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Résumé

Français English
L'article traite de la question du génitif singulier des thèmes en -o- à partir des données fournies par les dialectes latins dans un cadre qui prend en compte la comparaison des données et des réflexions générales sur le génitif. Je montre, en particulier, que -osio (dialecte de Satricum), -osio (arildatim) et -oeso (romain) servent, tout comme d'autres désinences documentées dans d'autres langues indo-européennes, des formations qui peuvent être rattachées à deux matrices abstraites: *-o/-os- -jo et *-o/e/-jo. Ensuite je formule quelques observations sur la différence sémantique et/ou syntaxique originelle entre ces désinences et -1 < *(e)H1.2

This article looks at the issue of the o-stem genitive singular, starting from the data of the Latin dialects, within a framework which takes into account comparative data as well as more general reflections on the genitive. In particular, I intend to show that Satrican -osio, Ardeatine -osio and Roman -oeso, like other endings attested in other IE languages, are formations attributable to two abstract matrices: *-o/-os- -jo and *-o/e/-jo. Subsequently, I will put forward some considerations on the original semantic and/or syntactic distinction between these endings and 1 < *(e)H1.2
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Texte intégral

1. Introduction

The question of the o-stem genitive singular (hereinafter GS) is broad and complex, involving key issues such as the genesis of the endings documented in the various IE languages, the relationship between them - within each language and in broader comparison - and, beyond that, the very definition of genitive. From the historiographical point of view, there is a gradual increase in the documentation, depending on the area and time period. This increase has on occasion led to the consideration of the question from perspectives affected each time by the new acquisitions, which have generally, et pour cause, tended to incorporate the new data in a predetermined framework. Giving the enormity of the subject, I will focus on Latin dialects, within which I also include Faliscan, in a framework which takes account of the comparative data from other IE languages as well as more general reflections on the morphosyntactical/semantic functions of the genitive. The initial spark for this focus was the publication in 2009 of a presumed Faliscan inscription dating from the 7th c. BC which has a form titi (Biella, 2009) analysable as the GS in -(1) [I] of a o(3)- stem tito-. In line with a general principle, of particular relevance in the context of Restsprachen, the notum insists on a review or a restating of the notion: in keeping with this principle, my intention was to take up the issue of the o-stem GS taking into account the new inscription. Recently Franus (2015) has shown the identification of titi to be the result of a misunderstanding: the inscription reads 44, identification number, according to Pasqui’s catalogue, of the tomb where the piece was found, scratched on after the discovery in the modern age. The exclusion of titi from the dossier does not change the overall picture. The hypothesis of an origin of -i, first noted in the 4th c. BC,3 from -osio,4 attested in the early stages of writing (7th-6th c. BC; see below), must be excluded on other grounds, in primis 68

for comparative reasons based on the o-stem GS ending -i in Celtic, secondarily because of the implausibility of the phonetic evolution involved. Beyond this, despite the temporal distance between the occurrences of -i and of -osio respectively, there is still the evidence of the coexistence of the two endings within the same linguistic tradition, the terms of which are to be clarified
2. The o-stem GS in the Latin dialects: data

The Latin dialects provide numerous forms which can be analysed with varying degrees of certainty as o-stem GS endings. Apart from -i, found in Roman, Faliscan and Praenestine, we also find:

- *osioʰ (*)utosioⁿ
  - 7th/6th c. BC
  - Faliscan
- kaiosioʰ
  - 6th c. BC
  - Faliscan
- aiosioʰ
  - 6th c. BC
  - Faliscan (?)
- caioˢ-í-j (*)?
  - 4th c. BC (?)
  - Faliscan
- poplicitio valëstioⁿ
  - 6th/5th c. BC
  - Satrician (?)
- taseioⁿ
  - 5th/4th c. BC
  - Praenestine
- cicioⁿ
  - 4th c. BC
  - Faliscan
- tītioⁿ
  - 3rd c. BC
  - Ardeaean (?)
- etoⁿ
  - Early 2nd c. BC
  - Roman
- aleschoⁿ
  - 2nd c. BC
  - Roman
- vincoⁿ bonoⁿ
  - Late 1st c. BC/early 1st c. AD
  - Roman

Even if some of these forms were to be removed from the dossier, there would still be a considerable polymorphism: this is a factum and, as such, the reasons need to be researched, maybe in the evolution of the o-stem GS between forms and functions.

I take as my starting point the Praenestine form taseioⁿ, occurring in an inscription placed next to a figure on a mirror:

This form is thus a likely candidate for the root of the Proto-Italic form *taseoⁿ, which is a representative of the o-stem GS. The presence of -oⁿ in this form is not only a phonetic adaptation but also a semantic one, as the form taseioⁿ is used in the sense of "to see," indicating the process of perceiving something.

The analysis of the form taseioⁿ shows that the Palatine form *taseoⁿ is the root of the Proto-Italic form *taseoⁿ, which is a representative of the o-stem GS. The presence of -oⁿ in this form is not only a phonetic adaptation but also a semantic one, as the form taseioⁿ is used in the sense of "to see," indicating the process of perceiving something.

3. Latin -osioⁿ, -oioⁿ/-oeoⁿ < *-o/es/-joⁿ, -o/e/i/-so/l/-jo

The data exhibited by the Latin dialects may be interpreted as indicative of a re-structuring which might and did have a number of different outcomes but in accordance with the same structural principles and the same morphological "material," both hereditary. I believe this observation is supported by the data manifested in other IE languages, apodically noted below, even in cases where I depart from the mainstream interpretation, deferring discussion of the individual forms to the book in preparation (Rigobianco, in prep.).

Calabrian -oⁿ; Mycenaean -oⁿ (?)

* -oⁿ
The data being examined would appear to derive from two matrices, which are to be understood not as reconstructions of original morphemes but rather aberrations starting from the very data:

1. 

   \[ \text{*-os-} \oplus \text{-i-} \oplus \text{-oo} \]

   "apophony"

   cf. Skt. desan < *d-var-o-i- etc.

2. 

   \[ \text{*-os-(-os-?)} \oplus \text{-jo} \]

   (*"apophony"?)

Keeping to the forms, the restructuring of the o-stem GS appears essentially based on the “pure” stem (*-o) or on a flexed form in *-os, in both cases with the possible conglutination of *-so and *-jo. The various forms documented in the different IE languages would be the result of the interference of such possibilities of morphological expression of the GS with the “apophony” (-o/e/-) plus the “thematicity” /o/e/ = /o/e/i/, with /-i/ juxtaposed to /-o/e/- as a phenomenon which, for whatever reason, has left traces in a number of IE languages, see Wackernagel, 1930, p. 89-90). Within a perspective which considers the evolution of IE and IE languages over time, space and society, polymorphism dissolves, as previously stated, in the fulfilment of potentialities founded on shared morphological “material” and structural principles.

The outline given here leaves many questions unanswered, which, although distinct, should nonetheless be placed in a unitary framework. These questions include: the status of Celtic (and Mycenaean?) *-os; the origin of GS *-os and its possible relationship with *-os of nominative singular of the same stems and *-os of GS of consonant stems;[30] function(s) of *-so/*-jo and the reason for their conglutination.[31]

The situation is complicated by -i, attested as an o-stem GS morpheme (and originally only in these stems), in the Latin and Celtic linguistic traditions.[32]

4. *-i versus *-osio, *-oio/-oo: Latin data and reconstruction

GS *i in the declension of o-stems in Latin and Celtic[33] is manifestly extra-paradigmatic and, therefore, at least as ancient as the “thematic” GS forms. This ending could be brought back to a derivational morpheme *-ij(o)H2, which would generate, among other forms, *i in the derivation from o-stems in Latin and -i(=) of feminine in Sanskrit[34] and Celtic; based on that data, a basic semantic notion of “inheritance” could be reconstructed for *-ij(o)H2. Evidence of the existence of -i with -osio, -oio/-oo within the Latin linguistic tradition and with -oi so in Celtic raises the questions of the relationship between these endings and the possible extension of one ending to the detriment of the other. These issues are likely to be framed within the assumption that -i and the “thematic” forms had features which were originally distinct but with the potential for interference.[35] The process would be comparable with matris mutandis, with the one generating the expansion of the meaning of the ablative singular to the detriment of that of the GS in the declension of the o-stems in Balto-Slavic, likely deriving from the expression of semantic functions for which there is interference between “genitive” and “ablative”. In the competition between -i and the “thematic” forms, semantic and/or syntactic factors could be included. More precisely, it is conceivable that such competition was influenced by the adjectival nature[36] and/or the semantics of “inheritance” of -i in contrast to the status of the “thematic” forms as case morphemes for adnominality, namely the relationship of syntactic dependence between two nouns, secondarily interpretable in terms of semantics (“relation”) [37]. On the other hand, an original different categorial status of -i and the “thematic” GS apparently crystallized in the known rule of the standard Roman which opposes nihil boni to the unacceptable of *nimbi dalicu (Hofmann-Stannyr, 1965, p. 57). The original categorial status, different but with the potential for interference, would have raised the possibility of (re)functionalisations within the different varieties in time, space and society.
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Notes

1 Material for this article is taken from a broader study on the genitive (Rigobianco, in prep.) wherein will be found further clarification and detail as well as a fuller bibliography.

2 On the linguistic position of Faliscan, see Bakkum, 2009, p. 341-360.

3 See, e.g., the inscription Bakkum 470.

4 The most recent expression of this hypothesis, as far as I am aware, is in Maftezak, 2002.

5 See, e.g., Leumann, 1977, p. 413. Maftezak 2002’s is an ad hoc hypothesis (“développement phonétique irrégulier dû à la haute fréquence”) which fails to take due account of the Celtic data.

6 For a possible attestation of -osio in Roman, see the article by Burroni and Brenzis (this volume).

7 Bakkum 3. I do not consider here the various reading and segmentation possibilities of the first part of the inscription (ceoquaesu tonedesio).

8 Bakkum 7.

9 Bakkum 487. On the Faliscan character of the inscription, see Bakkum, 2009, p. 577-578.
10 Bakkum 197. The integration cussius{s} (CIE 8286) is considered implausible by Bakkum, 2009, p. 487 because of the relatively recent dating of the inscription.
11 The editio princeps of the legis Statuense is in Stibbe et al. 1980. The linguistic attribution of the inscription is sub judice, apart from an almost universally shared attribution to a generic Latinity; see the considerations in Prosdocimi, 1984, p. 204; on this topic, see also Lucchesi e Magni, 2002; Rocc, 2009.
13 Bakkum 40.
14 Lejeune, 1989, p. 66.
15 Bakkum 483.
18 Lucil. 25.
19 Quint. Inst. 8, 6, 33 (attributed to Quintillian to Ovid).
20 The alternative reading tuasel/flus seems contrary to the evidence: see Franchi De Bellis, 2005, p. 78-9; 81.
21 Except that in the Sabellic name of the Dioscuri (Vetter 202 1ouisius.puelo; Vetter 204 [1ouisius.puelis/s]).
22 See the references in Bakkum, 2009, p. 587, to be integrated with Bolelli, 1943, p. 56; Campagnoli, 1961, p. 20; Bader, 1992, p. 82; Meiser, 1998, p. 117, 123.
23 See Devine, 1970, p. 12-14. For my part, I point out that Colson, 1924, p. 55 acknowledges that "the MSS. are fairly persistent in exhibiting 'o-so' in the second word", even if he reserved Metriso Fufetto.
25 Roman -so-for -jo is a matter of syllabicity (lex Lindenman and lex Sievee; see Prosdocimi, 1987).
27 I thank professor Adamik for this remark.
28 The Celtiberian GS in -o has been interpreted as an outcome of -i-s or *-os, or even as an outcome of an analogical readjustment (see the references in Eski, 1955, to be integrated with Untermann, 1999, p. 139-40 and Watkins, 1999, p. 7-8). The plausibility of -o standing for [*i] would mean interpreting the forms in question as forms of GS coinciding with the "pure" stem: I will return to the issue in Rigobianco (in prep.).
29 Mycenaean shows a GS ending -o as an alternative to -o-jo for the status quaestionis and updated references, see Pierini, 2011.
30 The derivation of -o from a pronominal ending *-osu (Brugmann, 1911, p. 161-2) instead of from *-osu, reported as "zweifelhaft" already by Brugmann, has been repeatedly questioned or refused (see, e.g., Sihler, 1995, p. 259-60); see however Rix, 1976, p. 139.
31 According to the common view, -is is the outcome of a pronominal ending *-eso (Brugmann, 1911, p. 161-2): this derivation has been sometimes questioned on the basis of formal considerations (see, e.g., Must, 1953).
32 I follow Prosdocimi's 2002 hypothesis, according to which -es and -e- are concurrent GS endings deriving from *-eso and *-e-io respectively, as against the standard hypothesis of an extension of the i-stem endings (Planta, 1892-1897, p. 109-9).
33 Gambare and Colonna, 1988. GS -oso also occurs in an inscription of Oden of uncertain linguistic attribution between Venetic and Celt (see lastly Eski and Wallace, 1999). This ending has also been explained phonetically starting from IE *osō, assuming a process of metathesis, whereas Bader (1991, p. 109-12; 1992, p. 81-2), Eski (1995, p. 41-2) and Prosdocimi (2009, p. 65-72) have proposed a morphological explanation.
34 Greek -oso, commonly connected to *-osu (Brugmann, 1911, p. 161-2), could theoretically be the reflex of an original *-osu (or *-iV; > *-iV, see Rix, 1976, p. 86).
36 This ending, a homophone of the nominative ending of the same stems, has been explained on the basis of an adjustment with the GS of consonant stems (see Sturtevant, 1933, p. 170), whereas Pedersen in 1933 put forward the hypothesis that the identity between the forms of nominative singular and GS in Littell is due to the preservation of an original feature which disappeared in other IE languages. 37 Brugmann, 1931, p. 160-2.
37 In this regard we should note, among others, Rix 1998's suggestion to analyse *-jo in *-osō and *-o in *-osō as anaphoric relatives (this interpretation of *-jo in *-osō has been proposed at least since Krukowski, 1887). Personally, I believe that, if this is the right line to pursue, an analysis of -oso as *-osu would be preferable, as it could also take account of Celtiberian (and possibly of Mycenaean) data: as to the qualification of *-jo as anaphoric being extended to *-osu, this is a matter for further research.
39 On the identification of the GS ending -i in other traditions (Venetic, Tocharian, and Albanian), see the references in Pairotti, 2014, p. 73-9.
41 According to some only of the i韵i- Flexion: see Pairotti, 2014, p. 75-9, for the bibliography.
44 On genitive and adjective see, among the others, Wackernagel, 1908, Benevento, 1990 and, in a syntactic perspective, the annotations in Giorgi and Longobardi, 1991.
45 "express some contextually determined relation" (Higginbotham, 1983, p. 397-8).
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