

Attribute: **Texts reflecting bi/multilingualism**

Attribute values as follows, with a four-part hierarchy (tri- etc. can be switched in for bi-as appropriate). It is likely that only up to three parts of the hierarchy would be regularly used. This is based on the work by Adams which transferred the terminology of bilingualism studies > Classics.¹ It has been discussed with several colleagues working in this field.²

- **Bi-version bilingual text**³ Two separate parts in different languages and a content which is usually, at least in part, common to both⁴
 - **Duplicating**⁵ - same content in each version (e.g. <https://gis.latinnow.eu/object/171846>)
 - **Partial** - versions say partly the same thing, but one says more (e.g. <https://gis.latinnow.eu/object/207067>)
 - **Overlapping** - versions say different things, but part of it is the same in both (e.g. <https://gis.latinnow.eu/object/190250>)
 - **Complementary** - versions say different things, but part of the same text (e.g. <https://gis.latinnow.eu/object/189168>)
- **Text with bilingual phenomena** Composed in one language but showing *bilingual phenomena* from another⁶
 - **Code-switching**⁷ (e.g. *valete* in the Gaulish Velleron stele <https://gis.latinnow.eu/object/233183>) ‘full blown switch from one language into another’ (Adams 2003 19)⁸
 - **tag-switching** - switch for e.g. a formula such as VSLM (e.g. <https://gis.latinnow.eu/object/233167>)
 - **inter-sentential** - between sentence/clause boundaries (e.g. <https://gis.latinnow.eu/object/201464>)
 - **intra-sentential** - within sentence/clause boundaries (e.g. <https://gis.latinnow.eu/object/212300>)

¹ Adams, J. N. 2003 *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge).

² I am particularly grateful to the LatinNow team, Alessandro Palumbo and James Clackson for their feedback.

³ There are awkward cases to consider, e.g. texts with versions which have different authors and/or are not contemporary. There are examples where one of the inscriptions falls outside the period of the dataset, e.g., in Roman Inscriptions of Britain, an Old English addition to a Roman inscription from Lincoln: <https://gis.latinnow.eu/object/139323>. Alessandro Palumbo reports this experience with post-medieval inscriptions on objects with medieval inscriptions (pers. comm.). The contemporaneity issue will need to be addressed by researchers on a case-by-case basis: if we are treating a text which has had subsequent generations add to it we may wish to count it as a multiple version text (e.g. funerary epigraphic text), but for an object which has multiple non contemporaneous inscriptions by unrelated authors, we will probably want to edit each text separately (e.g. Colossus of Memnon). I suspect the producer(s) of the text should be dealt with outside this specific schema and even if the value of the text may be reduced for thinking about individual bilingualism, it may still be relevant for community bilingualism. It is undesirable, to my mind, to set rules for these issues.

⁴ See in particular Mullen, A. 2013 *Southern Gaul and the Mediterranean* (Cambridge).

⁵ An additional specification would be the addition of ‘identical’ or ‘equivalent’ to the content that is the same in both versions. The latter would take in idiomatic funerary formulae for example, which essentially convey the same content.

⁶ Note that, of course, there is difficulty in some cases in deciding where the line is drawn between texts with a code-switch into another language and bi-version bilingual texts. Once again it is hard to create guidelines on how to treat such texts; contextual and culture-specific information will need to be deployed on by the author to decide (aspects such as length and layout of texts on the object etc. may all be relevant).

⁷ For issues with intentionality and the myriad ambiguous or ‘edge’ cases, see the discussion in Elder, O. and Mullen, A. 2019 *Language of Letters* (Cambridge).

⁸ Note that in the case of bi-version bilingual texts this would only refer to any switch *within* a single version of a bi-version bilingual text, rather than the fact of having two versions in different languages (i.e. we don’t usually view the switch between versions as a code-switch *per se*). A text can, however, have a mixture of these attribute values, e.g. Bi-version bilingual text *and* Text with bilingual phenomena.

- **lexical**
 - **syntactic** (e.g. the ‘Greek Latin’ deployed in the *res gestae* or *senatus consulta* etc.?)
 - **morphological** (e.g. Lusitanian word endings in Latin texts)
 - **phonetic**⁹
- **Interference** Features from another language unintentionally transferred into the main language of the text.
 - **lexical**
 - **syntactic**
 - **morphological**
 - **phonetic**
 - **Borrowing** Adoption of any linguistic element from one language into another. The items function in the adopting language as native elements, often with some degree of integration.
 - **lexical**
 - **syntactic**
 - **morphological**
 - **phonetic**
 - **calque** (translation of a foreign expression by a new native form which matches the foreign, e.g. sky-scraper, gratte-ciel)
 - **loan-shifting** (when a word undergoes semantic extension on the model of a foreign counterpart).¹⁰
 - **Translingualism** When forms chosen seem to be expressing more than one language at the same time, e.g. *nata*. This is a tricky one because sometimes it is simply the case that *we* cannot work out which language to assign something to, but in some cases it seems there is a desire to use translingualism (e.g. some of the Gaulish-Latin spindle whorls).¹¹
- **Mixed-language text** In genetically mixed languages or codes that are so mixed that it is impossible to identify the dominant language (e.g. some of the *defixiones* or the firing lists from La Graufesenque: <https://gis.latinnow.eu/object/218752>).
 - **Translingual text** (e.g. some of the Autun spindle whorls: <https://gis.latinnow.eu/object/233074>). Different from Text with bilingual phenomena: translingualism, as the whole text would be translingual.
 - **Biscriptal text**¹² Same language but using two script systems (e.g. Saint-Germain-Source-Seine which is in Gaulish but uses Latin and Greek scripts, <https://gis.latinnow.eu/object/193069>).¹³

⁹ Some of these categories are here for ‘structural completeness’ but wouldn’t necessarily be used for epigraphic texts.

¹⁰ The final two could be sub-categories of lexical.

¹¹ See Mullen’s chapter in Cousins, E. 2022 *Dynamic Epigraphy: New Approaches to Inscriptions* (Oxford).

¹² It has been useful to some scholars to deploy the sub-categories of bi-version texts here (duplicating, partial, overlapping and complementary etc.).

¹³ See now Bunčić, D., Lippert, S. L. and Rabus, A. 2016. *Biscriptality: A sociolinguistic typology* (Heidelberg). ‘Bigraphic’ has also been used, but since bi-scriptal seems to have widespread use we prefer this, plus bigraphic already has an

- **Transliterated text** Whole text is in a script which is not the primary one used for that language, e.g. possibly <https://gis.latinnow.eu/object/145440>.¹⁴
- **Text with biscriptal phenomena**¹⁵ (e.g. Velleron stele is Gaulish in Greek script but with *valete* which is Latin written in Greek script, so that text could be tagged with Text with bilingual phenomena: Code-switching: intra-sentential: lexical AND Text with graphic phenomena: Transliteration <https://gis.latinnow.eu/object/233183>)
 - **Graphic interference** - ('accidental') letter forms/orthographic rules/orthographic features¹⁶ from the script with which the author is more familiar intrude into the script of the text.
 - **Transliteration** - either by choice or because author doesn't know the other script of another language being used e.g. for code-switching in the primary.
 - **Graphic borrowing/code-switching** - when a script form is used from another set used to write a different language, for example to represent a sound in a name, e.g. tau gallicum forms in Gaulish names in Latin texts.

established other use in computing etc. Of course a bi-version bilingual text in Greek and Latin which uses the standard scripts for each is, in a sense biscriptal, but we would not tend to flag this.

¹⁴ As Alessandro Palumbo reminds me (pers. comm.) this is problematic for written cultures 'where several alphabets are used and where combinations of languages and scripts shift between being "marked" and "unmarked" depending on text type, chronology, geography, social stratum etc. For example, the relations runes–vernacular and Roman alphabet–Latin were the typical ones when Latin first was adopted in Scandinavia, but quite soon the Roman alphabet was used to write in the vernacular, and runes were also used quite often to write Latin.' This is of course correct, but, with careful attention to such changing cultural environments, users may find this a useful categorization to make for *some* contexts: for example for Greek written in Latin script in the Roman Empire.

¹⁵ NB this schema doesn't attempt to cover all graphic phenomena, e.g. stone cutters errors, just ones related to the interaction of different graphic systems.

¹⁶ e.g. such as serifs.