

MISCELLANEOUS

DANTE: PURGATORIO XIII, 49 ff.:

E poi che fummo un poco più avanti,
Udi' gridar: *Maria, ora per noi,*
Gridar: *Michele, e Pietro, e tutti i santi.*

Dante, on his way through the second circle of Purgatory, that of the envious, encounters souls who utter the words italicized above, words which form their prayer addressed to the Virgin Mary, to the Archangel Michael, to St. Peter and to all the Saints. It has generally been assumed that the words are part of the Litany of the Saints. Thus Scartazzini (Leipzig ed. of the Purgatorio) gives the note: "queste anime cantano le litanie de' Santi, nelle quali all' invocazione di Maria si fa succedere quella dell' Arcangelo Michele. . . . Le anime che qui piangono l'invidia, hanno in dispregio i miseri spartimenti delle eredità terrene, pensano alla celeste eredità partecipata, e non diminuita, da' figliuoli di Dio, e a tutti i possessori di quella eredità si raccomandano amorosamente colle *Litanie de' Santi*," etc. Scartazzini, following Perez (*Sette Cerchi*, p. 146), is interpreting the present passage in view of a later one, *Purgatorio* XV, 49 ff., which deals with the idea that through community of enjoyment the amount of heavenly bliss is not in any way diminished. Now, it seems just a trifle far-fetched to find any necessary connection between these two passages. Of course there is no reason why the penitent souls in this circle should not, in their prayers, call upon all the holy inhabitants of Heaven for aid; the *Litany of the Saints* is still one of the penances often enjoined in the Confessional upon penitents, and the prayer is no more out of place here than are, in other places of the *Purgatorio*, the *Misere* (V, 24), the *Salve Regina* (VII, 82), the *Te lucis ante* (VIII, 13), the *Te Deum Laudamus* (IX, 140), the Paraphrase of the *Lord's Prayer* (XI, 1), etc. But is it not a natural thing to suppose that the souls may simply be repeating here the second half of the *Confiteor*: "there-

fore I beseech the *blessed Mary* ever Virgin, the blessed *Michael* the archangel, the blessed John the Baptist, the holy apostles *Peter* and *Paul*, and *all the saints*, to pray to the Lord our God for me"? The words actually uttered by the souls form a large part of the second half of the *Confiteor*; they form a very small part of the *Litany of the Saints*. It should be said that Torraca and Casini accept the explanation given also by Scartazzini. Perhaps, however, it is not amiss to raise the question.

J. D. M. FORD.

NOTE ON THE FOREIGN ELEMENTS IN RUMANIAN

UNDER this title Mr. E. H. Tuttle published in *Modern Philology*, July, 1909, pp. 23-25, an article dealing with the derivation of Rumanian *sută*, the origin of the Rumanian supine, and the treatment of the group *sc*. The fact is interesting, indicating as it does that Rumanian, the Cinderella of the Romance tongues, is beginning to receive her share of attention on the part of American philologists. However, as is natural with a new subject and one which requires a preparation quite different from that of the average Romance scholar, the chances for error are numerous. Mr. Tuttle tells us, for instance, that Albanian "counts even tens as scores," whereas this is not the case, cf. Gegic *n'iset*, *Katerθet*, *gaštθet*, etc. Again, Mr. Tuttle would explain *sută* < Old Bulgarian *sūto*, thru a form **sotă*, whose *o* would have changed to *u* in the same way as Latin *o* gives Rumanian *u*. The parallel is inexact, for most words showing *u* for Latin *o* are either explained by Vulgar Latin forms in *u*, or else have undergone the influence of analogy. At any rate **sotă*, could only have given **soată*, not *sută*. I do not think that *cumătru*, to which I suppose Mr. Tuttle refers when he writes "there is at least one other case when it [Slavic ů] makes *u*," is in exactly the same situation as *sută*. Its *u* may be due to the influence of Bulgarian *kumŭ*, *kuma*¹ (with which compare *kupetra*) and not unlikely also that of Rumanian *cuscru*, *cusurin*. Moreover, modern Rumanian knows only the accentuation *cumă'tru* while the *u* in *su'tă* is stressed.

The reason why Meyer-Lübke (as also Miklosich, Ascoli and

¹ Densusianu, *Hist. de la langue roumaine*, I, 275.