

12

INSCRIPTIONAL EVIDENCE AS A SOURCE OF SPOKEN LATIN

PAUL A. GAENG

In his now classic article, on "The Reconstruction of Proto-Romance," Robert A. Hall, Jr. remarked that "it is incumbent on Romance scholars to analyze and interpret their exceptionally full stock of linguistic material, using all methods of study at their disposal, working both backward and forward in time. Only thus will Romance linguistics be enabled to do what others expect of it; to serve not only as an end in itself but as a model and training-ground for workers in all fields of historical linguistics."¹⁾ What the researcher in the history of the Romance languages is faced with is, on the one hand, the schemes of reconstruction (based on the principles of the historical comparative method) and the often puzzling testimonies of reality. Put in other terms, he has the choice of working with an abstract system represented by astericized Latin forms that do not belong to any real language, or the *reality* of the mass of mainly post-classical written records that have come down to us to be analyzed and sifted through with a view to discovering evidences of trends toward Romance in phonology, morpho-syntax, and vocabulary; and while there are no doubt materials whose meaning in terms of future evolution of the Romance languages is difficult, if not impossible to discover, there is an abundance of those that prelude the future. It is the attention to the future that, I believe, can give reality and life to the large number of forms collected from inscriptions, late writers, and other sources of "Vulgar", that is non-literary or non-classical Latin.

A little more than a hundred years ago, Hugo Schuchardt published the third volume of his *Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins* which he had begun in 1866. This epoch-making event marked the beginning of documentary research in the field of Romance Philology, the first concerted attempt at sifting out Romance features from non-literary written sources, inscriptions, manuscripts, glossaries, and remarks by grammarians. The novelty of the *Vokalismus*, however, did not merely consist of the linguistic

analysis of the direct sources of this non-literary - call it popular, spoken, colloquial Latin (what the Germans call *Umgangssprache*, as opposed to *Schriftlatein*, and the French call *langue courante*), or by the now consecrated term "Vulgar Latin", or *le latin tout court* to use Ferdinand Lot's expression ("le latin en usage dans toutes les classes de la société, en haut comme au bas de l'échelle") (quoted in Reichenkron *Historische Latein-altromanische Grammatik* (1965) p. 58) but also in Schuchardt's *a priori* belief that the *sermo plebeius* he was dealing with must have been locally differentiated from the earliest times on, though he himself had to admit, albeit reluctantly, that this rustic Latin appeared on all monuments of all regions as essentially the same.²⁾ Indeed, the axiom of a locally differentiated Latin, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the testimony of post-classical texts that seem to show a unified language with no appreciable local variations is one of the fundamental problems that has dominated Romance studies ever since.

The question, in other words, is this: do linguistic features that differentiate Romance languages and dialects correspond to dialectal differences already in existence in Latin?³⁾ A landmark attempt to show the existence of dialectal variants in colloquial Latin on the basis of evidence garnered from Late Latin authors and some inscriptional material was undertaken by Karl Sittl in his 1882 study on local differences of Latin, with special reference to African Latin.⁴⁾ In this work, which at the time had aroused quite a stir, Sittl tried to show that linguistic, particularly syntactic peculiarities in some Late Latin authors like Fronto, Apuleius, Tertullian were due to their *Africitas*, their African origin, and that these should be interpreted as good evidence for African dialectal variants of spoken Latin. Sittl's critics were quick to point out, however, that the alleged local differences and, specifically, his thesis of an *Africitas* were little more than a figment of his imagination⁵⁾ and that which Sittl had characterized as "African," "Gaulish," and "Hispanic" Latin were, in reality, post-classical syntactic peculiarities not delimited regionally. It is not generally known that in a subsequent research report on Vulgar and Late Latin Sittl retracted his thesis and admitted that even a close scrutiny of literary texts did not reveal local speech differences, but he predicted that once the inscriptional materials from all areas of the Roman Empire would be made available through the monumental *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* - which had barely begun publication in his days - these differences would become quite apparent.⁶⁾ For, had not the founder of the *Corpus* himself, the great

German historian Mommsen, said that the language of inscriptions was more closely connected with that of ordinary life than with that of literature?⁷⁾ And is it not axiomatic that the language of daily life, the living language of the people is locally and socially differentiated?

Sittl's importance for those of us who scrutinize Late Latin documents with a view to picking up every scrap of information that would help to deduce linguistic reality from their often baffling inconsistencies resides in the fact that he set the tone for a research program that has occupied Romance scholars for the past century.

The question of local speech variations in Latin of the imperial and both pre- and post-imperial periods and the treatment of Latin as a real language rather than an abstract system of relationships has given rise to a great deal of discussion and theorizing. It is not my purpose to review the history of the debate. For this, I can refer to Silva Neto's study *Historia do latim vulgar* (Rio de Janeiro, 1957), Antonio Tovar's "Research Report on Vulgar Latin and its local variations," (*Kratylos*, IX [2] 1964, 113-134), or G. Reichenkron's concise summary in his *Historische Latein-altromanische Grammatik* (Wiesbaden, 1965, p. 70). Suffice it to say that ever since W. Meyer-Lübke modified his rigid neo-grammarians stance around the turn of the century by substituting a chronologically, socially, and regionally differentiated *Volkslatein* (the term he preferred to *Vulgärlatein*) for a homogeneous, unitary Vulgar Latin language existing separately from and independently of literary Latin⁸⁾ the thesis of a vertically (socially) and horizontally (geographically) differentiated Latin has become generally accepted by Romanists, who have thus come to regard Vulgar Latin as a real language, an authentic *historisches Volkslatein* rather than a reconstructed Romance Latin (*romanisches Konstruktionslatein* - as Meyer-Lübke's critics referred to his earlier conception of Vulgar Latin). It is the degree of regional differences which, in the present state of our knowledge, is still and, presumably, will continue to be a matter of controversy, for there remains the vexing problem of reconciling linguistic differentiation of a living Latin spread over the vast area of the Roman Empire with the evidence of the available written monuments that reveal an essentially uniform Latin, giving little or no clear indication of local variations.

Let me then turn to the purpose of my paper and attempt to show in what way we can utilize inscripational material as a source of spoken Latin and evidence of its regional differentiation. Be it said at the outset that there is no, there

cannot exist such a thing as a text written in the *sermo vulgaris*, i.e., a text in so-called Vulgar Latin. The best we can hope for is to find hints, to catch an occasional glimpse as to the true nature of the spoken language through inadvertences and unconscious mistakes of the writer, since, as Palmer has pointed out, "the chisel of the stonemason, the pen of the loquacious nun, and the chalk that scribbles on the wall, disregard the tongue and move self-willed in traditional patterns,"⁹⁾ and Einar Löfstedt reminds us that "even the most uneducated person, as soon as he begins to write, if it be only a letter or a few words on a plastered wall, is directly or indirectly influenced by innumerable literary precedents or reminiscences."¹⁰⁾

It is generally admitted that private, that is, non-official inscriptions, particularly prose inscriptions of the funerary type, constitute a valuable source of spoken Latin because they very frequently deviate from the orthographic and grammatical norms of literary Latin and that many of these deviations are not fortuitous but, indeed, are prompted by spoken language habits that find eventual expression in one or the other Romance language. The validity of Veikko Väänänen's claim, for instance, that the 5,000 Pompeian graffiti "constituent un monument unique de la vie ordinaire" has been proven by the general endorsement of his monograph originally published in 1937, now in its third edition.¹¹⁾ And once the influence of the spoken language is acknowledged, there is no reason to assume that such an influence should be limited to phenomena that are common to all of Romania, to the exclusion of special features that are characteristic of a particular region.

"Inscriptions are a most important source of attestations of the changes that have occurred in early Vulgar Latin," said Gerhardt Rohlfs, one of the most distinguished and thoughtful Romanists of our time.¹²⁾ Seeing that they are localized and, in many instances, even datable with some accuracy, inscriptions yield information that can only exceptionally be gleaned from literary sources during the early post-classical stages of Latin. To illustrate his point, Rohlfs adduces the following example: in inscriptions from southern Italy and Rome (*CIL* vols IX and VI) one occasionally comes across the term *tata* in the meaning of 'father'. This term has survived to this day as the more usual one to designate this

member of the family, particularly when speaking of one's own father; thus, in the Calabrian dialect *tata oje non vene* corresponds to a Latin *tata hodie non venit*. The form *tata* also attested on inscriptions from the Danubian Provinces has replaced Lat. *pater* in Rumanian.¹³⁾

No one will quarrel with Rohlf's as far as localizing lexical items is concerned. The problem arises when one wants to investigate dialectal differences as they may be reflected in the language in which inscriptions are couched. As Tovar pointed out "there are irregularities in the materials whose meaning in connection with the future evolution of Romance languages is impossible to discover; there are others in which the future announces itself. Attention to the future is what can vivify the swarm of forms collected from inscriptions, late writers, and the rest of the sources for "Vulgar Latin."¹⁴⁾ If, indeed, misspellings can show important trends toward later Romance development, as Tovar claims, then we must ask ourselves just how much value we may attach to "mistakes" due to the negligence or ignorance of the stonemason so as not to read into them more than we are entitled to. More specifically, to what extent are we authorized to draw conclusions based on an isolated occurrence or even a group of geographically delimited inscriptions, such as the Pompeian *graffiti*?

Take the oft-quoted example of *imudavit* found on an inscription from Mérida in the Baetica that Hübner, the editor of volume II of the *Corpus* (devoted to Hispania) had interpreted as a "misspelling" for *immutavit*. The inscription, which includes an entreaty to Proserpina to avenge the theft of various objects, reads, in part: *Proserpina per tuam majestatem te rogo oro obsecro uti vindices quot mihi furti factum est; quisquis mihi imudavit, involavit, minusve fecit...*¹⁵⁾ Some scholars proposed to interpret the controversial *imudavit* as standing for *imundavit* (from a Lat. *imundare* "to make unclean"), a likely interpretation phonetically but semantically rather doubtful in the given context; more recently, Väänänen advanced the hypothesis of an *emundavit* with the slangy meaning of "cleaned out."¹⁶⁾ Under the impetus mainly of Carnoy's study on the language of inscriptions from Spain,¹⁷⁾ Hübner's interpretation has been perpetuated by some Romanists and considered by many to be evidence of an early sonorization of intervocalic voiceless stops. Even Carnoy's dating of this form as the second century A.D. has found its way into standard manuals.¹⁸⁾ No less a scholar than von Wartburg used this example for his

demonstration of the early rift of Romania into an eastern and a western portion.¹⁹⁾ Not until quite recently has it been shown that there is no real evidence to push back the date of the inscription on which *imudavit* is found to the second century of our era (the only *terminus ad quem* being that it is a pagan epitaph and, hence, probably composed before the fifth century) and that Carnoy's interpretation rests on a misreading of the editor's comment.²⁰⁾ Also, if Väänänen's proposed reading of *imudavit emu(n)davit* is correct, the question of sonorization remains moot.²¹⁾

From a philological point of view inscriptions have not escaped the critic's eye and limitations placed on their value have been pointed out more than once. For one thing, the variety of language is quite restricted and, except for metric inscriptions which are influenced to a large extent by literary and poetic traditions, they very often are made up of little more than traditional formulae, proper names, abbreviation, etc. Yet, even the severest critics admit that with a sufficient body of material it is often possible to cull some interesting information as to the state of the spoken language.²²⁾ Be it said in passing that critics of inscriptional material as valid evidence of the state of the Latin language at a given time, as well as being a source of information concerning specifically local features, have not spurned citing isolated inscriptional examples to support their theories.

Another limitation placed upon the value of inscriptional material - which, incidentally, it shares with other documentary evidence - is that certain spellings may not at all represent actual pronunciation but may rather be due to stereotyped orthography, much the way French *eau* represents the phoneme /o/ in the modern language, while reflecting a former stage of the language.

Lastly, we must be on our guard concerning inscriptions found in one locality but actually composed in another, seeing that some stonecutters may have got around in the world.²³⁾ This is particularly true of verse inscriptions and those of a more learned nature. Vives, editor of Christian inscriptions of Roman and Visigothic Spain, mentions the fact that the epitaph for a certain abbot Victoriano of the monastery of Asan, Huesca, was written by Venantius Fortunatus of Gaul.²⁴⁾

In this case, of course, the linguistic phenomenon would not be characteristic of the locality where the inscription was found; but these are exceptional cases.

All things considered and granted the shortcomings, limitations and caveats, scholars generally agree that inscriptions, particularly Christian prose inscriptions, are a valid source of spoken Latin, provided we do not draw hasty conclusions about phonological and morphological phenomena from single occurrences of a "misspelling" (though even a single occurrence of a given phenomenon may be significant) but conclusions based on the *frequency* of occurrence of certain "mistakes" within the context of classical Latin standards. Since linguistic inquiries into particular regions, such as those of Pirson on the language of Gaul²⁵⁾ and Carnoy already alluded to and the more recent study by Mihăescu on the language of the Danubian Provinces²⁶⁾ have yielded little if anything in terms of regional characteristics, it would seem that if we really want to learn something about local variations in spoken Latin we can only do so by means of a comparative *étude d'ensemble* on the language of Roman Italy and its Provinces, such as the one advocated by Sittl about 80 years ago.

My first study involving inscriptional material which saw the light exactly ten years ago is an attempt at just such an *étude d'ensemble*. For this investigation I chose Diehl's edition of Christian Inscriptions²⁷⁾ as well as the Vives collection as a supplement to Diehl. The advantage of working with Christian epitaphs, excepting official and verse inscriptions for reasons already stated, is that they are generally written by more or less literate people, that they are localized and that many of them are dated with some measure of accuracy. With a corpus of about 4,000 items from the Western Roman Empire, I divided my material into four main regions following the topographical classification of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, namely (a) the Iberian Peninsula (subdivided further into *Baetica*, *Lusitania*, and *Tarraconensis*); (b) Gaul (divided into *Narbonensis* and *Lugdunensis*); (c) Italy (subdivided into Northern, Central, and Southern Italy); and (d) Rome. The separate treatment of the capital of the Roman world seemed to be justified by the abundance of material. In addition, because of the high percentage of dated material (better than 80% in Iberia; ca. 46% in Gaul; over 40% in Italy; and 42% in Rome) I was also able to establish chronological divisions into, roughly, the fourth,

fifth, and sixth centuries.

In accordance with my belief that significant data could be obtained only by determining the frequency of occurrence of deviations in one region as against another, I made a count of vowels and diphthongs in both stressed and unstressed positions according to classical Latin standards and deviations therefrom. For the sake of chronology, the numerical analysis is based only on dated material, but examples of deviations also include non-dated inscriptions both to illustrate further a particular phenomenon observed in dated material and to supplement it. On the basis of comparative percentage figures given wherever the number of examples seemed to justify this procedure, I was able to show that despite the strongly formulaic nature of inscriptional material and the fact that deviations from the classical Latin norm appear to be more or less identical in all areas of the former Empire, it is possible to detect certain features that occur more frequently in one area with respect to another, thus pointing to regional differentiations during the period of latinity covered by the monuments investigated.

Here are a few examples taken at random:

1. *Stressed Vowels*: a. Latin /ē/ and /ĭ/ are frequently represented by *i* and *e*, respectively, in all areas; however, a statistical analysis seems to show that by the fifth century this phenomenon is particularly pronounced in Gaul, with a better than 15% differential over most of the Italian and Iberian areas.
- b. The *u* and *o* spelling for cl. Latin /ō/ and /ŭ/, respectively, is much less frequent and, in any case, not significant before the sixth century, except for the *Central Italian* area, suggesting that in the latter the back vowels may have merged at an earlier time than in the other areas.
- c. A comparative statistical analysis of the relationship between cl. Latin /ō/ and /ŭ/ and /ē/ and /ĭ/ suggests that the front vowels did not universally merge before the back vowels in the areas under investigation, as has generally been suggested by Romance scholars.
2. *Unstressed Vowels*: a. While Latin vowels in the initial syllable appear to be quite stable, Latin /ē/ in the area of Rome is frequently spelled with *i*.²⁸⁾

- b. In the intertonic and penult positions the *e* and *o* spelling for cl. Latin /*ĭ*/ and /*ŭ*/, respectively, appears most frequently in *Gaul* and *No. Italy*, and to some extent also in the *Iberian* area, probably reflecting a weakening of these vowels into a *schwa* as a first step towards total disappearance by syncope and precluding, at the same time, an important phonological rift within the so-called Western Romance languages, namely the pro-paroxytonic versus paroxytonic word structures.

Among phenomena with important morphological implications, let me mention the following:

1. The extension of the plural accusative *-is* ending of *i*-stem nouns and adjectives to the nominative plural in the *Italian* area, supporting the hypothesis advanced by some scholars to the effect that the /*i*/ plural ending of the third declension in modern Italian may indeed be the continuator of the classical Latin plural accusative *-is* ending. (I developed this hypothesis in an earlier study.²⁹⁾)

The extension of the *-is* ending to the nominative of third declension nouns and adjectives is also quite evident in the *Lugdunensis* area of Gaul, while *Narbonensis* hangs on to the accusative in *-es* (and even changes *-is* of *i*-stems to *-es*), much like the Iberian area where there is a trend to a generalized *-es* ending, reflecting subsequent developments.

2. The frequent *-as* ending for the Latin first declension feminine plural *-ae* also in the Italian area, and particularly in Rome, suggesting also that modern Italian feminine *-e* plural may derive from a popular *-as* ending rather than the classical *-ae*.³⁰⁾ The *-as* nominative plural ending is not attested in inscriptions from Iberia or Gaul, but studies on later Latin documents from these regions suggest that this sigmatic nominative reached them also, this morphological innovation (a reflex of the Oscan substratum?) having spread from south to north and west.³¹⁾

Here is another example that, I believe, will show what careful inscriptional reading may reveal. This particular example has interesting etymological implications: I have recorded forms like *lunis*, *mercuris*, (used with *dies* or *die*) from inscriptions from Spain and Italy, contradicting those scholars who would derive the corresponding Spanish and Italian forms from the Cl. Latin *lunae* and *mercuriī*, adding an analogical *-es* ending in the case of Spanish, as for example, Menéndez Pidal who derives Sp. *lunes* from a hypothetical *lunae-s*.³²⁾ Elcock states that the Latin basis of It. *lunedì* is *Lunae diem*.³³⁾ García Diego, while proposing

a Lat. *lunis* etymon for Sp. *lunes*, claims that the Latin form is not attested.³⁴⁾ (He just did not look long enough!) I did not find any attestation of either *lunae* or *lunis* in the area of Gaul, but I suggest that if I had, chances are it would have been *lunis* also, seeing that OFr. *lunsdi* can only derive from a sigmatic form.³⁵⁾

Väänänen has once defined Vulgar Latin as "l'ensemble de certaines tendances du latin que les monuments écrits nous révèlent sur tout le long de l'évolution de la langue."³⁶⁾ I hope I may have convincingly pointed to such trends on both the phonological and morpho-syntactic levels, suggesting certain regional characteristics. The material that is available for catching further glimpses of these "tendances" is far from exhausted but to sift through all the records in search for the real living Latin requires painstaking research that is, at best, very time-consuming. The choice between tracking down evidence of the unrecorded speech of our Latin speaking ancestors through these records or to reconstruct from existing Romance forms starred Latin forms that belong to an abstract system rather than any real language is a matter of taste and point of view. Of course, we have no idea how the Romans spoke, except by inference,³⁷⁾ but whatever scrap of information we are able to cull from linguistic monuments that have come down to us, particularly those written by the man-in-the-street is, to my mind, worth every ounce of effort.

University of Illinois at Urbana

NOTES

1) *Language*, 36 (1950), p. 27.

2) *Vokalismus*, I, Leipzig, 1866, p. 77.

3) Cf. also Antonio Tovar, "A Research Report on Vulgar Latin and Its Local Variations," *Kratylos*, 9, No. 2 (1964), pp. 113-134.

4) *Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des afrikanischen Lateins*, Erlangen, 1882.

5) W. Kroll, "Das afrikanische Latein," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 52 (1897), pp. 569-590.

6) "Jahresbericht über Vulgär- und Spätlatein 1884-1890," *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 67 (1892),

p. 226.

7) Quoted in the preface to C. M. Kaufmann's *Handbuch der altchristlichen Epigraphik*, Freiburg in Breisgau, 1917.

8) As first advocated in his "Die lateinische Sprache in den romanischen Ländern," in Gröber's *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, I, pp. 451-497. For his subsequent change of heart, cf. *Einführung in das Studium der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft*, Heidelberg, 1920,² par. 99, pp. 120-121.

9) *The Latin Language*, London, 1954, p. 149.

10) *Late Latin*, Oslo, 1959, p. 15.

11) *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes*, Berlin, 1966³.

12) My translation of the original German: "Wichtigste Zeugnisse für Veränderungen im frühen Vulgärlatein sind die Inschriften," in "Die lexikalische Differenzierung der romanischen Sprachen," *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Jahrgang 1954, (No. 4), p. 10.

13) Rum. *tată*. In the languages that extend between southern Italy and Rumania the word for 'father' derived from Lat. *tata* is also attested, e.g., Old Dalm. *tata*, *tèta*, Vegliote *tuota*, and Alb. *tate*. Rohlfs, *loc. cit.*, cf. also *REW* #8596 (1935³).

14) *Tovar*, *art. cit.*, p. 119.

15) *CIL*, II, #462, (ed. E. Hübner).

16) Veikko Väänänen, "Autour du problème de la division du latin. Ap- point des sources écrites, en particulier des inscriptions," in *Travaux de linguistique et de littérature*, Strasbourg, Centre de philologie et de littératures romanes, 1968, p. 145.

17) A. Carnoy, *Le latin d'Espagne d'après les inscriptions*, 2nd ed., Bruxelles, 1906.

18) *Imudavit* remonte au second siècle et se trouve dans une inscription renfermant plusieurs vulgarismes et constituant un bel échantillon de la langue populaire de l'Empire," Carnoy, *op. cit.*, p. 119. Among Romanists who have perpetuated this view, let me randomly mention: (a) R. Menéndez Pidal who states that "este cambio [i.e., the sonorization of intervocalic voiceless stops] comienza a estar atestiguado en España en el latin imperial: *imudavit* inscripción del siglo II en Mérida..." (*Gramática*, Madrid, 1958¹⁰) p. 129; (b) R. Lapesa: "*imudavit* por *immutavit*" (*Historia de la lengua española*, Madrid, 1959⁵) pp. 30 and 58; (c) W. Entwistle: "intervocalic -p- -t- -k- are frequently voiced (*imudavit* for *immutavit*)..." (*History of the Spanish Language*, London, 1962²), p. 52. Also repeated in the Spanish edition of his book (Madrid, 1973), p. 75; (d) C. H. Grandgent adduces *imudavit* as evidence of early sonorization (*Introduction to Vulgar Latin*, Boston, 1907), par. 256; (e) G. Devoto: "lenizione delle consonanti intervocaliche documentata in Ispagna da un esempio della fine del II sec. d.C." (*Profilo di linguistica italiana*, Florence, 1953), p. 11.

19) "Seit dem 3. Jahrh. finden sich Schreibungen wie *putore* für *putore*, *lebra* für *lepra*, *migat* für *micat*, im 2. Jahrh. sogar schon ein *imudavit* für *immutavit* in Spanien" (*Die Ausgliederung der romanischen Sprachräume*, Bern, 1950), p. 31. Except for a *terminus a quo*, von Wartburg gives no indication as to precise or even approximate dating of his three examples. I found the form *lebra* on a Lusitanian inscription dated A.D. 589 (cf. J. D. Vives, ed., *Inscripciones cristianas de la España Romana y Visigoda*, Barcelona, 1942, No. 47).

20) Hübner's comment on this particular inscription reads, in part:

Tabella marmorea... versus finem proximi saeculi infixam muro lacus artificialis... ('a marble table... which toward the end of the last century [i.e., the 18th with respect to the 19th century in which *CIL* II was edited] was encased in the wall of an artificial lake...") Arrigo Castellani, in a note on the controversial *imudavit* (in *AGI*, 40 (1955), pp. 81-83), argues that Carnoy, while studying the inscriptions of Spain, misunderstood Hübner's comment and translated it as: "... encased in the wall of an artificial lake at the end of the second century."

21) Cf. H. Weinrich, "Sonorisierung in der Kaiserzeit," *ZRP*, 76 (1960), pp. 205-216, in which he refutes examples of sonorization found in inscriptional material and other sources dating back to the time of the Empire, i.e., before the early fifth century. "Wir müssen feststellen, dass es bisher im ganzen Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum und in anderen Quellensammlungen keinen gesicherten Beleg für eine Sonorisierung in der Kaiserzeit gibt" (p. 218).

22) Thus, for example, W. Kroll, *art. cit.*, p. 573.

23) "Die Schreiber und Steinmetzen mochten viel in der Welt herumkommen" (Schuchardt, *op. cit.*, p. 92).

24) Cf. Vives, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

25) J. Pirson, *La langue des inscriptions latines de la Gaule*, Bruxelles, 1901.

26) H. Mihăescu, *Limba latină în provinciile dunărene ale imperiului roman*, Bucarest, 1960.

27) E. Diehl (ed.), *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*, 3 vols, Berlin 1924-31. 2nd ed., revised, Berlin, 1961. *Supplementum* edited by J. Moreau and H. I. Marrou, Berlin, 1967.

28) The pattern of orthographic *i* for Lat. /ē/ in this position with respect to other Italian and Western Romance areas is so consistent that Rome may well be considered as the focal point of this phenomenon. For the /i/ outcome in modern Italian, cf. M. Pei, *The Italian Language*, New York, 1954, p. 36.

29) P. Gaeng, "The Plural *i*-Ending of Third Declension Masculine Nouns in Italian," in J. Fisher and P. Gaeng, *Studies in Honor of Mario A. Pei*, Chapel Hill, 1972, pp. 105-114.

30) For an extensive discussion of this problem with bibliographical references, cf. my *A Study of Nominal Inflection in Latin Inscriptions*, Chapel Hill, 1977, pp. 46-51.

31) *Ibid.*, p. 51.

32) *Gramática*, p. 187.

33) W. D. Elcock, *The Romance Languages*, London, 1960, p. 169.

34) V. García de Diego *Gramática histórica española*, Madrid, 1951, p. 204. Let us also add Entwistle (*op. cit.*) to this list who claims that Sp. *lunes* and *miércoles* derive from Lat. *lunae* and *mercurii* plus *-es* (p. 69) and that they are analogical formations. Analogical in Spanish or in Latin already? He does not say.

35) Cf. *REW* #5164.

36) "Le nominatif pluriel en *-ās* dans le latin vulgaire," *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 35 (1934), p. 81.

37) Cf. E. Pulgram, "Spoken and Written Latin," *Language*, 26 (1950), pp. 458-466.