

The Romance Collective Neuter and the Survival of the Latin Ablative 255

applied to the wives of kings¹³⁸) (especially in the formula *una cum coniuge*).¹³⁹) It was no doubt considered apt as a term of respect because of its archaic quality.

Earlier there is a similar tendency for the word to be employed in application to members of the Roman Imperial family.¹⁴⁰)

The Romance Collective Neuter and the Survival of the Latin Ablative

By GORDON M. MESSING, Cornell University, Ithaca

The term "collective neuter" is used by Romance scholars to cover a wide range of phenomena associated mainly with collective nouns in dialect-speaking areas of Italy and Spain. Clemente Merlo, writing on the derivatives of the Latin demonstrative *ille* in some of the Italian dialects, noted for instance that at Rieti the definite article was realized as *lò* (ò) instead of *lu* (u) before certain abstract substantives.¹) Gerhard Rohlfs, summarizing much previous research in his well known historical grammar of Italian,²) says that a special form of the article, clearly differentiated from the masculine, was developed for certain collective concepts in a fairly large area of southern Italy which extends as far north as southern Umbria (Norcia, Rieti) and the southern part of Le Marche (Macerata, Camerino, Recanati, Cingoli) and as far south as the area of Bari and Matera. Some of these words are historically Latin neuters while others were masculine in Latin.

¹³⁸) E. g. in *Diplomática española del período Astur* (718–910), ed. A. C. Floriano, Oviedo 1949–51, *coniux* is found 7 times, always in reference to the wives of kings; and in *Cart. San Mill. Cog.* it is found 41 times, 36 times in reference to the wives of kings.

¹³⁹) Note that at *Cart. San Mill. Cog.*, p. 109, after the formula *una cum coniuge* (of a queen), the same woman is described (in the nominative) as *uxor mea*. Conversely the expression *una cum uxore* is often used of the wives of commoners: e.g. *Cart. San Vic. Oviedo*, pp. 53, 55, 58, 66, 78, 107; *Cart. San Mill. Cog.*, pp. 19, 40, 43, 44, 45, 155, 156, 159, 161, 163, 190.

¹⁴⁰) E. g. *Act. Petri c. Simone* 34, *CIL* II. 810, 2070, 2200.

¹) "Dei continuatori del lat. *ille* in alcuni dialetti dell'Italia centro-meridionale," *ZRPh.* 30. 11–25 and 438–54 (1906).

²) *Historische Grammatik der italienischen Sprache und ihrer Mundarten*, 1949, 2. 133–4.

Long ago the great Menendez Pidal had observed in Asturias an apparent agreement of some feminine substantives with a masculine adjective (*la yerba ta secu* 'the grass is dry').³⁾ Dámaso Alonso, in an important article commenting on and accounting for this and other manifestations of what he calls the *neutro de materia*, finds an almost mathematical parallelism between the Spanish and the southern Italian phenomena, complex as they are.⁴⁾

It is essential for my argument that I list, although in as brief a compass as possible, the various categories which have been subsumed under the overall heading of "collective neuter" before attempting to deal with its origin. My distinguished colleague, Robert A. Hall, Jr., has done this most succinctly in a recent article entitled "'Neuters', Mass-Nouns, and the Ablative in Romance", an article to which I am heavily indebted, both for its content and its comprehensive bibliography of pertinent literature.⁵⁾

The first category shows a distinctive final vowel, normally -o, which contrasts with the -u of ordinary masculines. This may occur in a noun, as *fierro* 'iron', *vino* 'wine', cited from Lena (Asturias). It may occur in an adjective which refers to one of these collective neuter substantives, as *tá negro el arroz* 'the rice is black', also cited from Lena. There may be a differentiation affecting both the definite article and the collective neuter substantive, as *lo fero* 'the iron' but *lu piettu* 'the chest', cited from Norcia (Umbria). In some cases, only the article may be so differentiated, as in *o latte* 'the milk' but *u lope* 'the wolf'.

The second category is characterized negatively by an absence of palatalization in the consonant stem of the definite article, where such palatalization is normal for ordinary masculines. Thus for example *lu panə* 'the bread' contrasts with *ju kanə* 'the dog', cited from San Felice Circeo (Lazio); and *lə pepə* 'the pepper' contrasts with *i pètə* 'the foot', cited from Trasacco (Àquila).

In the third category, a similar negative distinction is observed in the absence of umlaut such as is regularly to be found in ordinary masculines in stressed syllables under the influence of final -u. An Asturian example is *pelo* 'hair' (the collective) in contrast with *pilu* 'a hair'; *kórpə* 'body' as opposed to *òto* 'eight', cited from Trevi

³⁾ Cited by Dámaso Alonso in the article mentioned in the following footnote.

⁴⁾ "Metafonía y neutro de materia en España," *ZRPh* 74. 1-24 (1958).

⁵⁾ *Language*, 44. 480-6 (1968).

The Romance Collective Neuter and the Survival of the Latin Ablative 257

(Umbria), shows contrast both in the quality of the stressed syllable and in the final vowel.

The fourth category involves gemination of the initial consonant of a substantive after the definite article, sometimes with the additional distinction of a lack of normal umlaut as just described under category three: in Neapolitan, *o mmèlè* 'the honey' contrasts with *o canè* 'the dog', while in Meta (Campagna) *lu ppanè* 'the bread' contrasts with *lu liettu* 'the bed'.

The fifth and last category concerns the modification of a feminine noun by a masculine adjective, which I have already mentioned: *la farina era tam blanku* 'the flour was so white', is cited from Cabranes (Asturias).

While the final category is rather far removed from the other four and perhaps cannot be explained in the same manner, and while some of the details are bound to be anomalous for one reason or another in so diverse a panoply of phonemic and morphological variants, it seems clear in the main that these phenomena must go back either to an original distinction between *-u* and *-o* in these collective nouns or to a distinction of the same sort in the definite article in the course of its evolution from the Latin demonstrative *ille*. But the real question is then to account for this distinction from the beginning.

A number of explanations have been offered. Meyer-Lübke suggested that the forms in *-u* ultimately derived from a close variety of short *ũ* extracted from the masculine nominative singular in *-us*; then the forms in *-o* came from an open variety of short *ũ* taken from the masculine accusative singular in *-um* or present in neuter pronouns like *istud* and *illud* or neuter substantives like *caput*.⁶⁾ (It is of course well known that *istud* and *illud* gave way in later Latin to *istum* and *illum*.) The drawback to this explanation is all too patent: it tries to differentiate forms which would normally and in fact did normally fall together without devising any adequate reason for such a differentiation. A variation of this suggestion, which is unfortunately open to the same criticism and is in any case even less likely from a phonemic standpoint, was offered by Rohlfs:⁷⁾ „Allen Entwicklungsformen wird man gerecht, wenn man für *illu(m)* ein *u* ansetzt, das qualitativ verschieden war von dem *u* von *illud* und die Kraft zur Palatalisierung besaß, also vermutlich *illū(m)* aber *illūd*.“

⁶⁾ Included in *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen* I, 643 (1890).

⁷⁾ *Op. cit.*, 2.135.

H. Lausberg⁸⁾ endorsed the view of Meyer-Lübke and did try to provide a rationale for it. He assumed a two-case Romance system as in Old French for masculine nouns of the Latin second declension; to avoid confusion of nom. sing. *-ūs* and acc. pl. *-ōs*, speakers did not merge the *ū* of *-ūs* with *o* but retained it as *u*, and this was capable of causing umlaut. Hence the forms we have been considering in *-u* come from the Latin nominative in *-us*, while the Latin ending *-ūm* became *-o*. Robert L. Politzer,⁹⁾ echoing Lausberg, assumed that a distinction between *-us* and *-um* was artificially maintained in the interest of morphological necessity. Using statistics drawn from the *Codex diplomaticus Cavensis*, an 8th century Latin document written in the Salerno area, he pointed out that *-u* occurred 16 times in the nominative singular (for *-us*) but was never used to represent a masculine dative or accusative singular of the second declension. He concluded that the distinction between masculine and neuter was due to an allophonic variation of *o* before final *-s* which permitted a contrast between *-us/-um* either in the endings of words or as umlaut attributed to the effect of *-u* (from *-us*).

Merlo,¹⁰⁾ more modestly, thought that he could explain the crucial contrast between forms in *-o* and in *-u* by assuming that there had arisen an analogical neuter of the demonstrative pronoun **ill'hoc* formed on *illud* after the model of *hoc* or even as a merger of *illud* and *hoc*, and that this **ill'hoc* or **illoc* was in juxtaposition with a masculine *illum* or *illu*. Although clever, this seems to be rather an *ad hoc* argument—or perhaps I should rather say *ad illud* argument! He was followed in this by Bertoni in the latter's *Italia Dialettale* (1916).

Hall, however, in the most ingenious article to which I have already referred,¹¹⁾ came up with a radically new suggestion. He saw the *-o* forms as coming indeed from a Latin ablative singular, hence an inherited *-ō*, but instead of the Classical Latin ending *-ō*, he pointed to the early Latin and Italic form in *-ōd*; it was apparent to Hall that a final consonant is in any case needed to account for interaction with the initial of a following word, whether this then resulted in loss, gemination, or some other procedure. Where Merlo's final consonant was *-c*, Hall's was *-d*. He further explained

⁸⁾ "Zum romanischen Vokalismus," *Romanische Forschungen*, 60.255–317 (1947).

⁹⁾ "Masculine and Neuter in South-Central Italian," *Word*, 13.441–6 (1957)

¹⁰⁾ *Op. cit.* ZRPh. 30.449 (1906). ¹¹⁾ Cf. fn. 5 above.

The Romance Collective Neuter and the Survival of the Latin Ablative 259

the use of the ablative in question by deriving it from the familiar use of the preposition *de* with a mass-noun in a partitive sense, a construction that had its roots in Classical Latin but served subsequently to replace the Latin genitive case in Romance: **de(il)losale* 'from the salt', and thereafter, 'some of the salt', 'some salt'.

Unfortunately, there is a fatal flaw in this assumption. This is the very early date at which the ending *-ōd* disappeared from Latin. It is furthermore not attested in Spain; whatever one may think of Menendez Pidal's view that Spain was originally colonized from Southern Italy, it does not seem likely that a feature lost so early in Italy could have conceivably migrated to Spain. It is not my purpose here to try to date the loss of Old Latin *-ōd* precisely. A rough dating suffices, and it must surely be somewhere between 200 and 150 B.C., on the basis of relevant texts, perhaps even somewhat earlier.¹²⁾ The so-called *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus*¹³⁾ of 186 B.C. shows widespread use of this ending, and yet, as has often been observed, the final words of this decree, *in agro Teurano* 'in the domain of Teurani', show no final *-d*. If these words are contemporary with the rest of the text, there is good reason to suspect that the occurrences of *-d* elsewhere in it are merely archaizing spellings rather than an indication of current pronunciation. Even if these words are to be divorced from the text and taken as a later addition, the loss of *-d* cannot be assigned to so very much later a date. No *-d* occurs, to take one example out of many, in the milestone of Forum Popillii in Lucania, dated 132 B.C.¹⁴⁾

In Umbrian to be sure *-d* had been completely lost prior to our texts, so that this Italic dialect has duplicated the Latin development (e.g. *poplu* cf. Lat. *populo*). In Oscan, to judge from our texts, the situation is admittedly that *-d* survived (e.g. *tristaamentud* would correspond to an Old Lat. *testamentod*). The *-d* still figures, for example, in the so-called "eituns" inscriptions from Pompei¹⁵⁾ which are therefore to be dated some time prior to 63 A.D. Oscan,

¹²⁾ E. H. Warmington wrote that *-ōd* remains "until after 200 B.C."; see *Remains of Early Latin*, Vol. IV, 1940, p. xxii. Similarly, Oswald Szeмерényi, *Einführung in die Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*, 1970, p. 168, "*-d* (scil. *-ōd*) geht um 200 v. Chr. verloren".

¹³⁾ *CIL*, I2, 581.

¹⁴⁾ *CIL*, I2, 638 (cf. "de agro poplico").

¹⁵⁾ See the standard reference works, e.g. E. Vetter, *Handbuch der italienischen Dialekte*, 1953, No. 23 (cf. "eksuk amvianud").

one could reasonably assume, may have lingered on for some years past that date. It might then be barely possible to claim *-d* as a substratum feature in Oscan-speaking territory even if it does not occur, as one might expect in accordance with that hypothesis, among the Latin graffiti from Pompei. But I think I can point to a piece of evidence, admittedly tenuous but still not negligible, which may indicate that even in Oscan, as in Latin and Umbrian, *-d* was unstable. In two words of the so-called Curse of Vibia written on a lead tablet in Oscan¹⁶) *-d* has apparently been replaced by *-h*, however this is to be interpreted in phonetic terms. It is certainly true, as Vittore Pisani remarked,¹⁷) that ancient curses, *defixiones*, “sono opera di persone mediocrementemente colte”, and variant forms such as these have often been dismissed as simple errors of spelling. But it is equally true that errors of spelling precisely when committed by such persons often reflect phonetic reality. If so, then *-d* may not have survived even in Oscan and could not have served, either via archaic Latin or via Italic,¹⁸) as a source for the Romance phenomena we have been considering; and if not in Italy, then *a fortiori* not in Spain.

On the other hand, a survival of the ablative as suggested by Hall seems to me a sensible way to account for the final *-o* of these forms and thereby differentiate them from the corresponding masculines in *-u*. It has occurred to me that the preposition *cum*, which survived in both Spain and Italy, would have lent itself equally well to being used with mass-nouns in the ablative. By itself, *cu(m) illo* would provide a final *-o* for the definite article, but there is still another peculiarity of *cum* which can be invoked in this connection. It regularly followed certain of its pronominal objects, as *mecum*, *tecum* ‘with me, with thee’, and these words passed into Spanish and Italian. I should like to propose that this postpositive use of *cum* might easily have been extended from the personal pronouns to the demonstrative pronoun and adjective *illud*, creating an **illo-cu*, reducible in sentence phonetics to **illo-c*.

¹⁶) Vetter, *op. cit.*, No. 6. The words in question are *suluh* ‘omnino’ and *svai puh* ‘sive’ (cf. Umb. *suepo* ‘si quod’).

¹⁷) *Le Lingue dell'Italia Antica oltre il Latino*² (*Manuale Storico della Lingua Latina*, IV), 1964, p. 87.

¹⁸) Juan Corominas fell back upon an Oscan substratum to explain the forms in question. He attributed the *o/u* distinction to the influence of Oscan phonology. See “Notas de linguística italo-hispanica con ocasión de dos libros nuevos,” *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispanica* 10.137–86 (1956).

The Romance Collective Neuter and the Survival of the Latin Ablative 261

Furthermore, ambiguity could have been avoided by extending to *illud* in addition the pleonastic use of *cum* which is well attested for some of the personal pronouns: *cum mecum*, with *cum* both fore and aft, is the basis of Spanish *conmigo*, and could have led to the creation of **cu(m) illo-c(u)* and eventually even to the use of mass-noun in *-o* plus postpositive *-c(u)*. In other words, I am proposing that a final *-c*, rather than a final *-d*, as derived from an analogical use of final *-cu* reducible to final *-c*, may offer a better solution to our problem.

I am aware that no answer is available to a more fundamental problem, namely why this particular differentiation of collective noun and normal masculine was deemed to be necessary, and the related and equally puzzling problem, why, when such a differentiation took place, was it confined to only a limited part of the Romance area. For the present, it may well be that there is no answer save that such a development did in fact take place and must be regarded as a datum. Elsewhere, the trend was clearly toward a merger of ablative singular and accusative singular into a single case. To judge by Bengt Löfstedt's statistics for the language of the Lombard Laws,¹⁹⁾ after the prepositions *de* and *cum* (the two utilized respectively by Hall and myself) his texts show more occurrences of the spelling *-o* than *-um*, and this might imply a lingering sense of how the two cases were to be allocated, although it might also faintly reflect learned tradition. Nevertheless, I shall not conceal one piece of evidence from Löfstedt which is demaging for both Hall's and my arguments: *-o* is considerably more common after these prepositions when the noun in question is masculine, but when the noun is neuter, *-um* is as common or commoner.²⁰⁾ Admittedly, arguments based on the spellings of late Latin manuscripts are not very convincing.²¹⁾ It may be more significant to point to the conclusions that U. Westerbergh has tried to draw from the *Chronicon Salernitanum* (a text which because of its provenance might be expected to throw some light on these phenomena in Southern Italy), that when nouns ending in *-um* are spelled with *-o*, such a spelling is almost wholly confined to the

¹⁹⁾ *Studien über die Sprache der Langobardischen Gesetze*, 1961, p. 226 ff.

²⁰⁾ *Ibid.*

²¹⁾ Politzer's statistics (fn. 9 above) show *-o* used 12 times as accusative, 28 as ablative, 39 as nominative; *-um* occurs 15 times as accusative and 8 as ablative. Clearly, a great many factors are involved in these spellings, some in evident conflict with others.

neuters;²²) yet the number of occurrences is slight, and here too the results, although in agreement with the Romance developments, are for that reason somewhat unreliable. I therefore continue to regard my suggestion as plausible but am discreet enough to realize that my **illō-cu/illō-c* is distantly related to Rohlf's *illūd* (vs. *illūm*), even more closely related to Merlo's **ill'hoc* or **illoc*, and a blood brother to Hall's *illōd*. We are all of us aiming more or less in the same direction, but perhaps none of us has as yet hit the bull's-eye squarely in the center.

The Dialect Geography of Modern Greek Passive Inflections

By B. E. NEWTON, Burnaby (Canada)

1. Introduction

Dialectal variation in the actual form of inflectional endings, particularly within the conjugational system, has been one of the most neglected areas in modern Greek linguistics.¹⁾ While the study of the morphophonemic reflexes of grammatical categories as opposed to their functions is not perhaps in itself very rewarding or revealing, at the same time the establishment of the distribution of

²²) *Chronicon Salernitanum*, 1956, p. 239. Westerbergh unhesitatingly links this spelling alternation with the differentiation of masculine and neuter in the South Italian dialects.

¹⁾ I assembled most of the data used in the present study while doing field work on modern Greek phonology during the years 1963 and 1968–9, this last research being supported in part by the grant of a Canada Council Leave Fellowship and by an award from the President's Research Fund, Simon Fraser University. In most cases the points for which data are presented were visited and informants consulted on the spot. For Dodona, Raftena and Ammotopos I rely on information provided by university students in Ioannina who are natives of these villages. Published studies were drawn on for the following points: Kephallonia (Skiadaresis, 1959), Lakonia (Koukoules, 1908), Germa (Georgiou, 1962), Skopelos and Limnos (Kretschmer, 1905), Naxos (Oikonomidis, 1952), Zea (Kolia, 1938), Kimolos (Vogiatzidis, 1925), Astipalea (Karanastasis, 1958), E. Crete (Pangalos, 1955). In all other cases the data are based on personal enquiries unless there is an explicit statement to the contrary.