

of two syllables or more that could metrically end a dactylic foot of a hexameter. Of these, 102 end in a consonant and 139 in a vowel. However, 37 (or 36.3%) of those 102 that end in a consonant are followed by punctuation, whereas only 17 (or 12.2%) of the 139 that end in a vowel are followed by punctuation. Just as striking are the figures for Livy. In the first 21 chapters of the first book, there are 688 words of two or more syllables that could end a dactylic foot of a hexameter. Of these, 414 end in a consonant and 274 in a vowel. 101 (or 24.4%) of those ending in a consonant are followed by punctuation; only 20 (or 7.3%) of those ending in a vowel are followed by punctuation. It is, I suggest, in figures such as these that we should seek the explanation for Professor Soubiran's statistics. It will be noted that both sets of figures will easily account for a 3 : 1 differential. The truth seems to be that there is a general tendency in both Greek and Latin, in prose as well as in verse, to end cola with short closed syllables rather than with short open ones, if the cola end with a dactyl. Professor Soubiran may or may not be right in suggesting that this tendency cannot be accounted for merely by the large number of words like *ἐπί*, *παρά*, *ubi*, *nisi*, that cannot end a colon—he gives no statistics that would really help in making such a judgement. He is, however, surely wrong in suggesting that his figures tell us anything about the pronunciation of hexameter poetry at sense break, and wrong also in the basic premiss that led him to his conclusions²⁶).

Palatized *l in Umbrian

By ERIC P. HAMP, University of Chicago

The conditions and the paucity of clear evidential data for the change of *l > ʀ rs in Umbrian have been well set forth by Poultney in his *The Bronze Tables of Iguvium* (1959) 72 § 55 b, and (in admirable

²⁶) An earlier version of this article was read to a meeting of the Classical Association of Ontario at Waterloo Lutheran University in November 1968. I am greatly indebted to my wife and to my colleagues and pupils both in Canada and Britain without whose long-suffering ears I could never have developed the ideas presented here.

detail) *Language* 25, 1949, 395–401. The purpose of this note is to attempt a clarification of the probable phonetics involved in this change.

Poultney states (*Tables* 72) “*l* became *d* by a sort of palatalization, and then participated in the change *d* > *ř* *rs*.” A change *l* > *d* is also referred to and assumed in the longer discussion *Lang.* 25. 396 (top of page), 398 (bottom of page), 399; but it should be remembered that Poultney’s meticulous discussion turned on the conditions not the nature of the phonetic change. Indeed, without a sure view of the conditions, we are not in a position to contemplate the nature of the phonetics proper.

Let us first summarize the conditions which Poultney has arrived at: While clear evidence for position before *i* and prevocalic *i* (*ii*) is lacking (*Lang.* 25.400), the change *l* > *ř* seems assured before *e* and *i* (*Tables* 72), and its failure to apply seems clear before non-prevocalic *i* as well as before *e* and all back vowels (*Lang.* 25.400–1, *Tables* 72). We may paraphrase the condition: *l* > *ř* before front tense vowels, or

$$*l > ř / [—cons] \text{ — } \begin{bmatrix} -\text{back} \\ +\text{tense} \end{bmatrix}.$$

However, there are two difficulties in the way of supposing that this change first proceeded via *l* > *d*. First, it is less likely to imagine that a continuant *l* became a non-continuant *d* (and not a retroflected flap *ɖ* such as one finds in south Italian dialects) precisely in continuant surroundings, rather than the reverse (which is the result in several Iranian, Nuristani, and Bantu languages, for example); i.e. we are supposing something that is the inverse of familiar assimilations—a supposition calling for powerful positive evidence if it is to be persuasive. Secondly, for a process identified as palatalization, *d* is a curious output for an *l*; i.e. no true phonetic palatalization seems to be involved if that is so. Yet the conditions do indeed strongly suggest palatalization.

It is supposed (*Tables* 29 § 3f.) that *ř* > *rs* stood for something on the order of Czech *ř*, perhaps a flap or retroflected spirant with slight groove spirancy. This is easily understood directly as a result of intervocalic weakening of *d*—as a sort of assimilation to a [+continuant] environment. Then the route from *l* to *ř* should not be via *d*, but rather we must seek a natural change in point and

mode of articulation, under conditions of palatalization, to take us from a clear (or even “dark”) lateral to ř.

The most natural development for *l* in the direction of frontness (palatality) and tenseness, and one paralleled in the history of many languages, is to [l'] or [ɬ]. Such a sound type then may readily proceed (as in Spanish, French, Albanian or Romanian dialects) to a spirant tense [j]; and this in turn may develop by change in the shape of the articulator to a groove (as in some varieties of Latin-American Spanish or in the Greek of Crete) to [ž] or [ẓ̌]. It would then be natural to suppose that the poorly opposed [ẓ̌] and [ř] (? output of *d*) merged as the spirant ř.

The frequent Umbrian gentilic spellings in *-dius* in Latin inscriptions, appositely pointed out by Poultney (*Lang.* 25.398–9), would then simply represent the spelling which was locally known as a common “equivalent” for ř. Such forms had never been pronounced with [d]. Local stonecutters simply thought they were rendering their native ř—sound into “Latin” letters, or “translating” the name into Latin.

Presumably what took place then, after the palatalization of original *l* before front tense vowels, was a merger of two closely similar intervocalic voiced groove blade spirants.

Ipsithilla or Ipsicilla? Catullus, c. 32 Again

By M. GWYN MORGAN, Austin, Texas

The name of the girl to whom Catullus, c. 32 is addressed has long puzzled editors. As consultation of the various editions will show, the manuscripts offer a choice between *ipsi illa*, *ipsi thila*, *Ipsitilla* and *Ipsicilla*, all alike without parallel, and commentators have not hesitated to add conjectures of their own. In general, however, the forms *Ipsitilla* and *Ipsithilla* have received the widest acceptance,