Classical Quarterly **53.1** 184–205 (2003) *Printed in Great Britain*

'*ROMANITAS*' AND THE LATIN LANGUAGE

I. INTRODUCTION

In what ways (if any) could 'Romanness' be conveyed through language? Was knowledge of the Latin language a defining feature of being a Roman, and did Romans have any linguistic policy which sought to enforce a view that Latin was a component of their identity? Is it legitimate in this context to talk of Latin as if it were a unity, or was Romanness associated with a particular variety of the language? Did Romans practise any sort of policy that might be labelled 'linguistic nationalism'? These are questions that have been asked in different forms before, if not explicitly with reference to the all but non-existent term *Romanitas*.[1] Here I offer a brief overview, concentrating on selected primary evidence rather than attempting to accumulate modern bibliography.[2]

If the ability to use Latin was indeed considered to be a component of Roman identity, then it could in theory be seen as such from two different perspectives: from the point of view of the Roman himself, looking outwards to a world in which not everyone was Roman and not everyone spoke the Latin language; and from the point of view of the outsider, looking towards Rome and perhaps aspiring to be Roman, but speaking as his primary language any one of the languages of Italy itself or of other parts of the Empire. The insider with a sense that Roman identity was in part defined by the Latin language might in a neutral sense merely esteem his native language, or he might seek to impose it on others, or use it aggressively as a form of exclusion in the hearing of those who did not understand it, or seek to promote its worth in his own and others' eyes by actively making favourable comparisons between it and other languages. There are many ways in which a person may find in the language he speaks a reason for pride in his identity. The English no longer attempt to impose their language on others, but they do reveal in various ways a feeling that the English language is esteemed and powerful in the world and a credit to its native speakers. Attempts by the French to eliminate 'Franglais' from the French language are reported with alacrity in the British press, with the implication that the English language is doing what the English people have ceased to do, colonizing foreign territory. The fading of French as an international educated language in the face of English is noted with satisfaction. Articles in the press speak of the 'richness' and 'subtlety' of English, without acknowledgement that the 'richness' of its vocabulary is largely due to its reception of foreign loan-words over a long period. If English is rich, other languages

[1] A version of this paper was delivered at a conference entitled 'Romanitas' held in the University of Warwick on 19 September 1998. The proceedings of the conference were never published. I would not have used the term myself were it not for the title of the conference, but the word has some currency in certain circles and I thought it appropriate to retain the form that the paper would have had if it had been published in conference proceedings. An anonymous referee made some useful comments on a version of the paper.

On the word *Romanitas*, see J. Kramer, *Die Sprachbezeichnungen* Latinus *und* Romanus *im Lateinischen und Romanischen* (Berlin, 1998), 81–2.

[2] There is of course a good deal of bibliography devoted to some of the questions listed in this paragraph. A notable paper, for example, is M. Dubuisson,'Y a-t-il une politique linguistique romaine?', *Ktèma* 7 (1982), 197–210. There is much of relevance in J. Kaimio, *The Romans and the Greek Language* (Helsinki, 1979). Further material is cited and discussed in my book, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge, 2003).

are less rich, and this English richness enhances the native speaker's feeling of cultural dominance. It does not matter if the comparative richness of English is asserted by those who are in no position to assess the richness of other languages.

The outsider, on the other hand, who aspires to fluency in Latin as he aspires to 'become Roman' is by that very aspiration acknowledging that the language is a marker of Roman identity. He might abandon his native language, or attempt to give himself a double linguistic identity by presenting himself as bilingual.

In this paper these two perspectives will be kept in mind, and distinguished as appropriate. It follows from the preceding two paragraphs that if Latin was indeed a necessary feature of Roman identity, we would expect it to be presented as one member of various oppositions, by both insiders and outsiders. Implicitly or explicitly, the insider will assess his language in a favourable light in contrast to other languages (particularly Greek), and the outsider will tend to downgrade his native language in favour of Latin. I should state here that not everything is as straightforward as it has been presented so far. It is in the nature of linguistic ideologies that attitudes are complex, and may vary not only with the circumstances but from speaker to speaker.

Language has often been seen as a defining feature of nationhood. As Hoffmann puts it,[3] 'In the history of nations, especially in Europe, the survival of a nation's language has frequently been equated with the continued existence of the nation itself.' Linguistic nationalism has taken many forms, including the imposition by large states of their language on other, smaller states, and the suppression within states of minority languages. It would be easy to cite evidence for an attitude that unless speakers know and use the dominant language of a state, they do not strictly belong. Sometimes, indeed, an assertive group who interpret their language as a feature of their national identity may even attempt to impose it on fellow citizens against an inexorable trend. Afrikaaners at a slightly earlier period of South African history were sometimes reported as insisting on the use of Afrikaans in English-speaking shops, thereby making an attempt to resist the imperialism of English, which has become unstoppable now that American influence is global, and there is instant access worldwide to English in spoken, written, and electronic forms.

II. LATIN AND THE CITIZENSHIP

Latin writers show remarkably little interest in problems of communication across language boundaries, and one has to look hard to find evidence for language attitudes. There was, however, some sense that possession of the Roman citizenship carried with it an obligation to know the Latin language. The evidence for this attitude is both anecdotal and direct. Suetonius (*Claud.* 16.2) reports that the emperor Claudius once stripped of the citizenship a *uir splendidus* from Greece because he did not know Latin: *splendidum uirum Graeciaeque prouinciae principem, uerum Latini sermonis ignarum, non modo albo iudicum erasit, sed in peregrinitatem redegit* ('a man who was of distinguished birth and a leading citizen of the province of Greece, but who did not know Latin, he not only struck from the list of jurors but deprived of the citizenship'). Cicero (*Verr.* 5.167) speaks of Roman citizens bound together by community of language, among other things: . . . *neque apud ciuis solum Romanos, qui et sermonis et iuris et multarum rerum societate iuncti sunt*. The (Latin) language is here placed on a par with Roman law as a shared attribute of Roman citizens. Cicero puts the matter more strongly at *Brut*. 140: *non enim tam praeclarum*

[3] C. Hoffmann, *An Introduction to Bilingualism* (London and New York, 1991), 199.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.184 Published online by Cambridge University Press

est scire Latine quam turpe nescire, neque tam id mihi oratoris boni quam ciuis Romani proprium uidetur. This sentence is translated by Douglas as follows:[4] 'It is not so much remarkable to be able *to speak Latin well* [my italics] as shocking to lack that ability, nor do I regard such knowledge as the perquisite of the good orator so much as of the Roman citizen.' In the context *scire Latine (loqui)* means 'to know how to speak Latin *correctly*', not simply to know how to speak the language. For Cicero on this occasion good Latin was virtually a moral requirement of citizens. Suetonius (*Tib.* 71) and Dio (57.15.2) both report that Tiberius once forbade a soldier who had been asked to give evidence to reply in Greek. The army was the prime instrument of Romanization, and there is abundant evidence for the learning of Latin by foreign recruits; the story in Suetonius and Dio encapsulates the attitude that the Greek-speaking Roman soldier should also be able to use Latin.

Such anecdotes do not tell us much about what was happening on the ground. In fact the Romans, as we will see, were perfectly happy to use Greek in the administration of the (eastern) provinces[5] and indeed in the running of the army. But clearly the attitude died hard that using Latin was in some sense an aspect of being Roman, even if pragmatism led Romans usually to accept Greek in day-to-day affairs. Nor are anecdotes the only evidence we have on the matter. There is some primary evidence for an obligation which the authorities sought to impose in the eastern provinces that those possessing the citizenship should under certain circumstances use the Latin language as symbolizing their status.

A connection between the citizenship and Latin emerges in Egypt in the insistence that certain types of legal documents concerning Roman citizens should be in Latin, even if the citizens did not know the language. The requirement was presumably not particular to Egypt, but it is especially clear there because of the survival of many legal documents on papyrus, and because there were Roman citizens present who were Greek speakers. It led to complications in the drawing up of the documents. If a Roman citizen did not know Latin and wanted to write a will, he would have to resort to translators to have the Latin version done; and since he would have to sign, his signature would be in a language different from that of the rest of the document. The result of this policy is the survival of a cluster of documents in a mixture of languages, with the Latin having official status and the Greek provided only for the information of the Greek speaker. Having such documents drafted must have imposed a burden on Roman citizens, as will be seen from the complicated nature of the mixed-language texts discussed below. Citizens will have been aware that a linguistic demand was being made of them which symbolized the obligations carried by possession of the citizenship, great though the benefits might be.

The two classic document-types that had to be in Latin were birth certificates and wills. There was a fundamental importance to birth certificates,[6] namely that they provided evidence of Roman citizenship.[7] The requirement that birth certificates should be in Latin thus provides an explicit example of the symbolic use of Latin in matters to do with the citizenship. Wills of Roman citizens had to be in Latin until

[4] A. E. Douglas, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Brutus* (Oxford, 1966), 112.

[5] See e.g. the testimonia collected by B. Rochette, *Le latin dans le monde grec* (Brussels, 1997), 160, n. 420.

[6] On which see F. Schulz, 'Roman registers of birth and birth certificates I', *JRS* 32 (1942), 78–91; II, *JRS* 33 (1943), 55–64, with the list at I.78–80.

[7] See Schulz, II.63–4; also I.82–3 (only children in possession of the citizenship could be registered).

the time of Alexander Severus.[8] Again this requirement is related to possession of the citizenship, because it was only Roman citizens who had the right to make a Roman will;[9] this testamentary privilege was felt to be a desirable concomitant of citizenship.[10]

The difficulties imposed by the language requirement are illustrated by a birth certificate found in a house at Karanis of illegitimate twins registered by one Sempronia Gemella.[11] She went to Alexandria to have a text done. This may have been either because she could not find a local scribe to do it, or because there were not enough Roman citizens on hand to witness the document.[12] *P.Oxy.* 38.2857 is in a form that must have been commonplace. This is the draft of a Roman will dated 17 May 134. There is a fragmentary Latin text and a Greek version, which will have been of no legal validity but merely a copy for the Greek-speaking testator.[13] The drafting of a Latin will for a Greek speaker in, say, Egypt, will have required various stages. As the editors point out at *P.Oxy.* 38.2857, the testator must first have dictated his requirements in Greek. The Latin will would then have been drawn up, and a Greek translation done; or perhaps the final Greek version was produced first.

It was not only birth certificates and wills that had to be in Latin. Various other types of legal documents concerning Roman citizens display the form of linguistic policy mentioned above. *P.Oxy.* 9.1201, for example, is a 'succession to an inheritance'. The text contains an application (dated A.D. 258) to the prefect Mussius Aemilianus from a man whose father has died intestate, asking for the *agnitio bonorum possessionis* or right of succession to the estate. It is in a mixture of Greek and Latin. There are four parts to the document. The first comprises the petition in formulaic Latin, of which only four lines survive:

> Mussio Aemiliano u(iro) p(erfectissimo) praef(ecto) Aeg(ypti)
> ab Aurelio Heudaemone.
> rogo domine des mihi b(onorum) p(ossessionem)
> [Catilli]i Variani patris mei . . .

The second section (in a second hand), which confirms the presentation of the petition, has the name of the petitioner (Eudaemon) in Greek, but written for him by a certain Aurelius Theon because Eudaemon was illiterate. Lines 9–11 are as follows: *Αὐρήλιος Θέων Ἁρπάλου ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μὴ ἰδότος γράμματα.*

The third section (three words only) is the endorsement by the prefect in Latin granting the petition: *ex edicto: legi.* It was standard practice for the Roman official to put his notation in Latin rather than in Greek or in both languages, even though the milieu was Greek and the participants Greek-speaking. So it is that at *ChLA* 3.201, a fragment of a petition addressed by a veteran Aelius Syrion to Aurelius Sanctus, prefect of Egypt, the notation *recognoui* is found after the Greek translation of the prefect's reply (line 36). The editor (*ChLA*) collects other examples of *recognoui*, and observes (p. 73): 'In the light of these parallels, *recognoui* is a visa giving authenticity to a text: here it affirms the authenticity of the Greek translation of the Prefect's reply,

[8] See A. Stein, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Verwaltung Aegyptens unter roemischer Herrschaft* (Stuttgart, 1915), 142–4; Rochette (n. 5), 115 (see too the material assembled by Rochette, 112–13); also the commentary on *P. Oxy.* 52.3692.

[9] See the discussion of E. A. Meyer, 'Explaining the epigraphic habit in the Roman Empire: the evidence of epitaphs', *JRS* 80 (1990), 78–81.

[10] See ibid., e.g. 80.

[11] *P. Mich.* III.169, Schulz (n. 6, I), text no. 16.

[12] See Schulz (n. 6, II), 60.

[13] Often it is only the Greek copy that survives, as e.g. at *P.Oxy.* 22.2348.

which must have been in Latin.' The endorsement of a petition was a formal bureaucratic act, and there seems to have been a convention whereby the official used Latin for this purpose. It might alternatively be suggested that, if the extant versions of the documents were purely archival, then the prefect's notation would not have been for the eyes of anyone but the prefect's officials, in which case it could not be interpreted as evidence for any sort of (public) language policy. There is however extant at least one document, though not from Egypt (a text from the archive of Babatha found in the Cave of Letters in Judaea), in which the Roman official's notation was on the version of the text displayed in public in an area where Latin was scarcely spoken.[14]

I return to *P.Oxy.* 9.1201.There follows finally the translation into Greek (ἑρμηνεία τῶν Ῥωμαικῶν) of the (largely missing: see above) Latin version of the petition.

A text such as this shows the exercise of a language policy, in that the office of the prefect required that a petition of this type under Roman law should be submitted at least partly in Latin. The petitioner had to go to a good deal of trouble to have the transaction carried out. He had to find someone to sign for him. He had to have a translation done; the Greek instructions which he dictated will have been put into the correct legal form in either Greek or Latin and then translated into the other language. The complications caused by the necessity that the document should contain Latin will have brought home to the petitioner that Roman citizens were expected to know Latin.

It should be stressed in conclusion that there was never any legal requirement that citizens should learn Latin. Outside the special documents just referred to, all that we have seen is an occasional implication that a knowledge of the language was desirable in citizens. No doubt some individuals held stronger views on this matter than others (with that of Cicero in the *Brutus* representing an extreme).

III. PROVINCIALS LEARNING LATIN

The material discussed in the previous section showed Roman officialdom requiring that Roman citizens use Latin under certain formal circumstances. An attitude is implicit on the part of the Romans themselves that knowing the language was a mark of being Roman. I now turn to outsiders aspiring to be Roman. They too can from time to time be seen by their behaviour to define the use of Latin as essential if they were to acquire Roman identity.

There is a story in Livy that in 180 B.C. the people of Cumae applied to Rome to be allowed to conduct certain forms of public business in Latin: 40.43.1 *Cumanis eo anno petentibus permissum ut publice Latine loquerentur et praeconibus Latine uendendi ius esset* ('in that year in response to a request from the people of Cumae it was granted that they might use Latin in public business and that auctioneers should have the right to sell in Latin'). Cumae was a Greek foundation, but was conquered by the Oscans *c.* 421 (Diod. Sic. 12.76.4). It was Oscanized, but retained some Greek culture (Strabo 5.4.4). The language shift envisaged will have been from Oscan to Latin, though it is possible that Greek had lingered on alongside Oscan. The passage shows that by this time the upper classes of the town were capable of speaking Latin and no doubt did so often in private, because a language shift in public would not have been possible were bilingualism (or multilingualism) not well entrenched. Since the Cumaeans did not need the permission of Rome to use Latin, the story implies that

[14] Text no. 16 in the archive: see N. Lewis, *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters. Greek Papyri* (Jerusalem, 1989), 65.

they wanted to be seen by Rome to be Latin-speaking.[15] The interpretation of the passage is problematic,[16] but the conclusion is inescapable that the Cumaeans were treating Latin as a language of prestige. Provincials who attached prestige to Latin were displaying an attitude that would lead to a language shift, and implicit in any such shift was a feeling that use of the Latin language was a requirement of being Roman. Cumae was a *ciuitas sine suffragio*, which was apparently attempting to strengthen its links with Rome by a public language policy.[17]

On the other side of the coin, a condescending attitude on the part of Latin speakers to Italic (or Italic-influenced Latin) can arguably be detected in a line of Lucilius: 581 *primum Pacilius tesorophylax pater* ***abzet***. On the interpretation of Mras,[18] the last word represents an Oscanization of Lat. *abiit* (= *mortuus est*), on which view Pacilius (who has a name of Oscan origin) will have spoken a form of Latin marked by interference from Oscan. Although there is no context extant, it is difficult to believe that the man was not being disparaged. The provincial upper classes were no doubt sensitive to such disparagement, and that sensitivity will have further stimulated a desire to master Latin among those aspiring to be assimilated to Roman culture.

The sense that the use of Latin in public was a part of becoming Roman can be detected in the pottery of La Graufesenque in southern Gaul. Here, in the first century A.D., there were Gaulish potters with Gaulish names who recorded details of the firings of pottery by scratching lists on plates.[19] At this rather humble social level Gaulish had still not been supplanted by Latin, but there are signs that things were starting to change. Gaulish was used in the records (alongside some Latin),[20] and in these Celtic documents the potters regularly inflected their names with the Gaulish nominative ending *-os*, even if (as was sometimes the case) they had taken on a Latin name.[21] Thus, for example, the Gaulish document no. 2 has a mixture of Celtic and Latin names, all of them with the Gaulish ending (e.g. *Masuetos*, *Priuatos*, *Tritos*, *Regenos*). This text gives us a glimpse of language use and naming practice within the pottery. But there also survive many products of the pottery, in the form of pots with makers' stamps. These stamps have typical forms, such as genitive of the maker's name, or nominative, or nominative + *fecit*. A large collection of material was published by Oswald.[22] It is a remarkable fact that in these stamps not only is the *-us* ending almost universal, but Celtic names themselves are eliminated, and the Latin language is exclusively used (as can be seen in the names and their inflections and in the verb *fecit*). Thus, for example, *Cintusmos* gives way to *Primus* or *Primulus*, *Allos* to *Secundus*, *Tritos* to *Tertius*, *Petrecos* to *Quartus*, *Matugenos* to *Felix*, the Latin name in each case being a translation of the Celtic. The explanation for this would appear to be that potters went on using Gaulish, as well as Celtic names and the *-os* ending, in their own community, or

[15] Note P.A. Brunt, *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays* (Oxford, 1988), 104, n. 25: 'The inference sometimes drawn that Rome had hitherto forbidden Cumae the official use of Latin seems absurd. Presumably the Cumaeans, to ingratiate themselves, intimated their wishes and Rome gave a sanction that was not required legally.'

[16] See e.g. A.L. Prosdocimi, 'Le lingue dominanti e i linguaggi locali', in *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica*. II. *La circolazione del testo* (Rome, 1989), 59–60.

[17] See J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Romans and Aliens* (London, 1979), 116.

[18] K. Mras, 'Randbemerkungen zu Lucilius' Satiren', *WS* 46 (1927–8), 81–2.

[19] See R. Marichal, *Les graffites de La Graufesenque* (Suppl. XLVII to *Gallia*) (Paris, 1988).

[20] Gaulish, however, markedly predominates.

[21] Full details can be found in my book, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, ch. 7, and here I summarize and oversimplify.

[22] F. Oswald, *Index of Potters' Stamps on Terra Sigillata 'Samian Ware'* (East Bridgford, 1931).

alternatively Latin names with the *-os* ending (as the abundant Latin names with the *-os* ending in the documents numbered 1–23 in Marichal's collection suggest), but that their products intended for an outside world were felt to require a Latin stamp. The language choice is determined by the expected readership. Implicit in the decision to use Latin outside the pottery is in effect a grading of the two languages in terms of their status, with Latin treated more as an international or imperial language, but Gaulish as provincial and unsuited for use in the wider world. In many cultures names have a special power to express status or claims to membership of an ethnic or social group. A Gaul who used a Latin form of his name for outside consumption was giving himself a Romanised identity in public, though he might still have had his Celtic identity within the pottery itself. The attitude implicit here would eventually lead to a language shift.[23]

Also worth noting is an inscription (possibly funerary) in Gaulish from S. Bernadino di Briona (Novara), which was discovered in 1859 and is published by, for example, Lejeune[24] and Lambert,[25] with full commentary in each case:

TANOTALIKNOI
KUITOS
LEKATOS
ANOKOPOKIOS
SETUPOKIOS
ESANEKOTI
ANAREUIŠEOS
TANOTALOS
KARNITUS

(a)]N[-]K[--]ESASOIOIKAN[-]
(b) TAKOS.TOUTAS.

I translate the main part of the inscription, after Lambert (72): 'The sons of Dannotalos, Quintus the legate, Andocombogios, Setubogios, and (the sons) of Essandecot(t)os, Andareuiseos, Dannotalos, have erected (this mound?).' The name in the first line has the Celtic patronymic suffix *-ikno-*. The last word of the main text (*karnitus*) is a third-person plural preterite verb, possibly derived from a Celtic noun **karno-* 'heap of stones'. But what stands out for our purposes is the Latin name of the first-named son, *Quintus*, and his designation as *legatus*. Quintus, who had clearly rendered some service to the Romans (hence his Latin title), had abandoned his native name and adopted a Romanized identity. It is likely that he was bilingual. The change of name and the retention of the Latin title are sure signs of a desire to be seen as assimilated to the culture of Rome, and it is a fair guess that in the eyes of this individual being Roman entailed the use of Latin.

In different parts of the Empire there can be found evidence of provincial élites both learning Latin and seeking to parade themselves as Latin-speaking, but the evidence

[23] D. R. Langslow, 'Approaching bilingualism in corpus languages', in J. N. Adams, M. Janse and S. C. R. Swain (edd.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society. Language Contact and the Written Text* (Oxford, 2002), 33 argues that in a language shift writing conventions are the first to be affected, followed by onomastics and then the language itself. This seems to have been the order of events at La Graufesenque (where the potters had adopted the Latin alphabet, Roman numerals, and Latin sigla in the writing of Gaulish).

[24] M. Lejeune, *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises*, vol. II, fasc. 1, *Textes gallo-étrusques, textes gallo-latins sur pierre* (Paris, 1988), 19–20.

[25] P.-Y. Lambert, *La langue gauloise* (Paris, 1995), 72.

from La Graufesenque shows that it was not only the upper classes who made this connection between Latin and Romanness.

IV. 'ROMAN' LATIN AND THE 'ROMANNESS' OF LATIN

So far we have seen Latin used in such a way as to define it as a characteristic of Romanness, in the sense that it was, for example, under some formal legalistic circumstances required of Roman citizens that they should use the language virtually as symbolic of their possession of Roman citizenship. If we use the epithet 'Roman' of the Latin language in this context, we give the adjective its wider meaning. It refers to the Latin language not as spoken by Romans in the narrow literal sense (that is, as inhabitants of the city of Rome), but as used by or sometimes required of Roman citizens anywhere in the Empire, whatever their origins. It is, however, an interesting cultural phenomenon that there was a period (above all during the Republic) when 'being Roman' could be defined linguistically in the literal sense, as using the Latin accent of the city of Rome itself. Outsiders could be recognized and were stigmatized for their non-Roman accents. This was a passing phase. From the Augustan period onwards we find the adjective 'Roman' as applied to Latin referring not to the language of the city of Rome but to the language of the Empire in general (but see below on Quintilian 8.1.3). The period of an exclusivist *Romanitas* of Latin was replaced by a tolerance of any (Italian) variety of the language as marking Romanness. In this section I discuss the early attitude to the language and the change discernible in the Imperial period.

Although there is no clear-cut example of a narrow use of *lingua Romana* signifying a Roman dialect or variety of Latin (see further below), there *was* in the Republican period a consciousness of the distinctiveness of the Latin of Rome, and the gradual fading of that consciousness raises interesting questions.

To be more precise, the feeling is sometimes expressed or implied as early as the time of Plautus that the Latin spoken in the city was superior to that spoken outside the city in Latium and beyond. Such an attitude is most clearly marked in Cicero, but it can also be detected in Plautus, Lucilius, and a few others who will not be dealt with here. One must, however, be wary of ascribing the strong views of a few extant writers to the majority of educated (or indeed uneducated) speakers. Those who express heated feelings on matters of linguistic correctness may have special motives (such as an awareness of their own regional origins, or adherence to a doctrinaire position), and their own views need not be representative of those of the generality of members of their class. An attempt to construct an idealized Romanness of city speech can indeed be discerned in the second and first centuries B.C., but not all linguistic observers were so naïve as to talk of the superiority of this Roman construct. Varro's objectivity as an occasional commentator on regional variation approaches that of a dialect geographer, and there were even those who esteemed the rural, allegedly 'inferior' varieties of the language more highly than the supposedly 'superior' variety of the city itself. That is no surprise, given the traditional Roman pride in the moral virtues of their rustic ancestors. A rustic accent might even be cultivated as a mark of old-fashioned moral purity.

I make these remarks at the outset because a good deal of the evidence from the Republican period is tendentious. That Cicero in particular was capable of extreme linguistic positions was seen earlier in his statement that citizens should be able to use *correct* Latin.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.184 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I begin with some familiar evidence to do with Praeneste. Plautus could make a joke at the expense of a 'rustic' character (Truculentus; for *agrestis* applied to him, see *Truc.* 253) who used a word with a regional flavour. At *Truc.* 688 Truculentus uses the noun *rabonem* instead of *arrabonem*:

TR.: *rabonem* habeto, uti mecum hanc noctem sies.
AS.: perii! '*rabonem*?' quam esse dicam hanc beluam?
quin tu *'arrabonem'* dicis? TR.: 'a' facio lucri,
ut Praenestinis *'conea' est 'ciconia'*.

The term does not pass unnoticed, and is clearly meant to be funny; the other speaker calls attention to the word. Truculentus compounds the joke by appealing to the analogy of the Praenestine term *conea* for *ciconia* (with haplology?). *Rabonem*, possibly an invented form, though it may have been based in type on a regional habit, need not have been genuinely Praenestine. But it is beyond question that the rustic Truculentus' justification of his usage by invoking a Praenestine form before a Roman audience must have been intended as a joke, and we may deduce that Praenestine Latin was (i) different and (ii) not taken seriously in the city. A whole audience (as distinct, for example, from an in-group of the highly educated) is invited by Plautus to participate in the joke, and it can be inferred that the populace at large had a concept both of the separateness of city Latin compared with Praenestine, and of its superiority.

Lucilius also seems to have made disparaging remarks about the Latin of Praeneste, in mocking a certain Vettius: Quint. 1.5.56 *taceo de Tuscis et Sabinis et Praenestinis quoque (nam ut* ***eorum sermone utentem Vettium Lucilius insectatur****, quem ad modum Pollio reprendit in Liuio Patauinitatem* ('I say nothing about Tuscan, Sabine, and even Praenestine [words] (Lucilius attacks Vettius for employing usages of this last people, just as Pollio finds fault with "Patavinity" in Livy)'); I can surely treat all Italian words as Roman'). The comment is not about Italian languages,[26] but about regional varieties of Latin, in this case the incorporation of Italian words into Latin. The section of Quintilian begins with a statement that words may be either Latin or foreign; foreign words have entered Latin from almost every people. After the reference to Vettius, Quintilian gives some examples of foreign words (from Gaul, Africa, and Spain) that had come into Latin (1.5.57). Moreover in the passage quoted the comparison between Livy's *Patauinitas* and Vettius' practice makes it quite clear that Quintilian is referring throughout to Italian regionalisms rather than languages distinct from Latin. *Verbis* is understood with the adjectives 'Etruscan', 'Sabine', and 'Praenestine', but it is to the last that Lucilius was referring. In the list of three types of *uerba*, *Praenestinis* is highlighted, in that it has *quoque* attached, and the emphatic position of *eorum* before *sermone* suggests that it looks back to the highlighted member of the list.

I move on to Cicero. Quintus and Decimus Valerius Soranus (from the Latin town of Sora) were friends and neighbours of Cicero: *Brut.* 169 *Q. D. Valerii Sorani,* ***uicini et familiares mei***; *De orat.* 3.43 *nostri minus student litteris quam Latini; tamen ex istis, quos nostis, urbanis, in quibus minimum est litterarum, nemo est quin* ***literatissimum togatorum omnium, Q. Valerium Soranum****,* ***lenitate*** *uocis atque ipso oris pressu et sono* ***facile uincat*** ('our citizens devote themselves to literature less than the Latins; and yet of those city dwellers you know in whom there is scarcely a trace of literary culture, there is none who would not easily surpass Q. Valerius Soranus, the most lettered man of all the *togati*, in smoothness of voice and in the articulation of his mouth and its

[26] As W. V. Harris, *Rome in Etruria and Umbria* (Oxford, 1971), 171 with n. 7 seems to take it.

sound'). Both were very learned in Greek and Latin literature. Of the pair Quintus Valerius, whose *floruit* must have been at the time of the Social War, is singled out as the most 'lettered' of all the *togati*, a high compliment indeed since the Latins devote themselves to letters more diligently than Romans (*nostri minus student litteris quam Latini*). But despite his learning he had (according to Cicero) an inferior, non-Roman accent. It is clearly stated that even a poorly educated Roman would sound better than the most highly educated Latin (note *facile uincat* in the second passage).The language is impressionistic, but the reference is obviously to the alleged superiority of the Roman accent. The speaker goes on to make it even more explicit that there is an accent peculiar to the city of Rome and the 'Roman race' which is pleasant to listen to: *De orat.* 3.44 *qua re cum sit* ***quaedam certa uox Romani generis urbisque propria****, in qua nihil offendi, nihil displicere, nihil animaduerti possit, nihil sonare aut olere peregrinum,* ***hanc sequamur*** *neque solum* ***rusticam asperitatem****, sed etiam peregrinam insolentiam* ***fugere discamus*** ('therefore since there is a definite accent peculiar to the Roman race and to the city, in which nothing can cause offence and nothing give displeasure, in which nothing is deserving of censure and there is no possible trace or whiff of the provincial, let us strive after this, and let us learn to shun not only rustic harshness but also the strangeness of the provincial'). Provincial or rustic accents should be avoided (*fugere discamus*).

There is a recognition of the existence of regional accents of Latin as close by as in the towns of Latium. Cicero does not display the linguist's neutrality towards varieties of speech, but instead value judgements are expresssed and he is prescriptive. Not only does the speech of Rome have 'pleasant' characteristics, but that of the rural periphery is perceived as 'harsh' (note *rusticam asperitatem* in the last passage). It is implied that speakers of such forms of Latin should seek to suppress their accents and cultivate city speech. That Cicero was attempting to give 'Roman' Latin the status of an educated standard is seen in his comparison of this variety with Attic in Greek: *De orat.* 3.42 *sed hanc dico suauitatem, quae exit ex ore; quae quidem ut* ***apud Graecos Atticorum****, sic* ***in Latino sermone huius est urbis maxime propria*** ('but I mean the sweetness which issues from the lips; just as among the Greeks this is peculiar to Attica, so in Latin speech it is especially the attribute of this city').

I offer a few conclusions. First, those who attempted to set up a Roman Latin superior to the Latin of other areas in every case had their origins outside the city. I refer to Plautus, Lucilius, and Cicero (and also Asinius Pollio in the passage about Livy). There would seem to a reflection here of the power of the city to assimilate outsiders, and of the ambition of such outsiders to be seen as assimilated. If Cicero was able to speak in these terms even of his educated friends from provincial towns, his own speech is unlikely to have preserved any tell-tale signs of provincial origin. If Cicero is at all typical, the prestige of the city accent would have caused it to be imitated by other outsiders as well, and this process would inevitably have led to a levelling of Italian speech, at least among the élite.

Second, most of the disparagement of non-city Latin that can be found belongs to the period before the Social War, or to a generation or two after it.[27] From this period onwards we continue to have comments on the existence of regional variations, but a

[27] I stress that the evidence which I have cited here is highly selective. There is a good deal more material of relevance, which I hope to deal with elsewhere. There is also a collection of evidence in R. Müller, *Sprachbewusstsein und Sprachvariation im lateinischen Schrifttum der Antike* (Munich, 2001).

new stage now begins in the expression of attitudes to this diversity. Italian regionalisms do continue to be noted, but comment is now exclusively neutral in tone. On comments of this type there is no space to dwell; Columella, for example, makes observations about Italian usages. The new attitude to Italian Latin can be illustrated from various passages, most notably Quintilian 1.5.55: *uerba aut Latina aut peregrina sunt . . . taceo de Tuscis et Sabinis et Praenestinis quoque . . .* ***licet omnia Italica pro Romanis habeam***. Citing the attacks of Lucilius on Vettius and Pollio on Livy (see above), he states that it is permissible for him to regard 'Italian' words as 'Roman'. This does not mean that Italian provincial Latin did not exist any longer; the wording implies that it did. What is new is Quintilian's attitude to such varieties; they are put on a par with Roman Latin. Or, to put it another way, Romanness of Latin does not exclusively reside in Roman Latin in the strict sense, but is also found in the Latin of Italy outside Rome. It would seem that with the Romanization of Italy a linguistic tolerance had developed to the linguistic varieties of the peninsula.

Quintilian is not, it is true, entirely consistent. At 8.1.3 he recommends that one's speech should be redolent of the city: *quare, si fieri potest, et uerba omnia et uox huius alumnum urbis oleant, ut oratio Romana plane uideatur, non ciuitate donata* ('If possible, then, let all our words and our pronunciation have a whiff of city breeding, so that our speech seems to be native Roman, not simply naturalized' [Russell, Loeb]). The language and attitude here are suggestive of Cicero, and it is certain that Quintilian was thinking of some of the passages already mentioned (for the use of *haec urbs*, *oleo*, and *uox*, see the last two passages of Cicero cited above). Indeed an anecdote about Theophrastus told by Quintilian immediately before the passage quoted (8.1.2) is taken with modification from Cic. *Brut*. 172, where Cicero again talks of the 'sound' (*sonus*) of *urbani* (that is, Romans), which he likens in the manner already seen above to that of the *Attici* in Greece. Quintilian's attitudes were more tolerant than those of Cicero (as 1.5.55 above shows), but he was not able to free himself entirely from Cicero's linguistic judgements.

For *Italian*, as distinct from Roman, as by implication the new ideal standard, there is also the evidence of a passage of Statius: *Silu.* 4.5.45–6 ***non sermo Poenus****, non habitus tibi, / externa non mens:* ***Italus, Italus*** ('Your speech is not Punic, nor your bearing; your outlook is not foreign: Italian you are, Italian' [Coleman]). Here a certain Septimius Severus, an African, is complimented by Statius for his complete Romanization, even in speech. I take *sermo Poenus* here as referring not to the language Punic, but to an African accent in Latin.[28] But it is noticeable that he is praised not for the specific Romanness of his speech and other attributes, but for their Italianness. Also worth noting is the use of *nostri* in Julius Romanus (*ap*. Charisius p. 279.1 Barwick *primo pedatu et secundo, ut Maximus notat; hodieque* ***nostri per Campaniam sic locuntur***—'. . . to this day our people speak thus throughout Campania'), which seems to imply a certain linguistic solidarity within Italy.

Romanness of dialect is thus a fleeting ideal, which seems largely to disappear by the end of the Republic. Even then it conflicted with the ideal of rusticity as morally worthy and old fashioned.

The disappearance of the concept that there was a Roman Latin can be illustrated from the use of the expression *lingua Romana*.[29] If specifically Roman Latin continued

[28] In this I follow K. M. Coleman, *Statius Siluae IV* (Oxford, 1988), 169.

[29] In the following discussion I rely heavily on P. Flobert '*Lingua Latina* et *lingua Romana*: purisme, administration et Invasions Barbares', *Ktèma* 13 (1988), 205–12; also Kramer (n. 1), who oddly does not cite Flobert.

into the Empire as an ideal standard, one would have expected this expression to mean precisely that. But it does not.[30] In the early Imperial period *Romanus* applied to language is already a synonym of *Latinus*. Just as the adjective was early generalized to indicate, for example, a Roman citizen having no physical contact with Rome, so *lingua Romana* was the language which had spread with Roman power, and not a particular variety of that language restricted to Rome. When Virgil said (*Georg.* 3.148–9 *cui* ***nomen*** *asilo* / ***Romanum*** *est, oestrum* ***Grai*** *uertere uocantes*) that the 'Roman' word *asilus* was the equivalent of the Greek *oestrum*, he did not mean that the word *asilus* was confined to Rome, but rather that it was Latin as distinct from Greek.

This general use of *lingua Romana* is also clear in Velleius Paterculus (2.110.5) in reference to the spread of Latin in Pannonia, or perhaps among auxiliaries recruited in Pannonia, and in Tacitus (*Agr*. 21.2) in reference to the instruction of British aristocratic youth not only in the Latin language, but also in eloquence in that language. There are similar examples in Ovid (*Pont*. 1.2.67) and Pliny the Younger (*Epist.* 2.10.2 *sine [tam insignes libros] per ora hominum ferantur isdemque quibus* ***lingua Romana*** *spatiis peruagentur*—'let them be on all lips, let them range abroad over the same spaces as the Roman language'). Of these examples the most telling is that in Virgil, because the word has been unambiguously generalized to mean the 'Latin language' without any geographical implication. The passage of Pliny virtually invites the reader to draw an analogy between the *lingua Romana* and the *imperium Romanum*: both have spread widely in the world, and the Roman tongue is not the preserve of inhabitants of the city.

At least as early as the time of Virgil, therefore, *Romanus* had been generalized such that it was applicable to the Latin language in general and not that of the city of Rome. The question arises whether the expression *lingua Romana* could earlier refer more narrowly to specifically *Roman* speech. Flobert does not find examples with this meaning.[31] One possible case is in a quotation by Pliny the Elder of some verses of Tullius Laurea, a freedman of Cicero, written in honour of the orator (*Nat.* 31.8):

> quo tua, *Romanae* uindex clarissime *linguae*,
> silua loco melius surgere iussa uiret
> atque Academiae celebratam nomine uillam
> nunc reparat cultu sub potiore Vetus,
> hoc etiam apparent lymphae non ante repertae,
> languida quae infuso lumina rore leuant.

Cicero was a 'famous defender of the Roman tongue'. As we have seen, he was an advocate of the superiority of a Roman Latin, and he may be praised here as a champion of city Latin, but Flobert is probably correct in taking the passage to refer to the Roman tongue as the language of the *imperium Romanum* as a whole.[32]

[30] Kramer ([n. 1], 72–3) discusses Quint. 8.1.3 (for which see above) under the heading *lingua Romana* 'als Sprache der Stadt Rom', but *oratio* rather than *lingua* is used there under the influence of Cicero's notions about the Roman accent. *Oratio Romana* looks like Quintilian's off-the-cuff phrase, and in any case *Romana* is predicative; it cannot be deduced from Quintilian's expression that *lingua Romana* was current at the time in reference to 'Roman' Latin. Similarly, the classification found at Isidore, *Etym*. 9.1.6–7, who attributes to 'certain persons' (*quidam*) a division of the Latin language into four stages—*prisca*, *Latina*, *Romana*, and *mixta*—is artificial (though not without its interest), and tells us nothing about the possible currency at any time of *lingua Romana* in the sense 'Latin of the city of Rome'. That is not precisely the meaning of the term even as it appears in the classification.

[31] Flobert (n. 29), 208

[32] Ibid. See too Kramer (n. 1), 70.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.184 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There is a distinctive use of *sermo Romanus*/*lingua Romana* in Apuleius which deserves mention. At *Met*. 11.28 the narrator states that, as a consequence of his stay abroad (in Rome), he was able to make money from pleading as a lawyer in the 'Roman language': *quae res summum peregrinationi meae tribuebat solacium nec minus etiam uictum uberiorem sumministrabat—quidni ?—spiritu fauentis Eventus quaesticulo forensi nutrito per patrocinia sermonis Romani* ('This afforded the greatest comfort for my stay abroad in Rome, and furthermore it even provided a richer livelihood—not surprisingly, since my small profits from pleading at law in the Roman language were nourished by the breeze of favouring Success' [Hanson, Loeb]). There is an implicit contrast here between his native Greekness (see *Met*. 1.1 on his acquired Latin) and his use of Latin during a *peregrinatio*. *Sermo Romanus* means the *language* of Rome (Latin, as distinct from Greek), not the *Latin* of Rome: there is no suggestion of a Roman dialect. There is a similar usage at *Florida* 18. There Apuleius refers to a dialogue that he has written in the two languages (Greek and Latin are several times contrasted) between Severus and Persius. The part in the language of Rome has been given to Severus, that in the language of Athens to Persius: §43 *paulatimque illis Seuerum adiungo, cui interim* ***Romanae linguae*** *partes dedi. nam et Persius, quamuis et ipse optime possit, tamen hodie uobis* ***atticissabit***. The cirumlocutions are references to the two languages which have already been contrasted, and not to particular dialects.

There is, then, no clear evidence in the late Republic or early Empire for a marked, restrictive use of the adjective *Romanus* in phrases denoting the Latin of the city of Rome, apart from Quintilian's *oratio Romana* discussed above (see n. 30).

I note in passing that, while there are some examples of *lingua Romana*, the normal designation of the Latin language remained *lingua Latina.* If one asks what might have motivated a writer to use *lingua Romana* on a particular occasion, various factors come to mind.[33] Quite a few of these examples are in poetry or poeticizing prose, and one might be tempted to see here the poet's or pretentious stylist's striving after the unusual. But what is more striking is that several times the phrase refers to the spread of the Latin language to distant parts, to Britain in the passage of Tacitus, all over the world in Pliny, and to Pannonia in Velleius. The notion that underlies such examples seems to be a feeling that the spread of Latin represents a form of imperialism. It is not a specific dialect of Latin that is spreading, but rather the Latin language as an instrument of the imperialism of the Roman people. The Romans now have their *imperium Romanum* abroad, and so, as was suggested above, their *lingua Romana* extends its sway with that *imperium.*

Lingua Romana must have remained in use as a designation of the Latin language for centuries, as it turns up not only in late grammarians but also at the Council of Tours of 813, in an interesting context: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Concilia* II, p. 288, canon 17 *uisum est unanimitati nostrae, ut quilibet episcopus habeat omelias continentes necessarias ammonitiones, quibus subiecti erudiantur, id est de . . . ut easdem omelias quisque aperte transferre studeat in* ***rusticam Romanam linguam*** *aut Thiotiscam, quo facilius cuncti possint intellegere quae dicuntur* ('. . . that each should strive to translate the same homilies clearly into the rustic *lingua Romana* or *Thiotisca* [i.e. West Frankish], so that everyone can more easily understand what is being said'). This is the famous requirement that sermons should now be translated into the so-called 'rustic' *lingua Romana* or, alternatively, West Frankish, so that ordinary people could

[33] See the discussion of Kramer (n. 1), 70–6.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.184 Published online by Cambridge University Press

understand them.[34] The implication is that the spoken language of the ordinary people in the Latin-speaking provinces had now diverged so far from the fossilized classical Latin which the clergy were still apparently capable of speaking (or perhaps, one should say, reading from a script) that a sermon delivered in the old Latin could no longer be understood by ordinary people. *Rustica* is the key word here. There was still a theoretical possibilty that *lingua Romana* on its own could mean 'Latin'. In this passage there is by implication a difference between *rustica lingua Romana* on the one hand, and a non-rustic *lingua Romana* on the other, namely Latin. But hereafter an interesting devolpment takes place, as has been elucidated by Flobert. The old word *Latinus* becomes specialized as a designation of the classical language Latin, and *Romanus* comes to be used in the same way as the fuller expression *rustica lingua Romana* is used in the Council of Tours, of the spoken language or languages that have now diverged radically from Latin as we know it. It is as a result of this development that the term 'Romance languages' comes into being, with *Romanus* in fact replaced by an augmented form *Romanicus*.[35]

There is a paradoxical consequence of these developments. The *lingua Roman(ic)a* is now the popular language spoken by the masses in the western parts of the former Roman empire, not of the educated class, some of whom might have known something of the classical Latin which we associate *par excellence* with Rome itself. Clearly *Roman(ic)a* in this collocation has absolutely no connection with the city of Rome, but it is general and without anything resembling a circumscribed geographical reference.

I conclude that the lack of attestation of *lingua Romana* in a specific sense of the Latin of Rome suggests that a narrow 'Romanness' of Latin was not regarded as an ideal for long. The broader use of the term, which is well attested from Virgil onwards, shows that it was the Latin language in general which constituted a component of 'Romanness'.

V. THE 'AGGRESSIVE' OR 'ASSERTIVE' USE OF LATIN; ROMAN SOLDIERS AND THE LATIN LANGUAGE

To the Romans, languages other than Greek and Latin virtually did not exist. Although it is easy to find evidence for foreigners learning Latin, we rarely hear of first-language speakers of Latin learning any of the vernacular languages of the Empire. In the west Romans did not so much actively stamp out local languages, as act as if there were none, leaving it to members of local populations to learn Latin if they wanted to get on. We saw the consequences of this policy at La Graufesenque, where the potters were linguistically leading a double life, in that they were using Gaulish in the pottery but projecting a Latin-speaking identity to the outside world. In the east Romans were usually content to communicate and administer through the *lingua franca*, Greek. Greek was extensively used, for example, in eastern units of the Roman army, as can be seen in military papyri from Egypt. Some Latin is found, but the majority of texts are in Greek. In Egypt prefects of Egypt communicated with the local administration in Greek, and issued their edicts exclusively in Greek. Hearings before Roman officials were conducted largely in Greek. Unlike the Ptolemies, the

[34] I take *transferre* to mean 'translate', though well aware that the matter is now controversial: see R. Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance* (Liverpool, 1982), 120–1.

[35] See Flobert (n. 29), 210–11; Kramer (n. 1), 84–6.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.184 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Romans were not prepared to accept documents in Egyptian.[36] The one sphere in which written Demotic survived into the Roman period in official usage was that of tax receipts issued on ostraca, but these display a significant development in the early phase of Roman rule. Bagnall notes that under the Romans there is soon a dramatic decrease in the number of such Demotic texts.[37] They fall by about 85 per cent from the first to the second half of the first century A.D., hold steady until the middle of the second century, and then disappear by *c.* 235. The Romans disregarded the existence of Demotic, and if an Egyptian needed a text (for example, a petition) written, it would have to be in Greek from this period, even if he did not know the language. What is noteworthy is that there was no attempt by the Romans to impose Latin on the local population in this sphere: Greek was acceptable.

But this accommodation to Greek caused some mixed feelings. There was a persistent sense that Greeks in particular should have Latin inflicted on them from time to time by Romans as a show of Roman superiority. An unease about accommodation surfaces in a story concerning Cicero's use of Greek in the senate at Syracuse. For this he was criticized by an opponent, partly on the grounds that it was an improper act of deference for a Roman to speak Greek in public before a Greek audience: *Verr.* 4.147 *ait indignum facinus esse quod ego in senatu Graeco uerba fecissem; quod quidem apud Graecos Graece locutus essem, id ferri nullo modo posse* ('he said that it was improper that I had spoken in a Greek senate; and that I had spoken Greek before Greeks was absolutely intolerable'). There is evidence that periodically Romans foisted Latin on Greek audiences as an aggressive and symbolic act of Romanness. According to Valerius Maximus 2.2.2, early magistrates, in their zeal to maintain Roman *maiestas*, used only Latin in giving responses to Greeks, and forced them to speak through an interpreter, not only in Rome itself, but also in Greece and Asia. The aim (according to Valerius) was to increase the respect in which the Latin language was held:

magistratus uero prisci quantopere sui populique Romani maiestatem retinentes se gesserint hinc cognosci potest, quod inter cetera obtinendae grauitatis indicia illud quoque magna cum perseuerantia custodiebant, ne Graecis unquam nisi Latine responsa darent. quin etiam ipsos linguae uolubilitate, qua plurimum ualent, excussa per interpretem loqui cogebant non in urbe tantum nostra, sed etiam in Graecia et Asia, quo scilicet Latinae uocis honos per omnes gentes uenerabilior diffunderetur

How carefully the magistrates of old regulated their conduct to keep intact the majesty of the Roman people and their own can be seen from the fact that among other indications of their duty to preserve dignity they steadfastly kept to the rule never to make replies to Greeks except in Latin. Indeed they obliged the Greeks themselves to discard the volubility which is their greatest asset and speak through an interpreter, not only in Rome but in Greece and Asia also, intending no doubt that the dignity of Latin speech be the more widely venerated throughout all nations. (Shackleton Bailey, Loeb)

This passage cannot be taken completely at face value, because there is plentiful evidence that Greek was allowed under the circumstances described by Valerius, but there is an element of truth to it. Latin was not inflicted on Greeks systematically as a rigid form of policy, but occasionally when a clear expression of Roman power was felt to be appropriate Latin speakers were prepared to use their language even when there could be no expectation that the hearers would understand what was being said.[38] Thus Cato at Athens in 191 addressed the crowd in Latin (Plut. *Cat.* 12.4–5),

[36] See P. Fewster, 'Bilingualism in Roman Egypt', in Adams, Janse, and Swain (n. 23), 225–6.
[37] R. S. Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton, 1993), 236.
[38] Relevant Republican evidence is collected and discussed by Dubuisson (n. 2).

leaving it to a subordinate to translate the speech into Greek. The Latin will have been largely incomprehensible to the audience, but of symbolic significance.[39] Levick uses the term 'propriety' of what she calls 'the speaker's sense of his position in relation to his audience', and remarks in this connection that sometimes 'using Latin was not just using one language rather than another, but making a claim to status or authority'.[40]

A passage in Apuleius (also found in truncated form in the Greek *Lucius or the Ass*, 44) eloquently reveals the use to which Latin might be put, *ad hoc*, in a Greek area to place the hearer at a disadvantage. At *Met.* 9.39 a legionary soldier, probably a centurion, comes upon the market gardener who has possession of the donkey Lucius, and demands to know in arrogant tones where he is taking the donkey: *quidam . . . miles e legione, factus nobis obuius, superbo atque adroganti sermone percontatur, quorsum uacuum duceret asinum*. The gardener does not understand Latin, and without replying moves on: *at meus, adhuc maerore permixtus et alias Latini sermonis ignarus, tacitus praeteribat*. For this he is beaten, and is moved to say that through ignorance of the language used by the soldier he could not know what had been said to him: *tunc hortulanus subplicue respondit sermonis ignorantia se, quid ille diceret, scire non posse*. The soldier switches into Greek, and puts his question again (Apuleius of course translates it into Latin, this time using direct speech): *ergo igitur Graece subiciens miles: 'ubi' inquit 'ducis asinum istum?'*

Although the soldier is bilingual and the confrontation is set in a Greek-speaking part of the Empire, and although the *hortulanus* is a humble local character who could not have been assumed by the soldier to be a Latin speaker, nevertheless the *miles* chose to address him in Latin. Significantly Apuleius describes the form of address as 'arrogant'. The soldier asserts his Roman identity and military authority by inflicting momentarily the language of the imperial power on the peasant.

It is of particular interest here that the unnamed character is a soldier. Soldiers recruited into the army from isolated parts of the Roman Empire were proud of their acquired Roman identity, and it was felt to be appropriate to express that attribute through the Latin language on occasions. It has been pointed out by Millar that Palmyrenes, 'alone of all "nationalities" who contributed to the auxiliary forces of the Imperial army, might take their language and their art with them'.[41] In practical terms this means that when Palmyrene soldiers were commemorated in epitaphs, Palmyrene Aramaic was sometimes used alongside Latin.[42] By contrast, auxiliary recruits speaking a diversity of vernacular languages *other than* Palmyrene did not maintain (in public at least) their original languages, but took on a Roman identity as expressed through the Latin language. In Egypt, where, as noted earlier, the day-to-day conduct of military affairs was mainly in Greek, there is one sphere in which Latin is dominant. Although Greek predominates in the epigraphy of Roman Egypt, epitaphs of soldiers are overwhelmingly in Latin.[43] An epitaph is a fossilization of a person's identity, and all over the Empire soldiers' epitaphs can be found in Latin even in units

[39] See Kaimio (n. 2), 98–9; Dubuisson (n. 2), 200; E. S. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (London, 1993), 64–5, 68–9, 237.

[40] B. Levick, 'The Latin inscriptions of Asia Minor', in H. Solin, O. Salomies, and U.-M. Liertz (edd.), *Acta Colloquii Epigraphici Latini Helsingiae 3.–6. sept. 1991 habiti* (Helsinki, 1995), 396.

[41] F. G. B. Millar, *The Roman Near East 31 B.C.–A.D. 337* (Cambridge, MA, 1993), 328.

[42] See *CIL* III.7999, VIII.2515; D. R. Hillers and E. Cussini, *Palmyrene Aramaic Texts* (Baltimore and London, 1996), 158, PAT 0990.

[43] See Stein (n. 8), 181 with n. 3.

[44] For a few examples from the East, see B. Isaac, *The Limits of Empire. The Roman Army in*

and areas where Latin would not have been the primary language of the referents.[44] A revealing instance in this respect is found at *CIL* III.125: *Κλ. Κλαυδιανὸς οὐετ(ρανὸς) Θεοφάνου* **leg(atus) p(ro) p(raetore) ex leg(ione) III K(yrenaica)** *ἐποίησεν τὴν στήλην ἰδίαις αὐτοῦ δαπάναις*. The epitaph is basically in Greek, but the rank and unit of the deceased are given in Latin. It may be deduced that he and his family were Greek speakers, but that his membership of the most Roman of all institutions was a source of pride to them. His Roman identity was therefore expressed symbolically through partial use of the Latin language in setting out his position in the army. The epitaphs of soldiers of the *legio II Parthica* found at Apamea in Syria are also revealing in this respect.[45] It was obviously a struggle for those composing and writing these texts to use Latin. Interference from Greek is common (for example, no. 9 *D.M. Aur[elius] Moucianos mil. leg. II Pat.*; *Moucianos* is a grecizing spelling, not only in the ending [morphological interference], but also in the first syllable [orthographic interference], since at this period Gk. *ου* was used to transliterate both long and short *u* of Latin), and some texts are incoherent (e.g. no. 2). The writers were working under the influence of a tradition that favoured the use of Latin for symbolically encapsulating an aspect of a soldier's identity. In this connection two pieces of evidence from Asia Minor cited by Levick are worth noting. From Ancyra in Galatia there is a grave monument set up in Latin by a wife to her husband, a soldier from Apamea (*CIL* III.6766). The man 'did not come from a Roman colony and may well have had Greek as his original tongue', but the wife in choosing Latin 'either knew what was required or had been issued with instructions by her husband'.[46] Even more remarkable is a series of three stones from Caesarea Mazaca in Cappodocia (*AE* [1984], 893) which show 'a leading centurion receiving a Latin grave monument from his wife and son, the wife herself getting one in Greek from her daughter, and the son getting one in Greek from his sister'.[47] Again, as in the case of the mixed-language text quoted above, we see evidence that the family language of the referents was Greek, but that a Latin commemoration was essential to express the Romanness of the centurion's identity. As Levick puts it, 'the use of Latin is one of the most crisply assertive and unmistakable ways of expressing Romanness . . . especially in the ultimate utterance of the grave-stone'.[48]

The place of Latin in the Roman army is a complicated matter, which cannot be entered into at length here. It will not do simply to assert, as is often done, that Latin was the 'official' language of the army. There are many official documents from the army in Egypt, for example, which are in Greek. It would, however, be true to say that Latin had the potential to symbolize the *Romanitas* of the institution and its members in appropriate circumstances. The soldier in Apuleius chose to assert his authority by using Latin even to a Greek peasant. In the grand setting of the Colossus of Memnon high-ranking officers in the Roman army regularly left records of their visits (and of their status and units) in Latin.[49] At other pilgrimage sites (for example, Dakka and

the East (Oxford, 1990), 319; and in particular a good deal of the material cited from Asia Minor by Levick (n. 40), 394–400.

[45] These inscriptions have not yet been published in full, but see J. C. Balty and W. Van Rengen, *Apamea in Syria. The Winter Quarters of Legio II Parthica. Roman Gravestones from the Military Cemetery* (Brussels, 1993); see also J. C. Balty, 'Apamea in Syria in the second and third centuries A.D.', *JRS* 78 (1988), 91–104.

[46] Levick (n. 40), 397. [47] Ibid., 400. [48] Ibid., 398.

[49] See J. N. Adams, 'The poets of Bu Njem: language, culture and the centurionate', *JRS* 89 (1999), 128–9.

Kalabcha) soldiers for the most part used Greek.[50] The Colossus was visited particularly by the upper classes, including emperors, and was apparently felt to be a suitable site for the symbolic assertion through the medium of Latin of the Romanness of military and political power in Egypt. Prefects of Egypt too used Latin in inscriptions here, though Greek was the language which they preferred in daily administration.

In the material just cited it is the soldiers themselves (or members of their families) who seek to express a Roman identity to the outside world through the use of the Latin language. Within the army itself Latin could under certain circumstances be insisted on by the military authorities to bring home the fact that this was a Roman institution, whatever the native languages of the individual soldiers. For example, there is evidence that stereotyped orders were given in Latin, even in the east and as late as the Byzantine period. The evidence is found, for example, in ps.-Mauricius, *Strategicon* 3.5, 12.14, and is discussed in detail by Lot and Reichenkron.[51] Orders include *aequaliter ambula*, *largiter ambula*, *ad latus stringe*, *iunge*, *percute, cum ordine sequere*. Also of note are the military diplomas issued mainly to auxiliaries on honourable discharge granting recipients the citizenship. These are uniformly in Latin, whatever the origin of the auxiliary, and they serve as another link between the citizenship and the Latin language.

VI. SOME AMBIGUITIES: ROMAN ATTITUDES TO GREEK AND LATIN

From an early period Romans displayed an ambiguous attitude to the Greek language *vis-à-vis* their own. On the one hand, for example, Greek syntactic patterns were imitated in the formation of a Latin literary language (particularly in poetry),[52] but on the other hand from time to time an unease emerges about Greek elements in the language. As early as Livius Andronicus there can be seen an attempt to latinize some of the divine apparatus of epic. *Μοῦσα* becomes not *Musa* but *Camena* (fr. 1), *μοῖρα* is replaced by *Morta* (11 [12]), and *Μνημοσύνη* by *Moneta* (23 [25]). Naevius latinized the nominative form of the name *Aeneas* (fr. 23 *blande et docte percontat, Aenea quo pacto | Troiam urbem liquerit*). Quintilian, putting words into the mouth of a hypothetical grammarian who is *ueterum amator*, speaks of 'increasing the power of the Latin language' by this process of latinizing the inflection of Greek names in Latin: 1.5.60 *quin etiam laudet uirtutem eorum, qui potentiorem facere linguam Latinam studebant nec alienis egere institutis fatebantur* ('he would also praise the patriotism of those who attempted to make the Latin language more powerful and did not allow that it needed foreign rules'). It is clear from the whole discussion at 1.5.58–64 that there was a good deal of debate about the method of inflecting Greek names in Latin (see also earlier Varro *Ling*. 10.70), indicative of ongoing concern about the intrusion of Greek elements into Latin. Or again, Tiberius is reported as refusing to allow the use of the word *ἔμβλημα* in a senatorial decree, and instructing

[50] This is a story in itself, which I deal with in my book *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, ch. 5.

[51] F. Lot, 'La langue du commandement dans les armées romaines et le cri de guerre français au moyen age', in *Mélanges dédiés á la mémoire de Félix Grat* I (Paris, 1946), 203–9; G. Reichenkron, 'Zur römischen Kammandosprache bei byzantinischen Schriftstellern', *BZ* 54 (1961), 18–27. For further bibliography, see Rochette (n. 5), 143, n. 354.

[52] See, for example, R. Coleman, 'Greek influence on Latin syntax', *TPhS* 1975, 101–156; also H. Rosén, *Latine loqui. Trends and Directions in the Crystallization of Classical Latin* (Munich, 1999), index, s.v. 'Imitatio'.

that the foreign word (*uox peregrina*) should be replaced by one of 'our own' (*nostratem*), or, if none such was available, by a circumlocution: Suet. *Tib*. 71 *atque etiam cum in quodam decreto patrum ἔμβλημα recitaretur, commutandam censuit uocem et pro peregrina nostratem requirendam aut, si non reperiretur, uel pluribus et per ambitum uerborum rem enuntiandam* ('and when in a senatorial decree the word ἔμβλημα was read out, he recommended that it should be changed and that instead of the foreign term one of our own should be sought, or, if such could not be found, that the thing should be expressed by several words or by a circumlocution').[53] I stress here the use of *nostras*: Latin to Romans was 'our own' language, a notion that comes up occasionally when attitudes to Greek are at issue. There is a degree of 'linguistic nationalism'[54] apparent in these various pieces of evidence, born of a linguistic insecurity caused by an unspoken sense that Greek might in some way be 'superior' to Latin, and should be kept at arm's length.

That insecurity is even more obvious in discussions of the relative 'richness' or 'poverty' of the Greek and Latin languages.[55] Lucretius famously spoke of the poverty of Latin (1.136–45), but Cicero, motivated by the same sort of linguistic nationalism as that seen above, asserted that it was in fact Latin which was the richer: *Fin.* 1.10 *sed ita sentio et saepe disserui,* ***Latinam linguam*** *non modo <non> inopem, ut uulgo putarent, sed* ***locupletiorem etiam esse quam*** *Graecam* ('but I feel and have often argued that the Latin language is not only not poor, as is commonly supposed, but is even richer than Greek'); cf. *Fin.* 3.51 *cum uteretur in lingua copiosa factis tamen nominibus ac nouis, quod nobis* ***in hac inopi lingua*** *non conceditur, quamquam* ***tu hanc copiosiorem etiam soles dicere*** ('. . . even though he was using a copious language [Greek], he was still resorting to words made up and novel, something which is not allowed to us in this impoverished language [of ours]; though you are fond of saying that Latin is actually more copious than Greek'). The Ciceronian passages in effect acknowledge that any assertion of the superiority of Latin went against the common opinion.[56]

The ambiguities inherent in the Roman attitude to Greek and the Greeks also emerge from a consideration of the way in which Cicero uses Greek loan-words in different parts of his work. In the philosophical and rhetorical treatises Greek words could be used neutrally as technical terms, though even here Cicero did his best to avoid them (see *Fin*. 3.15).[57] In the speeches on the other hand they are rare, and used predominantly with irony or to convey contempt for persons with 'Greek' tendencies.[58] In public therefore (as in speeches) Romans sought to remain true to their Roman

[53] The same story is found in Cassius Dio (57.15.3). The passages are discussed by Kaimio (n. 2), 106, 132–3.

[54] I use the expression very loosely of the speaker's pride in his own language and a consequent attempt to downgrade the other language. Contrast the more usual sense of the term at section I above.

[55] See now T. Fögen, *Patrii Sermonis Egestas. Einstellungen lateinischer Autoren zu ihrer Muttersprache* (Munich and Leipzig, 2000).

[56] See J. G. F. Powell, 'Cicero's translations from Greek', in J. G. F. Powell (ed.), *Cicero the Philosopher* (Oxford, 1995), 283–4. The alleged limitations of Latin involved only the lexicon, as Powell (284) points out, and there were many ways in which a lack of philosophical terms of the type demanded by the character of Greek philosophy could be remedied, as Cicero (see *Fin*. 3.15) and Lucretius were well aware. On Lucretius, see D. Sedley, 'Lucretius' use and avoidance of Greek', in J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer (edd.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, Proceedings of the British Academy 93 (Oxford, 1999), 227–46.

[57] Cf. *Acad*. 1.24–6, with the discussion of Sedley (n. 56), 228–9. See also L. Laurand, *Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron* (Paris, 1936–8), 81; Powell (n. 56), 289.

[58] See the discussion (with substantial data) by Laurand (n. 57), 72–4.

identity by using a form of Latin untainted by Greek; there was a purist movement at the time of Cicero.[59] Greek culture could readily be presented as decadent, and this decadence could be implied by the contemptuous use of Greek terms relating to activities of which the Romans publicly disapproved as being supposedly typical of Greeks. Thus in the speeches Cicero uses the Latin terms *sapientes* and *docti* when referring neutrally to philosophers, but switches to *philosophus* (*philosophia*) when he wishes to express hostility towards such persons.[60] It is a striking fact that terms in Latin suggestive of passive homosexuality are borrowed from Greek (*catamitus*, *cinaedus*, *pathicus*; also *malacus* in Plautus), and herein is implicit an attitude that it was Greeks above all who were prone to such behaviour, and that Romans with these tendencies should be characterized by Greek words.

On the other hand in private the Roman educated classes profoundly admired Greek culture, and in their non-popular or private output (such as letters) they admitted masses of loan-words and even pure Greek, particularly in reference to technical disciplines. If the public terminology of passive homosexuality was Greek and pejorative in tone, in private Greek might be used by some with affectionate tone to accompany heterosexual intercourse, if Juvenal and Martial are to be believed (Juv. 6.191, 195, Mart. 10.68).

Similar ambiguities can be detected in the Romans' view of the Greek which they themselves used. Sometimes admiration is expressed for the Roman who is more Greek than the Greeks, in that his own Greek is at least as good as that of a native speaker. Note for example Plin. *Epist*. 4.3.5 ***hominemne Romanum*** *tam Graece loqui? . . . inuideo Graecis quod illorum lingua scribere maluisti* ('can a Roman speak such Greek? . . . I envy the Greeks that you have preferred to write in their language'). Noteworthy here is the emotive use of *homo Romanus* in juxtaposition with *Graece*: it is paradoxical that a Roman could be so fluent in Greek. There were even occasions when educated Romans went so far as to appropriate Greek for themselves, as it were, by claiming it along with Latin as 'their own' (whereas the adjective *noster* and associated words are usually applied to Latin: see above).[61] The emperor Claudius, on encountering a barbarian fluent in the two languages, complimented him on his mastery of 'our two languages': Suet. *Claud.* 42.1 *cuidam barbaro Graece ac Latine disserenti: 'cum utroque' inquit 'sermone* ***nostro*** *sis paratus'* ('to a barbarian fluent in Greek and Latin he said, "since you are equipped in both of our languages" ').

On the other hand, the expression *homo Romanus* is used in a context with a rather different implication at Cic. *Att*. 1.19.10 *quo facilius illas probaret* ***Romani hominis*** *esse, idcirco barbara quaedam et soloeca dispersisse* ('[he said] that he had sprinkled a few barbarisms and solecisms to make his readers more willing to believe that it was written by a Roman' [Shackleton Bailey]). The reference is to Lucullus' history of the Social War, written in Greek. Lucullus maintained that he had deliberately admitted solecisms and barbarisms in his Greek to prove that the history was the work of a Roman. Lucullus may have been covering himself against any accusation that his Greek was not good, but equally he may genuinely have believed that it would not do to be as Greek as the Greeks. The Greek translations of Roman *senatus consulta*

[59] See Powell (n. 56), 289.

[60] See the material cited by Laurand (n. 57), 72–3, with 73, n. 1. *Philosophus* is used with a contemptuous tone as early as Plautus (*Rud*. 986) (so too *philosophor*).

[61] For the normal use of *noster* (of Latin alone), see Cic. *Tusc*. 3.7 *haec enim fere sunt eius modi quae Graeci πάθη appellant; ego poteram 'morbos', et id uerbum esset e uerbo, sed in consuetudinem* ***nostram*** *non caderet*.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.184 Published online by Cambridge University Press

produced apparently in Rome for circulation in the Greek world,[62] and also the Greek translation of Augustus' *Res Gestae*, are notable for the imposition of Latinate idioms on Greek: no attempt is made to accommodate the idiom to that natural to Greek.[63]

VII. CONCLUSION

Only in a loose sense did the Romans have linguistic policies, and one will look in vain for any explicit formulations. Different linguistic behaviour can be detected in different parts of the Empire, and the variations must have been the product of at least some debate. Foreign languages other than Greek were disregarded all over the Empire. A guardsman of Germanic origin in Jerome's *Vita Hilarionis* (13) who set out to consult the Aramaic-speaking holy man Hilarion in Palestine took with him interpreters who spoke not Aramaic but Greek. The assumption was made by the party that they could get by in Greek; Aramaic in their eyes might not have existed, never mind that it was the predominating language of the region, and of the holy man himself. In the western provinces this attitude of indifference to vernacular languages had no serious consequences for the Romans, because Latin had high status among local élites both within Italy (witness the story about Cumae in 180 B.C.) and in nearby provinces such as Gaul.[64] The locals themselves were therefore moved to take the initiative in learning the language, and the Romans simply had no need to enforce any form of strict linguistic policy. What the Romans probably did in the west was to make available instruction in Latin literacy practices, as is suggested by the survival of numerous texts in vernacular languages (for example, Etruscan, Gaulish, Venetic, Punic) written in the Latin script and making use of Latin numerals. The fact that these writers were writing their own languages in this way implies that no aggressive attempt was being made by the Romans to stamp out the local languages; but instruction in Latin literacy must have been accompanied by instruction in Latin itself, because primary speakers of Latin are unlikely to have taught locals how to write their own native languages in Latin letters. Some sort of instruction was laid on, and the locals were left to their own devices in making a language choice; nevertheless, even the act of providing instruction can be seen as the operation of a mild policy. The potters at La Graufesenque employed Latin literacy practices, but they were permitted to write either language through these means in the records of the firings. It was the prestige which they granted Latin (as can be seen in the choice of that language for makers' stamps) which would lead to the death of Gaulish.

In the east things were not so straightforward. Again Latin was not imposed, but here there was no mass movement from the locals themselves to acquire Latin; Greek speakers in particular traditionally esteemed their own language, and that attitude will have prevented a widespread language shift.[65] Here Roman pragmatism prevailed.

[62] For which see R. T. Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East:* senatus consulta *and* epistulae *to the Age of Augustus* (Baltimore, 1969).

[63] Some details can be found in A. P. M. Meuwese, *De Rerum Gestarum Diui Augusti uersione Graeca* (Buscoduci, 1920) and L. A. Holford-Strevens, '*Vtraque lingua doctus*: some notes on bilingualism in the Roman Empire', in *Liverpool Classical Papers* no. 3. *Tria Lustra: Essays and Notes Presented to John Pinsent Founder and Editor of Liverpool Classical Monthly by Some of its Contributors on the Occasion of the 150th issue* (Liverpool, 1993), 203–13.

[64] On one occasion Caesar used a local Gallic *princeps* as an interpreter (*Gall*. 1.19.3); there is a hint here that local chieftains may have been to the fore in learning Latin.

[65] But those Greeks who wanted to advance in the higher reaches of the Roman administration will undoubtedly have needed to master Latin. On Greeks learning Latin, see the extensive discussion of Rochette (n. 5), ch. III.

They had had a long and intimate association with Greek, and found it no difficulty to use Greek as a *lingua franca* in the administration not only of the Empire itself (as is particularly clear in Egypt), but even of the Roman army. Although the learning of Latin took place on a large scale in the army, the military writings that have survived from the east are predominantly in Greek.

But there are complications to this picture. The Romans had long had a sense of insecurity about their own language in relation to Greek. This insecurity emerges in the conflicting attitudes discussed in the previous section. Romans worried about the possible 'poverty' of Latin compared with Greek, and were unhappy about giving way to Greeks linguistically by using Greek rather than Latin in formal public exchanges with Greek speakers. Such worries must have been exacerbated in the Republican period by an incident at Tarentum in 282 B.C., when the Roman ambassador L. Postumius Megellus was mocked by the Tarentines for his bad Greek and even excreted on (D.H. 19.5).[66] Hence there arose what I have called an 'assertive' or 'aggressive' use of Latin. From time to time Romans asserted their Romanness, particularly in dealings with Greeks, by forcing Latin on their hearers in circumstances in which Greek might have been expected. It is just such an assertive use which lies behind Valerius Maximus' statement about Republican linguistic policy towards Greek officials. It can be seen too in the story about the Roman soldier in Apuleius, and in Cato's behaviour at Athens referred to earlier (p. 198). This assertive use was at odds with the usual accommodating acceptance of Greek by Romans, but it never got in the way of communication. After a show of Roman superiority, the soldier in Apuleius switched into Greek, and Cato too condescendingly had a subordinate provide a translation. Latin was merely called on occasionally for an assertive show.

Many Roman citizens did not speak Latin, particularly no doubt after A.D. 212 following the enfranchisement of the free inhabitants of the whole Empire by Caracalla. There are numerous legal documents from Egypt drafted on behalf of Roman citizens which have an official version in Latin but Greek translations for the benefit of the referent or petitioner, and these provide explicit evidence of ignorance of Latin on the part of citizens. Neverthless, we have seen signs of an expectation that citizens should learn the language, and Latin was obligatory in certain types of documents concerning citizens and the citizenship, in which its place was heavily symbolic; here again is a language policy of a sort.

Finally, we saw a passing stage in which a Roman identity in the literal sense of the term was marked by the ability to speak a form of Latin which was distinctive of the city itself. In this period outsiders were not merely Greeks and speakers of vernacular languages, but even Latin speakers from outside the city with provincial accents. Soon though the 'Roman language' (*lingua Romana*) came to embrace all varieties of Latin. The Roman soldier in Apuleius will have symbolized his Roman identity by the choice of Latin, whatever the accent he used.

All Souls College, Oxford J. N. ADAMS

[66] See the discussion of the incident by Gruen (n. 39), 229–30.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.184 Published online by Cambridge University Press