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**Oscan slaagāi—**

By Brian D. Joseph, The Ohio State University

Oscan slaagāi—, with its spelling variant slagāt—, is glossed by Buck (1904: 226, 227, 229, 334) as having the same range of meanings as Latin finis, i.e. ‘boundary, border’ but also ‘territory, district’. These meanings come through fairly clearly in the uses of this word in the Cippus Abellanus (Buck pp. 226–227, inscription 1), an inscription which represents an agreement reached by the cities of Nola and Abella concerning the use and ownership of a temple of Hercules, owned by both cities and located on their common boundary. Slaagāt— occurs in the ablative case (slaagātδ) in the description of the position of the temple:

sakaraklūm Herculeæ [up / slaagātδ pūd ist . . . (ll. 11–12) ‘the temple of Hercules which is at the border . . .’

and later in the inscription, occurs twice in the accusative (slaagim), in the meaning ‘territory’:

pūst in slaagim / senetis suveis tangi—/ nūd tribarakavātum li— / kitud (ll. 34–37)

‘let it (i.e. a building) be allowed to be built by the decision of the senate of each (city) according to the territory’

avt anter slaagim / Aβellanam inūm Nūvianam (ll. 54–55)

‘but between the Abella and Nolan territory . . .’

Since both the citation from Callimachus and our proposed emendation refer to Herakles as slayer of the Nemean lion, we may have here a cult-epithet comparable to the curious title for Herakles, νεωγγι, “dog-thruster” (Hippom. F. 3a West). On this, see the interpretation of Olivier Masson, Les fragments du poème Hippomac. Édition critique et commenté (Paris: Klincksieck, 1962) 104–106; cf. also the form δεπαγγι, c.c. “thrashing” (AP 6.107.4).

**Oscan slaagī—**

Despite the relatively clear and uncontroversial meaning of slaagī—, the etymology is most unclear. Buck (p. 229) somewhat tentatively suggests a connection with Old Irish sleige ‘street’ and sleicht ‘track’, and no better suggestions seem to exist in the literature. However, there are formal problems which prevent one from accepting this slaagī— → sleige/sleicht connection. The Irish words are generally, though not wholeheartedly, taken to somehow represent an IE root *slēg- (Pokorny IEW 663) with the meaning ‘glide; smooth’ (cf. Old Norse slíkr ‘smooth’, Old Irish fo-slēgm glossed ‘line’) either directly (Pokorny) or indirectly by a contamination with the meaning of the root *slēk- of Old High German slēkan ‘strike’ (Vendryes [1974: s.v.v.]). Although the semantics of these root connections for the Irish words leave something to be desired, their form, coming from a zero-grade *slēg-, is such that a connection with Oscan slaagī— can be ruled out, for one would expect an Oscan cognate to be either slēgī— (full-grade) or slēg— (zero-grade), but not slēgī—. Thus a different etymology for slaagī— must be found.

Although no exactly equatable i-stem form exists in Indo-European for slaagī—, there are forms which offer a better root etymology, with morphological and semantic parallels as well to strengthen the connection. In particular, Greek λῆγω ‘leave off, cease’, along with its apparent Germanic cognates, e.g. Norwegian slēken ‘slack, loose’, provides the etymology for slaagī—. The Greek form points to a root *slēg- (the Germanic forms are from an o-grade form *slēĝ-), which can be rewritten in laryngealistic terms as *slēĤg-. The initial λ- of λῆγω is from an earlier *sl-, as shown by the geminate in the compound ά-λῆγος-τος and in ά-λῆγος-σαν (Od. 12.224), thus allowing for the connection with slēken and especially slaagī—.

Moreover, the meaning of λῆγω makes it a very good cognate for slaagī—. The connection between a meaning ‘leave off’ and a concretized sense of ‘border, boundary’, i.e. ‘where something leaves off’ (the meaning ‘territory’ would be an extension from ‘boundary’, as with Latin finis, properly “boundaries”), seems natural enough to the attractive in this case. Furthermore, such a semantic connection is implied by the use of λῆγω in a local sense by Herodotos in the description of the endpoint, i.e. boundary, of roads, mountains, and the like, e.g. 7.216: ἀπαὶ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἄναξικῆς ἀπειρᾶ ἄναξικα μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Λασσπᾶνος ποταμοῦ . . . λῆγε δὲ κατὰ τὰ Λεόρα κατακλῆ (cf. also Hdt. 2.8 in regard to a mountain range and 4.39 [2 × in regard to a peninsula).
Given the connection with λύω, then, *slaag- would represent a zero-grade *slag- (*slHg-), with the usual Italic development of *g to ã, as in Latin lâna from *glyna (cf. Skt. ārupa, Greek λυσις) and apparently (though with no indication of length) Umbrian an-gla ‘ocean, i.e. bird from whose note an augury is taken’ from *sk- (cf. Latin cūrō, Greek καλλω). The spelling variant slagi-noted earlier would simply by the result of the usual Ocean in- consistency in the writing of ‘etymological’ [k], e.g. fratrurum from *bratrōm. Although the alternative zero-grade vocalization, to *slag- (indicated for this root by Pokorny IEW 959), would yield Ocean slag-, from which the hy-form slag- could be derived by the ‘secondary lengthening’ of a seen in Ocean sannamaffol ‘locavit’ (Buck § 77.2), in view of the problems, admitted by Buck, with the nature and conditioning for this secondary lengthening process, it seems best to derive slaag- directly from the zero-grade vocalization *slag-.

Morphologically, slaag- would be a zero-grade i-stem formation from the verbal root, parallel to such forms as Sanskrit dr̥i- ‘(the act of) seeing, beholding’, and ruc- ‘light, splendor’, or Middle High German luc, Old Church Slavonic lăs, both from *lug- ‘falsehood’. As Brugmann (1904: § 420) notes, these formations are generally verbal abstracts, though they can undergo a concretization in meaning, as with ruc-. Slaag-, then, fits into this pattern of originally abstract verbal nouns which have taken on a more concrete meaning.

The connection of Ocean slaag- with Greek λύω, therefore, encounters no phonological, morphological, or semantic difficulties, and so must be preferred over Buck’s suggestion of Old Irish slīge/ slēgh. Moreover, if one assumes that slaag- shows that Italic inherited a zero-grade *(a)lag- from this root, then some insight may be gained into the problematic connection of Latin lazus and Greek λαγός with the root of λύω (cf. Chantraine 1968: s.v. layaio). Lazus is unlikely to reflect a zero-grade *(a)lag- of *slaHg-, with vocalization of the laryngeal and not the liquid, because, as noted above, the Ocean form most likely represents a zero-grade with the vocalization *(a)Hg- *(a)lag- in traditional terms), not *sλag-. Latin lazus would thus have to be from a root *(a)lag- (with an s-extension), which would provide the basis for Greek λαγός and related words (layaio, etc.). Similarly, though van Windekens (1970: s.v.) connects Tocharian A ṣλακѣ ‘mobile, agile, instable’ with λαγός, lazus, and λύω, positing *slag- for the

Tocharian forms, a preform *lag- would yield the A ṣ to B a correspondence in the root syllable as well. Lazus, λαγός, and ṣλακѣ (etc.) would thus represent an entirely different root from that of λύω and slaag-.
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Latin ut/nē and ut (… nōn)

By Eric P. Hamp, Chicago

The accounts in the handbooks of the phonological and morphological background of what we read in Latin as ut uf are quite inadequate, and this is essentially because they do not take proper account of the syntaxes into which ut enters. The focus is heavily, rather, on what translational equivalences ut may take.

We may first remove one subsidiary phonetic question, which is not of great importance to the total problem in any case. There can be no doubt that we must assume a form *uta in order at least to explain the combination ali-uta; it is also quite possible to derive uti-nam and uti-que from this form. But, more important, the prominent syntax with *uta 1) would be optimally explained by the

1) For a detailed listing of Korrelativa im Hauptsatze (ita – ut, eso – ut, etc.) see Stenzyr 633; the later pleonastic accumulations need not concern us here for purposes of tracing the sources of ut. Recognition of the basic relevance of *ita to *ut is demonstrated by Leumann’s (1977) juxtaposition (482 § 377B) of *ita and uti uti ut under -ta modal.