

## III.1

## FABLES OF BABRIUS (17, 16, AND 11) TRANSLATED (LATIN–GREEK)

*P.Amh.* II 26: New York (NY), J. Pierpont Morgan Library [inv. Amherst Gr. 26]

Frr. (papyrus roll): fr. 1 (19.3×26 cm) + fr. 2 (21.5×26 cm)

III–IV AD

Egypt

Source: antiquities market (purchased by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, then sold to J. P. Morgan in 1912)

Literature: B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt in *P.Amh.* II 26 (1901); Adams (2003: 725–41); J. Kramer (2007a: 137–44 no. 10: only fr. 2 ll. 4–21); Scappaticcio (2017c: 99–166). Calderini (1945: 31–2 no. 1); *CPL* 40; *CLA* XI 1656; Seider (1978a: 55–8 no. 17); MP<sup>3</sup> 172; LDAB 434; TM 59335

Reference edition (Babrius, *Mythiambi Aesopei*): Luzzatto and La Penna (1986)

This fragmentary roll contains some fables of Babrius and a Latin translation of them: first a partial Latin version of Babrius 16, followed by the Greek of Babrius 17 and 16, a Latin translation of Babrius 11, and the Greek of Babrius 11. This papyrus is of exceptional importance, since the scribe and translator may be the same person, and therefore someone who was (1) a native speaker of Greek learning Latin, (2) able to write in both Greek and Latin scripts and already acquainted with basic Latin grammar, and (3) perhaps doing his exercise in Latin inflectional morphology using a bilingual Greek–Latin dictionary. The scholastic success of the fables of Babrius (together with their moral message) is thus documented here even in contexts where Latin was learned as a foreign language.

The original Greek text of the seventeenth, sixteenth, and eleventh fables of the collection of Babrius appears here in a different order from that in the Byzantine manuscript tradition of the tenth-century codex London, British Library inv. Add. MS 22087 (*Ath.*) and the eleventh-century New York, J. Pierpont Morgan Library 397 (*Nov.*); the fables are in alphabetical order of their initial (Greek) words. The Greek text of Babrius is not analysed here, but see Vaio (2001: xxxi–xxxii). An αἴλουρος (a cat), an ἄγροικος (a countrywoman), and an ἄλωπις (a fox) are the main characters in the fables, and are introduced at the very beginning of the first choliambic verse of each. The Latin translation of the fable of the cockerel unmasking a cat that is trying to conceal itself in order to capture a bird is not extant elsewhere (Rodríguez Adrados 2003: 108–9 H. 81), while a

partial version survives elsewhere of the Latin translation of the fable of the lazy wolf stupidly believing the promises of an old woman (Rodríguez Adrados 2003: 220–1 H. 163); the Latin translation of the fable of the fox with the burning tail is also extant in its entirety (Rodríguez Adrados 2003: 418–19 not-H. 66).

Several enthusiastic scholarly contributions accompanied the publication of the *editio princeps* of *P.Amh.* II 26 in 1901, given the unique character of a Latin translation of the fables of Babrius and the (sometimes amazing) peculiarities of the Latin preserved in the papyrus (Ihm 1902; Radermacher 1902; Calderini 1945: 31–2). The original editors stressed the distinction between the scribe of *P.Amh.* II 26 and the author of the Latin translation: the bad Latin translation gives the impression of having been produced by someone who knew little Latin, and then copied by someone who knew even less and added mistakes on top of mistakes. A different hypothesis was formulated by J. Kramer (2007a: 137–44), according to whom the translator and the scribe were the same person, whose imperfect knowledge of Latin was the main reason for the mistakes. The Latin translation of the fables of Babrius is structured word by word, and mechanically reproduces the word order of the original Greek, with the consequence that the Latin syntax lacks any rules.

The compiler of the Latin translation of the fables of Babrius of *P.Amh.* II 26 had a good knowledge of declensions, although he sometimes failed to recognise the grammatical case; for example, he wrote *spaeorum* for *sperum*, with *spae-* for *spe-* being a hypercorrection (fr. 2 l. 10; see

Adams 2003: 728; Mancini 2004: 178). Verbs are not always correctly translated. No difficulties arise with the translation of active subjunctives and infinitives, but the Greek aorist active participle is always translated with the Latin perfect passive participle, showing that the translator had not fully learned the Latin participles (Adams 2003: 729–30). For example, *auditus* stands for ἀκούσας (fr. 1 ll. 1 ~ 17), *[p]utatus* for νομίσας (fr. 1 ll. 2 ~ 18), and *su[c]census* for ἄψας (fr. 2 ll. 6 ~ 16). In the process of learning a foreign language, the finite (active) verb system preceded the participial system (Adams 2003: 730).

Aberrant forms can often be explained only by keeping in mind how bilingual Latin–Greek and Greek–Latin glossaries and *hermeneumata* were structured. The case of *tulitus* for ἄρας (fr. 1 l. 7 ~ fr. 2 l. 2) is illustrative: the *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* establish a parallel between αἶρω and *tollo* and between the aorist of αἶρω and the root *tul-* (from which *fero* and *tollo* both form their perfects), and it emerges that the translator of *P.Amh.* II 26 was using a glossary in which a translation similar to the *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* was found; it is therefore unsurprising that he mistakenly translated a Greek aorist active participle with a Latin perfect passive participle (Scappaticcio 2017c: 137–8). *Inimfortunam* for ἐχθρόν (fr. 2 ll. 4 ~ 14) might be a *monstrum* generated by mixing the Latin adjective commonly used to translate Greek ἐχθρός, *inimicus*, with a noun accompanying that adjective in the bilingual glossary he was

using, *fortuna*, which was unnecessary in this context (Scappaticcio 2017c: 141–3).

The two non-adjacent fragments come from a roll written exclusively on the *recto* along the fibres. Upper and lower margins of 2.5 and 2 cm survive; each column is 22 cm high and 12–13 cm wide; and the original roll must have been almost [26] cm high. A kollesis is recognisable in both fragments (see Scappaticcio 2017c: 103–4 n. 16). Latin precedes Greek, although the latter is the reference text. Each choliambic verse of Babrius occupies one line, and the corresponding Latin translation of each verse occupies a single line as well, although the Latin lines are longer than the Greek ones.

The Latin and the Greek were copied by a single hand, which was skilled in both scripts. The Latin script is a new Roman cursive characterised by graphic Graecisms and inclined to the right (Ammirati 2015a: 49). The same hand added dividing signs between the Latin translations and the original Greek fables, and often intervened to correct the text with both additions and deletions.

Alongside the aforementioned linguistic peculiarities are examples of expressive gemination (fr. 1 l. 1, *luppus*; l. 6, *luppa*). *B* and *v* are often confused; note e.g. *bulpecula* for *vulpecula* and *binearisq[ue]* for *vinearisque* (fr. 2 l. 4). For further linguistic discussion see Adams (2003: 725–41) and Scappaticcio (2017c: 118–66).

This edition is based on examination of the original papyrus.

M. C. Scappaticcio

fr. 1 (Babr. 16.3–10; Babr. 17, 16.1–7)

<sup>1</sup> Luppus autem audītus anucellam vere dictu[m] [16]  
<sup>2</sup> [p]utatus m[a]nsit quasi parata cenaret.  
<sup>3</sup> Dum puer ‘quidem’ sero dormisset  
<sup>4</sup> [ip]se porro esuriens et luppus enectus [s]ver[e]  
<sup>5</sup> rediuit frigit[is] spebus frestigiatur.  
<sup>6</sup> Luppa en[i]m eum coniugalis interrogabat:  
<sup>7</sup> Quomod[o n]ihil tulitus venisti s[i]cut sole[bas?]  
<sup>8</sup> Et ille [dix]it: Quomod[o enim quis mul[ieri credo?]  
<sup>9</sup> Αἴλουρος ὄρνιν οἰκίης ἐνεδρε[ύων,]  
<sup>10</sup> κόρυκος οἶα πασσάλω[ν] ἀπηρτήθη. [17]

fr. 1 (Babr. 16.3–10; Babr. 17, 16.1–7): 1 oblique stroke above the first *u* of *luppus* 3 interlinear addition by the scribe 4 *ver[e]* corrected in *scribendo* over *ser[e]* 8–9 blank space (1.5 cm) and long horizontal dividing strokes between the Latin translation of Babr. 16 and 17

fr. 1 (Babr. 16.3–10; Babr. 17, 16.1–7): 1, 4 *lupus legendum* 2 *putatus Grenfell et Hunt* 4 *ipse Grenfell et Hunt* | *ver[e] ex ser[e] legi: dubitanter ex eer[e] in apparatu Grenfell et Hunt* 5 *frigidis legendum* | *praestigiatus legendum: vel vestigiatus vel praestigiatus dubitanter in commentario Grenfell et Hunt: praestolatus Ihm (1902)* 6 *lupa legendum* | *enim Grenfell et Hunt* 8 *mulieri cr[edo] Grenfell et Hunt* 9 ὄρνεις *Ath.: ὄρνις Nov. | οἰκίης Ath.: οἰκίειν Nov.* 10 ὥς θύλακός τις *Ath. Nov. | ἀπηρτήθη Ath.: ἀπηρτίση Nov.*

<sup>11</sup> Τὸν δ' εἶδ' ἀλέκτωρ πιτυτός ἀνκυ[λογλώχιν,]  
<sup>12</sup> καὶ ταῦτ' ἐκερτόμησεν ὀξύ φωνήσ[ας]  
<sup>13</sup> Πολλοὺς μὲν οἶδα θυλάκους ἰδῶ[ν ἥδη]  
<sup>14</sup> οὐδείς ὀδόντας εἶχεν μεῖζον αἰλούρ[ου.]  
<sup>15</sup> Ἀγροϊκος ἠπείλησε νηπίῳ τίτθῃ κλαί[οντι·]  
<sup>16</sup> Σίγα, μή σε τῷ λύκῳ ρίψω.  
<sup>17</sup> Λύκος δ' ἀκούσας τήν τε γραῦν ἀληθεύειν  
<sup>18</sup> νομίσας ἔμεινεν ὡς ἔτοιμα δειπνήσων,  
<sup>19</sup> ἔως ὃ παῖς μὲν ἐσπέρας ἐκοιμήθη,  
<sup>20</sup> αὐτὸς δὲ πενίων καὶ χανών λύκος ὄντος  
<sup>21</sup> ἀπῆλθε ψυχραῖς ἐλπίσιν ἐνεδρεύσας.

*fr. 2 (Babr. 16.8–10; Babr. 11; Babr. 11.1–9)*  
<sup>1</sup> Λύκαινα δ' αὐτόν ἢ σύννευος ἠρώτα·  
<sup>2</sup> Πῶς οὐδὲν ἦλθες ἄρας, ὡς πρὶν εἰώθεις;  
<sup>3</sup> Κάκεϊνος. Ὁ δ', εἶπε{ν}, πῶς γάρ, ὅς γυναικὶ πιστε[ύ]ω;  
<sup>4</sup> Bulpecula inimfortun[am] binear[is]que hort[isque]  
<sup>5</sup> peregrina volens circummitti [g]uis saevi[tia]  
<sup>6</sup> codam su[c]census et li[n]ei quidem a[lli]gatus  
<sup>7</sup> sinuit ful[ge]re. [H]anc speculator genius malus  
<sup>8</sup> i[n]fra aruras missuro procedebat  
<sup>9</sup> ignem babbendam. Erat autem tempus sectilis  
<sup>10</sup> et pulcheri fructus spaeorum sorsus  
<sup>11</sup> oportet[er]go serenae magis aut in ἀέqua irasci  
<sup>11bis</sup> nec vidit eius ariis Cereris.  
<sup>12</sup> Est quidam ira ultricis quem custodiamus  
<sup>13</sup> ipsismet ipsis nocentiam ferentes animosali[bus].  
<sup>14</sup> Ἄλῳ[τε]κ' ἐχθρὸν ἀμπέλ[ου] τε καὶ κήπ[ου]

*fr. 1 (Babr. 16.3–10; Babr. 17, 16.1–7):* 11 τόν: possibly a sign like Λ above ο (cf. l. 13) | δ' εἶδ': elision signs by the scribe 13 possibly a sign like Λ over the initial π (cf. l. 11) 20 οντος: the second ο is uncertain; surely not an ω  
*fr. 2 (Babr. 16.8–10; Babr. 11; Babr. 11.1–9):* 3 κα'; coronis sign by the scribe 3–4 blank space (1 cm) and horizontal long dividing strokes between Babr. 16 and the Latin translation of Babr. 11 4 in scribendo correction over an uncertain letter (Λ? Α?) 5 quis corrected in scribendo over guis 6 codam: deleting signs over D 8 in scribendo correction over an uncertain letter (F?) 11 perhaps a paragraphos and a deleted uncertain letter at the beginning of the line | oportet corrected in scribendo over oportec 11bis the line is a later addition between 11 and 12

*fr. 1 (Babr. 16.3–10; Babr. 17, 16.1–7):* 11 εἶδ' Ath.: ἰδεν Nov. | πιτυτός Ath.: λαμπρῶς Nov. | ἀγκυλογλώχιν Ath.: ἀγκυλογλόχῃ Nov. 12 ὀξύ φωνήσας Ath. 13 θυλάκους Ath.: θύλακας Nov. | ἰδῶν Ath.: ὀρῶν Nov. | ἥδη e.g. ab Ath. suppletum: ἴδει Nov. 14 δ' ὀδόντας Ath.: δ' ὄντας Nov. | εἶχε ζώντος Ath.: οὔτως (pro οὔτος) εἶχεν Nov. 15 versus exitum post τίτθῃ habet Ath. 16 παῦσαι Ath. 17 ὁ λύκος Ath. | ἀληθεύειν emendavi 18 δειπνήσων Grenfell et Hunt 19 ἐσπέρας legendum: ἐσπέρης Ath. 20 λύκος χανών Ath. | ὄντως Ath.; ὄντος Grenfell et Hunt 21 νωθραῖς ἐλπίσιν παρεδρεύσας Ath.  
*fr. 2 (Babr. 16.8–10; Babr. 11; Babr. 11.1–9):* 1 σύννοικος Ath. 2 ἄρας ἦλθες Ath. | ὥσπερ Ath. | εἰώθης legendum: εἰώθης Ath. 3 ὁ δ' supra κάκεϊνος scriptum ab ipsa manu: ὁ δ' Ath. | γυναικός Ath. 4 vulpeculam legendum: bulpecula Grenfell et Hunt: bulpeculam Kramer | iniονfortunam Grenfell et Hunt: imfortunam Kramer | vinearisque legendum | hort[isque] Grenfell et Hunt Kramer 5 circummitti (cum Kramer) legendum vel potius circumiect- | quis ex guis legi 6 linei Grenfell et Hunt Kramer 7 sivit legendum 8 infra Grenfell et Hunt Kramer | in rura fortasse legendum: pro intra aruras in commentario Kramer 10 pulchri legendum | sperum legendum: spaeorum Grenfell et Hunt: sp[er]a[rum] Kramer 11 oportet ex oportec legi: ex oportee in apparatu Grenfell et Hunt: oportet Kramer 11bis nec Grenfell et Hunt: ne' c' Kramer 14 ἐχθρὸν Ath. Nov.: in ἐχθρὴν a Babrii editoribus emendatum | ἀμπέλων et κήπων Ath. Nov.

<sup>15</sup> [ξέν]η θελήσας περιβαλε[ῖν τις α]ῖκείη  
<sup>16</sup> [τή]ν κέρκον ἄψας καὶ λίνου τι [πι]ρ[οσδήσα]ς  
<sup>17</sup> ἄφῃκε φεύγειν. Τὴν δ' ἐπί[.]σκοπος [δαίμ]ων  
<sup>18</sup> εἰς τὰς ἀρούρας τοῦ βαλόντος ὠδήγε[ι]  
<sup>19</sup> τὸ πῦρ φέρουσιν. Ἦν δὲ ληίων ὥρη  
<sup>20</sup> καὶ καλλείκαρπος ἐλπίδων πλήρη[ς]  
<sup>21</sup> οὐδ' εἶδεν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἄλωνα Δημήτηρ.

III.2

FABLE OF THE SWALLOW AND THE BIRDS (LATIN–GREEK)

*P.Mich.* VII 457 + *P.Yale* II 104: Ann Arbor (MI), University of Michigan, Hatcher Graduate Library [inv. P. 5604b] + New Haven (CT), Yale University, Beinecke Library [P.CtYBR inv. 1158 (*verso*)]

Frr. (papyrus roll): 8.5×13 cm

III AD  
Tebtynis?

Source: antiquities market (brought to the British Museum by M. Nahman on 17 July 1930; purchased by the University in 1931)  
Literature: H. A. Sanders in *P.Mich.* VII 457 (1947); Roberts (1957: *P.Mich.* VII 457); Parásoglou (1974: *P.Mich.* VII 457 + *P.Yale* II 104); S. A. Stephens in *P.Yale* II 104 (1985); Scappaticcio (2017c: 87–98). *CPL* 80 (*P.Mich.* VII 457); *CLA Suppl.* 1780 (*P.Mich.* VII 457); MP<sup>3</sup> 2917; LDAB 134; TM 59039

This text is a clear expression of how moral values could be taught and circulate together with linguistic training, or could be employed for the latter. The text preserves the fable of the wise, cautious swallow (or owl) whose advice went unheeded by other, less experienced birds. A swallow foresaw something dangerous that would threaten its life and the life of the other birds, so it admonished them to pay attention to this danger; its suggestions were ignored by the other birds, who were later caught, while only the swallow remained safe. On this fable, see Rodríguez Adrados (2003: 54–6 H. 39a–b). Although there is a well-established nucleus to the fable, at least fourteen versions exist. The version preserved here combines two different themes: the swallow

as main character (common; see the *Collectio Augustana* 39b, Hausrath 1957) and the flax (from which nets were woven) as the dangerous plant instead of the more common mistletoe (first attested here; see Rodríguez Adrados 1980: 195). This version of the fable has strong analogies with the medieval *Romulus* fable (24) – both possibly going back to the tradition of the *Collectio Augustana* – and appears neither in Phaedrus’ collection nor in the *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*. Like most of the parallels – see the fables in *P.Amh.* II 26 (III.1), *P.Oxy.* XI 1404 (III.3), and *PSI* VII 848 (IV.17) – this papyrus is evidence of the use and circulation of the fable not simply in educational contexts, but especially in those where the Latin language was taught to and practised by native

III.1: fr. 2 (*Babr.* 16.8–10; *Babr.* 11; *Babr.* 11.1–9): 19 ληίων

III.1: fr. 2 (*Babr.* 16.8–10; *Babr.* 11; *Babr.* 11.1–9): 15 θελήσας περιβαλεῖν τις αἰκείη *Ath.*: *ordo verborum mutatus in Nov.* | ξένη *Ath.*: ξένην *Nov.* | αἰκίη *legendum*: αἰκίη *Ath.*: ἱκίει *Nov.* 16 λίνου *Ath.*: λίνον *Nov.* 17 δ' *Ath.*: δὲ *Nov.* | ἐπίσκοπος *Grenfell et Hunt Kramer* 19 ἦν δὲ ληίων ὥρη *Ath.*: μηδειλίων τὰς ὥρας *Nov.* 20 καὶ καλλείκαρπος (καλλίκαρπος *legendum*) *contra metrum*: καὶ καλλίπαις ἄμητος *Ath.*: τοιθηδὲ πᾶς ἀμειτὸς *Nov.*; καὶ καλλείκαρπος *Grenfell et Hunt*: καὶ καλλ[ε]ίκαρπος *Kramer* 20–1 *versum* (11.8: χρὴ πρᾶον εἶναι μηδ' ἄμετρα θυμοῦσθαι *Ath. Nov.*) *om.* 21 ἄλωνα *Ath. Nov.*

speakers of Greek. The translation below follows the Greek where the Latin is not preserved.

These two contiguous fragments come from a good-quality roll, most of which was originally used to copy a Latin literary text with jurisprudential contents which has been shown to be the oldest example of this category, *P.Mich.* VII 456 + *P.CtYBR* inv. 1158 *recto* (**IB.32**). The fable is copied on the *verso* against the fibres; the left margin is lost and the lower one probably broken.

The entire Latin version of the fable precedes the Greek one; among the bilingual Latin–Greek and

Greek–Latin texts on papyrus, this layout is shared only by the fables of *P.Amh.* II 26 (**III.1**). The same scribe copied both the Greek and the Latin. The Latin script is a non-calligraphic old Roman cursive datable to the third century AD (see e.g. *P.Yale* II: 50; others, e.g. Ammirati 2015a: 40, 49 n. 9, specify the first half of that century). Three Latin lines are extant, while the Greek version of only one and a half of them survives (ll. 1–2 ~ ll. 14–15).

This edition is based on previous editions and photographs.

M. C. Scappaticcio

<sup>1</sup> [. . . . .]aves, cum caperentur, <sup>2</sup> [intellexerunt q]uantum detrimentum  
<sup>3</sup> [. . . . .]consil]io non obtemper[a]re.  
<sup>4</sup> [. . . . .]ἐπεὶ τὸ λί]νον ἐσπάρη, χελιδὼν <sup>5</sup> [. . . . .]ἡπεί]ξατο τὰ λοιπὰ ὄρνεα ὅπως  
<sup>6</sup> [. . . . .] συλλέξαντες ἀφανίσω- <sup>7</sup> [-σι . . . . .]εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀπώλειαν.  
<sup>8</sup> [. . . . .] τὴν συμβουλ[ε]ῖαν <sup>9</sup> [. . . . .]ν . . μετ’ οὐ  
πολύ δέ, ὅτε <sup>10</sup> [. . . . .] δίκτ]υα ἐπλέκετο, ἡ μὲν χε- <sup>11</sup> [-λιδὼν μετήν]εγκεν ἑαυτὴν  
«εἰς δώμα- <sup>12</sup> [-τα ἀνθρώπων] καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὴν στέ- <sup>13</sup> [-γην νεοοσιὰ]ν ἑαυτῇ  
κατεσκεύασεν. <sup>14</sup> [τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ὄρν]εα, ὅτε ἐπιάζοντο, ἐνόη- <sup>15</sup> [-σαν - - -] . .  
- - -

(When the flax was sown, a swallow urged the other birds to assemble quickly and destroy the flax being grown for their destruction ... this plan ... And not much later, when ... nets were woven, the swallow

transferred herself to the houses of men and made her nest under the same roof. But the other) birds, when they were captured, realised how detrimental (it was) ... not to comply with the advice ...

1 . . . sed enim ceterae] aves cum Turner apud Stephens: ]ques cum (tor)]ques in apparatu Sanders: ]quescum (dubitanter an in questum emendandum) Roberts: ] .ques cum Parássoglou | caperentur Parássoglou Stephens: caperen[t Sanders: caperent[ Roberts  
2 intellexerunt Hermeneumatibus collatis supplevi | q]uantum Parássoglou: syco]pantam (sycophantam legendum in commentario) Sanders: ] .antum Roberts: cognoverunt demum q]uantum Stephens | detrimentum Parássoglou Stephens: detrimen[tum Sanders Roberts 3 ]o Sanders: ] .o (dubitanter an consil]io vel bo]no in apparatu) Roberts Parássoglou: esset iis qui consil]io Stephens | obtemper[a]re Turner apud Stephens: obtemper[ant Sanders Roberts: obtemperant Parássoglou 4 ]νον Sanders: [ἐπεὶ τὸ λί]νον Roberts Parássoglou: [vellent. ἐπεὶ τὸ λί]νον Stephens | χελιδὼν Parássoglou Stephens: χέιν[ (χέννιον in apparatu) Sanders: χελι[δὼν φρονιμωτάτη Roberts 5 ]ξατο Sanders: συνελέ]ξατο Roberts: σοφὴ ἡπεί]ξατο Parássoglou: φρονιμωτάτη ἡπεί]ξατο Stephens | ὄρνεα ὅπως Parássoglou Stephens: ὄρν[εα Sanders: ὄρνε[α Roberts 6 ]ου πῆξαντες Sanders: [συλλέξαντες Roberts: τὸ σπέρμα] συλλέξαντες Parássoglou: [ἐκκλησίαν] συλλέξαντες Youtie apud Parássoglou: ταχέως ἐκκλησίαν] συλλέξαντες Stephens | ἀφανίσω- Stephens: ὥφε[ Sanders: ἀφα[νὲς ποι- Roberts: ἀφανήσω- Parássoglou 7 ]οστόλου τῶν ἀπο[ Sanders: ] . .στ .αυτῶν ἀπο[ .[ Roberts: εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀπόλ[αυσιν Youtie apud Roberts: -σι παντελ]ῶς τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀπώλειαν Parássoglou: -σι τὸ λίνον φθόμενον] ἰς τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀπώλειαν Stephens 8 ] τὴν συμβουλ[ήν Sanders: ἀρίσ]την συμβουλ[ήν Roberts: τὰ δ' ἡγνόησαν] τὴν συμβουλείαν Parássoglou: τὰ δὲ κατεγέλασαν αὐτήν] τὴν συμβουλ[ε]ῖαν Stephens 9 ]αφτου πολὺ ἰχ[ Sanders: ] . . . του πολὺ δε[ Roberts: ] .μεφτου πολυδε .[ Youtie apud Roberts: τῆς χελιδόν]ος .μετ' οὐ πολὺ δέ, οὔτε Parássoglou: ὡς ματαιολογίαν οὔσα]ν .μετ' οὐ πολὺ δέ, ὅτε Stephens 10 ]ι λεπτὰ κατὰψυ[ Sanders: ] . ἰά επιτ . .ε . .η .[ Roberts: τὰ λινὰ δίκτ]υα ἐπλέκετο, ἡ μὲν χε- Parássoglou: ἐκ τοῦ λίνου δίκτ]υα ἐπλέκετο, ἡ μὲν χε- Stephens 11 -λιδὼν μετήν]εγκεν ἑαυτὴν ἰς δώμα- Parássoglou: ἦν]εγκεν ἑαυτὴν κ[ Sanders: μετήν]εγκεν ἑαυτὴν ἰς [τὰς οἰκίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων Roberts: -λιδὼν μόνη μετήν]εγκεν ἑαυτὴν ἰς δώμα- Stephens 12 τα ἀνθρώπων] καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὴν στέ- Parássoglou: ] καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὴν] Sanders: ] καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὴν ὀροφὴν Roberts: τα τῶν ἀνθρώπων] καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὴν στέ- Stephens 13 -γην νεοοσιὰ]ν ἑαυτῇ κατεσκεύασεν Parássoglou: ] νέας τῇ κατεσκ[ Sanders: νεοοσιὰ]ν ἑαυτῇ κατεσκ[εύασεν Roberts: -γην ἀδεῶς νεοοσιὰ]ν ἑαυτῇ κατεσκεύασεν Stephens 14 τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ὄρν]εα, ὅτε ἐπιάζοντο, ἐνόη- Stephens: ] ὅτε ἐπιάζοντο [ Sanders: ] . .ὅτε ἐπιάζοντο .[ Roberts: τὰ δ' ἄλλα ὄρν]εα, ὅτε ἐπιάζοντο, ἐνόη- Parássoglou 15 vestigia nemo nisi Parássoglou legit



III.3

FABLE OF THE DOG CARRYING A PIECE OF MEAT

P.Oxy. XI 1404: Wellesley (MA), Wellesley College [inv. P.Oxy. 1404]

Fr. (papyrus roll): 10.6×5.9 cm

III AD  
Oxyrhynchus

Source: Egypt Exploration Society excavations  
Literature: B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt in *P.Oxy.* XI 1404 (1915); Scappaticcio (2017c: 75–86). *CPL* 38; *CLA* XI 1667; Seider (1978a: 61 no. 20); MP<sup>3</sup> 3010; LDAB 136; TM 59041

The fable of the dog carrying a piece of meat is found in the collection of ‘Aesop’ (185 in Chambry 1960<sup>2</sup>), and was taken over from there by Phaedrus (1.4), Babrius (79), and the medieval *Romulus* (6). The theme of greed punished goes back even further, to the Theognidean dog who crosses a brook and loses the staves it is carrying (347–8); on this fable, see Rodríguez Adrados (2003: 174–8 H. 136). The cynic theme of avidity punished lent this fable enormous success and a documented circulation in academic environments. Indeed, it is listed among the examples of a progymnastic opusculum by Aelius Theon (*Progymnasmata* 75), in the corpus of fables of Aphthonius (fable 35), and in the section of fables in the bilingual *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* (*Leidensia* 86.2183–6 in Flammini 2004; *Fragmentum Parisinum* in *CGL* III: 97.19–30). This fragment is doubtless a further example of how the fable circulated, in this case in the educational context of Oxyrhynchus, although the scantiness of the fragment does not allow an exact reconstruction of how the transmitted story fits within what is otherwise known of the textual tradition; see also *P.Mich.* VII 457 + *P.Yale* II 104 (III.2), *P.Amh.* II 26 (III.1), and *PSI* VII 848 (IV.17). The tale as preserved runs as follows: after he found a piece of meat, a dog crossed a river with the meat in his mouth, but when he saw the meat reflected in the water, he thought he was seeing another piece. The text breaks off at this point, but the end is well known: by trying to grab what he thought was another piece of meat, the dog lost the real one. Although it has

been argued that *P.Oxy.* XI 1404 might represent the oldest manuscript witness to a fable of Phaedrus and its reception (Fernández Delgado 2006: 35; Pugliarello 2014: 82–3), it has recently been demonstrated that this fable has stronger analogies with the one known through the *Hermeneumata* and the *Romulus* traditions (Scappaticcio 2017c: 78–82, 86).

The fragment comes from the lower section of a roll, and a blank space of 2.5 cm after l. 4 may represent the lower margin (or part of it). Only Latin lines survive, but nothing keeps us from hypothesising that this was a bilingual text like the Latin–Greek fable of *P.Mich.* VII 457 + *P.Yale* II 104 (III.2). The fable was copied on the *verso* of a document containing accounts in Greek dated to the second half of the second century AD.

The script is an old Roman cursive that slopes to the right, and was copied by an experienced scribe with a tendency towards a chancery style (Cavallo 2008: 161; Ammirati 2015a: 39).

The verb *transire* is conjugated as belonging to the fourth conjugation (l. 2: *t·ransiebat* for *transibat*), as in the same fable in the *Hermeneumata* tradition (see Scappaticcio 2017c: 83). The dropping of the final *-m* in *altera* (l. 4, *altera* for *alteram*) has been explained as the expression of the weakness of the consonant at the end of the word (Lenchantin de Gubernatis 1916: 203; see recently Scappaticcio 2017c: 84–5).

This edition is based on previous editions and on photographs.

M. C. Scappaticcio

— — —  
|<sup>1</sup> canis carnem inv[e]nit et flu-|<sup>2</sup>-men t·ransiebat, deinde cum in |<sup>3</sup> aquam vidisset  
umbram car-|<sup>4</sup>-nis existima[v]it altera

2 transibat legendum 4 alteram legendum

A dog found some meat and was crossing a river, then thought it was another (piece of meat) ...  
when he saw the reflection of the meat in the water, he

III.4

LIVY, *AB URBE CONDITA* 1.5.7–6.1

*P.Oxy.* XI 1379: Oxford, Bodleian Library [inv. MS Lat. class. f. 5 (P)]

Fr. (papyrus roll): 14.3×10.3 cm

III–IV AD  
Oxyrhynchus

Source: Egypt Exploration Society excavations (purchased by the Bodleian Library in 1923)  
Literature: B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt in *P.Oxy.* XI 1379 (1915); R. Funari in *CPS* B.1.1 (2011: 229–37 no. 2). *CLA* II 247; *CPL* 35; Seider (1978a: 95–7 no. 36); MP<sup>3</sup> 2926; LDAB 2575; TM 61430  
Reference edition (Livy, *Ab Urbe condita*): Conway and Walters (1914)

This badly damaged fragment contains a passage related to the assault on Amulius and explicitly mentions Remus and Numitor. The preserved text can be compared to the genuine textual tradition of Livy’s book 1 (for a detailed recent analysis, see *CPS* B.1.1: 229–37). It seems to have preserved different (and more reliable) textual variants at two points (ll. 11–12 and 13–14), but the lacunae prevent us from confirming this impression.

The fragment comes from a papyrus roll. The papyrus – rectangular in shape – preserves the upper margin (3.6 cm) and is broken on the bottom, whereas on the right and left sides the ends and beginnings of the lines are partially preserved. The yellowish colour tends slightly to grey and in some places is darker and more reddish. It is written on the *recto* along the fibres in a brown ink; eighteen lines of text are partially preserved. The *verso* is blank.

The script is a *b-d* uncial, named after two letters that feature a semi-uncial shape. The size of the let-

ters is regular on the whole (measuring 0.3×0.3 cm), but *A*, *B*, and *D* are slightly taller, while *F*, *P*, and *R* (as well as *L* in l. 3) exceed the notional baseline. The interlinear space measures 0.3 cm. The shape of some letters deserves mention: *R* takes a form intermediate between the uncial and the semi-uncial; *N* has a majuscule shape; *H* features an additional stroke at the bottom of the upright. There is a general affinity with *P.Oxy.* XVII 2089 (IV.59). A wide range of dates is possible for this script, from the late third century (*P.Oxy.* XI: 188) to the end of the fourth (*CLA* II: 36). Three punctuation signs are used by the scribe: a medial dot, to indicate a weak (ll. 4 and 17) or a stronger pause (l. 5); a lower dot, to indicate an even weaker pause (ll. 15 and 16); and a high dipole, which marks the end of a sentence (l. 6).

This edition is based on examination of the original papyrus.

R. Funari

[re-<sup>1</sup>gi]am venire pastoribu[s <sup>2</sup>ad reg]em impetum facit; <sup>3</sup>[et a do]mo Numitoris alia <sup>4</sup>[com]parata manu, adiuva[t <sup>5</sup>Rem]us; ita regem optrun-<sup>6</sup>[cat.] N[u]mitor int[er] pri-<sup>7</sup>[-mu]m t[u]multum hos[tes <sup>8</sup>invasi]se u[r]bem at[que <sup>9</sup>adortos r]egiam dict[itans, <sup>10</sup>cum pube]m Albanam [in <sup>11</sup>arcem pra]esidio armis[que

III.4: 4 manu· 5 ]us· 6 ^n[

III.4: 2 ad reg]em Grenfell et Hunt: [±2 reg]em Funari 3 [et a do]mo Grenfell et Hunt: [±3 do]mo Funari 8 [invasi]se Grenfell et Hunt: [±6]se Funari 9 [adortos Grenfell et Hunt: [±6/7 Funari | r]egiam Funari: reg]iam Grenfell et Hunt 10 [cum pube]m Grenfell et Hunt: [±3/4 pube]m Funari 11 [arcem Grenfell et Hunt: [±4/5 Funari

[<sup>12</sup> obtine]ndam avocasset, [. . . |<sup>13</sup> ±8 i]uven[<sup>14</sup> e]nes per[. . . |<sup>14</sup> . . . caed]e pergere ad se  
g[ra-]|<sup>15</sup>-tulantis vidit, extempl[o |<sup>16</sup> advoca]tō ç[on]cilio, sce[le-|<sup>17</sup>-ra in se] fr[at]ris,  
orig[inem |<sup>18</sup> nepotum] ut geniti [- - -]  
- - -

III.5

COLLECTION OF MODEL LETTERS (LATIN–GREEK)

*P.Bon.* 5: Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria [inv. 1 (*recto*)]

Fr. (papyrus roll): 21×137 cm

late III – early IV AD  
Oxyrhynchus?

Source: antiquities market (purchased by A. Vogliano from M. Nahman in 1931)  
Literature: Montevecchi and Pighi (1947; edition by Pighi); Vogliano (1948: 199–216; com-  
mentary by L. Castiglioni and addenda by P. Maas, 407–8); O. Montevecchi in *P.Bon.* 5 (1953;  
with proposals by R. Merkelbach); Merkelbach (1958a: col. I l. 26–col. VII l. 28, only Latin);  
J. Kramer (1983: 109–23 no. 16); P. Cugusi in *CEL* I 1 (1992). *CPL* 279; *CLA Suppl.* 1677;  
Seider (1978a: 94–5 no. 35); MP<sup>3</sup> 2117; LDAB 5498; TM 64278

This anonymous collection of Latin model letters, thematically arranged, has been equipped with a Greek translation, presumably to help learners of Latin as a foreign language. Several stages of the text’s development can be reconstructed. First, the Latin letters were composed by an unknown author or authors; the vocabulary, onomastics, and prose rhythm are consistent with a date from the middle of the first century AD to the end of the second. It is unclear whether they were written as a collection or later assembled into one. Secondly, the collection was equipped with a Greek translation, probably in the Greek East. Thirdly, one or more stages of copying intervened between the bilingual autograph and this roll, since the Greek version preserves some features that have become mechanically corrupt in the Latin (Gitner and Scappaticcio 2023; see also Lucarini 2020).

Thirteen letters are extant, though the first and last are mostly lost; they represent four epistolary sub-genres, which are labelled with bilingual titles that resemble terminology used in the two surviving Greek epistolography manuals, ps.-Demetrius’ Τύποι Ἐπιστολικοί and ps.-Libanius’ Ἐπιστολιμαῖοι Χαρακτῆρες. The sub-genre of the first two letters is not extant but presumably involves gratitude for performing a favour (εὐχαριστικάί or ἀπευχαριστικάί?). The next sub-genres are: advice about stingy bequests (§§3–5); congratulations on receiving an inheritance (§§6–11); and congratulations on manumission (§§12–13). The surviving letters are relevant to Roman law, but they also have gnomic elements, specifically the use of solemn, concluding *sententiae*, and rhetorical features, especially *prosopopoeia*; for epistolography as rhetorical exercise see Aelius Theon,

III.4: 15 vidit. 16 ç[on]cilio. 17 fr[at]ris.

III.4: 12 vel optine]ndam (obtinendam *legendum*): obtinendam *codd.*; [opti]nendam *Grenfell et Hunt*: [±6]ndam *Funari*  
13 [±7/8 i]uven[<sup>14</sup> e]nes *Funari*: postquam iuvenes *codd.* *Grenfell et Hunt* ([postquam i]u[ve]nes) 13–14 per[. . . caed]e *Funari*:  
perpetrata caede *codd.* *Grenfell et Hunt* (per[petrata caed]e), sed l. 13 supplementum litterarum spatium excedit; an peracta?  
16 advoca]tō *Grenfell et Hunt*: [±7] .o *Funari* 16–17 scelera *codd.* plerique *Grenfell et Hunt* *Funari*: scelus M | in se] *Grenfell et Hunt*:  
±4] *Funari* 18 [nepotum] *Grenfell et Hunt*: [±7] *Funari*



*Progymnasmata* 115.22 Spengel (= 70 Patillon). The letters might have been at home in either legal or rhetorical pedagogy, and their content is roughly comparable to the beginner texts found in the *Hermeneumata* collections, but with more complex syntax. It is also possible that they were used as epistolary models by individuals or professional scribes. Two items within the Greek *P.Paris* 63 (Memphis, second century BC) identified as model letters by U. Wilcken (*UPZ* I 144 and 145) might offer a typological parallel. In any case, this text is unique as the only extant Latin representative within the ancient genre of model letter collections.

Many of the Latin mistakes are plausibly explained as transmission errors (§4.1, *cum<mut>et*; §5, *pr[os]-[b]]'éras <res>*; §10.1, *<non>*; §12.3, *<fortunam>*). When such errors are fixed, the Latin becomes much more proficient, with an ambitious handling of complex subordinate clauses, usually idiomatic word placement, and classical quantitative clausulae. Several collocations can be paralleled in Roman literature (see Gitner and Scappaticcio 2023). Furthermore, the general content of the letters implies a Roman context, with reference to *clientes* and an interest in inheritance and manumission. All the names are Roman, including two *praenomina* (Quintus, §2.1; Publius, §4.1), three *gentilicia* (Licin(n)ius, §3.1, §5, and §9.1; Rutilius, §8.1; Sulpicius, §10.1), and one *cognomen* (Fabianus, §11.1). Nevertheless, for direct address only the vocative *frater* is used. This suggests a period when *tria nomina* were still in use but direct address by name had fallen out of practice, which is consistent with a date in the first or second century AD (see Dickey 2002: 44–5). The loss of six to ten letters at the left of the first column makes the reconstruction of this portion difficult, especially since the meaning of the Greek is unclear (especially col. I ll. 11–21). The text appears to have suffered corruption at §12.3 (col. VII ll. 14–19).

By contrast, the Greek translation is clearly secondary to the Latin. Several errors must have arisen through misunderstanding or excessively literal translation (e.g. §8.1, ἐπαφρεδεῖσῖα as a calque on *veneratio*; §12.4, στήλη for *titulus*, ‘claim to distinction’). Some of these may have arisen from over-reliance on a bilingual glossary, and several similarities with surviving glossaries can be identified, without any consistent agreement. Nevertheless, the translator has aimed for more freedom and variation than is typical of a language-learning text;

for example, he translates the same Latin word with multiple Greek synonyms (e.g. *gaudeo*, *obsequium*, *remunerari*, *titulus*) and renders a Latin finite clause freely as a genitive absolute (§2.3). The hapax ὑπείκῖα is found as a translation of *obsequium* (§3.2). The document also contains the only ancient occurrences of συγχαριστικός (in titles at col. VII l. 2 and perhaps col. III l. 13), elsewhere only attested in the Byzantine additions to ps.-Libanius (61.12 in Weichert 1910).

The text is copied on the *recto* of a roll, from which three contiguous and conspicuous fragments are extant. A Greek account dating to the very beginning of the fourth century is copied on the *verso* (*P.Bon.* 38). The extant fragments preserve at least five kolleseis. Seven double columns with Latin on the left and Greek on the right side survive; each column is 12.5–13 cm high and c. 18 cm wide, and bears 26–9 lines. The space between columns measures c. 3 cm. The Greek and Latin columns regularly start at a distance of 10 cm from each other. An upper and a lower margin of 3 and 3.5 cm are recognisable.

Both the Greek and the Latin scripts are copied by the same scribe, and the form of some letters is identical in the two alphabets, although effort to differentiate them is also evident. The Latin script is a primitive minuscule without cursive elements, which is comparable to that of the Livy papyrus *P.Oxy.* IV 668 + *PSI* XII 1291 (II.7). Both are among the latest surviving evidence for the book-roll format (Ammirati 2015a: 47). The title of each letter genre in both Latin and Greek is centred between the double columns and framed by horizontal lines; for a similar use of horizontal lines to highlight focus concepts see the grammar from Karanis, *P.Mich.* inv. 4177p *verso* + *P.Lond. Lit.* II 184 + *P.Mich.* VII 429 (II.12). The first word of each model letter is written in ekthesis with an enlarged first letter, in both Latin and Greek; a paragraphos is regularly employed to separate the letters. Interpunction occurs both to divide words and sporadically in compound words. Corrections in the form of deletions and superlinear additions survive, written by the original scribe. For instance, at §5 the scribe corrected the mistaken *prosberas* with deletion and superlinear addition (cf. §5 where *parem gratum* was corrected to *parum grate*). Some scribal mistakes were left uncorrected (§9.2, *remuneantur* for *remune<r>antur*, against §2.3), and they make the text difficult to understand at several points.

There are a few non-standard spellings: *meamor[e]m* for *memorem* (§9.1), *bae[nis]se* for *venisse* (§6, *b* for *v* and hypercorrect *ae* for *ē*, if the supplement is correct), *boluit* for *voluit* (§10.1). Other unusual spellings have classical authority: *cum<mut>et* (§4.1, unless *cum* has arisen by error), *narant* (§4.1), and *suppremus* (§3.3, §6, §9.1). Typical of a Greek milieu is the geminate *Licinnium* (§3.1, §5, but *Licinium* at §9.1). The form *sequiens* (§12.3) is unique. The Latin shows some unusual syntax: there are four genitives of cause (§2.2 twice, §10.1, §11.1), which have been regarded as corruptions; a concessive *cum* clause appears with the indicative (§7.2); the construction of *per* with the genitive is unparalleled (§9.2); and there is a *constructio ad sensum* in gender agreement (§12.4). Verbal diathesis occasionally departs from the classical norm, as in the deponent *compertus sum* (§3.1), active *hortarem* (§3.2), and active *remuneravit* (§10.1 and passive at §4.1; but deponent at §2.3); all are paralleled in literary works of the first century AD. *Parum* is used to intensify, rather than negate, a negative (§4.1). The subjunctive *procerit* (§8.2) depending on *videbatur* does not correspond to the participle in Greek and seems unlikely to be original. The neuter *genium* (§2.3), if correct, is also noteworthy. Semantic peculiarities possibly relevant to dating the Latin composition are §8.2, *etiam* used concessively (first attested at Columella 12.52.2), and §10.1, *praestantia*, ‘generosity’ (first attested in an Antonine decree: *Inscr. Ital.* X.4 31.27). We discuss these and other errors and peculiarities in Gitner and Scappaticcio (2023).

In the Greek translation, there is some uncertainty in the spelling of vowels: *ει* appears for *ι* both in the case of etymologically long *ι* (§6, *τειμῆς*; §7.2, *γε[ίνε]ται*; §8.1, *ἐπαφρεδειςίς*; §8.2, *ἔκρειν[ε]*; §9.1, *τείς[αντα]* and *ἡμεῖν*) and when it is etymologically short (§11.1, *ἐπειφόρη[μ]α{ι}*), and *ε* is substituted for *ο* in the third syllable of *ἐπαφρεδειςίς* (§8.1). Note also *ἐπειδεάν* (§12.2). The prefix *συν-* remains unassimilated throughout. Strikingly the scribe wrote a Latin *l* and *c* in the name *L[ic]c[us] ἡ ἰννιον* before correcting only the *c* (§5). Some

likely errors are the participle written as an infinitive (§3.2, *ἐμνημονευ[κέ]ναι* for *-κότα*) and the omitted infinitive ending (§10.1, *καταλελοιπέναι*). Scribal error also accounts for *μέν* (§11.1) and perhaps the loss of *ἡθῶν* (§4.1). *Αὐτός* is sometimes written *ἄτός* (§2.3, §12.2, but with *αυ* at §7.2, §10.1, §10.2, and twice at §11.1). Its genitive *αυτου* appears both as a third-person possessive (e.g. §7.2, §10.1) and as a reflexive possessive (§5, §9.1), apparently contrasting with emphatic reflexive *ἑαυτῶν* (§6); in the latter passages reading either *αὐτοῦ* or *αὐτοῦ* could be defended. *Οἶδαμεν* (§12.1) is used for classical *ἴσμεν*. The article is often omitted where classical usage requires it (e.g. §3.1, §3.3, §4.1, §5, §7.2, §11.1), perhaps due to Latin influence; its function is obscure at §2.3 (*τὸν ἀχάριστον*), and it is once used for a relative pronoun (§10.1, *τό*). Syntactically the Greek often stays close to the Latin idiom, even where this produces peculiar constructions (e.g. imitation of the connecting relative at §3.2; cf. §4.1, §8.1, and perhaps §2.1, *οὗ τό*). The hanging nominatives at §2.2 (*ἡ αἰδημοσύνη ... καὶ ἐνκράτεια*) in a damaged portion of the text are difficult to explain. The perfect indicative is used in a *ἵνα* clause expressing result (§12.4). In addition to the calques mentioned above, note also §6, *παρακολουθία* (calqued on *obsequium*; first attested in Epiphanius, *Panarion* 48.13 (fourth century AD)). Other words are used in senses that clearly parallel the Latin: §3.2, *ὀλίγον* (for *parum*, ‘hardly’); §10.2, *ὑπόστασις* (for *substantia*, ‘property’); §12.2, *καθ’ ἰδίαν* (for *peculiariter*, ‘in particular’). These are only some of the peculiarities resulting from the translation, and we have largely omitted discussion of §2, where the reconstructed Latin is extremely uncertain.

The apparatus cites divergent readings from Vogliano, Montevecchi, Kramer, and Cugusi. Pighi’s preliminary readings, superseded by Montevecchi, have been excluded to save space. Vogliano’s readings, though published after Pighi, derive from his personal inspection of the papyrus in 1931–2. This edition is based on examination of the original papyrus.

A. S. Gitner and M. C. Scappaticcio