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PREFACE

The purpose of this dissertation is to make a detailed and systematic analysis of the use of the Latin language in the writings of Martin, sixth-century Bishop of Braga, the Roman Bracara Augusta, the major city in that area of northwestern Spain called Galicia. The analysis of Martin's Latin is restricted to morphology, syntax, and vocabulary; it is thus a linguistic rather than a stylistic study.

The accuracy of a linguistic analysis is dependent upon the validity of the text of the author which is used. This presents a serious problem for many authors in the Late Latin period, especially for Christian authors; for many of these writers do not have a text based upon a scientific study of the manuscripts in accordance with the principles of textual criticism. Fortunately, for Martin of Braga this problem does not exist. In 1950 Claude W. Barlow published the entire corpus of his works, Martini Episcopi Bracarensis Opera Omnia, issued by the Yale University Press as Volume XII of the Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome; this excellent edition, painstakingly and minutely compiled over a period of twenty years, provides a full description of the textual history of each piece of writing.
and has an extensive critical apparatus. Consequently, for a linguistic study of Martin, it provides a very solid basis upon which to build an analytic structure; one need have no doubts here because of a lack of confidence in the text.

There has been no extensive and thorough study of the language of Martin of Braga. C. P. Caspari published an edition of the *De Correctione Rusticorum* in 1883, in the introduction to which he discusses the language used by Martin; but his purpose was to confute Martin's claim to write the sermon in the Vulgar style and his analysis is in no wise thorough. The Reverend Harold F. Palmer, using Caspari's edition, made a few brief and unorganized comments about Martin's language in a commentary on the *De Correctione Rusticorum* which he wrote as a part of a Master's thesis at the Catholic University of America in 1932. Ernst Bickel, in an article, "Die Schrift des Martinus von Bracara Formula Vitae Honestae," in the *Rheinisches Museum*, 60 (1905), 505-551, has made numerous comments on the language of that essay, but only incidentally to his study of the relationships in thought, vocabulary, and structure between Martin and Seneca; and, while he establishes a very close parallelism in all three areas, he does not afford us a thorough understanding of the nature of Martin's Latinity even for this one work. Finally, Sr. Mary Petronilla Francoeur discussed the language of the three Christian moral essays, the *Pro
Repellenda Iactantia, the Item De Superbia, and the Exhortatio Humilitatis, in a doctoral dissertation, The Relationship in Thought and Language between Lucius Annaeus Seneca and Martin of Braga, done at the University of Michigan in 1944; she gives more attention to the thought than to the language, about which her remarks are rather brief, quite incomplete, and at times somewhat inaccurate. Since all four of these studies were based upon texts that are highly unsatisfactory, even those conclusions which were reached must be re-examined in the light of Barlow's text. Barlow has a few comments on morphology, syntax, and vocabulary in the introductory essays to each of the writings. So far as the writer has been able to determine, there is no other study, direct or indirect, of the language of Martin of Braga.

The analysis in the dissertation includes Scriptural quotations and the bracketed passages, but both have been clearly identified whenever they occur. While Martin cannot be held responsible for the language of Scripture, which was fixed canonically by his time, it does form a part of his Latinity; furthermore, there is considerable interest in the language of Scripture at this period, so that it is of value to include the quotations in the analysis. The bracketed passages are also studied; these do not at any point substantially affect the conclusions reached, and, although it
is most probable that Martin never wrote them, they are included for the sake of thoroughness and precaution.

Regarding the periods into which the history of Latin literature and language is divided, certain arbitrary decisions have to be made; for this history does not fall into neat sections. Old Latin here includes all writers through Lucilius. Classical Latin includes Varro and Cicero and all prose writers down to 14 A.D., and all poets from Lucretius through Ovid. The Silver Latin period begins with writers from the reign of Tiberius. Livy, who strictly belongs to the classical period, exhibits some Silver characteristics in some details of syntax and vocabulary, and, in a certain degree, shows signs that a transition to the characteristics of the Silver period is beginning; therefore, where Livy is the sole prose writer before 14 A.D. to employ a usage which occurs frequently in the Silver writers, that usage is here classified as Silver. The Late Latin period begins with Fronto and Apuleius; while these writers are properly put into an archaizing period, it has seemed sufficient for the purposes of the dissertation to make them part of the Late period and simply to note archaizing usages where it is pertinent. The distinction between Late and Christian Latin is discussed in the first chapter.

Because it is in the nature of a study such as this to refer frequently to certain standard grammars,
dictionaries, linguistic studies, and special works, it is advantageous to use abbreviations in the references. A list of these follows the Table of Contents; full bibliographical information about each book is found in the bibliography. The one serious lacuna of which the writer is aware is Volume Four of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* which, unfortunately, was unavailable to him during the time when this dissertation was in progress.
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CHAPTER I

LATINITY

A scholarly study of an author's Latinity consists of a detailed analysis of the many facets of his language; it includes the areas of orthography, morphology, syntax, vocabulary, and style. In such a work as, for example, Max Bonnet's *Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours*, the phonology of the author is examined at great length; these orthographical changes which the writing reflects can be utilized in tracing the development of the language. In other studies, such as Pierre Médan's *La Latinité d'Apulée*, an extensive description of the writer's style is given, often with the analysis centered upon the rhetorical devices and prose rhythms involved. Other investigations, like that of Henri Goelzer and Alfred Mey, *Le Latin de Saint Avit*, present a minute analysis of the syntax and vocabulary. And most of these studies, while they may emphasize one area or another, include materials about all the aspects of their subject's use of language. The purposes of these analyses are fourfold: to advance and deepen knowledge of the historical development of Latin; to describe thoroughly the particular usages of an author in order to facilitate and make accurate
the reading of his writings; to assess his place in the
history of the Latin language; and to judge his worth as a
figure of Latin literature.

Such a study is beyond the scope of a doctoral dis­
sertation. Therefore the writer has chosen to limit his
study to three areas, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary,
and to center the analysis of these areas on the question of
literary quality. All formal writing uses language that is
consciously chosen; this involves, as any choice does, the
making of value judgments about language. Thus, through the
critical estimations and aesthetic sensibilities of writers
and their teachers toward individual usages in the language,
formal writing creates different levels of excellence in the
language. Those usages which are judged of suitable
excellence for writing are considered literary and may be
said to possess literary quality.

It is probably a truism that the concept of what con­
stitutes literary quality is constantly changing. Yet in a
literature where there is a classical period of unsurpassed
brilliance, there is a tendency to equate literary quality
with classical usage. But the writer of any time, at any
rate the writer who pretends to write literature, considers
his own work as possessed of literary quality. What must be
done, for a precise understanding of this concept, is to
describe the language of literature accurately for each
period and each author.
This dissertation, then, will analyze Martin's morphology, syntax, and vocabulary with some thoroughness and will attempt, as far as the evidence studied will allow, to pass judgment on the nature of his language; that is, it will do what other studies of Latinity do, but within its limits. It is a linguistic study, not an aesthetic or stylistic analysis; it is based upon the concept that the language of sixth century Latin literature possesses a literary quality that can be determined and described. This first chapter will present a discussion in general terms of the problems which the literature of the sixth century involves.

The Latin Literature of Sixth Century Spain

Literary quality exists not in abstract concepts but in writings. Any thorough account of a literary language necessarily involves the history of its literature. Thus Latinity is closely bound to the development of Latin literature, and cannot be comprehended well without a knowledge of that literature's history. In a work of the nature of this dissertation, however, it is not at all necessary to review the entire history of Latin literature; the reader who comes to this work already knows it. This may not be true, though, of sixth century Spain. Hence a brief account for the time of Martin of Braga of the literary situation in this part of the Mediterranean, an area which had given so
many brilliant stars to Latin literature, may prove helpful to the reader.

For Latin literature in general the sixth century is an unhappy and desolate period. Its "great" names are men of such second-rate talent that it is only the information which they give, information otherwise unattainable, and the knowledge which they provide for our understanding of the political, social, economic, religious, linguistic, and literary history of Western Civilization that makes the survival of their works important. There are hardly more than ten names worthy of remembrance: the poets Avitus, Annodius, and Venantius Fortunatus; the historical writers, Gregory of Tours and Jordanes, who scarcely deserve to be called either historians or artists; the grammarian Priscian; Benedict of Nursia and Pope Gregory the Great; Cassiodorus Senator and Boethius. Several of these men are of great importance for their influence on the Middle Ages, as providers of information mostly; but only Boethius can claim any real merit as a thinker or scholar or writer. The sixth century literary scene is a barren desert with a few far-scattered oases.

Spain, once a hub of Roman literary creation, was even more desolate than the other lands of Western Europe. It could only glory in its antique past, the Senecas, Lucan, Quintilian, Martial, and Columella, men indeed without whom Silver Latin would have been greatly impoverished. But the
grandeur rapidly faded; and Prudentius, who died in the early fifth century, is the last great Spanish writer before Isidore of Seville who lived in the last years of the sixth century but who produced his literary works in the seventh. There is, as Barlow indicates,\textsuperscript{1} no name of brilliance on the Spanish peninsula between these two authors, though perhaps the word brilliance is inapt for any writer of this time. So sterile is the period that standard histories of Spanish literature, such as Brenan’s,\textsuperscript{2} do not mention a single name from Prudentius to Isidore, except, occasionally, Orosius who is barely capable, much less, brilliant.

According to the \textit{Index of Diaz y Diaz},\textsuperscript{3} there are extant only seventy pieces of writing from sixth century Spain. Of these fourteen are councils, eleven epitaphs, eight anonymous pieces, and two laws; hence for only half, thirty-five, can definite names be given. And of these thirty-five, Martin of Braga is the author of ten (he also was certainly the author of the two Councils of Braga, though some still contest this). These meager remain reflect quite well what is known of the literature of Spain at this time from external literary references.

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{1}C. W. Barlow, "The Literary Heritage of Spain (350-600 A.D.)," \textit{Folia}, 1 (1946), 101-111.


\textsuperscript{3}M. C. Diaz y Diaz, \textit{Index Scriptorum Latinorum Medii Hispalorum} (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1959), pp. 3-18.
Most of the writers were clerics and most of the writing was epistolary, doctrinal, or scriptural commentary. Thus we have letters of Montanus, Bishop of Toletanuus, of Licinian, Bishop of Cartagena, and one from King Reccaredus to Pope Gregory the Great. Doctrinal treatises were written by Eutropius, Bishop of Valencia, and Leander of Seville, the brother of Isidore. Scriptural commentaries, ever abundant in Christian lands, survive from Justus, Bishop of Urgel, who wrote an allegorical explanation of the Canticle of Canticles, and from Apringius, Bishop of Beja, who wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse. The allegory of Justus illustrates the literary quality of these writings very well; it is completely unoriginal in thought, giving the already standard interpretation of the bridegroom-bride allegory, and its style is average and pedestrian.

History claimed little attention. A Ioannes Biclaresensis wrote a Chronicon for the years 567 to 590 A.D.; its importance is not literary but historical since it is the sole surviving account of these years in Spain. A history of the Goths by Maximus, Bishop of Saragossa, is lost.

All other writers of whom we known, except one, are mere names, men such as the brothers of Justus of Urgel, Justinian, who wrote a non-extant doctrinal treatise, Nebridius, and Elpidus; their names survive mainly through Isidore of Seville. If they were inferior in ability and
quality of writing to the men already named, then fate has been beneficent to spare us the fruits of their labors. It is a sad, sad time for the fiercely proud Spaniards.

Sad indeed; for the one real literary talent came to Spain from abroad. This is Martin of Braga, Pannonius genitus, as he tells us in his Epitaphium. Martin was well educated, had traveled extensively in the East, was one of a very few men in the West who knew Greek, and was sent to Spain to complete the conversion of the Arian Sueves to Catholicism. Martin's learning is attested by Gregory of Tours and Venantius Fortunatus; it is attested by the extent to which Martin uses earlier authors, pagan and Christian, in his writings, and especially by his thorough understanding of Seneca's works; it is attested by the fact that his fellow bishops entrust to him the writing of the Councils and request him to write sermons and treatises for them; and it is attested by the FVH, in that Martin wrote this essay at the request of King Miro who is not likely to have chosen an inferior scholar for such a task. Martin has a sense of style and a very accurate knowledge of language. He recognizes that different styles befit different types of writing, an old Roman literary principle; thus for Greek translations, Church councils, moral essays, and popular sermons, there is a noticeable variation of style.

*Cf. Barlow, Appendices 4, 5, and 6, pp. 294-300.*
He uses language also to accord with the purpose of what he writes; thus a sermon for the common man has in it conscious vulgarisms, and a moral essay based on natural reason completely avoids Christian terms and concepts. If we consider Isidore of Seville to belong to the seventh century, Martin of Braga can truly be said to be Spain's only important literary figure in the sixth century. This fact in itself justifies the writing of this dissertation.

Martin's extant writings are fifteen in number. They fall into several distinct types. There are two translations from the Greek, the Sententiae Patrum Aegyptiorum and the Canones Ex Orientalium Patrum Synodis; it will be indicated later that the Christian theory of translation was to be very literal, so that it is not surprising that these writings exhibit a number of Grecisms. The first was directed to the monks at the monastery in Dumium, over which Martin served as abbott; hence it is simpler and more popular in style. The canons, on the other hand, reflect the official language of Church administration. This is also the style of the two Councils of Braga which were held in 561 A.D. and 572 A.D.; Martin wrote both these Councils and presided over the second one. He composed five moral treatises. Three are Christian in content and flavor but have strong Senecan

5The deacon Paschasius of Braga, at Martin's request, had also translated the Sententiae under the title Verba Seniorum.
undertones, the *Pro Repellenda Iactantia*, the *Item de Superbia*, and the *Exhortatio Humilitatis*; the other two, the *De Ira* and the *Formula Vitae Honestae*, are taken directly from Seneca and are similar, that is, based on natural reason, not on revelation or theological reasoning. For a fellow bishop Martin wrote a sermon aimed at the common people of Spain to castigate them for their pertinacious belief in certain pagan superstitions; this is commonly called the *De Correctione Rustlicorum*, but probably ought to be entitled *Pro Castigatione Rustlicorum*; it pretends to be Vulgar in style and language. Martin also is the author of two doctrinal treatises dealing with certain details of Church liturgy, the *De Trina Mersione* and the *De Pascha*; the first concerns the question of one of three immersions in baptism, and the second fixes a procedure to determine the date of Easter. Finally, Martin composed three occasional poems, *In Basilica*, for the dedication of a church to Martin of Tours, *In Refectorio*, an inscription for the doorway of a monastery's dining hall, and his *Epitaphium*.

---

6 This is an epitome of Seneca's *De Ira*. Cf. C. W. Barlow, "A Sixth Century Epitome of Seneca, *De Ira*," *TAPA*, LXVIII (1937), 26-42. Such a work was not at all considered an act of plagiarism in the ancient world.


8 Ibid., pp. 159-160.
Medieval Latin

There were three major outside forces that affected the Latin language. These were: 1. the peoples subjugated by Rome; 2. the barbarian invaders; and 3. Christianity. In the previous section it has been demonstrated that provincialisms and foreign influences, except for Greek with its richness of thought, literary achievement, and means of expression, had very little effect on Latin. The Roman soldiers, merchants, businessmen, bureaucrats, and colonizers, bringing with them the impressive Latin literature, and especially the disciplinary influence of the new rhetorical schools, spread Latin throughout the Western Empire so effectively that many of the native languages were totally eradicated. Nonetheless, the tendency to differentiate was bound to express itself once strict control was removed, and the barbarian invaders removed that control. What happened to Latin as a result is to be discussed here; Christianity's influence will be taken up at length in the next section.

Latin had already begun to develop in divergent directions in the Roman world itself because of a tendency for the literary language to become artificial, not in the artistic sense, such as the "artificial" language of Cicero, but in a pejorative sense. It tended to divorce itself from the main currents of the living speech. The barbarian disruption of the Empire fixed the tendency in reality. Gone was the central control that had previously held spoken
and written language more or less close together. The new rulers, worse off than Shakespeare, had no Latin; and although they were assimilated and adopted the new language of the Latin culture, they did not learn it very thoroughly—even when they went to school to learn it. Thus the lack of control allowed the living language to develop freely, drifting apart from the literary. Literature became the product and property of a few, usually traditionalists vainly striving to recapture Rome's lost glory, or Christians who, as will be shown, were either practical writers uninterested in "style" or followers of the strict literary tradition. By the sixth century Latin was a learned language, different from the spoken language.

Still it does not seem likely that in the sixth century literary Latin was regarded as a foreign language. Probably the ordinary, uneducated person could understand it—if it were read aloud and if it were not too complex; Martin's De Correctione Rusticorum is surely concrete evidence of that.\(^9\) And, as Lot points out,\(^10\) the educated

\(^9\)F. Lot, "A quelle époque a-t-on cessé de parler latin?" Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi, VI (1931), 97-159, disagrees with this: "... et le traité De Correctione Rusticorum de l'évêque Martin de Braga ... 'rempli de reminiscences de Sénèque' (est incapable) de nous donner une idée du latin parlé in Espagne pendant cette period." The important point is not whether people spoke this way but whether they understood what they heard. Barlow, pp. 160-163, argues convincingly that the sermon has such a quality. The linguistic analysis provided by this dissertation should resolve the question.

\(^10\)Ibid.
could and did use the popular Latin as well as the literary Latin. However the difference was distinctly noticeable; for Cassiodorus' monks seem to have had great difficulty with copying literary works:

\[\ldots\text{monachi mei subito clamare coeperunt "quid prodest cognoscere nos vel quae antiqui fecerunt vel ea quae sagacitas vestra addenda curavit nosse diligenter, si quem ad modum ea scribere debeamus omnimodis ignoremus? nec in voce nostra possumus reddere quod in scriptura comprehendere non valemus."}\]

Gregory of Tours points out the difference also, "quia philosophantem rhetorem intellegunt pauci, loquentem rusticum multi." In neither case, however, is anything more indicated than the low state of education which has resulted in a failure to appreciate the complex and to be able to recognize the traditional orthography; Cassiodorus goes on to present the rules of good spelling and in no way suggests that the spoken Latin of his monks is a different language from the writing they were to copy.

Furthermore, it is not actually until the ninth century that we have concrete evidence that the people no longer understood the written Latin, though, of course, they probably did stop understanding it much earlier. Canon 17 of the Council of Tours in 813 A.D. required the clergy to

---


12Gregory of Tours, Historia Francorum, praefatio.
address the people in rusticam romanam linguam which is the phrase used at this time to indicate Romance dialects as opposed to literary Latin. In the Capitularia of 857 A.D. and 864 A.D. Charles the Bald tells the bishops of Gaul to use language the people would understand. And already in 824 A.D. the Oaths of Strasbourg had been taken partly in the vernacular. While it is true that the vernaculars arose in different areas at different times, it still holds that by the ninth century literary Latin was a foreign, school-learned language. This breakdown was the direct result of the barbarian invasion.

Charlemagne's reform had institutionalized the divorce. The literary Latin was now what is called Medieval Latin. One could demonstrate that the line of unity with prior literary Latin was not broken, that Medieval Latin continues the chain; but this is necessary for this dissertation only if Martin of Braga writes Medieval Latin. This, in turn, can best be determined by describing Medieval Latin in general terms. If the description fits Martin, then he is a medieval writer; if not, he belongs to the Late Latin period.

It has already been stated earlier in the paper that sharp division into periods is a matter of logical

\[ \text{13Cf. Lot, op. cit., and H. F. Muller, "On the Use of the Expression lingua romana from the First to the Ninth Century," Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, 43 (1923), 9-19.} \]
convenience, not a description of reality. So, too, one cannot cut off at any specific time the Late Latin from the Medieval period. Also, within each period, as Bossaut points out, the Latin language was a great diversity, with several special applications, each with its own manner; this was true in the classical period, and it is so in the medieval. Nevertheless, there are certain common characteristics and usages peculiar to each period, so that logical division is justified in terms of the full-flowering of the period. One should not be misled, therefore, into thinking of neat, simple separation lines; it is now widely recognized that the process was a slow evolution, not a sudden change.

Medieval Latin is often called a dead language. Ludwig Traube, the revered founding father of medieval philology, called it, in a rather harsh metaphor, a dead body the hair and nails of which, as in the folk belief, continue to grow. There has been much reaction to this

---


15 Cf., e.g., L. R. Lind, Medieval Latin Studies (Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Publications, 1941), p. 5; or F. Blatt, "Classical Features in Medieval Latin," Classica et Mediaevalia, V (1942), 1, 48; or H. F. Muller, "When did Latin cease to be a spoken language in France?" The Romanic Review, XII (1912), 318-334.

violent concept, and there are some who maintain quite the contrary, that Medieval Latin was a living language. But one must say, strictly, that it was not. Bieler correctly indicates that it does not perform its natural functions and that it lacks a speech-community; yet it was widely used as the written language of literature, government, law, business, and education. That is, as Meister says, it was not a living language in the strict sense that Bieler defined, and yet it was not completely dead since it was both written and, to a lesser extent, spoken.

What kind of language was it then? Meister and Bieler both call it a *Traditionssprache*, a language, not the native language of the user, learned in school but used in active life to create new works of art and to carry on various contemporary functions. Such a language is not one from the past studied in school as a subject-matter for scholarly or aesthetic reasons; but rather it is the language of a restricted community who use it for specific reasons, but outside these areas use some vernacular

\[ \text{gelesen habe. In diesen Bild wurde die lateinische Sprache als das, was sie ist, als eine tote bezeichnet; aber wie nach dem Glauben des Volkes Haare und Nägel des toten Menschen noch weiter wachsen, so meine man auch an dieser toten Sprache noch eine gewisse Weiterbildung zu spüren.} \]


language that is living and spoken by a particular ethnic community. It is an international language, spoken by no country, used by all——die Müttersprache des Abendlands. It is basically the language of an earlier period, but does not any longer undergo natural linguistic change; it evolves, but along its own peculiar lines.

Hellmann calls it a Hochsprache, the language of hierarchy and aristocracy. One must qualify this by saying that it was not the sole language of clerical and civil ruling classes, but only their business, scholarly, and literary language. Priests addressed their parishioners in the vernacular; generals exhorted their troops in the vernacular; lords collected taxes in the vernacular. And very likely the after-dinner conversations were in the vernacular. Hellmann's epithet exklusiv is quite descriptive, however, as this is precisely the nature of Medieval Latin—it excludes from its community all those who have not prepared themselves for membership by a prolonged education. It is the language of the educated, and of the liturgy which was only understood through education in the Latin language.

19Cf., Bieler, op. cit., 104.

Even many clerics did not understand the services they conducted.21

Christine Mohrmann's description22 is perhaps the most apt. She calls it a Kunstsprache, a language stylized, traditional, formed by a unifying idea of tradition or religion, but also inspired by the facts of general culture, serving a set literary purpose. She compares it, very happily, to the Greek epic dialect. Its community was that group of intellectuals commonly referred to as the república clericorum. It had two bases, the Christian religion with its heritage from the palaeochristian period, and the heritage of antiquity. This dualism created an interplay of forces which gradually fused and by the twelfth century produced a new, dynamic, variable instrument of communication. Like other scholars, Miss Mohrmann too indicates Latin's exclusive nature, the fact that it was largely the written language of an elite, and not in any place the spoken language of an ethnic community.

It is immediately apparent that the language of the sixth century fits to a surprising degree this description—but not quite. Latin was still the language of the various

21Cf. G. G. Coulton, Europe's Apprenticeship (London: Thomas Nelson and sons, Ltd., 1940), especially Section I.

ethnic groups of Western Europe; and however far it had
departed from the literary language, it was not for another
two or three centuries, as we just demonstrated, that
vernaculars clearly can be seen to exist. The processes
were begun, but not far advanced; it is a period of
transition.

The literary language of the sixth century was a
Hochsprache, and a Traditionssprache, and a Kunstsprache; it
was exclusive and a language to be learned at school. Yet
it was still very much alive in the processes of natural
linguistic change that had been operative in it during the
centuries of the Late Latin period. It had not yet
received the artificial stamp that came with Charlemagne,
that is, it was not yet fixed as a tradition or as a
language of art. It too was in a period of transition.

The facts of this transitional nature appear in the
details of the language, its syntax, morphology, and
vocabulary. Muller\textsuperscript{23} lists five characteristics of Latin
that serve as criteria: case inflection, absence of an
article, synthetic verb forms, word-order and sentence
construction, and vocabulary. The transition occurs in each
area at a different time and a different rate. In all these
matters the sixth century appears as involved in the change,
both on the literary and non-literary levels; but in no

\textsuperscript{23} See footnote 13.
case is the change completely effected. Muller gives the passive voice as a remarkably good clue to the status of Latin, and traces the history of the present passive infinitive which showed confusion in the first, second, and fourth conjugations in the sixth century but did not disappear (except for the formulaic fieri) until the second half of the eighth century. Somewhat earlier Karl Sittl had traced in a very concise but thorough article the same transitional processes for the declensions. These examples will suffice to illustrate that it is a reasonable conclusion which Lind made when he said that Late Latin began to take on a "definite medieval form" by the sixth century.

Historically one encounters the same problem in attempting to set a line between antiquity and the Middle Ages. Yet it seems quite clear that the sixth century was a part of the transition—a period when the elements that constitute the Middle Ages had begun to develop but were still in various stages of infancy. The closing of the schools of Athens and the rise of the monasteries, the abolition of the consulship in 540 A.D., the Lombard

---

24 "The Latin passive system is a vital part of the Latin language. As long as the Latin passive forms were used and understood, Latin can be said to have been a living language; when this ceased to be the case, Latin became a dead language."


26 Lind, op. cit., 5.
invasion of Italy and the final, utter collapse of the Western Empire, the rise of the papacy under Gregory the Great—all these events point clearly to the movement away from antiquity, yet are not firmly fixed in the new culture that will be the Middle Ages. Henry O. Taylor perhaps most aptly expresses this idea. He gives as the elements of the spiritual life of the Middle Ages, the pagan antique, the Christian antique, and the diverse and manifold capacities of the medieval peoples. Then he continues:

The distinguishing characteristics which make the Middle Ages a period in the history of western Europe were the result of the interaction of the elements of mediaeval development working together, and did not spring from the singular nature of any one of them. Accordingly, the proper beginning of the Middle Ages, so far as one may speak of a beginning, should lie in the time of the conjunction of these elements in a joint activity. That could not be before the barbaric disturbers of the Roman peace had settled down to life and progress under the action of Latin Christianity and the surviving antique culture. Nor may this beginning be placed before the time when Gregory the Great (d. 604) had refashioned Augustine, and much that was earlier, to the measure of the coming centuries; nor before Boethius (d. 523), Cassiodorus (d. 572), and Isidore of Seville (d. 636), had prepared the antique pabulum for the mediaeval stomach. All these men were intermediaries or transmitters, and belong to the epoch of transition from the antique and the patristic to the properly inceptive time, when new learners were beginning in typically mediaeval


28Note how C. Mohrmann has developed much the same idea for the language for the Middle Ages.

ways, to rehandle the patristic material and what remained of the antique . . .

He concludes by pointing out that the conversion of the barbarians was not yet completed in the sixth century.

Considering these arguments and the conservative nature of the written language, then, Martin of Braga is to be considered a Late Latin author, at the period's end, in whose writing one may expect to find occasional medieval usages. But Martin is not a writer of Medieval Latin. The linguistic analysis will bear this out conclusively.

Christian Latin

... le latiniste le moins averti, s'il quitte un auteur profane pour aborder la lecture d'un auteur chrétien, se sent plongé incontestablement dans un monde nouveau. Un monde nouveau d'idées et de sentiments bien sûr; mais il a en outre l'impression que la langue elle même est renouvelée, sinon nouvelle.30

The third major outside force that affected the Latin language was Christianity, which alone of the external influences came into contact with Rome peacefully, yet not unbloodily. The provincials were crushed under the disciplined and unrelenting might of Roman military power, often in the bloodiest of wars as in Spain and Gaul; the barbarians came with sword, fire, and destruction. Yet in the end both were enticed by the allure of the superior culture to abandon the ways of war and adopt the life of

30 Blaise, Manuel, p. 13.
civilization of a high quality. The Christians came preaching, teaching, writing, and in the end they conquered the Roman culture. But it was not the force of ideas alone that made them successful in a conquest more thorough than that of the barbarians; it was, ironically, their own spilt blood which gave them their greatest strength. Ultimately the Christian influence on Roman culture was so pervasive that it dominated every aspect of life in the Roman world. Here, however, our interest is only in its effect on the Latin language.

That the language of Christian literature was different in one way or another from pagan Latin was recognized in scholarly circles at least as early as the Renaissance, which generally contemned it as inferior in style and correctness to classical Latin. The nineteenth-century scholars called it Ecclesiastical Latin and this term has acquired wide acceptance and use.\(^1\) It even aroused surprise that Latin could be capable of expressing the abstract and strange mystical concepts of this foreign, deeply personal, spiritual religion. "Rien ne semble, au premier abord, moins capable des idées chrétiens que cette vieille langue latine qui, dans son aperçu primitive, ne semble faite que pour la guerre, pour l'agriculture et pour les procès," wrote Frédéric

\(^1\) For example, Lewis and Short use it in their dictionary.
This same scholar, and a few others, planted the seeds of a theory that the effect of Christianity on Latin produced a resurgence of linguistic creativity which in turn produced a new kind of Latin. "Ainsi, dès les premiers temps de l'empire, la corruption de la langue se déclare, le latin perit: ce n'est donc pas le christianisme qui le tue, au contraire, c'est par le christianisme qu'il allait revivre."33

In the early years of this century Monsignor Joseph Schrijnen, working from this idea of Ozanam, developed a theory that there existed a special Christian language that was to be distinguished from secular Latin.34 This was not simply a technical vocabulary within the common language; rather it was a Sondersprache, a language distinct in itself, formulated from, but apart from, the secular Latin, incomprehensible for the most part to those who did not know it—including the pagan who lived next door. That is, it was distinctive not only in vocabulary but also in morphology, syntax, and style. As Schrijnen's most distinguished student Christine Mohrmann, says, the most remarkable thing

---

33 Ibid., 125.
34 Schrijnen quite properly prefers the term secular to pagan; for the Christians, in their daily life, would also use the common Latin when dealing with their fellow Romans. Also some Christians wrote non-religious literature in which they used their school Latin. It would be a bit inaccurate to call their language pagan; secular betters covers the actual situation.
about Christian Latin was its own idiom—its specific expression peculiar to itself.35

One cannot help but approach this idea of a Sonder-sprache with scepticism; for immediately there comes to mind that creation of Karl Sittl's youthful exuberance, Africitas,36 which Kroll37 and others so thoroughly debunked. The major fault with the theory of Africitas was that the peculiar usages ascribed to it had not been thoroughly studied in their historical development and use in authors outside North Africa; that is, the theory collapsed when a thorough study had been completed.

But mere scepticism proves nothing. Only a detailed study of all authors of the Late Latin or early Christian period, both pagan and Christian, and a detailed study of the development of the individual items of morphology, syntax, vocabulary, and style can settle the matter. For although


37W. Kroll, "Das afrikanische Latein," RhM, 52 (1897), 569-590. In fairness to Sittl, it should be mentioned that he had already abandoned his own theory before Kroll's article—but those who had taken it up had not.
much study has been expended already, the issue is not at all settled, as Knott writes:38

But the existence in the speech of the general lay community of a differentiation affecting lexicology, semantics, morphology and syntax, has yet to be demonstrated. Until it has been shown that the ordinary Christian felt the driving impulse of the "disciplina Christianorum" which led him to speak a form of Latin modified in all these departments, it remains a possibility that the form taken by Latin in the writings of the Church Fathers was merely a combination of popular features . . . and of Christian elements familiar from their constant study of the Bible.

The critical phrase "has not yet been demonstrated" must not mislead one, however. A huge amount of material has been studied and analyzed, as a glance at the bibliography of the dissertation will amply indicate; but still there is a vast number of writers and works yet to be examined, and the whole mass of information requires synthesis. From the work so far done, it is clear that the proponents of a Christian special language have a strong case; the evidence carries too much weight to be dismissed by a mere assertion such as that of Baxter in his comments on Christian Latin as a Sonder-sprache:39

It is sheer confusion of mind that has led to the false distinction, and the lexicographer finds, as his knowledge deepends, that Christian Latin and pagan Latin are one tongue, shedding


light upon each other, just as the language of the Greek papyri has shed light upon the Greek of the New Testament.

Baxter may be right; but one must demonstrate his position by detailed argument since those who maintain the existence of a Christian Latin offer such argumentation to support their contentions. Let us, then, examine this concept of a Christian special language to see to what extent the evidence justifies it.

The most commonly quoted definition of a special language is that of Joseph Vendryes. He writes, "On entend par langue spéciale une langue qui n'est employée que par des groupes d'individus placés dans des circonstances spéciales." There are several aspects to this concept. First, the language is used by a group bound together by some unifying force; usually this is of a technical, social, or religious nature. Thus there can be a legal or military or culinary special language, for example; or in certain countries women speak a language variant from males, and the separate religious language, a liturgical language, is common in history and in the contemporary world. The stronger the unifying force and the loyalty of its adherents to it,

---


the greater the linguistic differentiation will be.  

Secondly, the special language is based upon, and works in accordance with, the principles of the common language from which it is divergent; it never dissociates itself completely from the general colloquial language of the linguistic community from which it arose.  

Further, different special languages will diverge more or less from the common language, depending upon the linguistic needs of the special group; this may result in no more than a technical vocabulary or it may produce a language different not only in vocabulary but also in phonology, morphology, syntax, and style.

Schrijnen defines Christian Latin as a Sonder-sprache. Every change in social structure results in some modification in the conditions by which a language develops.

Christianity effected a very strong change in its converts.


44We are excluding from consideration a second totally different language, such as Medieval Latin as a scholarly language.

45A. Meillet, Linguistique Historique et Linguistique Général (Paris: librairie Ancienne, 1926), p. 115, maintains that it is primarily vocabulary which is differentiated by a special language, that other differences are slight and of little real significance.

and their social life. It was the disciplina Christianorum with its all-pervading influences on not only the Christians but on the whole Roman world that produced the social unifying force around which the special group rallied and through which it created the special Christian language. The disciplina Christianorum was the differentiating factor, and it was so powerful that it affected all areas of the common language: "... die Differenzierung ist also semantischer, lexikologischer, morphologischer, syntaktischer, ja sogar phonetischer Art."47 So thoroughly did it rework the language of the Christians that they became bilingual, but not in the sense that the special language was a foreign language, but that only those who especially learned it could understand it— it was unintelligible to non-Christians, but it was still Latin. "Les chrétiens étaient bilingues, comme cela arrive aux membres de tout groupe social, jurists, ouvriers, etc."48 Christian Latin, according to Schrijnen, breaks away from the unity of Latin and becomes a separate thread of the language.

Christine Mohrmann modifies this view to a certain extent by changing the terminology. Sondersprache is a very strong term indicating, as Schrijnen held, a very great


difference from the common language; it is the next thing to a dialect, or even a new language. Mohrmann emphasizes the Latinity of the Christian special language by concentrating on its Christianity, calling it a Gruppensprache rather than Sondersprache; this term, now used extensively, better expresses the special language nature of Christian Latin, by clearly identifying its Latin nature and removing the aura of dialect from the concept.

Scarcely anyone denies now that there is a Christian special language; the existence of a Christian terminology is indisputable, and the "strangeness" of Christian writing is apparent as Blaise pointed out in the quotation that begins this section. The argument is over the nature of this special language. There are three major objections to the extreme position taken by Schrijnen and Mohrmann: that there is not sufficient evidence to justify it; that the Christian disciplina was not sufficiently strong to produce such changes; and that, whatever the technical terminology, there are too few morphological and syntactical differences to support their position.

The first objection presents, as was pointed out above, a paradoxical situation. There has not yet been enough research; much, much work remains to be done. Nonetheless, the results of what has already been studied

and analyzed, and it is not a small amount, demonstrate beyond question that some sort of Christian special language exists; but it also seems to indicate more and more, as further research is completed, that the differentiation is not as great as the advocates of a Sondersprache have claimed, though there may well be a Gruppensprache. Those who object to Schrijnen's view have for the most part accepted the existence of a Christian Latin, scholars of considerable reputation such as Marouzeau and Løfstedt; for the evidence is unquestionable. But it remains unclear exactly what is the nature of this special language.

The second objection, expressed by Knott in the quotation above, is also the result, it seems to me, of incomplete study. Certainly no one can deny the "apartness" of the Christians in the Roman world nor their clannish "togetherness" as far as religion goes. The Romans were struck by the strangeness of this foreign religion and persecuted this eastern "superstition" precisely because of its exclusive nature. Yet there seems some exaggeration in the extent of separation claimed by Schrijnen and Mohrmann. Both admit daily intercourse between Christians and pagans; this even necessitates Schrijnen's theory of bilingualism. Also many of the quotations from Christian authors asserting the differences, quotations which the advocates of Christian Latin cite over and over, refer to no more than the thought and spiritual life, the inner life apart, and not at all to
an actual segregation into a ghetto life. Further, although Christian writers recognize differences in language, primarily in style, they do not at all maintain that they speak and write a different Latin from their non-Christian compatriots; as late as the eighth century the grammarian Smaragdus in defending Christian usages takes pains to indicate the unity of these with secular Latin. The use of phrases like *ui Chrlstianl dlcunt* with Christian words by writers like Ammianus need indicate no more than that the word is literarily impure or used in a connotation not accepted by the pagan audience of the writer. In both instances the existence of a special language is attested; but a lack of comprehension is by no means demonstrated, even if it be there. Far too much is made of the lack of understanding; it is certainly to be expected when a technical vocabulary is involved. Most of the pagan abhorrence and rejection, as Christian writers point out, stems from the poor literary quality of Christian writing and not from significant linguistic differences; that is, the question is one of Latinitas, not one of lingua Latina. At any rate, there is ground for objection to the belief in the extensive effect of the disciplina Christianorum on the language. Further study may clarify the problems.

The third objection is the most serious of all. It is advanced by Marouzeau and Løfstedt, among others, who maintain that, while there are a few peculiar expressions and constructions, the morphology and especially the syntax of Christian Latin do not show any really significant departures from secular Latin, certainly not enough to justify calling it a Sondersprache. Løfstedt expresses this position very well:

The new system of thought called for and created not quite a new language, but certainly new forms of expression . . . indeed Christian Latin forms one of the most important phases in the long historical development of the Latin tongue. It has qualities which set it apart from classical Latin on the one hand, and from the main body of Late Latin on the other: peculiarities which appear most clearly, as might be expected, in the field of lexicology and semantics. As for syntax, Christian Latin certainly possesses some peculiar expressions and constructions, which have been influenced by the language of the Scriptures . . . but to speak of a Christian syntax would be on the whole a misuse of language.

Again the question is not of the existence of a special language, but of its extent. It seems to me that this objection is most damaging to the extreme view and has not at all been satisfactorily answered. The chapters on morphology

51 Cf. J. Marouzeau in reviews of certain books of Schrijnen and Mohrmann in REL, 10 (1932), 241-24; 14 (1936), 425-426; and 16 (1938), 185-186.


53 Ibid., p. 68.
and syntax will, I believe, demonstrate the strength of this objection.

Granting the existence of a Christian Latin, then, let us examine the description of it by Schrijnen. He divides what he calls Christianisms into two types, direct and indirect. A direct Christianism is a word or connotation which expresses a specifically Christian idea, thing, or institution, e.g., episcopus, diaconus, ecclesia, angelus, salvator, sacramentum, baptizare, beatificare. Naturally this type is restricted solely to vocabulary, since a form, syntactical usage, or stylistic device can hardly express a specifically Christian concept. Hence there are indirect Christianisms which are those linguistic details which are not concerned by nature with Christian ideas, but which developed under Christian influence. This can be vocabulary, e.g., degradare, discipulatus, fornicari, inscrutabilis, or veraciter, or morphological or syntactical, such as the illogical superlative or the negative with omnino. Now there are two types of indirect Christianisms, the integral and the partial. The integral or absolute type is restricted to those words, forms, usages, etc., which are found only in Christian writers; the partial or relative refers to those details which occur infrequently in secular writers, but very frequently in Christian writers. Thus the verb honorificare is an integral indirect Christianism, but intimare is a partial one.
Direct Christianisms are sufficient in themselves to form a Christian special language of the technical vocabulary type. Integral indirect Christianisms carry the process a step beyond and create a true special language. One can, however, object that mere presence in Christian writers cannot alone establish that this particular word or expression did not exist in non-written Latin; and in view of the variegated nature of Christian Latin, which will be described shortly, there is a certain validity to this objection. One wonders, for example, why Schrijnen did not extend further the principle that he applies to Tertullian: "Le fait qu'on trouve des mots, des changements de sens, des peculiarités syntaxiques pour la premier fois chez Tertullien ne prouve donc en aucune façon qu'il en ait été l'inventeur." Why not chez chrétiens? The answer lies in the great number of integral indirect Christianisms. It is highly improbable that so many items could have accidentally survived only in Christian writing and escaped altogether all secular writing; certainly the abundance suggests a process at work that was not present in the common language.

With partial indirect Christianisms, however, the situation is quite different. This, it seems to me, is the

real weak point in Schrijnen's theory. Every item of morphology and syntax, except for a very few really odd and unlatin expressions, is a partial Christianism. Now it is the indirect Christianism, as Mohrmann points out, that is the real key to the nature and extent of the Christian special language; and here in the area of morphology and syntax, as was pointed out above, in these partial Christianisms lies the fate of Christian Latin as a Sondersprache, as, that is, a separate special language. The difficulty with partial Christianisms is that mere numbers are meaningless in the Christian period, in the time after Marcus Aurelius; for the number of Christian authors, and the volume of Christian writing, far exceeds what is left of secular writing. Hence the fact that a word or construction occurs two or three times in secular writers, but twelve or fifteen times in Christian writers, in no way in itself demonstrates that it is a particularly Christian word or expression. And if the usage occurs in pre-Christian Latin, one is on exceedingly thin ice to call it a Christianism. These partial Christianisms, it seems to me, must be considered, with a few exceptions, not a matter of language but of style; the Christian style allowed what secular literary quality refused. Literary quality is in absolutely no regard

a determinant in a special language. The burden of proof surely rests on the advocates of a Sondersprache in the matter of partial Christianisms; they must show that the usage is a linguistic, not a stylistic, development.

A very definite service has been performed by Schrijnen and Mohrmann in distinguishing the kinds of Latin that are associated with Christianity, though again this seems to me to be more a matter of style than of linguistic difference. Schrijnen objects to the term Patristic Latin because it excludes numerous writings, e.g., the acta, passiones, sacramentaria, the Peregrinatio Aetheriae, and the liturgy and official acts of the Church's administration. He protests the term Ecclesiastical or Church Latin because properly it should be restricted to liturgical and official language. The term Patristic Latin is altogether discarded; this is valuable since its association with theological and apologetic literature causes it to be misleading. The term Ecclesiastical Latin is referred to the official language of Church administration, a formal, partly literary language which Martin's Canones no doubt reflect. A new term Liturgical Latin is applied to the language of the liturgy which is actually a Kultsprache, a sacred or hieratic language of a very stylized nature, following the stylistic principles common to such languages, that is, it is itself a special
Christian Latin, then, refers to that special language finally evolved from a combination of the paleochristian colloquial Latin as it became consolidated and fixed by the authority of the Bible and early Christian leaders, such as Tertullian, and of the traditional Latin which reformed the colloquial during the fourth and fifth centuries.

As in secular Latin, there is in Christian writing a great variety of styles. There would be considerable value in subdividing Christian Latin into literary and non-literary, analyzing the nature of each group and attempting a synthesis of some sort. As it is now, the "nature" of Christian Latin depends upon the author discussed. The results are quite different for an Aetheria (or whatever her name may be), a Cyprian, or a Gregory of Tours, from a Tertullian or Ambrose, from an Augustine or Jerome, or from a Martin of Braga. This very observation seems to support the contention that much of Schrijnen's Sondersprache is more a matter of style than of language. But the whole situation is still clouded, and the synthetic analysis of types remains undone, the key to the problem uncut.

The Christian special language, however it be defined, was shaped by four influences: Greek, Bible translations, the Vulgar speech, and, through the rhetorical schools, pagan tradition. In each instance the Christian language followed principles inherent in the linguistic and stylistic development of the common Latin language; but because of the class status of the first Christians, their ideas, their institutions, and by the process of interaction of the above four influences which were less well defined than in the common language, the result was a special language, distinct to a certain degree from secular Latin, yet still unmistakably Latin.

That Greek should exercise a strong influence on the language of Christians is to be expected from the very history of the spread of early Christianity. Its first language was koine Greek, at this time the international language of the Mediterranean; further the Gospel was first preached to Hellenistic Jews who spoke and wrote Greek, not Hebrew. The first gentile converts belonged to the lower and foreign elements of the cities, usually port cities, and they too used Greek. Naturally then the Scriptures were first written in Greek. Thus by the time that significantly

---

large numbers of Latin speakers were converted, Greek had been fixed as the hieratic, literary, and administrative language; and all the important, basic ideas, institutions, and objects of Christianity had Greek names. The use of these in Scripture and mystical literature gave them a *divina auctoritas* that eventually proved highly resistant to innovation.

This Greek influence is largely restricted to vocabulary; the few syntactical influences will be discussed shortly. There are several types of Greek vocabulary borrowings. First there are the direct loan words, e.g., *angelus, ecclesia*. Secondly, there are *calques*: Latin words existed which had in common with Greek words certain connotations; when a connotation not present in the Latin word originally is transferred to it from the Greek equivalent, it is called a *calque*. Thus *εἰρήνη* which had itself acquired a new connotation from the Hebrew *shalom*, passed on to *pax* this Hebraic significance which *pax* did not have in its original meaning at all. The same thing occurred with *sacramentum* and the Greek *μυστήριον*; but here there also comes into play another factor, the desire to avoid words which had a pagan religious significance. The Latin borrowing *mysterium* could not serve a Christian idea in Latin because the Latin Christians were much stronger in their feelings about the use of pagan terminology than the Greeks, who, while the same principle operated with them, still had
no scruples about using μυστήριον. The meaning of the Greek was thus transferred to sacramentum. Thirdly, there are semantic neologisms that are mostly loan translations of Greek, such as incarnatio and resurrectio. Fourthly, certain Hebrew words entered Latin through Greek, as gehenna.

These Greek terms were retained, however, only for concrete concepts; for fundamental abstract ideas Latin terms were adopted or created. Thus sermo or verbum acquired the meanings of λόγος; ratio correctly translated λόγος, but it had Stoic religious connotations and the antipathy to profane religious terms was a powerful deterrent in Latin. New words were created, e.g., salvator for σωτήρ, nouns in -tor and -tio, adjectives in -bilis, verbs in -ficare, such as florificare and vivificare, and numerous others. This process was, in fact, simply the operation of a principle of Latinitas applied to the Christian language. The Romans too, as was indicated earlier, avoided Greek borrowings as much as possible; Cicero allowed termini technici because they were essential to the expression of the ideas involved. The Christian direct borrowings are largely limited to such terms. Attempts to eliminate even these, however, largely met with failure, e.g., to replace baptisma with tinctio; the Christian purist ran in the face of an already strong tradition supported by the divina auctoritas.

The translators of the Bible from Greek to Latin are responsible to a great degree for both shaping the Latin of
the Christians and establishing the divina auctoritas for Christian literature. It is not St. Jerome's Vulgate to which we refer here, but the earlier translations which were very numerous and very different from one another. The two most common versions are called the Itala and the Afra to indicate in a very general way their origin and area of influence; but there were apparently dozens of translations, whose variants, especially those of heretical sects, caused some confusions which Jerome was commissioned by Pope Damasus to clear up. Although these translations influenced the Christian special language in numerous details, their major importance can be indicated in three directions: literalness of translation, use of the Vulgar speech, and the stylistic ennobling of the sermo humilis.

The Greek Scripture had already acquired the divina auctoritas; an inspired religious literature acquires such prestige, reflected in the Latin of the Arval brotherhood, for instance, or in the religious books of Sanscrit. The strong sense of a personal God working through representatives He had Himself chosen added to the weight of the prestige. The translators did not, then, follow Cicero's theory of translation, the movement from idea to idea, idiom to idiom; they did not follow the general Roman conception of very free adaptation. Rather they produced a very

58 This material is a summation and synthesis of information scattered in many of the bibliographical items on Christian Latin.
literal, sometimes almost transliteral, version, respecting the exact phrasing and expression of the inspired word of God. The result was to give a strong foreign or exotic flavor to the Latin. The effect of this on vocabulary has already been discussed; the natural tendency to borrow from Greek was here intensified and given the sanction of the divina auctoritas. This extended also to certain syntactical elements and to certain stylistic devices, especially word order. This placed in the Christian language a real element of differentiation which was a potent force in early Christian writing, but not unchecked, as we shall see.

Christianity was a religion of the people, not of the aristocracy. Hence there was present in it a strong democratic tendency which, when combined with a relatively low level of education, gave rise to a stylistic and literary freedom in the use of language. The purist and rhetorical-school influences had little effect in early Christian speech and writing, though, of course, a writer would have some knowledge of "educated" language and make some use of this in his writing. But the Bible translators show the democratic tendencies in their admission of Vulgar Latin into their ordinary style, employing vulgarisms regularly and not just for special effect. Thus their language becomes a combination of the sub-standard and the colloquial with some literary and educated usages. The use in Scripture, however, gave the vulgarisms the sanction of the divina auctoritas;
and eventually, through a variety of processes, many of them were elevated to literary acceptability, although, as we shall see shortly, there was strong resistance to the process of elevation on the part of educated Christian writers. It is further to be noted that the inclusion of vulgarisms into the standard Christian language was aided by three factors: the practical needs of the Church preaching and teaching, the plain fact that most of the Christians in the West spoke Vulgar Latin, and the secular literary scene where the same process of elevation was at work but in a much smaller degree.

The third effect of the Bible translations was specifically stylistic. The results of their efforts produced a style that was rather gross with inelegant, even incorrect, syntax, base and indecorous vocabulary, a commonplace realism, and a lack of any recognized literary form; it was derisively called the *sermo piscatorius*. Auerbach maintains that this style expressed ideas of the utmost profundity and mystery, and that the utter simplicity of its expression of these spiritually exciting ideas created an ecstasy in the reader. Here were the concepts befitting the grand style expressed in the low style. Now the idea of *humilitas* was at the center of Christian life: God had become

---

59 E. Auerbach, "Sacrae Scripturae Sermo Humilis," *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 42 (1941), 57-67, and "Sermo Humilis," *Literatursprache und Publikum* (Bern: A. Francke, 1958), pp. 25-63. The *sermo humilis* was elevated to literary position; whether Auerbach's explanation is correct or not requires further study, but it is presented here as an intriguing theory.
man and had revealed these high truths, not to the great and wise, but to the lowly and the ignorant—non oratorem, non senatorem, sed piscatorem. Everything in Christianity was lofty, and even humility was a lofty concept that could be referred to by such a phrase as peraltissima humilitas. Thus the concept of humility combined with the divina auctoritas to elevate the sermo humilis to a position of literary prestige. This process was aided by the necessity for preachers to use language that their congregations and audience could comprehend. The sermo humilis in Christian circles achieved the status of Latinitas, not in the sense of a style suited for certain situations that called for simplicity, but as a vehicle to express the very grandest of thoughts.

Thus far three of the four elements which combined to create the Christian special language have been discussed, Greek, Bible translations, and the Vulgar speech. These elements were not, however, neatly separate and clearcut, as was said before, but were thoroughly mixed and interacting in a variety of ways and to serve a variety of functions. If these elements had been left alone, a real Sondersprache might have been the result. But in the course of the

60 St. Augustine, De Civitate Dei, 18.49.

61 Cf. C. Mohrmann, "Le latin langue de la chrétienté occidentale," Aevum, 24 (1950), 133-161. "Sie cette évolution avait continué le latin serait devenu, déjà au cours du quatrième ou du cinquième siècle, une langue toute nouvelle, saturée d'éléments étrangers, dans laquelle on
fourth century a consolidation occurred, and then a reorganiza-
tion by men heavily influenced by the secular rhetorical 
education of the day. As soon as educated men became 
Christians, resistance to the conglomeration of non-literary 
expressions developed, e.g., in Minucius Felix and 
Lactantius. However, no really effective opposition could 
develop because of the divina auctoritas Scripture gave to 
the language employed. What had to occur was a synthesis in 
which the sermo humilis was preserved, but the really harsh 
non-literary and Vulgar elements were eliminated. It is this 
synthesis, worked out in the fourth and early fifth cen-
turies, that is the Christian special language.

The problem was a complex one. Pagan educated men 
laughed at and derided the Christian literature because of 
its lack of form and impure language, because of its lack of 
Latinitas; educated Christians were painfully aware of this, 
but were faced by the twofold need to communicate to the 
uneducated and to adhere to the authority of Christian usage. 
The only possible solution was this synthesis which would 
maintain the unity of Christian Latin with secular Latin, 
would elevate the sermo humilis to literary acceptability, 
and yet would keep the sacred character of the writing 
intact. There had to be, in Mohrmann's terminology, a 
combination of Romanitas and Christianitas. This required 

"

aurait à peine reconnu la langue de Cicéron. Il n'en a pas été ainsi."


at once an elevation of Christian Latin and a defense of it.

St. Hilary well expresses the situation, the need for elevation, yet the auctoritas of Scripture:  

... Non enim secundum sermonis nostri usum, promissa in his esse oportet facilitatem; sed loquentibus nobis ea quae didicimus et legimus, per sollicitudinem sermocinandi honor est reddendus auctor. Et exemplum nobis coelestis doctrinae praestat humani officii consuetudo. Si enim quis verba regis interpretes, et praecpta eius in aurem populii deducens, durat diligentia et caute per officii reverentiam regis satisfacere dignitati, ut cum honore ac religione omnia relegantur et audiantur: quanto magis convenit Dei ad cognitionem humanam retractantes, dignos nos hoc officio praestare? Sumus enim quoddam sancti Spiritus organum, per quod voces varietas, et doctrinae diversitas audienda est. Vigilandum ergo et curandum est ut nihil humile dicamus, metuentes huius sententiae legem: Maledictus omnis faciens opera Dei negligenter (Jerem. XLVIII, 10); proposito contra praemio curae et diligentiae eorum, qui cum reverentia et metu sanctas Scripturas sibi tamquam Dei verba commendent, et cum debita dignitate ea insinuent mentibus audientium, Domine dicente: Et super aspiciam, nisi super humilem et mitem et trementem verba mea (Esal. 66.2). Oportet igitur et praedicantes existimare non hominibus se loqui, et audientes scire non hominum sibi verba proferri, sed esse Dei voces Dei constituta, Dei leges, et reverentiam maximam utrique officio convenire. Maximè enim periculi res est, de thesauris Dei, de sacramentis reconditis, de testamento aeterno aliquid aut supervacuum proferre, aut negligentem audire. Consignanda sunt omnia animis, commendanda sensibus, quia nihil est verborum Dei, quod non sit implectum; et omne quod dictum est, habet quamdam iam efficiendi necessitatem; quia Dei verba decreta sunt.

St. Hilary, to put the matter very simply, suggests that the very sacredness of the Scripture and the awesomeness of the

---

majesty of God requires that there be an elevation of style, and that it is not the educational level of the hearer that must be heeded, but the grandeur of God's revelation. The defense of Christian usages by Christian writers has been well discussed by Christine Mohrmann and others and need not be repeated here. The important qualification to her ideas on the subject, however, is that Christian writers like Augustine were not defending a separate Latin, but rather the concept of a literary quality that was determined by contemporary usage and certain authorities not sanctioned by literary men. The synthesis that resulted did not create a Latin that broke with the secular chain of Latinity, but it reforged the weakened link of Christian Latin into full connection with that chain.

Two additional observations will end this discussion. First, the harmonizing of Christian Latin with the secular tradition broadened the variety of styles and types of writing; the need to analyze this material has been previously discussed. Secondly, this very variety raises the question of the internal unity of the Christian special language. If there really is a special language, then, as De Ghellinck points out, it must have this internal unity which at once sets it apart and identifies it. The

---

definition of this unity, the body of words and usages common to all writers of every style, type, and level of the special language, comes through the study of individual authors, followed by a synthesis of the results of these studies. Hence the importance of the present dissertation is to be seen, in part, in the additional information Martin of Braga will provide concerning the nature of Christian Latin.

Thus it is that a knowledge of the nature of Christian Latin contributes to the dissertation in two ways. Martin of Braga is an unquestionably Christian writer who lives after the special language has been fixed; he should reflect it. Thus in order to understand his usage, one must understand what Christian Latin is. Then, in turn, Martin will shed light that will contribute toward the resolution of the difficult and disputed questions about the nature of the Christian special language.
CHAPTER II

ORTHOGRAFHY AND MORPHOLOGY

It is not the purpose of this chapter to present a thorough study of the spelling and inflection of Martin's Latin in itself or in relation to other sixth century Latin. Rather those words which differ in orthography and form from classical Latin will be examined to discover what information they will contribute to resolving the basic questions which this dissertation has set out to answer. Now a certain caution is necessary. Whatever is true of his syntax, vocabulary, or style, Martin's orthography and inflection are, as the following pages will show, remarkably pure for the sixth century. In other words, the number of items to be discussed here is surprisingly small for the period. This in itself suggests that Martin belonged to the educated, literary group of writers rather than to the half-educated or uneducated, nearly formless, and Vulgar group. It also suggests, however, that the conclusions from this chapter will be neither extensive nor sufficient proof in themselves of the theses set forth.
The following forms are not variants but misprints in Barlow's edition:

- aetimatio, PRI, 3.58.
- consuetudine, CBS, 4.4
- descendens, SPA, 28.2.
- gloriosissimus, CBP, 1.15.
- ianua, CEX, LXXXVIII.1.
- licet, CBP, 7.X.1.
- loquitatur, EH, 3.48.
- luna, DP, 5.84.
- manes, PRI, 5.100.
- perpetrantur, DI, 5.18.
- salutio, CBP, 7.III.tit.
- seden, IDS, 5.62.
- spirituali, CEX, I.3.

Barlow's critical apparatus shows no variant readings. The Migne edition\(^1\) reads aestimatio, descens, ianuam, irascitur, loquitur, lunae, manus, perpetrantur, and sedem; the edition of Church Councils by Mansi\(^2\) has consuetudines, gloriosissimus, liceat, sceleribus, and spirituali. Also for the reading descendens Barlow in the apparatus criticus quotes the text as though it read descendens. No edition of the Councils (which carried the titles) was available to the writer; however, the form salutio shows no variants in Barlow's apparatus, yet is unattested in any of the sources as an existing word. Since the text suggests that salutatio is the correct reading, and since it is unlikely that earlier editors would have left the unusual salutio unaltered, it is most probably a misprint.

\(^1\)Migne, PL, 72, 21-52.

\(^2\)Mansi, 9, 773, 839, 841, and 849.
Orthographical Variants

One of the serious problems in discussing ancient orthography is how to determine whether a particular spelling is due to a later scribe or to the author himself. In some instances a definite decision can be made, particularly whether manuscripts vary, when knowledge of the usages of the author's times have an external bearing on a specific spelling problem. For example, there is abundant evidence that Cicero pronounced $c$ as a $k$; if one finds the spelling "preclum" in a manuscript of one of Cicero's speeches, he can reject it confidently and write "pretium." But for a writer of the sixth century the situation is complicated by the change in pronunciation that caused -ti and -ci to sound alike; an educated writer may have spelled the word either way and one must have ample manuscript evidence or strong external proof before he rejects -ci$\phi$. The result is that in some points of orthography the question of correct spelling can never be answered. In this dissertation, for example, no attempt will be made to resolve the problems raised by prefixes. It is possible that assimilation was complete by the sixth century and that even educated writers used the assimilated forms, e.g., annuntiare and not adnuntiare; later educated scribes often attempted a restoration of proper orthography and "emended" to proper forms. In many cases, especially for non-classical authors, this change left no trace of the form actually written; thus the
readings, in various manuscripts are very confused and contradictory. Such is the case for Martin of Braga; both adpetitus and appetitus appear in the IDS (at 5.72 and 9.116) and SPA, 21.3, has attendere while the Vulgar DCR, 16.2 has the "educated" form adtendere. The issue cannot be settled; it probably would shed little light on Martin's Latinity anyway.

In the DP, 2.34, appears the form asparsione. The word itself is classical, but the normal and Ciceronian spelling (e.g., De Div., 1.13, and De Leg., 2.10) is aspersio. The verb spargo when compounded became aspergo by vowel weakening; the derived noun is either aspergo or aspersio. Nevertheless aspargo occurs both as a noun and verb form; the verb is perhaps a recomposition from spargo and the noun a new derivative. However, the form aspargine is found in a Vergilian passage (Aen., III.534) where the prominence of the -a- assonance in the line suggests a progressive assimilation for the noun form aspargo. The Thesaurus\(^3\) cites the form aspersio only in the Didascalia Apostolorum, and is unaware of the usage in Martin.\(^4\) Both Blaise\(^5\) and Souter\(^6\) list asparsio as an alternate form for aspersio but

\(\text{---}\)

\(^3\) Cf. TLL, II, 827.

\(^4\) The Thesaurus editor used the Migne text, where the word appears as aspersione; this text has no apparatus criticus.

\(^5\) Blaise, 101.

\(^6\) Souter, 24.
neither cites any actual instance. The preferred form, of course, is *aspersio*.

The problem in the text of the *De Pascha* arises, not from the possibility of the form *asparsione*, but from the reading *aspersione* in manuscript *C* and all editions before Barlow. Barlow⁷ holds that *C* derives from an archetype that rewrote the text; an examination of the readings of *C* confirms this and hints at a literary "elevation" of Martin's style in the direction of a closer conformity to strict classical usage. The editor of *C* may have supposed that Martin wrote *asparsione* from the Vulgar phonology of the sixth century when the A-E confusion was common. But, as Bonnet⁸ demonstrates, A became E frequently in the Vulgar Latin of the sixth century, but E very rarely became A; hence it seems unlikely, in view of the previous existence of *asparsio*, that this is a current vulgarism in Martin. *Asparsio* does not even need to be considered a vulgarism of any period, even though it first appears in a Vulgar document, in view of Vergil's *aspargine*. Since, however, poets are not always safe guides to current prose usage, and since the *Didascalia Apostolorum* is written in a low (hence Vulgar) style, the form can be properly listed as Vulgar in view of the apparent incompleteness of the evidence in the source material—if Blaise and Souter are referring to a

⁷Barlow, 265.

⁸Bonnet, 95-96, 105-106, and 113-117.
frequent variant and not to just these two instances. Only the form would be a Christianism in any event since the meaning and root are used in classical and later Latin.

Here two principles come into conflict. Either the form is one of the few Vulgarisms that have slipped into Martin's text or it is a Christianism that has been raised from a Vulgar to a literary level by the sixth century. Since the form is extremely rare, and since the evidence indicates that Christian usage agrees with secular usage in preferring *aspersio*, it seems likely that *aspersio* is a Vulgarism rather than an elevation.

The AE-OE-E confusion in the manuscripts is a strictly orthographical problem; for it is quite clear that by the fourth or fifth century AE was pronounced as a short E and OE as a long E. The natural tendency would be to let spelling reflect pronunciation; the confusion arises from the valiant attempt of the schools to preserve classical spelling and from the resultant uncertainty and frequent hyperurbanism among writers of varying levels of education. Writers became unsure which combination to use in a particular word. This immensely complicates the problem for the modern editor, since he can never be sure whether a particular spelling is that of the Late Latin writer or that of a much later scribe.

In the CBP, 3.VI.1, the form *coelesti* appears without any manuscript variants; but in the SPA, 29.4, PRI, 4.81,
IDS, 6.77, and DCR, 3.1, 4.3, and 8.7, the spelling is cael-. The OE spelling is a Late Latin development\(^9\) and apparently was due to false etymologizing from the Greek κοσμον.\(^10\) There was, however, no uniformity; and the word appears as cael-, coel-, and cel-, though the Thesaurus restricts the last to the latest times. The OE probably originally had an OI sound for this word and developed in early Christian circles through Greek influence, appearing in writing at a relatively late date. The later similarity in sound, with both AE and OE having an E sound as indicated above, added to the predominance of the standard secular AE spelling, gave rise to the confusion. Coelestis, although it is not the only, nor even the preferred, spelling in Christian writers, is a specifically Christian orthography, an indirect Christianism.\(^11\) Martin, then, may have used the peculiarly Christian spelling in the canon of the first council to give it a particularly Christian flavor; but elsewhere he prefers and uses the normal Latin form which had an unbroken history. The root noun of the adjective caelestis is caelum which also had a Late Latin variant, coelum. Martin uses caelum nineteen times in the PRI, IDS,\(^9\) Cf. TLL, III, 79.


\(^{11}\) The word is not a strict technical term nor confined to strictly Christian contexts; therefore I prefer to list it as indirect rather than direct.
EH, and DCR; and in every occurrence the spelling is cael-, even in the popular and Christian DCR where coel- might be expected. Thus in twenty-five out of twenty-six instances Martin prefers cael- to coel-. Consequently no real conclusions can be drawn from the use of coelestis. It may be a recognition of a Christianism in spelling or simply a common alternate spelling that slipped in unconsciously or a later scribe's version which became fixed in the manuscript tradition. The striking preference for the standard spelling does, however, indicate Martin's traditionalist inclination.

The spelling coena in the CBP, 3.XVI.1, is clearly a Christian Grecism;¹² the context shows the special nature of the word:

Si quis quinta feria paschali, quae vocatur Coena Domini, hora legitima post nonamieiunus in ecclesia missas non tenet . . . (emphasis mine)

This is the only occurrence of the word in Martin, and it is in a specifically Christian work.

The spelling coherentes appears in the DI, 6.6. The interesting thing about this spelling is that Seneca's De Ira, which Martin is epitomizing,¹³ has the word spelled cohaerentis;¹⁴ in both cases the word modifies amicitias. Although Martin often modernizes the language of Seneca, he

¹²Through the influence of Greek ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ. Cf. Kent, loc. cit.

¹³Cf. Barlow, 145.

¹⁴Seneca, De Ira, II, 29.2.
is elsewhere conservative in orthography and usually preserves the AE spelling. It is probable that *coherentes* is an accidental Vulgarism.

The verb *faenerare* appears in Martin as follows: PRI, 3.72, *fenerat*; EH, 5.98, *foenerans*; CEX, LXII.3, *feneravit*; and DCR, 19.3, *feneravimus*. The classical and purist spelling is *faen-*°. The change of AE to E follows the normal pronunciation of the sixth century but does not accord with Martin's usual practice of retaining classical spellings. But it seems that this word was a source of spelling problems very early; the *Thesaurus*¹⁵ states, "... scribitur *faen-*, *fen-*, vel *foen-* sine certa ratione, ut videtur." In fact the confusion goes all the way back to classical times, as Varro attests:¹⁶

In pluribus verbis A ante E alii ponunt, alii non, ut quod partim dicent *scaeptrum*, partim *sceptrum*, alii Plauti *Faeneratricem*, alii Feneratricem . . .

Gellius¹⁷ quotes from the third book of Varro's *De Lingua Latina*, a book no longer extant, where he derives *faenator* from *faenus*, and *faenus* from *fetus*. He adds:

Idcirco et M Catonem et ceteros aetatis eius feneratorem sine a littera pronuntiasse tradit, sicuti fetus ipse et fecunditas appellata.

¹⁵*TLL*, VI, 1, 475-476.
Finally in the early seventh century Isidore of Seville\textsuperscript{18} writes \textit{fenerator} and \textit{fenus} and indicates no variation in spelling. From this brief survey the history of the word becomes clear; \textit{fen-} was at least a literary pronunciation if not spelling in the Old Latin period, but in the classical period \textit{faen-} was the preferred literary spelling and pronunciation but without unanimous agreement. In the sixth century \textit{fen-} was again the acceptable literary orthography, with a third possibility \textit{foen-}.

The spelling \textit{foetor} occurs in the CBS, 3.X.2; and at DP, 5.65, a Scriptural quotation, the form \textit{foenum} appears. \textit{Foetor} already had a classical variant \textit{fetor}, and \textit{foenum} was spelled either \textit{faenum} or \textit{fenum}.\textsuperscript{19} The noun \textit{foetus}, which does not appear in Martin, also had variant spellings as early as classical Latin. Apparently confusion about the orthography of these words arose very early in the history of the language, no doubt through mutual analogical influence as well as popular confusion. Hence Martin's spellings do not reflect any particular period.

In the PRI, 5.107, Martin writes \textit{praedium}, but at DI, 3.4, \textit{proeliis}. The classical spelling was \textit{proelium} and the word is an excellent example of the \textit{AE-OE-E} confusion in

\textsuperscript{18}Isidore, \textit{Etymologiae}, X, 96.

\textsuperscript{19}TLL, VI, 1, 165, "scribitur in codicibus vel faen-vel foen- vel fen-; scripturam genuinam esse faen- apparat ex faeni-secei in inscr. a. 117 a. Chr." The gender is discussed below.
in the later period. Isidore writes:20

Differt autem bellum, pugna, et proelium . . .
Rursus in una pugna multa sunt proelia . . .
proelium pars pugnae est . . . Prelia dicuntur
ab impremando, hostis hostem. Unde et prela
ligna quibus uva premitur.

The etymology clearly shows the word was pronounced with an
E sound, however it was spelled; and the whole wording of the
quotation illustrates the unstable nature of the spelling of
the word. Forcellini21 quotes the same passage but spells
praelia. He also quotes from the grammarian Apuleius, De
diphthongis, 22:

Praelium a praelo, quia sicut in praelo humor
uvarum vel olivarum, ita in praelio sanguinis
funditur hominum.

The spelling praelium also appears, according to Forcellini,
on early inscriptions. It seems likely that in the sixth
century a writer had a choice of spellings. In such a
situation one would expect Martin to choose the classical
form as in the DI, but he did not; even so, praelium is not
a Vulgarism, but a Late Latin literary orthography.

The spelling paenitentia occurs in SPA, 109.13 and 42,
and in the DCR, 17.13 and 14; in twenty-four other instances
in the SPA, CEX, DI, and DCR, the word is spelled poen-.
The basic noun form, poena, appears five times (CEX, XXXI.6;
DI, 10.10 and 14; DCR, 14.21, and 18.34) with -oe-; and the
verb poenitere is found five times (CEX, XXIII.tit., 1, and

20 Isidore, Etymologiae, XVII, 1.8-10.
21 Forcellini, IV, 898.
4; XXX.6; and LXXX.2) also with -oe-. The fact that the
instances with -ae- occur in pairs close together and that
the -oe- spelling appears several times in the same works as
well as the preponderent number of times elsewhere compel
one to conclude that paenitentia is an inadvertent ortho-
graphical variant in Martin rather than any scribal
finagling. It is simply a variant, neither Vulgar nor
Christian nor anything at all special.

The substitution of short E for short I is a very com-
mon phonological and orthographical phenomenon by the sixth
century. One would then expect that, as in Gregory of
Tours,²² Martin of Braga would have at least some such
confusions. There is, however, but one: in the CBS, 3.0X.9,
there occurs the spelling letanias which all editors of
Martin except Barlow emend to litanias.²³ Blatt²⁴ cites the
forms lit-, let-, lat-, and lyt-, and says that let- was the
normal medieval spelling. Forcellini²⁵ adds a spelling
laet-. Du Cange²⁶ quotes a medieval glossary, "Letania, a
laetor, quia laeta voce cantatur." He also cites numerous
instances of the spelling lit-. Blaise²⁷ indicates an

²²Cf. Bonnet, 117-123.
²³For example, Mansi, 9, 840.
²⁴Franz Blatt, Novum Glossarium Mediae Latinitatis
(Copenhagen: Einar Munkgaard, 1957), fasc. L, pp. 11 and 159.
²⁵Forcellini, III, 779.
²⁶Du Cange, V, 122.
²⁷Blaise, 498.
alternate spelling let- and cites the Letters of Gregory the Great and the Sacramentum Gallicanum, both of which can be considered Vulgar. Souter gives letania as a form used from the sixth century on. Isidore spells lit-. The occurrence in the CBS is surely a vulgarism since the present evidence for the spelling letania indicates that it was neither standard sixth century nor standard Christian orthography.

At PRI, 3.68, occurs the word elemosinam which all the editors before Barlow emend to eleemosynam. The noun does derive from the Greek ἐλεµοσόνη; nonetheless, the reading should not be emended. The earliest and best manuscripts read elemosina for all Latin authors, or sometimes they have the later and less preferable elemosyna; inscriptions follow the same pattern. At DCR, 17.17, Martin has the spelling elemosyna. The I-Y confusion for the Greek upsilon is normal, and the variation will be found almost without any clear principle. But the double -e- is definitely late, beyond the sixth century, that is, beyond the sixth century in strictly Latin writings; it occurs in Martin at SPA, 109.20, eleemosyna. Manuscript evidence compels us to accept this spelling and to assume that Martin

---

28 Souter, 230.

29 Isidore, Etymologiae, VI, 78-79.

30 CF TLL, V, 2, 350.
actually wrote it. It is, however, in a translation from
the Greek; here Martin is usually scrupulously faithful to
the Greek spelling, and this will explain the variant. In
the two occurrences with a single -e- both are found in
strictly Latin writings. Further, the use in the DCR sug-
gests this was the ordinary pronunciation which the spelling
would tend to reflect. On this point Bonnet writes,31
"Gregoire ne connait que elemosina. C'est d'ailleurs la
seule orthographe de son epoque." Hence the spelling is
sixth century and literary.

J. H. Waszink32 in his review of Barlow's edition of
Martin mentions the confusion of B and V which he says is
typical of Spain (i.e., Visigothic manuscripts); he suggests
that the form praieiveris is preferable to praeiberis at EH,
4.70. The concern here is not with these two words; for the
manuscripts both spell with a -b- and any emendation would
have to be settled both on syntactical and orthographical
grounds.33 Barlow correctly rejects B-V variants. Martin's
foreign origin and education and his literary acumen, even
though not the best, do not allow for confusions except very
occasionally and inadvertently. This is supported by the
manuscript evidence, in which the B-V variation is almost

31 Bonnet, 142.
32 J. H. Waszink, Vigiliae Christianae, 6 (1952), 58-60.
33 Since the B-V confusion is quite likely at this
period and in Visigothic manuscripts, it gives no conclusive
argument to cite this principle in itself.
invariably found in the inferior manuscripts and even then neither frequently nor consistently.

The orthography of contempnere at CEX, XIX.1, and of commissione in the same work at LXXXI.1, both of which occur nowhere else in Martin, is Vulgar. So too would be the reading of autoritas for auctoritas which manuscript 0 uses throughout the DTM; but here Barlow abandons his normal practice of preferring the manuscript to the editors and reads auct-. Since Martin elsewhere writes auct-, since Vulgar forms are likely to be only occasional, since the manuscript, the sole existing one, dates from the sixteenth century, and especially since the other readings of 0 reveal an abundance of Vulgar spellings quite unparalleled in Martin's other works, Barlow is wholly justified in his emendation.

The spelling coercionem appears at DI, 7.14; the editors, except Barlow, emend to the normal classical form coercionem. Seneca reads coercionem. The syncopated form is well attested for coercio and coertio, though the reason for the syncope is not at all clear; the Thesaurus suggests derivation from a verb form coercio as an alternative since syncopation of an accented syllable is apparently

---

34At PRI, 5.90; CBP, 3.VII.3, 3.VIII.3, 6.1 and 6, 7.IV.3, 7.XV.tit; CEX. LXV.3; DI, 10.9; FVH, 2.49; and DP, 7.102, all without manuscript variation.

35Seneca, De Ira, I, 16.1.

36Cf. TLL, III, 1438.
not possible. For CT to become T is a common phenomenon demonstrated by the variant autoritas for auctoritas in the previous paragraph. The spelling coercio is not recognized by the Thesaurus, but is by Lewis and Short and Forcellini; the substitution of CI for TI before, during, and after the sixth century is attested by Sommer, Kühner-Holzweissig, and others. The usual explanation is that TI assibilated early, then somewhat later CI assibilated, and a confusion arose. Sommer and Sturtevant, among others, maintain that no genuine example of assibilated CI occurs before the early sixth century; apparent instances before this time are explained by Carnoy as hyperurbanisms. Elsewhere Carnoy has demonstrated that the CI assibilation actually did occur in Spain in the latter part of the sixth century while it occurred in Italy in the seventh and in Gaul in the eighth. The problem is greatly complicated by the unreliability of

37 LS, 360.
38 Forcellini, II, 266.
39 Sommer, 218-220.
44 A. J. Carnoy, Latin d'Espagne d'après les inscriptions (Brussels: Misch and Thron, 1906), 158-159. He cites iudigium for iudicium, for example.
the later manuscripts, as Bonnet points out in reference to this CI-TI confusion.\textsuperscript{45} The only manuscript of the \textit{De Ira} belongs to the tenth century and reads \textit{quohercionem}, an obvious vulgarism. Barlow emends this to \textit{coercionem} as it is inconceivable that Martin could have written such a barbarism as the manuscript represents. Even so, the form remains a Vulgarism; \textit{coerctio} and \textit{coertio} had literary precedents, as the sources cited above show, but not \textit{coercio}. That this CI-TI confusion did exist in Martin is suggested, though not proved, by the variant \textit{conditio}, at CEX, XLVI.1, and \textit{conditionalibus} in the title of that canon, but \textit{condicio} at PRI, 1.13, CBS, 3.VI.7, and DI, 9.18. This confusion is common, however, even in manuscripts for the best of classical authors and really does not prove anything.

The syncopated form \textit{domno} is found at CEX, 1, and DI, 1. The syncope follows the normal rule.\textsuperscript{46} The problem arises because elsewhere in 64 additional occurrences of this word Martin uses the full form, both referring to God and to human beings; in just the salutations, however, he has \textit{domno} twice and \textit{dominus} twice, at DCR, 1, and DTM, 1. The syncopation is neither Vulgar nor especially Christian; the name of the pagan empress Julia Domna furnishes a

\textsuperscript{45}Bonnet, 172. "Les manuscrits postérieurs au VIIIe siècle... n'ont guère d'autorité en ces matières."

\textsuperscript{46}Kent, \textit{op. cit.}, 96, and Grandgent, 100-101.
clearcut example. Sommer\textsuperscript{47} quotes instances from Pompeii which puts the practice early, at least in the Silver period. However, its literary and elevated usage appears to be Late Latin. A definite construction developed along with a more or less promiscuous use of the two forms. The short form would appear if the proper name was employed; if it was not, then the full form was required.\textsuperscript{48} The short form need not be used with the proper name, but etiquette did allow it there; that is, as Bonnet expresses it,\textsuperscript{49} domnus is a title or expression of respect. Niermeyer\textsuperscript{50} also gives, as one use for domnus, a title of honor before a Christian name. None of these distinctions, of course, holds for poetry where meter affects the form.\textsuperscript{51} Löffstedt\textsuperscript{52} adds that the short form can be used in a friendly, personal situation, the long in a more formal one. Such seems to be Martin's usage here; the address in CEX and DI is apparently to bishops who are personal friends, whereas in the DCR and DTM the situation is more formal.

\textsuperscript{47}Sommer, 134-135.
\textsuperscript{48}Cf. TIL, V, 1, 1907,
\textsuperscript{49}Bonnet, 146.
\textsuperscript{50}Niermeyer, 353=354.
\textsuperscript{51}Cf. Goelzer-Mey, 383.
\textsuperscript{52}Löffstedt, Kommentar, 115-116.
In PRI, 5.108, Barlow adopts the form typhosus against the variant tiposus from the manuscripts and typosus of Florez. Martin regularly employs the -h- in Greek borrowings as the following list demonstrates:

acolythus, anachoreta, anathema, anathematizare, apocryphus, archangelus, archidiaconus, archiepiscopus, archipresbyter, blasphemia, blasphemus, catechumenus, chartula, chrisma, eunuchus, hymnus, hypocritus, mathematicus, moechari, monachalis, monachus, neophytus, orthodoxus, parochia, parochialis, patriarcha, propheta, prophetia, propheticus, rhetor, schema, schisma, schismaticus, scyphus, sophista, sophista, thia.

The I-Y variation, as was indicated before, is normal throughout Latin when a Greek upsilon is involved; with educated writers who know Greek, it is preferable to adopt the more proper Y unless a good reason can be found for preferring I as in elemosina above. The word romphaea at SPA, 43.2, does not carry the rh and is the only occurrence in Martin where the -h- does not appear in a Greek loan word; it is a very easy and common omission since Latin did not have the rh sound. This led to confusion even in classical times; thus the spelling arrha at SPA, 27.3, is classical though the less preferred orthography.

A few other variants occur, all of which have classical precedents. At EH, 3.42, appears ungendo rather than unguendo. The word for vegetables, olus, occurs four times, always without the initial h-. The form tentare is found in DI, 4.12, 8.4, and 10.6, but temptare in SPA, 51.3, and CEX, VIII.2, and temptatio in SPA, 8.9 and 36.2; there is no
Christian form involved here, as the confusion occurs in both classical and Silver writers. A bit surprising is the form subrigens at FVH, 7.4; this is undoubtedly a Senecan influence since Seneca uses the form subrigere several times in his extant writings, and there is so strong a Senecan influence on the FVH that it has often been falsely attributed to him. Elsewhere Martin has surgere seven times.

DeclensionalVariants

In SPA, 11.1, occurs the form mercato (and at 5.1 and 5, mercatum), and in DI, 3.7, libito. The normal declension for both words is the fourth. It is a common phenomenon in Late Vulgar Latin for fourth-declension nouns to switch over to the second declension. The Thesaurus lists numerous examples of mercatus in the second; Niermeyer and the Novum Glossarium give instances of libitus in the second. But all indicate that the fourth-declensional endings were preferred even in the medieval period; Bonnet too demonstrates the strong hold that the -u form had. It is quite clear,

53 For example, cf. Grandgent, 148.
54 TLL, VIII, 790.
55 Niermeyer, 609. (Cf. also 672 for mercatus.)
56 Blatt, op. cit., L, 125. (Cf. also, Meabilis-Miles, 400-403, for mercatus.)
57 Bonnet, 135-138, 355-359.
however, that second-declensional usages do not occur until Late; *libitus* itself occurs only in Late Latin, though Tacitus has a plural form *libita*. Divergence from the classical period does not in itself make a form non-literary and that is exampled with these two words. The second-declension forms were surely Vulgar in origin, but their use by educated and literary authors shows their elevation to literary standards; for *mercatus*, besides the scholiast of Horace, there were Jerome, Fulgentius, and Prudentius, to name only a few; for *libitum*, Tacitus is of sufficient weight to require no further support. It should also be noted that these forms are not Christianisms, even though Late.

Weakness of the fourth declension is a sign of heavy Vulgar influence; conversely, strength of the fourth declension should indicate educated and literary status. Martin has retained the fourth declension very strongly, as is shown by the following list of fourth declension nouns which he uses:

- abortus, accessus, actus, aditus, adpetitus, adventus, affectus, ambitus, apostolatus, artus, casus, clericatus, conatus, conflictus, consensus, conspectus, contemptus, conventus, cruciatus, cultus, cursus, diaconatus, dictatus, dispectus, ducutus, effectus, eventus, exitus, fastus, flatus, fructus, gemitus, gradus, habitus, ictus, idus, impetus, introitus, intuitus, iudicatus, lapsus, latratus, lectoratus, luctus, luxus, morsus, motus, obitus, obtentus, partus, planctus, primatus,

---

58 In addition to the dictionaries, cf. Krebs-Schmalz, II, 21.
principatus, profectus, prospectus, quaestus, reatus, recessus, reditus, respectus, risus, ritus, saporatus, senatus, sensus, sexus, sinus, spiritus, status, subdiaconatus, sumptus, tractatus, transitus, tumultus.

The following Greek nouns in -ma are found in Martin: chrismα in CBP, 7.XIX.tit. and 2, CBS, 3.IV.tit., CEX, LI. tit., 1, and 2; dogma in IDS, 10.135 and IB,1; schema in SPA, 45.4 and 49.6; and schisma in IDS, 10.136. Anathema also occurs twenty times, nineteen as a nominative and once (CBS, 3.5) as a genitive singular, anathematis. In every instance except CEX, LI.tit., these nouns are neuters of the third declension; this was the standard Latin literary practice with such words. The exception occurs in a title, De chrismα conficienda, where it is a first declension ablative. As was indicated earlier, it is quite doubtful that these titles are Martin's own; hence this may be a Vulgarism or Christianism of a later scribe. If it is considered as Martin's, it must be classified as a Vulgarism, probably written hastily, and certainly inadvertently since chrismα as a neuter accusative appears twice in the canon itself. The Greek noun pascha appears occasionally in Christian authors in general as a neuter rather than with the usual first declension feminine forms. Martin uses the word twenty-six times, as a first declension feminine except at CBS, 3.IX.3, DI, 1.6 and 10, DP, 4.58, 5.85, 7.100,

106, and 113, 8.130, 9.133 (and in all of these instances except the first the form is an accusative singular *pascha*). The word is originally Hebrew and came into Greek as an indeclinable neuter μάχα. In Vulgar Latin the adoption of words of this form was often a confused matter; so *pascha* appears in Christian Latin as a neuter of the third declension, a feminine of the first declension, and an indeclinable neuter. It occurs in all of these forms in an author as literary as Jerome, as well as in the Vulgar writers. Clearly Martin preferred the feminine, but the neuter is a literary and acceptable form. The feminine was by far the more preferred form; one is tempted to call the neuter a Grecism, but the evidence will not allow it.

The word *baptlsma* Martin has as both a third declension neuter (DTM, 2.16 and 21, 3.34, 41, and 42) and as a second declension (elsewhere); the second declension form is probably the masculine *baptlsmus* rather than the neuter *baptismum* since this was the more common form, although the absence of a nominative or of a plural accusative leaves this conjecture. Greek had two forms, ψάπλωμα and ψαπλωματι, thus the Latin variation is traced to a Greek variation. The citations in the *Thesaurus*\(^{60}\) indicate that grammarians allowed all three forms and that Christian authors of all periods and stylistic levels used all three forms with no

\(^{60}\) *TLL, II, 1717-1719.*
apparent consistency. Martin clearly preferred the second declension; but for some reason, perhaps technical, uses the neuter form of the third declension in the DTM.

There are several nouns in Martin which have some variation in declensional form. The word *altar-* occurs in Old Latin and classical Latin only in the plural form *altaria;* but in Christian authors two singular forms are found, *altare* and *altarium*. Martin has the plural genitive *altarium* in CBP, 7.X.tit., but this can easily be taken as the plural of *altare*, of which the singular genitive *altaris* occurs at CBP, 7.X.1 and the ablative *altare* at CBS, 3.X.8. Second declension forms appear at CBP, 7.XIX.2 (*altarium*, accusative), CBS, 3.III.6, CEX, XVII.5, XXIV.7, and LV.tit. (*altario* in all four instances). The variation is found in literary authors, for example, *altare* in Petronius and Apuleius, but *altarium* only in Christian authors; and although the third declensional form seems to be preferred, both forms are literarily acceptable.61

The word *caelum* appears as a second declension neuter eighteen times in the PRI, IDS, EH, and DCR; it also occurs at DCR, 15.17, as a masculine accusative plural, *caelos,* for which there are manuscript variants *caelum,* *celis,* and *celo.* The masculine form is found in two quotations from Ennius by Nonius, in Lucretius (II, 1097) and Petronius (39.5), and

61TILL, I, 1725-1729; Blaise, 73-74, Neue-Wagener, I, 832; Krebs-Schmalz, I, 149.
in Christian writing; the masculine form in pagan writers apparently referred to the sky as a divinity, or at least Nonius quotes Varro to that effect. Christian writers used *caeli* plural to translate the Hellenistic *θεόπαντος* which is in turn a translation of the Hebrew word for heaven in the sense employed at DCR, 15.17. The Christianism is based upon a Latin form which apparently had lapsed into a Vulgarism. It is, however, difficult to classify the form here. The other plural forms, *caelis* (DCR, 13.27 and 16.26) and *caelorum* (EH, 7.126, a Scriptural quotation, and DCR, 12.16 and 18.8), probably also belong to this masculine plural; then the form is a Christianism and the difference is simply due to an option allowed Christian writers. If the form *caelos* is unique in Martin at this locus, it is either inadvertent or an intended Vulgarism in the DCR; this seems unlikely since the phrase *ascendit in caelum* occurs at 13.25 and the singular is used in eight other instances in the DCR. There is no reason for such an isolated Vulgarism. The form is most likely a Christianism.

The noun *contagio, -onis*, appears at PRI, 7.125 and CBP, 2.3; but at IDS, 9.117 it is a second declension neuter *contagium*. Contagio is the standard form which appears in

---


63 TLL, III, 79; LS, 263; Neue-Wagener, I, 624; Krebs-Schmalz, I, 249.
all periods of Latin; *contagium* is poetic and Silver. The
word illustrates how Late authors have variations of per-
fectly acceptable literary quality, based upon the
auctoritas of different types or periods. The difference
apparently developed through the poets who created a plural
contagia, perhaps metri causa; for this form first appears
in the poets and most extensively in the poetic-flavored
Silver writings in prose. The singular *contagium* is then
derived, falsely, from contagia, and it is used by a few
Silver writers.\(^64\)

**Diaconus** is a strictly Christian word. Normally it
is in the second declension and Martin so uses it twenty-
four times in the CBP and CEX. But the word has a few third
declensional endings, and Martin uses the nominative plural
diacones at CBP, 7.IX.1, CEX, XVI.12, XVIII.6, and XXIV.tit.
This variation apparently derives from the doublet forms for
the word in Greek, ὁδικός and ὁδικονος. The two forms in
Latin were used promiscuously, though the second declension
was preferred.\(^65\)

In the DCR, 14.8, Martin uses the nominative singular
famis which classical Latin writes as fames. The -is form

\(^{64}\) LS, 444; Neue-Wagener, I, 644; Krebs-Schmalz, I,
349; IH, 209.

\(^{65}\) TLL, V, 943-944; LS, 569; Blaise, 267-268; H. Rönsch,
Itala und Vulgata (2d ed.; Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 1875),
p. 262.
for -es is a fairly common Vulgarism, and very appropriately appears in the DCR. 65

At CBP, 7.XX.2, Martin has the genitive lectorati and subdiaconati, but he uses lectoratu at CEX, XLIII.1, and the subdiaconatus at CEX, XXV.6. The regular form for both words is the fourth declension; in fact, these two instances are the only ones cited in the source material for the genitive in -i. 67 Both words are late formations and the -i genitive is probably a Vulgar form, exhibiting the tendency to move fourth declension words to the second declension.

The noun presbyter occurs in Martin forty-seven times; and in forty-six instances it is in the second declension. At CEX, XL.1, however, it appears as presbyterem with a manuscript variant presbyterum. The third-declension form has not been noticed in any of the sources used for this dissertation. This lack of evidence prevents any conclusions, though the predominance of the second declension in Martin suggests, if the reading stands, an inadvertent Vulgarism.

Martin uses the genitive plural form sapientum in FVH, la.1. This form, while not the usual one, is not unexampled in earlier, especially poetic, Latin.

In the IDS, 3.31, Martin uses miseria as a noun of the fifth declension, writing miseriem which the editors before

65 TLL, VI, 1, 228; LS, 723; Grandgent, 153.
67 Blaise, 490 and 780.
Barlow emend to *miseriam*, while at DCR, 18.9, he has the ablative *miseria*. This particular word is not authenticated as of the fifth declension in any available source, though it does occur as a manuscript variant. However, the practice of making -ia words of the first declension into fifth declension nouns is so widely attested,\(^{68}\) that its extension to non-cited words is to be expected. Even so, when such variations in form are permitted, one must be extremely cautious about individual words. The variation suggests that the process itself was not accepted as literary or educated practice, but certain words affected by it came to be accepted. It is also possible, as Carnoy indicates,\(^{69}\) that later scribes may have created anomalous fifth declension forms. There is quite insufficient evidence to pass judgment on *miserias*. All that can be said at present is that the form here in Martin appears to be a Vulgarism.

The gender of nouns is strictly classical in Martin's writings except for *dies* and *foenus*. The word *dies* appears 109 times. In sixty-one instances the gender cannot be determined. It is masculine at SPA, 109.2 and 3; CBP, 1.15, 3.IV.2, 3.IX.3 and 10; DI, 5.5; DCR, 8. 18 and 19, 9.6, 10, and 12, 16.11, 18.11, 15, 18, 22, 25, and 27; DP, 1.8, 2.22, \(^{68}\) Cf. the numerous examples in Neue-Wagener, I, 560-569.

3.40, 41, and 47, 4.55, 5.69 and 80, 6.88 and 91. The word occurs in the feminine gender at CBS, 3.I.10; CEX, LVII. tit. and 2; LXIV.1; DCR, 13.15, 15.16, 17.11, 18.31; DP, 4.57, 5.83, 6.90 (twice), 7.108, 110, 111, and 113, 8.118 and 124. In general the usage here is classical, but there is some confusion that shows no consistency in phrases like dies dominica or primo die. Sometimes the feminine occurs, 
tertia die (DCR, 18.31) or Dominica die (DP, 4.57); sometimes the masculine septimo die (DCR, 9.6) or die dominico (DCR, 18.15). Apparently the phrase dies dominicus was an intentional Vulgarism on Martin's part; it occurs only in the DCR and elsewhere Martin uses the feminine.

The word foenum is neuter ordinarily; it appears as a masculine in a Scriptural quotation in the DP, 5.65, omnem foenum. This was a Vulgar variant, but Martin is not to be held responsible for a variant form in Scripture.

As for declensional endings Martin is strictly classical except in two points. The forms dui in IDS, 5.70, and mensuum in the DP, 5.70, are not the regular classical forms, but both do have classical precedents of literary stature; their more frequent use is Late. The first exception is the ablative singular mare at DCR, 8.9 and 12, 9.4; this is probably an intentional vulgarism, since the form, even though it occurs in classical authors, was more common in Vulgar Latin than in the literary at all periods. In every other instance Martin uses the normal -e ending; and
in the dative singular of the third declension he invariably uses the -i so that variants such as fornicatione at PRI, 1.9, are properly rejected. The second non-classical variation is found in the ablative singular of the present participle. In classical Latin when the participle is used as an adjective, the ending is regularly -i; but when it is used as a noun or in the ablative absolute, the ending is regularly -e. In Martin, the present participle occurs as an adjective ten times. In seven instances -e is used; in the remaining three there are two formulaic and hence conservative phrases, succedenti tempore (CEX, 6 and XXII.6) and sequenti anno (DP, 6.95). He does have the phrase in praesenti in the PRI, 3.70 and DCR, 18.4; there is likely an ellipsis of tempore here and again a formulaic phrase, though it is possible to take it as a noun with a third variation from classical morphology. Martin appears to follow Late usage and regularly has the ablative of the present participle in -e.

A very peculiar form Scythi is found in SPA, 12.2, viam eremi Scythi, and 45.1, de Scythi. The Greek source has τὴν δόξα τῆς Σῆμερας and εἰς Σῆμεραν. Sophocles gives SPA, 17.2, 18.2, 36.2; CEX, 6, X.tit., XXII.6, XXXI.tit.; DP, 4.58; and IR, 3.

Migne, PG 65, 206.5 and 219B.

the form Σκυθις as an alternate form of Σκυθις, a place in Egypt which is near the border of Libya; he also quotes Cassian, one of Martin's sources, in eremo Scythi. The difficulty lies in deciding the nominative form of this word, Scythus or Scythis. One can conjecture that Martin wrote Scitis or Scytis, with an ablative Sciti or Scyti and that later scribes, confused by the strange form, changed it to Scythi, a more familiar looking word; the manuscript variants, scitii and scithi, ignoring the editor's Scythia, support this view, though the best evidence is for the above forms. Still we have seen above how careful Martin is in transcribing Greek words, particularly the -th- letters. The loss of the -s in the genitive singular of the first reference is a simple scribal error, easy of explanation, if we reject actual emendation. To make the word third declension also explains Cassian's phrase most readily. If the readings are retained on the strength of the manuscript evidence, one must make the nominative Scythus, still meaning a place in Egypt, and explain the second reference by an ellipsis of terra.

Adjective Variants

The adjective stem unanim- seems to have been a great trouble-maker through much of the history of the Latin language. In the CBP, 8.3, appears unanimi in the nominative plural, which W reads as unianimi and the Hispana
Systematizata as unanimes; in the CBS, 1.17, occurs unanimes in the nominative, which Isidore Mercator emended to read unanimes. This yields four variants, all of which are attested for the sixth century or earlier. The forms unanimus and unanimis are relatively rare; but Souter says unanimis occurs from the third century on in the earliest and best manuscripts. Nevertheless, the rarity seems to rule out these variants. Unanimus occurs throughout all periods of Latin; in the Late period it is used by both secular and Christian authors. Unanimis is not clearly represented in the available sources. Lewis and Short cite only Late authors; Neue-Wagener ascribe the form to Vergil, but modern editors unanimously adopt the -us declension in preference to the -is declension in all the lines cited. It appears that Late authors had a choice and that either form was literary; hence Martin may vary the forms from one council to the next. The -is form is not a Christianism, however, since it is used by Claudian (and Vopiscus if unanimiter is considered derived from it).

Verb Variants

Barlow rejects the variant anathematum which Q, W, V, and the Hispana Systematizata present and chooses

\[ ^73 \text{Note the examples in Neue-Wagener, II, 152-154.} \]
\[ ^74 \text{Souter, 447-448.} \]
\[ ^75 \text{IS, 1929.} \]
anathematizatum in the CBP, 8.10. The verb anathemare occurs early and throughout the Christian period, but infrequently. What probably happened was that an attempt was made to Latinize the Greek form by creating a verb form directly from the noun; but since anathematizare is foreign to Latin, semasiologically as well as morphologically, and since secular Latin had already adopted from the Greek forms in -izo, the Grecism got a firm hold and maintained itself against a more genuinely Latin form.76

In IDS, 3.35, the perfect tense of the verb sapere is found with a -u-, sapuerit. The usual perfect of this verb was sapii. Late Latin has sapivi, which Ernout77 says was a Vulgar form which had been driven underground by the classical writers; sapivi was used by Novius according to a quotation in Nonius Marcellus.78 The form sapui is quoted in all the sources only for Christian authors; however, Nonius in his reference to the word writes, sapivi, pro sapui.79 This would suggest that sapui had become the preferred educated form even among secular authors of the late third century. Ernout maintains that the form is the perfect for a second

76 TLL, II, 20, shows that the -izo form is the earlier of the two.
78 IS, 1629.
79 Nonius, op. cit., III, 817 (508M).
conjugation form of this verb, *sapeo, sapere*, rather than *sapio, sapere* of the third -io conjugation, and that it is from this that the French verb *savoir* developed. This would indicate that the second conjugation form was a Vulgarism; but the perfect here has been elevated to literary position (it appears in St. Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, 1.10, and *Ep.*, 102.10, for example, as well as in the passage of Nonius). Sommer holds that it arose by analogy to *rapui*; this explanation does not indicate whether the analogous form was Vulgar or not, though analogy was more a Vulgar than a literary process by the late centuries. *Sapui* appears to be the preferred form in Late Latin, Vulgar as the French derivative suggests, and literary as the cited authors suggest. In view of the evidence adduced, the form must surely be regarded as literary in spite of Vulgar uses.

A very common phenomenon with verbs was for deponents to acquire active forms; this occurred in Vulgar Latin at all periods and was common in Late literary Latin as well. Several instances occur in Martin:

causare: SPA, 86.2. The verb itself is poetic and Silver, but appears normally as a deponent. It occurs as an active form in only a few Christian authors. (*TLL*, III, 706; *LS*, 304; Blaise, 141; Neue-Wagener, III, 30.)

Sommer, 573.

Also authors like Gregory of Tours use it. Cf. Bonnet, 421, footnote 6.

For example, the poet Avitus, cf. Goelzer-Mey, 60; they call it a new form of the perfect.
epulabunt: SPA, 7.4 where L and the editors before Barlow read epulantur. The active form is cited only for Christian authors; it occurs as early as the Itala, suggesting a Vulgar origin, but it is used by literary authors and the grammarian Priscian from the fourth century. The deponent remained the preferred form, however.

(TLL, V, 2, 704; LS, 652; Blaise, 312; Neue-Wagener, III, 39.)

fornicaverit: CEX, LXXVII.1, although at XXVII.1 appears the form fornicatus fuerit as a deponent (and at DI, 3.31, the indeterminate fornicandi). The verb is a Christian creation. The active form occurs in Sidonius Apollinaris in the connotation "to vault; it appears in the connotation "to whore" rarely in Christian authors, mostly in popular writings though it is found in one of Augustine's sermons. The deponent was such preferred, and the active form is probably a Vulgarism.

(TLL, VI, 1, 1123-1125; LS, 770; Blaise, 361; Souter, 152.)

meditare: SPA, 21.7, though in line three the form is deponent meditari. The verb appears in the active form only in Christian authors of a Vulgar style; it is used with passive significance, however, by some classical authors, even Cicero, and literary Christian writers.

(TLL, VIII, 574; LS, 1124; Blaise, 521; Neue-Wagener, III, 56-57.)

recordaveris: EH, 3.37, and recordare, DCR, 14.25 and FVH, 2.38, and recordatis, DCR, 18.5, while deponent forms occur in IDS, 5.56 (recordemur), EH, 5.93 and CBS, 1.20 (both recordari). The verb has an active form in a fragment of Quadrigarius and is also found in Varro; it occurs with a passive meaning in Sidonius once. It is used with an active form occasionally by Christian authors. Apparently the active is a Vulgarism; but the matter is complicated by the late confusion of final -e and -i which caused innumerable scribal errors.

(LS, 1536; Blaise, 701; Neue-Wagener, III, 84.)

reminisce: EH, 8.137, but reminiscimur in SPA, 15.1, and reminiscita est in CBP, 6.2. The active form is a Vulgarism.

(LS, 1561; Blaise, 710.)

*83That the future is the correct tense the context clearly shows.
The deponent form delectatur in SPA, 30.1, is used as a transitive with the object passiones; the second hand of P changes to passionibus and editors other than Barlow insert an in. The usage is found in Petronius, 45.7 and 64.2, and Christian authors. Leumann-Hofmann\(^84\) suggest it is a colloquial hyperurbanism; but this can hardly be so in Martin. In both instances in Petronius the usage is Vulgar, that is in sections where the speech is Vulgar; in Christian authors it is Vulgar or poetic.\(^85\)

There is one instance of the poetic third person plural perfect active, demisere, in DI, 5.26. This is simply appropriated from Seneca, De Ira, II, 32, 3.

The carrying over of the -n- infix of the present stem was a common phenomenon in Late Latin.\(^86\) Martin has only two instances: confinxit, DCR, 7.18, and relinquuerunt, DP, 5.26. The DCR is an intended popular work and the Vulgarism may well be purposed; the DP is a Christian treatise in which the heat of penned battle may have caused an oversight of this Vulgarism. Both words occur elsewhere in Martin in their regular forms.

Adverbial Variants

Martin has a number of adverb forms consisting of a preposition and an ablative or accusative, but as one word.

\(^{84}\) LH, 545 ff.

\(^{85}\) Cf. TLL, V, 1, 422.

\(^{86}\) Cf. Bonnet, 419-420.
This was a common usage in the sixth century and earlier for certain formulaic expressions; it is imply noted here. The words are: amodo in DCR, 19.4; e contrario in DCR, 17.6; postergum in DP, 8.130; and proculdubio in the CBP, 8.13, and DTM, 5.81.

The adverb rursum, in FVH, 9.5, was the regular form in Old Latin. The purists suppressed the -um form in favor of rursus which Martin uses twice, in the DP, 7.105 and 8.121. Rursum no doubt was revived not only through elevation from continuous Vulgar usage but through the archaistic movement. Both forms are literary in the sixth century.

Considering that Martin of Braga wrote in the sixth century, we must maintain that the number of divergences in orthography and morphology are small, certainly small compared to a writer like Gregory of Tours. When we subtract from these the forms which, while unacceptable in classical times, had acquired a literary quality and auctoritas in Martin's time, the remainder is small indeed. And of these Vulgarisms it is most remarkable that nearly all of them occur in works whose style could more readily bear them, the Christian and popular works, particularly those written without the classic polishing and care, written in some haste, perhaps, for some immediate practical need. In the carefully composed literary writings, there are very, very few unclassical, and even more rarely unliterary, forms.
CHAPTER III
SYNTAX

Case Usage

The Vocative

There are no variations from classical usage of the vocative case in Martin of Braga except for the Aramaic word abbas.1 With this word Martin uses the normal vocative form, abba, as at SPA, 9.5, domine mi abba; this is the inevitable form for a Christian author since it appeared thus in the New Testament. Two examples illustrative of Martin's classical regularity are: SPA, 9.18-19, domine noster pater, and 18.3, proxime mi frater.

The Nominative

The following instances of the nominativus pendens construction occur:

SPA, 68.1, omnis causa quam non abscidit a se homo iterum in ipsa implicatur; 69.1, omnis labor qui supervenit homini, victoria eius ipsa est requies; CBP, 7.XV.1, item placuit ut hi qui pro haeresi aut pro crimine aliquo excommunicantur, nullus eis communicare praesumat; 7.XVI.1, item placuit ut hi qui sibi ipsis . . . inferunt mortem

---

1Cf. E. Hauber, Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie, 2 (1885), 292-314, for a thorough discussion of the forms of abbas.
nulla illis in oblatione commemoratio fiat; CBS, 3. VII. 2, uthi qui infantes suos ad baptismum offerunt, si quid voluntarie pro suo offerunt voto, suscipatur ab eis.

It is important to notice that this is quite different from the nominative absolute type of construction, e.g., *benedicens nos episcopus, profecti sumus*. Logically, to use SPA, 69.1, as an example, Martin's sentence should have *labor* in the genitive, objective to *victoria*; instead it appears in the nominative and is left hanging by being replaced with the *eius*. Hofmann calls this an isolated, emphatic nominative, an anacoluthic expression which is eventually set aright by a pronoun. This type of nominative, he points out, has Old Latin precedents, and he cites Plautus and Cato; it is also used, though probably as a conscious literary device, by Cicero, and then by Petronius in a colloquial passage. When the nominative can be viewed as in apposition, as it were, to another case, as here *labor* to *eius*, they call the usage

\[^2\]Peregrinatio Aetheriae, 16.7. Cf. Lofstedt, Kommentar, 158. Martin has a single instance of the nominative absolute, at CBP, 5.1, Relecti ex codice . . . canones . . . post quorum lectionem Lucretius episcopus dixit.

\[^3\]IH, 375 and 639. It should be noted here that E. Adelaide Hahn in a lecture to the American Philological Association entitled *Relative and Antecedent*, delivered December 30, 1962, at Baltimore, Maryland, attacked the idea of anacoluthon and proposed rather that in such an instance the noun is the subject, object, or whatever, of the subordinate clause and the relative really an adjective modifying that noun; thus here the construction is: *victoria eius, qui labor* . . .

\[^4\]Bennett, II, 4-7, does not mention this usage.
Vulgar and cite inscriptions. Schrijnen⁵ and Mohrmann⁶ call this an indirect Christianism, one of the partial type, that is, a usage developed and latent in secular writing but most widespread in Christian authors.

The only surviving Greek text of Martin's sententia reads:⁷

Εἶπεν πάλιν: Πᾶς κύτος ἃς ἀν ἐπέλησα σοι, ἢ μὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστι σιωπὴν.

Schwyzer⁸ and Köhner-Gerth⁹ consider this a rhetorical anacoluthon and cite Andocides, Xenophon, Plato, and Homer. Plater-White¹⁰ point out that it is a common Hebrew construction that may have entered through the Bible translations. The Greek usage is clearly literary. To what extent the literary authors cited for Latin were influenced by Greek in their use of this construction, if at all, is not clear; and it is difficult to see how the earlier authors came under the Greek influence. For Christian writers,

---

⁵J. Schrijnen, Charakteristik des altchristlichen Latein, p. 18.

⁶C. Mohrmann, "Quelque traits caracteristiques du latin des chrétiens," Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati, I, 453.

⁷Migne, PG, 65, 332.37.


however, the construction may have received additional impulse to its already existing Latin use from the Hebrew and the *divina auctoritas* of Scripture.

Since Martin of Braga uses it twice in translations from Greek and three times in canons whose basic construction is probably modeled on the canons of Greek Councils, his usage would seem to be directly under the influence of Greek; but this is not necessarily so, except for SPA, 69.1, since the construction has a long history in Latin literature with no direct dependence on Greek indicated. Christian authors use it very often, nonetheless, it does not seem likely that it should be called a Christianism, even an indirect one, since it appears several times in secular authors before the Christian era. Of the three "sources" for this construction, Greek originals, secular literature, and Christian use, the Greek seems strongest to me, because of the exact equivalence of SPA, 69.1, to the Greek; but Martin could translate literally with the sanction of previous usage, both secular and Christian.

There is but a single instance of the nominative with the infinitive, at SPA, 54.1-2:

*Quid est pro nihilo se ipsum homo aestimare?*

Here our Greek source is no help; for it reads only τι τοσίν

---

Normally a nominative occurs as the subject of an infinitive complement of a passive form of *aestimare* in Late Latin; but the verb is not cited at all with such a construction complementing its active form. The entire construction here does not fit the classical pattern for the nominative with the infinitive which is itself a poetic and Silver Grecism. In the absence of a Greek model and because of the irregularity, the construction is probably to be considered a Vulgarism in this place.

There is also one occurrence of what Lidfstedt calls the illogical nominative, where the nominative is used in apposition to an oblique case but gives the name of a word. In DCR, 15.3-5, is the sentence:

*Nam cum singuli nomen vestrum dedistis ad fontes, verbi gratia, aut Petrus aut Ioannes aut quodlibet nomen . . .*

This, however, is a standard classical usage. So too are all the other nominatives which occur in Martin's writings.

**The accusative**

Accusative of the direct object

One of the prominent features of Late Latin is the number of transitive verbs that are either intransitive in classical Latin or do not occur before the Late periods. There are several types: 1. those which are intransitive and

---

12 Migne, PG, 65, 332.41.
13 Cf. IH, 588-589.
become transitive; 2. those which occur in Old Latin, disappear, then reappear later; 3. those which occur for the first time in the Silver or Late Latin; and 4. those which occur only in Christian authors. The following verbs in these categories are found in Martin:

1. Intransitive becoming transitive

- **aptare**: DI, 4.17, and FVH, 2.10. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, II, 323-327; LS, 145; Blaise, 92; Gimborn, 7)

- **benedicere**: CBF, 7.XIX.2. The word is first used with an accusative direct object by Christian writers. (TLL, II, 1867-1970; LS, 231; Blaise, 112; Souter, 29; Gimborn, 7.)

- **indigere**: IDS, 8.102 (nihil indigean) and CEX, XVI.4. Varro is cited but with nihil; Vitruvius is also cited once. All other instances are later, secular and Christian. (TLL, VII, 1, 1172-1176; LS, 934; Blaise, 433; Gimborn, 12.)

2. Old Latin with later reappearance

- **ignoscere**: DI, 5.27 (elsewhere it is used absolutely). The verb appears in comedy, in Cicero (two citations in TLL, though LS says it does not occur), in Vergil, then in Silver and Late authors. (TLL, VII, 1, 315-319; LS, 882; Blaise, 402.)

- **magnificare**: IDS, 8.110. It occurs in Plautus and Terence, then Fliny the Elder, and, very extensively, in Christian authors. (TLL, VIII, 106-109; LS, 1098; Blaise, 508; Souter, 230; Gimborn, 24.)

- **oblivisci**: DI, 1.7; DCR, 5.3, 6.3, 13.2, and 17.12, a Scriptural quotation. With the accusative of person the verb occurs in Old Latin, then in Late where all the citations are for Christian authors. With the accusative of the thing it is classical. (LS, 1237; Blaise, 565; IH, 406; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 186-187.)

- **perpetrare**: IDS, 4.87. The verb is found in Plautus and Varro, but appears most frequently in Silver authors. (LS, 1351; Blaise, 615.)
resolvere: FVH, 4.40. The verb is cited for Plautus and Cato, then for the classical poets, and then for Silver and Late writers. (LS, 1579; Blaise, 717; Gimborn, 26.)

saudere: DCR, 12.8 (but with the dative at DCR, 4.7 and 8.5, and absolutely at FVH, 2.32). The accusative object occurs in Plautus, Apuleius, and very rarely in Christian authors. (LS, 1770-1771; Blaise, 779; Souter, 390.)

sustellere: IB, 18. It occurs in Plautus, in the classical poets, then in Late writers. (LS, 1822; Blaise, 804; Souter, 409.)

3. First occurrence in Silver or Late Latin.

adnuntiare: DCR, 2.1 and 13.19. The verb appears as a transitive verb in Silver authors and several times in Apuleius; however, the overwhelming number of occurrences are in Christian authors. (TLL, I, 787-789; LS, 126; Blaise, 55-56; Gimborn, 17.)

adorare: DCR, 6.5 13.3, 17.7, and 18.26. Poetic and Silver; it is widely used among secular authors even in the Christian sense. (TLL, I, 818-821; LS, 45; Blaise, 57; Gimborn, 17.)

artare: SPA, 21.5. Widely used among Silver authors. (TLL, II, 707-710; LS, 168; Blaise, 99; Gimborn, 18.)

compeacere: DI, 4.6. The verb appears once in Plautus as transitive, in the classical poets, then in Silver Latin where it is widely used. (TLL, III, 2061-2064; LS, 388-389; Blaise, 181.)

depraedare: PRI, 2.39. The word occurs twice in Ulpian and once in Apuleius; all other citations are for Christian authors. (TLL, V, 593-594; LS, 551; Blaise, 257.)

evacuare: PRI, 3.74. It is found in Pliny the Elder, perhaps Columella,\textsuperscript{15} and Ulpian; all other citations are for Christian authors. (TLL, V, 2, 983-986; LS, 665; Blaise, 317; Souter, 129, Gimborn, 21.)

\textsuperscript{15}The reading is dubious.
exaltare: SPA, 39.7. Columella uses the word in the meaning "to deepen"; Seneca uses it in the exalting sense, as do the Christian authors. The citations are mostly Christian. (TLL, V, 2, 1157-1162; LS, 672; Blaise, 321.)

excedere: EH, 3.37 and FVH, 6.4, but EH, 2.35, is intransitive. Silver. (TLL, V, 2, 1208-1211; LS, 675-675; Blaise, 323; Gimborn, 10; Arts, 11; Bieter, 14; Druhan, 7.)

gravare: FVH, 4.31 and passively at SPA, 5.3 and 6. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VI, 2, 2310-2315; LS, 829; Blaise, 381, Gimborn, 11; Arts, 11; Prendergast, 15.)

imputare: SPA, 52.3. Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 728-732; LS, 911; Blaise, 416.)

lnquietare: CEX, XXXV.5 and DI, 5.18. Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 1799-1802; LS, 960; Blaise, 421; Gimborn, 23; Prendergast, 15.)

Insinuare: EH, 2.32. The verb occurs transitively with reflexives in Old and classical Latin; but with non-reflexive accusative direct objects it is found first in Silver writers. (TLL, VII, 1, 1914-1918; LS, 966; Blaise, 451; Bieter, 15.)

intimare: DTM, 2.19. The verb is cited transitively for Solinus, Ammianus, Symmachus, the codices of Justinian and Theodosius where it has a special legal sense, and in Christian authors where it has its greatest use. (TLL, VIII, 17-20; LS, 988; Blaise, 468.)

lancinare: DI, 9.3. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1032; Blaise, 485.)
latere: CEX, XV.8 (but elsewhere intransitively). Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1038-1039; Blaise, 487; Gimborn, 13; Adams, 17; Arts, 11; Bieter, 16; Prendergast, 16.)

mentiri: PRI, 2.32 (in the sense "feign," elsewhere the word is used intransitively). The word occurs very rarely transitively in Old and classical Latin (once in Cicero and once in Sallust; otherwise poetic), but quite frequently later. (TLL, VIII, 776-781; LS, 1134; Blaise, 526; Gimborn, 13.)

Molestare: SPA, 40.1. The verb appears twice in Petronius, a number of times in the technical writers and jurists, and very frequently in Christian writers. (TLL, VIII, 1350-1351; LS, 1158; Blaise, 537.)

mulcere: DI, 10.3. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1170; Blaise, 542.)

nutrire: CEX, LXVI.1 and 3, and FVH, 4.23. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1220; Blaise, 562; Gimborn, 24.)

ordinare: SPA, 9.27; CBP, 7.VIII.1, 7.X.2; CBS, 3.III.10; CEX, VI.3, VIII.5; XI.1, XII.3, XVI.4; XXXIII.6, XLV.2; and FVH, 2.38. The verb occurs as a transitive in the classical poets, Nepos, Livy, then later writers, secular and Christian. (LS, 1277; Blaise, 583; Bagan, 9; Bieter, 16.)

perpensare: DI, 6.16 and FVH, 2.2. Late. Blaise cites only Martin for Christian authors. (LS, 1351; Blaise, 615.)

persentire: CBP, 8.9. Poetic and Late. (LS, 1354; Blaise, 66.)


plangere: SPA, 82.2 and 109.30 (but elsewhere in seven occurrences the verb is used intransitively). Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1384; Blaise, 628; Gimborn, 14; Prendergast, 16.)

praegustare: CBP, 3.XIV.4 and 7.XIV.3. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1421.)

praesumere: CBP, 7.VIII.1, 7.XV.2, 7.XX.5, and 8.12; CEX, X.4, XIV.3, XXII.9, and XXVIII.2. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1432-1433; Blaise, 656; Gimborn, 25.)
praevale: CEX, III.8. (*nihil praevale*). Silver. There are no citations for an accusative object and it is surely better not to consider *nihil* an accusative of direct object. However, the occurrence is noticed. (IS, 1437; Blaise, 658; Souter, 320.)

praevener: FVH, 4.48. Silver. (IS, 1437; Blaise, 659; Souter, 320; Gimborn, 25; Arts, 11; Dmuhan, 9.)

pullulare: IDS, 10.133. The transitive use occurs in Apuleius and Christian authors. (IS, 1489; Blaise, 684.)

restrauere: CEX, 13 and XIV.4. Silver. (IS, 1582; Blaise, 719; Souter, 353; Gimborn, 26.)

rimari: EH, 2.18. The verb is cited once for Varro and once for Cicero; but it occurs frequently in the poets and the Silver writers. (IS, 1596; Blaise, 724; Souter, 35716, and Gimborn, 15.)

subnervare: EH, 2.17. Apuleius and Christian writers. (IS, 1779; Blaise, 784.)

4. Only in Christian writers

abominare: CBP. 2.23 and 4.2; CEX, VII.6. This verb does appear in secular authors from Livy on; however, they use it either in the deponent form or the passive periphrastic of the active form. The active with an accusative direct object occurs first in the *Itala* and then very often in Christian authors. (TLL, I, 122-124; IS, 9; Blaise, 36; Gimborn, 17.)

adimplere: EH, 5.92. Only Macrobius is cited outside Christian authors for the transitive form. (TLL, I, 686-687; IS, 36; Blaise, 51; Gimborn, 17.)

baptizare: e.g., DCR, 13.20 (the word occurs many times, but only in specifically Christian works). (TII, II, 1720-1721; IS, 221; Blaise, 110; Gimborn, 28.)

---

16 Souter refers to Paulinus of Nola, Car., 21, 628, and holds that the verb is intransitive; Blaisse quotes the same passage and holds that it is transitive. The line reads, "numquam rimante sepulchro," clearly ambiguous. Martin's use is transitive beyond question.

17 The citation of Plautus, *Trinummus*, 708 (3.2.82), *multam abomina*, is based upon a poor manuscript reading; the editors now read *multabo mina.*
compendiare: CEX, LXXX.2. (TLL, III, 2036; LS, 387; Blaise, 180.)

evaginare: SPA, 47.2. The TLL cites only Christian authors but indicates that its entries are incomplete; IS and Blaise cite Justinian and Hyginus. (TLL, V, 2, 992; LS, 665; Blaise, 317.)

excommunicare: e.g., CEX, XI.3 (the word occurs 17 times, but only in the canons). (TLL, V, 2, 1279-1280; LS, 679; Blaise, 325.)

exhonorare: CEX, L.2. (TLL, V, 2, 2088-2092; LS, 818; Blaise, 328; Souter, 137.)

glorificare: EH, 8.151 and in a Scriptural quotation at SPA, 47.5 and PRI, 3.69. (TLL, VI, 2, 2088-2092; LS, 818; Blaise, 377; Gimborn, 29.)

hereditare: SPA, 34.3. (TLL, VI, 3, 2643-2645; LS, 848; Blaise, 389.)

humiliare: SPA, 89.1 and EH, 8.149. (TLL, VI, 3, 3100-3103; LS, 870; Blaise, 396; Souter, 177.)

impinguare: EH, 3.40 (a Scriptural quotation). (TLL, VII, 1, 619-620; LS, 903; Blaise, 413.)

mensurare: SPA, 39.7, 53.3, 67.1, and 109.27. The verb occurs primarily in Christian writers, but is also found in Late Latin technical writers. (TLL, VIII, 770-771; LS, 1133; Blaise, 526.)

operari: SPA, 51.6, 78.2, and 109.18, and in a Scriptural quotation at IDS, 1.13 and 5.52. The word is used in a non-religious sense as here only in Christian authors. (LS, 1268; Blaise, 579; Souter, 277; Gimborn, 30; Adams, 17; Druhan, 8.)

perexire: CEX, L.3. This word conforms to a common Late Latin process of compound verb formation; it occurs, however, only in Christian authors, though Souter just says from the fourth century on without distinguishing. (LS, 1339; Blaise, 610; Souter, 294; Skahill, 16.)

pertimere: EH, 2.14 and CBS, 3.VII.8. (LS, 1348; Blaise, 619.)

18 Cf. Løfstedt, Kommentar, 92 ff. Perexire is one of the verbs discussed.
plasmare: CEX, XXI.5 and DCR, 4.2. (LS, 1385; Blaise, 619.)

salvare: DCR, 18.3. The verb is cited for Vegetius, but is clearly a Christian formation. (LS, 1623; Blaise, 734; Souter, 362; Gimborn, 27.)

scandalizare: DCR, 12.6 (a Scriptural quotation). (LS, 1639; Blaise, 714; Gimborn, 30.)

There is also one other word that is transitive and is not found before Martin. This is importunare in the phrase importunans se at CEX, XXXV.5; this word is cited only for the late Middle Ages by Niermeyer (fasc. 6, 515) for the thirteenth century and by Ducange in the form importunari for the late Middle Ages.

An examination of the list reveals very clearly the literary nature of Martin's writing; for only suadere and oblivisci can be considered vulgarisms here, and they occur in the DCR where Martin is intentionally striving for sermo rusticus, though even here he uses saudere twice with a dative complement. Another interesting thing to note is the heavy influence of Silver Latinity on Martin; this is to be expected of an admirer of Seneca. Further, it should be observed that new Christian transitive verbs occur only in those writings which are specifically Christian and in the moral treatises on pride; in the latter the IDS contains one instance (in a Scriptural quotation) and the EH, which has the strongest Christian flavor of the three essays contains five.
Accusative of the internal object

Martin's usage is strictly classical. There are two examples in which the same root occurs in verb and noun, the *figura etymologica*:

EH, 6.108: quod belligerator ille David, bella Domini bellans.
FVH, 5.21-22: Tacenda enim tacet, loquenda loquitur . . .

There is one instance where the ideas are cognate:

SPA, 9.17-18: tollere mercedem pro opere quod non laboravi.

And there is one instance of the extended usage:

SPA, 12.1: Ascendens aliquando viam eremi Scythi . . .

This does not depart from classical usage but no doubt is here under strongest influence from its Greek model which reads:19

'Ανερχόμενος ποτε τὴν ὅδον τῆς Σκῆτεως...

Accusative of specification

Even in the classical period this was poetic and a Grecism; it entered prose in the Silver period.20 The one example in Martin which is most clearly of this construction is found in a translation from the Greek:

SPA, 55.3: et est continens linguam et ventrem.

---

19 Migne, PG, 65, 205.5.
20 LH, 378-379.
Strangely, however, the existing Greek of the Sententiae has the genitive with the adjective: 

καὶ ἐγκρατὴς γενοσ γλῶσσης καὶ κοιλιας. 21

The adjective continens for ἐγκρατὴς occurs rarely in Latin 22 and takes in with the ablative when it requires modification. Martin maintains the exact Greek phraseology, in accordance with the principles of literal translation followed by the Christians, by employing a Grecized, but acceptable, literary accusative.

The interrogative adverbial quid probably had its origin in this usage, "with respect to what?" 23 Two instances are:

SPA, 22.7: Quid volo ego cum homine aliquam habere malitiam?
DI, 9.21: Quid levioribus verbis publicum malum abscondo?

Accusative of duration

Only one instance of this usage is found in Martin:

SPA, 109.21: Cogitans omnem dieum mortem esse vicinam.

Other time expressions with the accusative will be discussed under the prepositions ante and post.

---

21 Migne, PG, 65, 77.6.
22 LS, 499; Blaise, 214.
23 LH, 645; ET, 136.
Accusative of place to which

Martin uses this construction only with the prepositions _ad_ and _in_, under which it will be treated.

The double accusative

Martin's use is strictly classical:

SPA, 46.1: doce me quod faciam.
PRI, 5.96: si aliquid recti quosdam docere voluit . . .
CBS, 3.I.8: catechumeni symbolum . . . doceantur.
CBS, 3.I.10: haec suos clericos discuserit vel docuerit.

Martin does not use this construction with verbs that acquired it after the classical period; he prefers to define the relationship more exactly through prepositional phrases, as at DCR, 13.3, _pro deo daemones adorarent_, where Late usage would have allowed a double accusative.\(^{24}\)

The genitive

The partitive genitive\(^{25}\)

From Old Latin on there was a tendency for this genitive to be extended more and more. Martin reflects the breadth of this extension in the Late Latin period; but he is still considerably more restrained than many Late and Christian authors, as one would expect of an author who was literary and traditional. It is especially noteworthy that

\(^{24}\)Gimborn, 34-36; Bieter, 23-25.

\(^{25}\)IH, 388-392; ET, 40-45; Gimborn, 39-45; Adams, 20-21; Bagan, 11-12; Bieter, 28-31, Bonnet, 552-553; Druhan, 12-13; Goelzer-Mey, 101-104; Hoppe, 20-21; Prendergast, 4-5; Skahill, 18-20.
non-classical usages occur in every instance only in the specifically Christian writings, never in the more literary ones.

1. The partitive genitive with nouns occurs in Martin in the genitive of material, a classical usage.

   SPA, 9.7: certam tritici mensuram.
   DCR, 7.15: acervos petrarum.

2. With neuter pronouns this genitive is classical, but its use was much more extensive in the Late period.

   aliquid: PRI, 4.78, aliquid boni, 5.96, aliquid recti; DCR, 17.7, caeli aliquid; FVH, 1.5-6, aliquid . . . aut consultationis aut exhortationis aliquid sancti aliquid honestique.

   nihil:26 SPA, 109.32, nihil mali.

   quid: PRI, 3.73, si quid boni, 5.94, quid boni operis; EH, 8.130, si quid . . . boni operis.

   quidquid: EH, 8.138, quidquid . . . boni.

   quod: EH, 7.118, quod boni est.

3. The partitive genitive with masculine pronouns is found before the Silver period, but becomes more widely used from that time on.

   aliquid: CBP, 8.12, aliquid fidelium; CBS, 3.V.1, ab aliquo fidelium, 3.VIII.1, aliquem clericorum.

   nullus:27 CBS, 3.II.1 and 3.VI.5, nullus episcoporum.

26 Cf. Löfstedt, Syntactica, I, 136-139, for full discussion.

27 The use of nullus for nemo is rare before Silver Latin, frequent only in Late Latin.
quis: CBP, 3.XV.1, si quis clericorum vel monachorum; CEX, LXXI.1, quis paganorum.

unusquisque: CBP, 8.5, unusquisque nostrum; CBS, 3.V.5, unusquisque episcoporum.

4. The use of the partitive genitive with eo occurs first in Sallust, then in Silver writers; in Sallust it is found only with abstract nouns, but later also with the concrete as here: CBS, 4.2-3, eo placitorum facto.

5. The partitive genitive with positive neuter adjectives is found in the poets, Sallust, and Silver writers; Cicero uses it occasionally with comparatives and superlatives only. Martin has the following instances:

With the positive: PRI, 5.102, quantum admirationis, 6.13, parum ponderis; CBS, 3.IV.1, modicum balsami; and DI, 8.22, quantum . . . commendationis.

With the comparative: DI, 10.9, plus auctoritatis.

With the superlative: EH, 8.137, te minimum omnium aestima; CEX, XXX.6, in ultimo vitae; DI, 8.22, plurimum mali; DP, 8.127, plurimum . . . noctis.

6. This was naturally extended to masculine adjectives, quite early. The use with unus is quite rare in classical Latin which preferred ex with the ablative; this is also true of Martin who has only a single instance, CBP, 7.XXI.3, apud anum clericorum, where the genitive is very close to a defining noun. The use of medius as a noun qualified by a genitive belongs to Late Latin; this occurs in Martin only at DP, 5.68-70, horum trium medius . . . nec

For the partitive use of ex, cf. under the preposition ex.
solum mensis medius sed etiam dies mensuum medii, where both
Late and classical usage is found. Elsewhere the classical
standards for masculine adjectives are adhered to:

SPA, 49.6-7, multos schematis monachalis . . .
multos laicorum; CBP, 7.VI.1, ceteri episcoporum; DCR, 3.4,
primus omnium.

7. The genitive of intensity, which is a type of the
partitive genitive, occurs only three times in Martin, which
is unusual for a Late Christian author; for the usage,
although found early in Latin itself and a pure Latin con-
struction, received a strong impulse to extensive use through
Hebrew influence in the Bible translations. Martin uses
this genitive at:

EH, 3.52, in a Scriptural quotation, dominantium
Dominum; DCR, 19.8-9, and DP, 9.136-137, in saecula
saeculorum.

The possessive genitive

Martin uses the possessive genitive approximately 175
times; the great number of these occurrences are strictly
classical in usage. Only a very few Late Latin extensions
are found.

1. The use of the genitive personal pronoun for the
possessive adjective occurs but once: CEX, III.5, praesentiam
sui.

29IH, 392-394; Bagan, 12-13; Bieter, 31-32, Gimborn,
45-58; Goelzer-Mey, 90-93; Prendergast, 2-3; Skahill, 20-21.
2. The use of a possessive genitive depending on an abstract noun is a very common Late usage; in classical Latin the abstract noun would be an adjective modifier.

EH, 1.4-5, non verborum elatione, sed mentis puritate, 3.36, adulationum nimietas; CEX, LXXIII.2, viriditate arborum; FVH, 1.7-9, laudabili tuae pietatis . . . studium . . . regalis reverentiae gravitatem; DP, 5.65, in a Scriptural quotation, omne viride ligni.

3. All genitives of possession with esse in Martin's writings follow classical usage, e.g., EH, 7.125, which is a Scriptural quotation, quoniam ipsorum est regnum caelorum, and CEX, LXXIII.2-3, omnis haec observatio paganismi est. Martin's classicism in this usage is especially well illustrated at EH, 1.6, veritatis haec culpa, non mea est, where the possessive nature of the genitive is highlighted by the possessive adjective.

The genitive of definition

This genitive had its origins in Old Latin, and certain other types develop in the classical poets; but it is not common in either and its usage in classical prose is very limited. In Late Latin this genitive surges into considerable prominence; and it is a very common usage among Christian authors, for whom certain Hebrew constructions may have added force to the new secular popularity which the

30LH, 394-395; Blaise, Manuel, 80-81; Bagan, 13-15; Bieter, 32-37; Bonnet, 550-552; Gimborn, 48-56; Goelzer-Mey, 93-95; Hoppe, 18-20; Schrijnen-Mohrmann, I, 78-85; Skahill, 21-23.
usage had acquired. Martin has used this genitive with an amazing frequency, more than 350 times in less than 3000 lines of writing.

The categories set up by Gimborn in discussing the genitive of definition are excellently suitable for such a complex construction which requires careful classification. They are employed here also.

1. There is a use of this construction where the noun and its genitive are only a circumlocution of the genitive idea alone; this is sometimes called a genitive of apposition. It occurs in Cicero with words ratio and species; then the number of words with which it is employed gradually increases with the growth of the genitive of definition in general. Martin uses this type very sparingly.

CEED, LXXXIII.3, constitutam regulam disciplinae; DCR, 9.14, sub specie nominum istorum; DP, 5.83, luminaria solis et lunae; and EE, 4, cultum institui ritumque sacrorum.

2. The strict genitive of definition occurs when the genitive is important to the meaning of the noun it qualifies, when it adds to the idea expressed by that noun. This genitive is very rare in classical prose; but beginning with Livy and the Silver authors, it undergoes a vast expansion in Late Latin. Most of Martin's uses of the genitive of definition fall within this category; only a few examples are given here. 31

31 One should note that many of these phrases come from Scripture, e.g., verbum salutis and terram repromissionis, and others are standard or trite phrases, e.g., signum crucis.
SPA, 5.7, opus fructificationis; 31.1, verbum
salutis; 34.2, terram repromissionis; 45.4, schema monachi;
47.4, in die tribulationis tuae; 88.2 salis condimentum.
PRI, 1.1, vitiorum genera; 4.81, elationis . . .
morbus; 5.88, hoc iactantiae vitium; IDS, 2.21, illa
superbiae celsitudo; 6.75, prini illius veneni . . .
interitus; 7.89, superbiae tumor; 9.129, in summo perfectionis
culmine; EH, 1.4, humilitatis virtus; 4.65, ad honoris tui
cumulum.

CBP, 1.14, in vinculo pads; 2.19, praescriptae
fidei exemplar; 3.IV.3, in vera hominis natura; 7.I.1,
psallendi ordo; 7.XX.2, in officio lectorati vel subdia-
conati; CBS, 2.10, pro unitate rectae fidei; 3.I.15, diem
iudicii; 3.VII.3, per necessitatem paupertatis; CEX, II.2,
pro longinquitate itineris; X.3, honorem sacerdotii; XXI.1,
pro casu suae aegritudinis; XXXV.6, spem futurae
reconciliationis; LI.3, ante diem Paschae; LV.4, in odorem
suavitatis, LXXX.2, sapientiam texendi.

DI, 1.1, mutuae conlal;ionis adloquio; 5.15,
consuetudinem non facile credendi; 6.12, dulcedine urbanitatis.

DCR, 4.8, in exilio mundi istius; 7.6 vocabula
sceleratorum hominum; II.2, dies tinearum et murium; 16.7,
signum crucis; 18.11, ad necessitatem reficiendi corpusculi.

FVH, 1.12, nulla sophismatura ostentatione; Ia.1,
quattuor virtutum species; 2.16, faciem mendacii; 3.8,
vindictae . . . genus; 4.18, iustitiae . . . legem; 8.4,
mediocratatis linea.

DTM, 1.5, pontificalis gratiae ritu; 3.48,
Deitatis substantiam; DP, 1.1, mysterium Paschae; 2.31, per
figuram servitutis; 5.63, veris tempore.

3. The genitive of definition in metaphorical phrases
occurs in the Silver poets, Tacitus, and the writers of the
Second Sophistic. A mark of the ornateness of later style,
it was greatly extended in usage. Martin has some 20
instances, of which the following are typical.

SPA, 25.5 ostium sermonum illius; 27.3, arrhas
renuntiationis; IDS, 9.126, circumspectae mentis oculo; EH,
3.41, caput interioris hominis, quod est cor; CBP, 3.8, de
corpore . . . catholicae ecclesiae; FVH, 1.3, moralis
scientiae rivuli; DP, 2.23, veritatis ipsius etiam umbra.

4. The so-called chorographic genitive of description
is simply the appositional genitive applied to place names.
It occurs in Latin very early, probably a development of the possessive genitive with the name of a deity of a place. Apparently it was Vulgar before the Silver Age; only the author of the *Bellum Africanum* uses it in the classical period, then Livy and Tacitus. Its widest usage comes, as might be expected, in the Late period when this genitive was extended beyond place names. Both place names and the extensions occur in Martin, as the following examples show.


PRI, 5.102, *per quadam dictatus sui loca*; IDS, 5.67, *in locum beatituddinis*; CBP, 7. VI. 2, *sedendi . . . locum*; and DI, 8.12, *in imo pectoris recessu*.

5. The *genitivus inhaerentiae*, or genitive of identity, is another type of the genitive of definition. It occurs as early as Naevius, is used infrequently in classical and Silver prose, and becomes frequent with Apuleius and Justinian; it is especially common in Christian writers. Martin has about 15 instances, of which the following are characteristic.


6. The final category of this genitive which occurs in Martin is the use of a genitive noun where an adjective

---

of the same meaning would fit equally well. This usage arose in the Silver authors, but became frequent, as usual with the genitive of definition, only in Late writers, especially Christians. Martin has but a few instances.

SPA, 29.4, dulcedinem caelestium; PRI, 2.35, animo virgilitatis; DCR, 8.20, in gente Graecorum; FVH, 9.6, nimiae rigiditatis asperitate; 10.4, eo medietatis tramite.

Circumlocution was one of the particular marks of the Late Latin style with its wordiness, overembellishment, and bombastic adornment. Hence the extensive employment of the genitive of definition is not at all surprising; it fits the theory well. Martin makes use of it in every one of his works, Christian, moral, homiletic, literary, and poetic. Perhaps the phrase most illustrative of the style, demonstrating with much impact its nature, is a genitive of definition in Martin not quoted above, FVH, 10.4-5, velut in quodam meditullio summitatis adsistens. The usage, as already indicated, also had the sanction of the divina auctoritas. This double authority sufficiently explains the large number of occurrences of the genitive in Martin.

The objective genitive

This genitive is found frequently throughout the history of Latin; but, as with many of the usages, it is greatly extended in the Late period. The genitive arose

---

IH, 396-397; Blaise, Manuel, 79-80; Bagan, 16-17; Bieter, 38-40; Druhan, 17-18; Gimborn, 56-59; Goelzer-Mey, 95-97; Prendergast, 4; Skahill, 24-25.
apparently from the abstract noun derived from the verb; as
the verb required an object to complete its meaning, so the
noun required a complement in the genitive. This usage
extended to non-verbal substantives where an objective com­
plement was possible. It seems probable to me that the Late
Latin effusion of the objective genitive must be directly
related to the large number of new abstract verbal substan­
tives created in this period; the linguistic tendency to
extend the usage continued its operation with non-verbal
substantives, as before, producing many far bolder genitives
than are found in classical Latin. Martin reflects this
enlarged usage; for the objective genitive occurs more than
200 times. However, the great majority of these is with
verbal substantives. The following are representative of
Martin's usage.

1. With verbal substantives: SPA, 4.2, cogitationis
passionum; 8.1, privatio rerum materialium; 13.1, in sec­
tura messis; 22.8, timor Dei; 39.6, directionis animae;
PRI, 3.54, huius iactantiae curatio; 5.98, praemissae
suspcionis delectatione; IDS, 1.9, in agnitonem omnium
futurorum; 8.94, ad perfectionem virtutum; 9.116, adpetitus
... vanae gloriae; EH, 4.63, in huius humilitatis
supputatione; CBP, 1.24, prosecutio tuae beatitudinis; 2.12,
apostoli Petri successor; 3.XIII.1, creationem universae
carnis; CBS, 3.III.7, profusione munerum; CEX, III.9,
ordinatio episcopi; LXXIV.3, creator omnium; DI, 2.6,
rabida vocis eruptio; DCR, 7.12, litigiorum et discordiae
commissor; 13.10, ad cultum creatoris sui; FVH, 4.55,
alicuus rei scientiam; 6.5, investigator latentium; DTM,
3.50, personarum . . . nulla differentia; DP, 1.7, Dominicae
passionis commemoratio.

2. With non-verbal substantives: SPA, 9.7, mercedem
conductelae suae; 35.4, voluntatem peccandi; IDS, 8.106, ad
eius . . . similitudinem; CBP, 3.XVI.4, per missas
defunctorum; DI, 4.4, in corporum cura.
3. A very few instances of the genitive of personal pronouns occur; this was rare in classical Latin where the possessive adjective was more common. Martin's classical tendencies are revealed here with only four instances: PRI, 3.58, nimia aestimatione sui; CBP, 3.VII.3, aliquem sui . . . auctorem; DI, 3.27, in taedium . . . sui; FVH, 7.7, aerumnosam sui memoriam.

The subjective genitive

This genitive is almost identical with the possessive, as Hofmann indicates. Martin's use is in full accord with the classical; the construction occurs about 30 times, though in many instances it is difficult to separate it from the possessive usage. The following are typical examples of Martin's use.

SPA, 56.3, habere aestimationem bonam in conspectu hominum; 109.30, de nullius hominis actu; EH, 2.28, inter varios aurarum flatus; CBP, 3.XIV.1, in usus hominum; 8.19, episcoporum subscriptio; DCR, 11.9, per adinventiones daemonum.

The genitive with adjectives

Martin's usage here is quite restrained. Only the following instances occur.

conscius: CEX, XXVI.3, homicidii . . . conscius, and LXXVII.5, conscius scelerum. With the genitive of the thing this is found as early as Terence; Cicero, however, prefers the dative, but does use the genitive occasionally. The genitive is common in Caesar, Sallust, and Silver authors.

34 LH, 395-396; Bagan, 17-18; Gimborn, 56; Goelzer-Mey, 97; Hoppe, 18.

35 LH, 403-406; Blaise, Manuel, 84; Adams, 22-23; Bagan, 19-20; Bieter, 42-43; Bonnet, 553; Druhan, 20-21; Gimborn, 65-69; Goelzer-Mey, 104-106; Hoppe, 21-24; Prendergast, 6-7; Skahill, 26-27.
contrarius: CEX, XXII.9, contrarius magni consilii. Although the dative and other constructions are far more common with this adjective, the genitive is cited for Cicero several times, and for Quintilian.

cupidus: PRI, 2.71, inanis gloriae cupidus (a Scriptural quotation); DCR, 7.14, homines cupidi . . . luceri; FVH, 4.69, sapientiae cupidus. Old Latin.

fugax: RVH, 4.46 esto vitiorum fugax. The genitive after adjectives in -ax was frequent in Late Latin. Fugax, however, is found in both Ovid and Seneca with a genitive complement.

immemor: DI, 1.7, affectuum immemor. Like memor below, this occurs in all stages of Latinity from Plautus on.

impatiens: DI, 4.13-14, omnium rerum existit impatien. Poetic and Silver.

impotens: DI, 1.6, sui impotens. In prose the first occurrence is Livy, then it is quite common in Silver writers.

inimicus: FVH, 6.10, simplicitatis inimicus. This occurs in Old and classical Latin, as well as Late, with the genitive, though the dative is much preferred.


proprius: CEX, XV.9, res propriae episcopi; XV.11, ea quae episcopi propria sunt; FVH, 2.12, prudentis proprium est. Cicero uses the genitive more frequently than the dative; the genitive also occurs in other classical prose authors.

timidus: DI, 9.11, tam timidum offensarum. Poetic and Silver.

In every instance Martin's usage concurs with classical or Silver Latin. Particularly noteworthy is the strong Silver influence, especially the Senecan flavor.

The genitive with verbs

Of classical verbs that have a genitive complement only two occur in Martin with the genitive, SPA, 27.3, miserere mei, and DI, 3.2, nullius eum meminisse officii sinit. Indigere and oblivisci which can take the genitive are used in Martin with the accusative. 

The verbs reminisci and recolere occur with the genitive at SPA, 15.1 and 3, reminiscimur malorum and recolimus malorum. The extant Greek text reads in both places, μνησθόμεν τῶν κακῶν. Reminisci is found in earlier secular Latin occasionally with the genitive, under the influence of meminisse, and recolere could easily follow the analogy. But the direct Greek influence seems more immediate here.

In this dissertation the ablatives causa, gratia, and merito are considered as prepositions governing the genitive case, and are treated in the next section.

Genitive of the charge

Martin uses this with reus only. This usage was limited to facti and capitis before Quintilian who adds...
furti as a third genitive. In Late Latin many other words were added as complements, and Martin follows this late practice.

PRI, 4.75-76, reus efficitur aeterni supplicii; CBP, 8.13-14, divinae procudubio sententiae reum; CEX, XIV.5, et tamquam furti aut latrocinii reus.

The noun reus is also used at CEX, XIX.4, reus erit fraterni concilii. Here it apparently governs an objective genitive rather than a genitive of the charge, i.e., "he will be a defendant before a council of his confreres."

None of the authorities consulted extend this usage to complement nouns other than reus and its derivative reatus. At CBS, 3.VIII.1 occurs the phrase in accusatione fornicationis; while this is probably to be interpreted as an objective genitive with a verbal substantive, it certainly is suggestive of the genitive of the charge since accusatio is derived from a verbum iudicale which regularly takes this genitive.

The genitive quality

The use of this genitive is very limited in Old and classical Latin; then it gains momentum in the Silver period, and in the Late period comes to be preferred to the

41 LH, 397-400; Blaise, Manuel, 82-83; Bagan, 18-19; Bieter, 40-41; Druhan, 18-19; Dimborn, 59-63; Goelzer-Mey, 98-101; Løfstedt, Syntactica, I, 148-162; Skahill, 25-26.
ablative. In Martin of Braga only a single instance of the ablative occurs, in the *Epitaphium*, 5-6.

Teque, patronus, sequens famulus Martinus eodem Nomine, non merito, hic in Christi pace quiesco.

The genitive occurs eleven times. For example, CBP, 5.22, ad interrogationem . . . venerandae memoriae praecursoris tui, which is a typical Late Latin type, and DI, 7.9, aeger et infelicis valetudinis animus est, a familiar classical type. In only two instances is the genitive unmodified, and these are formulaic phrases involving the coalescence of formerly separate words, CBP, 8.11, cum huiusceendi homine, and CEX, 8.4, huiusceendi factum. All eleven instances are adnominal.

There is one instance in Martin of the Genitive of Price, and it is completely classical, FVH, 2.6, nec magni aestimes.

The dative

The dative with verbs

The dative complement after various verbs is a feature in all periods of Latin. Even before the Silver period, however, as early as Livy, this usage became widely extended in prose, and in the Late Latin period is of very frequent occurrence. The development resulted from two principles,
analogy and compounding. Analogy worked primarily in a positive way through similarity of meaning or form, and partly in a negative way through the use of the construction with verbs of opposite meaning. Compounds which were constantly being introduced into Latin increased greatly in number in the later periods; at first this process followed the classical procedure of repeating the preposition with its case when the verb had its literal meaning, but using the dative for a figurative sense; but in the Late period this distinction was fogged, and the dative occurred in all significances. The result was that by the sixth century, the dative has a very broad usage as a complement of verbs. Martin reflects this later usage in the number of dative verbs which he uses; but those that were developed in the Late Latin period are surprisingly few in his writings.

1. Simple transitive verbs

agere:* in the phrase agere gratias alicui, EH, 6.111 and 114; CEX, LXXII.6 (a Scriptural quotation). Old Latin. (LS, 75; Bagan, 21.)

aperire:* EH, 4.60. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, II, 211-219; LS, 136; Bagan, 21.)

aptare:* DI, 4.17. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, II, 323-327; LS, 145; Gimborn, 75; Bieter, 45; Druhan, 23; Goelzer-Mey, 70.)

---

43 In general, verbs with a simple indirect object of regular classical usage have been omitted.

44 An asterisk indicates that the verb appears elsewhere in Martin either absolutely or with a different construction.
copulare: CEX, LXXX.1. Poetic and Silver. There is a possible occurrence in Cicero, but the TLL maintains that the word must be emended there.
(LS, 468; Gimborn, 74; Bieter, 46; Druhan, 23; Bonnet, 542.)

credere:* SPA, 104.1, 109.35 and 38; EH, 6.107; and DI, 5.2. Old Latin.
(LS, 479; LH, 410-411; Bagan, 22.)

intimare: DTM, 2.18. The verb was treated under the accusative of the direct object above where it was found to occur in Late and Christian authors; this is true also for its use with an additional dative complement.
(TLL, VIII, 17-20; LS, 998; Gimborn, 74; Bagan, 22.)

largiri: IDS, 1.6. Old Latin.
(LS, 1036-1037.)

ministrare:* CBS, 3.III.6-7. This verb occurs with a dative in Cicero's Letters, Vergil, and Silver authors.
(TLL, VIII, 1017-1023; LS, 1146-1147; Bagan, 22; Druhan, 24.)

nuntiare:* CBS, 3.IX.6-7. The verb is used with the dative of person as an impersonal passive by Cicero and Caesar; in the active it appears in Cicero's Letters, then frequently in Silver Latin. Thus it has classical origins, but it is mainly a Silver usage.
(LS, 1228-1229; LH, 411; Bagan, 23.)

portare:* DCR, 18.20. It is well-known that classical purists considered this verb Vulgar. It appears with the dative of the person in Plautus, Terence, and Propertius; its first and only occurrence in classical prose is in Sallust. The Silver Age from Livy on also uses the verb sparingly in this construction. Citations for Late and Christian authors are not frequent.
(LS, 1402; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 326; Blaise, 635-636.)

(LS, 1883-1884; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 669.)

tribuere:* PRI, 3.74; IDS, 2.25; EH, 6.105 and 114.
Classical.
(LS, 1897; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 676-677; Goelzer-Mey, 71.)

2. Simple intransitive verbs

auxiliaris:* SPA, 36.4. Old Latin.
(TLL, II, 1616-1618; LS, 212; LH, 411; Druhan, 23.)
blandiri:* IDS, 9.123-126. Old Latin, but most common in Silver and Late.
(TLL, II, 2030-2033; LS, 241; Bagan, 22.)

dominari:* PRI, 1.15. The verb with a dative complement is poetic and Silver, though it occurs infrequently in Silver and Late authors, more often in Christian.
(TLL, V, 1898-1906; LS, 608; Krebs-Schmalz, I, 471; Gimborn, 75; Goelzer-Mey, 72; Prendergast, 10.)

facere:* SPA, 105.1-2 (with male), 110.9 (in a bracketed passage); CBS, 3.1.14; DCR, 8.5, 13.23, 17.18; DP, 3.42. Poetic and Silver.
(TLL, VI, 1, 82-125; LS, 717-718.)

frascri:* SPA, 109.35; DI, 4.14, 5.9, 7.18, 8.20, and 9.1 and 6. Old Latin.
(LS, 1000; IH, 411.)

licet:* CBP, 7.X.1, 7.XII.2; CEX, I.1, XVIII.8-9, XXXVII.5, LI.1, LIII.1, LX.1, LXX.1, LXXIII.1, LXXXIV.1; DI, 8.11. Old Latin.
(LS, 1062-1063; IH, 411.)

mereri: DI, 4.2. Classical.
(TLL, VIII, 519-524; LS, 1122.)

mentiri:* IDS, 9.128; DCR, 12.1. This verb with a dative complement appears in Plautus, Terence, and Horace; in prose, however, it is found only in Christian authors.
(TLL, VIII, 776-781; LS, 1134; Gimborn, 75; Bagan, 22.)

misereri: SPA, 2.5 and 109.42. This is a Late Latin development; it is cited for Hyginus, a few late scholars, and many times for Christian authors. The usage is probably a Vulgarism elevated to literary acceptability by Christian writers.
(TLL, VIII, 1114-1130; LS, 1150; IH, 407; Blaise, 534; Gimborn, 75; Bieter, 46; Goelzer-Mey, 72; Prendergast, 10; Skahill, 71.)

nasci:* PRI, 5.102. Only two references occur in my source material: Cicero, Fam., 16.22.2, and the Mulomedicina Chironis, 52. The usage apparently belongs to Vulgar Latin. In all three instances, the dative word is a pronoun: illi, mihi, and sibi.
(LS, 1187; Löfstedt, Kommentar, 143.)

nocere: SPA, 85.2; DCR, 16.20; FVH, 3.5 and 5.8. Classical.
(LS, 1211-1212; IH, 377.)
opitulari:* CBP, 7.4, 8.12; DCR, 1.9. Old Latin.  
(LS, 1270.)

(LS, 1302; IH, 377; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 241; Bagan, 23.)

patere:* DI, 5.5. Classical.  
(LS, 1313; Bagan, 23.)

place: (PRI, 2.20, 4.84; IDS, 1.4; EH, 4.74-75, 5.98; CBP, 2.20-21, 7.1.1; CBS, 1.24, 3.1.1, 4.2; CEX, XIII.4, LVIII.2; DCR, 4.1; FVH, 2.50; DP, 1.11. Old Latin.  
(LS, 1318; IH, 411.)

(LS, 1768; IH, 376-377 and 407.)

suadere:* PRI, 6.111; DCR, 5.7 and 8.5. Old Latin.  
The usage with an accusative was treated under accusative of the direct object above.  
(LS, 1770-1771.)

3. Compound transitive verbs

accomodare:* FVH, 2.9. Classical, but more common in Silver and Late.  
(TLL, I, 330-333; LS, 18.)

addicere: PRI, 1.13-14. Apparently a term from judicial terminology, the verb was used widely in classical prose as well as later.  
(TLL, I, 574-577; LS, 30-31.)

adnectare:* CBS, 3.11. Extremely rare in classical Latin, the verb became very prominent in Silver.  
(TLL, 777-779; LS, 125.)

adnuntiare: DCR, 2.1 and 13.19. With a dative the word occurs only in Christian authors.  
(TLL, I, 787-789; LS, 126.)

adponere: DCR, 8.3. Old Latin, but most frequent in Silver and Late.  
(TLL, II, 299-303; LS, 143; Bagan, 23: Druhan, 24; Goelzer-Mey, 73.)

adscribere:* PRI, 2.32; IDS, 3.38; DCR, 7.16. Classical.  
(TLL, II, 772-775; LS, 172.)
adsumere:* CEX, IV.5. Classical, but far more frequent in Silver and Late.
(TLL, II, 926-936; LS, 182.)

afferre:* DI, 8.22. Old Latin.
(TLL, I, 1192-1206; LS, 66; Goelzer-Mey, 73.)

affingere:* FVH, 4.16. Classical, but more common in the Silver and subsequent periods.
(TLL, I, 1216-1217; LS, 67.)

applicare; IDS, 3*27; EH* 7*118-119. This verb usually governs ad with the accusative, very rarely the dative before the Silver Age. Poetic and Silver, beginning with Livy.
(TLL, II, 295-299; LS, 142; Gimborn, 77; Bieter, 48; Skahill, 29; Prendergast, 7.)

approximare: SPA, 11.2-3. Only Christian writers are cited.
(TLL, II, 316; LS, 144; Blaise, 92.)

commendare: DCR, 2.5-6. Old Latin.
(TLL, III, 1840-1853; LS, 376-377.)

committere:* DEX, XI.2 and XV.3-4. Old Latin.
(TLL, III, 1901-1913; LS, 379-380.)

commodare:* CBP, 1.24. Old Latin, but most common in the Silver period.
(TLL, III, 1917-1921; LS, 381; Bagan, 23.)

communicare:* CBP, 7.xv.2; CEX, XXXVII.6, LXXXI.8-9, LXXXIV.1 and 4. This particular construction where the dative alone is the verb's complement is found only in Christian authors. In other constructions it is classical.
(TLL, III, 1954-1960; LS, 383-384; Gimborn, 77-78; Bieter, 49; Goelzer-Mey, 72.)

conscribere:* EH, 8.138-139; FVH, 1.15. The dative with this verb is not cited by any of my sources.
(LS, 427.)

declarare:* CBP, 2.6 and 4.3. Classical.
(TLL, V, 182-187; LS, 521.)

deferre:* PRI, 2.36; CBP, 7.VI.2-3. This verb is used with the dative in both Old and classical Latin, though other constructions are more frequent.
(TLL, V, 313-321; LS, 529.)
denegare: CEX, LXXXII.2. Old Latin.  
(TLL, V, 523-525; LS, 545.)

depingere: PRI, 5.96. This verb is rare with the dative. It is found in Cicero, however.  
(TLL, V, 572-573; LS, 549; Bonnet, 538.)

deputare: PRI, 7.121-122; IDS, 8.104-105; CEX, LXIII.1. With a dative object this word occurs almost exclusively in Christian authors, except for Symmachus and the legal writers.  
(TLL, V, 620-625; LS, 553; Gimborn, 79; Bieter, 50; Prendergast, 7; Druhan, 25.)

detrahere: SPA, 109.37. In all connotations the verb occurs with a dative complement from Old Latin on, though other constructions are used with it more frequently.  
(TLL, V, 822-834; LS, 563; Bieter, 50; Prendergast, 8.)
digerere: DI, 1.3-4. Dative is cited only for Christian authors.  
(TLL, V, 1115-1120; LS, 576-577.)
dispensare: CEX, XVI.1-2. Occasional in Late secular writers; primarily used in Christian writing.  
(TLL, V, 1401-1405; LS, 591-592.)
exhibere: DCR, 9.15 and 11.5. There are several classical citations, but the most prominent usage was Silver.  
(TLL, V, 2, 1411-1433; LS, 685; Bonnet, 539.)
(TLL, V, 2, 1604-1617; LS, 692.)
exponere: DI, 3.16. In the connotation, expose, the usage with the dative is Silver.  
(TLL, V, 2, 1756-1765; LS, 697.)

immittere: SPA, 15.3; PRI, 3.54-55; DCR, 11.6. Poetic and Silver.  
(TLL, VII, 1, 468-472; LS, 893; Gimborn, 80; Goelzer-Mey, 74; Druhan, 25.)

impertire: FVH, 4.70. Classical.  
(TLL, VII, 1, 591-594; LS, 902.)

impingere: FVH, 1.7-8. The verb appears with the dative in a letter of Caelius to Cicero for its only occurrence before the Silver Age; it is probably literary only at that time.  
(TLL, VII, 1, 616-619; LS, 903.)
imponere: DCR, 7.6; FVH, 2.52 and 4.5. Classical.
(TLL, VII, 1, 650-550; LS, 906; Goelzer-Mey, 74; Bagan, 24.)

imputare: SPA, 52.3. Silver.
(TLL, VII, 1, 728-732; LS, 911; Gimborn, 80; Druhan, 25; Bagan, 24.)

inclinare:* EH, 4.77. Poetic and Silver; classical prose uses ad with the accusative.
(TLL, VII, I, 940-948; LS, 923; Prendergast, 8.)

indulgere: SPA, 28.2, 35.3, 37.5; DCR, 17.4. Classical.
(TLL, VII, 1, 1250-1256; LS, 938; Gimborn, 80.)

incutere:* DI, 10.12. The verb occurs in Cicero's translation of the Timaeus and in a letter of Caecilius to him; otherwise the instances cited in prose are largely Silver.
(TLL, VII, 1, 1101-1103; LS, 931; Druhan, 25.)

inferre:* CBP, 7.XVI.1-3; DTM, 2.15. Classical.
(LS, 944; Goelzer-Mey, 75.)

ingerere:* CBP, 3.10; DI, 3.9-10. Poetic and Silver.
(TLL, VII, I, 1548-1553; LS, 951; Bieter, 51; Gimborn, 80; Skahill, 30; Bagan, 24.)

(IS, 1234.)

offerre:* EH, 1.9-10, 4.77, 8.149; CBP, 7.XX.6; DCR, 7.5, 8.4; FVH, 1.4-6 and 13. Old Latin.
(IS, 1259)

permittere:* FVH, 9.4-5. Classical.
(IS, 1348.)

persolvere: DCR, 1.3-4. Classical.
(IS, 1355.)

porrigere: EH, 5.85; DI, 7.3; DCR, 1.6 and 17.17. Classical.
(IS, 1400.)

praebere:* SPA, 107.4. Silver.
(IS, 1410-1411; Druhan, 25; Bagan, 24.)

praecipere:* SPA, 107.2; CBS, 3.IX.10-11; CEX, LII.2; DCR, 13.19. Old Latin.
(IS, 1413.)
praeculder: DI, 1.8: Classical.
(LS, 1414.)

praedicare: CBS, 2.29; DCR, 13.9. Old Latin, though the connotation "preach" is Christian, of course.
(LS, 1416.)

praedivinare: PRI, 5.103. The verb occurs in Plautus, Varro, Pliny the Elder, and a few Christian authors.
(LS, 1417; Blaise, 645.)

praeponere:* PRI, 4.80-81. Old Latin.
(LS, 1425-1426.)

praesumere:* CEX, X.4. With the dative the verb occurs a few times in Silver Latin and becomes a bit more frequent in Late.
(LS, 1432-1433; Gimborn, 82.)

prohibere:* CEX, XXXII.6. Old Latin, but other constructions are more frequent.
(LS, 1461.)

promittere:* DI, 5.73-74; DCR, 17.9. Classical.
(LS, 1464-1465; Bagan, 24.)

proponere:* FVH, 2.21 and 40. Classical.
(LS, 1473.)

(LS, 1535.)

referre:* CEX, LXV.3 (gratias auctori Deo referre). The dative occurs from Old Latin on but usually with gratiam rather than gratias.
(LS, 1544.)

remittere:* DI, 6.26. Instances of a dative complement are found as early as Plautus in the sense used here. The dative occurs with the verb in general throughout Latin but with a variety of other constructions also.
(LS, 1562; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 498-499; Druhan, 26.)

renuntiare: SPA, 76.1-2; DI, 6.1. Old Latin.
(LS, 1565-1566.)

reservare:* FVH, 9.5. Classical.
(LS, 1577.)
restaurare:* CEX, V.5 and XIV, 3^4. The verb is first cited for Tacitus and Ulpian. In none of the sources was the dative complement cited for any but Christian authors. (LS, 1582; Blaise, 719; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 512; Bonnet, 540.)

subdere: DI, 3.18; DCR, 3.12. A very few occurrences are found before Late Latin, but in the connotation, subject to, the usage is primarily Late. (LS, 1773-1774; Gimborn, 82; Bieter, 52; Goelzer-Mey, 76; Skahill, 33; Druhan, 26; Bagan, 24.)

subducere: IDS, 8.107; DCR, 11.3-4. Classical. (LS, 1774; Goelzer-Mey, 76.)

subicere:* DP, 2.14 (a Scriptural quotation), 2.19 and 21, 5.86. Classical. (LS, 1776; Goelzer-Mey, 76; Bagan, 24.)

subiugare: DP, 4.60-61. This occurs in the Digesta in a technical legal sense; all other occurrences are in Christian authors. (LS, 1777; Blaise, 783; Souter, 393; Skahill, 33.)

subscribe:* CBP, 8.17-18; CBS, 4.1-2 and 4.7-21. In the connotation, subscribe, the dative complement is Late. (LS, 1780; Bieter, 52; Bagan, 25.)

suggerere: IDS, 8.101. In the connotation, suggest, this verb is Silver and Late. (LS, 1794-1795; Bieter, 52; Bagan, 26.)

superponere: CBP, 7.IX.3. Silver (LS, 1808-1809; Goelzer-Mey, 76.)

supplere:* IR, 10. Silver, but rare with a dative complement. (LS, 1814.)

4. Compound intransitive verbs

abrenuntiare: DCR, 15.8-10 and 23; 16.2. The verb occurs only in Christian writers. (TLL, I, 131-132; LS, 9; Blaise, 37; Bieter, 52; Prendergast, 9; Druhan, 26.)

acquiescere: EH, 8.134. With a dative complement the verb is Silver and Late; classical Latin uses in with the ablative. (TLL, I, 422-425; LS, 23; Blaise, 44; Prendergast, 8; Druhan, 26; Bagan, 25.)
adgaudere: PRI, 3.56; EH, 2.20. This verb is cited only for Christian authors.
(TLL, I, 1304-1305; LS, 70; Blaise, 50.)

(TLL, 633-637; LS, 34; Gimborn, 83; Bieter, 52; Druhan, 26.)

adludere: FVH, 2.54 and 9.4. Silver.
(TLL, I, 1697-1699; LS, 94.)

adspirare: CBP, 1.16. Poetic and Silver.
(TLL, II, 840-842; LS, 176.)

apparere:* SPA, 30.6; FVH, 9.5-6. Classical, but far more frequent in Silver and Late.
(TLL, II, 259-268; LS, 140.)

approprinquare: SPA, 42.1. Classical
(TLL, II, 314-316; LS, 144.)

astare:* SPA, 84.1; FVH, 1.16 (adstantes). Poetic and Silver.
(TLL, II, 953-956; LS, 183; Gimborn, 83; Druhan, 26.)

benefacere: SPA, 57.2 and 101.2. The word appears in Old Latin with a dative complement, but then becomes very rare in the classical period, occurring only in Sallust. It is found in Silver Latin, but its greatest frequency is during the Late period.
(TLL, II, 1875-1876; LS, 230; Krebs-Schmalz, I, 238.)

complacere; EH, 8.134-135; CBP, 6.4. The word occurs in Plautus and Terence, but its first appearance in prose is in Columella, then Apuleius and Gellius, Symmachus and the Christian authors. As a prose word, then, it is probably best classified as Late.
(TLL, III, 2077-2079; LS, 389; Gimborn, 84; Bieter, 53.)

(LS, 396; Bonnet, 541; Bagan, 25.)

condolere: SPA, 2.5. This verb appears only in Christian writing.
(LS, 409.)

congaudere: SPA, 109.37. This verb also occurs only in Christian authors, and there somewhat rarely.
(LS, 416; Goelzer-Mey, 77; Bieter, 53; Druhan, 26.)
consentire:* IDS, 3.30; CBS, 3.VI.5-6; DCR, 3.6-7 and 10. Classical, though other constructions are more common. (LS, 428-429.)

constare:* FVH, 3.3 (constare sibi.) The verb occurs in classical Latin with a dative complement, but its use with sibi is very, very frequent. (LS, 438-439.)

contingere:* CEX, XV.7; DGR, 11.7. Very rare in Old Latin, but frequent in Classical, especially prose. (LS, 449-450.)

convenire:* CBP, 5.5-6. Old Latin. (LS, 462-463.)

deservire: PRI, 1.5 and 10. Classical, but relatively infrequent in occurrence. (TLL, V, 691-693; LS, 556.)

displacere: FVH, 4.16. Old Latin. (TLL, V, 1415-1420; LS, 592-593.)

imminere: CBS, 4.5-6. Classical, but relatively infrequent; much more common in Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 458-460; LS, 892; Bagan, 25.)

impendere: CBP, 7.XVII.1-3. Rare in Old Latin, more frequent in classical prose, but usage with other constructions is more common in all periods. (TLL, 1, 544-548; LS, 898.)

incedere:* EH, 5.88-89. Classical. (TLL, VII, 1, 853-858; LS, 917.)

inessse: FVH, 3.1. Classical, but more frequent in Silver. (LS, 972; Gimborn, 86; Goelzer-Mey, 77; Prendergast, 8.)

inhaerere: FVH, 4.9. Very rare in classical Latin prose; poetic and Silver is probably the correct classification. (TLL, VII, 1, 1587-1589; LS, 953.)

inhiare: FVH, 1.2. Poetic and Silver, though there is a single occurrence in Cicero (Cat., 3.8.19). (TLL, VII, 1, 1594-1596; LS, 953; Hoppe, 29.)

innotescere:* CBP, 4.4-5. The verb occurs in the connotation, become known, only Christian authors; in the connotation, come to know, it is found in Justinian. Absolutely it occurs occasionally in Silver Latin. (TLL, VII, 1, 1711-1714; LS, 598; Bieter, 54; Blaise, 449.)
**interesse:** CEX, XXXVIII.3-4; LXIV.2; FVH, 5.15. Classical. (LS, 986; Hoppe, 29; Skahill, 30.)

**irruere:** CEX, LXXXI.7. The use with the dative is quite rare. In poetry it is cited only for Claudian; in prose for only a few Christian authors. (LS, 1003; Blaise, 476.)

**obedire:** CBS, 3.3. Classical. (LS, 1239.)

**obesse:** DI, 6.13. Old Latin. (LS, 1245.)

**obsistere:** FVH, 1.11. Classical. (LS, 1243; Bagan, 25.)

**occurrere:** IDS, 9.123. Classical. (LS, 1252-1253.)

**participare:** CEX, LIV.2-3. My source material does not indicate clearly whether this is an exclusively Christian usage or whether secular writers also used the dative complement. However, only Christian citations are given. (LS, 1308; Blaise, 596; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 246-247.)

**praecedere:** EH, 1.2. This verb with a dative complement is cited only for Plautus (Asin., 629). Perhaps in Martin the dative was attracted by the presence of praecelles as the line reads, . . . praecelles ac providae gubernationis utilitate ceteris praecedlB hominibus. Otherwise the usage is probably a vulgarism; but there is much too little evidence to render a confident judgment. (LS, 1411; Blaise, 640; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 345-346.)

**praecellere:** EH, 1-2. Cf. the remarks above on praecedere. Silver, but rare (Silius Italicus and Tacitus are each cited). (LS, 1411; Blaise, 640; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 346; Gimborn, 87.)

**praesire:** EH, 4.69-70. Classical, but rare in all periods in the connotation, excel. (LS, 1418.)

**praesidere:** EH, 1.9, 6.104; DCR, 13.14. Old Latin. (LS, 1429.)

**praestare:** PRI, 5.104; DCR, 11.13. Classical. (LS, 1430-1431.)
prodesse:* DI, 8.20; FVH, 5.7. Old Latin.
(IS, 1477; Bagan, 26.)

With a dative complement the verb is very rare. Cicero uses it seldom; all other citations are from Christian authors.
(IS, 1457-1458; Blaise, 669; Souter, 325; Gimborn, 87; Skahill, 30.)

provenire:* IDS, 8.103. Poetic and Silver.
(IS, 1480; Blaise, 680; Gimborn, 87; Skahill, 32.)

reddere:* CEX, XLIX.4; DCR, 7.14-15; FVH, 2.35-36.
Old Latin.
(IS, 1538.)

remanere:* PRI, 3.46. Rare in classical Latin, more frequent in Silver.
(IS, 1560.)

resistere:* IDS, 7.86 (a Scriptural quotation), CBP, 8.8; DI, 10.12. Classical.
(IS, 1579.)

sacrificare:* DCR, 8.11-12. Old Latin.
(IS, 1612.)

satisfacere: SPA, 61.7, 104.1; CEX, XXXVI.5. Old Latin.
(IS, 1634; Bagan, 26.)

subrepere:* IDS, 1.5, 3.36; DCR, 10.1; DTM, 4.53.
Poetic and Silver.
(IS, 1817-1818; Gimborn, 87; Skahill, 33.)

subripere:* FVH, 4.63-64. Poetic and Silver.
(IS, 1818.)

(IS, 1786.)

succedere:* EH, 8.138. Classical.
(IS, 1786-1787.)

(IS, 1789.)

(IS, 1810; Druhan, 27; Bagan, 26.)
superinsidere: SPA, 42.2. This verb may well be a creation of Martin. It occurs in only one other place, a commentary on parts of the New Testament by a Luculentius who was a contemporary of Martin. The occurrence in Luculentius is in a sentence which exactly reproduces Martin's:

Martin: Succensae ollae non appropinquant muscae, tepidae vero superinsidunt.

Luculentius: Sicut enim succensae ollae non appropinquant muscae, tepidae vero superinsedunt (sic) . . .

The Greek text has the verb ἐπιυγῇν, for which superinsidunt is a calque. Since the knowledge of Greek was so uncommon in the West, it seems likely that the wording is due to Martin, who knew Greek, not to Luculentius. (Blaise, 797; Souter, 403.)

supervenire:* SPA, 69.1. Silver. (LS, 1812.)

For convenience it is helpful to summarize by periods the above list of verbs. The first occurrence in prose is the general criterion; however, for Old Latin, any verb whose occurrence is sufficiently frequent to suggest general usage is included even if it is not cited for a prose author. All verbs are continuous from the point of first occurrence through later periods.

Old Latin: adponere, afferre, agere, auxiliari, benefacere blandiri, commendare, committere, commodare, concedere, convenire, credere, deferre, denegare, detrahere, displacere, expedire, irasci, largiri, licet, obesse, obicere, offerre, opitulari, parere, placere, praecipere, praedicare, praeponere, praesidere, prodesse, prohibere, reddere, referre, remittere, renuntiare, sacrificare, satisfacere, saudere, studere, tradere.

---

45 His work is in Migne, PL, 72, 803 ff. The word occurs in column 817D.

46 Migne, PG, 65, 349.11.
Classical Latin: accommodare, addicere, adscribere, adsumere, affingere, apparere, appropinquare, cedere, communicare, consentire, constare, contingere, declarare, depingere, deservire, exhibere, imminere, impendere, imperti, imponere, incedere, incutere, indulgere, inesse, inferre, interesse, mederi, ministrare, nassi, nocere, nuntiare, obedire, obsistere, occurrere, patere, permettere, persolvere, porriger, portare, praecidere, praedivinare, praeire, praeestare, proficere, promittere, proponere, reconciliare, remanere, reservare, resistere, subducere, subicere, subvenire, succedere, succumbere, superesse, tribuere.

Silver Latin: acquiescere, adhaerere, adludere, adnectare, adspirare, aperi, applicare, aptare, astare, copulare, dominari, exponere, facere, immittere, impingere, imputare, inclinare, ingerere, inhaerere, iniare, praebere, praecellere, praesumere, provenire, subdere, subrepere, subripere, suggerere, supplere, superponere, supervenire.

Late Latin: complacere, dispensare, intimare, subscribere.

Christian Latin: abrenuntiare, adgaudere, adnuntiare, approximare, condolere, congadere, deputare, digerere, innotescere, irruere, mentiri, misereri, participare, restaurare, subiugare.

There are three verbs found with the dative only in Martin: conscribere, praecedere, and superinsidere. The last is probably a neologism.

Of 151 verbs which take a dative complement in Martin, 41 stem from Old Latin, 57 from classical, 31 from Silver, four from Late, and 15 from Christian, while three are found only in his writing. That is, of the 151 verbs only 22 belong to the Late period. This again demonstrates very strongly the heavily traditional flavor in Martin.
The dative with *videri*\(^47\)

The verb *videri* regularly governs a dative of the person who sees or thinks. This perfectly classical construction occurs five times in Martin, twice with nouns and three times with pronouns.

**EH**, 2.25, patrono visum fuerit; 4.79, mihi ... visum est; **CBP**, 4.4, *si vestrae fraternali* *videtur*; **CBS**, 2.3-4, nobis ... visa sunt; **DP**, 1.6, *rectius sibi videri*.

**Dative of the agent**\(^48\)

The dativus auctoris with the passive periphrastic is found in Old Latin and all other periods. Martin has eight instances: **IDS**, 8.93, 8.116; **CBS**, 2.20; **DI**, 5.2-3; **FVH**, 2.52-53, 5.13, 91.1; and **DP**, 4.61. The usage with the perfect passive participle occurs as early as Plautus, especially with the form *notum*; it is more common, however, in the Silver period and very frequent in Late Latin. Martin has a single instance: **DI**, 5.7-8, *suspectum notumque sit nobis*.

Occasionally even in classical Latin *ab* and the ablative was used with the passive periphrastic for clearness in expressing the agent. In Late Latin, and even earlier in Vulgar usage, the gerundive became a simple future passive participle;\(^49\) this may explain the freer use of *ab*


\(^48\) **LH**, 417; **ET**, 63-65; Bieter, 60-61; Bonnet, 547-548; Gimbore, 104-107; Goelzer-Mey, 85-86; Skahill, 37.

\(^49\) Cf., eg., Grandgent, 49.
to replace the dative of agent. But Martin's classicism is well demonstrated by the single occurrence of this usage in his writing; the gerundive keeps its sense of obligation and the ab-ablatitive phrase adds emphasis to the idea of agency, i.e., it makes it very clear. CBF, 4.2, *ea quae a catholicis abominanda sunt et damnanda*. . .

The dative with adjectives

The dative as a complement of an adjective was used widely in Old Latin; then the classical purists greatly restricted and limited the usage. TheLate period with its arcaism and Christian Latin with its democratic tendencies again returned to the wider usage. Martin, as a man of his times, makes a moderate extension of the use of the dative with adjectives; but, as a traditionalist, he is much more reserved than many of the Late, especially the Christian, authors.

Acceptabilis: DTM, 1.12. The adjective occurs only in Christian writers.
(TLJ, I, 281; LS, 16; Blaise, 41.)

Aequus:* SPA, 86.1 (perhaps a dative of reference). Perhaps this is better classified as a dative of reference. Classical.
(TLJ, I, 993-999; LS, 56.)

Amicus: SPA, 5.4. Old Latin.
(TLJ, I, 1902-1906; LS, 105-106; Bennett, II, 178.)

---

50IH, 413-414; Bagan, 26-27; Bennett, II, 178-183; Bieter, 56-58; Druhan, 27-29; Gimborn, 90-95; Prendergast, 10-11; Skahill, 33-35.

51An asterisk indicates the adjective is also used absolutely or with other constructions.
benignus:* FVH, 4.58; DTM, 1.7. Poetic and Silver.
(TLL, II, 1901-1904; LS, 232-233; Gimbhorn, 91; Bennett, II, 179; Druhan, 28.)

cowardly: FVH, 4.59. Rare in Old Latin, common only in Silver.
(TLL, II, 2036-2040; LS, 241; Bennett, II, 179; Frendergast, 10.)

consonans: CBP, 3.XVII.4-5. Late,
(LS, 434; Bieter, 57.)

(LS, 479-480; TH, 413.)

desiderantissimus: DII, 1 and DCR, 1. Late; with the dative it appears in Christian authors, legal writers, and inscriptions.
(TLL, V, 709; LS, 557.)

devotus: IB, 17. Silver except for one occurrence in Ovid and Grattius.
(TLL, V, 883-884; LS, 567; Bagan, 26; Gimbhorn, 92; Skahill, 34; Druhan, 28.)

dissimilis: DI, 9.5. Classical, though other constructions occur more frequently.
(TLL, V, 1471-1476; LS, 595; Bieter, 57; Druhan, 28.)

descriptus: FVH, 4.59. Old Latin, though more frequent in classical and later periods.
(TLL, VI, 251-252; LS, 724; Bennett, II, 180; Druhan, 28.)
fidelis:* DCR, 14.11. Old Latin.
(TLL, VI, 1, 655-659; LS, 745; Bennett, II, 180.)
gratus:* PRI, 2.27. Old Latin.
(TLL, VII, 2, 2260-2264; LS, 827; Bennett, II, 180; Druhan, 28.)

infestus: IDS, 8.92. Old Latin, but more common in classical and later periods.
(TLL, VII, 1, 1406-1410; LS, 945, Bennett, II, 180.)
(TLL, VII, 2, 209-212; LS, 996.)
molestus:* SPA, 49.4. The adjective occurs in Old Latin, occasionally in classical, then frequently in Silver.
(TLL, VIII, 1351-1355; LS, 1157; Bennett, II, 181.)
obnoxius: CBP, 8.13 and CEX, XVI, 10-11. Old Latin; rare in classical, more frequent in Silver. In the present legal sense it is mostly Silver. (IS, 1238; Bennett, II, 181; Gimborn, 94; Bieter, 47; Prendergast, 11; Bagan, 27.)

opportunus: CBP, 1.10. Old Latin; rare in classical, more frequent in Silver. (IS, 1271; Bennett, II, 181; Gimborn, 94.)

oppositus: FVH, 4.63-64; Classical. (IS, 1271.)

optatus: CBP, 1.14-15. Classical, but rare. (IS, 1273.)

particeps:* CEX, LXXXII.4. Poetic and Silver. (IS, 1308; Gimborn, 94; Bieter, 57.)

propinquus:* DI, 4.7. Old Latin. (IS, 1459-1470; Bennett, II, 182.)

proprius:* SPA, 81.1-2; IDS, 7.91; CEX, XV.7 and LIV.3. Old Latin, but the usage with the genitive is more common. Martin uses the genitive three times, as was indicated earlier. (IS, 1472; Bennett, II, 182; Gimborn, 95; Skahill, 26; Bagan, 27.)

proximus:* CBP, 3.XV.2. Old Latin. (IS, 1470; Bennett, II, 182.)

salutaris: FVH, 2.53. Old Latin, but more frequent in classical and later periods. (IS, 1622; Bennett, II, 182.)

satis:* FVH, 4.4. Old Latin. (IS, 1633.)

similis:* SPA, 54.2-3; 94.2; IDS, 4.45; 5.61; 5.62 and 69 (a Scriptural quote); DCR, 3.5-6; 14.9; FVH, 2.28. It occurs very rarely in Old Latin, frequently in classical, very frequently in Silver and almost invariably in Late. Martin uses only the dative. (IS, 1700-1701; Bennett, II, 182; Bieter, 58; Gimborn, 68; Prendergast, 11; Skahill, 27; Druhan, 29.)

If blandus is counted as a Silver usage, the twenty-eight adjectives belong to periods as follows: fourteen to
Old Latin; four to classical, seven to Silver, two to Late; and one to Christian Latin. The only Christianism, acceptabilis, occurs in a Christian essay.

The dative with verbal substantives

The only actual occurrence of this usage in Martin is in a Scriptural quotation at SPA, 35.4, Dominus mihi adiutor est. The word adiutor with a dative is found occasionally in Old Latin and classical, but is much more frequent in Silver and Late.

Perhaps under this category should also be listed the present participle used as a noun but retaining a dative complement. There are two instances.

SPA, 1.4, oportet enim servientem Deo in istis coartari. SPA, 198.33, nec habeas . . . odium contra inimicantem tibi sine causa.

The dative of the person addressed

This is not really a separate category of the dative, but is a kind of indirect object with verbs of saying. It occurs very frequently in Martin, eg., SPA, 1.1, dicebat fratribus; EH, 5.93, ait enim illis. The following verbs occur:

- dicere: with pronouns, 39 times; with nouns, 11 times
- ait: once with a pronoun
- loqui: with pronouns, 3 times; with nouns, 2 times
- respondere: once with a pronoun

52XH, 413; Gimborn, 19; Bagan, 28.
This dative also occurs in epistolary salutations at the beginning of DI, DCR, FVH, and DTM.

The dative of possession

The dative with esse to indicate the person for whose benefit a thing exists or who possesses something is a good classical usage. This is the only type that occurs in Martin and it is found in only six instances:

EH* n2.22, vitium est . . . gregi verba potentium subsequi; DCR, 14.7, ubi iam nullus illis erit aut labor aut dolor; FVH, 4.10, Virtus tibi ex facili sit; 4.32, Non erit tibi scurrilitas; 5.22, alta illi pax est; IR, 7, Vina mihi non sunt . .

The dative of reference

This is more commonly called the Dativus Commodi vel Incommodi. It is a perfectly classical construction. About 30 instances occur in Martin. Most of these are datives of advantage with person; this is very common with the reflexive sibi which occurs eight times. Examples are:

SPA, 47.2, amat tibi ipsi vim facere; PRI, 2.34, gloriam sibi exigunt de transactis; IDS, cum semel sibi obtinuerit; DI, 8.2, maximum illi remedium est morae dilatio; FVH, 5.17, etiam non invocanti testis est.

54 After impersonal expressions this dative can be used dependent on the phrase as a kind of subject of an infinitive; cf. Allen and Greenough, op. cit., 288.

55IH, 414-415; Blaise, Manuel, 86-87; Gimborn, 95-97; Bieter, 58-59.
The dative of advantage with things if found only in the following instances:

PRI, 7.123, quia soli inanitati suae vana gloria vindicat . . .; CEX, XV.1, debent ecclesiae conservari; DI, 1.4, haec tuo studio . . . disserui.

The dative of disadvantage occurs only four times:

SPA, 23.1, si facta est monacho despectio; CBS, 3.III.5, anathema danti et accipienti; FVH, 3.5, numquam indicabis tibi contumeliam fieri; 4.36, sitque tibi tam triste laudari a turpibus quam si lauderis ob turpia.

The dative of reference may also be used with interjections. Martin has a single instance which is a dative of disadvantage basically: DCR, 11.9, vae illi homini.

The sympathetic dative

This dative replaces a possessive adjective or a genitive of possession to give a more intimate, a more intense or subjective, a warmer feeling to the expressions. It occurs in classical literature but much less often than the adjective or genitive; however, in colloquial Latin the opposite is true and the dative is preferred. In Old Latin it was restricted to pronouns, but expanded to nouns in Late. Martin has only three certain instances:

CBP, 4.8. ut quibus fortasse per iniuriam abolita ecclesiastica constituta; FVH, 4.19, res tibi exiguae est; 4.36, quies tibi non desidia erit.

— Though, of course, for a monk despectio is a thing of advantage.

IH, 415-417; Läfstedt, Syntactica, I, 224-237; Gimborn, 98-103; Bieter, 59-60; Skahill, 36-37.
Another type of this dative is what is sometimes called the dative of separation; it is used with verbs of taking away to designate the person from whom something is taken away or removed. There are four instances in Martin:

SPA, 5.4, qui tibi violenter plus tollit; CBS, 3.VII.4, nullum illis pignus violenter tolletur a clericis; DI, 3.8, iudicium suum eripi sibi . . . non sinit; 10.7-8, sapiens furenti amico omnia ultionis instrumenta occultius removebit.

The dative of comparison

This usage begins in the classical period with Sallust for whom a single example is quoted (hist., fr. 2.37) with the adjective inferior; Vergil and Ovid also use secundus in this way. In Late Latin the usage is somewhat extended, but for the most part it occurs only with irregular comparatives. Martin has three examples:

SPA, 85, Dixit senex: Humilitas . . . et timor Dei superiora sunt omnibus virtutibus; 109.27, crede te inferiorem esse omni creaturae; EH, 4.80, ad te quicumque prior es aliis.

Martin has single instances of two other classical dative usages, the final dative (DI, 1.9, et ruinae fit simul) and the double dative (DI, 10.15-16, voluptati sit inimicis).

The ablative

Many usages of the ablative involve prepositions. Where this is the case, the particular type of ablative will

58IH, 428-29; Blaise, Manuel, 89; Bonnet, 545.
be discussed here in its simple case usage and also under the appropriate preposition; comparison will for the most part be made in the section on prepositions.

The ablative of local departure

This ablative occurs in Martin with prepositions in every instance except one; such a usage was occasional in Old Latin, rare in classical though Sallust uses it fairly frequently, and then rather common in Silver Latin. It occurs with ab, de, and ex in Martin; de is most used, then ab, then ex. The use of de is strictly Late Latin; the use of ab and ex depends upon the particular verb complemented.

The sole occurrence without a preposition is at IR, 8, Quaeque Sarepteno palmite missa bibas (palmite means vineyard, a Silver connotation).

The ablative of source

Martin expresses source with ab and ex but for one instance, EE, 1, Pannoniis genitus. Genitus occurs in classical prose, but is primarily a poetic word; Martin very appropriately uses it in a poem.

---

59IH, 420-422; Bieter, 68-69; Druhan, 32-33; Gimborn, 112; Skahill, 39.

60IH, 422-423; ET, 70-71; Bagan, 31-32; Bieter, 69; Druhan, 33; Gimborn, 112-113; Goelzer-Mey, 111; Skahill, 39-40.
The ablative of separation

This ablative occurs in Martin mostly with the prepositions ab, de, and ex. The occurrences without a preposition are with the following verbs:

**carere**: DI, 9.4, consilio caret. Old Latin.

egere: IDS, 5.61, egeret consilio; 5.64, cuius se protectione credidit non egere. The genitive was preferred in Old Latin and from Livy on; however, Cicero uses the ablative almost invariably.

elabi: DI, 7.4-5, si manibus . . . clavis elapsa. Poetic and Silver; classical has a preposition.

The above are the only occurrences of these three verbs in Martin.

The ablative of separation also has an adverbial usage with certain adjectives. Only *alienus* is so used in Martin.

CEX, IX.3, alienum eum ab ecclesia esse oportet; XXX, a communione habentur alieni; XXXII.5, ab omni mala suspicione alienae sunt; XXXIX.4, alienus sit a ministerio; LXII.6, alienus habeatur a clero.

Classic usage was both with and without a preposition.

The ablative of comparison

The ablative of comparison is found as a simple

---

61 LH, 423-425; ET, 71-73; Bagan, 32-34; Bieter, 69-70; Druhan, 33-34; Gimborn, 113-115; Goelzer-Mey, 106-111; Skahill, 40-41.

62 The adjective also occurs more than 20 times as a simple modifier.

63 LH, 425-29; Bagan, 34; Bieter, 71-72; Bonnet, 556; Druhan, 34-35; Gimborn, 115-116; Goelzer-Mey, 112-113; Skahill, 41-42.
ablative five times:

IDS, 9.128-129, sanctiores eos melioresque omnibus esse; 10.138, execrabiliores his omnibus blasphemiām; EH, 7.122, humilior aliis . . . caelo . . . altior; DI, 7.8, ecquid hac insania dementius.

It also occurs simply but with a peculiar addition of quam in a Scriptural quotation at SPA, 14.2, maiorem hac caritatem nemo habet quam ut . . .

The use of quam to express comparison is more frequent in Martin than the simple ablative. The occurrences are as follows:

quam with a comparative adjective: SPA, 91 (fortior); PRI, 2.27 (gratius); EH, 1.9 (verius), 3.43 (melius); DI, 2.14, (minus), 3.10 (honestior), 5.30 (satius), 8.24 (gloriosius); FVH, 2.36 (plenius), 4.16 (maius); DP, 3.51 (melius), 8.131, (melius).

magis . . . quam: PRI, 4.91; EH, 2.19; CEX, LXX.2; DI, 7.13; FVH, 4.24. Also magis is used with a comparative twice: PRI, 2.21 (magis delectabilius) and DI, 9.17 (magis gravius).

plus . . . quam: PRI, 2.26, 2.38, 3.58; IDS, 8.93; EH, 4.78; DCR, 1.3; FVH, 4.21.

potius . . . quam: EH, 2.18; DI, 5.27; FVH, 4.24.

The Late Latin use of prepositions to express comparison, e.g., SPA, 109.28, deteriorem a quovis homine, quolibet peccatore, occurs in Martin and is discussed under the appropriate prepositions.

Martin's usage in the matter of comparison is definitely characteristic of Late Latin. Quam occurs almost five times more often than the simple ablative; while classical Latin did use quam with some frequency, this great preference is Late. Furthermore, classical Latin generally
used the simple ablative in sentences involving general negative ideas; Martin always uses *quam*, at SPA, 91; PRI, 2.27; EH, 1.9; DI, 2.14 (where Seneca also has it), and 8.24 (where Seneca's sentence is positive), and FVH, 4.16. The use of *magis* in addition to a comparative is a vulgarism which was common in Late Latin.

The ablative of accompaniment

Martin uses the construction with verbs in accordance with strict classical usage; he always has *cum* and there are no instances of verbs governing a simple ablative. In three instances the ablative with *cum* appears to modify a noun rather than a verb: SPA, 8.2, *tribulatio cum patientia* (note lines five and six, *in persona tribulationis et patientiae*); CBP, a.19, *exemplar cum suis capitis*; and 2.25, *exemplar fidei cum suis capitis*.

There is one instance of this ablative modifying an adjective, SPA, 109.36, *esto pacificus cum omnibus*. In none of the source material, including that for medieval Latin, is this usage cited. *Pacificus* in the sense "peace-making" occurs from the fourth century on, so that the usage is probably at least Late. More likely it is a Grecism; however, the extant Greek text gives no clue to this as it

---

64 IH, 429-430; ET, 74-75; Bieter, 72; Gimborn, 116; Skahill, 44-45.

65 Souter, 282.
is much shorter than Martin's version which is probably based on a different Greek text.

The ablative of accompaniment also occurs with the following verbs of contention:

- **contendere**: DI, 5.34-36.
- **habere causam**: SPA, 16.3-4; 18.2,4, and 6; 40.3.
- **habere malitiam**: SPA, 22.7.
- **pugnare**: DI, 8.8.

The ablative of external appearance or attendant circumstances66

Leumann-Hofmann classify this ablative as an ablative of accompaniment. It is very difficult to distinguish from the ablative of manner as far as meaning is concerned; however, grammarians generally limit the ablative of manner to a few fixed words that are more adverbial than ablatival in actual usage. The rule for attendant circumstances that *cum* is used with the simple ablative, but usually omitted when the noun is modified, is not a very secure one, though it is in general true for classical prose; in Old, Silver, and Late Latin, it does not hold. Martin's usage is as follows:

**Unmodified Ablative without cum**: CEX, LXXXI.8, humilitate subiaceat (perhaps manner, for note line two, in humilitate subiaceat); DI, 3.23-24, aliorum vitiorum more; and 5.28, more magnae ferae.

**Unmodified Ablative with cum**: SPA, 5.4, 13.2 19.9, 20.4, 28.4 35.5, 60.1, 109 (passim); DCR, 18.14 and 19; FVH, 2.36 and 4.5.

---

66IH, 429-430; Bagan, 35; Druhan, 35-36; Gimborn, 116-120; Skahill, 43-44.
Modified Ablative with *cum*: SPA, 9.19; CEX, 11. XV.1-2, XVI.2; DI, 8.10; FVM, 3.2.

Modified Ablative without *cum*: EH, 3.57 and 5.89; CBP, 7.XI.1 and 2; CBS, 2.27, 3.II.8; CEX, VII.5, LVII.6; DI, 3.33, 9.12; DP, 1.6.

Once again Martin's usage accords with Late Latin practice, but in a more restrained manner than most of his contemporaries. This is to be expected of an educated, traditionalist writer.

The ablative of manner

All instances are in full accord with classical usage. The words that are unmodified and without *cum* are all fixed, nearly adverbial words.

*casu*: CEX, LXXVIII.3.

*modis*: CBS, 3.I.5 (*modis omnibus*); DI, 5.20 (*his modis*).

*modo*: CBP, 5.3, uno modo; 7.III.2, uno modo; 7.XVI.2, golibus modo; 7.XVII.2, simili modo; DI, 4.9, eodem modo; 10.20, vario modo; DTM, 3.41, uno modo. The word occurs unmodified as a simple adverb ten times.

*nullomodo*: CBP, 7.XVIII.1 and 4 (two words in latter); CEX, XV.8 (two words), XVI.4, XX.1, XXVII.2, and XXXIII.2; DCR, 11.5 (two words).

*omnimodis*: CBP, 7.XIV.6; CBS, 1.26, 3.IX.2; DTM, 2.18.

*omnimodo*: CEX, V.4, XXXIII.3.

*ordine*: CBP, 7.IV.1, eodem ordine missae celebratur.

*re vera*: IDS, 4.43, ita re vera est.

67IH, 430-431; Blaise, *Manuel*, 90; Bieter, 72-73; Gimborn, 120-122.
**sponte:** CEX, VI.2, sua sponte.

**vice:** IDS, 5.73, versa vice.

**voluntate:** CEX, LXXVIII.3.

The ablative of quality

The Late Latin the genitive was preferred to express a descriptive attribute. Martin has a single instance of the ablative, as was mentioned above, and that occurs in a poem, EE. 5-6:

Teque, patrone, sequens famulus Martinus eodem Nomine, non merito, hic in Christi pace quiesco.

The ablative of Means

This ablative, like many other constructions, was extended in its usage from the classical period. Martin has nearly 200 instances of the ablative of means; most of these are classical, but some reflect Silver and Late extensions. It does not seem particularly useful to list all of the verbs with which Martin has the ablative of means since most are classical; the following is a list only of the 23 verbs which are not classical.

Those which occur very rarely in classical prose and which are not cited there with an ablative: **denotare**, EH, 3.44; and **succrescere**, IDS, 9.119.

---

68 IH, 431-433; Løfstedt, Syntactica, I, 148-162; Blaise, Manuel, 82; Bieter, 73; Druhan, 37; Gimborn, 122; Goelzer-Mey, 122-123.

69 IH, 433-439; Bagan, 37-40; Bieter, 74-75; Druhan, 38-40; Gimborn, 123-128; Goelzer-Mey, 123-128; Skahill, 45-47.
Those which occur with an ablative of means first in Silver Latin:

- circumllnere: IDS, 6.75-76.
- cruspare: IR, 5.
- incurre: IDS, 4.47.
- infestare: PRI, 1.1.
- lassare: DI, 4.16.
- praeemlinere: IDS, 5.59.
- praevenire: FVH, 4.48.
- provenire: CBS, 1.7.
- prurire: PRI, 5.98.
- subrepere: IDS, 10.132.

Those which occur with an ablative of means first in Late Latin:

- decantare: EH, 8.146.
- operarel SPA, 21.3 and 109.15 (a Scriptural quotation).
- sordidare: PRI, 1.8 (the verb appears in Sidonius, Carm., 23.147; all other citations are Christian).
- subnervare: EH, 2.16.
- sustollere: IB, 17.18. Poetic and Late prose.

Those which occur only in Christian authors:

- adimplere: EH, 5.92 and FVH, 1.20-22.
- leilunare: CEX, LVII.2.

There are also two verbs which appear only in Martin.

Praedlinare PRI, 5.103, is cited for Varro, Pliny the Younger, and the Council of Ephesus, but in none of these is there an ablative of means with the verb. The word dinitidare, EH, 3.41-42, is a ἀπελέγμενον (cf. TLL, V, 1218; Blaise, 275; Souter, 105).

As in classical Latin the deponents which take an ablative of means complement do so in Martin:

- abutor: FVH, 1.10.
- fruor: DI, 1.1-2.
- fungor: CEX, LVII.7.
- utor: CBP, 7.IX.1 and 4; 7.XIV.1; CEX, L.3; DI, 5.12-13; FVH, 5.19. (It is also used twice absolutely.)
These are the only occurrences of the verbs in Martin.

The ablative of means is used as a complement to the following five adjectives in Martin:

- **abundans**: EH, 7.127-128.
- **contentus**: CEX, XVI. 5-6; FVH, 4.4.
- **dignus**: CEX, XV.10 and XXI.3.
- **plenus**: SPA, 83.5; FVH, 2.43 (sapientiae modifies studiis), and 6.9.
- **praeditus**: IDS, 1.2; FVH, 1.2 and 4.67.

None of these adjectives is used in Martin to govern any other case, except perhaps dignus depending upon how one interprets DCR, 19.7, dignos sanctorum angelorum suorum socios (the genitive is governed by the noun, it seems to me—"worthy comrades of his holy angels" since the alternative, "comrades worthy of his holy angels," is hardly orthodox theology). Martin's usage, then, is wholly classical.

There is also one instance of what is called the cognate ablative of means, where the ablative is of the same root as the verb. This occurs at DCR, 4.5, morte moreretur. It is found chiefly in popular literature, as here, but does have literary precedents.

Means is also expressed in Martin as in other Late writers by prepositional phrases. This is discussed under the proper prepositions.

The ablative of personal agent

Martin's usage is strictly in accord with the classical; all these ablatives, except two instances, one of which

---

70IH, 435; Bieter, 75-76; Bonnet, 557-558; Gimborn, 128-129.
has been discussed above in connection with the dative of agent, have ab with the ablative and follow a passive verb or an adjective-form of the perfect passive participle. The other exception is at SPA, 25.3 loquente fratre conturbor; and perhaps this is better taken as an ablative absolute.

Typical instances of Martin's usage follow.

SPA, 15.3, quae nobis a daemonibus immittuntur; PRI, 5.94-95, priusquam ab aliis eruditus aut eloquentissimus appelletur; IDS, 5.63-64, desertus a Deo; CBP, 7.III.3, respondetur a populo; CBS, 2.28, agi videtur a nobis; CEX, LVII.3-4, quod ab apostolis traditur; DCR, 13.2, a diabolo et angelis eius malis inludi; FVH, 5.6, ut ameris a Deo.

This construction also occurred with other prepositions, especially per, in Late Latin. Martin's usage is discussed in the section on prepositions.

The ablative of specification71

This ablative was used sparingly throughout the history of the Latin language; it occurs ten times in Martin's writings. The following verbs are complemented by it.

defendere: DI, 9.5. All citations for defendere give in with the ablative as the proper construction here; moreover, the passage in Seneca from which Martin's sentence is taken72 has in omni peccato for Martin's omni peccato.


praecedere: EH, 1.2. Rare in classical Latin, more frequent in Silver.

71IH, 443-444; Baga, 40-41; Hieter, 77-78; Druhan, 37-38; Gimbhorn, 137-138.

72Seneca, De Ira, III, 27.2.
praecellere: EH, 1.1. Very rare in classical prose; primarily a poetic and Silver usage.

The ablative also occurs with a noun in a standard classical usage, DCR, 5.6, excepto uno iusto, nomine Noe. Martin also uses it with the following adjectives:

dives: EH, 7.127. Poetic and Silver.

pauper: EH, 7.125 (a Scriptural quotation), 7.126. The use with an ablative is cited only for Late and Christian authors.

severus: FVH, 4.59-60. No citations of this adjective with the ablative were noticed.

Use with prepositions is discussed under the appropriate prepositions.

The ablative of price\(^73\)

This ablative is found in Martin three times, twice with classical verbs, emere and aestimare, and once with the Silver verb, venundare.

CBS, 3.III.3, non aliquo pretio . . . venundetur; CBS, 3.IV.5, pecunia emere; DI, 3.21, aestimata pretio insignia. (It is interesting to note in the last example that Martin uses pretio where Seneca has simply magno.\(^74\))

The ablative of cause\(^75\)

In Martin of Braga this ablative has been largely replaced by prepositional phrases. The instances which do

\(^73\)IH, 439-441; Bagan, 40; Bieter, 76; Druhan, 41; Gimborn, 131-132; Skahill, 47-48.

\(^74\)Seneca, De Ira, II, 36.6.

\(^75\)IH, 442-443; Bagan, 43; Bieter, 76-77; Gimborn, 133-137.
occur are classical or Silver in their History. The following are the only times that the ablative of cause occurs in Martin’s work.

IDS, 5.57-58; nullo alio nisi hoc solo superbiae vitio, ad inferna dilapsus est; CEX, LXXXIII.1, sacras scripturas fabulando non audit; FVH, 2.34-35, otio marcat; 8.5, nec avara temeritate sordidus aut obscurus existas.

There are two instances in the epistolary salutations at the beginning of essays that appear to be the ablative of cause; in both cases the usage is Late and accords with the formal etiquette prevailing in such matters in the sixth century.

CEX, 1: Domino beatissimo atque apostolicae sedis honore suscipiendo (note that suscipiendo is a dative adjective parallel to beatissimo and means “worthy of being received”76 with honore giving the cause of worthiness).

DTM, 1: Domino beatissimo ac reverentissimo et apostolicae caritatis perfectione colendo (again colendo is a dative adjective meaning “worthy of being cherished”77 with perfectione giving the cause of worthiness).

The use of eo as an ablative of cause occurs at CBS, 3.VI.3, eo quod . . ., and DTM, 3.41, eo quod . . . It is also used adjectivally at CBS, 2.8, eo specialiter prospectu, ut . . . Both are classical.


77Ibid., 97.
The ablative of place where

Approximately 95 instances are found in Martin; only 16 of these do not have *in* with the ablative. The use with *in* is in all cases in accordance with classical usage with the understanding that classical Latin allows either the simple case or the preposition with some words like *loco* and *parte*. The 16 simple ablatives occur as follows:

Unmodified: EH, 3.45, aliud corde tenere; CBP, 2.3, Hispaniarum provinciis detecta sit; CEX, XXXV.5, importunans se palatio aures principum inquietare voluerit; DI, 9.14, spatium ... quo; FVH, 2.56, sed circumplices quo eundum sit; DTM, 5.77-78, et antiquorum patrum expositionibus, quin etiam officialium sacramentorum documentis, scribitur; IB, 19, templum ... quo.

Modified: CEX, 14, una parte conscripti sunt; DI, 1.3, brevi tibi aliquia libello digererem; 9.4, eodem loco; 9.6, eo ... loco; 10.14, serva istud animo tuo; DP, 3.53, uno loco; IB, 2, toto ... orbe; IR, 3, abaco splendente.

Although certain of these words are not used in this sense in classical Latin, the ablative itself does not depart from the classical norms. Martin reflects, that is, as elsewhere, to a limited degree the more extended later usage; but his restraint, again, typifies the traditionalist.

The ablative of time

Classical Latin generally preferred the simple ablative to express time when, and used *in* when the circumstances or situation was more prominent than the time of the

---

78 LH, 450-451; Bieter, 80-83; Gimborn, 151-154; Skahill, 47-48.

79 LH, 451-453; Blaise, Manuel, 91; Bagan, 43-44; Bieter, 79-80; Druhan, 41-43; Gimborn, 155-157; Skahill, 50-51.
action. Popular and poetic Latin at all periods tended to use *in* to express time; Late Latin, as so often, elevates this to literary usage. Martin uses *in* with the ablative to express time in about 40 instances. Two of these accord with the classical construction with multiple numerals, CBP, 7.XXI.4, *aut semel aut bis in anno*, and CEX, XVIII.2, *bis in anno*. Nearly all the other instances are non-classical; only one clearly expresses circumstances, CEX, 4, *in tantis temporibus*. There are also about 35 occurrences of the simple ablative of the classical type, e.g., SPA, 109.24, *omni hora*; CBP, 6.2, *eodem tempore*, CEX, XXII.1, *aetate legitima*; DCR, 13.15, *tertia die*.

The extent of time is expressed in classical Latin by the accusative for duration, but the ablative is allowed for time within which. Martin uses the ablative for time within which three times, at SPA, 17.2 and 4, and DP, 6.89. Late Latin also used the ablative for extent of time. Martin has this construction 14 times, at SPA, 32.2-3; EH, 3.57; CBP, 7.XX.2; CEX, XXXI.2, XXXIV.2, LXXI.4, LXXVI.2, LXXVII.6, LXXVIII.4-5, LXXIX.5, LXXXI.2 and 7-8; DCR, 13.15-16; and DP, 6.89 (a Scriptural quotation).

When Martin's usage is analyzed in detail, the not unsurprising result emerges that almost invariably the non-classical temporal usages occur only in the Christian and popular writings. In the PRI, IDS, EH, DI, FVH, and the poems, there is only one instance of a non-classical usage,
the ablative of time listed above for the EH which has a strong Christian flavor.

There is one instance of the ablative of degree of difference, in full accord with classical usage, at DI, 2.13-1r, quanto . . . tanto. There is also one instance of a Late Latin usage where the ablative of the gerund is used in the place of a present participle,®0 PRI, 3.48, quia semper ascendendo hoc illis tantum superest quod descendant, here an ablative of cause.

The ablative absolute®1

Martin does reflect his own era in this construction; yet, as in other areas of case syntax, he is restrained and, for the most part, traditional.

1. He has three absolutes in succession at CBP, 1.4-6, consedentibus simul episcopis, praesentibus quoque presbyteris, adstantibusque ministris vel universo clero; and two at SPA, 9.13, multum autem illis compellentibus, et illo non adquiescente (this is repeated in similar words at 9.25-26, if the construction there is an ablative absolute); and at CBS, 1.5-6, consedentibus his simul episcopis atque universo clero praesente. At SPA, 24.1-2, one pronoun has

®0 Cf. Allen and Greenough, op. cit., 319.

®1 LH, 445-450; Began, 41-42; Bieter, 78-79; Bonnet, 558-568; Druhan, 43-46; Gimborn, 140-150; Goelzer-Mey, 137-140. Gimborn's scheme of discussion is excellent, and I am following it as far as it applies to Martin.
four participles to modify it, Surgente te vel ambulante vel sedente vel aliud quodlibet faciente.

2. With various attributes. Martin uses the present participle as an attribute 37 times; the usage itself is classical, but the frequency is more characteristic of Late Latin. A number of these are stock phrases by Martin's time, e.g., CBP, 8.1-2, opitulante nobis Domino; CBS, 1.12, dicente Domino; CBS, 1.12, dicente Domino; 2.4, auxiliante Domino.

The perfect passive participle occurs as an attribute 62 times. This is the normal classical usage. Later constructions such as the future active participle, the deponent participle, or the gerundive, do not occur in Martin.

There is one instance of an adjective attribute, CEX, XIV.2, inscio clero. There is also one instance of a noun attribute, IB, 15; te duce. Both usages are classical.

3. The ablative absolute with an accusative object begins with Sallust and the Silver writers. The following instances occur in Martin, only with present participles, of course:

SPA, 24.1-2, te . . . aliud quodlibet faciente; IDS, 8.103-104, Deo id gubernante.

4. The ablative absolute with a dative complement occurs four times in Martin:

CBP, 1.16, adspirante sibi Domino; 8.12, opitulante nobis Domino; DCR, 1.9, opitulante tibi deo; PRI, 5.108, praesumpta sibi fortitudinis arrogantia.
5. The ablative absolute which is related to another part of the sentence is very rare in Martin; it occurs fairly frequently in many Late authors. At SPA, 9.13, the absolute modifies the subject, though the construction is softened by the subject being unexpressed, multum autem illis compellentibus, et illo non acquiescente, abierunt ad quendam senem diiundicari; this is a strictly vulgar usage. The absolute related to oblique cases does occur in classical prose. There may be one such instance in Martin if one interprets the following as an ablative absolute: SPA, 9.25-26, et omnes mirati sunt in utrisque, uno quidem non consentiente accipere aliquid, illis vero compellentibus violenter suscipere fratrem merecedem suam.

6. There is only one instance where an absolute is made coordinate to another, different construction, here a present participle, SPA, 100.1, Si habens passionem et relicta illa pro alia re . . .

7. In only two instances is an absolute limited by a conjunction, IDS, 8.106, quasi stupentibus cunctis, and CEX, LXV.2, nisi hymno dicto. Quasi so used occurs in Livy and the Silver writers. Nisi occurs in Old and classical Latin, but is more frequent in Silver and Late.

8. Martin has only a few instances where the ablative absolute introduces a dependent construction:

complementary infinitive: SPA, 9.25-26, quoted above. This usage is found in the historians, Livy, Tacitus, Curtius, and Ammianus.
relative clause: CBS, 3.1-2, Cognitis his quae ex epistola Petri apostoli recitata sunt; CEX, XXXIII.6, non consentiente episcopo suo a quo recessit; DCR, 19.8, prastante ipso qui vivit et regnat in saecula saeculorum. This usage is found in Livy and the Silver writers.

One minor bit of information that may be of interest is the position of the noun and its attribute. Martin overwhelmingly prefers to put the attribute first:

- present participle: 32 of 37 have participle first.
- perfect participle: 51 of 62 have participle first.
- adjective: the adjective is first.
- noun: the ablative noun is first, the attribute noun second.

Thus 84 out 101 of the absolutes have the attribute first.

Prepositions

-ab

This preposition is used to express separation in Martin's writings some sixty times. The extent to which classical usage is followed can best be judged by examining the verbs with which the ablative of separation is used.

1. Simple transitive verbs

-amputare: SPA, 30.5, a bracketed passage, and CEX, XXI.6. Rare in Silver; frequent in Christian authors. (TLL, I, 2020 ff.)

-custodire: DCR, 19.6-7. It occurs with ab as early as Nepos and Ovid, but is otherwise found in Silver and Late authors. (LS, 505; Brown, 80, who fails to note the classical instances.)

---

mundare: SPA, 110.11, a bracketed passage. Cited only for Christian authors. (LS, 1175; Blaise, 544.)

privare: CBS, 3.X.9 and CEX, XIV.5. Normal classical usage is with the simple ablative. Prendergast states that the use with ab is classical; Woodcock also lists it as a verb that may or may not take ab. Ernout and Thomas, on the other hand, classify the verb as taking a simple ablative. The only citations with ab are for Christian authors, and the expression appears to be a Christianism though the evidence is thin. (LS, 1447; Blaise, 664; Prendergast, 35.)

solvere: IB, 10. Classical, but more frequent in Silver. The classical usage is more common in poetry, as here. (LS, 1725 ff.)

2. Compound transitive verbs

abscidere: SPA, 26.2 and 68.1. Rare in Silver and Late; very common in Christian writers. (TLL, I, 147 ff.; LS, 10; Blaise, 37; Prendergast, 36.)

abstine: CEX, LXXIX.2; DI, 5.34; DCR, 18.24-25; FVH, 4.13 (two of these are in the passive and could be construed as intransitive). Classical. (TLL, I, 193 ff.; LS, 12.)


avertere: CEX, LXXXIII.2. Old Latin. (TLL, II, 1319 ff.; LS, 214.)

deponere: CBP, 7.XIX.2 and CEX, LXIII.4. It is cited for Firmicus, Math., the Querolus, and a few Christian authors. (TLL, V, 576 ff.; LS, 550; Skahill, 98.)

dividere: DCR, 9.4. Classical. (TLL, V, 1593 ff; LS, 602.)

excidere: IDS, 10.139-140. The construction occurs only in poetry before Christian writers; even in Christian prose other expression are preferred. (TLL, V, 2, 1240 ff.; LS, 676 ff.; Blaise, 324 ff.; Skahill, 109; Bagan, 92; Brown, 82.)

---


84 ET, 72.


expellere: CEX, XXXVII.9. The construction is cited for Cicero and Livy, but otherwise it is infrequent before the Late period. (TLL, V, 2, 1629 ff.; LS, 692 ff.; Brown, 79; Druhan, 98.)

mortificare: SPA, 110.7, a bracketed passage. The verb itself is a Christian creation; its use with ab is cited only for Cassian. (LS, 1167; Blaise, 541.)


procicere: CEX, XXII.9. Poetic and Christian prose. (LS, 1565; Blaise, 671.)


repellere: SPA, 8.8-9. Classical. (LS, 1567.)

requirere: SPA, 45.7; CBS, 3.V.2-3, 3.VII.7-8, and 3.VIII.3. Classical. (LS, 1574 ff.)

respuere: CEX, XXXVII.6. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1582; Brown, 79.)


segregare: CEX, LXXXIV.3. Old Latin. (LS, 1662; Bagan, 92.)

separare: DCR; 14.5. Classical. (LS, 1673; Bagan, 93.)

subducere: EH; 4.59. Poetic; it is not cited for any prose author. (LS, 1774.)

3. Simple intransitive verbs

cadere: DI, 8.25. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, III, 16 ff.; LS, 258 ff.)

cessare: CEX, XXII.8, and DCR, 11.12. Silver. (TLL, III, 957 ff.; LS, 322 ff.; Druhan, 97; Bagan, 91.)
fugere: SPA, 27.3, and 40.5. Plautus and Cicero use the construction, but it is rare before the Late period. (TLL, VI, 1, 1475 ff.; LS, 788.)

vacare: CEX, XXXIX.4. Classical, but infrequent. (LS, 1950; Brown, 82; Druhan, 99; Bagan, 93.)

4. Compound intransitive verbs

abesset: CEX, LXIV.1. Classical. (TLL, I, 205 ff.; LS, 12 ff.)

absentare: CEX, LXIV.tit. The verb itself is Late; with ab it is noticed only for Christian authors. (TLL, I, 170; LS, 10.)

descendere: EH, 8.143. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, V, 641 ff.; LS, 554 ff.; Brown, 81.)


differre: CEX, LXXIX.2. Old Latin. (TLL, V, 1069 ff.; LS, 574 ff.)

discedere: SPA, 27.2. Classical. (TLL, V, 1275 ff.; LS, 585.)

recedere: SPA, 21.7 and 109.23; CEX, XXXIII.2 and 6; XLVII.2; DCR, 13.22-23. Cited once for Cato, otherwise classical. (LS, 1529 ff.)

resurgere: DCR, 13.15, 15.16, 18.27 and 31-32. The verb is poetic and Silver, but the use with ab is cited only for Christian authors. (LS, 1585; Blaise, 720; Brown, 82; Druhan, 98; Bagan, 92.)

5. Verbs signifying beginning

incipere: FWH, 5.11. Classical, but more frequent in Silver Latin. (TLL, VII, 1, 912 ff.; LS, 921.)

6. Verbs of freeing from

liberare: SPA, 33.2-3, and DP, 2.15, a Scriptural quotation. Classical. (LS, 1058.)

These verbs break down into periods as follows: seven in the Old Latin period, eighteen in the classical, six in
the Silver, eight in Christian writers, and one not cited before Martin. The Christianisms are somewhat more numerous than in previous syntactical points; but they appear in the purely Christian writings only, except for excidere and this is found in the IDS which has a strong Christian flavor.

The use of ab with adverbs to indicate separation first occurs in Vitruvius. The phrase a longe, which is found in Martin at SPA, 65.7 and EH, 4.82, is used for the first time in the Itala where it is modeled on the Greek ἀνὸς μανδήθεν. Leumann-Hofmann therefore classify it as a Grecism, but consider the general phenomenon a Vulgarism. For a longe the only non-Christian source cited is Hyginus, Fab., 257.85

There is one instance in Martin where ab follows an adverb to indicate a kind of separation, at CEX, LIII.1, non liceat presbytero prius ab episcopo in baptisterium introire. The peculiar combination prius ab is unattested in the source material. This canon is taken from the fifty-third canon of the Council of Laodicea which reads simply the preposition πρὸς;86 this could be translated ante, as it appears in the title of the canon. Hence the construction does not seem to be a Grecism. It is probably best to consider it a Vulgarism, by analogy perhaps to such an expression


86Cf. Mansi, 2, 574.
as ab ante. But lack of evidence makes judgment on this point hazardous.

There are four instances where ab is joined with another preposition to indicate the point of departure and the point of destination:

SPA, 87.1, a minore actione usque ad maiorem quam homo agit; CEX, VI.1, episcopum a propria parochia non liceat transire in aliam; DCR, 5.7, a primo ergo homine Adam usque ad diluvium; and FVH, a corpore ad spiritum quantum potes abducere.

All four are in accord with classical usage.

The preposition ab is also used to indicate source or origin. The usage appears only adverbially in Martin and can be best analyzed from the verbs with which it is used.

accipere: SPA, 9.12; CEX, LVII.1, CEX, LXX.tit. and 1. Classical. (TLL, I, 304 ff.; LS, 17; Bagan, 94.)
aestuare: DI, 2.2, This particular verb is not cited with ab to indicate source; however, Seneca, in the passage from the De Ira (I, 1.4) from which this sentence is drawn, has ab with the compound exaestuare. (TLL, I, 1112 ff.; LS, 62.)
consurgere: IDS, 2.18. Vergil is first cited for this construction which is very rare. (LS, 444.)
dimittere: SPA, 7.2. Classical. (TLL, V, 1207 ff.; LS, 581 ff.)
dirigere: CBP, 5.22 and 7.V.4. A very rare usage cited for only a few Christian authors. (TLL, V, 1232 ff.)
elicere: DI, 1.2. The usual preposition is ex, but ab does occasionally occur in Cicero and later writers. (TLL, V, 2, 365 ff.; LS, 638; Krebs-Schmalz, I, 501.)
esse: PRI, 3.65. Old Latin. (LS, 1798; Brown, 87.)
expetere: DCR, 7.4 and 12.11. Classical. (TLL, V, 2, 1691 ff.; LS, 694.)


pati: SPA, 15.2. Not cited in the source material.

postulare: DTM, 2.22. Old Latin. (LS, 1407; Bagan, 94.)


supervenire: SPA, 8.10. Silver, but infrequent. (LS, 1812.)

Martin's usage here is typical of the Late Latin period. Of the fourteen verbs used, four cannot be traced before the Late period, though pati is such a common verb that the absence of citation may be accidental. Perhaps the most striking feature about Martin's usage here is his choice of verbs with which the construction has occurred with such rarity.

The ablative of agent is expressed by ab. This construction occurs about ninety times in Martin, but is regularly classical. It has already been discussed above in the section on the ablative case.

The means is usually expressed by the simple ablative, and Martin's usage with the ablative case has already been cited. The use of ab to indicate means occurs rarely in Old and Silver Latin and somewhat more frequently in Late. Martin has only two instances, one in a doubtful passage: SPA, 26.4, ante armetur quam a peccatis inquinetur, a
bracketed section; and PRI, 1.12, cum singulos homines constet ab his singulis impugnari.

There is a single instance in Martin of ab used to express comparison: SPA, 109.28, deteriorem a quovis homine. This construction is found only in Christian authors.

Martin has four instances of the temporal ab, all classical:

SPA, 15.4, a bracketed passage, ab initio; CBP, 3.XVI. 3, ab hora tertia; DCR, 1.5, ab initio mundi, and 12.15, ab initio.

Absque

This preposition occurs only in Old Latin and archaistic Late Latin. Apparently it belonged to the Vulgar language and was elevated to literary usage by the archaists, especially Pronto. It is used frequently in Late Latin; Martin, however, has it only twice, in consecutive canons translated from the Greek:

CEX, III.1, non debet ordinari episcopus absque concilio et praesentia metropolitani episcopi; and IV.5, nihil sibi praesumptive adsumat absque concilio ceterorum.

In both instances absque means sine, its ordinary connotation.

87 TLL, I, 186 ff.; LS, 11; LH, 531; Bagan, 114 ff.; Bieter, 150 ff.; Bonnet, 602; Brown, 130 ff.; Goelzer-Mey, 204 ff.
The local meaning of *ad* to indicate motion, direction, or action, is the most common in Martin. It occurs about ninety-five times with the following verbs:

- *abire*: SPA, 9.13. Old Latin, but in with the accusative is more common. (TLL, 65 ff.; LS, 6.)
- *accedere*: CEX, XXXI. 4; DCR, 15. 2; FVH, 1a.2 and 4.10. Old Latin. (TLL, I, 253 ff.; LS, 15.)
- *admittere*: CEX, XXI.7, XXIII. tit., XXVI.1, XXX.4, XXXI.3 and 7. Old Latin. (LS, 40 ff.)
- *attingere*: PRI, 2.44. The simple accusative is the normal construction with this verb. It occurs with *ad* once in Plautus, once in Mela, and rarely in Late Latin, according to Krebs. All citations for the Late period are from Christian authors. (TLL, II, 1143-1146; LS, 196; Blaise, 61; Bonnet, 586; Krebs-Schmalz, I, 216.)
- *concurrere*: PRI, 3.49. Classical. (LS, 405.)
- *conferre*: IDS, 9.123. The expression *conferre se ad* . . . is classical. (LS, 411 ff.)
- *convenire*: CEX, LXIII. tit. and 4, LXXII.3; DP, 3.50. The usual construction is in with the accusative; however, in the connotation "assemble" there are classical precedents for *ad*. (LS, 462.)
- *convertere*: EH, 3.51. The sense here is the classical "turn to" and not the Christian "convert." The usage is classical. (LS, 464; Freyergast, 28; Druhan, 78.)

---

**convocare**: CEX, XIX.1. Classical. (LS, 466.)

**currere**: CBS, 3.I.1. Old Latin. (LS, 503.)

**deducere**: SPA, 3.6; CBP, 7.XVI.1. Old Latin. (TLL, V, 270 ff.; LS, 526 ff.)

**deferre**: CBS, 2.7 and CEX, LXIX.1. Old Latin. (TLL, V, 313 ff.; LS, 529.)

**descendere**: DCR, 15.16. This verb usually governs in with the accusative; the construction with ad is found, however, in classical Latin, though rarely; it is more frequent in Silver. (TLL, V, 641 ff.; LS, 554 ff.; Brown, 3; Bieter, 85.)

**dilabi**: IDS, 5.58. Silver. (TLL, V, 1157 ff.; LS, 579.)

**dirigere**: DCP, 2.13, 5.21, and 7.1; DCR, 1.5 (though one may prefer to take the ad with scripta). There are both classical and poetic precedents; but in poetry, Silver, and Late Latin, in with the accusative was the preferred construction. (TLL, V, 1232 ff.; LS, 584; Bagan, 70; Bieter, 85; Brown, 2.)

**ducere**: SPA, 1.5, and CBS, 2.29. Old Latin. (TLL, V, 2135 ff.; LS, 615 ff.)

**festinare**: SPA, 41.2. Rare in classical Latin, but frequent in Silver. (TLL, VI, 1, 615 ff.; LS, 742.)

**inclinare**: SPA, 29.3 and 5. Classical, but most frequent in poetry and Silver Latin. (TLL, VII, 1, 940 ff.; LS, 923.)

**intromittere**: CEX, XXXII.2. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VII, 2, 80 ff.; LS 990.)

**perducere**: CEX, XVIII.5 and DI, 5.18. Classical. (LS, 1337; Bonnet, 585.)

**pergere**: PRI, 5.107. Classical. (LS, 1342 ff.)

**pertinere**: EH, 4.63; CBP, 1.22, 4.6 (8.2-3); CBS, 1.11, 15, and 18; CEX, 13 and 15, II.5, VII.4, XV.5, 9, and 14, and XIX.2; DCR, 18.16. Classical. (LS, 1358 ff.)

**pervenire**: SPA, 22.4; IDS, 8.94; CEX, XXXV.6. Old Latin. (LS, 1360 ff.)
portare: CEX, LXIX.tit. Old Latin. (IS, 1402.)
prolabi: FVH, 2.13. Classical. (IS, 1462.)
promovere: CEX, XXI.3 and 8; XXII.2. Silver.
(IS, 1465; Blaise, 692 ff.; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 399ff.)
provehere: FVH, 5.11. Silver. (IS, 1479 ff.;
Krebs-Schmalz, II, 417; Bieter, 86.)
recurrere: CBS, 2.23. Old Latin. (IS, 1537.)
redire: CEX, XXXIV.4; DCR, 1616; DP, 8.118. Old
Latin. (IS, 1539 ff.)
redudere: DCR, 13.4. Old Latin. (IS, 1542.)
revertere: CBS, 4.3; CEX, XXXIII.3, XXXV.2; DCR,
(IS, 1591.)
revolvere: DCR, 17.16. Classical. (IS, 1591 ff.)
transire: PRI, 5.99, and CEX, V.tit. and 2. The
construction is frequent in Old Latin, but not so much in
classical which prefers in with the accusative. (IS, 1889.)
vadere: CEX, XXXIV.2. The construction is rare,
but it does occur in Cicero and Ovid. (IS, 1951.)
venire: SPA, 6.1, 18.5, 19.6 (with usque), 28.1,
44.1, 45.1, 50.1, 52.2 and 5, 57.3, 61.8; CBP, 7.XX.1 and
3; CEX, XIX.tit., XXI.4, XXVI.4, XXXVIII.2; DI, 5.24. Old
Latin, though classical Latin had a strong inclination to
use in with the accusative. (IS, 1969).

Martin's usage is overwhelmingly traditional as the follow­
ing summary of the foregoing verbs indicates: sixteen in Old
Latin, seventeen in classical; five in Silver, one in
Christian. The one Christianism, ambulare ad, occurs in
the DCR, a Christian work. The verb attingere ad is what
Schrijven would classify as a partial indirect Christianism;
but since it occurs in Plautus and Mela, before Christianity, it cannot properly be considered a Christianism. I have classified it as Silver for prose usage; it is probably a vulgarism, and its rarity suggests that it had not been elevated to literary acceptability.

There are two instances in which ad complements a noun, CEX, LVII.6, sed recto vultu ad Dominum orationum fungamur officio, and FVH, 4.41, nec hunc promerendi ad te aditum aliis pandas. The use of ad with aditus is classical; it occurs in Varro and very frequently in Cicero in the phrase aditus ad causam and with the personal pronoun as in the second instance here. Oratio with ad is a Christian usage; it is cited very rarely.

There are several verbs which normally govern a dative, but which show ad with the accusative in Martin's writings:

- conscribere: CBP, 2.17. This verb has already been discussed under dative verbs; the usage with the dative is peculiar to Martin. Hence the replacement of the dative by ad must also be considered peculiar to Martin, though this is stretching the point; ad with the accusative after the verb is a normal construction.

- destinare: CEX, LI. 3; DCR, 16.16.

- scribere: DCR, 1.1. This occurs in Cicero's Letters.

- vacare: SPA, 45.6. This occurs in Seneca.

Martin also replaces the dative of the person addressed
after certain verbs of saying with *ad* and the accusative on occasion:

*dictare:* PRI, 5.99. (The verb occurs absolutely at FVH, 5.5.)

*dicere:* SPA, 48.2, and 61.5.

*loqui:* SPA, 25.7, 110.2, a bracketed passage, and EH, 4.79-80, where *ad* may be used to avoid the confusion with *mihi* dependent on *visum est* and the second *ad* follows to maintain the parallelism.

In the section on the dative of the person addressed it was indicated that *dicere* has the dative fifty times and *loqui* five times; hence Martin’s usage is actually strongly regular.

Martin also has *ad* in the local sense to indicate simple nearness or proximity, with the connotation "at." The construction is classical at CEX, LXXXI.2, DCR, 13.25, 15.4 and 17, and 16.4. While the construction itself is classical, the particular uses here belong more to the Vulgar language which is the likely source of the construction anyway; four of the five occur in the popular sermon which pretends commonness; and the fifth is in a Christian phrase, *subiaceat ad ecclesiam*, which could well have a Vulgar origin translated into technical terminology. The use with *esse* at SPA, 9.1, is Vulgar and Late. Martin’s usage, then, is Late and Christian.

The connotation "against" which *ad* can have with verbs of contending occurs throughout the history of Latin, but infrequently in all periods. Martin has only one
instance of this usage, SPA, 19.1-2, litigaverunt fratres ad alterutrum nimis.

The temporal meaning of *ad* in the expression *usque ad* is classical, but classical authors, and even most Silver authors, restrict it to a few standard phrases. Late and Christian authors extended this considerably. Martin uses this construction eight times in Christian extensions:

- CEX, XX.4, usque ad hanc aetatem legitiman conservari; LVII.5, usque ad Quadragesimam; LXXIX.2, usque ad mortem; LXXXII.tit, usque ad finem vitae; DP, 2.34, usque ad consummationem mundi; 7.112, usque ad vicesimam primam lunam; 8.125, usque ad vicesimam primam partem; 8.129, usque ad vicesimam primam.

It should be noted that all eleven of these extensions occur in two Christian works.

*Ad* in a final construction was frequent in classical Latin; and by the Late period, as often happened, it was extended so greatly that it could be used with almost any verb. Martin has the following:

- **adsciscere**: FWH, 10.1. Classical. (TLL, II, 763 ff.; LS, 171 ff.)
- **congaudere**: SPA, 109.39. The verb occurs only in Christian authors. (LS, 416; Blaise, 199.)
- **consurgere**: IDS, 4.45. Silver. (LS, 444; Bieter, 87.)
- **dare**: CEX, LXII.2, a Scriptural quotation, and DP, 9.17. Citations are rare, but the construction does occur as early as Terence. (TLL, V, 557 ff.; LS, 604 ff.; Bieter, 87.)
- **eligere**: CEX, XXXIX.1. Classical. (TLL, V, 2, 375 ff.; LS, 638; Brown, 19.)
incantare: DCR, 16.12. A late verb, but the usage with *ad* is not attested in the source material. (TLL, VII, 1, 846 ff.; LS, 917.)

irritare: DCR, 5.4. Silver. (LS, 1002.)

irruere: CEX, VII.3. Not cited in the source material.

offerre: CBS, 3.VII.2 and 3.IX.12. Classical. (LS, 1279; Brown, 20.)

proficere: SPA, 20.1; CBS, 3.15; DP, 2.24. Classical, but more common in Silver. (LS, 1457 ff.; Brown, 20; Bieter, 89.)

roborare: CBS, 1.21. The construction is attested only for Christian authors. (LS, 1597; Blaise, 725.)

suscipere: CEX, XLIX.tit. and 2. This usage is found only in Christian writers. (LS, 1819; Blaise, 802; Bieter, 89.)


Martin also uses this *ad* with the noun *via* at SPA, 33.5, which is a classical construction, and with the following adjectives:

humilis: SPA, 62.2. Not cited in the source material.

inhabilis: DI, 1.8. Silver; classical Latin uses the dative. (TLL, VII, 1, 1582 ff.; LS, 952 ff.)

pronus: FVH, 4.64. Classical. (LS, 1467.)

tardus: FVH, 4.64. Classical, though all the citations for the classical period have a gerund with *ad*. (LS, 1343; Brown, 24.)

Martin's usage derives from different periods as follows: one from Old Latin, seven from classical, three from Silver, three from Christian writings, and three which the source material does not cite before Martin. Once again Martin's
usage is predominantly traditional, and the three Christian instances all occur in Christian writings.

Ad and a gerund or gerundive to express purpose is a common Latin construction in all periods of the Latin language. It occurs in Martin six times; CBP, 7.XIII.1; CBS, 3.V.1; CEX, LI.2; DCR, 18.10; FVH, 4.63; and DP, 2.33.

Ad expressing a general relationship occurs in all periods of Latin. Martin has only three verbs with which he employs this connotation:

- **augmentare**: EH, 4.65. This occurs in Firmicus, Math., otherwise only in Christian writers. (TLL, II, 1360; LS, 204; Blaise, 105.)

- **cor habere**: SPA, 75.1 and 105.2. Not cited in the source material.

- **respicere**: SPA, 99.1-2; EH, 4.71; DI, 9.18. Classical. (LS, 1580 ff.)

Ad with the connotation *secundum* appears in classical Latin. The construction is somewhat extended in Late Latin. Martin has the following examples:

**IDS**, 8.106, praerepta gloria Dei, ad eius se similitudinem proferunt admirandos; FVH, 4.12-13, atque ita quasi ad exemplar divinum compositus; DP, 1.5, ad lunae computationem diversis generibus Pascha celebremus (here ad avoids an awkward repetition of secundum); 3.43, necdum mensis ad lunae cursum significantia nominum computatur.

**Adversus**

This preposition occurs only once in Martin at DI, 6.10, aliquos etiam pro nobis facere; alios adversus nos.

---

89 TLL, I, 851, ff.; LS, 50; LH, 518 ff.; Bagan, 80; Bieter, 121 ff.; Brown, 54 ff.; Druhan, 89; Skahill, 104 ff.
sed coactos ... The meaning here is the normal classical "against." It is interesting to note that Seneca reads without adversus: alios pro nobis facere, alios coactos facere. Martin completely abandons the parallelism, changes the structure to make the thought more explicit, yet retains the Senecan idea and the Senecan vocabulary. He does not simply copy out Seneca; such changes reflect his modernization of the text and justify the assertion that the language is his, not just Seneca's mechanically repeated. Late writers generally preferred adversus to contra; this is not true of Martin, however.

Ante

Martin has nine instances of ante in its local meaning. One of these is purely local in the classical sense, CEX, LIII.tit., quia non licet presbytero ante episcopum in baptisterio introire. Six have the connotation coram which is a Christian extension of meaning which came into Latin through the Scripture translations from Hebrew and Hellenistic Greek. These occur at SPA, 61.4, 70.1; IDS, 1.50, a Scriptural quotation; EH, 3.45 and 5.88; and DCR, 13.7. One instance is unclear and could be interpreted in either way, SPA, 22.6 dicens ei quod oportet adstare ante Deum. An

---

90 Seneca, De Ira, II, 28.5.
apparently local usage, but somewhat unusual, is the phrase at DCR, 14.3, omnes ante iudicium Christi venturi sunt.

Ante in its temporal significance occurs sixteen times, at CBS, 3.I.tit. and 6; CEX, VIII.1, XXV.1, XLIX.tit. and 1 (twice), LI.3, LXV. tit. and 1; DTM, 2.22; DP, 1.9, 7.106 and 114; 8.129, and 9.133. All instances accord with classical usage.

Apud

There are nineteen occurrences of this preposition; all the usages, except one, are classical or Silver. It is found at: SPA, 54.4, a Scriptural quotation, 56.4, 89.1; PRI, 5.101; IDS, 3.31; CBP, 5.15, and 21, 7.5, 7.XXI.3; CEX, 10 and XVII.9; DI, 6.7, 7.22, and 10.16; FVH, 2.7; DTM, 3.37 and 5.83. At DTM, 3.39, appears the phrase apud Acta S. Silvestri; this is a Late extension since classical Latin used in with the ablative to indicate the work and apud for the author.

Causa

This is an ablative of cause which came to have a prepositional force; it takes the genitive case, the genitive being properly a type of the genitive of definition. The

---


93 TLL, II, 681 ff.; LS, 304; LH, 443; Bagan, 21; Bieter, 44; Skahill, 28.
usage is classical. Martin has one instance: CEX, XLVII.1, causa religionis.

**Circa**

This preposition is most frequent in the Silver period. A single occurrence is found in Martin at CBP, 7.XVIII.2, sed si necesse est deforis circa murum basilicae usque adeo non abhorret.

**Contra**

This preposition occurs thirteen times in Martin who reveals his traditional inclination by preferring contra to adversus, as was just indicated, when most Late authors leaned toward adversus. Ten of the instances are fully classical: SPA, 41.1, 43.2, 86.1-2 (twice), 98.3, 109.33; CBP, 2.16 and 3.12; CEX, XII.3 and XXII.8; and DI, 5.1. At CEX, III.10, appears the clause, si . . . aliquis contra suam malitiam in aliquo contradixerit; this repetition of contra is Late. At CEX, V.5, contra occurs with the adjective importunus; this usage is not noticed in the source material.

---


95LS, 454 ff.; LH, 506; Bagan 79 ff.; Bieter, 106 ff.; Brown, 58; Druhan, 88 ff.; Skahill, 98 ff.
It appears twice in Martin, at CBP, 5.1 coram concilio, and 6.5, coram his omnibus. The usage is classical. Late Latin authors used the preposition very frequently; Martin's sparing use also demonstrates his traditionality.

Martin uses *cum* to express accompaniment, community, or connection in the classical manner, except that it is extended to a number of verbs that are not attested in classical writing. He uses it with the following verbs:

- **accipere**: CBS, 3.8. Cited only for Gregory of Tours by Bonnet who accepts it as a regular construction. (Bonnet, 606 ff.)

- **cadere**: DCR, 14.10. Cited only for Christian authors. (TLL, III, 16 ff.; LS, 259 ff.; Blaise, 121.)

- **cohabitare**: SPA, 107.1 and CBP, 7.1.3. The word itself occurs only in Christian authors; the construction is a natural extension from *habitare*. (TLL, III, 1535 ff.; LS, 363; Blaise, 165; Bieter, 152.)

- **comedere**: DP, 4.58. Cited only for Christian authors. (TLL, III, 1763 ff.; LS, 373; Blaise, 171.)

- **communicare**: CBP, 8.11. Classical. (TLL, III, 1954 ff.; LS, 335 ff.)

- **concurrere**: DP, 7.109. The construction is cited for Nepos, Livy, and later authors. (LS, 405.)

- **considerare**: FVH, 4.2. Old Latin. (LS, 431.)

---

96 LS, 469; LH, 534 ff.; Bieter, 159 ff.; Brown, 131; Druhan, 108.

constituere: SPA, 105.1. Classical. (LS, 437 ff.)
contendere: DI, 5.34. Classical. (LS, 446 ff.)
convenire: CBS, 1.2. Old Latin. (LS, 452 ff.; Brown, 126.)
esse: SPA, 8.8, 11.2, 54.5; EH, 2.34; CBP, 7.III. tit., 2, and 3; CEX, VII.2, SVI.3 and 11; DCR, 14.6. Classical. (LS, 1797.)
facere: DCR, 15.3 and 22, 16.17, 17.6. Cited only for Christian authors. (TLL, VI, 1, 123; LS, 716 ff.; Brown, 126.)
habere actionem, causam, malitiam: SPA, 16.3, 18.2, 4, and 6, 22.7, and 40.3. With causam the construction appears in Old Latin; the other words are easy extensions. (LS, 304.)
habitare: SPA, 6.2, 6, and 10, 8.8, 10.1. Old Latin. (TLL, VI, 2, 2472 ff.; LS, 836.)
inchoare: DP, 5.85, Cited only for Christian authors. (TLL, VII, 1, 966 ff.; LS, 824.)
intaminare: CEX, XVI.8. Only this instance is cited, and non cum is made the equivalent of sine. (Blaise, 459.)
levare: DCR, 13.26. Cited only for Christian authors. (LS, 1055; Blaise, 493.)
loqui: DCR, 7.4. Classical. (LS, 1078.)
mensurare: SPA, 39.7, 53.3, and 109.27. The word itself is late, but it is not cited for this construction. (TLL, VIII, 770 ff.; LS, 1133; Blaise, 526.)
meretricari: DCR, 7.19-20. The word itself dates from the fourth century A.D., is cited only for Christian authors, but not with this construction. (LS, 1136; TLL, VIII, 826 ff.; Blaise, 527; Souter, 250.)
orare: CEX, LXX. tit and 3. Old Latin, but the usage is probably Vulgar as it does not appear in any author of the classical or Silver period except for one place in Caesar where it is part of a series of verbs; cum eo de salute agit, orat, atque obsecrat (B.C., 1.22). (LS, 1280.)


In addition there are a large number of verbs that have this cum in Martin which are not cited in the source material: coquere (CEX, LVIII.3), damnare (DCR, 14.16), deicere (DCR, 3.6), formare (DI, 8.15), lactare (DCR, 3.13), intrare (DCR, 14.5), introire (CEX, LIII.2), mittere (DCR, 14.18), permanere (CEX, XXVIII.4), pertrahere (DCR, 12.14), proicere (DCR, 3.10), reservare (DCR, 5.6 and 6.2), sumere convivium (CEX, XXIX.2).

No conclusions can be drawn from this information because the construction is a very common one that is not necessarily closely related to the basic significance of the verb; consequently the lack of citation may well be simply accidental except for those verbs which require it because of their meaning. Those verbs cited, too, may well have occurred earlier or elsewhere. One might note, however, that of the thirty-eight words above, only three occur in non-Christian writing, two in the DI and one in the FVH. In general, more popular or Vulgar style allows greater use of prepositions than the literary. This construction at least suggests that Martin was aware of the stylistic distinction.
**Cum** circumstantial or relational occurs in all periods of Latin, but was somewhat extended and more frequent in the Late period. The usage is found in Martin at: SPA, 3.1, 5.4, 9.19, 13.2, 19.9, 20.4, 28.4-5 (twice), 35.5, 60.1, 92.1, 109 (passim); CEX, 11, VIII.3, XV.1, XVI.2 and 8, LXXIV.tit. and 2, LXXXII.6; DCR, 11.1, 18.14 and 29, 19.5; FVH, 2.36, 3.2, 4.4, and 30; DP, 2.16, a Scriptural quotation. Once again it is noteworthy that all of these instances except the four in the FVH are in Christian works, and most of them in the popular SPA and DCR.

There are four instances of *cum* instrumental, CEX, XV.3, XVII.6, XL.1, and XLVI.tit. This usage is rare in Old Latin, disappears during the classical period, is used very rarely in Silver writers, and only develops in the Late period. All of Martin's uses are in the CEX, a translation from the Greek, and may have well been under Greek influence.

Martin has a single clear occurrence of *cum* in the significance of *apud*, a usage which is rare in Old and Silver Latin and which becomes frequent only in the Late period. It occurs at CBP, 2.17, regulam fidei contra Priscillianam haeresem cum aliquibus capitulis conscribentes ad Balconium.

The postpositive *cum* after personal pronouns in the ablative is maintained throughout by Martin in accordance with classical practice. There are ten instances: *mecum* at SPA, 107.1; *tecum* at SPA, 54.4, a Scriptural quotation,
De

De was used to indicate motion, separation, or departure in all periods of Latin. In the later centuries, however, it was extended to words with which it was not employed in the classical period. Martin has the following verbs with this de:

- abscidere: CBP, 3.8. There is only one reference to this construction, in a Vulgar Christian text; ab is the usual literary usage. (TLL, I, 147 ff.; LS, 10.)


- defendere: DCR, 11.15. The verb commonly occurs with ab, sometimes with contra or adversus in classical Latin; de is cited only for a few Christian authors. (TLL, V, 293 ff.; LS, 528; Krebs-Schmalz, I, 404.)

- degradare: CBP, 7.XXII.3. The word is Christian; no occurrence of de is cited. (TLL, V, 386; Blaise, 249.)


- deponere: CEX, XII.6, XXI.7, XXXIV.5, LIXII.5, LXII.6; DCR, 13.14. Cited for Cicero, but apparently rare even in Christian authors. (TLL, V, 576 ff.; LS, 550; Blaise, 256.)

- destinare: CEX, LI.3. Late technical and Christian. (TLL, V, 755 ff.; LS, 560; Blaise, 263; Bieter, 137.)


---

discedere: CEX, XXXI.8. Classical but rare.  
(TLL, V, 1275 ff.; LS, 585 ff.; Bagan, 96; Bieter, 138.)

effluere: CEX, LV.3. In classical ex is used; 
Silver writers preferred ex but a few instances of de do 
appear.  (TLL, V, 2, 192 ff.; LS, 630 ff.)

egress: PRI, 2.34. Late.  (TLL, V, 2, 271 ff.;  
LS, 633 ff.; Blaise, 301; Bieter, 137; Brown, 92; Druhan, 
101.)

eicere: CBP, 8.10. The verb occurs rarely in 
classical and Silver Latin with de.  (TLL, V, 2, 303 ff.; 
LS, 34 ff.; Bieter, 137; Brown, 92.)

exedere: EH, 2.34. Old Latin, but infrequent in 
all periods.  (TLL, V, 2, 1205 ff.; LS, 674 ff.)

exigere: DCR, 13.4. Silver, but not usual.  (TLL, 
V, 2, 1449 ff.; LS, 686; Krebs-Schmalz, I, 546; Prendergast, 
38.)

exire: SPA, 110.10, a bracketed passage, and DCR, 
13.10. Classical.  (TLL, V, 2, 1351 ff.; LS, 682 ff.;  
Bieter, 137; Brown, 93; Druhan, 101.)

expellere: IDS, 6.28 and DCR, 8.9. It occurs in 
Cicero's Letters, but is mostly Christian.  (TLL, V, 2, 
1630 ff.; LS, 692 ff.; Krebs-Schmalz, I, 551; Bagan, 96; 
Brown, 93.)

iactare: DCR, 4.8. Classical.  (TLL, VII, 1, 
48 ff.; LS, 1010.)

ingredi: SPA, 32.2. Not cited in the source 
material.

liberare: DP, 2.17 and 24. This construction is 
attested only for Apuleius and Christian authors.  (LS, 1058; 
Krebs-Schmalz, II, 18 ff.; Blaise, 494; Bieter, 138; 
Prendergast, 38.)

movere: SPA, 28.3. Poetic and Silver.  (LS, 1168 
ff.; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 106; Druhan, 102.)

proicere: CEX, LIX. 2 and LXXXIII.4. Cited only 
for Christian authors.  (Brown, 95; Bieter, 138.)

recedere: CBS, 3.VII.7. De is cited only for 
Christian authors and then very rarely.  (LS, 1529 ff.;  
Blaise, 698.)
reducere: DCR, 13.4. Not cited in the source material.

servare: CEX, XXIV.4. Ex and ab are normal; de is not cited in any of my sources.

suscipere: CBS, 3.III.1 and DCR, 15.7. Cited only for Christian authors. (LS, 1819; Blaise, 802; Brown, 96.)

transire: CEX, V.tit. and 2. Cited only for Ovid, Seneca and Christian authors. (LS, 1889; Blaise, 824; Brown, 95; Bagan, 97.)

venire: SPA, 45.1 and CEX, VII.2. De is cited for Lucretius, Celsus, Apuleius, and Christian authors. (LS, 1969; Blaise, 840; Bagan, 97; Bieter, 139.)

This usage breaks down as follows: three in Old Latin, six in classical, five in Silver, two in Late, six in Christian, and there are five verbs not cited before Martin in the source material. It appears from the information produced so far that Martin's prepositional syntax is more in accord with Late Christian Latin than his noun syntax; nevertheless, the strength of his classical or traditional tendency is demonstrated even where the Christian usage is strong, as in this use of de where over half of the governing verbs fully agree with classical usage.

De can also indicate source or origin. This usage is poetic and Late prose; the Late writers extended it beyond what the classical poets followed: Martin has several instances:

accipere: CBS, 3.VII.tit. This construction occurs in Cicero and Silver writers, though ab is more frequent. (TLL, I, 314 ff.; LS, 17; Blaise 42 ff.)
nasci: DCR, 13.13 and 15.14. Usually with ex, the verb occurs with de in Plautus, Ovid, Vitruvius, and a few Christian authors. This suggests it may be a Vulgarism, very appropriate for the DCR. (LS, 1187; Blaise, 548; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 161 ff.; Bennett, II, 292; Brown, 98; Prendergast, 39.)

transferre: SPA, tit. De is cited only for Christian authors. (LS, 1889 ff.; Blaise, 824; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 673.)

venia: DCR, 17.10, fiducialiter veniam de deo spera. Not cited by the source material.99

De in the partitive sense was most widely used in the Old and Late Latin periods, and was very limited in classical and Silver Latin where ex was preferred. Martin uses this construction very sparingly:

CBS, 3.II.tit., neque tertiam partem de oblationibus quaerat; CEX, XIV.2, de rebus ecclesiasticis aliquid praeumperit vendere; XVII.1, aliquid de ministeriis ecclesiae venundasse; XXXIV.1, si quis presbyter aut diaconus aut aliqui de clero . . .

The use of de to indicate the ablative of material is poetic, Silver, and Late. Martin has only two examples: DCR, 4.1, placuit deo de limo terrae hominem plasmare; and 5.2, mulier eius quem de ipsius carne deus creavit.100

De with a connotation "concerning" to indicate the subject matter of mental acts occurs fairly often in

99 This particular use of de is exactly parallel to the French de, pardon de Dieu. This could well be a Vulgar usage, taken from the language of the people and put by Martin into a sermon for the common people because of its familiar ring.

100 It is possible to interpret DP, 2.28, agnus . . . de cuius sanguine demos suos super limina obsignaret, as another instance of this usage; or it may also be viewed as the sole occurrence in Martin of de instrumental, a not unusual medieval meaning of de.
classical Latin. Silver and Late writers extend this usage to a certain extent. Martin's use can be seen from the following verbs with which he has this de:

- **aestimare**: EH, 8.134. Cited only for Christian authors. (TLL, I, 1096 ff.; LS, 67.)

- **affirmare**: DTM, 4.59, a Scriptural quotation. Classical. (TLL, I, 1222 ff.; LS, 67.)

- **ait**: DP, 2.13. Classical. (TLL, I, 1452, ff.; LS, 78 ff.)


- **cogitare**: SPA, 55.3; DCR, 18.9; FVH, 2.39. Old Latin. (TLL, III, 1451 ff.; LS, 360.)

- **commemorare**: IDS, 8.99. Classical. (TLL, III, 1830 ff.; LS, 378; Druhan, 103.)

- **commendare**: DCR, 2.6. Classical. (TLL, III, 1140 ff.; LS, 378 ff.)

- **conferre**: CBP, 2.1. Not cited in the source material.

- **confiteri**: PRI, 3.60. In the meaning "acknowledge" or "admit" this construction occurs in Cicero and Tacitus, though other constructions are more common. (LS, 415.)

- **consulere**: SPA, 44.2. Classical. (LS, 441.)

- **credere**: DI, 6.2. Classical, but rare. (LS, 479.)


- **definire**: FVM, 2.13. Cited only for Christian authors. (TLL, V, 342 ff.; LS, 530; Blaise, 247.)

- **desparare**: DCR, 17.3. Classical. (TLL, V, 370 ff.; LS, 559.)

- **dicere**: PRI, 1.4, 3.68, 4.83 and 84, 7.125; EH, 3.46 and 47; CEX, XXIII.5; DI, 5.17; DCR, 11.1; FVH, 3.5. Classical. (TLL, V, 967 ff.; LS, 570 ff.)
**digerere**: DI, 1.3. Not cited in the source material.

**dissere**: DI, 1.4-5. Classical. (TLL, V, 1459 ff.; LS, 594.)

**dubitare**: DCR, 17.5. Classical. (TLL, V, 2080 ff.; LS, 613 ff.)

**facere**: SPA, 7.2. It occurs in the passive in Plautus and Terence; with the active it is cited for Cicero, Sallust, Nepos, Ovid, and Christian authors. (TLL, VI, 1, 104; LS, 716 ff.; Bagan, 171)

**interrogare**: CEX, LXXXI.5. Classical. (LS, 985.)

**iudicare**: CEX, X.5. Classical. (TLL, VII, 1, 1151 ff.; LS, 1015; Krebs-Schmalz, I, 804.)

**loqui**: SPA, 39.3, 51.2-3; PRI, 3.63; EH, 4.79; DI, 6.7 and 8. Silver. (LS, 1077 ff.; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 35 ff.)

**observare**: CEX, XXV.5. Not cited in the source material.

**perquirere**: CBP, 1.17. Cited only for Christian authors. (LS, 1352; Blaise, 616.)

**placere**: CBP, 7.XVI.5; CEX, XI.4 and XVIII.8. This usage is attested for Cicero's Letters and Christian authors. (LS, 1382; Blaise, 627.)

**postulare**: DTM, 2.21. Classical. (LS, 1407.)

**praeclpere**: DI, 4.4-5. Classical. (LS, 1413.)

**praesumere**: CEX, X.4. Cited only for Tacitus and Christian authors. (LS, 1432 ff.; Blaise, 656; Bagan, 98; Bieter, 142.)

**scire**: CEX, 15-16; FVH, 5.15-16. Classical. (LS, 1643 ff.)

**scribere**: DCR, 1.4-5. Classical, in Cicero's Letters. (LS, 1647.)

(IS, 1883; Bieter, 142.)

This connotation of de is also used with certain adjectives; some grammarians hold that in the case of these adjectives de is causal. Martin has three such:

conscius: CEX, XXXIV.7. Classical. (IS, 426.)

It also occurs with existimatio at FVH, 4.37, a usage found in classical writers, and with item in the title of the IDS. Of the 36 words governing this usage of de in Martin, then, one occurred in Old Latin, twenty-six in classical, three in Silver, three in Christian writers, and three are not cited before Martin in the source material. In this particular usage Martin is again overwhelmingly traditional.

There are in Martin seven clear examples of de causal:

PRI, 3.50, Alii enim de acceptis honoribus laudari cupiunt; CBP, 1.24-25, de causa; 3.10, de permixtione talium aliquod orthodoxis reputatur opprobrium; CBS, 1.10, de visione alterutra gratulemur; 4.5, totius consilii increpatione correptus severissimam sibi de sui ordinis inclinatione noverit imminere sententiam; DCR, 14.19, caro illa iam de resurrectione accepta . . . gemens; 17.15, de praeteritis peccatis indulgentiam petat.

This connotation occurred in classical Latin but was not frequent; it is more poetic and Vulgar. The above usages are typical of the Late period, except de causa which is classical.
A perfectly classical use of de is to indicate general reference, the meaning "with regard to." This occurs in Martin eleven times: SPA, 5.5; PRI, 3.62 and 5.91; IDS, 9.124; CBS, 3.10; CEX, XVII.5, LXI.tit. and 2, LXIX.2, LXXIX. 4, and FVH, 9.3.

At CBP, 3.X.1 occurs a very peculiar de, si quis duodecim signa de sideribus . . . per singula animi vel corporis membra disposita credunt. This seems very much like the French de, indicating a type of partition. It is perhaps, then, a colloquial usage.

At DCR, 19.9, appears the phrase de improviso, at 17.16, de futuro, and at CBS, 3.VI.5, de cetero, with the meaning, for the future. These are the only occurrences of the adverbial de in Martin; the first two are classical, the third occurs once in Seneca, and frequently in Late and Christian authors.

The preposition ex, like ab and de, could indicate separation or departure. The major difference in Late usage is, as usual, simply an extension of the verbs with which the construction was allowed. Martin has the following:

abicere: CEX, XXIV.3. Silver (TLL, I, 83 ff.; LS, 7; Brown, 104.)


convenire: CBS, 1.1 and 9. Classical. (LS, 462.)

dilabi: IDS, 5.57. Silver. (TLL, V, 1157 ff.; LS, 579.)

exire: DTM, 4.64. Old Latin. (TLL, V, 2, 1351 ff.; LS, 682 ff.)
invenire: SPA, 51.5. Classical. (TLL, VII, 2, 134 ff.; LS, 993.)

producere: IDS, 2.21. This usage is cited once for Petronius. (LS, 1455 ff.)

proferre: IDS, 9.126; DI, 2.9. Classical. (LS, 1457.)
pullulare: IDS, 10.133. Cited only for Christian authors. (LS, 1489; Blaise, 684.)
quaeerere: CEX, LCII.3. Classical. (LS, 1501.)

recitare: CBS, 2.33 and 3.1. Classical but infrequent. (LS, 1534.)

relegere: CBP, 3.1. Cited only for Christian authors. (LS, 1555; Brown, 108.)

requirere: CBS, 3.II.3. Classical. (LS, 1574 ff.)
suspendere: PRI, 3.61. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1819 ff.; Bagan, 102.)
tollere: DI, 5.10. Classical. (LS, 1876 ff.; Bagan, 102.)

transferre: CEX, 7. In general, classical; but for the connotation "translate" only Silver authors are cited. (LS, 1889 ff.; Bieter, 145.)

Martin's usage is again very traditional, reflecting scarcely at all the Late extensions. The verbs from Old Latin number four; classical, eight; Silver, five; Christian, two.

Ex is also used to indicate source or origin. This usage occurs in classical Latin but infrequently and with only a few verbs. Late usage, again, is extended. Martin has this connotation with the following verbs:

- **concipere**: CEX, LXXVIII.3-4; DCR, 13.6. Classical. (LS, 400 ff.; Brown, 108.)
- **ducere originem**: DCR, 14.2. Silver; classical uses *ab*. (LS, 1278 ff.)
- **esse**: EH, 8.135. Classical. (LS, 1797 ff.; Brown, 109; Bieter, 145; Skahill, 119.)
- **existere**: CBP, 3.V.1. Classical. (TLL, V, 2, 1868 ff.; LS, 702; Brown, 109; Prendergast, 41.)
- **generare**: PRI, 7.127; IDS, 2.22 and 10.134; CBP, 7.XXI.5. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VI, 2, 1789 ff.; LS, 807; Brown, 109.)
- **nasci**: CBP, 3.III.1; DCR, 15.15. Classical. (LS, 1187; Brown, 110; Bieter, 145; Skahill, 119; Prendergast, 41.)
- **oriri**: DCR, 6.7. Classical. (LS, 1279; Skahill, 119; Prendergast, 41.)
- **propagare**: DCR, 5.2. Silver, but infrequent. (LS, 1467.)

Every one of the occurrences in Martin's writings is classical or Silver.

Partitive *ex* was widely used in Old and classical Latin. Late Latin extended the preposition to some words
not so employed earlier. Martin has the following:

**alliquid or quid:** SPA, 109.4; EH, 1.10; CBP, 7.xxii.1; CBS, 3.V.3; and CEX, XVII.tit. Classical.

**aliquis or quis:** CBP, 8.7; CEX, XXXII.2; DCR, 16.2. Classical.

**quicumque:** CEX, XXXIII.2 and FVH, 2.5. Apparently Late.

**quidam:** DI, 1.6; DTM, 2.15 and 4.58. Classical.

**quilibet:** CBP, 7.X.1. Late.

**quantum:** PRI, 5.96 and 105. Classical.

**hoc:** SPA, 39.10. Classical.

**nihil:** PRI, 2.26, 6.118; EH, 2.33 (with *aliud*), and CEX, XV.3. Classical.

**nemo:** EH, 4.81. Classical.

**unus:** SPA, 9.3 and DCR, 3.3. Classical.

**portio:** EH, 3.56 and CBP, 7.VII.1. Late.

**pars:** CBS, 3.II.3. Late.

**multus:** DCR, 8.9. Classical.

**paucus:** DCR, 14.2. Classical.

There is only one instance in Martin of *ex* expressing the material from which a thing is made. This occurs at IDS, 5.67, *hominem factum ex pulvere*. The usage is classical.

*Ex* instrumental is a Silver and Late development. Martin has eight instances: SPA, 60.2; IDS, 3.28; EH, 8.147; CBP, 5.3; CBS, 3.X.2; DI, 4.14; DP, 1.2 and 3.45.

*Ex* to indicate change of state is found in classical Latin, but usually with verbs of making or becoming. The extended usage is Late. Martin has three instances.
Causal *ex* also occurs in classical Latin, usually with verbs of motion, with a local connotation retained, or to indicate the external cause. Indication of the external cause is classical, but not frequent until the Late period. In Late Latin *ex* can designate internal or external cause with a great variety of verbs. Martin's usage is as follows:

With verbs of motion: internal cause, IDS, 5.74.

With other verbs: external cause at EH, 5.96, CBS, 3.V.2, DI, 5.8, DOR, 11.7, and FVH, 5.13; internal cause at IDS, 2.23 and CEX, XXXII.4.

Martin, then, reflects here the Late practice rather than classical.

*Ex* has a post-classical connotation" with reference to" which is used where classical Latin might have *de*. Martin has three examples of this construction:

CBP, 8.4, *ut ex omnibus his . . . unusquisque nostrum studet docere atque informare dioecesin*; CEX, XXIII.4, *ex poenitente enim dicimus*; DI, 6.1, *ex his autem . . . alia renuntiantur nobis* (Seneca, *De Ira*, II, 29.2, also has *ex* here).

Classical Latin used *ex* in the sense of *secundum* with a few standard phrases, e.g., *ex decreto* or *ex senatus consulto*. Silver and Late Latin extended the construction considerably. Martin has four examples, all extensions from classical practice:

CBP, 1.2-3, *ex praecipto . . . regis . . . convenissent*; DI, 3.6-7, *ira ex proprio libito iudicat*
(Seneca, De Ira, I, 17.7, also has ex); 8.5-6, donec quod ex eius imperio est agendum (Seneca, De Ira, III, 32.2, also has ex); DTM, 3.30, quam ex Romani antistitis auctoritate sacerdotes . . . retinet.

Ex also came to form certain prepositional phrases serving adverbial functions. Martin has a number of these, some classical, some Late:

- **ex animo**: CBS, 2.37. Old Latin.
- **ex tota anima**: SPA, 110.2, a bracketed passage, Late.
- **ex toto corde**: SPA, 29.4, a bracketed passage, Late.
- **ex facili**: FVH, 4.10. Silver.
- **ex tota Intelligentia**: SPA, 110.2, a bracketed passage, Late.
- **ex utraque parte**: PRI, 4.81-82. Classical.

Temporal ex occurs three times in Martin, in wholly classical constructions: CBS, 3.IX.12, mediante Quadragesima ex diebus viginti; DP, 5.70-71, ex V enim Id. Febr . . . ex V Id. autem Mart.

Extra

Martin's usage is strictly classical. The preposition appears at: CBP, 3.II.1, 7.XII.1; CBS, 2.21; CEX, XIX.3, LXVII.2; DI, 8.12; FVH, 7.1 and 6.

Foris

The use of foris as a preposition with the ablative is a Christianism since only Christian authors (and only a few

---

102 TLL, V, 2, 2051 ff.; LS, 709; Brown, 64; Bagan, 82; Bieter, 110 ff.

103 TLL, VI, 1, 1046; LH, 510; Bonnet, 587.
of them) are cited. Martin used the preposition three times in the phrase foris monasterio suo at SPA, 18.2, 4, and 7; foris translates the Greek ἐπὶ. The word occurs as an adverb in four other places in Martin's writings.

Gratia

This is a regular Old Latin and classical usage, the ablative of cause, as with causa, having acquired a prepositional force. Martin has four occurrences: PEI, 4.77; CBS, 2.36, a Scriptural quotation; DCR, 15.4 and 7.

In with the ablative

In with the ablative is the most frequently used preposition in Martin of Braga; it occurs nearly 450 times. Although such frequency in such a small number of pages of writing is unusual and perhaps indicative of the later tendency toward prepositional phrases to replace case endings, Martin's usage is characteristic; it is typically Late and Christian literary practice, modern but strongly traditional.

The local connotation occurs some 150 times, in both strictly local and in a figurative sense; yet these


105 TLL, VI, 2, 2234 ff.; LS, 825 ff.; LH, 442 ff.; Bagan, 21; Bonnet, 622 ff.

instances nearly all adhere to classical standards. Examples of the strictly local use are:

SPA, 6.2-3, vidit nitrum in manibus eius; 11.1, cum fuisset aliquando in mercato; 21.2, sedere in cella; CBS, 2.19, in hac provincia nihil est dubium; 3.VI.4, quod in aliquibus locis usque modo dicitur fieri; CEX, XIII.2, episcopos qui in provincia sunt; DI, 4.9, et in statione tranquilla locatus; DCR, 4.2, quem posuit in paradiso.

Typical figurative uses are:

SPA, 32.3, discernens in semetipso cogitationes suos; CBS, 3.X.3, in huius praesumptionis audacia detineri; CEX, XXXIII.1, si quis in contemptu positus; XLIII.1, in lectoratu permaneat; DCR, 14.28, in arbitrio hominis posita est; FVH, 10. 4-5, velut in quodam meditullio summitatis adsistens.

The phrase in conspectu is classical Latin means "in the sight of," but in Christian usage it comes to have the meaning apud. The phrase is found in Martin five times; SPA, 36.3, in conspectu bonitatis Dei; 39.7, in conspectu Dei; 56.2, in conspectu hominum; DCR, 3.2, qui in conspectu ipsius adstantes; 3.12, in conspectu domini perseverant.

Classical writers refer to an author's work in particular by using in, in general by apud; in Late Latin this distinction is lost. Martin's usage is as follows:


Vulgar Latin tended to confuse in with the ablative and in with the accusative. This variation also occurs in authors of the Late period, especially Christians; but
because of the manuscript spellings which often follow pronunciation in dropping final -m, it is difficult to call this a literary or Vulgar usage at any time. In Martin a fairly large number of verbs appear with the ablative after in, where one would expect an accusative. These are:

admittere (CEX, XXXI.3 and XXXIV.8), ascendere (SPA, 51.2 and EH, 7.122), attrahere (EH, 3.51), cogere (CBS, 3.II.8), commeare (DTM, 2.15), convenire (CBF, 1.3; CBS, 1.3; CEX, X.4; DP, 7.108), deicere (CEX, XIV.4; DCR, 3.7), dimittere (CEX, XVII.3), effundere (DI, 7.9; Seneca, De Ira, II, 26.3, has in res), lactare (DCR, 4.8), incidere (DI, 4.12), inclinare (SPA, 58.2-3), ingredi (SPA, 60.2), intrare (DCR, 14.10), introducere (EH, 4.61 and CEX, LXXI.2), introire (CEX, LIII.3, though in with the ablative does occur in Old Latin), ire (SPA, 40.5), irrepere (IDS, 9.118), levare (DCR, 13.26; this usage is poetic and Silver), mittere (DCR, 14.17-18), occurrere (SPA, 16.2), recipere (CEX, XXXI.1), revertere (CEX, XXXIV.5), succedere (DCR, 4.3 and 6), suscipere (SPA, 16.3), transferre (CEX, 6), transire (DCR, 7.14), vadere (SPA, 18.8), and venire (SPA, 98.2).

A breakdown of these instances shows that eight occur in the SPA, eight in the DCR, ten in the CEX, three in the CBS, two in the IDS, three in the EH, one in the DTM, one in the DP, and two in the DI. Although there are more occurrences in the more popular than in the more literary writings, the usage is spread throughout the different types to an extent that makes any conclusions hazardous.

A particularly Christian development of the local in occurred with the phrase in Christo to indicate a mystical indwelling. This was then extended to other phrases to express the idea of an indwelling. Martin has in Christo at CEX, 1-2, LV.4 (in Christo Iesu), DI, 1-2, and DTM, 2;
and the phrases in Domino at CBS, 1.17. Typical extended usages are:

SPA, 8.7, si actus in aliquo homine fuissent; 24.3, si ergo cogitatio haec manet in homine; 61.8, cum vero monachile opus humilitatis vidi in te; 84.2, utrum in te sit spiritus Dei an in illo; PRI, 6.110, praeccludit ergo elatio in quibusdam.

In with the meaning "with reference to" or "with relation to" is classical; but in Silver and Late Latin the usage was extended considerably. Martin has some forty examples; those which are not classical are listed below:

With verbs: admirari (SPA, 9.25), admonere (EH, 4.62), aestimare (DI, 3.10), arguere (SPA, 22.5; CEX, XLVII.2), contradicere (CEX, III.10), declinare (CEX, LXXXIII.3), discutere (DI, 6.14), efficere (IDS, 8.95), facere (SPA, 93.1 and 110-8-9, a bracketed passage, and DCR, 9.9), mutare (FVH, 2.10), placere (PRI, 2.19), prodesse (DI, 10.5, poetic and Silver), recordari (EH, 3.36), timere (DCR, 12.5).

With adjectives: liber (SPA, 96.1).

With nouns: initium (SPA, 109, passim), pes (IDS, 2.16), potestas (CEX, XVI.1), praesumptio (CEX, XIV.tit.).

Thus about one-half of the instances of this usage are Late extensions; as indicated before, it is precisely in the use of prepositions that one would expect the greatest syntactical divergence from classical norms; Martin is unexpectedly restrained for a writer of the sixth century, yet he does follow Late practice on occasion.

In with the ablative to indicate "in the form of" is a colloquial referential in. It occurs but twice in Martin, and in both instances persona in the ablative makes the
meaning completely clear. The two occurrences are at SPA, 8.5-6 and 16.4-5.

Martin's usage of instrumental in accords with Late practice. This particular construction was developed by Christian authors through the Bible translations which carried it over from influences of the Hebrew. Martin has about thirty-five instances of this in, a rather large number for so traditional a writer, except that many of these are frequently repeated Christian formulae; further, only two or three occur in the literary works and the great majority are in the purely Christian writing. Examples are:

SPA, 1.3, constringamus ergo nos in ipso panes et sale; IDS, 6.77, in hoc et caelestis et terrena cecidit creatura; CBS, 3. VIII.1, si quis aliquem clericorum in accusatione fornicationis impetit; CEX, LXXXI.1, si quis . . . in cuiuslibet animalis commissione peccaverit; DCR, 3.4, videns se in tanta gloria praefulgentem; 13.20, baptizarent eos in nomine . . . (a formula); DP, 4.60, creatura quem liberabat in sanguine suo.

A causal in had already developed in classical Latin but its use there was quite rare. It became most extensive in Christian authors, under the impulse of Scriptural influence; it was a colloquialism in classical times, but was elevated to literary acceptability by Christian authors. Martin has only five instances:

PRI, 4.85, a Scriptural quotation, quoniam laudatur peccator in desideriis animae suae; CBS, 3. III. tit., ut episcopus in ordinatione clericorum commodum nullum accipiat; CEX, XIII.1, si quis episcopus in aliquibus accusationibus indicatur; DI, 4.3, ne in ira peccemus; DCR, 7.8, qui fuerat magus et in tantis adulteriis incestus.
The final use of *in* is also a Late Christian development. Martin has only two definite instances: SPA, 1.2, patres . . . fortes facti sunt in opere Dei; IDS, 8.97, sed et in illorum qui maximi sunt insidiis adsidet.

Martin has the following adverbial phrases using *in* and an ablative:

- **in abdito**: DI, 2.13. Silver.
- **in duplo**: SPA, 109.19. Late and rare; accusative normal.
- **in primis**: SPA, 110.4, a bracketed passage; EH, 2.13 and 8.130; DP, 3.49. Classical.
- **in promptu**: EH, 4.83. Classical.

As was stated in the section on the ablative of time, classical usage required the simple ablative to express "time when," and *in* to indicate circumstances rather than time. Martin has about sixty instances of temporal *in*; in about thirty-five of these he employs *in* where classical Latin would have omitted it, but otherwise his use of *in* accords with classical norms. But the significant thing is that this non-classical *in* occurs in four works, the SPA, the canons, the DCR, and the DP, all Christian writings; and it is never found in the literary works.

*In* with the accusative

The local connotation of this preposition, both literal and figurative, is the most frequent in Martin. It

---

occurs with the following verbs:

- **abire**: SPA, 61.3. Old Latin. (TLL, I, 65 ff.; LS, 6.)


- **agere**: DI, 3.27 and EE, 2. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, I, 1366 ff.; LS, 74 ff.)


- **cadere**: SPA, 23.4. Classical. (TLL, III, 754 ff.; LS, 258 ff.; Brown, 146; Bieter, 161.)

- **colligere**: CEX, XVI.13 and DI, 7.8. Poetic and Silver (TLL, III, 1606 ff.; LS, 366 ff.; Brown, 140.)

- **condere**: DP, 5.82. Old Latin which also has in with the ablative. (LS, 408 ff.)

- **constringere**: DI, 4.7-8 and FVH, 4.1. Not cited in the source material.

- **convenire**: CBS, 1.9 and 3.IX.8. Classical. (LS, 462 ff.)

- **convertere**: SPA, 30.7, a bracketed passage, and 45.3; DI, 3.28 and 5.22. Classical. (LS, 464; Bieter, 162, Bagan, 116; Prendergast, 116; Druhan, 113.)

- **currere**: DI, 3.33. Classical. (LS, 503)

- **descendere**: SPA, 51.7 and FVH, 4.51. Classical. (TLL, V, 641 ff.; LS, 554; Brown, 140 ff.; Prendergast, 45; Druhan, 113.)

- **discedere**: SPA, 9.3 and 16. Classical. (TLL, V, 1275 ff.; LS, 585 ff.)

- **discurrere**: DI, 4.11. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, V, 1365 ff.; LS 589 ff.)

- **dominari**: DI, 3.19. Poetic and Silver, with a single occurrence in Cicero; in with the ablative is also used. (TLL, V, 1898 ff.; LS, 608; Brown, 141.)

- **exire**: SPA, 47.10. Classical. (TLL, V, 2, 1351 ff.; LS, 682 ff.; Brown, 145.)
extendere: FVH, 2.11. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, V, 2, 1959 ff.; LS, 706 ff.; Brown, 142.)

flectere: DI, 8.13. Classical, though ad is more common in prose. (TLL, VI, 1, 891 ff.; LS, 758.)

incedere: CEX, XV.14 and FVH, 2.40. Classical. (TLL, VII, 1, 553 ff.; LS, 917 ff.)

incidere: CEX, XXII.5-6, a Scriptural quotation; DI, 4.3 and 5.16; DTM, 4.60. Classical. (TLL, VII, 1, 897 ff.; LS, 920; Bagan, 116.)

inclinare: SPA, 30.6. Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 940 ff.; LS, 923.)

ingredi: SPA, 32.1-2; CEX, XLII.1. Classical. (TLL, VII, 1, 1567 ff.; LS, 952.)

insurgere: EH, 6.109, a Scriptural quotation. Not cited in the source material.

intrare: CEX, XLII.5. Classical. (TLL, VII, 2, 56 ff.; LS, 990; Bagan, 116; Druhan, 113.)

introire: CEX, LIII.5 and LXXXIV.1. Old Latin. (TLL, VII, 2, 71 ff.; LS, 990; Bagan, 116; Druhan, 113.)

ire: SPA, 49.7. Old Latin. (TLL, V, 2, 626 ff.; LS, 648 ff.; Prendergast, 46.)

irruere: CEX, LXXVI.1. Classical. (LS, 1003.)

mittere: SPA, 48.2; DI, 3.31; DCR, 16.9. Classical. (TLL, VIII, 1163 ff.; LS, 1152 ff.)

mutare: DI, 3.1. Silver and Poetic. (LS, 1181; Bieter, 163; Brown, 148.)

nasci: DCR, 13.7. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1187 ff.; Brown, 145.)

pandere: IB, 5. Silver. (LS, 1296 ff.)

perducere: CBS, 3.4; DCR, 12.14; FVH, 6.11. Classical. (LS, 1377.)

pertrahere: DCR, 3.25. Silver. (LS, 1359; Druhan, 113.)

proferre: CBS, 118. Classical. (LS, 1457; Bieter, 163; Bagan, 116.)
rapere: SPA, 49.5. Old Latin. (LS, 1523 ff.)
recedere: SPA, 48.4-5. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1529 ff.; Bagan, 116.)
reportare: SPA, 6.10. Classical. (LS, 1571.)
retorquere: IDS, 7.87-88. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1587; Bieter, 162.)
revocare: CBS, 2.5. Rare in classical; frequent in Silver. (LS, 159.)
subicere: DP, 2.15 and 17. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1776.)
subrogare: IDS, 5.67. Silver. (LS, 1818.)
tendere: IDS, 1.9-10. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1852 ff.)
transire: CEX, VI.1. Classical. (LS, 1889; Brown, 146; Bagan, 118.)
transmittere: PRI, 5.100. Silver. (LS, 1892.)
vadere: SPA, 5.1 and 5; CEX, XXXVIII.tit. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1951.)
venire: SPA, 22.8, 61.1 and 4; CBS, 2.5; CEX, VII.2; DI, 3.6 and 8.1 and 9.13. Classical. (LS, 1969; Bieter, 163; Brown, 146; Bagan, 116; Prendergast, 46.)

This connotation is also used with the following noun and adjectives:

conversio: SPA, 109.42. Not cited in the source material.
elatus: CEX, XXII.5-6, a Scriptural quotation. Once in Statius, then Late. (TLL, V, 2, 150 ff.; LS, 629.)
festinus: FVH, 7.2. The only citation is in Claudian. (TLL, VI, 1, 621 ff.; LS, 742.)

illiberalis: DI, 7.1. Cited only for Cicero's Letters. (TLL, VII, 1, 369; LS, 885.)

pronus: DI, 3.5. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1467; Brown, 153.)

For the verbs this breaks down as follows: six from Old Latin, twenty-two from Classical, seventeen from Silver, and one which is not cited before Martin in the sources. The very heavy traditional usage is quite surprising for this century; the influence of Silver Latin on Martin is very noticeable here.

The verb oredere in Martin's writings is followed by in and the accusative at CBS, 3.1.8, a Scriptural quotation, DCR, 15.12, 18, and 24, and 16.24. It is followed by in and the ablative at DCR, 8.17 and 18.5. Both usages occur frequently in Christian writing, and there seems to be no distinction in meaning.

The variation of case with in also occurs with in and the accusative. Again the problem arises whether this is the author's practice or whether the manuscripts added an -m by a false, spelling. Conclusion, on the basis of present evidence, are risky. Martin has the following verbs governing in with the accusative where one would expect an ablative:

configere (DCR, 16.23), esse (PRI, 4.87, a Scriptural quotation: DI, 4.1; DCR, 14.6), observare (DCR, 16.11), offendere (CEX, XXXVI.2), ordinare (CEX, XXXIII.5-6), ostendere (DCR, 7.3), permanere (CEX, VI.3), sumere initium (SPA, I09.5-6; note that the other phrases
in this long series have the ablative), tenere in memoriam (DCR, 2.5), usurpare (CEX, XVI.6).

He also uses the accusative with in after the noun prophetia (KDS, 1.9-10) and the adjective particeps (CBS, 3.6-7). It is noteworthy that the literary works are represented here by a single occurrence, and that the bulk of the occurrences are found in the popular writings.

Final in was infrequent before Silver Latin, but then was used extensively. Martin has only a few instances:

SPA, 7.3, da illam in ecclesiam clericis; CBF, 3.XIV.1, quos Deus in usus hominum dedit; 7.VII.2, ex rebus ecclesiasticis tres aequae fiant portiones . . . tertia in recuperationem vel in luminaria ecclesiae; DI, 7.5, cum hoc non in tuam contumeliam fecit; DCR, 13.21, baptizarent eos . . . in remissionem peccatorum; FVH, 5.2, conventio in adiutorium multorum inventa.

Adverbial phrases formed with in and the accusative are not frequent in Martin. Only the following occur:

in saecula: EH, 5.102; DCR, 19.8; DF, 9.136.

Christian.
in tantum: DCR, 18.17. Poetic and Silver.

Inter

Martin's use of inter is mostly in accordance with classical standards. He has the local connotation, both literal and figurative, seventeen times in classical usages;

there are also the following Late extensions:

- **deputare**: CEX, XXIII.1-2. Christian. (TLL, V, 620 ff.; LS, 553; Prendergast, 33.)

- **mediare**: CBS, 2.17. The verb is Late; the construction is not cited in the source material.

- **orare**: CEX, LXXXI.11. Christian. (LS, 1280.)

- **unire**: CBP, 5.16. The verb is Late; the construction is not cited in the source material.

There is a single instance of *inter* expressing the notion of preference with a verb of surpassing, IDS, 5.58, *cum inter ceteras supernas virtutes* (i.e., angelos) .. . praemineret; this usage is classical. There are two instances of the partitive significance of *inter*, PRI, 1.12, *unus inter haec omnia morbus*; and DI, 1.2, *illud inter cetera*. The first is classical, the second occurs from Livy on.

A very peculiar usage occurs at SPA, 81.1, *inter medium Dei et hominis*. This is apparently a Grecism peculiar to Martin; for the Greek text reads: ἀναμείκτον αὐτοῦ καὶ θεοῦ.109

*Infra*110

This preposition occurs twice in Martin, both times in accordance with classical norms:

- **CBP**, 7. IX.2, *diacones .. . infra tunicam utuntur orariis; DI, 4.60: omnia infra se premens.*

109 Migne, PG, 65, 33.54.

110 TLL, VII, 1, 1482 ff.; LS, 948.
Intra

Martin's use of *intra* is largely non-classical. The local connotation in classical Latin indicated "within a closed space" and Martin has this usage at CBP, 7.XVIII.1 and 4. Silver Latin resurrected an Old Latin meaning, "in the interior of a space," and this occurs at CBP, 7.XIII.1. Another Silver usage is to make *intra* the equivalent of *in* with the ablative to express place where; Martin has this at CEX, LXIII.2, qui intra civitatem fuerit. Also Silver is the use of personal pronouns with *intra*; Martin has two instances, SPA, 27.2, intra te, and DI, 6.26-27, *intra se*. Finally, the temporal meaning of *intra* was extended beyond the classical use with *annis* and *dies* to other words, from the time of Livy on; Martin has a single occurrence, DP, 8.121, *intra primi mensis terminos retineatur*.

Ob

Martin's use is strictly classical:

Causal: IDS, 5.71, non ob aliam causam, sed tantum ut . . .; CEX, XXXVI.2, et ob hanc causam fuerit excommunicatus; FVH, 4.36-37, si lauderis ob turpia.

*Ob hoc*: IDS, 3.33, 6.77; CBS, 3.8-9; DI, 3.15; FVH, 1.3.

*Quamobrem*: FVH, 1.3.

*IS*, 989; Brown, 65 ff.; Bieter, 113 ff.

*IS*, 1232; Brown 42 ff.
This preposition was used in classical times to indicate "in the possession of" or "in the power of." This seems to be the significance of the one occurrence in Martin at DTM, 4.65, cetera ita penes se retinent sicut nos.

The local significance of per occurs in Martin's writings some ten times, all classical except colligere per (CBS, 2.13-14) which is Silver. There was a local distributive sense of per which developed in Livy and the Silver writers from a usage of the classical poets; Martin has this at CBS, 3.IV.2, 3.VII.1; CEX, IV.1, XVIII.2, LI.1; DCR, 16.5 and 18.11; and DP, 2.30.

The temporal meaning of per occurred in Old Latin, was rare in Classical, then came to be used extensively in Silver Latin. Martin has seven instances:

SPA, 109.2-3, per singulos dies (twice); CBP, 7.II.1, per . . . vigillias vel missas . . . legant; CBS, 3.IX.tit., per singulos annos; 3.IX.8, per triduum; CEX, LVII.4-5, tam per omnes dominicas quam per omnes dies; DP, 3.49, per singulos annos; 6.94, per singulos annos.

Per to indicate agent occurs in classical Latin, but it is not frequent until the Late period. Martin reflects Late usage; for he has this construction eleven times: IDS, 113IS, 1328 ff.; LH, 502; Brown, 53 ff.

7.84 and 85; EH, 5.101; CBP, 2.12; CEX, 11 and 12, XIII.5, XIV.10; DCR, 6.1-2, 14.25, and 18.2.

Instrumental per is also rare before the Late period, but frequent during Martin's time. The usage is very common in Martin, occurring about forty times, e.g., at SPA, 29.2; EH, 7.123; CBP, 5.16-17; CBS, 3.IV.3; CEX, III.3; DCR, 9.2; FVH, 1.5; DTM, 2.14; and DP, 2.20.

Likewise causal per occurs in classical Latin, but it becomes frequent in the Silver and Late periods. Martin has twenty-two instances, e.g., at SPA, 9.5; CBP, 2.4; CBS, 3.VII.3; CEX, XXI.4; and DCR, 12.15.

Post

This preposition occurs three times in Martin in its local sense and forty-one times in a temporal sense. In only two instances, post haec as the equivalent of postea at IDS, 5.66 and FVH, 5.1, is Martin's usage non-classical, and these two are Silver. Post, as in Late Latin in general, is usually used with the accusative rather than as an adverb with an ablative to express time.

Prae

Martin has this preposition four times in two phrases: prae oculis at SPA, 24.2 and 95.1; and prae manibus at CBP, 115LS, 1404; LH, 500 ff.; Bieter, 103 ff.; Brown, 47 ff.; Druhan, 84 ff.

116LS, 1410; LH, 532 ff.
2.19 and 6.4. The first accords with classical usage, and the second is an Old and Late Latin idiom for "at hand."

**Praeter**

Praeter occurs ten times in Martin: in the classical connotation "except" at SPA, 60.2; CEX, XVIII.9, LVI.1; DCR, 17.7; FVH, 4.22; and DTM, 4.64; in the classical connotation "more than" at CEX, III.7 and DCR, 18.15; in the classical connotation "contrary to" at CEX, IV.3; and in the Old Latin and Silver Latin use of praeter haec for praeterea at DCR, 8.8.

**Pro**

This preposition occurs in Martin's works ninety-one times. None of these has the local significance; forty-nine have purely classical connotations, and require no further discussion though in a few cases the verbs with which pro appears were not cited in the source material for this construction. The less ordinary uses will be discussed here.

The connotation "instead of" was rare in classical Latin, frequent in Old, Silver, and Late. Martin has one instance: DCR, 15.6, aut certe qui (i.e., sponsor) pro te fidem fecit.

117 LS, 1434; Bieter, 118 ff.; Brown, 71 ff.

The connotation "according to," "by virtue of," or "in proportion to" was very limited in classical Latin to a few stereotyped phrases. Late Latin greatly expanded the usage. Martin has the following instances:

CEX, XXV.2, sed tantum pro religione nomen presbyteri portet; FVH, 10.2-4, hanc . . . formulam pro qualitatibus temporum, locorum, personarum, atque causarum . . . teneat; DTM, 3.41-42, unum baptisma, non pro unitate Catholicae . . . sed pro una tintione.

Causal pro is found in Old Latin but not in classical. It is first used with real frequency in Late Latin. Martin's works show twenty-two instances of this Late usage. Examples:

IDS, 5.56, qui pro splendore decoris sui Lucifer nominatus; CEX, XXI.1, si quis pro easu suae aegritudinis naturalia . . . habuit secta; LVIII.1-2, si quis non pro abstinentiae disciplina, sed pro exsecratione escarum abstinet; DCR, 3.6, et pro hac superbia . . . de illa caelesti sede . . . delectus est; 13.1, pro qua enim causa.

This usage occurs, however, only in the SPA, CBP, CEX, DCR, and, in one instance, in the IDS; in the literary works and doctrinal treatises it is not used at all.

Final pro is also a Late Latin development. There are but two examples in Martin: CEX, LXXII.3, observare et colere (signa) pro domo facienda; and DCR, 7.15, . . . acervos petrarum pro sacrificio reddunt. Grammarians debate whether pro final occurs at all before the Late period; but pro with the gerundive is definitely Late.

Pro meaning "as" and equivalent to tamquam is classical, but frequent only in the Late period. Martin has six instances: SPA, 54.1-2 and 89.2; DCR, 7.5, 11.3 and 5, 13.3.
A clearly Late usage is pro as the equivalent of de, "concerning." This occurs only in the SPA, at 17.1, 46.3, a Scriptural quotation, 51.1, 71.1, 108.1, and 109.43. It may well be a Grecism in Martin, though the existing Greek text reveals no common Greek equivalent for all the examples; the whole Late construction is thought to be under Greek influence.

**Propter**

This preposition occurs thirteen times in Martin. It always has the classical causal sense. It is generally agreed that ob is literary in Late usage and propter colloquial or popular. In Martin propter appears in the SPA, CBP, CEX, DCR, and DP; ob appears in the IDS, CBS (once), CEX (once), DI, and FVH. Thus Martin is aware of this stylistic nicety and makes the appropriate choice.

**Secundum**

The connotation in Martin is always "according to" which was the classical meaning. But classical Latin used this significance only with the word natura; Silver extended the usage slightly to lex and ratio. Martin has secundum rationem at CEX, XVIII.7. Late Latin used it with any

---
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appropriate noun, proper or common. Martin has the following:

Aaron (CEX, LXVI.2), Apostolus (CEX, XVI.5), canon (CBP, 3.IV.1; CEX, III.9, VI.4, XIII.6), doctrina (CBP, 1.13), error (CBP, 3.XVIII.1), genus (DP, 5.66, a Scriptural quotation), institutum (CBP, 1.17), mos (DP, 1.5), opus (CBS, 1.15), praeceptum (CBS, 3.VIII.2), and secta (CBP, 3.XVI.3).

In addition secundum governing a quod clause occurs three times at CBP, 5.6 and 7.XIV.4, and CEX, XVI.14; this usage is classical but rare. It is noteworthy that all these instances are found only in technical Christian works.

**Sine**

This preposition is found in Martin thirty-two times. All instances accord with classical usage, though there are several examples of the sense of sine in place of a negative adjective, a usage which was rare in classical prose but common in poetry, e.g., SPA, 7.6, sine sollicitudine eris, and DI, 3.16, si vero sine viribus est.

**Sub**

The classical local significance occurs in Martin but once, at DCR, 3.7, in aere isto qui est sub caelo. Another classical connotation is the designation of subordination; this is found in Old Latin also, but is not frequent before

---
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the Silver period. Martin has three instances:

PRI, 6.119, velut infelix mancipium sub avara domina; DCR, 13.12, crucifixus est a Iudaeis sub iudice Filio Pontio; and 15.15, passus sub Pontio Pilato.

A use of *sub* to express under what condition, pretext, or legal title something occurred is found in Ovid and Sallust, then in Silver and Late writers. Martin has ten instances of this modal use: CBP, 3.5, 3.XVII.4; CBS, 3.VI.6; DCR, 9.14 and 19.1; DTM, 3.35, 45, 47, and 4.53; IB, 11.

Instrumental *sub* is a Late Latin development of the modal use. Martin has three examples:

SPA, 109.45, mortuus sub peccatis meis; 109.47, operarius est universae iustitiae sub gratia et virtute Domini nostri Iesu Christi; CEX, XXIII.8, publicam poenitentiam sub cilicio gerens.

*Super*124

This preposition appears in its classical local sense seven times in Martin's writings: SPA, 79.1, 109.19-20; EH, 3.47; CEX, LXVIII.tit and 1; DI, 1.9; and DCR, 16.9. It appears also in a Christian extension of the local sense twice: SPA, 50.2, et spiritum Dei super eum requiescentem; and EH, 5.90-91, a Scriptural quotation, super quem . . . requiescat spiritus meus, nisi super humilem et trementem mea verba.

Two distinctly Christian usages are *super* as equivalent contra and as equivalent to *plus quam*. Martin has the

first twice, at SPA, 36.5, a Scriptural quotation, et ego
vindicabo super inimicos meos, and 43.2, et exiens super eos
conside illos. He has the second once, at SPA, 5.3, ne
velis aliquod super quod valet vendere.

A very rare usage, but one which is classical, is the
sense "beyond." It appears at DP, 5.79, sed non sine causa
maiores nostri super VIII Kal. Apr. tres dies addiderunt.

Supra

This preposition occurs once in Martin. The usage is
strictly classical: DI, 8.12, cupit enim exilire ira . . .
et si paululum illi extra nos eminere licuit, supra nos est.

The Pronoun

The two parts of speech which show the greatest
syntactical development in the Late Latin period, especially
in Christian writers, are the preposition, which has just
been examined, and the pronoun. The traditional or modern
style of an author can be fairly accurately gauged by his
usage in these two areas; for both were under heavy influence
of the archaistic and poetic prose of the secular literary
theories, promulgated in the rhetorical schools, and of the
Vulgar and exotically-flavored prose of the Christian writers
which had come to be elevated into literary acceptance
through the triumph of Christianity and the resultant weight
of Church authority. All of these influences working

125LS, 1816; Bieter, 114; Brown, 71.
together produced a pronoun syntax, wholly Latin or nearly so, but distinctly different from the classical. Let us see, then, to what extent Martin reflects the modern pronoun syntax.

The personal pronoun

The nominative of the personal pronoun was not generally expressed in classical Latin except for a strong emphasis or to provide a contrast. As a result the nominative is relatively infrequent in classical writings. Vulgar Latin, on the other hand, was much freer with the nominative; this can be explained in several ways, but very important, it seems to me, was the emotional quality which expression of the pronoun effected. Late Latin, and Christian writers in particular, were much influenced by this popular usage. Martin's practice was as follows:

1. Ego: This form follows the classical norms of emphasis or contrast in seven instances: SPA, 5.5, 54.4, a Scriptural quotation, 61.8, 72.2; IDS, 8.165; EH, 4.70; and FVH, 1.10. It is expressed where classical Latin might have omitted it nine times: SPA, 9.16, 22.3, 6, and 7, 36.5, a Scriptural quotation, 40.3, 46.3, a Scriptural quotation, 49.5, and DCR, 18.12, a Scriptural quotation; DTM, 2.18 and 21 (this is perhaps softened by the preceding sed nam et).

In two additional occurrences, SPA, 107.2 and 109.44, there is a certain contrast, although probably too weak a one by classical standards. All eleven variations from classical norms occur in Christian writings, nine of them in the popular SPA and DCR. In the three instances where *ego* is expressed in the more literary works it follows classical usage.

2. *Nos*: This form occurs only ten times. It is classical, expressing contrast, at CBS, 3.IV.5 and DCR, 18.26 and 32. At DCR, 19.1, *ecce* calls for the *nos*; and at DTM, 2.44 and 4.66, it follows *sic* *ut* in a comparison. It is expressed where classical Latin might have omitted it at SPA, 9.11, 44.5, 82.1; and DTM, 3.33 (where it is preceded by *sed nam* *et*). In all its usages, *nos* occurs only in Martin's Christian writings.

3. *Tu*: Martin adheres to classical usage at SPA, 6.4, 18.8; EH, 6.48 and 8.150; DI, 8.25; DCR, 15.6; and FVH, 4.34. He adheres to Late usage at SPA, 6.5, 19.7, 53.2, 107.3; PRI, 3.64, a Scriptural quotation; CBS, 2.31, a Scriptural quotation; DI, 10.11 (where Seneca, *De Ira*, III, 39.4, has no pronoun); and DCR, 17.5. Every deviation occurs in a Christian *locus* except for the one in the DI; here Martin has switched persons and probably inserts *tu* for absolute clarity. Otherwise in literary works he maintains the classical standards.
4. Vos: This occurs only once in a Scriptural quotation at PRI, 3.64, in a non-classical usage.

By works this breaks down as follows: twenty-four in the SPA; four in the moral essays, one in a Scriptural quotation; two in the CBS, one in a Scriptural quotation; two in the DI; six in the DCR; two in the FVH; and five in the DTM. The predominance in the SPA suggests that the emotional flavor of the pronoun played a strong role in Martin's decision to use it where it was strictly unnecessary—a stylistic device permitted in Vulgar, popular writing.

The reflexive pronoun and adjective

In classical Latin the genitive sui occasionally was used to replace the possessive adjective suus: in Late Latin this usage became more frequent and was extended to the other persons, to mei, tui, etc., for meus, tuus, etc. There is only one instance of this usage in Martin, CEX, III.5, qui autem non venerit praesentiam sui per epistolas suas faciat.

Also in Late Latin suus was sometimes used for eius and eius for suus. Martin here is very conservative and careful. There are only two instances of suus for eius: CBP, 3.9, ut quisquis clericus . . . de corpore abscidatur catholicae ecclesiae, ne aut societates eius maculam suae pravitatis recte credentibus ingerant; and CEX, XLVII.2, si

quis servum alienum causa religionis doceat contemnere
dominum suum et recedere a servitio eius. And there is but
one instance of eius for suus: EH, 7.122, haec sola (i.e.
humilitas) in plano est, et quamvis humilior aliis videatur,
caelo tamen est altior, quia in regno eius hominem non
ascendendo, sed descendendo perducit. To give some idea of
the exceeding rarity of these vulgar usages, eius is cor-
rectly used in Martin sixty-three times, and suus much more.

Martin's purity is also reflected by the fact that
although the third person reflexive occurs in his writings
171 times, it is never used in place of the simple personal
pronoun. This is a common feature of sixth century Latin,
drawn from Vulgar usage, that Martin completely avoids.

In classical Latin the adjective proprius is used to
stress with emphasis the idea of possession; but in Late
Latin it has so weakened that it is no more than an equivalent
of meus, tuus, suus, etc. The adjective occurs thirty-one
times in Martin; in thirteen instances it accords with
classical usage; but otherwise it has the weakened Late
force. Examples of the latter are:

SPA, 39.10-11, . . . tota hoc virtute custodi, ut
non statuas propriam voluntatem, et habebis requiem; IDS,
5.60, non hoc beneficio creatoris sui, sed propria virtute,
se credidit obtinere (perhaps it is here used for variety);
CBP, 8.17, proprius unusquisque his gestis manu subscribat;
CEX, VI.1, episcopus a propria parochia non licet transire
in aliam; DI, 3.7, ira ex proprio libito iudicat (Seneca,
De Ira, I, 17.7, reads simply ex libidinie iudicat).
Reciprocal expressions vary in different periods of the Latin language. The normal classical way was *inter se*, *nos*, or *vos*; Martin has *inter se* at CBP, 1.12 and 2.16, and *inter nos* at CBP, 1.22, 5.12, and 16, and 7.7. He also employs the following expressions:

*invicem*: *ad invicem* at SPA, 9.4, and *ab invicem* at PRI, 3.65, in a Scriptural quotation. This usage began as early as Livy; the addition of a preposition is a Late feature, however.

*alterutrer*: *ad alterutrum* at SPA, 19.2 and 48.3; *alterutrum* at EH, 1.7; *de visione alterutra* at CBS, 1.10.

The adverbial usage is rare in Silver Latin and frequent in Late Latin; the pronominal usage is found only in Christian writers.

*uterque*: in *utrlsque* at SPA, 9.25; *utrimque* at DI, 8.26. The first occurs in Old Latin; the second is a Late Latin development.

*mutuus*: *mutuae conlationis adloqulo frueremur* at DI, 1.1. The usage is poetic and Silver.

*unus ad alterum*: SPA, 48.2. The combination of *unus* and *alter* already occurs in Old Latin; this form of the expression is cited, however, only for Christian authors.

The demonstrative pronoun and adjective

*is*, *ea*, *id* was always the weakest of the Latin demonstratives. In the Vulgar Latin of the Empire it began to lose ground, particularly in the monosyllabic forms and the nominatives; it was often replaced by *hic*, *ille*, *iste*, and *ipse*. Late writers, and Christian writers especially,
elevated these usages to the literary level. In Martin of Braga, although it is sometimes replaced by other pronouns, \textit{is} fairly well holds its own; for it occurs more than 325 times, in all of the writings except the poems.

Of the six nominatives, \textit{ea} feminine, \textit{ea}e, and \textit{ei} do not appear in Martin. \textit{Is} occurs at CBP, 8.12, where it is qualified by a \textit{qui} relative clause, a formulaic phrase. \textit{Ea} neuter occurs fourteen times, but always modified by a \textit{quae} relative clause, also formulaic. \textit{Id} is found as follows:

- nominative singular: \textit{id}, six times; \textit{id quod}, three times.
- accusative singular: \textit{id}, six times; \textit{id quod}, five times.
- the phrase \textit{id est}, a formula, twenty-four times.

Löfstedt points out that \textit{id est}, a favorite phrase in Christian writers, held \textit{id} from the same decay that affected the other forms of the nominative; certainly \textit{id est} is a strong phrase in Martin. However, the phrase is not found in the purely literary works, the DI, FVH, and the poems; but simple \textit{id}, once, and \textit{id quod}, four times in the accusative, are not frequent there either. Consequently it is likely that no real literary significance can be attached to the occurrence of \textit{id est} in Martin, and that he is in accord with Late practice in his use of \textit{is}, \textit{ea}, \textit{id}.

\textit{Hic} in classical Latin was the first person demonstrative; it indicated an object near the speaker in place, time, or thought. In colloquial expression it was often used with \textit{ego}, \textit{meus}, \textit{noster}. Already in Old Latin it had
begun to be confused with is; but the classical purists avoided any such confusion. Then in Silver Latin hic started to acquire the functions of other pronouns; and then it occurred with much greater freedom in Late Latin until it came to be used interchangeably with other pronouns and lost its distinctive meaning.

Martin's use of hic is rather conservative for his age. He uses it more than 250 times in accordance with its classical meaning; the only non-classical feature is the great frequency, but this is more a stylistic than syntactical point, though he is much more restrained in the literary than the popular writings. Hic for is occurs some thirty times, almost entirely in the hic qui construction. For example:

CBP, 7.XV.1, Item placuit ut hi qui . . .; CBS, 3.VII.2, episcopus . . . hoc praecipiat, ut hi qui . . .; CEX, XV.8, nihil eos latere possit ex his quae . . .; XLIX.2, oporter autem in his diebus ut hi qui . . .; FVH, 1.15, sed generaliter his conscripti qui . . .

The use of hoc as equivalent to idem is rare in Martin and restricted to the hoc quod combination. The following instances occur:

PRI, 2.36-37, iudices hoc sibi quaerunt referri quod regibus. Reges hoc se somniant posse quod Deus; EH, 2.33, in quibus hoc tibi dicitur quod et Deo.

The Silver and Late usage of post haec and post hoc for postea occurs in Martin as follows: post haec at IDS, 5.51 and 61, and FVH, 5.1; post hoc at CBP, 4.4.
Ille in classical Latin was the third person demonstrative, expressing what was removed in place, time, or thought. In Old Latin it occasionally replaced is; but, as with hic, classical authors maintained the distinction very carefully. Silver Latinity again revived the Old usage and increased its use; then Late Latin used it very frequently and so extensively that, like hic, it became rather confused in meaning.

Martin tends to be Late in his usage of ille. The strict significance occurs over 100 times; but ille as the equivalent of is also occurs over 100 times. The only distinction occurs in the DI where it always appear in its classical connotation and never in the weakened sense; in the FVH, however, the two senses are about equal in occurrence, and this is true for the moral essays also. The pronoun does not occur in the poems. It might be noted, although it is an easy surmise, that this confusion often leads to confusion, as at DCR, 3.5-6 (unus angelus) non dedit honorem deo creatori suo, sed similem se illi dixit; et pro hac superbia cum aliis plurimis angelis qui illi consenserunt de illa caelesti dede . . . delectus est. The first illi refers to deus, the second to angelus, and the illa to neither but serves practically as an article.

Ille for hic occurs infrequently in Martin. This is often a difficult distinction to make since the sense in many cases would allow ille even when hic might be more
classical. Examples occur at SPA, 3.6, Quod si volueris
haec in corde discutere, sine mora noxietatem eorum senties
... sed magis repelle illa; SPA, 9.13, multum autem illis
compellentibus, et illo non acquiescente; PRI, 3.68, unde
etiam et illud ... dicit, followed by a quotation.

This confusion, of course, destroyed the correlative
forms of hic - ille. This combination had begun to lose its
strict contrast even in the classical period, and Silver
Latin played free and easy with it. Martin has the following
combinations:

*illé-hic*: IDS, 6.78. Classical.
*illé-illé*: SPA, 9.13. Rare classical; frequent
Silver.
*illé-iste*: SPA, 14.7; FWH, 2.34 and 41. Late Latin,
material.
*illé-idem*: DP, 2.22. Not cited in the source
material.
*illé-unus*: SPA, 9.28. Not cited in the source
material.

*Iste* in classical Latin was of infrequent occurrence;
it either served as a second person demonstrative or was
used to express a strong emotional tone toward the person
addressed or discussed. In Late Latin it lost this strong
force and became much confused. Martin mirrors Late usage.
The word occurs forty-three times, hence rather frequently.
It does carry classical connotations, e.g., SPA, 56.3, CEX,
10.2, DI, 7.19, DCR, 12.2. It is used for *illé*, e.g., SPA,
8.7 and 35.5, DCR, 15.11. It replaces *hic*, e.g., SPA, 72.2
(*iste mundus* for *hic mundus* is a Christian formula), 77.2,
DCR, 5.2, FVH, 2.34 and 41. It is used where classical Latin would have *is* twice: SPA, 14.7 and CBP, 7.III.4.

*Idem* has a strong significance of identity in classical Latin which is weakened considerably by Late authors. It occurs in Martin twenty-nine times, twenty-eight of these expressing identity in the classical manner. At DP, 2.22, it seems to be equivalent to *hic*: *ut qui dies illa tristitiae fuerat, idem laetitiae redderetur*. Two interesting uses: CBP, 7.I.1, unus et idem psallendi ordo, and CEX, XXXVI.5, hoc idem.

*Ipse* in classical Latin was an intensive pronoun and not a demonstrative; in Late Latin it had lost much of its force and was freely substituted for demonstratives. Hence it perhaps best to treat of it here. Martin has the word about 170 times; over half of these occurrences are intensifying in the classical manner. The other instances to a certain extent reflect Late usage.

*Ipse* is substituted for *ille* rarely in Martin; this is a usage which is found in Late Latin authors with varying frequency. The occurrences in Martin are:

SPA, 8.4, a Scriptural quotation, *vivo ego, dicit Dominus, ipsi salvi erunt*; CBP, 2.6, in *ipsa extremitate mundi et in ultimis huius provinciae regionibus*; CBP, 6.6, quia mentio ipsius auctoritatis est habita; 7.VIII.2, nisi signata ipsius episcopi scripta susceperit; CEX, XLIX, Oportet autem in *ipsis diebus*; DI, 6.24, mutum animal est? Ipsum si irasceris, imitaris (*Seneca, De Ira*, 30.2, has *illud*); DCR, 15.2, *considerate quale in ipso baptismo pactum cum deo fecistis*; 18.13, diem dominico ... *in ipso* ...
Ipse has begun to replace *is* already in classical Latin; but the process is not clearly in operation before Curtius and Silver Latin. In Late Latin it is a frequent occurrence. Martin has about thirty-five instances.

Examples:

SPA, 7.4, da illam in ecclesiam clericis, epulabunt ex ipsa; 43.2, est romphaea contra ipsos, et exiens super eos conside illos (probably variety is the ruling principle here; all three pronouns refer to the same adversarii); CBP, 3.XV.4, adoptivas feminas . . . et cum ipsis cohabitant; CBS, 3.IV.2, modicum balsami . . . quia singuli tremisses pro ipso exigi solent; DCR, 3.10, alii angeli . . . cum ipso de caelo proiecti sunt.

**Ipse** for *idem*, in referring to a person or object previously mentioned, occurs in Old and Silver Latin occasionally. Martin has only three instances:

DCR, 17.16, sed de praeteritis peccatis indulgentiam petat, et de futuro caveat ne ad ipsa iterum revolvatur; DP, 2.30, quarta decima luna agnus . . . immolaretur . . . atque in ipsa nocte; 8.25, die Dominica . . . propter quod in ipsa Dominus resurrexit.

All of the usages of *ipse* so far discussed are found only three times in literary works, twice in the EH in Scriptural quotations and once in the DI where Martin changed the Senecan phrasing. It appears that Martin is conscious that literary language is based on traditional usages, stemming from different periods which gave them their auctoritas; by and large he strives to adhere as closely as possible to the usage established by the classical and Silver writers in his literary works, though modern usages creek in and he never sacrifices absolute clarity for tradition.
In classical Latin ipse began to be used as an emphatic reflexive, sometimes in conjunction with other reflexives which it strengthened. In Silver Latin ipse is made a non-emphatic reflexive, in the nominative or any oblique case. Late Latin has all these uses, frequently and freely. Martin has the following, neglecting the classical use of the nominative which were included in the normal uses above:

nos ipsos: SPA, 9.5, 41.4, 82.3.

sibi ipsi: SPA, 47.2.

te ipsum or ipso: SPA, 67.1, 109.26 and 29 (temetipsam).

sibi ipsi: CBP, 7.XVI.1.

se ipsum, ipsam, ipsos, ipso, ipsa, ipsis: SPA, 1.2-3, 22.3 and 4, 32.3 (semet ipso), 35.2, 39.5-7 (three times), 54.2, 60.4, 63.1, 89.1, 110.6, 7, and 11 (all three in a bracketed passage); PRI, 3.56 (semetipsis); IDS, 8.111 (sesetipso); CBP, 7.XV.3-4; 7.XVI.tkt.; DI, 3.28 (semetipsam).

non-emphatic reflexive: SPA, 89.1; IDS, 7.85; DCR, 3.3 and 7.5.

There are also a few instances of ipse strengthening other pronouns; but this accords with classical practice.

At IDS, 7.37, appears eos ipsos; At SPA, 106.4, CEX, XVII.5, DI, 3.13 and 15, hoc ipsum; and at PRI, 6.119, eidem ipsi.

Indefinite pronouns and adjectives

After particles like si, nisi, and ne, classical Latin employed the indefinite quis; it used aliquis only for

emphasis. Late writers, however, used *aliquis* whether emphasis was required or not. Martin's usage is as follows:

*si quis*: This occurs ninety-six times, e.g., SPA, 14.4, PRI, 2.27; IDS, 7.83, EH, 2.24; CBP, 1.20; CBS, 2.21; CEX, V.1; DI, 9.2; DCR, 18.15; FVH, 10.1; DTM, 5.72.

*si aliquis unemphatic*: PRI, 5.96 and 104.

*si . . . quis*: SPA, 57.3; DI, 10.6.

*si . . . aliquis*: EH, 1.5; CBS, 3.V.3, 3.VII.4; CEX, III.9, XVI.4, XXXIV.1, LXXVIII.3, LXXXI.10, LXXXIV.4; FVH, 4.44.

*ne quis*: CBP, 2.4; DI, 8.1.

*ne . . . aliquis*: IDS, 1.10 and 2.37.

*nisi quis*: PRI, 6.117.

*nisi . . . aliquis*: SPA, 5.3.

*ut quis*: SPA, 14.3, a Scriptural quotation.

*ut aliquis*: CBP, 1.25.

*ut . . . aliquis*: EH, 5.98; CEX, 7 and 16; DTM, 5.69.

*etsi aliquis*: DI, 8.16.

*num . . . aliqui*: DI, 8.18.

*Aliquis* used where classical Latin would use *quisquam* occurs at SPA, 18.3-4, 109.32, 37, and 46, 110.5, a bracketed passage, and CEX, XLIX.2. *Quisquam* itself is correctly employed according to classical standards at FVH, 4.21, 31, and 49. There is a neat distinction into non-literary and literary usage here.

There is one instance of the Late substitution of *aliquis* for *ullus* after *sine*, at CEX, XXIV.1, *si quis* pres-
byter aut diaconus sine aliqua examinatione ordinati sunt.
Ullus occurs once in this construction: CBS, 2.28, sine
ulla cunctatione.

Quis indefinite occurs without any preceding particle, all by itself, at SPA, 35.2 and 4, 58.2, 74.1, and
CEX, 15.

The remaining indefinites occur in the normal classical usages as follows:

qualscumque: twice in the FVH, a literary usage.

quicumque: twenty-six times in SPA, PRI, IDS, EH,
CBP, CBS, CEX, DI, DCR, FVH, DP.

guidam: thirty-nine times in SPA, PRI, EH, CBP,
CBS, CEX, DI, FVH, DTM.

guilibet: Fifteen times in SPA, EH, CBP, CEX, DCR,
FVH.

quisque: Six times in CBP, CBS, DI, IR.

quisquis: Eighteen times in PRI, IDS, EH, CBP,
CBS, DI, DCR, FVH, IR.

quivis: Five times in SPA, PRI, EH.

unquisquisque: Twenty-two times in SPA, CBP, CBS,
CEX, DI, DCR.

uterque: Eight times in SPA, PRI, IDS, CBS, DI.

There is nothing particularly unusual about Martin's use of the indefinite. He follows his normal practice, adhering to traditional usage with some modernity in the literary works,

130 The one unusual feature that I noted was the use of guidam in a series with alius and alter at PRI, 3.51.

131 There is a plural, quique, at DI, 9.9, where Seneca, De Ira, II, 24.4, reads quoque.
but being more modern in the popular and Christian works.

In Late Latin *alius* and *alter* came to lose their strict distinction and became confused. Martin uses *alius* 130 times and *alter* twenty-one times. He uses *alius* in its classical meaning everywhere except at SPA, 9.3, perhaps 107.1; EH, 4.69 and 79; CBP, 7.VII.2; perhaps CBS, 3.I.10 and 17; CEX, VIII.1; DCR, 13.23 and 17.18, where it is used for *alter*. *Alter* has its own meaning except at SPA, 18.5, CBP, 3.VIII.tit. and 1, and CEX, XLIII.tit. and 1, where it is used for *alius*.

In combinations, Martin has the following:

*alius*-*alius*: PRI, 1.4-9, 4.82-83; EH, 3.45-46; CEX, VII.2, XIII.3, LXXXIV.2-3; DI, 4.-46 and 12-13, 5.19-20, 6.1-2, 3-4, and 10; DCR, 6.5 and 7.7-17; and FVH, 7.5.

*alius*-*alter*: CEX, 7.

*alter*-*alter*: DI, 10.12-16.

*alius*-quidam-*alter*: PRI, 3.50-53.

The use of *nullus* as a substantive for *nemo* is a Vulgar usage which was elevated to literary acceptability in some Silver and numerous Late Latin writers. Martin has the following:

*nemo*: SPA, 14.2, a Scriptural quotation; IDS, 4.44; EH, 4.81; DI, 8.16 and 9.11; FVH, 4.54.

*nemin*<sub>i</sub>: EH, 1.8 and FVH, 4.59.

*neminem*: SPA, 39.3; PRI, 2.42; FVH, 3.8 and 9.
nullus: PRI, 3.60; EH, 5.96; CBP, 7.V.1, 7.XV.2, 7.XXII.2; CBS, 3.II.1, 3.VI.5, 3.VII.tit., and 3.IX.7.

nulli: FVH, 5.8.

nullum: SPA, 39.3, where it is combined with neminem, 91.1.

It is interesting to note that only one instance, nulli for nemini, appears in a literary work, though there are two instances in the Christian literary moral essays.

The Adjective and Adverb

In this section only a few points of adjectival and adverbial syntax will be discussed. All matters relating to vocabulary, eg., new adverb formations, will be treated in the next chapter. Those points of syntax have been chosen which most aptly reveal Late Latin usage.

There had been a substantivization of the adjective, both in the masculine and the neuter, throughout the history of the Latin language. In the classical period this was restricted somewhat to words like boni, mali, multi, adolescens, infans, sapiens, juvenis, amicus, inimicus, multa, paucia, and so on; Martin has numerous instances of such classical substantive usages. But Late Latin and Christian Latin, as they do so often, greatly extended this construction. Martin has the following adjectives not used substantively in classical Latin:

---

altissimus (i.e., Deus): IDS, 5.63 and 69, Scriptural quotations. Christian.

Catholicus: CBP, 4.2 and DTM, 4.64. Christian. At DTM, 3.41, appears Catholicae for the "Church."

Christianus: CEX, LXIX.tit. and 1, LXXI.tit., LXXII. tit. and 1; DCR, 16.20. Silver. Elsewhere it appears as an adjective, twice modifying homo, DCR, 11.3 and 18.21.

defunctus: CBP, 3.XVI.4, 7.XVIII.tit., 1, and 5; CEX, LXVIII.4, LXIX.1. Poetic and Silver.


futurum: DCR, 17.16 and FVH, 2.39. Silver. But futura at IDS, 1.10, DCR, 12.10, FVH, 2.20 and 38, is classical.

immunda, neut, pl.: SPA, 29.3 and 5. Christian, though there is an analogous Ciceronian usage, immundae, unclean women.

nullus: This was discussed in the previous section.


proximus: This occurs sixteen times in SPA and at PRI, 6.118. Silver.

quadragesima, fem. sing.: This occurs ten times in the SPA, CBP, CBS, and CEX. Christian.


septimana, fem. sing.: SPA, 17.2; CBP, 7.XXI.5; CEX, XLIX.tit. and 1, XLIX.3, L1; DCR, 9.9. Christian.

solidus: CBS, 3.II.tit. and 2. Late Latin.

transitoria, neut. pl.: SPA, 29.3. Christian.

There are a few others on the model of immunda and transitoria, which are cited above as examples; a complete list is not made because the principle was so commonly applied that any adjective at all could be so employed.
The use of an adjective form in the place of the genitive of a noun occurred in classical Latin only with proper adjectives and adjectives denoting professions, e.g., Pompeianus and militaris. But Vulgar Latin did not adhere to this restriction; and Late and Christian Latin, under strong Vulgar influence, also abandoned the purist limitation and extended the usage widely. Martin has it both with proper adjectives, e.g., Bracarensis, CBP, 1.4, and common ones. Only the latter are noted here:

- **angelicus**: DCR, 5.1, post istam ruinam angelicam.
- **apostolicus**: CBP, 1.13, secundum doctrinam apostolicam; the adjective occurs fifteen additional times in PRI, EH, CBP, CBS, CEX, and DTM, often with a purely adjectival force.
- **caelestis**: IDS, 6.77, in hoc et caelestis et terrena cecidit creatura. Also at CBP, 3VI.1; DCR, 3.1 and 7, 4.3.
- **canonicus**: CBP, t.XII.tit. De canonicit. scripturis. Also at SPA, 29.4; CBP, 7.XII.1; CEX, LXVII.2.
- **carnalis**: SPA, 70.1, omnis carnalis delectatio; 71.1, pro carnali necessitatic. Also at IDS, 10.131; CEX, XXI.6.
- **clericalis**: CBP, 1.20, officium ... clericale; and 4.6.
- **diabolicus**: DCR, 16.26, diabolicas incantationes.
- **dominicus**: CEX, LVII.2, die dominica. The adjective occurs in thirty other places in the EH, CBP, CEX, DCR, and DP.
- **episcopalis**: CBS, 3.15, episcopalis officii.
- **evangelicus**: EH, 3.51, evangelica illa gest; CBS, 3.IX.6, post lectionem evangelicam. Also at IB,1.
metropolitanus: CBP, 1.3, in metropolitana . . .

This adjective occurs another twenty-one times in the CBP, CBS, CEX, and DTM.

monachalis: SPA, 49.6, schematis monachalis, and 61.7, monachile opus.

parachialis: CBS, 3.II.4, in ecclesiis parochialibus, and 7; parochiales clerici.

paschalis: CBP, 3XVI.1, quinta feria paschali; DTM, 3.32, in ipsa Paschali festivitate.

sacerdotalis: CBP, 1.9, sacerdotalem . . .

It should be noted that all of these occur in Christian writings; the secular literary works do not show a single example.

Vulgar Latin had early begun to lose the strictness of meaning in the comparison of adjectives. Christian Latin and some times Late Latin show this trait. Martin does too. Sometimes the comparative serves its true function; but often it signifies no real comparison, but either indicates a kind of modification of the positive, a usage that is itself classical, e.g., tepidior at DI, 7.3, or curiosius at DTM, 2.24, or, somewhat more often, it is little more than an equivalent of the positive, e.g., attentius at IDS, 1.11; frequentius at DCR, 12.3; laetior at FVH, 4.37; occultius at DI, 10.8; saepius, EH, 6.115. The superlative usually exhibits a true superlative force, though at times it hardly seems necessary to the sense, e.g., PRI, 3.51, quidam panno vilissimo gloriantur; IDS, 9.119, subtilissima humanarum laudum delectatione succrescens; DTM, 3.47, sicut
verissime credimus. There is a peculiarly Late usage of the superlative as a title, a polite exaggeration that became fixed in official etiquette. Martin has the following instances:

- **beatissimus**: CBP, 2.11 and 24, 5.23, 7.V.4; CEX, 1; DI, 1; DCR, 1; DTM, 1 and 2.22.
- **benignissimus**: DTM, 1.7.
- **clementissimus**: FVH, 1.1.
- **desiderantissimus**: DI, 1; DCR, 1.
- **dilectissimus**: DCRm 17.1.
- **gloriesissimus**: CBP, 1.3 and 15; FVH, 1.
- **piissimus**: DBF, 1.15.
- **reverentissimus**: DTM, 1.
- **sacratissimus**: DTM, 1.10.
- **tranquillissimus**: FVH, 1.

Combinations of different degrees in a single phrase are rare in Martin, that is, rare for a sixth century author. He has the following instances:

- **Positive and Superlative**: PRI, 5.97, eruditus aut eloquentissimus appellatur; DCR, 18.2, per nos humillimos et exiguos; FVH, 4.64, . . . credulus . . . oppositissimus . . . tardus . . . pronus . . . firmus . . .

- **Positive and Comparative**: DI, 2.4, crebro et vehementius . . . quatitur . . .

- **Comparative and Superlative**: IDS, 9.120, deterrimum illum et crudeliorum superbiae . . . partum.

Irregularities in comparison, excluding new forms which are not treated, are few in Martin. These are the only ones noted:

- **With magis**: PRI, 2.20, magis delectabilius; DI, 9.16, magis gravius.

- **With satis**: IDS, 9.115, satis manifestissime.
The Co-ordinating Conjunction

In this section only the co-ordinating conjunction is considered; the subordinating conjunction can be best discussed in the section on verb syntax since the major point of syntax which it involves concerns the moods that occur in its clauses. Martin's usage of the co-ordinating conjunction, then, is as follows.

Copulative and disjunctive conjunctions

The conjunction *et* is probably the most frequently occurring word in Martin's works; it is found at least 1010 times. This great frequency is a decidedly Vulgar mark of style, giving a strong feeling of paratactical structure to the writing even though Martin has the normal hypotactical literary style. Often the conjunction appears several times within a few lines, as at DCR, 7.4-13, where *et* occurs ten times. This frequency is general, occurring in all of Martin's writings and not just the popular ones.

For the most part *et* is simply co-ordinate, joining words, phrases, and clauses. Its use at the beginning of a sentence seems to be colloquial; in Christian writers this usage undoubtedly received sanction because of its use in Scripture. Martin has this *et* forty-two times in the following writings: six in the SPA, three in the PRI, two in
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the IDS, four in the EH, five in the CBS, three in the CEX, thirteen in the DCR, four in the FVH, and two in the DTM. It is difficult to draw any conclusions from these figures, though it should be noted that there are no occurrences in the literary DI, but thirteen, the highest number in any one work, almost one-third of the total number of instances, in the popular DCR. Examples of this usage:

SPA, 13.1, . . . dicentem: Et tu loqueris? Et dimitens agrum fugit; EH, 1.5, et si forte dure aliquid videor loqui; CBS, 2.25, Et primum, si placet; DCR, 6.2, Et cum coepisset multitudo; FVH, 4.48, Et errori facile veniam dato; DTM, 3.36, Et ipsum librum . . . invenies.

Et in the meaning of etiam occurred in Old Latin occasionally in dialogue; it then is found in Cicero occasionally, also in dialogue, and with a few adversative conjunctions. With Livy the usage expanded considerably, and was used extensively in Silver and Late Latin. Martin has some sixty-five instances, e.g., SPA, 30.7, Sic est et anima, si lacrimas diligat; EH, 3.44 a quibus et caelum est pigneratum; IDS, 8.96, tantum . . . quantum et maior est qui superbit; EH, 2.33, hoc tibi dicitur quod et Deo; DI, 2.14, tanto et manifestius exardescit. However, most of these occur in phrases introduced by a conjunction or adverb, as follows:

dum et: CBP, 7.XX.5 and DTM, 1.5.

ergo et: EH, 6.11. Classical.

ita et: SPA, 42.2, 90.2, 108.2; and DCR, 11.7.
nam et: SPA, 33.4; CBP, 7.XVII.3, 7.XIX.3; DTM, 2.20 and 3.33. Classical.

postremo et: PRI, 6.115.

quamvis et: IDS, 7.83 and EH, 5.86.

quia et: DI, 6.4 and DP, 2.15, a Scriptural quotation; and unde quia et at CBP, 2.18.

sed et: SPA, 107.4; EH, 1.7 and 4.72. Classical.

sicut et: CBP, 7.VIII.2, 7.XII.3, 7.XIII.3; DCR, 10.6; FVH, 2.15; and DP, 1.8. Classical.

similiter et: EH, 8.141; CBP, 7.XVI.5; CBS, 3.II.7; CEX, 15, XXI.2, XXV.5, XXXII.6, XLIII.3, LVII.tit. and 3; DCR, 3.9, 10.1, 16.28; and DTM, 3.39. Classical.

simul et: CEX, 8 and DCR, 18.32. Classical.

siguïdem et: DTM, 1.8.

ubi et: EH, 5.88.

unde et: IDS, 4.49 and DP, 6.91; and unde etiam et at PRI, 3.67 and IDS, 8.99.

The particle -que disappeared from the Vulgar speech rather early and became a strictly literary form. Martin has it twice in the PRI, five times in the IDS, nineteen times in the DI, eight times in the FVH, four times in the IB, and once each in the EH, CBP, CBS, CEX, DCR (but in the literary opening paragraph here), DTM, IR, and EE. Martin, thus, regards the word as literary and generally avoids it in the non-literary writings. In certain instances it appears to be used for variety, to avoid repetition of et rather than for the tightness it provides to the idea expressed: IDS, 1.2, 9.128; CBP, 1.5; CEX, 8; DI, 1.9, 2.13,
3.6, 5.8, and 8.15; FVH, 6.10. In the poems the use is clearly metri causa.

The conjunctions ac and atque both appear in Martin. Ac occurs nineteen times in the PRI, IDS, EH, CBP, CBS, DI, DCR, FVH, and DTM; it always precedes a consonant except at PRI, 4.82. It is used to join together words except at IDS, 2.20 where it is part of the phrase ac si and at DTM, 4.52, where it begins the sentence. Atque is found twenty-four times in the PRI, EH, CBP, CBS, CEX, DI, FVH, and DP; it appears before vowels in all instances except CBP, 1.15 and 3.V II.4, CVS, 3.I.1, the title of the CEX, and FVH, 7.3 and 16.4. Atque forms part of three set phrases in Martin:

- **atque ita**: PRI, 2.37, 3.58; EH, 2.27; DI, 2.10, 5.20; FVH, 4.12, 5.22; and DP, 5.67.
- **hinc atque inde**: EH, 2.31.
- **unus atque idem**: CBP, 7.I.1.

In general -que, ac, and atque serve their classical functions. Thus -que joins together two words closely related into a tight unit, as at DI, 5.6, vitium suspectum notumque sit nobis. Atque and ac can give a little more emphasis than et, as in the phrase above unus atque idem or at DI, 2.10, horribilis ira depravat se atque intumescit, or at FVH, 1, gloriosissimo ac tranquillissimo. But, as pointed out in the discussion of -que, sometimes variety seems to be the criterion of choice. At any rate, the use of these conjunctions with such frequency is the mark of a literary
style, inasmuch as all three were little used in Vulgar writers.

Neque and nec both appear in Martin, apparently without any systematic principle of choice since both appear many times before both consonants and vowels. Neque occurs fifty-nine times, nec eighty-five times. The two words appear to be more literary than non-literary even though they are found in both types of works; for example, the DI and FVH have sixty-two instances, but the SPA and DCR, which are several pages longer, have only eighteen. For the most part, the classical meaning et non is used. The non-classical connotations, all of which arise in literary usage in the Silver period are:

nec as the equivalent of ne . . . quidem: CEX, XXV.4 and FVH, 2.26.
	nec as the equivalent of etiam non: CBP, 3.XIV.3 and 8.11; CBS, 3.X7; CSX, XV.9, LXI.1, LXXIV.2; DI, 3.4 and 27 (nam nec); DP, 7.101.

nec . . . quidem: DI, 5.3, 10, and 33.
The phrases nec tamen at PRI, 3.49, and nec enim at PRI, 3.55, EH, 4.70 and 82, are classical.

Necdum for nondum is a Silver usage. It occurs in Martin three times: SPA, 29.4, quia necdum gustavit . . . ; CBP, 7.XX.4, ut quia necdum didicit . . . ; DP, 3.43, in illo tempore . . . necdum mensis . . . computabitur.

Aut and vel by purist standards had distinct functions; aut excluded the alternative while vel gave a choice.
Classical authors generally, though not invariably, maintained the distinction. Late Latin lost it almost entirely and confused the two nearly completely, as the correlative use illustrates. Aut occurs in Martin almost 200 times, either simply affording a choice, as at SPA, 16.1, laesus a fratre aut iniuriatus, or excluding, as at DCR, 14.8, non famis aut sitis, non calor aut frigus, non tenebrae aut nox. That is, in Martin aut can have either its strict meaning or it can be used as the equivalent of vel. There are also two instances of the colloquial aut which is used for et: CBS, 2.13, et . . . et . . . et . . . aut, and CBS, 3.I.13, doceant illos, ut errores fugiant . . . aut quod nolunt sibi fieri non faciant alteri, et ut . . .

Vel is found some 120 times, usually in the classical sense of offering a choice, as at SPA, 45.5 dicere illis: Orate, vel sedete. It is sometimes used in the exclusive sense of aut, e.g., SPA, 106.3, si sunt seniores vel coaetani tui, or DCR, 6.5, lunam vel stellas. It also has the classical connotation "even" or "assuredly" at: SPA, 97.2; PRI, 4.79, 6.116; IDS, 9.117; DCR, 1.6, 2.5, 14.24; and DTM, 3.40. And it has the Late Latin equivalence to et at: SPA, 21.5; CBP, 1.6; CBS, 3.I.10, 3.IX.4; CEX, 2, XXX.6; DCR, 7.1, 8.6, and 18.15. There are also two examples of the use of vel in the sense of saltem, "at least," a usage which is rare in classical Latin, but frequent in Late Latin: CBP, 7.XIV.2, ut quicumque in clero cibo carnium non
utuntur pro amputanda suspicione ... vel olera cocta cum
carnibus totum praegustare cogantur; and DI, 8.9, pugnet
autem unusquisque secum, ut si vincere iram non potest, vel
celare meminerit (Seneca, De Ira, III, 13.1, does not have
this construction).

Sive too lost its strict conditional adversative force
in Late Latin and could be used simply as an alternative to
aut or vel. Martin has sive twenty-five times; as a dis-
junctive at CEX, XVII.4, XXXVII.1-2, LXXVII.3, DI, 3.26 and
5.34, DCR, 13.33-34, FVH, 2.30, and DP, 1.2-3; as the
equivalent of aut or vel at CBP, 3.6, 7.VII.3, CBS, 3.IX.10,
CEX, V.1-2, XXXVII.2, and LXXVII.6.

The correlative combinations of the various co-ordinat-
ing conjunctions occur quite often in Martin:

et - et: twenty-four times in SPA, IDS, EH, CBP,
CBS, DI, DCR, FVH, DTM, and DP, once with three members at
DTM, 5.75-77, and once with four members at DP, 2.37.

neque - neque: fourteen times in EH, CBP, CEX,
FVH, DTM, and DP, three times with three members at EH,
8.147-148, CEX, VI.1-2, and XXXII.1.

nec - nec: twenty-one times in SPA, PRI, CEX, DI,
FVH, and DP, once with three members at FVH, 4.18.

aut - aut: fifty-four times in SPA, PRI, IDS,
CBP, CBS, CEX, DI, DCR, FVH, and DTM, three times with
three members at CBS, 2.3, CEX, LXXII.2, and FVH, 7.6-7,
and three times with four members at CEX, XXVI.2-3, DCR,
8.9-10, and FVH, 2.32.

vel - vel: twelve times in SPA, IDS, CBP, CEX,
and DTM, twice with three members at SPA, 24.1 and CEX,
LXXII.3-4.
Certain mixtures occur, occasioned, of course, by the confusions in meaning; all of these occur either very rarely or not at all in classical prose:

- **et - -que**: FVH, 6.10.
- **et - ac**: CBP, 3.1.2.
- **ac - nec**: FVH, 2.55.

**nec - neque - neque**: SPA, 109.32-24; DCR, 17-7-8;

This could, of course occur in classical prose depending upon the beginning letter of the succeeding words.

- **neque - aut - aut**: CEX, XV.12-14 and LXXIII.2;
- **neque - aut**: DCR, 17.8 and FVH, 8.6.

**aut - vel**: CBP, 3.XV.1 (aut - aut - vel), 7.XVI.1-2

**vel - aut**: CEX, XVI.11, XVIII.6, XXIX.1, XXXVIII.4-5.

- **sive - aut**: CEX, XXXVI.1.
- **vel - sive**: CBP, 3.6.

- **sive - aut - vel**: CEX, XXXVII.3-4.

The classical combination **non solum - sed etiam** developed several variants in Silver and Late Latin. Martin has the following combinations:

- **non solum - sed etiam**: CBP, 1.10-11, 5.4; CBS, 1.10, 3.14, DCR, 7.19, 8.7-8; FVH, 5.9-10. Classical.

- **non solum - sed et**: EH, 4.71-72.

- **non tantum - sed etiam**: PRI, 3.54-55; DI, 5.30. Classical, but rare before Silver Latin.

- **non tantum - sed et**: SPA, 107.4; PRI, 3.59; EH, 8.146; FVH, 10.1-2.

- **nec solum - sed etiam**: PRI, 4.70, 5.93-94; DP, 5.69.
Adversative conjunctions

The adversative conjunctions _sed, vero, at, enimvero, autem, tamen, _and _quin,_ are used by Martin. In most instances his usage is classical. _Sed_ occurs some 169 times, either as a strong contrast standing on its own or, the more usual classical use, contrasting with a previously expressed negative. In five instances, it appears to have the colloquial connotation "and too," at _EH, 2, 18 and 21, CEX, XLVII.3 and LXI.1, and FVH, 5.3._ _Vero_ in classical Latin was a strong emphatic conjunction; in Late Latin, however, it often simply had the force of _autem._ _Vero_ is found forty-four times in Martin's writings; in four instances, _SPA, 42.2 and 3, 61.7, _and _IDS, 10.131, _it seems to have the sense of _autem, _and _in _three _other _instances _it _occurs in _a _second _clause _where _the _first _clause _had _autem, _at _SPA, 9.4 and 10, _and _DP, 8.125. _It _also _appears _in _a _sort _of _correlation _with _quidem, _a _Late _Latin _usage, _at _PRI, 3.57, _and _IDS, 3.26 and 28, _and _with _siquidem _at _EH, 2.20 _and _DI, 5.30._ _Vero_ _follows _si, _a _Ciceronian _usage, _at _CBS, 3.V.4, 3.VII.3, CEX, LXXIX.3, _and _DI, 3.16. _Also _it _joins _with _at _to _form _a _very _strong _adversative _phrase, _at _vero, _a _Ciceronian _construction, _at _PRI, 2.24, _IDS, 7.85, _and _DI, 3.33. _At _by

Itself appears only once, at DI, 6.14. The conjunction enimvero also appears but once, at DI, 5.27.

Autem is used by Martin about 112 times. It has its weaker adversative sense, the classical sense, everywhere except at PRI, 1.16, and CEX, XV.5, where it seems to have the meaning of enim, a usage which all of the grammars and studies of specific authors, which I have used, call Late Latin, but for which only Christian authors are cited. One special point in Martin's usage is a repetition in several succeeding clauses or sentences apparently to help indicate a change of subject, as, for example, at SPA, 49.2-4, Adstans autem discipulus eius dixit ... Ille autem tacens plangebat. Dum autem molestus illi esset discipulus ... Tamen occurs thirty-four times in its classical function except for the si tamen as equivalent to si quidem at CEX, XVI.3 and LXIII.4, a poetic and Silver usage. For the most part it appears in an aposodis after a concessive clause, consecutive to the following conjunctions:

* cum: EH, 4.68. 
* etsi: EH, 4.80; FVH, 4.19 (et si), and 5.17. 
* licet: SPA, 52.3; CBP, 2.4, 3.2, 6.3; DCR, 1818; DP, 8.127. 
* quamvis: PRI, 2.22 and 35; IDS, 2.17, 7.84, 8.93; EH, 1.8 and 11, 6.21, 7.122; DI, 8.16; FVH, 1.7, 7.6. 
* quantumvis: PRI, 6.120.

Quin occurs twice, at DI, 7.1, and DTM, 5.77, where it combines with etiam. Both constructions are classical.
Causal conjunctions

Martin has five causal conjunctions, **nam, namque, enim, unde, and quamobrem**. **Nam** occurs seventy-two times, in all of the writings except the poems; the only non-classical usage is an adversative connotation which is clearly used at CEX, XIX.3, DI, 9.16 (Seneca, De Ira, III, 26.2, has tamen), DCR, 3.13 and 14.12. **Namque** is found four times, simply as a strong **nam**, at IDS, 10.140, EH, 3.40 and 6.116, and CBP, 1.24. **Enim** is used eighty-five times; the only non-classical construction is an adversative connotation at SPA, 2.8, 16.5; PRI, 3.50; and CEX, XXIII.5. **Quamobrem**, already discussed under the preposition **ob**, has its regular Ciceronian meaning in its one occurrence at DI, 5.10. **Unde** carries a causal conjunctive sense in four instances, PRI, 3.67, IDS, 4.49 and 8.99, and DP, 6.91.

Illative conjunctions

Martin has the following illative conjunctions, **ergo, igitur, itaque, and idcirco**. **Ergo** occurs exactly one hundred times; most of these instances follow classical usages, concluding an argument as at CEX, VIII.3, DI, 2.14, or DCR, 5.7, expressing a weaker but conclusive connection with the preceding thought as at SPA, 9.6, DI, 6.2, or DCR, 9.9, introducing a section containing an argument as at PRI, LH, 678 ff.; ET, 380 ff.; Arts, 71.

LH, 682 ff.; ET, 381 ff.; Arts, 71.
5.88, EH, 213, or DCR, 18.1, with a question which seeks an explanation as at EH, 6.111 or DI, 9.15, and with an imperative as at DTM, 3.28. The main non-classical feature in these usages is the frequency of *ergo*; Martin often uses it where the sense allows it but where the structure of the discussion does not really require an *ergo*, that is, where even in its weakened form it is superfluous, e.g., at DI, 6.2 and 8.17. There are also a few Late Latin uses. *Ergo* seems to have a causal force at SPA, 30.5, DCR, 14.11, and DP, 4.55; this usage is cited only for Christian writers in the source material. *Ergo* is strengthened by conclusive adverbs as follows: *adeo* at DI, 5.32 (Seneca, *De Ira*, II, 33.2, has *adeo* but not *ergo*); *ita* at PRI, 6.116, DCR, 1.9, and FVH, 9.7; and *sic* at DCR, 18.21.

*Igitur* appears seven times, always postpositively. It is used on classical norms at IDS, 3.35, EH, 5.85, CBP, 1.14 and 7.3, FVH, 1a.4, and DP, 4.54; at PRI, 5.92, it seems to have the meaning of *enim*, a usage attested only for Christian writers. *Itaque* occurs eight times, DI, 5.33, 7.12, and 20, and 1020, and DP, 4.61, 6.97, 7.99, and 9.132, in classical connotations. *Idcirco* is found four times in the classical manner, twice preceded by an *ut* clause, CBP, 5.17 and DTM, 1.10, and twice followed by a *quia* clause, IDS, 7.89 and FVH, 1.17.
Interjections

There are only three interjections in Martin. *Vae* occurs once at DCR, 11.9, in its classical meaning, and followed by a dative noun. The interjection *O!* appears at IDS, 5.72, also in the classical manner.

*Ecce* appears thirteen times. At SPA, 37.1, it translates the Greek ὡς,\(^ {137}\) introducing a statement explanatory of a question that is to follow. At CBP, 5.3, it is used in the classical sense to move with emphasis from a situation just completed to a new one. The Vulgar method of emphasizing certain pronouns by a preceding *ecce* is the most common use in Martin:

- *ecce hic*: IDS, 6.75; EH, 6.103 and 115; DCR, 12.6, and 14.22.
- *ecce qualis*: DCR, 8.1 and 16.1.

At DCR, 15.21, the combination *ecce ergo* introduces a summary conclusion to a line of reasoning. All of these occurrences except the three in the IDS and EH are in the popular SPA and DCR where they are appropriate; the IDS and EH, semi-literary Christian works, because of their Christian nature, allow certain colloquial usages.

\(^ {137}\) Cf. Migne, *PG*, 65, 289 A.
The Verb

Verb syntax is a complex subject. Since this chapter has already grown to a considerable size, and since the analysis of Martin's verb usages has revealed no significant differences in the nature of his Latinity from what has preceded, this section has been somewhat restricted to the topics to be discussed. Those have been chosen which will most clearly reveal his usage and which will best resolve the problems posed for the dissertation. But, even with these topics, lest the chapter double itself, the treatment will be indicative rather than exhaustive.

The infinitive

Late Latin use of the infinitive represents a peculiar combination: extension of classical usage, yet a limitation of it. In the individual points of grammar the particular constructions were extended beyond the classical governing verbs and used to a greater degree than in classical Latin. But, often, the infinitive itself was replaced by clauses introduced by quia, quod, quoniam, and ut; this was a process which was present in Old and classical Latin, but which was never prominent until the Late period. The infinitive is a particularly literary form, the usage of

---

which, to a certain degree, is very revealing of the literary quality of an author.

The complementary infinitive occurs in Martin over 310 times with forty-two different verbs. Those which are used in this construction in classical Latin and which Martin uses are:

- audere, coepisse, constituere, contendere, 
- cupere, debere (twenty-eight times), desiderare (twelve times), desinere, discere, docere, 
- dubitare, festinare, licet (twenty-five times), 
- malle, mandare, nequire, nolle, oportet (fourteen times), 
- pergere, permettere, placere, posse (fifty-four times), prascipere, proponere, 
- scire, solere, studere, velle (fifty-four times).

Those which were extended to govern an infinite after the classical period and which Martin uses are:

- addiscere: SPA, 17.3. Silver. (TLL, I, 578; LS, 31.)
- amare: SPA, 47.2. A Grecism introduced into literary Latin by Sallust; it also appears in the classical poets and the Silver prose writers. In Martin it may be, here, a direct translation from the Greek. (TLL, I, 1951 ff.; LS, 357; Blaise, 162.)
- coartare: FVH, 5.18. The connotation is Late; the infinitive is cited only for Christian writers. (TLL, III, 1390 ff.; LS, 107; Skahill, 152.)
- consentire: CEX, XI.2. Silver. (LS, 428 ff.; Druhan, 122; Bagan, 131.)
- dignari: DCR, 18.2; DTM, 5.83. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, V, 1140 ff.; LS, 578; Druhan, 123; Bagan, 131; Skahill, 153; Prendergast, 53; Goelzer-Mey, 233.)
- gaudere: IB, 15. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VI, 2, 170 ff.; LS, 802 ff.; Druhan, 124; Goelzer-Mey, 238.)
meminisse: DI, 8.9. Classical, but frequent only from the Silver period on. (TLL, VIII, 645 ff.; LS, 1129; Druhan, 124.)

mereri: SPA, 16.3 and 6; IDS, 7.86; CBS, 3.7; DCR, 14.10. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VIII, 802 ff.; LS, 1135 ff.; Druhan, 124; Bagan, 131; Skahill, 153; Prendergast, 53; Goelzer-Mey, 237.)

nescire: DCR, 7.15. Silver. (LS, 1203.)

praesumere: CBP, 7.XV.2, 7.XX.5, 8.12; CEX, XIV.3, XXII.8, XXXVII.2. Late. (LS, 1432; Druhan, 124; Skahill, 154; Prendergast, 53; Goelzer-Mey, 234.)

pruriri: PRI, 5.99. This verb in this form appears only here.

sufficit: DP, 2.36. Poetic and Christian. (LS, 1791 ff.; Druhan, 124; Skahill, 154; Prendergast, 53; Goelzer-Mey, 234.)

tentare: DI, 8.4 and 10.6. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1856; Druhan, 125; Bagan, 133.)

The complementary infinitive is also used in Martin after noun and verb phrases as follows:

opus est: SPA, 103.1. Classical.
potestatem habere: CEX, VIII.5. Poetic and Silver.
contentus est: PRI, 1.15; IDS, 8.97. Poetic and Silver.
dignus . . . indignus: CEX, XVII.4. Poetic and Silver.

There are only a few instances of the nominative with the infinitive, all of which accord with classical usage except the first, deprehendere, which is a Late Latin construction.

CBP, 3.7, quisquis clericus . . . tale aliquid sentire vel defendere fuerit deprehensus; CBS, 3.VI.4, quod . . . dicitur fieri; CEX, XVII.1, si quis presbyter . . . inventus fuerit aliquid . . . venundasse; DTM, 5.72, neque
generalis neque localis uilla synodus . . . legitur tulisse sententiam; DP, 4.57, resurrexisse enim traditur Dominus.

The accusative with the infinitive construction occurs in Martin about 200 times. Those verbs with which it appears and which also governed it in classical Latin are:

- agnoscere, arbitrari, audire, cogitare, cognoscere, confingere, confirmare, confiteri, constare, constituere, convenit, credere (thirteen times), cupere, decernere, decet, desiderare, dicere (twenty-three times), discere, existimare, facere, fateri, ferre, gestire, ignorare, intelligere, invenire, iubere, iudicare, licet (twelve times), mirari, nolle, oportet (twenty-seven times), patet, placere, probare, putare, referre, scire, simulare, sinere, somniare, sperare, suscipere, velle, videre.

Those verbs which are extensions or represent a change in usage after the classical period are:

- admittere: CEX, XXI.3. This usage is cited only for Christian authors. (TLL, I, 748 ff.; LS, 40; Hoppe, 50.)
- aestimare: CEX, XXI.6. Silver. (TLL, I, 1096 ff.; Skahill, 155; Druhan, 126; Bagan, 135.)
- compellere: SPA, 9.16 and 26. Poetic and Silver; in classical prose ut is used. (TLL, III, 2029 ff.; LS, 387; Bagan, 138; Druhan, 128; Skahill, 158.)
- contingit: FVH, 5.20. Late. (IH, 588; Druhan, 128; Skahill, 159; Goelzer-Mey, 252.)
- divendere: IDS, 9.128. This usage is not cited for this verb by any of the sources.
- dubitare: DP, 5.67 and 6.38. Rare before the Silver period; the usage here with a negative concurs with earlier practice. (TLL, V, 2082 ff.; LS, 613; Bagan, 136; Hoppe, 50 ff.; Prendergast, 54.)
- iactare: IDS, 8.112. Silver. (TLL, VI, 1, 48 ff.; LS, 1010; Druhan, 127; Bagan, 137.)
- monstrare: DCR, 13.16. Poetic and Silver. (Bagan, 137; Prendergast, 54.)
nescire: DI, 9.3. Apparently poetic and Silver, though the available evidence is scanty. (LS, 1203.)

noscere: CBP, 8.12; CBS, 4.6; CEX, XXX.3. Rare in classical prose; primarily a poetic and Silver construction. (LS, 1216; Skahill, 156; Bagan, 136.)

ordinare: SPA, 9.27. This usage is not cited in the source material.

permittere: SPA, 3.7, a bracketed passage, 6.2, 51.1, 66.1; PRI, 3.55, EH, 3.57. With the passive infinitive, the construction is Silver; with the active infinitive, Late. (IH, 585; Skahill, 158; Prendergast, 54; Goelzer-Mey, 246.)

promittere: DCR, 15.27, 18.5. It occurs in Cicero with the passive infinitive; otherwise the usage is Silver and Late. (IH, 587.)

prospicere: EH, 2.25. Poetic and Silver. (IH, 586.)

quaerere: PRI, 2.36; CEX, XXXV.2. This usage is not cited in the source material.

stupere: IB, 4. Poetic and Silver. (IH, 157.)

The accusative with the infinitive also appears dependent upon certain combinations with esse as the subject or complement of the phrase:

dignum . . . et iustum est: CEX, XV.10-12. This usage is not attested; the usual construction is with ut.

est figura: DP, 2.32. This is not attested.

manifestum est: DP, 6.91. Classical.

necesse est: CBP, 7.XIV.5; DCR, 1.7. Classical, though ut is more common.

venit in mentem: DI, 9.13. This usage is at least Silver because Martin takes it from Seneca (De IRA, III, 25.1); the phrase goes back to Old Latin, but the usage is not attested.
The accusative with the infinitive also occurs as a title, CEX, XLIX, non suscipi debere infantes ad baptismum, nisi ante tres septimanas Pascae; it also occurs once in apposition, DTM, 2.14, illud quod per vestram nobis significastis epistolam, quosdam ... vestris auribus intulisse (the clause was probably drawn into the accusative with the infinitive construction by significastis).

The infinitive as a substantive occurs in Martin more than seventy times. The construction itself is Old Latin and classical; but beginning in the Silver period it was extended beyond the limits set in earlier times until it became a very broad and frequent usage. Also the Greek influence can be expected to affect Martin; it does so in the SPA where almost a third of the instances occur, nearly all direct translations of Greek infinitives, although none occurs in the CEX where, however, the nature of official administrative language may rule out the slight imprecision of the infinitive. Martin uses the infinitive as the subject of esse, e.g., SPA, 89, humiliare se ipsam ... profuro est monacho; and as the predicate nominative of esse, e.g., SPA, 73, peregrinatio est tacere; and both together, e.g., SPA, 21.2, sedere in cella manifeste est operari manibus ... He uses it as the subject of impersonal phrases and verbs, e.g., DI, 5.27, potius est non agnoscere quam agnovisse injuriam. Occasionally the infinitive appears as the object of a transitive verb, e.g., SPA, 31.2, ut
donet tibi habere in corde tuo luctum et humitatem. It even occurs several times as the subject or predicate nominative of another infinitive, e.g., FVH, 3.7, scito enim honestum et magnum vindictae esse genus ignoscere. Martin's usage, then, accords with classical principles, but with Late Latin practice as far as the extent and individual usages go.

The infinitive of purpose existed in Old Latin but was suppressed by classical authors for prose usage. It was revived in Silver prose and returned to literary status. Christian authors were further influenced by the parallel Greek structure. Martin has nine instances: SPA, 6.6, 9.14, 11.2, 14.6, 50.1, 109.46; DCR, 15.17; and DP, 5.37. It is noteworthy that seven of the nine occur in a Greek translation, and that all are found in Christian works.

There appears to be an instance of the imperative infinitive at FVH, 5.12, ab his incipe, ut non auferas. Et ad maiora provehere, ut etiam ab aliis ablata restituas. This construction occurs in Valerius Flaccus, but is otherwise Vulgar. It is possible, though the source material does not indicate it, that provehere had a Late collateral deponent form.

The gerund and gerundive

The gerund was fairly restricted in its usage in classical Latin; as usual, Late Latin broke away and extended...
the construction far beyond its classical limits. Martin has 30 instances in the genitive, accusative, and ablative, as follows:


Accusative: SPA, 62.2, esto . . . humilis ad discendum; CBP, 7.XIII.1, ingredi ad communicandum non liceat laicis; FVH, 4.63, ad nocendum . . . subripiunt.

Ablative: There is one instance where the gerund is governed by a preposition, SPA, 96.1, esto liber in loquendo. The remaining occurrences are classical in their basic construction, but often non-classical in usage since a classical writer would in most cases select a concrete noun to express the idea. The ablative of cause appears at CEX, LXXXIII.1, DI, 5.23, and DTM, 4.63; the ablative of means at EH, 7.117 and 118, 7.123, 8.149; CEX, LXII.5; DI, 3.31, 6.14 and 15, 8.28; DCR, 14.26 and 27, 16.13; FVH, 1.11, 4.56 and 57.

The use of the accusative object after the genitive gerund is infrequent in classical Latin; Martin has only one instance, after intromittendi, but it is a rather involved structure, licentiam . . . intromittendi ad se quasi adoptivam aliquam mulierem. After an ablative gerund an object is rare in classical Latin; Martin has two simple and not unclassical instances, DI, 5.23, falsa suspiciendo aut levia adgravando, and DTM, 4.63, errorem fugiendo.
Martin's use of the attributive gerundive is late. The construction occurs fifty-two times, in accord with classical principles, but employing a number of verbs not so used in classical Latin which restricted this gerundive fairly tightly to verbs of feeling or emotion. The use of the gerundive with a noun after ad to express purpose is classical and Martin has several examples. The gerundive with esse occurs in Martin some fifty times and always expresses obligation or necessity as in classical authors.

The participle

The participle was used as a substantive in all periods of Latin, but in different degrees. Classical Latin used the plural more than the singular, the neuter singular more than the masculine, the nominative singular very rarely, the perfect more than the present, and the future very rarely. In Latin there was a considerable extension of usage, particularly in the present participle and in the use of all the case forms. If we disregard a few forms that by the sixth century had long since lost their participial significance and become fixed as nouns, eg., scriptum, Martin has five substantive perfect participles, at EH, 2.27, CSB, 3.VIII.4, DI, 3.10, 4.5, and FWH, 6.9. He has forty-six substantive present participles, with only one, poenitens.

\[^{140}I^{40}\]
at CEX, XXXIII.1, in the nominative singular, and that had probably lost its force as a participle by the sixth century, though, of course, it is non-classical. There are three instances of the genitive singular, e.g., DI, 6.15, naturam voluntatemque discuties facientis; fourteen of the dative singular, e.g., SPA, 57.2, si quis benefacit facienti sibi malum; fourteen of the accusative singular, e.g., SPA, 109.33, neque odium contra inimicantem tibi sine causa; one of the nominative plural, EH, 3.31, cum multi adulantes . . . nihil aliud . . . insinuant; eight of the genitive plural, e.g., EH, 4.76, Deus noster non tantum dulcibus adorantium se precibus; five of the dative plural, e.g., CEX, XVI.2, ut dispenset necessitatem habentibus; and one of the accusative plural, FVH, 5.10, et etiam nocentes prohibebis. There are no instances of the substantive future participle other than futurum which was not a participle, but a noun, in the sixth century. The major non-classical feature of Martin's usage, then, is the extent to which he uses this construction rather than the way in which he uses it.

However, in other points of participial syntax he is much more in accord with Late and Christian practice. The present participle occurs nearly 250 times. It is used a few times as an attributive, a usage prevalent in all periods but greatly extended in Silver and Late Latin, e.g., CEX, IX.1, episcopus vacans, and DI, 6.6, amicitias . . . coherentes. The most frequent construction is a
present participle which modifies the subject of a finite verb, on the pattern of veniens dicit; this usage was quite extensively developed in Christian writers, undoubtedly under the combined influences of Greek and the Scriptures. It expresses a wide variety of ideas; temporal, e.g., SPA, 9.22, haec audiens senex miratus est; as a replacement for a perfect participle, e.g., CEX, XXXIV.1, propriae ecclesiae derelinquens ad alteram ecclesiam vadit; manner or means, e.g., SPA, 22.3, homo arguens se ipsum ... pervenit ad timorem Dei; continuity, e.g., CEX, XXXVII.8, si autem permanserit turbans et concitans ecclesiam; cause, e.g., EH, 1.10, timens ne ... orat Deum; concession, e.g., IDS, 1.112, dicentes enim se esse sapientes, stulti sunt; and condition, e.g., CEX, LVIII.4, iste non obediens nec suspicionem haeresis a se removens, deponatur de ordine clericatus.

Two other Late extensions of infrequent classical constructions occur in Martin. In a number of instances the participle is used where classical Latin would prefer a subordinate clause, e.g., SPA, 108.4, et ea quae videt vel audiebat quasi non videns et non audiens, or EH, 4.80, omnes extollunt, nemo ex illis id offerens quod ita dulce sit ... The use of the present participle to indicate action prior to the main verb is also frequent only in the Late period; Martin has several instances, e.g., SPA, 61.5, et surgens venit cum eo, et dixit.
One construction that is peculiar to Christian writers and which developed out of the Scriptures is the redundant *dicens*. This participle is practically nothing more than a quotation mark. But it occurs very frequently; Martin has over forty instances. Most of these are combined with verbs that in themselves could introduce a quotation, e.g., SPA, 40.1, interrogavit . . . dicens, IDS, 1.11, orat dicens, or CBS, 7.III.2, salutent dicentes; in three instances the *dicens* modifies the subject of a verb that does not itself introduce a quotation, SPA, 6.1, venit, dicens, 6.10, remisit, dicens, and 51.3, tem ptaverunt, dicentes. In two cases the participle modifies the noun *Apostolus*, CEX, XVI.5, secundum Apostolum dicentem, and XXII.5, secundum praeceptum Apostoli dicentis. All instances occur in the Christian writings only, over thirty of them the SPA, and some eight in the IDS, CBP, CBS, CEX, and DP.

The perfect participle in general follows similar patterns. The usage is more extensive than in the classical period, though in most instances it follows classical principles more closely than does the present participle. The chief divergence is the frequent employment of the perfect participle where classical Latin, and even Silver Latin, would prefer a relative clause, e.g., CBP, 2.23, abominata iam olim a sede beatissimi Petri apostoli et damnata Priscillianae haeresis figmenta cognoscant, or DCR, 14.19,
et caro illa iam de resurrectione recepta in aeternum
criciatur gemens.

The use of habere and tenere with a perfect participle in place of a simple perfect begins to occur frequently in the Late period. Martin has four instances: CEX, XXI.1-2, si quis . . . naturalia a medicis habuerit secta; LVII.4, similiter et quod ab apostolis traditum canon tenet antiquus; DCR, 8.16, quia deum habent iratum; and FVH, 2.44, animum aliquando remissum habent, numquam solutum.

The employment of positus or constitutus as a substitute for the non-existent present participle of esse is a strictly Christian construction. Martin has six instances: SPA, 110.3, a bracketed passage, quas si quis in coenobio . . . positus custodierit; CBP, 1.17, et simul positi consedemus; 2.7, qui in ipsa extremitate mundi et in ultimis huius provinciae regionibus constitut; CEX, XXXIII.1, si quis in contemptu positus; LXXXII.2, quod si in desperatione positus; and DI, 1.1, simul positi . . . frueremur. All of these are in Christian writings; for the instance in the DI occurs in the introductory paragraph addressed to Bishop Vittimerus, the essay's recipient.

Independent clauses

Agreement of subject and verb in number accords with classical standards everywhere in Martin except in two

---

sententiae from the SPA: 77, voluntas propria et requies et consuetudo istorum deicit hominem (note that in 78 there is a three member subject with a plural verb), and 89, humiliare se ipsum et dispectum se apud ipsum habere pro muro est monacho. For 77 we have the Greek text, and it also has a singular verb. It is likely that, in both instances, Martin has simply translated the Greek with Christian literalness. There is one instance of a failure of agreement of a different kind in the title of Canon Six of the CBS, ut qui oratorium pro quaestu suo in terra propria fecerit non consecetur; the subject of consecetur, as the text of the canon makes clear, should be oratorium and not the qui clause. It has been pointed out in the first chapter that there is some doubt concerning Martin's authorship of these titles; it is difficult to imagine Martin making a blunder like this in view of his regularity in such matters in the rest of the work.

Direct quotations are introduced by Martin in two ways, by verbs of saying which clearly indicate a quotation, and by nouns and verbs which contextually indicate one. The verbs of saying are: ait, eleven times in the IDS, EH, DTM, and DP (ais at DTM, 3.29); dicere, 171 times in the SPA, PRI, IDS, CBP, CBS, CEX, DI, FVH, and DP; inquit, seven times in the PRI, IDS, EH, and DI (twice in the last in the second person, 142 Cf. Migne, PG, 65, 314.83.
inquis); interrogare at SPA, 31.7 and 60.3; loqui at SPA, 40.2 and 110.1, a bracketed passage; requirere at SPA, 26.1 and 38.1; and respondere, forty times in the SPA, EH, and CBP. The contextual words are: addiscere at IDS, 4.41; clamare at IDS, 8.105; decantare at EH, 8.146; eloquium at EH, 7.125; legere at DCR, 10.4; recitare at CBS, 2.34; revolvere at EH, 8.142; and testimonium at EH, 8.140. The predominance of dicere is due only in part to the extensive use of the redundant participle since it accounts for only about one-fourth of the instances, Dicere is simply Martin's primary verb of saying.

Martin's use of impersonal verbs is classical. He has verbs which are regularly, impersonal: accidit, adsolet, complacet, constat, contingit, decet, evenit, expedit, licet, oportet, placet, restat, sufficit, and videtur. He has third person singular active forms of regular verbs at DI, 8.26, certaverit, and at CBP, 7.4, patet, and third person singular passive forms of regular verbs at DI, 8.27, concurritur, EH, 6.107, creditur, DI, 3.34, curritur, CBP, 2.2 and DP, 5.64, dictum est, DCR, 10.4, legitur, DI, 5.1, pugnandum est, and scriptum est which appears seventeen times in the SPA, IDS, CBS, CEX, and DTM.

Martin does not use parenthetical expressions very often, but those which he does have are quite standard; ut dicam, at PRI, 1.4; ut mihi videtur, at PRI, 3.46; ut adsolet, at EH, 1.10 and CBP, 2.4; hoc quod maius est,
at EH, 4.69; si mihi creditur, at EH, 6.107; si dici fas est, at DCR, 11.2; ut ego arbitror, at DTM, 2.18; and quod absit, at CBP, 5.11, CBS, 3.5, and DCR, 14.26.

Martin very seldom uses particles to introduce questions. He has -ne only at DI, 8.19, and num only at DI, 8.17 and 18, and 9.1, that is in passages traceable to Seneca. Both -ne and num disappeared from popular speech in the Empire and Late Latin. Numquid which Vulgar Latin used in place of the monosyllabic num, appears only at SPA, 109.44. The particle an introduces a direct question also but once, and that in a bracketed passage at SPA, 6.8.

The use of the present tense for the future is a Vulgarism. Martin has three instances in the SPA, at 19.5 and 7, and 23.3, which are literal translations of the Greek. There is one instance in the PRI where one would expect a future, at 7.121, sed dicit mihi aliquis, to introduce an inquiry that initiates an argument. Then there are seven instances in the DCR, 14.5, 12, 16, 18, 20 (twice), and 21, where the presents and futures are mixed together, perhaps for a sort of colloquial variety. The usage, at any rate, is confined to popular writings. There is perhaps one instance of the future for the present at EH, 1.1, quisquis nutu Dei cuiuslibet officii dignitate praecelles ac . . . praecedis; however, a case can be made for the true future here.

\[^{143}\text{cf. Migne, PG, 65, 364.173 and 269.20.}\]
The imperative in positive commands occurs 174 times. These are all the regular forms except for the following future imperatives:

- **abstineto**: FVH, 4.22.
- **dato**: FVH, 2.42 and 4.49.
- **esto**: SPA, 43.2, 53.3, 55.3, 62.2, 96.1, 109.18, a Scriptural quotation, 31, 35; FVH, 4.37, 46, 47, 54, and 60.
- **fugito**: FVH, 4.20.
- **habeto**: SPA, 109.27; EH, 3.54.
- **intendito**: FVH, 4.50.
- **memento**: DI, 9.9.
- **scito**: FVH, 2.25, 3.7, 4.44 and 45.

These are either fixed forms, like **esto** and **scito**, or are used for the sake of variety in passages with many imperatives.

The imperative is also expressed by the future tense, e.g., FVH, 4.45-46, *scito quia prodesse vult*. Non acerbus, sed blanda verba timebis. This is a colloquial usage which has either been elevated to literary usage, since it occurs so often in the FVH, or which Martin, employing the literary latitude of Late Latin, introduces for the sake of variety. This variety is also obtained by the free use of the jussive and indefinite second person subjunctive which Martin invariably uses as imperative in sense.

Prohibitions or negative commands are expressed in Martin in several ways. **Noli** and **nolite** with the infinitive
occur at SPA, 109.40, a Scriptural quotation, PRI, 2.71, also a Scriptural quotation, DI, 6.25, DCR, 17.5, 18.13 and 28; this is a classical construction. Also classical is the use of *cavere* with a *ne* subjunctive clause at DCR, 17.16 and FVH, 8.1. The use of *ne* with the indefinite second person subjunctive occurs at SPA, 3.2, 5.3, 56.3, DI, 5.26, and DCR, 18.15, a Scriptural quotation; this is classical. The use of *non* with both the indefinite second person and the jussive subjunctive is a construction which occurred infrequently before the Silver Latin period; Martin uses it numerous times, but after a positive command as in the literary usage. *Nec* with these subjunctives occurs very often in Martin; this is a classical usage.

The hortatory subjunctive, always in the first person plural, is found in Martin's writings sixteen times in the SPA, IDS, CBP, CBS, DI, and DP. All instances are positive. Examples: SPA, 1.3, Constringamus nos in ipso pane et sale; IDS, 2.15, Videamus ergo quid est quod dixit . . . ; DP, 4.54, definiamus igitur . . . There are two examples of a kind of potential-hortatory subjunctive in the first person singular, a softened transitional structure, at PRI, 7.127-128, nunc ad reliqua transeam, et quid aliud prius ex hoc malo generetur expediam.

The writer has not studied the periphrastic verb forms which use the perfect of *esse*, e.g., *inventus fuerit*. But
it should be noted that Martin has made use of this Late Latin form.

The subordinate clause

The relative clause within another subordinate clause occurs in the writings of Martin more than 170 times. In all instances except sixteen the indicative mood is employed, no matter what the mood of the other subordinate clause may be, whether that clause be an indirect statement or question, a purpose, substantive, causal, or conditional clause, or whatever. The potential subjunctive appears at PRI, 5.107, EH, 4.69, CBS, 3.VII.4, CEX, XXII.3, DI, 6128, 9.13 and 14, and FVH, 1.19. At SPA, 13.9 occurs a clause which is not potential but which presents a hypothetical case, pone in corde tuo quia habeas annum quod in sepulchro sis; this construction is classical in principle, but one would expect the imperfect subjunctive. At EH, 2.28 the relative clause is an indirect question, quia non habet quo exeat. The mood of the relative clause is subjunctive by attraction at CBP, 6.6, CEX, XIII.6, DI, 9.15, DCR, 8.7, and DP, 2.28.

There are three cases in which the relative pronoun has its co-ordinating function (i.e., qui as the equivalent of et is),


145The simple relative clause in a main clause occurs over 250 times.
and the subjunctives are jussive: CBP, 7.VII.3, CBS, 3.I.7, and 3.IX.7.

There are only three relative clauses of characteristic in Martin with the subjunctive as in classical Latin:

EH, 4.82, nemo ex illis id offerens quod ita dulce sit ut tamen a periculo longe sit; FVH, 4.68, Notaberis minutus . . . et qui subtilissimas suspiciones tuas ad deprehensionem alicuius impingas admissi; and IR, 5-6, Nec scyphus hic dabitur, rutilo cui forte metallo Crustatum stringat tortilis ansa latus.

There is only one relative clause of purpose: DCR, 3.2-3, fecit spiritales creaturas, id est angelos, qui in conspectu eius adstantes laudarent illum. This is classical.

Quod, perhaps better considered as a conjunction than a relative, but at any rate relative in origin, also appears in certain causal phrases. Eo quod is a classical construction that was used with frequency in the Silver and Late periods. Martin uses it twenty-three times in the forms eo quod, pro eo quod, and de eo quod, thus preserving its relative feeling; these occur in the SPA (once), PRI (once), CBS (once), CEX (nineteen times), and the DTM (once). The subjunctive is used except at PRI, 5.90, where the mood is indicative. The phrase propter quod is a causal construction which is found in the Vulgate, probably as a translation of διότι; Martin has three instances, with the subjunctive at SPA, 13.3 and CEX, LIV.3, but with the indicative at CP, 8.125.

The indefinite quisquis introduces a clause nineteen times, always with the indicative except at IR, 9, where the
subjunctive is potential. The indefinite quicunque appears in subordinate clauses fourteen times, all with the indicative except at DP, 7.100 where the subjunctive is in an indirect statement expressing the thought of someone other than the writer, a normal classical construction.

The indirect question in Martin is usually introduced by an interrogative pronoun, adjective, or adverb. Utrum occurs, with an, at SPA, 34.2 and DI, 2.10 only; an occurs as the introductory particle five times, at DI, 6.8, 16 (an . . . an), 17, 9.4, and FVH, 5.15 (an . . . an). The construction occurs fifty times, with the subjunctive as in classical Latin forty-five times, and with the indicative, an Old Latin Vulgarism which is found occasionally in Silver literature and frequently in Late and Christian writings, five times at IDS, 1.4 and 2.15, CBS, 3.IX.3, and DCR, 15.2 and 22.

With the exception of the conditional clause, the other subordinate clauses will be treated schematically and in alphabetical order according to the subordinating conjunction or adverb.

antequam: with the present subjunctive at SPA, 26.3, a bracketed passage, PRI, 5.104, CEX, LX.2, DCR, 12.12, and FVH, 4.20; with the imperfect subjunctive at CBF, 3.III.1, 3.XVII.2, and DP, 5.81. The subjunctive has lost its classical significance in Martin.

cum temporal: this occurs about sixty times in all the works except the DTM and the poems. It follows classical usage exactly. Note, for example, that the imperfect indicative at SPA, 61.6, and the perfect indicative at SPA, 61.7 and DCR, 15.3, define the time exactly, while the
present subjunctive at DP, 6.97, gives the circumstances, not the time.

cum causal: There are eleven instances in the SPA, PRI, IDS, CBP, DI, DCR, and DP, all with the subjunctive. At IDS, 9.15, occurs the familiar Ciceronian formula, quae cum ita sint.

cum concessive: PRI, 1.14 and 2.19, both with the subjunctive.

donec: "as long as," DI, 8.5, with the indicative; "while," CEX, LXXXII.4, LXXXIII.5, DCR, 12.8 and 13, with the subjunctive. The usage is classical, though the first meaning is rare before the Silver Latin period.

dum: "while," twenty-three times in the SPA, PRI, CBS, CEX, DI, FVH, and DTM, eighteen with the indicative as in classical Latin, five with the subjunctive as in Late Latin; "when," sixteen times in the SPA, PRI, CBP, DI, DCR, FVH, and DTM, a connotation occurring only in the "poorer" prose writers before the Late period, with the indicative, as traditionally, seven times, otherwise with the subjunctive, as Late; "since," classical but rare before Late Latin, at PRI, 5.107 and CBP, 7.XX.5, with the subjunctive; "although," at SPA, 14.5, with the subjunctive, a poetic connotation, but the subjunctive is Late.

dummodo: DP, 7.111, with the subjunctive.

etiam si: EH, 1.2, CEX, IX.2 (etiam si), DI, 3.8 and 9, 5.17. All with the subjunctive, as in Late Latin.

etsi: with the subjunctive at EH, 1.9, 4.30, CEX, XX.2, DI, 3.16, FVH, 1.16, 5.16 and 18, as in Late Latin; but with the indicative at CBP, 4.6, where classical Latin would have allowed it.

licet: SPA, 52.2, CBP, 2.2, 3.1, 6.2; DP, 8.125. All with the subjunctive, as in classical Latin.

postquam: SPA, 9.6, PRI, 2.22, CBS, 3.1.9, 3.XX.1, CEX, XXXI.8, DCR, 13.11 and 24, with the indicative as in classical Latin.

priusquam: SPA, 110.10, a bracketed passage, PRI, 5.97 and 100, IDS, 10.141, CEX, XXXI.3, all with the subjunctive, expressing contingency, design, and expectancy, as in classical Latin.

prout: CBS, 2.15, with the indicative; a classical usage.
qualiter: CBS, 3.10, with the subjunctive, a usage rare in Silver Latin, frequent in Late.

quamdiu: "how long," at DI, 6.18, with the subjunctive in an indirect question; "until," at CEX, XVIII.7, with the indicative, a Late connotation and construction.

quamvis: seventeen times in the PRI, IDS, EH, DI, and FVH, all literary works so that Martin must consider this a literary word rather than a popular one. The subjunctive is used everywhere except at PRI, 2.30 and 6.113, where the usage is poetic and Late, according with the conditional sense of the clause.

quando: SPA, 34.2, 35.3, CEX, LIV.2, DCR, 9.1, 11.14, and DP, 7.112, all with the subjunctive in accordance with classical usage, though the conjunction itself is not used with any frequency until the Late period.

quantumvis: PRI, 6.120, with the subjunctive; both the sense and the construction are rare before Late Latin.

gvia causal: It occurs 106 times, in every work except the poems, always with the indicative except at DP, 2.15, where the two gvia clauses are in indirect discourse. Martin thus prefers gvia to quod and cum, a preference characteristic of the Late Latin period.

gvia substantival: This occurs thirty-three times in the SPA, PRI, IDS, EH, CBP, CEX, DI, DCR, FVH, and DTM. The indicative occurs everywhere except at SPA, 18.8-9, where the mood is potential, and EH, 4.74. This use of gvia is classical, but rare before the Late period.

gvia as equivalent of δίκα: Christian writers adopted a Biblical Grecism, translating the Greek δίκα from the phrase Ελεγω δίκα by gvia, quod, or quoniam. Martin has this gvia at SPA, 32.1, 51.1, 72.1, 108.1, PRI, 3.69; EH, 4.62, and 8.142, all with the indicative, and all in Christian writings.

quod causal: Martin has but one instance, at CEX, LIX.1, with the Indicative. He and Late Latin prefer gvia.

quod substantival: with the indicative at SPA, 22.6, CBP, 1.7, and DTM, 2.21, and with the subjunctive at PRI, 3.48, IDS, 3.30, 4.44, CBP, 3.II.2, and FVH, 5.4. The usage is Late.
quod as the equivalent of ὅτι: There is one instance at DP, 2.14.

quoniam causal: with the indicative, as is classical, at PRI, 4.84 and 85, both Scriptural quotations, EH, 5.107, 7.125, both Scriptural quotations, CBP, 1.14 and 4.2, and DCR, 12.6, a Scriptural quotation; with the subjunctive, a Late Latin development, at DP, 2.22.

quoniam as the equivalent of ὅτι: There is one instance at SPA, 46.2.

quotiens: CBS, 3.5.1, DI, 5.14, FVH, 4.37, all with the indicative, as in classical Latin.

sicut: This occurs fifty-four times in the SPA, PRI, CBP, CBS, DCR, FVH, and DP, always with the indicative, as in classical usage. The combination, sicut . . . ita, is frequent only in Silver Latin; it occurs at SPA, 108, 1-3, PRI, 1.3, DCR, 18.30 and 34, DTM, 5.78. The form sicuti occurs at DP, 1.8 and 5.74. Quasi sicut at DCR, 11.7 is apparently a Vulgar pleonasm appropriate for that work; this combination, however, is not cited in the source material.

tamquam: IDS, 5.61, with the subjunctive as in classical Latin.

ubi: "where," thirteen times in the SPA, EH, CBS, CEX, DI, DCR, and FVH, always with the indicative except at DCR, 4.9, which seems to be an excellent example of the Silver Latin use of an iterative subjunctive with this conjunction; "when," at CBP, 7.XIII.tit., and DI, 7.10, both with the indicative.

ubicumque: SPA, 21.5, CBP, 1.12, a Scriptural quotation, and FVH, 5.16, all with the indicative, the usual classical mood.

ut purpose: This occurs over 115 times in every work except the poems, always with the subjunctive and in the proper sequence.

ut result: This occurs over forty times in all the works except the FVH and the poems, always with the subjunctive and in the proper sequence.

ut substantival: This occurs over 180 times in all the works except the PRI and the poems, always with the subjunctive except at CBP, 7.X.1 where licet appears; this is probably a misprint, as was indicated in the second
chapter, since Mansi reads *liceat* and all parallel constructions in Martin have *liceat*, including other *ut* substantival clauses.

**ut concessive**: DI, 6.27, with the subjunctive as in classical usage.

**ut conditional**: EH, 3.49, with the subjunctive in a classical construction.

**ut temporal**: IDS, 8.110, with the indicative, the classical mood.

**ut parenthetical**: DI, 3.25, FVH, 1.9, DTM, 4.60, 62, and 64, 5.67, with the indicative as in classical Latin.

Conditional sentences do not follow the set patterns of the grammars so smoothly in Late Latin as they do in classical Latin, although even in the classical period there is a good bit of mixing according to the sense of the sentence. Martin and other Late Latin writers tend to construct conditions according to the needs of their ideas rather than to some set formulae; hence there is a broader range of combinations for a Late writer to choose from. Therefore, conditional sentences are best treated, when the treatment is to be brief and schematic, according to the variety of patterns which they present.

**si est, est**: thirty-nine times in the SPA, PRI, EH, CBP, CEX, DI, and FVH. Classical, though where the imperative appears in the apodosis, the construction is more colloquial than literary in the classical period; but it does appear in literary sources and in the Silver period it is more frequent, for example, in Seneca. It is quite likely that this form was fully elevated to literary usage by the Late period.

**si est, erit**: nine occurrences in the SPA, PRI, CBP, and DI. Classical, but not Ciceronian.
si est, fuit: SPA, 57.2 and CEX, LVIII.1. Old Latin but not classical or Silver; Prendergast (68) says that this is a classical construction, but the reference she gives to IH does not bear out this statement.

si est, fuerit: DI, 5.16. This is the si est, est type with an indefinite second person subjunctive command in the apodosis.

si est, sit: forty-seven occurrences in the SPA, IDS, CBP, CBS, CEX, DI, FVH, and DTM. This is also the si est, est type, but with an indefinite second person command subjunctive, a jussive subjunctive, or a subordinate subjunctive verb in the apodosis.

si erit, erit: FVH, 5.7. Classical.

si erat, fuit: DCR, 15.6. Old Latin, but not classical.

si fuit, est: SPA, 23.1, PRI, 5.94, EH, 8.140, and FVH, 4.44. Classical.

si fuit, sit: CEX, I.3, where the apodosis is an ut clause, and CEX, XXIII.3, XXIV.1, XXVI.2, XLV.1, and DCR, 17.1, where the apodosis is a jussive subjunctive.

si fuerit est: thirty-six times in the SPA, PRI, IDS, EH, CBP, CBS, CEX, and DI. Infrequent before the Late period.

si fuerit, erit: twenty times in the SPA, PRI, EH, CEX, DI, and FVH. Classical.

si fuerit, fuit: CEX, XVII.1, LXXVIII.3, DCR, 14.3. Old Latin, but rare in classical and Silver.

si fuerit, fuerit: CBP, 8.6, CBS, 4.3. Classical.

si fuerit, sit: seventy occurrences in SPA, PRI, CBP, CEX, FVH. This is the si fuerit, est type with a jussive subjunctive or a subordinate subjunctive as the apodosis.


si fuerat, sit: CEX, XXI.8. A jussive apodosis. The basic type si fuerat, est, does not occur in Martin, and is cited only by Bagan (197).
si sit, est: twenty times in the SPA, PRI, CBP, CBS, CEX, DI, and FVH. Classical, but frequent only in the Silver and Late periods.

si sit, erit: twelve occurrences in the SPA, IDS, DI, DCR, FVH, and DTM. Classical, but common only from the Silver period on.

si sit, fuit: EH, 4.71, CBS, 3.II.6, DI, 1.5, and DTM, 3.48. Prendergast (68) says that it is classical; no other source mentions it.

si sit, sit: CBP, 7.XX.2, CBS, 3.V.6, 3.VI.1, XXXVI.4, XLIII.2, XLVII.1, FVH, 2.30. The general type is classical; but when the apodosis is a jussive subjunctive, the sentence can be considered a variant of the si sit, est type.

There are several instances where the protasis has a compound predicate with the verbs in different tenses, e.g., CEX, XIII.1, si quis episcopus . . . iudicatur et viderit . . ., . . . plaucuit. This also occurs at SPA, 71.1, CEX, XII.1, XXXI.1, LXIII.2, DI, 7.2, DCR, 4.2 and 18.6. The mixtures simply follow the sense.

Martin uses quasi four times, at EH, 8.141, DI, 3.13, DP, 1.4 and 25, with the subjunctive as in classical Latin. The use of ac si with tale is also classical.

Finally there are three instances of the et si quae clause: IDS, 7.2 and DI, 7.19, et si quae sunt alia, and DCR, 18.15, vel si quae gravia sunt. This is a very familiar classical formula.
CHAPTER IV

VOCABULARY

Because of the large number of words to be discussed in this chapter, it seems convenient to group the words according to categories. These follow to a certain extent the classifications in the Catholic University Studies which use the suffix as the principle by which a category is determined; but since the historical development of words in the early history of Latin is not the primary interest in this dissertation, in some cases a broader category has been employed, including what, by strict historical phonological development, would otherwise be separated. Strict classification has been followed where previous studies of vocabulary have indicated a special interest in words with a particular suffix; broader categories are used where no such special interest seems to require them. The main interest here is in the period and the type of Latin in which the word or its connotation arose or changed.
The Noun

Nouns of foreign origin

abacus: IR, 3. ἀβακός. An expensive table for serving luxurious meals. Classical. (TLL, I, 42; LS, 4.)

abbas: This noun occurs only in the SPA where it is found fifty-four times. It is Aramaic in origin and refers here to the head of a monastery, an abbot. The word is Christian, coming into use in the fourth century. (TLL, I, 49; LS, 5; Blaise, 34; Souter, 1.)


acolythus: CEX, XLI.2. ἀκόλουθος. Christian, third century. It designates one of the orders through which the clergy passed in becoming priests. (TLL, I, 419; Blaise, 44; Sainio, 65 ff.)

agon: SPA, 109.12. ἁγόν. Silver in form; the connotation "spiritual contest" is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, I, 1411 ff.; LS, 77; Blaise, 77.)

anachoreta: SPA, 28.1. ἄναξωρητής. The word appears in Sidonius, Jerome, Venantius Fortunatus, and Sulpicius Severus. A hermit. (TLL, II, 13; LS, 115; Blaise, 79.)

---

1 Barry, 178 ff.; Bonnet, 209 ff.; Ennis, 23 ff.; Hauber, 54 ff.; Hrdlicka, 42 ff.; Kinnavey, 67 ff.; Kinnirey, 20 ff.; Mahoney, 38 ff.; Mueller, 49 ff.; O'Donnell, 62 ff.; Zimmermann, 71 ff. No specific reference is made in this chapter to any work except the standard dictionaries unless the special work gives additional and significant information beyond the standard works.

2 Cf. E. Hauber, ALL, 2 (1895) 292-314, for a thorough and still valuable account of this word.

3 The orders of the clergy were fixed at least as early as Pope Gaius in the second half of the third century. They are, in an ascending order: minor orders: ostiarius, lector, exorcista, acolythus; major: subdiaconus, diaconus, presbyter. Then come the episcopus, archiepiscopus, and papa.
**anathema**: This noun occurs eighteen times in the CBP, at CBS, 3.III.5, and at CEX, LVII.3. An official excommunication involving a curse. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, II, 45; LS, 116; Blaise, 80; Sainio, 54 ff.)

**antidotum**: EH, 1.11. An antidote. Silver. (TLL, II, 168 ff.; LS, 132; Blaise, 86.)

**angelus**: The word occurs twenty-six times in the IDS, CBP, DCR, and DP. An angel, a spiritual being intermediate between man and God; the sense can be pejorative or ameliorative, generally the latter. Martin modifies if the context does not make it clear whether he refers to a good or an evil angel. The word is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, II, 45; LS, 118; Blaise, 81; Sainio, 56 ff.)

**apostolatus**: DTM, 1.4 and 11. A derivative from apostolus. Here the word designates the office of bishop. This word is a hybrid. Christian, fourth century. (TLL, II, 253; LS, 139; Blaise, 89.)

**apostolus**: The noun occurs twenty-five times in the SPA, PRI, IDS, EH, CBP, CBS, CEX, DCR, and DTM. In Christian Latin it can refer to an apostle or The Apostle, Paul; Martin has the general meaning five times, with the name Peter five times, with the name Paul five times, and alone but designating Paul ten times. The Christian word dates from the second-third century. The word also occurs in the Jurists for a notice sent to a higher tribunal. (TLL, II, 354; LS, 139; Blaise, 89.)

**archangelus**: DCR, 3.4 and 8. archangel. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, II, 459; LS, 154; Blaise, 94.)

**archidiaconus**: CBP, 7.VII.3. An archdeacon, apparently a chief of deacons in a dioceses. Christian, fourth century. (TLL, II, 461; Blaise, 95; Souter, 21.)

**archiepiscopus**: SPA, 20.2. An archbishop. Christian, fifth century. (TLL, II, 461; Souter, 22; LS, 154; Blaise, 95.)

---

4 A hybrid word is one composed of elements from different languages, as apostolatus has a Greek root and a Latin suffix. Henceforth these words will be indicated simply by the notation hybrid.
archipresbyter: CBP, 7.VII.3. ἀρχιπρεσβύτερος. A chief elder or priest; the exact functions vary from century to century. (TLL, II, 463; LS, 154; Blaise, 95; Souter, 22.)

balsamum: CBS, 3.IV.1. βαλσάμον. A kind of tree, or the gum from the tree. Vergil and Silver Latin. (TLL, II, 1709 ff.; LS, 221; Blaise, 110.)

baptisma: the noun occurs in two forms (for which cf. the chapter on morphology) thirty times in CBP, CBS, CEX, DCR, and DTM. βάπτισμα and βαπτισμός. The sacrament of baptism. The two forms in Greek originally had a distinction in meaning, but this was soon lost even in the Greek. Latin had no real distinction, though Tertullian used the -um form to indicate the sacrament and the -ma form to indicate the ceremony itself, but he is not consistent. The word is Christian and dates from the second-third century. (TLL, II, 1717 ff.; LS, 221; Blaise, 110; Sainio, 25 ff.)

baptisterium: CEX, LIII.tit. and 1. βαπτιστήριον. In Silver Latin it was the pool of a bath; the Christian sense of the baptismal font is a natural extension from the original method of baptising by total immersion in a pool. In its Christian sense, baptismal font, it dates from the fourth century. (TLL, II, 1719 ff.; LS, 221; Blaise, 111; Souter, 28.)

basilica: It occurs eleven times in the CBP, CBS, CEX, and the title of the IB. βασιλική. Classical in form; the Christian sense of a cathedral or metropolitan church dates from the fourth century. (TLL, II, 1761 ff.; LS, 223; Blaise, 111; Souter, 28.)


blasphemus: PRI, 2.40. βλάσφημος. In the connotation blasphemer it is Christian from the third century. (TLL, II, 2047 ff.; LS, 241; Blaise, 117.)

canon: The noun occurs twenty-nine times in the CBP, CBS, and CEX. κανών. Official rule of the religious life, except at CEX, LXVII.2, where it means the official books of Scripture. The word is Silver in form, Christian in connotation from the fourth century. (TLL, III, 272 ff.; LS, 280; Blaise, 127 ff.; Souter, 37.)
**catechumenus:** CBP, 7.XVII.tit. and 1; CBS, 3.I.tit., 7, and 8. Καταγωγή. Christian, second-third century. One receiving instructions in the faith. (TLL, III, 600 ff.; LS, 301; Blaise, 138; Sainio, 32 ff.)

**cathedra:** CBP, 5.23; CBS, 3.II.2; DTM, 2.23. Καθηδρα. Metaphorically in the sense of the bishop's office. Christian, fourth century. The form is poetic and Silver. (TLL, I, 611 ff.; LD, 301; Blaise, 139; Souter, 43.)

**cenodoxia:** PRI, 1.16. Κανοδοξία. Vainglory. Here it is a transliteration, the Greek equivalent of iactantia. Christian, fourth century. (TLL, I, 785; Blaise, 142.)

**chaos:** CBP, 3.VII.3. The formless mass from which the world was made. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, III, 990 ff.; LS, 325.)

**chartula:** CBS, 3.V.7. χάρτης. A little book. A hybrid. The word is rare in classical Latin, frequent in Late. (TLL, I, 1001 ff.; LS, 328; Blaise, 147.)

**christma:** CBP, 7.XIX.tit. and 2; CBS, 3.IV.tit.; CEX, LI.tit. and 2. χρίσμα. Consecrated oil. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, I, 1027 ff.; LS, 328; Blaise, 148; Souter, 49; Sainio, 36 ff.)

**clericatus:** CEX, XXI.3 and 7, XXVI.4, and LVIII.5. A hybrid from the Greek Κληρικός. The office of cleric. Christian, fourth-fifth century. (TLL, III, 1338 ff.; LS, 393; Blaise, 159.)

**clerus:** The noun occurs twenty-three times in the CBP, CBS, and CEX. Κληρος. The college of clerics, or the clergy. The word itself is Christian from second-third century, but this connotation is third century. (TLL, III, 1340 ff.; LS, 313; Blaise, 159; Sainio, 38 ff.)

**coenobium:** SPA, 110.2, a bracketed passage. Κοινωνία. A monastery with a community life. Christian, fourth century. (TLL, III, 1414; LS, 358; Blaise, 163; Souter, 57; Sainio, 66 ff.)

**daemon:** The word appears twenty-eight times in the SPA, CBP, and DCR. δάσκων. It occurs in Apuleius, De Deo Socratis where it is probably a direct Greek loan; in all other instances it is in Christian writers in both an ameliorative and a pejorative sense. Martin always uses it in the pejorative sense, a devil, but referring to fallen angels other than Lucifer, the devil, who is diabolus. (TLL, V, 4 ff.; LS, 510; Blaise, 233.)
daemonium: The noun occurs six times in the DCR. 

daemonium. An evil spirit always in Martin. It occurs in the ameliorative sense again in Apuleius, De Deo Socratis, where it is again likely a direct loan; other Christian authors use it in both ameliorative and pejorative senses. (TLL, V, 6 ff.; LS, 510; Blaise, 233.)

diabolus: This noun is used twenty-seven times by Martin in the SPA, CBP, CEX, and DCR. διάβολος. The word is Christian, second-third century. In Martin, always the devil; an ordinary evil spirit or bad angel is daemon, daemonium, or angelus appropriately modified. (TLL, V, 940 ff.; LS, 569; Blaise, 267.)

diaconus. The noun occurs twice in the CBP, 7.IX. tit. and 1, and twenty-six times in the CEX. διάκονος. On the form cf. Chapter Two. A member of the order of the clergy preceding presbyter; he distributed alms, administered the temporal affairs of a church, read the gospel. Early the word was used for any of the lower orders. It is, of course, Christian, second-third century; its one appearance in a secular author, Ammianus, 14, 9.7, is qualified by the phrase ut appellant Christiani. (TLL, V, 943 ff.; LS, 568; Blaise, 268; Sainio, 38 ff.)


dioecesis: CBP, 8.6; CBS, 3.I.tit. and 2, 3.II.tit. and 1; CEX, VII.tit. and LII.2. διοικησις. Form is classical, but the connotation, the province of a bishop, is Christian, fourth century. (TLL, V, 1223 ff.; LS, 583; Blaise, 295.)

dogma: IDS, 10.135; IB, 1. δόγμα. The form is classical, but the connotation, an official religious tenet, is Christian, fourth century. (TLL, V, 1813 ff.; LS, 606; Blaise, 289.)

ecclesia: The noun appears 104 times in the SPA, CBP, CBS, CEX, and DCR. ἐκκλησία. It occurs once in the Letters of Pliny, where it refers to the Greek assembly and is probably a direct loan; the Christian connotation, a church, dates from the second-third century. (TLL, V, 2, 32 ff.; LS, 624; Blaise, 297; Sainio, 40 ff.)

episcopus: The noun appears 188 times in the SPA, CBP, CBS, CEX, DI, FVH, DTM, and DP. ἐπίσκοπος. Bishop. Christian, second-third century; the word also occurs in the Jurists and inscriptions, meaning superintendent. (TLL, V, 2, 676 ff.; LS, 651; Blaise, 311; Sainio, 58 ff.)

epistola: The noun is found thirteen times in the CBS, CEX, DCR, FVH, and DTM; this is the usual Late spelling. ἐπιστολή. The form and general sense are Old Latin; the meaning, a letter of an Apostle in the canon of Scripture, is Christian. Martin has the general sense seven times, the special sense in reference to Peter five times and to Paul once. (TLL, V, 2, 680 ff.; LS, 651; Blaise, 311.)

epitaphium: EE, tit. ἐπιτάφιον. A funeral inscription. There is a single reference to Varro, and in LS, but not the TLL, a single reference to Cicero; all other citations are Late. (TLL, V, 2, 680 ff.; LS, 651.)

eulogia: CEX, LXX.tit. and 1. εὐλογία. The form is Christian from the fourth century; the connotation, benediction, a simple direct translation of the Greek, appears only in Ambrose, Gregory the Great, and Martin. (TLL, V, 2, 1048 ff.; Blaise, 319.)


evangellum: PRI, 3.63; CBS, 1.12; CEX, XXIII.2; DCR, 14.22; DTM, 4.62. εὐαγγέλιον. Gospel. Christian, second-third century; Cicero has the word, but in Greek, as "good news" in a Letter to Atticus (2.3.1). (TLL, V, 2, 998 ff.; LS, 666; Blaise, 317; Sainio, 46 ff.)

exorcismus: CBS, 3.I.7 and 3.IX.12. ἐξορκισμός. The rite, administered before baptism, by which evil spirits are expelled. Christian, third century. (TLL, V, 2, 1554 ff.; LS, 690; Blaise, 331.)


haeresis: The noun occurs thirteen times in the IDS, CBP, CBS, and CEX. ἁγέρεσις. The word has classical antecedents, but the meaning religious heresy is Christian. (TLL, VI, 3, 2501 ff.; LS, 838; Blaise, 386; Sainio, 48 ff.)
**hymnus**: CEX, LXV.tit. and 2. ὅμοιος. The word is Silver with a Christian specialization to a song of religious praise. (TLL, VI, 3, 3143 ff.; LS, 872; Blaise, 397.)

**hypocrites**: PRI, 3.68. ὑποκριτὴς. The form is Silver; the connotation, pretender, is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VI, 3, 3155 ff.; LS, 873; Blaise, 398.)

**idolum**: It occurs nine times in the CBS and DCR. εἰδωλον. The word is classical in form, but the connotation, graven image, is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VII, 1, 248 ff.; LS, 1013; Blaise, 401.)

**laicus**: The noun appears thirteen times in the SPA, CBP, CEX, and FVH. λαίκος. A layman. Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1031; Blaise, 484; Souter, 235.)


**martyr**: CBP, 7.XVIII.6 and 7.XXI.2; CEX, XLVIII.tit., 1, and 3. μάρτυς, μάρτυρ. A martyr. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VIII, 416 ff.; LS, 1116; Blaise, 516; Sainio, 60 ff.)

**mathematikos**: CBP, 3.X.1. μαθηματικός. An astrologer. The connotation is Silver, the form classical. (TLL, VIII, 471 ff.; LS, 1119; Blaise, 518.)

**metropolis**: CEX, XVIII.10. μητρόπολις. Capital city. Late Latin, fourth century. (TLL, VIII, 896 ff.; LS, 1141; Blaise, 529; Souter, 251.)

**monachus**: It occurs twenty-two times in the SPA and CBP. μοναχὸς. A monk. Christian, fourth century. (TLL, 1396 ff.; LS, 1160; Blaise, 538; Souter, 255; Sainio, 68 ff.)

**monasterium**: SPA, 18.2, 4, and 7; CBP, 7.1.3. μοναστήριον. A monastery. Christian, fourth century. (TLL, VIII, 1402 ff.; LS, 1160; Blaise, 538.)

**mystērion**: CEX, LCCCIII.3; DP, 1.1 and 3.48. μυστήριον. The form is classical; the connotation, Christian rites, dates from second-third century. (LS, 1183; Blaise, 547 ff.)

**neophytus**: CEX, XXII.tit. and 5. νεοφύτος. A new convert. Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1200; Blaise, 553; Sainio, 61 ff.)
paradisus: IDS, 6.78; DCR, 4.2 and 8. \textit{παραδείσους}. The form is Silver; the connotation, paradise, is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1300 ff.; Blaise, 592)

pascha: The noun occurs twenty-six times in the CBS, CEX, and DP. It is a Hebrew word that comes into Latin through the Greek adaptation, \textit{τὸ πάσχα}. On the form cf.
Chapter Two. Easter. Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1311; Blaise, 597 ff.; Souter, 288.)


pinax: DP, 9.132 and 134. \textit{πίναξ}. The form is Christian, second-third century; the connotation, a table of dates, is fifth century and rare. (LS, 1377; Blaise, 625; Souter, 304.)


presbyter: It appears forty-seven times in the CBP, CBS, CEX, and DTM. \textit{πρεσβυτέρος}. An elder, or here, a priest, of the church. Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1441; Blaise, 661; Souter, 321; Sainio, 63 ff.)


propheta: IDS, 1.1 and 4.40; EH, 3.42 and 8.146; CBS, 3.XVII.4; DCR, 14.22. \textit{προφήτης}. A Jewish prophet. Form is Late Latin; specific connotation 1. Christian. (LS, 1469; Blaise, 675.)


psalmus: It occurs seven times in EH, CBP, CBS, CEX, and DTM. \textit{ψαλμός}. A psalm. Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1483; Blaise, 682.)

romphaea: SPA, 43.2. \textit{ρομφαία}. A long missile weapon. Silver. (LS, 1594; Blaise, 724.)
schema: SPA, 45.4 and 49.6. Habit, i.e., clothing of a uniform type. Old and Silver, but not classical, Latin. (LS, 1641; Blaise, 742.)

schisma: IDS, 10.136. σχίσμα. A schism, not necessarily heretical, but often so. Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1641; Blaise, 742; Sainio, 51 ff.)

scyphus: IR, 5. σχιφος. A cup or goblet. Old Latin. (LS, 1651.)

simma: IR, 2. A Late spelling for sigma. σιμμα. A semicircular couch. Late Latin. (IS, 1696; Blaise, 758 and 761; Souter, 378.)

sophisma: FVH, 1.12. σοφίσμα. Sophism. Silver. (LS, 1730.)


subdiaconatus: CBP, 7.XX.2; CEX, XXV.6. A hybrid from diaconus. The office of the subdeacon. Christian; it appears in Gregory the Great and Martin. (Blaise, 780; Souter, 39.)

subdiaconus: It occurs eight times in CBP and CEX. A hybrid from diaconus. A subdeacon. Christian, third century. (LS, 1773; Blaise, 780.)

symbolum: The word is found seven times in CBS, CEX, and DCR. σύμβολον. The form is Old Latin; the connotation, the Apostle's Creed, is Christian, third century. (LS, 1829; Blaise, 805; Souter, 409.)

synodus: It occurs eleven times in CBP, CBS, CEX, and DTM. σύνοδος. A council. Christian, second-third century; it occurs in Firmicus, Math., and Ammianus, but in reference to Christians. (LS, 1829; Blaise, 806; Souter, 411; Sainio, 69 ff.)

Thla: CBP, 3.XV.2. θελα, an aunt. The word appears in the grammarian Rufinus (fourth-fifth century) and in Christians of the sixth century. (Blaise, 817; Soutier, 420.)

typus: CEX, LV.2. τόπος. Figure, image. Classical (LS, 1922; Blaise, 833 ff.)

tyrrannus: DI, 3.4. τυράννος. Tyrant. Classical. (LS, 1922; Blaise, 834.)
To summarize, the first occurrence of these words in form, that is lexicologically, occurs according to periods as follows: four in Old Latin, thirteen in classical Latin, eleven in Silver Latin, four in Late Latin, and forty-nine in Christian Latin; also there are three words that occur in both Late and Christian Latin, but probably independently, that is the Christians took the words directly from Christian Greek, not from Late secular Latin, apostolus, daemon, and episcopus. Of the non-Christian words, several developed special connotations, that is, they differ semasiologically from the secular form. According to periods these break down as follows: two from Old Latin, six from classical Latin, six from Silver Latin, and one from Late Latin. There is a predominance of Christian neologisms and semantic changes simply because most of these words are Christian technical terms developed in Greek and fixed in Christian thought before their adoption in Latin; these will be listed separately later.

Nouns in -io

The following nouns in this category which appear in Martin's writings are classical in form and meaning:


6It is recognized that some of the words listed in this classification also have Christian connotations—but not in Martin.
accusatio, actio, admiratio, admonitio, adsentatio, aestimatio, altercatio, ambitio, argumentatio, aspersio, castigatio, cogitatio, cognitio, collectio, collocutio, comessatio, commendatio, conceptio, conclusio, condicio and conditio, conductio, confirmatio, consecutio, consideratio, consolatio, constructio, consultatio, contemptio, contentio, conturbatio, correctio, criminatio, cunctatio, curatio, delectatio, desperatio, dissensio, distinctio, divinatio, divisio, eruditio, excusatio, existimatio, expositio, exsecratio, exultatio, fraudatio, habitatio, indignatio, inquitio, inquiratio, invitatio, laudatio, lectio, liberatio, mentio, obiurgatio, oblectatio, oblivio, occasio, occultatio, opinio, ostentatio, perigrinatio, perfectio, permixtio, privatio, probatio, procreatio, quaestio, reconciliatio, reprensio, salutatio, seditio, sessio, simulatio, sollicitatio, statio, superstition, supplicatio, veneratio, vituperatio.

One word, plasmatio, which belongs in this category, has already been discussed in the section on nouns of foreign origin.

Such a list will precede each of the following sections. It contains most, but not necessarily all, of the words of classical origin that occur in Martin; the writer did not index some common and obviously classical nouns. But the lists will provide some idea of the percentage of classical words which Martin uses. If there has been a semantic development, or if there is some other point of special interest about the word, it is listed in the section and discussed.

---

The difference noted below is one of form only.
abominatio: SPA, 70.1. An accursed thing. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, I, 121 ff.; LS, 9; Blaise, 36.)


abscisio: CEX, XXI.5. The act of cutting off; here, castration. The form is classical, but rare, limited to the technical rhetorical term aposiopesis; the connotation here is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, I, 152; LS, 10; Blaise, 37.)

adinventio: IDS, 10.135; DCR, 8.2 and 11.9. Invention. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, I, 689 ff.; LS, 36; Blaise, 52; Souter, 5.)

adulatlo: The noun occurs six times in the PRI, EH, and FVH. It is found once in Caesar, twice in Cicero, otherwise in Silver writers. (TLL, I, 874 ff.; LS, 46.)

afflictio: CBP, 3.XIV.2. Torment. Silver, but rare in non-Christian writers. (TLL, I, 1230 ff.; LS, 68; Blaise, 50; Souter, 5.)

agnltio: IDS, 1.9. It occurs once in Cicero in a disputed passage, once in Quintilian, otherwise in Late and Christian authors. Knowledge. (TLL, I, 1350 ff.; LS, 73; Blaise, 69.)


benedictio: CBP, 7.XIX.tit.; CEX, LXX,2. In the CBP the meaning is consecration; in the CEX it is praise, a connotation that appears in Apuleius. The first connotation is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, II, 1871 ff.; LS, 231; Blaise, 112 ff.; Souter, 29.)

cautio: DCR, 16.1. Bond. Form and basic connotation is classical; the spiritual sense is Christian, fourth century. (TLL, III, 712 ff.; LS, 305; Blaise, 141.)

celebratio: DP, 2.31 and 7.115. A solemn celebration. It occurs once in Cicero, occasionally in Silver Latin. (TLL, III, 740; LS, 308; Blaise, 141.)

coercio: DI, 7.14. On the form cf. Chapter Two. Form is classical; connotation, punishment, is Silver. (TLL, III, 1437 ff.; LS, 360.)
collatio: CBP, 1.13, 7.XXI.tit. and 1, 8.4; and DI, 1.1. Form is classical; both meanings used here, meeting and contribution, are Silver. (TLL, III, 1577 ff.; LS, 365.)

colligatio: CEX, LIX.2. A binding together. A somewhat rare word, occasional in Cicero, once in Macrobius, and a few times in Christian authors. (TLL, III, 1605; LS, 366.)

commemoratio: SPA, 109.8; CBP, 7.XVI.3, 7.XVII.2, 7.XXI.2; CEX, XLVIII.2; and DP, 1.7. The connotation, remembrance, in the SPA is classical; the other meaning, a commemoration in the liturgy, is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, III, 1828 ff.; LS, 376; Blaise, 172.)

commistio: CEX, LXXXI.1. On the form cf. Chapter Two. The word itself is Late; the connotation, sexual intercourse, is Christian, fourth century. (TLL, III, 1914 ff.; LS, 380; Blaise, 175.)

communio: The noun occurs eighteen times in the CEX. It means the Eucharist, except perhaps at CEX, XXXVI.3 and LXXXII.2 where the more general meaning of union seems to fit better. Form is classical; connotation is Christian, fourth century. (TLL, III, 1960 ff.; LS, 384; Blaise, 177 ff.; Souter, 73.)


confessio: CEX, LIV.4 and DCR, 16.1. An acknowledgment of faith. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 412; Blaise, 194 ff.)

confusio: PRI, 4.87, a Scriptural quotation. Moral ruin. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, fourth century. (LS, 416; Blaise, 198; Souter, 71.)

congregatio: SPA, 32.1; CBP, 1.15; CEX, XV.4. The form is classical; the connotation, gathering, in CBP is classical, while the other meaning, an assembly of Christians, is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 420; Blaise, 199.)

coniectatio: DI, 5.3. Surmise. Silver. (LS, 422.)

constitutio: DBP, 8.17; CEX, VII.3, VIII.3; FVH, 5.3. The form is classical; the sense, rule, in CBP and FVH is Christian, fourth, while the sense, establishment or ordination, in the CEX is Christian, second-third. (LS, 438; Blaise, 209.)
consummatio: DP, 2.34. End. Silver. (LS, 442; Blaise, 211.)

conventio: FVH, 5.2. Compact. Silver. (LS, 463.)

conversatio: SPA, 21.7 and CEX, LXXX.1. Conversation. Silver. (LS, 464; Blaise, 219.)

conversio: SPA, 109.42. Moral change. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, fourth century. (LS, 464; Blaise, 219 ff.)

creatio: CBP, 3.XIII.1. A creating. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, fourth century. (LS, 478; Blaise, 228.)


culpatio: FVH, 2.34. Blame. Silver. (LS, 488.)

damnatio: CBP, 7.XV.4. The form is classical; the connotation, spiritual condemnation, is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, V, 10 ff.; LS, 510; Blaise, 238.)

definitio: CBS, 2.III.4 and CEX, XIII.4. The form is classical; the connotation, decision of an authority, is Late, mostly Christian. (TLL, V, 350 ff.; LS, 521.)

decprecatio: SPA, 109.9. The form is classical; the connotation, a prayer for pardon, is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, V, 596 ff.; LS, 551; Blaise, 257.)

deprehensio: FVH, 6.8. The act of seizing. This connotation occurs once in Cicero and a few times in Ulpian; the word is very rare in all its meanings. (TLL, V, 611; LS, 590; Blaise, 257.)


detractio: SPA, 3.1; IDS, 10.137. Slander. The form is classical, but the connotation is Christian, fourth century. (TLL, V, 820 ff.; LS, 563; Blaise, 265.)

devotio: CBS, 3.VI.1. The form is classical; the connotation, piety, is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, V, 878 ff.; LS, 567; Blaise, 266 ff.)
**dignatio**: FWH, 1.4 and 4.26. Honor or reputation. It occurs once in Cicero, otherwise is Silver. (TLL, V, 1132 ff.; LS, 577; Blaise, 272.)

**dilatio**: DI, 8.2. Delay. Rare in classical Latin, frequent in Silver. (TLL, V, 1162 ff.; LS, 579.)

**directio**: SPA, 39.6. Silver. (TLL, V, 1228 ff.; LS, 584; Blaise, 275.)

**discrepatio**: IDS, 2.23. Difference. The word occurs once in Augustine, once in Rufinus, and once in Caelius Aurelianus, and nowhere else. (TLL, V, 1346; Blaise, 278.)

**discretio**: It occurs six times in SPA, EH, CBS. The form is Silver; the connotation, discernment, is Christian, fourth century. (TLL, V, 1349 ff.; LS, 589; Blaise, 278 ff.)

**discussio**: CBS, 3.III.9, CEX, XXXIV.tit. Examination. The form is Silver; the connotation is Christian, fourth century. (TLL, V, 1371; LS, 590; Blaise, 279; Souter, 107.)

**dissolutio**: CEX, XXXIV.6. The form is classical; the connotation, lasciviousness, is Late. (TLL, V, 1503 ff.; LS, 596; Blaise, 284.)

**elatio**: The noun appears seven times in the PRI, IDS, and EH. The form is classical; the connotation, pride or self-elevation, is Christian, third century. (TLL, V, 2, 324 ff.; LS, 636; Blaise, 302.)

**electio**: CEX, I.tit. and 1. Selection. Silver. (TLL, V, 2, 328 ff.; LS, 636; Blaise, 302.)

**emendatio**: CBS, 2.29 and 3.13. The first occurrence has the meaning, correction, which is classical; the second means perfection which is Christian, fourth century. (TLL, V, 2, 455 ff.; LS, 641; Blaise, 306.)

**eruptio**: DI, 2.6. The form is classical; the connotation, exclamation, is Silver. (TLL, V, 2, 846 ff.)

**examinatio**: CEX, XXIV.1. Investigation. Christian, second-third century; the word also appears in the Jurists. (TLL, V, 2, 1165 ff.; LS, 672; Blaise, 321.)

**excommunicatio**: CBP, 8.13; CBS, 3.VIII.4; CEX, XXXV II.2. Expulsion from communion with the Church. Christian, fourth century. (TLL, V, 2, 1279; LS, 679; Blaise, 325; Sainio, 95.)
fluctuatio: DI, 2.9. A wavering motion. Silver. (TLL, VI, 1, 939 ff.; LS, 761.)

fornicatio: SPA, 3.1; PRI, 1.9; CBS, 3.VIII.1; DCR, 13.23, 15.9, and 17.8. The connotation, vault, is Silver; the connotation, sexual intercourse, is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VI, 1, 1121 ff.; LS, 770; Blaise, 361.)

fructificatio: SPA, 5.7. The act of bearing fruit. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VI, 1, 1367 ff.; LS, 734; Blaise, 365.)

gubernatio: EH, 1.2; DCR, 12.11. Classical, but rare before Christian writers. (TLL, VI, 2, 2344 ff.; LS, 831; Blaise, 382.)

illustratio: DTM, 1.4. Nobility. Christian in connotation, second-third century; the form is Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 394; LS, 887; Blaise, 405.)

immolatio: DP, 2.33. The noun occurs in Cicero, Pliny the Elder, Quintilian, and Christian authors who usually refer it to Christ. (TLL, VII, 1, 487 ff.; LS, 894; Blaise, 409.)

impositio: CBS, 3.III.3. The laying on (of hands). The form occurs in Varro; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VII, 1, 666 ff.; LS, 907; Blaise, 414.)

impugnatio: SPA, 100.2. Temptation. The form occurs in Cicero; the connotation is Christian, third century. (TLL, V II, 1, 713; LS, 910; Blaise, 416; Souter, 189.)

incantatio: CEX, LXXIV.2; DCR, 16.23, 26, and 29 (twice). A spell. The word occurs in Firmicus, Math., and Chiron, and in Christian writers from second century. (TLL, VII, 1, 845 ff.; LS, 917; Blaise, 420; Souter, 192.)

inchoatio: DP, 5.70 and 6.93. A beginning. The form is Christian from second-third century; the connotation dates from the fourth century. (TLL, VII, 1, 964 ff.; LS, 924; Blaise, 422.)

inclinatio: CBS, 4.5. Inclination. Rare in classical Latin, but common in Silver in this connotation. (TLL, VII, 1, 938 ff.; LS, 923; Blaise, 423.)
increpatio: SPA, 106.3; CBS, 4.4; CEX, VII.5 and XXXIV.8. A rebuking. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VII.1, 1047 ff.; LS, 929; Blaise, 429.)

inspiratio: CBS, 1.7 and 16. Inspiration. Christian, second-third century; there is a single instance in Solinus. (LS, 968; Blaise, 456; Souter, 211.)

instigatio: SPA, 3.5, a bracketed passage. Instigation. Very rare in secular authors, though it does occur in the Rhetor ad Herennium. (LS, 969; Blaise, 456.)

institutio: Martin has the word in two meanings; education or information at FVH, 1.14, is a classical connotation; regulation at CBP, 5.9, 7.XX.5, FVM, 6.1, DTM, 2.2 and 5.76, is a sense not cited by any source except Niermeyer (fasc. 6, 546) and is apparently a medieval meaning just developing in the sixth century. (LS, 969; Blaise, 457; Souter, 211.)

instructio: CBP, 2.20, 4.6, 5.20, 6.3; CBS, 1.18. Instruction or formation. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, third century. (LS, 970; Blaise, 457; Souter, 211.)

interrogatio: SPA, 25.5; CBP, 5.21. Inquiry. The word occurs rarely in classical Latin in the meaning, a syllogism; primarily it is a Silver Latin word. (LS, 985; Blaise, 467.)

invocatio: CBS, 3.IV.3; DTM, 3.36. Invocation. Silver. (TLL, VII, 2, 252 ff.; LS, 997; Blaise, 473.)

iussio: CEX, XL.1 and DTM, 5.82. Command. Christian, second-third century; the word also appears in the Jurists. (LS, 1019; Blaise, 480; Souter, 223.)

lustratio: CEX, LXXI.3. Purification. The form is classical; the connotation is Silver from Livy on. (LS, 1087; Blaise, 505.)

maledictio: CEX, LXX.2. Curse. The word occurs once in Cicero, but in the sense reviling; the above connotation is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VIII, 170 ff.; LS, 1102; Blaise, 509.)

meditatia: SPA, 78.1. Contemplation. This connotation is rare in classical and Silver authors, common in Christian. (TLL, VIII, 570 ff.; LS, 1124; Blaise, 521.)
mersio: DTM, tit., and 3.46. Immersion. Christian, sixth century. (LS, 1137; Blaise, 528; Souter, 250.)

monoratio: DTM, 4.64. Diminution. Christian, fourth century, though the word does occur in the scholiast of Horace and in Priscian. (TLL, VIII, 1032; LS, 1147; Blaise, 533.)

murmuratio: IDS, 10.137. A crying. Silver. (IS, 1178; Blaise, 545.)

oblatio: The form is Late. In Martin it has three different connotations: an offering, CBS, 3.II. tit. and 13, 3.VI.2; a mass, CBP, 7.XVI.3, 7.XVII.2, CEX, XXXVII.3 and LXVIII.4; the Eucharist, CBS, 3.X.4 and 8, LV.4. All three connotations are Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1235; Blaise, 564; Souter, 270.)

observatio: At DP, 2.37 and 3.53, it means observance, the classical connotation; at CEX, LXXI.tit., LXXIII.1 and 3, LXXIV.tit. and 2; DCR, 11.8 and 12.2, it means ceremony, a fourth century Christian connotation. (LS, 1242; Blaise, 567.)

oratio: The noun occurs eighteen times in the SPA, EH, CEX, and DCR. The form is classical; the connotation, prayer, is Christian, second-third century (N. B., oratio dominica, the Lord's Prayer). (LS, 1274 ff.; Blaise, 582; Souter, 279.)

ordinatio: It is found twenty-one times in the CBP, CBS, and CEX. The word has the Christian, second-third century connotation, ordination, everywhere except at CBS, 1.8, where it has the Silver meaning, decree, and at CBS, 1.11, where it has the classical sense, regulation or ordering. (LS, 1277; Blaise, 583.)

passio: The noun occurs eighteen times in the SPA, IDS, DI, and DP. The general sense of passion or emotion is used in all instances except in the DP where the word means Christ's sufferings. The first connotation dates from the second-third century, the second from the fourth. (LS, 1312; Blaise, 598 ff.; Souter 288.)

perditio: SPA, 3.5 and 15.5, both bracketed passages, and CBS, 3.VIII.7. Perdition, i.e., spiritual ruin, damnation. Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1336; Blaise, 608.)

persecutio: SPA, 38.1 and 109.17, a Scriptural quotation. Persecution. The form is Late; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1354; Blaise, 616.)

peticio: SPA, 100.3. Request. The form is classical; the general connotation is Silver, with a Christian specialization to a request addressed to God, fourth century. (LS, 1364; Blaise, 621 ff.)

praedicatio: DCR, 1.10. The form is classical; the connotation sermon, i.e., preaching, is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1416; Blaise, 644; Souter, 313.)

praefiguratio: DCR, 11.6. Prototype or prefiguration. Christian, third century. (LS, 1419; Blaise, 647; Souter, 314.)

praesumptio: IDS, 10.134; CBS, 3.X.3; CEX, VII.tit., and XIV.tit.; DTM, 5.68. There are two connotations, superposition and a taking beforehand, both Silver. (LS, 1433; Blaise, 656 ff.)

profusio: CBS, 3.III.7. Prodigality. Silver. (LS, 1460; Blaise, 670.)

prosecutio: CBP, 1.24. Continuation. Late Latin. (LS, 1475; Souter, 329.)

protectio: IDS, 5.64. Protection. Christian, third century. (LS, 1477; Blaise, 679.)

recuperatio: CBP, 7.VII.2; CBS, 3.II.5. Repair. Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1532; Blaise, 702; Souter, 344.)

redemptio: CBP, 7.XVII.1; DP. 2.13. The form is classical; the connotation, release from sin and salvation, is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1532; Blaise, 702; Souter, 345.)

remissio: DI, 10.5; DCR, 15.20. In the DI the connotation is abatement, which is classical; in the DCR it is forgiveness of sin, which is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1561; Blaise, 710.)

renuntiatio: SPA, 27.3. Renunciation. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1565; Blaise, 712; Souter, 350.)

repromissio: SPA, 34.2. Promise. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1573; Blaise, 715; Souter, 351.)
resurrectio: The noun occurs nineteen times in CBP, CBS, CEX, DCR, and DP. The resurrection of a body. Christian, second-third century. (SL, 1585; Blaise, 720; Souter, 354.)

solutio: CEX, XVIII.1. A resolving. Silver. (IS, 1724; Blaise, 765; Souter, 381.)

suasio: IDS, 3.33 and 36. The form is classical; the connotation, persuasion, is Silver. (IS, 1771; Blaise, 779.)

submitio: SPA, 41.3. The form is classical; the connotation, instigation, is Christian, fourth century. (IS, 1801; Blaise, 784.)

subreptio: CEX, XXVI.4. Deceit. Late Latin. (IS, 1818; Blaise, 785.)

subscriptio: CBP, 8.19, where it means a signature, a connotation that is classical but rare before Late Latin, and CEX, II.4, where it means a list, a Late connotation. (IS, 1780; Blaise, 785; Souter, 395.)

supputatio: DH, 4.64; DP, 1.2. Calculation. Silver but rare in secular authors. (IS, 1816; Blaise, 801; Souter, 407.)

sustentatio: SPA, 109.8, where it means forbearance, a classical but rare connotation, and CBS, 3.V.9, where it means maintenance or support, a standard Late Latin connotation. (IS, 1821; Blaise, 804; Souter, 409.)

temptatio: SPA, 8.9 and 36.2. On the form cf. Chapter Two. Temptation. Christian, second-third century; the form is classical. (IS, 1855; Blaise, 812; Souter, 415.)

tinctio: DTM, 3.42, 45, and 49, 4.54 and 60, 5.68, 72, and 81. Baptism; a Latin word that never won favor in its Christian sense. Christian, second-third century. (Blaise, 817 ff.; Souter, 421.)

traditio: CEX, LXXII. tit. and 1; DTM, 3.29 and 44; DP, 3.42. A tradition. Silver. (IS, 1893; Blaise, 822.)

tribulatio: It appears eight times in the SPA and DCR. Affliction. Christian, third century. (IS, 1896; Blaise, 828; Souter, 428.)

ultio: DI, 10.7. Revenge. Silver. (IS, 1925; Blaise, 844.)
unctio: EH, 3.41. Ointment. The form is classical; the connotation is Silver. (LS, 1929; Blaise, 826.)

visio: CBS, 1.10; DTM, 3.39. The connotation, sight, in the CBS is Late; the meaning, dream or vision, in the DTM is classical. (LS, 1989; Blaise, 852.)

Post-classical neologisms above, by periods, are:
twenty-three in Silver Latin, eight in Late Latin, and twenty-three in Christian Latin. Of these, four Silver and three Late words underwent semantic change in the hands of the Christians. Of the words of classical origin, eight are listed solely because of their rarity in the classical period; seventeen were changed in meaning by later secular authors, twenty-nine by Christian authors, and three occur in Martin in two connotations, one in a Late secular changed connotation and one in a Christian changed meaning. For the mathematically inclined, then, Martin has 195 nouns in this category; ninety are classical in form and meaning, forty-nine in form but not meaning. Of the 195 nouns only twenty-three are purely Christian though thirty-eight others occur with Christian connotations. The variety of influences on a Late, Christian, traditionalist, literary author is well illustrated by these words.
Nouns in -ia

The following nouns in -ia which appear in Martin are classical in form and meaning:

amentia, amicitia, angustiae, arrogantia, audacia, avaritia, clementia, concordia, conscientia, controversia, contumelia, copia, custodia, deliciae, desidia, divitiae, fallacia, fiducia, hostia, ignavia, ignorantia, impreudentia, impudentia, industria, inedia, inimicitia, iniuria, innocentia, insania, intelligentia, invidia, iracundia, iustitia, laetitia, licentia, luxuria, malitia, memoria, miseria, misericordia, molestia, negligentia, nequitia, notitia, nuptiae, oboedientia, parsimonia, patientia, pecunia, pertinacia, pestilentia, potentia, praesentia, providentia, provincia, prudentia, saevitia, scientia, sententia, stultitia, superbia, tristitia, venia, verecundia, vesania, victoria, vigilantia, violentia.

The following words have already been discussed in the section on nouns of foreign origin:

blasphemia, cenodoxia, ecclesia, eulogia, letania, parochia, prophetia, and thia.

abstinientia: CEX, XXI.5; LVIII.1; FVH, 5.11. The sense refraining from is classical; the specific connotation refraining from food is Silver. (TLL, I, 191 ff.; LS, 12.)

abundantia: IDS, 9.120. The form is classical; the connotation excessive amount, is Silver. (TLL, I, 227 ff.; LS, 13.)

Barry, 43 ff.; Bogan, 21. 26, 45 ff.; Ennis, 3, 12; Hauber, 23 ff., 68 ff.; Hrdlicka, 23; Kinnavey, 4, 28 ff.; Mahoney, 23 ff.; 74 ff.; Mueller, 2 and 18; O'Donnell, 28; Zimmermann, 35.

Concerning the use of this word in the DI, Barlow writes, "It is noteworthy that the word for anger, used so often in the treatise, is always ira, never Cassian's occasional iracundia." (p. 145.) This is inaccurate; iracundia appears at 7.13 and 20, and 10.8 and 15. Martin also uses iracundia at SPA, 11.2, 17.4; PRI, 1.4, and DCR, 5.4.
affluentia: IDS, 1.8. Abundance. The word occurs in Cicero, otherwise it is Silver and later. (TLL, I, 1241 ff.; LS, 68.)

concupiscentia: CEX, XXI.6, and FVH, 4.5. Strong desire, usually sexual. Christian, second-third century. (IS, 404; Blaise, 190; Souter, 69.)

continentia: It occurs nine times in the SPA, CEX, and FVH. The word has the classical connotation of moderation at all places except CEX, XXXII.8 where the idea of sexual control is added; the latter is Christian. (LS, 448; Blaise, 215; Souter, 76.)

curia: IB, 3. The form is classical; the connotation, assembly or society, is cited only for Christian writers from the fourth century on. (IS, 501; Blaise, 235.)

differentia: DTM, 3.51. Distinction. The form and connotation are classical; the application to the Trinity is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, V, 1062 ff.; LS, 574; Blaise, 270.)

excellentia: FVH, 7.3. Classical, but infrequent before Christian writings. (TLL, V, 2, 1211 ff.; LS, 675; Blaise, 323.)

feria: The noun occurs seven times in the CBP, CEX, DCR, and DP. Classical with a Christian specialization in both the form (singular) and the meaning, a Christian religious feast, second-third. (TLL, VI, 1, 502 ff.; LS, 736; Blaise, 348.)

flagrantia: DTM, 1.7. Ardor. It occurs once in Plautus, once in Cicero, elsewhere in Late and Christian writers. (TLL, VI, 1, 845 ff.; LS, 755; Blaise, 355.)

gloria: The noun appears forty-four times in the PRI, IDS, EH, CBS, DCR, FVH, and DP. It has the classical connotation everywhere except IDS, 4.44, EH, 5.102, a Scriptural quotation, CBS, 2.38, a Scriptural quotation, 3.7, DCR, 3.4, 8, and 12, 14.9; and DP, 2.18 and 9.136 where various Christian connotations are used. In the PRI, IDS, and EH, Martin distinguishes by modification: humana, divina, or gloria Dei. (TLL, VI, 2, 2061 ff.; BS, 817 ff.; Blaise, 377; Souter, 162; also cf. Vermeulen, A. J., The Semantic Development of Gloria in Early-Christian Latin. Nijmegen: Dekker and van de Vegt, 1956.)
**gratia:** The word occurs thirty-four times in a variety of meanings: 1.) The classical meaning, thanks, SPA, 51.4, 92.1; IDS, 8.11; EH, 6.112, 113, 114; CBS, 3.1.4; CEX, LXV.3, LXXI.6, a Scriptural quotation; 2.) The Christian meaning, grace, SPA, 109.48; IDS, 3.37; CBP, 5.17, 8.5 and 15; CBS, 2.19, 3.3, 3.11, 3.11, 3.11, 3.DT.6 and 8; CEX, LIV.1, LXXI.4; DTM, 1.5 and DP. 9.135; 3.) The poetic and Silver connotation, charm or beauty, FVH, 9.10; IB, 20; IR, 10; 4.) The classical connotation, favor, IDS, 1.6; EH, 2.17; CBS, 3.11.8; DI, 6.4. (TLL, VI, 2, 2205 ff.; LS, 825 ff.; Blaise, 379 ff.)

**iactantia:** PRI, tit., 1.17, 3.54, 5.88; IDS, 6.76. Boasting. Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 43 ff.; LS, 1010; Blaise, 398 ff.)

**immunditia:** CBP, 3.XIV.3. Uncleanliness. It occurs once each in Plautus, Columella, Fronto, and Ulpian; elsewhere Christian from second-third century. (TLL, VII, 1, 499 ff.; LS, 895; Blaise, 409.)

**incursa:** CBP, 1.21, 4.8, and 4.11. Negligence. Classical but rare before the Late period. (TLL, VII, 1, 1080 ff.; LS, 930.)

**indulgentia:** CEX, LXXXIII.6 and DCR, 17.15. The form is classical; the general sense of remission is Late, but the Christian connotation, forgiveness, as here, dates from the second-third century. (TLL, VII, 1, 1246 ff.; LS, 938; Blaise, 436.)

**observantia:** CBS, 4.1. Observance, i.e., a following out or keeping of a law, custom, etc. The form is classical, the connotation Silver. (LS, 1242; Blaise, 567.)

**poenitentia:** The form is Silver; Martin has one instance, DI, 9.17, where the word has the Silver connotation, remorse. In twenty-five other occurrences in the SPA, CEX, and DCR, it has the Christian connotation sorrow, for sin or penance. At SPA, 61.4, it has the specialized sense of prostration, an Eastern custom; unfortunately the Greek for this passage is lost, and one cannot examine the original work. (LS, 1289; Blaise, 588.)

**protervia:** FVH, 1.8. Wantonness. Late Latin. (LS, 1478; Blaise, 679; Souter, 330.)

**reverentia:** There are three meanings: respect, classical but rare before Silver Latin, at FVH, 9.8; awe or veneration, also more Silver than classical, at CBP, 7.XVIII.6, CEX, XVI.2, DCR, 18.14 and 29; your reverence, a title of respect, used in Silver Latin in the sense of deference due
to your dignity, but as a title it is Late Latin, fourth century. (IS, 1589; Blaise, 723; Souter, 355.)

substantia: CBP, 3.I.2, 3.V.I, 3.VII.4; DTM, 3.46 and 48, 5.86. Being, material, essence, substance. Silver; certain Christian theological distinctions may be operating here, but the author is not qualified to judge these. (IS, 1782 ff.; Blaise, 786 ff.; Souter, 396.)

vigilia: SPA, 2.1, 109.14; IDS, 9.125; CBP, 7.II.1. The form is classical; the connotation, vigil, i.e., night prayer, is Christian. (IS, 1990; Blaise, 848; Sainio, 90 ff.)

To sum up, there are sixteen words of classical origin in the above list, five rarely appear in classical writing, two have undergone semantic change in Silver Latin, and nine in Christian. There are four words of Silver origin, one of which has had a Christian semantic development. There is one Late neologism, and one Christian neologism.

Nouns in -tor

accusator, adivitor, auctor, bellator, corrector, corruptor, debitor, deserter, inventor, investigator, occultator, scriptor, seminator, successor, ultor.

The word rhetor has already been discussed in the section on nouns of foreign origin.

adulator: EH, 3.43 and 44; FVH, 2.18. Flatterer. Silver. (TLL, I, 876; IS, 46.)

belligerator: EH, 6.108. Warrior, Christian, second-third century; Infrequent and mostly poetic. (TLL, II, 1814; IS, 226; Blaise, 112.)

---

castigator: DI, 7.15. A corrector. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, III, 532; LS, 298; Blaise, 136.)

commentator: FVH, 6.10. A contriver. The word appears in Apuleius and Christian writers. (TLL, III, 1862; LS, 377; Blaise, 173.)


confessor: At SPA, 94.2, it means an ascetic; at EE, 3, it is a title given to a bishop for firmness in the face of persecution or steadfastness in the fight against heresy. Both Christian connotations are from the fourth century. (LS, 412; Blaise, 195.)

contemptor: CEX, XI.tit.; FVH, 4.66. Despiser. Poetic, and Silver. (LS, 446; Blaise, 213.)

creator: The noun occurs nine times in the IDS, CEX, and DCR. The form is classical; the connotation, God, creator of the world, is Christian, fourth century. (LS, 478; Blaise, 228.)

detestator: FVH, 4.61. One who hates. Christian; it occurs only in Tertullian, Augustine, and Cassiodorus. (TLL, V, 809; LS, 562; Blaise, 364.)

exactor: EH, 5.99; FVH, 4.58 and 67. In the EH it has the meaning a collector of debts, which occurs in Caesar and Silver authors; in FVH it means an exactor, a Silver connotation. (TLL, V, 2, 1135 ff.; LS, 671; Blaise, 320.)

fornicat olor: CEX, XXVII.tit. One who commits fornication. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VI, 1, 1122 ff.; LS, 770; Blaise, 361.)

fundator: CBS, 3.V.2. Builder. It occurs once in Vergil, then in Late authors. (TLL, VI, 1, 1555 ff.; LS, 792; Blaise, 368.)


largitor: IDS, 2.25. Bestower. Rare in classical, more frequent in Silver. (LS, 1037; Blaise, 487.)
lector: It occurs nine times in the CBP and CEX. The lector was the second of the minor orders and designated the cleric who did the reading in the church. Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1046; Blaise, 490.)

ordinator: CEX, XII.6. One who ordains clerics. The form is Silver; the connotation is Christian, fourth century. (LS, 1277; Blaise, 583.)

pastor: CBS, 2.38, a Scriptural quotation, with the classical connotation, shepherd; and IB, 22, with the connotation, head of a Christian community, second-third century. (LS, 1312; Blaise, 599.)

peccator: The noun appears 15 times in the SPA, PRI, IDS, EH, and DCR. Sinner. Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1320; Blaise, 603; Souter, 290.)

praecessor: CBP, 5.22; CBS, 2.9; CEX, VIII.4. Predecessor. Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1412; Blaise, 641; Souter, 312.)

praesumptor: CEX, LXVIII.1. A bold, over confident person. Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1433; Blaise, 657; Souter, 319.)

raptor: FVH, 5.12. Robber. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1524; Blaise, 696.)

reprehensor: FVH, 4.47. A blamer. Classical, but rare. (LS, 1572; Blaise, 714.)

scrutator: FVH, 4.47, 6.5. Examiner. Silver, but rare. (LS, 1650; Blaise, 745.)

translator: CEX, 11. Translator. Christian, fourth century. The form is classical, however. (LS, 1892; Blaise, 826; Souter, 426.)

vestator: DP, 2.29 and 35. Devastator. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1959; Blaise, 837.)

To summarize, there are eight words of classical origin, three rare in classical writings and three which underwent semantic change in Christian authors. There are seven words of Silver prose usage, one of which has a
Christian change of meaning. There are two Late Latin neologisms, and eleven Christian neologisms.

**Nouns in -or**

The nouns in -or which appear in Martin but are classical in both form and meaning are the following:

amor, clamor, dolor, favor, foetor, furor, pallor, pudor, rubor, rumor, sapor, splendor, timor, tumor.

**error**

The noun has the following meanings: delusion, mistake, deception, classical connotations, at SPA, 23.4, DCR, 10.1, 11.1, 13.4, FVH, 4.48; moral error, sin, poetic and Silver connotations, at CBS, 3.I.11 and DI, 9.10; heresy, a Christian connotation of the second-third century, at CBP, 2.5, 3.5, 3.XVII.2 and 4, 3.9, CBS, 3.X.1, DTM, 4.63. (TLL V, 2, 814 ff.; LS, 657 ff.; Blaise, 314; Souter, 128.)

**fervor**

DI, 8.7. Heat. Classical, but frequent only in Silver and later writers. (TLL V I, 1, 600 ff.; LS, 742.)

**tenor**

CBS, 2.27; FVH, 9.1. A continuous course. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1855; Blaise, 8.12.)

**Nouns in -tas**

The following nouns in -tas which appear in the writings of Martin of Braga are classical in form and meaning:

aetas, asperitas, atrocitas, auctoritas, benignitas, bonitas, brevitatis, caecitas, civitas, communitas, credulitas, crudelitas, cruditas, dignitas, divinitas, egestas, extremitas, familiaritas, fidelitas, firmitas, germanitas,

**Barry**, 58 ff.

gravitas, hereditas, hilaritas, honestas, importunitas, indignitas, infirmitas, inhumanitas, integritas, lenitas, libertas, longinquitas, mediocritas, mobilitas, novitas, paupertas, pietas, potestas, pravitas, propinquitas, sagacites, sanitas, siccitas, simulitas, societas, stabilitas, suavitas, subtilitas, taciturnitas, temeritas, tempestas, tenuitas, tranquillitas, urbanitas, utilitas, vanitas, varietas, veritas, vicinitas, viriditas, voluntas, voluptas.

**ambiguitas:** FVH, 5.13. Uncertainty. The word occurs in Cicero, but it is primarily a Silver word. (TLL, I, 1839 ff.; LS, 102.)

**caritas:** It occurs twenty times in the SPA, PRI, EH, CBP, CBS, DI, DCR, and DTM, with the classical connotation, love, everywhere except at CBP, 5.9, CBS, 2.7-8, DCR, 1.1, 2.3 (perhaps), 19.2, where it is used as a Late Latin title of address. (Cf. Sr. Mary Bridget O'Brien, op. cit., 52 ff.)

**castitas:** SPA, 85.1, a bracketed passage. The word and the connotation are rare before Silver Latin; the reference to God is Christian. (TLL, III, 1267 ff.; LS, 349; Blaise, 157.)

**consangvininitas:** CBP, 3.XV.2. Blood relationship. Silver. (LS, 425; Blaise, 202.)

**deitas:** DTM, 3.48 and 49, 4.65. Divinity. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, V, 413; LS, 535; Blaise, 250.)

**dubietas:** CBP, 7.V.3. Doubt. Late Latin. (TLL, V, 2072 ff.; LS, 613.)

**ebrietas:** PRI, 1.10; DCR, 15.10; FVH, 4.7. Intoxication. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, V, 2, 7 ff.; LS, 623.)

**festivitas:** CBP, 3.XVI.3, 7.XXI.2; DTM, 3.33. A feast day. Rare in Old and later secular Latin; frequent in Christian Latin. (TLL, VI, 1, 622 ff.; LS, 743; Blaise, 350.)

**fragilitas:** PRI, 1.1; DTM, 5.83. Weakness. It occurs twice in Cicero, otherwise it is Silver and Late. (TLL, VI, 1, 1229 ff.; LS, 775.)

**fraternitas:** CBP, 2.9, 4.4, 5.3, 6.1, 7.5. The word occurs occasionally in Silver and Late Latin; but the connotation, religious brotherhood or society, is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VI, 1, 1258 ff.; LS, 777; Blaise, 363.)
humilitas: The noun is used twenty-seven times in the SPA, EH, CEX, FVH, and DTM. The connotation, humility, occurs in most of the references; this is Christian, second-third century. At FVH, 1.4, DTM, 1.6 and 12, the meaning is a late title, by humble self. (LS, 870; Blaise, 396; Souter, 177; Sr. M. B. O'Brien, op. cit., 73 ff.)

impossibilitas: DP, 1.3. Lack of power, weakness. The word appears once in Apuleius, otherwise it is Christian, second, third century. (TLL, VII, 1, 669 ff.; LS, 907; Blaise, 414.)

inaequalitas: CBP, 7.XXI.5. Inequality. Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 812 ff.; LS, 914; Blaise, 418.)

inanitas: PRI, 7.123. Emptiness. Classical, but rare before Silver Latin. (TLL, VII, 1, 829 ff.; LS, 915; Blaise, 419.)

iniquitas: SPA, 46.2, a Scriptural quotation; IDS, 1.13 and 5.52, Scriptural quotations; DCR, 17.14 and 13. Scriptural quotations. Wickedness. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VII, 1, 1636 ff.; LS, 955; Blaise, 448.)

innumerabilitas: IDS, 1.8. Innumerable multitude. The word occurs only in Cassian and here. (TLL, VII, 1, 1725; Blaise, 450; Souter, 208.)


magnanimitas: FVH, 1a.3, 3.1, 7.1 and 8. A manliness that stands above the petty. In this connotation in which the word is the equivalent of fortitudo. Cicero has the word once; elsewhere it is Silver and Late. (TLL, VIII, 102; LS, 1098.)

malignitas: FVH, 2.35. Ill-will. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VIII, 181; LS, 1103; Blaise, 510.)

medietas: FVH, 10.4; DP, 5.72. Middle, middle course. Late Latin (it was used once by Cicero as a translation of ). (TLL, VIII, 554 ff.; LS, 1123; Blaise, 520 ff.)

mutabilitas: IDS, 5.65. Classical, but quite rare in all periods. (LS, 1130; Blaise, 546.)

necessitas: The noun occurs sixteen times in SPA, PRI, CBS, CEX, DI, and DCR. Martin’s usage is about evenly divided between the classical sense of exigency or compulsion and the Silver sense of need. (LS, 1195; Blaise, 552.)
nimietas: EH, 3.36. Excess. Late Latin. (LS, 1208; Blaise, 555.)

noxietas: SPA, 3.4. The form is Christian, second-third century; the connotation, harmfulness, is found in Gaudentius (fourth-fifth century) and here. (LS, 1221; Blaise, 559; Souter, 268.)


officiositas: FVH, 4.58; DTM, 1.11. Complaisance. Late Latin. (LS, 1260; Blaise, 575; Souter, 275.)

parvitas: DTM, 1.6. Slightness, insignificance. It occurs once in Cicero; otherwise it is Silver and Late. The word here belongs to the complex language of the etiquette of the Late period. (LS, 1309 ff.; Blaise, 597; Sr. M. B. O'Brien, op. cit., 76 ff.)

passibilitas: DI, 1.3. The form is Christian, third century; the connotation, passion or spiritual malady, is used only by the Pseudo-Cyprian in the fourth century. (LS, 1312; Blaise, 598.)

prolixtas: CBP, 2.26 and 7.2; CBS, 2.1. A great extent. Late Latin. (LS, 1463; Blaise, 671.)

prosperitas: IDS, 9.119; FVH, 2.54. Success or prosperity. Rare in classical, occasional in Late Latin. (LS, 1477.)

puritas: SPA, 73.2, 109.9; EH, 1.5. Purity. Late Latin. (LS, 1493; Blaise, 685.)

pusillanimitas: SPA, 95.2. Faint-heartedness. Christian, third century. (LS, 1495; Blaise, 686.)

qualitas: DI, 1.3; FVH, 5.14 and 10.3. Nature, condition. Coined by Cicero to translate ποιότης; it is used widely in Silver Latin. (LS, 1504; Blaise, 689.)

rapacitas: PRI, 1.6. Greediness. Rare before Silver Latin. (LS, 1522.)

rigiditas: EH, 2.16; FVH, 9.6. Stiffness. Classical, but extremely rare since only Vitruvius is cited other than the occurrence here. (LS, 1595.)

saturitas: DCR, 11.10. Abundance. Old Latin, once in Cicero, then Silver. (LS, 1635; Blaise, 740.)
scurrilitas: PRI, 1.8; FVH, 4.32. Scurrility. Silver. (IS, 1650; Blaise, 746.)

securitas: SPA, 78.1; DCR, 11.10. Security. Silver. (IS, 1656; Blaise, 748.)

simplicitas: SPA, 109.13; EH, 4.76; DI, 5.12; FVH, 1.13, 4.18 and 43, 6.10. Innocence or honesty. Poetic and Silver. (IS, 1702; Blaise, 761.)

summitas: FVH, 10.5. The highest part. Late Latin. (IS, 1801; Blaise, 793.)

tenacitas: FVH, 8.5. The word is very rare but is classical in form; the connotation, parsimony, is Silver. (IS, 1852; Blaise, 811.)

trinitas: CBP, 3.II.1, 2, and 3; DTM, 2.17 and 25. The form is Late, but the connotation, Divine Trinity, is Christian, second-third. (IS, 1900, Blaise, 829; Souter, 430.)

unanimitas: CBP, 6.4. The form itself is very rare before the Late period but does occur in Silver Latin. As a title, as here, the word is fairly common from the fourth century on. (IS, 1929; Blaise, 856; Souter, 447; Sr. M. B. 'O'Brien, op. cit., 62 ff.)

unitas: CBP, 1.13; CBS, 2.10 and 19; DTM, 3.41, 46, and 49. Unity or oneness. Silver. (IS, 1933; Blaise, 858.)

vilitas: FVH, 4.33. Baseness. The form is classical; but the connotation is Silver. (IS, 1991; Blaise, 848.)

virilitas: PRI, 2.35. Masculinity. Silver. (IS, 1996.)

In summary, there are twenty words of classical origin in this category, fourteen rare in the classical period with one of these appearing in Martin in a New Christian sense, four with a Silver semantic change, and three with a Christian connotation. There are ten Silver words, one with a secular semantic development and one with a Christian change. There are nine Late Latin neologisms, one with a Christian
connotation. And there are seven Christian neologisms, but two of these, innumerosit\(\grave{a}\)s and noxiet\(\grave{a}\)s, are extremely rare.

**Nouns in -tudo**

The following words ending in the suffix -tudo and found in Martin are classical in form and meaning:

- altitudo, consuetudo, fortitudo, magnitudo, mansuetudo, multitudo, pulchritudo, similitudo, solitudo, turpitudo, valetudo.

- aegritudo: CEX, XIX.3 and XXI.1. Illness. Old Latin in form; Silver in connotation. (TLL, I, 951 ff.; LS, 54; Blaise, 65.)

- beatitudo: IDS, 5.67; EH, 7.124; CBP, 1.24 and 2.9; CBS, 1.19. The state of happiness or blessedness. The word apparently was coined by Cicero who uses it once; it is then quoted by Quintilian, and also occurs in Petronius and Apuleius. Elsewhere it is used by Christian authors who add a religious sense to it. Here, at CBP, 2.9, and perhaps 1.4, it is used as a title. (TLL, II, 1794 ff.; LS, 225; Blaise, 111; Souter, 29; Sr. M. E. O'Brien, op. cit., 3 ff.)

- celsitudo: IDS, 2.21. Height. The word occurs once in Velleius, once in Apuleius, elsewhere in Christian authors. (TLL, III, 771 ff.; LS, 310; Blaise, 142.)

- rectitudo: CBS, 2.19 where it has the fourth century Christian sense, orthodoxy; and FVH, 6.2, where it has the Late Latin meaning, uprightness. (LS, 1536; Blaise, 702.)

- solitudo: SPA, 7.6 and 40.5, where it has the classical connotation, anxiety; and CBP, 8.16, where it has the Late Latin connotation, care. (LS, 1536; Blaise, 765; Souter, 381.)

---

Nouns in -men, -mentum

The following nouns in this category appear in Martin with their classical form and meaning:

acumen, agmen, blandimentum, carmen, certamen, condimentum, culmen, detrimentum, ferramentum, fundamentum, germem, limen, nomen, ornamentum, semen, tegumentum, volumen.

cogitamen: PRI, 5.103. Christian, second-third century, but very rare. (TLL, III, 1446; LS, 360; Blaise, 163; Souter, 57.)

crimen: IDS, 7.84; CBP, 7.XV.1; CBS, 3.I.12; CEX, XXIII.6; DCR, 7.7; FVH, 4.62. In the FVH it has the classical meaning, accusation; elsewhere it means crime or offence, a connotation that is rare in classical latin, but frequent in Silver. (LS, 482; Blaise, 230.)

examen: CBS, 2.8. Examination. The form is classical; the connotation is Silver but rare before Christian authors. (TLL, V, 2, 1162 ff.; LS, 672; Blaise, 321.)

figmentum: CBP, 2.24, 3.5, 3.XII.2, 3.XVII.5. A fiction. Late Latin. (TLL, VI, 1, 708 ff.; LS, 748; Blaise, 351 ff.)

firmamentum: DCR, 9.4. The form is classical; the connotation, heaven, is Christian, fourth century. (TLL, VI, 1, 804 ff.; LS, 752; Blaise, 354.)

fluentum: FVH, 1.3. River. Poetic and Late Latin; very frequent in Christian authors. (TLL, VI, 1, 949 ff.; LS, 762; Blaise, 356.)

inquinamentum: SPA, 3.3 and 110.11, both bracketed. Filth. Rare in Silver and Late secular Latin; frequent in Christian writers from the second-third century on. (TLL, VII, 1, 1810 ff.; LS, 961; Blaise, 452.)


---

14 Barry, 51 ff.; Bogan, 26; Ennis, 12; Hauber, 25, 69 ff.; Hrdlicka, 11, 24; Kinnavey, 4, 31, 280; Kinnirey, 8; Mahoney, 4, 25, 77, 79; Mueller, 19, 156 ff.; O'Donnell, 29 ff.

nutrimentum: SPA, 76.2. The word is classical but rare before the Silver period; the connotation, nourishment, is Silver. (IS, 1230; Blaise, 562.)

sacramentum: The noun occurs thirteen times in the CBS, CEX, DTM, and DP. It means sacrament except at DTM, 5.78 where it has the connotation, rite, and at DP, 2.23, where it has the connotation, mystical meaning or mystery. The word is classical in form, but all three connotations are Christian, second-third century. (IS, 1611 ff.; Blaise, 729 ff.; Souter, 360.)

testamentum: CEX, LXVII.3. Christian Scriptures. The form is classical, but the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (IS, 1862; Blaise, 814; Souter, 417.)

titillamentum: EH, 3.50. Titillation. It appears only in Fulgentius and here. (IS, 1874; Blaise, 818; Souter, 421.)

Nouns in -arius, -arium,
-erius, -erium, -grius,
-erium

The words adversarius, magisterium, and operarius, which are in this category and which appear in Martin, are classical in both their forms and meaning. The words baptisterium and monasterium have already been discussed in the section on nouns of foreign origin.


bestiarius: FVH, 7.4. A beast-fighter. The noun occurs three times in Cicero, a few times in Silver, Late, and Christian Latin. (TLL, II, 1940 ff.; LS, 234; Blaise, 114.)

Bogan, 26, 46; Ennis, 11; Hrdlicka, 25; Kinnavey, 30; Kinnirey, 7 ff.; O'Donnell, 3, 32 ff.; Zimmerman, 3, 33 ff.

The word does not mean "the devil" in Martin.
luminarum: CBP, 7.VII.3; CBS, 3.II.5, 3.V.8; DP, 5.83. Candle. The noun is cited only for Christian writers of the fourth century and later; it probably developed from the plural of luminare, luminaria, by a false interpretation of the declension of the plural form which was not uncommon in secular Latin. (Blaise, 304; Souter, 236.)

notarius: CBP, 2.13. Secretary. Silver. (LS, 1217; Blaise, 558.)

ostiarius: CEX, XXIII.1 and XLIV.1. The doorkeeper, the lowest of the orders of clergy. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (IS, 1284; Blaise, 586.)

refectorium: IR, tit. Dining-room. Christian, sixth century. (Blaise, 704; Souter, 345.)

sacrarum: CEX, XLII.1. Sanctuary or sacristy, perhaps rather the latter. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, fourth century. (LS, 1612; Blaise, 731.)

sanctuarium: CBP, 7.XIII.1; CEX, LV.1. The sanctuary. The form is Silver; the connotation is Christian, fourth century. (LS, 1626; Blaise, 736.)

secretarum: CEX, XLI.2 and XLII.1. Either the sanctuary or the sacristy, probably the latter. The form is Late Latin; the connotation is Christian, fourth century. (IS, 1653; Blaise, 746; Souter, 369.)

Nouns in -us

The following nouns in -us which occur in the writings of Martin are classical in form and meaning:


17 Barry, 38 ff.; Bogan, 21, 47; Ennis, 11; Hauber, 23, 68; Hrdlicka, 24; Kinnavey, 5, 29 ff.; Kinnrey, 6 ff.; Mahoney, 25, 77 ff.; Mueller, 17, 19, 152 ff.; O'Donnell, 32 ff.; Zimmermann, 32 ff.

18 An asterisk indicates the fourth declension.

The following nouns in this category have already been discussed in the section on nouns of foreign origin:


*affectus: CEX, XXX.2; DI, 1.7; IB, 18. The form is classical, but rare before Silver; the connotation, affection or love, is Silver. (TLL, I, 1185 ff.; Ls, 66.)

avicellus: DCR, 16.19. This form occurs only in Martin; the form aucella is cited rarely from Varro on. (TLL, I, 1421; Blaise, 106; Souter, 26.20)


19On the gender of foenus and the form of mercatus, cf. Chapter Two.

20Both Blaise and Souter, following earlier editions of Martin, list the word as avicella, but Barlow's text reads per avicellos.
*conflictus: FWH, 3.9. The form is classical; the connotation, contest, is Late. (LS, 415; Blaise, 197.)

*contemptus: IDS, 5.74 and 10.137; CEX, XXXIII.1; DI, 3.16. Despite. The form is classical but rare before Silver Latin; the connotation is Silver. (LS, 446.)

cupellus: DCR, 11.4. A small cask. Late Latin. (LS, 498; Blaise, 234; Souter, 85.)

*dictatus: PRI, 5.102. A tractate. A fifth-sixth century Christian word appearing in Gennadius, Gregory the Great, and here. (TLL, v, 1005; Blaise, 269.)

granl: CBP, 7.XI.2. The word apparently occurs here for the first time. It is otherwise found in Isidore (Etym., 19, 23.7), who is a generation after Martin; in Isidore the context suggests the meaning tufts of hair worn on the body as a decoration. This meaning is possible here but does not fit well with dimittant. Blaise (379) and DuCange (IV, 100) both suggest mustache, and the tufts of hair could also mean curls. Isidore says granl are characteristic of the Goths and Martin's gentili ritu would surely fit the Goths. Meyer-Lübke21 gives granus as a Gothic word for beard. The word surely, then, has something to do with hair, either a mustache, beard, or curls.

*intuitus: DI, 2.1. Look. Late Latin; the single occurrence in Varro is an editor's conjecture. (TLL, VII, 2, 95 ff.; LS, 991; Blaise, 470; Souter, 217.)

*judicatus: CEX, VIII.4. Classical, but quite rare. The classical connotation, judgeship, does not fit here; the word means more the court, the judicial body. (LS, 1015.)

*lectoratus: CBP, 7.XX.2 and CEX, XLIII.1. The lectorate, office of the lector. This is the sole occurrence of the word. (Blaise, 490; Souter, 228.)

libitus: DI, 3.7. On the form, cf. Chapter Two. Caprice. Silver ultimately, but the singular form is Late. (LS, 1060; Blaise, 494 ff.)

magus: CBS, 3.IV.4; DCR, 7.8, 9.17, 16.29. The form is Old Latin; the connotation, soothsayer, is poetic and Silver. (TLL, VIII, 149 ff.; LS, 1101; Blaise, 509.)

maleficus: DCR, 16.29. Soothsayer. The form is Old Latin; the connotation is Christian, second-third century, though it also appears in the Scholiast of Juvenal and the Jurists. (TLL, VIII, 177; LS, 1103; Blaise, 510.)

*obtentus: PRI, 4.76. obtentu: in consideration of. The form is poetic and Silver; the connotation is Christian, fifth-sixth century. (LS, 1246; Blaise, 570.)


paganus: CBP, 3.IX.2; CEX, LXXI.1 and 3; DCR, 1.2, 11.8, 18.23. Pagan. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1290; Blaise, 589.)

*planctus: SPA, 33.2, 3, and 4, 34.5. Lamentation. Silver. (LS, 1383; Blaise, 628.)

*prinimatus: CBP, 7.VI.tit. and 1; CEX, IV.tit. and 1. Primacy. Rare in classical and Silver, frequent in Christian. (LS, 1443; Blaise, 662.)

*principatus: DP, 5.82 and 6.93. Beginning. Very rare in all periods of Latin. (LS, 1445; Blaise, 663 ff.)

*profectus: SPA, 21.4 and 58.1. Progress. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1457; Blaise, 668.)

*prospectus: CBS, 2.8; FVH, 2.20. The form is classical; the meaning, regard, in the CBS, is Silver; the meaning, foresight, in the FVH is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1476; Blaise, 678.)

*rectus: CEX, XXXIV.7. Guilt. The form is Silver, though Quintilian (8, 3.34) says that Messala first used the word; the connotation is Late. (LS, 1529; Blaise, 689.)

*respectus: DI, 8.17. Regard. The form is classical; the connotation is rare before Silver Latin. (LS, 1580; Blaise, 718.)

solidus: CBS, 3.II.tit. and 2. A gold coin, earlier called the aureus and once worth twenty-five denarii. Late Latin. (LS, 1719; Blaise, 764.)

*spiritus: The noun occurs twenty-one times in the SPA, IDS, EH, CBP, CBS, DCR, FVH, and DP. The sense "an energetic attitude" is classical and occurs in the IDS and EH; the sense soul or mind is Silver and occurs elsewhere. The word spiritus also appears twenty-one times in the SPA, IDS,
EH, CBP, CBS, DCR, DTM, and IB to indicate the Holy Ghost; eighteen times it is modified by sanctus, twice by divinus, and once by paraclitus. This use is Christian, second-third century. (*LS, 1743; Blaise, 771 ff.; Souter, 385.)

**sternutus**: DCR, 16.19. A sneezing. Late and rare. (Blaise, 775; Souter, 387.)


**transitus**: CEX, XV.7. Death. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, sixth century. (*LS, 1891; Blaise, 826.)

To sum up, there are two Old Latin words, one with a secular and one with a Christian semantic change. There are eleven classical words, three rare, three with Christian connotations, and one with both a later secular connotation and a Christian connotation. There are six Silver words, two with a Late Latin semantic development. There are four Late neologisms, and three Christian neologisms. Finally, there are three words that appear only in Martin.

**Nouns in -um**

The following nouns in this category which occur in Martin are classical in form and meaning:

- adulterium, aequinoctium, arbitrium, argumentum, artificium, atrium, augurium, auxilium, bellum, beneficium, cilicum, coniugium, concilium, consilium, consortium, contagium, convivium, damnum, decretum, desiderium, documentum, domicilium, donum, editum, elementum, exemplum, exilium.

---

22 Barry, 54 ff., 60 ff.; Bogan, 21, 26, 47; Ennis, 11, 12; Hauber, 3, 22 ff., 25, 70; Hrdlicka, 24 ff.; Kinnavey, 4, 30 ff.; Mahoney, 77; Mueller, 16 ff., 19, 155 ff., 157; O'Donnell, 30 ff.; Zimmermann, 36.

23 On the form, cf. Chapter Two.
exitium, exordium, factum, ferrum, flagitium, frenum, furtum, gaudium, gesta, gladium, gremium, gubernaculum, homicidium, iaculum, imperium, incrementum, indicium, ingenium, initium, institutum, instrumentum, interdixtum, iudicium, iumentum, iurgium, iusiurandum, latrocinium, libellum, lignum, lucrum, ludibrium, lutum, maledictum, mancipium, mandatum, matrimonium, meditullium, membrum, mendacium, meritum, momentum, negotium, nitrum, obsequium, odium, officium, oleum, ostium, otium, pabulum, pactum, palatum, patrocinium, peccatum, periculum, perilium, praeceptum, praecordia, prandium, pretium, principium, proelium, propositum, quadrivium, regnum, remedium, sacerdotium, sacrificium, sacrilegium, saeculum, sepulchrum, servitium, signum, silentium, somnium, spatium, spectaculum, studium, supplicium, suspendium, taedium, talentum, tectum, templum, testimonium, tonitruum, tributum, trivium, vasculum, venenum, verbum, vestigium, viaticum, vinculum, vinum, vitium, vocabulum, votum.

The following nouns have already been discussed in the section on nouns of foreign origin:

antidotum, balsamum, cenobium, daemonium, epitaphium, evangelium, idolum, mysterium, presbyterium, symbolum.

adloquiurn: DI, 1.1. Conversation. Silver. (TLL, I, 1692 ff.; LS, 94; Blaise, 54.)


canticurn: EH, 8.145 and 149. The form is classical; the connotation, song, is Silver, but it was applied by the Christians to the metrical parts of Scripture, such as the psalms. (TLL, III, 283 ff.; LS, 280; Blaise, 128; Souter, 38.)

capitulum: The noun occurs twenty times in the SPA, CBP, CBS, and CEX. A heading. Rare in Old Latin, classical, and Silver, but frequent in Christian. (TLL, III, 350 ff.; LS, 287, Blaise, 131.)
compendium: DCR, 1.8. The form is classical; the connotation, a shortening, is Silver. (TLL, III, 2037; LS, 388; Blaise, 180.)

constitutum: CBF, 4.9 and 8.7; CEX, V.3. An ordinance. The form is classical, but the connotation is Silver, but rare before Late Latin. (LS, 138; Blaise, 209.)

debitum: EH, 5.96; CBS, 3.V.2; DCR, 19.2; DTM, 1.10. Rare in classical Latin, occasional in Silver. A debt. (TLL, V, 105 ff.; LS, 515; Blaise, 240.)

delictum: SPA, 108.3, 109.30; DI, 7.16. Rare in classical and Silver, occasional in secular Late Latin. A transgression. (TLL, V, 460 ff.; LS, 538 ff.; Blaise, 252.)

diluvium: DCR, 5.5 and 8, 6.1. Poetic and Silver. The flood with reference to Noe is Christian, of course. (TLL, V, 1191 ff.; LS, 581; Blaise, 274.)

deliquum: CBS, 2.30. An outpouring. The word occurs only in Solinus. (TLL, V, 2, 391; LS, 638.)

deloquium: EH, 7.125. The form is poetic and Silver; the connotation, declaration, is Christian, fourth century. (TLL, V, 2, 412 ff.; LS, 679; Blaise, 305.)

despouium: CBS, 3.VII.8. Robbery. The word in this form is cited only for Martin. (Blaise, 336.)

folium: SPA, 51.5. A leaf. The word is rare before Silver Latin. (TLL, VI, 1, 1011 ff.; LS, 765; Blaise, 358.)

fulcrum: IR, 1. A couch, or perhaps here a table. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VI, 1, 1506 ff.; LS, 789.)

ieiunium: It appears eight times in the SPA, IDS, CBP, CBS, CEX. Fasting. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 248 ff.; LS, 1013; Blaise, 401.)

maleficium: CEX, LXXI.2; DCR, 16.13. A drug. The form is Old Latin; the connotation is Late Latin. (TLL, VIII, 174 ff.; LS, 1103; Blaise, 5.10.)


metallum: IR, 5. Ore or metal. Silver. (TLL, VIII, 870 ff.; LS, 1139; Blaise, 528.)
ministerium: The word has three senses in Martin: the Christian ministry, i.e., the office priest, at CEX, XXI.9, XXVIII.1 and 4, XXXIX, 1 and 4, a fourth century Christian connotation; church furniture, especially chalices and vessels, at CEX, XXXIX.tit. and 1, XXXI.tit. and 1, LXVIII.2, a fourth century Christian connotation developed from the Late meaning, table service; court-attendant, at FVH, 1.15, a Silver connotation. (TLL, VIII, 1006 ff.; LS, 1146; Blaise, 532.)

opificium: CBP, 3.VII.2 and 3, XIII.1. Work. It occurs in Varro and Late Latin writers. (LS, 1269; Blaise, 580.)

opprobrium: CBP, 3.11. Scandal. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1272; Blaise, 587.)
oratorium: CBP, 7.IX. tit., 2, and 4. The form is Late Latin; the connotation here, a stole, i.e., a religious vestment, occurs in Fulgentius Rupensis before Martin, and then in medieval Latin where it is common. (LS, 1274; Blaise, 582; Niermeyer, fasc. 8, 742.)
palatium: CEX, XXXV.5. The form is classical; the connotation, home of the emperor, is poetic and Silver, transferred to kings in Late Latin. (LS, 1291; Blaise, 589.)
praecipitium: CBP, 7.XV I.2; FVH, 10.6. A falling. Silver. (LS, 1413; Blaise, 641 ff.)

privilegium: CBP, 7.XVIII.3. Privilege. Silver, though the form is classical. (LS, 1447; Blaise, 664.)
pulpitum: CEX, XLV.tit. and 1. The form is poetic and Silver; the connotation, a platform from which the lector reads the Scripture, is Christian, third century. (LS, 1490; Blaise, 684.)
signaculum: DCR, 8.14. The form is Late; the connotation, the sign of the cross, is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1696; Blaise, 758; Souter, 377.)

statutum: CBP, 1.17, 2.1 and 23, 7.XV.3. A law. Christian, third century; it also appears in the Jurists. (LS, 1754; Blaise, 775; Souter, 387.)
suspirium: DI, 2.5. A breathing. Silver; the form is classical. (LS, 1821; Blaise, 803.)
turpiloquium: PRI, 1.8. Obscene speech. Christian, second-third century. (IS, 1919; Blaise, 833; Souter, 433.)

In summary, there is one word from Old Latin with a later secular connotation; there are thirteen classical words, five rare, two with a Christian meaning, and five which have undergone secular semantic development, and one which has both a later secular and a Christian connotation. There are eleven Silver words, one with a secular, and two with a Christian change of meaning. There are five Late neologisms, three with Christian special meanings; two Christian neologisms, and one word which appears for the first time in Martin of Braga.

Nouns of the second and third declension ending in -er, -r

The following nouns in this category which appear in Martin are classical in form and meaning:

adulter, aer, ager, cadaver, carcer, frater, iter, liber, magister, mater, mulier, pater, puer, uter, venter, vir.

The words archipresbyter and presbyter have already been discussed in the section on nouns of foreign origin.

minister: CBP, 1.5 and DCR, 7.1. In the CBP it means a church official, any one below the rank of presbyter, especially a deacon; this is a second-third century Christian connotation. In the DCR it has the classical meaning assistant, though applied to a Christian concept. (TLL, VIII, 999 ff.; IS, 1146; Blaise, 531; Souter, 253.)
Nouns in -o, -on

The following nouns in -o or -on which occur in Martin are classical in form and meaning:

- caligo, homo, imago, libido, ordo, origo, sermo, turbo, virgo.

The nouns agon, canon, and daemon have already been discussed in the section on nouns of foreign origin.

caro: The word has two meanings in Martin: the flesh of animals, i.e., meat, at CBP, 3.XIV.1 and 4, 7.XIV.tit., 1, and 3, CEX, LVIII.tit. and 3, a classical connotation; the human body, both of Christ (DCR, 13.6, 8, 17, and 26) and of men, a Christian application of a Silver connotation which appears fourteen times in the SPA, IDS, CBP, and DCR. (TLL, III, 480 ff.; LS, 294; Blaise, 135; Souter, 40.)

Nouns in -ela, -ura

The following nouns in -ela or -ura which appear in the writings of Martin are classical in form and meaning:

- conductura, mensura, querela, sectura, sepultura, tortura, tutela, usura.

conductela: SPA, 9.7 and 8. A hiring. Very rare, it is cited only for the Codex Theodosianus and here; Iohannes Bicalarensis uses it once in a different connotation. (Blaise, 193; Souter, 70.)

corporatura: DP, 2.17. The corporeal nature. Silver, but very rare. (LS, 472.)

creatura: The noun occurs thirteen times in the SPA, IDS, CBP, DCR, and DP. A creature. Christian, second-third century. (LS, 478; Blaise, 229.)


24 Barry, 42 ff.; Bogan, 26; Ennis, 11; Hauber, 23, 68; Kinnavey, 28; Kinnirey, 8; Mahoney, 25; Mueller, 17, 153 ff.; O'Donnell, 4, 28; Zimmermann, 35 ff.
cultura: The noun appears ten times in the DCR. The form is classical; Martin uses two connotations; rites and worship, both of which are Christian, third century. (LS, 488; Blaise, 233; Souter, 84.)

incantatura: CEX, LIX.tit. Incantation. It is cited only for Councils, then rarely. (Blaise, 420; Souter, 192.)

ligatura: CEX, LIX.tit. and 1. The form is Late; the connotation, amulet, is Christian, fourth century. (LS, 1066; Blaise, 496; Souter, 232.)

parentela: DCR, 7.10. Relationship. Late Latin. (LS, 1303; Blaise, 594; Souter, 286.)

Nouns in -a²⁵

The following nouns in -a which occur in Martin are classical in form and meaning:

alienigena, aqua, ara, arcula, arena, arrha, aula, aura, causa, caverna, cella, cena, columna, coma, cornuva, corona, crapula, cura, disciplina, epulae, esca, fama, femina, fera, figura, forma, fovea, gula, herba, hora, ianua, illecebra, ira, kalendae, lacrima, linea, lingua, littera, luna, macula, mensa, mina, mora, musca, natura, noxa, olla, pagina, palma, parricida, persona, petra, poena, procella, pruina, pugna, refuga, regula, ruina, scapula, secta, silva, specula, spelunca, sportella, spuma, stella, tenebra, terra, tunica, umbra, via, vida, vita.

The following words have already been discussed in the section on nouns of foreign origin:

anachoreta, basilica, cathedra, chartula, elemosina, epistola, pascha, patriarcha, propheta, romphaea, sophista.

aera: CBP, tit., and CBS, tit. The year of a particular period. The word occurs with this connotation only in Spain from the fourth century on; the form is Silver, but rare. (TLL, I, 1052; LS, 59; Souter, 10.)

²⁵Barry, 47 ff.; Hauber, 24; Kinnavey, 279; Kinnirey, 8; Mahoney, 26, 78; O'Donnell, 4, 28 ff.

²⁶On the form, cf. Chapter Two.
**anima:** The noun occurs thirty-eight times in the SPA, PRI, CBP, CBS, CEX, DI, and DCR. It is difficult to decide when a Christian means just "life" or the theological term "soul" for this word. At any rate "soul" is a Christian specialization of the classical connotation "vital principle."

**ansa:** TR, 6. Handle. The word appears in Cato, classical and Silver poets occasionally. (TLL, II, 122 f.; LS, 127.)

**deicola:** FVH, 1.19. A worshipper of God. Christian; it appears in the Itala, Jerome, Cassiodorus, and here. (TLL, V, 401; Blaise, 249.)

**doctrina:** SPA, 25.8; CBP, 1.13, 5.7, 6.7, 7.4, 8.8. The word is classical in form and meaning but has extensive use in Christian writers with specific reference to religious thought and exercises. (TLL, V, 1784 ff.; LS, 605; Blaise, 289.)

**exhortatiuncula:** EH, 1.3. The word occurs only here; probably equal in force to exhortatio. (TLL, V, 2, 1443; Blaise, 329.)

**formula:** The noun occurs ten times in the SPA, CBP, CBS, FVH, and DTM. The form is classical; the connotation, model, example, or pattern, is Silver. (TLL, VI, 1, 1114 ff.; LS, 769 ff.; Blaise, 361.)

**gavessa:** IR, 3. Some kind of dish. The word occurs only here. (TLL, VI, 1, 1720; Blaise, 371; Souter, 158.)

**missa:** The noun appears twelve times in the CBP, CBS, CEX, and IR. Mass. Christian, fourth century. (TLL, VIII, 1135 ff.; LS, 1151; Blaise, 535; Souter, 254.)

**offensa:** CEX, XVIII. 6; 8.21 and 9.11; DCR, 4.8 and 12.14. Injury, affront, wrgng. The form is classical, but rare; the connotation is poetic and Silver. (LS, 1259; Blaise, 574.)

**papa:** CBP, 2.11. The word in secular Latin means father, but no actual references were cited by the sources; the connotation, pope, is Christian, sixth century. Earlier, second-third century, Christians used it for any bishop. (LS, 1299; Blaise, 592; Souter, 284.)

**plecta:** SPA, 12.2 and 3. Cord or rope. It is here a translation of the Greek (Migne, PG, 65, 206.5). The form is Christian, fourth century; this use is Christian, sixth century. (Blaise, 629; Souter, 306.)
vindicta: IDS, 1.8 and 7.84; FVH, 3.7 and 8. The form is classical; the connotation is Silver. (LS, 1993; Blaise, 849.)

Nouns of the third and fifth declension

The following nouns in this category which have not been discussed above and which appear in Martin are classical in form and meaning:

altare, animal, arbor, ars, avis, caedes, calx, canis, cōnis, civis, clavis, color, comes, crux, daps, decus, dies, dos, dux, exemplar, facies, fames, fas, finis, foedus, fons, fraus, frigus, frons, frux, fulgur, gens, genus, grex, honor, hospes, hostis, ignis, infans, iūdex, iuveris, labes, labor, lanx, lapis, laus, lex, lumen, lux, mare, mel, mens, merces, meretrix, messis, miles, mors mos, murmur, mus, naris, navis, nefas, neptis, nubis, odor, olus, ops, opus, orbs, os (oris), os (ossis), panis, par, parens, pars, pax, pectus, pestis, pignus, planities, pondus, prex, princeps, pulvis, quies, radix, requies, rex, robur, sacerdos, sal, sanguis, scelus, sedes, seges, senex, series, servitus, sidus, sitis, soror, species, spes, suboles.

The following words have already been discussed under nouns of foreign origin:

dioecesis, extasis, haeresis, hypocrites, martyr, metropolis.

And these all ending in the suffix -ma:
anathema, chrisma, dogma, schema, schisma, sophisma.

aequor: EE, l. Sea. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, I, 1022 ff.; LS, 58.)

27 Barry, 68 ff.; Ennis, 12; Mahoney, 27.

28 On the form, cf. Chapter Two.
antistes: DTM, 3.30 and EE, 4. The first refers to the pope apparently, ex Romani antistitis auctoritate; the second refers to Martin himself. (TLL, II, 134 ff.; LS, 133; Blaise, 87.)

codex: CBP, 5.1 and IR, 4. The first reference is classical in its connotations; the second seems to refer to some sort of ornamental dish. (LS, 303; Blaise, 162.)

censor: CBS, 2.34, a Scriptural quotation. A fellow elder, that is, one who is also an old man. From the Vulgate, fourth century. (LS, 498; Blaise, 203; Souter, 73.)

esuries: SPA, 23.2. Hunger. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, V, 2, 865; LS, 660; Blaise, 316.)

fides: Martin has three meanings: belief, a classical connotation, at SPA, 109.20, CEX, XV.2 and LXXX.2, perhaps FVH, 5.15, and DTM, 3.34, a Scriptural quotation; promise, a classical connotation, at DCR, 15.7; the Christian faith, a Christian connotation, second-third century, occurs twenty-four times in the SPA, CBP, CBS, CEX, DCR, and IB. (TLL, VI, 1, 661 ff.; LS, 746 ff.; Blaise, 351.)

fomes: IDS, 10.133. Kindling wood. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VI, 1, 1020 ff.; LS, 766; Blaise, 358; Souter, 151.)

ingluvies: PRI, 1.9. Gluttony. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 1556 ff.; LS, 951; Blaise, 455.)


palms: IR, 8. Vineyard. Poetic of the Silver period. (LS, 1293 ff.)

plebs: CBS, 3.1.11. The form is classical; the connotation, congregation or laity, is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1386; Blaise, 629; Souter, 306.)

praesul: CBP, 2.18; DTM, 3.31. The form is classical; the connotation, bishop, is Christian, fifth century. (LS, 1432; Blaise, 656.)

salus: SPA, 31.2, 109.25; CBS, 3.IV.3; DCR, 2.3; DP, 2.24 and 26, 8.123. The form is classical; the connotation is the Christian salvation except at DP, 2.24 where the meaning is the classical deliverance without any spiritual connotation. The Christian connotation dates from the second-third century. (LS, 1622; Blaise, 734; Souter, 312.)
tremis or tremissis: CBS, 3.IV.2. A coin, the third part of an aureus: Late Latin. (LS, 1895; Blaise, 828; Souter, 428.)

virtus: Martin uses the word in several meanings: strength, a classical connotation, at EH, 6.110, a Scriptural quotation; power, i.e., δύναμις, based upon the classical connotation but here a Christian extension, fourth century, at SPA, 15.2, 24.3, 39.10, 109.48; CBP, 3.I.2; worth, a classical connotation, at SPA, 56.3; angel, a fourth century Christian connotation, at IDS, 5.59, and virtue, a classical connotation, occurs twenty-seven times in the SPA, PRI, IDS, EH, FVH, and IB. (LS, 1997; Blaise, .)

The Adjective

Adjectives of foreign origin

angelicus: DCR, 4.1. ἀγγελικός. The form is Late; the connotation referring to angels is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, II, 44; LS, 118; Blaise, 81.)


apostolicus: There are sixteen occurrences in the PRI, EH, CBP, CBS, CEX, and DTM. ἀποστολικός. Holy, i.e., worthy of an Apostle, at DTM, 3.29. Episcopal, at CBP, 5.21, 6.2, 7.1, 7.IV.3, and CEX, 1. Elsewhere, apostolic. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, II, 253 ff.; LS, 139; Blaise, 89.)


canonicus: SPA, 21.6, CBP, 7.XII.tit. and 1, CEX, LXVII.2. κανονικός. The form is Silver; the connotation in

29Barry, 86 ff.; 195 ff.; Bogan, 21 ff., 27 ff., 48 ff.; Ennis, 4 ff., 14 ff.; Goelzer-Mey, 478 ff.; Hauber, 3 ff., 29 ff., 57 ff., 72 ff.; Kinnavey, 12 ff., 26 ff., 44; Kinnirey, 5 ff., 46 ff.; Kinnirey, 10 ff., 38 ff.; Mahoney, 4 ff., 7, 27 ff., 44 ff., 57 ff., 81 ff., 99 ff.; Mueller, 2 ff., 29 ff., 165 ff.; O'Donnell, 7 ff., 37 ff., 77 ff.; Zimmerman, 9 ff., 47 ff. Once again the reader is advised that not every adjective in Martin is included here; several common classical ones have not been indexed for this study. This absence will not, however, substantially affect the conclusions reached.
the SPA, pertaining to religious regulations, is Christian, fourth-fifth century, while the connotation in the DBP and CEX, pertaining to the official Scriptures, is Christian, fourth century. (TLL, III, 275 ff.; LS, 280; Blaise, 128.)

catholicus: καθολικός. Orthodox, at CBP, 1.17, 4.2, CEX, LXX tit. and 1, and FVH, 1. Catholic, at CBP, 1.8, 3.8, 3.1.3, 8.2, CEX, XXIV.5, LXXVIII.1, LXXXIII.4, DCR, 15.20, DTM, 3.41, 4.62. The form is Christian, second-third century; the connotations are fourth century. (TLL, III, 614 ff.; LS, 301; Blaise, 129; Sainio, 35 ff.)

episcopalis: CBS, 3.15. Derived from episcopus, έπισκόπος. Pertaining to a bishop. Christian, fourth century. (TLL, V, 2, 675; LS, 651; Blaise, 311; Souter, 126.)

Christianus: Thirteen times in the EH, CEX, DCR.
χριστός. A hybrid. Both adjectival and substantivized.
Silver. (TLL, Onomasticon, II, 413 ff.; LS, 328; Blaise, 149.)


evangelicus: EH, 3.51; CBS, 3.IX.6; IB, 1. εὐαγγελικός. In the EH and CBS it means pertaining to the gospel; in the IB it means pertaining to Christian doctrine. Both are Christian, second-third century. (TLL, V, 2, 997 ff.; LS, 666; Blaise, 317.)

metropolitanus: twenty-two times in the CBP, CBS, CEX, and DTM. Derived from metropolis, μητρόπολις. The form is Late; the connotation, pertaining to a major see of a bishop, or substantivized into the bishop of a major see, is Christian, fourth century. (TLL, VIII, 898; LS, 1141; Blaise, 519; Souter, 251.)

monachalis: SPA, 49.6, 61.7. Derived from monachus, μοναχός. Pertaining to a monk. Christian, fourth-fifth century. (TLL, VIII, 1396; Blaise, 538; Souter, 255.)

orthodoxus: SPA, 38.2, CBP, 3.11, 8.2. ὁθεδωδοψῖς. Orthodox. Both adjectival and substantivized. Christian, fourth century; it also occurs in the Jurists. (LS, 1281; Blaise, 585; Souter, 280.)

parochialis: CBS, 3.11.4 and 7. Derived from parochia, παροχία. Pertaining to a parish. Christian, apparently fifth century. (Blaise, 595; Souter, 287.)

paschalis: CBP, 3.XVI.1; DTM, 3.32. Derived from pascha, πάσχα. Christian, fourth century. (LS, 1311; Blaise, 598; Souter, 288.)

schismaticus: CEX, LXX.tit. and 3. σχίσματικός. A separatist, not necessarily a heretic; that is, one who refuses to accept Church authority. Christian, third century. (LS, 1641; Blaise, 742; Souter, 367.)

In summary, there are two Silver Latin words here, one with a Christian connotation. There are three Late neologisms, two with Christian meanings, and fifteen Christian neologisms. This large number of Christianisms is traceable, as with nouns of foreign origin, to the established Greek technical terminology which the Latin church simply took over.

Adjectives in -us

The following adjectives in -us which occur in Martin are classical in form and meaning:

abjectus, acerbus, adversus, aegrotus, aemulus, aequus, aeternus, alienus, amarus, amicus, amoenus, angustus, antiquus, anxius, apertus, aptus, aridus,
assiduus, attentus, avarus, barbarus, benignus, caducus, callidus, carus, cautus, certus, ceterus, clarus, consanguineus, conscius, contentus, cunctus, cupidus, dignus, divinus, doctus, dubius, duplus, durus, egregius, eruditus, excelsus, exiguis, exquisitus, extremus, facetus, falsus, firmus, fraternus, gemenus, germanus, gratus, honestus, ignavus, immoderatus, immutatus, imperitus, impius, importunus, improvidus, imus, incertus, incustus, inculatus, inimicus, iniquus, iniustus, initus, insanus, inscius, inveteratus, invictus, invitus, iracundus, iucundus, iustus, laetus, languidus, lapideus, legitimus, ligneus, longinquus, longus, lubricus, magnificus, manifestus, mansuetus, medius, mendicus, merus, moderatus, modestus, modicus, molestus, moratus, mortuus, mutus, mutuus, natalitus, necessarius, neglectus, nimius, nitidus, nocturnus, novissimus, nudus, nullus, obscurus, obtusus, occultus, opportunus, oppositus, pacificus, parcus, perditus, perlongus, perpetuus, pius, placidus, planus, plenus, politus, praeditus, pravus, priscus, pristinus, privatus, prodigus, profanus, profundus, pronus, propinquus, propitius, proprius, prosperus, providus, proximus, publicus, purus, quietus, quotus, rarus, rectus, regius, reliquus, repentinus, rusticus, rutilus, sacrosanctus, sanus, sceleratus, serius, severus, sincerus, singuli, sollicitus, solus, sordidus, stultus, summus, superflus, surdus, tacitus, tantus, tardus, tepidus, timidus, torvus, tranquillus, trepidus, turbidus, unicus, urbanus, vacuus, vagus, vanus, varius, vastus, vernaculus, vernus, versutus, verus, vetustus, vicinus, violentus, vivus, voluntarius.

The following have already been discussed in the previous section:

apocryphus, bigamus, chartaceus, eremus, orthodoxus.

acutus: PRI, 4.81. The form is classical; the connotation, violent or rapid, is poetic and Silver. (TLL, I, 463 ff.; LS, 26.)

adoptivus: CBP, 3.XV.3; CEX, XXXII. tit. and 2. Acquired by adoption. Very rare in classical Latin, primarily a Silver word. (TLL, I, 808 ff.)
aereus: SPA, 81.2. Brazen. Very rare in classical prose; mostly poetic and Silver. (TLL, I, 1059 ff.; LS, 60.)

altus: IDS, 5.63 and 69, Scriptural quotations, 8.98 and 99; FVH, 2.52 and 5.22. The form and meaning is classical in the FVH; but in the IDS altissimus means The Most High, i.e., God. This is a Christian, fourth century, connotation. (TLL, I, 1772 ff.; LS, 95 ff.; Blaise, 75.)
arcanus: IDS, 9.122. Secret. The word occurs once in Cicero, otherwise poetic and Silver. (TLL, II, 434; LS, 153.)

arduus: EH, 8.121, where it means lofty; FVH, 1.18 and 2.46, where it means difficult. Both connotations are infrequent before the Silver period. (TLL, II, 492 ff.; LS, 156.)

artus: FVH, 4.1. The expression in artum is Silver. (TLL, II, 723; LS, 168 ff.)

auratus: IR, 1. Gilded. Rare in classical prose; poetic and Silver primarily. (TLL, II, 1520 ff.; LS, 208.)

beatus: Martin uses the word in several meanings. The classical sense of blessed, i.e., fortunate, at SPA, 92.1, PRI, 3.61, EH, 7.125, a Scriptural quotation; the Christian, fourth century, connotation, holy, at CBP, 2.24, 5.23, 7.V.4, CBS, 2.25, 3.2, DTM, 2.22 and 3.35; the Christian, fourth century, connotation, venerable, i.e., respected, CBP, 2.11 (this borders on holy), CEX, 1, DI, 1, DCR, 1, DTM, 1. (TLL, II, 1908 ff.; LS, 233; Blaise 111 ff.)
bissenus: IB, 1. Twelfth. Silver. (TLL, II, 2009; LS, 239; Blaise, 116.)


comptus: FVH, 1a.2. The form is classical; the connotation, adorned, is Silver. (TLL, III, 1992 ff.; LS, 385.)

congruus: CBP, 4.8. Fit. Plautus and Late Latin. (LS, 421; Blaise, 200.)

consonus: CBP, 3.XVII.5. Accordant. Classical but rare. (LS, 434; Blaise, 207.)

consummatus: DTM, 1.9. Perfect. Silver. (LS, 443.)

contritus: SPA, 110.12, a bracketed passage. The form is classical; the connotation, sorrowful or full of regret,
is cited for Christian writers of the fourth century on. (LS, 447; Blaise, 218.)

crustatus: IR, 6. Coated. Silver. (LS, 485.)

defunctus: There are nine occurrences in the CBP and CEX. Dead. The word is used substantively by the classical poets, adjectivally in Silver Latin. (TLL, V, 378 ff.; LS, 533.)

dirus: IDS, 9.127; FVH, 9.7. The form is classical; the connotation, terrible, is poetic and Silver. (TLL, V, 1268 ff.; LS, 585.)
diversus: It occurs eight times in the CBP, CBS, CEX, DCR, and DP. It means separately at CBP, 7.1.2, and different at CBP, 7.11.2, both classical connotations; elsewhere it has the meaning, various, a Late Latin meaning. (TLL, V, 1575 ff.; LS, 601; Blaise, 286.)
egenus: SPA, 99.2. Poor. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, V, 2, 231 ff.; LS, 632.)
elatus: SPA, 83.3; PRI, 4.33; EH, 8.147; and CEX, XXII.5. The form is classical but rare; the connotation, proud, in the SPA and CEX appears once in Vergil, otherwise Late and Christian, while the connotation, uplifted or lofty in PRI and EH is classical and Silver. (TLL, V, 2, 150 ff.; LS, 629; Blaise, 302.)
festinus: FVH, 7.3. Swift. Silver. (TLL, VI, 1, 621 ff.; LS, 742 ff.)
frivolus: DCR, 12.8. Futile. Classical, but rare before the Silver period. (TLL, VI, 1, 1341 ff.; LS, 782; Blaise, 365.)
furtivus: EH, 4.29. Sneaky. Rare in classical prose; mostly poetic and Silver. (TLL, VI, 1, 1643 ff.; LS, 797.)
futurus: Twelve times in the IDS, EH, DCR, FVH, and DP. Mostly substantivized. Cf. Chapter Two.
immaculatus: DP, 2.28 and 32. Unpolluted. Rare in Silver and Late secular writers, frequent in Christian. (TLL, VII, 1, 437 ff.; LS, 890; Blaise, 407.)
Immensuratus: FVH, 6.12. Immoderate. This word appears only a very few times in Christian writers of the fifth and sixth centuries. (TLL, VII, 1, 450; LS, 891; Blaise, 408; Souter, 185.)

Immodicus: FVH, 4.27. Intemperate. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 485 ff.; LS, 894.)

Immutus: FVH, 9.2. Unperturbed. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 497 ff.; LS, 895.)

Immundus: Eight occurrences in the SPA, IDS, CBP, and FVH. The classical connotation, filthy or dirty, occurs at FVH, 4.17; otherwise it means morally or religiously unclean, a Christian connotation of the second-third century. (TLL, VII, 1, 500 ff.; LS, 895; Blaise, 409.)

Imperfectus: SPA, 48.4. Unfinished. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 562 ff.; LS, 900.)

Improvisus: IDS, 9.123, where it has the Late Latin connotation, Improvident; and DCR, 12.9, where it has the classical connotation, unexpectedly, in the phrase, de improviso. (TLL, VII, 1, 700 ff.; LS, 909; Souter, 189.)

Inconsultus: DI, 9.20. Improvident. Classical, but rare before the Silver period. (TLL, VII, 1, 1031 ff.; LS, 927; Blaise, 426.)

Infensus: IB, 10. Hostile, Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 1366 ff.; LS, 943.)


Inquietus: DI, 2.6; FVH, 7.2. Restless. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 1804 ff.; LS, 960 ff.)

Intrepidus: FVH, 3.2 and 4, 5.24. Undaunted. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VII, 2, 49 ff.; LS, 989.)


Invius: IB, 6. Pathless. The word occurs once in Sallust; otherwise it is poetic and Silver. (TLL, VII, 2, 236 ff.; LS, 997.)

Lassus: DCR, 17.18. Weary. Rare in classical prose; primarily poetic and Silver. (LS, 1038.)
malignus: It occurs eight times in the SPA, CBP, DI, DCR, and FVH. Wicked. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VIII, 183 ff.; LS, 1103.)

matutinus: CBP, 7.I.2; CEX, XXXVII.3, LXIII. tit. and 3. Morning. Rare before the Silver period. At CEX, LXIII. tit. it is substantivized to a Christian connotation, morning office, i.e., prayers said in the morning as part of the official prayers of the day, a fourth-fifth century connotation; elsewhere this connotation is assisted by a noun making it clear. (TLL, VIII, 505 ff.; LS, 1121.)

nepandus: CBP, 2.10. Execrable. Very rare before the Silver period. (LS, 1197.)

neglegus: FVH, 4.58. Negligent. The word is not cited in any of the sources; apparently this is its only appearance in Latin.

noxius: FVH, 2.26. Harmful. Rare in classical prose, even then in archaic language; primarily poetic and Silver. (IS, 1221.)

obnoxius: CBP, 8.13; CEX, XVI.10. Subject to. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1238; Blaise, 566.)

perplexus: FVH, 2.45. Obscure. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1352; Blaise, 615.)

praedictus: FVH, 10.2. Before-mentioned. Silver. (IS, 1417; Blaise, 645.)

quadragesimus: It occurs ten times in the SPA, CBP, CBS, and CEX. Pertaining to the forty days of fasting during Lent. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, fourth century. (IS, 1499; Blaise, 687; Souter, 336.)

quinquagesimus: CEX, LVII. tit. and 5. Pertaining to Pentecost. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, fourth-fifth century. (IS, 1513 ff.; Blaise, 692 ff.; Souter, 339.)

rabidus: DI, 2.6. Wild. Rare in classical prose; primarily poetic and Silver. (IS, 1520.)

reprobus: IDS, 8.108, a Scriptural quotation, with the meaning unsound, a Christian connotation of the second-third century; and CBS, 2.30, a Scriptural quotation, with the meaning rejected, a Christian connotation of the fourth century. (IS, 1572; Blaise, 714 ff.; Souter, 351.)
sanctus: It appears fifty-one times in the SPA, IDS, EH, CBF, CBS, CEX, DCR, FVH, and DTM. The form is classical. The connotation, upright or just, a classical meaning, occurs at FVH, 4.35, and perhaps at IDS, 9.128, EH, 3.53, 4.59, and 8.144, though in these instances the Christian sense could apply too. The connotation, sacred or divine, at CBF, 3.XI.1, is classical, but the application to the Trinity is, of course, Christian. The connotation, saint, at CBP, 7.XVIII.2, CBS, 3.VI.6, s.IX.9, DCR, tit. and 18.11, is Christian from the second-third century. The word is used as a title at CBP, 1.9 and CBS, 1.8, a late development with a Christian flavor here. The general sense of holy, i.e., religiously good, occurs elsewhere, and is a Christian connotation from the second-third century. The word also appears as the modifier of Spiritus to designate the third person of the Trinity some eighteen times. (LS, 1625; Blaise, 736 ff.)

secretus: SPA, 21.6, with the meaning, solitary; and FVH, 5.21, with the meaning, secret. The form is classical but rare; both connotations are poetic and Silver. (LS, 1652.)

securus: DI, 5.29; DCR, 11.14; FVH, 5.22 and 26. The form is classical; the connotation, free from danger, is Silver. (LS, 1656.)

septimansus: SPA, 17.2; CBP, 7.XXI.6; CEX, XLIX, tit., 1, and 3; L.I; and DCR, 9.9. The form is classical; the connotation, as a feminine substantive week, is Christian fourth century, though it also appears in the Jurists. (LS, 1675; Blaise, 754; Souter, 374.)

subditus: DI, 3.18; DCR, 3.12. Subject to. Christian, fourth century. (LS, 1774; Blaise, 781; Souter, 391.)

supernus: PRI, 3.46; IDS, 5.59. Celestial. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1808.)

totus: It occurs twenty-nine times in the SPA, IDS, EH, CBS, CEX, DI, DCR, FVH, DP, and IB. Martin uses it in its classical connotation, the whole, or, all of, everywhere except possibly at DP, 8.117, where it seems to replace omnis; but even here the classical sense can fit. (LS, 1981 ff.; Blaise, 821.)

unanimus: CBP, 8.3; CBS, 1.17. On the form cf. Chapter Two. Of one accord. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1929; Blaise, 856.)
universus: It occurs twelve times in the SPA, PRI, EH, CBP, CBS, CEX, and DI. The classical sense holds everywhere except possibly at CEX, XXIV.4., where it seems to replace totus; but even here the classical sense can fit. (LS, 1932; Blaise, 858.)

virulentus: IDS, 9.117. Poisonous. Late. (LS, 1997; Blaise, 851.)

In sum, with the exclusion of totus and universus from the count, thirty of these adjectives are of classical origin, sixteen rare in classical prose, six with later secular change of meaning, and eight with Christian connotations. There are twenty-four of Silver origin, one with a Christian semantic change. There are three words of Late origin, one with a Christian meaning; and there are two Christian neologisms. Also there is one word, neglegus, which appears nowhere but in Martin. In this category of words, Martin is very traditional. He has 224 adjectives of classical origin and twenty-four of Silver, but only six later neologisms, although sixteen of the classical and Silver adjectives have later semantic developments. The heavy Silver influence is particularly interesting.

Adjectives of the third declension and indeclinable adjectives

The following adjectives in this category which appear in the writings of Martin and which are classical in form and meaning are:

anceps, brevis, communis, compos, deformis, dives, dulcis, gravis, hilaris, illiberalis, immanis, inanis, infelix, insignis, mediocris, mitis, mollis, multiformis, necesse, nequam, par,
particeps, praeceps, potis, putris, qualis, segnis, simplex, sollemnis, sauvis, sublimis, talis, tenuis, tristis, turpis, velox, vetus, vilis, viridis.

caelestis: SPA, 29.4; PRI, 4.81; IDS, 6.77; CBP, 3.VI.1; DCR, 3.1 and 7, 4.3. Heavenly, i.e. pertaining to the Christian Heaven. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, III, 67 ff.; LS, 262; Blaise, 121 ff.)

grandis: SPA, 9.19. Great, large. This word is classical in form and meaning. But it was one of the pair of words magnus and grandis which Vulgar Latin preferred. Martin has the literary magnus numerous times, but grandis only once, though that one occurrence is in a popular work. (TLL, VI, 2, 2179 ff.; LS, 823; Grandgent, 9.)

magnanimis: FVH, 3.4 and 10. In this form the word is Christian, a second-third century, but rare. (TLL, VIII, 101; LS, 1098; Blaise, 508.)

omnis: The word occurs 184 times in every work except the poems. It has its classical meaning everywhere except where it is used for totus, a Late and Vulgar usage, at EH, 8.138 (perhaps), CBP, 7.TII.4, CEX, L.2, and DCR, 9.7. It should be noted that Martin is remarkably pure in his use of cunctus, omnis, totus, and universus. (IS, 1265; Blaise, 577.)

pervigil: CBP, 8.15. Ever-watchful. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1361.)

uniformis: CBP, 7.6. Uniform. Silver. (LS, 1932; Blaise, 857.)

versipellis: FVH, 6.9. Cunning. Plautus, Pliny the Elder, Petronius, and Apuleius have the word; but this connotation is cited only for Plautus and Christian writers. (LS, 1976; Blaise, 843.)

Adjectives in -bilis

The following adjectives in -bilis which appear in Martin are classical in form and meaning:

admirabilis, amabilis, detestabilis, flexibilis, horribilis, impossibilis, incredibilis, innumerabilis, laudabilis, optabilis, stabilis, terribilis, tolerabilis.

affabllis: EH, 2.19 and FVH, 4.24. Friendly. Rare in classical prose; primarily poetic and Silver. (TLL, I, 1171 ff.; LS, 65.)
delectabilis: PRI, 2.20; EH, 2.13. Delightful. Silver. (TLL, V, 4.7 ff.; LS, 536.)
execrabilis: IDS, 10.137; CBP, 3.3. Accursed. Silver. (TLL, V, 2, 1634 ff.; LS, 700.)
inemendabilis: IDS, 3.33. Incorrigible. Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 1291; LS, 939.)
inexinguibilis: DCR, 14.18. That cannot be put out. The form is classical but rare; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VII, 1, 1333 ff.; LS, 942; Blaise, 439.)
inhabilis: DI, 1.9. Unfit. Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 1582 ff.; LS, 952.)
inmarcescibllis; CBS, 2.38, a Scriptural quotation, and 3.7. Incorruptible. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VII, 1, 443; LS, 891; Blaise, 507.)
instabilis: DI, 2.8. Tottering. The form is classical; the connotation is Silver. (LS, 968.)
invisibilis: DCR, 13.8. The word occurs in the Silver medical writers and Christian authors from the second-third century. (TLL, VII, 1, 219 ff.; LS, 996.)
irreprehensibilis: IDS, 3.34; CEX, XXIV.5. Without blame. Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1001; Blaise, 475; Souther, 220.)
odibilis: FVH, 4.27. Hateful. Late. (LS, 1256; Blaise, 573.)
rationabilis: CBS, 2.25. Reasonable. Silver. (LS, 1527; Blaise, 697.)
visibilis: DCR, 13.8. Visible. The form is Silver; the connotation is Late. (LS, 1998; Blaise, 852.)
In summary, three of these adjectives are of classical origin, one with a secular, one with a Christian change of meaning. Seven are of Silver origin, one with a Late secular semantic change. There are also one Late and four Christian neologisms.

Adjectives in -alis, -elis, -illis, -aris, etc.

The following adjectives in this category which occur in Martin are classical in form and meaning:

aequalis, crudelis, difficilis, dissimilis, facilis, familiaris, fatalis, fragilis, inutilis, natalis, naturalis, nobilis, nuptialis, penetratis, popularis, regalis, servilis, similis, subtilis, talaris, utilis, verisimilis, vulgaris.

The following adjectives have already been discussed under adjectives of foreign origin:

clericalis, episcopalis, monachalis, parochialinis, paschalis.

agilis: DI, 7.2. Quick. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, I, 1324 ff.; LS, 71.)

carnalis: SPA, 70.1 and 71.1, where it means bodily; IDS, 10.131, and CEX, XXI.6, where it means lustful. The form and connotations are Christian, second-third century. (TLL, III, 474 ff.; LS, 293; Blaise, 134.)

conditionalis: CEX, XLVI.tit. The form is Late; here the adjective is substantivized, a slave who takes the place of a spouse, a Christian, second-third century, connotation. (LS, 407; Blaise, 192.)

docilis: FWH, 4.70. Easily taught. Infrequent before the Silver period. (TLL, V, 1767 ff.; LS, 605.)

fidelis: At SPA, 38.2, CEX, XXXVI.6, DCR, 14.4 and 12, it means faithful to the Christian religion, a second-third century Christian connotation; at EH, 8.150 CBP, 7.XXI. tit. and 1, 8.12, and DCR, 15.1, it is substantivized and means
the faithful Christian, also a second-third century Christian connotation. The form is classical. (TLL, VI, 1, 655; LS, 745 ff.; Blaise, 351.)

generalis: CBP, 5.1 and 4; CBS, 2.9; DTM, 5.71. General. Infrequent before the Silver period. (TLL, VI, 2, 1772 ff.)

gentilis: CBP, 7.XI.2; CEX, LXII. tit. and 1, LXXIII.2. Pagan. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VI, 2, 1866 ff.; LS, 809; Blaise, 374.)

humilis: At EH, 2.22 it has the classical connotation, low; at DCR, 18.2, the classical connotation, obscure, lowly, and perhaps also at FVH, 2, though the Christian concept is probably intended. The meaning, humble, a Christian, second-third century connotation, occurs at SPA, 2.3, 62.2, 83.4, 106.4, PRI, 2.45, EH, 4.67, a Scriptural quotation, 5.89, 5.91, a Scriptural quotation, 7.126, and FVH, 4.65. (TLL, VI, 3, 3103 ff.; LS, 870; Blaise, 396.)

infraad: DCR, 8.14. Unbelieving. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VII, 1, 1415 ff.; LS, 945; Blaise, 441.)

irrationalis: SPA, 54.3. Without reason. Silver. (LS, 1000; Blaise, 474.)

localis: CBP, 5.2 and 4; DTM, 5.71. Local. Late. (LS, 1073; Blaise, 499.)

materialis: SPA, 8.1 and 109.11. Made of matter. The word occurs once in Macrobius; otherwise it is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VIII, 465 ff.; LS, 1111; Blaise, 508.)


moralis: FVH, 1.3. Moral. This word was created by Cicero, but used extensively only from the Silver period on. (LS, 1164; Blaise, 539 ff.)

paginalis: DTM, 5.82. Epistolary. Christian, fifth-sixth century. (LS, 1291; Blaise, 589; Souter, 282.)
pontificalis: DTM, 1.5. Episcopal. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, fourth century. (LS, 1397; Blaise, 634; Souter, 347.)
regularis: CBS, 1.22. Canonical. The form is Silver; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1553; Blaise, 708; Souter, 347.)

sacerdotalis: CBP, 1.9. Of priests. Silver. (LS, 1611; Blaise, 729.)

saecularis: CBP, 7.XII. Secular. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1613; Blaise, 732; Souter, 361.)

specialis: CBS, 2.13 and 20. Particular, i.e., not general. Silver. (LS, 1736; Blaise, 768.)

spiritualis: IDS, 9.124; CBS, 2.8; DCR, 3.2. Spiritual. The form is Silver; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1743; Blaise, 770.)


tortilis: IR, 6. Winding. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1880.)

To sum up, there are nine adjectives in this category of classical origin, one with a later secular change of meaning, and five with a Christian connotation. There are eight Silver words, one with a Christian semantic change. There are two Late neologisms, one with a Christian meaning, and three Christian neologisms.

**Adjectives of the second and third declension ending in -r**

The following adjectives of this category are classical in form and meaning in Martin's writings:

aeger, alacer, asper, immemor, integer, liber, membr, miser, mortifer, pauper, pestifer, piger, sacer, satur, uber.

salutifer: EH, 1.11; CBP, 1.12. Health-bringing, salubrious. Poetic and Late. (LS, 1622; Blaise, 735.)
Adjectives in -osus

The following adjectives in -osus which appear in Martin are classical in form and meaning:

- aerumnosus
- ambitosus
- curiosus
- furiosus
- gloriosus
- luminosus
- periculosus
- pretiosus
- seditiosus
- spinosus
- tumultuosus
- verbosus

**crimininosus**: CEX, XXIV.2. Blameworthy. The form is classical; the connotation is Late. (LS, 482; Blaise, 231; Krebs-Schmalz, I, 376.)

**fromdosus**: DCR, 7.5. Leafy. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VI, 1, 1346 ff.; LS, 783.)

**ignominiosus**: IDS, 4.47. Disgraceful. Classical, but not frequent before the Silver period. (TLL, VII, 1, 305 ff.; LS, 881.)

**onerosus**: CBS, 2.6. Onerous. Poetic and Silver. (IS, 1266; Blaise, 578.)

**otiosus**: SPA, 51.2. Idle, i.e., superfluous. The form is classical; the connotation is Silver. (IS, 1285; Blaise, 586.)

**pomposus**: EH, 1.3. Bombastic. The form is Christian, fourth century; the connotation is fifth century. (IS, 1395; Blaise, 633; Souter, 309.)

**religiosus**: CEX, XXIX.2, XXXII.6, LXI.1, LXV.1. The form is classical; the connotation, belonging to a religious order or living a non-lay life, is Christian, fourth-fifth century. (IS, 1557; Blaise, 709.)

**ruinosus**: IDS, 2.21. Spiritually dangerous. The form is classical, but rare at all periods; the connotation is Christian, fourth century, and is also rare. (IS, 1604; Blaise, 727.)

**tenebrosus**: SPA, 82.2; DCR, 3.9. Dark. Poetic and Silver. (IS, 1853; Blaise, 811.)
Adjectives in -ans and -ens

The following adjectives in this category which appear in Martin are classical in form and meaning:

amens, Clemens, constans, continens, demens, diligens, eloquens, impotens, ingens, insolens, intemperans, libens, potens, praegnans, prudens, sapien, tacens.

ardens: PRI, 2.22; DTM, 1.6. Ardent, fiery. Infrequent before the Silver period. (TLL, II, 487 ff.; LS, 156.)

desiderans: DI, 1; DCR, 1. Desiderantissimus is a Late title belonging to official etiquette. (TLL, V, 709.)


omnipotens: CBS, 3.I.9, a Scriptural quotation; DCR, 9.1, 15.12, 1625. All-mighty, applied to the Christian God, especially God the Father. The form is classical, but rare in prose; the application is Christian, fourth century. (LS, 1265; Blaise, 571.)

reverens: DTM, 1. Right reverend. The form is Silver; the connotation, a title of address to bishops, is sixth century. (LS, 1589; Blaise, 722 ff.; Souter, 355.)

Adjectives in -icus

The two adjectives, domesticus and poeticus, are classical in form and meaning in Martin. The following adjectives from this category have already been discussed in the section on adjectives of foreign origin:

angelicus, apostolicus, canonicus, catholicus, diabolicus, evangelicus, haereticus, schismaticus.

dominicus: It occurs thirty-one times in the EH, CBP, CEX, DCR, and DP. Of Christ, the Lord (as Martin himself defines it in the DCR, 18.11-13, Diem dominicum qui propterea dominicus dicitur, quia filius dei, dominus noster Iesus Christus, in ipso resurrexit a mortuis ...). With
dies, it indicates Sunday; with oratio, the Lord's Prayer. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, V, 1887 ff.; LS, 608; Blaise, 291; Souter, 112.)

forasticus: CEX, XXXVII.8, LVI. tit. and 1.; The first instance means secular, the second two, who comes from elsewhere. These are the first occurrences of the adjective in Latin; it is found occasionally in medieval Latin. (IS, 767; Blaise, 359; Niermeyer, fasc. 5, 440; DuCange, III, 546.)

Adjectives in -ulus

The adjectives, anniculus, credulus, imbecillus, which occur in Martin are classical in form and meaning.

breviculus: CBS, 3.IX.5. Here probably a substantive, abridgement or summary; Barlow's breviary, though correct, of course, is perhaps too much subject to misunderstanding at the present time since this word has a very predominant meaning in Roman Catholic ecclesiastical terminology different from that intended here. Plautus, Fronto, Apuleius, and a few Christian authors use the word. (TLL, II, 2170; LS, 250; Blaise, 119; Barlow, 322.)

incredulus: DCR, 14.12. The unbelieving (in the Christian faith). The form is poetic and Silver; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VII, 1, 1042 ff.; Blaise, 429.)

Adjectives in -arius, -orius, -erius

The adjectives, anniversarius, contrarius, solitarius, and temerarius, which Martin uses, are classical in form and meaning.

fornicarius: CEX, LXXVII. tit. Committing fornication. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VI, 1, 1120; LS, 770; Blaise, 361.)

litterarius: DTM, 1.11. Literary. The form is Silver; the connotation is cited only for Augustine, though the references suggest a wider usage. (LS, 1072; Blaise, 499; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 28.)
transitorius: SPA, 29.3, 55.3; DCR, 18.4; FVH, 2.6. 
Passing. The form is Silver; the connotation is Christian, 
fourth century. (LS, 1891; Blaise, 826; Souter, 426.)

Adjectives in -anus, -aneus, 
-enus, -tinus

The adjectives, quotidianus, terrenus, and vespertinus, 
are classical in form and meaning. The adjectives, 
Christianus, and metropolitanus, have already been discussed 
in the section on adjectives of foreign origin.

coaetaneus: SPA, 106.3. Of the same age. Christian, 
second-third century; it does, however, appear once in 
Apuleius. (TLL, III, 1374; LS, 356; Blaise, 160 ff.)

extraneus: DI, 6.17. Foreign or strange. The form is 
classical, but the connotation, a stranger, as here, is 
Silver. (TLL, V, 2, 2070 ff.; LS, 710.)

spontaneus: CBS, 2.35, a Scriptural quotation. Voluntary. Late. (LS, 1747; Blaise, 772.)

Adjectives in -ax

The adjectives, audax, contumax, loquax, pertinax, and 
sagax, which occur in Martin, are classical in form and 
meaning.

capax: FVH, 1.13. That can hold much. Poetic and 
Silver. (TLL, III, 300 ff.; LS, 282.)

The Adverb

The following adverbs which occur in the writings of 
Martin of Braga are classical in form and meaning:

30 Barry, 171 ff.; Bogan, 23, 29 ff., 50 ff.; Ennis, 7, 
18 ff.; Goelzer-Mey, 492 ff.; Hauber, 5 ff., 37 ff., 76 ff.; 
Hrdlicka, 14 ff.; 33 ff.; Kinnavey, 9 ff., 49 ff.; Kinnirey, 
14 ff.; 39 ff.; Mahoney, 6 ff.; 33 ff.; 57 ff., 90 ff.; 
Mueller, 4, 39 ff., 178 ff.; O'Donnell, 8, 45 ff.; Zimmermann, 
14 ff., 59 ff.
adeo, alibi, aliquando, aliquantulum, aliquotiens, aliter, amplius, ante, antea, aperte, audacter, bene, breviter, caste, celerius, certe, ciro, continuo, cotidie, crebro, deinde, denique, diligentius, diverse, dure, econtrario, etiam, extra, fere, fideliter, foras, foris, fortasse, fote, frequenter, funditus, gratis, graviter, gregatim, hic, hinc, hodie, hostiliter, huc, ibi, ibidem, ideo, illuc, interdum, interim, intus, item, latenter, liberenter, longe, mane, modo, mox, multibriter, multum, neglegentius, nimum, novissime, numquam, nunc, omnino, paene, palam, parce, pariter, parum, patienter, paulatim, paulisoper, paulo, paululum, perfecte, pie, postea, postremo, potius, praecipue, praesertim, praesto, privatim, proptererea, proterve, pueriliter, quam, quamlibet, quare, quatenus, quidem, quomodo, quondam, quoque, quotiens, recte, retro, rursus, saepe, saltem, salubriter, salutem, secreto, semel, semper, similiter, simplecti, simul, singillatim, siquidem, solitarie, solum, sponte, statim, strictim, studiosius, subito, subter, tam, tamquam, tandem, tantummodo, totiens, ubique, ulterius, umquam, unde, undique, usque, utique, valde, vehementius, velut, verum, viritim, vix.

adnuc: At SPA, 18.8, PRI, 5.107, CBP, 3.7, CEX, XXXI.7, and DCR, I.2, it means still or yet; at CBP, 2.5, 8.9, CBS, 3.X.2, it has an emphatic meaning, even yet at this time. The meaning at IDS, 10.131, is unclear because of a lacuna. The form is classical; the connotations are Silver. (TLL, I, 652; LS, 35.)

altrinsecus: FWH, 10.5. The form is Old and Late Latin; the connotation, from both sides, is Late. (TLL, I, 1771 ff.; LS, 99; Blaise, 75.)

amen: PRI, 3.69, a Scriptural quotation; EH, 5.102, a Scriptural quotation; DCR, 19.9; and DP, 9.137. In EH, it means truly; elsewhere, so be it. The word comes from the Hebrew through Greek. It is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, I, 1879; LS, 104; Blaise, 77.)

---

31 On the form cf. Chapter Two.

32 For combinations of etiam with other words, cf. Chapter Three, Conjunctions.
amodo: DCR, 19.4, From now, Christian, second-third century, modeled on the Greek ἀμόδος τοῦ σὸν or ἀμόδος ἐφίλην. (TLL, I, 1960; LS, 108; Blaise, 77.)

ardenter: FVH, 1.2. Eagerly. Rare before Silver. (TLL, II, 488; LS, 156.)

attente: IDS, 1.11; DCR, 2.4. Carefully. Rare before Silver. (TLL, II, 1124; LS, 194.)


catervatim: DI, 3.34. In companies. Rare in classical Latin, more frequent in Silver. (TLL, III, 610 ff.; LS, 301.)


congregatim: PRI, 1.13. In groups. Christian, fourth century, but not very common. (LS, 420; Blaise, 199; Neue, II, 552.)

curiose: DI, 7.4; DTM, 2.24; DP, 1.11. Carefully. Silver. (LS, 502.)


dehinc: EH, 8.132; DCR, 14.25. Henceforth. Rare in classical prose; primarily poetic and Silver. (TLL, V, 388 ff.; LS, 534.)

deliciose: PRI, 3.52. Luxuriously. Christian, rare. (TLL, V, 450; Blaise, 251; Souter, 93.)

desursum: EH, 8.143, a Scriptural quotation. From above. Christian, second-third century; apparently the word earlier was a Vulgarism (Quintilian, 1, 5, 38). (TLL, V, 791 ff.; LS, 561; Blaise, 264.)

destricite: FVH, 2.47. Strictly. Silver. (LS, 599.)

diu: CBP, 1.17. diu est, quod. Plautus and occasional in Late Latin. (TLL, V, 1559; LS, 599 ff.; Blaise, 286.)
dudum: DI, 1.1. Recently. Classical, but far more common in Old and Late. (TLL, V, 2175 ff.; LS, 616.)


exinde: CEX, LXXVII.1; DTM, 1.8. In the meaning, ab eo, it is a Late Latin substitute for inde. (TLL, V, 2, 1506 ff.; LS, 492.)

fidenter: FVH, 1.13. Faithfully. Classical, but more common in the Silver period. (TLL, VI, 1, 697; LS, 748.)

fiducialiter: DCR, 18.10; DTM, 5.75. In the first it means confidently; in the second, faithfully. Both connotations are Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VI, 1, 702; LS, 788; Blaise, 351.)

generaliter: IDS, 8.92; FVH, 1.15. In general. It occurs once in Cicero; otherwise it is Silver and later. (TLL, VI, 2, 1776 ff.; LS, 906.)

iam: It occurs thirty-two times in the SPA, PRI, IDS, EH, CBP, CBS, CEX, DI, DCR, DTM, DP, and IB. The meaning is classical except at CBP, 2.2 and 23, and 3.5, where it combines with olim to denote "long ago," a Silver connotation. (TLL, VII, 1, 79 ff.; LS, 1263.)

imperito: FVH, 4.45. Undeservedly. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 457; LS, 892.)

immobiliter: CBS, 2.4. Without change. Christian, fourth century. (TLL, VII, 1, 482; Blaise, 409.)

inante: DP, 8.128. In front. The form is Late; the connotation is Christian, fifth-sixth century. (TLL, VII, 1, 830; Blaise, 419; Souter, 191.)

inculpabiliter: FVH, 10.2. Without sin. Christian, fourth century. (TLL, VII, 1, 1067 ff.; LS, 930; Blaise, 430.)

inde: It means ab eo at CBS, 3.21.6, CEX, LX.3, and DCR, 13.25, 15.17, 18.9, a colloquial connotation in all periods. It means, de ea re, at DP, 1.4, a Christian, fourth century, connotation. Elsewhere it has its classical meaning. (TLL, VII, 1, 1107 ff.; LS, 932; LH, 491 ff.; Blaise, 431; Souter, 198.)
Insatiabiliter: FVH, 1.2. Insatiably. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 1837 ff.; LS, 962.)

Iterum: It occurs twenty times in the SPA, EH, CEX, DI, and DCR. All instances are classical except at EH, 2.26 and DCR, 15.12 and 18 where the Silver meaning, in turn, is used. (IS, 1008.)

Manifeste: It occurs eight times in the SPA, IDS, CBP, CEX, DI, and DTM. Clearly. Rare before the Silver period. (TLL, VIII, 313 ff.; LS, 1110.)

Mendice: PRI, 3.72. In a beggarly manner. The adverb is cited once for Seneca and once for Tertullian. (TLL, VIII, 709; LS, 1132; Blaise, 524.)

Modicum: SPA, 9.5. A little. Apuleius and Christian authors from the second-third century. (TLL, VIII, 1235; Blaise, 536.)

Multotiens: CEX, XVII.5. Many times. Late, infrequent. (LS, 1172; Blaise, 543; Souter, 259.)

Neglectus: DI, 7.4. Rather carelessly. Christian, fourth century, but very rare. (LS, 1178; Blaise, 552; Souter, 264.)

Nimis: At SPA, 17.3, 19.2, it has the classical meaning, too much; at SPA, 9.22, 51.4; PRI, 4.81, EH, 2.13, and DI, 10.13, it has the poetic and Christian meaning, exceedingly. (LS, 1208; Blaise, 555.)

Non: SPA, 6.5. Independently as an answer, no. Classical, occasional in literature, but primarily Vulgar. (IH, 642.)

Olim: CBP, 2.2 and 23, 3.5. Cf. iam.

Perticulatim: PRI, 1.14. Singly. Rare before the Silver period. (LS, 1708; Blaise, 596.)

Postergum: DP, 8.130. Behind. Christian, fourth-fifth century, infrequent, that is, if one takes this work, as Barlow, Blaise, and Souter do, as a single word and not just a variant manuscript spelling. (Blaise, 637; Souter, 311.)


prompte: PRI, 5.104. Quickly. Silver. (LS, 1465.)

protinus: DI, 1.4. Forthwith. Classical but rare in prose before the Silver period. (IS, 1479.)

quousque: FVH, 2.56. How far. The form is classical; the connotation is Silver. (IS, 1520.)

rationabiliter: CBP, 5.19. Reasonably, or perhaps here, justly. Late. (IS, 1527; Blaise, 697.)

scrupulosius: DP, 1.4. Very diligently. Silver. (IS, 1649.)

solummodo: PRI, 3.70; DTM, 4.54. Only. Quintilian, Late secular and Christian writers. (IS, 1724; Blaise, 765; Souter, 381.)

specialiter: CBS, 2.3, 3.1.9; FVH, 1.14. Particularly. Silver. (IS, 1736.)


subitum: FVH, 2.21. Suddenly. Silver, relatively rare in all periods. (IS, 1775; Blaise, 782; Souter, 393.)

tunc: It occurs twenty-five times in the SPA, IDS, EH, CBP, CBS, DCR, FVH, and DP. Then. Infrequent in classical Latin, more common in Silver. (IS, 1913 ff.)

violenter: SPA, 5.4, 9.26, 41.4, 49.5; CBS, 3.VII.5. Furiously. Rare before Silver Latin. (IS, 1994; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 741.)

voluntaire: CBP, 7.XV.3; CBS, 2.36; CEX, LXXVIII.1; DCR, 13.12. Voluntarily. Late, but mostly Christian. (IS, 2012; Blaise, 859.)

To summarize, there are two words of Old Latin origin, one with a later secular semantic change. There are twenty-two words of classical origin, seventeen rare, one with a Christian meaning, and three with a secular change of connotation. There are eleven Silver adverbs, and six Late
neologisms, one with a Christian connotation. There are fifteen Christian neologisms.

The Verb

Verbs of foreign origin


baptizare: This verb occurs fifteen times in the CBP, CBS, CEX, DCR, and DTM. The form is Late, but rare in secular writings; the connotation, baptize, is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, II, 1720 ff.; LS, 221; Blaise, 110.)

chrismare: CEX, LII.tit. The verb is derived from the noun chrisma which is from the Greek, χρίσμα. Baptize. Christian, sixth century. (TLL, III, 1028; Blaise, 148; Souter, 49.)


plasmare: CEX, XXI.5; DCR, 4.2, 9.6. The verb is derived from the noun plasma which is from the Greek, πλάσμα. Form. Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1382; Blaise, 629; Souter, 306.)

psallere: SPA, 41.2; CBP, 7.I.tit. and 1, 7.IX.2, 7.XII.2, 7.XVII.2; CEX, XLV.1, LXIII.3. The form is classical; but the connotation, sing the psalms, is Christian, second-third century. At CBP, 7.XII.2, however, the meaning is simply, sing hymns, a Christian, fourth century, connotation; this may be the meaning at some of other citations, but the context is not clear. (LS, 1483; Blaise, 681; Souter, 331; Sainio, 64 ff.)

Barry, 196 ff.; Bogan, 29; Hauber, 58; Hrdlicka, 44; Kinnavey, 72; Kinhibrey, 26; Mueller, 56 ff.; O'Donnell, 79 ff.; Zimmermann, 85.
scandalizare: DCR, 12.6, a Scriptural quotation.

(IS, 1639; Blaise, 741; Souter, 366.)

Simple Verbs

The following simple verbs which appear in Martin are classical in form and meaning:

aestimare, agere, ait, alere, ambire, ambulare,
aperire, arbitrari, arcessere, arguere, bibere,
cadere, caedere, carere, cavere, celare, cessare,
cingere, clamare, claudere, coepisse, colere,
condere, condire, coquere, credere, cupere,
currere, debere, decet, dicare, dicere, discere,
docere, dolere, edere, egere, emere, errare,
fallere, fateri, ferire, festinare, fingere,
flagrare, flectere, flere, foedare, frangere,
fundere, fungi, furere, gaudere, gemere, gerere,
gestire, gignere, gradi, gubernare, haurire,
humare, iactare, ignorare, ignoscere, imitari,
uiuare, Iacessere, laedere, largiri, latere,
laudare, lavare, legere, libet, licet, locare,
ludere, lugere, manare, mandare, mederi, meditari,
meminisse, mormorare, mentiri, mergere, metere,
minuere, mirari, miscere, monstrare, mordere,
movere, mulcere, mutare, narrare, nasci, nacare,
nectere, nequire, nescire, niti, nuntiare, odisse,
opitulari, optare, oriri, ornare, pandere, parere,
parere (-eo), parere (-io), pascere, patere, pati,
patrare, peccare, perdere, pergere, placare,
placere, plangere, plorare, pluere, ponere,
portare, potare, premere, privare, probare,
promere, pudet, pugnare, punire, purgere, putare,
raper, regere, rigere, rogare, ruere, rumpere,
sapire,34 sedere, sentire, sepelire, serpere,
servare, servire, silere, sinere, sistere, solvere,
sortire, spargere, sperare, spernere, statuere,
studere, stupere, suadere, sumere, surgere, tacere,
tangere, tendere, terrere, texere, timere, tollere,
tradere, tremere, tueri, tumere, ungere,34 urgere,
uti, vacare, valere, vendere, venerari,35 vereri,
vertere, vetare, vigere, vincere, vitare, vivere,
vocare.

34On the form cf. Chapter Two.

35The deponent form occurs at DCR, 11.3 and FVH, 5.9; the active form, which is found as early as Old Latin but only in Vulgar authors, is found in the popular DCR at 18.22 and 28. The gerundive form occurs at CBP, 5.22.

aptare: DI, 4.17; FVH, 2.10. Fit, adjust. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, II, 323 ff.; LS, 145.)


comere: FVH, 2.19. Adorn or arrange. The verb is classical in form; the connotation is Silver. (TLL, III, 1991; LS, 385.)

creare: SPA, 15.4, a bracketed passage; DCR, 5.2, 9.2, 18.25; DF, 2.17. The form is classical; the connotation, create, is poetic and Silver. (LS, 480.)

lancinare: DI, 9.3. Cut up. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1032.)

manducare: SPA, 1.1, 20.4; DCR, 13.17. The form is rare before the Silver period; the connotation, eat, is Silver, but occurs most often in Christian writers. (TLL, VIII, 273 ff.; LS, 1107.)

marcere: FVH, 2.44. Be languid. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VIII, 373; LS, 1112 ff.)

micare: DI, 2.3. Flash. The verb is rare in classical prose; primarily poetic and Silver. (TLL, VIII, 929 ff.; LS, 1142.)

nutrire: IDS, 3.28; CEX, LXVI.1 and 3; FVH, 4.23. In the IDS and FVH the meaning is nourish; in the CEX, take care of. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1230.)

orare: The verb occurs thirteen times in the SPA, IDS, EH, CEX, and DCR. In the connotations, pray, the word is classical; but the sense, pray to God, is Christian, second-third century. Also the word was rather formal and official in classical Latin, but the ordinary and common word for pray among the Christians. (LS, 1280; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 224; Blaise, 585.)

pendere: At CEX, LV.3, it has its classical meaning, hang; but at SPA, 49.1, it means fall and translates the Greek (cf. Migne, PG, 65, 408.2). This connotation is not attested in the source material. (LS, 1327 ff.; Blaise, 605.)
pruriri: PRI, 5.99. Itch, be eager. The verb is classical, but in classical Latin it is active in form. Barlow takes this verb to be a deponent; the deponent form is not attested in the source material. (IS, 1483; Barlow, 63.)

quatere: DI, 2.5. Here the sense is heave. The verb is rare in classical prose; primarily poetic and Silver. (IS, 1508.)

splendere: IR, 3. Glisten. This verb is found once in Cicero; otherwise it is poetic and Silver. (IS, 1744.)

stridere: DI, 2.7. Grate. Poetic and Silver. (IS, 1766.)

stringere: IR, 6. Bind together. The form is classical, but rare in prose; the connotation is poetic and Silver. (IS, 1766.)

tingere: DTM, 3.27, 29, 36, 43. Immerse in the baptismal waters. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. This verb was used as the Latin word for the Greek baptizare; however, the Greek form had too strong a hold and won out over the Latin. Still, tingere occurs now and then in Late authors. (IS, 1373; Blaise, 818; Souter, 421.)

vadere: This verb is found eleven times in the SPA and CEX. As a replacement for ire it is more Vulgar than literary. Martin restricts his use of it to two works which allow Vulgar usages. (IS, 1951; Blaise, 835.)

To sum up, there is one word, castrare, which originated in Old Latin, but was not used in classical, and then reappeared in Silver Latin. There are nine words of classical origin, three of these with a secular semantic change and two with Christian connotations. There are six words that first appear in Silver Latin. There are no Late Latin or Christian neologisms. Martin has two words which are peculiar to himself, the meaning, to fall, for pendere, and the deponent form, pruriri.
Compound verbs

The use of a large number of compound verbs is characteristic of Late Latin; Martin exhibits this trait, and this category is the one with the greatest number of verbs. Most of these, however, are classical in form and meaning. The following long, long list illustrates the heavy traditional influence on Martin's vocabulary:

abducere, abesse, abhorrere, abire, abstinere, abundare, abuti, accedere, accendere, accidit, accipere, accommodare, accusare, acquiescere, acquirere, addere, addicere, addiscere, adducere, adesse, aferre, adficere, adgredi, adhibere, adhortari, adigere, adiungere, adiuvare, administrare, admirari, admittere, admonere, adpetere, adponere, adprobare, adsciscere, adscribere, adsequi, adsidere, ad sistere, adsolere, adstare, adstringere, adsumere, advenire, advocare, affirmare, agnos cere, amittere, amplexi, amputare, antepone re, apparet, appellare, applicare, approprinquare, arrogare, ascendere, asperrnari, aspicere, attendere, attingere, attrahere, auferre, avertere, castigare, circumcldere, circumdare, circumspicere, cogere, cogitare, cognoscere, coherere, colligere, colloqui, comedere, commeare, commemorare, commendare, committere, communere, commovere, communare, compelle, comprime re, compleere, componere, comprehendere, comprimere, concedere, concidere, concipere, concitare, concupiscere, concurrere, conducere, conferre, conficere, confidere, confingere, confirmare, congregare, congruere, consentire, consequi, consenere, conservare, considerare, conspicere, constare, constitui, consulare, consurgere, contemnere, contemplari, contendere, contestari, continere, contingere, contradicare, contrahere, conturbare, convalescere, convenire, convincere,


37On the form, cf. Chapter Two.
convocare, cooperire, corrigere, corrumpere,
decernere, decidere, diciper, declarare, deferre,
deficere, defendere, defluere, delectare, 37
deliberare, demittere, demonstrare, deponere, deoscerere,
depravare, deprehendere, deridere, descendere,
descire, deserere, desiderare, desinere, desperare,
despicer, detinere, detrhere, devitare, devorare,
differre, diiidicare, dilabi, diligere, dirigere,
discendere, discernere, discrepare, disponere,
disserere, dissimulare, dissipare, distribuire,
dividere, edicere, edocere, efficere, effluere,
effugere, effundere, egredi, elicare, elabi, elaborare,
eliere, emergere, eminere, erigere, eripere, eruere,
esvere, evanescre, evellere, evenire, evitare,
evocare, evolare, exardescere, exaudire, excedere,
excidere, excipere, excitare, excudere, excusare,
exequ, exercere, exigere, exire, existere, existimare,
exorare, exoriri, expectare, expedire, expellere,
explodere, exponere, exquirere, exsecrare, extendere,
extrpine, extorquere, exulcerare, illudere,
illumine, immiscere, immittere, immolare, impellere,
imscere, impignare, incedere, incidere, inchoare,
ine, incider, incipere, incitare, inclinare,
includere, incurrere, indicare, indicere, indigere,
ingnari, inducere, inesse, inferre, inficere,
inflere, informare, ingredi, inhaerere, inire,
inlicer, inquinare, inquirere, inquit, inrepere,
inruere, inserere, insumulare, insinuare, inspicere,
instigare, instituire, intelligere, intenedere,
tercipere, interdicere, intesse, interficere,
interpretari, interrogare, intrare, introducere,
introire, intromittere, invadere, invenire, invivere,
inivitare, irasici, irrigare, iubere, litigare, obedire,
obiere, obiugare, oblectare, obligare, obliviare,
obrepere, obruere, obsecrare, obsequi, observare,
obsignare, obsistere, obstringere, obtinere, occidere,
occulere, occupare, occurrere, offendere, oppedere,
opponere, opprimere, ostendere, peragere, parcipere,
percurre, percutere, perdurare, perferre, perficere,
perhorrescere, perire, periuare, per lucrare, permanere,
permiscere, perriterre, permutare, perpeti,
perquirere, persequi, perservare, persolvere,
personare, perspicere, perstringere, pertinere,
pertractare, perturbare, pervenire, perrigere,
posidere, praebere, praecipere, praecxldere,
predicere, praefigere, praere, praeditari,
preeoccupare, praepeare, praeponere, praeripere,
presaeribere, presidere, praeterire, praetermittere,
presaevdere, prodere, prodesse, profferre, proficisci,
prohibere, proicere, prolabi, promittere, proumptiare, propagare, proponere, prosequii, prospicere, prostermere, protgeoere, provide, recedere, recipere, recitare, recolere, reconcile, reconciliari, recordari, reddere, redigere, redimere, redire, reducere, referre, reficere, refugere, refulare, reciere, reliquere, remanere, reminisci, remittere, renovere, renovare, renouintiare, repellere, repeterre, reponere, reportare, representer, reprehendere, requiescere, requirere, resecare, reservare, resistere, respicere, respuere, restare, restituere, reticere, retinere, retrahere, retribuere, revertere, revocare, satisfacere, secedere, seducere, segregare, separare, subducere, subiere, submittere, subripere, subrogare, subsequei, subtrahere, subvenire, succedere, succendere, succensere, succumbere, succurrere, sufficere, suffodere, supplere, suspendere, suscipere, sustinere, transferre, transgredi, transigere, transire, transmittere, vindicare, vituperare.

The following verbs which appear in the writings of Martin are post-classical in origin or connotation, or are very rare in classical Latin and primarily used in a later period:


ablcere, CEX, XXIV.3. Expel. The form is classical; the connotation, poetic and Silver. (TLL, 83 ff.; LS, 7.)

abominare: CBP, 2.23, 4.2; CEX, XII.6. On the form cf. Chapter Two. Make accursed. The word occurs rarely in Silver Latin in the active form; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, I, 122 ff.; LS, 9; Blaise, 37.)

abrenuntiare: DCR, 15.8, 11, and 23, 16.2. Renounce. Christian, fourth century. (TLL, I, 131; LS, 9; Blaise, 37.)

abscedere: SPA, 26.2 and 3, 68.1, and CBP, 3.8, where the verb has the classical connotation, cut off or separate; and CEX, XXI. tit., where it means castrate, a Christian, third-fourth century, connotation. (TLL, I, 147 ff.; LS, 10; Blaise, 37.)
abscondere: SPA, 21.4, where it means, preserve, a Silver connotation; and CBP, 7.IX.2, DI, 2.12, 9.22, and 10.17, where it has the classical meaning, hide. Souter says that the form absconsus is Vulgar and unliterary; but Isidore (diff., 1.9) makes a distinction in meaning, absconsus meaning hidden by skill, and absconditus meaning hidden by nature. This makes both forms literary for the generation after Martin; it is likely that absconsus was also literary in the sixth century. (TLL, I, 152 ff.; LS; 10.; Souter, 2.)

absolvere: DCR, 19.2. Pay a debt. Old and Silver Latin, but not found in classical writers. (TLL, I, 172 ff.; LS, 11.)

accelerare: FWH, 2.45. Speed up. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, I, 272 ff.; LS, 15.)

adaperire: SPA, 51.7. Open fully. Rare before the Silver period. (TLL, I, 568 ff.; LS, 80.)


adimplere: EH, 5.92; FWH, 1.22. Fulfill. The form is Silver; the connotation is Late, but appears mostly in Christian writers. (TLL, I, 685 ff.; LS, 36; Blaise, 51 ff.)

adinvenire: DCR, 16.19. Discover. Late. (TLL, I, 688; LS, 6; Blaise, 52.)

adlaudare: EH, 3.56. Extol. The verb is cited once for Plautus, once for Lucilius, and here. (TLL, I, 1660; LS, 92; Blaise, 53.)

adnectere: CBS, 3.11; FWH, 1a.5; DTM, 1.13. Combine, add to. Infrequent before the Silver period. (TLL, I, 776 ff.; LS, 125.)


adspirare: CBP, 1.16. The form is classical; the connotation, favor, poetic and Silver. (TLL, II, 840 ff.; LS, 176.)

adulterare: CEX, XXVIII.3. Commit adultery (for a man). The verb occurs in classical Latin, Silver Latin, and late secular writers, but it is most frequent in Christian writings. (TLL, I, 883; LS, 47; Blaise, 63.)

adunare: CEX, 15. Gather together. Late, but rare outside Christian authors. (TLL, I, 888 ff.; LS, 47; Blaise, 63.)

alludere: PRI, 5.95; FVH, 2.54, 9.4. Make sport of. Rare before the Silver period. (TLL, I, 1697 ff.; LS, 94.)

antecedere: PRI, 5.94; DF, 5.73, 8.131. The form is classical; the connotation, precede in time, is Old and Silver Latin. (TLL, II, 140 ff.; LS, 129.)

apprehendere: SPA, 109.2 and 4. Make (a beginning). The form is classical; this connotation is Christian, sixth century. (TLL, II, 305 ff.; Blaise, 91.)


attondere: CEX, LXVI.6 and 1. Cut (the hair). Poetic and Silver. (TLL, II, 1153 ff.; LS, 196.)

benedicere: PRI, 4.86, a Scriptural quotation, where the connotation is the classical praise; and CBP, 7.XIX.2, CBS, 3.IV.1, and CEX, LV.2, where the meaning is bless, a Christian connotation of the second-third century. (TLL, II, 1867; LS, 231; Blaise, 112.)

benefacere: SPA, 57.2, 101.2. Do well to. The verb is infrequent in classical prose; primarily poetic and Silver. (TLL, II, 1875 ff.; LS, 230.)

circumlinere: IDS, 6.76. Smear all over. Infrequent before the Silver period. (TLL, III, 1154; LS, 339.)

circurstarere: CBP, 6.7. In the participle, it means, a by-stander. Silver. (TLL, III, 1173 ff.; LS, 342.)

coartari: SPA, 1.4; FVH, 5.18. In the former passage it has the meaning, limit, a rare meaning before the Silver period; in the FVH it means compel, a Late Latin connotation. (TLL, III, 1390 ff.; LS, 357; Blaise, 162.)

cohibere: DI, 4.6; FVH, 5.13. The form is classical; the connotation, restrain, is poetic and Silver. (TLL, III, 1545 ff.; LS, 363.)

commaculare: PRI, 4.80. Defile. Classical and secular, but rare outside Christian writers. (TLL, III, 1818; LS, 375; Blaise, 172.)

commiscere: CEX, LXXXI.tit. The form is classical; the connotation, a commingle sexually, is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, III, 1896 ff.; LS, 379; Blaise, 175.)

communicare: Martin uses the word in these meanings: share with, take part in, a classical connotation, at CBP, 8.12, and CEX, LXXXI.9; receive Holy Communion, a Christian connotation from the third century, at CBP, 7.XIII.tit. and 1, CEX, XXIX.3, and LXXXIV.1 and 4; associate with, a Christian connotation of the fourth century, CBP, 3.XV.2 and CEX, XXXVII.6. (TLL, 1954 ff.; LS, 383 ff.; Blaise, 173; Souter, 63; Sainio, 94 ff.)

competere: Be fitting. The word occurs in classical Latin, but rarely; this connotation, however, is Silver. (TLL, III, 2065 ff.; LS, 389.)

complacere: EH, 8.135; CBP, 6.4. Please. Old and Late Latin. (TLL, III, 2077 ff.; LS, 392.)

computare: DP, 3.43. Calculate. Rare before the Silver period. (TLL, III, 2177 ff.; LS, 395.)

concierE: DI, 2.9. Excite. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 398 ff.)

condemnare: PRI, 5.90; CBS, 2.30, 3.5; CEX, XIII.3, XV.13, XXXV.2. Classical except in the CBS where it has the meaning, damn, a Christian connotation of the fourth century. (LS, 406 ff.; Blaise, 191.)

condolere: SPA, 2.5. Have compassion. Christian, second-third century. (LS, 409; Blaise, 193.)

confiteri: SPA, 37.4; PRI, 3.60; CBP, 3.I.1; CEX, XXV.2, 3, and 6; DCR, 15.24. It has the classical meaning, acknowledge, except at CBP, 3.I.1 and DCR, 15.24 where it has the Christian specialization, make an act of faith. (LS, 415; Blaise, 196.)
Christian, second-third century. (LS, 416; Blaise, 199.)

conscribere: EH, 8.139; CBP, 2.17; CBS, 2.17; CEX, 5
and 14; FVH, 1.15. The meaning is the classical write or
compose except at EH, 8.139, where the words means ascribe,
a connotation not attested in the source material. (LS,
427; Blaise, 292.)

consecrare: In the CBP (once) and the CBS (seven times)
it means consecrate, i.e., to make holy by official rites, a
Christian connotation from the fourth century; at DP, 7.104,
it has the classical connotation, dedicate. (LS, 427;
Blaise, 203; Souter, 73.)

condedere: CBP, 1.4 and 17; CBS, 1.4. Sit (generally
of an official body, such as a court). Late. (Blaise,
203; Souter, 73.)

consolari: DCR, 18.20; FVH, 2.32. The active form,
consolare, in the DCR is Old and Late Latin, here probably
a purposed Vulgarism; the connotation, console, is classi-
cal. (LS, 434; Blaise, 207.)

contristare: SPA, 14.7. Sadden. Silver. (LS, 459.)

convertere: SPA, 30.6, a bracketed passage, 45.3; EH,
3.52; CBP, 3.XVII.3; DI, 3.28, 5.23. Classical except in
the CBP where it has the meaning, convert to Christianity,
a Christian connotation of the second-third century. (LS,
464; Blaise, 220.)

corripere: EH, 3.38, CBS, 4.5, and CEX XVI.14, where
the verb means reproach; and DI, 3.29 and 4.5, where it
means seize. It occurs rarely in classical prose; pri-
marily poetic and Silver. (TLL, 473 ff.; Blaise, 226.)

crucifigere: DCR, 13.12, 15.15. The form is classical;
the connotation, crucify, is Silver. (Blaise, 231; Krebs-
Schmalz, I, 377.)

defungii: DCR, 14.15. The form is classical; the con-
notation, die, is Silver. (TLL, V, 376 ff.; LS, 533.)

degradare: CBP, 7.XXII.4. Reduce in rank. Christian,
fourth century. (TLL, V, 386; Blaise, 249.)
demorari: CEX, XXXIV.3. Remain. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, third century. (TLL, V, 510 ff.; LS, 544; Blaise, 254.)

denotare: EH, 3.44; CEX, XXV.tit. Brand with reproach. The form is classical; the connotation is Silver. (TLL, V, 536 ff.; LS, 546.)

depingere: PRI, 5.96. Describe. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, V, 572 ff.; LS, 549.)

depraedari: PRI, 2.39. Despoil. The verb occurs in Ulpian and Apuleius; otherwise it is Christian, second-third century. (TLL, V, 593 ff.; LS, 551; Blaise, 257.)

deprecari: CEX, LXXXIII.6; DCR, 18.10. Pray to God. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, fourth-century. (TLL, V, 598 ff.; LS, 551 ff.; Blaise, 257.)

deputare: Martin uses the verb in a variety of meanings: ascribe to, a Christian connotation of the fourth century, at PRI, 7.122, and IDS, 8.105; class among, a Christian connotation of the second-third century, at CEX, XXIII.2; concede, a classical connotation, at CEX, XXXIII.7; and assign to, a Late meaning, at CEX, LXIII.1. (TLL, V, 620 ff.; LS, 553; Blaise, 258.)

derelinquere: SPA, 82.1 and 2, 109.20; IDS, 4.46; CEX, XV.12, XXXIV.2; FVH, 7.7. Classical except at CEX, XV.12, and FVH, 7.7, where it means leave behind after death, a Christian connotation from the second-third century. (TLL, V, 626; LS, 553; Blaise, 258.)

deservire: PRI, 1.5 and 10. Be enslaved to. Classical, but not frequent until Silver Latin. (TLL, V, 691 ff.; LS, 556.)

destinare: At PRI, 5.95, it means resolve or intend, and at CEX, LI.2 and 4, appoint; both of these meanings are classical, but infrequent before Silver. At DTM, 3.32, the meaning is send, a Christian connotation of the fourth century. (TLL, V, 755 ff.; LS, 560; Blaise, 263.)

detegere: CBP, 2.3; CEX, XXIV.3. Expose. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, V, 792 ff.; LS, 561.)

devincere: CEX, XXII.7. The form is classical; but the meaning here, convict, is not attested in the source material. (TLL, V, 861 ff.; LS, 566.)

digerere: DI, 1.4, where the meaning is relate, and DP, 1.2.2, where it is compute. The form is classical; both connotations are Silver. (TLL, V, 1115 ff.; LS, 576 ff.)

dignoscere: IDS, 2.23. Distinguish. Silver. (TLL, V, 1219 ff.; LS, 582.)

dimmerere: This verb occurs twenty times in the CBP, CBS, CEX, and DCR. It is classical in meaning except at SPA, 7.1, where it means bequeath, a Christian connotation of the second-third century, and at CEX, XVII.4, where it means make a judgment, a Christian connotation of the fourth century. (TLL, V, 1207 ff.; LS, 581 ff.; Blaise, 274 ff.)

dimittere: EH, 3.42. Brighten up. This is the sole occurrence of the verb. (TLL, V, 1218; Blaise, 275; Souter, 105.)

dirimere: DI, 6.6. Break up. Classical, but more frequent from the Silver period on. (TLL, V, 1257 ff.; LS, 584.)

diripere: PRI, 2.41. The form is classical; the connotation, strive for, is Silver. (TLL, V, 1260 ff.; LS, 585.)

discurrenere: DI, 4.12. Run about. The verb is rare before the Silver period. (TLL, V, 1365 ff.; LS, 589 ff.)

discutere: SPA, 3.4, where it means discuss; 109.29, where the meaning is judge; and CBS, 3.1.2 and 10, CEX, XXIV.2, and DI, 6.15, where it means examine. All these connotations are from the Late Latin period. (TLL, V, 1372 ff.; LS, 590; Blaise, 279 ff.)

dispensare: arrange or order, a classical connotation, at SPA, 9.28, FVH, 2.8 and 37; distribute, a Silver meaning, at CEX, XVI.tit. and 1. (TLL, V, 1401 ff.; LS, 591 ff.)

displicere: CBS, 2.24; FVH, 4.37. Displease. Classical but more frequent in Silver and Late. (TLL, V, 1416 ff.; LS, 592 ff.)

disruptere: DCR, 16.17. Sunder. Classical, but rare outside Christian writings. (TLL, V, 1264; LS, 585; Blaise, 276.)

distendere: IDS, 4.44; DI, 2.6. The form is infrequent before Silver Latin; the connotation, swell, is Silver. (TLL, V, 1512; LS, 597.)
divendere: IDS, 9.130. The word is classical, but rare in all periods. The meaning in Martin is unclear. The TLL suggests boast (venditât or inactât); Barlow suggests defendit as a possible emendation. (TLL, V, 1571; LS, 600; Barlow, 73.)

eligere: IDS, 1.1, 8.100 (twice), CEX, VIII.5, XXXIX. tit. and 1; DCR, 14.29; IB, 21. The form is classical; so also is the meaning in the CEX and DCR. But in the IDS and IB the Christian connotation, choose for salvation (by God), is used; this originated in the second-third century. (TLL, V, 2, 375 ff.; LS, 638; Blaise, 304.)

emendare: CBS, 2.15, where it means correct, and CEX, 13, where the participle is used as an adverb, faultlessly. The verb is classical, but not common before the Silver period. (TLL, V, 2, 458 ff.; LS, 21.)


evacuare: PRI, 3.74; CEX, III.tit., V.4. Make void. The form is Silver, but occurs infrequently outside Christian writings; the connotation comes from the Jurists and Christians of the second-third century. (TLL, V, 2, 983 ff.; LS, 665; Blaise, 317.)

exacerbare: DI, 7.2. Irritate. Silver. (TLL, V, 2, 1132 ff.; LS, 671.)

exaequare: FVH, 2.46. Make level. The form is classical; the connotation is rare in all periods. (TLL, V, 2, 1141 ff.; LS, 671; Blaise, 320.)

exaltare: SPA, 39.7; IDS, 4.50, a Scriptural quotation; EH, 8.147, a Scriptural quotation. Exalt. Rare except in Christian authors. (TLL, V, 2, 1157 ff.; LS, 672; Blaise, 321.)

excaecare: SPA, 16.7, a bracketed passage. Make blind. Rare before the Silver period. (TLL, V, 2, 1194 ff.; LS, 675.)

excommunicare: The verb occurs seventeen times in the
CBP, CBS, and CEX. Expel officially from Church membership.
Christian, fourth century. (TLL, V, 2, 1279 ff.; LS, 679;
Blaise, 325; Sainio, 95.)

exhibere: CBP, 5.7, and DCR, 9.15, where it means show,
a poetical and Silver connotation; and DCR, 11.5, where the
meaning is the classical present. (TLL, V, 2, 1416 ff.;
LS, 685.)

century. (TLL, V, 2, 1438 ff.; LS, 685; Blaise, 329.)

exilire: DI, 8.11. The form is classical but rare; the
connotation, leap forth, is Silver. (TLL, V, 2, 1862 ff.;
LS, 702.)

explanare: DI, 2.5. The form is classical; the connota­
tion, utterly distinctly, is Silver. (TLL, V, 2, 1711 ff.;
LS, 695.)

Two. The verb appears in Cato, the poets, and Silver
writers. (TLL, V, 2, 1280 ff.; LS, 679.)

exserere: FVH, 1.13. Compose. The form is classical,
but infrequent before Silver; the connotation is Silver.
(TLL, V, 2, 1854 ff.; LS, 701.)

exterrere: SPA, 24.3. Frighten. In classical Latin
the verb is found in the passive only; the active form occurs
from the Silver period on. (TLL, V, 2, 2025 ff.; LS, 734.)

extollere: SPA, 10.2; PRI, 2.35; EH, 4.81; FVH, 4.49,
7.1. Extol, glory in. The form is classical; the connota­
tion is Silver. (TLL, V, 2, 2031 ff.; LS, 739.)

genuflectere: CEX, LVII.tit. Genuflect. Christian,
fourth century. (TLL, VI, 2, 1882 ff.; Blaise, 374; Souter,
160.)

impingere: At FVH, 1.8, it means impute, a Christian
connotation of the fourth century; at FVH, 6.9, it means
direct, an Old and Silver Latin connotation. The form is
classical, but it occurs rarely before the Silver period.
(TLL, VII, 1, 616 ff.; LS, 903; Blaise, 413.)

impinguare: EH, 3.40, a Scriptural quotation. The form
is Silver, but rare; the connotation, anoint, is Christian,
second-third century. (TLL, VII, 1, 619 ff.; LS, 903;
Blaise, 413.)
**Imputare:** SPA, 52.3. Ascribe. Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 728 ff.; LS, 911.)

**Inculcare:** DCR, 16.32. The form is classical; the connotation, trample upon, is Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 1064 ff.; LS, 929 ff.)

**Incurvare:** IDS, 4.47; EH, 6.115. Curve. The verb occurs once in Cicero in the passive; otherwise it is poetic and Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 1095 ff.; LS, 931.)

**Incitere:** DI, 7.22, 10.12. Strike into, excite. Classical, but rare before Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 1101 ff.; LS, 931.)

**Indulgere:** SPA, 28.2, 35.2, 37.5; DCR, 17.4. The form is classical; the connotation, pardon, is Late, but occurs mostly in Christian writings. (TLL, VII, 1, 1250 ff.; LS, 938; Blaise, 436; Souter, 201.)

**Ingerere:** mention, a classical meaning, but rare before the Christian writers, at EH, 4.81; bring in, a connotation which occurs in Cato, the poets, and Silver writers, at CBP, 3.10, and CBS, 2.6; and show, a Silver connotation, at DI, 3.10. (TLL, VII, 1, 1548 ff.; LS, 951; Blaise, 445.)

**Inhiare:** FWH, 1.2. Desire eagerly. Infrequent before the Silver period. (TLL, VII, 1, 1594 ff.; LS, 953.)

**Injurare:** SPA, 10.2, 16.1; DI, 9.1. Injure. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VII, 1, 1596 ff.; LS, 956; Blaise, 449.)

**lnnotescere:** CBP, 1.19, 4.5, 6.3. Become known. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 1711 ff.; LS, 958.)

**Inquietare:** CEX, XXXV.5; DI, 5.18. Disturb. Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 1799 ff.; LS, 960.)

**Insurgere:** SPA, 64.2; EH, 6.109; DI, 4.6. Rise up. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 972.)

**Intaminare:** CEX, XVI.8, XVII.5. Squander. The form is Christian, Fourth century; the connotation occurs only here. (Blaise, 459; Souter, 213.)

**Intumesceere:** DI, 2.10. Swell up. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VII, 2, 98 ff.; LS, 991.)

**Inungere:** DI, 10.6. Anoint. Rare before the Silver period. (TLL, VII, 2, 250 ff.; LS, 992.)
invocare: SPA, 47.4 and 5; CEX, LXXV.2; DCR, 8.5, 16.13; FVH, 5.17 (twice); DTM, 3.27. The classical connotation, appeal to, call upon, is used everywhere except at DTM, 3.27, where the Silver connotation, name, is used. The word is infrequent before the Silver period. (TLL, VII, 2, 254 ff.; LS, 997; Blaise, 473.)

irritare: DCR, 5.4. Provoke. Rare before the Silver writers. (LS, 1003.)

obsecundare: FVH, 4.24. Be compliant. Classical, but infrequent at all periods. (LS, 1241; Blaise, 567.)

offerre: Martin has several meanings for this word: bring forward, offer, a classical connotation, at EH, 1.10, 2.32, 4.77 and 82, CBS, 3. VII.2, 3. IX.13, FVH, 1.6 and 13; offer to God, a Christian, fourth century, meaning, at EH, 8.149; give in offering, a Christian, fourth century, meaning, at CBP, 7. XXI.2 and 6, CBS; 3. VII.3 and 4, CEX, LV. tit. and 1; offer the Mass, a Christian, third century, meaning, at CEX, XXV.2, XLVII.3, LVI.2 LXVIII.4; offer sacrifice, a Christian, fourth century connotation, at DCR, 7.5 and 8.4. (LS, 1259; Blaise, 575.)

perdurare: CEX, LXXII. tit. Endure. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1338; Blaise, 609.)

perexire: CEX, L.3. To go through to the end. Cf. Chapter Three, Acc. of D'O. Christian, fourth century, in form; but the connotation is found only in Martin. (LS, 1339; Blaise, 610; Souter, 294.)

perfundere: DTM, 2.25. Baptize by pouring water, not by immersion. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, fourth century. (LS, 1342; Blaise, 611.)

perpensare: DI, 6.16; FVH, 2.2. Consider carefully. Late Latin. (LS, 1351; Blaise, 615.)

perpetrare: IDS, 7.87; DI, 5.18. Perform, commit. Rare in classical prose; primarily poetic and Silver. (LS, 1351; Blaise, 615.)

persentire: CBP, 8.9. Perceive clearly. Poetic and Late. (LS, 1354; Blaise, 616.)

persistere: FVH, 6.13. Persist. Classical, but rare in all periods. (LS, 1355; Blaise, 616.)

pertimere: EH, 2.14. Fear greatly. Classical, but infrequent in all periods. (LS, 1358; Blaise, 619.)

pervidere: DTM, 3.33. View. Rare in classical prose; primarily a poetic word. In Late Latin _per-_ had lost its force. (LS, 1361; Blaise, 620; Krebs-Schmalz, II, 294.)

praecedere: precede, a poetic and Silver connotation, at PRI, 6.115, DCR, 16.21, DF, 4.58, and 5.82; excel, a classical connotation, at EH, 1.2. (LS, 1411; Blaise, 640.)

praecellere: EH, 1.1. Excel. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1411; Blaise, 641.)

praedicare: CBS, 2.29; DCR, 13.9. Preach. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1436; Blaise, 645; Souter, 313.)

praedivinare: PRI, 5.103. Have a presentiment of. Classical, but very rare in all periods. (LS, 1417; Blaise, 645.)


praefari: CBS, 1.3, and CBS, 1.2, where it means, in its participial form, the above-mentioned; and CBS, 5.11, where the meaning is say before. The form is classical; the first connotation is Late, and the second is classical, but not common before Silver. (LS, 1420; Blaise, 647.)

praefulgere: DCR, 3.5. Shine forth. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1420; Blaise, 647.)

praegustare: CBS, 3.XIV.4, 7.XIV.3; CEX, LVIII.tit. and 2. Taste beforehand. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1421.)

praefulgere: PRI, 6.110. Begin. Silver. (LS, 1422; Blaise, 649.)

praemittere: PRI, 5.98. Send out in advance. The form is classical; the connotation is Silver. (LS, 1423; Blaise, 650.)

praespicere: EH, 4.64. Look at before, but here perhaps, examine carefully. Christian, fifth century. (LS, 1430; Blaise, 655; Souter, 318.)

praestare: PRI, 5.104; CEX, XXX.4; DCR, 11.13, 19.8; FWI, 2.37. The form is classical; the connotation here is give or present, a Silver meaning, except at DCR, 19.8, where the sense is aid, a Christian connotation from the fifth century. (LS, 1430 ff.; Blaise, 655.)
praesumere: take up, take in advance, Silver, at PRI, 5.108, CBS, 3.X.1 and 8, CEX, X.4; undertake, dare, a Christian connotation of the fourth century, at CBP, 7.VIII.1, 7.XV.2, 7.XX.5, 8.12, CEX, XIV.3, XXII.9, XXXVII.2. (LS, 1432 ff.; Blaise, 656; Souter, 319.)

praevalere: CEX, III.8. Have force, be in effect. Late jurists and Christian writers of the fourth century. (LS, 1437; Blaise, 658.)

praeveneri: DI, 5.21, where the meaning is prevent, a Silver connotation; and FVH, 4.48, which has the meaning, precede, also from the Silver period. (LS, 1437; Blaise, 659.)

procedere: CEX, XVIII.4; DI, 3.23. In the first instance the verb has a Silver connotation, present one's self; in the second it has the standard classical meaning, advance. (LS, 1450 ff.; Blaise, 665 ff.)

procurare: SPA, 90.2, which has the Christian fourth century connotation, obtain; and 109.47 and DCR, 19.4, where the meaning is the classical, attend to. (LS, 1454; Blaise, 667.)

produere: SPA, 51.5 and 7; IDS, 2.22. Produce. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1455 ff.; Blaise, 668.)

proficere: SPA, 58.3, 66.2, 98.1; PRI, 6.119; CBS, 3.15; DI, 7.23; DP, 2.24. Classical, except at SPA, 97.1, where the verb has the connotation, make spiritual progress, a Christian meaning from the third century. (LS, 1457 ff.; Blaise, 669.)

promereri: deserve, a classical connotation, at EH, 6.105; obtain, a classical connotation, at CEX, LXIII.5, LXXXIII.6; win favor, a Silver connotation, at FVH, 4.41. (LS, 1464; Blaise, 672.)

promovere: CEX, XXI.4 and 8, XXII.2. Promote. The form is classical; the connotation is Silver. (LS, 1465; Blaise, 672.)

prorumpere: DI, 8.2. Break out. The verb occurs in classical prose, but is more frequent in poetry and Silver writer. (LS, 1474.)

provenire: IDS, 8.104; CBS, 1.8. Come to pass. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1480; Blaise, 680.)
provocare: EH, 7.121, and DI, 8.25, where it has the Silver connotation, challenge; and CEX, I.1, where it has the classical connotation, call forth. (LS, 1481.)

recensere: CBP, 1.18, 3.2, and 4.5. Go over, i.e., review. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1530.)

recolligere: CEX, XXXVII.6. Reconsider. Classical, but rare in this connotation. (LS, 1535; Blaise, 700.)

recuperare: DCR, 6.1. Restore. The verb is classical; the connotation is Christian, fourth century. (LS, 1532; Blaise, 702.)

recurrere: CBS, 2.22. Turn back. The form is classical; the connotation is poetic and Silver. (LS, 1537; Blaise, 702.)

referire: DI, 8.28. Strike back. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1544.)

relanguescere: DI, 8.7. Abate. The form is classical, but rare; the connotation is Silver. (LS, 1554.)

relegere: The verb occurs twelve times in the CBP and CBS. Reread (aloud). It is rare in classical prose; primarily a poetic and Silver word. (LS, 1555.)


reparare: DCR, 5.6. Restore. Rare before the Silver period. (LS, 1567; Blaise, 712.)

repromittère: CBS, 3.8. The form is classical; the connotation, promise, is Late. (LS, 1572 ff.; Blaise, 715; Souter, 361.)

reputare: CBP, 3.11. Ascribe. The form is classical; the connotation is found in the Jurists and Christian writers of the second-third century. (LS, 1576; Blaise, 716.)

resolvere: FVH, 4.40. Weaken. Poetic and Silver. (LS, 1579.)

restaurare: CEX, 13, V.5, XIV.4. Restore. Silver, but rare before Late Latin. (LS, 1582; Blaise, 719.)

resurgere: The verb occurs twelve times in the DCR and DP. The form is poetic and Silver; the connotation, rise
from the dead, is Christian, second-third century. (LS, 1585; Blaise, 720.)

retorquere: IDS, 7.88. Cast back. Rare in classical prose, primarily poetic and Silver. (LS, 1587.)

revolvere: EH, 8.142; DCR, 9.2 and 9, 17.16. Classical, except in the EH where it has the Silver connotation, reflect on. (LS, 1591 ff.)

sub crescere (suc-): IDS, 9.120; DCR, 6.3. Grow. Classical, but very rare in all periods. (LS, 1778; Blaise, 790.)

subiacere: CEX, LXXVIII.2, LXXXI.2 and 8. Lie near. Silver. (LS, 1777; Blaise, 781.)

subintroducere: CEX, XXXII.tit. Introduce secretly. Christian, fourth century. (LS, 1777; Blaise, 782.)

subiugare: DP, 4.61. Subjugate. Late. (LS, 1777; Blaise, 783.)

subnervare: EH, 2.17. Enervate. Late; not used very frequently. (LS, 1779; Blaise, 788.)

subnotare: CBS, 3.IX.5. Write down. Silver. (LS, 1779.)

subrepere: PRI, 5.88; IDS, 1.5, 1.36, 10.132; DCR, 10.1; DTM, 4.53. Steal upon. Rare before the Silver period. (LS, 1817; Blaise, 785.)

subscribere: The verb occurs twenty-three times in the CBP and CBS. The form is classical; the connotation, sign a document, subscribe, is Silver. (LS, 1780; Blaise, 785.)

subvertere: SPA, 80.2; IDS, 8.97. Destroy. Rare in classical prose; primarily a poetic and Silver word. (LS, 1786.)

suggerere: IDS, 8.101. Suggest. The form is classical; the connotation is Late. (LS, 1793; Blaise, 792.)

superinsidere: SPA, 42.2. This verb is probably a Greek loan-translation. For a discussion, cf. the section of the dative with verbs in Chapter Three.

superponere: CBP, 7.IX.3. Put over. Silver. (LS, 1808.)
superscribere: FVH, 1.18. Superscribe. The form is Silver; the connotation is Late. (LS, 1809; Blaise, 798.)

superseminare: SPA, 15.5, a bracketed passage. Sow after an earlier sowing. Christian, fourth century. (LS, 1809; Blaise, 798; Souter, 405.)

supervenire: SPA, 8.9, 25.7, 69.1; CBS, 3.IX.1, Come over. Silver. (LS, 1812.)


suscipere: The verb occurs twenty-eight times in the SPA, CBP, CBS, CEX, DCR, and DP. It has classical connotations everywhere except as follows: receive as a guest, a Christian connotation of the fourth century, at SPA, 6.2, 16.3 and 6, 28.2, 48.1, CEX, 1, XXXIV.7, LXXXIV.2; receive, get, a Late Latin connotation, at CBP, 7.IV.3, B.VIII.3, CBS, 3.III.2, 3.VII.3, CEX, LXXXI.4, LXXXIV.2. (LS, 1819; Blaise, 802.)

sustollere: IB, 18. The form is poetic and Silver; the connotation, erect, is Late. (LS, 1822.)

transcendere: At DCR, 4.7, it means transgress, a poetic and Silver connotation; at EE, 1, it means cross over, the regular classical sense. (LS, 1888.)

usurpare: PRI, 3.46; CBP, 7.XVI.5, 7.XVII.3; CEX, VIII.2, XVI.7. Assume or appropriate unlawfully. The form is classical; the connotation is Silver. (LS, 1938; Blaise, 862.)


To summarize, there are in this category five verbs that appear in Old Latin, then drop out of view in the classical period, but re-emerge in Silver or Late Latin. There are one hundred words which appear in classical Latin; forty-five of these are listed here because of their rarity in prose, twenty-three have undergone Christian semantic change, and thirty-two have acquired a later secular meaning. There are forty-seven Silver words, four with a later secular
connotation and three with a Christian meaning. There are ten Late neologisms and fourteen Christian neologisms. Martin presents two new words, *dinitidare* and *superinsidere*; and the meanings which he gives to *conscribere*, *devincere*, and *divendere*, are not cited in the source material for an earlier time. Martin's use of compound verbs is very traditional, and does not reveal the very creative abundance of the Late period.

**Verbs from substantives**

The following verbs which are derived from substantives and which appear in Martin are classical in form and meaning:

- amare, aucupari, auxiliari, bellare, colorare, criminari, cruciari, cumulare, curare, custodire, dominari, donare, epulare, examinare, fastidire, fenerare, formare, formidare, fraudare, frigere, furari, generare, gloriari, gustare, laborare, metuere, minari, munire, nominare, notare, oportet, regnare, salvare, scrutari, somniare, speculari, temperare, terminare, testari, tribuere, turbare, vulnerare.


39 On the form cf. Chapter Two.

40 The etymology of *oportet* is not clear; at one time it was derived from the noun *opus*, and thus it is placed here. More recent efforts at tracing its past posit a verb *op-vortet*; but this requires a simple verb *vortere* (*-eo*), which would be a relative of *vertere*, and there is not any evidence of such a verb. Cf. A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire, Etymologique de la langue latine* (3d ed.; Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1951), II, 821.
aestuare: DI, 2.2. Boil up. The form is classical; the connotation is poetic and Silver. (TLL, I, 1112; LS, 62.)

augmentare: EH, 4.65. Increase. Late, but mostly in Christian authors. (TLL, II, 1360; LS, 204; Blaise, 105.)

calcare: DI, 3.20. Trample upon. Classical, but most frequent from the Silver period on. (TLL, III, 134 ff.; LS, 267 ff.)

causare: SPA, 86.2. Contend in court, go to law. Old Latin has this verb in the active; then it reappears in Christian writers of the fourth century. (TLL, III, 703 ff.; LS, 304 ff.; Blaise, 141.)

companiare: CEX, LXXX.2. Shorten. Christian, second-third century, but very rare. (TLL, III, 2036; LS, 387; Blaise, 180.)

copulari: CEX, LXXX.1. Marry. The form is classical; the connotation is Christian, fourth century. (LS, 468; Blaise, 222.)

damnare: censure, a poetic and Silver connotation, at CBP, 2.3 and 24, 3.6, 3.XI.1, 4.2; DI, 8.19; FVH, 4.8; damn, a Christian connotation of the fourth century, at DCR, 14.16. The form is classical. (TLL, V, 12 ff.; LS, 510 ff.)

fabricare: IDS, 2.18. Form. In the active this is poetic and Silver. (TLL, VI, 1, 18 ff.; LS, 713.)

fabulari: CEX, LXXXIII.1. Speak. Old and Silver Latin. (TLL, VI, 1, 34 ff.; LS, 717 ff.)

figurare: SPA, 16.5, and DP, 2.25, where it means picture, a Silver connotation; and at CBP, 3.XII.3, where it has the meaning, form, a classical connotation which is, however, not common in the classical period. (TLL, VI, 1, 740 ff.; LS, 749.)

fornicare: CEX, XXVII.1, LXXVII.1; DI, 3.31. Commit fornication. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VI, 1, 1123 ff.; LS, 770; Blaise, 361.)

fulminare: DI, 4.8. Thunder. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VI, 1, 1532 ff.; LS, 791.)

germinare: IDS, 10.141; DP, 5.64, a Scriptural quotation, 66. Sprout forth. Silver. (TLL, VI, 2, 1925 ff.; LS, 812.)
hereditare: SPA, 34.4. Become an heir. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VI, 3, 2643 ff.; LS, 848; Blaise, 389.)

honorare: CBP, 3.IV.1 and 2; CEX, LXXIV.4; DCR, 8.2, 18.29. Give honor to. Classical, but rare before Christian times. (TLL, VI, 3, 2942 ff.; LS, 863; Blaise, 393 ff.)

indicare: This verb occurs sixteen times in the SPA, IDS, CEX, DI, DCR, FVH, and DP. Classical except at CEX, XIII.1 and 3, where it means condemn, a Plautine and Silver connotation. (LS, 933.)

maritare: CEX, XXXI.tit. Marry. Rare before Silver. (TLL, VIII, 402 ff.; LS, 1114.)


meretricari: DCR, 7.20. Play the whore. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VIII, 826 ff.; LS, 1136; Blaise, 527.)


operari: SPA, 45.2 and 3, 51.6, 78.2, 109.15 and 18; IDS, 5.13, 5.52; DP, 2.26. Work. The form is poetic and Silver; the connotation is Late. (LS, 1268; Blaise, 579.)

ordinare: The verb occurs thirty-three times in the SPA, CBP, CBS, CEX, and FVH. It means order or arrange, a classical connotation, at SPA, 9.27, CBS, 3.X.1, CEX, tit., XVI.4, and FVH, 2.38, and prescribe, at CEX, LXVI, tit. and 3, a Christian connotation of the fifth century. Elsewhere it has the meaning, ordain into some rank of the clergy, a Christian connotation of the third century. (LS, 1277; Blaise, 583; Souter, 279.)

pignerari: PRI, 2.44. Pledge. Silver. (LS, 1375.)

plantare: CEX, LXXII.4. Plant. Silver. (LS, 1384; Blaise, 628.)

poenitere: CEX, XXIII.tit., 1, and 4, XXX.6, LXXX.2. On the form cf. Chapter Two. Repent, be sorry. Silver, but most frequent in Christian writings. (LS, 1289; Blaise, 588.)
querelari: DI, 5.23. Make a complaint. This verb occurs only in Servius, Arnobius, and here (Seneca, De Ira, III, 12.1, has querelas manu fecit). (LS, 1509; Blaise, 691; Souter, 338.)

rimari: EH, 2.18. Search out. Classical, but infrequent before Silver. (IS, 1596.)

rixari: SPA, 19.3 and 6. Quarrel. Rare in classical prose; primarily poetic and Silver. (IS, 1597.)

roborare: IDS, 3.32; CBS, 1.22. Strengthen. Rare in classical prose; primarily poetic and Silver. (IS, 1597.)

salvare: SPA, 75.2, 110.3, a bracketed passage; DCR, 18.3. Save, i.e., bring to eternal salvation. Christian, second-third century. (IS, 1623; Blaise, 734; Souter, 362.)

signare: CBP, 7.VIII.2 where it has the classical connotation, seal; and CEX, LIII.1, DTM, 5.81, and DP, 2.34, where the meaning is mark with the sign of the cross, a Christian, fourth century connotation. (IS, 1697; Blaise, 759; Souter, 378.)

tribulari: DCR, 18.20. Be suffering. Christian, fourth century. (Blaise, 828; Souter, 428.)

ventilare: EH, 6.109, a Scriptural quotation, where the verb has the meaning, discomfit, a meaning that occurs rarely in classical prose, but is common in poetry and Silver Latin; and CBS, 2.8, where it has the Late connotation, discuss. (IS, 1969 ff.; Blaise, 840 ff.; Souter, 438.)

In summary, there are two words from the Old Latin period which are revived after disappearing in classical Latin. There are fifteen words of classical origin, five of which are rare before the later periods, five with secular meanings of a later time, and five with Christian connotations. There are seven Silver words, one with a secular meaning of the Late period. Also there are three Late and six Christian neologisms.
Verbs from adjectives

The following verbs which are derived from adjectives and which occur in Martin are classical in form and meaning:

blandiri, commodare, firmare, frequentare, gratulari, liberare, misereri, mollire, participare, praecipitare, sanare, sauciare, simulare, sollicitare.

amaricare: EH, 1.12. Be bitter. Christian, second century. (TLL, I, 1815 ff.; LS, 100; Blaise, 75.)


breviari: DCR, 1.6. Shorten. Silver, but most frequent in Christian authors. (TLL, II, 2172 ff.; LS, 250; Blaise, 119.)

celebrare: The verb occurs nineteen times in the CBP, CBS, CEX, DTM, and DP. It means engage in, perform, say, all classical connotations, at CBP, 5.17, CBS, 3.IX.10, CEX, LVII.8, DTM, 342 and 4.62; celebrate the Mass, a Christian connotation of the third century, at CBP, 7.IV.1 and CBS, 3.IX.10; elsewhere, it means celebrate a Christian religious feast, a Christian specialization of a classical meaning. (TLL, III, 742 ff.; LS, 308 ff.; Blaise, 141 ff.)

cordare: SPA, 35.1. Harmonize. Classical, but not frequent in any period. (LS, 403; Blaise, 189.)

dignare: DCR, 18.2; DTM, 5.83. Deem good. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, V, 1140 ff.; LS, 578.)


gravare: SPA, 5.3 and 6; FVH, 4.31. Oppress. Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VI, 2, 2310 ff.; LS, 829.)

---

humiliare: SPA, 89.1, 110.12, a bracketed passage; IDS, 4.49; EH, 8.149; CEX, LVII.6. Make humble. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VI, 3, 3100 ff.; LS, 870; Blaise, 396.)

importunare: CEX, XXXV.5. Make a nuisance of. This verb is not cited in any source for before the twelfth century. (DuCange, IV, 310; Miermeyer, fasc. 6, 515.)

incestare: DCR, 7.11. Defile (sexually). Poetic and Silver. (TLL, VII, 1, 892 ff.; LS, 919.)

infestare: PRI, 1.1. Attack, molest. Rare before the Silver period. (TLL, VII, 1, 1404 ff.; LS, 745.)

infirmare: SPA, 9.4, 15, and 15, where it has the meaning, weaken, a Silver connotation, and CEX, XXXIII.tit., where it has the classical meaning, invalidate. (TLL, VII, 1, 1436 ff.; LS, 946.)

inimicari: SPA, 109.33. Act in a hostile manner. This deponent form and the connotation are Christian, fourth century. (TLL, VII, 1, 1622 ff.; Blaise, 447.)

insanire: DI, 7.18, 9.2. Be insane. Classical, but most common in the Silver period. (TLL, VII, 1, 1829 ff.;

intimari: DTM, 2.19. Relate. Late, but mostly in Christian writers. (TLL, VII, 2, 17 ff.; LS, 988; Blaise, 468.)

lenire: DI, 1.5, 7.23, 10.2. Alleviate. Rare in classical prose; primarily poetic and Silver. (LS, 1049.)

levare: SPA, 9.8, where it means take; and DCR, 13.26, where it means raise. The form is classical; both connotations are Silver. (LS, 1055; Blaise, 493.)

mediare: CBS, 2.17, with the connotation, intercede, Christian, fourth century; and CBS, 3.IX.11, be in the midst of, Christian, second-third century, rare. (TLL, VIII, 558; LS, 1123.)

molestare: SPA, 40.1. Trouble. Rare and cited in Vulgar authors before Late Latin. (TLL, VIII, 1350 ff.; LS, 1158.)

mundare: SPA, 110.10, a bracketed passage. Cleanse. Silver, with a religious sense added by the Christians of the fourth century. (LS, 1175; Blaise, 544.)
pestiferare: PRI, 4.82. Infest. Christian, fourth century, but very rare, cited only for Lucifer (died 370) and here. (Blaise, 621.)

pullulare: IDS, 10.122. Sprout. Poetic and Silver. (IS, 1489.)

sociare: CEX, LXXII.4. Join together. Classical, but the reference to marital union is only poetic and Silver. (IS, 1715.)

sordidare: PRI, 1.8. Defile. Christian, third. (IS, 1732; Blaise, 766.)

superbire: IDS, 8.96; FVH, 4.56. Be proud. Rare in classical prose; primarily poetic and Silver. (IS, 1804; Blaise, 794.)

tenuare: DI, 8.8. Diminish. Poetic and Silver. (IS, 1956.)

unire: CBP, 5.16, 6.5. Unite. Silver. (IS, 1932; Blaise, 857.)

variare: CBP, 5.12 and 18, 7.6. The form is classical; the connotation, be different, is Silver. (IS, 1958; Blaise, 836.)


In summary, there are eleven classical verbs, six of them rare in that period, four with a later secular change of meaning, and one with a Christian connotation. There are eleven Silver words, one with a Christian meaning. And there is one Late neologism, and seven Christian ones. Finally, the verb importunare appears in Latin for the first time in Martin.

Verbs from other verbs

The following verbs which are derived from other verbs

42 Barry, 138 ff.; Mueller, 185.
and which appear in the writings of Martin are classical in both form and meaning:

- captare, spectare, suspicari, temptare (tentare), tractare, vexare.

**citare:** DI, 2.7. Quicken. The form is classical; the connotation is poetic and Silver. (TLL, III, 1199 ff.; LS, 3^4^5.)

**fugare:** DI, 7.4. Put to flight. Classical, but infrequent in prose before the Silver period. (TLL, VI, 1, 1498 ff.; LS, 789.)

**pulsare:** SPA, 100.3, where it means drive away, a late Latin connotation; and DI, 2.8, where it has the classical sense, strike. (LS, 1490; Blaise, 684.)

**sectari:** FWH, 5.5. Strive after. The form is classical; the connotation is Silver. (LS, 1654.)

**Verbs from adverbs**[^43]

Martin has only two verbs which are derived from adverbs, frustrari and superare, and both are classical in form and meaning.

**Verbs with the suffix -tare or -itare**[^44]

The verbs agitare, certare, dubitare, and latitare, which are of this type, are classical in form and meaning in Martin.

**absentare:** CEX, LXIV.tit. Be absent. The form is Christian, third century; the connotation is Christian, fifth century. (TLL, I, 170; LS, 10; Blaise, 38.)

[^43]: Barry, 139; Hrdlicka, 38; Mueller, 185.

[^44]: Barry, 139 ff.
dictare: PRI, 5.99, where the verb means compose; and FVH, 5.5, where the meaning is prescribe. The form is classical, but rare before Silver; both connotations are Silver. (TLL, V, 1009 ff.; IS, 572.)

dormitare: CEX, 9. Day-dream. Rare in classical prose; primarily poetic and Silver. (TLL, V, 2034 ff.; IS, 611.)

visitare: SPA, 58.2; DCR, 18.20; DTM, 1.6. Visit. Classical, but rare in all periods before the Christian. (IS, 1998.)

Verbs compounded with -ficare

The verbs sacrificare and significare from this category are classical in form and meaning in Martin.

aedificare: SPA, 33.3 (twice), 80.1, 90.1; CBS, 3.VI.2. In the SPA, the verb means to strengthen or increase, a Christian connotation of the second-third century; in the CBS it has its classical meaning, build. (TLL, I, 923 ff.; IS, 52; Blaise, 64; Souter, 2.)

glorificare: SPA, 10.2, 47.5, a Scriptural quotation; PRI, 3.69, a Scriptural quotation; EB, 8.151. Glorify. Christian, second-third century. (TLL, VI, 2, 2088 ff.; IS, 818; Blaise, 377.)

justificare: CEX, XIII.3. Vindicate. The form is Christian, second-third century; the connotation is fourth century. (IS, 1620; Blaise, 480.)

magnificare: LDS, 8.110. The form occurred in Old Latin; the connotation, extol, is Silver, but most frequent in Christian writers. (TLL, VIII, 106 ff.; IS, 1098; Blaise, 508.)


pacificare: SPA, 19.5 and 7. Make peace. Silver. (IS, 1287; Blaise, 586.)
Verbs in -scere

The verbs which have the suffix -scere in Martin have mostly been treated in previous sections: concupiscere, convalescere, desciscere, evanescere, exardescere, innotescere, oblivisci, perhorrescere, pertimescere, proficisci, relanguescere, and requiescere in the section on compound verbs, and vilescere in the section on verbs derived from adjectives. The verbs augescere, quiescere, and ulcisci are classical in form and meaning in Martin.


Neologisms, Rare Words, and Diminutives

There are several items of vocabulary usage which are of special interest and which will repay recapitulation. The number of neologisms occurring in Martin is not large, yet very interesting. Martin was not a very creative thinker or writer; yet as a man of letters he was active and productive within the limits that his life as a Christian bishop would allow. There are eleven words which do not occur in Latin before him: the nouns avicellus, grani (var.) lectoratus, exspolium, exhortatiuncula, and gravessa; the adjectives forasticus and neglegus; and the verbs dinitidare, superinsidere, and importunare. It is probable that avicellus, grani, and gravessa were words in popular use in Spain that Martin has put into literature for the first time; so too the word lectoratus most likely belonged to contemporary Church
administrative language. The other words, from the available evidence, appear to be neologisms. The nouns lectoratus and exhortatiuncula, the adjective neglegus, and the verb dinitidare are as far as the source material used indicates.

One of the marks of Martin's style that is particularly interesting is the rather large number of rare words that occur in his writing. A list of these follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RARISSIMA</th>
<th>RARIORA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOUNS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cogitamen</td>
<td>noxietas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dictatus</td>
<td>orarium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eliquium</td>
<td>rigiditas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incantatura</td>
<td>seditionarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innumeritositas</td>
<td>titillamentus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cereolus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commissor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deicola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deprehensor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>detestator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discrepacio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mutabilitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pinax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>primatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>principatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prosperitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reprehensor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scrutinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sternutus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADJECTIVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breviculus</td>
<td>immensuratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chartaceus</td>
<td>ruinosus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVERBS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mendice</td>
<td>neglectius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>congregatin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subitum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>postergum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERBS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adlaudare</td>
<td>pestiferare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compendiare</td>
<td>querelari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concordare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>divendere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mediare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>obsecundare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perexire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>persistere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pertimere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>praedivinare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subcrescere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subnervare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One is tempted to advance this trait as a sign of his education and as a mark of his literary quality. But some of the words have a definitely Vulgar ring: breviculus, postergum,
and subitum;, and some are likely from Christian technical language: orarium, primatus, seditionarius; this causes one to hesitate to make conclusions about the other words. Still, it seems generally true, in view of the literary background of the citations for most of these words, that this is a literary characteristic, and adds to the evidence that Martin is literary rather than Vulgar.

One very clear characteristic of a Vulgar style is an abundance of diminutives with non-diminutive functions. That Martin is not Vulgar is again indicated by the very small number of such diminutives in his works. The majority of words of diminutive form which occur are classical in origin and have either lost their diminutive force long before the Late period, such as calculus, formula, and scapula, or still retain it, such as arcula, libellum, or sportella. Martin has only five non-classical diminutives. Late Latin is the origin of cupellus and signaculum; cereolus is a Christian technical term, while Martin's own contributions are avicellus and exhortatiuncula. What is really noteworthy is that four of the five, all except exhortatiuncula, appear in the DCR, a work in which Martin intentionally put colloquial usages.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Late literary Latin represents a syncretism of forms, syntactical constructions and usages, and vocabulary; Martin of Braga is, in the sixth century which was once thought to be a time of barbarous and lacking in educated use of language, fully competent in his use of this syncretic literary language. In the first place, he is traditional. Educated in the schools of Pannonia, apparently, with a knowledge of Greek that was deep and thorough, he shows signs of his literary education. He distinguishes styles according to the type of work that he is writing. The Greek translations, in accordance with the Christian theory of translation, are fairly literal, though Martin does not hesitate to add material of his own or to clarify (and sometimes complicate as, for example, in the Sententiae Patrum Aegyptiorum, 21.4-8) the Greek. The Sententiae, aimed at his monks who were not highly educated, is a more popular work and presents a numer of Vulgarisms. The accounts of the Councils and the various canons exhibit the official language of Church administration, so that the Canones Ex Orientalium Patrum Synodis contains a much higher
level of linguistic usage than the Sententiae; for the language which was used by the hierarchy to carry on the official business of the Church was itself a peculiar mixture of the colloquial and literary. The three Christian moral essays, the Pro Repellenda Iactantia, the Item de Superbia, and the Exhortatio Humilitatis, are written in the standard Christian style, making free use of a somewhat loose structure, Christian vocabulary, and syntactical usages not found in classical, or even on occasion in contemporary, literature; the doctrinal treatises, the De Trina Mersione and the De Pascha, on the other hand, while they also use the standard Christian language, have a structure and style that is far more rigorous and complex, and far closer to the secular literary language. The literary language of secular Late Latin is itself exemplified in the consciously literary De Ira and Formula Vitae Honestae; both of these works are apparently epitomes of Seneca, but are composed in the literary language of the sixth century, modified by a strong Senecan flavor. The influence of Seneca can also be traced in the Christian moral essays and is characteristic of Martin's style. Both secular literary writings show a rigid exclusion, rigid by sixth-century standards, of the colloquial, the Christian, and the foreign. The De Correctione Rusticorum is written expressly for the uneducated population of Spain; its style is utterly simple, its language filled with vulgarisms but without the exotic except for technical terms of
religious life, now completely assimilated into the Latin language. And yet it possesses a literary organization and flavor that a congregation would expect in a preacher, and has the full panoply of rhetorical devices of the simpler type that were employed in the Christian sermon. Finally, the three poems are done in the two classic meters that are standard in Late and Medieval Latin, the In Basilica and the Epitaphium in dactylic hexameter and the In Refectorio in elegiac couplets; they are uninspired and stiffly correct in technique, with the best parts adapted from Sidonius Apollinaris, but they nonetheless reveal an awareness of literary method and language. Martin's knowledge of stylistic differences is also demonstrated by the introductory paragraphs of the De Ira, De Correctione Rusticorum, Formula Vitae Honestae, De Trina Mersonie, and De Pascha, which are in the elaborately florid epistolary style of Late Latin with its complex paraphrases and abstractions, while the body of these same works is in his characteristic style which is more simple and straightforward. The Formula comes closest to the Late bombastic style; and it is precisely the most literary of Martin's works.

Martin's linguistic usages also reveal his traditionalism. The classical purity of his morphology is remarkable for the time at which he lives; for example, Bonnet lists almost a hundred confusions of E and short I in Gregory of Tours, while Martin shows but one and that in the Greek loan
word, letania. Many of Martin's variants from classical spelling and inflection were literary in his time, and hence admissible; even so, they are not so numerous as one would have expected. In syntax the various constructions also show a predilection for the traditional; more important, however, than the presence of classical and Silver syntactical constructions and usages, which one would anticipate in a syncretic style, is the sparing employment of acceptable Late usages, and the awareness of their non-traditional nature, an awareness which caused Martin to avoid them in his literary works, though he felt free to resort to them in his Christian writings. The heavy influence from the classical and Silver vocabulary is graphically illustrated by the lists and summaries of Chapter Four.

Nevertheless, Martin belongs to his era. His language is not completely traditional but abounds in Late Latin forms, syntax, and vocabulary, both secular and Christian. When one analyzes a writer's language, classifying it in various categories and by various periods, he is in danger of losing sight of the whole. Martin may be sixty or seventy per cent traditional by a count of individual points of usage; but no one would mistake any but the simplest sentence for classical Latin. The Late Latin writer did not have our categories in mind. If he was traditionally educated and classically inclined, he would know what classical style and grammar were and he might try to write in that way, the way
of a past era; but more likely he lived in his own age and wrote by its standards, which are probably influenced very heavily and shaped to a more or less considerable extent by the traditional style and grammar. Martin of Braga, was, as his morphology, syntax, and vocabulary reveal, a modern writer of the traditional school. This is no doubt true of many Late Latin authors; but in the last two centuries of the Late period, adherence to the traditional school is on the wane. Martin thus belongs to a small number of literary, as opposed to Vulgar, authors of the fifth and sixth centuries.

For Martin is clearly literary, by sixth-century standards of literary quality, in morphology, structure, and vocabulary. This statement is not an attempt to pass aesthetic judgment on Martin; his whole period rates rather low aesthetically, and however high he is placed in his period, as a stylist and a writer in general he scarcely rises above the third-rate. Yet a linguistic analysis of his language establishes beyond doubt that he is a literary and not a Vulgar writer. Three types of Vulgarisms appear in his writing. First, the elevated Vulgarism. This is a usage which by classical standards is non-literary, but which over the centuries through one process or another has come to acquire literary acceptability, that is, literary quality; the majority of Vulgarisms found in Martin, as the preceding chapters amply demonstrate, belong in this category. In
reality these are Vulgarisms only by the strict definition of the Vulgar in terms of classical Latin; by our own definition of the Vulgar as the non-literary, they are not even Vulgarisms.

The second type of Vulgarism in Martin is the true Vulgarism, a usage which even by sixth-century standards cannot be considered literary. Such Vulgarisms must be considered accidental in Martin, the result of lack of polish, of haste or inadvertence; they do not occur systematically or invariably, but sporadically, and they do not occur in the carefully wrought De Ira and Formula Vitae Honestae. Martin was a busy man; he was busy as a devout, orthodox religionist with a strong sense of his obligations and devotion to his vocation. He was busy as the abbot of a monastery, and bishop of a metropolitan see in a country whose population was under the influence of sundry pagan superstitions and Christian heresies and whose clergy lacked adequate education. Moreover, writing appears to have been an avocation with Martin, not a major activity; he wrote always, not for the satisfaction of producing a creative work, but for some specific practical purpose. When to this is added the fact that literary Latin was a learned language that to a large degree differed from the day-to-day language, the likelihood of accidental Vulgarisms creeping into his writing and escaping his notice becomes very high.
The third kind of Vulgarism is the intentional Vulgarism. All instances of these are found in the De Correctione Rusticorum, and are classified as intentional because Martin claims to write the sermon in a rustic style, as was pointed out in the first chapter. It has been argued, especially by Caspari, that Martin's claim is not accurately followed out and that the language there is the educated colloquial rather than the Vulgar; Barlow counters this with considerable manuscript evidence of usages that can only be interpreted as Vulgar. The linguistic analysis of this dissertation supports Barlow. Martin did not dash off the De Correctione Rusticorum. The introductory paragraph indicates that some thought was given before the writing to its organization, content, and style; an examination of the sermon itself shows a rather tight structure and logical progression as well as a simplicity of style unlike Martin's more literate structure in any work except the Sententiae which was also popular in intent. Further, this sermon was written in response to a request by Polemius, Bishop of Asturica; the bishops of Galicia were required by the first canon of the Second Council of Braga to preach to the common people against the superstitions which they still practiced. Since Martin was devoted to his priestly obligations, and since he presided at the Council which framed the canon, it is not probable that he would have written this sermon in haste. It is rather altogether likely that it received as
much care as the literary work, the *Formula Vitae Honestae*, which was written for a king, for the moral edification of his court; this essay announces itself as a work of polish and contains not a single Vulgarism. Neither does it companion literary essay, the *De Ira*. Yet the *De Correctione Rusticorum* has more Vulgarisms than any other single work of Martin. Surely, then, these are intentional. It must not be assumed, however, that the sermon is an example of the speech of the common man of sixth century Spain, not at all, for the sermon was a literary form, and the people would expect, and Christian homiletic theory would require, some elevation of language. But a simple colloquial style with some colloquial language would facilitate understanding and perhaps move the people to abandon their superstition— the purpose Martin had for writing the sermon.

Grecisms and poetic vocabulary and syntax appear in Martin. The poetic vocabulary and syntax are wholly traditional or Late secular, mostly stemming from Silver prose as is apparent from the chapter on vocabulary. Grecisms occur occasionally; most of these are in the *Sententiae* and *Canones* where one would expect them to occur because of the Christian theory of literal translation. In both these areas Martin's style is restrained as traditional literary canons would require; but it is also modern insofar as he admits both types where they have become established, especially in the Christian writing.
Martin surely recognized the existence of a Christian special language. This is readily apparent from the vocabulary which he uses. Christian technical terms, as is natural in the Christian writings of a Christian bishop, are very numerous; there are seventy-four direct Christian terms, one hundred and eleven partial Christianisms in this category, and twelve indirect absolute terms which are technical as they are used but need not be so. In addition Martin has a number of indirect Christianisms, ninety-one absolute and eighty partial. In morphology and syntax the Christianisms are of two types, those which occur only in the Christian writers, that is, absolute, and those which are extensions of already existent secular constructions, that is, partial. The absolute Christianisms are few in number, especially in morphology, and are usually Hebraisms or Grecisms. The extended usages, however, are quite numerous. One must decide whether to adhere to the position of the advocates of a Christian special language who classify these as Christianisms and conclude a separate Christian Latin from their existence, or to the position of their opponents who hold that this is merely a reflection of the natural development of Latin, emerging in the freer literary form of Christian writing. Theoretically, the opponents seem to hold the more tenable position. But Martin's usage actually, to a certain degree, supports the Christian Latin theory since he uses many of these extensions only in the Christian
writings and avoids them where they are possible in the secular literary works. Still this does not resolve the question of whether these usages were primarily Christian in their origin and development or belonged to the general language; for Martin would naturally follow the freer Christian auctoritas in the Christian style and the more conservative secular auctoritas in the purely literary style. It does clearly indicate a consciousness on the part of Martin that there were different criteria for Christian literary works than for secular; but, as the evidence presented in this dissertation shows, this is much more a matter of stylistic difference than of linguistic difference. Christian Latin is a special language, but it is not a separate Latin; that is, it has its own vocabulary and a few syntactical peculiarities, like the technical Latin of the Silver period, and it has its own style, its own literary quality, which puts it in the same relation to other types of Latin as Silver is to classical, and Late Latin is to both of these.

The works of Martin of Braga are more valuable for the information they provide the scholar than for the aesthetic delight they afford the reader. Martin was an important figure in Spain during the second half of the sixth century; he leaves behind a body of writing which deals with a period little documented in Spanish history. Thus, even though his contribution is small in volume and indirect in subject matter, he is very important to the historian, both secular
and ecclesiastical. For the student of the history of literature he has importance as the major Spanish writer of the sixth century, and as the preserver, in the Formula Vitae Honestae, of at least the thought of a lost work of Seneca. For the linguist he presents a valuable bit of evidence about the state of Latin at a desolate time in the history of that language. And yet, over and above these practical values, his writing, while it is not great literature, does possess a charm and simplicity which, in spite of occasional lapses into the complexity and obscurity of the Late Latin style, rewards the reader with an unexpected delight.
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