

Unveiling Messapic Funerary Discourse

Kujtim Mani

Institute of Albanology in Prishtina
10000, Eqrem Çabej, Prishtina, Kosovo
Email: kujtim68@gmail.com
ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4647-2620>
Research interests: Literary studies, Linguistics, Cultural Anthropology

Abstract. Messapic, an ancient language from the 6th to the 2nd century BC in Southern Italy, remains a linguistically enigmatic and poorly understood entity, has been traditionally classified as an *extinct* language. Current scholarship predominantly views Messapic epigraphy as primarily consisting of personal names, anthroponyms, and theonyms. However, attempts to linguistically classify and interpret it within the broader framework of Greek, Latin, or other ancient languages have yielded limited insights. This article investigates Messapic epigraphy as a potential descendant of Proto-Albanian and reveals intriguing parallels with classical Albanian. The chosen exemplars challenge the prevailing assumption that Messapic is an extinct language, presenting it in a new light and underscoring its enduring linguistic and cultural legacy. This is notably exemplified through a distinctive funerary discourse that serves as a hallmark of the Messapic language.

Keywords: Messapic epigraphy; reconstruction; funerary discourse; (Proto)Albanian.

Introduction

The Messapians, an Illyrian tribe identified with the Sallentinians and Iapyges, inhabited the ancient regions of Apulia and Calabria. Despite their language, Messapic, being often associated with the Illyrian language (Herodotus, 2009; Krahe, 1955; West, 2007), it remains a linguistic enigma. Messapic appears as a palimpsest, seemingly having “lost” its architextual and paratextual imaginaries within its *scriptio continua*.

The intertwining of *Illyromania* and the interpretation of Messapic epigraphy has simultaneously spawned a counter discourse that paradoxically fosters an *Illyrofobian* perspective on Messapic interpretations. Consequently, different discourses have been tinged with diverse ideological syndromes, somewhat neglecting the dimensions of the text that could align it with the hermeneutics of *mute* languages.

Undoubtedly, the funerary discourse prevails in Messapic epigraphy. It serves not only as the discursive key for understanding Messapic but, more significantly, represents a hermeneutical *master key* applicable to various *unconceivable* text situations. This is why

the funerary discourse assumes the role of the methodological focal point in interpreting Messapic inscriptions, aiding in reconstruction by unlocking the *sealed* doors of the corpora, always accompanied by an internal-comparative approach.

Funerary discourse highlights the intrinsic semantic content of the Messapic texture, elucidating depictions of rituals, votive processions, offerings, and succinct narrative *stories* through both direct and indirect discursive modalities. Frequently, inscriptions adopt the guise of a dialogue with the deceased person during their journey to the underworld (Saunders, 2021), strategically employing funerary social practices as discursively shaped entities (Fairclough, 1989). This implies the nuanced exploration of *black* vocabulary and tonality associated with death, the deceased, grief, mourning, belief, and offering, encompassing rituals, myths, and votive practices. The article aims to underscore specific funerary discursive elements inherent in these inscriptions, leveraging this discourse to enhance comprehension of the Messapian world.

1. Revealing Messapic Corpora

Unveiling the mystery of Messapic and its profound historical narrative, an indispensable gateway lies at the heart of our investigation. This gateway is woven into the inherent connections among segmentation, reading, and interpretation. It is crucial to decode these inscriptions not merely as a compilation of texts but with a keen understanding of their structural subtleties and interpretative importance. This decoding encompasses detailed description, thorough analysis, and the construction of a grammar and dictionary, with a specific emphasis on their funerary discourse.

In tracing the evolutionary trajectory of Messapic, a comprehensive internal-comparative perspective is necessitated, responding to the call of historical linguistics and linguistic anthropology. This study endeavours to unveil the linguistic, grammatical, and cultural underpinnings of Messapic, drawing profound insights from the extensive Messapian epigraphic corpora. This undertaking exemplifies the challenges inherent in interdisciplinary research on ancient, undeciphered languages.

The Messapic language, considered an offshoot of the Illyrian language culture in Southern Italy (Haarmann, 2010, p. 62), has predominantly been positioned within the Indo-European family (cf. Hamp, 1957; Milewski, 1965; De Simone, 1981, 2017; Radulescu, 1994). Simultaneously, an archaeological perspective has classified Messapian culture as having Illyrian origins (D'Andria, 1990; Lombardo, 1991, 1994; Lamboley, 1996, 2002). However, doubts persist about the connections within the Illyrian-Messapic-Albanian triangle.

Hundreds of funerary inscriptions, both *intra muros* and *extra muros* (Lombardo, 1994; Lomas, 2015), remain unseen until the graves are opened in *Grotta della Poesia*, hundreds of Messapic texts, along with Latin and Greek inscriptions, are engraved on the cave walls (De Simone, 2017, p. 1842). Additionally, inscriptions on pottery and coins enrich the mosaic of Messapic epigraphy.

To unravel the Messapic world would seem impossible without delving into Messapic studies encompassing fragmentation, transliterations, and linguistic investigations conducted by classical scholars, including Hahn (1854), Deecke (1881), Bugge (1892), Pedersen (1895), Ribezzo (1907; 1938), Jokl (1911), and followed by another generation of scholars such as Whatmough (1927), Krahe (1929, 1955), Parlangèli (1960), Hamp (1957), Pisani (1976), and more recent authors like De Simone (1988, 2017), Marchesini (2020), Matzinger (2005, 2019), among others. This also encompasses historical, archaeological, and cultural arguments presented by D’Andria (1988, 1990), Lombardo (1991, 1992), Burger (1998), Lamboley (1996, 2002), Aigner-Foresti (2004), Graham (1982), Yntema (2008), Herring (2007), and Lomas (2015, 2018). The suggestions of Albanian linguist Çabej (1986) regarding the Messapic language as an Illyrian or Ancient Albanian dialect are also paramount.

The foundation for exploring the connections between Proto-Albanian, Messapic (as an Illyrian variety), and Albanian words and worlds relies on numerous linguistic and social convergences. Primarily, it is essential to contextualise the provided votive and funerary inscriptions, which parallel the internal-comparative linguistic situation, within a framework that reflects both the situation and the broader social context of remembrance and cultural memory (Assmann, 2006). This can be seen as a small but important step toward a new horizon of expectation, as declared by D’Andria regarding an “archaeology of inscriptions” (2022).

Given that these inscriptions were written in *scriptio continua*, the main keys to their readings involve finding an appropriate method of segmentation. The approach to fragmentation should first encompass the complex use of the interjection *ihi* and the verb *jam* meaning “to be” in its protoforms *as~a*, *os~o*, and “*st*”. This includes noting the repetition of the same lemmas across various inscriptions.

2. (Re)segmenting and Interpreting Inscriptions

Below are new readings presented as “reconstructing translations” of four votive inscriptions as they appear in the *Monumenta Linguae Messapicae* (= MLM), edited by De Simone & Marchesini, published in Wiesbaden in 2002. It is important to note that the re-segmentation of Messapic not only reflects its vocabulary but also its phonemic-morphemic structure, to a certain extent, encompassing aspects like tone and rhythm. This historical linguistic arch can be observed as Proto-Albanian > Early Albanian transitioned into Classical Albanian.

2.1 MLM 36 Cae: Reading & Reconstruction

| | | |
|--------------|----------------------------|----------|
| MLM 36 Cae | century VI-V BC | (p. 166) |
| Item | damikihinonaimo | |
| Segmentation | da miki <i>hi</i> nona imo | |

| | |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| Mes. > CALb. | da miku-<i>ihi</i>, nona ime |
| Stand. Alb. | u nda miku- <i>ihi</i> , nëna ime |
| English | /my/ friend passed a way- <i>ihi</i> /oh/ my mother |

da (v.) > *u* (*n*)*da*; *vdīq* ‘to die; deceased’. From PALb **en-danja* etymologically related to Skt. *dāyate*, *dāte id*, ‘to cut, to divide’. It is obvious that the verbal prefix **en* continues IE **en(i)* ‘in.’ Also, *dazima* might be *vdekja* ‘death’ < *daj* ‘to divide’; often used with prefix *n-* as *ndaj* in late Alb. It goes back to PALb **danja*, transformed from **daja* under the influence of other verbs in *-nja*. Cognates: Gk. *δαίωμα* ‘to divide,’ Skt. *dāyate*, Lat. *dividere*, Avest. *dvaidi* ‘to kill,’ Phryg. *addaket* ‘do, put,’ Goth. *daups* ‘i vdekur,’ *daupus* ‘death’; OIsl. *deyja* ‘vdes’ < PIE **dhau* ‘stifle.’ *Dazima* might be an anthroponym, as suggested by some scholars, and also an isoglosse. Three stages of the word: PALb: **en-danja* > Mes: *dazi(m)~nda~dazi* Alb: *da~i ndarë~ndarje*.

mik/i (n.) *mik* ‘friend’. This constitutes evidence that *mik* is not influenced by Lat. *amicus*, as previously believed (considering its appearance around the 6th to 5th century BC). All three elements, *m:i:k*, have roots in PIE. Cognates: Skt. *mitrá-* ‘friend,’ Hitt. *mīu-* ‘smooth, gentle,’ Av. *miθra-* ‘friend,’ OPers. *MiBra-* ‘name of god,’ Goth. *mēgs*, OHG. *mūg* ‘kinsman, relative,’ and Rom. *amic*. This likely stems from PIE **mei-* ‘to bind’ or **mēgh-* ‘friendly’ (Pokorny), evolving into **ámeikā*. Three stages of the word: PALb: **meik* > Mes: *mik* > Alb: *mik*.

i/hi (interj.) > *ihi* ‘ihi’. A mourning interjection and an element of Illyrian iso-singing, evidently inherited by the Albanian world; at times evokes reminiscences of the Gen. or another case. It might also function as a verbal ending, akin to Hittite. This aligns with the possibility of associating *hi/r* with both ‘grace’ and ‘remains,’ while acknowledging a divine grace as the root of the word *hia~hija*, signifying ‘shadow’. Three stages of the word: PALb: **ihi?* > Mes: *ihi* > Alb: *ihi*.

nona (n.) *nona~nana*, *ama~ëma*, *nëna* ‘mother’. Derived from PALb **na(n)nā?*, it relates to Skt. *nanā* and Hitt. *anna-* ‘mother, sister, deity’. It is also associated with Hitt. *annaaš* ‘mother,’ *ḫaannaaš* ‘grandmother,’ Lyc. *χῆνα* ‘mother’ < PANat. **honno-* ‘moon, mother’ < PIE **-ótn-o* or **h₁neun* ‘nine,’ as suggested by Pokorny. Other cognates encompass: Pruss. *ane* ‘old mother,’ Arm. *han* ‘grandmother,’ Lith. *anūta* ‘mother-in-law,’ Lat. *anna* ‘nursing mother,’ and Rom. *nana* ‘mother’.

Three stages of the word: PALb: **na(n)nā?* > Mes: *nona* > Alb: *nona~nana~nëna*.
imo (pr.) > *ime* ‘my’. From PALb **mei* < IE **meios*. This possessive pronoun is well preserved, both in terms of its form and function. It originates from PALb **i eme*, where *eme* reflects the old accusative form **eme*. Cognates: Gk. *ἐμέ*, Lat. *meus*, OPrus. *mais*, Slav. *mojъ*.

Three stages of the word: PALb: **mei* > Mes: *imo* > Alb: *imi~(j)emi*.

Bibliography

For words in PALb/Alb, please refer to the explanations and sources provided in the relevant word entries in Orel, 1998; 2000.

For a bibliography of words in Messapic, please refer to De Simone & Marchesini, 2002; Matzinger, 2019.

Others: Pokorny, 1955 [2007]; Lubotsky, 2021.

Commentary

This inscription, engraved on a skyphos, embodies a mourning character, serving as a specific lament for a departed friend. This form of lamentation distinguishes itself in the funerary discourse, occasionally expanding into more narrative inscriptions but always conveying the tone of grief for the deceased.

Regarding *i/hi*, although it has often been considered primarily as a genitive ending (Deecke, 1881; Frank, 1933; De Simone, 1992; Prosdocimi, 2006), it appears to be more versatile, functioning beyond a genitive role in certain cases. *Ihi* emerges as a paradigm of melismatic mourning interjection, representing the phenomenon of iso singing-mourning, later qualified into “iso-polyphony”. Consequently, *ih* is indicative of the bereavement genre and is still found in the modern Albanian tradition, known as *iso*, marking a distinctive feature of iso-polyphony.

One might hypothesise that *i/hi*, initially, had its own meaning as a root, possibly akin to Lubotsky’s interpretation. He explains the Sanskrit root *hi-* as “to impel, hurl; to injure, harm”, and *hīd-* as “to make somebody angry” (2021, pp. 227–235).

2.2 MLM 5 Bal: Reading & Reconstruction

| | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------|
| MLM 5 Bal | century III BC | (p. 94) |
| Item | traohanθihi | |
| Segmentation | trahan/θi/hi | |
| Mes. > CALb. | trahanē ty-hi | |
| Stand. Alb. | trahanē ty-hi | |
| English | <i>trahana</i> /sort of food/ for you- <i>hi</i> | |

traohan/ti~trohan/θes (n.) > *trahana*; *trohana* ‘sort of food’. It seems to generate its PALb form as a composite *tro-ha-* ‘a meal made from crumbs.’ Anatol. cognates: CLuw. *tarhuntiti-* and Hitt. ‘*tar-ḫu-un-ti-ti-a-aš* ‘a kind of food.’ Conversely, establishing semantic correspondences between *trohan/ti* and HLuw. *Tarhunt-*, *Tarhunza-* ‘Storm-god’ and Skt. *turḥati* ‘to overcome, to overpower,’ Av. *tauruuaiieiti* ‘to overcome,’ and PIE **terh₂-u-ti*, **trh₂-u-enti* proves challenging. Three stages of the word: PALb **troha-*? M: *trahan-* > Alb: *trahanē~trohanē*.

θi (pr.) > *ty*; *ti* ‘to you; you’. From PALb **tū* < PIE **tū*. The proto form has been rebuilt as **tei* or **tuei*. The first element of the diphthong is lost and PALb **yi* gave Alb. *i*. Cognates: Skt. *tū* Av. *tū*, Gk. *σύ*, Lat. *tū*, OIr. *tú*, OHG. *tū*, Slav. **ti* ‘you’.

The old attested form *tinē* has developed from the 1st pers. sing. *unē* ‘I,’ while the dative-accusative form *ty* comes from PALb **t(u)wā* < PIE *tuēm*. Huld reconstructs **ti* in PALb as a clear reflex of PIE **tu*.

Three stages of the word: PALb: **tū* > Mes: *ti~te* > Alb: *ti*.

Bibliography

For words in PALb/Alb, please refer to the explanations and sources provided in the relevant word entries in Orel, 1998; 2000.

For a bibliography of words in Messapic, please refer to De Simone & Marchesini, 2002; Matzinger, 2019.

Others: Miklosich, 1870; Meyer, 1891; Huld, 1984; Tischler, 2016.

Commentary

The term appears familiar in Messapic > Early Albanian but its first recorded written usage dates back to the end of the XIXth century, documented by H. Z. Kamberi. Although it seems homophonic to the word *tershane* “oats” and reminds us of cereal needing three months to ripen (Meyer, 1891), it is much more a word that refers directly to the products of grain, as the sepulchral context of the inscriptions will show. Although some have suggested that this food originated from the Ottoman Empire, Messapian evidence sheds light on its earlier existence. Derived from the word *trohë* “crumb,” *trahana* has a cognate in Bulg. **troxa* (Miklosich, 1870, p. 35; Meyer, 1891, p. 437), but not in other modern languages of the region. It appears that Albanian has preserved its early meaning, similar to Hitt and Luw.

Trahana, *trohana* or *terhana*, is likely the oldest known food or dish in Albanian cuisine (a ground meal made from grain or flour), and it is mentioned several times in inscriptions. *Trahana* is commonly considered a staple food, a grain product that can be prepared quickly, often by boiling flour in butter or meat sauce. It remains popular in Albania, Kosovo, and Macedonia.

While the word appears to be familiar in Messapic and Early Albanian, its first recorded written form dates back to the end of the 19th century, credited to H. Z. Kamberi. Despite its homophony with the word *tërshana* “oats” and evoking the idea of cereal needing three months to ripen (Meyer, 1891), *trahana* is more directly associated with grain products, as indicated by the sepulchral context of the inscriptions.

2.3 MLM 8 Car: Reading & Reconstruction

| | | |
|--------------|----------------------------------|----------|
| MLM 8 Car | century III BC | (p. 185) |
| Item | valdoaosakello | |
| Segmentation | val do aosa kel lo | |
| Mes. > CALb. | val to Aosa kel lo | |
| Stand. Alb. | valë /të/ Vjose ke lënë | |
| English | waves of Vjosa/Aosa/ you’ve left | |

val (n.) > *valë* ‘waves’. From PALb **walā* < PIE **uel-* ‘wave’. The word *valle* ‘dance’ is also etymologically linked to the root of the word *valë* ‘wave’. Typically, PALb **l* > Mes & Alb *ll*. Also, consider a possible IE root **bal-*, **balbal-* ‘flow/stream, sway’. Cognates: ON *alda* ‘wave’, OHG *wella* ‘flow, stream’, Lith. *vilnis* ‘wave’; Hitt. *ṽalliyatar*, *ṽalliyann-* ‘chant, song or dance accompanying prayer, ritual’, Skr. *balbalīti* ‘to move around’, Gk. βαλλίζω ‘to dance’, Lat. *ballāre* ‘to dance’. Regarding the connection with ‘wave’ see PIE **wallijō-* ‘flow, source, well’.

Three stages of the word: PALb: **walā* > Mes: *val* > Alb: *walë*.

do (prep.) > *të*, *te* ‘of; to’. Also related to archaic Alb *tek dhe tek* < PALb **tai ku* < IE **toi* ‘to’. The old form *deri* < PALb **deur(e)i* is also possible. Cognates: Lith. *aure*, Av. *avara*, Slav. **dori* ‘to’.

Three stages of the word: PALb: **deur* > Mes: *do* > Alb: *te~të*.

aosa (n.) > the ancient name of Vjosa, river in Albania.

ke (v.) > *ke* ‘(you) have’. From PALb **kapmi*, which is an athematic verb based on IE **kap-* ‘to seize, to grasp’. Unvoiced IE **k~kh* gave PALb **k* > Alb *k*. Also, all clusters consisting of an occlusive followed by PALb **m* developed into Alb *m*. Cognates: Lat. *capiō*, Got. *haban* ‘to have’.

Three stages of the word: PALb: **kapmi* > Mes: *ke* > Alb: *ka? ke*.

lo~la (v.) > *la~lë* ‘to let; to leave’. It appears also in the forms: *las*; *laono*; *lasb*; *lazes*. In these forms, aside from graphic alternation, the shift between *s:z* indicates variations in verb tenses. Originating from PALb **laidna*, which supersedes the more archaic form **laida*; the evolution of IE **l* resulted in PALb **l*, while *-a* originated from the PALb diphthong *ai*, with occasional loss of **n*. Cognates: Hitt. *lā-i* ‘to let; to leave’, Lith. *lėisti*, Latv. *laīst*, Goth. *letan* ‘to let’ < IE **leid-*. Additionally, it traces back to PALb **laide*, aligning with the Baltic particle of optative and permissive: Lith. *laī*, Latv. *lāi*, OPrus *lai*.

Three stages of the word: PALb: **laida* > Mes: *la-* > Alb: *la~lë*.

Bibliography

For words in PALb/Alb, please refer to the explanations and sources provided in the relevant word entries in Orel, 1998; 2000.

For a bibliography of words in Messapic, please refer to De Simone & Marchesini, 2002; Matzinger, 2019.

Commentary

The inscription’s tone embodies lofty and reverential vocabulary, The inscription’s tone embodies a lofty and reverential vocabulary, characteristic of the solemnity found in funerary discourse. It is crafted with a hymnal quality, serving as a poignant tribute to the departed. The metaphorical use of *val* “waves” to symbolise significant accomplishments resonates harmoniously within the sepulchral context.

Vjosa (Gk: Αώος, Aoös) meanders through the region of Epirus, likely traversing territories once inhabited by the early Messapians. Originating in close proximity to

Ioannina, Greece, this river gracefully courses its way to Vlora, Albania. It is crafted with a hymnal quality, serving as a poignant tribute to the departed. The metaphorical use of *val* “waves” to symbolise significant accomplishments resonates harmoniously within the sepulchral context.

Vjosa (Gk: Αώος, *Aoōs*) meanders through the region of Epirus, likely traversing territories once inhabited by the early Messapians. Originating in close proximity to Ioannina, Greece, this river gracefully courses its way to Vlora, Albania.

2.4 MLM 4 Ur: Reading & Reconstruction

| | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------|----------|
| MLM 4 Ur | century III BC (442) | (p. 185) |
| Item | diθehaihi | |
| Segmentation | diθe haihi | |
| Mes. > CALb. | ditë haji | |
| Stand. Alb. | ditë hajeje /dita e hajes/ | |
| English | day of food /day of offerings/ | |

diθ/e (n.) > ditë ‘day’. From PALb. **dītā*. The *i*-root exemplifies a situation where **ī* had remained unchanged in PALb and was also retained in Alb., akin to the persistent unvoiced PIE **t*, preserved in PALb **t* > Alb. *t*. Cognates: Skt. *dīti* ‘shining, brightness,’ Gmc. **īdiz* ‘time,’ OHG *zīt*, OE *tīd*.

Three stages of the word: PALb: **dītā* > Mes: *dite/a* > Alb: *dita*.

e > *e*; ‘ending; article’. It can serve as the ending of *diθ/e* or as a genitive article of *hai-* ‘of food,’ as evidenced by its appearance in Messapic.

haihi > *e* *hajit~e hajes* ‘of food/eating; to eat’. It originates from PALb **ed-(sk)a* derived from PIE **ed-*. Albanian exhibits accentual archaism with a stressed thematic vowel in 1 sg. **edd* < PIE **edam*. Additionally, the regular transformations include pretonic **-d-* > *-h-*, *-θ-*, as well as apheresis. Cognates: Gk. *xaivo* ‘to yawn, to gape,’ Skt. *khddati* ‘to eat, to devour,’ *ghas-* ‘to eat,’ *aiš / išš-* ‘mouth,’ Arm. *eker* ‘ate,’ Lat. *avere* ‘to enjoy, to be well,’ Tokh A, B *s’wa-* ‘to eat’ < from IE **(s)khed-*. At the same time, the *nti*-participle *ngrënë/ngranë* is derived from PIE **eer(a)-* ‘to swallow’; Cf. with PIE cognates: Skt. *as-*, Av. *āh-*, Lat. *ös*, OIr. *á* ‘mouth’; IE **h₁ed-* ‘eat’ and PIE **h₁eh₃-es-*.

Three stages of the word: PALb: **ed-(sk)a* > Mes: *ha-* > Alb: *ha*.

Bibliography

For words in PALb/Alb, please refer to the explanations and sources provided in the relevant word entries in Orel, 1998; 2000.

For a bibliography of words in Messapic, please refer to De Simone & Marchesini, 2002; Matzinger, 2019.

Commentary

This inscription is a typical votive example, conveyed through ritualistic discourse, and details deeds linked to offerings made on a significant day (possibly an anniversary) in memory of the deceased.

The interjection/ending *i/hi* in the inscriptions of *Ur* (Uria/Oria) is notably uncommon. In this specific instance, *i/hi* can indeed be considered a genitive ending, as often emphasised, even though the form of the lemma *hai* “to eat; food” may contain *-hi* within its thematic or inflective structure beyond a specific connection to the genitive.

Conclusion

The four inscriptions discussed exemplify the typical length of Messapic inscriptions, with three notably longer than average length. Nevertheless, all maintain a consistent funerary tone, incorporating specific narrative elements.

Unfolding as typical *sepulchral stories*, these inscriptions maintain their votive essence within the ritualistic context at the grave of the deceased. They convey details about offerings, food, rituals, and the characters of the deceased individuals, incorporating mini-storytelling elements – all within the sepulchral context.

Extending beyond typical funerary inscriptions in the Greco-Roman world, these inscriptions showcase a rich vocabulary imbued with a lamenting tone, illustrating the formation of the funerary discourse, exemplified best by *gjama* “lamenting, mourning,” a characteristic that will also be prevalent in Albanian tradition (Kondi, 2012). They encompass integral components of a votive discourse, preserving their poetic essence within the syncretic discursive context of life and death. Situated between mourning and admiration, rooted in sepulchral, votive, and procession culture, these inscriptions serve as *evidence* of the worldviews of the buried and the grief of their living loved ones. An essential aspect of the funerary character of these inscriptions is the dialogic form that pervades almost the entire discourse.

Contrasting with earlier assumptions that these inscriptions primarily listed names with few verbs, the examples here demonstrate a substantial use of verbs. The longer inscriptions amplify the number of verbs, indicating that, in Messapic inscriptions, the verbal system competes with the nominal system in both vocabulary and morpho-syntactic function. Consequently, the Messapian language, concealed for centuries by the challenges of *scriptio continua* text, reveals its complexity in vocabulary and grammar.

The evident Indo-European language background, coupled with its Proto-Albanian/Illyrian derivatives, are profoundly represented in Messapic inscriptions, suggesting a kind of *black discourse*. This linguistic richness underscores Messapic’s endurance in the hinterland of Illyricum, preserved for millennia primarily as an oral culture. Challenging the notion of Messapic as an *extinct* language, it aligns remarkably with classical Albanian. This alignment, within the context, opens a new horizon for the interpretation of Messapic epigraphy and its genuine character as a *black* funerary discourse.

References

- Aigner-Foresti, L., 2004. Gli Illiri in Italia: istituzioni politiche nella Messapia preromana [The Illyrians in Italy: Political Institutions in Pre-Roman Messapia]. In: G. Urso, ed. *Dall' Adriatico al Danubio. I convegni della Fondazione Niccolò Canussio [From the Adriatic to the Danube. The Conferences of the Niccolò Canussio Foundation]*. Pisa: ETS, pp. 79–94. [In Italian].
- Assmann, A., 2006. *Erinnerungsräume. Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses [Spaces of Memory. Forms and Transformations of Cultural Memory]*. 3. Auflage. München: Beck. [In German].
- Bugge, S., 1892. *Beiträge zur etymologischen Erläuterung der albanesischen Sprache [Contributions to the Etymological Explanation of the Albanian Language]*. *Beiträge zur Kunde der Indogermanischen Sprachen [Contributions to the Study of Indo-European Languages]*. Bezenbergers Beiträge. 18, pp. 161–201. [In German].
- Burger, G. J., 1998. *Constructing Messapian Landscapes. Settlement, Dynamics, Social Organisation and Culture Contact in the Margins of Graeco-Roman Italy*. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben.
- Çabej, E., 1986. *Studime gjuhësore I–VI [Language Studies]*. Prishtinë: Rilindja. [In Albanian].
- D'Andria, F., 1988. *Messapi e Peuceti in Italia omnium terrarum alumna [Messapians and Peucetians in Italy, the foster mother of all lands]*. Milan: G. Pugliese. [In Italian-Latin].
- D'Andria, F., ed. 1990. *Archeologia dei Messapi [The Archeology of Messapians]*. Bari: Edipuglia. [In Italian].
- D'Andria, F., 2022. Necessità di un'archeologia delle iscrizioni: tra Taranto, la Messapia e l'Athenaion di Castro [The Need for an Archaeology of Inscriptions: Between Taranto, Messapia, and the Athenaion of Castro]. *Orizzonti. Rassegna di archeologia*, XXIII/2002, pp. 67–85. Pisa, Roma: Fabrizio Serra Editore. [In Italian].
- Deecke, W., 1881. Zur Entzifferung der messapischen Inschriften I. [On the Decipherment of the Messapian Inscriptions I]. In: *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie [Philological Museum of the Rhine]*. Frankfurt Am Main: Verlag von Johann David Sauerländer, pp. 576–596. [In German].
- De Simone, C., 1988. Iscrizione messapiche della grotta della poesia [Messapian Inscriptions from the Cave of Poetry]. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, 3/18, 2, pp. 325–415. [In Italian].
- De Simone, C., 1992. Sul genitivo messapico in '-ihi' [On the Messapian Genitive in '-ihi']. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, 3/12, 1, pp. 1–42. [In Italian].
- De Simone, C., 2017. *Messapic*. In: J. Klein, B. Joseph, and M. Fritz (eds.). *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics*, 3. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 1839–1850.
- De Simone, C. & Marchesini, S., 2002. *Monumenta Linguae Messapicae [Monuments of the Messapian Language]*. Vol. 1–2. Wiesbaden: Reichert. [In Italian].
- Graham, A. J., 1982. The Colonial Expansion of Greece. In: J. Boardman; N. G. L. Hammond, eds. *The Cambridge Ancient History: The Expansion of the Greek World, Eighth to Sixth Centuries B.C. III*. Part 3, 2 ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 83–162. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521234474.006>.
- Hamp, E. P., 1957. *Albanian and Messapic. Gravengahe*: Mouton.
- Hahn, J. G. V., 1854. *Albanesische Studien [Albanian Studies]*. Jena: Verlag von Friedrich Mauke. [In German].
- Haarmann, H., 2010. *Die Indoeuropäer. Herkunft, Sprachen, Kulturen [The Indo-Europeans. Origin, Languages, Cultures]*. Verlag C.H. Beck: München. [In German].
- Herodotus, 2009. *The Landmark Herodotus. The Histories*. Ed. by R. B. Strassler, transl. by A. L. Purvis. New York: Anchor Books.
- Herring, E., 2007. Daunians, Peucetians and Messapians? Societies and Settlements in South-East Italy. In: G. J. Bradley, E. Isayev, and C. Riva (eds.). *Ancient Italy: regions without boundaries*. Exeter, pp. 268–294.
- Huld, M. E., 1984. *Basic Albanian Etymologies*. Columbus: Slavica.
- Fairclough, N., 1989. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Frank, G., 1933. AOI in the *Chanson de Roland*. *PMLA*, 48 (3), pp. 629–635. <https://doi.org/10.2307/458332>.
- Jokl, N., 1911. *Studien zur albanesischen Etymologie und Wortbildung [Studies on Albanian Etymology and Word Formation]*. Wien: Kommission bei A. Hölder. [In German].

- Kondi, B., 2012. *Death and Ritual Crying: An anthropological approach to Albanian funeral customs*. Berlin: λογος.
- Krahe, H., 1929. *Lexikon altillyrischer personennamen [Lexicon of Old Illyrian Personal Names]*. Heidelberg: C. Winter. [In German].
- Krahe, H., 1955. *Die Sprache der Illyrier. Erster Teil: Die Quellen [The language of Illyrians. First Part: Sources]*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. [In German].
- Lamboley, J. L., 1996. *Recherches sur les Messapiens, IVe-IIe siècle avant J.-C. [Research on the Messapians, 4th-2nd century BC]*. Ecole Rome. [In French].
- Lamboley, J. L., 2002. Territoire et société chez les Messapiens [Territory and Society among the Messapians]. *Revue belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 80 (1), pp. 51–72. [In French].
- Lomas, K., 2015. Hidden writing: epitaphs within tombs in Early Italy. In : *L'écriture et l'espace de la mort: épigraphie et nécropoles à l'époque pré-romaine [Writing and the Space of Death: Epigraphy and Necropolises in the Pre-Roman Era]*. Publications de l'École française de Rome, pp. 103–123. Available at: <<https://books.openedition.org/efr/2777?lang=en>> [Accessed 20 May 2022].
- Lomas, K., 2018. Language, Identity, and Culture in Ancient Italy. Responses to Roman conquest. In: A. Gardner, A., & Herring, E & Lomas, K. (eds.). *Creating Ethnicities & Identities in the Roman World*. Institute of Classical Studies. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, pp. 71–92.
- Lombardo, M., 1991. I Messapi: aspetti della problematica storica [The Messapians: Aspects of the Historical Issue]. In: Stazio, ed. *I Messapi. Atti del 30o Convegno di Studi sulla Magna Grecia [The Messapians. Proceedings of the 30th Conference on Studies of Magna Graecia]*. Taranto, pp. 38–109. [In Italian].
- Lombardo, M., ed. 1992. *I Messapi e la Messapia nelle fonti letterarie Greche e Latine*. Galatina: Congedo. [In Italian].
- Lombardo, M., 1994. Tombe e riti funerari in Messapia: evidenze e problemi [Tombs and Funeral Rites in Messapia: Evidence and Problems]. *Studi di Antichità*, 7, pp. 25–45. Available at: <https://www.academia.edu/1994585/Tombe_necropoli_e_riti_funerari_inMessapia_evidenze_e_problemi> [Accessed 22 May 2023]. [In Italian.]
- Lubotsky, A. 2021. Sanskrit roots *hi-* ‘to impel, hurl’, *his-* ‘to injure, harm’, *hīd-* ‘to make/be angry’ and the Indo-European root enlargements *-s-* and *-d-*. *Historische Sprachforschung*, 131/1, pp. 227–235. <https://doi.org/10.13109/hisp.2018.131.1.227>.
- Marchesini, S., 2020. Messapico [Messapic]. *PALAEOHISPANICA*, 20, pp. 495–530. <https://doi.org/10.36707/palaeohispanica.v0i20.378>. [In Italian].
- Matzinger, J., 2005. Messapisch und Albanisch [Messapic and Albanian]. *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction*, 2, pp. 29–54. Available at: <https://www.academia.edu/6679811/Messapisch_Albanisch> [Accessed 10 May 2022]. [In German].
- Matzinger, J., 2019. *Messapisch. Kurzgrammatiken indogermanischer Sprachen und Sprachstufen [Messapic. Concise Grammars of Indo-European Languages and Language Stages]*. Wiesbaden: Dr Ludwig Reichert Verlag. [In German].
- Meyer, G., 1891. *Etymologisches wörterbuch der albanesischen sprache [Etymological Dictionary of the Albanian Language]*. Strassburg: K. J. Trübner. [In German].
- Miklosich, F., 1870. *Albanische Forschungen. III. Die Form entlehnter Verba im Albanischen and einigen anderen Sprachen [Albanian Research. III. The Form of Borrowed Verbs in Albanian and Some Other Languages]*. Wien, Denkschr. Akad. Wien XX. [In German].
- Milewski, T., 1965. *The Relation of Messapic within the Indo-European family*. Adam Heinz, Mieczysław.
- Orel, V. E., 1998. *Albanian Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Orel, V. E., 2000. *A Concise Historical Grammar of Albanian*. Leiden: Brill.
- Parlangèli, O., 1960. *Studi Messapici [Messapian Studies]*. Milano: Istituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere. [In Italian].
- Pedersen, H., 1895. *Albanische Texte mit Glossar [Albanian Texts with Glossary]*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel. [In German].
- Pisani, V., 1976. Gli Illiri in Italia [The Illyrians in Italy]. *Iliria*, 5, pp. 67–73. [In Italian].
- Pokorny, J. B., 1955 [2007]. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, 2 Band [Indo-European*

Etymological Dictionary, 2]. Bern, Munich: A. Francke. [In German].

Prosdocimi, A. L., 2006. Il genitivo messapico in -ihi [The Messapic Genitive in -ihi]. In: R. Bombi, G. Cifoletti, F. Fusco, L. Innocente, and V. Orioles (eds.). *Studi linguistici in onore di R. Gusmani III [Linguistic Studies in Honor of R. Gusmani III]*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, pp. 1421–1432. [In Italian].

Radulescu, M. M., 1994. The Indo-European Position of Messapic. *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 22, pp. 329–344.

Ribezzo, F., 1907. *La lingua degli antichi Messapii [The Language of the Ancient Messapians]*. Napoli: Stab. tipografico della R. Università. [In Italian].

Ribezzo, F., 1938. *Corpus inscriptionum messapicarum [Corpus of Messapic Inscriptions]*. Bari: Edipuglia. [In Italian].

Saunders, D., ed. 2021. *Underworld: Imagining the Afterlife in Ancient South Italian Vase Painting*. Los Angeles: Getty Publications.

Tischler, J., 2016. *Vocabulaire Hittite. Y compris Louvite, Palaïte, Akkadien, et Summérien [Hittite Vocabulary. Including Luwian, Palaic, Akkadian, and Sumerian]*. Translated by Sylvie Vansevéren. Leuven, Paris, Bristol: Peeters. [In French].

West, M. L., 2007. *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Whatmough, J., 1927. On the Phonology of the Messapic Dialect. *Language*, 3 (4), pp. 226–231.

Yntema, D. G., 2008. Polybius and the Field Survey Evidence from Apulia. In: L de Light, S. J. Northwo, eds. *People, Land, and Politics. Mnemosyne Supplements. History and Archaeology of Classical Antiquity*, 303. Leiden: Brill, pp. 373–385.