

Lundquist
History of the Latin Language
UVM course, March 2015

Exercises

(For the first four questions, consider our working definition of rhotacism, and the subregularities within that definition.)

1. How can *herī* ‘yesterday’ and *hes-ternus* ‘of yesterday’ be etymologically related? (If you get stuck, return to the class discussion of *honor* and *honestus*)
2. See if you can figure out why *causa* is not an exception to the rule we have discovered in class, viz. ‘rhotacism,’ intervocalic *s* > *r*. Similar cases of exceptions to rhotacism include *cāsus* ‘accident’ and *dīuīsiōn-* ‘distribution’. Hint: according to the Roman grammarian Quintillian, Cicero actually wrote these words as <*caussa, cassus, diuissio*>.
3. The grammarian Festus (2nd cent.CE?) is known to us only from a later abridgment by Paul the Deacon (8th cent.CE). In Paul’s abridgment (or ‘epitome’) we find the form, acc.pl., *fesias* (Paul. *Fest.* 76L). What is this form in Classical Lat.? Why might it be preserved (consider the meaning of the word, and what kind of language a grammarian might be interested in). How would you interpret his statement (Paul. *Fest.* p.13L), “*arbosem*” *pro* “*arborem*” *antiqui dicebant*?
4. Give possible explanations why in the form *resēminō* ‘to sow again, (re)produce’ we do not get rhotacism. So too *dēsinō*.
5. Alternations occur within Latin, such as the following vowel alternations: *fāciō* vs. *re-fīciō* ‘restore’, *refēctus*; *tēneō* beside *retīneō* ‘keep’; *mōneō* ~ *memīnī*; *caedō* ‘slaughter’ ~ *occīdō* ‘kill’; *claudō* ‘close’ ~ *inclūdō* ‘shut in’. Can you offer (or perhaps just speculate on) a reason for this alternation (where does it occur with regard to syllable structure)?
6. Consider (work through and translate!) these specimens of Latin from Cato and Livy. What features can you point out as archaic? What has changed between Archaic Latin and Classical? How do you account for the archaisms in each author?

*deinde a paucis initio facto deum deo natum, regem parentemque urbis Romanae salvere universi
Romulum iubent; pacem precibus exposcunt, uti volens propitius suam semper sospitet
progeniem*

(Livy *Ab Urbe Condita* 1.16.3)

"Mars pater, te precor quaesoque uti sies volens propitius mihi domo familiaeque nostrae, quous re ergo agrum terram fundumque meum suovitaurlia circumagi iussi, uti tu morbos visos invisosque, viduertatem vastitudinemque, calamitates intemperiasque prohibessis defendas averruncesque..."

(Cato *De Agricultura* 141.2 sqq.)

7. Bonus: Here is a reproduction of the oldest Latin inscription (7th cent. BCE) with a translation into Cl. Lat. provided (an image is provided on the image sheet). The inscription's authenticity has been disputed, but by consensus (*fere omnium*) it is considered genuine. Can you make any sense of it? What changes have taken place in letter shapes? Note that the sign : indicates word or syllable division. What forms are recognizable, and how do you make sense of them?

MANIOS: MED : VHE:VHAKED: NUMASIOI

manius me fecit Numerio

(*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* I(2) 3)

8. Bonus for the Hellenists: What is the fate of PIE *s in Greek? What about Priscian's examples like Latin *septem* = Gk. *heptá*? Consider Greek *génos*-, gen.sg. *géneos/génous* in light of its cognate and translation Lat. *genus*, *generis*. Does the existence of sigmatic aorist forms like *éluse* confound your hypothesis? How would you explain the distribution of s-loss and preservation in Greek?