Part One

Introduction

THE COLLOQUIA AND THEIR CONTEXT

I got up in the morning, having been woken up, and I called a slave boy. I told him to open the window; he opened it quickly. Having gotten up, I sat on the frame of the bed. I asked for shoes and leggings, for it was cold. So then having been shod I received a linen towel. A clean one was handed to me. Water was brought for my face in a little jug. Doused by which water, first as to my hands, then onto my face, I washed myself; and I closed my mouth. I scrubbed my teeth and gums. I spat out the undesirable stuff as it accumulated, and I blew my nose. All these things were expelled. I dried my hands, then also my arms and my face, in order to go out clean. For thus it is fitting for a freeborn boy to learn. After this I asked for a stylus and my book; and I handed over these things to my slave boy. So having been prepared for everything, I went forth with a good omen, with my paedagogue following me.

<div align="right">(S 3a–8a)</div>

So begins a bilingual description of a child's day found in a sixteenth-century collection of glossaries. What is this work? Is it an original essay by a schoolboy, an easy reader for small children just learning their letters, a text for Latin speakers to learn Greek on, or a text for Greek speakers to learn Latin on? Is it a product of the first century AD, the early third century, late antquity, or the Renaissance? If ancient, does it come from the Western empire or from the East? Is it in its original form, or has it been damaged in transmission – for example, why does the child take such care over personal hygiene and then, on a cold day, go off to school apparently naked from the knees up?

This work is not unique, but rather one of a set of six such descriptions of daily life in the ancient world, with parallel text in Latin and Greek, that are cumbersomely known as the colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana. Some of the other colloquia are attested much earlier than the sixteenth century – the earliest colloquium fragment so far known comes from a papyrus of the fourth or fifth century – but for the most part they raise the same questions of purpose and origin. Despite these uncertainties, the colloquia have played a major role in forming our understanding of a wide variety of elements of daily life during the Roman empire, especially the lives and schooling of children, who feature prominently in the

colloquia. At the same time, much of their potential value to scholars has so far been lost, because so little is known about them and because the colloquia are very difficult to use: they have never been translated into a modern language, most do not even have adequate editions, and the essential information about them is often difficult to find.

The goal of the present work is to allow the potential value of the colloquia to be realized, by providing editions and translations to make them accessible and comprehensible to scholars in a wide range of disciplines, and by presenting those editions and translations in the context of information about the origins of the colloquia and explanation of their peculiarities. The gist of my conclusions about those origins will be that the colloquia are composite works made up of material composed mostly between the second and the fourth centuries AD, some of it from the Eastern empire (designed to help Greek speakers learn Latin), and some from the West (helping Latin speakers learn Greek).

The six colloquia are very different from each other but show signs of common ancestry. They are part of a much larger collection of bilingual teaching materials known as the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana (because in some manuscripts it is attached to the bilingual grammar of Dositheus). The Hermeneumata also occur in a variety of different versions; essentially each colloquium goes with a different Hermeneumata version, though there are some complications.

The Hermeneumata survived the Middle Ages exclusively in the West – there is no trace of them in the Byzantine world – and did so because of their usefulness to Latin speakers learning Greek. Numerous papyrus fragments, however, testify to the fact that much of the Hermeneumata material was used in antiquity by Greek speakers learning Latin, and many scholars believe that the colloquia at least were also used in antiquity by Latin speakers learning Greek. The texts therefore have a very complex tradition that needs to be understood before they can be properly edited or studied, and unfortunately that tradition has never been fully worked out. The last major attempt, that of Goetz (1923), came at a time when much of the relevant evidence had not yet been assembled nor, in the case of many papyri, even excavated. Now,

<div align="center">3</div>

armed both with additional primary evidence and with the results of ground-breaking analyses more recently conducted by a wide range of scholars,[1] we are at last in the position to piece together the history of the colloquia.

1.1 LANGUAGE LEARNING IN ANTIQUITY

The Roman empire was multilingual,[2] and learning of second languages was common, particularly in situations that produced extensive contact between speakers of different languages. The ancient language learning best known today is that which took place between native speakers of Greek and Latin, but large numbers of native speakers of other languages also learned both Greek and Latin. Sometimes such students learned one of the empire's main languages through the medium of the other, because better materials were available that way than in their own languages (as, until recently, a similar situation caused modern English speakers learning Akkadian or Hittite to do so through the medium of German). Our evidence rarely allows us to distinguish these non-native-speaker learners from the (presumably) larger group of learners who were native speakers of one of the empire's main languages and learned the other. In what follows, therefore, I shall use the terms 'Greek speakers' and 'Latin speakers' to refer not only to native speakers, but also to anyone who had acquired enough of either of those languages to be able to use it as the medium for learning the other.

1.1.1 GREEK LEARNING BY LATIN SPEAKERS

The best-known type of ancient language learning is that of Latin speakers who learned Greek.[3] The importance of Greek culture and literature was such that Roman literature was heavily dependent on it; indeed much early Latin literature consists of translations and adaptations from the Greek. It is clear that many Latin speakers were already learning Greek

before the Roman conquest of Greece in the middle of the second century BC, and the learning of Greek became even more widespread thereafter. In the late Republic and for most of the empire educated upper-class Romans began Greek at a very early age, often before starting school, and used the language frequently thereafter.[4] Greek was for the Romans the language of high culture, one of the most important marks of a truly cultivated and literate citizen (though knowledge of Greek could also be associated with decadence and lack of the historically Roman virtues), and was closely associated with appreciation of Greek literature.[5]

We know more about the educated elite than about other elements of Roman society, but the evidence we have suggests strongly that bilingualism was common at lower social levels as well, in part because throughout the historical period the lowest levels of Roman society included large numbers of native Greek speakers. At these levels too Latin speakers seem to have learned the Greek language as children (probably often without formal instruction) rather than later in life.[6]

1.1.2 LATIN LEARNING BY GREEK SPEAKERS

More likely to be overlooked today are the Greek speakers who learned Latin. The Greeks of the fifth century BC were conspicuously monolingual, but half a millennium and more later the Greek speakers of the Eastern Roman empire had a very different attitude. Most of those Greek speakers, of course, were not Greeks, in the sense that they neither lived in Greece nor were descended from people who had once lived in Greece. The adoption of the Greek language was perfectly compatible with the maintenance of a distinct cultural identity, as for example in the case of Jewish authors who wrote in Greek, and many of the groups that learned Greek when knowledge of Greek was advantageous were equally happy to learn Latin when knowledge of Latin became advantageous. Even among actual Greeks living in Greece, however, Latin

---

[1] E.g. Dionisotti, Ferri, Kramer, Rochette, Korhonen, Tagliaferro.
[2] On ancient multilingualism see e.g. Adams (2003a), Adams, Janse, and Swain (2002), Rochette (1996b, 1997a, 1998, 2007), Neumann and Untermann (1980), Müller, Sier, and Werner (1992).
[3] On this subject see e.g. Kaimio (1979a), Adams (2003a), Weis (1992), Dubuisson (1992); cf. Fögen (2000) on the Romans' view of Greek as inherently superior to Latin.

[4] See Quint. *Inst.* 1.1.12; Kaimio (1979a: 195–207, 317), Bonner (1977), Clarke (1971: 11–45), Rawson (2003: 146–209); cf. Rochette 2008: 82–5.
[5] Cicero, for example, was fluent in Latin and Greek and able to switch between them at will; when writing to people who were also fluent in both languages he used Greek particularly for its terminology of literary criticism (Adams 2003a: 323–9).
[6] Cf. Adams (2003a: esp. 14–15) and Kaimio (1979a: 317, 322–3).

appears to have made considerable headway once the Romans had been in control for several centuries; for example Plutarch (*c.* 50–*c.* 120 AD) refers to Latin as 'the language of the Romans, which now almost all men use'.[7] There is nothing surprising in such a shift in language-learning practices, as changes of this type are well paralleled in modern times: for example, half a century ago it was unusual for French speakers to learn a modern foreign language, and now the French learn English in large numbers.

In a work that deserves to be better known in the English-speaking world, Bruno Rochette (1997a, see also 1996b, 2008: 85–9) has studied the role of Latin in the Greek East. His exhaustive work examines evidence for official use of Latin, Latin teaching, and knowledge of Latin on the part of named individuals of Greek origin; the conclusion is that while knowledge of Latin in the East was less common than knowledge of Greek in Rome, it was nevertheless fairly widespread, particularly from the third century AD onwards. Other scholars have corroborated these results: for example in Egypt, much of the communication in the army, the courts (when dealing with certain types of case), and the highest levels of the civil administration took place in Latin.[8] Numerous scholars have documented the Latin loanwords that entered the Greek language via Greeks using Latin,[9] and other, more subtle, types of Latin influence on Greek have also been detected.[10] In the fourth century Libanius complained that people were no longer interested in studying at a traditional school of Greek rhetoric because everyone was learning Latin (*Oration* 43.4–5; cf. Rochette 1997a: 133–4).

There were, however, some significant differences between Greek learning and Latin learning: the ages of the students, the goals of the process, and the historical period at which it began. Latin never became part of the elementary school curriculum

for Greek speakers as Greek was for Latin speakers; Greek speakers who learned Latin did so as adults (Rochette 1997a: 210). The different ages of language learning were closely linked to the different goals for the process in the two halves of the empire: whereas Latin speakers learned Greek in order to gain access to Greek literature and culture, Greek speakers learned Latin because it was useful.[11] This utility was largely limited to certain areas, such as service in the Roman army, travelling to the West, and practising law, and therefore Greek speakers normally learned Latin only once they had embarked on a career choice that caused them to need it. Greek speakers had little interest in Latin literature, and the social cachet attached to knowledge of the other language was much higher in the West than in the East. In both halves of the empire it was knowledge of Greek and familiarity with Greek literature that particularly marked a well-educated citizen (at least until a very late period – there is some evidence that in the sixth century, just as Latin was disappearing altogether in the East, it developed social cachet there).

It also makes a difference that the tradition of language learning began much earlier among Latin speakers than among Greek speakers:[12] Greek teaching evolved in a different world from that which produced Latin teaching, one in which the scholarly tradition was more developed. In particular, the time lag means that bilingual language-learning materials developed by the Romans were available to be used by Greek speakers. It is likely that glossaries in particular were recycled between Latin and Greek speakers: the Romans must have had bilingual glossaries before Greek speakers felt a need for them,[13] and as those

---

[7] *Moralia* 1010d: ὁ Ῥωμαίων, ᾧ νῦν ὁμοῦ τι πάντες ἄνθρωποι χρῶνται (though this is a restoration of a corrupt text that actually has ὁρῶ μέλλω for ὁ Ῥωμαίων ᾧ); the context is a discussion of the paucity of prepositions in Latin as compared to Greek.

[8] Adams (2003a: 527–641), Kramer (2001a: 9–10), Kaimio (1979b); cf. Millar (2006: 84–93).

[9] See e.g. Cervenka-Ehrenstrasser (1996–), Daris (1991), Dickey (2003, 2012), Filos (2009), H. Hofmann (1989), Kahane and Kahane (1982), Kramer (1992, 2011), Meyer (1895), Viscidi (1944).

[10] See e.g. Cuvigny (2002), Dickey (2004, 2009), Dubuisson (1985), Famerie (1998), Freyburger-Galland (1997), García Domingo (1979), Hering (1935), Kramer (2011: esp. 55–80), Mason (1974), Ward (2007).

[11] Cf. Rochette (1996a: esp. 66, 1997a: 165–210) and Gaebel (1970: 290–6).

[12] The precise point at which Greek speakers began to learn Latin is debated; clearly the process began on a small scale no later than the first conquests of Greek-speaking areas by Romans, but equally clearly it grew as time went on, so that Latin learning was more common in the fourth century AD than in the first. Many scholars believe that the reforms of Diocletian (end of the third century AD) increased the use of Latin in the East (see Rochette 1997a: 116–26), but Adams (2003a: 635–7; cf. Rochette 2008: 87) finds little evidence that official policy had an actual impact on language use. For somewhat differing assessments of the role of Latin in the East in the fifth and sixth centuries see Averil Cameron (2009) and Millar (2006); cf. Zilliacus (1935); further bibliography in Averil Cameron (2009: 22 n. 40). For the numbers and names of Latin teachers known in different places at different periods see Kaster (1988: 463–78).

[13] We have no unambiguous examples of such glossaries, but that is inevitable: a bilingual glossary surviving via the manuscript

glossaries would have been useful to speakers of either language, it would have been uncharacteristic of the ancients to create new ones instead of using the available materials. In some cases we can actually trace the development of bilingual materials, as texts used by Latin speakers to learn Greek were adapted for Greek speakers learning Latin (cf. text 10 in figure 1.1; for details see Dickey 2010a).

Our evidence for language learning is also very different in the cases of Latin and Greek. Although the Romans' learning of Greek has left numerous traces in literature, we have very little in the way of actual primary documents: the tablets and rolls used by Roman schoolchildren are now lost, and we have little to go on when trying to reconstruct the actual process of instruction in Greek. By contrast the process of Latin learning by Greek speakers is exceedingly well documented in Egyptian papyri.[14] This disparity is of course an accident of survival – Egypt, which was a Greek-speaking province, happens to be the only place in the empire where large quantities of original ancient documents have been preserved – but this accident is a very handy one for our purposes, as it gives us considerable insight into a language-learning process that would otherwise be buried in obscurity.

1.1.2.1 *Surviving Latin-learning materials*

Figure 1.1 lists all the ancient Greek-medium Latin-learning materials known to me.[15] There is of course a certain difficulty in identifying language-learning materials: today, for example, a copy of a French newspaper might be language-learning material in an English classroom, but in the hands of a Frenchman the same newspaper would be something else entirely. Similarly a work of Latin literature found in Egypt could have been used by a Greek speaker as a vehicle for practising Latin, but it might also have been used

by a Latin speaker. The list in figure 1.1 includes texts produced before 600 AD that fall into at least one of the following categories: (1) texts that show evidence of a Greek speaker who was less than fully comfortable with Latin engaging with a work of Latin literature (e.g. a Latin papyrus with Greek translation, glosses, or commentary, or a Latin papyrus with accents and/or macrons, since the use of these reading aids on Latin texts was characteristic of Greek speakers[16]); (2) bilingual glossaries that were evidently designed for Greek speakers or whose audience cannot be securely determined,[17] but not bilingual glossaries evidently designed for Latin speakers; (3) Latin alphabets with annotations in Greek script, but not other Latin alphabets or elementary writing practices, since these might have been used by Latin-speaking children learning to write their own language; (4) Latin grammatical texts known to have been composed in Greek-speaking areas, containing Greek glosses, and/or evidently oriented towards Greek speakers.[18]

While all the materials listed seem to have been used by Greek speakers, they were not all used by *native* Greek speakers. Several papyri show signs of having been designed by and/or for speakers of Aramaic or Coptic who were learning Latin through the medium of Greek. Usually, however, we cannot tell whether the learners were native Greek speakers or not.

This is, of course, a large and diverse collection of material, but most of what it contains belongs to three

---

[16] Cf. Rochette (1997b), Gaebel (1970: 311–16).

[17] This latter group is included on the grounds that since Greek speakers were far more numerous than Latin speakers in Egypt, a glossary equally useful for both groups is far more likely to have been used by Greek speakers than by Latin speakers.

[18] The following have therefore been excluded: Latin papyri containing no indications that they were used by Greeks, Greek literary texts with Latin translations, glosses, etc. (unless there is some evidence that they were used for Latin-learning purposes), bilingual texts other than glossaries where the intended readership is unclear, and transliterated or bilingual documentary texts. Note in particular the following papyri, which have been excluded but fall on the borderline: *M–P³* 3003 (glossary of travel terminology with the Greek transliterated), *M–P³* 1251.02 (Isocrates with Latin translation), *M–P³* 2117 (model letters in Latin and Greek), *M–P³* 3004.01 (bilingual text of uncertain nature). For Latin papyri in general see e.g. Cavenaile (1958, texts of Latin papyri), Parker (1992: 52–65, lists of bilingual papyri and manuscripts), Kramer (1996a, list of bilingual papyri, reprints of selected texts, and discussion), Rochette (1996a, list of bilingual literary papyri with discussion), and J. D. Thomas (2007, list of Latin papyri from Oxyrhynchus). On methods of determining which papyri were used by Greek speakers and which by Latin speakers see Bataille (1967: 165–7), Kramer (1984), Rochette (1996a: 76), cf. Gaebel (1970: 285–6).

---

tradition could never be shown conclusively to come from the West rather than the East, and literary, scholarly, and educational materials do not survive as original ancient documents in the West. Sometimes, however, traces of the Romans' glossaries can be detected in materials adapted for use by Greeks: see Dickey (2010a).

[14] Strictly speaking, some of the ancient materials have been found not on papyrus, but on parchment, wood, or ostraca. For convenience I use the cover term 'papyri' for all the original ancient fragments except those on stone, regardless of the actual substance on which the letters are written.

[15] Further discussion of these materials and how they were used, with examples of each type, can be found in Hamdy Ibrahim (1992) and Dickey (2013).

1.1 LANGUAGE LEARNING IN ANTIQUITY

	Text	Date[*]	Reference[†]
1	Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana	various	Goetz 1892 + Dionisotti 1982; this volume
2	Greek–Latin glossary with grammatical information, principle of ordering uncertain (Latin is transliterated)	I BC	*BKT* IX.150 = Kramer 1983: no. 1 (*M–P³* 2134.5, *LDAB* 6764)
3	Latin alphabet with Latin letter names in Greek script	I–II AD	O.Max. inv. 356 = Fournet 2003: 445 (*M–P³* 3012.01, *LDAB* 10791)
4	Greek–Latin classified glossary, sections on vegetables and fish (Latin is transliterated)	I–II	*P.Oxy.* XXXIII.2660 = Kramer 1983: no. 6 (*M–P³* 2134.1, *LDAB* 4497)
5	Latin–Greek classified glossary, sections on zodiac signs and winds (Latin is transliterated)	I–II	*P.Oxy.* XLVI.3315 = Kramer 1983: no. 8 (*M–P³* 3004.2, *LDAB* 4498)
6	Latin–Greek classified glossary, section on words for animals (Latin is transliterated)	II	*P.Lund* I.5 = Kramer 1983: no. 9 (*M–P³* 3004, *LDAB* 4741)
7	Greek–Latin glossary in alphabetical order (Latin is transliterated)	II	*P.Oxy.* XLIX.3452 = Kramer 2001a: no. 7 (*M–P³* 2134.7, *LDAB* 4812)
8	Latin–Greek glossary (type unknown)	II	unpublished; on back of *P.Oxy.* XXXII.2624 fr. 28–56 (*M–P³* 3004.1, *LDAB* 4876)
9	Greek–Latin classified glossary, section on names of gods and goddesses (Latin is transliterated)	II–III	P.Mich. inv. 2458 = Kramer 1983: no. 12 (*M–P³* 2685.1, *LDAB* 5062)
10	Latin–Greek glossary of Latin words with multiple Greek translations, with grammatical notes, in alphabetical order	III	P.Sorb. inv. (= P.Reinach) 2069 = Kramer 1983: no. 2 = Dickey and Ferri 2010 (*M–P³* 3006, *LDAB* 5438)
11	Latin–Greek glossary in alphabetical order	III	*P.Sorb.* I.8 = Kramer 1983: no. 3 (*M–P³* 3008, *LDAB* 5439)
12	Greek–Latin classified glossary, sections on vegetables and fish (Latin is transliterated)	III	*P.Oxy.* XXXIII.2660a = Kramer 1983: no. 7 (*M–P³* 2134.2, *LDAB* 5382)
13	Greek–Latin classified glossary, section on fish names (Latin is transliterated)	III	*P.Laur.* IV.147 = *SB* XIV.12137 = Kramer 1983: no. 5 (*M–P³* 2134.3, *LDAB* 4675)
14	Aesop, fable 349 with Latin translation	III	*P.Yale* II.104 + *P.Mich.* VII.457 (*M–P³* 2917, *LDAB* 134)
15	Latin–Greek classified glossary, section on tavern terminology	III–IV	P.Vindob. inv. L 27 = Kramer 2001a: no. 4 (*M–P³* 3004.21, *LDAB* 5755)
16	Greek–Latin classified glossary, sections on merchandise and on military terminology (Latin is transliterated)	III–IV	P.Strasb. inv. G 1173 = Kramer 2001a: no. 6 (*M–P³* 2134.61, *LDAB* 9218)
17	Babrius, fables 16–17 with Latin translation done by Greek speakers	III–IV	*P.Amh.* II.26 = Kramer 2007a: no. 10 (*M–P³* 172, *LDAB* 434)
18	Greek–Latin table of verb conjugations in alphabetical order (Latin is transliterated)	III–IV	P.Strasb. inv. G 1175 = Kramer 2001a: no. 3 (*M–P³* 2134.71, *LDAB* 9217)

[*] Dates are given in centuries AD unless otherwise noted.
[†] *M-P³* refers to the third edition of the Mertens–Pack list of literary papyri, available online at http://www2.ulg.ac.be/facphl/services/cedopal/pages/mp3anglais.htm; *LDAB* refers to the Leuven Database of Ancient Books, available online at http:// www.trismegistos.org/ldab/index.php. Further bibliography can be found on both sites; in this column I have given only one or two names, numbers, or editions that are likely to be most useful in identifying the text concerned.

Figure 1.1 Surviving Greek-medium Latin-learning materials

7

	Text	Date	Reference
19	Latin–Greek classified glossary, section on human characteristics	IV	Kramer 1983: no. 10 (*M–P³* 3007, *LDAB* 5631)
20	Latin–Greek classified glossary, section on month names (Latin is transliterated)	IV	*P.Fay.* 135v descr. = Kramer 1983: no. 11 (*M–P³* 2013.1, *LDAB* 7680)
21	Latin–Greek glossary, ordering principle uncertain (Latin is transliterated)	IV	*P.Lond.* II.481 = Kramer 1983: no. 13 (*M–P³* 3005, *LDAB* 5678)
22	Latin–Greek conversation manual	IV	P.Berol. inv. 21860 = Kramer 2001a: no. 9 (*M–P³* 3004.02, *LDAB* 8897)
23	Aesop, fable 264, with Latin translation (Latin is on the left)	IV	*PSI* VII.848 = Kramer 2001a: no. 10 (*M–P³* 52, *LDAB* 138)
24	Virgil, parts of *Aeneid* 1 with Greek translation	IV	*P.Ryl.* III.478 + *P.Mil.* 1.1 + P.Cairo inv. 85644 A–B (*M–P³* 2940, *LDAB* 4146)
25	Virgil, parts of *Aeneid* 1 and 2 with Greek translation	IV	*P.Congr.XV* 3 = *BKT* IX.39 (*M–P³* 2939.1, *LDAB* 4149)
26	Terence, parts of *Andria* with Greek glosses	IV	*P.Oxy.* XXIV.2401, cf. McNamee 2007: 490–1 (*M–P⁸* 2934, *LDAB* 3982)
27	Seneca, *Medea* 663–704 with Greek marginalia	IV	Markus and Schwendner 1997 (*M–P³* 2933.01, *LDAB* 3907)
28	Charisius, Latin grammar (in Latin)	IV	Keil 1857–80: 1.1–296 = Barwick 1964
29	Dositheus, Latin grammar (in Latin with partial Greek translation)	IV	Keil 1857–80: VII.363–436 = Bonnet 2005
30	Bilingual commentary on Roman law	IV	unpublished (*M–P³* 2982.1, *LDAB* 9080)
31	Latin alphabets with Latin letter names in Greek script	IV–V	*P.Ant.* 1 fr. 1 = Kramer 2001a: no. 1 (*M–P³* 3012, *LDAB* 5832)
32	Latin–Greek conversation manual (fragment of *Colloquium Harleianum*)	IV–V	*P.Prag.* II.118 = Kramer 2001a: no. 8 = Dickey and Ferri 2012 (*M–P³* 3004.22, *LDAB* 6007)
33	Cicero, portions of *In Catilinam* 1 with Greek translation	IV–V	*P.Rain.Cent.* 163 = Cavenaile 1958: no. 21 (*M–P³* 2922, *LDAB* 554)
34	Virgil, portions of *Aeneid* 1 with Greek translation	IV–V	Ambrosian Palimpsest = Kramer 1996b = Scappaticcio 2009 (*M–P³* 2943, *LDAB* 4156)
35	Virgil, *Aeneid* 3.444–68 with Greek translation	IV–V	*P.Fouad* 5 = Cavenaile 1958: no. 6 (*M–P³* 2948, *LDAB* 4154)
36	Virgil, selected vocabulary from *Aeneid* 2.443–537 with Greek translation	IV–V	*PSI* VII.756 = Cavenaile 1958: no. 4 (*M–P³* 2946, *LDAB* 4155)
37	Terence, parts of *Andria* with Greek glosses	IV–V	P.Vindob. inv. L 103 = Danese 1989, cf. McNamee 2007: 490 (*M–P³* 2933.1, *LDAB* 3983)
38	Sallust, parts of *Bellum Catilinae* with Greek glosses	IV–V	*PSI* I.110 = Funari 2008, cf. McNamee 2007: 490 (*M–P³* 2932, *LDAB* 3877)
39	Diomedes, *Ars grammatica* (in Latin)	IV–V	Keil 1857–80: 1.297–529
40	Legal definitions and maxims, Greek and Latin	IV–V	*PSI* XIII.1348 (*M–P³* 2982, *LDAB* 5796)
41	Ulpian, *Ad Edictum* 32 with Greek scholia	IV–V	*PSI* XIV.1449, cf. McNamee 2007: 503 (*M–P³* 2960, *LDAB* 4131)

Figure 1.1 (*cont.*)

1.1 LANGUAGE LEARNING IN ANTIQUITY

	Text	*Date*	*Reference*
42	Gaius, parts of *Institutiones* 3 and 4 with Greek glosses	IV–VI	*PSI* XI.1182 = Cavenaile 1958: no. 78, cf. McNamee 2007: 493–6 (*M–P³* 2953, *LDAB* 1068)
43	Greek–Latin classified glossary, section on human characteristics	V	P.Vindob. inv. L 150 = Kramer 2001a: no. 5 (*M–P³* 2134.6, *LDAB* 6053)
44	Cicero, *In Catilinam* 2.14–15 and 3.15–16 with Greek translation	V	*P.Ryl.* I.61 + *P.Vindob.* L 127 (*M–P³* 2923, *LDAB* 559)
45	Cicero, *In Catilinam* 1.5 with Greek translation	V	*PSI Congr.XXI* 2 (*M–P³* 2921.01, *LDAB* 556)
46	Cicero, *Div. Caec.* 33–7 and 44–6 with Greek scholia	V	*P.Ryl.* III.477 = Cavenaile 1958: no. 23, cf. McNamee 2007: 473–8 (*M–P³* 2919, *LDAB* 558)
47	Virgil, *Georgics* 1.229–237 with Greek translation	V	Husselman 1957 (*M–P³* 2936, *LDAB* 4159)
48	Virgil, *Aeneid* 1.615–28 with Greek translation	V	*P.Oxy.* L.3553 = Fressura 2009a (*M–P³* 2943.1, *LDAB* 4160)
49	Virgil, *Aeneid* 5.671–4, 683–4 with Greek translation	V	P.Vindob. inv. L 24 = Kramer 1990 (*M–P³* 2951, *LDAB* 4161)
50	Virgil, selected vocabulary from *Aeneid* 4.661–5.6 with Greek translation	V	*P.Oxy.* VIII.1099 = Fressura 2009a (*M–P³* 2950, *LDAB* 4162)
51	Virgil, *Aeneid* 4.66–8 and 99–102 with accents and macrons	V	*PSI* I.21 = Cavenaile 1958: no. 11 (*M–P³* 2949, *LDAB* 4158)
52	*Anonymus Bobiensis* Latin grammar (in Latin)	V	Keil 1857–80: I.531–65 = De Nonno 1982; cf. Dionisotti 1984: 203–5
53	Cledonius, treatise on Donatus (in Latin)	V	Keil 1857–80: v.1–79
54	Legal text with Greek scholia	V	*P.Ant.* III.153, cf. McNamee 2007: 508–11 (*M–P³* 2979.2, *LDAB* 6326)
55	Latin alphabets with Greek equivalents and line of Virgil	V–VI	*P.Oxy.* X.1315 descr. = Kramer 2001a: no. 2 (*M–P³* 3013, *LDAB* 4163)
56	Latin transcription of Greek alphabet	V–VI	Feissel 2008, cf. Clarysse and Rochette 2005 (*M–P³* 2704.06, *LDAB* 9949)
57	Juvenal, *Satires* 7.149–98 with Greek scholia	V–VI	Roberts 1935, cf. McNamee 2007: 479–90 (*M–P³* 2925, *LDAB* 2559)
58	*Fragmentum Bobiense de nomine et pronomine* (in Latin)	V–VI?	Keil 1857–80: v.555–66 = Passalacqua 1984: 3–19; cf. Dionisotti 1984: 207–8
59	*De verbo* (treatise on Latin verb, in Latin)	V–VI	Keil 1857–80: v.634–54 = Passalacqua 1984: 21–60; cf. Dionisotti 1984: 206–7
60	Table of Latin noun declensions with Greek glosses and page numbers	V–VI	Wessely 1886: 218–21 (*M–P³* 2997, *LDAB* 6148)
61	Greek commentary on legal texts	V–VI	Fragmenta Sinaitica = Dareste 1880 (*M–P³* 2958, *LDAB* 3526)
62	Latin and Greek legal work with Greek marginalia	V–VI	*P.Ant.* iii.152 = Amelotti and Migliardi Zingale 1985: no. 4, cf. McNamee 2007: 507–8 (*M–P³* 2979.1, *LDAB* 6136)
63	Legal fragments with Greek commentary	V–VI	P.Vindob. inv. L 101 + 102 + 107, unpublished (*M–P³* 2993.5, *LDAB* 6193)

Figure 1.1 (*cont.*)

9

	Text	Date	Reference
64	Large Latin–Greek and Greek–Latin dictionary, largely in alphabetical order	VI	Fragmenta Helmstadiensia + Folium Wallraffianum = Kramer 1983: no. 4 (*M–P*^{3} 2134.4, *LDAB* 6279)
65	Latin–Greek–Coptic conversation manual (Latin is transliterated)	VI	P.Berol. inv. 10582 = Kramer 1983: no. 15 = Kramer 2010 (*M–P*^{3} 3009, *LDAB* 6075)
66	Virgil, portions of *Aeneid* 1 and 2 and selected words from part of 4, with Greek translation	VI	*P.Ness.* II.1 (also called *P.Colt* 1) = Cavenaile 1958: no. 8 (*M–P*^{3} 2939, *LDAB* 4166)
67	Virgil, portions of *Aeneid* 2 with Greek translation	VI	P.Vindob. inv. L 62 = Fressura 2009b (*M–P*^{3} 2944.1, *LDAB* 6194)
68	Virgil, portions of *Aeneid* 2–6 with macrons	VI	*P.Ness.* II.2 = Cavenaile 1958: no. 16 (*M–P*^{3} 2945, *LDAB* 4164)
69	Bilingual grammatical exercises	VI	P.Louvre inv. E 7401, unpublished (*M–P*^{3} 2997.1, *LDAB* 10635)
70	Priscian's Latin grammar (in Latin)	VI	Keil 1857–80: vols II and III
71	Eutyches, treatise on the verb	VI	Keil 1857–80: v.447–89
72	Justinian, Greek index to portions of *Digesta*	VI	*PSI* I.55 (*M–P*^{3} 2965, *LDAB* 2553)
73	Justinian, portions of *Digesta* with Greek glosses	VI	P.Sorb. inv. 2173 = de Ricci 1912 (*M–P*^{3} 2966.1)
74	Justinian's code, portions with Greek glosses	VI	*PSI* XIII.1347 = Amelotti and Migliardi Zingale 1985: no. 3, cf. McNamee 2007: 499 (*M–P*^{3} 2970, *LDAB* 6272)
75	Justinian's code, portions with Greek glosses	VI	P.Sorb. inv. (= P.Reinach) 2219 + 2173 = Amelotti and Migliardi Zingale 1985: no. 2 (*M–P*^{3} 2971, *LDAB* 2555)
76	Latin index to Justinian's code with Greek numbers and some other Greek material	VI	*P.Oxy.* XV.1814 = Amelotti and Migliardi Zingale 1985: no. 1 (*M–P*^{3} 2969, *LDAB* 6324)
77	Justinian, Greek scholia to portions of *Digesta*	VI–VII	P.Heid. inv. L 4 = Cavenaile 1958: no. 87, cf. McNamee 2007: 497–9 (*M–P*^{3} 2966, *LDAB* 2557)
78	Ps–Philoxenus, large Latin–Greek dictionary	various	Goetz and Gundermann 1888: 1–212
79	Ps–Cyrillus, large Greek–Latin dictionary	various	Goetz and Gundermann 1888: 213–483
80	Idiomata (bilingual lists of words with grammatical information)	various	Goetz and Gundermann 1888: 485–597

Figure 1.1 (*cont.*)

categories: glossaries, grammatical materials, and texts. Cutting across those categories is a group of thirteen transliterated papyri with the Latin in Greek script (2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 16, 18, 20, 21, 65). It is notable that Latin-learning materials from the earlier centuries of the empire are almost all transliterated, and that transliteration then became much less common, ceasing to be the rule in the third century and almost ceasing to appear at all after the fourth century. This shift is no doubt linked to the fact that literary texts do not appear among the language-learning materials until the fourth century AD: the focus of Latin learning in Egypt evidently changed from oral proficiency to literacy.[19]

There are also four alphabets (3, 31, 55, 56). The method of learning the Latin alphabet seems to have been copying out the letters, in order (in both capitals and cursive scripts, just as modern English-speaking children learn capital and lower-case letters together),

[19] On the transliterated texts see Brashear (1981), Kramer (1984), and their editions cited in figure 1.1.

while reciting either the Latin letter names or the Greek equivalents of the Latin letters; sometimes a line of Latin verse was also copied to illustrate the use of the letters in combination. Learners' alphabets therefore tend to have either the Latin letter names or the Greek equivalents of the Latin letters written over the letters of the Latin alphabet;[20] the letter names, if present, are written in the Greek alphabet, since the learner needed them at a stage when he or she had not yet mastered the Latin one.[21] Often the remains of these alphabets do not allow us to know whether what we have is the model written by the teacher or the copy written by the student; mistakes (both in the Latin alphabets themselves and in the Greek equivalents) are frequent, a fact that might suggest the work of learners, but since we have very little evidence about the standard of language instruction in antiquity it is not impossible that ancient teachers made mistakes even in elementary material. None of the alphabets, even those manifestly the work of students, are in 'school hands'; that is, they were clearly written by people who knew how to hold a pen and were familiar with the physical process of writing (Cribiore 1996: 30). Evidently Egyptian Greek speakers did not learn Latin at a very early age (cf. 1.1.2 above).

1.1.2.2 Glossaries

Glossaries are common among the Latin-learning materials;[22] in addition to the numerous glossaries in the Hermeneumata (1 in figure 1.1) and the very large lexica known as Ps.-Philoxenus and Ps.-Cyrillus (78, 79),[23] which were preserved via the medieval manuscript tradition, eighteen glossaries survive

in ancient copies (2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 43, 64); in the earlier period the glossaries represent the vast majority of the Latin-learning materials, but they become (proportionately) rarer from the fourth century. Most of the ancient glossaries are classified word lists (the type of works known to medievalists as 'class glossaries' and to Hermeneumata scholars as 'capitula'), giving the most important vocabulary (usually, but not exclusively, nouns) on a particular topic or topics.[24] The topics chosen for such glossaries tell us something about the sort of Latin words an Egyptian Greek speaker was likely to want. Foodstuffs, in their unprepared state, figure prominently: these words would be useful both for Greek speakers travelling abroad and, perhaps more relevantly, for Greek speakers wanting to communicate with visiting Latin speakers, such as army personnel. The Roman army was a major purchaser of food and drink in areas around its bases and outposts, so local producers would no doubt have been eager to communicate with the soldiers. Not surprisingly, Roman army vocabulary is also represented in the classified glossaries. Words useful for dealing with the ancient equivalents of hotels, restaurants, and pubs also occur; these were presumably of use primarily to travellers. Religious vocabulary also makes several appearances; as religious ceremonies were public and sometimes obligatory affairs in the Roman empire, this information too would have been of practical value.

Words in these classified glossaries were not arranged in alphabetical order; often related concepts were put next to one another (thus for example in a list of goddesses Proserpina follows Ceres and Latona follows Diana), and more important concepts frequently appear before less important ones, but sometimes the order seems to be largely random; as each section in such glossaries tended to be small, organization within the classifications was not really necessary. Unclassified glossaries also existed, however, and these tended to be arranged in alphabetical order (which, for the ancients, often meant simply grouping together words that began with the same first letter; in longer texts the first two or three letters might be used, but full alphabetization in the modern sense, where

---

[20] In accordance with the policy outlined above, Latin alphabets containing neither of these features have been excluded from the corpus on the grounds that we cannot be sure they were used by Greek speakers: they might have been used by Latin-speaking children learning to read their own language.

[21] The letter names used in these alphabets are not always the ones we would expect and can be very interesting in themselves; see Kramer (1999: 35–7, 2001a: 34–5).

[22] On the glossaries see Kramer (1996a, 1983: 7–18, 2001a: 1–31, 2004b), Rochette (1997a: 181–8), Bataille (1967), Brashear (1981), Radiciotti (1998: 110–20), Wouters (1988: 101–6), and the editions cited in figure 1.1. Kramer divides the surviving glossaries (including some not listed in figure 1.1 above) into two groups, scholarly and popular (those designed for travellers or other adults needing Latin for everyday life); cf. Goetz (1923: 13).

[23] Ps.-Philoxenus and Ps.-Cyrillus do not seem to be related to the Hermeneumata glossaries; cf. Kramer (2001a: 18). For the idiomata see below, 1.1.2.3.

[24] When only a small fragment of the text survives, containing only one section, it is impossible to know whether other sections also existed; many classified glossaries are usually presented as single-section works, but we do not know whether such single-section works actually existed.