Classical Quarterly **53.2** 530–575 (2003) *Printed in Great Britain*

THE NEW VINDOLANDA WRITING-TABLETS

I. INTRODUCTION

The third volume of Vindolanda writing-tablets[1] is particularly rich in new evidence for the history of Latin at a subliterary level. In this paper I discuss the linguistic features of the latest texts, and offer some interpretations of various words and usages that are relevant to the understanding of the documents in which they occur (see particularly below, pp. 552ff. on the letter of Maior [645]).

The tablets continue to throw up unattested or rare words or usages (for the first category see the editors on *infiblatoria*, *turdaris*, *anataris*, and below on *internumero*, *braciarius*, *cicnaris*, *curua* (?), *axio* (?), *scandella*, the form *senapidis*, the use of *fussa*, and the form *pestlus*; for the second see below, for example, on *ebriacus* (?), *magirus* (?), *contrullium*, *cocinatorium*, *segosius*, *uertragus*, *perporto*, *uitus*), and usages found only at a much later date (see on *expello*, *cimussa*, *lucernula*, *carrulum*, *glutem*, *pariter* + *esse*, and some of the words just listed). Sometimes the significance of a new item to the history of the language is considerable, as we will see in the case of the lexicalized verb-phrase *potest fieri*, which foreshadows a Romance usage. The form *habunt* is also of Romance significance. *Vectura* appears for the first time with a meaning with which it is reflected in some Romance languages; in this sense it is otherwise attested in Latin only in the medieval period, more than a thousand years after the example at Vindolanda, and then merely re-Latinized from early Romance. The tablets are a reminder that we know little about the language in everyday use, and that the rarity of a word or usage in extant literature does not mean that it was rare in speech. Yet despite the scattering of unique or unusual items across the documents, there is a unity about many of the Vindolanda tablets that becomes more apparent as more texts are published. There are reasons for this. Most of the texts were the output of a small literate group in military outposts. A good deal of the writing will have been done by a class of scribes who had received much the same training. There is a markedly consistent use of correct spellings, as I have noted before, which contrasts with the profusion of phonetic spellings found in other subliterary texts of much the same period (such as the Pompeian graffiti and the letters of Terentianus). I am thinking, for example, of the regular, correct, use of final *-m*, the avoidance of *e* for *ae*, and the correct use of short *i*, which had become a close *e* and is often elsewhere spelt as *e* (but see below, section III).

But it would not do to exaggerate this unity, for different educational levels and registers are also represented. Writers who admit a cluster of misspellings (and there is at least one, a certain Florus, in the new material: see below, sections III and IV) against the general norm of correctness were probably not members of the military scribal class. Their efforts allow us to get beneath the veneer of literacy to the underlying patterns of speech. At this lower social level it is interesting to find several possible parallels between the Latin of the tablets and that of the mime writer Laberius (on whose taste for 'sordid' words in use among the *uulgus*, see Gell. 16.17.4, 19.13.3). By contrast some of the writing in the letters is learned and bureaucratic, and hints at

[1] A. K. Bowman and J. D. Thomas, *The Vindolanda Writing-tablets (Tabulae Vindolandenses III)* (London, 2003). I am extremely grateful to the editors for giving me access to their readings in advance of publication, and for making numerous comments on various versions of this paper.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the superior educational level of a few of the officers. There is a new fragment by a woman (635; also perhaps 661), in which the placement of a pronoun reveals the continued vitality of Wackernagel's law (see p. 550). Finally, for the influence of register I would draw attention to the possible motivations of the form *senapidis* discussed below, section V.

The conservatism and consistency of the literary practices of the scribes are in no sphere clearer than in the use of punctuation. Trends observed in the earlier material are now abundantly confirmed in the new texts. I start with punctuation to bring out the unity to which I refer.

II. PUNCTUATION

Apices

Over long vowels
(1) *o*
611 *Flauió*, possibly *tantó*, 613 *Flauió*,[2] 628 *rogó*, *uexsilló*, *rogó*, 631 *suó*, 632 *Flauió*, 640 *occasió*, 641 *Ṃarinó*, 644 *Flórus*, 645 *meó*, *gesseró*, *egó* (twice), *Cocceiió*, *Maritimó*, 648 *Flauió*, 652 *fació*, 663 *Priscinó*, 666 *benefició*, 693 *illórum*, 706 *immó*
Total in letters: 22 or 23
580 *Licinió*, 581 *stabuló*, 608 *[r]ạtió*
Total in other documents: 3
(2) *a*
622 *Lepidiná* (?),[3] 628 *praecipiás*, 640 *á*,[4] 645 *fussá*, *morá*
Total in letters: 4 or 5
588 *á*
Total in other documents: 1

There are 30–2 apices correctly placed over long vowels. All are over either *o* or *a*, a feature also of the earlier tablets.[5] The new evidence, like that of the earlier texts, is suggestive of some sort of instruction given to scribes.

Twenty-five or 26 of the 30–2 apices are over *o*, a proportion of about 81 per cent. A similar characteristic was found in the earlier tablets (where about 32 of the 55 apices are over that letter).[6]

If the monosyllable *a* is left to one side, every correct apex but two (*Flórus*, *illórum*) is over a long vowel in final syllable.[7] This constant pattern suggests to me either that a stylized form of writing is at issue, such that writers, if they remembered, signed off words ending in one or the other of the two long vowels with a sort of flourish, or, if a linguistic explanation is to be sought, that long vowels in final position were subject to shortening in speech, and that scribes were encouraged to use the apex as a mnemonic for preserving the 'correct' quantity.

Rather more apices are used in the letters than in the accounts and other documents

[2] On 615.B.4 the editors note that there is possibly an apex mark over the *o* of *ego*.
[3] See the editors ad loc. on the reading here. Immediately before the name the editors suggest *ç[um tu]ạ*, and remark that there may be a trace of an apex over the *a*.
[4] On the text here, see the editors.
[5] J. N. Adams, 'The language of the Vindolanda writing tablets: an interim report', *JRS* 85 (1995), 97.
[6] See the lists in ibid. 97.
[7] Cf. ibid. 98 for the high incidence in the earlier tablets of apices on final syllables.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(about 87 per cent of the total are in letters), and a significant number (as was the case in the earlier tablets) are on names in the address of letters (for example, all four cases of *Flauió*). It would seem that there was a certain stylization about the use of the apex which made it more appropriate to creative or formal composition (that is, letters, particularly in the address) than to mundane lists.

Over short vowels
628 *dómine*, 645 *uólui*, *itá* (but the text is not certain here); also possibly 611 *mágis*, 796 *dómine*. At 588.a.i.1 the editors read *t.[c. 6].á*, suggesting with some hesitation *tr[ansla]tá*. If this reading were correct the apex would almost certainly be over a short *a*.

Four possible cases are on stressed syllables. There may be a reflection here of a tendency for short vowels in stressed syllables to be lengthened. Alternatively (and the other examples favour this possibility), the constant use of the apex over (long) *o* and *a* might sometimes have caused it to be used mechanically over these letters (particularly in final syllables) even if the vowel was short.

At 693, one of the minor (fragmentary) texts (a letter), there is a case of *diligenter* with what looks like an apex over the *n*: was it perhaps intended for the preceding *e*? At 734 there is a fragment *fráṃ* where the apex is clear. This may be the start of a personal name.

Interpuncta

The regular use of interpuncta between words is said to have faded in the middle of the first century A.D.,[8] and many of the new documents have none at all. There were, however, clearly still some conservatives who aspired to divide words in this way. One of the letters (650) and one of the other documents (597) have them throughout (cf. also 593, in which they are frequent), with the odd omission. I quote the letter:

ut · reṃiṭṭaṭ · meos · denariọs
ṣụṃ .aṣṣiṣ... ṣịtra
conscienṭiam · praefeṣti
sui · saluta · Verecunḍaṃ
et Sanctum · Ḷọ..um · Capito-
ṇem · et · omnes · ciues · et
ameṣos · cum quịbus · opto
bene ualeas · ..[ ] *vacat*?

There is no point between *et* and *Sanctum* (contrast *et · omnes*; the first case may be a slip), or in the prepositional expression *cum quibus* or the verb phrase *bene ualeas*. The omission of points after prepositions may reflect the proclitic character of the preposition and the pronunciation of the expression as a single word.[9] The writer might have felt that *bene ualeas* had the status of a compound. There are other documents in the new corpus where prepositional expressions lack interpuncta, as 618, 659, 588.1, 2. A notable example is the line *quae · ad officium · tuum* at 618.

Elsewhere I have discussed the emerging 'grammatical' use of points to mark off not individual words but sense units, constructions, and the like.[10] There is no great

[8] See ibid. 95 with bibliography.
[9] See ibid. 96 with bibliography.
[10] J. N. Adams, 'Interpuncts and the enclitic character of personal pronouns in Latin', *ZPE* 111 (1996), 208–10; cf. Adams (n. 5), 96.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

consistency to be seen in this respect in the recently published texts, but a few instances are worthy of note. Fairly consistently in 596 interpuncta are used as in line 3: *infiblatoria n(umero) VI · s(ingulare) · (denarios) XI ṣ(emissem)*, 'cloaks 6. Each: 11.5 denarii'. And at 582.b.3 (*suṃ(ma) · pull(orum) ṇ(umero) XXI*) the point may mark a heading; or does it in this case indicate an abbreviation?

III. VOWELS AND DIPHTHONGS

In my earlier article I noted that evidence for the merger of long *e* and short *i* as close *e* (a development that manifests itself in the misspelling *e* for short *i*, and anticipates a feature of the vowel system of most of the Romance languages)[11] was scarcely to be found in *Tab. Vind.* II.[12] But that need not necessarily mean that the merger would not have been heard at Vindolanda; rather, the absence of misspellings may merely indicate that those responsible for much of the writing at Vindolanda were well enough educated to be able to spell such forms in the traditional way, however they pronounced them. For the same reason there are very few cases in *Tab. Vind.* II of *e* for *ae* or of the omission of final *m*. But clear signs of the vowel merger at Vindolanda are now to be found in two letters of a certain Florus found on a single tablet (643) and written in a single hand. I quote the letter in full, using bold to highlight the relevant examples:

i

Floruṇ[s] Calauiro suo
saluṭ[e]m arculam clusa
ẹt res quequmque iniị
.]ạ coṃclusae su[n]ṭ **dabes**
....].o **benifeciạrio**
....]**signabet** anulo
traces?

ii

Florus Tito suo ṣạḷutem
frates securem quam iṇ
casula habea **dabes** Ḍạṃ[..
qui..[.....].ctiliạ[..
dabet et ut re[[.]]ddat
traces ?

Margin: opto benẹ [

Back: neque eạm ẹị ḍab[e]ṣ nisi
iṇ carrulo eaṃ ponạ[t] conti-
nuo Ingenua uos saluṭ-
tat u[e]stra filiạ
Caelouiro **dabeṣ**

[11] For the Romance significance of the merger, see e.g. V. Väänänen, *Introduction au latin vulgaire* (Paris, 1981[3]), 29–30. In early Latin *e* is sometimes written for short *i*, apparently in reflection of the similar articulation of the two vowels in the early period (see e.g. R. Wachter, *Altlateinische Inschriften. Sprachliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Dokumenten bis etwa 150 v. Chr.* [Bern, 1987], 305–6, 487–8), but by the empire the same misspelling presumably reflects the later vowel merger of long *e* and short *i* as close *e*.

[12] Adams (n. 5), 91.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the light of this document it can now be taken as certain that the absence of such forms in *Tab. Vind.* II was due to chance, and to the general literacy of the scribes. There are as well in the above letters instances of final *m* and final *s* omitted (i.2 *arculam clusa*; ii.3 *habea* [see below]) and of the spelling *e* for *ae* (i.3 *res quequmque*). Final *m* is usually written; there is one correct case of *ae* (*comclusae*), and a possible example in a foreign name, *Caelouiro* (i.Back 5), which seems to appear at the start of the first letter in the form *Calauiro*. Typically, a writer of lower educational level who admits any one of these misspellings is likely to admit all or some of the others as well, because he was spelling phonetically and any one phonetic spelling is as likely to occur as any other. There was the case in *Tab. Vind*. II of the letter of Octavius (343), which has an accumulation of misspellings of types not found for the most part in the rest of the volume.

All but one of the instances of *e* representing the close *e* emergent from the vowel merger are in verb endings. The spelling of *beneficiarius* is of a different kind: in adjacent syllables in a long word, two vowels (the second and third) have been reversed. I assume that the writer pronounced all of the first three vowels as close *e*, but was aware that in the written form of the word there was some alternation between *e* and *i*. He chose the wrong place for *i*.

Verb endings of the above types are never correctly spelt in the letters of Florus. Short *i* is sometimes correctly written, but for the most part under the accent, in hiatus where it was now the norm (see below), and in the preposition or prefix *in*. There is also a case in initial syllable before the accent (i.6 *signabet*). There would seem to be evidence here that the vowel merger was more marked in final syllables. Vowels in final syllables had throughout the history of Latin been prone to weakening of one sort or another,[13] and it is not unlikely that the vowel merger in the front-vowel system had established itself first in this position. There are many cases at Pompeii of the spellings *-es* and *-et* in the present tense of third conjugation verbs, and also a few in the third person in perfects such as *dixet*, *fecet*, and *fuet*.[14] Väänänen (*Inscript. pomp*.) is inclined to allow the possibility of substrate (Oscan) influence (see p. 22 with 130) at Pompeii,[15] but that explanation can be ruled out at Vindolanda. Such spellings there are a reflection of developments in popular Latin itself. The spelling *dabes*, found three times in the letters, also occurs three times in the address of letters at Vindonissa (for example, 15 *dabes S(exto) Caluo militi legionis*; cf. 31, 53).[16] It would be easy to list examples of *e* for short *i* in verb endings from other places. See, for example, *Graffiti del Palatino* I.304 *dicet*,[17] II.283 *futuet* (for *futuit* in the same expression, see II.286); Terentianus, *PMich*. VIII.468.38 *uolueret*, 41 *aiutaueret*, 471.33 *dicet*; and below for *fecet* at *CIL* II.2997.

For another manifestation of the effects of this vowel merger in a letter, again in a final syllable, see 642 *perporta obiter* ***ụbe*** *carra tua subinde ueniunt*.[18]

[13] See e.g. Adams (n. 5), 98.

[14] V. Väänänen, *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes* (Berlin, 1966[3]), 21–2.

[15] So V. Moltoni, 'Gli influssi dell'osco sulle iscrizioni latine della Regio I', *RIL* 87 (1954), 220–1, sees Oscan influence in the numerous forms of this type which she cites from the inscriptions of Regio I. Whatever one makes of Moltoni's interpretation of the evidence, the collection of material itself is of use.

[16] M. A. Speidel, *Die römischen Schreibtafeln von Vindonissa* (Baden-Dättwil, 1996) for the texts.

[17] V. Väänänen, *Graffiti del Palatino*, I: *Paedagogium* (Helsinki, 1966), II: *Domus Tiberiana* (Helsinki, 1970).

[18] The final *i* was subject to iambic shortening. Cf. J. N. Adams, *The Vulgar Latin of the Letters*

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Only occasionally does one come across a text with such a high proportion of substitutions of *e* for short *i* as that in the letters of Florus: see, for example, *CIL* II.2997 *Valerio Libero Valeria Leolonina coiogi merentessemo et Liberio filio karessemo fecet d(e) s(uo)*. Here *i* is written in hiatus four times, but the five other expected cases of short *i* are replaced by *e*. In this respect, then, the spelling of the inscription is completely phonetic; the juxtaposition of *fecet* with *karessemo* and *merentessemo* puts the *e* in the verb ending in the same category as the *e*s in the other words, and undermines any attempt to find Oscan influence in such endings.

The spelling *amecos* is possibly found in the letter 650 (the reading is not absolutely certain). The *ei* diphthong (as in original *ameicus*) developed to long *i* in Latin,[19] but in early inscriptions there is a (dialectal?) variant *e* perhaps representing a long close *e*.[20] At Paul. Fest. (14.13) *amecus* is noted as an old form (*ab antiquis autem ameci et amecae per E litteram efferebantur*). There is evidence that an *e* pronunciation for original *ei* lingered on into the late republic and even early empire as a dialectalism. Varro, *Rust*. 1.2.14 refers to a 'rustic' pronunciation *uella*, and a speaker at Cic. *De Or*. 3.46 mentions a 'broad' pronunciation of Cotta (such that the 'letter' *i* was replaced by a 'very full' *e*) as resembling that of *messores*.[21] In the early imperial period there are some such forms at Pompeii, including a case of *amecus* (*CIL* IV.3152; cf. *CIL* XIII.3430 *[a]meca memoria(m) tuam*).[22]

The evidence of the distribution of the spelling in the later period (that is, the first century B.C. and the first century A.D.) and of the comments on the 'rusticity' of the pronunciation which it reflects implies that it was seen as a regionalism and belonged down the social scale.

The spelling *consụbrino* at 761 (= *consobrino*) is common in inscriptions and manuscripts.[23]

Hiatus

The spellings (646) *ḅraciiario* for *braciario* (< *bracis*: of someone operating with *bracis*: see below, p. 562), and *Cocceiio* for *Cocceio* (645 back) contain an additional *i* representing a glide ([j]) inserted between vowels in hiatus.[24] In the graffiti of La Graufesenque there are numerous cases of *I longa* (representing the semivowel) in such a position (for example, 66.7 *mortariji*).[25] Cicero recommended the writing of *Maia* and *Aiax* as *Maiia* and *Aiiax* (see Velius Longus, *GL* Keil VII.54.16–17, Quint.

of Claudius Terentianus (Manchester, 1977), 8 for this type of spelling in the final syllable of a disyllabic subordinating conjunction (*nese*).

[19] M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (Munich, 1977[7]), 62–3.

[20] Ibid. 63–4.

[21] On the interpretation of this passage, and for further details of the spelling *e* for *ei* in early Latin, see R. G. G. Coleman, 'Dialectal variation in Republican Latin, with special reference to Praenestine', *PCPS* 216 (1990), 6.

[22] Väänänen (n. 14), 23.

[23] For discussion of the form, see B. Löfstedt, *Studien über die Sprache der langobardischen Gesetze* (Uppsala, 1961), 84–5.

[24] On this phenomenon, see e.g. Väänänen (n. 11), 45, id. (n. 14), 48–9, but citing very little evidence. See further Leumann (n. 19), 127; H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae* III.2, index p. 822 (with a small collection of material); and A. K. Bowman and J. D. Thomas, *The Vindolanda Writing-tablets (Tabulae Vindolandenses II)* (London, 1994), on 344.4–5. The evidence for the glide [w], as in *clouaca* for *cloaca*, is rather better.

[25] R. Marichal, *Les graffites de La Graufesenque* (Paris, 1988), 64. Some such examples are in texts arguably written in Gaulish, but the example quoted is in a text with a Latin heading.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1.4.11), and *maior* is sometimes written with a double *i* (for example, *CIL* II.1964, col. iii.10 *maiiorem*).

Treatment of Greek upsilon

In early borrowings from Greek, upsilon was usually rendered into Latin as *u* (for example, *bursa*, *buxus*, *cumba*).[26] *i* was also used, particularly later, alongside a learned spelling with the imported letter *y*.[27] There were by the time of the tablets so many representations available that uncertainty was generated, and we find some oscillation between one form and another. Thus at 594 there is the spelling *amilum*, whereas at II.204.5 *amuli* is the form used. At 588 there is a case of *thumum*. Both *tum-* and *tim-* are reflected in the Romance languages (see *REW* 8723).[28] *Cicnares* at 593 (*laquios · iii cicnares*) is a derivative of *cyc*[*-g*]*nus* (< κύκνος), of which the Romance reflexes derive partly from the form *cignus* (Italian *cigno*, and so on), and partly from *cicinus*.[29] The *TLL* does not give much coverage to the forms of *cycnus* and its derivatives, but this may be the first, if not the only, case of *cicn-*. On the suffix, see below, p. 543.

i and u before labials

The vowel 'intermediate' (see Quint. 1.4.8) between short *i* and short *u* in unstressed syllables before a labial was represented first by *u* (*optumus*), and later, from the time of Caesar (Quint. 1.7.21), by *i* (*optimus*). At 656 and 657 *contibernium* shows the later treatment (cf. 641 *con*]*ṭibernales*, and, in minor texts, 698 *contiberṇale* and 708 *contiberni*), but practice at Vindolanda was not uniform. In *Tab. Vind.* II the spelling *contubernalis* is preferred to the alternative by 5:1.[30] The variation in the spelling of *contib-* in this one corpus shows that hard and fast dates cannot be inflicted on spelling changes, or, to put it another way, that once a spelling change began to take place not everyone adopted it, or did so consistently.

I now list some banal phonetic spellings that require little or no comment:

Syncope

586 *corṇiclario*, 593 *euericlum* (= *euerriculum*), 596 *infiblatoria*, *uirdem*, 597a *lamṇis*, 597b *pestlus*, twice (see below), 607 *alicla*, 649 *singla*, *singlos*, 650 *ҫaṣṣiҫḷiṣ* (possibly representing *cassiculus*: see the editors ad loc.).

The form *uirdis* must have been commonplace in military Latin by this time. Used substantivally in the plural it has turned up three times in the same area of Egypt in military finds in the sense 'greens' (that is, vegetables), = CL *holera* (*O. Max.* inv. 80, *O. Wâdi Fawâkhir* 2, and in a text recently published by Bülow-Jacobsen et al.).[31] The

[26] This whole subject has recently been discussed at length by F. Biville, *Les emprunts du latin au grec. Approche phonétique*, II: *Vocalisme et conclusions* (Louvain and Paris, 1995), ch. 19.

[27] For details, see e.g. Leumann (n. 19), 52, 75; Väänänen (n. 11), 37, id. (n. 14), 32–3; Biville (n. 26).

[28] I use the abbreviation *REW* for W. Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1935[3]).

[29] *REW* 2435; J. André, *Les noms d'oiseaux en latin* (Paris, 1967), 54, s.v. *cicinus*.

[30] See index IV in Bowman and Thomas, *Tab. Vind.* II.394 (the one example of *contibernalis* is at 346.ii.4).

[31] For the last, see A. Bülow-Jacobsen, H. Cuvigny, and J.-L. Fournet, 'The identification of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

syncopated form was destined to pass into the Romance languages (for example, Italian *uerde*, French *vert*).

Contraction of vowels[32]

581 *Martis* = *Martiis* (three times), *Ianuaris* (twice), *Iunis*, 583, 584, 758 *Iulis*, 648 *dese* (apparently = *deesse*)

Closing of e in hiatus[33]

593 *laquios* (twice), 596 *corticia* (?), *coccinium*, 603, 604 *calciamenta*

Omission of a back vowel before another back vowel[34]

648 *Ingẹṇus*, 668 *bidum*

The digraph ae

In the earlier material *ae* is almost always correctly written,[35] and the same is true in the new texts. I have noted just five errors, one of them in the document of Florus: 591 *nucule* (a momentary slip, as the digraph occurs six times in the same document), 643 (Florus) *quequmque*, 645 (back) *VINDOLAṆDE*, 686 (back) *Vind]olande*, 716 *Vindolande*. The relative frequency of the locative *Vindolande* is worthy of note. In the letters of Claudius Terentianus the locative spelling *Alexandrie* accounts for seven of the nine instances of monophthongization in case endings in the corpus.[36] The locative must have been in constant use in familiar place names, and therefore written with a phonetic spelling.

IV. CONSONANTS

Again there are some commonplace misspellings, which I list without comment:

Omission of the aspirate

649 *abent*, *abet*
There are three possible cases of *abeo* for *habeo* in minor texts (691(b) *abet*, 707 *ạbebis*, 717*abeas*), but there are no contexts, and the readings are sometimes speculative.

Omission of final -m

643 *arculam clusa*
This is the first certain example of such omission at Vindolanda.[37]

Myos Hormos. New papyrological evidence', *BIFAO* 94 (1994), 35 (with a full discussion of the word).

[32] See Adams (n. 5), 92 on the earlier material.
[33] Adams (n. 5), 93. [34] Adams (n. 5), 93. [35] Adams (n. 5), 87–8.
[36] Adams (n. 18), 12.
[37] On the absence of the phenomenon at Vindolanda, see Adams (n. 5), 88.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Assimilation of final consonant to following consonant

669 *si quit tibi*

Omission of nasal before stop[38]

609 *Sactius* (= *Sanctius*), 655 *sigulas*; also possibly *ṛẹḷiquẹs* = *relinques* at 649.18 and *muḍetur* = *mundetur* at 661.

Omission of final -s

In subliterary texts of the early empire final *-s* is conspicuously more stable than final *-m*, as has often been noted,[39] and in a corpus such as that from Vindolanda in which even *-m* is usually written one would not expect to find much evidence of the omission of *-s*. There seems to be one example, after a long vowel, an environment in which omissions are hardly found.[40] It is in one of the letters of Florus already commented on for their accumulation of substandard features:

643 (ii) Florus Tito suo ṣaḷutem
frates securem quam iṇ
casula **habea** dabes Ḍạṃ[...
qui . . .

Final *-t* is fairly often dropped in verb forms after *a* in both the indicative and subjunctive at this period (in the Pompeian graffiti),[41] but a third-person verb would not be tolerable in this context. *Habea* may conceivably stand for *habeam*, and the omission of *-m* would of course be straightforward, but I believe that the subjunctive verb tells against taking the verb as first person (see below). If indeed *s* has been left out, after a long vowel, it would be possible to cite the odd parallel for the omission (see, for example, *CIL* IV.2260 *Victor* ***ualea*** *qui bene futuis*),[42] but one can only speculate about the significance of such occasional examples. There may be at issue a regional variety of Latin, or a social dialect, or a mere slip.

On the face of it, if *quam* is a relative pronoun and if the clause is relative, with a subjunctive verb, the sentence would appear to contain an instruction that a specific object (an axe) which someone *may* have should be given to a third party. Such an instruction would be rather odd. The difficulty disappears if *quam* is taken not as a relative pronoun (that is, < *qui*), but as an indefinite (that is, < *quis*). The indefinite pronoun is often, but not always, used after *si*.[43] If *si* is lacking, such a clause may be translatable as an implied conditional (= *si quis*), or by means of 'whoever' or the like. Note, for example, Cic. *Parad.* 44 *filiam quis habet, pecunia opus est* = 'if one has a daughter, there is a need of money'. The meaning above is thus 'if you happen to have any axe in your hut, give it to . . .' (= *securem si quam habea(s)*), or 'whatever axe you

[38] Adams (n. 5), 93 with n. 63.

[39] See e.g. Väänänen (n. 14), 77–8; Adams (n. 18), 29–30; id. 'Latin and Punic in contact? The case of the Bu Njem ostraca', *JRS* 84 (1994), 106–7.

[40] See e.g. Väänänen (n. 14), 77.

[41] Väänänen (n. 14), 70.

[42] Väänänen (n. 14), 80. For the phenomenon in early, mainly regional, inscriptions, see B. D. Joseph and R. E. Wallace, 'Is Faliscan a local Latin patois?', *Diachronica* 8 (1991), 166, 172; also Coleman (n. 21), 16.

[43] On the indefinite use of *quis*, see e.g. J. B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich, 1965), 194.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

may have . . .' It seems unlikely that the writer would speak in such uncertain terms about the possible presence of an axe in his own hut, and I would therefore rule out the interpretation of *habea* as representing *habeam*: Florus is not sure whether Titus has an axe, but if he does have one it is to be passed on to someone else.

Gemination and simplification

A feature of the earlier tablets was the frequency with which *s* was doubled after long vowels and diphthongs, as for example in the perfectum of *mitto* and its compounds (*-missi*, and so on).[44] Since the geminate in such forms is etymologically correct, this orthographic feature would seem to reflect the instruction that scribes had received, against the prevailing orthographic tendency for *ss* to be simplified in this position (see Quint. 1.7.20).[45] In the new material *fussa* (645) and *uss-* (641) fall into this class, as may 595 *.nfussici* (cf. *confusicius*) and the name *Chnisso* (581, 582), though in the last the length of the preceding vowel is unknown. In the letter of Maior (645) there are several anomalous cases of gemination. There is one definite example of *resscribere*, and a second possible example in the same verb. In addition, the scribe first wrote *pro ssumma* and then deleted the second *s*. *Resscṛibas* is also at 716. These spellings seem to indicate a particular determination to get *ss* 'right', with a consequent tendency to hypercorrection. In the first-century legal documents written by a certain C. Novius Eunus there is a similar frequency of double *s* after long vowels and diphthongs, along with occasional hypercorrections, as in *Assinio* and *possitus*.[46] *Pro ssumma*, however, could be explained in another way. Since the preposition *pro* (which has a long vowel) was proclitic, the two elements *pro* and *summa* would have been accented as a single word. The scribe might have treated the *s* as medial rather than word-initial, and geminated it in the usual way after a long vowel. He then realized his mistake.

The artificial form *diṇxsiṭ* occurs at 735; cf. 662.5 *maṇxsimum*.[47]

Incorrect simplifications are rare, as in the earlier texts,[48] but note 593 *euericlum* = *euerriculum*. For gemination of letters other than *s*, see 602 *Britṭ[ani-]*,[49] 591.12 *cummini* (if this represents the word for 'cummin').

A consonant cluster

The form *pestlus* is found twice in a fragmentary account (597b). The base is *pessulus* (*-m*) 'bolt of a door'. When this was syncopated to **pes(s)lus*, a non-Latin consonant cluster was produced (*s(s)l*). *t* was inserted as a glide between the *s* and *l*, as here. But *tl* in its turn was regularly changed by assimilation in Latin to *cl*, as ἀνταλεῖν > *anclare*, *uitulus* > *uitlus* > *uiclus* (*App. Probi* 6 *uitulus non uiclus*), *uetulus* > *uetlus* > *ueclus* (*App. Probi* 5 *uetulus non ueclus*).[50] Thus the expected outcome of *pessulus* would be

[44] Adams (n. 5), 88–9.
[45] See further Adams (n. 5), 89.
[46] J. N. Adams, 'The Latinity of C. Novius Eunus', *ZPE* 82 (1990), 239.
[47] For the spelling, see Adams (n. 5), 90–1.
[48] For which, see Adams (n. 5), 88.
[49] This form is a typical misspelling, whereby a geminate is placed in the wrong place in a long word which the writer was aware had one geminate (cf. *tyrranus* for *tyrannus*). Note too the regular *Brittones*, as at 649, which may have influenced this word.
[50] Väänänen (n. 11), 43, 65–6; Adams (n. 18), 33–4.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pesclus, and that is the form behind reflexes in Italian dialects (for example, L'Aquila *péschio*).[51]

Thus the form *pestlus* (marked with an asterisk by Väänänen, *Introduction*, 65) is intermediate between the CL form and that reflected in Romance. The present example becomes the first definite attestation of the form. At *TLL* X.1.1916.75ff. the one case cited is conjectural (though the conjecture is certain) and of much later date: Cassiodorus, *GL* VII.205.7 *astula et in elisione astla, pestulum <pestlum>*. *Pestulus*, a back-formation (*pessulus* > *pesslus* > *pestlus* > *pestulus*) is also cited from Caper, *GL* VII.111.1, *pessulum non pestulum*. An exact parallel for the development of *pessulus*, as Cassiodorus (just cited) brings out, is provided by *assula*, > *assla* > *astla* > *ascla* (Provençal, Catalan *ascla*).[52] For such intermediate forms in *tl* (before the assimilation to *cl*), see Adams, *Claudius Terentianus*, 33–4, Väänänen, *Introduction*, 43 on *mentla*, found four times at Pompeii (alongside Italian *minchia*, which reflects the later *cl* form).

V. MORPHOLOGY

Ablatives in -i in consonant stems[53]

645 *patri*, 650 *comiṭi*,730 *fratri*
There is possibly now an ablative form *paṭṛị* at Vindonissa (no. 12), but the reading is not certain.

Locative

In the second declension the locative inflection had largely been replaced at Vindolanda by the locatival ablative,[54] but practice was still variable, as the old locative form *Cataracṭoni* now found at 670 shows. In the earlier tablets *Cataractonio* occurs twice.[55]

A Graecizing genitive form (591)

A list 'juxtaposing some foodstuffs and some other, inedible natural products' (so the editors on 591) has the highly unusual genitive form *senạpidis*. Usually *sinapi* (the first vowel of the word is variable) is neuter in Latin, and its genitive would be expected to be *sinapis* (for a probable case of the normal form, *senapis*, see 588). There is a feminine example of the word at Plaut. *Pseud.* 817: *teritur sinapis scelera, quae illis qui terunt / prius quam triuerunt oculi ut exstillent facit. Scelera* here is probably a feminine adjective (*scelerus*, and so on) (so *OLD*) agreeing with the nominative *sinapis*, but even if *teritur* is interpreted, following Lindsay,[56] as an impersonal passive with accusative object *scelera* (neuter plural, with *sinapis* genitive rather than nominative singular), *sinapis* still has to be taken as a feminine because of the following relative clause introduced by *quae* (with singular verb) (Loeb: 'they . . . grate in murderous mustard that makes the graters' eyes ooze out before they have it grated'). This feminine *sinapis* (nominative) would also be expected in Latin to have a

[51] *REW* 6441; W. von Wartburg, *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bonn, 1928–), VIII.309 (henceforth abbreviated as *FEW*); Väänänen (n. 11), 65–6.
[52] Leumann (n. 19), 208; Väänänen (n. 11), 65.
[53] Adams (n. 5), 99. [54] Adams (n. 5), 110. [55] Adams (n. 5), 110.
[56] W. M. Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus* (Oxford, 1907), 53.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

genitive in *-is*, as in the second interpretation of the passage of Plautus just cited. In Greek too σίναπι is usually neuter, but σίναπις is attested once as a feminine in Themison's work on acute and chronic diseases (*RhM* 58 [1903], 88 σίναπις λεία).[57] The genitive of the Greek feminine form does not seem to be attested, but on the analogy of other feminine plant names in -ις it would be expected to be -ιδος.

The genitive ending *-idis* is Graecizing. Greek feminines in -ις, -ιδος were often borrowed into Latin either with their Greek genitive form retained (*-idos*), or with the ending partly Latinized into *-idis*. Many of the feminine plant names in *-is* of Greek origin listed by André (see n. 57) from Latin technical texts have one or the other of these two genitives. Some are attested with both forms (for example, *anagallis*).[58]

But borrowings into Latin that had the inflection -ις, -ιδος in their Greek form could be fully Latinized by being incorporated into the Latin class of *-is* nouns. Thus the name Θέτις, Θέτιδος is treated as an *-i* stem noun by Plautus, *Epid.* 35 (*Theti*, ablative).[59] Similarly some Greek plant names in *-is* are inflected as Latin. Thus, for example, though *cedris* (κεδρίς) is attested with a genitive *-idis*, at Ser. Samm. 551 its integration into Latin is indicated by the accusative form *cedrim*.[60]

The writer of the account was treating the word as a feminine plant name of Greek origin with an (implied) Latin nominative in *-is* (and genitive -ιδος in Greek). He must have been familiar with Greek, and with the treatment of Greek feminine plant names in Latin botanical or technical texts, in which they were usually only partially Latinized, if at all. The inflection he has used is highly abnormal for Latin, given the long currency of the word *sinapi* in the Latin language, as a third declension neuter or feminine with genitive in *-is*.[61] The editors, attempting to find some unity in the list, suggest the possibility that it may be 'an inventory of medical supplies or of substances used for medical purposes', and this Graecizing genitive form would suit such a hypothesis, given the long-standing Graecizing character of medical language in Latin.

Gender

There are some departures from the norms of classical gender in the new material, but these cannot simply be lumped together as exemplifying the loss of the neuter. There was not a sudden abandonment of the neuter; new neuter forms were always being generated by analogy. The evidence falls into a number of categories.

There are several examples of the neuter *carrum* (583, 642, 649, all plural), which can be added to the neuter diminutive *carrulum* (*carrula*) which turned up in the earlier tablets.[62] On the face of it the neuter use of *carrum* was standard in the camp, reflecting either widespread practice in the army or a convention that had caught on locally. It should, however, be noted that the neuter forms of the word hitherto attested, including those at Vindolanda, are predominantly in the plural (see *TLL* III.499.41ff.). There are so far no singular uses found at Vindolanda that would allow a proper assessment of the use of the word there.

In an account of which the components are in the accusative (*sarcinas*, *trullas*, *frenos*, and so on) the following expression is found (596, line 20): ***uelum uirdem*** · *i* · *m( ) xi s(emis) f(iunt) (denarii)*. The final *-m* of *uirdem* could simply be described as hypercorrect (against the loss of final *-m*), but looked at another way the phrase

[57] J. André, *Les noms de plantes dans la Rome antique* (Paris, 1985), 240.
[58] Ibid. 15. [59] Leumann (n. 19), 458. [60] André (n. 57), 54.
[61] For its hitherto attested forms, see André (n. 57), 240.
[62] See Adams (n. 5), 107, with further details about this neuter use.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

represents a transitional phase in the loss of the neuter. It is not unusual for a noun to retain its neuter form, but for an adjective with it to be given a masculine/feminine form. An interesting example is to be found in the poem of a centurion, Q. Avidius Quintianus, at Bu Njem:[63] 1–3 *quaesii multum* ***quot*** *memoriae tradere . . .* ***uotum communem***. Here *quot* = *quod* is a 'correct' neuter form in agreement with *uotum*, but then there is a lapse into a masculine form *communem*. There is a residual feeling for the neuter apparent here, but clearly the writer was under pressure to convert neuters into masculines. See further *Actus Petri cum Simone* 20 *per quem* ***lumen inaccessibilem*** *habemus*, *Compositiones Lucenses* A 14 *ungues* ***subtiles uitrea***, in both of which passages the noun retains its neuter form but has a masculine/feminine adjective in agreement. The second example cannot be explained away, as the other might, as exemplifying the hypercorrect addition of a final consonant. It is also worth stressing again that so far at Vindolanda final *-m* is virtually never omitted, and never falsely added (see above, p. 537), except possibly in this case and at II.343.40 (where the interpretation is doubtful), and it therefore seems preferable to seek a morphological rather than an orthographic explanation here.

In the same document (596.18) the form *frẹnos* is not significant, because the plural form *freni* corresponding to the neuter singular *frenum* is as well attested in classical literature as *frena*.[64] Note, for example, Probus, *GL* Keil IV.211.24, citing both plural forms from Virgil (the masculine is at *G*. 3.184). Charisius comments several times on the currency of the two plural forms (for example, 41.20 Barwick).

An account (593) has the following items:

retes quas reḷiquiṃụṣ
retem · turdarem
retem · anatarem

Rete is often neuter in Classical Latin (particularly in the plural form *retia*), but its reflexes in Romance are feminine, deriving either from the form *retis* (or rather *retem*: note Italian *rete*), or from *retia*, a form based on the neuter plural (see *REW* 7255 for details). In the republican period there are signs, despite the frequency of *retia* (neuter plural), that language standardization had failed to impose an invariable neuter gender on the word in the educated language. *Retem* is found in some manuscripts of Plautus at *Rud.* 984 (and is printed by Lindsay); the gender is not clear, but it cannot be neuter. Varro's practice in the *Res Rusticae* is variable. He uses the neuter plural at 2.2.9, but a feminine singular at *Rust*. 3.5.11 (*rete cannabina*, ablative). Two cases of *retem* (3.5.14, twice) are not neuters. At 3.5.8 (*obiecto rete*) and 3.9.15 (*intento supra rete*) the form *rete* might be either masculine or neuter, and various other examples of the ablative *rete* unaccompanied by an adjective (3.5.1, 3.5.13, 3.7.6, 3.11.3) could be masculine, feminine, or neuter. Even in the empire grammarians were not consistent in their pronouncements on the gender of the word. Charisius (36.12ff. Barwick) includes *retes* in a long list of feminines that are 'always plural' (*semper pluralia*), and his choice of words is notable: *nam et in consuetudine dicimus 'in retes meas incidisti'; retia enim si dixeris, pluralem facis a nominatiuo rete quod est neutri generis*. The expression *in consuetudine* concedes the currency of the feminine in the plural, as in the Vindolanda example. But at 76.7ff. Charisius appears to contradict himself:

[63] See most recently J. N. Adams, 'The poets of Bu Njem: language, culture and the centurionate', *JRS* 89 (1999), 110–11 for the text.

[64] F. Neue and C. Wagener, *Formenlehre der lateinische Sprache* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1892–1905[3]), I.815–16.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

rete neutrali genere an retis masculino dicendum sit quaeritur, ut in neutrali quidem plurali numero faciat haec retia, in masculino hi retes. feminine enim nullam capit adfirmationem, cum per deminutionem aut masculinum sit, ut hic reticulus, aut neutrum, ut hoc reticulum. nemo tam obstinatae inpudentiae est ut dicat feminino genere haec reticula huius reticulae.

the question arises whether one should say *rete* in the neuter gender or *retis* in the masculine, such that in the neuter plural it would form *haec retia*, in the masculine *hi retes*. Used as a feminine it has no support, since to judge by the diminutive the word is either masculine (cf. *hic reticulus*) or neuter (cf. *hoc reticulum*). No one is of such obstinate shamelessness as to say *haec reticula*, *huius reticulae*.

What is to be made of these inconsistencies? First, the fact that both the masculine and the neuter are deemed to be acceptable shows that grammarians had failed to impose the neuter alone. Secondly, the feminine, which was to pass into Romance and must therefore eventually have become the dominant gender, was already percolating through into the educated language in the republic. Thirdly, it is noticeable that Charisius condemns outright the feminine-singular usage, but acknowledges the currency of the feminine in the plural. It would appear that the feminine-plural use gained acceptability before the feminine-singular. Varro was well capable of admitting the odd usage which was out of line with standard educated practice.

A parallel for this type of change of gender is provided by the history of *lac*. It had an alternative neuter form *lacte* and alongside that a form **lactis*, deducible from an accusative *lactem*, which is masculine at Petron. 71.1, Apul. *Met*. 8.19, and Gell. 12.1.17, but has feminine as well as masculine reflexes in Romance and is attested in the feminine in late Latin.[65]

Finally, *uentrale* 'belly-band', previously attested only as a neuter, if Lewis and Short are to be relied on, appears in the form *uentralem* in the account 607.

The suffixes -alis and -arius

In the account 593 the adjectives *turdarem*, *anatarem*, and *cicnares* are on the face of it *hapax legomena*, but looked at another way they merely show a change of suffix in existing words, *-arius* > *-aris*. *Anatarius*, *turdarium*, and *cycnarium* are previously attested, and there was constant interchange between the two suffixes. Similarly in the earlier texts there is a case of *legionaris* for the more usual *legionarius*.[66]

The productivity of the suffix *-arius* is further confirmed by the new tablets.[67] In the earlier texts there were ten masculines in *-arius* designating practitioners of various professions, and seven neuters. In the new texts there are eight certain masculines (581 *ceruesarius*, *iumentarius*; 586 *seplasiarius*, *corniclarius*; 643 *beneficiarius* [possibly also 642]; 646 *braciarius*; 653 *reg(ionarius)*; 656 *argentarius*) and three neuters (596 *capitularia*, *lumbaria*; 597 *panarium*). At 647 *caducarium* may be preceded by *debitum*, in which case it would be adjectival.[68] Notable among the masculines are *braciarius* and *argentarius*. The first is a new word, its base (like that of *ceruesarius*) a local Celtic form (*bracis*), a fact which underlines that new coinages could be formed with this suffix with complete freedom (on *braciarius*, see below, p. 562). The second un-

[65] A. Stefenelli, *Die Volkssprache im Werk des Petron im Hinblick auf die romanischen Sprachen* (Vienna, 1962), 51.

[66] Adams (n. 5), 106 for further examples of this phenomenon.

[67] See on the earlier material Adams (n. 5), 104–6.

[68] There are other possible cases of the *-arius* formation in fragmentary texts: *braciarium* is considered likely at 595, and there may be instances of *librarius* (670), *balniarius* (732), *carnarius* and *contarius* (646).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ambiguously denotes in the context 'silversmith' (see below, p. 554). This is the first example of the word in this meaning; in Classical Latin it means 'banker' (this is the only meaning given by the *OLD*, s.v.), and it was hitherto only in later Latin that it was attested in the sense 'silversmith'.

Third-person plural perfects

574 *renuntiarunt*, 649 *onerarunt*
These forms derive from the type with short *e* in the ending (*-auĕrunt*, with syncope of the *e*). There are no cases so far at Vindolanda of the spelling *-auerunt*, which might conceivably have had a long *e*. The type with short *e* not only lies behind contracted forms of the above type, but is also reflected in Romance (for example, Italian *díssero* < *dixerunt*),[69] and must have been widespread in the spoken language.

615, side A *aḍ pretia adiḉierunt*
The verb would appear to be a perfect form of *adicio*, and the reading looks certain. It is possible to explain, but not, as far as I am aware, to parallel, the form. *Adicio* is a third-conjugation verb with a present tense in *-io*, and such verbs were subject to reinterpretation as belonging to the fourth conjugation.[70] The classic example of this reanalysis is provided by *fugio*, which, like *adicio*, in Classical Latin had an infinitive in *-ĕre* and a perfect marked by a long vowel in the root (*fūgi*). When the verb changed conjugations the infinitive was remodelled to *fugire* and the perfect (by analogy with, for example, *audio*, *audi(u)i*) to *fugi(u)i*.[71] If *adicio* were subjected to the same reinterpretation, it too would have developed an infinitive **adicire* and a perfect *adici(u)i*, the latter replacing the long-vowel form *adieci*. I have not been able to find comparable forms of *iacio* or its compounds, but there is no reason why an occasional *ad hoc* remodelling should not have occurred. The change of conjugation is not reflected in the Romance languages because *iacio* (which was replaced by the frequentative *iacto*) and its compounds did not survive.

A future-tense form

A letter (628) has the future form *rediemus* (*utrumnḛ cum uexsilló omnes rediemus*). In compounds of *ire* futures in *-iam*, *-ies*, and so on are sometimes found as alternatives to *-bo*, *-bis*, and so on, in parallel to the coexistence of two forms of the future of fourth-conjugation verbs (thus *audiam* alongside *audibo*, with the latter type mainly occurring in old Latin).[72] Note, for example, Tibull. 1.4.27 *transiet*, Apul. *Met*. 6.19 *redies*, Pall. 7.7.9 *rediet*.

habunt

This present-tense form in a letter (628) is identical to *debunt*, attested a number of times in the military reports with the heading *renuntium*,[73] but has the further interest that it lies behind the French *ont* (< **aunt*).[74] These *-unt* forms in the second conjugation are turning up overwhelmingly in auxiliary verbs or quasi-auxiliaries, and

[69] See e.g. Väänänen (n. 11), 141. [70] See e.g. Väänänen (n. 11), 135.
[71] For examples, see e.g. Neue and Wagener (n. 64), III.245; *TLL* VI.1.1475.54ff.
[72] Leumann (n. 19), 578; Neue and Wagener (n. 64), III.327–8.
[73] Adams (n. 5), 102–3. [74] W. D. Elcock, *The Romance Languages* (London, 1960), 128.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

they probably show the influence of the two auxiliaries that have this ending in the third-person plural (*sunt* and *possunt*).[75]

VI. SYNTAX

Indicative in indirect questions

There are several possible examples of this construction[76] in the new letters:

645 *in quibus (epistulis) scribit mihi ut ei notum faciam* ***quid gesseró*** *de fussá*
628 *cras quid uelis nos fecisse rogó dómine p̣ṛaẹc̣i̯piás utrumn̥ę cum uexsilló omnes* ***rediemus*** *an . . .*

The second is not straightforward. *Quid uelis* is an indirect question dependent on *praecipias*. It is possible that *utrumne . . . rediemus* is a secondary, explanatory indirect question based on the same governing verb, with indicative verb. It is not without parallel for a secondary indirect question to be given an indicative verb: for example, Ter. *An.* 649 *nescis quantis in malis* ***uerser*** *miser, / quantasque hic suis consiliis mihi* ***conflauit*** *sollicitudines* (where *conflarit* would have been possible metrically).[77] But *utrumne* can introduce the first alternative of a double question, direct as well as indirect (*OLD*, s.v. *utrum*, 1b, 2b),[78] and it is just as likely here that the writer has switched to a direct question.

A use of the perfect infinitive

Of significance is the use of the perfect infinitive *fecisse* in 628 (just cited) in reference to future time (note *cras*), 'I ask, lord, that you instruct (us) what you want us to have done tomorrow.' This aspectual nuance allows the writer to stress the completion at some future time of a prospective act: the speaker and his associates will actually get done tomorrow whatever it is that they are required to do. This type of infinitive is common in two types of contexts.[79] (i) In legal prohibitions of the type 'no one should wish to have offended' (for example, in the *S.C. De Baccanalibus*, *neiquis eorum Bacanal habuise uelet*),[80] where the perfective, according to Daube (39), is more threatening to the potential wrongdoer than the present would have been. The wrongdoer is in effect invited to consider what might happen to him if he were already in the position of having completed the deed. (ii) In poetry, especially in the second half of pentameters, where the ending *-uisse* in particular is convenient metrically. The usage seems to be absent from classical prose, and its presence in Augustan poetry is therefore at first sight suggestive of an archaic character with an

[75] J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge, 2003), 746.
[76] On which see most recently L. Stephens, 'Indirect questions in Old Latin: syntactic and pragmatic factors conditioning modal shift', *Illinois Classical Studies* 10 (1985), 193–214; C. Bodelot, *L'interrogation indirecte en latin: syntaxe—valeur illocutoire—formes* (Paris, 1987), ch. 4; A. M. Bolkestein, 'Questions about questions', in *De Vsu, Études de syntaxe latine offertes à Marius Lavency* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1995), 59–70.
[77] Bodelot (n.76), 107.
[78] On *utrumne*, see also Hofmann and Szantyr (n. 43), 466.
[79] See e.g. Hofmann and Szantyr (n. 43), 351–2.
[80] See the discussion of D. Daube, *Forms of Roman Legislation* (Oxford, 1956), 37–49.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

appeal to poets. What makes the present example interesting is that it is in a letter the Latinity of which is well down the educational scale. The decurion who composed the document even wrote the form *habunt*. The aspectual nuance must still have been alive in the ordinary language. This example has been used to support the point that poetic and colloquial usage sometimes correspond against that of literary prose.[81]

Imperativals

Both the future indicative and the ordinary imperative are used in the letters as 'imperativals':

617 *festinabitis*, 643 *dabes* (four times), 645 *mittes*, 648 *ạssụmẹs* (?), 649 *rẹcịpies*, *rẹlịquẹs* (?), *solues* (?),[82] *offeres* (?), 670 *dabis*, 698 *accipiẹs* (?).

611 *ualẹ*, 613 *uale*, 616 *omnẹs diligenter curate ụt*, 622 *c[um tu]ạ Lepidiná ueni*, *uale mi frater*, 623 *uale mi fṛat[er*, 628 *uale*, 632 *iube dari*, *uale mi frạter*, 635 *uale mị soroṛ*, 641 *s[al]ụta*, *ụale*, 642 *perporta*, *praẹsịde*, *saluta*, *ualẹ*, 645 *uale*, 646 *ual(e)*, 649 *ualẹ*, 650 *saluta*, 657 *saluta*, 661 *saluta*, *uale mi ṣoṛoṛ*, 667 *scribe mihi ụt*. Special case: 645 *fac ut certum mihi [r]ẹ[s]ṣcṛibas*. In minor texts *saluta* is at 689, 690 and possibly 692 and 717, and *uale* possibly at 706.

628 *rogó . . . prạẹcịpiás* (address of superior), *rogó iubeas mitti* (same letter), 655 *ita rogo credạs mihi*, 831 *ṛogo iubẹạs dari*.

The new material suggests a distinction between the two types of imperatival. The future is commonly used when the writer is asking for a favour ('send me, give me, pay me such and such'). When the writer is doing someone a favour, as in the invitation at 622, in greetings, in the expression of best wishes, and in the offering of gifts at 667 (fragmentary, but the implication is clear: . . . *tibi opụs fuerit scribe mihi ụt egọ tibi mịttam*) and 642, the plain imperative tends to be used. I deduce that the imperative was more peremptory, the future more polite,[83] and hence appropriate when the writer was seeking a favour; in issuing an invitation or the like (*cum tua Lepidina ueni*), on the other hand, there was no need to tone the 'order' down.[84] *Rogo* + subjunctive, addressed as it is by a subordinate to his superior twice in 628, seems to be rather more formal and polite even than the future. The frequency of *rogo* is a very distinctive feature of the letters.[85]

On the present indicative *scribis* apparently used as an imperative at 670, see below, p. 555.

[81] J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer, 'Introduction', 8, in idd. (edd.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry* (Oxford, 1999); R. G. G. Coleman, 'Poetic diction, poetic discourse and the poetic register', ibid. 83–4.

[82] The context is not complete, and this verb may not be imperatival.

[83] On the future with imperative force, see e.g. R. Risselada, *Imperatives and Other Directive Expressions in Latin* (Amsterdam, 1993), 169. Perhaps Risselada's views need to be reassessed in the light of non-literary material, but this is not the place to go into details.

[84] On 'bald' imperatives in such contexts in other languages, analysed in terms of 'politeness theory', see P. Brown and S. C. Levinson, *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage* (Cambridge, 1987^2), 99.

[85] Adams (n. 5), 117–18. For further examples in the new tablets, see 641 (fragmentary), 648 (*rogo ụt*), 618 (*tu domine quid sentias de negotio hoc rogo [[notum m]]*), 688, 694.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dative of advantage

In an expression such as *uale mi frater*, a formula that is common in the letters (for example, 623, 632), it is not clear whether *mi* is a dative and part of the verb-phrase (a redundant dative of advantage of a type common with many verbs in more colloquial forms of Latin), or a vocative attached to *frater*. For the dative in a comparable context (where the addressee's well-being is presented as advantageous to the writer), note Claud. Terent. *PMich*. VIII.467.2 *an[te omn]ia op[to te] fortem et h[i]arem [e]t* ***saluom mihi*** *esse*, and various passages in Fronto such as the following: 35.3 Van den Hout *semper* ***mi uale****, animus meus*, 38.22 ***uale mihi*** *Fronto carissime et iucundissime mihi*;[86] also, on papyrus, *PBerol.* inv. 14114 (= *ChLA* 10.462, *CEL* 218)[87] *opto deos · ut* ***mi[hi u]ạleas*** *· quod mẹ[um uotum est]*. The expression *uale mi soror carissima* which has now, it seems, turned up at 661 (but the reading is not absolutely certain: *uale mi ṣọṛọr ḳạṛịṣs[i]mạ*) and 635 (reading clearer: *uale mị soroṛ [karis]ṣịmạ [*)[88] favours the first explanation, though it has to be acknowledged that in later Latin there is some evidence for the generalisation of the form *mi* to the feminine and the plural.[89] The examples from Fronto and *PBerol*. show decisively that *uale* and *ualeas* were often accompanied by a dative of advantage, and that is how *mi* in *uale mi frater* should be taken.

Syntax of lists

I start with the document 597, the syntax of which is inconsistent. Some of the items in what appears to be a list are in the accusative, but at least one other is in the nominative:

b. **pestlus** · n(umero) ·i·
ọllas · refectas · n(umero) ·ii·

Similarly in 604 (an account of nails used in footwear) the item ii.3 *Pruḍenti* ***clauos*** *n(umero) XXX* contrasts with i.3 *in calciamentịs Tetrici* ***ḷ̣laui*** *n(umero) XXV*.

In lists at Vindolanda and elsewhere objects are usually in the accusative[90] or in the genitive (dependent on a quantity term, expressed or understood), a case that may alternate in one and the same document with the accusative. Such an accusative, if there is a quantity term present, may be described as in 'partitive apposition' to that term.[91] The accusative of objects in, say, a receipt, is easily comprehensible from a receipt such as 586, where *accepi* is expressed twice. It is then the nominatives above that are unusual. The alternation of accusative with nominative here should not be confused with the *systematic* alternation in lists between the nominative of personal names and the accusative of objects, as illustrated from Vindolanda by Adams[92] and

[86] See now E. Dickey, *Latin Forms of Address from Plautus to Apuleius* (Oxford, 2002), 215–16.
[87] *ChLA* is *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores*. For *CEL*, see P. Cugusi, *Corpus Epistularum Latinarum papyris tabulis ostracis servatarum* (Florence, 1992).
[88] See also (probably) *Tab. Vind*. II.292b (back).
[89] Dickey (n. 86), 215 (with n. 4), 216, n. 6.
[90] Adams (n. 5), 114–15; there are numerous examples in the new tablets. See also Adams, *Pelagonius and Latin Veterinary Terminology in the Roman Empire* (Leiden, 1995), 446–8 on the accusative in lists (with additional bibliography).
[91] For an example of such alternation, see *Tab. Vind.* II.182.6–7, with Adams (n. 5), 115; and cf. now 591, in which for example *ceraẹ p̣(ondo) [. . .]* is followed immediately by *bitumen p(ondo)* and *glutem tauri[nam* (without a quantity term surviving).
[92] Adams (n. 5), 115.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nicely exemplified in a letter relating to missing lances published recently by Tomlin:[93] for example, line 27 *Felicio lanciam [pug]natoriam*. The sense is that Felicio has lost a fighting lance: there is a functional distinction between the nominative and accusative, with the accusative expressing objects that are by implication patients of a verbal action, whereas the nominative expresses the person causing the event.

A use of the nominative of *objects* parallel to that in the above two texts can be found in the potters' lists at La Graufesenque,[94] but these are a special case because they come from a Celtic–Latin bilingual community. The names of the potters responsible for the vessels listed are usually in the nominative, with occasional genitives (5.10; some possible cases could be abbreviations). But the goods made by each potter are also in the nominative. However, most of the documents are arguably in Gaulish rather than Latin, as for example the long texts 2 and 19, which have an accumulation of apparent nominative forms such as *mortari*, *atramentari*, *catilli*, *paraxidi*. In the long Latin texts 47 and 74, on the other hand, the same or similar words tend to be given neuter forms (*catila*, *acitabla*, *uinaria*), and the intended case is indeterminate. But there are nevertheless a few fragmentary Latin texts in which the nominative can be seen: *panae* (30), *mortari* (47) and *acetabli* (83). La Graufesenque tells us nothing about ordinary Latin practice because of the likelihood of cross-language influence.

But parallels can be quoted for the use of nominatives in lists expressing the patient of an implied verbal process.The document represented by *PMich*. VII.434 and *PRyl*. IV.612 (*ChLA* 4.249) is a marriage contract from Karanis in Egypt, dated to the second century A.D. It contains a dowry list, most of the items of which are in the accusative, but at one point there is a switch into the nominative: line 13 *et osyptrum et arca [. . .]s* ***lecythoe duae*** *et cadiụṃ* . . . Here *arca* could be an accusative without final *-m*, but there is no such ambiguity about the next item.

There is also alternation of nominative and accusative in the Myconos curse tablet. Although the components of the list are personal names, the persons referred to are the patients rather than the agents of the implied verbal idea. The tablet starts off with the names in the accusative, and then in line 3 switches into the nominative (*ID* 2534 = *ILLRP* 1150).[95] I print part of the improved text of Solin:[96]

L. Paconium senem,
Q. Tullium Q. f. [. . . ca 6] A [ca 4] + (. . .]
N. Cottius N. f. + [. . .]

The list then proceeds again in the accusative, with some further nominatives later in the text. The list is basically in the accusative, with sporadic lapses into the nominative. It is not surprising that the names of the victims of the curse should be placed in the accusative, as the objects of an implied verb of cursing or the like. The *defixio* Audollent 139[97] = *CIL* I^2.1012 = *ILLRP* 1144 makes explicit the way in which such an ellipse takes place. A name in the accusative is first of all object of the verb-phrase *tibi commendo*, and then there follows a list of accusatival names*: item M. Hedium*

[93] R. S. O. Tomlin, 'Roman manuscripts from Carlisle: the ink-written tablets', *Britannia* 29 (1998), 58, no. 16.

[94] See Marichal (n. 25).

[95] F. Durrbach et al., *Inscriptions de Délos* (Paris, 1926–); A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae* (Florence, 1963–5).

[96] H. Solin, 'Appunti sull'onomastica romana a Delo', in F. Coarelli, D. Musti, and H. Solin (edd.), *Delo e l'Italia* (*Opuscula Instituti Romani Finlandiae* II) (Rome, 1982), 101–17.

[97] A. Audollent, *Defixionum Tabellae* (Paris, 1904).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Amphionem, item C. Popillium Apollonium, item . . . But equally it was possible to list the names of the victims in the nominative, as in the mixed Latin–Oscan *defixio* Vetter 7[98] = *CIL* I^2.1614 = *ILLRP* 1146, or in the long text *CIL* I^2.1148 = *ILLRP* 1148, which consists exclusively of the names without any verbs. Similarly on the *defixio* Audollent 135 (*Malcio Nicones oculos* . . .) Solin remarks:[99] 'Le maudit . . . était sans doute *Malchio*, fils de *Nico*. On a souvent supposé que *Malcio* serait un datif . . . mais cette forme n'est autre qu'un nominatif figé en dehors de la syntaxe qui se trouve souvent dans les *defixiones*.' There is a nominative-heading naming the victim, after which the curse proper is set out. In the Myconos tablet the writer has switched from time to time into the alternative convention of naming the victim in the nominative. It would seem then that, while for the most part in lists the accusative was preferred if the objects or persons listed were in some sense patients, the nominative, as a sort of base form,[100] was available as an occasional alternative, and sometimes a writer would lapse from one case to the other.

There is another possible alternation between accusative and nominative in a new Vindolanda text. The account 590 up to a point seems to contain the type of systematic case variation referred to above, whereby personal names on the left are in the nominative (there is also a name in the genitive, line 7 *Firmani uitreum*), but the items of domestic equipment on the right (presumably the things acquired) are in the accusative (though most of the latter forms are not distinctive in case, since they are in the neuter). Line 2, for example, shows the use of the nominative of the personal name (*Ạuḍax ụịṭreum*), and line 9 shows the use of the accusative of the thing received (..[..]..[.] *scutulam*). In line 6, on the other hand, the thing received is expressed in the nominative (*Jurius cucuma*). Given the virtual absence of omissions of final *-m* in the tablets, it would not be compelling (though not out of the question) to take *cucuma* as an accusative.

One determinant of the use of the nominative to express the things received or the like in a list might have been a feeling on the part of the writer that he was using an implied passive verb-phrase. Note particularly 604, *ṿi K(alendas) Augustas* · ***claui*** *caligares* · ***empti*** · *per Tauriṇum n(umero) CCCL* for an overt passive construction in a list; cf. 607a *vi K(alendas) Augustas emptum per Tạurinum* . . . At 581 there are constant uses of *pulli* (also *pullus*) in the nominative, with some hints that passive verbs might have determined the case: for example, lines 8 *pulli* (cf. 100, 105), 47 *pullus*, but 36 *ṗulli aḍempṭ[i*, 49 *absumptus p[ullus]*. The part played by an implied passive verb in establishing the case of the components of a list can be seen from a comparison of two passages in freedmen's speeches in Petronius. At 38.15 a list is in the accusative following an active verb (though that verb itself could not be understood as governing the accusatives): *solebat sic cenare quomodo rex: apros gausapatos, opera pistoria,* . . . *cocos, pistores*.[101] On the other hand at 47.5 the items listed are in the nominative, after a passive verb: *omnia foras parata sunt: aqua, lasani, et cetera minutalia*.

[98] E. Vetter, *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte* (Heidelberg, 1953).

[99] '*Corpus defixionum antiquarum*. Quelques réflexions', in L. Callebat (ed.), *Latin vulgaire, latin tardif. Actes du 4^e colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif. Caen, 2–5 septembre 1994* (Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York, 1995), 572.

[100] On the tendency for nominative forms to be fossilized, see e.g. E. Löfstedt, *Late Latin* (Oslo, 1959), 131–3.

[101] There is possibly textual corruption here: see the note of M. S. Smith, *Petronii Arbitri Cena Trimalchionis* (Oxford, 1975), ad loc.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Some uses of pronouns

In the document of Florus (643; see above, III) containing two letters to different recipients, one letter (it is not certain which) ends on the back with a switch to plural addressees, specified by *uos* and *uester*, in the expresssion of greetings: *Ingenua* ***uos*** *saḷutat* ***u[e]stra*** *filiạ*. It is not unusual (similarly) in conversational texts for a vocative in the singular to be accompanied by a plural second-person pronoun or verb:[102] for example, Plaut. *Mil*. 596 ***cohibete*** *intra limen etiam* ***uos*** *parumper,* ***Pleusicles***; 499 *an quia* ***latrocinamini***, ***arbitramini*** *quiduis licere facere* ***uobis***, ***uerbero***?; *Asin*. 629 *ut* ***uostrae*** *fortunae meis praecedunt,* ***Libane***, *longe*; Cic. *Fam*. 14.5.2 ***uos, mea suauissima et optatissima Terentia***, *si nos* ***amatis***, ***curate*** *ut* ***ualeatis***. The usage in the letter of Florus is virtually identical except that, though there had been a singular addressee hitherto, no vocative was expressed. The function of *uos* and the like in these passages is to include others closely associated with the addressee in the address ('you and your family, household, associates', and so on; in the letter of Cicero, 'you and Tullia'). The persons embraced by the pronoun *uos*, the possessive adjective *uester*, or the second-person plural verb will depend on the context, and in any given context will of course be clear to the named addressee. In the letter of Florus the recipient would have known who was intended by *uos*. The adjective *uestra* with *filia* might possibly be taken to suggest that the person associated with the addressee was his wife, but that is not necessarily the case. Kinship terms such as *mater*, *pater*, and *frater* are not infrequently used to express respect, affection, or the like when no blood tie exists,[103] and Ingenua might merely have been the 'young friend' of the associate(s) of the addressee. *Filia* and *filius* are not particularly common in an extended sense of this type, but they could certainly be used thus.[104] We do not know enough of the circumstances to be able to determine the force of *uestra filia*.

In the letter of Maior quoted in full below (p. 552) *ei* is used for *sibi* in line 5 (*scribit mihi ut ei notum faciam . . .*). This usage is commonplace, particularly in colloquial texts.[105]

A letter (635) by a woman (Claudia Severa to Sulpicia Lepidina, wife of Cerialis), which can now be placed alongside two others by the same person (291, 292), has the greeting *Aelius meuṣ ṭe et filiọlus sal[utant]*. Here *te* is in a variant of the 'Wackernagel' position,[106] in that it is second element in the clause, if *Aelius meus* is treated as a unit. It splits the extended subject to achieve this placement. Sometimes a pronoun splits a two-word constituent to go to the second position (for example, Caes. *Ciu*. 2.32.13 *hac uos fortuna atque his ducibus*), but sometimes it may follow the whole constituent which thus behaves as a unit (Cic. *De Or*. 3.7 *qui autem annus ei . . .*), as here.[107] Severa almost certainly used the same word order and expression at 291.9–10 *Aelius meus . [ ] et filioḷus ṣalutant* (supply *te*).

A vocative expression

The expression *ḍomine meụs* has turned up at 843. It is not unusual for a word in apposition to or in agreement with a vocative to be in the nominative, and this phrase

[102] Hofmann and Szantyr (n. 43), 433.
[103] See in general Dickey (n. 86), 110–28.
[104] See Dickey (n. 86), 126, and for *filia* in particular, see 120, discussing Ov. *Met*. 10.467–8.
[105] See e.g. Hofmann and Szantyr (n. 43), 175.
[106] For a manifestation of which in the earlier material, see Adams (n. 5), 118 on 332.
[107] J. N. Adams, 'Wackernagel's law and the position of unstressed personal pronouns in Classical Latin', *TPS* 92 (1994), 109 (on no. 11), 111 (on no. 14).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is commonplace in later (particularly Christian) Latin.[108] This may be the first example of the expression.

Expressions of direction

(1) *Locative*. There are two interesting examples of the place-name *Coria* (thought to be Corbridge) in the new letters:

611: *te tanto magis uenturụm Coriạ* [or *-is*] *sicut constituisti spero*;
617: *festinabitis Coris rae[*

The reading of the ending in the first example is uncertain. If *Coris*, this would be reminiscent of various examples of the locative *Alexandrie* in a letter of Terentianus (*PMich*. VIII.471) complementing the verb 'come' or the like (for example, 22 *uenire Alexandrie*, 25 *uen[i]o tequm Alexandrie*, 32 *uenire . . . Alexandrie*; five examples). Behind such locatival uses there lie various factors. First, there was a tendency in substandard Latin for adverbials expressing the idea 'place to' to be replaced by adverbials with the sense 'place at' as complements of verbs of motion. Thus, for example, *hic* (with, for example, *uenio*) encroaches on *huc* and *domi* on *domum* (for example, *CIL* IV.2246 ***hic*** *cum ueni . . . redei* ***domi***). Secondly, familiar place names tended to be fossilized in a commonly used case form, such as the locative (for example, *Arimini* > Italian *Rimini*),[109] and most of the examples of the usage attested are in commonplace names. For further instances, see, for example, Petron. 62.1 *dominus Capuae exierat*, *Vet. Lat.* II Tim. 1:17 (*d*) *uenisset Romae*, Vulg. John 5:1 *ascendit . . . Hierosolymis*, Donatus, *GL* Keil IV.393.12 *aut (si) interrogati quo pergamus respondeamus Romae*.

The usage was stigmatized by the educated, as the passage of Donatus shows, and it is overwhelmingly found in substandard texts, as in a speech by a freedman in Petronius and in a highly colloquial letter of Terentianus. It would therefore be surprising to have the usage in the letter of Haterius Nepos (611 above), who may have been the distinguished equestrian destined to become prefect of Egypt. The phraseology and syntax of the letter are not substandard but show the marks of education (see below, VIII). It is possible that one or both examples of *Coris* are ablatives, but since the letters were found at Vindolanda one would have to assume that the recipients, at Corbridge, had brought the letters with them to Vindolanda and left them there. There is a similarly ambiguous example of the same place-name in the earlier material (*Tab. Vind*. II.266 *uolọ ueniat ad me Cọris*).[110] Since it is unlikely that so many recipients had carried letters sent from Vindolanda back to their starting point, it would seem either that locally *Coris* had been fossilized in a directional/ locatival sense and was so commonplace that even the educated had taken to using it thus, or that Haterius Nepos in fact used *Coria*.

(2) *Accusative*. The letter 628 appears to have a plain accusative (*compitum*) without a preposition expressing goal: . . . *utrumnẹ cum uexsilló omnes rediemus an alterni comṇịtum* ('shall we all return to the crossroad with the standard (together), or every

[108] J. Svennung, *Anredeformen. Vergleichende Forschungen zur indirekten Anrede in der dritten Person und zum Nominativ für den Vokativ* (Lund, 1958), 274; *TLL* VIII.915.19ff.
[109] See e.g. Löfstedt (n. 100), 137 with n. 1. [110] Adams (n. 5), 110–11.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

other one [i.e. half] of us?'). Outside poetry the plain accusative is for the most part confined to names of towns and a few terms such as *domum*, but even in more colloquial texts there are occasional examples such as this.[111] For this sense of *alterni*, cf. Verg. *Aen*. 12.233 *uix hostem, alterni si congrediamur, habemus*.

A relative construction

In the remainder of this article I will several times discuss the letter from a certain Maior to Maritimus, which is long and well preserved (645). I quote the whole text at this point to facilitate reference to it:

i

Maior Maritim[o] ṣ[uo
salutem
scire te uólui epistulas mihi mis-
sas esse ab patri meó in qui-
bus scribit mihi ut ei no-
tum faciam quid gesseró de
fussá quod sị ịṭá gessịsti
negotium cum Ḉaesaria-
ṇis fac ut certum mihi
r]ẹ[s]ṣcṛibas ut egó paṭ[tr]ị

ii

meo sic resscribere
possim si quid inṭer-
numeraueris egọ ṭibi
sine morá brạḉem ex-
ṗellam pro s[[s]]ummá
quod effịciatur egó
cum hạec tibi scribẹ-
rem lectum calfacieba[m
opto sis felicissimuṣ
salutat te paṭ[....].[
ualẹ [
si mih]ị puerum miṣṣurus es miṭtes chiṛ[o-
grafum] cum eo quo securior sim

Back:
VINDOLAṆDE
Cocceịió Mari-
timó
a Ma]i[or]e

The construction *pro summa quod efficiatur* needs explanation. There is a use of *efficio* meaning 'raise (money)' (see *OLD* s.v. 7). Read in isolation as a relative clause, *quod efficiatur* could mean '(money) which may be raised', and that would suit the context perfectly: the writer would be offering to release (*expellam*: see below) an amount of grain determined by the size of the payment raised. A superficial problem lies in the lack of concord between the feminine *summa* and the neuter *quod*. But such violations of concord, whereby a feminine antecedent is picked up by a neuter

[111] See Hofmann and Szantyr (n. 43), 49, and the extensive discussion of possible examples by W. A. Baehrens, *Beiträge zur lateinischen Syntax.* Philologus, Supplementband 12.2 (Leipzig, 1912), 331–56.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(generalizing) relative, either singular or plural, do occur, particularly but not exclusively in late Latin.[112] The phenomenon can be traced back as far as Plautus, as in examples such as *Aul*. 770 *te de alia* ***re*** *resciuisse censui* ***quod*** *ad me attinet*. Here it is *res* which is picked up by a neuter in a sort of *constructio ad sensum*, in that *res*, though feminine, denotes a 'thing'. Quite early *quod* is used in reference back to places or place-names of whatever gender (see further below),[113] and in later Latin various feminine antecedents are attested followed by *quod*.[114] A neuter pronoun at any period could be used to refer back to a noun of whatever gender, provided that the noun designated an inanimate. Note, for example, Varro *Rust*. 2.9.11 *in fetura dandum potius* ***hordeacios*** *quam triticios* ***panes****; magis enim* ***eo*** *aluntur* (Loeb: 'During the period of gestation they should be fed barley bread rather than wheat bread, for they are better nourished on the former'), where *eo* looks back to *hordeacios panes*.

There are decisive parallels to the example under discussion from the period just before that of the Vindolanda tablets. The following inscription is from Pompeii: *CIL* I^2.1635 = *ILS* 5706 *laconicum et destrictarium faciund. et porticus et palaestr. reficiunda locarunt ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)* ***ex ea pecunia****,* ***quod*** *eos e lege in ludos aut in monumento consumere oportuit* (they let out the construction and repair of certain things 'from that money which they ought to have used on . . .').[115] Here too the context is financial, and the feminine noun for 'money' is picked up by a neuter relative. Even closer to the Vindolanda example is the following from the *Res Gestae* of Augustus (16.1):[116] *ea* ***[s]u[mma*** *sest]ertium circiter sexsiens milliens fuit,* ***quam*** *[p]ro Italicis praed[is] numeraui, et ci[r]citer bis mill[ie]ns et sescentiens,* ***quod*** *pro agris prouin[c]ialibus solui* ('that sum amounted to about 600 million sesterces which I paid for lands in Italy, and about 260 million which I disbursed for provincial lands'). Here *summa* is first picked up by the feminine relative pronoun *quam*, and then (as in the example from Vindolanda) by the neuter *quod*. The restoration of *summa* seems certain (the Greek version has *κεφαλαίου ἐγένοντο*), but in any case it is clear that the head noun was feminine. It emerges from these various examples that amounts of money could behave as neuters (as was the case with place-names: see above, and next paragraph).

There is also an interesting use of a neuter relative pronoun in another British text, precisely dated 14 March 118. The text is on a stylus tablet from the City of London, and is apparently the record of a formal enquiry into the ownership of a wood in Kent:[117] *cum uentum esset in rem praesentem,* ***siluam*** *Verlucionium, arepennia decem quinque, plus minus,* ***quod*** *est in ciuitate Canticcorum*. The antecedent of *quod* is *siluam*; even if it were (implausibly) taken to be *arepennia* (neuter plural) there would still be a violation of agreement, of a slightly different type. Here it is the place-name that behaves as a neuter (for which see above).

I suggest, then, that we have in the Vindolanda letter another case of a neuter pronoun referring back to an inanimate antecedent of feminine gender, of exactly the same type as that seen in the *Res Gestae* and in the Pompeian inscription. The sense is

[112] Hofmann and Szantyr (n. 43), 431–2; D. Norberg, *Beiträge zur spätlateinischen Syntax* (Uppsala, 1944), 58–60; J. Vielliard, *Le latin des diplômes royaux et chartes privées de l'époque mérovingienne* (Paris, 1927), 153–4.

[113] E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins* II (Lund, 1956), 148, n. 2.

[114] Norberg (n. 112), 60; Vielliard (n. 112), 153–4.

[115] Löfstedt (n. 113), I.3 n.

[116] I owe this example to Harm Pinkster.

[117] M. W. C. Hassall and R. S. O. Tomlin, 'Inscriptions', *Britannia* 25 (1994), 303–4, n. 34.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'I will get *bracis* out of store for you in proportion to the sum of money which may be raised.'

A parenthetical expression; parenthetical verbs

At 656 (*uidit autem me potest fieri apud aurifices aut apud argentarios*) it is unlikely that *potest* starts a new sentence. *Vidit autem me* would be odd on its own, and the next sentence would be hard to understand. It is more likely that *potest fieri* is parenthetical.

This example of *potest fieri* takes us closer to the starting point of the development of French *peut-être* than anything hitherto attested. *Potest fieri* is a common collocation. Sometimes it is accompanied by an *ut* clause (so the examples cited by *OLD* s.v. *possum*, 1c), but, more relevantly to the present case, it is sometimes used absolutely, without either a clausal complement to *fieri* or a subject of *potest* (*TLL* X.2.135.57ff.), particularly in comic dialogue: for example, Ter. *Haut*. 785 *credebam* :: *minime.* :: *scite poterat fieri*; *Ad.* 530 *quae non data sit? non potest fieri.* :: *potest*; *Ad.* 936 *nil agis.* :: *fieri aliter non potest*. There is also an example in a letter of Claudius Terentianus (*PMich*. VIII.469.3 *or[at] te si potes<t> fieri ut emas . . .*). It is this absolute use that we have in the Vindolanda letter, but there it is parenthetical, and it is the parenthetical absolute use that was to generate *peut-être* (with a different infinitive substituted). On the Romance construction, see *FEW* IX.236 n. 12, with an observation at 235 that constructions of the Ciceronian type *potest fieri ut fallar* (*Fam.* 13.73.2 = 'I may be wrong' [Shackleton Bailey]; the whole clause is here parenthetical, and is very similar to the Vindolanda example, except that it is not absolute) were to provide the genesis of the Romance usage; we can now be more precise about the nature of the Latin precursor.

Parentheses of the type which are unflagged by a connective such as *enim* or a subordinator such as *si* or a relative pronoun, and comprise a modal verb with or without a dependent infinitive, are (for example) common in the epistolary style of Pliny, who was roughly contemporary with the Vindolanda tablets: for example, 3.2.4 *amat me (**nihil possum ardentius dicere**) ut tu*, 4.17.6 *et iam mihi ab illo honor atque etiam (**audebo dicere**) reuerentia ut aequali habebatur*, 6.33.8 *sunt multa (**non auderem nisi tibi dicere**) elata*, 7.19.9 *quod matrem eius, illam (**nihil possum inlustrius dicere**) tantae feminae matrem*, 7.22.1 *omnibus titulis (**nihil uolo elatius de modestissimo uiro dicere**) parem*, 8.8.1 *quem ego (**paenitet tarditatis**) proxime uidi*, 9.28.5 *quas ego (**num parcius possum?**) centesimas computabo*. In each of these cases the parenthesis leads into the key word or revelation of the utterance, and that is the function of the Vindolanda example as well. The frequency of *possum* should be noted.

It has been observed by Hofmann and Szantyr[118] that in post-classical prose (Seneca the Younger, Pliny) parentheses foreshadowing Romance usages can be found; they cite Plin. *Ep.* 7.20.6 *sed nos (**nihil interest mea quo loco**) iungimur* (cf. French *n'importe*). This is the same type of anticipatory parenthesis as those seen in the previous paragraph. The parenthetical expression at Vindolanda, even if it cannot yet be exactly paralleled, fits a contemporary type which was to be influential in the development of the Romance languages. *Potest fieri* is a modal verb-phrase which is on the way to being lexicalized.

At 648 *spero* does not have the usual dependent accusative + infinitive, but is parenthetical: *de rotulis quas spero cito ex[pl]icabit*. In colloquial texts various verbs

[118] Hoffman and Szantyr (n. 43), 472.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(for example *scio*, *credo*, *fateor*, *rogo*), including *spero*, are regularly used parenthetically instead of with a dependent construction (a form of parataxis).[119] For *spero*, see for example Plaut. *Epid*. 124 *spero seruabit*; Ter. *An.* 314 *interea fiet aliquid spero*, *Ad*. 411 *spero est similis maiorum suorum*; Petron. 47.3 *spero tamen, iam ueterem pudorem sibi imponit*, 57.6 *spero, sic moriar, ut mortuus non erubescam* (the last two examples in freedmen's speeches).

The presence of this parataxis in the letter 648 opens the way to the interpretation of a difficult passage (670):

eṭ quid circ̣[a] eạs res agatụr
peto per occ̣[asi]o̩nem scṛibis
mihi si̩ oc̣[cas]i̩onem Brẹme-
si̩one noṇ h̥[abeb]i̩s dabis Catarac-
t̩oni Dụrṃ[...u]etẹrano ..

There are various ways of taking *peto* here. It may be construed with the preceding *quid*-clause, which would be an indirect question dependent on it ('I ask what is being done about those things'). For such dependent constructions with *peto*, see for example Hyg. *Astr.* 2.4.6 *peti<i>t a parente, quo facto calamitate ciuitatem posset liberare* and *TLL* X.1.1975.20ff. (where it is observed that there is a predominating notion of asking, *praevalente notione interrogandi*). On this interpretation *peto* would end a sentence, and the next, short, sentence would comprise the words *per occasionem scribis mihi* ('as the opportunity arises, write to me', with *scribis* a present indicative for imperative: see below). For the expression *per occasionem*, see for example Livy 2.11.2 and *TLL* IX.2.336.58ff. But *peto* is rare (and mainly late) with this construction, and the short following sentence does not entirely ring true. The alternative is to take *peto*, like *spero* above, as parenthetical. *Quid . . . agatur* would thus depend on imperatival *scribis*: 'write to me, I ask, what is being done about those matters when you get the chance. If you do not get the chance at Bremesio(?), give (a letter) to . . at Cataractonium'. This interpretation is in my opinion easier. For *peto* followed by an imperative, see *TLL* X.1.1973.66ff., and by a (jussive) subjunctive, 1974.73ff. (for example, Cic. *Att*. 3.25 *illud abs te peto, des operam* . . .). It was seen above (p. 546) that in the letters the future indicative is frequently used as an imperatival, but in colloquial Latin the present indicative is also common in this function,[120] though it does not happen to be found elsewhere in the Vindolanda material. With the merging of long *e* and short *i* in speech (see above, p. 533), *scribis* and *scribes* had the same pronunciation, and thus a verb form in *-is* need not have been unequivocally intended as a present. In late technical texts imperativals in *-es* and *-is* interchange haphazardly,[121] and it is not certain that scribes treated the two spellings as representing different tenses.

For a comparable parenthetical usage in the earlier tablets, cf. II.343.14–15 *rogo . . . mitte*.[122] To an overwhelming extent *rogo* is the verb of asking used in non-literary Latin and in colloquial texts of the empire,[123] but *peto* does sometimes occur, as in the letters *POxy*. 1.32 (twice; *rogo* is not found in this text) and *PDura* 64A–B = *CEL* (for which see n. 87) 199 (twice), and also at *Tab. Vind*. III.718 in a fragmentary letter without an identifiable construction.

[119] See e.g. Hofmann and Szantyr (n. 43), 528; J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache* (Heidelberg, 1951[3]), 107.
[120] See e.g. Hofmann and Szantyr (n. 43), 326–7.
[121] Adams (n. 90), 205–6, 461. [122] Adams (n. 5), 118. [123] See e.g. Adams (n. 5), 117–18.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

VII. LEXICON

Expello

The letter to Maior, as was seen above, has an unusual use of *expello*: *si quid inṭernumeraueris, egọ ṭibi sine morá braṣem exṗellam* ('if you make any interim payment(s) [see below on *internumero*], without delay I will "expel" *bracis*'). There is a parallel for this use of *expello* in Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc*. 4.34, p. 169.18 (see *TLL* V.2.1637.42): *factum est autem post paucos dies, dum in humilitate atque sanctitate se in omnibus exiberet, ut expellentes monachi de horrea anonas quasi choros tres ad solem siccare ponerent, quas huic custodire praecipiunt* ('after a few days, while he was conducting himself with humility and sanctity in every respect, it came about that that monks removed grain from the granary and put about three *chori* in the sun to dry. They instructed him to guard it'). *Expello* refers to the act of pushing grain out, presumably with some sort of implement. In the Vindolanda letter the verb is used elliptically, without explicit reference to the place from which the substance was to be 'expelled', and that implies that the usage was idiomatic. It is not at all unusual for a usage to turn up at Vindolanda centuries before its next attestation, as we will see again in this paper.

Fussa

The usage discussed above is relevant to a difficult word earlier in the letter, *fussa*: *in quibus scribit mihi ut ei notum faciam quid gesseró de fussá. quod sị ịtá gessịsti negotium cum Ṣaesarianịs* . . . ('in which [letters] he writes that I should make it known to him what I will do about the *fussa*. But if you have dealt with the business in this way [?] with the *Caesariani* . . .').

The repetition of *gero* suggests that the 'business' with the *Caesariani* concerns the *fussa*. *Fussa* looks very much like the past participle of *fundo*, with a historically correct gemination of *s* (for gemination of *s* after long vowels in the tablets, see above, p. 539). If so it has been used as a feminine substantive, and that would only have happened if the usage derived from ellipse of a feminine noun which might have been qualified by the participle. The letter goes on to deal with a type of grain (*bracis*: see below, p. 562), and it seems to me likely that that is the noun understood with *fussa*. *Fundo* could be used of pouring grain (*TLL* VI.1.1565.73ff.). We saw above that *expello* is used in the same letter of 'expelling' grain (presumably from a granary), a usage which suggests a particular method of storage of the grain in the granary. It has been noted that there are three potential ways of storing grain in a building,[124] though there is no good information about the method(s) favoured by the Romans. Grain may be stored loosely on the floor, or in bins, or in sacks. In this case the verb *expello* strongly favours loose storage on the floor, such that the substance could be pushed out, 'expelled'. And if it could be got out by 'expulsion', it would be put in by 'pouring'. There is a clear reference to the storing of grain in a *cella* (?: see below, n. 125) on the ground at [Virgil], *Moretum* 16, and the verb of storing is indeed *fundo*, in the participial form: *reserat clausae . . . ostia cellae. / fusus erat terra frumenti pauper aceruus* ('. . . to undo the door of his closed store-cupboard. On the ground had been poured a miserable heap of grain').[125] From here the rustic Simulus 'takes out' a

[124] G. Rickman, *Roman Granaries and Store Buildings* (Cambridge, 1971), 85.

[125] I have largely followed here the translation of E. J. Kenney, *The Ploughman's Lunch. Moretum. A Poem Ascribed to Virgil* (Bristol, 1984). On the text, see Kenney's note 18. There are

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

quantity for himself (*hinc sibi depromit*). The whole passage with its terminology provides a close parallel to our own: there is a heap of grain stored on the ground which had been 'poured' there, and the peasant gets some of it out. Also worth noting is Plin. *HN* 18.301, which refers to filling a granary 'from above' (*superne impleri*), a procedure consistent with pouring. I suggest that the elliptical usage in this letter arises from the familiarity of the subject-matter to writer and addressee (who will have corresponded already about the affair), and that grain which has been 'poured' is that which has been put in store and is lying loose; *fussa* would mean (elliptically) the 'loose stuff'.

Internumero

Internumero, in the same sentence as *expello*, is a new word, but it belongs to a type.[126] Compounds in *inter* often refer to something which is done or happens at intervals (here and there), in the physical sense, or intermittently (periodically), in the temporal sense. The present compound falls into the second category. Cf. *interaestuo* 'to be periodically inflamed', *intermico* 'shine fitfully', *interniteo* 'shine or gleam at intervals', *interoscitans* 'yawning from time to time', *interuocaliter* 'with cries at intervals' (examples from *OLD*). For the other category, see for example *interfringo*, *interlego*, *interputo*, *intersemino*, *interspergo*. The reference is to payments from time to time.

Notum facio

Notable in line 5 of the same letter (*in quibus (epistulis) scribit mihi ut ei notum faciam quid gesseró*) is the use of *facio* + past participle *notum* = 'make known to him what I will do . . .' The same expression is found in a military context at Bu Njem in what looks like a formal report to a commanding officer (*prepositus*): see *O. Bu Njem* 91 *notum ti[bi fa]cio*. Down to the time of Apuleius the usage is attested twelve times,[127] eight of which examples are in the correspondence of Pliny the Younger (2.11.2, 3.5.2, 4.20.1, 6.19.3, 10.7, 10.21.1, 10.59, 10.78.3). Interestingly, four of the Plinian examples are in the correspondence between Pliny and the emperor Trajan. Twice Trajan himself uses the phrase: 10.7 *tu ex quo nomo sit notum mihi facere debebis*, 10.78.3 *si milites erunt, legatis eorum quae deprehenderis notum facies*. There seems to be a bureaucratic ring to the expression. Note, for example, the context at Plin. *Ep*. 2.11.2: *existimauimus fidei nostrae conuenire* ***notum senatui facere*** *excessisse Priscum immanitate et saeuitia crimina quibus dari iudices possent*. This example is identical to that at Suet. *Aug*. 65.2 *libello per quaestorem recitato* ***notum senatui fecit***. The expression occurs for the first time at Ov. *Met*. 12.64 *fecerat haec notum, Graias cum milite forti | aduentare rates*. Bömer ad loc. is inclined to see the phraseology as belonging to 'Umgangssprache',[128] but such a judgement reflects the common ten-

considerable textual difficulties in the first line (*cellae* is an emendation), but not in the second, which is the one of importance here.

[126] It is reported at a much later date in the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (V.1439), but with a meaning ('to reckon among') which is not the same as that here.

[127] I am grateful to Dr G. Galdi of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* for information on this point. Apart from the examples listed or quoted in the text, see Hyg. *Grom*. 97.5, Fronto 75.6 Van den Hout.

[128] F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen. Kommentar, Buch XII–XIII* (Heidelberg, 1982), merely remarking that periphrases with *facere* belonged to the colloquial language.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dency to label as 'colloquial' anything which is unusual. Ovid seems to have adopted bureaucratic terminology in reference to an announcement of a military attack.

For constructions of this general type (that is, *facio* + object[129] + past participle), see *TLL* VI.1.119.58ff. (where, however, *notum facio* is not dealt with).[130] Sometimes, as in the combination *facere missum*, the periphrasis is equivalent in meaning to the transitive use of the verb of the participle (that is, *facere missum* = *mittere*), but that is not always the case. For a comparable expression to that here, cf. Vulg. Psalm. 31:5 *delictum . . . cognitum . . . feci*.

Propitius

Applied to a human at 628 (*sis mihi propitius*). Shackleton Bailey in reference to a case at Cic. *Att*. 8.16.2 (of a man likened to a god) remarks:[131] 'C. almost always applies [*propitius*] to deities (*Nat. deor.* II.145 is an exception).'[132] See Cato, *Agr.* 134.2 for a typical example: *Iane pater, te . . . preces precor, uti sies uolens propitius mihi*. The whole expression (with jussive subjunctive *sis* and dative *mihi*) used by the writer of the letter (Masclus, to Cerialis) seems to allude to religious language, and on the face of it might be taken to imply a sycophantic attitude to the prefect (Masclus also addresses Cerialis as *rex*). There is, however, in another non-literary text an example applied to a human (*O. Bu Njem* 147.5 *te salbo et propitio*) (context obscure), and there may well be a second instance of the formula in a new but fragmentary Vindolanda text (706 *opto sis . . h[ ] tiụs*; the editors plausibly suggest *opto sis mihi propitius*). If this restoration is correct, the expression had perhaps acquired the character of an epistolary formula locally.

Vectura, uelatura; merx

A short account of vehicle parts (600) containing a number of interesting words runs as follows:

i

sẹssiọnẹs *traces*
uitus iv
materies at tẹgum..[133]
curuas iv

ii

. . .
et a..on.. *traces (?)*[134]
ad capsum ueturae.

I deal at this point only with the last line (but see further below), which has a notable

[129] In the Vindolanda letter the object is the *quid*-clause.

[130] See also J. Svennung, *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache* (Lund, 1935), 459–60; Hofmann and Szantyr (n. 43), 392.

[131] D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus* IV (Cambridge, 1968), 358.

[132] The recent *TLL* article on *propitius*, however, shows that in Latin in general the application of the word to humans was not unusual.

[133] Possibly *tegumen* (so the editors).

[134] The editors tentatively suggest *axionem* here, but the reading is very difficult (but see below).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

lexical item (*ueturae*). *Capsus* occurs in Vitruvius (10.9.2 *insuper autem ad capsum raedae loculamentum firmiter figatur*) in the meaning 'body (of a carriage)' (*OLD*, s.v. 1), and that is the meaning which it must have here. The word is reflected in Romance (*FEW* II.316–17). The next word represents *uecturae*, with a banal assimilation *ct* > *(t)t* (cf. for example *octo* > Italian *otto*, French *huit*, *Otauius* = *Octauius*, and so on).[135] In this context *uecturae* (genitive singular) must have the concrete meaning 'wagon, vehicle' rather than its original abstract sense (note the identical phrase in Vitruvius, but with *raedae*). With this new sense the word is reflected in Gallo-Romance (e.g. Old French *voiture*, 'véhicule pour transport': *FEW* XIV.213 b.α) and in Italy (Italian *vettura*, Piedmontese *vitüra*: see *FEW* XIV.214). The semantic change had not hitherto been represented in Latin, but it has long since been recognized that it must have taken place in the Latin period (see for example *FEW* XIV.214).[136] The new example at Vindolanda not only has the Romance meaning, but it also has the assimilated form which the Romance reflexes show. This is therefore a striking anticipation of a Romance usage in two respects. More than a thousand years later *uectura* is quoted from British medieval Latin with the meaning 'mount *or* baggage-wagon'.[137] This usage will have been taken over from the contemporary vernacular (Old French) and re-Latinized. This is not the only example of *uectura* in the new tablets, as we will see shortly, though elsewhere it does not have this meaning.

The tantalizingly incomplete letter 649 has two examples of *uelatura* and one of *uectura* in close proximity to each other:

10 Vindolandạ cu.[c.9
et uelatura abent ạ.[c.7
ḍias uecturas id eṣt (denarios) singḷọs
et omnem uelaturạm eṭ quam
uecturam eis solues mẹṛce
tibi recte .dmẹ...ṛ

Velatura is a rare word,[138] but twice its sense is given by Varro: *Rust*. 1.2.14 *item dicuntur qui uecturis uiuunt uelaturam facere* ('likewise those who make a living by haulage are said to do *uelatura*'); *Ling*. 5.44 *Velabrum a uehendo. uelaturam facere etiam nunc dicuntur qui id mercede faciunt. merces . . . huic uecturae qui ratibus transibant quadrans* ('*Velabrum* is from *uehere* "to convey". Even now, those persons are said to do *uelatura* who do this for pay. The *merces* "pay" . . . for this ferrying of those who crossed by rafts was a farthing' [R. G. Kent, Loeb, adapted]). *Velatura* was the profession of making a living out of transport, ferrying, *uectura* (*OLD*, 'the business of a carrier'). As in the letter, so in both passages of Varro *uelatura* is closely

[135] See, for example, the material assembled by Väänänen (n. 11), 64–5; (n. 14), 63.

[136] See also E. Zellmer, *Die lateinischer Wörter auf -ura* (Frankfurt am Main, 1976), 286.

[137] R. E. Latham, *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources* (London, 1965), 506. I am grateful to D. R. Howlett and T. Christchev, of the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, for supplying me with the following examples: J. Tait (ed.), *The Chartulary or Register of the Abbey of St Werburgh Chester*, Part I (Manchester, 1920), 308, p. 205 (A.D. 1279) *concesserunt . . . quod . . . liberum habeant transitum imperpetuum cum bigis et plaustris et uecturis per uiam que ducit . . .*; J. Brownhill (ed.), *The Coucher Book of Furness Abbey* II (Manchester, 1915), 84 (A.D. 1293) *omnia necessaria capiant ad reparationem plaustrorum, carectarum et omnium aliarum uecturarum*.

[138] See Zellmer (n. 136), 286, and, on the formation, Leumann (n. 19), 315, < **uehela* + *tura*.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

associated with *uectura*; moreoever the letter has *mẹrce*, and the second passage of Varro *merces*, apparently with the same sense (see below).

In the letter *uectura* cannot have the sense that it has in Varro (that is, 'carriage' in the abstract verbal sense) or in the above account. As object of *solues* 'pay' it must have another concrete meaning, 'payment for carriage' (see *OLD*, s.v. 2). Nor can *uelatura* have the meaning ascribed to it by Varro, and the question arises what it does mean here. One can only speculate, because the context offers little or nothing to go on.

There are just two things that are known for certain about *uelatura*. First, there is what Varro tells us. Varro of all people cannot have been wrong. *Velatura* was an abstract verbal noun denoting the activity of transportation done for money, as a profession, and perhaps by some sort of contractual arrangement (*uectura* in the abstract sense was apparently more general, without reference to the activity as a profession). Secondly, it had acquired a concrete meaning. That much is clear from the Vindolanda text. Certain persons have the whole *uelatura*, and they appear to be bringing it with them. A sentence must begin at *abent* in line 11, with the *a* that follows either the preposition or the start of the sentence adverb *autem*. The wording implies a concrete thing. Abstracts in *-ura* are well known for acquiring a concrete meaning, as *uectura* itself in this letter, and in the account discussed above, shows. We must then ask ourselves what concrete meaning *uelatura* is likely to have taken on, from the starting point with which Varro provides us. Suppose, for argument's sake, we translate Varro's meaning as something like 'contracted transportation', 'transportation' because the noun was verbal, and 'contracted' because it was not a personal and private activity, but one done for others by some sort of prior arrangement. The persons in the tablet have the whole 'contracted transportation', which leads me to suggest that the concrete sense is 'the full load for transportation as contracted'. The subjects are coming with the full load as arranged, but they have only been paid for half of it, if we accept the editors' suggestion *dimidias* for *dịạṣ* (+ *uecturas*) in lines 11–12. The implication is perhaps that they were paid in part up front, but would only be paid in full at the end of the job. The addressee looks to have the task of receiving the full load and paying the remainder (?) of what is due.

If the reading *Vindolanda* is right, it is tempting in the first place to take it as an ablative, because (i) one would not expect a nominative place-name embedded in the middle of a sentence in this type of document, and (ii) the evidence for omission of final *m* is so poor in the texts. A difficulty with this interpretation is that the letter was found at Vindolanda. If this rules out the ablative,[139] then the form must be an accusative without *-m*, which is quite possible, given the other signs of poor spelling in the letter (notably omission of *h*). As we have seen, assorted misspellings tend to come in clusters. Whether ablative or accusative, someone (perhaps *Brittones*, as this word occurs earlier in the letter) must be bringing something from or to Vindolanda. Some such text as *uenient (-iunt) Vindolanda(m) cum sex carris et uelatura* would get the sense I am suggesting.

Quam uecturam solues (followed by *mẹrce tibi recte.dṃẹ...ṛ*) presumably means 'which contribution you will pay, that is, your contribution', or, taking *quam* as indefinite (see above, p. 538), 'any contribution you will make'. The verb which must follow *recte* is unfortunately obscure (*admetiar* ?: see the editors ad loc.), and the sense of *merce*, if it is the correct reading, is thus unclear. But *merx* sometimes took on the

[139] It does not entirely: there is no clear sign of an address in this letter, and, as the editors point out, the letter could be a draft, written at Vindolanda and never sent anywhere.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sense of *merces* (see *OLD*, s.v. *merx*, 3, and especially *TLL* VIII.852.12ff., above all line 20, giving the sense as *praemium, quod rependitur*). This last sense corresponds exactly to the primary meaning of *merces* as given by *OLD*, s.v. *merces* 1, 'A payment for services rendered, a wage, fee' (see the passage of Varro quoted above). Such a meaning would fit the present context. It is possible that the addressee was being promised a fee (or even a payment in kind: see sect. *c* of the same entry in the *OLD*) for his services in paying part of the carriage expenses.

Vitus

The same account of vehicle parts cited above has the item (line 2) *uitus iv*. *Vitus* is a rare but identifiable word. Its forms are discussed by Probus, *GL* Keil IV.116.22–33 (cf. IV.193.24),[140] but without any comment on its meaning. It turns up, however, in glosses, glossed by ἴτυς 'felloe of a wheel' (see the index, *CGL* VII.425, s.v. *uitus*). There are also examples in the Greek version of Diocletian's Prices Edict of both the noun βίτος and its derivative adjective βιτωτός = *uitutus* (15.31a, 15.34).[141]

Curua

The fourth line of the above account has simply *curuas iv*. The interpretation of the expression is not straightforward, as it depends on the way in which *materies* in the previous line is taken, and *materies* in its turn is open to several interpretations. First, *materies* may be singular = 'timber' (on the meaning of the noun, see further below), and the line might have ended after the prepositional expression which has so far not been completely read (thus, 'timber for . . .'). Alternatively, the word may be plural. Whereas *lignum* was typically used of firewood (see *OLD* s.v., 1), a basic sense of *materia* was 'timber used for building or construction' (see *TLL* VIII.449.63ff.). It is mostly used in the singular of the substance in general, but such words indicating a substance, entity, or the like often had a particularizing plural designating the components of the substance. Thus, for example, *caro* means 'flesh' in general, but *carnes* 'pieces of flesh', *uinum* 'wine', but *uina* 'types of wine'.[142] *Materiae* is used of 'pieces of timber' (for construction) at Tac. *Hist*. 4.23.3 (*struere materias in modum pontis*; cf. Plin. *Ep*. 10.41.2), just as *ligna* is used of 'pieces of firewood, logs' at Petron. 38.7 (*modo solebat collo suo ligna portare*). If *materies* in line 3 is the plural use, the prepositional expression might have been followed (in the same line) by a numeral. Or again, line 3 may have run on into line 4, with *curuas iv* agreeing with *materies* = 'four curved pieces of timber for . . .' But the other lines of the account seem to be self-contained, and in this position of the line *curuas* would be expected to be substantival rather than adjectival (cf. line 2 for the structure). If *curuas* is nominal there is a need to explain the gender. As was noted above on *fussa*, an adjective (or participle) could be substantivized in the feminine if there was ellipse of a feminine noun regularly used in conjunction with the adjective/participle. The obvious can-

[140] The form *uitus* is accusative plural; the list is in the accusative.

[141] See S. Lauffer, *Diokletians Preisedikt* (Berlin, 1971), 255. For further discussion of the word, see A. Walde and J.B. Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1954[3]), II.898; W. Heraeus, *Kleine Schriften*, ed. J. B. Hofmann (Heidelberg, 1937), 10–13; cf. A. Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.* (Oxford, 1949), s.v.

[142] See e.g. Löfstedt (n. 113) I.29, Hofmann and Szantyr (n. 43), 21; also J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax* I (Basel, 1926), 96.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

didate here would be *materia* (*-ies*) itself. I suggest the possibility that *curuas* meant something like 'curved pieces of timber' used in the construction of a wagon. If so it would presumably have had a precise technical sense no longer exactly recoverable from the limited context (could it, for example, have referred to the rim of a wheel?). The *TLL* does not record a feminine substantival use of the word,[143] but there are such uses reflected in various forms of Gallo-Romance with meanings comparable to that suggested for the present example: for example, Old Provençal *corba*, 'pièce de bois cintrée qui fait partie de la charrue' (*FEW* II.1590). Unfortunately there remain uncertainties in the interpretation of the text, and one cannot unequivocally treat *curua* as an addition to the lexica. There is possibly another case of the word in the fragment 685: . . . *urua* · *alḷigata*.

Axionem (?)

If the reading (in the same account) suggested very tentatively by the editors were correct, this word would represent an addition to the small group of masculine denominatives in *-io* designating things. Other members of the group are *pernio* 'chilblain' from *perna* 'ham', *cucullio* (cf. *cucullus*) and *matellio* from *matella*.[144] The base of the term would be *axis* 'axle'. These terms in *-io* do not seem to have been exactly synonymous with the base word. *Pernio*, for example, indicates a growth of flesh presumably resembling a ham in some way (but of much smaller size). Of particular note is the observation of Festus preserved at Paul. Fest. 113.7 *matellio deminutiuum a matula* (*sic*; *matella* would fit the context better). Thus a *matellio* was a pot smaller than a chamber-pot (*matella*), and the formation is interpreted as having diminutive force. On this analogy an *axio* might have been a small or short axle intended for a small wagon. The suffix is not likely to be *-o*, *-onis* (attached to an *-i* stem), as denominatives of this formation designate persons.[145] The suffix *-io* can often be interpreted as having a diminutive-pejorative sense even when it appears in names (for example, *Caesario* = *Καισαρίων*, 'son of Caesar', > 'little Caesar') or personal designations, such as *mulio* ('muleteer', a despised occupation). It may have entered Latin in Greek names, spread to Latin names with a pejorative quality (*Glabrio*), and from there to pejorative personal designations (*mulio*, *homuncio* alongside *homunculus*), before coming to be used as a neutral diminutive suffix in the formation of masculine denominatives.[146]

Braciarius

Here is another word attested for the first time at Vindolanda (646), a thousand years or so before its next occurrences in medieval Latin.[147] The question arises what it means. The base *bracis*, a Celtic word, is equated by Pliny (*HN* 18.62) with *far* 'spelt', and described as a word in use in Gaul. But Pliny is rather vague, and not necessarily to be trusted on the precise sense of the word. The Celtic base, as can be deduced from its representatives in Irish, Welsh, and Cornish, referred to malt used in beer

[143] But note *CGL* II.338.15, where *curua* is glossed by *καμπύλη* 'crooked staff'.
[144] Leumann (n. 19), 365. [145] Leumann (n. 19), 361.
[146] Leumann (n. 19), 364–5. The suffix might repay further investigation.
[147] For which see *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* I.213; O. Prinz (ed.), *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch* I (Munich, 1967), 1557; J. F. Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus* (Leiden, 1976), 103.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

making,[148] and that general sense is continued both in Romance reflexes of *bracis* and in the numerous derivatives of the same root in medieval Latin. *Bracis* itself is reflected in Gallo-Romance with a meaning which carries on that of the Celtic base (for example, French *brais* 'orge préparée pour fabriquer la bière', *FEW* I.483), and a verb **braciare* also has reflexes in the same area from which it can be deduced that it meant 'brew, prepare grain for brewing' (see *FEW* loc. cit.). In the medieval dictionaries cited in n. 147 there is a wide range of derivatives of *bracis* illustrated, all of them associated with brewing: for example, *braciarius* itself, *braciator*, *braciatrix*, *braciatorium*, *braciare*, *braciarium*, *braciatura*. Since another Celtic term attested at Vindolanda, *ceruesa* 'beer', and its derivative *ceruesarius*[149] show that beer-making was well established there, since the Celtic origin of *ceruesa* strongly suggests that the activity was taken over from the local population, and since both the Celtic cognates of *bracis* and its later continuators, Latin and Romance, in the medieval period are so firmly linked to brewing, the conclusion seems inevitable that *bracis* at Vindolanda indicated a substance used specifically for brewing beer. If that is so, we should probably see the *braciarius* not merely as a grain merchant in a general sense, but as someone engaged in some precise way in beer-making. One may speculate that *ceruesarius* was more general than *braciarius*, denoting the entrepreneur overseeing the whole process and supplying the finished product; *braciarius* on the other hand might have indicated one engaged in a specific activity within the process, such as the treatment of *bracis*. *Ceruesarius* may perhaps be translated as 'beer-maker', *braciarius* as 'brewer' (a sense it is given in dictionaries of medieval Latin) or, more precisely, 'maltster'.

Cimussa

Read in the account 607a: *ex eo sagaciam Auẹṇṭịṇị cimusṣạ* . . . (possibly followed in the next [missing] line by a participle such as *refectam*: see the editors ad loc.). The editors offer the translation 'From this the cloak of Aventinus was repaired with cord (?).'

Here is yet another word (of unknown etymology, according to Walde and Hofmann[150]) which is scarcely found in Latin but well attested in the Romance languages, in Gallo-Romance, Italian and dialects, and in Catalan (see *REW* 1917, *FEW* II.1.674). It has turned up hitherto only in glosses (*CGL* II.100.43, where it is equated with σειρά), but the derivatives *cimussare* and *cimussatio* are both found in the fourth-century grammarian Dositheus (*GL* Keil VII.435.23–4 *cimusso* σειρῶ *cimussatio* ἡ σειρὰ τοῦ βίρρου).[151] LSJ s.v. σειρά gives the meanings 'cord, rope, bandage', but in section 4 in reference to the example in Dositheus suggests the possibilty 'edge, border' (of a garment). In fact this is the meaning of the reflexes of *cimussa* in Gallo-Romance: see for example *FEW* II.1.674, citing for example Middle French *cimosse* 'lisière d'étoffe employée pour emmailloter les enfants'. This could well be the meaning in the account: the *sagacia* has been furnished with a hem.

Caballus, hospitium

The fragmentary text 632 (*set et hospitium ubi caballi belle sụnt*) has several features

[148] *FEW* I.483. [149] Adams (n. 5), 127–8. [150] Walde and Hofmann (n. 141), I.216
[151] For the date of Dositheus, see R. A. Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1988), 278.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of interest. The interpretation of *belle* as an adverb is undoubtedly right, as *belle esse* was idiomatic (see the editors ad loc., and *OLD* s.v. *belle*, 1.c *-e esse*, 'to have a nice time'). The context in which *caballus* occurs is notable; concern is shown for the welfare of the horses, much as in Greek letters of military provenance on papyrus horses are sometimes personalized and greetings sent to a cavalryman's animal (see for example *O. Flor*. 15 ἐ*ρρῶσθαί σε εὔχομαι μετὰ τοῦ . . . σου ἵππου*). Clearly in a context such as this *caballus* could not be pejorative, as it sometimes is in the literary language, nor is it likely to indicate a horse of low quality,[152] given that the referents must be military animals and are being looked after attentively. It would seem that in the language of serving soldiers *caballus* was the neutral term for 'horse', a semantic development which is known to have taken place from the Romance languages, in which reflexes of *equus* are absent and *caballus* provides the basic (non-pejorative) terms for 'horse'. It is of note that *equus* does not yet occur in the Vindolanda letters, whereas there are other cases of *caballus*.[153] An example in an earlier acount (*Tab. Vind*. II.182) in the light of the new attestation now looks certain to be neutral in tone. In the new texts see also 647, where *cabal[* must be restored as *caballus* (or *caballa*). I know of no other text of the relatively early period in which *caballus* is preferred to *equus*.[154] A notable example of the word in a neutral sense is in a graffito on a tile from Pilismarót-Dunamelléke (Hungary). The tile depicts a fine animal, with the accompanying words *caballum Mariniano Vrsicino magistro*.[155]

Hospitium is an unusual word to find in reference to stabling, but it offered the advantage over *stabulum* that it was more vague and need not have denoted a building specifically used for housing equine animals. The word (= 'place of hospitality') also again reflects the cavalryman's tendency to personalize his animal. The *TLL* (VI.2–3.3041.3) cites Verg. *G*. 3.343 *it . . . pecus longa in deserta sine ullis hospitiis*, where Servius glosses with *sine stabulis*. There are also one or two more abstract examples of the word, of 'hospitality' given to equine animals, as at Apul. *Met*. 3.26.

Puer, seruus

A distinction has emerged in the tablets between *seruus* and *puer*. *Seruus* was a formal indicator of status, and is used (preceded by a dependent genitive) in the address at the end of a letter by the writer alongside his name, a position in which names are often accompanied by titles at Vindolanda. See 347 c.back *[a Rh]ęṇo Similis seruo* (cf. the fragmentary texts 303 e.1 and 322.2, where the word may be used differently). This was the long-standing method of formally naming a slave, attested, for example, in the second century B.C. at Delos (for example, *ID* 1771). Officers, on the other hand, when they refer to their slaves call them *pueri*, not *serui*. In the new texts note 642 *praęṣiḍe ṗuęṛis tuis*, 645 *[si mih]į puerum miṣṣurus es*, and in the earlier 255.7 *ussibus puerorum meorum*, 260.7 *saluta . . . pueroṣ tuos*. Usually *pueri* is accompanied by a possessive adjective. The same usage is found in the ostraca of Bu Njem (86.3 *item per puroṣ tuuos*), and must have been standard in colloquial usage in the army.

[152] For further details on the use of *caballus*, see Adams (n. 5), 124.
[153] Adams (n. 5), 124.
[154] For a table showing the comparative incidence of the two words in a variety of republican and early imperial writers, see G. Bonfante, *La lingua parlata in Orazio* (with a preface by N. Horsfall) (Venosa, 1994), 49.
[155] See *Instrumenta inscripta Latina. Das römische Leben im Spiegel der Kleininschriften* (Pécs, 1991), no. 186 (p. 129) [no editor].

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The one example of *seruus* at Bu Njem is part of a technical term (71.5 *seru fugitiu*). *Seruus* was thus technical, *puer* colloquial.

Magirus

The list 590 begins: *] ṃaḡiro n̰[ec]essarioṛuṃ*. Among the following entries are several that comprise personal names in the nominative, followed by an item of culinary or dining equipment. The editors suggest that the text is 'a memorandum, list or account recording the issue of cooking or dining equipment to members of the unit by the cook, or the deposit of such equipment with the cook by the named individuals'.

Magirus (the editors are fairly certain about the reading) is a surprise. The μάγειρος in Classical Greek combined the roles of sacrificer, butcher, and cook.[156] But the word is virtually non-existent in extant Latin, except as the name of a cook in the *Testamentum Porcelli* and in a pun on the same name at *SHA*, *Heliog.* 10.5.[157] However, the compound *archimagirus* (late Greek ἀρχιμάγειρος) is more common (see *TLL* II.462.11ff.), and there are one or two significant examples of the word. An impressive Roman funerary inscription on marble (*CIL* VI.8750) records an imperial freedman, T. Aelius Primitivus, who is given the title *archimagirus* (*T. Aelius Aug. lib. Primitiuus, archimagiru<s>*) (see further 8751, 7458). It can be deduced from the later part of the inscription that he was a member of the *collegium cocorum Aug(usti) n(ostri)*. It is likely that the college made use of this and other titles to mark out the status and roles of its members, and if there were *archimagiri* there would have been *magiri* as well. *Archimagirus* is also found in Juvenal (9.109) in a reference to the staff of a rich man ('pastrycook, head chefs and carvers': *libarius archimagiri / carptores*). In these cases we seem to have a reflection of the technical language of culinary institutions in which hierarchies were indicated by special terms. The use of Greek is comparable to that of French for the same purpose in professional English kitchens (*sous-chef*, *chef*, and so on); Greek had been associated with cuisine from the earliest period at Rome, just as French is treated as the special language of cooking by the English. It is possible that *magirus* was a technical term of the military kitchen, or an eccentric individual might have given himself the title. Another possibility is that it is a name here, as in the two passages cited above.

Contrullium ҫoҫiṇatorium

More cooking terminology, found in the account 588. The first word is cited just once by the *TLL*, from the *Notae Tironianae*, from which the meaning is not clear. The formation is of a clearcut type. The suffix *-ium* occurs in many categories of words, but one of its most distinctive functions was to create nouns from prepositional expressions.[158] Thus *insomnium* 'dream' is a thing which comes 'in sleep' (*in somno*). An *inter-column-ium* is a space between columns (*inter columnas*), and *procestria* (*procastria*) (neuter plural) buildings in front of the wall, camp. A *contrullium* on this analogy must have been a thing 'with a *trulla*'. Since a *trulla* is unambiguously a ladle or scoop (see *OLD*, s.v.), the *contrullium* would be a thing equipped in some

[156] See e.g. E. Fraenkel, *Elementi plautini in Plauto* (Florence, 1960), 410–13; G. Berthiaume, *Les rôles du mágeiros* (Leiden, 1982), 5, with the specific chapters which follow. I am grateful to David Bain for information on this point.

[157] For details see *TLL* VIII.52.45ff.

[158] Leumann (n. 19), 295–6.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sense with a ladle. One possibility would be a large cooking pot which could only be used with the help of a ladle, and the adjective which follows, if the reading is right, favours such an interpretation.

Coquinatorius is a derivative of *coquinator*, a very rare word (found a few times in glosses) for a cook. *Coquinator* for its part is a derivative of the verb *coquinare* (= 'cook') another rare word, but attested in Plautus, the *Itala*, and the Salic law, and surviving in the Romance languages (for example, Italian *cucinare*, Catalan *cuynar*, Spanish *cocinar*, French *cuisiner*). This distribution establishes the colloquial character of the word, which was an alternative to the more usual *coquere*.[159] *Coquinatorius* thus means 'to do with a cook', 'cook's'. A *contrullium cocinatorium* would be a 'chef's pot (?) used along with a ladle', presumably a piece of professional equipment rather than a run-of-the-mill object.

Coquinatorius is another word hitherto only attested at a much later date (in the grammarian Caper and in Ulpian). Ulpian (*Dig*. 33.9.6) applies the adjective to *uasa* 'vessels', just as (it seems) it is applied to a type of vessel here. The existence of the adjective at Vindolanda implies the currency of the verb *cocinare*, and the Vindolanda evidence thus provides the bridge between Plautus on the one hand, and later Latin and the Romance languages on the other, and establishes the continuity of the spoken language in its use of the verb.

Ebriacus

Ebriacum may occur in an incomplete text (662 *illum maǧis essę ebriaçum*), though the reading is not completely clear (*ebriatum* is also a possibility). *Ebriacum* is linguistically the more plausible reading. The word is all but excluded from literature, but widely reflected in the Romance languages (see *REW* 2818, *FEW* III.199: for example, Old Provençal *ebriac*). It must therefore have been well established in speech. That it was stigmatized by the educated is suggested by Charisius' comment, 105.3 Barwick *eber et ebriacus ne dixeris*. It also turns up a few times in the sorts of late texts which often provide a glimpse of the colloquial language (most notably the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae* 45.3; also occasionally in Bible translations).[160]

Fragment 10 of the mimes of Laberius comes from Nonius 154.7 (Lindsay), who quotes it in this form: *homo ebriacus somno sanari solet*. But the emendation (of Bentinus) *ebriatus* (past participle of *ebrio*, a rare verb used by Ampelius [2.6] and a few times in late literary Latin) was accepted by Ribbeck and printed in the second edition of his collection of comic fragments.[161] *Ebriacus* is so well supported as a subliterary term (see above on the evidence of Charisius, the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, and the Romance languages) that one is bound to accept Nonius' text. Laberius, as was noted in the introduction above, was notoriously prepared to dip into subliterary Latin in keeping with the level of the genre in which he was working (see Gell. 16.17.4, 19.13.3). Similarly it is far more likely that the Vindolanda letter had a substandard colloquialism than an artificial participial usage.

[159] So also *FEW* II.2.1169.

[160] E. Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (Uppsala, 1911), 332; V. Väänänen, *Le journal-épître d'Égérie (Itinerarium Egeriae). Étude linguistique* (Helsinki, 1987), 141, 144.

[161] The *OLD*, presumably following an odd convention, accepts *ebriacus* in its rubric, but then prints *ebriatus* in its citation of the passage.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

De and ex

At 659 the verb *exportare* is complemented by a prepositional expression containing not *ex* but *de*: *ex quibus unum in uinculis iussus est de prouincia exportarę*. In Classical Latin *exportare* regularly takes *ex*, as is obvious from the material collected by the *TLL*, s.v. I have noted there about a dozen cases of *ex* (Cic. *Verr*. 1.53, 4.77, *Flacc*. 67, and so on), but none of *de*. But the use of *de* in the letter is part of a trend. *De* eventually displaced *ex*, and the type of displacement seen in our example can be traced back into the republic in colloquial texts, as in the early speeches of Cicero and the ps.-Caesarean works.[162] In non-literary Latin a nice illustration of the usage is to be found in the expression *exit de paedagogio*, which turns up about nine times in the Palatine graffiti.[163] Cf. in the present letters 649 *rę̣cipies de c̣arris Brittonum*; also *Tab. Vind.* II.310.14 *mittas per aliquem de nosṭri̯s̱*. *ex* tends to be more resilient in certain formulae or collocations, as for example with pronouns, including the relative. For some cases of *ex* in *Tab. Vind*. II, see 154.4 *ex eis*, 155.2 *ex eis*, 259.3 *ex qua*, 297.c.2 *ex eis*, 343.4 *e quo*. So the letter which has *de prouincia* above has by contrast *ex quibus*.

Domina

A fragmentary letter (661) reads in its first part as follows:

c̣urare autem debebis̱
ut niḷ qui tibi epistu̱ḷam
meam leget ilḻud domina[e
indi̯cet.

The editors translate: 'But you(?) will have to take care that the person who reads my letter to you does not indicate that in any way to the mistress.' The same word *domina* also occurs in the sentence immediately preceding this, but the text is too fragmentary for anything to be made of the meaning. The editors remark that the 'front [of the letter] seems to be concerned with a gift which the writer is giving as a surprise to his/her *domina*. This may be just a term of respect (*dominus* is so used frequently in the tablets) or it may mean that the writer is a servant speaking of his/her mistress.'

For *domina* used in the third person of the writer's/speaker's wife, see Petron. 66.5 *bene me admonet domina mea*.[164]

Some diminutives

Lucernula (641) is another word previously attested only at a much later date. The *TLL* (VII.2.1702.69ff.) cites examples only from Jerome and Arnobius. Diminutives are prominent in the tablets.[165] For examples in the new texts, see 607 *alicla* (< *allix*), 643 *casula*, 648 *rotula*, 643 *arcula*, *carrulo* (also in the previous texts, but hitherto not found until the Digest),[166] 642 *scandellae* (presumably = 'roof shingles', an equivalent

[162] See Hofmann and Szantyr (n. 43), 262–3, citing such examples as *de nauibus egredi*, *de castris educere* (*Bell. Afr*. 11.2, 58.1).

[163] Väänänen (n. 17), I.254, for a list.

[164] See the note of N. M. Kay, *Ausonius Epigrams* (London, 2001), 137 (with further parallels); also Smith (see above, n. 101), on Petron. 66.5.

[165] Adams (n. 5), 106–8.

[166] Adams (n. 5), 106–7.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the usual *scandulae*; this is the first example of the term with this suffix), 602, 603, 604, 605 *gallicula*, 591 *nucule*,[167] 677 *ca̤tellum*, 587 *porca̤lli̤*, 623, 635 *filiolus*.

Dominicus

The expression *domi̤nico̤.ussu* in a fragmentary letter (641) is open to two interpretations. It may represent *dominicos ussus*, in which case it would have been preceded by *ad* or *in*, 'for the use of the *dominus*, that is, owner or master'. For *in usus*, see the account 582, *ex eis · in usus p(raefecti) · n(ostri)*; cf. *O. Bu Njem*. 81 *m(odios) triginta ad usus militum* (cf. 75, 119), *O.Wâdi Fawâkhir* 1 *rogo te, frater, ut facias mi in m̤[e]os usos*. The expression *in/ad usus* was obviously current in military accounts (cf. the equivalent dative at II.255.7 *ussibus puerorum meorum*). Alternatively it might have been an ablative singular *dominico iussu*. *Dominicus* is often used for the subjective genitive *domini* in officialese (see *TLL* V.2.168.4ff.). In mock-official style at Petron. 28.7 it occurs in the second of these expressions (*quisquis seruus sine dominico iussu foras exierit*), and the other possible combination occurs in the Digest: Ulp. *Dig*. 7.1.13.8 *si balineum sit in domo usibus dominicis solitum*, 33.9.3 pr. *iumentorum, quae dominici usus causa parata sunt*. In these last examples the reference is to the owner of an object, whereas in the passage of Petronius the reference is to the master of a slave. There is not enough context in the Vindolanda letter to make it clear what the precise reference is, but given the frequency of *dominus* at Vindolanda used in address by subordinate to superior it is that use of the noun that is likely to lie behind the adjective.

Si qui = si quis

This substandard usage is at 657 and also in the earlier material.[168]

Obiter, subinde

At 642 both of these adverbs occur in the same sentence: *si ṭibi opus non sunt p̣erporta* ***obiter*** *ụbe carra tua* ***sụbịnde*** *ueniunt*.

Obiter, described by the *TLL* (IX.2.67.47) as an *adverbium notionis non satis dilucidae*, could be applied to something done 'in passing, *en route*' (see *OLD*, s.v.1). Thus for example the *uiator* addressed in the inscription *CE* 1879.1 (*tu, uiator, qui transis, rist(a), leg(e) tit(ulum) obiter*) is passing by (*transis*) the inscription and is asked to stop and read it as he does so. Alternatively the adverb may be more temporal than local, but with a similar implication. Note, for example, Petron. 31.4 *ac ne in hoc quidem tam molesto tacebant officio, sed obiter cantabant* ('and they were not even quiet when carrying out such an irksome task as this, but they sang all the while'). The reference is to a secondary activity (singing) carried out at the same time as the main task. In the example at Vindolanda the point is that if the addressee does not need the shingles, he should bring them while he is *en route* to somewhere else. The implication is that his wagons often come this way (note *subinde* and see below) for other purposes and can drop the tiles off in passing.

Obiter has an interesting distribution (see *TLL* IX.2.67.40ff.). It is completely absent from Classical Latin of the late republic, but found in Laberius (see the discussion of

[167] *REW* 5984, where it has an asterisk (as supposedly unattested: but see Plin. *HN* 15.87).
[168] Adams (n. 5), 101.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the word by Charisius, taken from Julius Romanus, 271 Barwick),[169] and it thus provides a link between the Latin of the tablets and that of mime (see also above on the more complicated case of *ebriacus*). Charisius also quotes a rebuke delivered by Augustus (in a letter?) to Tiberius for writing *peruiam* rather than *obiter* (271.16–18 *quamquam diuus Augustus reprehendens Ti. Claudium ita loquitur, 'scribis enim peruiam ἀντὶ τοῦ obiter'*). The point is twofold. Tiberius is ticked off for using a decided oddity, and for being pretentious in avoiding the basic word *obiter*. Augustus liked no-nonsense forms of expression (see below) of the type stigmatized by the grammarians. Two of the authorities cited in the passage of Charisius, the emperor Hadrian and the Hadrianic grammarian Scaurus, raise doubts about the Latinity of *obiter* (271.10–11 *diuus Hadrianus . . . quaerit an Latinum sit*; 12–13 *cum Scaurus Latinum esse neget*), and Scaurus is reported as saying that the *ueteres* used *eadem* (sc. *uia*) instead. We are then told that Hadrian wrote that Augustus, as a man who was *non pereruditus*, will have taken *obiter* from 'use' rather than reading (271.18–20 *sed diuus Hadrianus 'tametsi' inquit 'Augustus non pereruditus homo fuerit, ut id aduerbium ex usu potius quam lectione protulerit'*). The implication of all of this is that *obiter* was frowned on by some purists but current in popular use, and that would explain why it is absent from the classical literary language but found in mime. Augustus was well known for his readiness to accept colloquial or substandard Latin, as the fragments of his letters show. From a passage of Quintilian (1.6.19) we learn that he once rebuked his grandson Gaius Caesar for being pedantic in using the form *calida* instead of the syncopated *calda*, and the rebuke implied in Charisius is along the same lines. For Augustus' tendency to reject the rules of the grammarians, see also Suet. *Aug*. 88.

While it is absent from Classical Latin, *obiter* is used a number of times by Petronius (26.5, 31.4, 34.5, 38.3, 92.2), twice in speeches in the *Cena* (34.5, 38.3). It was not universally shunned by the educated at the time of the tablets, as it occurs in Pliny the Younger (*Ep*. 10.8.5) and also in the Elder Pliny (who was, however, given to colloquialisms).

Subinde, which was to replace *saepe* and which lies behind French *souvent*, etc.,[170] often has the sense 'from time to time, constantly, repeatedly' (see *OLD*, s.v.2), and it is some such sense that it has here: the addressee's wagons pass repeatedly, and the shingles can be delivered on one such trip. *Subinde* is a favourite word of Petronius, and there are a number of examples in the speeches of the freedmen.[171]

There is a significant overlap between the Latin of Petronius, particularly in the *Cena Trimalchionis*, and that of the Vindolanda tablets, and here in a single sentence we find two points of similarity between these two sources of popular Latin.

Adverbial certum

At 645, line 9 (*sị ịtá gessịsti negotium cum Ҫaesarianịs, fac ut certum mihi [r]ẹ[s]ṣҫṛibas ut egó pạ[tr]ị meo sic resscribere possim*) *certum* is not the direct object of *rescribas* but is adverbial ('if you have conducted the business with the Caesarians, let me know definitely so that I can let my father know'). Cf. for example Ter. *Eun*. 111 *arbitror, certum non scimu'*; *B. Hisp*. 22.4 *cum certum comperisset legatorum*

[169] On Julius Romanus, an important source of Charisius, see Kaster (n. 151), 424–5. The passage in question comes from a section in Romanus on adverbs (see Kaster, 424, for references).

[170] See the discussion of Stefenelli (n. 65), 23–6.

[171] Details in Stefenelli (n. 65), 23.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

responsa ita esse gesta ('when he had found out definitely that . . .'). See *OLD*, s.v. 4b, *TLL* III.915.70ff.

Perporto

Porto, which was more concrete in meaning than *fero*, notoriously replaced *fero* in popular Latin (and the Romance languages),[172] and similarly at 642 *perporto*, which is virtually unattested, is clearly equivalent to *perfero* in its basic sense of bringing something all the way to the desired destination: see *OLD*, s.v. *perfero*, 1. The compound may also occur at *Tab. Vind.* II.477.

Epistula, litterae

Litterae, which in the late republican period was the standard word for 'letter, epistle', was ousted from ordinary usage under the empire by *epistula*, being preferred only by a handful of archaizers.[173] In most of our non-literary sources *epistula* is standard.[174] In the earlier Vindolanda material there are nine examples of *epistula* and none of *litterae*. There is now a problematic case of *epistula* in the letter of Maior (645, line 3):[175] *scire te uólui epistulas mihi missas esse ab patri meó in quibus scribit* . . . The editors suggest that this is an instance of plural for singular (on the analogy of *litterae*). This is a possibility (see *TLL* V.2.680.72ff.),[176] but against it stands the fact that the examples cited of the usage belong to the high literary language (Tacitus, Pliny, Apuleius), in which the analogy of the now obsolete *litterae* might have retained its influence. The absence of *litterae* from the Vindolanda letters makes it unlikely that *litterae* influenced *epistula* in this corpus. I see no reason why the *pater* should not have sent more than one letter on this subject.

In the ostraca of Bu Njem *litterae*, against the trend, slightly outnumbers *epistula*, by 5:3.[177] Marichal, however, in his edition (see last footnote), points out (p. 58) that *litterae* is employed in documents written by scribes of quality, whereas *epistula* is only used by untrained and uncultivated writers. The two terms thus differ in their social level.

Omni tempore

Omni tempore at 664 (*omni tempore cupio. ego certe* . . .) occurs near the end of a sentence otherwise lost. The circumlocution belongs to a type. Numerous temporal adverbs and nouns were rivalled, particularly in more colloquial Latin, by circumlocutions comprising *tempus* + adjective (*tempus hibernum* = *hiems*, *nullo tempore* = *numquam*, *longo tempore* = *diu*, and so on).[178] Landgraf (see last footnote) points out that Cicero uses the expression *omni tempore* five times in the early speech *pro Roscio*

[172] See e.g. Väänänen (n. 11), 76; Bonfante (n. 154), 122–5.

[173] See J. N. Adams, 'The language of the later books of Tacitus' *Annals*', *CQ* n.s. 22 (1972), 357; cf. id. (n. 18), 77.

[174] See Adams (n. 18), 77 on Terentianus' practice.

[175] See also 661 for an example in the singular. There are plural cases in the fragmentary texts 691 and 699. For the word in another recent military letter, see Bülow-Jacobsen et al. (n. 31), text no. 4.

[176] See E.Wölfflin, *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Leipzig, 1933), 81.

[177] R. Marichal, *Les ostraca de Bu Njem* (Assraya al Hamra, Tripoli, 1992), index, 268.

[178] See e.g. Hofmann and Szantyr (n. 43), 155, 758, and on *omni tempore*, G. Landgraf, *Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1914^2), 116, on §51.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Amerino, but thereafter in the whole of the rest of the speeches only three times. The *pro Roscio* is full of colloquialisms which Cicero was later to reject.

Lautus, laute

The adverb is used at 666 in a fragmentary context in reference to the lavish conduct of (religious) festivities: *possimus lautius benefició tuo ferias curare*. This is a typical use of the word or its cognates. Cf. for example Petron. 65.10 *Scissa lautum nouendiale seruo suo misello faciebat*.

Glutem

An account (591) has the expression *glutem tauri[nam]*. *Glus*, *glutis* (feminine) was an alternative to *gluten*, *-inis* (*TLL* VI.2–3.2110.28ff.) and it is the accusative of the former that is used here. This word had hitherto been attested only in late Latin (of the fourth century: Pelagonius, Marcellus *Med*., Vegetius). The same expression *glutem taurinam* is found in Pelagonius (85). Whereas *gluten*, *-inis* leaves no trace in Romance, *glus* (*glute(m)*) survives in Gallo-Romance (French *glu*, Provençal *glut*) (*REW* 3806).

Praecipio

In the letter of Masclus (628) there is a use of *praecipio* which can be paralleled in an ink tablet from Carlisle. I quote first from the letter of Masclus: *cras quid uelis nos fecisse rogó dómine praecipiás*. The other text (concerning the loss of lances) was published by Tomlin,[179] text no. 16: *ita ut praecipisti lanciaror[um] quibus lanciae deessent omnia nomina subiecimus*. Tomlin remarks that the usage belongs to the language of military bureaucracy.[180] But what is noteworthy in both of these cases is that the verb is in the second person, and that the recipient of the order referred to is the writer of the letter. When the recipient of an order is someone other than the writer, *iubeo* tends to be used, as later in the same letter, where Masclus asks Cerialis to issue orders to others (*rogó iubeas mitti*). It would seem that *praecipio* 'instruct' was milder than *iubeo*, and that a soldier would prefer to think of himself as 'instructed' to do something rather than as 'ordered' to do so. Cf. *Tab. Vind*. II.314 *quas rogo continuo iubeas onerari* (an example which, when compared with that just quoted, shows the formulaic character of the language of the letters), 329 *iubeas Agilem*, 632 *iube dari* (no further context, but clearly the order is to be given to another), 659 *ex quibus unum in uinculis iussus est et de prouincia exportare*, 831 *rogo iubeas dari*. At *Tab. Vind*. II.317 it is not clear who has received the orders (*ita ut iuss[[eras]]isti*).

Iucunde + esse

With 629 (*utique enim scis* ***iucundissime mihi esse*** *quo[ti]ens pariter sumus*), cf. for example Cic. *Att*. 13.52.1 *o hospitem mihi tam grauem* ἀμεταμέλητον, *fuit enim periucunde*.

[179] Tomlin (n. 93), 57.
[180] Tomlin (n. 93), 59. See *TLL* X.2.444.8ff. for the verb *in re militari*.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Pariter + *esse*

In the first passage just quoted the expression *pariter sumus* is noteworthy. In Classical Latin the equivalent expression was *simul* + *esse* (*OLD*, s.v. *simul*, 2). For *pariter esse*, see *TLL* X.1.284.66ff. The earliest example cited there is from Apuleius (*Mund*. 19), and there is a scattering of instances in later texts.

Sigusius, uertragus

In the fragmentary account 594 the form *segosi* is legible twice in fr. *e* (for example, *.m segosi[*), and the editors plausibly suggest the restoration *cane]m segosi[um]*. There are several other places in the same account where *segosius* also probably lies behind a fragmentary text (for example, fr. *c*, 3 *s]egosi*). Again, fr. *b* has at one point *uer[*, and fr. *c]ṭragum*. In these cases the editors' restoration *uertragus* is equally plausible, as the two terms have a connection. I offer a few comments on these words which can be added to the material assembled by the editors.

Both words occur together in the *Lex Burgundionum*: 97 *si quis canem* ***ueltrauum*** *aut* ***segutium*** *uel petrunculum praesumpserit inuolare*. *Veltragus* (or *uer-*; there are variations too in the spelling of the ending) is a Celtic term for a hunting dog (literally, 'the swift-footed one').[181] It is attested as early as Martial (14.200.1;[182] cf. Grat. *Cyn*. 203). It survives only in Gallo-Romance (for example, French *veltre* 'chien employé surtout pour la chasse de l'ours et du sanglier [Roland]', *FEW* XIV.327), and in Old Milanese (*FEW* XIV.328). There is also an example (in the form *ueltrus*) in the Salic Law.[183] *Sigusius* (*segusius*; various spellings) is another Celtic term[184] for a hunting dog. It too is found in the Salic Law (*Pactus Legis Salicae* 6.1: accompanied by *canis*). It is reflected in Old French and Provençal, as well as in various other Romance languages (see *REW* 7789; *FEW* XI.414). It seems likely that the form in the *Lex Burg*. is a misspelling rather than a different term from *sigusius*. Clearly both of the words found in the Vindolanda tablet were current in Gaul, and they will either have been in use among the local British population as well and taken over into the local Latin, or have been transferred from Gaul to Britain by soldiers of Celtic origin.

The currency of these two words at Vindolanda is a reminder that the texts come from the Celtic fringes of the empire. In reference to the second volume of tablets, I have previously discussed[185] four Celtic terms attested at Vindolanda to that point (*ceruesa*, *bracis*, *bedox*, *tossea*), and another, *couinnus* (indicating a type of wagon: see *TLL* IV.1094.58), has now turned up several times in the new accounts (597, 598). If we did not know the geographical origin of the Vindolanda tablets we would be able to place them loosely in the north-west of the empire on the basis of these lexical items. Borrowing from substratum languages was probably the main factor contributing to a regional colouring of the Latin of provincial regions.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

I stress finally the linguistic diversity of the tablets, and highlight several features of the Latin.

[181] *FEW* XIV.328.
[182] Martial's fourteenth book is full of exotic words, e.g. *panaca* (14.100).
[183] F. Schramm, *Sprachliches zur Lex Salica. Eine vulgärlateinisch-romanische Studie* (Marburg a. L., 1911), 51.
[184] *FEW* XI.414. [185] Adams (n. 5), 127–8.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1. A good deal of the previous section was about subliterary language, but that is not the whole story. It would be a mistake to imply that the Latin of the letters uniformly comes from a social level below that of the educated upper classes. There is an element of high-style or bureaucratic language in some letters. A notable case is at 611, a letter to Flavius Genialis possibly from the T. Haterius Nepos, later to be prefect of Egypt. This piece contains the following two sentences:

quod in notitiam tuam
sicut debui pertuli. te
tanto magis uenturum
Coria sicut constituisti
spero.

. . . which I have brought to your attention just as I ought. All the more I hope that you will come to Coria as you agreed.

Two points are worth making about this short passage. First, for the expression *in notitiam tuam pertuli* the editors cite the following clause from Pliny the Younger: *Ep*. 10.67.2 *haec in notitiam tuam perferenda existimaui*; cf. 10.75.2 *quod in notitiam perferendum existimaui ob hoc maxime, ut* . . . Both letters are to the emperor Trajan, and the phraseology has a pomposity appropriate to such a correspondence. It is likely that this sort of language had a place in bureaucratese of the time, and it is significant that the Vindolanda example is in correspondence between two high officials. The same expression had already turned up in the earlier material (*Tab*. *Vind*. II.260), in a letter from Iustinus to Cerialis. It was seen above (p. 557) that another expression with a bureaucratic ring to it, *notum facio*, is found both at Vindolanda and in the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan. Secondly, the second sentence contains a fairly long accusative + infinitive construction which entirely precedes its governing verb *spero*. The accusative + infinitive construction is common in the letters, but examples are usually short and mostly follow the main verb. In the high literary language there is a considerable diversity in the placement of indirect speech in relation to the higher verb (with pragmatic factors the main determinant of placement), but there is abundant evidence in new non-literary Latin (for example, the letters of Claudius Terentianus, the ostraca of Bu Njem) that the norm in more mundane registers was for the construction to follow the verb, often with the subject accusative directly attached to the higher verb. The placement in the above letter is thus abnormal, and indicative of the relatively high educational status of the writer. This is not the place to dwell on the use of the accusative + infinitive, which I hope to deal with elsewhere (in relation to new non-literary material).

Another item which appears to be in elevated formal style is the fragmentary 660, which is probably the remains of a letter of recommendation (see the editors ad loc.). The best preserved four lines have language reminiscent of the terminology of higher education:

uiri boni accedit etiam libera-
lium studiorum amore
profectus morum denique
te[m]peramentum et cu-

The Graecizing inflection of *senapidis* (p. 540) is suggestive of the language use of doctors. Even in the western provinces doctors liked to convey a Greek persona;[186] at

[186] See e.g. Adams (n. 75), index, s.v. 'doctors'.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chester, for example, there is a notable dedication in Greek by a doctor who was probably associated with the army.[187]

2. At the other end of the spectrum we have seen colloquial usages, some of which foreshadow the Romance languages. Some of these could be deduced to have existed in Latin from the Romance evidence, but were as yet unattested. Others have now turned up at Vindolanda centuries before they were hitherto attested for the first time. Notable lexical items discussed above were *uectura*, *potest fieri*, *ebriacus* (?), *obiter*, *cocinatorius* (and *cocinator* and *cocinare*, which lie behind it), and *caballus*. This last is beginning to look like the soldier's standard informal designation of his mount, just as *puer* seems to have been his normal designation for a slave.

3. *Expello* and *fussa* on the other hand belong not so much to 'colloquial' Latin as to the technical terminology of grain storage, and *curua* was also possibly a technical term, from a different sphere (that of wagon construction). It is of note that the technical term *fussa* and also perhaps *curua* are elliptical, in that they have been substantivized by the ellipse of a feminine noun. Such ellipses are easy and commonplace in technical usage, because users of a technical terminology tend to abbreviate expressions which are familar to fellow experts. There is a good deal of technical terminology in the accounts which has been elucidated by the editors; see also above on, for example, *uitus* and *cimussa*. The attestation of *magirus* may offer a glimpse of the special terminology of the kitchen.

4. Evidence was seen in three different cases for what appears to be continuity between usage at Vindolanda and that of British medieval Latin at least a thousand years later (see above, p. 559 on *uectura* = 'wagon', p. 562 on *braciarius*, and n. 126 on *internumero*). In the first and third cases the apparent continuity is certainly illusory, and in the second case probably so. *Vectura* continued into Old French in this sense, and it was no doubt taken over from there into Britain and re-Latinized. *Internumero* does not have the same meaning later as it has at Vindolanda, and it was probably a new medieval coinage. *Braciarius* does not survive in Romance, but a reflex may well have continued on the Continent up to 1066 and been brought back into Britain after that date and re-Latinized.

5. There are now additional Celtic loan-words attested which confer a regional character on the Latin.

6. Finally, there are traces of local usages which had caught on in the epistolography of the area. The formula (670) *sc̣ias ṃe recte es̱s̱e̱ quod t̨e̱ inuicem face̱re̱ cupio*[188] has a variant in the earlier material (311), and another is identifiable (with a minor emendation) in a stylus tablet from London.[189] As far as I can determine, this is a 'British' formula. A second possible formula has been encountered in the present paper (*sis mihi propitius*: see above, p. 558). And an expression in the margin of the letter of Maior (645 *mi̱tte̱s chir̨[ografum] cum eo* ***quo securior sim***) is closely

[187] For a new text of the inscription, which is in hexameters, see now J. Clackson and T. Meissner, 'The poet of Chester', *PCPS* 46 (2000), 1–6.

[188] For the use of *facio* here, see Adams (n. 5), 123.

[189] See J. N. Adams, 'An unusual epistolary formula and the text at RIB II.4.2443.7', *ZPE* 140 (2002).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

paralleled in the fragmentary 716 (*mihi resscṛ̣bas* ***uṭ sim securiọr***). Both letters may be from the same person (the hand is different in each case, but different scribes might have been used by the same person),[190] or the phrase might have been a local cliché.[191]

Various words (or the objects which they designated) were familiar in Britain. The editors point out that *capitulare* 'cap' has turned up not only at 596, but also at Bath (*Tab. Sulis* 55) and Caistor-by-Norwich.[192] The Germanic word *baro* 'man', previously known from the Bath curse tablets,[193] is perhaps to be read at 713 (*baṛọnes*).

All Souls College, Oxford J. N. ADAMS

[190] It is a curiosity that both letters have *resscribo* (spelt with hypercorrect double *s*). Given that different scribes wrote the letters, if the sender was the same in both cases he must have specified the spelling of the verb.

[191] There is no significance in the fact that one letter has *quo* + comparative but the other *ut*. Cicero was capable of using both constructions in the same sentence: *Rosc. Am.* 14 *ut facilius intellegere possitis, . . . quo facilius . . . cognoscere possitis*. See further Hofmann and Szantyr (n. 43), 642 on *ut* + comparative.

[192] M. W. C. Hassall and R. S. O. Tomlin, 'Inscriptions', *Britannia* 13 (1982), 408, n. 9.

[193] See J. N. Adams, 'British Latin: the text, interpretation and language of the Bath curse tablets', *Britannia* 23 (1992), 15–16.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.2.530 Published online by Cambridge University Press