

**VARIETATE DELECTAMUR**





LATIN VULGAIRE – LATIN TARDIF  
*Studies on Non-Standard and Late Latin*

VOLUME 1

*General Editors*

Giovanbattista Galdi

Béla Adamik

*Editorial Board*

Béla Adamik (*University of Budapest*)

Carmen Arias Abellan (*University of Sevilla*)

Frédérique Biville (*University of Lyon*)

Gualtiero Calboli (*University of Bologna*)

Giovanbattista Galdi (*University of Ghent*)

Gerd Haverling (*University of Uppsala*)

Sandor Kiss (*University of Pécs*)

Benjamín García Hernández (*University of Madrid*)

Alfonso García Léal (*University of Oviedo*)

Piera Molinelli (*University of Bergamo*)

Maria Selig (*University of Regensburg*)

Heikki Solin (*University of Helsinki*)

Roger Wright (*University of Liverpool*)

*Varietate delectamur:*  
Multifarious Approaches to  
Synchronic and Diachronic  
Variation in Latin

*Selected Papers from the 14th International  
Colloquium on Late and Vulgar Latin (Ghent, 2022)*

*Edited by*

GIOVANBATTISTA GALDI

SIMON AERTS

ALESSANDRO PAPINI



BREPOLS

© 2025, Brepols Publishers n.v., Turnhout, Belgium.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.



D/2025/0095/14

ISBN 978-2-503-60679-8

e-ISBN 978-2-503-60680-4

DOI 10.1484/M.LVLT-EB.5.142508

Printed in the EU on acid-free paper.

# Table of Contents

|                |    |
|----------------|----|
| <b>Preface</b> | 11 |
|----------------|----|

## Orality and Diastratic Variation

|                                                                                 |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Terence's language between oratory and vulgar Latin</b><br>Gualtiero CALBOLI | 17 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|

|                                                                                                                                                               |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Les marques d'ouverture du discours direct dans le roman latin (le <i>Satyricon</i> de Pétrone et les <i>Métamorphoses</i> d'Apulée)</b><br>Joseph DALBERA | 31 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|

|                                                                                                                                        |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Motion pseudo-coordination in Plautus' and Terence's plays.<br/>A corpus-based analysis</b><br>Simone GENTILE and Carmelina TOSCANO | 43 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|

|                                                                                                                                       |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>La geminazione di s- preconsonantica nella koinè scrittoria<br/>latino-greca. Dati empirici e aspetti teorici</b><br>Serena BARCHI | 55 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|

|                                                                                                                                                  |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Latin technical legal terminology in Greek papyrus documents.<br/>Some examples from Late Antique and Byzantine Egypt</b><br>Alessia PEZZELLA | 67 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|

|                                                                                                                  |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Some evidence on <i>geminatio consonantium</i> between standardisation<br/>and variation</b><br>Lucia TAMPONI | 79 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|

|                                                                                                 |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Phenomena of graphic interference in Latin curse tablets from Africa</b><br>Mariasaria ZINZI | 91 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|

## Christian Latin in Late Antiquity

|                                                                                                        |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>La perífrasis <i>habeo</i> + infinitivo en el <i>Itinerarium Egeriae</i></b><br>Olga ÁLVAREZ HUERTA | 109 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

|                                                                                                                                                    |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b><i>Virtus adunationis</i>. Alcuni esempi di innovazione lessicale nel <i>De anima</i> di Cassiodoro</b>                                         | 121 |
| Michele DI MARCO                                                                                                                                   |     |
| <b>El uso de <i>ipse</i> y demás formas demostrativas en la <i>Regla</i> de San Benito de Nursia</b>                                               | 135 |
| Alfonso GARCÍA LEAL                                                                                                                                |     |
| <b>A spiritual use of Lat. <i>mens</i> in Gregory the Great's 'Homilies on Gospels'</b>                                                            | 151 |
| Octavian GORDON                                                                                                                                    |     |
| <b>Clausal word order in the <i>Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis</i>. An emerging V<sub>2</sub> grammar?</b>                                        | 161 |
| Kim A. GROOTHUIS                                                                                                                                   |     |
| <b>Morphologies in contact in Bible translations. The <i>nomina agentis</i> in New Testament Latin</b>                                             | 175 |
| Elisabetta MAGNI                                                                                                                                   |     |
| <b>Motions verbs in the <i>Vulgata</i>. Aspect and deixis in a diachronic and typological perspective</b>                                          | 189 |
| Andrea NUTI                                                                                                                                        |     |
| <b>Nuovi contributi sulla lingua dell'anonimo poema dell'<i>Heptateuchos</i> (i termini <i>anus</i> e <i>odium</i>)</b>                            | 203 |
| Maria Rosaria PETRINGA                                                                                                                             |     |
| <b>Il <i>de</i> con ablativo nelle <i>controuersiae</i> di Ennodio (<i>dict.</i> 21-22)</b>                                                        | 213 |
| Amedeo A. RASCHIERI                                                                                                                                |     |
| <b>Style matters. Hyperbaton and genre in Augustine of Hippo</b>                                                                                   | 225 |
| Agnes VENDEL                                                                                                                                       |     |
| <b>The Greek Loan Word <i>Presbyteri</i> in <i>Vetus Latina</i> and Vulgate Susanna (VVLG. Dan. 13). Reception by Cyprian, Lucifer, and Jerome</b> | 239 |
| Kevin ZILVERBERG                                                                                                                                   |     |
| Technical Latin in Late Antiquity                                                                                                                  |     |
| <b><i>Muliebribus uerbis usus sum</i>. The <i>Gynaecia</i> of Mustio and the language of midwives</b>                                              | 253 |
| Micaela BREMBILLA                                                                                                                                  |     |

|                                                                                     |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Nomi di mestiere nel glossario latino-greco degli <i>Hermeneumata Celtis</i></b> | 263 |
| Salvatore CAMMISULI                                                                 |     |

|                                                                                      |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b><i>Offa, ofella, offula. A semantic analysis in Apicius' De re coquinaria</i></b> | 273 |
| Marilena DE GREGORIO                                                                 |     |

|                                                              |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Ortografia ed evoluzione linguistica nel latino tardo</b> | 285 |
| Paolo DE PAOLIS                                              |     |

|                                                                            |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Sobre el acercamiento de <i>mitto a pono</i> en el latín posclásico</b> | 297 |
| María Isabel JIMÉNEZ and Chantal MELIS                                     |     |

#### Diachronic Perspectives on Latin

|                                                                                                      |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b><i>Alea iacta est. Insights from corpus semantics into the diachrony of the Latin passive</i></b> | 311 |
| Simon AERTS                                                                                          |     |

|                                                                                                               |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>La gran poesía latina y las pequeñas lenguas romances. Algunos ejemplos léxicos del Noroeste hispánico</b> | 327 |
| María Concepción FERNÁNDEZ LÓPEZ                                                                              |     |

|                                                                                                                      |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Classical and Late Latin poetry. Looking for diachronic variations in the grammatical categories distribution</b> | 339 |
| Dominique LONGRÉE and Marc VANDERSMISSEN                                                                             |     |

|                                                                                                                               |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Tracing the semantic change of socio-political terms from Classical to early Medieval Latin with computational methods</b> | 357 |
| Barbara MCGILLIVRAY and Krzysztof NOWAK                                                                                       |     |

|                                                                                                                                                       |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>La concordance négative (NC) et la négation explétive (EN) entre renforcement et affaiblissement dans l'évolution du latin aux langues romanes</b> | 371 |
| Anna ORLANDINI and Paolo POCETTI                                                                                                                      |     |

#### Late Latin Testimonies to Early Romance Innovations

|                                                                    |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Back vowel mergers in Dalmatian Latin and Dalmatian Romance</b> | 387 |
| Béla ADAMIK                                                        |     |

|                                                                                               |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Latin varieties and the study of language. Social stratification in language evolution</b> | 405 |
| Brigitte L. M. BAUER                                                                          |     |

|                                                                                                                                                                                |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>On problems in the description of the Late Latin verbal system</b><br>Gerd V. M. HAVERLING                                                                                  | 421 |
| <b>Termes interrogatifs dans le <i>Liber Historiae Francorum</i>.</b><br><b>Concordances et discordances avec les <i>Historiae</i> de Grégoire de Tours</b><br>Colette BODELOT | 437 |
| <b>Notes on the Late Latin Accusative Absolute construction</b><br>Paola COTTICELLI-KURRAS, Eystein DAHL and Jelena ŽIVOJINOVIĆ                                                | 451 |
| <b>Il verbo <i>insinuo</i> nelle epistole <i>commendaticiae</i> tardoantiche</b><br>Sara FASCIONE                                                                              | 465 |
| <b>Evidence of periphrastic gradation in Late Latin</b><br>Lucie PULTROVÁ                                                                                                      | 475 |
| <b>Re-verbs in Late Antiquity</b><br>Josine SCHRICKX                                                                                                                           | 489 |
| <b>Tensions « linguistico-communautaires » en Occident dans<br/>l'Antiquité (tardive) et au haut Moyen Âge (résumé)</b><br>Marc VAN UYTFANGHE                                  | 503 |
| <u>Early Medieval Latin on the Threshold of Proto-Romance</u>                                                                                                                  |     |
| <b>Reconsidering Langobards' Latinity from a socio-historical viewpoint</b><br>Rosanna SORNICOLA                                                                               | 513 |
| <b>Lexicographical notes on <i>Historia Brittonum</i></b><br>Maxime CANIN                                                                                                      | 541 |
| <b><i>Glutinium sermonum</i>. The metaphorical representation of a syntactic<br/>function</b><br>Paola COTTICELLI-KURRAS and Francesca COTUGNO                                 | 553 |
| <b>I toponimi nelle carte notarili della <i>Langobardia minor</i> (IX-X<br/>secolo): morfosintassi e proprietà testuali</b><br>Elisa D'ARGENIO and Cesarina VECCHIA            | 565 |
| <b>Manifestazioni del neutro nel latino <i>circa romançum</i> dei Regii<br/><i>Neapolitani Archiui Monumenta</i> (sec. X)</b><br>Eleonora DELFINO                              | 577 |



|                                                                                                                                                      |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Variazione lessicale e linguaggio notarile. Qualche esempio dalle carte mediolatine della Campania (IX-XII secolo)</b>                            | 591 |
| Valentina FERRARI                                                                                                                                    |     |
| <b>Sintassi, semantica e testualità dei pronomi relativi <i>qui</i> e <i>que</i> nelle carte notarili della <i>Langobardia minor</i> (IX secolo)</b> | 603 |
| Paolo GRECO                                                                                                                                          |     |
| <b>Norme et style dans les textes narratifs latins du Haut Moyen Âge. Essai de typologie</b>                                                         | 617 |
| Sándor KISS                                                                                                                                          |     |
| <b>Asigmatic non-standard plurals in 8th- and 9th-century Tuscan charters?</b>                                                                       | 627 |
| Timo KORKIAKANGAS and Tommi ALHO                                                                                                                     |     |
| <b>The syntactic glosses of the <i>Liber Iudicum Popularis</i></b>                                                                                   | 639 |
| Afra PUJOL I CAMPENY                                                                                                                                 |     |
| <b>Alternanze tematiche, innovazione e polimorfismo. Le testimonianze di alcune raccolte documentarie dell'Italia meridionale</b>                    | 655 |
| Simona VALENTE                                                                                                                                       |     |
| Workshop in Celebration of Gualtiero Calboli's Career                                                                                                |     |
| <b>Discontinuité du groupe nominal dans la Vulgate</b>                                                                                               | 667 |
| Bernard BORTOLUSSI                                                                                                                                   |     |
| <b>Aspects of juridical language in Benedict's <i>Rule</i></b>                                                                                       | 681 |
| Giovanbattista GALDI                                                                                                                                 |     |
| <b>El origen de <i>tīrō</i>, <i>-ōnis</i> 'novillo uncido' y de <i>*tīrāre</i> 'tirar'. Dos creaciones del habla rústica</b>                         | 693 |
| Benjamín GARCÍA-HERNÁNDEZ                                                                                                                            |     |
| <b>Les constructions infinitives selon la conception de Gualtiero Calboli</b>                                                                        | 705 |
| Sándor KISS                                                                                                                                          |     |
| <b>Sur l'interaction entre négation, verbes modaux et modalités</b>                                                                                  | 711 |
| Anna ORLANDINI and Paolo POCETTI                                                                                                                     |     |
| <b><i>Ille</i> in the Latin Gospel of John. Demonstratives and articles in translation</b>                                                           | 723 |
| Silvia PIERONI                                                                                                                                       |     |

|                                                           |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>On the scope of theticity in Latin</b><br>Hannah ROSÉN | 737 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----|

Workshop on Inscriptions and *tabellae defixionum*

|                                                                                                                    |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Shaping shapes. <i>Sicilicus</i> and other diacritics in Latin epigraphy</b><br>Lucia TAMPONI and Serena BARCHI | 753 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

|                                                                                                                                                                                            |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Exorcisms, oaths, and invocations in Greek and Latin curse tablets, funerary inscriptions, and amulets. Some preliminary results</b><br>Juraj FRANEK, Daniela URBANOVÁ and Ulrike EHMIG | 767 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

|                                                                                                          |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Normativity. Editing Latin inscriptions</b><br>Marietta HORSTER, Katharina KAGERER and Christine WULF | 779 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|



# Preface

*Varietate delectamur* brings together a selection of papers presented at the 14th International Colloquium on Late and Vulgar Latin (*Latin vulgaire – latin tardif* XIV or LVL14), which was organised in Ghent by the Latin section and the DiaLing research group of the Department of Linguistics at Ghent University's Faculty of Arts and Philosophy (5-9 September 2022); the conference was graciously funded by the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO Vlaanderen), the City of Ghent (Stad Gent), Brepols, the Henri Pirenne Institute for Medieval Studies at Ghent University and the research group 'Late Antiquity and Byzantine Studies' at the National Research School in Classical Studies in the Netherlands (OIKOS).

The LVL14 colloquium was the fourteenth gathering in a series of colloquia dedicated to all linguistic aspects of Late and Vulgar Latin (including the transition from Latin to Romance). Since the first edition, convened by the late József Herman in Pécs, Hungary in 1985 as *Colloque international sur le Latin vulgaire et latin tardif*, the LVL colloquia have been held regularly for more than three decades. After Bologna (1988), Innsbruck (1991), Caen (1994), Heidelberg (1997), Helsinki (2000), Sevilla (2003), Oxford (2006), Lyon (2009), Bergamo (2012), Oviedo (2014), Uppsala (2016) and Budapest (2018), the LVL14 colloquium was organised in Ghent in 2022, when the worst of the covid-19 pandemic had subsided. Over the course of these fourteen editions, the conference grew from only 19 papers to over a hundred.

During the week of 5-9 September 2022, 94 papers were presented in parallel sessions and specialized workshops by 112 speakers from 24 different countries. Seven additional papers were presented in plenary sessions on a variety of topics. All together, linguistic topics within the field of Late and Vulgar Latin included Morphology, Phonology, Lexicography, Syntax, Semantics, Pragmatics, Christian Latin, Grammarians, Epigraphy, (Historical) Sociolinguistics, Stilistics, Notarial and juridical Latin, and Digital approaches. These papers were presented in thematically coherent parallel sessions as well as two specific workshops, one of which was dedicated to the study of inscriptions and curse tablets, while papers in the other engaged with the work of Emeritus Professor and Honorary President of the *Comité d'honneur pour l'étude du latin vulgaire et tardif*, Gualtiero Calboli (Bologna).

The current volume is the first collection of papers from the LVL colloquia that is published by Brepols (LVL 1). Out of the 101 papers presented at the 14th edition, LVL 1 publishes 58 revised and double peer-reviewed studies that represent the various research areas the colloquia on Late and Vulgar Latin aim to address. The title chosen by volume and series editors (*Varietate delectamur*: multifarious

approaches to synchronic and diachronic variation in Latin) reflects the diversity in research topics and scientific approaches, the results of which have been grouped together in a number of sections according to a centrally shared interest among them.

For the second time, a competition was held among young scholars for the József Herman Award, which aims to inspire and reward academic excellence and innovation within the research scope of the conference series. In 2018, the prize was first established by the *Comité international pour l'étude du latin vulgaire et tardif* and József Herman's (1924-2005) widow, Marianne Bakró-Nagy. There were 9 candidates at the Ghent colloquium, out of whom Salvatore Cammisuli (Catania) was awarded the Herman Award 2022 for his paper 'Nomi di mestieri nel glossario latino-greco degli *Hermeneumata Celtis*', which is included in this volume.

The organising committee of the LVL14 colloquium was led by Giovanbattista Galdi, Professor of Latin Linguistics at Ghent University and lead editor of the current volume. The daily organisation during the colloquium was supervised by Simon Aerts, while Alessandro Papini and Kim Groothuis' efforts in the years during the global pandemic and leading up to the 2022 edition were of crucial importance to the success of the LVL14 colloquium. As conference organisers, we wish to express our gratitude also to the team of students and PhD students who took care of the various aspects of the organisation we are all too familiar with in academia; in addition, our special thanks go to the members of the *comité* for their continuous experience and support and for the time they took to evaluate the papers and presentations of the competitors for the Herman Award, as well as the many colleagues who graciously volunteered to chair any of the many sessions throughout the week. We are also immensely grateful to the City of Ghent, for allowing us the use of the beautiful Pacification Room at the City Hall, and to the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy and our Dean, for providing a venue for our closing reception. In particular, we thank also our hosts at St Bavo's House for their daily support during and in between the many academic sessions we held at their conference center. Personal thanks go to Evita Willaert, Ghent councillor for Education, Youth and Outreach, Mieke Van Herreweghe, Vice Rector of Ghent University, Gita Deneckere, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy, and Claudia Crocco, Head of the Department of Linguistics, for opening the colloquium at Ghent's City Hall and to Gualtiero Calboli, Gerd Haverling and Piera Molinelli for their contribution to a collective *In memoriam* for Maria Iliescu (1927-2020), Harm Pinkster (1942-2021) and James Noel Adams (1943-2021), all of whom dedicated a substantial part of their career to the study of Late and Vulgar Latin and had left us since the previous colloquium in 2018. A special mention goes to Marieke Van Acker, for creating the LVL14 poster and hosting an exhibition at the colloquium, combining her academic and artistic interests into her collage artwork.

As editors of the current volume, we wish to thank especially the many reviewers who contributed to the scientific rigour of the selected papers, and without whom the diversity in topics and research methodologies would never have been so well represented. Our thanks also go to the publishing team and to Tim Denecker in particular, for their continuous support and for the open communication that this first joint venture between the LVL community and Brepols required. Most of all,

we thank our colleagues, our conference participants and authors, for submitting their valued research to this volume and for their continued efforts and patience in shaping their scientific communication as part of the collection of selected papers they allowed us to publish as *Varietate delectamur*.

Giovanbattista Galdi  
Simon Aerts  
Alessandro Papini





# Orality and Diastratic Variation







# Some evidence on *geminatio consonantium* between standardisation and variation

## 1. Long consonants in Latin and consonant doubling<sup>1</sup>

As is known, the Latin phonological inventory featured a distinctive opposition between long and short consonants. The presence of phonologically long consonants is attested by minimal pairs such as *erat* ‘was’ ~ *errat* ‘wanders’, *canam* ‘I will sing’ ~ *cannam* ‘reed’ (acc. sg.), *operīrī* ‘to be covered’ ~ *opperīrī* ‘to wait’.<sup>2</sup> However, long consonants were not spelt through the doubling of the corresponding grapheme during the first stages of the history of the Latin language. As is known, *geminatio consonantium* was introduced only at the end of the third century BCE: this innovation is generally attributed to Ennius by ancient grammarians such as Verrius Flaccus in Festus (374.3–11 L) and possibly Festus (484 L).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The present paper was prepared within the framework of the PRIN Project ‘Ancient languages and writing systems in contact: a touchstone for language change’ (2017JBF9H) and the HORIZON-ERC-2022-ADG project no. 101098102 ‘Digital Latin Dialectology (DiLaDi): Tracing Linguistic Variation in the Light of Ancient and Early Medieval Sources’ (see <http://lldb.elte.hu/>). I owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Giovanna Marotta, for our work on the previous phases of this research.

<sup>2</sup> Weiss (2009, 66).

<sup>3</sup> The exact nature of Ennius’ role in the spread of Latin consonant gemination is not clear, nor is the related issue concerning a possible Greek linguistic influence in Latin. In our view, the mention of Ennius by the grammarians might testify to the importance of his prestige for the spread of consonant gemination (Mancini 2019a), although his role as the sole ‘reformer’ promoting *geminatio consonantium* should perhaps not be overemphasised (Bernardi Perini 1984). Similarly, the possible influence of the Greek consonant gemination, strictly related to Ennius’ linguistic background, might not have been the sole factor promoting Latin *geminatio consonantium*: the spelling might have also been favourably accepted by grammarians since it follows the general principle of formal transparency, whereby a biunivocal correspondence is established between grapheme and phoneme (Cotugno and Marotta 2017; Mancini 2019b). These issues are beyond the purport of our paper: for a more detailed insight into these problems, see Mancini (2019a); Tamponi (2022).

Lucia Tamponi • Pisa and Budapest



*Varietate delectamur: Multifarious Approaches to Synchronic and Diachronic Variation in Latin. Selected Papers from the 14th International Colloquium on Late and Vulgar Latin (Ghent, 2022)*, ed. by Giovanbattista Galdi, Simon Aerts and Alessandro Papini, LVL 1 (Turnhout, 2025), pp. 79–90.

BREPOLS PUBLISHERS

DOI 10.1484/M.LVLT-EB.5.143290

The first sporadic attestations of the spelling date to the end of the third century BCE (i.e. *Appius* CIL I<sup>2</sup> 577, 250-200 BCE), *Appios* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 17, 212 BCE), *Hinnad* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 608, 211 BCE), *Cottas* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 2877, 3rd c. BCE), *off(icina)* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 2489, 250-200 BCE), *Annei* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 2499, 250-200 BCE).<sup>4</sup> However, the generalisation of this spelling was a long process, as is generally acknowledged in the literature on the subject. The first more systematic attestations of *geminatio consonantium* in Latin epigraphic material (although still alternating with single consonant spellings) can be found in the decree by Aemilius Paulus dated to 189 BCE (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 614, *Lascuta*). However, also during the second and first centuries BCE a certain amount of variation between single and double consonant spellings can be found.

In order to shed light on the factors that might have influenced this alternation, we decided to examine a set of Latin inscriptions from Rome and Italy dating between the third century BCE and the first century CE. Indeed, epigraphic texts can help the studying of orthographic variation in Latin, since they are ‘direct’ sources of evidence, i.e. not mediated by the manuscript tradition. Due caution must be paid because of the issues connected to the authorship and dating of the inscriptions, as well as the interpretation of ‘non-standard’ spellings.<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, in the last decades several studies showed that inscriptions can be a valuable source for linguistic analysis, provided that a strict qualitative and quantitative methodology is adopted.<sup>6</sup> Thus, we decided to carry out an analysis on a set of inscriptions from Rome and Italy: here, an adequate number of inscriptions was available for our analysis, and by restricting the corpus to this area we could help reduce diatopic variation. The examined inscriptions are included in the section *Rome and Italy* of the corpus CLaSSES (*Corpus for Latin Sociolinguistic Studies on Epigraphic Texts*, <https://classes-latin-linguistics.fileli.unipi.it/>).<sup>7</sup>

Our corpus thus included 244 texts, for a total number of 11804 words. Among those sources, we examined the occurrences of consonant gemination (e.g. *Appius*, *iussit*), as well as the instances where a single consonant is displayed (e.g. *Apius* for *Appius*, *iusit* for *iussit*). The relative frequency of consonant gemination was examined with reference to several variables: dating (§ 2), text type (§ 3), alternation (§ 4) and word class (§ 5).

## 2. Chronology

Coherently with the chronology traditionally proposed in the literature, in our epigraphic sources consonant doubling is seldom attested in the inscriptions dating to the third century BCE. However, within our corpus consonant gemination seems

4 See Mancini (2019a).

5 See e.g. Herman (1990).

6 See e.g. Herman (1990); Adamik (2021); Marotta (2015); Barchi (2019); Cotugno (2022).

7 CLaSSES corpus was developed by the Department of Philology, Literature and Linguistics of the University of Pisa. This database was chosen because each text is tagged with linguistic and extra-linguistic metadata (Marotta et al. 2020), which allowed us to investigate the spelling variations in the sources according to different variables.



to be more widespread from the second century BCE, until it became standardized in the first century BCE.<sup>8</sup> The data concerning single and double consonant spellings in CLaSSES are summarized in Table 1, where the frequency of non-geminated consonants decreases markedly from the second century onwards (from 83% to 39%, reaching 7% in the first century BCE).<sup>9</sup>

Table 1. C and CC in CLaSSES (frequency over the corresponding 'standard' spellings)

|              | 300-200 BCE |      | 200-100 BCE |      | 100 BCE-50 CE |      |
|--------------|-------------|------|-------------|------|---------------|------|
|              | Tokens      | %    | Tokens      | %    | Tokens        | %    |
| <b>C</b>     | 35          | 83%  | 28          | 39%  | 26            | 7%   |
| <b>CC</b>    | 7           | 17%  | 44          | 61%  | 362           | 93%  |
| <b>Total</b> | 42          | 100% | 72          | 100% | 388           | 100% |

### 3. Lemmas and text types: 200-100 BCE

Given the higher variability in the spelling of long consonants recorded from the second century BCE onwards, it is interesting to assess whether the preference towards consonant gemination might be due to variables such as the lemmas and text types involved.<sup>10</sup> In particular, gemination seems not to be related to a specific lemma. With the exception of *Appius* and *iubeo*, for which 5 occurrences of single consonant spellings are attested (*Api* for *Appi* in CIL I<sup>2</sup> 418 a-e, and *iusit* / *iousit* in CIL I<sup>2</sup> 633, 636, 634), the other lemmas occur only once in the whole corpus.<sup>11</sup>

Also the data concerning the text type of the inscriptions are too scant to be conclusive. Table 2 reports the relative frequency of the spellings with double consonants (CC) over the spellings with single consonants (C) for each text type.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>8</sup> See Mancini (2019b); Tamponi (2022).

<sup>9</sup> In the table, 'CC' indicates the number of tokens displaying consonant gemination, e.g. *Annius, essent*, whereas 'C' refers to the tokens not displaying consonant gemination, e.g. *Mumius* for *Mummius*, *posidet* for *possidet*.

<sup>10</sup> For a detailed analysis of the first attestations of *geminatio consonantium* in earlier inscriptions, see Mancini (2019b); Tamponi (2022).

<sup>11</sup> For the complete list of lemmas where long consonants are not graphically rendered through *geminatio consonantium* in our corpus, see Tamponi (2022).

<sup>12</sup> Following the traditional epigraphic classification, private inscriptions on movable objects are included in CLaSSES sections corresponding to their findspot. We are aware of the problematic issues in determining the origin of such objects (see e.g. Cooley 2012, 82 ff.). However, we believe that these challenging aspects are less relevant when *instrumenta domestica* are examined to assess the presence of *geminatio consonantium* in a given time frame, as is proposed here.

Table 2. Consonants displaying C in CLaSSES and text type (200-100 BCE)

| Text type<br>(200-100 BCE) |  | <i>Honorarii</i> |      | <i>Sepulcrales</i> |      | <i>Sacri publici</i> |      | <i>Sacri priuati</i> |      | <i>Instrumentum</i> |      |
|----------------------------|--|------------------|------|--------------------|------|----------------------|------|----------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|                            |  | Tokens           | %    | Tokens             | %    | Tokens               | %    | Tokens               | %    | Tokens              | %    |
| <b>CC</b>                  |  | 5                | 31%  | 10                 | 67%  | 5                    | 71%  | 23                   | 82%  | 1                   | 17%  |
| <b>C</b>                   |  | 11               | 69%  | 5                  | 33%  | 2                    | 29%  | 5                    | 18%  | 5                   | 83%  |
| <b>Total</b>               |  | 16               | 100% | 15                 | 100% | 7                    | 100% | 28                   | 100% | 6                   | 100% |

A few additional comments are necessary. On the one hand, the apparently higher rate of double consonant spellings in the *tituli sacri publici* (71%) should not be overemphasized, since the available data are scarce (only 7 total instances are available). Similar considerations hold for the low incidence of consonant doubling recorded for *instrumenta domestica* (83%). Not only are the data extremely scarce (only 6 total tokens are recorded), but 5 instances out of 6 occur in *pocola deorum* displaying the same text (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 418a-e: *L(uci) Api*), mostly of Etruscan origin (the provenance of CIL I<sup>2</sup> 418e is uncertain).

On the other hand, however, the lower incidence of consonant gemination in *tituli honorarii* – for which a slightly higher number of occurrences is recorded – might be explained as a tendency to reject innovations and/or to preserve older spellings in public inscriptions. Indeed, a closer look at those texts seems to reveal a more marked tendency to avoid consonant doubling in archaizing public inscriptions.

Let us first examine the forms *iousit*, *iussit* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 633, 141-116 BCE), which occur on two boundary markers of *L. Caecilius* from Regio X, reported in Figures 1 and 2.

Both texts display archaizing features, whereas other forms diverging from the Classical norms are not found. In CIL I<sup>2</sup> 633, the diphthongs <OV> for <V> and <AI> for <AE> are retained (*iousit* for *iussit*, *Caecilius* for *Caecilius*). The latter spelling is also found in CIL I<sup>2</sup> 634. Both spellings are considered to be archaizing in the time of the crafting of the inscriptions: the diphthong *ou* evolved to *u* at the end of the third century BCE, whereas <AI> became to be spelt as <AE> already at the beginning of the second c. BCE.<sup>13</sup> Finally, no salient paleographic features are recorded: the letters are quite carefully carved and evenly spaced.

Finally, the forms *tabelariosque*, *suma* and *redideique* (for *tabellariosque*, *summa* and *reddidique*, CIL I<sup>2</sup> 638, 150-100 BCE) are found on a boundary marker from *Forum Popilii*, crafted in honor of consul *Publius Popillius*. Also in this case, the text displays the archaizing spelling where <OV> represents /ū/ (*Nouceriam* for *Nuceriam*). Furthermore, the capitals display consistent height and are evenly spaced.

Note also that the inscription bearing the form *Cina* (for *Cinna*: CIL I<sup>2</sup> 654, 127 BCE, from *Venafrum*), although not displaying archaizing spellings, does not show any divergent spellings (text: *L(ucius) Cornelius L(uci) f(ilius) Cina co(n)s(ul) III*).

13 See Allen (1978, 60, 63).

CIL I<sup>2</sup> 633

*[L(ucius) Caecili]us Q(uinti) f(ilius) pro cos(ule)  
terminos finisque ex senati consulto statui iusit  
inter Atestinos et Patauiños // L(ucius) Caecilius  
Q(uinti) f(ilius) pro cos(ule) [ex] terminos finisque  
ex senati consulto statui iusit inter Atestinos  
Patauiñosque*

Figure 1. CIL I<sup>2</sup> 633 (image from EDCS).CIL I<sup>2</sup> 634

*[...] senati co[nsu]lto sta[tui] iusit [...] L(ucius) Caecilius Q(uinti)  
f(ilius) pro co(n)s(ule) terminos finisque ex senati consolto / statui  
iusit inter Patauiños et Atestinos*

Figure 2. CIL I<sup>2</sup> 634 (image from EDCS).

Of course, the scarcity of data demands we examine the epigraphic material with awareness and caution. Nevertheless, it seems that consonant gemination tends to be avoided in both public and archaizing texts. This might hint at an incomplete standardisation process, whereby *geminatio consonantium* could still be perceived as an innovation by some speakers/writers. Of course, given the ongoing standardisation of the spelling, also public inscriptions can display a certain degree of variability, and thus may seldom display consonant gemination. This is the case, for example, of the aforementioned *tituli mummiani*, which display either the forms *Mumius* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 628) or *Mummius* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 627, 629), despite featuring the same text and no particular linguistic or paleographic features.



#### 4. Alternation <C> ~ <CC>: 100 BCE-50 CE

After 100 BCE, the spread of *geminatio consonantium* is more markedly attested (§ 2). However, a certain degree of variation is still observed, since a small number of forms

(26/388, see Table 1) still display single consonant spellings for lemmas showing <CC> in Classical Latin. With the exception of the lemma *communis* (occurring 12 times in the form *Comunis* in CIL XV 6382,2, 4-6, 8, 10, 13-18) and *annus* (occurring 5 times in the forms *anos*, CIL I<sup>3</sup> 1997; *ana*, CIL XV 6204; *anu*, CIL XV 6208a-c), the other lemmas occur only once in the whole corpus.<sup>14</sup> Thus, as was observed in the earlier texts, it is not possible to correlate the absence of consonant doubling with a specific lemma. In particular, the high number of token instances of *communis* lacking *geminatio consonantium* should not be overestimated, since these forms all belong to seals on oil lamps from Rome (CIL XV 6382,2, 4-6, 8, 10, 13-18), where the same text (the name *Comunis*) is reported.

When text type is examined, different degrees of variation are observed for the different typologies. Table 3 reports the frequency of the spellings with double consonants (CC) over those with single consonants (C) for each text type.

Table 3. Consonants displaying degemination and text type (100 BCE-50 CE)

| Text type<br>(100 BCE-50 CE) |  | <i>Honorarii</i> |      | <i>Sepulcrales</i> |      | <i>Sacri publici</i> |      | <i>Sacri priuati</i> |      | <i>Instrumentum</i> |      |
|------------------------------|--|------------------|------|--------------------|------|----------------------|------|----------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|                              |  | Tokens           | %    | Tokens             | %    | Tokens               | %    | Tokens               | %    | Tokens              | %    |
| CC                           |  | 106              | 98%  | 129                | 97%  | 8                    | 100% | 18                   | 90%  | 101                 | 85%  |
| C                            |  | 2                | 2%   | 4                  | 3%   | 0                    | 0%   | 2                    | 10%  | 18                  | 15%  |
| Total                        |  | 108              | 100% | 133                | 100% | 8                    | 100% | 20                   | 100% | 119                 | 100% |

The data concerning text types are unbalanced: it is not possible to make valid observations for sacred inscriptions (*tituli sacri publici* and *priuati*), since the total number of tokens is too low ( $\leq 20$ ). Although when examining the other text types – for which more than 100 tokens are available – single consonants seem to appear more frequently in private inscriptions (15% in *instrumenta domestica* vs 2% and 3% in *tituli honorarii* and *tituli sepulcrales*, respectively).

At this stage, when the long process of standardisation of the Latin language was still taking place (§ 1), our data can be explained with reference to two contrasting tendencies: the tendency towards archaism, on the one hand (which is more probable for public monuments), and the presence of writing mistakes, on the other (which is in principle more probable for private inscriptions). A more fine-grained qualitative analysis of our data seems to confirm this hypothesis. Firstly, the private texts displaying single consonant spellings also display other spellings diverging from the ‘Classical’ norms: this is the case, for example, of the oil lamp CIL XV 6204 (50 BCE-50 CE), featuring the form *ana* for *annum* (text: *Ana noum faustu felice ti(bi)*). In addition to *ana*, also the omission of final <M> is recorded (*faustu, felice*), as well as the omission of intervocalic <U> (*noum*). The same observations can be made for the

14 For the complete list of lemmas not displaying consonant gemination in this time frame see Tamponi (2022).

three occurrences of *anu* on the oil lamps CIL XV 6208a-c (50 BCE–50 CE), displaying a similar text (*Anu nou fau(stum)*), where the omission of final <M> is recorded in *anu*. Finally, the remaining occurrences of single consonant spellings in private inscriptions are found on simple, non-archaizing texts on portable objects, bearing only one word. This is the case of the 12 occurrences of the forms *comun(is)* on seals of oil lamps from Rome (c. 50 BCE–50 CE), *Opi* (for *Oppi*) on the amphora CIL XV 4637 (Rome, c. 50 BCE–50 CE), and *Umidiae* (for *Ummidiae*) on the *suppellex plumbea* CIL XV 7567.

From a cognitive perspective, such writing mistakes in the spelling of double consonants are not unexpected, since double letters seem to have a special status in orthographic representation. In coding and decoding processes, double letters appear to be coded differently from single ones, i.e. they are processed as independent units, so that letter doubling is a more complex task than writing different letters, both in reading and writing. This hypothesis is supported by several experimental studies on impaired subjects, as well as studies on language acquisition. For example, neuropsychological evidence concerning spelling performances of English patients with dysgraphia shows a higher number of errors in words displaying and specifically concerning double letters.<sup>15</sup> As for writing, it has been demonstrated<sup>16</sup> that the presence of double letters in a word affects the timing of writing: the subjects took more time to write words with double consonants (e.g. Eng. *dissipate* / It. *dissipare*) than words sharing the first three letters but without a double consonant (Eng. *disgrace* / It. *disgrazia*). Thus, the analysis of Latin inscriptions seems to highlight the special status of double consonants, which appears also to hold true for the Latin language.

On the contrary, the archaizing hypothesis seems more plausible for the two occurrences on public inscriptions. The form *comu[ne]* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 726, 85–83 CE) occurs on a fragment of a dedication to the Roman people by the Lycians. The text also displays the archaizing spelling <EI> for <I> in [*beniuolent*]iaei. The brief text of CIL I<sup>2</sup> 750 (Modena, 63 BCE: *C(aius) Antoni(us) M(arcus) Tuli(us) cos(ulibus)*), featuring *Tuli* for *Tulli*, although it is not archaizing, does not display other divergent spellings.

In conclusion, it is possible to hypothesise that from the first century BCE *geminatio consonantium* was standardized, as is testified by the extremely low frequency of single consonant spellings with respect to the earlier texts. Therefore, the few cases of single consonant spelling could be labelled as ‘degemination’ since in this period consonant gemination had already become the norm. Single consonant spellings seem therefore to be either writing mistakes (on private texts) or archaizing spellings (on public monuments).

## 5. *Geminatio consonantium* in anthroponyms

In our corpus, the alternation between single and double consonant spellings is frequently attested in nouns in all time frames. As is well known, epigraphic texts display a higher number of nouns with respect to other word classes.

<sup>15</sup> McCloskey et al. (1994).

<sup>16</sup> Kandel et al. (2019).



This class of nouns is particularly interesting to examine: single consonant spellings concerning anthroponyms covers almost one-fourth of the total attestations (24/89).<sup>17</sup> Anthroponyms display particular features that distinguish them from other word classes, especially common nouns. Among these features, of particular relevance to our analysis is the importance of anthroponyms in establishing the referent's identity in complex societies.<sup>18</sup> This is also true for the Roman society, where the connection between proper name and social status is clearly visible through various practices. For example, think of the primary importance of the *nomen* in the onomastic formula: it was inherited, and thus hinted at the social status of the referent, also through the connection with renowned characters from earlier history.<sup>19</sup> The expansion of the onomastic formula, e.g. through polyonymy, was a means recurrently adopted to emphasize the illustrious ancestry of the individual.<sup>20</sup> Furthermore, anthroponyms may display greater variation in the adoption of innovative spellings when illustrious individuals are mentioned. With specific reference to consonant gemination in Latin, already Väänänen<sup>21</sup> observed that the geminated variant *Paullus* is only found in inscriptions mentioning senators, whereas the variant *Paulus* is more frequently used for other individuals and in Christian epitaphs.<sup>22</sup> Francesco Rovai<sup>23</sup> showed that male anthroponyms tend to display more archaizing features than female ones, which is probably related to the higher social status displayed by the male citizens mentioned in the epigraphic corpus examined by the scholar. Similarly, in the CLaSSES corpus,<sup>24</sup> the personal names of high-ranking citizens tend to preserve archaizing <OS> endings (e.g. *Cornelios* for *Cornelius*) also after 250 BCE. The importance of the selection of prestigious variants in the spelling of proper names was also demonstrated by Rovai<sup>25</sup> for the *nomen* of the gens *Papiria*, which began to be adopted in the form *Papirius* instead of the earlier *Papeirius* at the end of the second century BCE, when the variant *Papeirius* could have been confused with a rustic pronunciation.

Given the relatively high frequency of anthroponyms evidenced in our corpus, it is worth verifying whether their distribution can provide further insight into the evolution of the spelling. The anthroponyms displaying C~CC alternation are the following: *Mummius* (1 token displaying C: *Mumius*, CIL I<sup>2</sup> 628; 3 CC: *Mummius* CIL I<sup>2</sup> 627, 629, *Mummio* Gordon I 67), *Cascellius* (2 C: *Cascelli* CIL I<sup>2</sup> 927, *Cascellius* CIL I<sup>2</sup> 2039; 1 CC: *Cascellius*, CIL I<sup>2</sup> 2040), *Oppius* (2 C: *Opio* CIL I<sup>2</sup> 384, *Opi* CIL XV 4637; 5 CC: *Opp(i)* CIL I<sup>2</sup> 1455, 2108, 3070, 6209, *Oppiae*

17 See also the lists reported in Tamponi (2022) relative to the section of CLaSSES corpus under investigation.

18 Fabrizio (2013).

19 Salway (1994, 126).

20 Bruun (2015, 802).

21 Väänänen (2006, 59).

22 See also Tantimonaco (2020).

23 Rovai (2008).

24 Tamponi (2017).

25 Rovai (2020).





Gordon I 15), *Tullius* (1 C: *Tuli*, CIL I<sup>2</sup> 750), *Ummidia* (1 C: *Umidiae*, CIL XV 7567), *Galloni* (1 C: *Galonius*, CIL I<sup>2</sup> 1616). These data, however, are too scant to make valid observations: for this reason, we decided to examine the spelling of double consonants in these lemmas in the inscriptions dating between 100 BCE and 50 CE included in the whole *Epigraphische Datenbank Claus-Slaby* (EDCS: <http://www.manfredclaus.de/>), one of the larger online databases of Latin inscriptions. In total, we recorded 188 occurrences of the aforementioned lemmas, the majority of which (178) displayed a double consonant. The results of our examination are reported in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Anthroponyms and C ~ CC alternation (EDCS; 100 BCE–50 CE)

|       | <i>Cascellius</i> | <i>Galloni</i> | <i>Oppius</i> | <i>Tullius</i> | <i>Ummidia</i> |
|-------|-------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| CC    | 13                | 10             | 72            | 80             | 3              |
| C     | 2                 | 4              | 2             | 1              | 1              |
| Total | 15                | 14             | 74            | 81             | 4              |

In this time frame, the behavior of the anthroponyms essentially confirms the picture outlined in the previous chapters: the majority of the forms display CC, with a small number of tokens displaying degemination. Among the examined forms, the lemma *Oppius* deserves a few comments. Not only is it one of the most frequent lemmas recorded (80 occurrences), but it is the only one that is also attested in inscriptions dating to the previous century and can thus shed light on the diachronic evolution of the spelling. Although the data from the second century are scarce, the distribution of the C ~ CC alternation in the lemma *Oppius* in the corpus EDCS seems to support the evolution outlined so far. In the second century BCE, the anthroponym does not display gemination: the only instance of *geminatio consonantium* (over 6 total occurrences) is found on the only *instrumentum domesticum* available (SupIt, 23, 2007, p. 212, nr. 43), whereas five variants with a single consonant are found in the other sacred and funerary inscriptions (CIL I<sup>2</sup>, 216, 217, 220, 1455, 2239), both for slaves and free citizens, thus independently of the person's social status. After 100 BCE an opposite picture emerges, coherently with the evolution described in § 2: gemination is found for the majority of occurrences (72 over 74), independently of the social status of the people mentioned (i.e. for freedmen, e.g. CIL I<sup>2</sup> 1738 *P Oppius A(uli) l(ibertus) Pamp(hilus)*, for free citizens, e.g. CIL XI 6799 *L(ucius) Oppius Cn(aei) f(ilius)*, and for women, e.g. CIL IX 2091 *Oppiae C(ai) l(ibertae)*). The only two instances with a single consonant spelling are instead found on a public monument (the honorific inscription from Capua CIL I<sup>2</sup> 2949 mentioning one of the *magistri* that committed the work: *N(umerius) Opius N(umeri) f(ilius)*) and on a funerary inscription (CIL IX 2895, *Neriae Victorinae Opius coniugi*), i.e. on texts characterized by a higher degree of formality or still displaying uncertainties in the adoption of *geminatio consonantium*. Thus, although <C> ~ <CC> alternation in anthroponyms is relatively frequent in our corpus, proper nouns do not seem to display a specific distribution of the alternation. Rather, they follow the general tendencies outlined for the other classes.

## 6. Conclusions

The data extracted from the CLaSSES corpus confirm the path already proposed in the literature: *geminatio consonantium* seems to be on its way to standardisation during the second century, when long consonants are often graphically represented. As is expected, variation is observed, which might be due to the degree of formality of the text and consequently to its more or less marked tendency to accept orthographic innovations. From the first century BCE onwards, consonant doubling is generalised, and the few occurrences of single consonant spellings might be either ascribed to conservatism or writing mistakes. The analysis of consonant gemination in anthroponyms does not falsify this picture. Distinguishing between archaic spellings and writing mistakes is not always an easy task,<sup>26</sup> although a correlation between the presence of archaisms and a high degree of formality of the texts can be observed. In the other cases, a writing mistake cannot be excluded, given the complexity of the graphic representation of double consonants from a cognitive perspective (§ 4).

## References

- Adamik, Béla. 2021. Romanization and Latinization of the Roman Empire in the Light of the Data in the Computerized Historical Linguistic Database of Latin Inscriptions in the Imperial Age. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 20 (1), 1-19.
- Adams, James N. 2013. *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Allen, William S. 1978 [1965<sup>1</sup>]. *Vox Latina: a Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Latin*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Barchi, Serena. 2019. On Vowel Prosthesis before sC in Substandard Latin and Koine Greek: A Synoptic Review. *SSL* 57 (2), 45-81.
- Bernardi Perini, Giorgio. 1984. Le 'riforme' ortografiche latine di età repubblicana. *AIÖN* 5, 141-169.
- Bruun, Christer. 2015. Roman Onomastics. In: Christer Bruun and Jonathan Edmondson (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy*. Oxford: OUP, 799-805.
- Cooley, Alison E. 2012. *The Cambridge Manual of Latin Epigraphy*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Cotugno, Francesca. 2022. *Writing and Orthography in Non-Literary Texts from Roman Britain: A Sociolinguistic Approach*. Wiesbaden: Dr Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Cotugno, Francesca – Marotta, Giovanna. 2017. Geminated Consonants in the Vindolanda Tablets. Empirical Data and Sociolinguistic Remarks. In: Piera Molinelli (ed.), *Language and Identity in Multilingual Mediterranean Settings. Challenges for Historical Sociolinguistics*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 269-288.
- Fabrizio, Claudia. 2013. Iconicità 'rovesciata' e altre anomalie dei nomi propri. *SSL* 51 (2), 9-56.
- Gordon, Joyce S. – Gordon, Arthur E. 1958. *Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions*. Vol. 1. Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press.

<sup>26</sup> See e.g. Adams (2013, 32).

- Herman, József. 1990. *Du latin aux langues romanes. Études de linguistique historique*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Kandel, Sonia – Peereman, Ronald – Ghimenton, Anna – Perret, Cyril. 2019. Letter Coding Affects Movement Production in Word Writing: an English–Italian Cross-linguistic Study. *Reading and Writing* 32 (1), 95–114.
- Mancini, Marco. 2019a. Lucilius and Nigidius Figulus on Orthographic Iconicity. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 18 (1–2), 1–34.
- Mancini, Marco. 2019b. Repertori grafici e regole d'uso: il caso latino <XS>. In: Luciano Agostiniani – Maria Pia Marchese (eds), *Lingua, testi, storia. Atti della giornata di studi in ricordo di Aldo Luigi Prosdocimi*. Roma: Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, 13–53.
- Marotta, Giovanna. 2015. Talking Stones. Phonology in Latin Inscriptions?. *SSL* 53 (2), 39–64.
- Marotta, Giovanna – Rovai, Francesco – De Felice, Irene – Tamponi, Lucia. 2020. CLaSSES: Orthographic Variation in Non-literary Latin. *SSL* 58 (1), 39–65.
- McCloskey, Michael – Badecker, William – Goodman-Schulman, Roberta Ann – Aliminosa, Donna. 1994. The Structure of Graphemic Representations in Spelling: Evidence from a Case of Acquired Dysgraphia. *Cognitive Neuropsychology* 11, 341–392.
- Rovai, Francesco. 2008. *Nomen maschile e nomen femminile*. Variazione linguistica e differenze sociali in latino. *L'Italia dialettale* 69, 251–266.
- Rovai, Francesco. 2020. Alcune osservazioni sul nome dei Papirii. In: Patrizia Del Puente – Francesca Guazzelli – Lucia Molinu – Simone Pisano (eds), *Tra etimologia romanza e dialettologia. Studi in onore di Franco Fanciullo*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 453–464.
- Salway, Benet. 1994. What's in a Name? A Survey of Roman Onomastic Practice from c. 700 BC to AD 700. *JRS* 84, 124–145.
- SupIt 23 = Supplementa Italica. 2007. Vol. 23. Roma: Quasar.
- Tamponi, Lucia. 2017. Sull'alternanza vocalica <O> ~ <U> nelle epigrafi latine di epoca arcaica. In: Giovanna Marotta – Francesca Strik Lievers (eds), *Strutture linguistiche e dati empirici in diacronia e sincronia*. Pisa: Pisa University Press, 111–132.
- Tamponi, Lucia. 2022. La *geminatio consonantium*: studio su un corpus di epigrafi latine anteriori al I secolo d.C. *SSL* 60 (2), 29–50.
- Tantimonaco, Silvia. 2020. Consonantal Degemination in Latin Inscriptions of the Roman Empire: A Dialectological and Sociolinguistic Perspective. *ACD* 56, 165–178.
- Väänänen, Veikko. 2006 [1963<sup>1</sup>]. *Introduction au latin vulgaire*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Weiss, Michael. 2009. *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. New York: Beech Stave press.



▼ **ABSTRACT** As is known, alternation between single and double consonant spellings is attested in epigraphic sources, at least from the third century BCE. However, the variables governing this alternation are a debated topic in the scientific community. This paper focuses on Latin consonant gemination in a set of Latin inscriptions from Rome and Italy, where the presence or absence of *geminatio consonantium* is related to several variables, including dating, text type and word class. Our results confirm that consonant gemination appears to be on its way to standardisation during the second century, thus confirming the traditional assumptions proposed in the literature. However, variation is observed and possibly depending on the level of formality of the text. From the first century BCE onwards, consonant doubling seems to be generalised, and the few divergent spellings might either be ascribed to conservatism or writing mistakes, depending on the type of text.

▼ **KEYWORDS** Latin; Orthography; Phonology; Epigraphy.

