an inscription from Pompeii (Pompei 24 in [Crawford et al. 2011](#), Po 3 in [Rix 2002](#)):¹

- (1) **v(iíbis). aadirans. v(iíbieís). eítivam. paam
vereiiaí. púmpaiianaí. trístaamentud.
deded. eísak. eítivad
v(iíbis). viínikiís. m(a)r(aheis). kvaísstur. púmpaiians.
trífbúm. ekak. kúmbennieís.
tanginud. úpsannam
deded. ísídum. prúfatted**

‘Vibis Aadirans, son of Vibis, gave money in his will to the *vereiia-* of Pompeii; with this money Vibis Viínikiís, son of Maras, quaestor of Pompeii, gave the construction of this building by decision of the senate. The same man approved it.’ (translation from [McDonald 2022](#))²

This text can be translated word-for-word into Latin, as in the following version from [Vetter \(1953: 49–50\)](#):³

- (2) *V(ibiús) Atranus V(ibi f.) pecuniam quam
iuventuti Pompeianae testamento
dedit, ea pecunia
V(ibiús) Vinicius M(a)r(aei f.) quaestor Pompeianus
domum hanc (de) conventus
sententia faciendam
dedit, idem probavit.*

All but the final two words of this inscription function as a single sentence, with a preposed relative clause which occupies the first three lines. The relative clause is remarkable for a number of reasons. The antecedent to the

¹ In references to Oscan and Italic material in the rest of the paper, I shall give the [Crawford et al. \(2011\)](#) reference followed by the [Rix \(2002\)](#) reference after an oblique slash, including line numbers where relevant taken from the [Crawford et al.](#) edition.

² [McDonald \(2022\)](#) does not latinize the personal names, hence Vibis Aadirans rather than Vibius Adiranus, as most previous scholars have rendered the name.

³ The line division is my own, in order to help the reader match the Latin text to the Oscan.

relative **paam**, ‘which’, occurs twice, firstly attracted to the accusative case of the relative (**eítuivam**), but fronted before the relative marker, and then in the main clause in the ablative case (**eítuivad**) where it is accompanied by the correlative **eísak**, ablative feminine singular of a pronoun whose citation form is the nominative *izic*.⁴ Students of Indo-European syntax will recognise that this sentence contains several elements which also appear in older languages of the family: relative clause placed before the main clause, incorporation of the antecedent into the relative clause (with attraction in case), repetition of the antecedent and the use of a correlative pronoun. [Watkins \(1995: 541\)](#) gave parallels from Vedic and early Latin, and also noted that Hittite texts sometimes show repetition of the antecedent in the relative clause and main clause. [Watkins](#) accordingly understood the Oscan inscription to continue very archaic syntactic structures.

The view of this Oscan relative clause as highly archaic now seems questionable, particularly with our improved knowledge of the date of the text. Rather than dating the original text to the second-century BCE or even earlier, as assumed by [Watkins](#) (following the arguments put forward by [Pocetti 1982](#) who sees the Oscan text as a recopying of an earlier inscription), scholars now take the inscription not to be a copy, but to be an original text from the first century BCE.⁵ As noted already by [Porzio Gernia \(1970\)](#), by the first century BCE a number of Latinisms had infiltrated the Oscan language, particularly in the field of legal and administrative terminology.⁶ The longest surviving Oscan text, the Tabula Bantina,⁷ a fragmentary bronze tablet with Oscan written in Latin script dating to the first decade of the first century BCE, shows numerous parallels to Latin phrasing and legal terminology.⁸ Another lengthy Oscan text, the Cippus Abellanus,⁹ a stone stela which records an agreement between two neighbouring Oscan communities in the Oscan alphabet, and which dates to around the same period also ‘shows clear evidence of influence of the drafting style of Roman legislation from C. Gracchus onwards’ ([Crawford et al. 2011: 887](#)). In the Vibis Aadirans inscription, the

4 See [Untermann \(2000: 355–8\)](#) for forms and attestations of this pronoun. Oscan and other Sabellic inscriptions written in non-Latin alphabets are here transcribed in **bold**, those written in the Latin alphabet in *italics*.

5 [Crawford et al. \(2011\)](#), [McDonald \(2012\)](#).

6 The existence of legal texts in Sabellic languages before any linguistic contact with Latin is, *pace* [Dupraz \(2009: 222 n. 21\)](#), insufficient evidence to argue against large-scale borrowings of Latin terms into Oscan at the end of the Republic, as is the common adoption, development and exchange of legal formulae, often on Greek models (*pace* [Dupraz 2020](#) and [2021](#)), see [Clackson \(2020\)](#).

7 Bantia 1 / Lu 1.

8 See [Porzio Gernia \(1970\)](#), [Campanile \(1976\)](#), [Crawford \(1996\)](#), [Decorte \(2016\)](#).

9 Abella 1 / Cm 1.

following words and phrases appear to be borrowed or calqued from Latin: **kvaísstur** (Latin *quaestor*), **trístaamentud deded** (*testamento dedit*), **kúmben-nieís. tanginud** (*conuentus sententia*), **úpsannam deded** (*faciundam dedit*, compare e.g. AE 1996, 685 (167-131 BCE)), **ísídum. prúfatted** (*idem probauit*, compare e.g. CIL I2 610 (200 BCE) and CIL I2 1565 (100 BCE) both of which parallel the final four lines of the text). These Oscan calques and phrasal similarities have accordingly led several scholars to see the relative clause structure also to be modelled on Latin legal formula.¹⁰

3 LATIN RELATIVE CLAUSES AND FRONTING

In support of the theory that the structure is calqued from Latin it is possible to cite Latin epigraphic texts from the second and first centuries BCE which also show a relative-correlative sentence structure, sometimes with fronting of the antecedent out of the relative clause. Most of these texts are legal or administrative, and Roman officials seem to have elaborated this particular style as a marker of legal language in the period between the Laws of the Twelve Tables and the end of the second century BCE (Halla-aho 2018: 153–8 and Pinkster 2021: 528–32, both with references and examples). Consider the following examples, all of which are discussed in more detail by Halla-aho (2018):

- (3) *Prata quae fuerunt proxuma faenisicei L. Caecilio Q. Muucio cos. in agro poplico, quem Viturios Langenses / posident et quem Odiates et quem Dectunines et quem Cauaturineis et quem Mentouines posident, ea prata / inuitis Langensibus et Odiatibus et Dectuninebus et Cauaturines et Mentouines quem quisque eorum agrum / posidebit inuiteis eis ni quis sicet niue pascat niue fruatur.* (CIL I² 584 (117 BCE) (Sententia Minuciorum) 37–40)

‘The meadows which were ready for the mower, during the consulship of Lucius Caecilius and Quintus Mucius, within the limits of the public state-land in the possession of the Langensian Viturii, and the public state-land in the possession of the Odiates and the Dectunines, and the public state-land in the possession of the Cavaturini and the Mentovini, in the case of the land which any of the said peoples shall severally possess, these meadows let no one drain, let no one graze, let no one have the benefit of, without the agreement of the Odiates and the Dectunines, and the Cavaturini

¹⁰ Adams (2003: 137), Clackson & Horrocks (2007: 63), McDonald (2012: 51).

and the Mentovini' (my translation, expanding that of Hilla-aho, who discusses this text at 2018: 163)

- (4) *uiatores praecones qui ex hac lege lectei sublectei erunt / eis uiatoribus praeconibus magistratus proue mag(istratu) / mercedis item tantundem dato ...* (CIL I² 587 (81 BCE) (Lex Cornelia de XX quaestoribus) ii 31–33)

'Whoever shall have been chosen or chosen in replacement as messengers and criers according to this statute, to those messengers and criers a magistrate or promagistrate is to issue similarly as much in fee as...' (translation and discussion [Halla-aho 2018: 179–80](#))

In each of these Latin cases, the fronted element acts as a topic of the sentence and is sometimes marked out as such in the original inscriptions by a preceding blank space (as in example (3), which begins a new line of the text with a small indentation). In the Oscan text there are two elements fronted out of the nominative clause, the name of the donor, Vibis Aadirans, which is also highlighted in the text itself since the first letter of the name stands further right than the two following lines, and the incorporated antecedent of the relative pronoun, *eñtiuvam* 'money'. Oscan thus goes one step further than the Latin examples, all of which only have a single fronted element. In the majority of the Latin cases examined by [Halla-aho](#), the fronted constituent is a nominative, and most frequently the title of a magistrate or other official or another animate noun (2018: 181–2). [Halla-aho](#) links these structures with what have traditionally been called 'hanging nominatives', i.e. fronted nouns that act as discourse themes. Hanging nominatives are found in epigraphic texts which do not contain a relative clause, such as curse tablets where the names of the cursed individual may stand at the beginning of the text, as in (5):

- (5) *Danae ancilla no(u)icia Capitonis: hanc (h)ostiam acceptam habeas et consumas Danaene(m), habe(a)s Eutyichiam Soterichi uxorem* (CIL I² 819 = [Kropp 2008: 1.4.4/2](#))

'Danae, new slave of Capito, her you should accept as sacrifice, and destroy Danae; you should accept (as sacrifice) Eutychia, wife of Soterichus' ([Halla-aho 2018: 185](#))

Although the preference in the Latin material seems to be not to front inanimate nouns, examples (3) and (4) cited above show that nouns which function as the topics of the following sentence or paragraph can be fronted out of their relative clause, and then repeated later in the sentence. The Oscan text, if

it is modelled on Latin official inscriptions, thus appears to combine two separate features into a single text, in a way which goes beyond any surviving Latin example.

4 RELATIVE CLAUSES IN OSCAN: THE RELATIVE DETERMINER

In the rest of this paper, I shall bring new light to bear on the question of whether the Oscan structure is a calque of Latin or an archaic survival, by considering whether there is evidence for other relative clauses in Oscan (and further afield in Sabellic) with a relative-correlative structure matching that seen in the Testament of Vibis Aadirans. If there is wider evidence for analogous structures in Oscan and other Sabellic languages, then it is possible that Oscan may have independently maintained an archaic Indo-European pattern. If there is no such supporting evidence, then this is more likely to reflect Latin influence.

First, I shall consider the Oscan evidence, taking Oscan written in the Oscan, Latin and Greek alphabets, and including Paelignian and Marrucinian inscriptions written in the Latin alphabet (which are sometimes termed ‘North Oscan’ dialects). In Oscan a range of relative determiners are used (set out in the table below), derived respectively from the Proto-Indo-European stems **k^wo-* and **k^wi-*. Table 1 gives the attestations of these forms in the Oscan corpus.¹¹

¹¹ I have not included in the table the form **púiiēh** (Capua 48 / Cp 41) which probably derives from a suffixed form of the **k^wo-* stem, [Untermann \(2000: 597\)](#). Attestations of forms are as follows:

In the singular of the **k^wo-* stem: **pai**, Capua 34 A 1, B 1 / Cp 37; **paí**, Abella 1 A 26 (restored from [jaí]), B 8 / Cm 1; **paei**, Bantia 1 22 / Lu 1; **pai**, Bantia 1 22 / Lu 1; **púd** Abella 1 A 12, 14, 15, B 23; Aufidena 1 / Sa 17 (read differently at Sa 17); Cumae 7 / Cm 17 (afp(ú)d, read differently at Cm 17); **adpúd** Capua 24 B 10 / Cp 33 (although likely to be a conjunction); **pod**, Bantia 1 10 / Lu 1, on the other two occurrences of *pod* in this text see below; **πωτ**, Anxia 1 / Lu 39; **paam**, Pompei 24 / Po 3; Teruentum 8-10 / Sa 4; **pam**, Abella 1 B 12 / Cm 1; **pam**, Sulmo 3 / Pg 4; **pui**, Capua 34 B 1 / Cp 37, although it is not certain whether this is actually a relative pronoun rather than an abbreviated writing of the indefinite **pui pui** ‘for whoever’ which occurs in the parallel text inside the lead curse tablet ([Dupraz 2009: 229](#)); **pad**, Teruentum 8-10 / Sa 16; **poizad**, Bantia 1 19 / Lu 1.

In the plural of the **k^wo-* stem: **pús**, Abella 1 A 8, B 7, 19 / Cm 1; Teruentum 34 A / Sa 1; **puus**, Corfinium 6 / Pg 9; **πους**, Buxentum 1 / Lu 62. If a form of the relative pronoun and not the conjunction **puz**, it cannot be accusative plural ([Zair 2016: 220](#)); **pas**, Capua 24 A 7, B 3 / Cp 33, 34; Capua 25 / Cp 30; Capua 26 / Cp 29; **pas**, Bantia 1 25 / Lu 1; **pai**, Capua 34 A 9 / Cp 37; **paí**, Abella 1 A 15 / Cm 1.

From the **k^wi-* stem: **pis**, Bantia 1 8, 19, Adamesteanu fragment 5 / Lu 1; **píd**, Abella 1 B 25 / Cm 1; **pid**, Sulmo 3 / Pg 4 (this is likely to be a conjunction, see [Dupraz 2009: 227–8](#) for discussion); **pím**, Aufidena 3 4; **piei**, Bantia 1 7 / Lu 1; **píís**, Pompei 7 / Po 39; **peis**, Teate Marrucinorum 6 / MV 8.

	Form	Oscan alphabet	Latin alphabet	Greek alphabet
from <i>*k^wo-</i>	NOM.SG.F	pai, paí	<i>paei, pai</i>	—
	NOM/ACC.SG.N	púd	<i>pod</i>	πωτ
	ACC.SG.F	paam, pam	<i>pam</i>	—
	DAT.SG.M	pui	—	—
	ABL.SG.F	pad	<i>poizad</i>	—
	NOM.PL.M	pús	<i>puus</i>	πΟΥΣ
	NOM.PL.F	pas	<i>pas</i>	—
	NOM/ACC.PL.N	pai, paí	—	—
from <i>*k^wi-</i>	NOM.SG.M/F	—	<i>pis</i>	—
	NOM/ACC.SG.N	píd	<i>pid</i>	—
	ACC.SG.M/F	pím	—	—
	DAT.SG.M/F	—	<i>piei</i>	—
	NOM.PL.M/F	píís	<i>peis</i>	—

Table 1 Attested forms of Oscan relative determiners

As seen from the above table, the forms derived from **k^wo-* are more numerous than forms derived from **k^wi-*. The **k^wi-* stem is also used as an interrogative pronoun, and more frequently as an indefinite pronoun. If we consider first the examples of the Oscan reflexes of the **k^wo-* stem, which are much more numerous and widely attested, most of the examples are used in embedded relative clauses, with the antecedent placed before the relative clause. There are also two or three cases where the neuter singular nominative accusative form, **púd** or *pod*, has developed as a conjunction.¹² These adnominal relative clauses using reflexes of the **k^wo-* stem may be either restrictive or non-restrictive. Example (6) below is a restrictive relative, where the antecedent is used with a form of the correlative pronoun; example (7) shows a restrictive relative used without a correlative pronoun and (8) shows a non-restrictive clause. The antecedent in all these cases stands before the relative determiner, although in (8) another constituent appears to interrupt the antecedent and relative clause. It should be noted that interpretation of

¹² As the second *pod* at Bantia 1 10 / Lu 1, and also at line 32 (in a fragmentary context) and the univerbation **adpúd** at Capua 24 B 10 / Cp 33 (example (10) below), see already von Planta (1897: 457–8), who also suggests the same explanation for πωτ at Anxia 1 / Lu 39 (1897: 700), which will be discussed more fully below.

(8), a lead curse tablet dated to the beginning of the second century BCE, is made particularly difficult by the fragmentary nature of the text, which, in the reading followed here, lacks any verb in the relative clause.¹³

- (6) **íním íúk tríba/rakkiuf pam núvlanús tríbarakattuset íním úíttiuf núvlanúm estud** (Abella 1 B 11–14 / Cm 1)
 ‘And that building which the Nolani shall have built and its use is to be of the Nolani’ (translation Crawford et al. 2011: 891)
- (7) *in(im) amiracatud allo famelo in(im) ei(tuo) siuom paei eizeis fust pae ancensto fust toutico estud* (Bantia 1 22–23/ Lu 1)
 ‘and the whole of his estate is to be sold and the whole of his property, which shall have been his and which shall not have been listed, is to be made public’ (translation Crawford et al. 2011: 1443)¹⁴
- (8) **keri: arent[íakai: man]afum pai: pu[i: pu]i heriam suvam leg[inum: suvam]** (Capua 34 A 1 /Cp 37)
 ‘To Ceres Arentica I have mandated, she who (exists) for whosoever [e.g. fears (?)] her will (and) her band of followers’ (translation Crawford et al. 2011: 445)

The use of correlative pronouns is generally rare in Oscan; apart from the examples in the testament of Vibis Aadirans, the Cippus Abellanus and the Tabula Bantina, there are only a couple of other possible cases, which will be discussed in the next section.¹⁵ There is also a single example in the Cippus Abellanus of the incorporation of the antecedent into the relative clause, in (9):

¹³ See further [Opfermann \(2018: 119–121\)](#) for discussion (with thanks to an anonymous reviewer for the reference). [Opfermann](#) gives a reading with main verb **a]fluḱad**, following [Rix \(2002: 101\)](#) and others (ultimately relying on [Marchese 1977: 302–303](#)), which would give a translation something like ‘To Ceres Arentica I have mandated, she who shall invoke her will (and) her band of followers for anyone’. I have preferred to follow [Crawford et al. \(2011: 444\)](#) in rejecting this reading on the grounds that lead deteriorates after exposure to air, and [Marchese](#) is unlikely to have seen more in 1977 than [Bücheler](#) (who recorded **akai** for the relevant letters) had done in 1878. In any case, the relative, whose antecedent is a specified goddess, can only be non-restrictive.

¹⁴ An anonymous reviewer draws my attention to [Agostiniani’s](#) discussion of this passage ([Agostiniani 2014: 206–213](#)), where it is suggested that the pronoun *eizeis* may be feminine, referring back to *famelo* ‘estate’, which would lead to a translation ‘the whole of the property, which shall have been the estate’s, and which shall not have been listed, is to be made public.’ The relative remains restrictive without a correlative pronoun if this interpretation is adopted.

¹⁵ I discuss one further possible example at *Anxia 1 / Lu 39* in detail below.

- (9) **sakaraklúm herekleís úp / slaagid púd íst íním teer[úm] / púd úp eísúd sakaraklúd [íst] / púd anter teremníss eh[trúís] / íst paí teremenniú mú[íníkad] tanginúd prúftú set** (Abella 1 A 11–16 / Cm 1)

‘as for the sanctuary of Hercules which is beside the *slaags*, and the land which is beside that sanctuary, whatever is between the outer boundary markers, which boundary markers were set up by joint decision’ (translation Crawford et al. 2011: 891)

In these five lines there are four relative clauses, the first three refer respectively to the temple and the land (twice); the fourth, introduced by **paí** is nested inside the third relative clause to specify the **teremníss** ‘boundary markers’ which mark out the land. The word for boundary marker is neuter, and so the neuter plural nominative/accusative of the relative determiner is used, with the antecedent repeated in the same case, **teremenniú**.¹⁶ The antecedent might have been repeated to avoid ambiguity since there are three different neuter nouns in play at this point of the text, temple (**sakaraklúm**), land (**teerúm**) and boundary markers. It is also possible that the repetition of the same noun in the relative and the superordinate clause is here modelled on Republican Latin legal styles, where such repetition is common.¹⁷

The first relative clause of (9) has the relative determiner placed next to the verb, with the verbal complement, **úp slaagid**, standing before the relative, and there are other occurrences of similar word-order pattern in the Cippus Abellanus. Consider example (10), where there are two relative clauses with the antecedent **feíhúss** ‘walls’; in the second of these there is another relative clause, **paí íp íst**, whose antecedent **víam** is fronted before the relative marker of the second clause referring to the walls, **pús stí<n>t**.

- (10) **puf] / herekleís fíísnú mefi[ú] / íst ehtrad feíhúss pú[s] / herekleís fííssnam amfr / et pert víam pús stí<n>t / paí íp íst pústin slagím / senateís suveís tangi / núd tríbarakavúm lí/kítud** (Abella 1 B 3–11 / Cm 1)

‘[where] the temple of Hercules is in the middle, outside the walls which surround the temple of Hercules, which lie beyond the road, which is there, within the *slaags* it is to be lawful by decision of their senate to build’ (translation Crawford et al. 2011: 891)

It is possible to cite close Latin parallels for this tendency to front verbal complements before the relative markers, such as (11), which is taken from a

¹⁶ Note that **teremenniú** and **teremníss** are part of a single nominal paradigm in Oscan.

¹⁷ Pinkster (2021: 528–30).

Roman legal inscription from Puteoli, around 50 km away from Abella, of a roughly contemporary date. In this text the complement *introitu in area* also precedes the relative marker of the clause *quod nunc est*.

- (11) *eisdem ostium, introitu in area quod nunc est et fenestras quae in pariete propter eam aream sunt parietem opstruito* (CIL I² 698 (Lex parieti faciendo Puteolana) 105 BCE, ll. 14-15)
 ‘He shall also block up the doorway which now forms an entrance into the building space and also wall up the windows which are in the wall along the said vacant space.’ (trans. [Halla-aho 2018](#): 166)

However, the stylistic device may also be a native Oscan feature, since it is found in a series of texts from around 300 BCE, which do not appear to have significant influence from Roman legal or administrative codes, as in examples (12) and (13).

- (12) **ek(úk) iúvil(ú) s(e)p(ieis) ka/lúvieís inim / fratrúm múi/nik(ú) est fiisíais / púmperiais pra/i mamerttiais / pas set kerssn/asias l(úvkeís) pettie[i]s meddikiai fufens** (Capua 26 / Cp 29)
 ‘This *iúvilú* is common to S(e)p. Calaius and his brothers; on the festival of the Pomperiae which is before that of March, there were offerings of grain in the term of the office as meddix of L. Pettius’ (translation [Crawford et al. 2011](#): 429)
- (13) **sak]ra[ít]ir. / kas[it dam]s[en]n/ias. pas. fií et. / pústreí. iúkleí / <v>ehiianasúm / a<v>t. sakrim / fakiíad kasit / medik(i)d. túvtik(ud) / kapv(anud), adpúd / fiíet** (Capua 24 B / Cp 33)
 ‘It is necessary that there should be a consecration; (the occasion is) the *damothoiniai* which take place on the day after the Vehianae; but it is necessary that one sacrifice a victim under the office of the *meddix titicus* at Capua until they take place’ (translation after [Crawford et al. 2011](#): 425)

Note also that in (13) the antecedent **dam]s[en]n/ias** (the name of a festival) is in the nominative, the same case as the following relative pronoun, but this does not seem to be analogous to the attraction inversa of **eítiuvam. paam** in (1) discussed above. Rather it appears, as indicated in the translation, that **dam]s[en]n/ias** acts as a nominal sentence on its own, and is not to be constructed as part of either the following or preceding sentence.¹⁸

¹⁸ Nicholas Zair (p.c.) suggests that it would be better to read **dam]s[en]n/ias(s)**, with final **s** standing in place of a geminate (compare the writing of single **d** in **medik(i)d**) and take the

5 RELATIVE CLAUSES USING FORMS DERIVED FROM THE $*k^wI-$ STEM

Examples of outcomes of the $*k^wi-$ stem used as relative determiners are far less numerous than the $*k^wo-$ stem, with most of the examples coming again from Tabula Bantina and Cippus Abellanus. In these texts these relatives are used to mark headless relative clauses, i.e. relative clauses which have no expressed antecedent, also referred to as ‘free’, ‘autonomous’ or ‘inherently maximalising’.¹⁹ In all the examples the relative stands at the beginning of its clause.

- (14) *íním píd e[íseí] / thesavreí púkkapid ee[stít] / aítíium altram altr[ús] / [f]erríns* (Abella 1 B 25–8 / Cm 1)
 ‘and whatever is ever in that thesaurus, they are each to take one (of the two) shares’ (translation Crawford et al. 2011: 891)
- (15) *pon censtur / ansae t<o>utam censazet pis ceus bantins fust censamur esuf in(im) eituum poizad ligud / iusc censtur censaum angetuzet* (Bantia 1 18–20 / Lu 1) ‘When the censors shall list the people at Bantia, whoever shall have been a citizen of Bantia is to be listed, himself and in respect of his property, under whatever condition those censors may have pronounced for the census’ (translation Crawford et al. 2011: 1443)

In these two examples, the relatives *píd* and *pis* refer to anything or anyone from a set of possible options, as also shown by the use of the ‘domain-widening’ particle *púkkapid* in (14); in both of these examples there is no correlative pronoun. One of the other instances of *pis* in the Tabula Bantina introduces a headless relative clause accompanied by the same particle *pocapit*. There is one instance of a dative from this stem, *piei*, which stands as a relative in line 7 of the Tabula Bantina, and is picked up by the correlative *izic* in the main clause (from the same paradigm as *ekak* and *íúk*).

Dupraz builds on this distribution of the two stems to argue that forms derived from $*k^wi-$ are restricted in Oscan to free relatives, and reflexes of $*k^wo-$ to adnominal relatives. This theory is made difficult, however, by the second relative clause in example (15), *poizad*, which is normally taken as the feminine ablative singular of the $*k^wo-$ stem, here standing alongside the noun *ligud* ‘law’.²⁰ Dupraz translates this as ‘selon laquelle loi ces censeurs auront

noun to be an accusative of time, giving a translation ‘It is necessary that there should be a consecration during the *damothoiniai* which take place on the day after the Vehianae’.

¹⁹ To use the terminology of Dupraz (2009), Pinkster (2021) or Probert (2015).

²⁰ On the derivation of *poizad*, see Untermann (2000: 596). The analogical replacement *pad* is attested in a fragmentary context at Teruentum 8-10 / Sa 16.

annoncé recenser’ (2009: 223),²¹ and understands that the reader is meant to supply an antecedent such as *ligud* ‘according to the law’ in the superordinate clause, which is omitted since the noun would be in the same case as in the relative. Crawford et al.,²² however, translate this clause as a maximalising relative ‘whatever law’. Crawford et al.’s reasoning is legal rather than linguistic: Roman statutes were written to be applicable in every possible eventuality, and in this case allowed magistrates to draw up specific rules for an individual census. Under this interpretation maximalising relatives also use reflexes of the **k^wo-* stem, and I shall offer another possible example of a maximalising relative of the same type in the next section.

6 RELATIVE CLAUSES WITH A RELATIVE PRONOUN DERIVED FROM **k^wi-* IN OTHER TEXTS

I shall now look at some further examples of Oscan relatives derived from **k^wi-*, which cast some doubt on the idea that these all function as free relatives. The first two texts to be considered require a little more explanation than we have given for Oscan material so far. The first example, which was not published at the time Dupraz wrote his article, is reproduced as (13) below.

- (16) **úpstúst úviiú [...] / herilím pím pú[...] / tens pústí pun[.] / ekík angítúst / avzsed** (Aufidena 3 (c. 100 BCE) lines 3-6)
 ‘Ouia is buried [here], what longed-for (memorial) they have [placed], when this is declared, she has ???’ (text and translation Crawford et al. 2011: 1240 with adaptations)

The text is inscribed as a funerary memorial for a woman named **úviiú** (Ouia). The lost text at the end of the first two lines is unlikely to be more than two or three words, and the third line may only lack a word divider at the end. The relative **pím** directly follows **herilím**, which is not attested elsewhere in the Oscan corpus but is interpreted as a masculine or feminine noun deriving from the Sabellic root **her-* ‘want’. All that is attested of the verb in the relative clause is the final syllable, **-tens**, which is a third person plural perfect form. This is followed by a temporal clause **pústí pun[.] / ekík angítúst**

21 Compare Buck’s translation ‘according to the law under which these censors shall have propose to take the census’ (1928: 287–8).

22 Note also McDonald’s translation (2022: 130) ‘according to whatever law those censors should decide to list’ and the discussion of Machajdíkóvá & Martzloff (2016: 97–8), who also note the *o*-stem form *poizeipid* in the Tabula Bantina, which seems to function in the same way as *i*-stem forms such as *πισπιτ* (see also Untermann 2000: 561).

which contains a neuter demonstrative pronoun **ekík** (so not co-referential with the relative **pím**). The verb which ends the inscription, **avzsed**, may find its correspondent in the obscure Paelignian form *afðed* and possibly the Latin gloss *abzet*, both of which are used at the end of epitaphs (see [Untermann 2000](#): 57–8). If **avzsed** is a transitive verb, its object must be **herilím**, and thus the relative clause interpreted as an embedded adnominal relative. A reading as a maximalising relative (‘whatever longed-for thing they have ...’) is made difficult by the absence of any clear correlative pronoun or noun in the main clause.

Another fragmentary Oscan text also appears to show a reflex of the **k^wi-* pronoun used as an adnominal relative. Pompei 7 / Po 39, a first-century BCE Oscan text from Pompeii which, although incomplete, can be restored with some confidence since it is part of a series of texts painted on street corners in Pompeii, known as *éituns*-inscriptions, which acted as instructions for military organization of the city during a period of siege.²³ In order to clarify the discussion I have arranged below with its original lineation, with the translation given line by line:

- (17) **eksuk amví[anud eít(uns)]**
set puz haf[iar tr(ííbs tú)v(tíks)
íní(m) víu mef(íru) [íní(m) tiurr]ís
nertrak ver[u ?????]u
píís sent eí[... dest]ra<k>
veru urubla[nu ?? tiur]rí(m)
mefíra(m) faammant
l(úvkis) púpíd(iis) l(úvkeís) m(a)r(as) auríl(iis) m(a)r(aheís).
 ‘The soldiers in this sector are [to be positioned]
 so that [the *domus publica*] may be held
 and the Mefírú road [and ?towers?]
 to the left of the ?? gate
 which /who are [?] to the right
 of the Urublanú gate [next to] the tower
 Mefírú. They command
 L. Popidius son of L. and Mr. Aurelius, son of M.’
 (text and translation adapted after [Crawford et al. 2011](#): 627).

²³ See [Willi \(2020\)](#) and [Weiss \(2022\)](#) for recent accounts of these texts (I am indebted to an anonymous reviewer for the reference to [Weiss 2022](#)). [Willi](#) gives a new etymology connecting **eítuns** to Oscan **eítuivam** / *eituam* ‘money’, with the meaning ‘soldiers’, whereas [Weiss](#) explains the noun to mean ‘gang.’ I have followed [Willi](#)’s account in the translation.

The structure of Pompei 7 follows closely that of five other painted texts, all of which begin **eksuk amvían(n)ud eítuns**, ‘the soldiers from this area’, then contain indications of location where the troops are to be positioned, and end with the name of the officer in charge. Pompei 7 is the longest of these texts, and is the only one to name two commanding officers. It includes an additional purpose clause, introduced by **puz** (the Oscan equivalent to Latin *ut*), which identifies the buildings and streets where the soldiers are stationed. The relative clause, introduced by the nominative plural (masculine or feminine) **píís** stands in this section, and appears to be in line with other Oscan texts which place the verb next to the relative determiner, with verbal complements before or after. In this case there are possible complements on both sides: a prepositional phrase headed by **nertrak** ‘to the left of’ followed by an identified city gate occurs before the phrase, and another prepositional phrase, possibly headed by **destrak** ‘to the right of’ (or possibly again **nertrak** ‘to the left of’) follows (**faamant** must mark the beginning of the next sentence). The matter is further complicated by what appears to be the beginning of a pronoun, **eí** immediately following the verb **sent**, which may come from the same paradigm as *izic* etc. discussed above, but cannot be nominative plural masculine or feminine.²⁴

How should we interpret the relative clause in example (17)? It seems to me that there are three possible alternatives: (1) the preceding sentence finishes at the end of line three and a new maximalising relative clause begins in line 4, with the relative specifying the soldiers stationed to the left of the gate. Since there is not enough space for a verb in the correlative clause, it is necessary to supply ‘are to be positioned’ or similar. The whole sentence would then mean something like ‘whoever is to the left of the ?? gate, [they are to be positioned] to the right / left of the Urublanú gate’. However, this does not make good sense; the initial clause **eksuk amvíanud eítuns** specifies the general area from which the soldiers come, and terms such as **nertrak** appear to refer to military positions along the walls, rather than areas in which soldiers are quartered. This interpretation would then indicate that whatever soldiers are stationed at one area of the defensives should be stationed elsewhere — a command that might be understandable in the heat of a siege, but not as a general injunction. Reading (2) is to take the relative clause **píís sent** as adnominal, with its antecedent supplied in the text preceding **nertrak** (here restored tentatively by **tiurrís** ‘towers’), with the relative within the **puz** clause and meaning ‘so that (various locations) may be held and the towers which are to the left of the ?? gate in the area to the right of the Urublanú gate

²⁴ See [Untermann \(2000: 355–7\)](#) for the paradigm of *izic*, with extensive discussion in [Dupraz \(2011\)](#).

[up to] the Mefírú tower.²⁵ Interpretation (3) would be similar to the last interpretation, with the relative clause clarifying further the location of the buildings and locations mentioned earlier, but understand this as a free relative in apposition to the preceding noun phrases.²⁶ The sentence would thus be interpreted to mean ‘so that (various locations) may be held, whichever are to the left of the ?? gate in the area to the right of the Urublanú gate [up to] the Mefírú tower.’ Both interpretations (2) and (3) make good sense, since the defenders are then charged with keeping control of strategically important features or a section of the walls. A syntactic problem with reading (3) is that the relative marker is clearly plural (and non-neuter), and would thus appear to refer back to specific items in the previous noun phrase, rather than serving as a general appositional phrase. In summary, interpretation of **píís sent** as an adnominal relative clause seems the most likely interpretation, although it is possible that there is overlap or confusion with a maximalising free relative clause in apposition to the earlier noun phrases.

These two texts may consequently give plausible examples of relatives from the stem **k^wi-* used in adnominal relative clauses, and may be compared with another relative from a ‘Marrucianian’ (a variety of ‘North Oscan’) text written in the Latin script (18), which has a structure very similar to that which occurs on the final lines of a stone epitaph, also written in a North Oscan variety (Paelignian), given here as number (19).

(18) *salaus peis leexe hala astas ...* (Teate Marrucinorum 6 / MV 8, c. 150 BCE)

‘(be) safe (you) who read this ???’ (text after Crawford et al. 2011: 238)

(19) *eite uus pritrome pacris puus ecic / lexe* (Corfinium 6 / Pg 9 lines 6–7, c. 100 BCE)

‘you go in ?, peaceful, who read this’

Dupraz (2009: 220) explains the different choice of pronouns in these two examples by the fact that in (19) the antecedent ‘you’ (*uus*) is overtly mentioned, whereas it in (18) it is not, even though it is implied by the adjective *salaus*. In both sentences, however, the relative clause functions as a maximalising relative: every possible reader of the text is to go in safety or peace, and the relatives apply across the board to as yet unknown readers. The second

²⁵ This is solution adopted by Crawford et al. (2011: 627).

²⁶ See Probert (2015: 133–5, 258–60) for discussion of Greek examples of free relative clause in apposition, including a passage in the Catalogue of Ships (Homer *Iliad* 2.615–18) where the relative clause gives extra precision to some named locations.

person pronoun *uis* in (19) functions in the same way as pronouns which occur alongside maximalising relatives, such as the article in Greek.²⁷

7 AN UNUSUAL INSTANCE OF A RELATIVE DERIVED FROM THE *K^WO-STEM

It is worth discussing here one final Oscan relative clause, attested in an early inscription from the far south of Italy, and written in the Greek script. There is consequently little scope for significant Latin contact influence on this text, although its interpretation has long baffled researchers:

- (20) πωτ φολ/λοηωμ. σορο/φομ ειν(ειμ) καπιδιτ/ωμ. καηας λεικειτ κω/[ρο
μ]αχερηι λιοκακειτ σφα/[ι τιω]μ εσοτ βρατωμ μειαι/ ανα[φακ-] (Anxia 1
/ Lu 39 (300-250 BCE))
‘What ???, ??? and ??? it is proper for you (the passer-by) to take,
[the monument] stands out for Machaireus (?) if you offer this
favour to my [*psyche* (?)-?]-’ (translation Crawford et al. 2011: 1435)

Although the meaning of many of the words in this text remains uncertain, the syntactic structure is reasonably clear. The run from πωτ to λεικειτ comprises a complete clause, with the impersonal verb λεικειτ ‘it is proper’ construed with a second person verb in the subjunctive, followed by three neuter nouns in the accusative case (φολ/λοηωμ, σορο/φομ and καπιδιτ/ωμ) with which a relative neuter pronoun πωτ would agree. The following clause also contains a verb λιοκακειτ. The final line may be a further clause, introduced by the conditional particle σφα/[ι ‘if’, or it may be a run-on of the main clause. There appears to be a combination of a pronoun and noun in the final line, εσοτ βρατωμ, but the pronoun is not the same as that used as a correlative in the other Oscan texts we have considered. Despite Crawford et al.’s translation given above, εσοτ cannot agree with βρατωμ (‘grace’ or ‘favour’), since this noun is elsewhere feminine in Oscan; if εσοτ is neuter, it could be in agreement with the neuter relative πωτ.²⁸

This text presents a possible example of a maximalising relative where the relative determiner stands alongside nouns which limit the reference of the relative: ‘whatever φολ/λοηωμ, σορο/φομ and καπιδιτ/ωμ’. If εσοτ does act as a correlative pronoun, it could be assumed to stand in apposition with βρατωμ ‘this as a favour’. The interpretation as a maximalising relative may be supported by the presence of the modal verb λεικειτ implying that there is not yet a fixed amount of φολ/λοηωμ etc., and circumstances might decree how

²⁷ See the discussion of analogous examples in Greek by Probert (2015: 135–42), who adopts the term ‘semi-free’ to refer to relatives of this type.

²⁸ See Dupraz (2011: 63 n. 2) and Zair (2016: 195–6) for discussion of this form.

much is available. It therefore seems as if this relative clause is of a parallel structure to the case of *poizad ligud* in example (15) given above. In both cases the relative stands alongside a noun within the relative clause to mean ‘whatever’.

8 PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS ON OSCAN RELATIVE CLAUSES

Consideration of all the Oscan examples allows us to reach some preliminary conclusions. Oscan can make a distinction between adnominal and free relatives, and this can be encoded in the stem of the relative pronoun, but it need not be. There are no Oscan adnominal clauses where the antecedent does not precede the relative clause, and there are no examples of incorporation of the antecedent, with the exception of the Testament of Vibis Aadirans; all other attested adnominal relative clauses are embedded in the sentence. Headless relative clauses show the relative determiner placed first in the clause, and they may either precede or follow the main clause. In the masculine and neuter nominative singular, forms derived from the stem **k^wi-* are used for headless relatives, which is in accord with early Latin, where *quis* and *quid* predominate in headless relative clauses. In some other case-forms, a process of merger of the two stems appears to be underway. Just as in Latin, where the *i*-stem *quem* is exclusively used as the masculine accusative pronoun, so in Oscan there is only evidence for **pím**, although this is attested only once (at Aufidena 3). The masculine nominative plural form of the pronoun is found formed from both stems, without any apparent distinction between the two. There are two possible examples of maximalising relative clauses which include a noun as well as the relative determiner, and in both cases, Oscan uses a form derived from the **k^wo-* stem, as in Latin.

To return to the testament of Vibis Aadirans, there is one possible way to explain how the distinctive structure of this text arose from a combination of Latin influence and Oscan relative clause syntax. As was seen above, the Oscan order of relative and then correlative may be calqued from Latin, since this is not an order found in other adnominal relative clauses in Oscan. Oscan speakers do not, however, seem to have tolerated the incorporation of the antecedent into the relative for clauses of this type. A more ‘Latinized’ style sentence, with only one constituent fronted before the relative determiner, of the type **v. aadirans. v. paam. eítivam ...** may have been interpreted as ‘whatever money Vibis Aadirans (gave ...)’ rather than ‘the money which Vibis Aadirans (gave...)’, and have been unacceptable to Oscan speakers. The fronting of both the name Vibis Aadirans and the antecedent is therefore likely to have been brought about by the combination of Latin influence and native Oscan syntax.

However, given the small number of Oscan examples, it remains possible that in some registers Oscan did show older Indo-European patterns of relative clause structure, which have not survived in the inscriptional record. In the next section, I will briefly consider the other languages of the Sabellic branch, to see if they offer any support for an inherited relative-correlative structures. If such structures existed in other Sabellic languages, and hence in proto-Sabellic, this would give some support to the notion that they were also preserved in spoken Oscan but do not survive in the inscriptional record.

9 UMBRIAN RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX

Umbrian relative clauses have been discussed in detail by Dupraz (2009: 235–54), whose main aim is to discuss the different uses of the outcomes of **k^wo-* and **k^wi-*, and a third relativizer used in Umbrian, the indeclinable *porsi*, which derives from the neuter of the **k^wo-* stem with an added particle, **k^wod-ī(d)*. Dupraz understands the three different relativizers to have different functions in Umbrian: reflexes of **k^wi-* are used for generic relatives (whether or not an antecedent is present) whereas reflexes of **k^wo-* occur where specific individuals or objects are concerned. Both of the inflected forms are further restricted to sentences where the antecedent and the relative pronoun agree in case and number. Where they disagree, the indeclinable *porsi* usually introduces the relative clause. I shall not attempt to reanalyse all the examples in the Iguvine tables, but here just concentrate on (i) the existence in Umbrian of the relative-correlative structure, (ii) the incorporation of the antecedent into the relative clause, and (iii) the repetition of the antecedent in both the relative and correlative clauses.²⁹

There are examples in the Umbrian Iguvine Tables of a relative-correlative structure, but these are only found with headless relatives, as examples (21) and (22). As in Oscan, these have a correlative pronoun in their main clause, respectively *erec* and *eaf*, and these belong to the same paradigm as the Oscan correlative pronouns met above, *izic*, **ekak** and **íúk**.

- (21) *pisi panupeī fratrex fratrus atiersier fust erec sueso fratrecate portaia
seuacne fratrom / atiersio desenduf* (VII b 1–2)
‘Whoever at any time shall be brother superior among the Atiedian
Brothers, during his term of office shall bring twelve victims for the
Atiedian Brothers...’ (translation Poultney 1959: 292).

²⁹ Dupraz counts 68 relative clauses in the Umbrian corpus (2009: 235).

- (22) *pafe trif promom haburent eaf acersoniem / fetu turse iouie popluper totar iouinar totaper iouina* (VIIa 52–3)
 ‘Whichever three they catch first, these (the *adfertor*) shall sacrifice at Acedonia to Tursa Jovia, for the people of the state of Iguvium, for the state of Iguvium’ (translation [Poultney 1959](#): 292).

It might be tempting to explain (23) as another relative-correlative structure, with *ařfertur* fronted from the relative (and thus providing an Umbrian parallel to the Vibis Aadirans inscription), but this is probably better explained as an embedded clause, since there is no correlative pronoun.

- (23) *ařfertur: pisi: pumpe: / fust: eikvasese: atieñier: ere: ri: esune: / kuraia:* (Va 3–5)
 ‘Whoever will be priest for the Atiedian meetings, he should care for the sacred thing.’ (translation after [Weiss 2009](#): 184).

For adnominal clauses, the best example of a relative-correlative structure is the restrictive relative clause in (24), which was taken by [Buck \(1928: 222\)](#) as a parallel to the Testament of Vibis Aadirans for the attraction of the noun to the case of the relative pronoun:

- (24) *uasor. uerisco. treblanir. porsī. ocrer / pehaner. paca. ostensendi. eo. iso. ostendu. pusi. pir. pureto. cehefi. dia.* (VIa 19–20)
 ‘The vessels at the Trebulan Gate which shall be exhibited for the purification of the mount, he shall exhibit them so that it might be given that fire might be taken from fire.’ (Translation after [Dupraz 2011](#): 132).

Following [Buck’s](#) account, the noun *uasor* ‘vessels’, displays nominative marking before the following relative determiner *porsī*, which is the subject of the future perfect third plural *ostensendi*. This explanation is problematic, however. The noun for ‘vessel’ is a neuter, and is referred to through the neuter plural pronoun *eo* (from the same paradigm as Oscan *izic*, *ekak* and *íúk*) in the main clause, but it is here marked with *-r* of the nominative plural masculine; the relative pronoun is the uninflected relative determiner derived from **k^wod-ī(d)*, and so has no overt case marking at all.³⁰ The marking of *uasor* is probably better explained through consideration of a parallel passage in the Iguvine Tables where a neuter noun takes a masculine nominative plural ending, given in (25) below:

³⁰ [Dupraz \(2009: 246\)](#) argues that *puře* / *porsī* is used when there is a mismatch in case between the main clause and the relative clause, although the rule is not obligatory where the reference is plural.

- (25) *tuderor totcor uapersusto auieclir ebetrafe...* (VI a 12)
 ‘the city boundaries are: from the augural seats to the Exit, ...’
 (translation [Poultney 1959](#): 234)

In (25) the text begins a new line after a space, and the use of the nominative marker on the noun phrase reflects the discourse function rather than the syntax. *tuderor totcor* acts as the heading for the section. Although *uasor* in (24) does not begin a new line of text, there is an area of blank space before it, and it also introduces a short section concerning the ritual vessels. The fronting of the noun in this case is therefore analogous to the left-detached constructions of Republican Latin epigraphy, studied by [Halla-aho \(2018\)](#). Even so, the sentence does offer a plausible Umbrian example of an adnominal relative-correlative structure, although it is worth noting that the correlative pronoun *eo* stands alone, without repetition of the head noun. It is worth noting that another interpretation of (24) is to read the relative clause introduced by *porsi* as a maximalising relative; rather than indicating an identifiable set of vessels at the Trebulan gate, the relative clause can be understood to refer to any vessels so employed. As noted by [Dupraz \(2009: 244\)](#), Umbrian *porsi* is also used to mark headless relative clauses and restrictive relatives.

In answer to the questions raised at the beginning of this section, Umbrian does indeed show relative-correlative structures for headless relatives, and (24) may be an example of its use with an adnominal relative. There is less good evidence for incorporation of antecedents in the Umbrian relative clauses, and no example of repetition of the head noun. The shared use of the same correlative pronoun as in Oscan, suggests that the relative-correlative structure is a common Sabellic feature. In passing I note that the structures which appear to be closer to a relative-correlative shape occur in the later tables, written in the Latin script. In the earlier tables written in Umbrian script, there is no unambiguous example of a relative-correlative construction. The sections of the Iguvine Tables written in Latin script are less clearly calqued on Latin legalese than the later Oscan texts which we considered; there are no Latinate lexical borrowings or reproductions of Latin phraseology. But there is still Latin influence on the language of these texts (as seen by the simple fact that they are written in the Latin alphabet), and it is not impossible that the demands of writing more elaborate instructions for the rituals led the Umbrian priests to adopt more Latinate sentence structures, although this must remain speculation.

10 RELATIVES IN SOUTH PICENE INSCRIPTIONS

The two dozen or so South Picene inscriptions comprise some of the earliest texts written in any Sabellic languages, dating for the most part to the sixth and fifth centuries BCE. Most of the texts are written on monumental stelae, and most of them appear to be in a particular stylistic register of the language, judging by the frequent occurrence of alliteration and hyperbaton. Although the texts are generally short (the longest has only around thirty words), relative clauses are not infrequent, with seven probable examples.³¹ I reproduce below two of these texts to illustrate some aspects of relative clause syntax.

- (26) **oidom: safinús: estuf: eorselít: tíom: povaisis: pidaitúpas: fitiasom: múfqlúm: menfistrú: nemúneí: praistaít: panivú: meitims: safinas: tútas: trebegies: titú: pra[i]staklasa: posmúi:** (Interamna Praetuttiorum 1 / Sp TE 5 (5th c BCE))
 ‘On this side (?), the Sabines erect (?) here, you (ACC), [-?-] (in respect of) anything you have decreed (?), a monument (?) of (your) deeds (?) stands out for [-?-] [-?-] the gift (?) of the Sabine community for Titus (son) of Trebecius, for whom the (?) stele (is)’ (text and translation from [Zamponi 2021](#))
- (27) **matereíh: patereíh: qolofítúr: qupíríh: arítih: ímih: puíh / púpúnúm: estufk: apaiús: adstaíuh: súaís: manus: meitimúm** (Asculum Picenum 2 / Sp AP 2 (c. 500 BCE))
 ‘The Appaei belonging to the Poponii have set up here with their hands the gift (?) which is erected well, with art [-?-] for the mother (and) for the father’ (text and translation from [Zamponi 2021](#))

In (26) there are two relative clauses: the first appears to be an embedded free relative, **pidaitúpas**, ‘what they have decreed’, written without a word break after the relative pronoun **pid** (continuing the stem **k^wi-*); the second relative clause occurs at the end of the text, **pra[i]staklasa: posmúi** ‘for whom the stele (is)’, where the dative singular of the **k^wo-*stem introduces a nominal sentence. In (27), there is only one relative clause, in which the nominative masculine form of the relative marker, **puíh**, also stands at the end of

³¹ The following are likely examples of relative pronouns in the corpus: nominative singular masculine **puíh** (Asculum Picenum 2 / Sp AP 2), **poi** (Anxanum 1 / Sp CH 1); nominative-accusative singular neuter **pid** (Interamna Praetuttiorum 1 / Sp TE 5); accusative singular masculine **pim** (Anxanum 1 / Sp CH 1), **pimpíh** (Superaequum 2 / Sp AQ 3); dative singular masculine **posmúi** (Interamna Praetuttiorum 1 / Sp TE 5 (Interamna Praetuttiorum 3 / Sp TE 7)). The connective **puúde** at Asculum Picenum 3 / Sp TE 1 may also derive from the relative stem, although it is likely to have a different function in the text (see [Weiss 2002](#)).

its clause.³² The main clause of (26) follows the relative clause and the antecedent, **meitimúm**, concludes the text as reproduced here. If the order of text (26) as given is correct, this would then constitute a relative-correlative clause structure, although it should be noted that the two ‘lines’ of this text (here separated by /) are actually written on adjacent faces of a stone stele, and it is possible that what is here given as the second line should be read before the first.³³ In (26) it would be possible to explain the position of **posmúi** as a relic of a *wh*-in-situ structure, as sometimes hypothesised for Anatolian IE languages (for example, Huggard 2011 on Hittite); **pra[i]staklasa posmúi** follows the expected order of a nominal sentence such as ***pra[i]staklasa titúi** ‘a stele for Titus’. The maintenance of this archaic syntactic structure seems unlikely, however, and the explanation will not work for **puíh** in (27), where the pronoun, acting as the verbal subject, comes last in the clause. It is preferable to explain these displacements through stylistic concerns, in particular the tendency to have alliterative word pairs which is evident in both texts. It is also worth noting that in neither of these texts nor any other South Picene text is there any clear evidence for correlative pronouns.³⁴

11 SUMMING UP

The very brief consideration of Umbrian and South Picene helps to add some extra background to the Oscan examples discussed in this paper. In both languages there is at least one case where an adnominal relative clause precedes the main clause, but neither language gives any parallel for the structure of repetition of the head noun in the relative clause and the main clause, nor indeed for the use of the correlative pronoun alongside the head noun in the main clause. Umbrian and South Picene do seem to have shared the Oscan (and Latin) tendency to limit the reflex of the nominative masculine /feminine **k^wis*, and the nominative /accusative neuter **k^wid* to use in head-

32 As an anonymous reviewer points out, it should be noted that some scholars have taken **puíh** not to be a relative pronoun at all, but an adverb from the same root which gives Latin *pius* ‘pious’. Under this reading, the two faces of the stela have separate texts, and there is no expressed subject for the verb in face A. Zamponi (2021: 38–9) gives references to previous discussions of this question, concluding for various reasons that the interpretation of **puíh** as a relative pronoun is to be preferred.

33 At the bottom of each inscribed side of the stele there is an arrow, which is usually interpreted to mean that the order to read the sides is that given here (Crawford et al. 2011: 192, Zamponi 2021: 63).

34 One possible candidate for a correlative pronoun is **io**k at Anxanum 1 / Sp CH 1, which occurs in the sequence : **poioúefa: iokipedu: pdufem:** (Untermann 2000: 356 lists **io**k under the nominative / accusative neuter plural forms of *izik* but includes the label ‘unklar’). This section of the text has, however, defied any convincing interpretation (Crawford et al. 2011: 1262, Zamponi 2021: 79).

less relatives, but in both languages the syntax of relative clauses diverges, with neither showing any clear parallel to the Oscan pattern of the relative marker standing at the front of headless and free relatives, but otherwise following the head noun. All these features make the syntax of the Testament of Vibis Aadirans stand out as unusual, not just in Oscan but also in the Sabellic languages, and argue in favour of the Oscan text reflecting interference from Latin. As I have shown, the Oscan syntax differs from the Latin models in having two elements fronted from the relative clause, and this is likely to show pressure to maintain the Oscan rule that the head noun must always precede a relative marker.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. N. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Agostiniani, L. 2014. Niumsis Tanunis, la Tabula Bantina e la flessione pronominale italia. *Studi Etruschi* 77. 197–215.
- Bücheler, Franz. 1878. Oskische Bleitafel. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 33. 1–77.
- Buck, Carl D. 1928. *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*. Boston: Ginn and Company 2nd edn.
- Campanile, Enrico. 1976. La latinizzazione dell' Osco. In *Scritti G. Bonfante*, 109–120. Bescia.
- Clackson, James. 2020. Roman Law in its Italic context. In Sinclair W. Bell & Paul J. du Plessis (eds.), *Roman Law before the Twelve Tables: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, 9–23. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Clackson, James. 2021. The Latin and Oscan imperfect subjunctive in *-sē-. In David M. Goldstein, Stephanie Jamison & Brent W. Vine (eds.), *Proceedings of the 31st annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, November 8th and 9th, 2019*, 55–78. Hamburg.
- Clackson, James & Geoffrey Horrocks. 2007. *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language*. Malden, Mass.: Wiley.
- Crawford, Michael. 1996. *Roman Statutes* BICS Supplement 64. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- Crawford, Michael H. et al. 2011. *Imagines Italicae: A Corpus of Italic Inscriptions* BICS Supplement 110. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- Decorte, Robrecht. 2016. Sine dolo malo: The Influence and Impact of Latin Legalese on the Oscan Law of the Tabula Bantina. *Mnemosyne* 69. 276–291.
- Dupraz, Emmanuel. 2009. Stratégies de relativisation dans les langues sabelliques. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 104. 215–258.

- Dupraz, Emmanuel. 2011. *Sabellian Demonstratives: Forms and Functions*. Leiden: Brill.
- Dupraz, Emmanuel. 2020. La notion de *praescriptio* dans l'épigraphie latine et sabellique: un élément d'une koinè italique médio-républicaine? In Coline Ruiz Darasse (ed.), *Comment s'écrit l'autre? Sources épigraphiques et papyrologiques dans le monde méditerranéen antique*, 121–139. Pessac: Ausonius Editions.
- Dupraz, Emmanuel. 2021. Il regolamento umbro VII b 1–VII b 4 come adattamento di norme redazionali latine. In Luis Unceta Gómez, Carmen González Vázquez, Rosario López Gregoris & Antonio María Martín Rodríguez (eds.), *Amice benigneque honorem nostrum habes: Estudios lingüísticos en homenaje al profesor Benjamín García-Hernández*, 661–674. Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Halla-aho, Hilla. 2018. *Left-dislocation in Republican Latin*. Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 28. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Huggard, Mattyas. 2011. On Wh-(Non)-Movement and Internal Structures of the Hittite Preposed Relative Clause. In Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert & Brent Vine (eds.), *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, 83–104. Bremen: Hempen.
- Kropp, Amina. 2008. *Defixiones: Ein aktuelles Corpus lateinischer Fluchtafeln (defixiones)*. Tübingen: Günter Narr.
- Machajdíková, Barbora & Vincent Martzloff. 2016. Le pronom indéfini osque *pitpit* 'quicquid' de Paul Diacre à Jacob Balde: morphosyntaxe comparée des paradigmes **kwi-kwi-* du latin et du sabellique. *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 21(1). 73–118.
- Marchese, M. P. 1977. Le defixiones osche (Ve. 3–7). *Studi Etruschi* 44. 292–305.
- McDonald, Katherine. 2012. The Testament of Vibius Adiranus. *Journal of Roman Studies* 102. 40–55.
- McDonald, Katherine. 2022. *Italy before Rome: A Sourcebook*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Meiser, Gerhard. 2003. *Veni Vidi Vici: Die Vorgeschichte des lateinischen Perfektsystems*. Munich: Beck.
- Opfermann, A. 2018. Gedanken über einen oskischen Graffito: ST Po 79 und das Pronomen oskisch **pis.pis**. In O. Hackstein & A. Opfermann (eds.), *Priscis Libentius et Liborius Novis. Indogermanische und sprachwissenschaftliche Studien. Festschrift für Gerhard Meiser zum 65. Geburtstag*, 111–130. Hamburg: Baar.
- Pinkster, Harm. 2021. *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Volume ii*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- von Planta, Robert. 1897. *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte, II. Formenlehre, Syntax, Sammlung der Inschriften und Glossen, Anhang, Glossar*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Pocetti, Paolo. 1982. Il testamento di Vibio Adriano. *Rendiconti della Accademia di Archeologia* 57. 237–245.
- Porzio Gernia, M. L. 1970. Aspetti dell'influsso latino sul lessico e sulla sintassi osca. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 55. 94–144.
- Poultney, James Wilson. 1959. *The Bronze Tables of Iguvium*. Baltimore: American Philological Association.
- Probert, Philomen. 2015. *Early Greek Relative Clauses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rix, Helmut. 2002. *Sabellische Texte*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Untermann, Jürgen. 2000. *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Vetter, Emil. 1953. *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weiss, Michael. 2002. Observations on the South Picene inscription TE 1 (S. Omero). In Mark R. V. Southern (ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives*, 351–366. Washington D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man.
- Weiss, Michael. 2009. *Language and Ritual in Sabellic Italy: The Ritual Complex of the Third and Fourth Iguvine Tables*. Leiden: Brill.
- Weiss, Michael. 2022. Issues in the **eituns** Inscriptions of Pompeii. In A. Calderini & R. Massarelli (eds.), *Ego: duenosio. Studi offerti a Luciano Agostiniani (= Ariodante. Linguistica ed epigrafia dell' Italia antica 1)*, 949–960. Perugia: Università degli Studi di Perugia.
- Willi, Andreas. 2010. The Umbrian perfect in **-nç-** /-ns-. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 108. 1–14.
- Willi, Andreas. 2016. The Oscan perfect in **-tt-**. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 114. 75–94.
- Willi, Andreas. 2020. Oscan **eituns**. *Cahiers du Centre de Linguistique et des Sciences du Langage* 60. 85–91.
- Zair, Nicholas. 2014. The Future Perfect in Oscan and Umbrian, and the \bar{o} -Perfect in South Picene. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 112. 367–385.
- Zair, Nicholas. 2016. *Oscan in the Greek Alphabet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zamponi, Raoul. 2021. *South Picene*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Clackson

James Clackson
Jesus College
Cambridge CB5 8BL
United Kingdom
jptc1@cam.ac.uk