

Latin prohibitions and the origins of the u/w-perfect and the type *amāstī*

By WOLFGANG DE MELO, Oxford

Summary: Among the various types of Latin prohibitions, there is one that does not fit well into the synchronic tense and aspect system: like all prohibitions, *nē* with the perfect subjunctive has non-past meaning, while this tense has past or anterior meaning elsewhere. Diachronically, however, the non-past usage makes sense. The prohibitive perfect subjunctive continues the functions of modal aorist forms. Magariños (1939) showed that in early Latin reduplicating perfects are by and large avoided in prohibitions in the perfect. The reason is that they go back to old perfects, not to old aorists.

There are various theories about the origins of the u/w-perfect (types *monuī* and *amāuī*). It is difficult to decide for one of them on purely morphological grounds. Looking at restrictions similar to those discovered by Magariños can help us here. Like the reduplicating perfects, the u/w-perfects are avoided in prohibitions. This makes it likely that they originated in perfects and that Rix (1992) was right to derive them from perfect active participles followed by the copula.

There are two main theories about the origins of short forms like *amāstī*. Some scholars derive them from s-aorists and believe that the association with *amāuistī* is secondary, while others think that the short forms are younger and derived from the long ones. Just like their longer counterparts, the short forms are avoided in prohibitions, which is a strong argument in favour of common origin; there is no reason why original aorists should be restricted in this way.

Classicists and philologists tend to approach Latin tenses rather differently. Most classicists are primarily interested in synchronic meanings, whereas most philologists want to know about the historical origins of the morphology that gives rise to these meanings. The two areas of research have drifted so far apart that the gap between them can in many cases no longer be bridged. To give one example, the Latin imperfect indicative is a past simultaneous background tense for the average classicist

(for the semantics compare Pinkster 1990: 227), but this meaning does not play any role in the diachronic derivations of the forms presented in Meiser (1998: 197-9) or Gippert (1999).

At first sight, the situation seems to be different when it comes to the Latin perfect. Latin perfect stems go back to older perfect and aorist stems, compare the reduplicating perfect *cecini* 'I have sung' and the sigmatic 'aorist' *dixi* 'I have said'. This piece of diachronic morphological information has often been connected with the synchronic semantics of the tense. The perfect can denote a present state which is the result of a past action (1), or it can stand for a past action without any present relevance, in which case it is a simple narrative tense (2):¹

(1) (*Pūblicaē litterae*) *docuērunt uōs quid lucellī fēcerit homō nōn malus*. (Cic. *Verr.* II 4.115)
'They (the official documents) have taught you what nice little profit a decent man has made.'

(2) *Hanc enim perfectam philosophiam semper iūdicāuī, quae dē maximīs quaestiōnibus cōpiōsē posset ōrnātēque dīcere*. (Cic. *Tusc.* 1.7)
'For I have always judged this to be the perfect philosophy which could talk about the most important questions eloquently and elegantly.'

Docuērunt is a perfect with present stative meaning ('they have taught you' = 'you know'). It takes primary sequence (*fēcerit*). By contrast, the past perfect *iūdicāuī* takes secondary sequence (*posset*).² The present perfect is said to continue the functions of the Indo-European perfect, and the past perfect is said to continue those of the Indo-European aorist (compare Kühner and Stegmann 1976: 124).

¹ Even though the perfect indicative is for the most part a past narrative tense, Serbat's view (1980: 53) that there is never any present reference is too extreme.

² A detailed discussion of the sequence rules can be found in Grassi (1966). These rules are by and large also valid for early Latin, cf. de Melo (2007: 51-91).

However, the connection between Latin semantics and Indo-European morphology is not as close as it might seem. It is not the case that only perfects which go back to pre-Latin perfects can have stative meaning, and similarly the past narrative function is not restricted to perfects with aorist morphology. Any perfect can have either of the two meanings; in (1) and (2) above we can see them for the same perfect type, the *u/w*-perfect.³ A comparison with the closely related languages Oscan and Umbrian might be instructive: like Latin, they have perfect stems that continue earlier perfect and aorist stems. But, as Meiser (1993: 170-1) points out, Oscan and Umbrian often have old aorist stems where Latin has old perfect stems and *vice versa*.⁴ For this reason it is likely that most verbs had separate aorist and perfect stems in Proto-Italic,⁵ with little semantic difference, and that the rationale behind which survived and which got eliminated is morphological rather than semantic. The double value of the Latin perfect can then be accounted for purely synchronically. Pinkster (1990: 229-32) for instance regards the perfect as a present anterior tense, that is, a tense which signals that an event took place before the moment of speech. This gives us two reference points: the past moment or time span during which the event happened, and the present, at which its consequences may persist. Thus, the two types of sequence of tenses can be accounted for differently: if a subordinate event is set in relation to the past time at which the main

³ I call the type *amāuī* 'I have loved' 'w-perfect' because the *-u-* stands for a bilabial glide. The only difference between the *-u-* in *amāuī* and that in *monuī* 'I have admonished' is that the former is non-syllabic, while the latter is syllabic.

⁴ Cf. Oscan *peremust* 'he will have accepted' with the short root vowel of the aorist stem **H₁em-* (Untermann 2000: 221) vs. the originally reduplicating Latin perfect *ēmī* 'I bought' < **H₁e-H₁m-*, or the reduplicating Umbrian *dersicust* 'he will have said' < **de-deyk-* vs. the Latin sigmatic 'aorist' *dīxī* 'I have said' < **deyk-s-*.

⁵ The shared features of Latin and Osco-Umbrian are of course partly due to borrowing in both directions, but some of them can be explained most easily if we assume a common proto-language (Meiser 1993: 170-1). I agree with Rix (1994: 28), who thinks that we need both the family tree model and the *Sprachbund* theory in this case.

event took place, this subordinate event is put into the imperfect or the pluperfect tense (secondary sequence); if the other event is set in relation to the present, the time at which one can see the consequences of the past action, this second event is in the present or the perfect tense (primary sequence).

Have the ties between diachronic morphology and synchronic semantics been severed irrevocably? Probably not. The two come together again in prohibitive clauses:

(3) *Nē quid quod illī doleā⁶ dīxerīs.* (Plaut. *Cist.* 110)
 ‘Don’t say anything that might hurt his feelings.’

There are several ways of expressing prohibitions in Latin. (3) shows one of the most common types of prohibitive clauses, *nē* with the perfect subjunctive.⁷ The perfect subjunctive is normally used for past events, as in (4):

(4) *Ne illa edepol prō meritō tuō memorārī multa possunt:
 ubi fidentem fraudāuerīs, ubi ero⁸ infidēlis fuerīs,
 ubi uerbīs conceptīs sciēns lubenter peiierārīs,
 ubi parietēs perfōderīs, in fūrto ubi sis prehēnsus,
 ubi saepe causam dīxerīs pendēns.* (Plaut. *Asin.* 560-4)

‘Really now, these many things can be told as your achievements: occasions on which you cheated someone trusting you, on which you were faithless to your master, on which you happily committed perjury with full knowledge and with solemn words, on which you dug holes into walls, on which you were caught stealing, and on which you often had to plead your cause while hanging.’

⁶ In early Latin, the shortening of vowels before final consonants other than *s* was still in progress.

⁷ There is a large amount of literature on Latin prohibitions and also on Latin directives in general. Two works on prohibitions are cited in most articles on the subject: Elmer’s theories (1894) have not met with widespread approval, but reappear in various more modern contributions; and Ammann’s work (1927) contains a number of untenable claims. The best work on Latin directives in general is probably Risselada (1993).

⁸ I do not put macrons on vowels which would be long in isolation, but which are actually elided.

Here all the perfect subjunctives present events that took place in the past. No such past or anterior meaning can be detected in the prohibitive perfect subjunctive in (3). Synchronically, the non-past perfect subjunctive is an exception to the system,⁹ but diachronically it can be accounted for easily. The perfect subjunctive in prohibitions continues modal, non-past uses of the aorist. There are good parallels in Greek, where the aorist subjunctive is employed in the same function (Goodwin 1897: 89, with examples), and in Sanskrit, where the aorist injunctive is used (Whitney 1896: 217, also with examples).

Even though the prohibitive perfect subjunctive cannot be described as perfective (Risselada 1993: 158), unlike its aorist counterparts in Greek and Sanskrit, this usage is one of those cases in which diachronic morphology can shed light on synchronic patterns. But can the synchronic patterns also help us with diachronic morphology? In this article I claim that they can. In particular, I shall examine what the usage of prohibitive subjunctives can tell us about the origins of the *u/w*-perfect (types *monuī* and *amāuī*) and of the type *amāstī* 'you have loved'. The origins of the Latin *u/w*-perfect have always been a matter of dispute. The traditional derivations of *-w-* from a phonemically irrelevant glide between the root **fū-* 'be / become' and the ending **-ay*¹⁰ or from a deictic particle **-u* which was somehow incorporated into the verb forms are problematic. More recently, Rix (1992) argued that such perfects came about when perfect active participles coalesced with the copula, and I shall present synchronic arguments in support of this theory. With regard to the type *amāstī* there are two theories. A number of scholars claim that *amāstī* is a shortened form of *amāuistī* which arose relatively late; other scholars prefer to regard

⁹ Cf. Pinkster (1986: 155). Attempts to give synchronic explanations for the use of the perfect subjunctive in prohibitions are artificial and unconvincing; for two such theories cf. Schütz (1929: 174-6) and Vairel (1981: 260-4). The type *nē quis fēcisse uelīt* may be different; for a synchronic account cf. Daube (1956: 39-48).

¹⁰ This ending is the original first person singular perfect ending **-H₂e > *-a* combined with the *hic et nunc*-particle **-i*.

amāstī as older and think that its association with *amāuistī* is secondary. Again I believe that synchronic patterns of usage can help us to decide; in this case I favour the first hypothesis.

The reason why prohibitive perfect subjunctives can help us with these diachronic questions is that there are certain synchronic restrictions on their use which are indicative of their origins. Magariños (1939: 140), on the whole followed by Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 337), pointed out that reduplicated perfects are avoided in early Latin prohibitions because they go back to old perfects. If there should be a similar restriction on the use of *u/w*-perfects, it would strongly support Rix's derivation of this type from periphrastic perfects. What is more, if we find such a restriction on the use of *u/w*-perfects, we can look at those short perfects which are associated with them, for instance *amāstī*. If they are freely used in prohibitive clauses, it is likely that they have a different, aoristic origin from the *u/w*-forms; but if the same restriction holds here as well, we are probably just dealing with secondarily shortened forms.

In what follows, I shall go into the various derivations of *u/w*-perfects and of the type *amāstī* in somewhat more detail before I turn to the main topic of my article, the help synchronic patterns of usage can give us in deciding for or against diachronic theories about these perfect types.

1. Different views on the u/w-perfect

The Latin *u/w*-perfect is a category for which we cannot find any parallels in Oscan and Umbrian. Consequently, it has been suggested that it is a purely Latin innovation. It is generally assumed that the two perfect types were identical originally: **mone-w-ay* (> *monuī* [*monuī*], *u*-perfect) and **amā-w-ay* (> *amāuī* [*amāwī*], *w*-perfect) both had a glide **-w-* between the stem and the perfect ending **-ay*. **-ay* regularly developed to *-ī*. The difference between the two types came about when short in-

ternal vowels were syncopated. This changed the syllabification patterns, with **-w-* becoming syllabic *-u-* in *monuī*.

The main problem is of course how to get the glide **-w-* in the first place. I do not wish to go into the theories which derive **-w-* from root-final **-H₃-* before perfect endings beginning with a vowel; by now no one seems to believe in them any more.¹¹ Schrijver (1991: 156-7) points out that the number of roots ending in this laryngeal is quite small and that most perfect endings begin with consonants, which would give us a very narrow starting-point.

Narten (1973: 136-9) suggests that *-w-* might have started in the perfect **(fe-)fū-ay*, the ancestor of classical *fūī*, which was phonetically realized as **(fe-)fūway*.¹² This was analysed as **fū-way* rather than **fūw-ay*, and the ending was added to the stem **moni-*¹³ to give us a paradigm **moni-way*, **moni-stay*. **moniway* yields *monuī* without problems, but in order to get *monuistī* we have to assume that **moni-way* was analysed as **moniw-ay*, giving us a perfect stem with **-w-*, and that an ending **-istay* was abstracted from older **moni-stay*. Only in this way can we get the new **moniw-istay*, the ancestor of *monuistī*.

The chief difficulties of this approach are the derivation of **-w-* from a phonemically irrelevant glide and the various processes of reanalysis. However, theories which attempt to connect the glide with finite verb forms of other Indo-European branches are by no means more successful. Schmidt (1985) for

¹¹ The idea that **H₃* can leave labial traces goes back to Martinet (1955: 216-18), according to whom the relationship between **k* and **k'* is mirrored by that between **H₂* and **H₃*; in other words, **H₃* is a labialized **H₂*. The theory was applied to the Latin *u/w*-perfect by Adrados (1956: 21-2).

¹² This theory goes back to Sommer (1914: 559), who starts from the root aorist **fū-m*, which received the perfect ending and became **fū-ay*. The derivation process is then essentially the same as for Narten.

¹³ Narten (1973: 133) assumes a stem **moni-* because of Gothic *nasiþs* 'healed' < **nosi-to-s*. However, for Latin a stem **mone-* is more likely because of Umbrian *tačez* 'silent' < **take-to-s*, cf. Schmidt (1985: 59) and Rix (1992: 224), *pace* Untermann (2000: 732), who thinks that **takē-to-* is morphologically impossible.

instance argues that the *-u* which occurs at the end of the Sanskrit perfect form *jajñá-u*¹⁴ ('I have / he has recognized') is the Indo-European distal deictic particle **-u*.¹⁵ It is not a perfect marker as such, but was associated with some of the perfect endings. Schmidt thinks that this particle also became part of the Latin perfect stem and that it was incorporated into the word 'unter nicht klaren Bedingungen' (1985: 92). Even if this is correct, the Latin and Sanskrit developments must be independent. I cannot follow Jasanoff (1991: 86, note 5), who reconstructs the first and third person singular endings of the late Indo-European perfect as **-ōw* on the basis of the Sanskrit forms. The reason is that the Iranian equivalents of the Indic perfect forms show no traces of this **-u* and that there are also Sanskrit forms without it, for which reasons the attachment of the particle *-u*¹⁶ to the perfect cannot even go back to Indo-Iranian. Moreover, the unclear conditions under which the incorporation must have taken place in Latin make it difficult to accept Schmidt's ideas.

I merely mention in passing that there have also been attempts to link the Latin *u/w*-perfect to Tocharian preterites with a *w*-element. Krause (1955: 139) starts from Tocharian B *nekwa* 'I destroyed'; the corresponding middle form of Tocharian A must have been **nakwe*, from which he reconstructs Proto-Tocharian **nokeway*, a form which is identical to the proto-form of Latin *nocuī* 'I have damaged'. Unfortunately, the absence of palatalization speaks against a sequence **-ke-* in Tocharian, which means that *-w-* did not follow a vowel. The connection cannot be maintained.

¹⁴ The Indo-European root is **g'neH₃-*, cf. Greek γινώσκω 'I recognize' Latin *gnōscō* 'I recognize'.

¹⁵ The so-called *uerba pūra* in Anglo-Saxon also contain a final *u*-element in the preterite (*cnēow* 'knew'), which, however, spread to the infinitive and present as well; Meid (1971: 81-2) regards it as an archaism and tries to connect it with the Sanskrit forms. Cf. also Hirt (1915: 144-7) for similar ideas.

¹⁶ If that is what it is; alternative explanations are possible. Leumann (1977: 597) notes that 'dieses ai. *-au* bzw. idg. *-ōw* ist als Personalform eine Tatsache ohne rechte Erklärung.'

Perhaps the most ingenious theory about the origin of the Latin *u/w*-perfect advanced in recent years can be found in Rix (1992). Latin has retained the present active and the perfect passive participles, while the present mediopassive participle is only preserved in the words *alumnus* 'nursling' (< **H₂al-o-mH₁no-s* 'one who is being fed') and *fēmina* 'woman' (< **d^heH₁-mH₁naH₂-* 'one who is being sucked'), and the perfect active participle may have left traces in *apud* 'at' (< **H₁p-wot-* 'having reached' from *apīscī* 'reach') and *tenus* 'until' (< **tn-wos* 'extending up to' from *ten-d-ere* 'extend') (compare Meiser 1998: 183).¹⁷ According to Rix, there is another trace of the perfect active participle in **-wos*: he argues that the *u/w*-perfect developed when such perfect active participles coalesced with the copula. In other words, the *u/w*-perfect continues an older periphrastic perfect. Univerbation and haplology resulted in the singular forms **portā-wisom* ('I have carried'), **portā-wis(s)*, **portā-wist*.¹⁸ The inherited perfect singular forms were **memon-ay* ('I remember'), **memon-tay*, **memon-ey*. *Portāuistī* arose when **portāwis* was recharacterized by adding the inherited ending **-tay*. *Portāuī* and *portāuit* came about when the perfect stem was reanalysed as **portāw-* and the inherited perfect endings **-ay* and **-ey* were added, the latter recharacterized by **-t*.¹⁹

Rix's hypothesis is very elegant since it is comparatively uncomplicated and also explains where all the perfect active participles have gone. In order to gain more widespread acceptance, however, it requires some independent confirmation. Such confirmation can come from the synchronic angle, as I shall try to show below; but first I shall turn to the type *amāstī*.

¹⁷ A trace of the perfect active participle may also be found in Oscan if Untermann (2000: 677) and Meiser (2003: 46) explain *sipus* 'knowing' correctly (< **sēp-wōs*, cf. Latin *sapere* 'know, be wise; have taste'). Cf. Haspelmath (1994: 162-5) for reasons why past participles tend to be passive, whereas present participles tend to be active.

¹⁸ This process is of course described by Rix in much more detail.

¹⁹ Some early third person singular perfects actually do not have this *-t* yet. Cf. Untermann (1968: 170) for inscriptional evidence.

2. The type *amāstī*

Short perfect forms exist for the *w*-perfect and the sigmatic perfect, for instance *amāstī*²⁰ for *amāuistī* and *dīxtī* for *dīxistī*. Synchronically they are simply morphological doublets of the longer forms. Diachronically the situation is more complicated. Traditionally, they are derived from the longer forms by sound changes and analogies; but there is also another approach, according to which some of them are original forms that were only secondarily associated with their longer counterparts.

I shall begin with the traditional derivation. Many short forms of the second and fourth conjugations can be derived by a sound law often referred to as the *lātrīna*-rule, which states that *-w-* is lost between vowels of the same quality if the stress is not on the second of these vowels;²¹ thus, *lātrīna* ‘privy’ is derived from *lauātrīna*, and the latter form exists in the classical language because it has been restored by analogy to forms like *lauō* or *lauem*. Similarly, *dēcrērunt* comes from *dēcrēuērunt* with stress on the antepenultimate; *dēcrēuērunt* was restored by analogy to forms such as *meruērunt* ‘they have deserved’ (Plaut. *Most.* 281),²² whereas *dēcrēuērunt* with stress on the penultimate remained unchanged. By analogy, the short forms spread to the first conjugation, where they could not arise through the standard phonological developments since *-w-* is never between identical vowels: *dēcrēuērunt*: *dēcrērunt* = *amāuērunt*: *x*, where *x* = *amārunt*.

²⁰ Not all the short forms in this article are necessarily attested; I use *amāstī* as a shorthand expression for ‘*amāstī* and forms like it, such as *laudāstī* ‘you have praised’, *spērāstī* ‘you have hoped’, etc.

²¹ For the influence of the accent and for general discussion cf. Sommer (1914: 48-50) and Niedermann (1985: 107-9). Since *auārus* did not become *fārus*, the rule began after the establishment of the classical accent, which probably took place in the fourth century BC (Meiser 1998: 53). *Cīuis* < *ceiuis* is likewise not affected because the diphthong became *-ī-* in the middle of the second century BC (Meiser 1998: 58), by which time the *lātrīna*-rule was not operative any longer.

²² Cf. also Italian *fecero* (stressed on *fe-*) and French *firent*, both from *fēcērunt*.

In the traditional approach, short forms of the *s*-perfect are derived by haplology. Speakers shorten *-sis-* to *-s-*, so that we get *dīxtī* beside *dīxistī*. Forms like *dīxeram* go back to old **deiksisām*, but since the haplology never applies here, it is said to have taken place after rhotacism, which is dated to the fourth century BC by Meiser (1998: 95-6).

The alternative to this traditional theory is to claim that the short forms are original. Untermann (1968: 171) for example thinks that *dīxtī* is essentially the inherited aorist **deik-s-s* redetermined by the perfect ending **-tay* and that *dīxistī* is the result of having an anaptyctic *-i-* between the aorist *-s-* and the ending.²³ On this assumption, *amāstī* and *amārim* are also ancient *s*-aorists (**amā-s-(s)tay* and **amā-s-ī-m*) which have not yet been replaced by the *w*-perfect. After *amāuistī* and *amāuerim* had arisen, *amāstī* and *amārim* were felt to be shortened forms.

This alternative theory cannot do without analogy either. Since Proto-Italic probably did not have a pluperfect, *amāram* cannot go back to an old aorist form and has to be derived differently. A form like *dēcrēram* could be derived from *dēcrēueram* by the *lātrīna*-rule, and *amāram* could be accounted for by the analogy *dēcrēueram*: *dēcrēram* = *amāueram*: *x*, where *x* is *amāram*.

It is generally acknowledged that there is an increase in short forms throughout the history of Latin.²⁴ In my opinion, this is a clear indication that they are young forms rather than a formation which is more ancient than the longer perfects. Untermann (1968: 171, note 23), on the other hand, does not accept this. Are there other synchronic arguments?

²³ We could also be dealing with a pure perfect ending rather than a redetermined aorist ending if Jasanoff (1987: 179) is right in claiming that the perfect ending **-tH₂e* had a doublet **-stH₂e*. (Cf. also Cowgill 1960: 137, who analyses the perfect ending in *oīσθα* as *-σθα* rather than *-θα*. Incidentally, this ending is the only piece of evidence for **tH₂ > θ* in Greek.)

²⁴ Cf. also Spanish imperfect subjunctives like *tomara* and *tomase*, which continue the short pluperfect indicative and the short pluperfect subjunctive of Latin.

One phenomenon that cannot go unnoticed is that many long forms have no corresponding short forms. We have *amāuerunt* and *amārunt*, but *dīxerunt* has no *†dīxunt* beside it. It would be difficult to explain why **amā-s-ont* survived, while **deik-s-ont* did not. The restriction does make sense, however, if *amārunt* is formed from *amāuerunt* by analogy to *dēcrērunt*, a form which arose from *dēcrēuerunt* by regular sound laws, while *dīxerunt*, not having a *-w-*, could not take part in the analogy and could not be shortened because the haplology of *-sis-* took place after rhotacism.

If the short forms go back to aorists, one may wonder why all of them are actually shorter than the long forms. **amā-w-ay* and **amā-w-istay* yield *amāuī* and *amāuistī*. The aorist forms must have been **amā-s-ay* and **amā-s-tay*. The latter gives us *amāstī*; but why does **amā-s-ay* not survive as *†amārī* ‘I have loved’?

One way out of this problem would be to say that the original aorists were later reanalysed as short forms of the *w*-perfects and that only those which are really shorter than the *w*-perfects were kept. This solution does not work, however. If there was a form **amā-s-tay* next to **amā-w-istay*, there was probably also a form **mone-s-tay* next to **mone-w-istay*. The first two give us *amāstī* and *amāuistī*, and **mone-w-istay* ends up as *monuistī*. But why did *†monesī* die out? The form is actually shorter than *monuistī*.

Admittedly, a subjunctive form *monerint* exists in early Latin (Lucil. 653). However, it is functionally different from its longer counterpart *monuerint* and also from the short perfect subjunctives such as *amārint*. *Monuerint* and *amārint* are true perfect subjunctives because they normally have past meaning. *Monerint*, on the other hand, is functionally equivalent to the type *faxint*, which is always non-past.²⁵ In what follows, I shall refer to *monerint*, *faxint*, *dīxīs* (Plaut. *Aul.* 744), and other forms like them as ‘special aorist subjunctives’. *Monerint* and *dīxim*

²⁵ Cf. de Melo (2005: 48-52).

could go back to Proto-Italic *s*-aorist optatives. *Faxint* must be an innovation and exists alongside other subjunctives like *fēcerint* which are built on more ancient aorist stems. A form like *fēcerint* acquired past meaning – except in prohibitions – by association with the perfect indicative,²⁶ while *faxint* and *monerint* remained outside the system and kept the non-past meaning everywhere.

Special aorist subjunctives exist for the first conjugation as well; we find forms like *amāssīs* (Plaut. *Mil.* 1007), which are characterized by *-ss-*.²⁷ They are another reason for not regarding *amārīs* as an old aorist form. If *amārīs* were an original aorist form, one would have to wonder why *amāssīs* was created at all.

Special aorist forms will play an important role in the following section. I have already mentioned *faxint*, *amāssīs*, and *monerint*. However, such forms need not have a sigmatic element. Non-sigmatic aorists are *duīs* and *attigās*. But now it is time to examine how prohibitive clauses can help us with the origins of the *u/w*-perfect and of the type *amāstī*.

3. Magariños' theory and its consequences

In Greek and Sanskrit, modal forms of the aorist are used in prohibitions, while the perfect is not employed in this way. The Latin perfect stems are made up of older aorist and perfect stems. The *s*-perfect *dīxī*, for example, clearly continues an earlier sigmatic aorist, while the reduplicating perfect *tetendī* continues an earlier true perfect. One would expect that this formal merger of two tenses into one was preceded by a semantic merger. While there can be no doubt that such a semantic merger took place, it does not have to be a complete one. This is

²⁶ Cf. Wackernagel (1928: 250).

²⁷ The most convincing explanation of the geminate *-ss-* can be found in Leumann (1977: 624), who establishes a four-part analogy of the type *dīxēs*: *dīxīs* = *amāssēs*: *x*, where *x* is *amāssīs*.

exactly what Magariños claims. According to him, reduplicating perfects in archaic Latin have preserved one of the restrictions of the earlier perfects, which stood in opposition to aorists: in Plautus and Terence, reduplicating perfects cannot be used in prohibitive clauses (1939: 140). The only exception in these two authors which he acknowledges is (5):

(5) *Nē dēstiterīs currere.* (Plaut. *Trin.* 1012)
 ‘Don’t stop running.’

Dēstiterīs is a reduplicating perfect subjunctive employed in a prohibitive clause. In Ennius we find a similar exception:

(6) *Nec mi aurum poscō nec mī pretium dederītis.* (Enn. *ann.* 194)
 ‘I don’t demand gold for myself, and don’t give me a ransom.’

According to Magariños (1939: 142), this passage does not have to be interpreted prohibitively, but I cannot take it in any other way.²⁸ Still, the theory looks appealing. If it is correct – and it has by and large been accepted by Hofmann and Szantyr²⁹ –, it ought to have repercussions on the *u/w*-perfect and the type *amāstī* as well.³⁰ If the *u/w*-perfect goes back to the perfect active participle in combination with the copula, it is an original periphrastic perfect, and for this reason it ought to be just as rare in prohibitive clauses as the reduplicating perfect. Similarly, if the type *amāstī* goes back to aorists and was only secondarily regarded as a shortened form of *amāuistī*, it is likely that it is as

²⁸ Wackernagel (1928: 250) also takes this as a prohibition.

²⁹ Cf. Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 337), where, however, the proviso is made that the reduplicating perfect is only completely excluded if alternative expressions such as *nē parserīs* ‘do not spare’ or *nē parsīs* ‘do not spare’ exist.

³⁰ In what follows, I do not consider forms of *sinere* ‘allow’. In Plautus, there are only three unambiguous prohibitions relevant here, two with the aoristic *sīrīs* (*Bacch.* 402 and *Epid.* 400) and one with *sīuerīs* (*Most.* 401); the reason for not taking these forms into account is that regular short *sierīs* and special aoristic *sīrīs* look so similar that speakers began to use them interchangeably (see de Melo 2004: 240). I also exclude the two prohibitive medio-passive perfects in my corpus, *ammīrātus sīs* (Ter. *Haut.* 826) and *oppertus siēs* (Ter. *Phorm.* 514).

frequent in prohibitive clauses as other perfects going back to aorists; if, however, *amāuistī* is older and *amāstī* is its derivative, *amāstī* ought to follow the same restrictions as *amāuistī*.

In order to test such theories, we can compare the prohibitions with perfect forms to those with special aorist forms.³¹ Let us first see whether Magariños' theory can be upheld for the perfects with old perfect stems in Plautus and Terence. I exclude the *u/w*-perfect in order to avoid a bias concerning its origins. The prototypical old perfect is reduplicating. One problem we face is that it is not immediately obvious what should count as reduplicated. While it is clear that a form such as *tetigī* 'I touched' is a reduplicating perfect,³² one may hesitate whether or not to include *attigerīs* (Plaut. *Persa* 793) because the reduplication was lost or reduced in compounds.³³ However, given that the connection to *tetigī* is still visible, I have decided to count it as reduplicating. I also counted *dēstiterīs* (Plaut. *Trin.* 1012) as reduplicating, even though the onsets of the reduplication syllable and of the root are not identical because of dissimilation. Similarly, I regard the perfect of *crēdere* as reduplicating although the verb is certainly not the prototypical reduplicating verb. *Vertere* and its compounds presumably lost the reduplication very early, but because of the root vowel *-o-* in the perfect I have classified *praeuertere* as having an old perfect. *Interuenīre* was counted as having an old perfect as well. Oscan preserves the 'aorist' *kūmbened* 'it was agreed' with *-ē-*, while the Latin long vowel perfect *-uēn-* goes back to a stative perfect (Meiser 2003: 205). With this in mind, we can begin our search. There are nine verbs which have perfects with old perfect stems and which occur in prohibitive clauses containing perfect subjunc-

³¹ In what follows, I exclude any special aorist forms that are not unambiguously prohibitive; I also disregard prohibitions with present subjunctives or with imperatives.

³² Homer has the aorist participle τεταγών 'having seized' (*Il.* 1.591), but the Italic evidence points to a root aorist, which makes it highly likely that *tetigī* goes back to a perfect rather than an aorist (Meiser 2003: 190-1).

³³ In general, the type *occucurrī* (Plaut. *Merc.* 201) with both preverb and reduplication is very rare.

tives, special aoristic subjunctives, or both; I present them with the number of perfect and special aoristic tokens in brackets: *attingere* 'touch' (1:6), *crēdere* 'believe' (0:4), *dare* 'give' (0:9), *dēsistere* 'stop' (1:0), *interuenīre* 'intervene' (1:0), *obstāre* 'stand in the way' (1:0), *ostendere* 'show' (2:0), *praeuertere* 'give precedence to' (1:0), and *referre* 'bring back' (1:0). If we add up these figures, we get eight prohibitive perfect subjunctives and nineteen special aoristic forms. Given that the regular perfect subjunctives can be formed from any verb with a perfect stem, and given that all special aoristic forms are on their way out, this is a remarkable pattern of distribution, despite the relatively low figures. Admittedly, Magariños' theory cannot be upheld in its strict form. Even if we leave out *interuenīre*, *ostendere*, and *praeuertere*, which may no longer have been felt to have old perfects due to the absence of reduplication, there are still three prohibitive perfect subjunctives in addition to the token of *dēstiterīs* cited in (5) above; all of them are reduplicating:

(7) *Nē sīs me ūnō digito attigerīs, nē te ad terram, scelus, affligam.* (Plaut. *Persa* 793)

'Don't even touch me with one finger, please, so that I don't knock you to the ground, you scoundrel.'

(8) *Ēminōr interminōrque: nē mi opstiterīt obuīam.* (Plaut. *Capt.* 791)
'I'm making a serious threat: let him not stand in my way.'

(9) *Incertus tuom caue ad mē rettulerīs pedem.* (Plaut. *Epid.* 439)
'So long as you are not sure, don't come back to me.'

These examples show that reduplicating perfects are not entirely excluded from prohibitions. In fact, even Hofmann and Szantyr's version cannot be upheld; prohibitive *attigerīs* is attested, as (7) above demonstrates, even though there is an aoristic alternative in the form of *attigās*:

(10) *Caue sīs me attigās, nē tibi hōc scīpiōne malum magnum dēm.* (Plaut. *Persa* 816-17)

‘Don’t touch me, please, so that I don’t give you a good spanking with this stick.’

Despite these exceptions, however, the pattern is still clear enough. Old perfects are dispreferred in prohibitive clauses, with eight perfect subjunctives and nineteen special aoristic alternatives. The pattern becomes even more remarkable if we examine the eight perfect subjunctives more closely: five of the tokens, *dēstiterīs* (Plaut. *Trin.* 1012), *opstiterūt* (Plaut. *Capt.* 791), *ostenderīs* (Plaut. *Rud.* 1135 and 1155), and *praeuorterīs* (Plaut. *Merc.* 113), belong to verbs which do not have any extra-paradigmatic forms anywhere in Latin; what is more, nowhere in Latin are there any extra-paradigmatic forms of the corresponding *uerba simplicia* or their remaining compounds. This makes it likely that the perfect subjunctives had to be used because there were no alternatives.

Two of the remaining perfect subjunctives, *interuēnerīs* (Plaut. *Mil.* 1333) and *rettulerīs* (Plaut. *Epid.* 439), belong to verbs which have no extra-paradigmatic alternatives anywhere in Latin themselves, but other forms of the same roots do have such alternatives in Plautus. Thus, we find *aduenāt* in Plaut. *Pseud.* 1030 or *apstulās* in Plaut. *Rud. frg.* This raises the question whether *interuenīre* and *referre* could also form such subjunctives in Plautus. If this were the case, their absence would be due to chance and the perfect subjunctives would not simply be employed because no alternatives were available. If, on the other hand, these verbs could not form special subjunctives, the perfect would be the only form available in prohibitions, which would bring us closer to Hofmann and Szantyr’s stance on the subject.

Let us begin with *uenīre* and its compounds. Plautus could probably not form special aoristic subjunctives to every verb belonging to this root. We find five tokens of *ēuenāt* / *ēuenant* in Plautus,³⁴ and this is also the only compound of *uenīre* that has

³⁴ *Ēuenāt*: *Curc.* 39, *Epid.* 290, *Mil.* 1010, *Trin.* 41; *ēuenant*: *Epid.* 321.

such forms in the early Latin attested outside Plautus.³⁵ Since the verb has only sixteen regular subjunctives in Plautus, the irregular forms must have been common. In Plautus, we also find *aduenāt* (*Pseud.* 1030), *peruenāt* (*Rud.* 626), and *peruenant* (*Trin.* 93). *Aduenīre* has thirteen regular subjunctives and *ēuenīre* has four. The small number of irregular forms of both verbs and of regular forms of the latter makes it difficult to say how unusual the irregular ones were. *Venīre* and the remaining compounds have 139 subjunctives in Plautus, none of which is irregular. It is unlikely that the absence of special aoristic subjunctives is due to chance, at least not for a frequent verb like *uenīre*, which has 87 subjunctives. *Interuenīre*, on the other hand, has only one regular subjunctive, the form used in a prohibition. It is impossible to state with any degree of certainty whether this verb had irregular forms. However, if the evidence from the above verbs which have alternative aoristic forms is anything to go by, it looks as if Plautus would have used prohibitive **interuenās* if such a form had existed.

The distribution of irregular forms of *ferre* / *tollere* and compounds is slightly different. Four such forms are attested outside Plautus: *attolāt* occurs twice in Pacuvius (*trag.* 42 and 228), the second person *attulās* is found in Novius (*Atell.* 87), and the *uerbum simplex* is attested in the third person *tulāt* (*Acc. trag.* 102). Neither of these verbs has special aoristic subjunctives in Plautus, even though *afferre* has seventeen regular subjunctives and *ferre* has forty-nine. The only irregular form attested in Plautus is *apstulās* (*Rud. fr.*); the verb has thirty-three regular forms. The remaining compounds of *ferre* and *tollere* together have forty-eight³⁶ regular subjunctives, but no irregular forms at all. This rarity of irregular subjunctives makes it look likely that there was no form available which Plautus could have

³⁵ *Ēuenāt* is also found in Enn. *scaen.* 183 Jocelyn and Pompon. *Atell.* 35. (Fragmentary dramatists except for Ennius are cited from Ribbeck's second edition.)

³⁶ I exclude the form *circumferam* (*inc. fab. fr.* xlviii (lxviii)), which could also be a future.

used instead of *rettulerīs*, even though *referre* itself has only nine regular forms.

Thus, there is only one old perfect used in a prohibition even though an alternative form would have been available. This is the form *attigerīs* (example 7 above). However, even this one exception must be contrasted with the six tokens of prohibitive *attigās* / *attigātis*.

This usage should be compared with that of the perfects which go back to aorists.³⁷ As I pointed out above, they often have special aoristic by-forms as well. The natural expectation is that the regular and irregular forms are used more or less indifferently wherever such by-forms exist; after all, which kind of aorist is employed should not matter so long as it is an aorist. This expectation is fulfilled for those verbs which have special aoristic forms in Plautus and / or Terence. Again I list the verbs together with the figures for regular perfect and special aoristic forms in brackets: *āmittere* 'lose' (1:1), *dicere* 'say' (7:5), *esse* 'be' (3:5), *excēdere* 'go out' (0:1), *facere* 'do' (10:8), *inducere* 'lead in' (1:1), *obicere* 'hold against' (0:1), *parcere* 'spare' (2:1), and *respicere* 'look back' (0:1). These verbs have twenty-four regular perfect forms and twenty-four special aoristic ones. Regular and irregular forms are used without much difference:

(11) *Parasītum ne āmiserīs*. (Plaut. *Curc.* 599)
'Don't lose the hanger-on.'

(12) *Quod dī dant bonī caue culpā tua āmissīs*. (Plaut. *Bacch.* 1188³⁸)
'Don't lose through your own fault the good which the gods give you.'

³⁷ The *s*-perfect obviously continues sigmatic aorists. The perfects of the other verbs considered here continue root aorists: for (*ad*)-*esse* cf. Meiser (2003: 201); for *facere* and (*ob*)-*icere* cf. the aorists ἔθηκα 'I put' and ἔηκα 'I threw', but note that the *-k-* fulfills different functions in Latin and Greek (Untermann 1993: 468); for *uidēre* cf. Meiser (2003: 205-6), where it is argued that *uidī* continues an aorist rather than the perfect we find in Greek (F)οἶδα 'I know' and Sanskrit *vēda* 'I know'.

³⁸ The line is in anapaests, with iambic shortening of *bonī* and elision of both vowels in the possessive pronoun.

Here we find prohibitive *āmiserīs* and prohibitive *āmissīs* without any semantic distinction, although there may of course be other differences, for instance of register.³⁹

Two verbs, *sūmere* and *uidēre*, have perfects that go back to aorists. Each has a prohibitive perfect subjunctive. Alternative expressions are presumably not possible, as there are no special aoristic forms of these verbs or their compounds anywhere in Latin. This leaves us with *adesse* and *mittere*. The former has one prohibitive perfect subjunctive, the latter has two. It is hard to tell whether alternative prohibitions would have been possible because the *uerbum simplex*, *esse*, has irregular subjunctives of the type *fuās*,⁴⁰ and because (12) shows that the compound *āmittere* has irregular forms as well. However, the general picture does not change. If a perfect goes back to an old perfect, alternative aorist forms are strongly preferred in prohibitions. If a perfect goes back to an old aorist, there is no difference in frequency between this perfect and alternative expressions wherever they exist.

Finally, I can come to the *u/w*-perfects. If the use of long forms like *amāuerīs* should turn out to be restricted in prohibitive clauses, they would pattern with the old perfects. This would strongly support Rix's theory that they go back to perfect active participles which coalesced with the copula. If this is the case, it is worth looking at short forms like *amārīs*. If such short forms behave like their longer counterparts, it is likely that they are derived from them by sound laws and analogies; but if the short forms are frequent in prohibitions, aoristic origin is more likely.

The relevant verbs fall into three categories: the *w*-perfect of the first conjugation, the *w*-perfect of the fourth conjugation, and the *u*-perfect. In Plautus and Terence, there are ten verbs of the first conjugation that are used in prohibitions with perfect or special aorist subjunctives: *amāre* 'love', *appellāre* 'call', *cēlāre*

³⁹ For the register of the *s*-subjunctives cf. de Melo (2003: 47-8).

⁴⁰ In Plautus, *fuam* is attested once, *fuās* four times, *fuāt* thirteen times, and *fuant* four times.

‘conceal’, *cūrāre* ‘take care of’, *dēmūtāre* ‘change’, *indicāre* ‘indicate’, *occultāre* ‘hide away’, *occupāre* ‘occupy’, *parāre* ‘prepare’, and *supplicāre* ‘entreat’. With the exception of *cūrāre* and *indicāre*, which have two prohibitive tokens each, every verb has just one. This gives us twelve prohibitions in total. What forms are used in these prohibitions? With one exception, the forms are all special aoristic subjunctives with *-ss-*:

(13) *Nēmo accūsāt, Syre, tē: nec tu āram tibi*

nec precātōrem parārīs. (Ter. *Haut.* 975-6)

‘No one is accusing you, Syrus; don’t get yourself an altar or someone to plead for you.’

(14) *Nē me istōc posthāc nōmine appellāssīs.* (Ter. *Eun.* 742)

‘Don’t call me by that name from now on.’

(13) is the exception because it contains the short form *parārīs*. It is one of the two relevant prohibitive subjunctives in Terence. The other one is in (14), which has *appellāssīs* with *-ss-*. Plautus, on the other hand, exclusively uses *ss*-forms for prohibitions containing verbs of the first conjugation. By Terence’s time, these forms have practically died out. Terence has only this one token. His other option is to resort to the regular perfect.⁴¹ But at least in Plautus the pattern speaks clearly for Rix’s theory, despite the small number of tokens; the complete absence of regular perfect subjunctives can most easily be explained if we accept his diachronic derivation. In fact, it does not seem unlikely that Plautus coined some forms simply for the purpose of avoiding the *w*-perfect in prohibitions;⁴² given the morphological transparency of the forms, this was easy enough. The com-

⁴¹ It seems unlikely that a form **parāssīs* was still available to Terence, even though Plautus has a future *comparāssit* in *Epid.* 122.

⁴² That such coinages are possible is proved by the sigmatic future *exoculāssitis* ‘you will have removed the eyes’ (*Rud.* 731), which is certainly a nonce-formation. *Cēlāre*, *occultāre*, and *supplicāre* have one sigmatic form each in prohibitions. The verbs in question and other forms of the same stems do not have any extra-paradigmatic forms anywhere else in early Latin, at least if we assume that the gloss ‘*cēlāssīs: cēlāuerīs*’ in Paul. Fēst. p. 61 Müller refers to the passage in Plautus.

plete absence of short forms like *amārīs* in Plautine prohibitions also makes it likely that they are not original aorists, but rather derived from the longer forms by sound changes and analogy.

In Plautus, we find one prohibitive perfect subjunctive of a verb belonging to the fourth conjugation:

(15) *Posthāc etiam illud quod sciēs nē scīuerīs.*⁴³ (Plaut. *Mil.* 572)
'From now on you shouldn't know even what you will know.'

There is no alternative *ss*-form available, so the *w*-perfect has to be used. Sigmatic forms belonging to a verb of the fourth conjugation are only attested for *ambīre* 'canvass', and even there the reading is problematic.⁴⁴

Finally, there are two *u*-perfects in prohibitions, one in Plautus and one in Terence. The form in Plautus is *monuerīs* (*Curc.* 384). Outside Plautus and Terence, *monēre* has two special aoristic forms which are functionally equivalent to the type *faxō / faxim*: we find a future perfect *moneris* in Pacuvius (*trag.* 30), and a non-past subjunctive *monerint* is attributed to either Pacuvius (*trag.* 112) or Lucilius (653). No such forms are attested for the compounds of *monēre*. It does not appear very likely that Plautus was in a position to use such an irregular form here, so there was no alternative to the *u*-perfect. *Minuerīs* occurs in a prohibition in Terence (*Andr.* 392). Again, there was no alternative; no irregular forms are attested in Latin for either *minuere* or any of its compounds.

On the whole, then, it seems as if *u/w*-perfects and the short forms are avoided in prohibitions wherever possible. This makes it likely that the *u/w*-perfects go back to old perfects, as has been suggested by Rix (1992), and that the short forms are not

⁴³ This is how Bentley reads the line. Lindsay prints *nescīuerīs*, which is presumably supposed to be a command in the perfect subjunctive. There are no good parallels for this; Bennett's perfect jussives (1910: 166) can all be interpreted differently. Madvig's explanation (1887: 484) does not convince me either ('verbum negativum pro negatione est').

⁴⁴ Leo writes *ambīssint* and *ambīssūt* in Plaut. *Amph.* 69 and 71, while Lindsay retains the manuscript readings *ambīssent* and *ambīssēt*.

original aorists, but derived from the *u/w*-perfects by regular sound laws and by various analogies.

4. Conclusions

I can now summarize my findings. I hope to have shown how important synchronic patterns of usage are for linguistic reconstruction. Plautus and Terence try to avoid perfects with old perfect stems in prohibitive clauses and instead use special aorist forms wherever possible. By contrast, they do not avoid perfects with old aorist stems in prohibitions, although the special aorist forms are by no means excluded either. The *u/w*-perfect patterns with the old perfects, and so do short forms of the type *amāsī*. These usages have repercussions on the origins of the forms. There are various theories concerning the *u/w*-perfect; but since it must go back to a perfect, Rix's derivation (1992) from perfect participles with the copula is the most likely hypothesis. The short forms are probably derived from the *u/w*-perfect by regular phonological developments and analogies; aoristic origin seems unlikely because the short forms are avoided in prohibitions, which would be very unusual for aorist forms.

Bibliography

- Adrados, F. R. (1956): 'Quelques traitements phonétiques des laryngales indo-européennes', in *Hommages à Max Niedermann*. Brussels (Berchem): 17-33.
- Ammann, H. (1927): 'Die ältesten Formen des Prohibitivsatzes im Griechischen und Lateinischen', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 45: 328-44.
- Bennett, C. E. (1910): *Syntax of Early Latin*. Vol. 1: *The Verb*. Boston.
- Cowgill, W. C. (1960): 'Evidence for laryngeals in Greek', in W. Winter (ed.), *Evidence for Laryngeals: Work Papers of a Conference in Indo-European Linguistics on May 7 and 8, 1959*. Austin, Texas: 93-162.
- Daube, D. (1956): *Forms of Roman Legislation*. Oxford.

- de Melo, W. D. C. (2003): 'The sigmatic subjunctive in Plautus and Terence', in G. Calboli (ed.), *Papers on Grammar; IX 1: Latina Lingua! Proceedings of the Twelfth International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics (Bologna, 9-14 June 2003)*. Rome: 45-56.
- (2004): *Traces of an Earlier Verbal System in Archaic Latin: The Meaning and Usage of the Types faxō / faxim / impetrāssere, duim, and attigās*. D. Phil. thesis, vol. 1. Oxford.
 - (2007): *The Early Latin Verb System: Archaic Forms in Plautus, Terence, and Beyond*. Oxford.
- Elmer, H. C. (1894): 'The Latin prohibitive', *American Journal of Philology* 15: 133-53 and 299-328.
- Gippert, J. (1999): 'Das lateinische Imperfekt in sprachvergleichender Hinsicht', in P. Anreiter and E. Jerem (eds.), *Studia Celtica et Indogermanica: Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid zum 70. Geburtstag*. Budapest: 125-37.
- Goodwin, W. W. (1897): *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*. London.
- Grassi, C. (1966): *Problemi di sintassi latina*. Florence.
- Haspelmath, M. (1994): 'Passive participles across languages', in B. Fox and P. J. Hopper (eds.), *Voice: Form and Function*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: 151-77.
- Hirt, H. (1915): 'Zur Verbalflexion', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 35: 137-47.
- Hofmann, J. B. and A. Szantyr (1965): *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München.
- Jasanoff, J. H. (1987): 'The tenses of the Latin perfect system', in G. Cardona and N. H. Zide (eds.), *Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald: On the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Tübingen: 177-83.
- (1991): 'The origin of the Italic imperfect subjunctive', *Historische Sprachforschung* 104: 84-105.
- Krause, W. (1955): 'Zur Entstehung des lateinischen *uī*- und *vī*-Perfekts', in H. Krahe (ed.), *Corolla linguistica: Festschrift Ferdinand Sommer zum 80. Geburtstag am 4. Mai 1955 dargebracht von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen*. Wiesbaden: 137-44.
- Kühner, R. and C. Stegmann (1976): *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. Part 2: *Satzlehre*. Vol. 2, rev. by A. Thierfelder. 5th edn. Hannover.
- Leumann, M. (1977): *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. München.
- Madvig, J. N. (1887): 'De formarum quarundam verbi Latini natura et usu disputatio', in J. N. Madvig (ed.), *Opuscula academica ab ipso iterum collecta, emendata, aucta*. Copenhagen: 448-503.
- Magariños, A. (1939): 'Peperci - parsi', *Emérita* 7: 136-45.
- Martinet, A. (1955): *Économie des changements phonétiques: Traité de phonologie diachronique*. Bern.

- Meid, W. (1971): *Das germanische Praeteritum: Indogermanische Grundlagen und Ausbreitung im Germanischen*. Innsbruck.
- Meiser, G. (1993): 'Uralische Modussyntax: Zur Genese des Konjunktiv Imperfekt', in H. Rix (ed.), *Oskisch-Umbrisch: Texte und Grammatik; Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft und der Società Italiana di Glottologia vom 25. bis 28. September 1991 in Freiburg*. Wiesbaden: 167-95.
- (1998): *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Darmstadt.
 - (2003): *Veni Vidi Vici: Die Vorgeschichte des lateinischen Perfektsystems*. München.
- Narten, J. (1973): 'Zur Flexion des lateinischen Perfekts', *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 31: 133-50.
- Niedermann, M. (1985): *Précis de phonétique historique du latin*. 4th edn. Paris.
- Pinkster, H. (1986): 'Three notes on the Latin subjunctive', *revue: Informatique et Statistique dans les Sciences humaines* 22: 147-56.
- (1990): *Latin Syntax and Semantics*. Translated by H. Mulder. London.
- Risselada, R. (1993): *Imperatives and Other Directive Expressions in Latin: A Study in the Pragmatics of a Dead Language*. Amsterdam.
- Rix, H. (1992): 'Zur Entstehung des lateinischen Perfektparadigmas', in O. Panagl and Th. Krisch (eds.), *Latein und Indogermanisch: Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 23. - 26. September 1986*. Innsbruck: 221-40.
- (1994): 'Latein und Sabellisch: Stammbaum und / oder Sprachbund?', *Incontri Linguistici* 17: 13-29.
- Schmidt, G. (1985): 'Lateinisch *amāvī*, *amāstī* und ihre indogermanischen Grundlagen', *Glotta* 63: 52-92.
- Schrijver, P. (1991): *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam, Georgia and Atlanta, Georgia.
- Schütz, H. (1929): 'Die Konjunktiv- und Futurformen auf *-ero -erim* im Lateinischen', *Glotta* 17: 161-90.
- Serbat, G. (1980): 'Le parfait de l'indicatif en latin', in G. Serbat (ed.), *Le sens du parfait en latin: Colloque de Morigny 2 décembre 1978*. Paris.
- Sommer, F. (1914): *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre: Eine Einführung in das sprachwissenschaftliche Studium des Lateins*. 3rd edn. Heidelberg.
- Untermann, J. (1968): 'Zwei Bemerkungen zur lateinischen Perfektflexion', in M. Mayrhofer, F. Lochner-Hüttenbach, and H. Schmeja (eds.), *Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft und Kulturkunde: Gedenkschrift für Wilhelm Brandenstein (1898-1967)*. Innsbruck: 165-71.

- (1993): 'Gr. ἔθηκα = lat. feci, gr. ἤκα = lat. ieci?', in G. Meiser, J. Bendahman, J. A. Hardarson, C. Schaefer (eds.), *Indogermanica et Italica: Festschrift für Helmut Rix zum 65. Geburtstag*. Innsbruck: 461-8.
 - (2000): *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Heidelberg.
- Vairel, H. (1981): 'Les énoncés prohibitifs au subjonctif: «ne facias», «ne feceris» et «ne faxis»', *Revue de philologie* 55: 249-72.
- Wackernagel, J. (1928): *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*. Vol. 1, 2nd edn. Basel.
- Whitney, W. D. (1896): *A Sanskrit Grammar, Including both the Classical Language, and the Older Dialects, of Veda and Brahmana*. 3rd edn. Leipzig and Boston.