

PAPERS AND MONOGRAPHS OF THE FINNISH INSTITUTE AT ATHENS VOL. VIII

GRAPTA POIKILA I

Edited by Leena Pietilä-Castrén and Marjaana Vesterinen

HELSINKI 2003

© Suomen Ateenan-instituutin säätiö (Foundation of the Finnish Institute at Athens) 2003

ISSN 1237-2684

ISBN 951-98806-1-5

Printed in Greece by D. Layias – E. Souvatzidakis S.A., Athens 2003

Cover: Aeschylus, *Hiketides* at the Delphic Festival in 1930.

Contents

Preface	i
---------	---

I Scribes, Language and Textual Tradition

MARTTI LEIWO	Scribes and Language Variation	1
MARJA VIERROS	Everything is Relative. The Relative Clause Constructions of an Egyptian Scribe Writing Greek	13
HILLA HALLA-AHO	Remarks on Phraseology, Spoken Language and Language Contact in the Letters of Claudius Terentianus (2 nd Century AD Egypt)	25

II Actuality and Cultural Politics in Performing Arts

MARJAANA VESTERINEN	Reading Lucian's Περὶ ὀρχήσεως – Attitudes and Approaches to Pantomime	35
HANNU K. RIIKONEN	Tradition Revived - The Open-air Performances of Greek Tragedies in France, Italy, Greece and Russia (1860-1960)	53
PIRKKO KOSKI	Greek Tragedies in 20 th Century Finland	69
PLATON MAVROMOUSTAKOS	Modern Greek Approaches to Ancient Greek Drama	85
RISTO PEKKA PENNANEN	Greek Music Policy under the Dictatorship of General Ioannis Metaxas (1936-1941)	103
List of Figures		133

Remarks on Phraseology, Spoken Language and Language Contact in the Letters of Claudius Terentianus (2nd Century AD Egypt)

Hilla Halla-aho

The letters of Claudius Terentianus from early 2nd century Egypt (P. Mich. VIII 467-481) are valuable documents for research into substandard Latin. To add to their importance, Terentianus was also a Greek-Latin bilingual whose letters in both languages have survived.

Terentianus' use of language, and of Latin in particular, has been studied in some detail because it shows many historical changes in progress, some of which are already symptoms of the later Romance evolution. The most comprehensive analysis is by J.N. Adams (1977).

Nevertheless, many questions remain to be asked and answered. In this article I shall focus on some aspects that have, in my opinion, not been discussed thoroughly enough, in the sphere of phraseology and syntax. First, I shall discuss the *accusativus cum infinitivo* constructions (Acl) and their relationship to epistolary phrasing and then move to the influence of colloquial language and language contact on Terentianus' variety of Latin. Finally I suggest some clarifications of the apparent regional variation in Latin epistolary phraseology resulting from contact with Greek.

The Acl, its gradual decline and the triumph of subordinate clauses are among the most studied topics in Latin syntax. From late republican times onwards, sporadic examples of finite complement clauses without anaphora are found with *verba sentiendi et dicendi* (in Suetonius, Tacitus, Plinius and Petronius¹). The finite complements begin to abound in the works of Apuleius and Gellius in the second century. Given the conservative nature of written language (as compared with the spoken) in general and that of literary Latin in particular, any such change in written language evidently betokens widespread change in the spoken, at least for the great majority of speakers.²

If we suppose that the use of the Acl was by this time, the beginning of the 2nd century, already decreasing, it would be reasonable to expect that the changes would be visible in substandard texts like the letters of Terentianus. This, however, is not the case. No instances of finite complement clauses governed by *verba sentiendi et dicendi* can be

¹ Petronius, naturally, differs from the others with regard to literary genre and linguistic representativeness; see below.

² Cf. Stefenelli 1962, 102. See also Hofmann - Szantyr 1965, 354; Kühner - Stegmann 1971, 274-275. For divergent views on the popularity of finite complements see Perrochat 1932, 133-139; Scivoletto 1962, 18-22; Cuzzolin 1991, 29-32.

found in his Latin letters. Infinitive constructions, for their part, are found in considerable numbers with these verbs. Among the infinitive phrases, there are standard salutary formulae like *an[te om]nia op[er]e[m] et h[ab]ere[m] [e]t salvom mihi esse* (467, 2: “Before all else, I pray that you be strong and cheerful and well”) and *op[er]e te bene val[e]re* (470, 27: “Before all else I pray for your health”), but the Acl occurs in the body text of the letters as well: *scias me, pater, accepisse* (467, 4: “Know, father, that I have received”), *scias domo nostrae deorum beneficio omnia recte esse* (467, 26: “Know that everything is going well at home, through the beneficence of the gods”).

From this data Adams has come to the conclusion, contrary to the view held by traditional handbooks, that infinitive complements were not falling out of use, but, instead, were still used in substandard and spoken Latin and were replaced by finite complement clauses only later in the history of Latin. Because of the absence of finite complements in these letters, Adams does not believe that those that are found in early vulgar texts are “the tip of an iceberg”. Adams claims: “Some examples of the acc. + infin. were clearly of a type formulaic in epistolography. But there remain sufficient instances to show that the construction was at home in the spoken registers of the author”.⁵

Of all the 19 certain instances of Acl in Terentianus’ Latin letters, 5 are with *opto* (467, 3 and 35; 468, 3 and 64; 470, 27) and 6 with *scio* (467, 4, 8 and 26; 468, 4, 43 and 47). The latter forms a clear pattern as well (of the type *scias me pater accepisse* or *misisse*), though not as formulaic as *opto*. The remaining 8 are distributed with *spero* (2: 468, 22 and 36), *nego* (2: 467, 9 and 471, 32), *dico* (1: 469, 12), *pareo* (1: 467, 17, anacolouthic) and two uncertain verbs (*sileo* in 471, 15 and something like *posco* in 467, 9 according to the editors Youtie and Winter).⁶ So, in my view, the sufficiency of this evidence, as far as spoken language is concerned, remains disputable. It must be remembered that the complement change from Acl to finite clauses was not an abrupt process that happened at some moment in time. The sporadic instances of finite complements in literary texts from the 1st century BC through the 1st century AD are a good indication of this.⁷ The change started with some verbs and in certain kinds of contexts, and gradually spread further. Semantic properties of the governing verbs often had a decisive role.⁸ Therefore, the use of Acl in these letters cannot be regarded as positive evidence concerning the verbal system as a whole.⁹

³ All translations of the Terentianus letters are by Youtie and Winter (1951).

⁴ Compare γεινῶσκειν σε θέλω, πατήρ, κεκοίμ[ε]σθαι με παρὰ Ἀχιλλέως καλῶν (476. 5) in Greek.

⁵ Adams 1977, 61–62. Calboli, like Adams, does not consider significant the fact that the majority of the infinitive constructions appear in salutary formulae (Calboli 1990, 29). Adams further states that “Had *quod* or *quia* clauses had any currency in Latin, we should have expected the existence of the Greek ὅτι construction to have provided an additional impulse for a bilingual to admit object clauses in Latin” (Adams 1977, 61). Syntactic interference and convergence in contact situations are very complex issues but will not be gone into here.

⁶ In addition to the instances mentioned above there are possible examples of Acl with *rescribo* in 468, 32 as well as *scio* in 470, 22. Calboli (1990, 37–39) has presented a table of all infinitive complements in both the Latin and Greek letters of Terentianus. Unfortunately it contains a number of mistakes: the verb (*ap*)*pareo* is claimed to occur twice in letter 468 with an infinitive complement, though *pareo* is found only in letter 467; *rescribus* is reported to have an infinitive complement in 470, though the contexts of all three instances are too fragmentary to permit any observations (470, 17, 18 and 22); in addition, the verb *rescribo* is not used in letter 467 contrary to what Calboli presents in his table; the formula *op[er]e te bene val[e]re* can be found also in letter 470; the verb *rogo* is not used in 470 with an infinitive complement as it is both times followed by an *ut*-clause (470, 4 and 19); and finally, the verb *nego* has an infinitive complement in letter 467 (467, 9).

Furthermore, some features of Terentianus' syntax could support the conclusion that the use of the Acl was more or less limited. In several places Terentianus seems to have difficulties in composing the infinitive complement correctly when the verb governing it differs from the ones normally used in his letters. In letter 467 we find an anacolouthic expression *ne tibi[i] paream a spe amar[a] parpa[tum] yagari quasi fugitivom* (467, 17: "... lest I seem to you to wander like a fugitive, lured on by a bitter hope"), where an adjective (*fugitivom*) referring to the subject is in the accusative instead of the expected nominative. A Greek-flavoured phrase *factum est illi venire Alexandria* (471, 22: "and he happened to go to Alexandria") is found in letter 471. Adams' suggestion, analogy from Greek dative + infinitive constructions, is convincing.¹⁰ In addition, Terentianus once shifted into a finite clause in the middle of an infinitive structure governed by the same verb: *ed [sci]as Carpum hic errasse ed inye[ntus est] Dios in legione et a[cc]e[p]isse me pro illo (denarios) VI* (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"). This happened in his Greek as well: [γ]εινώσκειν σε θέλω μ[ε]τὰ τὸ ἄγ[ω]ν ἡδ[ύ] [σ]ο[φ]ί[α] γ[ὰρ] ῥα μ[ε]λέ[ν]ον ἐν ἡγεγεμένον μοι [... ὅ]π[ω]ς τοῦ π[α]τρ[ὸ]ς Ἀνου[βί]ωνος τὸ καλῶν, καὶ τὸ τέ[λ]ος νῦν πα[ρ]εσ[τ]ῆν ἐμοί (477, 32: "I want you to know that after the above had already been written to you the basket was brought to me ... by Anubion's father (?), and now at last I have it").¹¹ These examples could imply that when Terentianus did not have the stock phrases for his support, he was not quite comfortable with the infinitive complement.¹²

Although the *quod*-clauses are absent, we have examples of the infinitive complement being replaced by finite ones. The verb *dico* is used only once construed with Acl. Elsewhere *dico* and other verbs of saying are followed by paratactic constructions, i. e. quotations from direct speech: *ait mihi si n[on] mi redd[as]* (467, 9: "He said to me: If you do not return ... to me"); *dico illi, da mi, di[c]o, q[ue]s paucum; ibo, dico, ad amicos patris mei* (471, 10: "I say to him, 'Give me', I say, 'a little money; I shall go', I say, 'to friends of my father'"). The verb can even be left out completely: *mater mea: spectemus illum dum venit* (471, 24: "My mother (says), 'Let us wait for him until he comes'").¹³ This is likely to reflect the spoken practice as the style in letter 471 is colloquial in other respects as well, e.g. long clause chains coordinated with *et*.¹⁴ Scivoletto has claimed that paratactic constructions, rather than *quod*-clauses, were the everyday substitute for Acl.¹⁵ In Terentianus the usage is quite natural as the governing verb is one of speaking. There is quite a variety of examples in Hofmann, including, for

⁷ Examples are cited e.g. in Kühner - Stegman 1971, 274-275.

⁸ Cf. Cuzzolin 1991, 74-75.

⁹ See Pinkster (1987, 213-214 and 1989, 322) where he deals with similar questions concerning future and perfect tense auxiliaries with *habere*. See Leiwo (2002) for discussion about the relationship between written and spoken registers in bilingual epigraphic data.

¹⁰ Adams 1977, 63-64. See also Weinreich 1953, 39. Because of typological similarity, interference between Greek and Latin is likely to take place even at the syntactic level: see Romaine 1989, 54.

¹¹ Cf. Adams 1977, 63.

¹² Salutory phrases could also be copied from other letters. The writer of letter O. Bu Njem 109 apparently knew Latin rather poorly but managed to write the closing salutation according to the standard.

¹³ Cf. Adams 1977, 62.

¹⁴ Another feature from colloquial language might be the use of *item* as a connective particle.

¹⁵ Scivoletto 1962, 19-20.

example, those with *scio* in Petronius: *scis, magna navis magnam fortitudinem habet* (76, 6: "As you know, a big ship has a big heart")¹⁶ and *scito autem, sociorum olla male fervet* (38, 13: "You know how it is; a shared pot goes off the boil").¹⁷

I have wanted to point out the limited variety of expressions in which the Acl occurs, as well as Terentianus' inability to always construe it correctly, although the absence of *quod* clauses in his letters is, of course, undeniable.

The most unquestionable and most regularly cited proof for the use of finite complement clauses in the 1st century AD comes from Petronius, although there are only four instances of the substitution, three of which are in the *cena Trimalchionis* (45, 10; 46, 4; 71, 9; 131, 7). The relationship between literary tradition and imitation of popular speech in the *cena Trimalchionis* is problematic. As an author, Petronius attempted to imitate the speech of the freedmen and to describe his characters by their linguistic behaviour. In the case of Echion, who utters two of the above examples, the finite complements beginning with *quia* certainly demonstrate the character in question. He is a rather vulgar figure, whose speech contains most substandard expressions. The conjunction in these utterances probably shows Greek influence, as *quia* is the usual equivalence for *ὅτι*.¹⁸ Sometimes Petronius may have exaggerated the substandard features of popular speech to make his point, but we have little means of finding out when this was the case. It is highly unlikely, however, that a native speaker of Latin, like Petronius, would have put into his characters' mouths phrases that were not at all possible in Latin. Undeniably there were people for whom *dixi quia* was a possible way of expressing themselves.

The aim of Terentianus, on the contrary, was to produce as proper language as possible. Neither kind of text is likely to be a straightforward reflection of spoken language. Before the outcome of the complement change was determined permanently there must have been a long transition period with considerable variation, the choice always depending on contextual factors, in which we must include the medium, speech or writing, as well.¹⁹

Adams argues that, unlike normal substandard texts, there are no signs in these letters of hyperurbanisms and literary affectation, to which the absence of finite complements could be attributed.²⁰ I have a slightly different view. Throughout the letters one can perceive how carefully Terentianus expresses his wishes in order to please his father as much as possible. He tries to write as well as he can, though his efforts are, perhaps, not always successful. The opening salutation in 467, *an[te om]nia op[er]a te] fortem et h[ab]ilem [et] salvom mihi esse cum nostris omn[ib]us*, *quod[en]ique aut[em] a t[ibi] habe[re] no[n]om mihi bene est* ("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."), to start with, clearly indicates some stylistic ambition and is paralleled in Pliny

¹⁶ The Petronius translations are from *Petronius, The Satyricon*. Translated with introduction and explanatory notes by P.G. Walsh. Oxford 1996.

¹⁷ See Hofmann 1926, 106–108.

¹⁸ Cf. Boyce 1991, 71; 82–83.

¹⁹ See Romaine 1982, 14–17 for discussion on the relationship between spoken, non-literary and literary language.

²⁰ Adams 1977, 61 and 85. Calboli (1990, 33) characterizes Terentianus' style as simple but also marked by grammatical correctness.

(*epist.* 10, 1, 2).²¹ Other examples of elaboration are *ne tib[i] paream a spe amari[a] parpa[tum] yagari quasi fugitivom* (467, 17; for the translation, see above); *nem[i]nem habeo enim karum nisi secundum deos te* (467, 18: “for I have no one dear to me except you”); *qu[on]i[a]m nihil mi pro dis fuerunt nisi verba null[i]us con[c]epi o[diu]m* (467, 15-16: “Since they were nothing to me – (I say this) in the presence of gods – but words, I conceived hatred of no one”). The same phenomenon is discernible in the Greek letters, and is manifested in letter 476 where Terentianus tries to assure his father of the necessity of bringing a woman into his household. At the same time, he attempts to avoid making his father angry: *εἰ πρὸς ἐστὶν ἡν ἐὰν δοκῇ μ[ο]ι κατενέγκαι ἡ δυναμένη μᾶλλον ὑ]πὲρ ἐμοῦ σοι εὐνοεῖν καὶ φροντίζειν σου πλείω ἐμοῦ, διατ[ε]λεῖται[ι] ἐμέ[σο]ι εὐχαρ[ι]στεῖν ἢ συ ἐμὲ μέμψασθαι* (476, 13-15: “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”).²²

It should not be supposed that perfect literary elegance or hyperurbanisms are the only possibilities for a substandard writer. In his restricted way, Terentianus did, in fact, achieve a rather high level, which obtains further merit if one thinks of the context he was writing in. The point is that, although Terentianus for obvious reasons was not familiar with the literary registers of Latin,²³ he was ambitious as a language user. This is connected with the wide variety of topics that are discussed in his long letters. In addition to normal enquiries and requests for different sorts of articles, Terentianus shares his feelings and fears with his recipient. This is more than can be said of average letter writers.

The infinitive complement occurs frequently also in the Greek letters of Terentianus. The majority of the infinitive complements are in standard opening and closing formulae like *εὐχομαι σε ὑγιαίνειν* and *ἐρῶσθαι σε εὐχομαι*.²⁴ Other verbs governing the infinitive complement are *θέλω*, *γινώσκω*, *γράφω*, *οἶδα* and *ἔρωτῶ*. *ὅτι*-clauses, for their part, are sometimes found governed by verbs which elsewhere take the infinitive complement, e.g. *γινώσκω*, *οἶδα*, *λέγω*.

In Greek, according to G. Horrocks, the non-finite complement began to fall out of use already in the Ptolemaic period. First, the infinitives replaced the participles together with verbs denoting perception and later, they were replaced by clauses beginning with *ὅτι*. This change was largely similar to that in Latin. The complement changed in official koine as well and not only in substandard texts, though there it is much more conspicuous. In Ptolemaic papyri the verbs *γινώσκω*, *οἶδα* and *γράφω* took both kind of complements, but *λέγω* was more often followed by a *ὅτι*-clause than by an infinitive. In later koine, the use of the non-finite constructions declined and finally they disappeared totally. By the beginning of the 2nd century AD, in the language of the uneducated, the non-finite complements were restricted to such formulaic phrases as *εὐχομαι σε ὑγιαίνειν* and *γινώσκειν σε θέλω*.²⁵

²¹ This formula could be modelled after Greek as well, cf. *ἐρῶσθαι σε εὐχομαι καὶ εὐχαρίνεσθαι* (cf. P. Mich. VIII 465, 45-46).

²² The syntax is interesting: *ἡ δυναμένη ... πλείω ἐμοῦ* seems to be parenthetical.

²³ Something which might be true of his father, though; see Calboli 1990, 36.

²⁴ The Greek salutations of Terentianus are noteworthy for their length and perfection. I have not found such elaborate combinations in other papyri, although the elements themselves are quite normal. The medial participle *ποσούμενος* in the *proskynema*-phrase draws special attention.

²⁵ Horrocks 1997, 45-46, 88, 99 and 122.

The evident parallelism of Greek and Latin epistolary formulae (*opto te bene valere* – εὐχομαι σε ὑγιαίνειν and ἐρῶσθαί σε εὐχομαι – *bene valere te opto*) leads us to a related topic. When it comes to opening and closing formulae, there appears to be distinct geographical variation between papyri and ostraca from Egypt on one hand and wooden tablets from Vindolanda on the other. In Egypt, the letters follow a Greek model with wishes for the recipient's well-being at the beginning and at the end. The salutations are usually construed with Acl like the Greek standard formulae.²⁶ In Vindolanda, however, there are hardly any salutary phrases at the beginning of the letters.²⁷ The writers get directly to business after the opening, A to B *salutem*. At the end, the wish for well-being is normally formulated with a finite complement (with the conjunction *ut* or, in many cases, paratactically), or simply as an imperative.²⁸ Now we can make explicit the notion that *opto (ut) valeas* and the imperative *vale* were the native Latin closings at this time and *opto te bene valere* was a translation from Greek, though perfectly in accord with Latin grammar. The latter was used in Egypt and the former in Britain, where old Roman conventions were still nurtured in other respects as well (e.g. in orthography).²⁹ The fact that the earliest Latin letters from Egypt, the correspondence of Macedo,³⁰ resemble the Vindolanda letters in their style, would support this interpretation. At this early date, the old Latin model for letter writing was still used by the immigrants who brought their Roman habits with them, but the following generations abandoned it in favour of the translated pattern.

G. Calboli has suggested that the Greek letters show Latin influence in the use of infinitive complements.³¹ This seems questionable. First of all, there is nothing extraordinary in the Greek constructions which should be attributed to Latin influence. At this time (leaving aside the standard formulae), Acl was at home in casual, though perhaps a bit more refined Greek epistolary registers. As I have argued, Terentianus was not totally uneducated. On the other hand, by this time, it was beginning to be possible to replace the Acl in Latin by finite clauses, at least in certain contexts. And finally, as we have seen, the close resemblance of the Greek and Latin opening and closing formulae is due to translation from Greek to Latin, and definitely not vice versa.³²

²⁶ In addition to the examples in Terentianus (and Tiberianus, P. Mich. VIII 472; see also Adams 1977, 4-5), the formula is found in Mons Claudianus *ben. valere te opto* (O. Claud. I 135, 5); *opto te bene valere et felicem esse* (O. Claud. II 367, 12-14) and 8 times in the Bu Njem ostraca (88, 7; 97, 11; 99, 8; 104, 7; 105, 5; 106, 2; 108, 3; 109, 5). Cf. also CEL 158 and 159 (= O. Latopolis Magnae. The former shows an interesting variant *opto te domine multis annis felicem videre*); CEL 161 (= O. Flor. inv. L2); CEL 169 (= P. Oxy. I 32); CEL 183, 190 and 191 (= P. Dura 78, 75 and 66). Rustius Barbarus in Wādi Fawākhir, however, writes *opto deos ut bene valeas que mea vota sunt* (CPL 304, 3), but here the phrase *que mea vota sunt* is clearly Greek in origin; the same is true of CEL 218 (= P. Berl. inv. 14114). The writer of CEL 83 (= P. Berl. inv. 11649, from Fayūm) also uses the *opto bene valeas* type.

²⁷ Even those opening salutations that are found do not show any uniform pattern, see tab. Vindol. II 225; 248; 299; 311; 321.

²⁸ From all the letters published so far from Vindolanda, I have found only three closing salutations of the type *bene valere te opto* (tab. Vindol. II 248, tab. Vindol. II 250, tab. Vindol. II 258), whereas there are altogether 17 examples of the types *opto (ut) valeas* and *vale*. In addition, *opto ut bene valeas* is also found in one letter from Vindonissa, CEL 19 (= tab. Vindoniss. 43.194).

²⁹ Adams 1995, 94-95. Adams argues, in connection with the Vindolanda letters, that conventions developed among groups of scribes with regard to salutary phrasing. He does not mention, however, language contact as a probable source for this variation; see Adams 1995, 117-118. Furthermore, the correspondents themselves might well have been responsible for the salutations, cf. Halla-aho (in print).

³⁰ P. Vindob. Lat. I, 1a, 1b = CEL 6-8.

Adams (1977, 4) observes that the opening formula which according to Seneca was common up to his time (Sen. *epist.* 15, 1), *si vales bene est ego valeo*, does not occur in Terentianus. It does, however, appear in one letter from Vindonissa³¹ and something similar is to be found in an Oxyrynchos papyrus.³² So this formula was not restricted to literary circles.

It should be noted that the interference from Greek to Latin happened at two levels. The epistolary formulae represent the written level and the other contact induced changes (e.g. phonological and lexical) the spoken one. The latter are not numerous. There are possible cases of phonological interference, but nothing extraordinary.³³ As regards morphology, we have a couple of instances where the accusative ending appears to be Greek instead of Latin: *illan* (468, 28) and *nostrous* (468, 62).³⁴ These, however, appear in the same letter (468) and therefore I think that they are due to the bilingualism or insufficient training of the scribe and not to the bilingualism of Terentianus.³⁵ In syntax, certain expressions seem to follow a Greek pattern, for example, the above mentioned phrase *factum est illi venire in Alexandria cum tirones* (471, 22), which shows probably Greek interference in the use of the dative case rather than the accusative.³⁶ Yet, language contact is mainly seen in the lexicon. The majority of the Greek loan words are generally known in Latin, e.g. *calamus* (468, 19), *gubernator* (468, 56), *amphora* (467, 27), *phiala* (468, 17), others are not as common but still attested e.g. *synthesis* ('set' 468, 16 = σύνθεσις), *anaboladium* (467, 5), *colymbas* (467, 28). There are only a handful of words that are not known elsewhere in Latin texts and even they may have been standard expressions in Egyptian Latin: *loncha* ('lance' 467, 20 = λογχή), *xylesphongium* ('sponge stick' 471, 29 = ξυλοσπόγγιον). It is important to keep in mind that lexical Greek loans and code-switching tend to indicate more about the Greek context of the letters than about Terentianus as a bilingual individual.

³¹ Calboli 1990, 29: "Wenn man nun in Rechnung stellt, dass die mit ἔτι und ὥς (und ἔπειτα u.dgl.) + verbum finitum eingeleiteten Konstruktionen im Griechischen dazu tendieren, den A.c.I. zu ersetzen, kann man natürlicherweise daraus den Schluss ziehen, dass ein Einfluss des Lateinischen auf den zweisprachigen C.I. Terentianus erfolgt ist." See also Calboli 1990, 28 and 37.

³² Calboli claims (1990, 36-37) that Terentianus simplified his language use and tried to make the two languages convergent with respect to non-finite complements and pronouns.

³³ *frater si vales [...], ego valeo* in CEL 16 = tab. Vindoniss. 43.190 (1st century AD).

³⁴ *st(i) vtales) btenest* in CEL 10 = P. Oxy. XLIV 3208 (Augustan era). The wish for mutual well-being can be seen also in tab. Vindol. II 311: *ut scias me recte valere quod te invicem fecisse cupio*.

³⁵ Adams has suggested (1978) that the merger of liquids in the words *parpatum* and *castalinum* results from Greek interference in the speech of Terentianus. The merger happened in Latin as well, but not usually in front of a stop as in *parpatum*. I think that these forms may as well come from a bilingual scribe. See Romaine 1989, 52 for under-differentiation of phonemes in contact situations. Adams (1977, 33-34) also tentatively attributes to Greek influence the tolerance of the cluster <tl> which in Latin is normally changed to <cl> but retained in *silla* (P. Mich. VIII 469, 12). See Romaine 1989, 53 and Weinreich 1953, 23 for related though not identical phenomena.

³⁶ *Isituchen* appears in letters 467 and 468, but for a Greek proper name the ending is not surprising.

³⁷ For the scribes in the Terentianus letters, see Halla-aho (in print). For the outcome of heavy lexical interference from Greek in a Latin marriage contract (ChLA IV 249 = P. Mich. VII 434 + P. Ryl. IV 612), see Leiwo and Halla-aho (2002).

³⁸ Adams argues that the order VO in subordinate clauses is probably due to interference from Greek; see Adams 1977, 66-67, 69-70, 73-74, 85. Changes in word order caused by interference are usual in the language of bilinguals; see Romaine 1989, 54 and 187-188.

I have presented some potential arguments against Adams' view that the AcI was still the standard expression in spoken Latin, based, as it was, solely on the evidence furnished by the Terentianus letters. By doing this I have wanted to point out the complex nature of this problem and the difficulties in making conclusions about spoken language on the basis of written data. Adams' opinion, however, does not seem unfounded but, instead, plausible, if we have a look on the whole corpus of Latin letters on papyrus, ostraca and wooden tablets (CEL I-II³⁹ and tab. Vindol. II). In these texts, the AcI is, indeed, generally used according to classical rules in many types of expressions and no finite complement clauses are used to replace it.⁴⁰ So, despite my considerations above, the documentary letters would preliminarily challenge the traditional view that in the 2nd century the AcI was disappearing from the spoken language of the uneducated majority. If we still want to adhere to the traditional view, then we must assume that letter writers were taught to write according to the traditional standard and they succeeded well in this task.

Conclusion

The relation between spoken and written substandard language appears to be more complicated than is usually thought. One should be extremely cautious in straightforwardly ascribing to popular speech those linguistic forms that appear in any written text, even those with such distinct substandard quality as these letters. The written text, to be sure, eventually exhibits changes in spoken language but only in the course of time and always with delay. Although the letters show several tendencies characteristic of spoken language — in orthography for example, where uncertainty caused by phonological changes is clearly visible — we cannot conclude that this affected every feature of, say, syntax. The strong impact of phraseology plays a decisive part in the composition of letters. Translated patterns were used in the East whereas native Latin ones (*opto (ut) bene valeas* and *vale*) were retained in Vindolanda. The exact nature of the language, and especially of the syntax, of documentary letters and their relationship to spoken registers of Latin needs to be outlined and analysed. This will form my future research project.

*Department of Classical Philology
University of Helsinki*

³⁹ By the time of writing this article I had not been able to see CEL III (published 2002).

⁴⁰ Cf. also Molinelli 1996, 467.

Bibliography

- Adams 1977 = J.N. Adams, *The vulgar Latin of the letters of Claudius Terentianus*, Manchester 1977.
- Adams 1978 = J.N. Adams, Two unexplained misspellings in Claudius Terentianus: Greek influence in Egyptian Latin?, *ZPE* 31 (1978) 135-137.
- Adams 1995 = J.N. Adams, The language of the Vindolanda writing tablets, *JRS* 85 (1995) 86-134.
- AGI = Archivio glottologico italiano
- Boyce 1991 = B. Boyce, *The language of the freedmen in Petronius' Cena Trimalchionis*, Leiden 1991.
- Calboli 1990 = G. Calboli, Vulgärlatein und Griechisch in der Zeit Trajans, in G. 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.
- CEL = *Corpus epistularum latinarum papyris tabulis ostracis servatarum*, P. Cugusi, ed., Firenze 1992.
- Cuzzolin 1991 = P. Cuzzolin, Sulle prime attestazioni del tipo sintattico *dicere quod*, *AGI* 76 (1991) 26-78.
- GIF = Giornale italiano di filologia
- Halla-aho (in print) = H. Halla-aho, Scribes and the letters of Claudius Terentianus, in H. Solin, M. Leiwo and H. Halla-aho (eds.), *Latin vulgaire - latin tardif VI. Actes du VIe Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Helsinki 29 août - 2 septembre 2000*, Hildesheim, 245-252.
- Hofmann 1926 = J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache*, Heidelberg 1926.
- Hofmann - Szantyr 1965 = J.B. Hofmann - A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II.2.2, München 1965.
- Horrocks 1997 = G. Horrocks, *Greek. A history of the language and its speakers*, London & New York 1997.
- Kühner - Stegmann 1971 = R. Kühner - C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre, Hannover 1971.
- Leiwo 2002 = M. Leiwo, From contact to mixture. Bilingual inscriptions from Italy, in J.N. Adams, M. Janse and S. Swayne (eds.), *Bilingualism in ancient society: Language contact and the written text*, Oxford 2002, 168-194.
- Leiwo and Halla-aho (2002) = M. Leiwo and H. Halla-aho, A marriage contract. Aspects of Latin-Greek language contact, *Mnemosyne* 55, fasc. 5 (2002) 560-580.
- Molinelli 1996 = P. Molinelli, Subordination and moods in nonstandard Latin of Egyptian papyri, in H. Rosén (ed.), *Aspects of Latin. Papers from the Seventh International Colloquium on Latin linguistics (Jerusalem April 1993)*, Innsbruck 1996, 463-469.
- O. Bu Njem = Robert Marichal (ed.), *Les Ostraca de Bu Njem*, Tripoli 1992.
- O. Claud. I = Jean Bingen, Adam Bülow-Jacobsen, Walter E.H. Cockle, Hélène Cuvigny, Lene Rubinstein & Wilfried Van Rengen (eds.), *Mons Claudianus. Ostraca Graeca et Latina I*, Le Caire 1992.
- O. Claud. II = Jean Bingen, Adam Bülow-Jacobsen, Walter E.H. Cockle, Hélène Cuvigny, François Kayser and Wilfried Van Rengen (eds.), *Mons Claudianus. Ostraca Graeca et Latina II*, Le Caire 1997.
- Perrochat 1932 = P. Perrochat, *Recherches sur la valeur et l'emploi de l'infinitif subordonné en latin*, Paris 1932.
- Pinkster 1987 = H. Pinkster, The strategy and chronology of the development of future and perfect tense auxiliaries in Latin, in M. Harris and P. Ramat (eds.), *Historical development of auxiliaries*, Trends in linguistics 35, Berlin 1987, 193-223.
- Pinkster 1989 = H. Pinkster, Some methodological remarks on research on future tense auxiliaries in Latin, in G. Calboli (ed.), *Subordination and other topics in Latin. Proceedings of the third colloquium on Latin linguistics, Bologna, 1-5 April 1985*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia 1989, 311-326.
- Romaine 1982 = S. Romaine, *Socio-historical linguistics. Its Status and methodology*, Cambridge 1982.
- Romaine 1989 = S. Romaine, *Bilingualism*, Oxford 1989.
- Scivoletto 1962 = N. Scivoletto, "Dico quod", "dico quia", *GIF* 15 (1962) 1-34.
- Stefenelli 1962 = A. Stefenelli, *Die Volkssprache im Werk des Petron*, Stuttgart 1962.
- Weinreich 1953 = U. Weinreich, *Languages in contact*, New York 1953.
- Youtie and Winter 1951 = H. C. Youtie and J. G. Winter, *Papyri and ostraca from Karanis* (P. Mich. VIII), Michigan 1951.