THE LANGUAGE OF THE VINDOLANDA WRITING TABLETS: AN INTERIM REPORT

By J. N. ADAMS

I. INTRODUCTION

The recent publication by A. K. Bowman and J. D. Thomas of *The Vindolanda Writing Tablets* (*Tabulae Vindolandenses II*) (1994)[1] provides another substantial corpus of Latin from a military outpost in the early Empire. The tablets take their place alongside such important military finds as the letters of Claudius Terentianus,[2] which are roughly of the same date, the ostraca from Bu Njem,[3] and the ostraca from Wâdi Fawâkhir,[4] which again are dated to the first/second centuries.

The Latin of the Vindolanda tablets has recently been discussed by H. Petersmann as a specimen of 'Vulgar Latin', at a conference devoted to Vulgar and Late Latin.[5] But while the influence of spoken varieties of the language can be detected in some misspellings, and in aspects of the syntax, morphology, and lexicon of the tablets, one must resist the temptation to find 'Vulgar Latin' (however one defines that problematical term: see below, IX.4) as the sole or principal element of the tablets.[6] Many of the documents were not composed by free composition, but have a formulaic structure which made little or no demand on the linguistic competence of the writer (e.g. applications for leave (166–77), the daily reports of a type found at Bu Njem, which have certain distinctive features of syntax (155–6)). Accounts and lists (178–209) too may in their syntax and format, if not necessarily in their spellings, be heavily influenced by the conventions of their genre. Moreover record-keeping of this type usually falls to individuals with a degree of education and numeracy, and their writing may have little or nothing to reveal about the spoken language which they used or heard.

Scribes were responsible for the writing of many of the Vindolanda tablets.[7] Since they are likely to have received some training in spelling from *grammatici*, they place a further barrier between the Latin spoken in the area of Vindolanda, and the modern reader attempting to identify colloquial patterns in written tablets. In this paper I will certainly be concerned with colloquial or 'vulgar' elements in the tablets, but these are only part of the story. The Vindolanda tablets deserve to be assessed as specimens of writing effected in a military setting in an outpost of the Empire. They may have something to tell us about, for example, standards of literacy within the garrison and its entourage, the training of scribes, and the influence of genre on syntax and lexical choice. The tablets should not be considered in isolation; we are in the position of being able to compare writing at Vindolanda with that in military environments in other parts of the Empire. A comparison of the orthography of the Vindolanda tablets with that of the letters of Claudius Terentianus and of the Bu Njem ostraca yields interesting information about the cultural level of the scribes operating at Vindolanda. I will be

emphasizing the conservative, even archaizing, tendencies of these scribes, tendencies which, rather surprisingly, are more prominent in the tablets than lapses into substandard spelling.

It is as well to dismiss at the outset any notion that the tablets might display a 'British' variety of Latin. The tablets are not the product of a local British population, but of highly mobile military personnel and (perhaps) their civilian entourage. Vindolanda was garrisoned by both Batavian and Tungrian units,[8] and consequently the Latin written there might in theory have reflected that in use among Romanized natives of areas such as Gallia Belgica and Germany rather than Britain. One writer (344) explicitly identifies himself as a *homo transmarinus*. There are indeed some traces of Celtic influence on the Latin of Vindolanda (see below, II.10, VIII.15). If Batavians or Tungrians in some cases at least employed a 'broken' or 'foreigners' Latin', that would be virtually impossible to detect because of the part which will have been played by well-trained scribes in putting such speech into writing. Nevertheless there are one or two oddities in a letter by a certain Chrauttius, to which I will come below.

II. ORTHOGRAPHY

II.1. *The Digraph ae*

In the first half of the first century A.D. in the legal documents of C. Novius Eunus the digraph *ae* is hardly ever written (one false example; *e* for *ae* seventeen times).[9] In the Vindolanda tablets, by contrast, *ae* is correctly written with remarkable consistency. I have noted about seventy three correct examples of the digraph.

It has recently been suggested that the *ae* diphthong was preserved until fairly late,[10] though the evidence of Eunus and indeed other evidence (see further below)[11] makes this unlikely. Nevertheless one is obliged to consider the possibility that in speech in the region of Vindolanda the diphthong was maintained. Such a conclusion would be untenable, at least as a generalization intended to describe the usage of a whole community. In just two documents there are revealing clusters of examples of *e* for *ae*. In the account numbered 186 the (genitive) spellings *ceruese* (twice) and *porcine* occur, and in the long letter by the entrepreneur Octavius (343) we find not only *arre*, *que*, *illec* (= *illaec*), and *male* (= *malae*), but also the hypercorrect form *mae* for *me*. Remarkably, in 186 there is no case of *ae*, and in 343 only one correct example (*uiae*). The two tablets taken together thus show a strong preference for *e* (7:2, with one case of *ae* false), which is in striking contrast to the consistent preference for *ae* elsewhere in the tablets (71:0 in documents other than these two).

These facts suggest the following conclusion. The diphthong *ae* had been converted to a monophthong in the speech of at least some (probably most) of the community,[12] but the cultural level of scribes associated with military personnel in the area was such that they were able regularly to write *ae* without error. The two tablets 186 and 343, which offer us a fleeting glimpse of a speech pattern which has otherwise been obscured by the successful preservation of a writing convention, may be treated as special cases. 186 is written in a hand described by the editors (146) as ugly and sprawling. It displays three times a remarkable phonetic misspelling (*Februuar-* for *Februar-*, with a glide [w] represented between two vowels in hiatus), which in this lexical item is unique not only at Vindolanda (where the word is correctly spelt about a dozen times), but perhaps in extant Latin as a whole. There is abundant evidence for loss of *u* in this word (after the consonant cluster -*br*-): see *CIL* IV.4182, *O. Bu Njem* 74, 76, 77, 101 *Febrarias*; cf. It. *febbraio*, Fr. *février*, etc.[13] The writer of 186 must have countered such loss in his speech by the insertion of a glide.[14] The writer's employment of this misspelling, as well as his use of *e* for *ae*, would seem to place him outside the group of scribes responsible for the bulk of the extant texts.

It is of some interest that Octavius, like the businessman C. Novius Eunus a couple of generations earlier, fell into error on one of just two occasions when he attempted a digraph.[15] Octavius' use of *e* for

[8] On the ethnic origins of those garrisoned at Vindolanda, see Bowman and Thomas, 30–2.

[9] See J. N. Adams, 'The Latinity of C. Novius Eunus', *ZPE* 82 (1990), 230–1.

[10] See P. Flobert, 'Le témoignage épigraphique des apices et des I longae sur les quantités vocaliques en latin impérial', in G. Calboli (ed.), *Latin vulgaire — latin tardif II. Actes du IIème colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif (Bologne, 29 août - 2 septembre 1988)* (1990), 105.

[11] For the evidence from Pompeii, see V. Väänänen, *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes*³ (1966), 23–5. See also R. G. G. Coleman, 'The monophthongization of /ae/ and the Vulgar Latin vowel system', *TPhS* (1971),

175–91. Coleman ('Vulgar Latin and Proto-Romance: minding the gap', *Prudentia* 25 (1993), 5) points out that Servius (*GL* IV.421.21) implies a monophthongal pronunciation of *ae* in contemporary *educated* usage.

[12] It is highly unlikely that there were just two speakers at Vindolanda who pronounced the original diphthong as a monophthong.

[13] See Väänänen, op. cit. (n. 11), 41.

[14] For the insertion of a glide [w] in hiatus after a back vowel, cf. e.g. *CIL* XI.6289 *puuer* = *puer*, *O. Bu Njem* 86 *duua* = VL *dua*, Varro, *Men.* 290 *clouaca* = *cloaca*, Petron. 44.18 *plouebat* = *pluebat*.

[15] For Eunus' error, see Adams, op. cit. (n. 9), 230.

G

ae, and of *ae* for *e*, is the first of a number of orthographic abnormalities (abnormalities, that is, by the standards of most of the other tablets) which we are going to see in his letter. The status of Octavius is open to question: was he a military contractor or civilian trader?[16] His orthographic practices may have some bearing on this question, as we shall see.

In this section I will be offering a detailed comparison between orthography at Vindolanda and that in two other extensive collections of military documents (the contemporary letters of Claudius Terentianus, and the Bu Njem ostraca). The correctness of the Vindolanda tablets in the writing of *ae* vs. *e* stands in sharp contrast to the frequency of misspellings in Terentianus and the ostraca. In Terentianus *ae* outnumbers *e* by only 21:18.[17] At Bu Njem the *e*-spelling outnumbers *ae* by 51:14, and one example of *ae* is hypercorrect.[18]

A crude count of examples of *ae* vs. examples of *e* at Vindolanda might have led one to deduce that in the 'Latin of Britain' *ae* was still a diphthong. We have been able to cast doubt on that possibility from a consideration of 186 and 343. The practice of counting examples of misspellings in relation to correct spellings in inscriptions from different areas of the Empire in an attempt to find regional variation in Latin is, on this evidence, futile.[19] A 'correct' spelling may reflect not a current pronunciation but adherence to an old writing convention.

II.2. *Final -m*

Another remarkable orthographic feature of the tablets lies in the accuracy with which *-m* is written in final position. There are about 393 cases of *-m* correctly written, but not a single certain case either of an omission, or of *-m* written where it does not belong.[20] Final *-m* was scarcely, if at all, audible in final position, even in educated speech (note Quint. IX.4.40, Velius Longus, *GL* VII.54.4). Failure to articulate final *-m* was not, therefore, a 'vulgarism', but failure to write it betrays a lack of control over the spelling system, and can be taken as a sign that the writer had not had a full literary education. Recently published non-literary documents, including those from military environments, tend to display omissions more or less frequently. In the first-century legal documents written in the hand of C. Novius Eunus *-m* is left out nine times and written hypercorrectly once (whereas in the 'correct' versions of the same documents in the hand of scribes it is always written, and correctly).[21] In the letters of Terentianus one accusative singular in five is without *-m* (29 out of 149 cases).[22] In the Bu Njem ostraca *-m* is omitted as often as it is written (forty two accusative singulars without *-m*, roughly the same number with). In another recently published set of early substandard documents (from La Graufesenque) there are various cases of omission.[23]

As Marichal has recently remarked,[24] 'La fréquence relative de *m* final est révélatrice du degré d'instruction d'un scripteur'. Scribes at Vindolanda would seem to have been of a distinctively higher cultural level than those responsible for various military documents written elsewhere in the Empire.

II.3. *Gemination and Simplification*

The writing of double consonants at Vindolanda provides further evidence of scribal competence. There are about 190 examples of geminates (I include here proper names, a number of them of non-Latin origin, e.g. 182 *Ircucisso*, etc., but omit for the moment certain etymologically correct examples of *-ss-* which will be discussed separately below). These are almost invariably 'correct' in words of Latin origin (but see below on *nissi*). By contrast there is only one clear case of false simplification, *Polịonis* (187). To this might perhaps be added *comodati* (180), but this term is somewhat obscure.[25] *Exerçịas* (233, < *exsarcio*) also displays a form of simplification, *exs* (i.e. *ekss*) > *ex*. The editors also suggest (141) that *-aliator* at 184 may represent *malleator*.

Early evidence for simplification is to be found in the documents of Eunus (seventeen examples)[26] and La Graufesenque, where there is haphazard alternation between geminate and single consonant in certain words;[27] but these documents, from a Latino-Celtic milieu, are perhaps a special case. Terentianus is close to Classical norms in this respect.[28]

[16] See Bowman and Thomas, 30.

[17] See J. N. Adams, *The Vulgar Latin of the Letters of Claudius Terentianus* (*P. Mich. VIII*, 467–72) (1977), 12.

[18] See J. N. Adams, 'Latin and Punic in contact? The case of the Bu Njem ostraca', *JRS* 84 (1994), 103.

[19] See, for example, P. A. Gaeng, *An Inquiry into Local Variations in Vulgar Latin as Reflected in the Vocalism of Christian Inscriptions,* University of North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures LXXVII (1968), J. Herman, 'Aspects de la différenciation territoriale du latin sous l'Empire', *BSL* 60 (1965), 53–70 (= idem, *Du latin aux langues romanes* (1990), 10–28).

[20] On the hypercorrect addition in substandard texts of *m* where it has no place, see Adams, op. cit. (n. 9), 236.

[21] See Adams, op. cit. (n. 9), 236.

[22] See Adams, op. cit. (n. 17), 22.

[23] See R. Marichal, *Les graffites de La Graufesenque,* Gallia, supplément XLVII (1988), 67.

[24] ibid., 67.

[25] See Bowman and Thomas, 125.

[26] See Adams, op. cit. (n. 9), 238.

[27] See Marichal, op. cit. (n. 23), 67.

[28] See Adams, op. cit. (n. 17), 35.

In addition to the correct geminates noted above, there is a substantial accumulation of examples of -ss- in environments in which the geminate is historically correct, though not usually written, i.e. after a long vowel (or diphthong) and deriving usually from assimilation/assibilation within the consonant clusters -tt-, -ts-, -dt-. The most notable cases of this sort are in the perfectum of *mitto* and its compounds:

256 *remisseris*, 268 *missi*, 280 *missi*, 299 *missit*, 309 *missi* (twice), 310 *promissit*, 312 *misseras*, 314 *missi*, 318 *missi*, 344 *commississem*.

Note too:

180 *ussus,* 255 *ussibus,* 225 *occassionem,* 225 *[oc]cassionem.*

There is just one hypercorrect case of -ss- after a short vowel, and that, interestingly, is in the letter of Octavius (343.20 *nissi*).[29]

In the perfectum of *mitto* there are thus eleven cases of gemination. Forms with a single consonant (-*misi*) also occur eleven times.[30] The use of a geminate in this position was by no means standard orthography elsewhere. In the letters of Terentianus perfect forms of *mitto* occur six times, always with a single *s*.[31] At Bu Njem there are twelve cases of -*s*-, but no certain example of the geminate.[32] In the Vindolanda material no tablet which has *miss*- also has *mis*-, and no tablet which has *mis*- has *miss*-. Scribes would seem to have been consistent in their choice of one system or the other. Moreover 180, in which *ussus* occurs, is written in the same hand as 344, which contains *commississem*.

Spellings of the -ss- type belong to the category discussed by Quintilian 1.7.20, who cites the spellings *caussae*, *cassus*, and *diuissiones* as in use at the time of Cicero and Virgil, but a little later displaying simplification (after the long vowel/diphthong).[33] They are well attested in laws and archaizing inscriptions of the kind which characteristically have a variety of old-fashioned spellings. In the Lex de Gallia Cisalpina of 49 B.C. (*CIL* I².592), for example, there are cases of *remeisserit*, *repromeisserit*, *repromeississet*, and *promeisserit*, alongside (e.g.) diphthongal spellings in *ei*, -*xs*- for *x* (on which see below, II.5), and *u* for the 'intermediate' vowel. Particularly relevant to the orthography of Vindolanda is the short verse inscription *CIL* I².1216 (= *CE* 58, Rome), which not only has *missit*, but also a number of examples of -*xs*-, *ei* for *i*, and a third declension ablative in -*i* (as distinct from -*e*: see below, IV.1.1); most of these spellings I will have occasion to mention below. Also revealing are C. Novius Eunus' determined efforts to write -ss- as often as possible. He 'correctly' writes *promissi* at XVIII.2.9, but also constantly uses the geminate after long vowels or diphthongs in words in which it was not etymologically justified (notably *Hessucus* and *Cessar = Caesar*; I assume that the derivation of *Caesar* from *caes(s)us* was a popular etymology). Several times for good measure he even writes it after short vowels (in *possitus*, three times, and *Assinio*).[34] Eunus' chaotic use of the geminate betrays an awareness that such spellings were appropriate to legal documents, but an ignorance of when they were historically correct.

Quintilian speaks as if the -ss- spelling was no longer in use by his day. He was, of course, almost contemporary with the Vindolanda tablets. The constant use of -ss- at Vindolanda (compared with its complete absence from the letters of Terentianus, of roughly the same date) suggests a taste for old-fashioned orthography among some scribes in the area, a taste which will be further demonstrated below. And whereas Eunus almost a century earlier was incapable of restricting the geminate to environments in which it was etymologically justified, the scribes of Vindolanda consistently used it correctly. The one exception in this respect, as noted above, was the writer of Octavius' letter. Octavius' *nissi* is exactly parallel to Eunus' *Assinio* and *possitus*.

The evidence thus continues to accumulate that at least some of the scribes of Vindolanda were of some educational attainment, and that the letter of Octavius is a case apart.

II.4. *The Aspirate*

I have noted about 111 cases of *h* correctly written (sixty times initially, twenty seven times in *mihi*, twice in *nihil*; also *coh(ors)* twenty two times; note in addition 184 *Huep-*, 187 *Huete-*). The aspirate is never omitted at the start of a word. *Mi* occurs just seven times, but in six of these cases it is in the letter of Octavius (343). Also worth noting is *chors* (*chortis*) at 127 (cf. *chor.* at 396), a form which reflects the loss

---

[29] For *nissi* (*nessi*), see *Tab. Sulis* 32.7, 14, 65.10, and R. S. O. Tomlin, 'The Curse Tablets', in B. Cunliffe (ed.), *The Temple of Sulis Minerva at Bath* II. *The Finds from the Sacred Spring*, Oxford University Committee for Archaeology Monograph XVI (1988), 151, 199. For a few further early examples of hypercorrect -ss- in this environment, see Väänänen, op. cit. (n. 11), 60. On such spellings in Eunus, see below.

[30] 218, 252, 259, 271, 292, 295, 300, 311, 317, 320, 345.

[31] *P. Mich.* VIII.467.27, 29, 468.5, 8, 15, 28.

[32] *Transmisi* at 76, 77, 78, 79, 86, 87(?), 101, 104, 110, 148(?), *misi* at 95, *remisi* at 103. *[Tr]asmisse* at 105 may represent *transmisisse*, with a haplography, but the text is very fragmentary.

[33] On the phenomenon, see in general M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*[6] (1977), 181. For a few examples of -ss- in this environment at Pompeii, see also Väänänen, op. cit. (n. 11), 59.

[34] Full details can be found in Adams, op. cit. (n. 9), 239.

of *h* intervocalically (*cohors* > *cors*), and its restoration graphically in the wrong place.[35] The only other case of omission is in *exibe* at 282.

With *alica* at 233 should be compared *halica* at 193. There may not have been an established 'correct' spelling. There was clearly some controversy among grammarians as to the correct form: note Charisius, *GL* 1.96.9, 'alicam sine aspiratione dictam Verrius tradit, et *sic multi dixerunt*'.

Finally, *haue* at 291.14 is the form most commonly found.

In the overwhelming majority of cases *h* is retained and is correctly written, particularly if one makes allowances for the letter of Octavius, with its accumulation of abnormalities. It follows that in 154 *in is* (six times) is likely to stand for *in iis* rather than *in his*, given that omission of *h* initially virtually never occurs, whereas *-ii-* is often contracted (see II.9). The alternation of *in is* with *ex eis* in the same tablet may have something to do with considerations of euphony.

There is one other piece of evidence at Vindolanda relevant to the aspirate. At 234 in a letter of Cerialis *et hiem* is erased and apparently replaced by *etiam*. The editors observe that this must be an error caused by dictation. If so, certain deductions can be made. It is scarcely conceivable that Cerialis pronounced *etiam* with an aspirate after the *t*. If the scribe wrote *et hiem* for *etiam*, then it follows that (a) he was used to hearing *hiems* without an aspirate; and (b) on hearing the word pronounced thus he was capable of writing it with the correct *h*-spelling. Thus we learn something both about the pronunciation of Cerialis, and about the learning of scribes associated with the officer class at Vindolanda. Cerialis' letter 225, which may well be in his own hand,[36] reveals a man with some stylistic pretentions (see IX.1); yet it would seem that he did not pronounce the aspirate in initial position. Scribes were obviously attuned to inserting the aspirate in writing when they had not heard it in speech. The consistently correct spellings in this respect throughout the whole corpus of documents suggest that scribes had a significant degree of training in the relationship between the spoken and written language.

The documents of Bu Njem present a radically different picture. If one leaves aside the official daily reports numbered 3–24, in which *in his* is correctly written twelve times, the aspirate is omitted eleven times,[37] but written only twice.[38] The contrast between the stereotyped reports and the rest of the tablets shows that exemplars were provided for those keeping records, and that these could have an influence on orthography.[39] The general indifference to the aspirate in the letters found at Bu Njem (*O. Bu Njem* 74–117) stands in contrast to the correctness of the correspondence at Vindolanda (if one leaves aside the idiosyncratic letter of Octavius).

In Terentianus *h* is more often written than omitted, but there are significant variations from letter to letter which betray the varying practices of different scribes. In *P. Mich.* VIII.467 *h* is written eleven times and never omitted. At the other extreme is 471, where it is omitted nine times (*inc*, *mi* five times, *abuit*, *abiturum*, *nil*), but written only three times (*hoc*, *mihi*, *nihil*). There seems to have been a fairly uniform literacy among scribes at Vindolanda which distinguishes them from the scribes to whom Terentianus had access.

II.5. -*xs*-

xs is commonly written for *x* in the tablets:

181 *uexsillari*, 284 *exsigas*, 301 *sexs*, 309 *axses, axsis, axses*, 333 *exse-*, 343 *uexsare*

Tablet 309, as well as having three instances of *xs*, also has *missi* twice (see further below on the combination of these two types of spellings).

For *x* unaccompanied by *s*, cf. 161 *Expeditus*, 182 *Exomnius, exungiae*, 185 *axes*, 190 *axungiae*, 218 *exegeras*, 225 *amplexus*, 282 *exibe*.

To these examples might be added *exercias* (233), where the etymologically correct *xs* (*ex-sarcio*) has been simplified. An anomalous spelling is *-tellexcisse* (229), perhaps for *intellexisse*.

The spelling *xs* probably derives from a feeling that a consonant cluster (*x* = [ks]) should be represented graphically by more letters than one.[40] While the spelling may turn up anywhere (e.g. in tomb inscriptions *uixsit* and *uxsor* are constant),[41] there can be no doubt that it had the status of a 'formal' or archaizing spelling, appropriate (e.g.) in laws which display a range of other archaizing spellings. For example at *CIL* 1².582 one finds *exsigito* (cf. *Tab. Vind.* II, 284, above), *taxsat*, *lexs*, *proxsumeis*, as well as diphthong spellings, the intermediate vowel *u*, and also third declension ablative singulars in -*i* (*luuci*, *luci* = *luce*), forms which, as we shall see (IV.1.1), are also attested at Vindolanda. Just as *Tab. Vind.* II, 309 has three cases of *axsis* alongside two of *missi* (see above), so the Lex de Gallia

[35] See F. Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*⁴ I (rev. R. Pfister, 1977), 154 n. 5, and on the history of the spelling, B. Löfstedt, *Studien über die Sprache der langobardischen Gesetze. Beiträge zur frühmittelalterlichen Latinität* (1961), 77.

[36] See Bowman and Thomas, 200.

[37] *Annibal* (32, 34, 68), *mi* (86), *oralura* (91, 103, 105, 113), *ordeum* (97), *Vrtato* (113), *abes* (116).

[38] *Hora* (67), *mihi* (83).

[39] See further Adams, op. cit., (n. 18), 96.

[40] cf. Väänänen, op. cit. (n. 11), 64.

[41] For *xs* spellings at Pompeii, see Väänänen, op. cit. (n. 11), 64.

Cisalpina (*CIL* I².592) has on the one hand *proxsume*, *duxserit*, *noxsiaeue*, *deixseritue*, and on the other a cluster of -*ss*- spellings in the perfectum of (-)*mitto* (see above, II.3). There is a consistency of practice in the *lex*: *xs* is always written, except in the preposition/preverb *ex*, which always has *x* alone. Also worth comparing with *Tab. Vind.* II, 309 is *CIL* I².1216 (see above, II.3), which not only has *missit* alongside four examples of *xs* (*uixsi*, *uixsere*, *senexs*, *saxso*), but also the *i*-ablative. It is the fact that the *xs* spelling at Vindolanda is attested alongside other archaizing spellings which gives it its significance. Scribal practice at Vindolanda was not only predominantly correct, but also conservative.

The presence of *xs* at Vindolanda may be contrasted with the convention followed in the letters of Terentianus. There I have noted about nineteen examples of *x* (note, e.g. *P. Mich.* VIII.467.8 *uexillo*, 468.18 *sex*), but not a single case of *xs*. In the same documents (as we saw, there are six examples of the perfectum of *mitto*, all of them spelt with a single *s*.

The Bu Njem ostraca follow the same conventions as the letters of Terentianus. The ostraca contain about ten cases of *x*, but just one of *xs* (78 *sexsagi*[*nta*]. Similarly the perfectum of (-)*mitto* alway has a single *s* (see n. 32).

II.6. *Final -t/-d*

In monosyllables and some 'grammatical' words there was some confusion between *t* and *d* in final position (see Quint. 1.7.5 on *at/ad*).[42] Confusion arose because of a tendency for the final consonant to be assimilated in voice to the phoneme which followed.

There is again a high degree of accuracy in the spelling of such forms in the Vindolanda tablets, with only isolated deviations from the norm in certain documents. *Ad* is correctly spelt more than sixty times (seven times, for instance, in the expression *ad te*,[43] in which the *d* was particularly subject to assimilation: see below). *Ad* is misspelt just twice, both times in the letter 292, in the expression *at te. Id* is correctly spelt three times, *quid* seven, *sed* three, *aliquid* three, *quod* fourteen (omitting *descripta*).

The only other misspellings comprise two in 248 (*it*, *quot*), and four in the letter of Octavius, 343 (*quit* twice, *aliquit* twice). Whereas in the documents as a whole correct spellings predominate overwhelmingly, in the letter of Octavius incorrect spellings predominate by 4:2 (*quod* is correctly spelt twice). Octavius alone at Vindolanda misspells *quid* and *aliquid*, and he alone makes a distinction between (*ali*)*quit* and *quod*. Here is further evidence for the abnormality of his orthography.

Incorrect spellings are rather more common in Terentianus (twenty two examples).[44] Terentianus (or his scribes) often spells *et* and *ut* as *ed* and *ud*, two spellings which nowhere occur at Vindolanda.

Bu Njem again provides the sharpest contrast with Vindolanda. Whereas (as we saw) at Vindolanda *ad te* predominates over *at te* by 7:2, at Bu Njem *ad te* is never correctly spelt. *At te* occurs five times, and *a te* three times.[45]

II.7. *Vowels*

The merger in Vulgar Latin of *ē* with *ĭ* and *ō* with *ŭ* causes misspellings of the type *e* for original *ĭ* and *o* for *ŭ*,[46] though early evidence of such mergers is neither extensive nor straightforward of interpretation.[47] The only possible case of a misspelling of this type at Vindolanda is *debetorem* at 250. Though I previously have interpreted this as a manifestation of the merger of *ē* and *ĭ*,[48] the absence of definite parallels in the full collection of documents now raises doubts about such an interpretation. It is possible that the word has been subject to a false analysis (*debet-orem*: influence of *debet*?).

The most interesting vocalic misspelling is *turțas* in the account 180.20. The editors tentatively suggest that this may be an alternative form to *torta*, which is attested a number of times in the Vulgate (see the editors, ad loc.) as a name for a type of twisted loaf. This suggestion is undoubtedly right, and paradoxically it is the misspelling with *u* which establishes its correctness.

Torta was no mere ephemeral oddity of the Vulgate. It survives widely in Romance languages with much the same meaning as the Latin term (e.g. Fr. *tourte*, It., Sp., Pg., Prov. *torta*).[49] It is of significance that the Romance forms reflect not the expected CL *ŏ* in the first syllable,[50] which would have produced an open *ǫ* in Romance, but have rather a close *o* ([ọ]) which was the Romance outcome of

[42] See e.g. Adams, op. cit. (n. 17), 27–8, idem, op. cit. (n. 9), 237.

[43] 218 bis, 226 bis, 252, 263, 318.

[44] Adams, op. cit. (n. 17), 27–8.

[45] *O. Bu Njem* 71, 76, 77, 78, 79; 86, 101, 104.

[46] See especially Löfstedt, op. cit. (n. 35), 56–66 (with extensive bibliography).

[47] Neither in the documents of C. Novius Eunus nor at Bu Njem is there a certain case of such a misspelling: see

Adams, op. cit. (n. 9), 231, idem, op. cit. (n. 18), 103. On *e* for *i* at Pompeii, see Väänänen, op. cit. (n. 11), 21–2 (considering the possibility of Oscan influence).

[48] In A. K. Bowman and J. D. Thomas, *Vindolanda: the Latin Writing Tablets,* Britannia Monograph Series IV (1983), 73.

[49] See W. Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*³ (1935), 8802.

[50] The *o* of the participle of *torqueo* in CL was short.

the merger of CL ō and ŭ.[51] Here indeed in the Vindolanda example we see the *u* which would have produced *ǫ* in Romance.

The *u*-spelling is readily explicable: *r* + consonant tended to close a preceding *o* (or indeed *e*, as the early spelling *stircus* shows). Cf. *Appendix Probi* 25, 'formica non furmica' (but possibly a popular etymology, < *fur*);[52] also *curs*, *curtis* for *c(h)ors*, *cortis* (< *cohors*).[53] *Cohors* is reflected in Romance with *ǫ* rather than *ǫ* (e.g. It. *corto*),[54] which shows that it developed on exactly the same lines as *torta*. For a further case of closing in this environment, see *GL* v.575.7, 'cortina per o dicendum, non curtina'. Also of note is *furnus* alongside its near-synonym *fornax*, both words perhaps of the same root as *formus* -*a* -*um* (cf. *Formiae*).[55] The form *furnax* is attested at Vindolanda (155.7), a spelling which might reflect contamination with *furnus*,[56] or an independent closing under the influence of *r* + consonant. *Fornus* at *O. Bu Njem* 7.14 looks like an inverse contamination.

Turta is thus a phonetic misspelling which represents an intermediate stage between the Classical and Romance forms. The sequence of changes was *tǒrta* > *tŭrta* > *tǫrta*.

11.8. Syncope

I have noted only five examples, three of them in titles or terms of address: 170 *domne*, 214 *fraterclo*, 215 *cǫrniclario*, 196 *subuclas* = *subuculas*. Syncope is particularly common in terms used in the vocative or in titles habitually attached to names.[57]

11.9. Hiatus

Abundant evidence for the modification of vowels in hiatus contrasts with the relative absence of evidence for various other phenomena, and leads to some interesting conclusions. I begin with a classified collection of the data:
(i) Contraction of -*ii*- in hiatus
154 *in is* (six times: on the interpretation of *is*, see above, 11.4), 154 *Coris*, 164 *gladis*, 175 *Coris*, 180 *bubulcaris*, 181 *uexsillari*, 185 *Vinouis*, 186 *Feb]ruuaris*, 189 *Iunis*, 250 *petit* = *petiit*, 266 *Cǫris*, 292 *peti*, 312 *Coris*, 343 *necessari*, 343 *petissem*, 345 *ali*, 349 *propiti*. To these twenty two examples might be added seven examples of *mi*, though orthographically (but not phonetically) there is a difference between the spelling *mi* for *mihi* and *gladis* for *gladiis*, in that some writers will have been aware of the place of *h* in the written form of *mihi*, and that awareness will often have helped them avoid the contracted spelling.

There is also a case of *chǫrtis* at 127, which, as we have seen (11.4), reflects *co(h)ors* > *cors* (> *chors*). But in this section I concentrate especially on the far more frequent contraction of *ii*.

I move on now to examples of *ii* which are *uncontracted* in writing. There are in total thirty one examples, but twenty seven of these comprise the form *mihi*, which, as we saw, is a special case in that it contains a letter to keep the written form of the vowels apart. Similarly there are two examples of *nihil*. The only other uncontracted forms are: 156 *Martii[s]*, 343 *Ianuariis* (cf. possibly 201 *Februari[is]*). Both examples are in the names of months; in the writing of dates the correct spelling may have been more persistent. The second example is of special note, because it is in the letter of Octavius, in which contraction is particularly frequent (see p. 95).

If *mi/mihi* and *nihil* are excluded, contracted forms outnumber uncontracted by 22:2.

The letters of Terentianus offer hardly any examples of *ii/i*, whether contracted or not, except in words originally written with *h* between the vowels. The only other case is *dis* at *P. Mich.* VIII.467.15, but that is a standard spelling. What the letters do show is the persistence of uncontracted spellings in those words which in their correct graphic forms have an *h* to keep the vowels apart. *Mihi* occurs sixteen times, *mi* eleven, *nihil* four times, *nil* once. These bare figures obscure variations from letter to letter which presumably reflect different scribal practices: in 467 *mihi* is preferred to *mi* by 9:0, whereas in 471 *mi* is preferred by 5:1, and in 468 by 6:4.

In this case there is a close correspondence between scribal practice at Vindolanda, and that of the Bu Njem tablets. In the latter *mi* and *mihi* are not frequent enough to influence the picture. *ii* is

[51] See Meyer-Lübke, op. cit. (n. 49), and especially O. Bloch and W. von Wartburg, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue française*[5] (1968), 642, s.v. *tourte*.
[52] See W. A. Baehrens, *Sprachlicher Kommentar zur vulgärlateinischen Appendix Probi* (1922), 55; also Leumann, op. cit. (n. 33), 48.
[53] See Löfstedt, op. cit. (n. 35), 77–82.
[54] ibid., 81.
[55] See A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*[4] (1959), 248.

[56] See Adams in Bowman and Thomas, op. cit. (n. 48), 73.
[57] See V. Väänänen, *Introduction au latin vulgaire*[3] (1981), 42 on *domnus/domna* in contrast to other Romance words which retain an original Latin sequence -*min*-: 'Quant à *dominus*, *domina*, la syncope tient à l'emploi de ce substantif comme appellation ou comme titre ...'

contracted twenty eight times (*mi* once, at 86), but correctly written only once, and that in *mihi* (83);
perhaps too *stationarii* at 28.

In various other aspects of orthography, as we have seen, the Vindolanda tablets are very much
more correct and conservative than those of Bu Njem. That the two sets of documents should
correspond so closely in this one respect reveals the extent to which the contraction of similar vowels in
hiatus had progressed. Scribes at Vindolanda set out to employ a correct orthography. That they should
so consistently have written *i* for *ii* except where *h* was present suggests that contraction was absolutely
normal in speech, and that there was not a 'correct' pronunciation current, say, among particularly
careful or educated speakers which might serve as the model for a 'correct' spelling. Contraction of *ii* is a
phenomenon which strictly should be given no place in handbooks of 'Vulgar Latin', because there is
every reason to believe that in the speech of all classes it was the norm from a relatively early period.[58]

I move on to some further misspellings found in different environments in hiatus.

(ii) Closing of *e* to *i* in hiatus after a consonant

Closing of this type is represented about seven times (159 *hordiar*[, 181 *balniatore*, 184, 207, 255
sagacia, 189 *uinias*, 299 *ostria*). In this environment there was undoubtedly a clearer perception of what
was 'correct'. *e* is correctly written in hiatus about thirty six times. Some words are regularly spelt
correctly (e.g. *commeatus*, at 168, 174, 175, 176, 177, *hordeum*, at 185, 213, and seven times in 190),
whereas *sagacia* (see above) is regularly misspelt. The familiarity in written forms of the language of
certain lexical items (e.g. *commeatus*) will have enabled scribes to spell them correctly. *Sagacia*, on the
other hand, was a new, specialized term (see v.1), which had not achieved a correct orthographical form.

The name *Cerialis* turns up constantly, spelt with an *i* (so too *Genialis*). Just once (261) it is spelt
Cerealis.[59]

(iii) Glide insertion

When two vowels of quite different quality stand together in hiatus, contraction is unlikely but the
insertion of a glide ([j] or [w]) may take place. One would not expect much sign of this phenomenon at
the level of spelling at Vindolanda, given that the orthography of scribes is conservative, but there are
two interesting cases. In 186 *Februar-* is three times spelt with a *u* (*Februuar-*) which represents [w]. In
the speech of the writer (see ii.1) [w] must have been inserted to counter the loss of *u* after *br* in hiatus.
This spelling sets the writer apart from the generality of scribes at Vindolanda.

Secondly, the Celtic(?) name *Gauo* is twice spelt *Gauuone* at the start of documents (192, 207), and
then at the end of both documents is written *Gauonis* (genitive), without the glide represented. This is
precisely the type of word in which one would expect to find orthographic uncertainty, since there was no
traditional written form to guide the writer. Presumably the glide would be heard, but was not
consistently indicated in writing because the Latin spelling system did not regularly mark glides.

(iv) Omission of *u* before a back vowel

One example, *Iugenus* (181).[60]

ii.10. *Some Consonant Clusters*

n is omitted before *s* just three times (187 *Masuetus*, 337 *castresia*, 344 *trasmarinum*). The
omission (in speech) had long been standard even in the educated language (Cicero said *foresia*,
megalesia, and *hortesia*: see Velius Longus, *GL* vii.79.1–2).[61] Its omission in writing was non-standard,
but the phenomenon is rare at Vindolanda. Conversely *formonsa* at 302 is hypercorrect; cf. *Appendix
Probi* 75, 'formosus non formunsus'.

The assimilated spelling *emtus = emptus* occurs twice (181, 189). This assimilation no doubt
reflects a widespread pronunciation; for an early Imperial parallel, one might compare *sumtuarium* in
the ostraca from Masada.[62]

The omission of *n* before a stop (136 *renutium*) occurs sporadically in early documents.[63]

This last misspelling is relevant to the interpretation of *souxtum* at 301.3:

> souxtum saturnalicium
> (asses) iiii aut sexs rogo frater
> explices

[58] C. Novius Eunus offers in the early first century A.D.
the spellings *sestertis*, *medis*, and *isdem* (see Adams, op.
cit. (n. 9), 235), against one case of *iis*. Contrast *iis*
sestertiis in the correct (scribal) version of TP15.
[59] On the variable spelling of *Cerealis/Cerialis*, see *TLL
Onom.* ii.343.37ff. (in inscriptions usually *Ceri-*); also
Servius on Virg., *Aen.* 1.177.
[60] See, e.g. Adams, op. cit. (n. 9), 235.

[61] See Leumann, op. cit. (n. 33), 146.
[62] See Hannah M. Cotton and J. Geiger, *Masada II.
The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports.
The Latin and Greek Documents* (1989), 722.7, 14 (with
37 n. 33).
[63] See e.g. Väänänen, op. cit. (n. 11), 67–8, Adams, op.
cit. (n. 9), 241.

Souxtum, the reading of which is certain, is a Celticized misspelling of *su(m)ptum*, with a typical Gaulish substitution of *xt* for *pt* (cf. *sextametos* 'seventh' at La Graufesenque, alongside Lat. *septimus*; also *captiuus* > Gallo-Latin **caxtiuus* > Fr. *chétif*).[64]

11.11. *Some Conclusions*

(i) In a number of respects the orthography of the Vindolanda tablets is largely correct: in the use of the digraph *ae* (11.1), the writing of final -*m* (11.2), in the preservation of geminates (11.3), and in the writing of the aspirate (11.4). The case of the dictation error *et hiem* (11.4) reveals the ability of a scribe to write *h* when he had not heard it. It has been shown that orthography at Vindolanda is superior to that in various other military documents.

(ii) Alongside this general scribal correctness we have noted certain archaizing tendencies, notably the writing of double *s* after long vowels (11.3). There is a distinction between the efforts of C. Novius Eunus in this respect, and of the scribes of Vindolanda, in that Eunus often writes *ss* where it is not historically justified. It has also been suggested that the examples of *xs* display an archaizing taste (11.5). These two forms of archaizing are completely absent from Terentianus and at Bu Njem. In the discussion of -*ss*- after long vowels and -*xs*- for *x* it was pointed out that the artificial form was not universally preferred in the tablets. But those tablets which have -*ss*- do not have *s*, and likewise those that have *xs* do not have *x*. There were two possible orthographies in each case, and scribes seem to have adhered to the one or the other. The letter 309 is especially remarkable because it combines two examples of -*ss*- with three examples of -*xs*- (with no cases of either long vowel + *s* or of *x*). To scribes of the archaizing school the two spellings belonged together; and we will see below (IV.1.1) another artificial form which went hand-in-hand with -*ss*-.

(iii) There are, of course, spelling errors at Vindolanda, and particular attention has been drawn to contractions in hiatus (11.9). Whereas scribes got some things constantly right, they constantly contracted -*ii*-, unless an aspirate was present in the written form of the word to separate the vowels. Contraction must have been so firmly established in the speech of all classes that it was difficult even for a well-educated scribe to be sure when to write *ii* rather than *i*. Some further statistics will be given below.

(iv) The letter of Octavius (343) displays an accumulation of spelling abnormalities when it is compared both with other letters, and with the documents, military and otherwise. Octavius usually fails to use the digraph *ae* (11.1), he shows a higher than normal rate of error in the use of the aspirate (11.4) and of *t/d* in final position (11.6), and he alone produces hypercorrect examples of the digraph *ae* (*mae*) and the geminate *ss* (*nissi*). In general the incidence of spelling errors in his letter is higher than that in other letters and in documentary tablets. I will return to this final contention below. The spelling irregularities of Octavius do not prove decisively that he was a civilian rather than a military man, but they point in that direction. If many of the other tablets were written by military personnel or military scribes, it is possible either that Octavius did not have access to a scribe, which might mean that he was not in the army, or that, if he did, his scribe was not of the same cultural level as those associated with the army.

(v) The relative incidence of various spelling errors prompts some tentative observations on the chronology and status of certain changes in spoken Latin. The contraction of vowels of similar quality in hiatus was clearly the norm in all social dialects. At the other extreme there is a total lack of clear-cut evidence for the vowel mergers *ē* with *ĭ* and *ō* with *ŭ*. This could mean that, even if these mergers were taking place, they were not so widespread that they could yet influence the orthography even of writers (such as Octavius) who were prone to various other types of spelling errors. The monophthongization of *ae* on the other hand *could* influence the spelling of Octavius. It follows that monophthongization of *ae* was further advanced than the vowel mergers, though it might possibly have been resisted in some social dialects.

(vi) The spelling *souxtum*, if our interpretation is right, would appear to reflect a Celticized pronunciation of a Latin term. The tablets were written in a Celtic-speaking area, but, more to the point, at least some of those garrisoned at Vindolanda probably originated in continental regions where Celtic was spoken. To explain the form of certain lexical items in Gallo-Romance (e.g. Fr. *chétif*) it is necessary to assume that substratum influence of this very type had caused a modification of the Latin term in Gallo-Latin. I take *souxtum* as one important piece of evidence for language contact and its influence on

---

[64] For details, see J. N. Adams, 'The interpretation of *souxtum* at *Tab. Vindol.* II.301.3', forthcoming in *ZPE*.

the Latin which would have been heard at Vindolanda. On Celtic loan-words at Vindolanda, see below, VIII.15.

I turn now briefly to the distribution of spelling errors across the various types of documents surviving at Vindolanda (military documents, lists and accounts, correspondence, if one follows the classifications of the editors). By 'spelling errors' I mean phonetically inspired *misspellings*, as distinct from deviant spellings which are not phonetically determined but motivated by notions of archaizing 'correctness' (e.g. *xs*). The study of the distribution of such spelling errors in a corpus of documents may well reveal variations of authorship, as some of the data from Terentianus noted above show (see II.4 on the writing of *h* in Terentianus, and II.9 on contraction of vowels in hiatus).

The distinction made by the editors between 'military documents' (127–77) and 'accounts and lists' (178–209) may be rather arbitrary, as at least some of the latter may have been 'military'. Nevertheless I treat the two categories separately here. In the military documents there are about fourteen spelling errors of the type defined above, of which the great majority (ten) involve the treatment of vowels in hiatus. Six of the errors are in the expression *in is* in 154. In accounts and lists there are twenty four errors, fourteen of which are in hiatus. There is no clear distinction in the pattern of errors between military documents and accounts; a feature of both categories is the high incidence of errors in hiatus. The account 186 stands out for the frequency of its errors: seven, or 29 per cent of all errors in accounts and lists. The document is far from providing 29 per cent of the lines in accounts.

In the correspondence there are thirty four errors, almost half of which (sixteen) are in the letter of Octavius. To these may be added the hypercorrect forms *mae* and *nissi* in the same letter. Though 343 is long (more than forty lines), it is certainly not half the length of the full corpus of letters extant. In nineteen other letters which I have chosen for comparison because of their good state of preservation there are some 280 lines, i.e. six times as many lines as in 343.

Errors in hiatus are again well represented (eight examples in 343, fourteen examples in all in the correspondence; six of the seven examples of *mi* in letters, as we saw (II.4), are in Octavius' letter). There is one error which is restricted to the letters (eight examples), that is confusion between *t/d* in final position. It is hard to know what importance to attach to this distribution. There are many examples of *ad* in military documents and accounts which might potentially have been misspelt.

The most significant feature of the distributions noted above is undoubtedly the rate of error in Octavius' letter.

III. PUNCTUATION

III.1. *Medial Points*

Interpuncts are not regularly used in the Vindolanda tablets,[65] though there are one or two documents in which almost all words are marked off (most notably 345; also 323). The evidence of Vindolanda fits in well with the general picture of writing with interpuncts which has been constructed from other evidence. It had been regular Roman practice up to the first century to write with interpuncts (see Sen., *Epist.* XL.11) but thereafter the practice faded out.[66] At Vindolanda then one would expect little or only sporadic interpunction.

But once *regular* interpunction had disappeared, the way was open for occasional medial points to be used for *syntactic* or related purposes, to mark cola, pauses, constructions, etc.[67] There is some evidence at Vindolanda for the use of interpuncts to mark sense pauses, if only occasionally. The ethnographical fragment 164 has interpuncts enclosing each of a pair of parallel negative clauses:

·non utuntur equites·nec residunt Brittunculi·

[65] See Bowman and Thomas, 56–7.
[66] Note also Cic., *Mur.* 25. See M. B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect. An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West* (1992), 10, T. N. Habinek, *The Colometry of Latin Prose* (1985), 43 with n., P. J. Parsons in R. D. Anderson, P. J. Parsons and R. G. M. Nisbet, 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaṣr Ibrîm', *JRS* 69 (1979), 131 with n. 43.
[67] See R. W. Müller, *Rhetorische und syntaktische Interpunktion. Untersuchungen zur Pausenbezeichnung im antiken Latein* (1964), 36: 'Erst das Verschwinden der Wortinterpunktion machte es möglich, den Punkt in mitt-

lerer Höhe für die Bezeichnung von Sinnpausen zu verwenden'. Müller cites (36–7) *P. Oxy.* 1.32 (= R. Cavenaile, *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum* (1958), 249), a second-century letter of recommendation, where some clauses are divided by interpunction. For such use of medial points in early manuscripts, see Habinek, op. cit. (n. 66), 61, 82–3 (on the Medicean manuscript of Virgil). On interpuncts in the Bu Njem ostraca which correspond 'à une coupure logique', see Marichal, op. cit. (n. 3), 40 (see *O. Bu Njem* 68, 71, 72, 81; perhaps too 77, 78).

This is the most striking example of syntactic/rhetorical interpunction, but there are some other cases. Note:

> 205   ]vii K(alendas)·Ianuarias·in singulos dies
>](sextarii) iiii·fiunt dies xliii
> m(odii) x s(emis)

Here the points (other than that after *K(alendas)*) happen to correspond to the punctuation in the editors' translation:

> 26(?) December. Per day, 4 *sextarii*. Total for 42 days, modii 10½.

In the address of 260 interpuncts separate the name of the addressee from that of the writer:

> Flauio Ceriali praef(ecto) coh(ortis)·a Iustino col(lega)·

For clauses or verb-phrases marked off, see:

> 242   cras·bene mane Vindolandam ueni·ut ...
> 266   uolo ueniat·ad me Coris·et accipiat

In 311 there is an absence of interpuncts except before a vocative expression:

> cupio·homo inpientissime

Cf. 175 'rogo·domine', 345 '·te·rogo·frater·'.

It is possible that occasionally the use of interpuncts may be relevant to the phenomena of enclisis and proclisis. I take proclisis first. Prepositions were proclitic, in the sense that they formed a single accentual unit with the dependent term.[68] No doubt for this reason prepositions are only sporadically divided from the dependent term by interpuncts in those texts which make use of points.[69] A good example of a document which, despite its regular use of interpuncts, generally does not separate preposition from dependent term is the Lex de Gallia Cisalpina (*CIL* I².592). At Vindolanda note:

> 211   de hac·re
> 315   et alias·ad Vocusium
>   Africanum·praefectum
> 323   ex ratiunculis·(in a text in which interpuncts are regular).

Of rather more interest in the Vindolanda material is a possible tendency for unemphatic (enclitic) pronouns to be left undivided from the term to which they are attached. 345 has almost complete interpunction, one exception of only two being ·*misi tibi*·. On 315 the editors (301) state that 'Interpunct is found everywhere except after monosyllables and after *carrula*'. This is a correct statement, but it should be noted that *carrula* is followed by a pronoun:

> ut carrula uobis·dentur·et alias·ad Vocusium

Note too 339:

> et suasit me·

I have not found any discussion of the possible relationship between interpunction and the accentuation of personal pronouns, nor can I find convincing parallels for the examples cited above.[70] Unless more material is discovered and parallels found it would not be safe to take the above items as new evidence for the enclitic character of unemphatic personal pronouns.

---

[68] See e.g. W. S. Allen, *Accent and Rhythm. Prosodic Features of Latin and Greek: a Study in Theory and Reconstruction* (1973), 24–5.

[69] See E. O. Wingo, *Latin Punctuation in the Classical Age* (1972), 16.

[70] But see *P. Berl.* inv. 11649, 'salutem tibi ·dicunt· nostri'.

III.2. *Apices*

The editors (57–61) list and discuss occurrences of the apex mark. I add here a few further observations, attempting in particular to assess what linguistic significance if any may be extracted from the use of the apex. The editors' lists require some minor adjustments. *Faciás* should not be in the list of items (59) showing apices over short vowels. Conversely *óptamus* should not be in the list of apices over long vowels. The editors include in their list quite a few apices which are difficult to interpret, either because the mark itself is unclear, or because the text is so fragmentary that the length of the vowel on which the mark stands is uncertain. Accordingly I give my own modified and abbreviated lists, containing only cases which are relatively certain, on which some statistical remarks will be based.

Apices over long vowels

> 194 *laterarió, compendiárium*, 196 *á Tranquillo, á (Broccho), Brocchó*, 212 *Verecundó, suó*, 215 *aequó* (?), *Cassió*, 221 *Fláuio*, 234 *Octóbres*, 239 *Fláuius, suó*, 242 *numerátioni*, 243 *suó, fráter*, 245 *-ró* (probably part of a name), 248 *tú*, 255 *Flauió*, 261 *suó*, 263 *tuó*, 265 *fráter, sacrifició, uoluerás*, 291 *rogó, interuentú, salutá, faciás*, 292 *Brocchó, uná*, 305 *Vettió, Seueró*, 307 *exoró*, 310 *suó*, 311 *cupió, putó, scribó, rogó, nómina*, 319 *Veranió, suó*, 324 *-inná* (probably a name in the ablative), 330 *meó*

I omit the (mostly doubtful) cases listed by the editors from 371–513.

Apices over short vowels

> 175 *rógo*, 192 *-neariá*, 198 *-brá, membrá*, 207 *sagá*, 248 *óptamus*, 265 *Kálendarum, sácrificio*, 291 *Severá, facturá*, 292 *necessariá*

There are in these lists forty three instances of apices placed over long vowels, and eleven over short.

Flobert, in his study of apices in various inscriptions,[71] has noted a marked tendency for an apex to be placed over vowels in stressed syllables. The placing of an apex on a *short* vowel in a stressed syllable might possibly be related to a tendency for short vowels under the accent to be lengthened (and, indirectly, to a converse tendency for long vowels in unstressed syllables to be shortened). In the Vindolanda material, however, there is little coincidence between apex placement and the position of the stress accent. There is only one case of a short vowel with an apex in a stressed syllable (175 *rógo*). As far as *correct* apices are concerned, these occur over vowels in *stressed* syllables in the following places:

> 194 *compendiárum*, 221 *Fláuio*, 234 *Octóbres*, 239 *Fláuius*, 243 *fráter*, 248 *tú*, 265 *fráter*, 311 *nómina*

Only about 16 per cent of the apices in the two lists are on stressed vowels. There seems to be little tendency to mark stressed vowels as such, and there is hardly any evidence here for the lengthening of short vowels under the accent.

Of the fifty four apices in the two lists, all but two (248 *tú*, 291 *interuentú*) are on the letters *a* and *o*. It may be worthwhile to consider the place within the word of these letters. I exclude from consideration the monosyllable *á* (twice at 196). The thirty nine cases of *a* and *o* with a correctly placed apex (i.e. an apex over a long vowel) are distributed thus:

	internal syllable	final syllable
over *a*	6	5
over *o*	2	26

Thus thirty one instances (= 78 per cent) stand on a long vowel in final syllable.

Incorrectly placed apices are distributed thus:

	internal syllable	final syllable
over *a*	2	7
over *o*	2	–

---

[71] op. cit. (n. 10), e.g. 104, 106.

The figures reveal a high incidence of apices on vowels in final syllables (76 per cent of instances in the two tables). The significant proportion of apices in this category might possibly be related to a tendency for long vowels in final syllables to undergo shortening. The final syllable of a Latin word never bore a stress accent, and for that reason vowels in this position were historically subject to modification of various types (e.g. loss, as in *homce > hunc, duce > duc, uidesne > uiden; opening of i to e to counter the particular vulnerability of i, e.g. facili > facile; shortening of long vowels, e.g. aue, as Quintilian 1.6.21 seems to imply; note too the phonetic spelling seese twice in the lex incerta, CIL I².582, apparently for sese). In the later period grammarians refer both to the lengthening of short vowels under the stress accent, and to the shortening of long vowels (including those in final syllables) which were not accented: e.g. Cĕrĕs for CL Cērēs, Sacerdos GL VI.451.13, 'per immutationem accentuum, ac si dicas Cērēs ce longa, cum breuis sit, et res breui, cum sit longa' (cf. Consentius, GL v.392.3, 11, 18).

Of the seven misplaced apices in a final syllable, every one is on an a. a is the only letter which in final position of a noun or adjective may carry different phonetic values of potential semantic significance (e.g. mensă nom. vs. mensā abl.). In the case system e in final position is always short, whereas i, o, and u are always long. Since, according to Quintilian (1.7.2), the apex was not to be placed over every long vowel, but used only to avoid confusion, there may have developed a tendency for apices to be written particularly over long a in final position in case endings. But if distinctions of length were being lost in this position, and if consequently scribes were often uncertain about the 'correct' length of the vowel, the conditions were ideal for the hypercorrect use of the apex where it did not belong historically.

I move on to apices over o. In six cases the apex is on the final o in a first-person verb form (291 rogó, 307 exoró, 311 cupió, putó, scribó, rogó). I have listed these examples under the heading 'apices over long vowels' for historical reasons only; in fact, in some or all cases the vowel may have been short. Rogo (twice) and puto are iambic words, in which the long final vowel would long since have been subject to iambic shortening.[72] Moreover by the Augustan period shortening of -ō begins to appear in non-iambic words (e.g. in Horace and Ovid).[73] Eventually in verb-endings, whether the structure of the verb was iambic or not, short o was to become the norm: note Charisius, GL 1.16.20, 'paulatim autem usus inuertit, ut in sermone nostro scribŏ, dicŏ, et item talibus, ubi o non solum correpta ponitur, sed etiam ridiculus sit qui eam produxerit' (the man who lengthens the o of scribo or dico makes himself ridiculus), Pompeius, GL v.232.21–37, 'nemo dicit dicō, sed dicŏ ... omnis ergo o in prima persona semper corripitur exceptis monosyllabis' (i.e. dō, but reddŏ).

It is likely then that at the time when the Vindolanda tablets were written, final -o in first-person verbs was tending to be shortened. The six instances of apices written in this position I would not classify as mistakes. Rather, they probably reflect an attempt by careful and well-trained scribes to counter the habit which was spreading in colloquial speech; the apex demonstrated that the writer was aware of the correct length of the vowel.

Among the correctly placed apices listed earlier, there are, quite apart from those in puto and rogo, various other examples on the second (historically long) vowel of iambic words (suó six times, tuó once, meó once). Thus eleven of the apices on final -ō appear in words of iambic structure. Again it is possible that the writing of the apex was motivated by a desire to counter the process of shortening which may have left a legacy in colloquial speech.

By the early Imperial period a short o begins to appear in final position not only in first person verbs of iambic and non-iambic structure, but even in non-iambic ablative and imperative forms (esto, uincendo).[74] I am inclined then to relate the high incidence of historically correct apices over final -ō in the Vindolanda tablets to the effects not only of an earlier iambic shortening, but also of a shortening of -ō which was spreading even to non-iambic words. The scribes of Vindolanda aspired to an orthographic correctness, and hence they often were careful to mark the correct quantity of the -ō.

The editors draw attention (60–1, with n. 55) to a long-standing convention whereby the apex was employed in the address of letters, on the ablative ending usually of names. This convention is probably unrelated to the shortening of long final vowels in the colloquial language, but is rather to be seen as a form of orthographic formality appropriate to the address of a letter.

The motivation for the use of the apex in the documents is far from easy to determine. The picture may become clearer as more tablets come to light. In the meantime I would tentatively suggest that the placement of apices may be of some linguistic significance. The constant use of apices on final vowels can be interpreted as a reaction against the shortening of long vowels, particularly -o, in that position.

[72] See Leumann, op. cit. (n. 33), 109–10, Allen, op. cit. (n. 68), 179–85.

[73] Leumann, op. cit. (n. 33), 110.
[74] ibid.

IV.1. *Nominal Morphology*

IV.1.1. *Ablative singular in the third declension*

There are various anomalous (or superficially anomalous) third declension ablative singulars in the tablets, namely *-i* in consonant stems, and *-e* in *i*-stem names of adjectival origin:

(i) *-i* for *-e* in consonant stems

312 *a Tullioni*, 344 *ua[let]udini*

Moreover a document recently published by A. R. Birley (Inv. 91/1022) provides an example of the phrase *ab patri*.[75]

(ii) *-e* for *-i* in names

181 *ab Vitale*, 242 <a> *Çeriale*, 263 *ab Equestre*, 343 *a Fatale*, 349 *Fatale*

These examples contrast with the following:

(i) *-e* in consonant stems

181 *ab Alione*, 181 *balniatore*, 192, 207 *a Gauuone*, 263 *centurione*, 263 *decurione*, 284 *decurione*, 343 *Gleuçone*

(ii) *-i* in *i*-stems

96 *sunthesi[* (?), 311 *a Sollemni*

These variations reflect the fact that there were two inherited singular endings in the third declension ablative, *-e* and *-i*, their historical distinction obscure to native speakers. The *-e* ending had long tended to be generalized to all roots in nouns, whether consonant- or *i*-stems. But the *-i* ending was kept alive partly by its persistence in certain *i*-stem nouns (e.g. *febri* alongside *febre*, *ciui/ciue*, *classi/classe*, *colli/colle*, *fini/fine*, *igni/igne*, *imbri/imbre*), and also by the fact that it had come to be assigned to adjectives, particularly those in *-is* (*omnis*, *omni*, etc.).[76]

I take first the *-e* ending in names of adjectival origin (*ab Vitale*, etc.). Though the adjective *uitalis* might be expected to have an *-i* ending, and though *Sollemni* (311) shows that a name derived from such an *-is* adjective might retain an *-i* ending, it is likely that in names the ending *-e* had become the norm. Note already at Pompeii, *CIL* IV.3943 *Ceriale*, with Charisius, *GL* 1.124.16, '*Ceriale* ablatiuo *e* terminabitur, si homo sit, *cereali*, si res sit, ut fructus'.[77] All the apparent examples of *-e* for *-i* so far attested at Vindolanda are in names, and they probably should not be treated as aberrant at all. It would, of course, be another matter if *-e* for *-i* in an *-is* adjective were to turn up (as e.g. at *CIL* XII.2366, 'animo forte').[78]

It is the forms *ualetudini* and *patri* which are of particular interest. I would interpret them not as 'vulgar' in any sense (but see below) but as (false) archaisms, and I would base this assertion on the distribution of such ablatives. Since it was *-i* which, some classes of adjectives aside, was under threat (as, e.g., is shown by a form such as *ciue* alongside *ciui*), it may have acquired a reputation for being old-fashioned or more 'correct' than *-e*, even in consonant stems. It is particularly common in archaizing inscriptions,[79] as for example in the Lex Agraria (*CIL* 1².585), which is heavily archaizing in its orthography: e.g.

XXIII ab eo *herediue* eius is ager locus testamento *hereditati deditioniue* obuenit

---

[75] Birley, op. cit. (n. 1), 441.

[76] Whereas *-i* is normal in *-is* adjectives, there is some variation in other types: e.g. *par, pari*, but *uetus, uetere*. On the whole it is true to say that the language had set up an economical distinction between *-e* and *-i*, with the former allocated to nouns, and the latter to many adjectives.

[77] Cited by Väänänen, op. cit. (n. 11), 84 n. 2.

[78] See further Väänänen, op. cit. (n. 11), 84.

[79] See the index to *CIL* 1², p. 819, quoting more than thirty examples of *-i* ablatives. Some, but by no means all, are in *-i* stem words. See also Leumann, op. cit. (n. 33), 435, stating: 'Endungen: *-ĕ* vorwiegend bei Substantiven, und *-ī* vorwiegend bei Adjektiven. Im Altlatein war die Verwendung nach Ausweis der Inschriften noch nicht so fest geregelt'. The situation in old Latin is difficult to determine, because most archaizing inscriptions are not old. But there can be no doubt that *-i* in nouns of consonant stem was by some *considered* to be old.

Note too in another law (Lex incerta reperta Bantiae, *CIL* I².582):

> in poplico *luuci* . . .
> palam *luci* in forum uorsus

This same *lex* also has six instances of *xs*, against three of *x*.
For further examples of *-i* in archaizing inscriptions, see:

> *CIL* I².1216, monumentum indiciost saxso saeptum ac *marmori*
> *CIL* I².1615, nomen delatum Naeuiae L. l. Secunda (*sic*), seiue ea alio *nomini* est

The inscription *CIL* I².1216 (above) has already been cited for certain of its archaizing spellings, notably *-xs-* and the form *missit*. If *xs*, *-ss-* in the perfectum of *mitto*, and *-i* in consonant-stem nouns all belonged in the eyes of the writer to the same level of (old-fashioned) orthography, then the presence of all three spellings at Vindolanda surely reflects an archaizing taste among some scribes there. Indeed the *-i* ablative and the *-ss-* spelling come together in the work of one scribe. The letter 344, which contains *ualetudini*, is in the same hand as 180, which has *ussus*. We have already seen (II.5) that another letter, 309, combines *-ss-* with *xs*.

Comparable ablatives in *-i* are also found in poetry: e.g. Enn., *Ann.* 324 Skutsch *sorti*, Catull. 68.124, Prop. II.30.39 *capiti*.[80] Poets no doubt found it metrically convenient at times to use both *-e* in adjectives and *-i* in nouns which were not original *i*-stems.

While aberrant ablatives in *-i* may often in archaizing registers have been determined by the conventions of the genre, an archaizing tendency does not explain all such spellings. For the sake of completeness I mention two examples found in a verse inscription from Rome, possibly belonging to the end of the second century A.D. (*CIL* VI.32808 (=*CE* 474)). Note first l. 9:

> ista prius triste munus posui *dolori* repletus

The *-i* of *dolori* must be scanned as a short; the unstressed vowel in final syllable, which ought to be long, has been treated as short. Once distinctions of vowel length were lost in final syllables (see above, III.2), the close and half-close vowels *i* and *e* may scarcely have been distinguished in pronunciation in this position, and that might have opened the way for scribes to write indifferently *i* or *e*. In this connection l. 5 of the same inscription is even more significant:

> *dolori* ma[g]no substentauit tempore longo

Here *dolori magno* is not ablative but accusative, with *-m* omitted, and with the *o* of *magno* representing the VL merger of *ō* and *ŭ* as close *ǫ*. The use of the *-i* spelling instead of the *-e* deriving from *-em* suggests that the scribe was not clear about the quality of the vowel in final position. Examples of *-i* for *-e* in ablatives in inscriptions of substandard Latinity abound,[81] and these may sometimes reflect not a hypercorrect ('archaizing') use of the *i*-stem ablative instead of the consonant stem form in *-e*, but a phonetically motivated uncertainty on the part of the writer about the quality of the short vowel in final syllable.

The scribes at Vindolanda were not given to vocalic misspellings (except in hiatus), and it is therefore more likely that forms such as *ualetudini* and *patri* arose from a transfer of the *i*-stem morpheme into consonant stems.

IV.1.2. *subligariorum*

Subligariorum (346) is a genitive form of *subligar*. From the plural *-aria* in such *-ar(e)* neuters a new nominative in *-arium* tended to develop by a back-formation. *Subligariorum* is thus strictly genitive plural of **subligarium*. A parallel is provided by the form *coclearium* which emerged alongside *cochlear(e)* (*Appendix Probi* 67, 'cochleare non cocliarium').[82]

---

[80] See O. Skutsch, *The* Annals *of Q. Ennius* (1985), 500, Kroll on Catull. 68.124 (also on 68.99, on *-e* for *-i* in adjectives and *i*-stem nouns in poetry, for metrical reasons).

[81] For examples in E. Diehl's *Vulgärlateinische Insch-* *riften* (1910), see e.g. nos 242 *funeri*, 536 *pro piaetati*, 1493 *generi*, 1556 *Bautoni*, 1566 *adulescenti*.

[82] For further parallels, see J. N. Adams, 'The Latin of the Vindolanda writing tablets', *BICS* 22 (1975), 20.

IV.1.3. *Some forms of the relative pronoun*

I start with:

234   qui feramus tem-
        pestates [[et hiem]] etiam si
        molestae sint

The preceding clause is not complete, but *qui* looks to be the old instrumental use of *qui*,[83] which is particularly well represented in Latin comedy but survived into the Classical period. A collection of material can be found in *OLD*, s.v. *Qui* is common as an interrogative (= 'how') (for example in Horace as well as comedy: *OLD* s.v. 1). For the relative use, see e.g. Ter., *Andr.* 512, 'multa concurrunt simul / qui coniecturam hanc nunc facio', Varro, *De uita populi Romani* 1 frg. *ap.* Non. p. 853.1 L., 'cocula, qui coquebant panem, primum sub cinere, postea in forno' (cf. Lucr. IV.615). *Qui* may be followed by a subjunctive verb (final / potential / generic), as apparently in the tablet: e.g. Plaut., *Aul.* 502, 'uehicula qui uehar',[84] *Stich.* 292, 'quadrigas / qui uehar', Varro, *Rust.* III.17.9, 'maritumum flumen inmisisset in piscinas, qui reciproce fluerent ips<a>e', Cic., *Att.* XI.11.2, 'qua re id quoque uelim cum illa uideas, ut sit qui utamur' ('so that there might be (something) which we might use'). This last example has formulaic phraseology: note Plaut., *Trin.* 355, 'habemus et qui nosmet utamur', Cato, *Agr.* 104.1, 'uinum familiae per hiemem qui utatur', Cic., *Att.* XIII.23.3, 'magis enim doleo me non habere cui tradam quam habere qui utar'. The relative / final use may have had a limited survival in the colloquial language, particularly in one or two formulae.

Qui is used for *quis* at 215.4: 'si qui uolet'. There is a difference of status between *qui* for *quis* before *s*, and that before other phonemes. The former is not uncommon even in literary and poetic texts, particularly in the expression *qui sit* (e.g. Cic., *Verr.* II.188), but the collocation which we have here would probably have been considered substandard by some.[85] Vitruvius, who was apologetic about his own Latinity (1.1.18), used *si quis* twice in the first chapter of his treatise (1.1.5, 1.1.10), but he thereafter lapsed into *si qui* (eighteen times).[86] *Si qui* occurs particularly often before *uolo* in Vitruvius, as in the tablet (e.g. 1.4.7, II.7.5, II.8.8, IV.3.3, V.5.6, etc.).

The letter of Octavius seems to have an example of the masculine form of the relative used for the feminine: 343.40, 'Frontinium Iulium audio magno licere pro coriatione *quem* hic comparauit (denarios) quinos'. The masculine form eventually subsumed the functions of the feminine (cf. e.g. Fr. *qui*, masc./fem.), and *qui* = *quae* is common in late Latin.[87] This example (somewhat undermined by the obscurity of the text) is very early, but note in C. Novius Eunus, *T.P.* XVIII.2.8f. (15 September 39), '*quem* suma [= *quam summam*] iuratus promissi me ... redturum'.[88]

IV.1.4. *A demonstrative form*

The letter of Octavius (343.19) provides an example of the demonstrative *illic* (with the deictic reinforcement -*c(e)*), in the form *illec* = *illaec* (neuter plural). *Illic* was primarily an old Latin demonstrative form, very common in Plautus.[89] Though it scarcely survived into the late Republic literary language (see Lucr. IV.1059, Catull. 50.5), there is a group of examples in the Pompeian inscriptions (e.g. *CIL* IV.1691, 'qui illunc pedicat'),[90] and another example of the same form *illec* in Octavius' contemporary Claudius Terentianus (*P. Mich.* VIII.469.18). Terentianus offers four other cases of *illic* in various forms.[91] The distribution of the word suggests unmistakably that it fell out of respectable educated use but lingered on in colloquial speech.[92]

IV.1.5. *A superlative form*

The superlative form (*homo*) *inpientissime* is used in the letter 311. In this case it would probably not be appropriate to call the usage substandard. The superlative form *piissimus* is well-attested, but it

[83] For which see Ernout-Meillet, op. cit. (n. 55), 556; most obviously found in *quicum*.

[84] See W. M. Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus* (1907), 43.

[85] For a comprehensive discussion of *qui/quis*, see E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins* (1956), II, 79–96.

[86] I have consulted L. Callebat *et al.*, *Vitruve, De Architectura, Concordance* (1984), s.v.; see also Löfstedt, op. cit. (n. 85), II, 92–3.

[87] See, e.g. E. Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (1911), 132.

[88] See Adams, op. cit. (n. 9), 243–4.

[89] See *TLL* VII.1.370.10ff., Adams, op. cit. (n. 17), 45, F. Neue and C. Wagener, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*³ (1892–1905), II, 428–9.

[90] See Väänänen, op. cit. (n. 11), 86 for further examples.

[91] See Adams, op. cit. (n. 17), 45.

[92] See also M. Jeanneret, *La langue des tablettes d'exécration latines* (1918), 79 for examples in curse tablets.

caused unease (see Cic., *Phil.* XIII.43). *Pius*: *pientissimus* may be based on the analogy of *beneuolus*: *beneuolentissimus*.[93] *Pientissimus* is particularly common in inscriptions.[94] It is possible that *inpientissimus* at 311 is the only example of the negative form attested.[95] Its use in a letter is of some interest. *Pientissimus* occurs mainly in grave inscriptions, and it might accordingly have been assumed that the formation was an artificial one restricted to this special register. The example at Vindolanda suggests that the remodelled superlative was established in colloquial Latin.

IV.1.6. *A change of prefix: exungia = axungia*

An account (182.16) has the item: 'pretio exungiae (denarios) xi (asses ii)'. The misspelling of *axungia* is of some interest.

Axungia is a compound (*ax-ungia*), the first part of which consists of the root of *axis* 'axle' (= 'axle grease').[96] But by a popular etymology this first element was reanalysed as the preposition *a(b)*; hence the forms *absungia, assungia* at *Mulomedicina Chironis* 599. By a change of prefix *exungia* emerged as an alternative to *absungia*. The verb *ausculto* 'listen' underwent a similar series of changes. *Ausculto* was dissimilated to *asculto* (cf. *Agustus* for *Augustus*), *a-* was interpreted as a prefix and hence the form *absculto* appeared; finally *ab-* was replaced by *ex-*, a change which lies behind Fr. *écouter*.[97] Changes, or confusions, of prefix in Vulgar Latin take two forms: (1) phonetically similar prefixes were often confused (e.g. *prae-* and *pro-*,[98] *di(s)* and *de*[99]); (2) the semantically equivalent, but phonetically dissimilar, prefixes *ex-* and *ab-*-might also interchange.

The spelling *exungia* at Vindolanda is remarkably early; previously the form had been attested in the manuscripts of late technical works, such as Theodorus Priscianus and the *Mulomedicina Chironis* (515, 887).

IV.2. *Verb Morphology*

IV.2.1. *debunt*

There is a substantial group of military reports with the heading *renuntium*, all of them of formulaic structure.[100] In six texts (130, 134, 135, 139, 145, 150) *quidebunt* is written. Should this be interpreted as representing *qui debunt, qui (ui)debunt*, or indeed something else?[101] I would now opt for *qui debunt*. I base myself on the clause-structure of the document-type and on considerations of meaning.

The full format is now clear from an unpublished document (Inv. no. 1418) reported by Bowman and Thomas, 76: '... coh. viiii Batauorum. omnes ad loca quidebunt et inpedimenta renuntiarunt optiones et curatores ....'

Debunt for *debent* linguistically raises no problems. The second and third conjugations were conflated in Vulgar Latin, and *-unt* for *-ent* is attested, for example, in a letter of Terentianus contemporary with the Vindolanda tablets (*P. Mich.* VIII.468.40 *ualunt*).[102] What would be puzzling about *debunt*, if that is intended, would be its presence in a type of document which was clearly quasi-official and formulaic. The documents are all in different hands.[103] The same phraseology would not have gone on repeating itself unless an exemplar had been provided for the use of the different *optiones*.[104] But if an exemplar was in use, it is remarkable that it should have contained a substandard form.[105] Even at Bu Njem a century later there was a model-letter form in use for recording the dispatch of goods, which, in its formulaic sections, contained no errors of orthography or syntax. And we have seen evidence earlier for the relatively high cultural standards of at least some of the scribes who were on hand at Vindolanda.

I turn to the interpretation of the immediate context. *Ad loca* (*-um*) must, as the editors suggest (75), mean 'at duty stations'. If *quidebunt* were taken as an abbreviation for *qui (ui)debunt*, the structure of the passage might be: 'omnes ad loca. qui uidebunt et inpedimenta'. The sense roughly would be: 'all (are) at duty stations. They will see also to the baggage'. There would seem to be two problems with this interpretation. First, the use of *uideo* in this sense, though not impossible (*OLD*, s.v. 19), would

[93] See Leumann, op. cit. (n. 33), 499.

[94] Neue-Wagener, op. cit. (n. 89), II, 208–9.

[95] At *TLL* VII.1.620.49ff. the form *impiissimus* is illustrated, but not *impientissimus*; so at Neue-Wagener, op. cit. (n. 89), II, 206.

[96] See Ernout-Meillet, op. cit. (n. 55), 62 (s.v. *axis* 1).

[97] See, e.g. Bloch-von Wartburg, op. cit. (n. 51), 211 s.v. *écouter*.

[98] Note, for example, *propositus = praepositus* at *O. Bu Njem* 84, 85 (see further J. Svennung, *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache* (1935), 378).

[99] See Löfstedt, op. cit. (n. 35), 294–7.

[100] See Bowman and Thomas, 73–6 for a discussion of these documents.

[101] See Bowman and Thomas, 75 on the problem of interpretation which this locution raises.

[102] See Adams, op. cit. (n. 17), 51.

[103] Bowman and Thomas, 74.

[104] On *optiones* as authors of the documents, see Bowman and Thomas, 74.

[105] Note that the correct form *debent* is found in the account 181.

certainly be somewhat unusual. But more worrying is the connective use of the relative *qui*. There is something of a literary flavour to the connective relative (= (*et*) *hi*), which is not appropriate to the document.

If on the other hand *debunt* is taken to be a substandard form for *debent*, good sense and syntax are introduced. *Qui* becomes a normal restrictive relative, with *omnes* as its antecedent: 'all who should be are at duty stations, and the baggage as well'. There is a special reason for taking the expression thus. When an infinitive has to be *understood* with *debeo* (as would be the case here: understand *esse*), it is particularly common for *debeo* to stand either in an *ut-* (= 'as') clause, or in a relative clause (e.g. Cic., *Cluent.* 185, *Cat.* 1.16, *Mur.* 3, Q. Cic., *Pet.* 4).[106] *Qui debunt* = *debent* would therefore have a decidedly idiomatic look to it.

If it is the substandard form *debunt* which recurs in these texts, we may speculate about how it got into formulaic documents. The answer may lie in the editors' suggestion (74) that the documents were written by *optiones* themselves. The exemplar may have been drafted not by one of the well-educated scribes who served the high-ranking officers, but by an *optio*. An item of soldiers' vernacular might thus have entered the model document and been perpetuated in later documents because it represented standard usage among those of the rank responsible for dispatching such reports. It is of considerable interest that the form *habunt* for *habent* has now turned up in an unpublished document (Inv. 93/1544) written by a *decurio*.[107]

If the above speculations are along the right lines, they have important linguistic and other implications. That the form should have been repeated by a variety of *optiones*, with no-one ever substituting the 'correct' form *debent*, suggests that *-unt* for *-ent*, despite its poor attestation in writing, was standard usage in the army in the speech of under-officers; and it is worth recalling that in Egypt at the same time the soldier Terentianus said *ualunt* for *ualent*. It is highly unusual to be able to locate a substandard usage so precisely on the social scale. Secondly, it would seem to follow that not all exemplars for use in the army were drafted by professional scribes of superior education. Some initiatives were left to minor officers themselves; and literacy extended beneath the level of the social élite.

IV.2.2. *rescripsti* (310.6)

I mention this form under verb morphology, but in fact it displays a commonplace haplology.[108]

V. WORD FORMATION

In this section I discuss various terms classified by suffix.

v.1. *-aceus*

Sagacia has now turned up four times in the tablets:

184.20	sagaciam (denarios) v (asses iii)
207.3	a Gauuone
	sagá n(umero) i̧i̧i̧
	ṣagacias ṇ(umero) vi̧i̧
255.8–9	sa-
	gaçias ṣex ṣagạ [*c. 3* pallio-]
	ḷa septem tu[nicas se]x
Tab. Vind. 1.44	sagacias duas

Sagaceus must in origin have been an adjective of the *-aceus* formation; hitherto only one example of the word used adjectivally has been attested (at Col. XI.1.21: see below). There are now sufficient examples at Vindolanda to make it clear that the word was also used as a feminine substantive signifying a type of garment; twice indeed it is immediately juxtaposed with *saga* 'cloaks', the term which provides its base. Whatever the *sagacia* was, it was presumably associated or worn with the *sagum*. The gender of the substantival use can only be explained from the deletion of a feminine noun (*uestis, tunica?*). The question arises what is the implication of the suffix *-aceus* in such a combination.

---

[106] See *TLL* v.1.97.33ff.
[107] I am grateful to Professor A. R. Birley for supplying me with a text of the letter.

[108] For examples, see Leumann, op. cit. (n. 33), 234, 598, Neue-Wagener, op. cit. (n. 89), III, 500–5.

Most -aceus adjectives are adjectives of material.[109] The base is usually, but not always, a plant name (e.g. betaceus, fabaceus, rosaceus etc.). For different types of base, note coriaceus 'made of leather' (TLL IV.950.48ff.) and membranaceus (sometimes = 'made of parchment': TLL VIII.631.82ff.). As far as can be deduced from the material assembled by Gradenwitz,[110] such extended uses of the suffix with non-plant names as base were rare.

Could sagaceus be an adjective of material? Cloaks (saga) were often recycled and converted into different objects.[111] Could it be that sagaciae (tunicae?) were utilitarian tunics(?) converted from saga? This possibility cannot be ruled out.

But there is another possibility. Not all -aceus derivatives are adjectives of material in the strict sense, as I have argued elsewhere:[112] 'The function of the suffix was ... widened to mean vaguely "belonging to, pertaining to, suited to"';[113] alternatively the suffix could denote the idea of resembling the object signified by the base. The one attested literary example of sagaceus suggests that it was indeed to this extended category that sagaceus belonged: Col. XI.1.21, 'frigoribus et imbribus, quae utraque prohibentur optime pellibus manicatis et sagaceis cucullis'. Bowman and Thomas quote the passage stating that 'the last two words must refer to cloaks with hoods attached to them'.[114] That may be the form of attire to which Columella alludes, but etymologically the phrase could not be given this meaning. The sense would have to be 'hoods associated with, worn with, saga'. It is then possible that sagaciae indicated items of clothing (tunicae?) typically worn with saga. The juxtaposition of sagaciae twice with saga suggests that the two went together.

The OLD interprets sagaceus at Col. XI.121 as meaning 'made of the material of sagum' (see our first interpretation above). On the available evidence it is impossible to determine decisively which of the two interpretations of sagaciae offered here is correct. The key to an understanding of the type of garment to which sagacia refers undoubtedly lies in the feminine noun which determined the gender of the substantival adjective.

v.2. -arius

The suffix -arius was particularly productive at all periods, and is represented in all Romance languages (e.g. Fr. -ier, It. -ajo, Sp. -ero). It furnishes adjectives, masculine and feminine substantival adjectives designating persons whose occupation centres on the object expressed by the base, and neuter nouns. There is an abundant corpus of examples of all three types in the Pompeian inscriptions,[115] which bears witness to the importance of the suffix in everyday life. At Vindolanda likewise it is by far the best represented adjectival suffix. I first list examples and then discuss a few interesting cases.

(i) adjectives:
carrarius, necessarius, regionarius

(ii) nouns indicating occupations, both military and civilian:
military technical terms: beneficarius, cornicularius, duplicarius, tesserarius, uexillarius
other: balnearius(?), bubulcarius, ceruesarius, scutarius, ueterinarius

(iii) neuters:
compendiarium, laterarium(?), locarium, ouarium, panarium, sudarium, superaria

carrarius: found at Vindolanda twice as an adjective, in the expression ax(s)es carrarios (185.20, 309.5), which must have been a technical term for 'carriage axles'. At 185 the axles belong not to a carrus, but to a raeda; it follows that the expression had a generic sense (= 'carriage axles' in general, as distinct from 'axles of a carrus'). Hitherto carrarius had not been attested as an adjective before the medieval period;[116] it was known as a noun, = 'carriage-maker, driver' (TLL III.497.41ff.).[117] The Vindolanda examples reveal the true range of the term. One might compare raedarius, which had both an adjectival and substantival use in the classical period (Varro, Rust. III.17.7, 'raedarias ... mulas', Cic., Mil. 29, 'raedarium occidunt'), and also carrucarius (for the adjectival use, see Ulp., Dig. XXI.2.38.8, 'carrucarias mulas').

---

[109] See Leumann, op. cit. (n. 33), 287.
[110] O. Gradenwitz, Laterculi Vocum Latinarum (1904), 482.
[111] I owe this information to Dr Wild. See J. P. Wild, 'Vindolanda 1985–89: first thoughts on new finds', in L. B. Jørgensen and E. Munksgaard (eds), Archaeological Textiles in Northern Europe: Report from the 4th NESAT Symposium 1–5. May 1990 in Copenhagen (1992), 72; idem, 'Vindolanda 1985–1988, The Textiles', in Vindolanda, Research Reports, new series. III. The Early Wooden Forts, 89 n. 23 on a cloak converted to a tunic.

[112] Adams ap. Bowman and Thomas, op. cit. (n. 48), 74.
[113] ibid.
[114] op. cit. (n. 48), 142.
[115] See Väänänen, op. cit. (n. 11), 91–5.
[116] See R. E. Latham, Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources (1965), 73 (uia carraria, c. 1216).
[117] See also R. O. Fink, Roman Military Records on Papyrus (1971), 58.ii.6.

regionarius: probably at 250.8: (*centurioni*) *regionario*. Perhaps the first example of the title *centurio regionarius*: cf. *RIB* 152, *CIL* XIII.2958.[118]

bubulcarius: hitherto attested only at *CGL* II.259.44, where it is glossed by βοώτης 'ploughman'. See now 180.9, 'bubulcaris in siluam m(odii) viii'.

The meaning of the term is not absolutely certain. Suffixal derivatives in *-arius*, as noted above, often designate an individual who deals in or makes or is in charge of or attendant upon the object denoted by the base (e.g. *subsellarius* 'maker of *subsellia*', *ceruesarius* 'brewer', *tabernarius* 'one who works in or is in charge of a *taberna*', *sumptuarius* 'one who is in charge of household expenses', *horrearius* 'superintendent of a *horreum*', etc.). If *bubulcarius* stood to *bubulcus* as *horrearius* to *horreum*, then the *bubulcarius* might have been the superintendent of *bubulci*.

But the fact that *bubulcarius* is here in the plural raises doubts about such an interpretation: it does not seem plausible that more superintendents than one would be needed to supervise *bubulci* working in a *silua*. An alternative possibility is that *bubulcarius* is synonymous with *bubulcus*. If so it would belong with a substantial number of purely augmentative terms in *-arius*, in which the suffix merely lengthens the base-term without contributing any discernible semantic nuance. I list a few examples below: *cataphractarius* (late Latin, including four examples in the *Historia Augusta*) = *cataphractus*, 'mailed' (<κατάφρακτος), which is classical (e.g. Sallust, Livy). Both *cataphractus* and *cataphractarius* had a substantival (*TLL* III.592.1ff., 55ff.) as well as an adjectival (591.71ff., 592.39ff.) use.
manifestarius (e.g. Plaut., *Bacch.* 918, 'moechum manufestarium'; cf. *Poen.* 862, 'manufesti moechi').
subitarius (e.g. Plaut., *Mil.* 225, 'res subitaria est'; cf. *Curc.* 302, 'res subita est').
praesentarius (e.g. Plaut., *Most.* 361, 'argentum ... praesentarium'; cf. *Poen.* 89, 'praesenti argento').

There were good analogies for the formation of *bubulcarius*. A number of terms denoting keepers of animals had this suffix (e.g. *asinarius*, *burdonarius*, *iumentarius*, *asturconarius*, *camelarius*). These had the name of the animal as their base, but they could still have motivated the augmenting of *bubulcus*.

ceruesarius: found at 182.14 (*Atrectus ceruesar[ius]*), where it can only indicate a person practising a profession, i.e. = 'dealer in, brewer of, beer'. Against the only example quoted by the *TLL* (*CIL* XIII.10012.7) it is observed 'siue de ceruesae potatoribus siue de coctoribus ... cogitandum est', but the first meaning can be ruled out. Bowman and Thomas (133) cite the revealing case *negotiator ceruesarius* (*AE* 1928.183). Cf. Fr. *ceruoisier* (since 1260).[119]

ueterinarius: the standard designation for a veterinarian in the early Imperial period,[120] found twice at Vindolanda (181.7, 310.11).

compendiarium: found at 194.B.1 in a text which is 'a list of household objects which are almost all related to cooking, eating or drinking' (Bowman and Thomas, 162); the find-spot was probably a kitchen. Neuters in *-arium* often signify receptacles, e.g. *granarium*, *pomarium*, and at Vindolanda *panarium* and *ouarium*.[121] One possibility is that a *compendiarium* was a receptacle for a *compendium*, 'savings, a saving'. What a *compendium* might have been in the context of the kitchen is not immediately obvious.

locarium: a significant new attestation of a very rare word: 185.24, 'Cataractonio locario (denarii) s(emissem)'. There is only one example of *locarium* (neuter) noted at *TLL* VII.2.1554.60 (Varro, *Ling.* v.15: see below), but the word is widely reflected in the Romance languages with the meaning 'rent', and it must therefore have been commonplace in spoken Latin (e.g. Fr. *loyer*, Cat. *lloguer*, Sp. *aloguero*, Pg. *aluguer*).[122] The Vindolanda example, juxtaposed with a place-name, can plausibly be given the meaning 'rent'. The editors (141) note the series of place-names in the document, and suggest that it may be an account of expenditure incurred on a journey.

The passage of Varro runs as follows: *Ling.* v.15, 'in<de> locarium quod datur in stabulo et taberna, ubi consistant'. This passage has, I believe, been persistently misinterpreted in the lexicographical tradition.[123] According to the *TLL* (VII.2.1554.60) *locarium* here does not signify rent paid by guests, travellers, but by tradesmen (hiring a stall in the market-place): 'pretium, quo taberna sim. locatur (cauponibus sim. potius quam hospitibus devertentibus)'. So too Lewis and Short, 'rent paid for a stall to sell goods from'; cf. *FEW* v.390. It is hard to see how the use of *in* + ablative would square with this view. The *OLD* continues the tradition ('rent paid for a stall in a market'), but does allow an alternative interpretation, 'or perh. = payment for accommodation in an inn or sim.'. There is a similar ambiguity about R. G. Kent's rendering (Loeb), '... "place-rent", which is given for a lodging or a shop, where the payers take their stand'. It is no doubt the presence of *consistant* (lit. 'take up a position')

---

[118] See further Bowman and Thomas, op. cit. (n. 48), 110.
[119] W. von Wartburg, *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* II.1 (1940), 613. See also G. N. Olcott, *Studies in the Word Formation of the Latin Inscriptions* (1898), 147f., giving the sense as 'brewer'.
[120] See J. N. Adams, 'The origin and meaning of Lat. *ueterinus, ueterinarius*', *IF* 97 (1992), 70–95.
[121] See too the examples of such terms at Pompeii collected by Väänänen, op. cit. (n. 11), 95.

[122] See *FEW*, op. cit. (n. 119), v, 390.
[123] The editors, on the other hand, are undoubtedly correct in stating, 144: 'the word can be interpreted as a charge for lodging or accommodation either for people or for animals'. See further J. Collart, *REL* 26 (1948), 61, noting the two interpretations which I mention below, and adding a third of his own.

which has led to the view that Varro was referring to the fee paid by market-traders. But *consisto* also possesses the meaning 'stay, break a journey': see *OLD* s.v. 2 'to break one's journey, make a stay': e.g. Cic., *Verr.* v.28, 'ex iis oppidis in quibus consistere praetores ... soleant'. On this interpretation *stabulum* and *taberna* would signify different types of lodging-places,[124] and the sense of *locarium* would be exactly that of the Vindolanda tablet, and of the Romance reflexes. *In stabulo* in Varro becomes perfectly understandable. This is not the first case we have seen of a usage at Vindolanda falling into line with evidence derivable from the Romance languages (see II.7 on *turta*; also below, v.6 on *excussorium*).

superaria: used as a substantival feminine at 184.2 (*superarias* (*denarios*) *xiii*), deriving no doubt from ellipse of *uestis* (cf. perhaps *sagacia*): note *CGL* IV.180.15, 'uestis que superinduitur'. *Superaria* had previously been well attested in glosses (cf. *CGL* VII.318, index s.v.), but the Vindolanda evidence now takes its coinage well back before the date of glossaries.[125]

v.3. -alis/-aris

Represented by *caligaris*(?), *dextralis*(?), *legionaris*, *uentrale*(?), *umerale*(?).

caligaris: in the expression *claui caligares* at 186.8. Clearly technical: note Plin., *Nat.* IX.69, 'squamis conspicui crebris atque praeacutis, *clauorum caligarium* effigie', *Nat.* XXII.94, 'si *caligaris clauus* ... adfuerit'.

legionaris: at 180.22 *militibus legionaribus*. An unambiguous example of a change of suffix, *-arius* > *aris*. *Legionaris* is elsewhere hardly attested: *TLL* VII.2.1109.60 cites only a variant reading at Caes., *Ciu.* III.2.2. There was a good deal of interchange between the suffixes *-arius* and *-aris*, both in military terminology and in other areas of the lexicon.[126] Olcott notes that 'in the military language ... *-aris* is readily forced into the position of *-arius*, (*alaris* decurio, *auxiliaris* miles, *commanipularis*, ...)'.[127] This is undoubtedly true, as our example shows, but equally it is easy to find examples of *-arius* for *-aris* in military terminology. A notable case is *primipilarius* for *primipilaris* (see HA, *Pesc. Nig.* 2.4, *Did. Iul.* 5.1), commented on at *Appendix Probi* 69. Note also (e.g.) *duplarius* for *duplaris*,[128] *sesquiplicarius* for *sesquiplicaris*.[129] The interchange operated in both directions, and not only in military language. For non-military examples of both types see, e.g. *balnearis* = *balnearius*,[130] *peculiarius* = *peculiaris*,[131] *pulicarius* = *pulicaris*,[132] *simplarius* = *simplaris* (*Dig.* XXI.1.48.8), and *urceolaris* alongside *urceolarius* (e.g. Pelagonius 39/37).

v.4. *Diminutives*

There are seventeen diminutives in the tablets: *carrulum*, *castellum*, *filiolus*, *flammula*, *fraterculus*, *gallicula*, *modiolum*, *ofella*, *palliolum*, *pellicula*, *porcellus*, *ratiuncula*, *scutula*, *siluola*, *tensiuncula*(?), *Brittunculi*, *ungella*. I omit some conjectural terms. The frequency of diminutives is testimony to the productivity of the formation both in technical vocabularies (note, e.g. *flammula*,[133] *gallicula*, *modiolum*, *palliolum*, *scutula*) and in colloquial speech (e.g. *filiolus*, *fraterculus*). I offer comments on a few of these terms.

ungella: at 233A.3, in a list of foodstuffs; in the extant text the term has no further specification. Culinary terms, particularly those designating parts of animals eaten as meat, were often diminutives. Note Celsus II.22.1, 'quod fere quidem in omni domestica fit, praecipue tamen *in ungulis trunculisque* suum, *in petiolis capitulisque* haedorum et uitulorum et agnorum, omnibusque *cerebellis*'.[134]

The force of *ungella* is difficult to grasp. Not infrequently, as in the tablet, the word occurs without specification of the type which might pin it down to any particular animal: e.g. Marc., *Med.* 20.27, 'statim dare debes lentem et betam coctam uel alicae ius uel oua apala uel *ungellam* discoctam uel cocleas elixas' (cf. 20.26). It seems generally to be taken to indicate the trotters of a pig.[135] Grounds for assuming such a specialization might seem to come from Apic. IV.5.2, 'iecinera *porcelli* et *gallinarum* et *ungellas* et *ascellas* [VE] diuisas'. The *ascellae* 'wings' would appear to belong to the *gallinae*, the *ungellae* to the *porcellus*, but the issue is confused by the fact that *aucellas* (Humberg) is an easy conjecture accepted by Milham (Teubner). At Apic. VII.1 *ungella* occurs twice (in the heading and at

---

[124] See T. Kleberg, *Hôtels, restaurants et cabarets dans l'antiquité romaine* (1957), 18–19 (*stabulum*), 19–20 (*taberna*).

[125] See also Bowman and Thomas, 138 ad loc., citing A. Bruckner and R. Marichal, *Chartae latinae antiquiores* (1954–), III.204.4.

[126] See (e.g.) Baehrens, op. cit. (n. 52), 121.

[127] op. cit. (n. 119), 183.

[128] See Olcott, op. cit. (n. 119), 151, *TLL* v.1.2258.5ff.

[129] See Olcott, op. cit. (n. 119), 168.

[130] See *TLL* II.1703.27ff.

[131] Olcott, op. cit. (n. 119), 162.

[132] Olcott, op. cit. (n. 119), 164.

[133] Bowman and Thomas, 354 on no. 463.

[134] For *cerebellum* as a culinary term, see J. André, *Le vocabulaire latin de l'anatomie* (1991), 34–5, and for *capitulum*, J. N. Adams, 'Anatomical terms transferred from animals to humans in Latin', *IF* 87 (1982), 106. See also below on *codicula* 'tail' of a pig, and *labelli*, found at Apicius VII.1.

[135] See J. André, *L'alimentation et la cuisine à Rome* (1981), 137 n. 43.

1.5) in a chapter which seems to deal with pork, though there is no specification. The heading reads 'uuluae steriles, callum, libelli, coticulae et ungellae', where André[136] plausibly emends *libelli* to *labelli* and prints an earlier emendation *codiculae* ('tails') for *coticulae*. *Vulua* is the delicacy sow's matrix, and there is therefore a likelihood that the other terms indicate edible parts of the pig. Diocletian's Prices Edict (4.12) also provides a hint, although an equivocal one, that *ungella* may have been especially applicable to the pig: 'ungellas quattuor et aqualiculum pretio, quo caro distrahitur'. *Aqualiculus*, though it came to be widened in meaning, was once the *vox propria* for the pig's maw.[137] But what is one to make of Apic. 1.9, 'callum porcinum uel bubulum et ungellae coctae'? Here *callum* 'crackling', seen above in the passage apparently about pork, comes either from the pig or from the ox; are the *ungellae* exclusively those of the pig? And at *Physica Plinii Flor.-Prag.* 11.23.3 the *ungella* is surely not that of the pig: 'sero cum *ungella* aut cum pede *de ansere*'.

Further evidence which is possibly of relevance is provided by the terms *acro* and ἀκρονάριον.[138] *Acro*, which is qualified by *porcinus* at Pel. 85, Veg. 11.130.2, Pel. 463, *Mul. Chir.* 201, was equivalent to Gk. ἀκρονάριον, as a comparison of Pel. 85 and Veg. 11.130.2 with *Corpus Hippiatricorum Graecorum* 11.73.11 shows.[139] ἀκρονάριον indicated the foot, not only of the pig, but of at least one other small domestic animal, the kid, as can be seen from a comparison of *Corp. Hipp. Graec.* 11.106.1 ἐρίφου κεφαλὴν μετὰ τῶν ἀκροναρίων with Veg. 1.56.17, 'caput haedinum depilatum cum pedibus suis' (also 111.8.1).[140] André therefore suggests (op. cit., 46) that *acro* (=ἀκρονάριον) denoted 'le pied (i.e. l'extrémité de la patte) de petits quadrupèdes domestiques, porc, mouton et chèvre'. Could it be that *acro* and *ungella* were synonymous? The trotters of various small animals may have been used in both culinary and medical recipes. It is possible that *acro* and *ungella* tended to be subtly distinguished: *acro* being the generic term, *ungella* tending to be specialized to the pig but capable of a more general meaning.[141]

ofella: at 203.2 in a shopping-list or menu for a single meal (so the editors, 174). There is no doubt that originally *ofella* denoted a piece, a mouthful, to be eaten. There are revealing examples of the other diminutive of *offa* in veterinary texts. At Pelagonius 296 *offula* signifies a lump of wheat flour formed with the use of water. At Vegetius IV.12.2 it is a lump of bread. And at Vegetius 11.134.7 an *offula* is the size of a nut, and composed of a variety of non-meat substances. It was the form of an *offula* which was distinctive, not its components, despite the statement at *TLL* IX.2.530.56 that it usually signified a piece of meat. So it was with *ofella*, though in this case a specialized reference to meat can be accepted. The editors, following Dunbabin,[142] tentatively translate as 'pork cutlet'. Dunbabin, basing himself on the recipes found at Apicius VII.4, says that '*ofellae* were of pork . . .; they were cutlets, not chops, for they would be made from the paunch'. However, Dunbabin goes on to acknowledge that 'in some of the recipes there is nothing to indicate what meat was used; this may have been pork, veal, or lamb, but not fish, since fish are dealt with in a separate book'. Though an *ofella* might be of pork, that was not a defining characteristic. What was distinctive was that the *ofella* was a piece (of meat), which might be shaped: note Apicius VII.4.2, 'ofellas *exossas*, *in rotundum* complicas, surclas, ad furnum admoues' (the *ofella* is boned and rolled up). As Dunbabin notes, this instruction is suggestive of Martial's use of the adjective *curua* with *ofella* at XIV.221.1. Whereas an *offula* was a shaped ball of any edible substance, an *ofella* was a piece of meat which might be rounded. That an *ofella* was little more than a mouthful is suggested by its use at Juvenal 11.144 and Mart. X.48.15, XII.48.17, in all of which passages it is implied that it was humble or insubstantial fare.

carrulum: in the plural at 315. Again the Vindolanda material allows an expansion of the early Imperial lexicon, as the diminutive has hitherto been attested only in the *Digest* (XVII.2.52.15). Its neuter gender shows that it was based on *carrum* = *carrus*, which is probably attested at 343.17, and was undoubtedly widely current: note *Bell. Hist.* 6.2, and Nonius p. 287.24L., 'carra neutri generis esse consuetudine persuasum est' (see further *TLL* III.499.41ff.). *Carrus* would have been drawn into the neuter on the analogy of such neuters as *uehiculum*, *plaustrum*, *carpentum*, and *petorritum*.

modiolum: probably signifies the nave of a wheel at 309.4, in a series of technical terms to do with vehicles (see, for the sense, Vitr. x.9.2, Plin., *Nat.* IX.8, *Edict. Diocl.* 15.3). In this sense the word is well represented in the Romance languages (e.g. OFr. *moieul*; particularly in Rheto-Romance and dialects of Friuli: see *FEW* (op. cit. (n. 119), VI.3.11). The neuter is scarcely found, and then only late (see the editors ad loc.), but the base-word *modius* is attested in the neuter as early as Cato (*Agr.* 58, 'salis unicuique in anno modium satis est'). It is possible that masculine (inanimate) technical terms tended to develop a neuter by-form. In the same document (309.7) *radius* occurs, probably for the first time in extant Latin, in the neuter plural (= 'spokes (of a wheel)').

[136] J. André, *Apicius, L'art culinaire, De re coquinaria* (1965), 186.
[137] See Adams, op. cit. (n. 134), 100.
[138] See J. André, 'Notes de lexicologie', *RPh* 40 (1966), 46–58.
[139] See André, op. cit. (n. 138), 46.

[140] ibid.
[141] See also W. Heraeus, *Kleine Schriften* (ed. J. B. Hofmann, 1937), 24–5.
[142] R. L. Dunbabin, 'Notes on Lewis and Short', *CR* 49 (1935), 10.

gallicula: at 197.2, in a fragment mentioning two items of footwear. *Gallica* is rather better and earlier attested than its diminutive (Cic., *Phil.* 11.76, Juv. 7.16 for *gallica*), which is mainly in late Latin; but see *RIB* 1.323.

v.5. *A Noun in -tio*

There is one neologism in *-tio* in the tablets, *coriatio* at 343.40: 'Frontinium Iulium audio magno licere pro coriatione quem hic comparauit (denarios) quinos', 'Frontinius Iulius is asking a high price in return for the *coriatio* which he bought here for five denarii apiece'(?). The sentence is very difficult to interpret.[143] *Licere* in this sense complemented by *pro* is unparalleled. Why is the masculine relative *quem* used when its antecedent seems to be the feminine *coriatione*? Is (*denarios*) *quinos* a sort of accusative of price (see below, vi.1.7)? The reading of *coriatione* is clear enough. As a verbal noun it must be based on a verb *corio(r)* 'make *corium*, leather', which is not attested until the late medieval period.[144] Like numerous abstracts in *-tio*, particularly in technical vocabularies, *coriatio* has apparently passed from an abstract to a concrete meaning ('leather making' > 'leather goods').[145] If it had already undergone a semantic change, it must have been in existence for some time, though hitherto nowhere attested. This case provides a salutary warning against making the assumption that extant literary Latin does justice to the range of technical vocabulary which must have existed at a subliterary level.

v.6. *A Noun in -torium*

The letter of Octavius has, in addition to *coriatio*, another substantival suffixal derivative with a technical meaning hitherto unattested, namely *excussorium = area*, 'place where threshing takes place': 343.27f., 'ut possim spicam habere in excussorio'. The sense emerges from the context, where both *excutio* (l. 25) and *perexcutio* (l. 29) are used of threshing.[146] The adjective *excussorius* is found at Plin., *Nat.* xviii.108 in an unrelated sense. Our neuter nominal use of *excussorium* belongs with a group of such neuters denoting rooms, places for specialized activities (e.g. *dormitorium*, *auditorium*, *gustatorium*, etc.).[147] The existence of *excussorium* and its association with threshing might have been deduced from certain Romance languages,[148] though its reflexes signify instruments for threshing rather than the place where the activity was carried out. Nevertheless *excussorium* in the specialized sense attested at Vindolanda undoubtedly belonged to a living technical vocabulary.

<center>VI. SYNTAX</center>

vi.1. *Cases and Prepositions*

vi.1.1. *A use of the locative*

Various letters contain on the back an address of the form (310):[149]

> Londini
> Veldedeio
> equisioni co(n)s(ularis)
> a Chrauttio
> fratre

---

[143] See Bowman and Thomas, 328.

[144] See Petersmann, op. cit. (n. 5), 288, referring to J. F. Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon minus* (1976), s.v. For *coriatio* Petersmann cites Latham, op. cit. (n. 116), s.v. An example of *coriatio* mentioned there is dated to the fifteenth century, but no reference is given. Greater detail can be found in the full *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (ed. R. E. Latham, fasc. 11, 1981), 491: '**coriatio**, (?) covering with leather', citing one example (*Fabr. York* 27, A.D. 1404). It would be hazardous to assume that there could be a direct line of descent linking an isolated fifteenth-century British example of a noun not reflected in the Romance languages, and our second-century example. The medieval example may be a very late, neo-Latin coinage. In any case, the attestation of the word in the fifteenth century does nothing to assist in the elucidation of the numerous difficulties which surround *coriatione* in the Vindolanda tablet.

[145] For such *abstracta pro concretis* in technical vocabularies, see e.g. A. Önnerfors, *Pliniana. In Plinii Maioris Naturalem Historiam studia grammatica semantica critica* (1956), 12–13, J. B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (1965), 749–50. Hofmann-Szantyr (749) cite as an early example *habitatio* = 'dwelling' at Plaut., *Most.* 498, Cato, *Agr.* 128.

[146] For *excutio* in this specialized sense, see A. K. Bowman, J. D. Thomas, J. N. Adams, 'Two letters from Vindolanda', *Britannia* 21 (1990), 49–50. *Excutio* has Romance reflexes with this meaning (op. cit., 50).

[147] See Bowman, Thomas, Adams, op. cit. (n. 146), 50; Leumann, op. cit. (n. 33), 301, on the formation.

[148] See Meyer-Lübke, op. cit. (n. 49), 2997, *FEW*, op. cit. (n. 119), III, 286–7.

[149] See in general Bowman and Thomas, 43–5.

Veldedeio is obviously the addressee, but what is the force of the locative? Does it signify the place where the addressee is, or the place where the letter was written? Bowman and Thomas (44–5) argue for the former, and they are undoubtedly right. They draw attention to some letters from Vindonissa where the locative is preceded by *dabis*;[150] the address can therefore be seen as an instruction to the carrier to hand the letter over at a certain place.

To the arguments marshalled by Bowman and Thomas I would add one further, decisive, piece of evidence. Claudius Terentianus, writing to Claudius Tiberianus, at one point instructs his addressee as follows:

> *P. Mich.* VIII.467.25 et si scr[i]bes mihi epistulam inscribas *in liburna N[e]ptuni*

> If you write me a letter, address it "On the ship Neptune".

In liburna Neptuni is clearly the address which is to appear on the letter. It is a locatival expression (= 'at, or'), not a directional (= 'to'), and it unambiguously refers to the place at which the addressee, Terentianus, would be found.[151] Here is unequivocal evidence that the address was expected to take the form of a locatival expression (indicating the place where the recipient would be), rather than a directional of the sort which might have seemed more logical to English speakers.

The convention may well have originated from the abbreviation of a fuller form of instruction to the bearer (e.g. *trade*, *dabis* + locative + dative of name: see above). A locative in an ancient letter may, of course, indicate the place at which the letter was written, but such a locative would be at the end of the letter proper, not on the address side. Alternatively an address such as *Londini Veldedeio* might just be derived from an adnominal locative of the structure *alicui Romae*, with the locative later promoted to focal initial position because the bearer had first to get to the place before finding the addressee. The editors cite (44 n. 24) a Carlisle stilus tablet with the order *alicui Romae*,[152] and to that might possibly be added *CIL* IV.879, 'M. Lucretio flam. Martis decurioni Pompei(s)'.[153]

It is also worth recalling that locatival expressions tended to take on a directional meaning in Vulgar Latin. From this same period we have *Alexandrie* (= -ae) used a number of times by Terentianus in the sense 'to Alexandria' (*P. Mich.* VIII.471.15, 22, 25, 32, 33),[154] and even in Cicero a locatival may come close to assuming a directional nuance. Note *Att.* XIV.2.4, '*in Tusculanum* hodie, *Lanuui* cras, inde *Asturae* cogitabam', where two locatives are in alternation with the directional *in Tusculanum*. As in the letter address, so too here the reader is left to supply the verb, which makes the locative less harsh (= 'I am planning to go *to* Lanuvium tomorrow and to spend the night *there*'). In the address the implication is 'destination to London, for Veldedeius who is *at* that place'. Notable in the Ciceronian example is the locative *Asturae* after *inde*; contrast *Att.* XIV.7.1, 'ut *inde* altero die *in Puteolanum*'.

I move on to some other structural features of addresses. If we leave aside the locative *Londini* which begins the address of 310, the rest of the address takes the form of a dative (= the recipient) followed by *a* + ablative (= sender): 'Veldedeio equisioni cos. a Chrauttio fr̥atre'. The structure of this address represents a reversal of the structure of the initial greeting, which names the sender first (in the nominative), followed by the recipient (in the dative), with *salutem* 'greetings' at the end: 310 (start), 'Chrauttius Veldeio suo fratri ... salutem'.

The same variation between the ordering of the initial greeting and that of the address on the reverse recurs at Vindolanda: e.g. in 255, '[Cl]o̥dius Super Ceriali suo salutem ... Flauio Ceriali praef. ḁ [C]l[o]dio Supero̥' (cf. 291, and probably also 260, 263, 292, 312, where the start is missing). The motivation of the reversal of order at the end is clear: in the address on the back the name of the recipient is promoted to the focal initial position, as is appropriate on the outside of a letter. It follows that a locative which precedes the name of the recipient is itself also bound to be focalized, i.e. to represent the destination of the letter. It is the very essence of such addresses that the name of the sender is demoted to final position, and it is accordingly structurally inconceivable that the place at which he was writing should be given prominence.

The address-structure of 255 and the other Vindolanda letters above was not a convention peculiar to Vindolanda. Note *P. Hibeh* 276 (= *CPL* (op. cit. (n. 67), 260)), which begins 'Iulius Repositus Cl. Germano suo salutem', and on the verso has the familiar change of construction: 'Cl. Nidio Germano a Iulio Reposito coll(ega)'. A letter of Terentianus (*P. Mich.* VIII.471) has on the back 'Claudio Tiberiano

[150] So Terentianus, *P. Mich.* VIII.468.68 appears to have the address *trade Claudio Tiberiano* (restoration).

[151] For the type of genitive to which *Neptuni* belongs (*gen. definitivus*), see Hofmann-Szantyr, op. cit. (n. 145), 62.

[152] See M. W. C. Hassall and R. S. O. Tomlin, 'Inscriptions', *Britannia* 19 (1988), 496, no. 32.

[153] Cited by J. Svennung, *Anredeformen. Vergleichende Forschungen zur indirekten Anrede in der dritten Person und zum Nominativ für den Vokativ* (1958), 23; also P. Cugusi, *Evoluzione e forme dell' epistolografia latina nella tarda repubblica e nei primi due secoli dell' impero* (1983), 65 n. 104.

[154] See Adams, op. cit. (n. 17), 38.

[pat]r[i a Cla]ud[io] Teren[tiano'. The start of the letter is missing, but it would undoubtedly have had the pattern *Claudius Terentianus Claudio Tiberiano . . . salutem* (cf. nos 467, 468, 469).

VI.1.2. *Ablative/locative*

In classical Latin, first declension locatives have the *-ae* ending, second declension (singulars) *-i*. In the tablets the first declension form is intact:

190.38	Brigae man[serunt]
292.c.2	Brigae mansura[155]

In the second declension, however, there has been a shift to the (locatival) ablative singular:

154.9	Londinio
185.23	Isurio
185.24	Cataractonio
250.9	Luguualio
343.16	Cataractonio
Inv. 88.836, p. 364	Cataractonio

To these examples could be added:

154.6	officio Ferocis (at the office of Ferox)

The old *-i* morpheme is found twice, at 310 (*Londini*: cf. *Londinio* above), and in a stilus tablet Inv. no. 575 *Eburaci* (see Bowman and Thomas, 44).

The use of *-o* alongside the old locative *-ae* confirms a development of the language.[156] The frequency of the place name *Romae* kept the *-ae* morpheme alive for much longer than *-i*. Although some Romance place-names reflect original locatives in *-i* (e.g. *Brindisi* < *Brundisi*, *Girgenti* < *Agrigenti*), the encroachment of *-o* on *-i* is well attested from Vitruvius onwards. Such a trend is particularly understandable in a region where place-names were of non-Latin origin and only recently assimilated to the Latin declension system; in an old name of Latin origin, on the other hand, the retention of *-i* might be supported by long-standing usage (e.g. *Brundisi*; perhaps too *Londini*).

VI.1.3. *ab + names of towns (in the ablative)*

Three times *ab* is used instead of the plain ablative of the name of a town, twice in conjunction with the verb *mitto*, once with *scribo*:

295.6	miseras a Bremetennaco
299.i.2	a Cordonouis amicus missit mihi ostria
225.24f.	a Vindolanda scribo

With the first two examples, compare (e.g.) Cic., *Verr.* 11.19, '*Messana* litteras Halaesam mittit', *Att.* 1.10.1, '*Roma* puer a sorore tua missus epistulam mihi ... dedit', *Fam.* III.11.1, 'quas ad me Q. Seruilius *Tarso* miserat'. With the third, cf. Cic., *Att.* IX.6.1, '*Roma* scripsit Balbus', *Att.* XVI.6.1, 'scribam ad te *Regio*'.[157] Prepositions + the ablative in such collocations are not unknown, particularly in colloquial texts and the post-classical period (e.g. Plaut., *Bacch.* 389, 'ex *Epheso* huc ad Pistoclerum litteras / misi'; *Bell. Hisp.* XII.3, 'a *Corduba* ad Pompeium missi sunt'; even Cic., *Phil.* XIV.23, 'at misit postea de Alexandrea, de Pharnace'),[158] but the prepositional construction which appears to be the norm at Vindolanda was in general non-classical. It represents another step of the many by means of which prepositions replaced unaccompanied cases in the history of Latin. The emperor Augustus was not afraid to use prepositions with the names of towns in the interests of clarity (Suet., *Aug.* 86.1).

The classical use of the plain ablative of the name of a town is probably to be found at 266, 'uolo ueniat ad me *Coris*'. The editors translate 'I want him to come to me *at Coria*' (my italics), but I feel that in this case *Coris* is unlikely to be locatival. The usual Latin idiom equivalent to Eng. 'come to me *at*

---

[155] See further the editors, 43–4 for two cases of *Vindolande* (= *-ae*) on a wooden leaf-tablet and a stilus tablet.
[156] See Löfstedt, op. cit. (n. 85), II, 73–8, Hofmann-Szantyr, op. cit. (n. 145), 145.
[157] See further G. Funaioli, 'Der Lokativ und seine Auflösung', *ALL* 13 (1904), 326–7.

[158] See R. Kühner and C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache: Satzlehre* (3rd edn., rev. A. Thierfelder, 1955), I, 478, Anm. 4 (the uses of prepositions illustrated at Anm. 3, (b), (c) have various special motivations).

Coria' was *ueni ad me Coria*, 'come to me *to* Coria': e.g. Caes., *Ciu.* ii.20.8, 'Varro Cordubam ad Caesarem uenit'.[159] Moreover *ad me* (*te* etc.) + ablative (= 'from X') is a standard collocation, in the expected order (cf. Cic., *Att.* xvi.6.1, *Fam.* iii.11.1, quoted above). It is true, as we have seen, that the preposition *ab* is usually used with place-names to express separation in the Vindolanda material, but it cannot be deduced from the limited evidence available that *ab* was absolutely invariable. If *Coris* is to be taken as locatival, it could only be a highly unusual (perhaps unparalleled) adnominal locatival attached to a pronoun. There seems to be an adnominal locative at 250.8, 'Annio Equestri (centurioni) regionario Luguualio', but this is somewhat easier to accept, because (a) the preceding name is not in the accusative (with *ad*) of motion (a construction which would tend to occur in a 'to-from' opposition), and (b) *Luguualio* has a noun-phrase (*centurioni regionario*) to hang on.

I return to *scribo ab* in the Vindolanda material. In one sense, as we saw, the expression is largely non-classical, in that the place-name is accompanied by a preposition; but in another sense it is a continuation of the classical practice, in that *scribo* is accompanied by a *separative* complement, rather than a locative. Though the locative does occasionally occur in classical Latin with *scribo*, *do* etc. of the point at which the letter was dispatched, the ablative was preferred.[160] There appears to have been some controversy about correct usage in this environment: note Varro *ap.* Scaur. *GL* vii.32, 'scribunt quidam "litterae datae e Gallia", item "Roma", uitiose; nam dici oportet "in Gallia" et "Romae"; dantur enim in loco, afferuntur e loco'.

vi.1.4. *Uses of ad*

Some distinctive uses of *ad* are found particularly in accounts (notably 180). There is a good deal of potential variability to the implications of *ad* when it is used without expressed verbs in lists, accounts, etc., and some of the Vindolanda examples are difficult to interpret. I begin with some extraneous evidence in order to provide some points of comparison with the Vindolanda material.

First, in the daily reports from Bu Njem (*O. Bu Njem* 1–62) expressions with *ad* are constant: e.g.

2	ad aqua balnei
	ad Boinag
3	ad preposit[um]
5	ad balneu
	ad st(ationem) camellar(iorum)
13	ad porta

These phrases are followed by numerals, signifying the number of men dispatched. Sometimes a passive form of *mitto* is expressed, and such cases furnish the key to the understanding of the various expressions: e.g.

12	missus ad Ešuba
36	missus ad lignu balnei

Ad often expresses destination. The noun dependent on *ad* indicates the place, person to which soldiers were sent (to carry out duties): *praepositus*, *statio camellariorum*, *porta*, *balneum*, *Boinag*, etc. Alternatively the noun may refer, rather elliptically, to the duty itself on which the men were sent: e.g. *ad aqua balnei* '(to supply) water for the bath', *ad lignu balnei* '(to supply) wood for the bath'.

Secondly, there are adnominal uses of *ad*-expressions, particularly in official inscriptions,[161] which tend to take on the status of titles. These uses recall the more familiar use of *ab* in titles such as *ab epistulis*, *a rationibus*. *Ad* in this function is typically attached to a name + a noun (e.g. in *-tor*) designating a profession, or to a name on its own: e.g.

(i) Name + professional designation + *ad*: e.g.

CIL vi.8450, D.M. T. Ael(io) Aug
(ustorum) lib(erto) Saturnin(o) . . .
tabul(ario) a rationibus, tabul(ario)
Ostis ad annona(m)

[159] See E. C. Woodcook, *A New Latin Syntax* (1959), 4.
[160] See Funaioli, op. cit. (n. 157), 325–6.

[161] Examples may be found at *TLL* 1.528.19ff.

Note here the juxtaposition of *tabulario a rationibus* with *tabulario ad annonam*.

> CIL VI.5197, Musico Ti. Caesaris
> Augusti Scurrano disp(ensatori)
> ad fiscum Gallicum prouinciae
> Lugdunensis
> CIL VI.8688, C. Iulio Basso Aemiliano
> actori Caesaris ad Castor(is) et
> ad loricata

For *loricata*, see *OLD* s.v. *loricatus -a -um*: '(fem. as sb., sc. *domus*?) A building with a protecting wall; (spec., perh.) one containing the imperial accounts'.

> CIL VI.9383, Diophanthus exactor ad insulas
> CIL XIV.20, C. Pomponius Turpilianus proc(urator) ad oleum

(ii) Name + *ad*: e.g.

> CIL VI.3985, Isochrysus Liuiae ad uestem
> CIL VI.3972, Syneros Ti. Caesaris ad imagines
> CIL VI.3973, Q. Annio Q. l. Philocalo
> Helenus Liuiae ad insul(am) ollam
> dat
> CIL VI.7884, Phoebo Marciae Maxsimi ad margarita

With *ad insulas* (*insula* = 'block of buildings') above, cf. *CIL* VI.3974, '<C>erdo *insular(ius)*', where *insularius* is no doubt interchangeable with *ad insulas*.

   These uses of *ad* can be readily derived from the final meaning of which the preposition is capable (e.g. *procurator ad oleum*, 'proc. for the purpose of, for supplying, oil'). In each case the noun dependent on *ad* indicates a substance, object, *sim.* which the person is responsible for or in charge of (e.g. *CIL* VI.3985, 'Isochrysus in charge of the wardrobe'). The original final nuance of *ad* is most obvious in those cases where the dependent noun is accompanied by a gerundive: e.g. *CIL* VIII.10500, 'proc. Aug. ad census accipiendos'.

   In a few cases the prepositional phrases, while still possibly final, could alternatively be interpreted as local, i.e. as indicating the locality, building *sim.* in which the official operates: e.g.

> CIL VI.8689, T. Fl. Aug. lib. Martiali proc. Aug. ad Castor(is)[162]
> CIL VI.8688, C. Iulio Basso Aemiliano actori Caesaris ad Castor(is) et ad loricata

The two senses, final and locative, are difficult to distinguish here.

   I turn now to the Vindolanda evidence, and begin with a revealing example which is clearly distinct from the cases discussed above:

> 185.20–1   axes carrarios
>   duos ad raedam
>
>   wagon-axles, two, for a carriage.

Ad here is final, and interchangeable with the *dativus finalis*.[163] For the same usage in a letter, see 309, 'missi tibi ... axses ad lectum'. This example does not have the same structure as that seen in the inscriptions above, because here the *ad*-expression indicates the purpose to which the object signified by the head-noun (*axes*) is to be put; in the inscriptional examples, the head-nouns signify not things but persons (professionals) exercising some sort of control over the objects expressed by the prepositional phrases.

   I move from here to the account 180, where there is a series of examples of *ad*, two of which have been translated by the editors as equivalent to the inscriptional examples cited above which have the force 'in charge of'. I cite all *ad*-expressions in the account:

[162] This example, quoted by P. R. C. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris. A Social Study of the Emperor's Freedmen and Slaves* (1972), 268 n. 2 is filled out by him as *ad Castorem*, but it is more likely that *Castoris* is intended (see Löfstedt, op. cit. (n. 85), II, 249).

[163] On this use of *ad*, see Kühner-Stegmann, op. cit. (n. 158), I, 522.

> (i)   3 mihi ad panem [
> (ii)   10 Amabili ad fanum m(odii) iii
> (iii)   20 ad turţas tibi m(odii) ii
> (iv)   27 Lucconi ad porcos [
> (v)   33 patri [a]d i̦[uu]ęncoș [
> (vi)   37 item mihi ad panem m(odii) i̦[

Nos (iv) and (v) are translated by the editors as 'to Lucco, in charge of the pigs', and 'to father, in charge of the oxen'. But is this correct? Nos (i), (iii), and (vi) are without question straightforward final cases, much like *ad raedam* above. Thus (i) 'to me (so many *modii*), for bread' (i.e. for the making of bread), and (iii) 'for twisted loaves, to you, 2 *modii*'. Nos (iv) and (v) can obviously be taken in the same way, in keeping with the pattern of the rest of the account. Thus, e.g., (iv) 'to Lucco, for the pigs, (. . . *modii*)'. *Ad porcos* on this view is a satellite not of *Lucconi* (which structure would make the expression parallel to e.g. *Isochrysus ad uestem*) but of *modii* (*frumenti*) (cf. *axes ad raedam*). The account lists quantities of *frumentum*; for *frumentum* used to feed pigs, see Varro, *Rust.* II.4.6, 'hoc pecus alitur maxime glande, deinde faba et hordeo et *cetero frumento*'.

Ad in *ad fanum* (ii) may mean much the same ('for the *fanum*'), though here perhaps the phrase shades into a local meaning ('to Amabilis, at the shrine': so the editors). At 30 (*Lucconi in ussos suos*) the writer has substituted a final use of *in*. On *bubulcaris in siluam*, see VI.1.5.

The final use of *ad* in the structure identified here occurs a number of times in other accounts: 183 *Candido ad porco̦[s . . .*, 190 *ad sacrum . . .* (four times); also *domino ad stipes* (showing the same juxtaposition of dative of the person, *ad* of the thing).

Finally, 155 presents some uses of *ad* identical to those in the daily reports from *Bu Njem* (nos 1–62).

> 3 ș[tr]ụctọrę̦ș ad balneum xviii

Here *structores* are to be dispatched to the baths to carry out duties; *ad balneum*, as we have seen, is also found at Bu Njem. Similarly at l. 7 (*ad furnaceș*) an unspecified number of men is to go to the kilns. On the other hand l. 4 —

> [a]d plumbum *uacat* [

— would appear to parallel Bu Njem examples such as *ad aqua balnei*, *ad lignu balnei*. Men are presumably to be sent off to *acquire* lead.

155 might be compared with 156, which is a similar type of document. There, however, *missi* (perfect participle) is expressed, as sometimes at Bu Njem, and the spheres of activity are made explicit by the use (three times) of the construction *ad* + noun + gerundive (as distinct from the more elliptical *ad* + noun).

One final question is worth posing in this section. Can any difference be discerned between the use of *ad* in accounts (expressing the object on which money or some other substance was disbursed), and that of the dative? Six examples of *ad* from 180 were quoted above, to which could be added, in the same document, the incomplete entry (16) *patri ad . . .* In addition we noted *Candido ad porcos* (183), and, in 190, four examples of *ad sacrum* and *domino ad stipes*. There is a total of thirteen examples of *ad*, nine of which are juxtaposed with a dative (of the pattern *Candido ad porcos*). It is only the expression *ad sacrum* in 190 which is not accompanied by a personal dative.

The dative instead of *ad* occurs in the following places: 181 *lignis emtis*, 182.1, 12 *pretio*, 182 *rebus minutis* (twice), *pretio exungiae*, 185 *faeci* (five times), *locario*. The total is twelve examples, none of which is juxtaposed with a personal dative. The conclusion is clear. *Ad* was substituted for the dative when another dative (of the person rather than the thing) had to be used in the immediate context.

VI.1.5. *A use of in* + acc.

The account 180, as well as offering the uses of *ad* seen in the previous section, also has the following entry:

> 9   bubulcaris in siluam m(odii) viii

The force of *in siluam* is difficult to determine. A purely locative sense, as adopted by the editors (who translate 'to the oxherds at the wood') does not seem possible. *Ad* is apparently used with local meaning in the next line (*Amabili ad fanum*), but *in* + acc. in this sense would be anomalous (though *in* + ablative acceptable). Later in the same document, as we saw, *in* + acc. is used in a final sense:

> 30   Lucconi in ussos suos

The development by *in* + acc. of a final meaning can be seen from its intrusion into expressions of purpose containing a gerundive: e.g. Lex pag. Herculan. (*CIL* I².682), 'utei in porticum . . . reficiendam pequniam consumerent', Livy XXVIII.45.18, 'Rusellani abietem (polliciti) in fabricandas naues'.[164] For other examples of *in*, without a following gerundive, which can be interpreted as final, see, e.g., Cic., *Verr.* II.38, 'in eam rem iudices dentur', Livy IX.24.1, 'nouisque cohortibus in supplementum adductis'.[165] To judge by the examples cited by Kühner-Stegmann, the final use of *in* + acc. was largely post-Classical.

I am inclined to take *in siluam* as parallel to *in ussus suos* and the uses of *ad* in the same document, i.e. as a pregnant final use, = 'for the purpose of the wood', i.e. 'for use in the wood'. It is in the very nature of *ad* as it is employed in the document that its exact implication is variable. *Ad porcos* implies 'for feeding to the pigs', whereas *ad panem* implies 'for the making of bread'. So too the function of *in* + acc. might in theory have varied with the context.

One might ask what *bubulcarii* were doing in a wood. The *bubulcus* was in charge of oxen, but since oxen were chiefly used to plough, *bubulcus* in effect refers to a ploughman (see Col. II.2.25). If *bubulcarius* means the same as *bubulcus* (see V.2), then it may seem rather odd that a wood should be the sphere of activity of ploughmen. Perhaps wooded terrain was being converted into ploughland. For this activity, see Col. II.2.11, which describes two methods of clearing. Either the trees might be torn out by the roots and removed, or if they were not densely packed they might be cut down, burnt, and then ploughed under. *Bubulcarii* might well have been engaged in this second activity (see further II.2.28). The *frumentum* would be for their oxen working there.

It is an alternative possibility that *in* (+ *siluam*) is purely local, with no final nuance: = 'for the *bubulcarii* (going) into the wood (to work with their animals)'. Could a local use of *in* + acc. be used adnominally in this way? It should be noted that on the other interpretation offered above, *in siluam* is not adnominal at all, but a satellite (with final sense) of an implied verb-phrase: *frumentum* (is given) to *bubulcarii*, for the purposes/needs of the *silua*. A *directional* adnominal expression (as distinct from the sort of *locatival* adnominal that *ad fanum* may be taken as) would be far from easy to defend.

VI.1.6. *Remarks on the syntax of case in accounts and lists*

Accounts and lists, for which there is an abundance of new evidence at Vindolanda, display forms of syntax without an expressed verb. Nouns may be juxtaposed with one another in a variety of cases: e.g. locative + dative + (accusative):

> 185.24   Çataractonio locariọ (denarii) s(emissem)

Often the cases adopted can be explained in relation to an implied verb. The account 185 appears to list a series of payments made on a journey, and a verb of giving, paying out can readily be supplied. Thus 185.24, '(I paid) at Catterick for lodgings, denarii ½'.

But that is by no means the whole story. There are instances of case usage in the Vindolanda documents which do not become explicable if the expected verb is understood. I illustrate this contention first from the same account, 185:

> 185.20   axes carrarios
>   duos ad raeḍaṃ (denarios) iii (s)emissem

The editors choose to interpret the denarius sign as standing for an accusative plural, but in fact its case is of no great significance. If one makes the assumption that case should be explained from an understood verb, then the denarii might be assigned either nominative case or accusative depending on whether the verb is taken to be active or passive. Of more interest is the accusative *axes carrarios duos*. It is obvious that a payment was made for carriage axles. Elsewhere in the account the object on which payment is made goes, predictably, into the dative case, which carries a final nuance. At 185.24 above *locario* means 'for lodgings', and five times in the account an entry begins *faeci* (= 'for lees of wine': but the reading is in every case problematical). Why then is *axes carrarios* in the accusative? It would be over-subtle to attempt to relate the case to an understood verb-phrase, e.g. '(I bought) carriage axles by means of X denarii'. For one thing the verb would have to be different from that understood in the other entries, and for another the denarii would have to be assigned a case other than nominative/accusative. The explanation seems to be that the accusative was a sort of unmarked case which in accounts and lists could be given to the nouns signifying the object(s) bought/sold, even in contexts in which that accusative could not readily be derived from the verb expected in such an account.

---

[164] See *TLL* VII.1.765.69ff.

[165] See further Kühner-Stegmann, op. cit. (n. 158), 1, 346, *TLL* VII.1.765.16ff., *OLD* s.v. *in*, 22.

Exactly the same variation as that between *faeci* (dat.) and *axes carrarios* (acc.) can be seen in 181.3–4, part of a 'cash account recording sums received and debts outstanding' (Bowman and Thomas, 129):

> lignis emtis (denarios) vii
> sticam (denarios) iii.

In this part of the account receipts are recorded. Thus in each of the next four lines we find *ab* + name (e.g. *ab Alione ueterinario*) followed by a quantity of denarii, = '(received) from X, Y denarii'. Line 3 obviously means 'for timbers purchased, (received) 7 denarii'. The next line must describe a comparable transaction (= '(for) a cloak, (received) 3 denarii'), but here the writer has lapsed into a syntactically unmotivated 'accusative of the thing sold, acquired'.

I note in passing that (*lardi*) *pernam* at 182.7 is not the same sort of unmotivated accusative as *sticam* above. In 182 there is variable case usage, but the variations can be explained in reference to verbs readily understood. Thus, l. 3, '[re]bus minutis (denarios) ii (asses ii)', = 'for sundries, (received) denarii 2, asses 2', or l. 5, 'Ircucisso ex pretio lardi (denarios) xiii s(emissem)', = 'Ircucisso (paid) as part of the price of bacon, 13½ denarii'. The next two lines differ from those just quoted, in that quantities bought rather than prices paid are stated:

> 6–7   Felicio (centurio) lardi p(ondo) xxxxv / item lardi pernam p(ondo) xv s(emissem)

Felicio the centurion (bought) 45 pounds of bacon, likewise bacon-lard 15½ pounds.

Here there is a typical variation between a genitive (*lardi*) in l. 6 dependent on *pondo*, and partitive apposition in the next line, with (*lardi*) *pernam* in apposition to *pondo* (cf., e.g. 191.5–6 for such variation in a list). *Lardi pernam* can be construed as object of the verb of buying/acquiring which is demanded by the quantity term *pondo*.

In 182 the persons acquiring goods from the unnamed trader who wrote the document are repeatedly expressed in the nominative case (at the head of the entry), followed by a statement of the sums paid/quantities bought. The nominative (of the name) is quite logical, in that it is a simple matter to supply a verb of which it is subject. Indeed in another document (181) the process of ellipse can be seen in action. Lines 11–15 have names/nominatives at the beginning of the entry, followed by an expression signifying a sum of money: e.g.

> 11   Ingenus (denarios) vii

In these entries, however, the intended verb is actually specified:

> 10   reliqui *debent*

We have identified then in the Vindolanda accounts a use of the accusative (of the thing), which may be difficult to relate syntactically to the verb-phrase which seems to be demanded by the nature of the account, and a nominative (of the person acquiring the goods), which can usually be taken as subject of an understood verb. I note finally that the two case uses, accusative of the thing and nominative of the person, come together repeatedly in the account 184. The account consists of a long series of entries of the following form:

> 20–1   sagaciam (denarios) v (asses iii)
>   Lucius scutarius

An accusative, expressing an object (bought) is followed by a monetary statement and then a name, in the nominative. Lucius must have bought the goods named, and the nominative is explicable in the sense described above.

Again, however, the accusative (of the goods) is not so easily amenable to logical syntax, because of its unspecified syntactic relationship to the denarius symbol. It is reasonable to conclude that the accusative was felt to be an appropriate case for the goods listed in an account, and that those using the case in a list would not necessarily have considered its theoretical relationship to an implied verb-phrase.

The accusative had a long history of use in recipes, lists, and the like where no verb was expressed (see, e.g. Cato, *Agr.* 128; also chs 12, 13, which consist entirely of accusatives, without a governing

verb).[166] The Vindolanda examples, and particularly those which display a switch from, say, a motivated dative to an unmotivated accusative, nicely illustrate this role of the accusative. For the same combination of nominative (of a name) and accusative of goods as that seen above in 184, note the Pompeian inscription *CIL* IV.4227:

pan(e)m l(ibram) *IS* P. Catillus lib(e)ra(m) I u(n)cias q(u)i(n)q(u)e semu(n)c(i)a(m)

VI.1.7. *Accusative of price*

Quantum at Petron. 43.4 ('uendidit enim uinum, *quantum* ipse uoluit') has traditionally been taken as an 'accusative of price',[167] though that interpretation has, quite justifiably, recently been questioned by H. N. Parker:[168] there seems no good reason why the second clause cannot be translated 'as much as he himself wanted'. But while Parker may be right about Petron. 43.4, it is going too far to suggest that the construction belongs only to the fourth century and beyond. Parker can quote only literary examples, but there are two possible cases from the early second century in non-literary sources. Octavius' letter (343) runs thus at ll. 38–41:

Frontinium Iulium audio magno licere pro coriatione quem hic comparauit (denarios) quinos

The passage is notoriously problematical (see above, v.5 on *coriatione*, and the editors ad loc.). Nevertheless, the syntax of the *quem*-clause seems to admit of only one interpretation: 'which he bought/acquired for five denarii apiece'. *(Denarios) quinos* would have to be an accusative of price.
     In addition to this case there is also Terentianus, *P. Mich.* VIII.469.17, '[m]erca minore pretium', a passage which is open to more than one explanation.[169]

VI.1.8. *A use of the accusative(?) in a letter*

The letter of Chrauttius (310) may be punctuated thus at ll. 4–9:

et rogo te, Veldei frater — miror
quod mihi tot tempus nihil
rescripsti — a parentibus nos-
tris si quid audieris aut
Quoṭm in quo numero
sit

I ask you, brother Veldeius — I am surprised that you have written nothing back to me for such a long time — whether you have heard anything from our 'parents', and Quoṭus — in what unit he is.

The obscure word *Quoṭm* must be a name (see the editors ad loc.), which ought to have been in the nominative as subject of *sit*.
     'Unconstrued' accusatives are well recognized,[170] but they do not represent a single phenomenon. 'Recipe-accusatives', for example, may sometimes be explained from ellipse of a verb. At Plaut., *Amph.* 1009 ('Naucratem quem conuenire uolui in naui non erat') and *Poen.* 644–5 ('hunc chlamydatum quem / uides, ei Mars iratust') the accusatives may perhaps be due to attraction into the case of the relative pronoun.[171]
     It is not easy to find parallels for the accusative in the letter of Chrauttius. Väänänen, however, distinguishes on the walls of Pompeii between unconstrued accusatives indicating materials and the like (op. cit. (n. 11), 117), a use not unlike the recipe-accusative, and accusatives, usually of names, which he describes as an 'accusatif exclamatif'. Note particularly *CIL* IV.3525, 'Puteolos Antium Tegeano Pompeios — hae sunt uerae coloniae'. Here the (virtually exclamatory) accusatives serve to introduce various places, and then follows a clause in which the names might have been expressed in the

---

[166] See, e.g. Hofmann-Szantyr, op. cit. (n. 145), 29, Svennung, op. cit. (n. 98), 185–7. For such accusatives (of materials, etc.) on the walls of Pompeii, unaccompanied by any verb, see Väänänen, op. cit. (n. 11), 117.
[167] See E. Löfstedt, *Spätlateinische Studien* (1908) 79–82, idem, op. cit. (n. 85), I², 271, idem, *Vermischte Studien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax* (1936), 173; also Adams, op. cit. (n. 17), 40–2.
[168] 'A curiously persistent error: *Satyricon* 43.4', *CP* 89 (1994), 162–6.

[169] See Adams, op. cit. (n. 17), 40–2.
[170] See the bibliography cited in n. 166; also D. Norberg, *Syntaktische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete des Spätlateins und des frühen Mittellateins*, Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1943: 9 (1943), 92–6, Å. Josephson, *Casae Litterarum. Studien zum Corpus Agrimensorum Romanorum* (1950), 165–8.
[171] See Svennung, op. cit. (n. 98), 183.

nominative. In the letter of Chrauttius a similar sort of accusative perhaps serves to introduce a new subject, which might instead have been in the nominative in the following indirect quotation.

It is not impossible that Chrauttius admitted a second example of the same type of accusative in l. 17 (see the editors ad loc.):

> et rogo te, frater Virilis,
> salutes a me Thuttenam
> sororem. Velbuteium –
> rescribas nobis cum . . .
> se habeat

. . . greet our sister Thuttena. And as for Velbuteius, write back to us how(?) he is.

If *Velbuteium* were object of *salutes*, the asyndeton bimembre would be odd, and *habeat* would appear not to have a subject.

vi.2. *Paratactic Uses of rogo*

A feature of the letters is the frequency with which, in requests, *rogo* is used paratactically with the (jussive) subjunctive, unaccompanied by *ut* (e.g. 233, 'rogo mittas mihi . . .'). *Rogo* (1st pers.) + subjunctive occurs twelve times definitely,[172] and possibly in two other places where the text is fragmentary.[173] By contrast there are five places where *rogo* is followed by *ut*.[174]

It seems likely that *rogo* + subj. introducing a request was current conversational Latin. Martial, who was roughly contemporary with the Vindolanda letters, preferred *rogo* + subj. to *rogo* + *ut*.[175] Petronius on the other hand preferred *rogo* (-*amus*) + *ut* to *rogo* + subj., but the latter is scarcely outnumbered;[176] all three examples of *rogo* + subj. are in speeches, two of them by freedmen. The distribution of *rogo ut/rogo* + subj. in Cicero's letters is of some interest. In the letters *ad Familiares rogo ut* overall outnumbers *rogo* + subj. by 43:10, but there are variations according to authorship. Cicero himself prefers *rogo ut* by 39:2,[177] but in the letters by his various correspondents *rogo* + subj. is preferred by 8:4.[178] There is also one example of *rogamus* + subj. (*Fam.* xi.2.3), in a letter by Brutus and Cassius, compared with one example of *rogamus ut* (*Fam.* v.12.9), in a letter by Cicero. The relative frequency of *rogo* + subj. in these various letters by miscellaneous correspondents suggests that Cicero's own letters falsely imply a lack of currency for the paratactic construction in late Republican educated usage. Cicero's use of *rogo* (*ut*) with indirect commands is rather formal (and formulaic), in that he tends to place the *ut*-clause before *rogo*, and he tends to use the construction in a restricted set of expressions. There must have been current a less formal use of *rogo* + subjunctive.

In the letters to Atticus *rogo ut* is similarly preferred by Cicero (25:2).[179]

I mention finally that Terentianus always uses *ut* in conjunction with *rogo* (seven times); in the same corpus of documents, however, his correspondent Tiberianus has *rogo* + subj. (*P. Mich.* viii.472.11).

The letters from Vindolanda thus provide new evidence for the frequency with which *rogo* must have been attached to a subjunctive in expressing a request.

There are other cases of first person present verbs followed by a subjunctive in the letters. Note 266 *uolo ueniat*; also the more usual *uelim* + subj. at 349.

In the Vindolanda letters the paratactic formula of farewell *opto bene ualeas* is preferred to the type with acc. + infin. (e.g. *opto te bene ualere* and variants). In other non-literary letters extant, while *opto bene ualeas* and also *opto ut bene ualeas* are found, the accusative + infinitive construction predominates.[180] *Opto . . . ualeas* has so far turned up at Vindolanda nine times (215, 260, 289, 300, 309(?), 312,

---

[172] 218, 233, 291, 301, 310, 311, 312 (three times), 314, 326, 345. Similarly in the *commeatus* documents 167, 174, and 176 the expression *rogo . . . dignum me habeas* is more or less preserved, and it is likely that in the remainder, which are fragmentary, it was also used. I have not included the three examples just listed in the figure of twelve.

[173] 257, 345. To these might be added 342, where *rogamus* rather than *rogo* seems to have a plain subjunctive complement, but there are gaps in the texts.

[174] 250 (a rather formal letter of commendation), 255, 313, 316 (twice).

[175] *Rogo ut* never; *rogamus ut* at vi.35.5. *Rogo/rogamus* + subj. seven times (-*o* ii.79.2, iii.95.3, vi.5.2, vii.95.18; -*amus* i.35.13, v.80.4, viii.2.8).

[176] *Rogo/-amus ut*: 64.1, 71.9, 75.8, 99.2, 134.11; + subj.: 49.6, 75.3, 137.6.

[177] *Rogo* + subj. only at *Fam.* v.18.1 (*rogo atque oro*), xiii.57.2.

[178] For *rogo* + subj., see *Fam.* v.10b (Vatinius), viii.11.4 (Caelius), x.21a twice (Plancus), x.24.8 (Plancus), xi.1.5 (D. Brutus), xi.9.1 (D. Brutus), xii.14.4 (Lentulus); for *rogo ut*, see viii.2.2, viii.9.4 (both Caelius), x.9.3 (Plancus), xi.28.5 (Matius).

[179] *Rogo* + subj. at iv.14.2, v.12.3.

[180] For a collection of the evidence, see P. Cugusi, *Corpus Epistolarum Latinarum* (1992), ii, 37.

316(?), 345, 353),[181] against three examples of the acc. + infin. (248, 250, 258). Conventions no doubt developed among groups of scribes.

An alternative form of paratactic construction shows *rogo* used in conjunction with an imperative. There is only one example of the construction so far in the Vindolanda material, in the letter of Octavius (343.14–15 *rogo . . . mitte*). Parallels turn up sporadically, usually in texts of colloquial colour (Petron. 67.1, 137.4, Mart. 11.25.2, Terentianus, *P. Mich.* VIII.469.17). There are a few examples in the correspondence of Cicero, one in a letter by D. Brutus (*Fam.* XI.26), and another in a letter from Quintus Cicero to the freedman Tiro (*Fam.* XVI.26.2).

Octavius uses various other paratactic constructions (following verb-forms other than the first person present indicative, discussed above): 343.16–17, 'scribe dentur',[182] 31–2, 'desiderabat coria ei adsignarem'.

<p style="text-align:center">VII. SOME SOCIOLINGUISTIC EVIDENCE</p>

VII.1. *Some Terms of Address*

The terms of address *frater* and *domine*, which in the vocative had lost their full lexical meaning,[183] are well attested in Latin, but the Vindolanda tablets are important in providing a substantial body of examples from one area and one time, which allow some deductions to be made about the implications of such addresses.

There are some significant contexts in which *domine* is used:

(i) In letters of application for leave (*commeatus:* 166–77)[184] the officer to whom the request is put is invariably addressed as *domine*, with a vocative of the name (e.g. 166 *domine Cerialis*, 172 *domine Flauiane;* ten examples in all; no example of e.g. *frater*).[185]

(ii) In an appeal to higher authority (containing the expression *tuam maiestatem imploro*) *domine* is used (344.7).

(iii) Twice in a formal letter of recommendation Cerialis is addressed as *domine* (250). Then in the final greeting the writer (probably Claudius Karus: see the editors ad loc., 221) apparently adopts a less formal tone, using *uale frater*. The editors suggest that Karus may have been a fellow-prefect of Cerialis. *Domine* turns up elsewhere in letters of commendation, perhaps most notably at *P. Oxy.* 1.32. In this, a second-century document addressed to a military tribune, *domine* is used three times (e.g. 7 *peto domine ut . . .*; cf. *Tab. Vind.* II, 250.6 *rogo ergo domine . . .*). In another relatively early (first- or second-century) letter of recommendation (*P. Ryl.* IV.608) note 6 *rogo domine . . . hab[eas]*.[186]

(iv) Next I quote the fragmentary letter of gratitude, 332:

<p style="text-align:center">salutem
summas tibi domine gratias</p>

There is no context, and the sender and addressee are unknown. What is interesting here is the use of *domine* embedded in a highly formal pattern of words. *Tibi* is in the so-called 'Wackernagel position' in second place in the clause, and along with the following vocative it separates the adjective *summas* from the noun *gratias*. For this order, cf. the opening of Cicero's tenth *Philippic*: ' maximas tibi, Pansa, gratias . . .'

(v) Finally, Cerialis'(?) letter (225) to a man (Crispinus) who is clearly his superior requesting that he intercede for him with the governor Marcellus not only has the vocative *domine*; in the same sentence the accusative *dominum meum* is used in apposition to *te* (4–6):

<p style="text-align:center">amplexus s[um do-
mine salutandi te occassionem
d]ominum meum</p>

For expressions of this same structure (i.e. vocative + a form of *tu* + an appositional expression which might alternatively, with re-phrasing, have been in the vocative), see Cic., *Mil.* 44, '*te*, Q. Petili, appello, *optimum et fortissimum ciuem*', *Mil.* 102, 'quid *tibi* (respondebo), Quinte frater, qui nunc abes, *consorti*

---

[181] cf. 264, 'opto . . . sis felicissimus' (so 310), 346, '[o]pto felicissimus uiuas'.
[182] For parallels and bibliography, see Bowman, Thomas, and Adams, op. cit. (n. 146), 48.
[183] For *frater* and its implication, see *O. Wâdi Fawâkhir* 2.6–9, HA, *Did. Iul.* 4.1, Hor., *Epist.* 1.6.54.
[184] On the type of document, see Bowman and Thomas, 77.

[185] Similarly *domine* turns up at Bu Njem in letters addressed by soldiers to their commanding officer: e.g. *O. Bu Njem* 76.4, 'transmisi at te domine . . .'
[186] For a collection of such *litterae commendaticiae*, see Bowman and Thomas, op. cit. (n. 48), 106.

mecum temporum illorum', *CIL* VIII.9052.4, 'a *te*, Clodia Luciosa, *uxore mea*, suscep<i>'.[187] It seems likely that forms of address of this type were highly formal.

Although most of the examples collected above from the tablets are in address to a superior, the use of *domine* does not inevitably imply a subordinate status for the writer. In this connection the letter of recommendation 250 ((iii) above) is revealing. Writer and addressee seem to have had equivalent status. It was the convention of *litterae commendaticiae* which dictated the use of *domine* in the body of the letter (whereas in the final greeting the friendship-term *frater* — on which, see below — could be substituted). *Domine* was a term of politeness or deference, with a formal tone. Though it was certainly suitable in address to a superior (see further below), its use might also be determined by circumstances requiring a posture of formality and deference. I mention finally 234, where Cerialis addresses a certain September. September was probably an equestrian officer (see Bowman and Thomas, 199; also 223, on 252), but he is unlikely to have been Cerialis' superior. If he was of subordinate status, then the use of *domine* must have been determined either by the nature of their relationship (formal rather than friendly), or by the context of the letter (which is fragmentary).

The evidence collected above showing *domine* used in an address by a subordinate to his superior may be compared with some contemporary material, the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan. *Domine* begins almost every letter from Pliny to Trajan,[188] but Trajan never uses the term in reply (cf. x.16.1 *mi Secunde carissime*, also x.20.1, x.50, x.55, x.62, x.80, x.89, x.95, x.99; cf. x.97 *mi Secunde*, x.44 *Secunde carissime*, also x.91, x.115, x.121). This non-reciprocity of address nicely establishes that *domine* was appropriate from an inferior addressing his superior. Sherwin-White, loc. cit., quotes further examples spoken by inferiors to superiors (both of free birth), though that, as we have seen, is not the whole story.[189] It is of note that Trajan responds to Pliny by means of friendship-terms (notably the *mi*-form of address, with frequent use of *carissime*). This would appear to be a form of condescension from superior to subordinate.

I move on to *frater/soror*. 233B is a letter from Cerialis to an equestrian officer Aelius Brocchus. Cerialis addresses Brocchus as *frater*, in a request accompanied by the familiar expression *si me amas*. 243, conversely, is a fragment of a letter from Brocchus to Cerialis; this too contains the vocative(?) *frater*. In 248, this time from Brocchus and another equestrian officer Niger to Cerialis, *frater* occurs again.

345 is a letter apparently from one prefect (Celonius Iustus) to another.[190] The unknown recipient is addressed as *frater*, and also as *frater et domine*.

Further down the social scale(?), in 310 we find a soldier with a Germanic name, Chrauttius, addressing his old mess-mate (*contubernalis antiquus*) Veldedeius as *frater*. In the same letter Chrauttius incorporates a message for the *ueterinarius* Virilis, who is addressed in the first person, again as *frater*.

301 is a letter from a slave Severus to another slave Candidus. *Frater* is used in the vocative.

Comparable to the use of *frater* is that of *soror*, which is nicely illustrated by the two letters 291–2. Just as letters survive which passed between Cerialis and Brocchus, so we have two letters from Claudia Severa, wife of Brocchus, to Sulpicia Lepidina, wife of Cerialis. *Soror* occurs five times in the vocative in the two letters, along with various endearments.

It is obvious then that *frater* and *soror* were used between speakers of equal status — prefect to prefect, slave to slave, soldier to soldier. *Frater* was not restricted to the speech of any one social class. Both *frater* and *soror* were at home in informal contexts. The tone of *frater* is revealed by (e.g.) HA, *Did. Iul.* 4.1, 'unumquemque, ut erat aetas, uel fratrem uel filium uel parentem adfatus *blandissime* est', but it is useful to have a new corpus of examples in letters composed by writers of different social classes. The most significant examples of *frater* are those in the correspondence between Cerialis and Brocchus and their families. The two families were on intimate terms, and *frater/soror* was clearly the appropriate form of address.

Finally, for completeness I note that the attachment to *domine* of *frater* or *karissime* or both occurs seven times in the Cerialis archive (*domine frater* at 252, 260, 289, *mi domine karissime* at 288, (*mi*) *domine frater karissime* at 247, 255, 285(?); cf. 242), but nowhere else in the Vindolanda letters. Little or nothing is known about the writers/addressees in these cases, and the letters are often fragmentary; it is not therefore possible to draw any conclusions about the character of such addressees.

---

[187] I am grateful to Dr F. Jones for supplying me with this last example.

[188] See A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny. A Historical and Social Commentary* (1966), 557.

[189] *Domine* could even be addressed to a child, as e.g. at

CIL v.1706 (aunt to nephew). This use represents a debasement of the deferential use into an empty (formal) form of address much the same as *Master* in English.

[190] See Bowman and Thomas, 334.

I

VII.2. *Female Terms of Address*

The archive of Sulpicia Lepidina (291–2 especially; also 293–4), brief as it is, seems to confirm that endearments were a distinctive feature of female speech in Latin.[191] In letters written by men, as we have seen, the standard terms of vocative address were *domine*, *frater*, combinations of the two, and combinations of either with *karissime*.[192] Occasionally too there is a *mi*-form of address, with *mi* preceding either a name (242 *mi Felici- . . . karissime*)[193] or *domine* (247 *mi domine frater karissime*, 288 *mi domine karissime*). The *mi*-form was intimate and affectionate, but it was not an endearment. *Carissime* may loosely be described as an endearment, but it was a hackneyed and fairly empty epithet.

The two letters of Claudia Severa to Lepidina are remarkable not only for the accumulation of examples of *soror* (five times, as noted above, twice within three words at 291.11–12), but also for the use of *anima* (+ possessive + adjective) twice as a vocative endearment: 291.12, 'uale soror *anima mea* ita ualeam *karissima*', 292.b.back, 'soror *karissima et anima ma desideratissima*'. There are no comparable endearments in the far more extensive letters written by men.

In our only substantial source of information about 'female' endearments, Latin comedy, *anima* (voc.) does not occur, though *mi anime* is regularly put into the mouths of females (nine times out of twelve in Plautus and Terence). *Mea anima* (in the plural) turns up twice in Cicero when he is addressing women (*Fam.* XIV.14.2, XIV.18.1). If *anima mea* had become established in the late Republic as a female endearment, it would not be surprising that it should also have been used by men addressing women;[194] endearments associated particularly with women may be used between the sexes, but rarely by a man addressing another man. There is a later example of *animae meae* at *Peregrinatio Aetheriae* 19.19, addressed by a woman to some other women. The editors cite an example of *anima* (voc.) accompanied by the adjective *dulcissima* addressed by a man to a man (in Fronto, *ad M. Caes.* II.10.3, p. 30 van den Hout; Marcus Aurelius to Fronto; part of an exaggeratedly affectionate and deferential farewell greeting: 'desiderantissime homo et tuo Vero carissime, consul amplissime, magister dulcissime, uale mi semper anima dulcissima'),[195] but it seems in general to be true that *anima* (voc.) was used by or to women rather than in discourse between two males.[196] It is not only the endearment as such that is of interest in the Lepidina archive; it is that endearments should be used twice in letters by a woman, but never in the more extensive correspondence composed by men.

The expression *anima desideratissima* occurs also (though not in the vocative, and conflated with the present participial form) at *CIL* VI.21974.6–8, cited by Bowman and Thomas, 262 (also *TLL* VI.1.710): 'coniugi carissim[ae] animae desideran[tissi]mae'. This example fits the pattern proposed above, in that it is from a tomb inscription dedicated by a man to his wife. *Desideratissima* ('much missed') was no doubt highly emotive, since it could be applied to a deceased loved one.

Ma (following *anima*) is perhaps a simple dittography, but alternatively it may be the reduced form *ma* = *mea*. *Ma* = *mea* is attested at much this time in the letters of Terentianus (*P. Mich.* VIII.471.34 *mater ma;* also 471.17 *pater tus*, 30 *sum negotium*). There is a set of such reduced forms (*mus, tus*, etc.), with reflexes in Romance (Fr. *mon, ton, ma, ta* etc.). These may reflect the effects of an accentuation *meús* for *méus*, *tuús* for *túus*, etc.[197]

VIII. VOCABULARY AND STYLE

In this section I discuss the lexical diversity of the tablets. It is, I stress again, a mistake to approach the Latinity of the tablets as if they were a specimen of 'Vulgar Latin'. They contain, it is true, a stock of terms (some of which have been seen already: *turta*, *locarium*, *excussorium*) of the type which are rarely, if at all, attested in literary genres, but which survive in the Romance languages. These clearly belonged to spoken, as distinct from literary, varieties of the language, but it would probably be more accurate to classify them as 'technical' rather than 'vulgar'. There are at least two other components of the

[191] For the evidence of comedy, see J. N. Adams, 'Female speech in Latin comedy', *Antichthon* 18 (1984), 71.

[192] *Homo inpientissime* (311.5) belongs apart, as it is not deferential or friendly.

[193] The only other names in the vocative are in the letter of Chrauttius, both accompanied by *frater*: 310.4 *Veldei frater*, 15 *frater Virilis*. *Frater* is not usually accompanied by a name when used in the vocative: see Bowman, Thomas, and Adams, op. cit. (n. 146), 37, 40.

[194] See the evidence collected by Adams, op. cit. (n. 191), 71–2.

[195] Marcus Aurelius seems deliberately to have used highly emotive language which might have been appropriately used by or to a woman.

[196] Bowman and Thomas, 258 note that the expression *anima dulcissima* occurs on a gold-ring found in the fourth-century *uicus* at Vindolanda (see R. P. Wright and M. W. C. Hassall, 'Inscriptions', *Britannia* 2 (1971), 301 no. 72): could the ring have been presented by a man to a woman?

[197] See B. Löfstedt, 'Die betonten Hiatusvokale in Wörtern vom Typus *pius*, *meus*, *tuus*', *Eranos* 60 (1962), 80–92, especially 89; also C. Lyons, 'On the origin of the Old French strong-weak possessive distinction', *TPhS* 1986, 22–7. For another example of *ma*, see Önnerfors, 'Iatromagische Beschörungen in der "Physica Plinii Sangallensis"', *Eranos* 83 (1985), 237 no. 4.

lexicon at Vindolanda (in addition to technical terminology) which should be distinguished from 'Vulgar Latin' elements. I refer first to learned/formal/literary terminology, and secondly to usages characteristic of the particular genre in which they occur. Genre as a determinant of linguistic usage has already been illustrated in the section on syntax, where (e.g.) certain features of the syntax of lists were discussed. The material in this section is miscellaneous; I begin with an example of a generically determined usage.

VIII.1. *item*

> 180.10   Macrino m(odii) xiii
> bubulcaris in siluam m(odii) viii
> *item* Amabili ad fanum m(odii) iii

The editors ad loc. (125) observe that 'the force and referent of this word is unclear here and in several other entries'. But *item* tended to lose its comparative sense ('likewise, in the same way'), and to take on a purely additive force (= 'also', *simul*, *praeterea*): see *TLL* VII.2.535.50. This is particularly clear in an example such as Apicius 11.2.6: 'isicia de pauo primum locum habent ita si fricta fuerint ut callum uincant. *item* secundum locum habent de fasianis, *item* tertium locum habent de cuniculis, *item* quartum locum habent de pullis, *item* quintum locum habent de porcello tenero'.[198] Here *item* has no other purpose than to introduce successive members of a list. This usage will have originated in lists, e.g. of medical recipes, remedies, where a recipe (or the like) so introduced had the same purpose as the recipe previously stated: e.g. Pelagonius 273, 'item. unctio Optati ad curam *suprascriptam*' (the *unctio* is for the same condition as that just mentioned, and *item* retains its comparative force). From its use in such contexts *item* came to be used mechanically to introduce the items in a list, even when no comparison was intended. Note, e.g. Pelagonius 169–71, 'item. ad clauum de mercurio ... item. ad cicatricem uel ut pilum ducat ... item. si dorsum motum erit'. Neither the diseases nor the treatments have anything in common, and *item* is purely a means of demarcation between one section and the next. This weakened use of *item* was as old as Cato in practical texts containing lists: e.g. *Agr.* 157.2, 'prima est "leuis" quae nominatur ... altera est crispa ... *item* est tertia, quae "lenis" uocatur ...' (for the form of the list, with ordinals, see Apicius 11.2.6 above).

There is a curious case of *item* in one of the ostraca of Bu Njem which may show a further stage in the debasement of *item*: 86.3, 'trasmisi at te domine ·item per puros tuuos gura duua semis'. Had the writer sent goods by another means, and is *item* accordingly comparative? Alternatively the word may have been used almost as a form of punctuation separating the formulaic verb-phrase *transmisi ad te*, *domine* from the equally formulaic prepositional expression.[199] If this second interpretation is along the right lines, *item* no longer comes at the head of items in a list, and its original comparative function is completely lost.

Whatever the case, the use of *item* in the Vindolanda tablets is determined by the conventions operating in lists.

VIII.2. *per siluolas repto*

This expression occurs in an incomplete letter (256):

> adhuc per
> siluolas repto tutior illo
> futurus si remisseris

The editors translate: 'I am still lingering in the thickets to be safer from him (?) if you release (?) him'. They are inclined to think that the writer is hiding from someone (228, 'Genialis appears to be admitting that he has behaved unacceptably towards someone and is afraid that he may have to suffer for it if his victim is released (or sent back) by Cerialis'). This is a lot to derive from a fragmentary context, and I would suggest that the implications of the expression as can be deduced from the (admittedly rare) literary occurrences of the verb (and *silua*, if not its extremely rare diminutive) would not support the idea that Genialis was in hiding.

Repto denotes slow movement. There is an example at Lucr. 11.318, applied to a flock of sheep as they slowly move along cropping the grass.[200] Two other examples of *repto* are in contexts similar to each other, and closely comparable to that of the example from Vindolanda. At Horace, *Epist.* 1.4.4 *repto* is applied to the slow movement of a literary man (possibly the poet Tibullus) through a wood in silent

---

[198] See Svennung, op. cit. (n. 98), 639 ('wertloses *item*').
[199] See Marichal, op. cit. (n. 3), 194 ad loc.; also 48.

[200] On the appropriateness of the verb to this activity, see C. Bailey, *Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura libri sex* (1947), ad loc.

contemplation: 'tacitum *siluas inter* reptare salubris / curantem quidquid dignum . . .' An example at Plin., *Epist* 1.24.4 is remarkably similar. The subject is another man of letters, this time the biographer Suetonius, who wants to buy a farm (*agellus*) where he can take repose. Pliny says that literary owners (*scholastici domini*) do not need much land: it is enough for them to wander though their land, observing the vines and shrubs (*arbusculae*). They are thereby refreshed: 'scholasticis porro dominis, ut hic est, sufficit abundare tantum soli, ut releuare caput, reficere oculos, reptare per limitem unamque semitam terere omnesque uiteculas suas nosse et numerare arbusculas possint'.

Reptare therefore was applicable to a leisurely stroll, taken for the purposes of pleasure and contemplation, on a country estate, amid woods or plantations (*silua, arbuscula*).[201] The linking of *repto* with *per siluolas* is strongly suggestive of leisure and contemplation. The image of an equestrian officer in hiding[202] in the undergrowth is not convincing.

The diminutive *siluula* occurs at Col. VIII.15.4 (though the word has no entry in the *OLD*).

To take *illo* as a masculine ablative dependent on *tutior* (= 'safer from him') is not compelling. 'Safe from' is regularly expressed by *tutus* + *ab* (Lewis and Short, s.v. A.β) rather than *tutus* + abl.[203] *Illo* looks like the adverb, which usually answers the question 'whither?' (= 'to that place'). But it had acquired a secondary sense by the first century A.D., answering the question 'where?' (i.e. = 'there'): see TLL VII.1.385.7off., quoting e.g. Sen., *Epist*. 108.6, 'cui philosophi schola deuersorium otii sit. non id agunt ut aliqua illo uitia deponant'.

It has to be acknowledged that, though the implication of *repto* may be deducible from its use in various literary texts, the situation which lies behind the letter 256 remains obscure.

VIII.3. *exsarcio*

In the letter 233B Cerialis asks Brocchus to send him nets (for hunting) ('rogo ṃittas mihi plagas'), then in a fragmentary text asks that they should be repaired:

> fortissime . . . frusta exerçias

The editors are undoubtedly right to interpret *exercias* as = *exsarcio;* for the form, see *CIL* XI.4095.

What makes this example interesting is that it exemplifies for the first time the literal meaning of the verb. *Sarcio* seems originally to have meant 'mend, repair by sewing',[204] a sense attested for *sarcio* itself at e.g. Cato, *Agr.* 2.3 ('quae opera per imbrem fieri potuerint: dolia lauari . . . funes sarciri') and Juvenal 3.254 ('scinduntur tunicae sartae modo') and for *resarcio* at Terence, *Ad.* 121 ('discidit / uestem: resarcietur'); note too the figurative use of *sarcio* at Plautus, *Epid.* 455 ('proin tu alium quaeras quoi centones sarcias'), and *sarcimen* 'seam, stiching' at Apuleius, *Met.* IV.15.[205] But verbs of this root were early generalized, taking on the sense 'repair' in general (e.g. Plautus, *Most.* 147, 'non uideor mihi / sarcire posse aedis meas', where *sarcire* = 'repair', of a house).

Exsarcio has hitherto been attested only in the general sense 'repair' (Terence, *Heaut.* 143, 'opere rustico / faciundo facile sumptum exsercirent suom', Q. Cicero, *Comm. pet.* 45, 'aliis te id rebus exsarturum esse persuadeas', *CIL* XI.4095; cf. Paul. Fest. 71.9 L, but with no context), and then so rarely that it is described by Ernout-Meillet as 'archaique'. Cerialis however reverts to the etymological sense, = 'sew up' (the torn, cut pieces of a net). *Frustum* is characteristically used of objects which have been cut to pieces (*OLD* s.v. 1).

If *exsarcio* was genuinely archaic, then Cerialis reveals a literary bent; but it seems more likely that the original sense of the term had been retained in the technical vocabulary of hunting and the maintenance of hunting nets; for damage to nets of the sort which would require such mending, see Hor., *Carm.* 1.1.28.

---

[201] For a *silua* as the appropriate place either for contemplation or for learned discussion, see Cic., *De orat.* III.18, *Att.* XII.15, and particularly Ovid, *Am.* III.1.1–6. In the last passage Ovid strolls (*spatior* is the verb used) in a wood (*silua*) seeking inspiration from his Muse. Notable in the passage is the association of a *silua*, slow movement, and literary contemplation.
[202] Cicero (*Att.* XII.15) talks of 'hiding himself away' (*me . . . abstrusi*) in a wood for contemplation.

[203] Lewis and Short, s.v. A.ε. cite only *Bell. Alex.* 1.3 for *tutus* + abl., and there the ablatival complement is a non-personal noun.
[204] See Ernout-Meillet, op. cit. (n. 55), s.v.
[205] See further the detailed discussion of Ernout-Meillet, loc. cit.

VIII.4. *membrum*

Membrum occurs twice in lists in what appear to be similar contexts:

> 196   çerui[
>   membra n(umero) [
>   cataçyseṇ[
>   ansatam
> 198   ]brá n(umero) x
>   ]. membrá n(umero) v

The editors twice (ad locc., 170, 171), speculating on the sense of *membra*, suggest that the only possible meanings appear to be 'branches' or 'parts of a catapult or ballista'. But a term of the generality of *membrum* could only take on such specialized meanings as a result of adjectival or some other form of contextual specification. The only possible specification in 196, which is a list of utensils and clothing (I leave aside 198, which is too fragmentary to be revealing), would come from the general contents of the list; 'part of a catapult or ballista' is out of the question, in a list of this type, and 'branches' hardly better. There is another, more general, use of *membra* which would be appropriate here.[206] In the plural *membra* could signify either items (e.g. of equipment) making up a set, or parts making up a whole. For the first use, see Varro, *Rust.* III.2.9, 'quid ... est ista uilla, si nec urbana habet ornamenta neque rustica membra' (= 'items of equipment' used on a farm: 'de apparatu ut torculis, uasis uindemiatoriis sim.': *TLL*). For the second use, see Vitr. VII.3.7, 'solidescendo, in quibuscumque membris est formata', ('becoming solid with whatever parts it is formed'), Plin., *Nat.* XXXVII.19, 'uidi ... adnumerari unius scyphi fracti membra' (of the (broken) pieces of a single item).

It is the first use of *membra* which may occur in 196 (= 'items', presumably of the type referred to in the (fragmentary) previous line).

VIII.5. *A Use of facio*

At 311–

> ut scias me recte ualere
> *quod* te inuicem *fecisse*
> cupio —

quod ... fecisse picks up *recte ualere* ('I am well, a thing which I want you to have been'). It might appear odd to have *fecisse* taking over from a stative verb. It seems more natural to an English speaker when *facio*, as a transitive verb, is substituted for an earlier transitive verb (-phrase): e.g. Cic., *Tusc.* 5.90, 'an Scythes Anacharsis potuit *pro nihilo pecuniam ducere*, nostrates philosophi *facere* non potuerunt' (cf. *OLD* s.v. 26, *TLL* VI.1.107.31ff.). But in fact it is not unusual for *facio* to replace a stative verb (i.e. a verb or verb-phrase expressing a state rather than an action or activity): e.g. Nep., *Chabr.* 3.4, 'neque uero solus ille *aberat* Athenis libenter, sed omnes fere principes *fecerunt idem*', Hor., *Sat.* 1.1.64, 'iubeas *miserum esse*, libenter / quatenus *id facit*'. In these cases, as in 311, *facio* is accompanied by a neuter pronoun. It is also worth noting Hor., *Sat.* 1.1.94, 'ne facias quod / Ummidius quidam'. Here *facio* does not replace an earlier verb, but is used in such a way that its subject is not agent of an action, but patient; *facio* is close in meaning to *patior* 'suffer'. Also related are examples such as *Mul. Chir.* 706, 'si quod iumentum clauulum in latus fecerit' (the animal does not cause the ailment, but suffers it); *Mul. Chir.* 475, 'statim uitae periculum faciunt, quibus hoc contigerit'.[207] The subject of *facio* may have the role indifferently of agent or patient.

VIII.6. *renuntium*

A formulaic set of reports (127–153) begins (after the date) with a noun *renuntium* (with dependent genitive): e.g. 134 'renuntiuṃ çọh(ortis) viiii Ḅaṭạụọrụṃ'. *Renuntius*, as the editors note (74), is cited by the lexica only a few times, as a masculine (= 'reporter'). The form in *-um* is to be explained neither as a mistake of gender nor as an accusative standing as object of an implied verb. The uncompounded base-noun *nuntius* is usually in the masculine, whether it means 'messenger' or 'message, but there was

[206] See *TLL* VIII.643.73ff.
[207] See J. N. Adams, 'Some Latin veterinary terms relating to diseases of the back (*pulmo, pulmunculus, pantex, cancer frigidum, pispisa, pilupia, clauus*)', in C.

Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* VI, Collection Latomus (1992), 486 n. 16, 493 n. 43.

an apparently learned neuter *nuntium* the motivation of which was to distinguish a 'message' from a 'messenger': note Servius on *Aen.* XI.896, 'nuntius est qui nuntiat, nuntium quod nuntiatur'. Nonius (317 L.) notes that the neuter has no widespread authority, but is attested in some *docti*: 'neutro aput aliquos non receptae auctoritatis lectum est, sed doctos'. It seems to have been old (it is cited by Varro, *Ling.* VI.86 from the *tabulae censoriae*), and it found its way occasionally into high literature (Catull. 63.75, Lucr. IV.704).

VIII.7. *A Use of* interuenio *(*interuentus*)*

By chance two letters preserve comparable idiomatic uses of the verb *interuenio* and its derivative noun *interuentus* which are not otherwise attested. At 343.35–6 Octavius writes '... constituerat se *uenturum* nec *interuenit*'. It is almost as if the compound, following the simplex, has completive force: 'he said that he would come and did not *do* so'. Similarly at 291.5–8 *interuentus* picks up *uenio;* 'rogo libenter facias ut *uenias* ad nos iucundiorem mihi [diem] *interuentu tuo* factura', 'I ask you to come, to make the day more pleasant by your *doing* so'. But the prefix *inter-* does not seem to have expressed completive aspect;[208] one is obliged to relate these uses not to compounding in any general sense, but to the semantics of *interuenio. Interuenio* often means 'show up, put in an appearance', unexpectedly or by chance. The idea of *unexpected*, or *chance*, arrival is certainly not present in our examples. It would seem that the verb could now mean 'make an appearance' in general, whether unexpected or hoped for. This sense, so far as I can see, is an addition to the lexicon; it is significant that the two contexts support each other.

VIII.8. *caballus*

Caballus occurs in an account (182.12 *pretio caballi*). *Caballus* rather than *equus* was to produce the Romance terms for 'horse', and it is usually treated as the archetypal vulgarism. But two uses of the word in the classical period are to be distinguished. First, it often has a pejorative tone, signifying a horse despised for some reason or useful only for heavy work: e.g. Lucil. 163, 'succussatoris, taetri tardique caballi', Petron. 117.12, 'quid uos, inquit, iumentum me putatis esse aut lapidariam nauem? hominis operas locaui non caballi' (of an animal such as a draught-horse used for heavy labour). Secondly, it may be used neutrally as a synonym of *equus*: e.g. Hor., *Sat.* 1.6.103, 'nam mihi continuo maior quaerenda foret res / atque salutandi plures, ducendus et unus / et comes alter, uti ne solus rusue peregre<ue> / exirem, plures calones atque caballi / pascendi, ducenda petorrita' (the possession of horses is by implication a mark of status; it is unlikely in such a context that Horace meant by *caballi* 'despised horses'), *Sat.* 1.6.58, 'non ego me claro natum patre, / non ego circum me Satureiano uectari rura caballo' (Horace is not of distinguished birth; he does not ride around an estate on a saddle-horse, which by implication would be a mark of upper-class status); note too the magical incantation quoted by Palladius XIV.17.2, where *caballus* is neutral in tone and generic in meaning: 'quomodo istud iacto, sic iactentur uermes de caballo illius albo aut nigro aut cuius fuerit coloris'.

In the first use above *caballus* may have been almost a technical term, and as such it might even have been acceptable in upper-class discourse in reference to an animal of conspicuously low quality. It is the second use which is most definitely vulgar. The reference is not specifically to low-grade animals. In higher genres *equus* would have been obligatorily used with this force.

In the account it is impossible to tell whether *caballus* was the writer's unmarked term for 'horse', or whether the sale is recorded of a horse of poor quality. In view of the ambiguity it would not do to find in the term further evidence for 'vulgarisms' in the tablets.

VIII.9. *A Use of* resido

The tablet 164 seems to describe the fighting habits of the Britons:

> gladis non utuntur equi-
> tes nec residunt
> Brittunculi ut iaculos
> mittant

In the context *residunt* can only refer to the act of sitting on horseback (to launch the javelin). The exact implication of the verb may be illuminated by the following points.

---

[208] See Ernout-Meillet, op. cit. (n. 55), s.v. *inter*.

(i) *Sedeo* and derivatives are not infrequently used of sitting on the back of an equine animal (see e.g. *Peregrinatio Aetheriae* 11.4 *sedendo in asellis*). The verb may be used absolutely in this sense: Pelagonius 168, 'si dorsum ab iniuria aut inperitia *sedentis* intumuerit' (= 'the rider'), 269.2, 'in sole calido *sedentes* exercemus' (= 'mounted'). For the compound *resideo* used of riding, see e.g. Ovid, *Fasti* III.749, 'ut . . . piger . . . tergo residebat aselli' (also Apul., *Met.* VIII.17). The example from Ovid is listed by the *OLD* s.v. 1 under the meaning 'to be or remain seated, sit'. The force of the prefix is weak or non-existent in this use.[209]

(ii) The distinction between *sedeo* and compounds, and *sido* and compounds is clear-cut. *Sedeo* is stative in meaning ('to be in a sitting position, sit'), whereas *sido* indicates the process whereby this state is arrived at ('to sit down').[210] Corresponding to the stative use of *resideo* illustrated above, there was a use of *resido* = (*OLD* s.v. 1) 'to take one's seat, sit down', in which again the force of the prefix is feeble: e.g. Virg., *Aen.* VIII.467, 'congressi iungunt dextras mediisque resident / aedibus'.

Just as at Pelagonius 269.2 above in the context of horsemanship *sedentes* (absolute, stative) = 'mounted', so *resident* in the same sort of context on the tablet is used absolutely of the *act* of mounting: 'nor do the Britons mount to throw their javelins'.

VIII.10. *A Use of ego*

A letter of Severa (292) begins, after the greeting:

> ego, soror, sicut tecum locuta fueram et promiseram ut peterem a Broccho et uenirem at te, peti . . .

In Cicero's *ad Atticum ego* is often the first word of a letter.[211] This opening is not so common in the more formal letters *ad Familiares* (VI.10.1, VII.7.1, XII.24.1, XIV.4.1). It is not always easy to grasp the force of *ego* (e.g. *Att.* XII.5c, 'ego misi Tironem Dolabellae obuiam'), but with the opening of Severa's letter, cf. Cic., *Att.* XII.33.1, 'ego, *ut heri ad te scripsi*, . . . Damasippum uelim adgrediare', XV.28, 'ego, *ut ad te pridie scripseram*, Nonis constitueram uenire in Puteolanum'. In all three places *ego* is followed immediately by an *ut-* (*sicut-*) clause which refers to a previous statement of the writer. In the Ciceronian examples *ego* introduces a confirmation of a previously stated wish or intention. In the letter of Severa, it introduces a confirmation of the fulfilment of a previously stated intention ('I *did* ask Brocchus, as I had promised . . .'). The usage may be classified as loosely confirmative, though the writer merely confirms something which he (or she) has said; he does not express agreement with something which the addressee has said. This latter (stronger) confirmative use[212] is usually effected by *ego uero*, but for unaccompanied *ego* used thus in a letter to Cerialis, see 265:

> salutem
> ego, frater, sacrificio diem
> Kalendarum sic-
> ut uolueras dedi-

Just as you wished, brother, I *have* consecrated the day of the Kalends by a sacrifice.

Similarly, when (as often) *ego uero* begins a letter to Atticus, it usually introduces a response to something which Atticus has said: e.g. Cic., *Att.* XI.9.1, 'ego uero et incaute, ut scribis, et celerius quam oportuit feci' ('yes, I *did* act incautiously, as you say'). Cf. e.g. V.1.1, X.7.1, XIII.3.1, XIII.41.1, XIII.43.

VIII.11. *cubitorius, cenatorius*

Tablet 196, a list of utensils and clothing, has, within seven lines, examples of *cubitori*[*a* and *cenatoria*. Both terms are also found in Petronius, the former hitherto exclusively so. Here is useful evidence for the currency in the early Empire of two technical terms to do with dining. The deverbative *cubitoria* is derived from *cubo, cubitum*[213] in its sense 'recline for dining' (Lewis and Short, s.v. B.2). At Petron. 30.11 the term is adjectival (applied to *uestimenta*); it signifies 'reclining garments', of some

[209] See H. Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata. Das Sprachidiom der urchristlichen Itala und der katholischen Vulgata* (1875), 380 quoting examples of *resideo* = *sedeo*, e.g. *Phaedr.* 1.13.4.
[210] See Ernout-Meillet, op. cit. (n. 55), 610, s.v. *sedeo;* Leumann, op. cit. (n. 33), 564.

[211] *Att.* VI.6.1, VIII.12a.1 (Pompey), IX.4.1, IX.19.1, X.2.1, XI.17a.1, XII.5c, XII.34.1, XII.53; this list does not include *ego uero*, on which see below.
[212] On which see H. Thesleff, *Yes and No in Plautus and Terence* (1960), 39–40.
[213] See Leumann, op. cit. (n. 33), 300.

luxury in the context. The example at 196 may be a substantivized neuter (deriving from ellipse of *uestimenta*). *Cenatoria* (n., subst.) at Petron. 21.5 (cf. 56.9) clearly refers to garments for dining: 'lassitudine abiecta cenatoria repetimus et in proximam cellam ducti sumus' (cf. Mart. x.87.12, xiv.136).

viii.12. *Formulae, Clichés, Formality of Style in Epistles*

A letter (212) from an unknown writer to Verecundus is restored (l. 2) by the editors as follows:

> occasion]em nactus sum scribendi

For this formula in epistolary contexts, see Cic., *Fam.* xii.17.2, 'me scito . . . quasi *occasionem* quandam . . . *nactum scribere*', Asinius Pollio ap. Cic., *Fam.* x.31.1, 'nunc uero *nactus occasionem. . .scribam* ad te'.[214] The letters are highly formulaic, and not only in the addresses and greetings. The editors draw attention to the similar, but perhaps more formal expression *amplector occasionem* in the long letter which is possibly written in the hand of Cerialis himself:

> 225.4   lib]enter amplexu̦ş ș[um do-
>   m̦ine şa̦lutandi te o̦c̦c̦a̦şşi̦o̦n̦e̦m̦

This formula occurs at Plin., *Epist.* ii.13.1, ' et tu occasiones obligandi me auidissime amplecteris'. With *libenter* in Cerialis, cf. *auidissime* in Pliny.

Also of note in the letter of Verecundus quoted above is the elegant disjunction *occasionem . . . scribendi*. There are two other notable instances of disjunction in the letters. First, in 225, note:

> 22   ut beneficio
>   tuo *militiam* [po]şşim *iucundam*
>   experiri

And at 332 (*summas tibi domine gratias*) the separation of *summas* from *gratias* recalls, as we have seen, the opening words of one of Cicero's speeches (see vii.1). While it may be possible to find 'vulgarisms' in some letters (see viii.13), the extant correspondence is not of uniformly low style. Cerialis' control of a formal, even literary style, is not only observable in the phenomena noted above. In the same letter 225 the attachment, for example, of a genitive to a substantivized neuter plural adjective in the expression *inter praecipua uoti* (9f., = 'among my chief wishes') is a syntactic structure which belongs to the high literary language (poetry, particularly epic, historiography, particularly Tacitus; very rare in classical prose:[215] cf., e.g. Tac., *Ann.* iv.40.1, 'quibus *praecipua rerum* ad famam derigenda') In this case Cerialis, far from using a cliché, has produced a novel variant on an epistolary formula: cf., e.g., the formula at O. Wâdi Fawâkhir 2.2, 'opto deos ut bene ualeas *que mea uota sunt*'.[216] On the style of Cerialis, see further below, ix.1.

Another stock expression, in a letter from a slave to a fellow-slave, is *ualde desidero* at 347 (without context). Cf. Cic., *Att.* ii.25.2, 'ualde te exspecto, ualde desidero'; and for the collocation without a personal object, see Cic., *Att.* xiii.13–14.2, 'uolo Dolabellae ualde desideranti'.

Note too 260.2–4:

> i]n̦ no̦[ti
> tiam tuam l̦u̦b̦e̦n̦ți̦ssi-
> me perfero

The editors compare Plin., *Epist.* x.75.2, 'quod in notitiam tuam perferendum existimaui'.

With 311.i.8–9 ('puto me *humanius facere* qui tibi scribo . . .'), cf. Cic., *Att.* xii.44.1, 'fecit . . . humane . . .; tu . . . etiam humanius' (cf. *Fam.* xi.27.7, *Phil.* xiii.36, Mart. ii.15.2).

viii.13. *Lexical Vulgarisms in Letters*

Outright lexical vulgarisms in the correspondence are few, and generally in significant letters. I return below (ix.4) to the variable meaning of the term 'vulgarism'.

---

[214] See further *TLL* ix.2.235.49ff.
[215] See Adams in Bowman and Thomas, op. cit. (n. 48), 72; Kühner-Stegmann, op. cit. (n. 158), i, 433.

[216] See Adams, op. cit. (n. 215), 72 n. 1.

In a letter possibly written by a slave (see Bowman and Thomas, 294), *ne* is unambiguously used in the sense of *ne . . . quidem* 'not even': 311.6, 'homo inpientissime qui mihi ne unam epistulam misisti'. This usage owes its interest to the fact that Quintilian (1.5.39), who was almost contemporary with the letters, notes it as a soloecism.[217] *Ne* is not, however, entirely absent from high literature, and its exact status is a matter for discussion (see IX.4).

The same usage is found in the letter of Octavius (343.5). Octavius' orthography, as we have seen, has aberrational features, and his syntax and morphology too are not without colloquial or substandard elements (see above, IV.1.4 on *illec*, VI.2 on parataxis).

The letter of Chrauttius to Veldedeius (310.5) has the remarkable phrase *tot tempus* (= 'for such a long time'), in which *tot* has been treated as an indeclinable singular.[218] I have not been able to parallel this usage, which is possibly foreigners' 'broken Latin'. Chrauttius' own name appears to be Germanic, and his addressee and others mentioned in the letter (*Thuttena*, *Velbuteius*) have non-Latin names. Chrauttius may have been a Batavian or Tungrian whose acculturation (unlike that of Cerialis) was not complete. His bizarre use of *tot* stands in contrast to the correct orthography of the letter, which contains the old-fashioned spelling *promissit*, the repeated correct use of *-m*, and no obvious errors. Chrauttius probably dictated to a scribe.

These are the only possible lexical vulgarisms that I have noted in the letters, but even these are not unequivocally vulgar on a strict definition of that term. I shall return to the problem of definition below. The usages in question are in letters by a slave (?), a foreigner, and the uncultured Octavius. Not much can be made of *quo* (= *ubi*)[219] at 215 ('si qui uolet uenire et quo lignum et materiem seruant aequo perferet'), because the letter is so difficult to understand; it does, however, have an example of *qui = quis* (see IV.1.3), a usage which, if not vulgar, was considered substandard by some.

VIII.14. *Miscellaneous Colloquialisms*

In letter 242 note the expression *bene mane*: 'cras bene mane Vindolandam ueni'. Cicero does not intensify *mane* in either his speeches or philosophical works, but in the letters cf. *Att.* IV.9.2 'bene mane haec scripsi' (cf. X.16.1, XIV.18.1; also Petron. 85.6, 'bene mane surrexi', Stat., *Silu.* IV.9.48). This is the colloquial intensive use of *bene*, which was to survive in Romance. Cicero admits intensifying *bene* (both with *mane* and in other collocations) in the letters.[220] *Bene* is particularly appropriate with *mane*, in which expression it perhaps retains a trace of its real force. *Mane* itself was of a root meaning 'good', the idea being that 'good time' is the morning (cf. Fr. *de bonne heure*).

Another letter (314) has the alternative expression *primo mane* (cf. Col. XII.1.3).

A request by Cerialis (233.3) is modified by the expression *si me amas*: 'si me amas frater rogo mittas . . .' *Si me amas* is rare in Plautus (but see *Trin.* 243–4), but common in Cicero's letters (e.g. *Att.* V.17.5);[221] cf. 287 *ama nos* (with *TLL* 1.1957.21ff.).

In connection with Severa's unusual use of *spero* (291.11, 'sperabo te, soror') Petersmann (op. cit. (n. 5), 289) draws attention to Ter., *Eun.* 195, 'dies noctesque me ames, me desideres, / me somnies, / me exspectes, de me cogites, / me speres'. The usage was possibly colloquial.

VIII.15. *Celtic Loan-words*

That the tablets originate in a Celtic-influenced milieu is shown by the relative frequency of Celtic loan-words, most of them inactive in literary Latin. Such words need not of course have been taken over exclusively from British Celtic; it is likely that most had entered the Latin of Romanized natives of areas such as Gallia Belgica who were now serving in Britain.

Bracis, signifying a cereal used in beer making (three times in the tablets: see the editors on 343.25), was known to Pliny as a term in use in Gaul for which there was a more familiar Italian synonym: *Nat.* XVIII.62, 'Galliae quoque suum genus farris dedere, quod illic bracem uocant, apud nos scandalam'. *Scandala*, itself a non-literary and no doubt foreign word,[222] must have been in popular use, at least in some areas: it has Romance reflexes in North Italy and the Iberian peninsula.[223] *Bracis*, which to Pliny was merely a linguistic curiosity (a provincialism), was clearly in everyday use at Vindolanda. The

[217] See Bowman, Thomas, and Adams, op. cit. (n. 146), 46. To the bibliography cited there, add H. Petersmann, *Petrons urbane Prosa. Untersuchungen zu Sprache und Text (Syntax)* (1977), 231–2.
[218] See Bowman, Thomas, and Adams, op. cit. (n. 146), 37–8.
[219] On which usage, see Svennung, op. cit. (n. 98), 383, Hofmann-Szantyr, op. cit. (n. 145), 277.

[220] See Petersmann, op. cit. (n. 217), 114; also J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache*[3] (1951), 74, Hofmann-Szantyr, op. cit. (n. 145), 163.
[221] See *TLL* 1.1957.4ff., Hofmann, op. cit. (n. 220), 127–8.
[222] See Ernout-Meillet, op. cit. (n. 55), s.v.
[223] See Meyer-Lübke, op. cit. (n. 49), 7650.

evidence of the tablets confirms the accuracy of Pliny's observation. *Bracis* is found in Irish and survives in Old French (a further hint of its Gallic origin).[224]

Ceruesa (seven times already in the tablets; note too *ceruesarius* at 182.14) was another term known to Pliny from Gaul: *Nat.* xxii.164, 'ceruesia et plura genera in Gallia aliisque prouinciis'. Its currency in Gaul is suggested also by its survival in French (*ceruoise*).[225] The frequency of the word at Vindolanda suggests that the drink itself and brewing had been brought to Britain from Gaul by soldiers. The form at Vindolanda is consistently *ceruesa*, though Meyer-Lübke gives *cereuisia* as the base of the Romance reflexes; *ceruisia* is attested sometimes in Latin texts.[226] *Bracis* and *ceruesa* were clearly characteristic of regional dialects of Latin (though not exclusively that of Britain).

Bedocem occurs in an account (listing various textiles) at 192.2. There are two significant examples of βέδοξ in Diolectian's Prices Edict. That at 19.56 is qualified by the adjective Γαλλικός, that at 19.58 by Νωρικός. Noricum was a Celticized Alpine province, and given too the 'Gallic' associations of the word/object (so 19.58), there can be no doubt that *bedox* was a Celtic term.[227] In the Latin version of the Prices Edict Lauffer restores the Latin form of βέδοξ as *fedox;* it is now clear that he should have written *bedox*.

Remarkably, there is a second Celtic word in the same account, *tosseas*.[228] *Tossia* (cf. Breton *toos*) had previously been known only from the Gallic inscription *CIL* xiii.3162,11 found at Vieux and now at Thorigny. The inscription, dated A.D. 238, records a specimen of a letter sent by Tiberius Claudius Paulinus, governor of Lower Britain, from an unidentified British town *Tampium*.[229] *Tossiam* is given the epithet *Brit(annicam)*. The account in which it occurs at Vindolanda lists items acquired *a Gauuone*. *Gauo* was probably a Celtic name (see Bowman and Thomas, 160); Gavo may have been a Celtic (British) entrepreneur supplying (among other things) traditional Celtic goods. It is in transactions of this sort that loan-words might have entered Latin in the region of Vindolanda. I would stress that there are two possible routes by which Celtic terms could have found their way into the Vindolanda tablets: some will have been brought from the Continent by soldiers transferred to Britain, while others may have been picked up in Britain through contact with the local population.

In the letter of Chrauttius (310) both the addressee Veldedeius and one of the persons mentioned in the letter (Velbuteius) probably have Celtic names (see the editors on 310.1, 17).

In this section I have restricted myself to Celtic terms inactive in mainstream Latin. It goes without saying that the tablets also contain some words of Celtic origin which had long since entered the Latin literary language (*sagum*, *raeda*).

To the lexical evidence for Celtic influence on Latin collected in this section can be added the Celticized pronunciation of a Latin word which lies behind *souxtum* (see 11.10).

IX. CONCLUSION: LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE, LITERACY AND SOCIOLINGUISTIC VARIATION AT VINDOLANDA

The tablets are a corpus of non-literary Latin composed during a relatively short period in or near a single outpost of the Empire. There is evidence that the authors of the documents were not of uniform social (or military) status. Many of the soldiers at Vindolanda must have been of 'barbarian' (i.e. Batavian or Tungrian) origin. The term 'Vulgar Latin', implying as it does a unity of sorts, cannot without qualification be used of the output of such a disparate group. Like the ostraca of Bu Njem, the tablets raise the question of the degree of acculturation of foreigners serving in the army. In this section I attempt a general overview of the Latinity of the tablets, giving particular attention to the variables which have contributed to the mixed character of the language.

[224] See J. André, *Les noms de plantes dans la Rome antique* (1985), 37.
[225] So too in the Iberian peninsula (Meyer-Lübke, op. cit. (n. 49), 1830).
[226] See *TLL* iii.943.71ff. A bilingual exercise has been plausibly attributed to Gaul on the grounds that it contains both *bracis* and *ceruisia*: see A. C. Dionisotti, 'From Ausonius' schooldays? A schoolbook and its relatives', *JRS* 72 (1982), 123.

[227] So too A. Holder, *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz* I (1896), 366.
[228] See J. André, '*Tossia* "couverture de lit"', *Études Celtiques* 11 (1964–5), 409–12.
[229] On the place and the inscription, see A. L. F. Rivet and C. Smith, *The Place-Names of Roman Britain* (1979), 467.

IX.1. *Foreigners (i.e. non-native speakers of Latin) at Vindolanda* (?)

Flavius Cerialis, prefect of the Ninth Cohort of Batavians, is likely to have been a Batavian noble. According to Tacitus (*Hist.* IV.12), Batavian units in the Roman army were commanded by their own *nobiles*. The cognomen *Cerialis* was surely taken, as the editors suggest (25), from Petillius Cerialis, who suppressed the Batavian revolt of A.D. 69–70.[230] Either Cerialis himself or his father must have received the citizenship for loyalty to Rome during the uprising. It is then likely that Cerialis was only a first- or second-generation Roman (but which?: see below), and, as commander of Batavi, a Germanic (or Celtic(?)) speaker.

Of the documents so far published, the draft letter 225, which the editors argue is in the hand of Cerialis himself, presents the most formal and literary Latinity. Its orthography is consistently correct, and it has two types of old-fashioned spelling (the etymologically correct *-ss-* in *occassio*, twice, and *saluom*) favoured by some of the scribes at Vindolanda. But more striking is its accumulation of formal literary phrases, word order, and syntax of a type which cannot simply be explained as manifesting hackneyed epistolary clichés. I refer to the ablative absolute in l. 2, the expression *libenter amplexus sum occassionem* + genitive of the gerund (see VIII.12), the combination of the vocative *domine* with the appositional expression *dominum meum* (see VII.1), the expression *spei compos*,[231] the syntax of *inter praecipua uoti* (see VIII.12), the phraseology *quomodo uoles imple* at 20,[232] the use of *instruo* at 22 (*amicis ita instrue*),[233] and the phraseology and word order of *militiam [po]ssim iucundam experiri* (23: see VIII.12). It may be no accident that a number of parallels for the phraseology in the letter have been found in Pliny (see also above, VIII.12), who was roughly contemporary with the Vindolanda tablets. If we can accept the plausible argument that 225 was by Cerialis himself, and that Cerialis was a Batavian noble, then it would seem to follow that he had been formally trained in the upper-class Roman literary culture.

Other features of the Cerialis archive suggest, albeit indecisively, that he was completely Romanized. He uses *exsarcio* (233) in its previously unattested etymological sense, either as an archaism or as a rare technical term. He admits the instrumental use of *qui* (234), which was surely all but defunct by this date. *Bene mane* (242) is good educated idiomatic Latin, as is the use of *ego* at 265. The correspondence between Severa, the wife of Brocchus, and Cerialis' wife Sulpicia Lepidina (291–2) is also consistent with assimilation to Roman culture. Severa's Latin is elegant, colloquial, and syntactically correct; on her use of *ego*, see above, VIII.10. If Cerialis' had been trained in the school of a *grammaticus* and perhaps even a *rhetor*, he is unlikely to have been a first-generation Roman citizen. Literacy in Latin was not a normal accomplishment even of Germanic chiefs until at least the fourth century,[234] but we do occasionally hear of schools for the education in Latin of the offspring of provincial élites (see Tac., *Agr.* 21, *Ann.* III.43, Plut., *Sert.* 14). If Cerialis' father had received the citizenship, the son may have been Romanized in a provincial school.

Chrauttius, author of the letter 310, must, in view of his name, have been of either Batavian or Tungrian origin. His addressee and two of the persons referred to in the body of the letter also have non-Latin names.

There is a contrast between the syntax of Chrauttius' letter, and its orthography (see VIII.13). Twice, for example, he appears to introduce a new person to the discourse by means of a syntactically unconstrued accusative (see VI.1.8), yet the spelling of the letter is correct. Chrauttius was probably dictating to a scribe, who had been taught to spell correctly, but was prepared to keep Chrauttius' odd phraseology. The variation in the form of the name of the addressee, *Veldeius/Veldedeius*, is also suggestive of dictation. The language of the letter is to some extent formulaic, but there is sufficient departure from mere clichés to show that Chrauttius' Latin was not unidiomatic. The initial greeting *suo fratri contubernali antiquo plurimam salutem* displays a creative variation on the normal formula.[235] The parenthetical *miror quod*-clause separating *rogo te* (4) from its dependent construction can on the one hand

---

[230] See further A. K. Bowman, 'The Roman imperial army: letters and literacy on the northern frontier', in A. K. Bowman and G. D. Woolf (eds), *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World* (1994), 111.

[231] See Bowman and Thomas, op. cit. (n. 48), 129, citing Livy XXIX.22.5.

[232] On which see Bowman and Thomas, op. cit. (n. 48), 131, citing Plin., *Epist.* 1.20.25.

[233] See Bowman and Thomas, op. cit. (n. 48), 131, citing e.g. Plin., *Epist.* X.28.

[234] See A. D. Lee, *Information and Frontiers. Roman Foreign Relations in Late Antiquity* (1993), 28.

[235] See Bowman, op. cit. (n. 230), 124.

be paralleled in colloquial texts,[236] yet on the other hand exhibits command of a fairly complex sentence structure. *A parentibus nostris si quid audieris* in idiomatic fashion has the expression *a parentibus nostris* focused by its position outside the *si*-clause.[237] The spelling *rescripsti* reflects the sound of the spoken language. And the use of (*promissit*) *pretio* is idiomatic.

If we can assume that the scribe was taking down dictation rather than writing Chrauttius' letter for him, then we might conclude that Chrauttius was a speaker of an idiomatic, but non-standard, variety of Latin. Stylistically the letter is at some remove from letter 225, but it is more suggestive of 'Vulgar Latin' than of 'foreigners' Latin'. The only item which might possibly fall into the second class is the use of *tot*. If then Chrauttius was a foreigner, he had picked up in the army a form of colloquial Latin. Similarly the Africans at Bu Njem had acquired a type of Vulgar Latin, though their efforts at writing do display abnormalities which are no ordinary vulgarisms. Foreigners recruited into the army were expected to learn and use Latin, but there must have been varying degrees of mastery among common soldiers. Chrauttius was well assimilated, but perhaps in *tot tempus* one can hear the voice of a second-language learner. Mass- and count-terms are often the subject of cross-language interference.

'Foreigners' Latin' at Vindolanda seems also to be reflected in the Celticized spelling *souxtum = suptum* (see II.10), in a letter written by one slave to another. Presumably the spelling represents the slave's pronunciation of the Latin word, whether he wrote the letter himself or dictated it to a scribe. This item is the best evidence that we have that there were speakers at Vindolanda whose Latin showed substrate influence.

Tablet 192 possibly introduces us to a foreigner of another type, Gavo. The document records the receipt of goods from Gavo. Two of the items have Celtic names (*bedocem*, *tosseas*), words scarcely attested in Latin. Could Gavo have been a local trader supplying the army with goods, some of them of British type (and name)? It is in commercial intercourse of this type, as we have suggested (VIII.15), that Celtic loan-words might have found their way into Latin.

IX.2. *Scribal Practices*

Orthography has been discussed earlier, and I add no further detail here. I would stress on the one hand the degree of orthographic correctness in many of the documents and the presence of old-fashioned spellings, and on the other the aberrant character of Octavius' spelling, which gives support to the idea that he may have been a civilian trader without access to military scribes. There was an educated secretariat at Vindolanda. Scribes were employed both by the cultivated (e.g. Cerialis, who it seems sometimes wrote his own letters, and sometimes had scribes write for him), and by speakers of substandard Latin (e.g. Chrauttius). While scribes successfully avoided a number of types of spelling 'errors' (e.g. omission of *h* and final *m*, *e* for *ae*), they were incapable of avoiding misspellings involving the treatment of vowels in hiatus. From this I conclude that vowels in hiatus had been so radically modified in a variety of ways that deviations from what might be called the classical (literary) norm were no longer perceived as errors.

IX.3. *Literacy Below the Level of the Social Élite*

It has been argued by Bowman (op. cit. (n. 229)) that there is evidence at Vindolanda for literacy among those who were below the level of the social or cultural élite.[238] A linguistic feature of the *renuntium* documents throws further light on this contention. These documents, of standard format, come from a variety of hands, probably of *optiones*. The various writers repeatedly wrote *debunt* for *debent*, even though in an account (181) the verb retains its second-conjugation form *debent*. It was observed earlier (IV.2.1) that various deductions

---

[236] See Bowman, Thomas, and Adams, op. cit. (n. 146), 37.

[237] For this phenomenon, see H. Pinkster, *Latin Syntax and Semantics* (1990), 170.

[238] It is worth noting that two centurions at Bu Njem

wrote poems (see Adams, op. cit. (n. 18), 112). The military ἱππιατρός Apsyrtus was *written to* by decurions for advice about the treatment of their horses (see *Corpus Hippiatricorum Graecorum* 1, *passim*).

can be made from the repetition of the error. First, the original exemplar of the *renuntia*, though clearly of official or semi-official status, could not have been drafted by a member of the highly educated classes or by one of the scribes at Vindolanda. It is significant that the account 181, containing the correct form *debent*, was written by a scribe who was also employed to draft personal letters: the hand is the same as that of 344, a letter of appeal. 344 is a document which contains both an etymologically correct -*ss*-spelling (*commississem*) and an archaizing ablative in -*i* (*ua*[*let*]*udini*), both tell-tale traits of the scribal class at Vindolanda. Clearly that class said *debent* not *debunt*. Secondly, the form *debunt* for *debent* would not have been persistently perpetrated by a group of writers, without ever being corrected, unless it were the standard form in the speech of every member of the group. The change *debunt* to *debent* is so minor that a writer unhappy about the form *debunt* might well have changed the spelling without disturbing the standard format. The *renuntia* thus give us an intriguing glimpse of a social class (probably that of the *optiones*) who regularly used the substandard form *debunt*, yet were literate.

IX.4. *Vulgar Latin*, *Technical Latin*, the *Influence of 'Genre'*

Since a good deal of the Latin which has turned up at Vindolanda emanates from well trained scribes and/or the officer class, it should not be labelled mechanically as Vulgar Latin simply because it is non-literary. But the tablets do have material relevant to the study of Vulgar Latin (on the term see below) and of developments in the spoken language. It is not inconsistent on the one hand to assert that many documents come from the hand of scribes with a taste for formality, and on the other hand to seek information about the spoken language in the same documents. I would stress the following points:

(i) A learned scibe might use correct orthography, but retain the lexical or syntactic errors which were dictated to him (note, e.g. the letter of Chrauttius (310), and also 311, with *ne* = *ne . . . quidem*).

(ii) Not all writers at Vindolanda belonged to the class of educated scribes (note, e.g. the *renuntia*, the letter of Octavius, and the account 186).

(iii) Even professional scribes were not necessarily of the highest educational attainment. Scribes at Vindolanda are consistently correct in some respects, but consistently incorrect in others, and this would suggest that they did not belong to that literary élite which might be capable of classing as a substandard deviation even a usage (such as the contraction of *ii* to *i*) which was deeply entrenched in the speech community.

The term 'Vulgar Latin' has been often criticized, and it is unsatisfactory, implying as it does that there was a single entity 'Vulgar Latin' distinct from another entity such as 'literary Latin'. Even a reasonable definition such as that of Coleman[239] — 'By *Vulgar Latin* is meant primarily that form of the language which was used by the illiterate majority of the Latin-speaking population' — runs into difficulties. The form *debunt*, for example, which was completely excluded from all varieties of literature, can be placed at its upper social level in the speech of under-officers such as *optiones* and *decuriones*, *who were not illiterate*. To describe -*unt* for -*ent* merely as a 'vulgarism' would be imprecise, because it was current above the level of the illiterate *uulgus*. Nevertheless it belonged to a variety or varieties of the language clearly distinguished from that of the educated élite. It is perhaps best to think of Latin as a single language which embraced the usual types of sociolinguistic and dialectal variations. Those usages which were departures from the educated norms as represented in high literature might differ in the degree and nature of their unacceptability to the educated.

The case of *ne* for *ne . . . quidem* (twice in the tablets) is subtly different from that of -*unt* for -*ent*. It is true that Quintilian (1.5.39) singles out *ne* as a soloecism, and his remark shows that there were those among the literate who would have found it unacceptable. But grammarians did not necessarily look much beyond their own social class for usages to brand as soloecisms. When 'Sergius' says (*GL* IV.517.24) 'nemo enim (dicit) *ab ante*', he probably means something like 'no-one *should say ab ante*', or 'none (of us, who are highly educated) says *ab ante*'. There is perhaps an implication that *ab ante* had penetrated, to the author's

[239] R. G. G. Coleman, 'Vulgar Latin and Proto-Romance: minding the gap', *Prudentia* 25 (1993), 2.

distaste, the social dialect of those around him. *Ne*, unlike *-unt* for *-ent*, is not excluded from high literature. It is used not only by Trimalchio in the *Cena Trimalchionis* (47.4), but even in the main body of Petronius' novel, at 9.6 in a remark by Encolpius. Typically, editors emend the text at 9.6, but with what justification? *Ne* for *ne . . . quidem* is also admitted in the novel of Apuleius, again in speeches (1.23, III.11).[240] There are no grounds for classifying *ne* as a vulgarism in the strict sense; indeed it may even have originated not in lower-class speech, but in the speech of the educated. In this milieu, as an innovation, it was perhaps accepted by some, but frowned on by others (such as the purist Quintilian). The acceptability or otherwise of a usage was also influenced by genre. A usage avoided in some varieties of literature (or writing) might be acceptable in others. It is surely no accident that *ne* turns up in novels. The novel was stylistically less exclusive than some other forms of high literature. And what was acceptable in a novel would presumably cause no comment in a private letter.

The influence of genre in determining the acceptability of a non-standard usage may also be illustrated from the case of *si qui = si quis*. I leave aside *si qui* before *s*. Vitruvius, as we saw, began by using *si quis* then switched to *si qui*. In no meaningful sense could the Latin of the highly educated Vitruvius be described as vulgar. But technical writers in Latin did not necessarily adhere to the purist conventions of the higher literary forms. *Si qui = si quis* clearly had some currency among the educated, even if there were genres in which it was avoided. Again it is found at Vindolanda in a letter.

The use of *item* discussed at VIII.1 will not be found in forms of high literature. But that does not mean that it was usually restricted to the speech of the illiterate masses. It belongs to a particular genre, in this case lists/recipes/accounts, and it is in these that it can be seen to have developed its special nuance.

Another non-standard, but not necessarily vulgar, phenomenon is the use of the accusative seen in accounts (VI.1.6). It was determined by the conventions of the genre, not by the speech patterns of the illiterate.

I move on to some usages which, at first sight at least, have more claim to be considered features of Vulgar Latin. In *caballus* Vulgar Latin and proto-Romance might seem to come together, because *caballus* survives in all Romance languages and must have become the standard term for 'horse' in the speech of the majority of the population across the Empire. But there are two possible determinants of its use in the account. The writer, influenced by popular usage, may have employed *caballus* as his generic term for 'horse'. But we have seen (VIII.8) that there is evidence (from such literary genres as satire and the novel) that in the early period (i.e. the Republic and early Empire) *caballus* was not yet exclusively a generic term, at least in the speech of the literate classes. It is used particularly of lower-quality animals of the sort which might be put to heavy work. In an account it is at least as likely to be a technical term as a vulgarism.

The reduced possessive form *ma* (if it is not simply a dittography) also has a superficial claim to be regarded both as a vulgarism and as an anticipation of a Romance form. Forms such as *ma*, *tus* etc. are completely avoided in all forms of literature, yet reflected in Romance. They will have developed in, and been restricted to, the spoken language. But the spoken language of what class? Of the illiterate classes (the *uulgus*)? Not necessarily. The example at Vindolanda was employed by a member of the immediate circle of the prefect Cerialis. *Ma* is used by a woman, in an affectionate expression. It is possible that *mus*, *tus*, *sus* were in use in the colloquial speech of all social classes, but never written. If so, they cannot be classified as vulgarisms. The term 'vulgarism' implicitly contrasts the practice of the uneducated masses with that of the educated. But the contrast in terms of which the register of *ma* may be explained is that between informal speech (of whatever class) on the one hand and formal speech/writing on the other. A good deal of the vocabulary, morphology, and syntax which survived from Latin into Romance was not restricted to the speech of the hypothetical *uulgus* but was common to all social classes, and this fact undermines the notion that Romance developed out of Vulgar Latin. Much of the classical Latin verb-morphology, for example, passed into Romance.

---

[240] See Petersmann, op. cit. (n. 217), 231–2.

The spelling *turta* = *torta* raises an issue of a different kind. *Torta* hardly turns up in literary texts, but that is not because it was a vulgar word, but because the object which it signified (apparently a sort of twisted loaf) was not the sort of thing which would inevitably come up in literary genres. But what of the spelling with *u* rather than *o*? The spelling reflects a current pronunciation, with *r* + consonant causing closing of the preceding vowel, but there is no means of knowing whether that pronunciation was standard in all social dialects, or only in the speech of the uncultivated. The spelling itself may justifiably be described as non-standard and as reflecting a certain lack of training *in spelling* on the part of the writer, but it cannot be argued from there that the *speech* of the writer would have differed from that of a better educated writer who might well have pronounced the word with *u* even though writing it with *o*.

I stress the distinction between substandard spelling and non-standard ('vulgar') pronunciation, because the two are constantly confused in handbooks of Vulgar Latin. A substandard spelling need not imply that the pronunciation which it represents was also considered substandard. The omission of final -*m*, for example, habitually finds a place in discussions of Vulgar Latin. But we know from the evidence of grammarians that -*m* was lost in the speech even of the educated class. What set the educated apart from those who had not been fully immersed in the literary culture was not necessarily the way in which they *pronounced* accusative singulars, but the form in which they *wrote* them.

Other spellings attested in the Vindolanda tablets which, while substandard as *spellings*, were probably based on widespread rather than distinctively 'vulgar' pronunciations are those which involve the treatment of vowels in hiatus. The spelling *Februuar*-, on the other hand (see II.1), is decidedly aberrant. It may reflect an idiosyncratic hypercorrect glide-insertion in the speech of the writer, and that might be seen as a reaction against a tendency, not yet fully established outside vulgar speech, for the *u* to be lost in pronunciation.

Some terms/forms which may have been vulgar in the restricted sense (i.e. characteristic of the *uulgus* rather than of the educated) are *exungia* and *quem* = *quam*. Neither is a mere phonetic misspelling. Both eventually found their way into texts, but not for some centuries. The status of *tot* (*tempus*) is impossible to determine: vulgarism or 'broken' Latin? The use of the accusative expressing price may have been restricted to lower social dialects. The demonstrative *illic* (represented by *illec* = *illaec*, neut.) seems to have died out in the Latin of the literary classes; there is growing evidence that it lingered on in lower-class speech.

The tablets throw up a number of words which are either extremely rare or otherwise unattested, at least in the senses in question. I draw particular attention to *coriatio*, *excussorium*, *locarium*, *exsarcio*, *cubitorius*, *cenatorius*, and *explico*, which has not been discussed here (see also below, IX.5).[241] To apply the designation 'vulgarism' to any of these would be inappropriate: they belonged rather to technical vocabularies of the sort which leave little mark on higher literary genres.

I have sought in this section to express reservations about the expression 'Vulgar Latin', instead of using it as a blanket term to embrace a variety of phenomena. One phenomenon, the conflated third/second declension form *debunt*, we have been able to locate in a precise social milieu. It is usually impossible to classify socially an aberrational form, and in this respect therefore the Vindolanda evidence is very valuable.

IX.5. *New Linguistic Material in the Tablets*

There is a good deal of new evidence in the tablets relevant to the history of the language and its technical varieties. I mention in summary:

(i) New words, or first attestations of words: *excussorium*, *coriatio*, *sagacia*, *bubulcarius*, *superaria*;

(ii) Known words in new meanings: *interuenio/interuentus*, *exsarcio*, *tot*;

(iii) Anticipations of Romance: *locarium*, *turta* (spelt with *u* rather than *o*), *ma*, the use of the masculine form of the relative pronoun for the feminine;

(iv) First attestations of abnormal forms of words: *exungia*, *renuntium*, *Februuar*-, *legionaris*, *carrulum*, *modiolum*, *radium*(?).

---

[241] See the editors, 324 (on 343.4).

The abundant examples of the apex allow some tentative conclusions to be drawn about the shortening of long vowels in final syllables. The obsolescence of the *-i* locative morpheme, and its replacement by a locatival ablative *-o*, are confirmed. And the numerous lists and accounts provide evidence for the case syntax of sentences without expressed verbs.

University of Reading