

## INTRODUCTION

The paired topics of ancient multilingualism and multiculturalism, literature and literacy, and cultural identity and cultural contacts animate current discussion in the field of classical studies. The Greeks and the Romans were in osmotic contact, influencing one another and the other ethnic, linguistic, and cultural realities that made up the Roman Empire. Classicists trace a complex path marked by absences and continuities, and this ancient Mediterranean web with its delicately intertwined threads hangs behind them. The *Corpus of Latin Texts on Papyrus* (CLTP) offers a tool for further exploring this network, gathering texts transmitted by papyri in which the presence of the Latin language signals a form of identification with Roman culture. But most of these texts had an Eastern circulation and often Eastern origins, and they thus contain elements that allow a reconstruction of the forms in which Latin functioned within multilingual and multicultural environments.<sup>1</sup>

The 1,483 texts collected in CLTP cover a wide chronological range and many different types and genres. Papyri preserve Latin texts both literary and documentary in nature, stretching in time from the first century BC to the Middle Ages and providing new knowledge in fields ranging from literature to linguistics and from palaeography and papyrology to economic and social history. The elegiac couplets of the Augustan politician and poet C. Cornelius Gallus represent a well-known case of how papyri have opened up new chapters in the history of Latin literature. The controversial figure of Gallus had long been known from indirect sources and from his contemporaries' and successors' acknowledgements of him as a pioneer in the elegiac genre. But nothing survived of his literary production until the late 1970s, when a papyrus fragment transmitting a few elegiac couplets mentioning his beloved Lycoris was discovered.

This scrap of a roll offered the only direct manuscript witness to an author of whom nothing was preserved via the medieval tradition; this is even more extraordinary given that the papyrus dates to the late first century BC, meaning that Gallus' *Amores* reached the Roman fort of Primis (Qasr Ibrîm) in Egyptian Nubia not long after their date of 'publication' (CLTP IA.1) – a phenomenon otherwise known only in the case of Cicero and Virgil, whose masterpieces also reached the periphery of the Eastern empire soon after their composition. But the 'Gallus chapter' is not the only papyrus that expands our knowledge of Latin literature, as the reader will find by leafing through the pages of CLTP. Other Latin literary unica preserved in papyri include the only known direct manuscript witnesses to a *fabula togata* (IB.1), an anonymous poem on the Egyptian war led by Octavian against Cleopatra (IA.3), a speech delivered by the emperor Claudius (IB.16), a dialogue on the virtues with an unusual mention of Ciceronian characters such as C. Laelius and Spurius Mummius (II.2), ethical maxims in the style of Publilius Syrus (IB.20), a theatrical adaptation in hexameters on the myth of Alcestis (IV.28), and a folk tale involving the emperor Hadrian (IV.29). And although Latin literary papyri offer unique witnesses to otherwise unknown works – an extraordinary matter in and of itself – they also offer evidence for the text of known authors like Terence, Cicero, Sallust, Virgil, Livy, Seneca the Younger, Lucan, and Juvenal, ranging from the first century BC to the sixth century AD, allowing the history of their use and transmission to be better understood.

Authors such as Cicero and Virgil played a primarily educational role in the Eastern empire, and papyri confirm what is otherwise known through the indirect tradition of grammarians and commentators and through

<sup>1</sup> 'Latin in Egypt' is the title of a key chapter in the reference monograph of Adams (2003: 527–641), where an outline of the story of the circulation of Latin in Egypt and the Eastern empire is found together with an updated bibliography; see also Rochette (1997), Scappaticcio (2015a: 13–17), and P. Swiggers and A. Wouters in Scappaticcio

(2015a: 507–15). This theme has been discussed in several works, from both a papyrological and palaeographic (e.g. Ammirati 2015a) and a linguistic perspective (e.g. Mancini 2004; Dickey 2009; Mairs 2019, focussing on the translation practice in bilingual documents on papyrus). On Latin literacy in Egypt, see Criatore (2003–4).

the literary legacy these authors left to their successors. We know of many readers of Cicero and Virgil, including in the East (see Sánchez-Ostiz 2013 and Scappaticcio 2016b on Cicero and Virgil, respectively). But only papyri bear traces of the hands of late antique (mainly Greek-speaking) readers annotating their texts of Cicero and Virgil and allowing us further to explore the reasons for their interest in these authors. Up to the third century, in fact, Latin literature was confined to either rolls perhaps destined for private reading or scribal exercises by copyists practising document scripts for the Roman army or for trading. The circulation of Latin authors in the late antique Eastern empire was mainly due to the need to study and become familiar with the language of Roman law. Educational tools such as bilingual Latin–Greek columnar Ciceros and Virgils, clearly destined for a non-Roman audience and a formative (but not exclusively scholastic) milieu, are only known thanks to papyri (see e.g. V.24 for Cicero and V.6 for Virgil). By also transmitting dictionaries and textbooks addressed to a Greek readership, papyri play a decisive role in the performance of ‘learning Latin the ancient way’ (Dickey 2016a).

As for Latin documentary papyri – which represent the majority of the *CLTP* texts – these open new windows on ‘everyday writing’ (Bagnall 2011) and life. Soldiers in the Roman army often appear unveiled in their private letters addressed to comrades, friends, or families (e.g. II.104–18); Latin epistolography is a chapter well nourished by papyrological sources. Documents issued from or addressed to official chanceries, on the one hand, and legal documents (birth declarations, marriage agreements, wills, the only known emancipation of a woman, acknowledgements of debts, contracts of various kinds), on the other, lend form to the administrative realities of the Eastern empire. Societal aspects of daily life emerge vividly from documents, exhibiting their ‘modernity’: note the document (II.62: a betrothal? or divorce?) involving the 39-year-old Demetria, who, having once been married to a man with whom she had two children, acts in the contract as officially engaged to another man. A fresh analysis of accounting documents in Latin known from papyri sheds light on the role merchants played in affirming the circulation of Latin as a language in Egypt before the third century. The Roman military presence in Egypt and the East is the main reason for the importance of Latin in those areas before the fourth century, and the massive quantity of military documents in Latin is thus unsurprising. But what these documents allow us to reconstruct, in terms of forms of administration of

the army and degrees of Latin literacy within the camps, is less expected. The only extant annual report from the Roman army, for example, is an Arsinoite papyrus document from AD 156 that bears a heading with the technical term *pridianus* (II.134); this is a unique resource full of details regarding soldiers, their numbers at a certain moment, and their previous roles, titles, transfers, losses, and absences from duty. Papyrological documentation (mainly in Latin) is also decisive for reconstructing the functioning of the Roman cohorts stationed in Masada in Palestine (see Cotton 1989) or in Dura-Europos in Syria, from which also comes the only entirely preserved roster of a Roman unit, revealing in fine detail how soldiers managed their daily duties (III.226; see e.g. Rostovtzeff 1934b; Austin 2010).

Although all the texts collected in this volume are ‘papyri’ in the sense that they were written on papyrus (or in a few cases parchment), they are above all *texts*, and as such they are of interest not only to papyrologists but to anyone concerned with the literature, history, language, or almost any other aspect of the ancient world. This corpus is thus fundamentally not a collection of Latin papyri but a collection of Latin texts on papyrus. An effort has been made to present these texts in a manner accessible to mainstream classicists and to offer the kind of treatment, analysis, and information such readers would expect from editions of texts preserved in other fashions – although we have at the same time been careful not to neglect the special material information that original copies of ancient texts are uniquely positioned to offer.

In *CLTP* literary scholars will find new texts that enrich our knowledge of Latin literature, on the one hand, and ancient copies of otherwise known texts which deserve to be compared with the rest of the (mainly medieval) manuscript tradition, on the other. But they will also have an opportunity to explore how educational tools destined for learning Latin match what is known from grammarians and commentators, how epistolary formulae in the letters of Cicero and Fronto appear in anonymous correspondence from the Egyptian military milieu, how an official letter issued by a Ravennate *comes sacri stabuli* (‘count of the sacred stable’, VI.83) finds its closest parallel in Cassiodorus’ *Variae*, and how traces of otherwise lost literature survived in rarely attested words (e.g. *ludio* in II.14) in bilingual glossaries used as tools to learn and practise Latin as a second language. Linguists will recognise traces of the Latin used by non-native speakers, of non-standard and diachronically marked forms, and of linguistically marked spellings, and will find these retained in their non-standard

form in the text edition, with discussion in the linguistic section of the accompanying entry. Historians will find a rich source of texts that deserve to be aligned with other historiographic sources to strengthen the reconstruction of aspects of social, economic, and political history (and microhistory), with contextual descriptions offered in regard to both dating and the historical frame and to proveniences and origins. Papyrologists and palaeographers will find reliable bibliologic and codicological information and descriptions of scripts and parallels (with internal cross-references playing a decisive role), with the original punctuation and signs of palaeographic interest carefully recorded primarily in the apparatus.

*CLTP* is a comprehensive tool, assembling editions of all Latin texts on papyrus in one place. As such, it benefits from two unique features. First, the applied work methodology and editorial criteria are consistent and yield genuine new editions that are the result of direct analysis and a complex examination of the texts, which has almost always led to improvements in the quality (and often the quantity) of the texts in question. Second, the *CLTP* editions of Latin texts on papyri were produced by studying them within the context of other Latin papyri, which has led to emphasis on previously untapped connections and patterns.

Thus, the *Corpus of Latin Texts on Papyrus* is both a destination and a departure point. Much remains to be explored. But some forward bases are established here to facilitate the critical use of texts transmitted on papyrus as a means of making better sense of the role Latin – and thus Rome – played in ancient Mediterranean culture and history.

## I. STATE OF THE ART

The idea of publishing a corpus of Latin papyri goes back to the early twentieth century, when Seymour de Ricci envisaged producing a work including all Latin papyri (de Ricci 1914a: 156). The promised publication never appeared, nor did a similar project proposed later by Friederich Bilabel (Préaux 1948: 250), Ulrich Wilcken (1936), and Augusto Traversa (1956) achieve its intended result. Meanwhile, Aristide Calderini (1945) published the first ever compendium of Latin papyrology, made up of notes from his academic lectures. A *Corpus papyrorum Latinarum* (*CPL*) by the papyrologist Robert Cavenaile finally appeared in 1956–8.

Since *CPL* was published, philology has continued to advance, and the number of known Latin texts on papyrus has greatly increased due to new archaeological

discoveries and the publication of material long stored unedited in collections worldwide. Even a quick glance through the *Codices Latini antiquiores* (*CLA*), the *Chartae Latinae antiquiores* (*ChLA*), the new volumes of papyrological collections, the *Bibliographie papyrologique* (*BP*), and new editions appearing in specialised reviews, as well as through papyrological databases such as the *Papyrological Navigator* (*PN*) or *Trismegistos* (*TM*), shows how many additional Latin texts on papyrus have emerged since 1958. The *CPL* was a praiseworthy and important collection and philological tool, which was unique in its genre and still represents the first port of call for scholars interested in Latin texts preserved on papyrus (see Scappaticcio 2019a, with a state of the art and an updated bibliography). After more than sixty years, however, it requires replacement. Since the 1970s, collections such as *Roman Military Records on Papyrus* by R. O. Fink (1971), the two volumes of *Glossaria bilingua* by J. Kramer (1983 and 2001), the *Corpus epistularum Latinarum* (*CEL*) by P. Cugusi (1992–2002), the catalogue of P. Buzi (2005), and first editions of important papyri such as those preserving the elegiac couplets of Cornelius Gallus, mentioned above, in 1979 (**IA.1**), the *Medea* of Seneca in 1997 (**IV.14–15**), and a considerable number of documentary texts, such as an unusual contract from Palestine in which women are among the commodities sold (**II.79**) and a Latin–Arabic letter entirely in Latin script (**VII.117**), have helped make clear how fertile this field of research can be in shedding light on the use of the Latin language, literature, and culture in the Eastern half of the empire; on ancient libraries, book circulation and archives; and on the Roman economy and Roman society, culture, and (micro)history. Reference works such as *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (2003) and *Social Variation and the Latin Language* (2013) by J. N. Adams have ratified the value of papyrus witnesses for the linguistic analysis of Latin across time, space, and social strata. Nonetheless, the fresh interest in this area driven by the promising research results of the last few decades has had to depend on an obsolete scholarly tool; *CLTP* aims to correct this situation.

*CLTP* is the main output of a research project intended to fully analyse the philological, literary, historical, and cultural contribution of Latin texts on papyrus (ERC-StG 2014 no. 636983, Project PLATINUM: Papyri and Latin Texts: INsights and Updated Methodologies. Towards a Philological, Literary and Historical Approach to Latin Papyri). In six years, this project has produced a new, enriched, multidisciplinary approach to Latin texts

on papyrus, in order to scrutinise their potential and offer fresh insights into their philological, linguistic, literary, historical (both economic and social), and cultural value. The project has produced many first editions of texts formerly left unpublished in papyrological collections worldwide, some of which appear in *CLTP* for the first time. Many previously edited texts have been newly analysed, often with surprising results, for example the likelihood that a copy of Seneca the Elder's *Histories* can be identified in a charred roll from Herculaneum (IA.4). This research aimed at reconstructing the circulation of the Latin language and Roman literature and its reflection of Roman society and culture through Latin texts on papyrus. The results tend in different directions, many of which deserve further exploration: while manuscripts from the West (e.g. Herculaneum) enrich our knowledge of Latin 'libraries', Eastern products – both literary and documentary texts – shed light on the circulation of the language, offering insights into new chapters of Latin literature and textual transmission, ancient education and multilingualism, economics, society, culture and history, and multiculturalism. *CLTP* aims to present Latin papyri from all disciplinary perspectives, providing a point of departure for research and showing the necessity of simultaneously taking a papyrological and palaeographical approach and a philological, linguistic, literary, and historical one. This multidisciplinary approach has been assured by the involvement of papyrologists, palaeographers, historians, historians of ancient law, Latinists, philologists, and linguists in the team of scholars contributing to *CLTP*.

## II. THE *CLTP* ENTRIES

*Corpus of Latin Texts on Papyrus* (1) offers comprehensive coverage of all known Latin papyri, both previously

published and new; (2) provides a synthetic introduction to each papyrus, covering textual, linguistic, and material matters; (3) presents critical editions based on direct examination of the original documents and/or photographs, using a consistent, clear critical system; (4) normally provides English translations; and (5) includes both a palaeographic and a critical apparatus.

With chronology being the primary organisational criterion within *CLTP*, each 'Part' includes texts ascribable to a certain chronological range, with entries identified by progressive numbers within each Part. A title briefly describing the content of the text introduces each entry, and the number and the title are followed by the initials of the papyrus – i.e. the abbreviation indicating the papyrological series within which it was previously published, if any, following the *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic, and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca, and Tablets* – and its place of conservation with inventory number.<sup>2</sup>

The heading of each entry then provides a schematic indication of the material form, date, and provenience of the papyrus.<sup>3</sup> The 'Source' – how the document was discovered and/or acquired, until it reached the present collection – and the 'Literature' concerning the papyrus follow. Note that 'Literature' covers only proper editions and descriptions (*descr.*, especially those in the *Chartae Latinae antiquiores*), together with references to corpora, collections, and databases.<sup>4</sup> This information is intended to assist the reader in undertaking further research, since online databases, for instance, contain links to digital reproductions often provided by collections. 'Reference edition(s)' are given for literary texts also known through the medieval manuscript tradition; the manuscript sigla used in these entries are taken from the edition in question.

<sup>2</sup> If first editions of papyri are not published in proper papyrological series but in articles (or book chapters) and later gathered in individual collections of papyri, the inventory number alone is cited, for reasons of consistency. Papyri are thus mentioned in the head section of each *CLTP* entry either via initials identifying a specific papyrological series or via their archival conservation and inventory number.

<sup>3</sup> Information about the provenience of papyri is not always clear, and certainty obtains only when an exact archaeological campaign and thus a systematically explored archaeological context is known. Many of the papyri collected here are from the antiquities market, which was primarily (and more or less legally) fed by excavations; dates of sale are registered only when we know them via archival research, although in some cases contextual information can be derived from data offered by papyri belonging to the same lot.

On the provenience of the Latin papyri progressively acquired by the Viennese Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, see Klos (1953) and H. Loebeinstein in *P.Rain.Cent.* 24–5. Archival details are also useful for reconstructing the provenience of some of the papyri acquired by German collections via the Deutsches Papyrskartell, on which see Primavesi (1996) and Essler and Reiter (2012).

<sup>4</sup> Originality in editorial intervention distinguishes what are here considered 'editions' and 'corpora'. Nevertheless, editions with proper editorial interventions can also appear in some corpora, although most corpora merely gather editions without textual changes or improvements. In the head section of *CLTP* entries, editions and corpora are separated by a full stop. Note that reference to e.g. Seider's collection or the *ChLA* signals the presence of a facsimile. Links to images can be found via TM, LDAB, MP<sup>3</sup>, and PN.



A short introduction clarifying the text's content and context follows. Ancient authors are referred to using the abbreviations of the *TLL* (for Latin authors), *LSJ* (for Greek authors), and R. Gryson's repertoires of 2004 and 2007<sup>5</sup> (for Christian authors). Juristic literature is referred to according to the definitions in Watson (2009<sup>2</sup>) and abbreviated according to the *TLL* where possible; see the List of Abbreviations. Grammarians are cited by the abbreviated name of the author, the abbreviation *gramm.* (standing for the title *Ars grammatica*, thus 'grammar'), and an indication of book(s) and paragraph(s) preceding the reference to the consulted edition in round brackets, with an indication of the page(s) and line(s) in question.

The introduction closes with a statement of how the textual work was carried out, i.e. whether a fresh examination of the original was conducted to produce the edition furnished in the entry or whether the analysis is based on a digital reproduction or even on previous editions (only in exceptional cases). Although overall revisions were made by the *CLTP* editor with an eye to consistency among entries, including in terms of definitions of textual types, and suggestions regarding editorial choices and readings were shared with the authors, the individuals who sign each *CLTP* entry are ultimately responsible for the textual choices and statements those entries contain.

The edition itself comes next, accompanied by a palaeographic apparatus (in English) and a critical apparatus (in Latin). In these editions the layout of the papyrus is respected only when relevant for the nature of the text (e.g. for lists, accounts, and columnar texts such as glossaries); otherwise, a continuous text is given, with a layout guided by the contents. The Leiden Conventions for editions of inscriptions and papyri are followed (see the Note on Editorial Conventions), with the exception of the use of round brackets for abbreviated words. Abbreviated forms are indicated in the palaeographic apparatus, and the abbreviated words are silently expanded in the main text; when the exact case/gender/number of an abbreviated word cannot be reconstructed, the root of the word is given with a hyphen (e.g. *domin-* means that some form of *dominus* was intended). Underdots are used only for genuinely uncertain letters; letters certain because of the context are not underdotted even when only partially preserved. Only mechanical scribal errors are corrected in these editions; linguistically marked orthographies are retained because of the information they convey. The text is referred to according to the papyrological criteria of columns, fragments, and/or pages (varying according to the characteristics of the specific

papyrus). For literary texts, the lines or sections of the transmitted text the papyrus covers are also indicated, to help those wishing to compare these texts with the standard editions. Punctuation is modern – the ancient punctuation is recorded in the palaeographic apparatus – as is capitalisation. For literary texts known from the medieval manuscript tradition, punctuation is given and lacunae are filled following the modern reference edition(s); if more than one reference edition is mentioned, the most recent one is followed unless otherwise specified. It is worth emphasising the aim of *CLTP* in offering editions of literary texts: the text as transmitted by the papyrus is published, with an obvious, necessary distinction between the author of the text and the scribe. This is even more important in connection with literary *unica*, such as the famous *Alcestis* and *Hadrianus* of the Montserrat codex (**IV.26–9**): the *CLTP* entries do not offer the text of the *Alcestis* and the *Hadrianus*, but the texts of the *Alcestis* and the *Hadrianus* as transmitted by the Montserrat codex, in the same way that the Virgilian texts as transmitted by a fragmentary calligraphic exercise are given in *CLTP* in place of the correct (philologically reconstructed) text. Another example that deserves mention is the bilingual collection of model letters transmitted by a third- or fourth-century roll (**III.5**), whose Latin–Greek text is given even though the authors of the *CLTP* entry are convinced that the original text was exclusively in Latin.

The palaeographic apparatus offers interpretations of uncertain readings and records distinctive markings of palaeographical interest. Abbreviations, apices, dots, and other lectional signs are also generally recorded.<sup>5</sup> Sometimes palaeographic features are noted only in the relevant entry introduction or group introduction. Interpunction (i.e. medial dots indicating word-division) is not registered in the apparatus unless it is not systematic, but its presence is noted in the introductions.

The critical apparatus clarifies the reasons for printing specific readings, such as corrections or conjectures by modern scholars (but readings that differ only in the position of dots and brackets are normally omitted). Cross-references to other *CLTP* entries also appear; in the case of literary texts, these manuscripts generally precede the rest of the manuscript tradition, since they are older. The abbreviation *edd.* indicates a consensus among the editors of the papyrus. Since linguistically marked orthographies are retained in the edited texts,

<sup>5</sup> In palaeographic descriptions 'apex' (not equivalent to Latin *apex*) and 'macron' are used indifferently of various diacritic signs above letters.

the standard forms are also noted in the critical apparatus through use of the expression *legendum*. The critical apparatus also includes proposals for the reconstruction of the original texts. In the case of literary texts, the readings of medieval manuscripts and their editors are also given in the critical apparatus, following the standard reference edition(s) for manuscript sigla and other abbreviations; *codd.* indicates consensus among medieval manuscripts.

Translations (by the authors of the entries, unless otherwise noted) are normally provided. But translations are not given for known literary texts or some others where good English translations can be found elsewhere. Additionally, some very fragmentary papyri cannot be translated.

A focus on texts rather than on the medium that transmits them has led to another editorial choice. If the same papyrus transmits multiple texts – not via reuse of the papyrus itself, in which case separate entries for the texts are provided – a multiple entry is created (see e.g. II.1–6), in order to restore independence to the various texts. Annotated copies of literary works are also given multiple entries, dividing the text of the literary work from that of the anonymous scholia.<sup>6</sup>

## II.1 The Herculaneum CLTP Entries

In the case of Latin texts preserved by the Herculaneum papyrus rolls, fragments are edited according to the sequence established by volumetric reconstructions of rolls and thus do not necessarily follow the progressive numbering of the *cornici* (i.e. the frames in which these fragments are stored). For a methodological reference guide to the correct handling of Herculaneum papyri, see Janko (2016). Herculaneum rolls are generally characterised by the density of breaks between individual layers, with the consequence that many strings of letters that were previously thought to be connected are actually on different layers and should therefore be placed at least one layer away from each other. When these parts are not recognisable words and cannot be placed in a new context, they are tacitly omitted. In this regard, the text given in *CLTP* sometimes offers less than previous editions and omits larger portions of the so-called *disegni* (eighteenth-century drawings). In the case of

Latin papyri from Herculaneum, it may be misleading to use readings obtained only on the basis of images without checking the stratigraphy of the original, and editorial work must therefore be conducted on the basis of direct examination of the original charred papyrus on the one hand, and on volumetric reconstruction with the support of multispectral images on the other. Fragments are classified by mentioning the number of *cornici* (*cr.*, ‘frames’) and *pezzi* (*pz.*, ‘pieces’). The so-called Neapolitan drawings, stored in the Naples National Library (Officina dei Papiri Ercolanesi ‘Marcello Gigante’), are referred to as *N*; in case different hands than that of the drawing person are identified, they are indicated with numbers in apex. P.Herc. inv. 1067 (IA.4) is often followed by the indication *sovrapposto* (*superp.*, ‘upper layers’), which indicates that the fragment is written on a layer of papyrus which is stuck to other layers. *Sottoposti* (*subp.*) properly are ‘lower layers’ and equally stand as fragments written on a layer of papyrus stuck to other upper ones.<sup>7</sup> The numbering of *sovrapposti* in this classification follows a progressive sequence and does not indicate the supposed relationship between the *sovrapposto* and the reconstructed base level.

## II.2 The CLTP Micro-entries

Latin is attested in various ways in papyri. Some texts – both literary and documentary – are written exclusively in Latin, while others are bilingual, with Graeco-Latin bilingualism expressed in forms ranging from proper translations to adaptations, to linguistic ‘fossils’ such as the presence of *legi* and *signavi* formulae at the end of late antique Greek documents. Greek is not the only language to coexist with Latin on papyrus: Latin–Coptic (V.31; on the circulation of Latin in Coptic cultural milieu, see Scappaticcio 2021d), Latin–Gothic (VI.6), and in one case Latin–Arabic (VII.117) papyri are preserved. The texts collected here illustrate this historical coexistence of languages, which is why *CLTP* includes all papyri on which Latin is attested to any degree. Nonetheless, a differentiated editorial solution has been adopted for texts in which the presence of Latin is marginal even if it has historical (and often linguistic) importance.

Many (mainly official) Greek documents feature a marginal presence of Latin in e.g. dating formulae, sub-

<sup>6</sup> ‘Scholia’ refers to marginal or interlinear annotations representing a form of exegetical work and commentary on the basic text, be it literary and/or juristic in character. The term ‘commentary’ is employed only for texts that belong to the specific literary genre of juristic commentary.

<sup>7</sup> Although apparently later than the other Herculaneum Latin *CLTP* entries and dating to the early first century AD, the entry of P.Herc. inv. 1067 appears together with the other older Herculaneum entries in Part IA.

scriptions attesting that a document was read and officially approved,<sup>8</sup> notarial subscriptions,<sup>9</sup> signatures, and the like.<sup>10</sup> In these cases, the texts are included in *CLTP*, but only a very brief description is provided in order to explain to the reader the role Latin plays in the texts and to offer a bibliographic guide to further investigation of the Greek text; the Greek itself is not provided (although it is summarised in the introduction), while the edition of the Latin follows along with its apparatuses and, when appropriate, a translation.

A similar solution is adopted for papyri that transmit juristic literature and imperial constitutions. In light of the exhaustive analyses and the new editions of some of these texts being produced as part of another project,<sup>11</sup> these papyri are provided with neither a description nor a text. Nevertheless, a bit of information is offered in order to orientate the reader, by contextualising the material, setting it in relation to coeval material of Eastern provenience, analysing the evolving role played by Latin as the language of law as a result of the key role played by the circulation of juristic literature in the Eastern empire

in Late Antiquity, and sketching diachronically the reasons for this and the extent of use of Latin in the (mainly Greek-speaking) East.

### III. ORGANISATIONAL CRITERIA AND METHODOLOGY

According to the definition in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* (Bagnall 2009a: xvii), papyrology as a discipline has very flexible boundaries, including consideration not only of papyrus and parchment scraps mainly from Egypt, but also of ostraca and tablets. *CLTP* accordingly gathers both papyrus and parchment fragments. In doing this it illuminates the role played by Latin within the multilingual Eastern Roman Empire and further defines the arc of its circulation. Nonetheless, the dry, arid eastern climate of Egypt, Palestine, and Syria was not the only situation in which ancient writing material of this sort survived, since we also have charred rolls (e.g. those from the well-known library in Herculaneum) and other papyrus artefacts that transmit texts both documentary and literary.

<sup>8</sup> 'Subscription' is used to mean a short sentence, phrase, or word written by an individual at the bottom of a document in order to validate it, regardless of whether this individual is the scribe copying an approved document or someone else. Interest in these approval marks is apparent in several relatively recent papyrological publications, e.g. Benaissa (2007b) and Daniel (2008).

<sup>9</sup> The only certain notarial subscriptions are those in which the formula 'di emu + notary's name + verb' is attested in more or less enriched forms, according to a common practice in late antique and Byzantine contracts. These notarial subscriptions are written in the Latin alphabet to validate Greek documents, a practice known from the fourth to the seventh century AD; see e.g. Diethart and Worp (1986). For other (non-notarial) subscriptions, there is no certainty about the subscriber(s); subscriptions are distinguished from the signatures also found on some documents in *CLTP*. Note that the following documents with previously supposed notarial subscriptions in Latin script are excluded from *CLTP*, given the impossibility of demonstrating the presence of Latin: (1) *SPP* XX 142, from the Arsinoite and dating to 30 August AD 543 / 29 August AD 558 (TM 41003); (2) *PKöln* III 156, perhaps from Antinoopolis and dating to 582–602 (TM 21226); (3) *P.Apoll.* 58, from Apollonopolis and dating to the second half of the seventh century (TM 39117).

<sup>10</sup> A special chapter is represented by the so-called 'Narratio documents'. These are six Greek documents, all dating to the fourth century and possibly transmitting a speech a lawyer would have made in a debate, containing a symbol consisting of an *N* crossed by a vertical stroke. The documents in question are: (1) *P.Sakaon* 35, from Theadelphia and dating after 307 AD (TM 13053); (2) *P.Princ.* III 119, dating to c. 325 AD (TM 16367); (3) *P.Panop.* 31, from Panopolis, c. 329 AD (TM 16201); (4) *P.Vindob. inv.* G 39757,

from Hermopolis, c. 340 AD (TM 32944); (5) *P.Col.* VII 174, from Karanis, c. 342 AD (TM 10528); (6) *PLips.* I 41, from Hermopolis, late fourth century AD (TM 33701). The *N* symbol has been variously interpreted. Wilcken (1908: 472) thought it was the initial letter of the abbreviated name of the lawyer. Collinet (1913: 264–5, 1932: 212) suggested instead reading the symbol as *narratio*, the *narratio* ('narrative') being the oral presentation of legal arguments by the prosecutor or the defendant. This interpretation was accepted by A. A. Schiller (in *P.Col.* I: 195) and Hanson (1971) but rejected by other scholars. Sijpesteijn and Worp (1978: 117–18) proposed reading the symbol as an abbreviation of *N(ομικός)*, given the existence of a similar Greek abbreviation and the unique character of a hypothetical Latin abbreviation in the margin of an otherwise entirely Greek document. The identity of the Latin *N* and the Greek *N* can obviously be misleading. The hypothesis of *N(ομικός)* was supported by R. S. Bagnall (in *P.Col.* VII: 174), while Youtie (1981: 1–15) argued for *ν(ικη)*. The discussion of this symbol was assessed by Lewis (1983), who rejected the previously formulated hypotheses and introduced the new possibility that the vertical stroke crossing the *N* might be the letter *I*, which was to be understood as standing before the *N*, yielding *in(-)*, *i(-) n(-)* or *iv(-)*, *i(-) v(-)*. Given that the meaning of the *N* symbol is still debated, the above-mentioned documents are not included in *CLTP*.

<sup>11</sup> Some of the papyri transmitting juristic literature will be published as a result of the work of the project REDHIS (REDiscovering the HIDDEN Structure: A New Appreciation of Juristic Texts and Patterns of Thought in Late Antiquity; ERC-AdG 2013 no. 3411102, concluded on 31 January 2020: <http://redhis.unipv.it>), run by Dario Mantovani. That project has asked that these papyri not be edited in *CLTP*, and therefore they are given only micro-entries using data recorded on the REDHIS website (latest consultation July 2021).

Latin ostraca will appear in a subsequent volume, while wooden and wax tablets are not edited in *CLTP*. This is not only because tablets often enter the domain of ‘epigraphy’ more than ‘papyrology’, but also because there are many good, recently published corpora and ongoing projects involving Latin tablets (e.g. on the tablets from Vindolanda, Vindonissa, and Campania, not to mention the overall epigraphical project EAGLE, which includes tablets). Tablets of Eastern provenience are listed in the Appendix, with bibliographic details, and are mentioned as parallels when necessary, together with tablets of Western provenience and other epigraphical material.

The inclusion criteria of *CLTP* can be found in two key words (and key concepts) of the project: ‘Latin’ and ‘papyrus’.<sup>12</sup> Papyrus fragments of Eastern provenience

are included along with those from the West, the latter consisting in the first-century rolls from Herculaneum on the one hand, and late antique and early medieval ones linked to the Ravenna court on the other. Late antique and early medieval papyri written in Italy, which are primarily documentary, are included for two reasons: (1) they show structural affinities with the Egyptian material, especially because their typologies reflect specific administrative practices that were widespread in both East and West (letters, records of proceedings, accounts, transactions) and among the people who produced these documents (e.g. the *exceptores*); and (2) the writing material itself, papyrus, represents a link with Egypt. In other words, all these documents partake of a Mediterranean cultural *koinē*.<sup>13</sup> On the other hand, a few papyrus codices of literary works have long been known as

<sup>12</sup> The census was based on detailed examination of all available paper and online resources. Thus, the whole *CLA*, *ChLA*, *CEL*, *CPL*, all collections of papyri (e.g. *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (*POxy.*), *Papiri della Società Italiana* (*PSI*), *Berliner griechische Urkunden* (*BGU*), etc.), and papyrological bibliographic databases (e.g. *Bibliographie papyrologique*: <http://www.ulb.ac.be/phil/cpeg/bp.htm>) have been sorted through and the results combined with a survey of the online papyrological databases (e.g. *MP*<sup>3</sup> and *LDAB*, but also *PN*, *HGV*, and *TM*). The presence of Latin was always verified directly, leading to some exclusions from *CLTP*.

The most relevant and less obvious exclusions are listed and explained here. In some cases, it is impossible to verify the presence of Latin in papyri; for instance, *P.Berol. inv. 17432* is supposed to contain some lines from a record of proceedings, including a bit of Latin, but this unpublished document cannot be located in Berlin, where it was stored (information kindly given by M. Gerhardt in July 2019). A bilingual record of proceedings dating between the fifth and sixth centuries, *P.Aegyptus Cent. 38* (*TM 976598*), has recently been published (Mitthof and Papatthomas 2021), but it is not included in *CLTP* because the Latin is illegible. Another fragment perhaps from a sixth-century codex and transmitting a (bilingual Latin–Greek?) inflectional table is lost in the Louvre’s collections, namely *inv. E 7401* (*MP*<sup>3</sup> 2997.1, *LDAB 10635*, *TM 81353*), on which see Wessely (1886), Wouters (1979: 17, 331), and Scappaticcio (2015a: 54). The parchment scrap *inv. E 7113* also remains unpublished at the Louvre (*TM 754586*); the script is datable between the fourth and fifth centuries, nothing is known of its provenance, and there is the suspicion that it preserves a few lines of otherwise unknown juristic literature. The presence of a subscription stating that a certain Olympios Isidorianus had rendered in Greek a (literary) text from Latin in *PRyl. II 62* (*MP*<sup>3</sup> 2519.0, *LDAB 3496*, *TM 62332*) is suggestive (see ll. 29–30: Ὁλύμπιος [π]ιος Ἰσιδωριανὸς [ . . . . . ] ἐρμήνευσεν ἀπὸ τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν); the original Latin can nonetheless not be reconstructed from this complex Greek literary text of a rhetorical or astrological nature (see *PRyl. II*: 1–2, against West 1974), as a consequence of which this third-century fragment was excluded

from *CLTP*. Careful examination of a fourth-century fragment stored in London, British Library *inv. Or. 9180 C* (*LDAB 113869*, *TM 113869*), has shown that no Latin is preserved in this Jewish magical or mystical text; see Buda and Lewis (2018). The parchment scrap from a fifth-century codex coming from ancient Palestine stored in Leuven, University Library Khirbet Mird *PAM 8* (*LDAB 2865*, *TM 61713*), preserves the Acts of the Apostles in Greek; although it was suggested that it might originate from a Greek–Latin bilingual manuscript, no Latin is extant and, if the original codex was bilingual, it is impossible to be sure that the second language was Latin. The presence of Latin in the seventh- to eighth-century *PRain. Unterricht 183* (*LDAB 6717*, *TM 65469*) cannot be demonstrated, since only Greek and Arabic are identifiable. The situation is even more complex for an apparently Latin sequence of letters in a barely datable fragment described in the *Chartae Latinae antiquiores* (*XLV 1354*), the Viennese papyrus *inv. L 153* (*TM 70129*); although the impression of an alphabetic sequence of repeated Latin letters is created, there is no certainty about the language, given the identity of the apparently Latin letters with their Greek equivalents and the difficulty of reading most of the extant traces. In addition, the hypothesis that Latin words in Greek script would be found in a tachygraphic commentary from between the fifth and the sixth centuries (*BKT IX 203*, *MP*<sup>3</sup> 2760.1, *LDAB 6087*, *TM 64849*) is far too weak and is limited by the complex nature of tachyographies themselves; see Brashear (1983: 172).

During the editorial process leading to the publication of *CLTP* a few more previously unknown Latin papyri appeared, sometimes at a point when it was no longer possible to include them in the corpus. Recently published texts omitted for this reason include *POxy. LXXXV 5495* (*TM 957501*), a Greek paraphrase of the *Digest* with technical legal terms in Latin.

<sup>13</sup> See Internullo (2018, 2019a, and 2019b); on the Graeco-Latin scribal *koinē*, see Cavallo (1970). Another peculiar phenomenon deserves emphasis. The circulation of Latin alphabets in Greek script and vice versa is well known for late antique Egypt – see e.g. *V.36* and *V.37* – and there can be no doubt that their destination is a bureaucratic milieu (Feissel 2008a), although it has been argued



part of the collections of major libraries, and as these are normally treated like medieval manuscripts and archival material, they are accordingly omitted here.<sup>14</sup> Parchment fragments are included when they can be traced to a reconstructable or plausible archaeological provenance.<sup>15</sup>

The ‘Herculaneum chapter’ deserves specific attention. More than 120 Latin rolls are known from Herculaneum (see Capasso 2011). There are also Latin documentary fragments, which are the only Latin documentary texts on papyrus from the ancient West (Del Mastro and Camodeca 2002), along with the one recently discovered in the Gallo-Roman villa of Mané-Vechen

(Plouhinec) in Brittany (France).<sup>16</sup> The poor condition of these documentary fragments, now stored in the Archaeological Museum in Naples, however, makes it impossible to edit them, and they are therefore omitted from *CLTP*. As for the literary rolls from Herculaneum, a selection was made from among the most promising ones. Nothing rules out the possibility that future techniques, such as the application of Reflectance Transformation Imaging at infrared wavelengths, synchrotron X-ray phase-contrast tomography, or X-ray fluorescence micro-imaging will make work on texts omitted from *CLTP* possible in years to come.

recently that shorthands must have circulated also among literate merchants and individuals from the middle class, such as the *virī honesti* (see Ghignoli 2016: 30–2). Note also the Latin *h* written as the Greek  $\eta$ , as in the presence of the abbreviations  $\eta\phi$  and  $\beta\eta$  in some documents from the Ravenna court, standing for *h(onesta) f(emina)* and *v(ir) h(onestus)*, respectively.

<sup>14</sup> A Latin translation of Flavius Josephus’ *Jewish War* is transmitted in the 92-page-long fragmentary papyrus codex in Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana Cmelio MS II/1 (sixth century; LDAB 2458, TM 61316); for an updated reference edition of the text, see Mazzucchi (2017). The sixth-century papyrus codex Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France Lat. 8913 + 8914, transmitting letters and homilies of Avitus of Vienna (15 pages; LDAB 429, TM 59331), is as remarkable as the fifth- to sixth-century fragmentary codex of 104 pages, now divided among three libraries (Vatican City, Biblioteca Vaticana Barberini Lat. 9916 + Sankt Florian, Stiftsbibliothek III.15.B + Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek L 2160; LDAB 1287; TM 60171), that transmits the treatises *On the Trinity* and *Against the Arians* of Hilary of Poitiers. Another collection also deserves mention. Texts both Greek and in Latin are listed among the Pommersfelden papyri; they all date between the fifth and the beginning of the seventh century and certainly come from Ravenna, having arrived in Germany between the tenth and the eleventh century. They belong to a private collection preserved in the Gräflisch Schönborn’sche Bibliothek; on the Latin Pommersfelden papyri, see *P.Pommersf.*: 9–11. Latin texts preserved among the Pommersfelden papyri include portions of an annotated copy of the *Digest*, book 45 (foll. 1–6; LDAB 2556, TM 61412); a still unidentified, unpublished literary text, perhaps Christian (foll. 7–13 *recto*); Evagrius’ *Altercatio Simonis Iudae et Theophili Christiani* (foll. 7–13 *verso*; LDAB 7616, TM 66366); a fragment of the *Gesta municipalia* (fol. 14 *recto* = *P.Ital.* II 59 – V.126); and Nicetas of Remesiana’s *De vigiliis* (fol. 14 *verso*; LDAB 7617, TM 66367). As for the Greek papyri in the collection, traces of Latin are limited to a single word (*facto*) in fr. 10e *verso*; they offer no evidence of bilingualism.

<sup>15</sup> The fifth-century Virgilian bilingual columnar glossary preserved in the lower script of the fragmentary palimpsest parchment codex Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana inv. L 120 sup. foll. 113–20 (MP<sup>3</sup> 2943, LDAB 4156, TM 62964) is probably from the Mount Sinai library (thanks to M. Fressura for sharing this information with me in November 2019) and therefore is not included in the

*CLTP*. This choice might seem surprising, given that the fragment has been listed among the ‘papyri’ since R. Cavenaile included it in his *CPL* (no. 7). Nonetheless, the codex was bought by A. Ratti from the German antique dealer L. Rosenthal in December 1910, when Rosenthal was selling items from St Catherine’s Monastery on Mount Sinai. In fact, all Latin fragments from Mount Sinai – e.g. the commentary on Paul, Ulpian, and perhaps Gaius, the so-called *Fragmenta* and *Scholia Sinaitica*, now lost (MP<sup>3</sup> 2958, LDAB 3526, TM 62361); on the newly discovered Latin manuscript from St Catherine’s, see Brown (2018) – are excluded from the *CLTP* on grounds of provenience; they will be separately treated by the ‘Sinai Palimpsest Project’ led by C. Rapp. Other fragmentary parchment codices transmitting juristic literature lack an archaeological provenience; these are Sankt Gallen, Stiftbibliothek inv. MS 908 foll. 277–92 (fifth century; LDAB 8377, TM 67108), perhaps transmitting imperial constitutions; Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare inv. MS I (1) foll. xi–xii (fifth century; LDAB 7830, TM 66582), with portions of the text of a treatise *De iure fisci* (‘On the Law of the Treasury’); and Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek inv. MS Lat. 1b (fifth century; LDAB 4136, TM 62944), with lines from Ulpian, *Institutes* 2. As for the so-called *Fragmenta Londinensia Anteiustiniana* (*FLA*) – perhaps the only direct witness to the Gregorian Code, preserving numeration and glosses in both Greek and Latin – from the private collection of Christopher de Hamel, its provenience is uncertain, but it has been plausibly argued that these seventeen fragments come from the binding of a codex; research aimed at producing an edition of the *FLA* is being conducted within ‘Project Volterra’.

<sup>16</sup> Not only is the preservation of a papyrus in French Brittany remarkable, but the recently discovered papyrus also has analogies with other Western written material, such as that from Vindolanda. See Tomlin (2022) and in Fournet (2021: 56). The fragment has been dated between the second and third centuries AD on palaeographic grounds due to its use of old Roman cursive script. A few scanty lines (no more than ten) survive. It has been hypothesised that this text in Latin is a personal letter or a memorandum of some kind; the presence of coins in the same archaeological context as the fragment has been taken to suggest that it deals with financial matters. The text remains unpublished, and only a notice in an archaeological report is known, making it impossible to include this papyrus in the *CLTP*. I am grateful to A. Bowman for this information (June 2019).

As for chronological criteria, texts are grouped by century and according to their literary or documentary nature. Within each century, literature – with poetry and prose preceding *incerta* – and paraliterary texts (including grammars, inflectional tables, glossaries, and alphabets), followed by Judaeo-Christian and juristic literature, precede documentary texts. Because of their nature and specific characteristics, imperial constitutions known thanks to papyri mark a link and a divider between literature and documentary praxis.<sup>17</sup> Documents issued by or addressed to official chanceries and legal documents concerning people and property precede fiscal and private accountings. Private letters follow. Military documents are grouped together in a separate section even when they belong to one of these other document types, since they concern administration exclusively within the Roman military milieu in the Eastern empire and its functioning. Uncategorisable documents follow.

Both published and unpublished Latin texts on papyrus are collected in *CLTP*. Particular attention has been paid to previously unpublished items, since these are scattered throughout the world's papyrus collections and are often omitted by collections from lists and databases in order to prevent unauthorised publication of them. For this reason, institutions with papyrological collections were contacted, and in some cases fruitful collaborations were established: many unpublished Latin papyri stored in the Viennese Österreichische Nationalbibliothek; in the British Library in London; in the Hatcher Graduate Library of the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor; in the Beinecke Library of Yale University in New Haven, Connecticut; and on occasion in other collections, have been assigned to contributors to *CLTP*. In some cases, known Latin texts on papyri are not included in *CLTP* since these papyri had been assigned for edition prior to 2014; these texts were accordingly treated as inaccessible and do not appear here.<sup>18</sup>

Maria Chiara Scappaticcio 2020

<sup>17</sup> On imperial constitutions known via epigraphy and papyrology, and on their role in filling lacunae via their textual variants and often augmented versions, see the reference work of Purpura (2009).

<sup>18</sup> Among these are a number of literary texts preserved on papyrus stored in Vienna in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, all apparently transmitting lines of works unknown from the medieval manuscript tradition: inv. L 160 *recto* (first–second century AD; *CLA* XLV 1359, *MP*<sup>3</sup> 3025.11, *TM* 70133); inv. L 16 (second–third century AD; *CLA* X 1520, *MP*<sup>3</sup> 3026.1, *LDAB* 5474, *TM* 64254); inv. L 87 (fourth–fifth century AD; *CLA* X 1530, *MP*<sup>3</sup> 3026.6, *LDAB* 5863, *TM* 64632); inv. L 89 (fourth–fifth century AD, transmitting a prose text mentioning a Claudius; *CLA* X 1532, *MP*<sup>3</sup> 3026.8, *LDAB* 5864, *TM* 64633); inv. L 25 (fifth century AD; *CLA* X 1523, *MP*<sup>3</sup> 3026.3, *LDAB* 6055, *TM* 64817); inv. L 88 (fifth century AD; *CLA* X 1531, *MP*<sup>3</sup> 3026.7, *LDAB* 6059, *TM* 64821); inv. L 158a (fifth century AD, transmitting a few lines from the prologue of the so-called *Hermeneumata Monacensia-Einsidlensia*; see Fressura 2018: 36). Another unpublished fragment in Vienna deserves to be mentioned, namely inv. Pehl. 582 *verso*, copied on the back of P.Rain.Cent. 13 (26); this item is briefly described by Fournet (2019: 79) as perhaps the latest known example of a bilingual record of proceedings, but it is very uncertain whether Latin is present. Unpublished Latin papyri are also stored in Cairo's Egyptian Museum, but although several attempts were made to contact the Egyptian authorities, it proved impossible to request photos or preliminary information about these items, namely: P.Mich. inv. 6311 (first–second century AD, from structure C 63 of Karanis; *TM* 110835); P.Mich. inv. 5950b (second–third century AD, from Karanis); and P.Fay. 159 (*TM* 10793), an official document in Greek dating to AD 175/6, from Bacchias, preserving only the name of the prefect of Egypt Pactumenius

Magnus in Latin. Unpublished, probably documentary Latin papyri are also preserved in the Papyrussammlung of the University of Cologne: inv. 485 (*TM* 70145), inv. 554 (*TM* 70146), inv. 1769 (*TM* 70147). An apparently bilingual Latin–Greek calendar seems to be preserved in an unpublished fragment in Leipzig, inv. 1173 (perhaps second–third century AD). Among the unpublished Latin papyri from the Berliner Papyrussammlung, one from the second–third century AD characterised by legal vocabulary is known, namely inv. 25674; a preliminary analysis of it was presented by T. M. Teeter on the occasion of the 28th Congress of Papyrology in Barcelona ('An unpublished Latin legal text'). Unpublished Latin documentary items are also stored in the papyrological collection of the University of Michigan: inv. 1027 *recto*, inv. 1411, and inv. 2564, all dating to the third century AD and all from Karanis. Note also inv. 24, inv. 5848, inv. 5872d, inv. 1167, and inv. 1412. See also the Michigan fragment inv. 5869z36 + z19 (second century AD), from House C 123 of Tebtynis. P.Tebt. inv. 1051 + 1052 + 1053, a second- to third-century AD documentary Latin papyrus, is also from Tebtynis (stored in Berkeley, Bancroft Library). Three unpublished fifth-century AD records of proceedings are kept in the National Library in Prague, namely P.Wessely Prag. Gr.-Lat. 1 (*ChLA* XLVII 1466, *TM* 70150), P.Wessely Prag. Gr.-Lat. 2 (*ChLA* XLVII 1467, *TM* 70151), and P.Wessely Prag. Gr.-Lat. 3 (*ChLA* XLVII 1468, *TM* 70152). A fourth-century AD Greek document with a Latin dating formula (*PSI* inv. 423) and a sixth-century Italian inventory of charters perhaps from Ravenna (P.Vic. inv. *s.n.*) are preserved in Florence, Papyrological Institute. The Goodspeed Manuscript Collection of the University of Chicago also preserves an unpublished documentary text dating to the second to third century AD, perhaps a contract rather than an edict concerning veterans, but written in any case entirely in Latin with a few lines in Greek (P.Chicago inv. L 331).