

J. N. ADAMS

THE LATINITY OF C. NOVIUS EUNUS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 82 (1990) 227–247

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## THE LATINITY OF C. NOVIUS EUNUS

### INTRODUCTION

In 1959 some wax writing tablets were found at Murecine near Pompeii which relate to a variety of legal transactions at Puteoli.<sup>1</sup> The original edition of the tablets is flawed, but the tablets are now being re-edited by G. Camodeca.<sup>2</sup> Some of them, dated to the years A.D. 37-9, present us with the business activities of a freedman C. Novius Eunus. J.G. Wolf and J.A. Crook have recently produced a new edition of this archive.<sup>3</sup> Eunus had borrowed 10,000 HS and then another 3,000 HS on the security of a quantity of perishable goods (TP 15, 16). The goods are stored in the *horrea Bassiana* at Puteoli.<sup>4</sup> Another tablet from the same archive (TP 7) 'is a declaration by the slave of one C. Novius Cypaeus that he has let to the creditor of Novius Eunus the repository space in which are contained the goods that the creditor has this day taken in pledge'.<sup>5</sup> The documents numbered TP 15 and 18 survive in two versions, a correctly spelt version on the exterior, and a version on the interior replete with spelling errors. The correct versions will have been the work of a professional scribe. The 'incorrect' versions, in the hand of Eunus himself, are of considerable linguistic interest, throwing light as they do on Eunus' pronunciation. Though he cannot spell, Eunus writes a good hand.

I reproduce here for illustration most of the text established by Wolf and Crook of the two most important documents (TP 15 and 18). In each case the correctly spelt version is numbered 5.

---

I am grateful to H.D. Jocelyn for his comments on a draft of this paper.

<sup>1</sup> For general discussion of the tablets, see J.H. D'Arms, *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981), 88, 107 n. 48, *id.*, *JRS* 64 (1974), 107 n. 21, M. Frederiksen, *Campania*, ed. by N. Purcell (Rome, 1984), 320, 327f., J.A. Crook, *ZPE* 29 (1978), 229ff.

<sup>2</sup> See *Puteoli* 6 (1982), 7-8 (1983-4), 9-10 (1985-6).

<sup>3</sup> *Rechtsurkunden in Vulgärlatein aus den Jahren 37-39 n. Chr. (Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 1989: 3, Heidelberg)*. Wolf and Crook provide a useful list of misspellings found in the tablets (44-6).

<sup>4</sup> For further details, see Crook, *ZPE* 29 (1978), 234ff.

<sup>5</sup> Crook, *op. cit.*, 235.

## SOME TEXTS

- TP 15 (28 June 37)
- I CHIROGRAPHUM C NOV II EUNI HS  $\bar{X}$  MUTUORUM  
 II PUT IV K IUL PROCULO ET NIGRINO COS
- 2 1 CN ACCERONIO PROCULO C PETRONIO *po*NTIO COS  
 2 IV K IULIAS  
 3 C NOVIUS EUNUS SCRIPSSI ME ACCEPISSE AB  
 4 MUTUA AB EUENO TI CESSARIS AUGUSTI  
 5 LUBERTO PRIMIANO APSENTE PER  
 6 HESSUCUS SER EIUS ET DEBERE EI SESTERTA  
 7 DECEM MILIA NUMMU QUE EI REDAM  
 8 CUM PETIAERIT ET EA SESTERTA DECEM MI  
 9 LIA S S S P R D STIPULATUS EST HESSUCUS  
 10 EUENI TI CESSARIS AUGUSTI L PRIMIANI  
 11 SER SPEPODI EGO C NOVIUS EUNUS  
 12 PRO QUEM IIS SESTERTIS DECEM MILIBUS  
 EI  
 13 NUMMU DEDE PIGNORIS ARABONIS
- 3 1 VE NOMINE TRIDICI ALXADRINI MODIUM  
 2 SEPTE MILIA PLUS MINUS ET CICERIS FARIS  
 3 MONOCPI LENTIS IN SACIS DUCENTIS MODIUM  
 4 QUATOR MILIA PLUS MINUS QUE OMINIA  
 5 POSSITA HABEO PENUS ME IN HOREIS BASSIANIS  
 6 PUPUBLICIS PUTOLANORUM QUE AB OMINI  
 7 VI PERICULO MEO EST FATEOR  
 8 ACTUM PUTOLIS
- 5 1 CN ACERRONIO PROCULO C PETRONIO PONTIO NIGRINO  $\dot{C}\dot{O}\dot{S}$   
 2 QUARTUM KALENDAS IULIAS  
 3 C NOVIUS EUNUS SCRIPSI ME ACCEPISSE MUTUA AB EUENO  
 4 TI CAESARIS AUGUSTI LIBERTO PRIMIANO APSENTE PER  
 5 HESYCHUM SERVUM EIUS ET DEBERE EI SESTERTIUM  
 6 DECEM MILLIA NUMMUM QUAE EI REDDAM CUM

7 PETIERIT / ET EA HS  $\bar{X}$  M N Q S S S P R D STIPULATUS EST  
 8 HESYCHUS EUENI TI CAESARIS AUGUSTI L PRIMIANI  
 9 SERVUS SPOPONDI EGO C NOVIUS EUNUS / PROQUE  
 10 IIS SESTERTIIS DECEM *Mill*IBUS NUMMUM DEDI  
 11 EI PIGNORIS ARRABOnISVE NOMINE TRITICI ALEXANDRINI  
     *pluS mi*NUS  
 12 MODIUM SEPTEM MILLIA ET CICERIS FARRIS MONOCOPI  
 13 LENTIS IN SACCIS DUCentIS *mod*IUM QUATTUOR MILLIA P M  
 14 QUAE OMNIA REPOSITA HABEO PENES ME IN HORREIS  
 15 BASSIANIS PUBLICIS PUteoLANORUM QUAE AB OMNI VI  
 16 PERICULO MEO ESSE FATEOR ACT PUTEOLIS

TP 18

(15 September 39)

2 1 CN DOMITIO AFRO A DIDIO gALIO COS  
 2 XVII K oCToBE RES  
 3 C NOVIUS EUNUS SCRIPSSI ME DEBERE  
 4 HESUCO C CESSARIS AUGUSTI GERMANIC  
 5 SER EUENIANO STERTERTIOS MILE  
 6 DUCENTOS QUIQUAGINTA NUMMOS  
 7 RELiQUOS RATiONE OMINI PUTATA  
 8 QUOS AB EO MUTOS ACCEPI QUEM  
 9 SUMA IURATUS PROMISSI ME  
 10 AUT IPSSI HESUCO AUT C SULPICIO  
 11 FAUSTO REDTURUM K NOEMBRIBuS  
 12 PRIMIS PER IOBE OPTUMM MAXU  
 13 MU ET NUME DIBI AUGUSTI ET  
 14 GENIUM C CESSARIS AUGUSTI  
 15 QUOTSI EA DIE NON SOLVERO

3 1 ME NONT SOLUM PEIURIO TENE  
 2 RI SET ETIAM PEONE NOMINE  
 3 IN DE SIGULOS SESTERTIOS VIGIENOS  
 4 NUMMO OBLIGATUM IRI ET  
 5 EOS HS ICCL Q S S S PROBOS RECTE  
 6 DARI STIPULATUS ET HESSUCUS C

- 7 CESSARIS AUGUSTI SER SPEPODI C NOVI  
 8 US EUNUS
- 9 ACTUM IN COLONIA IULIA  
 10 AUGUSTA PUTOLIS
- 5 1 CN DOMITIO AFRO A DIDIO GALLO COS  
 2 XVII K OcTOBRES C NoVIUS EUNUS SCRIPSI  
 3 ME DEBERE HESYCHO Ç CAESARIS AUGUSTI GERMA  
 4 NICI ŞeR *euenia*NO ŞESTERTIOS MILLE DUCENTOS  
 5 QUINQUAGINTA NUMMOS RELIQUOS RATIONE  
 6 OMNI PUTATA QUOS AB EO MUTUOS ACCEPI  
 7 QUAM SUMMAM IURATUS PROMISI ME AuT  
 8 IPSI HESYCHO AUT C SULPICIO FAUSTO REDDITU  
 9 RUM K NOVEMBRIBUS PRIMIS PER IOVEM OPTU  
 10 MUM MAX ET NUMEN DIVI AUG ET GENI  
 11 UM C CAESARIS AUGUSTI QUOD SI EA DIE NON  
 12 SOLVERO ME NON SOLUM PEIURIO TENERI  
 13 SED ETIAM POENAE NOMINE IN DIES SING  
 14 HS XX NUMMOS OBLIGATUM IRI ET EOS HS MCCL  
 15 Q SSS P R D STIPULATUS EST HESYCHUS C CAESARIS SER  
 16 SPOPONDI C NOVIUS EUNUUS ACT PUTEOLIS

## ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONOLOGY

### I Vowels and diphthongs

*ae* had been monophthongised in ordinary speech by the early first century A.D. Eunus has *e* for *ae* 17 times. The name *Caesar* is spelt *Cessar(is)* at 15.2.4, 15.2.10, 16.2.1 (*Cessasare*), 16.2.5, 16.3.2, 17.2.4, 17.3.3, 18.2.4, 18.2.14, 18.3.7; in the second versions of 15 and 18, however, the digraph is correctly written (15.5.4, 15.5.8, 18.5.3, 18.5.11, 18.5.15). Cf. *pret(er)* at 16.2.8, *que* = *quae* at 15.2.7, 15.3.4, 15.3.6, 16.2.9, 16.3.12 (but *quae* in the correct version 15.5.6, 15.5.14, 15.5.15), and *peone (sic)* at 18.3.2 (but *poenae* at 18.5.13). Eunus' only example of the digraph is hypercorrect (for CL *ē*: 15.2.8 *petiaerit*, which is correctly spelt in the other version, 15.5.7; for such verb-forms,

cf. e.g. *uoluaerit* at *CIL* VI.16809, 26942).<sup>6</sup> Since there are no vocalic misspellings in Eunus reflecting the VL merger of  $\bar{e}$  and  $\check{i}$  or  $\bar{o}$  and  $\check{u}$ ,<sup>7</sup> the documents provide an indication that the monophthongisation of *ae* preceded adjustments to the vowel system.<sup>8</sup>

The *au* diphthong is always correctly written by Eunus.

At 17.2.9 *petiarit* seems to exhibit opening of *e* before *r* (cf. Terentianus, *P. Mich.* VIII.468.23 *itarum = iterum*).<sup>9</sup>

Eunus twice has the old-fashioned *u*-spelling for the short 'intermediate' vowel before labials (18.2.12f. 'per Iobe *optumm maxumu*'). Perhaps the old spelling tended to be kept in this religious formula. More peculiar is the spelling *luberto = liberto* at 15.2.5 (the conventional spelling is used in the alternative version, 15.5.4). Since the *i* of *libertus* is long, one would not expect *lubertus* as a variant. *Lubertus* must be hypercorrect archaising orthography. Eunus had presumably observed *u* for *i* in such words as *lubens*,<sup>10</sup> and falsely introduced the *u*-spelling here despite the length of the vowel.

The spelling *dede* (15.2.13) = *dedi* can be paralleled by various cases of *e* for  $\bar{i} < ei$  in Pompeian inscriptions (e.g. *CIL* IV.1516, 1517 *futue*). Väänänen comments:<sup>11</sup> 'Il se peut ... qu'à Pompéi les épels  $\bar{e} = \bar{i} < ei$  reflètent un traitement dialectal de *ei* dû à l'influence de l'osque, qui conservait la diphthongue *ei* ou la rapprochait de  $\bar{e}$ '.

## II Syncope

Short unstressed vowels are omitted by Eunus as follows: 15.3.1, 16.3.5 *Alxadrini*, 15.3.3 *monocpi* ( for the correct form *monocopi*, see the alternative version, 15.5.12, and also 16.3.9), 16.2.5 *Hessco* (this name is elsewhere variously spelt as *Hessycus* (15.2.6), *Hesychem* (15.5.5), *Hessucus* (15.2.6, 16.3.1), and *Hesico* (7.2.7)), 16.3.13 *priculo*, 18.2.11 *redturum*, 18.2.12 *optumm*.

<sup>6</sup> There is a similar hypercorrection in the document of Diognetus, the slave of C. Novius Cypaerus: 7.3.6 *aeodem = eodem*.

<sup>7</sup> But in Diognetus note 7.3.3 *ube* (for which form cf. *CIL* VI.9659, 10458, 26708) and 7.3.4-5 *legumenum = leguminum*.

<sup>8</sup> This chronology was tentatively suggested by R.G.G. Coleman, 'The monophthongization of /ae/ and the Vulgar Latin vowel system', *TPhS* 1971, 175ff., especially 185.

<sup>9</sup> On this form of opening, see e.g. J.N. Adams, *The Vulgar Latin of the Letters of Claudius Terentianus* (*P. Mich.* VIII.467-72) (Manchester, 1977), 13f.

<sup>10</sup> On the alternation of  $\check{i}$  and  $\check{u}$  in this environment (after *l* and before a labial in the first syllable of a word: e.g. *clipeus / clupeus*), see M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*<sup>6</sup> (Munich, 1977), 89f., F. Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*<sup>4</sup>, revised by R. Pfister (Heidelberg, 1977), 62.

<sup>11</sup> V. Väänänen, *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes* (Berlin, 1966), 23.

There are some oddities in this list. The omissions in *monocpi*<sup>12</sup> and *redturum* produce unusual consonant clusters which have not been assimilated. Moreover syncope of *o* (*monocpi*) is rare.<sup>13</sup> Eunus has surely not used 'syllabic writing'.<sup>14</sup> The *c* of *monocpi*, for instance, could not stand for *co* in such a system: it would be expected to indicate *ce*. *Priculo*, another unusual form (the usual syncopated form is *periculum*), could conceivably be a case of syllabic writing, with *p* standing for *pe*, but this seems unlikely. *Optumm* is another curious spelling: could the final *m* perhaps be an attempt to render a nasalised vowel? Presumably the spellings are due to a mixture of factors, such as idiolectal syncopations, spelling slips, and eccentric abbreviations.

In the document of Diognetus, *singlis* (7.3.9) coming immediately after *singulos* (7.3.8) illustrates the indifference to spelling regularity at this period. For an early case of syncope in this word, cf. Lucr. 6.1067 *singlariter*.

### III Epenthesis

Eunus writes *ominis* (*omini*, *ominia*) 6 times (15.3.4, 15.3.6, 16.3.4, 16.3.12 twice, 18.2.7), *omnis* never; hence *ominis* must have represented his pronunciation. Cf. 16.2.12 *recete* = *recte* (*recte* 18.3.5), 17.2.2 *Septeberes*, 18.2.2 *Octoberes*. The form *ominis* is not mentioned by the *TLL*, but cf. *CIL* IX.385, X.444, XII.2366,<sup>15</sup> Tjäder P.20.84  $\omega\mu\epsilon\nu\iota\beta\omega\varsigma$ .<sup>16</sup> Examples are also quoted from later Latin documents from the area of modern Portugal.<sup>17</sup> Epenthesis is found between *m* and *n* in Oscan (*comenei*, Umbr. *kumne*),<sup>18</sup> but there had also long been a tendency for a vowel to be inserted in this environment in Latin (Plaut. *Mil.* 628 *tamine* (?), *mina* <  $\mu\nu\hat{\alpha}$ , Petron. 41.12 *staminatas* <  $\sigma\acute{\tau}\acute{\alpha}\mu\nu\omicron\varsigma$  (?), *CIL* VIII.410 *alumino*).

With *recete*, cf. *CIL* VIII.6239 *Ocetaui*.

Epenthesis tended to occur within unusual or foreign consonant clusters, but it was never more than a tendency because of the counter effects of syncope and assimilation.<sup>19</sup> All but two of the examples in Eunus are in clusters subject to assimilation (for *-ct-* > *-t-*, see, e.g.

<sup>12</sup> On this unexplained word, see Crook, *ZPE* 29 (1978), 235 n.11.

<sup>13</sup> See Väänänen, *Introduction au latin vulgaire*<sup>3</sup> (Paris, 1981), 40.

<sup>14</sup> For which in early Latin, see W.M. Lindsay, *The Latin Language* (Oxford, 1894), 12, 177.

<sup>15</sup> See further S. Kiss, *Les transformations de la structure syllabique en latin tardif* (Debrecen, 1972), 50f., H. Mihăescu, *La langue latine dans le sud-est de l'Europe* (Bucarest-Paris, 1978), 193.

<sup>16</sup> J.-O. Tjäder, *Die nichtliterarischen lateinischen Papyri Italiens aus der Zeit 445-700* (Lund, 1954-5).

<sup>17</sup> See N.P. Sacks, *The Latinity of Dated Documents in the Portuguese Territory* (University of Pennsylvania, Publication of the Series in Romance Languages and Literatures, No. 32, Philadelphia, 1941), 53.

<sup>18</sup> C.D. Buck, *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* (Boston, 1904), 53.

<sup>19</sup> See further Kiss, 99ff. on the relationship between syncope and epenthesis.



*CIL* IV.10135a *Vitorius*, VIII.18419 *Vitor*, IX.154 *Otauius*; and for *-mn-* > *-nn-*, see *CIL* III.2240 *alonnus*, the *cacemphaton cum nos* at *Cic. Fam.* 9.22.2, and the hypercorrect *amn* = *ann(is)* at *CIL* VI.3604). Clearly epenthesis and assimilation are closely related. Assimilation is due to an economising of effort in a difficult consonant group, and epenthesis also facilitates the pronunciation of an awkward cluster (note the alternative forms *aluminio* and *alonnus* quoted above). Some cases of epenthesis may well have been due to an attempt to counter assimilations of which the speaker was conscious in the everyday language.

#### IV Vowels in hiatus

In the documents of Eunus there is no instance of *i* written for *e* in hiatus (but in the document of Diognetus note *Putiolanorum* at 7.2.9f., and *Putiolis* at 7.3.10), but both *i* and *e* are constantly omitted in hiatus: *sesterta* (15.2.6, 15.2.8),<sup>20</sup> *Putolanorum* (15.3.6), *Putolis* (15.3.8, 16.3.14, 17.3.6, 18.3.10), *Putola...* (16.3.7), *tra* = *tria* (16.2.7, 16.2.11), *debo* (16.2.10), *fator* (16.3.13), *mila* (16.3.6), *de* = *dies* (18.3.3). There is some inconsistency within these same tablets; note for instance, *milia* at 15.3.4, and with *debo* and *fator* contrast *habeo* (15.3.5) and *fateor* (15.3.7).

These omissions fall into two categories:

(1) In a number of words the original *e* or *i* was in an unstressed syllable (*Putolanorum*, *debo*, *fator*, *mila*). Such spellings are extremely common in inscriptions and papyri.<sup>21</sup> They do not indicate the total loss of a phoneme, since there is abundant evidence, both in Latin itself and Romance, of the presence of yod or of the palatalisation and assibilation which it effected. The omission is one of the graphic methods of representing the formation of a glide ([j]) in hiatus and the consequent syllabic reduction.<sup>22</sup>

(2) In *tra*, *de* and *Putolis* the original *e* or *i* was under the accent. I take each of these in turn.

(a) *Tría* may have undergone a change of accent-position (> *triá*), in accordance with a tendency for the accent to gravitate to the more open of two vowels in hiatus (e.g. *pariète* > *pariéte*, *filiólus* > *filiólus*, *mulíerum* > *muliérum*).<sup>23</sup> A parallel change of accent is attested in

<sup>20</sup> For this spelling see also Väänänen, *Inscript. pomp.*, 40.

<sup>21</sup> Note, for example, *CIL* IV.8083 *canites*, 10004 *Eupla*, III.3381, IV.7563, 7695, VIII.20855 *filus*, VI.10464 *aleno*, VI.35243 *abalenare*, XIII.2189 *laesone*, VI.10238 *custoda*, VI.10329 *sortitone*, *P. Mich.* VIII.467.5 *anaboladum*, with Adams, *Terentianus*, 19f. See further, e.g. J. Svennung, *Kleine Beiträge zur lateinischen Lautlehre* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1936: 7), 7ff., Kiss 53f., with numerous examples.

<sup>22</sup> See Kiss 53 n. 103; also Adams *loc. cit.*

<sup>23</sup> See B. Löfstedt, 'Die betonten Hiatusvokale in Wörtern vom Typus *pius*, *tuus*, *meus*', *Eranos* 60 (1962), 91. For *muliérum*, *muliérem*, *muliéris*, see the passages quoted by J. Kramer, *Literarische Quellen zur Aussprache des Vulgärlateins* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1976), 36, with Kramer's comments, 37.

Greek (MGk τρία < τρία).<sup>24</sup> One may conjecture that in the pronunciation of Eunus, since the accent had changed position, the *i* was weakened to the point of being lost. For the disappearance of an unaccented first vowel in a hiatus-group, cf. *februarius* > *febrarius*, *quiescerent* > *quescerent*, *quiétus* > *quetus*.<sup>25</sup> Väänänen,<sup>26</sup> citing examples of *quetus*, *febrarius*, etc., points out that the loss takes place after a complex consonant group (*k<sup>w</sup>*, *br*). This is also true of *tra*; note too the spelling *qua* = *quia* (in manuscripts and inscriptions).<sup>27</sup>

The development to *tra* is not the standard treatment of *tria*. The spelling *trea*, representing presumably opening to *tr̄ea* under the influence of *tres*, is common (e.g. *CIL* III.13917).<sup>28</sup> But *tria* > *tra* is consistent with the practice of Eunus.

(b) For *des* = *dies*, see e.g. *CIL* VI.17508 (also without final *-s*), VIII.9056.<sup>29</sup> The accent may again have changed position (*dies* > *diés*), partly in keeping with the tendency discussed in the previous section, and partly under the influence of the accentuation of oblique-case forms such as *diébus*.<sup>30</sup> In this case too the *i* will not have been lost, but become consonantal (*dj-*). Later spellings such as *zes* represent a further development of *dj-*.<sup>31</sup> As examples of synizesis in *dies* in early Latin, Lindsay<sup>32</sup> cites Plaut. *Poen.* 869 *Diespiter*, 1207 *diebu' paucis liberas*.<sup>33</sup>

(c) In *Putéoli* too there was perhaps a change of accent position. There is abundant early evidence for the closing of *e* to *i* in the suffix *-eolus*. Väänänen<sup>34</sup> cites examples from Pompeii, including *Putiolos*, *Putiolanus*, and we have seen a case of *Putiolanorum* in the document of Diognetus (see above, p. 233). In *Putíoli* the accent presumably shifted to the more open vowel (*Putióli*), with the *i* becoming consonantal. Mod. It. *Pozzuoli* reflects these developments, with the typical *uo* diphthong under the accent. Väänänen<sup>35</sup> cites *CIG* III.5853 (A.D. 174) ΠΟΤΙΩΛΟΙC 'comme le plus ancien témoignage du déplacement d'accent survenu dans *-iolus*', but the spellings *Putolis* etc. suggest that the accent had moved much earlier, at least in this place-name.

<sup>24</sup> See E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* I (Munich, 1936), 245, B. Löfstedt 91 n.1.

<sup>25</sup> See, e.g. G.K. Meadows, *PMLA* 63 (1948), 768.

<sup>26</sup> *Inscript. pomp.*, 41.

<sup>27</sup> See B. Löfstedt 89.

<sup>28</sup> See B. Löfstedt 83f.

<sup>29</sup> Also B. Löfstedt 90, Kiss 54.

<sup>30</sup> See B. Löfstedt 91.

<sup>31</sup> B. Löfstedt 90.

<sup>32</sup> W.M. Lindsay, *Early Latin Verse* (Oxford, 1922), 61f.

<sup>33</sup> Note too his comments, 141 (cited also by B. Löfstedt 89): 'die seems ... to represent dje ... The *i* was not reduced but rather changed from a vowel to a consonant'. On synizesis, see further S. Timpanaro, 'Sinizèsi', *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* (Rome, 1984-88), IV, 877ff.

<sup>34</sup> *Inscript. pomp.*, 36f.

<sup>35</sup> *Inscript. pomp.*, 37 with n. 1.

The commonplace spelling *quator* (15.3.4, 16.3.11) may exhibit the loss of *u* in a post-tonic syllable before a back vowel (cf. 18.2.8 *mutos* = *mutuos*).<sup>36</sup> Once the *u* was lost in a form such as *mutuum*, the way was open for forms such as *muta* = *mutua* (16.2.4).

The contraction of *-ii-* in hiatus (e.g. *mi* = *mihi*) is a common early phenomenon:<sup>37</sup> note 15.2.12 *sestertis*, 16.3.8 *medis*, 16.3.12 *isdem* (cf. in the document of Diognetus, 7.2.10 *medis*, 7.3.2 *isdem*, 7.3.8 *Iulis*, 7.3.9 *sestertis*, 7.5.8 *medis*, 7.5.14 *Iulis*).

#### V Intervocalic /b/ and /w/

The *nomen* *Nouius* is always correctly spelt with intervocalic *u* (15.2.3, 15.2.11, 16.3.3, 17.2.3, 17.3.5, 18.2.3, 18.3.7), but two of the other three words which ought to have *u* in this position are spelt with *b* (18.2.12 *Iobe*, 18.2.13 *dibi*), and the third is without either *u* or *b* (see below). The spelling of the *nomen* perhaps throws no light on pronunciation, because one might expect a freedman to spell his new *nomen* correctly. The figures are not large, but sufficient to suggest that in the speech of Eunus original intervocalic [w] was changing character in some way. The two misspellings showing *b* for *u* are the more striking, because in the extensive Pompeian inscriptions of roughly the same period, such intervocalic confusion of *b* with *u* is perhaps not attested at all.<sup>38</sup>

Intervocalic *b* on the other hand is not replaced by *u* in the documents (note 15.2.5 *luberto*, 15.2.6 *debere*, 15.3.5 *habeo*, 16.2.7 *debere*, 16.2.10 *debo*, 17.2.4 *debere*). The greater frequency of the misspelling *b* for *u* as against *u* for *b* has been noted in widely scattered areas and at different periods.<sup>39</sup> One must agree with Gratwick's argument that the data, at least for the earlier period, scarcely support the notion that *b* and *u* had merged completely (as e.g. [β]). It is possible that in the speech of Eunus intervocalic *b* was intact, but that [w], at least after a stressed vowel, was subject to change, perhaps to [β].

The third word in which intervocalic *u* ought to appear but does not is *Noembrib*<*u*>*s* (18.2.11). The spelling *Noember* is also attested elsewhere in Pompeian inscriptions (e.g. *CIL* IV.4606).<sup>40</sup> One possible explanation is that [w] between vowels of different quality

<sup>36</sup> See, e.g. Väänänen, *Inscript. pomp.*, 41. Alternatively such spellings may be taken as parallel to *debo* etc.: perhaps they are due to the formation of a glide ([w]) in hiatus in an unstressed syllable, with the syllabic reduction reflected in the omission of *u* (see N. Vincent, in M. Harris and N. Vincent (edd.), *The Romance Languages* (London - Sydney, 1988), 36).

<sup>37</sup> See, e.g. Väänänen, *Inscript. pomp.*, 39f.

<sup>38</sup> See Väänänen, *Inscript. pomp.*, 51, A.S. Gratwick, 'Latinitas Britannica: was British Latin archaic?', in N. Brooks (ed.), *Latin and the Vernacular Languages in Early Medieval Britain* (Leicester, 1982), 25f.

<sup>39</sup> See most recently Gratwick 23.

<sup>40</sup> See Väänänen, *Inscript. pomp.*, 49.

tended to be lost when the second of those vowels was stressed.<sup>41</sup> Alternatively one might explain the spelling *Noember* orthographically.<sup>42</sup> Between vowels of different qualities in hiatus a glide ([w] or [j]) must often have been inserted in speech, without being marked regularly in writing (thus *duo* in writing, *du<sup>w</sup>o* presumably in pronunciation; cf. *CIL* IV.3730 *poueri* = *pueri*, with the glide marked).<sup>43</sup> Hence the assumption might have been made that the 'correct' spelling of *Nouember* (with [w] in pronunciation) was *Noember*. I would favour the first explanation of the spelling *Noember* offered above. Whatever the case, the relationship between the glide seen in (e.g.) *poueri*, and the *b*-spelling seen in *Iobe* in the same phonetic environment, is problematical. Perhaps usage varied, with some saying [w], others [β] in this environment; by contrast intervocalic *b* must have been stable at this period.

## VI Final consonants

### -m

-m is omitted 9 times by Eunus. There is one omission after *u* in the accusative singular (18.2.13 *maxumu*), and 4 in the genitive plural (*nummu* = *nummum*, the archaic alternative to *nummorum*: 15.2.7, 15.2.13, 16.2.8, 16.2.11).<sup>44</sup> Eunus does not have *nummum* (but note the gen. plur. *modium* at 15.3.1, 15.3.3, 16.3.6, 16.3.10). For omission after *e*, see *septe* (15.3.2, 16.3.6) and *Iobe* (18.2.12). Both cases of *septe* precede a word beginning with *m* (*milia*, *mila*), and may simply be due to haplography.<sup>45</sup> Finally, for omission after *a*, note *suma* = *summam* (18.2.9). There is a hypercorrect addition of *m* at 15.2.12 (*pro quem* = *proque*). Cf. e.g. Terentianus, *P. Mich.* VII.471.27 *factam est*.<sup>46</sup>

-m is more often written after *u* than omitted (15 times: in addition to the 4 examples of *modium* cited above, note *Putolanorum* (15.3.6), *actum* (15.3.8, 16.3.14, 17.3.6, 18.3.9), *centum* (17.2.6), *redturum* (18.2.11), *optumm* (18.2.12), *genium* (18.2.14), *solum* (18.3.1), *obligatum* (18.3.4). But after *e* and *a* -m is hardly more often written than dropped (note *decem* at 15.2.7, 15.2.8, 15.2.12, *quem* at 18.2.8, *redam* at 15.2.7). The greater persistence of *m* after *u* has often been noted,<sup>47</sup> though in accusative singular forms (rare in

<sup>41</sup> M. Niedermann, *Précis de phonétique historique du latin*<sup>4</sup> (Paris, 1953), 109f. cites, as well as *Noember*, examples of *faiilla* = *fauilla*, *faonius* = *fauonius*, *paimentum* = *pauimentum*. See also Lindsay, *The Latin Language*, 52.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Väänänen, *Introduction*, 45, *Inscript. pomp.*, 49.

<sup>43</sup> See Väänänen, *loc. cit.*

<sup>44</sup> For another possible omission of -m in this genitive form, see Väänänen, *Inscript. pomp.*, 74.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Väänänen, *Inscript. pomp.*, 72 with n.1.

<sup>46</sup> See further Väänänen, *Inscript. pomp.*, 75.

<sup>47</sup> See e.g. Väänänen, *Introduction*, 66, *Inscript. pomp.*, 76, Adams, *Terentianus*, 23f.

Eunus) rather than in general. The figures offered by the documents of Eunus are not large enough to be particularly significant.

In the document of Diognetus *-m* is omitted twice, both times before vowels (7.2.6 *cora ipsum*, 7.2.10f. *repositu est triticum*). Before consonants *-m* is always correctly written (7.2.6, 2.8, 2.9f., 3.5). This distinction of treatment may be no mere chance. Quintilian (9.4.40) observes that before vowels *-m* 'parum exprimitur ... adeo ut paene cuiusdam nouae litterae sonum reddat', and in verse *-m* is elided before vowels, but makes position before consonants. At a later stage *-m* was lost entirely, before consonants as well as vowels, but the earlier stage may be reflected in the document of Diognetus.

-s

Final *s* is omitted at 18.3.3 (*de singulos; de* for *des*, = *dies*), 18.3.4 (*nummo obligatum;* cf. the correct version, 18.5.14 'HS XX nummos obligatum iri'), and perhaps 18.3.6 (*et*). The first example displays the common tendency for *s* to be left out before *s* at the start of the next word, and is of no phonetic significance.<sup>48</sup> Though Eunus twice has *ets* for *est* (16.3.1, 17.3.3: see p.242), *et = est* may be a mere slip rather than a representation of the phonetic omission of *s* in *ets*.

I have noted some 83 cases of *-s* correctly written in the documents of Eunus. Clearly *-s* was relatively stable at this time, whereas *-m* was subject to omission.<sup>49</sup>

The addition of *s* at 16.3.4 ('in qua omnis suma') may be hypercorrect against the tendency for *-s* to be left out before *s* at the beginning of another word (see above).

-t / -d

There is some confusion between final *t* and *d* in monosyllables (16.3.6 *quot est*, 18.2.15 *quotsi*, 18.3.2 *set etiam*), arising from the tendency to assimilate in voice the final consonant to the next phoneme, with a resultant uncertainty about the correct spelling. Only *quot (si)* could be described as an assimilated form. *Quot* is very common in inscriptions (e.g. *CIL* III.1041, VI.10246, VI.10322, XIV.1357).

---

<sup>48</sup> Cf. e.g. Terentianus, *P. Mich.* VIII.471.21 'pater meu sopera', Adams, *Terentianus* 30; cf. Väänänen, *Inscript. pomp.*, 79 for examples at Pompeii.

<sup>49</sup> See Väänänen, *Inscript. pomp.*, 81, drawing the same conclusion from the Pompeian material.

## -n

Eunus leaves out final *-n* at 18.2.13 'per Iobe optumm maxumu et *nume* dibi Augusti' (note the parallel treatment of *-n* and *-m* in this expression). *-n*, which is rare in Latin, was, like *-m*, lost, except in a few areas and in the negative *non*.<sup>50</sup> Cf., e.g. *CIL* III.10518 *tubice*; cf. It. *nome*, Rum. *nume* < *nomen*.

At 18.3.1 note *nont* (*solum*) for *non*. In Vulgar Latin there was one environment in which *-n* and *-nt* were in alternation, in third person plural verb forms (e.g. *CIL* IV.8250 *cantan* = *cantant*). Though *nont* is not a verb form, the spelling may be hypercorrect, inspired by a feeling that *-nt* was more 'correct' than *-n*. Cf. *CIL* VI.19345 *eorunt* (for *eorun* = *eorum*, see *CIL* VI.13246, 25398 etc.; spellings with *-n* for *-m* result partly from assimilation to a following consonant, and partly (because of such assimilations) from uncertainty about the correct final consonant.<sup>51</sup>

## VII Gemination and simplification of consonants

Simplification of double consonants is well attested from the first century A.D. onwards, with a particular frequency in Africa.<sup>52</sup> In Eunus there are abundant examples. I leave aside *s* for the moment: *faris* (15.3.2, 16.3.10), *sacis*, *-os* (15.3.3, 16.3.8), *quator* (15.3.4, 16.3.11), *redam* (15.2.7), *horeis*, *-eo* (15.3.5, 16.3.7, 16.3.8, 16.3.12), *suma* (16.3.4, 18.2.9), *mile* (17.2.10, 18.2.5),<sup>53</sup> 15.2.13 *arabonis* = *arrabonis*; cf. 18.2.11 *redturum*. There are only a few false geminates: 15.2.1 *Acceronio*, 15.3.5 *pos<i>tta*.<sup>54</sup> The first of these is a special type of spelling error: in polysyllabic words with both a geminate and a single consonant, a writer will sometimes double the wrong consonant (cf. e.g. Terentianus *P. Mich.* VIII.468.54 *Tjurranium*).

In the above lists there are 17 cases of simplification, compared with 2 of gemination. Simplification occurs indifferently after both long and short vowels. This evidence is remarkably early, and shows in which direction the language was moving. Statistics which purport to show that simplification was more common in some parts of the Empire than

<sup>50</sup> Both *non* and *no* survived. See in general Väänänen, *Introduction*, 67.

<sup>51</sup> For an abundance of evidence, see E. Diehl, *De m finali epigraphica* (Leipzig, 1899), 301 ff.

<sup>52</sup> See Kiss, 75f.

<sup>53</sup> This form is singled out for criticism by Consentius (*GL* V.392.7ff. 'per detractonem fiunt barbarisimi sic: litterae, ut si quis dicat uilam pro uillam, mile pro mille'), and it is widely reflected in Romance (see H. Kohlstedt, *Das Romanische in den Artes des Consentius* (Diss. Erlangen, 1917), 72). The simplification follows a long vowel (see below), but the singular form may also have been influenced by the plural *milia*.

<sup>54</sup> Curiously, in the correct version of TP 15 there are four hypercorrect geminates (15.5.6, 12, 13 *millia*, 15.5.10 *m<ill>ibus*).

others are at best crude, based as they are on inscriptions which are often undated, or of widely different dates. In parts of Italy geminates were maintained,<sup>55</sup> and Kiss's table (76) shows three areas (Africa, Dacia and Gaul) in which simplification is supposedly more frequent in inscriptions than in either north or south Italy or Rome, but the archive of Eunus prompts some scepticism about the statistical approach.

*s* on the other hand is constantly doubled by Eunus, between vowels and after *p*: *scripssi* (15.2.3, 16.2.4, 17.2.3, 18.2.3), *Hessucus* (15.2.6, 15.2.9, 16.2.5 (with syncope of the second vowel), 16.3.1, 18.3.6), *possita*, *-um*, *-i* (15.3.5, 16.3.6, 16.3.11), *apssente* (15.2.5), *Cessariss* (15.2.4, 15.2.10, 16.2.1 (*Cessasare*), 16.2.5, 16.3.2, 17.2.4, 17.3.3, 18.2.4, 18.2.14, 18.3.7), *ipssi* (17.2.8, 18.2.10), *su<p>ssi* (17.2.8), *promissi* (18.2.9), *Assinio* (17.2.1). There are 28 examples of false geminates here, 19 of them between vowels. The contrast between Eunus' treatment of *s* and of the other consonants is remarkable, and calls for an explanation.

In classical orthography it is usual for a single *-s-*, even where a geminate is justified etymologically, to be written after a long vowel or diphthong, whereas *-ss-* is retained after a short vowel (thus, e.g. *hausi*, *caesus*, *misi*, *cāsus* on the one hand, all with a geminate historically, but *gēssi*, *mīssus*, *pāssus*, *dīssimilis* on the other).<sup>56</sup> The orthographic shift from *-ss-* to *-s-* after a long vowel or diphthong was still in progress in the late Republic and early Empire, if one is to believe Quintilian 1.7.20, who says that Cicero and Virgil had written *caussa*, *cassus*, *diuissiones*.

*Promissi* fits into the same category as the spellings *caussa*, *cassus* etc. Etymologically the *-ss-* is correct (*\*meit-s-i* > *meissi* > *misi*). *-m(e)issi* turns up in Republican laws (e.g. in the *Lex de Gallia Cisalpina* of 49 B.C. (*CIL* I<sup>2</sup>.592), where there are cases of *remeisserit*, *repromeisserit*, *repromeississet*),<sup>57</sup> a fact which suggests that it had a formal or archaising status (note too *ei* for *ī* in the above law). It is also sporadically attested elsewhere, notably in Vindolanda writing tablets.<sup>58</sup> At what stage, and under what circumstances, archaising spellings such as *m(e)issi* came into vogue is unclear, because the orthographic practice of the early Republic (until the early second century B.C.) was not to mark geminates. Thus the spelling *compromesise* is found in the *S.C. de Bacchanalibus* of 186 B.C.

*Cessare* and *Hessucus* can be put into the same class as *missi*. There must have been a feeling on the part of Eunus that, regardless of the pronunciation, a double *-ss-* spelling after a long vowel or diphthong was older and more 'correct'. Both spellings would therefore be hypercorrect.

<sup>55</sup> Väänänen, *Introduction*, 58.

<sup>56</sup> See, e.g. Niedermann, 121f., Leumann, 180f.

<sup>57</sup> See also Leumann, 181.

<sup>58</sup> See my remarks, quoted by A.K. Bowman and J.D. Thomas, *Britannia* 18 (1987), 141f.

While *-ss-* tended to be simplified after a long vowel or diphthong, there was a complementary tendency for *s* to be doubled after a short vowel.<sup>59</sup> The linguistically false geminate in *pōssitum* and *Āssinio* brings these words into line with *gessi*, *passus* etc.

*Ipsi*, *apssente*, *scripssi* and *supssi* belong together. *ps* assimilated to *s(s)* in speech (e.g. *CIL* IV.8364, 8954 *isse* = *ipse* > It. *esso*;<sup>60</sup> cf. *scriserunt* at *CIL* VI.22579, *scrisi* at *CPL* 193.13 (2nd C.)<sup>61</sup> and *suscrissi* at *Tab. Alb.* XIV.21, 22;<sup>62</sup> also *Vistano* = *Vipstano* elsewhere in the same group of tablets from Murecine: see *AE* 1978, nos. 130, 133, 138). It is possible that Eunus reinstated a 'correct' *p* to the VL assimilated forms *issi*, *assente*, *scrissi*, *sussi* (in this last case the nasal *m* would previously have been lost before the stop *p*).

The alternation between long vowel / single consonant on the one hand, and short vowel / double consonant on the other, is also in evidence in Latin when the consonant is other than *s* (note the pairs *camēlus* / *camēllus*, *cūpa* / *cūppa*, *\*Iūpater* / *Iūppiter*).<sup>63</sup> To explain Eunus' differing treatment of *s* and of other consonants one must make one or both of the following assumptions: (a) that Eunus was particularly conscious of changes involving the pronunciation of *ss* / *s*, presumably because these changes were actually in progress; (b) that the tendency to gemination after a short vowel was particularly marked in the case of *s*, probably because of the rarity (owing to the effects of rhotacism) of single *s* in this environment.

### VIII Intervocalic voicing of stops

*Triticum* is twice spelt with intervocalic *d* for *t*, and in one case *g* is written for *c* as well (15.3.1 *tridici*, 16.3.5 *tridigi*). The word is correctly spelt in the other version of TP 15 (15.5.11). The spelling *tridicum* is also found in Pompeian inscriptions (*CIL* IV.8830).<sup>64</sup> Though intervocalic voicing of stops did not take place in general in the dialects of Southern Italy,<sup>65</sup> there can be little doubt that there was a tendency for voicing to occur in this one

<sup>59</sup> For e.g. *possuit* in inscriptions, see Sommer, 156, W.A. Baehrens, *Sprachlicher Kommentar zur vulgärlateinischen Appendix Probi* (Halle, 1922), 76. Note too *CIL* IV.1555 *Assellus*. For *bassilica*, see *CIL* IV.1779 (with Väänänen, *Inscript. pomp.*, 60). *Nissi* is found at Vindolanda (Inv. no. 88/946, 20), and in Bath curse tablets (see B. Cunliffe (ed.), *The Temple of Sulis Minerva at Bath*, vol. II (Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, Monograph No. 16, Oxford, 1988), with the notes of R.S.O. Tomlin on 32.7 and 65.10).

<sup>60</sup> On *isse* at Pompeii, see Väänänen, *Inscript. pomp.*, 65f., stating however (66) that it seems to be 'un doublet familier de *ipse* ... ayant une valeur hypocoristique, plutôt que représentant l'aboutissement phonétique de ce dernier'.

<sup>61</sup> R. Cavenaile, *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum* (Wiesbaden, 1958).

<sup>62</sup> See Kiss, 32

<sup>63</sup> See Kiss, 77, Leumann, 183.

<sup>64</sup> See Väänänen, *Inscript. pomp.*, 54 n. 2, and also Coleman, *TPhS* 1974, 87f.; W. von Wartburg, *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch XIII*, 308 cites such forms as Bormio *tridik*, O Sard. *tridigu*.

<sup>65</sup> See Coleman, *loc. cit.*



lexical item in the area of Pompeii in the mid-first century A.D. I would not describe the misspelling as an 'isolated idiolectal example of a sound-change that was never generalized in this locality',<sup>66</sup> but rather as a manifestation of the working of 'lexical diffusion'.<sup>67</sup> Sound changes do not necessarily operate simultaneously in every lexical item which they might theoretically affect; a change may begin in a word or group of words and affect other relevant words either later or not at all. Voicing may have got under way at Pompeii with *triticum* but not spread further.

### IX Omission of nasals before stops

Nasals are frequently omitted before stops by Eunus: 15.3.1, 16.3.5 *Alxadrini* (cf. CIL VI.4428 *Alexadrus*, XIII.2000 *Alexsadri*), 15.2.11, 16.3.3, 17.3.5, 18.3.7 *spepodī*, 17.2.2 *Septeberes*, 18.2.6 *quiquaginta* (cf. e.g. CIL XIII.2430 *qīqe = quinque*), 17.2.8 *su<p>ssi*, 18.3.3 *sigulos*. Nasals are constantly left out in this environment in vulgar documents, including Pompeian inscriptions.<sup>68</sup>

### X *Trigina*

*Trigina = triginta* (17.2.6, 17.3.1) is anomalous and perhaps without parallel, but the repetition of the spelling tells against a mere slip. The Romance reflexes retain the *-nt* (e.g. It. *trenta*, Log. *trinta*, Fr. *trente*, Sp. *treinta*). Consentius *GL* V.392.4ff. ('accentus, ut siquis dicens triginta priorem syllabam acuat et sequentem grauius enuntiet, qui modus et per immutationem fieri uidetur') implies that in Vulgar Latin *triginta* was accented on the first syllable,<sup>69</sup> and the form *trigina* may in some way be the outcome of this initial stress. A more predictable misspelling would be *trigit(t)a* (note CIL III.8500 *trigitta*), with omission of the nasal before the stop (see above). For a misspelling comparable to *trigina*, note CIL VI.27041 *mereni = merenti*. *Merenti*, like *triginta*, was sometimes spelt without the nasal.<sup>70</sup> *Trigina* must be an idiolectal or ephemeral case of assimilation (cf. Eng. *twenny = twenty*), related to the initial stress and a tendency for names of tens to be pronounced rapidly.

<sup>66</sup> Coleman, 88.

<sup>67</sup> For a case of lexical diffusion in Latin, see T. Janson, *Mechanisms of Language Change in Latin* (Stockholm, 1979), 46ff., especially 55f.

<sup>68</sup> Väänänen, *Inscript. pomp.*, 67f., Kiss, 29f. On the interpretation of such spellings, note Väänänen's comments (68), 'nos exemples ... ne traduisent sans doute pas l'amuissement total de la nasale, mais plutôt une occlusion lâche de celle-ci'.

<sup>69</sup> See Väänänen, *Introduction*, 35, 119 (comparing *uiginti (uīginti?) > uinti* in inscriptions and with Romance reflexes).

<sup>70</sup> For *benemereti*, see Kiss, 29.

Väänänen<sup>71</sup> notes that 'les noms des dizaines présentent des anomalies de prononciation dues à un débit plus ou moins rapide' (cf. e.g. *quadraginta* > *quarranta*, *CIL XIII.7645*, Fr. *quarante*, etc.).

*Vigienos* (18.3.3 'in de sigulos sestertios uigienos nummo obligatum iri'; cf. the correct version, 18.5.13f. 'in dies sing. HS XX nummos obligatum iri') may be a conflation of *uiginti* and *uiceni*. Perhaps Eunus started out to write *uiginti*, then switched into the distributive.

### XI Metathesis

Eunus had trouble spelling *est*. Twice he has *ets* (16.3.1, 17.3.3),<sup>72</sup> and at 18.3.6 *et* (see p.237). The word is correctly spelt at 15.2.9, 15.3.7, 16.3.6. All three cases of the misspelling are in the same context: 16.3.1 'stipulatus ets Hessucus', 17.3.2f. 'stipulatus / ets He<sycus>', 18.3.6 'stipulatus et Hessycus'. Of the correctly spelt examples only that at 15.2.9 is in the same formula. It is possible that Eunus found the sequence of *s*'s and *t*'s a tongue-twister, and hence committed a metathesis.

Haphazard metatheses (some with reflexes in Romance) were common in substandard Latin, as is clear from the remarks of Consentius, *GL V.392.23f.*<sup>73</sup>

### XII *stertertios* (18.2.5)

It is possible that Eunus syncopated *sestertios* in speech (*s(e)stértios* > *stertios*). Having started to write the syncopated form *ster-*, in mid-word he may have checked himself and reverted to the second syllable of the correct form. Or is the spelling a sort of dittography,<sup>74</sup> whereby the second part of the word (*-ster-*) is anticipated in the previous syllable?

<sup>71</sup> *Introduction*, 119.

<sup>72</sup> For this spelling, see *CIL VI.17565*, *VIII.9768*, and cf. *CIL IV.7756* <Au>*gutsa*.

<sup>73</sup> See the discussion of Kohlstedt, 85f.: for a few examples in Pompeian inscriptions, see Väänänen, *Inscript. pomp.*, 81.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Leumann, 235, Svennung, *Kleine Beiträge*, 46ff.

## MORPHOLOGY AND SYNTAX

## I Case usage with prepositions

In Eunus prepositions select the correct cases by classical standards, both in the singular (e.g. 15.2.4 *ab Eueno*, 16.2.4f. *ab Hessco*, 16.3.4 *in qua ... suma*, 17.2.7 *ab eo*) and plural (e.g. 15.3.3 *in sacis*, 15.3.5 *in horeis*). A case of *per* + nominative at 15.2.5-6 (*per Hessucus*) is presumably an insignificant slip.

In the document of Diognetus, however, which was written at much the same time as those of Eunus (2 July 37), *coram* is used once with the accusative (7.2.6 *cora ipsum*; cf. *coram ipso* at 7.5.5 in the correct version of the same document). Hitherto *coram* has not been attested with the accusative until the *Itala*.<sup>75</sup> *Ipsum* is not likely to be due to a haphazard hypercorrect addition of final *-m* to a word ending in a vowel (as in *pro quem = proque* at 15.2.12), because there is no evidence in our documents for the merger of *ō* and *ŭ*.

In the same document note 7.3.6f. 'ab aeodem *Eunum*' (cf. CPL 193.12 *aeadem diem*; ablative expected). Often in vulgar texts a writer uses the correct case with a preposition and then at a further remove from the preposition lapses into the accusative: e.g. *CIL* III.6122 'ex equitibus siculares', inscription published by N. Gostar, *St. Cl.* 5 (1963), 305f. 'cum filiis suis', *CIL* VIII.9020 'cum Iulia Donata coniuge et Clodii Aprile filio ceterasque filias'. At *CIL* VIII.19929 ('cum tribunis et aralibus') the writer corrects himself after using the accusative.

There is some evidence then that the accusative was becoming the prepositional case,<sup>76</sup> but Eunus still adhered to the classical practice.

## II Masculine form of the relative for feminine

At 18.2.8f. Eunus writes '*quem suma* iuratus promissi me ... redturum'. This expression (which appears correctly as *quam summam* in the alternative version of the document, 18.5.7), if it is not a haphazard error, suggests that the masculine form of the relative was already absorbing the feminine in the first century.<sup>77</sup> Two possible analogies in Pompeian graffiti (*CIL* IV.2188 'Scordopordonicus hic bene fuit quem uoluit'; cf. 2247 'Bellicus hic

<sup>75</sup> See J.B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich, 1965), 259.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Väänänen, *Inscript. pomp.*, 120f.

<sup>77</sup> Rather than in the fourth, as E. Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (Uppsala, 1911), 131f. believed; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, 440.

futuit quendam')<sup>78</sup> are ambiguous, since *futuo* could be used as an equivalent of *pedico* (e.g. *CIL* IV.4977, 8897).<sup>79</sup>

There is now a possible early example from Vindolanda: Inv. no. 88/946.40 'Frontinum Iulium audio magno licere pro coriatione quem hic comparavit (denarios) quinos'. *Coriatio*, if the text has been read correctly, is a *hapax*, used apparently in a concrete rather than an abstract sense ('leather goods?').

### III *Spepodī*

Eunus writes this form 4 times (15.2.11, 16.3.3, 17.3.5, 18.3.7), whereas in the correct documents (15.5.9, 18.5.16) the prefix is *spo-* (on Eunus' omission of the nasal, see p. 241). So *spopondi* is used a number of times in certain tablets from Herculaneum, which are linguistically correct.<sup>80</sup> *Spepondi* and some similar reduplicated perfects are discussed at length by Gellius 6.9. *Spepondi*, according to Gellius, was in use among earlier writers.<sup>81</sup> At §12 Probus is cited as authority for Valerius Antias' use of the form, and at §15 it is stated that Cicero and Caesar also said *spepondi*: 'sic M. Tullius et C. Caesar "mordeo, memordi", "pungo, pepugi", "spondeo, spepondi" dixerunt'. Clearly by the first century A.D. in Pompeii *spopondi* had acquired the status of the 'correct' form. *Spepo(n)di* was presumably an archaic spelling observed by Eunus in earlier documents. *Spondeo* was probably legalistic and not in everyday use.<sup>82</sup>

### IV A use of *nomine*

*Pignoris* at 16.3.4f. ('dedi ei pignoris') seems to be an example of the old genitive of the 'rubric' (c.f., e.g. *dotis dare* at Plaut. *Pers.* 394, *lucris dare*, etc.).<sup>83</sup> But in a similar context at 15.2.13 (cf. 15.5.11) ('dede pignoris arabonisque nomine') the genitive is made to hang on *nomine*. Here is an illustration of a syntactic development which had taken place in the legal

<sup>78</sup> See Väänänen, *Inscript. pomp.*, 114.

<sup>79</sup> See Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London, 1982), 121.

<sup>80</sup> See G.P. Carratelli *PP* 3 (1948), 165ff.

<sup>81</sup> The original vowel of the prefix in such reduplicated perfects was *e*, which tended to be assimilated to the vowel of the stem (see Leumann, 586).

<sup>82</sup> *Spondeo* does not survive in the Romance languages. If it were in use in current Vulgar Latin it would probably have lost its prefix in the *perfectum*. For the form *spondi*, see Adams, *The Text and Language of a Vulgar Latin Chronicle (Anonymus Valesianus II) (Institute of Classical Studies, Bulletin Supplement No. 36, London, 1976)*, 30.

<sup>83</sup> See Hofmann-Szantyr, 71f., E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica: Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Latein I*<sup>2</sup> (Lund, 1942), 126ff.

language. The plain genitive would have been the earlier construction,<sup>84</sup> but because its function ceased to be understood it was re-motivated by the attachment of a governing noun.<sup>85</sup> In such an expression *nomine* has virtually lost its original sense and functions as a preposition (= *pro*, *causa*). This 'prepositional' use of *nomine* is well attested in the legal language (e.g. for *dotis nomine dare* as a substitute for the earlier *dotis dare*, see *Cod. Iust.* 5.18.9).<sup>86</sup> Cf. *peone nomine = pro poena* at 18.3.2, 18.5.13.<sup>87</sup> *Nomine* found its way beyond the technical legal language: cf. Catull. 29.11 'eone nomine, imperator unice, / fuisti in ultima occidentis insula, / ut ...', Cic. *Sest.* 64 'patriae nomine laborantem' (= *pro patria*), *Quinct.* 52, etc.

Various other nouns in later Latin developed a similar 'prepositional' use in the ablative (*bono*, *uitio*, *commodo*, *merito*, *beneficio*, *officio*, *obsequio*, *ministerio*).<sup>88</sup>

#### V *que* (*omnia*) ... *est*

Twice Eunus appears to construe a neuter plural *quae* (*omnia*) as subject of a singular verb *est*: 15.3.6f. 'que ominia pos<i>tta habeo penus me ... *que* ab omni ui periculo meo *est* fateor', 16.3.12f. 'modium quator milia qui sunt possiti ... *que omnia* ab omni ui periculo meo *est* fator'. The alternative version has this formula in a syntactically correct form: 15.5.15f. 'quae omnia ... *quae* ab omni ui periculo meo *esse* fat<e>or'.

Eunus has switched (in *est*) from an expected acc. + infin. to the paratactic construction so favoured for reporting speech in colloquial Latin (cf., e.g. *CIL* IV.8258, Terentianus, *P. Mich.* VIII.471.10). It is a remote possibility that the lack of concord between *que* and *est* is a Grecism.<sup>89</sup> It is rather more likely that Eunus mechanically wrote the nearest finite equivalent (graphically) to the *esse* of the official formula. If so it is perhaps odd that he did so twice.

<sup>84</sup> For examples of this type of genitive in Oscan and the Twelve Tables, see Hofmann-Szantyr, 72.

<sup>85</sup> As an analogy compare the replacement of the genitive with verbs of accusation etc. (the 'gen. forensis') by *nomine* (et al.) + genitive (see Hofmann-Szantyr, 76, C. De Meo, *Lingue tecniche del Latino* (Bologna, 1983), 107).

<sup>86</sup> There is a large collection of examples of *nomine = causa, pro* in F. Lesser (ed.), *Vocabularium Iurisprudentiae Romanae* IV (Berlin, 1914), 190ff.

<sup>87</sup> The genitive of the rubric *poenae* occurs in the Twelve Tables (8.4) and elsewhere: see Hofmann-Szantyr, 72.

<sup>88</sup> See J. Svennung, *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache* (Lund, 1935), 357, 553.

<sup>89</sup> On this type of Greek construction in later Latin, see Hofmann-Szantyr, 431. A possible early example in Petronius (71.10 *faciatur*) has not found favour with scholars (see M.S. Smith, *Petronii Arbitri Cena Trimalchionis* (Oxford, 1975), *ad loc.*; also Hofmann-Szantyr, *loc. cit.*).

Both passages call to mind the later fossilisation of *omnia* and *quae* as indeclinable collective singulars:<sup>90</sup> e.g. Oribas. *Syn.* 7.48 La 'haec omnia probatum habemus', *Comp. Luc.* S 22 'quod uos legitis, nos omnia probatum habemus'.<sup>91</sup> It would be rash to suggest that *que* or *que ominia* were already fossilised in our passages, but it is worth recalling the background to their fossilisation. From the earliest period neuter plural pronouns (adjectives) occur in alternation with the singular in a collective sense. At 16.3.6 Eunus himself takes up a plural expression *modium septe mila* with a singular *quot* ('modium septe mila quot est possit<um>'), whereas at 15.3.4 he takes up a similar plural with a neuter plural expression (*que ominia*) ('modium quator milia plus minus que ominia pos<i>tta habeo penus me'). *Que ominia* is here in alternation with *quot*. Similarly Cato at *Agr.* 81 takes up the neuter plural *eadem omnia* with a neuter singular pronoun *id*: 'eadem omnia indito, quae in placentam. id permisceto in alueo, id indito ...'.<sup>92</sup> Conversely at Plaut. *Poen.* 542 ('per iocum itidem dictum habeto quae nos tibi respondimus') it is a neuter plural which picks up a singular.<sup>93</sup> In the passages of Eunus it may have been the interchangeability of *quae* (*omnia*) with *quod* which led Eunus unconsciously to treat *quae* (*omnia*) as a collective singular. If so this would be an isolated early case of confusion which was later to harden into regular usage.

The sense of the formula in these passages must be (roughly) 'which things I confess would suffer from all violence at my risk'. The writer acknowledges that the goods are in store at his risk. The syntax of *ab omni ui* even in the correct version is obscure. One must assume that the obscurity springs from the truncating of a longer original formula.

#### IV *penus*

The preposition *penes* was old-fashioned and no longer in everyday use.<sup>94</sup> As such it was a candidate for remodelling by those who would not normally use it. *Tenus* may have provided the analogy for *penus* (15.3.5 'poss<i>ta habeo penus me'; cf. 15.5.14 *penes*). For *penus* = *penes*, see also *CIL* III.6441.

<sup>90</sup> See, e.g. Hofmann-Szantyr, 432, D. Norberg, *Beiträge zur spätlateinischen Syntax* (Uppsala, 1944), 54ff., Löfstedt, *Komm.* 307ff., *Synt.* I, 8f., Svennung, *Unt.* 263f.

<sup>91</sup> Quoted by Svennung and Löfstedt.

<sup>92</sup> See Hofmann-Szantyr, 432, Löfstedt, *Synt.*, I, 8 for further examples.

<sup>93</sup> See Löfstedt, *loc. cit.*, who also cites (8 n. 2) *Lucr.* 1.921f. for a similar alternation.

<sup>94</sup> See A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*<sup>4</sup> (Paris, 1959), 496 (s.v. *penus*).

## CONCLUSION

There are 88 lines of Latin in the documents of Eunus, excluding the two alternative versions. The tablets are in the hand of Eunus himself (note T.P. 16 *chirographum C. Nouii Euni*), and are probably the earliest extended piece of subliterate Latin from a single hand extant. It is unusual to have such a precise date for Latin of this type. Eunus did not follow the norms of classical orthography, and numerous misspellings recur. It is therefore possible to obtain a good idea of some of the features of his pronunciation.

Eunus had no *ae* diphthong, but on the other hand he did not merge  $\bar{e}$  and  $\check{i}$ . He either contracted vowels in hiatus, if they were of similar quality (e.g. *medis*), or converted the first into a glide. *-m* he will have dropped in all environments, and there are signs of instability in other consonants in final position. *-s* is sometimes omitted, *-t* and *-d* are not distinguished consistently, and *-n* is dropped in one place (note too *nont*). Eunus had a pronounced tendency to insert an epenthetical vowel in certain consonant clusters, but on the other hand he sometimes dropped unstressed short vowels. One of his idiosyncratic habits was to metathesise the *-st-* in *est*, at least in the neighbourhood of other *s*'s and *t*'s. There is no sign of assimilation of consonant clusters, except indirectly (perhaps) in spellings such as *apssens*, and in the numeral *triginta*, in the final syllable. In this last case a particular lexical item was subject to an otherwise abnormal sound change; similarly *triticum* was tending to undergo voicing of its internal intervocalic voiceless stops, whereas other words do not show voicing in comparable environments. Eunus tended to simplify geminates, but he almost always wrote *-ss-* between vowels. He may have done so not because the *-ss-* always represented his pronunciation, but because changes were in progress (with *-ss-* undergoing simplification after long vowels or diphthongs, and *-s-* undergoing gemination after short vowels) which made him unsure of what was considered 'correct' in any given case.