

RECENSIONI

REVIEWS

Pietro Scudieri

J. Martínez-Pinna, *El nacimiento de la República romana* (ca. 509-486 a.C.) (2020) 259

Giuseppe Mercuri

L. Polverini, *Gaetano De Sanctis - Arnaldo Momigliano. Carteggio 1930-1955* (2022) 265

Old Latin *bouerum* and *Iouerum* from a Diachronic Point of View

Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak

DOI – <https://doi.org/10.7358/erga-2023-002-witk>

ABSTRACT – The aim of this article is to discuss two Old Latin aberrant genitive plural forms in *-erum*, namely *bouerum* «bouum» (Cato, *Agr.* 62) or *Iouerum* «Iouum» (Varro, *Ling.* VIII 74), on the basis of the morphological and semantic considerations. It is hard to imagine how the regular third declension forms *bouum* and *Iouum* could be changed into *bouerum* and *Iouerum*. In his commented edition of Varro's *De lingua Latina* (2019) Wolfgang de Melo, following Roland Kent, explains them as «analogical formations», influenced by *iūgĕrum* n. «an acre; jugerum (of land)» (→ *bōuĕrum*) and gen. pl. *Vĕnĕrum* «of statues of Venus» (→ *Iōuĕrum*). This explanation should be rejected for at least two reasons: semantic and morphological. The innovative genitive plural in *-erum*, I will argue, was based on old nominative and accusative dual forms with additional plural morphology: cf. **bouē* nom.-acc. du. «two oxen», gen. pl. *bouĕrum* «of oxen» (originally «of two oxen»), **Iouē* «two Jupiters» (here in elliptic use: «Jupiter and Juno»), gen. pl. *Iouĕrum* «of Jupiters» (originally «of two Jupiters; *i.e.*, Jupiter and Juno»).

KEYWORDS – dual number; elliptic forms; genitive case; Old Latin – forme ellittiche; genitivo; latino antico; numero duale.

1. INTRODUCTION

In Proto-Indo-European (*i.e.*, the reconstructed ancestor of Latin and several other Indo-European languages), the dual number was a productive grammatical category and it was retained as such in many of the daughter languages. In Latin and (probably) in the other Italic languages, however, it disappeared rather early; Classical Latin, at any rate, only displays rather insignificant vestiges of the dual¹.

The lexemes *ambō*, *ambae*, *ambō* «both» and *duo*, *duae*, *duo* «two» (representing the so-called *dualia tantum* in Indo-European) exhibit a peculiar inflectional pattern, resulting from a thorough remodelling

¹ Kent 1946, 16; Buck 1959, 171; Sihler 1995, 245-246; Weiss 2009, 195; Fritz 2011, 192-195.

of the primeval dual paradigm and its integration into the Latin first and second declensions. The lexemes do retain certain archaic forms originally proper to the dual number, e.g., in the nominative; still, the other cases display plural endings instead (gen. pl. *ambōrum*, *ambārum*, *ambōrum*; dat.-abl. pl. *ambōbus*, *ambābus*, *ambōbus*). Therefore, we are clearly dealing with a process of morphological adaptation and the ousting of the old dual paradigm by plural morphology².

All in all, there is a consensus among scholars that the Latin language of Cicero's and Augustus' times only possessed few marginal remnants of the dual paradigm, essentially limited to the three numerals *duo*, *octō* and *vīgintī* as well as the lexeme *ambō*³. Markedly controversial, on the other hand, is the problem of the retention of nominal dual morphology at the earlier stages of Latin. Thus, in the present work, I shall endeavor to answer the question of whether any other traces of the inherited dual may be uncovered in Old Latin literature⁴.

2. ALTERNATIVE GENITIVE PLURAL FORMS OF THE LATIN THIRD DECLENSION IN -ĒRUM

In Chapter 74 of the eighth book of his *De lingua Latina*, the famous writer, philologist and encyclopedist Marcus Terentius Varro of Reate (116-27 BCE) notes the existence of some atypical genitive plural forms in older texts:

Nor ought usage to fluctuate, in that some speak of herds *boum* «of cattle» and others *bouerum*, and in that some speak of statues *Ioum* «of Jupiters» and others *Iouerum*, since like *Iouis*, *bouis*, and *struis* «heap» (all gen. sg.),

² The same phenomenon is observed in other Indo-European languages, which lost the dual number during their development. The dual category in Polish became unproductive in the 17th century, but some dual forms, especially *dualia tantum*, were adopted as irregular plural forms, e.g., PSL. **oči* (du.) «two eyes» > Pol. *oczy* (pl.) «eyes» (the regular plural form *oka* is used in some specific situations); PSL. **ręce* (du.) «two hands» > Pol. *ręce* (pl.) «hands»; PSL. **uši* (du.) «two ears» > Pol. *uszcy* (pl.) «ears» (the regular plural form *ucha* refers to «ears of a vessel»). In Polish, many declensional forms of dual origin are replaced by the plural forms, e.g., such innovative variants as *oczami* «by eyes», *rękami* «by hands», *uszami* «by ears» prevail over (or live together with) Pol. *oczyma* (< PSL. **oči*ma instr.-dat. du.), *rękoma* (of dual origin), *uszyma* (< PSL. **uši*ma instr.-dat. du.) in the vernacular language. See Długosz-Kurczabowa - Dubisz 2006, 222.

³ Weiss 2009, 195.

⁴ The article continues my earlier studies on traces of dual forms in Latin: Witczak 2015a, 101-120; 2017a, 37-58; 2017b, 185-196; 2018, 47-58; 2019, 107-123; 2021a, 5-18; 2021b, 262-276.

so also *Iouem*, *bouem*, and *struem* (all acc. sg.) and *Iouī*, *bouī*, and *struī* (all dat. sg.).⁵

The use of the gen. pl. ending *-erum* for third declension nouns is, of course, something of an oddity. Unfortunately, Varro does not name the source of either of the forms he discusses. However, as regards the form *bouerum*, scholars usually point to Chapter 62 of Cato the Elder's *De agricultura*, in which we find the following passage:

You should have as many carts (*plostra*) as you have teams (*iuga*), either of oxen (*bouerum*), mules, or donkeys.⁶

Roland G. Kent gives the following explanation of Varro's passage: «It is doubtful if these forms had any real existence; if so, *bouerum* was formed after *iugerum*, and *Iouerum* after *Venerum*, to avoid the inconvenient forms *boum* and *Ioum*, which Varro would have pronounced *bouom* and *Iouom*»⁷.

It is obvious that the form *bouerum* is really documented in Cato's work on agriculture, thus Kent's sceptical position must be rejected. On the other hand, Kent explains the genitive plural forms in **-erum* as purely Latin innovations formed after the neuter *es*-stem nouns, thus he concludes that the words *bouerum* and *Iouerum* attest the short vowel [e]⁸. Unfortunately, his statement is only a guess. There are no *es*-stem nouns in Latin or other Indo-European languages which may derive from PIE. **g^uous* f./m. «cow, ox» (hence Lat. *bōs*, gen. sg. *bouis* «id.») or PIE. **Dⁱēus* m. «Sky-god» (hence Lat. *Iouis*, gen. sg. *Iouis* m. «Jupiter»)⁹.

In his valuable edition of Varro's *De lingua Latina* Wolfgang de Melo gives the following commentary: «We move on to the problem of allomorphy among endings used for the same word. Varro exemplifies this with the genitive plural of *bōs* 'cow' and *Iūpiter* 'Jupiter', for which apparently two forms were in use, the regular third declension *boum* and *Ioum* and the unusual *bouerum* and *Iouerum*. The point to be made is that *Iūpiter* as the name of a deity very rarely has a plural, and only in

⁵ For translation cf. de Melo 2019, I, 527; cf. also Kent 1958, 429 and 431.

⁶ For translation cf. Harrison 2016, 73; cf. also Hooper 1934, 75 and Dalby 2012, 126. The Latin text (Cato, *Agr.* 62) runs as follows: *Quot iuga bouerum, mulorum, asinorum habebis, totidem plostra esse oportet*. See Mazzarino 1982², 59.

⁷ Kent 1958, 429, § 74, n. a.

⁸ Cf. Weiss 2009, 248.

⁹ It is worth emphasizing that Lat. *bōs* f./m. «cow, ox» represents most likely a prehistoric borrowing from Sabellic, esp. from Sabine (as demonstrated by the phoneme [b] from PIE. **g^u*). On the other hand, the Latin nominative *Iouis* is remodelled by analogy (based on the gen. sg. *Iouis* < PIE. **Dieues*).

reference to statues or the like, where *duo Iouēs* can mean ‘two statues of Jupiter’. A construction *signa Iouum* ‘statues of Jupiters’, postulated here, is an artificial construct that does exist in the real world because the plural is already inherent in *signa*¹⁰.

Wolfgang de Melo explains the plural forms of the Latin theonym *Iūpiter*, using *duo Iouēs* «two statues of Jupiter» as a standard example. He does not consider the fact that the dual number may be reconstructed for an earlier phase of Latin. The dual form in question should be reconstructed as **duō Iouē* in Old Latin or even **duō Diouē* in the preliterary phase of Archaic Latin¹¹, cf. the Vedic dual *dyāvā* m. du. «heaven and earth» (RV II 6.4; VII 65.2 etc.) and «night and day» (RV I 113.2)¹², motivated by Ved. *dyauh* m. «heaven, sky; day»¹³. The Vedic theonym *Dyauh* m. «a Sky-god» has close equivalents attested in Greek (Ζεύς, dat. sg. Δί, attested as *di-we* [*Diwei*] in Linear B texts), Oscan (*Diúvei* dat. sg.), Umbrian (*iuve* dat. sg.), Lat. *Iouis* or *Iuppiter* m. «Jupiter, a Roman Sky-god» and some other Indo-European languages, including Lusitanian (*Reus*, dat. sg. *Reue*)¹⁴.

It is worth emphasizing that the dual forms, created on the basis of IE. *g^hóus* f./m. «cow; ox» (cf. Gk. βούς f./m. «ox, cow»; Arm. *kov*; OIr. *bó* f. «cow»; Ved. *gauh* m. «ox», f. «cow» etc.¹⁵), are clearly attested in several Indo-European languages, cf. Gk. Hom. βόε du. «two cows; two oxen»¹⁶; OIr. *bai* nom. du. «two cows, two oxen» (acc. du. *boin*)¹⁷ < PCelt. **bowī* «id.» (< IE. **g^hóuē* «two cows; two oxen»¹⁸); Ved. *gāvā*

¹⁰ de Melo 2019, II, 1095-1096.

¹¹ The stem **diou-* (< PIE. **dieu-*) is attested in some Archaic Latin inscriptions as well as in the Oscan texts, see Untermann 2000, 182-186; Weiss 2009, 159.

¹² Mayrhofer 1992, 750; Graßmann 1996⁶, 604 and 640; Malzahn 1999, 41; Monier-Williams 1999, 499-500, s.v. *Dyāvā*; Burrow 2001, 217.

¹³ Mayrhofer 1992, 750-752; Graßmann 1996⁶, 601-606; Monier-Williams 1999, 478, s.v. *Dív*, *dyú*.

¹⁴ Witczak 1999, 65-73; 2001, 245-253; 2005, 211-217. See also Witczak - Kaczor 1995, 269-270.

¹⁵ Mayrhofer 1992, 478-480; Wodtko - Irlinger - Schneider 2008, 189-195.

¹⁶ Il. XIII 703; Hes. *Op.* 436; *IG P* 426, ll. 58 and 59 (5th c. BCE). See Adrados 1994, 745.

¹⁷ Vendryes 1959, B-61.

¹⁸ One of the anonymous reviewers correctly indicates that Proto-Celtic **bowī* (du.) «two cows, two oxen» can also reflect the dual ending **-ī* (< PIE. **-ib₁*), attested e.g., in Lith. *akėi* (du.) «two eyes», OCS. *očī* (du.), Ved. *ákṣī* (du.), Gk. ὄσσε (du.) «id.» (< PIE. **ot^hk^u-ib₁* du. «two eyes»). In fact, PC. **ī* can represent both IE. **ī* and IE. **ē*, cf. PC. **rīx* m. «king» = Lat. *rēx* m. «id.». It should be noted, however, that the dual ending **-ī* (< PIE. **-ib₁*) originally appeared in inanimate nouns, whereas the ‘strong’ ending **-ē* (< PIE. **-eb₁*) was added for creating dual forms of animate nouns. Oxen and cows belong to the world of animals. This is why OIr. *bai* nom. du. «two cows,

(secondarily *gāvāu*) du. «two oxen; two cows»¹⁹ (< IE. **g^uóyē* «two cows; two oxen»); Av. *gāuuā* f. du. «two cows»²⁰. The above-mentioned comparative data, attested in the Ancient Greek, Old Irish, Vedic and Avestan vocabulary, clearly indicates that the expected dual form of Lat. *bōs*, should be reconstructed as **bouē*²¹. Of course, the original dual phrase **duō bouē* «two oxen» could easily be pluralized in Old Latin as *duo bouēs*. However, it seems probable that some dual forms (especially so-called *dualia tantum*) attested with the innovative plural endings in an early phase of Old Latin. Plural endings were attached to the numeral *duo* «two» in the oblique cases, thus the quasi-plural form *duōrum* (with the dual sense «of two») appeared in the genitive. By analogy, the parallel quasi-plural genitive (i.e., *bouērum* «of two oxen») may have been created for the dual form **bouē*²². The form *bouērum* was used by (at least some) speakers of Latin (e.g., Cato) even after the dual number had become obsolete.

two oxen» (< PC. **bouī* du.) should be reconstructed as IE. **g^uóyē* (du.) and not **g^uóyī*. Also OIr. *sieir* du. «two sisters» can represent IE. **syésor-ē* (cf. Ved. *svásarā* du. «two sisters»), **syésor-ī* or even **syésor-e*, according to Adams 1991, 12. The Gaulish inscriptional form *suioirebe* instr. du. «with two sisters» (< IE. **syésor-ē-bhēm* instr. du.) completely rules out the Proto-Celtic ending **-ī*, see Witczak 2015b, 59-62.

¹⁹ Mayrhofer 1992, 478-480; Malzahn 1999, 6; Monier-Williams 1999, 363, s.v. *gó*, *gaús*.

²⁰ Mayrhofer 1992, 479; Beekes 2011, 217.

²¹ Ved. **-ā*, Av. **-ā* and OIr. **-ī* regularly go back to the dual ending **-ē* (< PIE. **-eb₁*), which was used in consonantal stems (for animate nouns). Homeric Greek *βόε* (du.) contains a short vowel *ε* [e], which generally confirms the reconstruction with the laryngeal **b₁* (Fritz 2011, 200). It is unclear, however, whether the short vocalism in the Greek dual forms is a native innovation (e.g., by a secondary shortening in Proto-Greek or a laryngeal loss in the final position), or whether it demonstrates an original zero-grade variant **-b₁*, or whether it reflects an alternative ending **-b₁e* (created by an early metathesis of PIE. **-eb₁*), cf. Nussbaum 1986, 284-285; Fritz 2011, 200-202; Witczak 2015a, 106-107.

²² If the dual number was productive in the classical times, then the Old Latin form **bouē* (du.) «two oxen» should be changed into Lat. **boue* in nom.-acc. du. (with the shortened *ē*). The shortening of long vowels in the final position is clearly observable in the Latin first declension (*-ā*-stem nouns), e.g., Lat. *fāma* f. «news, rumour, public opinion, reputation, fame» (< OLat. **fāmā*, cf. Gk. Att.-Ion. *φήμη* f. «quotation, enunciation, rumour, reputation, speech»). Of course, the long vowel **ē* had to be preserved in the internal position, thus the reconstruction *bouērum* (by analogy to *fāmārum*) seems to be firmly established. Note additionally that the Latin second declension (containing *-o*-stem nouns) demonstrates the ending *-ōrum* (with the lengthened vowel *ō*) in the genitive plural, e.g., *deōrum* «of gods». In other words, the genitive plural in Latin could not be other than **-ērum*, even if the dual ending in Archaic Latin contained the short vowel *-e* (= Gk. *-ε*).

The unexpected genitive plural form *bouērum* may be a reflex of **bouē* nom. du. «two oxen»: note that larger wagons (*plostra maiora*) were always drawn by a pair of oxen, and regular wagons (*plostra*) – by a pair of mules or donkeys²³. Needless to say, in Cato's days (234-149 BCE) the dual number as a synchronic category would have been an archaic feature; nevertheless, isolated language habits inherited from ancestors – to whom dual forms were neither unusual nor foreign – apparently persisted in certain commonly used terms. This routine of sorts, then, allowed Cato to use the form *bouērum* (gen. pl. based on nom. du. **bouē*) – rather than the regular *boum* or *bouum* – in reference to the pair of oxen pulling a wagon (*plostrum*).

The Roman grammarian Flavius Sospiter Charisius supplies further instances of third declension nouns attested with the gen. pl. in *-ērum*, excerpted from authors of the Archaic period²⁴:

While the ablative singular ends in *-e*, *-i*, or *-u*, the ending *-um* is used for the genitive plural [...]; however, we also find divergent forms used by authors. Thus, Coelius said *nucerum* («of nuts»), Lucilius *nauerum* («of ships»), and Gellius *regerum* («of kings») as well as *lapiderum* («of rocks»).²⁵

It is evident, therefore, that not only Marcus Porcius Cato, but also three other Roman writers of the 2nd century BCE (to wit, Lucius Coelius Antipater, Gaius Lucilius and Gnaeus Gellius) employed the alternative gen. pl. in *-ērum* for third declension nouns (*lapis* m., rarely f. «rock», *nāuis* f. «ship», *nux* f. «nut», *rēx* m. «king»). As indicated above, an ending like this may easily have arisen in the course of the pluralization of originally dual forms terminating in *-*ē* (nom.-acc. du. of consonant stems)²⁶. Consequently, the following dual forms may be plausibly reconstructed on the basis of the extant genitives in *-ērum*:

- 2.1. OLat. **bouē* m. «two oxen», whence – via pluralization – gen. pl. *bouērum* «of (two) oxen».
- 2.2. OLat. **Diouē*, later **Iouē* m. «two Jupiters» (in elliptical sense, «Jupiter and his divine partner Juno»²⁷), whence – via pluralization – *Iouērum* (gen. pl.) «of Jupiters».

²³ White 2010, 80. Further to this, it should be noted that the expected dual forms **mūlō* «two mules» and **asinō* «two donkeys» may have undergone pluralization in a relatively easy fashion.

²⁴ Reichardt 2008, 173 and 204.

²⁵ 857, 54; my own translation.

²⁶ Witczak 2015a, 108-110; 2021a, 15 n. 41.

²⁷ The elliptic use of the dual forms is frequently observed in the oldest Indo-European languages, especially in Vedic (Oliphant 1912, 33-47; Malzahn 1999, 75).

- 2.3. OLat. **lapidē* m. (or f.) «two rocks», whence secondary gen. pl. *lapidērum* «of rocks», used by Gellius according to the testimony of Charisius²⁸. Of course, the interpretation of *lapidērum* as a pluralized dual form is my own hypothesis. The Latin grammarians interpreted *lapidērum* as an archaic variant of *lapidum*.
- 2.4. OLat. **nāuē* f. «two ships», whence gen. pl. *nāuērum* «of ships» (Lucilius; Charisius)²⁹. In my opinion, Gaius Lucilius mentioned something connected with two ships only, not with many ships, thus he preserved an archaic distinction between *nāuērum* «of two ships» and *nāuium* «of ships».
- 2.5. OLat. **nucē* f. «two nuts» (or «two small boats resembling nut halves»), whence gen. pl. *nucērum* «of nuts/boats» in Coelius's works according to the testimony of Charisius³⁰. The Roman historian Lucius Coelius Antipater most probably mentioned two small boats, not many boats.
- 2.6. OLat. **rēgē* m. «two kings», whence the innovative gen. pl. *rēgērum* «of kings» in Gellius's works according to Charisius³¹. It seems highly probable that Gnaeus Gellius referred to the Pontic kingdom governed by two kings (159-150 BCE), *i.e.*, Mithridates the fourth and Mithridates the fifth³².

Of course, it is impossible to know whether Lucius Coelius Antipater (ca. 180-120 BCE), Gaius Lucilius (ca. 180-102 BCE) and Gnaeus Gellius (2nd c. BCE) used the genitives in *-ērum* with the obsolete dual sense

This dual, firmly established in the ancient literature, has «essentially artistic and poetical» functions (Oliphant 1912, 33). For example, Ved. *pītārā* m. du. «parents» (orig. «two fathers»; Burrow 2001, 217) or *mātārā* f. du. «parents» (orig. «two mothers») emphatically indicates the most important person in a marriage, whereas the second member of the pair remains unnamed. The dual *dyaāvā* du. «heaven and earth; Sky-god and Earth-goddess» (literally «two heavens») represents an elliptic form of the dvandva dual *dyaāvā-prthivī*, which puts the masculine element in an exclusive position. The Homeric dual Αἴαντε (literally «two Ajaxes») refers to Ajax and his brother Teucer. The divine twins are frequently named *Castores* in Latin, though Castor was only one of two gods (Pollux was his twin brother). The sanctuary of the divine twins at Rome was called *aedes Castorus* (in Archaic Latin), later *aedes Castoris* (elliptically) or *aedes Castorum*. See Witczak 2021a, 8-9.

²⁸ Briscoe 2005, 62; Reichardt 2008, 173, 204.

²⁹ Cf. Ved. *nāvē* f. du. «two ships» (RV II 39.4a); Malzahn 1999, 41.

³⁰ Reichardt 2008, 204.

³¹ Briscoe 2005, 62; Reichardt 2008, 173 and 204.

³² Cf. Witczak 2015a; 2021a. One of two peer reviewers suggests that the dual **rēgē* (indicated by the genitive form *rēgērum*) may reflect the joint rulership of two first kings of ancient Rome: Romulus and Titus Tatius. In fact, Gnaeus Gellius wrote a huge work entitled *Annales* (containing 97 or more books), which presented a chronological history of Rome from mythological narratives to his own times.

(e.g., *rēgērum* «of two kings») or with the innovative plural semantics (i.e., *rēgērum* «of kings»).

3. THE DUALIA TANTUM AND THE ORIGIN OF THE FIFTH LATIN DECLENSION

The genitive plural forms in *-ērum* are well known in the fifth Latin declension (grouping numerous *ē*-stem nouns). However, there are only two words of the fifth declension demonstrating a full paradigm, including plural forms, namely *diēs* f./m. «day» (gen. pl. *diērum*) and *rēs* f. «thing, object, fact» (gen. pl. *rērum*). Most nouns, belonging to the fifth Latin declension, represent the so-called *singularia tantum*. In my earlier papers³³ I have demonstrated that numerous Latin *ē*-stem nouns were created on the basis of earlier dual forms with the ending **-eh₁* (for animate nouns)³⁴ or **-ih₁* (for inanimate nouns), e.g., Lat. *māteriēs* (gen. sg. *māteriēi*) f. «timber, tree trunk; building material; substance, ingredient, element» is motivated by the Latin word *māter* f. «mother, tree trunk» (< IE. **mātēr* f. < PIE. **meh₂ters* f. «mother»³⁵), but it derives (by the process of singularization) from the (inanimate) dual form **māterī* f. du. «two tree-trunks, two elements, two ingredients» (< PIE. **meh₂ter-ih₁*, cf. Lith. *móteri* f. du. «two mothers»; OCS. *materi* f. du. «id.»).

³³ Witczak 2015a, 113-114; 2021b, 273.

³⁴ The dual ending **-eh₁* is generally reconstructed on the basis of Indo-Aryan **-ā*, Iranian **-ā*, Proto-Celtic **-ī*, as well as Ancient Greek *-ε* (Myc. Gk. **-e*), Lith. *-e*, Venetic *-e* and Toch. B *-e* (Nussbaum 1986, 284-285; Witczak 2015a, 106-107; 2021b, 266-267). Some researchers suggest the primitive ending **-h₁* (e.g., Fritz 2011, 200-202), others prefer the variant **-h₁e* (e.g., Beekes 2011, 216). Note that the Balto-Slavic languages introduced the inanimate ending **-ī* for creating feminine dual forms from consonantal stems, cf. Lith. *móteri* f. du. «two mothers»; OCS. *materi* f. du. «id.» (vs. Ved. *mātārā* f. du. «two mothers», elliptically «parents» ← Ved. *mātā* m. *r*-stem «mother»; Ved. *pitārā* m. du. «parents» ← Ved. *pitā* m. *r*-stem «father»; Toch. B *orotse pacere* m. du. «two grandparents» ← Toch. B *pācer* m. «father»).

³⁵ I accept Szemerényi's law, according to which the final nominative ending **-s* was lost in some consonantal stems, including *r*-stem, in an early phase of Indo-European (Collinge 1985, 237-238). The loss of **-s* after **r* was compensated by the lengthening of the final vowel, thus PIE. **-er-s* yielded IE. **-ēr*. The final **-s* is attested in the Anatolian languages, including Hittite, Palaic and Luwian, cf. Hitt. *ḫaššušar(a)š* «queen» (the vowel /a/ between *r* and *š* is, in fact, dumb) vs. Lat. *uxor*, gen. sg. *uxōris* «wife» (< **uk-sōr*). The second member of the Hittite and Latin appellatives goes back to PIE. **sor-s* f. «woman». The same term is also preserved in Lat. *soror* f. «sister» (< IE. **suyésōr* f. < PIE. **suyé-sor-s* f. «sister»), cf. de Vaan 2008, 576-577.

Also the Latin term *diēs* f./m. «day» (gen. pl. *diērum*), which is commonly treated as the main basis for creating the Latin (and Proto-Italic) fifth declension, seems to be a reflex of the original duale tantum **diuī* n. du. «day and night; 24 hours» (motivated by OLat. *diuom* n. «heaven, sky», also «days») ³⁶. The Classical Latin term for «day», *diēs* (*ē*-stem), cannot be separated from its numerous Celtic cognates, e.g., OIr. *diē* «day», OW. *did* «id.», MW. *dydd*, OBret. *ded*, Bret. *deiz* «day» ³⁷. The Insular Celtic forms regularly go back to PC. **diiī-* (< **diiī-* < **diiī-*), demonstrating a similar morphological shape to Lat. *diēs* f./m. (*ē*-stem) «day». The Latin, Goidelic Celtic and Bryttonic Celtic appellatives for «day» derive from the Italo-Celtic archetype **diiīēs*, which finally goes back to an elliptic dual (PIE.) **diu-ih₁* («day and night», literally «two days») ³⁸, created on the basis of the simple Proto-Indo-European noun **diióm* n. «clear sky, day», which is clearly attested in four subgroups:

- 3.1. INDO-ARYAN: Ved. *divám* n. «clear sky, day» (< PIE. **diióm*); Ved. *sudivám* n. «beautiful day», *divédive* (reduplicated loc. sg.) «every day» (< PIE. **diiói-diiói*);
- 3.2. ARMENIAN: Arm. *tiv* (*o*-stem) «day» (< PIE. **diióm*);
- 3.3. ITALIC: OLat. *diuom* n. (*o*-stem) «sky» (< PIE. **diióm*), Lat. *sub diuō* «under the open sky»; note that some early compounds like Lat. *bīduum* n. «a period of two days» (< **diiis-diióm*) and *trīduum* n. «a period of three days» (< **trīs-diióm*) additionally demonstrate the alternative meaning «day»;
- 3.4. CELTIC: PC. **diióm* n. «day» is attested in some archaic compounds, e.g., OIr. *indíu* «today» (< Goidelic Celtic **en-diióm*, lit. «in the day»); W. *heddiw* «today», Corn. *hethew* «id.» (< Bryttonic Celtic **se-diióm*, lit. «this day») ³⁹.

³⁶ The duale tantum **diiī* represents an Italo-Celtic isogloss. Parallel elliptic formations are also attested in Indo-Aryan, e.g., Ved. *ābanī* n. du. «day and night», lit. «two days» (← Ved. *ābar-*, *ābas-* n. «day») vs. Skt. *rātry-ābanī* n. du. «night and day» (dvandva dual); Ved. *dyāvā* f. du. «night and day» (RV I 113.2d), lit. «two days» (← Ved. *divám* n. «clear sky, day»); Ved. *uśāsā* f. du. «dawn and night», lit. «two dawns» (← Ved. *uśās-* n. *s*-stem «morning light, dawn, morning»); Ved. *nāktā* f. du. «night and day/dawn», lit. «two nights» (← Ved. *nāktam* n. *o*-stem «night», *nāktiḥ* f. *i*-stem «id.») vs. Ved. *nāktā-uśāsā* f. du. «night and dawn» (dvandva dual).

³⁷ Matasović 2009, 101.

³⁸ The dual forms can be created not only from a basic stem, but also directly from a nominal root, cf. PSl. **oko* (gen. sg. **očese*) n. (*es*-stem) «eye» vs. PSl. **oči* du. «two eyes». This instance shows that the original stem of the basic word was frequently disregarded during creating some dual forms.

³⁹ Pokorný 1959, 185; Matasović 2009, 101; Witczak 2021, 272-273.

The Italo-Celtic formation in question (**diuīēs*), originally representing the so-called *duale tantum* (PIE. **diuīh₁*), lost an elliptic and abstract sense («day and night; 24 hours' time», lit. «two days») and secondarily introduced a singular meaning («a day»). In other words, the primitive *duale tantum* was singularized as early as in a late Italo-Celtic period or in the archaic stage of Old Latin, hence it became the *singulare tantum* (Proto-Latin **diuīēs*, lit. «time of 24 hours») and later a simple noun *diēs* with the singular meaning («day») in Classical Latin⁴⁰. The semantic innovation resulted in creating the plural forms as early as the preliterary phase of Archaic Latin⁴¹. It cannot be doubted that the genitive plural form *diērum* («of days»), like OLat. *bouērum* «of two oxen» and OLat. *Iouērum* «of two Jupiters (in elliptic sense)», should be treated as a reflex of the lost dual paradigm, partially pluralized in the early phase of Old Latin.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Let us briefly recapitulate our results and research hypotheses.

- 4.1. By the 2nd century BCE, old dual forms that used to end in *-ē* (< PIE **-eh₁*) had been remodelled as plural, e.g., gen. pl. *-ērum*. Latin authors of the 3rd or 2nd centuries BCE attest the following innovative forms: OLat. *bouērum* (gen. pl. ← **bouē* nom.-acc. du. «two oxen» ← *bōs* nom. sg.), *Iouērum* (gen. pl. ← **Iouē* nom.-acc. du. «Jupiter and Juno» ← *Iouis*, earlier **Diouis* nom. sg.), *lapidērum* (gen. pl. ← **lapidē* nom.-acc. du. «two stones/rocks» ← *lapis* nom. sg.), *nāuērum* (gen. pl. ← **nāuē* nom.-acc. du. «two ships» ← *nāuis* nom. sg.), *nucērum* (gen. pl. ← **nucē* nom.-acc. du. «two nuts/boats» ← *nux* nom. sg.) and *rēgērum* (gen. pl. ← **rēgē* nom.-acc. du. «two kings» ← *rēx* nom. sg.).
- 4.2. The disappearance of the dual category from Latin, as I argue, was frequently connected with the pluralization of old dual forms, i.e.,

⁴⁰ Cf. Witczak 2021b, 270. The suggested dual explanation of Lat. *dies* f./m. «day» will be discussed in more detail in my separate article devoted to selected Italo-Celtic archaisms.

⁴¹ It should be emphasized that the Latin word *rēs* preserved the original abstract sense («reality, truth, property», supported by the etymological relation to some Indo-Iranian abstracts, e.g., Ved. *rayīh* m./f. «property» and Av. *raiiš* f. «wealth», cf. de Vaan 2008, 520-521) and later introduced a secondary concrete meaning («thing, object»). In other words, the Latin word *rēs*, as well as *diēs*, gained the full paradigm thanks to their innovative semantics. Note that attestations of OLat. *res* in *The Laws of the Twelve Tables*, formally promulgated in 449 BCE but linguistically modernized many times during the Late Roman Republic, suggest an early date of this concrete sense.

- associating them with a plural meaning and morphology. The same process is also attested in other Indo-European languages, which lost the dual number.
- 4.3. In my opinion, the pluralization of old dual forms like *bouēs*, *bouērum* (← **bouē* nom.-acc. du.) caused the accumulation of a large number of nouns characterized by the element *-ē-* (i.e., the typical dual feature) within the third declension. This is why a number of anomalous genitive plural forms in *-ērum* appeared in the Latin language of the pre-Classical era.
 - 4.4. The primitive *dualia tantum*, construed as unified twofold objects, were frequently collectivized and singularized, providing the basis for the formation of the Latin fifth declension, characterized precisely by the presence of a large number of lexemes only appearing in the singular form (*singularia tantum*) with a singular meaning. Only two Latin nouns of the fifth declension, *diēs* and *rēs*, attest a full paradigm, including plural forms and plural sense.
 - 4.5. The Latin term *diēs* f./m. «day» (gen. pl. *diērum*) is explained as a trace of the original *duale tantum* **diuī* n. du. «day and night; 24 hours» (← OLat. *diuom* n. «heaven, sky», also «day»). This term can be treated as the main basis for creating the Latin (and Proto-Italic) fifth declension.

KRZYSZTOF TOMASZ WITCZAK
ORCID: 0000-0001-8895-974X
University of Lodz, Poland
krzysztof.witczak@uni.lodz.pl

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams 1991
D.Q. Adams, The Dual in Indo-European and Tocharian, *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 5 (1991), 11-44.
- Adrados 1994
F.R. Adrados, *Diccionario griego-español*, IV, Madrid 1994.
- Beekes 2011
R.S.P. Beekes, *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*, Amsterdam - Philadelphia 2011.
- Briscoe 2005
J. Briscoe, The Language and Style of the Fragmentary Roman Republican Historians, in T. Reinhardt - M. Lapidge - J.N. Adams (eds.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, Oxford 2005, 53-72.

- Buck 1959
C.D. Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, Chicago 1959.
- Burrow 2001
T. Burrow, *The Sanskrit Language*, Delhi 2001.
- Collinge 1985
N.E. Collinge, *The Laws of Indo-European*, Amsterdam - Philadelphia 1985.
- Dalby 2010
A. Dalby (ed.), *Cato, On Farming / De Agricultura*, Totnes 2010.
- de Melo 2019
W.D.C. de Melo (ed.), *Varro, De lingua Latina*, I-II, Oxford 2019.
- de Vaan 2008
M. de Vaan, *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*, Leiden - Boston 2008.
- Długosz-Kurczabowa - Dubisz 2006
K. Długosz-Kurczabowa - S. Dubisz, *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego*, Warszawa 2006.
- Fritz 2011
M. Fritz, *Der Dual im Indogermanischen. Genealogischer und typologischer Vergleich einer grammatischen Kategorie im Wandel*, Heidelberg 2011.
- Graßmann 1996⁶
H. Graßmann, *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*, edited by M. Kozianka, Wiesbaden 1996⁶.
- Harrison 2016
F. Harrison, *The Complete Works of Cato the Elder*, Hastings 2016.
- Hooper 1934
W.D. Hooper (ed.), *Cato and Varro, On Agriculture*, London - Cambridge, MA 1934.
- Keil 1857
H. Keil (ed.), *Flavii Sosipatri Charisii Artis grammaticae libri V*, in H. Keil (ed.), *Grammatici latini*, I, Lipsiae 1857.
- Kent 1946
R.G. Kent, *The Forms of Latin: A Descriptive and Historical Morphology*, Baltimore, MA 1946.
- Kent 1958
R.G. Kent (ed.), *Varro, On the Latin Language*, II, London - Cambridge, MA 1958.
- Malzahn 1999
M. Malzahn, *Der nominale Dual im Rgveda. Diplomarbeit zur Erlangung des Magistergrades der Philosophie an der Geisteswissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Universität Wien*, Wien 1999.
- Matasović 2009
R. Matasović, *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*, Leiden - Boston 2009.

- Mayrhofer 1992
M. Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, I, Heidelberg 1992.
- Mazzarino 1982²
A. Mazzarino (ed.), *M. Porci Catonis De Agricultura*, Leipzig 1982².
- Monier-Williams 1999
M. Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Delhi 1999.
- Nussbaum 1986
A.J. Nussbaum, *Head and Horn in Indo-European*, Berlin - New York 1986.
- Oliphant 1912
S.G. Oliphant, The Vedic Dual: Part VI, The Elliptic Dual; Part VII, The Dual Dvandva, *JAOS* 32.1 (1912), 33-57.
- Pokorny 1959
J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern - München 1959.
- Reichardt 2008
C. Reichardt, *Sprachlich-stilistische Untersuchungen zu den frühen römischen Historikern*, Bamberg 2008.
- Sihler 1995
A.L. Sihler, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, New York - Oxford 1995.
- Untermann 2000
J. Untermann, *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*, Heidelberg 2000.
- Vendryes 1959
J. Vendryes, *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien*, I, A-B, Dublin - Paris 1959.
- Weiss 2009
M. Weiss, *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*, Ann Arbor - New York 2009.
- White 2010
K.D. White, *Farm Equipment of the Roman World*, Cambridge - London - New York - Melbourne 2010.
- Witczak 1999
K.T. Witczak, On the Indo-European Origin of Two Lusitanian Theonyms, *Emerita* 67.1 (1999), 65-73.
- Witczak 2001
K.T. Witczak, Reve Gallaeco: A Contribution to the Worship of a Sky-God in the Ancient Gallaecia and Lusitania, *Eos* 88 (2001), 245-253.
- Witczak 2005
K.T. Witczak, *Język i religia Luzytanów. Studium historyczno-porównawcze*, Łódź 2005.
- Witczak 2015a
K.T. Witczak, Konsekwencje zaniku liczby podwójnej w języku łacińskim. Głos w sprawie dualnej genezy piątej deklinacji łacińskiej, *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 63.6 (2015), 101-120.

Witczak 2015b

K.T. Witczak, Gaulish SUIOREBE ‘with two sisters’, *Lingua Posnaniensis* 57.2 (2015), 59-62.

Witczak 2017a

K.T. Witczak, Pozostałości liczby podwójnej w języku łacińskim epoki archaicznej, *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 65.3 (2017), 37-58.

Witczak 2017b

K.T. Witczak, Łacińskie *tōrum* w świetle etymologii, *LingVaria* 12.2 (2017), 185-196.

Witczak 2018

K.T. Witczak, O kilku możliwych śladach *duale tantum* w językach indoeuropejskich, *LingVaria* 13.2 (2018), 47-58.

Witczak 2019

K.T. Witczak, Liczba podwójna w archaicznej poezji rzymskiej, *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 67.3 (2019), 107-123.

Witczak 2021a

K.T. Witczak, Rodilniške oblike na *-erum* in *-us* v arhaični latinščini, *Keria: Studia Latina et Graeca* 23.1 (2021), 5-18.

Witczak 2021b

K.T. Witczak, The Origin of the Latin Fifth Declension, *Philologia Classica* 19.2 (2021), 262-276.

Witczak - Kaczor 1995

K.T. Witczak - I. Kaczor, Linguistic Evidence for the Indo-European Pantheon, in J. Rybowska - K.T. Witczak (eds.), *Collectanea Philologica II in honorem Annae Mariae Komornicka*, Łódź 1995, 265-278.

Wodtko - Irslinger - Schneider 2008

D.S. Wodtko - B. Irslinger - C. Schneider, *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*, Heidelberg 2008.

Copyright (©) 2023 Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak

Editorial format and graphical layout: copyright (©) LED Edizioni Universitarie



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives – 4.0 International License

How to cite this paper: K.T. Witczak, Old Latin *bouerum* and *Iouerum* from a Diachronic Point of View, *Erga-Logoi* 11.2 (2023), 141-154. doi: <https://doi.org/10.7358/erga-2023-002-witk>