

Re: Latin descended through creolization

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2007-12/msg01208.html>

- *From:* Joachim Pense <snob@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 23 Dec 2007 14:20:14 +0100
-

Peter T. Daniels wrote:

On Dec 22, 4:20 pm, "ranjit_math...@xxxxxxxxxx" <ranjit_math...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Dec 22, 10:53 am, "Brian M. Scott" <b.sc...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

You can't look at words derived from
reduction and words
in their pristine strong forms as cognates
(say sanskrit
Vidhawa and English Widow).

Apparently *you* cannot do so, but *we* can certainly say
with confidence that Skt. <vidhāvâ> and Eng. <widow> are
cognates, along with Latin <vidua>

Is this a modern respelling of Classical Latin or is it Medieval
Latin? In Classical Latin, it had to be <vidva>.

The convention is to use <u> in lowercase, <V> in capitals, thus uidua
or VIDVA depending whether you're transcribing a manuscript or an
inscription respectively..

I have been wondering if this convention is something peculiar to
English-speaking countries. In Latin those texts by German publishers
(mostly for school usage, though) I know, the convention is to use V
whenever it is supposed to be a semivowel, and u when it's a full vowel;
for both upper and lower case.

So I memorized the perfect forms "monui", but "delevi".

Re: Latin descended through creolization

Joachim

.