

*Athematica Italica II:*

**Is the Latin 3<sup>rd</sup> conjugation *-iō* class a continuation of a Proto-Italic athematic or ‘half-thematic’ type?**

Ville Leppänen

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

ville.leppaenen@campus.lmu.de

Proto-Italic plays a key role in understanding the development of the Italic languages. In recent decades, several comprehensive studies in Italic and Latin verb morphology (e.g. Meiser 2003; Bock 2008; Garnier 2010) have facilitated the reconstruction of the Proto-Italic verb system, and considerable fragments of it can now be reconstructed. These individual fragments provide evidence for the systemic relations that are relevant for the organisation of morphological paradigms.

In an earlier paper (*Athematica Italica I: Zur Rekonstruktion der athematischen Präsenskonjugation im Uritalischen*) I examined a number of Italic present formations in order to determine, which (or if any) of them was conjugated without the intervening thematic vowel in Proto-Italic. I concluded that only certain forms of PIt. *\*es-/s-* ‘to be’, *\*ej-* ‘to go’, *\*uel-* ‘to want’, and *\*ēd-* ‘to eat’ were conjugated athematically, while all other inherited PIE athematic formations (e.g. nasal presents, reduplicated presents, root presents, desideratives) were already thematised by Proto-Italic, at the latest. I also demonstrated that the previously reconstructed ‘half-thematic’ or ‘*a*-thematic’ paradigms were mostly due to the application of ‘deductive reconstruction’ (i.e. the derivation of Proto-Italic forms from their PIE ancestors by known regular sound changes), as opposed to the systematic application of the comparative method.

In this paper, I will examine the development of the Latin 3<sup>rd</sup> conjugation *-iō* class in order to determine its status within the Proto-Italic verb system (possibly also resulting in ‘indogermanistically’ interesting insights). In synchronic terms, this class is a mixture of regular 3<sup>rd</sup> conjugation (prs.ind. 2sg., 3sg., 1pl., 2pl., imp.) and 4<sup>th</sup> conjugation (prs.ind. 1sg., 3pl., prs.sbj.) forms; there can be little doubt that prs.ind.1sg. *-iō* and 3pl. *-iunt* reflect thematic (or thematised) formations. The status of this class is somewhat unclear in Sabellic (e.g. Buck 1904: 165-166, Wallace 2007: 29), but the few attested forms (e.g. Osc. prs.sbj. **fakiiad**, imp.fut. *factud*) point to a similar mixed inflection than in Latin. While 4<sup>th</sup> conjugation forms have an underlying *-ī-* in the stem, 3<sup>rd</sup> conjugation *-iō* verbs have *-ī-*.

Aside from the fairly trivial development of 1sg. and 3pl. (which in Latin reflect thematic/thematised formations everywhere but in *sum, sunt*), the rest of the paradigm can be explained variously. The origin of the type is the PIE *\*-i-e/o-*present – according to *LIV*<sup>2</sup> (p. 19), a thematic formation – but some verbs in this class are secondary (e.g. *faciō* is based on the root aorist weak stem, PIt. *\*fāk-* < PIE *\*d<sup>h</sup>h<sub>1</sub>(k)-*). Thus, regularly 1sg. PIE *\*-i-oh<sub>2</sub>* > PIt. *\*-i-ō* > Lat. *-iō*, 3pl. PIE *\*-i-onti* > PIt. *\*-i-ont* > Lat. *-iunt*. More problematic are the rest of the forms: it

is, namely, not entirely clear, whether Lat. 2sg. *-īs*, 3sg. *-īt* (etc.) are phonologically regular continuations of PIE *\*-j-e-si*, *\*-j-e-ti* (etc.) (for arguments against a phonological solution, see Leumann 1977: 568-569). If not, the class must be analysed as a secondary ‘half-thematic’ type (with a Balto-Slavic cognate formation, cf. Kortlandt 1989: 109), where the thematic vowel is not present in forms that synchronically have an underlying *-ī-*, i.e. 2sg. *-īs* < *\*-i-s*, etc. (cf. Leumann 1977: 567-568, Meiser 1998: 195). Yet a third option is to derive the Italic forms from a PIE athematic *i*-present (e.g. Beekes 2011: 255), in which case the *ī*-forms are regular continuations of the PIE weak stem and only 1sg. and 3pl. have been thematised (just like Lat. *eō* ← *\*h<sub>1</sub>éj-mi*, *eunt* ← *\*h<sub>1</sub>j-énti*) (Schrijver 1991: 411, Schrijver 2003). This would thus constitute a genuine Proto-Italic ‘half-thematic’ conjugation, and the Italic 3<sup>rd</sup> conjugation *-iō* class would be a (partial) continuation of the respective PIE athematic formation.

### References:

- Beekes, Robert S. P. 2011. *Comparative Indo-European linguistics: an introduction*. 2nd ed. revised and corrected by Michiel de Vaan. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Bock, Bettina. 2008. *Die einfach thematischen Präsensformen in der dritten Konjugation des Lateinischen* (Grazer Vergleichende Arbeiten 22). Graz: Leykam.
- Buck, Carl Darling. 1904. *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*. Boston: Ginn and Company.
- Garnier, Romain. 2010. *Sur le vocalisme du verbe latin: étude synchronique et diachronique* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 134). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 1989. ‘Lith. *statyti* and related formations.’ *Baltistica* 25/2, 104-112.
- Leumann, Manu. 1977. *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. München: C. H. Beck.
- LIV<sup>2</sup> = Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, ed. by Helmut Rix. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001.
- Meiser, Gerhard. 1998. *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Meiser, Gerhard. 2003. *Veni Vidi Vici: Die Vorgeschichte des lateinischen Perfektsystems* (Zetemata 113). München: C. H. Beck.
- Schrijver, Peter. 1991. *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam/Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- Schrijver, Peter. 2003. ‘Athematic *i*-presents: the Italic and Celtic evidence.’ *Incontri Linguistici* 26, 59-86.
- Wallace, Rex E. 2007. *The Sabellic Languages of Ancient Italy*. München: Lincom Europa.