Remarks on code-switching in Cicero's letters to Atticus

By George E. Dunkel, Zurich

Bilingualism often induces deviations from the norms of one language due to the influence of the other. All such linguistic interference can be traced to two fundamental, polar mechanisms: borrowing and code-switching. Borrowing is practicable even for monoglots, since no knowledge of the other language's grammar is necessary. But code-switching – a single speaker's shifting between languages within an utterance, whether at or above the level of the single word – presupposes the entire other grammar and thus bilingualism as a *sine qua non.* Not only words can be borrowed, but also individual phonemes[1] and morphemes[2] and syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic elements as well. Although a natural division exists between the orthographically and inflectionally naturalised *Lehnwörter* and the fully Greek *Fremdwörter* and phrases which concern us here[3], distinguishing between the two fundamental mechanisms can be difficult precisely in the case of single words.

Such issues, about which an immense sociolinguistic literature has arisen since U. Weinreich's *Languages in Contact* of 1953, have, aside from the traditional study of loan-words, only slowly penetrated into classical philology[4]. M. Dubuisson has profitably applied sociolinguistics to such problems as why, during Caesar's murder, both the victim and his assassins may have shifted into Greek and to the various linguistic defense mechanisms provoked by the Roman inferiority complex as regards Greek[5]. But the specific motivations for the practice of code-switching, controversial in early Latin literature and banished entirely during the "classical gap"[6], have aroused comparatively little

1 As in the *oris ... vitia in peregrinum sonum corrupti* (foreign accent) which plagued some Roman boys due to their acquisition of Latin too late after Greek (Quint. *Inst.* 1.1.13).

2 As in 1.16.13 *non flocci fac*τεον, 7.17.2 Σηστιωδέστερον "more Sestian" and the passages of footnote 24.

3 The *Fremdwörter* were occasionally retranscribed, as in 14.14.2 *tyrannida* in Latin context beside 2.17.1 τυραννίδα in Greek context. On the borderline is e.g. 6.6.2 *de Eleusine*, with Greek stem but Latin ending.

4 Besides Kaimio 1979 (on which see M. Dubuisson, *Revue belge de philologie* 63, 1985, 108–115) see also L. Zgusta in: G. Neumann/J. Untermann (eds), *Die Sprachen im röm. Reich der Kaiserzeit* (Köln 1980) 121–145; recent surveys in *Kontaktlinguistik*, ed. H. Goebl *et al.* (Berlin 1996).

5 The first in Dubuisson 1980 (compare Dubuisson 1992: 193 n. 55), the second in *Les études classiques* 49 (1981) 27–45.

6 While Ennius had restricted himself to Greek constructions and figures, Lucilius' wholesale admixture of Greek words was severely criticised by Horace (*Sat.* 1.10.20–35; cf. Cicero, *Off.* 1.111). The technical pinnacle of code-switching in post-classical times is Ausonius' sixth epistle.

interest. O. Wenskus's welcome recent studies of "triggering" mechanisms use an achronic approach, mixing evidence from all periods[7]. I prefer to examine the phenomenon in one coherent corpus, in fact in an idiolect (Oksala 1953: 103): the fully bilingual[8] Cicero's letters to his equally philhellenic friend T. Pomponius, not for nothing called Atticus[9]. That the letters provide a trustworthy picture of Cicero's conversational persona is suggested by our knowledge that he usually wrote them personally (4.17.1; 5.19.1 *scripta mea manu*; 10.17.2; 11.24.2), as did Atticus[10], although at times both had to resort to dictation[11], and that they were published without major editing[12]. Although corruptions involving the Greek are frequent[13], a linguistic approach can help decide between proposed emendations.

Previous studies of Cicero's Graecisms have been largely atomistic and lexicographic[14], but isolated words can teach us little about syntactic issues; here we shall focus not on *which* words are used, but on *how* they are used. To do this, we must examine passages with clusters of Greek phrases and clauses rather than isolated words, and preferably in rapid-fire alternation with Latin rather than segregated into continuous Greek, such as[15] 1.12.1 σκήψεις *atque* ἀναβολαί, *sed nescio an* ταὐτόματον ἡμῶν; 2.3.3 *ad* ὑπόστασιν *nostram ac* πολιτείαν, *in qua* Σωκρατικῶς εἰς ἑκάτερον, *sed tamen, ad extremum*, ... τὴν ἀρέσκουσαν; 2.19.1 *ego fortasse* τυφλώττω *et nimium* τῷ καλῷ προσπέπονθα; 9.10.5 *quem* φιλόπατριν *ac* πολιτικόν; 10.18.1 *quod* εὐτόκησεν *gaudeo*; 14.22.2 φαινοπροσωπητέον *ergo et* ἰτέον *in castra*? Here, as Cicero plays the *saltator utrarumque linguarum*, we can profitably ask: are there grammatical constraints on this type of behavior? Is its distribution patterned? Are its motivations discernible?

We exclude from our corpus three categories of Greek. First, all identifiable literary quotations and proverbs. These are in general not syntactically in-

7 *Glotta* 71 (1993) 205–216; *IF* 100 (1995) 172–192; *IF* 101 (1996) 233–257.

8 As shown *inter alia* by his θέσεις πολιτικαί (*me exercens et disserens in utramque partem, tum graece tum latine*: 9.4.1; 9.9.1). See J. Marouzeau, *Quelques aspects de la formation du latin littéraire* (Paris 1949) 135.

9 Cicero often jocularly groups Atticus among the Greeks: 1.16.8 (*studium*) *contentionis, quem* ἀγῶνα *vos appellatis*; 4.4a.1 *indices ... quos vos Graeci, ut opinor*, σιλλύβους *appellatis.*

10 See 6.9.1; in 14.19.1 *aritia (sic enim tu ad me scripseras)*, Cicero comments on either the illegibility of Atticus' hand or (if for *avaritia*) the productivity of the *latrina*-law in his idiolect.

11 See 2.23.1; 4.16.1; 5.14.1; 8.12–3.1; 10.3a.1; 13.25.3; 14.21.4; 16.15.1.

12 The isolated *verum tamen* at the end of 13.2 and 14.8 suggests that these letters were sent off unfinished.

13 The incorporated gloss *quid est hoc* after τί ἐκ τούτου at 15.1.4 betrays the level of some copyists' Greek.

14 Tyrrell/Purser 1904: 85–87; R. Steele, *AJP* 21 (1900) 387–410; H. Rose, *JHS* 41 (1921) 91–116; Oksala 1953: 91–109; Kaimio 1979: 310–311; M. Puelma, *Frb. Zeitschr. Philos. Theol.* 33 (1986) 45–69; B. Baldwin, *Acta Classica* 35 (1992) 1–17.

15 About 130 passages contained Greek clustered densely enough to be useful for this study. The grammatical observations offered below are however based on the entire text.

tegrated into their context in any interesting way other than an occasional explicit labelling (or "flagging") with contextual indicators such as *ut aiunt* or *illud*[16]. But since this is not always the case, an unknown number of otherwise seemingly unmotivated switches may in fact involve unidentifiable citations. That even the recognisible passages and proverbs have often been playfully modified[17] or shortened[18] adds to the difficulty of tracking down any of the rest.

We also exclude the switches which are due to Cicero's quoting Atticus, as in 9.11.2 νέκυιαν, *ut tu appellas* and 9.18.2 *quae, ut tu soles dicere*, νέκυια, both referring to Atticus' sentence quoted in full at 9.10.7. To be sure, from these we can learn something about Atticus' own idiolect, which evidently included such personal shibboleths as exclamatory ἅλις[19] (2.1.8 *sed, ut tu ais*, ἅλις σπουδῆς; 2.19.1 *dices fortasse, "dignitatis* ἅλις *tamquam* δρυός"; 15.3.2 *de Quinto filio, ut scribis*, ἅλις) and ὑπέρευ "super-cool!" (10.1.3 *tua ista crebra* ἐκφώνησις); see also n. 10.

Finally we exclude three passages in continuous Greek: the θέσεις πολιτικαί of 9.4.1 and two disquisitions *graece* ἐν αἰνιγμοῖς (6.7.1, cf. 2.19.5) in which Cicero expresses suspicions about the honesty of his wife's freedman (6.4; 6.5). Although true switches, these all lack the linguistic transitions (called "smooth" when the language and syntactic boundaries agree, otherwise "ragged") which interest us.

That Cicero's matrix language is underlyingly Latin is shown by the fact that the particles, adverbs and complementisers generally remain Latin, as in the passages above[20]. Since the only Greek clauses which start with ὅτι, καί or the like are quotations[21] and the few entire Greek sentences which seem to be Cicero's own and not quotations[22] are surprisingly asyndetic, Shackleton-

16 E.g. 5.10.3 *O illud verum* ἔρδοι τις; 5.11.5 *si verum illud est* οἵαπερ ἡ δέσποινα; 9.9.1 *sed nosti illud* Διονύσιος ἐν Κορίνθῳ.

17 As in ἔργα λόγοιο 14.13.2 for ἔργα γάμοιο of *Il.* 5.429 and αἰδέομαι *non Pompeium modo, sed* Τρῶας καὶ Τρῳάδας (7.1.4, cf. also 7.12.3; 8.16.2; 13.13.2; 13.24.1; after *Il.* 6.442, quoted 2.5.1).

18 As in 9.15.3 τέτλαθι, κύντερον *ne illud quidem nostrum proprium*, contracting Hom. *Od.* 20.18, and 6.1.16 μηδὲν αὐτοῖς – *scis reliqua* and 13.20.4 μὴ γὰρ αὐτοῖς. On one-word sentences such as 14.21.3 βεβίωται and 13.31.3 κέκρικα see O. Wenskus, *Glotta* 71 (1993) 214f.

19 Like Achilles at Hom. *Il.* 9.376–377 ... ἅλις δέ οἱ· ἀλλὰ ἕκηλος / ἐρρέτω.

20 Compare also 15.17.2 *litterae sic et* φιλοστόργως *et* εὐπινῶς *scriptae*, 15.19.1 *est illud quidem* ἐργῶδες, *sed* ἀνεκτόν, and the frequent *sed* μελήσει(ς). In 1.14.4, hardly a quotation, Shackleton-Bailey's triple ἤ is therefore less likely than Purser's triple *si.*

21 13.42.1 καὶ μάλα κατηφής; 15.12.1 καὶ μάλα σεμνῶς; and probably 7.20.2 καὶ συναποθανεῖν <θέλω> as well. Compare 2.9.4; 2.12.4 καὶ Κικέρων ... ἀσπάζεται with 2.15.4 *ea ... et* Κικέρων *... salutem dicunt.*

22 2.17.1 ὁμολογουμένως τυραννίδα συσκευάζεται, 6.1.8 οὐκ ἔλαθέ σε, 9.7.3 εἰδώς σοι λέγω, 12.5.1 ποῖ ταῦτα ἄρα ἀποσκήψει, 12.12.2 ἀνεμέσητον γάρ, 12.51.2 τοῦτο δὲ μηλώσῃ, 15.12.2 (see below), 15.20.3 πάσχω τι; also with nominal predicates, 14.5.1 *a balneatore* φυρμὸς πολύς; 14.21.4, 16.1.4 λῆρος πολύς and 15.16a *sed nescio quo modo* οἶκος φίλος (cf. 4.8.1). 10.10.3 σύνες ὅ τοι λέγω probably quotes Pindar Fragment 105, and the tragic (pseudo-)Doric dialect implies that 15.12.2 τὰν δ' αἰτίαν τῶν Βρούτων τις ἔχει is a playfully modified quotation, al-

Bailey's sentence-initial αὐτίκα γὰρ at 6.9.2 does not agree with Cicero's own usage (but rather with the citation in 9.5.3). The reality of a Latin matrix constantly underlying the Greek is also suggested by the occasional outbursts of Latin in the midst of otherwise continuous Greek: 6.5.2 *hoc tu indaga, ut soles, at hoc magis*; 6.9.2 *si me amas*; 7.9.2 *et simul hoc* διευκρινήσεις πρόβλημα *sane*[23] πολιτικόν.

Incompatibility due to structural dissimilarity can engender constraints on shifting, as shown by the difficulty of mixing English and French within simple phrases like *white house* and *maison blanche.* Such friction can become serious when the grammars differ typologically, but this is not the case with the classical languages. Their relatively free word-order is complemented by the fundamental identity of their enclitics' behavior, so that Latin *-que* can easily conjoin Greek words and phrases[24]. Nominal congruence freely extends over language-boundaries[25], and attraction functions interlinguistically as well[26]. The different codings of the instrumental, locative and separative functions (as ablative in Latin, dative and genitive in Greek)[27] and details of verbal government (κλῦθι μευ but *audi me*)[28] are far outweighed by the many "striking" (usually inherited) agreements in case usage such as the partitive genitive[29]. While prepositional phrases usually remain monolingual, Greek nouns are often governed

though its source remains unknown; it might however be a deliberate literary joke. The variant τῶνδε is less powerful.

23 Why not πάνυ (cf. 15.27.1)? Banal insertions at 9.13.4 *inquit* Πλάτων, 9.15.4 *ut ait ille*, 10.1.1 *inquit ille.* 9.10.8 τὸ μέλλον *ibi* καραδοκήσεις is due to Atticus.

24 12.4.2 ψιλῶς*que*; 13.51.1 πρὸς ἴσον ὅμοιόν*que*; 15.13a.2 *nos hic* φιλοσοφοῦμεν ... *et* τὰ περὶ τοῦ καθ<ήκ>οντος *magnifice explicamus* προσφωνοῦμεν*que Ciceroni.* Greek enclitics follow only Greek words (15.20.3 πάσχω τι, 9.4.3 τῶν προὔργου τι), which speaks for Shackleton-Bailey *est magnum et* and against Wesenberg's *et magnum* τι at 10.1.3.

25 4.6.3 *ne* βαθύτης *mea, quae* ...; 5.10.3; 6.1.2 *meam* βαθύτητα; 12.12.1 *germanam* ἀποθέωσιν. The rule that greek compound adjectives lack a separate feminine is scrupulously observed: 2.14.1 *has actiones* εὐανατρέπτους; 6.1.2 *ad me* ... ὑπομεμψιμοίρους *litteras miserat*; 14.10.1 *itaque* γῆν πρὸ γῆς *cogito; tua tamen* ὑπηνέμιος.

26 Attraction into the case of the relative clause in 13.37.4 *de ceteris quae scribis* ἀνεμοφόρητα; gender attraction (with ragged boundary): 1.18.6 *sed interea* πολιτικὸς ἀνὴρ οὐδ' ὄναρ *quisquam inveniri potest.*

27 Latin ablatives are usually rendered with Greek datives (n. 28 and 30), although for the true ablative see 5.19.3 τὸ νεμεσᾶν *interest* τοῦ φθονεῖν.

28 Note the Greek dative for the Latin (instrumental) ablative in 6.2.3 *idque* τῷ τῶν νεῶν καταλόγῳ *confirmabat*, 16.4.4 *uti* ὁμοπλοίᾳ, 16.7.3 *opus est* σχολίῳ and, without explicit case-marking (due to interference from Latin), 13.27.1 *quid opus est* παρακινδυνεύειν?

29 7.2.1 *hunc* σπονδειάζοντα *si cui voles* τῶν νεωτέρων *pro tuo vendito*; 7.11.1 *ne umbram quidem* ... τοῦ καλοῦ. Common but not inherited is the dative of agent with perfect passives: 14.21.3 *sed mihi quidem* βεβίωται (cf. 12.2.2 *homini* ... βεβίωται) and gerunds: 10.1a.4 *mihi* ... πολιτευτέον *fuit.*

by the prepositions of the matrix[30]; Latin case-forms depending on a Greek preverb[31] or preposition[32] are rarer.

Still, nouns are in any case relatively simple to insert; a more telling index of the syntactic depth of code-switching is the use of finite verbs. Here too, shared nominal morphosyntax such as accusative-infinitival indirect statement[33] and passive infinitives[34] helps to ease the transitions. But switching with "smooth" boundary between conditional protasis and apodosis is simple enough[35]. Of the 61 Greek finite verbs used by Cicero to Atticus outside of quotations and continuous Greek[36], only eleven occur in subordinate clauses.

This brings us to one major syntactic constraint on code-switching detectable in these letters: the complete absence of subordinate optatives. This is quite striking in comparison to the frequency of subordinate infinitives and indicatives[37], and is evidently due to friction between the two systems of temporal "sequence" of subordinate subjunctives when the main verb is preterital: in Greek they are replaced by a different mode (the optative), but in Latin by a

30 E.g. 12.5.1 *non ad* διψῶσαν κρήνην *sed ad* Πειρήνην. The Greek dative for a Latin ablative is comprehensible when its function is locative (4.16.3 *in* πολιτείᾳ; 6.6.2 *de* προπύλῳ; 16.8.2 *numquam in maiore* ἀπορίᾳ *fui*, 16.5.3 *de* ὁμοπλοίᾳ) or instrumental (without preposition: 5.21.2 *nullo nostro* εὐημερήματι and 10.11.4 *illo Rhodiorum* ἀφράκτῳ) but odd for a true ablative (13.21.3 *ab* ἐποχῇ; 16.11.1 *sine* φαλλῷ [codd. *vallo*] *Luciliano*). Here one wonders whether the phonetic overlap in [-ō], [-ē] and [-ā] served as a trigger – somewhat like like the overlapping [-t-] in *factus* and -τέον (n. 2).

31 As are the datives in 1.14.4 ἐνεπερπερευσάμην *novo auditori Pompeio*, 5.12.2 *cui* ... συνηγωνίων, 5.17.2 *omnes* ... συμφιλοδοξοῦσιν *gloriae meae*, *et al.*

32 I have noted only 16.15.3 ἐν πολιτικῷ *genere*, with a ragged switch in mid-noun-phrase.

33 2.10.1 *est enim* ὑποσόλοικον, ... *repente* ἀναφαίνεσθαι ... *inepte peregrinantem*; 7.2.4 *te* ... *laetor* ... *probari tibi* φυσικήν *esse*; 7.8.5 *est enim* ἄμορφον, ἀντιπολιτευομένου χρεωφειλέτην *esse* (with ragged boundaries between copulas and predicates); 8.8.2 *at ille tibi* πολλὰ χαίρειν τῷ καλῷ *dicens*; 12.25.2 *scio me* τετυφῶσθαι; 13.21a.1 *ne videar* περὶ μικρὰ σπουδάζειν. But also: 10.18.1 *quod* εὐτόκησεν *gaudeo*. The subject infinitive of 5.19.3 was quoted in n. 27.

34 2.6.1 *nec tam possunt* ἀνθηρογραφεῖσθαι *quam videbantur*; 2.14.1 *malim* ἐντυραννεῖσθαι; 13.13.1 *scire cupio quem intellexeris ab eo* ζηλοτυπεῖσθαι; 16.7.8 *Piliam* πειράζεσθαι παραλύσει *te scripsisse aiebat.*

35 2.16.4 *si possunt, ... ego faciam*; εἰ δὲ μή, ... *malo* ...; 13.37.2 φοβερ<ὸν> ἂν ἦν, *nisi viderem*, 15.12.2 *bona indoles*, ἐὰν διαμείνῃ.

36 The distribution of the persons is: first singular 26, plural 7; second 8/∅; third 18/2.

37 Many subordinate infinitives have already been quoted; the subordinate indicatives occur at 1.14.4 *quo modo* ἐνεπερπερευσάμην, 5.12.2. *cui* ... συνηγωνίων, 9.10.4 *quam tu* ... ὑποκορίζῃ, 9.13.4 *quos Matius* ἐλάπιζεν, 10.18.1 *quod* εὐτόκησεν *gaudeo*, 12.12.2 *etsi* μεθαρμόσομαι, 13.49.1 *qui quidem* ... μέμψιν ἀναφέρει *mihi*, 14.5.1 *quoniam* ᾐσίτησας, 15.29.2 *etsi* ἐβδελυττόμην. The only subordinate subjunctives are at 15.12.2, quoted in the previous footnote, and 12.3.2 *ne talis vir* ἀλογηθῇ (cf. 9.4.3 *ne tibi* ἄκαιρος *sim*). The latter is also the only instance of a ragged switch between a negation and a verb; typical are 6.1.8 οὐκ ἔλαθέ σε *illud*, 13.38 *sed fortasse* οὐκ ἐπέστησεν, 16.15.3 μηδὲ σωθείην. On 1.18.6 οὐδὲ ... *quisquam* see n. 26.

past tense of the same mode. This annoying difference[38] led to the avoidance of such constructions.

True interference, i.e. deviation from Greek syntax, is seen when Greek nouns appear in the Latin exclamatory accusative instead of in the genitive (as is normal in Greek: 10.15.2; 12.9, *et al.*): 6.1.18 *O* ἀνιστορησίαν *turpem*! (so soon after 6.1.17 ὢ πραγμάτων ἀσυγκλώστων!), 10.17.1 *quam in me incredibilem* ἐκτένειαν! and 13.52.2 *O hospitem mihi tam gravem* ἀμεταμέλητον! Also un-Attic is the Greek infinitive in an oblique case but without the article: 13.27.1 *quid opus est* παρακινδυνεύειν? In general surprisingly little use is made of the Greek article, in theory at least a useful addition to the Latin grammatical panoply.

Turning now to the motivation of code-switching, at the level of the word the major cause is, as has long been known, the need for technical vocabulary. Most single Greek words in our text are terms from Greek-created and -dominated disciplines such as medicine, philosophy, rhetoric, physics, poetics and literary criticism, publishing, politics, education, seafaring, and warfare. Such one-word Graecisms are much more rarely "flagged" than the citations and proverbs[39]. The still-Greek *Fremdwörter* do not belong to both lexica as do the naturalised *Lehnwörter*, which is why Cicero is indeed switching rather than borrowing. Clustering of technical terms can be exemplified by 2.3.2–3 (geometry, rhetoric), 2.6.1; 2.17 (politics), or 15.13a.2 (literary; quoted in n. 24). The effect is of toggling back and forth between languages but the actual mechanism consists of just dropping Greek words, usually nominal in nature, into Latin slots. This leads to Latin syntax filled with Greek forms, as in 13.21.3 *similem facit* ἐποχῇ.

All such "need-filling" code-switching[40] aside, we confront the remaining idiosyncratic switches into Greek. The use of code-switching as a discourse marking procedure (to indicate topic change and the like), though frequently mentioned in the sociolinguistic literature, seems to be not at all characteristic of Cicero. Turning to M. von Albrecht's observation that Greek provided both a low-key solidarity with the addressee and an urbane distancing from the subject matter (1973: 1274–1275), at least three distinct social factors which lead to switches inexplicable technically can be identified; these illuminate certain attitudes of Cicero's milieu as well as his own socio-pragmatic self-image.

38 Seen historically, the entire concept of tense relationships among the modes is a remarkable parallel innovation of the classical languages.

39 See n. 9 and 4.16.2 *ut Aristoteles in iis quos* ἐξωτερικοὺς *vocat*; 13.44.2 *sed, ut aiunt*, μνημονικὸν ἁμάρτημα.

40 An alternative interpretation of these in terms of diglossia, the socially conditioned use of "dialects", would certainly seem forced.

First, Greek was felt to be the proper language of conspiracy[41]. This signaling function explains such otherwise apparently unmotivated but mysterious sounding switches as 2.16.4 εἰ δὲ μή, 2.17.3 περὶ τῶν ὅλων, cf. 13.40.2 τὰ ὅλα ... *ut sciam*; 5.4.2 πρόσνευσιν *sustulisti*; 5.14.3 *illud* ἐνδόμυχον; and perhaps 15.12.2 τὰν δ' αἰτίαν τῶν Βρούτων τις ἔχει (though see n. 22). It also supports Tyrrell's conjecture in 9.5.4: *ex eo fortasse* νέα *consilia nascentur aliaeque litterae.* It further explains why Cicero used Greek for security in 6.4 and 6.5 even though Greek was the slave population's *lingua franca.* Of course, slave-Koiné need not have been particularly subtle (witness the proletarian Greek in Plautus and Petronius), and in any case Cicero took the additional precaution of using code-names (2.20.3 ἀλληγορίαις *obscurabo*, 13.32.3 διὰ σημείων). More importantly, comprehensibility was not the point because the coding was not linguistic but social: it was simply felt to be μυστικώτερον (6.4.3, cf. 4.2.7), when being tricky or sneaky, to use Greek.

Psycho-social and emotional life also provoke clusters of Greek: 1.14.6 ἀπρακτότατος, καχέκτης; 2.10.1 (quoted n. 33); 2.12 (entire); 7.8.5 ἄμορφον; 8.16.2; 9.7.2 ἀπάντησις (with Caesar), 9.1.3 ἀναπάντητον; 9.10.2 ἐν τοῖς ἐρωτικοῖς; 10.11.5 ἀποτόμως – θυμικώτερον; 13.9 (entire); 15.14.4 *ita sum* μετέωρος; 15.17.1 φιλοστόργως, 15.26.1 ἀτοπώτατον; 15.29.2 οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο(ν); 16.15.2 δυσωπίαν ... In fact, almost all of the expressions for which Tyrrell (1904: 86) suggested French or slang translations belong to this sphere. This is not just etiquette or a party-lingo of fun times; the profound effect of Greek as the language of nannies and pedagogues in upper-class families (and therefore as the boys' *de facto* first language)[42] is betrayed by Cicero's reversion to Greek at emotional high points (13.29.1) and especially when mentioning his son (2.15.4 *ea tibi igitur et* Κικέρων, ἀριστοκρατικώτατος παῖς, *salutem dicunt*[43], 7.17.4 *pueros* ὑπεκθέμενος *in Graeciam*) or daughter (10.8.9 *est* στοργή, *est summa* σύντηξις) or even chatting with his nephew (13.42.1, unless these be quotes from Menander).

Finally, many switches are due to the desire for humor, high-spirited male bonding or cameraderie (von Albrecht 1973: 1275; above n. 9. 10. 22). Naturally citations can serve humorous purposes as well. Sheer human playfulness (above n. 17. 18) should not be underestimated as a motivation for code-switching, despite the inherent difficulty of cold philological proof. The reverse phenomenon is at any rate easy to observe: Cicero's abstention from Greek when he was feeling down. Although Greek is far more frequent in the Atticus letters than in the others (Oksala 1953: 104), its distribution within our corpus is notably uneven. Books 3, written in exile (58–57), and 11, from Brundisium in 47

41 Von Albrecht 1973: 1275; Dubuisson 1992: 193f.: "langue de connivence". However: 10.11.4 *nos iam nihil nisi occulte.*

42 On Greek as the language of intimacy, deep emotions and in fact of the subconscious in the Roman upper class see Dubuisson 1980: 886ff.; 1992: 193.

43 Contrast the cooler 7.7.7 *Alexim, humanissimum puerum, ... salvere iubeas velim.*

while Tullia was sick and Cicero's position precarious, are totally lacking in Greek. After the hysterically lighthearted 12.12, directly after the death of Tullia (Feb. 45), book 12 is also remarkably low in Greek.

The result of all these factors combined is virtuoso switching between languages and topics, as exemplified by 5.20.6; 6.1; 13.27.1 or 13.52. Space limitations prevent me from examining here the further conditioning factors of sentence-rhythm and the place of writing.

Repeated references

M. von Albrecht 1973	"M. T. Cicero, Sprache und Stil, Ciceros Briefe", *RE* Supplementband 13, 1271–1286.
M. Dubuisson 1980	"«Toi aussi, mon fils!»", *Latomus* 39 (1980) 881–890.
M. Dubuisson 1992	"Le grec à Rome à l'époque de Cicéron", *Annales* 47 (1992) 187–206.
J. Kaimio 1979	*The Romans and the Greek Language*, Soc. scient. fenn., commentat. human. litterarum 64 (Helsinki 1979).
P. Oksala 1953	*Die griech. Lehnwörter in den Prosaschriften Ciceros*, Ann. acad. scient. fenn. 80 (Helsinki 1953).
R. Tyrrell/L. Purser 1904	*The Correspondence of Cicero* I (Dublin 1904).