

LEIDEN UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

*“Medēlae mūtantur”*

An Inquiry into the Formal and Functional  
Development of the Latin Nominal Suffix *-ēla*

ResMA Linguistics thesis

by

Xander Vertegaal

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment  
Of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts

July, 2015

Supervisor: dr. L.C. van Beek  
Study program: Research Master Linguistics  
Specialisation: Comparative Indo-European Linguistics



## *Amīcīs meīs*

(Sextus Caecilius, a jurist, discusses the Laws of the Twelve Tables with his friend, the philosopher Favorinus.)

*“Non enim profecto ignoras legum oportunitates et **medelas pro temporum moribus** et pro rerum publicarum generibus ac pro utilitatum praesentium rationibus proque vitiorum, quibus medendum est, fervoribus **mutari atque flecti** neque uno statu consistere”*

(Aulus Gellius [2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE], *Noctes Atticae* 20.1.22)

“For surely you are not unaware that **according to the manners** of the times, the conditions of governments, considerations of immediate utility, and the vehemence of the vices which are to be remedied, the advantages and **remedies** offered by the laws **are often changed and modified**, and do not stay in the same condition” (transl. J. Rolfe)

## Table of Contents

Preface and Introduction . . . . .	6
Abbreviations . . . . .	8
 Chapter one . . . . .	 9
§1.1 Formal considerations . . . . .	9
§1.1.1 Spelling vacillation . . . . .	9
§1.1.1.1 Dictionaries. . . . .	10
§1.1.1.2 Classical authors . . . . .	10
§1.1.1.3 Allophony & free variation . . . . .	11
§1.1.1.4 Suffixwechsel . . . . .	14
§1.1.1.5 Phonetic development . . . . .	16
§1.1.2 Etymology . . . . .	17
§1.1.2.1 Indo-European suffix . . . . .	17
§1.1.2.2 Inner-Latin reanalysis . . . . .	22
§1.2 Semantic considerations . . . . .	23
§1.3 Conclusion . . . . .	26
 Chapter two . . . . .	 29
§2.1 Description of data set. . . . .	29
§2.2 Justification of forms . . . . .	31
§2.3 Discussion and classification . . . . .	33
§2.3.1 Spelling variation . . . . .	34
§2.3.2 Morphological base . . . . .	36
§2.3.3 Other subgroupings: authors, genres . . . . .	38
§2.4 Semantics . . . . .	42
§2.5 Conclusion . . . . .	44
 Chapter three. . . . .	 47
§3.1 Setting up a Latin archetype . . . . .	47
§3.1.1 Spelling . . . . .	47
§3.1.2 Morphological base . . . . .	51

§3.1.3 Semantics . . . . .	54
§3.1.4 Conclusion . . . . .	55
§3.2 Competing suffixes/derivational processes . . . . .	56
§3.2.1. Suffix <i>-tiō</i> . . . . .	56
§3.2.2 Suffix <i>-entia</i> . . . . .	58
§3.2.3 Suffix <i>-mōnia</i> . . . . .	59
§3.2.4 Miscellaneous. . . . .	61
§3.2.5 Summary . . . . .	62
§3.3 Etymology . . . . .	65
§3.3.1 Italic cognates . . . . .	65
§3.3.2 Indo-European cognates: Greek . . . . .	65
§3.3.3 Reconstructing <i>-ēla</i> 's PIE ancestor . . . . .	68
§3.3.3.1 Greek <i>δοτήρ/δώτωρ</i> and their inflection. . . . .	68
§3.3.3.2 Root vocalism and semantics . . . . .	71
§3.3.4 Summary . . . . .	72
Conclusion . . . . .	74
Appendix . . . . .	76
Works Cited . . . . .	84

## Preface and Introduction

Present-day English makes use of several nouns whose origins can be traced back, either as early loanwords or via Old French, to Latin words ending with the suffix *-ēla*. Some of these nouns are quite common, such as 'candle' (< Lat. *candēla* 'id.')

 and 'sequel' (< *sequēla* 'id.'); others, such as 'quarrel' (< *querēla* 'complaint'), 'tutelage' (< *tūtēla* 'care, custody') and 'clientele' (< *clientēla* 'id.') are found less often. In Latin, formations with the suffix *-ēla* were decidedly not very common, which is probably the reason why this suffix has received but little attention in scholarly literature, although it holds more than one unsolved mystery. Not only are its etymology and historical development unknown and is it found spelled in two distinct ways (*-ēla* and *-ella*) throughout Latinity, but it was also added to nominal stems as well as verbal stems, which cannot have been the original situation. Additionally, in light of *-ēla*'s limited synchronic productivity, it is remarkable that it was not replaced by other, more popular suffixes. New formations with *-ēla* are sporadically formed throughout Latinity.

The present study aims to provide a history of Latin *-ēla*, presenting both an account of *-ēla*'s synchronic features and peculiarities as they appear from the texts transmitted to us, as well as possible explanations for these phenomena. To achieve this goal, six secondary questions (listed below) have been formulated which will be answered in the course of three chapters. The first chapter, at the outset of our inquiry, lists analyses of *-ēla*'s spelling, semantics and etymology given by classical and modern scholars. Difficulties with these existing theories will be noted, thereby establishing the place of this research in present-day scholarship on *-ēla*. Then, in the second chapter, the first three secondary questions will be answered. They are descriptive in nature and explore various facets of *-ēla* as they appear from our material; by answering them we will acquire deeper insight into *-ēla*'s form, function and distribution throughout Latinity. The resulting overview of *-ēla*'s inner-Latin history and development will then serve as a starting point for the third chapter, in which an attempt is made to explain the features and changes of *-ēla*'s form and function, and to conjecturally trace back *-ēla*'s origins to Proto-Italic and even Proto-Indo-European. The end result of this thesis is a chronological account, following *-ēla*'s (possible) origins from Proto-Indo-European times to and throughout Latinity. Although the data set containing an overview of all attestations of *-ēla* in Latin up until 735 CE is not properly introduced before the second chapter, the reader is recommended to take a quick glance through the Appendix to familiarise him- or herself with the material before assessing the views of previous scholarship in the first chapter.

I am perfectly aware of the fact that a study on a suffix which makes up a mere 0.016% of our total (classical) Latin corpus is highly unlikely to lead to ground-breaking conclusions which radically alter our view on Latin itself - this has never been my central aim. Rather, my goal while writing this thesis has been to apply the methodology and mode of reasoning which I admire greatly in Alan Nussbaum's article on Latin *-idus* (1999) and Ivy J. Livingston's treatment of Latin *Monēta* (1997: 27-37), in order to present a thoroughly supported, perspicuous and acceptable solution to this unsolved problem of Latin historical linguistics.

Central question:        **“What is the formal and functional development of the Latin nominal suffix *-ēla*?”**

Secondary questions:

- Descriptive
  1. To what extent are *-ēla* and its variant *-ella* found throughout Latinity?
  2. What are the morphological bases to which *-ēla* was added?
  3. What semantic value(s) does *-ēla* possess?
- Interpretative
  4. Do the oldest/most isolated instances of *-ēla*/*-ella* point to a single oldest spelling, a single morphological base and a single meaning? (“Latin archetype”)
  5. Can we explain *-ēla*'s limited synchronic productivity and extensive diachronic productivity by analysing its competition with other suffixes?
  6. What is *-ēla*'s etymology?

I am indebted to prof. dr. Alexander Lubotsky, dr. Alwin Kloekhorst and dr. Lucien van Beek for introducing me into the field of Comparative Indo-European Linguistics and for acquainting me with its methods and achievements. Additionally I am very grateful to dr. Lucien van Beek, my thesis supervisor, without whose helpful contributions and constructive criticism the quality of thesis would not have nearly been as high. Our discussions have been interesting as well as delightful, and the insights gathered from them resonate through many of these lines. On a more personal level I wish to express my profound gratitude to my close friends Arjan Cuppen, Harry Basten and Timo de Jong, who supported me during the long and difficult months in which this thesis was committed to paper, and to whom I gladly and wholeheartedly dedicate this humble booklet.

Leiden, June 2015

## Abbreviations

Alb.	Albanian
CGL	<i>Corpus Grammaticorum Latinorum</i> . Ed. Alessandro Garcea. Université Paris Diderot. [ <a href="http://kaali.linguist.jussieu.fr/CGL/index.jsp">http://kaali.linguist.jussieu.fr/CGL/index.jsp</a> ]
EDHIL	Alwin Kloekhorst, <i>Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon</i> (2008)
FG	Full grade (ablaut)
GL	Heinrich Keil, <i>Grammatici Latini</i> (1855-80)
Gr.	Greek
HetKonk	<i>HetKonk (Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln)</i> . Ed. Silvin Košak. Universität Würzburg. [ <a href="http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/">http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/</a> ]
Hitt.	Hittite
Lat.	Latin
LG	Lengthened grade (ablaut)
LLT-A	<i>Library of Latin Texts - Series A</i> . Brepols Publishers. [ <a href="http://apps.brepolis.net/BrepolisPortal/default.aspx">http://apps.brepolis.net/BrepolisPortal/default.aspx</a> ]
LSJ	Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott & Henry Stuart Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . Ed. Maria Pantelia. <i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae</i> . [ <a href="http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/lsg/">http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/lsg/</a> ]
MoEng.	Modern English
OFr.	Old French
OLD	P.G.W. Glare, <i>Oxford Latin Dictionary</i> (1982)
OHCGL	Michael Weiss, <i>Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin</i> (2009)
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
PIt.	Proto-Italic
PGr.	Proto-Greek
PLat.	Proto-Latin
Skt.	Sanskrit
Ved.	Vedic Sanskrit
WH	Alois Walde & Johann Baptist Hofmann, <i>Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch</i> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> ed. (1938-1956)
ZG	Zero grade (ablaut)



## Chapter one

The present chapter contains an overview of the most important scholarly literature written on different facets of *-ēla*. There are but few in-depth treatments in existence for the reason that *-ēla* is often set aside as merely a minor suffix whose etymology and further analysis are unknown. I have not been able to find a synopsis of all attested *-ēla* formations in the secondary literature; often we only find mention of the best known examples (such as *querēla* 'complaint' and *tūtēla* 'guardianship, protection').

This chapter is split up in two parts. In the first part scholarly opinions regarding *-ēla*'s formal characteristics and etymology will be explored. The second part is less extensive and will treat *-ēla*'s semantic properties. Wherever appropriate, I will comment on the theories and explanations put forward, evaluating their strengths and weaknesses.

### §1.1 Formal considerations

#### §1.1.1 Spelling vacillation

One of *-ēla*'s most conspicuous properties is that it is not found spelled consistently in our modern text editions, where we find both *-ēla* and its variant *-ella*. However, not every word composed with *-ēla/-ella* always shows both spellings.<sup>1</sup> An exhaustive list of attestations will be given in the next chapter, but a few examples are presented here to illustrate this curiosity. *Clientēla* 'clientship, body of clients' is spelled consistently as such throughout classical antiquity and Late Antiquity up until 500 CE. Only thereafter do we occasionally find *clientella*. By contrast, *querella* is only slightly less dominant than *querēla* in classical antiquity (up until 200 CE), as we find 195 examples of *querēla* (in various cases) next to 186 attestations of *querella*.<sup>2</sup> In the case of *loquēla* 'speech' the distribution is very even. We find *loquella* 104 times in the period 200 – 500 CE, with *loquēla* not far behind with 101 attestations. One may ask whether the split between *-ēla/-ella-* is a matter of orthographical variation (both sequences representing the same pronunciation) or that it must indicate an actual phonetic difference, in which the last part of *custōdēla* 'custody', *clientēla*, and *suādēla* 'persuasion' was pronounced differently than that of *loquella*, *querella*, *sequella* 'follower, consequence'. As we will see below, scholars do not agree on how to answer this question.

---

1 For convenience I will generally write *-ēla* to denote both spellings, regardless of whether the actual attestations of the words in question favour one or the other.

2 We also find *quaerēla* (twice in the period 500-753 CE) and *quaerella* (24 times in post-classical times). A thorough investigation into the *e ~ ae* vacillation (though interesting) falls beyond the scope of this thesis and is not particularly relevant for the *-ēla/-ella* vacillation studied here.

### §1.1.1.1 Dictionaries

The major dictionaries do not adhere more importance to a single spelling as being more historically “correct” than the other. The OLD, for example, lists *querēla* as “*querēla* ~*ae*, f. *querella*. [QUEROR + -ELA]” (s.v.). Other lemmata are presented in different styles: e.g. *fugēla* ‘flight’ (“*fugēl(l)a* ~*ae*, f. [FVGIO + -ELA]”) and *sequēla* (“*sequella* (-*ēla*) ~*ae*, f. [SEQVOR + -ELA]”), where the spelling *-ēla* is put between parentheses. While it is possible that the lack of uniformity in presenting these lemmata reflects a certain preference for a certain mode of spelling, it is also envisionable that it is due to inadvertence by the authors of the OLD.

On the other hand, Lewis and Short's *A Latin Dictionary* occasionally does show a preference for a particular spelling. *Loquella*, whose attestations we have seen are nearly as commonly found as those of *loquēla*, is marked as “incorrectly written” (s.v.). Similarly *medella* ‘treatment, cure’ is confined to a parenthetical remark while it is not much less used than *medēla* in classical antiquity and even supersedes it after 200 CE. Michiel de Vaan's *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages* (2008) generally follows the spelling used by the OLD.

### §1.1.1.2 Classical authors

Interestingly, while the interpretation of the spelling variation *-ēla/-ella* is still an apple of discord for dictionaries and modern scholars, ancient grammarians were quite agreed on *-ēla* being the correct spelling. A small treatise titled *De Orthographia* from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century CE, attributed to a certain Caper, mentions: “*querela loquela per unum l*” (GL 7.96) (“*querela* [and] *loquela* [should be written] with a single *l*.”) Two centuries later Marius Victorinus (4<sup>th</sup> c. CE) writes: “*camelus vero et loquela et querela et suadela et tutela uno l scribenda sunt, ut uno r narat, narus.*” (*Ars* 80) (“But *camelus* ('camel') *loquela*, *querela*, *suadela* and *tutela* should be written with one *l*, just as *narat* and *narus* should, with one *r*.”)<sup>3</sup> Beda Venerabilis (*De Orthographia* 45) and Alcuin (*De Orthographia* 26), both from the 8<sup>th</sup> century CE, give the same instructions, making no mention of any other possible correct spelling. That the geminate variants were at least present in the 6<sup>th</sup> century CE (and probably also even earlier than that), is confirmed by Cassiodorus, whose *De Orthographia* testifies:

---

3 “*Narat*” and “*narus*” here are more commonly found as *narrō* ‘to relate, to tell’ and *gnārus* ‘experienced, adept’ (< PIE \**ǵneh<sub>3</sub>*) in modern dictionaries. On the spelling variability in *narrō/nārō*, see Weiss (2010), where it is presented as an extension of the “Iuppiter rule” (also known as the “Littera rule”). This rule describes cases in which the Latin long vowels *ī* and *ū* (< PIE diphthongs \**ei* and \**ou*) before a single consonant are often found spelled with short *i* or *u* followed by a geminate consonant. (OHCGL 144)

*“querella apud antiquos per unum l scribebatur, sicut suadela tutela candela corruptela, quamvis usus sibi etiam apud eos vindicaret ut aliqua in figura deminutivorum per duo l scriberentur, ut capella fabella tabella. nunc autem etiam querella per duo l scribitur.”* (GL 7.159,4)

*“Querella was written with one l by ancient writers, similar to suadela, tutela, candela, corruptela ('corruption'), although the language usage (“usus”) that some [words] were written with two l's in the form/model of the diminutives, such as capella ('kid' < caper 'goat'), fabella ('anecdote' < fabula 'talk, conversation'), tabella ('tablet' < tabula 'plank, table'), gained ground even in their times. Today, querella is written with two l's as well.”* (own transl.)

While Pseudo-Caper, Marius Victorinus, Beda Venerabilis and Alquin were all concerned with the question how one *should* write *querēla/querella*, Cassiodorus' remarks are of great value for their description of the actual spelling usage in his time, i.e. how *ēla*-formations *were* in fact written. He exemplifies his claim that several (*'aliqua'*) words were written with two *l*'s by ancient writers with *querella*. This corresponds nicely to the fact that *querella* is by far the most often found *-ella* spelling in classical literary Latin, as we will see in section 2.3.1.

It is to be expected that Cassiodorus' statements regarding the spelling of ancient writers are based on earlier and less corrupt manuscripts than the ones we possess now, which makes it less likely that the spelling vacillation we encounter in our manuscripts is entirely due to recent transmissional corruption or editorial choices. Cassiodorus' statement that the geminate spelling *-ella* was used in the shape/model of the diminutives (*'in figura deminutivorum'*) can be interpreted in two ways. If *figura* is taken simply as 'form, shape', then Cassiodorus simply draws attention to the formal similarities between *-ella* spelled variants of *-ēla* on the one hand and the diminutive suffix *-ella* on the other. Alternatively, if *figura* is interpreted as 'model', then this could be taken as an attempt at designating an origin for the spelling vacillation Cassiodorus identifies.

### **§1.1.1.3 Allophony & free variation (Lachmann & Heraeus)**

Regarding the *-ēla/-ella* variation, two scholars still frequently mentioned in contemporary secondary literature are Karl Lachmann and Wilhelm Heraeus. They have conflicting opinions about how to interpret this particular spelling variation.

Lachmann's commentary to Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* (1850) contains a lengthy discussion (written entirely in Latin) on whether to prefer *luēla* or *luella* 'expiation, atonement' (from *luō* 'to make amends') at the end of line 1015 in the third book. Lachmann replaces *luēla* found in the manuscripts by *luella* ("rectius scribitur" [204]).<sup>4</sup> In his view, we should emend to *-ēla* when a long (or heavy) syllable precedes it, and vice versa *-ella* should be read whenever it follows a short (or light) syllable.<sup>5</sup> Lachmann does not elaborate much on his reasons to assume such a split. He argues that he bases himself on "those books from which the common orthography ("*orthographia vulgaris*") can be learned best" (ibid.), subsequently mentioning several specific manuscripts which apparently conform to the spelling dichotomy presented above.<sup>6</sup>

Lachmann apparently sees a systematic original distribution here, the use of either spelling variant being governed by the quantity of the preceding syllable.<sup>7</sup> He might have thought of a phonetic development, by which the pronunciation of *-ēla* became markedly different from that of *-ella* under the influence of the previous syllable. Presumably this would make *-ēla* and *-ella* automatic allomorphs or combinational variants of each other. Their difference in orthography and pronunciation was automatic at one point and this did not lead speakers to view them as distinct formations.

It is difficult, however, to imagine how and why older *\*custōdella* would become *custōdēla* or, vice versa, why *loquēla* would become *loquella* (Lachmann does not mention which variant he deems the oldest). In both cases the word accent lies on the penultimate, which means that the split could not have been due an accent shift as in the *mamilla*-rule.<sup>8</sup>

Furthermore, Lachmann does not explain why the strict distinction he observes is so frequently broken, as in the case of *querēla/querella*. As will be shown in the second chapter of this thesis, a search query in a corpus of literary Latin texts from classical times alone yields

---

4 This *lectiō* has been taken over in E.J. Kenney's edition of book three of *De Rerum Natura*, and he refers to Lachmann in his commentary. (2014: 216)

5 "*Itaque l simplici scribuntur in quibus e litteram longa syllaba praecedit, ut custodela clientela suadela candela sutela cautela tutela corruptela mandatela (...) l geminatur ubi prima brevis est (...) ut loquellam querellam sequellam; ergo luellam, quem admodum fugella bene scriptum est (...)*" (ibid.)

6 Specifically, these are the *Codex Mediceus* (5<sup>th</sup> c. CE) containing works by Vergil, Gaius' *Institutiones* (preserved on a palimpsest from the 5<sup>th</sup> c. century CE), the *Codex Fuldensis* (6<sup>th</sup> c. CE), which is a New Testament manuscript, and the *Littera Florentina* (6<sup>th</sup> c. CE) containing parts of Justinian's *Digesta*.

7 Free variation between both spellings is unlikely in a language in which vowel length and gemination are phonologically relevant.

8 The *mamilla*-rule postulates that geminates are simplified if the accent shifts from the syllable directly preceding the geminate to the one following it. The example after which the rule was named, is *mamma* 'breast', which in diminutive form is *mamilla* 'nipple' (with single *m*) after a pre-stage < *\*mammilla*. Cf. OHGCL for further explanation and more examples. (156-7)

no less than 195 'violations' (*querēla*) against Lachmann's rule.<sup>9</sup> Similarly, Lachmann's allophonical explanation runs into trouble with evidence put forward by Stefan Schaffner (see below, section 1.1.1.4), who adduces data from the Romance languages. Since the Romance languages seem to continue both *candēla* 'candle, light' and *candella*, he argues, these two forms must have coexisted at some point, which should not have happened in Lachmann's scenario. We will explore in the next chapter how well this dichotomy is supported by the actual Latin data.

Wilhelm Heraeus is also still mentioned in contemporary literature, although his treatment of *-ēla* does not extend beyond a few lines. He proposes a sort of compromise between *-ēla* and *-ella*, stating that “[*q*]uerēlla war jedenfalls die Aussprache der klassischen Zeit, wie auch die Schreibung, nicht wesentlich anders klingend als *querēla* (...)” (1906: 402). According to Heraeus, all cases of *querēla* as well as *querella* should be read *querēlla*, with a long *ē* and a geminate.<sup>10</sup> It is indeed difficult to ascertain whether the vowel in *-ella* before a geminate is long or not.<sup>11</sup> We will return to this question in Chapter three (section 3.1.1).

In any case, Heraeus' claim that *querēla* and *querēlla* would not be pronounced very differently should be treated with appropriate caution. Latin is a language in which the distinction between geminates and singletons is phonologically and phonetically relevant. Generally, this distinction is very consistently represented in the spelling of Latin words, and replacing a geminate with a singleton (either in pronunciation or writing) will sometimes change the meaning of a word entirely. An example of this is *pallam* (accusative singular of *palla* 'mantle') which is opposed to *palam* (adv.) 'publicly'. It would therefore be unexpected to see that writers could freely choose between *-l-* or *-ll-*. Additionally there appear to be certain *ēla*-formations which are nearly consistently spelled with either *-ēla* or *-ella*, such as *candēla* and *clientēla*, of which *-ella* spellings are non-existent or occur only in Late Antiquity. In Heraeus' scenario of free scribal variation it is difficult to justify such seemingly systematic choices for a single spelling.

9 For a full introduction and description of the corpus used, see section 2.1.

10 Although cases of long vowels before geminate consonants are rare in Latin, there does not seem to be a phonotactic constraint barring this sequence, as exemplified by *stēlla* 'star' and *corōlla* 'circlet'.

11 Metrical passages are of no help in determining whether we should read *-ella* or *-ēlla*, since both sequences would be scanned trochaically. Also, while the rules of Latin weakening surely indicate that the *-ē-* in *-ēla* is long (since short *-ĕ-* would probably weaken to *-u-* in front of *l pinguis*), they are non-probative in the case of *-ella*, as weakened *-ĕ-* before *l exilis* remains *-ĕ-*. For more details cf. OHCGL 117.

#### §1.1.1.4 Suffixwechsel (Leumann & Schaffner)

Manu Leumann's *Lateinische Grammatik* (1977), containing an in-depth treatment of most, if not all, suffixes involved in Latin nominal word formation, also has a section devoted to *-ēla/-ella*. Regarding the *-ēla/-ella* "Wechsel", Leumann writes the following: "Die römischen Grammatiker vermischten dieses nicht mehr produktive *-ēla* orthographisch mit dem *-ella* der Deminutiva (...); aber für die rein deverbativen wie *querēla* fehlt natürlich das Grundwort (*\*quera* oder *\*querula*) eines eventuellen *-ella*-Deminutivums." (312) He thus envisions a confusion of two different suffixes: the deverbative/denominative *-ēla/-ella* we have been investigating thus far as well as the *-ellus/-ella/-ellum* diminutive suffix.<sup>12</sup> The latter is generally analysed as a conditioned variant of the more common *\*-elo-*, which yields *-ulus*, *-a*, *-um* in Latin, as in *digitus* 'finger' > *digitulus* 'little finger'. When *\*-elo-* follows a nominal stem ending in a resonant, the *-e-* in between the two resonants is syncopated, after which the effects of assimilation and weakening take place. The word *ocellus* '(lit.) little eye', for example, derives from < PLat. *\*ok<sup>w</sup>el-(e)los*, which in turn comes from the nomen instrumenti Plt. *\*ok<sup>w</sup>-(e)los*, attested in *oculus* 'eye'. Similarly *patella* 'dish' < *\*paterla* < PLat. *\*pater-(e)la-* from *patera* 'broad bowl' (Pl.+ ) (related to *pateō* 'to be open'). Leumann rightly argues against this hypothesis that of many *-ēla/-ella* abstract formations which show both variants, the expected base form for such secondary *ellus*-diminutives is not attested. As we will see in the next chapter, *querēla* and *querella* are both attested quite well in classical antiquity (195 times *-ēla*; 186 times *-ella*). Consequently, this word would seem to be an example showing the effects of Leumann's suffix confusion par excellence. There is, however, no substantive *\*\*quera* or *\*\*querula* attested from which an *-ella* diminutive could have been created, and *querēla* is the only productive *ēla*-abstract whose base stem ends with a resonant.<sup>13</sup> Leumann therefore cannot conclude that there has been a direct confusion of liquid stem diminutives and their counterpart liquid stem *ēla*-formations. Rather he must assume analogy to have taken place (be it on the part of only the grammarians or also literary authors) by which abstract-forming *-ēla* was influenced *as a class* by diminutive *-ella*. It is difficult to find evidence favouring or contradicting such a claim. However, two notions are to be kept in mind while judging Leumann's theory.

---

12 I find it hard to understand why Leumann restricts the confusion of *-ēla* and *-ella* to the Roman grammarians ("Grammatiker"). As we will see in Chapter two (and the Appendix), both variants are well attested in many literary authors, sometimes even within the same text.

13 The other *ēla*-formations with a stem ending in a resonant are *monēla* 'admonition' (occurring thrice in Tertullian [2<sup>nd</sup> - 3<sup>rd</sup> c. CE] and Lucifer Calaritanus [4<sup>th</sup> c. CE]) and *cantilēna* 'little song, ditty' (presumably dissimilated from *\*cantilēla*, from *cantilāre*, cf. Leumann [1977]: 312), if this form belongs here at all. The evidence for and against treating this word as veritable *ēla*-formations will be presented in section 2.2.

Firstly the same warning applies here as with the geminate/singleton distinction touched upon in the previous section. Latin had a phonologically relevant distinction between different vowel quantities; a well-known example of this is *mālum* 'apple' next to *malum* 'evil'. For that reason one would not expect speakers to simply start using *-e-* and *-ē-* interchangeably. At the same time, however, speakers must apparently have been able to connect *querēla* to *querella*, since both variants are essentially the same lexical unit with the same semantic content.<sup>14</sup> Secondly, while *ella*-diminutives and *ēla*-abstracts might be formally similar, they do not have the same semantics. Denominal diminutives are something quite different from deverbal and denominal abstracts, and it is plausible that speakers of Latin were able to tell the difference and distinguish *-ēla* as an abstract suffix from diminutive *-ella*. These two points do not disqualify Leumann's theory, but rather challenge why abstract *-ēla* would have been influenced by *-ella* merely on the basis of phonetic similarity.

In an article from 2006, Stefan Schaffner analyses the Latin word pair *mūstēla*/*mūstella* 'weasel', which shows the same spelling vacillation as our *ēla*-abstracts. Schaffner is careful to equate the variation in both types for the reason that it is doubtful that *mūstēla* belongs in the same category of denominal abstracts as *clientēla*, *corruptēla*, *parentēla* et cetera due to the absence of a nominal base *\*mūst-* on which *mūstēla* could have been built. He nevertheless wonders for both categories whether “es sich bei dem Nebeneinander von Formen auf *-ēla* und *-ella* in der kodikalen Überlieferung um rein graphische Variationen oder um eine tatsächliche, sprachwirkliche Koexistenz beider Formen handelt, die die kodikale Überlieferung reflektiert.” (7) In the case of *mūstēla* he argues for the latter on the basis of evidence from the Romance languages, which seem to continue both the geminate and the singleton variant. Interestingly, Schaffner mentions that the same is true for *candēla* 'candle, light', which is continued as such in It. *candēla*, OFr. *chandoile*, Sp. *candela*, Port. *candeia* etc. while preserved as *candella* in MoFr. *chandelle*. (Schaffner 8, with literature)

Since *candēla* most probably belongs to our *ēla*-abstracts and – according to Leumann – is even one of the oldest instances (cf. section [1.1.2.2]), one may wonder whether word pairs similar to Schaffner's *chandoile* ~ *chandelle* can be found in the Romance languages. These could support the theory that both variants coexisted in Old Latin. Indeed, Georg Cohn (1891) mentions Old French *chandelle*, *querelle*, *tutelle*, *sequelle*, *clientelle*, and *curatelle* which could

---

<sup>14</sup> Assuming here that the vacillation indeed represents two phonetically different pronunciations co-existing in antiquity.

very well continue a Latin pre-form with geminate *-ella*. (217-9) However, corresponding forms continuing *-ēla* are not as easy to find. Cohn rightfully argues that OFr. *cautéle*, *clientèle*, *loquèle* and *parentèle* are in fact late borrowings from Latin. Although these forms appear to be direct continuants of Latin *ēla*-spelled *cautēla*, *clientēla*, *loquēla* and *parentēla*, their ending *-èle* is not the expected Old French outcome of inherited *-ēla*. Latin long stressed *-ē-* undergoes an early development into *-ei-* before transforming further into *-oi-* around the 12<sup>th</sup> century CE. Examples are MoFr. *avoir* 'to have' < Early OFr. *aveir* < Lat. *habēre* and MoFr. *toile* 'web, canvas' < Early OFr. *teile* < Lat. *tēla*. (Kibler 1984: 124-5) *Cautéle*, *clientèle* etc. must therefore be (perhaps even post-12<sup>th</sup> century) borrowings from Latin and consequently cannot be taken as evidence of the coexistence of *-ēla* and *-ella* in classical or Late Antiquity. Only Schaffner's *chandoile* ~ *chandelle* is informative in this respect.

Schaffner comments further: "Das sprachwirkliche Nebeneinander von Formen auf *-ēla* und *-ella*, wie sie durch das Romanische reflektiert ist, beruht auf ursprünglichem Suffixwechsel bzw. Suffixtausch im Lateinischen (...) Bei den lateinischen Suffixen *-ēla* und *-ella* dürfte die Möglichkeit des Suffixwechsels rein formal durch ihre lautliche Ähnlichkeit bedingt gewesen sein" (8-9). In this manner he subscribes to Leumann's theory about the influence of diminutive *-ella* and follows him in denoting the forms in *-ēla* as the older variant.

#### §1.1.1.5 Phonetic development (Cohn)

Georg Cohn (1891) opposes the idea of 'Suffixwechsel' as advocated later by Leumann and Schaffner. He objects: "Das bloße Anklingen des Suffixes *-ēl-* an das Suffix *-ell-* – und mag das letztere im Vulgärlatein. auch noch so fruchtbar geworden sein – würde, weil es zu lose gewesen ist, zu dem Ersatze des ersteren Suffixes durch das letztere nicht geführt haben können, wenn nicht noch eine Triebfeder hinzugekommen wäre, und diese hat gefehlt." (212) In Cohn's view, phonetic similarity is not sufficient to cause confusion between two suffixes which are semantically so very different. Instead he follows Wilhelm Corssen (1858), who explains the *-ella* forms by a 'mechanical' phonetic development, by which the pronunciation of *-l-* was sharpened: "bloß durch geschärfte Aussprache des *l* ist *ll* in einigen Nominalformen, die das Suffix *-ē-la* aufweisen, entstanden." (226) Cohn lastly comments that long *-ē-* should probably be read in *-ella-* along the same lines as Heraeus (see above).

While Cohn is certainly right in stating that merely the phonetic similarity between *-ēla* abstracts and *-ella* diminutives is not enough to warrant a spelling confusion, the phonetic



development he and Corsen propose here is untenable. If *-ella* is truly the result of phonetic change, we would expect this change to be exceptionless, provided that we stick to the basic tenets of the Neogrammarians. There are several counter-examples to Cohn's and Corsen's theory: cases of *-ēl-* or *-ēla* which do not show the alternation we find in our abstracts. One such example is *tēla*, the nominative-accusative plural of *tēlum* 'projectile'. Never in Latinity do we find the *\*\*tella* as its variant. We will again refer to Cohn's rejection of a confusion with diminutive *-ella* in Chapter three, section 3.1.1.

### §1.1.2 Etymology

Over the course of time several etymologies have been proposed for Latin *-ēla*. Lucie Pultrová presents a recent overview of the main suggestions still relevant today without subscribing to any of them (2011: 111-2). Two theories in particular are still frequently repeated in scholarly literature. First, there are Émile Benveniste and Elisabeth Rieken, who believe that *-ēla* is of Indo-European stock, and secondly there is Manu Leumann, who argues that *-ēla* is rather the result of an inner-Latin reanalysis.

#### §1.1.2.1 Indo-European suffix (Benveniste, Rieken)

Émile Benveniste's (1935) *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen* mentions Latin formations with *-ēla* in a chapter on Indo-European *\*-l-*formations in general. He connects the *ēla*-suffix of Lat. *querēla* and *loquēla* to the Hittite suffix *-ēl*. This is found in *šūēl* 'thread' and *ḫurkēl*, which Benveniste translates as 'capital punishment' ("peine de mort") and derives from the verb *ḫark<sup>zi</sup>* 'to die' (42).<sup>15</sup> He believes that the Latin forms represent feminisations of an older suffix *\*-ēl* which, on the basis of its occurrence in both Hittite and Latin, must be as old as Proto-Indo-European (ibid.). Benveniste subsequently adduces other Latin nominal forms containing *\*-ēl* to corroborate this claim: *contumēlia* 'insult, insulting language' would be built on supposed *\*con-tum-ēl*, proposedly "gonflement, insolence", while *crūdēlis* 'cruel' has been secondarily created from *\*crūd-ēl*, which is either a substantive ("cruauté") or an adjective ("cruel"). Later, when *\*-ēlis* was no longer understood as *\*-ēl-is* but as a single appurtenance suffix ("simple suffixe d'appartenance" [ibid.]), other adjectives in *-ēlis* such as *patruēlis* 'belonging to a paternal uncle' and *carduēlis* 'goldfinch' were created directly from the thematic substantives *patruus* 'paternal uncle' and *carduus* 'thistle, cardoon', respectively.

<sup>15</sup> This etymology and meaning have been abandoned, however. As Alwin Kloekhorst puts it: "The word refers to sexual offences like incest and bestiality, and may therefore be translated 'perversity'." (EDHIL, s.v. "ḫurkil-")

To strengthen the connection between the Latin and Hittite *ēl*-forms, Benveniste lastly treats Latin nouns in *-tēla* (*tūtēla*, *cautēla*, *corruptēla* and *sūtēla*) as morphologically cognate to Hittite nouns in *-zel/zēl*: “*tayazēl* “vol” (de *taya*- “voler”)” and “*šarnikzēl* “compensation” (de *šarni(n)k*- “compenser, dédommager”)” (ibid.). This comparison between Latin *-tēla* and Hittite *-zel/zēl* originates from an article by Edgar Sturtevant (1928) on the sources of Hittite *z*. Sturtevant stated: “This *zel* is undoubtedly a complex of two suffixes, and I would compare the Latin suffix *-tēla* (...). Whatever the prior element of the Latin conglomerate, Hittite *zel* is most naturally connected with the IE suffix *ti* (...). The final consonant of *zel* comes from nouns like *waštul* “injury” beside *wašta*- “injure” and *išhiul* “contract” beside *išhiya*- “bind”.” (229). Apparently Sturtevant analysed Hittite *-zel/zēl* and Latin *-tēla* as compounded suffixes. While he did not propose a possible origin for the final *-l* in Hittite *-zel/zēl*, Sturtevant interestingly seemed to suggest that the first elements of both suffixes (Latin *\*-t-*, Hittite *\*-z-*) are not cognate, which is something Benveniste apparently took for granted.

Some sixty years after Benveniste's and Sturtevant's publications, the Hittite evidence was discussed afresh by Elisabeth Rieken (1999). In her overview of Hittite nominal morphology and derivation in Hittite, she dedicates a separate section to the neuter “Stämme auf *-il-*”. (473-94) A careful analysis of the attestations of Benveniste's *hurkēl* and *šuēl* leads her to interpret these words instead as *hurkīl* and *šuīl* in the nominative-accusative singular since the oldest Hittite texts contain sequences ending in the unambiguous sign IL.<sup>16</sup> The oblique cases originally had a short *-i-*.<sup>17</sup> She also mentions that the forms *tayazēl* and *šarnikzēl*, analysed as ending in *-tēl* by Benveniste and connected to Latin *-tēla*, unequivocally point to Hittite *-zīl/-zil* rather than *\*-zēl*: “Andere Vorschläge [...] sowie von E.H. Sturtevant [...] und E. Benveniste [...] (*-zzil-* < *\*-tēl-*) scheitern an lautlichen Schwierigkeiten, namentlich an den Bedingungen für die Assimilierung *\*t > z*.” (476, note 2343) Note that Rieken mistakenly assumes that Sturtevant takes Hittite *-zīl/-zil-* as direct cognates to Latin *-tēla*. While Sturtevant's and Benveniste's Hittite *-ēl* could be matched quite easily with Latin *-ēla*, the same is not true in the case of Hittite *-īl/-il-*.

Rieken nonetheless does not discard Sturtevant's and Benveniste's theories, but reconstructs an original ablauting (hysterodynamic) PIE *l*-stem paradigm, showing a LG suffix *\*-ēl-* in the

16 This interpretation with *i* instead of *e* is taken up by EDHIL.

17 The phonological status of plene *i* is still unclear, since the E and I signs could also be used to disambiguate adjacent ambiguous signs. EDHIL is hesitant whether to interpret *hu-ur-ki-i-il* as showing “an underlying short *\*i* that is accented and therefore lengthened” or “a real accented long */ī/*.” (51)

nominative singular and a ZG suffix *\*-l-* in the oblique cases.<sup>18</sup> In late PIE a FG *\*-el-* was introduced through analogy with the nominative-accusative singular. This unaccented pretonic *\*-el-* then (regularly) became pre-Hittite *\*-il-* before it spread to the direct cases, yielding *\*-īl* in the nominative-accusative singular. Rieken tabulates this process as follows with the neuter word *\*h<sub>2</sub>ur̥g<sup>h</sup>-él*: (475)

N-A.sg.	<i>*h<sub>2</sub>ur̥g<sup>h</sup>-él</i>	>	<i>*hurg-él</i>	>	<i>*hurg-él</i>	>>	<i>hurg-īl</i>
Obl.	<i>*h<sub>2</sub>ur̥g<sup>h</sup>-l-és</i>	>>	<i>*hurg-el-ós</i>	>	<i>*hurg-il-ás</i>	>	<i>hurg-il-ás</i> or <i>-īl-as</i>

This reconstruction requires Rieken to assume two important analogical developments. For the first analogy (*\*-él/\*-l- >> \*-él/-el-*) Rieken envisions a spread of FG *\*-el-* to the oblique cases. This, however, requires *\*-el-* to be present somewhere else in the paradigm, since I cannot explain otherwise how a newly created *\*-el-* could have been preferred over *\*-ēl-*, which was already in use in the nominative(-accusative) singular. Rieken therefore assumes (judging by the short-long *\*é*) that the FG *\*-el* in the nominative(-accusative) singular was extended to the oblique cases before it was definitively lengthened to *-él*. Secondly Rieken argues for a spread of the suffix *\*-il-* from the oblique cases to the nominative(-accusative) singular, where it would have replaced original *\*-ēl* and was lengthened to *\*-īl* under the accent. This spread must have occurred after the pre-Hittite development of pretonic *\*e > i*.

While this reconstruction would allow for a connection with our Latin *ēla*-formations in theory, the following points render this reconstruction on the basis of a hysterodynamic paradigm less probable.

First of all there are but few indications that the Hittite nouns were inflected hysterodynamically. Since the suffix only appears as LG *-īl* or LG *-il-* in our texts, the original *\*-ēl/-l-* (LG/ZG) ablaut is obscured. The picture is further complicated by the fact that the expected hysterodynamic genitive singular *\*-il-ás* with a(n accented) lengthened vowel in the final syllable is only found once. This plene spelled *hur-ki-la-a-aš* (254/d II 15'), furthermore, is part of a late Young Hittite text, so that it is of little help to anyone determining the Old

<sup>18</sup> The abbreviations FG (full grade), LG (lengthened grade) and ZG (zero grade) are used to distinguish between the different ablaut grades.

Hittite (let alone the pre-Hittite) state of affairs.<sup>19</sup> Judging from Rieken's data, the ending *\*-la-aš* is the most frequent, occurring even in Old Hittite law texts (e.g. *ta-ja-zi-la-aš* [KBo VI 2+ IV 44]). This form points to an unaccented genitive singular ending, which would be unexpected if this is truly a hysterodynamically inflected word, as we would expect the accent to be on the final syllable in that case. Additionally, the noun *šūil* 'thread' is mostly spelled with the sign *-ú-* (e.g. nom.-acc.sg. *šu-ú-i-il* [KUB XII 51+ i 8']), which, according to EDHIL, points to */sūil-/* (< PIE *\*seuh<sub>1</sub>-el-*), showing a FG root which does not fit in the hysterodynamic paradigm reconstructed by Rieken.

Secondly, we should recall that all *il*-stem neuters in Hittite are neuter nouns, which are not generally found in the hysterodynamic inflectional class. We could solve this problem by assuming a pre-Hittite transfer of (certain) *il*-stem nouns from common gender to neuter gender, although it is unclear to me what the motive could have been. This hypothesis has a second advantage, as it allows for a more natural spread of FG suffix *\*-el-* to the oblique cases. When the *il*-stems were still common gender nouns, they would have an accusative singular ending in *\*-él-om*, whose FG suffix *\*-el-* would then have spread to the oblique cases.

Rather than connecting these obscure *il*-stem substantives to the Latin abstracts in *-ēla*, they are perhaps better compared to the Hittite *ul*-stem substantives, which are quite similar in certain respects. These *ul*-stems are not frequent either, as Rieken lists only 16 lemmata (459-73). Those occurring most often are *aššul-* (n.) 'greeting, welfare'; *uaštul-/uštul-* (n.) 'sin, crime'; *takšul-* (n.) 'bond, friendship'; *išhiul-* (n.) 'bond, covenant'. Apart from the fact that this group of *ul*-stem substantives consists exclusively of neuters, the same FG/ZG root ablaut of *il*-stem substantives (*šūil* [FG] and *hurg-íl* [ZG]) is also found in *uaštul-/uštul-*.<sup>20</sup> Their semantics are also quite similar, as substantives of both groups seem to be *nomina rei actae*: *uaštul* 'sin' < *uašta-i* 'to sin, commit a crime'; *išhiul* 'bond' < *išhai-i* 'to bind, obligate'; *šarnikzīl* 'compensation' < *šarni(n)k-zi* 'to compensate. Note, however, that *šūil* 'thread' (< PIE *\*seuh<sub>1</sub>-* 'to sew') is a *nomen instrumenti*.

Whatever its analysis and origin, it seems reasonable to suppose that the Hittite *il*-stem substantives are somehow related to those in *-ul*.<sup>21</sup> If that is the case, then an etymological

19 HetKonk lists this inscription as "sjh": "spätjunghethitisch".

20 Seeing that both classes of substantives are evidently deverbal, EDHIL (s.v. *uštul- uaštul-*) rightly supposes that the ZG in the root is old (the suffix being accented), and that the FG was introduced only secondarily from the verbs on which these substantives were based (e.g. *wašta-/ušta-* 'to offend' and *taia-* 'to steal' [> *taiazīl*]).

21 This is also H.C. Melchert's opinion, who proposes that *-il-* and *-ul-* are in fact conglomerates of *-i-l-* and *-u-l-*.

connection to Latin *-ēla* would be improbable, since it is impossible to arrive at the *-u-* in Hittite *-ul-* in terms of Indo-European ablaut.

We will now move on to other formations within Latin which, according to Benveniste, are cognates of *-ēla*, and thereby form additional evidence in favour of his theory of a LG suffix *\*-ēl* in PIE. Specifically, Benveniste mentions the isolated substantive *contumēlia* 'insulting language, offence' and the adjectives ending in *-ēlis*. In my opinion the best etymology for *contumēlia* is taken up by De Vaan (2008, s.v.) who takes it as a substantivation of *\*contumēlis* which was later apparently reanalysed as a singular form from the 1<sup>st</sup> declination.<sup>22</sup> *\*Contumēlis*, furthermore, would have been derived from an unattested base verb *contumeō* 'to insult'. If this is correct, *contumēlia* is best treated with the adjectives in *-ēlis*, as is done below.

As will appear from the data presented in the next chapter, there is no positive evidence that adjectives in *-ēlis* could be derived directly from nouns in *-ēla* or vice versa. Synchronically there are simply no pairs of *ēla*-substantives in combination with *ēlis*-adjectives, such as *crūdēlis* next to *\*\*crūdēla* or *\*\*querēlis* next to *querēla*.<sup>23</sup>

Additionally one might be tempted to assume a direct morphological derivation from thematic adjectives as the common source for both *ēlis*-adjectives and *ēla*-nouns, since presumably *crūdēlis* < *crūdus* 'crude, raw' and *tūtēla* 'protection' < *tūtus* 'safe'. This explanation would not do, however, seeing that *ēla*-nouns are mostly built directly on verbs (*sequor* > *sequēla*, *candeō* > *candēla*) or on direct derivations thereof (*caveō* > *cautus* > *cautēla*). The same cannot be said of *crūdēlis* < *crūdus*, *patruēlis* < *patruus* and *carduēlis* < *carduus*, which are certainly not verbal or directly deverbal in any way.

It is possible, of course, that the sequence *-ēl-* underlying *crūdēlis* and *contumēlia* is somehow

---

(1984: 119f.) However, as Rieken remarks, there are no parallels for this formation in other Indo-European languages.

22 We may envision this substantivisation in the following way: in origin *contumēlia* could have been a neuter plural adjective to *verba*: "insulting words". At a certain time, perhaps, *contumēlia* [*verba*] was seen as a collective noun referring to the general insult; this would fit its meaning 'insulting language' well. It was then interpreted as a first declination noun. A similar transfer, but from the 3<sup>rd</sup> to the 2<sup>nd</sup> declension, can be found in, e.g., the festival names *Sāturnālia* and *Terminālia*, of which not only the genitives *Terminālium* and *Sāturnālium* are attested, but also *Termināliōrum* and *Sāturnāliōrum*.

23 It must be admitted, however, that there is one abstract noun in *-ēlitās* (which are mostly formed on *ēlis*-adjectives, cf. *crūdēlitās* 'cruelty' < *crūdēlis* 'cruel') built on an *ēla*-noun, which would be an argument in favour of a connection between *-ēlis* and *-ēla*. Seeing, however, that it is only one form (*cautelitātem* 'care, carefulness' < *cautēla* 'id.(?)') occurring in a late source (Ennodius' *Epistulae* from the 6<sup>th</sup> century CE), I do not believe that derivation in *-tās* from *ēla*-nouns has ever been a productive source for new abstract nouns in pre-medieval Latin, and I wonder what possible semantic difference could have existed between *cautēla* and *cautelitās*, both supposedly being denominal in origin < *cautus* 'safe'.

cognate to *-ēla*, but the secondarily added *-i-* as well as the adjectival character of *crūdēlis* and *\*contumēlis* make it impossible to determine cognacy on semantic grounds. The function and form of *-ēlis* are different from that of *-ēla*, and without any clear links (e.g. shared derivational patterns) between both formations I am hesitant to take *crūdēlis* and *\*contumēlis* as cognates of *-ēla* and as evidence for a PIE suffix *\*-ēl*.

### §1.1.2.2 Inner-Latin reanalysis (Leumann)

Manu Leumann (1977) emphasised those forms with *-ēla* which are built on verbs from the second conjugation (*ē*-conjugation), such as *suadēla* 'persuasion', *candēla* 'candle', *monēla* 'admonition' and *nitēla* 'brightener' as especially relevant for determining *-ēla*'s origin. He wrote: "Vom Latein aus scheint das *ē* aus der 2. Konjugation zu stammen." (312) According to this scenario there was originally a suffix *\*-la*, which could be added to verbal stems to create verbal abstracts. When added to verbal stems on *-ē-*, this first created the abovementioned *-ēla* forms. Later (presumably when the suffix *-la* was not often used anymore) speakers analysed *candēla*, for instance, no longer as *candē-la*, but as *cand-ēla*. This enabled the creation of new deverbal *ēla*-abstracts which are not necessarily based on second conjugation verbs, such as *fugēla* and *sequēla*, derived from a third conjugation 'iō'-verb (*fugiō*) and a fourth conjugation deponent verb (*sequor*), respectively. Next, Leumann explained the formation of denominative *ēla*-abstracts as follows: "Dann nach Muster *tūtēla*, bezogen auf *tūtus*, Denominativa: einerseits *client-*, *custōd-*, *parent-ēla*, andererseits *caut-*, *corruptēla*; durch seine Beziehung auf *tūtor* auch *sūtēla* zu *sūtor*." (312)

Leumann's theory is attractive because it rightfully makes a distinction between denominal and deverbal *ēla*-formations, and furthermore proposes a possible derivational scheme in which the former are based on the latter. As opposed to Benveniste and Rieken, who argued that both *-ēla* and *-tēla* are old and probably even existed in PIE, Leumann did not recognise *-tēla* as a separate suffix, but connected it to *-ēla*, while attributing the existence of both to a specific inner-Latin development. Additionally Leumann's derivation of *-ēla* from older *\*-la* has two benefits. Firstly, it accounts for the long vowel *ē* we synchronically find in Latin; secondly, it may explain the relatively high frequency of second conjugation verbal stems amongst the derivational bases for *-ēla*.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>24</sup> No less than 6 out of 24 *ēla*-lemmata are built on second conjugation verbs: *candēla*, *fovēla*, *medēla*, *monēla*, *nitēla*, *suadēla*.

There are some issues with the process sketched above that need to be addressed. First of all, Leumann is absolutely right in noting that the number of 2<sup>nd</sup> conjugation verbs (types) to which *-ēla* has at one time been added, is relatively high. However, the number of their actual attestations (tokens) is not all that impressive. *Nitēla* and *cantilēna* are only attested twice in classical antiquity (until 200 CE), and *monēla* (used nearly exclusively by Tertullian) is not even attested in classical antiquity at all. The most frequently occurring *ē*-stem deverbal *ēla*-formation is *medēla* (built on the deponent verb *medeor*), occurring sixteen times, not counting the *medella* spellings. By contrast, *tūtēla* is attested 379 times in classical antiquity and *querēla* 140, not counting *querella*. *Ēla*-forms made from second conjugation verbs are therefore not all that frequently attested. Now, that this is not the case need not invalidate Leumann's thesis. It is still very well possible that *ē*-verbs were indeed the source from which *-ēla* arose after reanalysis. One could argue, however, that it is not likely that so few second conjugation *ēla*-formations could spawn such relatively productive abstracts as *tūtēla* or *querēla*. In other words: Leumann's theory would have been supported better if we had encountered many *ēla*-tokens built on second conjugation verbs.

Secondly, while Leumann is able to explain denominal forms as *cautēla* and *corruptēla* as proportionally analogical creations on the basis of *tūtus* : *tūtēla* = *cautus* : *x*, *x* = *cautēla*, this formal analogy does not work for *clientēla*, *parentēla* and *custōdēla*, since there are no models such as *\*\*clientus*, *\*\*parentus* and *\*\*custōdus* on the basis of which *-us* could simply be replaced by *-ēla*. These three forms are still in need of an explanation.<sup>25</sup>

Lastly some more evidence supporting Leumann's proposed abstract suffix *\*-la-* would have been very welcome. Why do we not find this suffix productively in any of the other conjugational classes? In other words: how can we explain the absence of, for instance, *\*\*vocāla* (1<sup>st</sup> conjugation), *\*\*audīla* (3<sup>rd</sup> conjugation) and *\*\*mittula* (4<sup>th</sup> conjugation), or what constraints would have barred this *\*-la-* abstract suffix from appearing after verbal stems not ending in *ē*? Naturally, absence of evidence for a (pre-)Latin *\*-la-* cannot be taken as evidence of its absence, but it is doubtful whether the reconstruction of a generally verbal suffix *\*-la-* is justified if we only find its reflexes in a specific category of verbs.

## §1.2 Semantic considerations

A full consideration of *-ēla* is incomplete without paying attention to its semantic value.

---

<sup>25</sup> Perhaps Leumann (quoted above) meant to say that *tūtēla* 'protection' spawned *clientēla* 'clientship, protection' (< *cliēns* 'client') by virtue of the semantic similarity between the two. This idea (which Leumann did not express explicitly) will be defended in section 3.1.2.

As mentioned by Leumann (see above) and as will appear in Chapter two when we take stock of the *-ēla* formations in our extant literary Latin corpus, *-ēla* could be added to various types of morphological bases: next to deverbal formations such as *loquēla* 'speech, utterance' from *loquor* 'speak' and *nitēla* 'brightener' from *niteō* 'to shine' we find *clientēla* 'body of clients' from *cliēns* 'client' and *custōdēla* 'custody' from *custōs* 'guard(ian)', which are clearly denominal. While deverbative formations can be described in terms such as *nomina agentis* (denoting the agent of the action), *nomen instrumenti* (denoting the instrument with which the action is performed) or *nomen rei actae* (denoting the completed result of the action), these characterisations cannot be adhered to the class of denominatives. Nonetheless, what is common to many *-ēla* formations, is that they form abstract nouns.

Several authors of grammatical handbooks take *-ēla* as a primarily deverbal suffix, and presumably for that reason remain silent on possible semantic values for the denominal formations. In this chapter the semantic treatment of *-ēla* will be limited to an overview of previous scholarship. The next chapter (section 2.4) will contain a descriptive account, based on the actual Latin data.

Lucie Pultrová (2011) in her recent treatment of Latin deverbative nouns characterises the first class as follows: “With the exception of the subst. *candēla* (= “that shines, that emits light”) we can describe them as real *nomina actionis*, i.e. the words denoting the action (if we could judge from the few examples, more likely of the perfective type). (...) But at the same times we can regard the subst. *candēla*, *loquēla*, and *querēla* as an instrument of action (“that is used to cast light”; “a word = by the use of what the speech is generated”; “a lament, a complaint = by the use of what one complains”) (...)” (111)

By contrast, Manu Leumann (1977; followed by Schaffner [2006: 7]) argues that deverbative *-ēla* forms should be interpreted as *nomina rei actae* (denoting the concrete result of the action expressed by the verb) and draws attention to *suādēla* 'persuasion', *loquēla* 'speech', *querēla* 'complaint' and *ob-sequēla* 'obedience, compliance' < *ob-sequor* 'to obey, to follow'. (312) At least for one noun in *-ēla* his argument finds confirmation in a passage from Varro's grammatical work *De Lingua Latina* (1<sup>st</sup> c. BCE). When speaking about derivations from *loquor* (such as *loquāx* 'talkative', *eloquēns* 'eloquent') he remarks: “*hinc quidam loquelam dixerunt verbum quod in loquendo efferimus*” (6.57), which translates to: “From this [verb *loquī*] a word we express in speaking has been called a *loquēla* by some”.



Both scholars seem to have conflicting opinions on how to interpret the meaning of *loquēla* (and of *-ēla* abstracts in general and both explanations are well defensible. Translated as 'word' or 'speech', *loquēla* can indeed be taken as the act of speaking itself ('utterance'), as is evident from the following context in a poem written by Catullus, who asks his friend Camerius where he is:

*“Nunc te lacteolae tenent puellae? Si linguam clauso tenes in ore, fructus proicies amoris omnes. Verbosa gaudet Venus loquella. Vel, si vis, licet obseres palatum, dum vestri sim particeps amoris.”*  
(Catullus, *Carmina* 55.27-33)

“Do the milk-white maids detain you? If you keep your tongue shut within your mouth, you will waste all the gains of love; Venus loves an utterance full of words. However, if you will, you may lock up your lips, so long as you let me be a sharer in your love.” (transl. F.W. Cornish)

If *loquella* is interpreted here as the words which have been spoken (nomen rei actae), then *verbosa* 'full of words' feels a bit strange ('words full of words'). There are however also cases where *loquēla* is most naturally interpreted concretely as a nomen rei actae, as exemplified by the following passage from Vergil, where Sleep approaches Palinurus, Aeneas' helmsman, to cast him overboard:

*“(…) cum levis aetheriis delapsus Somnus ab astris aera dimovit tenebrosum et dispulit umbras, te, Palinure, petens, tibi somnia tristia portans insonti; puppique deus consedit in alta, Phorbanti similis, funditque has ore loquellas: ‘Iaside Palinure, ferunt ipsa aequora classem; aequatae spirant aerae; datur hora quieti.’”* (Vergilius, *Aeneis* 5.838-44)

“(…) when Sleep, gliding lightly down from the heavenly stars, parted the gloomy air, and scattered the shadows, seeking you, bringing you dark dreams, Palinurus, though you were innocent: the god settled on the high stern, appearing as Phorbas, and poured these words from his mouth: “Palinurus, son of Iasus, the seas themselves steer the fleet, the breezes blow steadily, this hour is granted for rest.” (transl. A.S. Kline)

An instrumental value, as supposed by Pultrová, seems unlikely. The examples she calls to mind (*querēla* 'a complaining, complaint', *loquēla* 'speech, utterance') are best seen either as nomina rei actae or nomina actionis instead. As a nomen instrumenti to *loquor* 'speak' we would perhaps rather expect a word such as *os* 'mouth' or *lingua* 'tongue', not something

which is at the same time the result of that action.<sup>26</sup>

Accordingly, the dictionaries do not give one type of translation for each *-ēla* formation. Lewis and Short translate *sequēla* (from *sequor* 'to follow') with both 'that which follows' (nomen agentis) and 'consequence' (result noun); *fugēla* (from *fugiō* 'flee') is translated by the OLD as 'the act of fleeing' (nomen actionis) but also as 'flight' (result noun). Often, as in the case of the last one, the two interpretations seem equally well possible. Note, for instance, the ablative singular *fugella* here, in a fragment of a speech delivered by Cato: *Sed a benefactis, ab optimis artibus fugit maxima fugella, perpetuissimo curriculo*: "But he flees from good deeds, from the best arts, with the fastest flight, on a most continual course" (*Orationum Fragmenta* 12.1). *Fugella* can be interpreted here as 'a fleeing' (the action in itself), 'flight' (being the result of fleeing) or perhaps even 'flight' (being the instrument with which one flees). In this context (and many others) it is difficult to adhere a single semantic value to deverbal *-ēla*, although we can be sure that it does not normally form nomina agentis.<sup>27</sup>

The semantic value of denominal *-ēla*, equally variegated and difficult to capture, has not received ample separate treatment in existing scholarly literature. We will attend to this question and describe its semantic value in the next chapter, after we have collected all available evidence of Latin *-ēla*.

### §1.3 Conclusion

It is now time to take stock. In our overview of proposals and theories regarding *-ēla* we have come across a variety of interpretations and opinions on three different aspects of *-ēla*: its spelling, its etymology and its semantic value. This disagreement is symptomatic of the fact that much work is still needed before we can truly understand the function and origins of *-ēla*.

---

26 Pultrová's statement that *candēla* 'candle' is an example of an instrument noun, is also debatable. The verb *candeō* means 'to be bright, to shine', and a candle can hardly be viewed as an instrument with which one shines or emits light. *Candēla* is rather denotes the object emitting light itself. (The term *nomen agentis*, indicating the agent of the action, is probably not meaningful here: a candle cannot be really seen as an 'agent' since there is no 'patient' involved in the action 'to shine'.)

27 As Pultrová already mentions in a footnote (regarding whether to translate *loquela* with 'speech' or 'word'): "From the records it is difficult to judge, the tropes *pars pro toto* and *totum pro parte* are of course absolutely common and one cannot tell which is the original" (111, fn. 151). Metonymical shifts are also probably responsible for the wide variety of semantic values possible for deverbative *-ēla*. One could easily imagine a metonymic shift from *querēla* 'act of complaining' > '(actual) complaint' or the other way around.

Regarding *-ēla*'s spelling we have seen discord among scholars and dictionaries alike. Some dictionaries prefer one spelling variant over the other while others are more hesitant. Ancient grammarians, on the other hand, appear to be well in favour of *-ēla* as the correct spelling, and the fact that they wrote explicitly on this matter clearly shows that at least some confusion existed in antiquity surrounding the right way to spell *-ēla*. Modern scholars explain the vacillation between *-ēla* and *-ella* in various ways. Four modern standpoints have been discussed, but none of them can be accepted without problems. Lachmann has proposed a complementary distribution in the sense that *-ēla* should be read after a heavy syllable and *-ella* consistently after light ones. Secondly, Heraeus argued that *-ella* is in fact *-ēlla* and that both variants were probably not pronounced all that differently in antiquity, so that free spelling variation might be an option. Leumann defended the thesis that a confusion of original *-ēla* with *-ella* from the diminutives has taken place, a standpoint supported by Schaffner. Finally, Cohn assumed a phonetic development (first proposed by Corssen), by which the *-l-* of *-ēla* was gradually pronounced differently, so that it came to resemble the *l exilis* we find in *-ella*.<sup>28</sup>

The etymology of *-ēla* is likewise still an apple of discord for several scholars. Two theories are worth mentioning as they are still commonly referred to in present-day literature on *-ēla*. On the one hand we find Benveniste, who, following Sturtevant, proposed an etymological connection with Hittite neuter nouns in *-ēl/-īl*. In Benveniste's eyes, the Hittite and the Latin suffixes are both descendants of an older PIE suffix *\*-ēl-*. In that case, *-ēla* would represent a secondary feminisation, while the Latin adjectives in *-ēlis* and the isolated noun *contumēlia* 'insulting language' would be inner-Latin cognate formations. More recently, Rieken has refined Benveniste's connection with Hittite, showing that the nominative-accusative singular of the Hittite forms actually points to *-īl* instead of *-ēl*. Consequently she has reconstructed an ablauting hysterodynamic paradigm for PIE to explain Hittite *-īl/-il-* from older PIE *\*-ēl/\*-l-*. On the other hand we find Leumann, who did not think *-ēla* is an isolated relic from PIE but rather saw it as the result of a special derivational process within Latin. He regarded *-ēla*'s long *-ē-* as the stem vowel we find in second conjugation (*ē*-stem) verbs and supposed that a suffix *-la-* was added to these verbal stems to form corresponding *nomina rei actae*.

---

<sup>28</sup> The lateral liquid *-l-* had two variants in Latin: *l exilis* ('thin *l*'), which is found before *i* or another *l*, and *l pinguis* ('fat *l*'), which is found in all other environments. This situation is more or less the same as in Modern English: the two *l*'s in "lily" are pronounced differently than the *l* in "field". (Allen [1978]: 33f.; OHCGL 62)

The semantic value of deverbal instances of *-ēla* has been explored most thoroughly by Pultrová, who argues that most of the *-ēla* formations found in our corpus can be interpreted as *nomina actionis* (although she does not rule out an instrumental meaning, drawing attention to a remark made by the ancient grammarian Varro). Leumann on the other hand marks them as generally denoting *nomina rei actae*. Denominal *-ēla* has, as far as I am aware, received no separate semantic treatment in modern scholarship. An descriptive account of its semantics will be given in the following chapter.

## Chapter two

As we have seen in the previous chapter, several treatments of Latin *-ēla* exist, concerning not only its possible etymologies and origins, but also the nature of its alternation with *-ella*.

Before we are in a position to correctly judge these views on *-ēla* and, perhaps, to add one of our own, a descriptive overview of all extant attestations of *-ēla* in Latin is a prerequisite. The following chapter aims to provide this, presenting an alphabetical list with lemmata ending in *-ēla* which can be found as Table 1 in the Appendix.

### §2.1 Description of data set

The table found in the Appendix contains all attestations of *-ēla/-ella* recovered from Brepolis' LLT-A (Library of Latin Texts - Series A) in the period December 2014 – March 2015.<sup>29</sup>

Although the LLT-A holds an enormous corpus of Latin documents spanning from Livius Andronicus (ca. 284 – ca. 204 BCE) to the Second Vatican Council (1962 – 1965 CE) and although new works are added on a regular basis, some instances of *-ēla* are only found in works not part of the LLT-A corpus, such as *acūtēla* 'sharpness', which is mentioned only once in Priscian's (ca. 500 CE) *Institutiones Grammaticae* (GL 2.120.8).<sup>30</sup> Another such form is *assidēla* 'sacrificial table', taken up by the OLD and mentioned by Manu Leumann (312). This form is only attested once in its plural form *assidēlae* in Paulus Diaconus' (8<sup>th</sup> c. CE) *Epitoma* ("abridgment") of an earlier work by the grammarian Festus, which is not part of the LLT-A's corpus either. For consistency's sake these forms are not included in the overview presented in the Appendix, since it would be require too much time to investigate which potentially significant works are not part of the LLT-A and to search them manually. Similarly I have not undertaken the laborious task of sifting through all the extant epigraphical evidence, although it is very well possible that several more old (perhaps even pre-literary) instances of *-ēla/-ella* can be found there. One last restriction to the corpus consulted for this research is one regarding time periods. I have not included *-ēla/-ella* attestations from medieval or modern Latin texts, making use only of texts datable to the period before the death of the Venerable Bede (Beda Venerabilis) in 735 CE. The reasons for not searching beyond this date are threefold. On the one hand, since this is an investigation into *-ēla*'s history, special importance

---

29 As of July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014 this database contains over 74 million word forms across 3,625 works, cf. Preface to Tombeur 2014.

30 Heinrich Keil's editions of the *Grammatici Latini* (GL) can be searched via the CGL (*Corpus Grammaticorum Latinorum*) as hosted by the Laboratoire d'histoire des théories linguistiques of the Paris Diderot University. [<http://kaali.linguist.jussieu.fr/CGL/index.jsp>]

is to be adhered to the earliest attestations of *-ēla*, while later (medieval and more recent) formations are of less interest. Secondly, by not adding copious amounts of data to the overview presented here, the table retains its general intelligibility and does not engulf the reader with floods of late derivations and secondary formations. Lastly it should be noted that the terminus of 735 CE used here is adopted from the LLT-A, thereby expediting and facilitating the search for attestations of *-ēla*.

In conclusion, the overview presented in the Appendix is not to be seen as a comprehensive collection of *all* Latin words (deriving from those) ending in *-ēla/-ella*. As for literary attestations up until 735 CE, however, the list is quite complete.

Table 1 should be read as follows. The second column shows every separate lemma of *-ēla/-ella* alphabetically in the spellings in which it is attested. Whenever a word is found spelled in more than one way, the first variant mentioned is the one with the most attestations in (classical) antiquity. *Loquilla*, *loquēla*, for example, is found in both spelling variants. While *loquēla* is more frequently found overall (192 times *-ēla* as opposed to 142 times *-ella*), the variant *loquilla* is mentioned first because it is prevalent in antiquity (2 times *-ēla* next to 6 times *-ella*). Words listed in a smaller font (e.g. *obsequella* 'obedience' to *sequella*, *sequēla*) beneath the main lemma are derivatives, consisting mostly of composite forms with the privative *in-* or preverbs.

The fourth column alphabetically lists all attested case forms of their respective lemmata. Following each case are three numerals corresponding to three of the five time periods used by the LLT-A to structure its corpus: "Antiquitas" (containing works composed in the period until ca. 200 CE); "Aetas Patrum I" (includes writers from Late Antiquity in the period ca. 200 – ca. 500 CE); "Aetas Patrum II" (for texts written between ca. 500 and 735 CE).<sup>31</sup> The three numerals indicate how many attestations of the respective form are found within each time period. For example "*suādēlīs* (1/2/3)" means that the dative or ablative plural of *suādela* is found once in classical antiquity (up to ca. 200 CE), twice in the period ca. 200 – ca. 500 CE and thrice in the years following ca. 500 until the death of the Venerable Bede in 735 CE. From these numbers one may deduce how frequent certain formations were and whether they lost or gained popularity in the course of time.

Before the sixth column closes off the table with the presumed morphological bases of each

---

<sup>31</sup> Data from the Vulgate, which are kept separately by the LLT-A, have been counted under Aetas Patrum I.

lemma, the fifth column contains a list of authors using the form in question in the time period in which it is first found. The authors are ordered chronologically according to the century in which they lived, and then alphabetically within each century.

## §2.2 Justification of forms

Regarding the exclusion of some *-ēla* forms from Table 1 it has already been mentioned that attestations from inscriptions or literary texts not part of the LLT-A have not been listed in the table. I have also omitted two other words (that are in fact part of the LLT-A), which seem to show the same spelling alternation as do our *-ēla/-ella* formations. These are the following:

- *mustela* (Pl.+)/*mustella* (Pl.+) '1. weasel, 2. certain fish'
- *turdela* (7<sup>th</sup> century CE+)/*turdella* (1x Fest.) 'thrush'<sup>32</sup>

*Mŭstēla/mustella* has already been mentioned as the main focus of an article written by Stefan Schaffner (2006), who rightly separates this word from *ēla-/ella*-abstracts: “*Mŭstēla* dürfte aber nun kaum (...) dem Typ der deverbativen Nomina rei actae auf *-ēla* angehören, weil eine entsprechende verbale Ableitungsbasis fehlt, sofern man nicht mit Alessio 1969: 20 (...) annimmt, daß *mŭstēla* erst nach einem Muster wie *tūtēla* (Abl. von *tūtārī*) zu *tūtus* bzw. *cautēla* zu *cautus* oder in Anlehnung an *nītēla*, *nītella* f. 'Haselmaus' (Mart.+) von *mustus* 'jung, frisch, neu' abgeleitet sei.” (10) Another reason to not view this word as an *ēla*-abstract is its very concrete and specific semantics, which are incomparable to the denominative abstracts in *-ēla*.

Secondly comes *turdella* '(little) thrush', usually analysed as a “double” diminutive of *turdus* (m.)/*turda* (f.) 'thrush' via *turdulus* '(little) thrush'. (WH s.v.) The feminine variant *\*\*turdula* is not attested, but the combination of substantives in *-us*, *-a* next to those in *-ulus*, *-a* and/or *-ellus*, *-a* is in any case quite common in Latin. The expected diminutive suffix for first and second declension nouns is *-ulus* (*-a*, *-um*).<sup>33</sup> *-Ellus* is usually restricted to stems ending in a liquid or nasal, such as *ager* 'field' > *agellus* 'little field' and *asinus* 'donkey' > *asellus* 'little

32 For a full discussion of these words and their descendants in various Romance languages, see Cohn (212-9).

33 The suffix *-ulus* (< *\*-elo-*) had two functions: it is mostly known as the diminutive suffix of substantives of the first and second declension (see also section 1.1.1.4 and OHCGL 280). It could also be used, however, to form characterising deverbal agent adjectives such as *bibulus* 'thirsty, drinking' (< *bibō* 'to drink'), *garrulus* 'talkative' (< *garrīō* 'to chat'). Not rarely these adjectives developed into substantives: *discipulus* 'disciple, student' (< *discō* 'learn'), *serpula* 'snake' (< *serpō* 'crawl'), of which instrumental nouns, such as *iaculum* 'spear' (< *iaciō* 'throw'), *oculus* 'eye' are an important sub-group (cf. OHCGL 279-81, Leumann [1977]: 311).

donkey'. To explain the derivation of *turdella* from *turda* we have to assume that **\*\*turdula** existed at a certain time as a feminine counterpart to attested *turdulus* (Varro+), before it was further diminuted to *turdella*. This double diminution might seem awkward, but there are several parallels within Latin for this phenomenon. Examples are: *locus* 'place', *loculus* 'little place, drawer', *locellus* 'little box' and *porcus* 'pig' > *porculus* 'little pig' > *porcellus* 'very little pig' (OHCGL 281).

The variant *turdela* occurs only once before 735 CE in Isidorus Hispalensis (6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> century CE). Given the concrete meaning of *turdel(l)a* unlike that of our *-ēla/-ella* abstracts, I deem it highly unlikely that *turdela* is a true *-ēla* abstract, although its *-ela* spelling might be a back-formation influenced by the vacillation of 'true' *-ēla/-ella* pairs.

Very tentatively added to the list of attestations in Table 1 of the Appendix are the following two substantives, which may or may not be true abstracts in *-ēla*:

- *turbēlae/turbellae* (Pl.+)'petty commotion'
- *cantilēna* (Ter.+)'old song, ditty'

*Turbēlae* must be taken as either a double diminutive of *turba* '1. uproar; 2. crowd' (as defended by Schaffner [2006: 7]) or a veritable deverbal *-ēla* abstract from the verb *turbāre* 'to stir up, to confuse'. In classical antiquity it is found only with Plautus (2x), Festus (2x) and Apuleius (4x) (latter two 2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE), and only in the plural, although that might well be coincidental.<sup>34</sup> Against analysing this form as a double diminutive, one could argue that no 'single' diminutive **\*\*turbula** 'little commotion(?)' is attested in pre-Apuleian times. As noted above, diminutives in Latin were only made with *-ellus, -a, -um* if the stem ended in a liquid or nasal. Therefore *turbēlae/turbellae* can not have been built directly on the noun *turba* without **\*\*turbula** as an intermediate stage, leading to the tentative conclusion that it is best viewed as an *-ēla* abstract. Its apparently being derived from a first conjugation verb *turbāre* is rare in view of our other data, as only *cantilēna* (if it is an *-ēla* abstract at all, see below) must also be derived somehow from a verb ending in *-āre*. As will be shown below, however, already in Plautus' times many distinct stems (denominal and deverbal, active and deponent) were liable to suffixation with *-ēla*, so that this observation should not trouble us too much.

---

<sup>34</sup> According to the LLT-A we find geminate spelled *turbellas* once in Plautus (*Bacchides* 1055). Stefan Schaffner, however, points out that the manuscripts are in discord, so that we may well prefer to read *turbēlas*, especially since geminate spelling in *-ēla* abstracts is virtually absent until the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE.



The inclusion of *cantilēna* (Ter.+)'old song, ditty' similarly requires some comments. Leumann has argued that this is an *-ēla* derivation of the verb *cantilāre* 'to sing', resulting from dissimilation of original *-l-* to *-n-* in *\*cantilēla*. *Cantilēna*'s *-ēna* cannot easily be explained otherwise, and semantically this word is comparable to other instances of *-ēla*. In comparison, *querēla* (to be connected with *queror* 'to complain') most often has the concrete meaning of 'complaint, protest' (OLD, s.v), and *cantilēna* 'song' appears to be used very similarly from *cantilāre* 'to sing' as a *nomen rei actae*.

Against Leumann's dissimilation one might argue that *-l-* is expected to dissimilate to *-r-*, as in *populāris* 'of the people' < *\*populālis* (OHCGL 155). Then again, dissimilations such as these are a late and sporadic phenomenon, and the dissimilation of *-l-* to *-n-* proposed here is not unprecedented, as we find *cuntellum* instead of 'correct' *cultellum* 'little knife' (from *cultellus*, the diminutive form of *culter* 'knife') in the *Appendix Probi* (ca. 4<sup>th</sup> c. CE). (ibid: fn. 39)<sup>35</sup> A different counter-argument against accepting *cantilēna* as a dissimilated *-ēla* formation is that we do not find the presupposed base verb *cantilāre* before the 2<sup>nd</sup> century CE writer Apuleius. One may argue that it is a matter of coincidence that we do not find *cantilāre* in the centuries separating Terence from Apuleius, but this does not seem likely. Supposedly for that reason Leumann explains Apuleius' *cantilāre* as a back-formation (from *cantilēna*) and marks 'original' *\*cantilāre* as an old, unattested verb. (323)

As with *turbēlae* (see above), derivation from a first conjugation active verb would be odd in light of our other data, but does not necessarily render the inclusion of *cantilēna* in the present discussion impossible or implausible by itself.

### §2.3 Discussion and classification

The data collected in Table 1 can be analysed and classified in multiple ways. Not only are some attestations of *-ēla* different from others with respect to their spelling, but also the differences regarding their morphological basis allows for further sub-categorisation. Before we can sketch a history of *-ēla* throughout Latin, it is necessary to look at each of these categories separately and to mark their distribution across different era's, authors and perhaps even style registers. Should it become evident, for instance, that deverbal formations first appear at a later date than denominal formations, then one would be justified in arguing that deverbal abstracts in *-ēla* were secondarily built after their denominal relatives. In other

<sup>35</sup> The *Appendix Probi* is a list of common errors in the post-classical Latin spoken at the time it was composed. Each 'wrong' word is paired with its correct classical Latin correspondent. The full entry of *cuntellum* is "*cultellum non cuntellum*": "*cultellum*, not *cuntellum*". *Cuntellum* has survived as *kuntielle* 'knife' in the Italian dialect of Agnone. (OHCGL 155, fn. 39).

words: *-ēla* might then have spread from only verbal stems to both verbal and nominal stems.

To make such developments visible, the attestations of *-ēla* noted in Table 1 have been counted, and their distribution over different spelling types and morphological bases has been set out against the three time periods employed in the classification of the data. The results are presented in Table 2, which aims to be of help in discerning distributional patterns such as the one noted above. The last row of Table 2 requires some additional explanation. The percentages in this row indicate how often *-ēla* is attested with regard to the total word count of each era. Although the LLT-A does not list the exact number of words contained by each era in the database, it is possible to deduce these data from the total count of *sententiae* (text lines), which the LLT-A does provide, as well as the total word count of the entire corpus, which is estimated in the LLT-A manual at 74,120,000 words (6).<sup>36</sup>

As expected, *-ēla* is never very frequent in (literary) Latin. Its attestations never make up more than 0.016% of the entire corpus. What is remarkable, however, is that its prominence stays more or less constant (at least up until 735 CE). Given *-ēla*'s rarity one might expect the suffix by replaced (e.g. by more productive suffixes) at a certain moment in time, but this does not seem to have happened: *-ēla* never totally disappears.

### §2.3.1 Spelling variation

Regarding the ratio of *ēla*-spellings to *ella*-spellings across classical antiquity and Late Antiquity, it becomes clear from the numbers in Table 2 that *-ēla* is much more common than *-ella* in all eras. *-Ella* does not disappear, however, although it does appear to become a lot rarer in Aetas Patrum II, with about 4.5 attestations of *-ēla* for every attestation of *-ella* as opposed to ca. 3.8 to 1 in Antiquitas and 2.9 to 1 in Aetas Patrum I. This of course precludes a replacement of *-ēla* by *-ella*, as we would perhaps expect since *-ella* is also commonly found as a diminutive suffix.<sup>37</sup> Rather, both variants keep being used throughout Latinity (also in the

---

<sup>36</sup> 74,120,000 words over a total of 3,602,947 lines yields an average of ca. 20.572 words per line for all eras.

Given that, for instance, the corpus of texts from Antiquitas contains 300,271 lines of text, I estimate the total word count for this time period at around 6,177,190 words. The 976 attestations of *-ēla* make up around 0.016% of this number.

<sup>37</sup> We may recall Stefan Schaffner's article here, where reference is made to Meyer-Lübke (1972: 402/3), who distinguishes between *Suffixwechsel* and *Suffixvertauschung*. The former indicates that one suffix replaces another, and that the suffix which is being replaced, becomes rarer and rarer. By contrast, when both variants are used next to each other without one suffix getting the upper hand, this would be *Suffixvertauschung*, according to Meyer-Lübke. If anything, I would call the *-ēla/-ella* confusion analysed in this thesis a *Suffixvertauschung*.

centuries after 735 CE). It is remarkable that the authors whose works are the oldest complete works to contain *-ēla* (Plautus and Terence) nearly *consistently* use *-ēla* instead of *-ella*. *-Ella* is only found once in Plautus' *Bacchides* (line 1056) in the form *turbellas* 'little uproar, commotion' from *turbāre* 'to whirl, to stir', notably the only time in Latinity where *turbēlae* is ever written with a geminate. We will return to this fact in section 3.1.1 when we will investigate which spelling type is older.

A particularly striking feature of the distribution as tabulated in Table 1 is the following. Looking closely at our *ella*-spelled attestations in Antiquitas, we see that, from a total of 202, no less than 186 are found in the lemma of *querēla/querella* 'complaint' (ca. 92%). Other *-ella*'s are relatively rarely attested: *loquella* 'speech' (6x), *medella* 'cure, treatment' (5x) and *sequella* 'follower, sequel' (4x), but it must be emphasised that they are all, interestingly enough, derived from deponent verbs.<sup>38</sup> It is plausible that the spelling *-ella* has spread in antiquity from, for instance, *querella* to similar deverbals *-ēla* abstracts which did not originally have this spelling. One could easily imagine that the frequent use of *querella* spawned *loquella* and *sequella*, since both verbs at the base of these formations are third conjugation deponent verbs. *Loquella* and *sequella* are furthermore formally quite similar, their base verbs *loquor* and *sequor* being both disyllabics ending in *-quor*. We will return to the question of analogical spread when trying to recover the 'Latin prototype' of *-ēla* in the first part of Chapter three.

Returning momentarily to the distributions envisioned by Lachmann and Heraeus as mentioned in Chapter one, we can clearly see that neither can be upheld in light of the data in Table 1. We have already seen *querēla*, which is a strong counter-argument to Lachmann's thesis that *-ēla* was originally used after heavy syllables, while *-ella* would have been placed after light syllables. Additionally, Lachmann's theory runs into trouble with the following spellings: *cantilēna* (139x) 'song', *fugēla* (1x) 'flight', *loquēla* (192x) 'speech', *medēla* (159x) 'cure', *monēla* (1x) 'admonition', *nitēla* (2x) 'shine, brightness', *sequēla* (16x), *candella* (1x), *suadella* (6x).

Wilhelm Heraeus' statement that the pronunciation in classical times was probably *-ēlla* and that we should read all attestations of *-ēla/-ella* as such, is not satisfactory either, given the data collected in Table 2. Beside 959 attestations with a geminate conforming to Heraeus' expectations, we are left with 3279 singleton spellings which require an additional

---

<sup>38</sup> Especially *medella* is notable here, since its *-ella* count ramps up to 149 in Aetas Patrum I before swinging back again to 42 in Aetas Patrum II. The only other *-ella* not listed here is *fugella* 'flight' found once in a small text fragment, presumably from Cato, in a manuscript of Priscian (5<sup>th</sup> c. CE).

explanation. The problem is that while all attestations containing a geminate could have been influenced by the *-ella* diminutives, the same cannot be said of singleton spelling *-ēla*, which has no comparanda within Latin responsible for its spread across so many forms. We shall pursue the question of the origins of the vacillation *-ēla/-ella* in Chapter three.

### §2.3.2 Morphological base

The distinction between denominal and deverbal formations with *-ēla* was already highlighted by Leumann in 1977. *Querēla* 'complaint', for example, is clearly built on the verb *queror* 'to complain', but the same cannot be said of *clientēla* 'clientship, body of clients', since there is no such verb as *\*\*clienteō* or *\*\*clientor* (deponent). Ten different denominal *-ēla* abstracts can be distinguished: *captātēla* 'capture', *cautēla* 'caution', *clientēla* 'clientship', *conductēla* 'behaviour, conduct', *corruptēla* 'corruption', *custōdēla* 'custody', *parentēla* 'parentship' *peccātēla* 'sin(ning)', *sūtēla* 'device' and *tūtēla* 'custody'. Of these, *tūtēla* (380/295/66, regardless of spelling) is by far the most frequent, followed by *corruptēla* (27/333/33) and *cautēla* (3/119/160) which both gain in popularity rapidly after antiquity. On the other end of the spectrum we find *captātēla*, *conductēla*, *mandātēla* and *peccātēla*, all of them ἄπαξ εἰρημένα in our corpus. It is remarkable that most of these denominatives are built on either thematic adjectives in *-tus* or (possibly) nomina agentis in *-tor* (*captātus/captātor*, *cautus/cautor* etc.), which are in turn deverbal: *tūtus* 'safe, careful' / *tūtor* 'someone who keeps safe, guardian' < *tueor/tuor* 'to watch, to keep safe'.<sup>39</sup>

*Clientēla*, *custōdēla* and *parentēla*, which happen to be very similar semantically, cannot be derived from such deverbal nominal forms (thematic adjectives in *-tus* or nomina agentis in *-tor*).<sup>40</sup> Specifically these three, together with *tutēla*, all denote a certain relationship between a protector and a protégée. Moreover, it should be noted that, with exception of *custōdēla*, all these denominal abstracts end in *-tēla*. Both similarities may have played a role in the spread of *-ēla* to new denominative formations on the basis of old existing ones.<sup>41</sup>

39 *Tuor* (*tueris*, *tuitur* etc.) is conserved from Plautus to Lucretius (De Vaan, s.v. *tueor*). *Tūtor* and *tūtus* are probably built on this form.

40 It cannot be said with certainty whether *custōdēla* is denominal from *custōs* 'guardian' or denominal from the verb *custōdīre* 'to guard', since both *custōs* and *custōdēla* occur in our oldest literary texts. However, since fourth conjugation (*i*-stem) verbs are otherwise not found suffixed with *-ēla* and because it is semantically very close to *clientēla* and *parentēla* which are both clearly denominal, not deverbal, *custōdēla* will receive the same analysis in this thesis.

41 One particular secondary word which may have been formed under the influence of these *-ēla* "guardianship terms" is medieval Latin *curatēla* 'care, guardianship' (14<sup>th</sup> c. CE) from *cūrātus* 'cared for, looked after' or *cūrātor* 'care-taker', which is clearly built after the nearly synonymous *tūtēla* (Niermeyer, s.v.).

Regarding the deverbal abstracts in *-ēla*, it is noteworthy that most of them are built on either second conjugation active verbs (*candēō* 'to shine', *foveō* 'to refresh, to favour', *moneō* 'to warn', *niteō* 'to be bright', *suādeō* 'to persuade') or third conjugation deponent verbs (*loquor* 'to speak', *queror* 'to complain', *sequor* 'to follow'), with *medēla* being derived from a 'combination' of both classes: *medeor* 'to heal, to cure', a second conjugation deponent verb.<sup>42</sup> *Luēla* 'atonement' and *fugēla* 'flight' on the other hand are from third conjugation active verbs (*luō* 'make amends', *fugiō* 'flee'), and *cantilēna* and *turbēlae* are, as we have already seen, somewhat peculiar in that they seem to be based on first conjugation active verbs. In summary, we can discern four distinct bases on which *-ēla* abstracts are built:

1. Deverbal, second conjugation verbs: *candēla*, *fovēla*, *monēla*, *nitēla*, *suādēla* (*medēla*);
2. Deverbal, fourth conjugation deponent verbs: *loquēla*, *querēla*, *sequēla* (*medēla*);
3. Denominal, *-tus* adjectives or *-tor* nomina agentis: *captātēla*, *cautēla*, *conductēla*, *corruptēla*, *mandātēla*, *peccātēla*, *sūtēla*, *tūtēla*;
4. Denominal, "relationship" terms: *custōdēla*, *clientēla*, *parentēla*.

Words not classifiable in this manner are *fugēla* 'flight', *luēla* 'expiation' and, perhaps, *cantilēna* 'old song' and *turbēlae* 'petty commotion, uproar'.

Whereas the ratio between *-ēla* and *-ella* appears to be quite consistent throughout Latinity, there is certainly a change happening in the distribution of deverbal and denominal formations. In Antiquitas both variants are about evenly frequent with a ratio of ca. 1.02 deverbal *-ēla/-ella*'s for each denominal one. In Aetas Patrum I, however, the ratio ramps up to ca. 2.93 to 1. Thereafter the ratio stays the same in Aetas Patrum II, resting at ca. 2.63 deverbal formations to 1. This indicates that in post-Classical times, deverbal *-ēla* becomes relatively more frequent than denominal *-ēla*, although the denominals certainly do not disappear before 735 CE. However, whatever the distribution in post-Classical Latin may have been: when thinking about the original distribution in Latin as well as possible patterns for analogical spread, we should keep in mind that in our oldest texts, deverbal *-ēla* is about as frequently attested as denominal *-ēla*.

<sup>42</sup> Priscan (5<sup>th</sup> c. CE) marks *suādēla* (Pl.+ ) as denominal (as if from *suādus*): "*ergo in a desinentia denominativa i habent brevem ante a vel l vel n vel r*" "Therefore the denominatives ending in *-a* either have a short *-i-*, *-l-*, *-n* or *-r* before that *-a-*" (GL 2.118-9; own transl.). This cannot be the case however, since the adjective *suādus* is probably secondary, as it is only found from the 1<sup>st</sup> c. BCE onward (Cic.+).

Lastly, mention must be made of a striking feature of *-ēla*'s morphological bases: with very few exceptions, *-ēla* is added solely to uncompounded bases. Compounded forms do exist, but they are mostly late and secondary, such as *incautēla* 'carelessness' (5<sup>th</sup> c. CE+), *conductēla* 'hiring (of mercenaries)' (6<sup>th</sup> c. CE) and *insequella* 'close following' (6<sup>th</sup> c. CE).<sup>43</sup> The only compounded formation in *-ēla* which is found from Plautus onward is the denominal abstract *corruptēla* 'corruption' (< \**con-rumpō*). Later in this thesis, however, it will be argued that denominal *-ēla* is secondary to deverbal *-ēla*, so that *corruptēla* could have been created when the constraint of non-composition was no longer operational (cf. section 3.1.1).

### §2.3.3 Other subgroupings: authors, genres

Looking at individual authors, it becomes clear that while some authors are more inclined towards using *-ēla* abstracts in their works than others, the suffix does not seem to be confined to one genre or writing style in particular. We find formations with *-ēla* in such diverse works as the Plautine comedies (3<sup>rd</sup> c. BCE), Pacuvius' tragedies (2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE), Horace's epodes (1<sup>st</sup> c. BCE), Vergil's epic (1<sup>st</sup> c. BCE), Suetonius' emperor biographies (2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE) and Gaius' law codes (2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE). Authors using *-ēla* in their works probably did not actively invite the reader to see their compositions in a specific (epic, dramatic, lyric) way.

Some authors, however, are more prone to using *-ēla* abstracts than others, and some seem to form new words with *-ēla* productively, as they are attested only once. Of course we should be careful in making such conclusions on the basis of the limited data we have. Nevertheless, it is remarkable that *nitēla* 'shining, brightness' is found only in Apuleius' (2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE) *Apologia*, 6.17 and that *fugēla* (2/0/0) 'flight', *cautēla* (3/119/160) 'caution', *custōdēla* (11/0/0) 'custody', *cantilēna* (11/98/30) 'song' and *suādēla* (5/13/5) 'persuasiveness, persuasion', all relatively rare in antiquity, are also found in Apuleius.<sup>44</sup> The same is true of Tertullian (2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE), whose *captātēla* (*De Pallio* 5.1) is a ἄπαξ εἰρημένον in literary Latin. Additionally, Tertullian's *De Anima* is our only source for *fovella* 'refreshment' (7.15) and *peccātēla* 'sin' (40.7).<sup>45</sup> These two authors show that *-ēla* was not merely used in obscure, petrified expressions but could still be used in their times to form new, understandable words. In other words: *-ēla* was still productive in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century CE, be it only restrictedly.

43 *Obsequella* 'compliance, obedience', found twice in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE (according to the LLT-A), can safely be disregarded, to my mind: cf. fn. 53.

44 Apuleius might even have coined *medēla* 'cure, treatment' which becomes highly popular in Aetas Patrum I. See Chapter three, fn. 55 for doubts surrounding the sole pre-Apuleian attestation of *medēla* in a fragment of Titinius.

45 Note the highly conspicuous variation in spelling within the same text. We will return to this case and others in the next paragraph.

Unfortunately, it is not the case that every author shows a specific preference for either *-ēla* or *-ella*. Rather, the improbable picture emergent from our data is that many authors vacillate between different spellings within their oeuvre, and sometimes the variation is even visible in the same lemma within the same text. Within the confines of *Antiquitas*, it is expected that the four deponent deverbals *-ella*'s, of which we have seen that they constitute nearly all *-ella* spellings, are involved in this confusion. Of these four substantives (*querella* 'complaint', *sequella* 'sequel, follower', *loquella* 'speech', *medella* 'cure, treatment'), the following authors show both the *-ēla* and the *-ella* variant of the same lemma within their corpus:

### 1. *Medēla/medella*

- Apuleius
  - 8x *-ēla*: *De Platone et eius Dogmate* (1x), *Metamorphoses* (7x)
  - 1x *-ella*: *Metamorphoses* (1x)
  
- Aulus Gellius
  - 7x *-ēla*: *Noctes Atticae*
  - 3x *-ella*: *Noctes Atticae*

### 2. *Querēla/querella*

- Catullus
  - 3x *-ēla*: *Carmina* (all in 'carmen' 64)
  - 1x *-ella*: *Carmina* (specifically: 'carmen' 66)
  
- Cicero<sup>46</sup>
  - 55x *-ēla* (across 18 works)
  - 28x *-ella* (across 12 works)
  
- Ovidius
  - 13x *-ēla*: *Amores*, *Ars Amatoria*, *Epistulae ex Ponto*, *Heroides*, *Remedia Amoris*
  - 21x *-ella*: *Fasti*, *Metamorphoses*, *Tristia*

---

<sup>46</sup> We find both *querēla* and *querella* in only three works by Cicero out of 27 in which *-ēla* or *-ella* is found: *In Calpurnium Pisonem oratio*, *Laelius de amicitia* and *Pro Q. Ligario oratio*. Interestingly the Oxford editions of the first two (Nisbet [1961] and Powell [2006], respectively) read *querēla* where the Teubner edition (Klotz [1919]) has *querella*. The critical apparatus of the Oxford editions is remarkably silent on these alternative readings, and does not indicate why *-ēla* is preferred over *-ella* (which, according to Klotz, is the preferred reading). If *querēla* is indeed to be read in these *locī*, then these two works may be removed from the list presented here, as they are otherwise fully consistent in their spelling.

- Petronius
  - 1x *-ēla*: *Carmina*
  - 5x *-ella*: *Satyrica*
  
- Quintilian
  - 1x *-ēla*: *Institutio Oratoria*
  - 2x *-ella*: *Institutio Oratoria*
  
- Seneca Minor
  - 7x *-ēla*: *Medea, Naturales quaestiones, Phaedra, Troades,*
  - 31x *-ella*: *De amicitia fragmenta, De beneficiis, Dialogorum libri, Epistulae morales ad Lucilium*
  
- Statius
  - 5x *-ēla*: *Achilleis, Silvae*
  - 17x *-ella*: *Thebais*

A remarkable feature of this list is that although the entire oeuvre of each of these writers is not consistent in predilecting one spelling variant over the other, individual works themselves do in fact betray a fairly high degree of regularity. This is immediately obvious from Ovid, Petronius, Seneca Minor and Statius, whose works always contain either *querēla* or *querella* but never both. Cicero's extant corpus is also relatively consistent, given the amount of *-ēla/-ella* formations it holds (cf. fn. 46). This consistency of spelling within works is difficult to connect to the observed variance in the whole text body of each individual author.

It is not unthinkable that we are looking at the consequences of a divergent manuscript tradition, in which different manuscripts have come to favour different spellings. This might have happened in, for instance, the most authoritative manuscripts of Ovid containing his *Amores, Ars Amatoria, Epistulae ex Ponto, Heroides* and the *Remedia Amoris*, which seem to have a preference for *-ēla*. On the other hand, our best editions of his *Fasti, Metamorphoses* and *Tristia* appear to be based on manuscripts containing *-ella*. The same might also be responsible for Catullus' irregular usage of *querēla* and *querella* within the same work, since the text of his poems is notoriously corrupt and its transmission highly complicated.<sup>47</sup>

Alternatively, this phenomenon could be caused by the preference of modern editors who for some reason use one spelling variant in favour of the other in their editions. This choice might

---

<sup>47</sup> For more information on the problems surrounding our text of Catullus (and why we need a new text edition), see Harrison 2000.



even be based on only little or no support of the manuscripts. A short survey among the authors whose works can be most clearly divided in those consistently using *-ēla* on the one hand and those with *-ella* on the other, shows that this hypothesis is very well possible. Ovid's works containing *-ēla* (*Amores*, *Ars Amatoria*, *Remedia Amoris*) are all edited by R. Ehwald (1907). Of his works in the LLT-A containing *-ella* (*Fasti*, *Tristia*, *Metamorphoses*), however, editions made by other scholars are used (E.H. Alton et al., J.B. Hall and W.S. Anderson, respectively). The same holds for Seneca Minor, of whose text editions used by the LLT-A some editors only use *-ēla* (R. Peiper & G. Richter for the *Medea*, *Phaedra* and *Troades*, and H.M. Hine, for the *Naturales Quaestiones*), while others are restricted to using *-ella* (F. Haase, E. Hosius, E. Hermes and O. Hense for, respectively, the *De Amicitia*, *De Beneficiis*, *Dialogorum Libri* and the *Epistulae morales ad Lucilium*). Editions of Cicero's texts can likewise be divided reasonably well in those showing *-ēla* and those using *-ella*. Of the sixteen editors whose editions of Cicero employ *ēla*-formations, twelve use one spelling variant consistently. Four others use both *querēla* and *querella* either in the same text edition (see fn. 46) or in different editions.<sup>48</sup>

The pattern emerging from this quick survey is therefore not entirely clear. Generally speaking, editors appear to be consistent in their spelling of *-ēla* or *-ella*, which arouses the suspicion that they have generalised one spelling independently of the manuscript data. The four editors of Cicero mentioned above, however, contradict this claim. It is at least plausible, in any case, that some modern editors have favoured one spelling over the other (notwithstanding the most authoritative readings of the manuscripts), either for consistency's sake or for other reasons. Thereby the original spelling vacillation emerging from the manuscripts could have been obscured.<sup>49</sup>

The problem presented above begs the question how useful the data in Table 1 are for retracing the origins of the spelling variation *-ēla/-ella*. If our attestations are so dependent on manuscripts or editors preferring one spelling over the other, is it then still possible to conclude anything meaningful from these data about the historical reality behind them? I

---

48 T. Maslowski's edition of Cicero's *Pro M. Caelio oratio* from 1995 has *-ēla* (*querēlae* in cap. 74) while his edition of the *Pro P. Sestio oratio* has *querella* (1x), *querellae* (2x) and *querellis* (1x).

49 One indication that at least one editor did not feel the need to justify his choice between *querēla* / *querella* in his critical apparatus can be found in W.S. Anderson's edition of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* at line 2.343. There Anderson writes that he has read "miseras (...) querellas" instead of "miseris (...) quere(l)lis". This remark can only justify his choice of case ending (accusative instead of ablative) here. It cannot be taken as a defense for his choice of spelling, since he remains silent in all ten other cases where he prints *querella* (in various case forms) in the *Metamorphoses*. That our manuscripts of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* have conflicting readings the these eleven *loci* is apparent from R.J. Tarrant's recent OCT edition of the *Metamorphoses*, who prints *querēla* no less than nine times, while agreeing in only two instances with Anderson that *querella* must be read.

believe we should not despair. Even though we cannot be sure that every attestation of *-ēla* or *-ella* represents the exact way the original author would have written (or pronounced) the word in question, the spelling variation is in any case very real. If copyists in Late Antiquity or the Middle Ages had universally generalised a certain tradition of spelling some words with *-ēla* and others with *-ella*, we would expect our data to show a more homogeneous distribution. As it stands, we see that the use of *-ēla* and *-ella* changes over time: *-ella* is virtually unattested in our oldest texts before the 1<sup>st</sup> century CE, and seems to become rarer and rarer in post-Classical times. Consequently, some words are only found spelled in one way until a certain point in time, such as *suādēla*, whose variant *suādella* only arises after 200 CE. This is unexplainable in a scenario where the manuscripts have already been corrupted at a very early stage of transmission, and I assume that the distribution apparent from our data still approaches the underlying historical reality to a certain degree. That the *-ēla/-ella* vacillation was at least present in the lemma of *querēla/querella* 'complaint' in antiquity is, as we have seen, corroborated by Cassiodorus (4<sup>th</sup> c. CE), who must have had access to manuscripts far better and trustworthier than ours (see section 1.1.1.2).

## §2.4 Semantics

The data collected here confirm the range of meanings scholars have variously attributed to our *-ēla* formations. Most words can be adequately translated as action nouns (*nomina actionis*) or as result nouns. To my mind, the term *nomen rei actae*, denoting the product of the verbal action, is a sub-category of result nouns.<sup>50</sup> It is not always clear which interpretation is the more correct. *Querēla*, for instance, is mostly to be understood quite concretely as a 'complaint', a *nomen rei actae*:

*“Teneasne memoria (...) ad me consulem querelas Puteolanorum esse delatas?” (Cicero, In P. Vatinius testem interrogatio 12)*

“Do you remember (...) that the complaints of the people of Puteoli were deferred to me, the consul?” (own transl.)

---

<sup>50</sup> *Cantilēna* 'song' can be seen as the “product” of the transitive verb *cantilāre* 'to sing', because a song is something which is sung. Similarly, *loquēla* in the concrete meaning of 'speech' can be taken as a *nomen rei actae* from the verb *loquor* 'to speak', since speech is something which is spoken. On the other hand, *fugēla* 'flight' (< *fugiō* 'to flee') is not something which is/has 'fled', and *sequēla* 'consequence' (< *sequor* 'to follow') is not something which is followed. The latter two are therefore better analysed simply as result nouns.

Translating *querēlās* here as a nomen actionis '(a) complaining' would be somewhat awkward: actions cannot be brought to a consul, only the concrete results of the action can. Furthermore, it would be strange to find a nomen actionis in the plural (yielding \*'[several] complainings?'). The fact that we find *querēlās* in the plural here rather betrays its concrete character in this context as a nomen rei actae. It seems that a translation along the lines of a nomen rei actae is more often valid if the *-ēla* abstract in question is concrete or material. In several contexts, on the other hand, *querēla* is equally well interpretable as a nomen actionis:

*“Lygdamus in primis, omnis mihi causa querelae, veneat et pedibus vincula bina trahat”*  
(Propertius, *Elegiae* 4.8.79-80)

“First of all, let Lygdamus, the cause of all my complaining/every complaint of mine, be sold, and let him pull double bonds with his feet. (own transl.)

The semantic value of denominal *-ēla* in many cases appears to be quite similar to that of deverbal *-ēla*, as can be exemplified by looking at different contexts of *corruptēla* 'corruption'.

*“Mirum videtur rure erilem filium Strabacem non redisse: nisi si clanculum conlapsus est hic in corruptelam suam.”* (Plautus, *Truculentus* 669)

“I find it strange that my master's son Strabax has not returned from the countryside; unless he has secretly fallen into his debauchery here.” (own transl.)

Here *corruptēla* denotes the action of its base verb *corrumpō* 'to corrupt' and can be viewed as a nomen actionis. In the following example, however, a specific person is meant, so that is possible to analyse *corruptēla* as a nomen agentis.

*“Eccum adest communis corruptela nostrum liberum.”* (Terentius, *Adelphoe* 792)

“There is the common corruptor of our children.” (own transl.)

Alternatively, it is possible to take *corruptēla* here as the action of corrupting: in that case this

person in question is referred to metonymically as 'corruption', comparable to MoEng. 'bother' for 'boring or annoying person'.

Lastly, denominal "relationship term" *-ēla*'s (*clientēla*, *custōdēla*, *parentēla*) are also commonly found as *nomina actionis*:

*"Contra ego: "et quae, tu", inquam, "dic sodes, custodela ista feralis?"* (Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 2.22)

"I said in reply: "And what, please tell me, does this guarding of the dead involve?"" (own transl.)

*Clientēla*, however, commonly conveys the notion of 'clienthood, clientship', denoting the relationship between client and protector, or, metonymically, refers to the body of clients itself, as in the following example.

*"Caesar etsi multis necessariisque rebus in Italiam revocabatur tamen constituerat nullam partem belli in Hispaniis relinquere quod magna esse Pompei beneficia et magnas clientelas in citeriore prouincia sciebat."* (Caesar, *Commentarii de Bello Civili* 2.18)

"Although Caesar was called back to Italy by many pressing circumstances, he decided to leave not a single bit of war in Hispania, for he knew that in the closer province there was much support as well as many client(ele)s for Pompey." (own transl.)

We see that both deverbally *-ēla* and denominal *-ēla* show the same range of meanings: they can most often be characterised as *nomina actionis* or, in some concrete cases, result nouns (c.q. *nomina rei actae*). There is one clear example of a noun indicating a concrete object effectuating the action of the verb: *candēla* 'candle' < *candēō* 'to shine, to be white' is most naturally interpreted as 'that which shines'. A true *nomen instrumenti* (indicating the instrument used to complete the action) is found in *nitēla* 'brightener' from *niteō* 'shine'.<sup>51</sup>

## §2.5 Conclusion

As a conclusion to this chapter, an overview is given of *-ēla*'s most important descriptive facts,

---

<sup>51</sup> *Nitēlās* is found in Apuleius' *Apologia* 6.18: "*Misi, ut petisti, munditias dentium, nitelas oris ex Arabicis frugibus, tenuem, candificum, nobilem pulvisculum*" "I have sent [you], as you requested, a cleaning agent for your teeth, a brightener for your mouth of Arabian spices, a delicate, whitening, excellent little powder" (own transl.)

as based on the synchronic linguistic evidence.

Within the confines of our corpus, spanning from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE to 735 CE, we find 24 distinct *-ēla* formations, although it is contestable whether *cantilēna* 'old song, ditty' and *turbēlae* 'petty commotion, uproar' belong here. All in total, *-ēla* (in various spellings and cases) is attested 4238 times up until the death of Beda Venerabilis (735 CE). *-Ēla* is never a highly productive or 'popular' suffix. Over all three eras its number of attestations relative to the total number of words never exceeds the 0.016% mark. Despite *-ēla*'s rarity, however, it is remarkable that the suffix does not disappear. It is not generally replaced by other suffixes and remains in use throughout Latinity.

As for the spelling variation between *-ēla* and *-ella* the following points are especially noteworthy:

- *-Ēla* is more common than *-ella* than all eras
- The oldest literary authors in our corpus (Plautus and Terence) avail themselves of virtually only *-ēla*.
- Within Antiquitas, *-ella* is only found in deverbial deponent verbs, and *querella* makes up for more than 90% of these instances of *-ella*.

*-Ēla* formations can be classified according to their morphological base, the most important division being between deverbial and denominal *-ēla*. Whereas both deverbial and denominal instances of *-ēla* are equally often found in Antiquitas, deverbial *-ēla* greatly overtakes denominal *-ēla* in frequency in the eras thereafter.

We find *-ēla* in a wide variety of texts and authors, rendering the hypothesis implausible that it is only found in certain genres or writing styles. It is remarkable, however, that modern editions of classical texts show a preference for either *-ēla* or *-ella*, conveying the false impression that each author has a consistent preference for either *-ēla* or *-ella* in every single work. This is most likely the result of editorial choices, a divergent manuscript tradition or both.

*-Ēla*'s semantics, lastly, are not easily captured under a common measure. Most deverbial formations can be interpreted as *nomina actionis*, denoting the action of the verb. The same is

true of those denominal *-ēla*'s which are based on deverbal nouns, such as *corruptēla* 'corruption' < *corruptus* 'corrupt' < *corrumpō* 'to corrupt'. Only *clientēla*, which has no obvious links to any verbal action, cannot be interpreted as such.

Several *-ēla* formations, particularly those with concrete semantics, are also often translatable as result nouns or *nomina rei actae*. Good examples from our data are *querēla* 'complaint' and *turbēlae* 'commotion'. Lastly *candēla* 'candle' and *nitēla* 'whitening powder' deserve special attention: the former cannot be interpreted otherwise than as an object effectuating the action of the verb it is based on (*candeō* 'to shine, be white'); the second is only understandable as a *nomen instrumenti*, denoting the tool or instrument with which the action of the verb is performed (*niteō* 'shine').

## Chapter three

### §3.1 Setting up a Latin archetype

Continuing our investigation deeper into the history of *-ēla*, our first step towards its pre-Latin history consists of setting up a Latin archetype of *-ēla* using only data from within Latin itself (i.e. without using comparative material from other related dialects and languages). With the term 'archetype of *-ēla*' the earliest reconstructible form and meaning of *-ēla* are meant. These are found by investigating the oldest (and, ideally, most isolated) instances of *-ēla*, as they are more likely to have retained *-ēla*'s original form and meaning than later, secondary creations. An attempt will be made in this chapter to separate later, secondary attestations of *-ēla* from the oldest ones and to retrace how the latter could have been spawned by the former.

As appears from the data presented in the previous chapter, not all attestations of *-ēla* are of the same age. On the one hand, some formations are attested later than others and are clearly built on other *-ēla* formations. One such formation is *parentēla* 'relationship' (based on *parēns* 'parent'), which is not found in antiquity and was probably only later modelled after *clientēla* 'clientship, protection' (which does occur in antiquity and is built on *cliēns* 'client'). On the other hand, we find words which are all attested from antiquity onward and which have presumably been created via the same derivational processes, so that it is not easy to decide which form is the more original. This is exemplified by *candēla* (Hem.+) 'candle' and *suādēla* (Pl.+) 'persuasion', both first attested in early antiquity and deriving from second conjugation active verbs. It is not immediately recoverable from our data which one has been created before the other.

#### §3.1.1 Spelling

We will start the reconstruction of our archetype with the establishment of its spelling, being either *-ēla* or *-ella*. Three facts concerning our oldest attestations are especially noteworthy in this regard. Firstly it has already been noted that in recent editions of works of two of our oldest authors, Plautus and Terentius, we find only *-ēla*, not *-ella*, the only exception being *turbellas* in Plautus' *Bacchides* 1056.<sup>52</sup> Secondly we should recall that within the confines of *Antiquitas*, *-ella* is found with only a few deverbal nouns: *querella* 'complaint', *loquella*

---

<sup>52</sup> *Turbēlae*'s appurtenance to our list of *-ēla* formations is, as we have seen, debateable. For discussion, see section 2.2.

'speech', *sequella* 'sequel', *medella* 'cure, treatment'.<sup>53</sup> It should be emphasised strongly that *querella* is by far the most common of these in antiquity. Lastly we should note that *querēla/querella* only starts occurring in the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE, in the works of Cicero, Ovid and Catullus.

On the basis of these facts, I conjecture 1.) that *-ēla* is older than *-ella* and 2.) that *querella* played a key role in the spread of *-ella* throughout forms that originally only showed *-ēla*. The first hypothesis is corroborated by the simple fact that *-ella* only starts to be used frequently two centuries after our first attestations of *-ēla* (in the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BCE), with the appearance of *querella*. The second claim finds support in our 2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE attestations of *medella* and *loquella*. While *medēla* (Tit.+ [2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE]) and *loquēla* (Pl.+ [3<sup>rd</sup> c. BCE]) are quite old, *loquella* (Lucr.+ ) is only found from the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE onwards, and *medella* even later (Apul.+ [2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE]). I therefore propose the following spread pattern for these forms.

Before the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE only *-ēla* was normally used: *loquēla* (Pl.+), *medēla* (Tit.+), *cautēla* (Pl.+ ) 'caution', *tūtēla* (Pl.+ ) 'guardianship', *candēla(brum)* (Caec.+ [2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE]) 'candelabrum' etc. for a total of 21 attestations. *Querēla* (Cic.+ ) was created in the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE, and not much later its variant *querella* (Cic.+ ) must have been formed. Geminate spelled *querella* spawned *loquella* (Catul.+ ) shortly thereafter, since it is first attested around the same time, as a variant to pre-existing *loquēla* (Pl.+ ). A century later, *sequella* (Fron.+ [1<sup>st</sup> c. CE]) was created on the basis of both *querella* and *loquella*, and some time after that we find *medella* (Apul.+ ) as a variant for much older *medēla*. Lastly, we find *sequēla* (Tert.+ [2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE]), which was back-formed from *sequella* under influence of *loquēla*, *medēla* and *querēla*.

This development can be chronologically tabulated in the following way (printed bold are formations presumably added in each century). Note that only the four deponent verbs showing vacillation in spelling are listed here. Although they are not that frequent in the centuries before the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE (both *loquēla* and *medēla* are found only once), other more common *-ēla* abstracts such as *custōdēla* (4x in Plautus) and *corruptēla* (3x in Plautus), are also consistently spelled with *-ēla* before the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE, which shows that *-ēla* was the normal spelling in the time before *querella* arises.

<sup>53</sup> I have omitted *fugella* (Cato [frr.], 1x) 'flight' and *obsequella* (Turpilius [frr.] 1x and Afranius [frr.] 1x) 'compliance, obedience' from the hypothesis presented here, since these words are found only in fragments handed down to us by later authors. Cato's *fugella*, for instance, is found in Priscian (5<sup>th</sup> c. CE, GL 2.88.10). It is therefore very well possible that their original spelling has been compromised by that of later authors. In Priscian's time, the spelling *-ella* had become more common than in classical antiquity.



<u>3<sup>rd</sup> c. BCE</u>	<u>2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE</u>	<u>1<sup>st</sup> c. BCE</u>	<u>1<sup>st</sup> c. CE</u>	<u>2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE</u>
loquēla	loquēla	loquēla/ <b>loquella</b>	loquēla/loquella	loquēla/loquella
	<b>medēla</b>	medēla	medēla/ <b>medella</b>	medēla/medella
		<b>querēla/querella</b>	querēla/querella	querēla/querella
			<b>sequella</b>	<b>sequēla/sequella</b>

If this process is correct, that would mean that *-ēla* is the oldest variant and that *-ella* started encroaching on words written in that manner only after *querēla/querella* was introduced. Within Antiquitas the four deponent verbs mentioned above are the *only ones* to show the spelling *-ella*. In later times *-ēla* abstracts based on active verbs and nouns started being written with *-ella* as well. *Fovella* 'refreshment' (< *foveō* 'refresh'), for instance, is found in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE, and *candella* 'candle' (< *candeō* 'be bright') only from the 4<sup>th</sup> c. CE onward.

The question is now whence *querella* might have received its different spelling. In section 1.1.1.4, the theory was put forward that the spelling variation *-ēla/-ella* might have arisen from confusion with the common suffix *-ell-* we most often find in diminutive formations (Leumann [1977]: 306, 312). In that same section I objected to such a general conflation of these two classes of substantives that *-ēla* verbal abstracts and *-ella* diminutive substantives have quite different semantics. The case of *querēla*, however, shows some mitigating circumstances which perhaps make confusion with *-ella* diminutives not as unexpected as it would be in the case of other *-ēla* abstracts.

Although *querēla* is clearly a verbal abstract of *queror* 'to complain', it has a very concrete meaning: in most cases, it can be comfortably translated with 'complaint' (nomen rei actae). This is probably also the reason why *querēla* is relatively often found in the plural; within Antiquitas we find *querēla/querella* ca. 210x in the plural as opposed to ca. 170x in the singular. Other *-ēla* formations with a more abstract meaning, such as *tūtēla* 'guardianship', *cautēla* 'care, caution' and *corruptēla* 'corruption' are found pluralised much less often: within Antiquitas we find *tūtēla* ca. 40x in the plural as opposed to ca. 340x in the singular.

*Querēla*'s specific, concrete denotation could have lead speakers or writers to confuse it with *-ella* diminutives, as diminutives are generally also have concrete referants. The semantic gap between the diminutives and other instances of *-ēla* (whose meaning was more abstract than that of *querēla*) was possibly big enough to prevent or delay this confusion. This is

corroborated by the fact that *tūtēla*, although very common in Antiquitas (380x) is only found sporadically spelled with *-ella* in Aetas Patrum I and II (6x in total). There thus seems to be a correlation between the concreteness of an *-ēla* abstract, how often it occurs in the plural and how often it was written with *-ella*. Seeing that *querēla* is arguably one of the most concrete instances of *-ēla* in our corpus, one could expect *-ella* spellings to be especially frequent there.

Secondly, *querēla* is the only *-ēla* formation in our corpus that has a cognate form in *-ulus*, which is the adjective *querulus* 'grumbling, protesting'. In several cases adjectives of this kind developed into agent and instrumental substantives, such as *iaculum* 'javelin' and *speculum* 'mirror'.<sup>54</sup> Although *querulus* itself is never used as a substantive in Latin, its ending is homophonous with nouns from this agentive/instrumental class.

Now, as we have seen in the case of *\*turdula* ~ *turdella* '(little) thrush', when these two types of *\*-elo-* nouns (diminutive and agentive/instrumental) were diminuted, the suffix *-ellus*, *-a*, *-um* emerges (section 2.2). Examples of these pairs are:

- *capsula* 'little box' ~ *capsella* 'id.'
- *catula* 'little dog, puppy' ~ *catella* 'id.'
- *oculus* 'eye' ~ *ocellus* 'little eye'
- *porcula* 'piglet' ~ *porcella* 'little piglet'

One could imagine that *querēla*, given its quite concrete meaning, gradually came to be interpreted as a diminutive formation (although it did not have that meaning) when it was first used in the time of Catullus and Cicero. Since substantives ending in *-ellus*, *-ella*, *-ellum* are quite common in classical antiquity and suffixation with *-ēla* was, as we have seen, only marginally productive, it is perhaps not improbable that speakers familiar with the *-ulus* adjective *querulus*, *-ula*, *-ulum* would start writing or pronouncing *querēla* as *querella* because there are many formal parallels for *-ulus* ~ *-ellus* pairs.

*Querēla*'s concreteness, its formal similarity to substantives diminutable with *-ellus*, *-a*, *-um* and the existence of *querulus* might all together have functioned as the 'Triebfeder' Georg Cohn required for the spelling confusion theory to be plausible. As we may recall (section 1.1.1.5), Cohn argued that formal similarity between *-ēla* and *-ella* was not enough to cause

---

54 For more examples and literature, see Chapter two, fn. 33.

*Suffixvertäuschung* in light of the semantic gap that separates *-ēla* and (diminutive) *-ella*. In the case of *querēla*, however, that gap is bridged by its concrete semantic value (similar to that of diminutives) and by the existence of a cognate form with the suffix *-ulus, -ula, -ulum* which was found next to *-ellus, -ella, -ellum* diminutives in several other words.

Regarding the length of the *e*-vowel in front of *-ĕlla*'s geminate, we may recall Wilhelm Heraeus' thesis that it may have had the same length as *-ēla*, so that *-ēlla* should be read rather than *-ella* (section 1.1.1.3). In light of the preceding argument where confusion with the diminutive suffix *-ellus, -a, -um* is assumed, one is bound to wonder whether such an incomplete confusion is a credible scenario. While *-ēla* and *-ella* both occurred long separately before these two suffixes were mixed up in some *-ēla* abstracts, *-ēlla* is not ever found as a productive suffix anywhere in Latin. If speakers of Latin misinterpreted *-ēla* on the basis of the diminutive suffix, the expected result would be to see *-ēla* pronounced (and written) like the diminutive suffix, so that we should find *-ella*, not *-ēlla*.

### §3.1.2 Morphological base

As we have seen in section 2.3.2, *-ēla* can be found added to different bases (verbs as well as nouns). Because it is highly improbable that *-ēla* originally could be added to verbal stems as well as nominal stems, one of them must be older. It is crucial for the reconstruction of our Latin archetype that we try to discover whether deverbal or denominal *-ēla* is the more original, and how later formations could have arisen from older ones. For the answer to this question, the oldest forms are again the most interesting. Our oldest attestations of *-ēla* (in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries BCE), distributed over the four bases distinguished in section 2.3.2 are as follows:

1. Deverbal, second conjugation active verbs: *candēla* (Pl.+), *suādēla* (Pl.+) (*medēla* [Tit.+])<sup>55</sup>;
2. Deverbal, fourth conjugation deponent verbs: *loquēla* (Pl.+), (*medēla*);
3. Denominal, *-tus* adjectives or *-tor* nomina agentis: *cautēla* (Pl.+), *corruptēla* (Pl.+),

---

<sup>55</sup> It should be noted that *medēla* is only found once (*medēlam*) in a fragment of Titinius (*Prilia*, fr. IX, 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE), for which the LLT-A uses the Teubner edition by O. Ribbeck (1873). After Titinius, however, *medēla* is never used again (in either spelling) until the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE (in the works of Apuleius, Aulus Gellius and Fronto). This might be the reason why the same O. Ribbeck emended *medēlam* to *remedium* in a later Teubner edition (1898). *Medēlam* might be a later emendation by Nonius Marcellus (4<sup>th</sup>/5<sup>th</sup> c. CE) in whose work *De Compensiosa Doctrina* Titinius' fragments are preserved.

*sūtēla* (Pl.+), *tūtēla* (Pl.+);

4. Denominal, “relationship” terms: *custōdēla* (Pl.+), *clientēla* (Ter.+).
5. Other: *fugēla* 'flight' (Cato+), (*cantilēna* 'little song' [Ter.+], *turbēlae* 'uproar' [Pl.+])

Unfortunately, *-ēla* formations of every distinguishable class are represented in our oldest texts, so that it is not immediately clear on the basis of the data which classes of *-ēla* abstracts are particularly older than others. Only conjectures are possible at this point.

It does not seem strange to suppose that the creation of “relationship” terms *custōdēla* and *clientēla*, together with (clearly secondarily formed) *parentēla* 'relationship' (5<sup>th</sup> c. CE+), was sparked by *tūtēla* 'protection, guardianship'. Not only is *tūtēla* semantically very similar to the “relationship” terms, denoting the relationship between a caretaker and a person or object under its care, but it is also by far the most common *-ēla* formation in *Antiquitas* (attested 380 times in various case forms), which renders it more probable that *clientēla* (59x in *Antiquitas*) and *custōdēla* (11x) were built on it than vice versa.

A good starting point for our investigation into the oldest morphological base for *-ēla* is Manu Leumann's theory (see section 1.1.2.2). He took the *-ē-* in *-ēla* simply to be the same *-ē-* we typically find in the second conjugation (*cand-ē-re*). In later times, when *-ēla* was not recognised anymore as *-ē-* + *-la* but was simply analysed as *-ēla*, it was added to other bases, so as to form, for instance, *luēla* 'expiation' from the third conjugation verb *luō* 'to atone', and *tūtēla*, *corruptēla*, etc. from nominal bases. However, in this scenario it is difficult to argue why *-ēla* would have spread from present stems to (apparently) nomina agentis in *-tor* or verbal adjectives in *-tus*. In other words: why do we not find *\*\*tuēla* (based on *tueor/tuor* 'to watch, take care of') instead of *tūtēla*? Another problem inherent to Leumann's analysis is that it assumes the existence of a suffix *\*-la*, whose further analysis is unclear.

In the following section two modifications are proposed to solve these problems which allow for a more precisely formulated inner-Latin derivation of *\*-ēla* and for its spread from verbal stems to nominal stems.

Instead of analysing *-ēla* as the result of older *\*-ē-* + *\*-la*, we may envision *\*-sla* as a second element. As opposed to Leumann's *\*-la*, which, to my knowledge, has no parallels in Latin, the suffix *\*-sla-* or *\*-slo-* assumed here is found in Latin on multiple occasions, for example in *scālae* 'stairs' < Plt. *\*skand-sla-* (cf. *scandō* 'to ascend'), *pālus* 'stake, pole' < Plt. *\*pāg-slo-* (cf.

*pangō* 'to fix, attach').<sup>56</sup> These substantives are normally interpreted as instrumental nouns, and \*-slo-/-sla- are often taken as instrumental suffixes. (Leumann [1977]: 311) However, these nouns can be equally well understood as concrete objects effectuating the action of the verb: a 'stake' is something which is 'fixed'; a 'ladder' is 'something which is ascending'.<sup>57</sup> In this interpretation, *scālae* and *pālus* are not unlike the -ēla formation *candēla* 'candle'. Importantly, the base verbs *scandō* and *pangō* are both 3<sup>rd</sup> conjugation verbs while *candēō* is a second conjugation verb. One could imagine that \*-slo-/-sla- was originally added directly after the verbal stem, and that -ēla represented the addition of \*-sla- to second conjugation verbal stems, for instance: \**candē-sla*. Intervocalic \*-sl- then regularly developed into -Ūl-, presumably through \*-Vzl-. This can be illustrated by Lat. *vēnum* (acc.) 'sale' < PIE \**uesnom*, cf. Skt. *vasná-* 'price' and probably also Lat. *pūlex* 'flea' < PIt. \**pusl-*, cf. taboo-deformed Skt. *plúṣi-*, Gr. *ψύλλα*, Lith. *blusà*. (OHCGL 165) In later times, when \*-sla- was not recognised as such anymore, speakers reanalysed -ēla as the abstracting suffix and added it to other verbal stems, creating *loquēla* 'speech' (= *loqu-ēla*) and *fugēla* 'flight' (*fug-ēla*).

One way to account for the spread of -ēla from verbs to nouns is to take *tūtēla* (Ter.+) as key form. In the secondary literature this abstract noun is always interpreted as denominal, either from the verbal adjective *tūtus* or from the nomen agentis *tūtor*. (OHCGL 301; Leumann [1977]: 312) However, this may not be necessary. As early as Naevius (3<sup>rd</sup> c. BCE) we find traces of a verb *tūtō* (*tūtāre*) 'to protect, look after', which is found in Plautus only as a deponent *tūtōr* (*tūtārī*) 'id.'. This verb *tūtāre/ī* could in theory either be denominative from the adjective *tūtus* 'safe, protected' or an intensive formation built on the participle *tūtus* pertaining to the verb *tu(e)or* 'to watch over, protect'.<sup>58</sup> (OHCGL 401) However this may be,

56 *Prēlum* 'press' (from *premō* 'to press') is often included here. However, its analysis as proposed by Leumann (1977: 311) as \**prem-slo-* is deemed as "not very likely" by De Vaan (2008: s.v. *premō*), for the reason that we would this to develop into \**prem-Vslo-* (with anaptyxis). Instead, De Vaan analyses this word as \**pres-lo-* and argues that the present stem *prem-* was back-formed from *premi* on the model of *tremō* ~ *tremi* 'to shiver'.

57 The action noun to *scandō* is *scansiō* 'climbing' (Var.+ [1<sup>st</sup> c. CE]) which occurs only thrice in Antiquitas. The verb *scandō* itself is not attested before Cato (2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE) while compounded *ascendō* 'to ascent', *dēscendō* 'descent', *ēscendō* 'to mount' *cōnscendō* 'id., to board' and *īnscendō* 'id.', as well their action nouns *ascensiō* 'ascent' and *īnscensiō* 'mounting' are all attested well from Plautus onward. Possibly the PIt. root \**skand-* was originally restricted to composed forms. Note that uncompounded *scālae* is also attested from Plautus onward.

The same pattern might be true of the *pangō*, whose oldest related verbal and nominal attestations in Plautus, Ennius (3<sup>rd</sup> c. BCE) and Pacuvius (2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE) and Cato (2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE) are nearly always composed:

*antepagmentum* 'facing of a window-frame' (Cato+), *prōpagmen* 'prolongation' (Enn.+), *prōpāgō* 'offspring' (Cato+), *repāgula*, *-ōrum* 'door-bars' (Pl.+), etc. (For more examples, cf. De Vaan [2008]: s.v. *pangō*). The simple verb *pangō* is attested as early as Plautus (2x *pepigī*), Ennius (1x *pānixit*) and Naevius (2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE; 2x *pactō*). We will return to this pattern in section 3.2.2.

58 Examples of repetitives/intensives formed as such are *cantāre* 'recite, incant' < *canere* 'sing', *dictāre* 'recite' < *dicere* 'say', *pressāre* 'press' < *premō* 'press'.

once *\*-ēla* had become productive as an abstract suffix in its own right, it was added to the verbal stem of *tūt-āre/ī* to form *tūt-ēla*. Later still, the simple analogy *tūtus : tūtēla = cautus : x*,  $x = \textit{cautēla}$  facilitated a spread from deverbal to denominal formations. New abstracts in *-tēla* could now be formed directly from *-tus* participles (cf. *peccātēla* 'sin' < *peccātus* 'sinned'; *corruptus* > *corruptēla* 'corruption').

The entire process can be tabulated in the following way.

Proto-Italic		Latin						
Deverbal						Denominal		
<i>*candē-sla-</i>	>	<i>candē-la</i>	→	<i>cand-ēla</i>	→	<i>tūt-ēla</i>	→	<i>caut-ēla</i>
<i>[*skand-sla-</i>	>	<i>scā-lae]</i>	(reanalysis)		(spread)		(analogy)	<i>corrupt-ēla</i>
<i>[*pag-slo-</i>	>	<i>pā-lus]</i>						(etc.)

### §3.1.3 Semantics

In the previous chapter we have come across an extensive range of different semantic values for deverbal *-ēla*. Most can be translated as action nouns, while others are best taken as result nouns. Only once do we find an undoubtable example of a *nomen instrumenti*, and similarly there is but one true abstract denoting the object effectuating the action of the verb.

It is most economical to assume that *-ēla* originally formed *nomina actionis*, which is only secondarily followed up by nouns denoting the object effectuating the verbal action, the instrument or the result of that action. Denominal *-ēla* is presently not so interesting for the reconstruction of our Latin archetype, since it is probably secondary to the deverbal formations.

If *-ēla* is truly the generalised reflex of *\*-slo-/-sla* as is supposed above, one might try to link *-ēla*'s original semantics as reconstructed here even further back in time, and link them to the agentive/instrumental denotation of *\*-slo-/-sla-*. Seeing that feminisation marks abstraction elsewhere in Latin (see section 3.3.3.1), one could suppose that *-ēla* was originally an abstract of an older agentive adjective in *\*-slo-/-sla-*.<sup>59</sup> This is all necessarily speculation, however, and more scenario's to link *\*-slo-/-sla-*'s semantics to those of *-ēla* are imaginable.

<sup>59</sup> The Greek pair of *τομός, -ή, -όν* 'cutting, sharp' (agentive adjective) ~ *τομή* '(the) cutting, incision' (action noun) could be a model for this combination.

### §3.1.4 Conclusion

Summarising our investigations into *-ēla*'s original spelling, base and semantics, I conclude that *-ēla* was originally pronounced with a long *-ē*-vowel and a single *-l-* (*pinguis*). The geminate spelling *-ella* was secondarily introduced (presumably via *querella*) in certain concrete *-ēla* formations due to confusion with the highly productive diminutive suffix *-ella*. Furthermore, *-ēla* was deverbal in origin, spreading only later to nominal stems through formations such as *tūtēla*, which was formally built on the verb *tūtāre/ī* but also had a participle *tūtus*, so that the mere combination <sup>0</sup>-*tus* ~ <sup>0</sup>-*tēla* analogically spawned new *-tēla* formations on the basis of nominal forms in *-tus*.

Lastly, *-ēla*'s original semantic value can be characterised as denoting *nomina actionis*. Later, some of these abstracts could more concretely indicate *nomina rei actae*, while only a few developed into *nomina instrumenti* and nouns denoting the object effectuating the verbal action.

A possible inner-Latin development of *-ēla* from older *\*-slo-/-sla-* has also been discussed. According to this scenario *-ēla* is a reanalysed and generalised variant of *\*-sla-* added to second conjugation verbal stems. There are but few words in Latin representing reflexes of this older *\*-slo-/-sla-*, and they betray an older agentive or instrumental function. It is very well possible that our *nomina actionis* in *-ēla* were derived from these *\*-slo-/-sla-* nominals.

### §3.2 Competing suffixes/derivational processes

In order to give an account of *-ēla*'s productivity throughout Latinity, an overview is necessary of formations with which our abstracts in *-ēla* might have been in direct competition. We are then in a better position to explain why certain *-ēla* abstracts are more or less often used. Not every case of suffixal competition will be treated here in detail. Many bases to which *-ēla* is added do not have near-synonymical derivations with other suffixes which are in direct competition with *-ēla*, such as *tūtēla* 'guardianship' and *candēla* 'candle'. In other cases, such as *fugēla* 'flight' ~ *fuga* 'id.', one variant is clearly secondary to the other while a difference in meaning is hard to detect. *Fugēla* only occurs twice in our corpus, while its synonym *fuga* is very frequent. It is hard to uncover the reason why Apuleius and Cato, the two authors using *fugēla*, would have preferred this form over *fuga*. The following discussion will treat cases of suffix competition which are of special interest, either because of the distribution of both suffixes or because of special differences in meaning.

#### §3.2.1. Suffix *-tiō*

One suffix which has a meaning very similar to that of *-ēla* is the suffix *-tiō*, commonly analysed as a compound suffix (\*-*ti-* + \*-*on*) and formally identical to Armenian *-tiwn*. It is found in, among many others, *probātiō* (Cic.+)'approval' < *probō* 'approve' and *actiō* (Varro+)'action' < *agō* 'do'. It has become highly productive in Cicero's days and like *-ēla* it creates deverbal abstracts denoting either the action or its result. (OHCGL 311) Comparing our attestations of *-ēla* with attested *-tiō* nouns, we find the following pairs:

- *captātiō* (Cic.+)'capture' ~ *captātēla* (Tert.+)'id.'
- *cautiō* (Cic.+)'caution, security' ~ *cautēla* (Pl.+)'id.'
- *conductiō* (Cic.+)'1. tenancy, 2. summary' ~ *conductēla* (6<sup>th</sup> c. CE)'hiring of (mercenary) troops'
- *corruptiō* (Cic.+)'corruption' ~ *corruptēla* (Pl.+)'id.'
- *locūtiō* (Cic.+)'speaking, speech' ~ *loquēla* (Pl.+)'id.'
- *monitiō* (Col.+ [1<sup>st</sup> c. CE])'admonition, reminding' ~ *monēla* (Tert.+ [2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE])'id.'

*Captātēla*, *conductēla* and *monēla* occur three times or less, and only in the post-classical period before 735 CE. They are clearly secondary and do not replace their earlier *-tiō* counterparts. Also secondary are *monēla* and *captātēla*, which are used mainly by Tertullian.



This particular author was, as we have seen, quite fond of using and creating *-ēla* abstracts (see section 2.3.3). The one instance of *conductēla* in Iohannes Biclarensis' *Chronicon* in the 6<sup>th</sup> century CE is readily understandable: the verb *condūcō* has the specialised meaning of 'to hire as mercenary, to conscribe', but its abstract in *-tiō* could not refer to this technical term. To create an abstract from *condūcō* whilst signalling a difference in meaning from the usual *conductiō*, *conductēla* was created.

*Cautiō*, *corruptiō* and *locūtiō*, however, show a different story. While *cautiō* and *cautēla* are used from antiquity onward and are attested in medieval times, no real difference in meaning can be uncovered. Although *cautēla* is much older, it is only found once in Plautus and twice in Apuleius in the years before 200 CE. *Cautiō*, on the other hand, is attested 48 times in the same period. Between 200 and 500 CE both *cautiō* and (especially) *cautēla* become more and more frequent and the initial difference between the two is waning: *cautēla* is attested 113 times while *cautiō* is attested no less than 209 times. In the following centuries (500-735 CE), *cautēla* (154x) clearly overtakes *cautiō* (92x). It continues to do so in the Middle Ages, where we find 831 times *cautēla* next to 245 times *cautiō*. It is clear that *cautēla* is gradually replacing *cautiō*, although total replacement never seems to happen: both variants continue to be used throughout Latinity.

The situation with *corruptēla/corruptiō* and *loquēla/locūtiō* is in origin the same as with *cautēla/cautiō*, but its outcome is quite the opposite. Again, the *ēla*-forms are first found in Plautus while the *tiō*-form is not attested before Cicero, showing that *corruptēla* and *loquēla* are decidedly older. *Corruptēla* is more common in antiquity with 27 attestations next to six times *corruptiō*.<sup>60</sup> *Loquēla*, on the other hand, is not more common than *locūtiō* in any era, as

---

60 The latter is first found twice within a single passage from Cicero's *Tusculanae Disputationes*, where it is clearly opposed to another abstract in *-tiō*.

"*Morbum appellant totius corporis corruptionem, aegrotationem morbum cum imbecillitate, vitium, cum partes corporis inter se dissident; (...) ita fit, ut in altera corruptione opinionum morbus efficiatur et aegrotatio, in altera inconstantia et repugnantia.*" (Cicero, *Tusculanae Disputationes*. 4.13.28)

"They call that a disease where the whole body is corrupted; they call that sickness where a disease is attended with a weakness, and that a defect where the parts of the body are not well compacted together; (...) Thus it happens that, in the one case, a disease and sickness may arise from a corruption of opinions; in the other case, the consequence may be inconstancy and inconsistency." (transl. C.D. Younge, 139)

One could think that Cicero, who has coined many new *-tiō* formations in his works, created *corruptiō* here to mirror *aegrōtātiō* 'sickness', but *aegrōtātiō* is likewise not attested before Cicero. It is very well possible that he has created them both.

the former is found 8 times in antiquity, while *locūtiō* occurs 13 times (although this might well be coincidental). Interestingly, authors who use *locūtiō* never seem to use *loquēla* and vice versa. This might be due to personal preference, since there seems to be no special difference in meaning between the two.

In the two eras following Antiquitas, the forms in *-tiō* increased in popularity even more. *Corruptiō* (1146/678) and *locūtiō* (861/620) seem to replace *corruptēla* (238/28) and *loquēla* (205/121) in Aetas Patrum I and II, although both variants remain in use throughout the Middle Ages.

### §3.2.2 Suffix *-entia*

The suffix *-entia* is in fact a compound suffix, consisting of the present participle suffix *\*-ent-* augmented with *\*-ija*. Formations with *-entia* are already found in Plautus, and the suffix seems to form deverbal abstracts (nomina actionis) from various types of verbs, such as *distantia* (Lucr.+) 'difference' < *distō* 'be at a distance', *patientia* (Pl.+) 'patience' < *patior* 'endure', *sapientia* 'wisdom' (Pl.+), *sapiō* 'be wise'. (OHCGL 279)

Regarding verbal stems which are also the basis for verbal abstracts in *-ēla*, *-entia* is found added to the verbal stem of the fourth conjugation deponent verbs *loquor* 'speak' and *sequor* 'follow' to form *loquentia* and *sequentia*. Whereas *loquēla* is attested from Plautus onward, *loquentia* is only found twice (in Pliny the Younger [1<sup>st</sup> c. CE] and Aulus Gellius [2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE]).<sup>61</sup> This might give rise to the suspicion that *loquentia* did not exist until the 1<sup>st</sup> century CE, but this is only half true. From Ennius and Plautus onward, we find several compounded forms in antiquity with *loquentia* as their second member: *blandiloquentia* (Enn.+) 'flattering words', *stultiloquentia* (Pl.+) 'silly talk', *vaniloquentia* (Pl.+) 'idle talk, vaunting', *eloquentia* 'eloquence' (Varro+), *tolutiloquentia* (Novius [1<sup>st</sup> c. CE]) 'talking on a trot' (< *tolūtīm* [adv.] 'trottingly'), *breviloquentia* (Cic.+) 'shortness of speech' (Cic.+), *magniloquentia* (Cic.+) 'elevated language', *suaviloquentia* (Cic.) 'pleasant manner of talking' and *superbiloquentia* (Cic.) 'arrogance'. It thus seems that *loquēla* and *loquentia* are found in a complementary distribution: *loquēla* is only found as a simplex; *loquentia* is mostly found in compounds. Seeing that *loquentia* is only used very late in Antiquitas and only very rarely thereafter (8 times in Aetas Patrum I, 4 times in Aetas Patrum II), one may rightfully surmise that an early appearance and extensive spread of *loquentia* as simplex was halted by the existence of *loquēla*, its (virtual) synonym. *Loquēla*, importantly, is never found compounded in Antiquitas.<sup>62</sup>

61 Not counting, of course, instances of the active participle nom.-acc.n.pl. *loquentia*, gen. *loquentium*.

62 These data might even point to an original distribution in which *-entia* was restricted to compound forms, as

The same might be happening with *sequēla* ~ *sequentia* 'following, sequel', although these words are but rarely found. It is true that the simplex *sequentia* is only found compounded in Antiquitas, while our oldest attestations of *sequēla* nearly always show the simplex.<sup>63</sup> *Sequēla* itself, however, is very rare in Antiquitas (occurring two times), and compounded forms with *sequentia* are not common either: we find 7x *consequentia* (Cic.+)'result, consequence', 3x *obsequentia* (Pl.+)'compliance' and only 1x *inconsequentia* (Quint.) 'inconsequence, something which has no logical connection'. All in all, the attestations are too few to make any definitive statements about some complementary distribution between *sequēla* and *sequentia*.

Here, we should recall the observation made in footnote 57 that deverbal formations based on the stems of *scandō* 'climb, ascend' and *pangō* 'fix' are normally found compounded in our oldest texts. *Scālae* 'stairs' and *pālus* 'stake, pole' are notable exceptions to this rule. If an etymological connection truly exists between \*-*sla*-/-*slo*- (with which *scālae* and *pālus* are built) and *-ēla*, then we could suppose that, at one time, \*-*sla*-/-*slo*- could only be added to uncompounded verbal stems. This assumption is compatible with the conclusion reached earlier about deverbal formations in *-ēla* (section 2.3.2): they are always uncompounded.

### §3.2.3 Suffix *-mōnia*

Next to *querēla* 'complaint, lament' we find *querimōnia* (57/77/38, Pl.+), the productivity of which is visibly inhibited after Antiquitas.<sup>64</sup> According to OHCGL, substantives in *-mōnia* "fall into two groups: temper (*ācrimōnia* 'vigor', *aegrimōnia* 'grief', *querimōnia* 'complaint') and religious practice (*caerimōnia* 'sacredness', *castimōnia* 'ceremonial purity', *sāctimōnia* 'holiness')." (277) This might suggest that *querimōnia* denotes something more emotional or mood-related than *querēla*, which is then to be interpreted as a formal, 'official' complaint. However, no such distinction can be recovered from the contexts in which these words occur. Both *querēla* and *querimōnia* seem to be used for formal complaints presented to a political body as well as grief-laden deplorations. Four quotations from Cicero are presented here to illustrate this virtual synonymity.

---

seems to be the case for Homeric Greek *-ίη*, which is mostly found in compounds (Risch [1974]: 116-8). I have not been able to find literature confirming or refuting this hypothesis.

63 The only two exceptions from are *obsequella* (2x) 'compliance, obedience' in fragments of Turpilius (2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE) and Afranius (2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE), which have already been noticed before (see fn. 53) because of their remarkably early *-ella* spellings. These two forms are probably best left out of consideration here, as they are likely to be added secondarily by a later author.

64 Our corpus in Aetas Patrum I is at least double the size of that of Antiquitas. Aetas Patrum II contains about as many lines as Antiquitas.

In the first two, *querimōnia* denotes an official complaint whereas *querēla* ('*misera quidem et lūctuōsa*') appears to be an emotional lament.

1. (The Carthaginians have occupied all land surrounding Saguntum, a city allied to Rome. The Saguntines have sent envoys to Rome to ask for help and protection. In response, the senate and the consuls decide to send envoys to Carthage, which they instruct as follows.)

*"Quibus si videretur digna causa, et Hannibali denuntiarent, ut ab Saguntinis, sociis populi Romani, abstineret, et Carthaginem in Africam traicerent ac sociorum populi Romani querimonias deferrent."* (Livius, *Ab Urbe Condita* 21.6.4)

"If there was a just cause to do so, [the envoys] should warn Hannibal to keep away from the Saguntines, the allies of the Roman people, and they should cross over into Africa to deliver the complaints of Rome's allies." (own transl.)

2. (Cicero reacts to the claim made by Antony that he had done Cicero a favour for which Cicero showed no gratitude.)

*"Sed sit beneficium, quando quidem maius accipi a latrone nullum potuit: in quo potes me dicere ingratum? An de interitu rei publicae queri non debui, ne in te ingratus viderer? At in illa querela misera quidem et luctuosa, sed mihi pro hoc gradu in quo me senatus populusque Romanus conlocavit necessaria, quid est dictum a me cum contumelia, quid non moderate, quid non amice?"* (Cicero, *In M. Antonium orationes* 2.6)

"I, however, grant that it was a kindness, since no greater kindness could be received from a robber, still in what point can you call me ungrateful? Ought I not to complain of the ruin of the republic, lest I should appear ungrateful towards you? But in that complaint, mournful indeed and miserable, but still unavoidable for a man of that rank in which the senate and people of Rome have placed me, what did I say that was insulting? that was otherwise than moderate? that was otherwise than friendly?" (transl. C.D. Young)

In the next two quotations, however, the mirror image appears: *querēla* is now found as a political, official complaint while it is *querimōnia* which now denotes an emotional plea.

3. *"Teneasne memoria (...) ad me consulem querelas Puteolanorum esse delatas?"* (Cicero, *In P. Vatinius testem interrogatio* 12)

“Do you remember that the complaints of the people of Puteoli were deferred to me, the consul?” (own transl.)

4. (Cicero reproaches his opponent Verres for having stolen the property of his own friend, Malleolus, which was rightfully due to his son after his death.)

*“Homo avarissime et spurcissime, redde bona sodalis filio, si non quae abstulisti, at quae confessus es! Cur cogis sodalis filium hanc primam in foro vocem cum dolore et querimonia emittere? Cur sodalis uxorem, sodalis socrum, domum denique totam sodalis mortui contra te testimonium dicere?”* (Cicero, *In Verrem orationes* 2.1.94)

“O most avaricious and most licentious man, restore the property of your comrade to his son; if not all you have robbed him of, at least that which you have confessed that you received. Why do you compel the son of your comrade to utter his first words in the forum with the voice of indignation and complaint? Why do you compel the wife of your comrade, the mother-in-law of your comrade, in short, the whole family of your dead comrade, to hear evidence against you?” (transl. C.D. Younge)

It is not easy either to indicate another distinction in use: both *querēla* and *querimōnia* are found in rhetorical speeches and personal letters, both can denote accusations to a higher authority or reproaches to a person of lower standing et cetera. It is clear that an original difference in meaning must have been so small that *querēla*, which does in fact become very popular after Antiquitas, started to obscure *querimōnia* at a certain moment.

### §3.2.4 Miscellaneous

This group consists of suffixes added to the same stems as some of the *-ēla* abstracts. However, these suffixes cannot be seen as true concurrent suffixes of *-ēla* for various reasons we will discover below.

While *custōdia* (Naev.+), like *custōdēla* (Pl.+), is a nomen actionis/nomen rei actae of *custōdiō* 'to guard, to take care of', both variants are not used interchangeably because there is a small difference in meaning: whereas *custōdēla* regularly means 'entrusting, care', *custōdia* is more specifically used in a military sense as 'guard, watch, protection', as is illustrated here by two fragments from Plautus.

1. “*Tibi auscultamus et, Venus alma, ambae te obsecramus Aram amplexantes hanc tuam lacrumantes, genibus nixae, in custodelam nos tuam ut recipias et tutere.*” (Plautus, *Rudens* 694-6)

“We listen to you, blessed Venus, we both beg you in tears while clasping this altar of yours and kneeling, to take us in your care and protect us.” (own transl.)

2. (Lycus is put under pressure to be put on trial; he offers to pay money instead)  
Lycus: “*Verum obsecro te ut liceat simplum solvere, Trecentos Philippos: credo, conradi potest. Cras auctionem faciam.*”

Agorastocles: “*Tantisper quidem ut sis apud me lignea in custodia.*” (Plautus, *Poenulus* 1362-5)

L.: “But I beg of you to let me pay this simple sum of 300 Philippeans: I believe this amount can be scraped together. I will hold an auction tomorrow.”

A.: “Only on the condition that you remain in my house, in wooden custody.” (own transl.)

The same appears to be the case with *medēla* (Titin.+) ~ *medicīna* (Pl.+), both ultimately related to the verb *medeor* ‘to heal, to cure’. While the former is best translated broadly as ‘curing, healing’, the latter should be understood as an adjective of *medicīnus* ‘having to do with medicine’. *Medicīnus*, in turn, is derived from *medicus* ‘doctor, physician’ via the suffix *-īno-*, which makes denominative genitival adjectives, e.g. *equus* ‘horse’ > *equīnus* ‘equine’. (OHCGL: 288). In combination with an elliptic [*ars*] *medicīna* means ‘(the study/art of) medicine’; combined with [*rēs*] the specific ‘cure, medicine, drug’ is meant. In some instances the difference is very slight but it was apparently noticeable enough to keep both variants alive: both *medēla* (21/222/101) and *medicīna* (579/947/351) remain in use in antiquity and beyond.

### §3.2.5 Summary

In this section we have come across several instances of suffix competition, which together form an intricate picture of replacements and distributions. We have found the following oppositions:

- No alternatives existing to *-ēla* (before 735 CE)
  - *candēla* 'candle'
  - (*cantilēna* 'old song, ditty')
  - *clientēla* 'body of clients'
  - *fovēla* 'refreshment'
  - *luēla* 'atonement, expiation'
  - *mandatēla* 'entrusting'
  - *parentēla* 'relationship'
  - *suadēla* 'persuasiveness'<sup>65</sup>
  - *tūtēla* 'protection'
  
- *-Ēla* overtakes or replaces a competing suffix
  - *cautēla* (Pl.+) 'caution, security' ~ *cautiō* (Cic.+) 'id.'
  - *querēla* (Cic.+) 'complaint, lament' ~ *querimōnia* 'id.'
  
- *-Ēla* does not replace a competing suffix
  - *captātēla* (Tert.+) 'capture' ~ *captātiō* (Cic.+) 'id.'
  - *conductēla* (6<sup>th</sup> c. CE) 'hiring of (mercenary) troops' ~ *conductiō* (Cic.+) '1. tenancy, 2. summary'
  - *corruptēla* (Pl.+) 'corruption' ~ *corruptiō* (Cic.+) 'id.'
  - *fugēla* (Cato+) ~ *fuga* (Pl.+)
  - *loquēla* (Pl.+) 'speaking, speech' ~ *locūtiō* (Cic.+) 'id.'
  - *monēla* (Tert.+ [2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE]) 'admonition, reminding' ~ *monitiō* (Col.+ [1<sup>st</sup> c. CE]) 'id.'
  - *peccatēla* (Tert.) 'sin' ~ *peccatum* (Pl.+) 'id.'
  
- *-Ēla* is found in a complementary distribution with a competing suffix
  - *loquēla* (Pl.+) 'speaking, speech' ~ *loquentia* (Enn.+)
  - (*sequēla* (Gel.+) 'following, sequel' ~ *sequentia* [Pl.+]?)
  
- No or little mutual influence due to semantic differences
  - *custōdēla* (Pl.+) 'entrusting, care' ~ *custōdia* (Naev.+) 'guard, protection'
  - *medēla* (Titin.+ [2<sup>nd</sup> c. BCE]) 'healing, treatment' ~ *medicīna* (Pl.+) 'medicine, cure'
  - *suādēla* (Pl.+) 'persuasiveness' ~ *suāsiō* 'recommendation' (Cic.+)

---

65 An abstract *Suada* 'persuasiveness' does exist, but it is only used specifically as a deity name.

- *sūtēla* (Pl.+) 'cunning device' ~ *sūtūra* (Liv.+) 'stitch'
- (*turbēlae* (Pl.+) 'petty disturbance' ~ *turba* (Pl.+) 'commotion, upheaval, crowd')

Apparently, some formations with *-ēla* stay popular throughout Latinity and even eclipse words containing other suffixes which are similar in meaning. This results in the high diachronic productivity we have observed in the previous chapter: popular formations such as *querēla* and *candēla* could thus provide a model for the new *-ēla* formations that appear occasionally in antiquity as well as the Middle Ages.

Other formations, on the other hand, steadily become rarer and rarer, and some never become popular at all.

Together, these two tendencies help explain a prominent feature of *-ēla*: its quite consistent synchronic productivity in the three eras we have been investigating. As can be seen in Table 2 in the Appendix, *-ēla*'s number of attestations relative to the total number of words is fairly unchanging, remaining 0.015%-0.016% in all three eras. It is very well possible that the increase in popularity of *-ēla* in some lemmata negated the dwindling number of attestations in other lemmata, so that the overall relative number of attestations remained more or less constant.

Lastly, we have found an interesting distribution between uncompounded *loquēla* and compounded <sup>o</sup>*loquentia*. Possibly *loquentia* was used in compounds due to the reason that *-ēla* (or perhaps even *\*-slo-/-sla-*) could not be added to compounded stems. When speakers wanted to form an abstract of, for instance, *blandē loquī* 'to speak flatteringly', they had to resort to *-entia* to form the abstract *blandiloquentia*, as *\*\*blandiloquēla* could not be formed.



### §3.3 Etymology

As an alternative to the inner-Latin etymology of *-ēla* proposed in the first section of this chapter, this section will investigate the possibility that *\*-ēl(a)* is in fact of pre-Latin date. The suffix looks quite isolated within Latin and has already very limited productivity in our oldest texts. For that reason it is very well possible that its origins lie in pre-Latin times.

#### §3.3.1 Italic cognates

Unfortunately, no sure cognates of *-ēla* are found in the non-Latin Italic languages. Jürgen Untermann mentions Lat. *cicindēla* 'firefly' as a possible cognate form (suggested by Emil Vetter [1953]) to the Umbrian word **čihčeřa** (acc.sg./pl.) which we find once in the Iguvine Tables (III.15).<sup>66</sup> The Umbrian word should denote something which could be stuck into a **kletra** (some sort of sacrificial 'carriage, stretcher, wagon'). It is translated by Vetter as 'Funken, Flämmchen', which is based on his interpretation that the **kletra** somehow contained sparking live coals (214). However, Michael Weiss marks Vetter's interpretation of **čihčeřa** as "impossible" and finds Vetter's interpretation of the **kletra** "a bizarre idea". (2010a: 118, fn. 64) Weiss rather interprets **čihčeřa** as 'branches', basing himself on a depiction of a sacrificial procession from Pompeii, where a carrying chair is shown with two decorative branches on either side. (ibid.: 122) Since Vetter's suggestion does not seem to be broadly accepted by the scholarly community, we are left without a sure Italic cognate of *-ēla* outside of Latin. Our corpus of Italic texts outside Latin is very small, however, so that the chances of finding cognates to such a rare phenomenon as *-ēla* were slim from the outset. Therefore it might very well be a coincidence that it is not found in the texts transmitted to us; in other words, this need not disprove Proto-Italic (or Proto-Indo-European) origins for *-ēla*.

#### §3.3.2 Indo-European cognates: Greek

The most promising cognate to Latin *-ēla* in the other Indo-European languages is found in the form of an isolated and equally archaic-looking Greek suffix: *-ωλή*. The following overview, taken from the comprehensive list compiled by Hans Schmeja (1968: 138), contains all Homeric formations. With one (or two) exception(s) (*πασωλή* and *θαπωρή*), these forms are all based on thematic medio-passive verbs.

---

<sup>66</sup> As is conventional in scholarly literature on the Sabellic languages, words originally written in native script are printed bold.

<u>Greek</u>	<u>Translation (based on LSJ)</u>	<u>Base verb</u>
εὐχωλή	1. 'boasting, vaunt'; 2. 'prayer.'	εὐχομαι
(μετα)παυσωλή <sup>67</sup>	'rest, stopping'	παύομαι/παύω <sup>68</sup>
τερπωλή	'joy, delight'	τέρπομαι
φειδωλή	'(a) sparing, consideration'	φείδομαι
άλεωρή <sup>69</sup>	1. 'escape, shelter'; 2. 'defence, ward'	άλέομαι
έλπωρή <sup>69</sup>	'hope, expectation'	έλπομαι
θαλπωρή <sup>69</sup>	1. 'warming'; 2. 'comfort, consolation'	θάλλω

Interestingly, many characteristic features of *-ēla* marked in the previous chapters are also found with Greek formations ending in *-ωλή*. Like *-ēla*, *-ωλή* is a deverbal suffix found from our oldest authors (Homer) onward, and has only limited synchronic productivity. Although new formations with *-ωλή* occasionally crop up in Greek, the suffix is never used prolifically at any time in our texts. Moreover, the semantic value of *-ωλή* appears to be quite similar to that of *-ēla*. In most cases, substantives ending in *-ωλή* are best interpreted as action nouns. In some cases, on the other hand, a translation as result nouns or *nomen rei actae* is more appropriate, as is the case with *εὐχωλή* in the following lines spoken by Odysseus in the *Odyssey*:

67 Opinions differ on how to interpret *μετα-* here. Schmeja is inclined to follow Leumann (1950: 93.A.55) in separating it from *παυσωλή* and treating it adverbially as 'thereafter' (for the attestation, see fn. 68 below). On the other hand, Walter Porzig (1942: 235-6) takes *μεταπαυσωλή* as original and makes no mention of the possibility that *μετα-* is secondary here.

68 *Παυσωλή* and *μεταπαυσωλή* both occur only once in the *Iliad*. Both are apparently built on the (sigmatic) aorist stem, and theoretically, they could be derivations from either the middle verb *παύσασθαι* 'stop' (intr.) or the active *παῦσαι* 'stop' (tr.). The two contexts in which they occur are non-conclusive (*pace* Schmeja, who claims that *παυσωλή* is unlikely to have been built ["*kaum zu*"] on the active verb [1968: 129]):

1. "ὀππότε τις μεταπαυσωλή πολέμοιο γένηται" (19.201) 'When there is an interruption of battle' (own transl.)
2. "οὐ γὰρ παυσωλή γε μετέσσειται οὐδ' ἠβαιὸν // εἰ μὴ νύξ ἐλθοῦσα διακρινέει μένος ἀνδρῶν." (2.386-7) 'for there will be no rest [in battle] if night does not come and part the fury of men' (own transl.)

In both contexts (*μετα*)*παυσωλή* can be read with a genitive *πολέμοιο* 'of battle', which is only implicit in the second quotation. If these genitives are taken as objectival genitives, then transitive *παῦσαι* is the most plausible morphological base; intransitive *παύσασθαι* would however be the most natural starting point if *πολέμοιο* is taken as a subjective genitive. The latter interpretation (*παυσωλή* < *παύομαι*) seems preferable to me in these contexts and conveniently fits the pattern of most other *ωλή*-formations. A derivation from *παύω* cannot be excluded, however.

69 *Άλεωρή*, *έλπωρή* and *θαλπωρή* are thought to be dissimilations from older \**άλεωλή*, \**έλπωλή*, \**θαλπωλή*, cf. Risch (1974: 109) and Debrunner (1917: 164).

“Νύμφαι Νηϊάδες, κοῦραι Διός, οὐ ποτ’ ἐγώ γε

ᾔψεσθ’ ὑμῖν ἐφάμην· νῦν δ’ εὐχολῆσ’ ἀγανῆσι

χαίρετ’· ἀτὰρ καὶ δῶρα διδώσομεν, ὡς τὸ πάρος περ, (Homerus, *Odyssea* 13.356-8)

"Naiad nymphs, daughters of Zeus, I never thought I would ever see you. Now rejoice in my gentle prayers; we will also bestow gifts [on you], as we have in the past.' (own transl.)

We also find deverbal adjectives in *-ωλός*, such as *φειδωλός* 'sparing, thrifty' and *ἀμαρτωλός* 'erroneous', and it has for that reason been proposed (by Chantraine [1933: 243], among others) that the abstracts in *-ωλή* were derived from adjectives in *-ωλός*, *-ωλή*, *-ωλόν*. Hjalmar Frisk, however, has shown that this is probably not the case: “die Substantiva auf *-ωλή* sind teils zahlreicher, teils – was schwerer ins Gewicht fällt – älter als die seltenen Adjektiva auf *-ωλός*. So ist *ἀμαρτωλή* ['error'] schon bei Theognis belegt, *ἀμαρτωλός* erst bei Aristoteles.” (1966: 45, fn. 2)

Lastly, we find a neuter substantive *εἶδωλον* 'phantom, image, form', which is probably related (in some way or another) to the abstracts in *-ωλή*. Like most other *-ωλή* abstracts, it is formed from a thematic medio-passive verb: *εἶδομαι* 'to be visible, appear, seem'. Unlike the forms in *-ωλή*, however, *εἶδωλον* only allows for a translation as a result noun in Homer. For explaining the relation between *-ωλον* and *-ωλή*, two scenario's are possible:

- *-ωλον* is as old as *-ωλή*: in this scenario the forms ending in *-ωλή* and *-ωλον* are substantivisations of an original class of deverbal adjectives in *-ωλός*, *-ωλή*, *-ωλόν*. These adjectives later disappeared, leaving behind only traces in the form of verbal abstracts in *-ωλή* and *-ωλον*. (Note that the secondary adjectives *φειδωλός*, *ἀμαρτωλός* etc., first found in post-Homeric Greek, are not part of this class.)
- *-ωλον* is younger than *-ωλή*: *-ωλον* could have been formed secondarily, either from older *-ωλή* or even from a pre-form PGr. *\*-ōl-*. In accordance with other neuter nouns, the accent subsequently shifted to the antepenult. Motives for this secondary transformation are hard to give. Perhaps the neuter gender of *-ωλον* indicates that it is semantically different from the verbal abstracts in *-ωλή*, seeing that it is quite concretely a result noun.

Since *εἶδωλον* may very well be formed secondarily, it is unusable in our search for the origins

of *-ēla* and *-ωλή* and it will therefore be left out of discussion here.

### §3.3.3 Reconstructing *-ēla*'s PIE ancestor

The semantic and formal similarities of Greek *-ωλή* with Latin *-ēla* are obvious and point strongly to a common descent.<sup>70</sup> What needs to be explained, however, before cognacy can be accepted, is the difference in vocalism. We see that Latin has a long *-ē-* while Greek has long *-ō-*, showing an opposition which can be explained in terms of Indo-European ablaut. With respect to a common ancestor of Lat. *-ēla* and Gr. *-ωλή*, two Proto-Indo-European reconstructions are envisionable which both yield late-PIE *-ēlā̃/-ōlā̃*.<sup>71</sup>

1. PIE *\*-e/oh<sub>1</sub>l-(e)h<sub>2</sub>*
2. PIE *\*-ē/ōl-(e)h<sub>2</sub>*

Although both reconstructions are theoretically possible, the latter is to be preferred on typological grounds. Nominal suffixes in PIE normally have the structure *-eC-* or *-CeC-* (if they are not in ZG), and in cases where two consonants follow the vowel, the last consonant is invariably a *-t* (as in *\*-ent*, *\*-uent*). (Beekes 2011: 172) Therefore it is unlikely that the Latin and Greek formations analysed here continue something along the lines of PIE *\*-Vh<sub>1</sub>l-*, whose FG/LG vowel is found before two consonants of which the last one is not a *-t*. We are thus left with the second reconstruction (*\*-ē/ōl-(e)h<sub>2</sub>*) and with the question how the LG *\*-ē-/ō-* ablaut is to be explained.

To my mind, the most plausible solution would be to regard Lat. *-ēla* and Gr. *-ωλή* as secondary feminisations of older *l*-suffix nouns, following the analysis given by Émile Benveniste (for which see section 1.1.2.1).

#### §3.3.3.1 Greek *δοτήρ/δώτωρ* and their inflection

We may compare the *\*-ēl-* and *\*-ōl-* suffix ablaut to two related word pairs: Greek *δώτωρ/δοτήρ* and Skt. *dātā/dātā́*. These four words all continue the same Proto-Indo-

---

70 This connection has first been noted by Hjalmar Frisk, who briefly notes: “Ich möchte in *-ωλή* eine Ablautsvariante zu lat. *-ēla*, heth. *-el* (darüber Benveniste, *Origines* I 42) erblicken.” (1966: 45, fn. 2)

71 Although most IE languages show a long *-ā* in the nominative singular (as if from PIE *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>*), in Latin we systematically find short *-a*, whose origins are disputed. It is often taken (by OHCGL 232, for example) as being influenced by the vocative singular (< PIE *\*-h<sub>2</sub>e*). The vocative itself, however, is semantically quite different with regard to the nominative and is often set apart syntactically from the rest of the sentence. For that reason I find it difficult to accept this theory. Robert Beekes takes the Latin form as an archaism and reconstructs PIE *\*-h<sub>2</sub>* for the nominative singular (2011: 200).

European root and suffix: *\*deh<sub>3</sub>-* 'to give' and the *\*-ter-* nomen agentis suffix, respectively. Therefore, they can be translated broadly as 'giver'. However, they are differentiated by their accentuation and their ablaut pattern as well as a certain semantic nuance, so that two distinct paradigms can be discerned which must go back to PIE. The paradigms and their reconstruction are tabulated as follows by Eva Tichy (1995: 375).

		Vedic		Greek		PIE
I. "Akrodynamic"	nom.sg.	<i>dātā</i>		<i>δώτωρ</i>		<i>*dóh<sub>3</sub>tō(r)</i>
	acc.sg.	<i>dātāram</i>	~	<i>δώτορα</i>	<	<i>*dóh<sub>3</sub>torm<sub>ḡ</sub></i>
	gen.sg.	<i>dātṛṣ</i>		<i>δώτορος</i>		<i>*dóh<sub>3</sub>tṛs</i>
II. "Hysterodynamic"	nom.sg.	<i>dātā́</i>		<i>δοτήρ</i>		<i>*dh<sub>3</sub>té(r)</i>
	acc.sg.	<i>dātā́ram</i>	~	<i>δοτήρα</i>	<	<i>*dh<sub>3</sub>térm<sub>ḡ</sub></i>
	gen.sg.	<i>dātrás</i>		<i>δοτήρος</i>		<i>*dh<sub>3</sub>trés</i>

The second type (nom.sg. *\*CC-ér*) corresponds to the hysterokinetic paradigm ("Klasse III") in the "Erlangen school" of PIE accent-ablaut paradigm reconstruction (cf. e.g. Schindler [1975: 262]) and the fourth subtype of the hysterodynamic inflection in the "Leiden school" (type *\*ph<sub>2</sub>-tér*, cf. Beekes, 2011: 190). The first type (nom.sg. *\*CéC-ōr*), which is accented solely on the root, does not conform to any of the four accent-ablaut paradigms of the Erlangen reconstruction.<sup>72</sup> As a possible origin for this "acrodynamic" paradigm, Eva Tichy tentatively proposes a scenario by which it was internally derived from heteroclitic abstracts ending in *\*-tr/-tn-*. (1995: 375-6) According to the Leiden interpretation, *\*dóh<sub>3</sub>-tōr* (or *\*déh<sub>3</sub>-tōr*) simply represents another subtype of the hysterodynamic inflection (subtype no. 3).<sup>73</sup>

72 Tichy reconstructs *\*dóh<sub>3</sub>-tōr* (FG *o* in the root) while Beekes (ibid.) and Fortson (2010: 124) reconstruct *\*déh<sub>3</sub>-tōr* with an *e* in the root. The Greek and Sanskrit forms cannot be used to determine the quality of the vowel. I will follow Fortson and Beekes here.

73 Robert Beekes has argued that these two paradigms (and others) represent different continuations of the same early Proto-Indo-European hysterodynamic paradigm, which has the following shape: (1985: 154 & 2011: 190-1) (C: any consonant; R: any resonant.)

Nom.sg.	<i>*CéC-R</i>
Acc.sg.	<i>*CC-éR-m</i>
Gen.sg.	<i>*CC-R-ós</i>

To Beekes' mind, some nouns (*δοτήρ*-type) have undergone an analogical replacement, whereby the nominative root and suffix *\*CéC-R* were replaced by *\*CC-éR* from the accusative. *δώτωρ*-type nouns appeared in a later stage of PIE when vowels emerged in unaccented positions, giving rise to an *\*-o-* in the suffix of original *\*CéC-R*. This development would then have eventually yielded *\*CéC-oR*.

In Vedic Sanskrit, the original difference in meaning associated with this inflectional difference is still present. According to Tichy, subscribing in part to the distinction marked by Benveniste (1948: 11f.), acrodynamic Ved. *dātā* is a 'giver' whose 'giving' is a permanent quality: a habit or a capability manifesting itself at an undetermined point in time. It can also be an earned characteristic based on an earlier accomplished feat. On the other hand, hysterotonic *dātā́* is more actual and bound to a special occasion. It is applicable to someone who is needed or destined to 'give' in a particular situation.<sup>74</sup> (1995: 376-9)

The LG we find in the suffix of our two types \**CC-éR*/\**CéC-ōR* has been explained in various ways. Beekes takes these long vowels as the result of regular lengthening before word final resonant in the nominative singular of \**CC-éR*/\**CéC-ōR*. (1985: 152f.) Outside of Leiden, however, many scholars subscribe to Szemerényi's Law, which explains the LG as the result of compensatory lengthening after the disappearance of nom.sg. \*-s. (Fortson 2010: 70) However this lengthening may have operated, it presumably gave rise to the LG's found in the suffixes of Gr. *δοτήρ/δῶτωρ*.

This example shows that two different patterns of vocalism within the same formation need not invalidate historical cognacy. In the case of Latin *-ēla* and Greek *-ωλή*, we could analyse Lat. *-ēl-* with words of the type Gr. *δοτήρ*/Ved. *dātā́* as descendants from PIE \**CC-éR*. Greek *-ōl-*, furthermore, might continue PIE \**CéC-ōR* alongside Gr. *δῶτωρ*/Ved. *dātā*. The Latin *-ēla* abstracts and the Greek ones in *-ωλή* would then continue PIE \**CC-ēl* and \**CéC-ōl*, respectively.

The *-a* and *-η* were probably added after lengthening had occurred before word final \*-l, either in PIE (in the form of \*-h<sub>2</sub>) or separately in Greek and Latin. The function of PIE \*-h<sub>2</sub> to indicate abstractness is well attested in various Indo-European language branches. (Fortson 2010: 132) Moreover, in Latin itself *-a* is frequently found at the end of (verbal) abstracts of different types, such as *patientia* 'patience' (< *patior* 'endure'), *intellegentia* 'intelligence' (< *intellegō* 'understand'), *ūsūra* 'enjoyment' (< *ūsus, ūtī* 'to use') and *fuga* 'flight' (< *fugiō* 'flee'). (OHCGL 300-2)

---

74 Hysterotonic *dātā́* does not always refer to 'giving' in one particular situation, as was thought by Albert Debrunner ("Einzelfall", 1954: 683). Although this 'actual' use is certainly applicable in some instances of *dātā́*-type nouns, the 'giving' might also take place repeatedly or in the future, in which case its meaning approaches that of habitual/characterising *dātā*.

### §3.3.3.2 Root vocalism and semantics

After seeing that the vocalism in the suffix of both *-ēla* and *-ωλή* can be explained through secondary developments in the prehistory of Latin and Greek, it is worth investigating whether the properties of the root in these two data sets correspond to the original vocalism recognised for Indo-European. For the oldest deverbal Latin attestations (*\*CC-éR*) this means that we would prefer to see a ZG root while Greek (*\*CéC-ōR*) should ideally show a FG root with an *e*.

Unfortunately, the Latin and Greek data are difficult to interpret, since the vocalism of the abstracts in *-ēla* and *-ωλή* is invariably the same as that of their corresponding present verbal stems. In Latin, for instance, we find the expected ZG in *candēla* 'candle' (< Plt. *\*knd-*) and probably also in *fugēla* 'flight' (< PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>ug-*). However, an FG *e*-vowel is regularly used in *medēla* 'cure, treatment' and in *suādēla* 'persuasion' (< *\*sueh<sub>2</sub>d-*) and an *o*-vowel in *loquēla* (< PIE *\*tlok<sup>w</sup>-*).<sup>75</sup>

While it is still possible that the root vocalism of *-ēla-* and *-ωλή-* originally consisted of a ZG and FG, respectively, this can no longer be proven. The form of related formations such as the present verb has influenced the root vocalism of our *-ēla-/ωλή* abstracts, so that remnants of possible older ablaut types have been irrevocably obscured. On the basis of root vocalism alone, one could even plausibly argue that Latin *-ēla* and Greek *-ωλή* have been formed independently on the basis of their present verbal stems, thereby ruling out a common ancestor in PIE.

One last way to find support for a double PIE paradigm containing *\*CC-él* and *\*CéC-ōl* of which Latin *-ēla* and Greek *-ωλή* could be daughter-forms, is to examine their semantics and try to discover whether a semantic difference can be found for their presumed ancestors (*-ēl/-ōl*) which is somehow similar to that of Gr. *δῶτωρ/δοτήρ* and Ved. *dātā/dātā́*.

In this scenario of common PIE ancestry, however, this is made difficult by the necessary assumption that both *-ēla* and *-ωλή* are secondary abstractions, marked explicitly as such by their feminine gender. The original meaning of the presumed PIE nominal forms in (*-ēl/-ōl*) is masked by an additional layer of abstractness, making it impossible to establish with certainty

<sup>75</sup> For *candēō* < PIE *\*knd-*, cf. De Vaan, s.v. *candēō* and Schrijver (1991: 495f.). Peter Schrijver has noted that consonantal clusters of (C)CCCC epenthesised to (C)CaCCC in Latin. This rationale has been applied to *cand-* by Michiel de Vaan, who supposes that the *-a-* may have arisen in forms such as *\*knd-ro-* (cf. Skt. *candrā-* 'brilliant') or *\*knd-no-* (cf. Alb. *hënë*). From there, it could have spread to the verb and other related formations.

whether they originally denoted action nouns, agent nouns *vel sim.*, let alone whether there any small subtle semantic difference between the two.

### §3.3.4 Summary

Our search for cognates of Latin *-ēla* started with the non-Latin languages pertaining to the Italic sub-branch of the Indo-European language family. Unfortunately, no sure cognates can be found within these languages, which is not unexpected given *-ēla*'s rarity within Latin itself and the small size of our extra-Latin Italic text corpora.

With regard to the other Indo-European languages, however, a comparandum has been found in Greek verbal abstracts ending in *-ωλή*, which is found in our oldest texts and is formally as well as semantically very similar to Latin *-ēla*. This connection has already been noted by Frisk, who calls them ablaut variants, but the reconstruction of their common ancestor has, to my knowledge, not yet been undertaken.

The most plausible scenario accounting for the ablauting LG *-ē-/-ō-* would be to regard the Latin and Greek formations as variant reflexes of hysterodynamically inflected PIE *l*-stems. After the suffix vowel was lengthened in the nominative singular, these two variants were enlarged on the basis of the nominative singular, either in PIE by adding the abstract/feminine suffix *\*(e)h<sub>2</sub>* or in Greek and Latin themselves. The following diagram gives a clear overview of *-ēla*'s pre-Latin history as envisioned here.

PIE (variant 1)		(late PIE)		Latin
<u>Ns. *CC-él</u>	→	(*CC-él-(e)h <sub>2</sub> )	→	<i>-ēla</i>
As. *CC-él-m				
Gs. *CC-l-ós				
PIE (variant 2)		(late PIE)		Greek
<u>Ns. *CéC-ól</u>	→	(*CéC-ól-(e)h <sub>2</sub> )	→	<i>-ωλή</i>
As. *CC-él-m				
Gs. *CC-l-ós				



The synchronic similarities of *-ēla* and *-ωλή* as well as the different vocalism in the suffix can be understood through this reconstruction. However, there is no further indication that this scenario is correct. The root vocalism of both the Greek and Latin abstracts is masked by a strong formal similarity to the present verbal stem, so that the existence of earlier, more original ablaut types cannot be proven. Also masked are the semantics of these supposed (late) PIE abstracts in *\*-ēl/-ōl*, by the secondary feminisation. It is not possible to recover any semantic difference between *\*-ēl/-ōl*, which one could compare to the established PIE type lying at the origin of Gr. *δώτωρ/δοτήρ* and Ved. *dātā/dātā́*.

## Conclusion

At the end of our inquiry, it is time to present an overview of *-ēla*'s development before and throughout the literary period. Two ultimate origins have been proposed for *-ēla* in the course of this thesis. On the one hand, it has been suggested that *-ēla* is the result of an inner-Latin reanalysis. According to this scenario, *-ēla*'s pre-form would be *\*-ēsla*, a combination of the *ē* we find in second conjugation verbal stems, and a suffix *\*-sla-*, which has cognates in *scālae* 'stairs' and (masculine) *pālus* 'stake, pole'. On the other hand, there is the possibility that *-ēl-* is datable back to PIE, either in combination with Hittite nouns in *-īl/-il-* (as per Rieken) or Greek abstracts in *-ωλή*. All three scenarios are not without their problems and the data supporting each of them is slim. However, I believe that the scenario of inner-Latin reanalysis is preferable over those which aim to understand *-ēla* in PIE terms. The Hittite data are hardly reconcilable with the PIE hysterodynamic inflectional model supposed to connect them to the Latin data. Furthermore, for a double PIE paradigm *\*-ēl/-ōl-*, needed to connect Latin *-ēla* with Greek *-ωλή*, the only evidence is furnished by the suffix itself. The shape of the root and the semantic value of abstracts formed with *-ēla* and *-ωλή* are inconclusive with regard to such a reconstruction. In both cases, the only evidence for the reconstruction of a PIE suffix *\*-V̄l-* comes from Latin and Greek, so that the argument runs the risk of being circular. (The existence of a PIE suffix *\*-V̄l-* is suggested by Latin *-ēla* and Greek *-ωλή*, whose cognacy can only be understood through a PIE suffix *\*-V̄l-*.)

The derivation of *-ēla* from within Latin is more credible. Both elements of the pre-form *\*-ē-sla* have parallels within Latin. Additionally, the fact that the roots of *-ēla* abstracts are formally the same as the present verbal roots on which they are built, lends support to a deverbal origin. According to this scenario, *\*-slo-/-sla-* was added to verbal stems to create deverbal adjectives with an agentive force, while *\*-sla-* additionally created deverbal action nouns. Possibly, this suffix *\*-slo-/-sla-* could originally only be added to uncompounded verbal stems. Secondary phonetic developments obscured the form of *\*-sla-*, so that it was not recognised as a separate suffix anymore. Rather, Latin speakers used *\*-ēla* (which was originally only present in deverbal abstracts made from second conjugation verbs), to form new verbal abstracts.

Even before our literary attestations begin, *-ēla* spread from merely verbal stems to verbal and denominal stems. This might have happened through *tūtēla* (built on *tūtāre/ī* 'to protect'), which existed next to the participle form *tūtus* (from *tu(e)or* 'to watch, to guard').

Subsequently, analogy led to the creation of new *-tēla* abstracts made directly from *-tus* participles (such as *corruptēla* 'corruption' and *cautēla* 'caution'). Lastly, presumably under the influence of semantically similar *tūtēla*, *-ēla* could even be added to nominal stems which were not participles in *-tus*, so as to form *clientēla* 'body of clients' and *parentēla* 'relationship'. *-Ēla*'s variant spelling *-ella* makes its first appearance in the 1<sup>st</sup> c. BCE, when we find *querella* 'complaint' as a variant of *querēla* 'id.'. <sup>76</sup> From here the spelling spread to other lemmata. The spelling *-ella* might have resulted from confusion with the diminutive suffix *-ellus/-ella/-ellum*. This confusion most likely started with *querēla*, whose semantical concreteness ('complaint') was similar to that of the diminutive formations. Furthermore, *querēla* had a related form in *-ulus*, which is a suffix often found in combination with the *-ellus/-ella/-ellum* diminutive suffix.

Also before our first literary attestations, there must have been a semantic extension, through which *-ēla* was not only used to create action nouns anymore, but also result nouns (such as *sequēla* 'sequel').

Throughout Latinity, abstracts in *-ēla* have 'competed' with other suffixes which had a similar meaning. Some *-ēla* abstracts overtake their concurrent forms in frequency and seem to replace them slowly but surely (e.g. *cautēla* 'care' overtakes *cautiō* 'id.');

Other formations in *-ēla* find themselves replaced by other abstracts (e.g. *corruptiō* 'corruption', which becomes more popular than *corruptēla*). These two developments might very well have cancelled each other out, so that the amount of *ēla*-attestations (tokens) relative to the total word count of our literary corpus never exceeds the 0.016% mark yet remains quite constant. *-Ēla* remains a fairly uncommon suffix in Latinity, but its curious features and properties – spelling vacillation, various morphological bases, obscure origins – nevertheless require much more scholarship than it has received thus far. Even 'minor suffixes' can spark thought-provoking questions.

---

<sup>76</sup> I believe we can safely disregard the spelling found in *fugella* (Cato) 'flight' and *obsequella* 'compliance'. (Cf. fn. 53.)

## Appendix

**Table 1: Attestations, spelling variants and derivatives of nouns containing the suffix *-ēla-***

#	SPELLING	MEANING	ATTESTED FORMS	AUTHORS <sup>77</sup>	BASE
1.	candēla	'candle, waxed cord'	candēla (3/0/6) candēlae (4/4/1) candēlam (1/1/2) candēlārum (1/1/1) candēlās (1/1/4) candēlīs (4/0/1)	<u>2 BCE</u> : Hem. <u>1 BCE</u> : Var., Vittr. <u>1 CE</u> : Col., Liv., Mart., Pers., Plin.Mai. <u>2 CE</u> : Juv.	candeō
	cicindēla	'firefly, candle'	(2/1/13)	<u>1 CE</u> : Mart., Plin.Mai.	
	candēlābrum	'candelabrum'	(26/256/213)	<u>2 BCE</u> : Caecil., Cato <u>1 BCE</u> : Cic. <u>1 CE</u> : Var., Vittr., Mart., Petr., Plin.Mai., Quint.	
	candēlifera	'candle-bearer'	(0/1/0)	<u>2 CE</u> : Tert.	
	candellabrum	'candelabrum'	(0/0/1)	<u>8 CE</u> : Liber quaestionum in evangeliis	
2.	cantilēna	1. 'often repeated saying', 2. 'little song'	cantilēna (2/35/5) cantilēnae (0/26/12) cantilēnam (8/21/8) cantilēnārum (1/4/2) cantilēnās (0/5/1) cantilēnīs (0/7/2)	<u>2 BCE</u> : Ter. <u>1 BCE</u> : Cic., Epist.Cic. <u>1 CE</u> : Sen.Min. <u>2 CE</u> : Apul., Fest., Gel.	cantilō
3.	captātēla	'capture'	captātēlam (0/1/0)	<u>2 CE</u> : Tert.	captātus
4.	cautēla, cautella	1. 'caution', 2. 'security'	cautēla (3/80/105) cautēlae (0/12/13) cautēlam (0/21/36)	<u>3 BCE</u> : Pl. <u>2 BCE</u> : Apul.	cautus
			cautella (0/4/1)	<u>5 CE</u> : Fulgentius Mythographus, Paulinus Petricordiae,	

<sup>77</sup> An alphabetic list of classical authors and their abbreviations can be found in Table 3 of this Appendix.

			cautellae (0/1/0) cautellam (0/0/2)	Salvianus Massiliensis	
	incautēla cautēlitās	'heedlessness' 'heedfulness'	(0/1/2) (0/0/1)	<u>5 CE</u> : Salvianus Massiliensis <u>6 CE</u> : Ennodius	
5.	clientēla, clientella (cluentēla)	1. 'clientship', 2. (concr.) 'body of clients', 3. '(transf.) protection, guardianship'	clientēla (10/1/1) clientēlae (10/3/0) clientēlam (14/1/0) clientēlās (17/2/0) clientēlīs (7/0/0)  [cluentēlam (1/0/0)]	<u>1 BCE</u> : Caes., Cic., Hirt. <u>1 CE</u> : Liv., V.Max. <u>2 CE</u> : Flor., Gel., Suet.  [ <u>2 BCE</u> : Ter.]	cliēns
			clientella (0/0/2) clientellae (0/0/3)	<u>8 CE</u> : Aldhelmus Scireburnensis	
6.	conductēla	'hiring (of troops)'	conductēlam (0/0/1)	<u>6 CE</u> : Iohannes Biclarensis	conductus
7.	corruptēla, corruptella	1. 'moral corrupting', 2. 'source of corruption'	corruptēla (6/78/11) corruptēlae (6/66/6) corruptēlam (7/62/9) corruptēlārum (2/6/0) corruptēlās (3/13/1) corruptēlīs (3/12/1)	<u>3 BCE</u> : Pl. <u>2 BCE</u> : Ter. <u>1 BCE</u> : Cic. <u>1 CE</u> : Fron., Liv., Rut.Lup., Sen.Min. <u>2 CE</u> : Apul., Suet.	corruptus
	incorruptēla	'integrity'	corruptella (0/1/0)	<u>4 CE</u> : Ambrosius Mediolanensis	
			(0/95/5)	<u>2 CE</u> : Tert. <u>4 CE</u> : Ambrosius Mediolanensis, Irenaeus Lugdunensis <u>5 CE</u> : Augustinus Hipponensis, Faustus Reiensis, Iohannes Cassianus, Maximus Taurensis	
8.	custōdēla	'custody'	custōdēla (4/0/0) custōdēlae (1/0/0) custōdēlam (6/0/0)	<u>3 BCE</u> : Pl. <u>2 CE</u> : Apul., Gaius	custōs
9.	fovella	'refreshment'	fovella (0/1/0)	<u>2 CE</u> : Tert.	foveō

10.	fugēla, fugella	'flight'	fugēla (1/0/0)	<u>2 CE</u> : Apul.	fugiō
			fugella (1/0/0)	<u>2 BCE</u> : Cato	
11.	loquella, loquēla	'speech, utterance'	loquēla (0/24/24) loquēlae (0/42/27) loquēlam (2/22/10) loquēlārum (0/1/1) loquēlās (0/9/9) loquēlīs (0/3/18)	<u>3 BCE</u> : Pl. <u>1 BCE</u> : Var.	loquor
			loquella (4/35/10) loquellae (0/16/6) loquellam (0/19/9) loquellārum (0/1/2) loquellās (2/12/1) loquellīs (0/21/4)	<u>1 BCE</u> : Catul., Lucr., Ov., Verg.	
12.	luēla	'expiation'	luēla (1/0/0)	<u>1 BCE</u> : Lucr.	luō
13.	mandātēla	'entrusting'	mandatēla (1/0/0)	<u>2 CE</u> : Gaius	mandātus
14.	medēla, medella	'treatment, cure'	medēla (7/21/14) medēlae (1/6/8) medēlam (3/38/27) medēlārum (2/3/1) medēlās (2/6/0) medēlīs (1/2/0)	<u>2 BCE</u> : Titin. <u>2 CE</u> : Apul., Gel., Fro.	medeor
			medella (2/45/9) medellae (0/17/2) medellam (2/66/28) medellārum (0/4/0) medellās (0/9/1) medellīs (1/7/1)	<u>2 CE</u> : Apul., Gel., [Quint.]	
	medēlātrīx medellātor medelliferus	'healer' 'healer' 'curing'	(0/1/0) (0/1/0) (0/0/1)	<u>5 CE</u> : Fulgentius Mythographus <u>5 CE</u> : Fulgentius Mythographus <u>8 CE</u> : Beda Venerabilis	

15.	monella, monēla	'reminding, admonition'	monēla (0/1/0)	<u>2 CE</u> : Tert.	moneō
			monella (0/2/0)	<u>2 CE</u> : Tert. <u>4 CE</u> : Lucifer Calaritanus	
16.	nitēla	'something that brightens or adorns'	nitēlās (1/0/0)	<u>2 CE</u> : Apul.	niteō
17.	parentēla, parentella	'relationship'	parentēla (0/2/4) parentēlae (0/0/6) parentēlam (0/1/3)	<u>5 CE</u> : Augustinus Hipponensis, Petrus Chrysologus, Scriptores Historiae Augustae	parēns
			parentellae (0/0/2)	<u>8 CE</u> : Aldhelmus Scireburnensis	
18.	peccātēla	'sin'	peccatēlam (0/1/0)	<u>2 CE</u> : Tert.	peccātus
19.	qu(a)erēla, qu(a)erella	1. 'protest', 2. 'complaint', 3. 'difference of opinion' 4. 'subject for complaint, grievance, or sim.'	querēla (55/171/71) querēlae (28/32/6) querēlam (17/45/20) querēlārum (10/17/7) querēlās (45/45/18) querēlīs (40/33/22)	<u>1 BCE</u> : B.Afr., Catul., Cic., Epist.Cic., Hor., <i>Lydia</i> , Ov., Prop., Tib. <u>1 CE</u> : <i>Ciris</i> , Col. Mart., Petr., Phaed., [Ov.], Plin.Min., Pub., Quint., Sen.Mai., Sen.Min., Sil., Stat., Tac., [Tib.] <u>2 CE</u> : Apul., Gel., Juv., Quint.(dub.), [Quint.], Suet., Tra.Plin.	queror
			quaerēla (0/1/2)	<u>2 CE</u> : Tert.	
			querella (52/116/46) querellae (19/18/5) querellam (19/43/18) querellārum (5/7/2) querellās (49/33/9) querellīs (42/41/8)	<u>1 BCE</u> : Catul., Cic., Lucr., Ov. <u>1 CE</u> : <i>Ilias</i> , Calp., Carm.Eins., Curt., Liv., Luc., Man., Pers., Petr., Plin.Mai. Quint., Sen.Mai., Sen.Min., Stat., V.Max. <u>2 CE</u> : Fest., Flor., Fron., Gaius, Sic.Fl., V.Flac.	
			quaerella (0/11/0) quaerellae (0/3/0) quaerellam (0/5/1)	<u>3 CE</u> : Cyprianus Carthaginiensis <u>4 CE</u> : Ambrosiaster, Fragmenta Ariana, Hilarius Pictaviensis, <u>5 CE</u> : Augustinus Hipponensis, Maximus Taurinensis,	

			quaerellārum (0/1/0) quaerellīs (0/2/1)	Possidius, Scriptorum Historiae Augustae	
	querēlor (-atur) querēlōsus querellōsus	'complain' 'full of complaints' 'id.'	(0/1/0) (0/1/4) (0/2/1)	<u>5 CE</u> : Arnobius Junior <u>5 CE</u> : Augustinus Hipponensis <u>5 CE</u> : Augustinus Hipponensis	
20.	sequella, sequēla	1. 'A follower, attendant' 2. 'A consequence, corollary'	sequēla (0/7/0) sequēlam (0/2/0)	<u>2 CE</u> : Tert. <u>3 CE</u> : Novatianus <u>4 CE</u> : [Cyprianus], Zeno Veronensis <u>5 CE</u> : Rufinus	sequor
			sequella (0/2/0) sequellae (0/1/0) sequellam (0/1/0) sequellās (2/1/0)	<u>1 CE</u> : Fron. <u>2 CE</u> : Gel.	
	insequella obsequēla obsequella	'close following' 'compliance, obedience' 'id.'	(0/0/1) (1/4/2) (2/15/3)	<u>6 CE</u> : Ruricius Lemovicensis <u>2 CE</u> : Fest. <u>2 BCE</u> : Afran., Turp.	
21.	suādēla, suādella	'persuasion, persuasiveness; (in pl.) methods or means of persuasion'	suādēla (4/6/2) suādēlam (0/5/0) suādēlīs (1/2/3)	<u>3 BCE</u> : Pl. <u>1 BCE</u> : Hor. <u>2 CE</u> : Apul.	suādeō
			suādella (0/2/0) suādellam (0/0/1) suādellīs (0/2/1)	<u>4 CE</u> : Ambrosius Mediolanensis <u>5 CE</u> : Augustinus Hipponensis, Cyprianus Gallus, Prudentius	
22.	sūtēla	'A cunning device, stratagem'	sūtēlae (1/1/0) sūtēlam (0/1/0) sūtēlās (1/0/0) sūtēlīs (1/1/0)	<u>3 BCE</u> : Pl. <u>2 CE</u> : Fest.	sūtus
23.	turbēlae, turbellae	'petty commotion, uproar'	turbēla (0/1/0) turbēlae (1/1/1) turbēlam (0/1/0)	<u>3 BCE</u> : Pl. <u>2 CE</u> : Apul., Fest.	turbō



			turbēlas (4/1/1) turbēlis (2/3/2)		
			turbellas (1/0/0) <sup>78</sup>	<u>3 BCE</u> : Pl.	
24.	tūtēla, tūtella	1. 'guardianship', 2. 'source of protection', 3. 'that which is protected' 4. 'maintenance, upkeep'	tūtēla (196/107/23) tūtēlae (62/26/11) tūtēlam (111/109/22) tūtēlārum (4/6/1) tūtēlās (5/9/2) tūtēlīs (1/28/3)	<u>2 BCE</u> : Caecil., Pac., Ter. <u>1 BCE</u> : Cic. Hor., Hyg., Nep., Ov., Prop., Tib., Verg., Vitruv. <u>1 CE</u> : Col., Curt., Fron., Grat., <i>L.Pis.</i> , Liv., Luc., Man., Mart., [Ov.], Petr., Phaed., Plin.Mai., Plin.Min., Pomp.Trog., Quint., Sen.Mai., Sen.Min., [Sen.Min.], Sil., Stat., Tac., V.Max., Var., Vell. <u>2 CE</u> : Apul., Fest., Flor., Fro., Gaius, Gel., Juv., Priap., Quint. (dub.), [Quint.], Sic.Fl., Suet., V.Fl.	tūtus
	tūtēlāris	'relating to guardianship'	tūtella (0/1/2) tūtellam (0/1/2)	<u>5 CE</u> : Paulinus Petricordiae, Cyprianus Gallus	
	tūtēlārius	'concerned with custody'	(0/7/0)	<u>2 CE</u> : Tert. <u>4 CE</u> : Arnobius Maior, Iuris Romani anteiustani <u>5 CE</u> : Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Macrobius Ambrosius Theodosius	
			(1/1/0)	<u>1 CE</u> : Plin.Mai.	

**Table 2: No. of attestations**

	ANTIQUITAS		AETAS PATRUM I		AETAS PATRUM II		TOTAL	
-ĒLA	765		1675		839		3279	
-ELLA	203		570		186		959	
DENOMINAL		483		762		281		1526
DEVERBAL		485		1483		744		2712
TOTAL ABSOLUTE	968		2245		1025		4238	
TOTAL RELATIVE	0.016%		0.015%		0.015%		0.015%	

<sup>78</sup> Only once in Plautus, but the manuscripts contain conflicted readings. For discussion, see Chapter two, fn. 34.

**Table 3: Alphabetical list of classical authors, with abbreviations and rough dating**<sup>79</sup>

<u>Abbrev.</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Century</u>	<u>Abbrev.</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Century</u>
Afran.	Afranius (fr.)	2 BCE	Pac.	Pacuvius (fr.)	2 BCE
Apul.	Apuleius	2 CE	Pers.	Persius	1 CE
B.Afr.	Bellum Africum (Corpus Caesarianum)	1 BCE	Petr.	Petronius	1 CE
Caecil.	Caecilius Staius (fr.)	2 BCE	Phaed.	Phaedrus	1 CE
Caes.	Caesar	1 BCE	Pl.	Plautus	3 BCE
Calp.	Calpurnius Siculus	1 CE	Plin.Mai.	Plinius Maior	1 CE
Carm.Eins.	Carmina Einsidlensia	1 CE	Plin.Min.	Plinius Minor	1 CE
Cato	Cato	2 BCE	Pomp.Trog.	Pompeius Trogus	1? CE
Catul.	Catullus	1 BCE	Priap.	Priapea	2 CE
Cic.	Cicero	1 BCE	Prop.	Propertius	1 BCE
Ciris	Ciris (App. Verg.)	1 CE	Pub.	Publilius Syrius	1 CE
Col.	Columella	1 CE	Quint.	Quintilianus	1 CE
Curt.	Curtius Rufus	1? CE	Quint. (dub.)	Quintilianus (dubium)	2? CE
Epist.Cic.	Epistulae ad Ciceronem servatae cum Ciceronis Epistulis ad familiares	1 BCE	[Quint.]	Pseudo-Quintilianus	2 CE
Fest.	Festus	2? CE	Rut.Lup.	Rutilius Lupus	1 CE
Flor.	Florus	2 CE	Sen.Mai.	Seneca Maior	1 CE
Fro.	Fronto	2 CE	Sen.Min.	Seneca Minor	1 CE

<sup>79</sup> The abbreviations used for these authors are in principle those of the OLD. The LLT-A does not treat Tertullian as a classical author and lists him under Aetas Patrum I. His name is commonly abbreviated in the OLD, however, and since he appears quite often in Table 1, his name will appear abbreviated there as well.

Fron.	Frontinus	1 CE	[Sen.Min.]	Pseudo-Seneca Minor	1 CE
Gaius	Gaius	2 CE	Sic.Fl.	Siculus Flaccus	2? CE
Gel.	Aulus Gellius	2 CE	Sil.	Silius Italicus	1 CE
Grat.	Grattius	1 CE	Stat.	Stattius	1 CE
Hem.	Hemina (frr.)	2 BCE	Suet.	Suetonius	2 CE
Hirt.	Hirtius	1 BCE	Tac.	Tacitus	1 CE
Hor.	Horatius	1 BCE	Ter.	Terentius	2 BCE
Hyg.	Hygnius Astronomus	1 BCE	Tert.	Tertullianus	2 CE
Ilias	Ilias Baebi Italici	1? CE	Tib.	Tibullus	1 BCE
Juv.	Juvenalis	2 CE	[Tib.]	Lygdamus (Elegiae una cum Tibulli carminibus traditae)	1? CE
L.Pis.	Laus Pisonis	1 CE	Titin.	Titinius (frr.)	2 BCE
Liv.	Livius	1 CE	Tra.Plin.	Traianus Imperator	2 CE
Luc.	Lucanus	1 CE	Turp.	Turpilius (frr.)	2 BCE
Lucr.	Lucretius	1 BCE	V.Fl.	Valerius Flaccus	2 CE
Lydia	Lydia (App. Verg.)	1? BCE	V.Max.	Valerius Maximus	1 CE
Man.	Manilius	1 CE	Var.	Varro	1 BCE
Mart.	Martialis	1 CE	Vell.	Velleius Paterculus	1 CE
Nep.	Nepos	1 BCE	Verg.	Vergilius	1 BCE
Ov.	Ovidius	1 BCE	Vitr.	Vitruvius	1 BCE
[Ov.]	Pseudo-Ovidius	1 CE			

## Works Cited

- Allen, W. Sidney. *Vox Latina. A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Latin*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1978.
- Beekes, Robert S.P. *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: an Introduction*. Rev. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2011.
- . *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Ed. Alexander Lubotsky. Leiden: Brill, 2015. Indo-European Dictionaries Online (2009). *Brill Online*.
- . *The Origins of the Indo-European Nominal Inflection*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 46. Ed. Wolfgang Meid. Innsbruck: Inst. für Sprachwiss., 1985.
- Benveniste, Émile. *Noms d'agent et noms d'action en indo-européen*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1948.
- . *Origines de formation des noms en indo-européen*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1935.
- Catullus, Gaius Valerius. *Catullus, Tibullus and Pervigilium Veneris*. Ed. Francis Cornish Warre et al. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1962.
- Chantraine, Pierre. *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1933.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *Orationes in P. Vatinius testem et pro M. Caelio*. Ed. Tadeusz Maslowski. M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia 23. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1995.
- . *Pro Sestio oratio*. Ed. Tadeusz Maslowski. M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia 22. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1986.
- . *The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero*. Transl. C.D. Young. London: George Bell & Sons,

1903.

---. *Tusculan Disputation; Also, Treatises on the Nature of the Gods and on the Commonwealth*.  
Transl. C.D. Younge. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1877.

*Corpus Grammaticorum Latinorum*. Ed. Alessandro Garcea. Last updated January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012.  
Accessed March 2015. [<http://kaali.linguist.jussieu.fr/CGL/index.jsp>]

Debrunner, Albert & Jacob Wackernagel. *Altindische Grammatik Band II,2. Die Nominalsuffixe*.  
Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954.

Debrunner, Albert. *Griechische Wortbildung*. Indogermanische Bibliothek. Eds. Hermann Hirt &  
Wilhelm Streitberg 8. Heidelberg: Winter, 1917.

Fortson IV, Benjamin W. *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Malden:  
Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Frisk, Hjalmar. *Kleine Schriften zur Indogermanistik und zur griechischen Wortkunde*. Studia  
Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 21. Gothenburg: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1966.

García Ramón, José Luís. "Altlatein *cortumiō* 'Geländeauschnitt', Idg. *\*k<sub>ṛ</sub>-tomh<sub>1</sub>-ó-* \*(Schnitt)  
schneidend', *contemnō* 'Schmähe' und Griechisch *κέρτομος* 'schmähend', *κερτομέω*  
'Schmähe.'" *Aevum Antiquum* 7 (2007): 285-98.

Gellius, Aulus. *Attic Nights, Volume III: Books 14-20*. Transl. J.C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Libraray  
212. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1927.

Harrison, Stephen J. "The Need for a New Text of Catullus." *Vom Text zum Buch*. Ed. Christiane  
Reitz. Subsidia Classica 3. St. Katharinen: Scripta Mercaturae Verlag, 2000.

*HetKonk (Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln)*. Ed. Silvin Košak. Accessed April 2015.  
[<http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/>]

- Heraeus, Wilhelm. "Beiträge zur Bestimmung der Quantität in positionslangen Silben." *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik* 14 (1906): 393-422.
- Kibler, William W. *An Introduction to Old French*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1984.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Ed. Alexander Lubotsky. Brill, 2015. Indo-European Etymological Dictionaries Online (2008). *Brill Online*.
- Lachmann, Karl. *T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*. Berlin, Georg Reimer, 1850.
- Leumann, Manu. *Homerische Wörter*. Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 3. Basel: Reinhardt, 1950.
- . *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. Lateinische Grammatik Vol. 1. München: Beck, 1977.
- Lewis, Charlton T., and Charles Short. *A Latin Dictionary: Founded on Andrew's Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879. [www.perseus.tufts.edu]
- Library of Latin Texts - Series A*. Ed. Paul Tombeur. Turnhout: Brepols Publishing. (Accessed December 2014 – March 2015.)
- Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott & Henry Stuart Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Ed. Maria Pantelia. Hosted by *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. [http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/lsg/]
- Livius, Titus. *The History of Rome. Vol. 3*. Transl. Rev. Canon Roberts. London: Dent & Sons, 1905.
- Lucretius Carus, Titus. *De Rerum Natura*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Ed. E.J. Kenney. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2014.
- Melchert, H. Craig. *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology*. Ergänzungshefte zur Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 32. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm. 1894. *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen. Band 2: Romanische Formenlehre*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1972.

Niermeyer, J.F. & C. Van de Kieft. *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*. 2nd ed. Ed. J.W.J. Burgers. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2002.

Nisbet, Robin G.M. *M.Tulli Ciceronis in L. Calpurnium Pisonem oratio*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

Nussbaum, Alan J. “\*Jocidus: An account of the Latin adjectives in -idus.” *Compositiones indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*. Ed. H. Eichner & H.Chr. Luschützky. Prague: Enigma, 1999. 377-419.

Ovidius Naso, Publius. *Amores. Epistulae. Medic. Fac. Fem. Ars amat. Remedia amoris*. Ed. Rudolf Ehwald. P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera. Vol. 1. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1907.

---. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum libri sex*. Eds. E.H. Alton, D.E. Wormell & E. Courtney. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1997.

---. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Tristia*. Ed. J.B. Hall. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1995.

---. *Metamorphoses*. Ed. W.S. Anderson. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1981.

*Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Eds. P.G.W. Glare et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

Porzig, Walter. *Die Namen für Satzinhalte im Griechischen und im Indogermanischen*. Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft 10. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1942. Print.

- Powell, Jonathan G.F. *M. Tulli Ciceronis De re publica, De legibus, Cato maior de senectute, Laelius de amicitia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006.
- Pultrová, Lucie. *The Latin Deverbative Nouns and Adjectives*. Prague, Karolinum Press: 2011.
- Rieken, Elisabeth. *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 44. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999.
- Risch, Ernst. *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache* 2<sup>nd</sup> rev. ed. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1974.
- Schaffner, Stefan. "Lateinisch *mūstella*, *mūstēla* 'Wiesel; Quappe' und der Wortbildungstyp vedisch *aśvatará-*." *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 3.1 (2006): 1-50.
- Schindler, Jochem. "Zum Ablaut der neutralen *s*-Stämme des Indogermanischen." *Flexion und Wortbildung*. Ed. Helmut Rix. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Regensburg 9. – 14. September 1973. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1975. 259-267.
- Schmeja, Hans. "Zur griechischen Wortbildung. Die Nomina auf -ωλός, -ωλή, -ωλον." *Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft und Kulturkunde. Gedenkschrift für Wilhelm Brandenstein*. Ed. Manfred Mayrhofer. Innsbrück: AMOE, 1968. 129-39.
- Schrijver, Peter. *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rhodopi, 1991.
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. *De amicitia fragmenta*. L. Annaei Senecae Opera quae supersunt, supplementum. Ed. F. Haase. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1902.
- . *L. Annaei Senecae De beneficiis libri VII; De clementia libri II*. Ed. C. Hosius. L. Annaei Senecae Opera quae supersunt. Vol. 1, fasc. 2. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1900.



- . *L. Annaei Senecae Dialogorum libros XII*. Ed. E. Hermes. *L. Annaei Senecae Opera quae supersunt*. Vol. 1, fasc. 1. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1905.
- . *L. Annaei Senecae Epistularum moralium ad Lucilium quae supersunt*. Ed. O Hense. *L. Annaei Senecae Opera quae supersunt*. Vol. 3. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1938.
- . *L. Annaei Senecae Naturalium quaestionum libros*. Ed. H.M. Hine. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1996.
- . *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae*. Ed. Rudolf Peiper & Gustavus Richter. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1902.
- Sturtevant, Edgar H. "The Sources of Hittite z." *Language* 4.4 (1928): 227-31.
- Tarrant, Richard J. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004.
- Tichy, Eva. *Die Nomina agentis auf -tar- im Vedischen*. Indogermanische Bibliothek. Dritte Reihe: Untersuchungen. Ed. Manfred Mayrhofer. Heidelberg: Winter, 1995.
- Tombeur, Paul. "User's Guide to the LLT-A". Brepols Publishers, 2014. Pdf file. Accessed March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2015. [[http://clt.brepolis.net/llta/manuals/manual\\_en.pdf](http://clt.brepolis.net/llta/manuals/manual_en.pdf)]
- Untermann, Jürgen. *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Heidelberg: Winter, 2000.
- De Vaan, Michiel. *Etymological Dictionary of the Latin and the other Italic Languages*. Ed. Alexander Lubotsky. Brill, 2015. Indo-European Etymological Dictionaries Online (2008). *Brill Online*.
- Vergilus Maro, Publius. *The Aeneid*. Transl. A.S. Kline. Poetry in Translation. [<http://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Latin/Virgilhome.htm>]

Vetter, Emil. *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*. Vol. 1. Heidelberg: Winter, 1953.

Walde, Alois & Johann Baptist Hofmann, *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 3 vols. Heidelberg: Winter, 1938-1956.

Weiss, Michael. *Language and Ritual in Sabellic Italy. The Ritual Complex of the Third and Fourth Tabulae Iguvinae*. Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 1. Eds. Craig Melchert & Olav Hackstein. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2010a.

---. "Observations on the *Littera* Rule." Paper presented at the 29<sup>th</sup> East Coast Indo-European Conference, June 19, Cornell University. 2010b.

---. *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor, Beech Stave Press: 2009.