

various localities, as far as the levelling influence of school and army permitted; the universal inclination of language to diverge was reinforced by the original habits of the diverse speakers and by such peculiarities of native accent as had survived.¹ The differentiation progressed, being accelerated when schools decayed and the military organization was broken, until the dialects of distant localities became mutually unintelligible. At this point we may say that Vulgar Latin stops and the Romance languages begin. Although any definite date must be arbitrary, we may put it, roughly speaking, in the sixth or seventh century of our era. The Vulgar Latin period lasts, then, from about 200 B. C. to about 600 A. D.; it is most sharply differentiated from Classic Latin in the last few centuries of this epoch.²

4. If we compare Classic and Vulgar Latin, we shall see that the latter was always tending to become more flexible and more explicit. We note an enormous development of modifying and determining words, such as articles and prepositions, and an abundant use of prefixes and suffixes. We find also a great simplification of inflections, due partly to phonetic but mainly to syntactic causes. Furthermore, we observe certain changes in pronunciation, some of which can be ascribed to an inclination to discard those parts of words that are not necessary for their identification (as when *viridis*, *vetulus* become *viridis*, *veclus*), some to a tendency to assimilate unlike adjacent sounds (so *ipse* is spoken *isse*, and the diphthong *ai* is reduced to *e*), some to a desire for differentiation (which lowers *i* to *e* to make it more remote from *i*), some to unknown reasons. Why, for instance, *ai* almost

¹ Cf. Sittl and Hammer; Pirson and Carnoy; also, for African Latin, B. Kübler in *Archiv* VIII, 161.

² For a history of the Latin language, see *Lat. Spr.* 492-497.

universally became *e*, while *au* did not in Latin generally become *o*, is a problem as yet unsolved.

5. Our sources of information¹ concerning the current spoken Latin are: the statements of grammarians²; the non-Classic forms occurring in inscriptions and early manuscripts³; the occasional lapses in cultivated authors, early and late; a few texts written by persons of scanty education; some glossaries and lists of incorrect forms; and, most important of all, the subsequent developments of the Romance languages.⁴ All of these are to be used with caution. Of especial value are the *Peregrinatio ad loca sancta*, a considerable fragment of a description of travel in the East, by an uneducated woman (probably a Spanish nun) of the latter part of the fourth century⁵; the *Appendix Probi*, a list of good and bad spellings, possibly as early as the third century⁶; the so-called *Glossary of Reichenau*, made in France in the eighth century.⁷ There is an interesting collection of spells by A. Audolent, — *Defixionum Tabellæ*, 1904.

¹ Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Lat. Spr.* 455-461; G. Gröber, *Sprachquellen und Wortquellen des lateinischen Wörterbuchs* in *Archiv* I, 35.

² Utilized by E. Seelmann, *Aussprache des Latein*, 1885. For a brief account of the Latin grammarians, see Stolz, 55-67.

³ Used by H. Schuchardt, *Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins*, 1866-68.

⁴ For the chronology of developments, the distinction of learned and popular words, and the establishment of unattested Vulgar Latin words, see G. Gröber, in *Archiv* I, 204 ff., and VII, 25 ff.

⁵ See P. Geyer, *Itinera hierosolymitana sæculi iii-viii*, 1898; E. A. Bechtel, *S. Silvie Peregrinatio, The Text and a Study of the Latinity*, 1902; E. Wölflin, *Ueber die Latinität der Peregrinatio ad loca sancta* in *Archiv* IV, 259; M. Férotin, *Le véritable auteur de la Peregrinatio Silvie* in *Revue des questions historiques* LXXIV (N. S. XXX), 367. Cf. E. Lommatzsch, *Zur Mulomedicina Chironis* in *Archiv* XII, 401, 55 L, and W. Heraeus, *Zur Sprache der Mulomedicina Chironis* in *Archiv* XIV, 119.

⁶ See W. Heraeus, *Die Appendix Probi*, 1899, *Zur Appendix Probi* in *Archiv* XI, 61, *Die Appendix Probi* in *Archiv* XI, 301; G. Paris in *Mélanges Renier* 301, *Mélanges Boissier* 5; W. Foerster in *Wiener Studien* XIV, 278.

⁷ See W. Foerster and E. Koschwitz, *Altfranzösisches Übungsbuch*, 1902; P. Marchot in *Romanische Forschungen* XII, 641; K. Hetzer in *Zs.*, Beiheft 7.



C. VERBS.

I. THE FOUR CONJUGATIONS.

396. There was some confusion of conjugations; the first and fourth were least affected. In the *Peregrinatio* the second decidedly preponderates over the third (Bechtel 87); in other texts the third gains at the expense of the second.

The second gained most in Spain, the third in Italy, the fourth in Gaul. Eventually Spanish and Portuguese discarded the third, Sicilian and Sardinian the second.

New formations went into the first and fourth.

a. FIRST CONJUGATION.

397. The first conjugation generally held its own, defections being few and partial.

Beside *do*, *dant* and *sto*, *stant* there came into use **dao*, **daunt* and **stao*, **staunt*: Rum. *daŭ*, *staŭ*; Old It. *dao*; Pr. *dau*, *daun*, *estau*, *estaun*; Pg. *dou*, *estou*. Mohl, *Lexique* 47, would connect these forms with Umbrian *stahu*, but it seems more likely that they were late Latin formations due to an effort to keep the root vowel distinct from the ending. Cf. Probus, "adno non adnao," *Lexique* 47.

In northern Gaul there may have developed with **stao* a **stais* and a **stait*, on the analogy of (**vao*), **vais*, **vait* (see § 405): cf. *Lexique* 47-54.

The Italian present subjunctive *dia* from *dare* is associated by Mohl, *Lexique* 47 and *Pr. Pers. Pl.* 30, with Umbrian *dia*. It is entirely possible, however, that the form is a later, Italian development due to the analogy of *sia*: see § 419, (2).

398. For new formations, —such as *abbreviare*, *follicare*, *verrizare*, etc., —see §§ 33-35. Germanic verbs in *-on* and in

-an (but not *-jan*) regularly went in the first conjugation: *roubôn* > It. *rubare*, *witan* > It. *guidare*. Cf. § 36.

b. SECOND CONJUGATION.

399. Even in Classic Latin there was some confusion between the second conjugation and the third: *fervēre*, *tergēre*. In Vulgar Latin the second lost some verbs to the third in most of the territory: **ardēre*, **lucēre*, *lugēre* (R. 283), *miscēre* (R. 284), **mordēre*, **nocēre*, **ridēre*, *respondēre* (Bechtel 88: *responduntur*), *tondēre*, **torcēre* (for *torquēre*). Other verbs passed over locally or occasionally: *seditur*, Bechtel 88.

400. Some verbs went into the fourth, probably through the pronunciation of *-eo* as *-io* (see § 224): **complire*, *florire* (R. 284), **implire*, **lucire*, *lugire* (R. 284), **putrire*. The inchoative *-escere* then became *-iscere*: **florisco*, *lucisco*, **putrisco*.

Habere, at least in Italy, sometimes became *habire*: *Vok.* I, 266 ff.; *havite*, *C. I. L.* V, 1636; *habibat*, *Itala*, Luke VI, 8; *avire* in many Italian dialects in which *e* does not phonetically become *i*, and even in early Tuscan (cf. E. Monaci, *Crestomazia italiana dei primi secoli* I, p. 20, l. 10, etc). According to Mohl, *Lexique* 108-109, this is a peculiarity of ancient Umbrian.

401. While retaining *habeo*, *habes*, *habet*, *habent*, the verb *habere*, under the influence of *dare* and *stare*, adopted the forms **ho* or **hao*, **has*, **hat*, **hant* or **haunt*.

c. THIRD CONJUGATION.

402. The third conjugation gave a few verbs to the second, perhaps beginning with those that had a perfect in *-ui*, such as *cadere* **cadui*, *capere* **capui*, *sapere* *sapui*: *sapere* was influenced, especially in Italy, by *habere*; *capere* may easily have imitated *sapere*, and *cadere* may have followed *capere*.

In Spain all the third conjugation verbs eventually passed into the second. This transition was probably helped by a partial fusion of *esse* and *sedere*.

403. The anomalous *pösse pötui*, *vëlle völu* naturally went over to the second conjugation, assumed the infinitive forms *potëre*, **volëre*, and conformed their inflection more or less to the regular type. *Vëlle*, however, was discarded in Spain and Sardinia.

(1) *Potere*, *potebam* occur repeatedly in the sixth century (*Pr. Pers. Pl. 24*), *potebo* is found in the *Gl. Reich.*, *potebas* in Fredegarius (Haag 60). *Posso* for *pössum* is used by Gregory and Fredegarius (*Pr. Pers. Pl. 24*), *poteo* is attested in 745 A.D. (*Pr. Pers. Pl. 25*). The present indicative must have been inflected something like this:—

<i>pössu pösso pötëo *pössëo</i>	<i>*potëmu(s)</i>
<i>potë(s)</i>	<i>potëstë(s) *potëte(s)</i>
<i>*potë(t)</i>	<i>pössun(t) *pötëu(t)</i>

The present subjunctive must have had corresponding forms.

(2) *Volimus* is found in the sixth century (*Lat. Spr. 478*), *volemus* in the seventh (*Pr. Pers. Pl. 21*); *voles* is found in the *Gl. Reich.* *Volestis*, framed on the pattern of *potestis*, is twice used by Fredegarius (*Pr. Pers. Pl. 21*). The present indicative forms must have been something like this:—

<i>*volëo</i>	<i>völimu(s) völemu(s)</i>
<i>völe(s)</i>	<i>völestë(s) *völetë(s)</i>
<i>*völe(t)</i>	<i>*völeu(t)</i>

The present subjunctive must have been similarly inflected.

404. Beside *facëre* there doubtless existed **fare* (*Facere* 48), strongly influenced by *dare* and *stare*. *Dare* and *facere* were associated in old formulas: *Lexique* 53. Furthermore, a suggestion of shortening existed in the monosyllabic imperative

fac (also *fa*: *Zs. XXV, 735*), which must have led to **fate* beside *facite*. The present indicative certainly had several sets of forms, one series being on the pattern of the first conjugation, but the present subjunctive retained its old inflection (see *Facere* 72, 121; *Zs. XVIII, 434*):—

<i>facjo *fao *fo</i>	<i>fäcimu(s) *fäimus *fämu(s)</i>
<i>face(s) *fais *fas</i>	<i>fäcite(s) *fäitis *fäte(s)</i>
<i>face(t) *fait *fat</i>	<i>fäciun(t) *fäunt *fänt</i>

There was also a rare infinitive *facire*, which occurs several times in the sixth and seventh centuries: *Facere* 72.

405. *Vadëre* supplied its missing past tenses from *ire* and other verbs. These other substitutes, whose origin constitutes one of the most discussed problems in Romance philology, resulted—to cite only the principal types—in the verbs **allare* or *alare* (used in northern Gaul), **annare* (used in southern Gaul), **andare* (used in Spain and Italy). It is now generally thought that **allare* and **annare* developed in some peculiar way (perhaps through distortion in military commands) from *ambülare*, which is very common in late Latin in the sense of ‘march’ or ‘walk.’ **Andare* is commonly traced to **ambitare*, coming either from *ambitus* or, more probably, from *ambülare* with a change of suffix. C. C. Rice, in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* XIX, 217, argues that the three verbs sprang from Latin *annare* (= *adnare*) and its derivatives **annülarë*, **annitare*. For a bibliography of the subject, see Körting. Cf. also A. Horning in *Zs. XXIX, 542*; H. Schuchardt in *Zs. XXX, 83*; *Lexique* 56–78. Both *ambulare* and *alare* occur in the *Gl. Reich.* *Annavit* is found on a sixth century African vase: see F. Novati in *Studi Medievali* I, 616–617.

Ire and the other substitutes were introduced also into the

present. The present indicative, moreover, was influenced by *facere fare*:—

<i>vado</i>	* <i>vao</i>	* <i>vo</i>	<i>vādimu(s)</i>	<i>īmu(s)</i>	etc.
<i>vade(s)</i>	* <i>vais</i>	* <i>vas</i>	<i>vādite(s)</i>	<i>ite(s)</i>	etc.
<i>vade(t)</i>	* <i>vait</i>	* <i>vat</i>	<i>vādun(t)</i>	* <i>vaunt</i>	* <i>vant</i>

406. Verbs in *-io* tended to pass into the fourth conjugation (see, however, § 416): **capīre*, beside **capēre*; *cupīre*, Lucretius (*Lat. Spr.* 477), Densusianu 148, Bon. 426; *fodīri*, Cato; *fugīre*, St. Augustine (*Lat. Spr.* 477), common in the Vulgate (R. 285), Sepulcri 229, Bon. 427, Haag 60, *Gl. Reich.*; *morīri*, Plautus, and **morīre*.

Some others went over, at least locally: **fallire*; *gemire*, Pirson 148; *occurire*, Pirson 148; **offerire*, **sofferire*, by the analogy of *aperire* (*sufferit*, R. 286; cf. *deseret*, *offeret*, Bechtel 90; *offeret*, first half of the 7th century, Carnoy 112); **sequire*, beside **sēquere*.

Dicere, probably in the Vulgar Latin period (cf. *Lexique* 62), developed a form **dire*, doubtless suggested by *dīc* (cf. *fac* and **fare*, § 404) and helped by the analogy of *audire*.

d. FOURTH CONJUGATION.

407. The fourth conjugation usually held its own, and gained some verbs from the others.

For new formations, — such as **abbellire*, *ignire*, — see § 34. Germanic verbs in *-jan* regularly went into the fourth conjugation in Latin (Kluge 500): *furbjan* > It. *forbire*; *marrjan* > Fr. *marrir*; *harrjan* > Fr. *tarir*; *warnjan* > It. *guarnire*. Cf. § 36.

For the intrusion of the inchoative *-sc-* into this conjugation, see § 415.

2. FUNDAMENTAL CHANGES IN INFLECTION.

408. Of the personal forms of the verb there remained in general use in Romance only the following tenses of the active voice, the entire passive inflection having been discarded: the

indicative present, imperfect, perfect, pluperfect, and in some regions the future perfect; the subjunctive present, pluperfect, and in some regions the perfect; the imperative present. For instance: *amo*, *amabam*, *amavi*, *amaram*, (*amaro*); *amen*, *amassem*, (*amarim*); *ama*. See Syntax.

Of the impersonal forms of the verb there remained: the present active infinitive, the present participle, the perfect participle, the gerund (especially the ablative case), and probably in some standing phrases the gerundive. For instance: *amare*, *amans*, *amatus*, *amando*, (*amandus?*). The supine fell into disuse from the first century on. See Syntax.

409. The entire passive inflection came to be replaced, towards the end of the Vulgar Latin period, partly by active and reflexive constructions but mainly by a compound of the perfect participle with *esse* (in northern Italy *fieri*): *littera scribitur* > *littera scripta est* (or *fit*).

Deponent verbs became active: *mentire*, *operare*, etc., R. 298; cf. R. 297–302, 388–389. Conversely, some writers substituted the deponent for the active inflection of a few verbs: Petronius, *rideri*, etc., R. 304; cf. R. 302–304.

Cf. §§ 112–114.

410. The Latin perfect was kept in its preterit sense. In its perfect sense it was replaced, in the Vulgar Latin period, by a compound of *habere* and the perfect participle — in the case of neuter verbs, *esse* and the perfect participle: *fēci* > *habeo factum*; *reverti* > *reversus sum*, R. 289. Similar compounds replaced the pluperfect and the future perfect. See §§ 121–124.

The old pluperfect indicative (*amāram*, *audīram*) was kept, as a preterit or a conditional, in various regions: see § 124. In the subjunctive the pluperfect was used instead of the

imperfect, which disappeared everywhere but in Sardinia (*facheret*, etc.): *amārem* > *amāssem*, *audīrem* > *audīssem*; cf. § 118.

The old future perfect — *amā(vē)ro* — fused with the perfect subjunctive — *amā(vē)rim* — and apparently remained more or less in use, as a future indicative or subjunctive, in all regions except Gaul and Rætia. It is best preserved in Spanish and Portuguese, but is found also in Old Rumanian and Macedonian. There are traces of it in Old Italian, sometimes confused with the pluperfect indicative and later sometimes with the infinitive (*āpriro*, *pōteri*, *crēdere*, etc.): see C. De Lollis in *Bausteine* 1; V. Crescini in *Zs.* XXIX, 619.

411. The old future, with the exception of *ēro*, was crowded out by the present and by new formations, especially by the infinitive combined with the present indicative of *habēre* (*amābo* > *amar' habeo*): see §§ 125–129. In this compound all the various forms of the present indicative of *habēre* were used (see §§ 273, 401): **amar' ābeo*, *āyo*, *āo*, *ō*; **amar' ābe(s)*, *ās*; **amar' ābe(t)*, *āt*; **amar' āben(t)*, *āunt*, *ānt*. In the first and second persons plural, *habēmus* and *habētis* eventually, as they came to be regarded as mere endings, were reduced to *ēmu(s)*, *ēte(s)*, to correspond to the dissyllabic or monosyllabic *āyo*, *ābe(s)*, *ābe(t)*, *āben(t)* and *ō*, *ās*, *āt*, *ānt*: **amar' ēmu(s)*, **amar' ēte(s)*.

On the model of this new future, an imperfect of the future, or conditional, came to be made, in late Vulgar Latin and Romance, from the infinitive combined with the imperfect or the perfect of *habēre* (see § 130): **amar' ābe(h)a(m)* or **amar' ābui*. In these formations the unaccented (*h*)*ab* disappeared, as in the first and second persons plural of the future: **amar' ē(h)a*, **amar' īsti*, etc.; but **amar' ābui*, etc. In Italian we find, beside *īa* from *habēbam* and *ābbi* *ēbbi* from *habūi*, a form in *īi* (*amerēi*), which has prevailed in the

modern language, while in Old Italian the *ei* was sometimes detached and used as a preterit of *avere*: it is probably due to the analogy of the first person singular of the weak preterit (*credēi*, hence *credērēi*), cf. § 426.

412. The imperative disappeared, except the present, second person singular and plural: *āmā*, *amāte*; *tēnē*, *tenēte*; *crēdē*, *crēdēte*; *audī*, *audīte*. The first and third persons were supplied from the present subjunctive. In some verbs the present subjunctive was used instead of all imperative forms. See § 115.

Instead of the plural form, the second person plural of the present indicative came to be used: *adferte* > *adferitis*, R. 294. For the monosyllabic *dic*, *duc*, *fac*, writers sometimes employed *dice*, *duce*, *face*: R. 294.

3. INCHOATIVE VERBS.

413. The Latin inchoative ending *-sco* was preceded by *ā-*, *ē-*, *ī-*, or *ō-*. The types *āsco* and *ōsco* were sparingly represented and were not extended in late and popular Latin; they have bequeathed but few verbs — such as Pr. *irāisser* < *irāscēre*, *conōisser* < *co(g)nōscēre* — to the Romance languages. The types *ēsco* and *īsco* — as *parēsco*, *dormīsco* — were extended in the third century and later, and lost their inchoative sense.

414. There is some evidence of a confusion of *ēsco* and *īsco* in Latin. Virgilius Grammaticus (Sepulcri 194) mentions double forms of inchoative verbs, such as *calesco calisco*, etc. *Clarisco*, *erubisco*, etc., are common in Gregory the Great: Sepulcri 193. Cf. *criscere*, etc., in *Vok.* I, 359 ff.

In Veglia, the Abruzzi, Sardinia, and a part of Lorraine neither of these two endings left any trace. Only *ēsco* survived in the Tyrol, the Grisons, French Switzerland, Savoy, Dauphiné, Lyons, the Landes, Béarn, and Spain — Sp. *parecer*,

florece; *-esco* was preferred also in Rumanian. Elsewhere, although there are traces of *-esco*, *-isco* prevailed — Fr. *il fleurit*, It. *fiorisce*. For Pr. *despereissir*, etc., see E. Herzog in *Bausteine* 481.

415. The ending *-isco* eventually entered into the formation of the present stem of fourth conjugation verbs. There is no direct evidence of this in Latin, nor are there any traces of it in Spanish, Portuguese, Sardinian, or southern Italian; but in the earliest texts of France, northern and central Italy, Rætia, and Rumania we find a type

* <i>finisco</i>	<i>finimu(s)</i>
* <i>finisce(s)</i>	<i>finite(s)</i>
* <i>finisce(t)</i>	* <i>finiscun(t)</i>

The *-sc-* then generally disappeared from the infinitive — It. *fiorire*. Later, in some regions, the *-sc-* was carried throughout the present indicative (Fr. *finissons*, *finissez*); it also penetrated the present subjunctive (Fr. *finisse*), and in some districts eventually the present participle and the imperfect indicative (Fr. *finissant*, *finissais*).

See *Archiv* I, 465; *Zs.* XXIV, 81; *Rom.* XXX, 291–294; *Lat. Spr.* 478.

4. PRESENT STEMS.

416. Many verbs in *-io* dropped the *i* whenever it was followed by another vowel. In the present participle this was a regular phonetic development (see § 225): *audientem* > **audente*, *facientem* > **facente*, *partientem* > **partente*, *sentientem* > **sentente*. Hence forms without the *i* were introduced more or less into the indicative and subjunctive: *audio* **audio*, **dormo*, *partiunt* **partunt*, *sentiam* **sentam*, etc.

By the analogy of these, the *e* was occasionally lost in the second conjugation: *video* **vido*. On the other hand, by the

analogy of *capiunt*, *faciunt*, etc., the second conjugation admitted such forms as **habeunt*, **videunt*, etc., beside the regular *habent*, *vident*, etc.

417. The verbs *struere*, *trahere*, *vehere* developed infinitive forms **strugere*, *tragere*, *vegere* (*tragere* and *vegere* are used by Fredegarius, Haag 34) and a whole present and imperfect inflection with *-g-*, as **trago*, **tragam*, **tragēbam*. The guttural was derived from the perfect indicative and the perfect participle — *struxi structus*, *traxi tractus*, *vexi vectus* — on the analogy of *ago actus*, *figo fixi*, *lego lectus*, *rego rexi rectus*, *tego tectus*, and also *frigo frigi*, *fructus*, *tango tactus*, and probably *cingo cinxi cinctus*, *jungo junxi junctus*, *pango panxi panctus*, *plango planxi planctus*, *ungo unxi unctus*, etc.

There may have been also **strucere*, **tracere*, **vecere*, based on the analogy of *dico dixi dictus*, *duco duxi ductus*.

Cf. *Substrate* VI, 131.

418. The verbs *dare*, *debere*, *dicere*, *facere*, *habere*, *posse*, *stare*, *vadere*, *velle* underwent considerable changes in the present: see §§ 273, 397, 401, 403–406, 412, 416.

419. *Esse* was made into **essere*, to bring it into conformity with the usual third conjugation type. Considerable alterations were made in the present indicative and subjunctive. For the use of *fiēri* for *esse*, see § 409. The Spanish use of *sedere* for *esse* is probably later than our period.

(1) The present indicative shows some signs of a tendency to normalize its erratic inflection by making all the forms begin with *s*. The old *esum* cited by Varro (*Pr. Pers. Pl.* 128) went out of use. Italian *sei* and Rætian *šēš* point to a **sēs* beside *ēs*; Italian *siete* and Rætian *siede*, etc., indicate a **sētis* for *ētis*, while there is some evidence of an alternative **sūtis* on the model of *sūmus*; Old Italian *se* for *ē*, Provençal *ses* for

es, usually understood as reflexive forms, may go back to **sēt* and **sēt* for *ēst*. In the first person plural *sūmus* became *sūmus* and *simus* (see § 220); *sūmus*, the usual Classic form, was preferred in Spain, Portugal, northern Gaul, and the Tyrol (Sp. *somos*, Old Fr. *sons*, etc.); *simus*, which was used, according to Suetonius, by Augustus, and by various purists of the Augustan age (Stolz 58), prevailed in southern Gaul, Italy, Dalmatia, and Dacia (Pr. *sem*, Old It. *semo*, etc.): cf. *Lat. Spr.* 479; *Pr. Pers. Pl.* 130; *Rom.* XXI, 347. Provençal *esmes* < **ēsmus* seems to be a new formation on the analogy of *ēstis*; Mohl, *Pr. Pers. Pl.* 135, would derive it from old *esimus*, which existed with *esum*. The present indicative inflection was doubtless something like this:—

<i>sem</i>	<i>semu(s)</i>	<i>semu(s)</i>	* <i>esmu(s)</i>
<i>ēs</i>	* <i>es</i>	<i>este(s)</i>	* <i>sete(s)</i>
<i>est</i>	* <i>set</i> ?	* <i>set</i> ?	* <i>sete(s)</i> ?
		<i>sent</i>	

(2) In the present subjunctive the analogy of other third conjugation verbs tended to introduce the characteristic vowel *a*. It is likely, too, that from early times there was a reciprocal influence of *fiam*, etc., and the Old Latin optative *siem*, etc. (cf. *Lexique* 51): *fiet* is common for *fit*, Pirson 150; *fiam* replaces *sim* in northern Italy and Dacia. Hence comes an alternative inflection **siam*, etc., which ultimately prevailed:—

<i>sem</i>	* <i>sea</i>	<i>simu(s)</i>	<i>sidmu(s)</i>
<i>sīs</i>	* <i>sea(s)</i>	<i>sīte(s)</i>	* <i>sidte(s)</i>
<i>set</i>	<i>sea(t)</i>	<i>sent</i>	* <i>sean(t)</i>

For *sīat*, see *sead* in *Vok.* II, 42. *Siamus*, according to *Lat. Spr.* 478, occurs in Italian documents of the eighth century.

5. IMPERFECT.

N. B.—For the loss of the imperfect subjunctive, see § 118.

420. The endings were *-ābam*, *-ēbam*, *-ībam*, *-ībam*. In the third conjugation *-ībam* regularly developed into *-ēbam*,

just as *-ientem* > *-entem* (see §§ 225, 416): *faciēbam* > **facēbam*. In the fourth conjugation *-ībam* and *-ēbam* existed side by side from early times (Neue II, 445), *-ībam* — as in *munībam* — being common in early Latin and recurring at later periods (Lindsay 491); *-ēbam*, which stressed the characteristic vowel of the fourth conjugation, prevailed in popular speech, and *-ībam* disappeared: *vestibat*, etc., Dubois 277–278.

421. *Habēbam*, pronounced *aβeβa* (cf. § 318), developed another form, **aβea*, probably through dissimilation. Hence came an alternative ending *-ea* for *-eβa*, which in Romance was widely extended, affecting all the conjugations but the first: It. *vedēa*, *credēa*, *sentēa*. It is common to nearly all the Romance territory except Rumania: *Lat. Spr.* 479.

6. PERFECT.

422. We must distinguish two types, the weak and the strong: the weak comprises the *v*- perfects in which the *v* is added to a verb-stem (*-āvī*, *-ēvī*, *-īvī*), the strong includes all others. Verbs of the first and fourth conjugations generally had weak perfects, those of the second and third had mostly strong. Only six verbs — all of the second conjugation and most of them rare — regularly had a perfect in *-ēvī*: *deleo*, *fleo*, *neo*, *-oleo*, *-pleo*, *vieo*; *silevit* for *siluit* occurs also, R. 287.

All first and fourth conjugation verbs with strong perfects probably developed a weak one in Vulgar Latin: *praestavi* > *praestavi*, R. 289; *salui* > *salivi*. For further encroachment of the weak type on the strong, see § 426.

a. WEAK PERFECTS.

423. A tendency to keep the stress on the characteristic vowel, and also a general inclination to omit *v* between two *i*'s (see § 324), led early, in the fourth conjugation, to a reduction

of *-ivisti* to *-isti* and *-ivistis* to *-istis*, which brought about, still early, the further reduction of *-ivi* to *-i* and **-ii*, *-ivit* to *-it* and **-it*, *-iverunt* to *-erunt*, and, later, the reduction of *-ivimus* to *-imus* and probably **-immus* (the lengthening of the *m* being due to compensation and also, perhaps, to a desire to distinguish the perfect from the present). For *-it*, as in *lenit*, see Servius *ad Aen.* I, 451; for *-erunt*, see Neue III, 452-454; for *-imus*, as in *repetimus*, etc., see Neue III, 449.

Then a contraction of the two vowels gave, in the first and third persons singular and the third person plural, *-i*, *-it*, **-irunt*: *audi*, Neue III, 434 (cf. S. 241: 65-121 A.D.); *petit*, etc., Neue III, 446-448; "*cupit pro cupivit*," Priscian XII, 17 (Keil II, 587); *perit*, *petit*, *redit*, Bayard 60; *perit*, etc., Bon. 440.

A contraction without the fall of *v*, in the third person singular, gave rise, locally, to an alternative form, **-iut*: It. *servio*, etc.

424. The loss of *v*, carried into the first conjugation, gave rise early to a reduction of *-avisti*, *-avistis*, *-averunt* to *-astī*, *-astis*, *-arunt*. Much later *-avi* > *-ai*, *-avit* > *-ait* and *-at*, *-avimus* > *-amus* and probably **-ammus*: *calcai* (Probus), *edificai*, *probai* (Probus), *Vok.* II, 476; *σερβαι*, Densisianu I, 152; — *laborait*, *C. I. L.* X, 216; *speclarait*, *Vok.* II, 476; *dedicait*, *Lexique* 46; "*fumât pro fumavit*," Priscian XII, 17 (Keil II, 587); *denumerat*, *judicat*, Fredegarius (Haag 55); — *celebramus*, *memoramus*, *vocitamus*, Gregory of Tours (Bon. 440); *speramus*, Fredegarius (Haag 55). The third person singular in *-ait* is found in Old Sardinian: *Lat. Spr.* 479.

A contraction without the fall of *v* gave rise, in the third person singular, to *-aut*; and, in the first person plural, probably to **-aumus*: *triumphaut* in Pompeii, Densisianu I, 152. This *-aut* prevailed in Romance: It. *amò* and *amáo*, etc. The

**-aumus* is preserved in some Old French dialects near Douai: *Rom.* XXX, 607.

425. The forms in the first and fourth conjugations, therefore, were:—

<i>-avi</i>	<i>-ai</i>			<i>-ivi</i>	<i>*-ii</i>	<i>-ii</i>	<i>-i</i>
<i>-asti</i>				<i>-isti</i>			
<i>-ave(t)</i>	<i>-aut</i>	<i>-ait</i>	<i>-at</i>	<i>-ive(t)</i>	<i>*-iut</i>	<i>*-iit</i>	<i>-it</i>
<i>-avimu(s)</i>	<i>-amu(s)</i>	<i>*-ammu(s)</i>	<i>*-aumus</i>	<i>-ivimu(s)</i>	<i>-imu(s)</i>	<i>*-immu(s)</i>	
<i>-aste(s)</i>				<i>-iste(s)</i>			
<i>-arun(t)</i>				<i>*-irun(t)</i>			

With the exception of *-ivi* in Old Italian, the forms with *v* were not preserved in Romance.

Verbs in *-ēvi* doubtless had a similar inflection: **delēi*, *delēsti*, etc. Some other second conjugation verbs apparently adopted this perfect: *silevit*, R. 287.

426. Compounds of *dare* had a perfect in *-didi* (*credidi*, *perdidi*, *vendidi*, etc.), which in Vulgar Latin became *-dedi* (see § 139): *perdedit*, etc., Audollent 544. This *-dedi* was extended to many other verbs in *-d-*: *prandidi*, Keil IV, 184; *descendidi*, *respondidi*, *Lat. Spr.* 479, 480; *ascendiderat*, *descendidit*, *incendederit*, *odedere*, *pandiderunt*, *prendiderunt*, *videderunt* (cf. *edediderit* with an extra *-de-*), R. 288.

Through the analogy of *-ai*, **-ei*, **-ii*, helped by dissimilation, this *-dedi* became **-dei*. Hence arose eventually an inflection **-dei*, **-desti*, **-det*, **-dem(m)u(s)*, **-deste(s)*, *-derun(t)*, from which there came a set of endings **-ei*, **-esti*, etc., corresponding to the *-ai* *-asti*, etc., and the *-ii*, *-isti*, etc., of the first and fourth conjugations: so *caderunt*, *Gl. Reich*. In some of the Romance languages these endings were carried into other verbs of the third and even the second conjugation (It. *battéi*, Pr. *cazél*); in Provençal they invaded the first also (*améi*). In Dacia, on the other hand, they apparently did

not develop at all. In Italy, under the influence of *stetti* < **stētui*, *dare* had (beside *diēdi* < *dēdi*) a perfect *detti*, whence arose an inflection *-detti*, etc., and a set of endings *-etti*, etc., side *-dei* and *-ei*.

Through these endings the weak type encroached somewhat on the strong. In Italy all strong verbs except *esse* introduced weak endings in the second person singular and the first and second persons plural: It. *presi*, *prendesti*, etc.; cf. *plaudisti* for *plausisti*, R. 286, also *vincisti*, *Gl. Reich*. In Rumania, where there was no *-dei*, the *-ui* and *-si* types were extended.

A few weak verbs adopted strong inflections: *quasīvi* > **quasi*, *sapīvi* > *sapui*.

b. STRONG PERFECTS.

427. There are three types — those that add *u* to the root, those that add *s*, and those that have nothing between the root and the personal endings: *plac-u-i*, *dix-s-i* = *dixi*, *bib-i*. In the first class the *u* lost its syllabic value and became *w* (cf. § 326): *placwi*, etc.

428. The *-ui* type, according to Meyer-Lübke, *Gram.* II, 357, included from the start not only perfects of the *placui* sort, but also all perfects in *-vi* not made from the verb-stem (cf. § 422), — such as *cognōvi*, *crēvi*, *mōvi*, *pāvi*, — this ending being pronounced *wui*, but written *vi* to avoid the doubling of the *v*. At any rate, the development of the *vi* indicates that it was sounded *wui*, *wwi*, or *βwi* in Vulgar Latin: cf. It. *conōbbi*, *crēbbi*, etc.; Pr. *mōc*, etc.

This perfect disappeared from the first and fourth conjugations: *crepui* > **crepavi*, *necui* > *necavi*, etc.; *aperui* > **aperii* **apersi*, *salui* > *salivi* *salii* **salsi*, etc. In the second and third conjugations it maintained itself very well: *cognōvi*, *crēvi*,

gemui(?), *messui*(?), *molui*, *movi*, *pavi*, *tenui*, *texui*. It lost *posui* (> *posi*), *silui* (> *silevi*), and possibly a few others. On the other hand it received many additions: *bibi* > **bibui*; *cēcidi* > **cadui* **cadedi*; *cēpi* > *capui*, Haag 56, *Lat. Spr.* 479 (so **recipui*); *expavi* > *expabui*, *Lat. Spr.* 479; *lēgi* > **lēgui* **lēxi*; *natus sum* > **nacui*; *peperci* > *parcui*, R. 288; *sapivi* > *sapui*; *sēdi* > **sēdui*; *stēti* > also **stētui*; *sustūli* > **tolui* **tolsi*; *texi* > *texui*, *Lat. Spr.* 479; *vēni* > also **vēnui*; *vīci* > also **vīncui* **vīnsi*; *vīdi* > also **vīdui* **vīdui*; *vīxi* > also **vīscui*; etc. Cf. A. Zimmermann in *Archiv* XIII, 130; *Zs.* XXVIII, 97.

429. Of the *-si* class, — which comprised perfects in *-si*, *-ssi*, and *-xi*, — some thirty-five were preserved: *arsī*, *cinxi*, *clausi*, *coxi*, *divisi*, *dixi*, *duxī*, *excussi*, *finxi*, *fixi*, *frixī*, *junxi*, *luxi*, *mansi*, *mīsi* (also **mīssi*, perhaps on the model of *missus*, cf. § 163), *mulsi*, *pīnxi*, *planxi*, *pressi*, *rasi*, *rexi*, *risi*, *rosi*, *scripsi*, *sparsi*, *-stinxi*, *strinxi*, *struxi*, *tersi*, *tinxi*, *torsi*, *traxi*, *unxi*, *vixi*. *Sensi*, however, became **sentii*.

In Vulgar Latin there were perhaps some thirty or more new formations: *abscō(n)si*, Keil VII, 94; **accō(n)si*; **apērsi*; **attīnxi*; **copērsi*; **cūrsi*; **defe(n)si*; **ērsi* from *ēri*go; **franxi*; **fūsi*; **impīnxi*; **līxi*; **mōrsi*; **occīsi*; **offērsi*; **pē(n)si*; *pērsi*, *Lat. Spr.* 480; *pōsi*, R. 288; **pre(n)si*; **pūnxi*; **quasi*; **redēmpsi*; **respō(n)si*; **rōsi*; **salsi*; **sōlsi*; **sūrsi*; **taxi*; **tanxi*; **tē(n)si*; **tōlsi*; **vīnsi*; **vōlsi*. Some of these — **defensi*, **fusi*, **mōrsi*, **occīsi*, **pensi*, **prensi*, **responsi*, **rosi*, **tensi* — assumed the *s*- perfect through having an *s* in the perfect participle.

Cf. *Einf.* § 165.

430. Among the *-i* perfects, the reduplicative formations were discarded in Vulgar Latin, with the exception of *dēdi* and *stēti* (also **stētui*), whose reduplicative character was no longer

apparent; compounds of *dare* usually formed their perfect like the simple verb (cf. § 426; but *circumdavit* in *Gl. Reich.*), while compounds of *stare* tended to follow the regular first conjugation model (*praestitit* > *praestavi*, R. 289). *Cecidi* became **cadui* or **cadedi*; *fefelli* > **falii*; *peperci* > *parcui*, R. 288. The other reduplicative perfects either disappeared or passed into the *-si* class: *cucurri* > **cürsi*; *momordi* > **mörsi*; *pependi* > **pē(n)si*; *pupūgi* > **pūnxi*; *tetendi* > **tē(n)si*; *tetēgi* > **taxi* **tanxi*.

The other *-i* perfects were greatly reduced in number in Vulgar Latin. Some simply disappeared, some became weak, some went over to the *-ui* or the *-si* type: *ēgi*, *vērti*; *fūgi* > **fugii*; *bibi* > **bībui*, *cēpi* > *capui*, *lēgi* > **lēgui*, *sēdi* > **sēdui*; *accendi* > **accē(n)si*, *defendi* > **defē(n)si*, *frēgi* > **franxi*, *fūdi* > **fūsi*, *lēgi* > **lēxi*, *prendi* > **prē(n)si*, *solvi* > **sōlsi*, *vīci* > **vīnsi*, *volvi* > **vōlsi*. There were no additions. Two of the old perfects maintained themselves intact, and two more were kept beside new formations: *fēci*, *fui*; *vēni* **vēnui*, *vīdi* **vīdui*.

431. In *fui* the *u* was originally long, but it was shortened in Classic Latin; Vulgar Latin seems to show both *ū* and *ū̄*. In an effort to keep the accent on the same syllable throughout (cf. §§ 423-424), *fuisti* > **fusti*, *fuistis* > **fustis*; then *fuimus* generally became **fum(m)us*, *fuit* was often shortened to **fut*, and *fuērunt* became **furunt*. There may have been also, through dissimilation, a form **förunt*.

The prevailing inflection, with some variations, was probably something like this: —

<i>fui</i>	<i>fōi</i>	* <i>fōm(m)u(s)</i>
* <i>fōstī</i>		* <i>fōste(s)</i>
<i>fue(t)</i>	* <i>fot</i> * <i>fut</i>	* <i>fōrun(t)</i> * <i>fūrūn(t)</i> * <i>fōrun(t)?</i> * <i>fōrun(t)?</i>

7. PLUPERFECT AND FUTURE PERFECT.

432. When preserved at all, these tenses followed the old types: *placuēram* (cf. § 137), *placuīssem*, *placuēro*; *dixēram*, *dixīssem*, *dixēro*; *fēcēram*, *fēcīssem*, *fēcēro*. In formations from weak perfects only the contracted forms were used: *amāram*, *amāssem*, *amāro*; *delēram*, *delēssem*, *delēro*; *audī(e)ram*, *audīssem*, *audī(e)ro*; cf. *alaret*, *ortaret* in *Gl. Reich.* Bayard 60-61 notes that St. Cyprien employed only the shortened forms — *petisset*, etc. — before *ss*.

433. In some regions a tendency to keep the accent on the same syllable throughout the pluperfect subjunctive led to a change of *-assēmus*, *-assētis*, etc., to **-ássimus*, **-ássitis*, etc.: It. *amássimo amáste*, Sp. *hablásemos habláseis*; but Pr. *amessém amessétz*, Fr. *aimassions aimassiez*.

8. PERFECT PARTICIPLE.

434. Verbs which had no perfect participle were obliged to form one in order to make their passive and their perfect tenses: *fērio*, **feritus*.

435. In the first conjugation *-ātus* was preserved and was extended to all verbs: *frictus* > *fricatus*; *nectus* > *necatus*; *secus* > *secatus*; so the new *alatus*, *Gl. Reich.* The ending *-itus*, in the first conjugation, generally fell into disuse: *crepitus* > **crepatus*; *domitus* > *domatus*, R. 295; *plicitus* > *plicatus*; *sonitus* > **sonatus*; *tonitus* > **tonatus*; *vetitus* > *vetatus*, R. 296. Nevertheless there were some new formations in *-itus*: **lōvītus*, *prōvītus*, *rōgītus*, *vōcītus*; cf. *Lat. Spr.* 480.

In the third conjugation *-ātus* disappeared: *oblatus* > *offertus* (*Gl. Reich.*), *sublatus* > **suffertus*, by the analogy of *apertus*, *copertus*; *sublatus* (from *tollo*) > *tōllitus* (*Gl. Reich.*).

436. In the fourth conjugation *-ītus* was preserved and was extended to nearly all verbs: *salvus* > **salītus*; *sensus* > **sentītus*; *sepultus* > *sepelītus*, old and found in all periods, Pirson 152, *Gl. Reich*. *Apertus* and *copertus*, however, were kept; and *ventus* generally became **venūtus*.

In the third conjugation *quæsītus* > **quæstus*.

437. In the second conjugation the rare *-ētus* disappeared as a participial ending: *completus*, etc., were kept only as adjectives.

438. The ending *-ūtus*, belonging to verbs in *-uere* and *-vere* (*argutus*, *consutus*, *minutus*, *secutus*, *solutus*, *statutus*, *tributus*, *volutus*), offered a convenient accented form, corresponding to *-ātus* and *-ītus*. It was extended to nearly all the verbs that had an *-ui* perfect: **bibutus*, **habutus*, **parutus*, **tenutus*, **venutus*, **vidutus*, etc.; but *status*. It did not always, however, entirely displace the old perfect participle: *natus* was kept beside **nascūtus*.

Eventually *-ūtus* was carried further, — as **credutus*, **perdutus*, **vendutus*, — and in Sicily encroached largely on *-ītus*.

On the other hand, **mōvītus* and **mōssus* were formed beside **movutus*, **sōlvītus* (or **sōltus*) beside *solutus*, **vōlvītus* (or **vōltus*) beside *volutus*.

439. The ending *-ītus* tended to disappear (cf. § 435): *absconditus* > *absco(n)sus*; *bibitus* > **bibutus*; *creditus* > **credutus*; *fugitus* > **fugītus*; *molitus* > **molutus*; *paritus* > **parutus*; **parsus*; *perditus* > **perdutus* **persus*; *submonitus* > **submo(n)sus*; *venditus* > **vendutus*. A few of these participles, however, remained, and there were some new formations in *-ītus*: *gēmitus*?, *pōs(i)tus*, *sōlitus*; **lēvītus*, **mōvītus*, *prōvītus*, *rōgītus*, **sōlvītus* (or **sōltus*), *tōllītus*, *vōcītus*, **vōlvītus* (or **vōltus*).

440. The ending *-tus* was kept for some twenty verbs, occasionally with a change of stem: *cinctus*; *dictus*; *ductus*; *extinctus*; *factus*; *fictus* *finctus*, R. 295; *fractus* **francus*; *frictus*; *lectus*; *mistus*; *pictus* **pinctus*; *punctus*; *rectus*; *scriptus*; *strictus* **strinctus*; *structus*; **surtus* for *surrectus*; *tactus*? **lanctus*?; *tinctus*; *tortus*; *tractus*. There were a few new formations in *-tus*: *offertus*, **quæstus*, **suffertus*, **vīstus*; and perhaps **sōltus*, **vōltus* (cf. § 439).

About fifteen verbs probably replaced *-tus* by *-ātus*, *-ītus*, or *-ūtus*: *captus* **capītus*; *cognōtus* > **conovūtus*?; *crētus* > **crevūtus*?; *fartus* > **farcītus* and *farsus*, *Lat. Spr.* 480; *frictus* > *fricātus*; *mōtus* > **movūtus*? and **mōssus*; *nectus* > *necātus*; *pastus* > **pavūtus*?; *salvus* > **salītus* and **salsus*; *sectus* > *secātus*; *sepultus* > *sepelītus*; *tentus* > **tenūtus*; *texus* > **texūtus*; *ventus* > **venūtus* and *venītus*, Bechtel 91; *victus* > **vincūtus* and **vincus*; *victus* > **vixūtus*.

441. The ending *-sus* was generally kept: *acce(n)sus*; *arsus*; *clausus*; *defe(n)sus*; *divīsus*; *excussus*; *fixus*; *fuscus*; *ma(n)sus*; *mīssus*, also perhaps **mīsus* by the analogy of *mīsi*; *morsus*; *pe(n)sus*; *pre(n)sus*; *pressus*; *risus*; *rosus*; *sparsus*; *te(n)sus*; *tersus*; *to(n)sus*; *visus*, also probably **visitus*. Several of these developed also a participle in *-ūtus*: **pendutus*, **vidutus*, etc. *Salsus*, 'salted,' maintained itself beside *salītus*.

A few verbs replaced the old form by one in *-ītus* or *-ūtus*: *expansus* > **expandutus*; *falsus* > **fallītus*; *fuscus* > *fundutus*, *Gl. Reich*.; *gavīsus* > **gaudutus*; *messus* > *metītus*, Dubois 282; *sensus* > **sentītus*; *sessus* > **sedutus*.

On the other hand, there were some new formations in *-sus*: *absco(n)sus*, Keil VII, 94, *Lat. Spr.* 480, R. 295 (very common); *farsus*, *Lat. Spr.* 480; **mossus*; **parsus*; **persus*; **salsus*; **submo(n)sus*.

9. PERSONAL ENDINGS.

442. For the reduction of *-io* to *-o*, see §416.

443. Meyer-Lübke, *Grundriss* I², 670, assumes that in Italy *-ās* and *-ēs* became *-i*. The evidence, historically considered, does not support this view. Italian *lodi* and Rumanian *lauzi*, from *laudas*, are correctly explained by Tiktin 565-566 as analogical formations.

444. As unaccented *ē*, *ĕ*, and *ĭ* came to be pronounced alike (§243), great confusion ensued between *-ēs* and *-īs*, *-ēt* and *-īt*. This confusion is very frequent in the *Peregrinatio*: Bechtel 88-89, *colliget*, etc.

445. In southern and to some extent in northern Gaul the first person plural lost its final *s*, perhaps in the Vulgar Latin period: *vidēmus* > Pr. *vezēm*. This is not a phonetic phenomenon, as *-s* did not fall in this region. It may be that *-s* was dropped because it was regarded as a characteristic of the second person, as *t* was of the third (cf. *Pr. Pers. Pl.* 73-80):—

<i>āmo</i>	<i>*amāmu</i>
<i>āmas</i>	<i>amātes</i>
<i>āmat</i>	<i>āmāt</i>

446. According to Mohl, *Pr. Pers. Pl.*, forms like **cānomus*, due to Celtic influence, were used in northern Gaul instead of *canimus*, etc.; then the accent was shifted to the penult—**canōmus*, whence came the French *-ons*. This theory has not found acceptance.

447. In strong perfects the first person plural, *-imus*,—through the analogy of *-istis* and *-isti*, and doubtless of weak perfects as well,—tended, perhaps after our period, to stress its penult: *fēcimus* > Pr. *fezēm*. There are traces of this in inscriptions and elsewhere: S. 47, 53. The shift, however,

was not universal, as there are in Italian and French remains of the original accentuation.

448. In the present indicative and imperative, *-imus*, *-itis*, *-ite* generally became, in the sixth or seventh century, *-ēmu(s)*, *-ēte(s)*, *-ēte*,—the penult assuming the accent, to match *-āmu(s)*, *-āte(s)*, *-āte* and *-ēmu(s)*, *-ēte(s)*, *-ēte* and *-īmu(s)*, *-īte(s)*, *-īte* in the other conjugations. The shift was perhaps helped by the analogy of the future—*mittimus*, for instance, being attracted by *mittēmus*: *Pr. Pers. Pl.* 30, 64. Rumanian, however, kept the old accent (Tiktin 596): *ūngem*, *ūngeti*; *vīndem*, *vīndeti*; etc. There are some traces of its preservation in southeastern French dialects also. Furthermore, *facimus*, *facitis* and *dīcimus*, *dīcitis* kept their old forms in many regions.

449. For the reduction of *-iunt* to *-unt*, see §416. Beside *-ent*, in the second conjugation, there was an ending **-eunt* (**habeunt*, etc.),—due to the analogy of *-iunt*,—which was particularly common in Italy: cf. §416.

The endings *-ent* and *-unt* came to be very much confused (**crēdent*, **vidunt*, etc.); their interchange is frequent in the *Peregrinatio*: Bechtel 88-90, *absolvent*, *accipient*, *exient*, *respon-duntur*, etc. According to Mohl, *Pr. Pers. Pl.* 112, the confusion goes back to early Italic. The Classic distinction was best kept in Gaul and northern Italy; in Spain and Portugal, Sardinia, and a part of southern Italy, *-ent* prevailed; in central and the rest of southern Italy, Rætia, Dalmatia, and Dacia, *-unt* was preferred.

450. In the perfect, the third person plural ending *-ēre* was discarded. The ending *-erunt*, in Classic Latin, sometimes had a short *e* (*ĕ* is common in the comic poets, Virgil wrote *tulērunt*, etc.); in Vulgar Latin this vowel was apparently always short: *dēbuerunt*, *dixerunt*, *viderunt*. Cf. §137.