Original publication:

Van Rooy, Raf. 2018. "Latin as a Variable Language: Livy's *Patauinitas* through Early Modern eyes." In *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Vindobonensis: Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies (Vienna 2015)*, edited by Astrid Steiner-Weber and Franz Römer, 767–77. Leiden & Boston: Brill. <https://brill.com/view/book/edcoll/9789004361553/BP000079.xml>

Latin as a Variable Language.

Livy's *Patauinitas* through Early Modern Eyes

Raf Van Rooy

It has been eloquently argued by, among others, Wilfried Stroh that Latin is the international language par excellence.¹ Stroh stresses its immortality; Latin is said to be a language that enables people to communicate across space as well as time, with the great minds of the past and the future, thanks to its invariability.² Nevertheless, despite such claims of grandeur, Latin started out as one of the many rural varieties within a dialectal continuum of non-standardized speech forms. Therefore, it may not be surprising that we find testimonies of dialectal variation in ancient Italy and Latium.

A possible case in point is Livy's (59 BC-AD 17) rather mysterious *Patauinitas*. As a matter of fact, Quintilian (ca. AD 35-100) informs us twice that Asinius Pollio (ca. 76 BC-ca. AD 5) rebuked Livy for having a certain *Patauinitas* in his speech. However, no further information on this particularity of Livy's language is offered; this led later scholars to propose several diverging interpretations of Pollio's criticism, not only in recent times, but also in the works of early modern authors such as the German professor of eloquence, Daniel Georg Morhof (1639-91), who is best known for his encyclopedia entitled *Polyhistor*. Morhof also wrote a monograph on Livy's *Patauinitas* (*De Patauinitate Liuiana liber*, published in 1685),³ in which he reported and considered preceding views on Livy's *Patauinitas*, which constitute the topic of my paper. I aim at (1) offering an overview of the ways in which Livy's *Patauinitas* was approached and understood in a number of Neo-Latin writings before Morhof's book, (2) contextualizing these views, mainly within the early modern debate on language-internal variation, and (3) contrasting them with the conception of Latin as a unitary

¹ Wilfried Stroh, *Latein ist tot, es lebe Latein. Kleine Geschichte einer grossen Sprache* (Berlin, 2013 [2008]).

² Stroh, *Latein ist tot* (see above, n. 1), 313-4. Cf. also John Considine, "Claudius Salmasius and the Deadness of Neo-Latin," in *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Upsaliensis. Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies (Uppsala 2009)*, ed. Astrid Steiner-Weber (Leiden, 2012), vol. 1, 295-305.

³ See Roger Zuber, "Littérature et urbanité," in *Le statut de la littérature. Mélanges offerts à Paul Bénichou*, ed. Marc Fumaroli (Genève, 1982), 87-96, for a discussion of Morhof's views in relation to the notion of *urbanitas* and French literature.

language, which is most famously championed by Lorenzo Valla. The focus will be on the place of Livy's "Patavinity" or "Paduanness" in discussions of variation within one language during the Renaissance, here limited to the period ca. 1500-1680.

1. What is the *Patauinitas Liuiana*? A brief overview of its (early) modern interpretations

1.1. Modern linguistics

James Noel Adams offers an excellent *status quaestionis* of modern views on Livy's *Patauinitas*, starting from the two remarks Quintilian makes at 1.5.56 ("taceo de Tuscis et Sabinis et Praenestinis quoque (nam ut eorum sermone utentem Vettium Lucilius insectatur, quem ad modum Pollio reprehendit in Liuiio Patauinitatem)") and 8.1.3 ("et in Tito Liuiio, mirae facundiae uiro, putat inesse Pollio Asinius quandam Patauinitatem").⁴ Livy's *Patauinitas* has been interpreted as referring to, among other things, (1) the usage of specific Paduan words in his (lost) writings (unlikely according to Adams), (2) a general "provincial touch" in his speech, (3) the hyper-Romanness of his language, revealing him as non-Roman (provincial), (4) the usage of *sibe* and *quase* instead of *sibi* and *quasi* (unlikely statement based on Quintilian 1.7.24, where Asconius Pedanius is quoted), (5) stylistic lengthiness, and (6) non-linguistic features such as a specific Paduan morality (unlikely according to Adams).⁵ Adams stresses, however, that Pollio "need have had no clear idea himself" of what he meant by Livy's *Patauinitas*.⁶ For Pollio's vague reference to *Patauinitas* stands in sharp contrast to other instances in which he shows himself to be a puristic hairsplitter in matters of correct linguistic usage.⁷ Yet, it does tie in with the general tendency of Romans to utter their reproaches without

⁴ The account of this section is largely based on James Noel Adams, *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC – AD 600* (Cambridge, 2007), 147-53 (hereafter cited as Adams), but, on Livy's *Patauinitas*, see, e.g., also Kurt Latte, "Livy's Patavinitas," *Classical Philology* 35/1 (1940), 56-60, who interprets it as a literary cliché taken over from the Greek tradition, but not adequate for the Latin context, and Tamás Adamik, "Remarks on Livy's Patavinitas," in *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif VIII. Actes du VIII^e colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif (Oxford, 6 – 9 septembre 2006)*, ed. Roger Wright (Hildesheim, 2008), 34-41, there 40, who analyzes it as referring to a number of concrete "stylistic exaggerations" in Livy's work.

⁵ See, e.g., Ronald Syme, "Livy and Augustus," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 64 (1959), 27-87, there 50-1; id., *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1963), 485-6; Gary B. Miles, *Livy. Reconstructing Early Rome* (New York, 1997), 51 (n. 57); and Joaquín Muñoz Coello, "Livio, Polión y la patavinitas. El relato historiográfico," *Klio* 91/1 (2009), 125-43, for possible "sociopolitical connotations" (quoted from Miles, *Livy*, 51 (n. 57)) of Livy's *Patauinitas*.

⁶ Adams (see above, n. 4), 149.

⁷ Cf. *ibid.* for a number of examples.

offering concrete evidence to support it. Adams concludes, with a high degree of plausibility, that “Pollio probably made a vague charge of provincialism against Livy without going into detail, and Quintilian was not sure exactly what was meant.”⁸

1.2. Early modern views

Early modern authors, in their turn, were often not satisfied with a “vague” interpretation of Livy’s *Patauinitas*, such as the one Adams propounds. Instead, they proposed diverging concrete solutions to this problem, both linguistic and non-linguistic. In what follows, I concentrate on their linguistic interpretations.

Early on in the 16th century, Georgius Haloinus (ca. 1470-1536/37) already stressed the universality of dialectal diversification in his *Restauratio linguae Latinae*, which was published in 1533, but already begun in or shortly after 1508:⁹

De lingua Graeca legitur quod quinque diuersas linguas comprehendebat. Linguam Latinam similiter diuersam fuisse ex hoc patet, quod legimus Liuio obiectam fuisse Patauinitatem, hoc est quod more Patauinorum loquebatur, a quibus originem sumpserat. Experientiaque uidemus ad oculum linguas omnes totius orbis de loco ad locum non amplius duorum miliarium distantia aliquantulum diuersas esse; si longius procedere uelis, tam diuersas inuenies, ut uix alius alium intelliget [*sic*].¹⁰

About the Greek language it is said that it comprised five different tongues. The Latin language was similarly diverse, as is clear from the fact that we read that Livy was reproached for his Patavinity, i.e., because he spoke in the manner of the Paduans, to whom he owed his origin. And out of experience we see for display that all the languages of the whole world are somewhat different from locality to locality by a distance of no more than two milestones; if you would want to proceed farther, you will find such diverse tongues that one barely understands each other.

⁸ Ibid., 153.

⁹ Constant Matheeussen, “Haloinus (Halewijn, Halewyn, ook Cominius), Georgius,” *Nationaal Biografisch Woordenboek* (Brussel, 1977), vol. 7, 313.

¹⁰ Constantinus Matheeussen (ed.), *Georgii Haloini Cominiique domini De restauratione linguae latinae libri III* (Leipzig, 1978), 55. Matheeussen, *ibid.*, 19, points out that Haloinus sometimes uses the indicative mood (*intelliget*) with an *ut consecutiuum* rather than the expected subjunctive mood (*intelligat*). See also Raf Van Rooy, “The Labyrinth of Greece. Renaissance Approaches to Greek Dialects” (forthc.), for this passage. Translations in this paper are mine.

Haloinus identifies the *Patauinitas Liuiana* simply by stating that Livy “spoke in the manner of the Paduans, to whom he owed his origin.” He thus opted for an explanation that reminds of the second modern interpretation I listed *sub* 1.1: “(2) a general “provincial touch” in his speech.” The great French Hellenist Henri Estienne (1528/31-1598), in his turn, interprets it as a variety of Latin “slightly differing from the genuine elegance of Latin speech.”¹¹

Some early modern thinkers were, however, clearly aware of the existence of more than one possible interpretation of “Patavinity”, as for example Claude (de) Saumaise (1588-1653). In his *Funus linguae Hellenisticae* (1643), he lists several possibilities. Apart from the general “Paduan touch,” Saumaise also mentions the possibility that Patavinity only concerns some words Livy uses rather than his whole language. But he eventually denies that we are able to understand the exact nature of Livy’s *Patauinitas*; for it does not appear, Saumaise states, in the extant works of Livy. His conclusion is that Livy’s *Patauinitas* must refer to a feature or particularity of his lost works.¹² Nevertheless, relying on the two passages in Quintilian, he is inclined to believe that Livy’s *Patauinitas* consists in the usage of a number of words that are particular to the speech of Padua.¹³ Saumaise claims to have found a parallel in poem 97 by Catullus (ca. (?)81/80/79-(?)52/51/50 BC), in which the poet uses a local word: *ploxenum*, “wagon-box.”¹⁴ Saumaise also lists other possible interpretations of Livy’s Patavinity, which he had read in the *De Romanae historiae scriptoribus excerpta* by Balthas(s)ar Bonifacius (1584-1659), published in 1627.¹⁵

¹¹ See Henri Estienne, *Hypomneses de Gall. lingua, peregrinis eam discentibus necessariae; quaedam uero ipsis etiam Gallis multum profuturæ*. [...] ([Geneuae], 1582), *iiir: “Sic certe eos Liuii locos in quibus Patauinitatem deprehendit Pollio, nihil habere putandum est quod barbarum potius quam Latinum dici queat; sed tantum aliquid quod a genuina Latini sermonis elegancia aliquantum discedit.” Cf. also Rodolphus Goclenius, *Problematum grammaticorum libri V* (In nobili Francofurto, 1609),)(6v.

¹² Claude de Saumaise, *Funus linguae Hellenisticae, siue Confutatio exercitationis de Hellenistis et lingua Hellenistica* (Lugduni Batauorum, 1643), 236 (hereafter cited as Saumaise): “Quid si in illis Liuii reliquiis quae supersunt nulla restant uestigia aut notae illius Patauinitatis, quae in aliis operibus quae intercidere apparebant impressae? Hoc certe suspicor. Nam in Liuianis quae hodie extant nullum superesse puto ex Patauinitate maculam, si modo recte teneo quid sit *Patauinitas*. [...]. Voces ille fuisse uult aliquot Italicas Patauini soli quas usurparat Liuius, quae delicatis auribus Romanorum inusitatae erant, ac proinde durae uidebantur.”

¹³ Ibid., 237: “Patauinitatem illam in solis Patauinis uocabulis aliquot quae Liuius usurparat sitam fuisse hinc liquet. [...]. Non igitur, ut ex his liquidum est, in elocutionibus et dicendi genere, illa Patauinitas consistebat, sed in aliquot uocibus, non plane Romanis, sed Italicis, quibus usus fuerat Liuius.” See also ibid., 238: “Omnes, ut uidere est, a scopo longe aberrarunt, cum Patauinitas illa in solis uocibus ex Patauino solo usurpatis et orationi Romanae insertis constiterit.”

¹⁴ Ibid., 237: “Catullus ex eodem Patauino solo, Transpadanum uocabulum, ut idem notat Quintilianus, *Ploxenum*, in uersu posuit.” He refers to Catullus 97.6 and Quintilian 1.5.8. Cf. Adams (see above, n. 4), 176-7.

¹⁵ Saumaise (see above, n. 12), 238.

Bonifacius mentions several explanations.¹⁶ Some believe, Bonifacius states, that Pollio's delicate sense of taste is at the basis of the reproach; Livy had not succeeded to fully master the "genius of Roman speech."¹⁷ Others claim that Pollio intended to attack his foreign orthography: i.e. the spelling of *sibi* and *quasi* as *sibe* and *quase*; as we have seen, this view would persist well into modern times (see (4) *sub* 1.1). Saumaise, elaborating upon Bonifacius' account, already dismisses this interpretation by referring to ancient Latin inscriptions. This spelling is not particular to Padua, he notes, but to the orthography of older Latin inscriptions in general!¹⁸ In doing so, he anticipates modern refutations of this claim (see *sub* 1.1). The third interpretation mentioned by Bonifacius, which is rather vague, is the following: the *Patauinitas Liuiana* is said to refer to the repetition of several words in the same periods. The last two interpretations Bonifacius lists are of a non-linguistic nature: Livy's *Patauinitas* is associated with his political preferences (the party of Pompey) or it is understood to refer to a praise of Padua and its citizens in a part of his work that is not extant.¹⁹ Bonifacius himself, while emphasizing the difficulty of this question, does not seem to attach much value to the truthfulness of Pollio's reproach.²⁰ Instead, he suggests that Pollio did not really have a clear idea himself of what he meant by his reproach of *Patauinitas*. In doing so, Bonifacius prefigures, to a certain extent, Adams' conclusion (cf. *sub* 1.1).

2. Discussions of Livy's *Patauinitas* and their contexts

The *Patauinitas Liuiana* pops up in several contexts. Bonifacius, who offers the greatest number of possible interpretations, discusses it in his description of Livy as a historian: i.e. in a philological-

¹⁶ Balthassar Bonifacius, *De Romanae historiae scriptoribus excerpta* [...] (Venetiis, 1627), 22.

¹⁷ Ibid.: "nonnullis existimantibus delicatum Pollionis Asinii palatum uisum sibi fuisse aliquid in Liuiio gustare, quod non usquequaque saperet genium Romani sermonis." Bonifacius took this interpretation, in fact, from Gerardus Johannes Vossius, *De historicis Latinis libri tres* (Lugduni Bataurum, 1627), 85: "Sed de stylo etiam litem intentabat olim Asinius Pollio. Patauinitatem in eo animaduertere se aiebat. Nimirum delicatum Romani hominis palatum uidebatur sibi aliquid sentire, quod non usquequaque saperet genium Romani sermonis." Here, Vossius abuses the loaded term "genius" (for which, see Toon Van Hal, "Génie de la langue. The Genesis and Early Career of a Key Notion in Early Modern European Learning," *Language & History* 56/2 (2013), 81-97) to make this vague claim of his.

¹⁸ See Saumaise (see above, n. 12), 238: "Alius credidit hoc nomine reprehensam fuisse peregrinitatem orthographiae. Nam scripsisse illum ex lapidibus colligi, *sibe* et *quase* pro *sibi* et *quasi*. Atqui haec uetus etiam Romana fuit orthographia, non Patauina."

¹⁹ See Bonifacius (see above, n. 16), 22-3: "Quibusdam uolentibus studium partium Pompeianarum illam esse Patauinitatem ab Asinio notatam. Denique non paucis suspicantibus patriae suae suorumque ciuium laudes, parte operis iam deperdita, effuse amplificatas, hac uoce censerit."

²⁰ Ibid., 22: "Quo maior sit eorum inscitia, qui Patauinitatem quandam in Liuiio reprehendunt, quam dispeream si Asinius ipse, tam ridiculae inuentor calumniae, quid esset sciebat."

historiographical context. Yet, much of the discussion occurs in a philological-linguistic context. To start with, Saumaise's interest was triggered by a comment of Daniel Heinsius (1580-1655), with whom he was engaged in a fierce polemic on the (non)existence of a so-called Hellenistic "dialect" in which Heinsius believed the Septuagint and the New Testament were written.²¹ Saumaise reacts against a passage in Heinsius' work, in which the latter had compared the *Patauinitas Liuiana* with the *lingua Hellenistica*. Saumaise, however, stresses the difference between biblical Greek and Livy's Patavinity. He dedicates six pages of his *Funus* to this problem,²² but the following passage probably summarizes his rejection of it most clearly:

Haec etiam Patauinitas fuit Liuiana in uerbis singulis minime Romanis, sed Patauinis et Gallicis. At oratio τῶν septuaginta non uerbis Ἑβραϊζεῖ, sed phrasibus. Nulla ergo similitudo Patauinitatis et idiotismorum Ebraicorum, qui in phrasi et elocutione uersantur.²³

Also, this Patavinity of Livy's consisted in separate words, least of all Roman, but Paduan and Gaulish. Yet, the speech of the Septuagint does not Hebraize in words, but in phrases. So there is no similarity between the Patavinity and the Hebrew particularities, which occur in phrasing and diction.²⁴

Most importantly, however, Livy's *Patauinitas* functions as a very popular notion to "prove" the existence of dialectal variation in Latin. Remarkable in this regard is the fact that early modern scholars often do not make explicit how they interpret Livy's *Patauinitas* in this context. There is a relatively long list of such instances, which I will not be able to discuss exhaustively here. Therefore, I will limit myself to a few revealing examples.

I already elaborated on the way in which Georgius Haloinus used Livy's Patavinity to confirm the universality of dialectal diversification (see *sub* 1.2). Another important early modern language scholar, Theodore Bibliander (1509-64), also alludes to it in a similar context:

²¹ See, e.g., Toon Van Hal, "Moedertalen en taalmoeders." *Het vroegmoderne taalvergelijkende onderzoek in de Lage Landen* (Brussel, 2010), 35; cf. also John Considine, "Why Was Claude de Saumaise Interested in the Scythian Hypothesis?," *Language & History* 53/2 (2010), 81-96.

²² Saumaise (see above, n. 12), 235-41.

²³ *Ibid.*, 240.

²⁴ It is possible that Saumaise was inspired by the distinction "barbarism"- "solecism" in analyzing the difference between Livy's *Patauinitas* (deviant linguistic usage in words, i.e. barbarism) and the language of the LXX (deviant linguistic usage in phrases, i.e. solecism).

Sunt autem non tantum LXXII dialecti, quot filii et nepotes trium patriarcharum, qui terrarum orbem coloniis impleuerunt, sed ἀπερίληπτοι et innumerabiles, [...]. Et singulis ciuitatibus in eadem gente proprium quiddam in loquendo est. Quemadmodum in Liuiο eloquentissimo uiro notaui Pollio Patauinitatem, quia T. Liuius fuit Patauinus.²⁵

But there are not only 72 dialects, as many as there are sons and grandsons of the three patriarchs, who filled the world with colonies, but there are indefinite and innumerable ones, [...]. And separate cities in the same tribe have something proper in speaking, as, for instance, Pollio noticed in Livy, a most eloquent man, Patavinity, because T. Livy was a Paduan.

Bibliander stresses the infinite variety of tongues by expanding on variation within languages. Apart from mentioning the Greek dialects, which are omnipresent in such discussions,²⁶ he also refers to diversity within Latin. Variation in Greek and Latin is also bracketed together by the French scholar Loys Le Roy (1510-77). Le Roy uses the *Padouennerie de Tite-Live* as primary evidence for the existence of variation within Latin, albeit on the level of rhetoric and stylistics rather than on the level of linguistic features *stricto sensu*.²⁷

In the 17th century, other “dialects” of Latin increasingly came into the picture of early modern scholars. For example, the German grammarian Justus Georg Schottel (1612-76) states that the “Latin language has its dialects and distinctions, for there is frequent mention of the Latin, Volscian, Sabine, Oscan, and Etruscan languages, and Pollio also noticed in Livy some Patavinity.”²⁸ Morhof, in his

²⁵ Theodore Bibliander, *De optimo genere grammaticorum Hebraicorum commentarius* (Basileae, 1542), 54.

²⁶ Ibid.: “Cum enim quinque ferantur Graecarum dialecti, rursum tamen Ionica in quattuor insignes distribuitur.”

²⁷ See Loys Le Roy, *De la vicissitude ou variété des choses en l'univers*, [...] (A Paris, 1575), 22r: “Les Grecs demourans en la vraye Grece, en Italie, en Asie, en Sicile et autres isles avoient quatre langues, l’Attique, Dorique, Eolique, Ionienne: et en elisant par les poëtes de chacune parolles et figures ainsi que mieux à propos leur venoit, ils en feirent naistre une appellee commune: et apres soubz un nom seul les appellerent toutes cinq la langue Grecque. Et jaçoit que l’Athenienne fust elegante et feconde plus que les autres: les sçavans qui n’estoient point Atheniens de nation, escrivirent seulement à leur mode naturelle, craignans paravanture de pouvoir parvenir à la purité Attique, à laquelle parvenoient rarement et à tard ceux qui estoient naiz ailleurs. Car Theophraste qui avoit longuement residé en Athenes réputé tresdisert fut reconnu en son parler pour estranger par une vieille Athenienne. Pollion objectoit la Padoüennerie à Titelive. Et à Virgile qui estoit Mantuan fut reproché qu’il ne parloit pas Romain.”

²⁸ Justus Georg Schottel, *Ausführliche Arbeit von der teutschen Haupt Sprache* [...] (Braunschweig, 1663), 176: “Lingua Latina habuit dialectos et sua discrimina, fit enim crebra mentio linguae Latinae, Volscae, Sabinae, Opicae, Hetruscae et in Liuiο quoque animaduersa est a Pollione quaedam Patauinitas.” Cf. also Saumaise (see above, n. 12), 238-9, and Henry Stubbe, *Clamor, rixa, ioci, mendacia, furta, cachini*, [...] [Second title page:] Θεροσ(της ἀκριτόμυθος. [...] (London, 1657), 43.

book on the *Patauinitas Liuiana*, also notices that “it is widely known that there were formerly several languages in Italy,” after which he enumerates some “dialects” of Latin (e.g., Praenestine and Tusculan).²⁹ It is interesting to note within this context that, early in the 16th century, Livy’s *Patauinitas* was a source of inspiration to attribute to Virgil a certain *Mantuanitas*, a particular linguistic usage of Virgil’s hometown Mantua (to the existence of which St Jerome had already alluded in one of his letters, without, however, using the term *Mantuanitas*).³⁰

All these instances may, in fact, be seen as an indirect reaction against the ideas of influential scholars from the Quattro- and Cinquecento who had stressed and even praised the uniformity of Latin. The most famous example is Lorenzo Valla’s (ca. 1407-57) preface to the first book of the *Elegantiae linguae Latinae*. In it, he explicitly opposes the linguistic and political unity of the Roman Empire to the diversity in Ancient Greece in both these regards.³¹ Juan Luis Vives (1492/93-1540) even explicitly states that “the Roman [language] has no dialects,” but “it is one and unmixed.”³² Desiderius Erasmus (1466/67/69-1536) also hints at the original uniformity of Latin in his dialogue on the correct pronunciation of Latin and Greek.³³

It seems safe to state, by way of conclusion, that the *Patauinitas Liuiana* was, so to speak, the “pet notion” of early modern scholars to talk about, “prove,” and, at the same time, exemplify variation within Latin (often without giving a precise interpretation of it!). It contributed, to a certain extent, to placing the Latin language in a historical-variational perspective, which is largely absent in the thought of influential 15th- and 16th-century scholars such as Valla, Vives, and Erasmus. Yet, Livy’s

²⁹ Daniel Georg Morhof, *De Patauinitate Liuiana liber*. [...] (Kiloni, 1685), 148-9: “Linguas in Italia complures olim fuisse, ut dixi, res est notissima. [...] Fuerunt uero illae uel Cis-Tiberinae, ut Latina, cuius dialecti Tusculana, Lanuuina, Praenestina, Formiana, Marsorum etc. quae et ipsae antiquitus a Latina discrepabant, et Graeca, cuius species Sicula et Tarentina. Intermediae quasi erant Sabina, Osca, Volsca, Campana, Brutiorum. Vel Trans-Tiberinae, ut Etrusca, cuius species Falisca et Rhetica et Ligurum. Ab his uicinis linguis primum creuit Latina lingua, quae inopiam suam externarum uocum accessione subleuauit. Illinc e Graecis uoces accepit plurimas; hinc ab Etruscis et Tuscis.”

³⁰ Marinus Becichemus, *Elegans ac docta in C. Plinium praelectio*. [...] (Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1519), XIII: “Scio et Hieronymum scripsisse ab aliis Mantuanitatem quandam fuisse in Vergilio deprehensam, quod patriae suae consuetudine dixerit, sceleratum frigus, sceleratas faces aliter quam Homerus.” Becichemus is elaborating upon a passage in Saint Jerome’s *Epistulae* 121.10: “Nec hoc miremur in apostolo, si utatur eius linguae consuetudine, in qua natus est et nutritus, cum Vergilius, alter Homerus apud nos, patriae suae sequens consuetudinem ‘sceleratum’ frigus appellet.”

³¹ See Lorenzo Valla, *Laurentii Vallae opera*, [...] (Basileae, 1540), 4: “[...] et multarum gentium uelut una lex, una est lingua Romana; unius Graeciae (quod pudendum est) non una, sed multae sunt tamquam in republica factiones.”

³² See Juan Luis Vives, *De ratione dicendi libri tres. De consultatione* (Louanii, 1533), X.iiiv: “Romana dialectos non habet, unica est et simplex.”

³³ See Desiderius Erasmus, *De recta Latini Graecique sermonis pronuntiatione* [...] *dialogus*. [...] (Lugduni, 1528), 34-5: “Quot barbaricas linguas nobis uulgu ex una Latina reddidit! Quot discriminibus sectus est Italiae sermo, quot Galliae, quot Hispaniae!”

mysterious *Patauinitas* was not the only point of reference for scholars to assert that Latin was internally diversified; from the 16th century onwards, there was a growing awareness of further dialectal diversification in Latium (and ancient Italy), for which early modern scholars rely on other (initially mostly literary) evidence.³⁴

3. Brief outlook

In this necessarily incomplete overview, I have tried to give a rough sketch of the various interpretations of Livy's *Patauinitas* and the different contexts in which it was discussed or used, with specific attention to the problem of "dialectal" variation within Latin. It emerged that many modern interpretations, in fact, are foreshadowed by early modern views, and that the debate surrounding the *Patauinitas Liuiana* has, so to speak, repeated itself to a certain extent.

I have focused on the period ca. 1500-1680. However, it would be worthwhile to investigate more extensively the interpretations and uses of Livy's Patavinity before 1500 as well as in and after Morhof's 1685 monograph, in which the German polymath minutely "examined and refuted this accusation" of *Patauinitas*.³⁵ For lack of time, this does not fall within the scope of the present paper. Yet, I would like to give an indication of the use of Livy's Patavinity in the later early modern period. I will do so by briefly referring to two authors from the second half of the 18th century: the English scientist Joseph Priestley (1733-1804) and the German scholar and education reformer Friedrich Gedike (1754-1803). Both scholars stress the existence of dialectal variation within Latin, for which Livy's Patavinity is used as a piece of proof par excellence. Yet, they must grant that there is no evidence to support this, because Latin had a (quasi-)uniform standard language in writing, which left (almost) no trace of dialectal variation to posterity.³⁶ Thus, their approach to Livy's *Patauinitas* appears to be more or less in line with that of scholars of the period 1500-1680, although Priestley

³⁴ See, e.g., Vincenzo Borghini's (1515-80) *Della lingua contadinesca*, in which he refers to Plautus' *Trinummus* 608, where a Praenestine phrase (*tam modo*) is mocked at. See Vincenzo Borghini, *Scritti inediti o rari sulla lingua*, ed. John Robert Woodhouse (Bologna, 1971), 141.

³⁵ Zuber, "Littérature et urbanité" (see above, n. 3), 88. See, e.g., brief treatises on this topic by, among others, Jacopo Facciolati (1682-1769), "Ex Iacobi Facciolati orationibus et aliis ad artem dicendi pertinentibus Patauii anno MDCCXLIV. editis, epistola X. de T. Liuii Patauinitate," in *T. Liuii Patauini Historiarum ab urbe condita libri*, [...], ed. Arn. Drakenborch (Stutgardiae, 1828), vol. 15, 472-3.

³⁶ See Joseph Priestley, *A Course of Lectures on the Theory of Language, and Universal Grammar* (Warrington, 1762), 138, and Friedrich Gedike, "Ueber Dialekte, besonders die griechischen," *Berlinsches Magazin der Wissenschaften und Künste* 1/2 (1782), 1-26, there 2.

and Gedike seem to put stronger emphasis on the impossibility to reveal the true nature of Livy's "Paduanness."

Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO) & KU Leuven