Pultrová, Lucie

The Latin adjectives with the suffix -idus

Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. N, Řada klasická. 2007, vol. 56, iss. N12, pp. [87]-95

ISBN 978-80-210-4388-6
ISSN 1211-6335

Stable URL (handle): https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/113997
Access Date: 20. 02. 2024
Version: 20220831

SBORNÍK PRACÍ FILOZOFICKÉ FAKULTY BRNĚNSKÉ UNIVERZITY
STUDIA MINORA FACULTATIS PHILOSOPHICAE UNIVERSITATIS BRUNENSIS
N 12, 2007

LUCIE PULTROVÁ

THE LATIN ADJECTIVES WITH THE SUFFIX *-IDUS*

The Latin adjectives with the suffix *-idus* belong to the most pronounced Latin adjective types. The type is relatively productive and considerably – although not absolutely – semantically homogeneous. In almost every diachronically oriented Latin grammar book, this suffix is particularly accentuated as a representative of the suffix belonging to the so-called "set of suffixes" (Suffixverband). This important linguistic term denotes a group of suffixes by which the nouns and adjectives, or verbs, are derived from one root of specific type; these derivations then form a group of related words within which we cannot distinguish between the primary and secondary derivation (that is which words are derived from which within the given suffix family). In Indo-European linguistics, holding a prominent place among the "sets of suffixes" or "systems of suffixes" is the so-called "Caland system of suffixes",[1] comprising the suffixes **-ro-/*-mo-*, stative verbs in **-eh$_1$-* (> *-ē-*), *-es*-neuters, the comparatives in **-i̯os-* and the superlatives in **-is-to-*. In Latin, such a prominent set of suffixes is formed – from the synchronic point of view – by the mentioned adjectival suffix *-idus* with the substantive *-or* and the verbal *-ēre* or *-ēscere*, e.g. *calidus – calor – calēre – -calēscere*; *tepidus – tepor – tepēre – -tepēscere* etc.[2]

---

1 The term "Caland system of suffixes" is rather a kind of abbreviation in the "jargon" of Indo-Europeanists – Holland linguist Willem Caland (1859-1932) himself is, from our today's perspective, only remotely associated with this issue. The law he formulated and through which he made his mark in the history of linguistics (so-called Caland's law), consists in that the adj. in *-ro-* in Avesta in the position of the first member of compounds are substituted by the adj. in *-i-*, e.g. the compound *kh̬vi-dru-* to the adj. *khrūra-*. Later, J. Wackernagel acknowledged this phenomenon to be generally Indo-European (that is why it is often called also Caland-Wackernagel's law) and only after various scholars had gradually researched the issue, the awareness of the semantically interconnected set of suffixes developed (cf. e.g. Collinge 1996: 23ff.).

2 Among Latin adjectives in *-idus*, the adjectives of this particular type (i.e. with related stative verbs in in *-ēre* and the abstract nouns in *-or*) are absolutely dominant; however, it is not the only type: on the one hand, these sets are not always complete, either the verb is missing (e.g. *lepidus*), or the abstract noun is not formed (e.g. *āridus*), and on the other hand there are other marginal types, e.g. the derivations from the verbs of other types (*cupiō – cupidus*) or the

Despite the unquestionable importance of the suffix *-idus* in Latin word-formative system and in spite of many attempts made to explain its origin, the linguists have so far failed to accomplish the task. The basic problem is that Latin suffix *-idus* has no clear unequivocal equivalent among other IE languages and that the adjectives derived thereby are, at first sight, quite unique in the IE linguistic area.

Let us start our interpretation with an outline of the up-to-now presented opinions on the origin of the suffix *-idus* and on the formation of these adjectives:

1) The easiest thing to do is simply to presume that Latin suffix *-dus* is a direct successor of the PIE suffix **-do-* or **-d^ho-*. Trying to answer the question whether **-do-*, or **-d^ho-*, the linguists usually lean on the presumed related forms recorded in other Italic languages, which are, however, ambiguous: Umbrian *KALEŘUF* / *calersu*[3] would testify rather to **-d-*, Oscan *Callifae*[4] , on the other hand, sooner to **-d^h-* (cf. e.g. Brugmann 1906: 471f.; Nussbaum 1999: 381f.).

Benveniste (1935: 144) regards the suffix *-idus* to be related to the – neither sufficiently explained – gerundival suffix *-e/ondo-*. In his opinion, the gerundival suffix is formed parallelly to the suffix of active participles in *-e/ont-*; i.e. he construes the element *-e/on-* either with *-t-*, or with *-do-*, and this very *-do-* is according to Benveniste identical with the *-do-* in our suffix *-idus*. The suffix *-do-* (according to Benveniste **-d^ho-*) indicates a state.

The weak point of this whole interpretation is evident and it has already been mentioned: we can see, apart from isolated forms, no equivalent adjectives in other IE languages, and we cannot postulate a PIE suffix on the basis of a single language, or a single language branch.

2) Already in 1878, Osthoff (1878: 121ff.) came with a completely different solution, cited as possible by most of the later authors researching in the topic (e.g. also Brugmann 1906: 472). In his opinion, the adjectives in question are actually compounds (*cali-dus*), the first element of which is formed by the appropriate content verbal abstract noun (according to Osthoff namely *-es*-abstract noun, converting in composition to the *o*-declination); the second element is then also verbal, that is *nomen agentis* from the root **deh$_3$-* (Lat. *dare*) or **d^heh$_1$-* (in Latin only in compounds, e.g. *condere*). The adjectives formed in this way then would be equivalent to the other Latin compound adjectives, ending in *-ficus*: *horri-ficus* (to *facere*) ~ *horri-dus* (to *dare*, "give", or **dare*, "lay"). Balles has quite recently (2003) come with quite the same solution, citing the root **d^heh$_1$-* ("lay") in the base.

---

evident denominatives (*herba – herbidus*) – for an exhaustive list of singular types see e.g. Nussbaum (1999).

3 *Tabulae Iguvinae* Ia 20, resp. VIb 19; this is assumed to be the equivalent to Latin *calidus*, "with a white spot on the forehead" (ISID. orig. 12,1,52).

4 Local name known only from the citation in LIV. 8,25,4; it is usually associated with Lat. *calidus*, "warm" (i.e. possibly "a place with warm springs").

3) Another hypothesis of the origin of the suffix *-idus* stems from the fact that it seems to have a semantic relation with the suffixes belonging to the so-called "Caland system of suffixes" (see above) – as if it stood for the suffix *-ro-* in Latin system. This hypothesis was researched in detail by Bloch (1954), who, having made comparison with the Greek adjectives in -ro~ and Indo-Iranian in *-ra-*, comes to the solution that in regard to sence they are comparable; but, on the other hand, that only few Latin adjectives in *-idus* have direct equivalents among the IE adjectives in *-ro-* (e.g. *crūdus* – OInd. *krūrá-*, *madidus* – madaro~; in other cases we find only a semantic relation, e.g. adjectives *frigidus* – yucro~, *pallidus* – wcro~, *puttidus* – sapro~ and other, see Bloch 1954: 24f.).

From the view of phonology, the hypothesis that Lat. *-dus* < PIE **-ros*, is only partly acceptable: the alternation testifying to phonetic closeness of *r* and *d* exists in Latin (e.g. **medi-diēs* > *meridiēs*) and the dissimilation *r – r* > *r – d* (**c**r**ū**r**us* > *c**r**ū**d**us*) is easy to imagine, nevertheless, two simple and weighty objections can be raised: First, only a minority of the adjectives with the suffix *-dus* has in the root the phoneme *r*, which could effect the dissimilation. Secondly, there is a number of Latin words where the sequence of two *r*s is maintained while no dissimilation occurs (*prōsperus*, *properus* etc.).

4) Quite recently, another interesting hypothesis was put forth by Danish researcher B. A. Olsen (1994), based on two premises: first, the adjectives of the type *calidus* stand by the verbs that do not form the participles in *-tus*; secondly, the cases are well recorded where an occlusive in contact with the preceding laryngeal **h_1* or **h_2* yields an aspirate (e.g. Greek plhqu~ < **pleh$_1$-tu-*). Olsen therefore suggests the reconstruction of the Latin suffix *-idus* from **-t^{h}os* < **-h$_1$-tós*, with the laryngeal **h_1* representing the zero grade of the suffix **-eh$_1$-* of stative verbs, which she derives the given adjectives from.

One weak point of the theory can be seen at first sight: such process evidently did not occur in the participles of the type *(g)nātus* (< **g'nh$_1$-tós*), and these, in my opinion, can be only with difficulty considered secondary, analogical.

Concerning the element *-i-* in the suffix, possible variants of its origin are summed up by Sznajder (2002: 63f.): it can be a) the *-i-* in the compound according to the Caland-Wackernagel's law (see above note 1), or b) the compositional vowel *-i-* (which prevails in Latin, disregarding the form of the first member of the compound) or c) the reduced thematic vowel *e/o* of the base verbs, or d) the reflex of the laryngeal **h_1* of the suffix of stative verbs. To which can be added that quite simply this can also be the anaptyctic vowel, common in Latin words on the seam between the root and the suffix.

Let us briefly once again sum up the fundamentals of the mentioned hypotheses and their strong and weak points.

The hypothesis in the point 2), considering Latin adjectives in *-idus* to be original

compounds, is very tempting from the formal point of view. The so-formed adjectives would have equivalents in Latin adjectives in *-ficus* and also *-i-* closing the first element of the compound is easy to be explained in several ways, according to what word-formative type we assign the first element of the compound (the orthodox Indo-Europeanist would probably lean to the "Caland's" *-i-*). What causes troubles here is, however, the semantic aspect of the matter: to interpret the adj. *calidus* as "giving warmth" instead of "being warm" (this way, we would probably have to expect sooner **calibus* (?) < **-b^{h}u-os*) seems to be rather purpose-built; however, it cannot be excluded.

Other above mentioned hypotheses presuppose a common suffixal derivation, the scholars, however, disagree on what type of derivation is in question, whether deverbative or denominative one.

LIV treats the verbs of the type *calēre* among the primary verbs. Contrary to the traditional image of the form of stative verbs (suffix **-eh$_1$-*), it attributes to them the structure *R(z)-*h$_1$i̯é-*,[5] i.e. the suffix consisting of two elements, **-h$_1$-* (the zero-grade of the stative suffix **-eh$_1$-*) + the suffix *-i̯é-*. What must be added, however, is that when going through the *LIV* dictionary, next to the Latin verbs of similar type we can usually find the notes such as "with analogical R(e)", "neologism" etc., in other words, in most cases the suggested reconstruction in fact does not, following the up-to-now defined sound laws, correspond to the Latin outcome.

This interpretation, namely that the verbs of the type *calēre* are primary verbs, implies that the adjectives of the type *calidus* are deverbatives. Traditionally, these adjectives are regarded as deverbatives also by the researches who postulate the inherited suffix **-do- / *-d^{h}o-* (not by all, though, see Nussbaum below); this interpretation would probably be preferred also if we accepted the hypothesis of the origin from the PIE **-ro-*, which is sooner considered to be deverbative,[6] and certainly this applies to the hypothesis by Olsen. Regarding the latter, we must express two critical comments, which, in my opinion, fundamentally dispute its validity:

1. Were we to attribute a verbal characteristics to Latin adjectives in *-idus*, then we would definitely have to describe them as "stative adjectives". The PIE verbal adjectives with the suffix in *-tó-* are, however, anything but stative: they are in principle adjectives derived from the active (transitive) verbs. Stative, i.e. perfect verbal adjectives, have in PIE the reconstructed suffix **-u̯es-* (in Latin, we may perhaps consider even the transition to the suffix *-u̯o-*, see Pultrová 2006b: 54ff.),

5 "R(z)" is a symbol used in *LIV* to denote the root in the zero grade (× "R(e)" = the root in the full *e*-grade).

6 This, however, is by no means clear, since neither the PIE suffix **-ro-* has an unambiguous function; e.g. Leumann (1977: 315) introduces the interpretation of Latin adjectives in *-ro-* by the following: "soweit etymologisch ableitbar, Deverbative"; Brugmann (1906: 348ff.) evades the definition of the function of the suffix, he offers just mere list of IE formations in *-ro-*.

but by no means **-to-*; we cannot presuppose any analogical secondary formation here, since the very basis of Olsen's hypothesis is that these adjectives must have been formed very early, surely in the PIE period, before the elimination of laryngeals took place.

2. The PIE verbal adjectives in **-tó-* are primary verbal derivations, which is to say that they are derived by adding the suffix directly to the verbal root, not to the verbal stem. If we were, therefore, disregarding the semantics, to derive standardly the adjective in *-tó-* from the root e.g. of the verb *calēre*, the result would read as follows: **k'l̥-tós* > Lat. ***kultus* (?).

In contrast with *LIV*, Watkins (1971: 68) describes the verbs of the type *calēre* as "adjective-verbs" and classes them sooner with denominative statives. I consider this interpretation absolutely pertinent. If we acknowledge that in the deep structure of language there exist the categories of quality, which hardly anyone would dispute, then it is hard to imagine which word type would better conform to this particular category. To put it simply, it is certainly more natural to derive the verb with the meaning of "to be warm" (*calēre*) or "to get warm" (*calēscere*) from the adjective "warm" than vice versa (besides, modern languages clearly attest to it).

All in all, I believe that we must start from the fact that neither in the case of the verbs of the type *calēre*, nor in the case of the adjectives in *-idus* we deal with deverbative derivations; they do not express the relation towards an action, but they denote the quality of a substance. From the semantic aspect then we must regard the adjectives in *-idus* as "adjectives of quality". The same applies also to the related abstract nouns in *-or* (*calor*) – also these are clear cut qualitative abstract nouns, not verbal abstract nouns (nouns of action). For that matter, Nussbaum (1999) came to the same conclusion, when he presupposed the evolution from the primary adjective through the *i*-abstract noun to the adjective in *-idus* (demonstrated on the relation between the adjectives *rūfus – rūbidus* – p. 404).

The adjectives of quality generally derive both from the concrete and the abstract nouns. Turning for help to the mother language of the author (since English is actually not very "eloquent" in discussing word-formation), we can list as the examples of the adjectives of quality derived from concretes for instance *tuk – tučný* ("fat – fatty"), *špína – špinavý* ("dirt – dirty"), *piha – pihatý* ("freckle – freckled"), from the abstract nouns then for example *naděje – nadějný* ("hope – hopeful"), *štěstí – šťastný* ("happiness – happy") etc.[7] In Latin, corresponding to this type is e.g. *barba – barbātus* (in Latin grammar books these types of adjectives usually are referred to not as "qualitative" but "possessive", in the sense of "furnished with something").

Here, a little digression must be made: The most important types of denominative adjectives in Latin have the suffixes identical with the deverbative suffixes

7 The examples are taken from *MČ*, I, 370f.

(in particular *-nus*, *-lis*, *-tus*); their main characteristics, however, is – regarded synchronically and disregarding the marginal cases – that they join the stem of their founding noun, and if the stem is vocalic, the respective vowel is lengthened. Thus we have *barba – barbātus*, *crīnis – crīnītus*, *Rōma – Rōmānus*, *tribus – tribūnus*, *cūria – cūriālis* etc. Apparently, there must have been another word-formative element in between the suffix itself and the founding word; naturally, the connection with laryngeal offers itself. Bader (1992: 99ff.) identified in similar cases the denominative suffix of appurtenance ***-h_2-**.

This brings us back to the hypothesis by Olsen, to which I have expressed critical objections earlier; this, however, certainly is not meant to dispute the mentioned phonological principle, e.g. that the laryngeals ***h_1** or ***h_2** in some cases cause the aspiration of the succeeding *t*. On the contrary, based on that principle, the theory by Bader and, at the same time, the semantic analysis of the Latin adjectives in *-idus*, a new hypothesis can be put forth. Latin adjectives in *-idus* could have originated from the following structure:

F-*h_2*-*tos,

where F stands for the founding abstract noun with the meaning of quality and the structure ***-h_2-*tos** is thus actually identical with the complex suffix occurring in the adjectives of the type *barbātus* (***-h_2-** is the Bader's appurtenance suffix). The founding word must have been an abstract noun in the form of the root word of the type *lūx* (similarly also *rōs – rōridus*).

Some more comments to be made on the hypothesis: I build on the theory that the group of phonemes with the interconsonantal laryngeal in medial syllable in Latin yields C*i*C (not C*a*C as in initial syllables), which I formulated in detail in Pultrová 2006a: 76ff. The general opinion on the evolution of laryngeals in the interconsonantal position is that what occurred here was not the "vocalization" of the laryngeal, but the insertion of the anaptyctic vowel into the consonant group (and in some languages, e.g. in Greek, the anaptyctic vowel was then coloured according to the type of the laryngeal). The development of the researched group of phonemes could then have been as follows:

***-C*h_2*t- > *-C*t^h*- > through anaptyxis *-C*i*t^h- > -C-*id*-**.

To be fair we must admit that the weak point of this hypothesis lies in its difficult verification, at least within the scope of Latin. Unambiguously parallel formations are not likely to be found in the structure of Latin language – I mean the formations where the consonant ending of the founding word was joined with the suffix of appurtenance ***-h_2-** followed by the suffix in *-t-*.

Suppose we were looking for the parallels on the purely phonological level, then we are sure to find the words containing the consonant group CH*t*[8] in Latin,

8 C ≠ R; in the group *RH*t* we have to take into account a different development.

although even of these there are not many (cf. e.g. Schrijver 1991: 94, 99). Even more limited list of words we shall obtain if we are interested in this consonant group in the medial syllable only. On the basis of Schrijver's synthetic work, we can class into this file only the prefixed derivations from the verbs *patior* (< *ph_1-t-*) and *fateor* (< *b^hh_2-t-*)[9], verbal adjectives *satus* (< *sh_1-t-*), *status* (< *sth_2-t-*), *passus* (< *p_eth_2-t-*), to which must be added *datus* (< *dh_3-t-*), *ratus* (< *rh_1-t-*), and according to *LIV* also *missus* (< *$mith_2$-t-*) and *fossus* (< *$b^h_ed^hh_2$-t-*), and perhaps *Iūpiter* < *pater* (< *ph_2t-*).

No derivation from the above listed founding words shows the phonological development *H*t* > **t^h^*, but in fact they cannot be considered real parallels to our hypothetical phenomenon, as in all the present cases the laryngeal is the part of the root. The works concerned with laryngeals in general mechanically research the development of the laryngeals in specific phonological environments, that is of specific groups of phonemes (e.g. CHC, CRHC etc.), regardless of to which morpheme the single phonemes of the group belong. In my opinion it is evident that the development of phoneme groups depends on the morphematic structure of the word and in this respect the sound laws should be specified, above all when defining the development of laryngeals (but also of other phonemes, e.g. syllabic resonants). Thus for example the PPP from the verbs with the root H*e*C- would have to look quite differently from the reality should we use the "mechanical phonological" interpretation (*HC- > C-), e.g. *edō*: **h_1d-tos* > ***dtos* > through anaptyxis ***d*V*tos*, or even ***ttos* > ***ssos* > ***sus* (?). Language, or at least Latin, however, will not allow such development – actually eliminating the root – and opts for an alternative. Yet another example of a different kind: so-called *ā*-intensive (the type *facere* – *-ficāre*, see Leumann 1977: 534, 549) is formed from the verb *stāre* in quite a different way than from the other verbs: to "help" with the formation, the *n*-infix is needed (*-stināre*), since by undergoing the standard derivation the suffix would completely cease to exist, the derivation would be homonymous with the base verb and thus unclear as to the meaning. In a word, phonological and word-formative processes, at least in Latin, in principle occur in the way as not to obscure the meaning of the word – as if there always were more variants of how the language can "deal with" unsustainable group of phonemes. Should the standard way bring obscuring of the word's sense, the alternative is chosen. What must be always maintained is a clear (syllabic) root and an unambiguous ending; an unambiguous word-formative suffix then where it is "grammaticalized" (i.e. it became the means to express a grammar category; in Latin for example the deverbative suffix *-tus*). Our example falls right within these theoretical reflections.

To sum up, I suggest that we add one more hypothesis to the up-to-now presented interpretations of the origin of Latin adjectival *-idus*, one which presupposes the

9 The same reconstruction applies also to the adj. *fātus* (to *fārī*), which has in Latin a problematic (difficult to explain) long *ā*.

structure of "root qualitative abstract noun + *-h_2- + *-*tos*" and which is in fact an attempt to synthesize the theories by Nussbaum (on denominative character of the adjectives in -*idus*), Bader (on derivation of denominative nouns and adjectives by the means of the suffix of appurtenance *-h_2-) and Olsen (on the development *$h_2t > t^h > d$). To either confirm or disprove this hypothesis will only be possible after further research in Latin phonological phenomena, above all the development of laryngeals, against the background of morphematics and word-formation.

REFERENCES

Bader, F. (1975). La loi de Caland et Wackernagel en grec. In *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Émile Benveniste*. Paris, Société de linguistique de Paris, 19–32.

Bader, F. (1992). Problématique du génitif thématique. *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris*, 87 (1), 71–119.

Balles, I. (2003). Die lateinische Adjektive auf -*idus* und das Calandsystem. In E. Tichy – D. S. Wodtko – B. Irslinger (eds.). *Indogermanisches Nomen* (Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Freiburg, 19. bis 22. September 2001). Bremen, Hempen Verlag, 9–29.

Benveniste, E. (1935). *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen*. Paris, Librairie Adrien-Maisonneuve.

Bloch, A. (1954). Zur Herkunft der lateinischen Adjektive auf -*idus*. In *Sprachgeschichte und Wortbedeutung (Festschrift Albert Debrunner)*. Bern, Francke, 19–32.

Brugmann, K. (1906). *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik*, II,1 (*Lehre von den Wortformen und ihrem Gebrauch*). Strassburg, K. J. Trübner.

Ernout, A. (1957). Metus – timor. In *Philologica II*. Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck, 7–56.

Ernout, A. (1971). Les mots en -*eō*, -*or*, -*idus*. In *Notes de philologie latine*. Paris – Genève, Droz, 1–18.

Krisch, Th. (1992). Analogische Prozesse in der lateinischen Sprachgeschichte. In O. Panagl – T. Krisch (eds.). *Latein und Indogermanisch* (Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Salzburg, 23.–26. September 1986). Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 155–181.

Leumann, M. (1977). *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre, Lateinische Grammatik I*. München, C. H. Beck.

LIV = Rix, H., et al. (2001). *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden, Reichert.

MČ = Petr, J., et al. (1986). *Mluvnice češtiny*. Praha, Academia.

Niedermann, M. (1899). Studien zur Geschichte der lateinischen Wortbildung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 10, 221–258.

Nussbaum, A. J. (1999). **Jocidus*: An Account of the Latin Adjectives in -*idus*. In H. Eichner – H. Ch. Luschützky – V. Sadovski (eds.). *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*. Praha, Enigma Corporation, 377–419.

Olsen, B. A. (1994). *The Stages of IE Aspiration by Laryngeal*. In G. E. Dunkel – G. Meyer – S. Scarlata – Ch. Seidl (eds.). *Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch* (Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 5. bis 9. Oktober 1992 in Zürich). Wiesbaden, Reichert, 267–277.

Osthoff, H. (1878). *Das Verbum in der Nominalkomposition im Deutschen, Griechischen, Slavischen und Romanischen*. Jena.

Pultrová, L. (2006a). *The Vocalism of Latin Medial Syllables*. Praha, Karolinum.

Pultrová, L. (2006b). The Indo-European Verbal Adjectives and their Reflexes in Latin. *Listy filologické* CXXIX (1–2), 51–70.

Schrijver, P. (1991). *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam – Atlanta (GA), Rodopi.

Sihler, A.L. (1995). *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Sznajder, L. (2002). Les adjectifs en *-idus, -ida, -idum*. In Ch. Kircher-Durand (ed.). *Grammaire fondamentale du latin*, Tome IX: *Création lexicale: la formation des noms par dérivation suffixale*. Louvain – Paris – Dudley (MA), Peeters, 55–65.

Watkins, C. (1971). Hittite and Indo-European studies: the denominative statives in *-ē-*. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 51–93.

RESUMÉ

Článek se vrací k mnohokrát řešené, a přesto dosud uspokojivě nevyřešené otázce původu latinských adjektiv na *-idus*. Shrnuje dosavadní teorie a nabízí i hypotézu novou, která je pokusem o syntézu teorií Nussbauma (o denominativním charakteru adjektiv na *-idus*; 1999), Baderové (o odvozování denominativních jmen a adjektiv prostřednictvím příslušenského sufixu **-h_2-*; 1992) a Olsenové (o vývoji **$h_2t > t^h > d$*; 1994). Podle této hypotézy jsou lat. adjektiva na *-idus* denominativní adjektiva odvozená prostřednictvím příslušenského sufixu **-h_2-* a sufixu *-tus*, jímž se odvozují jakostní adjektiva.

Lucie Pultrová
Ústav řeckých a latinských studií FF UK
(Lucie.Pultrova@ff.cuni.cz)