de Vaan, Michiel Arnoud Cor. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages* (vol. 7 in the series "Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary"). Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008. xiii, 825 p. € 229.00, $ 341.00. ISBN 9004167978.

Reviewed by Wolfgang David Cirilo de Melo, Universiteit van Gent (wolfgang.demelo@ugent.be).

There is no shortage of recent dictionaries of Latin, most of which contain a modest amount of etymological information, but de Vaan's book is the only purely etymological one. For the Sabellic languages we have of course Untermann's important *Wörterbuch* (2000), which provides a wealth of data and thorough discussion, but for Latin, before de Vaan's work appeared, one had to use Walde-Hofmann (1938) or Ernout-Meillet (1959). These older works are on the whole reliable, yet it is good to see an up-to-date dictionary fully adopting the laryngeal theory.

I have learnt much from reading de Vaan. I shall just give three examples. As an undergraduate I used to read the *Miscellen* or *Gemischte Beiträge* in various journals, but never understood why the first vowel in *miscellus* is long since the one in *miscere* is short; de Vaan lists the word under *minor* and derives it from **minuscellus* > **minscellus*, and now the quantity and the meaning make sense: the long vowel is the result of compensatory lengthening (loss of *n* before *s*) and the meaning is influenced by *miscere*. Second, the *Appendix Probi* contains an entry *pauper mulier non paupera mulier*. Here we can see how *pauper* adopted a more productive type of inflection (Italian *povero*). But the feminine *paupera* occurred already in Plautus (fr. xlvi Lindsay). I used to think that the Plautine form foreshadowed Romance developments, but de Vaan points out that the adjective was originally thematic and became athematic under the influence of its antonym *diues*. Hence the Plautine form may be a genuine archaism not connected with the later rethematization. Naturally I also learnt much about languages other than the Italic ones by working through de Vaan's book. In German a common insult is *dämisch* or *dämlich* "stupid", which most speakers derive from *Dame* "lady / woman". The correct etymology, however, is less misogynistic: the word is not connected with *Dame*, but ultimately has the same root as Latin *temetum* "alcoholic drink".

The structure of de Vaan's dictionary is clear and simple. After a brief list of abbreviations and introduction, the main part of the book consists of the dictionary entries, followed by a bibliography and useful indexes. The introduction outlines de Vaan's view of Indo-European, which is fairly orthodox; for instance, he believes in three laryngeals, whose places of articulation match those of the velar stops: palato-velar, pure velar, and labio-velar. He follows the traditional reconstruction of manner of articulation for the stops: there are voiced, voiceless, and voiced aspirated ones. After the Indo-European period, he accepts an Italo-Celtic and then a Proto-Italic stage and regards Venetic as an Italic language. It is useful to have de Vaan's outline of the major sound changes and the reconstructed sound system of Proto-Italic in the introduction.

The dictionary entries are systematic and easy to follow. The headword is followed by a rough translation, the declension or conjugation class, and other relevant information, such as first attestation or variant forms. This is followed by a section listing derivatives, again with first attestations. Next come the reconstructed Proto-Italic forms and the Italic cognates. After this we are presented with the Indo-European forms and cognates in non-Italic languages. Then we get a brief discussion and bibliography.

Reviewing a dictionary is very different from reviewing any other type of book. The reviewer is one of the few people who can reasonably be expected to read the entire work from cover to cover, while others are more likely to read only individual entries. And while the reader of a more general book will not be upset if one or two paragraphs contain mistakes because it is the whole that matters, people consulting a dictionary and finding a faulty entry will of course be upset because it is typically just one entry they need. For this reason the rest of my review is a list of suggested improvements, but it would be appropriate to offer first an overall assessment: de Vaan has produced a useful book fully incorporating recent research, and in many respects he replaces the older etymological dictionaries of Latin (though for the Sabellic languages I naturally prefer Untermann). The work is very reliable; if my list of corrections seems lengthy, one should not forget that the book is over eight-hundred pages long. However, I also have some points of criticism. I find it regrettable that de Vaan so rarely tells us his own opinions. For the most part we only get summaries of earlier research. As any etymologist freely admits, reconstructed forms can never be absolutely certain. But there are degrees of certainty. The etymology of *equus*, for example, is much more certain than that of *abies*. It would have been nice to have a clearer marking scheme for what is relatively certain, moderately certain, and completely uncertain. My final and most important point of criticism concerns the treatment of loanwords. All words that are definitely loanwords are excluded from the discussion. This is not a peculiarity of de Vaan's work: all dictionaries in the series follow the same procedure. However, the omission of all certain loanwords means that de Vaan's book cannot be a sufficient etymological work on its own.

But now it is time to turn to the finer points. My list of corrections begins with some obvious omissions and mistakes. *Nux* is feminine, not masculine, so it should be *nux Abellana* under *Abella*. *Clam* is listed as adverb. One would have liked to see at least a mention of its prepositional use in early Latin. The etymology of *consulere* advanced by de Vaan may well be correct, but **kom-sed-* is dismissed too easily in view of *considium* in Plaut. *Cas.* 966. Under *doleo* we find the statement that the experiencer must originally have been expressed in the dative. This construction is actually well attested. *Elutriare* is listed under *lauare* as if it were a native formation, and the first two vowels are marked as long. But this rare word (attested in Laber. *com.* 151) is probably of Greek origin (ε)/lutron) and the first two vowels are consequently short (the Laberius passage is inconclusive in this respect). Under *facio* I would have liked to see the form *vhe:vhaked* from the *fibula Praenestina*, even if de Vaan should consider the document a forgery. Under *forceps* de Vaan states that *forfex* is a by-form that arose by metathesis. This cannot be right. The form that arose by metathesis is *forpex*, and *forfex* is derived from this by long-distance assimilation or by association with agentive nouns in *-fex*. All three forms are feminine, but *forfex* is attested with masculine agreement in Vitr. 10. 2. 2, which makes the second explanation, that there was an association with agent nouns, more likely. The noun *gerulifigulus* is listed under *gero* as if it were securely attested. It is a textually problematic *hapax

legomenon</i> (Plaut. <i>Bacch.</i> 381). Under <i>hic</i>, the nominative plural <i>hisce</i>, mostly used before vowels, is not even mentioned. It seems rather unlikely that <i>in-</i> is automatically lengthened before <i>-gn-</i> (see my comments below). <i>Iuxta</i> is normally said to have a short first vowel; de Vaan does not indicate vowel length here (or in <i>iuxtim</i>), but derives the word from <i>*jougVsto-</i>, in which case of course the first vowel ought to be long. Inscriptional evidence for long <i>-a-</i> in <i>largus</i> is mentioned, but if this is accepted, should de Vaan not also mark the derivatives of the word as having a long vowel? Much the same can be said of <i>forma</i> and its derivatives. <i>Liquidus</i> is discussed under <i>liqueo</i>. I would have liked to see a note stating that the first syllable of <i>liquidus</i> occasionally scans as heavy in Lucretius (3. 427 <i>liquidus umor aquai</i> as hexameter ending). <i>Muricidus</i>, a <i>hapax legomenon</i> in Plautus (<i>Epid.</i> 333), is glossed by Paulus Diaconus as <i>ignauus</i> and <i>stultus</i>. We are clearly dealing with an insult, though the exact meaning remains unclear. We find this word under <i>marceo</i> in de Vaan's dictionary, who thinks that it belongs here for semantic reasons and that it could be a by-form of <i>murcidus</i> (his term is "corruption", but obviously an emendation to <i>murcide</i> (voc.) in the Plautus verse would be unmetrical). He could be right if the first three syllables are light, but the first and third syllables can also count as long, in which case the meaning could be "mouse-slayer" (an insult for a cowardly soldier?) or "wall-destroyer" (an insult for a thief, <g>toixwru/xo/s</g>, also <i>perfossor parietum</i> in <i>Pseud.</i> 980). <i>Muscus</i> is marked with a macron on the first vowel, <i>muscosus</i> is not; the length of the first vowel is unclear in either case. Under <i>nasci</i> de Vaan cites an inscription with <i>nationu gratia</i> "on account of giving birth"; the inscription is of course from Praeneste (<i>CIL</i> 14. 2863) and the spelling is archaic, with <i>cratia</i> rather than <i>gratia</i>. On <i>noxit</i>, which de Vaan regards as an <i>s</i>-present to <i>noceo</i>, I refer to my book on the early Latin verb; this is definitely not an <i>s</i>-present, but an aoristic formation. <i>Pater</i> is said to go back to a nursery form <i>*pa</i>, phonologically <i>*pH2</i>. Much as I like the laryngeal theory in its modern form, a phonological representation of babies' first babbling seems slightly over the top. Exactly the same could be said about <i>atta</i> "daddy" < <i>*H2et-o-</i>. As for <i>penis</i>, I agree with de Vaan that the most likely semantic development is from "tail" to "penis". However, here as elsewhere I have to take issue with his chronological considerations; he argues that his theory finds support in the fact that the meaning "tail" is attested as early as Naevius, while "penis" is not found before Catullus. Roman comedy deliberately avoided terms like "dick" or "cunt", so the mere date of first attestations does not mean anything. Under <i>pluma</i> de Vaan lists another Plautine <i>hapax legomenon</i>, <i>plumatile</i>, which he translates as "feathered" and scans with the two first syllables heavy. The word occurs in <i>Epid. </i> 233 in a list of women's dresses and stands in opposition to <i>cumatile</i>, which must be connected with <g>ku/ma</g>. Since de Vaan's scansion leads to an impossible divided anapaest, it is better to scan the first two syllables as light and derive the word from <g>plu/ma</g>, as Duckworth (1940 <i>ad loc.</i>) does. His translation "watery or dishwatery" also brings out the joke. Under <i>pungo</i> we find a brief discussion of <i>pugna</i> and related words. Again it is claimed that before <i>-gn-</i> vowels are automatically long, a statement which is hard to maintain in view of Italian <i>degno</i>, <i>segno</i> < <i>dignus</i>, <i>signum</i> (not too much should be made of the spellings <i>seignum</i> in <i>CIL</i> 1^2. 42 and <i>dIgne</i>, with <i>i longum</i>, in <i>CIL</i> 6. 6314). Under <i>quiris</i> we read that the word might be a loanword with Sabellic connections; but in that case the labiovelar would be odd. Under <i>saxum</i> de Vaan lists Germanic words for "knife" as possible cognates, but then says that the connection between "rock" and "knife" is not straightforward. However, Latin <i>saxum</i> can of course also refer to a flint knife (as in the proverbial

inter sacrum saxumque sto), so perhaps the connection is not far-fetched. Under *se*, it is wrongly claimed that Plautus still uses the accusative / ablative *sed* (he only uses *med* and *ted*). Under *limus* "oblique", an adverb *sublimen* is listed. Though this word occurs several times in Plautus manuscripts (e.g. *Men.* 992), we are probably dealing with nothing more than a corruption of adjectival forms of *sublimis*. *Subuolturius* is listed under *uoltur* as if it were a normal derivative, while in reality it is a nonce-formation punning on *subaquilus* (Plaut. *Rud.* 422). Under *uerbera* I miss a reference to the verb form *uerberit* in a *lex regia*, discussed in Szemere/nyi (1987). Since de Vaan distinguishes between vocalic *u* and consonantal *v*, it should be *veruina* rather than *vervina* (under *veru*), and conversely, *volvi* rather than *volui* (under *volvo*). The alternative form *uotare* for *uetare* is not a *hapax*, *pace* de Vaan. *Vinum* receives an Indo-European reconstruction and the fact that this might be a later loan (possibly from Semitic, where words of similar shape occur) is not even mentioned. The form *ullo* (Acc. *trag.* 293), a future perfect of *ulcisci*, should probably be restored to *ulso*; de Vaan comes up with an *ad hoc* sound change **-lks-* > **-ls-* > *-ll-*, but obviously *l* and *s* look rather similar in certain types of minuscule manuscripts.

The treatment of Faliscan data is sometimes less than satisfactory. Of course Bakkum's impressive treatment of Faliscan, published in 2009, was not yet out when de Vaan submitted his book, but some oddities point to a lack of knowledge of Faliscan. *Sta* MF 28,[[1]] glossed as "(it) stands", and *statuo* MF 29, glossed as "I erect", are considered to be related with *stare*. Since in both cases these are the only words on the objects, the interpretation looks unlikely. It is clear that a dedicated object stands, the question is who set it up for whom. Probably we are dealing with abbreviated names. *Tulom* MF 68 does certainly not belong with *tollere*. The alleged meaning, "I set up", makes no sense on a one-word inscription, where we would expect the donor or the recipient; there are also morphological difficulties if the 1st sg. perfect ends in *-ai* (*pe:parai* EF 1), unless one resorts to the unlikely assumption that Faliscan preserved a separate aorist ending as well. Perhaps the inscriptions just means "of the Tulli" (with an old genitive plural in *-om*). It is odd that under *unda*, Faliscan *umom* "water vessel" EF 2 (< **ud-mo-*) is not mentioned. Finally, the alleged Faliscan forms *datu* (under *do*), *rected* (under *rego*), *sacru* (under *sacer*), and *uootum* (under *uoueo*) all come from an inscription in the Faliscan alphabet (LF 214), but the language is clearly Latin; the Faliscan ending is *-om* or *-o*, not *-um* or *-u*, and long vowels are not written double in the Oscan style in Faliscan.

Venetic remains a language of which we know little. Several times de Vaan follows earlier literature in assigning meanings to words which in fact remain obscure. *Atisteit* (**Es 122[[2]]), under *at* and *sto*, is considered to have a prefix *ati-* and is glossed as *adstat*; the meaning of this word remains uncertain. Equally obscure is *stati* (Od 1), analysed by de Vaan as an instrumental singular meaning "weight". Whether Venetic *poltos* (Es 113) belongs with *pellere*, as alleged, is doubtful. A certain amount of scepticism, along the lines of Untermann (1980), would have done no harm.

In an etymological dictionary one expects correct indications of vowel length. By and large, de Vaan gets it right, but there are several unfortunate mistakes. Before <i>-ns-</i> and <i>-nf-</i>, and before <i>-nct-</i> and <i>-nx-</i>, vowel length is automatic because the nasal was lost and there was compensatory lengthening (Meiser 1998: 78); de Vaan omits macrons in around eighty cases. On the other hand, vowels are not automatically long before <i>-gn-</i> (see above), and while de Vaan does not always mark them as long here, he does so in around fifteen cases where they are probably short. Elsewhere, macrons are often omitted, which can lead to some confusion; the correct forms are as follows (I leave the head words in brackets unmarked): <i>āctiō</i>, <i>a=ctor</i>, <i>a=ctus</i>, <i>a=ctu=tum</i> (all four under <i>ago</i>), <i>ada=re=scere</i> (<i>areo</i>), <i>adule=scentia</i>, <i>adule=scentia=ri=</i>, <i>adule=scentulus</i> (all three under <i>alo</i>), <i>affli=ctim</i> (<i>fligere</i>), <i>a=rde=re</i>, <i>a=rdor</i>, <i>a=rdus</i>, <i>a=rfacere</i> (all four under <i>areo</i>), <i>ascri=pti=uus</i> (<i>scribo</i>), <i>bili=x</i> (<i>licium</i>), <i>ca=nu=tus</i> (<i>canus</i>), <i>capessitu=rus</i> (<i>capio</i>), <i>cati=lla=re</i>, <i>cati=llus</i> (both under <i>catina</i>), <i>ce=na=culum</i>, <i>ce=na=re</i>, <i>ce=na=ticus</i>, <i>ce=na=tus</i> (all four under <i>cena</i>), <i>cla=mo=s</i> (<i>clamo</i>), <i>co=mptio=na=lis</i>, <i>co=mptus</i> (both under <i>emo</i>), <i>co=na=tum</i> (<i>conor</i>), <i>concilia=tri=x</i> (<i>calo</i>), <i>concubi=na=tus</i> (<i>cumbo</i>), <i>co=nsente=s</i> (<i>sum</i>), <i>corre=ctor</i> (<i>rego</i>), <i>cra=stinus</i> (<i>cras</i>), <i>crea=tri=x</i> (<i>creo</i>), <i>de=lecta=mentum</i> (<i>lacio</i>), <i>de=pudi=ca=re</i> (<i>pudeo</i>), <i>di=le=ctus</i> (<i>lego</i>), <i>e=bria=cus</i>, <i>e=briola=tus</i>, <i>e=briolus</i> (all three under <i>ebrius</i>), <i>e=le=ctilis</i> (<i>lego</i>), <i>e=mpti=cius</i>, <i>e=mptor</i>, <i>e=mpturi=re</i>, <i>e=mptus</i>, <i>exe=mptio=</i> (all five under <i>emo</i>), <i>facit a=re=</i> (<i>areo</i>), <i>fari=na=rius</i> (<i>far</i>), <i>fautri=x</i> (<i>faueo</i>), <i>fictri=x</i> (<i>fingo</i>), <i>fugiti=ua=rius</i> (<i>fugio</i>), <i>hono=ra=rius</i>, <i>hono=ra=tus</i> (both under <i>honos</i>), <i>imma=tu=rus</i> (<i>maturus</i>), <i>indipi=sci=</i> (<i>endo</i>), <i>ine=sca=re</i> (<i>edo</i> "eat"), <i>labo=ra=re</i> (<i>labor</i>), <i>la=psus</i> (<i>labo</i>), <i>lupi=llum</i> (<i>lupus</i>), <i>mandu=ca=re</i> (<i>mando</i>), <i>mendi=ca=bulum</i> (<i>mendum</i>), <i>mo=ra=tus</i>, <i>mo=rigera=ri=</i>, <i>mo=rigera=tio=</i>, <i>mo=rigerus</i> (all four under <i>mos</i>), <i>mu=ste=li=nus</i>, <i>mu=stricula</i> (both under <i>mus</i>), <i>nefa=stus</i> (<i>fas</i>), <i>negle=ctus</i> (<i>lego</i>), <i>ni=xa=ri=</i>, <i>ni=xus</i> (both under <i>nitor</i>), <i>obua=gi=re</i> (<i>uagio</i>), <i>o=ra=culum</i>, <i>o=ra=tio=</i>, <i>o=ra=tor</i> (all three under <i>oro</i>), <i>o=sculentia</i>, <i>O=stia</i> (both under <i>os</i> "mouth"), <i>pa=stus</i> (<i>pascere</i>), <i>praefesti=na=tim</i> (<i>festino</i>), <i>praema=tu=rus</i> (<i>maturus</i>), <i>pro=mpta=re</i>, <i>pro=mpta=rius</i>, <i>pro=mptus</i> (all three under <i>emo</i>), <i>Pu=blius</i> (<i>populus</i>), <i>quadra=ginta=</i> (<i>quattuor</i>), <i>qua=rticeps</i> (<i>-ceps</i>), <i>qui=nta=nus</i> (<i>quinque</i>), <i>qui=nticeps</i> (<i>-ceps</i>), <i>qui=nti=lis</i> (<i>quinque</i>), <i>re=cta=</i>, <i>re=ctor</i> (both under <i>rego</i>), <i>rede=mptita=re</i>, <i>rede=mptor</i> (both under <i>emo</i>), <i>re=gillus</i>, <i>re=gna=re</i>, <i>re=gna=tor</i>, <i>re=gnum</i> (all four under <i>rex</i>), <i>ro=bo=sem</i> (<i>robur</i>), <i>sci=ta=menta</i> (<i>scire</i>), <i>scro=fipa=scus</i> (<i>scrofa</i>), <i>se=me=stris</i> (<i>sex</i>), <i>strui=x</i> (<i>struo</i>), <i>subre=ctita=re</i> (<i>rego</i>), <i>su=mptio=</i>, <i>su=mptuo=sus</i> (both under <i>emo</i>), <i>ta=ctus</i> (<i>tango</i>), <i>trili=x</i> (<i>licium</i>), <i>ui=nde=mia</i>, <i>ui=nde=mia=tor</i>,

ui=nde=mitor (all three under *emo*), *u=ti=* (*utor*). Occasionally de Vaan marks a vowel that is short as long; thus the prefix *re-* always has a short vowel, so it should be *re/concinnare*[[3]] (under *concinnus*), *re/cusare* (under *causa*), *re/laxare* (under *laxus*), and *re/sumere* (under *emo*). Similarly, *de-* is shortened before vowel, so we should have *de/ambulare* (under *ambulo*), *de/esse* (under *sum*), *de/hortari* (under *horior*), *de/orio* (under *haurio*), and *de/osculari* (under *os* "mouth"). The other cases where a short vowel is marked as long are the following (head words in brackets): *conuo/uere* (*uoueo*), *da/re* (in several places), *dente/* (*dens*), *e/ra* ("mistress", under *ira*), *fauce/* (*faux*), *late/bricola*, *late/brosus* (both under *lateo*), *mone/trix* (*moneo*), *ni/si* (*ni*), *pro/fecto* (*facio*), and *pro/fiteri* (*fateor*).

All remaining errors are of minor importance. The author's English is very good and almost free of mistakes, but Latin of the Empire is called Imperial Latin rather than "Empirical Latin" (p. 503). This new, important dictionary cannot be neglected by anyone interested in the history of words.

References:

Bakkum, G. C. L. M. (2009), *The Latin Dialect of the Ager Faliscus: 150 Years of Scholarship*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam).

de Melo, W. D. C. (2007), *The Early Latin Verb System: Archaic Forms in Plautus, Terence, and Beyond* (Oxford).

Duckworth, G. E. (1940), *T. Macci Plauti Epidicus: Edited with Critical Apparatus and Commentary, in Which Is Included the Work of the Late Arthur L. Wheeler* (Princeton).

Ernout, A. and Meillet, A. (1959^4), *Dictionnaire e/tymologique de la langue latine: Histoire des mots* (Paris).

Pellegrini, G. B. and Prosdocimi, A. L. (1967), *La lingua venetica*, vol. 1: *Le iscrizioni* (Padua).

Szemere/nyi, O. S. L. (1987), "*Si parentem puer verberit, ast olle plorassit*", in *Scripta Minora: Selected Essays in Indo-European, Greek, and Latin*, vol. 2: *Latin*, ed. by P Considine and J. T. Hooker (Innsbruck), 892-910.

Untermann, J. (1980), "Die venetische Sprache: Bericht und Besinnung", in *Glotta* 58: 281-317.

------ (2000), <i>Wo+rterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen</i> (Heidelberg).

Walde, A. and Hofmann, J. B. (1938^3), <i>Lateinisches etymologisches Wo+rterbuch</i> (2 vols. + reg.) (Heidelberg).

Notes:

[[1]] The numbers are those in Bakkum (2009).

[[2]] The numbering system is that introduced by Pellegrini and Prosdocimi (1967).

[[3]] For typographical reasons I use the acute here to mark a short vowel.

<u n=http://www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip0818/2008022003.html>Table of Contents</u>.