Alex Mullen

Post-doctoral Research Fellow

All Souls College, University of Oxford

Email: alex.mullen@classics.ox.ac.uk

All Souls College

Oxford

OX1 4AL

United Kingdom

T: +44 (0)1865 279352

'In both our languages': Greek-Latin code-switching in Roman literature

Abstract

After a short introduction to code-switching and Classics, this paper offers an overview of the phenomenon in Roman literature with some comments on possible generic restrictions, followed by a survey of Roman attitudes to the practice. The analysis then focuses on Roman letter writing and investigates code-switching in the second-century correspondence of Fronto (mainly letters between Marcus Aurelius, who became Emperor in AD 161, and his tutor Fronto). This discussion uses part of a new detailed database of Greek code-switches in Roman epistolography and is largely sociolinguistic in approach. It makes reference to *comparanda* in ancient and modern corpora where possible and highlights the value of code-switching research in responding to a range of (socio)linguistic, literary and historical questions.

Code-switching and Classics

The interaction of Greek and Latin languages and cultures is a defining feature of the Roman World and the majority of well-educated members of the western Roman elite were likely competent in both Latin and Greek language and literature (*utraque lingua docti* 'learned in both languages') during a large part of the late Republican and Imperial periods. Despite this, attitudes towards the Greek language oscillated between disdain and respect for what was considered one of their two languages. Roman commentators discussed this complex relationship and, though there was no rigid official linguistic policy, occasionally even Emperors made pronouncements on the appropriate use, or avoidance, of Greek: Tiberius, for example, rejects a Greek word in a senatorial decree and forbids testimony in Greek from a soldier (Suetonius *Tiberius* 71; Rochette, 1997). Studying Classics has always entailed an appreciation of this biculturalism but it is only more recently that we have fully engaged with modern bi- and multilingualism theory and practice and have more systematically extended our perspective beyond Latin and Greek,[1] literature and the elite (Adams, 2003; Biville et al., 2008; Cotton *et al.*, 2009; Mullen and James, 2012; Mullen, 2013a).

All the direct sources of linguistic code-switching for Classicists are written. Scholars have been at pains to demonstrate that the terminologies, models and concepts designed for bilingual speech can be applied, with caution, to the written evidence. In more optimistic moments some have ventured to suggest that our evidence might even be easier to handle than oral output. Swain notes that, whilst literature suffers from generic / stylistic interference effects and oral output is plagued by Labov's 'Observer's Paradox', ancient corpora such as Cicero's correspondence (that of a highly proficient balanced bilingual, written outside the constraints of 'high literature' and probably not intended for publication) might come 'close to solving a problem that besets research into oral communication' (2002: 145). But we need to be realistic about the range of issues posed by our ancient, written evidence. We often have to fill many gaps: [2] who are the authors; what are the dates and precise contexts; are we dealing with dictation or autography;[3] how do we reconstruct the manuscript transmission; what editing of the text has been undertaken (ancient, medieval and / or modern); how have texts been reordered (Beard, 2002; Freisenbruch, 2004: 43–57); how much has been lost and how secure are any restorations; what script(s) might the original author have employed; how can we reconstruct the intentionality and spontaneity of the language of the author? Sociolinguists struggle with numerous problems in analysing modern code-switching, but these are exacerbated when we tackle ancient written material. Awareness of the issues that researchers of the past face might remind sociolinguists of the pitfalls of making assumptions about modern contexts of interaction and intentionality and of the strengths and weaknesses of their own evidence.

The wealth of material from the ancient and medieval worlds may also serve to highlight the depth, breadth and complexity of the code-switching phenomenon. In the first part of this paper I present a brief survey as to which genres of Roman literature offer code-switching and which do not, and trace some attitudes towards the practice. In the main part of this paper I focus on code-switching in Roman letter writing. Commentators have tended to focus on the well-known Ciceronian correspondence (Adams, 2003; Elder, 2014; Swain, 2002), but I would like to expand our view to consider Fronto's *epistulae*, which include, amongst others, letters to and from the Emperors Marcus Aurelius (hereafter Marcus) and Lucius Verus from the mid-second century AD. An assessment will be made of the frequencies, types, functions and possible constraints of code-switching into Greek across this corpus, with comparison to the Ciceronian, Plinian and modern equivalents where appropriate. This analysis should allow us to consider the similarities and differences between the code-switching found in these letters and modern equivalents and between these and bilingual speech. It highlights the value of code-switching for investigating classical material and demonstrates the possibilities for comparative investigations.

Generic restrictions on code-switching in Roman literature

Code-switching was a linguistic reality for the Roman elite who created the bulk of our extant literature and the literature itself reports several examples in speech. Plutarch, the Greek historian-philosopher and Roman citizen, tells us that the late Republican Cassius spoke in Greek whenever he was feeling affectionate (φιλοφρονούμενος, Plutarch *Brutus* 40.2–3) and various versions of the assassination of Caesar describe Casca addressing his brother in Greek and Caesar addressing Casca in Latin but Brutus in Greek (Plutarch *Brutus* 17, *Caesar* 66; Suetonius *Iulius* 82). The second-century AD author Aulus Gellius, who knew the letter writer Fronto, provides us with testimony of conversations between Fronto and various interlocutors which contain a total of seventeen (all but one intra-sentential) code-switches from Latin into Greek. Seven of these may not properly be considered code-switches as they are simply the citation of the Greek words under discussion, but the other ten have functions which seem to reflect relatively accurately those in Fronto's correspondence: 6 'Greek term more appropriate'; 1 literary quotation; 1 proverb; 1 title of a comedy; 1 quotation of an interlocutor. Whether these conversations ever happened or not they are surely meant to strike the contemporary consumers of Aulus Gellius's oeuvres as naturalistic and representative of a linguistic reality.

More work needs to be undertaken on the precise nature of the spread of, and restrictions on, code-switching in Roman literature, but it appears that the choices made by authors might be influenced by two factors: the formality and social context of the genre and the *auctoritas* of key players. As Rochette (2010: 287–288) has neatly generalized: '[i]n 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';[4] Greek also means, of course, the language of slaves, mercenaries and traders. Given this cultural context we can follow scholars who have argued that third and second-century BC Roman comedy allows frequent code-switching both in the representations of lower-status speakers and behaviours (Shipp, 1955) and also in reflecting the bilingualism of the Roman elite (Jocelyn, 1999: 172). The tide changes when the Roman comedian Terence eschews the practice almost entirely and writes almost exclusively in Latin, perhaps in deference to Greek models of purity of language (using the equation *Hellenismos* = correct, unadulterated Greek, so *Latinitas* = correct, unadulterated Latin) and / or to assert Latin hegemony (Jocelyn, 1999: 173). Satire also admits code-switching as a reflection of in-group elite discourse and in its in-group lampooning, though Horace's rejection of the mode carries weight in the choices made by later satirists. Letters of the Roman upper echelons similarly employ code-switching as part of a range of linguistic resources designed to construct and reflect a sophisticated elite discourse.[5] All three of the major extant first-century BC to second-century AD letter collections, those of Cicero, Pliny and Fronto, contain code-switching into Greek. Cicero's correspondence offers around 1,000 code-switches into Greek, a carefully controlled linguistic practice determined by context.

This code-switching, it should be remembered, is not only practised by Cicero: about ten per cent of the letters are written to him by other members of his household and other elite correspondents, and his own letters sometimes cite the words of others. Through these examples we can establish that code-switching was part of a broader elite discourse, not merely a feature of Cicero's idiolect. Fronto's correspondence too is replete with letters from others: nearly three-quarters of the correspondence consists of letters between Fronto and Marcus, with each penning roughly as many letters to the other.

Roman elegy, lyric and epic did not tend to permit code-switching. Apart from the *Annales* of the Republican author Ennius, whose early attempt to bring epic to a Roman context relied heavily on Greek loanwords, rhythms, morphology, syntax, and occasional full-blown switches, the rest of Latin epic was imbued with Greek but not with code-switching. When we turn to the mass of Latin technical texts, we see that Roman writers, faced with the apparent overwhelming 'Greekness' of the subjects (Hutchinson, 2013: 31–32) and the 'poverty' of the Latin language (Lucretius 1,832; 3,260), fought to create a Latin discourse. Cicero launches a concerted effort to expand the functional range of the Latin language (*Tusculan Disputations* 1.1) and both he and Pliny the Elder attempt to move away from Greek and even apologize for its use (*Natural History* 2,13; 16,6; 21,28), though there were occasions when the citation of a Greek term was necessary. Langslow (2002: 38) notes the numerous Greek terms at various stages of integration into Latin in the thousands of pages of Latin medical texts, some of which may be single word code-switches, but only one of which occurs above the level of the word.[6] Writers of history, whether Sallust, Livy or Tacitus, also avoided code-switching in their Latin prose. One striking exception is Suetonius, though his decision to include Greek can be understood within the more anecdotal and 'autobiographical' context (Townend, 1960) and as a by-product of his choice of sources, including, for example, citation of letters, which, as we have seen, can admit code-switching.

Roman attitudes towards code-switching

Cicero's vast and diverse corpus provides a window onto first-century BC linguistic practices and attitudes amongst the upper classes. He self-consciously steered a careful linguistic path. In public contexts Greek could be a dangerous choice, as he found to his cost when his decision to address Greeks in Greece in Greek was described as an *indignum facinus* 'disgraceful act' (*In Verrem* 2.4.66). Accordingly, there are only a handful of possible code-switches across his voluminous public oratory. In Cicero's *philosophica* Greek is usually translated, explained or equivalents found and Greek quotations are translated, whereas they often appear in the original in his letters. Even in Ciceronian correspondence code-switching is carefully policed, only occurring between certain correspondents under certain conditions. He was aware that the practice of code-switching

could be ridiculed, and should be avoided in some contexts, as he mentions in his treatise on ethics dedicated to his son: 'for we ought to employ our mother-tongue, in case, like certain people who are continually dragging in Greek words, we attract well-deserved ridicule.' (*De Officiis* 1.111); and in the philosophical dialogue named the *Tusculan Disputations*: M. 'I'll put it [a saying of Epicharmus] into Latin if I can. For you know I am no more inclined to speak Greek in a Latin discourse than Latin in a Greek.' A. 'And rightly so.' (1.15). The first-century BC poet Horace, though he uses Greek morphology with Greek names, also attacks the code-switching of the earlier satirist Lucilius, ridiculing those that are impressed and saying that it is a dereliction of the *patria* and akin to the embarrassing mixed language of the Canusinians (*Sermones* 1.10.20–35).

Presumably code-switching is permitted in Cicero's letters because of the in-group context and the conversational register often employed. The Greek treatises on letter writing talk of a difference between rhetorical and epistolary style and of the similarity of the latter to conversation, though care is always taken to raise it above loose vernacular.[7] Cicero echoes this sentiment in expressing the importance of modifying styles according to context, and explains that the language of the law courts and public meetings differs from that in a letter, saying that 'as for letters, we weave them out of the language of everyday' (*Ad Familiares* 9.21.1). Probably inspired by the Ciceronian practice, the only Latin technical discussion of epistolography, the fourth-century AD *Ars rhetorica* 27 of Iulius Victor, specifically refers to code-switching in personal letters: 'it is pleasant to add some Greek to your letters, if it is not ill-timed or too frequent: and it is appropriate to use a well-known proverb, and a line of poetry or a bit of verse'. Fronto too praises one of Marcus's letters for its impressive interweaving of Latin and Greek: 'indeed all that Latin is interwoven by you and alternates with Greek verses as skilfully as the movements of the multi-coloured performers in the Pyrrhic dance when they run together blending now with these, now with those, dressed some in scarlet, others in yellow, and purple and violet' (VdH 8,20–9,3).[8] Marcus's letter from AD 145 that inspires this comment contains, within a mere 52 lines, 13 intra-sentential code-switches, plus 7 inter-sentential code-switches all of which are quotations from the *Odyssey*, except one from Callimachus.

Roman letter writing and Fronto

Some might question whether epistolography, so often stuck in the marginal space between literature and documents, can legitimately count as 'literature' but then the definitional fixity and value of the term itself are sometimes regarded as at the level of the 'phlogiston' (White, 2010: 90). Ancient letter writing of the type produced by elite Roman males such as Cicero, Fronto and Pliny offers a range of registers, but it rarely strays too far from literary standards and some letters reach the highest levels of polish and literary dexterity (Fleury,

2006; Hutchinson, 1998). When we approach high-society Roman letters we are in the realms of collections of aristocratic letter-headed missives, not scribbled notes. Roman letter writing had literary pretensions and also served an essential communicative purpose: our major corpora are overwhelmingly political, even when the content is not explicitly so, a life-line in fact for historians of certain periods (Whitehorne, 1977: 41). Letters served to replace the frequent face-to-face meetings of the elite when members were away from Rome on business in an increasingly vast Empire, for example when Pliny was governor of Bithynia-Pontus or Fronto was *quaestor* of Sicily. The political elite needed to stay abreast of developments in the centre and elsewhere in the provinces and would send streams of letters whenever possible.

Our letter writer, Marcus Cornelius Fronto, was born around AD 95 in Cirta, Roman Numidia (modern Constantine, Algeria), the descendent of apparently wealthy Roman colonists. He became a leading advocate at Rome (Dio 69.18.3) and a teacher of literary criticism and rhetoric. By the 120s Fronto was a senator and in 142 he was made *consul suffectus*.[9] He was appointed as Marcus's Latin teacher in 139 and continued until Marcus became co-regent and focused his attention on other studies in around 145. About this time the correspondence appears to have reduced in frequency, but even when Marcus became Emperor in 161 they still corresponded, though Fronto barely veiled his sadness at being side-lined. He died in around 167, ill and distraught, following the loss of his wife and grandson in quick succession. His last letters focus on these losses; earlier ones bemoan death too: five out of six of his own children had perished (Claassen, 2007).

Fronto is an overlooked character of Roman literature.[10] One reason is that his letters are a bizarre mix of the sublime and the mundane, clearly not to everyone's taste. At one moment we are reading about the finer points of stylistic practice and the next about diarrhoea.[11] We might also be put off by Fronto's old-fashioned literary tastes and his obsession with flattering the Emperors Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. Van den Hout notes how devastating the judgement of modern literati on this corpus has been, but offers an equally devastating qualification: 'Fronto was no simpleton, only a third-class writer' (1999: x). Van den Hout refers to Fronto's 'pure, simple style, with a great deal of colloquialisms (but not as many as Marcus's letters) and many a post-classical turn of phrase' (1999: x). But we should not be misled: the letters are mostly not slapdash outpourings in the vernacular; they are full of archaisms, quotations, proverbs, puns, alliterations, assonances, *figura etymologica*, homoioteleuta and other rhetorical features, all carefully chosen to impress and to instruct his correspondents.

Another reason for the restricted interest lies in the defective nature of the collection and text as transmitted to us and the issues with the available editions and translations, which constantly throw obstacles before any

analysis, not least a sociolinguistic one. These limitations should be made absolutely clear before we can proceed. The letters were perhaps not edited until the fourth century, and they were probably not prepared for publication by Fronto.[12] The text itself, which represents only part of the original *corpus*, was discovered by Angelo Mai in the early nineteenth century and in palimpsest: Fronto's letters seem to have been copied out in the fifth century and then the same manuscript used to record the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon in the seventh century. Mai used crude chemicals to try to read the earlier text and the resultant text is extremely difficult to restore, with numerous gaps and questionable emendations.[13] Van den Hout's 1988 edition of the Latin (replacing his own edition of 1954) has now become the standard text (hereafter VdH), though Holford-Strevens (1991) regrets that this is a diligent report of others' work rather than a full re-edition based on autopsy.[14] The standard translation of the texts into English, Haines's out-dated Loeb edition (1919–1920), is based on a reconstructed chronological ordering rather than the manuscript order of the letters (Gibson, 2012: 64), and proffers a faulty Latin text and imperfect translations.[15]

The problems with transmission and comprehension of this text are far from irrelevant to a sociolinguistic analysis: apparent examples of code-switching from ancient texts can easily be repeated in secondary literature and become fossilized, though the reading and / or interpretation may dissolve on scrutiny. In a few cases Haines's text and VdH differ as to whether the words of Greek origin are in Greek or Roman script (e.g. *hypothesim* at Haines, *Ad M.Caes*. iii.16.1, versus ὑπόθεσιν at VdH 49.10), a decision which may influence whether they are taken as a code-switch, as we will see below. In one or two cases the difference is not just in the script used but also the words, for example, we find *phonemata* in Haines's text (*De Eloquentia* 3.2) where we have ἴδια ῥήματα in VdH (148,14). At times the editors agree on the use of Greek script but not on the Greek, though in no instances does this significantly alter the functional analysis.

Language choice and categorization of code-switching in Fronto's correspondence

Marcus appears as Fronto's most regular correspondent; over 170 of the 232 extant letters are a result of this epistolary relationship. There are also letters to and from Lucius Verus, Antoninus Pius and some slightly less-towering figures (Pflaum, 1964). Most of the letters are in Latin, but seven are entirely in Greek. Four of these are written to Greeks: letters to and from the Greek historian Appian, a letter to the high-powered Greek Herodes Atticus, and a letter to Appius Apollonides, Greek secretary of Marcus and Verus (Eck, 1992). Marcus's mother, Domitia Lucilla, is the recipient of two letters. The reason for this linguistic choice has been debated: was she Greek, was Greek 'favoured by the ladies of the court' (Claassen, 2009: 67), or are there more subtle issues at play (Swain, 2004: 22–23; Wenskus, 2001)? The only other extant letter in Greek is written by

Fronto to Marcus on love, a topic with important Greek cultural and literary associations, and the guise of the Platonic dialogue allows him 'to get away with a lot here, in fact even more than he puts on paper' (Richlin, 2006a: 117). Indeed amatory matters broadly conceived, taking in *amicitia*, erotic love and affection, consistently draw out Greek, with 8.1% of the code-switches in the Latin letters sparked by the subject. Greek is the language of love *par excellence* in the Graeco-Roman world and enables specific homosexual possibilities to be implied, and, if necessary, denied by the pair, in a way that might have been impossible in Latin.[16]

Forty-seven letters, or c. 20%, display code-switching. Marcus writes letters containing code-switching marginally more often than Fronto, at a ratio of roughly 26%:20%, though the latter switches slightly more times in total than the former (63:61). The other correspondents provide so few letters that percentages are not meaningful. But what counts as a code-switch in these letters? We follow the definition of a code-switch as the full-blown switch from one language to another within a single text, in this case, a letter. It is distinguished from borrowing by its relative 'spontaneity' and the fact that the words used in the switches (in this case, Greek) are not used by monolinguals in the other language (Latin), i.e. it is a bilingual practice (see Gardner-Chloros, 2009). This might sound straightforward, but we know that in reality identifying switches can be extremely problematic and it is worth highlighting some problems which arise particularly when working on ancient texts. One obvious point is that we cannot ask directly what the writers think they are doing with their language. Nor is it always clear what might count as a borrowing, since we are dealing with a restricted volume of the total spoken and written evidence from the ancient world. For example, several Greek words are found in the Frontonian corpus in Roman script and Latinized, but not attested earlier (e.g. *daduchis* VdH 132,18) or not attested anywhere else in Latin sources (e.g. *opisthodomis* VdH 12,3). Does the fact that these words may not have been widely taken up in Latin matter? Or might it be enough for the word to have been accepted as Latin in the idiolect of the author for it to count as a borrowing and not as a code-switch? We have to remember that individual lexemes themselves should not have the exclusive label 'borrowing' or 'code-switch' inherently attached to them: they can be analysed differently depending on the circumstances. In making a decision on whether the rarely attested Latinized Greek terms in Fronto might be taken as code-switches or borrowings, we might be guided partly by the comments of a contemporary of Fronto. In a passage reported by Aulus Gellius where Fronto and interlocutors are discussing whether the Greek-origin word *nani* 'dwarfs' counts as a Latin word or not (Latin has its 'own' word *pumiliones* already), Apollinaris states that 'this word would at once have been granted citizenship or been made a Latin colony if you [Fronto] had deigned to use it' (19.13.3).[17] Careful attention to the text of Fronto's correspondence also helps to determine whether the Greek-origin words in Roman script might be regarded as code-switches or as borrowings: in nearly all the cases where Latinate

endings have been employed the context does not suggest a code-switch; the words may not be widely used borrowings but are integrated into the Latin discourse in these letters, akin perhaps to what Poplack and others have called 'nonce borrowings' (see e.g. Sankoff et al., 1990). Close reading of the correspondence suggests that, in this text at least, the Greek code-switches have on the whole been presented in Greek script. However, we need to be cautious: the Greek script might trick us into thinking that we can make easy decisions, but we cannot be sure whether the original authors made this script choice, or later editors, ancient or modern (Pelttari, 2011; Jocelyn, 1999: n.5).

A database was compiled of the code-switches in Fronto's correspondence to allow detailed analysis.[18] It contains information in the following fields: reference (Haines's edition); reference (VdH); author; addressee; date; citation of Greek code-switch; category of code-switch (inter- or intra-sentential); syntactic and grammatical information; function of code-switch; flagged; context; comments. Admittedly, the total number of switches (125) in the database from Fronto's correspondence is lower than in those often compiled by modern sociolinguists (e.g. Callahan (2004) treats over seven thousand examples), but nevertheless it was deemed important to scrutinize each code-switch and to allow some kind of qualitative *and* quantitative analysis. The Frontonian data is set within a bigger database which also includes Greek code-switches analysed under the same categories found in the correspondence of Cicero, Pliny and the corpus of Suetonius, which brings the total number of switches to around 1,500. The database is the result of a collaborative project involving the author and Olivia Elder and is available online.[19] The database allows direct comparison across the authors and has already been the basis for preliminary work on Cicero (Elder, 2014).

The first five headings require no explanation; the sixth, 'category of code-switch', does. Code-switches have been categorized in numerous ways over the last half-century, sometimes using inconsistent terminology. Here a relatively straightforward division has been chosen which seems to respond well to the material, that between *inter-sentential switching,* a switch in languages between sentence or clause boundaries, and *intra-sentential switching,* a switch within the sentence or clause boundary.[20] In the majority of cases the classification is relatively straightforward, though, for example, two instances caused hesitation since it was unclear whether διασκευῇ et παρεκβάσει 'elaboration and digression'(VdH 151,19) should count as one intra-sentential switch or two, and εἰκοστῷ demum ἔτει venisset εἰς πατρίδα γαῖαν 'at last after twenty years he had come to his fatherland' (VdH 6,10–11) as one or three;[21] it was decided that each should count as one given the coherence and co-occurrence of the terms (the second involves quotation from the *Odyssey* interspersed with Latin). A separate category of *tag-switching* did not appear to be relevant for Fronto's correspondence, despite its use by

Adams (2003) for describing code-switching in the ancient world (e.g. in funerary epitaphs). The subdivision of intra-sentential code-switches (for example following Muysken, 2000) was not undertaken, in part to avoid the straitjacket of any particular grammatical model and in part because my focus is sociolinguistic rather than structural / grammatical. Instead grammatical and syntactic information about the Greek switches themselves and the surrounding Latin were included for future investigation.

'Function of code-switch' is the most difficult of the categories to assign. Research on code-switching in writing is still developing and a survey of modern sociolinguistic analyses demonstrates the breadth of possible functions: from Valdés-Fallis's discussion of 'powerful bilingual images' (1977) and Lipski's rather binary view of the types of bilinguals behind certain types of code-switching (1982) to more recent work by Hess describing code-switching as 'a liminally creative and fertile linguistic underpinning for literary designs' which serves to 'underline central themes of alienation, transition and liminality' (1996: 17) and Omole's (1998) highlighting of the societal realism expressed by code-switching. A list of recurring functions of code-switches in writing might include all of those and the following: quotations; emphasis; clarification / elaboration; repetition; commentary; exclamation; directives; change of topic; change of interlocutor; parenthesis; idiomatic expression; symmetric alternation; triggered switch; stylistic; lexical need; interjection; expletive and so on (see e.g. Callahan, 2004, Montes-Acalá, 2001; also Gumperz, 1982, Poplack, 1980 (on speech)). But clearly different levels of analysis are operating here: the function of underlining central themes may be at a higher level than the discourse function 'exclamation', for example.

Code-switches in Fronto's correspondence were not categorized following any particular modern classification nor with conscious pre-judgment about the functional aims of the writers, rather they were assigned a categorization which best seemed to fit each example based on close reading. The resultant list of eight functions may therefore seem not completely coherent as a group, but has been generated by the evidence: description, exclamation, Greek term more appropriate, instruction / request, joke / wordplay, metalinguistic, naming, quotation (*Table* 1). Naturally any analysis of this kind is highly subjective (though colleagues checked the data), and is made even more difficult by the gap in time and space. This can only be plugged by a reconstruction, however inadequate, of the cultural context. In addition, code-switches cause problems in that they may fit into more than one category, so in the case of a request from Marcus to Fronto for reading to free him ἐκ τῶν κατειληφυιῶν φροντίδων 'from the cares that trouble' (VdH 105,16), this switch is perhaps intended to soften the request, to channel the associations of the Greek language with pleasurable reading and, possibly,

in the final word to play on Fronto's name. The database provides the most salient function of each code-switch as far as can be recovered, in a few cases more than one function is recorded.

A field was included to indicate where the use of Greek is explicitly flagged with phrases such as *Graeci…appellant* or *quae Graeci…vocant*.[22] These stand out in the text but are in fact only associated with a relatively small number of switches, under 10% of the examples, and are only employed by Fronto. Quotations from authors are often introduced, especially by Marcus, but this practice has not been included under the 'flagged' category as it tends to serve other purposes (citation of author and origin or point of the quotation) rather than expressly highlighting a change of language. A note has been made when it appears that a switch may have been, at least in part, triggered by the same or similar switch in a previous letter. This seems relevant in a handful of the cases, but in no instance seems to be the salient reason for the switch. A word of caution again should be sounded: Fronto's correspondence is a fragmentary collection and our earliest version, from the fifth century, itself subsequently jumbled, was not arranged in chronological order. Firm dates are rarely provided in the text and our chronological understanding of the letters has to be treated with caution (Champlin, 1974), so our 'time-line' for any triggering may be faulty.

An interpretation of code-switching in Fronto's correspondence

Code-switching in the corpus might be described as intermittent rather than frequent. A total of 125 examples occur across 277 pages of Latin Loeb text (Haines), or roughly on average 0.45 per page. A comparison with Cicero's correspondence, also in the Loeb format, suggests a similarity of practice here: Elder (2014: 14) reports an average of roughly 1.2 code-switches per page across the letters to Atticus, 0.3 in the letters *Ad familiares* (excluding correspondents who receive no code-switching) and 0.4 in the letters to Quintus. A similarity between the two Roman epistolary collections comes as no surprise: Cicero was a model for subsequent letter writers and Fronto repeatedly refers to the influential stylist. This kind of systematic analysis allows us to counter the impressionistic claim that: '[a]lthough Fronto considers Cicero's letters, with their conversational Latin spiced with Greek vocabulary, as the epitome of Latin style, his own is far less interspersed with Greek words, only occasionally a technical term such as σχήματα or εἰκόνες' (Claassen, 2009: 68). Fronto's correspondence in fact offers code-switching at a similar frequency to Cicero's correspondence with his brother Quintus.

The majority of code-switching in both sets of correspondence is intra-sentential. Only around 15 examples in Fronto's correspondence might be classed as inter-sentential out of a total of 125, around 12%. This figure

tallies with the Ciceronian correspondence where the inter-sentential switches reach only 9% (Elder 2014: 15). Montes-Acalá's corpus of code-switching in Spanish-English writing shows a higher percentage of inter-sentential switching, at around 30% (2000: 225). If we did not already know this from other evidence, the high percentage of intra-sentential switching would have encouraged us to see Fronto and Marcus as proficient balanced bilinguals. We know from other sources that Fronto would have learnt Greek in childhood with his paedagogus (Quintilian 1.1.12–13 recommends that Roman boys should learn Greek before Latin) and later in life with Greek teachers. His wife G/Cratia was possibly of Greek origin.[23] Marcus chose to write his *Meditations* in Greek and, of his four teachers in the arts of oratory and rhetoric, three taught Greek and only one, Fronto, Latin (*Historia Augusta* 2.1–4, Dio 72.35.1–2).[24] The intra-sentential switching serves also to reinforce and construct the intimacy between Fronto-Marcus that is so regularly and overwhelmingly expressed in the letters.

There is no space here for a detailed grammatical analysis of the intra-sentential code-switching in Fronto's correspondence, but now that a large database has been created for code-switching in several Roman authors, detailed comparative work can be undertaken.[25] Indeed, though a large proportion of modern socio-linguistic research, and to a lesser extent medieval (Schendl and Wright, 2011), has focused on modelling intra-sentential code-switching and the identification of linguistic constraints, counter-examples and the lack of consensus have led many scholars to admit that the theories do not propose universals, but rather strong tendencies. Classicists so far have been less interested in pursuing these lines of enquiry, partly due to the relative paucity and restrictions of our evidence, but also perhaps because Adams, the most influential commentator on ancient bilingualism, has been dismissive about the prospects: '[i]t seems to me perverse that some linguists have shown a desire to establish "universal" constraints on code-switching when there is as yet so little empirical data available about a practice which is undoubtedly familiar all over the world' (2003: 298).

An influential model, the Matrix Language Framework (MLF) of Myers-Scotton and co-workers (see recently e.g. Myers-Scotton, 2006: 233–287, Myers-Scotton and Jake, 2009; Gardner-Chloros and Weston, this volume) is extremely complex and has been subject to numerous revisions. A critic might wonder about the potential circularity in establishing whether a switch constitutes an 'embedded island' (EL) within the Matrix Language (ML) or not (there appears to be no firm diagnostic except that it does not follow 'the rules'), about the point that the model applies to 'Classic' code-switching (allowing everything that does not fit 'the rules' to be excluded) and about the fact that there is now so much flexibility in how the same parts of speech can be legitimately involved in a switch or not that 'the rules' might seem evanescent. It is noted that closely related

languages in contact might not follow the rules (Myers-Scotton and Jake, 2009: 339) and that begs the question what is left to test of the MLF on the code-switching between the closely related languages Latin and Greek. Nonetheless, assessment of the Roman material in the new database suggests that one of the most important tenets of the MLF, 'no chaos allowed' (or 'Uniform Structure Principle', Myers-Scotton and Jake, 2009: 336–337), does hold. Apart from in very unusual examples, such as the fragmented quotation cited on p. 10, the integrity of both languages seems to be preserved and the flow of the mixed discourse is never completely compromised, though occasionally a slight disjointedness may have been deliberately created for emphasis.

In Fronto's corpus many of the switches have Greek in Greek script, with Greek phonology and morphology, with very few examples of Latin 'morphemes' (as designated in the MLF). The example of an intrusive Latin conjunction 'et' in διασκευῇ et παρεκβάσει (VdH 151,19) stands out and does not follow the '4-M model' which states that 'most coordinating conjunctions are also content morphemes' (Myers-Scotton and Jake, 2009: 354) and therefore ought to be in the language of the switch (however the problem is solved if we see this as two separate switches!). Only a small number of the intra-sentential switches involve verbs, the majority concern nouns or noun phrases, often with adjectives. Where the readings are uncontroversial, most of these nouns and adjectives appear with Greek morphology, though there is one clear example of a Latin morpheme on a Greek noun: εἰκόνε 'simile' (VdH 41,22). This Greek word appears nine times in code-switches and elsewhere consistently appears with Greek morphology. The problem with dealing with manuscript transmission is that the difference orthographically between a Greek epsilon (the extant) and iota (the expected) is trivial and may be, for example, the result of miscopying. This near consistent use of Greek (EL) morphology needs to be investigated further as according to Myers-Scotton and Jake (2009: 347): '[w]hen the ML is a language with case assigning verbs (and/or prepositions), case markers are also outsiders. Almost without exception, EL elements receive the expected ML case marker as in […] (9), English *grass* is inflected with prepositional case from Russian [*grass*-e]'. Presumably the similarity of the case systems in Latin and Greek means that the same, or closely equivalent, case can easily be found, so Greek can be left to do the job. There is one way in which the complete Greekness of the switches is more consistently dented: of over forty single noun switches only five are given the required Greek article, in deference presumably to Latin where articles are not used. However, the MLF counts definite articles as early system morphemes and says they can be from either the ML or the EL (2009: 342), so this seems not to contravene 'the rules'.

Nine functions (*Table* 1) are assigned to the 125 code-switches in the correspondence (136 tokens given that a small number of examples had more than one salient function, see above). Over half of the instances (62.5%)

have been assigned to the category 'Greek term more appropriate', within which the sub-category 'literary / rhetorical / grammatical' is easily the largest with around 70% of the examples. This demands some explanation. The traditional texts of instruction and the language of instruction on literature, rhetoric and grammar in the Graeco-Roman world were Greek. Latin creates its own terminology and claims some ground over time, particularly from the Ciceronian era, but the origins are unmistakably Greek. Fronto is Marcus's teacher of Latin rhetoric and literature and many of the letters consider these themes; it is therefore completely natural that a lover of tradition such as Fronto should reach to Greek for the 'mot juste'. In some of these code-switches other functions might be involved, but the overwhelming function seems to be the need to express key terms in the language which created and promoted those terms: it taps into the external associations beyond the word itself to evoke a broader cultural world and, importantly, to delve into a shared education and learning between Fronto and Marcus (in the terms of Blom and Gumperz (1972), a metaphorical from a situational usage). Several of these words do not have precise equivalents in Latin, so could come under the banner 'lexical need',[26] but by the second century AD Latin has an elaborate lexicon and the motivation is more than simply filling gaps in the dictionary. The point seems to be that the Greek term is more appropriate to evoke the necessary cultural associations. At this juncture it is worth highlighting a potential terminological headache: I have used 'metalinguistic' to refer to the switches whose primary function is to comment on the use of language. Others, such as Swain (2004: 22), would refer to all the literary / rhetorical / grammatical terms used in Greek as 'metalinguistic' code-switching. This seems questionable: the texts in which these switches occur are discussions (of similes etc.) that could be termed 'metalinguistic', so the switch of language ought to be conditioned by another function.

The second most significant function is that of quotation at 26.5% of the total instances, which again, unsurprisingly, has literary examples leading the way at 72%, followed by imagined quotations, those of the author himself, correspondent or contemporary, and proverbs. Of the five examples of imagined quotations in Greek two involve Fronto concocting a philosophical discourse as he invokes the teaching of philosophy (which he despises), and another concerns Marcus fabricating a victory declamation for Fronto (who has won the prize for being the greatest lover). Philosophy, love and agonistic contexts all trigger Greek. Elsewhere it is clear that the literary and other quotations *could* have been translated into Latin, but are not. Cicero helps us to interpret: in a letter to Paetus he cites a Greek quotation in Latin but immediately makes the comment that 'this is better in Greek' (*Ad Familiares* 9.26.2) and remarks that Paetus can translate it, if he wants. Here Cicero explicitly flags the fact that something is lost in translation (probably that the Greek verb has a double sense which the equivalent Latin does not). If author and recipient both fully understand Greek and are happy to receive it,

translation is unnecessary, unless a point needs to be made, for example to an old-fashioned, conservative Roman such as Paetus.

Function of code-switch	Number of instances	% of total
Description	1	0.7
Exclamation	1	0.7
Greek term more appropriate (total)	*85*	*62.5*
---- Literary / Rhetorical / Grammatical	---- 59	---- 43.4
---- 'Love'	---- 11	---- 8.1
---- Medical	---- 2	---- 1.5
---- Politics / Law	---- 3	---- 2.2
---- Philosophy	---- 5	---- 3.7
---- Other	---- 5	---- 3.7
Instruction / request	4	2.9
Joke / wordplay	2	1.5
Metalinguistic	3	2.2
Naming	4	2.9
Quotation (total)	*36*	*26.5*
---- Imagined	---- 5	---- 3.7
---- Literary	---- 26	---- 19.1
---- Proverbial	---- 2	---- 1.5
---- Of self, correspondent or contemporary	---- 3	---- 2.2
Total	136	100

Table 1: **Functions of code-switches in Fronto's correspondence**

Fronto and Marcus explicitly use Cicero's letters as a model, which is why code-switching is admitted, but the functionality of the code-switching has a different feel. Elder has around twice as many functional categories for Cicero's code-switching and, though the two most commonly attested functions are quotations at 24% and 'Greek term more appropriate' at 21% (2014: 16), and therefore mirror the Frontonian experience, the code-switching in Cicero feels a much more varied practice and more difficult to categorize due to its multi-functionality. Now that the databases exist for both Fronto and Cicero, a detailed linguistic analysis of the specific types of Greek employed could be undertaken, but an impressionistic generalization might admit that Cicero's Greek covers a wider range of dialects and employs intricate strategies of coding, punning, partial quotations and allusion which are not so exploited by Fronto and Marcus. Cicero's code-switching seems more complex and yet also more 'conversational'. Elder has well over 200 Ciceronian switches categorized as 'descriptive' or 'referential', which is a category not even needed for Fronto's correspondence. Even further towards the conversational mode, Callahan's categorization of 7,366 Spanish-English code-switches in writing from the US between 1970 and 2000 has 60% assigned to a 'referential' function, and conversely a small proportion, only 7%, to quotation (Callahan, 2004: 75).[27]

The functional analysis presented here for Fronto's correspondence is at variance with Fleury's unsupported comments (2012: 65–66) that 'Greek is frequently used as formula [*sic*] for common expressions outside of all

literary referent. This practice suggests that, at least in bilingual circles, the use of Greek in this period was not seen as pedantic but was rather a common practice within the everyday experience of educated men.' Instead, it seems to reflect what Rochette has said about Greek in Pliny's slightly earlier Latin letters: '[w]hereas Cicero's Greek presents all the characteristics of a real *Umgangssprache*, Pliny's is more artificial and tied to the literary tradition' (2010: 289, see also Deane, 1918a, 1918b, Rochette, 2013). Even (or especially?) when Fronto and Marcus engaged in the most intimate and private discussions, they write with careful reflection and judicious analysis of the terms (Freisenbruch, 2004: 251): Marcus must be cautious not to commit errors in writing to his *magister* and Fronto has to negotiate a tricky relationship as *magister* to a *Caesar*. Letters are the realm of Roman literature where public and private are most consistently blurred and intertwined and the constant dilemma arises of 'how much of one's "self" to put on the line' (Freisenbruch, 2007: 238).

Fronto and Marcus perform epistolary code-switching in ways that both mirror and diverge from Cicero's practice. But we need to add some qualifications. We might label Cicero's code-switching more varied and more 'naturalistic', but this too is deliberate: even Cicero's most 'conversational' passages are carefully constructed and part of a strategy to promote, not biculturalism, but Romanness (Swain, 2002). Equally the more artificial and restricted code-switching we encounter in the Frontonian corpus does not necessarily mean that conversational code-switching was less commonly practised amongst the Roman elite of the mid-second century AD than in the mid-first century BC or that elite bilingualism was rarer. Again we have highly proficient bilingual elites employing 'both our languages' to create a Roman identity, but perhaps by this stage the division of labour has been confirmed for the languages and Romans are more confident in their own cultural strengths and in allowing the stage for Greek to channel certain cultural associations within a Roman discourse. Other historical, literary and epigraphic evidence suggests that societal and individual bilingualism in some respects might even be at its apogee in the second century AD (Rochette, 1997: 63) and the correspondence of the Roman elite will provide pieces for the linguistic puzzle.

Looking forward and back to Fronto

In 2001 McClure remarked that 'oral codeswitching has both a wider range of form than written codeswitching and also a wider range of functions' (188) based, at least in part, on a corpus where the two languages are represented by different scripts in opposite directions, posing no doubt some practical issues not relevant for oral switching. Lipski (1982: 192–193), conversely, was of the opinion that 'many, if not most examples– particularly in bilingual poetry–represent configurations that would be most unlikely to occur spontaneously in unreflective speech'. More recent work by Callahan (2004: 69) argued that there are no significant differences

between speech and writing in terms of functional or grammatical constraints, though Myers-Scotton's MLF did not completely hold for the dialogue sections of her US Spanish-English corpus. Differences clearly *do* exist between spoken and written code-switching,[28] particularly concerning practicalities, intentionality and the context of interaction (reader versus interlocutor), and we need, through collaborative projects, such as that represented by this special issue, to establish exactly what these are.

Variation in the use or avoidance of the practice and the modes employed are intimately linked with social circumstances, levels of bilingualism, attitudinal factors and the types of writing involved. Cross-culturally it seems that code-switching is more common in less formal genres (see Montes-Acalá, this volume) and certainly the *sermo purus* of proper *Latinitas* resisted mixing. Detailed empirical investigations into the form and function of code-switching across different genres, authors and contexts might help us to explain and perhaps even construct the cultural picture in the case of the ancient world. This chapter has aimed to show that the classical world offers interesting material for research into code-switching and has presented a preliminary analysis of the code-switching in the correspondence of Fronto and drawn comparisons with other material. As the databases multiply and are refined, this comparative work can be expanded and asked to respond to a range of linguistic and cultural questions. We will want to explore in detail the modalities of Latin-Greek code-switching in all its sociolinguistic complexity.

Acknowledgements

References

Adams JN (2003) *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beard M (2002) Ciceronian correspondence: making a book out of letters. In: Wiseman TP (ed.) *Classics in Progress: Essays on Ancient Greece and Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.103–144.

Biville F, Decourt J-C and Rougemont G (eds) (2008) *Bilinguisme gréco-latin et épigraphie*. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée.

Blom J-P and Gumperz JJ (1972) Social meaning in linguistic structure: code-switching in Norway. In: Gumperz JJ and Hymes D (eds) *Direction in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, pp.407–434.

Callahan L (2004) *Spanish/English Codeswitching in a Written Corpus*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Champlin E (1974) The chronology of Fronto. *Journal of Roman Studies* 64: 136–159.

Champlin E (1980) *Fronto and Antonine Rome*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Claassen J-M (2007) *Fronto avus*: the tale of a grandfather. *Akroterion* 52: 49–59.

Claassen J-M (2009) Cornelius Fronto: a "Libyan nomad" at Rome. *Acta Classica* 52: 47–71.

Cotton HM, Hoyland RG, Price, JJ and Wasserstein DJ (eds) (2009) *From Hellenism to Islam. Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davenport C and Manley J (2014) *Fronto: Selected Letters*. London / New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Deane SN (1918a) Greek in Pliny's letters. *The Classical Weekly* 12.6: 41–44.

Deane SN (1918b) Greek in Pliny's letters (concluded). *The Classical Weekly* 12.7: 50–54.

Dunkel GE (2000) Remarks on code-switching in Cicero's letters to Atticus. *Museum Helveticum* 57: 122–129.

Eck W (1992) P. Aelius Apollonides, ab epistulis Graecis, und ein Brief des Cornelius Fronto. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 91: 236–242.

Eck W (1998) M. Cornelius Fronto, Lehrer Marc Aurels, *consul suffectus* im J. 142. *Rheinisches Museum* 141: 193–196.

Elder O (2014) It's Better in Greek? Historical Implications of the Code-Switching in Cicero's Letters. Unpublished M.St. dissertation, University of Oxford.

Fleury P (2006) *Lectures de Fronton: un rhéteur latin à l'époque de la Seconde Sophistique.* Paris: Belles lettres.

Fleury P (2012) Marcus Aurelius' letters. In: Van Ackeren M (ed.) *A Companion to Marcus Aurelius.* Oxford / Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, pp.62–76.

Fleury P and Demougin S (2003) *Fronton: correspondence.* Paris: Belles lettres.

Freisenbruch A (2004) *The Correspondence of Marcus Cornelius Fronto.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge.

Freisenbruch A (2007) Back to Fronto: doctor and patient in his correspondence with an emperor. In: Morello R and Morrison AD (eds) *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.235–256.

Gardner-Chloros P (2009) *Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gibson R (2012) On the nature of ancient letter collections. *Journal of Roman Studies* 102: 56–78.

Gibson R and Morello R (2012) *Reading the Letters of Pliny the Younger: an Introduction.* Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.

Gratwick A S (1971) Hanno's Punic speech in the Poenulus of Plautus. *Hermes* 99.1: 25–45.

Gumperz JJ (1982) *Discourse Strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haines CR (1919–1920) *Fronto: Correspondence* (2 vols). London / Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Hess N (1996) Code switching and style shifting as markers of liminality in literature. *Language and Literature*
5.1: 5–18.

Holford-Strevens L (1991) The new Fronto. *Classical Review* 41: 76–80.

Holford-Strevens L (2000) Fronto. *Classical Review* 50: 460–462.

Hutchinson GO (1998) *Cicero's Correspondence: a Literary Study.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hutchinson GO (2013) *Greek to Latin: Frameworks and Contexts for Intertextuality.* Oxford: Oxford University
Press.

Jocelyn HD (1999) 'Code-switching in the comoedia palliata' In: Vogt-Spira G and Rommel B (eds) *Rezeption
und Identität. Die kulturelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Greichenland als europäisches Paradigma.*
Stuttgart: F. Steiner, pp.169–195.

Langslow DR (2002) 'Approaching bilingualism in corpus languages' In Adams J N, Janse M and Swain S
(eds) *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text.* Oxford: Oxford
University Press, pp.23–51.

Laes C (2009) What could Marcus Aurelius feel for Fronto? *Studia Humaniora Tartuensia* 10: 1–7.

Lipski JM (1982) Spanish-English language switching in speech and literature: theories and models. *The
Bilingual Review* 9.3: 191–212.

Malherbe AJ (1988) *Ancient Epistolary Theorists.* Atlanta: Scholars Press.

McClure E (2001) Oral and written Assyrian–English codeswitching. In: Jacobson R (ed.) *Codeswitching
Worldwide II.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp.157–191.

McDonnell M (1996) Writing, copying and autograph manuscripts in ancient Rome. *Classical Review* 46: 469–
491.

Montes-Alcalá C (2000) Attitudes towards oral and written codeswitching in Spanish–English bilingual youths.
In: Roca A (ed.) *Research on Spanish in the US.* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project,
pp.218–227.

Montes-Alcalá C (2001) Written codeswitching: powerful bilingual images. In: Jacobson R (ed.) *Codeswitching Worldwide II.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp.195–219.

Montes-Acalá C (2005) Selected proceedings of the second workshop on Spanish sociolinguistics. In: Sayahi, L and Westmoreland, M (eds) *Selected Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics.* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp.102–108.

Morello R and Morrison AD (2007) *Ancient letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mullen A (2013a) *Southern Gaul and the Mediterranean. Multilingualism and Multiple Identities in the Iron Age and Roman Periods.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mullen A (2013b) The language of the potteries: communication in the production and trade of Gallo-Roman *terra sigillata*. In: Fulford M and Durham E (eds) *Seeing Red: New Economic and Social Perspectives on* terra sigillata. London: Institute of Classical Studies, pp.97–110.

Mullen A and James P (eds.) (2012) *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Muysken P (2000) *Bilingual Speech. A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton C (2006) *Multiple Voices: an Introduction to Bilingualism.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Myers-Scotton C and Jake J (2009) A universal model of code-switching and bilingual language processing and production. In: Bullock BE and Toribio AJ (eds) *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-switching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.336–357.

Omole JO (1998) Code-switching in Soyinka's *The Interpreters.* In: Epstein EL and Kole R (eds) *The Language of African Literature.* Trenton, NJ / Asmara: Africa World Press, pp.57–72.

Pelttari A (2011) Approaches to the writing of Greek in late antique Latin texts. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 51: 461–482.

Pfaff CW (1979) Constraints on language mixing: intrasentential code-switching and borrowing in Spanish / English. *Language* 55.2: 291–318.

Pflaum H-G (1964) Les correspondants de l'orateur M. Cornelius Fronto de Cirta. In: Renard M and Schilling R (eds) *Hommages a Jean Bayet.* Brussels-Berchem: Latomus, Revue d'études latines, pp. 544–560.

Poplack S (1980) Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18.7–8: 581–618.

Poster C (2007) A conversation halved: epistolary theory in Greco-Roman antiquity. In: Poster C and Mitchell LC (eds) *Letter-Writing Manuals and Instruction from Antiquity to the Present.* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, pp.21–51.

Richlin A (2006a) Fronto + Marcus: love, friendship, letters. In: Kuefler M (ed.) *The Boswell Thesis: Essays on Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 111–129.

Richlin A (2006b) *Marcus Aurelius in Love*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Richlin A (2011) Parallel lives: Domitia Lucilla and Cratia, Fronto and Marcus. *Eugesta* 1: 163–203.

Rochette B (1997) *Le latin dans le monde grec: recherches sur la diffusion de la langue et des lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l'Empire romain*. Brussels: Latomus, Revue d'études latines.

Rochette B (2010) Greek and Latin Bilingualism. In: Bakker EJ (ed.) *A Companion to the Greek Language*. Malden / Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp.281–293.

Rochette B. (2013) Traces du bilinguisme dans la correspondance de Pline le Jeune. In: Garcea A, Lhommé M-K and Vallat D (eds) *Polyphonia Romana. Hommages à Frédérique Biville.* Hildesheim / Zurich / New York: Georg Olms Verlag, pp.469–481.

Rutherford RB (1989) *The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius: a Study.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sankoff D, Poplack S and Vanniarajan S (1990) The case of the nonce loan in Tamil. *Language Variation and Change* 2.1: 71–101.

Schendl H and Wright L (2011) (eds) *Code-Switching in Early English*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Sebba M, Mahootian S and Jonsson C (eds) (2012) *Language Mixing and Code-Switching in Writing: Approaches to Mixed-Language Written Discourse*. London: Routledge.

Shipp GP (1955) Plautine terms for Greek and Roman things. *Glotta* 34: 139–152.

Stowers SK (1986) *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Swain S (2002) Bilingualism in Cicero? The evidence of code-switching. In: Adams JN, Janse M and Swain S (eds) *Bilingualism in Ancient Society. Language Contact and the Written Text.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.28–167.

Swain S (2004) Bilingualism and biculturalism in Antonine Rome Apuleius, Fronto, and Gellius. In: Holford-Strevens L and Vardi AD (eds) *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.3–40.

Townend GB (1960) The sources of the Greek in Suetonius. *Hermes* 88.1: 98–120.

Trapp M (2003) *Greek and Latin Letters: an Anthology with Translation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Valdés-Fallis G (1977) The sociolinguistics of Chicano literature: towards an analysis of the role and function of language alternation in contemporary bilingual poetry. *Point of Contact* 1.4: 30–39.

Van den Hout MPJ (1954) *M. Cornelii Frontonis epistulae.* Leiden: Brill.

Van den Hout MPJ (1988) *M. Cornelius Fronto: epistulae.* Leipzig: Teubner.

Van den Hout, MPJ (1999) *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto.* Leiden: Brill.

Wenskus O (2001) Wie schreibt man einer Dame? *Wiener Studien* 114: 215–232.

Wenskus O (2003) Codewechsel bei Marc Aurel. In: Zybatow LN (ed.) *Europa der Sprachen: Sprachkompetenz, Mehrsprachigkeit, Translation.* Frankfurt: P. Lang, pp.305–315.

White P (2010) *Cicero in Letters: Epistolary Relations of the Late Republic.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Whitehorne J (1977) Was Marcus Aurelius a hypochondriac? *Latomus* 36: 413–421.

Wilcox A (2012) *The Gift of Correspondence in Classical Rome: Friendship in Cicero's Ad familiares and Seneca's Moral Epistles.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Zetzel J (2000) Review of Van den Hout, MPJ (1999) *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto.* Leiden. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2000.07.26.

---

[1] This paper is focused on Greek-Latin code-switching in Roman literature, but it should be remembered that other languages very occasionally surface in that literature too, for example, Punic in the *Poenulus* of Plautus, see Gratwick, 1971.

[2] These issues can be added to when dealing with code-switching in non-literary, archaeological material such as funerary epigraphy or inscribed pottery, as we are often confronted with even more contextual holes, see e.g. Mullen, 2013b.

[3] Elite Roman letter writers would usually employ a secretary to take their dictations (McDonnell, 1996). Indeed the majority of Marcus's letters were dictated (VdH 63,14–15), but he was praised for writing personally to his closest associates, e.g. Fronto (Dio 72.36.2). Indeed autograph letters between Marcus and Fronto appear to be the norm and a lapse elicits excuses, usually physical incapacity (Freisenbruch, 2007: 251–253).

[4] There are, of course, exceptions, see e.g. Macrobius *Saturnalia* 2.3.

[5] For recent work on the genre, see Gibson and Morello, 2012; Morello and Morrison, 2007; Stowers, 1986; Trapp, 2003; Wilcox, 2012.

[6] Pelagonius *Ars veterinaria* 268.3–4.

[7] For Demetrius, Ps-Demetrius, Ps-Libanius, Philostratus of Lemnos and Gregory of Nazianzus on letter writing, see Malherbe, 1988 and Poster, 2007.

[8] In a short discussion of Marcus's code-switching, Wenskus (2003: 312) notes that she can see Fronto warning Marcus about the risks of over-doing code-switching here; this is not my understanding of the passage.

[9] AD 142 as demonstrated in Eck, 1998, rather than 143 as in Van den Hout, 1999 vii.

[10] Perhaps Laes (2009, 2) is right when he speculates that it may be the bad reputation of the letters in terms of both content and style that has kept the social and cultural historians largely at bay. I suspect that the quality of the text and editions and (especially in the nineteenth century) the possible pederastic content have also been off-putting factors.

[11] For the leitmotif of medical matters and the charge of hypochondria, see Freisenbruch, 2004: 145–186; 2007; Whitehorne, 1977.

[12] Freisenbruch, 2004: 23–30 has details of the publication debate.

[13] See Freisenbruch, 2004: 15–60 for the transmission and editing.

[14] The commentary based on this text, Van den Hout (1999), is rich (though again not without faults, see Holford-Strevens, 2000; Zetzel, 2000), and refers directly to VdH by page and line number, rendering this edition of the text indispensable.

[15] The most recent English translation and commentary, Davenport and Manley, 2014, tackles only fifty-four of over two hundred letters. Richlin's 2006b translation is also selective. Fleury and Demougin, 2003 provides most of Haines's text with facing French translation. All the translations in this paper are my own.

[16] Richlin (2006a and 2006b) focuses on the nature of the relationship between Fronto and Marcus Aurelius (the homosexual nature of which is denied by Laes, 2009).

[17] The idea of non-Latin words becoming Roman through the granting of citizenship, that most 'Roman' of concepts, also appears in Seneca: 'since the word "analogy" has been admitted to citizen rank by Latin scholars, I do not think that it ought to be condemned, but I do think it should be brought into the citizenship which it can justly claim. I shall, therefore, make use of the word, not merely as admitted, but as established' (*Epistles* 120.4) and Suetonius: 'for you, Caesar, can confer citizenship on men but not on a word' (*De grammaticis* 22).

[18] I have not included ambiguous examples in Latin script, but save these for more detailed discussion elsewhere.

[19] A publically available, searchable version of the database can be found at <http://codeswitches.classics.ox.ac.uk>.

[20] See Poplack, 1980 for the terminology, also Mullen, 2013a: 74–94. Some scholars use 'code-switching' to refer to 'inter-sentential switching', and 'code-mixing' for 'intra-sentential switching', see Muysken, 2000: 1.

[21] See the special issue of *International Journal of Bilingualism* (2000, vol. 4) for a system of coding for complex language interaction phenomena in oral evidence, where attention is drawn to problems of this kind.

[22] See Pfaff, 1979: 297–298 for modern equivalents.

[23] See Richlin, 2011 for the debate on and possible relevance of the first initial of Fronto's wife's name (preferring *Gratia*) and the contention that Champlin (1980: 26, 151) is wrong about her probably being from Ephesus.

[24] For the meditations, see Rutherford, 1989.

[25] For a cursory attempt with the Ciceronian material, see Dunkel, 2000.

[26] For switching into Greek for 'lexical need', see Vitruvius 5,4,1.

[27] Very little work on code-switching in modern letter collections has so far been undertaken (Montes-Alcalá, 2005: 102). Montes-Alcalá's own study on letters and notes is too cursory and the data too lacking in contextualization to be used here (we are not told about the precise size of the corpus or how many examples of code-switching were analysed).

[28] Written code-switching allows for complexities in visual representation, such as page layout, images, writing styles etc., which require proper analysis, see Sebba, Mahootian and Jonsson, 2012.