ERIC P. HAMP
University of Chicago
Chicago

UDC 807. 5—541.2

DERIVATIVES OF *SUE IN LATIN

1. *soleō* „be wont"

The current accounts[1] of the obviously isolated, and therefore probably archaic and relic, verb *soleō* are unsatisfactory and inconclusive. They point to connexions which will not hold up[2].

A possible phonological reconstruction is **su̯eleio̯*, which could be formed from an underlying thematic substantive **su̯elo-*[3]. This in turn would be a thematization of an ancient genitive **su̯e-l* „of oneself, one's own"[4]. The original meaning would have been „have, handle as one's own". This meaning would explain the use of *solēre* in the sense „have relations with" (de mulieribus)". The phrase *ultrā solitum* (and the like) might have replaced an ancient *oltrā suelom*, with the noun on which the verb was formed.

We may now refine the derivation of *sōlus*, discussed in the reference adduced in footnote (4). The verb *soleō* reflects **sue-l*, thematized to **suelo-* „one's own". But *sōlus* < **seu̯el-o-* is a derived thematization with insertion by rule[5] of **e*; its proper original meaning was „pertaining to one's own" → "restricted to one's own." It was by emphasis on the nuance of restriction that the sense of „solitary, alone" developed.

As the productivity of thematic derivatives with radical **-e-* declined, parallel forms such as **suelo-* and **seuelo-* became more and more liable to contamination. This would account for the presence of *suus* (→ *sui*) beside *sis* < **su̯eis* < **su̯ois*. Despite assertions to the contrary[6] *suus* and SVOM cannot go back directly to OLat. *souos* = Osc. *súvad*, Gk. ἑός < **seu̯os*, since this violates the assumption for *nouos* = Gk. νέ(ϝ)ος. We must assume, rather, that originally there was **su̯e* and the rule-derived **seuo-*. Then an analogical **suo-* developed. The latter then contaminated **seu̯o-* to yield **su̯u̯o-*, as if a Sievers form. Thus:

**sue* ——— **suo-* > ** s(u̯)o-*[7] > *s-is*

** su̯u̯o-* > SVOM. *suus*

**seuo-* > OLat. *sou̯o-*

This will explain the rise of the duplicate scansion as *su̯*-and *sŭ*-in *suēscō* and *suētus* and then in *suādeō*.

[1] See *LEW*$_3$, *DELL* svv. F. Bader, *BSL* 77, 1982, 119 note 184, avoids an analysis.

[2] See my discussion of **sĕd-* and **sedh-*, as distinguished from **su̯-*, *Živa Antika* 32, 1982, 33-4.

[3] Not „surprenante", as *DELL* calls it.

[4] Parallel to Greek φίλος; see *BSL* 77, 1982, 251—62, esp. 261, See my discussion of such remnants, *AJP* 103, 1982, 214—6.

[5] *IF* 82, 1977, 74—6 footnote 4;, *JNES* 39, 1980, 215; *Chicago Linguistic Society*, *Parasession* 1978, 193—4.

[6] Pfister revision of Sommer *Handbuch* (1977) 55 § 53. 2. a; Leumann (1977) 46 § 43a. F. Bader cites (*BSL* 77, 1982, 93 note 54) Buck, but his doublets will not account for all the observed forms.

[7] For loss of **u̯* see *AJP* 96, 1975, 64—6.