

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 *cuscu*, *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.

Gustav Meyer²) has rejected the derivation of *sută* from Old Slavonic *sŭto* is obvious: the form we should in all likelihood expect in the case of a regular phonetic development would be *stǎ'u* (with the loss of *ŭ*, cf. the common Slavic *sto*, and the same treatment of *o* as in Hungarian *to'* > Rumanian *tău*. Even the atonic form of the Slavic word for hundred (Bulgarian *dve'astea*, *tri'sta*, *če'tiristo-*) does not help much to explain Rumanian *sută*, as the insertion of *u* and the change of accent in the Rumanian word would still remain unexplained.

In the note on the supine Mr. Tuttle thinks that Jensen's theory of an Albanian influence is "far fetched" in spite of the fact that the so-called supine is preceded by *de*, Albanian *per*, and that these two prepositions present a most remarkable parallel. His drawing into the argument the Old Bulgarian infinitive is misleading, as the Bulgarian and Rumanian infinitives have not the same syntax. The great majority of Bulgarian participles end in *nŭ*, thus rendering, even on Mr. Tuttle's ground, more unlikely the otherwise improbable influence of the Bulgarian past passive participle. The whole question is not so much one of phonetic influence as one of comparative syntax.

It is not so certain that the change $\hat{s}\hat{c} > st$ is due to Slavic influence, though this is possible. This change affects the inherited Latin, but on the other hand we do not find it so generally followed in Rumanian formations like *cășcioară*.³ Meyer-Lübke regards the preservation of *šč* besides *št* as dialectal. If the change of *šč* to *št* were due to Slavic influence, we should expect for it the same prevalence as, for instance, of the change of initial *e* to *ie*. *Adhuc sub judice lis est.*

FELICIU VEXLER

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

² G. Meyer, *Alban. Studien*, II, 12; Ascoli in *Archivio Glottologico Italiano*, Suppt. II (1895), 132. Ascoli's contention that the form *insutit*, with *t*, proves *sută* of Ante-Roman origin does not bear examination, as *t* is preserved also in *inșeptit*, cf. *inșesit*.

³ Tiktin in Gröber's *Grundriss*² I, no. 98, p. 447; no. 115, p. 448.