ARCTOS

Acta Philologica Fennica

VOL. LIV

HELSINKI 2020

ARCTOS – ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

INDEX

THE SOCIOLINGUISTIC STUDY
OF ANCIENT GREEK AND LATIN
Review Article

Mark Janse

The sociolinguistic study of Ancient Greek and Latin is a relatively recent phenomenon.[1] This is not to say, of course, that the social contexts in which Greek and Latin were used have been ignored until the advent of modern sociolinguistics and historical sociolinguistics as separate disciplines. Of course we all know that the Greeks and Romans were well aware of the differences between languages, dialects and sociolects. The Greeks had dedicated verbs to refer to speaking foreign languages and different varieties of Greek: βαρβαρίζω, σολοικίζω, ἑλληνίζω, ἀττικίζω, αἰολίζω etc. Similarly, the Romans distinguished between *sermo latinus* and lower varieties referred to as *sermo vulgaris, sermo plebeius, sermo cotidianus* or *sermo rusticus*. The study of Biblical Greek and Vulgar Latin occasioned comparisons with the higher or 'classical' varieties and so on. In recent years, the sociolinguistic study of Latin is intimately connected with the name of the undisputable giant in this field, J.N. Adams.[2] The sociolinguistic study of Greek cannot be associated with the name of a single scholar, but recent work is conveniently summarized in various chapters in

---

[1] This is a review article of: James Clackson, *Language and Society in the Greek and Roman Worlds,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2015, xiv, 204 pp. ISBN 9780521140669. £19.99. It was originally solicited by another journal, but due to consecutive health issues it was finished too late to be included there. I apologize to the editors and also to my friend and colleague James Clackson for the unduly delay, but I hope my comments illustrate my respect and interest in the work under review and may help to further improve future editions of it.

[2] Cf. Adams (1982; 2003; 2007; 2013; 2016); Adams – Janse – Swain (2002); Adams – Vincent (2016) as well as many separate case studies. I feel fortunate and privileged to be allowed to count Jim Adams among my dearest friends in the academic world.

Bakker (2010), Horrocks (2010) as well as Giannakis (2014). For Latin we have Clackson (2011) as well as Clackson and Horrocks (2007).

      James Clackson (henceforth: JC), Professor of Comparative Philology at the University of Cambridge, is a well-known expert in Indo-European and Latin linguistics, with a particular interest in the sociolinguistics of Latin and the sociology of language in the Roman World.[3] He has written a very accessible and timely introduction to the relationship between language and society in Greek and Roman Antiquity. Its main purpose is to explore "how ancient languages and language use can function as a window onto the history of the ancient world" (p. 1), with special attention to the Greek and Roman civilizations between 800 BC and AD 400. The book is part of the CUP series *Key Themes in Ancient History*, "designed in the first instance at students and teachers of Classics and Ancient History, but also for those engaged in related disciplines" (p. [ii]). JC himself states that he wanted "to ensure that the text might be understood by an undergraduate student or even an educated layperson" (p. xiii). It is important to keep the intended audience in mind when reading or, in this particular case, reviewing a short work of such formidable scope, which without any doubt is also of great interest for historical sociolinguists less familiar with the sociolinguistics of Greek and Latin.

      The handsome little book is very well organized in six coherent chapters, written in a very entertaining and engaging style. The first chapter, 'The linguistic ecology of the Mediterranean', discusses what and especially how little we know about the various languages in the period under discussion. As JC explicitly admits (p. 3), maps 1.1 and 1.2 (inserted between pp. 82 & 83), depicting the language situations around 500 BC and around AD 400, can only be understood to be very approximative, given our extremely limited knowledge, based as it is on the available written sources, both literary and, in the case of the majority of the languages other than Greek and Latin, epigraphic, in combination with toponomastic evidence and stray references by ancient writers. JC discusses the pitfalls of especially the last two types of indirect evidence, taking the examples of ancient Liguria, Crete and Cyprus (pp. 3ff.). The main point of the maps, however, is to illustrate the spectacular spread of Greek and Latin at the expense of innumerable local languages, many of which we only know by name. The

---

[3] See especially Clackson (2011; 2012a; 2012b; 2015) and the numerous excursions on sociolinguistic issues in Clackson – Horrocks (2007).

following are treated in more or less detail: Cydonian, Elymian, Eteocretan, Eteocypriot, Etruscan, Gaulish, Iberian, Lemnian, Lepontic, Libyan, Ligurian, Lusitanian, Lydian, Mysian, Oscan, Pelasgian, Phrygian, Rhaetic, Tartessian, Tyrrhenian. The genetic relationship of only a few of these has been secured: Gaulish and Lepontic (Celtic), Oscan (Italic), Lusitanian (Celtic or Italic), Lydian (Anatolian) and Phrygian are Indo-European languages, but the identity of the other languages is either entirely unknown or heavily debated. Here, as elsewhere, JC takes into account insights of modern (socio)linguistics, as in his discussion of the distinction between 'language' and 'dialect' and associated problems in the Greek and Latin terms for linguistic varieties (pp. 11ff.), language origins and language change with due attention to so-called 'mixed' languages (pp. 16ff.), and the correlations between language diversity and variation and ecological factors (pp. 25ff.). JC mentions the 'mixed languages' of Crete mentioned in Homer (*Odyssey* 19,172–3, quoted on pp. 7 & 11) and the 'mixed barbarians' mentioned in Plutarch (*Bravery of Women* 247a, quoted on p. 11).[4] As a modern example of a mixed language he quotes Michif (p. 17), but an example much closer to the topic of the book is Cappadocian, a Greek-Turkish mixed language (Janse 2002, 359ff., with the very relevant quote from Kontosopoulos 1994, 7).

Chapter 2, 'States of languages/languages of states', deals with questions of language planning, particularly standardization and purism. It starts with the case of Old Persian, in particular the trilingual Behistun (Bisitun) inscription, written in Elamite, Babylonian Akkadian and Old Persian cuneiform.[5] The inscription records the achievements of the Achaemenid King Darius I (r. 522–485 BC), who claims to have created the script for this particular purpose. Some space is devoted to the use(s) of Old Persian cuneiform in the Achaemenid administration alongside Elamite and Aramaic, the latter destined to become the administrative lingua franca of the ancient Near East. He concludes that it cannot be considered a standard language in the modern sense of the word and proceeds to enumerate established criteria (pp. 35ff.). JC then applies these criteria to Classical Latin as

---

[4] See Janse (2002, 333ff.) for more examples of 'mixed languages' in Antiquity, including the 'Old Oligarch' on the 'mixed language' of the Athenians (quoted in a different context by JC on p. 53).

[5] The Behistun inscription is comparable to the Rosetta Stone in that the decipherment of Old Persian allowed for the decipherment of Akkadian and Elamite and, eventually, of other Near Eastern languages written in cuneiform such as Sumerian, Hattic, Hurrian, Urartian, Hittite and Luwian, the last two being (Indo-European) Anatolian languages like Lydian.

a standard language (pp. 37ff.), tracing its origins back to the second century BC, with purists such as Lucilius and Accius, until the establishment of the notion of *Latinitas* or '(pure) Latin'. The codification and promulgation of Classical Latin proceeded "as much by example as by prescription" (p. 38), the writings of Caesar and Cicero eventually becoming models of *Latinitas*. The expansion of Classical Latin is illustrated with the creation of a technical vocabulary largely based on and adapted from the Greek (p. 39). The final stage of standardization is what JC calls the "[s]peakers' internalization of the notion of a 'correct' Latin" (*ib.*) and its concomitant condemnation of other varieties as low(er), corrupt and indicative of lack of education, intelligence, pedigree and even morality.

JC moves on to Greek, starting with its oldest script, Linear B, which is comparable in its (restricted) uses to Old Persian cuneiform (pp. 33ff.). He discusses the situation in the archaic and classical periods with its proliferation of regional dialects and subdialects, which even used local variants of the four major alphabets (pp. 44ff.). The situation is complicated by the use of literary dialects which do not seem to correspond with any single and often even mix several dialects, Homer being just one of the best-known examples. Even the Classical Attic of the fifth and fourth centuries BC had different varieties, termed 'literary' and 'conservative' by Horrocks (2010, 64, quoted on p. 52), the former represented by the tragic playwrights and Thucydides, the latter by the orators and Plato, whose speech is closer to the local vernacular. The "creeping Ionicization" (p. 54) of what was later called 'Great Attic' eventually led to the establishment of the κοινή or 'common language', which JC considers, "in some respects, the Greek equivalent to a standard language in the Hellenistic and Roman periods" (p. 56). The κοινή would eventually level most of the Ancient Greek dialects, with the exception of Laconian which is used alongside the κοινή in dedications at the sanctuary of Artemis and which partially survives in present-day Tsakonian (p. 55). All the other Modern Greek dialects derive from the κοινή or its regional varieties. Cappadocian and Pontic, for instance, have retained many features of the Asia Minor Greek κοινή (Horrocks 2010, 113f.).

The discussion of Atticism, the puristic movement determined to purge the language of κοινή elements (p. 57f.), anticipates chapter 3, 'Language and identity', which starts with a brief discussion of the interaction of Welsh and Irish Gaelic with English in Wales and Northern Ireland as a prelude to the linguistic choices of communities and individuals as part of their construction

of identity in the face of Greek and Roman conquest and colonization (pp. 63ff.). JC discusses the example of Favorinus, a sophist born in Gallia Narbonensis, who boasted a triple identity: Roman, Greek and Gaulish (pp. 67f.). It would have been helpful to make the distinction more explicit in terms of political, cultural and ethnic identity. This could have been illustrated further with the division of the Roman Empire in 395, unfortunately just outside the time frame JC set for himself, when the Byzantines continued to call themselves Ῥωμαῖοι 'Romans' to assert their political identity, even though culturally as well as linguistically they were Greeks. The fourth-century Cappadocian Church Fathers Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzus all assert their Cappadocian identity, culturally as well as linguistically, with stray references to the indigenous Cappadocian (probably Anatolian) language as well as to their peculiar Greek accent, which Gregory of Nazianzus characterizes as ἄγροικος 'rustic' (Janse 2002, 356). Cappadocian is one of several languages that survived beyond the fourth century in Asia Minor, in addition to Galatian (Gaulish) and Phrygian, both mentioned by JC (Janse 2002, 350ff.).[6]

The chapter continues with a discussion of various cases of language contact which JC rightly discusses in terms of diglossia in the sense of Fishman rather than bilingualism or even plain "counter attacks" (p. 69ff.). Oddly enough, the term 'diglossia' does not appear in the text, although it is listed in the index (p. 201) with references to pp. 70 and 92, where the difference between High and Low varieties is explained.[7] It is a missed opportunity that he chose to illustrate the phenomenon with Arabic instead of Greek, even though Ferguson's classic article (1959) on diglossia included the case of Modern Greek, where before the creation of Standard Modern Greek in the twentieth century (dubbed κοινή by Greek linguists), a reconstructed archaic form of Greek called καθαρεύουσα 'purifying (language)' was called into existence in the nineteenth century as the High variety to purge the language from forms associated with the Low variety, the natural development of spoken vernacular Greek called δημοτική 'popular'

---

[6] JC wrongly assumes that the Cappadocians mentioned in the biblical passage known as the γλωσσολαλία 'speaking in tongues' of the Apostles (*Acts* 2,4ff., mentioned on p. 29f.) were among the peoples who were "probably speaking Greek at this date" (p. 55 fn. 28), i.e. the first century AD, whereas we have evidence that they were not (Janse 2002, 349ff.).

[7] The adjective 'diglossic' is mentioned between quotation marks on p. 161 (see below, p. 349).

– a situation comparable to the rise of Atticism in the first century BC.[8] It is therefore wrong to claim that "the language situation in ancient Greece has no clear modern counterpart" (p. 58), as the tension between H and L varieties continues in the Byzantine and modern periods (Holton 2010, 542ff.; Horrocks 2010, 262ff.).

JC presents examples of the use of languages other than Greek and Latin in special domains, such as Etruscan instead of Latin in the sphere of divination (the so-called *disciplina Etrusca*, p. 71ff.). The next section discusses the use of other Italian languages, especially during the 'Social War' of 91–88 BC, where the use of Paelignian, an Oscan variety, has been wrongly interpreted as a sign of resistance to the Romans, as JC convincingly argues (pp. 75ff.). The, admittedly rare, existence of bilingual inscriptions is the subject of a balanced discussion in which JC carefully shows "what they can, and what they cannot, tell us about the communities and individuals who commissioned and composed them" (p. 78). His main interest is in the erection of bilingual inscriptions as identity markers (pp. 78ff.). The use of Eteocypriot (instead of the local Cypriot Greek dialect written in the same syllabic script) in a Cypriot inscription from the late fourth century BC written also in 'Great Attic' and of Gaulish in an Italian inscription from the second century BC written also in Latin are clear examples. The use of minority languages or Low varieties marks the identity of the commissioners, whereas the use of 'Great Attic' instead of the local Cypriot Greek dialect and of Latin is dictated by the desire to get the message across to the outside world. The very few extant trilingual inscriptions usually serve the same purpose but usually with an additional political agenda, like the monumental inscriptions of the Persian kings Darius I and Shāpūr I, the latter written in the third century BC in Middle Persian, Parthian and Greek. JC, however, also discusses (pp. 81ff.) a trilingual Sardinian inscription from the second century BC commissioned by a (Greek?) slave, written in Latin, Greek and Phoenician and dedicated to Asclepius Merre (Merre possibly being the name of a local Sardinian deity and Asclepius being rendered with its Phoenician equivalent Ešmun).

The rest of the chapter is devoted to the best documented case in the ancient world: Greek and Latin bilingualism (pp. 87ff.). JC discusses the use and prestige of Greek in the Roman world, epitomized in the emperor Claudius' quip

---

[8] See Horrocks (2010, 438ff.) and especially Mackridge (2009). The term διγλωσσία 'diglossia' was coined in 1885 by the Greek writer Emmanouil Rhoïdis (Mackridge 2009, 27ff.).

utroque sermone nostro 'in both of our languages' (Suetonius, *Life of Claudius* 42) which became a commonplace in the Roman Empire captured in the set phrase *utraque lingua* 'in both languages' (p. 88).[9] He sets out the stages from the largely monoglot early Republic to the largely bilingual Empire, carefully distinguishing between the different domains and registers in which Greek was used and accepted and, indeed, acceptable (pp. 88ff.). JC again refers to the diglossic situation in the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire without using the term, emphasizing that both Greek and Latin were High varieties, even though Latin is not widely attested in the inscriptional record (pp. 92ff.). He concludes that even though identity has often been dismissed as having lost all explanatory salience, many of the examples discussed in this chapter show that the linguistic choices of communities and individuals in Antiquity are demonstrably "part of their self-identification and self-definition" (p. 95).

Chapter 4, 'Language variation', starts with musings about the problems inherent in working with historical data (pp. 96f.). Writing itself imposes restrictions on the range of variation and only a very small percentage of the (predominantly male) elite was literate, ranging from 5-10% during the Classical period in Greece and 20–30% during the Late Republic/High Empire in Rome. Another problem is the relative sparseness of the available evidence, even though Greek and Latin are of course far better documented than any of the languages spoken on their territories. The next section, 'Studying linguistic variation' (pp. 97ff.), contains an elaborate discussion of Labov's classic study on the social stratification of (r) in New York City, emphasizing once again the difficulties of applying modern linguistic theories based on spoken language to ancient language variation in written sources (p. 103). JC discusses the case of Cicero, an individual speaker/writer of Classical Latin who not only commented on his own speech habits but was also the object of the observations of many other Latin speakers/writers after him (p. 103ff.). Cicero remarks that he writes his letters *plebeio sermone* 'in the language of the plebs', that is in colloquial style (*Letters to Friends* 9,21,1), as opposed to the more formal register of his civil court cases, but JC rightly highlights the pitfalls of contrasting different written genres in terms of formal and informal registers (p. 104). He also mentions the often underestimated

---

[9] It may be noted that the catch phrase *utraque lingua* is the main title of at least three publications on Greek-Latin bilingualism (Dubuisson 1981; Nicolas 1996; Fögen 2003) and *utroque sermone nostro* of another (Torres Guerra 2011).

impact of the manuscript tradition, which may have ironed out colloquial features not corresponding to the classical norm (p. 105). The variation encountered in real autographs such as the innumerable Greek letters written on papyrus may reveal idiolectal idiosyncrasies, as shown by Evans (2012), but deviant spellings are sometimes no more than plain mistakes against the highly conservative Greek orthography clearly ill-suited to the language of the Post-Classical, Byzantine and modern periods, as JC argues at some length (p. 106ff).

He then turns his attention to the representation of language variation in literary texts. Ancient Greek comedy is an important source for diastratic and diatopic variation, especially in the plays of Aristophanes p. (109ff.), whose 'languages' (*sic*) have been studied in great detail by Willi (2003).[10] Aristophanes represents women, non-Athenian Greeks, and foreigners ("barbarians", p. 113) as speaking different varieties of Greek.[11] With respect to other aspects of sociolinguistic, especially diastratic variation, JC is rightly very cautious: "in Aristophanes' comedies linguistic characterization is generally not continuous" (p. 111). As an example, he discusses attempts at interpreting the variation in dative plural endings in *Clouds* in terms of 'rustic'/'conservative' vs. 'urbane'/'innovative' and concludes that "the variation represented by Aristophanes probably does not correspond to any real-life variation in the streets and marketplaces of Athens" (p. 112). Interestingly, Aristophanes himself, in a famous fragment, distinguishes three different social varieties: διάλεκτον ἔχοντα μέσην πόλεως, οὔτ᾽ ἀστείαν ὑποθηλυτέραν τ᾽ οὔτ᾽ ἀνελεύθερον ὑπαγροικοτέραν "having the middle-of-the road speech of the city, neither the more refined effeminate variety, nor the more slavish country one" (fr. 706 - quoted in translation on p. 113). It should be noted that the distinction between ἀστεῖος and (ὑπ)άγροικος '(somewhat) rustic' (compare Gregory of Nazianzus' use of ἄγροικος, discussed above on p. 337) corresponds with the Latin use of *urbanus* vs. *rusticus* (p. 118).

"[A]n unparalleled source for language variation in Latin" (p. 116) is Petronius' novel *Satyrica* from the first century AD. The language of the freedmen in the *Cena Trimalchionis* 'Banquet at Trimalchio's' the largest extant fragment of

---

[10] See also Willi (2002; 2010b).

[11] For Aristophanes' characterization of Greek dialects other than Attic see Colvin (1999); for the representation of male speech in Aristophanes, on which JC is skeptical (p. 113), see now the recent article by McDonald (2016); on the Greek concepts of βάρβαρος 'barbarian' and βαρβαροφωνέω / βαρβαρίζω 'speak like a barbarian', whether 'speak a foreign language' or 'speak bad Greek', see Janse (2002, 334ff.).

the *Satyrica*, offers "the clearest indication from the ancient world of the speech of the sub-elite" (*ib.*). The language of the freedmen "is so far removed from Classical Latin that when the *Cena Trimalchionis* was published in 1664, on the basis of a single manuscript, many scholars thought that it was a later forgery or pastiche, and passages were thought to reveal an original French or Italian version, imperfectly translated into Latin" (p. 115). Non-standard features include the use of periphrastic constructions to express the future and the confusion of case and gender (*ib.*, cf. p. 121). A hilarious case of hypercorrection of rustic speech is immortalized in Catullus' poem 84, where a certain Arrius is ridiculed for hypercorrect *h*-popping to mask his *h*-dropping (p. 117). JC quotes only half the poem, so the reader misses the punchline: *cum subito affertur nuntius horribilis, | Ionios fluctus, postquam illuc Arrius isset, | iam non Ionios esse, sed Hionios* "when suddenly a horrible message arrives that the Ionian Sea, ever since Arrius went there, was no longer Ionian but Hionian" (84,10–12). My late professor of Latin literature (who taught Classical, not Late Latin, to be sure), being a speaker of an *h*-dropping Flemish dialect, like myself, in a desperate attempt to mask his accent, unwittingly reversed the joke by saying that "the Hionian Sea, ever since Harrius went there, was no longer Hionian but Ionian", turning Arrius into a Roman Harry instead of the "Roman 'Arry" of the "Englished" title of Sir Richard Francis Burton's translation of the poem (1894).

Hypercorrect *h*-popping was condemned as *rusticus* (as opposed to *urbanus*) by well-educated scholars like Nigidius Figulus, a contemporary of Catullus (p. 118). As a matter of fact, *h*-dropping must have been well underway in the classical period (Allen 1978, 43ff.): intervocalic -*h*- was regularly deleted in words like *mī < mihi* 'to me', *nēmo < nē hemo* 'no man: no-one',[12] *nīl < nihil* 'nothing' even in the speech of classical authors and hypercorrect *h*-popping/dropping appears in orthographic variants such as *(h)umerus* 'shoulder' (cf. Sanskrit *áṃsa-*, Greek ὦμος, Gothic *amsa*), *(h)umor* 'moisture' and *(h)umidus* 'wet' (by popular etymological connection with *humus* 'earth' according to Varro, *On the Latin Language* 5.24) and *(h)arena* 'sand' (cf. Archaic Latin *(h)asena*, Faliscan *fasena*). By the end of the fourth century AD, *h*-dropping is not only accepted by Augustine (*Sermons* 1,18,29) but its pronunciation is actually considered "pedantic and overly reliant on trying to reproduce the speech of a former era" (p. 120; see

---

[12] *Hemō* is the older form of *homō*: *hemonem hominem dicēbant* "they used the say *hemō* for *homō*" (Festus 89,8).

also p. 148). Not surprisingly, none of the Romance languages have preserved the original Latin *h-* except in artificially reconstructed orthographies such as French *homme*, Spanish *hombre* from Latin *homine(m)* (accusative, not nominative).[13] The chapter ends with a discussion of the notion of 'Vulgar Latin' which has been uncritically transferred from "the language of the sub-elite in the Roman" world to "later stages of Latin", as in the title of the biannual conferences on "Vulgar and Late Latin" (p. 119, cf. p. 120ff.). The chapter concludes, programmatically: "The challenge for the historical sociolinguist is twofold. First, to work out which variations in our texts correlated to real variations in speech; and second, to try to understand whether ancient communities interpreted these speech differences as indicative of social background or status" (p. 122).

Chapter 5, 'Language, gender, sexuality', starts with a quotation from an oration by Dio Chrysostom (first-second century AD) in which he criticizes the inhabitants of the city of Tarsus in Asia Minor for habitually 'snorting', an unpleasant sound which he compares to the female voice (φωνή) when uttered by men: "[S]upposing certain people should as a community be so afflicted that all the males got female voices and that no male, whether young or old, could say anything man-fashion, would that not seem a grievous experience and harder to bear, I'll warrant, than any pestilence?" (*Orations* 33,38, quoted on p. 123). This is interpreted as if men speaking with a female voice had lost "a distinctively male speech pattern" (*ib.*). Although the quotation is intended to introduce the following sections on female and male speech, JC here misses the mark, as Dio is obviously referring to voice qualities and not to speech patterns, as is clear from the continuation of the oration, not quoted in the book: "But who are they who make that sort of sound? Are they not the creatures of mixed sex [i.e., androgynes - MJ]? Are they not men who have had their testicles lopped off?" (33,39). The Greek word for 'sound' used here is ἦχος, which clearly refers to the quality of the voice (φωνή). A modern analogy of men speaking with female voices would be the (Monty) Pythons playing women (or playing women who impersonate men, as in the stoning scene from *Monty Python's Life of Brian*).[14]

---

[13] JC claims (p. 90) that *elephantus* is taken from the Greek genitive ἐλέφαντος (nominative ἐλέφας), but *panthera* from the accusative πάνθερα (nominative πάνθηρ). It is safer to assume that both were based on the accusative or on the stem of the oblique cases. The accusative was the basis of the nominative formations in the later stages of Greek and also of Latin and the Romance languages.

[14] To Dio's credit, it should be stressed that he did not think that the female voice in itself was offensive to the ear: "And yet to speak with female voice [γυναικῶν φωνή 'women's voice'] is to speak with

The next section is devoted to female speech. Once again, Greek comedy is an important source of information on, as JC quite rightly emphasizes, "ancient (*male*) ideas of the characteristics of female speech" (p. 125 - italics mine, MJ). Already in chapter 4, JC presented an example of female speech in the case of one woman correcting another who inadvertently swears "by the two goddesses" (Demeter and Persephone) while practising to take the part of a man in the Assembly (Aristophanes, *Assemblywomen* 156ff., quoted on p. 110). In the present section, JC presents an example of female speech uttered by a man disguised as a woman to infiltrate a woman-only festival who is asked to try on a party dress: νὴ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην, ἡδύ γ᾽ ὄζει ποσθίου "by Aphrodite, it has a nice smell of weenie" (*Women Celebrating the Thesmophoria* 254, quoted on p. 125). The female characteristics of this Pythonesque scene are the oath "by Aphrodite" (instead of "by Apollo", the male equivalent) and, according to JC, also the use of the word ποσθίον, a diminutive form of ποσθή, here translated as "weenie". Ποσθή is not really "the vulgar word for penis" (p. 126), which is πέος, but refers to "a small member or a young boy's member" (Henderson 1991, 109). JC claims that "the joke surely lies in the incongruity of the obscenity coming from a woman's mouth" (*ib.*), but the man is not yet impersonating a woman, as he is still in the presence of his kinsman Euripides and Agathon, two famous Athenian playwrights. JC's interpretation is intended as a rebuttal of the traditional understanding of the use of ποσθίον "to be a slighting or affectionate reference to the manhood of the notoriously effeminate poet Agathon" (*ib.*), but Henderson notes that "[t]he pederast Agathon's clothes smell sweetly of [ποσθίου] … because of his predilection for small boys" (1991, 109). The use of the diminutive is in any case not just "a vain attempt to feminize the vulgarity" (*ib.*), as recent studies on female speech in Greek (Bain 1984) and Latin (Adams 1984) "show that ancient observations about feminine preference for diminutive forms … were borne out in the comedies" (p. 128; cf. Fögen 2010, 322).

The discussion of particular forms of address which have been associated with female speech ends with an inconclusive "we can't be certain that in the same circumstances women would employ a particular phrase any more than men" (p. 127). Yet it would have been helpful to compare Latin examples such

---

human voice [ἀνθρώπων φωνή 'humans' voice'], and nobody would be vexed at hearing a woman speak" (*Orations* 33,38). Aristotle (*Generation of Animals* 5,7,786b–787a) considers the deep voice of men as opposed to the high voice of women as the mark of a nobler nature (*sic*).

as *anima (mea)* 'my soul, life' with its Greek counterparts ζωή (μου) 'my life' and ψυχή (μου) 'my soul', both attested in Greek (*sic*) by Martial (*Epigrams* 10,68) and Juvenal (*Satires* 6,195) and explicitly associated with female speech. Dickey (1996, 187) quotes Theocritus (24,8), where a mother addresses her two babies with the Doric equivalent as ἐμὰ ψυχᾱ́.[15] A comparison with later stages of the Greek language would have been instructive, as the use of such terms of endearment is particularly frequent in Modern Greek female speech, where next to ζωή μου and ψυχή μου the diminutive forms ζούλα μου and ψυχούλα μου are used perhaps even more frequently (in addition to a host of similar diminutive forms such as αγαπούλα μου 'my darling', καρδούλα μου 'my heartlet' etc.). The use of Greek in the Roman Republic and early Empire was a prerogative of well-educated men and a marker of "advanced male solidarity" (Swain 2002, 164), but on the other hand "Greek was typically the language on the lips of prostitutes (many of whom may have been Greek), and Greek phrases were considered titillating in a young lover" (p. 136, with reference to Adams 2003, 360f.), as in the examples from Martial and Juvenal (the latter quoted and discussed on p. 136f.).

This leads JC to a discussion of the correlations of language choice and gender in situations of societal bilingualism in the Roman world. The last speakers of the native languages almost invariably appear to be women, because "[i]ndigenous languages typically survive longer in the domain of the household, while the new or dominant language prevails outside the home, in the market, the factory, the law court and the town hall" (p. 130f.). The best documented case is the use of Coptic almost exclusively by women after the fourth century AD, discussed at some length by JC (p. 131ff.). As a modern analog to the Egyptian case JC mentions the use of Romani by women in bilingual communities in Northern Greece as opposed to men, who "use codes which mix Romani and Greek" (p. 130, with reference to Matras 2002, 245f.). A Modern Greek analog is Cappadocian, which in several villages in southern Cappadocia was used almost exclusively by women (Janse 2002, 358). Cappadocian also provides a female analog to Chambers and Trudgill's NORMs or "nonmobile, older, rural males" (1998, 29, quoted by JC on p. 130): the most archaic and conservative variety of Mišótika, the only surviving Cappadocian dialect in present-day Greece, is spoken by SERFs (sedentary, elderly, rural females).

---

[15] This example is to be distinguished from the use of ψυχή by men to address other men (Dickey 1996, 186)

The final section of chapter 5 is devoted to 'Obscenity' (see Janse 2014a for a recent survey). JC discusses some of the difficulties in finding English equivalents for ancient obscenities. A case in point is the verb βινέω (sometimes spelled βεινέω) with its doublet βενέω, which "seems to have had the same force and flexibility in Greek as *fuck* does in English" in the words of Henderson (1991, 151, quoted on p. 138). This is refuted by JC, who points out some of the different uses of the English verb, e.g. *fuck!* or *fuck off!* and some of the, admittedly rare, legal uses of the Greek verb (p. 138f., but discussed in much greater detail in Bain 1991, 57ff.). With respect to the latter, he refers to the Alexandrian lexicographer Hesychius (5ᵗʰ–6ᵗʰ c. AD) who recorded the verb in the laws of Solon (p. 139). It would have been useful to quote the entry in full: βεινεῖν· παρὰ Σόλωνι τὸ βίᾳ μίγνυσθαι, τὸ δὲ κατὰ νόμον ὀπύειν, i.e. in Solon's laws βινέω means 'to have violent (βίᾳ) intercourse', whereas ὀπύω means 'to have legal (κατὰ νόμον) intercourse' (my translation). The various words used in the Hesychian entry seem to contradict JC's claim that "there is no parallel for the English system of a high-register word next to the obscenity" (*ib.*). The mediopassive verb μίγνυμαι (and not the active μίγνυμι, p. 139) is one of the "more general terms … used to refer to intercourse" (*ib.*). However, the verbs βινέω and ὀπύω are here clearly opposed to one another. Bain concludes that "it is clear that [βινέω] is at all periods a comprehensive term for intercourse" (1991, 59), e.g. βινεῖν βούλομαι 'I want to fuck' (Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 934, said by Cinesias (Greek Κινησίας), one of the sex-desperate husbands with the punning name associated with the synonymous verb κινέω 'move', hence 'fuck'). De Lamberterie derives the verb on the basis of the doublet βενέω from *gʷen-*, the Indo-European word for 'woman', and thinks its original meaning was 'take to wife, marry' (Chantraine 1999, 1384; rejected by Beekes 2010 *s.v.*).

From a semantic perspective, an interesting comparison can be made with the verb γαμέω 'take to wife, marry' or 'marry in lawful wedlock' (Liddell – Scott 1996 *s.v.*). The verb has taken on the exclusively obscene meaning 'fuck' in Medieval and Modern Greek, including some uses akin to the English verb, e.g. (ἄϊ) γαμήσου '(go) fuck yourself, fuck off' or γαμῶτο '(I) fuck (it)', for which some early attestations are usually identified: Αἴγισθος ὑπὲρ μόρον Ἀτρεΐδαο | γῆμ' ἄλοχον μνηστήν   'Aegisthus beyond destiny took the wedded wife [Clytaemnestra] of the son of Atreus [Agamemnon]' (Homer, *Odyssey* 1,35f.); [Κασσάνδραν] γαμεῖ βιαίως σκότιον Ἀγαμέμνων λέχος 'Agamemnon will take

[Cassandra] by force to be an illicit paramour' (Euripides, *Trojan Women* 44).[16] It is doubtful whether γαμέω already had its later sense in these examples, in which case the semantic development of γαμέω from 'take to wife' to 'take a wife' in the sense of 'fuck' is a counterexample to "the 'Allan-Burridge law of semantic change': 'Bad connotations drive out good', i.e. euphemistic replacements of obscenities come to take over the primary meanings" (p. 140). Another counterexample is Ancient Greek πέος 'cock, dick, prick', "the vulgar *vox propria* [with] shock value" (Henderson 1991, 108), which has become the high-register equivalent of the vulgar πούτσος or πούτσα in Modern Greek (Janse 2014a, 80). The Latin word *pēnis* < *pes-nis, etymologically related to Greek πέος < *pés-es and Sanskrit *pás-as-* 'penis', underwent a similar development and became the high-register equivalent of French *bitte*, Italian *cazzo*, Spanish *polla*, Romanian *pulă* etc.

The final chapter 6 deals with 'The languages of Christianity'. The first section discusses the first Bible translations and their importance. JC mentions the Latin translation known as the Vulgate and made by Jerome around 400 as well as the earlier Latin versions collectively called *Vetus Latina* (p. 145), but the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures known as the 'Translation of the Seventy' or Septuagint (Lat. *Septuaginta*, Gr. Ἑβδομήκοντα) is not mentioned here but only briefly in the next section (p. 153), despite its being the earliest Bible translation, its peculiar originary legend, its explicit translation poetics and its importance for our knowledge of the κοινή (Janse 2002, 338ff.). Hebrew, Greek and Latin were considered the three *linguae sacrae* 'sacred languages' by the seventh-century scholar Isidore of Seville (*Etymologies* 9,1–2, mentioned on p. 147). Several translations are the first and sometimes also the only witnesses of ancient languages such as Gothic or 'Caucasian Albanian', the language of an ancient people unrelated to the Balkan Albanians, fragments of which were recently discovered on Georgian palimpsests at St. Catherine's Monastery in the Sinai peninsula (p. 144). Sometimes the translations prompted the invention of new scripts, such as the Gothic alphabet invented by Wulfila in the fourth

---

[16] It should be noted that ἄλοχος is etymologically related to λέχος and literally means 'bedfellow', which explains why Clytaemnestra is referred to as Agamemnon's ἄλοχος μνηστή 'wedded bedfellow' and Cassandra as Agamemnon's σκότιος λέχος, literally 'dark, secret bed', i.e. 'illicit bedfellow'.

century (p. 144),[17] the Armenian and possibly also Georgian and Caucasian Albanian alphabets by Mesrop in the same century (*ib.*), the Glagolitic alphabet by Cyril and Methodius in the ninth century, and the Cyrillic alphabet possibly by disciples of the brother saints in the same century (*ib.*). The section continues with an overview of other local languages used to spread Christianity and the "apparent tolerance of linguistic diversity" on the part of early missionaries such as Augustine with respect to Punic (p. 147), although JC emphasizes the fact that the Bible was never translated in languages "outside the boundaries of imperial control" (p. 148) and actually "widened the franchise of the Latin language" (p. 149, quoted from Brown 1968, 92).

The next section addresses the linguistic situation in first-century Palestine and the question of the languages of Jesus (see Janse 2014b for a recent survey). The written record indicates that Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek and Latin were used at the time, but almost certainly for different purposes and audiences. Latin was the "language of imperial power" (p. 151), whereas Greek was the "second language of the imperial administration" (*ib.*) and without any doubt the first language in the eastern provinces (Janse 2014b, 239). Greek was the major lingua franca in the eastern Mediterranean next to Aramaic, the home language of the Palestinian Jews and the native language of Jesus, who is quoted as speaking Aramaic on occasion in the Gospel according to Mark, including the cry from the cross (p. 153f.).[18] Jesus is addressed as ῥαββουνί, the Greek transcription of Aramaic *rabbūnī* 'rabbi', by Mary (*John* 20,16) and by the blind man Bartimaeus (*Mark* 10,51), whereas he is consistently addressed by the apostles as ῥαββί, the Greek transcription of Hebrew *rabbî* (Janse 2014b, 240).[19] Both Aramaic and Hebrew are referred to in Greek with the adverb ἑβραϊστί, which is translated by JC as 'in Hebrew'. Elsewhere I have argued that ἑβραϊστί does not mean 'in Hebrew' but rather 'in the language of the Hebrews' (Εβραῖοι), which could be either Aramaic or Hebrew (Janse 2014b, 240). The trilingual sign

---

[17] Wulfila, whose name means 'Little Wolf' in Gothic, is correctly dated to the fourth century on p. 144, but erroneously to the third on p. 169.

[18] The cry from the cross (*Mark* 15,34) is an Aramaic rendering of *Psalm* 22,1, transmitted in various Greek transcriptions in the majority of the witnesses with the notable exception of the fifth-century Codex Bezae (D), which presents a Greek transcription of the Hebrew text.

[19] The name Βαρτιμαῖοις is preceded by its translation: υἱὸς Τιμαίου 'son of Timaeus', the latter being a Greek name, the former a hybrid formation containing the Aramaic word *bar* 'son' (Hebrew *bēn*).

on the cross (*John* 19,20, mentioned as an example of a trilingual inscription by JC on p. 81) was written ἑβραϊστί 'in the language of the Hebrews' (Aramaic or Hebrew), ῥωμαϊστί 'in the language of the Romans' (Latin), and ἑλληνιστί 'in the language of the Hellenes' (Greek). In this respect it is interesting to compare the seventh-century Byzantine version of the three languages by Maximus the Confessor (*Mystagogia* 60): ῥωμαϊκά 'in the language of the Romans [i.e. Greeks of the Eastern Roman Empire]' (Greek - see above, p. 337), λατινικά 'in the language of the Latins [i.e. the Romans]' (Latin), and συρικά 'in the language of the Syrians' (Syriac, i.e. Aramaic). Jesus' native tongue was Galilean Aramaic, which was ridiculed in the Talmud for its incomprehensibility (p. 153). As a matter of fact, Galilean is already presented in the New Testament as a distinctive Aramaic dialect, as when Peter is accused of being one of Jesus' apostles: ἡ λαλία σου δῆλόν σε ποιεῖ 'your accent gives you away' (*Matthew* 26,73). There are, however, numerous occasions where Jesus would have had to speak Greek with his interlocutors, such as the 'Greek Syro-Phoenician' woman near Tyre (*Mark* 7,24ff.) or Pontius Pilate (*Mark* 15,1f.), both mentioned by JC, who is absolutely right in rejecting the idea that Jesus would have known Latin (p. 154). Another occasion would have been Jesus' preaching in the Decapolis, a flourishing centre of Hellenistic culture (*Mark* 7,31ff.), which is the scene of the demon expulsion into a huge herd of pigs (*Mark* 5,1ff.; *Matthew* 8,28ff.), "arguably one of the most comic scenes in the NT" (Janse 2014b, 239).

The next section discusses the question whether 'Christian Greek' and 'Christian Latin' were separate varieties. JC rightly stresses the fact that the writings of the New Testament exhibit different stylistic levels, the language of the Gospel according to Luke, who may also have been the author of *Acts*, being "closer to the administrative standard Greek (the *koinḗ*)" than the other gospels (p. 157) and the language of Paul's epistles including "literary flourishes not found in the gospels" (p. 155). As Christian authors began engaging in polemic with pagans, they also started defending the lower register of the language of the Scriptures as being the language of fishermen (Lactantius, *Divinae Institutiones* 5,2,17) or sailors (Origen, *Against Celsus* 1,62, cf. Janse 2007, 647). The Greek Church Fathers, on the other hand, increasingly shifted towards "a more formal, Atticizing language, away from the more colloquial and contemporary language of the gospels" in an attempt to make themselves understood by the intellectual elite of the time (p. 158; see the discussion of Atticism above on p. 336). JC

observes a similar movement in the language of the Latin Church Fathers, with the notable exception of, again, Augustine (p. 159ff.). He concludes that "Greek- and Latin-speaking communities had become 'diglossic', accustomed to deal in a different variety for written composition and formal occasions from the language of the street" (p. 161). From this perspective, there is no point in distinguishing separate varieties such as "Christian Greek" or "Christian Latin" (p. 163).

The final section of the chapter is devoted to the impact of Christianity on the local languages in the Roman Empire. JC discusses the case of Aramaic, particularly the Syriac dialect which "came to be the vehicle for a substandard corpus of written literature (mostly, but not entirely, Christian)" (p. 165). The reason for its survival may be that "there was already a literary culture in the kingdom [of Osrhoene - MJ] before it came under Roman control" (p. 166). The first Bible versions in Syriac were probably translations of the Hebrew Scriptures and Syriac was also the language of the teachings of Mani, the third-century founder of Manicheism (*ib.*). The fact that Greek continued to be used as a lingua franca in the eastern provinces is taken as evidence that "language does not seem to have been utilized as a political tool in the local tussles with central authority" (*ib.*). The rise of Coptic in the third century is another case in point (p. 167). Turning to Latin, JC rightly emphasizes the fact that one cannot deduce from the written records "that the spoken languages themselves did not continue to be spoken, particularly in out-of-the-way areas or close-knit communities" (p. 169). He concludes that "there is no secure way of knowing the date of the triumph of Latin in the west, whereas it can be stated for certain that the Arab invasions from the seventh century on cut short the story of Greek in the east" (*ib.*). This is not entirely correct: "During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries there were large and, for the most part, prosperous Greek communities throughout the Near and Middle East, *I kath'imas Anatoli* (Our East) to use the evocative Greek phrase" (Clogg 2013, 78f.). Particularly in Asia Minor, Greek remained the official language after the Arab invasions and still was the first language of many Greek-Orthodox Christians in the early twentieth century before the exchange of populations between Greece and Turkey in 1923–1924, especially on the west coast and the Dodecanese islands (the latter occupied by Italy from 1912 until 1947), and in Pontus and Cappadocia (Janse 2008, 120ff.).[20]

---

[20] Witness the huge amount of Greek loanwords in Turkish (Tzitzilis 1987).

The conclusion is entitled 'Dead Languages?', a question which is answered in the affirmative by JC: "All the languages discussed in this book are 'dead languages', an expression that neatly encapsulates the truism that languages live in the minds and mouths of their speakers" (p. 171). He reiterates the important point that "it is often much more difficult to match writing to speech than is assumed in some works on ancient languages and linguistics" (p. 172). He rightly concludes on a positive note: "provided the researcher is aware that written language is not identical to speech, it is nevertheless possible to use the methods of modern linguistics to gain some insight into ancient verbal behaviour" (p. 174).

The book ends with a 'Bibliographic essay' (p. 176ff.), which gives a useful, though selective, survey of the 'sources' and a selection of (exclusively English) titles in sociolinguistics and historical sociolinguistics. It is of course easy to criticize any author's selection, but there is one conspicuous omission: Brill's three-volume *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics* (Giannakis 2014), specifically designed to be used by non-classical linguists who are not familiar with the Greek alphabet (all Greek examples have been transliterated, to the frustration of many a contributor). The *EAGLL* contains a wealth of information on every imaginable topic in Greek linguistics, including numerous entries on sociolinguistic topics such as 'Accommodation', 'Aischrology' (profane and obscene language), 'Ancient Greek sociolinguistics and dialectology', 'Attitudes to language', 'Bilingualism', '"Christian" Greek', 'Diglossia', 'Forms of address and sociolinguistic variation', 'Language contact' (with separate entries for particular cases such as JC's contribution 'Greek and Armenian', and separate entries on loanwords, both in and from Latin and Greek), 'Language policies', 'Politeness', 'Register' and many others.

In addition to this bibliographic essay, the book would have been even more useful if JC had added 'Suggestions for further reading' at the end of each chapter with references to the most relevant publications. I have already mentioned J.N. Adams as the single most important figure in Latin sociolinguistics and dialectology, and the attentive reader will have learned this from the frequent references to his work, but it would nevertheless be serviceable to make this point at the end of each chapter. And although this book is obviously intended primarily for an English readership, it will and definitely should be more widely read, so it would seem appropriate to include (more) non-English titles. After all,

the standard reference grammars for Greek and Latin were all written in German and listed as such in the bibliographic essay (p. 176).

A few remarks are in order in view of the intended readership (see above, p. 334). The transliteration of Greek is nowhere explained, although it obviously follows Allen (1987), including accents and vowel length. The same system is used in the *EAGLL*, which contains a useful table in the introduction. The transliteration is generally consistent - I have found only one inconsistency: Ancient Greek {υ} is transliterated as {y} in *symmákhos* (*sic*) instead of *súmmakhos* 'combatant, ally' (p. 107; compare *psúllos*/*psúlla* 'flee' on p. 58).[21] Sometimes, the reader is expected to be a bit more classically educated than "the educated layperson" (p. xiii). To quote just a few examples (which could be multiplied): the Aetolians are mentioned on p. 50, but Aetolia does not figure on maps 2.1 and 2.2; Caesar's *Trēs Galliae* 'Three Gauls' (*Gallic War* 1,1,1) may not be familiar to everyone; the general reader will probably know who Marcus Aurelius is (if only because his name was systematically mispronounced Marcus *Orillus* in Ridley Scott's 2000 movie *Gladiator*), but would s/he know Fronto (p. 127)?

I hope that these critical remarks show the interest with which I have read JC's important and welcome introduction to a booming field of research which should be of interest to sociolinguists and historical sociolinguists alike. May some of them find their way in a future revised edition for which, I am sure, there will be both a market and a demand. On a personal note, I believe that the book would benefit from paying a bit more attention to the continuity of the Latin and especially the Greek language, as I have indicated on several occasions. Many of the issues discussed have close parallels in the modern languages and it is profitable for both classicists and students of the latter to keep this in mind. There is no better way to make this point than to compare the extraordinary history of the Greek language and its speakers by JC's predecessor in Cambridge, Geoff Horrocks (2010).

Ghent University / Center for Hellenic Studies, Harvard University

---

[21] The transcription of the Aramaic examples on p. 154 is incorrect: *talitha qum* (ταλιθα κουμ in the Greek version, *Mark* 5,41) should be *ṭəlītā qūm*, *ʾAbbā́* (ἀββά in the Greek version, *Mark* 14,36) should be *ʾabbâ* (Janse 2014b, 240). The Aramaic spoken in Mel Gibson's 2004 movie *The Passion of the Christ* (mentioned on p. 154) is not Galilean or some other ancient Aramaic dialect, but loosely based on Chaldean Neo-Aramaic.

References

J. N. Adams 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, London.

J. N. Adams 1984. "Female Speech in Latin Comedy", *Antichthon* 18: 43–77.

J. N. Adams 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language,* Cambridge.

J. N. Adams 2007. *The Regional Diversification of Latin,* Cambridge.

J. N. Adams 2013. *Social Variation and the Latin Language,* Cambridge.

J. N. Adams 2016. *An Anthology of Informal Latin, 200 BC–AD 900: Fifty Texts with Translations and Linguistic Commentary,* Cambridge.

J. N. Adams – M. Janse – S. Swain (eds.) 2002. *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text,* Cambridge.

W. S. Allen 1987. *Vox Graeca: A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Greek* (3rd ed.), Cambridge.

W. S. Allen 1978. *Vox Latina: A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Latin* (2nd ed.), Cambridge.

D. Bain 1984. "Female Speech in Menander", *Antichthon* 18: 24–42.

D. Bain 1991. "Six Greek Verbs of Sexual Congress", *Classical Quarterly* 41: 51–77.

E. Bakker (ed.) 2010. *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language,* Malden – Mass. – Oxford.

R. S. P. Beekes 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. With the assistance of Lucien van Beek. Brill.

P. Brown 1968. "Christianity and Local Culture in Late Roman Africa", *Journal of Roman Studies* 58: 85–95.

R. F. Burton 1894, *The Carmina of Caius Valerius Catullus*. Now first completely Englished into verse and prose. London (privately printed).

J. K. Chambers – P. Trudgill 1998. *Dialectology* (2nd ed.), Cambridge.

P. Chantraine 1999. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque.* Avec un Supplément sous la direction de Alain Blanc, Paris.

A.-F. Christidis (ed.) 2007. *A History of Greek from the Beginnings to Late Antiquity,* Cambridge.

J. Clackson 2011. "The Social Dialects of Latin", in J. Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language*, Malden – Oxford, 505–26.

J. Clackson 2012a. "Oscan in Sicily", in O. Tribulato (ed.), *Language in Linguistic Contact in Sicily*, Cambridge, 132–48.

J. Clackson 2012b. "Language Maintenance and Language Shift in the Mediterranean World during the Roman Empire", in Mullen – James (2012), 36–57.

J. Clackson 2015. "*Latinitas*, Ἑλληνισμός and Standard Languages", *Studi e Saggi Linguistici* 53: 309–30.

J. Clackson – G. Horrocks 2007. *The Blackwell History of Latin,* Malden – Oxford.

R. Clogg 2013. *A Concise History of Greece* (3rd ed.), Cambridge.

S. Colvin 1999. *Dialect in Aristophanes: The Politics of Language in Ancient Greek Literature*, Oxford.

G. A. Deissmann 1923. *Licht vom Osten: Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt,* Tübingen.

E. Dickey 1996. *Greek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian,* Oxford.

M. Dubuisson 1981. "*Utraque lingua*", *L'Antiquité Classique* 50: 274–86.

T. Evans 2012. "Linguistic and Stylistic Variation in the Zenon Archive", In M. Leiwo – H. Halla-aho – M. Vieros (eds.), *Variation and Change in Greek and Latin*, Helsinki, 27–42.

C. Ferguson 1959. "Diglossia", *Word* 15: 325–40

T. Fögen 2003. *Utraque lingua: A Bibliography on Bi- and Multilingualism in Graeco-Roman Antiquity and Modern Times,* Essen.

T. Fögen 2010. "Female Speech", in Bakker (2010), 311–26.

G. K. Giannakis (ed.). 2014. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics.* (3 vols.), Leiden.

J. Henderson 1991. *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy* (2nd ed.), New York.

D. Holton – I. Manolessou 2010. "Medieval and Early Modern Greek", in: Bakker (2010), 539–63.

G. Horrocks 2010. *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers* (2nd ed.), Malden – Oxford.

M. Janse 2002. "Aspects of Bilingualism in the History of the Greek Language", in Adams et al. (2002), 332–90.

M. Janse 2007. "The Language of the New Testament", in A. -F. Christidis (ed.), *A History of Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, 646–53.

M. Janse 2008. "Grieks lichaam, Turkse ziel. Multiculturele symbiose in Cappadocië en de Cappadocische Diaspora [Greek Body, Turkish Soul. Multicultural Symbiosis in Cappadocia and the Cappadocian Diaspora]", in Danny Praet (ed.), *Us & Them: Essays over filosofie, politiek, religie en cultuur van de Antieke Oudheid tot Islam in Europa ter ere van Herman De Ley*, Gent, 107–37.

M. Janse 2014a. "Aischrology", In Giannakis (2014), 76–86.

M. Janse 2014b. "Bilingualism, Diglossia and Literacy in First-Century Jewish Palestine", in Giannakis (2014), 238–41.

N. P. Kontosopoulos 2001. *Διάλεκτοι και ιδιώματα της Νέας Ελληνικής* [Dialects and Accents of Modern Greek] (3rd ed.), Athens.

H. G. Liddell – R. Scott 1996. *A Greek English Lexicon.* Revised and augmented throughout by Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie. Oxford.

P. Mackridge 2009. *Language and National Identity in Greece, 1766–1976,* Oxford.

Y. Matras 2002. *Romani: A Linguistic Introduction*, Cambridge.

K. McDonald 2016. "The Sociolinguistics of Gender, Social Status and Masculinity in Aristophanes", *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics* 2: 155–88.

A. Mullen – P. James (eds.) 2012. *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman Worlds,* Cambridge.

C. Nicolas 1996. *Utraque lingua. Le calque sémantique: domaine gréco-latin,* Louvain.

S. Swain 2002. "Bilingualism in Cicero? The Evidence of Code-Switching", in Adams et al. (2002), 128–67.

J. B. Torres Guerra 2011. *Vtroque sermone nostro: Bilingüismo social y literario en el imperio de Roma,* Pamplona.

O. Tribulato (ed.) 2012. *Language and Linguistic Contact in Ancient Sicily,* Cambridge.

Ch. Tzitzilis 1987. *Die griechische Lehnwörter im Türkischen (mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der anatolischen Dialekten),* Wien.

A. Willi, Andreas 2002. "Languages on Stage: Aristophanic Language, Cultural History, and Athenian Identity", in Andreas Willi (ed.), *The Language of Greek Comedy*, Oxford, 111–50.

Willi, Andreas. 2003. *The Languages of Aristophanes: Aspects of Linguistic Variation in Classical Attic Greek.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

A. Willi 2010a. "Register Variation", In Bakker (2010), 297–310.

A. Willi 2010b. "The Language of Old Comedy", in G. W. Dobrov (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Study of Greek Comedy*, Leiden: Brill, Leiden, 471–508.