

ELEANOR DICKEY

THE CREATION OF LATIN TEACHING MATERIALS IN ANTIQUITY  
A RE-INTERPRETATION OF P.SORB. INV. 2069

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 175 (2010) 188–208

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THE CREATION OF LATIN TEACHING MATERIALS IN ANTIQUITY  
A RE-INTERPRETATION OF P.SORB. INV. 2069

An important and relatively early Latin-Greek glossary<sup>1</sup> is preserved on P.Sorb. inv. 2069 (also known as P.Reinach 2069) verso,<sup>2</sup> a collection of fragments covering parts of seven columns and probably written in the third century AD.<sup>3</sup> This text is strikingly different from other ancient bilingual glossaries both in format and in content, and in consequence it has hitherto been poorly understood; owing to the difficulties of comprehension it has never been translated. Careful study reveals, however, that most of P.Sorb. inv. 2069 can indeed be understood, and I present here a study and translation designed to accompany the edition of the text produced by Rolando Ferri and myself (this volume, pp. 177-187). Among the findings of this study are that the glossary in its current form is the product of a long and complex transmission history, much of which can be traced: it probably started life no later than the early second century AD as a glossary of homonyms within the Latin grammatical tradition, was adapted as a bilingual work for Latin speakers learning Greek, and was then re-adapted as a tool for Greek speakers learning Latin. Because of its uniquely traceable history, this text sheds important light on the creation of the Latin teaching materials used by Greek speakers under the Roman empire.

### 1. The layout of the text

A discussion of layout is normally unexciting and often trivial and / or irrelevant to the more important questions about a text's meaning and origins. In the case of this papyrus, however, the layout provides crucial information about the text's history and thereby about both its meaning and its origins; it thus invites an examination that, I hope, is neither trivial nor unexciting.

Papyri containing bilingual glossaries are not uncommon; we have more than twenty examples. In almost all these texts the material is arranged in two very narrow columns (one to three words wide); usually the Latin is on the left and the Greek on the right, but sometimes the Greek is on the left and the Latin on the right.<sup>4</sup> The same columnar layout is also normally used for other ancient bilingual texts, including the bilingual versions of literary classics (usually Virgil and Cicero)<sup>5</sup> and bilingual and

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Ann Hanson, Dieter Hagedorn, Daniela Colomo, Martin West, Peter Parsons, Jim Adams, Philomen Probert, and especially Rolando Ferri for invaluable assistance with this work.

<sup>2</sup> Mertens-Pack 3006; editions by Collart (1940), Kramer (1983: no. 2), and pp. 177-187 of this volume; significant discussion by Bourguignon (2007); edition of recto by Dumoulin (2001, cf. *SB* 26.16528). For complete bibliography see p. 177.

<sup>3</sup> For the date of the text see p. 177 with notes 4 and 5.

<sup>4</sup> Glossaries using the two-column layout: P.Reinach 2140 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 3008), P.Vindob. inv. L 27 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 3004.21), *M-P*<sup>3</sup> 3007, P.Louvre Eg. 2329 (Kramer 1983: no. 14, *M-P*<sup>3</sup> 3003), P.Vindob. inv. L 150 (Kramer 2001: no. 5), *Fragmenta Helmstadiensia* (Kramer 1983: no. 4), *Folium Wallraffianum* (Kramer 1983: no. 4), P.Oxy. 20.2660 (Kramer 1983: no. 6), P.Oxy. 46.3315 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 3004.2), P.Laur. inv. 3.418 (Kramer 1983: no. 5), P.Lund 5 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 3004), P.Oxy. 49.3452 (Kramer 2001: no. 7), P.Mich. 2458 (Kramer 1983: no. 12), P.Oxy. 33.2660a (Kramer 1983: no. 7), P.Strasb. inv. g 1175 (Kramer 2001: no. 3), P.Strasb. inv. g 1173 (Kramer 2001: no. 6), P.Fay. 135v (Kramer 1983: no. 11), P.Lond. 2.481 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 3005). Glossaries using a different layout: P.Berol. 21246 (Kramer 1983: no. 1; text laid out in a single column with Latin words underneath the Greek and slightly indented), Chester Beatty AC 1499 (Wouters 1988, *M-P*<sup>3</sup> 2161.1). There is also an unpublished glossary on the back of P.Oxy. 32.2624 fr. 28-56 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 3004.1), but I cannot verify its layout. The above are Latin-Greek texts, but Greek-Coptic glossaries also use the same layout: see Naoumides 1969: 185 n. 8.

<sup>5</sup> Using the two-column layout: P.Oxy. 8.1099 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 2950), P.Oxy. 50.3553 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 2943.1), PSI 7.756 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 2946), P.Rain.Cent. 163 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 2922), P.Fouad I.5 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 2948), P.Vindob. L 24 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 2951), P.Congr.XV 3 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 2939.1), PSI Congr.XXI 2 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 2921.01), P.Ness. 2.1 = P.Colt. 1 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 2939), P.Ryl. 3.478 + P.Mil. 1 + P.Cairo inv. 85644 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 2940), P.Ryl. 1.61 + P.Vindob. L 127 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 2923), *Ambrosian Palimpsest* (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 2943), *M-P*<sup>3</sup> 2936, P.Berol. inv. 21245,

trilingual conversation manuals.<sup>6</sup> In these texts, unlike in the glossaries, the narrow columns are awkward because the frequent line breaks interrupt the flow of the sentences and make it necessary to read each column independently in order to put the syntax together. For example Virgil, *Aeneid* I. 588-91 looks as follows in a late antique bilingual version:

restitit Aeneas	ἀνέστη ὁ Αἰνεΐας
claraque in luce	καὶ ἐν καθαρῷ τῷ φωτὶ
refulsit	ἀντέλαμψεν
os: umerosque	τὸ πρόσωπον· καὶ τοὺς ὄμους
deo similis	θεῷ ὅμοιος
namque ipsa: decoram	καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴ· εὐπρεπῆ
caesariem nato	τὴν κόμην τῷ παιδὶ
genetrix: lumenque	ἡ γεννήτιρα· καὶ φῶς
iuventae	τῆς νεότητος
purpureum et laetos	πορφύρεον καὶ ἰλαρὰς
oculis	τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς
adflarat: honores	προσπεπνεύκει· τιμάς

(Ambrosian Palimpsest, IV-V AD, ed. Kramer 1996: lines 1-24; diacritics are editorial but punctuation original)

Despite this drawback the two-column format was standard for bilingual materials<sup>7</sup> throughout antiquity and indeed well into the middle ages;<sup>8</sup> the practice of writing interlinear translations, which to us seems to produce a more readable text, was unknown at the date of this papyrus and only became common in the Renaissance.<sup>9</sup>

The glossary on the verso of this papyrus, however, does not conform to the standard format. It is laid out in long lines,<sup>10</sup> and within each line there is repeated alternation between Latin and Greek: short phrases in Latin are followed by their Greek translations. This format is considerably more difficult to read than the usual two-column layout, as the flow of syntax in each language is interrupted not only by line breaks but also by intervening words in the other language. For example, lines 103-7 are arranged as follows on the papyrus:

uobis	υμειν	in comparatione plura	[[li]]li	εν συγκρι[σ]ει πληθυντικη
hoc quoque graece	και τουτο ελληνικη	genetius fit casus	γε-	
	νικη γεινεται	πτωσις	per omnia	κατα παντα
	υψ	uobis acutior	hic	
	ως υμω[ν ο]ξ[υ]τερος	ουτος	uobis disertior	υμων λο[γ]ιωτερος
	uobis prior	υμ[ω]ν	προτερος	

In order to read these lines it is almost essential to re-arrange them into the layout used by other ancient bilingual glossaries, thus:

fr. 1-2 = CPF 119T, 116T (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 1251.02). Using a different layout: P.Amh. 2.26 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 172; whole paragraphs of Latin and Greek interspersed with each other), PSI 7.848 (Kramer 2001: no. 10, *M-P*<sup>3</sup> 52; Greek on recto and Latin on verso).

<sup>6</sup> E.g. P.Bon. 5 (Kramer 1983: no. 16, *M-P*<sup>3</sup> 2117).

<sup>7</sup> Monolingual (Greek-Greek) lexica sometimes used this layout and sometimes (in the case of lemma with lengthy definitions) used one in which each lemma and definition made a separate paragraph, with the first line of each paragraph projecting a bit to the left. Superficially this layout seems to resemble that of P.Sorb. inv. 2069, but fundamentally it is very different, because different entries are never combined into a single paragraph: each entry always begins with a new line. See Naoumides 1969: 184-7.

<sup>8</sup> Most medieval manuscripts of the *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* use this layout both for the glossary sections and for the colloquia, which are continuous text (see Goetz 1888-1923: vol. iii, though Goetz has eliminated the gaps between the columns to save space); some of the Renaissance manuscripts use wider columns for the colloquia, but this is clearly a later innovation.

<sup>9</sup> Bonnet (2005: xxxiii) maintains that interlinear translation was occasionally used in antiquity, citing two examples, PSI 1.110 and 11.1182 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 2932 and 2953 respectively). These papyri, however, contain not full interlinear translations but sporadic interlinear glosses, which are a very different thing.

<sup>10</sup> Complete lines contain five to fifteen words, with an average of nine words per line.

uóbis	υμειν
in comparatióne plura[[li]]li	εν συγκρι[ci]ει πληθυντικη
hoc quoque græce	και τουτο ελληνιστι
genetiuis fit casus	γενικη γεινεται πτωσιc
per omnia	κατα παντα
ut uobis acutior hic	ωc υμω[v o]ξ[v]τεροc ουτοc
uobis disertior	υμων λο[γ]ιωτεροc
uobis prior	υμ[ω]v προτεροc

Now it is possible to read down each column, as with the Virgil passage quoted above, and to fit the syntax together. If these lines were reformatted for modern readers with accents, breathings, punctuation, capitalisation, and spelling normalisation they would become almost easy to read:

Uobis:	ύμῖν·	‘You (dat. pl.)’;
in comparatione plurali	ἐν συγκρίσει πληθυντικῇ	in comparison in the plural
hoc quoque Graece	καὶ τοῦτο Ἑλληνιστὶ	this too in Greek
genetiuis fit casus	γενικὴ γίγνεται πτωσιc	becomes the genitive case
per omnia:	κατὰ πάντα·	in all respects,
ut uobis acutior hic,	ὡc ὑμῶν ὀξύτεροc οὗτοc,	as ‘this man (is) sharper than you’,
uobis disertior,	ὑμῶν λογιώτεροc,	‘more learned than you’,
uobis prior.	ὑμῶν πρότεροc.	‘before you’.

The layout used in P.Sorb. inv. 2069 has one important advantage over the standard two-column format: it is much more economical in terms of space, as can be seen from the two versions of lines 103-7 above. Many bilingual papyri seem to have been relatively short, and therefore issues of space consumption would not have been terribly important. The glossary of which P.Sorb. inv. 2069 is a fragment, however, must have been of impressive bulk, to judge from the size of the preserved material: the work was probably once more than 60 columns long.<sup>11</sup> The scribe who produced our copy of the text clearly felt a need to exercise economy, for he used the back of a poor-quality piece of papyrus (there are a number of places where some of the surface had clearly flaked off before our text was written). It is therefore likely that the unusual layout was adopted in order to save space when writing out such a long work.

Some specific elements of the papyrus’ layout also indicate conversion from a two-column format. Some of the lines are indented, and these indentations are consistently found in lines beginning with Greek words, or with Latin words that are not the first word of a phrase.<sup>12</sup> In other words, lines are indented when the beginning of a line does not coincide with the beginning of a Latin phrase -- when the beginning of a line in the current layout is not where the line would begin in the traditional layout. In addition, gaps one to two centimeters wide are left when the scribe changes languages; that is, where line or column breaks would have occurred in the traditional layout. These peculiarities indicate that our glossary was originally laid out in narrow columns like other ancient bilingual texts, and that the layout found in this papyrus is a modification of that format. The modification could have been made in the copying of the papyrus we have, or it could have been made in the copying of another papyrus from which P.Sorb. inv. 2069 is ultimately descended.

Further evidence for the rearrangement of the text comes from a dislocation within it that must have occurred when it still had the original two-column layout. A phrase in line 128 beginning with the word

<sup>11</sup> See n. 12 p. 180.

<sup>12</sup> Of the 57 lines with (more or less) intact beginnings, 38 are not indented, and all but one of these begin at the start of a Latin phrase (the exception, line 121, begins with a Latin word that is not the start of its phrase; most likely the lack of indentation here is due to scribal error). 19 lines are indented; of these 18 begin with a Greek word and one (line 118) with a Latin word that is not the beginning of its phrase; in one other line (82) a highly probable restoration works only on the assumption that a line beginning with the second Latin word of a phrase was indented.

*ualetudo* belongs just before two other phrases beginning with *ualetudo* in lines 119-20 (see section 3 below). Such a dislocation could not have occurred when the papyrus had its current layout, but the standard two-column layout would have made this error easy. Faced with three lines in a row beginning with *ualetudo*, a scribe accidentally skipped one; the omitted line was then copied later when the scribe noticed the mistake, either into the text at the point the scribe had then reached, or into a margin whence a subsequent copyist incorporated it into the wrong place in the text. What we know of textual corruption suggests that the latter process was more common; if it is responsible for the dislocation here the text must have been copied at least twice by people who were essentially copyists rather than composers or reworkers. Even if one assumes the former process at least one such copying is necessary, and that copying must have occurred when the text had the traditional two-column layout.

There are a very few other bilingual texts with layouts resembling that of P.Sorb. inv. 2069.<sup>13</sup> One of these is Sangallensis 902, a ninth-century manuscript of Dositheus' grammar; there is good evidence that this text originally had the traditional two-column layout, as has been demonstrated by Karl Krumbacher (1884: 356-7).<sup>14</sup> The likelihood that in Sangallensis 902 a layout closely resembling that of our papyrus is the result of conversion from the standard ancient two-column format is additional evidence that the same is true in our papyrus. The other example known to me of a bilingual text with a layout like that of our papyrus is Chester Beatty Codex AC 1499, a word-list to the letters of Paul that has been variously dated from the fourth to the fifth or sixth centuries (Wouters 1988: 17; Rochette 1996: 73). The codex's editor found it to have a considerable transmission history (Wouters 1988: 90-91); it is not unlikely that this history included conversion from the standard two-column format to one with longer lines, though there is little evidence for or against such conversion.

Understanding the layout of the text and the reasons behind it has two advantages. It enables us to restore the text to its original format and thereby greatly increase its comprehensibility, and tells us that the text on the papyrus cannot have been composed by the scribe who wrote it; it has a history. Most ancient bilingual glossaries are surrounded by uncertainties about their origins: were they composed for the first time by the writer of the papyrus in which we find them? Were they copied verbatim from an exemplar? Are they adaptations of earlier glossaries containing similar but not identical information? One can speculate about the answers to these questions, but except when another text with clear affinities to the one on the papyrus is preserved, it is difficult to make any headway in understanding the history of a particular text. Therefore the fact that P.Sorb. inv. 2069 can be shown on the basis of its format to be a copy, indeed a copy of a copy, rather than an original composition allows us more insight into the process of its creation than is available for most other ancient Latin-learning materials.

## 2. The glossary as a tool for Greek speakers

In its original two-column layout, the glossary must have had the Latin in the left-hand column, for the Latin half of each entry always comes first,<sup>15</sup> and the alphabetisation (by first letter only) is based on the

---

<sup>13</sup> Kramer (1983: 29 n. 4) claims that a number of the texts in the *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* have the same layout as our glossary. But the layout of the *Hermeneumata* texts he refers to (which in any case does not really resemble that of P.Sorb. inv. 2069 very closely) is a feature of Goetz's edition (1888-1923: vol. iii), not of the manuscripts on which that edition is based, most of which use the standard two-column layout and none of which, to my knowledge, uses either the layout found in Goetz's edition or anything at all resembling the layout of this papyrus.

<sup>14</sup> This argument has been disputed by Bonnet (2005: xxxiv) who, while agreeing that the layout of Sangallensis 902 cannot be original, thinks it might have resulted from conversion of an interlinear format (the Greek written above the Latin in long lines) rather than from a two-column format. Bonnet's argument here (part of an effort to defend the interlinear position of the Greek in his edition of Dositheus' grammar, a position that he more or less concedes is adopted primarily to make the text legible to modern readers) rests on his argument for the existence of interlinear translations in antiquity; for the untenability of that argument see note 9 above.

<sup>15</sup> A possible exception to the rule that the Latin always precedes the Greek would be *acuimus* as restored in line 87 to follow its Greek equivalent ὄξυτονοῦμεν, but this restoration is by no means certain (its violation of this rule being the chief

Latin rather than the Greek. The glossary must therefore have been designed to provide information about Latin words, as the Latin words are the only ones that can be looked up in it. So the intended users of the glossary were probably primarily Greek speakers, though Latin alphabetisation does not exclude use of the glossary by Latin speakers wanting to use Greek actively.

Stronger evidence for the orientation of the glossary towards Greek speakers comes from the frequent provision of information on how to inflect the Latin lemmata. Such information is efficiently offered by reference to a set of standard paradigms, which allow the declensions of most nouns and the conjugations of most verbs to be indicated by comparison to a paradigm noun or verb. Thus first-declension nouns are said to decline like *alta*, second-declension masculines are said to decline like *altus*, second-declension neuters are said to decline like *bellum*, and third-declension nouns are divided among *Cato* (for *n*-stems and *t*-stems), *calx* (for *c*-stems), and *altior* (for *r*-stems); for verbs the paradigm of the first conjugation is *accuso*, that of the second conjugation is *foueo*, and that of the third conjugation is *ago*.<sup>16</sup> Thus the entry for *uiator* (lines 124-5) reads:

U[ia]tor	ἀρχιυπηρέτης καὶ <sup>17</sup> ὁδοιπόρος·	‘Chief minister’ and ‘traveller’;
cetera ut altior	τὰ [λοι]πὰ ὡς τὸ ὑψηλότερος.	the other (forms of <i>uiator</i> are declined) like <i>altior</i> .

The inflections of some third-declension nouns cannot be worked out from this type of information alone, as the final vowel of the stem needs to be indicated as well. In such situations a longer formulation is sometimes given, specifying the change of vowel, as in the entries for *tibicen* and *tubicen* (lines 8-10):

[Tibicen]	αὐλητής, αὐλ[ητ]ρίς·	‘Piper’, ‘female piper’;
tubice[n]	[καλπικτή], καλπ[ι]στρια·	‘trumpeter’, ‘female trumpeter’;
[horum duo]rum cetera	τούτων τῶν δυ[οῖν] τὰ λοιπὰ]	the other (cases) of these two (nouns)
ut Cato declinatur	[ὡς τ]ὸ Κάτων κλίνεται, <sup>18</sup>	are declined like <i>Cato</i> ,
e reciden[te in i]	[τοῦ ε̅] μεταπίπτοντος <sup>19</sup> εἰς τὸ ἰ.	with the <i>e</i> changing to <i>i</i> .

At first glance one might think that the Greek words given as paradigms are meant to indicate the inflection of the Greek glosses, just as the Latin paradigms show the inflection of the Latin lemmata; thus for example in lines 124-5 Latin *uiator* declines like *altior* and Greek ὁδοιπόρος declines like ὑψηλότερος. Such similarity in the Greek is, however, purely coincidental and occurs relatively infrequently: it does not apply to ἀρχιυπηρέτης in line 124, for example, and in lines 8-10 both the Latin lemmata decline like *Cato* but none of the four Greek glosses declines like Κάτων. It is clear that the inflectional information is intended to relate only to the Latin glosses, and that the Latin words used as paradigms have simply been translated mechanically into Greek without regard for the type of declension or conjugation that the translation would have in Greek.

The fact that inflectional information is given only for the Latin points unambiguously to an intended readership of Greek speakers, in particular Greek speakers with limited competence in Latin. Such a readership is of course unsurprising on other grounds: Roman Egypt contained many more Greek speakers than Latin speakers, and while some bilingual materials found on papyrus seem to have been designed for Latin speakers learning Greek, the vast majority were apparently designed for Greek speakers learning Latin (cf. Kramer 2004).

argument against it, cf. Bourguignon 2007: 299-300). If the text as restored is indeed what the papyrus originally held, the original probably resulted from a scribal error.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Bourguignon 2007: 296; the inclusion of *ago* depends on a re-reading of line 66 (cf. p. 183).

<sup>17</sup> [κ]αι | και pap.

<sup>18</sup> κλίνεται pap.

<sup>19</sup> με]ταπίπτοντος pap.

The person who provided this inflectional information, moreover, was not fully competent in Latin. In line 9 he uses a singular verb with a neuter plural subject: *horum duorum cetera ut Cato declinatur*. In Latin of all periods plural subjects require plural verbs, regardless of their gender, but in classical Greek a neuter plural verb does indeed take a singular subject, so τούτων τῶν δυοῖν τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς τὸ Κάτων κλίνεται is perfectly correct, indeed conspicuously so. (In vernacular Greek of the Hellenistic and later periods plural verbs are more and more often found with neuter plural subjects, and indeed the use of a singular verb with a neuter plural subject is now commonly known as the σχῆμα Ἀττικόν and seen as an Atticizing feature in Roman-period and later texts.<sup>20</sup>) The provider of this inflectional information must therefore have himself been a well-educated Greek speaker whose Latin studies had not yet progressed to a very high level: he knew the rule that in formal written language a neuter plural subject takes a singular verb, but he did not grasp that that refinement did not apply to Latin.

### 3. The glossary as a tool for Latin speakers

All the evidence so far discussed points to a text written by a Greek speaker for an intended audience of Greek speakers, but there is also another body of evidence that points in the opposite direction: information probably produced by and intended for Latin speakers. The Latin words chosen for inclusion in the glossary are in most respects a heterogeneous group, for they belong to a variety of different parts of speech and different stylistic registers, and some are very common words while others are more obscure. But they all share one feature in common: they are from a Greek perspective homonyms, words with multiple meanings.<sup>21</sup> Every Latin lemma in this glossary, as far as one can tell from the extant remains, is given two or more Greek translations; there is not a single verifiable exception to this rule.<sup>22</sup> Sometimes, as in the entries quoted in section 2 above, the Latin lemma is simply followed by two or three translations without further discussion, and in such cases the lexical information given would be equally useful to Greek and to Latin speakers.

In most entries, however, there is some further discussion or illustration of the different circumstances in which the Latin word would receive the various Greek translations. The most common way of providing that information is to offer a series of short phrases, in each of which the Latin word would be translated differently in Greek; usually one example is offered for each of the translations initially provided. This format can be seen in lines 80-2:

[Ungula]	ὀπλή, ὀνόχιον, χη(λή)·	‘Hoof’, ‘trotter’, ‘cloven hoof’:
un[gula] equi	ὀπλή ἵππου,	‘horse’s hoof’,
un[g]ula porci	[ὀ]ν[ύχιον χοί]ρου,	‘pig’s trotter’,
ungula [bouis] <sup>23</sup>	[χ]ηλή βοός·	‘cow’s (cloven) hoof’;
et cete[ra u]t alta	καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς τὸ ὑψηλή.	and the other (forms of <i>ungula</i> are declined) like <i>alta</i> .

Here the entry begins by giving the Latin lemma and listing its Greek equivalents; Latin *ungula* ‘hoof’ could be used for three types of animal foot that were distinguishable in Greek (though in actual Greek texts the distinction is not always as clear-cut as this entry makes it appear). Then for each of the Greek

<sup>20</sup> See Mayser 1970: 28-30; Debrunner 1950: 607-8; Jannaris 1897: 314.

<sup>21</sup> Modern linguists make a distinction between homonymy (two etymologically different words that happen to have the same form, as Latin nominative *tribus* ‘tribe’ and dative *tribus* ‘three’) and polysemy (a single word with several distinct meanings, as *uertex* ‘whirlpool’ and ‘top of the head’). The ancients made no such distinction, and the glossary contains words with both types of ambiguity, so the two terms will be used interchangeably here.

<sup>22</sup> In lines 103-7 *uobis* is initially translated only with ὑμῖν, but later in the entry ὑμῶν is also given as a possibility. In line 66 an unknown Latin word is followed by a space that would not easily accommodate multiple Greek glosses, but without knowing the length of any of the words concerned it is impossible to say with any confidence what might have stood in the gaps originally; indeed the space available is so small that one wonders if the Greek glosses were omitted altogether.

<sup>23</sup> *ungula* [[*uobis*]] [*bouis*] pap.

equivalents an example is given: *ungula* is translated with ὀπλή when it means the hoof of a horse, with ὀνύχιον when it means the hoof of a pig, and with χηλή when it means the hoof of a cow. Lastly a note on the inflection of the Latin word is provided; in this case it tells us that *ungula* belongs to the first declension.

The information provided in the last line of this entry, as previously noted, would have been useful only to Greek speakers. The information provided in the first line would have been useful both to Greek speakers wanting to know what *ungula* meant and to Latin speakers wanting to talk about hooves in Greek. But the information in the three middle lines would have been useful only to Latin speakers: a Greek speaker would learn from those lines nothing that he had not already understood from the first line. Having ascertained that the Latin word *ungula* was the equivalent of three different Greek words, he would have no difficulty using the Latin word (he would use it whenever one of the three equivalents would be appropriate in Greek), nor would he have any difficulty in translating it into Greek (knowing the meanings of the three Greek equivalents, he would select the right one according to the context). For such a reader the second, third, and fourth lines of the entry are of no use whatsoever, but for a Latin-speaking reader they are crucial. A Latin speaker, after reading the first line, would still have a problem: he would not be able to use any of the Greek words provided, because he would not know the difference between them. For the Latin-speaking reader the additional information provided in the second, third, and fourth lines was absolutely vital; it allowed him to translate *ungula* into Greek, or to use its Greek equivalents in his own contexts.

It is not only the entry on *ungula* that provides information designed for the Latin-speaking reader; more than half the entries have the same pattern of a list of Greek translations followed by collocations that differentiate them. Another example comes from lines 101-2:

Uter	πότ[ερος], ὑτέρα ἢ τῆς γυναικός·	‘Which of two’, ‘woman’s uterus’:
uter uestru[m]	πότερος ὑμῶν,	‘which of you two’,
uter muljeri[s]	ὑτέρα γυναικός.	‘uterus of a woman’.

Here again a Greek-speaking reader would have all the information he needed after the first line, while a Latin speaker would need the second and third lines to enable him to use the information provided in the first line. This time no inflectional information is provided, so the entire entry seems to be directed toward a Latin-speaking audience.

It is the recurrence of this pattern that allows us to know that the entry for *ualetudo* has been split up in transmission (cf. section 1 above). The entry for *ualetudo* in lines 119-22 reads:

ualetudo ἡσά	ὑγεῖα κ[αλή],	‘good health’,
ualetudo ἡ[commo]δα	νόσος δυετραπέλος·	‘harsh illness’;
cet[era ut Ca]lto femi<ni>ne	τ[ὰ λοιπὰ ὅ]ς τὸ Κάτων θηλυκός,	the other (forms of <i>ualetudo</i> are declined) like <i>Cato</i> (but are) feminine,
recidente <sup>24</sup> ο[ i]η i	μεταπίπτο[ντος] <sup>25</sup> τῶ ο· εἰς τὸ ι·.	with the <i>o</i> changing to <i>i</i> .

This provides the examples and the inflectional information, but not the initial set of definitions that would be clarified by the examples; those are found in line 128, which must have been the original first line of this entry:

Ualetudo	ὑγεῖα καὶ νόσος·	‘Health’ and ‘illness’:
----------	------------------	-------------------------

A few entries, such as that on *uobis* quoted above in section 1, provide additional information on the finer points of translating the Latin lemma into Greek. The entry on *uos* (lines 95-100) is particularly interesting in this respect:

Ἦσ	[ὑμεῖς, ὑμῶ]ς·	‘You (nom. pl.)’, ‘you (acc. pl.)’:
[uos priores uenisti]s	ὑμεῖς πρότεροι ἐληλύθατε,	‘you (nom.) came earlier’,
[uo]s sic iussi	ὑ[μᾶς οὕτως ἐ]κέλευσα.	‘I ordered you (acc.) thus’.
genituii sic fit c[asus]	[γε]νικῆς οὕτω γ[ίνεται] π[τῶ]ς·	It becomes a genitive case thus:

<sup>24</sup> *reccidente* pap.

<sup>25</sup> μεταπίπτο[ντος] pap.



audió uos	ἀκούω ὑμ[ῶν, ἀκο]ύω ὑμᾶς,	‘I hear you (gen.)’, ‘I hear you (acc.)’,
contemñ[o uos]	καταφρονῶ ὑμῶν·	‘I despise you (gen.)’;
datiui rursus [sic]	δοτικῆς πάλιν οὕτως	but (it becomes) a dative thus:
sequor <sup>26</sup> u[o]s	[ἀ]κολουθῶ ὑμῖν,	‘I follow you (dat.)’
adiuuo uos	βοηθῶ ὑμ[τ]ίv.	‘I help you (dat.)’.

This entry begins like the others we have seen, with a single Latin word and two Greek equivalents followed by examples of collocations to make it clear how to use each of the Greek equivalents. It then proceeds to alert the reader to the additional issue that the Latin accusative *uos* is sometimes equivalent to a Greek genitive or dative, when it is the object of a verb that in Latin would take the accusative and in Greek would take the genitive or dative. We would consider this problem to have nothing to do with the particular word *uos* but rather to be a characteristic of the verbs concerned, but the writer of this material seems to have had a different view. His view is not wholly untenable: in practical terms the verbs indicated would not infrequently be followed by a second person pronoun, and if one is using the format this glossary has, information on the cases taken by particular verbs has to be classified under the words used as objects rather than under the governing verbs themselves.

The writer begins the discussion of the additional cases by noting that *uos* can be the equivalent of a Greek genitive if it is the object of *audio*, since in Greek ἀκούω takes the genitive; he then concedes that ἀκούω can also take the accusative, adding ἀκούω ὑμᾶς. This information is much more useful for a Latin speaker, who might well not be aware of the complications of using ἀκούω, than for a Greek speaker, who would already be aware of the different cases taken by ἀκούω. The writer then goes on to give another example of a verb that takes the genitive in Greek, καταφρονῶ, and two examples of verbs that take datives, ἀκολουθῶ and βοηθῶ.

This grammatical information is provided using the word *fit*, which is correctly deployed. Now the forms and uses of *fit* are not material that an elementary Latin student would command at the beginning of his studies; *fit* is difficult, and students do not normally master it without considerable effort. (In most modern Latin courses *fit* is not even presented to students until they have reached a fairly advanced level, but we cannot assume that ancient Latin syllabi resembled our own in this respect.) The syntactic information on the translation of *uos* into Greek thus appears to have been produced by someone with an excellent command of Latin, quite possibly a native speaker of the language.

#### 4. The glossary as a whole

In the form in which we have it, the glossary evidently had more than one intended audience: some of the information in it was useful only to Latin speakers, and other information was useful only to Greek speakers. A single individual could in theory have composed such a dual-purpose work, but in fact it is unlikely that all the information in this glossary was provided by one and the same person. The material on the cases taken by various Greek verbs in lines 95-100 was written either by a native speaker of Latin or by an advanced student of the language; this can hardly be the same person who in line 9 used a singular verb with a Latin neuter plural subject. Therefore the glossary as we have it is a composite work, with different elements added by different people for different purposes.

Not all entries contain both the information directed towards Latin speakers and the information for Greek speakers, but those that do show a fixed order for the information: the initial definitions come first, then the usage examples (information for Latin speakers), and lastly the inflectional information (information for Greek speakers). This ordering suggests that the inflectional information was added to the ends of entries and therefore is the most recent layer in the development of the text.

Further evidence in this direction can be gathered from the distribution of material in the different entries, which is detailed in table 1. Although inflectional information and illustrations of usage are

<sup>26</sup> *sequor* pap.

omitted with approximately equal frequency, there seems to be a difference in the circumstances surrounding such omission. The omission of inflectional information is confined almost entirely to entries where there is a good reason for such omission: those in which the Latin lemma is indeclinable (*unde, uos, uobis*) or not the normal citation form (*tribuit, uincit*) and those in which the lemma belongs to different parts of speech in different meanings (*tribus, tactus, uter, usus, uentum* -- though some words in this category do get inflectional information, e.g. *turbo*). Only three entries (*studeo, uipera, ulciscor*) lack inflectional information without one of these reasons, and it is possible that the omission in the case of *ulciscor* was caused by lack of a deponent paradigm verb. Omission of examples of the different Greek translations, however, does not appear to be governed by any principle and seems largely random. This situation could have arisen from sporadic removal of extraneous information in the course of transmission: Greek speakers copying this glossary would have had a tendency to leave out information that would be of no use to them, whereas they would have been much more faithful about copying the obviously useful inflectional information.

<u>Entry</u>	<u>Definitions</u>	<u>Examples of when to use different Greek translations</u>	<u>Inflectional information</u>	<u>Other information</u>
? (line 2)	?	?	x	
? (3)	x			
<i>studeo</i> (3 ff.)	x	x		
? (6)	x		x	
<i>tibicen / tubicen</i> (8 ff.)	x		x	
<i>tribus</i> (11 f.)	x	x		
<i>turbo</i> (12 ff.)	x	x	x	
<i>trudo</i> (16 f.)	x		x	
<i>triumphus</i> (17)	x	?	?	
<i>tibi</i> (25 f.)	?	x	?	
<i>tessera</i> (26 ff.)	x		x	
<i>tribuit</i> (29 ff.)	x			
? (30 f.)	x		x	
<i>tempestat</i> (32 f.)		x	?	
<i>tectum</i> (44 ff.)	x	x	x	
<i>tendo</i> (48 ff.)	x	x	x	
<i>tanto</i> (51 f.)		x	?	
? (60)	?	?	x	
<i>tactus</i> (60)	x			
<i>tessera</i> (61)	x		x	
<i>tonsa</i> (62)	x		x	
<i>uoluptas</i> (64 ff.)	x	x	x	
? (66 f.)	?		x	
<i>uipera</i> (67)	x			
<i>uelim</i> (67 f.)		x		
<i>uectura</i> (68 f.)	x		x	
? (70)	x		x	
<i>uentum</i> (79 f.)	x	x		
<i>ungula</i> (80 ff.)	x	x	x	
<i>ulciscor</i> (83)	x	x		
<i>ultrix</i> (84)	x		x	
<i>unde</i> (85 ff.)	x	x		x
<i>uiolo</i> (88 ff.)	x	x	?	
<i>uerna</i> (93 ff.)	x	x	x	
<i>uos</i> (95 ff.)	x	x		x
<i>uter</i> (101 f.)	x	x		
<i>usus</i> (102)	x			

<i>uobis</i> (103 ff.)	x			x
<i>uitio</i> (107 ff.)	x	x	x	
<i>uero</i> (111)	?	x	?	
<i>uertex</i> (115 ff.)	x	x	x	x
<i>ualetudo</i> (119 ff. + 128)	x	x	x	
<i>urus</i> (123 f.)	x		x	
<i>uiator</i> (124 f.)	x		x	
<i>uincit</i> (126 ff.)	x	x		
<i>ualeo</i> (129 ff.)	x	x	x	x
Total	38 + 5?	24 + 3?	25 + 6?	5

Table 1: Types of information provided in different entries; x indicates that the information is provided, a blank that it is not provided (as far as one can tell), and ? that owing to gaps in the papyrus I do not know whether it was provided.

Further evidence for the history of the glossary comes from the style of the writing. Although the copyist of our papyrus was clearly experienced in both alphabets, the Greek has some cursive elements while the Latin is written more distinctly and in slightly larger letters, as if for readers more familiar with the Greek than with the Latin alphabet. This difference in writing suggests that the final version of the document we have was intended for Greek speakers. At the same time, the text contains a number of Latin diacritics characteristic of centuries earlier than the date of this papyrus: apexes, which are found in Latin texts through the second century AD but become rarer in the third and later centuries (Oliver 1966: 131), and interpuncts, which largely disappear from Latin texts at the end of the first century AD. In a purely Latin text from the third century apexes would be somewhat unexpected and interpuncts very surprising, so perhaps the presence in this papyrus of such out-of-date features suggests that the later phases of its transmission took place in a Greek-speaking environment insulated from changes in the scribal practices of the Latin-speaking world.

There are, however, some difficulties with the interpuncts in this text, as their distribution is atypical. The classical Latin use of the interpunct was as a word divider, and a typical text with interpunctuation has raised dots between every or almost every word; when this system started to break down it changed to one in which dots were used as punctuation, to mark syntactic, accentual, or rhetorical units.<sup>27</sup> This latter use of interpunctuation is already found in some of the Vindolanda tablets from the early second century, though a certain amount of random interpunctuation also occurs at Vindolanda.<sup>28</sup> In our papyrus the dots seem to be used sporadically, indicating neither systematic word division nor any type of punctuation.<sup>29</sup> This sporadic usage could be, like its parallels at Vindolanda, a Latin scribe's work at the time of the breakdown of the classical interpunctuation system -- or it could be

<sup>27</sup> See Müller 1964: 34-46; Anderson et al. 1979: 131; Parkes 1992: 10; Adams 1996.

<sup>28</sup> See Adams 1995: 95-6, 2003: 532-3. In addition, there are some Latin papyri with less than full interpunctuation (though not, as far as I am aware, with random interpunctuation): *PSI* vii.743 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 2100), from the first-second century AD and containing Greek in Latin characters, generally uses dots but omits them in some places, usually but not always between words that go together closely (see edition of Ciriello and Stramaglia 1998). *CPL* 45 (*M-P*<sup>3</sup> 3023), written before AD 115, seems to have dots dividing phrases. I am particularly grateful to Peter Parsons for pointing out these texts and providing other information about interpunctuation.

<sup>29</sup> The examples are as follows. A) Eleven dots occur between two words of a Latin entry: *ut· cato declinatur* (9), [*turbo et*] *uis· uenti* (13), [*tectum· est· cubicellum*] (45), [*tectu*]m· *triglini ae[di]fica[t]* (46), *et cetera· ut ca[li]* (84), *unde h[om]ines fiunt* (85), *uitio· uirginem* (109), [*hoc· posteri[or]*] (112), *cetera· ut altus* (124), *cetera· ut altior* (125). B) Four dots occur at the end of a Latin entry (lines 85, 86, 111, and 119). C) Three dots occur between two words of a Greek entry: [*επουδ*]αζω· *φιλοπονω* (3), [*η· και ορνεον*] (6), *τριτην· [[βουλη] φυλη* (11). D) One or two dots occur at the end of a Greek entry (lines 10 and perhaps 135). The dot between *cetera* and *ut* in lines 84, 124, and 125 would be useful word dividers (preventing the reading *aut* -- but in lines 28 and 110 *cetera ut* occurs without an intervening dot), while the dots at the end of entries and those within the Greek entries (which all separate different definitions from one another) might function like punctuation, but most of the others are difficult to justify on either system.

the remnants of a text with full interpunction copied several times by Greek scribes who were unfamiliar with that system of word division and had a tendency to omit dots.

Surprisingly, several apparent examples of interpunction occur in the Greek portions of this text, though normally speaking Greek texts do not use interpuncts.<sup>30</sup> The dots in the Greek might be high points and unrelated to the Latin interpuncts, though their use is less consistent than one would expect for a punctuation mark as well established as the Greek high point. Alternatively, they might be survivals from an earlier version of the text, produced by and for Latin speakers, in which systematic interpunction was used not only in Latin but also in Greek; such word division would have been very useful to a Latin speaker trying to learn Greek and would have come naturally to a scribe trained primarily in Latin.

Whatever the origins of the interpuncts in P.Sorb. inv. 2069, their presence and that of the apexes is somewhat old-fashioned for a text of the third century, a fact that suggests a period of transmission apart from the mainstream of Latin scribal practice. Like the content and arrangement of the document, therefore, its writing suggests a text that in its current form, and for a century or so before the writing of our papyrus, was written by and for Greek speakers but that at an earlier period of history was written by and for Latin speakers: an originally Roman text adapted and transmitted by Greeks. There is nothing inherently surprising in this path of transmission; the Romans had been learning Greek for centuries before they annexed Egypt, and when Greek-speaking Egyptians first felt the need for bilingual glossaries it would have been far easier to adapt existing materials from the Romans than to create new ones from scratch. Nevertheless, because so few texts designed to help Latin speakers learn Greek survive, the Latin-learning materials found in papyri are often assumed to have been created entirely by Greek speakers. P.Sorb. inv. 2069 is therefore a key piece of evidence in understanding the history of these materials.

### 5. The origins of the glossary

The words found in P.Sorb. inv. 2069 are notably different from those in other ancient bilingual glossaries. Those other glossaries contain largely common, everyday vocabulary of the type that would have been needed in ordinary interaction between Greek and Latin speakers: military terminology, types of food, names of gods, etc.; when they go beyond the basics it is normally for the sake of completeness in vocabulary lists classified by subject. The glossary on our papyrus contains some common words, but also others that a traveller would be very unlikely to need, such as *uertex* and *urus*, and it shows no preference for any particular semantic field(s). The unifying principle of inclusion is clearly neither subject matter nor usefulness, but polysemy: P.Sorb. inv. 2069 is a glossary of homonyms.

The study of homonyms does not seem to have been a regular part of ancient foreign-language learning. Of course other bilingual glossaries include polysemous words and may provide multiple translations of such words, but there are no other known examples of ancient bilingual works devoted exclusively or even primarily to homonyms, and the examples of usage in different senses that are so frequent a feature of P.Sorb. inv. 2069 are not found in other ancient glossaries even when multiple translations of homonyms are given.

But the study of homonyms is well attested within the monolingual Latin grammatical tradition, since the ambiguities they caused could be a stumbling block for native speakers as well as for foreigners; a concern for the proper use of homonyms to avoid ambiguity is found from Quintilian (*Inst.* 8.2.13) onwards. Some of the words glossed in P.Sorb. inv. 2069 would have been ambiguous only from a Greek point of view and not from the perspective of a native speaker: a monolingual Roman would probably not have been bothered by the fact that Latin *ungula* can refer to the feet of various different kinds of animal without indicating precisely which animal, just as speakers of modern English

---

<sup>30</sup> Though other symbols are occasionally used to indicate certain types of division; see Turner 1987: 144.

are not usually bothered by the same polysemy in English ‘hoof’. But most of the words in this text are ambiguous even for native speakers: the fact that *tribus* can be either the nominative of a word for ‘tribe’ or the dative of the word for ‘three’ is a genuine problem within Latin, and the same is true of the ambiguities of *turbo* (both noun and verb), *tactus* (noun and participle of *tango*), *tonsa* (noun and participle of *tondeo*), *uentum* (noun and participle of *uenio*), *uter* (noun and pronoun), *usus* (noun and participle of *utor*), *uitio* (noun in dative and verb), *uincit* (form of *uinco* and of *uincio*), etc. Therefore the majority of the words in this text would have fitted well into the grammatical tradition of discussions of homonyms. These discussions include statements such as the following:

a) homonymia est, cum duae res uel plures uno nomine nuncupantur, ut ‘liceat superesse nepotem’, filium filii, et ‘quis ganeo, quis nepos’, id est luxuriosus. hic enim nepos uno nomine multa significauit. (Marius Plotius Sacerdos (III AD), *Artes Grammaticae* vi.455.4-7 Keil)

‘Homonymy is when two or more things are called by one name, as *liceat superesse nepotem*, where *nepos* means a son’s son, and *quis ganeo*, *quis nepos*, where *nepos* means one who lives luxuriously. For this word *nepos* signified many things with one name.’<sup>31</sup>

b) sunt nomina, quae appellantur homonyma, hoc est quae una significatione uarias res designant, ut puta nepos foedus scortum agmen aries et cetera talia. nepos enim modo tertiam progeniem hominum, modo luxuriosum designat; item foedus modo turpem, modo iusiurandum significat; item scortum modo corium, modo meretricem demonstrat; item agmen modo multitudinem modo iter significat; aries uero modo animal, modo machinam belli demonstrat: sic et cetera alia. (ps-Probus (IV AD), *Instituta artium* iv.120.10-17 Keil)

‘There are nouns that are called homonyms, that is which indicate different things by means of one term, as for example *nepos*, *foedus*, *scortum*, *agmen*, *aries*, and other such words. For *nepos* sometimes indicates the third generation of men (i.e. ‘grandson’) and sometimes one who lives luxuriously; also *foedus* sometimes means a foul person and sometimes an oath; also *scortum* sometimes indicates a hide and sometimes a prostitute; also *agmen* sometimes means a crowd and sometimes a journey; indeed *aries* sometimes indicates an animal (i.e. ‘ram’) and sometimes a war machine (i.e. ‘battering ram’); and also others in the same way.’

c) inueniuntur itaque quaedam nomina homonyma et participiis et uerbis similia, alia quoque aduerbiis. de quibus quid dici potest, nisi quod accentus sit arbiter discernens utriusque significatus differentiam? sic, parens obsequens significatur, intelligitur et pater: prius participium est tractum a uerbo quod est pareo, posterius nomen. quotiens igitur participium significat, primum syllabam producimus, ut est Vergilianus ille, ‘iamque ibat dicto parens’; eandem uero in altera significatione corripimus, ut est ‘alma parens’. item uerbis similia sic, labor est nomen et uerbi prima positio: in nominis significatione primam syllabam corripimus, ut est ‘tot adire labores’; at in uerbi producimus, ut est ‘matrisque adlabitur aures’ et ‘summas perlabitur undas’. item aduerbiis sic, late est et aduerbium et uerbum modi imperativi: in aduerbio tam prima syllaba producit, ut est ‘hinc populum late regem’, quam in uerbi significatione corripitur, ut est ‘aut aliquis latet error equo’, item ‘nec latuere doli’ et ‘ut superi uoluere, late’. omnia autem huius modi facilius ex metrica structura comprehenduntur.’ (Diomedes (IV AD), *Ars grammatica* i.434.9-35 Keil)

‘And so certain homonymous nouns are also found, similar to participles and to verbs, and also others similar to adverbs. What can be said about them, except that the prosody is the judge deciding the difference between each meaning? Thus *parens* means ‘being obedient’, and it is also understood as ‘father’: the first is a participle derived from the verb *pareo*, the second a noun. So whenever it means a participle, we pronounce the first syllable long, as in that phrase of Virgil’s, *iamque ibat dicto parens* (—|—|—|—|) but in the other meaning we pronounce the same syllable short, as in *alma parens* (—|—|) etc. Also ones similar to verbs thus: *labor* is a noun and the first person singular of a verb: in the meaning of the noun we pronounce the first syllable short, as in *tot adire labores* (—|—|—|—|), but in the verb we pronounce it long, as in *matrisque adlabitur aures* (—|—|—|—|) and *summas perlabitur undas* (—|—|—|—|). Also ones similar to adverbs thus: *late* is both an adverb and a verb in the imperative mood: in the adverb the first syllable is pronounced long, as in *hinc populum late regem* (—|—|—|—|), just as in the verbal meaning it is pronounced short, as in *aut aliquis latet error equo* (—|—|—|—|), also *nec latuere doli* (—|—|—|—|) and *ut superi uoluere, late* (—|—|—|—|). But all the homonyms of this sort are more easily grasped from the metrical structure.’<sup>32</sup>

d) inueniuntur tamen quaedam homonyma eadem propria et appellatiua, ut ‘Magnus Pompeius’ et ‘magnus cuius’. (Priscian (c. 500 AD), *Institutiones grammaticae* ii.59.15-16 Keil)

<sup>31</sup> The quotations are Verg. A. 10.47 and Cicero *Catil.* 2.7.

<sup>32</sup> The quotations are Verg. A. 1.695, 2.591 (and elsewhere), 1.10, 9.474, 1.147 (with a word missing), 1.21, 2.48, 1.130, and Lucan 1.419.

'Nevertheless some homonyms are found in which the same words are both proper names and adjectives, as *magnus* in the name *Pompeius Magnus* 'Pompey the Great' and the expression *magnus ciuis* 'a great citizen'.'

e) similiter quartae sunt, quae rerum uocabulis homonyma inueniuntur, ut magistratūs, ἀρχὴ καὶ ὁ ἄρχων, huius magistratus, hic saltūs, ἡ πῆδησις καὶ ἡ νάπη, huius saltus, hic uersūs, ἡ τροφή καὶ ὁ τρίχος, huius uersus, hic exercitūs, ἡ γυμνασία καὶ ὁ στρατός, huius exercitus. (Priscian (c. 500 AD), *Institutiones grammaticae* ii.256.5-9 Keil) 'Likewise belonging to the fourth declension are those nouns that are found to be homonymous with words for incorporeal things, like *magistratūs* meaning 'magistracy' and 'magistrate', genitive *magistratūs*; *saltūs* meaning 'leap' and 'glen', genitive *saltūs*; *uersūs* meaning 'turn' and 'verse', genitive *uersūs*; *exercitūs* meaning 'exercise' and 'army', genitive *exercitūs*.'

Other such passages include Priscian iii.88.22-89.13 Keil (different senses of *ubi* glossed with Greek ποῦ and ὅπου, and different senses of *o* illustrated with quotations), Pompeius Maurus' (V AD) commentary on Donatus v.146.12-16 Keil (with discussion of *nepos* and with different sense of *palma* illustrated with quotations), 'Sergius' (VI AD) commentary on Donatus iv. 538.10-19 Keil (different senses of *nepos* and *acies* illustrated by quotations), and Dositheus (IV AD) 398.3-6 Keil (explanation of *nepos* and *acies*, with full Greek translation).

Though none of these passages is exactly like the glossary in P.Sorb. inv. 2069, between them they provide parallels for most of its key features.<sup>33</sup> Homonyms are disambiguated by indicating their different meanings, and the various meanings are often illustrated by examples. There is a significant difference in that the grammarians' illustrations are almost always quotations from literature and those in the papyrus are usually not literary, but Priscian's examples for *magnus* may be just simple illustrative phrases rather than identifiable quotations,<sup>34</sup> and it is possible that some of the phrases in the papyrus may have been adapted from literary quotations: *unde homines fiunt* in line 85 could be an adaptation of Virgil *Georgics* 1.63 *unde homines nati, durum genus*.

Sometimes, moreover, a grammarian clarifies the different meanings of homonyms by translation into Greek. In extant grammatical writers this use of Greek is found only in Priscian, and it may be a reflection of the fact that Priscian worked in Constantinople, which was a thoroughly Greek-speaking environment. Indeed Priscian's grammar, while it clearly requires a very advanced knowledge of Latin, was probably intended primarily for an audience of native Greek speakers.<sup>35</sup>

It is, however, also possible that the use of Greek to disambiguate homonyms was not Priscian's innovation but had a long history, albeit only in texts that are no longer preserved, as part of the grammatical discussion of Latin homonyms. The obvious comparison for this use of Greek is the use of Latin in English discussions of the Greek verbs 'to be' and 'to go', which are traditionally known as 'εἶμι *sum*' and 'εἶμι *ibo*'. Just as English schoolchildren were taught Latin from an early age and therefore found these labels useful, so aristocratic Roman boys of the late Republic and early Empire learned Greek early enough and well enough that Greek translations would have been useful to them. One can easily imagine the education system depicted by Quintilian including such study of homonyms, and the same is true for the education of men of the late Republic such as Cicero, whose frequent introduction of Greek literary terminology to otherwise Latin letters points to an extensive use of Greek in his schooling (cf. Adams 2003a: 323-9). Although by Priscian's day the bilingual education tradition

<sup>33</sup> The inflectional information provided by Priscian in the last quotation is not really a parallel for the inflectional information in the papyrus, however: the genitives are given only to further Priscian's argument that such nouns belong to the fourth declension, not in order to tell readers how to use the words in question.

<sup>34</sup> It may, however, be worth noting that prior to Priscian the phrase *magnus ciuis* seems to appear only once in extant Latin, in Juvenal 6.557.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. remarks like *inueniuntur praeterea apud nos aduerbia diminutiua, quae apud Graecos non sunt, ut clam 'clanculum', bene 'belle, bellissime'* iii.88.21-2 Keil.

had largely broken down, so that such use of Greek would have been relatively ineffective in Rome itself, he could nevertheless have drawn upon an earlier tradition.<sup>36</sup>

It is therefore possible that Priscian holds the clue to the origins of the papyrus. Perhaps the glossary on our papyrus started life as a purely Latin list of homonyms in which Greek translations were frequently used to disambiguate the Latin, as in Priscian.<sup>37</sup> It could then have easily been adapted as a tool for Romans learning Greek by being made fully bilingual, and by the addition of words such as *ungula* that only become problematic when one tries to translate them into Greek. Whether or not the use of Greek comes from this source, however, the ultimate origins of the glossary of homonyms must be in the Latin grammatical tradition. P.Sorb. inv. 2069 thus provides important evidence for the existence of detailed works on such topics at an earlier date than we would otherwise have suspected from the extant grammars. Even the date of the papyrus itself is earlier than other work on Latin homonyms; and since the text appears to have been transmitted for some time in its later, Greek-oriented form (see section 4 above), the original creation of the glossary of homonyms can hardly be later than the early second century AD.

## 6. Restored version of the text

I present here a restored version of the more legible portions of the text as it probably appeared after adaptation for Greek speakers but before reformatting into long lines. Diacritics and punctuation have been added and spellings normalized in accordance with modern conventions (for the original diacritics and punctuation see pp. 181-185), and a translation is provided. Line and column numbers are those of the new edition (pp. 177-187), not those used by Collart and Kramer; horizontal lines separate the different entries.

### Column 1

2	[cetera ut altus]	[τὰ] λοιπὰ ὡς τὸ ὑψηλός	. . . and the other (forms of this are declined) like <i>altus</i> .
<hr/>			
3	[ ]	[ ]	[ ? ] <sup>38</sup>
<hr/>			
3	[Studeo]	[σπουδ]άζω, φιλοπονῶ·	‘I am eager’, ‘I study’:
4	[ ]	[ ],	[ ? ], <sup>39</sup>
4	[non studet]	ἀμελεῖ,	‘he does not care’,
5	[ ]	[ ],	[ ? ], <sup>40</sup>
5	[studebam]	[ἐβ]ολόμην.	‘I wanted’.
<hr/>			
6	[ ]	[ ] ἢ καὶ ὄρνεον[ . . . . . ]·	‘[ ? ]’ and a [ ? ] bird;
6	[et cetera ut al]ta	καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς τὸ ὑψηλ[ή].	and the other (forms of this are declined) like <i>alta</i> .

<sup>36</sup> It has recently been argued (Barnett 2007: 713-17, cf. 2006: 267-72) that the *Appendix Probi*, a monolingual handbook of correct Latin that in its current form dates to the late antique or early medieval period (Powell 2007: 694), was originally a bilingual Latin-Greek work, probably a glossary of homonymous Greek words with Latin disambiguations. If this theory is correct, the *Appendix Probi* would provide a parallel for our text, both in being an ancient glossary of homonyms and in crossing the boundaries between monolingual and bilingual linguistic works.

<sup>37</sup> Particular thanks to Rolando Ferri for suggesting this course of evolution and directing me to many of the relevant passages from the grammarians.

<sup>38</sup> As the end of line 2 seems to be the end of an entry and the end of line 3 the beginning of another entry, the rest of line 3 apparently held a complete short entry; cf. lines 60 and 102 for other entries that take up only part of a line.

<sup>39</sup> One or two examples of *studeo* being equivalent to *σπουδάζω* and / or *φιλοπονέω* stood here.

<sup>40</sup> Probably an example of *studeo* being equivalent to a different Greek verb in a particular usage.

7	T		T
8	[Tibicen]	αὐλητής, αὐλ[ητ]ρίς·	‘Piper’, ‘female piper’;
8	tibice[n]	[καλιγκτήε], καλιπ[ί]ετρια·	‘trumpeter’, ‘female trumpeter’;
9	[horum duo]rum cetera	τούτων τῶν δυ[οῖν τὰ λοιπὰ]	the other (cases) of these two (nouns)
9-10	ut Cato declinatur	[ὡς τ]ὸ Κάτων κλίνεται, <sup>41</sup>	are declined like <i>Cato</i> ,
10	e reciden[te in i]	[τοῦ ε]μεταπίπτοντος <sup>42</sup> εἰς τὸ ἰ.	with the <i>e</i> changing to <i>i</i> .
11	[Tribus]	τριείν, φυλή. <sup>43</sup>	‘Three (dat. <sup>44</sup> )’, ‘tribe’:
11	tribu[s generibus]	[τ]ριεῖ[ι γ]ένεσιν,	‘three kinds (dat.)’,
12	[tribus Col]lina	φυλή Κολλείνα.	‘Colline tribe’.
12	[Turbo]	[λαιλαπετός, βέμ]β[ι]ξ, ῥόμβος, φυρῶ·	‘Hurricane’, ‘whipping-top’, ‘whirling’, ‘I mix up’:
13	[turbo et] uis uenti	λαιλαπετός καὶ ἰς ἀνέμου],	‘hurricane and force of wind’,
13	[turbo bu]xeus	βέμβιξ π[ύ]ξινος, <sup>45</sup>	‘whipping-top of boxwood’,
14	[turbo mag]icus	ῥόμβος μαγικό[ε],	‘magic wheel’,
14	[turbo composita]	[φυρῶ τὰ συ]γκείμενα. <sup>46</sup>	‘I mix up the established (order)’ <sup>47</sup> ;
15	[turbinis]	λαιλαπετοῦ·	(the genitive is) ‘of a hurricane’;
15	ce[te]ra ut Cato declinatur	[τὰ] λοιπὰ ὡς τὸ Κάτων [κλίνεται].	the other (forms) are declined like <i>Cato</i> .
16	[Trudo]	[ὠ]θῶ, ἐρ[ε]ίδω·	‘I push’, ‘I press’;
16	[trudis]	[ὠ]θεῖς, ἐρείδεις·	‘you push’, ‘you press’;
16	[trudit]	[ὠ]θεῖ, ἐρείδει·	‘he pushes’, ‘he presses’;
17	[cetera u]t ago	[τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς τὸ πράσσω].	the other (forms of <i>trudo</i> are conjugated) like <i>ago</i> .
17	[Triumphus]	[θρία]μβος	‘Triumph’ . . .

### Column 2

25	suadeo t[i]b[i]	[πειθω εε],	. . . ‘I persuade you’, <sup>48</sup>
25	[proui]de tibi	βλέπε σεαυτό(ν),	‘look after yourself!’,
26	maledico tib[i]	[λοιδορῶ εε].	‘I revile you’.
26-7	Tessera	πεσσός, σύντομο[ν, . . . . .] χα]ριεντιζόμενον·	‘Game-piece’, ‘recognition- token (?)’, <sup>49</sup> ‘[ ? ] said as a joke’;
28	cetera ut a[ll]ta	[τὰ λοιπὰ] ὡς τὸ ὑψηλή.	the other (forms of <i>tessera</i> are declined) like <i>alta</i> .

<sup>41</sup> κλίνεται pap.

<sup>42</sup> με]ταπειπτοντος pap.

<sup>43</sup> [[βουλη] φυλη pap. This error may have a phonetic rather than a visual basis; for the implications of this see below, n. 66.

<sup>44</sup> Here and in the next line *tribus* could of course be ablative as well as dative, but there was no simple way to represent this complication in Greek, so dative-ablative forms are regularly glossed as datives in this text (cf. line 103).

<sup>45</sup> ‘ρόμβος’ βεμβιξ π[ύ]ξινος pap.; ῥόμβος seems to have been added in error, perhaps by someone who confused this line with the first one of the entry. Although βέμβιξ is normally feminine, the masculine is also attested, e.g. D scholion to *Iliad* 14.413 (ed. Van Thiel) and *Etymologicum Magnum* 551.23 Gaisford.

<sup>46</sup> συ]νκειμενα pap.

<sup>47</sup> I.e. ‘disturb the peace’; cf. Tacitus *Ann.* 2.65.1 and Aurelius Victor *De Caesaribus* 15.5.

<sup>48</sup> These lines probably occur at the end of a discussion of *tibi* and illustrate circumstances under which it can be the equivalent of *σε* or *σεαυτόν* rather than *σοί* in Greek (cf. lines 95-100 and 103-7 on *uos* and *uobis*).

<sup>49</sup> As the noun *σύντομον* is unattested in Greek, the interpretation here is very doubtful and rests almost entirely on the different senses attested for *tessera*.



29	Tribuit	[νέμει καὶ ἔνει]μεν οἴονεῖ <sup>50</sup> τιμῆν τινα.	'He grants' and 'he granted' as an honour. <sup>51</sup>
30	Tr . . . [ . . . ] <sup>52</sup>	[ . . . . . ] καὶ ἀνόητος·	'[ ? ]' and 'foolish';
31	et cetera [ut alta]	[καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ] ὡς τὸ ὑψηλή.	and the other (forms of this are declined) like <i>alta</i> .
32	Tempeſt[as]	[χρόνος, χειμῶν] ἐξ ἀνέμων	'Time, storm from winds' <sup>53</sup> . . .

**Column 3**

44	Tectum	[δῶμα, ἔκτεγαμμένο]ν, κτέγη·	'House', 'roofed', 'roof':
44-5	tectu[m . . . ] . . . liη[ . . . ]	δῶμα καθ[ . . . . . ],	'[ ? ] house',
45-6	[tect]um est cubicellum	ἔκτεγαμ[μένον] ἐστὶ τὸ κοιτῶ[νάριον],	'the bedroom <sup>54</sup> has been roofed',
46-7	[tectu]m triclini <sup>55</sup>	[τ]ῆν κτέ[γην] τοῦ τρικλίν[ου] <sup>56</sup>	'he builds the roof of the dining room';
	ae[di]fīçā[t]	οἰκοδομεῖ·	
47	cel[t]era ut bel[l]um.	τὰ λ[οι]πὰ ὡς τ[ὸ] πόλεμος.	the other (forms of <i>tectum</i> are declined) like <i>bellum</i> .
48	Tendo	τείνω, [ἔρχομαι, σκηνῶ]·	'Stretch out', 'go', 'pitch a tent':
48	tendo . . . ]ne[i[ . . . ]]	[τε]ίνω . . . ραδου[ . . . ],	'I stretch out [ ? ]',
49	tendō in foru[m]	[ἔρχομαι εἰς ἀγ]ο[ρά]ν,	'I go to the forum',
49-50	[te]ndō i[ux]ta u[allum]	σκην[ῶ] πλη[σίον] τοῦ ῥύμ[ατος]	'I pitch the tent near the defensive wall';
50	[cetera ut ago]	[τ]ὰ [λοιπὰ] ὡς τ[ὸ] πρᾶξω	the other (forms of <i>tendo</i> are conjugated) like <i>ago</i> .
51	Tanto mel[lius]	[τοκούτω βέλτιον]	'So much the better' . . . <sup>57</sup>

**Column 4**

60	[cetera ut bellum]	καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς τὸ π[ό]λεμος[ς].	. . . and the other (forms of this are declined) like <i>bellum</i> .
60	[Tactus]	[θ]ίξις, θίγεις, τεθιγμ[ένος].	'Touch', 'touches', 'having been touched'. <sup>58</sup>
61	[Tessera]	[κύ]βος και ψῆφος κυβ[ευτικό]ς·	'Die' <sup>59</sup> and 'pebble used in dice- playing';
61	et ceter[um] ut alta]	[κα]ὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς τὸ ὑψηλή.	and the other (forms of <i>tessera</i> are declined) like <i>alta</i> .

<sup>50</sup> οἴον εἰ pap.

<sup>51</sup> I.e. *tribuo* means 'grant as an honour', and *tribuit* could be either the present or the perfect of this verb.

<sup>52</sup> [[τὰ] tr . . . [ pap. We are not absolutely sure that the first three letters are Greek, but they appear so to us; if this reading is right it provides interesting evidence for uncertainty between languages in transmission.

<sup>53</sup> Presumably the point of ἐξ ἀνέμων is to distinguish χειμῶν 'storm' from χειμῶν 'winter'.

<sup>54</sup> The meaning of *cubicellum* / κοιτῶνάριον is uncertain.

<sup>55</sup> *triglini* pap.

<sup>56</sup> τρικλιν[ου] pap.

<sup>57</sup> This must be part of the entry on *tanto*, which appears again at the end of this line, but the line with the initial definitions seems to be missing.

<sup>58</sup> I.e. the noun 'touch' in the nominative singular and plural (assuming that θίγεις is an otherwise unattested variant of θίξις, nominative plural of θίξις, θίξεω) and the perfect passive participle of θιγγάνω 'I touch', to translate Latin *tactus* (fourth declension) as nominative singular and plural and *tactus* (first-second declension), perfect participle of *tango*. Kramer takes θίξις to be a misspelling of θίξεις 'you will touch', and θίγεις to be a variant of θιγγάνεις; Bourguignon takes θιγεις to be an (otherwise unattested) aorist passive participle of θιγγάνω.

<sup>59</sup> I.e. singular of 'dice'.

62	[Tonsa]	[κεκαρ]μένα καὶ γλωσσ[ηματικῶς] <sup>60</sup> κώπη·	‘Having been cut’ and rarely ‘oar’;
62	cet[era ut alta]	τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς τὸ ὑψηλή.	the other (forms of <i>tonsa</i> are declined) like <i>alta</i> .
<hr/>			
63	U		U
64	[Uoluptas]	[ή]δονή, ἀπάτη, [ἀκολα]σία, τρυφή·	‘Pleasure’, ‘enjoyment’, <sup>61</sup>
64	[cetera ut] Cato <sup>62</sup>	τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς τὸ [Κά]τ[ων].	‘licentiousness’, ‘luxuriousness’;
65		[ . . . . . ]ου α τ[.]	the other (forms of <i>uoluptas</i> are declined) like <i>Cato</i> .
65	u[olup]tatem capio	[ἥ]δομαι, τρυφῶ, [ἀ]πατῶ·	[ ? ] <sup>63</sup>
65-6	e[t cetera ut rapi]o	τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς τὸ [ἀρ]πάζω.	‘I take pleasure’, ‘I live luxuriously’, ‘I enjoy’;
<hr/>			
66	U [ . ]	[ . . . ]	[ ? ];
66-7	et cetera sicut ago	[καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ] ὡς τὸ πράττω.	and the other (forms of this are conjugated) like <i>ago</i> .
<hr/>			
67	Uip[era]	ὄφις, ἔχιδνα].	‘Serpent’, ‘viper-like individual (?)’.
67-8	Uelim uenias	[θέ]λοιμι ἔλθ[η]ς	‘I would like you to come’ . . .
68	uelim f. [ . . . ]	θ [ . . . . . ] θα	[ ? ] <sup>64</sup>
<hr/>			
68-9	Uec[tu]ra	ὄχημα[α], [ἀ]γωγή, να[ύ]λος·	‘Vehicle’, <sup>65</sup> ‘transportation’, ‘passage-money’;
69	[et cetera ut alta]	[κα]ὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς τὸ ὑψηλή.	and the other (forms of <i>uectura</i> are declined) like <i>alta</i> .
<hr/>			
70	[ . . . ]	φα [ . . . ]	[ ? ];
70	[et cetera ut altus]	[καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ] ὡς τὸ ὑψηλός.	and the other (forms of this are declined) like <i>altus</i> .

### Column 5

79	[Uentum]	[ἄ]νεμον, ἐληλυθός·	‘Wind (acc.)’, ‘having come (neut.)’:
79	u[e]ntum se[c]u[n]dum	ἄνεμον αἴσιον,	‘favourable wind (acc.)’,
80	u[entum est] domu(m)	ἐληλυθός [ἐ]στιν εἰς οἶκον.	‘there was an arrival home’.
<hr/>			
80	[Ungula]	ὄπλη, ὄνυχιον, χη(λή)·	‘Hoof’, ‘trotter’, ‘cloven hoof’:
81	u[n]gula equi]	ὄπλη ἵππου,	‘horse’s hoof’,
81	un[g]ula porci	[ὄ]νυχιον χοί[ρου],	‘pig’s trotter’,
81-2	ungula [bouis] <sup>66</sup>	[χ]ηλή βοός·	‘cow’s (cloven) hoof’;

<sup>60</sup> For the meaning of this term see Valente 2009 and Kramer 1983: 37.

<sup>61</sup> For this and ἀπατῶ in line 65 see Robert 1960 and Kramer 1983: 37.

<sup>62</sup> ἄτ[ο] pap.

<sup>63</sup> This line probably forms part of the entry on *uoluptas*; there does not seem to be enough space in the gap at the left for a Latin phrase including the word *uoluptas*, so perhaps all the missing material was in Greek, some sort of extra explanation as in lines 107-8.

<sup>64</sup> The phrase here presumably involved a different use of *uelim* from the ‘I would like’ meaning above (probably one of the normal meanings of the Latin present subjunctive, as the distinctive feature of *uelim* is that it both functions as the regular present subjunctive of *uolo* and has a special usage for ‘I would like’), and thus a different Greek translation (though probably still using the verb θέλω). The entry seems to be missing the line with the initial definitions.

<sup>65</sup> For the ‘vehicle’ meaning of *uectura* see Adams 2003b: 559.

<sup>66</sup> *ungula* [[*uobis*] [*bouis*] pap. This error and correction are interesting: the error has a phonetic rather than a visual basis, suggesting that the glossary was at some point transmitted by dictation. Another probable phonetic error occurs in line

82	et cete[ra u]t alta	καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς τὸ ὑψηλή.	and the other (forms of <i>ungula</i> are declined) like <i>alta</i> .
83	Ulcis[cor]	[τιμωρ]ῶ καὶ ἀμύν[ο]μαι·	‘I avenge’ and ‘I punish’:
83	[ulci]scor hostis	ἀμ[ύ]νομαι τῶν πολεμίων.	‘I punish the enemy’.
84	Ultr[ix]	[νέμ]ετις, ἀμυν[τ]ηρι·	‘Vengeance’, ‘avenger(?)’;
84	et cetera ut ca[lx]	[καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς τὸ ἄβετος.	and the other (forms of <i>ultrix</i> are declined) like <i>calx</i> .
85	Und[e]	[πόθεν] καὶ ὅθεν·	‘Whence?’ and ‘whence’:
85	unde h[o]mines fiunt	[ὅθεν ἄν]θρωποι γίνονται. <sup>67</sup>	‘whence men arise’;
86	in [priora]mque syllabam	ἐν τῷ προτέρῳ [ἐκ]άτῃν ὄξυτονούμεν	in the former (meaning) we accent each
87	[acuimus]	[c]υλλαβήν,	syllable,
87	in sequen[do] sequen[dam]	[ἐν τῷ] ἑξῆς τὴν δευτέραν.	in the latter (we accent) the second. <sup>68</sup>
88	[Uiolo]	[μιαίνω], ἀσεβῶ, βιάζω, [φθε]ίρω·	‘I defile’, ‘I commit sacrilege’, ‘I treat with violence’, ‘I ruin’ . . .

## Column 6

93	Ἐρῆα	[οἰκογενής, θρεπτός, θρεπτή]·	‘home-bred slave’, ‘foundling (m.)’, ‘foundling (f.)’
94	[uerna] meus	[οἰκο]γενής ἐμὸς ἢ θρεπτ[ὸς ἐμὸς],	‘my home-bred slave’ or ‘my foundling (m.)’
94	[uerna] mea	[θρε]πτή ἐμή·	‘my foundling (f.)’;
95	[cetera] ut alta	[τὰ] λοιπὰ ὡς τὸ ὑψηλή.	the other (forms of <i>uerna</i> are declined) like <i>alta</i> .
95	Ἦος	[ὕμεῖς, ὑμῶ]ς·	‘You (nom. pl.)’, ‘you (acc. pl.)’:
96	[uos] priores uenisti[s]	ὕμεῖς πρότεροι ἐληλύθατ[ε],	‘you (nom.) came earlier’,
96-7	[uo]s sic iussi	ὑμᾶς οὕτως ἐκέλευσα.	‘I ordered you (acc.) thus’.
97-8	genetiui sic fit c[asus]	[γε]νικῆς οὕτω γίνεται πτός[ε]ως·	It becomes a genitive case <sup>69</sup> thus:

11, Greek βουλή corrected to φυλή. There is no reason to infer from this that our papyrus in particular was written from dictation: the scribe could easily have inherited a text containing phonetic errors from an earlier dictation and copied some of them mechanically before correcting them.

<sup>67</sup> γεινονται pap.

<sup>68</sup> This statement is intended to apply to the Latin, not the Greek: although Greek is the language best known for having the type of accentual distinction discussed here, in this entry only the Latin provides one word with two meanings that need to be distinguished, so that the accent discussion would not make sense if applied to the Greek. The rule of Latin accentuation mentioned here must be connected to one found in Priscian: *quomodo et ‘unde’, ut Horatius in II sermonum ‘unde et quo Catus?’ interrogatiuum acutam paenultimam habet, relatiuum grauatur: Virgilius in I ‘genus undè Latinum’ ‘just as unde when it is interrogative has an acute accent on its penultimate syllable, as in Horace S. 2.4.1 unde et quo Catus?, but when it is relative it is unaccented, as in Virgil A. 1.6 genus undè Latinum’ (iii.83.16-20 Keil).*

From the perspective of Latin grammarians ‘unaccented’ and ‘accented on the final syllable’ could be equivalent concepts for a disyllabic proclitic; this view was inherited from the Greek grammarians’ discussions of disyllabic proclitics and is also attested in Priscian: *sciendum autem, quod ‘qui’, quando pro interrogatiuo uel infinito, id est pro ‘quis’ ponitur, circumflectitur, quando autem pro relatiuo, acuitur per se, in lectione uero grauatur. similiter obliqui casus generalem accentuum regulam seruant, quando sunt infinita uel interrogatiua, quando uero relatiua, acuiuntur per se, idem in lectione grauantur per omnes syllabas.* ‘But it is necessary to know that *qui*, when it is used as an interrogative or indefinite, that is for *quis*, is accented with a circumflex, but when it is used as a relative, it has a final acute accent when standing alone and is unaccented in continuous text. Likewise the oblique cases of *qui* follow this general accent rule when they are indefinites or interrogatives, but when they are relatives they have a final acute when standing alone and in continuous text are unaccented on all syllables.’ (iii.9.20-5 Keil). I am particularly grateful to Rolando Ferri and Philomen Probert for help on this point.

<sup>69</sup> The syntax here and in line 99 looks peculiar but is probably original, the genitive being a genitive of quality (literal translation ‘it becomes of genitive quality thusly’): cf. ‘*recti*’ *genetiui casus est, numeri singularis* (‘*recti* is a genitive singular’) in Porphyrio’s commentary on Horace *Carm.* 4.4.34 (ed. Holder), and τὸ “Ἀκίω ἐν λειμῶνι” ἐνταῦθα γενικῆς πτόσεως ἔστιν (‘Ἀκίω is a genitive here’) in a D-scholion to *Iliad* 2.461 (ed. Van Thiel). Nevertheless it is notable that in lines 104-5 the same phrase recurs with ‘genitive case’ in the nominative instead of the genitive in both Latin and Greek.

98	audio uos	ἀκούω ὑμ[ῶν, ἀκο]ύω ὑμᾶς,	‘I hear you (gen.)’, ‘I hear you (acc.)’,
99	contemp[no] uos]	καταφρονῶ ὑμῶν·	‘I despise you (gen.)’;
99	datiui rursus [sic]	δοτικῆς πάλιν οὕτως	but (it becomes) a dative thus:
100	sequor <sup>70</sup> u[o]s]	[ἀ]κολουθῶ ὑμῖν,	‘I follow you (dat.)’
100	adiuuo uos	βοηθῶ ὑμ[τ]ιν.	‘I help you (dat.)’.
101	Uter	πότ[ε]ρος, ὑτέρα ἢ τῆς γυναικός·	‘Which of two’, ‘woman’s uterus’:
101	uter uestru[m]	πότερος ὑμῶν,	‘which of you two’,
102	uter mulier[is]	ὑτέρα γυναικός.	‘uterus of a woman’. <sup>71</sup>
102	Usus	χρήσις, χρ[η]σάμενος.	‘Use’, ‘having used’.
103	Uobis	ὑμῖν. <sup>72</sup>	‘You (dat. <sup>73</sup> pl.)’;
103	in comparatione plurali <sup>74</sup>	ἐν συγκρί[σ]ει πληθυντικῆ	in comparison in the plural
104	hoc quoque Graece	καὶ τοῦτο Ἑλληνιστὶ	this too in Greek
104-5	genetiuis fit casus	γενικὴ γίνεται <sup>75</sup> πᾶσι	becomes the genitive case
105	per omnia	κατὰ πάντα·	in all respects:
105-6	ut uobis acutior hic	ὡς ὑμῶν ὁξ[ύ]τερος οὗτος,	as ‘this man (is) sharper than you’,
106	uobis disertior	ὑμῶν λο[γ]ιώτερος,	‘more learned than you’,
107	uobis prior	ὑμ[ῶ]ν πρότερος.	‘before you’.
107-8	Uitio	κινῶ, κίνει, <sup>76</sup> ἐλαττώματι, φθείρω δὲ ἐπὶ γ[υν]α[ικ]οῦ ἐροῦμεν·	‘I harm’, ‘problem’, ‘defect’ (dat.), but we say ‘defile’ of a woman:
108	uitio rem	κινῶ [πρᾶγμα],	‘I spoil the business’,
108-9	uitio hoc tenetur	κίνει [τούτω κρα]τεῖται,	‘he is held in the grip of this problem’,
109	uitio uirginem	φ[θ]είρω τῆ]ν παρθένον,	‘I defile the virgin’,
110	ui[tias]	[κιν]οῖς, φθείρεις·	‘you harm’, ‘you defile’;
110	et cetera ut accuso	κ[α]ὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς τ]ὸ κατηγορῶ κλίνειις.	and you conjugate the other (forms) like <i>accuso</i> .
111	[uero]	[ἀ]ληθεῖ ἢ δ]έ·	‘True (dat.)’ or ‘but’:
111	uero amico	ἀληθεῖ φίλῳ],	‘to/for a true friend’,
111-2	[hoc uer]o sciebam	[τοῦτο δὲ ἠπιστάμην]	‘but I knew this’ . . .

## Column 7

115	[Uertex]	[κορυφή, ἰλιγξ].	‘Top’, ‘whirlpool’:
116	[uer]t[e]x ca[r]pitis]	[κορυ]φή κεφαλῆς,	‘top of the head’,
116-7	ue[r]t[ex] fl[um]i[n]um]	[ἰλιγξ πο]ταμῶν·	‘whirlpool of rivers’;
117	[cetera u]t calx	τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς τὸ ἄβ[ε]το[ς]	the other (forms of <i>uertex</i> are declined) like <i>calx</i>
117-8	[mascu]line	ἀρ[σ]ενικῶς.	in the masculine.
118	idem significat	τὸ αὐτὸ [σημαίνει]	<i>Uortex</i> also means the same thing.
119	et uortex	[καὶ οὐόρ]τεξ. <sup>77</sup>	

<sup>70</sup> *sequor* pap.

<sup>71</sup> On this sense of *uter* see Adams 1982: 88.

<sup>72</sup> υμεῖν pap.

<sup>73</sup> In fact *uobis* can be ablative as well as dative (cf. line 11 and n.), and it is an ablative usage that is discussed here.

<sup>74</sup> *plura [li]li* pap.

<sup>75</sup> γεινεταί pap.

<sup>76</sup> κινῶσιν ἢ ἐλαττώματι pap., with a distinct space between κινῶσιν and ἢ. As it stands this reading looks like dittography of the first word and should perhaps be corrected to κινῶ ἢ ἐλαττώματι, “‘I harm’ or ‘defect’”, but Kramer is probably right that the second word was originally a misspelling of the dative κίνει, later misdivided and the last letter misinterpreted. It is peculiar that ἐλαττώματι does not recur among the examples, but this problem remains no matter what one does about the words preceding ἐλαττώματι.

<sup>77</sup> The Greek form οὐόρτεξ is otherwise unattested, and simple transliterations are not used elsewhere in extant portions of this text. If the supplement is right (and it is hard to imagine what else could have stood here), transliteration was used

128	Ualetudo	ὑγεία καὶ νόσος·	‘Health’ and ‘illness’:
119	ualetudo bona	ὑγεία κ[αλή],	‘good health’,
120	ualetudo in[commo]da	νόσος δυστράπελος·	‘harsh illness’;
120-1	cet[era ut Ca]to femi(ni)ne	τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς τὸ Κάτων θηλυκῶς,	the other (forms of <i>ualetudo</i> are declined) like <i>Cato</i> (but are) feminine,
121-2	recidente <sup>78</sup> ο [i]η i	μεταπίπτο[ντος] <sup>79</sup> τοῦ ο· εἰς τὸ ι·	with the <i>o</i> changing to <i>i</i> .
123	Urus	κανθός γλωσσηματικῶς καὶ βούς Γ[ερ]μανός·	‘Tyre on a wheel’ <sup>80</sup> rarely, and a German ox;
124	cetera ut altus	τὰ λ[ο]ιπὰ ὡς ὑψηλός.	the other (forms of <i>urus</i> are declined) like <i>altus</i> .
124-5	U[ia]tor	ἀρχιπτηρέτης καὶ <sup>81</sup> ὄδοιπόρος·	‘Chief minister’ <sup>82</sup> and ‘traveller’;
125	cetera ut altior	τὰ λ[ο]ιπὰ ὡς τὸ ὑψηλότερος.	the other (forms of <i>uator</i> are declined) like <i>altior</i> .
126	Uincit	νικᾷ καὶ γλωσσηματικῶς δεσμεύει·	‘He conquers’ and rarely ‘he binds’:
127	uincit prudentia <sup>83</sup>	νικᾷ τῇ ἐμπειρίᾳ,	‘he conquers by skill’,
127-8	uincit <sup>84</sup> manus	δεσμεύει τὰς χεῖρας.	‘he binds the hands’.
129	Ualeo	ὑγιάινω, ἔρρωμαι, ἰχύω·	‘I am healthy’, ‘I am well’, ‘I am strong’:
129-30	ualeo tecum	ὑγιάινω μετὰ σοῦ καὶ ἔρρωμαι,	‘I am healthy along with you’ and ‘I am well’,
130	ualeo studere	ἰχύω φιλοπονεῖν,	‘I am strong (enough) to study’,
131	uales	ὑγιάινεις, ἰχύεις, ἔρρωμαι,	‘you (sg.) are healthy’, ‘you are strong’, ‘you are well’,
131	ualet	ὑγιάινει, ἰχύει, ἔρρωται,	‘he is healthy’, ‘he is strong’, ‘he is well’,
132	ualemus	ὑ[γιαίνο]μεν, ἰχύομεν, ἔρρώμεθα,	‘we are healthy’, ‘we are strong’, ‘we are well’,
133	ualetis <sup>85</sup>	ὑ[γιαίνετε], ἰχύετε, ἔρρωθε,	‘you (pl.) are healthy’, ‘you are strong’, ‘you are well’,
133-4	ualent	[ὑγιαί]νουσι, ἰ[χύου]σι, ἔρρ[ων]ται,	‘they are healthy’, ‘they are strong’, ‘they are well’,
134	uale	ὑγιάινε, ἴ[χυε], ἔρρωσο·	‘be healthy!’, ‘be strong!’, ‘be well!/goodbye’;
135	et cetera s[ic]cut]	[καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ κ]αθῶς τὸ	and the other (forms of <i>ualeo</i> )
135-6	foueo decl[i]nā[tur]	θ[ερμαίνω κλίνεται].	are conjugated like <i>foueo</i> .

here because there was no other good way to render the Latin: the point that *uertex* and *uortex* have the same meaning cannot be made clearly in Greek by translating *uortex*.

<sup>78</sup> *reccidente* pap.

<sup>79</sup> μεταπίπτο[ντος] pap.

<sup>80</sup> For the equation see Goetz 1888-1923: ii.338.27 and Kramer 1983: 39.

<sup>81</sup> καὶ | καὶ pap.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Collart 1940: 74.

<sup>83</sup> *gaudentia* pap.

<sup>84</sup> *uincit* pap.

<sup>85</sup> *ualetes* pap.

## References:

- Adams, J. N. (1982), *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London).
- (1995), 'The Language of the Vindolanda Writing-Tablets: An Interim Report', *Journal of Roman Studies* 85: 86-34.
- (1996), 'Interpuncts as Evidence for the Enclitic Character of Personal Pronouns in Latin', *ZPE* 111: 208-10.
- (2003a), *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge).
- (2003b), 'The New Vindolanda Writing-Tablets', *Classical Quarterly* 53: 530-75.
- Anderson, R. D., P. J. Parsons, and R. G. M. Nisbet (1979), 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qasr Ibrîm', *Journal of Roman Studies* 69: 125-55.
- Barnett, F. J. (2006), 'The Second Appendix to Probus', *Classical Quarterly* 56: 257-78.
- (2007), 'The Sources of the *Appendix Probi*: A New Approach', *Classical Quarterly* 57: 701-36.
- Bonnet, G. (2005), *Dosithée: grammaire latine* (Paris).
- Bourguignon, A. (2007), 'Un manuel de langue latine: remarques et restitutions', *Chronique d'Égypte* 82: 293-301.
- Casamassima, E., and E. Staraz (1977), 'Variante e cambio grafico nella scrittura dei papiri latini: note paleografiche', *Scrittura e civiltà* 1: 9-110.
- Ciriello, S., and Stramaglia, A. (1998), 'PSI VII 743 recto (Pack<sup>2</sup> 2100): Dialogo di Alessandro con i Ginnosofisti e testo giuridico romano non identificato', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 44: 219-27.
- Collart, P. (1940), 'Glossaire latin-grec inédit sur un papyrus d'Oxyrhynchos', in *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire offerts à A. Ernout* (Paris), pp. 61-74.
- Debrunner, A. (1950), *Griechische Grammatik* ii (Munich).
- Dumoulin, C. (2001), 'P. Sorb. inv. 2069, collection Th. Reinach, recto inédit: Compte de transport par eau de céréales', in I. Andorlini, G. Bastianini, M. Manfredi, and G. Menci (edd.), *Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Firenze 1998* (Florence), pp. 399-409.
- Goetz, G. (1888-1923), *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum a Gustavo Loewe inchoatum* (Leipzig).
- Jannaris, A. N. (1897), *An Historical Greek Grammar Chiefly of the Attic Dialect* (London).
- Kramer, J. (1983), *Glossaria bilingua in papyris et membranis reperta* (Bonn).
- (1996), 'Der lateinisch-griechische Vergilpalimpsest aus Mailand', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 111: 1-20.
- (2001), *Glossaria bilingua altera* (Munich).
- (2004), 'Essai d'une typologie des glossaires gréco-latins conservés sur papyrus', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 50: 49-60.
- Krumbacher, K. (1884), 'Ein neuer Codex der Grammatik des Dositheus', *Rheinisches Museum* 39: 348-58.
- Müller, R. W. (1964), *Rhetorische und syntaktische Interpunktion*, diss. Tübingen.
- Naoumides, M. (1969), 'The Fragments of Greek Lexicography in the Papyri', in *Classical Studies Presented to Ben Edwin Perry* (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 58, Urbana), pp. 181-202.
- Oliver, R. P. (1966), 'Apex and Sicilicus', *American Journal of Philology* 87: 129-70.
- Parkes, M. B. (1992), *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West* (Aldershot).
- Powell, J. G. F. (2007), 'A New Text of the *Appendix Probi*', *Classical Quarterly* 57: 687-700.
- Robert, L. (1960), 'Sur un papyrus de Paris glossaire latin-grec', *Hellenica: recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques* 11-12: 5-15.
- Rochette, B. (1996), 'Papyrologica bilingua Graeco-Latina', *Aegyptus* 76: 57-79.
- Seider, R. (1978), *Paläographie der lateinischen Papyri* II.1 (Stuttgart).
- Turner, E. G. (1987), *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, 2nd edn (London).
- Valente, S. (2009), 'Sul significato di γλωσσηματικῶς in Timeo Sofista', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 170: 65-72.
- Wouters, A. (1988), *The Chester Beatty Codex AC 1499: A Graeco-Latin Lexicon on the Pauline Epistles and a Greek Grammar* (Leuven).

Eleanor Dickey, University of Exeter (E.Dickey@exeter.ac.uk)