

ON CASES AND PREPOSITIONS IN VULGAR AND LITERARY LATE LATIN

Gerd HAVERLING
University of Aarhus, Denmark

1. Introduction

In Late Latin we have two opposite tendencies regarding the use of pure case forms and prepositions. On the one hand, we have the tendency to replace the case forms in a growing number of functions by expressions with prepositions and, on the other there is a tendency for certain case forms to replace others. Sometimes there is even a tendency to use case forms in functions where Classical Latin preferred expressions with prepositions.

Three problems are connected with this development: the first is philological and regards the often contradictory evidence of the manuscripts; the second is socio-linguistic and stylistic and regards the differences between different kinds of texts; the third has to do with the reliability of the evidence and the possible interference of linguistic conservatism and of hypercorrections. These problems all have an impact on the conclusions which we may draw regarding the language actually used at a given moment in Late Antiquity.

2. Variation between manuscripts

Some of the vulgarisms met in the less elegant Late Latin texts are problematic since the manuscripts often vary considerably and since the manuscripts providing the most vulgar readings are often very inconsistent in this respect. We often have a variation between constructions with prepositions and with case forms or between different case forms in the same text. I have found numerous examples of this in the manuscript tradition to the Late Latin translation of the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* and the *Old Commentary* to this text (1a-b):¹

¹ See HAVERLING, G. 'Sur le latin vulgaire dans la traduction "ravennate" des *Aphorismes* d'Hippocrate', SOLIN, H.; LEIWO, M.; HALLA-AHO, H. (edd.), *Latin vulgaire-latin tardif VI. Actes du VI^e Colloque International sur le latin vulgaire et tardif* (Helsinki 28 août-2 septembre 2000), Olms-Weidmann, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 2003, 157-172.

- (1a) Hippocr. *Aph.* 3.25 comm. *a septem mensibus usque ad annum dicit* (mss. Vc2, Va, Ah, Rg, G, Ba) & *a septem menses* (mss. Re, Ei, P5, Mc, Mp); cf. *Aph.* 3.24 comm.: *unde colligantur a nutricibus et hoc faciunt tribus modis* (mss. Re, Ei, P5, Mc, Mp)
- (1b) Hippocr. *Aph.* 1.1 *Ideo ad prolixam artem vitam comparavit brevem* ... (mss. P5, Mc, G, Ba, Es, Ei, Mp) & *Ideoque prolixam artem vitae comparavit brevi* ... (mss. Vc2, Va, Winter /var. lect. longam artem/)

The problem here is whether to ascribe the substandard features to the author of the texts and to his period or to the later manuscript tradition. There is always the danger that some scribes –especially in the centuries after the Carolingian reform– may have rendered the Latin in a text from Late Antiquity more elegant and more in accordance with what was then known of Latin grammar, but there is also the possibility that many of the vulgar features were introduced into the tradition in the period between the collapse of the Roman schools and the rebirth of scholarship over 200 years later². In the manuscript tradition to Benedict's *Regula monachorum*, the younger manuscripts sometimes seem to provide the more normal Latin (2a). The editorial reactions to this situation have varied a lot. About a century ago, scholars who edited Late Latin texts of this sort tended to accept all the vulgar elements in the manuscripts, often ascribing the orthographic and syntactic confusion to the ignorance and incompetence of the author. More recently, however, some scholars have been less inclined to ascribe all such elements to authors, who we know probably received a fairly good education³. As a consequence Iordanes' *Getica* appears in a much less 'vulgar' shape in the more recent edition by Giunta and Grillone than in Mommsen's edition of over a century ago (2b)⁴:

- (2a) Bened. *Reg.* 11.4 *post quibus lectionibus* (mss. ATBO¹S¹D¹) – *post quas lectiones* (mss. WLMO²S²D², from the 9th c. onwards) (cf. COLEMAN, R., p. 351)
- (2b) Iord. *Get.* 44 *de quas ...testatur* (MOMMSEN, TH., p. 65) & *de quibus ... testatur* (GIUNTA, F., & GRILLONE, A., p. 20)

Some of the vulgarisms thus seem to provide evidence of what might happen to texts between 550 and 850 AD rather than of the language in use at the time they were written or used by the individuals who wrote them.

Against this background I think we have to be somewhat cautious when we evaluate some of the substandard elements in a text for which we have only one manuscript (from the 11th century) like the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, or *Itinerarium Egeriae*⁵. Although this text does not entirely represent the "Vulgar Latin" of the late 4th c. AD, and despite the problems regarding the transmission of the text, it certainly gives us glimpses of the development in the contemporary spoken form of Latin. The evidence is, however, contradictory and the question is which constructions we may ascribe to the author herself. In the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae* we often have the pure ablative in expressions like 'at that time', but now and then we have the preposition *in* as well (3a). There are a growing number of expressions with *de* and the ablative in Late Latin and this construction replaces the pure case forms in several functions; the use of this construction instead of the ablative of instrument seems to have been quite vulgar in the 4th c. but becomes more frequent in the 6th c.; however, there is no overall consistency in the *Peregrinatio* and we have expressions indicating the means both with and without a preposition (3b)⁶. There is also notable variation in the orthographic system, for instance between *-um* and *-o* in an expression meaning 'around' (3c); such variation is met with not only in the presumed accusative or ablative forms, but also in the verbal form *nossem* which appears in the form *nosse* (3d)⁷:

² See COLEMAN, R., 'Vulgarism and normalization in the text of *Regula Sancti Benedicti*', PETERSMANN, H.; KETTEMAN, R. (edd.), *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; and HAVERLING, G. (2003), 167 f.

³ See e.g. COLEMAN, R., *l.c.*, 252 ff.

⁴ See GIUNTA, F.; GRILLONE, A. (edd.), *Iordanis De origine actibusque Getarum* (Fonti per la Storia d'Italia pubblicate dall'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo N° 17), Roma 1991; MOMMSEN, TH. (ed.), *Iordanis Romana et Getica* (Monumenta Germaniae Auct. Ant. V.1), Berlin 1882 (repr. 1961); on this problem cf. also LO MONACO, F.; MOLINELLI, P., 'Casi e preposizioni: aspetti della reggenza in Cassiodoro e Iordanes' (paper presented at *The XIIIth International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Bologna June 9th-14th 2003*).

⁵ See MARAVAL, P., *Égypte: Journal de voyage* (Sources chrétiennes 296), Paris 1982 (repr. 2002), 16 ff., 27 ff., 40.

⁶ See VÄÄNÄNEN, V., *Introduction au Latin vulgaire* (Bibliothèque Française et Romane, Serie A, Vol. 6), Paris 1981³, § 248; HAVERLING, G., *Studies on Symmachus' Language and Style* (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia XLIX), diss., Göteborg 1988, 140; DE LA VILLA, J., 'The Substitution of Instrumental ablative by prepositional phrases in Latin. Some evidence from the Vulgata', GARCÍA-HERNÁNDEZ, B. (ed.), *Estudios de lingüística latina: Actas del IX Coloquio Internacional de Lingüística Latina (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid 14-18 abril de 1997)*, Madrid 1998, 291-308.

⁷ See LEUMANN, M., *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II.2.1), München 1977, § 228.IIb; VÄÄNÄNEN, V., *l.c.*, § 127.

- (3a) 'that day': *Peregr.* 3.2 *in ea die* & 29.6 *ea die*; 'at that time': *Peregr.* 19.14 *Nam consuetudo talis erat in illo tempore, ut ...* & 7.7 *civitas, quae fuit illo tempore ...*
- (3b) 'with his hands': *Peregr.* 37.2 *de manibus suis ... premet* & *Peregr.* 3.6 *manibus suis elaborasse*
- (3c) 'around': *per giro* 'around' (*Peregr.* 2.5, 3.6, 19.10) & *per girum* (*Peregr.* 2.6, 3.1, 4.4, 8.1, 13.3)
- (3d) *Peregr.* 7.1: *Sane licet terra Gesse iam nosse* 'although I already knew the area called Gesse'

Sometimes there is also a tendency to use case forms in functions for which Classical Latin preferred expressions with prepositions. In the Literary Late Latin of the 4th c. AD, the use of the dative is usually relatively normal, but in the *Peregrinatio* we seem to have an instance of a development of which we have quite a few examples in 6th c. authors like Gregory of Tours and even in the learned Cassiodorus, i.e. the use of the dative instead of the preposition *ad* with the accusative in expressions indicating direction (4a)⁸. A literary author like Augustine uses the preposition *ad* in such a case (4c), but so also does the author of the *Peregrinatio* (4b)⁹:

- (4a) dat. for *ad* + acc.: *Peregr.* 39.5 *ingressus est discipulis*; 19.9 *cum iam prope plicarent civitati*
- (4b) *ad* + acc.: *Peregr.* 11.1 *Cum autem ingressi fuissetus ad eos*; 3.3 *ac sic ergo denuo plicavimus nos ad mare*
- (4c) Aug. *Conf.* 8.12 *inde ad matrem ingredimur*

E. Löfstedt (1911, pp. 10 f., 323) regarded the use of the dative in (4a) as an example of the linguistic uncertainty of the author¹⁰.

⁸ On Cassiodorus see SKAHILL, B.H., *The Syntax of the Variae of Cassiodorus* (Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin III), Washington D.C. 1934, 38; and BIETER, F.A., *The Syntax of the Cases and the Prepositions in Cassiodorus*, *Historia Ecclesiastica Tripartita* (Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin VI), Washington D.C. 1938, 62 ff.; on Gregory of Tours see BONNET, M., *Le latin du Grégoire de Tours*, Paris 1890, 536 ff.; cf. SZANTYR, A.; HOFMANN, J.B., *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II.2.2), München 1965, § 70.

⁹ On the development of the dative see e.g. 78 ff. in MOLINELLI, P., 'Casi e preposizioni in latino: lo sviluppo del genitivo e del dativo. Una prospettiva (anche) sociolinguistica', *Linguistica e Filologia* 3, 1996, 73–125.

¹⁰ LÖFSTEDT, E., *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache*, Uppsala & Leipzig 1911 (repr. Oxford & Uppsala & Leipzig 1936).

When we compare the use of cases and prepositions in such a text to the texts of a more literary and refined character from the same period, we find that the latter tend to prefer the older expressions more frequently. The use of the preposition in expressions meaning e.g. 'at that time' is rarer in literary Late Latin, but occasionally we also find it in more literary texts such as Symmachus' letters (5a)¹¹. Symmachus favoured linguistic features that were archaic in his day, such as the accusative of time to indicate duration; we sometimes have such forms, but in other cases the manuscripts provide us with the ablative in that function, which was more common in his day (5b)¹²:

- (5a) Symm. *Epist.* 2.7.1 *fortunatum te cumprimis hoc in tempore iudicarem, quod ...*; Symm. *Rel.* 40 *neque ullum responsum, quod eo tempore bello Persico rector imperii tenebatur, accepit*
- (5b) 'for three days': Symm. *Epist.* 2.3 *triduum conmorati ... Fors fuit an post biduo tenus eiusdem nos praedii annona retinere* & Symm. *Epist.* 8.40 *triduo conmoratus ...*

It is, of course, quite possible for an author to oscillate in this manner between different constructions and in some cases we probably have to consider this possibility. But in other cases the variation probably results from the work of the later scribes. The most obvious interference regards the loss of the final *-m*, but a comparison of different manuscripts of the same text shows that other changes, for instance in the use of the cases and the prepositions, may have also been introduced by the scribes.

3. Variation between texts

The more literary texts generally follow the Classical rules more often than the less literary ones. The choice between the pure case forms and prepositions was often not very consistent even in Classical Latin, but sometimes the rules were quite stable. Consider, for example, the constructions in expressions meaning 'to Rome' (6a–d), 'in Rome' (7a–d) and 'from Rome' (8a–d). In the expressions meaning 'to Rome' in the *Peregrinatio*, we sometimes find the accusative of direction and sometimes expressions with prepositions (6a); in this case, the use of the accusative of direction is the rule in a somewhat more literary author like the 5th century historian Orosius (6b) as

¹¹ See SZANTYR, A., *l.c.*, § 87; HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 140, 217.

¹² See HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 208 f.

well as in more genuinely learned writers such as Augustine (6c) and Symmachus (6d)¹³:

- (6a) *Peregr.* 17.3 *revertebar Constantinopolim*, 22.1 *ubi ... et eundo Ierusalimam iam fueram*; 12.11 *regressi sumus in Ierusalimam*, 25.12 *omnes ... in Ierusalima reuertuntur*
 (6b) *Oros. Hist.* 6.19.1 *Antiochiam ... rediit*
 (6c) *Aug. Conf.* 4.7 *a Thagastensi oppido veni Carthaginem* & 5.8 *Romam pergere*
 (6d) *Symm. Epist.* 2.24 *Romam ... venit*

However, in the expressions indicating the location in a city such as ‘in Rome’, where Classical Latin has the locative, the *Peregrinatio* has various prepositional phrases, and in one instance, what seems to be an undeclined form, but never the locative (7a); in Orosius we find both the locative and expressions with *in* and *apud* (7b), whereas Augustine (7c) and Symmachus (7d) usually have the locative and occasionally an expression with *apud*, in what appears to be the function of the old locative. The fact that the locative was no longer in use in colloquial Latin is further evidenced by the hypercorrect form used in other texts (7e)¹⁴:

- (7a) *Peregr.* 25.12 *in Bethleem peruigilant ... in Ierusalima tenere*; 17.1 *apud Edessam civitatem* & 23.3 *quam ... apud Ierusalimam noveram*; 49.2 *Episcopi ... hisdem diebus Ierusalima plus quadraginta aut quinquaginta sunt*
 (7b) *Oros. Hist.* 7.12.1 *terrae motus in Antiochia paene totam subruit civitatem* & 7.12.7 *in Alexandria autem commisso proelio*; 4.5.6 *pestilentia ingens apud Romam conflagravit* & 9.3 *paulisper Alexandriae substitit*
 (7c) *Aug. Conf.* 5.12 *et ecce cognosco alia Romae fieri, quae non patiebar in Africa* & 6.7 *studuerat apud me ... et postea Carthagini* & 8.6 *et erat monasterium Mediolanii*; 5.8 *apud Carthaginem foeda est et intemperans licentia scholasticorum* & 6.9 *cum adhuc studeret iam me audiens apud Carthaginem*
 (7d) *Symm. Epist.* 2.3 *peracto quod Romae agere destinastis* & 1.102 *Mediolani te agere*; 9.48 *cui lar apud Ariminum fuit*

¹³ See SZANTYR, A., *l.c.*, § 50; VÄÄNÄNEN, V., *l.c.*, §§ 245, 248; HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 210.

¹⁴ See SZANTYR, A., *l.c.*, § 88b.

- (7e) *Petron. Sat.* 62.1 *forte dominus Capuae exierat* & *Vet. Lat. II Tim.* 1.17 *cod. d venisset Romae*

It seems likely that people often actually said *in Roma*, for instance, but the examples actually encountered in the texts are late and relatively rare; the eMGH-4 has some examples from the 8th c., and volume 2 of CLCLT-5 has five such instances from the period between ca. 500 and ca. 750. Much more common in these texts is, however, the expression *in urbe Roma*, of which I found 88 examples from the period between ca. 200 and ca. 500 AD in the vol. 1 of the CLCLT-5. However, by far the most common expression in these texts is still *Romae*¹⁵.

In expressions meaning ‘from Rome’, for instance, the usage was not totally consistent even in Classical Latin: Cicero always has the separative ablative (e.g. *Att.* 2.12.2 *Roma veniens* ‘coming from Rome’) and Livy always the preposition *ab* (e.g. 26.15.8 *ab Roma venit* ‘came from Rome’); the Late Latin grammarians recommended the separative ablative in these cases¹⁶. In the *Peregrinatio* we usually find the preposition *de*, but in one case we have the separative ablative (8a); Orosius uses the prepositions *de* and *ex* (8b), whereas Augustine prefers the preposition *ab* (8c)¹⁷; the pure ablative in such cases was probably an expression of refinement and we find it, for instance, in Ammianus Marcellinus (8d):

- (8a) *Peregr.* 13.2 *profecta sum de Ierusalima* & 17.1 *profecta sum de Antiochia ad Mesopotamiam* & 10.3 *Proficiscens ergo Ierusalima faciens iter cum sanctis* & *Peregr.* 23.1 *proficiscens de Tharso ...*
 (8b) *Oros. Hist.* 7.33.12 *Valens egressus de Antiochia*; 6.19.4 (scil. *Caesar*) ... *Cleopatram sibi ex Alexandria occurrere imperavit*
 (8c) *Aug. Conf.* 5.13 *missum est a Mediolanio Romam ad praefectum urbis* & 4.7 *atque a Thagastensi oppido veni Carthaginem* (= *Hist. Aug., Vulg., Iust. Dig.*)

¹⁵ *MONUMENTA GERMANIAE HISTORICA auf CD-ROM, Lieferung 4*, Monumenta Germaniae historica, München & Brepols Publishers, Turnhout 2004 (= eMGH-4); *Library of Christian Texts CLCLT-5*, moderante Paul Tombeur, Centre Traditio Litterarum Occidentalium, Brepols, 2002 (= CLCLT-5).

¹⁶ E.g. Arusianus Messius, p. 469 l. 27, Dosith. *Gramm.* p. 425 l. 16; see SZANTYR, A., *l.c.*, § 72.1; HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 219 ff.; cf. BONNET, M., *l.c.*, 571–577.

¹⁷ Augustine normally uses the preposition *ab* in these expressions, e.g. always in the *Confessiones*, but in a couple of his letters we find *de* in this function (cf. *Aug. Epist. Divj.* 20.12 *ut tales de Roma litteras impetraret ...* & *Aug. Epist. Divj.* 23A.5–6 *ex quo de roma uenit*; = *Corp. Vind.* 88). Symmachus often has the separative ablative, but we do find examples with the preposition *de* (*Symm. Epist.* 9.142 *de Dalmatia ursos ... venturos*): see HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 219 ff., 223.

(8d) Amm. 31.7.1 *ipse Antiochia protinus egressurus, ut Constantinopolim interim peteret ...*

In Classical Latin the choice between a pure case form and an expression with a preposition was often a choice between a more archaic and poetic expression and a more prosaic and neutral one. In Literary Late Latin this dimension of style still holds in many cases: when Symmachus chooses the pure ablative with the verb *excedo* 'leave' (9c) he is probably intentionally imitating the kind of language often met with in Vergil and when Ammianus uses the preposition *ex* in a similar case he is probably aware of the fact that this was the normal usage in Classical prose (9b). In such expressions, however, the more colloquial kind of language met with in for instance the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae* prefers the preposition *de* (9a):¹⁸

(9a) *Peregr.* 12.3 *coepimus egredere de ecclesia*

(9b) Amm. 29.5.19 *provinciae rectores ... e latibulis ... egressi*

(9c) Symm. *Epist.* 9.88.3 *non quod his septem montibus eloquentia Latiaris excessit*

In this case, the training provided by the schools seems to have been fairly efficient; to some extent we can trace this in the grammarians, among whom some raise a warning finger against the use of *de* instead of *ex* or *ab* (cf. Terent. Scaur. *Gramm.* 7 p. 31)¹⁹.

We have non-classical constructions in all types of Late Latin texts, but the number of such items is considerably greater in the less literary texts.

4. Some new functions of the genitive and of *de* in Late Latin

Several functions of the case forms which were normal in the days of Cicero were no more in current use in Late Latin but occur now and then as archaisms in some of the texts from that period. Sometimes the case forms replace one another; the accusative of time indicating duration, which already had been replaced by the ablative from the 1st c. onwards is one example of this development (ex. 5b). Another example is the ablative indicating respect or quality which often was replaced by the genitive (ex. 17a–b). Other exam-

¹⁸ Cf. the pure abl. of separation in Plautus (e.g. *Bacch.* 289 *ubi portu eximus*) and Virgil (e.g. *Aen.* 2.713 *est urbe egressis tumulus*) to the prepositional phrases in Caesar (e.g. *Civ.* 2.4.5 *nac-ti idoneum ventum ex portu eximus*) and Cicero (e.g. *Catil.* 1.20 *egredere ex urbe, Catilina*): see SZANTYR, A., *l.c.*, § 72.I; HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 223 ff.

¹⁹ See HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 215.

ples are the many case functions which are gradually replaced by prepositional phrases.

The Latin genitive is already competing with the preposition *de* and the ablative in several functions in Classical Latin, but in Late Latin the number of functions in which *de* and the ablative may replace the genitive is growing. In Classical Latin, we often have the genitive in the partitive function but frequently also the preposition; the pattern met with in literary Late Latin generally follows that of Classical Latin²⁰. In the *Peregrinatio*, however, we find a rather frequent use of partitive expressions with *de* in some cases but not in others; for instance when referring to passages in the Bible the author uses expressions like *locus de libro* in 20 cases (10a) and the genitive only in one (10b); but with the noun *pars* she prefers the genitive (10b):²¹

(10a) with *de*: *Peregr.* 4.3 *locus de libro* (20 ex.); 14.2 *de argento et de heramento modica frustella* & 12.5 *sola de illis quinque* & 3.6 *dederunt nobis ... de pomis ...* & 37.2 *summitates de ligno sancto* & 10.4 *fundamenta de castris filiorum Israhel et habitationibus ipsorum*

(10b) with gen.: *Peregr.* 28.2 *locus evangelii resurrectionis...*(1 ex.); 7.8 *pars quaedam fluminis Nili* & 10.3 *in ea parte ripae, qua est Iericho* & 10.7 *lecta etiam pars quedam Deuteronomii in eo loco ...* & 3.5 *in ipsa summitate montis ...*

However, despite this apparently strong competition from the prepositional phrases, the genitive expands its functions in several respects in Late Latin and we have some very peculiar uses of it in literary as well as less literary texts. An example of this is what I have called 'the expanded form of the genitive of possession' (ex. 15c)²². The development of this usage in the literary language is probably the result of a blurring of some functions of the genitive in Classical Latin. In Classical Latin we have expressions where the genitive of possession indicates what is characteristic of somebody, as in (11a) 'it is a typical feature of those who are miserable, to be of ill-will towards others and to envy good people', or what is within the territory of something, as in (11b) 'whether we sit down or walk depends on the free will':²³

²⁰ See VÄÄNÄNEN, V., *l.c.*, §§ 248, 250; HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 140, 225; still valuable is the material collected by CLAIRIN, P., *Du Génitif Latin et de la préposition de: Etude de syntaxe historique sur la décomposition du latin et la formation du français*, Paris 1880; cf. also MOLINELLI, P., *l.c.*, 91 ff., 95 ff.

²¹ Cf. MOLINELLI, P., *l.c.*, 96 f.

²² See HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 155 ff.

²³ Cf. SZANTYR, A., *l.c.*, § 53.b; cf. HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 153 ff.

- (11a) Plaut. *Capt.* 583 *est miserorum, ut malevolentes sint et invideant bonis*
 (11b) Cic. *De fato* 9 *ut sedeamus quidem aut ambulemus voluntatis esse*

In the later period, some of the literary authors use this construction very frequently, mostly in exactly the same way as in Classical Latin. In some cases, however, they use it in ways which differ slightly from the Classical norm. Sometimes, as in (11b), this form of genitive has an almost causal function and this feature is further developed in Literary Late Latin, where Symmachus uses it to avoid subordinate clauses which would ruin the compact and 'short' style he wants to create; thus *fastidii* means 'because of disdain (i.e. because I disdained you)' (12a) and *fastidii tui* 'because you disdained me' (12b), *infortunii ... non voluntatis* 'because of misfortune and not because of a choice of mine' (12c) and *voluntariae benignitatis ... curarum* 'because of spontaneous kindness ... because of your occupations' (12d)²⁴:

- (12a) Symm. *Epist.* 4.58.2 *velim credas hanc abstinentiam (scil. scribendi) non fuisse fastidii*
 (12b) Symm. *Epist.* 1.95 *quod nullas sumpsi litteras tuas ... scio non fuisse fastidii tui*
 (12c) Symm. *Epist.* 1.83 *sed velim credas, infortunii fuisse non voluntatis, quod diu officio scriptionis abstinui*
 (12d) Symm. *Epist.* 9.152 *quod scribis, voluntariae benignitatis est, quod sero, curarum*

In the examples above, the function of the genitive has been reanalysed, but there are also cases in which the genitive does not seem to have much function at all. This development starts in the first century AD with the confusion of the expressions *mos est* 'it is customary' and *moris est* 'it is in accordance with custom'. In the earliest examples of this use of the genitive we always have an attribute as in *Graecorum moris est* 'it is in accordance with Greek custom' (13a) and in the constructions with the dative we always have the nominative (13b). But in the texts from the 1st c. AD we already encounter *moris est* without an attribute and with an expression in the dative (14a); Tacitus, for instance, seems to use *mos est* and *moris est* as synonyms (14b):

- (13a) gen. + attr.: *moris (non) est Graecorum* 'it is (in)compatible with Greek custom' (Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.66 *negavit moris esse Graecorum, ut in convivio virorum accumberent mulieres* & Liv. 36.28.4 *qui nobis imperes quae moris Graecorum non est*)
 (13b) nom. & dat.: *mos est alicui* 'it is customary for somebody' (Liv. 5.27.1 *mos erat Faliscis eodem magistro uti ...* & 28.2.7 *quibus in proelio concurrere mos est*)
 (14a) gen. + dat.: *moris est alicui* 'it is customary for somebody' (Quint. *Inst.* 4.3.1 *plerisque moris est excurrere* & Vell. 2.37.5 *sicuti Pompeio moris erat*, Tac. *Agr.* 39.1 *ut erat Domitiano moris* & 3.3.1 *ut barbaris moris*)
 (14b) nom. & dat.: *mos est alicui* 'it is customary for somebody' (Tac. *Ann.* 4.49.3 *ut mos barbaris* & *Hist.* 1.7.3 *ut est mos volgi*)

The expressions *moris est* and *mos est* were, in other words, not totally equivalent in Cicero's day, but a few generations later they overlap functionally and semantically²⁵. This is the background of a somewhat surprising development in Late Latin, of which we have several examples, even in a text like the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*. In the late Republic, we had a use of *consuetudo* and *consuetudinis est* which resembles that of *mos* and *moris est* in the same period. But, in Late Latin, we encounter a use of *consuetudinis est* (15a), which corresponds to the use of *moris est* which we have examples of from the early Empire (14a); in the *Peregrinatio* we encounter also, for instance, *desiderii est* 'it was my wish' (15b), and a conservative archaist like Symmachus may venture something like *vulgati proverbii est* 'there is a well-known proverb that says that' (15c)²⁶:

- (15a) *Peregr.* 11.1 *Id enim nobis semper consuetudinis erat, ut ...* & 16.4 *singula, quae consuetudinis nobis erant facere ...*
 (15b) *Peregr.* 11.1 *desiderii ergo fuit, ut ...*
 (15c) Symm. *Epist.* 8.61 *vulgati quippe proverbii est, enavigato Maleo oblimari earum memoriam, quos domi reliqueris ...*

I am inclined to agree with E. Löfstedt (1911, p. 278 f.) who preferred to regard this usage as an element of the written language rather than of the language of everyday conversation. These expressions in Late Latin show

²⁴ On Symmachus' *brevitas* see HAVERLING, G., 'Sullo stile di Simmaco', CONSOLINO, F.E. (ed.), *Pagani e Cristiani da Giuliano l'Apostata al Sacco di Roma: Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi (Rende, 12/13 novembre 1993)* (Studi di Filologia Antica e Moderna 1), Catanzaro 1995, 207-224.

²⁵ Cf. e.g. LÖFSTEDT, E. (1911), *l.c.*, 278; and SZANTYR, A., *l.c.*, § 53.b Zus. β; and see HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 155 ff.

²⁶ See HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 155.

that the Classical constructions from which they derive were no longer a living element in the language of ordinary conversation.

The genitive expands, however, also at the expense of other case forms. One such instance is the use of the genitive instead of the dative in its so-called 'final' use in less literary texts (16a–c)²⁷. Another example is the use of the genitive of quality instead of the ablative which is found in literary texts as well as in the inscriptions (17a–b)²⁸:

(16a) Oros. *Hist.* 6.10.19 *permetiens, rem suis maximi periculi fore, si per obstructas spatiosasque silvas ... hostem ... locis notissimum quaerent ...*

(16b) Oros. *Hist.* 6.11.23 *unum solum esse praesidii, si quoquo modo hostes aqua arceantur*

(16c) Petr. 119.47 *hoc dedecoris populo* (scil. est)

(17a) C.I.L. 3.1898 *filius adhuc intrepidantis aetatis*

(17b) C.I.L. 3.2144 *coiugi carissimo et incomparabilis pietatis*

The problem is to what extent the new uses of the genitive reflect the spoken language directly and to what extent they actually represent other expressions²⁹. It is at least sometimes tempting to assume a connexion with the new constructions with *de*. In literary Late Latin, there are many instances where the genitive seems to replace prepositional phrases with *de* and the ablative. In the *Peregrinatio* the expression 'learned in the holy scriptures' is *instructus de scripturis* (18b); in such a case Classical Latin would prefer the pure ablative 'of respect', *instructus aliqua re* (18a). A more literary Late Latin author, the 4th c. Christian historian Sulpicius Severus, uses the genitive of respect in an expression meaning 'very learned in religious matters' (18c)³⁰:

(18a) CL + abl: Cic. *De orat.* 3.137 *litteris instructor*

(18b) VLL + prep.: *Peregr.* 20.9 *valde instructus est de scripturis*

²⁷ See SVENNUNG, J., *Orosiana. Syntaktische, semasiologische und kritische Studien zu Orosius*, diss. (Uppsala universitets årsskrift 1922), Uppsala 1922, 12; SVENNUNG, J., *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache*, Uppsala 1931–1934, 219; cf. SZANTYR, A., *l.c.*, § 56.b Zus. γ; and LÖFSTEDT, E., *Late Latin* (Institutet for sammenlignende kulturforskning, ser. A, forelesninger XXV), Oslo 1959, 126 ff.

²⁸ See GALDI, G.-B., 'On the Latin Genitive: some special uses', CALBOLI, G. (ed.), *Papers on Grammar VIII*, Rome 2002, 101–121, 103; cf. HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 159 ff.

²⁹ Cf. GALDI, G.-B., *l.c.*, 118 f.

³⁰ Cf. the 'genitive of respect' in Symmachus (e.g. *Epist.* 1.3.4 *amantissimi litterarum morumque mirabiles*, 9.84 *bonarum partium spectatus*, 2.72 *vitae honestatisque complacitus*; *Honorum emeritus*): see HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 141, 176 ff.; and MOLINELLI, P., *l.c.*, 94 ff.

(18c) LLL + gen.: Sulp. Sev. *Chron.* 2.42.2 *vir divinarum rerum instructissimus*

Sometimes we find examples, even in Literary Late Latin, where the genitive replaces an expression with the preposition *de* with the ablative. A conservative literary snob like Symmachus uses the expression *qui inter se aliarum rerum saepe dissentiunt* 'who among themselves often disagree about other matters' (19b); Cicero preferred the construction with *de* (19a)³¹:

(19a) CL + prep.: Cic. *De orat.* 3.114 *cur doctissimi homines de maximis rebus dissentiant*

(19b) LLL + gen.: Symm. *Epist.* 1.15.2 *tunc nostrates viri, qui inter se aliarum rerum saepe dissentiunt, concordem sententiam super huius laude tenuerunt*

A parallel to this use of the genitive in Symmachus is Jerome's expressions *non erubesco infelicitatis meae* 'I am not ashamed of my unhappiness' (20b); in this case, also, Classical Latin used the construction with *de* (20a)³²:

(20a) CL + prep.: Sen. *Contr.* 2.3.8 *necesse est de aliis querar, de aliis erubescam ...*

(20b) LLL + gen.: Hier. *Epist.* 22.7 *non erubesco infelicitatis meae ...*

In the *Peregrinatio*, there is an interesting example of what seems to be a hypercorrect use of the dative (cf. e.g. ex. 4a). It would, however, be surprising for learned gentlemen like Symmachus and Jerome to commit simple mistakes of that kind. In the examples with the genitive in (ex. 19b) and (ex. 20b) we should therefore probably assume an interference between the so-called genitive of respect and the construction with the preposition *de*.

In Late Latin there is a growing use of the preposition *de* and the ablative in expressions where Classical Latin would have either preferred an adjective or another expression; partitive expressions like *Varius de doctissimis* in Porphyrio (21a) and *Attalum de summatibus viris* in Symmachus (21b) correspond to *Varius, vir doctissimus*, or possibly *Varius, unus doctissimorum*, and *Attalum summatem virum* in Classical Latin³³:

³¹ See HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 186 f.

³² Cf. *gratulor* with the genitive in Apul. *Met.* 7.26 and Symm. *Epist.* 1.91, 9.86.1; the more normal construction is with *de* (ThLL 6 col. 2256 l. 78 ff.); see HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 185 ff.

³³ See HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 226; cf. SZANTYR, A., *l.c.*, § 52.a Zus. t.

- (21a) Porph. *Hor. Serm.* 1.9.22 *Varius de doctissimis fuit*
 (21b) Symm. *Epist.* 7.113 *Attalum de summatibus viris* & *Hist. Aug.* 24.32.2 *fuit hic vir de primis erga rem p. domi forisque laudabilis*

In expressions meaning 'from a place', Classical Latin preferred adjectives like *Romanus* 'from Rome', but in Late Latin we encounter a growing number of expressions with *de*. We have several examples in the *Peregrinatio* (22a), but also in Symmachus (22b)³⁴:

- (22a) *Peregr.* 10.3 *cum sanctis, id est presbytero et diaconibus de Ierusalyma*, 10.8 *presbyter loci ipius, id est de Libiadae*, 12.7 *episcopus loci ipsius, id est de Segor*
 (22b) Symm. *Epist.* 2.9 *de septem montibus virum* & 2.33.A *quosdam alios de Sardinia*

Perhaps some odd uses of the genitive in Late Latin should be seen against this background. In Symmachus we have the expression *nullum partium nostrarum* 'nobody from our area' (23a), which may be compared to similar expressions with *de* (22b), and to the use of the genitive *Nolanae urbis* 'from the city of Nola' in a passage from Gregory of Tours (23b)³⁵:

- (23a) Symm. *Epist.* 4.29.1 *si contempleris ad viciniam Rheni ... nullum partium nostrarum commearere*
 (23b) Greg. Tur. *Conf.* 108 *fuit vir vitae Paulinus Nolanae urbis ex nobile stirpe ortus*

In some instances other qualities than geographical origin are expressed, for example when *de saeculo* seems to mean *saeculares* 'of this world' (24a) or *de caelo* seems to correspond to *caelestis* (24b)³⁶; we have the preposition ἐξ in the Greek passages corresponding to (24b) as well as (24c); in (24c) the Latin translator has added the adjectives *terrenus* and *caelestis*:

- (24a) Nemes. et alii ad Cypr. in Cypr. *Epist.* 76.1 *lectis (scil. litteris tuis) et pravi corriguntur et bonae fidei homines corroborantur ... nos in fidem facis crescere et de saeculo homines ad credulitatem accedere*

³⁴ See MOLINELLI, P., *l.c.*, 98; HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 167, 201; cf. CLAIRIN, P., *l.c.*, 113 f.

³⁵ Cf. HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 166 ff.

³⁶ Cf. MOLINELLI, P., *l.c.*, 99.

- (24b) Vulg. *Luc.* 22.43 *apparuit autem illi angelus de caelo confortans eum*; Vulg. *Gal.* 1.8 *licet ... angelus de caelo evangelizet vobis*; Tert. *Adv. Marc.* 5.2 *licet angelus de caelo aliter euangelizauerit*; Cypr. *Epist.* 63.11.1 *Cum ergo neque ipse apostolus neque angelus de caelo adnuntiare possit aliter aut docere praeterquam quod semel Christus docuit*
 (24c) Vulg. 1 *Cor.* 14.47 *primus homo de terra terrenus/ secundus homo de caelo caelestis*

Perhaps we should regard the rather frequent use of the new genitive of quality without an attribute not only as a development of the old genitive of quality, but also as related to the development of expressions like the *de saeculo homines* 'men of the world'. For instance, the Late Latin expression *vir litterarum* 'man of letters' corresponds to the Classical Latin *vir litteratus* (25a). With the expression *vir vitae* Gregory of Tours probably wants to say that Paulinus, who was a very pious man, was among those who were on the side of the eternal life and of God (25b)³⁷, i.e. that he is a man 'of the life', which would be a parallel to *de saeculo homines* 'men of the world' (ex. 24a):

- (25a) Symm. *Epist.* 1.78.1 *unus mihi adhuc supereras ex omnibus litterarum viris* & *Epist.* 3.69.2 *filius inlustris viri, et ipse iam honoris et meriti*
 (25b) Greg. Tur. *Conf.* 108 *fuit vir vitae Paulinus Nolanae urbis ex nobile stirpe ortus*

The literary authors in Late Antiquity do not employ the genitive in a hypercorrect manner on just any occasion they could have used the preposition *de* and the ablative. We tend to find these examples when there was a use of the genitive that could be stretched into a new function. The parallels between some of the new uses of the genitive and the constructions with *de* are, however, quite striking and a connexion between the two should therefore not be excluded.

5. Conclusions

The evidence of the use of prepositions and cases in Late Latin is often contradictory: the manuscripts are often inconsistent and we cannot always

³⁷ See HAVERLING, G. (1988), *l.c.*, 161 ff., 163 ff.; and SZANTYR, A., § 56.a Zus. E.

be sure that a vulgar feature met with in the later manuscript tradition actually belonged to the author or to his or her time.

However, a comparison of the choice between expressions with prepositions and pure case forms in literary and more colloquial Late Latin texts indicates that there is a notable degree of artificiality in the literary language of the time. Although educated authors follow the Classical rules to a notable degree they do not always do so, and it happens that a prepositional phrase belonging to the colloquial language creeps into even the most refined texts.

But, of more importance than such occasional slips made by literary authors is the very odd development of some of the pure case forms in the later periods. The development of the genitive is of particular interest. The fact that it now competes not only with the preposition *de* and the ablative, but, in a few cases, even with the nominative implies that to the Romans in Late Antiquity the use of old case forms in general, and of some of these constructions in particular, were felt to be a feature that placed a text nearer the highly literary and refined part of the scale between vulgar and colloquial language on the one hand and literary and refined language on the other. This suggests that the use of prepositions had become quite frequent in the language of everyday conversation –not only in the language of conversation used by men of poor learning, but even in that used by men of learning and literature.