

## NOTES ON LATIN NOUN FORMATION

### 1. *lūridus, lūtum*

*lūridus* denotes the pale colour of bile or of jaundice. The regularly formed noun which went with this was *lūrōr*. It seems reasonable not to divorce this stem from *lūtum*, a plant used for yellow dye. As LEW<sup>3</sup> 1.837 suggests, it seems also likely that an earlier \**lūros* was characterized more strongly as a colour name with the suffix seen in *lūridus* on the model of *lūidus* and its congeners from \*(s)lī-uo-.

*lūtum* is itself ambiguous but could plausibly be an ancient nomen instrumenti (cf. *Vesta*; Ériu 25, 1974, 259) \**loutom* (cf. *nūn-*: *nouem*). Thus we have two correct IE formations \**lōu-to-*, and \**lū-ro-* < \**luH-ró-*. The root here must be different from Pokorny's 1. *leu-* IEW 681. The alternation is reminiscent of λό(Ϝ)ω and λo(Ϝ)έ-σαι, λo(Ϝ)ε-τρον (GEW 2.139).

### 2. *lūstrum, mōnstrum*

There is no agreed account of *lūstrum* (LEW<sup>3</sup> 1.839, DÉLL<sup>3</sup> 661–2) or of *mōnstrum* (LEW<sup>3</sup> 2.110, DÉLL<sup>3</sup> 733–4), either for the base of the former or for the formation of both. Semantically both must be in origin nomina instrumenti, and *lūstrum* would be well explained as \**lou-s-tro-m* to *lauō* (cf. *februum* : *februārius*). It is true, as LEW<sup>3</sup> 1.839 claims, that \**louestrom* is phonologically unacceptable; cf. Glotta 59, 1981, 228–9. The trouble with such a reconstruction is the unexplained morphology, however, as well as the incorrect phonology.

If we assume archaic formations of the type of OPruss. *dalptan* 'chisel' and *hortus* < \**ghor-to-*, we arrive first at \**lou-to-* and \**mon-to-* 'a means of washing, purifying' and 'of reminding, warning'. As such formations became moribund in Latin, and easily confused with *-to-* participles (thus perhaps explaining the unsyn-copated *monitus*), \**lout-o-* and \**mont-o-* were segmented as thematically suffixed; then they were reinforced with the productive \**-tro-m*. Thus \**lout+tro-/mont+tro-* → \**loussro-/monssro-*. These then simplified the geminate *-ss-* by rule and developed an intrusive *-t-*: \**loustro-*, \**monstro-*<sup>1</sup>).

University of Chicago

Eric P. Hamp

---

1) Cf. with root- or stem-final dental, *claustra* neut.pl.: *claudō, rāstrum* < \**rāssrom* : *rādō*, on which see Niedermann *Phonétique historique* (1945) 219 f., whose account is more precise than that of Sommer *Handbuch* 241. It is not essential – *pace* Niedermann – that the *t* develop before \**ss* simplified to *s*. What is essential is that \**ss* was distinctive in relation to \**s* before \**r* at the time when \**sr* began to move towards *-br-*; on the last, see E. P. Hamp, *Glotta* 50, 1972, 290–1.

The distinctive behaviour of \**ss* and \**s* in clusters is confirmed by \**kert-snā* > \**kerssna* (cf. Osc. *kerssnais*) > \**kes(s)na* > *cesna* (Festus) > *cēna*, versus Skt. *pāṛṣṇī-*, Goth. *fairzna* : \**persna* > *perna*. See Sommer's excellent account *Handbuch* 253, 260.

Leumann's account, *Lat. Gr.* (1977) 197 § 198 (b), whereby *-str-* would be the direct continuation of \**t-tr* → \**tstr* > \**sstr*, seems to me inherently less likely