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Greek and Latin Bilingualism
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Introduction

Greco-Roman bilingualism is without doubt one of the clearest manifestations of the close cultural ties between Greece and Rome. The scope of this phenomenon, extending to numerous aspects of the ancient world, including diplomacy, literature, law, medicine, religion, administration, the military, commerce, and philosophy, reveals it as one of the principal foundations on which Greco-Roman cultural unity is based. This importance fully justifies the interest it has evoked in the linguistic, literary, and cultural sectors of Classical scholarship. Whereas Greco-Roman bilingualism was until the 1930s chiefly used to illustrate the symbiosis of two languages and two cultures in the Greco-Roman world (e.g., Boyancé 1956; Marrou 1965: 374–88), since the 1980s new perspectives have been opened up that have benefited from work in general linguistics, in particular the pioneering study of Weinreich (1953). The most recent developments in the study of Greco-Roman bilingualism are concerned with notions such as language contact (Dubuisson 1992b), linguistic interference (Biville 2001–3), *diglossia* (Adams 2003: 754–5), code-switching (Wenskus 1998), mixed language (Leiwo 1995), and language choice (Adams 2003: 35–6). Moreover, research in these areas has turned from quantitative to being qualitative in nature, in differentiating situations of bilingualism according to type of context. And advances in sociolinguistics have brought questions to the fore such as “Who speaks what language to whom and when?” In this respect the study of Kaimio (1979) and the work of Dubuisson (1992a) are typical of the shift in focus from the words spoken to their speakers in their actual contexts (see also Valette-Cagnac 2003: 149–51), with constant attention being paid to such parameters as the concrete speech situation, the speakers’ linguistic competence, their motivations, their sociocultural level, and their attitude toward foreign elements (see also the overview in Dickey 2003a).
Bilingualism in Classical Greece

The evidence on bilingualism in the world of Archaic and Classical Greece is scant. Before the fifth century BCE there is little to go by. The Homeric poems make only sporadic and largely inconclusive mention of linguistic diversity (e.g., Il. 2.204; 4.437; Od. 19.172; see Werner 1989). It is not until the fifth century that authors show awareness of the existence of linguistic diversity and of an opposition between foreign languages and Greek as one of the key elements of Greek identity (e.g., Hdt. 8.144; on non-Greek languages in Herodotus, see Munson 2005). At Politicus 262d Plato takes issue with a classification that divides humanity into two parts, τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν, the Greeks, on the one hand, and on the other all the other peoples that are referred to with a single name, “barbarians,” even though they do not all speak the same language (ἀσύμφωνοι). The languages of the barbarians lack a recognized status and are compared to the chirping of birds (Soph. Trach. 1060). Only Greek is considered to be a real language (Strab. 24.2.28). In the comedies of Aristophanes, the Persian Pseudartabas and the barbarian Triballus utter unintelligible sounds that are opposed to Greek. Such a lack of linguistic curiosity is not necessarily sheer ignorance, for Ar. Ach. 100 is authentic Persian. In such a context it is normal for polyglots to be looked upon as exceptions (Werner 1983). The adjective πολύγλωσσος in the sense of “speaking various languages” is rare (Rotolo 1972: 409 n. 52; Dubuisson 1983: 214–215). We know of some δίγλωσσοι, persons who know Greek and a barbarian language, either a Greek who can speak a foreign language, like Themistocles, who had learned Persian in a year, or a barbarian who knows Greek (Dubuisson 1983: 206–13; Rochette 2001). The Greek world remains monoglot at least until the Hellenistic period. Great Greek travelers such as Herodotus and Hecataeus do not feel the need to learn the languages of the peoples they visit, since they are convinced that Greek is universally understood and that they will always find people who are capable of translating the texts in which they are interested. We know from Herodotus (2.154) that Pharaoh Psammetichos I had entrusted Ionian colonists with Egyptian infants, in order to produce bilingual speakers who would become interpreters.

The Encounter of the Greek World with Rome

Flexible linguistic policies

The conquests of Alexander the Great had the effect of imposing Greek as the Weltsprache of the entire Macedonian Empire, thus supplanting Aramaic, the lingua franca of the Persian Empire (Zgusta 1980: 137). After the completion of his campaigns Alexander intended, according to Plutarch (Alex. 47.6), to unify his empire by establishing Greek as the sole administrative language of his provinces. After the king’s death, Greek became in fact the language used in the various kingdoms resulting from the division of the vast empire.
In the west, meanwhile, the rise of Roman power did not come at the expense of philhellenism: *Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit et artes | intulit agræstì Latio* “Greece, conquered, has conquered its wild victor and has imported the arts into rural Latium” (Hor. Epist. 2.1.156–7). The process of hellenization of Rome begins with the Punic Wars (Gruen 1992: 223–71). Greek becomes the language of choice of the educated class in Rome. The reading of Greek literary works spread among the elite due to the arrival in Rome of libraries taken as booty (such as that of Perseus, king of Macedon, brought to Rome by Emilius Paulus in 167 BCE). The Romans were accordingly aware of the prestige of Greek as an international language: *Græca leguntur in omnibus fere gentibus, Latina suis finibus, exquisitum sanctionem* “Greek texts are read by virtually all peoples, Latin texts are contained within their own restricted boundaries” (Cic. Arch. 23). Military exchanges between Italy and the Greek world as well as trade were also favorable to the diffusion of the two languages. From the second century BCE onward, *negotiatori* criss-cross the eastern Mediterranean and leave numerous epigraphical documents as traces of their passage. The epigraphical record at Delos shows that this island had become a meeting-place for merchants from Latium or Campania, who sometimes have been buried there (Adams 2002: 103–27; 2003: 642–86).

But increasing levels of bilingualism did not prevent the Romans from being aware of the prestige of their own language. Cato, even though he was capable of expressing himself in Greek, used Latin even when he was addressing native Greek audiences, such as the Athenians in 191 BCE.¹ In fact, it was customary for Roman magistrates to respond only in Latin to foreign ambassadors, whether in the Senate or abroad (Val. Max. 2.2.2: *magna cum perseverantia custodiebant, ne Graecis umquam nisi Latine responsa darent… non in urbe tantum nostra, sed etiam in Graecia et Asia* “They took care with the greatest perseverance never to respond to the Greeks in any language but Latin, … not merely in our own city, but also in Greece and in Asia”). In spite of being bilingual the Roman magistrates attached much importance to the use of Latin for diplomatic discourse in order to underscore the *maiestas* of the Roman people (Gruen 1992: 236 n. 61). In the Senate the use of Latin was mandatory for the same reasons (ibid. 238 n. 69). Interpreters would translate resolutions in Latin, whether in Rome (so C. Acilius during the embassy of the three philosophers of 155 BCE) or in the Greek world.² Augustus, whose knowledge of Greek was insufficient to speak the language fluently (*expeditum*, Suet. Aug. 89; cf. Dubuisson 2002) and Tiberius, a perfectly bilingual speaker, make efforts in the same sense to promote pure Latinity as unifying cement for the empire (Suet. Tib. 71). According to Kaimio (1979: 96), Valerius Maximus’ statement cited above could be explained as a wish to support the policy of Tiberius in favor of Latin.

Still, it was not Roman policy to impose by force the use of Latin on Greek-speaking provinces (Rochette 1997). Bilingualism functioned in a flexible and practical way, Roman policy being well adapted to the circumstances (Dubuisson 1982). Proof of this is provided by the formal request addressed by the citizen of Cumae to the Roman Senate in 180 BCE: *Cumani n a anno potestibus permissum est, ut publice Latine loquerentur et praebentibus Latine vendendi ius esset* “That year it was granted to the Cumaeans, at their request, to use Latin for their civic discourse and for the merchants
to use it in their transactions” (Livy 40.42.13). Cumae wished to obtain authorization to replace Oscan with Latin in their public discourse, in particular in their auctions. This example shows that the inhabitants of regions subjected to Roman power were not obliged to use Latin, even though they frequently wished to do so. The Romans did not have a rigid linguistic policy (Dubuisson 1982).

Promotion of Latin

In the Republican period the primacy of Greek gave rise to an anti-hellenic movement led by Cato the Elder, who was the first to write a Roman history in Latin, the *Origines*. Varro, pupil of the very conservative L. Aelius Stilo, can be placed within this same movement. Author of *De Lingua Latina*, he contributed to the autonomy of Latin toward which the Romans had been striving since the conquests of the second century and the definitive victory over Greece. He was not ignorant of the debt of Latin to Greek (*Ling.* 9.31) and is the author of an entire treatise on the Aeolian origins of Latin (Collart 1954: 205–28). But he maintains that certain words in Latin do not derive from any other language (*Ling.* 5.3). At the level of literary registers, Cicero took great pains to show that the Latin language is equally well, if not better, suited for the articulation of philosophical concepts, parting company with Lucretius on the subject of the *egestas patrii sermonis* “poverty of the language of the fathers” (e.g., Lucr. 1.139, 832; 3.260; see Fögen 2000: 77–41). In opposition to this formula, he tried to promote the language of Latium by using it for his philosophical treatises, thus endowing Rome with a corpus of literary works in its national language (Cic. *Fin.* 1.10). In creating numerous neologisms according to various mechanisms (Nicolas 2005), he made a monumental contribution to the enrichment of the Latin language.

The ambiguous status of Greek

In spite of its favorable position in the Roman Republic, the Greek language has always had an ambiguous status in Rome, being at the same time a foreign language and an integral part of Roman society (Dubuisson 1981a: 27–8 n. 6). Greek is both internal and external to Roman society. The ambiguous relation of Augustus with Greek as described by Suetonius (Aug. 89) is enlightening in this respect. According to the biographer, Augustus was greatly drawn toward Greek studies (*Graecae disciplinae*) and he excelled in them, having as rhetoric teacher Apollodorus of Pergamon. Nevertheless, he never learned to speak Greek fluently and he refrained from writing in that language (*aut loqueretur expedite aut componere aliquid auderet*). He wrote his text in Latin and had it translated (*Latine formabat uertendumque aliis dabat*).

Bilingualism was strongly favored in education and is most apparent at the level of the individual. Many educated Romans boasted excellent knowledge of Greek to the point of speaking it as a second maternal language. Cicero (Cic. *De Or.* 2.1.2) says of Crassus that he spoke Greek as if he did not know any other language. According to Cornelius Nepos (Nep. *Att.* 4.1), Atticus spoke Greek so well that one could have believed he was a native Athenian. Still, Greek was not universally used and known in
Rome (Quint. Inst. 12.10.57). Even Cicero could make mistakes (Holford-Strevens 1993: 209). Romans who knew Greek did not all understand the language in the same way: an educated aristocrat knew a homogeneous and codified Greek, whereas members of inferior classes would speak the Hellenistic Koine. Cicero himself did not have a uniform attitude toward Greek.

Did Romans use Greek in daily conversation with each other? There are few sources that allow us to form a precise idea on this subject (Kaimio 1979: 193). What is certain is that Greek was widely used for the composition of works on archeological, historical, and philosophical subjects (Henriksson 1956). Cicero had projected a Greek hypomnêma on his consulate (Att. 1.19.10; 2.1.2; Lendle 1967). His remarks in the letter to Atticus of 60 BCE (Att. 1.19.10) show that there existed a “Roman” variety of Greek, a Greek that allowed Romans to stay Roman. Cicero asks his friend, who speaks Greek like a native Athenian, to be indulgent if he finds un-Greek turns of phrase or a less elegant style (quod homini Attico minus Graecum eruditumqueuideatur). According to Cicero, Lucullus deliberately committed solecisms and barbarisms in order to sound Roman.

Bilingualism is thus closely linked with identity. The only bilingualism acceptable in Rome is the one that makes it possible to identify the speaker. This is why Romans who speak or write Greek never use the Greek of the Greeks, since they are eager to be different. The problem of identity is illustrated by an anecdote, reported by Cicero (Fin. 1.8–9), of Alucius being greeted in Greek in Athens by the praetor Scaevola, an apparently absurd gesture (Valette-Cagnac 2003: 170–9).

**Latin is Greek**

Greek and Latin are so closely linked in the linguistic consciousness of the Romans that they came to assume a total assimilation of Latin to Greek: Latin is a form of Greek. This is the thesis that has come to be formulated at Rome from the time of Sulla to the reign of Claudius: Latin is presented as a Greek dialect, Aecolic (Werner 1996). The grammarians Philoxenos of Alexandria, who is perhaps to be dated prior to Varro, wrote a dialectical treatise to this effect (Funaioli, Gram. Rom. Frag. I, p. XVI, 206–8; Collart 1954: 206–18). The cultural context underlying this theory is well understood. Annalists and early Roman historians who had prepared the framework within which the theory could develop (Gabba 1963) include Fabius Pictor, Hyperochos of Cumae, even Cato, who states that Evander upon his arrival in Latium made Greek and the Greek alphabet known to the barbarians of this region (Origines 1.19). Since Cato can hardly be credited with sympathy for the Greeks, such a statement is surely an echo of a communis opinio of the time (Gruen 1992: 235). Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who serves the cause of Augustus, takes up the theory in the first book of his Roman Antiquities (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.90.1), insisting on its three dimensions, cultural, religious, and linguistic, with the object of proving the ethnic unity of Greeks and Romans. In his view the Romans speak a language that is neither completely barbarian nor completely Greek. Speculations of grammarians on the origins of the Latin language would lead linguists of the generation of Charisius (fourth cent. CE) and Priscianus (c. 500 CE) to emphasize, on the basis of parallels, the
similarities between the two languages (Schöpsdau 1992). Macrobius (fourth cent. CE) would link the two languages so tightly as to confirm that the study of the one leads necessarily to the mastery of the other (Keil. Gramm. Lat. V.631).

Greek in Rome

Latin borrowing from the Greek

Rome is a bilingual city. The Greek epitaphs of the city, engraved by and for persons of foreign origin, slaves, freedmen, or immigrants from the East, but equally for Roman natives, reflect a cosmopolitan society and provide evidence for widespread bilingualism in the capital of the empire (Kajanto 1963: 43–4). Greek was the first language of numerous slaves and immigrants. Kaimio (1979: 315) even speaks of a Greek pidgin. Greek has infiltrated in the linguistic habits of Rome’s lower classes before it exerted influence on the higher echelons of society. The language of everyday speech in fact has undergone foreign influence from a very early date. Latin has borrowed not only Greek words, but also words from other Italic languages even when typically Latin words were available for the concepts in question. Popina “tavern” and rufus “red” are Latin borrowings from Oscan-Umbrian and Faliscan, whereas the Latin equivalents are coquina (< quoquina) and ruber (Meillet 1977: 100–1). These words have been completely “naturalized” and become generalized along with their host language.

From the Greek, Latin has borrowed two categories of words (Biville 1990–5: 1: 31).

a) Written and learned borrowings drawing directly on Greek texts. These words keep their original form fairly conservatively and are thus “ageless” (Biville 1992: 232–3). Aer (ἀήρ, ἀέρος), for example, is a Greek word completely naturalized in Latin. The “welcoming” of a Greek word in Latin is expressed by Séneca (Sen. Ep. 120.4) with the evocative image of civil rights, civitas, a term adopted by the grammarians (civitate donaverint).

b) Oral or “vulgar” borrowings subject to various types of deformation in their progressive integration within the Latin language. These phonetic phenomena, studied by Biville (1990–5), depend on the period in which the borrowing takes place and loan words continue to be modified along with the host language. Greek βαπτίζω becomes baptism, in Christian authors, since the Greek sound [z], at first assimilated to Latin s(s), comes to be written as di by the third century CE (pronounced [dz], Biville 1990–5: 2: 417–18). When entering into the language a Greek word undergoes deformations that render it suitable for the phonetic structures into which it is inserted and which make it lose its foreign character, e.g., suppression of a phoneme: ἱέων > leo; inversion: ψυχή > spyche; addition: μνᾶ > mina. Such adaptations can be formulated as rules of phono-graphemic correspondence between the systems of Greek and Latin (Biville 1990–5; 1991: 51–2). Once it has adapted to the rules of the host language the borrowing is part of the language and undergoes the same phonetic
developments as purely Latin words (Biville 1986: 852–4), e.g., πλατεία enters as *platea from which derive It. piazza and Fr. place. Far from being closed, this system is productive. It generates a Greco-Roman language system of neologisms created by hybridization (e.g., Romulidae, Anti-Catones) as well as a purely Greek presence within the Latin language, a “Greek Latin” composed of neologisms of entirely Greek provenance, but created by Latin speakers for whom Greek is not the primary language (Biville 1993).

The degree of receptivity of Latin to external influences can be best measured in the imperial period, particularly in subliterary texts (Adams 2003). Yet in spite of all the linguistic and cultural influences Latin has not lost its identity nor its force (Verg. Aen. 12.834–9).

**Code-Switching**

Besides borrowing, a further language-contact phenomenon manifests itself from a very early date in Latin literature: code-switching, the switch from one language to another within one and the same discourse. As early as the comoedia palliata the transition from Latin to Greek is very frequent (Jocelyn 1999). In Plautus this process appears in various passages, particularly in the responses of slaves or other characters of the lower social strata (Jocelyn 1999: 184–9). For Plautus, who addresses an audience that is largely bilingual, the use of Greek is clearly a sign of the condition of slave (Shipp 1953). But in everyday life code-switching was a living reality too and is frequently attested for the second and first centuries BCE (Jocelyn 1999: 177–84).

The best-known case in literature is that of Cicero, who was, as we saw, fluent in Greek both in speech and in writing. In 70 BCE he addressed the senate of Syracuse in Greek (Verr. 2.4.147) and he communicated with various Greek correspondents (Plut. Cic. 24.8–9). Whereas his public speeches present a pure Latinity, as symbol of Rome’s prestige, his letters abound with Greek words and expressions—up to 850. The switch from Latin to Greek in Cicero as well as in the writings of other members of the Roman elite has often been interpreted as a form of intimacy, or even of a “language of intimacy” (Pabón 1939), the maternal language of the Roman so to speak. According to some scholars, the language switch could be provoked by emotive and psychological contexts. Dubuisson attaches great importance to this aspect and extends it to the general use of Greek among the Roman upper class. Caesar’s καὶ σύ τέκνον would be due, according to him, to the fact that at the moment of his death he “refinds his mother tongue or at least his first language.” Pabón (1939: 129) sees proof that Greek was used as the language of the emotions in a passage in Juvenal’s sixth Satire (184–99), where Greek is presented as women’s language of sexuality. But that passage also points up a distinction between two linguistic spaces: the private sphere, where Greek is permitted, and the public sphere, where it was frowned upon. The use of either language is thus closely linked to the speech context. In private, the use of Greek signals culture and an element of recognition for an educated class. In public, in particular in the Senate, one abstains from speaking Greek, since Latin is
the language of formal civic discourse. Similarly, to speak Greek in the countryside produces unusual effects, since Greek is associated with urban life (Plin. *Ep. 7.25.2–5*). The Greek language is endowed with qualities that make it the preferred language in certain contexts: smoothness (Quint. *Inst. 12.10.27–8*), charm, grace, and cheerfulness (Plin. *Ep. 4.3*; cf. Valette-Cagnac 2003: 164–6).

The switches from Latin to Greek in Cicero’s letters cannot all be explained by the intimate character of the use of Greek in Rome. First, the Greek words we find in his letters are not all of the same status. Cicero uses many Greek medical terms in the absence of a fully developed medical vocabulary in Latin at the time. Code-switches also depend on the correspondent and the date of the letter in question. When he writes to politicians and dignitaries of the State, Cicero uses Latin without any code-switches, just as in letters to his wife and daughter, which are in general free of Greek (Wenskus 2001: 218–19). He reserves Greek for certain intimate friends, such as Atticus, who presents himself as more Greek than the Greeks themselves (Valette-Cagnac 2003). The use of Greek, language of “connivance,” serves to create rapport with the addressee of the letter.

Chronology plays a role as well (Venini 1952). At certain points in his career Cicero makes a more extensive use of Greek than at others. During his exile (April 58 to September 57) he refuses any use of Greek words, but within a month of his return he resumes the habits of the past. In the letters of the year 56 we find 63 Greek words, but we can observe a total absence of Greek in the letters of the years 48 and 47, another period of political crisis. But in the years 45–44, when he is composing his philosophical treatises, Greek appears again. However, in February of 45 during the days following the death of his daughter Tullia which greatly affected him, Cicero avoids Greek. We can conclude from this that there is a psychological dimension in Cicero’s code-switches. In periods of tension and anxiety he tends to avoid Greek, whereas when he is more relaxed, he uses it again. The use of Greek, then, is for him a conscious choice.

**The Balance of the Two Languages in the Empire**

_ Utrisque lingua

Under the Empire the two languages coexist on a basis of complete equality, as is shown by the expression _utrasque lingua_ “in either language” (Dubuisson 1981a) or the formula used by the Emperor Claudius, _uterque sermo noster_ “either of our two ways of speaking” (Suet. *Claud. 42.1*). Whereas the adjective _bilinguis_ never means “bilingual” (Poccetti 1986), _utrasque lingua_ underlines the close connection between the two languages, since it sets Greek and Latin together apart from all other languages, thus signaling the unity, parity, and complementarity of Greek and Latin. By contrast, _bilinguis_ has a negative connotation (Verg. *Aen. 1.661*) and designates a language that is mixed and corrupted, like that of the Branchchides, who had gradually abandoned their native language to adopt a foreign language (Quint. *Inst. 7.5.29*; Hor. *Sat. 1.1.20–36*).
In the western part of the empire Latin gradually won out over Greek, which remained the principal language of the Pars orientis. A passage in Plutarch (Quaest. Plat. 10.31 = Mor. 1010D) seems to signal the decline of Greek, even though his expression (“Latin… which nowadays is spoken by everyone”) is probably a rhetorical exaggeration. Plutarch himself knows Latin (see below), but admits that he does not know it sufficiently well to appreciate the stylistic finesses in Cicero’s speeches (Plut. Dem. 2.2).

Some authors write both in Greek and in Latin, depending on the occasion: the Christian apologist Tertullian, the Platonist Apuleius of Madaura, both Africans, and also the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, who wrote his Reflections in Greek, but in his younger days preferred Latin in his correspondence with his teacher, the purist Fronto. Greek is the learned language, adapted to such domains as history, philosophy, or science. The mathematician L. Tarutius of Firmum, a friend of Cicero and Varro, wrote a book on the stars in Greek. The Emperor Claudius wrote in Greek books on the history of Etruria and Carthage (Suet. Claud. 42.5). A number of philosophers (mostly Stoics), all full-blooded Italians, wrote their treatises in Greek so naturally that philosophers writing Latin, like Seneca, are the exception (Gauly 2004: 38–51).

But after the reign of Marcus Aurelius, which marks the culmination of the collaboration between the two cultures (Swain 2004), Greek gradually loses its favored position in the Pars occidentalis. At the personal level, this change is already visible in the correspondence of Pliny the Younger. Whereas Cicero’s Greek presents all the characteristics of a real Umgangssprache, Pliny’s is more artificial and tied to the literary tradition. After having been bilingual for various centuries, the West became exclusively Latin (Hier. Ep. 50.2). Toward the end of the fourth century CE it became difficult to find Greek teachers in the cities of the West (Cod. Theod. 13.1.11).

**Bilateral unilingualism**

In the domain of official communication the Roman conquest of the Greek world had not changed anything in the status of either language. Latin did not replace Greek, but rather was added as an instrument of social and economical advancement. Greek remained the language for official documents addressed to the cities of the Greek world. With some rare exceptions, such as the Res Gestae dini Augusti, all the senatus consulta and epistulae of the Republican period (Sherk 1969) as well as imperial constitutions (epistles, edicts, rescripts, instructions) from Augustus till the reign of Diocletian (Oliver 1989) are in Greek. But after 284 CE till the beginning of the fifth century Latin gradually takes over.

In the Greek provinces the use of Latin in the administration is limited to four principal domains: exchanges between the central government, i.e., the emperor and the Roman magistrates in function in the provinces (the correspondence of Pliny the Younger with Trajan is a good example); communication between the Roman magistrates and the Roman colonies; the administration of the Roman colonies; and, to a certain extent, administration relative to the ciues Romani. Roman administration thus uses Latin in the East for external communication, whereas Greek serves the purposes of internal communication, even though Latin can also be used for political
communication between cities in the East (Eck 2000). Before the Roman conquest Greek was of course already the language for international communication in the Mediterranean basin. It was also the administrative language for the Hellenistic monarchies and the language of culture enjoying considerable prestige in Roman society. The Roman administration needed Greek equivalents to the notions necessary to Roman government and so the scribes of chancelleries had to translate the documents into the other language (Mourgues 1995). The result was what Kaimio calls a bilateral unilingualism, since the Roman Empire is divided in two partes, one latinophone, the other hellenophone (Adamik 2006: 24–8). But alongside the two official languages, the local languages continue to have their place in the government of the provinces, often through the intermediary of interpreters (Eck 2004).

**Latin in the Greek World**

**A new linguistic policy?**

As indicated in the previous section, the situation gradually changes, starting from the second half of the third century CE and in particular in the fourth century. Diocletian and his successors are often thought to have pursued an aggressive linguistic policy that aimed at generalizing the use of Latin throughout the empire. Marrou (1965: 378) sees support for this in a passage in Libanius (314–93). In his autobiography (Lib. Or. 1.234) the rhetor from Antioch expresses concerns about the future of Greek rhetoric and holds Roman law and the Latin language responsible for the demise of his school (Cribiore 2007: 206–12). However, Libanius also specifies that the decline as he sees it is not caused by any decree or law (γράμμα μὲν οὖν καὶ νόμος τοῦτο οὐκ ἔπραττεν). Rather, it seems that the decline of Greek was due to the public prestige and influence that came with the knowledge of Latin. Arguments *e silentio* are always delicate, but if a systematic language policy had existed, it would have been very likely that Libanius, great defender of Greek language and culture, would have mentioned it and fought it energetically.

However this may be, the increasing importance of Latin in the Greek world, in particular from the fourth century CE, is no stranger to the creation of new imperial residences, that is, new administrative centers, in the Greek orient. With Nicomedia, where Diocletian took up residence, and in particular, somewhat later, Constantinople, the “New Rome” at the heart of the Greek-speaking world founded by Constantine in 324 CE, the faraway capital comes closer to its Greek subjects, who from now on have reasons to learn the language of Rome. The central administration uses Latin, the “language of the rulers” which is linked to the person of the emperor.

When the Tetrarchy came to an end with Constantine the Great, the administrative system that the Tetrarchs had established survived the organization in prefectures. Besides quantitative and territorial factors, there was also the qualitative factor in the increase in prestige of Latin among the hellenophones. A career in the bureaucracy of the empire or in the Roman army was attractive, and knowledge of Roman law, and hence of Latin, was indispensable for such a career. This is the reason why the Greeks
began to attend in great numbers the law school at Beirut, which was considered as early as the first century CE an island of Latinity in a Hellenophone world (Suet. Gram. 24). Libanius, who forbade himself the knowledge of Latin, complains of this phenomenon, which emptied the schools of traditional Greek παιδεία (Lib. Or. 1.214). But knowing Latin permitted one to rise faster on the social ladder (Chrys. Oppugn. 3.12 = PG 47.368), as is shown by the career of Strategius Musonianus, praefectus praetorio orientis in 354 under Constantine II (Amm. Marc. 15.13.1; Drijvers 1996). For efficient Latin language acquisition special textbooks appear, such as the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana (Debut 1984). This method is based on scenes of daily life composed in order to teach hellenophones Latin. In the fourth century CE, authors who are native Greek speakers, such as Claudianus of Alexandria or Ammianus Marcellinus of Antioch, use Latin for the composition of their works (Geiger 1999).

**Latin influence on Greek**

The importance of linguistic policy in favor of Latin, if it existed at all, has probably been exaggerated (Adams 2003: 635–6), but the prevalence of Latin in the eastern provinces toward the end of the Empire is a historical reality. The influence of Latin on Greek has long been presented as relatively unimportant and less significant than the reverse phenomenon. Such a perspective may be justified if one takes only literary language into consideration. The majority of Greek authors during the Empire are impervious to the influence of Latin, especially when they attempt to reproduce the purity of Classical Greek. This is especially clear in the case of the authors of the Second Sophistic (see ch. 31), such as Lucian, who nevertheless must have known Latin. But the Greek historians, some of them working at Rome (Dubuisson 1979), all undergo influence of Latin, partly due to the subject matter of their writing, as was also the case with their Hellenistic predecessor Polybius (Dubuisson 1985). Examples include Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Strabo, Plutarch, Arrian, Appian (Famerie 1998), Cassius Dio (Freyburger-Galland 1997), and Flavius Josephus (Ward 2007). As Dubuisson (1979: 99) notes, all these writers understood and spoke Latin and were capable of reading Latin literature.

In order to present Roman realities to his audience, the Greek historian had three methods at his disposal: (i) transcription pure and simple (per transcriptionem), by which consul is rendered as κωνσούλ; (ii) the calque (per translationem), the creation of a word composed of Greek elements which correspond to the original, consul becoming σύμβουλος; (iii) equivalence (per comparationem), by which consul becomes ἦπατος (Dubuisson 1992b: 102). The same three-fold strategy can be applied to quaestor (Famerie 1999: 218–25): transcriptio (κ(ο)υαίστωρ) is rare, but translatio (ταμίας) is frequent in many Greek cities; comparatio (ζητητής) does not appear until very late.

Plutarch’s rapport with Latin is instructive in this regard (Dubuisson 1979: 95–7; De Rosalia 1991: 450–1; Setaioli 2007). This author deals with Latin in two ways, first at a practical and later at a formal and theoretical level. He was certainly able to communicate with his interlocutors in Rome and Italy when he was living there. The
duties resulting from his official appointments under Trajan and Hadrian must have made extensive knowledge of Latin a necessity for him. Later, no doubt during his retirement at Chaeronea when he composed the majority of his works, he must have spent much time and energy on the study of Latin texts, which he cites frequently and which he understands well in general. Geiger (2002) shows that at *Cato Minor* 11, in the narrative of the death of Cato’s half-brother, Caepio, and Cato’s reaction, Plutarch renders *verbatim* a Latin expression used by Munatius Rufus in his polemic against Caesar.

But it is the papyrological documents of the imperial period that give us the best idea of the receptivity of Greek to the influence of Latin (Daris 1991; Cervenka-Ehrenstrasser 1996-2000; see also ch. 37 in this volume). The borrowings are (i) in the sphere of public life, in particular government administration and the military; (ii) in social life (industry, commerce, agriculture); and (iii) private life (home and furniture, food, and clothing). Examples are *αὐγουσταλιανός* (*augustalianus* “functionary of the *officium* of the Augustal in Alexandria”); *βορδωνάριος* (*burdonarius* “mule driver”); *δέκρητον* (*decretum* “decree”; *κεντηνάριος* (*centenarius* “centurio”; *κορτίνη* *cortina* “tapestry.”)

Dickey (2003b) has analyzed the chronological distribution of Latin borrowings in Greek papyri. The statistics that she has established show clearly that the fourth century CE represents the period in which Latin borrowings are most numerous: 3,565, which is 102 Latinisms for 100 documents as against 1,380 for the second century and 1,329 for the third. The influence of Latin also shows in expressions that are directly translated from conventional Latin formulae. Thus the epistolary concluding formula *ἐρρῶσϑαι σε εὔχ(ομαι), φίλτ(ατε)* is nothing other than the translation of *ulere te opto* (Dickey 2004a). By the same token, the vocative title *κύριε* frequently found in the Greek papyri of the imperial period seems to be a translation of Latin *domine* (Dickey 2001; see also ch. 22).

As we saw, not only the translation, but also the transliteration of Latin administrative terms is possible. The latter allows of a direct import of Latin terms in Greek. The use of calques, which was prevalent for centuries, can still be seen as a sign of resistance to Latinization through the opposition to direct borrowing, which would signal acceptance. First-century BCE borrowings are still concerned with objects, titles, or customs that were unfamiliar to Greeks (e.g., *κεντυρίων* (*centurio*), *λεγίων* (*legio*)), but fourth-century CE borrowings enter the language even when a Greek word existed for the reality in question (e.g., *βέστη* (*vestis*), *ὅσπες* (*hospes*), *φαμιλία* (*familia*); cf. Dickey 2003b: 257).

The epigraphical record, too, is witness to this influence of Latin. The Roman government units stationed all over the Greek world, as well as the numerous commercial exchanges, brought a never-ending stream of Latinophones to the Greek world. The epigraphy of the Near East shows evidence of Latin influence on Semitic languages through Greek. The term *legio*/*legiōn* in the New Testament, is found in the inscriptions of Palmyra as LGYWN (Millar 1995: 405). In Asia Minor, where the influence of Latin clearly manifests itself in the borrowings evident in Greek inscriptions (Kearsley and Evans 2001: 157–62), bilingual funereal inscriptions, whether translations or Greco-Latin assemblages, show that the persons commemorated desire in the choice of language to show their belonging to the one or the other community (Levick 1995: 399).
FURTHER READING

On multilingualism in the Greco-Roman world, see Rotolo 1972 and Werner 1983 and 1992. Kaimio 1979 offers a broad synthesis and rich bibliography on the attitude of the Romans to the Greek language. His perspective is sociolinguistic theoretically, but in practice his approach is historical and literary, as he discusses historical and social contacts between Greeks and Romans, the use of Greek in official documents, the use of Greek in private life, and Greek as language of high culture. On these issues, Dubuisson 1981b and 1992b, Weis 1992, Rochette 1996c, Valette-Cagnac 2003, and Dupont and Valette-Gagnac 2005 should also be consulted. On the subject of linguistic politics, Petersmann 1998 offers a well-documented synthesis. For the linguistic aspects, in particular Latin borrowing from Greek, see Biville 1990–5. Biville 2001–3 discusses the various aspects of linguistic contact: interference, transfer, and fusion. Code-switching in Cicero has attracted much attention and has led to various lines of interpretation, e.g., Wenskus 1993 and 1998, Dunkel 2000, Adams 2003: 297–416, Swain 2002, and Dubuisson 2005. For contacts between Latin and other languages, see Adams 2003, who opens wide perspectives and surveys a wide range of materials. He insists in particular on the need to consider the phenomenon of bilingualism comprehensively and takes into account not only literary texts, but also subliterary sources that are closer to the actual experience of the language user. The study offers a wealth of bibliographical material. On the process of Latinization of the Greek world, see Rochette 1997. The collective volume edited by Adams, Janse, and Swain (2002) is of great interest for methodological purposes; it approaches the phenomenon of bilingualism from various perspectives and goes far beyond Greco-Roman bilingualism proper. For the Byzantine period, see Zilliacus 1935.

NOTES

3 E.g., Quint. Inst. 1.1.12–14, a text that highlights the respective status of Greek and Latin. See also Dubuisson 1992a: 195–9.