Latin *-īnāre/-īnārī*

Brent Vine

1. Most Latin verbs in *-īnāre/-īnārī* are transparently denominative, based on adjectives in *-īnus*: e.g. *supīnāre* [Virg.+] 'throw onto the back' (cf. *supīnus* [Plt.+] 'lying on the back'), or *peregrīnārī* [Cic.+] 'sojourn abroad' (cf. *peregrīnus* [Plt.+] 'foreign'). The pattern is disrupted only slightly in a case like *coquīnāre/coquĭnāre* [Plt.] 'be a cook' (cf. *coquīnus* 'pertaining to cooking', *coquīna* 'kitchen; cookery' [Plt.+]), where the short-vowel variant is almost certainly generated secondarily via iambic shortening (Petersmann 1977:208, citing the **cocīnāre* of Romance [Span. *cocinar* etc.] in support of the basic *-ī-*). But apart from isolated forms that may have special explanations,[1] there is a second class of Latin verbs in *-īnāre/-īnārī* that is generally thought to reflect a quite different sort of denominative origin, the best-known exemplar of which is *festīnāre* 'hurry'.

2. In a short paper on Lat. *festīnāre* and its cognates in British Celtic, P. Schrijver (1990) has sought to elucidate certain formal and derivational details connected with the Latin verb and its close relative Lat. *cōnfestim* 'quickly, immediately'.

As for the form, he shows that the Celtic material — principally W. *brys* m. 'haste' — is best taken to derive from a zero-grade *ti*-stem **bʰris-ti-* (as opposed to the full-grade **bʰers-ti-* traditionally assumed), and that the same source may underlie the stem *festi-* of Lat. *cōnfestim* as well (for the phonology, cf. *testis* < **tristis*, among other such forms).

---

[1] E.g. *ūrīnāre/-ī* is sometimes said to be a "Latinization" of Gk. οὐρεῖν 'to urinate', with *ūrīna* 'urine' back-formed from the verb (thus Leumann 1977:328, 552). But *ūrīnāre/-ī* does not in fact mean 'urinate' (rather 'dive, become submerged'), and is probably better taken as a denominative to *ūrīna* that preserves its archaic sense 'water', cf. Ved. *vā́r*, Av. *vār-*, CLuv. *wa-a-ar(-ša)* (Watkins 1987:402 = 1994:1.312; on the morphology of *vā́r* etc., see now Ivanov 1997). In forms of the type *(dē-/in-)clīnāre* < **klei̯-nā-* (on which see recently Rix 1995:404f.), the *-ī-* is of course part of the root.

Derivationally, the verb *festīnāre* has traditionally been taken as a denominative to a presumed "*tiōn*-stem" **festiō* (this form being derived from the *festi-* appearing in *cōnfestim*), with an oblique stem **festīn-* serving as the basis of the denominative. Schrijver thus addresses the question, as he puts it: "[H]ow does a form **festīn-* (not **festiōn-*) fit in with the paradigm of *tiōn*-nouns?" (1990:243). He first notes the existence of similar alternations **-(t)iōn-/*-(t)īn-* in Osco-Umbrian (for the oblique: e.g. O. **leginum** 'legionem', U. **natine** 'natione'), together with, first of all, the unlikelihood of a direct PIE source for such an alternation,[2] and secondly, the possibility of interpreting Osco-Umbrian **-(t)īn-* as a syncope product of **-(t)i(i̯)ŏn-*. These considerations lead to the assumption of a morphologically ordinary inflection **-(t)iōn-/*-(t)iŏn-*, which can also be assumed for Latin, where the development of medial **-iŏn-* (in open syllable), whence **-iin-* and **-īn-*, is likely to be phonologically regular. Schrijver concludes, then, that "*festīnāre* reflects a direct parallel to the Osco-Umbrian *leginum*-inflection; and points to the existence of a **-iōn-/iŏn-* > **-iōn-/īn*-inflection in Primitive Latin" (1990:244). Following Osthoff (1895), Schrijver assumes that although this inflection was not maintained in Latin, "[d]enominative verbs in -*īnāre* based on -*iŏn*-stems were apparently created before the long -*ō*- was generalized throughout the Latin paradigm".

In formal terms, the assumption of a zero-grade *ti*-stem is a distinct improvement over the traditional full grade; and for Latin, the presumed phonological development **-iŏn-* > **-iin-* > **-īn-* is not problematic.[3] Derivationally, the hypothesis of a regular alternation **-(t)iōn-/*-(t)iŏn-* is clearly attractive for Osco-Umbrian forms of the **leginum** type, and the idea of setting up a similar pattern for corresponding *n*-stems at some early stage of Latin has an obvious appeal, at least at first glance. But this theoretical appeal must be tempered by certain reservations arising from the analysis of *festīnāre* itself. To begin with, the presumed derivational basis, namely the *n*-stem **festiō*, is in fact

---

[2] Differently X. Tremblay (1996:36n17), operating with a zero-grade *n*-stem form **-tih₂-n-* for U. **natine** and Lat. *festīnāre* (Lat. nom. -*tiō* < **-tih₂-ōn*); but for *festīnāre*, see below on the absence of the presumed basis **festiō*.

[3] Cf. several recent discussions of the treatment of medial **-ii̯V-* in open syllables in Latin (and Italic), e.g. M. Weiss (1993:30f., 1996:673), I. Livingston (1997:2-4).

unattested. To be sure, Lat. *-tiōn-* is an "Ersatz und Erweiterung der alten Verbalabstrakta auf *-ti-*", which is in fact "produktiv" (Leumann 1977:366); but this does not mean that, given the existence of a **festi-* 'haste' (cf. *cōnfestim*), a **festiō* can be assumed without further ado, especially since this **festiō* is apparently synonymous with the original (and vestigially surviving) **festi-*, rendering opaque the rationale for using **festiō* (as opposed to **festi-*) as the basis for the denominative.[4] Nor can one appeal to any propensity of *-tiōn-* nouns (as opposed to *-ti-* nouns) to form denominatives: although denominative verbs in *-(t)iōnāre/-(t)iōnārī* are attested with certainty, few are very common,[5] and none is particularly old. What is actually attested is **festi-* 'haste' (in *cōnfestim*) and the adj. *festīnus* 'hasty' (the latter not mentioned by Schrijver); ceteris paribus, it would be preferable to be able to derive *festīnāre* directly on the basis of one or both of these forms, without having to appeal to an otherwise unattested **festiō.* (I return below [§**5.**] to certain questions surrounding *festīnus.*)

3. Also troubling is the apparent status of *festīnāre!*as the sole representative, at least in Schrijver's treatment, of an alleged class of "[d]enominative verbs in *-īnāre* based on *-iōn-*stems". Although Schrijver's phrasing alludes to the existence of other such cases, he names none; conspicuously lacking, in particular, is any mention of Lat. *opīnārī* (OLat. also *opīnāre*) 'suppose, conjecture', traditionally coupled with *festīnāre* as an example of the same sort of derivation.[6] Nevertheless, *opīnārī* does not appear to be a promising case of this sort.

---

[4] The synonymy of **festi-* and **festiō* is suspect in itself: as far as one can judge from existing cases, this is not what one would expect from such parallel formations: cf. Lat. *mēns* 'mind' beside *mentiō* 'mention'. (Conversely, the semantic similarity between *gēns* 'clan, stock, tribe etc.' and *nātiō* 'tribe, nation etc.' points, if anything, in the same direction, since *gēns,* which lacks any trace of the expected laryngeal of an ideal **ǵn̥h₁-tí-,* is transparently a relatively late creation; see recently Schrijver 1991:330.)

[5] The only ones occurring with any frequency are *cōntiōnārī* 'to hold forth in an assembly; be convened' and *auctiōnārī* 'to hold an auction', both Cic.+.

[6] In addition to Walde-Hofmann (s.v. *opīnor,* with earlier literature): e.g. Leumann 1977:366, with reference to the type O. **leginum** ("Gleiches *-īn-* und *-tīn-* vermutet man in lat. *opīn-ārī* und *festīn-āre*"), or, more recently, Reicheler-Béguelin 1986:207 ("Le latin, qui a étendu partout le

The idea that *opīnārī* derives from (the weak alternant of) an *n*-stem **opiōn-* depends on the gloss *praedotiont* 'praeoptant' (Fest. 222.24 L, so printed by both Lindsay and Mueller, the latter with crux[7]), traditionally emended to *praedopiont*. This conjecture is then thought to justify the existence of a verb **opiō/*opere* (assumed to be the basis of *optāre* 'choose'), from which can derive an *n*-stem abstract **opiōn-*, of the type *legō/legere* : *legiōn-* etc. The fragility of this construction need not be emphasized.[8] As for the conjecture itself, one cannot help but agree with Thurneysen ("sehr zweifelhafte Conjectur", 1879:31 = 1991:132); among other problems, the prefix form *praed-* (an *unicum*) is particularly difficult to justify.[9] Nor is there any reason to believe that a form more immediately underlying *optāre* (if in fact it does, cf. n. 7) would also underlie *opīnārī*. In sum, there is simply no real evidence, direct or indirect, favoring the existence of an *n*-stem **opiōn-*, or even any related form on which an **opiōn-* could have been based. Equally damaging is the testimony of *CIL* I[2] 547 OPEINOR, in a 3rd-century BC Praenestine inscription.[10] As seen already by W. Krogmann (1936:127-8), this spelling all but guarantees that the *-ī-* of the Class. Lat. form derives from a diphthong. Even though monophthongization[11] occurred notably early in Praeneste,[12] instances of "reverse" spellings with hypercorrect or archaizing <EI> for etymological *ī* are not attested until well into

degré *ō* du suffixe, conserve peut-être la trace du degré réduit en *ī* dans des verbes comme *opīnor* (cf. *opīniō(n)*) et *festīnare* (cf. *confestim*)", with a footnote reference to Brugmann.

[7] MS variants show only forms with *-t-*; with Lindsay's sigla: *praedotiont* Ald., *praedotiunt* ed. princ., *predotiom* W.

[8] I have addressed this problem in much greater detail elsewhere, with particular reference to *optāre* (1999).

[9] Pace e.g. Leumann (1977:561, *praed-* as a "Nachbildung" after *prōd-*, itself secondarily formed after *red-*); it would be considerably easier to justify a **praed-eō* or a **praed-igō* (cf. *red-eō, red-igō, prōd-eō, prōd-igō,* and even *antid-eō*) rather than a ***praed-opiō.*

[10] On the reading OPEINOR (and not OPEINOD, as still assumed, for example, by Vineis 1993:293), see Wachter 1987:§60a.

[11] See the recent discussion by Nussbaum (1994:182ff.).

[12] E.g. *CIL* I[2] 560 COFECI (1sg. perf., for expected COFECEI), in all probability a late 3rd-century or early 2nd-century text; cf. Nussbaum 1994:184 with n. 83.

the second century. Thus, under the likely assumption that the contracted *-īn*-result of the conjectured **-iin-* (from the alleged **-iŏn-* of the oblique *n*-stem alternant in question) would have fallen together with etymological *-īn-* (< **-iHn-*), the probability that such a contraction-product would have been spelled <EIN> in 3rd-century Praenestine Latin must be judged to be very low. The etymology of *opīnārī* remains uncertain, to be sure; but despite the virtual unanimity of the handbook treatments, nothing about the form — and least of all OLat. OPEINOR — actually supports the idea of an original *n*-stem.[13] Thus *festīnāre* remains isolated as the sole possible example of the formation in **-iŏn-ā-* (> *-īn-ā-*) claimed to exist by Schrijver, barring evidence from additional forms in *-īnāre/-īnārī*.

4. None of the other verbs in *-īnāre/-īnārī*[14] provides any further support for denominative *n*-stem-based formations of the type claimed to exist in *festīnāre.* All of the forms in question are very scantily attested, and display interpretive problems of one sort or another.

4.1. Lat. *carĭnāre* (or *-ārī*?) 'berate' is attested in Festus (41.13 L) and several other glosses (see TLL III.458.48ff.), but otherwise only twice in literary texts, both times in the *Annals* of Ennius. Each of these instances, however, appears to present a different scansion (458 *carĭnantibus* vs. 576 *carīnantēs*). Despite the traditional assumption that the short-vowel variant is basic (thus TLL, Ernout-Meillet, Walde-Hofmann, OLD; recently e.g. Schrijver 1991:429), O. Skutsch has argued (ad locc. [1985:616, 716f.] and 1985:60, 847) in favor of a basic *carīn-*, with secondary shortening in Enn. *Ann.* 458, as in Plt. *coquĭnāre* (§**1.** above). Even if this is so, and under the likely assumption that the derivation is somehow denominative, this totally isolated form offers no testimony whatsoever in favor of an *n*-stem basis **ker-i̯ŏn-,* as opposed to any other (such as a **carīnus* or **carīna,*

---

[13] H. Eichner has recently (although in a different connection) made the same point ("Die Schreibung OPEINOR ... zeigt, daß die an sich naheliegende Erklärung als Denominativ zu einem Substantiv **opio,* Gen. **opīn-is* ... unzulässig ist", 1988-90:238n103).

[14] See in general Mignot 1969:312ff., Leumann 1977:551.

of the type *coquīnāre* <--- *coquīnus/coquīna*). Nor is such testimony forthcoming from the standard cognates, despite superficial appearances in a few instances.[15]

4.2. A verb *bovīnārī* (and once *bovīnāre*) is attested in glosses only,[16] with meanings somewhat oddly split between 'cry out, revile, brawl' (*clamare, conviciari*) and 'play tricks, ambush' (*tricare, insidiari*). The closest thing to a literary attestation is the agent noun *bovīnātor* (Lucil. 417 M), correlated with *trīcōsus* 'trickster' (vs. CGL II.31.13 *bovinatores* 'θορυβοποιοί'). As all authorities agree, the etymology, under the circumstances, is quite obscure, although it is hard not to imagine some connection, if only folk-etymological, with an adj. *bovīnus* (as such first attested very late, but in principle a form that could have existed in popular speech for some time).[17] There is in any case not the slightest reason to assume a primordial *n*-stem **boviŏn-* behind *bovīnārī.*

4.3. In neither of the remaining possible *-īnā-* verbs is the quantity of the *-i-* guaranteed (despite confident notations in some handbooks), and the history of these forms is again largely opaque:

(i) *mŭgĭnārī* 'dither, dilly-dally' (Lucil. 1x, Cic. 1x, Gell. 1x, Festus) appears beside an odd variant *mŭsĭnārī* attributed to Varro (Plin. *Nat.* pr. 18). The usage by Atta (*Com.* 4) has sometimes seemed to authorize a second meaning 'murmur', but Flobert has rightly called this into question.[18] Thus the connection

---

[15] Thus, even if Gk. κάρνη· ζημία Hsch. is taken, principally because of its zero grade, to derive ultimately from an *n*-stem, this does not match the thematic formations of Slavic (OCS *u-korŭ* 'daring', SCr. *pòkor* 'blame') and Celtic (e.g. OIr. *caire* 'blame'); nor, in any case, would an old **ker-ō(n)/*kr̥-n-* necessarily support a (Lat.) **ker-i̯ŏn-.* The nasal formant of Latv. *karinât* 'tease, pester' is a productive affix that has nothing to do with nominal derivation, and the *-n-* of Toch. AB *kärn-* 'strike' has too many possible sources to provide any information at all, assuming the etymological connection is correct in the first place.

[16] Full survey in Flobert 1975:188 (deponent), 338 (active).

[17] Descriptively speaking, *bovīnārī* looks like a blend of *boāre* 'bellow, bawl' and *bovīnus* (for the formal alternation, cf. *boārius* and *bovārius* 'relating to cattle').

[18] "... le contexte est conjectural et les commentateurs se sont laissés abuser par *mūgīre*" (1975:94).

with *mūgīre* 'bellow, roar' often alleged in the handbooks (e.g. Walde-Hofmann, OLD) has very little to recommend it, and the etymological background of the word, particularly in view of the Varronian variant, is completely unknown. Even if, despite (or perhaps, from another point of view, because of) Varro's *mŭsĭnārī*, one wished to argue in favor of an ultimate connection with *mūgīre*,[19] there is again no basis for an *n*-stem *mŭgĭŏn-*.

(ii) *nătĭnārī* is attested as a hapax in Cato, cited by Festus (166.2 L): *natinatio dicebatur negotiatio et natinatores ex eo seditiosa negotia gerentes. M. Cato [hist. 126] "... tumultu Macedoniae, Etruriam, Samnites, Lucanos inter se natinari atque factiones esse"*[20] — whence the traditional interpretation 'be busy' or 'be agitated, rebellious', cf. also a gloss *natina* 'discordia' (CGL IV praef. xviii[21]). Some scholars (see Walde-Hofmann s.v.) have favored a connection with Lat. *nātiō* by way of a formation of the type thought to exist in *festīnāre*, from an original sense 'to form (rebellious) tribes' or the like. But Flobert (1975:94n1) has pointed out that in view of U. **natine**, as well as the presumed original meaning, such a form could just as well be a "sabinisme". In that case, of course, the verb would provide no support whatsoever for the existence of a "primitive Latin" **nātiŏn-* behind *nātīnārī* (if these vowel quantities are correct). If, on the other hand, the form is native Latin, then the semantics seem rather to favor a connection (preferred by Flobert and others) with Lat. *nāvus* 'industrious, energetic, busy'. Here we would have a situation reminiscent of that seen with *festīnāre*: we have an adjectival (in this case substantivized) derivative in *(-tinus/)-tina* beside the verb stem in *-tinari* (i.e., *natina/natinari*, cf. *festīnus/festīnāre*), and no trace of a **natio* 'energy, indus-

---

[19] As Michael Weiss points out to me, this could be supported by invoking similar words that may have sound-symbolic associations, as perhaps with Eng. *bumble* 'bungle, falter', cf. *bumble* 'drone' (although the first *bumble* may rather be a blend of *bungle* and *stumble;* thus AHD[3] 253, s.v.). Andrew Dyck (p.c.) observes that in terms of formation, *musinari* would appear to be based on *mussare*!'murmur, mutter', and that if there existed a by-form *muginari* of *mugire,* these two similar verbs for producing incoherent noise could have become confused, resulting in the semantic overlap apparently noted by Varro.

[20] Otherwise only glosses, in the form *natinare* 'negotiare' or 'negotiari' (CGL IV.367.24, V.544.43, 605.19).

[21] So-called "asbestos" glosses, on which see further Goetz 1885:324 (326 on *natina*).

triousness' (just as there is no actual *festiō). We must now return, then, to *festīnāre* — which has emerged, quite suspiciously, as the solitary relic with any sort of probative value of the alleged *n*-stem derivation in question — in order to consider the possibility of deriving the form without recourse to an "intermediate" *n*-stem *festiō.

5. In assessing the derivational history of *festīnāre,* it is immediately clear that the most natural background for such a form would involve a denominative derivation based on an adjective *festīnus* 'hasty, speedy', of the standard type *coquīnāre <--- coquīnus/-a* etc. (§**1.**). As already mentioned (§**2.**, ad fin.), an adjective *festīnus* actually exists; nevertheless, this derivation has been rejected, apparently for two reasons, although only the first has been noted explicitly. First, whereas *festīnāre* is first attested in Plautus and Cato, *festīnus* is not attested until Sallust, and becomes common only in Imperial times; in view of this apparent chronological obstacle, it has generally been assumed that *festīnus* is somehow post-verbal to *festīnāre,* which in turn therefore seems to require the independent *n*-stem derivation via a **festiŏn-,* as already described. Secondly, in the absence of a coherent theory of Latin formations in *-īnus,*[22] there has been no clear basis for evaluating the relative age and well-formedness of a formation like *festīnus* in the first place; lacking such criteria, it becomes easier to dismiss *festīnus* as a late creation, even though in principle, an old and well-formed **festīno-* could still have served as the basis of *festīnāre,* no matter how late an actual Lat. *festīnus* happens to be attested.

To consider the second of these points first, it must be said that we are now in a much better position to evaluate a formation like *festīnus*, thanks to recent work by A. Nussbaum (1996, 1998). In considering the origins of a wide range of denominative adjectival formations, in Latin and elsewhere, and primarily those built with the suffix **-to-* and displaying so-called "presuffixal lengthening", Nussbaum has developed an extremely attractive framework according to which many such forms are in origin "possessive instrumentals": beginning from a substantival instrumental (e.g. a root-noun instr. sg. **X-eh₁* 'with X'), one then forms an instrumental adj. in **-to-* (**X-eh₁-to-* > Lat. *X-ētus*: e.g.

---

22 See the variegated list of speculations offered in Leumann 1977:328, with further references.

substantivized *rubēta* '(type of reddish) toad' < **h₁rudʰ-eh₁* 'with redness'), and similarly with other stem-classes (*o*-stem instr. **X-o-h₁ > *X-oh₁-to-*, Lat. *-ōtus* [*aegrōtus* 'sick', cf. *aegrum* 'distress']; *i*-stem instr. **X-i-h₁ > *X-ih₁-to-* [*crīnītus* '(long-)haired', cf. *crīnēs* 'locks'; etc.). The entire process, moreover, is merely a subtype of a derivational pattern involving the agglutination of adjectival formants like **-to-* with inflected case-forms, as in the genitival type *avītus* 'of one's *avus*, ancestral' (i.e. gen. *avī* + *-to-*, producing an adjective that functions like an adnominal genitive). Nussbaum makes the further suggestion[23] that the same process no doubt appears with other formants, of which **-no-* would be a particularly likely candidate: he adduces genitival examples of the type Lat. *equīnus* (cf. *equī* 'of a horse'),[24] and instrumental examples of the type Gk. ἐχῖνος 'hedgehog' < *'having snakes' (cf. ἔχις 'snake'). I suggest, then, that according to this framework, an instrumental **bʰris-ti-h₁* 'with haste', built on the very *ti*-stem **festi-* 'haste' attested in Lat. *cōnfestim*, could thus serve as the basis for a well-formed Latin adj. **festīno-*; and that this form in turn is the direct source of Lat. *festīnāre.* It remains to reconsider, in that case, the allegedly late and secondary status of Lat. *festīnus* itself.

In his notice of forms in *-īnus* back-formed to verbs in *-īnāre/-ī,* Leumann (1977:327) cites *dīvīnus* in the sense 'Wahrsager' (Cic.+, cf. *dīvīnāre* 'predict', Plt.+), *inopīnus* 'unexpected' (also *necopīnus* 'id.'), and *festīnus.* The first example is not strictly comparable either to *festīnus* or to *inopīnus*: the new form ends up as an agent noun, and the process cannot in any event be separated from the adjective *dīvīnus,* which already existed in similar meanings ('divinely inspired, prophetic', Plt.+). Comparison between *festīnus* and *inopīnus,* however, is instructive. As Leumann makes clear, *inopīnus* is post-verbal not to *opīnor* directly (Latin has no such regular derivational process), but to the participial form *inopīnātus,* and the same derivation applies to *necopīnus* vis-à-vis *necopīnātus.*[25] In addition to the

---

[23] 1996 [handout]:§3.2., 1998 [handout]:§2.2.1.5., 2.2.2.1.ff.

[24] Productive in Latin: *dīvīnus* (*dīvī* 'of a god'), *vīcīnus* (*vīcī* 'of the neighborhood'), etc.

[25] Similarly e.g. Walde-Hofmann (s.v. *opīnor,* ad fin.), cf. also Osthoff 1895:292 (following F. Skutsch).

suggestive specificity of the negative prefix,[26] the textual attestations of these forms render the derivational patterns tolerably clear: thus *inopīnus* is first attested in Virgil, as opposed to the better-attested and earlier-attested *inopīnātus* (Cic.+, cf. TLL VII.1749.17ff., 1751.38ff.); and similarly for *necopīnus* (mainly Augustan and Silver Latin poetry) vs. *necopīnātus* (Cic.+; cf. OLD s.vv.). The situation with *festīnus* and *festīnātus* is not nearly so clear, and is in certain key respects quite different. To begin with, *festīnus* is significantly better-attested than *festīnātus* (see TLL VI.620.73ff., 621.30ff.). Moreover, *festīnus* (Sall., Virg., Ov.+) is actually attested earlier than *festīnātus*, which does not seem to occur before the elder Pliny, and which attains some degree of frequency only in the latter part of the first century AD. Indeed, the use of *festīnus* in Sallust, in Augustan epic, and in Apuleius (where the word is extremely frequent) could in principle point to a lexical archaism. In terms of semantics, finally, it is conspicuous that in addition to plain attributive usage ('quick, rapid') with nouns, common for both *festīnus* and *festīnātus*, the well-attested quasi-adverbial use of *festīnus*[27] is not matched by *festīnātus*, except for the marked adverbial form *festīnātō* (which again does not occur before the elder Pliny). Thus, in view of the possibility that *festīnus* may be a perfectly well-formed and potentially old *-īnus* formation of the instrumental type, and despite the chronological distance between the first attestations of *festīnāre* and *festīnus*, there does not seem to be any great obstacle to the assumption that *festīnus* is actually the direct source of the simple denominative *festīnāre*.[28]

Note further that *nātīnārī* (assuming vowel length as notated, cf. §4.3.ii) could in principle have the same sort of explanation. Accepting the likely connection with *nāvus*, and with the conventional assumption that *nāvus* continues *(g)nāvus* and belongs with the root of *(g)nōscō* (thus recently Schrijver

---

[26] An uncompounded *opīnus* 'supposed, conjectural' is all but unattested (OLD cites only Val. Flacc. 6.548).

[27] E.g. Virg. *A.* 488-9 … *noctes festina diesque / urgebam,* and frequent in Apuleius.

[28] Again (§**5.**, first paragraph, ad fin.), even if one chooses in the end to view Lat. *festīnus* itself as actually post-verbal to *festīnāre,* the verb may still be derived from an earlier well-formed **festīno-,* itself eclipsed by the plethora of other Latin adjectives with similar meaning (e.g. *alacer, rapidus, celer, mātūrus, praeceps, properus, vēlōx*).

1991:298), one could begin with a well-formed *ti*-stem *$\hat{g}\eta h_3$-tí- > Lat. *(g)nāti-*, thus providing, incidentally, an indirect trace of the phonologically expected cognate matching Gk. γνῶσις 'knowledge' and the *jātí-* underlying RV *jñātí-* 'blood relative' (vs. Lat. *nōtiō,* with secondary full grade, as in *nōscō*). However it came about that *nāvus* ended up with its meaning 'energetic, industrious, busy' (as opposed to 'knowledgeable' or the like), it would be reasonable to suppose that this *nāti-*, which had the same vocalism, likewise meant something like 'busy-ness, energy, fuss'.[29] The noun *nāti-* could then have served as the basis for an instrumental adjective *nātīno-* (*'with energy' > 'taking/making trouble, fussy'), which might even survive, in substantivized form (cf. *coquīna,* §**1.**), in the gloss *natina* 'discordia' (perh. = 'troublemaking'). The adj. *nātīno-* (or its substantivized variant) then serves as the basis for the denominative *nātīnārī* (both 'be busy, take the trouble to do something' and 'be a busybody/instigator, make trouble'), if this is indeed the correct representation of the vowel length, and with etymological assumptions as indicated above.[30]

6. It is legitimate to wonder, in conclusion, how long paradigms like *legiō/*legiŏn,- *festiō/*festiŏn-* might actually have survived in Latin. It is possible, for example, that *homō/homin-* 'person' might continue an original alternation *homō/*homŏn-* (cf. dimin. *homunculus*), which would have provided at least some minimal support for the type *legiō/*legiŏn-.* But surely by the stage of vowel-weakening and contraction, whence *legiō/*legīn-* and *festiō/*festīn-,* all such support would have dropped away, leaving forms like *legiō/*legīn-* entirely *hors système*: no comparable alternation is to be found in any Latin *n*-stem, much less animate *n*-stems, where the prominent subtype derived via the "Hoffmann-

---

[29] The original root meaning survives in only a single *(g)nā-* form, i.e. *ignārus* 'ignorant, unaware'.

[30] Michael Weiss points out to me that an alternative etymology could be based on a comparison with OIr. *do·gní* 'makes, does' (OW *gnim* 'labor, toil'). If, as generally assumed, this ultimately belongs with *$\hat{g}enh_1$-* 'beget', the derivational process would be the same, beginning instead from a *ti*-stem *$\hat{g}\eta h_1$-tí- 'birth' > *(g)nāti-* *'production, effort' vel sim. (the seṭ ancestor, as it were, of secondarily aniṭ *genti-* [n. 3 above], replaced in the original meaning also by the extended *tiōn*-stem *nātiō*).

suffix" (*Nāsō/Nāsōnis* etc.) involves what appears, descriptively, to be a generalization of the long vowel of the nominative. There is thus very little reason to expect that alternations like **legiō/*legīn-* would have survived long enough to yield an archaic class of denominatives based on the weak stem (as opposed to the type *cōntiōnārī* etc., §**2.** above). If, then, alternations like **legiō/*legiŏn-* actually existed in some early stage of Latin (which is indeed a possibility), a denominative **festiŏnā(i̯e/o-)* would need to have been formed exceedingly early (i.e. before the stage of vowel-weakening), would need to have been formed on the basis of a **festiō* that is no longer attested, and would appear to be the only surviving item of this type. But the above analysis of *festīnāre,* together with the lack of evidence for *n*-stem-based denominatives of this sort provided by similar verbs, suggests that — despite the handbooks — there may be no trace of such denominative **-iŏnā(i̯e/o-)* forms in Latin at all. Instead, *festīnus* (or a similarly-formed predecessor) may provide a valuable new element in the derivational complex recently elucidated by Nussbaum (i.e. a "de-instrumental" Latin adj. in *-īno-,* beside the otherwise well-attested "de-genitival" type in *-īno-*), with the result that *festīnāre* (and all other such forms in Latin) can be taken as having been formed according to the ordinary denominative pattern of *coquīnāre <--- coquīnus* etc. (§**1.**).[31]

References

AHD^3: *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*^{3}
(Boston/New York, 1993).

Eichner, H. 1988-90. "Reklameiamben aus Roms Königszeit". *Spr.* 34.207-238.

Ernout-Meillet: A. E. and A. M., *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: Histoire des mots*^{4} (1959, repr. 1985), Paris.

Flobert, L. 1975. *Les verbes déponents latins des origines à Charlemagne.* Paris.

Goetz, G. 1885. "Glossographische Kleinigkeiten". *RhM* 40 (n.s.).324-328.

Ivanov, V. 1997. "Luwian collective and non-collective neutral nouns in -*ar*", in *Indo-European, Nostratic, and Beyond: Festschrift for Vitalij V. Shevoroshkin* (ed. I. Hegedűs, P. Michalove and A. Manaster Ramer), 155-167. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man (JIES Monograph No. 22).

Jasanoff, J. 1978. *Stative and Middle in Indo-European.*!Innsbruck: IBS.

Krogmann, W. 1936. "Alat. *einom*". *KZ* 63.123-132.

Leumann, M. 1977. *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*^{2}. Munich.

Livingston, I. 1997. *A Linguistic Commentary on Livius Andronicus.* Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.

Mignot, X. 1969. *Les verbes dénominatifs du latin.* Paris.

Nussbaum, A. 1994. "Five Latin verbs from a root **leik-*". *HSCP* 96.161-190.

-----. 1996. "Latin *acētum, acūtus, aurītus, avītus*: four of a kind?" Paper presented at the 15th East Coast Indo-European Conference (Yale University).

-----. 1998. "More on 'decasuative' nominal stems in IE". Paper presented at the 17th East Coast Indo-European Conference (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill).

Osthoff, H. 1895. "Griechische und lateinische Wortdeutungen, 3. *festīnāre, cōnfestim*; air. *bras,* cymr. *brys*". *IF* 5.291-293.

Petersmann, H. 1977. "Vom Altlatein zum Romanischen: eine lexikalische Studie zu zwei Slang-Ausdrücken bei Plautus", in *Latinität und alte Kirche: Festschrift für Rudolf Hanslik zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Bannert and J. Divjak), 205-214. Hermann Böhlaus Nachf.: Wien-Köln- Graz [Wiener Studien, Ztschr. f. klass. Phil. u. Patristik, Beiheft 8].

Reichler-Béguelin, M.-J. 1986. *Les noms latins du type* mēns: *Étude morphologique.* Brussels.

Rix, H. 1995. "Einige lateinische Präsensstammbildungen zu Seṭ-Würzeln", in W. Smoczyński (ed.), *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume, Part One* (Cracow), 399-408.

Schrijver, P. 1990. "Latin *festīnāre,* Welsh *brys*". *MSS* 51.243-247.

-----. 1991. *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin.* Amsterdam / Atlanta.

Skutsch, O. 1985. *The* Annals *of Quintus Ennius.* Oxford.

Thurneysen, R. 1879 / 1991. *Über Herkunft und Bildung der lateinischen Verba auf* -io *der dritten und vierten Conjugation und über ihr gegenseitiges Verhältniss* [repr. in *Gesammelte Schriften* 1.101-167].

Tremblay, X. 1996. "Zum suffixalen Ablaut o/e in der athematischen Deklination des Indogermanischen". *Spr.* 38.31-70.

Vine, B. 1999. "Latin **opiō* and *optāre*". To appear in a Festschrift.

Vineis, E. 1993. "Latino", in A. Ramat and P. Ramat (eds.), *Le lingue indoeuropee* (Bologna), 289-348.

Wachter, R. 1987. *Altlateinische Inschriften.* Bern / Frankfurt am Main / New York / Paris.

Walde-Hofmann: A. W. and J. B. H., *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (1938-1954), Heidelberg.

Watkins, C. 1987 / 1994. "Two Anatolian forms: Palaic *aškummāuwa-,* Cuneiform Luvian *wa-a-ar-ša*", in *Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday* (ed. G. Cardona and N. Zide; Tübingen), 399-404 [repr. in *Selected Writings* 1.309-314].

Weiss, M. 1993. *Studies in Italic Nominal Morphology.*!Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.

-----. 1996. review of A. Sihler, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin. AJP* 117.670-675.