

ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ χαριεντισμὸν τινα ἀποκαλῶν, ἀποσεμνύων δὲ τὸ πάντων μέτρον, σπουδάσαι ἡμᾶς διεκελεύσατο περὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ λόγον; Here, the subject changes from the second person of ἐνενόησας to the third (= Protagoras) of διεκελεύσατο. Consequently, the first participle ὀνειδίζοντος has the same case as Πρωταγόρου, while the following participles ἀποκαλῶν and ἀποσεμνύων are nominatives, as if Protagoras had been the subject of the sentence all the time. This shift is possible because Protagoras is obviously the logical subject of the sentence, which also explains the use of the reflexive pronouns ἑαυτοῦ and αὐτοῦ. Similarly, at *Phdr.* 241d4–6 the text reads: καίτοι ὄμην γε (v.l. σε) μεσοῦν αὐτόν (v.l. αὐτοῦ), καὶ ἔρεῖν τὰ ἴσα περὶ τοῦ μὴ ἐρώντος, ὡς δεῖ ἐκείνῳ χαρίζεσθαι μάλλον, λέγων ὅσα αὐτῷ ἔχει ἀγαθὰ. Here, the participle λέγων is nominative instead of accusative for the same reason, namely that the logical subject is more important than the grammatical subject.<sup>15</sup>

As mentioned above, the context requires that the subject of ἔλεεῖν (and ἐπαινεῖν) at *Resp.* 606b3 be the lower half of the soul. For this reason, we may regard τοῦ θρηνώδους τούτου as the logical subject of the ἄτε-clause at b1–3. Therefore, the use of the nominative participle θεωροῦν to refer to τοῦ θρηνώδους τούτου is similar to the anacolutha in the *Theaetetus* and *Phaedrus* passages. Assuming an anacoluthon here, ἑαυτῷ at b1 may refer to τὸ θρηνώδες as well.

Universität Wien

CĂTĂLIN ENACHE  
 catalin.enache@univie.ac.at  
 doi:10.1017/S0009838824000442

## LATIN *LUPVS* ‘WOLF’ AS A GREEK LOANWORD

### ABSTRACT

*The Latin word lupus ‘wolf’ uniquely shares with Greek λύκος a metathesized form of Proto-Indo-European \*ul̥kʷos, and it is unlikely that they could have arisen independently. But an early borrowing from Greek into the Italic languages can be justified, after metathesis took place, but before the changes to labiovelar consonants in each language that would exclude the possibility.*

**Keywords:** etymology of ‘wolf’ in Indo-European; Latin *lupus*; Greek λύκος; Greek loanwords in Italic languages

The derivation of the Latin word *lupus* from \*ul̥kʷos, the most common Indo-European name of the wolf (preserved, for example, in Sanskrit *vṛkas*, Old Church Slavonic *vlikŭ*, Albanian *ulk* and Gothic *wulfs*), currently relies on two assumptions: that Italic uniquely

<sup>15</sup> G. Stallbaum (ed.), *Platonis Opera Omnia* (Gotha and Erfurt, 1857<sup>2</sup>), 3.1.68, ad loc.: ‘constructionis ratio exigebat λέγοντα, quod Stephan. requirebat. at nulla opus est mutatione, quandoquidem nominativus κατὰ τὸ νοούμενον subiicitur, quasi praecessisset: καίτοι ἐδόκει μοι μεσοῦν καὶ ἔρεῖν κ.τ.λ.’

shares with Greek the metathesis to *\*luk<sup>w</sup>os* assumed for λύκος; and that Latin borrowed its form of the word—with *p* for expected *qu* as the reflex of the labiovelar *k<sup>w</sup>*—from Sabellic, the dominant language of Italy before the rise of Rome.<sup>1</sup>

The transfer of this particular animal name can be explained by its cultic significance, and there is a parallel borrowing from Sabellic in the Latin word *bōs* ‘cow’. A different kind of root deformation is also proposed for Proto-Celtic *\*ulk<sup>w</sup>os*,<sup>2</sup> adding to the number of anomalous variants, and deepening the association with processes of taboo deformation. But since there are no early examples of the word in the Italic languages to support either of the primary assumptions, this leads to the problem of further having to assume that exactly the same innovation occurred independently in two of the three neighbouring language groups. It would be more plausible if metathesis happened only once, in Greek, and the resulting form were borrowed into Sabellic.

A borrowing from Greek requires it to have been earlier than the first millennium B.C.E. The labiovelar consonants attested in Mycenaean Greek had disappeared by the eighth century—their reflexes appear in stable spellings in the earliest alphabetic inscriptions—and the preceding change, by which labiovelars lost their labial element when next to *u* (the ‘*boukolos* rule’, which accounts for κ instead of π in λύκος), is already evident in Mycenaean. But a significant Greek cultural presence in Italy predates the period of Mycenaean textual records (beginning in the fourteenth century) by at least two centuries. The influence is widespread, represented in the burial objects of indigenous cemeteries, and reflects contact with the Greek-speaking peoples of the mainland rather than with Minoan Crete or Pre-Greek Aegean.<sup>3</sup>

A feature of Sabellic that makes it a good vector for naturalizing the Greek word is that unmetathesized *\*ul<sup>k</sup>os* would have developed into a form so close to the name of the fox, *\*wulp-o-s* alongside *\*wulp-i-s*, that the two could have merged, leaving a space for a loanword that restored a specific meaning. The semantic range of inherited *\*(H)ulp-i-* (antecedent of Sabellic *\*wulpis* and Latin *uolpēs*)—fox, jackal, wildcat, marten—suggests that it was originally a word for any wild canid or similar ground predator, thus preconditioning a merger. Latin, in preserving the labiovelar, would have maintained a contrasting word-pair; and the ousting of its inherited word for ‘wolf’ must be the result of compelling social factors. Beginning as a singular development of early Greek, this line of development through Sabellic is a better fit with the profile of taboo deformation.

This explanation of the word’s origin implies that metathesis took place before the middle of the second millennium B.C.E., allowing an extended period during which speakers of Proto-Sabellic could be exposed to Greek *\*luk<sup>w</sup>os*. And as a matter of relative chronology it implies that the ‘*boukolos* rule’, being a common feature across the East–West dialect divide, belongs to a period before Greek split into dialects, but after it separated from Indo-European. It also implies that there were other early

<sup>1</sup> Essential orientation on the etymologies follows M. de Vaan, *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages* (Leiden and Boston, 2016); and R. Beekes, with the assistance of L. van Beek, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (Leiden and Boston, 2016).

<sup>2</sup> K. McCone, ‘Varia II’, *Ériu* 36 (1985), 169–76, at 171–6: *\*luk<sup>w</sup>os* is tentatively considered, but rejected in favour of *\*ulk<sup>w</sup>os*, and this is adopted in R. Matasović, *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic* (Leiden and Boston, 2009).

<sup>3</sup> L. Vagnetti, ‘Western Mediterranean’, in E.H. Cline (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Bronze Age Aegean* (Oxford, 2010), 890–905.

Greek borrowings in *Italic*, especially of words related to cult and to Greek-mediated Aegean civilization.

*Traralgon, Victoria*

SIMON ESPOSITO

[sesposito@tutanota.com](mailto:sesposito@tutanota.com)

doi:10.1017/S000983882400020X

*RHETORICA AD HERENNIVM 1.2: QVOAD EIVS,  
QVOD EIVS OR QVOAD?\**

ABSTRACT

Rhet. Her. 1.2 *quoad eius fieri poterit* contains the surprising reading *quoad eius*. Earlier scholarship has debated the authenticity of this reading and its relationship to *quod eius*. A survey of the sources shows that *quod eius* appears in a number of inscriptions as well as in the transmitted text of nine passages within surviving Latin literature. So that phrase must be authentic; it appears to have arisen as a limiting formula in the language of the law. In two other passages, *quoad eius* appears in inferior manuscripts that lack authority, while the reading transmitted by authoritative textual sources is *quod eius*. Rhet. Her. 1.2 is the only passage in which *quoad eius* is the transmitted reading. This phrase is also linguistically problematic. Hence it is very likely to be corrupt. It probably arose as a conflation of *quod eius* with *quoad*, both of which are attested in similar contexts. On balance, it seems more likely that the original reading in this passage was *quoad*.

**Keywords:** Latin literature; textual criticism; editing; Latin syntax; legal Latin; *Rhetorica ad Herennium*

A passage near the start of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* may well cause the reader to stumble (1.2):<sup>1</sup>

oratoris officium est de iis rebus posse dicere, quae res ad usum ciuilem moribus et legibus constitutae sunt, cum adsensione auditorum, quoad eius fieri poterit.

It is the task of the orator to speak about public matters and the law, obtaining the agreement of the audience as far as possible. The last seven words of this passage were translated by Harry Caplan in his Loeb edition as ‘and to secure as far as possible the agreement of his

\* This article was written within the research group LITTERA at the Universitat de Barcelona (reference: 2021-SGR-00074). The author gratefully acknowledges a Ramón y Cajal Grant (RYC2018-024411-I) from the Ministerio de Universidades, and funding for the research project “Escrito para los dioses. Escritura y ritualidad en la Península Ibérica antigua” (PID2019-105650GB-I00) from the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación of Spain.

<sup>1</sup> I follow the recent edition with commentary by G. Calboli (ed.), *Cornifici seu Incerti Auctoris Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 3 vols. (Berlin and New York, 2020). *quoad eius* stands in the text in C.L. Kayser (ed.), *Cornifici Rhetoricorum ad C. Herennium libri IIII* (Leipzig, 1854) and in all later editions that I have seen.