

Eric P. HAMP

VENETIC *Louderai* – LITH. *Laumė*

The bronze situla from Cadòre (upper Piave, Prov. Belluno) is inscribed (Ca4)

.e..i.k.χo.l.tano.s.zoto lo.u.zera.i.kane.i.

eik Goltanos doto Louderai kanei

'...G. gave (vel sim.) *Libera(e)*' as Latin would put it.

Pellegrini-Prosdocimi Ling. Ven. I, 1967, 465–8, give us the basic text and commentary.

Prosdocimi Ling. Ven. II, 1967, 131–3, annotates *Louderai*, adducing (132) Ἐλεύθερος as an epithet of Dionysos and Zeus. He compares (133) Lith. *Laumė* (v. Fraenkel LEW 345) ~ *laūmė*, Latv. *laūma*¹. These are related to Lith. *liáudis*, obsolete term for common people (LEW 360–1). Note here that *iau* is regularly from **eu*.

Gāters (LEW 346) has a good account: **loudh-mē* is nearly right. He should have **ǵloudh-mā*. Cf. on the vocalism and suffix my discussion KZ 96, 1982–3, 171–7. I hope to have made clear there that **-mā* requires zero-grade; therefore we assume that **ou* was generalized from the masculine. Note, for comparison, *láimė*, *Laima* 'luck, fate' (LEW 333) < **laid-mė* (: *léisti*, Latv. *laīst* 'lassen').

Prosdocimi did not take account of this matter of vocalism in his footnote, which is also inconsistent on the fate of **eu* in Venetic. As he says correctly, we find *teuta* in Ca13 and 24 (*u. teuta* []).

It is important to note that the European IE branches Baltic and Italic agree on the feminine gender of this divine appellation. The Baltic *-m-* suffix is valuable because it indicates that we have here in **ǵleudh-* an old verbal base attested from its productive phase. The Italic alone would be ambiguous.

¹ Note also, as noticed by our sadly departed J. Kazlauskas, *Baltistica* III (2), 1967, 243, Prosdocimi's contribution „Litewskie *laūmė*, łacińskie *Libera*“ to the 1966 vol. III of *Acta Baltico-Slavica* in honour of J. Otrębski.