

W. D. C. de Melo

## Faliscan

### Verb morphology

As with nouns, there are no complete paradigms, but the attested forms allow a number of conclusions.

#### The Proto-Italic verb

One of the main reasons for postulating a Proto-Italic language rather than two independent branches of Indo-European, Proto-Latin(-Faliscan) on the one hand and Proto-Sabellic on the other, lies in the verb system. Indo-European is assumed to have had three ‘tense’ stems, the present stem, the aorist stem, and the perfect stem. The tenses and moods of the present stem are imperfective (ongoing) and those of the aorist are perfective (one complete whole). The perfect marks states resulting from previous actions.

Greek has preserved this distinction: present ποιῶ ‘I am doing’, aorist ἐποίησα ‘I did’, πεποίηκα ‘I have done’.

Latin, Oscan, and Umbrian only have a twofold distinction between present stem and perfect stem. The perfect stem, however, continues both perfect and aorist formants, which makes it likely that before this morphological merger there was a semantic merger of the two stems. Cf. Latin *tetuli* ‘I carried’ = reduplicated perfect stem, *dixi* ‘I said’ = sigmatic aorist stem.

The Indo-European present stem was not always formed in the same way. There are a number of different formations, e.g. *e/o*-presents (*ago, agis*), *ye/o*-presents (*cipio, capis*), or nasal infix presents (*rumpo, rumpis*).

If Latin and Osco-Umbrian were two separate branches of Indo-European, we would expect the number of shared present and perfect formations to be equally low or perhaps equally high because there was prolonged contact. This is not the case:

Of the 60 present stem formations attested in Osco-Umbrian, 44 (ca 75%) are identical with Latin; of 17 perfect stems, 11 are different; cf.:

Latin aorist, Osco-Umbrian perfect:

L. *fecit*, O. *fefacid*

L. *fui*, O. **fufens**

L. *dixi*, U. *dersikurent* < \**de-dik-*

L. *fixi*, O. **fifikus**

Latin u-perfect (replacing an s-aorist), U. perfect:

L. *compescui*, U. *peperscus*

Latin perfect, Osco-Umbrian aorist:

L. *pepuli*, U. **apelust**  
L. *tetuli*, U. **entelust**  
L. *ueni*, O. **kúm-bened**  
L. *emi*, O. *pert-emust*  
L. *legi*, Paelignian *lexe*  
L. *cepi*, U. *habe*  
L. *sedi*, U. *sesust*

Latin and Osco-Umbrian perfect:

L. *dedi*, O. **deded**  
L. *con-didi*, O. **prú-ff-ed**  
L. *poposci*, U. **peperkurent**  
L. *cecini*, U. *pro-canurent* (loss of reduplication in compounds)

How can this situation be explained? Chance or contact alone cannot explain the large number of shared present stems and the divergences in the perfect. It is perhaps easiest to assume that the three stems were still distinct in Proto-Italic. The present stem formations were by and large standardized, with a few competing formations still remaining. Perfect and aorist merged only after the Proto-Italic unity ceased to exist, and Latin had different criteria for selecting the new perfect stems than did Osco-Umbrian.

## Faliscan perfect stems

The following perfects are attested in Faliscan: **peparai**, **porded**, **fifiked**, **f(if)iqod**, **faced** / **facet**, **nuidice** (?), **tulom** (?).

**peparai**: L. *peper̄i*; both are reduplicating perfects. The reconstructed ending for the first person singular is  $*-H_2ei > -ai$ ; this gets weakened in Latin, cf. *fecer̄i* and later *fec̄i*.

**porded**: presumably from  $*por-deded$ , a perfect dereduplicated because of the prefix; cf. L. reduplicated *dedit*; cf. also *tetuli* vs. *contuli*. The ending *-ed*, which we find in early Latin, in Oscan and in Umbrian, continues the third person singular aorist ending. Note that *dedet* and *datu* in Ve 320 are Latin forms in an inscription which is essentially Latin.

**fifiked** and **f(if)iqod**: these correspond to L. *finxit* and *finxerunt*. Cf. O. **fifikus** with reduplication. Faliscan perfect stems thus do not always agree with Latin perfect stems, but note that there is still some variation even in Latin: *peperci* vs. *parsi*, *vhe:vhaked* from Praeneste vs. *fecit*. The ending *-od* stands for *-ond*, i.e. it is a third person plural aorist ending. The Latin endings are *-ēre*, *-ērunt*, and *-ērunt*. The latter is a contamination of the first two endings. *-ēre* goes back to  $*-eH_1-ri$ . *-ērunt* does not have an original *-r-*, but goes back to  $*-is-ont$ , cf. *laudā-u-is-tī*. The origins of *-is-* are obscure; the formant does not occur in Osco-Umbrian either.

**facēd / facēt:** there is no obvious explanation for *-et* instead of *-ed* (final devoicing? influence of the present ending? etc). Latin continues the aorist stem *fēc-* and the perfect stem in the fibula from Praeneste (*vhe:vhaked*); Oscan has the perfect stem in *fefakid*. The Faliscan form could continue a reduplicated perfect, with dereduplication from compounds, cf. *tuli* because of *contulī*, but earlier *tetuli*; alternatively it is conceivable that the root still had Ablaut in Proto-Italic; Latin generalized *fēc-* < *\*d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>k-* = singular of the root aorist, Faliscan continued *fac-* < *\*d<sup>h</sup>H<sub>1</sub>k-* = plural of the root aorist.

**nuidice:** Giacomelli thinks this means *posuit* and compares the obscure Oscan  $\lambda\omicron\alpha\alpha\chi\epsilon\iota\tau$ . Very doubtful.

**tulom:** Ve 259b. Giacomelli believes that this is an aorist, ‘I offered’, with an aorist ending; Vetter is unsure. Regardless of whether they have kept aorist or perfect stems, Latin, Oscan and Umbrian do not have alternative endings (except for *-erunt* and *-ēre*), and we have seen Faliscan **peparai**. ‘I offered’ is unlikely.

## Faliscan present stem forms

The following forms are attested: **statuo** (?), **sta**, **cupat / cupa**, **cupat** (pl.), **lecet**, **zot**, **pipafo / pafo**, **carefo**, **salue**, **saluete**, **salueto**, **douiad**.

**statuo:** Ve 254a. The inscription on a cup consists of only this word. According to Giacomelli, this means ‘I set up’. Vetter thinks that this is more likely to be an inscription indicating the owner, **stat(i) uo**( ).

**sta:** Giacomelli thinks this is a third person, Latin *stat*; Vetter believes that the attestation in 254b indicates the owner, while the one in 266c, again consisting only of this word, means **sta(tom)** ‘I set up’. Very doubtful.

**cupat / cupa** and **cupat:** the singular form **cupat** corresponds exactly to Latin *cupat*; in **cupa** the final consonant has been lost. **cupat** as plural shows that the nasal in **-ant** need not be written, a phenomenon also known from Latin inscriptions.

**lecet:** this means ‘lies’, a root found also in German *liegen* and Greek λέγος; the verb seems to belong to the second conjugation; or maybe to the third (no vowel weakening)?

**zot:** this is from Ve 342a2, where Vetter reads **tezot**. **z** mainly occurs word-initially, so it makes sense to regard this as the equivalent of Latin *sunt*, with a weak pronunciation of the nasal.

**pipafo / pafo:** **p** stands for the voiced stop. The verb is the same as L. **bibere**, except that in Faliscan it belongs to the first conjugation and in Latin to the third. As a first-conjugation verb **pipa-** has a future in **-fo**, corresponding to L. **-bo**. **pafo** could be a writer’s error or a genuinely dereduplicated form.

**carefo:** second-conjugation verb, corresponds exactly to L. *carebo*.

**salue, saluete, salueto:** imperatives of a verb corresponding exactly to Latin *saluere*; the imperative singular is the bare stem, and the plural and future endings are as in Latin as well.

**douiad:** 3rd person present subjunctive, ‘may he give’. The verb seems to belong to the same conjugation as L. *capere* or *audire*.

## A note on the simple future

The future in *-bo / -fo* is an innovation shared between Latin and Faliscan, but completely absent in Oscan and Umbrian. Oscan and Umbrian form the simple future with *-s-*, which is perhaps a desiderative formant. Cf.:

1st conjugation: O. *deiuu-s-t* ‘he will swear’

2nd conjugation: U. *staheren* < *\*-ē-s-ent* ‘they will stand’

3rd conjugation: U. *ferest* ‘he will carry’

The Latin future in the 3rd and 4th conjugation goes back to subjunctives (*agam, capiam, ueniam*). In the first and second conjugation Latin and Faliscan have the future in *-bō / -fo*; Latin also has it in the 4th conjugation, but only in early Latin (*audibo*).

The Latin (and presumably also the Faliscan) imperfect ends in *-bā-*. Oscan has an imperfect **fufans** (glossed as *erant*), which was originally the preterite of the reduplicated perfect of the root *fū-* < *\*b<sup>h</sup>uH-* ‘become’; ‘I had become’ became ‘I was’, so the pluperfect was reanalysed as an imperfect, and this is the Proto-Italic starting point of the Latin imperfect formant *-bā-*.

The Latin and Faliscan future arose by analogy: *eram: ero = amabam: amabo*.

## A note on douiad

This form contains an unexpected *-u-*, which we also find in Latin *duit* ‘may he give’ and Umbrian *purdouito* ‘let him offer’. The *-u-* has no parallels outside Italic; it cannot go back to a labial trace of the laryngeal in the root *\*deH<sub>3</sub>-* either. It seems that Italic had a second root meaning ‘give’, a root which was slightly different from the roots attested elsewhere. Should we reconstruct *\*deu-* or *\*deuH-*?

Umbrian has a participle *purditom* ‘offered’. Umbrian changes *-ū-* into *-i-*, but not *-ǔ-*, cf. Latin *manū* vs. Umbrian **mani**. Hence the participle, which must contain the zero-grade root, contained *\*-duH-* rather than just *\*-du-*, and the root was *\*deuH-*.