

λιανῆς τῆς κατὰ Πλακιδίαν τῆς γυναικὸς Ἀρεοβίνδου τοῦ στρατηλάτου. The three last named are well known figures whose relationship can be established with certainty: Placidia the daughter of Valentinian III, her daughter Anicia Juliana, and Juliana's husband Areobindus, cos. 506. Here, as in *Novel* 150, κατὰ plus acc. comes close to the possessive genitive, and 'of the house of' in effect means 'daughter of'. We should perhaps allow the possibility of this meaning in some of the texts discussed in § II, though it may be doubted whether the formula would be so used of any but those who could boast of a royal or noble 'house'.

Word Final Velar and Labial Stops in Latin

By JANE LAURITZEN, Aarhus

According to A. Ernout (1953 pp. 3 and 13) neutral consonant stem substantives in Latin use the zero ending in nom. acc. sing., i.e. show the bare stem. But the neutral consonant stem adjectives, including the present participles and the *-i-* stem adjective, which lose their *-i-* in nom. acc. sing., quite unexpectedly show the ending *-s* in nom. acc. sing.

The reason for this lack of distinction between masculine and neutral forms has bewildered many scholars. Some of them have tried to give an explanation, e.g. A. Ernout (1953 p. 3) who talks about a tendency in Latin to give up the distinction between masculine and neutral forms, and P. Monteil (1970 p. 183) who finds the origin of this extension of the masc. ending in the existence of neutr. nouns which designate animate beings. Other scholars find that none of the many suggested explanations are wholly convincing and consider the problem to be unsolved, e.g. C. D. Buck (1933 § 289), E. Kieckers (1931 p. 51), A. Meillet et J. Vendryes (1953 p. 538) and J. Safarewicz (1969 § 144). I think it is profitable to divide the question 'why does neutral adjectives of the *atrox* type use the masculine ending' into two parts: a) 'why did the neutral adjectives not use the expected zero ending' and b) 'why was a masculine ending used instead'.

In his book from 1913 about the phonemes in word final position in Indo-European R. Gauthiot (pp. 89 and 98) concludes that word final stops were very rare in the I.-E. languages, and that in Latin

only the dentals were still present and even they, too, were disappearing (incidentally Latin is said to be the language where word final stops are best preserved).

If Gauthiot is right and no word final labial or velar stops are found in Latin, something must have happened to the few word final ones inherited from I.-E. Now Latin has no endings in word final labial or velar stop, which means that all forms supplied with an ending can keep their stem final labial or velar stop. Such a stem final stop on the other hand would be threatened when it appeared in one of the following categories:

1. In the noun system: a) Masc. and fem. voc. sing. of stems in labial or velar stop. b) Neuter nom. acc. sing. of stems in labial or velar stop.

2. In the verbal system: present imperative active 2nd person sing. of athematic verbs in labial or velar stop.

3. In a group consisting of adverbs in the positive form, prepositions, particles and conjunctions.

1.a. This category presents no problems as all masc. and fem. voc. sing. have the nom. ending. This is a Latin innovation, in Indo-European the zero ending was used for the voc. sing. of the consonant stems (cf. P.Monteil 1970 p. 182).

1.b. According to O.Gradenwitz (1966) there are the following substantives: *lac*, (*h*)*a(l)lec* and *mulc*. The adjectives all have -s in nom. acc. sing. neuter.

2. Of the athematic verb stems no one ends in labial or velar stop, but there are three imperatives in velar stop: *dic*, *duc* and *fac*.

3. Here we have quite a lot of forms with the particle -c; *ac*, *nec* and *donec*; *ab*, *ob*, *sub*, *desub* and *ec*, according to Oxford Latin Dictionary fac. 3, 1971 a doublet form of *ex*; *volup* and *puppup*.

Almost all of these forms can be shown, however, to be later creations due to loss of a word final -e. This applies to the following words:

volup is from *volupe* (cf. Meillet et Vendryes 1953 p.143).

lac is from *lacte* (cf. Meillet et Vendryes 1953 p.150).
I here follow Meillet et Vendryes and regard *lacte* as a genuinely old form.

dic, *duc*, *fac* are all three from older forms in *-e* (cf. Meillet et Vendryes 1960 pp.142 and 143).

-c is from *-ce* (cf. Meillet et Vendryes 1953 p.497).

ac is from *atque* and *nec* is from *neque* (cf. Meillet and Vendryes 1953 p.142).

donec's final *-c* is from *-que* (or *-cum*) (cf. Ernout et Meillet 1959 p.184).

Then I think that the words *ab*, *ob*, *sub*, *desub* and *ec* can be disregarded, too, because prepositions, as a matter of fact, cannot be said to be independent words, as they form only one phonological word together with the word they govern (I owe this valuable information to Tore Janson, Stockholm), (cf. Meillet et Vendryes 1953 p.128).

The word *mulc* is only used by Plinius and is used to render a Persian word; moreover *mulc* is only one of several different readings of that passage (Plinius 37, 10, 68, § 183).

puppup is a word from Low Latin.

The word for 'fish-sauce' *hallec* occurs in several different spellings, but the most interesting is that a masculine and feminine form (*h*)*alex* is met with, too, e.g. Plautus Aul. frg.5 and Plautus Poen. 1310; in any case the word is probably a loanword.

In my opinion we have the following stages of development of Latin: In Indo-European there were very few cases of word final labial and velar stops. In Protolatin no word final labial or velar stop is permitted, and those inflectional forms, where such a stop was due to appear, are changed: The voc. sing. masc. and fem. takes the nom. sing. form, and the neuter adjectives take a word final *-s*. (If *hallec* is an old loan, we must accept it as an exception, in any case its masc. and fem. by-forms might be taken to show that the word form was unsatisfying).

In early Latin some word final *-e*'s disappear, causing words with word final velar or labial stop to appear.

Up till now the question has been the alleged phonotactic rule in Protolatin. That such a rule did exist is proved by the fact that one word at most (*allec*) contradicts it. But there are several ways to get rid of word final labial and velar stops; they can be dropped, replaced by some other sound or something can be placed after them.

As for the masc. and fem. voc. sing. dropping the word final labial or velar stop would probably be felt as disturbing the paradigmatic unity:

nom.	<i>rex</i>	<i>princeps</i>
vok.	<i>*re</i>	<i>*prince</i>
acc.	<i>regem</i>	<i>principem</i>
gen.	<i>regis</i>	<i>principis</i>
	etc.	etc.

On the other hand to use the nom. ending in voc. was a good solution as voc. was identical to nom. in almost all the declensions.

The neutral adjectives in labial or velar stop seem to have had several possibilities, once this paradigm was forbidden:

sing. nom.-acc.	<i>*audac</i>
gen.	<i>audacis</i>
dat.	<i>audaci</i>
	etc.

namely removal of *-c*, addition of *-e*, hereby creating another group of neutral adjectives in *-e*, or to let the masc. form already in use for fem. act as neuter. It is clear that the last solution was chosen. But why?

To distinguish between the masculine and the neuter gender was a rule in Indo-European, but in Latin some of the phonological developments had erased this distinction, viz. (for the sigmatic nom.sing.) in all cases where the nom.sing. morpheme *-s* had formed an intolerable cluster together with the stem final consonant, and (for the asigmatic nom.sing.) in some of the cases where the lengthened vowel in masc.nom.sing. had been shortened; i.e. in the stems in dental stop and in some of the stems in *-r* or *-l* (cf. A. Ernout 1953 pp.39 and 43—44).

In this way there were several cases of an identical form for consonant stem masculines and neuters, and this, I think, was the reason why the last possibility was chosen. Once the masc.sing. ending had spread to all three genders in some of the consonant stems, the stems in a dental stop followed.

A. Ernout (1953 p.3) states that from the beginning of the tradition there was a tendency to eliminate the distinction between masculine and neuter in the *o/e* declension. Whether this tendency

was caused by the development in the consonant stems, or was a contributory cause is a question I want to leave open.

After I had finished this article, I had the opportunity to consult the last edition of Manu Leumann's *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (1977, München, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung). In § 227 he states that some of the final consonants in Latin only appear due to loss of a word final vowel, without trying, however, to use this in connection with the problem of the neutral adjectives.

Bibliography

- C. D. Buck. 1933. *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- A. Ernout. 1953. *Morphologie historique du latin*. 3. éd. Paris, Klincksieck.
- A. Ernout et A. Meillet. 1959. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. 4. éd. Paris, Klincksieck.
- R. Gauthiot. 1913. *La fin de mot en indo-européen*. Paris, Paul Geuthner.
- O. Gradenwitz. 1966. *Laterculi vocum latinarum*. Hildesheim, Georg Olms.
- E. Kieckers. 1931. *Historische lateinische Grammatik*. Vol. II. München, Max Hueber.
- A. Meillet et J. Vendryes. 1953. *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*. Paris, Honoré Champion.
- P. Monteil. 1970. *Eléments de phonétique et de morphologie du latin*. Paris, Fernand Nathan.
- J. Safarewicz. 1969. *Historische lateinische Grammatik*. Halle (Saale), Max Niemeyer.

A Rejoinder to Eric Hamp on **HRC-* Sequences in Latin

By J. A. C. GREPPIN, Cleveland (Ohio)

Eric Hamp, ever provocative, has questioned¹⁾ some statements made by myself in an earlier issue of *Glotta*²⁾. My original paper dealt with the order in which a contiguous laryngeal and resonant, both in zero grade, became vocalized. I stated that in Greek the laryngeal became vocalized first, and the resonant was thus colored according to the texture of the laryngeal: **HRC-* > PGk. **VRC-*. Prof. Hamp found nothing to object to in this statement, but did

¹⁾ E. Hamp, 'On **HRC-* in Latin', *Glotta* 54, 1976: 261–263.

²⁾ J. Greppin, 'The Sequence *HRC-* in Latin', *Glotta* 51, 1973: 112–116.