NOTES ON THE RUMANIAN NUMERALS

In the second number of the Romanic Review, Mr. F. Vexler criticizes my notes on Rumanian publisht in the seventh volume of *Modern Philology*. I am sorry to find that he has misunderstood my views about the numerals, and shood like to explain them here.

I. THE Tens

In Albanian, 20 is exprest as 'one score,' while 40 is 'two score' in some regions and 'four tens' in others; see Pekmezi, Grammatik der albanesischen Sprache, § 62, Wien, 1908. Therefore I am justified in saying, in regard to the Rumanian multiples of ten, as I did in Modern Philology, that Albanian does not furnish a complete parallel for their formation. In Old Bulgarian the even tens, as well as the odd, ar counted as such: two tens, four tens, six tens, eiht tens; see Leskien, Handbuch der altbulgarischen Sprache, § 74, Weimar, 1898, and Vondrák, Vergleichende slavische Grammatik, II, 80, Göttingen, 1908. Since this is also the regular Rumanian method of counting, it seems reasonable to suppose it derived from Slavonic rather than from Albanian influence.

II. Sută 'HUNDRED'

In Old Bulgarian, o interchanges with \check{u} , as e does with \check{i} ; but this o stands for an erlier u-sound, Slavonic \check{u} being the regular representativ of Indo-European short u. Rumanian o is the usual strest derivativ of Slavonic \check{u} , as $dobitoc < dobyt\check{u}k\check{u}$, $sol < s\check{u}l\check{u}$. To explain such cases of $o < \check{u}$, beside $sut\check{a}$ with $u < \check{u}$, we need only to suppose that this word was borrowed erlier than the others, at a time when Slavonic \check{u} was a real u-sound, or more u-like than o-like. I hav never assumed such a form as $*sot\check{a}$; the honor of inventing it belongs to Mr. Vexler alone.

If Slavonic \check{u} made u in $sut\check{a}$, we milt expect to find such a treatment of \check{u} in other words. Tiktin thinks that $c\check{u}m\check{a}tru < k\check{u}motr\check{u}$ is a case of the same kind. Mr. Vexler objects to $cum\check{a}tru$ on two grounds: it may hav been modified by some other word;

and the ă is now strest. The ferst objection is valid, but the second is not. Erly Rumanian texts make use of stress marks, and Tiktin is careful to say that the older stress was cúmătru (Rumänisches Elementarbuch, §§ 32, 76, Heidelberg, 1905).

Mr. Vexler thinks that from the o of $s\bar{u}to$ we shood expect $\bar{u}u$, because Rumanian ău corresponds to present Hungarian final long o. But this theory is hardly tenable, even if we assume that short o and long o were treated alike. Hungarian final long o is a regular contraction of ou; see Simonyi, Die ungarische Sprache, 322, Strassburg, 1907. In some cases ou stands for an older au or av (ava, avo) cognate with Finnish ava; see Szinnyei, Finnischugrische Sprachwissenschaft, 102, Leipzig, 1910. Modern Hungarian shows traces of this contraction, as in to 'teich,' which has the dativ tónak, but the accusativ tavat, the plural tavak, and the personated forms tavam 'mein teich,' tavad 'dein teich' (Nagy, Ungarische Sprachlehre, 24, 37, Heidelberg, 1897). A few dialects still keep difthongs, as ao, au, ou, corresponding to literary long o; see Simonyi, Die ung. Sprache, 138. It is thus rather unlikely that Rumanian ău came from long o in words of Hungarian origin; it is probably derived from an old difthong.

Rumanian stressless \check{a} comes from Latin o in a few words, as $c\check{a} < quod$, $n\check{a} < nos$; also from medial Slavonic o, as $c\check{u}m\check{a}tru < k\check{u}motr\check{u}$, $st\check{a}p\hat{i}n < stopan\check{u}$. It is therefore possible that final \check{a} is derived from o in the vocativ adjectiv $drag\check{a}$ (Tiktin, R. Elementarbuch, § 197) and in the nouns $ciud\check{a}$, $pravil\check{a}$, $sticl\check{a}$, $sut\check{a}$ (Gartner, Darstellung der rumänischen Sprache, § 42, Halle, 1904), corresponding to Slavonic drago, $\check{c}udo$, pravilo, $s\check{t}iklo$, $s\check{u}to$. If the \check{a} of $sut\check{a}$ is not directly derived from o, it may be analogic, like \check{a} in $sor\check{a}$ for sor < soror; or it may come from a in the Slavonic plural $s\check{u}ta$. Hence there is no reason for douting that $sut\check{a}$ may be of Slavonic origin.

E. H. TUTTLE

New Haven, Conn.