THE ORIGIN OF G. S. *HOMINIS*, *CARDINIS*, *ORDINIS* (G. S. OF -*N* STEM -*ŌNIS* VS. -*INIS*)

Evgeniy G. Filimonov

Saint Petersburg State University, 7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation; evfilimonov@yandex.ru

The paper deals with an oddity in Latin morphology: the fact that a number of nouns (*margō*, *ōrdō*, *cardō*, *homō* and *nēmō*), in spite of being masculine, have, contrary to the general tendency, the G. S. in -*inis* instead of -*ōnis*. Some of the nouns (*margō*, *ōrdō*, *cardō*), unlike the other masculine nouns, retained their original G. S. form in -*inis* (which traces back to Old Latin *-ones) presumably due to analogy with the large group of feminine nouns in -*dō*, -*gō* because they have the same consonant at the end of stem. The G. S. of another exception, *homō*, is explained by analogy with the neuter nouns of the type *nomen*, *nominis*. The author also argues that the majority of G. S. -*ōnis* of feminina abstracta in -*iō* (type *nātiō*, -*ōnis*) can be explained phonologically without referring to their gender. Refs 8.

Keywords: historical grammar of Latin, Latin -n stem nouns.

1. Some Latin -*n* stem nouns in -*ō* have G. S. in -*ōnis*, while others have G. S. in -*inis*. The reason for this irregularity is not fully addressed in Latin grammars. It is normally said that -*inis* is a phonetically conditioned development of the earlier *-on-es, whereas -*ōnis* is an analogical innovation in which the vowel length of -*ō*- spread throughout the paradigm by analogy from -*ō* of N. S. It is unclear, however, why the spread of the -*ō* did not affect all of the -*n* stem nouns. E. g. I. M. Tronsky does not discuss this issue when writing about -*n* stem nouns: "The alternation between N. in -*ō*- and G. in -*inis* was retained in such words as *homō* (and its compound *nēmō*) *cardō*, *margō*, *ōrdō*, *turbō*, *virgō* and in the nouns with the suffixes -*dō*, -*gō*: *cupīdō*, *altitūdō*, *vorāgō*; as far as the other masculine nouns in -*ō*- and the nouns with the suffix -*iō* are concerned, the length of -*ō*- spread throughout the entire paradigm: *latrō* G. *latrōnis*; *nātiō*, G. *nātiōnis*; in archaic Latin there occur *hemōnem* (P. F. 89. 8), *homōnem* (Enn. *Ann*. 138)."[1] Authoritative historical grammars of Latin tend to merely describe the fact of the distribution -*ōnis* / -*inis* without entering into the individual history of particular nouns, which is understandable considering the breadth of material. When such attempts are made, only some of the nouns are covered. E. g. P. Baldi proposes an explanation for the prehistoric alternation in the suffix -*en*- / -*on*- in *homō*, *carō*, *cardō*,[2] but writes little on -*n* stems as a whole: "in stems ending in -*ōn*, the final nasal is lost, and the *ō* is mostly generalized throughout the paradigm: cf. *ratiō* gen. *ratiōnis* 'reason', *sermō*, *sermōnis* 'speech'."[3] M. Weiss writes at length on "a number of varieties" of -*n*- stems,[4] and on the individual development of *homō* (*ibid.* 468, 105, 281, 310), but little on the -*ōnis* / -*inis* distribution itself. A. Sihler divides all the Latin masculine and feminine *n*-stems into three groups: the first group is composed of a single noun *carō carnis* f. 'meat', with "(t)he apparent zero grade of the suffix throughout the

---

[1] Tronsky 2001, 166.
[2] Baldi 2002, 302.
[3] Ibid. 323.
[4] Weiss 2009, 309–313.

paradigm".[5] The second group, which has full grade generalized in place of zero grade, includes a few predominantly feminine primary nouns (e.g. *cardō, -inis* f. 'hinge', *homō, -inis* m. 'man') and a number of feminine composite affixes (*-tūdō, -tūdinis; -āgō, -āginis* and others). The third group comprises the majority of non-neuter n-stems which have generalized *-ō-* from N. S., e.g. *crābrō* 'charcoal', *caupō* 'shopkeeper'. Sihler concludes: "The nouns in simple *-ōn-* are almost all masc.; the few feminine are mostly names — *Iūnō*, and loan words from the Gr. Sapfè class, such as Gorgō, Gorgè. A few fem. *n*-stem nouns are seen in sublimated forms, for example the deity *Bellōna*. The two main fem. classes in this type are morphological complexes: (1) the vigorously productive affix *-tiōn-*, which is historically an agglutination of the *ōn*-stem and fem. *ti*-stem nomina actionis: *ratiō* (*reor*) 'reckoning', *mentiō* 'mention', *nātiō* 'birth, race', *āctiō* 'motion', and also *-āctiō, -ītiō-*, and so on. … (2) A large but closed class of verbal abstracts in *-iō*: *legiō* 'legion' (**'levy*', from *legō*), *regiō* 'line, direction' (from *regō*)."[6]

2. It is not at all clear from these accounts, why "the nouns in simple *-ōn-* are almost all masculine", and I do not know of any attempt to explain this phenomenon. A possible explanation would be that the analogical spreading of *-ō-* from N. S. throughout the paradigm was used in Latin as a marker for distinguishing masculine nouns from feminine and neutral nouns. The explanation, however, poses two questions: 1) why the nouns *homō, cardō, margō, ōrdō, turbō* did not follow the suit of the other masculine nouns; 2) why the numerous feminine nouns in *-iō, -(t)iō* presumably underwent the change characteristic of masculine nouns. These questions remain unanswered, which precludes the possibility of formulating a simple rule and necessitates complex definitions. Thus, A. Ernout proposes a correlation between gender and G. S. suffixes *-ōnis* or *-inis* rather than a rule: "Ont le génitif en *-ōnis* tous les masculins (sauf *cardō, homō*, et son composé *nēmō, margō, ōrdō, turbō, Apollō*), et tous les abstraits féminins, comme *nātiō -ōnis*, ou masculins, comme *pūgiō, -ōnis*. Sauf les masculins cités plus haut, tous les génitifs en *-inis* appartiennent à des mots féminins à nominatif en *-ō*, comme *virgō*."[7]

3. In my opinion, G. S.-*ōnis* of feminina abstracta in *-iō* (type *nātiō, -ōnis*) can be explained phonologically — without referring to their gender. G. S. in *-inis* would have resulted in a morphologically unclear form in *-īnis* (*nātiinis > *nātīnis ??). Thus, *-ōnis* allows to avoid the form in *-īnis* that would deviate from the normal consonant declension pattern whereby G. S. is one syllable longer than N. S. Forms in *-īnis* could also lead to an undesirable ambiguity: e.g. a hypothetical G. S. from *lātiō* 'a bearing, bringing' would be *lātīnis, a form partially homophonous with D.-Abl. Pl. *Latīnis*. Note that, all the nouns which have *-i-* before *-ōn-* always end in G. S. in *-iōnis -iō* irrespective of their gender and abstractness: *legiō — legiōnis* (f.), *natiō — natiōnis* (f.), *dissensiō — dissensiōnis* (f.), *scīpiō — scīpiōnis* (m.), *pūgiō — pūgiōnis* (f.).

4. The explanation of G. S.-*inis* (instead of the expected *-ōnis*) in the nouns *homō, cardō, margō, ōrdō, turbō* cannot be universal, as *homō* stands apart from the other four nouns. The form with *-ō- homōnem* is attested by Ennius (*Ann.* 138) and supported by Osk. humuns (< *homōnes). It shows that the *-ō-* spread from N. S. to some of the other cases, but eventually for some reason the form with a short *-o-* prevailed. It might have been either the high frequency of *homō* or the influence of neuter nouns such as *nōmen*,

---

[5] Sihler 1995, 296.
[6] Ibid. 295–296.
[7] Ernout 1914, 70–71.

nōminis that could have prevented the generalization of the long *-ō-* throughout the paradigm. It seems likely that both factors contributed to the result. The neuter nouns could not have influenced the N. and A. forms of *homō* because they have other endings in these cases (cf. *homō* and *hominem* — *nomen*, *homines* — *nomina*), therefore we find the long *-ō-* in A. S. (*hemōnem* Fest., *homōnem* Enn.) and can reconstruct N. A. Pl. *homōnes* on the basis of Osk. *humuns* — the forms in which neuter nouns could not be the source of analogy for *homō*. Among the *-ōn-* forms besides N. and A. only G. Pl. *homōnum* is attested (Novius, *Atellanae* 88).

5. The stages of development of *homō* can thus be reconstructed as follows: the original declension of *homō* had an alternation *-en-/on-*: N. S. *hemon / G. S *hemenes*,[8] with the short *-o-* later spreading from N. S. *hemon to the other cases of the paradigm.[9] After the N. S. developed a long *-ō* in *hemō *(< *hemon), this new long vowel tried to penetrate the other cases of the paradigm, but failed. Eventually *-o-* in *hemonis* underwent a regular phonetic change resulting in the classical form *hominis*.

6. *Cardō*, *margō*,[10] *ōrdō*, *turbō* require a different explanation. The table below shows that either ending (*-inis* or *-ōnis*) can be used after each stem consonant except *-t* and *-c*, which are only used with *-ōnis* (*feminina* are given in bold).

7. The words in *-dō*, *-dōnis* are normally of Greek origin (*spadō*, *-ōnis*), Latin deverbatives (*edō*, *-ōnis*, *mandō*, *-ōnis*) or denominatives (*Pedō*, *-ōnis*, *praedō*, *-ōnis*), and all of them denote persons. On the contrary, none of the nouns in *-dō*, *-dinis* denotes a person. The words in *-gō*, *-gōnis* are all of Greek origin, and therefore have *-ōnis* instead of *-inis*. The exception *ligō*, *-ōnis* forms a special group with the suffix *-ōn-*, which M. Leumann calls "Werkzeuge".[11] *Runcō* — *runcōnis* also belongs to this group. *Burdō*, *-ōnis* is classified by Leumann as a loan word. *Turbō*, *-inis* is difficult to account for.

8. Because *ōrdō*, *cardō*, *margō* do not denote a person and have the same end stem consonant as the group of abstract feminine nouns with the suffixes *-gō*, *-dō*, they followed their morphological pattern for G. S. *-inis* variant. The noun *virgō*, *-inis* is the only noun from the right column which denotes a person. *Virgō*, *-inis* fits into neither of the columns and belongs together with *homō*, *ōrdō*, *cardō* to the archaic group of nouns with G. S. *-inis*.[12] Its morphological structure and meaning differ from both Latin deverbatives (*edō*, *-ōnis*) and Latin denominatives (*Pedō*, *-ōnis*). The nouns in *-cō*, *-cōnis* and in *-tō*, *-tōnis* do not have any counterparts in the right column, which makes the nouns in *-dō*, *-dinis* and *-gō*, *-ginis* a more consolidated group in comparison to the more diverse noun group with G. S. *-ōnis*.

---

[8] Baldi 2002, 302.

[9] Baldi (ibid.) explains the *-in-* in *hominis* as the result of "vowel weakening from full-grade *-en-*", admitting, however, the possibility "that the *o*-grade is continued throughout the paradigm". Such forms as *homullus* (< *homonelos) and *homunculus* (< *homonecolos) speak in favour of this possibility (cf. Weiss 2009, 281).

[10] *Cardō* and *margō* are also attested as feminine nouns (Ernout, Meillet 1985, 99, 387), (Walde, Hoffmann 1938, I, 166; II, 39). The simplest explanation would be to suppose that these nouns were originally feminine, and only later, because of their concrete meaning, changed their gender to masculine. However, this is difficult to prove with certainty.

[11] Leumann 1977, 363.

[12] Leumann (ibid.) calls this group "altertümliche Flexion *-o, -inis*".

G. S. in *-ōnis*	G. S in *-inis*
spadō — spadōnis 'eunuch'	*ōrdō — ōrdinis* 'order'
edō — edōnis 'glutton'	*cardō — cardinis* 'hinge'
Pedō — Pedōnis n. pr. 'splay-foot'	***testūdō — testūdinis*** 'tortoise'
praedō — praedōnis 'pirate'	***consuetūdō — consuetūdinis*** 'habit'
burdō — burdōnis 'mule'	***hirundō — hirundinis*** 'swallow'
mandō — mandōnis 'glutton'	***(h)arundō — (h)arundinis*** 'reed'
	grandō — grandinis 'hail'
	crepidō — crepidinis 'base'
Gnathō — Gnathōnis n. pr. 'the name of a parasite'	
capitō — capitōnis 'big-headed'	
frontō — frontōnis 'with a broad forehead'	
mentō — mentōnis 'long-chin'	
Iūnō*, *-ōnis 'Juno'	
ligō — ligōnis 'hoe'	*margō — marginis* 'edge'
Aegōn — Aegōnis 'the Aegean sea'	***lānūgō — lānūginis*** 'woolly substance'
Old Latin ***Gorgō*, *-ōnis*** 'Gorgo'	***virgō — virginis*** 'maid'
	silīgō — silīginis 'winter-wheat'
	propāgō — propāginis 'off-spring'
	orīgō — orīginis 'beginning'
Alcōn — Alcōnis n. pr. 'Alcon'	
Lacō — Lacōnis 'Laconian'	
praecō — praecōnis 'herald'	
dracō — dracōnis 'serpent'	
runcō — runcōnis 'grubbing-hoe'	
būbō — būbōnis 'owl'	*turbō — turbinis* 'whirl-wind'
strabō — strabōnis 'with oblique eyes'	
carbō — carbōnis 'coal'	

9. To conclude, the origin of *-inis* in the five nouns *margō*, *ōrdō*, *cardō*, *homō*, *nēmō* remains uncertain. For some nouns there can be another explanation, e.g. *margō* and *cardō* could have been feminine nouns at the time of the generalization of *-ō-* from N. S. and consequently would not have undergone this analogy which was a marker of masculine nouns (except for the nouns in *-iō*, *-iōnis*). However, I think there is more evidence in support of the analogical explanation for all the five nouns: the analogy of the neuter nouns of the type *nomen*, *nominis* for *homō*, and the analogy of feminine nouns in *-dō*, *-gō* for *margō*, *ōrdō*, *cardō*.

References

Baldi P. *The Foundation of Latin*. Berlin, New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 2002.
Ernout A. *Morphologie historique du latin*. Paris, Klincksieck, 1914.
Ernout A., Meillet A. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. Paris, Klincksieck, ⁴1985.
Leumann M., Szantyr A., Otto W. *Lateinische Grammatik. Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. Bd. I. München, C. H. Beck, 1977.
Sihler A. *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York, Oxford. Oxford University Press 1995.

Tronsky I. M. *Istoricheskaia grammatika latinskogo iazyka. Obshcheindoevropeiskoe iazykovoe sostoianie (voprosy rekonstruktsii).* [The Historical Grammar of Latin. The Common Indo-European Language Stage (Questions of Reconstruction)] (In Russian). Moscow, Indrik, 2001.

Walde A., Hoffmann J. B. *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* Heidelberg, Winter, ³1938.

Weiss M. *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin.* Ann Arbor — New York, Beech Stave Press 2009.

ПРОИСХОЖДЕНИЕ G. S. *HOMINIS, CARDINIS, ORDINIS* (G. S.-*N* ОСНОВ -*ŌNIS* VS.-*INIS*)

Евгений Геннадиевич Филимонов

Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, Российская Федерация,
199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9; evfilimonov@yandex.ru

В статье объясняются так называемые исключения по роду атематического склонения латинских существительных с основой на -*n* (*margō, ōrdō, cardō, homō, nēmō*), которые, согласно общей тенденции, должны были бы иметь исход не на -*inis*, а, как и другие слова мужского рода, на -*ōnis*. Предлагается аналогическое объяснение: для *margō, ōrdō, cardō* — влияние слов женского рода -*dō*, -*gō*, а для *homō* — слов среднего рода типа *nomen, nominis*. По мнению автора, G. S.-*ōnis* существительных женского рода с абстрактным значением на -*iō* (*nātiō, -ōnis*) следует объяснять фонологически. Библиогр. 8 назв.

Ключевые слова: латинский язык, историческая грамматика, латинские существительные с основой на -*n*.