

The Latin -v- *perfectum* formant

In Latin, in school-grammar level, the -v- formant appears in the *averbo* of many verbs “hidden” in the form, as in its simplest case, in “laudō 1 (=laudāre), laudāvī, laudātus (or, depending on the dictionary in question, laudātum, which is the *supine* or *supinum*).

“laudāvī” is the “present perfect”, i.e. *praesens perfectum indicativi activi*. Although it can be stated in school-grammar that this verb has “two” stems, lauda- and laudav- the “real” stem ends in -a-, and everything else is a question of grammatical indicators (formants) as well as - if recourse has been taken to history - of their origin.

Three important statements are necessary in the beginning: one thing is the category (here *praesens perfectum*), and another thing is *how* this category is realized (i.e., there are also other forms like *ēgī*, which still belong to the same functional frame with *laudāvī*. And a third point is *how* the constituents congregated - through a very long, mainly prehistoric, development - in an “endpoint” which, in this case, is the Classical Latin language. The “endpoint”, linguistically, is improper, given that the Latin language continued to develop as we see today in its continuations, in Italian, Spanish, French and other spoken neo-Latin languages. They resemble, more less, their origin, the Classical Latin.

In synchronic level, such questions cannot be clarified. Indeed, synchrony is not much interested in history (in diachrony) whereas a hoped-for precise overall picture can be achieved only if the two approaches cooperate.

As a principle, can be stated: languages cannot be created or born in the form we encounter them today or in earlier complex systems as attested in written tradition. In other words, it is impossible that such complex systems as Sanskrit, Classical Greek or Latin, or any other similar language, appeared, wherever, suddenly in history. Concepts according to which linguistic bodies as, e.g., Sanskrit were handed down “from Heaven”/“by God” etc. in spoken or in written form, are part of the mythological tradition and of religion. The issue belongs to the unsolved great questions. Here: *how* human language came about, *when*, *where*, and *why*. These are the *final questions* like the *origin* and *aim* of the Universe, the appearance of *life*, further of *Human* on the Earth, and so on. For thousands and thousands of years now, ever since Homo is capable to speculate, the questions pop up, answers have been attempted at, and no satisfying solution has been found. Even the advanced theological suggestion (God existed ever, and everything comes from God) is not an answer. Theology does not accept the concept of refutability as science does: no categoric statement is permitted; there always must be left a “gateway” to find something better. And natural science, consequently, proceeds as far as it can, but the “final answer” and/or the “first solution” still are covered by uncertainty.

The components of inflected grammatical forms, such as those of Latin, can be understood - and if - only as a coagulation (grammaticalization) of independent forms (words), during very long, largely prehistoric, processes, partly common Indo-European, partly independent. (Independent in morphology, but dependent in syntax).

With regard to verbs, the “philosophy” must have been similar to what we find in actual English: “I/you etc. have seen/written” etc., “I was/you were going/speaking” etc. Such analytical forms became “synthetic” as we see in Latin (and also in Greek), and the “synthetic” forms have become by our time, again, more or less, “analytical”, such as is the picture in Italian, in French, English etc. (this is the *spiral movement*).

The -v- formant of Latin, is, by an expert¹ in Latin historical Grammar, not quite the simplest issue:

¹ Michael Weiss, *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor - New York, Beech Stave Press, 2009.

p. 410:

D. The Latin *v*-perfect, in which *u* is added to the stem before the perfect endings, by far the most productive sort of perfect, is something of a mystery. After a long vowel *-u-* surfaces as *-u-*. After a short vowel the outcome is *-u-* < **V̄u*.

pp. 411-412:

amō 'I love' → *amā-v-ī*.

(g)nōscō 'I recognize' → *(g)nō-v-ī* 'I know'.

doceō 'I teach' → **doke-u-ai* > *docuī*.

moveō 'I move' → **moʷe-u-ai* > *mōvī*.

1. This is most probably connected to the Vedic 1st and 3rd singular perfect in *-au* to roots ending in a final laryngeal, e.g.:

**steh₂-* >> *sthā-* 'stand' → perf. *tastháu*.

**gneh₃-* > *jñā-* 'know' → perf. *jajñáu*.

2. These probably go back to **stestoh₂-h₂e*, **stestoh₂-e*, and **gēgnoh₃-h₂e*, **gēgnoh₃-e*. By Jasanoff's Law these would have the potential to become **stestōu* and **gēgnōu*. In Latin it appears that the *u* was reinterpreted as a marker of the tense and generalized throughout the stem.⁵

- a. It is possible that the paradigms of *nōvī* 'I know' and *-plēvī* 'I filled' with "short forms" without *-vi-* predominating outside of the 1st and 3rd singular reflect this original situation:

<i>nōvī</i>	<i>nōmus</i> ⁶	<i>-plēvī</i>	<i>-plēmus</i>
<i>nōstī</i>	<i>nōstis</i>	<i>-plēstī</i>	<i>-plēstis</i>
<i>nōvit</i>	<i>nōrunt</i>	<i>-plēvit</i>	<i>-plērunt</i>

- b. However, in some cases the *-u-* was lost between like vowels:

plp. *cōnsuēverat* 'had been accustomed' > *cōnsuērat*.

plp. subj. *audīvissem* 'I would have heard' > *audīssem*.

2nd sg. *audīvistī* 'you heard' > *audīstī*.

It is therefore possible that *nōstī*, etc. could be analogical on the pattern:

audī-vis-tī : *audī-stī* :: *nō-vi-stī* : X, X = *nōstī*.

In Plautus the long forms are equally or more common than the short forms. For example, there are ±13 examples of *nōvisti(s)* vs. ±3 examples of *nōstī*, and 24 examples of *nōvisse* vs. zero of *nōsse*. For *-āvī* perfects the ratio of long to short forms is about 1:1.⁷ In Terence, Cicero, and Caesar, on the other hand, the short forms are more common than the long ones.⁸ Terence has 67 short forms vs. 8 long forms all at verse

end.⁹ Cicero has *audistī* 14 times, *audivistī* once; *audistis* 74 times, *audivistis* once. In Old Latin *audivī* (and *audivit*) are never contracted since the final vowel was not *ī* but *ē* < **-ei*. Only later does one find *audī* and *audīt*¹⁰ and on this model *inritāt* (Lucr. 1.70) and *disturbāt* (Lucr. 6.587).

Though, what Weiss writes is correct, after all, we are not informed what “-v-“ meant in terms of semantics, neither the theoretically possible fact that we do not know – though we, let’s say so, assume – a previously existing concrete meaning.

Weiss’ book is downloadable. I omitted the footnotes, and some other details.

Clearly, the “laryngeals”, their postulating, is operative. Let’s remind of the fact that a closer look at them is in our future plans as we proceed in IE Basics.

Let’s also remind of the fact that we already saw the laryngeals a couple of times, and for the last time in connection with the “ari-” issue (see Beekes’ Etymological Dictionary²). In a short survey: h_1 left no coloration, h_2 left [a], and h_3 left [o]. I.e., not the “laryngeals” themselves were \emptyset , a and o respectively, but their impact after they disappeared. For simplicity, and in this sense only, you can “identify” them with the given phonemes. However, the issue is considerably more complicated, and we can’t even claim that we have understood the basics. Maybe, exactly Beekes’ book (pdf available) on historical and IE linguistics will be of help.

On the practical side of the issue, it becomes once more, clear that the student must learn the lemma information (the *averbo*), and, for linguistics, acquaintance with other languages, too, is most helpful.

One could say, Weiss is an “empiricist”, not a “mentalist”. I try to add more, as far as I can find out more insights.

Buck³ may help us further:

p. 294:

415. *The perfect in -vī or -vī.*—This is a type peculiar to Latin (it is not even Italic), just as the κ -perfect is peculiar to Greek, and its evolution was along similar lines. A *w*-element which in some few cases belonged to the root or to an extended form of the root spread to other roots ending in a long vowel (cf. *flē-vī*, *crē-vī*, *sprē-vī*, *sē-vī*, *lē-vī*, *sī-vī*, *scī-vī*, *trī-vī*, *pā-vī*, *strā-vī*, *nō-vī*), also to some dissyllabic stems ending in a short vowel (whence *monuī*, etc.; see below), and to the great mass of verb stems in *ā* and *ī* of the first and fourth conjugations.

The important remark here is that this type of perfect is *peculiar to Latin*, and is not even Italic (which means that there could have been a first bend from Indo-European,

² **ari-*/**αρι-* would go back to **h₂er-* [CVC structure], whereby *-i-* is something to be explained but missing in Beekes, see p. 130.

³ C.D. Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, Chicago, Illinois, The University of Chicago Press, 1955.

and then one more to Latin; i.e. IE > Italic > Latin). Note that “Italic” is not Italian but referring to prehistoric and early linguistic developments on the Italian peninsula. Latin is Indo-European through Italic.

p. 295:

a. But the more precise starting-point remains uncertain. According to one view the principal rôle was played by early L. *fūi* pronounced, with the natural glide between *ū* and the following vowel, as *fūvī* and occasionally so written. But neither this nor any of the various other possibilities suggested has won general acceptance.

The perfect in *-uī* is only a variety of that in *-vī*, being formed from stems ending in a short vowel which appear also in the participles in *-itus* (437.2), that is, *-uī* from **-e-wai* with the same weakening as in *ēluō*, *dēnuō*, etc. (110.5).

The perfect in *-uī* is combined with that in *-sī* in *messuī* (*melō*) for **messī*, perhaps due to the influence of early *seruī* (*serō* ‘sow’), and in *nexuī* (*nectō*) for early *nexī*, like *texuī* (*texō*).

416. *The shorter forms of the perfect in -vī.*—Some of the “contracted” forms are the result of actual contraction, while others arose by analogy. Where *v* stood between like vowels, it was subject to loss, with resulting contraction of the vowels, as in *dītis* beside *dīvitis*, etc. (171). Such parallel forms as *audīvistī—audīstī*, *audīvissem—audīssem*, *audīvisse—audīsse*, *dēlēvērunt—dēlērunt*, *dēlēveram—dēlēram*, led to others like *nōvistī—nōstī*, *nōvērunt—nōrunt*, *nōvisse—nōsse*, and those of the first conjugation which are naturally the most frequent, *amāvistī—amāstī*, *amāvērunt—amārunt*, *amāveram—amāram*, *amāvisse—amāsse*, etc.

In perfects in *-ivī* the contracted forms remain restricted to those which had the sequence *ivī*. There are no forms in *-īrunt*, *-īram*, etc., parallel to *amārunt*, *amāram*, *amārō*, *amārim*, but rather *audiērunt*, *audieram*, *audierō*, *audierim*, and with these belongs 1 sg. *audiī*. These are probably not derived from the forms with *v*, but arose after the analogy of *iī* with its compounds, which is earlier than *ivī* and not originally of the *vī*-type (382).

The shorter forms, especially those of the first conjugation, are quotable from early Latin (cf. *conioura(s)se*, 186 B.C.) and are more common than the full forms in the classical period. But the details of relative frequency are too involved to be presented here.

417. *The endings of the Latin perfect.*

1. *First singular.*—*-ī*, early *-ei* (inscr. *fecēi*, etc.), is from a 1 sg. ending IE *-ai*, represented in Skt. 1 sg. perf. mid. *-e*, as *bubudhē*, also in ChSl. *vědě* ‘I know’, in form = L. *vidī*.

What I hinted at initially, analytical forms became synthetic, is here, but as a “precise starting-point remains uncertain”. “Fui”, naturally, is a form of the auxiliary *sum*, and the explanation of using it the way modern languages do (“I was walking/speaking” etc.), is probable but Buck sees it not proven.

In a theoretical level: it has been observed many times that linguistic development runs in an ascending circularity (contrary to ancient concepts, where *circularity* was understood in literal sense. The main exponent of this idea was the historian Polybius, 200–120 B.C.). Circular developments were reinterpreted, correctly, by Hegel, and following him by modern historians and linguists, such as J.G. Droysen and A. Meillet. (“Ascending” is an arbitrary designation – many thinkers maintain that “evolution has no direction”. This is not a point to discuss here).

p. 296:

2. *Second singular*.— *-istī*, early *-istei*, is to be analyzed as *-is-tī*, as also 2 pl. *-is-tis*. The first part belongs in origin to an *s*-aorist stem, the same which underlies the other tenses of the Latin perfect system (418). The second part is from the 2 sg. perf. ending *-tha* (Skt. *-tha*, G. *-θα*, 402), remade into *-tei*, *-tī* after the analogy of the first singular.

3. *Third singular*.—The earliest forms have *-ed*, as inscr. *fhefhaked*, *feced*, like Osc. *d e d e t*, etc., with the secondary ending *-d* from *-t* (337), which belonged to such forms as were thematic aorists in origin, like Osc. *k ú m b e n e d*, and was added by analogy to the original perfect ending *-e*.

The *-it* in Plautus and Terence (also inscr. *-eit*) has (besides the generalized *-t* for earlier *-d*) the long vowel after the analogy of the first singular.

Since we cannot determine whether this *-it* displaced the form with short vowel or was only one preferred by the early poets, it is uncertain whether the later *-it* comes from *-it* with the regular shortening (101), or represents the old *-ed*.

4. *First plural*.— *-imus* has the same *-mus* from *-mos* as the other tenses (338), while the preceding *i* may be explained in various ways and is very likely of various sources. It may be in part the weakening of *a* = IE *ə* belonging to the weak grade of certain roots, and correspond to the *i* of Skt. *-ima*, for example, in *dedimus* = Skt. *dadima*.

5. *Second plural*.— *-istis* is *-is-tis*, with the same *-is-* as in the second singular (above, 2), and with the same *-tis* as in other tenses (339).

6. *Third plural*.—Three forms, *-ēre*, *-ērunt*, and *-ērunt*. The *-ērunt*, frequent in poetry and also reflected in the Romance forms, is probably from *-is-ont*, with the same *is* as in 2 sg. *-is-tī*, etc.

Of the other two forms it is clear that *-ēre* cannot come from *-ērunt*, but that *-ērunt* may easily be explained as formed from *-ēre* after the analogy of the frequent 3 pl. *-unt* (or more specifically after *-ērunt*).

In fact, *-ēre* contains an inherited ending belonging to a group

p. 297:

of 3 pl. *r*-endings (parallel to the 3 pl. *nt*-endings) which are common in Indo-Iranian and are now attested also for Tocharian and Hittite. So, in the perfect, Skt. 3 pl. act. *-ur*, 3 pl. mid. *-ire* (where *-re* is parallel to *-nte* from *-ntai*), Toch. *weñār*, Hitt. *kuennir*. In the L. *-ēre* the *re* may be from *-ro*, parallel to the secondary middle ending *-nto*, and the preceding *ē* may belong in origin to verb stems ending in *ē*. But such details are uncertain.

418. *The other tenses of the Latin perfect system.*—These are all based upon a combination of the Latin perfect stem with an *is*-element (the same as in *-is-tū*, *-is-tis* of the perf. indic.), which represents a variety of the *s*-aorist stem, similar to the Skt. *iṣ*-aorist, as *abodhiṣam*, etc. (But the latter comparison is less perfect than it looks, for the Skt. forms contain in part IE *-as-*, like G. *ἐδάμασα*. Cf. also *ἐκάλεσα*. There were types with different vowels originally belonging to the verb stem, and of these Latin reflects that in *-is*.)

1. *Pluperfect indicative.*—*-eram* from *-isā-* (74a), with the same preterite *ā* as in *eram* (387) or perhaps formed after the analogy of the latter.

2. *Future perfect indicative.*—*-erō* from *-is^e/o-*, with the same short-vowel subjunctive as in *erō* (419), or perhaps formed after the analogy of the latter. The 3 pl. *-int* instead of *-unt* is from the perfect subjunctive.

3. *Perfect subjunctive.*—*-erim* from *-isī-*, with the optative *ī* (425.3). In early Latin the forms *-īs*, *-īt*, *-īmus*, *-ītis* prevail, as against *-is*, *-it*, *-imus*, *-itis* in the future perfect. But later there was much confusion, forms with *ī* in the future perfect and conversely with *i* in the perfect subjunctive. For *faxim*, etc., see 394.

4. *Pluperfect subjunctive.*—*-issem* from *-is-sē-* with the same *sē* as in the imperfect subjunctive (426).

Buck clarifies, then, the meaning and the origin of the personal endings, as far as this seems possible.

Sihler⁴, p. 584:

528. PERFECTS IN *-vī* OR *-uī*. These are a type peculiar to L—they are not even Italic. It is characteristic of (a) derivative stems (denominatives, causatives); (b) set roots (for example *domuī* ‘tamed’ < **domarwai* < **demH-*); (c) a small class of roots ending in a long vowel, typically from **VH* and often where one would expect a root aorist: *flēvī* (*fleō* ‘cry’), (*com*)*plēvī* ‘filled up’ (*-pleō*), *crēvī* (perf. of both *crēscō* ‘grow’ and *cernō* ‘sort’), *sprēvī* (*spernō* ‘reject’), *sēvī* (*serō* ‘sow’), *sīvī* (*sinō* ‘put’), *scīvī* (*sciō* ‘know’), *trīvī* (*terō* ‘rub’), *pāvī* (*pāscō* ‘nourish’), *strāvī* (*sternō* ‘strew’), *nōvī* (*-gnōvī* ‘I understand’, pres. (*-g*)*nōscō*), *-lēvī* (in compounds like *dēlēō* ‘erase’).

Here, the “peculiarity” is, again, underlined. This is something Latin, not even Italic.

A “tense marker” (below, p. 285) is hinted at as a possibility; after that the “be” verb – as many times – is discussed: **fūe(i)t* ‘was’, and also epenthetic parallels are quoted (epenthesis, we have seen, and will see, in phonology, is frequent and important).

Still further the short *-vī-* forms are listed, and the personal endings are analyzed.

To be remarked that “stative” below, refers to *perfectum*. And in this connection, *aoristos*, though classically, and in school level, a “past tense”, as we already have seen, is not “past” but a timeless state indication (“aoristos” means ‘not defined’ – in classical concepts “ἀόριστος χρόνος” – ‘indefinite time/tense’).

It was through long Greek linguistic development, until the case arrived at the point as is discussed in Classical Greek and in its grammar, becoming, in indicative mood, indeed a *tense*.

All the complicated system Sihler gives to the personal endings, availing himself also of laryngeal processes, is not the aim to quote here because our concern is the interpretation of the *-v-* and the *-vī-* perfectum.

⁴ A.I. Sihler, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, New York – Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1995.

p. 585:

What these have in common is that without the *-v-* they would have a hiatus between the root and the personal endings, all of which in L begin with vowels. Any element that could be pressed into service as a hiatus-filler for such stems would have spread rapidly. For the most part, that is what historians have searched for to explain the L *-v-*. It is hard to imagine that any possibility has been overlooked: root extensions (as mentioned in 453) in **-w-*, metanalysis of roots ending in **-w-* (like **sprew-*), and, inevitably, laryngeals. But all these suggestions are more or less desperate.

An alternative possibility is that the element was a morpheme to start with: a tense marker like the aor. **-s-*; something originally part of a particular personal ending; or some kind of particle. For example, some have wondered if the formation might not have begun with the perf. pple. in **-wos-* (561-2), which is however all but unattested in L—quite apart from the extreme difficulty of grafting personal endings onto a participle. (If the person markers of the forms in *-vī* resembled, say, remnants of the verb ‘be’, then a theory of an old periphrastic inflection fused into an inflected stem would be a realistic possibility.) An old idea notes that Indic long vowel roots like *dhā-* ‘put’ and *pā-* ‘drink’ make the 1sg. and 3sg. form in *-āu*, as *dadhāu*, *papāu* (for expected **dadhā* from both **dhe-dboH₁-H₂e* and **dhe-dboH₁-e*). The necessary point of tangency, however, say OL **gnōwai*, **plēwai*, involves reflexes of AORISTS, not statives, and there is nothing in the Indic aor. system remotely like the *dadhāu* type. (In any case, the long-vowel perfects in *-āu* are a purely Indic development, being unknown in Iranian, so *daða* 3sg. ‘put’ = Ved. *dadhāu*; and the RV actually still has a single form—in a strangely late hymn—with original *-ā*: the unique *paprā* ‘fills’.

According to one view, the origin of the *vī*-perfects is traceable to the perf. of ‘be’: **fūe(i)t* ‘was’ was evidently pronounced at least optionally as **fūwe(i)t*, as in OL occasionally so written (FVVT). A similar kind of thing is seen in OE verbs like *blāwan* ‘bloom’, *blōwan* ‘blow’, where the *-w-* to begin with was just a transition between the root and the ending, which hints that the same thing might account for (*g*)*nōvī* ‘understand’ (cf. *ōvum* ‘egg’ < **ōom*, 46.2). (The similar-looking development of It. *vedova*, *Genova* from L *vidua* ‘widow’, *Genua* is not a true parallel, as in those two words the /w/ was present from the outset, but was simply not written; see 66.5.) The difficulty with such an explanation is that a [w] occurring this way as a transition between a rounded vowel and an unrounded one would have had so little salience. By way of comparison, in NE one would hardly expect a new suffix *-wish* to arise from a misdivision of *bluish*, giving rise to **greywish*, **boywish*, and so on. In any case, neither this nor any other suggestion has won any but the most limited acceptance.

a. The perf. in *-uī* is only a variety of *-vī*, being formed from stems ending in a short vowel (cf. the usual corresponding pple. in *-i-tus*), that is **-uvī* < **-e-wai* < **-awai*

p. 286:

with the same weakening as in *ēluō* and *dēnuō* (66.5). According to some, this is the source of the perf. stem in *-uī* when the root itself ends with *-v-*, as in *mōvī* < **movuī* < **movawai*; a different (and better) explanation is given in 525.3.

b. *-Uī* and *-sī* are conflated in *messuī* (*metō* 'reap') for **messī*, due to the influence of early *seruī* (*serō* 'sow'). Similarly *nexuī* (*nectō* 'knot, weave, tie') for early *nexī*, after *texuī* (*texō* 'weave') where the *-s-* is part of the root (235.1a).

c. The exact history of the caus. perfects like *monuī* is uncertain. Outside of the present (456.2) a stem in **-i-* seems to be attested in Vedic, which may match the L type of *monitus*, though the medial vowel of the L is of course ambiguous (66). The etymon of *monuī*, therefore, if **mon-i-w-*, was perhaps directly modeled on the pplc. **monito-*, and in no sense an inherited formation.

529. THE SHORTER FORMS OF THE *-vī* PERFECT. Some of the apparently contracted forms are the result of actual contraction, while others arose by analogy. Where **-v-* stood between like vowels it should have been regularly lost (184.3), but as a morphological TYPE was involved, the underlying form was always available to speakers, as *dīvitis* beside *dītis*. (The same thing was of course at stake in the history of *mōvī*, *lāvi*, and the like (525.3), but there the long form was lost altogether because the short form happened to conform to the important general type of *sedeō*, *sēdī* and *veniō*, *vēnī*; 525.) Such parallel forms as *audīvistī/audīstī*, *audīvissem/audīssem*, *audīvisse/audīsse*, *dēlēvērunt/dēlērunt*, *dēlēveram/dēlēram*, led to others created on the same pattern, like *nōstī* (*nōvistī*), *nōrunt* (*nōvērunt*), *nōsse* (*nōvisse*), and those of the 1st conj. which are naturally the most frequent (*amāstī*, *amārunt*, *amāram* next to *amāvistī*, *amāvērunt*, *amāveram*).

In the 4th conj. the contracted forms remain restricted to those which had the sequence *-īvi-*: thus *-īstī*, *-īt*, and so on. There are no forms in **-īrunt*, **-īram*, and the like parallel to *amārunt*, *amāram*; but rather we find *audiērunt*, *audieram*, *audierō*, *audierim* (to which one should probably add *audiī*). These are probably not from forms with earlier *-v-*, but arose after the analogy of *īī* (*eō*) (486).

The shorter forms, especially those of the first conjugation, are quotable from OL (CONIOVRASE, short for *coniūrāvisse* 'to have sworn an oath', SC de Bacch.) and in the classical period are actually more common than the full forms. But the details of relative frequency and shifting status are too involved to be presented here.

530. ENDINGS. Although the inherited stative was not a tense, in the history of Ital. it came to be a component of the tense system. All but three forms were reinterpreted as a past completed ('perfectum') tense, and as mentioned above eventually merged, formally and functionally, with the old aorist.

To conclude with, from the older literature I paste a passage from F. Sommer⁵, p. 607, according to which the *-v-* perfect might have rooted in the “be” auxiliary (i.e. he gives the same concept), cf. classical *fuī*:

§ 371.]

Das lateinische Perfektsystem.

607

Von den *u*-Verben und speziell von *fuī* kann das *v*-Perfekt ausgegangen sein: Als **fū-m* zu **fū-ai*, **fū-u-ai* umgebildet wurde, löste man bei der Silbentrennung **fū-uai* das *-uai* u. s. w. als Suffix ab und übertrug es auf alle vokalischen Verbalstämme.¹⁾ Man gewann dadurch ein bequemes Mittel, ihren Wurzelaoist mit den überall im Praeteritalsystem vordringenden Perfektendungen zu versehen, ohne diese durch Kontraktion mit dem Stammvokal zu verdunkeln. Nach **fū-m* zu **fū-uai* wurde **sē-m* „ich säte“ zu **sē-uai* = *sēvī*, **gnō-m* „ich erkannte“ (gr. ἔγνω-ν) zu **gnō-uai* = (*g*)*nōvī*, **plē-m* „ich füllte“ zu **plē-uai* = *plēvī* umgeschaffen. Damit war der analogischen Übertragung des *v*-Perfekts auf alle vokalisches auslautenden Verbalstämme der Weg geebnet: wie *nō-sco* — *nō-vī* auch *pā-sco* — *pā-vī*, *crē-sco* — *crē-vī* etc. Die größte Ausdehnung erfuhr es durch seinen Übertritt zu den **Denominativen**: Wie zu *nā-re* *nā-vī*, zu *scī-re* *scī-vī*, so trat auch zu *plantā-re* *plantā-vī*, zu *fīnī-re* *fīnī-vī* u. s. w.

Während bei allen auf langen Vokal endigenden Verbalstämmen der Charakter *-v-* zunächst unverändert blieb, ergab kurzer Vokal + *u* in unbetonter Silbe nach § 75, IV *-u-*, es entstand also hier der Typus *-ūī*.

Much more would be possible to add, and more explanations of the formants in question would be possible to cite, however, for the purposes of our course, and for an answer to the question about the origin of the Latin *-v-* perfectum, I think the foregoing are enough. Applying the auxiliary *sum*, in its old forms, is probable and seems logical, moreover, it finds modern parallels (in the form of spiral developments as formulated – after Hegel – by J.G. Droysen for history, and A. Meillet for linguistics).

More to be seen in Historical Grammar and in Comparative Philology.
Dii ita faxint.

26.5.2024
A.L.K.

⁵ Ferdinand Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*. Heidelberg, Winter, 1902.