Functions of nominal apposition in Vulgar and Late Latin: change in progress?

Brigitte L. M. Bauer

Abstract

Analysis of the functions of nominal apposition in a number of Latin authors representing different periods, genres, and linguistic registers shows (1) that nominal apposition in Latin had a wide variety of functions; (2) that genre had some effect on functional use; (3) that change did not affect semantic fields as such; and (4) that with time the occurrence of apposition increasingly came to depend on the semantic field and within the semantic field on the individual lexical items. The 'per-word' treatment –also attested for the structural development of nominal apposition– underscores the specific characteristics of nominal apposition as a phenomenon at the cross-roads of syntax and derivational morphology.

FUNCTIONS OF NOMINAL APPOSITION
IN VULGAR AND LATE LATIN: CHANGE IN PROGRESS?

Brigitte L.M. Bauer
The University of Texas at Austin

ABSTRACT

Analysis of the functions of nominal apposition in a number of Latin authors representing different periods, genres, and linguistic registers shows (1) that nominal apposition in Latin had a wide variety of functions; (2) that genre had some effect on functional use; (3) that change did not affect semantic fields as such; and (4) that with time the occurrence of apposition increasingly came to depend on the semantic field and within the semantic field on the individual lexical items. The 'per-word' treatment – also attested for the structural development of nominal apposition – underscores the specific characteristics of nominal apposition as a phenomenon at the cross-roads of syntax and derivational morphology.

Introduction

In this paper I discuss the development of the functions of so-called nominal apposition in Vulgar and Late Latin. Nominal or attributive apposition is the combining of two nouns in a given context that are each other's syntactic equivalent, refer to the same person, object, or phenomenon, and have no formal marking expressing their co-dependency: they typically are asyndetic. Yet the elements are in formal agreement, of case and number. The nouns involved are either common or proper nouns: common noun + common noun or common noun + proper noun, cf.:

> La. *urbs Roma*; *flumen Rhodanus*; *Mars pater*; *L. Sentius C. f. praetor*; *Aetna mons*; *arbor olea*
> It. *Via Giulia*; *San Giovanni*; *Palazzo Doria*; It./Sp. *il/el monte Vesuvio*; Sp. *el rey Alfonso*; Fr. *oncle Louis*; *Musée Picasso*; *la ville de Paris*

The phenomenon is not limited to Latin or Romance, but occurs in other (non-)Indo-European languages as well, as the following instances show:

Engl. *Queen Elisabeth*; *Lake Austin*
Ja. *Tone-gawa* 'the (river) Tone'; Tu. *Cem Sultan* 'Prince Jem'
Basq. *Anderson jauna* 'Mr Anderson'[1]

I will first summarize the formal changes of nominal apposition in Latin. Subsequently I will provide an overview of its functions in early Indo-European, before focussing on their development in Latin. My research includes a variety of authors, representing different periods, genres, and linguistic registers. I will show how apposition came to be preferred for certain nouns within certain semantic fields.

Structural development of nominal apposition in Vulgar and Late Latin

In an earlier paper[2] I discussed the formal development of nominal apposition in Vulgar and Late Latin and I observed the following changes:

(a)   A change in the sequence of the nouns involved, in line with the shift from OV to VO structures,[3] cf.:

specific noun + generic noun   >   generic noun + specific noun
Garunna flumen (Caes., *BG* 1, 1, 2)   *flumine Eufraten* (Eg., 18, 2)

While this was a large-scale development, it typically was a word-specific change: a given author may e.g. favor *rex* + name, while systematically preferring the reverse order for *cursor*.[4]

(b)   The loss of asyndethic constructions in many instances, as in:

urbs Roma vs *urbem Patavii* (Virg., *Aen.* 1, 247) vs Fr. *la ville de Paris*
farinam libras iiii (Cato, *Agr.* 109) vs *piperis grana L* (Anth. 3) vs *duae partes de melle* (Anth. 10)

(c)   The loss of agreement patterns either because exotic proper names do not take case endings (*montem Iuram* [Caes., *BG* 1, 6, 1] vs *Thabor monte* [Pl., *R.A.* 6, 1]) or because the nominative spreads in agreement structures,[5] as in:

Imp[*eratore*] *Caesare C. Valerius Diocletianus pius…* (*CIL* 8, 22432)

Consequently the structural development of nominal apposition in the history of Latin shows a moving away from nominal syntax characterized by agreement to structures with a more explicit hierarchy.[6]

---

1.   Martin 1975; Lewis 1967.

2.   Bauer 2008.

3.   Adams 1977; Bauer 1995.

4.   See Bauer 2008, p. 44-45.

5.   Poukens 1912; Herman 1966 [1990].

6.   For more details, see Bauer 2008.

Functions of nominal apposition in early Indo-European

While rare in word formation processes, nominal apposition is found in all early Indo-European languages as a syntactic phenomenon. It typically is attested in the following semantic fields:

(a)   The semantic field of [religion], as in theonyms, which are among the oldest instances; they are common, especially in prayers:

> Gk. Ζεύς πατήρ; Ἀπόλλωνι ἄνακτι (Il.) 'to the ruler Apollo'
> Toch. B *yamor ñikte* 'Karma God > God Karma'
> La. *Mars pater*; *Cybeleia mater*

(b)   The semantic field of [kinship], as in:

> Skt. *ágne bhrā́taḥ* 'brother Agni'

With the increasing complexity of families and legal systems, this type of structure become more frequent and more complex, resulting e.g. in Latin patronymics.

(c)   The semantic field of [title]:

> Toch. B *Candramukhi lānte*   'of king Candrahka'
> Toch. A *Siṃhe wäl*   'king Simha'

These instances are also very common, often reflecting the increasing complexity of society.

(d)   The semantic field of [geographic location]:

> *in insula Samo*; *urbs Roma*

(e)   The semantic domains of [flora] and [fauna]: this terminology typically combines common nouns, as in:

> Gk. λάρῳ ὄρνιθι   'cormorant'

(f)   Finally, the semantic field of [other] including various types of nominal apposition, which are often language specific:

> Toch. A *ārsi nu käntwā*   'in the language Arsi'
> Gk. ἄνδρες δικασταί   'jurymen'
> La. *mensis November*[7]

---

7.   Examples from Schwyzer 1983; Hackstein 2003; Bauer 2008.

Functions of nominal apposition in Latin

This section focuses on the functional development of nominal apposition in Latin. One of the few to address this topic, Bennett[8] reported that apposition in Early Latin occurs in a number of contexts:

(a)   In combinations of a proper name with a noun, conveying "social status or other status."[9] Without specifying "other status," Bennett observes that this type of structure is "extremely frequent, occurring on almost every page."[10]

(b)   In the "frequent use of expressions,"[11] such as:

> *adulescens homo* (Pl., *Ba.* 65); *filiam adulescentulam* (Ter., *Heaut.* 602); *hominem seruom* (Pl., *As.* 470)

(c)   Finally, in quantitative expressions:

> *farinam libras iiii* (Cato, *Agr.* 109)
> *polentam grandem dimidium acetabuli indito* (Cato, *Agr.* 108)[12]

Tracing the diachronic development of the functions of nominal apposition, I will now present my own data found in texts by Plautus (all plays), Terence (all plays), Cato (*De Agricultura*), Varro (*De Re Rustica*), Caesar (*De Bello Gallico*), Apicius (*De Re Coquinaria*), Egeria (*Peregrinatio*), Anthimus (*De Observatione Ciborum*), and Antoninus Placentinus (*Itinerarium*). I made a list of more than fifty nouns representing the following semantic domains: [religion] (e.g. *deus*, *sanctus*), [kinship] (e.g. *frater*), [title] (e.g. *rex*), [social function] (e.g. *poeta*, *meretrix*), [age] (e.g. *senex*, *adolescens*), [sex] (e.g. *mulier*), [geographic location], [time] (e.g. *mensis*), [quantification], [feast] (e.g. *ludus*), and [other]. The choice of categories is based on patterns of recurrence, both in Latin and other languages. In the following I will provide an overview of the data found and the semantic fields involved, showing that certain patterns emerge that have parallels in the structural development of nominal apposition in Latin.

Early Latin: Plautus

I found 132 instances of apposition in Plautus, which include the following semantic fields:

(a)   The semantic domain of [kinship] (29 examples); they typically (20/29) combine with proper names.

---

8   Bennett 1914.

9.   *Ibid.*, p. 6.

10.   *Loc. cit.*

11.   *Ibid.*, p. 5.

12.   *Ibid.*, p. 6-7.

(b)   Seventy-one instances are from the semantic domains of [age], [title], [sex], and [social function], specifying the social status of the characters involved and typically combining a generic and a proper noun, cf.:

> *Bromia ancilla* (*Amph*. 1078)   [social function]
> *Hegionis senis* (*Capt*. 96)   [age]

Among the various generic nouns the most frequent ones – by far – are *seruus* (21; [social function]) and *rex* (17; [title]), cf.: *regem Pterelam* (*Amph*. 415), *seruom Stichum* (*Stich*. 656).

   In addition, in nineteen instances a generic noun combines with a common noun, as in: *puellae … seruolae* (*Pœn*. 1094) or *meretrices mulieres* (*Men*. 261). The generic noun *homo* is widely attested (25 instances), which with a few exceptions (4/25) typically combine with common nouns, such as *amicus* (7), *servus* (5), *adolescens* (2), *nemo* (2), *peregrinus* (2), cf. *seruom hominem* (*Ep*. 328), *amico homini* (*Ba*. 1156). Many of these nouns have adjectival origin, but it is important to underscore that they function as full-fledged nouns, in Plautus' texts and elsewhere.

(c)   In categories other than social status, we find four instances of [geographic location], e.g. *Aetna mons* (*Mil*. 1065), and one instance of [fauna]: *femina … canis* (*Men*. 838). Despite its clear adjectival origin, *femina* is commonly used as an independent full-fledged noun in Plautus. The construction in question therefore may be considered appositive.

   This overview is not comprehensive: many other instances of apposition may be found in Plautus and indeed even when casually reading, one finds many one-time instances, typically including a generic and a specific noun. These instances seem to reflect word formation rather than syntactic processes, cf.: *nauim cercurum* (Pl., *Merc*. 87).

Early Latin: Terence

   Examining the words included in my list, I found thirty-three instances of nominal apposition in Terence. They include the following semantic fields:

(a)   Nine instances from the semantic field of [kinship], predominantly including *filius*/*filia* (6) and combining with both proper and common nouns, cf.:

> *filiam uirginem* (*Ad*. 466); *filius … Aeschinus* (*Ad*. 462)

(b)   Nouns conveying social status typically refer to [sex], [age], or [social function], cf.:

> *ad meretricem Thaidem* (*Eun*. 352); *miles Thraso* (*Eun*. 353)
> *mulier meretrix* (*And*. 756); *uiduae mulieri* (*H.T.* 953)

The noun most commonly used in this context is *mulier* (5), always in combination with a common noun, sometimes of adjectival origin.

One third of all examples of apposition (10/33) includes the noun *homo*, all in combination with a common noun and conveying a variety of grammatical cases: three include *nemo* and four include nouns of adjectival origin, cf.:

> *homo amicus* (*Ph.* 562); *homini adulescentulo* (*And.* 828)
> *seruom hominem* (*Ph.* 292); *hominem senem* (*Ad.* 562)

Here again, the nouns of adjectival origin function as full-fledged nouns in Terence as their independent occurrence further supports.

(c)   One instance of [geographic location]: *apud Andrum insulam* (*And.* 222). Geographic names are not rare, but they typically do not combine with generic nouns in Terence.

The semantic domains of [social function] and [kinship] overwhelmingly predominate in Terence. The main difference between these categories is their combinatory behaviour: generic nouns conveying social status often combine with common nouns, whereas kinship terms typically combine with proper nouns.

Early Latin: Cato

Despite writing both about agriculture, Cato and Varro use nominal apposition differently. In Cato's text, we find more than twenty instances of nominal apposition, all with grammatical agreement:

(a)   Eleven instances are of the type [religion], cf.:

> *Mars pater* (141, 3); *Iane pater* (134, 3)

(b)   Seven examples pertain to [fauna], cf.:

> *porco piaculo* (141, 4); *porcum feminam* (134, 1)

(c)   Two instances are from the field [geographic location]:

> *fundo Venafro* (146); *agro ... Venafro* (136)

At face value this evidence suggests ample use of apposition, but closer observation shows that the variation in fact is rather limited. First with the exception of [fauna], all examples include proper nouns. Moreover the examples turn out to be rather repetitive: the seven [fauna] examples in fact include two constructions *porcus femina* (2) and *porcus piaculum* (5). Similarly the two instances [geographic location] are identical and the eleven examples from the field of [religion] are the vocatives *Iane pater* (4) and *Mars pater* (7).

(d)   In addition, in quantitative expressions in Cato we find both appositive and genitive constructions, cf.:

> *olei puri P. VIIII* (144, 4)   genitive
> *farinam libras iiii* (109)   nominal apposition

If the apparent rich use of nominal apposition in Cato is rather repetitive, it is important to note that the semantic fields are rather varied, including [religion], [fauna], [location], and [quantification].

Early Latin: Varro

In Varro we find twenty-eight instances of nominal apposition which cover the following seven semantic fields:

(a)   Three instances include generic nouns pertaining to [religion], cf.:

Tellus terra mater (1, 1, 5); *Libero patri* (1, 2, 19)

(b)   One instance of [kinship]:

fratres Veianios (3, 16, 10)

(c)   Eight instances are from the field of [title] and [social function], cf.:

Romulus rex (3, 1, 2); *Democritus physicus* (1, 1, 8)

(d)   Eight instances are from the semantic field of [geographic location], e.g.:

oppidum Olisipo (2, 1, 19); *sub urbe Roma* (1, 50, 2); *monte Tagro* (2, 1, 19)

(e)   Three instances of [flora], cf.:

arbor olea (1, 2, 20); *arbores alni* (1, 7, 7)

(f)   There are two instances of *homo*:

auctore doctissimo homine Dicaearcho (1, 2, 16); *hominibus servis* (1, 17, 2).

(g)   Finally, while there are too few quantitative expressions in Varro to find a pattern, there are three instances that qualify as [feast], e.g.:

feriae Robigalia (1, 1, 6); *ludi Floralia* (1, 1, 6)

Although Cato's and Varro's use of nominal apposition does not differ much in terms of frequency, the functions are rather different: Varro's use is more varied and not repetitive. With the exception of three instances of [fauna], he strongly prefers generic noun + proper noun combinations.

Finally, it is important to note that while most examples of *oppidum* occur in apposition, a noun like *ager* exclusively combines with adjectives (18 instances), cf.:

in agro Romano (1, 10, 3); *in agro Reatino* (2, 6, 2, 7)

Consequently, it is not so that words from certain semantic categories do not occur in the texts analyzed: they do occur but do not feature appositive constructions, but adjectival or genitival constructions instead, cf.:

Campo Martio (3, 2, 5, 2); *in mare Tusco* (3, 9, 17, 5)

Classical period: Caesar

Caesar's *De Bello Gallico* has been included here because of the length of the text, its sober style, and the diversity of topics involved: military expedition, customs of different peoples, seasons, and so forth. In that respect Caesar's text is very different from Varro's and Cato's agricultural treatises and from Plautus' and Terence's plays, which inherently focus on social relations.

In *De Bello Gallico* I found seventy-five instances of nominal apposition, all with full agreement. These are divided over the following semantic fields:

(a)   One instance from the field of [religion], cf.:

   ab Dite patre (6, 18, 1)

(b)   Four instances of [kinship], cf.:

   Diuiciaco fratri (1, 20, 6)

(c)   One instance of [age], including the generic *senex*, which commonly occurs as an independent noun as well, cf.:

   senex ... Lacon (5, 10, 7)

(d)   Thirteen instances of [title], cf.:

   L. Cassium consulem (1, 12, 5); *M. Crassum quaestorem* (5, 24, 5)
   Q.T. Sabinum et L.A. Cottam legatos (5, 24, 5)

(e)   Fifty-six instances of [geographic location], which include the following most common generic nouns: *oppidum* (9), *prouincia* (7), *flumen* (29), *mons* (5), other (6; e.g. *silua, lacus*), cf.: *flumine Rheno* (5, 3, 4), *Galliam prouinciam* (1, 35, 4), *ex monte Vosego* (4, 10, 1), *in siluam Arduennam* (5, 3, 4), *lacu Lemanno* (1, 2, 3).

We observe first of all a preponderance of [geographic location], which contrasts with just one example of [religion]. Moreover, the instances are varied, involving many different nouns and − as in the other authors − a strong variety of grammatical case (and prepositional groups, with accusative [21] and ablative [10]). We also notice a predominance of common noun + proper noun combinations, as opposed to common noun + common noun.

Another picture that emerges is the "per-noun" treatment, partly found Varro as well: a given noun typically favors a given construction. Although there are nine instances of *oppidum* + appositive noun in Caesar, there are many more instances of *oppidum* + genitive plural, referring to a given people, cf.:

   oppidum Biturigum (7, 12, 2) (< *Bituriges*, people)
   oppidum Mandubiorum (7, 58, 1) (< *Mandubii*, people)

Late Latin

In this section I discuss four Late Latin documents, including Apicius' and Anthimus' cookbooks, Antoninus Placentinus' *Itinerary*, and finally the *Peregrinatio* to which I have a slightly different approach.

Late Latin: Apicius and Anthimus

Apicius' use of nominal apposition mainly pertains to [quantification], as in:

> *gingiber mimimum* (2, 7); *costum modicum* (1, 16, 2)

Modicum in this context could be an adjective, but the combining of *modicum* with a feminine noun shows its nominal character, cf.:

> *rutam modicum* (3, 4, 1)

Moreover, Apicius commonly uses *modicum* as a noun governing a genitive as in: *modicum rutae* (4, 2, 12), *mellis modicum* (2, 7), or *olei modicum* (4, 2, 2).

The preceding examples already suggest that quantitative expressions in Apicius are either appositive or genitive constructions, cf.:

> *piperis scripulos VI* (4, 2, 5) vs *piper scripulos VI* (4, 2, 4)
> *pugnum salis* (3, 10, 1)   vs *sales communes lib. I* (1, 3)

For certain nouns we observe variation, while for others we find a predominance of the genitive, as for *ciatum*: *uini ciatum* (4, 2, 4), *liquaminis ciatum* (4, 2, 9), *passi ciatum* (4, 2, 9). On the whole, the genitive is more frequent than the appositive construction.

Anthimus' text provides fourteen examples of appositive noun + noun combinations, with or without agreement:
(a)   One example in the category [religion], the only instance including a proper noun, cf.:

> *domini nostri Iesu Christi* (57)

(b)   Two examples in the category [flora], e.g. *cicutam herbam* (26) 'hemlock'.
(c)   The very large majority (11) are quantitative expressions, including both appositive and genitive constructions:

> *mel modicum* (76); *oleum … coclear plenum* (67)
> *piperis grana L* (3); *duae partes de melle* (10)

Among these there is a slight preference for genitives or propositional phrases.

Late Latin: Antoninus Placentinus' Itinerary

In Antoninus Placentinus appositive noun + noun combinations include the following categories:

(a)   The semantic field of [religion], in particular saints, cf.:

> *sancti Stephani* (*R.A.* 25, 2)

Examples may include double apposition: *sancti Iohannis Baptistae* (*R.A.* 46, 7), where *sanctus* may function as adjective or noun.

(b)   The semantic field of [title] and [social function], cf.:

> *Helisius propheta* (*R.P.* 8, 2); *Iustiniani imperatoris* (*R.P.* 1, 3)

As in many other texts, the combining typically includes a generic noun and a proper noun and the constructions do not have the complexity of Caesar's titles.

(c)   The semantic field of [geographic location], cf.:

> *in ciuitatem Nazareth* (*R.A.* 5, 1); *in Triarim ciuitatem* (*R.P.* 1, 4)
> *fluuius Asclepius* (*R.A.* 2a, 1)

These instances are numerous and varied. Yet there are also many instances in which it is not clear whether there is agreement or not: the proper noun, of exotic origin, does not take case, as in:

> *in ciuitatem Nazareth* (*R.A.* 5, 1)

Moreover, for some generic nouns we find three structures, appositive, genitive, or "unknown":

> *subtus monte Carmello* (*R.P.* 3, 2)   apposition
> *in monte Oliueti* (*R.P.* 14, 4)   genitive
> *in Tabor monte* (*R.P.* 6, 1)   "unknown"

On the whole case endings tend to be used when the name ends in *-a* or *-us*, even if this may lead to apparent inconsistency of gender endings , as in *sanctum Zachariam* (*R.A.* 32, 3). Moreover, when case is expressed, there is a preference for appositive constructions.

Late Latin: Peregrinatio

For this text I had a slightly different approach: I checked a corpus of instances of apposition both with agreement and genitive constructions. Moreover, I examined a corpus of 267 occurrences of proper nouns, with or without generic nouns. Among the appositive noun + noun instances, the most common semantic fields are [religion], [social function], and [title], which are inherently asyndetic. The main issue is whether agreement is expressed or not: the factor at play is the occurrence of exotic proper nouns, cf.:

(a)   The semantic field of [religion] includes the following generic nouns:

> *deus* (9): *Deus noster Iesu* (10, 2); *Christo Deo nostro* (23, 5)
> *sanctus* (35): *sanctum Abraam* (14, 2); *sancti Iob* (13, 1)
> other: *domine Iesu* (19, 9)

Several examples have double apposition: *sancti Iohannis baptistae* (15, 6).

(b) [social function] and [title], cf.:

> *Achab regis* (4, 2); *de palatio regis Melchisedech* (14, 2)
> *ad palatium Aggari regis* (19, 6); *per Ananiam cursorem* (19, 8)

(c) In the other semantic fields we find both apposition and genitives, as the following examples from the field of [geographic location] (57 instances) illustrate:

> *sub monte Tauro* (23, 6) vs *mons Oliueti* (25, 11)

(d) Similarly in the semantic field of [flora]:

> *in horto pomario* (15, 6) vs *arbor sicomori* (8, 2) and *arbor ueritatis* (8, 4)

(e) Finally, two instances of [other] include: *mala granata* (1, 12, 1) and *mala cidonia* (1, 12, 3). While originally an adjective, *granatum* is often attested as an independent noun, 'pomegranate'.

As in Anthimus the pattern that emerges is that within certain semantic fields there is structural variation in relation to certain nouns: appositive constructions, genitive constructions, and "unknown" structures, the syntactic nature of which cannot be identified because of the absence of case.

The following examples illustrate this structural variety within given semantic fields and according to the individual nouns within that field. Within the field of [geographic location], for example, the noun *terra* favors either the genitive (5) or the unknown (11) construction, as in:

> genitive   *de terra Egypti* (5, 9); *terra Arabiae* (7, 1)
> ?   *ad terram Gesse* (7, 1); *terra Iesse* (7, 9); *terram Chanaan* (10, 1)

Within that same semantic field, the noun *mons* either occurs in appositive (3) or unknown (9) constructions, cf.:

> apposition   *sub monte Tauro* (23, 6); *montem Taurum* (23, 7)
> ?   *montem Nabau* (10, 8); *montis Nabau* (11, 4)

The regularity of these patterns suggests that *mons* favors apposition, while *terra* favors the genitive and that the names that combine with them −if they had case− would feature agreement or the genitive respectively. Yet based on data in absentia, this reasoning cannot be verified.

Within the semantic field of [time] including *hora*, *dies*, or *feria* we find appositive, genitival, and adjectival constructions; especially *dies* allows for variation:

> genitive   *hora lucernae* (39, 4); *dies Paschae* (47, 1)
>   *excepta una die sabbati* (27, 1)
> apposition   *excepta die sabbato* (44, 1)
> adjective   *secunda feria* (27, 4); *dominica die* (24, 8)
>   *diebus paschalibus* (39, 3)

The category [feast], finally, strongly favors the adjectival and genitive construction:

adjective   *Vigiliae paschales* (38, 1)
genitive   *octauis paschae* (40, 1)

They typically do not feature apposition in contrast to similar examples in Varro.

The large majority of a corpus of 267 proper names in the *Peregrinatio* however do not combine with a generic noun, especially in the field of [geographic location]. Categories represented are: towns, rivers (e.g. *Iordanis* [12, 4]), geographic areas, countries (e.g. *Arabiae* [10]), but also individuals (e.g. *Pilato* [37, 8]), peoples (e.g. *Persae* [19, 9]), and so forth. There is no pattern in these occurrences.

Noun-noun combinations in the *Peregrinatio* represent a large variety of semantic fields as well as syntactic structures. Among examples of nominal apposition we observe a strong predominance of the semantic field of [religion] and [geographic location]. It is also typical that because of the often observed absence of case endings in exotic names, many instances cannot be identified as examples of nominal apposition or genitive construction. Yet regularity in patterns suggests certain preferences for certain nouns.

Conclusion

Nominal apposition in Latin conveys a strong variety of functions. Different types of text show that genre to some extent may affect the type of apposition found in it. In cookbooks, e.g. we find many instances of [quantification], while the early Latin plays despite differences include many examples of apposition specifying social status. Yet semantic domains are not solely determined by genre: Varro has a stronger variety of semantic fields than Cato. Genre therefore has some effect on functional use, but it definitely is not the only factor.

Data presented here show that throughout its history, Latin had a substantial variety in nominal apposition covering the fields of [religion], [kinship], [title], [social function], [sex], [age], [geographic location], [time], [feast], [quantification], and [other]. In all periods nominal apposition typically is attested for [religion], [title], [social function], and [geographic location]. These types of apposition typically include proper nouns. It is important to note that in the hierarchy of proper nouns the names of persons and places represent 'core proper nouns'. Consequently the combining of a generic noun with a 'core proper noun' seems to be a constant feature in Latin. Moreover, appositive constructions of the type [religion], [title], and [social function] inherently are asyndetic.

With time there is no loss of semantic fields in Latin or an emergence of new ones, but nominal apposition increasingly comes to be attested for certain nouns within certain semantic fields. Moreover, texts by Anthimus and Apicius show that although apposition remains strong within the semantic field of [quantification] until quite late, the genitive alternative comes to predominate and certain nouns within the field

typically combine with a genitive, while others allow for both the appositive and the genitival construction.

Similarly, while the genitive is spreading in certain other semantic fields as well (e.g. [geographic location]), apposition is increasingly attested for certain nouns within these fields. In Varro already apposition typically does not occur in the context of *ager* or *mare*, but it does in the context of *oppidum*.

This 'per-word' treatment is not new in studies of nominal apposition in Latin: earlier I found a similar pattern in the structural development of the construction (see also p. 208). The shift in the order of elements was word related as well in the sense that authors prefer certain generic nouns to follow the specific noun but favor the reverse sequence for other nouns.

Findings in this article show that occurrence of nominal apposition in Latin increasingly came to depend on the semantic field and on the individual lexical elements within the semantic field. This 'per-word' treatment at structural and functional level may be accounted for by the fact that nominal apposition is at the cross-roads of syntax and morphology. The combining of two co-dependent nouns predominantly is a syntactic phenomenon in early Indo-European and in various languages develops into a morphological phenomenon providing a powerful tool in word formation processes as numerous examples from today's French illustrate. The 'per-word' treatment characterizing the functional development of nominal apposition in Vulgar and Late Latin therefore is not an isolated phenomenon.

Bibliography

ADAMS J. 1977, "A Typological Approach to Latin Word Order", *IF* 81, p. 70-99.

BAUER B. 1995, *The Emergence and Development of SVO Patterning in Latin and French: Diachronic and Psycholinguistic Perspectives*, Oxford.

— 2008, "Nominal Apposition in Vulgar and Late Latin. At the Cross-Roads of Major Linguistic Changes", *in* R. Wright (éd.), *Latin vulgaire, latin tardif*. VIII, *Actes du VIIIᵉ colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Oxford, 6-9 septembre 2006*, Tübingen, p. 42-50.

BENNETT C.E. 1914, *Syntax of Early Latin*. II, *The Cases*, Boston, Leipzig [repr. Hildesheim, 1966].

HACKSTEIN O. 2003, "Apposition and Word Order Typology in Indo-European", *in* B.L.M. Bauer, G.-J. Pinault (eds), *Language in Time and Space: a Festschrift for Werner Winter on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday*, Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 144, Berlin, p. 131-152.

HERMAN J. 1966, "Recherches sur l'évolution grammaticale du latin vulgaire : les emplois 'fautifs' du nominatif", *Acta classica Univ. Scient. Debreceniensis* 2, p. 109-112 [= 1990, *in Id.*, *Du latin aux langues romanes : études de linguistique historique*, réunies par S. Kiss, avec une préf. de J. Monfrin, Tübingen, p. 320-325].

LEWIS G.L. 1967, *Turkish Grammar*, Oxford.

LOFSTEDT L. 1982, "À propos des articles et des articloïdes", *in* C. Rohrer (ed.), *Logos Semantikos: studia linguistica in honorem Eugenio Coseriu 1921-1981*. IV, *Gramática*, Madrid, Berlin, p. 269-277.

MARTIN S.E. 1975, *A Reference Grammar of Japanese*, Yale Linguistic Series, New Haven, London.

POUKENS J.B. 1912, "Syntaxe des inscriptions latines d'Afrique", *Le Musée belge* 16, p. 135-179, 241-288.

SCHWYZER E. 1983, "Zur Apposition", *in* E. Schwyzer, *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. von R. Schmitt, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 45, Innsbruck, p. 149-162.