

quality of the poets (*tener*,¹⁸ *pessimus*) and their work (*venusta*, *cacata*, *pleni ruris et inficetiarum*). Nor is the epigram utterly direct. Catullus could have said "The *Smyrna* is a great poem, the *Annals* is not." Instead he makes statements that clearly imply that the one was composed carefully, the other hastily. Still, they are statements, not narratives.

The differences seem so marked that perhaps there is reason to revive the notion, not prominent recently, of a fundamental distinction between Catullus' lyric and epigrammatic modes.¹⁹ D. O. Ross, Jr., has reinforced the distinction with his attempt to establish differing historical origins for the groups of poems: for the polymetric (and also the longer) poems, Hellenistic poetry; for the epigrams, native Roman tradition.²⁰ Whether the explanation lies in their history or somewhere else, the groups do seem opposed to one another in the nature of their representation, and this deserves renewed consideration.²¹

JOSEPH B. SOLODOW
Yale University

18. On *tener* as designating quality rather than genre, see Buchheit, "Dichtertum und Lebensform," pp. 48–50, following up a suggestion made by Kroll, ed., *Catullus*, p. 65.

19. See I. Schnelle, *Untersuchungen zu Catulls dichterischer Form*, Philologus Supplementband 25.3 (Leipzig, 1933), esp. pp. 9–10; F. Klingner, "Catull," in *Römische Geisteswelt*³, (Munich, 1956), pp. 202–6; and more recently, Skinner, "Semiotics and Poetics," who similarly characterizes the lyric poems.

20. *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), esp. pp. 171–74.

21. I would like to express my gratitude to several colleagues and also to the journal's referees and Editor for their aid, generously given and deeply appreciated.

SUM: FURTHER THOUGHTS

Even with the publication of our paper of 1987,¹ there are still many details of the relationship and development of Latin first person singular *sum* and Oscan first person singular *súm* (etc.) that bear further examination and elucidation. In this note, we augment our earlier discussion in three such areas: we provide more evidence that the Oscan form is not a borrowing from Latin; we present additional facts relevant to the fate of *-s-* plus nasal clusters in Latin; and we attempt to clarify some aspects of the enclisis of *sum* and *súm* in Italic.

I. *iúvilú*-INSCRIPTIONS

In our other paper we argued from the general nature of Latin borrowings into Oscan (for the most part only cultural loans like *aídil*, not intimate loans of the sort that *súm* would have to be) and from the dating of the earliest Oscan forms of *súm* (late fifth century, and thus well before the period of Roman influence) that Latin could not have been a donor language for the Oscan form in question.² An additional argument for our position can be drawn from a small

1. B. Joseph and R. Wallace, "Latin *sum* / Oscan *súm*, *sim*, *esum*," *AJP* 108 (1987): 675–93.

2. Joseph and Wallace, "Latin *sum*," pp. 680–81.

group of Oscan inscriptions from Capua (Ve 74-94)—the so-called **iúvilú**-inscriptions—that contain an example of **súm** (Ve 83).³ **iúvilú**-inscriptions are found on stelae of baked clay or tufa; the stelae were erected at the gravesites of individuals or families in connection with memorial celebrations to honor the dead. To judge from (Ve 94), the celebrations themselves were associated in some way with the cult of Juppiter Flagius (**iúveí flagiúi**). In some cases we know that a high-ranking official of Capua (**meddis** [Ve 86]) was present at and was perhaps responsible for the sacrifice that accompanied the memorial celebration. All indications suggest, then, that the **iúvilú**-inscriptions document an officially sanctioned form of ancestor-worship, perhaps not unlike the Latin *Parentalia*.

Given the official and religious nature of the ceremonies documented by the **iúvilú**-inscriptions, one might expect their style to reflect the formal and conservative linguistic tendencies that characterize the language of religion. Consequently, it is only remotely conceivable that Latin *sum* could have been borrowed by Oscan, say at some point in the fifth century, and then have penetrated the conservative language of these ceremonies and these inscriptions by the late fourth century, the date of the oldest **iúvilas**; moreover, aside from the putative case of **súm**, there is no evidence that the language of these inscriptions was in any way influenced by Latin. We can conclude, therefore, that these Capuan inscriptions support our contention that Oscan **súm** was not borrowed from Latin.

II. -sN- CLUSTERS

In our earlier discussion, we pointed out that -s- plus nasal (N) clusters in Latin presented a problem for O. Szemerényi's description of the development of Latin *sum* and Oscan **súm**.⁴ According to Szemerényi's hypothesis, phonetic difficulties caused by -sN- clusters motivated the development of pre-Latin *esmi to *esomi (with vowel-epenthesis).⁵ We noted that Szemerényi's view was unlikely because the phonetic difficulties presented by such clusters in Latin were alleviated not by epenthesis but by the loss of -s- accompanied by compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel (e.g., *dh₃snom > *fānum*, "temple"). For Latin—and this is the point we wish to stress here—Szemerényi's description may also involve chronological difficulties.⁶

Presumably, Szemerényi would maintain that epenthesis occurred in *(H₁)esmi at a relatively early date, before the loss of final -i; that loss itself is, if not an Italic sound change, then a very early prehistoric Latin sound change, at least in the primary endings. But such a supposition does not square well with the fact that -sN- clusters seem to have remained intact in Latin until well into the historical period. Forms with -sN- clusters are preserved on the Forum inscrip-

3. For discussion of the **iúvilú**-inscriptions, see J. Heurgon, *Étude sur les inscriptions osques de Capoue dite iúvilas* (Paris, 1942).

4. Joseph and Wallace, "Latin *sum*," pp. 685-86.

5. *Syncope in Greek and Indo-European and the Nature of the Indo-European Accent* (Naples, 1964), pp. 191-95.

6. We thank Brent Vine (personal communication) for reminding us of this point.

tion (*iouxmenta*, “draught-animals”) and the Duenos vase (*cosmis*, “obliging”), inscriptions that can be dated fairly securely to the middle of the sixth century. Even more important for our purposes are the forms *dusmo* (“thicket”), attested in the work of Livius Andronicus (frag. 37 Warmington), and *losna* (“moon”), inscribed on a mirror from Praeneste (*CIL* 1² 2. 549), both of which date to the last half of the third century. These forms in particular suggest that the loss of -s- in -sN- clusters was a fairly late Latin sound change (perhaps as late as the fourth century) and thus must have occurred well after the creation of the first person singular *sum*. These forms, then, constitute additional evidence against Szemerényi’s account of Latin *sum*.

III. ENCLISIS

In our original paper, we argued that the enclitic nature of the verb “to be” in Italic was the key to understanding how a Proto-Italic *esom (and later *som in the individual languages) could have arisen from an inherited *(H₁)esmi. We also noted that the familiar process of syncope could have created the form *som (from *X-esom) that ultimately yielded Latin *sum* and Oscan *súm*, just as *nek^we-dum yielded *necdum*.⁷ It should be clear, though, that syncope could have occurred only if the putative “host” for the enclitic *-esom ended in a consonant.⁸ For hosts ending in a vowel, a different process needs to be invoked in order to produce *-som, and such a process is readily available. To judge from their behavior in both Latin and Oscan, the forms of the verb “to be” in Italic underwent prodelision after words ending in a vowel (cf. Oscan *terem-natust* (Ve 8), “is delimited,” < *teremnātā est); the loss of *e in *-esom that we posited could most probably be taken to reflect this process that is common to both Italic branches. If this suggestion is correct, it means that a surface allomorph [som] would have been available in a wider range of contexts than we first believed: from these contexts it could have been generalized at the expense of the accented (nonenclitic) form *ésom.

The additional evidence brought forth here, though perhaps minor in itself, nonetheless strengthens the case for our derivation of *sum* and *súm*. We believe, moreover, that only by examining these details of development will we advance our understanding of such complicated Italic phenomena as enclisis and syncope.

REX E. WALLACE
*University of Massachusetts,
Amherst*

BRIAN D. JOSEPH
The Ohio State University

7. Joseph and Wallace, “Latin *sum*,” pp. 689–90. Note that syncope appears to have occurred in host-plus-enclitic combinations throughout the history of Latin, if, as C. D. Buck suggests (*Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* [Chicago, 1933], p. 223), the shortened pronominal genitives such as the monosyllabic *quois*, *eis*, and *huis*, and the disyllabic *illīs*, all of which occur in early poetry (for *quois*, *eius*, *huius*, and *illius*, respectively) “arose from the fuller forms standing in close combination with a following word and unaccented.”

8. Thanks are due once more to Brent Vine (personal communication) for bringing this to our attention.