

**PUBLISHED IN: Language Variation and Change 4.105–119 (1992).**

**Socially Determined Variation in Ancient Rome**

by

Brian D. Joseph      &      Rex E. Wallace  
The Ohio State University      The University of Massachusetts,  
Amherst

mailing address:

Professor Brian D. Joseph  
Department of Linguistics  
220 Oxley Hall  
The Ohio State University  
Columbus, OH 43210

short title: **Variation in Rome**

*Abstract.* Phonological and morphological variation in Classical Latin, e.g. diphthongs *ae/au* vs. monophthongs *e/o*, retention vs. loss of final consonants and initial *h-*, GEN.SG *-is* vs. *-us/-os*, DAT.SG in *-ae* vs. *-a*, etc., has typically been treated as regional in nature. However, these seemingly "rural" features cannot be considered instances of purely geographically-based variation, for they also occur both on inscriptions from within Rome and in Roman literary usage.

Coleman (1990:14) hints at "a social dimension" to this variation, but only for *au* vs. *o* variation. We argue, however, that a distinctly social dimension must be recognized for much of this variation, based on: 1) instances of hypercorrection 2) the observation that datives in *-a* occur only in private, primarily domestic, inscriptions and never in public or official inscriptions 3) Augustus's use of "rural" *domos* for *domus*, in keeping with the populist image he cultivated upon his return to Rome.

This dialectal/sociolectal situation can be best understood, we argue, in terms of the model of urbanization of Milroy 1980 and Bortoni-Ricardo 1985. The transformation of originally geographic variation into socially determined variation in an urban setting resulted from migrations into Rome and the expansion of Rome after the 4th century BC.

*Acknowledgements.* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Philadelphia, PA, 1992. We thank several members of the audience at our session, particularly Robert Austerlitz, Richard Janda, William Labov, and Joseph Malone for their helpful comments. Thanks are due also to the two anonymous referees for this journal for their many valuable suggestions and corrections. Finally, we take this opportunity to gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Charles Babcock, who provided us with his expertise on the topics of Roman social history and the emperor Augustus. We respectfully dedicate this paper to him on the eve of his retirement.

## 1. Variation in Republican Latin

The work of the past 25 years in sociolinguistics, including but not restricted to that of William Labov (e.g. Labov 1966, 1972), has led to the realization that finding variation in a speech community tied to social stratification is quite normal, virtually the unmarked situation. Thus, an assumption that there was socially determined variation in the Latin of ancient Rome is not a difficult one to make. Moreover, given the premise of the Uniformitarian Principle,<sup>1</sup> whereby knowledge of the present is used to illuminate the view of the past, this assumption becomes almost a trivial one, perhaps. What is not at all trivial, however, is going beyond assuming and actually demonstrating that such was the case in ancient Rome. In this paper, accordingly, evidence bearing on the validity of this assumption is presented.

There is in fact a number of variable features evident in ancient Latin, taking a broad view geographically and focussing just on the middle and late Republican period, covering roughly the 4th to the 1st centuries BC, up to the death of Julius Caesar in 44 BC. For instance, as indicated in (1) through (4), there are several examples of phonological variation in the Latin of the Republican period;<sup>2</sup> similarly (5) through (7) provide instances of morphological variation in the same period. These are representative instances, not meant to be an exhaustive listing of all variable features in Latin;<sup>3</sup> while there are other examples of variation that could be cited, those presented here are especially revealing, for on the one hand they all give evidence of socially motivated variation and on the other, their provenance--coming from inscriptions or from the statements of Roman grammarians--is

such that there is no doubt that they reflect linguistic realities of Republican Latin.<sup>4</sup>

(1) Monophthongs vs. Diphthongs for Proto-Italic Short Diphthongs

a. *e* vs. *ai/ae* < \*ai

*cesula* feminine praenomen<sup>5</sup> *CIL* 376 [Pisaurum, 1q2C],

cf. *caesula*

*cedito* 3SG IMPV 'cut' *CIL* 366 [Spoletium, early 2C], cf.

*caedito*

*pretod* NOM SG 'magistrate charged with administration of justice' *CIL* 365/GG 59 [Falerii novi, c. 150], cf. *praetor hedus* 'goat', cf. <*h*>*aedus* [Var. *L.L.* 5.97]<sup>6</sup>

b. *o* vs. *au* < \*au

*plotia* feminine gentilicium *CIL* 2680 [Minturnae, 1C ?],

cf. *plautia*

*polia* feminine gentilicium *CIL* 83 [Praeneste, 2C/1C],

*lorelano* masculine gentilicium *CIL* 181 [Praeneste,

2C/1C], cf. *Laurelanus* (Wachter 1987:186, fn. 489)

*pola* feminine praenomen *CIL* 390 [Pisaurum, 1q2C], cf.

[p]aulla *CIL* 16 [Rome, 2h2C]

(2) *o* vs. *u* as outcome of Monophthongization of \*ou

*poloces* 'Pollux [deity]' *CIL* 549 [Praeneste, late 4C, early

3C], cf. *pollux*, *polluces* (both NOM SG) (Pl. *Bac.* 4.8.52),

for diphthong *-ou* note *podlouqueique* DAT SG + clitic

conjunction *-que* D 1271a [Madonnetta, c. 500]

*locina* DAT SG 'Lucina [goddess of child-birth]' *CIL* 359

[Norba, c. 250], cf. *lucinae* DAT SG, < \*louk- 'light'

(3) -∅ vs. -s after long vowels < \*-s

*pisaurese* NOM PL 'of Pisaurum' *CIL* 378 [Pisaurum, 1q2C],

cf. *pisaurenses* NOM PL

*plebe* NOM SG<sup>7</sup> 'the common people' *CIL* 2659 [Lacus

Albanus, c. 300], cf. *plebes* NOM SG

*sueq(ue)*<sup>8</sup> ABL PL 'their own' (\*sue:s) + clitic conjunction -

*q(ue)* *CIL* 62 [Praeneste, 3C], cf. *suisque*, ABL PL + *-que*

*coira* GEN SG 'Cura [deity]' *CIL* 442 [?, 1h3C] < \*koira:s, cf.

*familias* GEN SG 'household' (Classical Latin *curae* GEN

SG)

*cucordia* GEN SG 'Concordia [deity]' Wachter 1987:465 [?,

1h3C] < \*konkordia:s,<sup>9</sup> cf. *familias* GEN SG 'household'

(Classical Latin *concordiae* GEN SG)

(4) *h* vs. *f* for expected *f* (e.g. < Proto-Indo-European (PIE)

\*bh/\*dh)

*horda* "pregnant cow" [Var. *R.R.* 2.5.6],<sup>10</sup> cf. *forda*<sup>11</sup>

(5) DAT SG in *-a* vs. *-ae* < \*a:i

*filea* DAT SG 'daughter' *CIL* 60 [Praeneste, 3C/2C], cf.

*fileae* DAT SG

*fortuna primo.∅enia*<sup>12</sup> DAT SG 'Fortuna Primigenia [deity]'

*CIL* 60 [Praeneste, 3C/2C], cf. *fortunae primigeniae*

DAT SG

*menerua* DAT SG 'Minerva' *CIL* 365/GG 59 [Falerii novi,

c. 150], cf. *meneruai* DAT SG *CIL* 34 [Rome, 2C ?<sup>13</sup>]

(6) *-os* (> *-us*) vs. *-is* for C-stem GEN SG

*salutus* GEN SG 'Health [deity]' *CIL* 62 [Praeneste, 3C], cf.

*salutis*

*nationu*<sup>14</sup> GEN SG 'birth' *CIL* 60 [Praeneste, 3C/2C] <  
\*na:tio:nos, cf. *nationis* GEN SG  
*diouos* GEN SG 'Jove' *CIL* 360 [Norba, c. 200], cf. *iouis* GEN  
SG

(7) *-eis/-es* vs. *-i* for *o*-stem NOM PL

*profaneis* NOM PL 'unholy' *CIL* 1486 [Tibur, 1C ?], cf.  
*profani* NOM PL  
*coques* NOM PL 'cooks' *CIL* 1447 [Praeneste, 2C/1C], cf.  
*coqui* NOM PL  
*duomuires* NOM PL 'court or board consisting of two persons'  
*CIL* 1511 [Cora, 1C], cf. *duumui* NOM PL  
*leibereis* NOM PL 'freedmen' *CIL* 1531 [Sora, 2C/1C ?<sup>15</sup>],  
cf. *liberi* NOM PL  
*magistreis* NOM PL 'foremen' *CIL* 364 [Falerii novi, c.  
150], cf. *magistri* NOM PL<sup>16</sup>

## 2. The Social Dimension to Variation in Latin

Such variation has been subject to various interpretations, but the *communis opinio* (Campanile, 1961; Coleman, 1990; Giacomelli, 1979; Meillet, 1933:101-103; Palmer, 1954:60-62) is that these features represent geographically determined variation within the Latin-speaking area of Ancient Italy, and in particular that they represent features of "dialectal Latin" from the outlying areas surrounding the city of Rome and from Roman and Latin colonies. That there is some plausibility for such an interpretation is shown by the existence of several features that are regionally restricted within Latin and never occur within Rome itself. For example, the unusual

3SG imperatives in the Lex Luceria (*CIL* 401 [Luceria, 1q2C]), given in (8), even if they may have resulted from some form of language contact (e.g. if they were Oscanized Latin--see Wallace (1988)), nonetheless are not found anywhere outside of Luceria, a town located on the border between Samnium and Apulia in Southern Italy:

(8) *fundatid* 3SG IMPV 'let (no one) dump' *CIL* 401 [Luceria, 1q2C], cf. Classical Latin *fundato* 3SG IMPV

*proiecitad* 3SG IMPV 'let (no one) cast' *CIL* 401 [Luceria, 1q2C], cf. Classical Latin *proicito* 3SG IMPV

*parentatid* 3SG IMPV 'let (no one) perform sacrifices for dead relations' *CIL* 401 [Luceria, 1q2C], cf. Classical Latin *parentato* 3SG IMPV

Similarly, *a*-stem DAT SG forms in *-e* (for PIE long diphthong *\*-a:i*), such as *diane* DAT SG 'Diana [deity]' (*CIL* 376 [Pisaurum, 1q2C]), as opposed to Classical Latin *dianae*), never occur in Rome.

Such an interpretation, however well-motivated it might be as a general approach to variation, runs into one insuperable problem, with respect to the features in (1) through (7). In particular, there are no obvious regions to which these features are restricted. Of special importance here is the fact that some examples of most of these features can be found in Rome itself in the Republican period, as indicated in (9) through (12), where all the inscriptions originated from within the city of Rome:

(9) Loss of *-s* after long vowels (cf. (3))<sup>17</sup>

*statia* GEN SG feminine gentilicium *CIL* 480 [Rome, 3C/1h2C], cf. *familias* 'household' GEN SG

(10) DAT SG in *-a* < *\*ai* vs. *ae/ai* (cf. (5))<sup>18</sup>



*flaca* DAT SG feminine cognomen *CIL* 477 [Rome, 3C/1h2C], cf. *flaccae* DAT SG  
*[me]nerua* DAT SG 'Minerva [deity]' *CIL* 460 [Rome, 3C/1h2C], cf. *meneruai* DAT SG *CIL* 34 [Rome, 2C ?]

(11) C-stem GEN SG in *-os* (> *-us*) vs. *-is* (cf. (6))

*nominus* GEN SG 'name' *CIL* 581 [Tiriolo<sup>19</sup>, c. 186], cf.  
*nominis* GEN SG

(12) *o*-stem NOM PL in *-eis/-es* vs. *-i* (cf. (7))

*magistreis* NOM PL 'foremen' *CIL* 978 [Rome, 2C],  
*magistri* NOM PL

*lanies* NOM PL 'butchers' *CIL* 979 [Rome, 2C/1C ?], *lanii*  
NOM PL

*rosaries* NOM PL 'rose-dealers' *CIL* 980 [Rome, 2C],  
*rosarii* NOM PL

The occurrence of these features on inscriptions from within Rome means that one just cannot treat them purely and simply as non-Roman Latin. They are Roman in a strictly geographic sense. A straightforward geographic account of the variation evident in these features therefore cannot be maintained.

Consequently, other approaches to this variation must be considered, in particular, as suggested at the outset, a social motivation. Four pieces of evidence suggest that there is a social dimension to this variation in Latin.

First, Coleman (1990:14) has suggested that "there may well be a social dimension to the usage" of *o* for *au* (feature (1) above), since by paying attention to the social status of the authors of these inscriptions, he found that many such "inscriptions are by slaves or

freed persons".<sup>20</sup> Presumably these speakers came from the lower social classes, thus permitting the inference that *o* for *au* was a feature of lower class usage in Ancient Rome.

In the same vein, our own examination of various of the features under consideration here according to the type of inscription in which they are found reveals some interesting distributional facts. Two of these features, the loss of *-s* after long vowels (9) and the DAT SG in *-a* (10), are restricted in Rome to private inscriptions and never appear on public or official inscriptions. It would seem, therefore, that at least these two features can be characterized as nonstandard: they were particularized to individuals and appear to reflect register differences (roughly, official vs. colloquial). While such an ostensible register-based distribution is not in itself indicative of social conditioning of the variation, it is consistent with the observation that these features were not yet fully linguistically generalized, just as would indeed be expected if they were still in the relevant period a matter of socially determined variation.

Perhaps even stronger evidence of social conditioning is the fact that numerous hypercorrections focussing on the features in (1) through (7) are to be found in Ancient Rome. Under the assumption that hypercorrection is an inherently sociolinguistically determined process, induced by the pressures of a perceived prestige norm, then the occurrence of such hypercorrect forms as those given on the right in (13) - (16), e.g. hypercorrect *auscutor* 'kiss' for etymologically correct *osculator* with the reverse of the relation between *au* and *o* that is historically justified (see (1b) above), is an indication that the variation in question had a social dimension to it:

(13) \*au > o /o:/; *au* varies with etymological *o* /o:/ < \*o:<sup>21</sup>  
*osculator* 'kiss' vs. *ausculator* < \*<sub>o</sub>os-tlo-, cf. Vedic Sanskrit <sub>o</sub>as-  
'mouth' (Ernout-Meillet 1985:469-470)

(14) \*f > h; *f* varies with etymological *h* < \*%<sub>o</sub>gh/\*gh<sup>22</sup>  
<*h*>*aedus* 'goat' vs. *fedus* [Var. *L.L.* 5.97], *faedum* ACC SG  
[Paul. *Fest.* 74L] < \*ghaido-, cf. Gothic *gaitis* (Ernout-  
Meillet 1985:288)

*hostis* 'stranger, enemy' vs. *fostim* ACC SG [Paul. *Fest.* 74L]  
< \*ghosti-

(15) \*ae > e /e:/; *ae* varies with etymological *e* /e:/ < \*e:  
*fenum* 'hay' vs. *faenum* < \*dheh<sub>1</sub>- 'to suck(le), nourish,  
produce', (Ernout-Meillet 1985:225)

*scena* 'stage' vs. *scaina(m)* *CIL* 1794 [Prezza, 2C/1C  
?]/*scaena*, borrowed from Greek σκηνη [Var. *L.L.* 7.96]<sup>23</sup>  
*sceptrum* 'sceptre' vs. *scaeptrum*, borrowed from Greek  
σκηπτρον [Var. *L.L.* 7.96]

(16) \*h > ø; *h* varies with ø

*umerus* 'shoulder' vs. *humerus* < \*om(e)so-, cf. Gothic  
*amsans* ACC PL, Sanskrit *ámsa-*, Umbrian *onse* LOC SG  
*umor* 'moisture' vs. *humor* [Var. *L.L.* 5.24] < \*ug<sup>w</sup>- 'wet'  
*ave* 'farewell' 2SG IMPV *CIL* 1349 [Rome, 1C ?] vs. *have*  
*CIL* 1345 [Rome, 1C ?]

Finally, there is the testimony of one upperclass speaker of Latin, whose usage happens to have been recorded and reveals a possible social dimension to monophthongization. The speaker in question is Gaius Octavius, Augustus Caesar, who is reported by Suetonius to have used, as the GEN SG of the *u*-stem noun *domu-*

'home', the form *domos* /domo:s/ (from \*dom-ou-s), where Classical Latin had *domus* /domu:s/ (also from \*dom-ou-s, with a different treatment of the \*ou diphthong). The relevant passage from Suetonius' biography of the emperor is given below:

(17) *item . . . 'domos' genetiuo casu singulari pro 'domus'*<sup>24</sup> ['also [Octavian used to say] '*domos*' for the genitive singular instead of '*domus*'] (Suet. *Aug.* 87.2)

Augustus' *domos* for *domus* thus shows *o* /o:/ as the outcome of the monophthongization of \*ou noted above in (2).

Augustus' use of the monophthong *o* /o:/ from \*ou rather than *u* /u:/ could well reflect a persistent regional feature, since he was a native of Velitrae, some 25 miles southeast of Rome. There are indications that Velitrae was in a "o-monophthongizing" area. In particular, even though there are no Latin inscriptions from Velitrae itself in the 3rd or 2nd centuries BC in which such monophthongization could be attested, and in general not much inscriptional evidence from southern Latium in that period, there is one relevant form from Norba, which is in the same general vicinity as Velitrae, a few kilometers to the south:<sup>25</sup>

(18) Norba: DAT SG *locina* 'Lucina [goddess of child-birth]' *CIL* 359, (vs. Classical Latin *lucinae* DAT SG, < \*louk-, thus with *o* from \*ou)

Moreover, there is supporting evidence from Volscian, an Italic language of the Oscan-Umbrian branch, which shows the monophthongization of etymological diphthongs, e.g.:

- (19) a. *totico* ABL SG 'of the community' VE 222 < \*tout- (cf. Marrucinian *toutai* DAT SG 'community' VE 218, thus with *o* < \*ou)
- b. *declune* DAT SG 'Declona [deity]' VE 222 < \*declo:na:i (thus with -e < \*-a:i).

Thus this evidence from the Latin of Norba, and from Volscian, suggests that monophthongization of \*ou to *o* rather than *u* was an areal feature of central and southern Latium, so that attributing Augustus' genitive *domos* to his origins in Velitrae is reasonable indeed.

However, the question must still be asked why this feature persisted in Augustus' usage. Given what is known about Augustus' interactions with the people of Rome, an answer suggests itself. Augustus is well known for his concern for the people, and for his popularity with the common people of Rome, as documented in Suetonius's life of Augustus (see Yavetz, 1969:99-102 for a summary of this evidence). Moreover, at various times in his career, he needed the support of the common folk of Rome, e.g. upon his return after Julius Caesar's murder in 44 BC. To a certain extent, it can be said that he courted ordinary Romans, e.g. through his continuation of the popular public games that Julius Caesar had instituted and through his willingness to receive petitioning subjects (cf. Yavetz, 1969:101). His use of *o* in the genitive singular ending of a word such as *domos*, therefore, may well have been an affectation designed to show solidarity with the common people of Rome, a pronunciation which would have been recognized by the lower classes of Romans as provincial perhaps but clearly at their level. Coleman (1990:7) notes: "a dynast who could affect colloquialisms like *caldus* 'hot'<sup>26</sup> and rustic

similes like *celerius quam asparagi cocuntur* 'quicker than asparagus is cooked' might well have affected the occasional Italian pronunciation [i.e. non-Roman /o:/ in *domos* for Roman Latin /u:/] in the cultivation of his image". In a sense, therefore, one might view Augustus' use of *domos* as the Roman linguistic counterpart to some of the practices of modern politicians designed to curry favor with ordinary voters.

### 3. Problem and Solution

These indications of a social dimension to certain variation in Latin lead to the following problem: how do we reconcile evidence of regionally distributed variable features in Latin with the suggestion of social determination for that variation?

The answer draws on the insights of modern sociolinguistics, for we suggest that features that were originally regionalisms entered Roman Latin as their speakers migrated to Rome as part of Rome's urban expansion; in this urbanization process, these once-regional features became transformed into socially determined variation within the city of Rome, as the speakers who used them came to occupy the lower socio-economic strata. Thus, the process of "linguistic urbanization" suggested by Labov (1972) and documented by L. Milroy (1980) for Belfast and more recently by Bortoni-Ricardo (1985) for Brazil provides exactly the model needed to understand what was going on in Rome during the period in question.<sup>27</sup> As Bortoni-Ricardo describes the process (1985:1), "the growth of vertical stratification in languages is related to the decline of local dialects. Such linguistic phenomena are the consequence of a mass exodus from the rural hinterland to the urban areas".

Several lines of evidence support this contention. First, Rome in the early Republican period was growing and expanding as an urban center, and was in the process of becoming a real city. Thus, it was just like Belfast, which Milroy describes as a "relatively young city" (1980:188), and just like the Brazlândia studied by Bortoni-Ricardo, which has grown up in the past 40 years as a "satellite" city to Brasilia. Furthermore, available information about the population of Rome in this period, both in terms of the number of people and the composition of the populace, shows that rapid urbanization was responsible for the growth of Rome. The description given by Garnsey and Saller (1987:8) is revealing in this regard:

Rome in the age of Augustus was the seat of emperors, the court and administration and the residence of close on a million people. Rome was essentially a parasite city, feeding off the manpower and wealth of Italy and the numerous provinces that made up the Roman empire. The dramatic growth of the capital city in the two centuries before Augustus, in the course of which its population may have quintupled, was achieved by high levels of immigration of destitute Italian peasants and enslaved provincials.

The social conditions in Rome therefore were exactly those needed for linguistic urbanization to occur; speakers of rural dialects of Latin were coming to Rome in great numbers, and doing so in a relatively short span of time.<sup>28</sup>

Second, as Bortoni-Ricardo's description of the urbanization process indicates, the emergence of "vertical stratification" in urban

contexts goes hand-in-hand with the effacement of rural dialects. Such is clearly the case with Latin in Latium in the Republican period.<sup>29</sup> One well-documented local dialect of Latin was that spoken in Praeneste. Praeneste itself underwent a limited process of linguistic urbanization at an earlier period, before being overwhelmed by Roman linguistic influence in the latter half of the 2nd century BC. In particular, Wachter's (1987:192-211) discussion of names from the Praenestine Cippi leads to conclusion that in the 3rd-2nd centuries BC, the population of Praeneste was mixed, for about 30% (Wachter 1987:200) of the names on the Cippi have Oscan-Umbrian characteristics. Presumably, then, since these speakers were originally found in towns in the countryside to the northeast, east, and southeast of Praeneste, this mixture shows some infiltration of country folk into the city in this early period, presumably as Praeneste itself grew. These immigrants must have been responsible for introducing into Praenestine Latin some of the Oscan-Umbrian-like, non-Roman Latin features that characterize it, such as medial *f* (from PIE \*bh/dh, versus Roman *b/d*), vowel epenthesis in stop + resonant clusters, and *u* instead of *o* from etymological \*o.<sup>30</sup> Later, when Roman influence began to gain ground in Praeneste, all of these local features began to disappear from inscriptions, and were gone altogether from the documentary record by the 2nd half of the 2nd century BC.<sup>31</sup> The situation regarding the Latin of Praeneste, therefore, provides a perfect example of the decline of a local dialect as part of the urbanization process.

Third, it is generally accepted that regionalisms did reach Rome at least as far as the lexicon is concerned. There are several lexical



items found in use in the Latin-speaking area in general, and thus also in Rome, that have been identified as regionalisms in origin because they show apparently non-Roman phonology and belong to a lexical/semantic sphere suggestive of a rural origin. By way of illustration, a few such words are given in (20) - (23), along with an indication of what is non-Roman and possibly rural about them:

(20) *popina* 'cook-shop' (with labial [p], as in Oscan-Umbrian, for PIE \*k<sup>w</sup>, vs. Roman [k<sup>w</sup>], as in *coquit* 'cooks' < \*k<sup>w</sup>ek<sup>w</sup>- < \*pek<sup>w</sup>-; presumably rural if 'cook-shop' was associated with markets where produce and goods from rural areas were sold in Rome)

(21) *bos* 'ox' (with labial [b], as in Oscan-Umbrian, for PIE \*g<sup>w</sup>, vs. Roman [w], as in *uiuus* NOM SG 'living' < \*g<sup>w</sup>iH<sub>3</sub>wo-; presumed rural due to semantic sphere)

(22) *anser* 'goose' (with no initial [h-] from PIE \*gh, vs. Roman [h] (cf. (17) above); presumed rural due to semantic sphere)

(23) *rufus* 'reddish' < \*roufos < H<sub>1</sub>roudhos (cf. Gothic rau[ʃs], with medial [f] from PIE \*dh, vs. Roman [b], as in *ruber* 'red' < rubros < PIE \*H<sub>1</sub>rudhr<sup>os</sup> (cf. Greek ερυθρ<sup>ος</sup>); presumed rural due to phonology)<sup>32</sup>

These words show that the assumption that regional features could make their way into Roman usage is not a gratuitous one. As far as one can tell from their attested use, these words entered general Latin usage and do not seem to have been socially marked in any way.<sup>33</sup> In that sense, therefore, they are unlike the features under consideration here. Still, they may well have had a rural flavor to them when they first entered non-rural Latin, and their stylistically and

socially unmarked status in attested Latin may well reflect simply an earlier entry in Roman usage for them than for the other features. Thus, these words indicate that transformations in status affecting regional features took place in the ancient Latin-speaking world, thereby adding plausibility to the claim that a similar process was at work somewhat later on with monophthongization (1), with the DAT SG in *-a* (5), etc.<sup>34</sup>

Finally, the apparent register-based distribution of certain features in inscriptions reported on above, if it points to the restriction of these features to individuals, is consistent with the view that these features were originally regionalisms that only entered Rome as their speakers immigrated there. Such features would not have had a chance to spread into a wider range of speech styles and social strata.

#### **4. A Side-Benefit of this Approach**

We feel that the urbanization model provides the right model for understanding the relationship between the apparent geographically based distribution of certain features and their appearance within Rome. There is as well an additional side-benefit to this approach that we mention briefly.

Ancient Roman writers occasionally provide us with fragments of information about dialectal Latin features. In several passages the grammarian Varro records peculiarities of the speech of country folk (*rustici*) vis-à-vis urban Latin speakers during the last decades of the

Republic. In the texts of Varro, these features are reported by means of verbs in the present tense (*R.R.* 1.2.14, *appellant* 'they call'; *R.R.* 1.48.2, *uocant* 'they call', *L.L.* 7.96, *dicunt* 'they say'). Presumably, then, Varro has this information about the speech habits of the *rustici* first-hand, which is not too surprising since he was himself a native of a rural district (near Reate) in Sabine territory.

Later Roman grammarians and lexicographers who drew heavily on the work of Varro also generally report features of rustic pronunciation and vocabulary by means of a present tense verb (e.g. Paul. *Fest.* 28L, Paul. *Fest.* 325L, Paul. *Fest.* 333L, *appellant*; Paul. *Fest.* 93L, *dicunt*). Thus it is interesting and perhaps a bit puzzling that when Festus, the grammarian who abridged the earlier lexicographical work of Verrius Flaccus, makes reference to the variation *au* vs. *o* < \**au* with his observation about the usage among the *rustici* 'country folk', he uses a verb form in the imperfect tense, not the present; the relevant passage is given in (24):

(24) Fest. 196L: *orata* genus piscis a colore auri quod rustici orum dicebant ["An '*Orata*' is a type of fish (that gets its name) from the color of gold (*aurum*), which the country folk used to say as '*orum*']].

That is, even though in other observations about the speech habits of the *rustici*, Festus says "the country folk say", with the verb in the present tense, in (24) the verb form *dicebant* "used to say" occurs.<sup>35</sup> Yet, in terms of the account of variation proposed here, a ready explanation presents itself: Festus uses the imperfect *dicebant* 'used to say' instead of the present *dicunt* because the feature in question during the period being reported on was no longer restricted to the

*rustici*; it had become an urban feature as well, characterizing the speech of the urban lower class, the former *rustici* who came to dwell within the city of Rome.

## 5. Conclusion

Attempting to draw conclusions about the sociolinguistics of a speech community that is no longer accessible to direct study is admittedly a bit risky. However, doing historical linguistics often requires making the most of imperfect and limited data. Once we recognize, though, that historical figures such as Augustus were real people, and that the inscriptions cut in stone and preserved for so many centuries reflect the words of real speakers, then it is not so surprising that evidence should be available that demonstrates a linguistic sensitivity on the part of Romans to social differences or that the Uniformitarian Principle should be applicable here and should lead to the view that ancient Rome, in a sense, was no different sociolinguistically from urbanizing situations readily accessible to study today. It may be harder to prove such an assertion, but once demonstrated, it should be no harder to accept it.

## Footnotes

1. See Kiparsky (1988:363-364) for some discussion of the history of this principle.

2. We employ the following abbreviations in this paper: *CIL* = *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* 1<sup>2</sup>: 2.1-4; D = Degrassi (1957) and (1963); GG = Giacomelli (1963); VE = Vetter (1953). Abbreviations to Latin authors follow the standard conventions found in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. A list of the texts of the classical authors cited in this paper is given at the end of the references. We also follow standard epigraphic (editorial) conventions in our citation of words from inscriptions and texts: < > = letters accidentally omitted by the engraver of the inscription; [ ] = letters lost but confidently restored by the editor; ( ) = letters intentionally omitted by the engraver but supplied by the editor. Latin words in boldface type come from inscriptions written in the Faliscan alphabet. Etruscan is also printed in boldface type.

3. Additional examples of variation in Republican Latin include: the preverb *ar-* (*arf(uerunt)* 3PL PERF 'they were' *CIL* 581 [Tiriolo]) vs. *ad-* (*adfuerunt*); the preposition *af* (*af louco* PREP + ABL SG 'from the grove' *CIL* 2444 [Aricia, Nemus Dianae]) vs. *ab*; *-irC-* (*stircus* ACC SG 'dung' *CIL* 401 [Luceria]) vs. *-erC-* (*stercus*); medial *-f-* (*nefrones* 'testicles' Paul. *Fest.* 157L, attributed to the inhabitants of Praeneste) vs. *-b-* (*nebrundines* Paul. *Fest.* 157L, attributed to the inhabitants of Lanuvium); *a*-stem GEN SG *-aes* (*dianaes* GEN SG 'Diana [deity]' *CIL* 1597 [Campania ?]) vs. *-ae* (*dianae*). For more discussion,

and for additional examples, the reader is referred to the work of Coleman (1990) and Ernout (1909).

4. Inscriptional evidence is considered crucial because literary evidence can be tainted by later redactions in the manuscript tradition. Moreover, while the grammarians' observations are often decisive and revealing, they may have had prescriptivist notions in mind in some of their accounts and in some instances may have followed Greek models. Most of our evidence therefore comes from the 3700-or-so inscriptions that can be assigned to the middle and end of the Republican period (4C-1C). Examples from inscriptions are cited primarily from two sources, *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>: 2.1-4 and Degrassi (1957) and (1963). The dates for most of the inscriptions are from Degrassi (1965) or Wachter (1987). The dates of inscriptions not found in Degrassi (1965) or Wachter (1987) are followed by a question mark, but reflect conservative estimates offered by the authors of this paper. Note that we use "q" for "Xth quarter of" and "h" for "Xth half of" in these dates.

5. In Republican Latin a citizen is designated by at least two names and often by three. The gentilicium indicates membership in a family (the *gens*); the praenomen designates the individual within the family; the cognomen, which becomes common in later Republican Latin, serves to supplement either the praenomen, by facilitating the designation of an individual within the family (due to the fact that there were very few praenomina in use), or the gentilicium, by designating a particular branch of the family (*gens*). A typical example of a Roman name with all three components is Marcus (praenomen) Tullius (gentilicium) Cicero (cognomen).

6. Var. *L.L.* 5.97: *quod illic fedus, in Latio rure hedus: qui in urbe, ut in multis a addito <h>aedus* ["what is called '*fedus*' there (in Sabine territory), is called '*hedus*' in the countryside of Latium, and in the city (Rome) it is called '*haedus*', with an added *a*, as is the case in many words"].

7. The NOM SG in /e:s/ is the oldest Republican Latin form (Ernout-Meillet, 1985:513) for this word. For examples see Enn. 228; Lucil. 200; *CIL* 583 [Rome, c. 123/22]. A 3rd declension NOM SG /ple:bs/ is first attested in the last decades of the Republic (e.g. Cic. *Pis.* 64).

8. The differences in the quality of the vowels in *sueq(ue)* and *suisque* are the result of different outcomes of monophthongization of PIE \*-o:is. The probable phonological developments are: \*-o:is > \*-ois > \*-eis > -e:s (*sueq(ue)*) > -i:s (*suisque*).

9. The reading given in Benedetto (1973:66, no. 31) is *cucordie*, corrected to *cucordia* by Wachter (1987:465).

10. Var. *R.R.* 2.5.6: *quae sterilis est uacca taura appellata; quae praegnas, horda* ["a cow which is barren is called a '*taura*'; one that is pregnant, a '*horda*'"].

11. There are a few more examples of *f*- vs. *h*- variation attested in the writings of imperial Latin grammarians, lexicographers and commentators (e.g. *forctus* 'strong' vs. *horctus* [Paul. *Fest.* 91L] < \*bher%gh- 'high' or an extended form of the root \*dher-gh- 'to support'; *febris* 'fever' vs. *hebris* [Ser. *Aen.* 7.695], possibly from \*dheg<sup>Wh</sup>-ri-s ?, cf. *foueo* 'to keep warm'). Unfortunately, these examples do not have indisputable etymologies and so cannot be used

with any certainty. For discussion see Ernout-Meillet (1985:222) and Walde-Hofmann (1965:535-37).

12. According to Wachter (1987:216-218), following a proposal made by Giacomelli (1973:309-315), the retrograde *c* in *primo.øenia* is an attempt to spell a palatalized velar sound [%og]. Note that the innovative spelling of the voiced velar [g] by means of *g* (first at Rome c. 260/250) is not found in this inscription, *cratia* = /gra:tia:/.

13. This text is in Wachter's list (1987:347-349) of inscriptions from Rome whose dates can not be accurately determined. Presumably this inscription dates to the 1h2C.

14. In middle and late Republican Latin final *-s* was lost after short vowels if the next word began with a consonant. For discussion see Allen (1988:36-37) and Wallace (1984).

15. Warmington (1940:83) dates this inscription to c. 150 or later.

16. Several factors conspire to make a quantitative analysis of the geographical variation of the features listed in (1) to (7) either not very profitable or virtually impossible: Latin inscriptions during the middle Republican period (4C/1h2C) are not well-attested (for example, only 54 inscriptions from Rome!), are difficult to date precisely, can be of different epigraphical "registers" (official vs. private; honorary vs. dedicatory; etc.), are subject to the vagaries of survival up to the present, and often consist only of onomastica (not a very fruitful source, considering difficulties of etymology and the use of abbreviations for names). Many of the features listed here are poorly attested in the inscriptional record (1a, 1b, 6); others are listed because they merited brief mention in the work of Roman



lexicographers and grammarians (4, though note also lexicographers' mention of 1a and 1b), sources which give little or no idea of the provenance of the feature in question. By the time the inscriptional record becomes more abundant (2C/1h1C), possible regional dialect differences are concealed by adoption or imposition of the orthographical standards of Rome. Nonetheless, for most of these features, what is important is the fact that these variant forms occur at all, and in sufficient number (i.e., more than one occurrence) to show that they are not accidents or mistakes. Still, in footnotes 17 and 18 we provide an indication of the frequency and geographic distribution for two features that are reasonably well-documented.

17. The loss of *-s* after long vowels is found 7 times in Latin inscriptions from the relevant period. In addition to the one example from Rome (9), there are two examples from Latium (see (5) for forms from Praeneste and Lacus Albanus), one from Piceum (see (3) for form from Pisaurum), and two on inscriptions whose provenance is unknown (also in (3)). As opposed to these 7 instances of *s*-loss, there are 41 secure examples in the relevant period in which word-final *-s* is retained after long vowels.

18. These two are the only examples of DAT SGs in *-a* from Rome. There are three DAT SGs in *-ai* attested in inscriptions dated before 150 BC. DAT SGs in *-a* are attested more frequently in Latium and Latium Adjectum (DAT SG *-a* (19x; 3 of which are given in (5)) vs. DAT SG *-ai* (5x)). North of Latium in Etruria and northeast in Umbria and Picenum there are 8 examples of DAT SGs in *-a* (see (5) for an example from Falerii novi in southern Etruria) as compared with a single example of a DAT SG in *-ai*. South of Rome in Campania and in

Samnium there are two instances of a DAT SG in *-a* and 3 of a DAT SG in *-ai/-ae*.

19. Although this inscription, the so-called *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus*, was found at Tiriolo in southern Italy, it is an official decree of the Roman Senate and as such was composed in Rome (*sc(ribo)* . *ar(ri)* . *M. Claudi* . *M. f. L. Valeri* . *P. f. Q. Minuci* . *C. f.* ["(The senators) M(arcus) Claudius, son of M(arcus), L(ucius) Valerius, son of P(ublius), Q(uintus) Minucius, son of Gaius were present when it (the decree) was written"]). The text was subsequently dispatched to Campania where it was copied onto a bronze tablet (*utei . hoc . in . tabulam . ahenam . inceideretis* ["that you have this (decree) incised on a bronze tablet"]) and publicly displayed (*uteique . eam . figier . ioubeatis . ubei . facilumed . gnoscier . potisit* ["that you order this (tablet) to be posted in a place where it can be most easily seen"]), cf. Wachter (1987:277; 290).

20. Citizens, freedmen, and slaves are distinguished in Latin inscriptions via onomastic conventions (see footnote 5). For example, the convention indicating a freedman consists of the praenomen of the ex-master followed by the abbreviation of the word for freedman *l.* (= *libertus*), e.g. *CIL* 977 [Rome]: *C. Carvilius M. l. L. Munius L l.* ["Gaius Carvilius, freedman of Marcus; Lucius Munius, freedman of Lucius"].

21. Several other possible examples of hypercorrection (*o* vs. *au*) do not have good etymologies and thus are not certain: *plostrum* 'wagon' [Cato *Agr.* 2.10; Var. *R.R.* 1.22.3; *CIL* 593 [Rome, 46 BC] vs. *plaustrum* [Pl. *Epid.* 4.2.22; Cic. *de Div.* 1.27], cf. Suet. *Ves.* 22; *plodo* 'clap, strike' [Var. in Quint. *Inst.* 6.1.52] vs. *plaudo* [Pl. *Amp. fin.*; Cic. *Att.* 16.2.3]; *plotus* 'flat-footed' [Fest. 275L] vs. *plautus* 'flat, broad'

[Paul. *Fest.* 259L]; *coda* [Var. *R.R.* 2.5.8; *Fest.* 260L] vs. *cauda* 'tail' [Cic. *de Or.* 3.59.222; Paul. *Fest.* 261L].

22. Also mentioned in Varro, but without a good etymology, is <h>*ircus* 'he-goat, buck' vs. *fircus* [Var. *L.L.* 5.97]. For some discussion of the hypercorrection of etymological *h-* to *f-* in Latin see Wallace and Joseph (1991:89) and Joseph and Wallace (1991:166-169).

23. Coleman's suggestion (1990:23, fn. 52) that the *ae*-vocalism in Greek loanwords *scaeptrum* and *scaena* may be due to Etruscan intermediaries and thus irrelevant here is very unlikely. First of all, these two words are not attested in Etruscan. Second, the regular treatment of Greek  $\eta$  in initial syllables is by means of Etruscan *e*, not *ai*; in non-initial syllables, Etruscan *i* is the rule. There is one "irregular" case of Etruscan *ai* corresponding to Greek  $\eta$  and it is found in a medial syllable (for discussion, see de Simone (1970) 35-36; 282-83). Third, an Etruscan intermediary is impossible for *scaeptrum* in view of the fact that the medial consonant cluster *-ptr-* is not simplified to *-tr- vel sim.* (so de Simone (1970: 282)). Based on examples like Etruscan **nevtlane** < νεοπτ $\epsilon$ ολεμος, we expect Greek *-πτ-* to yield Etruscan *-t-/-θ-* (which is in fact consistently the case in Etruscan loans from Latin, e.g. **neθuns** < *neptunus*). Finally, a plausible inner-Latin explanation, namely hypercorrection, exists for the etymologically unexpected diphthongs in the first syllable. Appeal to Etruscan intermediation in this case, then, is in our opinion improbable.

24. The manuscripts of Suetonius also have a variant reading: '*domos*' *genetiuo casu singulari pro* '*domuos*'. The reading adopted by Ritschl, in which '*domos*' is replaced by '*domuos*' ('*domuos*' . . . *pro*

'domus'), stands a chance of being right (cf. *senatuos* GEN SG 'Senate' CIL 581 [Tiriolo, c. 186]) but it has no textual support and is not required on linguistic grounds. *domos* (< \*domous) is a perfectly legitimate dialectal Latin form.

25. The monophthongization yielding /o:/ may have been part of a more general process since /e:/ from etymological \*a:i also occurs in this area, e.g. *fortune* DAT SG 'Fortuna [deity]' CIL 48 [Tusculum, 3C/1h2C] (vs. Classical Latin *fortunae*, thus with -e from \*-a:i).

26. The full form of the adjective is *calidus*. The syncopated form *caldus* is attested in Varro and Cato in the ante-Augustan period. It appears infrequently in the other Republican authors. For example, Lucretius and Cicero seem never to use it. According to Quint. *Inst.* 1.6.19, *caldus* is the form preferred in the Augustan period, except by poets who needed the extra syllable provided by the medial -i- for metrical reasons.

27. See also Frazer (1983) for an interesting discussion of the introduction of a rural phonological feature into an urban environment.

28. The parallel, suggested to us by Richard Janda, with the rapid growth and accompanying linguistic stratification experienced by London after the 16th century is instructive; as Garnsey & Saller note (p. 83), "no city in the western world grew so big again [as Rome] until London topped the one million mark in the eighteenth century".

29. The languages spoken in areas surrounding Latium were also giving way to the Latin of Rome at this period. For example, in the Republican period, Faliscan underwent a major decline, so that after 241 BC, when the town of Falerii Novi was built to replace Falerii Veteres after its destruction by the Romans, increasingly fewer inscriptions in

Faliscan are found, and those that do occur are heavily Latinized. What makes this parallel less compelling is the likelihood that Faliscan was not a local dialect of Latin but rather was a separate language, though closely related to Latin (in fact, its closest "sibling"--see Joseph & Wallace 1991 for discussion). Still, it shows the levelling power of Roman Latin in Latium and surrounding territories in the relevant period.

30. For discussion and examples see Wachter (1987:187-192).

31. See Wachter (1987:238, 275).

32. It is possible that *rufus* entered the urban lexicon by virtue of the fact that it was used as an attribute for oxen sold in the markets in Rome. Compare the gloss in Paul. *Fest.* 325L:

*robum rubro colore . . . significari, ut bouem quoque rustici appellant, manifestum est* ["It's clear that *robum* gets its name because of its red color, which is also why country folk call an ox (by this name)."]

33. Admittedly, *anser* fits in historically with the socially determined h/Ø variation (see above (16)), but this word itself is never attested with an initial [h], and so was no more socially marked in this respect than any vowel-initial word.

34. Coleman (1990:22, fn. 31) also mentions this as a possibility for the datives in *-a*.

35. The imperfect tense of the verb *dicebant* is also disturbing to Coleman (1990:14), but unfortunately he does not speculate on the reason for its use here.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, W. Sidney. (1988). *Vox Latina. The Pronunciation of Latin*.  
2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bortoni-Ricardo, Stella Maris. (1985). *The urbanization of rural  
dialect speakers. A Sociolinguistic study in Brazil*. Cambridge:  
Cambridge University Press. (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics,  
Supplementary Volume).
- Benedetto, Rainiero, ed. (1973). *Roma medio repubblicana. Aspetti  
culturali di Roma e del Lazio nei secoli IV e III a.c.* Roma:  
Assessorato Antichità, Belle Arti e Problemi della Cultura.
- Campanile, Enrico. (1961). Elementi dialetti nella fonetica e nella  
morfologia del Latino. *Studi e saggi linguistici* 1:1-21.
- Coleman, Robert. (1990). Dialectal Variation in Republican Latin,  
with special Reference to Praenestine. *Proceedings of the  
Cambridge Philological Society* 216:1-25.
- Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Vol. I<sup>2</sup>: 2.1-4: *Inscriptiones Latinae  
Antiquissimae ad C. Caesaris mortem* ed. by Ernest  
Lommatzsch, Atilius Degrassi, Johann Krummrey. (1918 -  
1986). Berlin: Georg Reimer & Walter de Gruyter.
- Degrassi, Atilius. (1957). *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei  
Publicae. Fasculus prior*. Firenze: La nuova italia.
- Degrassi, Atilius. (1963). *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei  
Publicae. Fasculus alter*. Firenze: La nuova italia.
- Degrassi, Atilius. (1965). *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei  
Publicae. Imagines*. Berlin: W. De Gruyter.

- de Simone, Carlo. (1970). *Die griechischen Entlehnungen im Etruskischen*. Zweiter Band. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Ernout, Alfred. (1909). *Les éléments dialectaux du vocabulaire latin*. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Ernout, Alfred and Antoine Meillet. (1985). *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. 4th ed. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.
- Frazer, Timothy C. (1983). Sound change and social structure in a rural community. *Language in Society* 12:313-328.
- Garnsey, Peter and Richard Saller. (1987). *The Roman Empire. Economy, Society, Culture*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd.
- Giacomelli, Gabriela. (1963). *La lingua falisca*. Firenze: Leo S. Olschka.
- Giacomelli, Gabriela. (1973). A Problem in Praenestine Palaeography. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 1:309-315.
- Giacomelli, Roberto. (1979). Written and Spoken Language in Latin-Faliscan and Greek-Messapic. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 7:149-175.
- Joseph, Brian D. & Rex E. Wallace. (1991) Is Faliscan a Local Latin Patois? *Diachronica* 8.2:159-186.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1988. Phonological Change. In Frederick J. Newmeyer (ed.) *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey. I. Linguistic Theory: Foundations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 363-415.
- Labov, William. (1966). *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

- Labov, William. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Meillet, Antoine. (1933). *Esquisse d' une histoire de la langue latine*. Paris: Librairie Hachette.
- Milroy, Lesley. (1980). *Language and Social Networks*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell (*Language in Society 2*).
- Oxford Latin Dictionary*. (1982). London: Clarendon Press.
- Palmer, Leonard. (1954). *The Latin Language*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Vetter, Emil. (1953). *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Wachter, Rudolf. (1987). *Altlateinische Inschriften. Sprachliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Dokumenten bis etwa 150 v. Chr.* Bern: Peter Lang.
- Walde, A. and J. B. Hofmann. (1965). *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Erster Band*. 4th ed. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Wallace, Rex E. (1984). The Deletion of *s* in Plautus. *American Journal of Philology* 105:213-25.
- Wallace, Rex E. (1988). Dialectal Latin *fundatid, parentatid, proiecitad*. *Glotta* 66:211-20.
- Wallace, Rex E. and Brian D. Joseph. (1991). On the Problematic *f/h* Variation in Faliscan. *Glotta* 69:84-93.
- Warmington, E. H. (1940). *Remains of Old Latin*. IV. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Yavetz, Z. (1969). *Plebs and Princeps*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.



## CLASSICAL SOURCES CITED

Cato, A.C. (= Marcus Porcius Cato, *De Agri Cultura*)

Cic., *Att.*; *de Div.*; *de Or.* (= Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Epistolae ad Atticum*; *De Divinatione*; *De Oratore*)

Enn. (= Quintus Ennius)

Fest. (= Sextus Pompeius Festus, *De Verborum Significatu*)

Lucil. (= Gaius Ennius Lucilius)

Pl., *Amp.*; *Bac.*; *Epid.* (= Titus Maccus Plautus, *Amphitruo*; *Bacchides*; *Epidicus*)

Paul. *Fest.* (= Paulus Diaconus, *Epitoma Festi*)

Quint., *Inst.* (= Marcus Fabius Quintilianus, *Institutio Oratoria*)

Serv., *Aen.* (= Maurus Servius Honoratus, *in Vergilium Commentarius*)

Suet., *Aug.*; *Ves.* (= Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus, *Augustus*; *Vespasianus*)

Var., *L.L.* (= Marcus Terentius Varro, *De Lingua Latina*).

Var., *R.R.* (= Marcus Terentius Varro, *Res Rusticae*).