Hilla Halla-aho

The non-literary Latin letters.
A study of their syntax and pragmatics

Academic dissertation to be publicly discussed, by due permission of the Faculty of Arts at the University of Helsinki in auditorium XII, on the 19th of January, 2008 at 10 o'clock.

ISBN 978-952-92-3260-4 (paperback)
ISBN 978-952-10-4480-9 (PDF)

Helsinki University Print
Helsinki 2008

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1. INTRODUCTION **1**
1.1. The aim of this study 1
1.2. Non-literary letters: A general overview 2
1.2.1. Provenance of the texts and related matters *2*
1.2.2. Letters, writers, and language *7*
1.3. Non-literary letters and the Latin language 12
1.3.1. Research report *12*
1.3.2. The Latin of the letters: what is this study about? *16*
1.3.3. The linguistic perspective *19*
1.4. A note on the scribes — who produced the language? 21

2. SETTING THE CONTEXT: VARIATION IN LATIN **25**
2.1. Introduction 25
2.2. Syntax and vulgar Latin 25
2.3. Standardization 29
2.4. Variation: spoken and written language 32
2.5. Spoken language and substandard written language 36

3. LETTER PHRASEOLOGY **43**
3.1. Introduction 43
3.2. The opening address 44
3.3. Opening salutations 45
3.3.1. Vindolanda *46*
3.3.2. Egypt *49*
3.4. Closing salutations 53
3.4.1. Vindolanda *53*
3.4.2. Egypt *53*
3.5. Letter phraseology in the body text 56
3.6. Conclusion 63

4. SENTENCE CONNECTION **65**
4.1. Introduction 65
4.2. Connection of sentences with *et* and *item* 66
4.2.1. Et *66*
4.2.2. Item *68*
4.3. Paratactic asyndeton 69
4.4. Paratactic complements 76
4.4.1. Verba dicendi et sentiendi *76*
4.4.2. Rogo + *imperative* (peto + *indicative present/future)* *81*
4.4.3. Rogo + *subj.* *82*
4.5. Sentence connection in the letters of Rustius Barbarus: a case study 86
4.6. Conclusion 89

5. SYNTACTICAL INCOHERENCES IN THE LETTERS **90**
5.1. Introduction 90
5.2. Contamination 91
5.3. The letter of Chrauttius (tab. Vindol. II 310) 94
5.4. *Rogo* in tab. Vindol. II 250 and possible instances of *quod* for *quid* 98
5.5. Confusion in personal reference inside indirect speech 101
5.6. Uses of the accusative 103
5.7. Thematic constituents 107
5.7.1. Thematic constituents in the letters *110*
5.7.2. Excursus: proleptic accusatives *117*
5.7.3 On the historical development *118*
5.8. Conclusion 120

6. WORD ORDER **121**
6.1. Introduction 121
6.2. The order of O and V, word order change and the typological perspective 122
6.3. The order of O and V in the letters 131
6.4. The pragmatic perspective 140
6.4.1. Introduction *140*
6.4.2. Pragmatic analysis *143*
6.5. Conclusion 154

7. CONCLUSION **156**
7.1. Texts and spoken Latin in the study of non-literary letters 156
7.2. Variation 157
7.3. Text type and pragmatics 158
7.4. Historical syntax 159
7.5. Future perspectives 159

EXCURSUS: ON THE USE OF ANAPHORIC PRONOUNS **161**

BIBLIOGRAPHY **165**

APPENDIX: TABLE OF THE MATERIAL **183**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor Martti Leiwo who inspired my interest in language and linguistics and introduced me to non-literary material. I would also like to thank him for enthusiastic comments on various versions of this study as well as for his willingness and ability to read work which is still very much in progress. Moreover, I wish to thank both him and my second supervisor Heikki Solin for their generous support and encouragement during the years.

Throughout the final year of writing I received advice, support and critical remarks in abundance from Peter Kruschwitz. I am deeply indebted to him for his efforts, without which I would not have been able to complete the study in this time. We also exchanged numerous emails discussing the Latin language and the manifold problems involved in studying it.

I owe a very special thanks to J.N. Adams for his inspiring comments on chapters 4-6. Receiving feedback from the leading specialist in the field has undoubtedly been one of the most rewarding moments in writing this thesis.

I am also grateful to Olli Salomies who read through the whole manuscript and presented insightful observations on several important passages.

Furthermore, many thanks are due to my pre-examiners Harm Pinkster and Toivo Viljamaa for their reports and criticism, and to Robert Whiting for revising my English and, in addition, for providing many useful comments on the subject matter as well.

Financially, the writing of this study was made possible by Langnet, the Finnish Graduate School in Language Studies. In addition to the financial side, Langnet made me socialize with linguists — a scary enterprise for a philologist, but something that certainly has strengthened my identity as a linguist.

My study has also been financed by the University of Helsinki and the research unit *Ancient Greek Written Sources* funded by the Academy of Finland. The department of Classical Philology at the University of Helsinki has been a most pleasant environment to work in. I would especially like to thank Marja Vierros for her friendship, which goes back to our student years.

Finally, I wish to express my warmest thanks to my husband Jussi Halla-aho who shares my interest in languages (especially dead ones) and linguistics. We have had countless discussions on a wide variety of linguistic topics, among which many on the fascinating aspect of child language inspired by our two daughters.

Äidinkin kirja on nyt valmis.

Helsinki, 17 December 2007

Hilla Halla-aho

1. INTRODUCTION

This work is about the language of Latin letters: letters sent by a whole range of people who lived more than 1700 years ago — people writing to authorities, superiors, colleagues, or to their friends and family. How did they write? And what does this tell us about their language skills, about the language of Latin letter-writing, and the Latin language of their time in general?

1.1. The aim of this study

The corpus of non-literary Latin letters constitutes interesting material in many ways. One of the most important things is their contribution to our knowledge of the Latin language. These texts, written on papyri, ostraca and wooden tablets, offer valuable and often rare evidence of Latin as it was used outside the literary texts in the 1st and 2nd centuries AD. They not only bring to light many previously unattested expressions, linguistic varieties, and even text types that are never found in the literary texts and only very rarely in inscriptions, but also more generally the Latin of such language users who otherwise have largely remained invisible to posterity — producing language which is of foremost interest to the study of variation and change in Latin.

In this study I shall describe and analyze certain features of the syntax of these letters. My focus is on sentence structure. Key questions include: How did the writers organize the information they wanted to convey to the addressee? Were they able to render longer and more complicated structures coherently? What strategies did they use in such cases? What went wrong — and why? What kind of influence did spoken language have on the language of these written texts? A large part of the discussion will be about pragmatics, i.e., how the specific linguistic context and the information structure of the speech act affect the choice of the linguistic expression. Three topics will be discussed in detail: sentence connection (especially paratactic relations), syntactically incoherent structures, and word order (more specifically the order of the object and the verb). In addition, I shall pay special attention to letters as a text type. This text type is manifested most clearly in the occurrence of opening and closing formulae and other recurring elements, but the potential influence of the text type on the form of language

(syntax and pragmatics) will be observed throughout. Seeing the letters as a text type highlights the phraseological and typically written component in the linguistic expression. On the other hand, the influence of spoken language on the language of these letters will be another major theme. Thus, the interaction of spoken and written language in this type of non-literary material constitutes an essential part of my approach.

In the course of these examinations I shall at certain points discuss methodological issues, especially those related to the question of how the non-literary letters (or this kind of material in general) should be interpreted as evidence for variation and change in Latin. Furthermore, in one or two places the discussion expands towards a more general examination of the phenomenon in question. This study can claim to be the first one looking at all the non-literary letters from a syntactic point of view.

The term non-literary will refer to the nature of the texts, i.e. the corpus of documentary letters as opposed to the (literary or other) texts that are transmitted to us by the manuscript tradition.

1.2. Non-literary letters: A general overview

1.2.1. Provenance of the texts and related matters

It is necessary to give first an overview of the material, describing briefly where the texts have been found and what we know about their dating. In general, the non-literary letter material stems mainly from two areas, Egypt and Britain. In addition, there are some texts from North Africa outside Egypt, and a smaller corpus of very poorly preserved letters from Vindonissa in modern Switzerland. The texts from Egypt and North Africa are written on papyri or ostraca, those from Britain and Vindonissa on wooden tablets.

In the following, I present in chronological order first the papyri and ostraca (i.e. the Egyptian material), of which the most important ones are the letters of Claudius Terentianus and those of Rustius Barbarus, and after that, again in chronological order, the wooden tablets, of which the most important ones are the texts discovered at Vindolanda in Northern Britain.

I use the *Corpus epistularum latinarum papyris ostracis tabulis servatarum* published in 1992 by Paolo Cugusi as a practical general reference for the Egyptian material, except for the Terentianus letters for which I refer to the original publication (P.

Mich. VIII), as well as for the Mons Claudianus ostraca, which have been published after CEL I-II.[1] CEL I contains the texts and CEL II an extensive commentary. As I write this, I have not seen CEL III, which contains material published after the publication of the first two volumes. In the following overview I have given the *editio princeps* for each text (information about other editions can be found in CEL). For the Vindolanda material I refer to the editions of Bowman and Thomas and for the Vindonissa material to that of Speidel (on both of which, see below).

The oldest letters come from Egypt and are written on papyri. They have been found in various places.[2] The papyrus P. Berl. inv. 13956 (CEL 3) is the oldest Latin papyrus letter of any length. It is of unknown provenance. Both the sender Phileros and the recipient Menander are slaves.[3] It is written in rustic capitals, and the date usually suggested is late republican or early Augustan. The texts in P. Vindob. Lat. 1 (CEL 6-8) are from Egypt, three letters from a *volumen epistularum acceptarum* of a certain Macedo, i.e., they are letters sent to him, and thus written by different persons. The dating found in CEL 8 attributes the letters to the years 24-21 BC.[4] The papyrus P. Qaṣr Ibrîm inv. 78-3-21/24 (CEL 9) is from Qaṣr Ibrîm in Lower Nubia (south of the Aswan dam), a Roman border fort (Premium). It is datable on the basis of the archaeological context to the last quarter of the 1st century BC. A very well preserved text is P. Oxy. XLIV 3208 (CEL 10), a papyrus from Oxyrynchos, written in rustic capitals and datable on palaeographical grounds to the Augustan period. The recipient of the letter is a slave (address Chio Caesaris), as the writer Suneros probably is as well.

Wâdi Fawâkhir, situated on the route from Koptos to the Red Sea in the Eastern Desert of Egypt, has provided a number of letters on ostraca, most of them Greek but also several in Latin (O. Faw. 1-7,[5] CEL 73-80). Of these O. Faw. 1-5 (CEL 73-78) are better

[1] For the Bu Njem ostraca I refer to the edition by Marichal (1992), as CEL contains only a part of this material. The majority of the texts are also published in the collection of Cavenaile, *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum* (1958), and the military texts from Egypt also in Fink (1971).
[2] For general information on these texts see Cugusi notes ad locc. and Cugusi 1973.
[3] For the name Phileros see Solin 1996, 341-342 and Solin 2003, 162-165 and for Menander, Solin 1996, 259 and Solin 2003, 257-259.
[4] On the palaeography of P. Vindob. Lat. 1, see Seider (1983) in P. Rainer. Cent. (pp. 135-143), with notes on other early Latin papyri as well.
[5] First edited by O. Guéraud, *Ostraca grecs et latins de l'wâdi Fawâkhir* (*Bulletin de l'institut d'archéologie orientale*) in 1942.

preserved, and all of them are written by a person called Rustius Barbarus to one person, a certain Pompeius, in a cursive script. Opinions have differed as to the dating of these letters, but most probably they stem from the 1st century AD (according to Cugusi, from the middle of this century). It is noteworthy that all of these letters (CEL 73-78) are in the same handwriting and thus autographs of the sender Rustius Barbarus.

Two letters of recommendation are P. Ryl. IV 608 and P. Berl. inv. 11649 (CEL 81 and 83).[6] The former is of unknown origin and datable to the 1st or the 2nd century AD. It was sent from an architect]lius Celer to Ti. Claudius Hermeros. The latter letter (in cursive), from a Priscus to a Petronius, comes from Fayûm, and should probably be dated to the late 1st century BC although later dates have also been proposed.[7]

The text P. Oxy. VII 1022 (CEL 140) is a report in letter form of the recruitment of six soldiers in the *cohors III Ituraeorum*. It was originally written by the prefect of Egypt C. Minicius Italus[8] and addressed to Celsianus (the prefect of the cohort in question).[9] The copy of the letter was then stored in the archive of the relevant military unit. The letter is dated to AD 103.

The largest collection of letters from one person, the so-called Tiberianus archive, consists mainly of the letters of Claudius Terentianus, the son of Claudius Tiberianus. The archive stems from the beginning of the 2nd century AD and was found at Karanis in the Fayûm. There are six Latin letters (P. Mich. VIII 467-472 = CEL 141-142 and 144-147)[10], of which five are written by Claudius Terentianus and one by Claudius Tiberianus. In addition, there are nine Greek letters (P. Mich. VIII 473-481) of which five are from Claudius Terentianus and three from other persons to Claudius Tiberianus (in addition one by Claudius Terentianus to a woman called Tasoukharion). Claudius Terentianus served in the Alexandrian fleet but apparently was transferred to a legion later, judging by the subscript in P. Mich. VIII 476.[11] For the most part Claudius Terentianus seems to be writing somewhere in or near Alexandria. Probably the letters

[6] These texts as well as CEL 169 and CEL 177 are also published in Cotton 1981.
[7] CEL 85 (P. Berl. inv. 8334) is from an *exemplar codicillorum* of a Roman emperor, probably Domitian (see Cugusi note ad. loc).
[8] See PIR^2 M 614.
[9] See Cugusi ad loc.
[10] Two fragmentary letters (CEL 143 and 148) were originally published by Rodgers (1970). CEL 143 seems to contain the same text as P. Mich. VIII 468.
[11] See Youtie / Winter 1951 and Cugusi 1992 ad loc.

were taken to Karanis later as a part of the family archive, possibly when Claudius Terentianus settled there as a veteran.[12]

The text P. Thead. inv. 31 (CEL 149) is a petition from a *tiro* C. Valerius Saturninus to the prefect of Egypt M. Rutilius Lupus (prefect 113-117 AD) in order that he be accepted as a soldier in a cohort, i.e., he is asking for a *probatio*.[13]

The papyrus P. Lond. 482 (CEL 150) is an official letter (AD 130, of Egyptian provenance) from a procurator of the *ala uetrana Gallica*, reporting the receiving of hay for his soldiers and the sending of 30 cavalrymen.[14] There are also three announcements of debt in letter form, P. Mich. VII 438 (CEL 154), P. Fuad. I 45 (CEL 155) and P. Lond. 730 (= P. Grenf. II 108, CEL 156). The first of these (CEL 154) is from Karanis, the others from somewhere in Egypt. Also from somewhere in Egypt is P. Gen. Lat. 8 (CEL 157), a fragmentary letter from the middle of the 2nd century AD.

O. Latopolis Magnae 13 and 14 (CEL 158-159) are ostraca from Latopolis Magna (modern Esna, south of Luxor on the western bank of the Nile) and datable to the middle of the 2nd century AD on palaeographical grounds.[15]

The papyrus P. Oxy I 32 + II, pp. 318-319 (CEL 169) is a letter of recommendation from a *beneficiarius* Aurelius Archelaus to the military tribune Iulius Domitius, datable on palaeographical grounds to the middle of the 2nd century AD. P. Hibeh 276 (CEL 177) is also a letter of recommendation from the middle of the 2nd century, although much shorter than 169, and coming from Ankyropolis.

The Bu Njem ostraca (O. Bu Njem)[16] come from North Africa (ancient Gholaia). The letters, from the middle of the 3rd century, contain mainly reports concerning the delivery of goods by camel-drivers.

The most recently discovered Egyptian texts come from the Eastern Desert, from the fortress and quarry of Mons Claudianus and its surroundings. These are texts written on ostraca, and a number of Latin letters are included, although the overwhelming

[12] See Lewis 1959 for a letter in which a person is asking his brother in Karanis to help Claudius Terentianus to begin a life there after his discharge.
[13] It is similar in form and phraseology to later petitions addressed to the prefect of Egypt, P. Oxy XII 1466 (245 AD), P. Oxy IV 720 (247 AD), P. Oxy VIII 1114 (237 AD) and P. Oxy IX 1201 (258 AD). These are not letters and it is unclear to me why this particular text (CEL 149) has been treated as a letter.
[14] CEL 152-153 are various receipts in letter format.
[15] First published by Sijpesteijn in 1973, readings improved in Gilliam 1976.
[16] Edited by R. Marichal in 1992 (*Les ostraca de Bu Njem*).

majority of the texts are in Greek. They stem from the 2nd century and offer information about the Roman military presence in this part of Egypt. Latin texts are O. Claud. I 2, 131 and 135 as well as O. Claud. II 367. Additional Latin texts so far published from this region are O. Max inv. 254[17] and two other letters (M689 and M1107).[18]

The tablets from the legionary base of Vindonissa (modern Windisch in Switzerland) were newly edited by M.A. Speidel in 1996.[19] In only a handful of cases is there more than the address preserved. The texts can be dated to the period 17-101 AD.

There is also a wooden tablet from London, Tab. Londin. (RIB II, 4, 2443, 7 = CEL 87), written in cursive and datable to the end of the 1st century AD.

The Vindolanda material from Northern Britain, published in three volumes (tab. Vindol. I – III, but practically all texts of vol. I are republished in vol. II.), contains accounts, lists and letters written in ink on wooden tablets.[20] Most of the tablets from Vindolanda are datable to the period between c. AD 92 and c. AD 115. There is evidence for the presence of three auxiliary military units at Vindolanda, the First Cohort of Tungrians, the Third Cohort of Batavians and, most importantly, the Ninth Cohort of Batavians.[21] A large part of the military personnel for these units was probably originally recruited from Gallia Belgica of Germania.[22] These tablets contain much of interest for all fields of Roman studies, history as well as palaeography and language.[23] The largest group of letters belongs to the archive of Flavius Cerialis who was the prefect of the Ninth Cohort of Batavians at Vindolanda at the turn of the century. This group contains,

[17] By Bülow-Jacobsen / Cuvigny / Fournet in BIFAO (1994).
[18] In *La route de Myos Hormos* vol. 2 by H. Cuvigny (2003).
[19] *Die Römischen Schreibtafeln von Vindonissa*. Veröffentlichungen der Gesellschaft pro Vindonissa, Bd. 12.
[20] In those cases where the sender is known to have been at Vindolanda it is not clear how the letters ended up there. They might in some cases be file copies or draft letters which were never sent. In those cases where the address on the back mentions some place name other than Vindolanda we have to assume that the recipient brought the letter to Vindolanda at some later point in time, see Bowman / Thomas 1994, 42-45.
[21] Bowman / Thomas 1994, 22.
[22] Bowman / Thomas 1994, 30-32. According to Tacitus (*Hist*. 4, 12), the Batavian units were commanded by their own *nobiles*, and this fits well in with the name of Flavius Cerialis (see further Bowman / Thomas 1994, 25).
[23] See the introductions in Bowman / Thomas 1983, 1994 and 2003 and Bowman 1994a. An extensive discussion on the palaeographical importance of the Vindolanda texts as well as the palaeographical background (Old Roman Cursive and New Roman Cursive) is to be found in Bowman / Thomas 1983, 51-71. See Bowman (1994a, 85) for the typical format of the Vindolanda letters.

e.g., an elegant letter which apparently is a draft written by Cerialis himself (tab. Vindol. II 225), a letter of recommendation addressed to Cerialis (tab. Vindol. II 250), and a request that Cerialis should send clothing for the sender of the letter (tab. Vindol. II 255). Other well-preserved and interesting letters are tab. Vindol. II 310 by a man named Chrauttius, and tab. Vindol. II 343, the writer of which, Octavius, seems to be involved in supplying grain for the army.[24] From the newly published tablets one may mention tab. Vindol. III 611, which is an elegant letter from Haterius Nepos, in all probability the same person who later was to become the prefect of Egypt, and tab. Vindol. III 643, two letters on one tablet from a certain Florus, abounding in phonetic spellings. The letter tab. Vindol. III 670 seems to be of a considerably later date than the other tablets, apparently from the end of the 2nd century (both on archaeological and palaeographical grounds).[25]

Finally, a corpus of texts from Carlisle (tab. Luguv.)[26] needs to be mentioned. These are roughly contemporary with the Vindolanda tablets and contain one letter with more substantial remains, practically a report about missing lances (tab. Luguval. 16).

* * *

I have discarded the later texts (from CEL no. 178 onwards, including the Dura Europos material) because they spring from a clearly different, bureaucratic context and are thus not relevant to this work. I have, however, remarked on the Bu Njem ostraca in one or two places.

1.2.2. Letters, writers, and language

All of the texts studied in this work are letters. Letters as a text type can be defined by the occurrence of certain macrostructural patterns, such as the opening phrase (A to B *salutem*), closing salutation, and an address on the verso.[27] But inside this class there is considerable variety. They are letters written by different people and for different purposes. The material includes letters written by (and to) ordinary soldiers, officers,

[24] See Bowman / Thomas ad loc.
[25] See Bowman / Thomas ad loc.
[26] Published by R.S.O. Tomlin (1998).

civilians and slaves; there are requests of various kinds, letters of recommendation, letters informing the recipient about something important, and letters the exact purpose of which is difficult to determine without having more information on the context. The obvious way of dividing the letters into different categories seems to be along the line of private vs. official. Letters written by military personnel which seem to be official include most of those received (or sent) by the officers at Vindolanda (tab. Vindol. II 218 to Flavius Genialis, 225 and 242 from Flavius Cerialis, 248, 252, 260, 263 to Flavius Cerialis, 295 from Priscinus). The letter tab. Vindol. II 343 is a business letter, but not necessarily directly pertaining to military duties.[28] The letters of Rustius Barbarus (CEL 73-78) are mainly concerned with a small-scale bakery business.

Certain letters are clearly private, such as those of Claudius Terentianus from Egypt and those of Claudia Severa from Vindolanda. Private letters written to Flavius Cerialis are tab. Vindol. II 257, which contains a reference to his wife Sulpicia Lepidina (the letter is apparently written by a woman), and similarly tab. Vindol. II 247 with the request *Lepidinam tuam a me saluta*. This letter might, on the basis of the second hand visible in the closing salutation be from Aelius Brocchus, a fellow prefect. Also, tab. Vindol. II 265 mentioning the sacrifice on the *Kalendae* seems to be private. The letters tab. Vindol. II 310 and 311 are clearly private, the former concerned about getting news from certain persons and the sending of a pair of shears, the latter blaming the recipient for not writing.

However, in some cases it seems to be difficult to settle whether a letter is private or official, both in Egypt and in Britain. In a letter to Cerialis (tab. Vindol. II 255) Clodius Super, a centurion, asks Cerialis to send him clothing for his *pueri*, i.e. slaves. Is this to be understood so that Cerialis should send clothing to the slaves of a centurion as a part of his duties as the unit commander? And what should we think about tab. Vindol. II

[27] These elements seem to have served as criteria for inclusion in CEL (although not explicitly stated in the introduction).

[28] The status of the writer of this letter, Octavius, is not clear. The amount of grain that he is concerned with is so great that it can only be meant for consumption in the army. Adams (1995a, 94) observes that this letter contains many orthographical phenomena that are only rarely or not at all attested elsewhere in the Vindolanda texts – a fact that might point in the direction that Octavius was at some remove from the military personnel. There is only one hand, so that the letter is most probably an autograph – in fact the peculiar format of this letter (written first in the right-hand column) seems to suggest that the writer was left-handed; see Bowman / Thomas introduction to tab. Vindol. II 343.

233 where Flavius Cerialis writes to his colleague Brocchus and asks him to send hunting-nets (*si me amas frater rogo mittas mihi plagas* "If you love me, brother, I ask that you send me some hunting-nets")? Furthermore, Claudius Tiberianus, in a letter that seems to be related to his duties as a soldier, also sends greetings to the recipient of the letter from his son Claudius Terentianus.

Some of these texts, although letters according to the definition formulated above, are in fact other types of documents written in letter format (such as receipts or lists). I have looked at these, too, but usually these texts do not have much to offer from a syntactic point of view as they are composed from stock phrases.

The authors of the texts are, consequently, a group of people far from uniform in social, linguistic and geographical respects. For the most part, however, the texts are chronologically rather close to each other (the Vindolanda tablets from the end of the 1st and the turn of the 1st and 2nd centuries; the letters of Rustius Barbarus from Wâdi Fawâkhir most probably from the 1st century; the Terentianus letters from the beginning of the 2nd century) which enables one to treat them as some sort of corpus. Another thing connecting these texts is that the writers in most cases were somehow associated with the Roman army. At Vindolanda this is easy to understand, as the Roman presence there was first and foremost of a military nature. The use of Latin in Egypt is also usually seen as somehow inspired by the army. Still, there are letters from Egypt that do not contain any reference to military activities or posts of either the sender or the recipient. These include the earliest letters from Egypt (CEL 3-10) of which only CEL 9 contains a reference to the army, mentioning a *centuria*, but the context remains obscure. Also, nothing in the letters of Rustius Barbarus (the author of CEL 73-78) connects him with the army, but the general context in Wâdi Fawâkhir clearly was military judging by the Greek ostraca found in the same place.[29]

For the most part we do not know where the writers originally came from and where they had learnt Latin or why they used it when writing letters — not even whether it was their native language or not. The personnel for the cohorts at Vindolanda may originally have been recruited from areas that were already largely Romanized, such as

[29] See Guéraud 1942, 147.

Gallia Belgica and Germania.[30] Also, mobility inside the army must have been considerable, and there is evidence that the units attested at Vindolanda at the end of the 1st century were soon after that transferred elsewhere.[31] Even in Egypt, the soldiers for army units were recruited from various parts of the Empire.[32] On the other hand, if a person wrote a private letter in Latin in Egypt, this does seem to suggest that he or his family originated from a Latin-speaking region. This is probably the case of Claudius Terentianus, for example. For other people writing Latin in Egypt we have even less information. The village where the correspondence of Claudius Tiberianus was found, Karanis in the Fayûm, had a strong connection with the Roman army and apparently many veterans settled there after discharge. The mechanism of how this type of connection was established remains unclear. It is possible that the reason is in the recruitment policy: at a certain point in time many persons may have been recruited from one place where they then returned as veterans, and sons may have followed their fathers in a military career.[33]

J.N. Adams has pointed out that we should not describe Latin as some sort of official language of the Roman army in Egypt. In many document types the language choice seems to have been very flexible, the preferences of the unit commander possibly influencing the choice between Latin and Greek.[34] On the other hand, there is evidence that at least some native Greek speakers in Egypt learnt Latin in the first place as a spoken language.[35] For the purposes of this study it will be enough to state that the Latin used in these letters is, for all that we know, genuine Latin — there may be Greek influence on all levels of language, even syntax (in relevant cases this possibility is

[30] See Bowman / Thomas 1994, 30.
[31] See Bowman / Thomas 1994, 23-24. The ninth cohort of Batavians is mentioned on tile stamps found at Moesia Inferior from the beginning of the 2nd century.
[32] See Alston 1995, 40-48. Galatia and Africa seem to have been important areas of recruitment, although the evidence comes from only a few sources and may not be representative, see Alston 1995, 42-44.
[33] See Alston (1995, 39-48) for the recruitment policy of the Roman army in Egypt. He thinks that considerable randomness was characteristic of this policy, and choices made by individual commanders may have played a role here. It is possible that the relative number of Egyptians among the recruits increased in the late second century.
[34] Adams 2003a, 599-607. On the other hand, Latin also had the status of a 'super-high' variety. It may have been compulsory to use Latin in certain types of documents (see Adams 2003a, 608-614), and an individual may also have chosen Latin on grounds of prestige although it was not the language they normally used in the family (see Adams 2003a, 623-628 and Leiwo / Halla-aho 2002 on a Latin marriage contract with notable Greek influence).
[35] See Adams 2003a, 629-630.

naturally accounted for in my treatment) — but it is not an admixture of two languages, which would require a different linguistic approach and preclude the use of these texts in the study of Latin syntax. Generally, the use of Latin, and Graeco-Latin bilingualism, in Egypt is a topic of its own.[36]

At Vindolanda also, it should in principle be possible to detect substrate influence from a Germanic language, as the cohorts based there originated from Germanic-speaking areas (Batavian and Tungrian units). Somewhat surprisingly, perhaps, this is not the case.[37] A considerable part of the Vindolanda material stems from officer circles, and army scribes may also have been responsible for writing many private letters,[38] but even in those letters that show a less standard form of Latin it is not possible to find influence from the writer's first language (other than Latin). The officer class at Vindolanda clearly was Romanized to an astonishing degree, but even those writing on a lower cultural level were perfectly fluent in Latin.

Finally, a few words may be said about the transportation of letters. Military personnel who appear carrying letters are *eques* (tab. Vindol. II 252) and *centurio* (tab. Vindol. II 263)[39] as well as *frumentarius* (P.Mich. VIII 472)[40]. The latter letter is written by Claudius Tiberianus who himself was a *speculator*, a military post principally associated with the delivery of letters.[41] Still, it remains unclear even in this case whether the reference is to transportation as a part of their official duties. The text CEL 140, which reports the recruitment of six soldiers, was brought to the prefect of the cohort by an *eques singularis*.[42] Not much is known about the way in which private letters were delivered to the recipient. The writers had no access to the *cursus publicus*, which was reserved for the imperial government, and private persons had this opportunity only in

[36] For the most recent exhaustive discussion, see Adams 2003a (ch. "Latin in Egypt").
[37] Adams 2003a, 276.
[38] See below 1.4 on scribes.
[39] See Kolb 2000, 288-289. The *equites*, understandably, were often involved in transporting letters and other documents.
[40] See Kolb 2000, 290-294. The interpretation of this letter (P. Mich. VIII 472) is far from clear, though, due to both the fragmentary condition of the papyrus as well as its apparently incoherent syntax. The exact status and function of the *frumentarii* has been subject to different interpretations, see Kolb 2000, 290 and 294.
[41] See Kolb 2000, 287.
[42] See further on this Kolb 2000, 287.

special cases.[43] Usually letters must have been carried by people who happened to be travelling in the right direction. For example, in the draft letter of Cerialis, mentioned above, he refers to the movements of a certain person, this giving him the chance to write — and this in a letter written to a superior and undoubtedly pertaining to his position as a prefect.[44] In many letters the information to be conveyed is that something has been sent to the addressee. One then wonders whether the letters travelled attached to the goods or separately. It is conceivable that a person might be able to carry a letter but not bigger and heavier objects. There are some clues that the latter was indeed the case sometimes. For example, Rustius Barbarus (the writer of CEL 73-78) reports in one letter that he had sent bread through three different persons to the addressee of the letter (CEL 73, 4-10).[45] These letters also provide evidence for *equites* in the transporting business: an *eques* appears carrying bread or other goods in three letters (CEL 73, 74, 76).[46]

1.3. Non-literary letters and the Latin language

1.3.1. Research report

The letters of Claudius Terentianus have naturally attracted much interest ever since their publication in 1951. Older studies were written by R. Calderini (1951) and G. B. Pighi (1964), but the book by J.N. Adams (1977) is the most complete study on all aspects of their language (see below).[47] P. Cugusi has studied both the oldest Latin letters on papyrus (Cugusi 1973), and the letters of Rustius Barbarus (Cugusi 1981). His epistolographical studies include material from the non-literary letters (Cugusi 1983 and 1989) and there is also a more recent study concentrating specifically on their language (Cugusi 2005). His studies offer valuable information, especially on the phraseology of the letters and on parallels to be found in other Latin texts.

[43] See Kolb 2000 for the institution of *cursus publicus*.

[44] Also, in a Greek letter of Claudius Terentianus (P. Mich. VIII 476, 20-21) he tells his father that he had written the letter during night-time, finding the opportunity, but that he had been unable to send it.

[45] Similarly, in a Greek letter of Claudius Terentianus (P. Mich. VIII 477, 18-20) he reports to his father that he has not received anything from Anubion although his father had written that a basket had been sent through this person, the reason being that Anubion did not know that Claudius Terentianus knew about the parcel.

[46] The ostraca from Mons Claudianus (also from the Eastern Desert but later in date than those from Wâdi Fawâkhir) provide much interesting information about transportation and persons sending various things, and in some of them the delivery of letters is also mentioned, e.g. in O. Claud. II 250, 3-4 κόμισον παρὰ Ἡραίσκο̣[υ] ἐπιστόλια δύο. On the archive of Petenephotes to which this letter belongs, see Leiwo 2005.

A linguistic perspective is more marked in the studies by P. Molinelli. She has written on subordination and moods in Latin papyri (Molinelli 1996) and, together with E. Rizzi, on language contact and morphosyntax in Egyptian texts (Molinelli / Rizzi 1991). The approach adopted in these studies is largely typological and pertaining to historical syntax. The main problem is that the corpus of Latin texts examined includes material down to the 6th century AD, which is not comparable to the earlier texts in nature, context or language. Therefore the results are difficult to interpret.[48]

All the important non-literary Latin sources have been discussed by J.N. Adams. The Terentianus volume has already been mentioned. Beyond that, the most important for this study among his works are the articles on the Vindolanda tablets (Adams 1995a on tab. Vindol. II, Adams 2003c on tab. Vindol. III), as well as those on Petronius and non-literary Latin (2003b and 2005a), and naturally *Bilingualism and the Latin language* (2003a).[49]

His studies offer a detailed analysis of many aspects of the language of non-literary sources, appreciating the variety of the texts and the different varieties of Latin attested in them. It would be pointless to attempt to go through all his results here, even those having to do with syntax. Regarding individual passages or phenomena, his views will be discussed at the appropriate places — in a way, my study has risen as a response to certain aspects of his work. Here I shall, with the help of a few of examples, only illustrate the multitude and diversity of new information that has been brought to light by the non-literary material.

First of all, it is clear that a difference must be made between orthography and phonology. A trained person or scribe would retain a traditional, standard spelling which no longer reflected the pronunciation but a less educated one would usually write phonetically and only occasionally use the standard spelling (Adams 1977, 11).[50] A good example is the digraph *ae*. In Claudius Terentianus the monophthongization is well in

[47] Calboli 1990 is also a study on the letters of Claudius Terentianus.
[48] There is also an analysis of the word order in a bilingual papyrus text containing model letters (Rizzi / Molinelli 1994).
[49] In addition, there are studies on the writing tablets of C. Novius Eunus (Adams 1990), on the Bath curse tablets (Adams 1992), on the Bu Njem ostraca (Adams 1994c) and two poems on stone from Bu Njem (Adams 1999).
[50] A fact of course that is very easy to understand for native English or French speakers. See Cravens (1991, 56-62) for the methodology of interpreting spelling errors as evidence for phonological change.

evidence (Adams 1977, 11-12) but *ae* is written correctly almost without exception at Vindolanda. Still, this does not imply that an archaic pronunciation would have been preserved in Britain (Adams 1995a, 87-88). The Terentianus letters also proved that the change from /i/ to /e/ was already well on its way and that this phenomenon in the Pompeian inscriptions cannot be attributed (at least entirely) to Oscan influence (Adams 1977, 7-11). Adams also showed that the loss of the final *m* in writing happens more rarely in the 2nd declension than in the 1st or the 3rd (or the 4th) and took this to be mainly a graphic phenomenon (Adams 1977, 23-25)

There are certain extremely interesting morphological issues which are attested both in the Terentianus letters and at Vindolanda, for example, the 3rd person plural form of 2nd conjugation verbs ending in *–unt*: *ualunt, debunt*, *habunt* (Adams 1977, 51; 1995a, 102-103)[51]. These can be attributed to the spoken level of the language, and, on the basis of their distribution in both Egypt and Britain, also more generally to spoken Latin all over the Empire, at least in certain social classes. Highly interesting are cases such as the reinforced demonstrative pronoun *illic*, which is common in Plautus and turns up again in non-literary texts. It is attested both in the letters of Claudius Terentianus and in those written at Vindolanda (see Adams 1977, 45 and Adams 1995a, 101), but was not used in the classical literary register. It does not have reflexes in Romance. It is thus an interesting case of potential continuity on the spoken level from Plautus to the 2nd century AD, which however died out at some later point in time. As a third morphological phenomenon may be mentioned the 3rd declination abl. sing. in *-i*: *patri*, *ualetudini* (Adams 1995a, 99), which seems to be a hypercorrect use (or false archaism), since normally it would be the other way round, *-e* replacing *-i* in certain *i*-stem nouns and all 3rd declination adjectives.

As far as syntax is concerned there is what seems to be a genuine example of the accusative of price *quem hic comparauit (denarios) quinos* (tab. Vindol. II 343, see Adams 1995a, 116), hitherto attested this early only once in Petronius (63,5), and even there the construction has been subject to different interpretations. There is also an example of this construction in the Terentianus letters (P. Mich VIII 469 *merca minore*

[51] The implications of these morphological forms for what we know about the literacy of the rank of *optiones* are discussed in Adams 1995a, 130-131.

pretium, see Adams 1977, 40-42). In one Vindolanda letter we find the instrumental use of the relative pronoun *qui* (Adams 1995a, 101). Adams sees this use as colloquial, and assumes that the instrumental use of specifically the relative pronoun had been preserved in ordinary speech.[52] The usage of simple *ne* in the meaning *ne quidem* is also known in literary texts (Adams 1995a, 127), and it was therefore probably a normal feature of the spoken language of many social classes. Outside letters, the Vindolanda tablets have provided evidence for the use of the accusative in a specific text type, lists. The accusative is often used in lists even when it is difficult to see the motivation for this case (1995a, 115 and 2003c, 547ff).

Noteworthy features in the lexicon include *tot tempus* (Adams 1995a, 127) where *tot* is used as a 'mass' adjective (instead of the standard 'count' adjective), similarly to *paucum aes* in Claudius Terentianus (Adams 1977, 79). There is also evidence for technical terms, such as the verb *exsarcio* in the original meaning 'to sew up'. Only the metaphorical meaning of this compound had been known previously (Adams 1995a, 122). One might, furthermore, mention the expression *bene mane* (Adams 1995a, 127), *bene* used in a reinforcing function that appears also in Cicero's letters.

On the other hand, the Vindolanda letters also contain cases like *potest fieri* in tab. Vindol. III 656 (Adams 2003c, 554) — linguistic expressions that were to live on in the Romance languages (Fr. peut-être). On the basis of a single attestation like this we cannot say much about the popularity of similar constructions at this time, i.e., determine whether it is an incipient tendency or has already been going on for some time but simply not attested elsewhere.

Especially regarding the Vindolanda material, the variety of the Latin needs to be stressed. At Vindolanda it is clearly visible that the officer class who acted as prefects of the cohorts stationed at Vindolanda had achieved a considerably high sophistication in their use of Latin. This is evident from the elegant phrasing shown by the letters tab. Vindol. II 225, tab. Vindol. III 611 and tab. Vindol. III 660.

Finally I mention one particularly interesting case of substandard syntax: locatives (or ablatives used as locatives in the 2nd declension) indicating goal of motion.

[52] Here one might, however, note, that the form is found in a letter of Cerialis (tab. Vindol. II 234) and there is thus a possibility that it is not a colloquial feature, but part of the elevated phraseology of Cerialis.

Adams discusses this phenomenon on three occasions (Adams 1977, 37-39; 1995a, 110; 2003c, 551). The fullest treatment of this issue is, however, to be found in Mackay (1999). He collected evidence from various non-literary sources, and showed that this use of the locative was well established in non-literary Latin in different parts of the empire.

With the help of this highly restricted selection of examples I hope to have shown what an enormous variety of different linguistic forms and tendencies — new ones, old ones, 'high' ones, 'low' ones — the non-literary material contains — and still, all these together formed a linguistic system at any one point of time, a system full of variation and competing tendencies.[53] It is impossible to make any sensible generalizations about "the Latin of the letters".

1.3.2. The Latin of the letters: what is this study about?

As the contexts and persons differ from letter to letter, so does the language. Some writers have problems in producing written text or even the Latin language as such (the semi-literate writers of Bu Njem). The great majority of writers are familiar with the standard written formulae and are most probably native speakers or otherwise fluent in Latin but have not necessarily received higher education. Some writers are even comfortable using elegant phraseology, familiar from literary circles (e.g. Flavius Cerialis at Vindolanda). Still, a letter is basically a communicative act: people want to write so that they are understood and as well as they can. This must necessarily form the basis for any linguistic research on these texts.

In studying written data from a corpus language we never escape the question about the relationship between the text and the spoken reality behind the text. This question is especially relevant for those texts which, for one reason or another, are thought to reveal more about the spoken registers. Everyone giving these issues serious thought soon finds himself wandering around in a circle: the preconceptions one has about the register of the texts have a direct effect on how one interprets the linguistic forms present in them. This interpretation on the other hand has an effect on how the texts are seen as a part of the synchronic *Variationsraum*. The result of this reasoning also

[53] For the methodology needed in the study of the language of non-literary documents, see also Leiwo / Halla-aho 2002.

affects the way we interpret the letters as testimony of language change. If we think that they are a more or less faithful representation of contemporary spoken Latin, this means that they can be used as a *terminus post quem* for changes that were taking place in the language (the AcI, which is mostly used correctly throughout, is the most prominent example).

Anyone reading the more elegant compositions from Vindolanda would agree that whatever the true nature of this language is, it is not vulgar Latin (by any meaningful definition of the term), i.e., the linguistic form one traditionally expects to find in non-literary texts. However, I shall also challenge the traditional view that in the rest of this material we would find something definable as vulgar Latin. A revision of this view is needed in two respects. First of all, it will be argued that there *is* no meaningful definition for the term vulgar Latin. Discussions about vulgar Latin usually begin by mentioning the difficulties involved in using this term and then coming up with some more or less felicitous definition – after which the term is used anyway. The second, and more important, argument is related to the fact that, even if we abandon the term vulgar Latin, one might still maintain that the letters testify to contemporary spoken language. It will be argued that they do not, at least in any simple, readily explainable way. In most cases they in fact show awareness of letters as a text type as well as typical sentiments and expressions used in them.

What, one might ask, do they then tell us about the Latin language? The answer is sought in this study by a detailed analysis of certain syntactic features. Chapter 2 addresses the question of variation and change in Latin, and explains how these general issues and what we think about them are relevant for this study. Chapter 3 introduces the non-literary letters as a text type, the opening and closing formulae and the typical phraseological elements that are found in them. The following two chapters, 4 and 5 are about sentence connection and incoherent structures, respectively. Because the material is so heterogeneous, these parts are close to a syntactic commentary of certain interesting passages. In both of these chapters the differentiation between what is typically spoken and what is typically written will be a major theme. Chapter 4 is predominantly about synchronic variation in Latin with regard to certain types of sentence connection. Chapter 5 takes up the issue of the various syntactically incoherent structures that are found in the

letters. It is mainly about variation, too, although the synchronic aspect is brought in as regards the changing status of the accusative in the inflectional system of Latin. Chapter 6 is dedicated to word order, more particularly, the order of the object and the verb. It starts with an overview of the discussion about Latin word order in diachronic and typological perspectives, for which the non-literary letters (more particularly the letters of Claudius Terentianus) have provided an important contribution. Against this background will then be carried out an examination of the order of the object and the verb in the whole corpus of non-literary letters, and the possible pragmatic motivations to be found as determinants of the word order. Through the pragmatic analysis, this chapter is closely linked to chapter 5, as the concept of topicality is essential concerning the initial constituent in the sentence in both.

These three themes — sentence connection, incoherence and word order — may be expected to be particularly rewarding in the study of non-literary letters. By their very nature, although regulated by stock phrases at the beginning and end, letters as a means of interpersonal communication, be it private or official, entail a certain amount of individual composition on the part of the sender (the possible influence of the scribe on the language will be discussed below). Each writer will have had to decide how to present and organize the information he wants to convey to the recipient in the letter. This process will often result in interesting linguistic forms exactly in these three main fields under study here.

With regard to regional differentiation inside the material, the difference or similarity between the Vindolanda material and the Egyptian will be a major theme especially in the chapter on word order. The high, even literary quality of many letters at Vindolanda is an obvious fact and also generally a higher standard of Latin learning seems to be present at Vindolanda than in Egypt. With this in mind, I shall also ask whether it is possible to establish a difference between letters found at Vindolanda and Egypt with regard to a strictly syntactic variable, such as the order of the object and the verb. The different practice between these two areas will also come up in chapter 4 and in the excursus on the anaphoric pronouns. If such a difference can be observed, we are left with the question of what it tells us about social or geographical differentiation inside Latin.

1.3.3. The linguistic perspective

I am looking at the syntax of these texts from a linguistic perspective. I shall explain what this means with the help of the following quotation in which the authors are discussing the notion of 'bad language' attested in different Latin texts:

> Linguists are usually careful to avoid passing judgement on the quality of the written language or the speech that they may be studying. Literary critics by contrast regularly evaluate poems and other literary works as 'good' or 'bad', even though they may avoid such blatant terms and may even deny that they are making value judgements. Are linguists right to maintain (or attempt to maintain: see below) a neutrality? Current opinion would have it so, because prescriptive grammar has long been out of fashion. But the matter is not as simple as it might seem. A written sentence is the product of a creative act, and many laymen would intuitively feel that some sentences are well written and others badly written. Many would also express opinions about the appropriateness of this or that word as used in a particular context. Mistakes of usage are often identified. Even a linguist will readily comment on the quality of the writing in a student's thesis. Are they wrong to do so? (Adams / Lapidge / Reinhardt 2005, 14)
>
> ...
>
> Different again, but also 'bad', is the following accusative + infinitive construction in a letter of Claudius Terentianus on papyrus. (P. Mich. VIII 468, 43-5)
>
> > ed [sci]as Carpum hic errasse, ed
> > i̯n̤u̯[e]n̤tus est Dios in legione,
> > et a[cce]pisse me p̱r̤o̱ i̯l̤l̤o (denarios) VI
>
> Here the speaker (Terentianus was probably dictating to a scribe) sets out to use a construction dependent on *scias*, but in the second (co-ordinated) clause he forgets about the head verb *scias* and lapses into a direct construction. He recovers the syntax in the third clause. This then reflects a momentary lapse of concentration. (ibid. 16)

However, the difference in attitude described here is not essentially a difference (in principle, at least) between linguists and literary critics (are philologists then somewhere in a no man's land between these?), but depends on what one is doing, and what one is trying to say about the texts under study. A linguist will refrain from making subjective

evaluations, not because he would never come across language he thinks is bad, but because as a linguist he is interested in the way language works, and every attestation of language is valuable for him as a legitimate object of scientific inquiry.

As far as momentary lapse of concentration is concerned, this naturally happens in speech, and it is easy to think that the same applies in the case of non-literary written texts like these letters. But this is not self-evident. When dictating a letter even a person like Claudius Terentianus obviously knew that he was composing a written text. Furthermore, whatever the reason for a bad sentence or anacolouthon may be, as long as it is what the writer had in mind, it is nevertheless interesting for the linguist. And in this particular example from Claudius Terentianus there is even a well-established linguistic motivation for the lapse (because paratactic complements with *verba sentiendi* were well established), and that is what the linguist is interested in. The matter is naturally totally different with literary texts and anacolouthic expressions in them, and it certainly is out of the question in literary texts that the writer would not have had a look at his text after writing it.[54]

When studying a syntactic phenomenon in these letters (or any non-literary text) the first thing one has to do is to remove the possibility that it is a pure mistake, either by the author himself of by the scribe when taking down the dictation. Sometimes this is possible (see below 1.4), sometimes not. The cases that, in all probability, count as genuine linguistic phenomena can roughly be divided into those which tell us more about variation, different styles of writing, etc., and those that are attestations of a change taking place in the language but perhaps invisible or poorly attested elsewhere the preserved texts.

It is necessary to make a distinction between different levels of language organization. Even if a writer wrote the letter himself and did not manage to adhere to standard orthography (on which see below 1.4), this does not mean that he would have been unable to modify his syntactic expression. Furthermore, even inside one language level there can be various tendencies visible: typical letter phrases and expressions coming from speech may well exist in the same letter if the writer is less experienced in

[54] For a reevaluation of anacolouthon in literary Latin see Adams 2005b; also Adams / Lapidge / Reinhardt 2005, 16ff.

writing. In short, we need to fully appreciate the variety even inside one letter, and even inside one level of language organization.[55] Keeping this in mind is central, as a superficial look at the material (the phonetic spellings and other usages not found in literary texts catching the reader's attention), easily gives the wrong impression that everything in it must be a true reflection of the speech of the author.

Besides traditional philological methods I have made use of modern syntactic theory. The most influential theoretical framework in the study of Latin syntax during recent years has been the Dutch school of Functional Grammar (see Dik 1997), applied for Latin most importantly in the work of Harm Pinkster and A. Machtelt Bolkestein. These studies, in addition to having provided valuable insights concerning many essential aspects of Latin syntax, also offer suitable concepts for pragmatic analysis — these have proved to be useful tools in this study, too.

1.4. A note on the scribes — who produced the language?

The letters were often written by persons other than those who appear as senders. This is obviously the case regarding those letters in which the closing salutation and the name of the sender are written in a different hand from the body of the letter. Also, if we have more than one letter from the same person, and these are written by different hands — such is the case of Claudius Terentianus, for example — he clearly was using scribes. If there is only one hand visible, it is possible and even probable that the letter is an autograph – but not absolutely certain. In the Vindolanda material, the editors have even been able to identify the same handwriting on tablets sent by different persons.[56] The term scribe implies that the writer was some sort of a professional, but this was not necessarily the case. At Vindolanda, especially taking account of the high scribal standards, it is even possible that the letters were written by army scribes. On the other hand, it is not probable that Claudius Terentianus in the Alexandrian fleet was dictating to army scribes — but not much more than speculation is possible here.[57]

[55] For more on this see Halla-aho (forthcoming).
[56] Bowman / Thomas 1994, p. 256 and 260.
[57] For scribes in the Roman army, see Stauner 2004. For scribes in the letters of Terentianus, see Adams (2003a, 542) and Halla-aho 2003.

The question about scribal activity is highly relevant for the linguistic approach. As far as the orthographical, and related to that, also to some extent the morphological appearance of the texts is concerned, it is clear that the scribe and his training had an effect on the written form of the language. There is indisputable evidence from Vindolanda that the scribes were able to produce in writing orthographic forms that did not reflect contemporary pronunciation.[58] But who was responsible for the syntax, the sender of the letter or the scribe?

First of all, we need to think about the possible ways in which the sender transferred his message to the scribe. Two ways are conceivable: either the scribe wrote according to what was dictated to him, or the sender handed over a written draft. There is evidence in the Vindolanda material, in fact in the archive of the prefect Flavius Cerialis, for both of these.[59] For the most part, the use of a scribe did not mean that the sender himself would have been unable to write it. Why, then, scribes were used to such an extent (even by persons other than officers) is a more difficult question — presumably a scribe wrote faster and had better handwriting. However, there is an interesting passage in tab. Vindol. III 661 which seems to imply that the recipient, a woman, was not able to read: *ċurare autem debebiṣ ut niḷ qui tibi epiṣṭuḷam meam leget iḷḷud domina[e] indiċet* ("But you (?) will have to take care that the person who reads my letter to you does not indicate that in any way to the mistress").

The question of who produced the syntax is relevant for the linguist in two respects. First, certain oddities in the syntax may not reflect anyone's competence, neither the sender's nor the scribe's, but they may be dictation errors without any linguistic motivation (for the most part it is of course impossible to tell these mistakes apart from pure mistakes committed by the composer of the text). Also, if it were the case that the scribes were responsible for the actual composing of the letter and formulated the syntax, we would not be able to make any connections between the linguistic form and the person

[58] Adams 1995a, 87-90 and 94-95.

[59] The letter tab. Vindol. II 225 in all probability is a draft written by Cerialis himself, probably to be given to a scribe later. On the other hand, in the same archive (tab. Vindol. II 234) there seems to be a phonetic dictation error by the scribe (*et hiem* is erased and *etiam* written instead); see Bowman / Thomas ad loc. and Adams 1995a, 90. The draft letter tab. Vindol. II 233 is written on a tablet on the other side of which there is a fragment of a list of foodstuffs apparently written by the same hand as the one who wrote the letter. It therefore seems that the person writing was a part of Cerialis' household, possibly a slave, and not a member of the military unit (see Bowman / Thomas ad loc).

who appears as a sender (in most cases, of course, his/her name is the only thing known to us in the first place). If the syntax was produced mainly by the scribes, it would also be the product of a considerably smaller and more homogeneous group than those who appear as senders.[60] Even in that case, however, it would be an attestation of Latin as it was used in letters at this time, and as such, worthy of a study.

In this study, however, I work with the assumption that the syntax is essentially produced by the sender of the letter and transmitted to the scribe in one way or another. Throughout, however, this aspect will be kept in mind and the possibility of scribal mistakes will also form part of my argument regarding certain passages.

I shall illustrate my point with an example from tab. Vindol. II 218. Here, I think, it is possible to identify a scribal error.

> (1) *rogo si quid utile mihi credid[eris] aut mittas aut reserues quid nobis opus esset Paterno n(ostro)* m^2 *et Gauoni* m^1 *ad te manda[[re]]* m^2 *ui* (tab. Vindol. II 218, 1-3: 7)[61]
> "Please either send or keep on one side anything which you believe useful for me. I sent word to you by our friend Paternus and by Gavo as to what our needs were."

Neither the editors nor Adams (1995a) make any comment on this passage although the construction *mandare* + dat. + *ad* (+ a *quid* clause) does not seem to be in accord with standard syntax. According to ThLL the basic meanings of this verb are 1) *dare, tradere, committere* 2) *imperare, praecipere* 3) *nuntiari iubere* 4) *nuntiare, declarare* 5) *mittere*. Here we are most probably dealing with the meaning 3) *nuntiari iubere*. With this meaning, the second argument is expressed by the dative ('addressee', as with *dicere*) or a prepositional phrase with *ad* ('recipient', as with *dare*) but both cannot be used at the same time and usually only one of them (either the recipient or the addressee) is explicitly expressed[62] and the other can be inferred from the context (or is not relevant). The following example from Cicero cited (and commented) by ThLL gives a good idea of how arguments can be left out if they can be recovered from the context.

---

[60] On this aspect, see Bowman 1994a, 88.
[61] The editorial marks should be taken to mean that another hand added *et Gauoni* and struck away the two final letters of *mandare*, then wrote *ui* instead.
[62] But there are also examples like Caes. Gall. 7,17,8 *haec eadem centurionibus tribunisque militum mandabant, ut per eos ad Caesarem deferrentur*, where both the addressee and the recipient are expressed.

(2) *saepe enim ad eum scripsi multisque mandaui* (sc. *ut ei dicerent*) (Cic. *Att*. 11,12,1)
"…for I have often told him myself and instructed others to tell him"

In the Vindolanda letter we seem to have a contamination of these two constructions and meanings: *mandaui ad te* 'I send a word to you' and *mandaui Paterno et Gauoni* 'I ordered P. and G. to'. What the sender is trying to say is undoubtedly 'I ordered P. and G. to let you know what we needed'.

It is understandable that a verb with so many different meanings and structurally similar though not identical constructions as *mandare* can cause uncertainty and result in contaminations in speech. Here, however, it is probable that the scribe caused the confusion. As can be seen, the letter was corrected by another hand, that of the sender. When reading the draft, he probably noticed that the other name (Gavo) was missing and added *et Gauoni*. Likewise, he corrected the infinitive *mandare* to a finite form *mandaui* after noticing that there was no finite verb in the clause. Originally he may have intended a different finite verb in the end, e.g. *iussi* or *imperaui* which, however, the scribe erroneously did not write. This would help to explain the odd construction as *iubere* or *imperare* could be followed by a dative + infinitive construction (e.g. *iussi Paterno et Gauoni mandare ad te*, see Hofmann-Szantyr 1965, 363). Hence, the reason for the confusion in this example is in all probability totally extralinguistic.

* * *

The translations in this work are as follows: for the letters of Claudius Terentianus from P. Mich. VIII, for the Vindolanda tablets from tab. Vindol. I-III, for the Mons Claudianus ostraca from O. Claud. (where in English in the edition), for CEL 10 from the *ed. pr*. (Brown 1970), for CEL 150 from Fink (1971, no. 80). For other texts, which either have translations in French (most importantly CEL 73-78), or no translations at all, the translations are mine.

2. SETTING THE CONTEXT: VARIATION AND CHANGE IN LATIN

2.1. Introduction

In this chapter I shall address questions that are relevant when defining the position of these letters in the Latin *Variationsraum*, that is, how they are situated in their synchronic space, on the one hand, and on the diachronic continuum, on the other. This will necessarily bring up certain general themes which recur in Latin language research. The study of Latin variation and change usually operates with three basic concepts: literary Latin, vulgar Latin and *Umgangssprache*. In the following I first discuss vulgar Latin. I then deal briefly with standardization, and finally, at some length, discuss the relationship between spoken and written language, first in historical perspective and then, related to *Umgangssprache* and colloquial language, concerning these letters in particular.

2.2. Syntax and vulgar Latin

Due to the impact of sociolinguistics, Latin studies have witnessed a growing interest in variation — different varieties and registers. While the complexity of these issues has become more and more apparent, the concept of what might be called two macro-registers, literary (classical) and vulgar Latin, has also been reconsidered. It has been stressed that Latin was a language with variation determined by user and context, variation in essence similar to that which is an inherent property of all modern (and ancient) languages. Adams writes

> "The term 'Vulgar Latin' has been often criticized, and it is unsatisfactory, implying as it does that there was a single entity 'Vulgar Latin' distinct from another entity such as 'literary Latin' … It is perhaps best to think of Latin as a single language which embraced the usual types of sociolinguistic and dialectal variations" (Adams 1995a, 131)

Traditionally, the term vulgar Latin has been associated with a wide variety of texts from chronologically, socially and geographically varying contexts: from Plautus and Petronius to the *Peregrinatio Egeriae*, from inscriptions to later technical treatises. The problem is that the 'vulgar' variants present in these different texts do not share a

common register or social class or even time period.[1] All they have in common is, in fact, that they tell us something about what kind of variation existed and what kind of changes were taking place behind the literary (or, more generally, written) standard. If we take only one variable, it is often possible to identify the 'high' and the 'low' variant. But, on their basis we cannot reconstruct two coherent varieties with systematic differences on all levels of the language. However, it seems to be something of a tradition that a study on vulgar Latin first attempts to define the term, pointing out the problems involved in this, and then goes on to use it after coming up with a more or less satisfactory definition.[2] Usually it is, however, taken for granted that there *is* something called vulgar Latin and the only problem is how to define it adequately.

All languages change. Likewise, all languages have variation within their system at a given point of time. Variation is the source of change but not all variation leads to change.[3] Often what is called a change can only be discerned from some temporal distance, as usually a change is in fact a slowly emerging tendency, visible for a long time only as a statistical preference for one variable. This is especially true concerning syntactic variation and change which are closely connected with other concepts such as pragmatics and style, and thus always more difficult to identify and analyse.

The term vulgar Latin has been less essential in the study of Latin syntax than in the study of phonology, morphology or lexicon. Hofmann in his *Lateinische Umgangssprache* did not even think he was studying something called 'vulgar Latin syntax'. Still there are certain areas which usually are mentioned under 'syntax' in studies on vulgar Latin, e.g. such well-known and often-mentioned developments as the use of finite complements instead of AcI, and more generally the movement from synthetic towards analytic structures; or SVO word order, and more generally a change from left-branching to right-branching (or modifier-head to head-modifier). Both of these tendencies are usually seen as indications of a typological change. However, there has been some evidence recently that even some of those well-established cases might need

[1] The double meaning of this term is well illustrated by e.g. Coleman (1999, 25) "Even the most vulgar Pompeian graffiti were after all written by literates and subject to conventional literary pressures" — a statement which of course is very much to the point. Similarly Adams (1992, 24) "The writer who uses a 'vulgar' spelling need not himself be 'vulgar' ".
[2] Most recently Kiesler 2006.
[3] This is the 'variationist approach', see Weinreich / Labov / Herzog 1968.

reevaluation. Adams (2005a) suggests that in fact the *quod* clauses which replace AcI might have been first used in literary language and not in lower class speech. Statements like

> "Naturally, Vulgar Latin did not use the lengthy, complex, and carefully constructed sentences found in literary language; in Vulgar usage the constructions were comparatively simple and straightforward" (Herman 2000,87)

imply a certain idea of typical vulgar Latin syntax. But what is behind this is in fact nothing else than the common observation that spoken language typically uses simpler structures than written language (simpler, that is, at least in the traditional sense of this word, with less subordination, etc.).

In fact all the research on vulgar Latin is on variation and change in Latin. This is what the two most eminent scholars of this field, József Herman and Veikko Väänänen in effect are saying, although with different terms, when they try to give a definition for the term:[4]

> Taking all these considerations into account, in this book the term "Vulgar Latin" (henceforth regularly used without these inverted commas) is used to refer to the set of all those innovations and trends that turned up in the usage, particularly but not exclusively spoken, of the Latin-speaking population who were little or not at all influenced by school education and by literary models.(Herman 2000, 7)

> Le latin vulgaire au contraire, tel que nous le concevons, comprend les états successifs depuis la fixation du latin commun, à l'issue de la période archaïque, jusqu'à la veille des premiéres consignations par écrit de textes en langue romane; il n'exclut ni les variations sociales, ni même régionales. (Väänänen 1981, 6)

What all this means then is: Innovative tendencies, all through the history of Latin, emerging mainly in the spoken language, taking into account social and regional variation – this is what the study of language variation and change is all about. I claim that vulgar Latin, as defined above by Herman and Väänänen, is used as an abstract noun for "variation and change in Latin".

[4] Kiesler (2006, 8-14) offers a useful summary of the different definitions and opinions regarding this problematic term.

The problem with later Latin developments is not "how/why/whence did the Romance languages emerge" but "how/why did the status of (classical) literary Latin as a written prestige variety remain for centuries so strong that it was, to a considerable degree, able to conceal the changes that had taken place in the spoken language"; cf. the following quotation from R. Wright

> "But to historical linguists it is self-evident that Imperial Latin only has direct spoken continuity with Medieval Romance, post-classical written Latin being a separate entity of problematic origin and an unclear relationship with either of the others" (Wright, intr. 5, in Wright (ed.) [1991])

The reasons behind this situation are not linguistic but sociohistorical, be it because (due to social changes in the Roman empire and the influx of new speakers of Latin) the literary tradition became overwhelmingly the property of a small élite, or for some other reason.[5] What is spoken is always primary and sooner or later bound to be reflected also in writing – in the case of Latin in was rather 'later'. Of course there is no such thing as 'extinction of Latin as a spoken language', unless one were to suggest a very radicalist view about an abrupt language change within a generation or two, with a break in the native language transmission – this, for all we know, certainly did not happen. Otherwise there is always continuity of the spoken vernacular.[6]

Only the nature of the preserved Latin material has given rise to the thought that there is something that might be called vulgar Latin – the texts we have seem in most cases to be divisible into two groups, those which tell us something about vulgar Latin and those which do not. Vulgar Latin thus is defined as that layer of Latin that hosts the variation and the change stemming from this variation.[7] Given the fact that innovations are often created in lower class speech (this is implied in the definition by Herman above), the term 'vulgar' naturally has its justification. This is what in sociolinguistics is called 'change from below', yielding the prototypical picture where the lower classes

[5] Heather (1994, 183-185 and 196) describes late Roman literacy in pessimistic terms: members of the elite desired knowledge of classical culture and literature in order to qualify for well-paid, although short-lasting, positions in the imperial government. This artificial common heritage was no longer useful in the changed situation after the fall of the empire and, consequently, could no longer be maintained.

[6] See Lloyd 1991 and Janson 1991 for giving names to languages and metalinguistic changes in the late Latin period.

push the change forward at the same time that the élite is trying to fight against it.[8] These aspects undoubtedly are the reasons for the continued popularity of the term vulgar Latin. However, we do not encounter these innovations when they are created, but much later, when they are widespread enough for a literate person to write them, even if it be unintended. On the most profound level all this ends up in the question of what we mean when we speak of Latin. Does 'Latin' refer to the corpus of texts that we have or does it refer to the language which once existed and of which a great part is lost forever? There is a difference, on a theoretical level, between these two – and precisely because of this all information from non-literary sources is so important.

2.3. Standardization

We might ask what it means to speak of a standard language in the case of Latin. In modern societies the concept of a standard variety is closely related to the written language which is taught at schools and used in public communication.[9] The existence of a standard requires an institution (the state) which creates and maintains it. Recently there has been discussion and reevaluation of many traditional views about Latin literary language, standardization and style, represented most importantly by the two volumes Adams / Mayer (eds.) 1999 and Reinhardt / Lapidge / Adams (eds.) 2005. When referring to standardization I have in mind a broad concept that goes beyond literary style.

We might say that there were two phases in the standardization of Latin. First, the written literary tradition and its language was created in Latin through the imitation of Greek literature.[10] But, quite generally, there certainly is variation and stratification in a language already before the creation of literature or even written language in the first place.[11] Then, in the 1st century BC the written language was further developed into what we know as classical Latin, partly following Greek models, partly building on native

[7] On the other hand, vulgar Latin can and has been used as a technical term for those Latin forms which are continued in Romance. This, however, is not how, e.g., Herman and Väänänen have used it.
[8] The parallel term 'change from above' refers to those changes which are the result of school teaching and hypercorrect usages. In reality these issues are of course far more complicated. There is now a great amount of information on the social causes of language change in Labov 2000.
[9] A very useful discussion on standardization (mainly in English) is in Taavitsainen / Melchers 1999, 1-17.
[10] According to Joseph (1987, 50), a model from another written tradition is essential in the forming of a standard language and therefore Latin meets the criteria of a standard language better than Greek.
[11] See Adams 2005b, 73-74.

Latin traditions. But clearly this process is much more complex than has been assumed and there were individual differences in literary taste and language ideal.[12]

The distance between the standard and the vernacular can change over time. According to one view, in the beginning of the written tradition the written is very close to the spoken language. For example, it has been claimed that Old French was very much a spoken language and adapted sometimes better sometimes worse to writing.[13] With regard to Latin, this question is usually centred on Plautus and the problem of how spoken language and the artistic literary language interact in his language. The standard view still seems to be the following "Als ausgemacht kann gelten, dass in altlateinischer Zeit Sprechsprache und geschriebene Sprache noch weniger weit auseinanderklaffen als in späteren Epochen, in denen sich eine nach griechischem Vorbild ausgebaute Sprachnorm von der normalen Evolution immer weiter abhob" (Müller 1997, 9). But, even in the case of Plautus this issue is anything but simple. His language is a *Kunstsprache*, showing many kinds of internal differentiation with regard to situation, person, etc.[14] Throughout we must be careful not to make simple equations between Plautus' language and contemporary spoken language.[15]

The traditional view is that classical literary language and Terence as its forerunner tried to avoid that which was common among the lower classes.[16] The classical literary language may have codified forms or expressions, such as the personal passive, which were rare from the beginning in spoken registers, as the correct expression.[17] On the other hand, existing parallel to this, one might also see here a

[12] See Adams (2005b, esp. 77-78) for a discussion on the emergence of classical literary Latin and the *Bellum Africum*.
[13] Jucker / Fritz / Lebsanft 1999, 5 (citing Fleischman).
[14] Three different macroregisters have been identified in Plautus' language (speech in iambic senars, resitatives and *cantica*). The iambic speech parts are apparently closest to real spoken language, whereas the *cantica* parts are by all criteria artistic literary compositions, see Happ (1967, 80) — but even this is a simplification. In Terence a difference between 'Langversstil' and 'Senarstil' is not maintainable, see Bagordo 2007.
[15] Happ (1967, 79-87). Interesting in this connection are Happ's observations concerning the construction *habere* + perfect passive participle (1967, 92-103). His conclusion is that in old Latin and in Cicero the construction was normally used in a higher register (and, related to this, in legal language). After Cicero, the construction fell out of use and was reintroduced in later Latin, undoubtedly influenced by normal spoken usage. On this construction see also Nuti 2005.
[16] Bagordo 2001, 18.
[17] See Väänänen 1981, 129. The relationship of the emerging standard to existing social and geographical variation can vary. For some observations on German and Italian, see Holtus / Radtke 1990, xi.

development whereby the literary language from Terence onwards in fact moves closer to the contemporary spoken language, discarding archaisms and old-fashioned ornaments.

The ability to use the standard language is often associated with the higher socio-economic classes.[18] However, not even the members of this elite in any society learn to speak the standard as their vernacular language. Those who do master it at a later stage of life have had to learn it separately.[19] After that acquisition process it can and will naturally have an effect on the spoken language as well.

It is an inherent feature of the standard language that it tries to minimize the differences within it, control variation, and, as a consequence, resist change. In the course of time this tendency widens the distance between the vernacular and the standard. When this distance is great enough the standard will begin to be perceived as artificial.[20] Then it will also become more difficult to maintain and can be fossilized as a classical language.[21] This schematized picture of the life cycle of a standard language is well represented at least in later Latin.

The question of how the written standard managed to maintain its position for such a long time remains. This happened through the texts from earlier centuries which served as the source of written standard language and were taught in Roman schools. The basic material in language education consisted of canonized literary texts. From these texts emerged the conception of what correct written language was like, i.e., what we would call a standard.[22] In the context of letter writing, an interesting case is an inscription from Pompeii with an epistolary opening formula and a line from Virgil.[23]

K. Versteegh has offered interesting parallels from the arabophone world regarding the status of the standard language.[24] Although not all literates are competent in the standard, it is nevertheless conceived of as common property and the target in written production even by those who never master it.

---

[18] Ammon 1986, 22-23.
[19] See Joseph 1987, 17 and Versteegh 2002, 70.
[20] Joseph 1987, 109 and 118.
[21] Joseph 1987, 172-173. Latin grammars only start appearing when the traditional form of writing, at least with regard to morphology, has become a special art, see Wright 2002, 72-73.
[22] Selig (1992, 7) notes that the Latin standard was established in a way that deepened the gap that exists in all languages between the standard and other varieties.
[23] See Lebek 1985.
[24] Versteegh 2002, 66-70.

2.4. Variation: spoken and written language

Both spoken and written language contain a large amount of internal variation and together they form a continuum, with polished literary language and the speech of the illiterate lowest classes representing, in a way, the two extremes (more on this below). It is not before the late Latin period (if even then) that we can speculate on the existence of two separate and internally coherent systems, a certain kind of diglossia.[25] Naturally, spoken and written language always differ from each other, at least stylistically (see below). The relationship between written and spoken language can be different in different times and in late Latin their distance from each other was probably greater than usual.[26] The situation was, according to Wright, "complex yet monolingual". Others have found Wright's unitarian position too optimistic regarding the actual linguistic diversification: even if people thought there was just one language, this does not mean that there actually was.[27]

The paradox of variation in Latin is formulated, e.g., by Herman (1996, 45). Only very little variation is attested in texts if we consider the vast region, the multitude of people(s) and contexts, and the great time span.[28] The written language was used successfully in a surprisingly similar form in all the different contexts. This fact testifies to the efficiency of the Roman literate education system: those who learned to write learned to do so in the same way. Literacy was essential to the imperial government, both civil and military. The variation in the vernacular is hidden behind this standard and

[25] But, even in diglossic communities, the two varieties are not kept separate; they, too, often form a continuum with mixed varieties between the two extremes, see Versteegh 2002, 67-68.
[26] Wright 2002, 10 and 310-311.
[27] Herman 1991, Versteegh 1992, 269 and 277-278.
[28] Of course it is possible, that, after all, there was relatively little dialectal variation. Wright draws attention to certain studies on colonial societies in which variation seems to be of a very limited nature. He refers to the concept of interdialect (see Trudgill 1986, 142-148) which means the convergence of dialects of the same language in a prolonged contact situation, resulting often in the survival of the 'highest common factor'. This kind of contact usually arises in colonies or military settlements. When describing the linguistic situation in the Roman empire outside Italy, the interdialect theory is attractive (Wright 2002, 26-28 and 301). It has also been observed that, in general, both geographical and social mobility seem to level variation (Chambers 2003, 73). In immigrant areas homogenization may be more than a transitory phenomenon at the beginning of the settlement. If mobility continues to be a vital force it may exert a persistent influence on language change. Mobility of both kinds must have been a characteristic feature of Roman colonies and settlements.

deviations from the norm are more or less equal everywhere, even in inscriptions produced by the lower classes.[29]

In the first two centuries AD there was an influx of new speakers of Latin. It has been pointed out that this must have had an effect on the linguistic system of Latin. This does not mean an easily definable substrate influence from a particular language to the target language (Latin) but rather a more complex process set in motion by a large quantity of second language learners shifting their language.[30] The letters studied here come from the border areas of the Roman Empire where Latin was never rooted permanently. Still, only a relatively small amount of indisputable evidence of imperfect learning has come to light from them (the Bu Njem ostraca are perhaps the most prominent example).[31]

An additional reason for the apparent uniformity of the written language might lie in the different role played by literacy and writing in Roman society.[32] The literacy rate was, in any case, considerably lower than in modern societies.[33] This has a twofold effect. Firstly, only a small proportion of the people were exposed to the written standard language and, consequently, the majority of the people remained largely unaffected by its unifying force as regards their speaking habits. Secondly, these illiterate masses have left no direct testimonies of their language use. A possibility that follows from this is that the gap between the standard written language and the vernacular of the majority could have been larger than we, from our modern viewpoint, are able to imagine.[34] Parallels from modern languages are bound to be unsatisfactory because of the unifying effect that universal literacy and mass media have on the linguistic situation in contemporary

[29] See Galdi 2004 for morphological variation in the inscriptions of the Eastern provinces and e.g. 354-356 for the complexities involved regarding the desinences of the 1st declension. See the papers in Adams / Janse / Swain (eds.) 2002 for the difficulty of making any kind of conclusions about the spoken language(s) in bilingual contexts on the basis of written material (Leiwo 173, 178, 186-188, 192-194 on substandard bilingual epigraphic material and Swain 129-130 and 147 on code-switching in Cicero' letters).
[30] See Janson 1979, 44; Versteegh 2003, 71-72 and Varvaro 1991, 47-48.
[31] But see Adams 2003a 599-536 for the situation in Egypt and Adams 1995a, 93-95 and Adams 1996 for the spelling *souxtum* at Vindolanda. On the Bu Njem ostraca see Adams 1994.
[32] See Fruyt 1996, 54. Wright (2002, 310 and 317) stresses the fact that knowledge of the role of writing and literacy in a given society is necessary when examining only written material. On the other hand, the Roman culture was in many ways deeply literate, even to an astonishing extent, as the non-literary material, among others, shows.
[33] See Harris 1989 and Bowman / Woolf (eds.) 1994 for the discussion on literacy.
[34] Reciting aloud sermons in later times probably changed this situation in some respect.

western societies.[35] The supposed literacy rate also has an effect on how we place the non-literary letters in the sociolinguistic continuum. If we think of, say, a literacy rate of 30%, then, e.g., the letters of Claudius Terentianus would also have to be included in this "top" third.[36]

Most probably the apparent homogeneity of Latin is the combined effect of all these factors: a rather weak dialectalization, a reasonably strong written standard and a relatively low literacy rate. But see now Adams (forthcoming) for regional diversification in Latin.[37]

Changes in written language always emerge with a delay and they do not necessarily mirror directly the spoken language but rather the metalinguistic attitudes towards the written standard.[38] The well-known examples of later texts that do not follow the classical standard, *Mulomedicina Chironis* and *Peregrinatio Egeriae*, should be taken as evidence of variation in the written register. Naturally they reveal more about the changes already having happened in the language than other texts that followed more strictly the classical standard, but that is not to say that they would be examples of contemporary spoken language. The relationship of the late Latin authors to their diverging spoken and written languages must have been a complex one.[39]

Adams (1995a, 88 and 94) emphasizes the fact that standard orthography reveals only that the writer had received schooling in that field. Those phonological features that were shared by everyone (e.g., loss of the final /m/) could be retained in writing only if the writer knew how to make a distinction between the written and the spoken. As regards these features, nothing can be said about the writer's social status on the basis of pronunciation and writing. Naturally, however, those writers who were better educated and could follow the standard orthography usually also came from the higher social

[35] Wright 2002, 169. See also Weinreich / Labov / Herzog 1968, 103 n. 6: "Investigations of the long-range effects of language planning of mass literacy and mass media, have therefore a special relevance to the over-all study of linguistic evolution … whose effect is recent at best."
[36] Bowman notes (1994b, 116) that what people wrote in the first place may have been restricted even though writing did have many functions.
[37] I am grateful to J.N. Adams for this information.
[38] Versteegh 2002, 58-62.
[39] For some aspects of this, see Bolkestein 1995 (on mood in indirect questions) and Haverling 2005 (on tense and viewpoint).

classes. Wright has made the same point in connection with later Latinity.[40] This is a necessary corrective to the old conception that the élite spoke (and pronounced) as they wrote. On the other hand, the fact that the standard orthography reflected the pronunciation of nobody does not necessarily mean that everybody spoke in the same way. Phonetic differences might also have existed and phonological changes may have taken place at a different rate in different sociolinguistic layers. Literate education may have changed the speech habits of those who received it and slowed down some changes among the upper classes, as we know to be the case in modern languages.[41]

A conservative orthography can be used as a standard for centuries because learning and using it is, after all, quite mechanical. It is far more difficult to adhere to a syntactic standard, which is always more abstract. As a consequence, the texts probably reveal more about contemporary spoken syntax than they do about phonology. Still, although the effect of writing is seen more clearly with regard to phonology, it is relevant in syntax as well. Every person who has received enough schooling to be able to write undoubtedly changes his idiom when writing, according to the more or less vague conception of the written norm that he has.[42] Montgomery notes in connection with the Ulster emigrant letters that

> "… all writers, including less than fully literate individuals, tend to use their better English, or are at least more careful about their language, in writing anything; they do so today, and they must have done so a century or more ago" (Montgomery 1995, 33)

How do syntactic variation and change relate to all this? How does syntactic inquiry differ from the research on other linguistic levels? The fact that has been stressed most is that syntactic change is always slow.[43] A state of stable variation can last for centuries and the potential changes are seen only in statistics. A famous example from Latin is the gradual and by no means simple development where the finite clauses introduced by *quod*

[40] Wright (2002, 5 and 86-87) stresses the fact that also in later times all speakers used 'evolved' forms in speech, as opposed to traditional written forms. See also Wright 2002, 59 and 64.
[41] Social class and learning of course do not necessarily coincide, and a slave may have been more literate than his master, as Fruyt (1996, 54) remarks.
[42] For Latin, see, e.g., Pulgram 1950, 459; Löfstedt 1959, 15 and Selig 1992, 14 n.28.
[43] Wright 2002, 203-204.

(or similar conjunctions) come to compete with the standard AcI constructions.[44] Wright's thesis is that, because of the gradualness of syntactic changes, the texts from earlier centuries were intelligible even to the illiterate if they were read aloud using evolved phonetics (at least until the Carolingian reforms).[45] In general, variation appears to be more important than change in the study of historical syntax. This theme will re-emerge in the chapters on paratactic complements and word order.[46]

2.5. Spoken language and substandard written language

All literate language users have some kind of intuitions about the differences between typical written and typical spoken language. Numerous attempts have been made at grasping these intuitions.[47] Naturally, spoken and written language vary internally as well, depending on the situation and the speaker/writer in question. Still, there seem to be some features that can be said to be typical of either spoken or written registers. One of them is the different level of internal organization and cohesion required in speech and writing. Writing requires more planning beforehand and, as a consequence, written language is usually characterized by strict syntactic structure and explicit reference. In spoken language thoughts can follow each other in loose chains. This is related to the preference in written texts of hypotactic structures. It has also been pointed out that the need of syntactic explicitness is greater in writing, as a writer has to express everything by syntactic means but a speaker can resort to contextual and pragmatic devices. These kinds of general characterizations are best suited to describe formal written language and informal spoken language.[48] Hence, it has been argued that actually two dimensions are needed, one of which is the medium, speech or writing, and the other the linguistic register, ranging from informal to formal (or "Sprache der Nähe" and "Sprache der Distanz" in the terminology of Koch und Oesterreicher 1985).

---

[44] Wright (2002, 203) remarks that the *quod* clause "is also found in Plautus as an available alternative, probably marked but certainly not peculiar" and, on the other hand, "accusatives and infinitives are often used now, particularly after verbs of perception". Adams has recently offered an interesting view about the origin of the *quod* clause, namely that it originated in the literary language and not in the spoken language as has usually been thought (change from above instead of change from below) (Adams 2005a, 196-197).
[45] Wright 2002, 10; 33; 43; 50-53; 69.
[46] On word order, see Pinkster 1991.
[47] Ochs 1979, Tannen 1985, Chafe 1985, Halliday 1989.
[48] Beaman 1984.

It has been acknowledged that the difference between written and spoken language cannot be caught in statements like "written language is more complex than spoken language". In fact, spoken and written language both seem to exhibit their own complexities.[49] Nearly all research in this field has been on English. The results, therefore, can be generalized only to some extent. Especially such concepts as 'complexity' are difficult because the nature of complexity is not uniform in languages, not to speak of individual scholars' notions of it.[50] "Spoken language is syntactically less restricted in general, besides having certain syntactic patterns that are not used in written language" (Bartsch 1987, 10) is perhaps a well-balanced generalization of this complex field.

In historical linguistics, the search for oral traits in written texts has received growing interest in the recent years although it has not been absent earlier.[51] A general model for the interaction between spoken and written strategies in different contexts (language of immediacy and language of distance) has been developed by Koch and Oesterreicher (1985). In recent years there has been a trend in Latin studies to emphasize the fact that Latin once was a living, spoken language. The conception of orality and its different realizations in texts have received much attention.[52] The term 'orality' usually entails a psychological aspect regarding the different communicative strategies in written and spoken and as such, it usually means looking for universal features of orality rather than, e.g., language-specific differences in vocabulary between written and spoken language.[53] The purpose has been to extract from the texts all sorts of evidence regarding the oral level of the language, such as exclamations and hesitation phenomena.[54] Syntactical matters have not received much attention, although the differences between written and spoken, as they have been studied in modern languages, appear mainly in the sphere of syntax and pragmatics.

---

[49] On this see Halliday 1989.
[50] See Halliday (1989, 86-87), Chafe (1985, 106 and 110) and Beaman (1984, 58).
[51] For Latin, of course, Hofmann 1951 [originally 1926], for earlier interest in orality in other languages see Jucker / Fritz / Lebsanft 1999.
[52] Dangel / Moussy (1996); Koch 1995; Oesterreicher 1995. For other languages see Jucker / Fritz / Lebsanft 1999.
[53] See Koch 1995, 125-126. In many essential respects these are already present in Hofmann's classic study *Lateinische Umgangssprache*.
[54] See Fruyt 1996 and Koch 1995.

It has naturally been acknowledged that the most informal registers (language of immediacy) are never represented in texts authentically.[55] What still needs to be stressed in connection with this letter material is that not all written language that in some way reflects oral strategies does so because of the immediacy or emotionality of the communicative situation but rather because of the less than perfect command of the written language: the letters under study here do not as a rule represent an informal written register.[56] This aspect is essential for my definition of substandard written language and the central themes of this study.

Written language is usually subdivided into literary and non-literary texts. Some non-literary documents, such as juridical texts, contracts and various documents with formulaic language are in many cases even more alien to spoken language than the literary texts. On the other hand, private letters (especially by semi-literate writers) are often mentioned as a text type where the features of spoken language have an easier access to written language than in the literary registers.[57] Literary and non-literary language is best seen as forming a continuum.[58]

A private letter is usually associated with the expression of personal feelings and thoughts.[59] Most of these letters are not private in this sense but the letters do show some variation in this respect. In some letters there undoubtedly is a personal feeling involved, as in the correspondence of Sulpicia Lepidina from Vindolanda and the letters of Claudius Terentianus to his father. For example, in the letters by Claudia Severa to Sulpicia Lepidina (tab. Vindol. II 291 and 292) taking care of the social network seems to be as important as the actual message, i.e., an invitation to a birthday party. In tab. Vindol. II 248 the purpose of Niger and Brocchus seems to be primarily to flatter Cerialis (see 3.3.1 ex. (8)). Most letters, even if they are private in the sense that they do not involve strictly official matters pertaining to the duties of, e.g., military personnel, they

[55] Oesterreicher 1995, 149.
[56] Cf. Oesterreicher 1995, 146.
[57] E.g., Chafe 1985, 113; Fruyt 1996, 61; Müller 1997, 8-9. See Schneider 2002, esp. 75-77, on using letters by semi-literates as a linguistic source. For an idea of what the English of a "less than fully literate individual" looked like in 1793, see Montgomery 1995, 31. For private letters as sources in the study of language change, see also Meurman-Solin 1999.
[58] Taavitsainen / Melchers 1999, 13.
[59] See Tannen 1985, 124 for general observations concerning letter writing.

are not private in the sense that they deal only with matters of personal interest.[60] Usually, the contents consist of taking care of practical matters, asking for various goods and informing the recipient about items that have been sent. Therefore, the language is often marked by relative simplicity in linguistic expression and pragmatic structure.

However, as the letters are by definition written, the oral traits are reflected in them only indirectly.[61] Cicero's letters (to Atticus at least) were probably closer to spoken language than many literary texts but in this respect they are not comparable to the letters studied here. Cicero could modify his expression to suit the subject matter and the particular recipient and use more colloquialisms on some occasions than on others. Every reminiscence of spoken language is deliberate. The writers of these letters, quite on the contrary, tried to write as well as they could according to the norms they had learned. I see it as a reasonable starting point that, as the writers were literate, they also had some conception about the norms of the standard, including syntax. The degree of this conception and the ability to follow the standard naturally differed greatly among the writers. Even if a writer had an idea of the standard he may still have failed to produce his thoughts according to the norms because of inexperience in writing. Still, as I shall argue, usually these writers tried to write according to the standard.

A full recognition of these, partly controversial, factors (striving for the standard and the inability to always adhere to it) is necessary before an overall picture of the effect of spoken language on, and its complicated interaction with, the written can be obtained.

Naturally, when all we have is written, it is not always easy to determine which elements are typical of spoken language. There are, in principle, four possible sources: 1) documents that are generally labelled as colloquial or substandard (circularity inherent!) 2) comments and advice from the grammarians 3) parallels from other languages and research on the differences between written and spoken language 4) subsequent historical development of the language in question (which, for the most part, has its origin in the spoken language).

We are used to including in the first group texts like Plautus, certain letters of Cicero, Petronius, Christian authors, papyri and to some extent, inscriptions (also Gellius,

[60] It also appears that there was no strict borderline between private and official letters, see ch. 1.2.2.
[61] See Oesterreicher 1995.

Apuleius, Martialis). Later Latin texts are also relevant, although, as I have noted earlier, the interaction in them between spoken and written is far from simple. The second group would consist of Quintilianus, possibly Cicero and Gellius, and later grammarians. Plautus and Petronius are authors most frequently cited as witnesses of spoken Latin. The relationship to spoken language is different in each case. Even in dialogue parts, a playwright like Plautus was probably more concerned about creating an illusion of a conversation than about reproducing what actually might have been said (see 5.2 below). Petronius, on the other hand, was trying to portray vulgar characters, being himself a member of the elite. His depiction serves a literary aim, even if he knew enough of popular language to be able to imitate it.[62] The conception "fingierte Mündlichkeit" has been used in this connection to describe written texts in which a selection of spoken and written strategies are used to create an image of spoken language or dialogue.[63]

I shall continue the discussion with two terms that are currently used in literature on substandard Latinity, 'colloquial language' and "Umgangssprache". For Hofmann, in accordance with the general tendency of his time, the most important component in *Umgangssprache* was psychological, i.e., its affective nature, as opposed to the intellectual written language.[64] In Hofmann's terms, *Umgangssprache* equals more or less the spoken language, including, at least in principle, *sermo familiaris* (the spoken language of the educated) as well as *sermo vulgaris* and *sermo plebeius* (speech of the lower classes). In the case of Latin, the sources testify mainly to the educated *sermo familiaris*.[65] Bagordo (2001, 22) defines *Umgangssprache* (and colloquial) as that part of Terence's language which, derived from spoken language (but not equalling it), forms a stylistic deviation from the *Kunstsprache* of comedy. The same definition is applicable to

[62] See Adams 2003b for the similarities between Petronius and the non-literary material and Adams 2005a for the subtleties of the linguistic characterization in the *Cena*.
[63] See Goetsch 1985. For Terence's resources in creating a dialogue see Müller 1997.
[64] Hofmann 1951, 1 and 5.
[65] *Umgangssprache*, as it is used in the German tradition, can refer to different aspects depending on whether it is placed inside the standard or outside it: 1) outside the standard = vernacular, 2) inside the standard = colloquial, an informal spoken register of those who also master the written standard (Ammon 1986, 21, himself equating *Umgangssprache* with the vernacular). For a different view, see Albrecht 1990, 62, according to whom *Volkssprache = der diastratisch markierte Substandard* (sociolinguistic), *Umgangssprache = diaphasisch markierte Varietät* (stylistic).

many other contexts where this term has been used, such as Cicero's letters and Petronius.[66]

The corresponding term in Anglo-American tradition is colloquial language, which is largely synonymous with *Umgangssprache* as defined above. Both terms potentially have two meanings, "spoken language of the educated" and "spoken language in general" (as opposed to written language). In the first sense, they are commonly used when referring to texts that are thought to contain features of educated casual language, e.g., in connection with Cicero's letters (especially those to Atticus). Certain misconceptions are bound to arise if the two meanings are not kept separate. For instance, with regard to the letters of Cicero, 'colloquial' should not be understood in the sense that all those features were typical of actual spoken language, but rather formulae and idioms of polite, even if informal, written epistolographical registers.

Using a term 'substandard Latin' is not without problems either. What is the standard they should be compared with? The term substandard (or non-standard) is used with slightly different meaning in different traditions. In Anglo-American and French contexts it is defined as a deviation from the educated standard. In the German tradition, substandard refers to spoken varieties between the dialects and the superregional spoken standard.[67]

The features that can be labelled as substandard relate to the standard in varying ways. To take a simple example, we might first consider the use of the prepositions *cum*, *in* and *pro* with the accusative case, attested in the letters of Claudius Terentianus (and in the Pompeiian graffiti). In standard literary texts of this period such usages do not occur. They must have been current in Terentianus' spoken language, possibly along with the standard ablative. This is a clear substandard feature: it is not attested in literary texts at this time, and the non-literary texts in which it appears also contain other characteristics labelled substandard.[68]

[66] See Adams 2005b, 86-93 for colloquialisms in less classical literary works and Adams / Mayer 1999, 5-10 for colloquialism and orality in Latin poetry.
[67] Mattheier 1990, 1-2.
[68] To illustrate the complexities involved in this question, one can consider a word like *hospitium*. Cf. Adams 1992, 5: "*hospitium* was not the Vulgar Latin word for house … but it may have been a regional word in Roman Britain". But, it must have been current elsewhere as well; cf. *spiti* in modern Greek.

In addition to these clearly linguistic differences, substandard (as I will use it in this work), also refers to differences in refinement and style. These differences are due, on the one hand, to the fact that the writers (for the most part) had not received higher literary education although they were competent in writing and reading, and, on the other hand, to the function of the language which is principally to take care of practical matters. Ungrammatical constructions should be kept clearly apart from register differences, and a contextual explanation for their emergence should be sought.[69]

[69] See Adams / Lapidge / Reinhardt 2005, 19.

3. LETTER PHRASEOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

The texts under study here stem from different contexts, both geographically and socially speaking, and their functions also are different. However, as was stated briefly in the introduction (1.2.2), there is one thing they have in common: they are all letters. This means that each of them has a structure that is typical of this text type. This structure is constituted by the occurrence of certain macrostructural patterns. There are potentially four of these patterns in each text:

- the opening address
- the opening salutation
- the letter proper
- the closing salutation

In addition to these four parts, there may be salutations to be delivered to other persons, relatives and common acquaintances that precede the closing salutation.

The opening address is naturally the most important of these elements and it is found in every text where the beginning of the letter is preserved. Nearly all letters also have a closing salutation, but a considerable number of them do not have an opening salutation – notably the majority of the Vindolanda letters. In addition, the letters naturally contained an address on the verso indicating to whom, and sometimes also where, it was to be delivered.

In this chapter I shall present and discuss those formulaic elements that appear in these four main parts of the letters. The presence of stock formulae in the opening and closing parts is self-evident,[1] but in the letter proper there are also many recurring expressions. Partly these are due to epistolographical conventions and partly to the fact that a majority of the letters were written mainly for a limited set of practical purposes: usually the writers were asking for things to be delivered or taken care of or informing the recipient that something had been sent to him.

[1] See Cugusi 1989, 384-389 for a brief overview on both Latin and Greek opening and closing formulae.

Letter phraseology falls only partly under the main theme of this work, that is, syntax and pragmatics. However, recognition of the conventions and traditions in letter-writing is relevant for the appreciation of the letters as written documents — documents which as a text type were familiar to all of these writers, even those who are usually labelled substandard. Having a closer look at the opening and closing formulae enables one to see the letters as tokens of a culture of writing. If the person writing a letter knew how to compose the opening and closing part according to current epistolographical custom, he will also have known the standard ways of expressing oneself in writing. In other words, knowledge of opening and closing phrases implies familiarity with letters as a text type, even if they were dictated to scribes (see further on this 3.4.2 below). Furthermore, in the following chapters my argument is sometimes based on the recurrence of certain elements in the body text of the letters (see especially on *rogo* in 5.3 and 5.4).

3.2. The opening address

The letters always begin with the address which is usually in the form A (sender) B (recipient, in the dative) *suo salutem*, with *salutem* either written in full or abbreviated, *sal(utem)*, for example *[Fl]auius Genialis Ceriali suo saluṭem* (tab. Vindol. II 256). This form is almost invariable at Vindolanda: it is attested at least 43 times, and is the probable restoration in many other cases. In some instances there is a further noun characterising the addressee, e.g. *frater* (tab. Vindol. II 214, 310, 311, 343; tab. Vindol. III 670),[2] or *dominus* (tab. Vindol. III 614 and 647).[3] There is also one instance of *rex* used in an address (*Masclus Ceriali regi suo salutem* in tab. Vindol. III 628).[4] It may be of interest to note that for the most part those letters in which something other than the simple form A to B *suo salutem* is used come from writers outside the officer class.[5] Furthermore, at

[2] On *frater* as a term of address to non-relatives, see Dickey 2002, 123-125. On terms of address in the Vindolanda tablets, see Adams 1995a, 118-120.
[3] On *domine* as a term of address, see Dickey 2002, 77-99.
[4] On *rex* as a term of address, see Dickey 2002, 106-107.
[5] The letter tab. Vindol. II 310 is written by a man named Chrauttius (see 5.3 for the peculiar syntax of this letter), tab. Vindol. II 343 is the letter of Octavius who probably was not a soldier, and tab. Vindol. II 311 is written by a person named Sollemnis who probably was a slave.

Vindolanda *salutem* is modified with *plurimam* only four times, and in three of these the term *frater* is also used of the recipient (tab. Vindol. II 214, 310, 311).[6]

In the Egyptian material there is more variation. The simple address is found 9 times.[7] The earliest of the texts, CEL 3, has a longer variant *Phileros s(alutem) d(icit) conserueis o̩mnibu̩s*. Otherwise, in Egypt attaching *pater*, *frater* or *dominus* (or a combination of these) to the name of the addressee is common.[8] As far as the distribution of the two types is concerned, it may be observed that the letters using the simple form of the opening address are formal in nature (CEL 140 and 177, of which the latter is a letter of recommendation), or early (CEL 8). The remaining examples of this type come from Mons Claudianus where the opening address has the same form as it has at Vindolanda.

There are a couple of examples in which the name of the recipient appears before that of the sender (CEL 158 and 169; O. Claud. II 367). This order is usually thought to be a signal of respect on the part of the sender. This interpretation fits well in the context of both CEL 169, a letter or recommendation, and CEL 158, which is a report sent by a centurion to a prefect.[9] The cause for this ordering in O. Claud. II 367 is more difficult to determine, but also there the recipient was of higher position and addressed as *domine* in the bodyof the letter. In CEL 149, which is more a petition than an actual letter (see above section 2.1.1), the beginning reads *M(arco) Rutilio Lup[o] praef(ecto) Aegypti ab C(aio) Valerio Ṣ[a]turnino tirone*. What is notable here is the absence of *salutem*, a fact that might indicate that this text is not a letter at all.

3.3. Opening salutations

The traditional Latin way of expressing the opening salutation was by *si uales bene est ego ualeo*, used by Cicero and claimed by Seneca to have been common up to his day

[6] In the one remaining example (tab. Vindol. II 309) the order is odd, *Meṭṭo Aduẹcto plurimam sụo salutem*. Also, the one opening from Vindonissa has *fratri suo salutem* (Tab. Vindon. 52). Opening addresses from other British letters are *praefecto suo salutem* (Tab. Luguv. 16), and the rather extraordinary ordering *Rufus Callisuni salutem Epillico et omnibus contubernalibus* (CEL 87 = Tab. Londin.).

[7] CEL 8, 84, 140, 177 and O. Claud. I 2, 131 and 135, M1107, O. Max. inv. 254, M689. In the last two there is no *suo*. In addition, there is one example of *plurimam salutem* in CEL 10.

[8] Claudius Terentianus in P. Mich. VIII 467, 468 and 469; Rustius Barbarus in CEL 73, 74 and 77; also CEL 83, 157 and 173. – On *dominus* as a term of address, see Dickey 2002, 87. She draws attention to the interesting difference in the use of *dominus* in the Tiberianus archive. In the opening address *domine* can be combined with *pater* and thus used in reference to members of the family, whereas as a vocative in the body *domine* is restricted to unrelated addressees.

[9] See Cugusi ad loc. CEL 169 and the editors ad O. Claud. II 367.

(Sen. epist. 15, 1).[10] This formula is attested in only two non-literary letters, tab. Vindon. 52, 2 *frater si uales b[ene e]ṣt uero ego ualeo* and CEL 10, 1 *s(i) u(ales) b(ene est)*. The latter letter is relatively early, probably from the Augustan period, and the presence of this older formulary is thus easy to understand.

3.3.1 Vindolanda

At Vindolanda there are hardly any salutary phrases at the beginning of the letters. The writers usually start the letter proper immediately after the opening address. Those opening salutations that are found do not show any uniform pattern. Example (1) probably expresses more or less the same thought as the traditional Latin letter opening, but in a longer form:

> (1) ... *omni tempore cupio ego certe cum hoc scribsi ualebam recte* (tab. Vindol. III 664, 2-3)
> "… I desire at all times. I at any rate when I wrote this was in very good health"

Not much else is preserved of this letter so that it is impossible to tell what kind of information it contained.

The following is also part of an opening salutation:

> (2) ... *quod est principium epistulae meae te fortem esse* (tab. Vindol. II 299, 1-2)
> "… which is the principal reason for my letter (to express the wish?) that you are vigorous"

The only content of this letter is to report that the sender has received oysters from a friend and there is thus no reason why an elaborate salutation should be used in this particular letter.

Very surprising is the following, which in fact is all this letter consists of:

> (3) *opto male tibi eueniat. uale* (tab. Vindol. II 321, 3)[11]
> "It is my wish that it might turn out badly for you. Farewell."

[10] See Cugusi 1983, 47-56 for Latin opening salutations and their evolution in general. I have not been able to consult C. Dana Lanham, *Salutatio formulas in Latin letters to 1200: Syntax, Style and Theory*, München 1975.
[11] For the reading, see tab. Vindol. III Appendix.

It is not easily to be understood that letters were used as some sort of curse tablets, as this example seems to imply. The same phrase and idea can be found CIL IV 10243h *C. Raro male eueniat*. If the corrected reading is right, the Vindolanda text shows how mechanically *uale* was added to the end of a letter – it was only a part of the letter phraseology and completely empty of meaning.

In addition, there are some particularly interesting openings, which Adams has called "local (British?) epistolary formula".[12]

> (4) *ut scias me recte ualere quod te inuicem fecisse cupio* (tab. Vindol. II 311, 3-5)
> "I want you to know that I am in very good health, as I hope you are in turn"[13]

> (5) *sc̣ias ṃe recte eṣṣę quod ṭę inuicem fac̣ęrę cupio* (tab. Vindol. III 670,i,3-4)
> "Know that all is well with me and I wish that the same may be true for you"

It is interesting that two different tenses of the infinitive are used in a formula which otherwise is identical. It may be of relevance here that tab. Vindol. III 670 is a text that seems on both archaeological and palaeographical grounds to be considerably later than the rest of the tablets (last quarter of the 2nd century), but it is impossible to say whether the change of tense has anything to do with that. The past tense of *facere* is attested also in the third occurrence of this formula (a stilus tablet from London), in a finite verb form

> (6) *certiores uos esse credo me recte ualere si uos inuicem [f]ecistis*[14] (RIB II.4.2443.7 = CEL 87, 2-4)
> "I believe that you know that I am well, if you have been so in your turn"[15]

It may be of some interest to note that the recipient Paris in (4) is probably (on the basis of his name) a slave and this would make it likely that also the sender Sollemnis is a slave (he addresses Paris as *frater* in the opening).[16]

---

[12] Adams 2002; see also Adams 2003c, 574-575.
[13] The letter continues with ex. (24) below, *homo inpientissime qui mihi ne unam epistulam misisti sed puto me humanius facere qui tibi scribo* – an indication of the heavily phraseological nature of both the opening salutation and the reproach for not writing.
[14] For the reading of this passage see Adams 2002.
[15] Translation from Adams 2002.
[16] See Bowman / Thomas ad loc. For Sollemnis as a slave name in Rome, see Solin (1996, 142), and for Paris in Rome see Solin (1996, 341-342) and Solin (2003, 554-556).

The perfect infinitive with a verb of wishing is attested at Vindolanda also in a context where it refers to future time, tab. Vindol. III 628 *cras quid uelis nos fecisse, rogo, domine praecipias*. I have argued elsewhere that this passage also represents a formulaic use of the perfect infinitive, without any implications that aspectual nuances of the perfect infinitive were preserved in spoken language.[17] The use in this formula was probably derived from the old use of this construction in laws and decrees. Although in (4) as well as in (6) there is nothing extraordinary in the use of the past tense, the fact that here too the perfect infinitive is used in a formula with a verb of wishing makes it not inconceivable that formulae like (4) may have contributed to the use of *fecisse* in tab. Vindol. III 628.

In (6) the AcI construction dependent from another one *certiores uos esse credo me recte ualere* also deserves mentioning. For the independent use of *ut* (expressing a wish or a request) in (4) we find a parallel in Tab. Vindon. 40, 2-4 *ut ac{c} cohorte mi rescribas, u[t] semper in mentem abes, ut mi rescribas*, although this is not a letter opening, but a request immediately before the closing salutation.

A draft letter of Flavius Cerialis begins with the following elegant formulation

(7) *[G]ṛattịo Ḉrisṗino redeunte […] [c. 10] [[non fui mihi]] et .ḍ.[.] [c.7 li]benter amplexụṣ ṣ[um do]mịne ṣạlutandi te oḉḉạṣṣịọṇẹṃ [d]ọminum meum et quem saluom [[ḥạbere]] esse et omnis spei [[suae]] compotem inter praecipuạ uoti habeo*
(tab. Vindol. II 225, 4-9)
"Since Grattius Crispinus is returning to … and … I have gladly seized the opportunity my lord of greeting you, you who are my lord and the man whom it is my very special wish to be in good health and master of all your hopes"

The elaborate language of this letter has attracted attention and is suggestive of the educational level of the equestrian class where the prefects of cohorts came from.[18] Despite the highly formulaic nature of this phrase, *occasio* most probably refers to a real chance of writing the letter, i.e. getting it delivered to the recipient.[19] This is suggested by the beginning of the letter *[G]ṛattịo Ḉrisṗino redeunte*. Almost the same phrase

[17] See Halla-aho (forthcoming).
[18] See Adams 1995a, 126.
[19] See the discussion on this and similar phrases in Lebek 1985.

appears in tab. Vindol. II 212, 2 *occasion]em nactus sum scribendi*, but without any further context.[20]

The combination *praecipua uoti* is attested only once in Augustine, but *inter praecipua* is common in various expressions, with or without a modifier.[21] On the other hand, whereas *compos uoti* is a common expression, *spei compos* is only attested once in Livy (29,22,2)[22] and apparently the next time in Ambrose.[23] So, we may conclude that Cerialis not only knew elegant popular phraseology but also was able to modify it and produce variants of his own.[24]

Other persons who were associating with Cerialis were also familiar with more elegant epistolary phraseology. For example in a letter written to him by Niger and Brocchus

> (8) *optamus frater it quot acturus es felicissimum sit; erit autem quom et uotis nostris conueniat hoc pro te precari et tu sis dignissimus* (tab. Vindol. II 248, 3-9)
> "We pray, brother, that what you are about to do will be most successful. It will be so, indeed, since it is both in accord with our wishes to make this prayer on your behalf and you yourself are most worthy"

Apart from this lengthy opening, and the closing (written in a different hand *op<t>amus frater bene ụaleṛẹ ṭẹ domine*) the letter consists of only one sentence, *consulari n(ostro) utique mạturius occurres* ("You will assuredly meet our governor quite soon"), so that in effect there is no actual information to be told in the whole of this letter. Both persons who appear as senders (Aelius Brocchus and the other person who is probably Valerius Niger) were equestrian officers.[25]

3.3.2 Egypt

There appears to be a clear difference in the opening salutations between the Vindolanda tablets and the letters of Claudius Terentianus and Rustius Barbarus. In Egypt, the letters

[20] The *occasio* of writing is also mentioned in tab. Vindol. III 670.
[21] E.g., Plin. *epist*. 8,12,1; 10,98,1, Quint. 1,8,7; 11,2,47.
[22] Bowman / Thomas ad loc.
[23] *Si autem bonae spei compotes sunt, migrare magis quam deficere credendi sunt* (Ambr. *Cain et Ab*. 2,9,35).
[24] In the ed. pr. (tab. Vindol. I, p. 72 and 129), the editors connect *inter praecipua uoti* with the formula *quae mihi uota sunt* from Egypt.
[25] See Bowman / Thomas ad loc.

often seem to follow a Greek model in the opening salutation. Claudius Terentianus uses exceptionally elaborate and full salutary formulae at the beginning of two of his Latin letters, with elements that are not attested in Latin letters outside Egypt:

> (9) *Claudius [T]er[en]tianus Claudio Tiberiano domino et patri karissimo plurimam salutem. an[te omn]ia op[to te] fortem et h[i]larem [e]t saluom mihi esse cum nostris omn[ibus], quotị[en]ṣque autę[m a t]ę habe[o no]uom mihi bene est* (P. Mich. VIII 467,1-3)
> "Claudius Terentianus to Claudius Tiberianus, his lord and dearest father, very many greetings. Before all else, I pray that you be strong and cheerful and well, together with our entire family, and I am pleased whenever I have news from you."

The expressions *ante omnia opto* and *cum nostris omnibus* are clearly of Greek origin (see P. Mich. VIII 481 cited below), but on the other hand the collocation *fortem et hilarem* is found also in a letter of Pliny *(*Plin. *epist. 10, 1, 2 fortem te et hilarem, imperator optime, et priuatim et publice opto*). The other opening salutation

> (10) *Claudius Terentianus Claud[i]o Tiberi[ano pa]tri suo ed domino plur[i]mam sal[utem]. ante omnia opto te bene [u]alere, que m[ihi ma]xime uota [su]nt* (P. Mich. VIII 468, 1-4)

is more clearly a straightforward parallel for the initial part of his Greek opening salutation (πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὔχομαί … ὅ μοι εὐκταῖόν ἐστιν):

> (11) πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὔχομαί σε ὑγιαίνειν καὶ εὐτυχεῖν μοι, ὅ μοι εὐκταῖόν ἐστιν, ὑγιαίνω δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ποιούμενος σου τὸ προσκύνημα καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν παρὰ τῷ κυρίῳ Σεράπιδι καὶ τοῖς συννάοις θεοῖς (P. Mich. VIII 476, 2-5)
> "Before all else I pray for your health and success, which are my wish. I myself am in good health and make obeisance for you daily in the presence of our lord Sarapis and the gods who share his temple."

The opening salutation has almost the same form in two other Greek letters of Claudius Terentianus, P. Mich. VIII 477 and 478 (in 480 it is shorter and simpler and in 479 there is the same opening but without the *proskynema* phrase). In a letter to Tasoukharion (P. Mich. VIII 481) there is only πρὸ μὲν [πάντ]ων εὔχ[ο]μαί σε ὑγιαίνε[ιν μετ]ὰ τῶν σῶν πάντων. Both the Latin and the Greek opening salutations in Claudius Terentianus are

noteworthy in their fullness and elaboration and they fit well in line with his way of writing to his father and the respect he seems to show towards him (see below).

There is a close parallel to (10) in a letter of Rustius Barbarus (the writer of a small archive of ostracon letters in the Eastern Desert of Egypt, 1st century AD):

(12) *opto deos ut bene ualeas que mea uota sunt* (CEL 74,2)

Yet another example of the same formula can be found in a somewhat later (probably 3rd century) letter from Egypt

(13) *opto deos ut mi[hi u]ạleas quod mẹ[um uotum est] ego enim ualeọ coṛpọṛe* (CEL 218, 3-4)

Reference to gods in a salutation brings to mind the Egyptian *proskynema*. Furthermore, the construction *opto deos ut* is very rare in Latin and might be influenced by Greek (or *rogo*, or both).[26] However, it is attested also in Vindonissa (Tab. Vindon. 52, 3 *rogo et opto deos u[t?*), a fact which naturally does not rule out Greek influence, but in any case makes it less obvious.

Notwithstanding these obvious Greek components in the Latin opening salutations, it is possible that as far as the infinitive construction in εὔχομαί σε ὑγιαίνειν is concerned, Latin has in fact influenced Greek here. This question will be brought up again below, as the evidence for this conclusion comes from a closing salutation. The important observation, however, which has not been mentioned previously concerning these phrases, is that (whatever the direction of influence in this particular infinitive construction), the practice of beginning the letters with a long salutation like this clearly is attributable to Greek influence in Latin letters — and this is influence on the cultural level, in the habit of letter writing (rather than on the linguistic level).

In the other letters of Rustius Barbarus there are no opening salutations. It may be of interest to note that the letter that contains the opening salutation (ex. (12) above) is the longest and most elaborate of his letters, and one in which he tries to influence his correspondent (for examples, see below). In fact, the same applies in the case of Claudius Terentianus as well. Those letters which have the longest openings also are the longest

[26] See ThLL 833, 5-11, quoting in addition to passage (12) only CIL VI 15106 *optarem deos ut tale exsitum meum aliqui meorum faciat* and Drac. *laud dei* 2, 548 (later, 5th century). See also Cugusi 1981, 736.

and most elaborate as a whole. The letter P. Mich. VIII 469, shorter and without any requests for Terentianus himself, begins without further formula with *salutat te mater mea et orat (...)*.[27] This might give a hint that the writers used more elaborate formulae when they had something important to say or requests to make, and were for this reason particularly concerned about expressing themselves politely (the recipient is the same in these cases, so that cannot be the reason for the different openings). But, admittedly the material is too fragmentary here to allow for any more definite conclusions.

One of the earliest Latin letters from Egypt begins as follows

(14) *Phileros s(alutem) d(icit) conserueis o̩mnibu̩s [s]e̩i ual(etis) recte* (CEL 3, 1-2)

The writer uses *recte* also in another formula *de reliq(uo) domi omnia recte* (3,7-8). The opening salutation *[s]e̩i ual(etis) recte* (scil. *est)* is usually thought to be a variant for *si ualetis bene (est)*.[28] However, as far as I am aware there is no parallel for *recte* used in place of *bene (est)* in a letter. Usually, when *ualere* and *recte* are juxtaposed in letters, *recte* modifies *ualere* (cf. (1) above). The use of *recte* in (14) thus seems to be without parallel. Considering this it would also be possible (and perhaps even better) to restore *[ut]e̩i ual(eatis) recte*, *ut* used in the same way as in (4) above. It may be mentioned that CEL 3 is certainly written by a slave, which is also possible in (4).

The letters from the Mons Claudianus region do not have opening salutations, except for O. Claud. I 2 which begins *Antistius Flaccus Calinio suo salutem. A Raima*[29] *te, frater, saluto et indico* .... Again, just as with the opening address, the letters from Mons Claudianus resemble more the Vindolanda texts in their phraseology. Other Egyptian letters that do not have an opening salutation are CEL 140, 150 and 158 which are official army reports and CEL 81, 83, 84, 169 and 177, all of which are letters of recommendation. The opening salutation clearly did not belong to these letter types, not even in Egypt where it was commonly used in private letters.

[27] In the letters P. Mich. VIII 470 and 471 the opening part is not preserved.
[28] Cugusi 1992 comm. ad loc and Cugusi 1973, 653
[29] A place called Raima was in the vicinity of Mons Claudianus in the Eastern Desert of Egypt.

3.4. Closing salutations

3.4.1. Vindolanda

The traditional Latin way of closing a letter was simply with *uale* or *cura ut ualeas* (Cugusi 1983, 57-58).[30] At Vindolanda, by far the commonest closing is *opto (ut) ualeas* with a finite complement to go with *opto*, or simply *uale* (or both). In addition, the infinitive complement with *opto* (the type *opto te bene ualere*) is attested in four letters (tab. Vindol. II 248, 250, 258 and 669)

I have counted 13[31] examples of simple *uale* (often together with the vocative) and 12[32] examples of *opto (ut) bene ualeas*. In addition there are four examples of the type *opto sis felicissimus*, e.g., tab. Vindol. III 645, 19-20: *opto sis felicissimuṣ salutat te ṗą [....] . [ ] uaḷe*. [33] Likewise at Vindonissa the closings are also rather simple: *ama nos et uale* (tab. Vindon. 31), *aue et opto ut bene ualeas* (tab. Vindon. 40), *frater care uale* (tab. Vindon. 45). Remarkable are the elegant closings that Claudia Severa at Vindolanda has inserted in her own hand: *sperabo te soror uale sororṇ anima mea ita ụąḷeam karissima ẹt haue* (tab. Vindol. II 291) and *[ual]e ṃ.. ṣọror ḳąrissima et aṇịṃą ma desideraṭissima* (tab. Vindol. II 292).[34]

3.4.2. Egypt

Apart from CEL 9 (discussed below), the earliest Latin letters from Egypt use *opto bene ualeas*. CEL 10 does not have any closing formula at all.

Closing formulae in Claudius Terentianus show in three cases the *bene ualere te opto* type that is also found in the letter of Claudius Tiberianus, (15) d) below:

(15) a) *bene ualere te opto multis annis cum tuis omnibus uale* (P. Mich. VIII 467, 35-36)
b) *uale mihi* [then continued in the margin] *bene ualere te opto mult[i]ṣ annis felicissime im perpetuo ual(e)*(P. Mich. VIII 468, 63-65)

[30] For an overview of closing salutations see Cugusi, 1983, 56-64.
[31] 247, 252, 288, 611, 613, 622, 623, 628, 632, 635, 642, 649, 661.
[32] 215, 260, 289, 300, 309, 312, 316, 353 + 255 [*ualeas* without *opto*], 643, 646 [+vale], 650 (ii,5-9 *saluta Verecunḍaṃ et Sanctum Ḷọ..um Capitoṇem et omnes ciues et amęcos cum quịbus opto bene ualeas*).
[33] Tab. Vindol. II 310, 264; tab. Vindol. III, 645 and slightly differently in tab. Vindol. II 346 (*...[c]ontibernales cum quibus [o]pto felicissimus uiuas*). Something similar is to be found also in 641,ii,5-8: *ṣ[al]ụta a me Crescen[tem] Ḟlọrentinum [et omnes tuos con]ṭibernales [cum quibus opto si]ṣ felix m² ụale*.
[34] On *soror* as a term of address of non-relatives, see Dickey 2002, 125.

c) *o[p]to te bene ual[e]re* (P. Mich. VIII 470,27)[35]
d) *opto t[e], domine, ben[e u]alere* (P. Mich. VIII 472, 24-25)

The fourth closing that we have from him is different:

(16) *saluta qui nos [a]mant ual(e)* (P. Mich. VIII 469, 21-22)

There is a parallel and a probable source for this in the Greek ἄσπασαι πάντες τοὺς φιλοῦντε̣ς̣ [ἡμᾶς] κατ' ὄνομα found in one of his Greek letters (P. Mich. VIII 476, 31). In 471 there is no closing salutation whatsoever. In the longest letters 467 and 468, where Terentianus has many things to relate to his father and is also asking for many things, the closings (like the openings) are also more elaborate: (15) a) and b) above.

There is clear parallelism between Latin and Greek in opening and closing salutations:

opening: *opto te bene ualere* - εὔχομαί σε ὑγιαίνειν

closing: *bene ualere te opto* - ἐρρῶσθαί σε εὔχομαι

It has been suggested that Latin is the source here and the Greek has been coined using the Latin as a model.[36] The decisive piece of evidence is found in the letter CEL 9 = P. Rain. Cent. 164 (date Augustan), where the suggested restoration in lines 15-16 *]a salua sana ual[ere te hilarem et] / [sa]luom cupimu[s* would be the first attestation of the infinitive complement in this formula in Latin, and thus predating the earliest Greek attestation (around 100 AD) by almost a century.[37] As noted above, the infinitive construction is also used at Vindolanda.

On the other hand, in Greek letters the opening εὔχομαί σε ὑγιαίνειν is often followed by the *proskynema* formula which is of Egyptian origin, and if a Latin source for the syntax in the infinitive complement is accepted, these formulae show how a mix of different elements was created in Egyptian epistolography.[38] This is pointed out by Adams in his discussion on these phrases (2003a, 79-80). He refers to the complicated nature of this contact phenomenon and concludes "In military communities in Egypt and elsewhere in the east epistolary formulae as used by bilingual soldiers might have passed

[35] Similarly in the letter of Claudius Tiberianus *opto ṭ[e] ḍomine ben[e u]alerę* (P. Mich. VIII 472, 25).
[36] P. Parsons in P. Rainer Cent. 164 ad loc.
[37] See P. Rain. Cent. 164 note ad. loc.
[38] See also Cugusi 1989, 386-387.

indifferently from one language to the other. There might indeed have been input from native-language speakers of both languages in the establishment of the formulae used in letters" (Adams 2003a, 80).

Adams also draws attention to the matching word order between these closing expressions (2003a, 79). This holds for (15) a) and b) in Terentianus, but the order is different in the closing in 15 c) and d), and also in M689 (cited below).[39] In Latin the words used in the opening and the closing salutations are identical whereas in Greek the infinitive is ὑγιαίνειν in the opening and ἐρρῶσθαι in the closing. This would in fact indicate that, at least in Claudius Terentianus, these phrases were influenced by Greek.[40]

In his discussion of the Vindolanda tablets, Adams (1995a, 118) notes that the preference for different phrases might be due to conventions that developed among groups of scribes, but, in fact, in many cases the closing salutation is certainly or possibly added by a different hand, that of the sender of the letter (at Vindolanda in e.g. tab. Vindol. II 309, 310, 247, 252, 258, also in letters of Claudius Terentianus), and thus cannot be attributed to scribal practices. Conventions seem to have developed among groups of people sending letters.

Closings from other Egyptian letters show either simple *uale* or *opto te bene ualere*. In the older letters the following are attested: CEL 3,9 *ual(ete)*, CEL 7,ii,17-21 *uale mihi Macedo et memor nostri esto et filio meo beneuolentiam eam praesta quem ego tibi praestiti*, CEL 8, 14-15 *aṃa nos ut instituisti uale*. In CEL 7, after the closing salutation, the letter goes on with salutations to friends, but also apparently a request to recommend the son of the writer to somebody (as if a postscript).

Rustius Barbarus uses very simple closings in the traditional Latin manner *uale* (CEL 73 and 75) and *uale frater k[a]ṛịṣṣịṃẹ* (CEL 74). The Latin letters from Mons Claudianus and surroundings have either the *opto te bene ualere* type or simple *uale*: *bene uale frater karissime* (O. Claud. I 2, 9-10), *uale* (O. Claud. I 131, 6 and O. Max. inv. 254, 14), *ben(e) ualere te opto* (O. Claud. I 135, 5), *opto te bene ualere et felicem esse*

[39] In the openings, however, the word order matches, *opto te bene ualere* – εὔχομαί σε ὑγιαίνειν.

[40] On *multis annis* and πολλοῖς χρόνοις see Adams (2003a, 80 and 506-507). Adams (2003a, 507): "An alternative possibility to that of the Latin origin of the whole formula is that the infinitive formula originated in Greek, was taken over by Latin, but with the addition at some point of the typical construction *multis annis*; then the Latin version could in its turn have influenced the Greek."

(O. Claud. II 367, 11-13), *opto te bene ualere* (M689, 7), *bene ualere te opto uale* (M1107, 8-10).

In CEL 83, a letter of recommendation, the closing salutation is *opṭọ bene ualeạs* (CEL 83, 8).[41] The other examples of *opto* with the finite complement from Egypt are in openings from a letter of Rustius Barbarus and CEL 218, (12) and (13) above.

3.5. Letter phraseology in the body text

As was mentioned above, letters originating from the officer class at Vindolanda often contain phrasing which is found also in the correspondence of literary writers. The following two examples both contain the phrase *in notitiam perferre*:

(17) a) *de..ṣ. debiṭọrịbus ṣuis quoḍ in noṭịṭiam tuam sicut debui ṗẹṛṭuli te tanto magis uenturụm Corịạ sicut constituisti spero* (tab. Vindol. III 611,i,a.1-6)
"… his debtors which I have brought to your attention just as I ought. So much the more do I hope that you will come to Coria, just as you decided"

b) *esse scrị[c.7 i]ṇ nọ[ti]tiam tuam lụḅẹṇṭiṣsime perfero* (tab. Vindol. II 260, 2-4))
"… I have the greatest pleasure in bringing to your notice"

Both examples are from letters written by prefects, (17) a) by Haterius Nepos and (17) b) by Iustinus. The phrase *in notitiam perfero* can be found in Pliny (*epist*. 10,67,2).[42] However, similarities between non-literary and literary writers are also found in letters stemming from lower social levels. In a letter to Macedo (CEL 7, 19-20) we find the expression *beneuolentiam praestare*, which is paralleled in Cicero and his correspondents.[43] Macedo and his correspondents were probably freedmen.[44]

(18) *uale mihi Macedo et memor nostri esto et filio meo beneuolentiam eam praesta quem ego tibi praestiti* (CEL 7, 17-21)[45]

[41] Opinions of the dating of this text have varied from 1st to 3rd century AD, see Cugusi 1992, note ad loc.
[42] See the editors ad loc. and also Adams 2003c, 572-573 on the AcI preceding *spero* in (17) a).
[43] Cic. *fam*. 12,2,3; Marcell. Cic. *fam*. 4,11,1. See Cugusi 1973, 672.
[44] The writer of CEL 8 (to Macedo), Paconius, is concerned about his *conliberti*, and this might indicate that Macedo was also a freedman; see Cugusi 1973, 655. For Macedo as a slave name, see Solin (1996, 367-368) and (2003, 639-641).
[45] Noteworthy in this passage is also the masculine form of the relative pronoun *quem* referring to a feminine antecedent (*beneuolentia*) – a common phenomenon but especially interesting here as it appears in a phrase with *beneuolentiam praestare*.

"Farewell, Macedo, do remember me and show the same benevolence to my son which I have showed to you"[46]

The letter CEL 10 contains elements that probably reveal proverbial sayings, but it is difficult to say whether they were especially typical in letters:[47]

(19) *itaque nihil ultra loquor quam [[no]] ne patiarus te propter illos perire crede mihi nimia bonitas pernicies homiṇ[i]ḅus est uel maxsuma* (CEL 10, 3-5)
"Therefore I say nothing more than 'do not let yourself come to ruin on their account'. Believe me, excessive generosity brings disaster, perhaps more than anything else, on men"

(20) *deinde ego clamare debeo siquod uideo deuom atque hominum [[fidem si tu ista non cuibis]]* (CEL 10, 7-8)[48]
"Then I ought to cry out, if my perceptions are to be trusted, 'heaven and earth!'"

The commonest recurring component (outside the opening and closing formulae) in these letters is undoubtedly the verb *rogo*.[49] This is most natural given that the letters were written usually in order to take care of practical matters, typically the delivery of all sorts of goods. Other ways of expressing the request are *fac (ut) mittas*, *(rogo) mitte* and the future tense (*rogabis*). The verb *peto* is used mainly in letters of recommendation where it was part of the established phraseology.

In a letter from the Eastern Desert of Egypt, (M689, 3-4) the writer uses the phrase *recte facies* to introduce a request: *recte facies per amaxas mittas nobis aqua quia deest nobis*. Used in such a context this phrase immediately brings to mind the Greek phrase καλῶς ποιήσεις which is frequent in exactly this function, introducing a request. There is of course nothing extraordinary in the Latin phrase as such,[50] but it was not the normal way of expressing a request in a letter. So it is probable that there is Greek influence in the way the native Latin phrase is used in this letter.

[46] My translation.
[47] See Cugusi ad loc.
[48] The writer has deleted the words from *fidem* to *cuibis*, but of these the first one, *fidem*, erroneously as it is needed to complete the previous sentence, see Brown 1970 ad loc.
[49] See Cugusi 1989, 403-405 for more examples of common phrases.
[50] E.g., Hor. *epist*. 1,1,59 *at pueri ludentes 'rex eris' aiunt, 'si recte facies'*; Sen. *epist*. 40,9 *Recte ergo facies, si non uideris istos, qui quantum dicant, non quemadmodum quaerunt, et ipse malueris, si necesse est, ut p. Vinicius dicere.*

Claudius Terentianus uses the collocation *oro et rogo* three times when asking his father to send him something.: *oro et rogo te pater* (467,17 and 468, 30),[51] *rogo et oro te, pater* (467, 29-30).[52] This is used also by Cicero and was clearly part of the Latin epistolographical language (*rogo atque oro* appears 3 times in Cicero).[53] With *opto* instead of *oro* the phrase is attested in Vindonissa: *rogo et opto deos u[t?* (Tab. Vindon. 52, 3).

There is one more observation to be made on the phraseology of *rogo*. Claudius Terentianus usually attaches the object pronoun *te* to the verb (without it two times), whereas at Vindolanda the writers more often than not leave the object pronoun out. On the other hand, Cicero very often attaches *te* to *rogo*.

What is striking in the letters of Claudius Terentianus is the politeness and respect that he uses when addressing his father. This is visible in the following examples where he asks his father to send him various items

> (21) *oro et rogo te, pater, nem[i]nem habeo enim karum nisi secundum deos te, ut mitta[s m]i[h]i pe[r V]alerium gladiu[m pu]gnatorium et …* (P. Mich. VIII 467, 17-19)
> "I ask and beg you, father, for I have I have no one dear to except you, after the gods, to send me by Valerius a battle sword …"

Adams (2003a, 78) attributes this phrase to Greek influence, citing P. Giss. I 68, 8-9 οὐδένα <ἔ>χω [μ]ετὰ τὸν θεὸν εἰ μὴ σέ (from the 1st half of the 2nd century).[54] Another parallel is found in Mons Claudianus ἄλλον γὰρ θεὸν οὐκ ἔχω ἢ σέ (O. Claud. II 286, addressed to a *centurio*). Similarly in another letter of Terentianus:

> (22) *çạṛu {en} eni habemụs sequndu dẹum te et tu nos* (P. Mich. VIII 469, 19-21)
> "For we hold you in affection after god, as you hold us."

[51] The phrase in this order *oro et rogo* is attested once in a letter from Marcus Aurelius to Fronto (Aur. Fronto 5,43,1 *si quid umquam me amasti, hodie ama et uberem mi materiam mitte, oro et rogo* καί ἀντιβολῶ καί δέομαι καί ἱκετεύω). The collocation of the two verbs *oro* and *rogo* is found also once in Pliny (*epist*. 6,8,9): *Quamquam quid denuntiationibus et quasi minis ago? quin potius, ut coeperam, rogo, oro des operam, ne ille se, quod ualdissime uereor, a me, ego me neglectum a te putem*.
[52] The plain *rogo* in P. Mich. VIII 468, 20; 23; 27 and 41.
[53] Dickey (forthcoming).
[54] The context seems to give better motivation for the use of this phrase than in the Terentianus letter: The sender is writing about the burial of his son and asks for help.

Another parallel for the references to gods in Egyptian material is found in P. Mich. VIII 466, 4 (107 AD) πρὸ τῶν ὅλ[ων εὔχομ]αί σε ἐρρῶσθαι, ὅ μοι εὐκτόν ἐστιν, [ὅτι σέβομ]αί σε μετὰ τοὺς θεούς.[55] In their comments to this passage, the editors cite P. Mich. III 209, 12-13 οἶδας γάρ, ἄδελφε, ὅτει οὐ μόνον ὡς ἀδελφόν σε ἔχω ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς πατέρα καὶ κύριον καὶ θεόν (late 2nd/early 3rd century AD).[56] This latter example, then, in turn resembles the following lengthy passage from a letter of Rustius Barbarus:

> (23) *quid mi tan inuidiose scribes aut tan leuem me iudicas si tan cito uirdia mi non mittes stati amicitiam tuam obliscere debio non sum talis aut tan leuis ego te non tanquam amicum habio set tanqua[m] fratrem gemellum qui de unum uentrem exiut* (CEL 74, 3-9)
> "Why do you write to me in such a hostile manner, or think that I am as unreliable a person as that? If you do not send me the vegetables as soon as possible, I shall have to forget about your friendship immediately. I am not like that or that unreliable. I do not think of you as my friend but as my twin brother who has been born from the same womb"[57]

Laments about the recipient not writing often enough are very common in Egyptian letters, cf. P. Mich. III 221, 6 (clearly later, c. AD 296) πάλι οὖν οὐκ ἔχις με ὡς θυγατέραν σου <ἀλλὰ> ὡς ἐχθράν σου, where a daughter is writing to her mother — not about anything dramatic, but about her disappointment in not receiving any letters from her.[58] A similar sentiment, also rather strongly put, is expressed in a letter from Vindolanda:

> (24) *homo inpientissime qui mihi ne unam epistulam misisti sed puto me humanius facere qui tibi scribo* (tab. Vindol. II 311,i,5-9)
> "You neglectful man, who have sent me not even one letter. But I think that I am behaving in a more considerate fashion in writing to you"

The noun *homo* was often used in this way, as a vocative and modified by positive or negative adjectives.[59] This remark appears after the opening salutation, see (4) above. The remaining part of the letter that has been preserved contains salutations to other person, and it looks as if (24) was not meant to be a cruel reproach. Asking for the recipient to

[55] See Youtie and Winter ad loc. for this example.
[56] The editor ad loc. "Saturnilus writes to his brother in terms bordering on adulation".
[57] My translation.
[58] See Cugusi note ad loc. CEL 74 and Cugusi 1989, 404.
[59] See Dickey 2002, 198-191.

write as often as possible is a very common sentiment in Egyptian letters, e.g., in a letter of Claudius Terentianus *rogo, pater, ud continuo mihi rescribas* (P. Mich. VIII 468, 41-42).

Claudius Terentianus also seems to be extremely concerned about whether his father is satisfied with those things that he has been able to send him

> (25) *rogo te [p]ạ[t]ẹr ud contentus sis ista. m[o]do si non iacu[i]sse speraba me pluriam tibi missituruṃ ed itarum spero si uixero* (P. Mich. VIII 468,21-23)
> "I beg you, father, to be content with that."

or about what his father thinks about his doings

> (26) *qu[on]i[a]m nihil mihi ṗro dis fuerunt nisi uerba, null[i]us con[c]ẹpị ọ[diu]ṃ. et iui me ..[..].[.]. [n]aui et ṗẹr eọs me probaui in classe nẹ tiḅ[i] pareaṃ a spe ạṃạr[a] paṛpa[tum] ụagari quasi fugitiuom* (P. Mich. VIII 467,15-17)
> "Since they were nothing to me – (I say this) in the presence of the gods – but words, I conceived a hatred of no one. I went … by boat, and with their help I enlisted in the fleet lest I seem to you to wander like a fugitive"

And when he asks his father to send him leathern boots, he adds *si tibi uidebitur* to soften the request:

> (27) *rogo te, pater, si tibi uidebitur ut mittas mihi inde caligas cori subtalare ed udones par* (P. Mich. VIII 468, 23-25)
> "I beg you, father, if it meets with your approval, to send me from there low leathern boots and a pair of felt socks."

This attitude is visible also in one of his Greek letters.[60] Other references to gods in Terentianus are the following:

---

[60] Cf. the following rather confused passage where Claudius Terentianus tells his father about his plans to bring a woman into his household (P. Mich. VIII 476, 9-15): ἔπεμψέ μοι φάσιν περὶ γυναικός, γνώμην μου λαμβάνων ἐ̣ω̣ν̣ε̣ῖ̣τ̣ό μοι. πάλαι ἂν πρὸ διετίας ἐσχήκειν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν μ[ο]υ ἀλλα᾽ ο̣[ὐ]κ̣ ἐπέτρεψα [ἐ]μαυτῷ οὐδὲ ἐ̣π̣ι̣τ̣ρ̣έ̣π̣ω δίχα σου λαβεῖν τ[ι]να καὶ τ̣ο̣ῦ̣ν̣παλιν οὐκ ἔχεις ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἀκ̣[οῦ]σαι περὶ τοῦ πράγμα[το]ς τούτ[ου]. ε̣ἴ̣ π̣ο̣ύ̣ ἐστιν ἣν ἐὰν δοκῇ μ[ο]ι κατενέγκαι ἡ δυναμένη μᾶλλο[ν ὑ]πὲρ ἐμοῦ σοι εὐνοεῖν καὶ φροντίζειν σου πλείω ἐμοῦ, διατ[ε]λεῖτα[ι] ἐμέ [σο]ι εὐχαρ[ι]στεῖν ἤ συ ἐμὲ μέμψασθαι.
"He sent me a word about a woman; with my consent he was buying one for me. As far back as two years ago I would have taken a woman into my house, but I did not permit myself nor do I permit myself to take anyone without your approval, and you will not hear otherwise from me on this subject. If perchance the woman whom I decide to bring down is one able to be the more kindly disposed toward you for my sake (?) and to take more thought for you than for me, the outcome is that I do you a favor rather than that you blame me" (transl. by Youtie and Winter). See Adams 2003a, 594-597 on the importance of this passage for the question of language choice in Claudius Terentianus.

(28) a) *et si deus uolueret spero me frugaliter [u]iciturum et in cohortem [tra]nsferri* (P. Mich. VIII 468, 35-38)
"And if god should be willing, I hope to live frugally and to be transferred to a cohort"

b) scias domo nostrae deorum beneficio omnia recte esse (P. Mich. VIII 467, 26-27)
"Know that everything is going well at home, through the beneficence of the gods"

The only reference to gods at Vindolanda seems to be *di propiti sunt* (tab. Vindol. II 349, 2).[61]

There are two aspects that emerge from the phraseology in the letters of Claudius Terentianus. The first, and the most important, is that he clearly was able to elaborate his language and use phrases and sentiments that were commonly used in letters in those circles where he moved. The other aspect is the nature of his language and the attitude he shows towards his father. Either he is showing his true feelings and tries to make the best possible impression on his father, or, alternatively, it is possible to see here a different habit of letter writing, an eastern fashion with an exuberant expression, submissive politeness and frequent references to gods. It might be of relevance here that Rustius Barbarus also addresses his correspondent in a somewhat dramatic way, cf. (23) above — and this not in a personal letter but a letter mostly concerned with trade-offs, sending bread and other goods. On the other hand, the only examples from Vindolanda of more personal letters are those of Claudia Severa to Sulpicia Lepidina so that there is not much to compare the Egyptian letters with.[62]

Letters of recommendation were composed of certain standard expressions and sentiments. I shall not to go into detail in this respect here.[63] The phraseology used in recommendations comes up below (ch. 5.4) concerning tab. Vindol. II 250, which is a letter of recommendation addressed to Flavius Cerialis. The editors Bowman and Thomas also identify the fragmentary text tab. Vindol. III 660 as a letter of recommendation:

[61] The context is fragmentary, but probably the reference is to future actions of the writer, which will take place if the gods are propitious.
[62] It is difficult to say what effect the difference in writing materials had on the habit of letter writing.
[63] For the phraseology of letters of recommendation, see Cotton 1981; also Halla-aho (forthcoming) on CEL 169.

"Another example of this type is 250, but 660 clearly comes from a higher social and professional level".[64]

There are two assumptions that so far have played a role in the analysis of letter phraseology on the non-literary level. The first of these is that recurring letter phrases were used because the writers were not able to express themselves in other ways (Cugusi 1989, 405). While this may be true in some cases, I would rather stress another aspect of epistolary phraseology. Precisely because they are recurring, they imply familiarity with letters as a text type. All of the writers presumably were literate and able to express themselves in writing, although not on the same level as the members of higher social strata (see below my discussion on the letter of Chrauttius from Vindolanda).

The second assumption, which is also expressed in connection with letters stemming from literary circles, is that that private letters are close to spoken discourse and that they give us glimpses of Latin *Umgangssprache*. This is also often assumed regarding Cicero's letters, and it is usually taken as more or less self-evident with respect to letters from the non-literary level. This is no doubt true of certain expressions, but even private letters are ultimately written texts.

There are many phrases in this material that are used also by Cicero in his letters, and not only in the British material, but also in Egyptian letters. Above the combination *oro et rogo* was mentioned. Adams (1995, 127) under "miscellaneous colloquialisms" refers to the phrase *si me amas* in a request by Cerialis (in a letter to a fellow officer Aelius Brocchus). It is common in Cicero's letters (rare in Plautus), and is, according to Adams, "possibly colloquial". However, all that we can say about it on the basis of this distribution is that it was common as an epistolary phrase.[65] A case in point is various parenthetical expressions. One from Claudius Terentianus was cited above as (21) (*rogo te ... neminem habeo ... ut*) and later on I shall discuss a passage from tab. Vindol. II 310, the letter of Chrauttius, and the parenthesis with *miror quod* there (see 5.3). It has been suggested that the parentheticals in the letters of Pliny are evidence for

[64] Tab. Vindol. III 660, b. 2-5: *uiri boni accedit eṭịam liberalium studiorum amore profectus morum denique tę[m]peramentum et cu-*. Other letters of recommendation in the non-literary material are CEL 81, CEL 83, CEL 84, CEL 169 and CEL 177.
[65] For a critical view on 'colloquialisms' in literary texts, see Adams 2005b.

the colloquial character of his letters.[66] Adams (2003c, 554-555) connects letter parentheticals with *potest fieri* (see introd.) and a development towards the Romance languages. My impression is that we have to make a distinction between different types of parentheticals — not all of them (such as those in Pliny's letter) were necessarily typical of spoken language, but belonged to the style of letter writing. Thus the examples in the non-literary material tell us that the writers were also familiar with this feature of typical epistolographical language.[67]

3.6. Conclusion

It has become clear that there is considerable geographical variation in epistolary phrasing. What kind of addresses or opening and closing salutations the writers use, or whether they use them at all, seems to be determined predominantly by the geographical context. At Vindolanda the usage of salutary formulae is sparse overall. It is not possible to see any difference in the formulae used as determined by the social or official standing of the sender or the recipient. In Egypt, undoubtedly because of Greek influence, fuller and longer formulae were favoured, especially by certain writers, Claudius Terentianus being the most prominent example. What is especially striking here, then, is that the phraseology used at Mons Claudianus is similar to the Vindolanda letters, and not to other Egyptian letters which are also closer in date to them than the Vindolanda material.

Another point, closely connected to the first one, is that not only were the most formulaic letter phrases, i.e. the opening and closing formulae, influenced by Greek, but also the mentality in writing a letter seems to have been affected by Greek habits of letter-writing. Thus, many Latin letters from Egypt are, when seen from an epistolographical perspective, more closely connected with Greek letters in Egypt than with Latin letters from other parts of the Empire.

However, it is of interest to note that despite areal differences in the exact filling (or in the case of opening salutations, even the existence) of the different parts in a letter there is a standard in the structure of this text type to be observed, applied all over the

[66] See Häusler 2000.

[67] See also Bolkestein 1998 on parentheticals in Cicero's letters. Full clauses as parentheticals are placed before the main focus of the sentence (Bolkestein 1998, 11). For illocutionary parentheticals see also Risselada 1989.

Empire. The most probable explanation for this is that phrases needed in letter writing were taught in schools as part of the training for achieving literacy.

4. SENTENCE CONNECTION

4.1. Introduction

Many of the claimed differences between spoken and written language are traceable to the way in which the units (utterances or sentences) are connected to each other: what means are used to confer the relationship between successive units and to create cohesion in a string of these units. This issue is, however, far more complex than the traditional view, still sometimes expressed, that written language makes more use of subordination than spoken language, or that the syntax of written language is typically more complex than that of spoken language. On the other hand, different types of written language also show divergent tendencies in sentence connection. This chapter will be about different types of sentence connection in the letters, both between subsequent main clauses and between a main clause and a subordinate clause. In each case I shall relate the phenomenon in question to these general themes and discuss the evidence that the non-literary letters offer for these issues, especially regarding the relationship between spoken and written language.

The first section deals with connection between main clauses by *et* and *item*. It will be pointed out (section 4.2) that, first of all, there are two uses of *et* in the letters when it is used for connecting sentences, and secondly, that there is a hitherto unrecognized use of *item* to be noted in one of the letters of Claudius Terentianus.[1] Next I shall draw attention to paratactic sentence connection, first paratactic asyndeton, i.e. instances where the link between subsequent main clauses is not overtly expressed although such a link (e.g., consecutive) is felt to be present (section 4.3). The following section (4.4) has to do with connection between a main clause and a subordinate clause, (i.e. paratactic complements) with two types of verbs (*uerba sentiendi et dicendi* and *rogo*). Finally, the last section (4.5) will discuss sentence connection in the letters of one person, Rustius Barbarus (CEL 73-78).

[1] I have not included sentence connection with *et* under parataxis although that, too, would have been possible, see below.

4.2. Connection of sentences with *et* and *item*

4.2.1. Et

The frequency of *et* as a conjunction, connecting sentences, is clearly visible even by a superficial look at the letter material.[2] It seems that it is possible to distinguish two uses of *et* as a sentence connector.[3] The first of these is a familiar one, connecting sentences in a narrative. In this function *et* is often translatable as "and furthermore" or "and then", being thus something besides a mere connector (underlined in the following examples).[4] This potential apparently is a very old feature of *et*.[5]

Examples (1) and (2) are from a letter by Claudius Terentianus (P. Mich. VIII 471). The tone of this letter is apparently close to actual spoken narrative in its confused organization and upset mood (instances of *et* without marking are between noun phrases, and thus on a different level).

> (1) *mater mea spec[t]emus illum dum uenit <u>et</u> uen[i]o tequm Alexandrie <u>et</u> deduco te usque ad naue* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 24-26)
> "My mother (says): Let us wait for him until he comes, and I go with you to Alexandria and take you to the ship."

> (2) *ed sci[as] Carpum hic errasse, <u>ed</u> inu[e]ntus est Dios in legione, <u>et</u> a[cce]pisse me pro illo (denarios) VI* (P. Mich**.** VIII 468, 43)
> "Know that Carpus came here in his wanderings and Dios was found (?) in the legion and I accepted 6 denarii on his behalf"

It is possible that the source for this 'narrative' function of *et* is in actual spoken narratives. The same usage is discernible in (3) below which is a "micro-narrative" inside a letter of recommendation. Here, too, the writer uses *et* when reporting the doings of the person being recommended. It may be noted that in English the connector "and" is likewise frequent in spoken narratives, but as with Latin *et*, not all instances of "and" are to be regarded as coordinating conjunctions.[6] In ThLL the examples of *et* listed at

[2] Similarly, in Greek letters on papyrus καί is used very frequently as a conjunction.
[3] For the term 'sentence connector', see Pinkster 1990, 257-258.
[4] For this use, see Petersmann 1977, 243 and Pinkster 1990, 253.
[5] See Penney 2005, 42-44.
[6] See Tannen 1985, 131 and Beaman 1984, 58-61; 76.

896,30ff (*pro enunt. temporali*) are closest to this use, but there are no exact parallels, understandably, as this type of simple narrative is not frequent in extant Latin texts.

More interesting, however, is the other usage of *et*. Koch (1995, 129) refers to it as "changement de thème", in connection with some passages in Petronius, and it might be said to have a topic-changing or topic-introducing function (boldface in the examples (3)-(7)); also the first *et* in ex. (2) above).

> (3) *reliquit enim su[o]s [e]t rem suam et actum <u>et</u> me secutus est <u>et</u> per omnia me se̩[c]u̩rum fecit* ***et*** *ideo peto a te ut habeat intr[o]itum a̩t te et omnia̩ ti̩bi refererę potest* (CEL 169, 10-16 = P. Oxy. I 32)
> "And he left his family and his possessions and business and followed me and made me secure in every respect and so I ask from you that he would have access to you and could tell you everything"[7]
>
> (4) (after a list of goods that Terentianus has received from Tiberianus) … ***et*** *ago tibi gratias quod me di̩gn̩[um] habuisti ed sequrum fecisti* (P. Mich. VIII 468, 7-16)
> " … and I thank you because you considered me worthy and have made me free from care"
>
> (5) *ego eni̩m ab illo accepi si qui uolet ueni̩rę* ***et*** *quo̩ lignum et materiem seruant aequo̩ perferet* (tab. Vindol. II 215, ii, 3-6)
> "For I have got [it?] from him, if anyone wants to come, and he will not mind where they are storing the wood and timber"
>
> (6) *salutabis a me Diligentem et Cogitatum et Corinthum* ***et*** *rogo mittas mihi nomina* (tab. Vindol. II 311, 3-6)
> "Greet from me Diligens and Cogitatus and Corinthus and I ask that you send me the names …"
>
> (7) *Chrauttius Veldeio suo fratri contubernali antiquo plurimam salutem* ***et*** *rogo te Veldei frater* (tab. Vindol. II 310, 1-6)
> "Chrauttius to Veldeius his brother and old messmate, very many greetings. And I ask you, brother Veldeius …"

In (3) *et* marks a change in subject, from 3rd person to 1st person. The transition is of consecutive nature, marked also by *ideo*. The author of the letter now moves on to express the actual request, after listing the good properties of the recommendee. In examples (4) – (6) *et* more clearly marks a change of topic, and in (7), it is even used to begin the letter proper after the salutation. There does not seem to be anything related to

[7] My translation.

this usage in ThLL. As this topic-changing function appears also in Petronius, there is a possibility that it reflects actual syntax in spoken narratives.[8] Be that as it may, it clearly was used as a standard way of introducing a new topic in letters.[9]

The following examples are particularly interesting, as they stem from slightly different contexts, (8) from a letter of recommendation (2nd–3rd century AD), where *et* again begins the letter proper after the salutation, and (9) from a documentary letter, reporting the delivery of hay and the sending of 30 cavalry soldiers:

> (8) *Iulius Repositus Cl(audio) Germano suo salutem* ***et*** *praeses te domine frater rogaueram coram Ammonium orthographum leg(ionis) n(ostrae) amicum n(ostrum) karissi[mum]* (CEL 177, 3-5)
> "Iulius Repositus to Claudius Germanus, greetings. And, being present myself, I had asked you, my lord and brother, [to recommend?] Ammonius, the scribe of our legion, a dear friend of ours …"[10]

> (9) *accipi fenum contur[m]alibus meis mensis Iuni et naulum sụṣtuli per me* ***et*** *tibi fiunt eccutes triginti* (CEL 150, 4-7)
> "I have received hay for fellow-members of my *turma* for the month of June and I have paid the freight myself and they total thirty cavalrymen for you"[11]

4.2.2. Item

It seems that also the word *item* could be used in a very similar function, when moving on to the next issue or topic. It appears twice in the above-mentioned letter of Terentianus (P. Mich VIII 471). In (10) the use of *item* is not extraordinary since the subject is the same in both predications,

> (10) *si aequm tempus ẹsset se exiturum Alexandrie ṣ[i]luị[t]*[12] *item non mi d[e]dit aes quam aureum matri mee in uestimenta* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 14-16)
> "He did not tell me that if there were a favorable opportunity he would go to Alexandria. He did not give me money, as he gave my mother an *aureus* for clothing."[13]

[8] Petr. 41,11 *et mundum frigus habuimus* (Dama, turning to coldness after remarks on the passing of time), 42,5 *et quid si non abstinax fuisset* (Seleucus returns to his story about Chrysanthus after a digression on human fragility), 46,3 *et iam tibi discipulus crescit cicaro meus* (Echion, starting the story about his son).
[9] For this use of *et* may be quoted also the following passages: tab. Vindol. III 670 B, ii,1; CEL 75, 7, 9, 13; and perhaps CEL 178, 3 and 5 (=Fink 98).
[10] My translation. Apparently *coram* here means that Ammonius had also been present at the occasion, although *coram* would normally be construed with the dative.
[11] Translation from Fink (1971) 80.
[12] This suggestion (Youtie / Winter 1951) seems to me unlikely.
[13] See Adams 1977, 55-56 for the translation.

Here *item* also forms a loose comparative expression with *quam* in the following clause, as indicated in the translation.[14] In (11), then, the subjects of the subsequent clauses are different, but the subject of the second predication is present in the previous one as an anaphoric pronoun (*illi*). However in (12) there is nothing in the preceding text to which *item* could refer.

> (11) *dico illi, da mi, di[c]o, a[e]s paucum; ibo, dico, ad amicos patris mei. item açu lentiaminaque mi mandauit* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 10-11)
> "I say to him, 'Give me,' I say, 'a little money; I shall go,' I say, 'to friends of my father'. Then he turned over to me a needle and linens."

> (12) *dende pos paucos dies parit et non poterat mi succurrere. item litem abuit Ptolemes pater meu sopera uestimenta mea* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 19-21)
> "Then after a few days she gave birth, and she was not able to help me. Then my father Ptolemaeus had a quarrel about my clothes"

There seem to be no parallels to this use recorded in ThLL. Even in those examples where *item* is used in a narrative there is at least an identical subject in the two predications. The best translation would probably be something like 'then'.

This is interesting given the weakened use of *item* when it is used in lists, which is attested already from Cato onwards. This use is attested also in a list from Vindolanda (tab. Vindol. II 180, 18).[15] Especially in later medical texts the members of a list introduced by *item* do not necessarily have any connection with the previous context.[16] In fact it is exactly this type that is attested in the Terentianus letter. It is interesting that a similar use is attested in a highly informal letter and in lists. While it is difficult to say anything about the source of this use of *item* (whether it originated in lists or spoken language), it is nevertheless interesting to note the two different contexts where it is used.

4.3. Paratactic asyndeton

Both this and the following section are concerned with constructions that are usually called paratactic. This concept is complex and used to describe a variety of constructions, in general as well as in Latin in particular. It is not always clear whether all of the

[14] See Adams 1977, 55-56.
[15] For which see Adams 1995a, 121.
[16] See Adams 1995b, 121 for examples from Pelagonius.

constructions classified as paratactic in fact have much to do with one another. According to one definition (Halliday 1994, 221):

> "parataxis is the linking of elements of equal status"
> "hypotaxis is the binding of elements of unequal status"

Equal here means that both elements are free, i.e. each could stand as a functioning whole. If the elements are of unequal status, the dominant element is free but the dependent element is not. In principle, paratactic and hypotactic relations are not qualified by any overt markers, e.g., conjunctions or the lack of them.[17] Often, however, parataxis as a general concept refers only to those cases where no overt marking is present, i.e. asyndeton.[18] I have followed this definition and therefore treated paratactic asyndeton and sentence connection by *et* separately.[19]

Parataxis on a larger scale is often thought to have existed in the prehistoric past of the Indo-European languages, and consequently, as an archaic trait in Latin speech, as opposed to the more elaborate means developed later in written literary language. However, it has been pointed out that reconstructing for the Indo-European protolanguage a state with no hypotactic relations is not necessary, at least not merely on the grounds that we cannot reconstruct any conjunctions.[20] On the other hand, even if we allow that parataxis was a more common feature in certain earlier linguistic forms, this does not mean that it would be a typical structure in the spoken language at some later stage of development. Wholly another matter, then, is, that writing by its very nature gives the opportunity for the writer to elaborate hypotactic constructions in a way that is not possible (or at least not desirable) in cultures without writing. The classical periodic prose style in Latin may certainly be considered a culmination of such elaboration.

Also, parataxis (at least as a general concept) is not necessarily the most characteristic feature of spoken syntax in modern languages. Spoken language, too,

---

[17] Both paratactic and hypotactic relations can be expressed by a conjunction, e.g. paratactic *nam, et* and *sed* and hypotactic *quia* and *ut*. See Bolkestein 1991 for the choice between parataxis and hypotaxis in causal relations.
[18] On this see Touratier 2002, 394-395.
[19] Note that, with both 'parataxis' and 'asyndeton', I am referring to sentence level phenomena.
[20] For critical remarks about the paratactic past of Latin and further literature, see Pinkster 1972, 167-169 and Pinkster 1990, 139-140.

exhibits its own complexity, also in grammatical respect.[21] Here the overwhelming majority of research is on English, and it is therefore difficult to estimate the degree of language-specific tendencies in this question.

The simplest form of parataxis, often used to illustrate the basic difference between parataxis and hypotaxis, is probably the one where an anaphoric or demonstrative pronoun is used in a context where a relative clause would have been possible. Here is an example from a letter of Claudius Terentianus

> (13) *et abes in imboluclum amictorium ṣinglare, hunc tibi mater mea misit* (P. Mich. VIII 468, 14-15)
> "You have also in the bag a cape of single thickness; my mother sent this to you."

In this section I shall discuss examples of paratactic sentence connection from the letters. They are instances of what is usually called paratactic asyndeton. In asyndeton, the semantic relation between two predications is not expressed by a conjunction or a particle and the addressee is trusted to understand this relation from the context.[22] Although the judgement about a "missing" connector is naturally based on a subjective feeling, the punctuation (a colon or a semi-colon inserted between the clauses) in editions and translations[23] supports it to some extent. The traditional view, expressed in the grammars,[24] is that this kind of asyndeton is a colloquial feature, and belongs to Latin *Umgangssprache*, cf. Hofmann (1951, 110):[25]

> "Wie die Umgangssprache der Hypotaxe aus dem Wege geht, so liebt sie auch bei der Beiordnung der Sätze die lockere partikellose Anreihung (das Asyndeton), indem sie es der Betonung, dem Zusammenhang, der Situation überläßt, die logischen Beziehungen zwischen den einzelnen Sätzen zu knüpfen."

---

[21] For parataxis and spoken language (or 'unplanned discourse') see Ochs 1979, 67; Chafe 1985, 110 and Halliday 1989, 86-87. A true picture of the degree of paratactic connection in spoken language does not emerge if every instance of "and" counts as parataxis (Beaman 1984, 59-61).

[22] See Pinkster 1990, 244. Asyndeton of course exists also on the noun phrase level, but I am not concerned with that here.

[23] In the following, the translations of Plautus are mostly from Loeb editions and for Petronius I have modified the translations by P.G. Walsh (The *Satyricon* transl. with introd. and explanatory notes, Oxford 1996) and R. Bracht Branham / Daniel Kinney (*Satyrica* ed. and transl., London 1996).

[24] Hofmann / Szantyr 1965, 469-470 and Kühner / Stegmann 1971, II, 2 148 and 155.

[25] The term 'paratactic asyndeton' will in this work refer only to the kinds of constructions discussed here in 4.3. The type *rogo facias* (which has also been called paratactic asyndeton) will be treated separately in 4.4.3.

The preference for this type of sentence connection is apparent in early Latin, i.e., mainly Cato.[26] Because of the scarcity of the evidence it is very difficult to say how much this is due to the developing literary language and how much it is attributable to individual preferences — in other words, what do we see as changing, the language itself or the literary taste? Cato may have been consciously creating a simple style, partly reminiscent of spoken language, and in *De Agricultura* the genre also mostly favoured a rather simple sentence structure.[27]

In periodic style, asyndeton is used to create an effect of speed. Later it is used often by, e.g., Seneca the younger as a rhetorical device.[28] The appearance in Petronius may still point to an association with spoken language, but the *Satyricon*, and even the *Cena Trimalchionis*, are in many ways first and foremost literary compositions (see below for examples of parataxis in Petronius).

How much paratactic constructions were used in written language, then, depends not only on the time period, and the social and educational background of the author in question, but, most of all, on the genre of the text. In the end we are faced with the problem that we do not know what and how much the texts tell us about spoken Latin, and our interpretation of the data is always based on some preconception about this relationship.

Basically, constructions like paratactic asyndeton are instances where pragmatic devices are preferred for syntactic ones: a speaker may omit a conjunction if he believes that the context is clear enough for the hearer to understand the relationship between the two predications. In general linguistic research on the differences between written and spoken language, asyndeton (on the sentence level) has been said to be more typical of the latter, but there is no conclusive evidence here, and the situation may be different in different languages.[29]

The following is a simple example of an asyndetic connection:

---

[26] Courtney (1999, 6): "Archaic Latin on the contrary tends to leave the listener or reader to work out for himself the relationship between one statement and the next; Cato is particularly sparse with logical linkage"

[27] On Cato's 'styles' see Courtney 1999, 41-43. See also Penney 2005, 44-46 on Cato. For the influence of genre and subject matter for language and style in Pliny the Elder, see Pinkster 2005 (especially 239-243).

[28] See Pinkster 1990, 245; Kühner / Stegmann II, 2, 160 and Hofmann / Szantyr 1965, 469.

[29] See Ochs 1979, 66-68.

(14) *contubernalis Fronti amici hic fuerat desiderabat coria ei adsignarem* (tab. Vindol. II 343, 29-32)
"A messmate of our friend Frontius has been here. He was wanting me to allocate (?) him hides."

The relationship between the two sentences does not need any further definition. But in the next examples from Claudius Terentianus the linkage that is left without an overt expression is clearly consecutive:

(15) *caligae autem nucl[e]atae nugae sunt, bis me in mensem calcio* (P. Mich. VIII 468, 25)
"Boots with buttons (?) are worthless; I provide myself with footgear twice a month."

The fact that Terentianus has to furnish himself with new shoes twice every month is a consequence from *caligae nucleatae* being of poor quality. Similar cases may be found in another letter by Terentianus:

(16) *matrem meam aute praegnatam imueni; nil poterat facere* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 18-19)
"… but I found my mother was pregnant; she was able to do nothing."

(17) *soli nihil poteramus facere, absentia illim aḅit[u]ri* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 23-24)
"Alone we were able to do nothing and by reason of his absence were about to leave that place"

In (16), the inability of Terentianus' mother to do anything was (presumably) the result of her pregnancy. Likewise, in (17), Terentianus and his mother were going to leave since they were not able to do anything by themselves.[30] Comparable examples are found in Plautus as well:

(18) *ita haec morata est ianua: extemplo ianitorem clamat* … (Plaut. *Asin*. 390)
"There's the way this door has been trained: … it bawls for the porter directly"

Not only consecutive relations can be left without an overt expression, as we can see from the next example:

[30] This is based on the interpretation that *absentia* means "in (his) absence", i.e. when Ptolemaeus was absent.

(19) *set perseuera qui de tam pusilla summa tam magnum lucrum facit dominum occidere uolt* (CEL 10, 5-6)
"But stick to it: he who makes so great a profit from so trifling a sum is willing to kill his master."

The relation between *set perseuera* and *qui … facit …dominum occidere uolt* is causal or perhaps, better, explicative as the latter clause offers an explanation or motivation for the preceding hortation *set perseuera*.[31] With this we can compare an example from Claudius Terentianus with *quoniam* and *autem* connecting the sentences:

(20) *et tunicam bra[c]ilem cum bracis meis ut habeam quoniam extri[u]i tuni[ca]m antequam me pr[o]barem in militiam, bracae autem nouae postae sunt* (P. Mich. VIII 467, 21-23)
"… and a girdled tunic, together with my trousers, so that I may have them, since I wore out my tunic before I entered the service and my trousers were laid away new"

The asyndetic type can be found frequently in Plautus and Petronius:

(21) *odi ego aurum; multa multis saepe suasit perperam* (Plaut. *Capt*. 328)
"Gold! I despise it: it wasted many a man into many a wrong course"

(22) *miser sum; argentum nusquam inuenio mutuom* (Plaut. *Pseud*. 80)
"Poor me; nowhere can I find money to borrow"

(23) *modo sic modo sic inquit rusticus, uarium porcum perdiderat* (Petr. 45,2)
"Now it's this and now it's that said the countryman, having lost his dappled pig"

(24) *itaque domi gaudet, plus in die nummorum accipit, quam alter patrimonium habet* (Petr. 44,13)
"He sits there at home, happy; pockets more money in a day than the next man's entire fortune"

(25) *ego malo mihi uitrea, certe non olunt* (Petr. 50,7)
"I myself prefer glassware; at any rate it doesn't smell"

It may be observed that referential identity between the subjects of the successive sentences is not necessary in these constructions. Examples (15) and (19) above show this clearly.

Should we then be content in regarding these examples as further proof of the colloquial character of such constructions (i.e., that they were typical in speech)?

[31] Cf. *asyndeton causale s. explicativum* in Kühner / Stegmann II, 2, 158

However, as in other respects, likewise concerning parataxis, it should be stressed that the relationship between spoken and written language in this letter material is not a simple one.

After all, we do not know what role parataxis had in spoken Latin discourse. It is not impossible that parataxis in this kind of context is essentially a feature of *written* language and has little or nothing to do with spoken language. It is, primarily, a stylistic option, and favoured in certain genres and text types for either stylistic or pragmatic reasons. As with so many other linguistic features that are attested in texts we traditionally consider colloquial, like Plautus and Petronius, there is a certain amount of circularity in the argument.

Asyndeton might be said to be a short and convenient way of expressing certain causal, consecutive and explanative relations between two predications, and this economy of expression, so to say, may then have caused its use in different contexts, in fictive spoken contexts, as a rhetorical device (including Cato and early prose), and in rather simple written language, like the language of these letters, where the writers wanted to express their actual message without too many complications.

On the other hand, it might also be maintained that the combined evidence from so many different sources that are traditionally considered to be witnesses of a colloquial register certainly gives some plausibility to the claim that this type of asyndeton should be associated with actual spoken syntax.

Most of the examples are from Claudius Terentianus, a fact that might be considered to be additional proof for seeing in this construction a feature of spoken language. Moreover, the one example from Vindolanda is from the letter of Octavius, which is said to contain colloquial features, and the same might apply to CEL 10 as well. Even this distribution inside the non-literary material, however, is not as conclusive as it might seem at first sight, as these letters, too, contain language which is essentially written.

4.4. Paratactic complements

In this section I discuss instances where paratactic constructions have been used as arguments instead of embedded predications. They are referred to as paratactic

complements. Kühner / Stegmann calls them "grammatische Parataxe, logische Hypotaxe" because the formal means of the expression are paratactic but the logical relation between the two predications is hypotactic, e.g., with *dicere* that which is said is, in principle, subordinate to the main verb *dico*. Thus, the relationship between the two predications is not paratactic in the sense that both elements are free (cf. the definition of Halliday above), since a governing verb like *dico* requires a complement to go with it.[32]

4.4.1. verba dicendi et sentiendi

J.N. Adams has called to attention the fact that, in the non-literary material, no finite clauses introduced by *quod* or *quia* are found after *verba sentiendi et dicendi* and the AcI is used regularly.[33] The writers were for the most part representatives of the 'normal' language users who supposedly would have been inclined to choose the *quod* complement instead of the non-finite one, had it been the most common alternative in their spoken language. Therefore we shall have to reconsider the general view regarding the loss of the AcI, in favour of the *quod* clauses, in spoken registers of this time.[34] Adams also points out that the *quod* complement seems to have originated in the literary registers and that the usual equivalent in spoken language was the paratactic construction (or quoted direct speech). This conception about the paratactic construction being the true alternative for the AcI in spoken language has been presented previously by Scivoletto:

> "Ciò che, invece, rispondeva bene a tale bisogno di immediatezza e di espressitività, propri sempre della lingua corrente, era la costruzione paratattica del tipo *credo, id cogitasti* (Ter. heaut. 641), costruzione che si usava in maniera illimitata con quasi tutti i verbi *dicendi* e *sentiendi*." Scivoletto (1962, 20)

As regards the use of the AcI in the non-literary material, Adams observes that it is restricted in its form. Usually the governing verb precedes the whole dependent construction. The subject accusative, which is often a pronoun, is placed next to the

[32] See Scherer, 1975, 237. Cf. also "parataxe complétive", Touratier 2002, 399.
[33] Adams 1977, 61-63 and 2005a, 195-196.
[34] What can be called the standard view, expressed in Hofmann / Szantyr (1965, 354), is that the change in favour of the finite complements introduced by *quod, quia, quoniam* etc. was happening "in der Volkssprache der Kaiserzeit". Kühner / Stegmann (1971, II, 2, 274) states only that in the "Volkssprache" a construction with *quod* etc. developed for the *verba sentiendi et dicendi*.

governing verb in 36 out of 59 cases of postposition of the AcI.[35] The dependent construction is usually short and simple, e.g. *negauit se habere aspros* (P. Mich. VIII 467, 9).[36]

With *verba dicendi*, paratactic constructions (or quoted direct speech) are found in the letters of Terentianus, mainly P. Mich. VIII 471.[37] The extraordinary quality of this letter has already been mentioned. In reporting the disagreement he has had to his father, Terentianus repeatedly adds quoted direct speech after *dicere*:

> (26) *dico illi, da mi, di[c]o ạ[e]s paucum; ibo, dico, ad amicos patris mei* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 10-11)
> "I say to him, 'Give me,' I say, 'a little money; I shall go,' I say, 'to friends of my father'"

> (27) *mater mea: spec[t]emus illum dum uenit et uen[i]o tequm Alexandrie* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 24-25)
> "My mother (says): 'Let us wait for him until he comes and I go with you to Alexandria and take you to the ship' "

> (28) *dico illi, ueni interpone te si potes aiutare Ptolemaeo patri meo* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 27-29)
> "I say to him, 'Come, intervene (and see) if you can help my father Ptolemaeus' "

> (29) *attonitus exiendo dico illi da m[i] pauqum aes ut possim uenire con rebus meis Alexandrie, im inpendia* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 30-32)
> "In my astonishment, I say to him (?) as he leaves, 'Give me a little money for expenses so that I may be able to go with my things to Alexandria' "

> (30) *ueni, dicet, Alexandrie ed dabo t[i]bi* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 33)
> " 'Come,' he says 'to Alexandria and I'll give it to you' "

There is one instance of this construction in the letter P. Mich. VIII 469, and another in a letter of Rustius Barbarus.

> (31) *dico illei et ego, nolim [pe]ṭere illas* (P. Mich. VIII 469, 14)
> "I say to her, 'I should not like to go looking for them' "

[35] It is difficult to tell how (and if) this is related to the observation of Herman (1989, 139) that in later Latin, the Christian writers used only the AcI when the subordination is placed before the governing verb.
[36] Adams 2005a, 201-202. Note however the AcI dependent from another one in the opening salutation in CEL 87 *certiores uos esse credo me recte ualere*, showing the formulaic nature of such salutations.
[37] In addition to the examples quoted below, there is also one standard case with *inquit*: *hoc est, inquid, quod pater tus mi mandauit* (471, 16-17).

(32) *et dic Serapiadi si uult (denarios) XV accipere afferam illei* (CEL 75,13-15)[38]
"And say to Serapias, if he wants to get 15 denarii, I shall give it to him"

As pointed out by Adams (2005a, 201-202), the difficulties in using the AcI caused Terentianus and Rustius Barbarus to use quoted direct speech when there was a conditional clause included, as in (32).[39] Direct quotation can be found in the literature as well (*inquit* etc.) though not often with *dico* (ThLL s.v. *dico*, 982,33ff). One very important observation should be made at this point. There are no comparable uses of *dico* attested in Latin, because this type of informal report of the sayings of the writer or some other person does not occur in the extant literature. It undoubtedly was the normal way of reporting speech in spoken conversation. This gives us a glimpse of how restricted in type our written material of Latin really is.

In Plautus and Petronius, paratactic complements are found frequently after *uerba sentiendi*. Cicero also uses the construction, mostly in his letters.[40]

(33) *spero tamen iam ueterem pudorem sibi imponit* (Petr. 47,3)[41]
"I hope my stomach remembers its manners now"

(34) *credo, dixerit non decere grauitatem eius tam humiles ineptias* (Petr. 52,10)
"I imagine she told him that such clownery didn't become him"

(35) *mihi in mentem uenit, illic homo hoc de umero uolt pallium detexere* (Plaut. Amph. 293)
"It looks to me as if this fellow wants to take my cloak off for me"

(36) *sed scio, tu oleum haud magni pendis* (Plaut. *Pseud*. 221)
"But I understand — you don't think much of oil"

[38] It should be noted that this example is in fact not direct quotation, since the subjects of the governing verb (*dic*) and the subordinate verb (*uult*) are different. My translation.
[39] For Terentianus, see the fragmentary passage P. Mich VIII 467, 9-10 *ait mihi si … … referam patri tuo*. The Mons Claudianus ostraca furnish interesting evidence about the difficulties in reporting quoted speech: O. Claud. II 226, 15 ἔγραψες μον [sic] τὸ ἀντιγράφον ὅτι "ἔλαβα" ἢ "οὐκ ἔλαβα" ("Write to me the answer that 'I have got it' or 'I have not got it'") See also O. Claud. II 228 and 236. See also below, section 5.4.
[40] E.g., *credo uoluit … nobis esse par* (Cic. *Att*. 5,20,4); *narro tibi, plane relegatus mihi uideor* (Cic. *Att*. 2, 11,1). See also, e.g., Plin. *epist*. 1,12,11: *impleuit quidem annum septimum et sexagensimum, quae aetas etiam robustissimis satis longa est; scio. euasit perpetuam ualetudinem; scio. Decessit superstitibus suis, florente re publica, quae illi omnibus carior erat; et hoc scio*.
[41] It is noteworthy in this example that the verb *imponit* is in the present indicative.

In the non-literary letters, parataxis after *verba sentiendi* is not frequent but not totally excluded.[42] Two examples are found:

> (37) *de roṭuḷis quas spero cito ex[pl]ḭcabịt* (tab. Vindol. III 648)
> "... about the wheels which, I hope, he will quickly sort out(?)"

> (38) *eḍ [sci]as Carpum hic errasse, ed ịṇụ[e]ṇtus est Dios in legione, et a[cce]pisse me prọ ịllo (denarios) VI* (P. Mich**.** VIII 468, 43-45)
> "And know that Carpus came here in his wanderings and Dius was found (?) in a legion and I accepted 6 denarii on his behalf"

In (38), from Claudius Terentianus, two AcI constructions are dependent on *scias* (*Carpum errasse* and *a[cce]pisse me*) but between them there is a finite predication *ed inuentus est Dios in legione*. From the literary examples above it has become clear that with *verba sentiendi* there existed, besides the AcI, an alternative paratactic construction which presumably was at least an alternative if not the standard complement in informal registers.[43] Apparently Terentianus here set out to construe the whole complex sentence (with three embedded predications) with the AcI. The second embedding, however, was more complicated than the other two as it would have contained a perfect passive infinitive. Therefore, as the paratactic construction was possible with *scio*, he changed into a finite predication. This passage shows nicely how the two constructions (AcI and parataxis) were allowed with *scio* and other *verba sentiendi*. The conclusion, then, must be that, when writing, Terentianus normally used the AcI, which was the standard

[42] See Adams 2003b, 19-20.

[43] The *tabulae Sulpicianae*, originating from Puteoli but found near Pompeii (Murecine), offer some interesting data concerning the AcI. Novius Eunus, who was not a master of Latin orthography, is the writer of two tablets. The closing formula is *que ob omini ui periculo meo est fateor* in TP Sulp. 51 and *que ominia ab omini ui priculo meo est fator* in TPSulp. 52. The non-standard orthography shows that Novius Eunus apparently wrote the document from memory (or from dictation) and not from a written model. Apparently the AcI was not a part of the normal spoken apparatus of the writer and the formulaic language of the document did not make his task in rendering it correctly any easier. Therefore Novius Eunus reverted to the construction with which he was more familiar, the parataxis. With the verb *fateor*, the paratactic construction is used frequently by Plautus and also by Cicero (See Calboli 1999, 338). These instances demonstrate well how the normal spoken variant could enter even a formulaic document like this one if the writer was not totally competent in the formulaic language used in documents. In addition, the finite verb *est* is in the wrong number. Adams (1990, 245) has suggested that Novius Eunus simply took the finite form that was closest to the infinitive *esse*. This is possible but implies that Novius Eunus in fact was aware of the correct wording in this formula, namely *esse fateor*. If this was the case, we might ask why he did not just write it that way. Therefore I would suggest that the structure of the clause was not entirely clear to the writer. He perhaps did not know what the subject of the verb *esse* was and chose the singular as the unmarked variant. Phonological factors may also have contributed to the confusion, as *que* was pronounced (and written!) without the final <m>.

complement with *verba sentiendi* in the written language, but, when the outcome was going to be too complicated, he chose the paratactic construction instead. The same interpretation and conclusions are offered in Adams 2005a, 201-202.

In the case of paratactically construed *verba sentiendi* it is not always clear whether the *verbum sentiendi* is the main verb in the predication. Often it comes closer to an adverbial containing information about the whole predication. This is especially clear in the following example, as the verb is in the imperative[44]:

> (39) *crede mihi nimia bonitas pernicies homiṇ[i]ḃus est uel maxsuma* (CEL 10, 4-5)
> "Believe me, excessive generosity brings disaster, perhaps more than anything else, on men"

The imperative *crede* is used for example by Cicero nearly always with the finite complement, and only in a handful instances (out of a total of 86) does he employ the non-finite construction.[45]

Many factors, such as word order and the mode of the 'subordinate' predicate, influence the way in which the relative status of the two verbs is defined, that is, whether one is dependent on the other or not. But, there is probably no point in trying to set strict boundaries between them.

As a general impression concerning the study of historical syntax, I think we should concentrate less on the question 'when did the change happen' and try to approach the problem by asking 'what kind of variation existed'. Often what we are dealing with is not an instance of actual change in the linguistic system but a situation of co-existence and variation, with changes happening to a large extent in the level of literary norms. Adams states quite cautiously in a footnote (2005a, 202) that restricted use of the AcI may always have been a feature of substandard and spoken Latin. In fact, this is only to be expected. This is not so much a question of Latin and the special characteristics of the AcI but a natural conclusion from what we know of uneducated and spoken registers in languages generally: analytic and finite structures are usually preferred in them.

---

[44] These are called Disjuncts in Pinkster 1990, 32. Another way is to analyse them as parentheticals, see Bolkestein 1998, 11-14 ("modalizing mental state verbs").

[45] The infinitive construction at Cic. *Att*. 12,43,2; Cic. *fam*. 6,13,3; 10,6,2; 13,7,2. Cf. also in Petronius (Petr. 52,8) *credite mihi, cordacem nemo melius ducit* "Believe me, nobody does the cordax better".

4.4.2. rogo + *imperative* (peto + *indicative present/future*)

As has been noted above (3.5), the verb *rogo* is the most frequently occurring verb in the non-literary corpus of letters. Here I shall discuss two constructions that appear with this verb, the first of them, *rogo* + imperative only very briefly by mentioning the examples that are found.

Sometimes in the letters the verb *rogo* is used with an imperative instead of a subordinate clause,[46] and once we find *peto* with the indicative present[47]:

(40) *ita rogo quam primum aliquit (denariorum) mi mitte* (tab. Vindol. II 343, 14)[48]
"So, I ask you, send me some cash as soon as possible"

(41) *rogo mittite omnia diligenter* (CEL 87, 4)
"Please send everything carefully"[49]

(42) *rogo rescribe mihi si* ... (tab. Luguv. 34)
"Please write to me if ..."[50]

(43) *ẹt quid circ̣[a] eạs res agatụr peto per occ̣asiọnem scṛibis mihi* (tab. Vindol. III 670)
"and write to me, I ask, what is being done about those matters when you have the chance"

Literary parallels are found in Petronius[51]

(44) *oro te, sic felicem me uideas, narra illud quod* ... (Petr. 61,2)
"Do tell us of that experience of yours, and you'll see my face light up"

(45) *non tenuit ultra lacrimas Trimalchio et: "rogo", inquit " Habinna, sic peculium tuum fruniscaris: si quid perperam feci, in faciem meam inspue."* (Petr. 75, 3)
"Trimalchio couldn't hold back the tears any longer. "Please, Habinnas, as sure as you hope to enjoy your own nest-egg, spit in my face if I've done anything wrong"

[46] See Bowman / Thomas 1994, 325.
[47] Or future, see Adams 2003c, 555.
[48] The construction has a parallel in Greek ἐρωτῶ σε, πέμψον, see Adams 2003a, 590-591.
[49] My translation.
[50] My translation.
[51] See Bowman / Thomas / Adams (1990, 37) and Adams (1995, 118) for more parallels in literary texts and Cicero's letters.

In these examples *rogo* (or *oro* or *peto*) clearly has a force similar to the English 'please', i.e., it is not a full verb but an expression of politeness, toning down the imperative.[52]

4.4.3. rogo + *subj.*

The verb *rogo* is frequently followed by a bare subjunctive in the letter material. In this section I shall discuss this construction as a part of letter phraseology and, closely connected to this, explicate what we actually know about the situation of this construction in the Latin *Variationsraum*.

The grammars state explicitly that the construction *rogo* + subj. has developed from an original parataxis with an independent subjunctive, and the subordinator *ut* has been added later.[53] Despite this paratactic past, the construction should synchronically be labelled hypotactic: "der Modus sowie die so oft eintretende Verschiebung des Tempus und der Person deutet doch schon auf ein entwickelteres hypotaktisches Verhältnis hin" (Kühner / Stegmann 1971, II, 2, 164).[54]

Whatever the history of this construction, it has such a close association with the *rogo ut* construction that it is easiest to take *rogo* + subj. as a form of hypotaxis, too. For that reason I have treated it here (and not with paratactic asyndeton, see above 4.3). The question of whether this construction should be classified as parataxis or hypotaxis is relevant mainly in an indirect way: if we consider it a paratactic relationship, this has implications for the sociolinguistic marking, as paratactic constructions are often thought to be colloquial in comparison with the corresponding hypotactic ones (see above).

In the Vindolanda letters, the asyndetic *rogo* + subj. is clearly preferred to the construction with *ut*. There are 18 instances[55] without *ut* against 5 with *ut*.[56] This preference for *rogo* + subj. at Vindolanda raises a question about the sociolinguistic status of this construction. Adams is of the opinion "that *rogo(-amus)* + subj. introducing

[52] For expressions of politeness in Latin requests, see Dickey (unpublished). I am grateful to Eleanor Dickey for allowing me to see the paper and refer to it.
[53] Kühner / Stegmann (1971, 164) and Hofmann / Szantyr (1965, 528-530).
[54] It should be noted, however, that this conception may partly result from the general desire to see a paratactic relationship behind hypotactic constructions.
[55] 218, 233, 250 (see below 5.4), 291, 301, 310, 311, 312 (3 times), 314, 326, 345, 628 (twice), 655, 671, 831. In addition there are 3 instances without the subordinator in *commeatus* documents, see Adams 1995a, 117 (n. 172).
[56] 250, 255, 313, 316, 648.

a request was current conversational Latin" (1995, 117).[57] He draws attention to the following facts:

> 1) Martialis preferred the asyndetic construction. *Rogo ut* does not occur.
> 2) In Petronius, although *rogo ut* is slightly more common, two of the three examples of *rogo(-amus)* + subj. are in the speeches of the freedmen.
> 3) Cicero's correspondents prefer the asyndeton but Cicero himself favours *rogo ut*. Cicero's own practice implies, falsely, that rogo *ut* (and not *rogo* + subj.) was current in spoken educated Latin.

First of all, however, some further observations can be made from the non-literary material. Claudius Terentianus uses *rogo ut* exclusively as does Rustius Barbarus (CEL 73, 10 and 73, 15). These writers do not exhibit the same high standard of Latinity that is conspicuous in many of the letters written at Vindolanda.[58] But, Claudius Tiberianus, whose Latin is closer to the standard and more idiomatic, has an example of *rogo* + subj. In fact, as such this distribution would rather point in the direction that *rogo* + subj. was the more formal of the two.

In letters of recommendation, the formula expressing the actual request is in the form of *rogo commendatum habeas* (CEL 81 and 82) and *rogo in meum honorem adiuues eum* (CEL 83).[59] Also, in documents in which the writers ask for leave, the standard formula was *rogo domine dignum me habeas cui des commeatum* (tab. Vindol. II 167, 174 and 176). Similarly, in CEL 149, which is a petition to the prefect of Egypt for the *probatio* of a soldier, the phrase goes *rogo domine [dig]num me iudices ut pr[obes] militem in cohorte*.[60] Additionally, in later petitions from the 3rd century the phrase is *rogo ... des*.[61]

---

[57] This conclusion was then based on the tab. Vindol. II material, with 12 cases without *ut* against 5 with *ut* (but, of the examples cited in Adams (1995a, 117 n. 174), in 316 there is only one *rogo ut*, in the other case the verb form is *rogas*) .

[58] This could also be a case of geographical variation, caused perhaps partly by influence from Greek.

[59] In tab. Vindol. II 250 the phrase is different, *rogo ut commendare digneris* but *rogo ut digneris* was undoubtedly idiomatic (and resulted in a more complex structure), as can be seen from the letters of Pliny where the phrase *rogo ut digneris* is used 5 times (10,12,1; 10,43,4; 10,47,3; 10,81,8; 10,118,3) against one example of *rogo digneris* (10,13,1) after which there is another subordinate clause introduced by *ut*. Note also P. Mich. VIII 472 *rogo digneris ... ut* and PSI IX 1026 (= CPL 117) A. 7-8 *petimus et rogamus digneris nobis adfirmare*.

[60] This text is not in fact a letter, but a petition, see above (1.2.1 and 3.2).

[61] See Cavenaile CPL 204, 205, 217, 218.

In a letter to Macedo we find an unusual word order, probably used to create some stylistic effect, together with *rogo* + subj., *[e]gọ tuos salutes rogo* (CEL 8, 10).

In addition, the passages from Petronius deserve some further comment. Of the two instances (cited in Adams 1995a, 117 n. 176) of *rogo(-amus)* + subj. in the speeches of freedmen, the other, at 75,3 is in fact not an example of *rogo* + subj. but, instead, of *rogo* either with an imperative *inspue*, or *rogo* in isolation with the meaning "please". The passage is cited above as example (45). In addition, the instance of *rogamus* + subj. at 49,6 is a collective request by the guests reported by Encolpius and not an utterance by any individual freedman. Furthermore, one place containing *rogo* + *ut* should be added (71,6). So, we are left with 6 cases of *rogo(-amus)* + *ut* (of which 3 are in speeches by Trimalchio) and 2 with *rogo(-amus)* + subj. Therefore, I do not think Petronius could be used as indisputable evidence for regarding *rogo* + subj. as the more informal variant, used in spoken language.

I suggest, however, that there may also be another factor involved in the choice between the two constructions, that is, the verbal context. Neither is necessarily more colloquial than the other, but they are preferred in different syntactic contexts. It looks as if the asyndetic construction as the shorter alternative was used more in contexts where the subordinate verb was close to the governing verb (which usually is in the first person) and the predication was rather short and simple e.g. in formal requests for leave. Most of the instances of *rogo* + subj. are in simple requests where the addressee is asked to send or do something (tab. Vindol. II 233, 301, 311, 312, 314) or to come to see the sender of the letter (tab. Vindol. II 291, 312). It is quite natural that in more complex sentences or in contexts where the subordinate verb was placed farther away from the governing verb, the subordinator *ut* was used to make the predication clearer and more easily comprehensible to the hearer/reader. At least 4 examples of *rogo* + *ut* (250, 255, 310 and 313) are easily explained along these lines, e.g., *et rogo ut ea quae ussibus puerorum meorum opus sunt mittas mihi* (tab. Vindol. II 255, 6-8). There remains only one (316, left margin, 4 *rogo uṭ rescri[bas*). On the other hand, at least two examples of *rogo* + subj. have a *si* clause between *rogo* and the subordinate verb (218 and 250, 5[62]). In the

[62] Interpreted with *uelis* dependent on *rogo*, see ch. 5.4 and my discussion there.

Vindolanda III texts, both the 4 (+1) examples of *rogo* + subj. as well as the one example with *rogo* + *ut* are in rather simple contexts with the verbs close to each other.

The asyndetic construction is also used in connection with verb forms other than *rogo* (see Adams 1995a, 118). Cases like *uolo ueniat* (266, 2), *uolo liqueat* (656, i, 2), and *uelim mihi ...[ ]ria explices* (349, 4-5)[63] are close in structure and meaning to the *rogo* constructions. Imperatives seem to favour the plain subjunctive, especially when another *ut* clause follows: *fac itaque emas et tradas* (CEL 86, 5-7), *fac mittas ... ut abeamus* (CEL 18, 1), *cura agas ut ... redigas* (CEL 87, 5-6), *dic ... accipiat* (O. Max. inv. 254, 6-8)[64], but also *fac ut certum mihi [r]e[s]ṣçṛibas* (tab. Vindol. III 645, 9-10). These examples meet my criteria for 'simple' contexts (subordinate verb close to governing verb). It is also relevant that the governing verb is in the first person or in the imperative.

There are also two more noteworthy examples in the letter tab. Vindol. II 343: *scribe dentur* (343, 16-17) and especially *desiderabat coria ei adsignarem* (343, 31-32). This usage of *desidero* with the plain subjunctive seems to be without parallel,[65] and it seems therefore to show an extended use of this construction – a construction that I would not primarily regard as the one favoured in speech.

As for Cicero, Adams notes (1995, 117) "Cicero's use of *rogo (ut)* with indirect commands is rather formal (and formulaic), in that he tends to place the *ut*-clause before *rogo*, and he tends to use the construction in a restricted set of expressions. There must have been current a less formal use of *rogo* + subjunctive." It would be interesting to investigate the Ciceronian practice further by taking into account the entire verbal context. For example, it may be the case that Cicero uses *ut* so often exactly *because* he usually places the subordination before that governing verb, and it is therefore a more complex construction than the reverse order.

[63] The verb *uelim* is a favourite expression of Cicero, especially in minor requests (Dickey, unpublished).
[64] See Penney 1999, 258 on *dico* + subjunctive: "… in everyday language as well as poetry, not in formal prose" and "Given this distribution, the status of the construction must be uncertain: old, it certainly is, but surely too familiar in the spoken language to be perceived as archaic."
[65] Bowman / Thomas / Adams 1990, 51.

4.5. Sentence connection in the letters of Rustius Barbarus: a case study

Finally, I shall discuss in some detail the letters of Rustius Barbarus (CEL 73-78). These letters (see 1.2.1) contain four passages that require comment regarding the way the sentences are connected to each other. In these cases we do not have to take into consideration the possibility of scribal interference. The letters are written by the same hand and there is no other hand visible in the closing. They are thus in all probability written by Rustius Barbarus himself. In the first two cases, as I see it, the organization of the different ideas in one predication results in a somewhat peculiar structure.

> (46) *rogo te frater ut facias mi in m[e]os usos pondera quan formosa <u>et scribe mi ut pretium aeorum quit uis</u> panem tibi faciam aut aes tibi mitam* (CEL 73, 12-14)
> "I ask you brother to make me for my use weights (?) as good as possible and write to me which you want as the price for them, that I make bread for you or send you money."[66]

Cugusi's characterization (ad loc.) of this passage goes as follows "si noti la disorganizzazione del periodo, tipicamente colloquiale".[67] There are two things the writer is trying to say in the part beginning with *scribe mi*. The addressee, Pompeius, should inform him first about the price of the weights, and second, about whether to make bread or send money to pay his debt. The *pondera* mentioned in the first predication introduces a new topic and *pretium aeorum*, which refers to *pondera*, is in the initial position of the second predication. After this comes the information the writer is asking for, *quit uis* (parenthetically) and further specified by two alternatives, *panem faciam aut aes ... mitam*.[68] As it is translated by Guéraud (in O. Faw.): "… et écris-moi pour que, en paiement, — selon tes préférences, — je te fasse du pain ou t'envoie de l'argent".

A similar phenomenon is to be found in another passage from the same writer:

---

[66] The translation of (46)-(49) is mine.

[67] In the way the semantic units are enumerated here this example bears some resemblance to what in early Latin has been called 'guttatim style' (by E. Fraenkel), see Courtney (1999, 4 and 153), e.g. *priusquam semen maturum siet, secato, et quod optimum faenum erit, seorsum condito, per uer cum arabunt, antequam ocinum des, quod edint boues* (Cato *agr*. 53).

[68] The method of language production in speech causes speakers to favour syntactic organization wherein the ideas are 'listed', so to speak, and not necessarily bound together by syntactic means typical of written language. This feature of spoken language has been called an "idea chain" by Chafe (1985, 110-111 and 113). If a writer is less experienced, he may produce similar structures in text as well.

(47) *diligenter rationem tuam scribe quae mi mittes ut possiṃ tibe con amicitiem redderem* (CEL 75, 9-11)
"Write your account of what (= those things that) you send me carefully so that I can repay you amicably."

There are three possibilities in interpreting this passage.[69] We may take *quae mi mittes* as an apposition to *rationem tuam*, further defining the object of the governing verb *scribe*. Presumably, the *ratio* is the account **of** those things that the addressee sends to Rustius Barbarus (this is how Cugusi interprets it, ad loc.). On the other hand, Guéraud[70] read *que* and took it as *quem*, referring to *rationem*.[71] This interpretation could of course be retained even with the reading *quae* in CEL (*quae=que=quem*). On the other hand, this is perhaps not plausible because it is quite clear that 'sending' refers to the goods that Pompeius will first send to Rustius Barbarus (who then settles up by, e.g., sending bread). The third possibility is to take *quae mi mittes* as an object of the of *ut* clause, brought outside its clause because it is topical. This, however, seems to result in a very formal expression and is therefore less likely to be the right solution.

The peculiar syntax in (46) and (47) has been used to illustrate the syntactical pattern of spoken Latin and even the syntactic change from Latin to Romance.[72] If this type of structuring was current in colloquial registers both in Latin and Romance, it is perhaps best to speak of an interesting persistence in syntactic variation than actual language change. This persistence can then be connected with the general properties of spoken (as opposed to written) language.

The other two passages both have to do with the conjunction *quod*.

(48) *misi tibe per Thiadicem equitem panes ṾI quod dixit se posse tollere* (CEL 73, 7-9)
"I sent to you through the cavalryman Theadices six loaves of bread, as he said he would be able to carry them"

[69] As far as the tense of the verb is concerned, *mittes* can be either a present indicative (*mittis*) or a future.
[70] In O. Faw. 3. Seider (1972, 26) also read *quę*.
[71] The masculine form *quem* can refer to a feminine, see e.g., *beneuolentiam quem* in CEL 7, ii, 20.
[72] Koch 1995, 136-137 and Durante 1981, 53-55 ("Abbiamo in questi testi una struttura di periodo semantica e sintattica che non dirrefisce minimamente dalla struttura romanza, beninteso del regime colloquiale e non dei testi letterari" p. 54).

(49) *misi tibi per Ạṛṛiạnum equitem chiloma entro ha[b]et collyram I et in lintiolo […] alligatum quod rogo te ut ema[s] mi matium salem et [mi]ttas mi celerius quia pane uolo facere* (CEL 74, 12-18)[73]
"I sent you through the cavalryman Arrianus a box. Inside there is one loaf of bread and (a denarius?) wrapped in linen, as I ask you to buy me a *matium* of salt and send it to me quickly since I want to make bread."

This use of *quod* in these examples is called "polyvalent" by Koch (1995, 136) and, as Cugusi notes in his comments concerning (48), it is not impossible to see here an early example of the later development of *quod* into a universal conjunction.[74] A causal interpretation of *quod* is of course possible in (48), although not the one perhaps expected here.[75] Nor is a causal interpretation of *quod* the most natural one in example (49). It is, I think, principally the accumulation of these peculiarities in the letters of one person that makes them significant: as if the author quite did not manage to build his sentences in a coherent way whenever things got more complicated. Even if clearly fluent in Latin, he did not control the written register perfectly.

On the other hand, quite recently Adams (2006) has shown that the word order in *matium salem* (CEL 74, 16) is influenced by Greek. This construction, known as the partitive apposition, is also well attested in the non-literary material.[76] In Latin, however, the word order is always the other way round e.g. *oleum cotilas VI* (CEL 75, 7-8) whereas in Greek the word order is an exact parallel to *matium salem* here (e.g., μ[αρ]σίππιν σείναπιν in O. Claud. II 227).

Accordingly, it may be that Rustius Barbarus also has Greek influence elsewhere in his language. There are examples like *scito enim me uxorem ducerem* (CEL 73, 14-15) and *ut possiṃ tibi con amicitiem redderem* (CEL 75, 11-13) in which *ducerem* and *redderem* of course can be seen merely as orthographical confusions – even as such, however, they are somewhat surprising.[77] It is thus possible that the little peculiarities of

[73] Guéraud (O. Faw. 2) translates "et attaché dans un morceau de toile: cela pour que tu m'achètes un *matium* de sel et me l'envoies sans tarder".
[74] See Hofmann / Szantyr 1965, 579 and Herman 2000, 90-91.
[75] In other places Rustius Barbarus uses *quia* as the causal conjunction, see e.g. (49).
[76] See Adams 1975, 42.
[77] Cugusi, (1981, 743 and ad loc.) thinks that *ducerem* and *redderem* are "coniuntivo in luogo dell'infinito". The form *amicities* is attested in Lucr. 5, 1019. In CEL 74, 5 Rustius Barbarus uses the standard form *amicitia*.

syntax in (46)-(49) are due to the fact that the author was not a native speaker of Latin.[78] In that case the way *quod* is used here might not tell us anything about its use in Latin at this time.

4.6. Conclusion

I have pointed out that in certain respects the syntax of these letters may go back to actual spoken conversation, such as the use of *et* connecting sentences in narratives. I have also argued that there is distinguishable another use of *et*, in a topic changing or introducing function. In addition to the evidence about this, probably very old, multifunctionality of *et*, there is another piece of evidence for the use of *item* in contexts where it clearly is used in a way similar to that of the second *et*, i.e. carrying the narrative on to the next issue. The exact relationship of this use of *item* to that found in lists and medical treatises, and of both of these to actual spoken conversations, remains unclear.

The relationship between parataxis and different linguistic registers is a highly complex one. There seem to be at least three aspects to this complexity. First of all, the variety of constructions which are regarded as paratactic is great. Secondly, there most likely is no simple answer to the question about parataxis and spoken language, neither in general, nor in Latin. Thirdly, these letters are by no means straightforward testimonies of spoken Latin, not even regarding their syntax. For some of the constructions the claim for a direct origin in spoken language probably is quite strong, such as paratactic complements with *verba sentiendi et dicendi* which, along with *et* in narratives, can be placed among features most probably reflecting spoken practice. In the case of other constructions (paratactic asyndeton and the type *rogo mittas*), the matter is more complex.

In those cases of sentence connection from the letters of Rustius Barbarus that were discussed here, it is possible to see influence either from the spoken syntax of the author and his less than perfect command of the written register or from his first language, Greek.

---

[78] The Greek terms for the foodstuffs mentioned in these letters (see Cugusi 1981, 738-741) naturally tell us more about the Greek speaking context where the letters were written than Greek interference in the language of the author. But there is also a phrase that apparently is a translation of Greek: *scire to uolo*, cf. γιγνώσκειν σε θέλω, see Cugusi 1981, 737-738.

5. SYNTACTICAL INCOHERENCES IN THE LETTERS

5.1. Introduction

'Incoherent' in this study refers to what has traditionally been called anacoluthic, i.e. any kind of syntactic construction that somehow 'breaks up' without following the expected grammatical structure, or, as defined by Mayer (2005, 200): "Anacoluthon occurs whenever the sentence undergoes a change of constructions that leaves one part without proper government". Syntactically incoherent structures are often found in speech because speakers typically do not plan very much ahead what they are going to say:

> Syntactic errors attributable to syntactic rules used inconsistently within the incremental production process are initially caused by the fact that sentence production is content-oriented. That is, in producing a sentence as a series of content fragments that fit together both cognitively and thematically, speakers are less concerned with the syntactic well-formedness of a sentence than with its being an adequate expression of their intentions (Jordens 1986, 93)

A writer can (re)produce in writing such an incoherent expression. Adams (2005b, 91-92) rightly distinguishes "momentary cases of imperfect performance" as a category of its own among incoherent (or anacoluthic) constructions. These, however, one does not expect to find in writing as often as in speech, as writing inherently requires more beforehand planning than speaking. Non-literary, personally produced texts like these letters are among those written documents where even these structures might be found. Although we do have evidence that the senders read the letters after they were written and inserted corrections (see above 1.4), this might not have been done in every case, and it is therefore possible that constructions reflecting a momentary imperfect performance were left in the text.

On the other hand, if a writer does not control the written register perfectly, already the effort of putting his thoughts into writing may be the cause of incoherences, cf. Hofmann (1951, 163)

> "Namentlich dort, wo der ungebildete Durchschnittssprecher ihm ungewohnte schriftsprachliche Wendungen gebraucht, ergeben sich leicht Mischungen".

The term ‘ungebildete’ applies only as a relative notion — the writers of these letters had less experience and they had received less education in producing written texts than literary authors.

These two are the main reasons for syntactically incoherent structures in written text, but in many cases it is difficult or even impossible to say for sure which one of them is behind the incoherent structure.

In the following pages I shall discuss the relevant passages from the letters. In each case I shall draw attention to the source of the incoherent expression, that is, how and where (speech or writing) it was produced and what its relationship to the linguistic system was. I shall start with a simple contamination together with some methodological remarks (5.2) and then continue with the letter tab. Vindol. II 310 and questions related to that (5.3 and 5.4). There will be a short note on confusion in personal reference (5.5) and finally a discussion about the role of the accusative as well as thematic constituents (5.6 and 5.7).

5.2. Contamination

I shall start with a passage from Claudius Terentianus, (1) below, which is a classical example of contamination. This term is used to refer to such syntactic incoherences where two equivalent or otherwise closely connected constructions are joined together resulting in a merger of both; compare the definitions of Hofmann (1951, 163)

> “Kontaminationen … bei denen zwei konkurrierende Wendungen gleichzeitig in der Vorstellung des Sprechenden emportauchen, sodaß bei der sprachlichen Äußerung eine Mischung von beiden entsteht”

and Löfstedt (1933 II, 154)

> “…zwei synonyme oder irgendwie verwandte Ausdrucksformen sich nebeneinander ins Bewusstsein drängen, so dass keine von beiden rein zur Geltung kommt, sondern eine neue Form entsteht, in der sich Elemente der einen mit Elementen der andern mischen.”

In more modern research, contamination has been called syntactic fusion:

> “Syntactic fusion takes place if two constructions with more or less the same meaning are generated simultaneously” (Jordens 1986, 92)

In one of his letters, presumably closer to actual spoken language than any of the others (cf.. 4.2 and 4.4.1 above), Terentianus reports to his father the unacceptable conduct of a person called Saturninus, who has denied his help to Terentianus.

> (1) *non magis qurauit me pro xylesphongium sed sum negotium et circa res suas* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 29-30)
> "He paid no more attention to me than to a sponge stick but (looked only) to his own business and his own affairs"

As the editors Youtie and Winter suggest (comm. *ad loc*.), this is most probably a contamination of two constructions, *non magis curauit me quam xylesphongium* and *habuit me pro xylesphongio*.[1] A syntactic fusion like this fits well the overall tone of the letter, which is close to spoken narrative.[2]

In the light of the following examples (2) and (3) we may make some observations concerning similar confused expressions in literary texts of different periods.[3] Example (2) is parallel to (1) in that it contains a mixture of comparative and equating expressions, cf. Löfstedt (1933, 160): "eine Kreuzung von gleichstellender und komparativischer Konstruktionsweise":

> (2) *sed nullae magis leges tam impune, tam secure ... eluduntur* (Tert. *nat*. 1,15,3)
> "But no laws are/can be evaded so much, with such impunity and such safety"[4]

The same phenomenon is discernible in the often cited example from Plautus:

> (3) *Homo me miserior nullust aeque opinor / neque aduorsa cui plura sint sempiterna* (Plaut. *Merc*. 335-336)
> "There's no more miserable man alive than I am, I do believe, or one with more things eternally against him"

[1] ThLL (1503,32) cites one case of *curare pro* (Cod. Iust. 3,9,12 *ne quis pro petenda bonorum possessione curet*).
[2] It is of course possible that confusions like this were produced when taking the letter down by dictation, and that they do not reflect any actual linguistic expression. A probable instance of this (in tab. Vindol. II 218) is discussed in 1.4 (in connection with scribal practices and their possible effect on language use).
[3] See Löfstedt 1933, 157-172.
[4] In this chapter, the translations of literary examples are my own except for Plautus and Terence where I have used translations from the Loeb editions.

It should be noted that all three examples contain a negation. This may have been a condition that favoured contaminations in such contexts.[5]

After this kind of listing, i.e., citing parallel examples of contamination of a certain type from Latin literature, it may be useful to ask what information these examples actually give. Indeed, when studying corpus languages, finding parallels is the logical first step one has to take but there are questions to be asked after that. We should also ponder the possible causes and different contexts that the examples reflect. They are separated from each other by hundreds of years and they represent different genres and text types (not to speak of the historical context). Are such parallels in any way relevant to the Terentianus example, and if so, how?

Similar constructions may have different causes. In the case of Claudius Terentianus above, the sender of the letter either got confused because of inexperience in written expression or reproduced in writing a contaminated phrase used in his spoken language (the latter is perhaps the probable explanation here). Such confusions between two constructions are typical of spoken language because speakers often change the construction while speaking. Here the need to express the thought as strongly as possible probably also was essential.[6]

Plautus, centuries earlier, was in a completely different situation. He was composing a play, a literary text, at the very beginning of the Roman literary tradition. His compositions were comedies intended to amuse even the common people, but at the same time stylistically polished poetical compositions. In the quoted passage, Plautus was, therefore, most probably consciously imitating spoken language and its unplanned and pleonastic style, possibly also in order to produce comic effect. Furthermore, it is conceivable that he created expressions that would sound like typical spoken language and give the spectator a feeling of spontaneous dialogue even when the construction was not identical, or even close, to actual spoken idiom.

---

[5] Note also *ipsi pro nihilo contempti sunt* (Oros. *hist*. 6,1,16) which belongs to the same semantic field of 'despising' and 'ignoring' as the one from Terentianus (combining *pro nihilo ducere* and *contemnere*). We may speculate that by this time the distance between spoken and literary registers had grown greater, so that even the educated authors could not always follow the standard of written Latin that had been established hundreds of years earlier. Cf. also a contamination with *magis* and *nihilo minus* from Pelagonius (450,1 *cum frequenter tussientibus equis multis remediis subuenire uoluerim, adhibitis etiam potionibus, nihilo magis uitium tussis perseueraret*, cited in Adams 1995b, 658)

[6] See Cugusi 1993 for this and other colourful expressions with similar semantics.

The example from Tertullian may be due to his extraordinary literary style. He may have confused the construction on purpose, possibly because he wanted to give special emphasis to his expression.

In short, the mechanisms that produced these syntactic fusions were different in each case. Claudius Terentianus just got confused by his need of emphasis whereas Plautus and Tertullianus could modify their phrasing and even use incoherent expressions on purpose. Still, on the most profound level, they do illustrate the same linguistic phenomenon, i.e., syntactic fusions produced in spoken language.

5.3. The letter of Chrauttius (tab. Vindol. II 310)

The letter tab. Vindol. II 310 contains a number of interesting phenomena and I quote the text in full to make the discussion easier to follow. [7]

i

Chrauttius Veldeio suo fratri
contubernali antiquo pluri-
mam salutem
et rogo te Veldei frater miror
quod ṃihi tot tempus nihil
rescripsti a parentibus nos-
tris si quid audieris aut
Quoṭ m in quo numero
sit et illum a me salutabis
uerbis meis et Virilem
ueteriṇarium rogabis
illum ut forficem

ii

quam mihi promisṣit pretio
mittas per aliquem de nostṛiṣ
et rogo te frater Virilis
saluṭes a me Ṭhuṭteṇam
sororem Velbuteṇam
rescribas nobis cụm…
se habeat
m[2]? *opt<o> sis felicissimus*
uale

m[1] *Londini*
Veldedeio
equisioni co(n)s(ularis)
a Chrauttio
fṛạtre

"Chrauttius to Veldeius his brother and old messmate, very many greetings. And I ask you, brother Veldeius — I am surprised that you have written nothing back to me for such a long time — whether you have heard anything from our elders, or about … in

[7] The reading of the name in line 17 has been corrected to Velbuteṇam from the earlier *Velbuteịum*, cf. tab. Vindol. III, Appendix, 310.

which unit he is; and greet him from me in my words and Virilis the veterinary doctor. Ask him (sc. Virilis) whether you may send through one of our friends the pair of shears which he promised me in exchange for money. And I ask you, brother Virilis, to greet from me our sister Thuttena. Write back to us how Velbutena is. (2nd hand?) It is my wish that you enjoy the best of fortune. Farewell. (Back, 1st hand) (Deliver) at London. To Veldedeius, groom of the governor, from his brother Chrauttius."

The letter was probably written for Chrauttius by a scribe, although the editors note that the second hand visible in line 20 is quite similar to the hand in the body of the letter. I shall argue that the peculiarities of idiom in this letter reflect only partly the writer's actual spoken language. For the other part they were produced either by Chrauttius himself who could not conclude properly the long and complex expression he had on his mind, or, alternatively, by the scribe who was not able to follow Chrauttius' dictation (however, in view of the high scribal standard at Vindolanda this is perhaps improbable). Hence, we need to make a difference between 'illogical' incoherence and those cases that could be claimed to be a part of Chrauttius' 'grammar'. By the latter I refer to the interesting use of the accusative at the beginning of clauses on lines 8, 10 and 17 (*Quot. m*, *Virilem ueterinarium* and *Velbutenam*), which originated presumably in spoken syntax (thematic accusatives, on which see below 5.6). As for incoherence, I shall argue that 1) the verb *rogo* is used in this letter (as well as elsewhere in the non-literary letters) in the meaning 'to request', and 2) consequently, the subordination after *rogo* on lines 4 and 11 is incoherent. The verb *rogo* is the most frequently used phraseological constituent in the non-literary letters (apart from the opening and closing salutations; see ch. 3).

Adams has discussed this letter at some length in his 1995 article. He concludes (1995a, 130):

> If we can assume that the scribe was taking down dictation rather than writing Chrauttius' letter for him, then we might conclude that Chrauttius was a speaker of an idiomatic, but non-standard, variety of Latin. Stylistically the letter is at some remove from letter 225, but it is more suggestive of 'Vulgar Latin' than of 'foreigners' Latin'.

I have some suggestions to make concerning the interpretation of individual passages of this letter but eventually my conclusions are quite similar in essence.

The first clause after the salutation begins with *rogo te Veldei frater* which is interrupted by a parenthetical clause *miror quod mihi ... rescripsti*. After this comes a *si*-clause which has usually (following the edition) been thought to continue the phrase *rogo te* from line 4. This entails taking *rogo* in the meaning 'to inquire' and understanding the *si*-clause as an indirect question dependent from *rogo*.

The verb *rogo*, as is commonly known, has two meanings, and accordingly, two ways of constructing the subordination. Incidentally, these meanings are similar to those of the English verb 'to ask', that is, 'to request' and 'to inquire'. In the first sense, 'to request', the Latin verb can be accompanied either by a direct object, or a subordinate clause, with or without the subordinator *ut*. In the other meaning, 'to inquire', it is (naturally) accompanied by an indirect question. In the non-literary material, and perhaps also more generally in letters, the form *rogo* is used almost invariably in the first sense, 'to request'.[8] This is not surprising for obvious reasons: usually the writers of these letters wanted the addressee to send something or take care of something. To give *rogo* the meaning 'to inquire' would, in fact, be quite exceptional.

The conjunction *si* introducing indirect questions in the place of the particle *an* or enclitic *-ne* is found sporadically in literary texts already from classical times onwards. The early instances seem to be, for the most part, semantically ambiguous cases which show how the change came about, i.e., those contexts where *si* began to be interpreted as an equivalent of the particle *an* or *-ne*.[9] However, it appears that a *si* clause was normally not attached to *rogo* to form an indirect question, at least not to this form, the present indicative 1st person singular.[10]

Accordingly, I would like to suggest an alternative interpretation of this passage. After Chrauttius had stated the information that he is asking for (*a parentibus nostris si quid audieris*), he, or the scribe, forgot to add '*(ut) scribas*', possibly because he had already mentioned the verb *(re)scribere* in the previous clause. After this he wanted to say that he had not heard anything about *Quo̩t̩. s* either, and he continued with this

[8] For instance, in the letters of Pliny, *rogo* (present indicative 1st person sg.) seems to be used exclusively in the meaning 'to request, to ask to do something'. See Adams 2003c, 555 for a similar observation concerning *peto* in tab. Vindol. III 670, ii, 1-2 *quid ... agatur ... peto ... scribis*.
[9] Bodelot 1987, 81-85. See also Bowman / Thomas / Adams 1990, 37. But see P. Mich. VIII 469, 6 *uide si*. Also 469, 3 *o̩r̩[at] te si potes<t> fieri ut emas illę[i...]*?

thought. According to my interpretation, the subordinate clause dependent from *rogo* (most probably '*(ut) scribas*') was omitted, either by Chrauttius or by the scribe, because the structure was too long and complicated. The editors (Bowman / Thomas / Adams 1990, 38) cite here a passage from Cicero as a parallel (Cic. Att. 7,12,1 *quaeso ut scribas ... si quid ... audieris*) and I think this is what Chrauttius was trying to say, too.

The point here is that this letter, in fact, shows a good knowledge of suitable epistolary phraseology.

In what follows (*rogabis illum ut forficem quam mihi promissit pretio mittas*) the syntax seems again to be incoherent. The editors translate "Ask him (sc. Virilis) whether you may send…" without making any comments, although *rogo ut* in the meaning 'ask whether' seems to be quite exceptional, especially if one takes into account the idiomatic use of this phrase in letters.

I would prefer to understand some kind of a syntactic break somewhere before *mittas* (if it is not just an error for *mittat*). Perhaps Chrauttius was here already concerned with the next move, and asks Veldeius to send him the *forfex* that Veldeius had first received from Virilis. Or, more probably, after *promisit*, Chrauttius addressed Virilis instead of Veldeius, and this thought was continued in the next sentence, *rogo te frater Virilis* where Chrauttius addresses Virilis directly (see below example (8) for a parallel in Terentianus).

In short, I think Chrauttius simply had too many things on his mind simultaneously and, because of inexperience in written expression, could not bring them all into coherent clauses.

I would suggest that, in fact, Chrauttius might have been perfectly fluent in Latin, if not indeed a native speaker. The syntax of this letter is not a straightforward reflection of what Chrauttius normally might have said. Rather, it is the outcome of two partly opposite forces: the attempt to express oneself in the written medium and the inability to do this properly.

Adams (1995a, 129-130) argues that the passage discussed above *rogo te Veldei frater miror quod*, "can on the one hand be paralleled in colloquial texts yet on the other

[10] I have not found examples of *rogo si* (PHI #5 database, Brepols Library of Latin Texts), nor of *rogat si* or *rogamus si* before Augustine.

hand exhibits command of a fairly complex sentence structure". I suggest some modification of this view, following the suggestion I formulated above, that the *rogo*-clause is not continued as it should have been. Chrauttius aims at a rather complex sentence structure but is not successful in his efforts.

In addition I would note that the fact that a syntactic pattern is found in 'colloquial' texts (e.g., the letters of Cicero) does not imply that it was a typical structure in actual spoken language, but, quite the opposite, that it was typical in certain written registers, i.e. those of polite letter writing. In my view the parenthetical *miror quod*-clause that interrupts the *rogo*-construction reveals, in fact, that Chrauttius was to some extent familiar with the registers of letter writing.[11] Letters, especially private ones, are undoubtedly informal in nature compared with artistic prose but they, too, are written language produced for the most part by the educated class. Accordingly, phraseology that is found in other letters shows that a writer was familiar with letters as a text type. But, it needs to be stressed that a writer may still make mistakes in using the formulae that he has learnt.

To sum up, Adams regards the complex syntax as evidence of a good command of written Latin and the parenthesis as the influence of spoken language.[12] I suggest a reverse explanation. The syntactic structure is, indeed, complex but, more importantly, it is incoherent, and therefore indicative of the writer's inability to meet the needs of a more strictly organized register (supposing it was Chrauttius who made the mistake and not the scribe). The parenthesis, on the other hand, shows that the writer had some knowledge of the suitable phraseology to be used in letters.

5.4. *rogo* in tab. Vindol. II 250 and possible instances of *quod* for *quid*

In connection with the Chrauttius letter, it is useful to look at another letter from Vindolanda in which the meaning and argument structure of *rogo* have been subject to different interpretations. This passage is from a letter of recommendation addressed to Flavius Cerialis:

[11] Bowman / Thomas / Adams (1990, 37) cite here Petron. 75,3 and P. Mich. VIII 467 *oro et rogo, neminem habeo ... ut mittas*.

(4) *rogo ergo domiṇẹ ṣi quod a te petieriṭ [u]ẹḷiṣ ẹi subscribere* (tab. Vindol. II 250, 5)
"I therefore ask, my lord that, if he has made any request of you, you consent to give him your approval"[13]

In the *editio princeps* (tab. Vindol. I, p. 73) the editors wrote: "In colloquial Latin a blurring had long since taken place between *quis* and *qui*, but in No. 22,6 it is *quid* and *quod* which have been confused: *si quod a te petierit*. The classical distinction between the neuters was maintained far longer than that between *quis* and *qui*, but *(ali)quid* for *(ali)quod* does occur sporadically. *(Ali)quod* for *(ali)quid* is much rarer, and according to Löfstedt is not definitely found until late Latin (the text at Celsus 6,7,4 is doubtful). *Si quod* here would seem to be the first instance of this phenomenon."

In tab. Vindol. II their interpretation is different: "We remain doubtful that there is room to restore *ut* at the beginning of line 7. We now accept a suggestion of Adams that we understand *rogo* in line 5 to be followed by *si ... uelis*, and that we understand a break in the sense after *subscribere*, for which the meaning "write in support of to …" is difficult to defend; we now think that the marks after *ro* in line 9 are not ink; *quod a te petierit* will then be parenthetical, which removes the problem posed by *si quod* (see tab. Vindol. I p. 73)."

I would accept the editors' first suggestion with *uelis* dependent from *rogo* and *si quod a te petierit* as an independent clause because *rogo* + *si*-clause + *subj*. is idiomatic in this context, cf. tab. Vindol. II 218 *rogo si quid utile mihi credideris aut mittas aut reserues* where *si quid ... credideris* interrupts the *rogo*-clause without being its argument. It seems that in the non-literary letters *rogo* + (*ut*) + subj./imperat. is used always in the meaning 'to request' and the *si*-clauses interrupting them are parenthetical, as in the Ciceronian passage cited above (unless, of course, the two instances in tab. Vindol. II 250 and 310 are regarded as evidence for the opposite view).[14]

---

[12] On the expression *tot tempus* in this letter (l. 5), see Bowman / Thomas / Adams 1990, 37-38 and Adams 1995a, 127. *Tot* is used in the meaning of *tantum*, a use without parallels but analogical to the use of *paucus* meaning 'small', i.e. a plural ('count') adjective (*pauci, tot*), acquiring a singular ('mass') usage.
[13] Translation from tab. Vindol. I 22.
[14] There are, according to my counts, 37 certain cases of *rogo* (present indicative, 1st person singular) + *ut*/subj. in the meaning 'to request' in CEL and tab. Vindol. II-III (the three instances discussed above excluded). In addition, there are 16 cases where the context is too fragmentary to allow a definite decision

If *si quod ... a te petierit* is taken as a parenthesis, as I suggest, the construction in the matrix clause is *rogo ... uelis*. A parallel for this may be cited from Pliny: *illud unum, quod propter caritatem eius nondum mihi uideor satis plene fecisse, etiam atque etiam facio teque, domine, rogo, gaudere me exornata quaestoris mei dignitate, id est per illum mea, quam maturissime uelis* (Plin. *epist*. 10,26,3). Both the Vindolanda letter and that of Pliny are letters of recommendation. Concerning the nature of the request in the Vindolanda letter it is important to note that this type of phraseology ("if there is anything he asks you", "whatever he asks you" — "please give it to him") is very typical in letters of recommendation. As documentary examples may be cited CEL 83 (P. Berlin 11649), 4-6 *qui si qu[i]d eguerit auxili tui rogo in meum hoṇorem adiuues eum* and CEL 81 (P. Ryl. 608), 8-11 *cui quidquid ad dignitatem eius perṭ[i]nens praestiteris non disṣi[mulo] mihi gratissimum futurụ[m]*.

This interpretation leaves the problem of *quod* instead of *quid* to be explained. It would be the earliest certain case of *quod* for *quid*. Löfstedt is of the opinion that this phenomenon (*quod* for *quid*) belongs to late Latin since there are no early examples of it.[15] However, there seems to be an example of *quod* for *quid* in the letter CEL 10 (suggested date Augustan):

> (5) *qui de tam pusilla summa tam magnum lucrum facit dominum occidere uolt deinde ego clamare debeo si quod uideo deuom atque hominum [[fidem si tu ista non cuibis]] tuum erit uindicare ne alio libeat facere* (CEL 10,7-9)[16]
> "He who makes so great a profit from so trifling a sum is willing to kill his master. Then I ought to cry out for the *fides* of gods and men, if I see something. You will have to exact punishment so that another person will not want to do it."

Here, *si quod* is used where the standard expression would have been *si quid*. There is no noun to which *quod* here could refer. Because *si quod* for *si quid* is thus attested securely for the Augustan period, considerably earlier than the Vindolanda text and also in a letter, there is no problem in interpreting the text in tab. Vindol. II 250 as I have suggested

---

and two instances of *rogo* + imperative, where the meaning is inherently that of requesting. In addition there is one instance of *rogare ut* and one of *rogamus ... ignoscas* which have the meaning 'to request' as well. Also, CEL 177, 3 with different tense: *et prase(n)s te domine frater rogaueram coram Ammonium orthographum leg(ionis) n(ostrae) orthographum amicum n(ostrum) karissi[mum*.

[15] Löfstedt 1933, 81 n. 2.

above. In view of the general confusion regarding indefinite forms (cf. the comment of Bowman and Thomas above), the use of *quod* for *quid* even at this early date is not surprising. CEL 10 is written to a slave, and the writer is probably a slave, too, but, generally speaking the letter presents a relatively standard form of Latin. The Vindolanda letter is probably written by a fellow-prefect of Cerialis.[17] There is thus some evidence that the confusion was spreading already at the turn of the 1st and 2nd centuries AD.

In his two articles (1995a and 2003c) on the Vindolanda texts, Adams has called attention to various phenomena that have been attested in the tablets considerably before the next attestation. I think that *quod* for *quid* in tab. Vindol. II 310 and CEL 10 should be added to those cases (unless, of course, they are both considered to be simply scribal errors).

Finally, it may be added that OLD cites another passage from Celsus (7,7,5)[18] of *quod* used in the place of *quid*.

5.5. Confusion in personal reference inside indirect speech

The following passage from a fragmentary letter of Claudius Terentianus is interesting in its illogical use of the 2nd person pronoun:

> (6) *dico illei et ego, nolim [pe]ṭere illas sed posso tibi epistula scribere ẹṭ mittet tibi si imuenerit* (P. Mich. VIII 469, 14)
> "I say to her, I should not like to go looking for them, but I can write a letter for you and he will send them to you if he finds them"

Here Terentianus reports to Tiberianus what he has answered to his mother (*illei*). Inside this indirect expression there is a reference to Tiberianus. Since Tiberianus is the addressee of the letter and normally referred to in the 2nd person, Terentianus erroneously keeps to that practice here as well. After that, however, he continues correctly, Tiberianus in the 3rd person being the subject of *mittet* and *imuenerit*, and *tibi* referring to Terentianus' mother. Although the letter is fragmentary, it is clear from what remains that

---

[16] The writer cancelled *fidem si tu ista non cuibis*, the word *fidem* erroneously, as it is an integral part of the preceding phrase. He then added *siquod uideo* in smaller script at the end of line (Brown 1970, 138).
[17] See Bowman / Thomas ad loc.
[18] Cels. 7,7,5 (*tuberculum*) *circumcidi debet, hic quoque diligenter temperata manu, ne quod ex ipso angulo abscidat*.

Terentianus' mother is the person who wants certain things to be bought and sent to her.[19] This example hints at the difficulties raised by indirect expression when the addressee of the letter should suddenly be referred to in the 3rd instead of the 2nd person.

In this connection we may note an inscription (Germania Superior, probably 4th century) that Koch (1995, 134) gives as an example of syntactic incoherence typical of orality:

> (7) *hoc tetolo fecet Montana / conlux (i.e. coniux) sua Mauricio qui ui / sit con elo anus dodece et / portauit annus qarranta / trasit die viii kl iunias* (CIL XIII 7645)[20]
> "This tombstone was erected by Montana for her husband Mauricius who (i.e. Montana) lived with him twelve years and he reached the age of forty and died on the 26th of May"[21]

Koch notes the following referential incoherences: 1) *sua* refers to *Mauricio* and is thus cataphoric, 2) *qui* refers to *coniux* and not to the immediately preceding *Mauricio*, 3) *qui* is the subject of *uisit* but in what follows we have to take *Mauricio* as the subject of *portauit* and *trasit* because it is he who has died and been buried.[22] Obviously it was difficult for the writer to express clearly the subject of sequential clauses when it changes (or is simply unimportant because it would be evident in any case).[23]

I would consider such incoherences as examples of the difficulties posed by the written register rather than as examples of actual spoken syntax, or "incohérences syntaxiques typiques de l'oral" (Koch 1995, 134), even in cases like this where the contemporary pronunciation is reflected in orthography.[24] In the Terentianus example, the difficulty was caused by indirect expression.

---

[19] Cugusi comm. ad loc. "se l'interpretazione è corretta, nella frase in discorso diretto il primo *tibi* (l. 15) vale *tuo nomine* ('scrivere a tuo nome'), il secondo (l. 16) vale 'a te' (scil. alla *mater* di Terenziano, cui Terenziano si sta ora rivolgendo)". Pighi (1964, 61) offers a different interpretation which is essentially the same as mine: "Lo scrivente sovrappone due discorsi diretti: *posso patri et mittet tibi*, e *dico me posse tibi*".
[20] Also ILCV 2917 and AE 1997, 1195.
[21] My translation.
[22] This interpretation of this text is offered also in Kramer 1997, but it is not the only possible one. If *elo* is regarded as a lapsus for *ela*, there is no change of subject.
[23] Note that *et* may be serve here as an indication that the subject changes; cf. the discourse functions of *et* discussed in 4.2.1.
[24] On this see Kramer 1997

Perhaps not totally unrelated is the confusion in the letter of Chrauttius. He seems to have had difficulties when asking the addressee, Veldeius, to ask a third person, Virilis, to send him (Chrauttius) an axe. I think we should understand Chrauttius as changing his addressee already in *mittas* because in the next sentence Chrauttius addresses Virilis directly: *et rogo te frater Virilis*. This change of the addressee may have a parallel in a Greek letter of Claudius Terentianus although here it does not lead to incoherence in syntax. The letter is addressed to his sister Tasoukharion but suddenly a third person, their father, is addressed in the second person:

> (8) ἀσπ[αρά]γου πέμψαι νέ̣ο̣[ν] [....]ιν διὰ Μέλανος, ὅτι ἐρωτῶμεν σε, πατήρ, πέμψ[ο]ν̣ [....ι]ν [ἕν] (P. Mich. VIII, 481, 33)
> "…to send a fresh bundle (?) of asparagus by Melas, since we ask it of you, father, send one bundle(?)"

Together the letter of Chrauttius and ex. (8) indicate that it may have been difficult for these writers to express requests to a third person through the addressee of the letter.[25] This is connected with the difficulties posed by indirect expression.

5.6. Uses of the accusative

Traditionally, the nominative has been thought to be the most neutral or unmarked caseform in Latin, e.g., in cases where a thematic constituent in the nominative is placed before the actual predication (see examples (17) and (18) below).[26] This is true at least of standard literary Latin. However, the potential for the later development of the accusative can probably be seen in its use in exclamations, from earliest Latin onwards. The relative status in this respect of the accusative and the nominative changed in the course of time but, even synchronically, it may have been different in different registers. The letters under study offer some evidence concerning the spread of the accusative. The range of

[25] The letters may have been read aloud so that other people apart from the addressee could hear the contents as well and this, too, could have contributed to the confusion. Cf. also O. Claud. II 239 where one of the two addressees is explicitly named as the one to whom the requests in the 2nd person singular are directed (πέμψον μοι διὰ τοῦ ἀναδίδοντος σοι τὴν ἐπιστολήν. Ὡρίωνι ταῦτα λέγω).
[26] E.g., Bolkestein 1981, 65.

usages is indicative of its development as a neutral case (and towards the universal case).[27]

The default value of the accusative is apparent in constructions like (9). The text is a receipt (probably in letter form), from a *volumen epistularum acceptarum*. This document also shows other substandard features:[28]

(9) *interueniente Minucium Plotianum triarchum et Apuleium Nepotem scriba(m)* (CEL 156, 10)
"Intervening Minucius Plotianus, a trierarch, and Apuleius Nepos, a scribe"[29]

In this absolute construction only the first constituent (*interueniente*) is in the correct case and after that, the names of the persons and their titles are in the accusative.[30] In addition, *interueniente* is in the singular although it refers to two persons. Galdi (2004, 449) gives examples of similar constructions from the inscriptions of the eastern provinces:

(10) *cura agente Ulpium Ulpianu mag* (ISM I 351, Moesia Inf., II saec.)
(11) *curante Aur[…]o Menetem libertum eorum* (CIL III 3534, Pannonia Inf.)
(12) *adiutantibus nepotes suos, filies filios Gregorio et Laurentio fratres* (RIU 889, Pannonia Sup.)

Absolute constructions caused more and more uncertainty as the case system was experiencing profound changes. In late Latin, the expansion in the uses of the accusative in spoken language gave rise to the accusative absolute, which itself is a literary construction with characteristic expressive properties.[31] In the later period, when both accusative and absolute constructions were in use, there arose also so-called "mixed constructions". In these, it was nearly always the nominal component that was in the accusative and the participial one that was in the ablative.[32] But, as Adams (2003a, 612)

[27] The use of the accusative in lists may be related to this, although there some kind of an elliptical verb can usually be envisaged (cf. Adams 1995a, 114-116).
[28] See Adams 2003a, 612-613 for a discussion of this text.
[29] My translation.
[30] In principle it is of course possible that *interueniente* is also an accusative, but that is unlikely.
[31] Helttula 1987, 68-75. For a more recent study on absolute accusatives (in Pelagonius), see Gitton 2003. There is an instance of what looks like an absolute accusative (*lapides adtractos*) in the verse inscription by Iasucthan from Bu Njem (see Adams 1999, 122-123)
[32] Helttula 1987, 64-65. There are a number of unquestionable cases (in the plural) with the present participle in Gregory of Tours, e.g. *carcerarius (= carcerarios) adclamantibus*, with the ending *-ntibus* phonetically clearly distinct (see Helttula 1987, 77).

points out, example (9) probably has little to do with those late constructions. More likely, it shows an appositional use of the accusative. As it was on its way towards the universal case, the accusative could be connected with another constituent in the ablative.

I see as essential the fact that absolute constructions were not common in actual spoken conversation. People needed them mainly when they were composing a written text of a more formal nature. Usually there must have been some kind of a model, either in their mind or possibly read aloud (or even written down). In these expressions, the first component in the ablative serves as a marker, implying "what follows will be an absolute construction". The necessary morphosyntactic information of the ablative absolute is contained in the first component. In what follows, the persons who took part in the action expressed by the participle are simply enumerated. The accusative was probably felt to be a suitable, neutral case for constituents that clearly could not be put in the nominative. There is possibly further proof that the writer of this document used the accusative in a variety of functions: (a locative expression) *actum Puluinos* (CEL 156,11).[33] All this is well in accordance with the fact that the text is associated with the navy, where the level of Latin learning was lower than in other military units. Greek was probably the native language of many, including the writer of this receipt.[34] However, since such a Greek speaker would have learnt Latin in its spoken form,[35] the failure to produce standard language here may possibly be taken as indicative of genuine Latin usage.

I am tempted to connect the incongruous use (referring to the subject of the clause) of the accusative in (13) with the general trend of using the accusative in an increasing variety of functions:

> (13) *ṇe tiḅ[i] pareaṃ a spe ạṃạṛ[a] paṛpa[tum] ẏagari quasi fugitiuom* (P. Mich. VIII 467, 17)
> "… lest I seem to you to wander like a fugitive, lured on by a bitter hope"

I think that because the adjective *fugitiuom* is separated by so many words from the predicate, Terentianus used the accusative because he no longer could connect *fugitiuom*

[33] The same expression also in CEL 157, right margin. This form is probably an accusative, see also Adams 2003a, 611-612.
[34] Adams 2003a, 611.
[35] Adams 2003a, 629 and 632.

with the subject of *paream* and, therefore, chose the accusative as the default (or neutral) case. This example has been defined as a contamination between personal and impersonal constructions.[36] Contaminations undoubtedly played a part in creating such constructions. Still, the changes in the case system and the increasing use of the accusative probably made this type of contaminations possible in the first place.

The next passage from Claudius Terentianus also has an absolute construction of a kind. In his letter 468 Terentianus relates to his father that he had bought a mattress and a pillow but that they were stolen from him when he was lying ill on the ship. The scribe who wrote this letter was notoriously uncertain about the placing of the final nasals:[37]

(14) *et me iacentem in liburna sublata ṃi s[unt]* (P. Mich. VIII 468, 13)[38]
"While I was lying ill on the ship they were stolen from me"

Adams (1977, 59-61) has argued that *me iacentem* is not likely to be an ablative absolute as there is only one ablative absolute in the Terentianus correspondence, in the letter of his father, Claudius Tiberianus (*occasione inuenta*, a standard phrase). Therefore, Adams regards this case as an anacoluthon and comments "Terentianus had a vague conception of himself as the patient of a verbal action (e.g., *me iacentem aliquis priuauit culcita et pulbino*), but he lapsed into the passive because the author of the action was unknown" (1977, 60). Undoubtedly this is the most probable explanation. Since, however, *me iacentem* resembles ablative absolutes in corresponding semantically to a temporal subordinate clause, I would not rule out the possibility of an ablative absolute merely on the grounds that it is not found elsewhere in the letters by Terentianus.[39] This example could on formal grounds be connected also with thematic accusatives (see ch. 5.7 below) although *me iacentem* is not actually thematic, but rather the pillow and the mattress are (they are those constituents about which the predication predicates something).

[36] Adams 1977, 63 and 2005a, 202.
[37] See Halla-aho 2003, 248.
[38] Note the version *sublatum mi est* in another copy of this letter, Rodgers 1970.
[39] The ablative absolute is infrequent in the non-literary letters in general. The following are found: *occasione inuenta spero me celerius aput te uenturum* (P. Mich. VIII 472, 9-11), *etiamsi albescente caelo*

5.7. Thematic constituents

In this section I shall focus on a number of instances where a predication begins with a thematic constituent[40] that is more or less loosely connected with the rest of the predication. These kinds of constituents illustrate the pragmatic organization, i.e., the way in which the speaker organizes the ideas he is going to present.

Usually some element is chosen as the point of departure, the topic or theme about which something is going to be predicated. In the tradition of the Prague School, this element has been called the *theme* while the element that contains the central information of the predication is the *rheme*.[41] Pragmatic organization is naturally closely connected with the information structure, i.e., what is presented by the speaker as being recoverable (given) or not recoverable from the verbal or non-verbal context (new) for the speaker. There need not be a connection between pragmatic organization and the information structure (theme and givenness vs. rheme and new information) although usually the speaker will present as the theme an element already referred to or otherwise recoverable from the context.[42] The concept of theme or topic (the latter term is also used), particularly regarding its relationship with givenness, has been defined in various ways.[43] The pragmatic organization of a sentence will be further discussed in chapter 6 on word order.

In Latin studies the definition of S. Dik has been influential because recent studies on Latin thematic constructions have been based on Dik's Functional Grammar[44], formulated for Latin in Pinkster (1990). Dik makes a difference between Topics (corresponding to themes above) and Themes that do not form a part of the actual predication, but precede it as rather independent elements. Pinkster (1990, 37) has defined a Theme as follows: "By a constituent with the pragmatic function Theme we

---

exire uoluero (tab. Vindon. 46, 3-4), *G]ratţio Ćrispino redeunte* (tab. Vindol. II 225,2), *et indico tibi diis uolentibus aquam creuisse ydreuma* (O. Claud. I 2, 4).

[40] I shall use the term thematic constituent when referring to the various types of sentence initial constructions discussed in this chapter. The term Theme constituent will be used only in those cases when reference is made to Functional Grammar.

[41] For a short overview of Functional Sentence Perspecive, see Panhuis 1982, 7-17, esp. 9-10 on the concepts theme and rheme.

[42] Halliday 1994, 296-298. See Hoffmann (1989, 194-195) for one taxonomy of given—new information.

[43] For a compact and critical summary of the topic discussion, see Gundel / Fretheim 2004, 176-181.

[44] Originally Functional Grammar 1978; revised in 1997 as The Theory of Functional Grammar 1-2, edited by Kees Hengeveld.

understand a constituent which does not form part of the predication, but precedes it and creates, as it were, a kind of framework within which the predication is to be interpreted." According to Dik, a Theme is usually in an 'absolute' form which is usually the nominative. Alternatively, it may anticipate the syntactic role it is going to have in the following predication.[45] Also explicit Theme-forms may occur ('as for' in English, *de* + abl. in Latin)[46]. If the Theme is coreferent to a constituent in the predication, it will often be referred to with a pronominal element inside the predication.[47] The degree of the grammaticalization of Theme constituents varies across languages: in some languages they may be regarded as a substandard feature, in others they may be part of the standard grammatical apparatus.[48] The point in bringing up the theoretical side of this issue is, first of all, to recognize the pragmatic motivation for these types of structures, and secondly, that it reminds one of the fact that this is not a phenomenon peculiar to Latin.

Studies on vulgar and late Latin have given some attention to 'constructionless' cases, mostly nominatives, which appear at the beginning of sentences. In his 1926 article on the so-called *nominativus pendens*, Havers collected examples of isolated-emphatic nominatives that were used independently before the actual predication. He concluded that this use of the nominative was a feature of the spoken language and, unlike similar constructions in Greek, it never became quite accepted in the literary standard (but see below). It was used especially in early Latin, because at that time the standard written language had not yet been established. According to Havers (1926, 210), the nominative is a natural choice in a function of this kind, due to its status as a 'neutral' or 'relationsless' case. An example[49] is

(15) *olea quae diu fuerit in terra aut in tabulato, inde olei minus fiet et deterius* (Cato *agr*. 64,2)

[45] Dik 1997 2, 391-393.
[46] Cf. also the phraseological use of *de reliquo* in CEL 3 (ll. 4 and 7).
[47] Dik 1997 2, 393-395.
[48] See Dik 1997 2, 390. This type of organization is very common in e.g. modern Greek and French.
[49] The label 'unconstrued nominative' applies here as a synchronic analysis. The history of this type might be in the Indo-European 'high-style' bipartite relative clause (sc. *quae olea diu fuerit …, ea olea olei minus*) in which the antecedent appears both in the preposed relative clause and in the following matrix sentence; see Watkins 1995, 541. Watkins also derives the construction known as *attractio inversa*, from this relative clause type, see Watkins 1995, 541 n. 2 and Adams / Lapidge / Reinhardt 2005, 18-19 and n. 24.

"Olives that have been long on the ground or the floor, these will yield less oil and of a poorer quality."

After the study of Havers, Svennung (1935, 178-188) offered a comprehensive account of 'constructionless' cases.[50] He also deals in more detail with those occasions where the isolated constituent is in some case other than the nominative, most importantly the accusative. Most of the early examples of unconstrued accusatives are easy to explain as attractions to the case of the resumptive pronoun in the predication proper, so, for example in

(16) *eam pellem et far et salem et serpullum, haec omnia una conterito cum uino* (Cato *agr*. 73)
"This skin and wheat and salt and thyme, crush them all together with wine"

This construction is identical to the so-called recipe accusative known from medical Latin (see further discussion below).

Already Havers had pointed out the close relationship between 'isolated-emphatic' nominatives and 'thematic' nominatives.[51] More recent studies on this point have been carried out by scholars working with the theory of Functional Grammar.[52] By way of pragmatic analysis it has been possible to establish a relationship between hanging nominatives and prepositional phrases introduced by *de*.[53] Both of these were, in fact, approved expressions even in literary Latin.[54]

As examples of thematic nominatives from literary texts the following may be cited:

(17) *sed urbana plebes, ea uero praeceps erat* (Sall. *Cat*. 37,4)[55]
"But the city-crowd, that was really eager"

(18) *ceterae ... disciplinae ... , eas nihil adiuuare arbitror* (Cic. *Fin*. 3,11)[56]
"the other disciplines, I believe that they will be of no help"

[50] See also Hofmann 1951, 103-105; Norberg 1943, 79-86 and Hofmann / Szantyr 1965, 29.
[51] See Havers 1926, 212-214 and 228.
[52] See Hoffmann 1989, Pinkster 1990, Somers 1994, as well as Bolkestein 1981. See also Álvarez Huerta 2005 on *accusativus pendens* in Latin.
[53] On *de* + abl. as a topic marker see Molinelli 1999.
[54] They could be analysed as Theme constituents in the framework of Functional Grammar.
[55] From Bolkestein 1981, 60.
[56] From Bolkestein 1981, 67.

More recently there has been some enlightening discussion on this phenomenon in the volume *Aspects of the language of Latin prose* (esp. the introduction by Adams / Lapidge / Reinhardt 2005 and Adams 2005b on the *Bellum Africum*). The most important aspect emerging from these articles is that these structures obviously were accepted expressions in literary prose, too, although used to varying degrees by different authors (and even by the same author in different genres) — it is a matter of choice and style, of the preferences of individual writers, and not about inadequate formulation.[57]

5.7.1. Thematic constituents in the letters

In the following pages I shall discuss different kinds of sentence initial thematic constituents that appear in the non-literary letters. Relevant examples from other Latin texts will also be cited. Special attention will be given to the degree and manner of linking between the thematic constituent and the predication proper, as well as to the accusative introducing thematic elements in non-literary Latin. The observations to be made contribute to our understanding of the pragmatic organization of the Latin predication as well as to the informational status of the thematic constituents.

I shall start with an example where the sentence begins with a topical constituent.[58] The prominence of this patterning in the non-literary material, as I see it, is related to two factors: 1) the letters as a genre where several issues can be referred to in the course of a relatively short text,[59] and 2) the linguistic restrictions of the non-literary writers as regards the use of other devices (such as *de* + abl. or *quod*-clauses). The tendency to begin the sentences with a topical constituent will be discussed and exemplified further in chapter 6 on word order. Here I will just draw attention to two cases that markedly show this tendency:

[57] Adams 2005b, 92-93 and Adams / Lapidge / Reinhardt 2005, 17-18.

[58] I shall use the term 'topic' (and topical) to refer to the entity 'about' which the sentence can be said to be, see 6.4.1. The term "thematic constituent/element" refers to those cases where a more or less separate unit is discernible before the predication proper.

[59] Also worth considering is the fact that letters often have a context that has been established in earlier correspondence between the two parties and often the mere mention of a key element of the context is sufficient to reestablish the entire context without having to repeat things that have been said previously. Thus "with regard to …" or "concerning …" or "in re …" resumes a conversation *in medias res*. A great deal of "givenness" can be recovered with a small amount of thematic constituent.

(19) *coria que scribis esse Cataractonio scribe dentur mi* (tab. Vindol. II 343,15-17)
"The hides which you write are at Cataractonium — write that they be given to me"

As the editors imply by their translation, *coria que scribis esse Cataractonio*, being heavy and long, is not a typical constituent in the beginning of the predication, even if syntactically nothing, of course, impedes taking it as the subject of *dentur*. This possibility of a double analysis results from the fact that in Latin the resumptive pronoun may well be left out in the subject position.[60] Examples like (19) illustrate well this continuum from sentence initial topics to thematic constituents, which are separated from topics in not having a syntactic relationship to the following predication. Similarly in the following example

(20) *scaṇdeḷlas centum quas habeo penes Roṃaṇium si ṭibi opus non sunt ṗerporta obiter ṵbe carra tua sṵbịnde ueniunt* (tab. Vindol. III 642, ii, 3-5)
"As to the one hundred shingles which I have at Romanius', if you have no need of them, transport them *en route* when your wagons come from time to time"

scandellas can of course be taken as the object or *perporta*, although it is at some distance (also the intervening *si tibi opus non sunt* requires *scandellas* in the nominative as its subject). On the other hand, this example resembles constructions known as *attractio inversa*, a structure where the head of the relative clause is attracted to the case of the relative pronoun, instead of being in the case of the main clause, such as *Naucratem quem conuenire uolui in naui non erat* (Plaut. *Amph*. 1009). It occurs rather frequently in early Latin (mainly Plautus and Cato). This type of structure (noun + relative clause) is itself a typical way of expressing the topic of the following predication, and therefore *attractio inversa* can easily be associated with other ways of introducing a thematic constituent.[61]

[60] In the terminology of Functional Grammar: "The difference between Theme and Fronted Topic, therefore, is not a binary one, but is one of shades" (Somers 1994, 158). See further Dik 1997 2, 395.
[61] On *attractio inversa*, see Adams / Lapidge / Reinhardt 2005, 18-19 "… because such constructions represent an identifiable, and possibly rather stylized, transitional stage in the development of the relative sentence", stressing the origins of this construction in preposed PIE relative clauses. On the archaic character of *attractio inversa*, see Penney 1999, 251-252. For an interesting epigraphical example, see Rodger 2000.

I shall now move on to those cases where the initial constituent is independent, i.e. 'hanging'. Example (21), from a letter of Terentianus, contains a thematic constituent which appears to be in the nominative but, in fact, is more likely to be an accusative[62]:

(21) ea [sc. dolabra] *q[u]am mi misisti optionem illan mi ab[s]tulisse sed gratias illi ag[o..]..* (P. Mich. VIII 468, 27-29)[63]
"(Know that) the adjutant took from me the one (a pickaxe) that you sent me, but I am grateful to him…"

The thematic constituent is an anaphoric pronoun and it is referred to with a resumptive pronoun inside the predication (*illan*).

In the following examples the unconstrued constituent is definitely in the accusative. In most cases, they anticipate their syntactic role as the object of the following predication. The first example is from the letter of Chrauttius from Vindolanda:

(22) *et Virilem ueterinarium rogabis illum ut forficem quam mihi promisṣit pretio mittas per aliquem de nostris* (tab. Vindol. II 310, 10-14)[64]
"Virilis, the veterinary doctor, ask him (to send?) and then send me (?) through one of our friends the pair of shears which he promised me in exchange for money."

Virilem uetarinarium is in the accusative and anticipates its role as the object of *rogabis* in the following predication. It has been placed before the actual predication and is then taken up with a resumptive pronoun *illum* in the object's proper place.

This type of organization is often used by Cato and the following can be cited as examples:

(23) *columellam ferream quae in miliario stat eam rectam stare oportet in medio ad perpendiculum* (Cato *agr*. 20,1)
"The central pivot of iron which stands in the mill, it should stand straight in the middle perpendicularly"

(24) *amicos domini eos habeat sibi amicos* (Cato *agr*. 5,3)

[62] It is likely that *ea* represents the accusative, because the scribe of this letter had difficulties in placing the final nasals correctly.
[63] A predicate such as *scias* should be understood, Adams 1977, 62.
[64] Here I have punctuated and translated differently from the editors. In tab. Vindol. II 310, 10-11 *et Virilem ueterinarium* can well be another object of *salutabis* as an afterthought (so the editors: "and greet him from me in my words and Virilis the veterinary doctor", although in the note to line 17 they see *Velbutenam* as a similar case to the accusatives on lines 8 and 10, which would imply an interpretation similar to mine).

"The friends of the master, he should have them as his own friends"

(25) *illos qui dant eos derides* (Plaut. *Asin*. 527)
"Those who give, you shall mock them"

In these cases, too, the thematic constituent anticipates its syntactic function and is referred to with a resumptive pronoun in the predication proper. I am tempted to see in these examples a potential candidate for a genuine feature of spoken Latin.

The next two examples are from the same letter as (22):

(26) *et rogo te Veldei frater miror quod mihi tot tempus nihil rescripsti a parentibus nostris si quid audieris aut Quot m in quo numero sit et illum a me salutabis uerbis meis* (tab. Vindol. II 310, 5-10)
"And I ask you, brother Veldeius — I am surprised that you have written nothing back to me for such a long time — whether you have heard anything from our elders, or about Q. in which unit he is."

(27) *Velbutenam rescribas nobis cum[...] se habeat* (tab. Vindol. II 310, 17-19)
"Write back to us how Velbutena is (?)."

According to Adams, the word *Quot m*, which is probably a personal name, "… perhaps serves to introduce a new subject, which might instead have been in the nominative in the following quotation". He continues: "Sometimes an unconstrued nominative or accusative acts as a sort of heading … though usually such an accusative can be explained as due to ellipse, attraction, conflation or the like" (Adams 1995a, 116-117). Adams also sees a possibility of interpreting the second instance, Velbutenam, in the same way and suggests a translation "And as for Velbuteius (= Velbutena)". In the *editio princeps* the editors likewise noted that *Quot m* is possibly an "isolated" accusative.[65]

Thus, (26) and (27) would seem to be clear examples of thematic accusatives. However, as they are subjects in the following predication, there is no resumptive pronoun in what follows (except when Q. is the object of *salutabis*).

On the other hand, examples (26) and (27) are formally identical to those syntactic constructions that have traditionally been called proleptic accusatives, and they

[65] Bowman / Thomas / Adams 1990, 38.

are, in fact, identified as such by Cugusi.[66] Prolepsis mainly appears with predicates designating speech, thought and perception.[67] An example is (28):

(28) *me pernosti … qualis sim* (Ter. *Andr*. 503)
"You know me … how I am"

Prolepsis is used predominantly in archaic and colloquial Latin (see below), and therefore it would not be impossible to classify (26) and (27) above as proleptic accusatives. However, I argue that they should be associated rather with thematic constituents because 1) the verbs, especially *rescribere*, are not among those which usually govern proleptic accusatives, and 2) the generally incoherent syntax in (26) favours an identification as a thematic constituent. Finally, as *Virilem ueterinarium* in (22) from the same letter is a thematic constituent, it is probably best to regard (26) and (27) as similar cases. See, however, below 5.7.2 for further discussion on proleptic accusatives.

In the following the motivation for the use of the accusative is more difficult to determine:

(29) *eosdem camellos iube adaquentur et r[eue]niant* (M1107, 6-8)[68]
"Also command that the said camels be given water…"

The initial constituent, *eosdem camellos,* should, according to classical syntax, be in the nominative. However, the verb *iubere* often had accusatives next to it, usually expressing the person for whom the order was intended (both with finite and non-finite complements). This probably is the reason for the accusative here, although the camels, naturally, would be objects of *adaquo* (and, accordingly, subjects of *adaquentur*, as they are subjects of *r[eue]niant*). The camels cannot be objects of *iubere*, which they normally would be in this position, since the verb is finite and *iubere* thus is used with a finite complement, *iube (ut) adaquentur*. This construction might also be explained as a contamination between the infinitive (*iube camellos adaquari*) and the finite complement (*iube (ut) camelli adaquentur*). This example is notable because those Latin ostraca that

[66] CEL Appendix ad tab. Vindol. pertinens η.
[67] Also wishing, causation and being afraid, see Bolkestein 1981, 75.
[68] A standard construction with *iube* + acc. + passive infinitive can be found in CEL 140, 4-6 *tirones sẹxs probatos a mẹ iṇ coh(orte) cui praees in numeros referri iube*.

so far have been published from Mons Claudianus (or elsewhere from the Eastern Desert), usually contain remarkably correct Latin.

The last passage to be discussed comes from Bu Njem. At Bu Njem, more than elsewhere, we have to take into account the possibility that the writers were not native speakers of Latin. Some of them certainly were not, and the writer of (30) should probably be included in this group:[69]

> (30) *un asinu cuis nobis atulisti Barlas decimu cal(endas) emit asinu* (CEL 216, 4-7 =O. Bu Njem 99)
> "A donkey that you brought us, Barlas bought the donkey on the 10th day before the Kalends"[70]

The writer begins by mentioning the donkey which the recipient has brought to him earlier. After this he states that a certain Barlas has bought this particular donkey. The form *asinu* is likely to be an accusative also at the beginning of the sentence because it is similar in form to the second instance, which definitely is in the accusative, being the object of *emit*. Moreover, the dropping of final *m* from *unum asinum* is easier to explain at this date than the dropping of *s* would be from *unus asinus*. The final *u* of *unu* was also dropped before *a* at the beginning of the next word, *asinu*.[71] It is noteworthy that here the resumptive element is not a pronoun but instead repeats the noun *asinu*.[72] In light of this difference, it is possible to see in this expression further evidence for non-native Latin in Bu Njem.

It may be of some interest to look briefly at the informational status of the thematic constituents, i.e., how the thematic entity relates to the preceding verbal or surrounding non-verbal context. There are two cases of textually evoked thematic constituents, (21) and (29), where the axe and the camels have been mentioned in the previous sentence. In (19) and (30) the entity (*coria* and *un asinu*, respectively) may be said to be in the consciousness of the addressee but they have to be reactivated and are therefore further specified by a relative clause. The same is true of (20). In (22), (26) and

[69] See Adams 1994 and 2003a, 100 and 236 for the language of these letters, e.g., on the use of nominative as an uninflected base-form, like *cuis* in (30).
[70] My translation.
[71] Marichal 1992, 207.
[72] See the discussion in Adams 1994c, 97.

(27) the names of the various persons undoubtedly were recoverable to the addressee from the non-verbal context.

Accordingly, we may conclude that the writers of the non-literary letters often used thematic constituents as a device for introducing new topics, bringing into the addressee's knowledge an entity about which the following predication was to be. Hoffmann (1989, 193 and 195) makes a similar observation regarding Cicero' letters. Therefore, a temptation arises to connect this tendency with the text of letter writing. In letters, thematic constituents were usually not 'given' in the sense that they would have been mentioned in the previous discourse. This is easy to understand; in letters various different topics had to be dealt with consecutively and the writers needed suitable tools for changing the topic. The formal means to introduce the next topic are different in Cicero and the non-literary material. Cicero favours *quod* clauses and prepositional phrases with *de*. The non-literary writers use other methods, simply placing the thematic constituent in sentence-initial position with or without a resumptive pronoun in the following predication (see also 6.4.2 on object placement).

A note on the so-called recipe accusatives may be added.[73] In predications like (the example is from the medical writer Marcellus, early 5th century)

> (31) *Herbam, quae Gallice dicitur blutthagio, nascitur locis umidis, eam teres* (Marcell. 9,132)
> "The herb which is called *blutthagio* in Celtic, grows in humid places, tear it."

the constituent, which on purely syntactic grounds resembles thematic constituents, is quite different in its informational status. What is conveyed in this initial part is, in fact, totally new information. As was noted above, different approaches have defined differently the relationship between the theme and givenness. In Dik's formulation, theme was disassociated from givenness: a Theme constituent is simply something about which the predication predicates something. This may be said to be true even of examples like (31). If we want to associate recipe accusatives with thematic constituents, the difference in informational content could be seen as a genre difference: in medical texts, thematic elements can contain brand new information and be used as an introducing, rather than

[73] See e.g. Svennung 1935, 186-187.

reactivating device. The nature and subject matter of medical texts is such as to favour thematic constituents in the accusative. This together with the fact that medical texts are mostly late, creates a natural context for the frequent use of such structures.

Although there is a difference in information structure, it is interesting to note that on strictly syntactic grounds recipe accusatives can be connected with thematic constituents. The examples from Cato, (23) and (24), fit together well with recipe accusatives as in both types the thematic element contains information which has not been referred to previously.

5.7.2. Excursus: proleptic accusatives

As noted above, examples (26) and (27) from the letter of Chrauttius from Vindolanda raise a question concerning the relationship between thematic constituents in the accusative case and the so-called proleptic accusatives. Both contain an unconstrued accusative at the beginning of the predication.

Proleptic accusatives are frequent in earlier Latin literature, especially in Plautus, but also in Cato and Terence and later in Varro.[74] The verbs that usually govern proleptic accusatives are *scire*, *nosse*, *uidere* and above all, *facere*. Cicero uses the construction mainly in his letters. In late Latin, prolepsis is again used more freely by archaists and the so-called colloquial writers, most importantly by the fourth-century writer Chiron.[75] Accordingly, prolepsis has been seen as a feature of archaic and colloquial Latin.[76]

The following passage from Cato illustrates the close relationship between thematic constituents and proleptic accusatives:

> (32) *sub urbe hortum omne genus, coronamenta omne genus, bulbos megaricos, murtum coniugulum et album et nigrum, loream delphicam et cypriam et siluaticam, nuces caluas, abellanas, praenestinas, graecas, haec facito uti serantur* (Cato *agr*. 8,2)[77]

[74] See Laughton 1960, 6 on prolepsis in Varro and Adams 2005b, 90 on the construction in the *Bellum Africum*.
[75] However, the late examples should be studied separately from the early ones.
[76] Hofmann 1951, 113-114 and Hofmann / Szantyr 1965, 471-472. See also Bennett 1914 , 222-224 and Norberg 1943, 260-261.
[77] It should be noted that prolepsis is not often used with passive verb forms in the subordinate clause.

"Near the city, all sorts of plants, all sorts of flowers for garlands, Megarian hyacinths … these you should have planted"

The predication begins with a long list of various plant names in the accusative which are then taken up with a resumptive pronoun *haec* before the main predicate *facito*. Accordingly we can classify this as a thematic constituent. In the next example, the list of items is much shorter and perhaps therefore they are not repeated with a pronoun:

(33) *uectes iligneos, acrufolios, laureos, ulneos facito uti sient parati* (Cato *agr*. 31,2)
"Levers made of holm-oak, of holly wood … take care that they are available"

This example could be classified as prolepsis. Due to the fact that predications in Cato's work often begin with the object in the accusative, he has once used the accusative even though there was no motivation for it, i.e., the constituent was not the object of the following predication (see below example (34)).

Usually proleptic accusatives are close to the beginning of the sentence and preceded only by constituents with no emphasis, at least in the early examples. Pragmatic conditioning is obviously relevant in this phenomenon: proleptic accusatives are often topical.[78]

* * *

Clearly the matter requires more research, which, however, is beyond the scope of the present work. In general, the question of unconstrued cases (whether nominative or accusative) in Latin is complex and the barriers between different types (thematic accusatives, *attractio inversa*, proleptic accusatives, absolute accusatives) are not clear-cut.[79]

5.7.3. On the historical development

A few words on the historical development may be added. The following is the only usually cited example of an unmotivated thematic accusative in earlier Latin literature:

[78] Cf. also Hofmann 1951, 114 on proleptic accusatives, "häufiger Umschreibung mit *de*". See Bolkestein 1981 for a theoretical analysis of proleptic accusatives.
[79] See Svennung 1935, 187-188.

(34) *habitationem delutare. terram quam maxime cretosam uel rubricosam, eo amurcam infundito, paleas indito* (Cato *agr*. 128)
"To clean the house. Earth with as much clay or red clay as possible, pour olive fluid in it and add husks"

In addition we may quote an inscription from Pompeii:

(35) *iudicis Aug(usti) felic(iter). Puteolos Antium Tegeano Pompeios, hae sunt uerae coloniae* (CIL IV 3525)
"Good fortune for the decision of the emperor! Puteoli, Antium, Tegianum, Pompeii, these are true colonies"

This is usually classified as an exclamatory accusative[80] but whatever we want to call it, it certainly exemplifies the similarity of exclamatory and thematic accusatives. In late Latin, with the breaking apart of the case system, constructions like (36) and (37) start to appear in the written register.[81]

(36) *de anguis percussu. Italiam frigidioresque regiones in his partibus angues inueniuntur, serpentes minus terribiles* (Oribas. *syn*. 3 add. Aa p. 918)[82]
"About snakebite. Italy and colder regions, in these parts there are snakes, less terrible serpents."

(37) *item aliut. sanguisugas ustas, cinus earum cum aceto teris* (Oribas. *eup*. 4,20 add. Aa p. 543)[83]
"Another cure for this. Burnt leeches, grind their ashes with vinegar"

where the accusative is clearly used as a 'neutral' or relationsless' case. This was a more or less regular usage and no additional explanations are needed. But at the time of Cato, the situation was quite different. The accusative was used when there was a motivation for it and (34) must be explained by the ellipsis of a verb.[84] It is also connected with the

[80] Väänänen 1966, 116-117.
[81] See Svennung 1935, 187.
[82] Both passages are from parts where the Latin text contains additions to the Greek original, and accordingly it is impossible to say anything about Greek sources for these constructions.
[83] … *et tangis ex eo loca ubi pili aduletri sunt. ipsi cadent et alii non renascuntur*.
[84] Svennung (1935, 186) "…wenn er (sc. Cato) 128 anfängt *terram* usw., verwendet er einen Kasus, der innerhalb ser Satzkonstruktion gewöhnlicherweise den Gegenstand der Verbalhandlung bezeichnet; der Akk. trat bei dem Sachsubst. *terram*, als wäre dies Objekt, am ehesten in das Bewusstsein ein."

most popular predicational structure in Cato's work where the predications often begin with a constituent (or constituents) in the accusative and the predicate follows afterwards. Therefore, we must conclude that a change took place between Cato and late Latin whereby the accusative finally, with a status of a neutral case, became a standard way to express thematic constituents as well. In the earlier examples we can see only the roots of the later developments, and in them there usually was some sort of verbal action in the writer's mind that produced the accusative. As far as the later examples are concerned, it is not always possible to envisage such verbs, as can be seen from (37).

* * *

To conclude, we can state that although the constructions vary to some degree, there is a tendency in the letters to introduce a predication with a thematic element. Different types of thematic constituents have different stylistic connotations, so that nominatives and those with *de* + abl. were part of the standard written language. Unconstrued case forms at the beginning of sentences are usually those constituents about which the following predication is going to predicate something, i.e., they are thematic. Although the way the literary and non-literary examples are produced cannot perhaps be equated, since the contexts and writers are so different, they are different manifestations of the same need to start the utterance with a topic, the entity which will be central in the following predication.

5.8. Conclusion

The reason for some syntactic incoherences in the letters is that the writer was not able to express his thoughts in writing. In other cases 'incoherences' may be structures that are found in Latin literary texts as well (the majority of the thematic constituents).

Although there are many separable uses of the accusative, I think it is of some importance to recognize that they all are related to the substantial changes in the linguistic system. Thematic constituents in the accusative anticipate the role in the predication proper. This situation changes towards late Latin, where, at least in technical texts, the accusative has clearly taken the place of the nominative as the absolute (neutral, default) case.

6. WORD ORDER

6.1. Introduction

The discussion of Latin word order at the clause level has been largely concerned with two major issues. One of these is the alleged change in the basic word order from (S)OV to (S)VO.[1] The other is that, alongside this broader historical perspective, attention has been given to the way word order is determined in individual texts, and the pragmatic factors involved in this.[2] That pragmatics is one of the most important principles at work in Latin word order is generally accepted, but how exactly it works and, especially, how it interacts with the syntactic function of each constituent, is still largely open to discussion.[3]

Although we do not know enough of Latin word order even in literary texts, all information springing from non-literary sources, especially less formal ones, will be a very welcome addition to the discussion and bound to offer new insights into the intricate mechanisms at work in Latin word order. This is even more true given the fact that, inasmuch as word order is not governed by syntactic factors alone, the register, genre, style, etc. in question will affect the way pragmatics works in each case. Hence, we would expect the non-literary data to furnish us with valuable information concerning word order. Regardless of how we evaluate literary phrasing or style as components in the Latin *Variationsraum* — and it certainly would be wrong to give the impression that the word order in Classical Latin is not real or somehow unnatural — looking at word order in texts that are relatively free from literary phrasing will be of major interest. It may be worth stressing here that 'relatively free from literary phrasing' does not refer to any kind of romantic conception of some true, unaffected form of the language (as opposed to the literary language); but merely that the absence, in the largest part of the letters, of literary pretensions, and, even more importantly, the relative simplicity of the

[1] Linde 1923, Koll 1965, Adams 1976, Bauer 1995, from a Romanistic viewpoint Wanner 1987, Ramsden 1963.
[2] Panhuis 1981, 1982, 1984; Bolkestein 1996; Pinkster 1991; de Jong 1989, 1994; Adams 1994a, 1994b.
[3] The most useful discussions in this respect are found in Pinkster 1990, 163-188 and Adams 1994a and 1994b. See also Bolkestein 1996 and de Jong 1994. A summary of many aspects of the discussion on Latin word order is in Wanner 1987, 377-392. See Dik 1995, 9 for a good definition of what pragmatics is about.

subject matter, might uncover certain strategies that are more difficult to spot, or even invisible, elsewhere.

6.2. The order of O and V, word order change and the typological perspective

As mentioned above, the discussion concerning Latin word order change has been largely centred on the alleged shift from a (S)OV type of language to a (S)VO type of language. Until the 1976 study of J.N. Adams it was usually thought that the growing amount of (S)VO order in the course from classical to late Latin was an indication of a typological change, whereby an original (S)OV order, supposedly inherited from Proto-Indo-European, changed towards the Romance order (S)VO.[4]

The way one is disposed to the existence of one basic word order has a bearing on what one sees changing on the way from Latin to Romance. If we start from a basic SOV order, the change is from a Latin SOV to a Romance SVO. On the other hand, if we prefer to think that Latin word order is best characterized as variable with statistical SOV dominance, the change is primarily that of decrease in possible variant orders and the fixation of the SVO order.[5] This is usually associated with the changes in nominal inflection and the disappearance of the accusative-nominative distinction which left it to word order to express this basic grammatical relationship.

Plautus is often thought to be the key witness here, showing that whatever the true nature of the change, it cannot be a linear SOV → SVO that we could track in the texts as it happened (which would be very unlikely to happen anyway).[6] But even in the classical period, the considerable differences in the practice of different authors show, first of all, that the genre had a decisive role in determining the degree to which OV was preferred and secondly, that there was also plenty of room for personal preferences (style).

---

[4] But there is no real consensus on the OV character of PIE, see literature cited in Pinkster 1990, 168 n. 10.

[5] Pinkster (1991, 80) reminds us that the Romance languages of course do not show an invariable (S)VO order, but register, pragmatics, etc. are influential (see also Wright 2002, 203-204). Still it may be maintained that the status of the basic word order is considerably clearer than in Latin, and that it is SVO; cf. Versteegh 1992, 266-267 criticizing Pinkster for the "nothing changes" approach.

[6] Regarding Plautus and Terence there is naturally the possible effect of metrical factors on word order. Adams (1976, 95-96) argues that the higher than usual incidence of the order V (pass.) + S is indicative of the same ordering principle as VO, and supports the view that metrical factors do not have a decisive role here. Linde (1923, 11) explains the rare occurrence of sentence final verbs from the fact that certain verb forms would not fit the iambic or trochaic verse end.

We may also want to ask whether there exists such a thing as a basic word order, or better, what the essence of the basic order is in a language like Latin, with a highly flexible word order.[7] Highly flexible here means only the fact that any sequence of S, O and V is, in principle, possible in Latin. It goes without saying that much of literary Latin is predominantly of OV character, although the figures for individual authors vary to a great degree. Whether or not one wants to see a typological shift happening already in the early period, it is difficult to avoid the impression that, in the Classical period, OV or verb final, had been coined as some kind of a literary norm, especially in certain genres like historical narrative prose. The question is whether this conceals behind it a different basic order (VO) in the spoken registers.

Following the then current line in typological studies, Adams (1976) drew attention to the Greenbergian (modified by Lehmann) correlations, which had proposed a dependency relationship between various pairings of limiting and limited elements, such as adjective-noun and genitive-noun. It was claimed that languages would tend to be consistent with regard to the ordering of these pairings, the limiting element (modifier) being positioned to its limited element (head) as the object is to the verb. Accordingly, the classical Latin unmarked positioning of the adjective and the genitive after their nouns would point to a basic order VO. Combining this with the fact that in Plautus VO is considerably more frequent than in Cicero and Caesar, Adams concluded that Latin had changed from OV type to VO type already before Plautus.[8] The genitive position GN in archaic Latin is in accordance with this, and it is also possible to find traces of an ancient AN unmarked positioning of adjectives.[9] Furthermore, Latin shows signs of an earlier preference for postpositions.[10]

The order object-verb in classical Latin, then, would be an archaic order, a relic from a past stage of the language which was coined as a part of the classical literary style

[7] "Though in the wake of Mithun's (1987) article many languages are nowadays characterized as having pragmatically determined order, as Payne (1992b, 1) points out, to what extent such languages can be accommodated within the Greenbergian typology remains an open research question" (Siewierska 1998, 488)

[8] Some figures for Plautus from Adams (1976, 94-95): in *Captivi* main clauses OV:VO is 45:39, *Aulularia* (1-325) 28:20, in *Asinaria* (1-380) 30:15, *Miles Gloriosus* (1-500) 35:45. In subordinate clauses OV is clearly preferred, e.g. 43:15 in the *Captivi*.

[9] Adams 1976, 74 and 88-89.

[10] Adams 1976, 88.

and adhered to subsequently in varying degrees. The major shift in spoken language from modifier-head (OV) to head-modifier (VO), had, according to this view, taken place already by the time of the earliest texts, also with respect to the order of object and verb.[11] Accordingly, the predominance in the earliest texts of the OV order was an archaic feature already at the time of their composition. Of the earliest documents, the *leges XII tabularum*, (only OV) is a formal text *par excellence*, as is the *senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus* (only OV), so that the conservative order is only to be expected. The gradual decrease in the frequency of OV in favour of VO from classical to late Latin should not be taken as an indication of a change happening in spoken language, but merely the ancient order being gradually abandoned even in the literary register. Texts like the Terentianus letters show the actual state of the language (mainly VO).

Adams proposes, on the basis of the correlations, that the Plautine evidence should be interpreted to the effect that, as according to his view spoken language was at that time of the VO type, Plautus' variant word order is further indication of continuous register shifting, OV being the higher and VO the lower alternative. This, however, would be oversimplifying the nature of both linguistic registers and the mechanisms at work in Latin word order. The fact that later in classical Latin OV was preferred does not necessarily mean that in Plautus (or elsewhere) every instance of OV order should be an instance of more elevated language.[12] Solely on the basis of the Plautinian figures, with nearly as much VO as OV, Latin might even be classified as a split type, according to the terminology of Siewierska (1998), with both SOV and SVO counted as basic orders.[13] Furthermore, there is no reason to posit an invariable VO order for the spoken language of this period either. Word order was just one of the many linguistic variables contributing to the register in each situation.

Since the work by Greenberg, Lehmann and Vennemann there have been new studies on typology and more subtle information is now available on, e.g., word order

[11] Adams 1976, 93. Bauer (1995, 85; 90) argues that in the verb phrase the shift from left branching to right branching (i.e. OV to VO) happened later than in the other modifier — head pairs.
[12] Inasmuch as in Terence the occurrence of OV is higher than in Plautus, this is one further indication of how he is creating the literary norm, see Adams 1976, 96-97 for some figures from the *Andria* (lines 1-300 OV:VO 84:22, counting only main clauses with nominal objects 36:11).
[13] Cf. the Greenbergian notion 'ambivalent' referring to languages which are on their way from SOV to SVO (Adams 1976, 97).

correlations.[14] Recent typological studies have also made it clear that what is typologically unusual or inconsistent depends much on whether one uses a global or a European perspective as the point of comparison. What is rare in a global sample may the normal case in a European or Eurasian sample.[15] Thus, although typological studies since Greenberg have shed more light on the languages of the world, his original correlations seem to hold for the European languages.[16] For example, in what Dryer has labelled "the dominant Eurasian OV type", there is a strong preference for the order A(djective)-N(oun), whereas globally no such preference is visible.[17] On the other hand, this correlation does not hold in the other direction, because both AN and NA are common in VO languages. The same applies to the order of the genitive and noun. While Eurasian OV languages tend to place the genitive before the noun, the SVO languages in Eurasia as well as in the world as a whole do not show preference for either order of the genitive and noun.[18] In short, (S)OV languages seem to be a more homogenous, and at least in the Eurasian perspective, also a more consistent group, than the SVO languages, and making correlations in the other direction, from the ordering of other modifiers to the place of the object (e.g., NA → OV), does not seem to be possible.[19] The strongest connection seems

[14] See Dryer (1992, 81-82) for references and a short summary of the earlier research. Typological studies usually count only declarative main clauses with overt nominal subjects and objects. This type represents naturally only a minority of the actually occurring clauses, cf. Siewierska 1998, 478. Wanner (1987, 379): "The SOV string is an abstract entity sui generis, a true typological classification abbreviating the specifications for an entire syntactic behavior package. Typological classification on the word order level can only be a holistic judgment." See also Pinkster (1991, 71-72).

[15] Siewierska 1998, Dryer 1992 and 1998.

[16] "[with reference to the Eurasian OV type] … these languages conform to what was once thought to be the norm for OV languages, to place dependents before the head" (Dryer 1998, 306).

[17] Dryer 1998, 293-297 and 306.

[18] See Dryer 1998, 302-303 for correlations between the genitive position and the orders OV, SVO and V-initial, also mentioning the possibility that as both positions of the genitive are common in SVO languages, the history of the language would in some cases explain the discrepancy; e.g., in Finnic languages, which have changed from SOV to SVO, the GN order would be in accordance with the OV past of these languages.

[19] Likewise with regard to word order variation and its correlation with verbal agreement or nominal inflection European languages also seem to be at some remove from the global picture. Typological correlations between word order flexibility and verbal agreement or nominal inflection are not straightforward; of these two, verbal agreement correlates more strongly with flexible word order than nominal inflection: "This suggests that whereas the absence of agreement is a good predictor of lack of word order flexibility, the presence of agreement is not a good predictor of flexible order. And, conversely, whereas rigid order is not a good predictor of the absence of agreement, flexible word order is a good predictor of the presence of agreement." (Siewierska 1998, 507). Here too, however, the correlation is stronger in the European sample (Siewierska 1998, 521-522). We should remember that the Romance languages generally retained verbal inflection and hence, agreement.

to exist between OV order and postpositions, and, on the other hand, between VO order and prepositions.[20]

Accordingly, while the nature of the typological correlations is far from clear, it is possible to maintain that the combined effect of these different correlations (OV, GN, postpositions, possibly AN) might be used to support the view that prehistorical Latin was more or less consistently of the OV, or modifier-head type.

The most important aspect regarding typology, however, is that it should be asked what place, if any, typological correlations should occupy in reconstructing the linguistic past of one particular language, a point made by Pinkster (1991, 73). Even if typological correlations do exist in a sample of languages, it is debatable, how much weight can or should be given to these correlations or, even more so, to a concept like typological consistency when studying the system of one language, and the changes happening in this system.

As noted above, in typological studies the term highly flexible has been used to refer to languages which allow for all of the possible constellations of S, V and O. It may be of interest to note that Latin is "highly flexible" in quite a different sense from Finnish, for example, a highly flexible SVO language. In Finnish, too, all possible sequences of S, V and O are in principle possible, but the extent to which these possibilities are actually utilised seems to be very limited.[21] In Latin, by contrast, the figures for SVO are quite high in many writers given the fact that Latin is usually described as a SOV language.

D. Panhuis has stressed the fact that the OV character of Latin is based solely on classical and early imperial texts, and of these mainly on "military-administrative reporting style of the historians". He concludes that the verb final pattern was "(re-)established as a mark of good writing".[22] Panhuis, however, also accepts the view of Adams, that in earlier times Latin indeed had the basic order OV: "The written, literary language is archaizing. It reverts to patterns found in the legal and religious texts, where the verb tends to be final for two overlapping reasons. One reason is that the verbs in

[20] Dryer 1992, 83.
[21] See Vilkuna 1998, 186, reporting the order SVO for 78.2%, SOV 1.8%, OSV 5.0% of 541 three constituent positive declarative clauses with overt NP subject and object (the whole corpus consists of 10,000 clauses).
[22] Panhuis 1984, 152.

these texts tend to be final because they tend to be rhematic; the other is that the OV pattern of PIE and prehistoric Latin is perpetuated in legal texts" (Panhuis 1982, 115).

Both Adams (1976) and Panhuis (1984), although they importantly point out the stylistic nature of OV ordering in classical Latin, entail a somewhat mechanistic conception of how word order works, and of their being a VO pattern in speech and an 'archaic' pattern OV retained or reestablished in the literary style.

A good example of the individual preferences, or "style", involved in this matter is provided by Devine and Stephens 2006. The case concerns combinations of an object and a semantically "empty" verb where the object is a highly integral part of the verb phrase so that the two form one pragmatic unit. Already Pinkster (1991, 77) hints at the importance of such object-verb combinations in creating the notoriously stable Caesarean word order. According to Devine and Stephens, in Caesar, the order for two such combinations (*castra posuit/ponit*, *aciem instruxit/instruit*, finite verb, noun unmodified) is always OV, whereas in Livy 45 out of 55 examples the order is *posuit castra*, and 9 out of 14 have the order *instru(x)it aciem*.[23] Although this observation is based on very limited data, it is suggestive of what kind of aspects must be taken into account when discussing Latin in terms of a basic word order. There undoubtedly was much room for choice depending on the preferences of each author, and this makes it very difficult to speak of *the* basic word order in Latin (at least in syntactic terms). Given this situation, the following description of Latin word order by Pinkster has much truth in it:

> The most striking element is the strong variation one observes between individual authors and text types (a variation which persists until far into the Middle Ages) which makes any statement of the type 'Latin was a X-language' unfounded (Pinkster 1990, 188).

Linde's (1923) study on word order records, as is well known, the place of the verb in the sentence (and not the relative order of O and V). Naturally only a part of the verbs in final position are finite verbs with overt nominal or pronominal objects, but, on the other hand, even if the order is OV, the verb need not occupy the final position.

[23] Devine and Stephens 2006, 127. The same observation, that Livy often does not place the verb in the final position, is made in Linde 1923, 170-171. But there it is also noted that often the sentence end is surprisingly occupied by a "weak" constituent.

Therefore, it is difficult to say what information Linde's figures yield for the study of the ordering of O and V.

The importance of genre may need some further stressing.[24] Authors showing the highest percentages of OV (or in Linde's study, verb final) order represent more or less the same genre, i.e., historical narrative (Caesar, Livius, Tacitus). This may in part be caused by the inherent pragmatic requirements of the historical narrative genre but there may also have been at work a fossilization of a verb final style which became a mark of that genre. This does not mean that the preference for the OV order would be in any clear way associated with "archaising" tendencies. There is indisputable evidence that the genre indeed influences the word order. For example, Tacitus' Agricola differs from his historical works (*Annales* and *Historiae*) in the placement of the direct object. The object precedes the verb more often in the historical works than in the Agricola which is a biography.[25]

There is some more recent data available which specifically reports the ordering of O and V for various authors, and in many cases, more than one work for each (Frischer et al. 1999). The figures vary a great deal according to authorship. But there are interesting observations to be made from the raw figures.[26] For every single Latin passage on which this study is based, the order OV is more common in both main clauses and other clauses.[27] This consistency does offer some evidence, based on strictly numerical observations, in favour of positing for Latin a basic order OV. While it is clear that Latin word order is highly sensitive to the pragmatic organization, and undoubtedly this organization often also has a bearing on the order of object and verb, there still is the possibility that we must leave room for a default order of those two constituents in certain kinds of sentences which do not have a clear topic-focus assignment, i.e., 'broad scope focus' (term from Devine and Stephens, more on this below).[28]

---

[24] Cf. Panhuis (above); Pinkster 1990, 169.
[25] Tweedie / Frischer 1999, 90-91.
[26] Frischer et al. 1999, Appendix I.
[27] 'Other clauses' include all verbal forms other than the main verb in main clauses, such as subordinate clauses and participial and infinitival phrases; Frischer et al. 1999, 363. Counted as objects were overt nominal and pronominal direct objects in the accusative case (Frischer et al. 1999, 358 n.2). The first one hundred objects were counted from each passage.
[28] Cf. Pinkster 1990, 183-184 and 1991, 78-79: "all new" and presentative sentences.

The approach to the question of basic word order in Latin is either implicitly or explicitly present in all studies on the subject. The strongest support for an explicit view according to which there is no such thing as a basic unmarked word order defined in syntactic terms is put forward by Panhuis (e.g., 1984, 149). His extremely pragmatic approach, formulated in terms of the Prague tradition, implies that in every sentence the constituents are ordered according to their degree of communicative dynamism (CD, see more below) which usually means putting first the constituent with the lowest degree of CD and last the one with the highest degree of CD. Conversely, Devine and Stephens (2006) first argue for the presence of a basic OV order, and then base their study on this assumption.

As so often with Latin data, we are here again faced with the question of what the texts tell us more about, change or variation. I believe that the question of Latin basic word order (OV or VO) should be viewed more in terms of variation than of change. It is probably best to think, through much of ancient Latinity, there existed both basic orders, basic here in the meaning that neither order (OV or VO) was restricted to highly specific pragmatic conditions, at least not consistently at every point of the *Variationsraum*. Rather than postulate a change from OV to VO before Plautus I would assume a situation of variation which persisted through centuries — variation not only as it is perceived in the literary texts but in spoken language as well (this is where the letters under study here might have something to offer). The difference between them may have been perceived in frequencies, and it is in this sense that 'basic' should be understood, if we want to use that term in connection with Latin word order.

In later Latin, as a consequence of a process in which the number of possible choices was reduced from two basic orders to one, the order OV became markedly more learned and written and was used less and less. At some point in time it would have been restricted to written registers only, and conceived of as a marker of polished written language. It is often difficult to see what the relationship of classical Latin word order is to the contemporary spoken language, or to the language system as a whole. The highly literary style may be said to exploit the possibilities of the system differently than the

spoken, or less literary written, language.[29] The order OV most probably was both the default order in at least certain literary prose styles, and the pragmatically determined order in some contexts.[30]

Naturally the relative order of the object and the verb represents only a fraction of the problem of how Latin word order is determined and in fact, the most important more recent studies on the subject are not directly concerned with the ordering of the object and verb but discuss the placement of the copula and unemphatic object pronouns.[31] The main argument of these studies, to put it very briefly, is that both types of words are often placed after certain kinds of hosts, i.e., either inherently or contextually emphatic (e.g., antithetical) words.[32] However, as Adams observes (1994b, 121), "classical prose is often overtly antithetical in its sentence structure", and therefore we have to take into account the possibility that this phenomenon was particularly accentuated in literary language, although it undoubtedly formed an inherent part of the Latin system as a whole. Interestingly, there is some evidence that at least in formulaic non-literary language in the republican period, the same principles of word ordering were at work as is the case in classical literary Latin.[33]

The study of the word order of substandard texts has usually had a more or less typological approach.[34] Non-literary texts are important in word order studies since in most of them we do not, at least initially, have to deal with style. Nevertheless, I shall have occasion to point out below that the matter is more complicated even in the letters under study here, and that some kind of stylistic elaboration is to be found in the non-literary letters as well, and not only those that are the output of clearly more educated

[29] Cf. the following characterization of the word order of republican inscriptions (Kruschwitz 2004, 67): "Dies spricht dafür, daβ die Texte in der fachsprachlichen Tradition ihres Genres verankert sind, und daβ deren Fachsprache eine Reduktion der Stellungsvarianten, die es in der tatsächlichen Sprache gibt, vorsieht. Diese Reduktion bzw. Stilisierung der Sprache jedoch wurde von denjenigen, die die Texte verfassen, nicht durchgehend eingehalten, so daβ es zu Abweichungen kommt, die zugleich die Möglichkeiten der 'natürlichen' Sprache illustrieren."

[30] Cf. Adams (1994a, 68): "A purely statistical comparison of the frequency of S pred. est vs. S est pred. would be of little point because the determinants of S est pred. are so various and difficult to pin down. In the pattern S est pred. the role of the subject is just as influential in determining the order as the role of the predicate, whereas in the pattern S pred. est S is rarely a factor at all. In making a numerical count of S pred. est vs. S est pred. one would therefore not necessarily be comparing like with like."

[31] Adams 1994a and 1994b, respectively.

[32] See Adams 1994b, 167ff for the VO ordering in Claudius Terentianus and its significance regarding the placing of the unemphatic pronouns.

[33] See Kruschwitz 2004.

[34] Most importantly Adams 1977; for further literature see below.

circles. The letters as a text type naturally are rewarding for the linguist in this respect, as individual planning is certainly present in one way or another (be it the sender or the scribe who produced the actual word order).

6.3. The order of O and V in the letters

In this section I shall discuss the word order of the object and the verb in the letters, also paying attention to the way their evidence should be interpreted in view of the postulated diachronic changes taking place in the language. I shall offer the relevant figures and present an analysis of a sentence type where the order VO is clearly preferred.

The importance of the letters of Terentianus for the study of Latin word order has been established by Adams (1977). He concluded that their word order, which is mainly of VO character, shows the true nature of the spoken language as it was at this time, as opposed to literary genres where OV still prevailed.

> The letters of Terentianus are the first text extant to exhibit extensive VO features, in anticipation of Romance. Yet at much the same time Tacitus, for example, and Suetonius were preserving the OV patterns of an earlier period. The spoken language of the uneducated had evidently changed in type, whereas in literature OV patterns were retained as prestigious. (Adams 1977, 67-68)

Given this background it is highly interesting to look at word order in the Vindolanda letters. In strictly syntactic and numerical terms, there is a clear difference between the Egyptian material and Vindolanda.[35] Counting first only finite declarative main clauses with overt direct nominal objects,[36] the figures for the orders OV and VO are the following (the same tendency is visible in subordinate clauses, see below):

[35] I have here counted all of Vindolanda together and compared this with two more substantial letter archives from Egypt, those of Claudius Terentianus and Rustius Barbarus. Counting all Egyptian material included in CEL together would not be very informative, as it is so heterogeneous. This comparison is of course not quite fair, as the letters at Vindolanda come from so many different writers, and are thus heterogeneous, too.

[36] I have also counted as direct object *occurro* + dat. in tab. Vindol. II 248.

Main clauses	**OV**	**VO**
Claudius Terentianus[37]	7	15
Rustius Barbarus	1	8
Vindolanda	25	13

Generally speaking, the same picture emerges from the subordinate clauses (again counting only finite verbs with nominal objects):

Subordinate clauses	**OV**	**VO**
Rustius Barbarus	2	2
Claudius Terentianus	-	9 (12)[38]
Vindolanda	21	7

This difference clearly calls for an explanation, of which the most obvious is that at Vindolanda the writers were aware of and able to use the order OV as a standard in writing even though VO, visible in the Egyptian material, predominated in the spoken language. This would agree well the general picture, that at Vindolanda the standard of Latinity was higher and the level of learning closer to that of the literary circles than in Egypt. Although the two orders clearly were not interchangeable in all situations, it might still be maintained that in certain contexts (where the pragmatic constellation allowed for both of these orderings), those writers who had received literary training above the most elementary level were able to adhere to an OV ordering when writing. This, in turn, would be an indication that the order OV was associated with a more careful style. It will be possible to evaluate this explanation only after a detailed analysis of the examples.

On the other hand, we must also account for the possibility that there is Greek influence in Terentianus and Rustius Barbarus, and that the letters thus cannot be used as evidence for a change happening in Latin. In Greek the preference for sentence-final placement of the verb, or OV ordering, was never as strong a tendency as it was in Latin.[39] According to Adams (1977, 69-70), whereas the ordering in main clauses should

[37] Adams' figures, 23:9 (VO-OV, finite verbs in main clauses), for Terentianus apparently include the pronominal objects.
[38] The larger figure includes two uncertain cases (cited below in 6.4.2), and one prepositional phrase with *de* (also fragmentary).
[39] See Frischer et al. 1999, 357 (with references to earlier literature), 361, 366 and Tweedie / Frischer 1999, esp. 85-86.

be attributed to the actual state of the language, in subordinate clauses Greek influence may be visible, because in them the preference for OV persists considerably later than in main clauses. Since OV prevails in subordinate clauses in later Latin texts at a time when VO is already established in main clauses, Adams raised the possibility that the preponderance of VO order was the result of Greek influence in the bilingual Terentianus.[40] A comparison with the Vindolanda evidence reinforces this conclusion. This possibility also has to be considered after a detailed analysis of what types of sentences are actually attested. It should be noted that indications of the spread of the VO order have also been observed in the Pompeian material where Greek influence, although a possible factor, was not as overwhelming as it will have been in Egypt.[41]

It is also necessary to look at the number of verb-final sentences in order to find out whether the preference for OV in fact is an indication of a tendency to place the verb in the final place. However, there seems to be no strong tendency for clause-final placement. At Vindolanda, 15 of 25 OV orders (in main clauses with finite declarative verbs with nominal objects) are verb-final.

In principle it is possible that the difference between Egypt and Vindolanda stems from different clause types that inherently favour one or the other ordering but are unevenly attested in different parts of the corpus. There does, indeed, seem to be one sentence type that clearly favours the order VO, and that is particularly frequent in Claudius Terentianus and Rustius Barbarus. Both writers repeatedly report that they have sent something to the addressee of the letter: *misi tibi / habes / accipias X*).[42]

This tendency may be attributed to two causes. First of all, it naturally corresponds to a pragmatic pattern where the goods that are being sent is the most salient information (in focus) and thus is placed in final position. This explanation is relevant

[40] According to Adams (1977, 69-70), in the case of pronominal objects, due to the tendency of the finite verb to move towards the end of the clause, placement before the verb is preferred (counting both direct and indirect pronominal objects together).

[41] Magni 2000. This study also tries to establish a connection between the order VO and the absence of the accusative case marker <m> in the object constituent (on this also Molinelli 1989, a different view in Ramat 1984, 139), but this matter, as the whole question of the word order in the Pompeian texts, clearly requires more research. The article by Rizzi / Molinelli (1994) on the papyrus glossary P. Bon. 5 does not provide much useful information for my purposes here.

[42] It clearly was necessary to write these reports, and there may have been many reasons for that. If the goods were lost or stolen on the way, the recipient would know what he should look for. On the other hand, sometimes the person delivering the goods might bring the letter at the same time, and a list of the items would then allow the recipient to make sure he got everything.

especially for those instances where the object is relatively short and unmodified. (Generally, the pragmatic motivations for different orderings will be discussed in the next section.)

But there is another factor outside pragmatics that clearly has a bearing on the placement of the object (in main as well as in subordinate clauses), that is, the 'weight' of the object constituents themselves.[43] The list of goods being delivered may consist of more than one item (CEL 73, 3-7 and 74, 11-12), or be of considerable length (tab. Vindol. 309 and 346) or the item can be specified with a relative clause[44] (tab. Vindol. II 259; P. Mich. VIII 468, 15ff and 468, 8ff). Thus, this part is often long and 'heavy' and is therefore more easily placed towards the end of the clause. Accordingly, this is a context that clearly favours the order VO.[45]

At Vindolanda, 8 of the 13 VO orders are in this type of clause, and in Terentianus 4 of 15 VO. It is then immediately clear from these figures that it is not possible to attribute the difference between Terentianus and Vindolanda only to the greater frequency of this sentence type in the former. But it is clearly the reason for the strong preference for VO in the letters of Rustius Barbarus — this type covers all VO orders and makes up 6 of the 9 main clauses with nominal objects. In Terentianus and Rustius Barbarus all *misi* clauses are VO.

In the following I have listed all relevant examples from Claudius Terentianus, Rustius Barbarus and Vindolanda.

The *misi* type in Claudius Terentianus:

> (1) *misi [ti]bi pater per Martialem imboluclum con{co}su[tu]m in quo habes*
> (P. Mich. VIII 468, 8ff)
> "I have sent you, father, by Martialis a bag sewn together, in which you have …"
> (2) *[m]isi tibi amphoras II oliuarum co[lym]bade [un]a et uṇ[a] ṇigrạ* (*amphorae istae sunt pares ill[is*) (P. Mich. VIII 467, 27-28)
> "I sent you two jars of olives, one in brine and one black. These jars are the same as those …"

[43] For the heaviness of the constituents as a relevant factor in word order see, e.g., Dik 1997 1, 404, 430-432 and 441-442; see also Bolkestein 1996, 8.
[44] Of course a relative clause does not have to be placed preverbally even if the object constituent that it defines is so placed.
[45] In subordinate clauses a corresponding type are the requests for items that the sender is in need of. In these, the word order is usually *ut mittas (mihi) X*. See below.

(3) *et abes in imboluclum amictorium singlare* (*hunc tibi mater mea misit*) (P. Mich. VIII 468, 14-15)
"You have also in the bag a cape of single thickness; my mother sent this to you"
(4) *[e]t accipias caueam gallinaria in qua ha[bes]* (P. Mich. VIII 468, 15ff)
"Receive also a chicken coop , in which you have …"

In these examples there either is a long relative clause attached to the object or it is otherwise heavy, in (2) with further information about the *amphorae*, and in (3) with the locative expression *in imboluclum*. In these latter two the object is also introduced as the topic of the following main clause.

The *misi* type in Rustius Barbarus:

(5) *misi tibi per Popilium et Dutuporim panes xv, item per Draconem amaxitem panes xv ẹṭ ụạṣụ* (CEL 73, 3-7)
"I sent you through Popilius and Dutuporis 15 loaves of bread, also through Draco the carriage-driver 15 loaves of bread and a jar"
(6) *misi tibe per Thiadicem equitem panes ṿị quod dixit se posse tollere* (CEL 73, 8-9)
"I sent you through the cavalryman Theadices six loaves of bread, as he said he would be able to carry them"
(7) *misi tibe per Ạṛṛiạnum equitem chiloma* (*ẹntro ha[b]et collyram* …) (CEL 74, 12-13)
"I sent you through the cavalryman Arrianus a box. Inside there is one loaf of bread"
(8) *et misi tibi uasum oliarium* (*ut mittas mi oleum*) (CEL 75, 6)
"And I sent you an oil jar so that you could sent me some oil"
(9) *misi tib(i) per Capiton[em] Ṣaṇmia u[asa]* (CEL 79, 7-9)
"I sent you through Capito Samian jars"
(10) *accepi fasçọ çọḷiçḷos*[46] *et unum casium* (CEL 74, 11-12)[47]
"I have received a bunch of cabbages and one cheese"

In the first example the object is heavy. There is clearly a pattern in these examples to start with the verb, after which comes the person through whom the delivery is made, and the object constituent is placed last. The same pattern is visible in the schematic reports from the Bu Njem ostraca:

(11) *transmisi at te domine per kamellarius Iassuchthan sbitualis tridici vji noue q(uae) f(iunt) modios centum octo* (O. Bu Njem 77,3-5)[48]

[46] I.e., *fascem* (or *fasces*) *cauliculorum*.
[47] I have included this example here as it is so clearly of the same type.
[48] The same organization in O. Bu Njem 76, 78 and 79.

"I sent you, master, through the camel driver Iassuchthan 9 *sbitualis*[49] of wheat which make 108 *modii*"

The *misi* type at Vindolanda: VO

(12) *misi tibi frater tiliam ex qua* (tab. Vindol. II 259, 3)
"I have sent you, brother, a tablet from which…"
(13) *missi tibi materias per Saconem* (tab. Vindol. II 309, 3) (list of the items follows)
"I have sent you wooden materials through the agency of Saco"
(14) *mise]ram tibi paria udoṇ[um] ṭ. ab Sattua solearuṃ [ ] duo et subligariorum [ ] dụ[o* (tab. Vindol. II 346, 2-5)
"I have sent (?) you … pairs of socks from Sattua, two pairs of sandals and two pairs of underpants"
(15) *misi tibi peṛ […] ….i̯um lucernulam* (tab. Vindol. III 641, ii, 2-3) "I have sent you through … a small bronze (?) lamp"
(15b) *misi tibi seiụṇ[ ]liorum denarioṛum du[ ] quae sigulas in cartas* (tab. Vindol. III 655, A, 1-3)
"I have sent you separately (?) additional (?) *denarii*, which … into individual wrappings"
(16) *reçiṗies de çarris Brittonum …i̯ii ạṛąç … ṛomauco bracis ṃ.ṭ ……çis m(odios) trecentos octoginṭa unụṃ* (tab. Vindol. III 649, 2-5)
"You will receive out of the Britons' carts … from Rac..romaucus (?) three hundred and eighty-one *modii* of … grain"

Cf. also the following:

(17) *[si mih]i puerum miṣṣurus es miṭtes chiṛ[ografum] cum eo* (tab. Vindol. III 645, 22-23)[50]
"If you intend to send a boy to me (?), send a note of hand with him"
(18) *a Cordonouis amicus missit mihi ostria quinquaginta* (tab. Vindol. II 299, 2-4)
"A friend sent me fifty oysters from Cordonovi (?)"

The *misi* type at Vindolanda: OV

(19) *]ạ..um et Fṛọntinum equites remisi ad castra iiii K(alendas) Martias* (tab. Vindol. II 300, 2-4)
"I sent back … and Frontinus the cavalrymen to the camp on 26 February"
(20) *comm ... [ ] ex cohorṭe cui praesum missi ad te* (tab. Vindol. II 318, 2-4)
"I have sent … from the cohort of which I am in command to you"
(21) *? [pe]ṛ Ạ[t]tonem decurionem misi tibi* (tab. Vindol. II 345, i, 1-3)[51]

[49] See Marichal 1992, 101 for this measure. The number was erroneously written *vii* instead of *viiii*, see Marichal ad loc. and p. 101.
[50] Semantically, of course, this example corresponds to the subordinate *(ut) mittas* clauses.

"I have sent you … through (?) Atto the decurion"

What these last three examples have in common is that the object of *(re)mittere* is animate (soldiers). (21) is not certain, the object being now lost, but the following context makes it clear that the object is a person here as well. That the order OV is not merely a coincidence in these examples is suggested by two letters from Egypt reporting the sending of soldiers, which also have the order OV (both with *dimittere*):

(22) *Onnuphrin Panamea eq(uitem) turma Procli dismisi ex cursu VIII K(alendas) Ianuarias* (CEL 158, 3-5)
"I have sent back from courier duty Onnuphris, son of Panameus, an *eques* from the *turma* of Proclus, on the 26th of December"[52]
(23) *].uficcanum mil(item) [ ] ad praesidium dimisi* (CEL 159, 2-3)
"I have sent the soldier …uficcanus … to the garrison"

It is difficult to tell the significance of this difference, but at least in (19), (22) and (23) there seems to be a different pragmatic organization. When sending inanimate items, the only thing to be said about them usually is the identification of the goods in question. In these three examples, by contrast, there is a clear topic-focus distribution: the soldier(s) being sent are established as topics and the focus is on the satellite with the verb (either in the final position or immediately before the verb): *ad castra iiii K(alendas) Martias, ex cursu VIII K(al) Ianuarias, ad praesidium* (see below for more examples of objects placed preverbally as new topics).[53] So it is possible to conclude that at Vindolanda, too, the usual word order in this type, when it has to do with actual 'sending', i.e., sending goods, was VO.

Finally, there are two examples of this type from Mons Claudianus, one OV and one VO:

(24) *camellos quattuor misi at te* (M1107, 3)
"I have sent you four camels"
(25) *misi tibi fasciclos duos uirdiorum per Saluianum e[q]u[i]tem* (O. Max. inv. no. 254, 3-6)
"I have sent you two bunches of greens with Salvianus, the cavalryman"

[51] I have included this example which is uncertain but probable. There is no place for the object except in the preceding context, and given the essence of the *misi* clauses, it must be a nominal object.
[52] Translation according to Gilliam 1976, 60.
[53] Note also *accipi fenum contur[m]alibus meis mensis Iuni* (CEL 150, 4-5).

Of these (24) is noteworthy in that it apparently is the only example of this clause type with the order OV.

It was stated above that there is a marked preference for VO in subordinate clauses in Claudius Terentianus. However, as was the case in main clauses, in subordinate clauses there is also a sentence type with a preference for VO order. In the following 4 cases this order is clearly used as the only possibility with considerably long and heavy object constituents:

a) *rogo ut mittas* (Terentianus asks his father to send several items)

> (26) *ut mitta[s m]i[h]i pe[r V]alerium gladiu[m pu]gnatorium et l[ance]am et d[o]labram et colpa[m] et lonchas duas quam optimas et byrrum castalinum et tunicam bra[c]ilem cum bracis meis* (P. Mich. VIII 467, 18-21)
> "(I ask you) … to send to me by Valerius a battle sword, a …, a pickaxe, a grappling iron, two of the best lances obtainable, a … cloak, and a girdled tunic, together with my trousers"
> (27) *ut mittas mihi inde caligas cori subtalare ed udones par* (P. Mich. VIII 468, 24-25)
> "(I ask you) … to send me from there low leathern boots and a pair of felt socks"

b) relative clauses (Terentianus reports the sending of various items to his father):

> (28) *in quo habes amicla par unu amictoria [pa]r unu sabana par unu saccos par unu ẹ[t] sṭr[a]glum lini[u]* (P. Mich. VIII 468, 9-11)
> "… in which you have two mantles, two capes, two linen towels, two sacks, and a linen sheet"
> (29) *in qua ha[bes] sunṭhes[eis] uitriae et phialas quinarias p[ar u]nu et calices paria sex et chartas sc[holare]ṣ d[u]ạṣ et in charta atramentum et çạḷamos q[u]i[nq]ụẹ et panes Alexandrinos uiginṭi* (P. Mich. VIII 468, 16-20)
> "… in which you have sets of glassware, two bowls of quinarius size, a dozen goblets, two papyrus rolls for school use, ink inside the papyrus, five (?) pens, and twenty Alexandrian loaves"

Three further examples of VO in subordinate clauses are of the *(ut) mittas* type (dealing with the sending of goods in one way or another), but without heavy objects:

> (30) *ut mi mittas dalabram* (P. Mich. VIII 468, 27)
> "(I ask you) … to send me a pickaxe"
> (31) *ut em[a]s et mittas tr[e]ṣ toc[ades* (P. Mich. VIII 467, 30-31)
> "(I ask you to go) … so that you may buy and send three breeders"
> (32) *ut reciperes ab illo ṇ[o]ṣtr[um imbol]u[clu]m* (P. Mich. VIII 467, 11-12)
> "… so that you might recover from him our … (?)"

At Vindolanda, 4 of the 8 VO orders are in *(ut) mittas* or similar clauses (343, 233, 650 and 311 where, however, the letter breaks off right after the object). The only one with a heavier object is:

> (33) *nisi mittis mi aliquit (denariorum) minime quingentos* (tab. Vindol. II 343, 10-12)
> "Unless you send me some cash, at least five hundred *denarii* …"

But as 4 of the *(ut) mittas* clauses have the order OV, any preference for one or the other order clearly cannot be established for Vindolanda.[54] So, on closer inspection there is a tendency for postverbal placement of the object in Claudius Terentianus which is visible even in this specific sentence type.

The placement of pronominal objects in main clauses

Main clauses, pron. O	**OV**	**VO**
Claudius Terentianus	5	9
Vindolanda	6	5

These figures, if anything, point to a similar conclusion as the figures for nominal objects, that preverbal placement of the object is more common at Vindolanda than in Terentianus.

Pronominal objects in subordinate clauses

Subord. clauses, pron. O	**OV**	**VO**
Claudius Terentianus	2[55]	-
Vindolanda	7	-

The Vindolanda letters show a clear preference for OV here, but the Terentianus evidence is too meagre to admit any conclusions.

[54] In subordinate clauses 16 of the 21 OV orders have final verbs.
[55] Including a dative with *adiuto*.

6.4. The pragmatic perspective

6.4.1. Introduction

In this chapter I have first given an account of major trends in the study of Latin word order (at the sentence-level), and then presented figures for the order of the object and the verb in my corpus of non-literary letters, in that connection also drawing attention to a sentence type that strongly favours the order VO. In this section I move on to pragmatic analysis of the material. In the course of this analysis, I shall try to discover whether, and how, pragmatics influences the order of the object and the verb in this material.

I shall first give a brief overview of pragmatic approaches to Latin word order. After that I shall outline my pragmatic 'tool', i.e., give a description of what concepts I shall be using (and how).

It is clear that Latin word order is sensitive to the pragmatic organization of the sentence. How, exactly, this sensitivity is realized, is another matter. In the pragmatic approach it is assumed that linguistic output usually tells 'something' 'about' some entity. The entity about which something is pronounced has variably been called the topic or the theme, and the thing that is told about that entity has been called the rheme, the comment or the focus. Often it is assumed that old information will, generally speaking, precede new information.

The concept of a 'theme' has been defined in varying ways in different theoretical perspectives, and undoubtedly is the subject of most discussion (and confusion). There are two basic concepts that have been associated with theme: givenness (informational), and the thing about which something is predicated (mostly pragmatic). Accordingly, two 'continua', that of information status and that of thematic structure, have been posited. The first of these, informational status, refers to the concepts of given and new. An entity in a conversation can be given in many ways, either because 1) it has just been mentioned, 2) it is present in the non-linguistic context, or 3) it is in the shared knowledge of the 'speaker' and the 'hearer'. Thematic structure, on the other hand, refers to the way the speaker organizes the information; theme is then the entity about which he is going to predicate something. Different theories have seen the relationship between these two continua in different ways, especially the degree to which theme should be associated with givenness.

The relationship between the other ends of these continua is more straightforward: the most salient constituent, i.e. focus, often, even if not exclusively, contains new information. But focus, too, can be of various natures: the terms contrastive, emphatic, non-neutral have been used to refer to highlighted focal elements.

In Panhuis 1982 a serious attempt was made to define the pragmatic principles at work in Latin word order. The study is based on the framework laid out by the Prague School, the so-called Functional Sentence Perspective.[56] This framework predicts that constituents in a sentence will be organized according to the degree of Communicative Dynamism (CD) they have, i.e., how much new information they provide to carry the communication forward. The constituent with the lowest degree of CD (theme, T) will be posited in the first place in the sentence, and the one with the highest degree at the end of the clause (rheme, R). As far as the definition of the theme is concerned, it will not necessarily be 'given' in any strict sense of the word (here Firbas apparently differs from other representatives of the Prague School). The unmarked ordering in normal, i. e., 'non-emotive' sentences is T-R but in 'emotive' sentences the marked ordering R-T is used. Panhuis has also argued that at least in certain literary genres the verb-final order was established as the dominant pattern, thus separating the verb from the influence of the pragmatic organization T – R.[57]

Most scholars concerned with pragmatics in Latin word order have been working within the framework of Functional Grammar. In chapter 5, I have already given an outline of some of the pragmatic principles as formulated in the theory of Functional Grammar in connection with thematic constituents. These principles are highly relevant for word order.

Pinkster (1990, 168-184) provided a discussion of Latin word order following this theory. Pinkster's account includes syntactic and pragmatic as well as semantic factors. He approached the problem of a syntactically defined basic order and pragmatic sensitivity by positing certain basic clause types, formulated in syntactic terms (mainly on

[56] See Panhuis (1982, 7-22) for the outline of his theoretical framework. Panhuis follows mainly the ideas of Jan Firbas (see Panhuis 1982, 9 for references).

[57] See Panhuis 1984. Panhuis has also stressed the influence of genre on Latin word order, pointing out that even in Caesar the verb is less often in final place in the topographical descriptions (Panhuis 1981), but he attributes this difference to Greek influence from Caesar's sources. However, it certainly is inconceivable that Caesar would not have been able to translate his sources into proper Latin even if he was in a hurry.

the basis of Ciceronian material). Exceptions to these patterns might then be explained on pragmatic grounds. Pinkster also draws attention to the two principles in operation, placement of the verb in the final position in the sentence (in classical Latin), on the one hand, and pragmatic sensitivity, on the other.[58]

The discussion of Catonian word order in de Jong 1994 is concerned with what he entitles the Topic-Focus hypothesis. This is essentially the same approach, although formulated with different terminology, as the Functional Sentence Perspective. In this hypothesis constituents are ordered according the degree of 'focality' (= 'rhematicity' or 'communicative dynamism' in the Prague School terminology) they have. Those with the highest degree of focality will be placed at the end of the clause, except in specific emotive or contrastive settings in which the ordering is the other way round, from more focal to less focal and more topical. He concludes that this hypothesis does not predict correctly the different patterns found in Cato's *De Agricultura*.

While there undoubtedly are many relevant observations in the approach of Panhuis, it is clear at least since de Jong 1994, that the pragmatic conditioning in Latin word order is a more complicated matter than simply an ordering with respect to one variable (topicality – focality). I shall not assume that Latin constituent order is linearly determined according to the degree of topicality or focality.[59]

Also, some attention has been given to the placement of the subject in Latin (de Jong 1989). Bolkestein 1996 is a discussion the order V(erb) – S(ubject) with a detailed analysis of different causes that can be seen as motivating this ordering. These are not directly relevant to my purposes here as there are very few examples of VS clauses in the letters.[60]

The approach I have adopted for my analysis in the following is derived mainly from the tradition of Functional Grammar, applied for Latin word order mainly in the work of Pinkster and Bolkestein. The advantages of this approach, in addition to the fact that it already has a strong tradition in Latin studies, include the way in which especially the concept of topic is defined (which makes it a very useful tool, see below), and also the flexibility in the way topic and focus can be placed in the sentence.

[58] Pinkster 1990, 179.
[59] For a survey of sentence-beginnings in Latin see also Jones 1991.
[60] Review articles by Molinelli (1986) and Spevak (2006) do not contain much of help for my approach.

In many clauses (but not all) it is possible to identify a topic and a focus, and these are directly relevant to the word order. There is not necessarily an overt topic in every clause, i.e., a predication can be about some entity that is not present in it as a constituent. This constituent is prototypically the subject. There are topics which are 'given' in the sense that they are mentioned in the preceding context. But, there are also topics that are not 'given' in this sense, i.e., the predication can be 'about' an entity that has not been mentioned previously in the discourse. The latter are called new topics. The concept of a new topic may be especially relevant in letters.[61] Focus then is the most salient information in the sentence: that constituent which the speaker presents as the most important one to be conveyed to the addressee.

I shall also work with the assumption that in some clauses the concepts of topic and focus are more relevant than in others, and that there are sentences with broad scope focus, i.e., in which it is not relevant to look for a specific focus, but in which the whole predication may be thought of as an answer to a question "what happened?".[62] Furthermore, the concepts topic and focus themselves are continual, and topic and focus may be different in degree (strong/weak topic, contrastive focus). In some cases it may be difficult to say whether some emphatic constituent is topic or focus.[63]

The first position in the clause (not absolute, i.e., after conjunctions etc.) carries special significance, and it is usually occupied by a topical or focal element, the latter especially if it is contrastive.[64] There is another place for the focus at the end of the clause, but certain types of topics may also be placed in clause-final (or at least postverbal) position.

6.4.2. Pragmatic analysis

Also in this section I am looking predominantly at the order of the object and the verb. This perspective, although restricted, is justifiable given the central position of this issue

[61] See Pinkster 1990, 175 on Cic. *Att*. 1,5. I shall work with the assumption that the letters are coherent texts, and that the predications thus can be viewed in the context of what precedes and what comes after them.
[62] See Devine and Stephens 2006, 15 for this concept.
[63] As noted by Pinkster 1990, 175.
[64] See Pinkster 1990, 176-177. See Pinkster (2005a, 252-253) for the tendency in Pliny the Elder to place a topical constituent of the following section in the beginning of the sentence, regardless of its syntactic function.

in many discussions on Latin word order, and also the conclusions which have been made on the basis of the non-literary material concerning word order change. Therefore it seems worthwhile to find out what the non-literary material has to offer concerning the question whether and how the place of the object, especially in relation to that of the verb, is influenced by pragmatic factors. One would think that if such pragmatic factors exist and are recoverable, the material under study here would be ideal for this purpose, as many complications present in literary texts are absent in the letters (such as stylistic elaboration, prose rhythm and clausulae).[65] In the following I shall attempt to discover certain patterns that are relevant for this question. What kinds of patterns are discernible in the material when taking notice of both syntactic and pragmatic factors? In how many cases is it possible to find the same principle operating both in Egypt and at Vindolanda?

In chapter 5, I pointed out the tendency to begin sentences with a thematic (or topical) constituent. These were called thematic constituents because in certain cases they were independent, and not part of the structure of the following sentence. I shall begin this discussion on word order with instances where the placement of the object is influenced by its topicality. Certain predications seem to follow a scheme where the object is the topic and is placed in the initial, or at least preverbal, position in the sentence. When speaking of topics one usually has in mind an entity which is known from the preceding discourse, such as *huṇ[c uer]bum* in the following example:

(34) *huṇ[c uer]bum sepius tibi scribo* (CEL 74, 9-10)
"This message I have written to you many times"

Here the object is a given topic, as it refers to the preceding appeal for good will and brotherly love. As it appears, however, this is not a common type in the material under study here. In the following examples, the object has not been mentioned in the preceding context, but it is still classifiable as topic following the definition adopted here (first and foremost the entity about which the predication predicates something):

(35) *frates securem quam iṇ casula habea dabes Ḳaṃ[..]* (tab. Vindol. III 643, ii, 2-3)[66]

[65] Similarly de Jong 1994, 91 on Cato's *De Agricultura*.
[66] For the form *habea* (= *habeas*) see Adams 2003c, 538-539, and generally on this letter Adams 2003c, 533-535. Also *frates = frater*.

"Brother, if you happen to have (?) an axe in your hut, give it to Gam-"
(36) *matrem meam aute praegnata imueni* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 18-19)
"I found my mother was pregnant"
(37) *a Marino neruı̣ pondo centum explicabo* (tab. Vindol. II 343, 3-4)
"The hundreds pounds of sinew from Marinus — I will settle up"
(38) *ceruesam commilitones non habunt* (tab. Vindol. III 628, ii, 4-5)"My fellow-soldiers have no beer"

These examples differ in the way in which the new topics are marked as such. In (35) the topic is established by the attached relative clause. In (36) there is a topic shift and this is clearly marked by *autem*. In (37) this sentence is the first one after the opening salutation. All of these are obvious examples of new topics, introduced for the first time in the letter. Especially (37) and (38) are striking examples of a new topic which is not marked as such in any way (other than the word order). The newly established topic is also topical in the following context in (36), (37) and (38) (possibly also in (35), although there the part immediately after this sentence is damaged). In two of these, (36) and (38) the focal constituent is placed immediately before the verb (*praegnata, non*). In (35) the verb has focus together with the indirect object *dabes Gạṃ[..]*.

Interestingly, Cicero also introduces a new topic in a letter simply by placing it in the initial position of the sentence.[67] A comparable example to those cited above is

(39) *Quintum fratrem cotidie exspectamus* (Cic. Att. 1,5,8)
"We are waiting for Quintus every day"

where *Quintum fratrem* is mentioned for the first time in this letter. Pinkster notes "Sometimes a constituent has not yet been mentioned in the letter, but can nevertheless be interpreted as Topic on account of the familiarity of Cicero and Atticus" (Pinkster 1990, 172). The evidence presented here might indicate that in fact this was a way of introducing new topics in a letter, even in contexts other than between such close friends. This sentence type may be particularly common in letters where many different topics are often referred to in the course of one text. However, this might be a principle that is also more generally relevant for Latin word order.

[67] Pinkster 1990, 172.

The following example is interesting as it shows how the need to start with a topical constituent may override the tendency not to place heavy constituents in initial position (which was referred to above in connection with the *misi* clauses):

> (40) *arculam clusa et res quequmque inị [.]ạ coṃclusae su[n]ṭ dabes [....].o benifeciạrio* (tab. Vindol. III 643, i, 2-5)
> "The closed small box and whatever things have been locked in it (?) give to … the *beneficiarius*"

Here the object is again the topic, and the focus, i.e., what is to be done with it (*dabes [....].o benifeciạrio*), is in the final position. The organization is identical to that of (35), not surprisingly, as they stem from the same letter. Clearly the writer felt comfortable in placing even these kinds of heavy objects in sentence-initial position because they were topical.[68]

At this point the question to be asked is, of course, how often at Vindolanda the preverbal object might be characterised as a new topic. In addition to (35), (37) and (38) above the following can be cited:

> (41) *et ita (denarios) datur{ur}us erat* (tab. Vindol. II 343, 32-33)
> "He was ready to give cash"
> (42) *epistulas a Gleụçone accepi* (tab. Vindol. II 343, 44)
> "I have received letters from Gleuco"
> (43) *consulari n(ostro) utique mạturius occurres* (tab. Vindol. II 248, 9-11)
> "You will assuredly meet our governor quite soon"

Also (44), with an attached relative clause:

> (44) *epistuḷas meaṣ accipies quibus scies quiḍ sim actura* (tab. Vindol. II 292, iii, 2-3)
> "You will receive my letters by which you will know what I am going to do"

In two other cases this is possible but the context is fragmentary:

> (45) *et balteum me[um?] mihi subripuerunt* (tab. Vindol. II 322, 3-4)
> " … and stole from me my belt (?)"
> (46)] ... *bellos ḥabeo quos ipse tib[i] aḍferam* (tab. Vindol. II 281, i, 1-3)
> "I have nice … that I will bring you myself"

[68] Cf. Bowman / Thomas ad loc. "The texts of the letters are noteworthy as being among the poorest compositions from the linguistic point of view, if we have understood them correctly".

There is thus some evidence for (newly) topical objects being placed sentence-initially, resulting in OV order.[69]

So far I have been looking at topics. But, as far as sentence-initial constituents are concerned, the concept of focus is also relevant. Especially contrastive or otherwise emphasized focus is often placed in initial position. If such a constituent is the object, the concept of focus will therefore have a clear-cut influence on object placement. I think this is the case in the following examples:

> (47) (*e quo tu de hac re scripseras*) <u>*ne mentiọnem*</u> *mihi fecit* (tab. Vindol. II 343, 5-6)
> "(From the time you wrote about this matter) he has not even mentioned it to me"
> (48) <u>*nihil*</u> *malo animo feci* (tab. Vindol. II 297, 3)
> "I have done nothing with bad intentions"
> (49) <u>*nem[i]nem*</u> *habeo enim karum nisi secundum deos te* (P. Mich. VIII 467, 18)
> "For I have no one dear to me except you, after the gods"

In (47) *ne mentiọnem* has focus, and the topic *de hac re* is mentioned in the preceding subordinate clause. In (48), which is from the beginning of the letter, *nihil* naturally is in focus, and the subject, which is not present, is topical (the following sentence has *ego* as its topic). In (49) *nem[i]nem* is also clearly in focus.[70] In the following example

> (50) (*item açu lentiaminaque mi mandauit*) <u>*nullum assem*</u> *mi dedit* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 11-12)
> "In the same way, he turned over to me a needle and linens; he gave me not a single *as*"

nullum assem is contrasted with *açu lentiaminaque*, and is thus in contrastive focus (see below more on the word order in this particular letter). In all of these three instances the object is a negative expression and has strong focus. Other types of focal constituents can also begin the sentence and at this point I mention the following examples where a focal initial constituent is other than the object (these are not directly relevant for the placement of the object)

---

[69] Pronominal objects are often continued topics by their very nature, but are also placed preverbally, cf. *hoc enim me semper meruisti* (tab. Vindol. II 225, 9-10), *ha[ec ti]bi a Vindolanda scribo* (tab. Vindol. II 225, 24-25), *non illos mi accepto tulit* (tab. Vindol. II 343, 23), *neque eạm ẹị ḍaḅ[e]ṣ nisi iṇ carrulo eaṃ ponạ[t]* (tab. Vindol. III 643, back, 1-2), *hunc tibi mater mea misit* (P. Mich. VIII 468, 15).
[70] See Adams 2003a, 747 for the placement of *enim* in this example.

(51) *procur[a]tọrem te fạcio frater* (tab. Vindol. III 670, i, 4-5)
"I am making you agent, brother"
(52) *Nireo quoque conliberto suo multa sc[e]lẹra de te scripsit* (CEL 8, 10)
"He also wrote many bad things about you to his fellow freedman Nereus."
(53) *a Cordonouis amicus missit mihi ostria quinquaginta* (tab. Vindol. II 299, i, 2-4)
"A friend sent me fifty oysters from Cordonovi (?)"

In (51) the object complement *procuṛ[a]tọrem* obviously is the most important information to be conveyed in the sentence. In (52) *Nireo quoque conliberto suo* is what might be called an additive focus, since the writer has already written about slandering done by Iucundus, and now goes on to inform the recipient that these evil words have been told also to Nireus. *Multa scelera* is thus clearly topical. (53) is the first clause after what is probably the opening salutation (*quod est principium epistulae meae te fortem esse*), and the initial constituent *a Cordonouis* must be focal here. The items being sent, *ostria quinquaginta*, can be considered another, possibly somewhat weaker focus.[71]

Preverbal focal objects can thus also result in OV order. In the following examples, however, it is a postverbal object that seems to be the most salient information in the sentence and carry focus. However, they differ from the previous examples in that the focus is neutral, i.e. neither contrastive nor especially highlighted

(54) *onerarunt aụtem in singla carra m(odios) liii* (tab. Vindol. III 649, 5-6)
"Furthermore, they have loaded 53 *modii* into each individual cart"
(55) (*et si scr[i]bes mihi epistulam*) *inscribas in liburna N[e]ptuni* (P. Mich. VIII 467, 25-26)
"(And if you write me a letter), address it: 'on the liburnian of Neptune'"
(56) *reliquit enim su[o]s [e]t rem suam et actum et me secutus est* (CEL169, 10-12)
"For he left his family, his things and work, and followed me"

To add to the confusion, in a letter of Claudius Terentianus a postverbal object in two cases is clearly a continued topic from the previous context:

(57) *ego tamen inç ebinde collexi paucum aes* (*et emi pauca que ẹpẹdiui*) (P. Mich. VIII 471,12-14)
"I, nevertheless, gathered a little money here and there, and bought a few things that I wanted"

[71] Cf. also *nomina eorum et icon[i]ṣmos huic epistulae subiecị* (CEL 140, 6-8)

(58) *item non mi d[e]dit aes quam aureum matri mee in uestimenta* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 15-16)
"Likewise he gave me no money, although he gave my mother an aureus for clothing"

In (58) the object constituent, *aes*, is topical in the first part of this letter. In both cases the focal element is the verb phrase, *inç ebinde collexi* and *non mi d[e]dit*, respectively.[72] A comparable example from Vindolanda would be interesting, but there is none, if not (74) below (very fragmentary).

However, the same pattern may be observed in two subordinate clauses from Claudius Terentianus

(59) *quoniam extri[u]i tuni[ca]m* (P. Mich. VIII 467, 21-22)
"since I wore out my tunic"
(60) *si scr[i]bes mihi epistulam* (P. Mich. VIII 467, 25)
"If you write me a letter"

Both objects are postverbal, and both the *tunica* and the *epistula* have been mentioned in the immediately preceding context. These two subordinate clauses of course differ in type, in that the *quoniam* clause adds the explanation, afterthought-like, to Terentianus' request for a new tunic. The *si* clause, on the other hand, introduces the setting for the following main clause (but cf. below for OV in *si* clauses when the object is a new topic). Interestingly, it is possible to find a comparable example from Vindolanda where the postverbal object of a subordinate clause is a continued topic from the previous context

(61) *cum haberęt corią* (tab. Vindol. II 343, 37)
"since he had hides"

It is, however, not possible to explain all postverbal objects (main clauses) in Terentianus on these pragmatic grounds (continued topic or neutral focus), cf. the following

(62) *uidit Germani libertam* (P. Mich. VIII 469, 4-5)
"She has seen Germanus' freedwoman"
(63) *et emi pauca que ępędiui* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 14)

[72] Here *item ... quam* should be taken as a correlative expression, "he did not give me money, as he gave my mother an *aureus* for clothing" (Adams 1977, 55-56).

"and bought a few things that I wanted"

The object in (62) might be in focus, but the context is fragmentary and makes it impossible to say for sure. One indication that the object is focal here might be derived from the word order in the nominal phrase, as the order genitive + noun is unexpected in Terentianus (Adams 1977, 71: "a phrase with a formal ring"). In (63) the attached relative clause might have influenced the ordering. Here it should be noted that there may have been a tendency in Claudius Terentianus not to separate the object from the relative clause and it is this tendency which then results in VO order in such cases (cf. (44) above from Vindolanda with *epistulas .. quibus*). Unfortunately the other examples of VO in Terentianus stem from contexts too fragmentary to admit any conclusions (*[t]u autem dedisti illi aspros* (P. Mich. VIII 467, 6), *ṇullus [co]ṃputauit kasus sụ[ae] ụ[itae]* P. Mich. VIII 467, 13-14) [?*uendedi lentiamina*? (P. Mich. VIII 471, 34), ?*et qumqupibit illuc baḷ[ium?]*? (P. Mich. VIII 469, 6)[73])

Furthermore, there seem to be examples of a pattern where a preverbal object in a *si* clause is a new topic:

> (64) *si tan cito <u>uirdia</u> mi non mittes* (*stati amicitiam tuam obliscere debio*) (CEL 74, 4)
> "If you do not send me the vegetables as soon as possible, I shall have to forget about your friendship immediately"
> (65) (*quid est quod mi non rescripsti*) *si <u>panes</u> recepisti* (CEL 73, 4)
> "Why is it that you have not written to me, if you have received the loaves?"

This is obviously the case in (65), but also conceivable in (64), although the writer then goes on to elaborate on *amicitia* and not about *uirdia*.[74] The need to prepose topical constituents also in subordinate clauses is clearly visible in (66), with *pretium aeorum* as topic (see above 4.5 on this passage)

> (66) *scribe mi ut pretium aeorum <u>quit uis</u> panem tibi faciam aut aes tibi mitam* (CEL 73, 12-14)
> "…and write to me which you want as the price for them, that I make bread for you or send you money"

[73] These latter two are included in my figure 15 for VO orders in Terentianus.
[74] See de Jong 1994, 99 on conditionals generally functioning as topics.

Here focus is on the indirect question *quit uis*, and further on *panem tibi – aes tibi*.[75]

One pair of sentences from Claudius Terentianus is interesting. In (68) *gratias* is in contrastive focus (in the preceding sentence Terentianus has stated that the *optio*, to whom *illi* refers, had stolen an axe from him):[76]

> (67) *et ago tibi gratias quod me ḍign[um] habuisti et sequrum fecisti* (P. Mich. VIII 468, 7-8)
> "and I thank you because you considered me worthy and have made me free from care"
> (68) *sed gratias illi ag[o ..] .... mi praestat* (P. Mich. VIII 468, 30)
> "but I am grateful to him for furnishing me with …"

This might be used as evidence for the view that the default order in Claudius Terentianus in fact was VO and that OV was used only when there was clear pragmatic motivation for it, such as contrastive focus in (68).

It is noteworthy that four of the OV in main clauses (with nominal objects) in Terentianus are in the same letter, 471, which gives the impression of being close to a spoken narrative (see above 4.2). I have offered possible pragmatic motivations for (50) and (36) above. The pragmatic organization in *item açu lentiaminaque mi mandauit*, also cited above as (50), is probably best characterized as broad-scope focus, as if answering the question "what happened" (the subject, not expressed, being the topic). It is conceivable that these types of sentences are common in narratives. One of the OV orders in Terentianus is in fact a case of OVS

> (69) *item litem abuit Ptolemes pater meu sopera uestimenta mea* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 20-21)
> "At the same time, my father Ptolemaeus had a quarrel about my clothes"

This order is used when there is either emphasis on the subject or the whole state of affairs described by the predication is somehow unexpected.[77] *Ptolemes pater meu* is the topic in the following context (*et factum est illi uenire Alexandrie con tirones*).

---

[75] See Adams 1994b on unstressed personal pronouns attached to focused terms.
[76] See Adams 1994b, 165-166 for observations on these examples regarding the placement of the pronoun. (Also 166: "These two examples (like 186b) reveal that there is an intimate connection between the emergence of regular VO order and the position which clitic pronouns were ultimately to adopt in Romance." "As long as the language retained vestiges of OV order (*gratias illi ago*) …")
[77] See Bolkestein 1996, 12-13.

On the other hand, in (69) the verbal phrase *litem habuit* is an example of an object+verb combination where the verb is semantically empty and the two in fact form one pragmatic unit. Other examples of this type in the letter material (all are from Vindolanda) are *moram fecit* (tab. Vindol. II 270), *notum faciam* (tab. Vindol. III 645), *ne mentionem fecit* (tab. Vindol. III 343)[78], all showing OV order. It has been suggested that in this type of object+verb combination the default order is OV.[79]

If the appearance of the OV order in this letter (P. Mich. VIII 471) is not a mere coincidence I would attribute it to the genre, narrative. The ordering does not have any direct relationship to spoken language, i.e., it is not a difference between spoken and written language, but of genres and typical sentence types in them.

There is one more example of OV in Terentianus but it is impossible to say anything about the pragmatic organization due to a fragmentary context

(70) *n]ęc ob [haec] Marcel[l]um [o]di* (P. Mich. VIII 467, 14-15)
"nor do I hate Marcellus on this account"

After looking at OV in Terentianus it seems necessary to look at VO at Vindolanda. There are 13 cases of VO in main clauses with nominal objects; of these 8 are in *misi*-type or similar clauses. Of the remaining 5, the following have not been cited:

(71) *habebunt auctoritatem Seuerini* (tab. Vindol. II 215, ii, 2-3)
"they will have the authority of Severinus"
(72) *li]benter amplexuṣ ṣ[um do]mine ṣalutandi te occaṣṣioṇeṃ* (tab. Vindol. II 225, 4-5)
"I have gladly seized the opportunity my lord of greeting you"
(73) *et bracis excussi habeo m(odios) cxix* (tab. Vindol. II 343, 25-26)
"I have 119 *modii* of treshed *bracis*"
(74) *abent ą .[c.7]ḍias uecturas id eṣt (denarios) singḷos et omnem uelaturaṃ* (tab. Vindol. III 649, 11-13)
"Furthermore (?), they have half (?) the carriage-monies, that is one *denarius* each, and all the *uelatura*"

In (71) the object is in focus, and it is thus similar to (54)-(56) above. It is possible that (74) is an example of a continued topical object in postverbal position (see above), but

[78] Pragmatic motivation is also possible in this example, cited as (47) above.
[79] Pinkster 1991, 77. Cf. also Devine and Stephens above (6.2) on the difference between Caesar and Livius in similar object+verb combinations.

the context is here too fragmentary to allow any conclusions. Two of these examples have split objects. Example (72) is an epistolary phrase and can be compared with *[occasion]em nactus sum scribendi* (212, 2).[80] Example (73) shows dislocation, a pattern where the genitive before the verb is topical and the head is focal. We can compare with it *null[i]us con[c]ẹpị ọ[diu]m* (P. Mich. VIII 467, 16) where, however, the pragmatic organization is reversed, *odium* being more topical and *nullius* more focal.

The concepts of topic and focus obviously are useful in analysing Latin word order. Still, there are many cases where it is difficult or even pointless to try to determine whether a particular constituent is in fact topic or focus or something else. The following example is from the beginning of the letter:

> (75) *Theo adduxsit ad me Ohapim rẹgium mensularium Oxsyrychitem qui quidem mecum est locutus de inprobitate Epaphraes* (CEL 10, 1-4)
> "Theo brought to me Ohapis, the *regius mensularius* from Oxyrynchos, who then told me about the dishonesty of Epaphres"

It is often stated that the subject, if expressed, usually is topic. This letter starts with the subject (*Theo*), but the sentence definitely is not 'about' him. It only introduces a new topic *Ohapim*, with the attached relative clause, where *de inprobitate Epaphraes* in the final position carries focus. Even if the expressed subject is a personal pronoun it is not necessarily the topic in the sense this concept is used in the present work, cf. *ego* in the following two cases

> (76) *egọ ṭibi sine mora brạcẹm exṗellam pro s[[s]]umma quod efficiatur* (tab. Vindol. III 645, 13-16)
> "I shall remove grain from store (?) for you without delay in proportion to the sum which may be raised"
> (77) *ego frater sacrificio diem Kalendarum sicut uọlueras deḍi[caui?]* (tab. Vindol. II 265, 3-5)
> "Just as you wished, brother, I have consecrated the day of the Kalends by a sacrifice"

Although (77) is the only part remaining of this letter (beginning of the letter after the salutation), the content makes it quite clear that *diem Kalendarum* is the topic here, and

[80] This is a common pattern in the combination noun + genitive of a gerund, see Adams 1994a, 17 (there split by the copula).

sacrificio is in focus. Exactly the same patterning is visible in (76). There *ego* is needed to express the change of subject, but the sentence is 'about' grain, with *sine mora* in focus.[81]

* * *

Above I have tried to find certain patterns in the word order which can be attested both in Egypt and at Vindolanda. Now, it remains to be assessed how much these pragmatic factors influence the word order; in other words, how much the difference reported above in 6.3 in fact is the result of the nature of the material and the haphazard attestation of different sentence types in the British and the Egyptian corpus.

It seems to be the case that even though certain common patterns can be observed all through the corpus, there still remain instances where a pragmatic explanation for the preference of a certain order is not possible, and we have to leave room for the existence of a difference in 'basic' word order between the two ends of the empire, at least in written language. This aspect then leads to the next question: What does this difference reflect? Does it have more to do with geographical or social variation? Or a mixture of the two?

Even if the Terentianus evidence does offer some support for the claim that in spoken language there was a tendency to place the object after the verb, this tendency clearly was not strong enough to prevent the placement of topical (new topic) or focal (contrastive focus) objects in the preverbal position.

6.5. Conclusion

It is an interesting conclusion that both topical and focal constituents seem to occur both preverbally and postverbally. As for topics, it is possible to attribute this difference in placement to the different status of the topics, as has been established previously.[82] It is also possible to look for a difference in the status of focal constituents. There seems to evidence for contrastive focus being placed sentence-initially, and weak focus postverbally.

[81] See Adams 1995a, 125 for the confirmative function of *ego* in this and other similar cases. See also Pinkster 1987, 374-376 for the pragmatic motivation for the use of *ego* in Petronius.
[82] See de Jong 1994 and literature cited there.

Given this situation, and adding to this the fact that the occurrence of constituents other than the object and the verb naturally has an effect, not only on the topic-focus distribution, but also on the overall organization of the sentence, it is no wonder that it is very difficult to establish one or two parameters, be they pragmatic or syntactic, according to which Latin word order is determined. Cf. de Jong (1994):

> The Topic-Focus hypothesis does not predict correctly the full range of attested word order patterns in Cato. I have offered explanations along functional lines for seemingly deviating patterns. However, there is a danger involved in this. The charm of the original Topic-Focus hypothesis was its simplicity. The modifications proposed here, while adding to the range of possible orders, also brings us closer to the point where, for any given sentence in any context, it would in fact predict all possible permutations of that sentence. Exactly how close we have come to that point remains to be seen. (de Jong, 1994, 100)

On the other hand, there is no reason to suppose that there is a simple explanation available to this problem. In fact, all evidence we have indicates that there is no such thing.

It remains unclear what the difference between Egypt and Vindolanda with respect to the order of O and V is. Still, it has been possible to identify certain patterns that are relevant for the word order in this material, and potentially also for the general discussion on Latin word order. Do we want to see a basic word order, even though it would be different in Egypt and at Vindolanda, and explain the exceptions as pragmatically motivated, or do we try to explain everything as pragmatically motivated, in one way or another?

As for future research on the word order of the non-literary letters, I see special interest in looking at all the sentence-initial constituents and their pragmatic functions.

* * *

Interestingly, the difference in word order between Egypt and Vindolanda correlates with the difference in the use of the anaphoric pronouns *is* and *ille* (see Excursus), the Vindolanda letters retaining both OV order and the pronoun *is* clearly more often than the Egyptian material.

7. CONCLUSION

I began this study by posing two questions. What can be said about the language of these letters? And what does this tell us about the language of Latin letter writing, and about the Latin language of this time in general? The findings are summarized here under four thematic sections, followed by considerations concerning future perspectives.

7.1. Texts and spoken Latin in the study of non-literary letters

Such concepts as vulgar Latin, spoken Latin and substandard language use of less experienced (or even semi-literate) writers, are often mentioned in connection with non-literary material, especially private letters. First of all, we should abandon the term vulgar Latin. Using this term obscures the fact that we are in fact dealing with variation and change in Latin (2.2). We should also abandon the view that there is only one linguistic variety present in these texts. Their language is a mixture from various linguistic tendencies, even inside syntax. There may be typical letter phraseology together with incoherent syntax even in the same letter. In many cases the non-literary letters show similar expressions as letters written by literary writers and this is true not only of the well-educated and thoroughly Romanized officer class stationed at Vindolanda (3.5). The language of the non-literary letters differs from that found in the literary texts not only because of the different educational level of the authors but also because the subject matter often differs from them so greatly.

Written language is always different from spoken language and changes in the written language lag behind the spoken with considerable delay. In the case of literary texts this is well known. It needs to be stressed, however, that it applies also in the case of non-literary material, and even concerning such relatively informal, personally composed documents as these letters, for the most part, are (2.3-2.5). Clarifications should me made regarding terminology, especially concerning terms like colloquial language or *Umgangssprache*. It should always be made clear whether we are talking on a particular occasion about informal written language or something which was also current in spoken Latin.

The approach that should be adopted when assessing the language of these letters is to treat them for what they are, i.e., written texts with suitable epistolary phraseology used where it is needed. It is not adequate to call the writers semi-literate. That may be a proper term perhaps sometimes in the case of the Bu Njem ostraca, but definitely not elsewhere in this material. Even if a scribe or a person other than the sender himself often took care of the actual writing, the sender usually added at least a closing salutation in his own hand, and many of the letters are probably autographs of their senders. They were literate, not semi-literate.

Accordingly, there is no simple answer to the question of how much the letters tell us about spoken Latin. (2.5). The writers were, for the most part, able to use constructions that were essentially a part of written varieties of Latin. Sometimes, however, it is possible to recognize constructions which in all probability were common in contemporary spoken language (paratactic complements with verba *sentiendi and dicendi*, 4.4.1 and 4.4.2).

7.2. Variation

On the other hand, differences between written and spoken language, or informal and formal language, are not the only possible determinants for syntactic variation between alternative constructions. Such variation can, even in non-literary language, depend on the syntactic context (*rogo* + subj., 4.4.3), or on the needs of certain written registers (paratactic asyndeton, 4.3).

Calling a construction paratactic does not necessarily tell us anything relevant about this construction because the label ‘paratactic’ is used of so many different types of sentence connection. Accordingly, paratactic constructions generally cannot be characterized simply as a typical feature of spoken language. They differ from each other both with regard to their status in the linguistic system as well as their syntactic structure.

There is much variation within the material, most clearly represented by the different standards of Latin learning in Egypt and at Vindolanda. Partly this picture is caused by those elegant compositions we have from Vindolanda, stemming from the officer class who seem to have been Romanized to an amazing degree, even as far as their language skills are concerned. It is, however, now possible to establish a measurable

difference between Egypt and Vindolanda in the order of the object and the verb. The object precedes the verb considerably more often at Vindolanda than it does in the two more substantial Egyptian archives, that of Claudius Terentianus and that of Rustius Barbarus (6.3). This picture of Vindolanda showing linguistic tendencies that agree with literary practice and are against known historical trends (changes) is further confirmed by the distribution of the anaphoric pronouns, as laid out in the Excursus. *Ille* is used more in Egypt, *is* at Vindolanda. It is still impossible to answer to the question of whether these divergences in syntax are reflections of regional variation in spoken Latin (Latin spoken in Britain retaining more traditional features), or social variation in written Latin, i.e., that the persons writing at Vindolanda were able to use more OV ordering and the pronoun *is* in writing than in their speech.

7.3. Text type and pragmatics

Several features of the language in these letters can be connected to the common text type, letters. All of them share certain structural patterns, thus forming a coherent text type, although people writing letters in different parts of the empire had slightly different habits in openings and closings (3.2-3.4). Latin letter writing and phraseology in Egypt seem to have been influenced by Greek (3.3.2 and 3.5). However, the importance of this specific text type also comes up in other aspects. Recognizing letter phraseology and other recurrent expressions is essential in order to interpret correctly the syntax in this material (4.2, 5.3-5.4, 6.3).

The writer of a letter usually refers to many different issues in his text and has to change the topic accordingly. The devices that are found performing this function in the non-literary letters are relatively simple. Placing the object in the initial position of the sentence (6.4.2) or beginning the sentence with a suitable word, e.g., the multifunctional connector *et* (4.2), are two such devices. Sometimes there is also a specific thematic constituent to be found, detached syntactically from the rest of the predication (5.7.2). This topic-prominence can easily be connected with the text type.

Syntactical incoherences in the non-literary letters result either from reproducing a spoken incoherent expression (5.1), or from the incompetence to formulate a more complex written expression adequately (4.5 and 5.3). As far as unconstrued

thematic constituents (5.7.1) are concerned, we may perceive a continuum from those that were also adopted by literary writers to those that were typical of substandard written language.

7.4. Historical syntax

Traditionally the importance of non-literary texts (in syntax, as in other fields) has been derived from their use as evidence for historical linguistics, showing which changes had already taken place and which were yet to come. The historical perspective comes up in several places in this work (5.4 *quod* for *quid*, 5.7.3 uses of the accusative, 6.3 word order). A methodological reminder for the study of language change on the basis of written material is in place here: it is always probable that a spoken phenomenon is much earlier than our first written attestations.

7.5. Future perspectives

The documentary material has much to offer for the general study of the Latin language. This material, however, always needs to be consulted with special attention given to the nature of the texts, to conventions in each document type, and never losing sight of the context, of the surrounding factors. For more general purposes in the study of the Latin language, it is essential to fully acknowledge the range of the Latin *Variationsraum* although we possess only a fragment of it – only in this way will we have a chance of interpreting correctly the evidence we have.

The most important aspect emerging from this study for future research in non-literary letters (or other non-literary documents) is the necessity of looking at the texts as open-mindedly as possible, looking for different linguistic tendencies, without erroneous preconceptions that we are dealing with representations of spoken language, of only one substandard variety (vulgar Latin), or the like.

There definitely is more work to do on word order, as only a limited set of sentences (although a highly important one) was discussed in this study. It will be worthwhile to look at, e.g., all sentence-initial constituents generally, as well as pragmatic conditioning in all the other sentence types. Another promising aspect might be to look at the letters as a text type, asking, e.g., how new topics generally were introduced in a

letter, and comparing these results with, e.g., Cicero's letters and those strategies he uses in organizing the message in his letters.

EXCURSUS: ON THE USE OF ANAPHORIC PRONOUNS

The research on the use of anaphoric pronouns is often centred on the weakening and spread of *ille* and the development of the Romance article.[1] An essential part of this development is the weakening of *ille* and accordingly, its use as a neutral anaphora. The Terentianus letters demonstrated that *ille* was the anaphoric pronoun used in the overwhelming majority of cases (31 of *ille*, 4 of *is*, always in polysyllabic forms),[2] and consequently, that Petronius in the *Cena Trimalchionis*, where *ille* dominates as an anaphoric pronoun, was imitating a genuine feature of spoken Latin.[3]

In the following I shall offer two more observations on the way the anaphoric pronouns are used in the non-literary letters.

First of all, however, it is necessary to make a clear distinction between subject pronouns and pronouns in oblique cases. In the *Cena*, *ille* as a subject is used only 11 times in the speeches of freedmen but frequently, 71 times, outside the speeches of freedmen (*is* respectively freedmen: 1 – others: 6 times).[4] The use of subject pronouns might not be markedly different from classical prose if one considers the pragmatic functions of the pronouns and the type of text in question (conversational texts vs. narratives). According to Pinkster (1987, 376-378), *ille* as a third person subject pronoun in narratives serves to fulfil a topic changing function, both in classical prose and in Petronius, whereas *is* as a subject marks topic continuity.[5]

However, the picture looks somewhat different with respect to the oblique cases. *Ille* is used in the accusative 35 times by the freedmen and only 8 times by other persons (*is* 6 and 7 times respectively). In the dative, all characters favour *illi* above *ei*, and in the genitive other than freedmen use only *eius*, and the freedmen use *illius* 11 and *eius* 7 times.

---

[1] For the development of *ille*, see, e.g., Wolterstorff 1907, Orlandini 1981, Selig 1992 and Banniard 1995.
[2] See Adams 1977, 44.
[3] See Adams 2005a for other examples of the accuracy of imitation in Petronius.
[4] The figures are according to Boyce 1991, 68.
[5] In narratives, they are used to denote topic change whereas in conversational texts they often have some kind of focal motivation (Pinkster 1987, 369-370). See Pinkster 2005b on *is* and *ille* in Seneca Rhetor and Cicero.

Boyce called attention to the fact that most pronominal forms (in general), especially in the oblique cases, are more frequent in vulgar than in urban speech, and thinks this is because of "greater fondness of urban speech for relative constructions and other hypotactic conjunctions which obviate the need for the use of pronouns". In fact a more accurate characterization of the distribution is that in 'urban speech' *ille* is clearly used as a subject more often than in 'vulgar speech', but that especially in the accusative *ille* is used more often in 'vulgar speech'.[6]

The first observation to be made from the non-literary letters is that subject pronouns in general are extremely rare. Neither *ille* nor *is* is used as a subject pronoun in Claudius Terentianus. At Vindolanda there is only one certain case of *ille* as a subject in all of the non-literary letters (see below for *is* as a subject at Vindolanda).[7] Thus it seems that the similarities in the use of *ille* between the *Cena* and Claudius Terentianus go beyond the mere numbers.[8] A closer examination between Claudius Terentianus and Petronius is very revealing about the way *ille* in oblique cases is used (words in boldface introduce a new topic):

P. Mich. VIII 471
10 illi
21 **Ptolemes**
22 illi
24 illum
26 **Saturninus**
27-28 illi
31 illi

P. Mich. VIII 469
3 **mater mea**
4 illei
8 illei
13 illei
14 illei
18 illei

Petr. *Sat*. (*Cena Trimalchionis*)
43: **ille**, illum, frater eius, illius, illius, illius, illi, **ille stips**, illum, illius, illum, illum
45: **Titus**, illi, illi, illius, illlius, **Glyco**, ille, **stigmam**, illam, **Mammea**, ille
46: **cicaro** meus, illi, illi, magister eius, illum, illum, illi, illi

[6] Nor did Petersmann notice the difference in the way the pronouns are used by the different groups; see Petersmann 1977, 35 ("Die Rede der gebildeten Akteure geht, was diesen Gebrauch betrifft, also ganz konform mit dem der Freigelassenen").
[7] In tab. Vindol. II 312, 5. Possibly also in tab. Vindol. III 641, i, 3 (for *illud* tab. Vindol. 656,ii,1, impossible to say).
[8] Bolkestein / Grift (1994, 284) note that cases where the anaphoric pronoun is not expressed are probably more common in non-literary style although there are no statistics available. This letter material indeed points to the frequency with which the subject pronoun is not expressed.

Not only is *ille* almost the only pronoun that is used in these passages in Petronius,[9] but it is used in a way highly similar to that in Claudius Terentianus. All are in cases of topic continuity, that is, *ille* is referring to the same person. Furthermore, the letter P. Mich. VIII is a narrative and thus comparable with the Petronian examples regarding genre as well — all three passages from the *Cena* are little narratives inside the conversation.[10]

The other observation is that whereas in Claudius Terentianus *ille* dominates, the situation is clearly different at Vindolanda. There *ille* is used 24 times (of these only once in the nominative). *Is*, then, is used 24 times too (as a subject pronoun only *id*, four times in the phrase *id est*, once *optamus ...id quod ... felicissimum sit*). There is one noteworthy passage in the letter tab. Vindol. III 661, 3-6 *ċurare autem debebiṣ ut niḷ qui tibi epiṣṭuḷam meam leget iḷḷud domina[e] indiċet* where *illud* is used as if a reinforcement of *nil*, required since the object would otherwise be too far away from the verb.

It is, however, impossible to establish any distribution of these pronouns according to the social class of the sender or in concordance with other linguistic features. It is true that in the letter of Chrauttius (tab. Vindol. II 310), which contains many substandard features, *ille* is used two times and no form of *is* occurs:[11]

> (1) *aut Quoṭ.m in quo numero / sit et illum a me salutabis [[s]] uerbis meis et Virilem ueterinarium rogabis / illum ut forficem / quam mihi promisṣịt pretio / mittas* (tab. Vindol. II 310,912)
> "… or about Q. in which unit he is; and greet him from me in my words. And Virilis the veterinary doctor, ask him whether you may send the pair of shears which he promised me in exchange for money"[12]

But, *is* appears in two letters where other types of substandard linguistic forms are attested: tab. Vindol. II (the letter of Octavius) and tab. Vindol. III 643 (the letter of

[9] Wolterstorff 1907, 43 "Debilitata denique significatione praeditum pronomen *ille* permultis locis videmus. Ubi historiae breviores ab actoribus narratae innectuntur, plerique *ille* scriptum legimus, rarissime *is*". There are also other places in Petronius where the weakening of *ille* is to be seen: 56,4 *oves, quod lana illae nos gloriosos faciunt*; 71,3 *nam Fortunatam meam heredem facio et commendo illam omnibus amicis meis*; 85,5 *si ego hunc puerum basiavero, ita ut ille non sentiat, cras illi par columbarum donabo* ("exempla demonstrationis supervacaneae"). On these examples see also Pinkster 1987, 377-378.

[10] B. Löfstedt (1961, 266-267) points out that it is exactly this use of *ille*, its weakness as an anaphora (first substantivally and then adjectivally used) which is relevant for the development of the article.

[11] The only other examples, so it seems, of a letter where *ille* is used more than once is tab. Vindol. II 226, which is very fragmentary but thought to be a letter of Flavius Cerialis (see the editors ad loc.). Possibly also in tab. Vindol. II 217.

[12] On the interpretation of the syntax in this passage, see 5.3.

Florus). In the letter of Octavius *is* is used three times in sequence, referring to the same person.

> (2) *contubernalis Fronti amici hic fuerat desiderabat coria ei adsignarem et ita (denarios) datur{ur}us erat dixi ei coria intra K(alendas) Martias daturum Idibus Ianuariis constituerat se uenturum nec interueniṭ nec curauit accipere cum haberẹt coriạ si pecuniam ḍaret dabam ei* (tab. Vindol. II 343, 29-38)
> "A messmate of our friend Frontius has been here. He was wanting me to allocate (?) him hides and that being so, was ready to give cash. I told him I would give him the hides by 1 March. He decided that he would come on 13 January. He did not turn up nor did he take any trouble to obtain them since he had hides. If he had given the cash, I would have given him them."

In the letter of Florus *is* is used apparently three times in the same predication, two times referring to some object (*eam*) and probably once to a person in the dative:

> (3) *neque eạm ẹị ḍaḅ[e]ṣ nisi iṇ carrulo eaṃ ponạ[t]* (tab. Vindol. III 643, back, 1-2)
> "… and do not give it to him except on condition that he straightway places it in the cart"

It is also impossible with this (largely very fragmentary) evidence to say anything about the difference in use of the two pronouns at Vindolanda, e.g., regarding the pragmatic status of the antecedent.[13]

[13] See Bolkestein / Grift 1994 on the conditions in the choice of subject pronouns.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Editions

CEL I-II = *Corpus epistularum latinarum papyris tabulis ostracis servatarum* I-II, ed. Paolo Cugusi, Firenze 1992.

CPL = *Corpus papyrorum latinarum*, ed. Robert Cavenaile, Wiesbaden 1958.

Fink = *Roman military records on papyrus*, ed. Robert O. Fink (The American philological association, Monograph 26), Case Western Reserve University 1971.

ISM = *Inscriptiones Daciae et Scythiae Minoris antiquae* ed. D.M. Pippidi / I.I. Russu, Bukureşti.

M689 and M1107 = *La route de Myos Hormos* vol. 2 ed. Hélène Cuvigny (L'armée romaine dans le désert Oriental d'Égypte), IFAO, Le Caire 2003.

O. Bu Njem = *Les ostraca de Bu Njem,* ed. Robert Marichal, Tripoli 1992 (Supplément de *Libya Antiqua* VII).

O. Claud. I = *Mons Claudianus. Ostraca graeca et latina I*, ed. Jean Bingen / Adam Bülow-Jacobsen / Walter E.H. Cockle / Hélène Cuvigny / Lene Rubinstein / Wilfried Van Rengen, Le Caire 1992.

O. Claud. II = *Mons Claudianus. Ostraca graeca et latina II*, ed. Jean Bingen / Adam Bülow-Jacobsen / Walter E.H. Cockle / Hélène Cuvigny / François Kayser / Wilfried Van Rengen, Le Caire 1997.

O. Faw. = *Ostraca grecs et latins de l'wâdi Fawâkhir*, ed. O. Guéraud, *Bulletin de l'institut d'archéologie orientale* 39-42, Le Caire 1940.

O. Max. in "The identification of Myos Hormos. New Papyrological evidence", ed. A. Bülow-Jacobsen / H. Cuvigny / J.-L. Fournet *BIFAO* 94 (1994), 27-42.

O. Latopolis Magnae = "Letters on ostraca", ed. P.J. Sijpesteijn, *Talanta. Proceedings of the Dutch archaeological and historical society* 5 (1973), 72-84.

P. Mich. VIII = *Michigan Papyri vol. VIII, Papyri and ostraca from Karanis*, ed. H.C. Youtie and J.G. Winter, Michigan 1951.

RIB II, 4 = *The Roman inscriptions of Britain. Volume II Instrumentum domesticum. Fasc. 4.*, ed. S.S. Frere and R.S.O. Tomlin, Oxford 1992.

RIU = *Die römischen Inschriften Ungarns*, ed. by Barcóczi et al., Budapest/Amsterdam.

tab. Vindol. I, II, III = *Tabulae Vindolandenses* I, II, III, ed. A. K. Bowman / J. D. Thomas, London 1983, 1994 and 2003.

tab. Vindon. = *Die römischen Schreibtafeln von Vindonissa*, ed. M. A. Speidel, Veröffentlichungen der Gesellschaft pro Vindonissa (Band XII) 1996.

tab. Londin. = "Three Roman writing tablets from London", ed. I.A. Richmond, *AJ* 33 (1953), 206-208.

tab. Luguval. = "Roman manuscripts from Carlisle: the ink-written tablets", ed. R.S.O. Tomlin, *Britannia* 29 (1998), 31-84.

For other editions of papyri see John F. Oates, Roger S. Bagnall, Sarah J. Clackson, Alexandra A. O'Brien, Joshua D. Sosin, Terry G. Wilfong, and Klaas A. Worp, *Checklist of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets,* http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html, December, 2005.

Secondary literature

Adams, J.N. (1976): "A typological approach to Latin word order", *IF* 81, 70-99.

Adams, J.N. (1977): *The vulgar Latin of the letters of Claudius Terentianus*. Manchester.

Adams, J.N. (1990): "The Latinity of C. Novius Eunus", *ZPE* 82, 227-247.

Adams, J.N. (1992): "British Latin: the text, interpretation and language of the Bath curse tablets", *Britannia* 23, 1-26.

Adams, J.N. (1994a): *Wackernagel's law and the placement of the copula* esse *in classical Latin*. Cambridge.

Adams, J.N. (1994b): "Wackernagel's law and the position of unstressed personal pronouns in classical Latin", *TPhS* 92:2, 103-178.

Adams, J.N. (1994c): "Latin and Punic in contact? The case of the Bu Njem ostraca", *JRS* 84, 87-112.

Adams, J.N. (1995a): "The language of the Vindolanda writing-tablets: An interim report", *JRS* 85, 86-134.

Adams, J.N. (1995b): *Pelagonius and Latin veterinary terminology in the Roman empire*. Leiden.

Adams, J.N. (1996): "The interpretation of *souxtum* at *Tab. Vindol*. II.301.3", *ZPE* 110, 238.

Adams, J.N. (1999): "The poets of Bu Njem: Language, culture and the centurionate", *JRS* 89, 109-134.

Adams, J.N. (2003a): *Bilingualism and the Latin language*. Oxford.

Adams, J.N. (2003b): "Petronius and new non-literary Latin", in József Herman / Hannah Rosén (eds.) *Petroniana. Gedenkschrift für Hubert Petersmann*. Heidelberg 2003. 11-23.

Adams, J.N. (2003c): "The new Vindolanda writing-tablets", *CQ* 53, 530-575.

Adams, J.N. (2005a): "The accusative + infinitive and dependent *quod*-/*quia*-clauses. The evidence of non-literary data and Petronius", in S. Kiss / L. Mondin / G. Salvi (eds.) *Latin et langues romanes*, 195-206.

Adams, J.N. (2005b): "The *Bellum Africum*", in T. Reinhardt / M. Lapidge / J.N. Adams (eds.) (2005) *Aspects of the language of Latin prose*, 73-96.

Adams, J.N. (2006): "Greek interference in Egyptian Latin. An unusual partitive apposition construction", *Oxford University working papers in linguistics, philology & phonetics* 11, 1-4.

Adams, J.N. (forthcoming): *The regional diversification of Latin*. Cambridge.

Adams, J.N. / Mayer, R.G. (1999): "Introduction", in J.N. Adams / R.G. Mayer (eds.) (1999) *Aspects of the language of Latin poetry*, 1-18.

Adams, J.N. / Lapidge, Michael / Reinhardt, Tobias (2005): "Introduction", in T. Reinhardt / M. Lapidge / J.N. Adams (eds.) (2005) *Aspects of the language of Latin prose*, 1-36.

Adams, J.N. / Mayer, R.G. (eds.) (1999): *Aspects of the language of Latin poetry*. Oxford.

Adams, J.N. / Janse, Mark / Swain, Simon (eds.) (2002): *Bilingualism in ancient society. Language contact and the written text*. Oxford.

Albrecht, Jörn (1986): "Substandard und Subnorm. Die nicht-exemplarischen Ausprägungen der historischen Sprache aus varietätenlinguistischer Sicht

(Fortsetzung)", in G. Holtus / E. Radtke (eds.) (1990) *Sprachlicher Substandard III*, 44-127.

Alston, Richard (1995): *Soldier and society in Roman Egypt. A social history*. London.

Álvarez Huerta, Olga (2005): "¿Accusativus pendens *en Latín*?", in G. Calboli (ed.) (2005) *Papers on grammar* IX, 433-442.

Ammon, Ulrich (1986): "Explikation der Begriffe 'Standardvarietät' und 'Standardsprache' auf normtheoretischer Grundlage", in Günter Holtus / Edgar Radtke (eds.) *Sprachlicher Substandard*. Tübingen 1986. 1-63.

Bagordo, Andreas (2001): *Beobachtungen zur Sprache des Terenz. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der umgangssprachlichen Elemente*. Göttingen.

Bagordo, Andreas (2007): "Langversstil und Senarstil bei Terenz", in Peter Kruschwitz / Widu-Wolfgang Ehlers / Fritz Felgentreu (eds.) *Terentius Poeta*. München 2007. 127-142.

Banniard, Michel (1995): "*Ille* et son système: chronologie du développement (III^{e} – VIII^{e} s.)", in L. Callebat (ed.) (1995) *Latin vulgaire — latin tardif IV*, 313-321.

Bartsch, Renate (1987): *Norms of language*. New York.

Bauer, Brigitte L.M. (1995): *The emergence and development of SVO patterning in Latin and French*. *Diachronic and psycholinguistic perspectives*. Oxford.

Beaman, Karen (1984): "Coordination and subordination revisited: syntactic complexity in spoken and written narrative discourse", in Deborah Tannen (ed.) *Coherence in spoken and written discourse*. Norwood 1984. 45-80.

Bennett, Charles E. (1914): *Syntax of early Latin* II. Boston.

Bodelot, Colette (1987): *L'interrogation indirecte en latin: syntaxe, valeur illocutoire, formes*. Paris.

Bolkestein, A. Machtelt (1981): "Embedded predications, displacement and pseudo-argument formation in Latin", in A. Machtelt Bolkestein / Henk A. Combé / Simon C. Dik / Casper de Groot / Jadranka Gvozdanović / Albert Rijksbaron / Co Vet (eds.) *Predication and expression in Functional Grammar*. London 1981. 63-112.

Bolkestein, A. Machtelt (1991): "Causally related predications and the choice between parataxis and hypotaxis in Latin", in Robert Coleman (ed.) *New studies in Latin*

linguistics. Selected papers from the 4th international colloquium on Latin linguistics, Cambridge April 1987. Amsterdam/Philadelphia 1991. 427-451.

Bolkestein, A. Machtelt (1995): "Questions about questions", in D. Longrée (ed.) *De usu. Études de syntaxe latine offertes à Marius Lavency*. Louvain-La-Neuve 1995. 59-70.

Bolkestein, A. Machtelt (1996): "Free but not arbitrary: 'emotive' word order in Latin?" in Rodie Risselada / Jan R. de Jong / A. Machtelt Bolkestein (eds.) *On Latin. Linguistic and literary studies in honour of Harm Pinkster*. Amsterdam 1996. 7-24.

Bolkestein, A. Machtelt (1998): "Between brackets: (some properties of) parenthetical clauses in Latin. An investigation of the language of Cicero's letters", in Rodie Risselada (ed.) *Latin in use. Amsterdam studies in the pragmatics of Latin*. Amsterdam 1998. 1-15.

Bolkestein, A. Machtelt / van de Grift, Michel (1994): "Participant tracking in Latin discourse", in J. Herman (ed.) (1994) *Linguistic studies on Latin*, 283-301.

Bowman, A.K. (1994a): *Life and letters on the Roman frontier. Vindolanda and its people.* London.

Bowman, A.K. (1994b): "The Roman imperial army: letters and literacy on the northern frontier", in A.K. Bowman / G. Woolf (eds.) (1994) *Literacy and power in the ancient world*, 109-125.

Bowman, A.K. / Thomas, J.D. / Adams, J.N. (1990): "Two letters from Vindolanda", *Britannia* 21, 33-52.

Bowman, A.K. / Thomas, J.D. (1983), (1994), (2003) see tab. Vindol. I-III above under editions.

Bowman, A.K. / Woolf, G. (eds.) (1994): *Literacy and power in the ancient world*. Cambridge 1994.

Boyce, Bret (1991): *The language of the freedmen in Petronius'* Cena Trimalchionis. Leiden.

Brown, Virginia (1970): "A Latin letter from Oxyrynchos", *BICS* 17, 136-143.

Calboli, Gualtiero (1990): "Vulgärlatein und Griechisch in der Zeit Trajans", in Gualtiero Calboli (ed.) *Latin vulgaire-latin tardif II. Actes du IIème Colloque international*

sur le latin vulgaire et tardif (Bologne, 29 Août –2 Septembre 1988). Tübingen 1990. 23-44.

Calboli, Gualtiero (1996): "Accusative as the 'default' case in Latin", in H. Rosen (ed.) (1996) *Aspects of Latin*, 423-436.

Calboli, Gualtiero (1999): "Zur Syntax der neuen vulgärlateinischen Urkunden aus Murécine", in H. Petersmann / R. Kettemann (eds.) (1999) *Latin vulgaire—latin tardif V*, 331-344.

Calboli, Gualtiero (ed.) (1989): *Subordination and other topics in Latin. Proceedings of the third colloquium on Latin linguistics, Bologna, 1-5 April 1985*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Calboli, Gualtiero (ed.) (2005): *Papers on grammar IX. Proceedings of the twelfth international colloquium on Latin linguistics, Bologna, 9-14 June 2003*. Roma.

Calderini, Rita (1951): "Osservazioni sul latino del P. Mich. VIII, 467-472", *RIL* 84, 250-262.

Callebat, Louis (ed.) (1995): *Latin vulgaire — latin tardif IV*. *Actes du 4^{e} colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Caen, 2-5 septembre 1994*. Hildesheim.

Cavenaile, Robert (1958) see CPL above under editions.

Chafe, Wallace (1985): "Linguistic differences produced by differences between speaking and writing", in D. R. Olson / N. Torrance / A. Hildyard (eds.) *Literacy, language and learning*, 105-123.

Chambers, J.K. (2003): *Sociolinguistic theory: linguistic variation and its social significance*. Oxford.

Coleman, Robert (1999): "Poetic diction, poetic discourse and the poetic register", in J.N. Adams / R.G. Mayer (eds.), *Aspects of the language of Latin poetry*, 21-93.

Cotton, Hannah (1981): *Documentary letters of recommendation in Latin from the Roman empire*. Königstein.

Courtney, Edward (1995): *Musa lapidaria. A selection of Latin verse inscriptions*. Atlanta, Georgia (American Classical studies 36).

Courtney, Edward (1999): *Archaic Latin prose*. Atlanta, Georgia (American Classical studies 42).

Cravens, Thomas D. (1991): "Phonology, phonetics, and orthography in late Latin and Romance: the evidence for early intervocalic sonorization", in R. Wright (ed.) (1991) *Latin and the Romance languages in the early Middle Ages*, 52-68.

Cugusi, Paolo (1981): "Gli ostraca latini dello wâdi Fawâkhir. Pre la storia del latino", in *Letterature comparate: problemi e metodo. Studi in onore di Ettore Paratore*. Bologna 1981. 719-753.

Cugusi, Paolo (1983): *Evoluzione e forme dell'epistolografia latina nella tarda repubblica e nei primi due secoli dell'impero con cenni sull'epistolografia preciceroniana*. Roma.

Cugusi, Paolo (1989): "L'epistolografia. Modelli e tipologie di comunicazione", in *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica. Vol. II La circolazione del testo*. Roma 1989. 379-419.

Cugusi, Paolo (1992) see CEL above under editions.

Cugusi, Paolo (1993): "*Non magis quravit me pro xylesphongium* (P. Mich. VIII 471, 29)", *RFIC* 121, 391-395.

Cugusi, Paolo (2005): "Osservazioni sulle valenze storico-linguistica e letteraria dei papiri epistolari", *Aufidus*, 19:56-57, 7-27.

Dangel, Jacqueline / Moussy, Claude (eds.) (1996): *Les structures de l'oralité en latin*. Paris.

Dickey, Eleanor (2002): *Latin forms of address*. Oxford.

Dickey, Eleanor (forthcoming): "'Latin influence and Greek request formulae", in Trevor Evans / Dirk Obbink (eds.) *The language of the papyri*. Oxford.

Dickey, Eleanor (unpublished): " 'Please' and related expressions in classical and later Latin", paper given at Università di Pisa, 28 March 2006.

Dik, Helma (1995): *Word order in ancient Greek. A pragmatic account of word order variation in Herodotus*. Amsterdam.

Dik, Simon (1997): *The theory of Functional Grammar* 1-2 (edited by Kees Hengeveld). Berlin / New York.

Devine, A. M. / Stephens, Laurence D. (2006): *Latin word order. Structured meaning and information*. Oxford.

Dryer, Matthew S. (1992): “The Greenbergian word order correlations”, *Language* 68, 81-138.

Dryer, Matthew S. (1998): “Aspects of word order in the languages of Europe”, in A. Siewierska (ed.) (1998) *Constituent order in the languages of Europe*, 283-319.

Durante, Marcello (1981): *Dal latino all’italiano moderno. Saggio di storia linguistica e culturale*. Bologna.

Fink (1971) see above under editions.

Frischer, Bernard / Andersen, Roger / Burstein, Stanley / Crawford, Jane / Gallucci, Ralph / Gowing, Alain / Guthrie, Donald / Haslam, Michael / Holmes, David / Rudich, Vasily / Sherk, Robert K. / Taylor, Ann / Tweedie, Fiona / Vine, Brent (1999): “Word-order transference between Latin and Greek: the relative position of the accusative direct object and the governing verb in Cassius Dio and other Greek and Roman prose authors”, *HSPh* 99, 357-390.

Fruyt, Michèle (1996): “Oralité et langue latine: approche de la problématique”, in J. Dangel / C. Moussy (eds.) (1996) *Les structures de l’oralité en latin*, 53-68.

Galdi, Giovanbattista (2004): *Grammatica delle iscrizioni latine dell’impero (province orientali)*. Roma. (Papers on grammar, Monographs 3).

Gilliam, J.F. (1976): “Three ostraca from Latopolis”, *BASP* 13, 55-61.

Gitton, Valérie (2003): “L’accusatif absolu dans l’*Ars veterinaria* de Pelagonius”, in H. Solin / M. Leiwo / H. Halla-aho (eds.) (2003) *Latin vulgaire—latin tardif VI*, 525-539.

Goetsch, Paul (1985): “Fingierte Mündlichkeit in der Erzählkunst entwickelter Schrifkulturen”, *Poetica* 17, 202-218.

Guéraud, O. (1940) see O. Faw. above under editions.

Gundel, Jeanette K. / Fretheim, Thorstein (2004): “Topic and Focus”, in Laurence R. Horn / Gregory Ward (eds.) *The handbook of pragmatics*. Blackwell 2004. 175-196.

Halla-aho, Hilla (2003): “Scribes and the letters of Claudius Terentianus”, in H. Solin / M. Leiwo / H. Halla-aho (eds.) (2003) *Latin vulgaire—latin tardif VI*, 245-252.

Halla-aho, Hilla (forthcoming): "Linguistic varieties and language level in Latin non-literary letters", in Trevor Evans / Dirk Obbink (eds.) *The language of the papyri*. Oxford.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1989): *Spoken and written language*. Oxford.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1994): *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). London.

Happ, Heinz (1967): "Die lateinische Umgangssprache und die Kunstsprache des Plautus", *Glotta* 45, 60-104.

Harris, William V. (1989): *Ancient literacy*. Cambridge.

Haverling, Gerd (2005): "On tense, viewpoint and actionality in vulgar and literary late Latin", in G. Calboli (ed.) (2005) *Papers on grammar* IX, 281-291

Havers, Wilhelm (1926): "Der sog. Nominativus pendens", *IF* 43, 207-257.

Heather, Peter (1994): "Literacy and power in the migration period", in A.K. Bowman / G. Woolf (eds.) (1994) *Literacy and power in the ancient world*, 177-197.

Helttula, Anne (1987): *Studies on the Latin accusative absolute*. Helsinki. (Comm. hum. litt. 81).

Herman, József (1989): "Accusativus cum infinitivo et subordonnée à *quod*, *quia* en latin tardif-nouvelles remarques sur un vieux problème", in G. Calboli (ed.) (1989) *Subordination and other topics in Latin*, 133-152.

Herman, József (1991): "Spoken and written Latin in the last centuries of the Roman empire. A contribution to the linguistic history of the western provinces", in R. Wright (ed.) (1991) *Latin and the Romance languages in the early Middle Ages*, 29-43.

Herman, József (1996): "Les variétés du latin", in Günter Holtus / Michael Metzeltin / Christian Schmitt (eds.) *Lexikon der romanistischen Linguistik* Bd. II, 1. Tübingen 1996. 44-61.

Herman, József (2000): *Vulgar Latin* (transl. by Roger Wright). University Park, Pennsylvania.

Herman, József (ed.) (1994): *Linguistic studies on Latin. Selected papers from the 6th international colloquium on Latin linguistics (Budapest, 23-27 March 1991).* Amsterdam/Philadelphia 1994.

Hoffmann, Maria E. (1989): “A typology of Latin Theme constituents”, in M. Lavency / D. Longrée (eds.) (1989) *Actes du Ve Colloque de Linguistique latine*, 185-196.

Hofmann, J.B. (1951): *Lateinische Umgangssprache (3. Auflage)*. Heidelberg.

Hofmann, J.B. / Szantyr, Anton (1965): *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II.2.2.).

Holtus, Günter / Radtke, Edgar (1990): “Substandardbeschreibung in der Sprachwissenschaft: Aktuelle Skizzierung und offene Fragen”, in G. Holtus / E. Radtke (eds.) (1990) *Sprachlicher Substandard III*, vii-xxi.

Holtus, Günter / Radtke, Edgar (eds.) (1990): *Sprachlicher Substandard III. Standard, Substandard und Varietätenlinguistik*. Tübingen.

Häusler, Sabine (2000): “Parenthesen im Lateinischen am Beispiel der Pliniusbriefe”, *Glotta* 76, 202-231.

Itkonen, Esa (1978): “The significance of Merovingian Latin to linguistic theory”, in *Four linguistic studies in classical languages*, 9-64 (*Publications of the Department of General Linguistics*, University of Helsinki, 5).

Janson, Tore (1979): *Mechanisms of language change in Latin*. Stockholm. (Acta universitatis Stockholmiensis, Studia latina Stockholmiensia 23).

Janson, Tore (1991): “Language change and metalinguistic change: Latin to Romance and other cases”, in R. Wright (ed.) (1991) *Latin and the Romance languages in the early Middle Ages*, 19-28.

Jones, F. (1991): “Subject, topic, given and salient: sentence-beginnings in Latin”, *PCPhS* 37, 81-105.

de Jong, Jan R. (1989): “The position of the Latin subject”, in G. Calboli (ed.) (1989) *Subordination and other topics in Latin*, 521-540.

de Jong, Jan R. (1994): “Word order in Cato’s De Agricultura”, in J. Herman (ed.) (1994) *Linguistic studies on Latin*, 91-101.

Jordens, Peter (1986): “Production rules in interlanguage: evidence from case errors in L2 German”, in Eric Kellerman / Michael Sharwood Smith (eds.) *Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition*. New York 1986. 91-109.

Joseph, John Earl (1987): *Eloquence and power. The rise of language standards and standard languages*. London.

Jucker, Andreas / Fritz, Gerd / Lebsanft, Franz (1999): "Historical dialogue analysis: Roots and traditions in the study of Romance languages, German and English", in A. Jucker / G. Fritz / F. Lebsanft (eds.) *Historical dialogue analysis*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia 1999. 1-33. (Pragmatics & beyond new ser. 66).

Kiesler, Reinhard (2006): *Einführung in die Problematik des Vulgärlateins*. Tübingen.

Kiss, Sándor / Mondin, Luca / Salvi, Giampaolo (eds.) (2005): *Latin et langues romanes. Études de linguistique offertes à József Herman*. Tübingen.

Koch, Peter (1995): "Une langue comme toutes les autres: latin vulgaire et traits universels de l'oral", in L. Callebat (ed.) (1995) *Latin vulgaire — latin tardif IV*, 125-144.

Koch, Peter / Oesterreicher, Wulf (1985): "Sprache der Nähe — Sprache der Distanz. Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im Spannungsfeld von Sprachtheorie und Sprachgeschichte", *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 36, 15-43.

Kolb, Anne (2000): *Transport und Nachrichtentransfer im Römischen Reich*. Berlin.

Koll, Hans-Georg (1965): "Zur Stellung des Verbs im spätantiken und frühmittelalterlichen Latein", *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 2, 241-272.

Kramer, Johannes (1997): "Zwischen Latein und Moselromanisch: Die Gondorfer Grabinschrift für Mauricius", *ZPE* 118, 281-286.

Kruschwitz, Peter (2004): *Römische Inschriften und Wackernagels Gesetz. Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu epigraphischen Zeugnissen aus republikanischer Zeit.* Heidelberg.

Kühner, R. / Stegmann, C. (1971): *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre*. Hannover.

Labov, William (2001): *Principles of language change. Vol. 2: Social factors.* Oxford.

Laughton, Eric (1960): "Observations on the style of Varro", *CQ* 10, 1-28.

Lavency, Marius / Longrée, Dominique (eds.) (1989): *Actes du V^e colloque de linguistique latine (Louvain-la-Neuve/Borzée 31 mars – 4 avril 1989)*. Louvain-la-Neuve.

Lebek, W. D. (1985): "Neues über Epistolographie und Grammatikunterricht", *ZPE* 60, 53-62.

Leiwo, Martti (2002): “From contact to mixture: bilingual insriptions from Italy”, in J.N. Adams / M. Janse / S. Swain (eds.) (2002) *Bilingualism in ancient society*, 168-194.

Leiwo, Martti (2005): “Substandard Greek. Remarks from Mons Claudianus”, in Nigel M. Kennell / Jonathan E. Tomlinson (eds.) *Ancient Greece at the turn of the Millennium: Recent work and future perspectives. Proceedings of the Athens symposium 18-20 May 2001*. Publications of the Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens, 2005. 237-261.

Leiwo, Martti / Halla-aho, Hilla (2002): “A marriage contract. Aspects of Latin-Greek language contact”, *Mnemosyne* 55, 560-580.

Lewis, Naphtali (1959): “A veteran in quest of a home’, *TAPhA* 90, 139-146.

Linde, P. (1923): “Die Stellung des Verbs in der lateinischen Prosa”, *Glotta* 12, 153-178.

Lloyd, Paul M. (1991): “On the names of languages (and other things)”, in R. Wright (ed.) (1991) *Latin and the Romance languages in the early Middle Ages*, 9-18.

Löfstedt, Bengt (1961): *Studien über die Sprache der langobardischen Gesetze. Beiträge frühmittelalterlichen Latinität.* Stockholm.

Löfstedt, Einar (1933): *Syntactica* II. Lund.

Löfstedt, Einar (1959): *Late Latin*. Oslo.

Mackay, Christopher S. (1999): “Expressions to indicate goal of motion in the colloquial Latin of the early Empire”, *ZPE* 126, 229-239.

Magni, Elisabetta (2000): “L’ordine delle parole nel latino pompeiano: sulle tracce di una deriva”, *AGI* 85:1, 3-37.

Marichal, Robert (1992) see O. Bu Njem above under editions.

Mattheier, Klaus J. (1990): “Überlegungen zum Substandard im Zwischenbereich von Dialekt und Standardsprache”, in G. Holtus / E. Radtke (eds.) (1990) *Sprachlicher Substandard III*, 1-16.

Mayer, Roland (2005): “The impracticability of Latin ‘Kunstprosa’ ”, in T. Reinhardt / M. Lapidge / J.N. Adams (eds.) (2005) *Aspects of the language of Latin prose*, 195-210

Meurman-Solin, Anneli (1999): “Letters as a source of data for reconstructing early spoken Scots”, in I. Taavitsainen / G. Melchers / P. Pahta (eds.) (1999) *Writing in nonstandard English*, 305-322.

Molinelli, Piera (1986): “L’ordine delle parole in latino: studi recenti”, *L&S* 21, 485-498.

Molinelli, Piera (1989): “La caduta della desinenza di accusativo singolare in latino: tra morfologia e ordine delle parole”, *Quaderni del dipartimento di linguistica e letterature comparate (Università di Bergamo)* 5, 277-286.

Molinelli, Piera (1996): “Subordination and moods in nonstandard Latin of Egyptian papyri”, in H. Rosén (ed.) (1996) *Aspects of Latin*, 463-469.

Molinelli, Piera (1999): “ *De* + ablativo: marca di topic in latino”, in H. Petersmann / R. Kettemann (eds.) (1999) *Latin vulgaire—latin tardif V*, 277-285.

Molinelli, Piera / Rizzi, Elena (1991): “Per uno studio morfosintattico di latino e greco, lingue a contatto in Egitto (pronomi personali e aggettivi possessivi)”, *Athenaeum* 79, 31-58.

Montgomery, Michael (1995): “The linguistic value of Ulster emigrant letters”, *Ulster Folklife* 41, 26-41.

Müller, Roman (1997): *Sprechen und Sprache. Dialoglinguistische Studien zu Terenz*. Heidelberg.

Norberg, Dag (1943): *Syntaktische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete des Spätlatein und des frühen Mittellateins*. Uppsala. (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 9).

Nuti, Andrea (2005): “A few remarks on the *habeo* + object + passive perfect participle construction in archaic Latin, with special reference to lexical semantics and the reanalysis process”, in G. Calboli (ed.) (2005) *Papers on grammar* IX, 393-404.

Ochs, Elinor (1979): “Planned and unplanned discourse”, in Talmy Givón (ed.) *Discourse and syntax*. New York 1979. (Syntax and semantics 12). 51-80.

Oesterreicher, Wulf (1995): “L’oral dans l’ecrit. Essai d’une typologie a partir des sources du latin vulgaire”, in L. Callebat (ed.) *Latin vulgaire — latin tardif IV*, 145-157.

Olson, David R. / Torrance, Nancy / Hildyard, Angela (eds.) (1985): *Literacy, language and learning.* Cambridge.

Orlandini, Anna (1981): "Wesen und Entwicklung des Artikels vom lateinischen zu den romanischen Sprachen", *IF* 86, 223-247.

Ramsden, H. (1963): *Weak-pronoun position in the early Romance languages*. Manchester.

Panhuis, D.G.J. (1981): "Word order, genre, adstratum: the place of the verb in Caesar's topographical excursus", *Glotta* 59, 295-308.

Panhuis, D.G.J. (1982): *The communicative perspective in the sentence. A study of Latin word order.* Amsterdam.

Panhuis, D.G.J. (1984): "Is Latin a SOV language? A diachronic perspective", *IF* 89, 140-159.

Penney, J.H.W. (1999): "Archaism and innovation in Latin poetic syntax", in J.N. Adams / R.G. Mayer (eds.) (1999) *Aspects of the language of Latin poetry*, 249-268.

Penney, J.H.W. (2005): "Connections in archaic Latin prose" in T. Reinhardt / M. Lapidge / J.N. Adams (eds.) *Aspects of the language of Latin prose*, 37-51.

Petersmann, Hubert (1977): *Petrons urbane Prosa*. *Untersuchungen zu Sprache und Text (Syntax).* Wien. (Sitzungsberichte. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-Hist. Klasse 321. Bd).

Petersmann, Hubert / Kettemann, Rudolph (eds.) (1999): *Latin vulgaire—latin tardif V. Actes du Ve Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Heidelberg, 5-8 septembre 1997.* Heidelberg.

Pighi, Giovanni Battista (1964): *Lettere latine d'un soldato di Traiano*. Bologna. (Studi pubblicati dall'istituto di filologia classica 14).

Pinkster, Harm (1972): *On Latin adverbs*. Amsterdam.

Pinkster, Harm (1990): *Latin syntax and semantics* (transl. by Hotze Mulder). London/New York.

Pinkster, Harm (1991): "Evidence for SVO in Latin?", in R. Wright (ed.) (1991) *Latin and the Romance languages in the early Middle Ages*, 69-82

Pinkster, Harm (2005a): "The language of Pliny the Elder", in T. Reinhardt / M. Lapidge / J.N. Adams (eds.) *Aspects of the language of Latin prose*, 239-256.

Pinkster, Harm (2005b): "The use of *is* and *ille* in Seneca Rhetor", in S. Kiss / L. Mondin / G. Salvi (eds.) *Latin et langues romanes*, 57-64.

PIR^2 = *Prosopographia Imperii Romani. Editio altera.* Berlin.

Pulgram, Ernst (1950): "Spoken and written Latin", *Language* 26, 458-466.

Ramat, Paolo (1984): *Linguistica tipologica*. Bologna.

Reinhardt, Tobias / Lapidge, Michael / Adams, J.N. (eds.) (2005): *Aspects of the language of Latin prose*. Oxford.

Risselada, Rodie (1989): "Latin illocutionary parentheticals", in M. Lavency / D. Longrée (eds.) (1989) *Actes du V^e colloque de linguistique latine*, 367-378.

Rizzi, Elena / Molinelli, Piera (1994): "Latin and Greek compared: word order in a bilingual papyrian text (P. Bon. 5)", in J. Herman (ed.) (1994) *Linguistic studies on Latin*, 113-127

Rodger, Alan (2000): "*Attractio inversa* in the edict of Augustus from El Bierzo", *ZPE* 133, 266-270.

Rodgers, R. H. (1970): "From the Tiberianus archive", *ZPE* 5, 91-96.

Rosén, Hannah (ed.) (1996): *Aspects of Latin. Seventh international colloquium on Latin linguistics. Jerusalem 1993*. Innsbruck.

Schneider, Edgar W. (2002): "Investigating variation and change in written documents", in J.K. Chambers / Peter Trudgill / Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.): *The handbook of language variation and change*. Blackwell 2002. 67-96

Scivoletto, Nino (1962): "'Dico quod', 'dico quia'", *GIF* 15, 1-34.

Seider, Richard (1972): *Paläographie der lateinischen papyri.* Bd. I. Stuttgart.

Seider, Richard (1983): "Beiträge zur Paläographie der ältesten lateinischen papyri der Sammlung Erzherzog Rainer der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek", in *P. Rainer Cent*. (*Festschrift zum 100-jährigen Bestehen der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*), 135-143.

Selig, Maria (1992): *Die Entwicklung der Nominaldeterminanten im Spätlatein*. Tübingen.

Siewierska, Anna (1998): "Variation in major constituent order: a global and a European perspective", in A. Siewierska (ed.) (1998) *Constituent order in the languages of Europe*, 475-551.

Siewierska, Anna (ed.) (1998): *Constituent order in the languages of Europe*. Berlin/New York.

Sijpesteijn, P.J. (1973) see O. Latopolis Magnae above under editions.

Speidel, M.A. (1996) see tab. Vindon. above under editions.

Spevak, Olga (2006): "Recent studies on word order in Latin: a review article", *Mnemosyne* 59, 434-451.

Solin, Heikki (1996): *Die stadtrömischen Sklavennamen: ein Namenbuch.* Stuttgart.

Solin, Heikki (2003): *Die griechischen Personennamen im Rom: ein Namenbuch (zweite Auflage).* Berlin. (CIL auctarium s.n. 2).

Solin, Heikki / Leiwo, Martti / Halla-aho, Hilla (eds.) (2003): *Latin vulgaire—latin tardif VI. Actes du VI^e colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Helsinki 29 août – 2 septembre 2000*. Hildesheim.

Somers, Maartje H. (1994): "Theme and Topic. The relation between discourse and constituent fronting in Latin", in J. Herman (ed.) (1994) *Linguistic studies on Latin*, 151-163.

Stauner, Konrad (2004): *Das offizielle Schriftwesen des römischen Heeres von Augustus bis Gallienus (27 v.Chr. – 268 n. Chr.). Eine Untersuchung zu Struktur, Funktion, und Bedeutung der offiziellen militärischen Verwaltungsdokumentation und zu deren Schreibern*. Bonn.

Svennung, Josef (1935): *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache*. Lund.

Swain, Simon (2002): "Bilingualism in Cicero? The evidence of code-switching", in J. N. Adams / M. Janse / S. Swain (eds.) (2002) *Bilingualism in ancient society*, 128-167.

Taavitsainen, Irma / Melchers, Gunnel / Pahta, Päivi (eds.) (1999): *Writing in nonstandard English*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia. (Pragmatics & beyond new ser. 67)

Taavitsainen, Irma / Melchers, Gunnel (1999): "Introduction", in I. Taavitsainen / G. Melchers / P. Pahta (eds.) (1999) *Writing in nonstandard English*, 1-26.

Tannen, Deborah (1985): “Relative focus on involvement in oral and written discourse”, in D. R. Olson / N. Torrance / A. Hildyard (eds.) (1985) *Literacy, language and learning*, 124-147.

Tomlin, R.S.O. (1998) see tab. Luguv. above under editions.

Touratier, Christian, (2002): “Parataxe, juxtaposition et coordination”, in A.M. Bolkestein / C.H.M. Kroon / H. Pinkster / H.W. Remmelink / R. Risselada (eds.) *Theory and description in Latin linguistics. Selected papers from the XIth international colloquium on Latin linguistics (Amsterdam, June 24-29 2001)*. Amsterdam 2002. 393-403.

Trudgill, Peter (1986): *Dialects in contact*. Oxford.

Tweedie, Fiona J. / Frischer, Bernard D. (1999): “Analysis of classical Greek and Latin compositional word order data”, *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics* 6:1, 85-97.

Varvaro, Alberto (1991): “Latin and Romance: fragmentation or restructuring?”, in R. Wright (ed.) (1991) *Latin and the Romance languages in the early Middle Ages*, 44-51.

Versteegh, Kees (1992): “The debate concerning Latin and early Romance” (review article of Roger Wright (ed.) *Latin and the Romance languages in the early Middle Ages*. London/New York 1991), *Diachronica* 9, 259-285.

Versteegh, Kees (2002): “Dead or alive? The status of the standard language”, in J. N. Adams / M. Janse / S. Swain (eds.) (2002) *Bilingualism in ancient society*, 52-74.

Vilkuna, Maria (1998): “Word order in European Uralic”, in A. Siewierska (ed.) (1998) *Constituent order in the languages of Europe*, 173-233.

Väänänen, Veikko (1966): *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes (troisième édition augmentée)*. Berlin.

Väänänen, Veikko (1981): *Introduction au latin vulgaire* (3ème éd). Paris.

Wanner, Dieter (1987): *The development of Romance clitic pronouns. From Latin to Old Romance*. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam.

Watkins, Calvert (1995): *How to kill a dragon. Aspects of Indo-European poetics*. Oxford.

Weinreich, Uriel / Labov, William / Herzog, Marvin I. (1968): “Empirical foundations for a theory of language change”, in W. P. Lehmann / Yakov Malkiel (eds.) *Directions for historical linguistics*. Austin, Texas 1986. 95-188.

Wright, Roger (1991): “Introduction: Latin and Romance, a thousand years of incertitude”, in R. Wright (ed.) (1991) *Latin and the Romance languages in the early Middle Ages*, 1-5.

Wright, Roger (2002): *A sociophilological study of late Latin*. Turnhout. (Utrecht studies in medieval literacy 10).

Wright, Roger (ed.) (1991): *Latin and the Romance languages in the early Middle Ages*. London/New York 1991.

Wolterstorff, Godofredus (1907): *Historia pronominis* ille *exemplis demonstrata.* Diss. Marburg.

Youtie H.C. / Winter J.G. (1951) see P. Mich. VIII above under editions.

APPENDIX: TABLE OF THE MATERIAL

(the reference used in this work is in **bold**)

The material is classified according to provenance and listed chronologically.

1. Material from Egypt (and North-Africa)

Editio princeps	CEL	CPL	provenance, type, date
P. Berl. inv. 13956	**CEL 3**	CPL 246	Egypt, private, 1st BC
P. Vindob. Lat 1	**CEL 6**		Egypt, private, 1st BC
P. Vindob. Lat 1	**CEL 7**	CPL 247	
P. Vindob. Lat 1	**CEL 8**	CPL 247	
P. Qaṣr Ibrîm inv. 78-3-21/24 (L1/3)	**CEL 9**		Qaṣr Ibrîm (Premium), ?, 1st BC
P. Oxy. XLIV 3208, Brown 1970 (see bibliography)	**CEL 10**		Oxyrynchos, private, Augustan
P. Vindob. Lat 135	CEL 13		Egypt, loan contract
P. Aberdeen 61	CEL 72	CPL 185	Soknopaiou Nesos, receipt, 48-49 AD
O. Faw. 1	**CEL 73**	CPL 303	Wâdi Fawâkhir, private, 1st AD
O. Faw. 2	**CEL 74**	CPL 304	
O. Faw. 3	**CEL 75**	CPL 305	
O. Faw. 4	**CEL 76**	CPL 306	
O. Faw. 5a	**CEL 77**	CPL 307	
O. Faw. 5b	**CEL 78**	CPL 307	
O. Faw. 6	**CEL 79**	CPL 308	
O. Faw. 7	**CEL 80**	CPL 309	
P. Ryl. IV 608	**CEL 81**	CPL 248	Egypt, recommendation, 1st / 2nd AD
P. Berl. inv. 11649	**CEL 83**	CPL 257	Fayûm, recommendation, late 1st AD
P. Med. inv. 195	**CEL 84**		Egypt, recommendation, late 1st AD
P. Berl. inv. 8334	**CEL 85**	CPL 238	Egypt, from an imperial *exemplar codicillorum* (of Domitian)
P. Ryl. IV 613	**CEL 86**	CPL 256	Egypt, private,1st / 2nd AD
P. Oxy. VII 1022	**CEL 140**	CPL 111	Oxyrynchos, official, AD 103
P. Mich. VIII 467	CEL 141	CPL 250	Karanis, private, early 2nd AD
P. Mich. VIII 468	CEL 142	CPL 251	
P. Mich. VIII 469	CEL 144	CPL 252	
P. Mich. VIII 470	CEL 145	CPL 253	

P. Mich. VIII 471	CEL 146	CPL 254	Karanis, private, early 2nd AD
P. Mich. VIII 472	CEL 147	CPL 255	
P. Mich. inv. 5395, Rodgers 1970 (see bibliography)	CEL 143		
P. Thead. inv. 31	**CEL 149**		Theadelphia, official, 113-117 AD
P. Lond. 482	**CEL 150**	CPL 114	Egypt, receipt,130 AD
P. Mich. VII 438	**CEL 154**	CPL 188	Karanis, loan receipt, 140 AD
P. Fuad. I 45	**CEL 155**	CPL 189	Egypt, loan receipt, 153 AD
P. Lond. 730 = P. Grenf. II 108	**CEL 156**	CPL 191	Egypt, loan receipt, 167 AD
P. Gen. Lat. 8	**CEL 157**	CPL 192	Egypt, private?, 167 AD
O. Latopolis Magnae 13	**CEL 158**		Latopolis Magna (Esna), official, 2nd AD
O. Latopolis Magnae 13	**CEL 159**		
P. Iand. 68	**CEL 167**	CPL 239	Gizeh, official (imperial), 2nd AD
P. Oxy. I 32 + II, pp. 318-319	**CEL 169**	CPL 249	Oxyrynchos, recommendation, 2nd AD
P. Hibeh. 276	**CEL 177**	CPL 260	Ankyropolis, recommendation, 2nd AD
O. Claud. I 2			Mons Claudianus, official?, 2nd AD
O. Claud. I 131			Mons Claudianus, official?, 2nd AD
O. Claud. I 135			Mons Claudianus, private?, 2nd AD
O. Claud. II 367			Mons Claudianus, official?, 2nd AD
O. Max. inv. 254			Maximianon (El Zerqa), private, 2nd AD
M689			Maximianon (El Zerqa), official?, 1st / 2nd AD
M1107			Maximianon (El Zerqa), official?, 2nd AD
O. Bu Njem 74-117			Bu Njem (Gholaia) in modern Libya, mostly official, 3rd AD

2. Miscellaneous material from outside Egypt

Editio princeps	CEL	provenance, type, date
tab. Vindon.[1] **30**		Vindonissa, private, 1st AD
tab. Vindon. 31	CEL 21	
tab. Vindon. 36	CEL 18	
tab. Vindon. 40	CEL 19	
tab. Vindon. 45		
tab. Vindon. 46	CEL 17	
tab. Vindon. 52	CEL 16	
tab. Londin. = RIB II, 4, 2443, 7	**CEL 87**	London, private, late 1st AD
tab. Luguval. 16		Carlisle, official, late 1st AD

3. The Vindolanda tablets

The tablets mostly date from c. 92 AD to 130, but attribution to a more specific point in time usually depends on the association with some major archive, most importantly that of Flavius Cerialis (see Bowman / Thomas 1994, 19).

Editio princeps[2]	CEL	"archive", type
tab. Vindol. II 210	(CEL 89-139 are texts from Vindolanda according to their edition in tab. Vindol. I. CEL Appendix ad tab. Vindol. pertinens α – θ also contains texts from Vindolanda).	Verecundus, private?
tab. Vindol. II 211		Verecundus, official?
tab. Vindol. II 212		Verecundus
tab. Vindol. II 215		Saecularis, official?
tab. Vindol. II 218		Genialis, official?
tab. Vindol. II 225		Cerialis, official?
tab. Vindol. II 233		Cerialis, private?
tab. Vindol. II 234		Cerialis, private?
tab. Vindol. II 242		Cerialis, official?
tab. Vindol. II 247		Cerialis, private?
tab. Vindol. II 248		Cerialis, official,
tab. Vindol. II 250		Cerialis, recommendation
tab. Vindol. II 252		Cerialis, official?
tab. Vindol. II 255		Cerialis, official?
tab. Vindol. II 256		Cerialis, official?
tab. Vindol. II 257		Cerialis, private?,

[1] Tab. Vindon. is, strictly speaking, not the *editio princeps*, but the first full edition.
[2] Except for those texts which are newly published in tab. Vindol. II after being first published in tab. Vindol. I.

tab. Vindol. II 258		Cerialis, official?
tab. Vindol. II 259		Cerialis, ?
tab. Vindol. II 260		Cerialis, official
tab. Vindol. II 261		Cerialis, private
tab. Vindol. II 264		Cerialis, ?
tab. Vindol. II 265		Cerialis, private
tab. Vindol. II 266		Cerialis, ?
tab. Vindol. II 274		Cerialis, private?
tab. Vindol. II 281		Cerialis, official?
tab. Vindol. II 283		Cerialis, official?
tab. Vindol. II 291		Lepidina, private,
tab. Vindol. II 292		Lepidina, private
tab. Vindol. II 294		Lepidina, private
tab. Vindol. II 295		Priscinus, official
tab. Vindol. II 297		Priscinus, ?
tab. Vindol. II 299		Lucius, private?
tab. Vindol. II 300		Lucius, official
tab. Vindol. II 301		private?
tab. Vindol. II 302		private?,
tab. Vindol. II 305		official?
tab. Vindol. II 309		business
tab. Vindol. II 310		private (letter of Chrauttius)
tab. Vindol. II 311		private
tab. Vindol. II 312		official
tab. Vindol. II 313		?
tab. Vindol. II 314		?
tab. Vindol. II 315		official?
tab. Vindol. II 316		official?
tab. Vindol. II 318		official?
tab. Vindol. II 321		private
tab. Vindol. II 322		private?
tab. Vindol. II 323		?
tab. Vindol. II 326		?
tab. Vindol. II 328		?
tab. Vindol. II 343		business (letter of Octavius)
tab. Vindol. II 344		official
tab. Vindol. II 345		official
tab. Vindol. II 346		private
tab. Vindol. II 349		private
tab. Vindol. II 353		private
tab. Vindol. III 611		Genialis, official
tab. Vindol. III 613		Genialis, ?
tab. Vindol. III 615		Cerialis, ?

tab. Vindol. III 616		Cerialis, ?
tab. Vindol. III 617		Cerialis, ?
tab. Vindol. III 618		Cerialis, official?
tab. Vindol. III 622		Cerialis, private?
tab. Vindol. III 623		Cerialis, private?
tab. Vindol. III 628		Cerialis, official
tab. Vindol. III 629		Cerialis, private
tab. Vindol. III 632		Cerialis, official?
tab. Vindol. III 635		Lepidina, private
tab. Vindol. III 639		?
tab. Vindol. III 640		official?
tab. Vindol. III 641		?
tab. Vindol. III 642		business?
tab. Vindol. III 643		business?
tab. Vindol. III 645		business
tab. Vindol. III 648		business?
tab. Vindol. III 649		business
tab. Vindol. III 650		?
tab. Vindol. III 652		?
tab. Vindol. III 655		business?
tab. Vindol. III 656		?
tab. Vindol. III 659		official?
tab. Vindol. III 660		recommendation?
tab. Vindol. III 661		private
tab. Vindol. III 662		?
tab. Vindol. III 663		private?
tab. Vindol. III 664		?
tab. Vindol. III 665		?
tab. Vindol. III 670		official
tab. Vindol. III 671		official