

Dialectal Latin Fundatid, Proiectad, Parentatid*)

By REX WALLACE, Amherst

1. Introduction

The dialectal Latin verb forms FUNDATID “dump”, PROIECI-TAD “discard”, and PARENTATID “offer a sacrifice” appear only in CIL I², 401 (the so called *Lex Luceria*), a *lex sacra* intended to protect a sacred grove from profanation.¹⁾ The inscription, dated to the early 3rd century B. C., was discovered in Luceria (modern Lucera) and published in 1861.²⁾ The three verb forms in question appear in the context of a prohibition:

IN HOC LOVCARID STIRCVS
NE [QV]IS FVNDATID NEVE CADAVER
PROIECITAD NEVE PARENTATID
“Let no one dump dung, discard a dead
body, or offer a sacrifice to the dead
in this grove.”

Most discussions dealing with these verb forms favor a language contact explanation, in particular contact with Oscan-speaking Samnites who had settled in the area of Luceria before Latin colonization at the end of the 4th century (315/14 B. C.).³⁾ And in this case a

*) This paper is a revised version of a presentation given at the Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South (April, 1986). I thank Brian Joseph, Alan Nussbaum, and Don Ringe for reading and commenting on earlier versions. They are, of course, in no way responsible for any remaining errors. Words and morphemes in the native Oscan script are printed in boldface type. Oscan citations are from E. Vetter, *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte* (Heidelberg, 1953). Words in the native Latin script are italicized and citations from the *Lex Luceria* are in capitals.

¹⁾ For general discussion of this inscription see E. Pulgram, *Italic, Latin, Italian* (Heidelberg, 1978), pp. 173–75.

²⁾ The inscription was copied and published by J. B. d’Amelj, *Storia della città di Luceria* (Luceria, 1861), p. 119. For the date of the inscription see Vetter, *Handbuch*, p. 163–64.

³⁾ See O. A. Danielsson, “Zum altitalischen *t*-perfect, *Altitalischen Studien 4* (Hannover, 1885), 152–55, A. Ernout, *Recueil de textes Latins archaïques* (Paris, 1916), p. 47, E. Hermann, “1. Lateinisch-oskisch *proiectad*,” *KZ* 48 (1918), pp. 119–20, M. Leumann, *Lateinische Grammatik I* (München, 1977), p. 571, L. R. Palmer, *The Latin Language* (London, 1954), p. 278, V. Pisani, *Testi latini, arcaici e*

language contact explanation is almost certainly the correct one. Unfortunately, previous analyses of these verb forms do not go far enough in support of a contact analysis. First of all, there is no attempt to show why these verb forms cannot be explained by Latin internal developments. It stands to reason that the appeal of a language contact explanation is tied, in part at least, to deficiencies with an internally motivated explanation. Second, there is no attempt to support the contact hypothesis by means of historical information. Being able to provide historical evidence for contact between the languages at issue must be a preliminary requirement for a language contact explanation.⁴) And finally, these analyses adduce no evidence either for or against the various structural sources in Oscan - present (PRES) subjunctive (SUBJ) vs. perfect (PERF) subjunctive - which have been considered responsible for the peculiar shape of these dialectal Latin verb forms. In this paper I attempt to remedy these shortcomings (1) by showing that there is good reason to reject an analysis which explains these endings by internal Latin developments, (2) by noting the historical and additional linguistic evidence in favor of contact between Latin and Oscan speakers at Luceria, and (3) by showing that the structural source of -TID/-TAD is the Oscan PERF SUBJ ending -tíd, not the PRES SUBJ.

2. -TID/-TAD by internal developments

The only obvious avenue of explanation for these endings through Latin internal developments is by means of blending.⁵) The possible morphological formants which could be involved are delimited by the syntactic context in which **FUNDATID**, **PARENTATID** and **PROIECITAD** appear, namely prohibitions. In early Latin two morphological categories serve as the exponents of this function: imperatives (IMPV) and SUBJs. The sources of input for blending, then, are limited to formants from these categories.

volgari (Torino, 1975), p.19, and Pulgram, *Italic*, p.174, T. von Grienberger, "Die altlateinische Inschrift von Lucera," *IF* 33 (1917), pp.287-88.

⁴) For discussion of prerequisites for external explanation of linguistic change see S.Thomason, "On Establishing External Causes of Language Change," in *Proceedings of the Second Eastern States Conference on Linguistics* (Columbus, 1986), pp.243-251.

⁵) An alternative analysis, mentioned in passing by Pulgram, *Italic*, p.174, that the -ti- of these endings is a variant of the subjunctive suffix -ssi- is implausible.

The ending **-TAD (PROIECITAD)** can be rather easily derived as a blending of the IMPV ending *-tōd* and the 3rd & 4th conjugation PRES SUBJ ending *-ā*. On the other hand, the inflectional ending **-TID (FUNDATID and PARENTATID)** does not lend itself to such a straightforward solution. It cannot be a blending of *-tōd* with the 1st conjugation SUBJ ending *ē* because the *i*-vocalism of this ending cannot have *ē* as its source vowel. However, an alternative SUBJ formation does exist in Latin which possesses the *i*-vocalism required by **-TID** – namely SUBJs in *-ssi-*. In early Latin, to judge from the evidence of Plautus, this formation was fairly productive – productive enough certainly to be considered as a source for blending.⁶⁾ And in terms of Latin morphosyntax there are no problems with this formant since it too appears frequently in prohibitions.

It is possible, then, to construct a scenario for the derivation of the endings **-TID/-TAD** by means of blending; the endings are the result of a “fusion” between the Latin IMPV *-tōd* and the Latin SUBJs in *-ssi-* (for **-TID**) and *-ā* (for **-TAD**). But despite the fact that this hypothesis appears plausible, there is a very good reason why it must be viewed with scepticism. In the *Lex Luceria* the endings **-TID/-TAD** appear only in prohibitions, negative commands; in the positive commands in this inscription verbs have the etymologically expected IMPV ending **-TOD**, e.g. IOUDICATOD, ESTOD [L]ICETOD.⁷⁾ Our first inclination is to suggest that the blended forms were restricted to prohibitions because SUBJs and IMPVs are both exponents of negative commands but not of positive ones. But this is of course not the case; both SUBJs and IMPVs can be used in the 3rd SG in positive as well as negative commands. As a result, if the endings **-TID/-TAD** were the result of blending, it would stand to reason that they would appear in *both positive and negative* commands in this inscription. The fact that they do not is a decisive argument against the blending hypothesis.

3. *-TID/TAD by external causation*

As was noted above, a majority of attempts to explain these dialectal Latin verb endings have pointed to Oscan as the source. And this view has much to commend it. First of all, a hypothesis relying on

⁶⁾ This analysis was proposed by F. Ribezzo, “Epigrafia,” *RIGI* 6 (1922), p.151.

⁷⁾ I want to thank Brian Joseph (personal communication) and Alan Nussbaum (personal communication) for reminding me of this important point.

Oscan interference is unobjectionable on geographical grounds because northern Apulia was among the many territories in southern Italy settled by Oscan speakers.⁸⁾ The city of Luceria (modern Lucera) seems to have been under the control of Oscan-speaking Samnites up to the time of its capture and colonization by Rome in 315/14 B. C.⁹⁾ We can, as a result, be virtually certain that the city of Luceria was among the points of contact between Oscan and Latin speakers in the late 4th and early 3rd century, precisely the point in time when the *Lex Luceria* was produced. Second, we can point to other Oscan-like features on this inscription which may also be due to Oscan interference, e. g. phonological features such as epenthesis in stop/resonant clusters (MACISTERATUS “authority” – Oscan *pustiris* “later” [Ve 149] < *postrios), raising of *e* before *r* (STIRCUS “dung” – Oscan *amirikum* “business, occupation” [Ve 7] < *ambmerkum),¹⁰⁾ and raising of *e* in hiatus (IUM ACC SG PRO – Oscan *ionc* [Ve 2] < *eomke < *eyomke).¹¹⁾

Given the historical and linguistic information cited above, I doubt that contact between Oscans and Latins in Luceria c. 300 B. C. can be considered an issue. The questions that remain are (1) whether a structural source for these endings exists in Oscan and (2), assuming a source is identifiable, whether the morphological and syntactic contexts are such that they can reasonably be supposed to have been carried over into Latin.

Two possible sources for these dialectal Latin endings have been identified in the literature, the Oscan PRES SUBJ and the Oscan PERF SUBJ.¹²⁾

The first of these categories, the PRES SUBJ, can be rejected as a possible source for the dialectal Latin endings. Advocates of the

⁸⁾ For the migration of Oscan speakers into central and southern Italy see E. T. Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites* (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 32–40.

⁹⁾ Salmon, *Samnium*, pp. 20, 49, 238.

¹⁰⁾ Raising of *e* before *r* also appears in some other dialectal Latin inscriptions, e. g. inscriptions from Praeneste (*mirqurios* CIL 1², 533), and so may be an internal Latin development restricted to non-Urban Latin dialects.

¹¹⁾ *LOUCARID* “sacred grove” may also be of Oscan origin; the Latin word appears to be a simple *o*-stem *loucom* (CIL 1², 366). On the other hand it is not impossible to think of a secondary formation in *-ālis/-āris* which has subsequently replaced the *o*-stem (for the formation compare Latin *rēgālis*, etc.).

¹²⁾ For references see footnote 3. Leumann, Palmer, and Pulgram favor an Oscan PRES SUBJ analysis; Danielsson, Ernout, Hermann, Pisani, and von Grienberger prefer the Oscan PERF SUBJ analysis.

Oscan PRES SUBJ explanation must assume a blending, much like the blending described earlier, between the *Oscan* categories of PRES SUBJ and IMPV or between the *Oscan* endings of the PRES SUBJ and the *Latin* IMPV. The first suggestion is problematic inasmuch as Oscan PRES SUBJs and IMPVs do not have overlapping functions in commands in Oscan. IMPVs are used in positive commands, while PERF, not PRES, SUBJs are used in negative commands.¹³⁾ We reject this possibility then on morphosyntactic grounds. The second possibility seems equally implausible. Given the differences in function between the Oscan PRES SUBJ and the Latin IMPV, it is not easy to imagine Oscan speakers who were learning Latin somehow blending the two into their brand of dialectal Latin. And of course the morphosyntactic problems remain as well. There is, simply stated, no way to motivate a blending of this sort. Its pretty clear, then, that the PRES SUBJ is inadequate as a source for interference.

A more likely candidate as the source for interference, at least as far as the ending *-TID* is concerned, was identified by H. Buchholtz over 100 years ago, namely the Oscan PERF SUBJ ending *-tt-í-* as attested by forms like *tríbarakattíns* 3PL PERF SUBJ “build.”¹⁴⁾ This Oscan ending meets the basic contextual requirement since it appears in prohibitions in Oscan. Moreover, morphemic analysis of the Latin verb forms *FUNDATID* and *PARENTATID* matches up perfectly with respect to the Oscan verb cited above, i. e. stem morpheme (*tríbara-/FUNDA-*) + perfect morpheme (*-tt-/T-*) + subjunctive morpheme (*-í-/I-*) + desinence (*-ns/-D*). The Oscan *-tt-* formative often appears simply as *t* and, given the date of the Latin inscription, double writing of *T* would not be expected anyway. Similarly, Oscan *í* < **ē* regularly appears as *i* in Oscan inscriptions written in the Latin alphabet, e. g. *ligud* ABL SG “law” (= Latin *lēge*). From a formal point of view, then, this analysis encounters no difficulties.

The advantage of deriving the dialectal Latin form *-TID* by means of the Oscan PERF SUBJ, as opposed in particular to blending, has to do with the fact that it provides for a principled explanation of the complementary distribution of the ending *-TID* (*-TAD*) vs. the “regular” IMPV ending *-TOD*. Recall that in the *Lex Luceria* the

¹³⁾ See C.D. Buck, *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* (Boston, 1928), pp. 214–15.

¹⁴⁾ See von Grienberger, “Inscription,” p. 287.

ending -TID (-TAD) appears in prohibitions while the IMPV ending -TOD appears in positive commands.

In Oscan, prohibitions are signalled by means of PERF SUBJs not by IMPVs. On the other hand, positive commands are signalled exclusively by IMPVs. These facts about Oscan morphosyntax enable us to account for the distribution of -TID (-TAD) vs. IMPV -TOD by hypothesizing that the Oscan ending -*tíd* was carried over into Latin in the same syntactic contexts and with the same function that it had in Oscan, namely as an exponent of prohibitions. Since Oscan does not employ PERF SUBJs in positive commands there is no chance for morphological interference in this syntactic context and the “regular” IMPV ending -TOD is maintained as the exponent of this function. Thus, the contact hypothesis accounts neatly for the difference in function – negative s.v. positive command – between -TID (-TAD) and -TOD in the *Lex Luceria*.

The obvious difficulty with this interpretation is that it provides no explanation for PROIECITAD and in fact requires – in order to avoid multiplying solutions – that we emend this form.¹⁵⁾ The possibilities are dictated by certain fact of Oscan verb formation. Since -*tt-* formants are added to *ā*-conjugation verbs in Oscan, it is most likely the case that these formants were carried over into the same morphological contexts in Latin, namely verbs in -*ā*. Thus, PROIECITAD should be emended to *PROIECATID, a deverbative formation in -*ā*, similar to the formation attested by FUNDATID, cf. the thematic formation *fundit* in Latin.¹⁶⁾

While it is true that emendations are not always satisfying solutions to difficult problems, in this case it seems necessary. To explain -TID by language contact and -TAD by internal development is out of the question since it treats what are ostensibly similar items as different. More importantly, as was noted above, an explanation of PROIECITAD by morphological contamination does not account

¹⁵⁾ The suggestion that this form is in need of emendation is certainly not a novel one. For emendations see von Grienberger, “Inscription,” pp. 287–88, Hermann, “proiecitad,” pp. 119–20, and Pisani, *Testi*, p. 19.

¹⁶⁾ This is basically the emendation of Pisani, *Testi*, p. 19 and Hermann, “proiecitad,” p. 120, although Pisani treats the vocalism of the root as long (for which see below footnote 22). Von Grienberger, “Inscription,” pp. 287–88 emends PROIECITAD to *PROIECIAD, a 3 SG PRES SUBJ. This emendation is to be rejected because Latin does not write prevocalic *i* in this manner. In this regard von Grienberger’s appeal to Oscan *fakiad* – which is probably a mistake for **fakiad* anyway – as the model for the proposed double writing of **ii* is totally misguided.

for its distributional restriction (to prohibitions) and so must be rejected anyway. And finally, though this is not a license to emend, the inscription is known only from a copy. The possibility that the inscription was copied incorrectly cannot be discounted.

In the final analysis, then, it is best to emend **PROIECITAD** to ***PROIECATID** and preserve thereby a unified explanation – via the Oscan ending **-tíd** – for the dialectal Latin verb forms.

4. *The nature of the contact situation*

How Oscan inflectional endings came to be incorporated into the Latin recorded on this inscription is another question entirely, and one to which we will never be able to give an adequate answer. Unfortunately, there is little information about the socio-cultural setting of language contact between Oscans and Latins in northern Apulia. Nevertheless, what we know about other Oscan/Latin contact situations and what we know about contact-induced language change make it possible to offer a few observations concerning the incorporation of these endings into Latin.

It seems unlikely that Latin speakers borrowed the Oscan inflectional endings found on the verb forms under discussion.¹⁷⁾ Evidence from other Latin/Oscan contact situations – Latin-North Oscan [Ve 202–216], Latin-Pompeian Oscan [Ve 8–22 d], Latin-Bantian Oscan [Ve 2] – militates against this hypothesis. In other Latin/Oscan contact situations it is the case that Latin features – primarily lexical items, occasionally features of syntax, and rarely inflectional endings – are incorporated into Oscan.¹⁸⁾ In every instance Latin is clearly the donor, not the recipient, language. Moreover, if Latin speakers were to borrow Oscan features, we would expect them to borrow vocabulary items first, not features of inflectional morphology. As Sarah Thomason has shown, in borrowing situations the

¹⁷⁾ Borrowing is used in a rather technical sense here to refer to the incorporation of foreign characteristics into one's native language. For discussion see the following papers by Sarah Thomason: "Morphological instability, with and without language contact," in *Historical Morphology* (New York, 1980) p. 364 and "Are there Linguistic Prerequisites For Contact-Induced Language Change?," (ms., 1981) p. 8.

¹⁸⁾ For discussion of the Latinization of Oscan, the reader is referred to M. L. Porzio Gernia, "Aspetti dell' influsso latino sul lessico e sulla sintassi osca," *AGI* 55 (1970) pp. 94–144 and E. Campanile, "La latinizzazione dell' Osco," *Scritti in onore di Giuliano Bonfante 1* (Brescia, 1976) pp. 109–120.

first foreign features to enter the borrowing language are vocabulary items.¹⁹⁾ We should be hesitant, then, to attribute the Oscan features on these inscriptions to borrowing on the part of Latin speakers for two reasons: 1) This goes against the pattern of interference in other Latin/Oscan contact situations. 2) In borrowing situations vocabulary items are incorporated into a group's native language before phonological, syntactic, or morphological features. In order to argue for the borrowing position, we would at least like to see some Oscan vocabulary items in this inscription. There are none.

The type of Oscan influences which do appear on the *Lex Luceria* – phonological, syntactic, and morphological features – brings to mind the profile for substratum influence described by Thomason.²⁰⁾ Substratum influence occurs when a group of speakers who are shifting to another language fail to learn that language perfectly. The “errors” made by the group of speakers who are shifting languages may subsequently spread to native speakers if they (the errors) are imitated by native speakers. For our purpose, it is important to note that, unlike borrowing substratum interference does not begin with vocabulary items but rather with phonological and syntactic features; even features of morphology may appear in the language that is the target of the shift before words. As a result, it seems reasonable, based on the distinction between borrowing and substratum interference as described by Thomason, to claim that the Oscan features on this inscription are the result of substratum influence. We assume that Oscan speakers who learned Latin as a second language carried over into Latin certain of the features of their native language, on this inscription phonological, syntactic, and, in the case under discussion, inflectional, features. This interference is the result of Oscan speakers “erring” in their production of Latin, i.e. the result of imperfect learning. Whether these features were subsequently incorporated into the speech of native Latin speakers in Luceria is impossible to say because we know nothing about the circumstances which surrounded the production of this inscription, e.g. who authorized it, who inscribed it, the audience it was aimed at, etc. Still, if the ratio of Latin to Oscan speakers in Luceria was small at the time of the shift, it stands to reason that the chances of these Oscan “errors” actually being incorporated into Lucerian Latin were rather

¹⁹⁾ S. Thomason, “Morphological instability,” p. 364 and “Linguistic Prerequisites”, p. 8.

²⁰⁾ S. Thomason, “Linguistic Prerequisites,” pp. 8–9.

high. Be that as it may, it is not unreasonable to assume that the Oscan features of this inscription, in particular the inflectional endings on **FUNDATID** et al., are the result of Oscan substratum interference.

5. Final considerations

I have argued that the dialectal Latin inflectional ending **-TID** (**-TAD**) is best explained as the result of contact induced change. The appeal to external causation in order to explain the origins of this dialectal Latin ending is motivated primarily by the inadequacy of the explanation relying on Latin internal developments. At the same time I have tried to motivate the language contact explanation by offering historical evidence for Oscan/Latin contact in Luceria and by showing that the inflectional ending **-TID** (**-TAD**) can be reasonably explained based on interference from the Oscan ending **-tíd**. Given the evidence marshalled in favor of Oscan interference in this case, there is little reason for scepticism. We have here, then, a “documentable” case of substratum interference in Latin.²¹⁾

Appendix: More on **PROIECITAD**

The emendation of **PROIECITAD** to ***PROIECATID** eliminates but one of the problems with this form. A second problem, the *e*-vocalism of the root **IEC-** (from simplex *iac-*), *remains*. Under normal circumstances short **a* in medial syllables should be raised to *i*. Thus, we might expect the verb to be spelled ***PROICATID** /prōyikatīd/ with a single *i* written for /yi/. The spelling **PROIEC-**, with *e*-vocalism in the root, has generally been ignored or, when it has been discussed, has received little in the way of adequate explanation.²²⁾

As far as I can see, the *e*-vocalism in the root admits of two possibilities. The source of the writing **IEC-** may be tied to the constraint against representing /yi/ by means of the sequence *ii*. The constraint

²¹⁾ A brief discussion of possible Oscan features in Latin can be found in Leumann, Hofmann, Szantyr, *Grammatik I* (München, 1965), pp. 36*-37*.

²²⁾ According to Pisani, *Testi*, p. 19 the root vowel in **PROIECITAD** is long. The *ē*-vocalism is explained by reference to the vocalism of the perfect of the simplex *iēcī*. But this hypothesis does not explain the spread of the *ē*-vocalism of the simplex perfect into the present of a derived form.

is understandable, in part at least, in terms of the origins of the sequence /yi/. It arises only as the result of the restoration of /y/ from a simplex form, e.g. /yakiō/ vs. /prōikiō/ = = = > /prōyikiō/. Whatever the reasons for the spelling constraint are, the writing IEC- could be an attempt to provide an explicit representation of /yi/ with its morphologically restored yod.²³⁾

A second hypothesis links the spelling IEC- to a minor sound change found in Latin, namely the dissimilative lowering of *i* to *e* when preceded by *i*, e.g. *adiese* for **adiisse* in CIL 1², 581. A case could certainly be made, on the grounds of phonetic plausibility, for a similar tendency on the part of the morphologically restored *y + i* /yi/ sequences. The odd spelling in this case then may reflect nothing other than an attempt to indicate a real phonological process, the dissimilative lowering of *i* after the palatal sound *y*.²⁴⁾

There is no way to determine at this point which of the two possibilities is most likely to be correct. But note that the spelling of the root vocalism in PROIEC- is not an isolated example. The same spelling is found in the 3PL SUBJ form *conieciant*, which appears on the *Lex Acilia Repetundarum* CIL 1², 1202, line 50. In sum, the spelling IEC- does not require emendation, despite the fact that we cannot determine whether *e* is the result of a spelling convention or a sound change.

²³⁾ This appears to be the position of Leumann, *Grammatik* p. 128.

²⁴⁾ Ernout, in his note on *conieciant*, *Recueil*, p. 85 points to *adiese* as a comparable form. Presumably, then, he would explain the *e*-vocalism in PROIECI-TAD by means of sound change.