

NOTVLAE LATINAE

BY

ERIC P. HAMP

(Chicago)

1. TANDEM, TAM, VTINAM

I. Fischer has not only added (*Revue roumaine de linguistique* 15, 1970, 461–464) a valuable gloss ‘tam’ to *tandem*¹, but he has provided an elegant syntactic equation *tandem* = *tam* to add to Godel’s equation *tandem* = *tamen*. From this he draws (464) the Old Latin optionality of the syntagma *tam(-em/-dem)*, with expressive (or perhaps topicalizing) enclitics.

One may further remark that this analysis which Fischer has perceptively seen also confirms the non-enclitic syntax which he has argued (463) for *tandem*; cf. esp. *Cas.* 786. That is, the complexes *tamen* and *tandem* incorporate elements in conformity with Wackernagel’s Law. In fact, I would argue that semantically *tamen* and *tandem* are in origin precise equivalents, and mere syntactic variants: **tam-em* and **tam-d'-em* < *-de-em*². The internal syntactic structure of *tandem* is then exactly that of the Old Irish anaphora *suide* < **su-de-o-* and *sodain* < **su-do-sen-V-*, and the relation of *tandem* to *tam* is the equivalent of OIr. *suide* to the “emphasizing pronoun” variant *-so* < **su*. I have discussed these Celtic formations in my report to the Congress of Celtic Studies, Penzance 9 April 1975. This gives yet another equation for deictic *-δε* (= Arcad. *-vu*) seen in *δεε*, which J. T. Hooker has discriminated (IF 70, 1965, 164–171) from the (al)lative *-δε* (= Arcad. *-δα*), but which he regards as specifically Greek. We now see traces in Celtic and Latin as well.

The syntactic analysis, overtly stated, then becomes: *tam* = **tam-de-em* “correlative deictic + enclitic deictic + enclitic topicalizer”. We now see how, by repetition of the deictic feature, *tandem* has remained a close equivalent of *tam* and its correlative *quam* (*Quam uero indignus uideor* ≡ *Tandem indignus uideor*) to a higher degree than *tamen*.

Fischer has also shown (463) how *tandem* was also used as an equivalent for *tam*, and partially for *ita*, in correlative syntax with *ut*. In a separate study³ I have explored the detailed (morpho)-phonological background of *ita* ... *ut* < **i-tə* ... (*ne-*)*ku-tə* (> Skt. *iti*, Mediaeval Welsh *yt*^L (verbal particle), *cwt*^L ‘where’). This set of facts links the two

¹ The semantic development to the Classical value, in the presence of a temporal complement or feature, it may be noted, is similar to but the reverse of the French *enfin*. In terms of semantic features the change in Lat. *tandem* is that of assimilation; that in Fr. *enfin*, dissimilation.

² *Quidem* involves a more complex background.

³ *Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax*, Chicago Linguistic Society, 1976, 352 ff.; *Studia Celtica* X-XI, 1975-76, p. 66; *Pulgram Festschrift* (in press).

similar correlative sequences **i-tə ... ku-tə* and *tam ... quam*⁴. The structure in both cases is DEICTIC ... RELATIVE (INTERROGATIVE) & ADVERBIAL (in concord). The internal syntax of *tandem* is then seen to be equivalent to that of *utinam*; cf. Greek $-\delta\epsilon = -\nu\upsilon$.

We may now further understand the correlative pair *tam ... etsi*. I have shown⁵ that Lat. *sī* must be an old locative **suei*. This in turn must be a thematization of **su*, which we have just seen in the syntactic equation *tandem* = OIr. *suide*. Therefore in **tam ... eti suei* we have *DEICTIC + ADVERBIAL ... CONJUNCTION + DEICTIC + LOCATIVE (= ADVERBIAL). The underlying structure of *tam* has simply been echoed, and we therefore understand why the two elements are linked by *et(i)*.

2. TAM, -DAM, NAM

The internal structure of these words is not entirely clear and partly ambiguous; *tam* and *quam* are obviously correlative, and find perfectly clear parallels in *tālis*, *quālis*, etc.; it seems that *-dam* and *nam* belong originally to the series. But the last two also belong to another paradigm *-dam/-dum/-dem* and *nam/num/nem-pe*.

We should note now that, while *quam* finds a correspondence in Pael. *pam*, Umbr. *pre-pa*, Osc. *pan* = Umbr. *pane* match OLat. *quande*; this last equation gives us a structure *quam-de*. It is not at all certain that Armenian *k'an* precisely equals *quam*. The structure *quam-de* is a surface equivalent to *tan-d-em*.

Because of their enclitic rôle it is reasonable to see *-dam/-dum/-dem* as containing *-de*, at least in part. Moreover, *-dem* and *nem-pe* appear to contain *-em*, although this does not resolve the ambiguity of *quidem*. The same *-em* appears in *enim*, and because of the equivalence *nam* = *enim* it is possible that one source of *nam* is *-em*. The enclitic rôle of *-nam* with pronouns in forming structures of "indetermination" gives us a point of contact with *-dam*, and another possible value.

While the analysis of *-dum* is ambiguous, it is possible that *num* is **nu-(e)m*. The structures in *n-* may therefore have at least three sources for their first part: **nu* 'now', **nu* (Russ. *no*, Arcad. $-\nu$) an adversative or topicalizer, or the pronoun **n(e/o)-*; whether the last is related to Slavic *onъ* or *en-im* is another question.

We may now return to the series *tam*, *quam*, *nam*. The set *tam/quam* is the equivalent of the Slavic *takъ/kakъ*, etc.; I have recently discussed these (BSL 68, 1973, 77 ff.) latter, and reconstructed them as **to-H_o-k^w-/k^w-o-H_ok^w-*. It seems likely that we may enter in the same paradigm the pair **to-H_am/k^w-o-H_am*, and add, on the basis of this reasoning, another member **no-H_am*. In **-H_am* we seem to have an old element of manner or degree.

It is then possible to analyze *-dam* as the deictic **-de* + *-H_am*.

⁴ Note also *tam* with *quin*.

⁵ AJP, 96, 1975 64 ff.

3. *QUATTUOR*

There are actually three problems with this word, involving both phonology and morphology, and they cannot be treated separately: The well known failure of the vowel *a* to match *e* in other languages need only be alluded to; the geminate *tt* is certainly unexpected; the failure of this numeral to be declined in a conservative language such as Latin certainly calls for an explanation. For earlier discussion see Ernout-Meillet⁴ 554.

I have already claimed¹ that such forms as *quattuor*, Alb. *katër*, Slovene *štiri* are revocalized forms in their respective languages for zero grade clusters in initial position. We must therefore understand *quattuor* by placing it correctly in its original paradigm. The essential forms were²:

Nom. *k^wetuores*
 Acc. *k^wturms*
 Oblique *k^wtur+bh* ...
 Loc. *k^wtur+su*

These would have syllabified: *k^w etuores*, *k^w turms*, *k^w tuur+*.³ We may suppose that the distinctive accusative stem was, as elsewhere, eliminated early; this left just two stem shapes in play⁴.

We may further suppose that an early development was the vowel insertion that relieved the initial cluster: therefore **k^watuur+*. If we suppose that Sievers law and the old ablaut system were still in force, such a form would now violate the syllabication rules. Thus the geminate *tt* is motivated as a simple rule-preserving device. We may say, in other words, that seen in this context the geminate *tt* is a direct result of the *a*-insertion⁵. This gives us the paradigmatic pair **k^wetuor-/k^w attuur+*, i.e. **k^wetuor-/k^wattur+*.

We presume now that the regular development of **r* in such a position is as in *deorsum* or *mors* etc. Therefore the paradigm now becomes **k^wetuor-/k^wattuur+*, i. e. **k^wetuor-/k^wattur+*, and the old alternation is destroyed, leaving an otherwise unparalleled internal alternation of root vocalism and consonant length. Since the alternant **k^wattuor-* also occurred as the nom.-acc. of the neuter plural (cf. *tri-bus*, *tri-um* : *tri-a* : Osc. *petora*), it won out as the most widespread form attached to all semantic features in at least a portion of their representation.

¹ IF 74, 1969, 154, and elsewhere in press.

² Ériu 24, 1973, 17. The plus-sign denotes external sandhi. My disagreement with Ernout-Meillet will be immediately apparent.

³ It is the syllabification of the zero-grade that gives the long **ū* of the Slavic forms, as I discuss elsewhere (in press).

⁴ We must suppose that the distinctive feminine stem (cf. Ériu, *loc. cit.*) was also eliminated early. It would be speculative to utilize the hypothetical feminine stem in our present argument.

⁵ I also see the rule violation produced by *a*-insertion as the motivation for the special development which led to the divergence of the ordinal. Thus, **k^wtur-io-* = *k^wtuur-io-* > *k^watu-urto-* (with analogical suffix seen elsewhere). Then the rule violation could be avoided ("rectified") by favouring a naturally occurring (perhaps allegro) alternant which resulted from simple phonetic dissimilation: **k^watuurto-* (violation for **k^waturto-*) > **k^waurto-* = systematic *k^waurto-*. The dissimilated **k^waurto-* then leads naturally to **k^waurto-*; it is Szemerényi (*Numerals*, p. 79) who has perceptively seen that the pre-form of *quārtus* must be **quauortos*.

We must now enquire why the inflection **quattuores, quattuora, quattuorom, quattuor(i)bos* was abandoned ⁶. The reason seems perhaps too simple, but I believe it is quite plausible when the form is placed in relation to associated forms, i.e. other numerals. The trisyllabic stem we now see was certainly not usual as an inflected (esp. *r*-) stem type in Latin; it was unusually long and filled with complex sequences. It was quite unlike the normal shape of *trēs*. Moreover, in the series it stood next to the historically uninflected stems; thus, by being treated as the *o b l i q u e* plural cases had in any event once been treated (i.e. with external sandhi) *quattuor* came more nearly to resemble e.g. *quīnque* (with two full vocalisms), *septem*, *octō*, *noūem*, *decem* (each with two apparently full vocalisms), and even *uigintī*.

Thus the rule for concord was quite cheaply relaxed by having its scope restricted to '3'.

Moreover, this result gave a better solidarity between the cardinals and the formation of the ordinals. The motivation argued in footnote 5 for the favouring of dissimilation in the ordinal places the spread of the *-to-* suffix ⁷ relatively early in time; in fact, it must already have applied to '4' at the time the geminate *tt* developed in the cardinal, since we trace both events (the dissimilation and the gemination) to a common motivation. And that stage of rule behaviour antedates the phonetic change **ɣ > or*. This chronology forces us to assume the following paradigm:

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| <i>*k^wetuor-</i> | <i>/ k^wattur-</i> | : <i>k^waur-to-</i> |
| <i>k^wenk^we</i> | | : <i>k^wenk^w-to-</i> |
| <i>seks</i> | | : <i>seks-to-</i> |

which later became

| | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <i>*k^wattuor-</i> | : <i>k^waur-to-</i> |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|

The regularity of this paradigm was clearly enhanced by assigning *quattuor* to the indeclinables.

We have thus seen what far-reaching morphological consequences asimple phonetic fact can induce. All of the above divergent developments depend essentially on the early *a*-insertion which was itself designed to conserve a relatively constant stem shape. While we set out to explain the cardinal, we now understand, as a result, much more about the ordinal.

4. QVADRV-, QVADRAGINTA

The combining forms in Latin contain a long-standing riddle in the voiced *d*. The following is simply a suggestion.

The compounding forms of the numerals in IE were in zero-grade: **dwi-*, **tri-*. Therefore the form for '4' must have been **k^wtur-*. This would have originally vocalized before vowel and consonant, respectively, as **k^wtur-V...* and **k^wtuwɾ-C...* The latter early produced a metathesized

⁶ I do not find the phonetic arguments summarized by Ernout-Meillet ⁴ 553 convincing.

⁷ Cf. my remarks, *Foundations of Language* 11, 1974, 463.

variant **k^wtyru-C...* (the last two by Sievers Law). These last two developed variants, by simplification of the initial cluster and revocalized by Sievers Law: **i(u)ŕ-C...* and **tru-C...* We find these reflected vestigially in τρά-πεζα = Myc. *to(r)peza* and τρυ-φάλεια. The first was productively rebuilt in τετρα-, e.g. τετρά-φαλος.

The two original variants **k^wtur-V...* and **k^wtyru-C...* were revocalized with a full vowel to produce (under Sievers Law) **k^wetur-* and **k^wetru-*. From the first we derive Skt. *catur-*, Umbr. *petur-pursus* 'quadrupedibus', Lith. *ketur-akis*, Goth. *fidur-*. From the second we have Avestan *čathru-*, Gaulish *petru-*; in the interests of not multiplying entities, we must also derive Welsh *pedry-ollt* from the last, and not from **k^wetr-*. Albanian *katër-* could be original, but is ambiguous.

It is within the above picture that we must fit Lat. *quadru-*. Quite obviously, allowing for the typical Latin *a*-insertion, we must trace this somehow to **k^wtyru- > *k^watryru-*; but the latter immediately violates Sievers Law, and therefore called for re-shaping. We cannot simply assume revocalization, for that would have produced **quatu-* and there should then have been no cause for further problem.

Let us turn to *quadrāgintā*; this appears to be something on the order of **k^waDrH-dkmtH*. I assume (but do not propose to digress and defend here) that the medial *-H-* in such decades (cf. esp. Greek and Armenian) is some sort of linking formation, and not a neuter case ending. Now, working deductively on the model of *trīgintā*, we expect a zero-grade + *H* + zero-grade of '10' + neuter pl¹. Therefore, **k^wtuuŕH-dkmtH*. Now we suppose again that Latin characteristically imposed the *a*-insertion; thus **k^watūŕH-* (with automatic revocalization by Sievers Law) *> *k^waturā-*.

This last form would have provided a useful model for the reshaping of **k^watryru-* to avoid the violation of Sievers Law. Thus, we suppose that beside **k^waturā-genta* a new compounding form **k^waturu-* was shaped.

Now it is clear in any case that *-dr-* is a peculiar medial cluster in Latin; original **dr* seems regularly to have given *tr* (*taeter, lutra trahō*). I therefore suggest that *d* in these forms derived from **tu* in position before *r*; the combined effect of the *u* and *r* was to impart voicing of the dental.

5. ROMANIAN *MORMÎNT < MON(1)MENTVM*

O. Densusianu, *Histoire de la langue roumaine* II (1938) 42, regards this as an individual case of dissimilation. In view of the popular basis in the Latin that has yielded Romanian, it seems equally possible that this may represent an archaic survival of the phenomenon which is well known in *carmen* and *germen*, and which is clearly prehistoric in date.

Ernout-Meillet⁴ 412, s.v. *moneō*, records the variants *monu-* ~ *moni-* ~ *moli-* CIL X 6375¹, the last thought to be a dissimilation and cross with

¹ Actually, Breton *tregonl < *tri-kont-ā* shows us that these old plurals (as opposed to the dual of *uigintl*) originally had *o*-grade, as we find in Greek.

² We may add now VII 2269, 11480, and *mutum-* VIII 21489.

mōlēs (certainly a debatable supposition). E-M. also mentions Welsh *mynwent*, certainly a different (and thoroughly British) development of *m* after *n* (cf. *enw* 'name, nomen'), a cluster resulting from Latin syncope. But no discussion is offered for forms with *-r-*.

Romance offers other forms with liquids by apparent dissimilation: OIt. *molimento*, Sic. *mulimentu*, Prov. *morimen*, Sard. *murimentu* (Rohlf's). In view of the Romanian, I propose to regard these last as **mormentum*, rebuilt by insertion of the vowel found in the Classical form.

In *TLL* VIII, X (1963) we find attested *monmen* XIII 659, *monment* III 9450, *monmentum* VIII 168. These may now most simply be regarded not merely as syncope products, but as having restoration of the *-n-* from the rest of the paradigm. Such an explanation avoids an isolated and less regular syncope. We therefore have evidence from three sets of sources drawn from the popular language attesting to a shape **mormentum*. This would be best accounted for as a prehistoric **mon-men*, and adds to our inventory of early Latin verbal nouns; cf. for such non-finite formations my remarks *Classical Philology* 63, 1968, 285–7, and for comparable verbal nouns my article currently appearing in *Ériu*, 27, 1975, 1–20, esp. 19–20.

In the present case we have added one more example of a verbal noun formed (a) without its derivative causative stem-forming suffix seen in the present, (b) without *-s-* before **-mn* (cf. Old Irish *naidm*)².

Apparently a recessive formation.