

NEGLECTED EVIDENCE FOR FEMALE SPEECH IN LATIN¹

I. INTRODUCTION

By ‘female speech’ I refer to lexical and other features that may distinguish women’s use of language from that of men. ‘Sex exclusive’ usages are no doubt rare (two such are the female oaths *mecastor* and *ecastor* in Latin comedy), but ‘sex preferential’ usages are easier to find. There is some evidence, for example, that women use more polite modifiers than men.

Commentators on female speech in Latin² have missed an item of evidence in a late medical work, the Latin translation, or rather adaptation, of Soranus’ *Gynaecia*, attributed to a certain Mustio (or Muscio), and of another, more elementary work of question-and-answer format by the same author.³ The relationship of the extant Greek to these lost works is unclear. The Latin is much abbreviated and often does not correspond closely to the Greek work that survives.

The preface to the Latin version alludes to the lack of education of midwives (*obstetrices*). None could be found who had any acquaintance with *litterae graecae*, and it had therefore occurred to the writer to provide a Latin version of Soranus on gynaecological matters, in brief form so that ‘female minds’ would not be exhausted by the magnitude of the work. The preface continues:

hic autem multo simplicius uolui loqui et ut uerius dicam muliebribus uerbis usus sum, ut etiam inperitae obstetrices licet ab altera sibi lectam rationem facile intellegere possint.

‘Here⁴ I wanted to speak much more simply (than would have been the case if I had translated the complete works of Soranus), and, to be frank, I have used “women’s words”, so that even uneducated midwives can easily understand the account, even if it is only read to them by another woman.’

Obstetrices are likely to be illiterate,⁵ but not all women are expected to be so. An educated woman may help out by reading the text to the *obstetrix*. The feminine *altera* is noteworthy. Obstetrics is the province of women, and the possibility is not

¹ I am very grateful to K. D. Fischer and D. R. Langslow for numerous helpful and informative comments on drafts of this paper.

² See M. E. Gilleland, ‘Female speech in Greek and Latin’, *AJP* 101 (1980), 180–3, J. N. Adams, ‘Female speech in Latin comedy’, *Antichthon* 18 (1984), 350–73.

³ For the Latin, see V. Rose (ed.), *Sorani Gynaeciorum uetus translatio latina* (Leipzig, 1882). The extant Greek work is published by Rose in the same volume, but the standard edition is now that of I. Ilberg, *Sorani Gynaeciorum libri IV. De signis fracturarum. De fasciis. Vita Hippocratis secundum Soranum* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1927), which I quote here. For some remarks about Mustio and the relationship of his work to Soranus, see G. Sabbah, P.-P. Corsetti, and K. D. Fischer (edd.), *Bibliographie des textes médicaux latins. Antiquité et haut moyen âge* (Saint Étienne, 1987), 118.

⁴ Rose prints in his text *his*, but reports a variant reading *hic* which I have adopted here. If *his* were accepted it could not in the context be taken as a dative (of the indirect object dependent on *loqui*) referring to midwives but would have to be an ablative referring to Mustio’s present writings (= ‘by means of these [writings] ...’). But the plural is slightly difficult and the adverb *hic* gives more straightforward sense.

⁵ The author is not entirely consistent on this point. A page later it is stated as a requirement that the *obstetrix* should be one *quae litteras nouit* (1.3, p. 5.12). The inconsistency arises

allowed that the lector may be male. The question arises what the translator understood by 'women's words'. We happen to know from another source (Varro) of a 'female' word to do with female anatomy. *Porcus* 'pig' was a nursery word used by women, particularly wet nurses, of the pudenda of girls: *Rust.* 2.4.10 *nam et nostrae mulieres, maxime nutrices, naturam qua feminae sunt in uirginibus appellant porcum* ('for our women, particularly wet nurses, call the "nature" which makes them female "the pig" in girls').⁶ Mustio is not explicit about the words he had in mind, and it is left to the reader to attempt to identify such terms. I will offer some suggestions below. Even if I do not get anywhere, the passage is worthy of note in its own right for the attitude that it expresses. The writer seems to be implying that women have their own special terms dealing with female matters, unless he means more vaguely (and condescendingly) that he will use 'words that women can understand'. The second meaning cannot entirely be ruled out, but it would be a very weak one for the adjective (in the emphatic anteposed position) to have. It is much more likely that *muliebris* has its well-established meaning 'particular to women' (see *TLL* VIII.1568.47 'mulierum proprius', *OLD* s.v. 2, 'Typical of or natural to a woman').

If the translator meant to suggest that he was going to use 'women's' gynaecological terminology, he did not fulfil his promise. The anatomical terms of the first book are learned and Graecizing, and easily paralleled in medical treatises that do not make such a claim. I offer a few examples. At 1.6, p. 6.14 the question is put 'by how many names is the womb (*matrix*) known?' (*matrix quot nominibus uocatur?*). The answer is given as three, *ystera* (ὕστερα), *delfis* (δελφύς), and *matrix*, though this last is alluded to by means of an etymology rather than stated. These names, with the exception of *matrix*, a Latin word used in medical treatises to render the phonetically similar μήτρα,⁷ have simply been taken over from the Greek (see 1.6, p. 6.13 Ilberg). The first two had no currency in Latin, and it is obvious that the writer has made no effort to find plain Latin equivalents for uneducated Latin-speaking midwives. An indifference to the needs of such readers shows up constantly, though several times later in the work Mustio reveals that he is still keeping midwives in mind (see 2.24, p. 105.19–20, 2.34, p. 117.18–20). Usually he translates Greek terminology into Latin rather than transferring the Greek unchanged, but the obscurity is not necessarily any the less. The loan translations which he comes up with will have had no place in ordinary Latin, never mind female speech. Thus at 1.12a, p. 8.16 *sinus muliebris* is used of the vagina, a loan translation of γυναικεῖος κόλπος (cf. 1.10.1, p. 8.8 Ilberg τοῦ γυναικείου αἰδοίου) which would never have been used outside medical writings or circles.⁸ In this passage Mustio oddly gives the obscene or basic equivalent, *cunnius* (1.12, p. 9.3–4 *quem uulgo cunnum appellant*). It might be said that here at least there is a concession to ordinary readers, but it would not be convincing to suggest that *cunnius* was the accepted word in female speech.⁹ Whatever the writer's motives in offering such a crude gloss, he will hardly have admitted the term because it was specifically a 'women's word'; indeed, he tells us himself that the term was 'vulgar',¹⁰ and that

because in the preface he is stating his own views and at 1.3 those of the source (see the Greek at 1.3.1, p. 4.14–15 Ilberg).

⁶ See J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London, 1982), 82.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 106–8.

⁸ On this expression see *ibid.*, 90–1.

⁹ See *ibid.*, 216–17 for the attitudes to basic obscenities expected of women.

¹⁰ *Vulgo* (with a verb of saying, such as *[ut] dicitur*) may be used neutrally ('commonly, generally'), but there is also a use referring to a term that is substandard, unacceptable or the like,

is not the same as 'female'.¹¹ The same passage has another *recherché* loan translation, *pinnacula* of the labia (p. 9.5), a term based on *πτερυγώματα* and restricted to learned treatises (cf. 1.10.1, p. 8.9 Ilberg).¹² Just as far removed from the speech of ordinary women are the eight terms for parts of the womb (*orificium, collum, ceruix, caula, umeri, latera, fundus, basis*) listed at 1.11, p. 8.5–12, all of them either translated or borrowed from the Greek (see 1.9.2, p. 8.2ff. Ilberg).¹³ I mention finally one further direct transfer from the source. *Cissa* is used (first at 1.38, p. 15.14) of the craving for unusual foods suffered by pregnant women. This is simply a transliteration of *κίσσα* in the original (cf. 1.48 Ilberg), which was not a current word in ordinary Latin. At p. 15.16–17 the writer compounds the obscurity by taking over from the Greek an explanation of this usage (cf. 1.48.1 Ilberg): it may derive from the bird name *κίσσα* (Lat. *gaia* or *pica*): *apud alios ab ipsa aue quae et uoce et pennis uaria est* ('according to others [*cissa* is named from] the bird which is variegated both in voice and feathers'). But *cissa* was not an established bird name in Latin.¹⁴ The sentence would only have been meaningful to those who knew Greek, and Mustio has told us in the preface that his intended readers, humble midwives, did not. It is obvious that Mustio's claim to have spoken 'simply' using women's words is not all that it seems. The gynaecological terminology that any user of the treatise would have to understand is largely alien to Latin and slavishly derived from the Greek source, whether by transfer or translation. Straightforward Latin equivalents to the Greek technical terms are not consistently used. The main simplification that the Latin shows lies in the truncating of the original and the use of short sentences.

II. *DIDA* AND RELATED TERMS

The impression will have been given in the previous paragraph that anatomical and other technical terminology in the Latin treatise is entirely artificial and derived in various ways directly from the Greek. Much of the terminology is indeed artificial, but not all of it. The author did not always merely calque or borrow Greek terms, and he sometimes varied the way he rendered a single Greek word. He employed, for example, several words to designate the female breast (most notably *dida*, *mamma*, and *mamilla*). Although these terms are up to a point interchangeable and used to render the same Greek word (*μαστός*; see further below, section II.2), it can be argued that one of them in particular, *dida*, is used in distinctive ways. There are signs that in this semantic area at least the author was writing for women in the terms they might themselves have used in the nursery, thereby giving the Latin something of an informal, 'female' tone, if not the simplicity promised. In what follows (II.1–4) I discuss the distribution and use of *dida* in Latin and the Romance languages, its relationship to terms of the same semantic field, and the relationship of the group of Latin terms to the Greek original. In so doing I will

and that I take to be the use of the word here. See in general R. Müller, *Sprachbewußtsein und Sprachvariation im lateinischen Schrifttum der Antike* (Munich, 2001), 142–52.

¹¹ *Cunnius* is not the only basic obscenity that Mustio admits. At 2.76, p. 106.1 he has *landica* 'clitoris', a term which in tone was on a par with *cunnius*, *mentula*, *culus* etc. (see Adams [n. 6], 97–8). There is one other instance of *landica* in a medical text, in Caelius Aurelianus' translation of the *Gynaecia* of Soranus, p. 113.1392 (see Adams [n. 6], 98).

¹² See Adams (n. 6), 99.

¹³ See *ibid.*, 108, noting that 'Ordinary speech does not distinguish parts of the womb'.

¹⁴ See J. André, *Les noms d'oiseaux en latin* (Paris, 1967), 57, pointing out that it occurs merely as a transcription of the Greek in late translations.

come back to the theme announced by the title of this paper. I will then discuss a use of *mamma* (III), and move on (IV) to a few other terms of possible female character.

II.1 *The form and distribution of dida*

Dida has the familiar reduplicated structure of nursery words (cf. e.g. in Latin *mamma*, *tata*, *pappa*, *cacare*).¹⁵ The term is rare in extant Latin (see *TLL* V.1.1015.1ff.), being confined to just two texts (the Latin translation of Dioscorides, apart from that of Soranus) and to a gloss (*CGL* III.12.50).¹⁶ In one respect the use of *dida* in the two translations is very similar (see below, II.3).

It is a curiosity that both of the medical translations in which the word occurs were almost certainly done in Africa. This is not the place to go into detail, but I base the claim on the presence in both works of several Punic or African terms with no general currency in Latin, for which there were available Latin or Graeco-Latin equivalents. The African origin of *Mustio* was noted by his editor, Rose (n. 3), p. IV, and was elaborated on further by J. André.¹⁷ The significant terms are *ginga* 'henbane' (ὑοσκύαμος), *bob(b)a* 'mallow' (μολόχη, μαλάχη, *malua*), and *zenzur* 'knot-grass, *Polygonon aviculare*' (πολύγονον).¹⁸ The origin of the translation of Dioscorides has been regarded as uncertain,¹⁹ but the work contains several examples of a Semitic word *girba* used as a substitute for the ordinary term *mortarium*. *Girba* is otherwise found only in the African medical writer Cassius Felix.²⁰ In my opinion the most decisive linguistic evidence that one can ever hope to find for identifying the place of origin of a late text lies in the occurrence in that text of technical or obscure loan-words from vernacular languages, of the sort which are unlikely to have moved far from the place of their entry into Latin. This is a contention which I hope to defend elsewhere.

Dida may, however, have been more widespread than its limited appearances in Latin suggest. It seems to survive in Catalan, where its meaning is 'wet nurse'.²¹ This same meaning turns up unambiguously in a passage of *Mustio*: 1.114, p. 40.3 *aliae didae tradendus est quae eum uario strepitu sonorum et blandimentis mulceat* ('[the baby] is to be handed over to another wet nurse, who should soothe him with a variety of sounds and endearments'). It is not infrequently the case that a word for 'breast' also means 'wet nurse'. In *Mustio* himself *mamma* is commonly used of the breast (see below), and also in the sense 'wet nurse' (see below, III). In Greek τίθηη combines the two meanings (for 'wet nurse' see e.g. Soranus 2.19.1, p. 66.6 Ilberg). At Catullus 64.18 *nutrix* (strictly 'nurse') is used in the plural of the breasts, a usage no doubt derived by loan translation from τίθηη, with its double meaning.²²

¹⁵ See in general W. Heraeus, 'Die Sprache der römischen Kinderstube', *ALL* 13 (1903), 149–72, reprinted in *Kleine Schriften von Wilhelm Heraeus*, edited by J. B. Hofmann (Heidelberg, 1937), 158–80. I cite here the *Kleine Schriften* (see 172–3 on *dida*).

¹⁶ There are a few remarks about *dida* in J. André, *Le vocabulaire latin de l'anatomie* (Paris, 1991), 223.

¹⁷ 'Sur quelques noms de plantes', *RPh* 28 (1954), 54.

¹⁸ Further details may be found in André (n. 17), and in id., *Les noms de plantes dans la Rome antique* (Paris, 1985), s.vv.

¹⁹ See D. R. Langslow, *Medical Latin in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 2000), 70.

²⁰ See J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge, 2003), 454. For *girba* see also *TLL* VI.2–3.1996.44ff. On the origin of Cassius Felix see now A. Fraisse (ed.), *Cassius Felix De la médecine* (Paris, 2002), VII–IX.

²¹ See J. Coromines, *Diccionari etimològic i complementari de la llengua catalana* (Barcelona, 1980–2001), III 128–30.

²² See Adams (n. 20), 464.

Since there is reason to think that the translation of Mustio was written far from the Iberian peninsula (see above), it would seem to follow from the Catalan evidence that *dida* had some currency across a wide area, at least in this sense (but see further below, this section). Catalan aside, it has to be said that not all of the Romance evidence which has been adduced in relation to *dida* is convincing. There is a view that it also survives in Sardinia. André cites Logudorese *dida*,²³ to which he gives the meaning 'tétine', and Heraeus also refers to a Sardinian survival.²⁴ This doctrine is not accepted by M. L. Wagner²⁵. *Dida* = 'nurse' is cited by Wagner from Campidanese, but as a borrowing from Catalan rather than a direct descendant of Lat. *dida*. Another term, *dḍèdda*, meaning 'teat, nurse' in Logudorese, is explained as an abbreviation of *tittèdda*,²⁶ and Corominas is criticized for interpreting the word (to which he gives the form *dedda*) as a reflex of the Latin *dida*.²⁷

There is another term, **titta*, which should be mentioned here. *Titta* is reflected all over the Romance world (Italian *tetta*, French *tette*, Catalan, Spanish, Portuguese *teta*, Logudorese *titta*). The term and its Romance survival are discussed at length in FEW,²⁸ and the Romance forms interpreted as reflecting a borrowing from Germanic. Wagner (see above), II.489 s.v. *titta* questions this doctrine,²⁹ and rightly so, treating the term as a typical infantile formation. He also rejects attempts to derive some of the reflexes from Greek (τῖτθῆ: so REW 8759.2). It is hard to believe that nursery Latin had to resort to Germanic to find a word for 'teat', or that a German loan-word would have spread so widely. More to the point, *titta* is such an obvious nursery formation that it might have arisen independently in different places, both Latin- and German-speaking. For the same reason Catalan *dida* is not necessarily a direct survival of the Latin term found in our medical texts: it might simply reflect an independent late modification of *titta*. Nursery terms are variable in form (see below, IV). On *titina*, a derivative of *titta*, in our text and elsewhere, see also IV.

II.2 The interchangeability of *dida* and *mamma*

It is as well to dismiss at once any idea that *dida* in Mustio (or in the translation of Dioscorides) might have been inspired by a similarity of sound to a word in the Greek source. The editors of the first book of the Latin Dioscorides by implication suggested precisely that, when they speculated that *didās* might have been used in one place (where the Greek is missing) to render τῖτθός (p. 72.1–2 *didās pendentes colligit*, 'it gathers pendulous breasts').³⁰ But there are three examples of *dida* in a cluster in Book 5 of Dioscorides, all of them rendering not τῖτθός but μαστός. Note, for example, 5, p. 240.9 *cum aqua tritus inpositus didas tumentes et testes*

²³ (n. 16), 223.

²⁴ (n. 15), 173.

²⁵ *Dizionario etimologico sardo* (Heidelberg, 1960–64), 1 466.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 1.457.

²⁷ The reference was to the first edition of Corominas's etymological dictionary of Castilian (*Diccionario crítico etimológico de la lengua castellana* [Bern, 1954 7]). But see now J. Corominas and J. A. Pascual, *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellana e hispánica* (Madrid, 1980–91), 5. 479 s.v. *teta*, restating Corominas's old view but retracting it in brackets with reference to Wagner.

²⁸ W. von Wartburg, *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. XVII. Germanische Elemente S. Z* (Basel, 1966), 333–9.

²⁹ See also the remarks of André (n. 16), 223.

³⁰ See K. Hofmann and T. M. Auracher, 'Der Longobardische Dioskorides des Marcellus Virgilius', *Romanische Forschungen* 1 (1883), 72 n. 1.

curat ('crushed with water and placed on it'³¹ cures swollen breasts and testicles') alongside 5.150, III p. 103.3 Wellmann (λίθος γεώδης) καταχρισθεὶς δὲ μεθ' ὕδατος μαστῶν καὶ ὀρχέων παύει φλεγμονάς ('[an earthy stone] rubbed on with water stops swellings of the breasts and testicles').³² The phraseology of the Latin and Greek at 5, p. 241.6 5.153, III p. 104.13 Wellmann is much the same as that in the passages just quoted. For the third example in the cluster (5, p. 240.5, 5.149, III p. 102.14–15 Wellmann) see below, II.3.

In Mustio too *dida* may translate (or at least correspond to) μαστός. Note 1.28, p. 12.21 *plane uero a quarto decimo anno incipit (purgatio), et didas habent inflatas* ('obviously [menstruation] begins from the fourteenth year, and they have swollen breasts'), which corresponds loosely to Soranus 1.24.2, p. 16 Ilberg ἐκ τῆς ὥς ἐν πλάτει περὶ τὸ τεσσαρεσκαίδέκατον ἔτος ἐκφύσεως τῶν μαστῶν (the onset of menstruation is signalled 'by the growth of the breasts around the fourteenth year') (cf. the similar passage, 1.20, p. 13 Ilberg τὸ διογκοῦσθαι τοὺς μαστούς, 'the swelling of the breasts'). Again, the heading of 1.108 in the Latin corresponds to the heading which precedes 2.36 in the Greek, though the content of 108 corresponds rather to 2.37. The Greek has μαστός, the Latin *dida*: 2.36, p. 79 Ilberg πῶς δεῖ καὶ πότε διδόναι τῷ βρέφει τὸν μαστόν ('how and when is it necessary to give the breast to the child?'), 108, p. 38.7 *quomodo didam tradere debet?* ('how should she offer the breast?').

In its sphere of reference *dida* is not clearly distinguishable in the text from *mamma*. Words of this semantic field tend to be somewhat indeterminate, shifting between the meanings 'breast' in a wider sense and 'nipple' in particular. *Papilla*, for example, originally meant 'nipple', but it tended to be extended to embrace the whole breast.³³ The *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, s.v. *uber* gives as one of its semantic categories (1) 'A woman's breast or teat', making no clear distinction. This word, as well as sometimes designating the teat specifically, is 'presque l'unique nom du sein chez les poètes'.³⁴

There is the same indeterminacy or variability about both *dida* and *mamma* in Mustio. At 1.108, p. 38.13 *ne cum labore infans didas sugere incipiat* ('in case the infant begins to struggle in sucking the nipples') the act described was certainly that of sucking the nipples, but even this example is indeterminate. 'Sucking the breast' is a commonplace way of expressing the idea, and it could not be deduced from this phrase that the word was a specialized term meaning 'nipple'. By contrast at both 1.44, p. 17.1 *neque pectoralibus fasciis didas constringere* (of the pregnant woman: 'nor [should she] bind the breasts with chest bands') and 1.46, p. 17.15 *superiores uero partes sub didas amplius stringere* ('to bind the upper parts further beneath the breasts') the reference is definitely to the breasts as a whole. At 1.75, p. 27.17 *mamma* is used in exactly the same way: *paulatim strictius mammas ipsas fasciare iubemus* ('we instruct them gradually to bind the breasts themselves more tightly'). The Greek does not correspond exactly. In the Greek corresponding to 1.44 (which differs somewhat from the Latin) μαστοί is used (1.55.4, p. 40 Ilberg).

³¹ The subject is missing but must be *lapis* + adjective.

³² For the Latin text of this book see H. Stadler (ed.), 'Dioscorides Longobardus (Cod. Lat. Monacensis 337.)', *Romanische Forschungen* 13 (1902), 161–243. For the Greek work see M. Wellmann (ed.), *Pedanii Dioscuridis Anazarbei De materia medica libri quinque* (3 vols, Berlin, 1906–14).

³³ See André (n. 16), 223.

³⁴ André (n. 16), 224.

On the other hand *mamma* as well as *dida* is sometimes used when the act described affects the nipples rather than the breast as a whole. At 1.129, p. 42.22–3 there is reference to a method of weaning by smearing the ‘breasts’ with something bitter: *illae uero quae amara mammis inlinire solent nobis non placent* (‘but those who are accustomed to smear bitter substances on their breasts do not have our approval’). The Greek has θηλή ‘nipple’: 2.47.2, p. 87 Ilberg τὸ γὰρ πικροῖς τισι καὶ δυσώδεσι περιχρίειν τὰς θηλάς καὶ ἄθρόως ἀπογαλακτίζειν αὐτὸ βλαβερὸν (‘smearing the nipples with bitter and foul-smelling substances and suddenly weaning it is harmful’). And at 2.19.1, p. 66 Ilberg (on the choice of a wet nurse) the Greek makes a distinction between the breasts (μαστούς) and the nipples (θηλάς), whereas the Latin has only *mammæ* (89, p. 32.5), but corresponding as closely to θηλάς as to μαστοὺς: μαστοὺς ἔχουσιν συμμέτρους, χαύνους μαλακοὺς ἄρρυσώτους, καὶ θηλάς μήτε μεγάλας μήτε μικροτέρας, καὶ μήτε πυκνοτέρας μήτε ἄγαν σπραγγώδεις (‘[a woman] having breasts that are well proportioned, loose, soft and unwrinkled, and nipples that are neither big nor rather little, and neither lacking in porosity nor too hollow’) *pectus latum habeat et mammæ ipsas neque rugosas neque satis breues, et nec multum grandes cauernas habentes neque uerum raras et breues* (‘she should have a broad chest, and breasts which are neither furrowed nor very little, and nipples which do not have very big hollows nor indeed are porous and little’).³⁵

If there is a marked term for ‘nipple’ in the text, it is *mamilla* rather than *dida* (or *mamma*). At 1.36, p. 15.5–8 *mamilla* occurs twice in a passage about methods of determining the sex of the unborn child: if the child is male, the pregnant woman *dextramque mamillam maiorem habeat* (‘has a right nipple larger [than the other one]’), and if it is female *in sinistra mamilla inflationem habet* (‘she has swelling of the left nipple’). In both contexts the Greek has the same type of phrase, referring to the state of the ‘right/left breast and particularly the nipple’, with μαζός contrasting with θηλή: e.g. 1.45.1, p. 31.29–30 Ilberg τὸ μετ’ ὠχρίασεως ὀγκωδέστερον εἶναι τὸν εὐώνυμον μαζὸν καὶ μάλιστα τὴν θηλήν (the sign of a female is ‘the more swollen state of the left breast and particularly the nipple, along with pallor’). The translator disregarded the subtleties, but his choice of *mamilla* must have been inspired by the importance in the Greek version of the state of the nipple as allowing the prediction. There are other places where the writer presumably meant ‘nipple’ by *mamilla* (the Greek does not help): 1.72, p. 26.20 *lactis ad mamillas confusio* (‘a flow of milk at the nipples’), 1.95, p. 34.20 *cum aqua soluto (uino) mamillas ipsas inlinebant* (‘they smeared the nipples with wine mixed with water’). On the other hand, at 1.108, p. 38.12 *papillum* seems to have this sense:³⁶ *deinde ori eius adpositum papillum teneat* (‘then let her hold the nipple close to his mouth’).

It should be clear that semantically *dida* as it is used by Mustio is an alternative to *mamma*, with the same range of reference modulated by the context. I turn now to the

³⁵ The Latin is incoherent. I take it that *neque uerum* is the equivalent of *nec uero*. The first two adjectives with *mammæ*, *rugosas* and *breues*, suit the meaning ‘breasts’ (and the first of them, negated, corresponds to ἄρρυσώτους, which is an epithet of μαστοὺς not θηλάς), whereas *nec multum grandes cauernas habentes* seems to correspond to μήτε ἄγαν σπραγγώδεις and must therefore refer to the nipples. I have accordingly translated *mammæ* as ‘breasts’ in the first clause but as ‘nipples’ in the second. This is a nice illustration of the indeterminacy I have been referring to. It is not clear whether *raras* and *breues* refer to *cauernas* or to *mammæ*; I have taken them in the second way. *Raras* means the opposite of πυκνός, yet comes in roughly the same place in the sentence.

³⁶ The masculine form is problematic: see TLL X.1.254.32, 256 36.

motives of Mustio in using *dida*. Was there some factor other than meaning which determined its use? Was it perhaps used haphazardly? I will argue that it was not.

II.3 Distinctive features of the use of *dida*

The first example of *dida* in the text of Mustio (quoted above, II.2, with the Greek), corresponding to *μαστός*, refers to the breasts of a fourteen-year-old girl (1.28, p. 12.21 *plane uero a quarto decimo anno incipit [purgatio], et didas habent inflatas*). Similarly in the Latin Dioscorides, where, as we have seen, there is a cluster of examples of *dida* close together in Book 5 (*mamma* is the usual word in the translation), the first example is applied to the breasts of ‘virgins’: 5, p. 240.5 Stadler *didas uirginum crescere superuncta non admittit* (‘smeared on it does not allow the breasts of virgins to grow’). The Greek here too (5.149, III, p. 102.14–15 Wellmann) has *μαστός* (*μαστοῦς παρθένων κωλύει αὔξεσθαι*, ‘it prevents the breasts of virgins growing’). In neither case could it be argued that the Greek word in the source generated the choice of *dida* rather than *mamma*, because *μαστός* is a general term which could be rendered by *mamma* (see n. 35). It is possible, however, that the context influenced both writers. *Dida* was certainly not a specialized term for the breast of girls, as it is also used quite generally of the breasts of mature women. But it is possible that it was the sort of word that was appropriately used in the presence of children, because it retained the character of a nursery term more markedly than *mamma*, which must have originated as a children’s term but had spread in the literary language (but see further below, III). On this view someone referring to young girls might have fallen into the term that would have been used in addressing them. The translator of Dioscorides, having suddenly switched to *dida* for this reason, continued to use it for a few pages because it had been triggered in his consciousness. Unusual terms sometimes come in clusters.

This interpretation is supported by the statistics of the word’s use in Mustio. *Dida* is used eight times of the breast in the text. Leaving aside the example just seen, which is itself suggestive of the world of children, five³⁷ of the remaining cases denote the (nurse’s) breast when the baby is explicitly present and a participant in the action referred to:

1.107, p. 37.23 *post quantum lauacri ad didam adplicandus est infans?*

‘How long after a bath is the baby to be applied to the breast?’

1.108, p. 38.7 *quomodo didam tradere debet?*

‘How should she offer the breast?’

1.110, p. 38.24... *ita ut ante lauacrum aut in ipso lauacro numquam accipiat didam.*

‘... in such a way that he should never receive the breast before a bath or in the bath’.

1.111, p. 39.2 *infantes qui ante lauacrum aut in ipso lauacro didam accipiunt ...*

‘Babies who receive the breast before a bath or in the bath ...’

1.129, p. 42.21... *incipientes paulatim cibum addere et rarius ad didam adplicare.*

‘... beginning little by little to add food and to apply (the baby) to the breast less often.’

In three of these sentences the infant is subject of the verb phrase referring to the ‘receiving of the breast’ or the like, and in every case the infant is ‘applied to’, ‘receives’ or ‘is offered’ the breast.

³⁷ The other two cases of the word in the text, at 1.44, p. 17.21 and 1.46, p. 17.15, have both been quoted above, II.2.

Mamma almost always indicates the breast from a different viewpoint. This word tends to be used when the infant is not present in the context but the state of the woman's breast or a treatment applied to it is described. I quote all examples of the word meaning 'breast' in the work:

- 1.75, p. 27.17 *strictius mammas ipsas fasciare iubemus.*
'We instruct that they bind the breasts more tightly.'
- 1.75, p. 28.3 4 *tumor mammarum ...*
'swelling of the breasts ...'
- 1.89, p. 32.5 (*habeat*) *mammas ipsas neque rugosas neque satis breues.*
'She should have breasts that are neither furrowed nor very little.'
- 1.90, p. 32.15 16 ... *ut plurimum lactis et digestum mammis influat.*
'... so that much milk and that digested flows to the breasts.'
- 1.107, p. 38.5 *exsiccat is antea mammis sic infantem adplicet.*
'She should first dry her breasts and then apply the infant.'
- 1.108, p. 38.11 *ut ... infans ... de ambabus mammis accipiat.*
'so that ... the infant ... receives from both breasts.'
- 1.109, p. 38.15 *oportet ... mammas etiam fricare.*
'She ought ... also to rub the breasts.'
- 2.37, p. 65.20 *siquidem ... mammas inflatas habeant.*
'since ... they have swollen breasts.'

There are eight instances of *mamma* 'breast', of which only two occur in phrases referring explicitly to feeding. There is a partial overlap with *dida*, but the differences are more striking. *Dida* seems to be generated by the presence of the suckling infant in the context, whereas *mamma* seems simply to indicate a female body part. I conclude that *dida* was a marked nursery term which would have been heard from *nutrices* particularly, whereas *mamma* in the sense 'breast' was more neutral and suited to a treatise on the health of women.

II.4 Some conclusions

I review the use of *dida* and the findings so far. *Dida* is a very rare word in surviving texts. **Titta*, which differs mainly in having a voiceless rather than a voiced stop reduplicated, is non-existent in extant Latin (but see below, IV, on *titina*), but since it is reflected right across the Romance world it must have been widespread in the types of speech that remained submerged beneath the literary language. *Dida* and *titta* have every appearance of being infantile or, better, nursery formations, whose use is typically generated by the presence of children, particularly babies. The character of *dida* as a nursery term emerges clearly from the work of Mustio, by whom the word is mainly used when babies or young girls are alluded to. Nursery terms are not necessarily restricted to female speech, but they may be used particularly by women (and are thus 'sex preferential' rather than 'sex exclusive'), especially in societies in which babies are managed exclusively by women. The society about which Soranus and Mustio were writing was one in which babies were in the care of *nutrices*, cooperating no doubt with natural mothers, and mothers were in the care of *obstetrices*, who we are explicitly told were uneducated. It is not unlikely that Mustio was used to hearing *dida* mainly in the speech of the *obstetrices* and *nutrices* for whom he was writing, and that for him it was a *muliebre uerbum*. He may not have achieved a 'women's' gynaecological terminology, but *dida* at least

imparted a homely female tone to the work, appropriate to the social milieu of the humble women who will have been caring both for mothers and infants. It is virtually certain that the society for which he did his translation was in Africa. *Dida* must have been in use in Africa, but whether it was distinctive of Africa or more widely current we cannot be sure. The Catalan evidence suggests that it was more widespread, but there is an element of doubt about the way in which the word got into Catalan.

III A USE OF *MAMMA*

It was mentioned above (II.1) that a common word for 'wet nurse' in Mustio is *mamma*. There are eight examples, all of which are quoted below. We also saw that in one place *dida* is used in the same way. *Nutrix* is also used eight times in this sense (see below). The examples of *mamma* 'wet nurse' are unambiguous in meaning in the contexts in which they occur. By contrast, in epigraphy it is often impossible to pin down the sense of *mamma*, though it is generally believed that this meaning does turn up in inscriptions.³⁸

The frequency of *mamma* 'wet nurse' in our text is a distinct curiosity, and the example of *dida* is no less striking. *Mamma* in the meaning 'breast' was acceptable in medical writings and in the literary language, but *mamma* 'wet nurse' is a different matter. The only definite examples of *mamma nutrix* cited by the *TLL* VIII.248.21ff. are from our text (though not all examples in the text are listed). *Nutrix* is the usual word in medical texts. It is worth citing two examples of *nutrix* from another late African writer, Caelius Aurelianus, alongside passages of Mustio. At 1.89, p. 32.1 Mustio puts the question 'what (type of) wet nurse is suitable for nursing the infant?', using *mamma*: *quae est ergo mamma apta ad nutriendum infantem?* By contrast, at *Chron.* 1.79 Caelius uses *nutrix* in virtually the same context: *quomodo ... communiter nutrices bonae probentur, Muliebrum libris ... docebimus* ('how ... in general good nurses are to be tested, I shall explain ... in my books of *Muliebria*'). And at 1.114, p. 40.3, as we saw above (II.1), Mustio says that under certain circumstances the child 'is to be handed over to another wet nurse', using *dida* this time: *aliae didae tradendus est*. He uses *mamma* at 1.93, p. 34.5 similarly: *alterius mammae lacte accipiat* ('let him receive the milk of another wet nurse'). Caelius (*Chron.* 1.79) uses *nutrix* in the same context: *erunt igitur ... aliae nutrices exhibendae, ex quarum sano lacte infans nutriatur* ('therefore ... other nurses will have to be employed, from whose milk, being sound, the infant is to be fed').

One must consider the significance of Mustio's tendency to depart from standard usage. Bradley³⁹ formulates a distinction between *mamma* and *nutrix* (and *tata* and *nutritor*) as follows:

tata and *mamma* cannot be held to be pure synonyms for *nutritor* and *nutrix*; ... A distinction must be observed, and it can be straightforwardly stated: *nutritor* and *nutrix* are functional terms, designating people who carried out a particular kind of work assigned to them, whereas *tata* and *mamma* are personal terms, expressing the existence of a social relationship between adult and child.

³⁸ See the discussion of K. R. Bradley, *Discovering the Roman Family. Studies in Roman Social History* (New York and Oxford, 1991), 76–102; also H. S. Nielsen, 'On the use of the terms of relation "mamma" and "tata" in the epitaphs of CIL VI', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 40 (1989), 191–6. Both Bradley and Nielsen stress the difficulty of interpreting *mamma* (and *tata*) in inscriptions. Nielsen (193–4) claims to find cases of *mamma* = *nutrix* at CIL VI.16450, 18302. See too M. Corbier, 'Épigraphie et parenté', in *Épigraphie et histoire: acquis et problèmes* (Lyons, 1998), 134.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 89.

This formulation is plausible, though based on virtually no clearcut evidence.⁴⁰ Bradley shows in his chapter on *mamma* and *tata* that most of the *mammae* in *CIL* VI were not parents (see e.g. 86–7), but because of the uninformative contexts in which the word tends to occur in inscriptions he has for the most part to resort to speculation (87–9) in arguing that it often referred to nurses (but see 88). Though he mentions the odd case of *nutrix*, Bradley offers no systematic collection of examples of this word or discussion of its uses.

The seventeen examples of terms for ‘wet nurse’ in the first book of Mustio (I include in this figure the one case of *dida*) represent a sizeable body of material from the hand of a single writer, and it is worth examining this evidence to see whether a distinction between *nutrix* and *mamma* emerges. I begin by quoting all examples of the two words in this sense:

1. 1.91, p. 33.6 *si nutrix uinum multum bibat ...*
‘If the nurse drinks a lot of wine ...’
2. 1.91, p. 33.17 *quae sunt exercitia quae fieri possunt nutrici?*
‘What are the exercises which can be done by the nurse?’ [or ‘imposed on the nurse’]
3. 1.93, p. 34.3 *quid est faciendum si nutricis lac fuerit exterminatum?*
‘What is to be done if the nurse’s milk comes to an end?’
4. 1.95, p. 34.16 *quae adhibenda sunt secundum antiquos ut lac abundet nutricis?*
‘What according to the ancients are the measures to be applied to make the nurse’s milk abundant?’
5. 1.97, p.35.9 *quare acros et salsos cibos nutrices accipere non permittitur?*
‘Why are nurses not allowed to take sharp and salty foods?’
6. 1.109, p. 38.14 *a somno experrecta nutrice quid facere oportet?*
‘If the nurse is woken from sleep what should she do?’
7. 1.118, p. 41.1 *manibus nutricis retentus quasi ambulare discat.*⁴¹
‘He should learn to walk supported by the hands of the nurse.’
8. 1.141, p. 45.19 *omnia quae adstringere possunt et nutrici eius damus.*
‘We give to the nurse as well everything which can have an astringent effect.’
9. 1.85, p. 31.1 *digito debet mamma eius os ipsius inlinire uel mulsam tepidam instillare, et sic postera etiam lac offerre.*
‘His nurse should smear his mouth (with honey) from her finger or drip in warm hydro mel, and then on the next day offer milk as well.’
10. 1.88, p. 31.14 *materno lacte nutriendus est infans an mammae?*
‘Is the infant to be fed with the milk of his mother or of a nurse?’
11. 1.88, p. 31.16 *melius quidem de mamma nutritur.*
‘It is better if he is fed with nurse’s milk.’ [lit. ‘from a nurse’]
12. 1.89, p. 32.1 *quae est ergo mamma apta ad nutriendum infantem?*
‘What (type of) nurse therefore is suitable for feeding the infant?’
13. 1.93, p. 34.5 *alterius mammae lacte accipiat.*
‘He should receive the milk of another nurse.’

⁴⁰ Nielsen (n. 38), 192 makes a very similar distinction: ‘In all these epitaphs, the words *mamma* and *tata* are also used as terms of social relation and never as an indication of profession’. She adds that inscriptions with *nutrix* usually give information about a profession and not a social relationship.

⁴¹ *Quasi* introducing an infinitive seems to be redundant. Cf. J. N. Adams, *Pelagonius and Latin Veterinary Terminology in the Roman Empire* (Leiden, 1995), 484–5.

14. 1.107, p. 38.3 *ipsa mamma si non digesserit balneum et sic lacte dederit, male infantem accipit.*
'If the nurse herself has not shaken off (the effects of) the bath and then gives him milk, it troubles⁴² the infant.'
15. 1.134, p. 43.20 *ita ut mamma eius uinum non bibat ...*
'In such a way that his nurse does not drink wine ...'
16. 1.141, p. 46.2 *mulsam et omnia quae uentrem mollire possunt etiam mammae dabimus.*
'We shall also give to the nurse hydromel and everything which can have a softening effect on the bowels.'

There is some overlap between the two terms. Each occurs, for example, in an allusion to the undesirability of the nurse's drinking too much wine (1, 15). Both may have a dependent *eius*, referring to the infant in the care of the nurse (8, 15). Both are found within a short space (8, 16) in a discussion of what is to be done if the infant develops diarrhoea: the nurse is to take certain potions and the like. There is, however, a clear-cut distinction. Six of the eight examples of *mamma* (15 and 16 are the exceptions) occur in explicit references to the feeding of the infant, who is mentioned in the immediate context, whether by means of the word *infans* (10, 12, 14), by means of a pronoun (twice in 9), or as the understood subject of a verb (11, 13). The *mamma* is the one who feeds the baby. *Nutrix*, by contrast, never occurs in direct reference to feeding. In seven places *nutrix* is used in discussions of the health, recommended behaviour or diet of the nurse (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8). I include in this list 3 and 4, which deal with the questions what to do if the milk dries up, and how to ensure that there is an abundance of milk. Feeding is only indirectly at issue in these passages, in that the infant is not present in the context and it is the physical state of the nurse that is being discussed. In the eighth passage (7) the *nutrix* is to teach the infant how to walk.

I would not wish to suggest in advancing this distinction that the primary role of a woman designated *nutrix* was something other than to feed the infant. The *nutrix* and *mamma* were one and the same person with the same function, but the tone of the two words clearly differed. There is an unmistakable parallelism between the use of *dida* 'breast' and of *mamma* 'wet nurse'. We saw earlier that *dida* designated the breast from the perspective of the baby. So it is that the *mamma* is the baby's wet nurse. From the point of view of the parent or medical practitioner, interested in the way of life, suitability, and health of the nurse, the woman is a *nutrix*. *Nutrix* on this evidence has about it something of the neutral tone of a professional description, whereas *mamma* 'nurse' is an emotive term suggesting a link between nurse and infant. It is a term which takes us into the nursery, where small children might address their nurse, or the nurse might refer to herself in addressing them, or other women such as the mother or *obstetrix* might address or refer to the nurse in the presence of the child. In this environment the breast was called *dida* and the nurse *mamma*, at least in the region where Mustio was writing, though the distinction between *mamma* and *nutrix* is not of the sort that would ever be absolute. The absence of the usage from other medical texts would be explicable if it were a 'family' or 'women's' term in this sense. Up to a point Mustio seems to have turned away from scientific formality and to have peppered his work (deliberately, given the remark in the preface with which this paper began) with the emotive language in which mothers, babies and nurses communicated.

⁴² For *male accipere* = *uexare*, see Rose (n. 3), 149.

It will be seen that Bradley's distinction is much the same as that which emerges from the treatise of Mustio. I would myself define *nutrix* as a neutral professional designation and *mamma* (in this meaning) as a private, emotive term, suitable when a close bond between nurse and child was to be expressed, but not necessarily restricted to such contexts; within family groups and particularly among women and children it must have been commonplace. If the infant had addressed his nurse in one of his first utterances as *mam-ma* or the nurse referred to herself in the same way in addressing him, it is easy to see how that childish reduplicated form might have been used to convey real emotion in an epitaph for one of them, and equally easy to see how inappropriate it might have sounded in a learned medical treatise.

IV. FINAL REMARKS

There have been welcome attempts in recent years to characterize forms of technical language in Latin as special registers, with their own distinctive features of lexicon and syntax,⁴³ but Mustio's work suggests that it may not always be appropriate to treat the language of a technical treatise as entirely 'technical'. Mustio was an eccentric stylist among extant medical writers in Latin. To a considerable extent he used the scientific terminology that was by this time well established in the genre (see above I for some examples), but we also saw (I with n. 11) that almost uniquely among Latin medical writers he was prepared to admit the odd basic obscenity. Such terms, standing in the vicinity of learned loan translations and loan words, would at least have left midwives in no doubt as to his meaning, but they should not for that reason be classified as *muliebria uerba*. Basic obscenities were used freely by men throughout the recorded history of Latin. The 'women's words' that he has used are nursery terms, and in adopting these he has certainly in part accommodated the language of the treatise to the speech of its intended readers.

There may be a few other such terms in the work. A notable item is at 1.131, p. 43.6: *aliquando aquam aliquando uinum aquatius per uasculum uitreum ad similitudinem papillae formatum et pertusum, quod rustici ubuppam appellant aut titinam* ('[we should give the infant to drink] sometimes water, sometimes watery wine, by means of a little glass vessel formed in the likeness of a nipple and pierced, called by rustics *ubuppa* or "little teat"'). *Vbuppa* is obscure,⁴⁴ but *titina*, denoting a baby's drinking vessel with the shape of a woman's nipple, has the late diminutive suffix *-inus* elucidated by Niedermann,⁴⁵ here attached to the base **titta*,⁴⁶ a proto-Romance term mentioned above (II.1).⁴⁷ *Titina* is attested in

⁴³ See e.g. Langslow (n. 19).

⁴⁴ I can see no point in speculating about the etymology of this term, given that it is ascribed to 'rustics' in an African text and is therefore likely to be an African word of some sort. The derivation from *uber* proposed by D. Gourevitch, 'Biberons romains: formes et noms', in G. Sabbah (ed.), *Le latin médical. La constitution d'un langage scientifique* (Saint Étienne, 1991), 118 is unconvincing. No attempt is made to explain the ending, which is the crux of the problem. See also K. D. Fischer, 'Nochmals ubuppa und tit(t)ina', *Philologus* 131 (1987), 156–7. See also the next footnote.

⁴⁵ M. Niedermann, 'inus als Diminutivsuffix im späteren Volkslatein', in *Sprachgeschichte und Wortbedeutung. Festschrift Albert Debrunner* (Bern, 1954), 329–42. See 335 for *titina* (with n. 8 on *ubuppa*).

⁴⁶ For the loss of gemination which accompanies the shift of the accent from root to suffix, cf. *mamilla* alongside *mamma*.

⁴⁷ Gourevitch (n. 44), 119 speculates about the origin of *titina* but does not mention either the reconstructed term **titta* or Niedermann's article about the suffix of the word. André (n. 16), 223 likewise says nothing about the suffix of *titina* and does not refer to Niedermann.

its primary sense of the breast/nipple at ps.-Theodorus Priscianus p. 276.27: *mulieri capitellum de titina (ligabis)* ('in a woman bind the point of the breast'). Fischer cites the gloss CGL I.307 *mmae tittinae*.⁴⁸ There is also an example in the gynaecological fragments edited by Egert:⁴⁹ 66 *si post partum mulieri tityna doluerit* ('if after birth the breast/nipple of the woman is in pain').⁵⁰ The variant forms *sissina* and *sessina* occur in Sextus Placitus (III.β, lines 113, 122)⁵¹ *sissina mulieris, capitellum sessinae*.⁵² Used in the sense it has in Mustio, *titina* was almost by definition a nursery term, though Mustio himself classifies it as 'rustic', which need mean no more than 'familiar, popular'; again we see Mustio's readiness in a technical treatise to draw on low-register terminology in the context of the feeding of infants.

Oddly there is another diminutive in *-inus* just a few lines earlier in Mustio, again in the context of infant feeding. The question is asked what (solid) food should first be given to the infant, and in answer (1.130, p. 43.1) Mustio states: *micinas in mulsa uel in condito aut in lacte infusas* ('crumbs dipped in hydromel or flavoured drink or milk'). *Micina* is the diminutive of *mica* 'crumb, morsel'.⁵³ The Greek has *ψικίον* (2.46.3, p. 86.10 Ilberg), itself a diminutive, of *ψίξ*, which has the same meaning. *Micina* may well, given the context, have been another word used (mainly by women) in the presence of babies.

I mention just one other term. Throughout the treatise *urina* is used in reference to the urine of the female patient,⁵⁴ but in two places *lotium* is used instead, both times of the urine of the infant or foetus (1.54, p. 19.14 *infantis lotium*, 1.79, p. 29.8 *lotio puerili*). *Lotium* has tended to be seen as a 'vulgar' alternative to *urina*,⁵⁵ but there is a possibility that it had entered nursery language in Africa.

Mustio was not entirely consistent in his pronouncements. We saw earlier that in one place he implied that midwives would be illiterate, and in another stated that they should be literate. His stated intention of speaking simply so that uneducated midwives could understand his treatise if it were read to them is hardly fulfilled, given that the work has an abundance of obscure technical terminology. But there are other dimensions to the language that are unexpected in a medical treatise. There are Punic (or other African) words for which Graeco-Latin terms might have been substituted, basic obscenities, and some nursery language, triggered it seems

⁴⁸ See n. 44. Fischer also quotes a medieval text containing several examples of *titina* in its anatomical sense.

⁴⁹ F. P. Egert (ed.), *Gynäkologische Fragmente aus dem frühen Mittelalter nach einer Petersburger Handschrift aus dem VIII. IX. Jahrhundert zum ersten Mal gedruckt* (Berlin, 1936).

⁵⁰ I am grateful to K. D. Fischer for drawing my attention to this example. He also refers to the manuscript Sloane 475, fol. 116' *uirgini si alligata fuerit circa collo, tetine eius non crescent* ('if it [an amulet] is bound around the neck of a virgin, her breasts do not grow').

⁵¹ See E. Howald and H. E. Sigerist, *Corpus medicorum latinorum* 4 (Leipzig and Berlin, 1927), 245. Howald and Sigerist print *sessina(e)* in both places, but the form with *i* in the first syllable is a variant reading in the first.

⁵² See Niedermann (n. 45), 335, André (n. 16), 223. I would not myself be inclined (with André [n. 16], 224) to see *sissina* as a word of different origin from *titina*. Nursery terms were variable in their consonant structure, as *dida* alongside *titta* shows. Cf. the variants *pisinnus*, *pitinnus*, *pitzinnus*, *bizinus*, and *pipinna*, all illustrated by Niedermann (n. 45), 339.

⁵³ See the discussion of Niedermann (n. 45), 334. For the survival of the word in Romance (Italy), see C. Battisti and G. Alessio, *Dizionario etimologico italiano* (Florence, 1950) 7) 4. 2450.

⁵⁴ E.g. 1.58, p. 20.17, 2.20, p. 55.5, 2.21, p. 55.13, 2.30, p. 62.4, 2.50, p. 74.18, 2.59, p. 83.12, 13 and elsewhere.

⁵⁵ See Adams (n. 6), 246–8.

by contexts dealing with the feeding of the infant. Nursery language was mainly the province of women in the type of society about which Mustio was writing, and Mustio seems to have accommodated the work to his readers in using such language. All of these elements give the treatise a far less formal tone than that of many other medical works.

All Souls College, Oxford

J. N. ADAMS