

ŋv nicht weniger als sechsmal in εi zu korrigieren (3.105; 5,387. 446; 2,306; 3,271; 6,627). Neben diesem unmittelbaren Gewinn für den Text der Hal. zeigt sich, in welchem Maße O. der Temporal-satz-Syntax früherer epischer Sprache verpflichtet ist: Ohne Zugeständnisse an die Sprache seiner Epoche⁹⁵) folgt er frei den Beispielen seiner bedeutenden Vorgänger, erweist er auf diesem eingeschränkten Gebiet die Tradition der epischen Dichtung als ungebrochen bis in seine Zeit.

Early Italic Notes

By ERIC P. HAMP, Chicago

1. eu in early Italic

Sommer (*Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, 1914 59) states the change of *ě before ŷ as "in allen italischen Dialekten zu o". One of his illustrations to exemplify this is Lat. *nouem* < **neŷp*. The same doctrine is reflected in Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* 1933 (revised 1948) 81 § 80.1a: "This is an Italic change. Cf. Osc. *Núvlanam*: L. *novus*, and Umbr. *nuvime*: L. *novem*."

The refutation of this claim has been known for a considerable time in the shape of the extraordinarily archaic inscription (Vetter 364) from the necropolis of Ardea in Latium itself, *neuen*: *deiuo* 'novem deorum'. (Note that G. Devoto, *The languages of Italy*, Chicago 1978, 34 § 23 identifies *neven* as Faliscan.) The form *neuen* is of course highly interesting for its confirmation of the final -n (vis-à-vis **deiuom* in the selfsame inscription); on this phonetic aspect, pace O. Szemerényi, *Studies in the IE system of numerals* (1960) 171–3, see my remarks and references *Russian Linguistics* 2, 1975, 222. But equally or more important is the attestation of *eu* in *neuen*, which Vetter *Handbuch* 332 remarks and proceeds (333) to parallel from the Tor Tignosa (Lavinium?) altars, also dated to 3rd cent. B.C., with the two instances of *neuna* 'Nonae (dat. sg.)'¹).

⁹⁵) Siehe Radermacher 164–165, 170–179.

¹) While R. Pfister, in his fourth revised edition of Sommer's *Handbuch* (1977), deletes any mention in his paragraph (55 § 53.2a) on the change of **e* to *o* before ŷ of a common Italic change, he actually mentions Ardea

It might be that this last ordinal is to be read in the sense 'one of nine (i.e. the *nouendii*)', in the sense which I have discussed, on the basis of Benveniste's semantic formulation for ordinals, in connexion with the type of locution Czech *sám čtvrt*, *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1971 (1) 92.

Thus, *neuen* is only slightly removed from **H_enéun*, and *neuna* even less from **H_eneuno*²). On *ἐννέα*, *ἐννα-*, *ἐνενη-* see my proposal *MSS* 37, 1978, 61.

If we consider now the likelihood that Venetic is an Italic language, there is evidence to match that of early Latium. In Pellegrini-Prosdocimi, *La lingua venetica* (1967), it is reported (173–4 s. v. *teuta*) that Lejeune took the *eu* of *teuta* to be a reflex of Celtic influence, since the vocalism of Ven. *loudero-* is not really decisive. Prosdocimi suggests, following Schick, that Alpine Venetic conserved *eu*, as is seen in *heugo*[, which is to be equated with *Foug-* at Este. Now more recently (*Lingue e dialetti dell'Italia antica = Popoli e civiltà dell'Italia antica* vol. 6, 1978, 327 § 36) Prosdocimi has stated matters explicitly and succinctly: “. . . salvo **-eu-* che passa a *-ou-*: ma il fenomeno non è concluso, né per *-ew*≠ (*Foug-*; *loudero-* ecc. ma *teuta*, *Feugo*) né per *-e*≠*w-* (*Hevissos*), altrove solidale (cfr. lat. *novus*).”

NEVEN only briefly and in passing at the end of his note to the paragraph, and this form he characterizes as simply “dialektisch”. Dialectal or not, this is a highly important fact of Latin. But worse, in his note to §§ 28 and 29 (p. 42) on **eu* and **ou* Pfister remarks: “Da *ou* und *eu* italisch zu *ou* zusammengefallen sind . . .” This is today simply incorrect; moreover it misses the opportunity for seeing a possible phonetic link between the development of *eu* and of *eu* (i.e. *eu* plus vowel).

Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* 5², München 1977, does in fact mention (46 § 43a) *neuen* remarking “ist im Latein der Wandel jung”, but confuses the issue by mentioning also the change as “weiter verbreitet” for Oscan-Umbrian, Celtic, and Balto-Slavic. On Celtic see now D. Ellis Evans, *Indogermanisch und Keltisch* (ed. K. H. Schmidt, Wiesbaden 1977), p. 76, and on Balto-Slavic see E. P. Hamp, *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 19/2, 1976, 13–14. However the change *eu* > *ou* is called (61 § 66) “gemeintal.”, and so likewise (70 § 82.1) is *eu* > *ou*, even though *eu* is “noch im frühesten Latein bezeugt”. Leumann actually states (71 § 82.2) “die alte Annahme eines schon uritalischen Wandels *eu* > *ou* ist nicht mehr zu halten”. Yet this seemingly clear finding is obscured by the claim that *neuna fata* is **newenā*. Surely this last reconstruction is unnecessary and violates the morphology and formational rule, at least as it originally applied.

²) I take *nūndīnus* (SCBac *nouandinum*) to be **noun(o)-* < **neuno-*, but *nōnussis* as **nouen-assis* < **neuen-*; while *nōnus* must be a renewed **nouenos* perhaps at a stage as early as **neuenos*, replacing **neunos*.

This is striking and persuasive evidence for the most ancient recoverable state of affairs in Italy. It remains to be seen whether this is a feature distinguishing Latin-Venetic from “*p*-Italic”. One further wonders whether *eu* in Alpine Venetic, Germanic and Celtic was a feature of areal conservation.

2. Ardea *titoio*

Vetter *Handbuch* 332 (≠ 364) analyzes *titoio*, the possessor’s name, as an adjective formed like Lat. *quoiom*, rather than a genitive. That seems eminently plausible and violates no phonetics. But we may ask what permitted and motivated such a formation.

Now that we have the new evidence for *-osio* from Satricum we may imagine that a 3rd century rustic *-osio* would have been obtrusive in an area widely accustomed to *-ī*. It would have been a small adjustment of but one consonant to accommodate an old **-osio* to a less startling adjectival *-o-io(m)*, an easily expected result of dialect interference.

On **ri* in Latin and Albanian *krip*

By ERIC P. HAMP, Chicago

Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* 5², München 1977, 142 § 149 a a, correctly states that **ri* gives Latin *er* before dental, as in *ter*, *terr-uncius*, *ternī*, *tertius*, *testis*, *certus*. He is however properly troubled by *crispus* and *crīsta* ‘crest’.

Now *crispus* has long been compared, as Ernout-Meillet₄ 151 report, to such Celtic forms as Welsh *crych*. These Celtic forms go back to a proximate **kripsos*, but it must be remembered, as Ernout and Meillet do not, that an original **krispos* would have metathesized to give a Celtic **kripsos*. As we shall see, it is the Latin which demonstrates the status of **kripsos* as the original.

When we come to *crīsta*, we find that Ernout-Meillet₄ 151 compare *crīnis*, as being from **crīsnis*. But this would contradict the formulation for *ternī*. The obvious way to save all of these in a single relation is to reconstruct **kripsos*, **kripstā*, and **kripsnis*. We thus have an old set **krip-so-*, *+tā*, *+ni-*.

The regularity of **ri* > *er* is therefore preserved.