KAHOPOINNA

By Anne Marie Keaney, Princeton

In one discussion of the Rossano di Vaglio fragments¹), Michel Lejeune offers an etymology for the epithet καποροιννα²).

His argument is as follows. He constructs a protoform, * $\kappa a\pi o$ - $\varrho o \nu ia$. On the basis of the Latin noun caper and nomen Caprōnius,
he postulates a intermediate or "linking" form * $\epsilon apr\bar{o}$ 3), which undergoes anaptyxis and is extended by the feminine suffix - ϵu Thus: * $\epsilon apro(n) > \epsilon aporo(n) > \epsilon aporo(n)$.

The next stage of development is the diphthongization of the second o, Lejeune's theory of *i*-umlaut. We have then * $\kappa\alpha\pio\varrhoou\nu\iota\alpha$. The final form, $\kappa\alpha\pio\varrhoou\nu\iota\alpha$, is a result of a doubling of n before y (with subsequent loss of y). (This is by analogy of a tendency observed in the Tabula Bantina for certain consonants + y to geminate or become fricatives 5).)

One objection may be made. The y of the suffix -oria is held to account for both the i-umlaut and the gemination of n. This is highly improbable.

I would like to propose an alternate derivation. Let us agree that ** $\kappa\alpha\pi\sigma\rho\rho\nu\nu\alpha$ is the true protoform. If so, the first change was the gemination of n before y. This is a regular tendency of consonants in Oscan, and in contrast to the change at Bantia, the y remains 6). The y then caused i-umlaut and was lost in the process. The development would then be: * $\kappa\alpha\pi\sigma\rho\rho\nu\nu\alpha$ > * $\kappa\alpha\pi\sigma\rho\rho\nu\nu\alpha$ > * $\kappa\alpha\pi\sigma\rho\rho\nu\nu\alpha$. Lejeune's theory is still valid and, in fact, is strengthened by the reordering of the rules.

^{1) &}quot;L'Epigraphie osque de Rossano di Vaglio (Potenza)" in Dinu Adamesteanu and Michel Lejeune, "Il santuario lucano di Macchia di Rossano di Vaglio." *MALinc* XVI-2, 1971.

²) It appears in fragment RV-06, μ]efitial καποφοιννα[ι , "to Mefitis Capronia".

³) This is based, in turn, on a similar model of $aper/*apr\bar{o}/Apr\bar{o}nius$; the nomen, as well as nouns in $-\bar{o}$, $-\bar{o}nis$, are derived from the linking form.

⁴⁾ Lejeune (p. 57) explains the difference in vowel length: "On notera que les noms qui sont en latin en -ō/gén. -ōnis paraissent avoir présenté en osco-ombrien une alternance quantitative (flexion bâtie sur -ŏn-); aux dérivés latins en -ōnio- doivent correspondre des dérivés osco-ombriens en -ŏnio- et à lat. Caprōnio (gentilice Caprōnius) un osque Caprŏnio- (que nous estimons impliqué par Καπορουνια-)."

⁵⁾ Cf. C. D. Buck, A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian, p. 66.

⁶) Cf. Buck, p. 99; in any case, Lejeune admits that an example of n + y > nn is lacking in the *Tabula Bantina*.