

8-12-2022

Putting on a Fronto: Persona and Patterns of Language in Fronto's Correspondence

Peter G. Barrios-Lech
University of Massachusetts Boston, peter.lech@umb.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://crossworks.holycross.edu/necj>



Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Barrios-Lech, Peter G. (2022) "Putting on a Fronto: Persona and Patterns of Language in Fronto's Correspondence," *New England Classical Journal*: Vol. 49 : Iss. 1 , 27-54.
<https://doi.org/10.52284/NECJ.49.1.article.barrios-lech2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by CrossWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in New England Classical Journal by an authorized editor of CrossWorks.

Putting on a Fronto: Persona and Patterns of Language in Fronto's Correspondence

PETER BARRIOS-LECH

Abstract: The subject of this chapter is the language of letters exchanged between Fronto and correspondents, specifically those linguistic means by which Fronto and his epistolary correspondents construct a persona and maintain and negotiate relationships. Analysis of the frequency of (Latin to Greek) code-switches, the diversity, or range of unique, address-terms, letter openings and closings used, and the type and frequency of requests show how Fronto's relationship with Marcus Aurelius changes over time; and offer us one way to measure differences in Fronto's epistolary relationship with the other correspondents.

Keywords: Marcus Cornelius Fronto, Marcus Aurelius, Politeness, Latin and Greek Politeness, Code-Switching; Historical Sociolinguistics

Introduction: Fronto's Letters and The Social Function of Language

Marcus Cornelius Fronto (c. 95-c.166 CE) was sole Latin tutor (*rhetor*) for Marcus Aurelius (emperor from 161-180). We are fortunate to have their correspondence. It attests to literary culture in elite circles of the mid-2nd century imperial Rome (Champlin 1980); discloses an evolving relationship between tutor and pupil (Richlin 2006a and 2006b); displays early examples of distance learning; and documents how, in the apogée of Roman power, Latin-users manipulated language to forge, enact, and negotiate social bonds (Hall 2009; Elder and Mullen 2019).¹ Epistolary language is the closest of literary genres to a live conversation – Cicero calls it *amicorum colloquia absentium* (*Phil.* 2.7.12; Poccetti 2010: 106). Correspondence showcases language's social functions: letter-writers recommend, instruct, advise, request, teach; long absences force them to perform verbally their relationship to the addressee (Elder and Mullen 2019: 3).

This paper examines certain elements of epistolary language with which Fronto and his correspondents co-construct and negotiate a relationship. The elements fall under five categories: commands and requests; terms of address; letter-openings; letter-closings; and switches to Greek, so-called "code-switching." Expressions falling under these categories demonstrate that "language has *imperium*: the power to resolve problems, to negotiate relationships, and to construct characters and even Roman culture itself" (Elder and Mullen 2019: 3).

As a study on the social dimensions of Fronto's epistolary language, the current work belongs to the scholarship dealing with the *rhetor* and his relationships with each of his correspondents. Scholars exploring the social aspects of the letters employ close readings of relevant passages and prosopography. In this paper I employ close readings, informed by ideas from sociolinguistics, and data analysis. Through this analysis, I seek to isolate patterns which will, hopefully, show diachronic changes in a correspondent's epistolary language. I also want to distinguish the language of each subcorpus; in other words, to demonstrate how Fronto accommodates his impressive linguistic resources to each addressee; and how, in turn, each correspondent suits his language to Fronto. For instance, we could expect the 45-year-old Fronto to use different language with his rough contemporary, but social superior, Antoninus Pius *imperator*, than he would with Marcus Aurelius, his 20-something student.

¹ The text is in a bad state. For details see van den Hout (1988: vii-lxxx, esp. viii-xv; xx-xxiii; lxxviii-lxxix); Haines (1919): xi-xvii; Champlin (1980) 3-4. In general, modern literary critics do not hold Fronto's work in high regard: see Brock (1911) 3-5; Champlin (1980) 2; van den Hout (1999): viii; Richlin (2006b) is an effort to bring this work to a wider audience.

Thus, while the paper’s subject is not new, its methodology is relatively so, since it constitutes one of only two studies that use quantitative analysis to analyze Fronto. The other is that of Mullen and Elder (2019), on code-switching to Greek in the great Latin epistolary *corpora* (Cicero, Pliny, Fronto).

The Fronto Corpus

To compile each set of data, I have read Fronto’s correspondence, and entered the relevant items into a spreadsheet, which I make available online, in the hope that others will use it to build on this work. My text – the corpus of data – is Michael Van den Hout’s 1988 Teubner edition. In this corpus, Fronto’s correspondents are: Antoninus Pius, emperor from 138-161 and stepfather to Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus; Marcus Aurelius as Caesar (or emperor-designate, from 138-161 CE); the same Marcus Aurelius as emperor (161-180); Lucius Verus (co-emperor with Aurelius from 161-166 CE); Domitia Lucilla, Marcus Aurelius’ mother; and, finally, a number of Fronto’s friends. The letters are written mostly in Latin, although we find six items in Greek (VdH 16-17; 21-24; 32-33; 171; 242-248; 250-255).²

Even a cursory glance at **Table 1** reveals that the correspondence between Fronto and Marcus Aurelius predominates, consisting as it does of 120 letters out of the total 217 (about 55%).

Correspondents	Total Letters	Directives	Vocatives	Opening Phrases	Closing Phrases	Code-Switches
Fronto and M. Caesar	120	216	133	100	110	85
Fronto and Augustus	34	115	42	24	20	41
Fronto and L. Verus	14	37	16	8	4	7
Fronto and A. Pius	8	4	10	6	2	0
Fronto to Friends	41	59	14	26	1	10
	217	431	215	164	137	143

Table 1: Data Gathered from Exchanges between Fronto and Correspondents.

Scanning across the top row, the reader will see the categories of data collected: **directives** – basically, commands and requests— like “see to it that you remember and consider carefully” (*fac memineries et cum animo cogites*, VdH 224.13); **vocatives** like “my dear Pompeianus” (*mi Pompeiane*, VdH 180.15) or “excellency” (*domine optime*, VdH 74.2); **opening phrases**, like “Fronto sends greetings to his dear Caesar” (CAESARI SVO FRONTO [SALVTEM DICIT], VdH 2.18); **closing phrases** like *vale*; and **code-switching to Greek**, for instance (in Caesar’s request for a subject on which to write): “send me rich material, please, please, I beg and beseech and entreat” (*uberem mi materiam mitte, oro et rogo* και αντιβολῶ και δέομαι και <ί>κετεύω, VdH 77.10-11).

Some Concepts from Sociolinguistics and a Foreshadowing

To analyze this data, I make use of two ideas from sociolinguistics: facework and politeness. I also foreshadow in this section two important conclusions revealed by the data.

Facework and Politeness

² Citations of Fronto will be made according to the standard format of page in (1988) van den Hout edition and line number(s) of that page, thus, **VdH 94** means “page 94 of the Van den Hout 1988 edition”; and **VdH 164.10** means “page 164, line 10 of the Van den Hout 1988 edition.” Translations are my own.

“ce mépris, qui n’en est que plus piquant, parce qu’on voit que la politesse s’impose le devoir de le cacher.” Stendhal, *Le Rouge et Le Noir*, p. 298 (“this disdain, which is all the more stinging, because one sees that [normally] politeness obliges you to conceal it.”)

Politeness, for moderns, means words and acts demonstrating consideration for another. Politeness, evidenced in greetings and words like “please” and “thank you” is the “grease that lubricates the tracks” of conversation and social interaction generally. But polite phrases and actions may serve as a false veneer of friendliness and respect put on to advance the speaker’s personal agenda, or to conveniently hide true feelings. Sociolinguists have in the past forty years been attempting to put verbal politeness on theoretical footing. One popular Politeness theory deploys the concept of “face”. This is the theory we will use to explicate Fronto’s epistolary interactions.

A concept drawn from sociology, and given its definitive analysis by Erving Goffman, “face” means one’s positive self-image; in other words, “what the person protects and defends and invests his feelings in”; “an idea about himself” (Goffman 1967: 43). The upkeep of this positive self-image is the responsibility of both self and other, who cooperate in supporting each other’s face during the course of any interaction, because it is mutually advantageous to do so. If I do injury to your face, I risk reprisal in kind, with damaging consequences to the social bond. “Facework” is the cumbersome term that embraces the various words and actions that self and other take to mutually support the other’s face (Goffman 1967: 12). The idea is relevant to Roman society, as Kaster has shown (Kaster 2005: 162 n. 18). When interacting, Roman élites sought to maintain their own and take into consideration the other’s *dignitas* – the esteem in which they were held according to their societal position – *existimatio* – reputation – and *auctoritas* – “clout” as vouchsafed by prior deeds, social connections, and previous political positions held.³ I would argue that a Roman’s “face” involved all of three of these concepts, as all three contributed to the Roman (particularly male) self’s public image.⁴

We can observe how Aurelius, still a prince, engages in facework, showing due regard to Fronto, in a letter from the 150’s. In it, Aurelius alludes to a legal battle pitting Fronto against the Athenian rhetor Herodes Atticus (VdH 36-39; Champlin 1980: 63-64; 104-105). Both men are Aurelius’ tutors; the Caesar claims to love both (VdH 36.19-20). Fronto is an advocate for the defense; Herodes, the prosecution. Marcus Aurelius wants to avoid a verbal slanging match between two people very closely connected to him. Indeed, an ugly confrontation between two of Aurelius’ rhetors could prove embarrassing for the emperor-to-be. So Marcus asks Fronto to proceed with restraint and not be the first to lash out verbally.

1. Aurelius asks Fronto not to initiate verbal attacks on a legal rival.
Adeo sive tu me temerarium consultorem sive audacem puerulum sive adversario tuo benivolentiorum esse existimabis, non propterea quod rectius esse arbitror, pedetemptius tibi consulam. Sed quid dixi 'consulam'? qui id a te postulo et magnopere postulo et me, si inpetro, obligari tibi repromitto. Et dices: 'Quid! si lacessitus fuero, non eum simili dicto remunerabo?' At ex eo tibi maiorem laudem quaeris, si nec lacessitus quicquam responderis. Verum si prior fecerit, respondentem tibi utcumque poterit ignosci: ut autem non inciperet postulavi ab eo et impetrasse me credo (VdH 36.11-18).

³ Kaster (2005) 144 for the definition of *dignitas* and 56 for *existimatio* as a kind of “positive face” the positive regard that one wants the other to have for one’s self. Galinsky (2012) 9 for *auctoritas* as “clout,” which “[was] not a given but had to be constantly validated – thus living up to its derivation from *augēre*, which means to increase.”

⁴ Hall (2009) 12-13, by contrast, suggests that *dignitas* could be equivalent to the notion of “face” as outlined above. Unceta-Gómez (2018) offers the state-of-the question on studies in Latin politeness.

Whether you consider me a rash adviser, a brash boy, or kinder to your adversary, I will not be more cautious in counseling you, just because I think that to be more proper. But why did I say, “counsel?” I’m requesting something from you, and that vehemently. And if I obtain my request, I promise in turn that I will be obliged to you. You’ll say, “What if I was attacked first, won’t I return the attack?” On the contrary: you seek greater praise if, even though injured, you do not counter-attack. But if he started, one could forgive you for responding in whatever way. But I asked him not to, and I think I’ve obtained what I asked.

Marcus Aurelius employs at least two strategies here to soften the “blow”, that is, his request (or even order) that Fronto moderate his language in court. First, Marcus employs the strategy of self-humbling: for him to suggest to his *rhetor* what to do in court – that would be the act of “a rash advisor (*temerarius consulator*); a brash boy (*audax puerulus*); or – what was worse – a friend *not* to Fronto but to his *adversary* (Herodes) (*adversario tuo benivolentior*)”.⁵ Second, the future emperor verbally performs his friendship drawing attention to his frank speech. Specifically, Aurelius goes on record with his demand, not trying to sugarcoat it: his is not advice but a *request*, in his own interest (“but why did I say “counsel/advise you, since I am demanding, and that vehemently?” *sed quid dixi ‘consulam’? qui id a te postulo et magnopere postulo*). Aurelius confesses circumspection was called for, but instead insists on frank talk: “I will *not* be more cautious in counseling you, just because I think it [sc. more circumspect talk] to be more proper.” Aurelius concludes his verbal performance of friendship by pointing out that direct talk befits true friends: “I’ll end up having written with less wisdom, but I do that in preference to remaining silent, conduct unbefitting a friend,” *ego certe minus sapienter magis scripsero, quam minus amice tacuero* (VdH 36.24-25). With these utterances, Aurelius enacts one of the principal requirements of a friend, to be honest, even if it might hurt the other’s feelings (Cic. *Am.* 44; *Off.* 1.58).⁶

These two strategies – self-humbling and verbal performance of his friendship – are the epistolary means by which Aurelius supports Fronto’s “face” as a respected advocate, rhetor, and friend. They counterbalance the potentially face-threatening request, that Fronto tone down his attack on an adversary. Aurelius engages, then, in “facework” of a particular kind, which, in the literature is labelled as “**positively polite**”, or what Hall calls “**affiliative politeness**”, language which seeks to reduce the sense of distance between the interlocutors, with expressions of regard and affection being typical of such positive or affiliative politeness (Hall 2009: 12-14; Brown and Levinson 1987: 62-3). By contrast, language that acknowledges social distance has been termed “**negative politeness**”, or by Hall, “**politeness of respect/distance**” (Hall 2009: 7-14). Marcus’ self-humbling – he is a brash boy; a reckless *consigliere* – cleverly bows to Fronto’s *autoritas* as renowned rhetor.

Polite Expressions

These concepts – of positive and negative politeness – can be appreciated especially when a person realizes a command, request, suggestion, or other directive (Brown and Levinson 1987; Brown and Gilman 1989). In a letter advising Marcus on proper diction, Fronto frames his suggestions with the 1st person subjunctive form *dixerim*: “I would more properly say the dagger is besmeared with poison, but the rod is covered with birdlime”, *mucronem veneno <praelitum>, radium visco ‘inlitum’ rectius dixerim* (VdH 58.16-17).⁷ Thus, Fronto advises Marcus on how to use these verbs compounded of prefix+*lino*, but in doing so avoids addressing his superior directly.

⁵ The strategy of self-humbling as a means to soften a potentially offensive speech act, like requesting, is documented in modern languages: Brown and Levinson (1987: 185-186).

⁶ See Fleury (2006: 24) on frank declarations in the letter exchanges as expressions of friendship.

⁷ *Praelitum* is van den Hout’s suggestion for *oblitum*, which had already been mentioned earlier. It would seem odd for Fronto to use the same word twice in a passage highlighting the fine distinctions in *lino* and its various compounds.

In order to mitigate their commands and requests, Latin speakers also added polite words or phrases. In Fronto's time, people probably softened requests with *rogo*, like English "please" (Dickey 2015: 28). But since Fronto and his correspondents sought an archaizing style, they avoid what is common, instead turning to Terentian *sodes*, Ciceronian *obsecro* but, yes, also to contemporary (for Fronto and friends) *peto* (Dickey 2015: 26-28). Add to these options, the various polite clauses: comparative clauses like "do x, *ut facis*, "as you are doing [anyway]." Such expressions say, "I'm asking you to do something, but acknowledge that I am in no position to be ordering you around." They are "negatively polite," achieving a respectful distance, whether that social distance be measured horizontally or vertically (Hall 2009: 14-15; Barrios-Lech 2016: 34-35).

Or consider conditional clauses like *si me amas*, [*fac*]. This expression, "do x, if you love me" implies that friendship or some other intimate bond exists between speaker and hearer, and that the hearer can prove his love anew by doing a favor. With the expression (*si me amas*, [*fac*]), a speaker foregrounds the friendship precisely when he needs to request something. Thus, the phrase is a piece of "positive" or "affiliative" politeness. In principle, it would be absurd to ask a stranger to "do me a favor, if you love me," as strangers or mere acquaintances don't love each other with that peculiar Roman love (*amor*) that binds friends. At any rate, in our correspondence, only friends use *si (quid) me amas* and the like: Marcus Aurelius when writing to Fronto (VdH 60.20; 77.9, 86.22); Fronto when writing to Aurelius (VdH 69.41); and Fronto when writing to Arrius Antoninus, a former student and beloved friend (VdH 189.5).

Do Fronto and friends employ predominately positively polite expressions to extend and demonstrate *amor* to each other? Do correspondents who know each other less well employ "politeness of distance/respect"? Does the Fronto use such politeness of distance when writing to the emperor – Pius before 161 and Aurelius after 161?

An Asymmetric Relationship That Becomes More So

ego, si tu volueris, ero aliquid, "If you so desire it, I will be something"
(VdH 50.20, letter from Marcus Aurelius to Fronto dated to the early 140's)

Quid quaeris? Hanc ipsam epistulam paululum me porgere non sinunt instantes curae, quarum vacatio noctis demum aliqua parte contigit "To be brief: pressing concerns won't allow me to continue this letter even a little bit, concerns from which I am getting a respite finally during part of the night."
(VdH 103.21-23, letter from Aurelius the emperor to Fronto dated to between 161-167).

For clarity's sake, I anticipate here two key aspects of this paper concerning the relationship between Fronto and Aurelius. These were already noticed by others, but now stand out clearly revealed by patterns in our data.

First, the intensity of the affectionate language – sometimes frankly erotic – diminishes, particularly after Fronto's term as tutor finishes and Aurelius, in turn, has assumed duties of ruling as emperor in 161; it is commonly assumed that Aurelius' interests in philosophy and the assumption of rule distanced him from his former tutor (Richlin 2006a: 111-112; Richlin 2006b: 5-6; Elder and Mullen 2019: 205-209). The linguistic patterns we illuminate below underpin the relationship's "general contours...formed by modern readers using a fragmentary set of letters" (Elder and Mullen 2019: 206).

Second, the evidence will show that Aurelius recurs more frequently – often much more frequently – than does Fronto to positive politeness. Fronto does the opposite: his favored form of politeness is that conveying distance and respect. In other words, while

Aurelius recurrently hits the accelerator, rapidly closing distance down, Fronto likes to apply the brakes, cautiously widening the gap between himself and Aurelius. The question then is, why?

Common sense would dictate that a subject to the emperor would use the politeness of distance and respect, and this Fronto demonstrably does, when writing his superiors. But why does Aurelius, who has the upper hand, employ “affiliative politeness” with his subordinate? Sociolinguists of modern languages have noted this asymmetry in usage of politeness, with inferiors verbally demonstrating distance and respect and superiors expressing affection and esteem. More specifically, scholars observe that in certain hierarchical settings, it is considered inappropriate for the inferior to presume intimacy with a higher-status addressee; though the converse is acceptable. The reason for the differential in politeness usage is that positive politeness is more “venturesome”: to claim intimacy with another can be an unwelcome imposition (Morand 1996: 547-8). While the rights for use of positive politeness are not distributed equally between the interlocutors of unequal status, both high- and low-status speakers freely draw on negative politeness (Morand 1996: 549; Rees-Miller 2000). We will see, time and again, Aurelius presume intimacy with his social inferior, while Fronto cannot do the same – *at any point in their relationship*.

Data Analysis

I now start with directives, then continue analysis in the order presented above (address-terms, opening phrases, closing phrases, and code-switches to Greek). Once I finish the discussions on each category of data, I bring the individual results together in a conclusion.

Directives

As Fronto himself says, in a letter addressed to Aurelius’ co-regent, Verus (dated 163 CE), “*imperium* is not just a word for power, it belongs to discourse” (*imperium autem non potestatis tantummodo vocabulum, sed etiam orationis est*, VdH 123.16-18). Latin **commands and requests** are typically framed in the imperative, *modus imperativus*. The *imperativus* constitutes one way a language user can wield *imperium* over another. It is an attempt, realized through language, to get the addressee to do something. The relatives of the command are the request, the piece of advice, the instruction, the permission, the entreaty. All of these – from the peremptory command to a humble entreaty – can be subsumed under the term *directive*, that is any utterance (and it is usually an utterance) *directing* someone to do something (Searle 1976: 11-12). This technical term I employ for convenience’s sake. Here are some examples, drawn from the correspondence.

2. In an early letter, Aurelius asks Fronto to come visit him.

Tu modo perendie veni, et fiat quod volt (VdH 35.1-2).

Just come the day after tomorrow, and let what wants to happen, happen.

3. Fronto says that Aurelius heeds the *populus* when deciding whether to manumit a gladiator or pardon a criminal in the amphitheater. Likewise, Aurelius should take his audience into account when reciting an oration.

igitur ut populo gratum erit, ita facies atque ita dices (VdH 18.9-10)

So however it will please the people, so do and say.

4. Fronto asks Antoninus Pius to forgive an insult to a close confidant of the emperor’s (Champlin 1980: 100-101).

Tuae clementiae est, imp(erator), unicam hominis verborum culpam cum ceteris eius recte factis ponderare (163.15-17).

It is within the powers of your mercy, Emperor, to weigh the single fault of a man's words against his good deeds.

The utterances in passages (2.) through (4.) are directives because they constitute an attempt to get the addressee to do something. But they are not all alike. In passage (2.), Aurelius wants to see his tutor, and simply requests he come: *veni* "come," using the present imperative. In the passage (3.), Fronto steps into his role as tutor and advises Marcus Aurelius to take his audience's pleasure into account when delivering a speech. For this, he uses the 2nd person future indicative (*ita facies atque ita dices*). Finally, Fronto treads carefully in (4.), a passage directed to the emperor Antoninus Pius. Fronto had accepted property bequeathed to him by a man who, in turn, had gravely insulted Pius' confidant of twenty years. By accepting this legacy, Fronto appears to side against the *imperator*. But now the rhetor circumspectly asks Pius to consider that – apart from one bad episode – the now-deceased testator deserves the emperor's esteem (passage 4, above, and 163.17-22).

Fronto carefully words this request, using three strategies to mitigate it ("it is characteristic of your mercy, Emperor, to weigh the single fault of a man's words, against his good deeds", *tuae clementiae est, imp(erator), unicam hominis verborum culpam cum ceteris eius recte factis ponderare*, 163.15-17). First, Fronto addresses Pius as *imperator*, acknowledging thereby that his addressee does not have to comply: he is after all the commander-in-chief (Dickey 2002: 100). Second, Fronto does *not* use a second person pronoun like *tu* or *te*, which might be taken as more confrontational. Instead, he lodges his request impersonally: "it is characteristic" not of *you*, but of "*your clemency*" (sc. "to take a more holistic view of a person's character"). In summary, Fronto's strategy is one of impersonalizing and distancing, two linguistic means, documented across many modern languages, of showing negative politeness (Brown and Levinson 1987: 182-185; 190-194).⁸

Clearly, the relationship between the interlocutors plays a role in how speakers frame requests. Marcus as emperor-designate bluntly directs his subject to come visit. But in passage (4), Fronto, subject of the emperor, must lodge his request in a more submissive way. In passage (3), Fronto is expected to teach the Caesar. Advice-giving suits his role as tutor.

As mentioned above, commanding, requesting, advising, instructing, permitting, beseeching, and praying are all attempts (however realized) to get the hearer to do something; they are all "directives". The criteria I use to label a directive as a "command," "request," or any one of the other possible subtypes are drawn from previous work (Risselada 1993: 45-49; Denizot 2011: 23-24). One important distinction is who stands to benefit. If the speaker directs addressee to do something to the *speaker's* benefit, I consider the directive either a command or a request. Distinguishing between the two – command or request – requires the reader to take into account several factors. What is the weight of the request? Is the speaker asking the addressee to scribble a couple of lines in response to a letter or to forget a serious injury (cf. passage 4, above)? In addition, the modern reader should also consider the quality of the relationship between speaker and addressee. (Scholars agree, for instance, that Fronto and Marcus, as prince, are closer than Fronto and the same man when emperor.)

To demonstrate how I categorize directives, I submit the following sample analysis:

5. Caesar has completed an exercise Fronto sent him; he asks Fronto to send him another. Ego adeo perscripsi (tu **mitte** aliud quod scribam), sed librarius meus non praesto fuit, qui transcriberet. Scripsi autem non ex mea sententia, nam et festinavi et tua ista valetudo aliquantulum detrivit mihi. Sed veniam cras petam, cum mittam. Vale

⁸ It must be conceded that Latin has few terms of address like our "sir" to show appropriate distance and respect to strangers: see Dickey (2002: 255-256). We will discuss Fronto's use of terms like *domine* and *imperator* below.

mi dulcissime magister. Domina mea mater salutem tibi dicit. Nomen tribuni plebis, cui inposuit <no>tam Acilius censor, quem scripsi, **mitte** mihi (VdH 76.13-19).

I've finished writing it – send me another to do – but my copyist wasn't at hand to transcribe it. It wasn't to my liking; I rushed, and then your bad health has been distressing me. But let me ask forgiveness from you tomorrow, when I send it. Good bye, sweet teacher. My mother sends her greetings. Send me the name of the tribune of the plebs, on whose name Acilius the censor set the mark of censure.

Mitte, if it were a command, would not accord with the friendly concern expressed in the body of the letter (“your bad health has been distressing me”); and Aurelius’ self-humbling stance (“let me ask forgiveness from you tomorrow, when I send it”). I therefore interpret the imperatives (*mitte aliud...mitte mihi*) as requests.

Directives in the hearer's interest, advice (“you have a headache: take an aspirin”), permissions (“you want an ice-cream?” go ahead.”), and instruction, from which a pupil stands to benefit, feature often in the correspondence, unsurprising since the letters are a vehicle for Fronto's instruction and advice to the emperor. Consider the following passage.

6. Fronto instructs Aurelius on proper Latin usage.

Nolim igitur te ignorare syllabae unius discrimen quantum referat. Os 'colluere' dicam, pavimento autem in balneis 'pelluere', non colluere; lacrimis vero genas 'lavere' dicam, non pelluere neque colluere (VdH 58.5-8).

I wouldn't want you to ignore the difference even one syllable makes. I'd say “wash” (*colluere*) the face; but “clean” (*pelluere*) the floor in the baths; not “wash” (*colluere*) them. I'd say bathe (*lavere*) one's cheeks in tears, not clean (*pelluere*) or wash (*colluere*).

Fronto gives instruction on Latin diction – an act expected of him – but indirectly, with polite first person subjunctives: “I'd not like you to,” (*nolim*); “I would say,” (*dicam*) and later on in the passage “I would more properly say” (*rectius dixerim*, VdH 58.17). I have classified these three instances as instructions, albeit couched in a circumspect way.

Making minute distinctions – whether some utterance constitutes a piece of advice or an instruction, for instance – remains subjective. More straightforward is determining a particular utterance's membership to a *family* of directive, say “command-request” (where the speaker stands to benefit) or “advice-suggestion-instruction” (where the addressee stands to benefit). The analysis offered below, then, is based on my own interpretation of the data.

Of Commands, Requests, Suggestions, and Permissions

The following general points can be made about the directives exchanged between Fronto and Aurelius. First, the particular kind of directive used flows from the role played. Thus, Fronto, as befits a *rhetor*, frequently advises and instructs Caesar, his pupil. Of all directives employed by Fronto, more than one third (36.2%) are advice or instruction. This instruction ranges from advice on style (see passage 6, above) to morality, two of the main tasks of the language teacher in antiquity (Kaster 1988: 12-14).⁹ If the reader compares the two tables below, he or she sees that Fronto never fully abandons his role as teacher, even when Marcus becomes *imperator*.

⁹ For instance, “you will win friends for yourself if you take care to remove this one vice: let them not feel envy or hate you,” *quod [amicos tibi conciliaveris] si unum illud vitium...extirpandum...curaveris, ne liveant neve invident invicem amici tui*, VdH 54.5-7).

	<i>Advice</i>	<i>Instruction</i>	<i>Permission</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Request</i>
Fronto	10.4%	23.6%	2.1%	3.5%	60.4%
Caesar	3.1%	0.0%	4.7%	3.1%	87.5%

Table 2: Some Functions of Directives in the correspondence *ad M. Caesarem*.

Even after his active period as tutor ends in 161, Fronto continues to advise and instruct Aurelius, now emperor, about forty six percent (46%) of the time (see **Table 3**).

	<i>Advice</i>	<i>Instruction</i>	<i>Permission</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Request</i>
Fronto	31.3%	14.5%	4.8%	< 1.0%	42.2%
Aurelius as Aug.	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	92.3%

Table 3: Some Functions of Directives in the correspondence *ad M. Aurelium Imp.*

Proposals like *meliora, quaeso, fabulemur* (VdH 54.4) are the so-called 1st person plural hortatory subjunctives “let us do x.” In Greek and Latin new comedy, these appear almost always between equals, because it might have been untoward for an inferior to invite a superior to participate in a collaborative act (Barrios-Lech 2014; Kreiter-Spiro 1997: 228). Proposals cast in the 1st person plural hortatory subjunctive (like *meliora...fabulemur*) appear not infrequently in the earlier correspondence (between Fronto and Caesar), only to all but disappear when Marcus becomes *imperator*. This is but one sign of an increased relational distance between the two correspondents, especially after Marcus leaves the formal instruction (in 145) and becomes emperor.

Expressing Directives Politely

In the early correspondence (between 138-161), however, Marcus’ tone is markedly self-humbling, and effusively affectionate (VdH 2.6-7; VdH 25.23-26; VdH 49.20-23; VdH 51.15-16; VdH 55.10-14; VdH 249.6-7; 250.3). He displays his affection through “affiliatively polite” directive-softeners, like *ama et* “love me and do x” and *fave mi et* “show favor to me and do x.”

Marcus uses the positively polite softeners strikingly more often than does Fronto – five times as often as his *rheto*r. In a striking contrast, Fronto employs negatively polite softeners about 4 times as often as his charge (see **Table 4**).

	<i>Positively Polite Softeners</i>	<i>P.P. Softeners per 100 Directives</i>	<i>Negatively Polite Softeners</i>	<i>Negatively Polite Softeners per 100 Directives</i>
Caesar to Fronto (64 directives)	14	22/100	1	1.6/100
Fronto to Caesar (144 directives)	6	4.2/100	12	8.3/100

Table 4: Politeness Softeners in the Correspondence between Caesar and Fronto

We see the same pattern in the correspondence between Fronto and Aurelius after 161: Fronto’s distancing – through polite markers of distance/respect – contrasts with Caesar’s (continued) verbally-demonstrated affection (see **Table 5**).

	<i>Positively Polite Softeners</i>	<i>P.P. Softeners per 100 Directives</i>	<i>Negatively Polite Softeners</i>	<i>Negatively Polite Softeners per 100 Directives</i>
<i>Augustus to Fronto</i> (26 directives)	5	19/100	1	3.8/100
<i>Fronto to Augustus</i> (83 directives)	1	1.2/100	5	6.0/100

Table 5: Politeness Softeners in the Correspondence between Augustus and Fronto

Yet there are clear differences. First, the near absence of positively polite softeners in Fronto's correspondence with Aurelius after 161 (Table 5) is striking. Second, in the early correspondence, Fronto's politeness words actually convey politeness; after 161, however, they serve only an emphatic function.¹⁰

This change in Fronto's usage of softeners post 161, constitutes a further sign of a cooling-down in the relationship's intensity. Even so, *at no point* in his long friendship does Fronto ever presume an affectionate stance with his superior, at least when issuing directives.

The letter collections addressed to the two other main correspondents – Verus and Antoninus Pius – turn up few requests. From these, however, it seems that Fronto relies almost exclusively on politeness of distancing and respect when issuing directives to these other imperial addressees.¹¹

Address Terms

As Dickey (2002: 2-3) points out, the Romans were very aware of what address-terms were called for in a particular context, just as Spanish-speakers know when to use the informal *usted* or informal *tú*; the French when to say formal *vous* or informal *tu*; and English speakers when to say Mrs. Carlon, Jacqueline Carlon, Professor Carlon, or Jacqui.¹² Address terms can create respectful distance, for instance, Fronto's *imperator* (passage 4) directed to Antoninus Pius; they also forge intimacy, as Fronto's *mi Naucelle* (VdH 183.11), when the rhetor advises Marcus Julius Naucellus to take care of his health. Dickey's (2002) foundational work on Latin address terms will help us to understand what was meant by such addresses as we explore the patterns in the letter-corpora, proceeding chronologically.

Address Terms in the Correspondence between Fronto and Caesar

The following points of contrast between Fronto's and Caesar's address usage will emerge from the following: first, Caesar's usage of address terms is more affectionate than his tutor's, and Caesar exercises a broader palette of linguistic options.

¹⁰ There is a striking difference in usage of softeners pre- and post-161. In the correspondence before 161, *obsecro* typically conveys (affiliative) politeness (VdH 36.28; VdH 77.16), and *quaeso* appears bound to a subjunctive (VdH 5.12; 54.13). After 161, the same words appear as strengtheners emphasizing a question: *obsecro (dic, obsecro, mihi: de dialecticis istis equid tenes?* VdH 144.2); *oro (dic, oro te, Marce, idcircone Alsium petisti...? 238.17); and dic sodes hoc mihi: utrumne...recipi iubes?* (VdH 134.18). *Quaeso* appears simply to emphasize a request in the addressee's favor (VdH 92.23 bis; 93.18).

¹¹ Fronto relies exclusively on the politeness of distance and respect with Pius (152.15-17; 168.24-26) – we don't have any requests from Pius in the corpus. With Verus, he uses polite markers three times: two are negatively polite (*ut voles atque ut animus tuus feret*, 118.4; *si videbitur*, VdH 118.6). The positively polite request is in fact an impassioned plea that Verus cease carousing, for which he was notorious: *fac, oro te et obsecro, domine, quod tuo egregio ingenio decet, temperes et reparcas et modifieris desideriis omnibus* (vDH 110.3-4). The letters from Verus turn up little indeed on which to base conclusions.

¹² Cf. Dickey (2002: 49): "[t]he average English speaker is...likely to be addressed by name in two or at most four different ways."

To begin, we consider how each normally addressed the other. A standard address for Marcus employs the vocative *magister*, which appears in 60 of the total 79 addresses (76.0%), in combination, *meus* or *mi magister*, or with an adjective conveying friendship or affection, even if the superlative had lost most of its force by this time: *iucundissime*, *dulcissime*, *carissime*, or *suavissime*.¹³

Fronto's standard address in these exchanges is *domine* (42 of the 54 total contain *domine*, or 77.8% of the addresses). The form *domine* in Fronto's time was polite, but not servile in tone (Dickey 2002: 88-91).¹⁴ The accompanying adjectives which Fronto uses likewise convey a friendly bond (though, again, the superlative force had diminished by his time): *dulcissime*, the term used between valued male friends (Dickey 2002: 322-323), *desiderantissime*, a very rare term of affection used between male friends (Dickey 2002: 132; 319), and *optime*, "a term of respect and affection" (Dickey 2002: 346).

Aurelius' addresses time and again express outright affection: Caesar employs the endearing address, *mi+vocative*, in 60 of his 79 addresses, so 76.0% of his addresses.¹⁵ Aurelius' addresses verge on, or are frankly, erotic. Six times Aurelius addresses Fronto with the terms of endearment, *anima*, *animus*, or *spiritus*, the latter two definitely erotic.¹⁶ Four times, we find vocative strings with amatory forms of address, like the following: *mi magister dulcissime*, *homo honestissime et rarissime*, *suavitas et caritas et voluptas mea* (VdH 34.14-15). Similar are:

mellitissime, *meus amor*, *mea voluptas* (VdH 63.10-11);
meum desiderium, *mea voluptas* (VdH 63.20-21);
mi, *omnia mea*, *magister*, *amo me* (VdH 72.4-5).

The first in this list, *mellitissime*, *meus amor*, *mea voluptas* (VdH 63.10-11) contains two explicitly erotic address terms, *mellitissime* and *mea voluptas*, with *mellitissime* appearing only once elsewhere, in an erotic scene from Apuleius' novel *Metamorphoses*.¹⁷

In yet another striking contrast, Fronto very rarely employs the affectionate address: *mi+vocative* occurs in his letters 7 times of 54 total addresses, or 12.9% (Aurelius employs *mi+vocative* in 76.0% of his total addresses). Also striking is the *absence*, from Fronto's letters, of erotic or amatory address terms.¹⁸ Fronto allows himself just three times the endearing *mi domine dulcissime* (VdH 76.10; 77.27; 81.26). The remaining four endearing addresses feature abstract nouns, all devoid of erotic content.¹⁹

¹³ *iucundissime*, a "[t]erm of affection used by men to valued male friends" (Dickey 2002: 315), is Aurelius' favorite, appearing 19 times. *Dulcissime*, a "[t]erm of affection for family, lovers, and friends" (Dickey 2002: 322-3) comes a close second at 18 times. At a distant third and fourth, follow *carissime*, a "[g]eneral term of mild affection, esp[ecially] for friends or acquaintances of equal or lower status" (Dickey 2002: 335) employed 9 times; and *suavissime*, a "[t]erm of sincere affection for family and friends" (Dickey 2002: 360). In Fronto's time, these adjectives had lost most of their superlative force (Dickey 2002: 97).

¹⁴ On the use of *domine* as an address form directed to emperors see Dickey (2002: 96-97), who identifies it in informal contexts like letters as "subliterary, generalized *domine*."

¹⁵ On the endearing address, see Adams (1984: 68-73) and for modern data Brown and Levinson (1987) 123-124.

¹⁶ For *anima* and *animus* as terms of endearment, the latter used by women towards lovers, see Dickey (2002: 311); for *anima* used by women with each other or by a man toward a women, see Adams (1995: 120). *Spiritus* occurs in a frankly erotic context: *vale spiritus meus. Ego non ardeam tuo amore, qui mihi hoc scriperis?* (VdH 42.20).

¹⁷ See Dickey (2002: 365) for *voluptas* with *mea* as a "term of endearment, normally for lovers." Dickey (2002: 341) identifies *mellite* as a "term of strong affection for lovers". The only other attestation of the superlative is in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, in an erotic scene featuring Lucius and the slave girl Photis (*Met.* 2.10.3).

¹⁸ The only probable instance in my data appears in one of Fronto's letters to Caesar, where Fronto claims that Caesar is more important than his own *anima*, "life": *domine, anima mea potior* (VdH 77.20). But I do not find any erotic connotation here.

¹⁹ *mea gloria*, *meum gaudium*, *mea securitas*, *mea hilaritas* (VdH 70.6; 9.15; 21.10); *causa optima vitae meae* (VdH 81.7). To these four citations, I would add *decus patriae et Romani nominis* (VdH 31.23), which, though not an endearing form of address appears with *dominum meum* (accusative) in the following: *te, dominum meum, decus morum, solacium mali* (VdH 5.17), the following, *decus morum, solacium mali*, may be accusatives in apposition but they could equally well be vocatives.

We have, then, evidence from each man's address system to show that Aurelius can presume intimacy with his tutor; but Fronto cannot.

Aurelius' address system displays a much broader lexical palette than Fronto's. Caesar employs twenty (20) unique adjectives drawn from both Latin and Greek (*amantissime, amicissime, amplissime, benignissime, carissime, desiderantissime, disertissime, doctissime, dulcissime, gratissime, honestissime, iucundissime, optatissime, optime, μέγχα, maxime, mellitissime, praecipue, rarissime, suavissime*). But Fronto uses just four unique Latin adjectives (*desiderantissime, dulcissime, immortalis, optime*), and only one of these – *immortalis*, entirely suited to a Roman emperor-to-be – does not already appear in Aurelius' letters.

We have, then, seen both in Aurelius directive- and address-usage, an intimacy and affection, even *eroticism* that Fronto never assumes when addressing his pupil. We have also seen that more unique adjectives can be attributed to Aurelius than to Fronto. We will return to the question why this is so in the concluding discussion. For now, let us compare Fronto's address system with the one he used when Marcus was *emperor*.

Address Terms in the Correspondence between Fronto and Augustus

Fronto's address system, as it appears in his correspondence with the emperor, changes markedly from the earlier period. Several facts strike us immediately. First, although he had most frequently employed *domine* when addressing Caesar, now *domine* all but disappears. *Domine* appears just once (VdH 89.25), in a letter where Fronto more often addresses the emperor with his cognomen, *Antonine* (three times, VdH 86.2, 12, 88.6).

7. Fronto expresses his pride in both emperors' – Marcus' and Verus' – rhetorical attainments, and compares himself to a proud parent:

Fieri etiam vos [sc. Verus and Aurelius] cotidie facundiores video et exulto quasi adhuc magister. Nam quom omnis virtutes vestras diligam et amplectar, fateor tamen praecipuum me et proprium gaudium ex eloquentia vestra capere. Itidem ut parentes, cum in voltu liberum oris sui lineamenta dinoscunt, ita ego cum in orationibus vestris vestigia nostra<e> sectae animadverto, γέγηθε δὲ φρένα Λήτω: meis enim verbis exprimere vim gaudi mei nequeo.

I see you [sc. Verus and Aurelius] becoming more eloquent daily and I rejoice as if I were still your teacher. Now, although I do love and embrace all your virtues, I confess I take a special joy, peculiar to me, in seeing your eloquence. Just like parents rejoice, when they recognize their features in the faces of their children, so, too, do I, when I notice the traces of our school in your orations: γέγηθε δὲ φρένα Λήτω (and Leto rejoiced in her heart) (Hom. *Od.* 6.106). [I say it in Greek] since I can't express the degree of my joy in my own words (VdH 87.17-23).

What does Fronto convey by calling his addressee with the cognomen *Antoninus*? Addresses by cognomen are the most frequent of all addresses by name and were probably standard in Fronto's time (Dickey 2002: 56-63, esp. 60). So Fronto may be using an unmarked, standard form of address. The cognomen *Antoninus*, however, was special; for Marcus, on assuming the role of emperor, had taken this cognomen; while his co-ruler adopted Verus (Birley 2012: 155). Was Fronto giving honor to his addressee, then, by calling him *Antonine*?

We get a sense of the connotations of *Antonine* from two clues, one in a letter addressed to Verus, another in a letter from the emperor Aurelius. In a letter to Verus, Fronto praises the eloquence of Verus' dispatch to the senate. The former tutor imagines a dialogue in which he adopts a familiar tone to exhort Marcus to match Verus' oratory: "what is

this, Antoninus? I see that you have to accept the title [sc. of orator] you had rejected and withdraw from your [previous] opinion [sc. about the value of literary studies]. What can my literary studies do? What can your philosophers accomplish?" (*quid hoc rei est, Antonine? Nam tibi video nomen quod recusaveras accipiendum esse et de sententia decedendum. Quid nunc meae, quid philosophorum litterae agunt?* VdH 132.4-6). In another letter, the emperor Aurelius exhorts Fronto not to trouble himself about coming to the family's estate in Lorium to celebrate the emperor's daughter's birthday. He tells Fronto to do this "for your Antoninus," *hoc Antonino tuo da sollicitate et vere petenti* (VdH 86.23-24). In both passages, where *Antoninus* appears (either in address or referential usage), the speaker assumes a friendly, intimate tone with the addressee. I take, then, the address with cognomen *Antoninus* to convey a familiar intimacy. It would thus be entirely suited to the passage quoted above (7.), where Fronto likens himself to Marcus Aurelius' proud parent.

There is yet another striking departure from Fronto's early correspondence. For, now, Fronto calls the emperor Aurelius *Marce*, using the praenomen in six out of the eleven (11) total addresses.²⁰ Yet earlier, during the period of instruction, he had only *once* used called Aurelius *Marce*: *ain quid iudicas Marce?* (VdH 20.8, in a letter dating to 142).

Address by praenomen is rare and typically reserved for family members (Dickey 2002: 64-7). That Fronto now more frequently calls the emperor by his *praenomen* suggests that he indeed felt, or was trying to portray himself as, a family member. Many of the contexts of use have Fronto chiding the emperor as if he were still a young pupil. In one passage Fronto reproaches the emperor for incorrect diction (VdH 159.3-4); in another, he exhorts him to find time for literary study; in yet another, to get more sleep (233.16).²¹ In two more contexts, Fronto addresses the emperor with *Marce* when sharing personal information about his health or thanking the emperor for reading his, Fronto's, speeches (240.15-16: *Marce...mi Marce carissime*; 105.21).

But Aurelius did not reciprocate the intimate language, nor does he display as much affection towards Fronto anymore, after 161. Of the 30 addresses used by Aurelius, in 28, the emperor Aurelius employs the affectionate *mi magister*, with or without an adjective. That had been Aurelius' standard address to Fronto, during the period of instruction, and he continues to use it. That Aurelius refused to set aside the more formal relationship and verbally express more intimacy to his former teacher must have disappointed Fronto. We get a sense of Fronto's disappointment from the following words in response to Aurelius' solicitude for Fronto's health: "his [sc. my, Fronto's,] health...everything is good for this old man, and – as you address him – "your teacher"" , *seni huic, et, ut tu appellas, magistro tuo, bona salus...res omnis bona* (VdH 86.26-27).

The greater distance that Aurelius maintains is also measured by several other facts in his – Aurelius' – address system, post-161. First the erotic addresses disappear after 161: gone are addresses even remotely similar to *mea voluptas* or *mellitissime*. Second, the emperor has severely pruned down the range of adjectives he uses to accompany his address-terms, down to just four choices: *iucundissime* (5 times), *dulcissime* (2 times), *optime* (2 times); *bone* (1 time). Recall that, when Caesar, he had picked from 20 different adjectives to modify the address term.

Speaking of adjectives, Aurelius, in the earlier correspondence, had used the adjective *carissime* nine (9) times; five instances of *carissime* had modified the cognomen, Fronto (VdH 36.25, 38.12, 38.22, 54.20, 55.28). But after being made emperor, Aurelius addresses his former teacher neither as *Fronto* nor with *carissime*.

Fronto, conversely, addresses the emperor as *mi Marce carissime* (240.16), an adjective he *never* applied to Marcus in the letters from the early period of formal instruction.

²⁰ Seven out of 12 total, if we include a fragment, appearing in the grammarian Charisius (p. 267.6-8 Barwick), where Charisius points out that *male* can serve as an intensifying adverb like *valde*. Here we see Fronto addressing the (perhaps, now) emperor as *Marce*: '*male me, Marce, praeteritae vitae meae paenitet.*'

²¹ Recall the imagined rebuke to Anoninus, telling him to turn away from philosophy: *quid hoc rei est, Antonine?* (VdH 132.4).

The shift in each correspondent's address system after 161 cannot but strike us. Aurelius has abandoned any hint of eroticism in his addresses to Fronto; he continues to call his former tutor *mi magister*; but he creates distance by abandoning the more familiar forms of address he had used, for instance, not using the cognomen with *mi* and/or *carissime* (e.g. not using the addresses *Fronto carissime* 55.28; *mi Fronto* 50.25). Fronto, conversely, seeks, and affects, a greater intimacy with the emperor, something he had not done in the early period.

Emperors could be called *Caesar* or *imperator* or *domine*, with formality decreasing in this order (Dickey 2002: 100-102). It is not surprising then, that in Fronto's correspondence with the three emperors, Aurelius, Verus, and Pius, all three appear. The most informal – *domine* – of the set appears most often in Fronto's early letters to Marcus, 78% of the time; *domine* appears 44% of the time with Verus (four out of nine addresses), and with Pius, never.

Fronto always addresses Antoninus Pius with either *Caesar* or *imperator* (sometimes modified, with either *domine* or *sanctissime*). Three times, Fronto employs a title with Verus, Marcus' co-emperor: either *Caesar* (once) or *imperator* (twice), one-third of the total addresses (three out of nine addresses used by Fronto with Verus). Two further times, he addresses Verus with the praenomen, *Luci* (VdH 119.7; 132.16).²² But the tutor never uses *imperator* and very rarely *Caesar* with Marcus Aurelius at any point in their correspondence.²³ And in the later correspondence, when Aurelius is emperor, Fronto uses mostly cognomen and praenomen, and, as we saw, almost completely drops *domine* from the address system, in striking contrast to his earlier practice.²⁴

If Fronto keeps a respectful distance from Verus and Pius, the latter two convey intimacy in their addresses. Recall that with *carissime*, Fronto conveys intimacy with Aurelius the emperor, and the latter, when Caesar, had indeed used the same adjective with Fronto during the emotionally intense early period. Verus six times addresses Fronto in the correspondence, of which four have the adjective *carissime* with *magister* (*mi magister, Vero tuo dulcissime et carissime*: 114.16; 115.6; 109.11; 113.19).²⁵ The pattern matches what we find in the correspondence between Pius and Fronto. Fronto always uses the title with Pius, but Pius always uses *mi Fronto carissime* (VdH 162.2; 165.3).

Thus, in all these exchanges, positive, or affiliative politeness is normally directed down, from emperor to subject. Fronto's address system discloses that he, on the other hand, as a subject, does not express affection towards his imperial superiors Pius or Verus. The address system Fronto uses towards Aurelius the emperor, then, markedly deviates from this norm, as Fronto *does* express affection towards his former pupil, now *imperator*, in the later correspondence.

²² The first of these passages is in a badly damaged part of the text; in the second passage, Fronto is effusively praising Lucius' eloquence

²³ *Caesar* as an address term used by Fronto in just four out of 133 vocatives in the earlier correspondence (all dating before the 150s: VdH 2.19; 13.18; 25.20; 38.3), and once out of 42 address terms in the later correspondence, when Aurelius was emperor (VdH 148.15)

²⁴ It is worth noting here that with his close friends, Fronto uses the cognomen in an endearing address (*mi Naucelli carissime* 174.22; *mi Naucelli* 183.11). Thus the addresses to his friends approximate Fronto's post 161 addresses to the emperor Aurelius. Arrius Antoninus, a pupil of Fronto's is addressed as *mi fili* (190.14) or *mi domine fili carissime* (189.10), "perhaps betraying here a paternal intimacy in one without sons of his own" (Champlin 1980: 46). Another close friend, Aufidius Victorinus, is addressed once as *domine* (176.10), an address that was polite but considered 'subliterary' in the 2nd C.; Fronto uses it to his friends (in the passages just cited and at VdH 174.4, 13; *domine frater* 185.14). See Dickey (2002: 90-91) on the subliterary but polite nature of *domine*, and Fronto's usage of it to friends; combinations with kinship terms like *frater* (cf. VdH 185.14, *domine frater*) are typical of documentary texts, first appearing there in c. 100 CE and "becomes very common later," according, again, to Dickey.

²⁵ Perhaps Verus wanted a closer relationship with Fronto, as suggested in a letter from the Aurelius the emperor to Fronto: "I ask that you keep up the correspondence (*peto scriptites*) with my brother (sc. Verus). He really wants me to secure this request. His wishes are making me ungovernable and unreasonable" (*domino meo fratri peto scriptites. Valde volt ut hoc a te impetrem; desideria autem illius intemperantem me et violentum faciunt* VdH 92.8-9). This could explain Verus' intimate addresses, too.

Letter Openings and Closings

Greetings and valedictions, or, letter-openings and closings function as the *zeremonielle klammern* “ritual bracketing elements,” not only for face-to-face, but also for epistolary exchanges. Together, salutations and closings serve as a frame demarcating the limits and boundaries of the enclosed exchange (Müller 1997: 17). One particular letter-opening discloses the complex relationship between Fronto and his charge. “Marcus Aurelius Caesar sends greetings to his consul and teacher” (M. AURELIUS CAESAR CONSULI SUO ET MAGISTRO SALUTEM VdH 31.14-15). Aurelius is Caesar (M. AURELIUS CAESAR) to Fronto, who was consul (CONSULI) at the time of writing (in 142 CE). But whenever pedagogy is at issue, Fronto has a (limited) claim to superiority, as Aurelius’ teacher (MAGISTRO). Indeed, in a passage above (1.) we witnessed Aurelius’ deference towards Fronto, but also a performance of friendship. This *amicitia* is suggested by the possessive adjective SUO “his (Aurelius) very own”.²⁶

Opening Phrases

Private letters are “conceived of as a distant dialogue, in that [they] expect a reply and perform an interaction across space and time” (Pocetti 2010: 106). Salutations in conversations (*salve, have*), are supposed to begin the dialogue; so, too, do letter openings initiate a written exchange. Unlike salutations, however, letter openings are expected to be more elaborate (Pocetti 2010: 105).

Letter Openings in the Early Correspondence: Fronto and Caesar

Accordingly, we would expect Fronto, the accomplished stylist, to produce elegantly polished letter openings. But the opposite is true. Let us consider first opening phrases used in the early correspondence, exchanged between tutor and prince, Fronto and Aurelius Caesar. More than three quarters (79.2%) of Fronto’s letter openings to Caesar are simply *DOMINO MEO*, thirty-eight (38) of a total 48 letter openings preserved; thirty-nine (39) if we add *DOMINO MEO FRONTO* (VdH 56.5).²⁷

Fronto rarely diverges from this pattern. Only one extremely elaborate opening stands in this early letter corpus. Written when Fronto was consul, we see that the rhetor, in high dudgeon, begins, sustains, and concludes the letter in high-flown style. He introduces it with *CAESARI AURELIO DOMINO MEO CONSUL TUUS FRONTO SAL(UTEM)* (VdH 17.16). In the body, Fronto’s tone is ebullient, advising Caesar with the aid of various metaphors, from gladiator fights, to cloth and weaving, to horse-riding (VdH 18-19), and praising his rhetorical skill highly (VdH 19.15-20.5). Finally, Fronto closes the letter with an elaborate valediction, drawing from Plautine diction: *vale meum gaudium, mea securitas, hilaritas, gloria. Vale et me obscuro omni modo ames, qua ioco, qua serio* (VdH 21.10-11).²⁸

By contrast, only once does Fronto introduce a letter in a conversational way, with a vocative: *HAVE DOMINE* (VdH 38.4). But this letter is really a post-script, an afterthought dashed off “when I closed and sealed the last letter” and right then “something came to mind”: *clausa iam et obsignata priore epistula venit mihi in mentem [aliquid]* (VdH 38.6-7). The context – a brief message, fired off quickly – explains this, the only verbal sign of a looser style in Fronto’s letter openings.

²⁶ A search in Cicero’s *ad Familiares* (using the Perseus text) shows that Cicero writes to *Tironi suo* and *Terentiae suae*, also once to *Dolabellae suo*; Vatinius uses it to Cicero, as does Curio once. Cicero doesn’t use it to other correspondents. It therefore seems that *suo*+dative marks a close friendship in Cicero’s letters, and probably Latin epistles generally. I thank my co-editor Anne Mahoney for performing this research for me.

²⁷ Interestingly, all the letter openings with *suo* date from the first four years of the relationship, for instance: *M. CAESARI DOMINO SUO FRONTO* (VdH 8.8), from 139 CE; and *CAESARI SUO CONSUL* (VdH 31.20), again, from Fronto’s consulship of 142 CE. In any case, the default opening is *DOMINO MEO*.

²⁸ *qua...qua... for et...et... qua maris qua feminas* (Pl. *Mil.* 1113) and elaborate greetings: *o mea commoditas, o mea opportunitas, salve* (Pl. *Men.* 137-138).

A quick contrast with the letter openings from Fronto to friends shows the formal distance that Fronto maintains with Marcus. For only once does he use the pupil's first name, Marcus, in a letter opening, and one which dates from the beginning of the instruction, when Marcus was eighteen, and Fronto, about forty (139 CE): M. CAESARI DOMINO SUO FRONTO (VdH 8.8). With friends, however, Fronto always opens letters with the name, typically *gentilicium* and *cognomen*, for instance, to his close friend Arrius Antoninus, Fronto begins ARRIO ANTONINO (VdH 189.9).

For Aurelius' letter openings, three points can be made. First, Aurelius much more frequently employs a more colloquial tone; second, his openings are more affectionate and finally they are more stylistically varied, from the colloquial, to something neutral, MAGISTRO MEO (31 of his total 51 letter openings, or 61%), to stylistically elaborated, like the introduction to a letter that dates somewhere in this earlier period: M. CAESAR M. FRONTONI MAGISTRO SUO SALUTEM (VdH 60.1).

Let us take each of these points in detail. First, Aurelius begins his letters conversationally at an incidence of once for every five beginnings, simply by beginning the letter with a term of address eleven (11) times out of 51 of his opening phrases.²⁹ These are frequently affectionate: of the total 11 vocative opening-phrases, seven (7) feature the endearing address, *mi*+vocative ("my dear..."), for example HAVE MI FRONTO CARISSIME (VdH 38.11).

The default for Aurelius' letter openings, as we saw, is MAGISTRO MEO, almost two-thirds of his letter openings. But Aurelius' most elaborate letter openings date from the year when Fronto held a consulship, 142 (Eck 1998). In these five letter openings, the elevated style matches the augmented status of the addressee; for instance: M. AURELIUS CAESAR CONSULI SUO ET MAGISTRO SALUTEM (VdH 30.15; cf. 25.22, 29.10, 32.15, 10.1).

We now compare the two correspondents' usage in regard to letter openings, Caesar's and Fronto's. Aurelius, with a more frequent use of address terms as letter openings, initiates his written correspondence as if it were a face-to-face conversation with a good friend. Fronto is consistently more formal than Aurelius, using only one vocative phrase to introduce a letter; Aurelius uses eleven. Aurelius uses endearing forms of address – which are positively polite – in his letter openings; Fronto does not. Aurelius draws from a broader palette of letter openings, from informal, to neutral, to quite formal. Fronto mostly remains in the neutral register when choosing letter openings. Are there any changes once Aurelius becomes emperor?

Letter Openings in the Later Correspondence: Fronto and Augustus

We have few letters surviving from the period after 161 (see Table 1), and even fewer surviving letter openings. From the openings extant or recoverable, Marcus Aurelius, now *Augustus*, departs markedly from how he had introduced letters in his earlier correspondence. For now, without fail, Augustus uses MAGISTRO MEO, with or without SAL(UTEM).³⁰ Gone are elaborate letter openings; gone are vocatives, that Aurelius *Caesar* had employed, like HAVE MIHI MAGISTER DULCISSIME (VdH 63.12).

By contrast, Fronto departs little from the distant stance disclosed by letter openings he chose to use in the early period. If anything, Fronto further distances himself, preferring, nine times out of thirteen, to use the last half of the emperor's formal title, for instance: ANTONINO AUGUSTO DOMINO MEO (VdH 92.11).³¹ If we compare his letter

²⁹ CARISSIME (VdH 54.17); HAVE MI FRONTO CARISSIME (VdH 38.11); HAVE MI FRONTO MERITO CARISSIME (50.8); HAVE MI MAGISTER OPTIME (VdH 249.1, 85.3, 42.4, 43.1); HAVE MIHI MAGISTER CARISSIME (61.5); HAVE MIHI MAGISTER DULCISSIME (VdH 62.8); HAVE MIHI MAGISTER DULCISSIME (63.12); MI <FRONTO CONSUL> AMPLISSIME (25.22).

³⁰ Once he allows himself to insert Fronto's name in the dative case: MA<GI>STR<O FRONTONI> SA<L> (VdH 239.17), in a heartfelt condolence letter mourning the death of Fronto's grandson. Note, however, that this is an editorial supplement.

³¹ The emperor, after 161 was styled *Imperator Caesar M. Aurelius Antoninus Augustus*: Kovács (2012: 78). Fronto's infrequent alternative was DOMINO MEO (four times: VdH 102.8; 102.22; 104.4; 104.15).

openings with emperors with whom he did not have as close ties, Verus and Pius, we can appreciate the gap that has opened up in the relations between the men. For Fronto uses only the title when heading letters to Verus, with whom his relationship was “mercurial” (Champlin 1980: 110-116).³² He similarly only employs titles to introduce letters to Pius, with whom Fronto probably did not have any “real intimacy” (Champlin 1980: 97-102).³³

Letter Closings

Like letter openings, valedictions are highly scripted moments in any letter exchange. At least in the earlier correspondence, neither Caesar (64 total valedictions) nor Fronto (42 total) are ever content with simple valedictions, such as were presumably found in conversation and amply attested to in Roman comedy, like *vale*, *bene vale* or *valeas*. The most basic valediction in our corpus is *vale* followed by one or more vocatives (*vale, Caesar, decus patriae et Romani nominis; vale, domine* VdH 31.23-24). To such a valediction, Fronto will often attach a request that Caesar pass on a salutation to his (Caesar’s) mother, thus: *vale, domine, patri placeto, matri dic salutem, me desiderato* (VdH 51.26-27). Half of Fronto’s valedictions are like this. Aurelius reciprocates with the corresponding *vale*+vocative; *domina mea* (or *mater mea*) *te salutatur* (or *salutat te*) in about a third of his valedictions.

These recurrent formulae, Fronto’s *dominam tuam saluta* and Aurelius’ *domina mea te salutatur*, point to Domitilla Lucilla – Aurelius’ mother – as another connection between the two men. For Fronto’s wife, Cratia, was Domitilla’s *clienta*, and the two women were friends (Champlin 1980: 108-109). Cratia, however, “is a shadow next to Cicero’s Terentia or Pliny’s Calpurnia”: Fronto’s interests in the correspondence are elsewhere (Champlin 1980: 26-27); and so are Aurelius’, who never asks Fronto to pass on greetings to his wife, Cratia, in the closings.

We witnessed Aurelius’ stylistic variation in his address-system and letter openings; he also varies his letter closings, employing at least 6 unique valedictions, not found in Fronto; while the prince’s tutor uses three unique valedictions.

The stylistic variety may result from his desire to impress his teacher. On one occasion, Aurelius playfully elaborates a rather plain letter-closing, saying that, given his addressee, he should conclude his letter in a more structured way (*me dispositius dicere oportet*):

8.

Vale mihi Fronto iucundissime, quamquam ita me dispositius dicere oportet (nam tu quidem postulas talia): O qui ubique estis di boni, valeat, oro, meus Fronto iucundissimus atque carissimus mihi, valeat semper integro inlibato incolumi corpore, valeat et mecum esse possit. Homo suavissime, vale (VdH 2.13-17).

Farewell, my delightful Fronto, though I should say it in a more structured way (after all, such is what you demand): O, you good gods, whosoever you are, I pray that my Fronto be well, most pleasant and dear to me, well always in body, intact, unimpaired, whole; may he be well and [I pray that he] can always be with me. Most charming man, farewell.

Indeed, the closing is *dispositius dictum*. Aurelius voices a prayer arranged in descending tricolon with triple repetition of *valeat*, and assonance and alliteration in the second member (*integro inlibato incolumi corpore*). All of this is inserted between two valedictions, chiasmically arranged (*vale mihi Fronto iucundissime...homo suavissime, vale*). There is nothing this elaborate in Fronto’s letters, perhaps because Fronto doesn’t need to

³² Fronto always addresses Aurelius’ co-ruler, Verus as Augustus, for instance: DOMINO AURELIO VERO AUGUSTO (VdH 113.1).

³³ He always addresses Pius with the title, for instance: ANTONINO PIO AUGUSTO FRONTO (VdH 166.19).

impress Aurelius with his Latin, since his reputation as a master Latinist recommended him to Aurelius' family in the first place.³⁴

Aurelius also explores the opposite pole of the stylistic register, choosing a loose syntax – specifically *aposiopesis*, to close another letter (*vale meum...quid dicam?* VdH 63.20). Again, I find nothing like this in Fronto. Another way in which Aurelius' valedictions closely mimic a more relaxed register is in the use of *valebis*, found in Cicero's letters *ad Familiares* and *ad Atticum* (Fronto does not employ it); and *valeas*, frequently recurring in Roman comedy, and in the just-cited letter collections of Cicero. It may have belonged to the colloquial register. At any rate, Fronto does not employ it in any of his extant letters from this period.

Valedictions in correspondence between Fronto and Augustus

In striking contrast to the earlier correspondence, when Fronto permitted himself more ample closings, we now find just three: two are simply *vale*; one is only slight more elaborate (*vale* (VdH 101.19; *vale mi domine dulcissime; dominam et filiolos saluta; fratri interea orationes mittito*, 102.20-21; *vale*, 160.12).³⁵

When closing letters, Aurelius restricts the stylistic variety of his earlier correspondence for a more parsimonious *vale*+vocative; for instance: *vale mi iucundissime magister* (104.1).³⁶ New in this period are requests that the emperor's greetings be passed on to Fronto's grandson, in five of the thirteen total valedictions (86.16; 92.10; 101.24; 102.7; 103.15-16), for instance: *vale mi dulcissime magister; nepotem saluta* (102.7). Fronto's grandsons were born around the time Aurelius became emperor, so the emperor's requests (*nepotem saluta*) concluding these letters was to be expected.

Again, comparison with the other letter corpora is revealing.³⁷ Nowhere in Aurelius' correspondence – pre- or post-accession – does he say to Fronto *uxorem tuam saluta*. But we have one such valediction in the correspondence from the co-emperor Verus *vale, mi magister; Vero tuo carissime; Cratiam saluta* (VdH 114.13). Here we have yet another attempt by Verus to convey an intimacy with Fronto which the latter did not apparently feel.³⁸

Code Switches

Switches from Latin to Greek – **code-switches** – recur with some frequency in the major literary epistolary corpora. In fact, there is a broad community of practice, with Cicero (in *ad Familiares*), Pliny (in the first nine books of his letters) and Fronto code-switching about twice for every one Loeb page (Elder and Mullen 2019: 192-193).³⁹ It is fair to say that from Cicero's time, code-switching to Greek was one of the several defining features of Latin literary epistles.

But it is not always easy to determine whether the author has indeed switched to Greek. Loan-words like *strofa* ("I get that clever trick of yours," *intellego istam tuam argutissimam strofam*, VdH 50.9), by origin Greek but firmly part of the Latin lexicon by the author's time, are not always straightforward to identify (Elder and Mullen 2019: 18-19). Similarly hard to assess are words with Greek roots but Latin inflectional endings.

³⁴ The conclusion to a letter dated to Fronto's consulship comes close: *vale meum gaudium, mea securitas, hilaritas, gloria. vale et me obsecro, omni modo ames, qua ioco qua serio* (VdH 21.10-11).

³⁵ Thus only three valedictions conclude three letters out of a total twelve (12) whose endings are not damaged (with 22 total letters in this later correspondence from Fronto).

³⁶ We have twelve (12) letters from the emperor to his tutor. All but one contain a valediction; in two letters, the emperor signs off twice (86.15-19; 104.4-3).

³⁷ There is only one valediction in the correspondence with friends (173.26).

³⁸ See above, n. 25.

³⁹ For statistics on Cicero's code-switching over time, see Adams (2013: 372-374) with further elaboration in Elder and Mullen (2019: 136-9): he appears to use less Greek in times of crisis, but in fact, could turn to it during the fraught year of 49 to escape or to engage in serious deliberation.

For instance, Fronto, in a letter to Aurelius, chides the emperor for not relaxing more during his vacation, *perhaps* switching to Greek mid-way: “you should have had a party with all sorts of shell fish...rich dishes, fruits” (*convivium deinde regium agitates conchis omnium generum...matteis, pomis* (VdH 227.18-228.2). *Matteis* transliterates the Greek ματτή, “a rich, highly flavored dish” (LSJ s.v. ματτή) but carries the Latin *-is* ending. Elder and Mullen might have considered the word as a “word-internal code-switch” (2019: 80), but they do not include it in their database of code-switches.⁴⁰

Probably more difficult is finding the *reason* for a code-switch; in some cases, it is simply a matter of interpretation (Elder and Mullen 2019: 18-19; 195-196). It will not surprise, then, that my own and Elder and Mullen’s databases – compiled independently (and roughly at the same time, although neither knew about the other’s efforts!) – differ. So, too, the statistics in each of our works differs slightly.⁴¹ Drawing on previous work for my classificatory apparatus, in particular that of Adams (2003: 308-346) and Elder and Mullen (2019: 24-30), I offer here the most frequently recurring reasons for Fronto and friends’ switches to Greek.

First, because the discourse surrounding certain disciplines had been sustained in Greek for centuries, a technical vocabulary became associated with each of them, for instance, rhetoric, medicine, architecture, or cuisine. The author chooses the Greek technical term because it is *le mot juste*, more readily to hand, and more economical than a Latin version (Adams 2003: 337-40; Elder and Mullen 2019: 26, 92).

Second, quotations are relatively frequent in the correspondence. Along with switches motivated by the Greek discipline under discussion, quotations (of any kind, a proverb, from a work of literature, self- or other-quotation) figure among the top two most frequent motivations for switches to Greek in Fronto (Elder and Mullen 2019: 85). Understanding why the author employs the quotation is often more difficult: Cicero may make use of quotations during periods of crisis to “sum up and help him reflect on the problems [he] faced” (Elder and Mullen 2019: 139). But sometimes authors introduce quotations to highlight a shared identity with the addressee.

9. Fronto recommends a certain Volumnius to a beloved former pupil, Arrius Antoninus.

Demonstratus est mihi a doctis et multum mihi familiaribus viris, quorum apud me voluntas ipsorum merito valet plurimum. Igitur, si me amas, tantum Volumnio tribue honoris facultatisque amicitiae tuae complectendae; οἱ γὰρ φίλτατοι ἄνδρες conciliaverunt eum mihi. Igitur tam comi amicitia accipias velim quam ille Me<no>et<iadi> volebat, ζωρότερον δὲ κέραιρε quom imperabat (VdH 189.2-8).

He was pointed out to me by cultured men, who are very close to me, and whose good-will in my eyes – deservedly – means a great deal. So, please, give to Volumnius as much esteem [sc. as I do] and the opportunity to embrace your friendship. οἱ γὰρ φίλτατοι ἄνδρες [“for dear friends,” Hom. *Il.* 9.204] have

⁴⁰ <https://csrl.classics.cam.ac.uk/index.php>. For points where I disagree with the categorization of a particular code-switch, see my data, available on my website: https://www.umb.edu/academics/cla/faculty/peter_barrios_lech.

⁴¹ I submit a few code-switches eliminated from, on various grounds, Elder and Mullen’s database, but which I include: (1.) VdH 178.1 *tropos* (transliterated τρόπος; a correction by Mai of topos in MS A); (2.) καὶ παίζειν ἀναγκαῖον, VdH 183.2 (no MSS variation here); (3.) I would admit the playful *epistolicotata* and *rhetoricotata* VdH 188.4-5, even though they are nowhere else attested; cf. Mullen and Elder (2019: 80) who insightfully suggest that these are ‘word-internal code-switches’; (4.) *paronomasia* (transliterated παρονομασία) VdH 97.1; (5.) *epanaphoris* (transliterated ἐπαναφορά although the Matrix Language, Latin, governs the case ending, *is*), VdH 97.4; (6.) *matteis* (transliterated ματτή, “a rich, highly flavored dish”, LSJ s.v. ματτή), with the Matrix Language case-ending, *is*.

secured my favor towards him [sc. Volumnius]. So I want you to accept him with as warm a friendship as that one [sc. Achilles] wanted Menoetiades to [accept Ajax, Phoenix, and Odysseus]; when he ordered [Patroclus] to ζωρότερον δὲ κέραριε [mix the pure wine into the jug].

Arrius, the addressee, was a judge with jurisdiction in Cisalpine Gaul, precisely where Volumnius, the recommendee, had been a municipal senator for the town of Concordia. Volumnius, however, suffered exile. In another letter (not given here), Fronto will ask Arrius, in his capacity as *judex*, to restore Volumnius to the municipal senate (VdH 190-197; Champlin 1980: 69-70).

This was probably the context for our passage (9), where Fronto vouches for Volumnius' character: "he was pointed out to me by cultured men, who are very close to me, and whose good-will in my eyes – deservedly – means a great deal" (*demonstratus est mihi a doctis et multum mihi familiaribus viris, quorum apud me voluntas ipsorum merito valet plurimum* VdH 189.2-3). Fronto immediately points to a commonality all men share: literary culture. That shared culture provides the context for the switches to Greek.

With just a couple of citations from the famous embassy of the *Iliad*, Fronto evokes an entire scene – Achilles' tent – where the Greek hero swept aside existing tensions, and warmly welcomed Odysseus, Phoenix and Ajax. Several times, in their hearing, Achilles says these guests are "dearest to him" (Hom. *Il.* 9.198; 204). To demonstrate his fellow-feeling, Achilles has Patroclus mix wine (ζωρότερον δὲ κέραριε) and pour cups for everyone.

Fronto's brief allusions pay Arrius a two-fold compliment. First, he pays tribute to his learning, counting on Arrius to be able to evoke the scene for himself. Second, Arrius can be an Achilles, forgetting politics for a while to extend friendship to Volumnius. Alternatively, if Arrius so chooses, he can be Patroclus, heeding his revered teacher's advice. On display here, then, is one motivation for code-switching: to remind the addressee that both he and the writer form part of a learned in-group (Adams 2003: 316-317).

Code Switches in the Early Correspondence between Fronto and Marcus

Most of the tutor's code-switches draw, predictably, from the domain of Greek rhetoric (87.0%, or 27 of the 31 total code-switches from the period of instruction), as Fronto instructs his charge in the *ars rhetorica*. Otherwise, the Latin tutor but rarely (only four other times) switches to Greek for other reasons.⁴² Fronto's switches to Greek for didactic purposes recur ten times in a letter where he illustrates the effective comparison (the εἰκῶν). He begins by depicting the island of Ischia which "receives and repels" the waves, any naval force, pirates, etc.; within that island, he goes on, is a lake, which itself contains an island, "safe from dangers and difficulty" (VdH 40.17-18). So does the emperor Pius "endure the perils" of ruler while protecting Marcus "in his [sc. Pius'] tranquil bosom" (VdH 40.22-41.23). The remainder of the letter is taken up in teaching Marcus the effective use of such comparisons, and Fronto switches to Greek always out of a need to express a rhetorical concept.⁴³ Indeed,

⁴² Twice to quote (VdH 21.9-10, a Greek proverb; VdH 8.20, quoting Marcus Aurelius), once to request (VdH 50.5). The fourth instance deserves special comment. In a letter perhaps dating after the period of instruction, Fronto employs the philosophers to show that even they use *obliqua* – indirect means – of stating their points. Does Socrates, he asks chide his interlocutors *per iurgium an per πολιτίαν*? "by rebuking them or politely/urbanely" (VdH 48.14) Elder and Mullen give as a reason for this code-switch that Fronto draws from the Greek discourses surrounding politics and law ("Greek Culture Sphere: Politics/Law"). But given the context, I think it more likely that Fronto introduces a loan-translation for *urbanitas*, πολιτίαν, English "politeness." Elder and Mullen give Fronto 27 code-switches in this early period, before the mid-forties. I include in this early period four code-switches which cannot be securely dated within the period 139-161: VdH 45.19, 46.11, 48.12 and 48.14. For the early period, Elder and Mullen have 81% of Fronto's code-switching drawing from the Greek cultural domain of Literature/Rhetoric/Grammar. Obviously, the difference between our figures should not obscure the overarching agreement on Fronto's recurrent use of Greek to explicate ideas in the *ars rhetorica*.

⁴³ For a sustained reading of this letter, with careful attention to the code-switching, see Elder and Mullen (2019: 198-202).

as Elder and Mullen remind us, Fronto's reaching for *le mot juste* follows "no doubt his own training probably from several Greek teachers, of whom three, Aridelus, Athenodotus and Dionysius are mentioned in the letters" (Elder and Mullen 2019: 196).

By contrast, Marcus Aurelius employs 16 Greek rhetoric terms or about 30% (16 out of 54 total switches to Greek in his earlier letters).⁴⁴ Slightly more often, Marcus will insert quotations in his letters (19 times out of his 54 switches to Greek, representing a proportion of about 35%). Of these, fifteen (15) appear in a well-constructed letter which constitutes an *accusatio somni*, an accusation of sleep. Here Marcus sets up Odysseus and Agamemnon as examples of the perils of ill-timed naps and deceptive dreams, and draws liberally on the passages from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.⁴⁵

Code-Switches in the Later Correspondence between Fronto and Aurelius the Emperor

We have fewer code-switches for Aurelius the emperor (10), than we do for Fronto (31), but this is no doubt due to the fact that Fronto writes more frequently to the emperor, whose letters in turn, tend to be curt, in striking contrast with the earlier correspondence.⁴⁶

Once Aurelius becomes emperor, Fronto continues to teach him through epistles. This explains the high proportion – 55% (17 out of 31 total code-switches) – of Greek words or phrases which draw from the Greek discipline of rhetoric. But Fronto quotes from Greek sources much more often now than he did in the earlier correspondence, 29% (9 of the total 31 code-switches). Elder and Mullen, noting that these figures approach *Marcus'* style in the earlier correspondence, explain: "perhaps [Fronto] is, consciously or subconsciously, aping Marcus' earlier practice from their more intimate period of association."

I am in agreement with Elder and Mullen: the reason for Fronto's latter code-switching practice must be that he wants to accommodate to his addressee's well-known tastes for Greek culture, especially literature and philosophy. Fronto, therefore, now draws much more liberally on terminology from other cultural spheres traditionally associated with the Greeks – fine dining, philosophy and medicine (5 out of 31, or 16.1%). But in the early correspondence, Fronto had *exclusively* employed Greek rhetorical technical terms.⁴⁷ Now the former teacher inclines to drawing from Greek authors to illustrate rhetorical principles, and now expresses his emotions in Greek, two things he had not done in the earlier correspondence. Thus, when he illustrates the construction of a *prooemium* in oratory, he quotes liberally from the first four verses of the Apollonius' *Argonautika* (VdH 155.19-22). He twice turns to Greek to express his great pride in seeing Aurelius' successes, first, when praising Aurelius the emperor for carefully constructing a tricky phrase: "you've made me happy, really happy, so help me" (εὐφρανας, ὑπερέφρανας, σῶξέο μοι VdH 146.9-10) and, second, quoting Homer "Leto rejoiced in her heart", γέγηθε δὲ φρένα Λήτω (Od. 6.106) because "I'm unable to express my joy in my own words" at the emperors' rhetorical prowess (*meis enim verbis exprimere vim gaudi mei nequeo* VdH 87.22-23).

We have ten code-switches in Aurelius the emperor's correspondence. Half of these have a referential function, that is, to use Elder and Mullen's definition, they "advance the meaning of the text, but [do] not explicitly comment on or describe anything in the other language" (Elder and Mullen 2019: 29).⁴⁸ The other half, or five, draw from the traditional

⁴⁴ Elder and Mullen (2019: 209-210) count 52 switches for Marcus Aurelius, of which 38% are drawn from the cultural sphere of Literature, Rhetoric and Grammar and 29% are quotations. See above, and n.42, for the reason for differences between theirs and my own numbers.

⁴⁵ Fronto, indeed, praises Marcus for the carefully thought out letter (VdH 8.20-9.3): see, further, Elder and Mullen (2019: 210-211).

⁴⁶ We have twenty two (22) more or less complete letters from Fronto; against just 12 from Aurelius; and Fronto's are typically lengthier, like the letters *de Eloquentia* and the letter *de Orationibus*.

⁴⁷ Two of these from VdH 151.22-23 count both as quotations and phrases used in Greek philosophical discourse, that is they are imagined quotations, utterances one would probably hear in a Greek philosophical school.

⁴⁸ In practice, I found it difficult to distinguish the referential function from that of description, the latter a "function...assigned when the primary purpose of the code-switch is description" (Elder and Mullen 2019: 25). I found myself often notating "referential/description" for cases where the Greek advanced the meaning of the text,

Greek cultural spheres, with rhetoric predominating (VdH 105.17-18 *ter*). We have many fewer code-switches in this later correspondence, so it is impossible to analyze changes from Aurelius, earlier and later practice.⁴⁹

Code-Switching in the other Subcorpora

Here, too, comparison with code-switching practice in the other subcorpora will be instructive. Greek has an intimate as well as distancing function – it is useful to speak euphemistically about uncomfortable topics (Adams 2003: 335; Elder and Mullen 2019: 205). Also, as noted above, Greek can forge intimacy, pointing to a shared literary culture and used to express deep emotion.

Pius never, and Verus once (to cite a title, πεντηκονταετίαν Θουκυδίδης VdH 108.27) switches to Greek when writing to Fronto. This may result from the many fewer letters that we have from these men (see Table 1), but also from the quality of Fronto's relationship with them, which was certainly more distant than it was with Marcus. Fronto does code-switch to Verus, six times, but of these six, three are the Greek term φιλόστοργος and its cognates, used to describe Fronto's relationship not with Verus, but with a former pupil and close friend, Gavius Clarus (VdH 111.17, 18, 19). The term, he says elsewhere, does not exist in Roman, so he is forced to use the Greek here.⁵⁰ In another letter, we find Fronto defending himself for – after a four month absence from Rome – *not* greeting the new emperor Verus. To testify that he had intended to greet Verus, he quotes from a Greek letter written to the imperial *cubicularius* asking if “today would be good day to come” (VdH 116.16-18).

Fronto switches to Greek two more times in the correspondence, but on neither occasion does the code-switch have the function of forging intimacy with Verus. Once, the Greek code-switch occurs in praise for *both* Marcus Aurelius and Verus.⁵¹ In another code-switch, with a purely referential function, Fronto assaults emperors non trained in rhetoric who use speech-writers: they speak another's words, just like those whom an alien disease, “phrenitis[,] has taken hold of” (*qualis phrenitis morbus quibus implicitus est, aliena eloquentes imperitabant*, VdH 123.15-16).

In correspondence with his friends, however, Fronto's code-switching does forge intimacy. There are four quotations from Greek authors or thinkers highlighting Fronto's shared culture with the addressee, a close friend in all cases. We noted in passage (9), above, how Fronto switches to Greek in order to highlight the love for Greek literature he and his friend Arrius share. With another special intimate, Claudius Julianus, Fronto twice quotes from a *grammaticus* Valerianus, urging Julianus to treat a certain case with a light touch (VdH 182.19; 183.2; Champlin 1980: 34-36).

Fronto forges intimacy by complaining about medical ailments. This he does in Greek with another close friend, Aufidius Victorinus.⁵² We see Fronto more relaxed and playful in this correspondence. To the same Aufidius he commends a certain Aquila in

referring to some extralinguistic reality without commenting on a particular use of language or something mentioned in the letter.

⁴⁹ Elder and Mullen (2019: 210) similarly note three code-switches motivated by Aurelius need to express a rhetorical concept and otherwise observe that “his code-switching is more varied.” For this particular set of correspondence, I differ from Elder and Mullen on interpretation in many cases, hence our different conclusions. Elder and Mullen's remarks bear quoting here: “any analysis of this kind [sc. assigning a function to a code-switch] is subjective: we are constantly reminded of the inadequacies of our appreciation of the cultural context and question interpretations which are based on incomplete texts.”

⁵⁰ See n. 55 below.

⁵¹ In praising Varus' and Marcus' oratory, Fronto says that he is better equipped than “the torch runners at Eleusis, kings carrying scepters, the *quindecimveri* consulting their tomes” (*amplior mihi et ornatior videbar daduchis Eleusine faces gestantibus et regibus scepra tenentibus et quindecimviris libros adeuntibus*, VdH 132.17-19).

⁵² He complains about lower back pain, supplying the Latin translation of the term (*internatium Graeci hieron oston*, Suetonius... ‘*spinam sacram*’ appellanti) and adds “I would have preferred to be ignorant of the Latin and Greek term for any body part, as long as I could live without *this* pain” (VdH 179.6-9).

Greek, playing on the eagle's (*aquila*) excellence among birds in complementing *Aquila* as ῥητόρων ἄριστος (VdH 176.17). In another letter we find playful coinages, *epistolicotata* and *rhetoricotata*, to praise the writing of one Volumnius Quadratus. These, I believe, constitute code-switches to Greek (VdH 188.5).⁵³

Of the 10 total code-switches, then, four are quotations in letters to close friends, and another four create intimacy or indicate a light, playful tone. On the remaining two occasions where Fronto switches to Greek, he draws on terminology from spheres traditionally associated with the Greeks, rhetoric and deeply emotional relationships.⁵⁴ The near absence of rhetorical terminology in this set of correspondence, of course indicates that its concerns lie elsewhere: for instance commendation, requests, expressions of friendly concern.

The high proportion of quotations and the more frequent recourse to Greek terminology in cultural spheres *other than rhetoric* aligns this correspondence with Fronto's letters to Aurelius the emperor, where, as we saw, Fronto tries to accommodate to the emperor's interests in Greek.

It is now time to conclude by bringing together the paper's five strands – (1) commands and requests; (2) address terms (3) openings and (4) closings; (5.) code-switching.

Conclusion

Two main conclusions can be drawn about the early correspondence, between Fronto and Aurelius. First, Fronto consistently maintains relational distance, while Aurelius insists on closing that distance. We see this striking contrast – Fronto circumspect, Aurelius frankly intimate – in the following areas: Fronto (1.) uses polite markers of distance and respect, like *si videtur* “if it seems alright to you, [do it]”; Marcus Aurelius inclines much more to affiliatively/positively polite markers like *si me amas*, “if you love me, [sc. then do x for me]”; (2.) In his address system, Fronto generally avoids the affectionate address-form *mi+vocative* and never uses erotic language. Marcus Aurelius, however, *liberally* employs affectionate and erotic address terms. (3.) In letter openings, Fronto almost always uses the courteous, but brief DOMINO MEO. Marcus Aurelius, however, employs endearing address forms in the vocative to open letters, like HAVE MI FRONTO CARISSIME (VdH 38.11). These intimate addresses used to begin an epistle find no counterpart in Fronto's letters. Only several times does Fronto depart from his usual, distant letter opening, and this in a very early letter, M. CAESARI DOMINO SUO FRONTO, whose wording better characterizes Fronto's letter openings to his friends.

Second, Marcus Aurelius' style is more varied, adventurous, and colloquial than Fronto's. Marcus Aurelius address-system draws from an ample and various lexical palette, with more than 20 unique adjectives at his disposal. (Fronto's address system contains just four unique adjectives.) Marcus' letter openings are more colloquial, and more stylistically varied than Fronto's; and Marcus' letter closings show a similar variety against Fronto's more restricted set of closings. Finally, Fronto's code-switching in this early period reflects his role as a rhetoric instructor: most (87.0%) of the time, the *rhetor* switches to Greek to express a rhetorical concept. Marcus Aurelius' code-switching is more varied than is Fronto's. Although Marcus the rhetoric student expresses rhetorical concepts with the appropriate Greek term (30%), even more of his switches to Greek are quotations (35%). Marcus also uses the relevant Greek word to convey the relevant amatory, medical or philosophical idea. Sometimes he simply refers to or describes an extralinguistic reality in Greek, something Fronto never does.

Several questions remain. First, what accounts for the striking difference in the

⁵³ Mullen and Elder write memorably of this passage, “his letter is much more informal and relaxed in tone and we can imagine that a light-hearted discussion of styles of writing might trigger the desire for a Hellenic frisson” (2019: 80).

⁵⁴ Once Fronto again uses the Greek *philostorgus* (transliterated) to describe someone dear to him; this is a term, he says, that “doesn't appear in Latin” (*philostorgum... eius rei nomen apud Romanos nullum est*, VdH 173.15-16). Only once in this correspondence does he draw from Greek rhetorical terminology (VdH 181.3), for the focus of this set of letters is elsewhere.

stylistic mannerism between Fronto and Aurelius? Second, Fronto, in his directive and address system, and in his opening phrases, avoids affectionate displays towards the princeps. But how to reconcile this with the *content* of Fronto's letters themselves, which is at times strikingly affectionate?

Others have noted that Marcus' exuberant style contrasted with Fronto's cautious, and restrained usage, befitting a rhetoric teacher whose charge is to exemplify *Romanitas*.⁵⁵ We now have the data to underpin this claim. The emotions underlying Marcus' exuberant language (and Fronto's cautious reciprocation) were probably genuinely felt, especially since these letters were probably not meant for broader distribution (Champlin 1980: 3; Elder and Mullen 2019: 208).

The two letters which probably initiated the relationship set the tone. In 139 CE, when he was 45 and Aurelius 18, Fronto wrote a letter of introduction in Greek. This is Fronto's invention, an additional speech for Plato's *Phaedrus*. Throughout this letter, the tutor-to-be insists that, not blinded by desire, he can keep Aurelius' interests in mind better than could any lover, drunk with *ἔρωσ*: "As far as I'm concerned, you'll be called *καλός* (beautiful), but not beloved" (*καλός γάρ, οὐχὶ ὁ ἐρώμενος, τό γε κατ' ἐμὲ ὀνομασθήσει addit*. VdH 251.26). There is no consensus on Fronto's purpose in writing the letter. Interpretations have ranged from "jeu d'esprit" to "veiled seduction attempt".⁵⁶

We do better to focus on Marcus' response. If Fronto invokes Greek pedagogical practice, with its erotic bond between *ἐραστής* and *ἐρώμενος*, the Marcus turns this relationship on its head. He sees right through Fronto's diffidence (much as Socrates, or Phaedrus himself, saw through Lysias' in the *Phaedrus*): "you'll never drive away your lover (*erasten tuum*) – me, I mean" (*numquam tu tamen erasten tuum, me dico, depuleris*, VdH 249.2). At the conclusion of the same letter, Marcus says that he burns with as much love for Fronto as Socrates does for Phaedrus (VdH 250.1-3). Pupil, then, becomes teacher; beloved becomes lover, as Aurelius inverts the traditional relationship. His letter is also suffused with erotic language, drawn from Greek and Roman love poetry and New Comedy.⁵⁷

This initial exchange sets the tone for what is to come, with Marcus exaggeratedly passionate, and Fronto restrained. For in the early period, before 145 CE, Marcus' language continues to be overtly erotic. For instance, in a letter from the early 140's, Aurelius says his desire "swells" (*gliscit*), like a leek, quoting the mime writer Laberius:

10.

et quod ait Laberius de amore... "amor tuus tam cito crescit quam porrus, tam firme quam palma," hoc igitur ego ad desiderium verto, quod ille de amore ait (VdH 30.19-22).

'My love for you grows as quickly as a leek, as firmly as a palm tree': what he [sc. Laberius] says about love, I say about my desire for you.'

It is hard to ignore the sexual undertones here, and this is just one of Caesar's several frankly

⁵⁵ "The future emperor...is exuberant, slangy, sometimes impudent, and...bubbling over with love for Fronto; the eminent orator responds cautiously but, in the end, with a tragic sense of desertion and betrayal" (Richlin 2006b: 5-6).

⁵⁶ It constitutes a *jeu d'esprit*: Van den Hout (1999: 560). No, it is a seduction attempt, says Richlin: for in his *erotikos logos*, Fronto hides safely behind the mask of a character in the *Phaedrus* (Lysias') in order to flirt without appearing to do so (2006a: 113; 117). Maybe the two, so Davenport and Manley, invoke the context of Greek pedagogical practice, in an age devoted to reviving 5th C. Athenian literary culture. They therefore employ the language of the *ἐραστής* and *ἐρώμενος* "to show off their own literary and rhetorical prowess" (2014: 10). Pascale Fleury denies that this is a seduction attempt or a *bagatelle*; no, it is Fronto's veiled attack on philosophy (2006: 305-306: 321-323).

⁵⁷ Aurelius perishes from love for Fronto, *te ita amore depereo* (VdH 249.7): this is language used by *adulescentes amantes* in comedy (Pl. *Am.* 517; *Bac.* 747, *Ep.* 219). Marcus burns with desire (*arsisse*, *addit*. VdH 250.3); the language of burning frequent in amatory poetry (e.g. Vergil *Ec.* 2.1) and Roman comedy (Ter. *Eu.* 84-85).

erotic declarations.⁵⁸

These declarations apparently overwhelm Fronto, who is struck by their ardent nature (VdH 15.4-10); declares himself unable to match Caesar's love (VdH 3.14-19; VdH 13.18-14.6) or demurely declines to match the frequency of his charge's more-than-daily letters (VdH 46.3-25).

If Caesar "wears the trousers" in the relationship, as Swain (2004: 20) has put it, then Fronto willingly plays the passive role:⁵⁹

11. When Caesar wrote daily, Fronto was like Hero to Marcus' Leander:

simile patiebar quod amator patitur, qui delicias suas videt currere ad se per iter asperum et periculosum...nam ego potius te caruero, tametsi amore tuo ardeo, potius quam 'te ad hoc noctis natate tantum profundi patiar' [70 R³] (VdH 46.26-47.2)

I suffered like the lover does, who sees her boyfriend rush to her though the way is harsh and perilous...I will rather be without you, even though I burn with love for you, than suffer 'you to swim at this time of night across such a deep vasty sea.'

Thus, Fronto's persona in the letters is that of a 'passive lover', happy to let himself be seduced by the overwhelming erotic force of Aurelius' declarations. The patterns we discovered support Fronto's persona, for he rarely – in his polite request softeners, address system, and letter openings – ventures to express intimacy or strong affection in as stark terms.

In fact, Marcus' affection and Fronto's restraint finds a parallel in the other sets of correspondence, maintained by Fronto with Verus and Pius. For the latter two, when emperors, take the liberty of addressing Fronto affectionately with *carissime*, their adjective of choice. But Fronto never let himself forget the hierarchical nature of the relationship with *any* of his imperial addressees, and modern studies bear out that positive politeness is rarely "directed up." The difference between Marcus on the one hand, and Pius and Verus on the other, is that Marcus' language *also* contains an erotic element absent from Pius' and Verus' letters.

Striking changes emerge in the language patterns from the later correspondence between Fronto, and the (now) emperor Aurelius. For if in the earlier correspondence, Fronto maintains his distance, now the tables are turned. The former tutor closes down the relational distance, while Aurelius distances himself. Gone is Aurelius the emperor's former stylistic exuberance, which, now, Fronto seeks to imitate.

We see this inversion of roles most starkly in the address systems. Aurelius the emperor opens up distance between himself and his former tutor; while Fronto tries (desperately) to close it down. For now Aurelius the emperor no longer employs erotic address terms, no longer avails himself of the impressively wide range of vocative adjectives (instead restricting himself to just four unique adjectives); no longer do his letter openings or closings exhibit the stylistic range of the earlier correspondence; nor does the emperor anymore address his former teacher with the cognomen *Fronto*. One continuity in usage bridges early and later correspondence: Aurelius the emperor continues to rely on his standard address, *mi magister*, when writing Fronto. For Marcus Aurelius still viewed the relationship as a formal teacher-student arrangement, which disappointed Fronto.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ [*animus*] *qui nunc torretur ardentissimo desiderio tuo* (VdH 51.16), from a letter dated to the 140s. *imploro* [sc. *deos*], *uti...neque ego tam saepe tam saevo desiderio fatiger* (VdH 43.14-15), dated in the period between 139-161; *quom videbis in dolio mustum fervere, in mentem tibi veniat mihi sic pectore tuum desiderium scateret et abundare et spumas facere* (VdH 61.2-4), dated between 139-161.

⁵⁹ Swain (2004: 20) comments specifically on the erotically charged address *mi semper anima dulcissima* (VdH 30.13).

⁶⁰ Cf. Elder and Mullen (2019: 177): "Fronto barely veiled his disappointment at being sidelined"; and Richlin

Fronto, however, attempts to accommodate to the emperor's earlier, more affiliative style. For the first time in his correspondence, the tutor avoids *domine*, commonly used to imperial addressees. Instead the former tutor employs *predominantly* the emperor's *praenomen*, which he had ventured only once in more voluminous early correspondence, as an early, timid attempt to accommodate to the emperor's more colloquial and intimate style. Now, however, address by *praenomen* constitutes over *half* of Fronto's total address-terms. Reserved for family members, Fronto's frequent usage of the praenomen constitutes his bid to rekindle the intimacy, now lost, between the two. Moreover, Fronto twice uses the phrase *Marce carissime*, completely absent in his earlier correspondence.⁶¹

In fact, in letters directed to Aurelius the emperor, Fronto's address system – affecting intimacy and informality – approximates Fronto's address system in epistolary exchanges with his friends, where addresses by cognomen and with *carissime* are found.

Fronto's practice in code-switching also changes in the later correspondence. Greek rhetorical terms still constitute the majority (55%) of Fronto's code-switches, for he continues to teach Aurelius the emperor, whose code-switching continues to be varied in this later period, with a little under a third (three out of ten) of his switches to Greek motivated by a need to express a rhetorical concept. Fronto now accommodates to Aurelius' more varied use of Greek: the former tutor quotes from Greek markedly more often than he had done earlier, and he draws on Greek terms from spheres *other than rhetoric* more frequently as well. There is a clear desire to forge intimacy through this code-switching. Although Fronto does switch to Greek with Verus, he never does so to close down relational distance. Indeed, Fronto's code-switching practice with Aurelius the emperor aligns quite closely with his switches to Greek in correspondence with his friends.

At the beginning of his *Meditations*, Aurelius lists what he has learned from his family members and teachers. He has just a few words for Fronto, who, he says taught him to see beneath the dissimulation and subtlety of rulers and helps him recognize “that those who are called aristocrats somehow lack warmth” (καὶ ὅτι ὡς ἐπίπαν οἱ καλούμενοι οὗτοι παρ' ἡμῖν εὐπατρίδαι ἀστοργότεροί πως εἰσίν, 1.11). Fronto's letters disclose that the teacher's warm affection towards Marcus Aurelius did not change (in fact, it may have increased); while Marcus Aurelius' youthful passion, as revealed by the correspondence, would soon come to be replaced by the all-consuming duty of running an empire.⁶²

University of Massachusetts, Boston
Peter.Lech@umb.edu

(2006b: 6), on Fronto's feeling of being betrayed. These claims may appear subjective, and based on individual reading of certain passages, but the data bears them out.

⁶¹ In that earlier correspondence, by contrast, only Marcus had used *carissime*; and Pius and Verus use it with Fronto, but he never uses it with them. Here is a further indication that, in the later correspondence, Fronto is trying hard to forge intimacy with Aurelius the emperor – a verbally demonstrated intimacy which Aurelius does not reciprocate.

⁶² I would like to thank Anne Mahoney and the anonymous reader for *NECJ* for reading through an earlier draft and providing helpful comments; my thanks also to Luis Unceta Gómez and to Alex Mullen. Any errors or infelicities are to be attributed to me alone.

Works Cited

- Adams, J.N. 1984. "Female Speech in Latin Comedy." *Antichthon* 18: 43-77.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400003142>.
- . 1995. "The Language of the Vindolanda Writing Tablets: An Interim Report." *JRS* 85: 86–134. <https://doi.org/10.2307/301059>.
- . 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge.
- Barrios-Lech, P. 2014. "The 1st Person Plural 'Hortatory' Subjunctive in Plautus and Terence" *Rheinisches Museum* 157.3-4, 272-277.
- Barrios-Lech, P. 2016. *Linguistic Interaction in Roman Comedy*. Cambridge.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316416983>.
- Birley, A. 2012. "Marcus' Life as Emperor." In Marcel van Ackeren (ed.) *A Companion to Marcus Aurelius*, Malden MA. 155-170.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118219836.ch9>.
- Brock, M. Dorothy. 1911. *Studies in Fronto and His Age*. Cambridge.
- Brown, Penelope and S. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813085>.
- Brown, R. and A. Gilman. 1989. "Politeness Theory and Shakespeare's Four Major Tragedies." *Language in Society* 18: 159–212.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500013464>.
- Conte, G.B. (J.B. Solodow, trans.; D. Fowler and G.W. Most, rev.) 1994. *Latin Literature: a History*. Baltimore.
- Champlin, E. 1980. *Fronto and Antonine Rome*. Cambridge, MA.
<https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674331785>.
- Denizot, Camille. 2011. *Donner des ordres en grec ancien: étude linguistique des formes tion. Cahiers de l'ERJAC, n°3 – Fonctionnements linguistiques*. Mont-Saint-Aignan.
- Dickey, Eleanor. *Latin Forms of Address: From Plautus to Apuleius*. Oxford.
- . 2015. "How to say 'please' in post-Classical Latin: Fronto and the importance of Archaism." *Journal of Latin Linguistics*. 14.1: 17—31.
- Eck, W. 1998. "M. Cornelius Fronto, Lehrer Marc Aurels, Consul Suffectus im j. 142." *RhM* 141-2, 193-196.
- Elder, Olivia and Alex Mullen. 2019. *The Language of Roman Letters: Bilingual Epistolography from Cicero to Fronto*. Cambridge.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108647649>.
- Fleury, Pascale. 2006. *Lectures de Fronto: Un Rheteur Latin A L'Epoque de La Seconde Sophistique*. Paris.
- Galinsky, K. 2012. *Augustus: Introduction to the Life of an Emperor*. Cambridge.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139045575>.
- Goffman, E. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. New York.
- Haines, C.R. 1928. *Fronto Correspondence*. Cambridge MA. 2 vols.
- Hall, J. 2009. *Politeness and Politics in Cicero's Letters*. Oxford.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195329063.001.0001>.
- Kaster, R. 1988. *Guardians of Language*. Berkeley CA.
<https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520342767>.
- Kaster, R. 2005. *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome*. Cary, NC.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195140781.001.0001>.
- Kovács, P. "Epigraphic Records". In Marcel van Ackeren (ed.) *A Companion to Marcus Aurelius*, Malden MA. 77-91. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118219836.ch5>.
- Krieter-Spiro, Martha. 1997. *Sklaven, Köche und Hetären: Das Dienstpersonal bei Menander. Stellung, Rolle, Komik und Sprache*. Stuttgart.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110968453>.
- Laes, C. 2009. "What Could Marcus Aurelius Feel for Fronto?" *Studia Humaniora Tartuensia* 10.A.3. <https://doi.org/10.12697/sht.2009.10.A.3>.

- Morand, D. A. 1996. "Dominance, Deference, and Egalitarianism in Organizational Interaction: a Sociolinguistics Analysis of Power and Politeness." *Organization Science* 7.5: 544-556. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.7.5.544>.
- Müller, R. 1997. *Sprechen und Sprache. Dialoglinguistische Studien zu Terenz*. Heidelberg.
- Rees-Miller, Janie. 2000. "Power, Severity, and Context in Disagreement." *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 1087-1111. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00088-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00088-0).
- Pocetti, P. 2010. "Greeting and Farewell Expressions as Evidence for Colloquial Language: Between Literary and Epigraphical Texts." In E. Dickey and A. Chahoud (eds.), *Colloquial and Literary Latin*. Cambridge, 100–126. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511763267.008>.
- Richlin, Amy. 2006a. "Fronto + Marcus: Love, Friendship, Letters." in *The Boswell Thesis: Essays on Christianity Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, edited by M. Kuefler, 111-129. Chicago.
- Richlin, Amy (ed. and trans.) 2006b. "Marcus Aurelius in Love: Marcus Aurelius and Cornelius Fronto." Chicago.
- Risselada, Rodie. 1993. 1993. *The Imperative and Other Directive Expressions in Latin: A Study in the Pragmatics of a Dead Language*. Amsterdam. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004408975>.
- Swain, S. 2004. "Bilingualism and Biculturalism in Antonine Rome: Apuleius, Fronto, and Gellius," in *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius* edited by L.H. Strevens and A. Vardi, 3—40. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199264827.003.0001>.
- Timpanaro, S. 1987. "Il 'ius osculi' e Frontone." *Maia* 39: 201-211.
- Unceta Gómez, L., 2018. 'Gli studi sulla (s)cortesia linguistica in latino. Possibilità di analisi e proposte per il futuro', *Studi e Saggi Linguistici* 56(2), 9–37.
- . 1999. *A Commentary on the Letters of Marcus Cornelius Fronto*. Leiden.
- Valette, Emanuelle 2014. "Le vêtement bigarré des danseurs de pyrrhique": pratiques du bilinguisme dans la correspondance de Fronto et Marc Aurèle" in F. Mestre and P. Gómez (eds.), *Three Centuries of Greek Culture Under the Roman Empire: homo Romanus Graeca oratione*: 101-123.
- Williams C. 2012. *Reading Roman Friendship*. Cambridge. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511777134>.