Chapter III

The Background to Standardization

3.1 Introduction

The story of Latin in the centuries following its earliest attestations provides one of the first, and certainly one of the most important, examples of how the prestige of a 'standard language' and the benefits deriving from its use in the context of a rapidly expanding imperialist state can not only put great pressure on other varieties (thereby encouraging convergence in the direction of the norm), but also hasten the wholesale abandonment of other languages spoken by minorities within a larger political structure. The adoption or imposition of such a superordinate variety across ethnically, culturally and linguistically diverse communities may therefore have a dramatic impact, both in matters of language choice and ethnic identity, and in terms of shifting attitudes towards language, typically reflected as a growing resistance to change in the dominant language. The history of Latin offers many insights into these and related issues, and it is often revealing to compare the role of Latin in the western Roman Empire with the role of English today as a 'global language' (for which see Crystal (1997)).

In order to prepare the ground for the detailed discussion of later chapters we must first examine the notion of a standard language a little more carefully (see Joseph 1987, Hudson 1996: ch. 2, Downes 1998: ch. 2, Milroy and Milroy 1999 for a range of views), and then outline the long-term impact of the geographical spread of Latin occasioned by centuries of Roman conquest (see Dalby 2002: ch. 2, and especially Adams 2003).

3.2   How and Why Standard Languages Develop

Living, spoken languages are networks of continua, lacking clearly demarcated boundaries between their different varieties, whether geographical or social. Synchronic heterogeneity and diachronic change are, and have always been, the norm for most varieties of most languages for most of human history, though this basic fact has to a great extent been obscured in a world where the existence of, and need for, standard written languages is increasingly taken for granted.

But standard languages, often functioning specifically as 'national' or 'imperial' languages, are far from universal, and are by definition anomalous with respect to more regular, i.e. historically related, varieties, which, as spoken media, have typically evolved quite freely in the communities that use them under a range of essentially local linguistic and social pressures. It is precisely the establishment of a standard that first motivates the idea of a 'language' distinct from, and superordinate to, its (substandard) 'dialects', and which in turn leads to all the familiar notions of correctness and prestige deemed to characterize the former to the detriment of the latter. Standard languages emerge and are maintained through the conscious and protracted intervention of elites seeking to privilege a particular version of a language (i.e. the one based on the way they speak and, above all, write), and to this end they will usually employ all the resources of a centralized state to impose and reinforce their linguistic preferences and prejudices. The motives for doing this are, in practice, quite variable, but a fully developed standard is always autonomous with respect to all other varieties, existing on a higher level and, given a context of formal instruction and at least limited literacy, increasingly shaping their evolution as a norm imposed 'from above'.

The emergence of a standard is most naturally associated with state formation, or with the prosecution of imperial ambitions on the part of a state, in combination with the pressure for cultural innovation that the acquisition of empire typically engenders. A good example of this from the ancient world is provided by the development of the Attic dialect of ancient Greek as a standard (viz. the Koine, i.e. 'common dialect') in the context of the Athenian, Macedonian and Roman empires (Horrocks 1997: chs 3, 4 and 5). One obvious characteristic of such standard languages is the very high level of innovative vitality and functional elaboration that follows directly from their central role in law, government and education, and, in artistically modified variants, in literature, science and philosophy.

The prestige that arises from this association with high-level administrative and cultural activity attaches also to those able to deploy them effectively, i.e. the ruling classes and those who aspire to power and influence

under their patronage. In these circumstances a standard language may readily evolve into an important symbol of a state and of what it represents, at least in the minds of those in whose interests it is organized, but often also more generally, as a trickle-down effect of elite dominance of the political and cultural agenda. To participate fully in the life and work of the state it becomes essential to be able to use the standard, with consequential loss of status for other, increasingly parochial, languages and dialects with correspondingly restricted functional domains. The existence of a standard may therefore have the effect of encouraging communities to abandon their linguistic inheritance, as speakers and their families come to appreciate the advantages associated with the acquisition and use of the norm, a process which, over time, then contributes directly to the development of a sense of political unity and shared identity at the expense of more traditional, local sentiment.

A common, if irrational, consequence of the role and status of standard languages is a belief that these alone have the 'precise, logical structure' or 'aesthetic excellence' required for philosophy or literary composition. In truth all varieties have coherent grammars (otherwise they would be unlearnable and unusable), even if only the standard is thought worthy of formal codification; and any dialect is in principle capable of elaboration into a literary medium (cf., for example, the various literary dialects of ancient Greece before the emergence of Attic as a standard), even if the establishment of a standard language before, or in tandem with, the emergence of a literary culture may prevent this from occurring in specific cases. Those who interview candidates for admission to read Classics in British universities are still often told that much of the appeal of Latin as a language lies in its 'precision' and 'elegance'. To the extent that these qualities are indeed characteristic of Latin, they are characteristic of standardized Latin in the form in which it was codified in antiquity, a form of the language in which a great deal of earlier phonological, morphological, lexical and syntactic variety had been consciously suppressed by the 'great' authors of the late Republic and early Empire (thereby creating, *inter alia*, a higher than usual level of precision and consistency) whose works were then taken to constitute a literary canon at the heart of a great cultural tradition (a corpus therefore embodying, by virtue of its 'classic' status, the essence of correct and elegant usage).

Codification of a language, in the form of written grammars and lexica, coupled with the establishment of a canon illustrating the 'best' usage, typically leads to a growing resistance to change; if best practice is thought to be contained in and defined by such books, then any change must, by definition, be change for the worse, a view routinely endorsed by educational establishments with a vested interest in managing perceptions of language so as to highlight their own role as guardians and purveyors

of 'true' knowledge. (Kaster 1988 provides much illuminating discussion of the role of the grammarian in late antiquity in this regard). In time, then, a standard may come to be seen as the instantiation of a language in its 'ideal' form, and a whole linguistic ideology may evolve that runs entirely counter to what, in reality, is the natural state of affairs, viz. a world of linguistic heterogeneity and change.

It should be emphasized here that none of these developments is likely to occur unless a language has first been written down; the very idea of standardization, involving a lengthy process of selection, elaboration, codification and dissemination, presupposes that language is seen first and foremost as a tangible and permanent 'thing' rather than as manifesting itself primarily in a transitory stream of sound. The extent to which modern states prioritize the written over the spoken is obvious ('can I have that in writing?'), and this perception is reflected in many different ways, not least in an instinctive tendency to talk about 'pronouncing letters', or in casually dismissive attitudes to languages that have never been written, or have only marginal written functions. It has been estimated that such languages are currently being lost at the rate of approximately two per week as standardized languages with international, even global reach undermine their role in the communities that use them. As we shall see below, *mutatis mutandis*, things were not so very different in the Roman Empire.

3.3   The Roman Context

3.3.1   *Rome and Italy*

Even in the regal period, before the supposed foundation of the Republic in 509 BC, Rome had begun to expand at the expense of the city's neighbours, but the process gathered momentum under the Republic, and by the beginning of the third century only the Gauls in the north still posed any kind of threat to Roman dominance (see Cornell 1995 for a thorough and up-to-date account of Rome's beginnings). One major consequence of Roman expansion, notwithstanding the economic and political crises of the later Republic, was the gradual emergence of a sense of common purpose and common identity throughout Italy. This is a remarkable outcome when one recalls that Italy in the earliest period of Roman conquest was still extraordinarily diverse in terms of ethnicity, social and political organization, religion, language and material culture (see Chapter II). One significant feature of central Italian society at this time, however, was an apparent freedom of movement between local communities and their mutual openness to outsiders, as stories about the seizure of power at Rome by Etruscan kings and, shortly after the fall of the

monarchy, the admission of the Sabine aristocrat Appius Claudius to the Roman community suggest. This openness largely persisted, partly out of enlightened self-interest, in the years that followed. Thus those living in Rome were either Roman citizens, whether of patrician or plebeian origin, or slaves, but slaves freed by Roman citizens became citizens themselves, and Roman citizenship was soon made available to, or in some cases imposed on, first the other Latin communities and then progressively other Italian peoples, albeit often after ruthless conquest and the founding of defensive *coloniae* in newly acquired territories (David 1996).

But even though Roman power had extended throughout Italy, including the Po valley, by the early second century BC, it had not yet effaced the many differences, cultural, political and linguistic, that traditionally separated the many peoples of the peninsula and its neighbouring islands. Nonetheless, the virulent opposition to Roman power characteristic of the early period of Roman expansion in the fifth and fourth centuries had already started to given way to a growing sense of unity. Consider, for example, Hannibal's failure in the Second Punic War of 218–201 BC to drive any serious wedge between Rome and her Italian allies, despite the defection of Capua. In this evolving context we find communities voluntarily adopting Latin alongside, or instead of, their own languages, in recognition of changes in their status or in pursuit of the advantages that the use of Latin might bring, politically and commercially. Thus the multi-ethnic Italian trading community operating on Delos in the last centuries of the Republic very naturally used Latin for the conduct of its affairs (albeit alongside Greek, see Adams 2002, 2003: ch. 6 for details), while in 180 BC the town of Cumae formally asked the Roman Senate for permission to use Latin rather than Oscan as its official language.

(1) Livy 40.42
Cumanis   eo   anno   petentibus permissum ut publice Latine
Cumaeans-DAT that-ABL year-ABL asking-DAT (was-)permitted that publicly   in-Latin

loquerentur   et praeconibus   Latine uendendi ius
speak-3pl.IMPF.SUBJ and auctioneers-DAT in-Latin selling-GEN right

esset.
be-3sg.IMPF.SUBJ

'That year permission was granted to the Cumaeans, at their request, to speak on official matters in Latin, and for their auctioneers to have the right to sell in Latin.'

Cumae had been the first Greek colony on the mainland of Italy, but it was conquered by the Oscan-speaking Samnites during the fifth century

before finally being made a *ciuitas sine suffragio* in 338 BC (i.e. its citizens then had the 'private' rights of Roman citizenship, plus the duty to serve in the army, but lacked the 'public' right to vote). Since citizenship automatically entailed a closer political and cultural affinity with Rome, presumably including the wider use of Latin on an informal basis, we might be tempted to interpret Livy's account in (1) as pointing to some issue of public law. But given that there was no legal requirement to ask for permission to use Latin, the request seems rather to have a more symbolic function, namely to confirm that the Cumaeans' attitude to Latin was a strongly positive one and that they wanted the Romans to know they were using Latin, as an expression of their new identity and allegiance.

Other evidence in this period for the spread of Roman cultural influence, always reinforced by the realities of Roman power, is provided by the obvious competence of Italian writers in Latin. The spectacular overseas conquests of the third and second centuries (see 3.3.2 below) created a new self-confidence in the Roman ruling class which led some, for the first time, to lend their patronage to literary composition in Latin. The so-called 'Scipionic circle' of the later second century, supposedly comprising a group of eminent Roman aristocrats with Hellenizing interests and a commitment to making the ruling class less 'provincial' and more 'worthy' of its imperial mission, may well be the product of wishful thinking in Cicero's time, but the fact remains that, even though Rome itself produced the first prose writers in Latin, all the earliest poets writing in Latin were Italians enjoying Roman patronage, with Naevius and Lucilius coming from Campania, Ennius and Pacuvius from the far southeast (Calabria to the Romans, but now part of Apulia/Puglia), Plautus (probably) and Accius from Umbria, and Caecilius from Cisalpine Gaul.

Inscriptions too provide significant information about the progress of Romanization, including changes in the use of language reflecting the impact of Roman institutions (such as the introduction of Roman titles for local magistrates), the appearance of Latin in official functions alongside or instead of local languages, and changes in onomastic usage marking the adoption of Roman-style civic status. Nor should we forget the role of Latin as the sole language of command in the Roman army, in which large Italian contingents served during the Punic wars and continued to serve in the wars of overseas conquest of the second century BC. Furthermore, the wider use of Latin greatly facilitated trade and communication across Italy, and this was later reinforced by large-scale population movements, especially in the first century, when many new colonies were established in order to give military veterans the land promised by their commanders.

Slowly, and with varying rates of success, the use of Latin therefore spread. Initially learned as a second language, it soon became a first

language for many Italians, as younger generations began to turn their backs on the traditional languages of their communities in favour of the only language that promised access to the means of advancement on the 'national' stage. In Umbria, for example, the Latin alphabet probably replaced the native alphabet during the late second century BC, when Latin inscriptions also begin to appear, and Umbrian itself quickly disappears from the written record after the Social War (91–87 BC, fought between Rome and its allies – *socii* – over the issue of full political rights, the granting of which was crucial to the eventual Roman victory). Though this almost certainly does not imply the immediate demise of Umbrian as a spoken language, it reflects directly the consequences of the granting of the full Roman franchise and the associated adoption of Latin as the official language of a newly 'Roman' community (cf. Bradley 2000 for an extended treatment of this and other related issues). Similar observations apply in Oscan-speaking areas, where Latin again replaces the local language in official written documents during the first half of the first century, though in this case there are a handful of graffiti from Pompeii that are certainly later (a couple may even have been scratched after the first earthquake in 63 AD), thus confirming its continued informal use for a while at least.

In Etruria, by contrast, despite a few Latin inscriptions from Veii from the third century BC (viz. a collection of dedications on altars to individuals and Roman deities), most cities seem already to have adopted the official use of Latin by the end of the second century, with Latin again becoming dominant after the Social War (see Bonfante and Bonfante 2002). Though formal bilingual inscriptions continue into the first century (e.g. the funerary dedications from Arretium (Arezzo), *c*.40 BC or later), these are all largely onomastic in character and there is good reason to think the language was no longer properly understood. Similar remarks apply *a fortiori* to later references to the practices of Etruscan priests (e.g. in AD 408 Etruscan *fulguriatores* offered to avert the threatened Gothic sack of Rome by reciting special prayers). Unsurprisingly, there is also good epigraphic evidence for the tenacity of Greek in some areas, e.g. Locri, where inscriptions continue beyond the end of the Social War, though Greek, of course, had the unique advantage of continuing prestige as a written medium (in the form of the standardized Koine and its literary variants), and the language was in any case extremely well-entrenched as a spoken medium in Sicily and the South, continuing in use in remote parts of (modern) Calabria and Apulia to the present day.

The acquisition of full Roman citizenship did not therefore entail the immediate abandonment of local languages, even as written media. Over time, however, Roman norms and standards were adopted almost everywhere, as Italians joined the community of Roman citizens and the

former city states lost their old importance. No doubt self-interested aristocrats, particularly in areas where the local identity lacked prestige, very quickly associated themselves with the 'superior' culture of those who governed the growing empire, while elsewhere others continued to take a genuine pride in their local history and traditions. But by the end of the first century BC, under the influence of Hellenistic and Roman models and the impact of Roman realpolitik, the peoples of Italy as a whole had effectively united under a single identity, that of a conquering nation with Latin as its national language, now the common language of trade, law, literature and government. We may usefully note here Quintilian's approach to defining what was 'native' in Latin: *licet omnia Italica pro Romanis habeam* (1.5.57), 'I am allowed to regard all Italian (words) as Roman.'

3.3.2   Rome and the Mediterranean

The last two centuries of the Roman Republic saw not only the transformation of Italian society and its economy but also the extension of Roman power throughout the Mediterranean. It has often been argued that the conquests of the third and second centuries BC were the unplanned result of a series of defensive campaigns fought against the Carthaginians and the Hellenistic monarchies, even if allowance is made for a more ruthless approach in the final period of the Republic, after the dictatorship of Sulla (*c*.138–78 BC, appointed dictator 82 BC), when personal greed and political corruption supposedly came to the fore. More recently, however, others have argued that greed and ambition were major factors all along, and that the changes observable in the late Republic reflect the fundamental shift of power from the senate and people to individuals such as Pompey and Caesar (see Beard and Crawford 1999 for some helpful discussion).

   Whatever the actual motivations, and these are likely to have been both varied and complex, it has been fairly noted that the one-year term of office legally available to Republican generals positively encouraged aggressive pursuit of the material rewards and personal prestige to be derived from a victorious short-term campaign outside Italy. Such campaigns required armies to be raised, as did the subsequent control of conquered provinces (even if formal annexation did not always follow immediately), and these armies were in large part demanded from, and supplied by, the Italian allies in recognition of Roman leadership of the peninsula. Maintenance of a leadership manifested primarily in the right to demand troops rather than taxes therefore required conquest if those troops were to be usefully deployed, and conquest brought enormous benefits to both Rome and Italy in the form not only of personal wealth for the ruling

senatorial elite but also of profitable tax-collecting contracts for the
publicani (men of equestrian status), while the recycling of this vast new
wealth in the form of building contracts and increased trade created many
business and employment opportunities further down the social scale.
This new level of economic activity was in turn stimulated by the fact
that provincials, who in the period of the Principate were increasingly
able to acquire citizenship (a process culminating in the granting of
citizenship to all free inhabitants of the Empire by Caracalla (Aurelius
Antoninus) in AD 212), were obliged to sell a proportion of their pro-
duce in order to pay their taxes, a situation which prompted urbaniza-
tion in so far as towns provided the necessary facilities for the efficient
exchange of goods and services. The economic unity of the Empire, based
on the growing interdependence of Rome and its provinces, thus quickly
took shape, and the kind of cultural and linguistic influences described
above in the Italian context also began to take hold further afield – though
in the East, as we shall see, Latin more than met its match in Greek.

3.3.3   Language diversity and language 'death' in the Roman Empire

It is hard to assess the number of languages spoken around the
Mediterranean at the beginning of the first century BC, since it is cer-
tain that many were never written, while the records of others are often
sparse, and difficult or impossible to interpret; some 'survive' only in the
form of place names etc., a notoriously difficult form of evidence to work
with. What follows is therefore only a partial survey, which also ignores
the many languages of Italy south of the Po (for which see Chapter II,
and 3.2.1 above; Adams 2003: ch. 2 provides a detailed treatment).

Beginning in the Iberian peninsula, much of the centre and north was
occupied by Celtic peoples commonly referred to as Celtiberians. There
are some written texts, including the famous bronze tablet of Botorrita,
which can now be partly read. The Mediterranean coast (including part
of southern France), apart from the Greek and Punic (Carthaginian) colonies
there, was occupied by a people known as Iberians. There are a number
of texts in Iberian, and the phonetic values of the characters used to write
it are now known, though the language itself (non-IE) remains uninter-
pretable. In the southwest there is also some evidence for a language known
as Tartessian, while further north, in much of the territory of modern
Portugal, a language called Lusitanian was spoken (which some have sought,
with little supporting evidence, to classify as Celtic).

In Gaul (France) the majority population was of Celtic origin, and Gaulish
varieties of Celtic had already displaced a number of earlier languages.
Celtic languages had also spread into northern Italy (Cisalpine Gaulish

and Lepontic), where Venetic (IE, possibly Italic), Raetic (non-IE, conceivably related to Etruscan) and Ligurian (only vestigially attested) were also spoken. But southwestern Gaul together with part of north-eastern Spain (Navarre bordering the Pyrennes) was inhabited by a non-Celtic people whom the Romans called Aquitani. After the Roman conquest the Aquitani began to write in Latin, but the surviving texts (mainly votive and funerary incriptions) contain many Aquitanian names. These are unmistakably Basque in their morphological structure and phonology, and it is now generally accepted that Aquitanian (sometimes also called Vasconian) was an ancestral form of that language.

In the Balkans, apart from Greek in the south, which by this time had also become, as a result of the Macedonian conquests of the later fourth century BC, the principal administrative and cultural language as well as the spoken *lingua franca* of much of the eastern Mediterranean, we find Illyrian in the northwest (of which almost nothing is known, though some see it as the ancestor of Albanian), and Thracian and Dacian in the northeast (each taken by others to be the ancestor of Albanian); ancient Macedonian (unrelated to the modern Slavonic language of that name), if this was not simply an aberrant Greek dialect, may also have still been spoken in parts of northern Greece and modern Macedonia, along with Paeonian further north and Epirot to the south (of which, once again, virtually nothing is known).

Further east, in Asia Minor, Greek had long been established in the major coastal cities, and had then spread inland with the Hellenization of the interior, where a bewildering variety of peoples and languages co-existed alongside it, including Lydian, Carian, Lycian, Milyan (all related to ancient Hittite), Phrygian, Lycaonian, Isaurian, Sidetic, Cappadocian, Cilician and Galatian (the language of Celtic migrants).

To the south, Syriac (the *lingua franca* of the Persian Empire) and other Aramaic dialects extended from western Mesopotamia down through Syria and Palestine as far as the borders of Egypt, confining Greek mainly to the major cities, while the great urban centres of the Phoenician coast (Byblos, Beirut, Sidon and Tyre), despite very intensive Hellenization, had successfully maintained Phoenician alongside Greek. We may also note here the presence of speakers of Arabic in parts of Syria and Palestine.

In Egypt too, though Greek had become the chief language of Alexandria and the other Hellenistic foundations, and some degree of bilingualism was routine, the local Egyptian language (later written in a Greek-based alphabet and known as Coptic) had continued to enjoy high prestige because of its religious significance and long written tradition, and had remained the dominant medium overall. Elsewhere in north Africa, from the borders of Egypt to the Atlantic coast, the native population

spoke a continuum of language varieties known variously as Libyan, Numidian or Massylian (the ancestor of modern Berber), though the great city of Carthage (destroyed by Rome in 146 BC, but later refounded) and the other Phoenician colonies of the seaboard, together with their hinterland, spoke a variety of Phoenician known as Punic (spoken also in colonies in Spain, see above).

By the time Roman rule spread eastwards, therefore, Greek was already established as the official language of government, education and high culture in the affected territories, while the long-term presence of important Greek colonies in southern Italy and Sicily had, from the late fourth century onwards, already introduced the Romans and their Italian allies to the many tantalizing possibilities opened up by Greek culture, a culture which became increasingly influential as Rome became more and more involved in the East. Widespread Roman respect and admiration for the Greek language and Greek culture, at least in its 'higher' forms, therefore meant that the eastern part of the Empire was never required to change its established linguistic habits. While Roman provincial officials and colonists naturally communicated with Rome and with one another in Latin, much of the day-to-day business of local administration involving Greek-speaking communities continued to be carried out, using both original and translated documents, in the standardized Koine, just as new developments in Greek intellectual life continued to play a major role in the evolution of Roman culture. In the end Greek was, in effect, appropriated as 'the other' Roman language alongside Latin, albeit with periodic reservations and misgivings. By the second and third centuries AD, in a period of philhellenism that had culminated in AD 212 with the political equalization of the two halves of the Empire, the linguistic 'border' between East and West in terms of language choice for official purposes had become rather less sharply defined, though it should be stressed that the role and status of Greek in the East were never seriously threatened. We may note, in particular, the later position of Greek as the sole official and dominant cultural language of the East Roman (Byzantine) Empire following the formal split between East and West in late antiquity.

But despite the high cultural status of Greek and its continuing official role in the East, Latin was the 'true' native language of the seat of Roman power and of the institutions of its government, including the law, just as it remained in theory the universal language of command in the Roman army once non-Italian contingents began to be recruited (we might compare the role of French in the Légion étrangère). In practice, however, Greek was tolerated in Greek-speaking units just as it was in day-to-day dealings with Greek-speaking civilians, with Latin often used only 'symbolically', and incomprehensibly, as a reminder of the fact of Roman rule. But in general Latin spread and took root with the consolidation of Roman

power, Roman culture and Roman citizenship, most obviously in the West, where there was no language with the status of Greek to rival it, and its long-term impact, as earlier in Italy, eventually proved fatal to many of the languages previously in use there. In the East the continuing use of Greek in high-prestige functions and as a *lingua franca* had a similar effect, though on a smaller scale, most dramatically in Asia Minor.

Consequently, of the 60 or so languages spoken around the Mediterranean in *c*.100 BC, only Latin, Greek, Coptic, Aramaic (including Syriac), Arabic, Libyan (Berber), Basque, the ancestor of Albanian (?Illyrian) and Punic remained in general use by *c*.AD 400, and Punic would very soon join the ranks of the lost. We may simply note that, leaving Latin and Greek aside, the long-term survivors fall into three sub-groups: the languages of small populations in inaccessible regions, those of nomadic peoples at the margins of the Empire, and those of large, long urbanized populations with deep-rooted literate cultures of their own.

3.4 Conclusion

In this chapter we have set the scene for much of what is to follow. Chapters IV–VI will deal with the progressive standardization of Latin from the mid-fourth century down to the period of the early Empire, examining the emergence and development of both official and literary written varieties. Chapter VII will then redress the balance by examining the evidence for sub-elite Latin in various regions, and considering in more detail the complex issues associated with growing bilingualism and the spread of Latin as a spoken as well as a written language. Finally, Chapter VIII will examine the fate of Latin in later antiquity, including a brief assessment of its spectacular 'afterlife' as a cultural language in the context of the development of local vernaculars.

References

Adams, J. N. (2002) 'Bilingualism at Delos', in J. N. Adams, M. Janse and S. Swain (eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 103–27.

Adams, J. N. (2003) *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beard, M. and M. Crawford (1999) *Rome in the Late Republic* (2nd edn.). London: Duckworth.

Bonfante, G. and L. Bonfante (2002) *The Etruscan Language* (2nd edn.). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bradley, G. (2000) *Ancient Umbria*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cornell, T. (1995) *The Beginnings of Rome*. London/New York: Routledge.

Crystal, D. (1997) *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dalby, A. (2002) *Language in Danger*. London: Penguin.

David, J.-M. (1996) *The Roman Conquest of Italy*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Downes, W. (1998) *Language and Society* (2nd edn.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horrocks, G. (1997) *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*. London/New York: Longman (Pearson).

Hudson, R. (1996) *Sociolinguistics* (2nd edn.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Joseph, J. E. (1987) *Eloquence and Power: The Rise of Standard Languages and Language Standards*. London: Pinter.

Kaster, R. A. (1988) *Guardians of Language*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Milroy, J. and L. Milroy (1999) *Authority in Language: Investigating Standard English* (3rd edn.). London: Routledge.