BILINGUALISM AND THE LATIN LANGUAGE

J. N. ADAMS

Senior Research Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York NY 10011–4211, USA
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, VIC 3166, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

http://www.cambridge.org

First published 2003

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Baskerville Monotype 11/12.5 pt *System* LaTeX 2ε [TB]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Adams, J. N. (James Noel)
Bilingualism and the Latin language / J. N. Adams.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0 521 81771 4 (hardback)
1. Latin language – History. 2. Languages in contact – Rome – History – To 500.
3. Latin language – Influence on foreign languages. 4. Latin language – Foreign
words and phrases. 5. Bilingualism – Rome – History – To 1500. 6. Code-switching
(Linguistics) – Rome. I. Title.
PA2057 .A33 2002
470′.42–dc21 2002019278

ISBN 0 521 81771 4

Contents

1

Introduction

1 INTRODUCTORY REMARKS; SOME ISSUES IN THE STUDY OF BILINGUALISM

It is thought that bilingualism is more common than monolingualism, and yet linguistics has traditionally operated as if the monolingual were the normal speaker.[1] Bilingualism across the Roman world cannot be quantified, but numerous languages survive in the written record (usually in a fragmentary state) or are attested in contact with Latin (Gaulish, forms of Hispanic, Oscan, Umbrian, Venetic, Etruscan, Hebrew, Aramaic, Egyptian Demotic and hieroglyphics, Coptic, Punic, Libyan (?), Thracian, forms of Germanic, as well as Greek),[2] and others were spoken without leaving any trace in our sources. In the vast expanses of the Roman Empire, where mobility was high among such groups as the army, administrative personnel, traders and slaves, language contact was a fact of everyday life. To survey bilingualism in the whole of the ancient world would be an immense task, but the Roman domain, particularly during the Empire, offers more manageable data.

Bilingualism has traditionally been of interest not only to linguists, but also to anthropologists, social and cultural historians and students of literature. As found in the Roman period it has received a good deal of attention, explicitly in some of the works of (e.g.) Dubuisson, Holford-Strevens, Horsfall, Leiwo, Millar, Neumann and Untermann, Rochette and Wenskus, and implicitly in virtually any work on Latin literary genres with Greek forerunners. The time seems appropriate for the topic to be taken up again, not least because bilingualism in modern societies has attracted much research by sociolinguists, psycholinguists and anthropologists in recent years. The issues have become clearer and methodologies

[1] See e.g. Milroy and Muysken (1995: 2–3), Romaine (1995: 1) on this point.

[2] When I say that such languages are attested 'in contact with Latin', I mean that we either have bilingual texts, or that there are *testimonia* recording or implying bilingualism of one sort or another.

have been developed. Those studying bilingualism in Roman antiquity have tended to concentrate on various subjects to the exclusion of others. Loan-words have been ceaselessly investigated to the neglect of code-switching,[3] learned imitation in one language of the syntax of another to the neglect of interference, the upper classes as second-language learners to the neglect of sub-élite bilinguals, lexical phenomena to the neglect of syntax, morphology and orthography, anecdotal evidence to the neglect of primary evidence, Romans as learners of Greek to the neglect of Greeks as learners of Latin,[4] and contact between Latin and Greek to the neglect of contact between Latin and other languages. Where Romans are concerned, much effort has been expended on an attempt to assess the extent of upper-class knowledge of Greek,[5] through the medium of ancient anecdotes about linguistic performance and through the study of literary translations mainly into the writer's first language. I will be trying to change the emphasis, by considering languages other than Greek in contact with Latin (though contact between Greek and Latin is the best attested, and must be given most space), by using primary material (inscriptions, ostraca and papyri) as well as anecdotal, and by dealing as much with sub-élites as with the upper classes. I will not be discussing (except in passing) the extent of bilingualism, the evidence for which is inadequate, nor will I be mapping language regions across the Empire and points of language contact.[6] Instead some of the major issues in current bilingual studies will be considered as they impinge on antiquity. These include the nature and motivation of code-switching, the related subject of the determinants of language choice, a topic which will be discussed particularly in relation to the place of Latin in Egypt, and bilingualism as an influence in language change. These issues, as we will see, in turn raise others, such as the part played by language choice and code-switching in the construction or perception of individual and collective identities, language choice as an expression of solidarity on the one hand and of power or dominance on the other, and the significance of topic or domain in language selection. Other themes of the book will include bilingualism in the army, and the relationship between second-language learning and the acquisition of literacy in a second language.

[3] Code-switching is now beginning to attract the notice of classicists: see Wenskus (1995, 1996, 1998), Jocelyn (1999), Dunkel (2000).
[4] But see now Dubuisson (1985), Holford-Strevens (1993), Rochette (1997a).
[5] See particularly Horsfall (1979), Dubuisson (1992).
[6] For which see Neumann and Untermann (1980).

In the present chapter I first introduce some terminology which is fundamental to the book, namely 'bilingualism' and the difference between 'élite' and 'non-élite' bilingualism, 'code-switching' as distinct from 'borrowing' and 'interference', and 'pidgins' and 'reduced' languages. Some of these topics will be dealt with at greater length in later chapters. I also consider here the main types of primary evidence which are relevant to bilingualism. It must be stressed that the primary evidence relating to bilingualism in dead languages is very different from that which modern linguists investigating bilingualism in spoken languages can call on. Written evidence raises its own problems of interpretation, and it would not do to accept uncritically all of the assumptions implicit in linguistic research on bilingualism in spoken forms. For that reason a good deal of space will be given to establishing a typology of texts with bilingual significance. Bilingualism as manifested in written form has been largely disregarded in the modern world. There is also a section on the concept of the 'authorship' of inscriptions, particularly bilingual and transliterated, since inscriptions will bulk large as evidence and their authorship is a complicated matter.

II BILINGUALISM

Bilingualism has been understood in many ways, and I begin with a discussion of the term leading to a definition on which this book will be based. Weinreich was content with a definition which does not even occupy two lines (1953: 1): 'The practice of alternately using two languages will be called BILINGUALISM, and the persons involved, BILINGUAL.' This would perhaps better serve as a description of code-switching (for which see below, V). Since then, the matter has been seen as more problematic. Hamers and Blanc (1989: 6–30), in a discussion of the difficulties inherent in such definitions, quote that of the *Webster Dictionary* (1961) for the word 'bilingual', as follows: 'having or using two languages especially as spoken with the fluency characteristic of a native speaker; a person using two languages especially habitually and with control like that of a native speaker'. There is embodied here an old and popular view that bilingualism is marked by equal and fluent competence in two languages. This view is found as well in earlier linguistic literature, notably in Bloomfield's assertion (1933: 55–6) that in cases 'where . . . perfect foreign-language learning is not accompanied by loss of the native language, it results in *bilingualism*, native-like control of two languages'. There are indeed bilinguals of this type, but equally there are speakers who have

greater competence in one language than another, and it would seem perverse to exclude them from a study of bilingualism given that they might be perfectly capable of communicating fluently in the second language.

From the Roman period, for example, educated Latin writers can be found who, while working with complex Greek as the language of their source material, seem to have made mistakes from time to time in their understanding of the language;[7] but they should not merely for that reason be deemed not to have been 'bilingual'. An example of an apparent error in a literary text is at Livy 38.7.10, a passage based on Polybius 21.28.11, describing a confrontation between the Romans and Aetolians in a tunnel at Ambracia in 189 BC. Polybius says that both groups thrust shields in front of them (διὰ τὸ προβάλλεσθαι θυρεοὺς καὶ γέρρα πρὸ αὑτῶν ἀμφότεροι), but Livy, seemingly confusing θυρεοί with θύραι, has them holding forth doors (*foribus raptim obiectis*).[8] Another possible case is at Livy 33.8.13, where *hastis positis* corresponds to Polybius' καταβαλοῦσι τὰς σαρίσας (18.24.9). Note Briscoe (1973: 263): 'Polybius said that they were to lower their spears for the charge and L. took him to mean that they were to put them down on the ground.'[9] But errors of translation (into one's native language) are arguably of a different order from errors of what I will call 'positive performance' in the second language itself (on 'performance', see below). It might even be suggested that misunderstandings of the above sort are of no significance at all in assessing second-language competence, because even monolinguals reading their own language do not always read with the same concentration or comprehension.[10] In a strong sense a writer of, say, Latin who could not use passive verb-forms might be said to

[7] See in general Horsfall (1979: 80–4), and on errors of differing degrees of seriousness in a variety of Latin writers (Gellius, Pliny, Cicero, Terence, Virgil and Catullus), see Holford-Strevens (1988: 169–70). Also worth noting is Lucretius' account of the plague at Athens (6.1138–1286), which is largely based on Thucydides, but with some misunderstandings. See the notes of Bailey (1947), vol. III, on 1151–9, 1152, 1197–8, 1198–1204, 1230–51, 1235. For errors in Cicero's translation of Aratus, see Soubiran (1972: 88–9).

[8] See Walsh (1958).

[9] Walbank (1967) ad loc. takes the same view, but the case is far from established. Livy talks of the phalanx of the Macedonians laying down their spears, the length of which was a hindrance, and taking to their swords, which is radically different from Polybius' account of a charge. The possibility cannot be ruled out that Livy made a deliberate change to the nature of the event, for whatever reasons of artistry (see Briscoe ad loc. for additional bibliography on this point). Other possible examples from Livy cited by Briscoe (1973: 6, 1981: 2) are even less convincing, and some are purely speculative. Sometimes, if Livy did not alter the narrative of the original slightly for his own purposes, he might simply have lost the drift of his source.

[10] See Powell (1995: 273–9) for a discussion of the possible reasons why Cicero might sometimes have committed 'errors' of translation. Powell too seems disinclined to treat such errors as particularly significant.

have had imperfect knowledge of the language, but errors of translation may in fact be based on *knowledge* of the other language. Livy analysed καταβάλλω correctly, but (if the conventional interpretation is accepted) did not recognise the technical use of the word;[11] and in the other case it is well to remember that a writer's source in manuscript form might often have been either corrupt or difficult to read.[12] The presence of non-military objects in the context (γέρρα, πίθος) does indeed suggest the possibility that Livy's text might have had a different reading.

The errors of translation that have been found in Apuleius[13] similarly lack significance. I cite just one example. At *De mundo* 25 (343), *nec ambigitur eum praestantem ac sublimem sedem tenere et poetarum* ***laudibus nomen eius consulum ac regum nuncupationibus praedicari*** (of the supreme god: 'nor is it doubted that he occupies an eminent and lofty seat, and that in the eulogies of the poets his name is designated by the titles of consuls and kings'), the words in bold correspond to Περὶ κόσμου 397 b 25 ὕπατός τε [= *summus*] διὰ τοῦτο ὠνόμασται ('because of this he has been called supreme'). Note Beaujeu (1973: xii): 'le traducteur ignorait ce sens assez rare d'ὕπατος, mot qui, de son temps, servait presque uniquement à traduire *consul*'. Thus it is Apuleius' knowledge of the current language that leads him astray, if we accept that a genuine mistake has been made.[14] There is no point in attempting to assess the quality of Romans' knowledge of Greek on the evidence of translation errors alone. For one thing, the high Greek literary language in its various forms did not much resemble the varieties spoken during the Roman period, and even Greeks themselves may have had problems in understanding earlier literature. Romans did not have access to scholarly tools of the modern type (most notably bilingual dictionaries) to help them with the interpretation of classical genres full of archaisms.[15] I will here follow implicitly the principle that bilingual competence can only be seriously examined through examples of positive *performance* in a second language.

But what does 'performance' mean? The skills deployed by a language user (including a bilingual) may be said to fall into four types, listening, reading, speaking and writing.[16] Listening and reading are passive, speaking and writing active, and it is to the last two, as the positive skills,

[11] Similarly Walsh (1958: 85) is inclined to take a lenient view of this error.

[12] Compare Bailey's (1947) note on Lucr. 6.1198–1204: 'Lucr. again misunderstands or misrepresents Thuc., unless . . . he was using a corrupt version or even an inaccurate Latin translation.'

[13] See Beaujeu (1973: xi–xii).

[14] Beaujeu (1973: 330), in his note on the passage, appears not so confident that Apuleius had not made a deliberate change.

[15] See the remarks of Horsfall (1979: 82).

[16] See Romaine (1995: 13).

that attention should ideally be directed.[17] From antiquity we do not have equal access to all four activities. In corpus languages it is possible only to glean bits and pieces of information about the *listening* and *speaking* skills of 'bilinguals' in their second language, from anecdotes or by making deductions from narratives of events (see below, III on the shortcomings of anecdotes as evidence). Evidence of this type has its place in the study of ancient bilingualism, but it will not be the main focus of this book. *Reading* a second language is the skill required of translators such as Livy and Apuleius, but in an ancient language the assessment of this activity is made difficult by the literary translator's artistic licence, which allowed him to make deliberate changes to the content of his source, and also by momentary lapses of no necessary significance, as discussed above. It is *writing* a second language that is the most positive bilingual performance which can be observed from antiquity. On this view translations by Romans of literary Greek into Latin[18] would have less to tell us than specimens of Greek composed by Romans, whether by free composition (note the exercise in declamation at Cic. *Att.* 9.4.2; cf. 6.4.3, 6.5.1–2)[19] or as renderings of Latin originals (as for example the Greek translations of *senatus consulta*, as collected by Sherk (1969)).[20]

A distinction which is sometimes made is between the *balanced* bilingual, 'who has equivalent competence in both languages' (Hamers and Blanc (1989: 8)), and the *dominant* bilingual, 'for whom competence in one of the languages, more often the mother tongue, is superior to his competence in the other' (Hamers and Blanc (1989: 8)). Hamers and Blanc stress that balanced bilingualism 'should not be confused with a very high degree of competence in the two languages; it is rather a question of a state of equilibrium reached by the levels of competence attained in the two languages as compared to monolingual competence'. They go on to say that equivalent competence 'should not be equated with the ability to use both languages for all functions and domains. Dominance or balance is not equally distributed for all domains and

[17] For reading a foreign language as easier than speaking it, see the remarks of Jerome, *PL* 29, 23–6, cited below, 2.VII.5.

[18] As for example Catullus' translation of Callimachus (66), Cicero's translations of the *Timaeus* (see Poncelet (1957); also Mueller-Goldingen (1992)) and the *Phaenomena* of Aratus. Cicero also translated the *Oeconomicus* of Xenophon (see *Off.* 2.87). On translating from Greek into Latin, see Quint. 10.5.2–3, Cic. *De orat.* 1.155, *Opt. gen.* 23. See also Horsfall (1979: 83–4), and on Cicero, Powell (1995), Vitruvius, Lendle (1992), and Gellius, Steinmetz (1992). Note too the general discussion (with bibliography) of Traina (1989).

[19] The last two passages were ostensibly in Greek so that the courier could not read them (for code-switching as a form of coding, see below, 3.III.3).

[20] On the usefulness of translating into Greek, see Quint. 10.5.4–5.

functions of language'. Doubts have however been expressed about the value of the concept of 'balanced bilingualism'. Note Romaine (1995: 19): 'The notion of balanced bilingualism is an ideal one, which is largely an artefact of a theoretical perspective which takes the monolingual as its point of reference.'

Identifying fluent or balanced competence in two languages from the written record of antiquity is not easy, though where Greek and Latin speech is concerned there is anecdotal evidence of individuals competent *utraque lingua* (see further below, III).[21] As far as 'non-balanced' bilingualism is concerned, it is not difficult in inscriptions and elsewhere to find specimens of Latin that were written by Greeks with imperfect competence in Latin, and vice versa (see below). The Greekness or Romanness of the writers is revealed by interference from the first language (on interference, see V), and there may also be signs of a reduced morphology in the target language. The clearest evidence for this latter phenomenon is to be found in a Greek's attempted translation into Latin of parts of two fables of Babrius (*P. Amh.* II.26). This piece will be the subject of Chapter 8. I set out in section IX below some examples of such reduced or imperfect Greek and Latin, which take us into the world of Greeks and others struggling to acquire and communicate in a second language. Material from the hand of learners of Latin as a second language is perhaps the best evidence that we have for the problems of everyday cross-language communication in the multilingual Roman Empire. The evidence is relevant to such issues as the part played by language learning in inflicting change on a target language, the stages in the acquisition of a second language and the nature of learners' errors, the relationship between language learning and the acquisition of literacy in the second language, and more generally the linguistic policy of some groups such as the Roman army. Such evidence, which largely concerns social strata below the level of the highly educated Greco-Roman élites, has tended to be disregarded by students of ancient bilingualism, who have concentrated instead on what might be called *élite bilingualism* (see below, III).

In this book I will not be subscribing to the popular view of bilingualism referred to in the opening paragraph of this section. The bilingual's proficiency in the two languages, on my understanding of the term 'bilingual', may vary greatly across such areas as the phonological, morphological, lexical, semantic and stylistic.[22] The merchant who manages to

[21] See Horsfall (1979), Dubuisson (1981). [22] See e.g. Romaine (1995: 12–13).

communicate in a foreign market place with a mixture of gestures and words of the foreign language shorn of some inflectional morphemes and articulated in a foreign accent may in a sense be described as a practising 'bilingual', but his proficiency in the second language is at a far remove from that, say, of a foreign ambassador who delivers a speech in Latin at Rome on a political subject.[23] It follows that I will be adopting an all-embracing definition of bilingualism. It will be assumed that speakers (or writers) of two languages may have an infinitely variable range of competences in the two languages, from native fluency on the one hand to imperfect competence verging on incompetence on the other. Even the speaker or writer with very poor command of a second language may be able to make himself understood in that language, at least within restricted domains, and is therefore worthy of study, particularly since language learners tend to turn up in important spheres of activity, such as the army and in trade, where their linguistic efforts, however inadequate, might have had considerable influence. Thus the term 'bilingual' will be used here to include even those whose second language is far from perfect. Setting up degrees of linguistic competence in a dead language is out of the question, and even in spoken modern languages is problematic.[24] Nevertheless the approximate opposites, competence and poor competence in the second language, are easy enough to distinguish.

I mention finally an obvious criticism to which the minimalist definition adopted here is exposed. Practically everyone knows at least a few words of a second language, and we are thus in danger of having to classify everyone as bilingual.[25] It is though intuitively clear that there is a difference between being bilingual, however that term is defined, and 'knowing a few words from a second language'. The bilingual 'performs', however imperfectly, in at least one of the areas listed above, whereas the 'non-bilingual' has at best a few bits and pieces of passive knowledge, which he may never use. The objection is not a real one for the student of ancient bilingualism, because of necessity attention has to be devoted to written sources, and these convey actual 'performance', or anecdotes about performance.

[23] Note the random list of fifteen types of 'bilinguals' given by Hoffmann (1991: 16–17), which include (e.g.) 'the two-year-old who is beginning to talk, speaking English to one parent and Welsh to the other', and 'the Portuguese chemist who can read specialist literature in his subject written in English'. Hoffmann (17) remarks: 'Many specialists would say that all the above individuals could be classed as bilinguals; but public opinion, and at least some of these people themselves, would probably disagree.'

[24] See e.g. Hamers and Blanc (1989: 14–25).

[25] Cf. Romaine (1995: 11).

III ÉLITE AND SUB-ÉLITE BILINGUALISM: ANECDOTAL EVIDENCE AND ITS SHORTCOMINGS

Those bilinguals who have attracted most attention among classicists, implicitly at least, might be called in the current jargon 'élite bilinguals', that is members of the educated classes who had freely chosen to become bilingual.[26] I say 'freely chosen' because there are other bilinguals who have no such choice. Upper-class Romans were by choice learners of Greek, and some are said to have achieved great competence in the second language. Quintilian asserted that the child (and he meant the upper-class child) should begin with Greek: 1.1.12 *a sermone Graeco puerum incipere malo, quia Latinum, qui pluribus in usu est, uel nobis nolentibus perbibet.* It might be said that a child had no choice, but in fact his father or parents were able to exercise such a choice on his behalf, and there is evidence that Quintilian's advice must often have been followed. Upper-class Romans who could not speak Greek (whether genuinely or allegedly) are sometimes disparaged, as Verres by Cicero: *Verr.* 4.127 *epigramma Graecum pernobile incisum est in basi, quod iste eruditus homo et Graeculus, qui haec subtiliter iudicat, qui solus intellegit, si unam litteram Graecam scisset, certe non sustulisset* ('it had a notable Greek inscription on its pedestal, which this learned exponent of Greek culture, with his delicate critical sense and unique appreciation of these matters, would certainly not (?) have removed if he had known a single Greek letter').[27] There is also a good deal of anecdotal and other evidence for fluent bilingualism (in Greek and Latin) among upper-class Romans, though opinions differ as to how it should be interpreted (see below). Here I select a few such anecdotes relating to Romans using Greek.[28]

According to Valerius Maximus, P. Crassus Mucianus as proconsul in Asia Minor in 131 BC was able to use the five Greek dialects: 8.7.6 *iam P. Crassus, cum in Asiam ad Aristonicum regem debellandum consul uenisset, tanta cura Graecae linguae notitiam animo conprehendit ut eam in quinque diuisam genera per omnes partes ac numeros penitus cognosceret.* The same anecdote is in Quintilian (11.2.50), perhaps taken from a common source: *Crassus ille dives, qui cum Asiae praeesset, quinque Graeci sermonis differentias sic tenuit, ut*

[26] See Hoffmann (1991: 46).

[27] There is obvious exaggeration here (so Dubuisson (1992: 188)), but it is of interest that elsewhere Cicero refers to an interpreter used by Verres, though allegedly for purposes other than interpreting (*Verr.* 3.84). The negative *non* in the final clause of the passage quoted may be wrong.

[28] Further details and evidence are discussed by Kroll (1933: II.118–19), Boyancé (1956), Kaimio (1979a: 94–110), Horsfall (1979: 84–7), Dubuisson (1982), id. (1992: 192), Weis (1992), Gruen (1993), chapter 6.

qua quisque apud eum lingua postulasset, eadem ius sibi redditum ferret.[29] Cicero on one occasion spoke Greek in the senate at Syracuse, an action for which he was criticised by an opponent, partly on the grounds that it was an improper act of deference for a Roman to speak Greek in public before a Greek audience: *Verr.* 4.147 *ait indignum facinus esse quod ego in senatu Graeco uerba fecissem; quod quidem apud Graecos Graece locutus essem, id ferri nullo modo posse.*[30] The Rhodian ambassador Apollonius Molo was allowed to speak Greek in the senate without an interpreter (Val. Max. 2.2.3). Atticus is said to have spoken Greek as if he were a native of Athens: Nepos *Att.* 4.1 *sic enim Graece loquebatur ut Athenis natus uideretur.* Much the same is said of L. Crassus: Cic. *De orat.* 2.2 *Graece sic loqui, nullam ut nosse aliam linguam uideretur.* Another who was more Greek than the Greeks was T. Albucius (Cic. *Brut.* 131 *doctus etiam Graecis T. Albucius uel potius plane Graecus . . . fuit autem Athenis adulescens*), who was mocked for his Hellenism by Scaevola in an incident reported by Lucilius (Cic. *Fin.* 1.8–9; Lucilius 88–94: see below, 3.IV.1). From the later Empire one may note, for example, the praetorian prefect Strategius Musonianus, who was famed for his knowledge of 'both languages': Amm. 15.13.1 *facundia sermonis utriusque clarus.*[31] Anecdotes on the other hand which portray Romans as either refusing to speak or use Greek themselves or to have it spoken directly to them cannot always be taken as evidence for an inability to use the language.[32] Greek, the language of high culture in Roman eyes, elicited in Romans a sense of cultural inferiority and in some of them a consequent linguistic aggression, particularly as Rome

[29] The division of the Greek dialects into five entailed classifying the koine as a dialect (along with Attic, Ionic, Doric and Aeolic): see Davies (1987: 14–15).

[30] For flattering remarks made by Apollonius Molo to Cicero after the latter had declaimed in Greek, see Plut. *Cic.* 4.4–5; also Rochette (1997a: 70–1).

[31] It has recently been argued (by Drijvers (1996)) that Musonianus knew Aramaic. The arguments advanced are convincing enough, but I would reject the tentative suggestion (537) that Ammianus might have meant by *facundia sermonis utriusque* 'those languages spoken in his hometown', viz. Greek and Aramaic. The phrase had long-standing literary associations and an accepted meaning, which could not possibly have been shed without very clear contextual pointers (contrast the example in Jerome, *PL* 29, 25–6, cited below, 2.VII.5, where there are such pointers). There are no pointers in the passage of Ammianus. On the contrary, it would be bizarre in the extreme if Ammianus had meant by *facundia* eloquence in any language other than Greek and Latin: these were the languages in which eloquence (*facundia*) in Greco-Roman culture could be displayed. Ammianus presumably meant that Musonianus was a gifted linguist, fluent of course in Greek and Latin, but by implication able to cope with other languages as well. A parallel can be found in the *protector* Antoninus, who defected to the Persians. He too was *utriusque linguae litteras sciens* (Amm. 18.5.1), but it emerges from the narrative that he could also communicate directly with Persians (see, e.g., 18.7.10–11 *dicere*, *auditis*), though Ammianus does not bother to tell the reader explicitly that he knew Persian (or Aramaic?). On Musonianus, see also 2.VII.5.

[32] See, e.g., Val. Max. 2.2.2, D.C. 57.15.2–3, Suet. *Tib.* 71.

established political control in the Greek world. On the one hand the educated Roman aspired to be fluent in Greek, but on the other hand it might be seen by some as humiliating to the Roman state if Greek was accepted on a public occasion. Attitudes were constantly changing, and what to Tiberius was unacceptable did not bother Claudius.[33]

It is worth dwelling a little longer on the diversity of anecdotal evidence about upper-class Romans and its interpretation. Not all anecdotal information is about fluent performance in the second language. Lesser degrees of competence are also occasionally acknowledged. Augustus, though he was interested in Greek culture and used code-switching into Greek in his letters (see Suet. *Tib.* 21.4–6), lacked confidence in the spoken language and was unwilling to speak extempore or to compose his own speeches in Greek: Suet. *Aug.* 89.1 *non tamen ut aut loqueretur expedite aut componere aliquid auderet; nam et si quid res exigeret, Latine formabat uertendumque alii dabat.* From the pages of Suetonius we are thus able to deduce a distinction between an individual's written and spoken Greek, or to be more precise between his writing of Greek to fellow Romans in private and his speaking of Greek to Greeks in public. Certainly Augustus did sometimes speak Greek before Greeks. After the battle of Actium he addressed the Egyptians and Alexandrians in Greek (D.C. 51.16.4),[34] but no doubt from a prepared text if we are to believe Suetonius. Claudius by contrast could reply to *legati* in extended speeches in Greek in the senate, and replies would not necessarily have been prepared in advance (Suet. *Claud.* 42.1 *ac saepe in senatu legatis perpetua oratione respondit*).

Another familiar story concerning poor competence has to do with the humiliation of Roman ambassadors to Tarentum in 282 BC under L. Postumius Megellus. The audience looked for errors in the Greek of Postumius and greeted his efforts with laughter. As the ambassadors left, someone excreted on the ambassadorial robe (D.H. 19.5).[35]

There is even found occasionally an attitude that mistakes in Greek might be made by a Roman deliberately, as a demonstration of Romanness: it would not do (in the eyes of some) to be considered too Greek. Thus, according to Cicero, Lucullus had inserted barbarisms and solecisms in his histories intentionally: *Att.* 1.19.10 *non dicam quod tibi, ut opinor, Panhormi Lucullus de suis historiis dixerat, se, quo facilius illas probaret Romani hominis esse, idcirco barbara quaedam et soloeca dispersisse.* Fluency in foreign languages may in some cultures arouse suspicion (see below 2 n. 381

[33] See, e.g., Suet. *Tib.* 71 alongside *Claud.* 42; see further Kaimio (1979a: 133–4).
[34] See Rochette (1997a: 98 n. 195) for bibliography.
[35] See Kaimio (1979a: 96), Dubuisson (1982: 196–7), Gruen (1993: 229–30), Rochette (1997a: 91).

for Roman suspicion of the linguistic skills of Carthaginians). Josephus (*AJ* 20.264), for example, asserted that his people 'did not favour those persons who had mastered the speech of many nations': παρ' ἡμῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἐκείνους ἀποδέχονται τοὺς πολλῶν ἐθνῶν διάλεκτον ἐκμαθόντας.[36] Cicero did not share the attitude of Lucullus. He sent a copy of the *commentarius* on his consulship to Atticus, asserting that any errors were not intended, and perhaps expecting Atticus to point out any necessary corrections if there was anything un-Greek in it: *Att.* 1.19.10 *in quo si quid erit quod homini Attico minus Graecum eruditumque uideatur . . . me imprudente erit et inuito.*[37] Also relevant in the present context are the Greek translations of *senatus consulta* written for circulation in the Greek world and also of the *Res Gestae* of Augustus (some linguistic features of which texts will be discussed in a later chapter (4.v.2.12)). These seem to be aggressively Latinate in their idiom: translators rendered Latin idioms literally into Greek, thereby producing a conspicuously peculiar Greek which may have been meant to impress Greeks by its Romanness. We should not (as has sometimes been done) take the translationese as a sign of the translators' poor command of Greek (see further below, 4.v.2.12).

I stress a few points in conclusion. First, a distinction must be made between those anecdotes which relate to knowledge of the Greek language, and those which relate to knowledge of Greek literature and culture.[38] There were Romans who affected to disregard Greek literature and culture (so Marius, Sall. *Iug.* 85.32, and L. Crassus, Cic. *De orat.* 1.82, 2.153), but that attitude should not be brought into discussions of the extent of Greek–Latin bilingualism. It was not impossible that a Roman fluent in Greek might parade a hostility to Greek culture. L. Crassus, just mentioned, was said to be so fluent in Greek that some thought it his native tongue (Cic. *De orat.* 2.2, cited above),[39] and Marius too knew Greek.[40] Plutarch's remark about Marius (*Mar.* 2.2), to the effect that

[36] For a full discussion of this passage, see Sevenster (1968: 65–71).

[37] It would be wrong though to ascribe this Ciceronian ideal of achieving correctness in one's Greek to Cato as well, on the basis of a well-known story. The fact that Cato rebuked A. Postumius Albinus for inserting in the preface of his Greek history an apology for any errors which he might have committed in Greek (Plb. 39.1, Plut. *Cato* 12.5) does not permit the conclusion that it was Cato's view that 'Romans who try their hand at writing Greek should do so at least as well as the Greeks themselves' (so Gruen (1993: 257)). The sources show that Cato was annoyed by the man's hypocrisy: he was not compelled to write in Greek, and to do so of his own accord and then to beg forgiveness for his barbarisms was ridiculous. Postumius' remark need have been no more than a commonplace of a Roman writing in Greek (see Walbank (1979: 727)).

[38] For the distinction, see Plb. 39.1.

[39] See the discussion of Gruen (1993: 264–5).

[40] See Gruen (1993: 268–9).

it was said that he never studied Greek literature, and never used the Greek language for any matter of real importance, nicely brings out the distinction I am suggesting: he knew Greek, but disregarded Greek literature. I note in passing that on this evidence Marius would seem (in the terminology of diglossia, for which see 5.I.3) to have been assigning a 'low' role to Greek, while reserving Latin for the 'high' functions.

Secondly, it is not satisfactory to treat 'Greek' as a unity. The language of classical literature was at a far remove from the koine spoken in the Roman period, and some Romans might well have been fluent in the spoken language but relatively unversed in literary Greek. It would be illogical to argue from the errors made by a person in understanding literary Greek that he could not speak the language. Confusions arise in discussions of Roman bilingualism because the various categories of Greek (and the categories of performance) are not always distinguished.

Thirdly, it is necessary to give some consideration to the reliability of anecdotal information in establishing the extent and quality of Roman élite bilingualism.[41] There are shortcomings in such evidence, two of which I mention here; another will come up in the next section. First, it is possible that Romans in the Republican period were active in constructing for themselves a reputation for fluent control of Greek, in defiance of the reality. I am not inclined though to dismiss the evidence of these anecdotes *en masse*. Some of the stories in our sources are so circumstantial that they must be believed. Cicero undoubtedly addressed the senate in Syracuse in Greek,[42] and Apollonius Molo must have spoken Greek in the Roman senate, thereby exercising the comprehension skills of the senators. A second inadequacy of such evidence is that it concerns a limited number of individuals, and cannot give any real idea of the proportion of educated Romans who were fluent Greek speakers, or (e.g.) of the extent of bilingualism among women as compared with men.[43] I quote Jocelyn (1973: 64): 'Deductions about the general level of Greek knowledge among upper-class Romans on the basis of Cicero's correspondence with Atticus are . . . dubious . . . The tone of the prefaces to the philosophical dialogues suggests that, at the time these were written, Greek was a special accomplishment and that more men claimed than really possessed an effective knowledge of the language and its literature . . . The many anecdotes related in extant literature about the

[41] Horsfall (1979) and Dubuisson (1992) to some extent take opposite sides on this issue.

[42] Cicero was also capable of writing an artificial literary Greek, as he did in two letters to Atticus apparently as a form of coding (see above, n. 19 and below, 3.III.3).

[43] For evidence concerning women, see below, 3.XII.6.

knowledge of individuals . . . have a tone indicating that such knowledge was not thought to be commonplace.'

It emerges from this section that, while anecdotal evidence concerning the bilingualism of the Roman élite has its interest, it is difficult to interpret, because tendentious assertions cannot always be distinguished from objective linguistic statements. It seems to me pointless to engage in a debate about the extent and quality of élite Roman bilingualism. Bilingualism existed, no doubt in many degrees of competence, but its extent cannot be determined.

III.1 Non-élite bilingualism

Bilingualism among those below the intellectual/social élite, whether involving Latin and Greek, Latin and another language, or other combinations of languages, has not received the same attention as the bilingualism of the upper classes. Yet it is well attested. It must be acknowledged that the notion of a 'sub-élite' is a vague one. I include within this category all speakers of Latin (and another language) who there is reason to believe did not belong to the small class which had received a literary education. The term is no more than a catch-all meant to embrace a diversity of educational and social levels.

A good deal of the non-literary evidence discussed in this book will concern such sub-élite bilinguals, and I merely introduce the category here without going into detail; as a preliminary illustration of the linguistic output of such persons I would cite the Christian inscription *ILCV* 4463 Βηρατιους Νικατορας [*sic*: = *Nicagoras*] Λαζαρίῃ καὶ ’Ιουλίῃ καὶ ’Ονησίμῃ κον φιλιους βενε μερεντες ὁ βίος ταῦτα, which, given its language mixture, was the work of a bilingual, and given its substandard Latin sections and the use of Greek script, was produced by someone who had not had a literary education (see below, V and 3.V.1 for a discussion of the inscription). The mass of bilingual speakers of less than the highest educational standards was not homogeneous. I will move between slaves on the one hand (though slaves too might be well educated) and local provincial worthies on the other, but without excluding educated bilinguals when the topic justifies their inclusion; there will however be no particular concentration on high literature as a source of information. It is my intention to be as wide ranging as possible in seeking out bilingualism beyond the literary classes, instead of restricting the scope of the book by imposing a rigid definition of the social classes to be included.

Concentration on anecdotal evidence for bilingualism (see further above) to the exclusion of primary sources can have the effect of portraying only the élite as second-language learners. Dubuisson's article (1992), for example, presents on the one hand upper-class Romans as learners of Greek, and on the other hand slaves as basically Greek-speaking (see 189 on Juv. 11.148, a passage which does indeed imply, no doubt with a degree of exaggeration, that slaves were often addressed in Greek (see also below, 3.v, n. 130 on this passage)). But if the Greek inscriptions of Rome (and indeed the Latin inscriptions) are examined in detail,[44] evidence emerges for ordinary Greeks learning Latin and showing some concern about the presentation of their linguistic identity.

IV ROMANS, GREEKS AND OTHERS AS LANGUAGE LEARNERS

In the material assembled in section III it was mainly Romans who were second-language learners (of Greek). But in the Roman period those who spoke or wrote Latin as their mother tongue and Greek as an acquired language represent only one of many categories of bilinguals. Latin speakers learnt languages other than Greek, and speakers of various languages other than Greek picked up some Latin. In the next chapter evidence will be discussed of Latin in contact with a variety of languages, and the discussion will introduce bilingualism of different types. For the moment, as a corrective to any false impressions which might have been created by section III, I offer a piece of evidence for language learning of another type.

I stress first that, just as there is evidence for Romans learning Greek, so there is abundant evidence for Greeks learning Latin (and I refer here to the élite as well as those lower-class Greeks at Rome mentioned in the previous section). It has long been the conventional opinion that Greeks were indifferent or hostile to the learning of foreign languages,[45] but recently it has been shown that that view is far from the truth. Latin in particular was widely known, as has been demonstrated by Holford-Strevens (1993) and on a massive scale by Rochette (1997a).[46] The whole of Rochette's book deals with the issue, but I would draw attention particularly to pp. 69–82 ('Les Romains et le latin vus par les Grecs'),

[44] Some such inscriptions will be discussed later in this chapter, and others in Chapter 3 (on code-switching).

[45] See the discussion of Rochette (1997a: 69–83).

[46] Note too Colvin (1999: 70): 'One thing that emerges from the *Anabasis* is that when their environment demanded it, Greeks were just as ready as anybody else to learn the languages of their neighbours' (some evidence cited).

pp. 83–143 ('Le latin dans les relations officielles avec l'Orient'), and above all Chapter 3 (pp. 211–56), a prosopographical study of Greeks known for their knowledge of Latin, from the Republic to the late Empire. The material bearing on this issue dealt with in the present book will be rather different from that of Holford-Strevens and Rochette: not (for the most part) anecdotal, but primary. Primary evidence richly documents Greeks using Latin.

I mention here just one anecdote which concerns knowledge of Latin among members of the Greek educated classes (Gell. 19.9). The passage has been discussed by Rochette (1997a: 267–9), but in connection with the Greeks' knowledge of Latin literature. It has as well a sociolinguistic dimension. Gellius tells of a dinner party, no doubt at Rome, attended by the Spanish *rhetor* Antonius Julianus, whose Latin had a Spanish accent: 19.9.2 *uenerat tum nobiscum ad eandem cenam Antonius Iulianus rhetor, docendis publice iuuenibus magister,* ***Hispano ore*** *florentisque homo facundiae et rerum litterarumque ueterum peritus.* Also present were some Greeks, described as expert in Latin literature: 7 *tum Graeci plusculi, qui in eo conuiuio erant, homines amoeni et nostras quoque litteras haut incuriose docti.* The Greeks turn on Julianus, attacking him as barbarous and *agrestis*, as of Spanish origin, and as a *clamator.* Given Julianus' *os Hispanum*, as already introduced by Gellius to the context, and the Greeks' concentration on his manner of speech, it is natural to see in the accusations an allusion to the man's regional accent. *Agrestis* is not unusual in reference to regional accents of Latin, as for example at *SHA, Hadr.* 3.1 *quaesturam gessit Traiano quater et Articuleio consulibus, in qua cum orationem imperatoris in senatu* ***agrestius pronuntians*** *risus esset, usque ad summam peritiam et facundiam Latinis operam dedit*[47] and Sen. *Contr.* 1 *praef.* 16 *nulla umquam illi cura uocis exercendae fuit: illum fortem et* ***agrestem*** *et Hispanae consuetudinis morem non poterat dediscere.*

There can be no doubting the Greeks' competence in Latin, but there is more to be extracted from the passage. It is a curiosity that Greeks, who will almost by definition have had an accent in their own Latin (on the Greek accent in Latin, see below, 4.v.1.1), should have felt no unease about mocking, if only obliquely, the accent of a man who was, after all, (unlike them) a native speaker of Latin. But it has been observed by sociolinguists that foreign accents are sometimes evaluated more highly than the regional accents of native speakers of a language. Hamers and Blanc (1989: 131) report a study which showed that 'English spoken with a French foreign accent was rated in a very favourable way, as superior to

[47] Note that the regional accent is mocked.

any regional accent and much superior to an Italian or German foreign accent.' The Greek accent in Latin probably had some prestige.[48]

The learning of languages other than Greek and Latin will come up in the next chapter, but here it is worth noting the model of second-language acquisition presented by Ovid in his exile poetry. The poems are full of curious linguistic assertions. He claimed variously not to be understood by the Getae and others or not to understand them (*Trist.* 5.10.37–40 *barbarus hic ego sum, qui non intellegor ulli, / et rident stolidi uerba Latina Getae; / meque palam de me tuto mala saepe loquuntur, / forsitan obiciunt exil-iumque mihi*; cf. 3.11.9, 3.14.39–40, 4.1.89–90), to have partly forgotten his Latin (5.12.57 *ipse mihi uideor iam dedidicisse Latine*; cf. 3.14.45–6, 5.7.58),[49] to have been conscious or fearful of the intrusion of foreign words into his Latin (5.7.59–60 *nec dubito quin sint et in hoc non pauca libello / barbara*, 3.14.49–50 *crede mihi, timeo ne sint inmixta Latinis / inque meis scriptis Pontica uerba legas*), to have been afraid that the *barbara terra* in which he was might cause him to use incorrect Latin (3.1.17–18 *siqua uidebuntur casu non dicta Latine, / in qua scribebat, barbara terra fuit*), to have been compelled to say many things 'in the Sarmatian way' (5.7.56 *Sarmatico cogor plurima more loqui*), to have learnt to speak Getic and Sarmatian (5.12.58 *nam didici Getice Sarmaticeque loqui*), to be contemplating the possibility of writing 'in Getic measures', such was the din around him of Thracian and Scythian (3.14.47–8 *Threicio Scythicoque fere circumsonor ore, / et uideor Geticis scribere posse modis*), and finally to have written a *libellus* in the Getic language, with barbarian words 'in our measures' (*Pont.* 4.13.19–20 *a, pudet, et Getico scripsi sermone libellum, / structaque sunt nostris barbara uerba modis*). He also asserted that he had to use gestures to make himself understood (*Trist.* 5.10.35–6 *exercent illi sociae commercia linguae: / per gestum res est significanda mihi*).[50]

It is difficult to know what to make of these inconsistencies. Ovid does however seem to have been constructing an image of himself as a gradual learner,[51] eventually achieving mastery of a third language, though it is

[48] There are indeed a few bits of evidence for the affecting of Greek mannerisms by Latin speakers, or at least for a favourable attitude to Greek sounds. On this subject see the appendix to this chapter.

[49] A topos: see Solon frg. 36 West (drawn to my attention by David Bain). Note too Jerome, *Epist.* 29.7: so immersed was Jerome in Hebrew that his Latin was becoming 'rusty'. See further 2.IX for another example.

[50] It is of interest that, though Sittl devoted a chapter of his book on gestures (1890: 211–24) to sign language, he did not discuss this passage or the phenomenon of communication by gestures in a foreign country. For some allusions to the practice in Greek, see Aesch. *Ag.* 1060–1, Xen. *Anab.* 4.5.33.

[51] Cf. Lozovan (1958: 397); on the ethnic background to Tomi, see e.g. Lambrino (1958), but above all Syme (1978: 164); also Millar (1968: 126), id. (1993b: 10) (on Tomi as a Greek rather than a Getic town).

distinctly odd that various conflicting assertions about different degrees of competence seem to be presented in a cluster in book 5 of the *Tristia* (dated to AD 12).[52] Ovid's linguistic assertions in the exile poetry (and there are more of them) may be based on pure fantasy or fabrication,[53] and they certainly tell us nothing of substance either about the linguistic situation in Tomi (see further below, IX) or about Ovid's multilingualism, but they do reveal a Roman's attitudes to the problems of communication in a foreign place and to the possibility of second-language learning. They constitute a construct of the stages in second-language acquisition, with some recognition of the influence of those stages on the first language. We can distinguish (1) communication by gestures; (2) the picking up of some foreign words, which enter the first language; (3) the intrusion of non-specific 'interference' into the first language; (4) partial use of the second language (note *plurima* at 5.7.56); (5) fluent bilingualism. It will be an aim of this book to discuss most of these stages in action through the medium of primary sources. The idea, for example, that one language may be 'corrupted' by another will be seen in Chapter 4 (V.1.1, p. 435). It is of some interest how Ovid portrays his alleged new fluency in Getic.[54] He does not speak of linguistic skill as such, but rather of his literary skill in the second language. Élite Romans do from time to time show some interest in communication skills, pure and simple, in a second language, but they perhaps found it difficult to disentangle the ideals of fluency in the second language, and command of the culture expressed through that language. Thus, for example, Gellius (19.9) tells us nothing about the Latin of the Greeks at the symposium (see above), though manner of speech is partly at issue in the context, but concentrates on their learning in Latin literary culture. So Ovid's 'bilingualism' manifests itself not merely in an ability to communicate with the Getae, but in an impressive literary performance in the second language.

V CODE-SWITCHING, INTERFERENCE AND BORROWING

The terms 'code-switching', 'interference' and 'borrowing', which are used with variable meanings in linguistic literature, recur throughout this book, and some definitions must be given at the outset. The issues

[52] See Syme (1978: 39) on the date of *Trist.* 5.

[53] For the bibliography on Ovid's 'bilingualism', see Rochette (1997a: 54 nn. 29–31). Note in particular Della Corte (1976).

[54] Notice Syme's ironical observation (1978: 16–17): 'Ovid had been able to acquire a fluency in speaking foreign languages beyond parallel among the Romans in any age.'

involved are complex and little agreement has been reached among students of bilingualism. Note Romaine (1995: 180): 'Problems of terminology continue to plague the study of language contact phenomena with terms such as code-switching, mixing, borrowing not being used by all researchers in the same way or even defined at all.' Code-switching and its relationship to the other phenomena will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3, and I here merely introduce the term and offer a few comments.

Code-switching is usually described along these lines: 'the alternate use of two languages or linguistic varieties within the same utterance or during the same conversation' (Hoffmann 1991: 110): cf., e.g. Milroy and Muysken (1995: 7): 'the alternate use by bilinguals of two or more languages in the same conversation'. I generally use the term here to describe a full-blown switch from one language into another within one person's utterance or piece of writing.[55] The existence of code-switching is sometimes acknowledged in ancient anecdotes or comments.[56] Cicero seems to condemn the practice several times (*Off.* 1.111 *ut enim sermone eo debemus uti qui notus est nobis, ne ut quidam Graeca uerba inculcantes iure optimo rideamur, sic* . . . ,[57] *Tusc.* 1.15 [ostentatious refusal to quote Epicharmus in Greek] *dicam, si potero, Latine. scis enim me Graece loqui in Latino sermone non plus solere quam in Graeco Latine. – et recte quidem* . . . [Latin translation of Epicharmus] . . . *iam adgnosco Graecum.*),[58] though the first passage might just be taken as referring to borrowing (on the difference between code-switching and borrowing, see below).[59] Horace notes the presence of what I take to include code-switching in Lucilius (*Sat.* 1.10.20–1 *at magnum fecit, quod uerbis Graeca Latinis / miscuit*, 'but his achievement was great, in that he mingled Greek words with Latin'), and the discussion of language

[55] Other types of alternation have also been called 'code-switching', though they will not be of much significance in this book. Note Milroy and Muysken (1995: 7): 'Sometimes switching occurs between the turns of different speakers in the conversation [for which see below, 3.VI.1, p. 386 with cross references], sometimes between utterances within a single turn, and sometimes even within a single utterance.' It is this last type that will be my main concern.

[56] See also Jocelyn (1999: 89–94).

[57] Loeb: 'For as we ought to employ our mother-tongue [rendering *innatus* rather than the transmitted *notus*: the point of *notus* here has been questioned (see Dyck (1996: 282) ad loc.)], lest, like certain people who are continually dragging in Greek words, we draw well-deserved ridicule upon ourselves, so . . . '.

[58] Loeb: 'I shall give it [i.e. a *sententia* of Epicharmus] if I can in Latin: you know I am no more in the habit of using Greek in speaking Latin than of using Latin in speaking Greek.' A. 'Quite right. . . . Now I recognise the Greek.'

[59] Dyck (1996: 281) ad loc. suggests that when Cicero wrote these words he might have been thinking of T. Albucius, who, as we saw (above, III) was ridiculed in Lucilius (88–94, as quoted by Cicero himself at *Fin.* 1.9: see 3.IV.1) for his habit of using Greek. If so the allusion at *Off.* 1.111 would definitely be to full-blown switches into Greek, and not to integrated loan-words.

mixing goes on for some ten lines. The practice of Lucilius is compared with that of the bilingual people of Canusium (29–30 *patriis intermiscere petita / uerba foris malis, Canusini more bilinguis*, 'would you prefer to intermingle with native words words procured from abroad, in the manner of the bilingual Canusine?'), where Oscan and Greek (and Latin as well?) were presumably mixed (see below, 2.II.5).[60] Code-switching does occur in Lucilius, but there is evidence even in such a fragmentary text that some of it is not used by the poet in his own person, but put into the mouths of various characters and in fact ridiculed (see 3.III.2, IV.1)). Juvenal castigates women who switch into Greek at every opportunity (6.184–97). Martial writes disparagingly of an upper-class woman who switches into Greek in the bedroom (10.68) (see below, 3.V on these passages). Tacitus describes an altercation between two German brothers, one of whom kept switching into Latin as the exchange became more heated: Tac. *Ann.* 2.10.3 *cernebatur contra minitabundus Arminius proeliumque denuntians; nam* ***pleraque Latino sermone interiaciebat****, ut qui Romanis in castris ductor popularium meruisset* ('. . . he was interspersing many remarks in the Latin language, as one who had served in the Roman camp as the leader of his fellow-countrymen'). The fact that Arminius had served in the Roman army as an officer in charge of his own countrymen explains his knowledge of Latin (foreign units in which at least some men remained monolingual in their mother tongue could only be commanded by those who knew Latin as well as the mother tongue),[61] but it does not, as Tacitus appears to think, explain why he employed code-switching on this occasion. One can only guess about the circumstances. Of the two brothers, it was Arminius the code-switcher who was

[60] See below, p. 370 n. 314 for the continuing popularity of Greek names among some families in the town at a much later date, after the place was Romanised.

[61] It cannot be assumed that all soldiers in the Roman army, least of all auxiliaries, could understand Latin. Tacitus several times comments on the linguistic diversity as an impediment to cohesion: *Hist.* 2.37.2 *neque aut exercitus linguis moribusque dissonos in hunc consensum potuisse coalescere*, 3.33.2 *utque exercitu uario linguis moribus, cui ciues socii externi interessent, diuersae cupidines et aliud cuique fas nec quicquam inlicitum*. Similarly ps.-Hyginus *Met. castr.* 43 says that irregular units should receive orders in their own language, and orally: *symmacharios et reliquas nationes quotiens per strigas distribuimus, non plus quam tripertiti esse debebunt nec longe abalterutrum ut uiua tessera suo uocabulo citationes audiant.* There are also bits and pieces of evidence for some maintenance of their linguistic traditions by foreign units. Tacitus (*Hist.* 2.22.1) refers to a song of German cohorts (*aduersus temere subeuntes cohortes Germanorum, cantu truci et more patrio nudis corporibus super umeros scuta quatientium*), and it seems to be implied by the last clause of Tac. *Germ.* 3.1 that such *cantus* had words (*sunt illis haec quoque carmina quorum relatu, quem baritum uocant, accendunt animos futuraeque pugnae fortunam ipso cantu augurantur*), despite Anderson (1938) ad loc. Ammianus describes this song at 16.12.43 in terms that imply that it was without words, but at 31.7.11 the Goths are said to have praised their ancestors in this way. On the maintenance of Palmyrene by Palmyrenes serving in the Roman army, see 2.VII.2, p. 256.