ABOUT THE LIMITS OF METALANGUAGE: AN ESSAY ON THE MODELISATION OF LATIN GRAMMATICAL LEXICOGRAPHY[1]

Marco Antonio GUTIÉRREZ
University of Pais Vasco, Spain

Abstract

Progress in methodology in specific fields is usually very closely linked to the technological progress in other areas of knowledge. This justifies the fact that lexicographical techniques have had to wait for the arrival of the IT era of the last decades of the 20th century in order to be able to create specialised electronic dictionaries which can house and systemise enormous amounts of information which can later be dealt with quickly and efficiently.

This study proposes a practical-methodological model which aims to solve the grammatical treatment of adverbs in Ancient Latin. We have suggested a list of 5 types, in a decreasing order from a greater to lesser degree of specialisation; technical (T), semi-technical (S-T), instrumental-valued (I-V), instrumental-descriptive (I-D), instrumental-expository (I-E).

Key words: *lexicography, modelisation,* (*semi-*)*technical, Latin, adverbs*

Résumé

La méthodologie des langages de spécialité est liée du processus technologique. Jusqu'à l'ère IT des dernières décennies du XXe siècle, les techniques lexicographiques n'étaient pas assez développées. Le progrès technique dans le domaine de la lexicographie est constitué par la création des dictionnaires électroniques spécialisés, qui réunissent et systématisent beaucoup d'informations, rapidement et de manière efficiente.

Par cette étude on propose un modèle pratique-méthodologique qui résolve le traitement grammatical des adverbes du latin ancien. On a propose une liste qui comprend 5 types, en ordre décroissant, du plus haut degré de spécialisation au plus bas: technique (T), semi-technique (S-T), à valeur instrumentale (I-V), instrumental-descriptif (I-D), instrumental-expositif (I-E).

Mots-clés: *lexicographie, modélisation,* (*semi*)*technique, latin, adverbes*

[1] I would like to thank the MICINN for financial support (HUM2007-65331).

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

1. Introduction

Modern day technical Latin lexicography took its first steps between the last decades of the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th with works such as *De grammaticism vocabulis apud latinos* (Job, 1893), *Contribution to Latin Lexicography* (*Nettleship, 1889*). *La Grammaire latine selon les latins du Ive et du Ve siècle* (*Lambert, 1908*), *De Prisciani studiis Graecis* (Luscher, 1912) or *Die Grammatische Terminologie bei Quintilian* (Schreiner, 1954).

Studies carried out in this field with this type of terminology did not advance much throughout the best part of the 20th century. Marouzeau (1931: 32) pointed out then that «[u]n des aspects les moins étudiés du vocabulaire latin est celui de la langue technique», although, as he also indicated on another occasion, «[o]n s'aperçevrait vite, en appliquant ces suggestions à l'étude de la terminologie des sciences et des arts à Rome [...], à quel point l'histoire du vocabulaire latin commun en serait enrichie et illustrée» (Marouzeau, 1931: 32). However, by this time, scholars such as Stéphanidès (1925) had already proposed some very ambitious theoretical objectives:

1. trouver la signification qu'un terme avait dans une école scientifique ou pendent une période de l'histoire de la science, c'est-à-dire, déterminer les phases de la terminologie antique;

2. faire apparaître la confusion éventuelle entre des termes rencontrés chez les écrivains non spécialistes et signaler les dénominations erronées données par les dictionnaires actuels;

3. relever les termes de la langue ordinaire qui eu dans la science une signification particulière et noter leur valeur comme termes techniques.

Several decades later things had still not changed much and De Saint-Denis (1943: 56-57) looked for reasons which would justify such neglect in a) the complexity of the topic: «après avoir groupé le matériel qui constitue chaque langue spéciale, il ne suffit pas de dresser des statistiques et d'aligner des chiffres; reste un travail élémentaire, mais indispensable: préciser la signification de chaque terme»; and b) the lack of interest shown in a task such as this with the consequent indifference on behalf of the investigators: «[t]ravail humiliant; que de leçons de modestie! Que de

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

vocables dont la signification reste floue, en dépit des progrès de la linguistique, de la lexicographie, de l'histoire des civilisations, techniques et réalités anciennes!».

Collart (1964: 229) describes a similar situation in the second half of the 20th century: «[i]l es un type de recherche qui ne semble guère, jusqu'à présent, avoir tenté les philologues de façon systématique: c'est l'étude du vocabulaire technique grammatical par lui-même».

With the arrival of the IT era, which for the first time ever made it much easier to deal with huge amounts of information, the first electronic instruments for technical Latin lexicography were made. Among them, two are worthy of mention, *El Index Grammaticus*: *An Index to Latin Grammar Texts*, by Valeria Lomando and Nino Marinone (1990), which was in fact more of an *Index Generalis*, as all the words used by the Latin grammarians in their treatises were to be found there. The other is *Prisciani Intitutionum grammaticalium Indices et Concordantiae* by Cirilo García and Marco A. Gutiérrez (1999-2001). In order to assess the importance and range of the lexicographic instruments two things must be kept in mind: firstly, we are dealing with concordances (and indexes) of the most important work in ancient Latin grammar; and secondly, and no less important, they are the first concordances to be included in Latin and Greek texts in their respective alphabets.

Colombat (2002: 299) is to be found at the other extreme in methodology and proposes the following in his plan to make a *Diccionaire de la terminologie linguistique*: «[a]ctuellement nous avons retenu environ 160 entrées qui correspondent à une centaine de concepts fondamentaux, concernant le noyau de base de la grammaire». This is a provisional list as the degree of detail to be included has not yet been decided. As Colombat himself (2001: 300, n. 5 and n. 6) points out, «les anciens reconnaissent dans le *genus nominum* cinq categories [...], que nous n'avons pas reconnues comme entrées; pour les gendres des verbes, ils admettent également cinq catégories [...]. Nous n'avons admis en entrée que les *deponens*». And in the following footnote: «[l]es différents modes: *indicativus*, *imperativus*, *conjunctivus*, ou *subjunctivus*, *optativus*, n'ont pas fait l'object d'une entrée séparée». It is, therefore, evident that the author has opted for such a simple

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

strategy that his aim seems to be a "basic lexicon" of Latin grammatical terminology rather than a dictionary.

We believe that the method of work chosen is somewhat contradictory when we observe how the author in question (Colombat, 2001: 303) finishes his study: «[s]i nous voulons vraiment comprendre la terminologie linguistique actuelle, nous n'avons d'autre choix que d'étudier en profondeur, c'est-à-dire dans leur contexte, les termes latins (et grecs) dont elle est issue». In our opinion, the selection of (semi)-technical terminology and its appropriate contextualisation, together with an efficient systemisation, are the basic objectives so that a lexicographical instrument of this type can be really valid.

Recently the outstanding work of Samantha Schad (2007) entitled *A Lexicon of Latin Grammatical Terminology* has finally filled the void in the field of Latin grammar lexicography that has existed since the early 20th century and was brought to light by the authors, Marouzeau, Stéphanidès, De Saint-Denis and Collart, as we mentioned earlier. The author herself refers to recent times in the Introduction by saying (Schad, 2007: XVII): «major developments have taken place in the study of ancient grammar, and the computer technology has facilitated the construction of concordances and the comprehensive analysis of text. The time was ripe for a fresh sally into the field».

The basic contents of reference in Schad's work are very often laid-out as if they were a kind of semi-concordance, as Swiggers points out (2009: 2): "It is intended […] as a reference-list (if not a concordance)". However, it does seem surprising that the British lexicographer has not used the previously mentioned concordances of Priscian[2].

Schad's work has rightly been welcomed by experts and has been acclaimed "a major work of reference in the field of ancient grammar" (Uría, 2008: 177), or "a major gap in the scholarly literature on Latin grammar by providing a comprehensive and largely reliable dictionary of Latin grammatical terminology" (Swiggers, 2009: 1). Nevertheless, these

[2] This conclusion was arrived at, not only because she does not list them in the main body of her work or in the final bibliography, but in particular because had she used them she would have optimised the term selection process itself, as you will see further on.

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

same critics in their respective reviews on Schad's work state that there are frequent incongruities, not only in the layout and presentation, but even in the selection of the technical terminology chosen or/and omitted. The latter is particularly significant as this seems to be due to a certain ambiguity or lack of coherence in the principles that inspire this selection process. In our opinion there are two main causes for these apparent contradictions: on the one hand, the selection of possible words in the category of "technical" is not as exhaustive as it should be. On the other hand, the limits of the concept of the word "technical" have not been defined from the beginning and in many cases the *modus operandi* seems to be intuitive, which may explain the reason for, but does not justify, the many contradictions and incongruities. In other words, Schad's *Lexicon* offers a substantial increase in data and information compared to other previous lexicographic instruments but the quantitative jump is not accompanied by a similar qualitative improvement with regards to the refinement in the methods of work chosen here.

2. Problems with methods and limits

From the comments made in the previous paragraph, two closely linked consequences can be deduced. For one thing, it seems to us that one condition to be kept in mind from the beginning in the production of a modern lexicographic instrument is the knowledge of all possible terms that could be considered such in any given moment. This implies that not only the words that are permanently used (or in general) with a special value are of interest, but also that those used only occasionally or those which can have a semi-technical use, i.e. those words which depending on the context, can have a specialised semantic twist which goes beyond its normal use.

Bearing in mind that this type of context is often the breeding ground for the germination and development of terminology which often ends up being markedly technical, then the interests shown from various viewpoints – of lexicography, historic semantics and historiography linguistics – can be well understood There is no lack of interest either if we point out here that in these types of situations there can sometimes be doubts as to whether or not we have before us a completely specialised use or not, as in our opinion

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

the technical/non-technical dichotomy seems to be inappropriate for the sort of problem being dealt with here, because what is really being discovered in the evolution of such words are the different phases of a process. Colombat (2001: 301) became perfectly aware of these kinds of problems when he commented the following: «il y a beaucoup de termes très vagues au départ, et qui se sont ensuite spécialisés [...]. Mais certains termes ont gardé leur sens initial à cotè du sens spécialisé, avec pour conséquence de nombreuses ambiguïtés».

We understand that in order to carry out this first selection which we propose, the guide of a mere *Index Grammaticus* like the one compiled by Valeria Lomanto and Nino Marinone might not be enough, however detailed it may be. We suggest beginning with some concordances from the corpus to use as a reference. This proposal would help to improve the process of selection of terms, especially with unjustifiable omissions or/and contradictions which could lead to the validity of the final result being questioned. Nevertheless, there is still one more aspect to be resolved, which in our opinion is crucial. We try to demonstrate this below.

Beyond incoherencies and specific contradictions found in small groups of words lies the problem of substantiating the general premise that serves to establish, a) the limits of selecting terms in a systemised way and in a complimentary way, b) the principles that guide the efficient systemisation of it, allowing its own internal coherence to favour an efficient query of the results obtained

We have already commented on how the method used by Schad (2007) in the selection and layout of material is certainly worthy of praise because it amounts to an enormous qualitative leap compared with others who have tried it before her. Yet at the same time, we have also pointed out that this lexicographer has apparently failed to use the concordances from the complete works of Priscian (Published in Olms, Hildesheim, 8 volumes, 1999-2003) as a basis to carry out her work. Furthermore, we also suspect that she did not use any concordances either from complete or partial texts in Latin from where she obtained the extracts quoted in every entry.

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

This way of working has only lead to the defects and shortcomings being criticized in Uría (2008) and Swiggers, (2009)[3]. Perhaps the most important is the one referring to the way in which limits should be established. Given that Schad's method of work in this aspect seems to be somewhat intuitive, as a preliminary stage for a selection of candidates to be on the list of the technical lexicon we suggest beginning with virtual concordances. The solution to the problem seems to be in the elaboration of a first draft of such candidates that after a series of refinements can be established and set permanently.

Her method of working could be valid and materially possible if the length of the texts dealt with were limited. However, not only is this not the case, but the enormous complexity of systemising all the possible variables that could arise for our proposal must be taken into account as well.

It is now necessary to find a realistic alternative to what has been mentioned above. Perhaps various candidates can be presented, yet in our opinion the most effective solution, from both theoretical and practical points of view, is to use a scaled down model of the problem. For the procedure to be valid, two things must be kept in mind: firstly, the type of terminology must be representative; and secondly, the sample reference taken into consideration must be long enough for the representative amount to appear in it, not only the candidate terms but also the possible specific uses these may have[4].

So, as far as our proposal of the first premise to have a scaled down model is concerned, together with the objectives we have pointed out, we believe that adverbs are the best candidates. Adverbs happen to be the words that least appear in technical lexicographical instruments. A perfect example of this can be found in *Diccionario de termimnología gramatical griega* by

[3] It is true that the reviewers have not finished with the catalogue of deficiencies to be found in Schad's Lexicon, but we believe now it is not the time to go into this any further.

[4] The sample should be homogeneous in both the subject matter and its general approach. In other words, it should be only one study and it is also possible that by having only one author instead of various would help obtain results.

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

Bécares Botas (1985), where adverbs are not mentioned as independent lemma but only in the development of some[5].

Although adverbs appear in specialist lexicographical instruments almost as a residual type of word compared to nouns, adjectives and even verbs, such circumstances are particularly useful every time the situation that is "prototypically marginal" can be the one that gives more information and clues in relation to the characteristics that define such a borderline position between technical and semi technical (and its variants) as we will demonstrate further on.

On the other hand, we understand that no other work would be more suitable and significant for the objectives that we are pursuing here than the Priscian's *Institutio Grammaticae,* not only for its relevance to the history of the Latin grammar, but also for its considerable size in offering optimum objective conditions in relation to the *desiderata* already mentioned.

Here are a few statistics that will help give us some idea as to the possible differences in the end results when using different methods of work.

In Colombat's (2001) proposal we can record a total of 161 terms, none of which are adverbs; 137 in Rosier's (1992) list where there are no adverbs either; Schad's (2007), where the number rises to 1,439 (according to Swiggers, (2009) according to Uría (2008: 182), the total sum could reach 1500). From these lists only 102 are adverbs, which is about 7%, a percentage that should not be scorned at.

On the other hand, in the DECOTGREL we found a total of 211 terms, which are adverbs susceptible to have a (semi)-technical use, which means a quantitative increase of 109 terms, a 106.8% increase compared to Schad's work. Besides, we must not forget that, at least in theory, Schad´s work includes the entire Latin treatises in question, whereas our work only refers to Priscian's *Institutio Grammaticae*.

The previous data seems to indicate that according to our method the number of adverbs that could appear in a technical lexicographical instrument is much greater than could be expected. For that reason it seems

[5] See, for example, the case of the term *pneumatikôs* (Bécares Botas, 1985: s.v. *pneumatikós*).

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

logical that choosing the category of adverbs as a model for the method of selecting the technical terms could be an advantage, at least where the delimitation of the (semi)-technical concept is concerned.

In the following section there is a Table where column 2 shows the 102 adverbs listed in Schad's work. A number preceded by three hyphens and followed by an asterisk indicates that this word is not included in Schad's list and the relative number it has in the said "missing" list, reaching a total of 109. a.

In column 3 (PRISCIAN) the sequence of numbers preceded by three hyphens and "&" symbol indicates that the respective term in column 2 has not been included in Priscian's work. A total of 47.

In column 4 (INSTIT), we record the number of appearances that the term in column 3 has in Priscian's work. Such appearances have been written as follows; firstly the information relating to *Priscianus minor* and secondly, separated by "//" those concerning *Priscianus maior*, while at the same time pairs of data separated by "/" means that the figure on the left refers to the number of times this has a (semi)-technical use, and the figure on the right, the total number of uses recorded in the work in question. The data is broken down in this way because we believe that both the absolute number of appearances of a term and the relative (semi)-technical/non-technical use could be of great importance in this study.

In column 5 (ETYM) terms etymologically related to the adverb that also have (semi)-technical uses are listed.

Columns 6 (SYNO) and 7 (ANTON) list (semi)-technical terms which have a more or less close relation in synonymy and antonymy with the referred adverb.

In column 8 (ALTER) there are terms which could coincide, but do not necessarily have a relation of synonymy or antonymy. In columns 5, 6, 7 and 8 abbreviations are used: S (= Schad) and P (= Priscian).

In column 9 (Q) we indicate which of the five types of adverbs, established by us for their study and classification, they belong to. The abbreviations used here are; T = technical; S-T = semi-technical; I-V = Instrumental-valued; I-D = Instrumental-descriptive; I-E: = Instrumental – expository.

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

Column 10 (q) indicates whether the adverb in question has a single (semi)-technical use or alternates between specialist use and general (=g) use.

2. Table of Latin Technical Adverbs

N°	SCHAD	PRISCIAN	INSTIT	ETYM	SYN.	ANT.	ALTER	Q	q
1.	Absolute	Absolute	(9/9) // (9/9)	Absolutus <S,P>	Intransitive >S,P>		Discretive, transi Tive >S, P; S,P>	T	/g
2.	Absolutive	--- 1&	---	Absolutivus >S,--->	---	---	Comparative, su perlative >S,T; S,--->	T	/T
3.	--- 1*	Absurde	(0/0) // (1/1)	Absurdus < ---,P>	Recte >---,P>	Rationabiliter >---,P>	---	I-V	/g
4.	Abusive	Abusive	(0/0) // (7/7)	Abusivus <S,--->	---	Proprie >S,P>	---	I-V	/g
5.	Active	Active	(2/2) // (8/8)	Activitas, acti vus <S,---; S,P>	---	Passive >S,P>	---	T	/T
6.	Adverbialiter	Adverbialiter	(2/2) // (2/2)	Adverbium, ad verbialis <S,P; S,P>	---	---	Verbaliter, inter iective, participialiter >S,---; S,P; S,--->	T	/T
7.	Aequaliter	--- 2&	---	Aequalitas, ae qualis <S,---; S,P>	Pariter, similiter > ---,P; S,P>	---	Aliter, inaequaliter >---, P; S,P>	I-D	/g
8.	Affirmative	Affirm.	(10/10) // (0/0)	Affirmatio, affir mativus <S,P; S,P>	Confirma tive >S,P>	---	Dubitative, inter rogative >S,P; S,P>	T	/g
9.	---2*	Aliter	(11/15) // (19/22)	---	---	Pariter >---,P>	Similiter >S,P>	I-D	/g
10.	Analogice	--- 3&	---	Analogia, ana logicus <S,P; S,--->	---	Anomale >S,P>	Congrue >S,P>	T	/T
11.	Anomale	Anomale	(0/0) // (3/3)	Anomalia, ano malus <S,---; S,P>	Incongrue >S,P>	Analogice >S,--->	---	T	/T
12.	---3*	Antique	(0/0) // (7/7)	Antiquitas, anti quus <S,P; S,P>	Olim >---,P>	Nunc >---,P>	Novissime >---,P>	I-D	/g
13.	---4*	Apertissime	(1/1) // (0/0)	Apertus < ---,P>	---	Confuse >S,P>	---	I-V	/g

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

14.	---5*	Apte	(3/3) // (1/1)	Aptus < ---,P>	Congrue, recte >S,P; ---,P>	Incongrue >S,P>	Aptissime, aptius >---,P; ---,P>	I-V	/g
15.	---6*	Aptissime	(9/9) // (3/3)	Aptissimus < ---,P>	Rectissime >---,P>	---	Apte, aptius >---,P;---P>	I-V	/g
16.	--- 7*	Aptius	(3/3) // (3/3)	Aptior < ---,P>	Rectius >---,P>	---	Apte, aptissimus >---,P;---,P>	I-V	/g
17.	Aptote	--- 4&	---	Aptotus <S,P>	---	---	---	T	/T
18.	Aspere	--- 5&	---	Asperitas asper <S, P; S,,P>	---	---	Lêviter, tenuiter >S,---; ---,P>	S-T	/g
19.	--- 8*	Assidue	(0/0) // (1/3)	---	Saepe >---,P>	---	---	I-D	/g
20.	--- 9*	Attente	(1/1) // (0/0)	---	---	---	Attentissime, attentius >---,P;---,P>	I-E	/g
21.	--- 10*	Attentissime	(0/0) // (1/1)	---	---	---	Attente, attentissime >---P;---,P>	I-E	/g
22.	--- 11*	Attentius	(0/0) // (1/1)	---	---	---	Atentte, attentissime >---P;---,P>	I-E	/g
23.	--- 12*	Audacissime	(0/0) // (1/1)	---	---	---	---	I-E	/g
24.	Bisyllabe	Bisyllabe	(0/0) // (1/1)	Bisyllabus <S,P>	---	---	Trissyllabe >S,P>	T	/T
25.	---13*	Bene	(34/49) // (23/51)	---	---	Male > ---,P>	Recte >---,P>	I-V	/g
26.	---14*	Breviter	(1/1) // (12/12)	Brevitas, bre vis <S,P>	---	---	---	I-E	/g
27.	Circumfl.	---6&	---	Circumflecto, circumflexus <S, P; S,P>	---	---	---	T	/T
28.	---15*	Collectim	(0/0) // (1/1)	Colligo, collectivus <---,P; S,P>	---	Separatim >---,P>	---	I-E	/g
29.	Communicative	---7&	---	Communicatio <S,--->	Congregative >S,--->	---	---	T	/T

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

30.	Communiter	Communiter	(3/3) // (3/5)	Communis <S,P>	---		Singulariter, plura liter >S, P; S,P>	T	/g
31.	Comparative	Comparative	(0/0) // (1/1)	Comparativ us <S,P>	---	---	Positive, superlative >S,P; S,--- >	T	/T
32.	---16*	Comprobative	(1/1) // (0/0)	Comprobo <---,P>	---	---	Interrogative >S,P>	T	/T
33.	Confirmative	Confirmative	(10/10) // (1/1)	Confim atio, confir mativus <S,P; S,P>	Affirmati ve >S,P>	---	Dubitative, in terrogative >S,P; S,P>	T	/g
34.	Confuse	Confuse	(2/2) // (0/0)	Confusio, con fusu<S,P; S,P>	---	Congrue, recte >S,P; ---,P>	---	I-V	/g
35.	Congregative	---8&	---	Congregati vus <S,P>	Commun icative >S>	---	---	T	/T
36.	Congrue	Congrue	(5/5) // (2/2)	Congruitas, con gruus <S,P; S,P>	Recte, convenie nter >---, P; ---, P>	Incongru e >S,P>	Iure >---,P>	I-V	/g
37.	Coniuncte	Coniuncte	(1/1) // (0/0)	Coniungo, con iunctio <S,P; S,P>	Coniunct im, co pulate, iuncte >-- --, P; ---,P; S,--- >	Separate > S;---,P>	---	I-D	/g
38.	---17*	Coniunctim	(0/0) // (1/1)	Coniungo, con iunctio <S,P; S,P>	Coniunct e, con pulate, iuncte > S,P; S,---; S,--- >	Separate > S;---,P>	---	I-D	/g
39.	---18*	Continue	(0/0) // (1/1)	Continuatio <S,P>	---	Separate > S;---,P>	Coniuncte, con pulate, iuncte > S,P; S,---; S,--- >	I-D	/g
40.	---19*	Contra	(12/26) // (15/71)	---	---	Sic(ut), similiter >---, P; S,P>	---	I-D	/g
41.	---20*	Convenienter	(2/2) // (1/1)	Convenio <S,P>	Congrue, recte > S,P; ---, P>	Incongru e >S,P>	---	I-V	/g

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

42.	Copulate	---9&	---	Copulatio, copu latus <S,---; S,P>	Coniunct e, con iunctim, iuncte > S,P; ---,P; S,--->	Separate > S;---,P>	---	I-D	/g
43.	Correpte	Correpte	Corresp tio, correp tus <S,---; S,P>	---	Cursim >S,--->	Producte, tractim >S,P; S,--->	---	T	/T
44.	Corrupte	---10&	---	Corruptio, cor ruptus <S,P; S,P>	Vitiose >---, P>	Incorrupt e >A,--->	---	I-V	/g
45.	Cursim	----11&	---	---	Correpte >S,--->	Producte, tractim >S,P; S,--->	---	S-T	/g
46.	Declinative	---12&	---	Declino <S,P>	Mobiliter >S,--->	Aptote, immobili ter >S,---; S,--->	---	T	/T
47.	---21*	Deinde	(1/7) // (4/18)	---	---	---	Primum >---,P>	I-E	/g
48.	Demonstrative	Demostrative	(1/1) // (1/1)	Demostro, de mosntrartio, de mosntrativu s <S,P; S, P; S,P>	---	---	Relative >S,P>	T	/g
49.	---22*	Difficile	(0/0) // (4/5)	Difficilis <P>	---	Facile >---, P>	---	I-D	/g
50.	Diminutive	Diminutive	(0/0) // (1/1)	Diminuo, dimi nutio, diminutivus <SP; S P; SP>	---	---	---	T	/T
51.	---23*	Discrete	(0/0) // (2/2)	Discretio, dis cretus<S,P; ---,P>	Distincte >---,P >	Indiscret e >S, --->	Discretive, dis tinctive, >S,P; S,P>	I-D	/g
52.	Discretive	Discretive	(1/1) // (0/0)	Discretio, dis cretivus<S, P; S,P>	---	Absolute	Discrete, distinctive >---,P; S, P>	T	/T
53.	Dispariliter	---13&	---	Disparilitas, dispa rilis <S,--->	---	Aequalite r >S,--->	---	I-D	/g

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

54.	Dissimiliter	---14&	---	Dissimilitudo, dissimilis <S, ---; S,P>	---	Similiter >S,P>	---	I-D	/g
55.	---24*	Distincte	(0/0) // (2/2)	Distinctio, distinctus <S,---; ---,P>	Discrete >---,P>	Indiscrete > S,--->	Discrete, distinctive, >S,P; S,P>	I-D	/g
56.	Distinctive	Distinctive	(1/1) // (0/0)	Distinctio <S,--->	---	---	Distincte, discrete >---,P; S,P	T	/T
57.	Dubitanter	Dubitanter	(1/1) // (0/0)	Dubitatio, dubitandi <S,P; S,P>	---	---	Indubitanter <---, P>	S-T	/g
58.	Dubitative	Dubitative	(3/3) // (2/2)	Dubitatio, dubitandi, dubitativus <S, P; S,P; S,P>	---	Confirmative >S,P>	Dubitanter >S,P>	T	/g
59.	Enclitice	Enclitice	(0/0) // (1/1)	Encliticus <S, P>	---	---	---	T	/T
60.	Exiliter	---15&	---	Exilitas, exilis (S,---; S,P)	---	---	---	S-T	/g
61.	---25*	Etiam	(273/283) // (849/856)	---	Quoque >---,P>	---	---	I-D	/g
62.	---26*	Facile	(1/4) // (8/15)	Facilitas, facilis <---,P; ---, P>	---	Difficile >---,P>	---	I-D	/g
63.	Feminine	Feminine	(0/0) // (1/1)	Femininus <S,P>	---	---	Masculine, neu traliter >S,---; S,P>	T	/T
64.	Frequentative	---16&	---	Frequentativus (S,P)	---	---	---	T	/T
65.	---27*	Fere	(6/6) // (26/35)	---	---	---	Semper, numquam >---,P; ---,P>	I-D	/g
66.	---28*	Figurate	(18/18) // (42/42)	Figuratio, figuratus <S,P; S,P>	Translative >S,P>	---	---	I-V	/T
67.	---29*	Forte	(1/11) // (7/23)	---	---	---	---	I-D	/g

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

68.	---30*	Frequenter	(49/49) // (40/40	Frequens, <---, P;	Saepe >---,P>	---	Frequentius, fre quentissime >---, P; --,P>	I-D	/g
69.	---31*	Frequentissime	(29/29) // (12/12	---	Saepissime >---,P>	---	Frequenter, fre quentius >---, P; ---,P>	I-D	/g
70.	---32*	Frequentius	(7/7) // (14/14)	Frequentior <---,P>	Sapeius >---, P>		Frequenter, fre quentissime >---, P; ---,P>	I-D	/g
71.	---33*	Generaliter	(12/12) // (3/4)	Generalis <S,P>	---	---	Frequentissime, saepeissime <---,P; ---,P>	I-D	/g
72.	---34*	Graece	(1/1) // (5/6)	Graecus <---,S,>	---	---	Latine >S,P>	S-T	/g
73.	Graviter	---17&	---	Gravis <S,P>	---	---	---	S-T	/g
74.	Immobiliter	---18&	---	Immobilis <S,P>	Aptote, immobiliter > S,--->	Declinative, mobiliter >S,---; S,--- >	---	T	/T
75.	Imperative	Imperative	(1/1) // (0/0)	Imperativus <S,P>	---	---	Indicative, opta tive, >S, P; S,P>	T	/T
76.	Impersonaliter	---19&	---	Impersonalis <S,P>	---	Personaliter >S, --->	---	T	/g
77.	---35*	Iam	(6/25) // (27/79)	---	---	---	Nondum >---,P>	I-E	/g
78.	Inaequaliter	Inaequaliter	(0/0) // (1/1)	Inaequalitas, inaequalis <S, P; S,P>	Anomale >S,P>	Analogice >S, --->	Incongrue >S,P>	I-V	/g
79.	Inchoative	---20&	---	Incohativus <S,P>	---	---	---	T	/T
80.	---36*	Inconcinne	(1/1) // (0/0)	Iconcinnitas <---,P>	Vitiose >---,P>	Poetice >S,P>	---	I-V	/g
81.	Incongrue	Incongrue	(5/5) // (2/2)	Incongruitas, incongruus <S, P; S,P>	---	Congrue >S,P>	Anomale >S,P>	I-V	/g
82.	Incorrupte	---21&	---	Incorruptus <S,--->	---	Corrupte >S	Latine >S,P>	I-V	/g

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

83.	Indicative	Indicative	(0/0) // (2/2)	Indicatio, indi cativus <S,P; S,P>	---	---	Optati ve, Impe rative >S,P; S,P>	T	/T
84.	Indifferenter	Indifferenter	(2/2) // (4/4)	Indiferentia , in diferens <S,---; S,--->	Indistinct e >S,--->	Distincte > ---,P>	Indiscrete >S,--->	I-D	/g
85.	Indiscrete	---22&	---	Indiscretus <S,P>	---	---	Semper >[S],P>	I-D	/g
86.	---37*	Indistanter	(0/0) // (1/1)	---	---	---	---	S-T	/g
87.	Indistincte	---23&	---	Indistinctus <S,--->	Indiferen ter >S,P>	Distincte > ---,P>	Indiscrete >S,--->	I-D	/g
88.	---38*	Indubitanter	(2/2) // (1/1)	Indubitabili s <---,P>	---	Dubitant er >S,P	---	I-D	/g
89.	---39*	Irrationabiliter	(2/2) // (13/13)	Irrationabili s <S,P	Anomale , vitio e >S,P; ---,P>	Analogic e >S,--- >	---	I-V	/g
90.	Integre	---24&	---	Integritas, inte ger <S,---;S,P>	---	---	---	I-D	/g
91.	Interiective	Interiective	(0/0) // (1/1)	Interiectio <S,P>	---	---	Adverbialiter >S,P>	T	/T
92.	Interrogative	Interrogative	(10/10) // (0/0)	Interrogatio , in terrogativus <S,P; S,P>	---	---	Confirmative, relative >S,P; S,P>	T	/g
93.	Intransitive	Intransitive	(18/18) // (2/2)	Intransitivu s <S,P>	---	Transitiv e >S,P>	---	T	/T
94.	Iuncte	---25&		Iungo Iunctura <S,P; S,P>	Coiniunc te, con iunctim, copula te >S,P; S,---; ---,P>	Discretiv e, sepa rate >S,P; ---,P>	---	I-D	/g
95.	---41*	Invicem	(8/16) // (6/6)	---	---	---	---	I-D	/g
96.	---42*	Iure	(6/9) // (26/29)	Ius <S,--->	Congrue, iuste >S,P; ---,P>	Incongru e >S,P>	Recte >---,P>	I-V	/g
97.	---43*	Iuste	(0/0) // (1/1)	Iustus <S,P>	Congrue, iure >S,P; ---,P>	Incongru e >S,P>	Recte >---,P>	I-V	/g

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

98.	---44*	Iuxta	(1/2) // (4/8)	---	---	Longe >---,P>	---	I-D	/g
99.	---45*	Late	(0/0) // (3/5)	---	---	---	Latius, latissime >---,P; ---,P>	I-D	/g
100.	Latine	Latine	(0/0) // (1/3)	Latinus <S,P>	---	---	Graece >---,P>	S-T	/g
101.	---46*	Latissime	(1/1) // (0/0)	---	---	---	Late, latius >---,P; ---,P>	I-D	/g
102.	---47*	Latius	(7/7) // (17/17)	---	---	---	Late, latissime >---,P; ---,P>	I-D	/g
103.	Legitime	---26&	---	---	Congrue, iure >S,P; ---,P>	Incongrue >S,P>	Recte >---,P>	I-V	/g
104.	Leniter	---27&	---	Lenitas, lenis <S,---; S,P>	---	---	---	S-T	/g
105.	Leviter	---28&	---	Levitas, levis <S,--; S,;P>	---	Aspere, graviter >S,---; S-->	---	S-T	/g
106.	Lêviter	---29&	---	Levitas, levis <S,---; S,;P>	---	Aspere >S,--->	---	S-T	/g
107.	Localiter	---30&	---	Localis <S,P>	---	---		T	/g
108.	---48*	Longe	(1/2) // (2/7)	Longus <S,P>	---	Iuxta >---,P>	---	I-D	/g
109.	Mobiliter	---31&	---	Mobilitas, mo bilis <S,---; S,P>	---	Immobiliter >S,--->	Declinative >S,--->	T	/g
110.	---49*	Magis	(23/34) // (111/126)	---	---	Minus >---,P>	Maxime >---,P>	I-D	/g
111.	---50*	Male	(0/0) // (5/11)	Malus <---,P>	---	Bene >---,P>	Anomale, incon grue >S,p; S,P>	I-V	/g
112.	Masculine	---32&	---	Masculinus <S,T>	---	---	Feminine, neutra liter >S, P; S,P>	T	/T

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

113.	---51*	Maxime	(30/36 // (44/50	---	---	Minime >---,P>	Magis >---,P>	I-D	/g
114.	---52*	Melius	(4/6) // (19/28)	---	---	---	---	I-V	/g
115.	---53*	Minime	(6/8) // (16/20)	---	---	Maxime >---,P>	Minus >---,P>	I-D	/g
116.	---54*	Minus	(2/11) // (8/23)	---	---	Magis >---,P>	Minime >---,P>	I-D	/g
117.	Naturaliter	Naturaliter	(7/7) // (34/34)	Natura, naturalis <S,P; S,P>	---	---	---	I-V	/g
118.	---55*	Necessario	(20/20) // (28/29)	Neccesitas <S,P>	---	---	---	I-D	/g
119.	Neutraliter	Neutraliter	(0/0) // (2/2)	Neutralis <S,P>	---	---	Masculine, femi nine >S,---;S,P>	T	/T
120.	---56*	Nimium	(1/3) // (0/14)	---	---	---	---	I-D	/g
121.	---57*	Nondum	(3/4) // (1/3)	---	---	---	Iam >---,P>	I-D	/g
122.	---58*	Novissime	(0/0) // (1/1)	Novitas, novi ssimus <S,---; S,--->	Nuper >---,P>	---	Antique, olim >---,P; ---P>	I-D	/g
123.	---59*	Nunc	(4/29) // (47/106)	---	---	---	---	I-D	/g
124.	---60*	Numquam	(4/13) // (45/65)	---	---	Semper >S,P>	Nusquam >---,P>	I-D	/g
125.	---61*	Nuper	(0/3) // (1/6)	---	Novissim e >---,P>	---	---	I-D	/g
126.	---62*	Nusquam	(1/3) // (1/3)	---	---	---	Numquam >---,P>	I-D	/g
127.	Optative	Optative	(1/1) // (0/0)	Optatio, optativus <S,---; S,P>	---	---	Indicative, Impe rative >S,P; S,P>	T	/T

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

128.	---63*	Olim	(0/5) // (1/16)	---	---	Nuper >---,P>	Novissime, anti que >---,P; ---,P>	I-D	/g
129.	---63*	Omnimodo	(3/8) // (7/13)	---	---	Omnino >---,P>	---	I-D	/g
130.	---65*	Omnino	(2/2) // (5/8)	---	---	Omnimodo >---,P>	---	I-D	/g
131.	---66*	Oportune	(6/6) // (1/1)	Oportunus >---,P>	---	---	---	I-V	/g
132.	---67*	Optime	(0/3) // (1/3)	Optimus <---,P>	---	---	---	I-E	/g
133.	---68*	Paene	(3/3) // (26/29)	---	---	---	Plerumque >---,P>	I-D	/g
134.	---69*	Pariter	(0/0) // (8/10)	---	---	Aliter >---,P>	Aequaliter, simi liter >S,---; S,P>	I-D	/g
135.	Participialiter	---33&	---	Participium, participialis <S,P; S,P>	---	---	Adverbialiter, verbaliter, inter iective >S,P; S, P; S,P>	T	/T
136.	Passive	Passive	(3/3) // (36/36)	Passivitas, pa ssivus <S,---; S,P>	---	Active >S,P>	---	T	/g
137.	Patronymice	---34&	---	Patronymicus <S,--->	---	---	---	T	/T
138.	---70*	Penitus	(6/7) // (9/19)	---	---	---	---	I-D	/g
139.	---71*	Perfecte	(0/0) // (1/1)	Perfectio, per fectus <S,P>	Integre >S,--->	---	---	I-V	/g
140.	Personaliter	---35&	---	Persona, per sonalis <S,P; S,--->	---	---	---	T	/g
141.	Personative	---36&	---	Personativus <S,--->	---	---	---	T	/T
142.	Pinguiter	---37&	Pinguitudo, pinguis <S,---; S--->	---	---	Tenuiter >S,--->	Plene >S,--->	S-T	/g

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

143.	---72*	Plane	(0/0) // (3/3)	Planus <---,P>	---	---	---	I-D	/g
144.	Plene	---38&	---	Plenitudo, ple nus <S, P; ---,P>	Pinguiter >S,--->	Semiplene >S,--->	Plenius, plenissime >---,P; ---,P	S-T	/g
145.	---73*	Plenissime	(0/0) // (1/1)	---	---	---	Plene, penius >S,---; ---,P>	I-E	/g
146.	---74*	Plenius	(0/0) // (2/2)	---	---	---	Plene, plenissime >S,---; ---,P>	I-E	/g
147.	---75*	Plerumque	(11/12) // (86/94)	---	---	Paene >---,P>	---	I-D	/g
148.	Pluraliter	Pluraliter	(1/1) // (4/6)	Pluralitas, plu ralis <S,---; S,P>	---	Singulariter >S,P>	---	T	/T
149.	---76*	Plus	(2/10) // (14/30)	---	---	Minus >---,P>	---	I-D	/g
150.	Poetice	Poetice	(0/0) // (2/2)	Poetica/e, poeti cus <S,P; S,P>	---	---	---	I-V	/T
151.	Positive	Positive	(3/3) // (0/0)	Positivus <S,P>	---	---	Comparative, su perlative >S,P; S,--->	T	/g
152.	---77*	Potius	(2/4) // (3/13)	---	---	Praecipue >---,P>	---	I-D	/g
153.	Possessive	Possessive	(1/1) // (0/0)	Possessivus <S,P>	---	---	Relative >S,P>	T	/T
154.	---78*	Postremo	(2/2) // (2/4)	Postremus <S,P>	---	Primum >---,P>	Deinde >---,P>	I-E	/g
155.	---79*	Praecipue	(1/1) // (1/4)	---	---	Potius >---,P>	---	I-D	/g
156.	Praepostere	Praepostere	(3/3) // (11/11)	Praeposterus <S,P>	---	---	---	I-V	/g
157.	---80*	Primum	(6/23) // (2/5)	Primus <S,P>	---	Postremo >---,P>	Deinde >---,P>	I-E	/g

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

158.	Producte	Producte	(0/0) // (1/1)	Productio, pro ductus <S,P; S,P>	Cursim >S,--->	Correpte, tractim >S,P; S,--->	---	T	/g
159.	Proprie	Proprie	(7/8) // (33/34)	Proprietas, pro prius <S,P; S,P>	---	Usurpative, vitiose >S,---; ---,P>	Communiter >S,P>	I-V	/g
160.	Pure	---39&	---	Purus <S,P>	---	---	---	I-V	/g
161.	---81*	Quidem	(86/101) // (175/196)	---	---	---	---	I-D	/g
162.	---82*	Quodammodo	(1/1) // (1/1)	---	---	---	---	I-D	/g
163.	---83*	Quomodo	(126/130) // (181/181)	---	---	---	Similiter >---,P>	I-D	/g
164.	---84*	Quondam	(1/9) // (0/11)	---	---	---	---	I-E	/g
165.	---85*	Quoque	(251/258) // (919/930)	---	---	---	Etiam >---,P>	I-D	/g
166.	---86*	Quotiens	(5/11) // (8/11)	---	Semper >S,P>	Numquam >S,P>	---	I-D	/g
167.	---87*	Rationabiliter	(4/4) // (12/12)	Ratio <S,P>	Congrue >S,P>	Incongrue, irrationabiliter >S,T; ---,P>	---	I-V	/g
168.	---88*	Reciproce	(1/1) // (0/0)	Reciprocus <S,P>	---	---	---	S-T	/g
169.	---89*	Recte	(6/11) // (5/13)	Rectus <S,P>	Congrue >S,P>	---	Rectius, rectissime >---,P; ---,P>	I-V	/g
170.	---90*	Rectissime	(1/1) // (1/1)	---	---	---	Recte, rectius >---,P; ---,P>	I-V	/g
171.	---91*	Rectius	(1/1) // (3/6)	---	---	---	Recte, rectissime >---,P; ---,P >	I-V	/g
172.	Regulariter	---40&	---	Regula,regularis <S,P; S,--->	---	Abusive >S,P>	---	I-V	/g

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

173.	Relative	Relative	(3/3) // (0/0)	Relatio, Relativus <S,P>	---	Absolute >S,P>	Active >S,P>	T	/g
174.	Retransitive	Retransitive	(0/0) // (1/1)	Retransitio, re transitivus <S, P; S,P>	---	---	---	T	/T
175.	---92*	Saepe	(19/22) // (56/67)	---	---	Numquam >---,P>	Saepius, saepissime >---,P; ---,P>	I-D	/g
176.	---93*	Saepissime	(5/7) // (9/13)	---	---	Numquam >---,P>	Saepe, saepius >---,P; ---,P>	I-D	/g
177.	---94*	Saepius	(2/5) // (0/3)	---	---	Numquam >---,P>	Saepe, saepissime >---,P; ---,P>	I-D	/g
178.	---95*	Satis	(1/10) // (1/23)	---	---	---	---	I-D	/g
179.	Semiplene	---41&	---	Semiplenus <S,--->	---	Plene >S,--->	---	S-T	/g
180.	Semper [pluralis/ singularis]	Semper	(6/18) // (88/89)	---	---	Numquam, nusquam >---,P; ---,P>	---	I-D	/g
181.	---96*	Separate	(1/1) // (0/0)	Separatio <S,P>	Separatim >---,P>	Coniuncte >S,P>	---	I-D	/g
182.	---97*	Separatim	(1/2) // (14/15)	Separatio <S,P>	Separate >---,P>	Coniuncte >S,P>	---	I-D	/g
183.	---98*	Sic	(80/94) // (176/197)	---	Sicut >---,P>	---	Similiter,quomodo > ---,P; ---,P>	I-D	/g
184.	---99*	Sicut<i>	(19/22) // (184/188)	---	Sic >---,P>	---	Similiter,quomodo > ---,P; ---,P>	I-D	/g
185.	Significanter	---42&	---	Significatio, significans <S, P; S,P>	---	---	---	I-V	/g

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

186.	Similiter	Similiter	(167/168) // (305/305)	Similitudo, simi lis <S, P; S,P>	Aequaliter, pari ter >S,---; ---,P>	Dissimiliter <S,--->	---	I-D	/g
187.	Simpliciter	---43&	---	Simplicitas, simplex <S,P; S,P>	---	---	---	S-T	/g
188.	---101*	Sincere	(0/0) // (1/1/)	Sinceritas, sin cerus <---,P; ---,P>	---	---	Recte >---,P>	I-V	/g
189.	Singulariter	Singulariter	(3/3) // (4/4)	Singularitas, singularis <S,---; S,P>	---	Pluraliter >S,--->	---	T	/g
190.	---102*	Sufficienter	(4/4) // (5/5)	---	---	---	---	I-E	/g
191.	---103*	Superius	(8/8) // (20/21)	---	---	---	Supra >---,P>	I-E	/g
192.	Superlative	---44&	---	Superlatio, super lativus <S,---; S,P>	---	---	Positive, Comparative >S, P; S,P >	T	/T
193.	Supervacue	Supervacue	(2/2) // (0/0)	Supervacuus <S,P>	---	---	---	I-V	/g
194.	Suppositive	Suppositive	(1/1) // (0/0)	Suppositivus <S,P; S,P>	---	---	---	T	/T
195.	---104*	Supra	(96/100) // (295/314)	---	---	---	Superius >---,P>	I-E	/g
196.	Syllabice	Syllabice	(0/0) // (2/2)	Syllaba, syllabicus <S, P; S,P>	---	---	---	T	/T
197.	---105*	Tam	(95/104 [tam quam 88/95])// (268/287 [tam quam 267/268])	---	---	---	Sic, similiter, quomodo >---,P; ---,P; ---,P>	I-D	/g

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

198.	---106*	Tantum	(9/24) // (29/44)	---	---	---	Tamtummodo >---,P>	I-D	/g
199.	---107*	Tantummodo	(2/2) // (12/13)	---	---	---	Tamtum>---,P>	I-D	/g
200.	Tenuiter	---45&	---	Tenuitas, tenuis <S,---; S,P>	---	Pinguiter >S,--->	Leniter, leviter >>	S-T	/g
201.	Tractim	---46&	---	---	Producte >S,P>	Cursim, correpte >S,P; S,--->	---	S-T	/g
202.	Transitive	Transitive	(19/19) // (2/2)	Transitio,transitivus <S,P; S,P>	---	Intransitive >S,P>	---	T	/T
203.	Translative	Translative	(1/1) // (0/0)	Translatio, trans lativus <S,P; S,P>	Figurate >---,P>	---	---	I-V	/g
204.	Trisyllabe	Trisyllabe	(0/0) // (1/1)	Trisyllabus <S,P>	---	---	Bissyllabe >S,P>	T	/T
205.	Varie	Varie	(0/0) // (2/2)	Variatio, varius <S,P; S,P>	---	---	---	I-D	/g
206.	Verbaliter	---47&	---	Verbum, verba lis <S, P; S,P >	---	---	Adverbialiter, interiective, parti cipialiter >S,P; S,P; S,--->	T	/T
207.	---108*	Vbique	(8/9) // (27/31)	---	Semper >S,P>	Numquam, nus quam >---,P; ---,P>	---	I-D	/g
208.	---109*	Vitiose	(0/0) // (1/1)	Vitium <---,P>	Abusive, usur pative >S,P; S,--->	Proprie >S,P>	---	I-V	/g
209.	Vniformiter	---48&	---	Uniformis <S,P>	Analogic e >S,--->	Anomale >S,P>	---	I-V	/T
210.	Vocative	Vocative	(0/0) // (1/1)	Vocativus <S,P>	---	---		T	/T
211.	Vsurpative	---49&	---	Vsurpatio, usur pativus <S,P; S,--->	Abusive, vitio se >S,P; ---,P>	Proprie >S,P>	---	I-V	/g

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

3. Summary and systemisation

3.1. Technical adverbs <T> (58 terms)

Adverbs with a strict technical use which were recorded by Schad or/and Priscian add up to a total of 58. They could be systemised into pairs or groups in a descending order according to their specific technical use, as follows:

A)

Aa.-

active/passive, incohative, indicative, optative, imperative, impersonaliter,

transitive/intransitive, retransitive

verbaliter, participialiter, adverbialiter, interiective, vocative

pluraliter/singulariter

Ab.-

absolute, aboslutive, positive/comparative/superlative, diminutive, relative, feminine/masculine, neutraliter, discretive

Ac.- bissylabe, trissyllabe, circumflexe, communiter, correpte/producte, enclitice

B)

Ba.-

aptote, immobiliter/mobiliter, declinative

Bb.-

affirmative, confirmative, dubitative, interrogative, communicative, congregative, comprobative, demonstrative, distinctive, frequentative, localiter, patronymice, personaliter, personative, possessive, suppositive

C)

Analogice/anomale

3.2. Semi-Technical adverbs <S-T> (17 terms)

A)

cursim/tractim, plene, semiplene, simpliciter, indistanter, pinguiter, aspere, exiliter, graviter, tenuiter, leniter, leviter, lêviter

B)

Graece, Latine

C)

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

dubitanter

3.3. Instrumental-Valued adverbs <I-V> (41 terms)

A)

significanter, naturaliter, poetice, figurate, translative, praepostere

B)

Ba.-

iure, regulariter, uniformiter, iuste, legitime, rationabiliter, proprie, recte, rectius, rectissime, bene, melius, oportune, apte, aptius, aptissime, congrue, covenienter, pure, incorrupte, perfecte, sicere, apertissime

Bb.-

vitiose, male, inaequaliter, absurde, abusive, usurpative, confuse, corrupte, inconcinne, incongrue, irrationabiliter, supervacue

3.4. Instrumental-Descriptive adverbs <I-D> (77 terms)

A)

Aa.-

generaliter, ubique, assidue, quotiens, semper, frequenter, frequentius, frequentissime, plerumque, saepe, saepius, saepissime, praecipue, satis, nunquam, nusquam, plus, magis/minus, maxime/minime, nimium, quoque, etiam, tam, tantum, tantummodo, paene

Ab.- c

oniuncte, coniunctim/separatim, iuncte/separate, copulate, continue, integre, iuxta

Ac.-

late, latissime, longe, fere, nondum

B)

Ba.-

facile/difficile, indubitanter, plane, necessario, discrete, indiscrete, forte,

Bb.-

aequaliter, pariter, similiter/dissimiliter, aliter, dispariliter, distincte, varie, indifferenter, indistincte, omnimodo, omnino, penitus, quodammodo, quomodo, sic, sicuti

Bc.-

quidem, potius, invicem, reciproce, contra

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

C)

antique, olim, novissime, nunc, nuper

3.5. Instrumental-expository adverbs <I-E> (18 terms)

A)

attente, attentius, attentissime, audacissime, optime, plenius, plenissime

B)

sufficienter, breviter, collectim

C)

primum, deinde, postremo, supra, superius, iam, latius, quondam

4. Final conclusions

Absolute data and relative percentages of use of each of the five groups into which we have classified the type of adverbs considered in this work allow us to make our first conclusions.

Total terms: 211

T: 58 terms (27.4%)

S-T: 17 terms (8.0%)

I-V: 41 terms (19.4%)

I-D: 77 terms (36.4%)

I-E: 18 terms (8.5%)

The following sub-totals may be of interest if they are considered in a relative way.

T + S-T: 75 terms (35.5%) = I-D: 77 terms (36.4%)

I-V + I-D: 118 terms (55.9%)

See how the technical terms *par excellence* (T) do not form a majority use and only if they are added to the S-T does the joint percentage rise to be almost the same as the non-technical uses in the sub-section I-D. Whichever way it is looked at, it must be pointed out that the sum of the technical terms (T + S-T = 35.5%) does not reach 50% of the total.

Only if the percentages of I-V (19.4%) and I-D (36.4%) are added together do we get the super type with a majority use (55.8%). However, the assimilation of one or another could be quite arbitrary as there are almost as many reasons to put I-V in relation to I-D as there are with T or S-T.

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

The previous considerations lead us to think that, indeed, the guidelines for the modelling of lexicographical treatment for scientific terminology (technical lexica *lato sensu*) that we propose in the present work are along the right lines concerning the method, not only in reference to the stages of work for the selection of terms but also in the proposed divisions for their systemisation.

The following paragraph contains a brief comment on some of the particular connections that each of the five groups have with the others. Such observations are not intended to exhaust the conclusions that could be obtained from a detailed analysis of all the given data in this general plan, but simply act as a short guide to help better understand the importance and possibilities of our proposal of methodology.

As already mentioned, the terms in group T are not in a majority and it is therefore necessary, in a complimentary way, to point out that almost all the uses of these terms in (semi)-technical work offer a very specialised value. Such adverbs are backed by adjectives or/and nouns with strict and defined technical uses where a close etymological relationship is maintained. Furthermore, on occasions it is necessary to bear such circumstance in mind in order to be able to determine with precision the significant importance of the adverb in question. The limit of the strictly technical adverbs (T) can rival, not only with the semi-technicals (S-T) but with the instrumental Value (I-V) as well. Let us look at a couple of examples. *Correpte* and *producte* are two technical terms which Schad (2007: s.vv.) points out, and mean, respectively, “with a short vowel or syllable” and “with a long pronunciation», at the same time *cursim* and *tractim*”, mean respectively, according to Schad (2007: s.vv.): “with a short pronunciation”, and “in a long drawn-out manner”. In other words, the terms of the first pair (*correpte/producte*) seem to form a perfect opposition of antonyms. This does not happen in the second pair (*cursim/tractim*) where the opposition seems to be symmetrical[6]. The mentioned relevance of a symmetrical opposition between strictly technical adverbs is made more evident in the following pair of adverbs, supposedly antonyms:

[6] Shad (2007: s.v. *tractim*) explains that «[a] drawn-out pronunciation (*sic*) is associated with the circumflex accent».

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

dubitanter/indubitanter. We have included the first in our group of (semi)-technical (S-T) and the other in the Instrumental-descriptive (I-D). This decision has not been arbitral. The fact that Schad (2007: s.v.) included the first but not the second in her Lexicon seems to confirm this. The second also appears several times in Priscian (see the Table above).

Let us have a look at a second example. *Anomale* means that something has been done in an irregular way, i.e. non-analogical. But this does not mean that the use of the form in question is wrong, i.e. it could be described as *abusive* or *vitiose*. This justifies that these last two adverbs (and others of the same type and their opposites) form part of the instrumental-value (I-V) group when *anomale* strictly speaking belongs to the technical (T) group. Please note that on the other hand, once again *analogice/anomale*, when used in technical terms, form a symmetrical opposition – in contrast rather than its equivalent – in the I-V section it is much more varied and disperse. In consequence, the terms are much more imprecise. Here is a sample which is by no means exhaustive: *iure*, *uste*, *regulariter*, *proprie*, *congrue/proprie*, *vitiose*, *abusive*, *absrude*, *confuse*.

Let us continue with the adverbs from the instrumental-descriptive (I-D) group. First and foremost, it should be made clear that this type of adverb is very relevant not only because it is the most varied as far as the number of terms is concerned, but also because we believe that the total number of examples is far superior to those of all the other groups[7].

In relation to the 77 terms in I-D, the following should be underlined: 7 of them are in Schad (2007: s.vv.), but not in Priscian; 66 are listed in Priscian yet they are not considered by Schad and finally only 4 are found in both Schad and Priscian. These are: *coniuncte*, *indiferenter*, *similiter*, *varie*. Here, we are not going to discuss the whys and wherefores of this difference in criteria as this would take us beyond the aims of this study. However, the following seems significant: for example, Schad (2007: s.v.) lists *coniuncte* but not its opposite *separate* which is found in Priscian (see Table above); while on the other hand Schad (2007: s.vv.) includes amongst the terms both

[7] As mentioned, the numerical data in the Table are taken from Priscian's *Institutio grammaticae*. However, we believe it to be highly significant and revealing in relation to our objectives here.

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

similiter and *dissimiliter*. The 7 terms recorded in Schad (2007: s.vv.), but not in Priscian, have a very close relation to the 4 we mentioned earlier: *aequaliter*, *copulate*, *dispariliter*, *dissimiliter*, *indiscrete*, *indistincte*, *iuncte*.

After previous considerations we wonder why certain terms like *pariter*, *distincte*, *indistincte* and *aliter* were left out of Schad's selection. The basic problem that arises here is the fact that the British lexicographer's criteria are in no way clear in determining the reasons which justifies the criteria used when including/excluding certain terms which have a more or less close connection of synonymy /antonymy between them.

Nevertheless, it is also important to point out that in some pairs of terms with a semantic relation of antonymy a functional asymmetry is produced as far as its technical vocabulary is concerned. Therefore, *aequaliter* (I-D)/*inaequaliter* (I-V); *dubitanter* (S-T)/*indubitanter* (I-D).

We would like to mention one last peculiarity of the adverbs in group I-D. The accumulation of adverbs is relatively common in Latin. However, in relation to the adverbs used in this study it must be said that we have not recorded syntagmas with two or more adverbs belonging to the following groups: T, S-T, or I-V. When an accumulation of adverbs is produced in our Table it always has the same format: one in group I-D joins with one from T, S-T or I-V. This has confirmed the idea that these last three groups have a close relationship between them which goes beyond mere semantic similarities and distinguishes them from the other groups I-D and I-E. Here are some examples: *omnimodo naturaliter* (*GLK* 8.369) = I-D + I-V; *similiter praepospere* (*GLK* 12.594) = I-D + I-V.

Let us look at the last group. There are not many terms (18 = 8.5%) included in the last group instrumental-expository (I-E) and according to the data from Priscian (see the Table above) the terms in question are used on few occasions. The main characteristic is that the specialised use is not intrinsic, i.e. words that do not form a part of metalanguage grammar, either because strictly speaking they are not grammatical terms (as in groups T, S-T, and I-V) or the technical language used does not allow them to gain a certain specialist value enabling them to become integrated in a (semi)-technical context (as occurs in group I-D). The terms in group I-E are interesting because they help us understand the expository mechanisms used

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

by an author, i.e. it makes a technical piece distinguishable from a literary one, apart from the obvious subject matter being dealt with. These types of adverbs enable us to see whether an author follows a predetermined order or not (*primum*, *deinde*, *postremo*) and whether or not cross-references (*supra*, *superius*) and other similar things are used. Although they have no direct relation with the scientific contents dealt with, or with the defended thesis, they can be of great use to orientate scholars as to the principles and strategies which inspire the layout of the material, or the attitude adopted by the author in relation to the relevant importance of the topics to be treated. In this sense an analysis of these types of adverbs can be of invaluable help in certain studies of micro-lingusitic historiography.

From a general perspective we could say that the limits in groups I-D and I-E are much less clear than the other three insofar as one single detailed analysis of the likes and customs of one particular treatise writer can efficiently give the clues to determine the terms, which really are significant for the proposed objectives in both groups.

From what has just been said it can be understood that the terms in group I-E are the ones that tend to have a less systematic behaviour. We can only limit ourselves to demonstrating this with the following example: in some series of adverb grading (positive/comparative/superlative) the representatives of the three elements do not necessarily have one single use or belong to the same group; e.g. *late*, *latissime* (= I-D)/*latius* (= I-E); plene (= S-T)/*plenius*, *plenissime* (= I-E).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alvar Ezquerra, Antonio, “Estado actual de la lexicografía latina”, en Antonio Alvar (recop.), *Minerva restituta*. *9 lecciones de Filología Clásica*, Alcalá, Universidad de Alcalá de Henares, 1986, p. 203-223.

Bécares Botas, Vicente, *Diccionario de terminología gramatical griega*, Salamanca, Universidad, 1985.

Bosque, Ignacio, “Sobre la teoría de la definición lexicográfica”, *Verba* 9, 1982, p. 105-123.

Collart, Jean, *Varron grammairien et l’enseignement gramatical dans l’antiquité romaine 1934-1963*, *Lustrum* 9/1964, p. 213-241.

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

Colombat, Bernard, «Quels termes latins retenir comme entrées pour un *Dictionnaire de la terminologie linguistique*?», en Colombat, Bernard & Savelli, Marie (eds.), *Métalangage et terminologie linguistique*. *Actes du colloque inernational de Grenoble* (*14-14 mai 1998*), *I-II*, Peeters, Leuven, 2001, p. 293-313.

Conde Salazar, Matilde & Martín Puente, Cristina, *Lexicografía y lexicología latinas*. (*1975-1997*). *Repertorio bibliográfico*, Madrid, CSIC, 1998.

De Miguel, Elena (ed.), *Panorama de la lexicología*, Barcelona, Ariel, 2008.

De Saint-Denis, E., "Des vocabulaires techniques en latin", *Mémorial des études latines offert à Jean Marouzeau*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1943, p. 55-79.

Cousin, Jean (1943-1944), "Reseña a: J. Marouzeau (1943), *Lexique de la terminologie linguistique* (*français*, *allemand*, *anglais*), Paris, Geuthner", *REL* 21-22, p. 254.

Egger, Émile, *Apollonius Dyscole*. *Essai sur l'histoire des théories grammaticales dans l'antiquité*, Paris, Auguste Durand.

Garcés GÓMEZ, María del Pilar (ed.), *Diccionario histórico*: *nuevas perspectivas lingüísticas*, Madrid, Iberoamericana, 2008.

García Román, Cirilo & Gutiérrez Galindo, Marco A., *Prisciani institutionum grammaticalium librorum Indices et Concordantiae*, Hildesheim & Zurich & New York, Olms & Weidmann, York, 6 vols, 1999-2001.

García Román, Cirilo & Gutiérrez Galindo, Marco A., *Prisciani operum minorum grammaticalium Indices et Concordantiae*, Hildesheim & Zurich & New York, Olms & Weidmann, 2 vols, 2003.

Grilli, Alberto *et alii*, "Concordanza dei grammatici latini", *Atti dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* (*Supplemento al vol 112*), Torino, 1979, p.1-53.

Guerrero Tamos, Gloria (2003), "La terminología y los lenguajes de especialidad en el marco de la comunicación", in M. Casas & C. Varo (eds.), *VII Jornadas de llingüística*, Cádiz, Universidad, 2003, p. 109-135.

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

Gutiérrez, Marco A., *La doctrina de las conjunciones en los gramáticos latinos, I-II*, Madrid, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (PhD Thesis), [1987] 1989.

Gutiérrez, Marco A., "Isidore de Seville, *Orig*. I, 12: Syntaxe vs. Sémantique", *Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale* XXIX, 1987, p. 177-184.

Gutiérrez, Marco A., "La oposición estructural 'Copulativas/ Disyuntivas' en los gramáticos latinos", *Veleia* 5/1988, p. 287-291.

Gutiérrez, Marco A., "Las definiciones de conjunción en los gramáticos latinos: Un capítulo importante en la historia de la sintaxis", *Revista Española de Lingüística* 19/1989, p. 389-420.

Gutiérrez, Marco A., "L'interprétation des théories des grammairiens latins sur les conjonctions selon le structuralisme fonctionnel", *Glotta* 68/1990, p. 105-118.

Gutiérrez, Marco A., "Diccionario Electrónico Concordado de Términos Gramaticales y Retóricos Latinos (*DECOTGREL*): historia, métodos y objetivos", *Cuadernos del Instituto Historia de la Lengua* 5/2010, p. 87-113.

Haensch, Günther, "Tipología de las obras lexicográficas", en Günther Haensch *et alii*, *La lexicografía. De la lingüística teórica a la lexicografía práctica*, Madrid, Gredos, 1981, p. 95-187.

Jahn, C.F., *Grammaticorum Graecorum de coniunctionibus doctrina*, Gryphiae, Typis Frid. Kunike, Reg. Acad. Typogr (Diss.), 1847.

Job, L., *De grammaticis vocabulis apud latinos*, Paris, Lutetiae Parisiorum, Bouillon, 1893.

Lambert, Ch., *La grammaire latine selon les grammairiens latins du IVe et du Ve siècle*, Dijon & Paris, Damidot Frères, 1908.

Lana, Maurizio, "A proposito della recente pubblicazione dell'*Index grammaticus* a cura de V. Lomanto e N. Marinone", *BSudLat* 21/1991, p. 319-326.

Lara, L.F., *De la definición lexicográfica*, México DF, Colegio de México, 2004.

Lomanto, Valeria, *Lessici latini e lessicografia automatica*, Torino, Accademia delle Scienze, 1980.

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

Lomanto, Valeria, "A concordance to Keil's latin grammarians", *Computers and the Humanities* 24/1990, p. 427-435.

Lomanto, Valeria & Marinone, Nino, *Index Grammaticus*: *An Index to Latin Grammar Texts*, Hildesheim & Zurich & Nueva York, Olms & Weidmann, York, 3 vols, 1990.

Luscher, Albert, *De Prisciani studiis Graecis*, Breslau, 1912.

Marouzeau, J., "Chronique", *REL* 9/1931, p. 27-35.

Marouzeau, J. (1943), *Lexique de la terminologie linguistique* (*français*, *allemand*, *anglais*), Paris, Geuthner.

Nettleship, H. (1889), *Contribution to Latin Lexicography*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, .

Pérez Castro, Lois C., "Vocabularios científico-técnicos y léxico común en el latín clásico", *RSEL* 27, 1997, p. 107-114.

Pérez Castro, Lois C., "Sobre las terminologías ¿técnicas? latinas. El léxico de las *res rusticae*", *Actas del IX Congreso de la SEEC* (*Madrid, 27-39 de septiembre de 1995*), Madrid, Ediciones Clásicas & SEEC, III, 1998, p. 211-215.

Rodríguez Adrados, Francisco, "Organización de los artículos del diccionario. Criterios a seguir", in E. Gangutia (ed.), *Introducción a la lexicografía griega*, Madrid, CSIC, 1997, p. 259-280.

Rodríguez Adrados, Francisco, "Teoría lingüística de la Antigüedad: panorama actual y desiderata", *RSEL* 13/1983, 1-26.

Rodríguez Adrados, Francisco, "Les définitions linguistiques", *Alpha* 5/1992, p. 29-92.

Rodríguez Adrados, Francisco, "Los orígenes del lenguaje científico", *RSEL* 27/1997, p. 299-315.

Rosier, Irène, "La terminologie linguistique latine médiévale", in Auroux, Sylvain (dir.), *Histoire des idées linguistiques*, Liège & Bruxelles, Mardaga, II/1992, p. 590-597.

Sancho Royo, Antonio, "Aproximación al sistema conjuncional griego desde la perspectiva de los gramáticos antiguos", *HABIS* 15/1984, p. 95-116.

Schad, Samantha, *A Lexicon of Latin Gramamtical Terminologie*, Pisa & Roma, Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2007.

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)

Schreiner, Max., *Die grammatische Terminologie bei Quintilian*, Munich (PhD Thesis), 1954.

StéphanidèS, Michel, "La terminologie des anciens. Note introductive" *ISIS* 7/1925, p. 468-77.

Swiggers, Pierre, "Samantha Schad, *a Lexicon of Latin Grammatical Terminology*. Studia Erudita 6. Pisa & Rome: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2007", *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2009, p. 1-12.

Uría, Javier, "SAMANTHA SCHAD, *A Lexicon of Latin Grammatical Terminologie*, Pisa & Rome, Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2007", *Historiographia Linguistica* XXXV/2008, p. 177-182.

Wünster, Eugen, *Introducción a la teoría de la terminología y a la lexicografía terminológica*, Barcelona, Institut Universitari de Lingüística Aplicada, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 1998.

Zampolli, A. & Brogna, D., *Procedura elettronica di spoglio* en "Concordanza dei grammatici latini", *Atti dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* (*Supplemento al vol 112*), Torino, 1979, p. 35-51.

SOURCES

www.latinalexis.com

BDD-A3844 © 2011 Editura Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:39 UTC)