



Latin Sum/Oscan Sum, Sim, esum

Brian Joseph; Rex Wallace

The American Journal of Philology, Vol. 108, No. 4 (Winter, 1987), 675-693.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-9475%28198724%29108%3A4%3C675%3ALSSE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-9>

The American Journal of Philology is currently published by The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/jhup.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

LATIN *SUM*/OSCAN *SÚM*, *SIM*, *ESUM**

1. INTRODUCTION

Oscan and Latin, as is well known, show a striking similarity in the form of the first person singular (1 sg.) present of the verb 'to be'. In Latin the form is *sum* while in Oscan one of the forms found is **súm** (written in the native Oscan alphabet).¹ What makes this similarity so striking is that the Oscan and Latin forms differ considerably from the forms generally found elsewhere in Indo-European (IE); for example, Sanskrit has *ásmi*, Avestan *ahmi*, Hittite *ešmi*, Greek εἶμι (Aeolic ἐμί), Albanian *jam*, Old Church Slavic *jesmĩ*, Old Irish *am*, Armenian *em*, Gothic *im*, etc., all of which point to a preform *(H₁)ésmi from which neither the Latin nor the Oscan can be derived straightforwardly.

This similarity becomes especially interesting when it is viewed in the context of the genetic relationship between the two languages. It is conventionally assumed—although some controversy exists here²—that

*This paper is a revised version of one read at the 1986 Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, and incorporates part of an earlier paper read at the 1982 Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South. This work was written in part while Wallace was the Rome Prize Fellow at the American Academy in Rome, and was also supported in part by the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies at the Ohio State University. We would like to express our thanks to Martin Peters of the University of Vienna, Donald Ringe of the University of Pennsylvania, and James Poultney of Johns Hopkins University for their comments on and invaluable help with our paper.

We use bold face type for Oscan forms in the Oscan alphabet, bold face italic type for forms in Ancient Oscan and South Picene, and italic type for forms in the Faliscan and Latin alphabets. The Ancient Oscan inscriptions are cited from L. Agostiniani, *Le "iscrizioni parlanti" dell'italia antica* (Firenze 1982) (= [Ag]). The other Oscan inscriptions may be found in E. Vetter, *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte* (Heidelberg 1953) (= [Ve]). The South Picene inscription is cited from A. Marinetti, *Le iscrizioni subpicene-testi* (Firenze 1985) (= [Ma]).

¹Other Oscan forms are discussed below in section 3.

²The question of the relationship between Latin and Oscan-Umbrian (the so-called Italic controversy), has a long and involved history and so cannot be discussed in detail here (see W. Diver, *The Relation of Latin to Oscan-Umbrian* (diss. Columbia University 1953) for an overview). The controversy centers on various linguistic features found in both Latin and Oscan-Umbrian and specifically the question of whether these are the result of shared innovations, thus requiring the postulation of a period of common development for the languages (so Buck, Diver, Kent, Meillet—n. 3 below), or in-

Oscan and Latin are closely related Indo-European languages, both springing from the same intermediate common language, Common (or Proto-) Italic. This is a position that has been taken by Buck, Diver, Kent, Meillet, etc., and it is one that we agree with.³ Notable shared innovations are:

- a. the formation of the imperfect with *-bh(w)ā-⁴
- b. the formation of an imperfect subjunctive with *-sē-
- c. the formation and syntax of gerundives in *-nd- (Latin *-nd-*, Oscan *-nn-*)⁵
- d. the voicing of word-final original voiceless stops⁶
- e. the spread of the *o*-stem ablative ending *-Vd to vocalic stem nominal classes
- f. the development of the IE voiced aspirates to voiceless fricatives⁷

stead are merely (accidental) similarities or similarities due to contact, and therefore irrelevant for subgrouping (so G. Devoto, *Gli antichi italici* [Firenze 1951], M. Beeler, "The Interrelationships within Italic," in *Ancient Indo-European Dialects* [Berkeley 1966] 51-58; R. Jeffers, "Problems in the Reconstruction of Proto-Italic," *JIES* 1 [1973] 330-44).

³C. D. Buck, *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* (Boston 1928) 2; W. Diver, *Relation*, 155-61; R. Kent, *The Sounds of Latin* (Baltimore 1945) 27-28; A. Meillet, *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine* (Paris 1933) 48.

⁴It is generally agreed that the suffix *-fa-* in Oscan *fufans* corresponds to Latin *-ba-*, probably from IE *-bhwā-. For a dissenting view see V. Pisani, "Oscan *fufans*," *KZ* 78 (1963) 101-103.

⁵See E. Risch, *Gerundivum und Gerundium. Gebrauch im klassischen und älteren Latein. Entstehung und Vorgeschichte* (Berlin/New York 1984) for a recent discussion of the prehistory of the Italic gerundive.

⁶Though voicing of final stops is not a common phonological development, it may have occurred in Hittite, Luwian, and Palaic (depending on one's interpretation of the writing system). If so, its occurrence in Italic could be a retention of a Proto-Indo-European sandhi process, and not a shared innovation.

⁷R. Jeffers, "Problems," 337-42 argues that the development of the IE aspirates must be independent in Latin and Oscan-Umbrian. He claims that the medial stops in Latin can be derived from IE without an intermediate fricative stage, a stage required by Oscan-Umbrian. However, just such an intermediate fricative stage is called for by Faliscan, a language which is commonly regarded as closely related to Latin, and by certain dialectal Latin glosses. Compare, for example, Faliscan *loferta* 'freedwoman' with Latin *liberta* < *louth- and Praenestine Latin *nefrundines* 'testicles' with Lanuvian *nebrundines* < *nebhro- (Greek νεφρός). Thus, it appears that IE aspirates developed regularly to fricatives in Italic and that the Latin dialects spoken in the city of Rome subsequently innovated by voicing and stopping fricatives in medial position.

These innovations and possibly others all point, in our opinion, to a period of unity in the development of Oscan and Latin from IE.

Given such an assumption of Italic unity, the question naturally arises as to what the status is of the parallel forms *sum/súm* found in Latin and Oscan respectively. Five positions on these forms can be identified in the literature.

1.1. Silence

Interestingly, a number of publications dealing with the question of Italic unity, either for it or against it, have completely ignored the existence of this parallel in Latin and Oscan. For example, neither Beeler, nor Jones, nor Palmer say anything about *sum/súm*, even though, in some instances some rather insignificant morphological innovations are mentioned, for example, the development of a relative pronoun from an interrogative/indefinite stem (insignificant because it is typologically such a common development, found in many other languages).⁸ While we suspect that part of the reason behind this absence is the fact that the origins of the forms are rather obscure, nonetheless, it is a bit curious that at least some mention is not made of these forms in every work concerned with the question of Italic unity.

1.2. Shared Innovation

Perhaps the standard view on *sum/súm* is that these forms represent a common innovation which took place in a period of linguistic unity during which Oscan and Latin were one and the same speech community, Common (or Proto-) Italic. When Oscan and Latin split off into separate sub-branches of this once unified group, they both inherited the Common Italic innovative form. This is the view espoused by Buck, Diver, Kent, Meillet, etc.⁹ Oscan and Latin would thus stand alone as sharing this innovation away from the Common IE form

⁸M. Beeler, "The relation of Latin to Osco-Umbrian," *Lg* 28 (1952) 435-443; D. M. Jones, "The Relation of Latin to Osco-Umbrian," *TPS* (1950) 60-87; L. R. Palmer, *The Latin Language* (London 1954) 5-11.

⁹C. D. Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Chicago 1933) 273; W. Diver, *Relation*, 52; R. Kent, *The Forms of Latin* (Baltimore 1946) 106; M. Leumann, J. B. Hofmann, D. Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik II* (München 1963) 310; A. Meillet, *Esquisse*, 65.

*(H₁)ésmi reconstructed on the basis of the forms from Sanskrit, Greek, Hittite, etc., cited above.

1.3. Shared Retention

Bader, in her discussion of the conjugation of the verb 'to be' in IE, has argued that a present paradigm for 'to be' with secondary endings, as indicated below, can be reconstructed for IE.¹⁰

1 sg.:	*s-ém (also *s-óm)
2 sg.:	*és-s (also *és-i)
3 sg.:	*és-t
3 pl.:	*s-ént. ¹¹

Certain features of this paradigm, for example, the zero-grade of the root in the 1 sg. form, can be explained, she argues, if it is taken to derive from an original middle paradigm; the development of the familiar primary athematic paradigm with 1 sg. *(H₁)ésmi is considered to be a later, dialectal, though widespread, development in which Italic did not participate.¹² The main evidence pointing to this archaic paradigm, especially with regard to the 1 sg. form, is the Latin and Oscan forms in question here and the Tocharian A form *nasam*. For Bader, the Tocharian form is to be segmented as *na-sam*, with *na-* being an "empty" preverb (from *no) akin, functionally at least, to *no* in Old Irish. Under this interpretation, the Latin and Oscan forms become an archaism,

¹⁰F. Bader, "Le présent du verbe 'être' en indo-européen," *BSL* 71 (1976) 17-111.

¹¹Bader is not the first to argue that Latin *sum* is the most archaic 1 sg. form of 'be'. G. Bonfante, "Latin *sum*, *es*, *est*, etc.," *BSL* 33 (1932) 111-29 reconstructs a singular paradigm similar to that of Bader and argues that *es- is introduced into the 1 sg. of IE languages other than Latin by means of paradigmatic levelling. A similar view, though different in detail, is expressed in W. Schmalstieg, *Indo-European Linguistics. A New Synthesis* (University Park 1980) 108, though refuted in J. Rasmussen, "Review Article on W. R. Schmalstieg, *Indo-European Linguistics. A New Synthesis*," *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 17, 2 (1982) 182-84.

¹²The 1 sg. form of the verb 'to be' in one of the ancient languages of Sicily, Elymian εμ < *esmi, may be relevant here (for discussion of the evidence see M. Lejeune, "Notes de linguistique italique. Observations sur l'épigraphie élyme," *REL* 47 (1969) 133-83 and A. Zamboni, "Il Siculo," in *Popoli e civiltà dell' Italia antica. Lingue e dialetti VI* (Roma 1978) 949-1009). According to Lejeune, "Observations," 179, Elymian is to be subgrouped with Latin and Oscan-Umbrian as Italic. If Lejeune's hypothesis is right, then the claim that Italic inherited *esmi from IE is provided with empirical support.

rather than an innovation, inasmuch as they then represent a retention (in a peripheral area) of an archaic feature of IE inflection. Since shared retentions are generally not held to be probative regarding subgrouping, this account accordingly is neutral on the question of the relationship of Oscan to Latin (though Bader does assume Italic unity).

1.4. Independent Innovations

Yet another view is that the similarity between Oscan and Latin with regard to this form is indeed the result of an innovation away from Common IE *(H₁)ésmi, but it is an innovation which does not date from a period of unity between the two languages. Rather, it is the result of separate and independent but somewhat parallel innovations undertaken by Oscan and Latin each on its own. This is the position held by Szemerényi and Safarewicz, and is implicit in Nyman, whose account of Latin *sum* rests on purely Latin-internal developments for its motivation.¹³ As with Bader's account above, this position is neutral on the unity question (though again, Szemerényi, Safarewicz, and Nyman seem to accept Italic unity).

1.5. Language Contact

Finally, as another position that is neutral on the question of Italic unity, at least as far as the *sum*/*súm* parallel is concerned, there are those who claim that the similarity is the result of language contact, with one language having innovated (or retained) the form and the other having then borrowed it and incorporated it into its own verbal system. The direction of the borrowing that is assumed is from Latin into Oscan. This position is held by Bonfante and Pisani and discussed by Szemerényi.¹⁴

¹³O. Szemerényi, *Syncope in Greek and Indo-European and the Nature of the Indo-European Accent* (Naples 1964) 191-95; J. Safarewicz, "A propos du Latin *sum*," *EOS* 66 (1978) 306-07; M. Nyman, "Where does Latin *sum* come from?," *Lg* 53 (1977) 39-60.

¹⁴G. Bonfante, "La nuova iscrizione di Satricum e il genitivo in -osio," *RALinc* 5-6 (1978) 272; V. Pisani, "Le lingue preromane d'Italia," in *Popoli e civiltà dell'Italia antica. Lingue e dialetti VI* (Roma 1978) 50; O. Szemerényi, *Syncope*, 194, n. 3. Although Szemerényi, *Syncope*, 191ff. argues that Latin *sum* and Oscan *súm*/*sim* are indigenous developments, he admits the possibility that the color of the vowel in Oscan *súm* may be due to Latin influence.

1.6. Quo Vadimus Re Sum/Súm?

Most of the attention paid to these forms in Oscan and Latin has focused on the origin of Latin *sum* only.¹⁵ This is somewhat unfortunate since, given the occurrence of ostensibly the same form in these two languages which seem to be closely related genetically, one might well want to look for a solution to the origin question that takes in both languages. In this paper, we propose such an account; starting from our assumption of Italic unity, we show the following:

- i. the similarity between Latin and Oscan with regard to the 1 sg. form cannot be the result of language contact
- ii. the hypothesis of Bader that *sum/súm* is a shared archaism is untenable
- iii. an account consistent with the unity hypothesis can be constructed which accounts not only for *sum* and *súm* themselves but for certain additional evidence as well.¹⁶

2. EVALUATION OF THE BORROWING POSITION

Of the positions discussed above, the hypothesis of borrowing is perhaps the easiest to evaluate and, moreover, to reject. Despite the fact that borrowing is in principle a legitimate possibility, there are good reasons to reject it as the explanation of the parallel in the 1 sg. form of 'to be' in Latin and Oscan.

The clearest indication that Oscan *súm* is not a borrowing from Latin comes from considerations about the nature of borrowing in general. First, it is hard to see why just one piece of the paradigm of 'to be' would have been borrowed and not any other forms. Especially important here is the fact that the 3 pl. forms differ between the two lan-

¹⁵For example, M. Nyman, "Latin *sum*," 39-60 discusses the origin of the Latin form in considerable detail but does not mention the Oscan 1 sg. forms.

¹⁶We have little to say about the independent innovation position. We note, though, that independent innovation is usually assumed for languages that are completely unrelated (e.g., Latin and Proto Eastern Miwok, see C. Callaghan, "An 'Indo-European' type paradigm in Proto Eastern Miwok," in *American Indian and Indo-European Studies. Festschrift in Honor of Madison Beeler* [Hague 1980] 31-41) even though in principle such an explanation is as possible for a similarity between Latin and Oscan as it is for one between Latin and Eastern Miwok. It is just that other possible explanations have a greater degree of plausibility in the Latin-Oscan case than they do in the Latin-Eastern Miwok case.

guages: Oscan has *sent* and Latin *sunt*. Second, the borrowing of an isolated form within a paradigm does not accord with the nature of other clear Latin influences in Oscan.¹⁷ For the most part these borrowings include linguistic loans (Oscan *aídil* (Ve 20) = Latin *aedilis*, Oscan *kvaísstur* (Ve 12) = Latin *quaestor*, Oscan *líímítú[m]* (Ve 1B) ‘boundary line’ = Latin *limes*, etc.), semantic shifts (Oscan *actud* (Ve 2) ‘prosecute’ in judicial contexts = Latin *agere*, Oscan *kúmbened* (Ve 1) ‘it is agreed’ in legal contexts = Latin *convenit*), and calques (Oscan *tanginud* (Ve 1) = ‘consent’ = Latin *sententia*). A great majority of the loans are restricted to political, administrative, and judicial contexts and thus fall into the category of “cultural” borrowings. The borrowing of *súm* would not be linked to some aspect of culture, and thus would have to be considered an “intimate” loan, and as a result would be completely anomalous within the contextual sphere of Latin-Oscan borrowings.

Chronological considerations also argue against taking *súm* as a borrowing from Latin. As is well known, the phase of Roman influence on Oscan speakers begins at the end of the fourth century but does not become particularly strong until the end of the third and beginning of the second century.¹⁸ And yet there is inscriptional evidence (Ve 117) attesting the existence of *súm* in Oscan in the late fifth century, that is, well before the period of Roman influence.¹⁹

3. EVALUATION OF THE SHARED RETENTION POSITION

The specific shared retention hypothesis advocated by Bader—and more generally, any view that takes *sum/súm* as an archaism—can be rejected on a number of grounds.²⁰

¹⁷See M. Porzio Gernia, “Aspetti dell’ influsso latino sul lessico e sulla sintassi osca,” *AGI* 55 (1970) 94–144, for detailed discussion of Latin influences in Oscan.

¹⁸M. Porzio Gernia, “Aspetti,” 95.

¹⁹(Ve 117) reads: *luv.cies.cnai.viies.sum* “I am (the property) of Lucius Naevius.” A. Morandi, “Iscrizioni vascolari osche della Campania,” *SE* 42 (1974) 391 dates this inscription to the last half of the fifth century. The onomastica are in the gen. sg., the *-es* ending is in all probability due to Etruscan interference (see Agostiniani, *Iscrizioni*, 253–58 for discussion).

²⁰It is worth mentioning here that Szemerényi, *Syncope*, 191 finds the reconstruction of IE *som unacceptable on methodological grounds. He claims that such a reconstruction “runs counter to all established principles of comparative grammar and even the most subtle distinction between *area maggiore* and *area più isolata* will fail to make impression.”

First of all, Bader's analysis of Tocharian is flawed, and therefore positing *sum/súm* as an archaism finds no support from comparative evidence. In particular, the Tocharian A form *nasam* cited by Bader as support for the reconstruction of a 1 sg. form **som/*sem* for IE is not admissible as a comparandum. A complete examination of the paradigm of the verb 'be' in both Tocharian languages makes it clear that the Proto-Tocharian stem for this verb must be **nesə-/*nese-*:

	Tocharian A	Tocharian B	Proto-Tocharian
1 sg.	nesau	nasam	*nese-
2 sg.	nest	nast	*nest (< *nesət)
3 sg.	nesam	nas (< *nasäs)	*nesə-
1 pl.	nesem	nasamäs	*nesem
2 pl.	nescer, ne]šcer	—	—
3 pl.	nesäm	neñc	—

Thus Bader's segmentation of *nasam* as *na-sam* cannot be maintained; the standard analysis segmenting the form as *nas-am* and connecting it with the IE root **nes-* of Sanskrit *nás-ate* 'unite, take as a companion' and Greek *νέομαι* 'go, come, return', inter alia, retains its validity.²¹

Therefore there is no available comparandum from Tocharian (or any other IE language) for *sum/súm* as shared retentions. Still, though, it is possible that they might represent shared archaisms restricted to just these two languages. However, recent additions to the corpus of Oscan inscriptions provide further evidence against any interpretation of these forms as shared archaisms. In addition to the Oscan 1 sg. form *súm*, and its dialectal variant *sim*,²² there is a 1 sg. form *esum* which appears on two inscriptions discovered in Southern Campania, (Ag 614) from Nuceria Alfaterna near Salerno and (Ag 615) from Vico Equense

²¹The standard analysis was first proposed by A. Meillet, "Remarques linguistiques," *JA* 17 (1911) 449-64 (see also A. J. van Windekens, *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes* [Louvain 1976] 309). We would like to thank Donald Ringe (personal communication) for drawing all the relevant Tocharian facts to our attention.

²²This variant is restricted geographically to the ancient city of Saticula (modern S. Agata de' Goti), in Campania. It is found in four inscriptions (Ve 126, Ve 127, Ve 128, Ve 130). For Bader, *sim* derives from an ablaut variant **sem* of the 1 sg. form in IE; for our account, see below section 4.4.

near Naples.²³ According to the scenario of Bader, or any shared-archaism explanation of *sum/súm*, this 1 sg. form *esum* would have to be accounted for by means of analogical change, specifically the extension of the full-grade form of the 2 sg. and 3 sg. to the 1 sg. That such a change is plausible cannot be doubted. However, chronological considerations suggest that *esum* was not a late creation. The inscriptions on which *esum* is found are generally attributed to the 6th century.²⁴ If the dating is even reasonably close, then the evidence suggests that the existence of *esum* predates that of *súm* by at least a century, if not more.

Comparative evidence also suggests that *esum* is not a late analogical creation. The form *esum* is also attested on a South Picene inscription from Campovalano in Picenum (Ma TE.4). This South Picene inscription is generally considered to be contemporaneous with the Campanian inscriptions mentioned above.²⁵ Thus, if *esum* were an analogical creation, it would have to be an innovative analogical creation of very early date indeed – that is, dating to the period of Oscan-Umbrian unity. But then we might well wonder why there are any examples of *súm* at all, given that we would expect the innovative analogical creation to replace the “old,” that is, inherited, form *súm*.²⁶ Since this is not

²³We interpret the ancient Oscan inscriptions as follows: (Ag 614) *IIBRA-TIESIIESUMII*, gen. *fraties* + *esum* “I am (the property) of Fratius.” (Ag 615) *IEVIESIIESUM:PIJLES:ADARIES*, gen. *ievies* + *esum*, nom. (artisan) “I am (the property) of Ievius. P. Adarius (made me).” We follow G. Colonna, “Nuceria Alfaterna,” *SE* 42 (1974) 379–85 with respect to word-division but we do not agree with his analysis of *fraties* and *ievies* as nom.sgs. of adjectival formations similar to Faliscan *madicio* (contra Colonna, see Agostiniani, *Iscrizioni*, 254). Rather, we believe that these forms are to be interpreted as genitive singulars in *-es*, a variant Oscan formation due probably to Etruscan interference. For different interpretations of these inscriptions the reader is referred to R. Arena, “L’iscrizione di Vico Equense,” *SE* 42 (1974) 387–90 and A. Prosdocimi, “Le iscrizioni italiane, acquisizioni, temi, problemi,” in *Le iscrizioni prelatine in Italia* (Roma 1979) 142–45.

²⁴See Agostiniani, *Iscrizioni*, 159–60.

²⁵According to A. Marinetti (Ma TE.4), the South Picene inscription reads: *A-PIESESUM*. We interpret the inscription as gen. *a-pies* + *esum* “I am (the property) of A[.]pius.”

²⁶Such a development is suggested by the well-documented “Fourth Law of Analogy” of J. Kurylowicz (“La nature des procès dits ‘analogiques’,” *Acta Linguistica* 5 [1945–49] 121–138), which states that a newly created analogical form will take over the primary function of a given linguistic unit, with the form that is replaced being relegated to secondary functions. By extension, then, one would expect that a newly created *esum* would occur in greater frequency from early on.

the case, then, it does not appear feasible to treat *esum* as an analogical creation.²⁷

Thus, the existence of the form *esum* in Oscan and South Picene renders the shared-retention hypothesis untenable.

The previous discussion has made it clear, then, that the borrowing explanation (1.5) and the shared-retention explanation (1.3) are unacceptable. Any truly adequate account of the development of the 1 sg. of 'to be' in Italic must explain all of these forms—in the section to follow, we pursue such an account within the context of the Italic unity hypothesis, under which the processes which gave rise to *sum/súm* represent a significant set of shared innovations (1.2).

In doing so, we are intentionally bypassing the independent innovation explanation (1.4). In our opinion, it is not really possible to argue against the position that two languages—related or not—independently innovated to produce the same form as long as the changes involved are all relatively natural types of sound changes or morphological changes. Closeness of genetic relationship between two languages (as between Oscan and Latin, being at least IE languages and probably both of the same sub-branch) need not exclude the possibility of independent innovation—some accounts of Germanic umlaut, for instance, treat it as a set of parallel but independent innovations affecting several closely related languages.²⁸ In a certain sense, then, such a position is a null hypothesis and relatively uninteresting. Accordingly, we instead consider the question of how *sum/súm* can be explained as the result of shared innovations, and let the plausibility of the account we reconstruct speak for itself against the independent innovation position.

4. OUR ACCOUNT

Hypotheses concerning the origin of *sum/súm* are numerous. Most of the early accounts (see, e.g., Buck, Ernout, Kent, Sommer) and even some recent ones (see Pisani) derive these forms by means of ana-

²⁷It is worth pointing out that, according to Varro (*L.* 9. 100), *esum* was at one time the 1 sg. form of the verb 'to be' in Latin (*sum nunc dicitur olim dicebantur 'esum'*). This form is generally considered an analogical creation on the part of Varro. However, the existence of *esum* in both Oscan and South Picene suggests that *esum* may have been a legitimate form in some dialects of Latin.

²⁸See, for example, R. Jeffers and I. Lehiste, *Principles and Methods for Historical Linguistics* (Cambridge 1979) 33. See also n. 16 above.

logical changes.²⁹ Generally, it is assumed that the 3 pl. form *sonti was analyzed as *s- + -onti, that is, as stem + thematic ending, and that this analysis was extended to the 1 pl. form, that is, *s- + -omos, which in turn influenced the 1 sg. form, that is, *s- + -om.

The attempts to derive *sum*/*súm* by means of analogical changes have not been very successful, particularly in accounting for the Oscan word. These proposals require *sont(i) as the starting point for reanalysis of the paradigm. However, the 3 pl. form of the verb 'to be' in Oscan (and Umbrian) is *sent* < *senti. As a result, it is difficult to motivate the remodeling of *smos along the lines of 1 pl. forms in thematic paradigms and, accordingly, the thematization of *esmi.

Recently, attempts have been made to account for the development of Latin *sum* and Oscan *súm*/*sim* by means of phonological change.³⁰ According to Szemerényi, for example, the development of Latin *sum* can be motivated by epenthetic processes which responded to phonetic difficulties presented by *-sm-* clusters (e.g., *esmi > *esomi so as to avoid *ēmi, then > *sum*). Similarly, Szemerényi argues that the development of Oscan *súm* and *sim* are to be attributed to epenthesis breaking up the cluster *-sm-* (e.g., *esmi > *esimi > *sim*, or under the influence of *smos > *somos, *esmi > *esomi > *súm*). The scenario sketched by Szemerényi appears plausible in the case of Latin, for difficulties with *-sm-* are evident in that language (though the resolution is compensatory lengthening, as in *prīma* 'first' < *prismā, and not epenthesis). Such is not the case for Oscan, however. In Oscan, and in the other Oscan-Umbrian languages as well, *-sN-* clusters (N = nasal consonant) do not present the phonetic difficulties they do in Latin, for example Umbrian *snata* (IIa 19), *snates* (IV 9) 'wet' (?) (< *snā-), *fesnafe* (IIb 16) 'sacred precinct', Oscan *fíisnu* (Ve 1), Paelignian *fesn.* (Ve 216) (< *dhesnā), Paelignian *prismu* (Ve 213) proper name (?) (= Latin *prīma* < *prismā, Umbrian *esme* (VIb 55) Loc. sg. pronoun (< *e(k)sm-), Oscan *casnar* (Paul.-Fest. 41L) 'old man', Paelignian *casnar* (Ve 214) (< *kasn-). As a result, it is impossible to explain the development of the Oscan forms by reference to epenthetic processes

²⁹Buck, *Comparative*, 273; A. Ernout, *Morphologie historique du latin* (Paris 1953) 176; Kent, *Forms*, 106; F. Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (Heidelberg 1914) 528; Pisani, "Le lingue preromane," 50.

³⁰See Szemerényi, *Syncope*, 191-95, Nyman, "Latin *sum*," 50ff., and P. Cipriano/M. Mancini, "Enclisi e morfologia del verbo 'essere' nel Latino e nell'Osco," in *Studi Latini e Romanzi in memoria di Antonino Pagliaro* (Roma 1984) 22-23, n. 20.

breaking up *-sm-* clusters, in the manner of Szemerényi.³¹ Phonological explanations relying on difficulties presented by *-sN-* clusters are viable only for Latin.

It appears, then, that a successful explanation of *sum/súm* must begin with some motivating factor shared by Oscan and Latin.

The similarities between the present indicative of 'to be' in Oscan-Umbrian and Latin do not end at the formal level; the verb 'to be' also shares certain behavioral characteristics, the most important for our purpose being enclisis.³² The enclitic nature of 'to be' in Latin is well known and can be supported by several pieces of evidence:³³ (a) the prodelision of *e* in the environments *V*[#], *-m*[#], and *-s*[#] attested by epigraphical (e.g., *vocitatust* CIL I, 199, 17) and metrical (Plautus *quidamst*, *Mil.* 1012) evidence;³⁴ (b) raising of **o* to *u* in unaccented, closed final syllables (cf. *aliud* < **aliod*); (c) the testimony of the ancient grammarian Marius Victorinus (K 6, 22) who describes prodelision of initial *e* when *est* is in construction with participles. For Oscan(-Umbrian) support for an assumption of enclisis comes from the following facts: (a) *scriptio continua* writing of *sim* (e.g., (Ve 127) *culchnasim*); (b) prodelision of *e* in **est* when in construction with adjectives and past participles, e.g., Oscan *destrst* (Ve 74) 'is on the right (side)' < **dekstrā est*, and *teremnatust* (Ve 8) 'is delimited' < **teremnātā est*; (c) raising of *e* to *í/i* in the 3 sg. form, e.g., Oscan *íst* (Ve 1), Paelignian *íst* (Ve 213).³⁵

Thus in both Latin and Oscan(-Umbrian), there are indications of enclitic behavior for the verb 'to be'. The unmarked inference to draw

³¹We do not understand why Szemerényi, *Syncope*, 194 insists on explaining Oscan *sim* and *súm* by means of epenthesis, particularly after having noted that *-sN-* clusters remain in Oscan-Umbrian.

³²For discussion of enclisis of 'to be' in Latin and Oscan, see Cipriano/Mancini, "Enclisi," 11-62.

³³Nyman, "Latin *sum*," 44-46 claims that loss of the vowel in monosyllabic forms like *es(s)* and *est* by enclisis is "incomprehensible." But English provides numerous cases of just such a loss in monosyllabic forms. Consider, for example, the clitic variants of *is*, *would*, *has*, namely *-s*, *-d*, *-s*. For discussion see A. Zwicky, "Auxiliary Reduction in English," *LJ* 1 (1970) 323-336 and W. Labov, *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular* (Philadelphia 1972).

³⁴A. S. Gratwick, "Curculio's Last Bow: Plautus, *Trinummus* IV.3," *Mn* 34 (1981) 348-49 discusses some metrical evidence which indicates that monosyllabic verbs were still sentence clitics in Plautus.

³⁵Bader, "Le présent," 50 is responsible for the suggestion that raising of **e* to *í/i* in the verb forms of 'to be' in Oscan is due to enclisis. We prefer this hypothesis to that of Cipriano/Mancini "Enclisi," 49-50, who derive the vowel *í* in *íst* from **ēst*, perhaps a back-formation from a contracted **ne esti*. While this hypothesis is certainly a possible one, it does involve the additional step of positing a back-formation.

from this parallel behavior in these closely related languages is that it represents a process inherited from Common Italic. It is our contention, then, that the enclisis of ‘to be’ is a feature of Common Italic, and further, that it is this process which provides the motivation for the restructuring of the paradigm of the verb ‘to be’, and hence the anomalous, from an IE point of view, form of the 1 sg. *sum/súm*.

If we assume the enclisis of the present indicative forms of ‘to be’ as a starting point, it is then possible to construct a relatively convincing scenario for the development of *sum/súm*.

Assuming that Common Italic had both enclitic and accented forms of ‘to be’, the following path of development suggests itself:

Common Italic	enclitic forms	accented forms
	* \acute{X} -esmi	*ésmi
– loss of *i#	* \acute{X} -esm̄	*és̄m̄
– epenthesis	* \acute{X} -esəm	*ésəm
followed by		
– rounding	* \acute{X} -esom	*ésom
[or: morphological reshaping via thematic secondary *-om]		
A. Latin		
– inherited	* \acute{X} -esom	*ésom
– syncope	* \acute{X} -som	*ésom
– raising of *o	* \acute{X} -sum	*ésom
– outcome	<i>sum</i> →	<i>sum</i>
followed by		
– generalization of enclitic form over accented form		
B. Oscan		
– inherited	* \acute{X} -esom	*ésom
(→ South Campanian outcome)	<i>esum</i>	*ésom
– syncope (→ usual Oscan outcome <u>/<ú> as spelling for *o) (with presumed generalization ultimately of enclitic form over accented form, though later than in Latin)	<i>sum/súm</i> →	<i>sum/súm</i>
– labial dissimilation [after raising??](→ Saticulan outcome)	<i>sim</i>	

Although the basic lines of development should be clear, some aspects implicit in this schema require further discussion.

4.1. Loss of Final *i

The loss of final *i in the primary endings is, in our opinion, a Common Italic process.³⁶ The only potential counter-example to this claim is the Latin word *tremonti* (Festus 205M); however, this word must be treated with scepticism. First of all, *tremonti* occurs in a passage of Festus which is corrupt in at least two respects.³⁷ Second, the phrase cited by Festus is apparently preserved also in Terentius Scaurus (K 7, 28). But in the passage cited by Scaurus, the text reads *praetexere monti*, not *pretet tremonti*. And given the fact that the grammarians could scarcely understand the text, as we are informed by Quintilian (1.6.40), it is difficult to accept either "interpretation" as necessarily reflecting the original state of affairs. It is also worth noting at this point, that an additional verb form cited by Festus (205M), *prodotiont* (= *prae(d)opiont?*) '*praeoptant*', and believed by some to belong to the *carmen saliare*, appears without a final *i. If nothing else, this should prevent us from uncritically accepting *tremonti* at face value.

4.2. Secondary *m̄

The development of secondary *m̄ resulting from loss of final *i need not parallel the development of original *m̄ > *em*. Compare, for example, the development of primary *r̄ > *or* as opposed to secondary *r̄ > *er*, for example, Latin *mors* 'death' < *m̄rtis vs. *ager* 'field' < *agr̄ < *agr̄s < *agros. If we assume the epenthesis of a schwa-like vowel, that is, *m̄ > *əm, then one could argue that the labial vowel *o*

³⁶This is not to say that word final *i is lost categorially in Latin and Oscan-Umbrian. Final *i has in fact survived in some morphological categories, e.g., the abl. sg. of consonant stems. What we are claiming here is that final *i was lost in the primary endings of the verb (with the possible exception of *tremonti* discussed in 4.2.). Moreover, as Calvert Watkins has reminded us (personal communication), the final *i in the primary endings need not have been lost from all the endings at the same time, inasmuch as each ending presents a different phonetic environment. Furthermore, if *inquam* originally contained a primary ending, then it shows that the 1 sg. must have lost final *i prior to the completion of the loss in the primary endings.

³⁷The text of Festus reads *pretet tremonti praetemunt pe*; it is generally interpreted as *prae tet tremonti, praetremunt te*.

was the result of the following labial consonant *m*. An additional possibility is that final **m̄* became **om* as the result of pressure from the thematic secondary ending **-om*, which must have existed in Common Italic.³⁸

4.3. Syncope of **e* via Enclisis

The loss of *e* in the enclitic form of the 1 sg. of 'be' is to be attributed to syncopating processes which existed independently in both Latin and Oscan(-Umbrian). These syncopating processes are responsible not only for deletion of medial vowels in words but are also responsible for deletion of medial vowels in word groups consisting of host word + clitic, compare Latin **nek^we-dum* 'and not yet' > *necdum*, *dice mihi* 'tell me' > *dic mihi*, etc.³⁹ To judge from the oldest Latin inscriptions and from the inscriptions in the South Picene language, the syncope of vowels (in short open syllables) was not a feature of Common Italic, at least not in the more formal styles.⁴⁰ And given the position of *esum* in the Ancient Oscan inscriptions and in South Picene, and lack of any indication of a word boundary, *esum* is to be viewed as an enclitic form.⁴¹ As a result, **som* itself cannot be considered as a Common Italic innovation inherited by Latin and Oscan; rather, it must be seen as an

³⁸See C. Watkins, *Indogermanische Grammatik III* (Heidelberg 1969) 48. We would like to thank Martin Peters (personal communication) for reminding us of this possibility, though as George Cardona has pointed out (personal communication), such an account is rendered less plausible by the usual reconstruction of **esām* > Latin *eram* as the past of 'to be'. But if, as Don Ringe (personal communication) has suggested, original syllabic nasals remained in Common Italic (cf. the different developments in word-initial position: Latin negative prefix *in-* vs. Oscan-Umbrian *an-*), then Watkins' analogical explanation of **-om* may well be preferable. There are, however, other possibilities: original **m̄* could have developed into **əm* in Common Italic, so that secondarily created **m̄* would not have merged with it.

³⁹M. Leumann, J. B. Hofmann, D. Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik I*, (München 1977) 93.

⁴⁰But **e* could have been syncopated in Common Italic in more casual styles of speaking, as Martin Peters (personal communication) has reminded us.

⁴¹Recall that in (Ma TE.4) *A-PIESESUM* (see n. 25 above) shows *esum* written in *scriptio continua*, which may be an indication of enclisis. Similarly, in (Ag 615) (see n. 23 above), there seems to be a distinction between clear word boundaries, marked with two points arranged vertically (:), and some other boundary-type, marked by two vertical strokes (||); there are two vertical strokes to the left of *esum* but two vertical points to its right, suggesting that it is enclitic. (Ag 614) has two vertical strokes as boundary markers, and so is ambiguous as to the possible clitic status of *esum*.

independent but parallel development which resulted from (1) enclisis and (2) syncope. *esom is the Common Italic innovation.

4.4. Saticulan **sim**

The derivation of Saticulan **sim** as a dialectal Oscan development admits of several possibilities. Phonological explanations, two of which we present below, are not, in our opinion, as likely as some morphological solution because one must assume an ad hoc development of *o to u in **sum** as a starting point. But given that assumption, one possibility is that **sim** is the result of dissimilation of u around labials which is attested sporadically throughout the Italic languages. For example, in Latin *liber* 'free' is to be derived from *lūber < *loudheros, cf. Faliscan *loferta* (Ve 322a) 'freedwoman', Marrucian *cibat* (Po 205) 'is buried' < *kubāti, cf. Paelignian *incubat* (Ve 214), and possibly Paelignian *lifar* if it is subj. pass. from *lubh-, cf. Latin *lubet* 'is pleasing'. Saticulan **sim** may have resulted from similar dissimilatory processes. Another phonological solution is suggested by Latin forms like *aurufex* vs. *aurifex*, *maxumus* vs. *maximus*. The variation in these forms is the result of a change (*o >) u > i in unaccented open syllables before labials (p, b, f, m).⁴² A more likely explanation, though, for Saticulan **sim** is that it results from some analogical process(es). In the case of the *-eH₁ statives in Oscan, there may have been a pattern 1 sg. **-im** < *-ēm : 3 pl. **-ent** < *-ěnt (by Osthoff's Law), from which **sim** might have resulted analogically.⁴³ This suggestion neatly accounts for the vocalic variation between the 3 pl. **sent** and 1 sg. **sim**, that is, variation between i and e. Another morphological solution is offered by Cipriano/Mancini who suggest that Oscan **sim** is actually an old optative form (cf. Latin *sim*) which has somehow come to have indicative functions, thus replacing the regular indicative formation **súm**.⁴⁴

⁴²One would have to assume that in dialectal Oscan 1 sg. **súm** was subject to a similar process in the context ____ *V (i.e., *X-sum*V- was syllabified as *X-su · m*V- > *X-sim*V-) and that the variant **sim** was subsequently generalized at the expense of **súm**.

⁴³This explanation was suggested to us by Martin Peters (personal communication). It depends on the assumption that the -ē- of the 3 pl. ending was shortened before -nt, presumably via Osthoff's Law.

⁴⁴Cipriano/Mancini, "Enclisi," 55.

4.5. Generalization of Enclitic *Sum*/*Súm*

One final thing that must be explained in this account is why Latin lost a strong form **esum* altogether, that is, why the originally weak form *sum* was generalized at the expense of the strong form. This may well have been an Italic trend, as suggested below, and it is a development which is found in other languages (e.g., Greek, see also below). However, there is good reason, internal to Latin itself, to suppose that a form such as **esum* in early Latin would have been likely to be lost.

For one thing, a Latin **esum* would, at a somewhat later date (c. fourth century B.C.), have become **erum*, so that a connection between strong **erum* and weak *sum* would have been most opaque, especially within the set of prevailing strong/weak alternations (that is 2 sg. *es(s)/s(s)*, 3 sg. *est(st)*).⁴⁵ Thus Latin rhotacism would ultimately have placed **esum* in a vulnerable position structurally within the system of paradigmatic relationships.

Furthermore, although one might imagine that it would have been “attractive” for Latin to generalize a root-shape *es-* for the 1 sg. form to give *es-* throughout the singular,⁴⁶ the Latin 2 pl. form, *estis*, with a root-shape *es-*, would have worked against such a movement toward *es-* as a characteristic of singular forms. In fact, the traditional account of *sum*, which takes it as analogical within Latin based on pressure from 1 pl. **somos* (itself supposedly based on 3 pl. **son(i)*), need not be discarded altogether; a 1 sg.-1 pl.-3 pl. “linkage” is a possible intraparadigmatic pressure that could have aided in the generalization of *sum* over **esum*.⁴⁷

⁴⁵Nyman, “Latin *sum*,” 52.

⁴⁶Compare the situation in Modern Greek, where, for verbs that still take a past tense augment, the singular with augment has been polarized against the plural without augment, and variation in the 3 pl. (e.g., *égrapsan* = *grápsane* ‘they wrote’) is being resolved in favor of the augmentless form.

⁴⁷It seems likely in our view that paradigmatic pressure was responsible for remodeling the inherited 1 pl. form **smos* (cf. Sanskrit *smáh*) to *sumus* through an intermediate stage **somos*. The reduction of initial **sn-* clusters to *n-* in Latin (cf. *na-* ‘swim’ < **snā-*) suggests that the *lautgesetzlich* development of the 1 pl. form would have been **mos*, a form without any obvious relationship to the rest of the paradigm of ‘be’. At some point, then, within the history of Latin, the paradigmatic relationship was renewed by reshaping the 1 pl. form to **somos*, presumably with the initial sequence of the 3 pl. **son(i)* (and possibly also of the 1 sg. **som*, depending on the chronology of the creation of

Moreover, adopting these factors as crucial in the ultimate loss of **esum* in Latin becomes more compelling when one considers the fact that *esum* was retained in Oscan at least into the historical period, that is, apparently later than it was retained in Latin. Oscan shows no signs of movements toward rhotacism (via intervocalic voicing of [s] to [z]) until approximately 100 B.C. in the Tabula Bantina), so that an *esum/súm* connection would have been more transparent in Oscan than was possible in Latin. Also a linkage of 1 sg. -1 pl. -3 pl. in Oscan would have been less likely than in Latin because the Oscan 3 pl. is *sent*, with a different vocalism from *súm*.

Still, it must be admitted that Oscan did not retain *esum* as the primary form of the 1 sg. 'to be', to judge from the relative frequency and chronological relationship of the two forms. Thus it may be that Italic underwent a trend in the direction of replacing strong forms of the verb with weak ones, a trend which was brought to completion at different times in the individual languages for reasons such as those sketched above. In fact, such a development may even have been the continuation of a dialectal IE phenomenon. Greek too underwent such a change; the predominantly recessive accent found in Greek finite forms is a generalization of the IE enclitic forms of the verb originally restricted just to main clauses (cf. the situation in Sanskrit with unaccented main clause verbs but accented subordinate clause verbs, though see H. Hock for a different interpretation).⁴⁸

The two related questions, therefore, of the absence of **esum* in Latin and of its longer retention in Oscan find relatively natural explanations both internal to Italic and internal to Western IE.

5. CONCLUSION

The lines of development suggested here for Latin *sum*, Oscan *súm*, *sim*, *esum* are, it must be admitted, somewhat speculative. However, our view has the advantage of giving a plausible explanation for all

this 1 sg. form) providing the model. The classical Latin form *sumus* is probably the result of two phonetic developments, *o* > *u* in closed final syllables and *o* > *u* before *m* (for which see Leumann, *Grammatik* 1, 48), though given the existence of *domus* 'house' as a counter-example to the latter change, some special clitic phonological developments may be responsible for the initial syllable of *sumus*.

⁴⁸H. Hock, "Clitic Verbs in PIE or Discourse-Based Verb Fronting? Sanskrit *sa-hovaca gargyah* and Cognates in Avestan and Greek," in *Papers on Diachronic Syntax: Six Case Studies*, Studies in the Linguistic Sciences 12.2 (University of Illinois 1982) 1-38.

of the forms of 1 sg. 'to be' in Italic, not just the Latin form. Moreover, it draws on features (e.g., enclisis of 'to be') and changes (e.g., loss of *i[#]) which arguably were present in Common Italic or at least are Pan-Italic in distribution (e.g., loss of *i[#], if *tremonti* is taken at face value). As such, it lends some support to the Italic unity position, for it shows that several non-ad hoc and inherently plausible assumptions can lead to an explanation of *sum*/*súm* that is consistent with a close genetic affiliation of the two languages.

BRIAN JOSEPH
REX WALLACE

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS, AMHERST