

PART II
FROM II AD TO II–III AD

I. LITERARY TEXTS

I.1. LITERATURE AND PARALITERARY TEXTS

II.1–6

LITERARY TEXTS, EXCERPTS, AND REMINISCENCES

P.Tebt. II 686: Berkeley (CA), University of California, Bancroft Library [inv. 3010 + 1422]

Fr. (papyrus roll): *a* (*a*: 33.5×34.2 cm + *a*₁: 10.7×8.2 cm) + *b* (17×29.5 cm)

late II – early III AD

Tebtynis

Source: University of California Excavations (led by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt in Winter 1899–1900: House T676)

Literature: B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and E. J. Goodspeed in *P.Tebt.* II 686 (1907: *descr.*); R. Marichal in *ChLA* V 304 (1975). MP³ 3015.2 + 2998 + 3015.1 + 3015 + 2938; LDAB 4145; TM 97904

To describe the content of this papyrus as a ‘literary anthology’ would be wrong, but its importance consists in the fact that it transmits a number of literary texts by using them for its own purposes. This might instead be more accurately described as a ‘script anthology’, or simply as a calligraphic notebook belonging to someone who was practising Latin script and chose a variety of texts for this purpose (see Scappaticcio 2017a: 385–91). In some cases, the exercise has preserved known hexameters, e.g. Verg. *georg.* 4.1–2 (II.6). But other texts are unknown and extremely interesting, such as a fragment of a dialogue on virtues with a strong Ciceronian ‘essence’ and Ciceronian characters (II.2), and a pair of prose passages (II.1 and II.3). There are also sequences of apparent nonsense which might either come from now-lost literature or have been excerpted from surviving texts (II.4 and II.5). These texts must have circulated in (Roman?) milieux in Tebtynis, from which copyists got material for practising writing.

The papyrus consists of two large, non-joining fragments from a roll. The literary material it contains is written on both sides of a fragment that also preserves several accounts (II.90–1). All the texts except one of the accounts are written along the fibres. It is impossible to establish the sequence in which these texts were copied with any certainty, but the larger account (II.90) was probably the first text on the papyrus. The calligrapher responsible for the literary material seems to have started with a reused roll; he may have begun copying on the blank back of that roll (turning it 90 degrees to write along the fibres) and then moved on to its front, where some of

the literature overlaps with an account. On fr. *a* →, the column is complete on the left and probably also at the top, as the broad upper blank space suggests; this space preserves remains of some writing and the ‘T-number’ added by Grenfell and Hunt (O’Connell 2007: 815–19). The black ink is faint on the bottom right, the middle, and the bottom left. Fr. *a*₁ is broken on all sides.

The scripts in which the literary lines are written can be dated between the end of the second and the beginning of the third century AD. They are all cursive and can be included under the common designation ‘old Roman cursive’ (Radiciotti 2010: 91), regardless of the speed with which the writing was produced. Ornamental serifs are visible in some letters, and in repeated sequences the first letter of each line is significantly taller than the others. An exhaustive palaeographic analysis has been carried out by R. Marichal (*ChLA* V: 53), whose division of the hands continues to be accepted today (see Ammirati 2015a: 36–7). Two kinds of calligraphic exercise can be recognised. In one, a long passage is copied once (II.1, II.2, and II.3), while in the other, the same sequence is copied several times (II.4, II.5, and II.6); it is possible that the former exercise preceded the latter. Almost all the texts were written by the same hand, although it produced slightly different kinds of script, while the intervention of a second hand – definitely less skilled than the first – can be recognised in II.3. A third hand seems to have written a few lines from a prose text (II.1).

These editions are based on examination of the original papyrus.

M. C. Scappaticcio

II.1

LITERARY TEXT

Literature: B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and E. J. Goodspeed in *P.Tebt.* II 686 (1907: *descr.*); R. Marichal in *ChLA* V 304 (1975). MP³ 3015.2; LDAB 4145; TM 97904

The uncertain nature of this line is due not only to its scantiness, but also to the difficulty of reading the script. If the text is from a literary context, as seems to be the case, it is otherwise unknown. The name Arnus may be present, which would imply a reference either to the Etruscan river (see e.g. Sulp. 4.8.3; Liv. 22.2.1; Plin. *nat.* 3.50; Tac. *ann.* 1.79) or to the legendary king of the Italian

peninsula known from Sil. 5.7. The mention of Arnus is not enough to ascribe the text to a specific literary genre, but it makes it impossible that the line is from a document, unless one imagines that it concerns Etruria, which seems improbable for a roll from Tebtynis. The sequence *maes* may include *es*, ‘you are’, which would suggest direct address.

fr. a →
.mm . . .maes illi Arnus qu .[- - -]
- - -

II.2

LITERARY DIALOGUE ON VIRTUES
(UNKNOWN FRAGMENT OF CICERO’S *DE RE PUBLICA*?)

Literature: B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and E. J. Goodspeed in *P.Tebt.* II 686 (1907: *descr.*: partial transcription of ll. 5–8, 10, 14); R. Marichal in *ChLA* V 304 (1975); Scappaticcio (2016c). *CPL* 60; *CLA* XI 1647; MP³ 2998; LDAB 4145; TM 97904

These lines of literary prose mention both the historical figures Laelius and Spurius and the mythological figures Hercules, Eurystheus, Amphion, and Zethus. This mixture is unique in what we know of Latin literature (Scappaticcio 2016c). The text is not simply a description of Hercules’ labours, although the mention of Eurystheus has encouraged that hypothesis (*CLA* XI 1647; *ChLA* V 304), and the coexistence of historical and mythical characters can be explained by considering the symbolic and exemplary value certain myths had in literature and philosophical thought. The twin brothers Amphion and Zethus, sons of Antiope, symbolised the opposition between the contemplative and the active life (e.g. Cic. *inv.* 1.94; *orat.* 2.155; *rep.* 1.30; *rhet. Her.* 2.27.43), while Hercules, representing the victory of virtue over pleasure, was regarded by Stoics as an allegory of the wise man (e.g. Cic. *ac.* 2.108;

fin. 2.118–19, 3.66; *off.* 3.40; *Tusc.* 2.20–2); the common feature of these two myths is that they represent the value of *virtus*. The presence of Laelius, a Ciceronian character, can then be explained by imagining a discussion of *virtus* focussing on mythical examples; it is impossible to say whether the Spurius mentioned here is the Ciceronian Spurius Mummius who takes part in the dialogue *De re publica*, or whether the common presence of Laelius, Spurius, and two mythical examples associated with virtue encourages the unverifiable hypothesis that this is an otherwise unknown portion of Cicero’s *De re publica*.

There are no signs or blank spaces between lines or word sequences to indicate that the scribe put together phrases from different texts; it is therefore unlikely that this passage is from an anthology. The calligraphic old Roman cursive script can be dated

II.1: fortasse -ma es, illi Arnus qu- potius quam -mae Silli Arnus qu-: maes illi amns qu . [Marichal

between the second and the third century AD. Analogies with *P.Lond.* II 229 (II.74) are evident and show that no functional distinction existed between library and documentary scripts in this period (Ammirati 2015a: 36–7). Diacritical marks are employed sporadically. Macrons and apices were written by the origi-

nal scribe, who also made additions and deletions *in scribendo*.
In the deleted *[[prai]]* (*fr. a₁* → l. 1), *ai* stands for *ae*. In *fr. a* → l. 14 *end[* can be supplemented as the archaic form *endo* (attested in Varro *rust.* 3.17, but also in Cic. *leg.* 2.13; *rep. fr.* 6).

fr. a →
|¹ [- - -]st qua[- - -]am[- - -] |² neminem in . . . rae u nīm nūm . [.
] . . . mer[- - -] |³-nerti d seꝛo per urbem [.
 .] consulem [- - -] |⁴-do C. Laelius hanc sententiam dixit et Spurium a[.]
nostrae [- - -] |⁵ consulere non oporteret idem nos . . . cr dpo
 . quocum- |⁶-que modo res bene gesta s[i]t nostris sen [.] Hercu-
 |⁷-les passus est actus per terras perqu[e] ma[ria] |⁸ h[.]s iniustis Eurysthei
qu [.]u [.]m . m[- - -] |⁹ ere ut suum sanguin[em] ipse Her[cul-]
 |¹⁰ o imperio profugus in ult[.] c'ā enis regiones facile l[- - -] |¹¹ . . . [sterē
 . s .] pro potenti patre . . . er . . . u . . . Amphion et Zethus n[- - -] |¹² - - - m]isericordia
pastoris sustinu as solitudine . . . sp . qui . . [- - -] |¹³ exceperant spiritum
aꝛedim[.] sederat in[[t]] rostris et n[o]li gn[- - -] |¹⁴ - - - a]urea coronatus
est end[- - -] |¹⁵ - - -]um sparget in[- - -] |¹⁶ - - -] [- - -]
- - -

fr. a₁ →
- - -
|¹ [- - -]parandum [[prai]] dilig[e]n[- - -] |² - - -]ssetque frater patriae con[- - -]
- - -

fr. a →: 3 horizontal stroke after -nerti 4 -do- | c(aius) 6 rē or rē(s) 7 -lēš 10 -ō imperiō | upper addition by the scribe
11 deletion by the scribe | amphiōn 12 m]isericordiā 13 deletion by the scribe |]lī
fr. a₁ →: 1 deletion by the scribe 2 -ssetq(ue) | patriāē

fr. a →: 1 . . . p Marichal 2 nemine [. . .] . . tu . . . [. . .] et m . . . [±14] [Marichal 3 nert
urbē . . . [.] Marichal 4 dorc[i]lae l m p . c spu nostrae Marichal 5 oporteat
Grenfell, Hunt, et Goodspeed Marichal | non . . . Grenfell, Hunt, et Goodspeed | post nos vestigia tantum et quocum- Marichal 6 res vel
re: res Grenfell, Hunt, et Goodspeed: rēs Marichal | sīt Grenfell, Hunt, et Goodspeed Marichal | sen[Grenfell, Hunt, et Goodspeed: sen . .
 Marichal 7 per . . . [Grenfell, Hunt, et Goodspeed: per . . . m [Marichal 8 tantum]s iniustis Eurysthei
qu[Grenfell, Hunt, et Goodspeed | fortasse H[ercule]s: . . [.] Marichal | Euristhei qui[Marichal 9 d ere Marichal | pie
Marichal 10 tantum imperiō profugus Grenfell, Hunt, et Goodspeed | inult- vel in ult-: in u qēnis Marichal: fortasse in ultimas
legendum; dubitanter an qēa'enis pro oce'a'nis | facile Marichal 11 . . . et res . . p . . pente Marichal | . . mp . rīcae et . . th . ns . a
 . [Marichal 12 . . en cordia Marichal | sustin [.] is solitudine . . . se . . u . . [Marichal 13 . . erant spiritū . . x . . d . . ed erat in
 . roš . . sīt[. .]n legi[Marichal | fortasse a te dim-, dubitanter an dimissum supplendum | sederat vel consederat vel sed erat 14 tantum
corona a]urea coronatus est Grenfell, Hunt, et Goodspeed | fortasse in sella a]urea potius quam corona a]urea cum Marichal | fortasse
end[o: est ter . . [Marichal 15] m sparget . . [Marichal
fr. a₁ →: 1 dilig[e]n[ter] vel potius dilig[e]r[e]: praedilig . [Marichal 2]set q- frater patriae fecon[Marichal

fr. a →: ... nobody ... late (?) through the city ... the consul ... Gaius Laelius expressed this opinion and Spurius ... our ... should not consult ... the same ... we ... once the situation has been managed in one way or another ... our ... Hercules suffered, driven over lands and seas ... unjust ... Eurystheus ... his blood ... Hercules himself ... power ... fugitive in ... the regions easily ... on behalf of the powerful father ... Amphion and Zethus ... the shepherd's pity ... solitude ... had welcomed the courage (you lost?) ... had seated on the rostrum, and (you) do not ... golden ... was crowned ... sprinkles ...
...
fr. a₁ →: to be prepared (?) ... brother ... of the fatherland ...

II.3
LITERARY TEXT

Literature: B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and E. J. Goodspeed in *P.Tebt.* II 686 (1907: *descr.*: l. 2 only); R. Marichal in *ChLA* V 304 (1975). *CPL* 60; *CLA* XI 1647; *MP*³ 3015.1; *LDAB* 4145; *TM* 97904

It has long been supposed that the text transmitted and, in a sense, hidden within this calligraphic exercise could have been quite solemn (*ChLA* V: 53), as the mention of *munera* ('obligations' at l. 3) and the overall context suggest. The words are probably from a literary context, but the text is otherwise unknown. The first-person plural (ll. 1–2: *contulimus*; l. 2: *nobis*) implies that the quotation may come from a speech or dialogue. A reference to the need to grant the 'indulgence of resting' (l. 2) is clearly legible, although the periphrasis *venia requiescendi* is otherwise unattested.

fr. b →
— — —
|¹ [±13] p enta contu-|²-limus vel ipsa nobis
iam ut deberet veniam requiescendi dare, |³ nec b ter[. . .] . . quam
muneribus r . . uī . . ere nito-|⁴ - [.]t totis pura temporib[us]
.[. . .] .[.] . . gemm . . .
— — —

... we brought together, or the same things for us already, ... than obligations ... all ... times ...
so that ... should grant the indulgence of resting and not

II.3: 2 *requiescendi-dare*
II.3: 3 uī . . ere nito- *dubitanter legi: ut te Feneto Marichal*

II.4

LITERARY EXCERPT OR REMINISCENCE

Literature: B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and E. J. Goodspeed in *P.Tebt.* II 686 (1907: *descr.*); R. Marichal in *ChLA* V 304 (1975); Seider (1976). *CPL* 60; MP³ 3015; LDAB 4145; TM 97904

The text transmitted by this calligraphic exercise makes no sense, since the Latin words are inflected and perhaps modified for purely scribal needs. Meaningful words – perhaps from *nullus*, ‘no’ (but the form *nullium* would be non-standard), *um* (see the complex Plaut. *Truc.* 481), *mullus*, ‘red mullet’, or *mulier*, ‘woman’ (with gemination of *l*), *incipio*, ‘begin’, or *Cipus* (a legendary Roman praetor on whose head horns grew: Ov. *met.* 15.565) or *cippus*, ‘pillar’, or *clipeus*, ‘shield’; certainly from *miles*, ‘soldier’ – might have been deformed by be-

ing transformed into a wordplay exercise (see Scappaticcio 2017a: 390). Nonetheless, the hypothesis that the scribe was merely ‘playing’ with words remains: there is a symmetry in the sequence – *ulli*, then *um* and the inverse *mu*, then *ulli* again – which suggests that there is no real sense in the text as it stands. The reading *nul-li, um, mullieri, Cipe, tum militem* is too hypothetical to allow a new literary – theatrical? see the text below (II.5) – fragment to be excerpted from this calligraphic exercise.

fr. b →

--
|¹ nulliummullierīcipeummilitem[n]ullium[m]ilite . .
|² nulliummullierīc[i]peummilitemnu[l]li
|³ nulliummullierī[ci]petummilitemn[ul]li
⁴ n[±16]

II.5

LITERARY EXCERPT OR REMINISCENCE

Literature: B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and E. J. Goodspeed in *P.Tebt.* II 686 (1907: *descr.*); R. Marichal in *ChLA* V 304 (1975). MP³ 2998; LDAB 4145; TM 97904

This writing exercise preserves a text whose literary character can be reconstructed from the scanty traces. It contains two onomastic indications in the repeated references to a P. Vettius and a (Iulius?) Myrtilus. Vettius has been identified as an otherwise unknown comic poet or actor, and more specifically with the Vettius Philocomus of Suet. *gramm.* 2.3, while Myrtilus has been taken

to be the mythical son of Hermes and Myrto (*ChLA* V: 53). The *comicus* (ll. 1–5, 7, 9) Vettius and the mythical charioteer Myrtilus would thus have been linked in the calligraphic exercise; but the sad destiny of Oenomaus’ chariot driven by Myrtilus (Hyg. *fab.* 84) seems unlikely to have offered material for a comedy. Moreover, the transmitted text reads *comicu*, and nothing prevents us

II.4: 1–4 -llieri- or -llien-

II.4: 1–2 *fortasse* -cipetum- (*a l. 3*) *legendum* 1–4 *fortasse* nulli um mullieri cipe tum militem, nulli um milite[- - -] (nulli, um, mullieri, Cipe, tum militem, nulli, um, milite[- - -] *legendum*) *vel* nullium mulli incipe tum militem, nullium milite[- - -] (nullum mulli – *vel* molli *vel* muli – incipe tum militem, nullium milite[- - -] *legendum*): nullium mulli pricipium militem nullium milite Marichal: nullium mulli trilicium militem nullium militem Seider: nullium mulli incipe tum militem dubitanter Scappaticcio (2017a: 390)

from supposing that it stands for *comicum*, referring to (accusative) Myrtilus, rather than for *comicus*, referring to (nominative) P. Vettius. It is also possible that *comicus* is a mistake for *amicus*, ‘friend’, and that in ll. 6 and 8 a different scribe – perhaps a teacher – unsuccessfully intervened to correct the exercise. P. Vettius Chilon was a friend of Verres (Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.166–8); if the ‘friend’ Vettius came from a set of Ciceronian examples, Myrtilus too could be identified with the character who appears in Cicero’s letters (Cic. *Att.* 15.13.6, 16.11.5). For more extensive analysis, see Scappaticcio (2017a: 388–9). In sum, there are two different possible interpretations of these lines: either we learn of a comic author named P. Vettius and a character he used, or we gain some in-

sight into how Cicero’s works were employed in educational contexts.

A hand using a blackish ink darker than that of *m*¹ is recognisable at ll. 6 and 8 (*m*²). This hand is less skilled and calligraphic and decidedly more banal than *m*¹, and it has been supposed that it belongs to a teacher; see *ChLA* (V: 53).

If *comicu* stands for *comicus*, the omission of *-s* is interesting; omission of *-m* if it stands for *comicum* would be better paralleled. The second name is variously spelled: usually *Myrtilum*, sometimes *Murt-* without the ‘foreign’ letter *y* (ll. 2, 13), and sometimes *-lium* (ll. 9–13), perhaps influenced by the *Iulium* that precedes in ll. 10–13.

fr. a ↓
-- --
[¹ P. Vettius comicu Myrtilum My]rtilum Myrt[ilum - - -]
[² P. Vettius comicu Myrtil]u[m] Murtilum M[yrtilum - - -]
[³ P. Vettius comicu Myrtilum Myrtilum Myrti[lum - - -]
[⁴ P. Vettius comicu Myrtilum Myrtilum Myrti[um - - -]
[⁵ P. Vettius comicu Myrtilum Myrtilu[m] Myrtilum - - -]
[⁶ P. Vettius amicus c [- - -]
[⁷ P. Vettius comicu Myrtilum My[rtilum Myrtilum - - -]
[⁸ P. Vettius am-
[⁹ P. Vettius comicu Myrtilum Myrtilum Myrtilium Myrt[ilum - - -]
[¹⁰ Iulium Myrtilium Myrtilum [- - -]
[¹¹ Iulium Myrtilium Myrtilu[m] - - -]
[¹² [Iu]lium [M]yrtilium Myrtilum [- - -]
[¹³ I[uli]um Murtilium Myr . . [.] . . . [- - -]
-- --
fr. a₁ ↓
-- --
[- - -]um Myrtilium . . . [- - -]
-- --

fr. a ↓: The comic P. Vettius, Myrtilus Myrtilus Myrtilus ... (five times)	The friend P. Vettius.
The friend P. Vettius ...	The comic P. Vettius, Myrtilus Myrtilus Myrtilus ...
The comic P. Vettius, Myrtilus Myrtilus Myrtilus ...	Iulius Myrtilus Myrtilus Myrtilus ... (at least four times)
	fr. a ₁ ↓: ... Myrtilus ...

fr. a ↓: 1–5 *m*¹ 6 *m*² 7 *m*¹ 8 *m*² | after *am(-)* blank space 9–13 *m*¹
fr. a ↓: 1–5, 7, 9 *comicus potius quam comicum legendum* 8 *fortasse am(icus) legendum*

II.6

VIRGIL, *GEORGICS* 4.1–2

Literature: B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and E. J. Goodspeed in *P.Tebt.* II 686 (1907: *descr.*); R. Marichal in *ChLA* V 304 (1975); Scappaticcio (2013a: 175–6 no. 35). *CPL* 18; *CLA* XI 1646; MP³ 2938; LDAB 4145; TM 97904
Reference editions (Virgil, *Georgics*): Geymonat (2008²); Ottaviano and Conte (2013)

The two hexameters that open book 4 of the *Georgics* are transmitted by this fragmentary writing exercise. Many such Virgilian exercises survive from the Eastern empire, all dating between the first century BC and the early third century AD; see e.g. P.Hawara inv. 24 (IB.5–6), *P.Oxy.* L 3554 (IB.9) with Radiciotti (2010: 91). Nonetheless, this is the only one to use the *Georgics*, which rarely appears in Eastern copies; see the library codex of *P.Ant.* I 29 (IV.5–6) and the bilingual version of P.Allen

inv. 282 (V.3), both of them definitely later than this fragment.
Aëri in place of *aërii* (4.1) could be either a scribal mistake, with omission of the second *i*, or incorrect orthography reflecting a peculiar perception of the double vowel. A scribal omission is clearly recognisable in *exquar* in place of *exequar*: the two forms are both attested in the exercise. It is thus also likely that *exequar* is simply an orthographic variant of the commonly accepted *exsequar* (4.2).

fr. b ↓

— — —
[¹ Protinus aëri melli[s caele]stia dona / exequar: hanc etiam, Maece[nas, aspice partem.]
[² Protinus a[ëri me]llis c[aelestia do]na / ex<e>quar: hanc etiam, Maec[enas, aspice partem.]
[³ Protinus aër[i m]ellis cae[lestia do]na / ex<e>quar: hanc etiam, Ma[ecenas, aspice partem.]
[⁴ Protinus a[ër]i [mellis] caelestia dona / ex<e>quar: hanc etiam, M[aecenas, aspice partem.]
[⁵ Protinus aëri mell[i]s caelest[i]a [do]na / exequar: hanc etiam, [Maecenas, aspice partem.]
[⁶ P[rotinus aëri mellis caelestia dona / exequar: hanc etiam, Maecenas, aspice partem.]
— — —

fr. b ↓: 1–6 aërii codd. Geymonat Conte | exsequar codd. Geymonat Conte

II.7

EPITOME OF LIVY, *AB URBE CONDITA* 37–40, 47, 48–55

P.Oxy. IV 668 + *PSI* XII 1291: London, British Library [inv. Pap. 1532 (*recto*)] + Cairo, Egyptian Museum [inv. SR 3796 25/1/55/2 (11) (*recto*)]

Frr. (papyrus roll): *P.Oxy.* IV 668: frame 1 (col. I: 25.8×15.8 cm); 2 (col. II + col. III: 26.8×36 cm); 3 (col. IV: 25.8×19.5 cm); 4 (col. V + col. VI: 26×23.6 cm); 5 (col. VII + col. VIII: 26×35.7 cm); 6 (*fragmenta minora*) + *PSI* XII 1291 (col. III *bis*): 25×7.7 cm

II–III AD

Oxyrhynchus

Source: *P.Oxy.* IV 668: Egypt Exploration Society excavations (led by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt in 1903, later purchased by the British Museum in 1906); *PSI* XII 1291: Società Italiana dei Papiri excavations (led by E. Breccia: Kom Abu-Teir)

Literature: B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt in *P.Oxy.* IV 668 (1904); Kornemann (1904: 14–34: *P.Oxy.* IV 668); Rossbach (1910: *P.Oxy.* IV 668); V. Bartoletti in *PSI* XII 1291 (1951); Jal (1984: 116–27: *P.Oxy.* IV 668 + *PSI* XII 1291); R. Funari in *CPS* B.1.1 (2011: 49–225 no. 1). *CLA* II + *Suppl.* 208; *CPL* 33–4; Seider (1978a: 88–94 no. 34); *MP*³ 2927; *LDAB* 2574; *TM* 61429

These fragments belong to an epitome of Livy. Commonly known as the *Oxyrhynchus Epitome* and completely unknown until the discovery of this papyrus at the beginning of the twentieth century, it consists of a selective summary, in most cases a brief book-by-book presentation, of part of *Ab Urbe condita*. The roll to which these fragments belonged must have covered approximately the first sixty books of Livy's work; it would have been the first volume of an edition in two or at most three rolls. This edition, probably produced in Egypt, was not a luxury item but a medium-quality book for ordinary use. The epitome is written on the *recto* along the fibres; the *verso* contains one of the earliest known witnesses to the Greek New Testament, extensive passages from the *Epistle to the Hebrews* (2.14–5.5, 10.8–11.13, 11.28–12.17). This material, published as *PSI* XII 1292 + *P.Oxy.* IV 657, was probably copied about a century after the Livy epitome.

The surviving Livy fragments allow a partial reconstruction of the physical characteristics of the edition from which they come. Most columns had 27 lines (but col. III had 28), generally with an interlinear space of 0.4 cm, for a column height of c. 18 cm. The top and bottom margins were each c. 4 cm, and the total height of the roll c. 26 cm. The lines varied greatly in length, without any obvious motivation: the longest were c. 17 cm, and the intercolumnar space about 6–7 cm. The book numbers appear as centred headings. The lines in which consuls are mentioned, at the beginning of each new year, are set slightly outwards in order to distinguish them from the other lines, which are evenly aligned on

the left. Some of the columns on *P.Oxy.* IV 668 are in excellent condition, particularly col. VII, which survives almost intact, but others are very fragmentary, and *PSI* XII 1291 preserves only the very ends of the lines of a single column (III *bis*).

The papyrus is dated by its script, which belongs to the transition from capital to minuscule that occurred between the late second and fourth centuries (Ammirati 2015a: 46–7). Editors have made a wide range of choices within that period, including the third century (*CLA*), the third or fourth (*PSI* XII: 207), and not later than the fourth (*P.Oxy.* IV: 91).

The text is full of copying errors, most of which probably have a graphic basis and make it difficult to identify the linguistic features of the original author. But candidates for such features include spellings such as *intergessit* for *intercessit* (col. I l. 27), *circumscriberant* for *circumscripserant* (col. II l. 12), *Cethecus* for *Cethegus* (col. IV l. 2), *philius* for *filium* (col. IV l. 19), and the initial consonant of *vastaita* for *basilica* (col. III l. 3). Probable examples of non-standard morphology include *homini* for *homines* (col. II l. 24) and *marem* for *mare* (col. III l. 17). Apparently non-standard case usage includes *[Quirin]alem* for *Quirinalis* (col. I l. 5), *minantes* for *minantibus* (col. I l. 8), *in Africam* for *in Africa* (col. V l. 16). Syntactic anacoluthon may appear in *quod Philippo ... suo desiderante* (col. II ll. 26–7).

This edition is based on examination of the original papyrus.

R. Funari