
The triennial Late and Vulgar Latin Conferences, initiated by József Herman in 1985, have led to a series of well-known and widely cited conference proceedings. Like its predecessors, this volume is intended to deal with late and vulgar Latin in all its aspects. It contains forty-four contributions (I exclude the introduction from this count); fifteen of these are in Spanish, thirteen in French, six in English, five in Italian, and five in German. Given this number of articles, I cannot discuss each of them in detail, but will restrict myself to brief comments and a more general judgment at the end of this review.

Several papers concern methodology and other general topics. Molinelli argues that instead of talking about soldiers’ Latin, Christian Latin, and so on, every text ought to be classified according to its provenance, its sociolect, its closeness to the spoken language (e.g. Augustine’s sermons versus his other works), and its genre. Mańczak poses an old question: did archaic Latin develop into two distinct varieties, classical Latin and vulgar Latin, or did vulgar Latin originate from classical Latin? In other words, when did diglossia begin? Mańczak, looking at phonology and morphology, comes to the conclusion that vulgar Latin originates from the classical language. In my opinion, the problem is not so simple. Every language has different registers at all stages of its history, and there must have been an archaic vulgar Latin as well. It is probably true that there was no diglossia in the classical period as far as pronunciation and morphology are concerned, just as *Katharevousa* is pronounced in the same way as *Dhimotiki*—in fact, differences in pronunciation between high and low varieties in a diglossic milieu are comparatively rare. However, it seems likely that certain syntactic features of the early colloquial registers, absent in the written language of the classical period, remained in use and resurfaced later as vulgar Latin. A case in point is the present infinitive passive instead of its future tense equivalent in the accusative and infinitive construction. Herman points out that some ‘late’ phenomena are actually attested early on, even if only sporadically; in particular, he looks at the well-known replacement of the accusative and infinitive by *quod/quia*-clauses and at the monophthongization of *au*, which seems to have taken place twice (*caudā > codā* is early, cf. the preserved [k] in French *queue*, but *causa* kept the diphthong for a long time, cf. French *chose* with *k > i_/>.A). B. Adamik asks why there are so few Romance languages in the eastern half of the Roman Empire. The answer must be that Latin was used by the government only for internal communication, while for external communication Greek was used. In the eastern parts, ‘Romaniza-
tion’ was thus conducted in Greek. Ariza Viguera examines to what extent Osco-Umbrian settlers could have influenced the Latin spoken in Spain. There are a number of parallels between sound changes in Osco-Umbrian and Spanish, but in Spanish the changes took place too late to be the result of Osco-Umbrian influence, or they happened in the wrong regions; all of the changes in question have parallels in completely unrelated languages as well. I should merely like to add that the Osco-Umbrian change *nd > nn (and *mb > mm, etc.) cannot be used to argue for substrate influence anywhere if there is a similar change; the reason is that Oscan and Umbrian have clusters like nd as well (from earlier *nd).

Callebat examines technical language and how it achieves precision; technical terms should identify one and only one type of object, and this can be achieved by borrowing words or by creating new words from old morphemes (e.g. pandatio ‘warping of wood’). Callebat also looks at pseudo-Greek, e.g. andron in the meaning ‘corridor’—in Greek the word stands for ‘men’s quarters’. Similar phenomena occur in modern languages as well, cf. the use of pseudo-English ‘handy’ in the meaning ‘mobile phone’ in the lower sociolects of German. Stella shows how the statistical analysis of medieval poetry can give new insights: in general, the more learned a text is, the greater is the average distance between subject and verb, and the greater this distance is, the less likely is the poem to have a refrain because refrains belong to a lower style. Iliescu examines which factors furthered the loss of lexemes in the transition from Latin to Romance. Among the formal factors are word length and regularity; short and irregular words were eliminated or lengthened and regularized. Among the semantic factors are expressivity, prototypicality, and polysemy. Verbs which are not expressive are replaced by more colourful terms (ędere → comedere/manducare); nouns which are too general or too specific are lost; and polysemous words are eliminated as well. Biville looks at doublets and glosses in late treatises. While it makes sense to gloss difficult words, we frequently encounter glosses for banal words (type fit uel generatur). Biville argues that there are various reasons for glosses: didactic considerations, the frequent use of bilingual dictionaries, and the successive insertion of glosses by later copyists.

A number of contributions deal with linguistic questions concerning individual authors or individual texts, and among these authors, most space is devoted to Isidore of Seville. Müller shows how Isidore uses existing terminology in a more precise and technical way to refer to stages the Latin language went through. He is the first one to employ historical events for the demarcation of these periods; thus, lingua prsca refers to Latin before the Roman kings, lingua Latina to Latin under the kings, lingua Romana to the language of the Republic and the early Principate, and lingua mixta to the period after Augustus. The most interesting article on Isidore is that by García-Hernández, who discusses book 1 of the