

Orthology Photography Fiction Fishing
Christianity Art Cooking Essays
Buddhism Freemasonry Medicine Biology
Music Ancient Egypt Evolution
Carpentry Physics Dance Geology
Mysticism Fitness Shakespeare
Marketing Confidence
Immortality Biographies Poetry
Psychology Witchcraft Electronics
Chemistry History Law Accounting
Philosophy Anthropology Alchemy Drama
Quantum Mechanics Atheism Sexuality
Mental Health Ancient History Criminal
Entrepreneurship Languages Sport
Paleontology Newsweek Islam
Metaphysics Investment Archaeology

Forgotten Books

— www.forgottenbooks.com —

Copyright © 2016 FB &c Ltd.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law.

HINTS ON THE STUDY OF LATIN

(A.D. 125-750)

HINTS ON THE STUDY OF LATIN

(A.D. 125-750)

HELPS FOR STUDENTS OF HISTORY. No. 21

EDITED BY C. JOHNSON, M.A., AND J. P. WHITNEY, D D., D C.L.

HINTS ON THE STUDY OF LATIN

(A.D. 125—750)

BY

ALEXANDER SOUTER, D.LITT. 1873-
"

LONDON

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1920

4666

THE STUDY OF LATIN

(A.D. 125—750)

LATIN literature may be conveniently, if somewhat arbitrarily, divided into a number of periods. The first period might be called the pre-Ciceronian, and would include the works of Plautus, Terence, Cato, and various fragments. The second period is the Ciceronian, of which Cicero and Cæsar are the great representatives in prose. The surviving works of Cicero cover a period of nearly forty years, and enable us to trace the gradual fashioning of one of the most wonderful literary instruments ever wielded by man. His contemporary, Cæsar, is classed with him, in spite of certain differences of idiom which show themselves. In the opinion of those who have studied pagan Latin prose literature from the point of view of style, these are the greatest names. Only less great are those of the third period, which begins in Cicero's later life and may for convenience be called the Augustan period. This includes such writers as Sallust,

Nepos, and Livy. Of the poets, Lucretius and Catullus are within the Ciceronian period, and are soon succeeded by others who fall rather within the Augustan period—Virgil, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid. Poets stand apart somewhat from the ordinary course of literary development, as they are of necessity more artificial than prose-writers, and are often consciously and deliberately antiquarian, as is, for example, Lucretius. The fourth period may be called the post-Augustan, and lasts till about A.D. 125. This period comprises such names as Manilius, Velleius Paterculus, Valerius Maximus, the two Senecas, Persius, Petronius, Lucan, the two Plinies, Quintilian, Tacitus, Statius, Juvenal, and Suetonius.

These names are familiar to the classical student. If he has pursued an honours course in a university, he has read some part at least of most of these writers. Many of them are pre-Christian, and all of them are non-Christian. They have been recognized since the Renaissance by the severe humanist as alone worthy to be read or imitated. In our own day the composer of Latin prose is usually expected to imitate Cicero or Cæsar; the composer of hexameters models his work on Virgil, and the composer of elegiac verse similarly follows Ovid. The greatest scholars, men like Casaubon, Gataker, Price, Heraldus, Wasse, Bentley, to take a few names at random, widened their

own reading to the whole stretch of ancient letters, but anything beyond Suetonius has been *terra incognita* to most of our classical scholars for the past century or more. It is the post-Suetonian period, roughly speaking, that is thus shut off, and may be called for convenience our fifth period, the period of late Latin.

The beginning of this period may be fairly placed at about A.D. 125, but it is not so easy to assign an end to it. In a sense it is not ended yet, as Latin is still handled with freedom by certain at least of the Roman Catholic clergy, as well as by a few scholars not belonging to that body. Until about a century ago Latin was in regular use by members of all Faculties in our Western universities. But I take it that the reader of this pamphlet is mainly concerned with a somewhat shorter period than that thus indicated. We can set various bounds even to this shorter period. Some will draw the line at the middle of the fifth century, others at the end of the sixth century, yet others at the death of the Venerable Bede (A.D. 734); others will include the Carolingian period, and yet others will embrace the whole of the Scholastic period within their interests. It is improbable that many will turn to the present paper for help in the study of such exquisite Latin as we find in the works of Erasmus. The present writer must at once avow his limitations. He claims no know-

ledge of Latin after the ninth century, and little of Latin after the middle of the fifth century. Regarding, as I do, the period A.D. 350 to 450 as the Golden Age of the later Latin literature, I will confine most of my remarks to the authors of that period, the period of Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine.

It is surely less necessary than before to recommend students to make an acquaintance with the later Latin authors. The principle of the "survival of the fittest" has operated in the preservation of Latin literature. It is very remarkable how little that is really objectionable in Latin literature has survived to our time. Some pagan authors have been saved, as it were, by a miracle, but most of the Christian Latin literature that existed in the sixth century still survives. And not only this: it survives in an accurate and trustworthy text such as few pagan authors can claim. I do not necessarily mean that the reader can find such texts in print in every case, but rather that in the vast majority of cases the manuscript materials for the construction of such texts still exist. And the literature is by no means exclusively Christian. Our period includes Florus, Justin, Fronto, Gellius, Apuleius, Firmicus Maternus,¹ *Scriptores Historiæ Augustæ*, *Panegyrici*

¹ In his case we have one work belonging to his unconverted state (*Mathesis*), and a much shorter work belonging to his Christian period (*De Errore Profanarum Religionum*).

Latini, Ausonius,¹ Symmachus, and Claudian,¹ to take only a few names. The whole period should be studied without any reference to the religious beliefs of the writers. At least, my own point of view is that of a philologist who would seek to discover rather what unites than what separates these writers. The classical scholar will soon discover that the writers of the later period, Christian and non-Christian alike, are careful writers, some of them very careful, and that the themes on which they write are at least equal in interest and importance to those of the classical writers. They are, for the most part, men in dead earnest about their subjects. The bulk of the late literature also vastly exceeds that of the earlier; for example, the surviving works of Augustine are about six times the bulk of the surviving works of Cicero. Thus the explorer is in no way cramped; he can roam as freely as he likes over those vast and little-known tracts.

The present paper offers the reader some information, first, regarding general works on the subject of the later Latin; second, with reference to works concerned with particular authors; and third, about certain uses of words which might puzzle him.

The completest repertory of late Latin texts is

¹ Slight traces of Christianity in Ausonius and Claudian may be ignored.

10 HINTS ON THE STUDY OF LATIN

the *Patrologia Latina* of the Abbé Migne, which of necessity includes only Christian works. This great compilation contains 221 volumes, of which the last four are indexes to the whole work. It comprises a nearly complete set of such Latin Christian works written before A.D. 1200 as had been printed down to the period of its publication—that is, the middle of last century. The practice of the editor was to take in each case what was considered the best edition of an author's works, and to reprint it, preserving the original pagination by the use of thick type figures, which enable one to use the indexes, which also are reprinted from these earlier editions. The reprints, on the whole, are very accurate. A considerable portion of the publisher's stock was, however, destroyed by fire. This made it necessary to set up the missing volumes afresh. In some cases, as, for example, that of the works of Ambrose (*P. L.*, vols. xiii. to xvii.), this has been done very carelessly, with the result that the text is disfigured by a large number of misprints. The reader is advised, therefore, if he employs Migne at all, to use the original Migne. But, better still, he should, if possible, use the texts which Migne employed. Part of the Migne collection has been superseded for critical purposes by the great Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, which has been in process since 1866, and of which about sixty volumes

have appeared (down to 1916). A number of Christian Latin texts remain unprinted. The total of these, however, has been lessened by the appearance of publications like the *Spicilegium Solesmense* of Dom Pitra, O.S.B., the Cambridge *Texts and Studies*, the *Texte und Untersuchungen*, the two sets of *Anecdota Maredsolana* of Dom Germain Morin, O.S.B. (Oxford: Parker, for the first set; Paris: Picard, for the one volume of the second), and the *Kirchenhistorische Anecdota*, etc., of C. P. Caspari (Christiania). Certain Christian texts are also represented in the two series—B. G. Teubner's *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Græcorum et Romanorum* (Leipzig) and the *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica* (*Auctores Antiquissimi*, etc.) (Berlin: Reimer)—though these series are even more important for the non-Christian part of later Latin literature. In all cases it may be assumed that a later text is better than that of Migne. Even these series, however, do not comprise everything that is necessary. For example, separate publications of importance are *Sancti Beati presbyteri Hispani Liebanensis in Apocalypsin ac plurimas utriusque fœderis paginas commentaria*, ed. Florez (Matriti, 1770), a work of which there are probably more manuscript than printed copies in existence; and H. B. Swete's *Theodori Episcopi Mopsuesteni in Epistolas B. Pauli Commentarii*, 2 vols. (Cambridge University Press).

12 HINTS ON THE STUDY OF LATIN

The reader will naturally desire information about the Christian authors themselves. This he will find in Herzog-Hauck's *Real-Encyklopädie*, with its two supplementary volumes (Tübingen and Leipzig), of which a somewhat modified American edition¹ has been published by Funk and Wagnalls under the title *The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*, and Pauly-Wissowa's still incomplete *Real-Encyklopädie der classischen Altertums-wissenschaft* (Stuttgart), as far as concerns the more important authors. For all the authors, the best works to consult are O. Bardenhewer's *Patrologie*, 3 Aufl. (Freiburg: Herder), or the English translation of the second edition published by the same firm; and the same author's larger work, the still unfinished *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* (Freiburg: Herder). Latin authors who wrote before Eusebius are included in A. von Harnack's *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur* (Leipzig: Hinrichs). For authors, Christian and non-Christian alike, the reader should use the third and fourth parts of M. Schanz's *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers-Justinian* (Munich: Beck), of which the fifth part is not yet published; and W. S. Teuffel's *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, 6^{te} Aufl., . . . *neu bearbeitet von W. Kroll u. F. Skutsch*, III. Bd. (Leipzig: Teubner). All these works have bibliographies.

¹ Lacking as yet the very important supplementary volumes.

As a first book nothing could be better than the late Professor Swete's work, published under the title *Patristic Study* (Longmans). It should be added that Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (John Murray) is not yet superseded.¹

At the head of the Latin dictionaries comes the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinæ* (Leipzig: Teubner), the publication of which began in 1900. The letters A to C have been completed and portions of D and F. The materials for the work were collected by about two hundred scholars. The whole of Latin down to and including Tacitus, along with Tertullian and Augustine's *City of God*, was completely registered on slips. For authors later than Tacitus, with the exceptions just named, the promoters had to depend on the voluntary help of readers, who received definite tasks, and recorded what seemed to them notable on slips of an approved form and size. It is obvious, therefore, that the value of the material from late authors incorporated in the *Thesaurus* depends, for the most part, on the knowledge of Latin possessed by those contributors. Homogeneity in such a case is impossible. In Britain the work has been judged mostly from the point of view of classical Latinity. On the one

¹ For lists of editions of the Fathers, C. T. G. Schoenemann's *Bibliotheca Historico-literaria Patrum Latinorum* (Lipsiæ, 1792-1794) and J. E. B. Mayor's *Bibliographical Clue to Latin Literature* (Macmillan) are indispensable.

14- HINTS ON THE STUDY OF LĀTĪN

hand, we have Professor Lindsay¹ commending the work for the exhaustiveness with which classical Latin is recorded; on the other hand, we have Professor Housman² condemning the classification of the material in individual cases. Both are right. The classification of the material is in the hands of about a dozen young graduates of German universities, who are under the superintendence of a secretary and an editor. Their task is one of excessive difficulty, one from which far more experienced scholars than they might well shrink. Errors of various kinds in the citations have crept in, and the character of the work has suffered through the successive deaths of the three giants who revised the proofs in early days—Wölfflin, Bücheler, and Leo. But when all is said that can be said by way of criticism, the work remains a splendid monument of scholarship and industry. Nowhere else will the student find so much on the late Latin for the part of the alphabet covered. The greater part of that is pioneer work. Along with the *Thesaurus*, the *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie*, begun in 1884 and concluded in 1907 by the appearance of the fifteenth volume, should be employed. A large quantity of valuable material on the parts of the alphabet not yet covered by the *Thesaurus* is to be found there, and

¹ *Classical Quarterly*, vol. xi. (1917), p. 41.

² *Classical Quarterly*, vol. xii. (1918), pp. 32 f.

the excellent indexes in the tenth and fifteenth volumes render this material easily accessible.

Next to the *Thesaurus* the most important work is the *Nouveau Dictionnaire Latin-Français*, by E. Benoist and H. Goelzer (Paris: Garnier Frères). This work contains more Latin words than any other dictionary, and is now in a fourth edition (originally published 1893). It incorporates not only the vocabulary as contained in the seventh edition of K. E. Georges' *Lateinisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch* (Leipzig: Hahn), but the scattered material published in the various works of H. Rönsch and Carl von Paucker. The books and articles of these two scholars are all worthy of the attention of the student of the later Latin, as they spent a lifetime enriching the Latin vocabulary from neglected sources. After the death of Paucker Rönsch collected his scattered papers, and compiled a *Supplementum Lexicorum Latinorum* (Berlin: Calvary), which reaches to the end of L, but came to an end there with the death of Rönsch. A valuable work, begun but never finished, is G. Koffmane's *Geschichte des Kirchenlateins* (2 parts published; Breslau: Koebner). Later Latin poetry is well treated in L. Quicherat's *Thesaurus Poeticus Linguae Latinae* (Paris: Hachette). The information in all these books can be usefully supplemented and improved from the "indices verborum et locutionum" in the Vienna *Corpus*, the *Monu-*

16 HINTS ON THE STUDY OF LATIN

menta Germaniæ, and the other series already mentioned, as well as from the monographs on special authors, which fall to be mentioned later. On the language of the law books there are two excellent works, Dirksen's *Manuale* (Berlin, 1827) and the *Vocabularium Iurisprudentiæ Romanæ* (Berlin: Reimer), still unfinished.

It must be confessed with shame and confusion of face that our country has done hardly anything by way of helping this work. The dictionary most used, that of Lewis and Short, is worse than careless in regard to the late authors. The few scattered references to them would better have been left out altogether. It would be easy to fill many pages with proofs of ignorance on their part, wrong references to authors, works, passages, and wildly wrong statements with regard to usage. It may be hoped that the S.P.C.K. will itself supply a valuable corrective. The defects of Lewis and Short are well known to those who take any real interest in Latin lexicography. Professor Nettleship's *Contributions to Latin Lexicography* (Oxford University Press) ought to be in the hands of all who use Lewis and Short, but he naturally refers mainly to classical Latin. The broken promises made to Nettleship as well as to the promoters of the *Thesaurus* seem to indicate a profound aversion on the part of British scholars to the *labor improbus* which such a task involves. And yet I know from

personal experience how rich the harvest is, and how near at hand it lies.

But if Lewis and Short is negligible, the same cannot be said of some of the older dictionaries on which it depends or ought to have depended. I have again and again been startled by the valuable indications contained in the *Thesaurus Eruditionis Scholasticæ* of Bāsilius Faber (especially as revised by Leichius, Francof, 1749). Bishop Westcott and Professor Mayor well knew the value of this book, of which the latter presented a sumptuous copy to Owens College, Manchester. Faber, as well as Forcellini, and Scheller (translated by Riddle; Oxford University Press), are all distinctly useful to the student of late Latin. It is probably because Faber arranges the words according to roots that his valuable material has not been fully incorporated by later lexicographers.

The grammar of the later writers has commanded even less attention than their vocabulary. Büne-mann, in his splendid edition of Lactantius (Lipsiæ: Walther, 1739), is the earliest commentator known to me who thinks such matters worthy of attention. In the *Lateinische Grammatik* of Stolz and Schmalz, fourth edition (Munich: Beck, 1910) a proper respect is paid to the usages of the late authors, and a most valuable list of monographs concerning them is given. Even in the unpretentious *Gram-*

maire Historique Latine of L. Laurand (Paris: Picard) room is found for indications with regard to late Latin usage. Of comprehensive works written in English, the only one known to me that touches our subject at all is Grandgent's *Introduction to Vulgar Latin* (Boston, 1907), and most of what we are concerned with is not vulgar Latin at all. Observations on grammatical points are not infrequently to be found in the indexes to modern critical editions.

Before proceeding to consider the helps which exist for the study of particular authors, it would perhaps be well to remind the reader that some knowledge of the subject-matter of the texts with which he is to deal is requisite. This it is no easy matter to obtain. Some of the authors with which he is concerned are provided with good old commentaries—and it is never safe to neglect old commentaries, any more than old texts—but for the great bulk of them no commentary exists; for a few there are modern commentaries, but these tend to be puerile, in the lack of great predecessors for them to draw upon. The translator may, in fact, have to make a commentary for himself, and this commentary he cannot make unless he has read a great deal round his subject. He must have read general history in such works as Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, Seeck's *Untergang der antiken Welt*, Dill's *Roman Society in the Last Century*

of the Western Empire (Macmillan), Ozanam's *La Civilisation au cinquième Siècle* (Paris: Lecoffre), and the *Cambridge Mediæval History*. It will be necessary for him to know something of Church history, to learn to use such a storehouse as Tillemont's *Mémoires*, to profit by the profound knowledge of Bright's *Age of the Fathers* (Longmans), and to study the best books on the subject. A knowledge of Church institutions such as can be obtained from the still invaluable *Origines Ecclesiasticæ: The Antiquities of the Christian Church*, by Joseph Bingham (modern editions published by H. G. Bohn and by the Clarendon Press), will never come amiss. Not infrequently he will be led somewhat astray and encounter serious difficulties if he has not at least a slight knowledge of the history of philosophy—for example, the Neo-Platonic philosophy—and the history of Christian dogma. This last subject is minutely treated in Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte*, translated as *History of Dogma* (Williams and Norgate), Loofs' *Leitfaden zum Studien der Dogmengeschichte* (fourth edition; Halle: Niemeyer), and R. Seeberg's work on the same subject. It must be understood that the works mentioned in this paragraph are only a very few out of the many. Any book covering the topics of history, institutions, dogma, is better than none. The more knowledge the translator has of creeds, Christian

20 HINTS ON THE STUDY OF LATIN

worship, the Scriptures in Greek and Latin, the better.

Some of the more important late Latin authors will now be mentioned, with the best helps for their study. The arrangement will be chronological rather than alphabetical.

SECOND CENTURY.

Florus: Biography of the author in Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie*, Bd. vi., pp. 2761 ff. (O. Rossbach); best text by O. Rossbach (Leipzig: Teubner); best commentary by C. A. Duker (Leiden, 1744).

Fronto: Introduction in M. Dorothy Brock's *Studies in Fronto and his Age* (Cambridge University Press); best edition by Naber (Leipzig: Teubner, 1867), now out of print and scarce, shortly to be replaced by E. Hauler (Leipzig: Teubner).

Gaius: Edited with notes by J. Muirhead (Edinburgh, 1880); best text in E. Huschke's *Iurisprudentia Antejustiniana* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1908).

Gellius: Best edition by E. Hosijs (Leipzig: Teubner, 1903); interesting lexical notes on him, particularly in relation to Lewis and Short's Dictionary, by C. Knapp in *American Journal of Philology*, vol. xvi. (1895), pp. 52-65 (*cf.* vol. xiv., pp. 216-225).

Apuleius : Best text of *Metamorphoses* (Golden Ass) by R. Helm, second edition (Leipzig: Teubner, 1913); best edition of the Cupid and Psyche episode is *The Story of Cupid and Psyche as related by Apuleius*, by L. C. Purser (Bell, 1910). Best commentary on the whole work by John Price (Pricæus) (Gouda, 1650). English translation of the whole work by H. E. Butler (Oxford University Press); English paraphrase of the Cupid and Psyche episode in W. Pater's *Marius the Epicurean* (Macmillan). E. Rohde's *Psyche* (Tübingen and Leipzig, 1903) should also be read. Best text of the *Apologia* by R. Helm (Leipzig: Teubner); best commentary (with introduction, etc.) by H. E. Butler and A. S. Owen (Oxford University Press). Best text of the *Florida* by R. Helm (Leipzig: Teubner). Best text of the opuscula *de philosophia* by P. Thomas (Leipzig: Teubner). Best complete commentaries on his works are by Jo. Wouwer (Hamburg, 1606), the *variorum* Lyons edition (1614), Oudendorp and Bosscha (Leyden, 1786-1823).

Minucius Felix : Best text by Waltzing (Leipzig: Teubner, 1912); translation by J. H. Freese (S.P.C.K.); best commentaries by D. Heraldus (Paris, 1613), H. A. Holden (Cambridge University Press), and Waltzing (Bruges, 1909). *Index verborum* in the edition of E. Boenig (Leipzig: Teubner, 1903); *Lexicon Minucianum* by Waltzing (Liège, 1909).

Tertullian: Best-text of *De Spectaculis*, *De Idololatria*, *Ad Nationes*, *De Testimonio Animæ*, *Scorpiace*, *De Oratione*, *De Baptismo*, *De Pudicitia*, *De Ieiunio*, *De Anima*, *De Patientia*, *De Carnis Resurrectione*, *Aduersus Hermogenem*, *Aduersus Valentinianos*, [*Aduersus Omnes Hæreses*], *Aduersus Praxean*, *Aduersus Marcionem* in the Vienna Corpus, vols. xx. and xlvii. The best text of the rest of the works is that of F. Oehler (Lipsiæ, 1853, 1854), which contains what is the most useful complete commentary. The best separate commentaries on the *Apologeticus* are those of D. Heraldus (Paris, 1613), H. A. Woodham (Cambridge University Press), R. Heinze (subject-matter especially; Leipzig, 1910), J. P. Waltzing (Louvain, 1911), John E. B. Mayor (with translation by the present writer) (Cambridge University Press). Complete *index verborum* to the Apology by P. Henen (Louvain and Paris). On the text, the works of H. Schrörs, *Zur Textgeschichte und Erklärung von Tertullians Apologetikum* (Leipzig: Hinrichs); E. Löfstedt,¹ *Tertullian's Apologeticum textkritisch untersucht* (Lund and Leipzig); E. Löfstedt, *Kritische Bemerkungen zu Tertullians Apologeticum* (Lund and Leipzig), are most suggestive *Liber de Pallio*, edited by Cl. Salmasius (Leyden, 1622, 1656). A

¹ The student of the later Latin should acquire all the works of the Swedish professor, E. Löfstedt. No writer will be found more helpful.

guide to the language of Tertullian is H. Hoppe, *Syntax und Stil des Tertullian* (Leipzig: Teubner); to his theology, A. d'Alès, *La Théologie de Tertullien* (Paris, Beauchesne).

Latin Bible: Pending the appearance of Pfarrer J. Denk's collection of the fragments of the Old Latin version or versions of the Bible, to be published in four large quarto volumes by Fock of Leipzig, the reader must still employ the three folios of Sabatier (Reims, 1743-1749; Paris, 1749-1751). This can be supplemented by *Old-Latin Biblical Texts* (Oxford University Press) and other works. The best complete edition of the Vulgate is edited by Hetzenauer (Innsbruck); the best of the New Testament is the smaller edition of Wordsworth and White (Oxford University Press and British and Foreign Bible Society); down to and including the Epistle to the Romans the best edition is the larger edition of Wordsworth and White (Oxford University Press). Among various concordances to the Vulgate, that of Dutripon (Paris) may be mentioned. On the language of Biblical texts in general, the *Itala und Vulgata* of H. Rönisch (Marburg) is still important, though now capable of very considerable additions.

Irenæus: The Latin version of Irenæus is edited by A. Stieren (Leipzig) and W. W. Harvey (Cambridge University Press). The New Testament quotations with critical apparatus and copious

introductions by W. Sanday and collaborators will shortly appear (Oxford University Press).

Festus, epitomator of Verrius Flaccus, edited by W. M. Lindsay (Leipzig: Teubner).

Ulpian in Huschke's *Iurisprudentia Antejustiniana* (Leipzig: Teubner).

THIRD CENTURY.

Porphyrion, commentator on Horace, edited with copious index by A. Holder (Innsbruck).

Cyprian: Best edition by Hartel in the Vienna *Corpus*. So far as the *Testimonia ad Quirinum* is concerned, the true readings are to be found in the apparatus before the symbol L. The best edition of the *Sententiæ Episcoporum* is by H. von Soden in the Göttingen *Nachrichten* for 1907. The best account of the manuscripts of the letters is by the same writer, *Die Cyprianische Briefsammlung* (Leipzig: Hinrichs), to whom we also owe the restoration of his New Testament, *Die lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians* (same publishers). Standard works on the language: E. W. Watson in *Studia Biblica*, vol. iv. (Oxford University Press), L. Bayard (Paris: Hachette). The subject-matter is treated in Archbishop Benson's *Cyprian* (Macmillan). There is much recent literature on pseudo-Cyprianic writings.

Novatian: *De cibis Iudaicis*, edited by Landgraf

and Weyman, in *Arch. f. lat. Lex.*, Bd. xi.; handy edition of *De Trinitate*, by W. Y. Fausset (Cambridge University Press).

Commodian, ed. Dombart in the Vienna *Corpus*. A copious literature on this mysterious author.¹

Victorinus of Pettau, ed. Haussleiter, in the Vienna *Corpus* (published 1916).

Solinus: Edited by Mommsen for the second time (Berlin: Weidmann, 1895). Best annotated edition by Salmasius (Utrecht, 1689).

Panegyrici Latini, ed. W. Baehrens (Leipzig: Teubner). On these see R. Pichon, *Les Derniers Ecrivains Profanes de la Gaule* (Paris, Leroux).

Scriptores Historiæ Augustæ: Best text by H. Peter (Leipzig: Teubner); best commentaries by Is. Casaubon (Paris, 1603), *cum notis variorum* (Leyden, 1671); complete lexicon by K. Lessing (Leipzig, 1906).

FOURTH CENTURY.

Arnobius: Best text by A. Reifferscheid in the Vienna *Corpus* (valuable critical material in E. Löfstedt, *Arnobiana* [Lund and Leipzig]); best commentary by Elmenhorst (Hamburg, 1603 and 1610).

Lactantius: Best text by Brandt and Laubmann

¹ Who is much more probably to be assigned to the middle of the fifth century.

in the *Vienna Corpus*; best commentary by J. L. Bünnemann (Leipzig, 1739).

Iulius Valerius, ed. B. Küblèr (Leipzig: Teubner).

Iuuenecus: Best edition by J. Huemer in *Vienna Corpus*. Neglected MSS. in Musée Plantin, Antwerp.

Nonius Marcellus: Best edition by W. M. Lindsay (Leipzig: Teubner); compare also Lindsay's *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary of Republican Latin* (Oxford: Parker).

Firmicus Maternus: Best edition of his *Mathesis* by Kroll, Skutsch, and Ziegler (Leipzig: Teubner); best edition of his *De Errore Profanarum Religionum* by Ziegler (Leipzig: Teubner): both with copious indexes of his language.

C. Marius Victorinus: Good edition of his grammatical works only in Keil's *Grammatici Latini* (vol. vi.) (Leipzig: Teubner).

Ælius Donatus: *Commentum Terenti*, ed. P. Wessner (Leipzig: Teubner).

Palladius, ed. C. Schmitt (Leipzig: Teubner). On his language, see Schmalz in *Glotta*, Bd. vi. (1914), pp. 172 ff.

Aurelius Victor, ed. Pichlmayr (Leipzig: Teubner). Best annotated edition is by H. J. Arntzen (Amsterdam, 1733).

Eutropius: Best edition by Droysen in the *Monumenta Germaniæ*; best annotated edition by

H. Verheyk (Leyden, 1762, 1793). An index to him by Eichert (Breslau, 1850).

Hilarius: Best edition of the complete works¹ by P. Coustant and S. Maffei (Verona, 1730). Best text of the commentary on the Psalms by Zingerlé in the Vienna *Corpus* (see also Vienna *Sitzungsberichte*, Bd. cxxviii.); of the *De Mysteriis* and the historical fragments, by A. L. Feder in the Vienna *Corpus* (published 1916). A monograph on his language by I. A. Quillacq (Tours, 1903). The translation of select works, with long introduction, by E. W. Watson in *Post-Nicene Fathers* is most helpful.

Lucifer of Cagliari, ed. W. v. Hartel in the Vienna *Corpus*, with somewhat inaccurate index of Scripture passages, etc.

Zeno of Verona, ed. J. B. Giuliani (Verona, 1883, 1900); cf. E. Löfstedt, *Patristische Beiträge* (Leipzig).

Priscillian and **Instantius**,² ed. G. Schepss in the Vienna *Corpus*.

Gregory of Elvira: *De fide orthodoxa contra Arrianos* (Migne, xvii. 549, etc.); *Tractatus Origenis de Libris SS. Scripturarum*, ed. Batiffol and Wilmart (Paris, 1900); *Tractatus in Canticis Canticorum*, ed. G. Heine (Leipzig, 1848); *Arca Noe*, ed. A. Wilmart in *Revue Bénéd.*, xxvi. (1909), pp. 1 ff.; xxix. (1912), pp. 47 ff.

¹ With the exception, of course, of the recently discovered *De Mysteriis*.

² To him the tractates are now attributed by Dom Morin.

Avienus, ed. A. Breysig (Leipzig: Teubner). Best annotated edition by H. Friesemann (Amsterdam, 1786).

Ausonius: Best ed. R. Peiper (Leipzig: Teubner).

Querolus, ed. L. Havet (Paris, 1880). See also Pichon's work, cited under *Panegyrici*.

Pacianus, ed. Peyrot (Zwolle, 1896).

Optatus, ed. Ziwsa in the Vienna *Corpus*.

Filaster, ed. Marx in the Vienna *Corpus*, with excellent index. See also *Sitzungsberichte sächs*, lvi. 43. Cf. P. C. Juret, *Etude Grammaticale sur le latin de St. Filastrius* (Erlangen).

Symmachus: Best edition by O. Seeck in *Monumenta Germanicæ*.

Ammianus Marcellinus: Best text by C. U. Clark (Berlin: Weidmann). Good annotated editions by F. Lindenbrog (Hamburg, 1609), Hen. Valesius (Paris, 1636), Hadr. Valesius (Paris, 1681), Jac. Gronov (Leyden, 1693).

Servius, ed. Thilo and Hagen (Leipzig: Teubner).

Pelagonius, ed. M. Ihm (Leipzig: Teubner).

Claudius Hermeros, ed. E. Oder (Leipzig: Teubner).

Vegetius: *Epitome rei militaris*, ed. Lang (Leipzig: Teubner); *Mulomedicina*, ed. Lommatsch (Leipzig: Teubner).

Ambrosius: Complete editions are the Roman of 1579, and the Benedictine, reprinted by Migne. The following works have appeared in the Vienna

Corpus: Exameron, De Paradiso, De Cain et Abel, De Noe, De Abraham, De Isaac, De Bono Mortis, De Iacob, De Ioseph, De Patriarchis, De Fuga Sæculi, De Interpellatione Iob et Dauid, Apologia David, Apologia David quæ uocatur altera, De Helia, De Nabuthæ, De Tobia, Expositio Euangelii secundum Lucan, Expositio Psalmi CXVIII. A comprehensive work on the Latinity of Ambrose is much needed.

Ambrosiaster: His commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul in the editions of the complete works of Ambrose; his *Quæstiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, edited by the present writer in the Vienna *Corpus*; his fragment on Matthew, ed. C. H. Turner in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. v. (1903-1904), pp. 218 ff. His language treated in the present writer's *Study of Ambrosiaster* and index to the ed. of the *Quæstiones*.

Niceta of Remesiana, ed. A. E. Burn (Cambridge University Press). See also Carl Weyman in *Archiv*, Pd. xiv.

Hieronymus (Jerome), ed. Vallarsi (especially the earlier edition, Verona, 1734-1742), supplemented by *Anecdota Maredsolana*, ed. Morin, vol. iii. (3 parts). Best edition of Epistles (1-120) by Hilberg, and of the commentary on Jeremiah by Reiter in the Vienna *Corpus*. On his language an excellent monograph by H. Goelzer, *Etude Lexicographique et Grammaticale de la Latinité de Saint Jérôme* (Paris: Hachette).

FIFTH CENTURY.

Rufinus : The only critical editions of Rufinus are that of Engelbrecht in the Vienna *Corpus*, which covers only his translation of Gregory of Nazianzus' Homilies, and that of Koetzschau in the Prussian Academy's *Kirchenväter*, which contains only his translation of Origen, *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν* (*De Principiis*). Migne, *P. L.*, xxi., contains only his independent works; his translations must be sought, for the most part, in complete editions of the Greek originals.

Prudentius : The latest edition is by A. Drössel (Leipzig, 1860), which will be superseded by the Vienna edition of J. Bergman, who began a *Lexicon Prudentianum* at Upsala in 1894. Important annotated editions by Nic. Heinsius (Amsterdam, 1667) and Chr. Cellarius (Halle, 1703, 1739). The Delphin edition contains a complete index.

Paulinus of Nola : The best edition is by W. v. Hartel in the Vienna *Corpus*. The best annotated editions are those of J. B. Lebrun des Marettes (Paris, 1684) and L. A. Muratori (Verona, 1736). A monograph on his language will be published by J. H. Baxter of Glasgow University; that of M. Philipp (Erlangen, 1904) is incomplete and slight.

Claudian : The best texts are those of Birt (*Monumenta Germanicæ*) and Koch (Leipzig: Teubner); the best commentaries are by Nic. Heinsius

(Leyden, 1650, etc.) and by J. M. Gesner (Leipzig, 1759).

Augustine : The best complete edition is that of the Benedictines of St. Maur (Paris, 1679-1700); all the later reprints of this are inferior to the original. The best edition of the *Confessions* is by Gibb and Montgomery (Cambridge University Press), of the *City of God* by B. Dombart, third edition (Leipzig: Teubner), of the *Ars grammatica* in Keil's *Grammatici Latini*. The following works have appeared in the Vienna Corpus:¹ *Speculum*, *De Utilitate Credendi*, *De Duabus Animabus*, *Contra Fortunatum*, *Contra Adimantum*, *Contra Epistulam Fundamenti*, *Contra Faustum*, *Contra Felicem*, *De Natura Boni*, *Secundini Epistula*, *Contra Secundinum*, *De Genesi ad Litteram*, *Locutiones in Heptateuchum*, *Quæstiones in Heptateuchum*, *Adnotationes in Iob*, *Confessiones*, *Epistolæ*, *Retractationes*, *De Civitate Dei*, *De Fide et Symbolo*, *De Fide et Operibus*, *De Agone Christiano*, *De Continentia*, *De Bono Coniugali*, *De Sancta Virginitate*, *De Bono Viduitatis*, *De Adulterinis Coniugiis*, *De Mendacio*, *Contra Mendacium*, *De Opere Monachorum*, *De Divinatione Dæmonum*, *De Cura pro Mortuis Gerenda*, *De Patientia*, *De Perfectione Iustitiæ Hominis*, *De Gestis Pelagii*, *De Gratia Christi et de Peccato Originali*, *De Nuptiis et Concupiscentia*, *De Consensu Euangelistarum*, all the anti-Donatist

¹ The order is roughly the order of publication.

works, *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione et de Baptismo Parvulorum*, *De Spiritu et Littera*, *De Natura et Gratia*, *De Natura et Origine Animæ*, *Contra Duas Epistulas Pelagianorum*. The only works on Augustine's language worthy of mention are the indexes of words and expressions in the Vienna *Corpus*, vols. liii. and lx. (J. H. Baxter and the present writer have independently made considerable manuscript collections on his language, which we shall be glad to consult for the benefit of any scholar interested.) It is understood that a complete concordance to Augustine exists in the library of the Benedictine house of St. Bonifaz in Munich.¹

Sulpicius Severus: Best text of the complete works by Halm in the Vienna *Corpus*; best edition of the *Chronica*, with French translation and commentary, by Lavertujon (Paris: Hachette). Monographs on his language by Paucker (Berlin, 1883) and Goelzer (Paris, 1883). On the text of the *Vita S. Martini* Dr. Gwynn's *Liber Ardmachanus* (Dublin University Press) should be consulted.

Tyconius: Best text of the *Rules* by F. C. Burkitt (Cambridge University Press).

Pelagius: A critical edition of the works of this author is much needed. The writer hopes to

¹ In this connection the *Geistesfrüchte aus der Klosterzelle* of the late Dom P. Odilo Rottmanner (Munich: Lentner, 1908) should be mentioned.

supply one of the *Expositions on Thirteen Epistles of St Paul*, never before printed in its original form.

Macrobius: Best text by Eyssenhardt, second edition (Leipzig: Teubner).

Marcellus Empiricus, ed. Helmreich (Leipzig: Teubner). A monograph on his language by Chabert (Paris, 1897).

Theodore Priscian, ed. Rose (Leipzig: Teubner).

Avianus, ed. R. Ellis (London, 1887). Good early edition by Cannegieter (Amsterdam, 1731), with complete index.

Martianus Capella: There is as yet no satisfactory text. The best edition is by U. F. Kopp (Frankfurt a. M., 1836).

Rutilius Namatianus, ed. C. H. Keene, with translation and commentary (Bell). Cf. J. S. Gruber (Nürnberg, 1804).

Orosius, ed. Zangemeister in *Vienna Corpus* (smaller edition, Leipzig: Teubner).

Marius Mercator, ed. Garnier (Paris, 1673), with copious dissertations; ed. Baluze (Paris, 1684).

Cassian, ed. Petschenig in the *Vienna Corpus*, with valuable indexes.

Eucherius:¹ Part of the works edited by Wotke in the *Vienna Corpus*. Complete collations of the manuscripts exist among the papers of the late Dr. Alfred Holder of Karlsruhe (ob. 1916).

¹ See P. S. Allen's *Opus Epist. Des. Erasmi*, vol. iii., p. 98 (No. 676).

Vincent of Lerins, ed. Moxon (Cambridge University Press).

Leo, ed. P. and H. Ballerini (Venice, 1755 ff.). See also C. H. Turner, *The Collection of the Dogmatic Letters of St. Leo* in *Miscellanea Ceriani* (Milan, 1910).

Prosper: His *Chronicle* in *Monumenta Germaniæ*, ed. by Mommsen. On the falsely attributed *De Promissionibus et Prædictionibus Dei*, see *Collectanea Biblica Latina*, vol. iv. (Rome, 1913), pp. 227 ff.

Patrick: Edited, and translated by N. J. D. White (S.P.C.K.).

Codex Theodosianus, ed. Mommsen and Meyer (Berlin: Reimer).

Cælius Aurelianus, ed. C. Amman (Amsterdam, 1709, etc.).

Cassius Felix, ed. V. Rose. On his language, see Wölfflin in Munich *Sitzungsberichte* for 1880, i., pp. 381 ff.

Merobaudes, ed. Vollmer in *Monumenta Germaniæ*.

Claudius Marius Victor in *Vienna Corpus* (vol. xvi.), by K. Schenkl.

Orientius, ed. L. Bellanger (Paris, 1903).

Cyprian of Toulon, ed. R. Peiper in the *Vienna Corpus*, with which use *The Latin Heptateuch*, by John E. B. Mayor (Cambridge University Press), invaluable to all students of late authors.

Salvian, ed. F. Pauly in the *Vienna Corpus*; best annotated edition by C. Rittershusius (Altdorf, 1611).

Apollinaris Sidonius, ed. Mohr (Leipzig: Teubner); letters translated by O. M. Dalton (Oxford University Press). Best annotated editions are by J. Savaro (Paris, 1609) and J. Sirmond (Paris, 1614). On the latinity, see H. Kretschmann (Memel, 1870, 1872).

Mamertus Claudianus, ed. A. Engelbrecht in the *Vienna Corpus* (good index).

Faustus Reiensis and **Ruricius**, ed. A. Engelbrecht in the *Vienna Corpus*. On the authorship of certain sermons attributed to Faustus in Engelbrecht's edition, see Dom Morin in *Revue Bénédictine*, ix. (1892), pp. 49-61.

Arnobius Junior: His works are not yet united in one edition. The commentary on the Psalms and the *Conflictus* and the *Prædestinatus* in Migne, liii.; the *Expositiunculæ in Euangelium* in G. Morin, *Anecdota Maredsolana*, vol. iii., part 3; the *liber ad Gregoriam* in his *Études, Textes, Découvertes*, t. i., pp. 383-439, in which volume also (pp. 309-382) is the best account of the author's works and latinity.

Cæsarius of Arles: The sermons of this great preacher are in part to be found in the appendix to the Sermons of St. Augustine, in part in Migne, lxxvii. A complete edition for the *Vienna Corpus* has long been in preparation by Dom G. Morin, who has

meantime published a number of new pieces in the *Revue Bénédictine*, xiii., xvi., xxi., xxiii., xxvii.

SIXTH CENTURY.

Gelasius : The *Decretum Gelasianum de Libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*, edited by E. von Dobschütz (Leipzig: Hinrichs); the Gelasian Sacramentary, ed. H. A. Wilson (Oxford University Press).

Maximus of Turin : The defects of Bruni's edition (Rome, 1784) are in part neutralized by the work of Spagnolo and Turner in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xvii. (1915-16).

Gennadius : The *De Viris Illustribus*, ed. Richardson (Leipzig: Hinrichs); the *De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus*, ed. C. H. Turner (*Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. vii.).

Victor Vitensis, ed. Petschenig in the Vienna *Corpus*.

Dares Phrygius (with **Dictys Cretensis**), ed. F. Meister (Leipzig: Teubner). Good old edition by Fabri (Amsterdam, 1702).

Sedulius, ed. Huemer in the Vienna *Corpus*.

Alcimus Auitus, ed. R. Peiper in the *Monumenta Germaniæ*. Copious monograph on the latinity by H. Goelzer (Paris, 1909).

Dracontius, ed. F. Vollmer in *Monumenta Germaniæ* and also in the *Pœtæ Latini Minores* (Leipzig: Teubner).

Boetius : The *De Consolatione Philosophiæ*, ed. R. Peiper (Leipzig: Teubner), to whom, however, was unknown a valuable ninth-century manuscript in the Laurentian library, Florence. The *In Isagogen Porphyrii*, ed. S. Brandt in the Vienna Corpus.

Ennodius, ed. F. Vogel in the *Monumenta Germaniæ*: older edition by J. Sirmond (Paris, 1611).

Fulgentius of Ruspe : Certain works ed. by R. Helm (Leipzig: Teubner); a good monograph on his language by O. Friebe (Paderborn, 1911).

Priscianus, ed. in Keil's *Grammatici Latini*, vols. ii. and iii.

Cassiodorus : Best ed. of collected works by Garet (Rouen, 1679; Venice, 1729); the *Complexiones in Epistolas, Acta Apostolorum et Apocalypsin*, ed. S. Maffei (Florence, 1721), S. Chandler (London, 1722); the anti-pelagianized revision of Pelagius' expositions of the Epistles of St. Paul, published under the name of Primasius in Migne, *P. L.*, lxxviii.; the *Variæ*, with splendid index by L. Traube, ed. Mommsen in the *Monumenta Germaniæ*; the *Chronicle* by the same in the same series; the grammatical works in Keil's *Grammatici Latini*. The papers of P. Lehmann in recent volumes of *Philologus* are important.

Iordanis, ed. Mommsen in the *Monumenta Germaniæ*: on the latinity, F. Werner (Halle, 1908).

Gildas, ed. Mommsen in the *Monumenta Germaniæ*.

Gregory of Tours, ed. Omont, Collon, and Poupardin (Paris: Picard, 1913). A standard monograph on the latinity by M. Bonnet (Paris, 1890); a German translation, with excellent historical notes, by S. Hellmann, 3 vols. (Leipzig: Dykschen, 1911-1913).

Anthimus, ed. V. Rose (Leipzig: Teubner).

Justinian's Institutes, ed. J. B. Moyle (1890); *Digest*, ed. Mommsen (Berlin: Weidmann).

"Apollonius of Tyre," ed. Riese (Leipzig: Teubner, 1893).

Maximian, ed. Petschenig (Berlin: Calvary); ed. Webster (with commentary) (Princeton, 1901).

Arator: Best edition by H. J. Arntzen (Zutphen, 1769); last ed. G. L. Perugi (Venice, 1909).

Venantius Fortunatus, ed. F. Leo and B. Krusch in *Monumenta Germanicæ*.

Corippus, ed. Petschenig (Berlin, 1886): annotated editions by A. Goetzius (Altdorf, 1743) and P. F. Fogginus (Rome, 1777).

Gregory the Great: Best edition by the Benedictines (Paris, 1705; Venice, 1768-1776).

Eugippius: His *Vita Sancti Seuerini*, ed. Mommsen (Berlin: Weidmann); his excerpts from St. Augustine, ed. P. Knöll in the *Vienna Corpus*.

Apringius: His commentary on the Apocalypse, ed. Férotin (Paris, 1900).

Primasius: His commentary on the Apocalypse in Migne, lxviii.; the Biblical text critically edited

by Haussleiter (Zahn's *Forschungen*, Bd. iv.). See under *Cassiodorus*.

Iunilius : The *Instituta Regularia Divinæ Legis*, ed. H. Kihn (Freiburg, 1880).

Eugenius Toletanus, ed. Vollmer in *Monumenta Germaniæ*.

SEVENTH CENTURY.

Isidore of Seville : Best edition of the collected works by F. Arevalo (Rome, 1797-1803); best edition of the *Etymologiæ (Origines)* by W. M. Lindsay (Oxford University Press). Best account of the older manuscripts of Isidore's works by C. H. Beeson (Munich: Beck). The *Historia Gothorum, Vandalorum et Suevorum*, ed. by Mommsen in *Monumenta Germaniæ*.

Virgilius Maro, grammarian, ed. Huemer (Leipzig: Teubner). On the language, cf. P. Geyer in *Archiv f. lat. Lex.*, ii. (1885), pp. 25 ff.

Fredegarius, ed. B. Krusch (Hannover, 1888) in *Monumenta Germaniæ*.

Aldhelm : Best ed. of the *De Virginitate* by R. Ehwald in *Monumenta Germaniæ*.

EIGHTH CENTURY.

Venerable Bede : Best edition of the *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* by Plummer (Oxford University Press); valuable annotated edition of Books III. and IV. by Mayor and Lumby (Cam-

bridge University Press). Portions of his *De Temporibus* edited by Mommsen in *Monumenta Germaniæ*; his grammatical works in Keil's *Grammatici Latini*, vol. vii. With these exceptions, none of his works is critically edited, though excellent manuscripts abound.

The **Itinerarium Etheriæ** (Eucheriæ), of uncertain date, is edited by Heræus (Heidelberg, 1908) and others: translated by Provost Bernard and (for S.P.C.K.) by M. L. McClure and C. L. Feltoe. Cf. Anglade, *De Latinitate Peregrinationis ad Loca Sancta* (Paris, 1905), and a large literature besides, of which E. Löfstedt's *Philologischer Kommentar* (Lund u. Leipzig) is of conspicuous importance.

The later Latin is, on the whole, easier than the earlier, but it differs from it in certain respects. To a few of these attention may now be called.

Colloquialisms which appear in the comedies of Plautus, in the more conversational letters of Cicero and his correspondents, in Horace's less formal poems, in the younger Seneca and Petronius, are, for the most part, rigidly excluded from polite literature in the early days. With Fronto and Apuleius they begin to appear again in literature, and very few of the later authors are free from them. The earlier forms of the Latin Bible abound in colloquialisms.

There appears to be also a considerable conscious

antiquarian element in some of the late authors—for example, Fronto and Gellius. At least, there are many words found in Plautus and other early writers which are unexampled again until we come to the second century A.D. Some of these may, of course, have been in continuous colloquial use in the interval. It is unsafe to assume that words not found in the Ciceronian period were then obsolete.

Again, there is a tremendous accession of the Greek element in Latin. Greek was certainly the leading language of the Roman Empire down to A.D. 150 or 200, and many words which had been recognized as foreign were now written in Latin letters, having become part of the Latin language. It would be very instructive, if we had sufficient reliable evidence from the manuscripts, to trace the date of the appearance of certain Greek words in Latin. Some words were written as Greek in Cicero's time which in Jerome's time had become Latin.

The reader will also discover that the vocabulary has grown enormously, particularly in the direction of compounds and of abstract nouns. There is, for example, a large accession of words compounded with the negative particle *in-*, and the increase in the number of abstract nouns is sufficiently explained by the growing need for the expression of philosophical and theological conceptions in Latin.

In the Christian literature there is the whole

mass of definitely Christian terminology to be reckoned with. This terminology was the invention of the translators of the Bible and of the Christian authors. Until Christianity reached a level in the social scale where Greek was not understood, a Latin Bible was unnecessary. When it became necessary, it was, as I believe, the work of those whose proper language was Greek, and who possessed or used little but a colloquial knowledge of Latin. Hence many of the *bizarreries* of the Old-Latin Bible, some of which disappeared under continuous revision.

The foundation of the more technical language of Christian theology was laid by Tertullian. He had a wide knowledge of ancient Greek and Latin literature, and as a trained lawyer possessed also a minute knowledge of Roman law. It is to him more than anyone else that the Latin of the Christian authors owes its definitely legalistic tinge. Some of the words he employs fell into disuse later, but a considerable portion of his vocabulary became a settled part of Christian terminology. Words like *persona* and *trinitas* are first employed by him in their special senses. It is in Hilary, however, that we first find *incarnatio*.

The average prose of the later authors is distinctly easier to follow than that of the classical period. Writers like Tertullian, Hilary, and Augustine can be at times hard enough, but the majority are fairly

easy. This is due, in part at least, to the rules of the rhetorical schools, according to which clauses are short, and the sentence is built, as it were, by the addition of one brick at a time. The parallelism between clauses becomes at times rather mechanical and wearisome, but this want of variety helps the understanding of the reader. A number of the nicer distinctions of classical times—for example, the difference between the indicative and the subjunctive following *ante quam* and *prius quam*—tend to disappear. The accusative and infinitive construction becomes less and less used, and the substituted constructions bring us nearer to the practice of modern languages.

The later Latin prose is distinguished from the earlier by the greater prevalence of poetic diction in it. The influence of Virgil may be traced in nearly every later Latin author, though not in all to the degree visible in Tacitus. Virgil became a school-book almost immediately, and thus we find his influence cropping up constantly where we should never expect it, and in authors who would be glad to eliminate all pagan influence if they could. The rather illiterate Ambrosiaster begins his 65th *Quæstio* with the words: “*obscuris uera inuoluere non est bonum.*” This is, of course, an echo of Virgil, *Æneid* vi. 100, “*obscuris uera inuoluens,*” used of the Cumæan Sibyl. Jerome constantly echoes Virgil, Horace, and other poets;

Augustine shows a good knowledge of Lucan. But the influence of poetry appears not only in recollections of the poets, but in the use of words created for poetry, of which the origin was forgotten. There would never have been a word *eloquium*, except for the fact that *eloquentia* will not go into the hexameter: yet *eloquium* is most frequent in the late prose-writers. Again, adjectives ending in *-dicus*, *-ficus*, are mostly poetical, and the suffix is almost otiose in most cases. Such formations are very convenient amplifications of the simple word, as *lætificus* of *lætus*, if one is writing hexameter verse, but the later prose-writers took over a word like *ueridicus*, constructed for verse as it was, and superfluous from the prose point of view.

Perhaps, however, what will trouble the classical reader most is the extraordinary way in which certain simple words have changed their meaning. With some illustrations of this feature of late authors the present paper must close. The illustrations are selected somewhat at random, and have no relation to one another.

In philosophical and theological writings it is useful to be able to distinguish throughout the forms of *anima*, "life-principle," "soul," from those of *animus*, "spirit." It is only in the dative and ablative plural that there is any difficulty. The difficulty does not seem to have been felt in classical

times, when more was left to the intelligence. But the Christian-writers always use *animabus* for the dative and ablative plural of *anima*, and thus avoid the ambiguity. In the classical period the use of this *-abus* form is very restricted.

In the later authors the word *adiutorium* occurs a countless number of times, and is probably at that time the commonest word for "assistance." In Cicero it occurs only once. The early word *adiumentum* is, on the contrary, very rare in late Latin. *Auxilium* and *suffragium* persist. In classical Latin the word *civis* does duty for "citizen" and "fellow-citizen"; in late Latin we have *conciuis* for the latter, in the same way as *πολίτης* divides up later into *συμπολίτης* for the latter sense, *πολίτης* for the former. Among the new words coined is *deitas* (from *deus*). Arnobius already uses it, but Augustine, a century later, considers it necessary to apologize for its use.

The later authors appear to prefer an ablative like *ueterī* to *ueterē*. The former appears to have been invented by the hexameter poets because of the difficulty of using the other in the hexameter. Even in prose, of course, a tribrach would generally be avoided. In classical Latin only the comparative of *certus* is used with a clause dependent on it; in late Latin the positive frequently occurs in this use. In classical Latin the ablative case is employed after the comparative of an adjective; in late Latin

we sometimes find the genitive, on the analogy of Greek.

One of the most remarkable changes affects the value of certain well-known pronominal adjectives. The word *is* was always a weak word, and, if it was wrongly aspirated, some of its forms were liable to be confused with those of *hic*. The failure to aspirate forms of *hic* was a much commoner occurrence, and led to confusion with forms of *is*. The effect was to drive the word *is* almost out of the language. It resulted from this that *hic* came to have the sense of *is*, as it has almost universally in late authors. *Iste*, a comparatively rare word in classical times, came to have the value of *hic*, as we see from Romance forms like Spanish *este* ("this") it must have had. This new sense rules in late authors.

In classical Latin the want of a present participle to the verb *sum* often causes difficulty. This was got over in late times by giving *constitutus*, *positus*, and *consistens* the weaker sense of the missing participle. *Constitutus* is oftener used by African writers; *positus* is oftener used by European writers; *consistens* is comparatively rare. *Corrigo* and *emendo* are sometimes employed intransitively in late Latin, like the English "reform." Not infrequently we find in certain late authors a curious intransitive use of *dissimulo*, followed by *a*, *ab*, in the sense, "I neglect"; there is also a use of

proficio with the dative of persons or things, in the sense of *prosum*. There is no trace of either of these uses in classical Latin.

It has been noted that *sæpe* tends to die out in late Latin: *sæpe numero* seems hardly to have been remembered at all. The place of these words is taken by *frequenter*, etc. The word *denique* undergoes very strange developments in late Latin, the most common of its new senses being “for.” Classical Latin says *usque adhuc*; in late Latin we also find, first *usque nunc*, and then later even *nunc usque*.

The preposition *iuxta* is very often employed in late Latin=*secundum*, “according to.” *A* is used sometimes after the comparative instead of the plain ablative. In Augustine and other authors we find phrases like *a longe, de longe*, “from a distance”; in classical Latin the distance only might have been expressed without any other indication of place or direction.

In the *Bellum Hispaniense*, now attributed to one of Julius Cæsar’s officers, we find the first certain example of a use of *quod* which becomes very widespread and influential in later times, not only in Latin, but also in the Romance languages: the use, I mean, to introduce a noun clause after a word of saying or thinking, instead of the accusative and infinitive. In late times the purists continue to employ the old construction; the slightly less

48. HINTS ON THE STUDY OF LATIN

strict allow themselves the *quod* construction, followed by indicative or subjunctive. Under the influence of the Greek Bible, where *ὅτι* may mean “that” or “because” according to the context, a foreign use of *quia* and *quoniam* arises in Latin, where they become widely used in the sense “that.” *Quia* is more literary than *quoniam* in this use. Even *ut* is found occasionally with the same force.

In introducing a question where a negative answer is expected, classical Latin employs *num* or *numquidnam*. Late Latin dropped *num* entirely or almost entirely, and regularly used *numquid*, much less frequently *numquidnam*. In classical Latin *etenim* naturally stands in the first place in the sentence, being really two words, *et enim*, but in late Latin, on the analogy of *enim* and perhaps under the influence of the poets, it is also very frequently used in the second place. In the sense of “but if not,” “otherwise,” late Latin sometimes employs the extraordinary phrase *si quo minus*; *sin aliter* seems to be dead; but *alioquin* and *sin autem* are frequent.¹ Finally, *propter quod* occurs extremely often in the sense of “wherefore,” “for which reason,” perhaps a literal rendering of Greek *διότι*.

¹ See Burkitt's *The Old Latin and the Itala* (Cambridge University Press), p. 41, for Biblical examples.