PAPERS AND MONOGRAPHS OF THE FINNISH INSTITUTE AT ATHENS VOL. XVII

VARIATION AND CHANGE IN GREEK AND LATIN

Edited by
Martti Leiwo, Hilla Halla-aho & Marja Vierros

HELSINKI 2012

ISSN 1237-2684
ISBN 978-952-67211-4-9

Printed in Greece by ΑΛΦΑΒΗΤΟ ABEE, Athens

Cover: Riikka Pulkkinen

Layout: Sarianna Kivimäki, Maija Lehikoinen and Lassi Jakola

Contents

Literary Late Latin and the Development of the Spoken Language

Gerd V.M. Haverling

Introduction

All languages change over time, and we can observe that process particularly well in Latin and Greek, since we have documents written in these languages from a very long period of time. Some of the changes from Early to Late Latin occur in texts of every kind from the later periods; but due to a conservative school tradition, the language in the literary texts is often astonishingly similar to that of the Classical or early Post-classical period. The definition of the literary standard varies, however, a great deal. It changes gradually over the centuries, but there are also differences between contemporary literary authors, some of whom were more conservative than others; and sometimes one and the same author may be more conservative in one text than in another.

The differences in language and style which we find in the texts from the Late Latin period are therefore considerable. Several less literary texts provide us with many linguistic features which do not meet the requirements of the literary standard, whereas the authors of the literary texts differ in attitude towards the ongoing changes in the language. Some of the changes occur, however, in all sorts of Late Latin texts, since there is a difference between changes in the language of which the educated authors were aware and had learnt to avoid and those changes of which they were not aware.

Many new linguistic features in the Late Latin texts reflect the growing difference between spoken and written language in Late Antiquity. Some of them, however, may reflect not the language of the authors themselves, but rather the competence of later scribes.

The problem of the manuscripts

The substandard Latin expressions occurring in some Late Latin texts are often found in contemporary inscriptions too, which thus confirm the existence of such expressions in the Latin of the time.[1] However, in the texts transmitted to us by manuscript traditions such substandard features are often very problematic, because the manuscripts contradict each other. A famous example of this is the late sixth century historian Gregory of Tours, whose Latin appears in a more irregular shape in his most popular work, the *Decem libri historiarum* "Ten Books on History", than in his other works.[2] The contradictions in the manuscripts of such texts concern in particular the spelling system and the use of case forms and prepositions.

Many orthographical problems of this kind occur in the 11th century manuscript which is our only source for a text of some importance for our assessment of the difference

---

[1] See e.g. Galdi 2004.

[2] Haverling 2008a; Hilchenbach 2009, esp. 85–87.

between spoken and literary Latin in the late fourth century CE, the *Itinerarium Egeriae*.[3] By the late fourth century the final *-m* in for instance the accusative forms had been weakly pronounced for centuries,[4] but its spelling is nevertheless quite consistent in the literary texts. From this point of view Egeria's *Itinerarium* is in a mess: we sometimes read *per giro* without the *-m* (*Itin. Eger.* 2.5, 3.6, 19.10), sometimes *per girum* with it (*Itin. Eger.* 2.6, 3.1, 4.4, 8.1, 13.3); and in one passage we read *Antiochia* 'to Antioch' as well as *Ierusolimam* 'to Jerusalem' (*Itin. Eger.* 22.1); with the preposition *cum* we have both the ablative form *epistula* (*Itin. Eger.* 19.16) and the accusative form *epistulam* (*Itin. Eger.* 19.17); and in one passage the form *terra* is an accusative and what looks like the infinitive *nosse* 'to know' is actually the first person imperfect subjunctive form *nossem* 'I knew' (*Itin. Eger.* 7.1). There are, however, also problems which could not easily be ascribed to the phonetic development. With the preposition *cum* we usually have the ablative (e.g. *Itin. Eger.* 35.2 *cum apostolis*), but in a couple of cases we have the accusative and in one of them the accusative form could not just be ascribed to the slack pronunciation of *-m* (e.g. *Itin. Eger.* 24.1 *cum monazontes*).

Similar orthographical problems occur in the manuscript traditions to for instance Gregory of Tours, Jordanes, Benedict of Nursia and the Late Latin translation of the *Hippocratic Aphorisms*. In such cases there is often a variation between different manuscripts, some of which have a more irregular form of Latin than others. There is, however, often also much variation within the manuscripts which present us with a less elegant form of Latin, in the sense that both correct and incorrect expressions occur in them: the manuscripts which have the correct form *a septem mensibus* 'from the age of seven months' in the commentary to Hippocr. *Aphor*. 3.25 tend to always be correct in the choice of case form in such prepositional phrases, whereas the manuscripts which have the incorrect form *a septem menses* in that passage oscillate between correct and incorrect forms with the preposition *ab*.[5]

Sometimes this variation reflects the ongoing changes in the language in a direct manner, as for instance the use of the accusative with the preposition *cum*, which we encounter in inscriptions and other contemporary documents from the first century onwards, which means that it probably was a common feature in the language spoken in the late fourth century CE.[6] This is, however, not always so: the variation between, for instance, *post quas lectiones* and *post quibus lectiones* in the manuscripts to Benedict's rule (Bened. *Reg*. 11.4) and *de quibus ... testatur* and *de quas ... testatur* in Jordanes' *Getica* (Iord. *Get*. 44) does not indicate that the incorrect forms *post quibus ...* and *de quas ...* occurred in the spoken language,[7] but rather that the changes in the case system had reached a point where the accusative and ablative case endings were regarded as equivalent written varieties.

The question is whether we may ascribe such substandard features to the authors of these texts or whether they should be ascribed to later scribes. Väänänen thought that

---

[3] This manuscript was found in Arezzo in 1884; cf. Maraval 1982, 40ff.

[4] Leumann 1977 § 228; Väänänen 1981 § 127.

[5] Haverling 2003a, 166; Haverling 2010b, 109–110.

[6] The earliest examples of this usage occur in inscriptions from Pompeii (e.g. *CIL* IV 698 *Saturninus cum discentes suos*) and in a letter by Claudius Terentianus (*C.Epist.Lat.* 146 = *P. Mich.* VIII 471 l. 22 *con tirones*): see Väänänen 1981 § 247.

[7] On the variation in Benedict's rule, see Coleman 1999, 351; in Iord. *Get*. 44, Mommsen (1882, 65) has *de quas*, whereas Giunta and Grillone (1991, 20) have *de quibus*; on Jordanes, see also Galdi 2008.

we could ascribe much of the orthography in the only manuscript in which we have her *Itinerarium* to Egeria herself.[8] This is, however, by no means certain. There were medieval scribes, especially after the Carolingian Renaissance, who were very well capable of rendering our texts more handsome – perhaps more so than they should be – and there were scribes, especially in the earlier Middle Ages, who obviously created quite a lot of confusion when they dealt with our texts.[9] This does not mean that the *Itinerarium Egeriae* is no longer of value for our assessment of the colloquial Latin of around 400 CE – just that we do not know whether all the inconsistencies in grammar and spelling actually belong to the author.

The problems of such manuscript traditions is thus of importance for the assessment which we make of the development of the spoken language. It is, however, also of importance for the way in which we look upon the historical development and the cultural setting in Late Antiquity and especially in the sixth century CE.

Cases and prepositions in literary and less literary Late Latin

The changes in the case system and in the use of the prepositions are reflected in different ways in literary and in less literary Late Latin texts. In Late Antiquity the grammarians were very well aware of the ongoing changes in this field and they warned against them and recommended the usage found in Classical authors such as Terence, Cicero, Sallust and Virgil. One example of the less literary character of her language is Egeria's use of the preposition *de* instead of *ex* 'out of' (*Itin. Eger*. 3.6 *de ecclesia* 'from the church') and *ab* 'from' (*Itin. Eger*. 1.2 *de eo loco* 'from that place'). The grammarians warn against this kind of mistake (1). In the literary Late Latin texts we usually find the prepositions recommended by the grammarians (e.g. Amm. 29.5.19 *e latibulis ... egressi* 'having left their hiding places') or, especially in the more conservative literary texts, the separative ablative (e.g. Iul. Val. 1.7 *conclavi exit* 'he left the room'):[10]

1) Terent. Scaur. *Gramm*. 7 p. 31 *'de' quoque non numquam perperam ponitur pro 'ex', ut cum 'de provincia venire' quis dicit ... eximus ut 'e nave', 'e circo', sic 'e provincia'*

   De is also often incorrectly used instead of *ex*, as when someone says *de provincia venire* 'to come from the province' … as we say *e nave* 'from the ship' and *e circo* 'from the circus', so we also say *e provincia* 'from the province'.

Another example of this variation in the choice of the preposition is found in the expressions meaning 'from a city/town'. In such expressions, we find the separative ablative in the Latin of the late Republic (e.g. Cic. *Catil*. 2.16 *Roma profectus est* 'he left Rome'), but from the early empire onwards the prepositional phrase with *ab* becomes frequent (e.g. Liv. 26.15.8 *ab Roma venit* 'he came from Rome'). In literary Late Latin

---

[8] Väänänen 1987, 19–21. For some more examples of the spelling, cf. Väänänen 1987, 25f.

[9] See e.g. Coleman 1999, 345ff.; cf. Haverling 2005a; Haverling 2008a. Even a text written in perfect Classical Latin might be affected by "Merovingian" orthography and there are traces of an archetype of that kind in the later manuscripts to Caesar's *De bello Gallico*: see Buchner 1955, XXXVII.

[10] See Hofmann and Szantyr 1965 § 72.I; cf. Haverling 1988, 223ff.; Haverling 2006, 352; cf. also Arusianus Messius, 469 l. 27; Dosith. *Gramm*., 425 l. 16.

the more frequent form is *ab* (e.g. Aug. *Conf*. 5.13 *a Mediolanio* 'from Milan'), whereas the separative ablative has an archaic and poetic character (e.g. Amm. 31.7.1 *Antiochia ...egressurus* 'intending to leave Antioch'). Egeria normally uses the preposition *de* (e.g. *Itin. Eger.* 13.2 *profecta sum de Ierusolima*, 18.1 *profecta sum de Antiochia*), but once she has an expression without a preposition (*Itin. Eger.* 10.3 *proficiscens ergo Ierusolima*). In the late sixth century, Gregory of Tours frequently uses the preposition *ab* (e.g. *Franc*. 3.10 *ab Arverno*), but sometimes he has *de* instead (e.g. *Franc*. 3.2 *de Rutino*).[11]

Egeria often has a prepositional phrase where contemporary literary Latin usually does not. In the expressions meaning 'to a city', she sometimes has the accusative of direction (e.g. *Itin. Eger.* 17.3 *revertebar Constantinopolim*) and sometimes the prepositional phrase with *in* (e.g. *Itin. Eger.* 12.11 *regressi sumus in Ierusolimam*). She never uses the locative but usually replaces that form with prepositional phrases with *in* (e.g. *Itin. Eger.* 25.12 *in Bethleem ... in Ierusolima*) or *apud* (e.g. *Itin. Eger.* 23.3 *apud Ierusolimam*); and in one case she has the form *Ierusolima* without preposition in the sense 'at Jerusalem' (*Itin. Eger.* 49.2). In contemporary literary Late Latin, however, the use of the accusative of direction is still the rule (e.g. Aug. *Conf*. 4.7 *veni Carthaginem* and Symm. *Epist*. 2.24 *Romam ... venit*); and although it is quite clear that the locative had lost ground in the language of everyday conversation,[12] it is still regularly used in the higher register of fourth century literary Latin (e.g. Symm. *Epist*. 1.102 *Mediolani* and Aug. *Conf*. 5.12 *Romae* and 6.7 *Carthagini*), although there are instances in which *apud* and the accusative seems to have this function as well (e.g. Aug. *Conf*. 5.8 *apud Carthaginem* and Symm. *Epist*. 9.48 *apud Ariminum*). In the late sixth century, Gregory of Tours frequently uses the accusative of direction (e.g. *Franc*. 2.1 *Romam veniens*), but also indeclinable nouns (e.g. *Franc*. 2.38 *Parisius venit*), the dative (e.g. *Franc*. 3.13 *Arverno regressus est*) or prepositional phrases (e.g. *Franc*. 10.12 *in Pectavum*, 2.37 *ad Arvernus*).[13] He occasionally uses the locative (e.g. *Franc*. 1.40 *Romae*), but also indeclinable expressions (e.g. *Franc*. 3.18 *Parisius*) and prepositional phrases (e.g. *Franc*. 2.36 *in Arverno*, 2.43 *apud Parisius*) in that function. Literary Late Latin, as reflected by Symmachus and Augustine, is in this respect very close to Classical and early Post-classical Latin, whereas the usage met with in the *Itinerarium Egeriae* is closer to what we find in sixth century texts like Jordanes' *Romana* and the *Decem libri historiarum* by Gregory of Tours.[14]

There is thus a certain amount of inconsistency in the choice between case forms and prepositional phrases in Late Latin. There is, however, more such inconsistency in the less literary texts. In the sense 'with his/their hands', Egeria has the classical ablative of instrument, *manibus suis*, in one passage (*Itin. Eger.* 3.6) and the prepositional phrase,

---

[11] See Hofmann and Szantyr 1965 § 72.I; cf. Bonnet 1890, 576–578; Väänänen 1987, 27, 35f.; Haverling 2005a, 340; Haverling 2006, 351.

[12] The use of the locative in expressions indicating direction is found in a letter of Claudius Terentianus (*C.Epist. Lat.* 146 = *P. Mich*. VIII 471 l. 25 *venio tecum Alexandrie* 'I come with you to Alexandria') and perhaps already when a freedman is speaking in Petronius (*Sat*. 62.1 *forte dominus Capuae exierat*); it also occurs in a *Vetus Latina* translation of the Bible (Vet. Lat. II *Tim*. 1.17 cod. d *cum venisset Romae*; cf. Vulg. II *Tim*. 1.17 *sed cum Romam venisset*): see Hofmann and Szantyr 1965 § 88b; cf. Haverling 1988, 203f.

[13] See Hofmann and Szantyr 1965 § 72.Ia; cf. Bonnet 1890, 569–574; Väänänen 1987, 26; Haverling 2005a, 338; Haverling 2006, 349–350.

[14] See Bonnet 1890, 574–576; Väänänen 1987, 26; Galdi 2008; cf. Haverling 2005a, 339; Haverling 2006, 350; Haverling 2011b, 280.

de manibus suis, in another (*Itin. Eger.* 37.2);[15] and in an adverbial phrase meaning 'that day', she seems to have both the ablative *ea die* (*Itin. Eger.* 29.6) and the prepositional phrase *in ea die* (*Itin. Eger.* 3.2). There is, however, some inconsistency of this kind even in the literary texts: in the sense 'in that night' Augustine has both *hac nocte* (e.g. Aug. *Cons. evang*. 3.2.7) and *in hac nocte* (e.g. Aug. *Cons. evang*. 3.2.6).[16]

Sometimes we find a pure case form instead of a prepositional phrase used in Classical Latin. With the verb *ingredior* 'go into' Egeria sometimes uses the preposition *ad* (*Itin. Eger.* 11.1 *cum ... ingressi fuissemus ad eos*), as in Classical Latin and in literary Late Latin (e.g. Aug. *Conf*. 8.12 *ad matrem ingredimur*), but in one passage she uses the dative in that function (*Itin. Eger.* 39.5 *ingressus est discipulis*); this dative of direction is more frequent two centuries later, for instance in Gregory of Tours (e.g. *Franc*. 3.5 p. 112.20 *Lugduno regressus est* 'he returned to Lyon').[17]

There are, however, new uses of the genitive which we find in the literary texts from the late fourth century. The ablative is often replaced by other expressions when occurring with adjectives. In Egeria we have the expression *instructus de scripturis* 'learned in the Holy Scriptures' (*Itin. Eger.* 20.9), where Classical Latin would prefer the so-called 'ablative of respect', *instructus litteris* 'equipped with literary learning' (e.g. Cic. *De orat*. 3.137), and where a more literary late fourth century author like the Christian historian Sulpicius Severus uses the genitive 'of respect', *vir divinarum rerum instructissimus* 'very learned in the religious matters' (*Chron*. 2.42.2). Sometimes we even find this genitive with verbs, such as with *dissentire* 'disagree' in Symmachus (2a) and with *erubescere* 'be ashamed' in Jerome (2b). With *dissentire* Cicero preferred the construction with *de* (e.g. *De orat*. 3.114); and with *erubescere* too, Classical Latin used the construction with *de* (e.g. Sen. *Contr*. 2.3.8).[18] Here we have both a change in the function of the old case form and a growing overlap between the function of the case form and the prepositional phrase:

2a) Symm. *Epist.* 1.15.2 *tunc nostrates viri, qui inter se aliarum rerum saepe dissentiunt, concordem sententiam super huius laude tenuerunt*

who among themselves often disagree about other matters

2b) Hier. *Epist.* 22.7 *non erubesco infelicitatis meae*

I am not ashamed of my unhappiness.

One of the problems which we are facing in literary Late Latin concerns the extent to which such new uses of the old case forms reflect a new use of these forms in the spoken language and the extent to which they are to be regarded as hypercorrect. In the late fourth century, the new use of the genitive found in the literary texts does not freely occur on any occasion when the preposition could be used: in (2a–b) there is a connection with the

---

[15] See Väänänen 1981 § 248; cf. de la Villa 1998.

[16] See Hofmann and Szantyr 1965 § 87; cf. Haverling 1988, 217.

[17] See Hofmann and Szantyr 1965 § 70; cf. Bonnet 1890, 536ff., 572f.; Löfstedt 1911, 10f., 323; Skahill 1934, 38; Bieter 1938, 62ff.; Molinelli 1996; Haverling 2006; Haverling 2011b, 280, 282.

[18] See Haverling 1988, 141, 176ff., 186; Haverling 2005a, 341–342.

genitive of respect with adjectives. However, the fact that there was this expansion of the case forms in literary Latin at the same time as they apparently declined in the spoken language suggests that there is a connection with the development of the prepositional phrases: this is suggested when the genitive is used instead of Classical Latin *ab* (and Late Latin *de*) in the sixth century (cf. e.g. Greg. Tur. *Franc*. 7.29 *detractu a balteo gladio* and Greg. Tur. *Franc*. 7.47 *extracto baltei gladio* 'having drawn his sword from the belt').[19]

Sometimes old features were reinterpreted and given a slightly new function or sense in the later texts. One example of this is the overlap between the genitive and the nominative, which is the result of a reinterpretation of certain earlier uses of the genitive of possession. In Classical Latin we encounter this kind of genitive, always with an attribute, in expressions indicating what was in accordance with somebody's habit (e.g. Cic. *Verr*. 2.1.66 *negavit moris esse Graecorum* 'he said that it was not in accordance with Greek custom'); there is a similar expression with the possessive dative and the nominative without an attribute (e.g. Liv. 5.27.1 *mos erat Faliscis* 'it was the custom of the Faliscians'). In the first century CE, however, these two expressions overlap and this kind of genitive occurs without an attribute (e.g. Vell. 2.37.5 *sicuti Pompeio moris erat* 'as was Pompey's custom'). In later Latin this genitive sometimes competes with the corresponding nominative constructions. In Egeria we have the expression *consuetudinis nobis erat* 'it was our habit' (*Itin. Eger*. 10.1 and 15.4) and *desiderii fuit* 'it was (my) wish' (*Itin. Eger*. 7.1). In Symmachus we have several examples of this use of the genitive; a particularly striking case is in (3):[20]

3) Symm. *Epist*. 8.61 *vulgati quippe proverbii est, enavigato Maleo oblimari eorum memoriam, quos domi reliqueris ...*

An old proverb says that once you have passed Maleum the memory of those you have left back home will fade away.

This use of the genitive seems to be a part of the literary language rather than of the language of everyday conversation.[21] If that is so, we have here one of several examples of Egeria's use of literary linguistic features.[22]

Some of the changes in the case system and in the use of the prepositions which we find in a text like the *Itinerarium Egeriae* do not occur, or are rare, in the more literary texts from the same period. There is, however, some variation between prepositional phrases and the pure case forms even in the literary texts, but there are also examples of new uses of the old case forms, which are sometimes due to a reinterpretation of the old case functions and sometimes connected to the growing use of the prepositional phrases in the spoken language.

---

[19] See Haverling 2006; Haverling 2011b, 290f.; on the use of the prepositions in the more colloquial language, see e.g. Molinelli 1996.

[20] See Haverling 1988, 155–157; cf. the nominative in Sen. *Epist*. 22.1 *Vetus proverbium est gladiatorem in harena capere consilium: aliquid adversarii vultus, aliquid manus mota, aliquid ipsa inclinatio corporis intuentem monet*.

[21] Cf. Löfstedt 1911, 278ff.

[22] Another example is her use of polite formulations such as *nolo aestimet affectio vestra* (*Itin. Eger*. 20.13): cf. Haverling 2005a, 324–325. For such "literary" features in the letters of Claudius Terentianus, see Halla-aho 2009, 62–63.

Subordination in literary and less literary Late Latin

One of the fundamental changes from Early and Classical Latin to Late Latin and Romance is the increasing tendency to use conjunctions instead of the accusative and the infinitive with the so-called *verba dicendi et sentiendi*. The accusative and the infinitive is in these cases the by far most frequent construction in the Late Latin texts, but there is a difference in the choice among the alternative constructions. In a very conservative author like the fourth century pagan senator Q. Aurelius Symmachus, the only alternative found is *quod* (e.g. Symm. *Epist*. 9.1, 9.87), which is the alternative met with in the highest register of literary Late Latin. However, a Christian bishop like Ambrose sometimes also uses *quia* (e.g. *Epist*. 57.6), which represents a somewhat less conservative level of style in literary Late Latin. In Augustine there is a variation between the more conservative style in the *Contra Academicos* (five examples of *quod*), the somewhat less conservative style in the *Confessiones* (where there are also some examples of for instance *quia*), and the more colloquial style in his sermons, where *quia* is the by far most frequent alternative.[23] With the verb *dico* 'I say' a less literary author such as Egeria has *quoniam* (e.g. *Itin. Eger*. 12.7), *quia* (e.g. *Itin. Eger*. 12.9) and *eo quod* (e.g. *Itin. Eger*. 19.17).

Another difference between Late Latin and Classical Latin concerns indirect questions, which in Classical Latin were usually introduced by the conjunctions *num* and *-ne*; the conjunction *an* occurs in certain expressions, such as *haud scio an* 'I do not know that not' or *dubito an* 'I hesitate whether' (= 'perhaps'). In Post-classical Latin, however, *an* is often the conjunction used in indirect questions in the sense 'if, whether'. In less literary Late Latin we often find *si* (and the indicative) in this function (4a), whereas literary Late Latin normally has the post-classical use of *an* (4b) or a new literary Late Latin use of *utrum* (4c) (and the subjunctive) in this function.[24] The use of *num* (e.g. Symm. *Epist*. 1.11.2) or *-ne* (e.g. Symm. *Epist*. 1.76) is a kind of archaism in Late Latin:[25]

4a) *Vet. Lat. Sap*. 2.17 ap. Lact. *Inst*. 4.16.8 *videamus ergo, si sermones eius veri sunt*

Let us then see whether his speeches are true.

4b) Symm. *Epist*. 6.64 *scire postulo, an praedicta curatio efficax fuerit*

I would like to know whether the said cure was efficient.

4c) Symm. *Epist*. 6.8 *vestra in manu est, utrum hoc inultum esse patiamini*

It is up to you to decide, whether you shall let this behaviour go unpunished.

---

[23] See Hofmann and Szantyr 1965 § 312a Zus. α; cf. also Haverling 1988, 243ff. and Haverling 2005a, 331–332. For an analysis of this development in Late Latin, see Cuzzolin 1994.

[24] Cf. also e.g. Aug. *Civ*. 1.21: *et merito quaeritur, utrum pro iussu Dei sit habendum, quod ...* 'it is rightly asked whether it is to be taken as God's order that …'; see Hofmann and Szantyr 1965 § 250d; cf. Haverling 1988, 237–238.

[25] See e.g. Ernout and Thomas 1953 § 319; Väänänen 1981 § 379; cf. Haverling 1988, 236–239; Haverling 2003a, 168.

The different attitudes towards the literary standard are thus reflected by the choices in the syntax of subordination made by some contemporary authors who were all active in the late fourth century CE.

The verbal system in literary and less literary Late Latin

Some of the changes in the verbal system do not occur or are very rare in the more literary Late Latin texts. The periphrastic future with *habere*, which now and then occurs in Egeria (e.g. *Itin. Eger.* 2.1, 4.5, 24.1), is known from around 200 CE, when we meet it in Tertullian (e.g. *adv. Marc*. 4.40, *adv. Marc*. 5.13.3 and *anim*. 35.1) and Porphyrio (*Hor. epist*. 2.1.17), but although such expressions seem to have been common in the spoken language they are remarkably rare in the Late Latin texts, where they usually retain the original modal function when they occur. In the translations of the Bible, the *Vetus Latina* often has the construction with *habere* (e.g. Vet. Lat. *Luc*. cod. 5 19.4 *quia inde habebat transire* 'for he was to pass that way'), where the *Vulgate* has the periphrasis with the future participle (Vulg. *Luc*. 19.4 *quia inde erat transiturus*).[26] The colloquial character of the construction with *habere* is underlined by the fact that the only example of it in Gregory of Tours in the late sixth century is found in a passage of conversation (5):

5) Greg. Tur. *Mart*. 1.16 *dicit sanctus ad illam: 'In Gallias habui iam redire, sed propter istum qui foris iacet in atrium me remoratum profiteor'*

The holy man said to her: "I was already going to go back to Gaul, but I confess I stayed in the atrium because of him who is lying outside".

What appears to be the first example of the new synthetic future formed from this construction and found in most Romance languages, the form *daras* 'you shall give' (< *dare habes*), occurs as a pun in a conversation in Fredegar's *Chronicle* from the seventh century (Fredeg. *chron*. 2.62 p. 85).[27]

In later Latin there is a development where the constructions with past participles and forms of *esse* gradually stop expressing the perfect tense. In this new system the passive present form *amatur* is replaced by expressions like *amatus est* in the sense 'is loved'. The earlier examples are often in the subjunctive: *auditus sit* is by Egeria used in the sense of *audiatur* (*Itin. Eger.* 36.3) and *electae sint* 'are elected' (Pallad. 1.28.3) corresponds to *eligantur* in that sense in an earlier text (Colum. 8.11.11). Here we have a difference between less elegant Late Latin texts which have the new periphrastic forms (e.g. Chiron 307 *maxillae constrictae fient* 'the jaws are tied together') and more elegant texts which have the old synthetic passive forms (e.g. Veg. *mulom*. 2.92.2 *astringuntur ... maxillae* 'the jaws are tied together').[28] Connected to this development is the use of *fui* and *fueram* instead of *sum* and *eram* in the passive perfect and pluperfect. In Classical Latin there is a system in which the passive forms with *fui* or *fueram* and a past participle

[26] See Hofmann and Szantyr 1965 § 175g and Stotz 1998 § 62.1; cf. Haverling 2010a, 396–399; cf. NT *Luc*. 19.4 ὅτι ἐκείνης ἤμελλεν διέρχεσθαι 'for he was to pass that way'.

[27] See Bonnet 1890, 690.

[28] See Hofmann and Szantyr 1965 § 170 Zus. d; cf. Svennung 1935, 456–461; Kiss 1982, 23–26; Haverling 2010a, 371–372.

indicated anteriority, but in later Latin this system is blurred. In Classical Latin, in for instance the sense 'a city was founded', we only find the perfect with *est* (e.g. Cic. *Rep*. 2.10, Liv. 44.11); the first example of *condita fuit* is from the third century (Justin. 13.7.1 *Cyrene autem condita fuit ab Aristaeo* 'but Cyrene was founded by Aristaeus'); in later Latin we have more examples of this form, but the by far most frequent form met with in literary Late Latin is still *condita est*, as in Augustine (e.g. *Civ*. 18.22 *tempore igitur, quo Roma condita est* 'at the time, when Rome was founded').[29] In Egeria we have several examples of this phenomenon. Most of them are, however, in the pluperfect, where we meet the form *fueram* instead of the expected *eram* (e.g. *Itin. Eger.* 16.5 *quod ei fuerat revelatum*). But in the more literary texts of the late fourth century, we find a usage more in accordance with the classical rules and for instance Augustine normally uses the pluperfect with *eram* (e.g. *Conf*. 1.19 *in quam proiectus eram*).[30]

There are, however, changes which occur more frequently in literary Late Latin texts too. One such change is reflected by the inconsistency sometimes found in the use of tense forms. One example is found in a historical *cum*-clause which indicates a situation anterior to the one described by the main clause. In such cases Classical Latin prefers the pluperfect subjunctive (e.g. Cic. *fam*. 13.29.4), but Egeria has the imperfect subjunctive in such a clause (6a). There are examples in the Vulgate too (6b); and in Augustine we sometimes find the pluperfect (7a) and sometimes the imperfect (7b) in such clauses:[31]

6a) *Itin. Eger.* 13.4 *ego autem cum <u>viderem</u> locum tam gratum, requisivi*

but as I saw such a beautiful place, I asked

6b) Vulg. *Luc*. 13.12 *quam cum <u>videret</u> Iesus vocavit ad se et ait illi*

and when Jesus saw her, he called her and said to her

7a) Aug. *bapt.* 2.1.2 *cum <u>vidissem</u>, quia non recte ingrediuntur ad veritatem evangelii, dixi Petro*

as I had seen that they do not go into the truth of the gospel in the right way, I said to Peter

7b) Aug. *epist*. 82.2 *cum <u>viderem</u>, quia non recte ingrediuntur ad veritatem evangelii, dixi Petro*

as I saw that they do not go into the truth of the gospel in the right way, I said to Peter

The construction represented by *ne hoc feceris* 'don't do this!', which is quite frequent in Classical Latin, loses ground in Late Latin, and the corresponding use in the aorist in Greek (NT *Marc*. 10.19 μὴ φονεύσῃς, μὴ μοιχεύσῃς, μὴ κλέψῃς 'do not kill, do not commit adultery, do not steal') may be translated by the present subjunctive in the

---

[29] See Hofmann and Szantyr 1965 § 179 Zus. b; Stotz 1998 § 64; cf. Haverling 2010a, 428–432.

[30] In temporal clauses introduced by *cum* and with the nominative of the participle *ingressus*, we encounter only the imperfect subjunctive (e.g. *cum ingressus esset*) in texts from before ca. 200 CE, but in texts from ca. 200–500 CE we have 17 examples of the imperfect and 20 of the pluperfect subjunctive (e.g. *cum ingressus fuisset*): see CLCLT–6. In the eMGH–4, where the number of later and less polished texts is greater, we have 8 examples of the imperfect against 44 of the pluperfect.

[31] See Haverling 2010a, 418–419, 435–437.

Vulgate (Vulg. *Marc*. 10.19 *ne adulteres, ne occidas, ne fureris*). The use of constructions like *ne dixeris*, however, remains rather frequent in literary Late Latin, where there is an overlap with the constructions with the present subjunctive (8):[32]

8) Aug. *spec*. 23 *non sequaris concupiscentiam cordis et ne dixeris: 'quomodo potui?' ... ne dixeris: 'peccavi et quid accidit mihi triste?' ... et ne dicas: 'miseratio dei magna est, multitudinis peccatorum meorum miserebitur'*

Do not follow your heart's desire and do not say "how could I?" and do not say "I have sinned and what bad thing happened to me?" and do not say: "God's compassion is great; he will have pity on my numerous sins".

Classical Latin features were sometimes reinterpreted and given a slightly new function or sense in the later texts. One example of this is the use of the future perfect *videro* in main clauses, which in Classical Latin means 'I shall have a look at it later, I defer the matter for the present' (e.g. Cic. *fin*. 1.10.35, *de orat*. 2.2.33).[33] The future perfect had already become rare in main clauses in Classical Latin and in the subsequent development it became a form typically occurring in subordinate clauses, which the Late Latin grammarians (e.g. Sacerd. *Gramm.* 1 p. 453 ff., Don. *Gramm.* 1.4 p. 360 ff., p. 384, and Prisc. *Inst*. 8 p. 416 ff.) regarded as the future of the subjunctive and not, as Varro (*Ling*. 9.57, 9.96), as the future of the *perfectum*.[34] The use of *videro* in some literary Late Latin texts is therefore a reflexion of the phenomenon occuring in the earlier texts, but it is there found in the new sense 'I leave aside, I shall not discuss' (9a–b). In the old function 'I shall have a look at it later', later Latin has the simple future (e.g. Quint. *decl. min*. 275.2 *Postea videbo qua causa dimissus sit* 'I shall later discuss for what reason he has been discharged'):[35]

9a) Symm. *rel*. 3.10 *videro quale sit quod instituendum putatur*

I shall leave aside what it is that they want to introduce.

9b) Ambr. *exc. Sat.* 2.131 *sed videro quid vos de vobis, gentes, opinionis habeatis*

I shall leave aside what opinion you have of yourselves, you pagans.

The changes in the actional system are reflected in both literary and less literary Late Latin texts. In Classical Latin the opposition between atelic and telic actionality is often indicated by a prefix: we have for instance *edo* meaning 'eat of something' (e.g.

---

[32] See Ernout and Thomas 1953 § 251.II.B.1; Hofmann and Szantyr 1965 § 186.III; cf. Haverling 2010a, 399–400.

[33] See Haverling 2010a, 377–385, esp. 361f.; cf. Haverling 2010c, esp. 164–165.

[34] See Binnick 1991, 12, 42, 467; cf. Haverling 2010a, 377–385; Haverling 2010c, 167–171, Haverling forthcoming, section 2. For an overview of the changes in the modal function of the tense forms, see Haverling 2010d; Haverling forthcoming.

[35] See Haverling 2010a, 401–402: cf. also Aug. *fid. et op.* 12.18 *unde mox videbo, si deus iuverit, quid secundum scripturas sentiendum sit* 'therefore I shall soon discuss, if God helps me, what we have to think according to the scriptures'.

Plaut. *Capt*. 77) and *comedo* meaning 'eat up something' (e.g. Plaut. *Most*. 559). In Late Latin this opposition is blurred and *comedo* is frequently found in the atelic function (10). In this text, as well as in some other later texts we find partitive expressions (*de ligno* etc.) used to emphasize the atelic function:[36]

10) Vulg. *Gen*. 2.16–17 *(Deus) praecepitque ei dicens: ex omni ligno paradisi comede. de ligno autem scientiae boni et mali ne comedas. in quocumque enim die comederis ex eo morte morieris*

And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, "You may freely eat of every tree of the garden; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall die".

We have the same change in the relationship between *bibo*, which in Early and Classical Latin means 'drink of something' (e.g. Plaut. *Poen*. 534, Cato *orat*. frg. 221), and *ebibo*, which in Early and Classical Latin means 'drink something, empty a glass of something' (e.g. Plaut. *Curc*. 359, Cels. 5.27.4). In Late Latin we sometimes find a prepositional phrase emphasising the atelic function of *bibo* (11a), since the unprefixed verb now may be used in a telic sense as well (11b). There are, however, still some instances of *ebibo* in what resembles the old sense (11c):

11a) Vulg. *Ier*. 51.8 *de vino eius biberunt gentes*

The nations have drunken of her wine.

11b) *Hist. Aug*. 19.4.1 *bibisse autem illum saepe in die vini Capitolinam amforam constat, comedisse et quadraginta libras carnis ...*

It is clear that he often drank a Capitoline amphora of wine in a day and ate forty *librae* of meat.

11c) Ambr. *Noe* 29 *neque iustus vinum ebibit, sed de vino*

And the just man does not drink all the wine, but of the wine.

The opposition between a state and a change into a state was in Early and Classical Latin often expressed by the opposition between two verbs; for instance *taceo* means 'I am silent' (e.g. Plaut. *Curc*. 21) and *tacui* 'I have been silent, was silent' (e.g. Plaut. *Truc*. 817) on the one hand and *conticesco* 'I stop talking' (e.g. Plaut. *Bacch*. 798) and *conticui* 'I (have) stopped talking' (e.g. Plaut. *Asin*. 448) on the other. In Late Latin, however, this opposition is blurred and *tacui* now often occurs in the sense 'I stopped talking' (12a–b); and we also have some examples of a hypercorrect use of the prefixed *conticui* in the sense 'I have been silent' (13a), of which the earliest example is from around 200 CE (Ulp. *Dig*. 48.19.6). In the infectum *conticesco* and *taceo* were now regarded as synonyms (13b). *Conticeo*, which occurs in the sense 'stop talking' once in the first century CE, is a poetic formation (Calp. *Ecl*. 4.98); in Late Latin it occurs in some literary prose (e.g. Hier. *In Psalm*. 20) and in the grammarians, for instance in Priscian who describes it

[36] See Haverling 2000, 205–209; Haverling 2003b, 113ff.; Haverling 2008b, 74–82.

as the infectum form that corresponds to *conticui* (13c); a seventh century grammarian even mentions the verb *tacesco* (Virg. *Gramm. Epist*. 3.9). Many of the examples of the prefixed verb forms occur in grammarians; the other examples occur in the more literary forms of Late Latin:[37]

12a) Vulg. *Act*. 15.13 *postquam tacuerunt, respondit Jacobus*

when they stopped talking, J. answered

12b) Amm.16.6.3 *et Dorus evanuit et Verissimus ilico tacuit*

And Dorus disappeared and Verissimus immediately stopped talking.

13a) Symm. *Epist*. 5.89.1 *hucusque conticui*

I have kept silent so far.

13b) Mar. Victorin. *Defin*. p. 37.3 *conticescere est tacere*

Conticescere means the same as *tacere.*

13c) Prisc. *Gramm*. III 469.22–25 *'conticuere' quae pars orationis est? verbum. quale? perfectum. quo modo dictum? indicativo, coniugationis secundae. cur secundae? quia in praesenti tempore secundam personam in -es productam desinit, 'conticeo', 'contices'...*

Conticuere – what kind of word is it? A verb. Of which kind? A perfect. What form? The indicative, of the second conjugation. Why second? Because in the present tense the second person ends in -es, *conticeo*, *contices.*

In Early and Classical Latin we have the non-dynamic *latere* 'to be hiding' (e.g. Plaut. *Most*. 5, *Amph*. 432) and the dynamic *delitescere* 'to hide oneself' (e.g. Plaut. *Rud*. 466, Cic. *Nat. deor*. 2.52); but in literary Late Latin the prefixed verb is frequently used in the non-dynamic sense (14a–b):

14a) Amm. 27.12.11 *mensibus quinque delitescentes*

hiding for five months

14b) Claud. Mam. *Anim*. 2.9 p. 137.13–14 *qui hactenus delituere*

who have been hiding so far

The sometimes hypercorrect use of the old forms indicates the change that was going on in spoken forms of Latin – even in the form of Latin that was spoken by the educated authors of literary Late Latin texts. The obsolete forms remain for some time in the

[37] See Haverling 2000, 224–225, 262ff.; Haverling 2005b, 283–284; Haverling 2010a, 327–330.

literary texts, but are replaced by others in the language of everyday use (cf. the section on vocabulary below).[38]

In literary Late Latin texts, there are no or very few traces of some of the fundamental changes in the tense system, but there is sometimes some inconsistency in the use of the tenses and a phenomenon known from the Classical texts, such as the use of *videro* in (9), is reinterpreted and used in a somewhat new manner. The changes in the actional system, which were not understood by the grammarians, occur, however, in all kinds of texts and are in the literary texts often reflected by a new use of the old prefixed forms.

The Late Latin vocabulary in literary and less literary Late Latin

Quite a few lexical items in a text like the *Itinerarium Egeriae* do not occur in the more literary Latin texts of the same period.[39] One example is the frequently recurring use of *in giro* (e.g. *Itin. Eger.* 37.1) or *per girum* (or *per giro*, e.g. *Itin. Eger.* 2.5) in the sense 'around'; in the more literary texts from the same period we have *circum* (e.g. *Hist. Aug*. 23.10.6) or *circa* (e.g. *Hist. Aug*. 23.9.3) in that sense.[40] Egeria's words for 'town' or 'city' are *civitas* (e.g. *Itin. Eger.* 19.9) and *metropolis* (e.g. *Itin. Eger.* 9.5); but in the more literary style we usually find *civitas* in its old sense of the body of citizens (e.g. Aug. *Conf*. 5.13) and the old words *oppidum* (e.g. Aug. *Conf*. 6.7) and *urbs* (Aug. *Conf*. 8.6) in the sense 'town' and 'city' respectively. Egeria's word for 'evening' is *sera* (*Itin. Eger.* 3.1 *sabbato sera* 'on Saturday evening' and 39.5 *sera hora forsitan noctis secunda* 'perhaps around the second hour of the evening'). Augustine uses this word as an adjective meaning 'late' (15) and *vesper* (Aug. *Conf*. 5.9 *bis die, mane et vespere* 'twice a day, in the morning and in the evening') and *vespera* (Aug. *Serm*. 4 lin. 158 *facta est vespera* 'it became evening') in the sense 'evening':

15) Aug. *Epist*. 8.6 *ad discendum, quod opus est, nulla mihi aetas sera videri potest*

To learn what is necessary no age is in my view too late.

In the late sixth century, Gregory of Tours uses the preposition *circa* 29 times (e.g. *Franc*. 2.32) and *in giro* once as an adverb (*Franc*. 10.29) and once as a preposition (*Franc*. 10.16). He often uses *civitas* in the sense 'town, city' (e.g. *Franc*. 1.7), but he also uses *oppidum* (e.g. *Franc*. 1.19) and *urbs* (e.g. *Franc*. 3.12). For 'evening' he uses *vesper* (e.g. *Franc*. 9.6) and never *sera*. In this respect his lexicon seems more similar to that of literary fourth century Latin than to Egeria's Latin.

---

[38] We have a similar pattern in the decreasing use of enclitics from Early to Late Latin discussed by Janson 1979, 90–119.

[39] On the vocabulary in Late Latin texts of different kinds, cf. Haverling 1988, 27ff. On the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, cf. Swanson 1966–1967.

[40] Cf. Väänänen 1987, 46, 103. In Classical Latin *gyrus* means 'circle' and is used of the circular movement of a creature or an object and *in gyro* means 'in a circle'. In Late Latin we find *in gyro* used as a preposition with the genitive or with the accusative; this usage is found especially in some Christian texts. The examples are relatively rare before 500 CE, but in the later centuries the number of examples grows. In this respect the language met with in Egeria's text thus seems to be in accordance with the later development. See ThLL VI 2 (s. v. *gyrus*) 2388.55ff.; cf. also Löfstedt 1911, 66f.

Another change in the spoken language concerns the function of diminutive suffixes, which in later Latin tend to replace forms without the suffix (16a–b).[41] In literary texts we still find the old diminutive forms in their old function, as for instance in Symmachus around 384 CE (17a). In the late sixth century, Gregory of Tours sometimes seems to use the old diminutive forms instead of the unsuffixed forms (he prefers, for instance, the diminutive form *geniculum* in the accusative singular and the unsuffixed form *genua* in the accusative plural),[42] but normally he uses them in a way which reflects literary language rather than the contemporary development in the spoken language (17b–c):[43]

16a) Pelagon. 153 in 153 *cimicem vivum in aurem equi mittito*

Put a living bug in the ear of the horse.

16b) Pelagon. 54 *spongiam mollem ... in auriculam mittito*

put a soft sponge in the ear

17a) Symm. *Rel*. 15.2 *sumite igitur ... sollemniter auro ducta munuscula*

Take then ... these small gifts of gold fashioned in the usual way.

17b) Greg. Tur. *Glor. conf*. 27 *et sic fenestella parvula patefacta*

And thus a small window was opened.

17c) Greg. Tur. *Glor. conf*. 30 *hospitiolum cuiusdam pauperis*

the little lodgings of a certain poor man

As the old diminutive suffixes lost their diminutive function in the spoken language, they were replaced by other suffixes in that function, for instance by *-īnus*, of which we have a few examples in some technical texts (18a) and in the inscriptions (18b). When describing the not altogether enthusiastic reaction of the people at the court of the emperor Constantius II when they learned about the unexpectedly glorious military successes of the young prince Julian, Ammianus mentions that they called him *Victorinus* 'the Little Vanquisher' – which probably gives us an example of the use of this suffix in the spoken language (19):[44]

---

[41] Cf. the warning in *Appendix Probi* p. 197 *auris non oricla, ..., neptis non nepticla, anus non anicla*; cf. Haverling 2011a, 245f.

[42] There are four examples of the acc. sing. *geniculum* (*Hist*. 2.37; *Glor. mart*. 87; *Mart*. 3.9, 4.41) and nine examples of the acc. pl. *genua* (*Hist*. 3.18, 6.36, 10.25; *Glor. mart*. 40; *Mart*. 2.47; *Vit. patr*. 1, 8; *Glor. conf*. 90, 104); for example Pelagonius prefers the form *geniculo* in the abl. sing.: cf. Adams 1995, 545.

[43] See Bonnet 1890, 459ff.; cf. Haverling 2011a, 246ff.

[44] See Niedermann 1954; cf. Haverling 2011a, 251ff.

18a) Chiron 965 *ciconinas iam paene volantes*

little storks almost capable of flying

18b) *CIL* VIII 12794 *Nimp*(*h*)*ydua miserina, vixit anno uno m. VIII diebus XX*

Poor little Nymphidia lived for one year, eight months and twenty days.

19) Amm. 16.12.67 *inrisive ideo Victorinum nominabant, quod verecunde referens, quotiens imperaret, superatos indicabat saepe Germanos*

Therefore they mockingly called him 'Little Vanquisher', since he, although in a modest manner, whenever he described his military activities often indicated that the Germans had been defeated.

A morphological change which clearly was going on in Late Latin, although there are remarkably few traces of it in the texts, is the decline of the neuter. From Early Latin onwards some words occur both as neuter and as masculine nouns (e.g. *aevus* / *aevum*, *caelus* / *caelum*, *loca* / *loci*, *gelu* / *gelus*). When Petronius in the first century CE describes the speech of the freedmen, he sometimes makes them use previously unattested masculine forms, such as *vinus* instead of *vinum* (*Sat*. 41.12) or *fatus* instead of *fatum* (e.g. *Sat*. 42.5). There are examples of another aspect of this development in Egeria, when the plural of two neutral nouns have become new feminine singular forms, *stativa* 'pause' (*Itin. Eger*. 23.2) and *virgulta* 'shoot' (*Itin. Eger*. 4.6).[45] Another change not represented in literary Late Latin is the use of new verbal forms such as *potebam* instead of *poteram*, of which we have an example in a *Vetus Latina* manuscript (Vet. Lat. *Luc*. 19.3 cod. d *et non potebat*), but not in the corresponding passage in the Vulgate (Vulg. *Luc*. 19.3 *et non poterat*). In the late sixth century, Gregory of Tours still uses the form *poteram* (e.g. *Franc*. 2.30), whereas Fredegar (20) and the grammarian Virgilius in the seventh century (Virg. *Gramm. Epist*. 15 p. 92, l. 17) have *potebam*:[46]

20) Fredeg. *Chron*. 2.62 *...cumque eum* (sc. *Bellisarium*) *Antunina adflictum et merentem vidisset, et non potebat cognuscere, quae haec esset adflictio ... dixit ...*

When Antonina saw Bellisarius sad and full of sorrow and she was unable to find out the reason for his sadness, she said …

Such morphological changes are very rare in the more literary Late Latin texts, but a change of this character of which we have some examples in literary Late Latin is the use of the Late Latin verb *odire*, which replaces the older perfect *odisse* in the sense 'to hate'. Augustine normally uses the present perfect *odi* 'I hate' in the traditional manner, but in a few instances he uses the new verb *odio*, which he probably heard other people use quite frequently, in that sense. He has seven instances of the new present *odis* 'you hate' (21a) and 96 instances of the present perfect *odisti* 'you hate' (21b):

---

[45] See Väänänen 1981 §§ 213–225; cf. also Löfstedt 1911, 134ff.; Väänänen 1987, 22f.

[46] See ThLL X 2 (s. v. *possum*) 126.64ff.; Väänänen 1981 § 315; cf. also Fredeg. *Chron*. 2.57 *Amicus eiusdem Tolomeus nullo ingenio potebat qualiter eidem res agebatur narrare* (var. l. *poterat*).

21a) Aug. *discipl.* 4 *'odis te'. quanto magis dicis quia amas te, odis te*

"You hate yourself"; the more you say that you love yourself, you hate yourself.

21b) Aug. *in psalm*. 140.2 *et convincit quia non te diligis; immo convincit quia et odisti te*

And he proves that you do not love yourself, indeed he proves that you even hate yourself.

In Augustine there is sometimes a certain variation between more recent and earlier forms. A famous example is his choice of constructions with the *verba dicendi et sentiendi*, which varies between the more conservative style found in the *Contra Academicos* and the more colloquial style found in his sermons (cf. the section on subordination above).

In later Latin the anaphoric pronoun *is* is frequently replaced by demonstrative pronouns such as *hic* and *ille* and sometimes even by *ipse*.[47] The frequent use of *ipse* in the function of *ille* or *is,*which is met with in Egeria and which sometimes resembles the use of the Romance article (*Itin. Eger*. 15.1 *requisivi de eo, quam longe esset ipse locus* 'I asked him, how far away the place was'), is not found in more literary texts. The confusion of *hic*, *ille* and *is* is, however, frequent in the literary texts too. Classical Latin had *illis diebus* in the sense 'in those days' (e.g. Liv. 3.5.11) and *his diebus* and in the sense 'in these days, nowadays' (e.g. Cic. *Epist. ad Q. fr*. 3.1.11); but in the late fourth century we find *his diebus* in the sense 'in those days' not only in Egeria (22a) but also in a more literary text such as the *Historia Augusta* (22b):[48]

22a) *Itin. Eger.* 5.3 *ubi fuerunt castra filiorum Israhel his diebus, quibus Moyses fuit in montem*

where the camp of the sons of Israhel was located in those days, when Moses was on the mountain

22b) *Hist. Aug*. 16.5.1 *his diebus, quibus ille natus est*

in those days when he was born

In this case a part of the change is met with in all sorts of texts from the later periods, whereas another part of it is found only in the texts representing the lower registers of the language.

As a result of the changes in the actional system (cf. exx. 10–14 in the section on the verbal system) some old verbs tend to disappear in Late Latin. The unprefixed *bibo* 'drink' is very frequent and occurs in all sorts of later texts, whereas *ebibo* is found only in more elegant Late Latin texts.[49] The old *ēsse* or *edere* 'eat' becomes rare in the later texts and of the remaining two verbs used in that sense, *comedo* seems to have a

---

[47] See Väänänen 1981 §§ 269–274.

[48] See Väänänen 1981 §§ 272, 275; on *ipse* in Benedict's rule, see Coleman 1999, 348–349; cf. Haverling 1988, 39f.

[49] *Ebibo* occurs in Ambrose (4 ex. vs. 260 *bibo*), Augustine (7 ex. vs. 1010 *bibo*), Jerome (7 ex. vs. 622 *bibo*), Sulpicius Severus (1 ex. vs. 2 *bibo*), Cassiodorus (6 ex. vs. 44 *bibo*), and Gregory the Great (8 ex. vs. 137 *bibo*). *Bibo* is the only one of these two verbs found in e.g. Ammianus (4 ex.), in the *Historia Augusta* (26 ex.), Egeria (2 ex.), Caesarius from Arles (118 ex.), and Gregory of Tours (13 ex.).

higher stylistic value than *manduco*. Egeria's word for 'eat' is *manduco*; we have many examples of this verb in the Vulgate too, but the by far most frequent word for 'eat' there is *comedo*, which is the verb preferred in the more literary Late Latin texts and by Jerome. *Comedo* is the more frequent word also in Gregory of Tours and Gregory the Great, whereas *manduco* is more common in for instance Ambrose, Augustine, Cassiodorus and Caesarius of Arles.[50]

A parallel to the disappearance of *ebibo* is the disappearance of *emorior* 'pass away, leave life' and *emortuus* 'dead'. The use of this verb as well as of *conticesco* and *conticeo* and *delitesco* still occurs in certain literary Late Latin texts, but it becomes rare in the lower registers of Late Latin. Around 400 CE we find them in Augustine and Jerome but not in Egeria. In the sixth century CE, we find these verbs in Cassiodorus and Gregory the Great, but not in Caesarius from Arles, Gregory of Tours and in the *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri*.[51]

The atelic and dynamic function of the *sco*-suffix is now blurred and new verbs formed with the prefix *in-* and the intransitive suffix *-are* tend to replace old *sco*-verbs. The transitive use of a verb like *inveterare* is old (e.g. Cic. *nat. deor*. 2.5), but in Late Latin there was a tendency in the somewhat less elegant language to use such verbs intransitively (e.g. Vulg. *Is*. 65.22). Old *sco*-verbs are often replaced by these new verbs: for instance *pinguescere* 'grow fatter' (e.g. Lucr. 5.899) and *crassescere* 'grow thicker, thicken' (e.g. Colum. 8.9.2) are replaced by *impinguare* (Apic. 8.7.5) and *incrassare* (e.g. Vet. Lat. *Is*. 6.10 in Cypr. *Testim*. 1.3) in the sense 'grow fat' in the less literary form of Late Latin.[52] In the Late Latin translation of the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* we find several verbs of this kind, for instance *insurdare* 'become deaf' (Hippocr. *Aph.* 4.60), *infrigdare* 'cool down' (Hippocr. *Aphor.* 4.40, Hippocr. *Aphor.* 5.19), and *incrassare* 'grow fat' (Hippocr. *Aphor.* 5.44). The evidence provided by the manuscripts is, however, contradictory, because some manuscripts prefer the active and intransitive verbs (23a, 24a, 25a), whereas others have the passive forms of the active and transitive verbs (23b, 24b, 25b).

---

[50] There are 45 examples of *edere*, over 540 of *comedere* and ca. 170 of *manducare* in the Vulgate: see ThLL V 2 (s. v. *edo*) 100.10ff.; *comedere* is the verb most frequently found in the parts which were translated by Jerome himself and we have reasons to believe that he preferred it because it was considered to be the "better" word: see Löfstedt 1959, 40–41. *Comedo* is the more frequent verb in Jerome (763 vs. 186 *manduco*), *Historia Augusta* (17 ex. vs. 1 *manduco*), Gregory of Tours (11 vs. 2 *manduco*) and Gregory the Great (245 vs. 59 *manduco*); and *manduco* is the more frequent verb in Ambrose (253 vs. 7 *comedo*), Augustine (1327 vs. 174 *comedo*), Sulpicius Severus (2 vs. 1 *comedo*), Cassiodorus (73 vs. 24 *comedo*), and Caesarius from Arles (101 vs. 17 *comedo*).

[51] *Emorior* occurs in Ambr. (3 ex.), Aug. (17 ex.), Hier. (6 ex.), Greg. M. (6 ex.) – but *not* in Amm., *Hist. Aug*., *Itin. Eger*., Sulp. Sev.; *emortuus*: occurs in Ambr. (6 ex.), Aug. (24 ex.), Hier. (12 ex.), *Hist. Aug*. (1 ex.), Cassiod. (3 ex.), Greg. M. (4 ex.) – but *not* in Amm., *Itin. Eger*., Sulp. Sev. *Conticesco* occurs in Ambr. (13 ex.), Aug. (11 ex.), Hier. (13 ex.), Amm. (1 ex.), Cassiod. (6 ex.), Greg. M. (18 ex.) – but *not* in *Hist. Aug*., *Itin. Eger*., Sulp. Sev., Caes. Arel., Greg. Tur., *Hist. Apoll*.; *conticui* occurs in Ambr. (5 ex.), Aug. (3 ex.), Hier. (21 ex.), Amm. (5 ex.), Sulp. Sev. (2 ex.), Cassiod. (2 ex.), Greg. M. (5 ex.) – but *not* in *Hist. Aug*., *Itin. Eger*., Caes. Arel., Greg. Tur., *Hist. Apoll*.; and *conticeo* occurs in Hier. (3 ex.), Greg. M. (2 ex.) – but *not* in Ambr., Aug., Amm., *Hist. Aug*., *Itin. Eger*., Sulp. Sev., Cassiod., Caes. Arel., Greg. Tur., *Hist. Apoll*. *Delitesco*: occurs in Ambr. (7 ex.), Aug. (13 ex.), Hier. (4 ex.), Amm. (7 ex.), Greg. M. (1 ex.) – but *not* in *Hist. Aug*., *Itin. Eger*., Sulp. Sev., Cassiod., Caes. Arel., Greg. Tur., *Hist. Apoll*.; *delitui* occurs in Amm. (1 ex.) – but *not* in Ambr., Aug., Hier., *Hist. Aug*., *Itin. Eger*., Sulp. Sev., Cassiod., Caes. Arel., Greg. Tur., Greg. M., *Hist. Apoll*.

[52] See Haverling 2000, 153ff., 183ff., 302ff., 311ff.; Haverling 2003a, 168ff.; Haverling 2003b, 123ff.

23a) Hippocr. *Aphor.* 5.44 *antequam incrassent*

before they become fat – e.g. ms. *Mu* and *P2*; and Müller-Rohlfsen (1980)

23b) Hippocr. *Aphor.* 5.44 *antequam incrassentur* – e.g. ms. *P1*, *Vc1*

24a) Hippocr. *Aphor.* 5.26 *aqua, quae cito calefit et cito infrigdat, levissima est*

water which quickly gets warm and quickly gets cold is very light – e.g. ms. *P2*

24b) Hippocr. *Aphor.* 5.26 *aqua, quae cito calefit et cito infrigdatur, levissima est* – so ms. *Mu*, *P1*, *Vc1*, and $P2^2$; and Müller-Rohlfsen (1980)

25a) Hippocr. *Aphor.* 1.3 comm. *et de multo sanguine corpora eorum incrassant .... vel alii, qui impinguant*

and their bodies get thick with blood … or others, who become thick – so ms. Re, Ei, P5, P4; and Kühn (1981)

25b) Hippocr. *Aphor.* 1.3 *incrassantur … impinguantur* – so ms. Ba, Vc2, Mc, G

This variation is due to the difference in style between the intransitive verbs, which were clearly regarded as substandard and of which there are very few examples in the texts, and the transitive verbs used in the passive voice, which are quite frequent in the literary texts too.[53]

Several of the changes in the vocabulary which we find in less literary texts such as the *Itinerarium Egeriae* or certain technical texts do not occur or are very rare in the more literary texts from the same period: this can be seen particularly in the introduction of new kinds of word formation. Certain changes are, however, found in texts of all kinds from the later periods: demonstrative pronouns and prefixed verbs from older Latin are used in a new manner even in literary texts. The more conservative literary texts tend to keep the old words, which are sometimes used in a hypercorrect manner, since the original function is no longer fully understood. In the less literary texts such words tend to disappear.

Conclusions and discussion

In several respects the differences between "lower" and "higher" registers in Late Latin are considerable. We find these differences in the vocabulary, in the subordination syntax, in the case syntax, and in the morphology of verbs and nouns. The features belonging to the "lower" register occur not only in texts which are characterized by a substandard form of Latin, but sometimes also in literary texts, for instance when spoken language is depicted, or when literary authors choose to pick up certain features typical of the spoken language. These rare descriptions of spoken language in literary texts indicate that there

[53] See Haverling 2005b, 282–283; Haverling 2010a, 324–326.

was a growing difference between the written language and the language of everyday conversation, even among those who belonged to the educated elite.[54]

In several respects literary Late Latin remains very conservative. The changes of which people were aware were generally avoided. Only few of the changes in the use of prepositions and cases occur in such texts, although they are quite frequent in less literary texts from the same period. The changes in the system of the tenses are also very rare in literary texts, although the later development indicates that they were frequent in the spoken language and they occur quite often in less literary texts. The use of the locative in the names of towns and cities is an interesting example of this conservatism: in the language of everyday conversation of the majority of the population the locative was dead in Late Latin – and it is even likely that this was so in the everyday language of the educated elite – but nevertheless it remains very frequent in the higher literary register.

The development of the spoken language is, however, reflected in literary Late Latin in several different ways. First, there are certain changes which appear in all sorts of texts, even if they do so to a lesser degree in the more literary texts. Among the changes occurring in the highest registers of Late Latin are the change in the use of determinative pronouns (e.g. *hic* = *is* or *ille*), some of the changes in the subordination system (e.g. *quod* instead of AcI with *verba dicendi et sentiendi*), in the case system (e.g. a certain oscillation between prepositional phrases and case forms or the use of the genitive instead of the ablative of respect), and in the actional system (e.g. the use of *comedo* in the sense 'eat of' in ex. 10 and of *tacui* in the sense 'I stopped talking' in ex. 12).

Then there is sometimes a new use of certain old forms, for instance as a result of the changes in the case system (e.g. the reinterpretation of the function of the genitive which paves the way for the use of the genitive instead of the nominative in ex. 4), in the system of the tenses (e.g. the use of *videro* in the sense 'I leave aside, I shall not discuss' in ex. 9), and in the actional system (e.g. *conticui* in the sense of *tacui* in ex. 13 or *delitescere* in the sense of 'be hiding' in ex. 14). Sometimes, however, the relationship between the development of the written language and the development of the spoken language is more subtle and we cannot always ascribe the new ways in which the case forms are used to hypercorrection even when there is a connection to a corresponding use of the prepositional phrase (as e.g. in ex. 2).

Developments are sometimes accepted only in part: a verb like *incrassare* is accepted as a transitive verb in literary Late Latin, but the corresponding intransitive use of that verb is not. Some of the differences found between contemporary Late Latin texts should not be ascribed to differences in education and learning, but to different attitudes towards the literary norm: this is particularly clear in the syntax of subordination, but to some extent also in the choice of words and kinds of word formation.

Literary Late Latin authors sometimes give us a hint of the spoken language when describing a conversation, as when Ammianus informs us of the fact that Julian the Apostate was called *Victorinus* 'the little vanquisher' (ex. 19) or when Gregory of Tours and Fredegar use new forms indicating future in passages describing a conversation (ex. 5). However, in literary Late Latin private letters, where "colloquial" features should be used according to the prevailing rhetorical ideals, the elements reflecting spoken Latin

---

[54] For the different registers in fourth century Atticistic Greek, see e.g. Fabricius 1962, 143ff.

are usually not taken from the contemporary form of spoken language but from the Early Latin comedies or Cicero's letters.[55]

The kind of Latin which we find in the literary texts from Late Antiquity remains remarkably stable for several centuries, but there are certain changes. In the late sixth century several new features become more frequent in the literary texts, which were, however, already established in less literary Latin (e.g. the use of the dative of direction mentioned in the section on cases and prepositions). This development seems to reflect a change in the form of Latin spoken in educated circles in the fourth and fifth centuries.

The relationship between the evidence met with in the written texts and the language that was actually spoken at the time is therefore very difficult to assess and has been much discussed;[56] but perhaps the clearest indication of the conservative character of the written literary language and the difference between that language and the spoken language is found when some historians give us a hint of what somebody actually said or when conservative and learned Late Latin authors use old forms in a new manner.

[55] On Symmachus, see Haverling 1988 (e.g. 260); on a similar attitude in Gellius, see Holford-Strevens 2010.
[56] See e.g. Banniard 1992; Wright 2002.

Bibliography

Adams 1995 = J.N. Adams, *Pelagonius and Latin Veterinary Terminology in the Roman Empire*, Leiden–New York–Köln 1995.

Banniard 1992 = M. Banniard, *Viva Voce. Communication écrite et communication orale du IVe au IXe siècle en Occident latin*, Paris 1992.

Bieter 1938 = F.A. Bieter, *The Syntax of the Cases and the Prepositions in Cassiodorus'* Historia Ecclesiastica Tripertita, Washington D.C. 1938.

Binnick 1991 = R. Binnick, *Time and the Verb: A Guide to Tense and Aspect*, New York and Oxford 1991.

Bonnet 1890 = M. Bonnet, *Le latin du Grégoire de Tours*, Paris 1890.

Buchner 1955 = R. Buchner, *Gregor von Tours: Zehn Bücher Geschichten*, Erster Band, Buch 1–5, Darmstadt 1955 (repr. 2000).

CLCLT–6 = *Library of Christian Texts CLCLT–6*, moderante Paul Tombeur, Turnhout 2005.

Coleman 1999 = R. Coleman, 'Vulgarism and Normalization in the Text of *Regula Sancti Benedicti*', in Hubert Petersmann and Rudolf Kettemann (eds.), *Latin vulgaire – Latin tardif V: Actes du V^e^ Colloque International sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Heidelberg, 5–8 septembre 1997*, Heidelberg 1999, 345–356.

Cuzzolin 1994 = P. Cuzzolin, *Sull'origine della costruzione DICERE QUOD: aspetti sintattici e semantici*, Firenze 1994.

de la Villa 1998 = J. de la Villa, 'The Substitution of Instrumental Ablative by Prepositional Phrases in Latin. Some Evidence from the Vulgata', in B. García-Hernández (ed.), *Estudios de lingüistica latina: Actas del IX Coloquio Internacional de Lingüística Latina, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid 14–18 abril de 1997*, Madrid 1998, 291–308.

eMGH–4 = *MONUMENTA GERMANIAE HISTORICA auf CD-ROM, Lieferung 4*, Turnhout 2004.

Ernout and Thomas 1953 = A. Ernout and F. Thomas, *Syntaxe Latine*. 2nd ed., Paris 1953.

Fabricius 1962 = C. Fabricius, *Zu den Jugendschriften des Johannes Chrysostomos. Untersuchungen zum Klassizismus des vierten Jahrhunderts*, diss., Lund 1962.

Galdi 2004 = G. Galdi, *Grammatica delle iscrizioni latine dell'impero (province orientali). Morfosintassi nominale*, Rome 2004.

Galdi 2008 = G. Galdi, 'L'apporto linguistico dei modelli nell'opera di Jordanes', in G. Calboli (ed.), *Papers on Grammar X*, Rome 2008, 109–131.

Giunta and Grillone 1991 = F. Giunta and A. Grillone, *Iordanis De origine actibusque Getarum*, Rome 1991.

Halla-aho 2009 = H. Halla-aho, *The Non-literary Latin Letters: a Study of Their Syntax and Pragmatics*, Helsinki 2009.

Haverling 1988 = G.V.M. Haverling, *Studies on Symmachus' Language and Style*, diss., Göteborg 1988.

Haverling 2000 = G.V.M. Haverling, *On Sco-verbs, Prefixes and Semantic Functions: A Study in the Development of Prefixed and Unprefixed Verbs from Early to Late Latin*, Göteborg 2000.

Haverling 2003a = G.V.M. Haverling, 'Sur le latin vulgaire dans la traduction "ravennate" des *Aphorismes* d'Hippocrate', in H. Solin, M. Leiwo and H. Halla-aho (eds.), *Latin vulgaire – Latin tardif VI: Actes du VI^e^ Colloque International sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Helsinki 28 août–2 septembre 2000*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 2003, 157–172.

Haverling 2003b = G.V.M. Haverling, 'On Prefixes and Actionality in Classical and Late Latin', *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* vol. 50.1–2 (2003) 113–135.

Haverling 2005a = G.V.M. Haverling, 'On Linguistic Development and School Tradition – Direct and Indirect Evidence of the Development of Late Latin', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 55, 2004 (2005) 323–347.

Haverling 2005b = G.V.M. Haverling, 'On Tense, Viewpoint and Actionality in Vulgar and Literary Late Latin', in G. Calboli (ed.), *Latina Lingua! Proceedings of the Twelfth International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Bologna 9–14 June 2003, Papers on Grammar IX.1*, Rome 2005, 281–291.

Haverling 2006 = G.V.M. Haverling, 'On Cases and Prepositions in Vulgar and in Literary Late Latin', in C. A. Abellán (ed.), *Latin vulgaire – Latin tardif VII: Actes du VII^e^ Colloque International sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Sevilla, 2–6 septembre 2003*, Sevilla 2006, 345–360.

Haverling 2008a = G.V.M. Haverling, 'On Variation in Syntax and Morphology in Late Latin texts', in R. Wright (ed.)*, Latin vulgaire – Latin tardif VIII: Actes du VIII^e^ Colloque International sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Oxford, 6–9 septembre 2006*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 2008, 351–360.

Haverling 2008b = G.V.M. Haverling, 'On the Development of Tense, Viewpoint and Actionality from Early to Late Latin', in F. Josephson and I. Söhrman (eds.), *Interdependence of Diachronic and Synchronic Analyses*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia 2008, 73–104.

Haverling 2010a = G.V.M. Haverling, 'Actionality, Tense and Viewpoint', in P. Cuzzolin and P. Baldi (eds.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, vol. 2, Berlin-New York 2010, 277–523.

Haverling 2010b = G.V.M. Haverling, 'On Textual Criticism and Linguistic Development in the Late Latin Translation of the Hippocratic *Aphorisms'*, in D. R. Langslow and B. Maire (eds.), *Body, Disease and Treatment in a Changing World. Latin Texts and Contexts in Ancient and Medieval Medicine (Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference 'Ancient Latin Medical Texts', Hulme Hall, University of Manchester, 5^th^–8^th^ September 2007)*, Lausanne 2010, 105–118.

Haverling 2010c = G.V.M. Haverling, 'On Absolute–Relative Future, Viewpoint and Mood', in G. Calboli and P. Cuzzolin (eds.), *Papers on Grammar* XI, Rome 2010, 159–173.

Haverling 2010d = G.V.M. Haverling, 'On Tense, Viewpoint and Modality from Early to Late Latin', in P. Anreiter and M. Kienpointner (eds.), *Latin Linguistics Today. Akten des 15. Internationalen Kolloquiums zur Lateinischen Linguistik, Innsbruck, 4.–8. April 2009*, Innsbruck 2010, 139–154.

Haverling 2011a = G.V.M. Haverling, 'La suffixation 'diminutive' du latin préclassique et classique au latin tardif', in M. Fruyt and O. Spevak (eds.), *La quantification en latin. Actes du colloque sur la quantification en latin tenu à l'université Paris IV–Sorbonne les 5–7 juin 2006*, Paris 2011, 225–257.

Haverling 2011b = G.V.M. Haverling, 'Le flottement entre les cas en latin tardif', in D. Pardee and M. Fruyt (eds.), *Grammatical Case in the Languages of the Middle East and Europe. Acts of the International Colloquium 'Variations, concurrence et Évolution des cas dans divers domaines linguistiques, Paris, 2nd-4th April 2007*', Chicago, 275–296.

Haverling forthcoming = G.V.M. Haverling, 'On Tense and Mood in Conditional Clauses from Early to Late Latin', in F. Josephson and I. Söhrman (eds.), for the *acts of the 2nd symposium on diachronic typology, Gothenburg 18th–20th May 2006*, 18 pp, forthcoming.

Hilchenbach 2009 = K.P. Hilchenbach, *Das vierte Buch der Historien von Gregor von Tours. Edition mit sprachwissenschaftlich-textkritischem und historischem Kommentar,* Teil I + II, Bern 2009.

Hofmann and Szantyr 1965 = J.B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (= *Lateinische Grammatik. Zweiter Band*, by M. Leumann, J.B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr), Munich 1965.

Holford-Strevens 2010 = L. Holford-Strevens, 'Current and ancient colloquial in Gellius', in E. Dickey and A. Chahoud (eds.), *Colloquial and Literary Latin*, Cambridge 2010, 331–338.

Janson 1979 = T. Janson, *Mechanisms of Language Change in Latin*, Stockholm 1979.

Kiss 1982 = S. Kiss, *Tendances évolutives de la syntaxe verbale en latin tardif*, (Studia Romanica, Series Linguistica 4), Debrecen 1982.

Kühn 1981 = J-H. Kühn, *Die Diätlehre im frühmittelalterlichen lateinischen Kommentar zu den hippokratischen Aphorismen (I.1 – 11): Text und Untersuchungen*, Neustadt / Weinstr. 1981.

Leumann 1977 = M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut– und Formenlehre* (= *Lateinische Grammatik. Erster Band*, by M. Leumann, J.B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr), Munich 1977.

Löfstedt 1911 = E. Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache*, Uppsala–Leipzig 1911 (repr. Oxford and Uppsala and Leipzig 1936).

Löfstedt 1959 = E. Löfstedt, *Late Latin*, Oslo 1959.

Maraval 1982 = P. Maraval, *Égérie: Journal de voyage*, Paris 1982 (repr. 2002).

Molinelli 1996 = P. Molinelli, 'Casi e preposizioni in latino: lo sviluppo del genitivo e del dativo. Una prospettiva (anche) sociolinguistica. *Linguistica e Filologia* 3, *Quaderni del dipartimento di Linguistica e Letterature Comparate*, 1996, 73–125.

Mommsen 1882 = T. Mommsen (ed.), *Iordanis Romana et Getica*, Berlin 1882 (repr. 1961).

Müller-Rohlfsen 1980 = I. Müller-Rohlfsen, *Die lateinische "Ravennatische" Übersetzung der Hippokratischen Aphorismen aus dem 5./6. Jahrhundert n. Chr. (Textkonstitution auf der Basis der Übersetzungscodices)*, (Univ. Hamburg, Geistes– und Sozialwissenschaftliche Dissertationen 55), Hamburg 1980.

Niedermann 1954 = M. Niedermann, '*-īnus* als Diminutivsuffix im späteren Volkslatein', *Sprachgeschichte und Wortbedeutung: Festschrift Albert Debrunner, gewidmet von Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen*, Bern 1954, 329–342.

Skahill 1934 = B.H. Skahill, *The Syntax of the* Variae *of Cassiodorus*, Washington D.C. 1934.

Stotz 1998 = P. Stotz, *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters*, vol. 4: *Formenlehre, Syntax und Stilistik*, Munich 1998.
Svennung 1935 = J. Svennung, *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach– und Volkssprache*, Uppsala 1935.
Swanson 1966–1967 = D.C. Swanson, 'A Formal Analysis of Egeria's (Silvia's) Vocabulary', *Glotta* 44 (1966–1967), 177–254.
ThLL = *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Leipzig 1900–.
Väänänen 1981 = V. Väänänen, *Introduction au Latin vulgaire* (Bibliothèque Française et Romane, Serie A, Vol. 6), 3rd ed., Paris 1981.
Väänänen 1987 = V. Väänänen, *Le Journal-èpître d'Égérie* (Itinerarium Egeriae). *Étude linguistique*, (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, ser. B, tom. 230), Helsinki 1987.
Wright 2002 = R. Wright, *A Sociophilological Study of Late Latin* (Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy), Turnhout 2002.