

THE UMBRIAN -NKY- PERFECT

DAVID H. JERRETT

State University of New York at Buffalo

One of the more perplexing problems of Umbrian morphology has been the *-nky-* perfect, which occurs uncontested eleven times in the Iguvine Tables from three denominative verbs. The forms attested are:

1. To a present stem **kombifia-*¹ "announce" (cf. *combifiatu* "let him announce" VI b 48): *combifianši* "he has announced (subjunctive)" (VI b 52) < **kombifiankyēd*; *combifianšiusi*, *combifiansiusi*, *combifianšust* "he will have announced" (VI b 49, 52; VII a 5) < **kombifiankyust*;
2. *disleralinsust* "it will have rendered (the rite) void" (VI a 7) < **disleralinkyust*;²
3. To a present stem **pordowi-*³ "offer, present" (cf. *pordovitu* "let him make the presentation" VI a 56): **purtinçus**, *purdinšus* "you will have made the presentation, presented" (I b 33, VI b 23) < **pordowinkyus*; *purdinsust*, *purdinšus*, *purdinsiusi* "he will have presented, made the presentation" (VI b 16, 24; 37, 38; VII a 43) < **pordowinkyust*.

Following K. Olzscha⁴ one may add to these:

¹ Containing the preverb **kom-* "with" (cf. Lat. *cum* "with") and I.E. **bheidh-* "advise;" cf. Lat. *perfidia* "treachery," *confidere* "trust in, rely upon," Gk. *πειθω* "persuade," and Goth. *beidan* "to await."

² I here follow C. D. Buck, *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* (Boston 1904, hereafter Buck) 191, and later scholars in deriving this word from an adjective **dislerali-* "off the track, wrong, void," containing the prefix *dis-* and I.E. **leis-* "rut, furrow, track;" cf. Lat. *delirare* "draw the furrow awry in ploughing, be crazy," OHG. *wagan-leisa* "wagon rut." For another interpretation see G. Devoto, *Tabulae Iguvinae* (Rome 1940) 153 f.

³ From an apparent preverb **pr-*, cf. Lat. *porrigere* "offer," and **dowi-* < I.E. **do(w)-* "give;" cf. Lat. *duim* "I would give," Falisc. **doviad** "he may give," Skt. *dāvāne* and Cypr. *δοφεvat* "give."

⁴ "Das umbrische Perfect auf -NKY-," *Glotta* 36 (1957) 300-304 (hereafter Olzscha).

purtitius, purtius "you will have presented, made the presentation" (I a 33; 27, 30; II a 7, 9) < **pordowinkyus*;

and from two other verbs:

4. To a present stem **heri*-⁵ "wish, want" (cf. **herter** "it is intended, necessary" II a 40): **heriiei** "(the *adfertor*) wishes (subjunctive)" (II a 16) < **herinkyēd*;
5. To a present stem **opesa*-⁶ "perform, do, make" (cf. *osatu* "let him make" VI b 24): **usaie, usaçe** "(Lucius Tetteius) did, approved (the foregoing)" (I b 45; II a 44) < **opesankyed*.

Previous attempts to explain this type have been unsatisfactory. Von Planta⁷ rightly rejected the hypotheses of his predecessors and, noting that the length of the attested *-nky-* perfects suggested a periphrastic origin, theorized that nominals such as **kombifiam* combined, as in the case of the supine, with perfect forms of the verb "to go," e.g., *iust* "he will have gone" (VI a 7). To such nominals was suffixed a "directional word," either *-ke* or *-kom*. This hypothesis is at first glance attractive, since it finds a close parallel in the well-known Latin type *pugnatum it* "he goes to fight." The construction is attested also in Umbrian: *aseriato est* "(who) shall go to observe" (VI a 6). But it is difficult to find a satisfactory analysis of the first member of such a periphrasis. **Kombifiam* is not a supine, nor can it be, as von Planta implies, an infinitive; one would expect in the first instance **kombifiato(m)* (cf. *aseriato* above) and in the second instance **kombifiaum*.⁸ One can only take it to be an accusative action/abstract noun, an assumption justified by the fact that the *-nky-* perfect occurs only with denominative verbs, which presuppose the existence of such nominals.

⁵ I.E. **gher-* "wish, want," cf. Osc. *herest* "he will wish," Lat. *hortari* "encourage," Gk. *χαίρω* "I rejoice," Skt. *hāryati* "he is pleased." It is not certain that Umbrian **heri-* is a denominative verb; **heriiei**, however, can be explained as analogical to **purtiiei*, cf. **purtiuis**.

⁶ Denominative to **opesa*, cf. Lat. *opera* "toil, exertion," Osc. **uupsens** "they performed," Pael. *upsaseter* "it might be done," Lat. *operari* "work, be occupied with."

⁷ R. von Planta, *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrische Dialekte* (Strassburg 1892, hereafter von Planta) II. 351-53.

⁸ Cf. Osc. *censaum* "assess." There is no example in Umbrian of an infinitive to an *-ā-* stem verb, but forms such as **afterum** (I b 10) indicate that the formation was identical in Umbrian *ā-* stems.

Furthermore, von Planta's suggestion that these forms contain *-ke* or *-kom* as postpositive directional words is not supportable. First of all, the meaning of *-kom* in Umbrian is basically locative,⁹ while only a word with allative meaning would make sense for his construct; nor does *-kom* occur in Umbrian with any case but the ablative.¹⁰ Post-clitic *-ke* is only slightly more acceptable. Throughout Italic it is suffixed only to pronominal and adverbial forms.¹¹ In addition, *-ke* is emphatic or ich-deictic in Italic, never allative, as shown by its apparently random and presumably optional suffixation in early Latin¹² and in Oscan and Umbrian.¹³ One may also compare the Latin adverbial pairs:

<i>hīc</i> "here"	<i>hūc</i> "hither"
<i>illīc</i> "there"	<i>illūc</i> "thither"

in which the locative-allative contrast stems from underlying pronominal case-forms, not the suffix. Similarly in Umbrian **eruk** "then," **itek** "thus," and so forth,¹⁴ *-ke* has no apparent allative force.

Whether proclitic *ke-*, seen in Latin *ce-do*, *ce-tte* "give (here)" and Oscan *cebnust* "(anyone) will have come (entered?)," is to be connected with *-ke* is uncertain.¹⁵ The etymology of *cedo* is unsure, but if its second element is cognate with that of Old Saxon *hīr-tō* "to this, moreover,"¹⁶ and with Old High German *za*, *zuo*, Old English *tō* "to," then initial *ce-* in *cedo* could well have had only ich-deictic force. As for *cebnust*, usually analysed as **ke-benust*, which Conway¹⁷ translates

⁹ E. Vetter, *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte* (Heidelberg 1953, hereafter Vetter) s.v., translates it "*cum*, *apud*, *ad*," where *ad* means "at," never "to."

¹⁰ Buck 207; J. W. Poultney, *The Bronze Tables of Iguvium* (A.P.A. Monograph XVIII, 1959, hereafter Poultney) 148.

¹¹ A. Walde and J. Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg 1956, hereafter W. H.) derive Lat. *ecce* from **en-ce*, the first member of which is taken to be cognate with Gk. *ἔν*, but neither they nor H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg 1954) give an etymology for *ἔν*.

¹² W. M. Lindsay, *The Latin Language* (London 1953², hereafter Lindsay) 432.

¹³ See, for example, Buck 141-42, for paradigms, especially Umb. *erer*, **ererek** "of him, of it."

¹⁴ For a list of such forms see Poultney 115.

¹⁵ A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire etymologique de la langue latine* (Paris 1959, hereafter E.M.) separate them; W.H. do not.

¹⁶ As suggested by W.H., s.v. *cedo*.

¹⁷ R. S. Conway, *The Italic Dialects* (Hildesheim 1967², hereafter Conway) 607.

"*venerit, advenerit*," Buck¹⁸ "*venerit*" and Vetter¹⁹ "*devenerit*," the force of *ce-* is again unsure. The word occurs only in *T.B.* 20:

aut suaepis censtomen nei cebnust dolud mallud . . .

"But if anyone by fraud shall have failed to enter the census . . ."

Here *censtomen* is a prepositional phrase equivalent to Latin *in censum*; *-en* and the accusative which accompanies it carry the allative force. On the basis of these difficulties, von Planta's explanation of the *-nky-* type must be rejected as morphologically and semantically neither paralleled nor likely.

More recent explanations have been few and inconclusive. Buck²⁰ hesitantly hypothesized adjectival stems in **-în-k-yo-*, which, presumably, came to be used as perfect participles and combined periphrastically with forms of the copula to create future perfects, e.g., **pordowinkyos eset* > **pordinkyost* > *purdinsiust*. From such forms there could have arisen perfects, by the analogy:

benust:**bened*:*:purdinsiust*:X. = **purdinšied* **purdinšed*

The type could then have spread to *-ā-* verbs, creating, for example, **opesānkyed* > **usaçe**. Von Planta²¹ had already rejected such an explanation. A combination of adjectival suffixes **-în-k-yo-* looks odd and is attested neither in Oscan nor in Umbrian; nor does Buck explain the semantic or functional development of his hypothetical adjectives.

Olzscha hesitantly compared the *-nky-* type with Etruscan preterites ending in *-nce*, such as *muti-nce* "entered" but one would much prefer an explanation based on internal etymology to one based on borrowing, especially in the case of morphological items.

Finally, Poultney's revision²² of von Planta's explanation, that the *-nky-* perfect arose from periphrases like **fugam-k(e)-iust* > **fuganšust* "he will have gone in flight," or **meddiki(o)m-k-iust* "he will have gone to the pronouncement of justice," is unacceptable. Poultney considers

¹⁸ Buck 193.

¹⁹ Vetter 390.

²⁰ Buck 173.

²¹ II.351 note 2.

²² Poultney 135-36.

-*ke* as an allative suffix, an assumption which has already been shown to be unsupportable. Despite the semantic similarity which Poultney traces between -*ke* and Greek -δε in, e.g., Latin *hi-c* and Greek ὅ-δε, there is no sure example of an allative -*ke* parallel to -δε in Greek οἰκόνδε. Furthermore, -δε is apparently to be related to Old Saxon -tō, etc., mentioned above,²³ while no such semantic or etymological clarification can be made for -*ke*.

Although the foregoing hypotheses have been problematic, the -*nty*-perfect can be explained satisfactorily as periphrasis. The likelihood of such an origin is supported not only by the length of such forms as *combifiansiust*, as von Planta noted, but also by the commonness of periphrasis in Italic. Examples of this tendency, and a further tendency toward coalescence of the members of the periphrasis, can be seen not only in isolated words such as:

1. Lat. *mando* "I entrust" < **manom do*,²⁴ and Osc. **manafum** "I entrusted" < **man-fefom*;²⁵
2. Lat. *manumitto* "I free (a slave)" < **manu mitto*;
3. Lat. *vendo* "I sell" < **venum do*;²⁶
4. Umb. **eitipes** "(the Atiedian Brothers) decided," if from **eitom hepens*.

but also, systematically, in:

5. the Latin perfect passive system, e.g., *coctumst prandium* "dinner is ready" (Plaut. *Bacch.* 716) < *coctum est prandium*;
6. the Latin imperfects and futures in -b-, and Osc. **fufans** "they were;"
7. Latin future participles such as *facturum* "going to do" rebuilt to infinitive *facturum* "to do" < **factu erom*;²⁷
8. Latin future passive infinitives *datuiri*, *missuiri*, *sublatuiri* "to be given, sent, lifted" (Lact. *Inst.* IV xvii 3, VII xviii 3, Cod. A. of the *Bellum Alexandrinum* XIX 2) < *datum iri*, etc.;

²³ Cf. Frisk.

²⁴ Cf. E.M.

²⁵ Buck 170.

²⁶ W.H., s.v. *venus*.

²⁷ Postgate, *IF* 4 (1894) 252-58.

9. the Osco-Umbrian future perfect, e.g., Umb. *dersicust* "he will have said" (VI b 63) < **dedikwos eset*;²⁸
10. Plautine periphrases such as *confidentias* < *confidentia est* = *confido* "I trust."²⁹

As asserted above, the *-nky-* perfect occurs only with denominative verbs. One may therefore reconstruct for some stage of Umbrian the following accusative nominals as the first members of periphrastic combinations:

1. **combifiam* "common advisement, announcement," simplex **ffiam* "advice, advisement" < **bhidhyam*, cf. Lat. *perfidia* "falsehood;"
2. **herim* "wish, act of wishing" < **gherim*, cf. Gk. *χάρις* "favor" and especially Lat. **heriēs* "will;"³⁰
3. **pordovim* "offering, presentation," simplex **dovim* "gift, act of giving;"
4. **upsam* "work, accomplishment" < **opesam*, cognate with Lat. *operam* "toil, exertion;"
5. **disleralim* "off the track, wrong, void" < **dis-leisalim*.

These and others combined with perfect forms of a verb derived from I.E. **kēi*. Such a construction seems first to have been hinted at by von Planta,³¹ who rejected it apparently because he was searching for a verb meaning "to go" and was justifiably skeptical about the existence in Umbrian of a reflex of **kēi* with this meaning. In fact, as the following partial list of reflexes³² illustrates, this root meant either "set in motion" or "be in motion:"³³

Gk. *ἔκινον* "I went;"
κίατο "he moved himself, went;"

²⁸ I here follow Poultney 136.

²⁹ W. M. Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus* (New York 1936²) 56.

³⁰ Postulated by E.M. on the evidence of *Heriem Iunonis* (Aul. Gel. 13.23.2), *Herem* (Ennius A 104), and *herem* (P.F. 89.6), the latter two presumably for **heriem*, but possibly for **herim*?

³¹ II.352.

³² From J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bern 1957).

³³ I suspect that the former meaning was the original, the latter developing in the middle voice.

κίννυμαι "I am in motion, go;"

σεύεται "he hurries;"

Alb. *qoj* "I rouse" (< **kienyo*)

Lat. *cio* "I set in motion, summon;"³⁴

cio "I set in motion, summon;"

OHG. *heizan* "to drive, order, call;"

Skt. *cyávate* "he moves himself, goes forth" (= Gk. *σεύεται*);³⁵

Arm. *ču* "breakup, uprising" (< **kyutis*);

to which may probably be added:

Hitt. *kiš-* "become."³⁶

Although no reflex of **kēi* is directly attested in Oscan or Umbrian, it is plausible to assume that one did exist at some stage, since the root is widespread in Indo-European and occurs in Latin as *cio/cieo*. To judge from its early occurrences, Latin *cio/cieo* had as a basic meaning "set in motion." A quasi-periphrastic usage with action/abstract nouns is attested, appearing archaic in Republican literature and very rare in the Empire:³⁷

atqui nunc aps te stat, verum hinc cibit testimonium (Plaut. *Rud.* 1101)

"to be sure he's on your side now, but he will produce evidence from these (girls)."

quid subiti mihi febris civit mali? (Acc. *Trag.* 155)

"What sudden malady has fever produced within me?"

A more cogent and possibly more archaic example than these is the old legal phrase (*h*)*erctum ciere*, in which (*h*)*erctum* is an accusative supine or

³⁴ I follow Lindsay 481 in taking *cio* as a morphological transfer to the causative conjugation because of its basically causative meaning. *Cio*, occurring as early as Plaut. *Rud.* 1101, has a chance of being the original verb.

³⁵ There appear to be phonological difficulties involved in the inclusion of this verb and *ceṣtati*, below; Pokorny and others, however, include them.

³⁶ This verb has, to my knowledge, been connected only with Lat. *gero* "I carry wage," by E. Laroche, *BSL* 53 (1958) fasc. 1, 170 note 4. *Gero* seems to have no sure etymology. *Kiš-* occurs mostly with middle inflection, and the root could be analyzed as **ki-s-* and compared with Skt. **ceṣ-*, which is implied by *ceṣṭā* "motion, activity," whence the denominative *ceṣtati* "he moves his limbs, is in motion."

³⁷ Cf. E.M.

a neuter noun derived from the *-to-* participle of *(h)erciscor* "divide up an inheritance."³⁸ The whole phrase means "bring about division of an estate,"³⁹ cf.

herctum citum <divisio patrimonii> (supp. Heraeus) quae fit inter consortes (P.F. 72.20)

"*herctum citum*: a division of the inheritance among the relatives."

Whatever the present stem of the Umbrian reflex of **kēi-* may have been, one may hypothesize a perfect stem **ki-* derived from a thematic aorist.⁴⁰ The Umbrian perfect and future perfect active paradigms, as far as they can be reconstructed, would have been:

PERFECT INDICATIVE			
sing.	plur.	sing.	plur.
1. <i>*šium</i>	—	Osc. manafum	—
		parallel to	
2. <i>*šie(d)</i>	<i>*šient,</i> <i>*šie(n)(s)</i>	Umb. dede ⁴¹	Umb. eitipes
PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE			
3. <i>*šie(d)</i>		parallel to	Osc. hipid
FUTURE PERFECT INDICATIVE			
2. <i>*šius</i>	—	Umb. benus	—
		parallel to	
3. <i>*šiust</i>	<i>*šiurent</i>	Umb. fakust	Umb. fakurent

Combination of certain of these forms with the nominals postulated above created periphrastic phrases⁴² which coalesced to form single words, as in the case of Latin *mando*, etc., above:

1. **combifiam šieđ* > *combifianši*;
2. **combifiam šiust* > *combifianšiust*, etc.;

³⁸ Cf. E.M.

³⁹ W.H., s.v. *erciscor*.

⁴⁰ Cf. Gk. *ἐκίον*, though E.M. assume an athematic aorist. If they are right, my reconstructions need not be wrong, since the Osco-Umbrian perfect was thematic, and a zero-grade root could have been generalized.

⁴¹ Vetter #230; this form is presumably Umbrian but should be **deře*. The reconstruction is guaranteed by Osc. **kúmbened**, etc.

⁴² A typological parallel to such phrases is seen in the Sanskrit periphrastic perfects to denominative verbs.

3. **disleralim šust* > *disleralinsust*;
4. **herim šied* > **heriiei**;
5. **pordovim šius* > *purdinsus*, etc.;
6. **pordovim šust* > *purdinsust*, etc.;
7. **upsam šied* > **usaçe: usaie**.

Originally, these phrases were intransitive, a state particularly suited to the intransitive use of **pordowi-*, cf.:

ererunt kapiřus puemune vesune purtuvitu (IV 5-6)

"From the same bowls make the presentation to Pomona and Vesona."⁴³

pune purtius unu suřu pesutru tikamne iuvie (II a 7-8)

"When you have made the presentation, present one pig-persondro to Dicamnus Iovius."⁴³

Having coalesced to single words, and having thereby lost their phrasal identity, they came to serve as perfects for the denominative verbs to which they appeared closely related, assuming at the same time the meanings of these denominatives. It will be noted that the semantic changes were slight:

1. *combifiansi*: "has made an announcement" → "has announced;"
2. *combifiansust*: "will have made an announcement" → "will have announced;"
3. *disleralinsust*: "will have brought about a void (rite)"⁴⁴ → "will have rendered void;"
4. **heriiei**: "has brought about the act of willing" → "has willed;"
5. *purdinsust*: "will have effected an offering" → "will have made the presentation, will have offered;"
6. **usaçe**: "brought about an accomplishment" → "accomplished, did."

The Umbrian -*nky*- perfects, then, preserve an archaic periphrastic construction, and it is clear why the language saw fit to preserve it. A

⁴³ Translations from Poultney.

⁴⁴ Originally, **disleralim* must commonly have modified a masculine or feminine substantive meaning "rite." Another possibility is that **disleralis* became a noun meaning "nullified rite," or "nullification of the rite," like Osc. **amviannud** "detour" from gerundive **amviandod* "to be circumambulated."

large percentage of the Osco-Umbrian verbs whose present stems end in a vowel were denominatives, corresponding to the Latin first, second, and fourth conjugation types *curare*, *florere*, and *servire*. There was no Indo-European aorist or perfect stem-type for denominatives. These verbs, therefore, had no source from which to derive perfect forms, by contrast with verbs which did inherit an aorist or perfect stem and verbs whose root structure made analogical formation of such a stem possible. The resulting hole in the morphological system of Osco-Umbrian denominatives was filled by innovation, and the results of this innovation were extended to most verbs with vocalic stem-final. Latin created its *w*-perfects (whatever their source) to fill just such a hole. Osco-Umbrian built some denominative perfect stems to resemble those of verbs with consonantal stem-final, e.g., Umbrian *portust* "he will have carried" versus *portaia* "let him carry," and possibly *opset* "they made" (Vetter #234) versus **osatu** "let him make." The favored method, however, was periphrasis. The *f*-perfect, type Oscan **aikdafed** "he built," arose before Oscan and Umbrian diverged, or as a result of separate but parallel development, and the type is probably periphrastic in origin. Oscan created its *-tt*-perfects, type **dadikatted** "he dedicated," also probably of periphrastic origin.⁴⁵ Finally, Umbrian utilized periphrastic combinations of action/abstract nouns and reflexes of I.E. **kēi-*, some of which have been preserved in coalesced form in the *-nky-* perfect.

⁴⁵ Buck 172.