

GUALTIERO CALBOLI

THE VINDOLANDA TABLETS AGAIN, AND NOW MORE

Summary: At the beginning of my paper I have explained why I could not use the new finds of the Vindolanda Tablets. In this regard I quoted the letter I sent to Professor Bowman and the kind answer he gave me. Then I took into account three elements of the Vindolanda Tablets until now published that deserve attention, namely (1) the conflation of second and third conjugation of Latin verb, which is considered a feature of Vulgar Latin, (2) the presence of official language in distinguishing the familiar *puer* from the formal *servus* to mention a slave, and (3) the use of *rogo* (or similar verbs) + *ut* or the simple subjunctive. In all these cases the presumption of Vulgar Latin in Vindolanda tablets must be reduced. As to the first I actually challenged in some cases the supposed conflation of second and third conjugation. I demonstrated that the expression *qui debunt* (instead of *debent*) must be read *qui debent*, because the letter *V* of *debunt* is a false reading for *E* written in the cursive form employed not only in Vindolanda tablets but also in a letter sent by Cl. Terentianus to his father, Cl. Tiberianus, in *P. Mich.* VIII 468. 40. The closing greetings *Valu fratur* (Vindolanda Tablet 301 Plate XXIII), which of course must be read *Vale frater* is a proof that in the cursive formula of final greetings, written in a kind of *currente calamo*, a cursive script was employed and the conflation of second and third conjugation must be reduced in some cases to a cursive (and regular) script. Also as to the difference between *puer* and *servus*, and *rogo* + subj. (with *ut* or without *ut*) the Vindolanda's Latin was not so vulgar as could be supposed if we consider Octavius' and Chrautius' *Latinitas*. In particular the construction of *rogo* + subj. (with *ut* or without *ut*) was object of study because Latin speaker showed a great attention in choosing one or the other construction as happened in a couple of letters sent by Brutus and Cassius to Mark Antony. Maybe this depended upon the action of military scribes, as Adams right supposed. On the other hand, if we consider the role played by Britain Latin in the Carolingian Renaissance, every defence of correct Latin in this region requires a larger investigation. Therefore the use of the new Vindolanda Letters should have a great weight.

Key words: *Vindolanda* tablets, Britain Latin, military scribes, bureaucratic language, cursive script, *rogo* + *ut* subj.~ *rogo* + simpl.subj., *puer*~*servus*, *Rhetorica ad C. Herennium*

First of all I must reduce the title of my paper removing the last three words: “and now more”. I was actually hoping to have access to the new material found at Vindolanda and following a suggestion given me by Jim Adams, I wrote to Professor Bowman who kindly answered me and informed me that they are working on deciphering the new tablets (“about a dozen or so tablets with substantial text, mainly letters”)

and preparing an edition and a previous presentation to appear in the journal *Britannia*. Before the future publication the texts of the new tablets are not available at all. I hope that the new edition will be at the same high level as the previous ones, with clear pictures of all the tablets. Nevertheless now I will try to say something not completely useless, as I hope, about the material at our disposal.

As a matter of fact, the first question we meet when taking into account the Vindolanda Tablets, from the point of view of Vulgar and Late Latin, is whether we find some kinds of vulgar Latin in these Tablets or not, or, better to say, whether same peculiarities of Vulgar Latin can be found in these Tablets. Roughly said, we can oppose Hubert Petersmann's position¹ to that of J. N. Adams. The main difference between them is the fact that Petersmann, though pointing out the differences which we find in the documents and admitting that some uses are more vulgar, some other less, does not consider the scribes who wrote these documents. On the contrary Adams ascribed a great importance to the military scribes, following a point of view that he had already assumed in his excellent book about the Vulgar Latin of Claudius Terentianus. In this respect I did not agree completely with him and highlighted a passage in a Greek letter wrote by Cl. Terentianus to his father, Cl. Tiberianus 476. 20, where it is clear that he wrote the letter with his own hands: $\nu\kappa\tau[\acute{o}]\varsigma \sigma\omicron\iota \xi\gamma\rho\alpha\upsilon\alpha$ $[\tau]\eta\nu \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\eta\nu \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu \epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{o}\nu \epsilon\upsilon\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$, "I wrote you this letter at night, having found an opportunity" (translation by Youtie and Winter).² The same can perhaps be said of the following letter 478, whose script and hand is similar to that of 476.³ This means that not all letters were written by military scribes. Though it is not sure that the letters were always written by a scribe and it is not excluded that the sender wrote himself some of them, I think that the action of military scribes improved the language of these letters. But at this point another question arises, namely why Cl. Terentianus' Latin and the Latin that we find at Bu Njem, though consequence of the activity of military scribes, is much more vulgar than the Latin of the Vindolanda Tablets.⁴ A first answer to this question can be found in the special position of Britain, namely in the Latin used in Britain and in the organization of military corps acting in Britain.

¹ PETERSMANN, H.: Zu den neuen Vulgärlateinischen Sprachdenkmälern aus dem römischen Britannien. Die Täfelchen von Vindolanda. In ILIESCU, M. – MARXGUT, W. (eds): *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif III. Actes du III^{ème} colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif* (Innsbruck, 2-5 Septembre 1991). Tübingen 1992, 283–291. Vindolanda's Tablets have been published in the following works: BOWMAN, ALAN K. – THOMAS, DAVID J. (with contributions by J. N. ADAMS): *The Vindolanda Writing-Tablets (Tabulae Vindolanaenses). Vol. II*. London, British Museum Press 1983; BOWMAN, ALAN K. – THOMAS, DAVID J. (with contributions by J. N. ADAMS and R. TAPPER): *Vindolanda Writing-Tablets*. London, Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies 1994; BOWMAN, ALAN K. – THOMAS, DAVID J. (with contributions by J. PEARCE): *The Vindolanda Writing-Tablets (Tabulae Vindolanaenses). Vol. III*. London, The British Museum Press, 2003.

² YOUTIE, H. Ch. – WINTER, J. G.: *Papyri and Ostraca from Karanis* [Michigan Papyri VIII]. Ann Arbor – London 1951. Cf. CALBOLI, G.: Una nuova frontiera della grammatica latina: A proposito del libro di James Noël Adams: *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge 2003. *Maia* 60 (2008) 474–503, here 489–491.

³ Following the competent view of YOUTIE (n. 2) 54.

⁴ Cf. MARICHAL, R.: *Les ostraca de Bu Njem*. Assraya al Hamra – Tripoli 1992.

Adams⁵ highlighted the regional peculiarities of Britain and the Celtic influence, connected with the fact that the First Cohort of Tungrians, the Third Cohort of Batavians and the Ninth cohort of Batavians were present at Vindolanda, and both Tungrians and Batavians were of German origin, not Latin speakers. It is important whether they were legionary or auxiliary cohorts: the Tungrians are considered “an auxiliary *cohors milliaria peditata* by Bowman–Thomas,⁶ but we have also at 214⁷ *Vittius Adiutor aqui-/lifer leg(ionis) · iī Aug(ustae) / Cassio Saeculari fra-(ter)clo suo plurimam*. The action of legionary scribes of a high-level is not excluded.

As for the use of Vulgar Latin, I exclude that a Vulgarism occurs in a point where Adams,⁸ on the contrary, admitted it. In a series of Vindolanda Tablets (130, 134, 135, 139, 145, 150) we find the form *quidebunt*, e.g. 134. Here Bowman and Thomas read *renuntium coh(ortis) viii Bataurorum omnes ad loca q(ui) uidebunt et impedimenta* because they believe that *qui* has been abbreviated. Adams, on his side, would like to divide as follows: *ad loca qui debunt*, where *debunt* should be a vulgar form for *debent*. The linguistic justification of this form given by Adams is that “the second and third conjugations were conflated in Vulgar Latin, and *-unt* for *-ent* is attested, for example in a letter of Terentianus contemporary with Vindolanda tablets (*P. Mich. VIII 468. 40 ualunt*)”. However, it is because of the comparison with this *ualunt* that some doubts arose in me. First of all I think that Adams is right in dividing *quidebunt* into *qui debunt* but in my opinion he is wrong in reading *debunt* instead of *debent*. We must follow step by step Adams’ demonstration.⁹ He is convinced, as we saw, that in these passages we have to do with the confusion between the second and third conjugation, typical of Vulgar Latin. The alleged example is *ualunt* of *P. Mich. VIII 468.40*, which occurs in a letter written by Cl. Terentianus in a passage where the young soldier of the fleet explains to his father, Cl. Tiberianus, how difficult is to get the promotion to a legion, because such a movement needs money and without money it is quite impossible. I give the whole passage (in the version of Youtie and Winter), because also the meaning has been taken into account in order to solve this mystery:

(1) *P. Mich. 468. 35–41*

*et si deus
volueret spero me frugaliter
[v]iciūturum et in cohortem
[tra]nsferri. Hic a[ut]em sene aer[e]
[ni]hil fiet neque epistulae com-
mandaticiae nihil val(eb)unt nesi
si qui sibi aiutaveret.*

⁵ ADAMS, J. N.: *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC–AD 600*. Cambridge 2007, 577–623.

⁶ BOWMAN–THOMAS (n. 1) 1994, 91.

⁷ BOWMAN–THOMAS (n. 1) 1994, 189.

⁸ ADAMS, J. N.: The Language of the Vindolanda Writing Tablets: An Interim Report. *Journal of Roman Studies* 85 (1995) 86–134, here 102–103.

⁹ ADAMS: The Language (n. 8) 102–103.

Youtie and Winter corrected the original *valunt* and wrote: “the correction follows the tense of *fiet* in l. 39”, and translated as follows: “And if god should be willing, I hope to live frugally and to be transferred to a cohort; but here nothing will be accomplished without money, and letters of recommendation will have no value unless a man help himself.” Already my ‘Lehrvater’ Giovanni Battista Pighi¹⁰ challenged this explanation. He excluded *fiet* to be a future and explained it as a present with the meaning of *fit*. So he thought to have eliminated every support in favour to the future *val(eb)unt* conjectured by Youtie and Winter. Then Pighi wrote: “quanto a *ualunt* è un prezioso volgarismo e non si deve toccare”. I am not sure that the horrible *ualunt* is a precious Vulgar expression which must not be touched. The reading by Pighi¹¹ is, therefore, as follows: *hic a[ut]em sene aer[e]/ [ni]hil fiet neque epistulae com- mandaticiae nihil valunt nesi /si qui sibi aiutaveret*. Adams¹² accepted and supported with some other observation Pighi’s explanation and wrote: “Pighi¹³ is undoubtedly right in noting that a future is not convincing here. It is better to retain *ualunt* and treat *fiet* as a present (= here nothing is achieved without money, and letters of recommendation are of not value. [...]) *Valunt* poses no problems. There is haphazard interchange of terminations between second and third conjugation verbs in vulgar texts (hence *-ent* for *-unt*)”, with mention of Grandgent.¹⁴ But in Grandgent there are only examples of infinitives.

As for me, I think that *uolueret* (= *uoluerit*) and *aiutaueret* (= *aiutauerit*) are future II, but *fiet* and *ualunt* can be both present, because Terentianus is speaking of a present situation. On the other hand *ualunt* in Terentianus’ letter as well as *debunt* in the formulas of Vindolanda Tablets are not a product of confusion between second and third conjugation, but a writing that must be read *ualent* and *debent*. We actually see that the letter *e* can be written in a way very similar to the letter *u*. Bowman and Thomas took into account, in the part dedicated to paleography, the different writings of the letter *e* and, illustrating a form which looks as a *u*, wrote:¹⁵ “A more cursive form of *e* with the cross-stroke joined to the foot of the down-stroke is illustrated in FIG.11.11 [v] : this is not uncommon in second-century papyri but is rare in the tablets”, and later:¹⁶ “Only rarely, if at all, do we find the very cursive single-stroke version shown in col.3 [v] in the body of a letter [...]. However, it is not at all uncommon in closing greetings, see 247, 285, 295, 301, 310.”

Moreover what matters is that in the conclusion of a letter in Vindolanda Tablet 301 (Plate XXIII) I found a formula written *Valu fratur* which must be read obviously *Vale frater*, with the verb *valere*. I gave already the same solution for the word *penes* that I found written *penus* in a passage of C. Novius Eunus, a representative

¹⁰ PIGHI, G. B.: *Lettere latine d'un soldato di Traiano* (PMich. 467-472). Bologna 1964, 54.

¹¹ PIGHI (n. 10) 43.

¹² ADAMS, J. N.: *The Vulgar Latin of the Letters of Claudius Terentianus* (P. Mich. VIII 467-72). Manchester 1977, 51.

¹³ PIGHI (n. 10) 54.

¹⁴ GRANDGENT, C. H.: *An Introduction to Vulgar Latin*. Repr. New York 1962, 167.

¹⁵ BOWMAN-THOMAS (n. 1) 1983, 63.

¹⁶ BOWMAN-THOMAS (n. 1) 1994, 50.

of Vulgar Latin in Documents from Murecine, frequently quoted by Adams, and I reached¹⁷ this conclusion starting from the written cursive form of *e* ($\left| \left| < \right| \right| < \right| \right|$). Last but not least, **we should remember the fact pointed out by Adams,¹⁸ that the scribes were not all of superior education** (“it would seem to follow that not all exemplars for use in the army were drafted by professional scribes of superior education”). I agree with this opinion almost completely and in my explanation I actually accept the point of view of Pighi and Adams with the only difference that they were grounding their explanation on Vulgar Latin, whereas I consider determinant the cursive script [V] which the military scribes could have used in formulary expression or with the verb *valere*, either *variandi causa* or as a kind of personal signature or for other sakes that we don’t know. At any rate the script is the first step, and the only one in the explanation of this case. A second step is the linguistic one, but it is not necessary in this case. On the other hand, the linguistic explanation, namely the Vulgar use of the third conjugation instead of the second is evident in the case of *habunt* (628 *ceruesam commilitones / non habunt*, where the script seems to be *habunt*, not *habent*, because the letter *u* is too expanded in the superior stroke (*habunt*) and the existence of this form is confirmed by the French *ont* (<**aunt*) and was probably under the influence of two auxiliaries as *sunt* and *possunt*.¹⁹ All in all I believe that Adams’ judgement on the Latin of Vindolanda Tablets²⁰ is right and he pointed out the real character of this language, namely that: “A good deal of the previous section was about subliterate language, but that is not the whole story. It would be a mistake to imply that the Latin of the letters uniformly comes from a social level below that of the educated upper classes. There is an element of high-style or bureaucratic language in some letters.” In the case of *debunt* and *ualunt* we have not to do with Vulgar Latin, but only with a kind of cursive writing of *debent* and *ualent*.

In Adams²¹ I found a notice about the use of *puer* with the meaning of slave in Vind. 642 *praeēside pueris tuis*, 645 *si mih]i puerum miſſurus es mittes chir[o-/grafum] cum eo quo securior sim*. Adams quotes another example from Bu Njem 86. 3, where *puer* is employed with the meaning of slave and concludes: “*Seruus* was thus technical, *puer* colloquial.” On the other hand we find also *seruus*, in an example where *puer* could not be employed: 347 c. Back [*a Rh]eño Similis seruo*, because the sender, declaring himself, needed to use ‘the formal indication of status’, therefore *seruus*, not *puer*. I agree completely with the explanation given by Adams²² who writes that “*seruus* was a formal indicator of status” and was used (preceded by a dependent genitive) in the address at the end of a letter by the writer. I suppose that this use depended

¹⁷ CALBOLI, G.: Encore une fois sur les Tablettes de Murécine. In ARIAS ABELLÁN, C. (ed.): *Latin vulgaire – Latin tardif. Actes du VII^{ème} Colloque sur le latin vulgaire et tardif* (Séville, 2-6 septembre 2003). Sevilla 2006, 155–168, here 164–165.

¹⁸ ADAMS: *The Language* (n. 8) 103.

¹⁹ ADAMS, J. N.: The New Vindolanda Writing-Tablets. *Classical Quarterly* 53.2 (2003) 530–575, here 544–545.

²⁰ ADAMS: *The New Vindolanda* (n. 19) 573.

²¹ ADAMS: *The New Vindolanda* (n. 19) 564–565.

²² ADAMS: *The New Vindolanda* (n. 19) 564.

upon the fact that both the *puer* (boy) and the *puer* (slave) were under the *potestas* of the *pater familias*.²³ Moreover, the relationship between owner and slave was not always contrastive – I think – and could run mostly in a familiar way of life where *puer* meant nothing more than dependence upon the *pater (familias)*. Now I want only to refine this notice with reference to the classical text of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, where of the ten occurrences of *puer*, six are referred to a slave (or more slaves) and four to a boy:

- (2)a **Puer, -i**: ‘Necesse est peperisse, quoniam sustinet **puerum** infantem.’ II 39; “Heus”, inquit, “adolescens, **pueri** tui [sc. *serui*] modo me pulsarunt; satis facias oportet.” IV 14; Quid? cum tibi **pueri** ad pedes uolutarentur, misericordia motus es? At eorum patrem crudelissime sepultura quoque prohibuisti.’ IV 33; Cum **puerum** [sc. *seruum*] respicit hunc unum, quem ego noui – uos non arbitrator –, alio nomine appellat, deinde alio atque alio IV 63; **Puer** [sc. *seruus*], qui iam bene <eri> naturam norit: “Tu illo plures mittas oportet,” inquit, “si hodie uis transnumerari.” IV 63; Sannioni **puero** [sc. *seruo*] negotium dederat, ut uasa, uestimenta, **pueros** [sc. *seruos*] rogaret IV 64 (*bis*); Nuntiat **puer** [sc. *seruus*] argentum repeti: pertimuerat enim, qui commodarat IV 64; “Heus”, inquit, “Gorgia” pedisequo **puerorum**, “absconde **pueros**, defende, fac, ut incolumis ad adulescentiam perducas.” IV 65 (*bis*) fr(equentia)10 (from my Lexicon).²⁴

Therefore, it seems that *puer* (= slave) occurred not only in colloquial but in usual language, where it was not necessary to point out that the referred people were slaves. Already the great jurist Paulus gave the different meanings of this word: Paul. *dig.* 50. 16. 204 *pueri appellatio tres significationes habet: unam, cum omnes seruos pueros appellaremus; alteram, cum contrario nomine puellae diceremus; tertiam, cum aetatem puerilem demonstraremus*. This distinction is a formal distinction. However, as for the social status, we have only two kinds of people: *liberi~serui*. As for the meaning of *seruus* cf. *ThLL* X.II 2512. 40–49; 2517. 64–2519. 40 [Spath]. Cf. also the use of *seruus* in the *Ad Herennium*:

- (2)b **Seruus, -i**: inprudenciam, ut ille, qui de eo **seruo**, qui dominum occiderat, supplicium sumpsit, cui frater esset, antequam tabulas testamenti aperuit, cum is **seruus** testamento manu missus esset I 24 (*bis*); Spes celandi quae fuerit quaeritur ex consciis, arbitris, adiutoribus, liberis aut **seruis** aut utrisque II 7; “Hic tuus **seruus** me pulsauit.” IV 16; Descende in integram defensionem, noli quicquam recusare; da **seruos** in quaestionem, stude uerum inuenire. IV 41 fr(equentia) 5 (from my Lexicon)

²³ On *pater familias* cf. SCARANO USSANI, V.: *Padri, Padroni, Patroni. Identità romana e diritto delle persone, della famiglia e delle successioni mortis causa fra l'epoca arcaica e l'età di Adriano*. Roma 2017, 30–50.

²⁴ In my new edition of ‘Cornifici seu Incerti Auctoris, *Rhetorica ad C. Herennium*, Prolegomena, Textus et Apparatus, Traduzione Italiana, Commento et Lexicon, in printing by W. de Gruyter, Berlin.

In my opinion, Adams' explanation is confirmed not only by four of the quoted examples from the *Ad Herennium*, but mostly by 4. 11. 16 '*Hic tuus seruus me pulsauit*', an example which we must consider a little more attentively. Two similar examples have been given in *Rhet. Her.* 4. 10. 14 and 4. 11. 16 to represent the same situation and the same style, namely *in adtenuato figurae genere*, but in two different kinds of language, the first one in an elegant simplicity of diction, the second in a dry and bloodless kind of style (the previous *in uirtutibus*, the second one *in uitiiis*). I give now the second text with the English translation by Harry Caplan:²⁵ the *Auctor ad Her.* changed the previous formulation (4. 10. 14 *pueri tui modo me pulsarunt; satis facias oportet*) by leaving out in the second formulation *satis facias oportet*:

- (3) *Rhet. Her.* 4. 11. 16 '*Nam istic in balneis accessit ad hunc; postea dicit: "Hic tuus seruus me pulsauit." Postea dicit hic illi: "Considerabo." Post ille conui-cium fecit et magis magisque praesente multis clamauit.*' *Friuolus hic quidem iam et inliberalis est sermo: non enim est adeptus id, quod habet attenuata figura, puris et electis uerbis compositam orationem.* "Now this fellow came up to this lad in the baths. After that he says: 'Your slaveboy here has beat me'. After that the lad says to him: 'I'll think about it'. Afterwards this fellow called the lad names and shouted louder and louder, while a lot of people were there." This language, to be sure, is mean and trifling, having missed the goal of the Simple type, which is speech composed of correct and well-chosen words." (Translated by H. Caplan). About this example and the construction *praesente multis*.²⁶

What has been left out in the second formulation is the expression: *satis facias oportet*, namely the juridical consequence of *Hic tuus seruus me pulsauit* and the usual *pueri* has been changed into the more technical *seruus*. The word *seruus* was employed when the juridical status of the slave-boy had to be highlighted and this was enough not only to signify that the action could not pass off without the owner's responsibility, but also to mean that a *satisfactio* was supposed to happen without adding *satis facias oportet*. This is completely in accordance with Adams and in particular with Adams' idea that Vindolanda's language was mostly confidential with some features of bureaucratic language. Already Adams²⁷ pointed out the correspondence of some expressions in a letter to Flavius Genialis 611 with those that we find in two letters sent by Pliny the Younger to the emperor Trajan (*epist.* 10. 67. 2 and 10. 75. 2), where the expression *in notitiam tuam / sicut debui pertuli* occurs (Vind. 611 to Flavius Genialis perhaps from T. Haterius Nepos, later prefect of Egypt) and can be perfectly compared with Pliny's *haec in notitiam tuam perferenda existimaui* (10. 67. 2) and *quod in notitiam perferendum existimaui* (10. 75. 2).²⁸

²⁵ Cicero: *Ad C. Herennium libri IV De ratione dicendi*. With an English Translation by H. CAPLAN. London–Cambridge, Mass. 1954.

²⁶ Cf. also CALBOLI, G.: Linguistic Hypercorrectness versus Colloquial Use in Latin at First Century BC and Afterwards. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 16 (2017) 1–10.

²⁷ ADAMS: The New Vindolanda (n. 19) 573.

²⁸ In Terence's *Phormio* 151–152 a slave (*Geta*) by addressing himself to another slave (*Davos*) calls him *puer*: *GE. ut bene sit tibi. / puer, heus.*

Another point which deserves attention and has been highlighted carefully by Adams²⁹ concerns the use of *rogo* (or similar verbs) + *ut* or the simple subjunctive.³⁰ Adams reports on its use by some authors roughly contemporary with the Vindolanda letters as Martial and Petronius, starting with the assertion that “*rogo* + subjunctive introducing a request was current in conversational Latin”. Martial prefers *rogo* + subjunctive to *rogo* + *ut*, whereas Petronius prefers *rogo ut* to *rogo* + subj., even if with a little difference in the frequency: *rogo/-amus ut* (5 times: 64. 1, 71. 9, 75. 8, 99. 2, 134. 11); *rogo* + subj. (only three: 49. 6, 75. 3, 137. 6). Martial, however, never used *rogo ut*, and only one time *rogamus ut*, at IV 35. 5, while *rogo/rogamus* + subj. seven times: *rogo* II 79. 2, III 95. 3, VI 5. 2, VII 95. 18; *rogamus* I 35. 13, V 80. 4, VIII 2. 8. Then Adams mentions an use of *rogamus* + subj. in a letter written by Brutus and Cassius, as *praetores* to Marc Antony, as *cos.* (Cic. *Fam.* XI 2 and 3) and adds that Cl. Terentianus (*P. Mich.* VIII 467–471) always uses *ut* in conjunction with *rogo* (seven times); in the same corpus of documents, however, his correspondent, Cl. Tiberianus, as it seems, the father of Cl. Terentianus, writing to Longinus Priscus, uses *rogo* + subj. (*P. Mich.* VIII 172. 11). Now I would like to take into account this explanation in order, on one hand, to confirm Adams’ explanation, and, on the other hand, to refine it. I considered already³¹ the two letters sent by M. Iunius Brutus, *praetor urbanus*, and C. Cassius Longinus, *praetor peregrinus*, to Marc Antony, namely Cic. *Fam.* XI 2 (May 44) and Cic. *Fam.* XI 3 (Sextilis 44). Highlighting the different situation in which each letter had been written, I asserted that Brutus influenced in a prevailing way the first letter and Cassius the second and I demonstrated how such a different influence marked the language of both letters. For the sake of giving in a concentrate way all notices necessities to understand the whole situation I quote now the abstract of my paper where I discussed this question:

“Between end of May and beginning of August 44 M. Junius Brutus, *praetor urbanus*, and C. Cassius Longinus, *praetor peregrinus*, sent two letters to M. Antony who was *consul*. These letters were different in content and style but also the two senders were different. If we take into account the facts of this time we see that the situation in Rom changed and M. Antony gave up his previous position (assumed 17 March 44, in a Senate session), which was oriented towards the *concordia*, for a new position directed towards the vengeance for Caesar’s murder. This depended upon the intervention of Octavian who took

²⁹ ADAMS: The Language (n. 8) 117.

³⁰ On this construction cf. also MOLINELLI, P.: Subordination and moods in nonstandard Latin of Egyptian papyri. In ROSÉN, H. (ed.): *Aspects of Latin. Papers from the Seventh International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics (Jerusalem 19-23 April, 1993)* [Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft]. Innsbruck 1996, 463–469; and CALBOLI, G.: Die Modi des griechischen und lateinischen Verbums. *Lustrum* 53 (2011) 9–150; 54 (2012) 7–207, here (2012) 118. By the following (7d) it appears that the supposed distinction between Trabant- and Argument clause (only the last with *ut*) by Molinelli doesn’t exist, as for the use of *ut*, since a clause with *ut* and another one without *ut* are dependent upon the same verb (*Deos rogamus*) and have the same meaning.

³¹ Two Letters by Brutus and Cassius to Mark Antony: Different People, Different Times, Different Styles. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 14 (2015) 241–267.

the hereditary name of C. Iulius Caesar and gave himself as aim Caesar's vengeance, an aim M. Antony had to assume in order to remain head of Caesarian party. Brutus' and Cassius' attitudes were different: Brutus tried to save the *concordia*, Cassius to defend with the weapons Liberators' position, Brutus was formed in Stoic culture, Cassius was rather inspired by old Roman tradition. Therefore the first letter where Brutus and Cassius invite M. Antony to save the *concordia* seems to be inspired by Brutus and the second letter, a kind of ultimatum to M. Antony, rather inspired by Cassius. More interesting is that also the style of the first letter is closer to Brutus' than Cassius' style, while the second letter is more connected with Cassius' language as it appears from Brutus' and Cassius' letters we read in Cicero's correspondence. It seems therefore that the first letter, where the Liberators tried to save the *concordia* was written mostly by Brutus, the second one, the ultimatum letter, by Cassius. The style confirms this hypothesis."

Cassius was much more concrete than Brutus.³² He was together with Cicero the defender of the strongest opposition to Cesarian and Antony's party, while Brutus played rather for *libertas* (and *concordia*).³³ In the time of the first letter (May 44) it was not yet completely clear that Antony changed his behaviour and embraced Octavian's position and Brutus' aim could dominate the letter, while in Sextilis time (second letter) Antony position became clear and Cassius could send his ultimatum: as for the style, the first letter is quite close to Brutus' style, and the second to that of Cassius. In particular, in the word order, the most impressive structure employed by Brutus seems to be the retraction of the verb from the end of a clause and the use of putting a pronoun or a couple of pronouns at the end, e.g.:

- (4)a (Brut. in *ad Brut.* I 4a. 3 [11 Sh.B.])
quod utinam inspectare posses timorem de illo meum.
- b (Brut. in *ad Brut.* I 7. 1 [19 Sh.B.])
nostra necessitudo debet conciliare te illi [sc. L.Bibulo]
- c (Brut. in *ad Brut.* I 13. 1 [21 Sh.B.])
qui [sc. Lepidus] *si eripuerit se nobis*, eqs.

More interesting is the use of *rogo* + subj., which appears prevailing, but not exclusive by Brutus, like:

³² See DETTENHOFER, M. H.: *Perdita Iuventus, Zwischen den Generationen von Caesar und Augustus*. München 1992, 256. K. MATIJEVIĆ (*Marcus Antonius, Consul – Proconsul – Staatsfeind. Die Politik der Jahre 44 und 43 v.Chr.* Rahden, Westf. 2006, 131) gives the same evaluation of the two letters (*Fam.* XI 2 and 3). Brutus and Cassius used their imperium with a great efficiency which we must avoid to judge in a negative way because of the exitus of the final battle: we don't know how effective and strong was the role of the 'intelligence' payed by Octavian's money (cf. CALBOLI, G.: A Roma da un periodo all'altro: come avvertirlo, come nascondere. In CALBOLI, G. – FARINELLI, F. – BARILLI, R.: *I periodi della storia*. Ariccia 2016, 31–32).

³³ DETTENHOFER (n. 31) 280.

- (5) (Brutus in *ad Brut.* I 6. 2 [12 Sh.B.])
rogo te, et quidem ualde rogo [...], eripias eum ex custodia conseruesque. [...]
 4 [...] *rogo te, Cicero, et Flauius rogat rem conficias.*

However *rogo* + *ut* is not excluded in Brutus' language and actually has been employed but in a very special occasion, e.g. where Brutus was recommending Veterem Antistium to Cicero, after saying that Antistius gave to him the money to enrol an army to defend the Roman Republic:

- (6) (Brutus in *ad Brut.* I 11 [16 Sh.B.])
Ego etiam, mi Cicero, proprie familiariterque te rogo, ut Veterem ames uelisque esse quam amplissimum.

I can add that also the position of the predicate verb in *Fam.* XI 2 and *Fam.* XI 3 is different, namely in *Fam.* XI 2 is close to Brutus' use and in *Fam.* XI 3 to that of Cassius: in the seven letters sent by Brutus to Cicero the last position has been employed 62.64 %, the previous position 37.36%. This position in Cassius' letter is sensibly different, i.e.: the last position has been used by Cassius 78.07%, the previous position 21.93%.

In the letter *Fam.* XI 2 the percentage of verb position is for the last position 52.17, previous one 47.83, very close to Brutus' percentage, whereas in *Fam.* XI 3 the percentage for the last position is 80.77, previous position 19.23, and this is Cassius' style.

Therefore I can conclude today almost with the same words I used in my paper:³⁴ "Uses of these three constructions in *Fam.* XI 2 suggest that the style of this letter (b, c and d [first part]) was influenced more strongly by Brutus, in a reduced way by Cassius, while *Fam.* XI 3 (second part) was influenced by Cassius rather than by Brutus."

- (7)a (Brut. et Cass. in Cic. *Fam.* XI 2. 1 [329 Sh.B.])
De tua fide et beneuolentia in nos nisi persuasum esset nobis, non scripsissemus haec tibi.
 b *Fam.* XI 2. 2
qua re petimus a te facias nos certos tuae uoluntatis in nos
 c *Fam.* XI 2. 3
Rescribas nobis ad omnia rogamus.
 d (Brut. et Cass. in Cic. *Fam.* XI 3. 4)
Deos quaesumus consilia tua rei p. salutaria sint ac tibi; si minus, ut salua atque honesta re p. tibi quam minimum noceant optamus.

To conclude this point, I believe that, if we follow the parameters which we have elucidated until now, it should be not so strange, albeit non scientifically proved, that in

³⁴ CALBOLI: Two Letters (n. 30) 257

(7)d, i.e. *Fam.* XI 3. 4 the clause *Deos quaesumus consilia tua rei p. salutaria sint ac tibi* looks rather as a product of Brutus than of Cassius, however the following clause *si minus, ut salua atque honesta re p. tibi quam minimum noceant optamus*, seems to have been produced rather by the mood and language of Cassius, even more because this is the clause which concludes the whole letter.

Anyhow the three parameters we highlighted, namely pronoun (Brutus)/verb (Cassius) at the end of the clause, *quaesumus* + subj. (Brutus)/*quaesumus* + *ut* (Cassius), *salutaria* (Brutus)/*noceant* (Cassius) seem to confirm what I said. In this case we could see in which a clever way a little difference in the use of an expression was employed to mark some great differences, but in Vindolanda use we find only a reduced effect of this great difference, namely only a distinction between a colloquialism (*rogo* + subj.) and an high-style or bureaucratic language (*rogo* + *ut*),³⁵ in particular *rogo ut* occurs twice (and perhaps three times) in 250, a rather formal letter of commendation written by Claudius Karus to Cerialis.³⁶

Another point where the question *urbanitas*–*rusticitas* appears treated by Cicero himself concerns some loan-words of Celtic origin as *bracis* and *ceruisia*.³⁷ That *bracis* and *ceruisia* are Celtic has been attested by Pliny, *Nat.* 18. 62 and 22. 64. Both terms occur at Vindolanda and these Celtic words may have been brought to Britain by Celtic soldiers or may have been found in Britain as introduced before the arrival of Romans. What matters is the fact that in Vindolanda the presence of Celtic terms is natural and the Celtic loan-words were already taken into account by the Roman rhetoricians or grammarians as Cicero. Cicero's intervention deserves to be considered, because he grounded and substantiated his distinction between *urbanus* and non-*urbanus* on Celtic words, which were probably the foreign barbarian (i.e. not Greek) words Cicero could most easily find. As a matter of fact he wrote:

- (8) Cic. *Brut.* 170–172 *Tum Brutus: quid tu igitur, inquit, tribuis istis externis quasi oratoribus? Quid censes, inquam, nisi idem quod urbanis praeter unum, quod non est eorum urbanitate quasi quadam colorata oratio? Et Brutus: qui est, inquit, iste tandem urbanitatis color? Nescio, inquam; tantum esse quendam scio. Id tu, Brute, iam intelleges, cum in Galliam ueneris [Brutus was sent to Gallia Cisalpina as praetor 46 by Caesar]; audies tum quidem etiam verba quaedam non trita Romae, sed haec mutari dediscique possunt; illud est maius, quod in uocibus nostrorum oratorum retinnit quiddam et resonat urbanus. Nec hoc in oratoribus modo apparet, sed etiam in ceteris. Ego memini T. Tincam Placentinum, hominem facetissimum, cum familiari nostro Q. Granio praecone dicacitate certare. [...]; sed Tincam non minus multa ridicule dicentem Granio obruebat nescio quo sapore vernaculo: ut ego iam non mirer illud Theophrasto accidisse quod dicitur, cum percontaretur ex anicula quadam, quanti aliquid venderet, et respondisset illa atque addidisset 'hospes non pote minoris', tulisse*

³⁵ Cf. ADAMS *The Language* (n. 8) 117.

³⁶ Cf. also BOWMAN–THOMAS (n. 1) 1994, 222.

³⁷ Cf. ADAMS: *The Language* (n. 8) 127 f., and ADAMS, J. N.: *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge 2003, 441–442.

eum moleste se non effugere hospitis speciem, cum aetatem ageret Athenis optumeque loqueretur omnium.

In this long passage the essence of the Roman *urbanitas* is concentrated and a reference is given to the Greek origin of this speech purism. The quoted episode is only in an indirect relation to the grammatical activity of Theophrastus, and this appears even more clearly if we consider the explanation given by Quintilian, why the old woman in Athens acknowledged that Theophrastus was a foreigner:

- (9) Quint. *Inst.* 8. 1. 2 *quo modo et illa Attica anus Theophrastum, hominem aliqui disertissimum, adnotata unius adfectione uerbi hospitem dixit, nec alio se id depredisse interrogata respondit quam quod nimium Attice loqueretur.*

Moreover Theophrastus developed in his *Περὶ λέξεως* the doctrine of the ἀρεταὶ (and κακίαι) τῆς λέξεως, distinguished in σαφήνεια (*perspicuitas*), Ἑλληνισμός (*Latinitas*), πρέπον (*aptum*), κατασκευή (*ornatus*), though this doctrine occurs partially in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* Book III, where Aristotle presented the Ἑλληνισμός (Arist. *Rhet.* III 1407a 20 ἔστι δ' ἀρχὴ τῆς λέξεως τὸ Ἑλληνίζειν) and the σαφήνεια (Arist. *Rhet.* III 1404b 1 ὁρίσθω λέξεως ἀρετὴ σαφὴ εἶναι): cf. J. Stroux,³⁸ who considered these virtues according to the order given to them in Diog. Laert. 7. 59.³⁹ The Ἑλληνισμός (*Latinitas*) is the rhetorical and grammatical fundament of Greek and Roman distinction from barbarian language.⁴⁰ The question of a correct speech was already Greek and in Athens the attention to the Ἑλληνισμός was even stronger than to *Latinitas* in Rome. Nevertheless the school of the grammarian, imported from Rhodes in the time of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (86–82 BC) imposed a great attention also to *Latinitas* (*Rhet. Her.* 4. 12. 17) and this attention was observed also in the Vindolanda's documents of high level, apart from the use of some few words which were typical of Gaul and Britain.

To conclude, the colloquial nature of the language in the Vindolanda Tablets seems to be confirmed, though in a mostly fragmentary matter. The cursive script can indeed lead to possibly wrong readings, as it has been the case with *debunt*, instead of *debent*, as well as *ualunt* seems to be a wrong reading for *ualent* in *P. Mich.* VIII 468. 40, but not a Vulgarism. Another kind of investigation concerned the distinction between *puer/pueri* and *seruus*. Here I had at my disposal the lexical matter of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, and this showed me how reduced was the use of *seruus* in comparison with *puer*, and that, as highlighted by Adams, the term *seruus* was always used in

³⁸ STROUX, J.: *De Theophrasti virtutibus dicendi*. Leipzig 1912, 10, 13–28, 61.

³⁹ See Consulti Fortunatiani, *Ars Rhetorica. Introduzione, Edizione Critica, Traduzione Italiana e Commento*. A cura di L. CALBOLI MONTEFUSCO. Bologna 1979, 435–446.

⁴⁰ On *Latinitas* cf. VAINIO, R.: *Latinitas and Barbarisms According to the Roman Grammarians. Attitudes towards Language in the Light of Grammatical Examples*. Univ. of Turku, Dept. of Classics 1999, who treated *Latinitas* and Barbarisms according to Roman Grammarians (without reference to Greek origin).

an official, bureaucratic sense. Thirdly we compared *rogo* (and similar) + subj., substantially colloquial and, in some respects, friendly, with the more official and bureaucratic *rogo* + *ut*. Also in this construction, where I took into account two letters from Brutus and Cassius to Marc Antony in a very dramatic situation, the use that we meet in the Vindolanda Tablets can be confirmed, as well as Adams' explanation. On the other hand, the vulgar forms of future (I cannot speak of vulgar style, Octavius' Latin excluded) of the Vindolanda Tablets seem to be not so strong and consistent as those we find in Bu Njem and in the Latin of Michigan Papyri by Cl. Terentianus and Cl. Tiberianus. The temptation is strong to connect this Latin with the Latin which came later in Alcuinus' time from Britain to France, and Adams⁴¹ in one case, *braciarius*, did not exclude such a connection through the Continent. However, until the deciphering of the new material, this remains rather a hope.

Gualtiero Calboli
Department of Classical Philology and Medieval Studies
University of Bologna
Italy
gualtiero.calboli@unibo.it

⁴¹ ADAMS: The New Vindolanda (n. 19) 574.