

# *How Coptic speakers learned Latin? A reconsideration of P. Berol. inv 10582*

Article

Published Version

Dickey, E. (2015) How Coptic speakers learned Latin? A reconsideration of P. Berol. inv 10582. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 193. pp. 65-77. ISSN 0084-5388 Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/39386/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

Published version at: [http://www.habelt.de/index.php?id=27&tx\\_shpsystem\\_pi1\[mode\]=0&tx\\_shpsystem\\_pi1\[journal\]=ZPE&tx\\_shpsystem\\_pi1\[HeftNr\]=193](http://www.habelt.de/index.php?id=27&tx_shpsystem_pi1[mode]=0&tx_shpsystem_pi1[journal]=ZPE&tx_shpsystem_pi1[HeftNr]=193)

[http://www.habelt.de/index.php?id=27&tx\\_shpsystem\\_pi1\[mode\]=0&tx\\_shpsystem\\_pi1\[journal\]=ZPE&tx\\_shpsystem\\_pi1\[HeftNr\]=193](http://www.habelt.de/index.php?id=27&tx_shpsystem_pi1[mode]=0&tx_shpsystem_pi1[journal]=ZPE&tx_shpsystem_pi1[HeftNr]=193)

Publisher: University of Koeln

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

[www.reading.ac.uk/centaur](http://www.reading.ac.uk/centaur)

**CentAUR**

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

ELEANOR DICKEY

HOW COPTIC SPEAKERS LEARNED LATIN?  
A RECONSIDERATION OF P.BEROL. INV. 10582

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 193 (2015) 65–77

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## HOW COPTIC SPEAKERS LEARNED LATIN? A RECONSIDERATION OF P.BEROL. INV. 10582

The trilingual colloquium preserved in P.Berol. inv. 10582 is a fascinating document, offering as it does a glimpse into a moment when some language learner(s) used Latin, Greek, and Coptic in the same text.<sup>1</sup> The text on the papyrus<sup>2</sup> is a cross between a dialogue and a phrasebook, evidently intended for early-stage language learning, with the Latin transliterated into Greek script. First published by W. Schubart in 1913,<sup>3</sup> the text was largely neglected until Johannes Kramer re-published it in the context of more information about ancient language-learning materials (1983: no. 15, 2010).<sup>4</sup> Despite the considerable advances made by Kramer, further improvement is possible both in the text and interpretation of the colloquium and in making it comprehensible to readers, so a revised edition and translation are offered here.

The papyrus has no archaeological context (it was purchased on the antiquities market in Egypt in 1904) but can be dated to the fifth or sixth century AD from the script, which has Coptic tendencies. Kramer expressed a preference for the fifth century and Schubart for the sixth, but both believed that it could come from either century.<sup>5</sup> The papyrus has been badly damaged; not only are there numerous holes, particularly in the middle of the page, but a chemical solution used by Schubart (1913: 34) to make the ink more readable has caused it to run, so that many lines are now illegible. Fortunately not all parts of the papyrus were treated with the solution (some small fragments that had escaped Schubart's attention and hence his chemicals emerged in the 1980s), and photographs of the text before the chemical damage also exist. Nevertheless I have not been able to read (or, in some cases, even find) some letters that appear to have been present when earlier editors saw the text. In those situations I have respected the earlier editors' readings and merely added dots or brackets to indicate the current condition of the papyrus.

The papyrus is a single leaf from a codex 27 cm high and 19 cm wide, containing two columns on each side; each line in each of these columns contains a Latin word in Greek transliteration, a double point, a Greek word, another double point, and then a Coptic word.<sup>6</sup> The columns are somewhat wider than could conveniently be fitted onto the page, so the second column on each page has an irregular left margin as it wraps around the line-ends of the first column. Occasionally a long phrase is continued on the following line, which therefore ends up unusually short; these continuations are usually marked with paragraphoi. This layout is a significant handicap for a reader (or editor), because the way the boundary between the two columns fluctuates means that it is not always certain which column a word was supposed to belong to. Because the Latin is in Greek script and the Greek and Coptic alphabets are effectively identical except in a few letters, it is not possible to distinguish the different languages by their alphabets: one has to decipher the words first and then decide which language they belong to, and this situation combined with the layout has naturally led to some disagreements about the interpretation of letters in the middle of the page. I attempt to reproduce the original layout here, but because modern readers are used to reading Greek and

---

<sup>1</sup> I am extremely grateful to Fabian Reiter and the staff of the Neues Museum in Berlin for allowing me to see the original document despite the considerable complications involved, for providing me with excellent photographs, and for help with some readings. I am also very grateful to Rachel Mairs and Daniela Colomo for help with the Coptic, and to Jürgen Hammerstaedt, Martin West, and Philomen Probert for reading this article and suggesting numerous corrections. All mistakes that remain are my own.

<sup>2</sup> The papyrus is number 3009 in *M-P*<sup>3</sup> (<http://promethee.philo.ulg.ac.be/cedopal/indexsimple.asp>), 6075 in *LDAB* (<http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/>), and I 609 in Beltz's catalogue of the Berlin Coptic manuscripts (Beltz 1978: 98).

<sup>3</sup> This edition was reprinted by Cavenaile (1958: no. 281).

<sup>4</sup> Kramer's 1983 edition was reprinted by Hasitzka (1990: no. 270).

<sup>5</sup> See Schubart (1913: 28) and Kramer (1983: 97, 2010: 558); the fifth-sixth century date is also given by Cavenaile (1958: 394) and Hasitzka (1990: 210).

<sup>6</sup> This layout is normally altered in modern editions of the papyrus, but see the comments by Ammirati and Fressura (forthcoming: §5).

Coptic in distinctly different fonts the Latin and Greek are here transcribed in a Greek font and the Coptic in a Coptic font.

The Coptic version of this text is highly problematic. It was evidently composed and/or copied by someone with a poor understanding of the language, and it has then been edited by a succession of scholars with little knowledge of Coptic. The only attention this text has received from a real Coptic scholar came in 1985 from Wolfgang Brunsch, who made some corrections to the Coptic on the basis of Kramer's 1983 edition; Kramer later incorporated those corrections into his 2010 edition. But Brunsch must have worked from the edition rather than a photograph or the original, for the Coptic readings have in a number of places ended up incompatible with the preserved traces: they may be what the scribe should have written or even what he intended to write, but they cannot be what actually stood on this papyrus. I am not in a position to solve this problem fully, since I am not a Coptic expert either. I have therefore decided that the best solution for now is to alert scholars to the problem, remove from the text the readings that cannot be reconciled with the traces on the papyrus, and include in the notes explanations of the difficulties; I hope that some day soon a real Coptic scholar will re-edit this text.

This edition is based on a personal examination of the papyrus as well as numerous photographs from different dates.

Diplomatic transcript:

	column 1	Recto	column 2	
			<i>traces</i>	
1	ομνιβουc:παcιν·ογoηηηε; : ακκoυμβεντιβoυc:τοicανακει —μενοιc:εcηηκεβολ:ογτη[ρ]oγ; : αι:ομνηc:ειπαντεc:εcχεντο	φηκι:εποηηαc;[αιειρε] ακκενδιτε:αναπαται: . . . . . : λουκερ[ν]αc:τουcλυχνου[c]:ηηηεc		36
5	βιβεριντε:επιαν:αγωφ; τεργε:καταμαξον:βωτι: μενcaμ:τηντραπεζαν: αδπωνιτε:θεται:ογωφ ινμενδιουμ:ειcτομεcον:	πεμπαται:αγωφαρωο'πηνχοογ ομνηc:παντεc σερμω: ομιλια:πωαχετηρογ κω[τιδια]νουc:καθημερινη: _ηεεηηηηε:		40
10	κανδελαβραc:τα[cλυχνι]αc ηηκαηηηααι· κοιδ'φακιμουc ετακκεντιδε:κ[αιαναη]αταιαγωχωρο τιποιουμεν:τηηρογ λουκερναc:λου [. . . . .]:ηηηεc: φρατερ:αδελφε διλουκε:φωθ[ιcον:ρογοειη] δατενοβιc:δοτε[ημιν: . . . . .]	[λι]βε[ν]τερτη:ηδεωcσε:†ηαγωφαι εαιπηεηηατεροκ: πθεροκ		45
15	βελλαρια:τραγηματα: ουνοεντουμ:μυρογ:cτοι δικιτε:ειπατε:χοοc ομνηc:παντεc:ετηρητη φιλικιτερ:ευτωχοc	βιδεω:ορω: ετεγωδη:καγωσε:αγωαηοκτοκ· δομινε:δεcποτα:πχοειc: ετωc:καιημειc:αγωαηοη:		50
20	βενενωc:καλωχημαc[:] ακκιπιcτι:εδ[εξω:] ετρεγαλιτερ:καιβραc[ιλικω]c: ουτ:τιβι:ωc:coi:ηε[εετc]ραηηακ δεκετ:αρεκει	νεcκ[ιω]:ουκοιδα:ηηηcοογηηη κοic:τιc:ηηη: οcτιcουμ:τηνθυραν:μηπρο: πω'λατ:κρουει:πεcηωαλ εξειητο:εξελη[ε]:ηηηογβολογη:		55
25	νηκοιδ:μητι:μηπωφc: βουλιc:βουλεcθαι:ηηετηνογωφ ικδορμρε:ενταυθα:κοιμηθηηαι:εηηκοτρηηηηα:	κιτωφοραc:ταχεωεξω: κωβοληηηηηη:		60

- κουοδερωετ:οτιοψεεστιν:χερογρφε:ετδικε:καιμαθε:  
 εστινοκ καιεντουτω:αγωρ̄ηπαϊ αγωειμη:  
 30 γρατια:χαριτα:†ψ[επ]ειηθ:οτιημοτ [κο]ι:εετ:τι:ε[ε]τιν:ηημη:  
 αβημο:εχομεν: . . [ . . ]πτ αυτκοι[εμ:]ητινα:η . . ω ηησληηη: 65  
 ουτιουσσει:τι:ωκ[εκελευκα: πετι:αναζητει]:  
 κουοδβω:ουμει:†πετετη ]κωτει:  
 βουλι:τι:βουλεθε:†τε[τηογωω α]βουρηλιω:απα[υρ]ηλιου  
 35 εγωμεουμ:εγωτορεμον:ακοκπε:†πρωι:  
 βηνι:ηλθεν:†αει:

Textual notes: Latin and Greek (NB ‘Kramer’ refers to his 2010 edition)

- 12 λου[κερνωκ] Schubart (in the Greek); τωρ[ λωχνουκ] Kramer. Kramer’s reading receives strong support from the parallel in line 38 and may well be what the scribe intended, but it cannot be what he originally wrote, as the λ at the start of the Greek is unmistakable.  
 13 αιδουμε: ψωθ[ιων] Schubart  
 21 κεδε[ξ]ω Kramer  
 26 βουλεσκαι Kramer  
 28 κε οτι οψε εστιν Kramer  
 32 κ[εκελ]†εϋ[κ]ακ Kramer

Textual notes: Coptic (NB ‘Kramer’ refers to his 2010 edition)

- 1 ΟΥΟΗ ΗΗΗ Kramer and Schubart, making sense in Coptic, but the last letter is certainly not Η  
 3 Thus Schubart, suggesting scribal error for εϸ[ρω] εβωλ; Kramer reads εϸ[ηχ] εβωλ, which at Brunsch’s suggestion he takes to be scribal error for εϸ[ηηχ] εβωλ, but there is certainly no horizontal at the bottom of the fourth letter. The line drawn around the end of this line and the next seems to indicate that ογ†η[ρ]ογ is to be taken at the end of line 4  
 6 βωηη Schubart  
 7 Schubart suggests that the Coptic was omitted here because it would be identical to the Greek  
 10 Kramer suggests that ηηκληηηλλ is scribal error for ηηκληηηλλβρλ  
 11 Kramer suggests that αγωχρφο is scribal error for αγω χερο  
 12 Kramer suggests that ηηηβω is scribal error for ηηηβω  
 18 Kramer suggests that ε†ηη†ηη is scribal error for ηηηηη  
 19–22 Schubart suggests that the Coptic was omitted here because it would be identical to the Greek  
 24 Schubart suggests that the Coptic was omitted here because it would be identical to the Greek  
 26 Both Kramer and Schubart read the Coptic thus, but the second τ does not have a crossbar; it looks exactly like ι  
 27 Thus Schubart; κειηκοτκ ηηηηλ Kramer, but there is no space for the κ, and the Coptic is perfectly good without it  
 30 †ψ[ηπ]ειηθ:οτιημοτ Kramer, following Brunsch who thinks this would be scribal error for †ψηημοτ εηηοτη – but the lacuna is too big to have only one letter in it, and Rachel Mairs suggests the legitimate variant †ψ[επ]ειηθ:οτιημοτ, which would fit better. Schubart read only ψ[ηημοτ], but since then an additional fragment has provided part of the rest of the words  
 31 Traces after the Greek, left undeciphered by Schubart, are probably Coptic; Kramer reads them as ημοτ, but that would be both redundant (since it already appeared on the previous line) and the wrong word to repeat if one were going to repeat something here (since it means ‘thanks’ rather than ‘have’ or ‘give’). The traces remaining indicate that the word here would have been at least five letters long and end in something like ηη  
 33–4 To match the Latin and Greek the Coptic ought to have ‘what you’ on line 33 and ‘you desire’ on 34. Schubart left 33 blank and in 34 read τε[τηογωω], with a note saying that Plaumann suggested τω[βη]. Schubart’s reading of 34 fits the traces well and works linguistically if one assumes that the scribe was

- aiming for ΝΤΕΤΝΟΥΩΨ ‘you desire’, as in line 26, but accidentally omitted the first Ν; it is however incomplete without ‘what you’ on line 33, where Rachel Mairs accordingly suggests the supplement ΠΕΤ ΕΤΗ. Kramer took a different tack, restoring on 33 [ΠΕΤΕΤΗΤΩΒΞ], which means ‘what you desire’ and therefore translates the Latin and Greek of both 33 and 34; in 34, following a suggestion of Brunsch, he read ΗΜ[ΟΩ], which is incompatible with the surviving traces
- 35 Kramer suggests (1983: 105) that ΔΚΟΚ (which makes no sense but is certainly the reading on the papyrus) is scribal error for ΔΝΟΚ ‘I’; Schubart reads ΔΝΟΚΠΕ ΤΑΠΤΗ . . .
- 36 Kramer supplements this line with ΔΕΙΡΕ, but Daniela Colomo points out that it should be ΔΙΕΙΡΕ
- 37 Kramer suggests ΧΡΟ here, as scribal error for ΧΕΡΟ, but a longer word than ΧΡΟ or even ΧΕΡΟ is needed
- 38 ΚΗΚΗΒΕC Kramer; ΗΚΗΒΕC Schubart; ΗΚΗΒΕC was suggested by Rachel Mairs
- 42 ΗΨΑΧΕΤΗΡΟΥ Schubart, which is equally possible from the traces but does not make sense
- 46 Kramer suggests that ΤΗΑΡΟΥ is scribal error for ΤΗΝΑΡΟΥ; Schubart read †ΤΗΝΑΡΟΥ, but there is not enough space for that
- 48 Brunsch suggests that ΨΑΙ may be scribal error for ΨΑΡΟΙ
- 49 ΕΙΔΙΠΘΕΝΕ ΕΡΟΚ: ΠΘ ΕΡΟΚ Kramer, but the middle of this does not fit the traces; ΞΕΡΟΚ: ΤΙΘΕΡΟΚ Schubart, who did not have the fragment containing the first part of this phrase
- 50 There is no good explanation for the omission of the Coptic here; it would not have been the same as the Greek (as is the case in many other places where the Coptic is omitted) but rather †ΗΔΥ
- 51 Kramer suggests that ΔΥΩΔΝΟΚΤΟΚ is scribal error for ΔΥΩ ΔΝΟΚ ΝΤΟΚ
- 58 Kramer’s {Π}ΕCΧΩΞ is a typographical error; he clearly intended to follow Brunsch’s suggestion that the text has ΠΕCΧΩΞ, scribal error for ΕCΧΩΞ. Schubart reads ΠΕCΧΩΞ and suggests that this is scribal error for ΠΕCΧΩΞ
- 59 ΗΜΟΥΒΟΛΟΥΗ is Schubart’s reading and what stands on the papyrus; the dots on either side of the initial Η indicate expunction, which fits with the fact that the Η should not be there, but the final ΟΥΗ, which makes no more sense, is not expunged. Kramer reads {Π}ΔΜΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΔΗΠΗ, incompatibly with the surviving traces
- 61 ΚΩΞΟΛΔΗΠΗ Schubart
- 63 ΔΥΩΕΙΜΕ: Traces of about three additional letters appear below and to the right of this word; it is unclear whether they belong to this line or to the following one, as they are aligned with neither
- 64 Both Kramer and Schubart read ΗΙΜΠΕ, but the last letter has a long vertical and seems most unlikely to be Ε; it looks like Η
- 65 ΗΟ[ ]ΚΩΤΗΝCΔΝΙΜ Schubart; ΗCΥΧΩC Η ΗCΔ ΗΙΜ Kramer, but this does not fit the traces and does not make sense in the Greek context
- 69 †ΔCΔ! Schubart, with note suggesting that this is scribal error for ΔCΕΙ

		Verso		
		column 1	column 2	
70	[γουντιο]υμ:φασιν:ογογψ: [τουλι]τ: ηνεγκεν:αειειηη κ[λα]μα:καλεσον:μογτε ιλλουμικ:αυτονεν[τ]αυθα:ροδεπ[ιμα:] κουδ'εστ:τιεστιν[ε]ογογπε:	κουοδο:οτι μουλτω:πολλω:ζηζαζ: τεμπορε:τωχρονω:πιογψ: λιττεραc: γραμμααc: ατη: αποcου:zeitootk	107	
75	πουερ: παι:πκογι! κοιδ':τι:ηιμ: νουιτιαc:αναγγελε[ιc:] [ομ]για:παντα βενε:καλωc	νονακκιπι: ουκελαβον:ηπιχι: ποcτμουλτουμ: μεταπολυν: ..... ν .....:ηηηηcζαζ: εργο:τοιγαρτοι: τεμπουc: [χρον]ογ	110	115
80	μαξιμουc:μαξιμοc: τηβουλ:cε[β]ολεται:cογοφκ:	μιττεμ[ι:αποc]τιλογμοι:δηνιτcηηα: [επιcτουλα]μ: επιcτολην		

	καλουταρε[.]απαααθ[αι:ψιηε: ουτιλ]αριου:ιναιλαρο:	
	ουβιετ:πουεστιν:ατ[ωη]:	__ξε]ογροτ:
	φορα:εξω:βολ	φια[μ:γε]νηθω:τηαψωπε
85	στα:ισταται:ααζερατ:	απαααψιηε:
	βενιατ:ελθατω:μαρεαει:	ομνι:τουω:παντα:τουσσου:
	ιντρο:ενδον:ριογη	__ηε]τηημακτηρογ:
	βενε:καλω:εαερψαη	βενιατ:ελθατω:μαρεαει
	βενιτσι:ηλθαα:ακει	ιντρω: ενδον:ριογη:
90	καλουταντ:απαζονταιε:	βο [ . . . . ] . . ε . . . . .
	__εογασπασεμοοκ:	ομ [ . . . . . ] . . . . .
	τηνφανατης:εταβρεφη:	ετ [ . . . . . ] . . . . .
	__ηκεε	ακουτ[:κα]θω:
		[π]ερηρηριη: οιξενοι:νωημο:
	επαρεντης: καιοιονει:ηηηιοτε . . . κ θ . . . εμοτ:	
95	ιτορουμ:αυτων:ηωγ	ν . . . . . c:χενεζτοογ:
	μιηρουντ:επεμψαν:αχχοογκαεβιγιλια: αγρυπνεις:κρησ:	
	τιβι: αυτεμ:κοιδε:	νεκεσσιτ:α:ηαναγκη:
	ανκ: ταυτην:τα!	φηκιμη: εποιησενμε:αααατ:
	επιςτουλαμ:τηγ[επι]στολη	βιγιλιαρε: αγρυπνησαι: . . . ρησ:
100	περ: πουερουμ[:διατ]ουπαιδο:	προ[δεα]μους:προελθωμεν:
	__ριηηκογι[ . . . . . ] . . .	μαρ[ηηπρο]ελαθε:
	αιγναταμ[:εσφραγιμενην:]	[ινλουμ]εν:ειςυ[παιθ]ρον:
	ετβαλδη[:κ]αιπαυ: . . . η[ . . . ] . . ριβαλ	
	κονστηρηατουσσουμ:	κουρρε:δραμε:πωτ:
105	ελυπηθη:ααρχολη:	ινδομουμ:ειςτηνοικιαν
	φρατερ:αδελφε:πσοη:	

Textual notes: Latin and Greek (NB 'Kramer' refers to his 2010 edition)

78 [ο]μινα Kramer

81 [βο]υλεται Kramer; [βουλεται] Schubart; there is definitely no υ on the papyrus

96 μιερονντ Kramer

101–2 There are traces of three letters towards the end of one of these lines; Kramer takes them as the *eme* of *εσφραγιμενην* in 102, but this cannot be right because the first letter is not *c*, they appear to come at the end of the line and certainly do not leave space for three more letters to the right, and they occur directly below line 100. I have therefore attached these traces to 101; if that placement is correct they are probably Coptic rather than Greek

105 ελυπητη Kramer

114 κλεου ην τα Schubart; [μ]ηκουμ Kramer, but that is far too short for the surviving traces and does not make sense; the Coptic of this line translates 113 and therefore does not help here

115 ]ις Schubart

116 ]λε Schubart

117 απος]τιλογμοι: . . . ηηαι Schubart; μιττε:[αποστι]λονμοι:αηιτσηηαι Kramer

127 βου[ . . . ] ειε ν εν Kramer; βογ[ . . . ]ειετ . . . Schubart

128 ομν[ Kramer and Schubart

129 ετ [ . . . ]ογ Kramer; ετ . . . [ . . . ]οι: Schubart

131 κοιξενον Kramer

132 . . . :κοθε Schubart, plausibly in view of the preserved traces but without making sense; κουρ:τι Kramer, fitting in with his reading of the next two lines to give 'why have you been awake since dawn?' but implausibly in view of the traces



- 133 This line ought to contain Latin and Greek terms for ‘from dawn’, as that is the meaning of the Coptic, but it is surprisingly difficult to restore. Schubart proposed . . . αινάπει: αββα, which makes no sense, while Kramer made excellent sense with μᾶνη: ημερα, which however cannot be reconciled with the preserved traces
- 141 [. . .] γυγ Kramer and . . . ομη: Schubart, but this line should be Coptic
- 143 The Latin looks line ινδιαμουμ

Textual notes: Coptic (NB ‘Kramer’ refers to his 2010 edition)

- 71 αϕεινε Kramer and Schubart, as required by the sense, but the last letter is indubitably η
- 73 Kramer suggests that ρϕϕη[ιμα:] is scribal error for εροϕ επιμα
- 74 διχητιϕϕτι Schubart
- 79–80 Schubart suggests that the Coptic was omitted here because it would be identical to the Greek
- 84 Kramer suggests that βολ is scribal error for εβολ
- 87 Kramer suggests that ριογη is scribal error for ριογηη
- 88 Schubart suggests that ϕϕϕψαν is scribal error for ϕϕϕψαγ
- 91 κογασπασεμοοκ Schubart; εογ- Kramer following Brunsch, who suggests that ϕογασπασε μοοκ is scribal error for εγ-, though no error need have occurred as Rachel Mairs informs me that εογ- is also a valid beginning for this word
- 94 Kramer reads μηιουτε: and suggests that a second η should be supplied, but it is clearly present on the papyrus
- 96 Schubart suggests that λγϕοογϕαϕ is scribal error for λγϕοογηαϕαϕ, but this cannot be right as it conflates two verbs for ‘send’, ϕοογ and ηα; the reading of the papyrus is fine as it stands
- 99 Schubart suggests that the Coptic was omitted here because it would be identical to the Greek
- 101 Other editors take this line as complete before the break, but that requires fitting the three traces at its end into the Greek of 102, which as noted above does not work
- 103 Kramer reads λγω αη[ιματε], which would be scribal error for ηματε (thus Schubart) or for εηατε, both of which mean ‘very’ and thus would fit the context well; but unfortunately the last letter is indubitably η rather than η. The traces before the η are less clear, but there is enough to see that they too are a poor match for the rest of the restoration; in particular the traces that resemble ω occur at the beginning of the word. Moreover the word probably ended with the η, as although there is a break one can see the remains of a curved vertical line dividing the columns, and this occurs directly after η
- 109 ηογϕω Schubart, with a note suggesting scribal error for ηοογϕω, but ηογϕω Kramer, based on Brunsch’s point that the expected form here would be ηογϕω; in fact either ηογϕω or ηογϕω would be correct Coptic here, but neither is possible because there is not enough space. The traces look like ηοτιω
- 110 Schubart suggests that the Coptic was omitted here because it would be identical to the Greek
- 114 ηηηϕα ραη Kramer; none of the letters is really legible, but one can see where they are, and there is not enough space for the extra letter in Kramer’s version. Schubart suggests that this is what was intended by the scribe but that a letter was accidentally omitted
- 121 Kramer suggests that τηαψωπε is scribal error for τηηαψωπε, and Schubart suggests scribal error for τηηαψωπε, but the singular (which is clearly needed here) should actually be τηαψωπε, so Rachel Mairs suggests that the initial τ is an error for τ
- 124 Brunsch suggests that ηετηημακτηρογ is scribal error for ηετηημακτηρογ
- 131 ηωημο Kramer (with suggestion that this is scribal error for ηηωημο) and Schubart, but the papyrus very clearly has ηωημο, which must be scribal error
- 132 The traces look very much like εμοτ: (or εμοτϑ), but there is no such word; Schubart read ρμοτ: meaning ‘grace, gift, give thanks’, which would have to go with the preceding lines (‘as the foreigners give thanks?’), while Kramer disregarded the preserved traces entirely to read ρροκ: ‘why you?’. This fits very nicely with Kramer’s interpretation of this and the following lines (‘why have you been awake

since dawn?'), but as noted above that interpretation is incompatible with the preserved traces in the Latin and Greek as well

137 ἀΡΙ ΡΗΘ Kramer; ἀ κΡΗΘ Schubart; neither fits the traces well

141 Although both Kramer and Schubart read this line as Greek, it ought to be the Coptic equivalent of 'to the outside', as that is the meaning of the Latin and Greek on the previous line and this must be the Coptic version of that line. Either ⲉⲠⲃⲱⲗ (suggested by Rachel Mairs) or ⲉⲠⲃⲱⲗ (suggested by Daniela Colomo) would be possible, but the latter fits the preserved traces better. Neither restoration explains the two traces to the left of the word, but these may not be part of letters at all

Clearly this text is very peculiar. How and why was it created? It bears a striking relationship to a set of Latin-Greek bilingual dialogues known as the 'colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana'; these colloquia mostly survive via the medieval manuscript tradition, but fragments have also been found on papyrus.<sup>7</sup> The colloquia all share enough features in common to show that they go back to a (very distant) common ancestor, and the text on this papyrus, because of its close relationship to the colloquia, must also descend from that common ancestor. Originally, therefore, this text was bilingual in Latin and Greek, with the Latin in the Roman alphabet.

The original version of this text would also have had a different layout. In antiquity, Latin-Greek bilingual materials were normally arranged in very narrow columns, one column per language; this was true both for glossaries and for continuous texts like colloquia. The format of this papyrus, with no space between the different languages and a double point used instead to separate them, is characteristic of Greek-Coptic glossaries.<sup>8</sup> So three changes have been made to this text: the Coptic translation has been added, the Latin has been transliterated, and the layout has been altered. Who made these changes and why?

It is tempting to ascribe all three types of alteration to the same individual, a Coptic speaker who adapted a bilingual colloquium for fellow Coptic speakers; the extant papyrus could then be that adaptor's autograph manuscript. But such a simple explanation is unlikely, for the text probably has a transmission history in its trilingual form. The complex layout of the papyrus is most easily explained as being that of a copy of a pre-existing document, probably a document in which each page contained only one of the two triple columns now crowded onto each side of the surviving leaf.<sup>9</sup>

Moreover the combination of the typically Coptic layout with the poor linguistic quality of the Coptic indicates a process of transmission. Unlike the Latin and Greek, which are in reasonable condition, the Coptic is full of mistakes; it cannot be the autograph product of a native speaker but must have been either composed or copied (or both) by someone with little knowledge of the language, probably a Greek speaker.<sup>10</sup> Yet such a person would not have changed the text's layout from a typically Graeco-Latin one to a typically Coptic one, so another person, a Coptic speaker, must also have been involved in the composition or transmission of the trilingual version. The involvement of a minimum of two people indicates a transmitted text rather than the adaptor's autograph. Can we know anything more about the text's history?

One possibility is that the original adaptor was a native Coptic speaker; this person would have been responsible for both the translation and the layout, and the text would then have been copied by one or more people with little or no knowledge of Coptic. Such a scenario is surprising on several grounds. Non-Coptic copyists would have been unlikely to preserve the Coptic layout, particularly as it is very confusing, and transmission by non-Coptic copyists seems incompatible with the usual theory that the purpose of this text

<sup>7</sup> For these colloquia see Dickey (2012–15), Dionisotti (1982), Goetz (1892), and further bibliography cited therein. This fragment is most closely related to the Colloquium Montepessulanum but is clearly not identical to any of the colloquia known from other sources. This papyrus' relationship to the Hermeneumata colloquia was first observed by Schubart (1913: 27) and has also been discussed by Kramer (1983: 97, 2010: 558–9).

<sup>8</sup> See Dickey (forthcoming) and Ammirati and Fressura (forthcoming: §5).

<sup>9</sup> See Ammirati and Fressura (forthcoming: §5.2 with n. 83).

<sup>10</sup> Some mistakes could be due to poor literacy rather than to poor knowledge of Coptic, but others could not. For example, in line 35 the nonsense word ⲁⲚⲐⲚ has been written where ⲁⲚⲐⲚ 'T' was clearly intended; that is not a phonetic slip.

was to allow Coptic speakers to learn Latin.<sup>11</sup> It is normally thought that language-learning texts were copied chiefly by language students as part of the language-learning process; rarely do such texts show signs of professional scribal work, and this papyrus certainly does not come from a professional hand. Therefore if the copyist did not already know Coptic, he was probably using the text to learn Coptic. Of course there is in principle no reason why Egyptian Greek speakers should not have learned Coptic, but Latin and Greek were higher-status languages and the existing evidence points more to learning of those languages on the part of Coptic speakers than to the reverse. Probably some native Greek speakers knew Coptic, but such knowledge is likely to have come about via close contact with Coptic speakers rather than via deliberate language learning.

The other possibility is that the original adaptor was a Greek speaker with imperfect knowledge of Coptic; on this theory the text would later have been copied by one or more Coptic speakers who changed the layout. This scenario is also surprising, for it requires Coptic-speaking copyists to have refrained from correcting the errors in Coptic introduced by the original adaptor. The easiest way to explain it is that a Greek speaker who happened to have acquired some knowledge of Coptic ended up teaching Greek and/or Latin to monolingual Coptic speakers; he adapted a colloquium for their use by adding the Coptic column, and they then copied the result faithfully because he was the teacher and they did not want to correct him. Although this scenario is less implausible than the previous one it can hardly be endorsed with great confidence.

There is one thing of which we can be reasonably certain, however: the adaptor who added the Coptic translation was not a native Latin speaker, for the Coptic is not a translation of the Latin but rather a translation of the Greek. Although in most places the two are of course the same, sometimes the meanings of the Latin and the Greek diverge. The clearest example is in line 54, where the Latin has ‘you’ (*vos*) and the Greek ‘us’ (ἡμῶς, a common spelling error for ὑμῶς ‘you’); ‘you’ makes more sense and is clearly original, but the Coptic follows the Greek and translates with ‘us’.<sup>12</sup> The translator must therefore have been looking only at the Greek; it cannot be conclusively ascertained that he did not know Latin, but he clearly did not know enough Latin to pay attention to it when it would have helped him with a textual problem in the Greek.

The transliteration of the Latin was probably a separate process from the addition of the Coptic, given the lack of attention to the Latin showed by the Coptic translation. The bilingual version of this text could already have had the Latin in transliteration when the adaptor found it, for many bilingual Latin-Greek glossaries use transliterated Latin.<sup>13</sup> The background of the transliterator is difficult to establish. He knew how Latin was pronounced, for he has not simply replaced Latin letters with their Greek equivalents using a formulaic system based on the Latin spellings, but reflected the words’ late antique pronunciation fairly accurately. Of course, we have no way of knowing how the Latin words were spelled before the transliteration: the original version might have contained non-standard spellings reflecting contemporary pronunciation more closely than the classical spellings would (though the fact that the Latin of the colloquia tends largely to use standard spellings, both in papyri and in medieval manuscript copies, suggests that the original spellings in this version are likely to have been fairly ‘correct’ as well). But the transliterator understood things that could not have been conveyed in any Roman-alphabet spelling, such as which *u* signs represented vowels and which consonants, and therefore he must have known how Latin was pronounced.<sup>14</sup> That knowledge, however, does not necessarily make him a native speaker of Latin.

The presence of all three languages is difficult to justify on any theory of the adaptation of this text. If the adaptations were designed to make the colloquium usable by Coptic speakers who wanted to learn Latin, those Coptic speakers must not have known much Greek, since otherwise they would not have needed

<sup>11</sup> See Schubart (1913: 37) and Kramer (1983: 98).

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Schubart (1913: 35) and Kramer (1983: 97), also noting a similar mistake in line 105.

<sup>13</sup> For example, nine of the fifteen other texts in Kramer (1983) have the Latin in transliteration; for a more extensive list see Dickey (2012–15: i.7–10).

<sup>14</sup> For a detailed examination of the Latin spellings see Kramer (1983: 97–8, 103–8).

a Coptic translation. But why would Coptic speakers who did not know Greek have wanted to learn Latin, and why did they copy the Greek if it was no use to them? Although Latin had attained fairly widespread currency in some parts of sixth-century Egypt, Greek was undoubtedly much more useful as a second language in the East. One can certainly concoct a setting in which Coptic speakers might have needed Latin more than Greek – for example if they wanted to sell their produce to a Roman army base whose major purchasers came from the West – but such concoctions are a bit forced, and the question of why the Greek was also copied remains. On the other hand, if the text was used by Coptic speakers to learn Greek, or by Greek speakers to learn Coptic, why did they copy the Latin? There are really only two possible explanations for the presence of all three languages: either users wanted to learn more than one language from this text, or one language was retained unnecessarily because it had originally been part of the text and subsequent copyists hesitated to remove it. Given the conservatism that is inherent in much textual transmission, I suspect the latter motivation: one of the languages was probably retained despite being irrelevant to the text's last purpose. Whence it follows, unfortunately, that we cannot be certain that the final purpose of this text was to allow Coptic speakers to learn Latin; they might have been learning Greek.

The copyists' reluctance to eliminate the redundant language may also have been prompted by an uncertainty about which words belonged to which language, since it is not at all easy to work out how the text should be divided when all three languages are in effectively the same alphabet, the three columns are squashed together, and there are occasional overruns and omissions. Modern readers, of course, share the ancients' difficulties in deciphering the text in its current form. Editors have therefore usually provided some sort of restored version to make it clearer what the text says: Schubart and Cavenaile offered restored versions of the Latin, Brunsch offered a restored version of the Coptic, and Kramer in his 2010 edition provided separate restored versions of all three languages, plus a German translation. Such separate restorations are helpful for understanding how the text of each individual language works, but the original ancient writers never intended the versions in the different languages to be read separately. Like the other colloquia, for which no trace of a monolingual existence has ever been found, this text was created as a language-learning tool and never existed in a monolingual format: it is the interaction between the different languages that is the whole point of bilingual colloquia, and that point is lost when the languages are separated.<sup>15</sup>

A more accurate reflection of the text's intended function would be provided by a restoration of the colloquium as it originally appeared, before the transliteration of the Latin, the addition of the Coptic, and the change in layout. Such a restoration is therefore presented below, together with an English translation that follows the line-by-line translation format of the original as much as possible.

Restored version of the colloquium:

	Latin	Greek		Translation
				<i>The end of a dinner party</i>
1	omnibus	πᾶσιν		... to all the (diners)
2–3	accumbentibus.	τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις.		reclining.
4	si omnes	εἰ πάντες	<i>Host:</i>	If all
5	biberint	ἔπιαν		have drunk,
	terge	κατάμαζον		wipe
	mensam.	τὴν τράπεζαν.		the table.
	adponite	θέτε <sup>16</sup>		Put
	in medium <sup>17</sup>	εἰς τὸ μέσον		amongst us
10	candelabras,	τὰ[ς λυχνί]ας,		the candlesticks/lampstands,

<sup>15</sup> For composition in this format and its implications for our understanding of this text see Dickey (forthcoming).

<sup>16</sup> θεται pap.

<sup>17</sup> μενδίουμ pap.

	et accendite <sup>18</sup>	κ[αὶ ἀνάψ]ατε <sup>19</sup>		and light
	lucernas.	λου[ . . . . .].		the lamps.
	diluce.	φώτ[ισον]. <sup>20</sup>		Give us light!
	date nobis	δότε [ἡμῖν]		Give us
15	bellaria,	τραγήματα,		sweets (and)
	unguentum.	μύρον.		unguent.
	dicite	εἶπατε	<i>Guests:</i>	Say,
	omnes	πάντες		all of you,
	‘feliciter!’	‘εὐτυχῶς!’		‘Good luck!’.
20	bene nos	καλῶς ἡμᾶς		You have entertained us well
	accepisti	ἐδ[έξω]		
	et regaliter,	καὶ βασιλικῶς,		and royally,
	ut tibi	ὡς σοὶ		as befits you [Gk: as
	decet.	ἀρέσκει.		pleases you].
25	ne quid <sup>21</sup>	μήτι	<i>Host:</i>	Do you
	vultis	βούλεσθε <sup>22</sup>		want
	hic dormire,	ἐνταῦθα κοιμηθῆναι,		to sleep here,
	quod sero est?	ὅτι ὀψέ ἐστιν;		because it is late?
	et in hoc <sup>23</sup>	καὶ ἐν τούτῳ	<i>Guests:</i>	For this too
30	gratias	χάριτας		we are grateful,
	habemus,	ἔχομεν,		
	ut iussisti.	ὡς κ[εκέλευκας].		as you ordered. <sup>24</sup>
	quod vos	ὃ ὑμεῖς	<i>Host:</i>	Whatever you
	vultis:	βούλεσθε		want:
35	ego meum	ἐγὼ τὸ ἐμὸν		I have done my (duty).
	feci.	ἐποίησα. <sup>25</sup>	<i>Host to</i>	
	accendite	ἀνάψατε <sup>26</sup>	<i>servants:</i>	Light
	lucer[n]as	τοὺς λύχνου[ς]		the lamps
39–40	et prosequamini <sup>27</sup>	καὶ προπέμψατε <sup>28</sup>		and accompany them home,
41	omnes.	πάντες.		all of you!
<i>General conversational phrases</i>				
42	Sermo	Ὅμιλία		Daily conversation:
43	co[ctidia]nus:	καθημερινή		
45–6	quid facimus,	τί ποιοῦμεν,	<i>A:</i>	What (shall) we do,
47	frater?	ἀδελφέ;		brother?

<sup>18</sup> ακκεντιδε pap.

<sup>19</sup> [αναψ]αται pap.

<sup>20</sup> φωθ[ισον] pap.

<sup>21</sup> νηκουιδ pap.

<sup>22</sup> βουλεσθαι pap.

<sup>23</sup> εστινοκ pap.

<sup>24</sup> Schubart (1913: 33) and Kramer (2010: 565) both interpret this as meaning that the guests gratefully decline the offer. They are probably right, but another possibility is that line 32 provides an alternative to lines 30–31, as 53–4 provide an alternative to 51–2; in that case 32 may be an acceptance. The reference to an order is metaphorical; the closest English equivalent might be ‘if you insist’.

<sup>25</sup> εποιησας pap.

<sup>26</sup> αναψαται pap.

<sup>27</sup> προσεκουαμινο pap.

<sup>28</sup> προπεμψαται pap.

48	[li]be[nt]er te	ἡδέως σε		I am glad to see you.
50	video. et ego te, <sup>29</sup> domine. et nos vos.	ὀρῶ. καὶ γὰρ σέ, δέσποτα. καὶ ἡμεῖς ὕμᾱς. <sup>30</sup>		<i>B (if sing.):</i> And I (to see) you, sir. <i>(if plural):</i> And we (to see) you.
<i>A messenger's arrival</i>				
55	nesc[io] quis ostium <sup>32</sup> pulsat; exito <sup>33</sup>	οὐκ οἶδα τίς τὴν θύραν κρούει· ἔξελθ[ε]	<i>Master:</i>	Someone <sup>31</sup>  is knocking at the door;  go
60	cito foras	ταχέως ἔξω		out quick
62	et disce	καὶ μάθε		and find out
64	[qu]is est,	τίς [ἐ]στίν,		who it is,
65	aut qu[em]	ἢ τίνα		or who
66	[petit].	[ἀναζητεῖ].		he's looking for.
68	[a]b Aurelio	ἀπ' A[ὐρ]ηλίου	<i>Servant:</i>	He has come from Aurelius; <sup>34</sup>
69	venit;	ἦλθεν·		
70	[nuntiu]m [tuli]t. c[la]ma illum hic. quid est, <sup>35</sup>	φάσιν ἦνεγκεν. κάλεσον αὐτὸν ἐν[τ]αῦθα. τί ἐστίν,	<i>Master:</i>	Call him here. <i>(to messenger):</i> What is it,
75	puer? quid nuntias <sup>36</sup> ? [om]nia bene?	παῖ; τί ἀναγγέλλε[ις]; <sup>37</sup> πάντα καλῶς;		boy? What do you have to say? Is everything all right? <sup>38</sup>
<i>A visitor's arrival</i>				
80	Maximus	Μάξιμος	<i>Servant:</i>	Maximus

<sup>29</sup> ετεγωδη pap.

<sup>30</sup> ημας pap.

<sup>31</sup> Kramer (2010: 565) takes this as 'I don't know who is knocking', which would of course work better for the Greek. But the Latin would most naturally be interpreted as 'someone', and 'someone' makes more sense in context. The Greek of this colloquium is often a literal reflection of the Latin (not necessarily because it was composed by a non-native speaker of Greek, but more likely because a literal translation was more useful for Latin learners), as in line 19 and 70–71, and this line is probably another example of that practice. See Schubart (1913: 36) and Kramer (1983: 97).

<sup>32</sup> οστισουμ pap.

<sup>33</sup> εξιειτο pap.

<sup>34</sup> This and *Maximus* in 80 are generic names, like 'John Doe' (cf. Schubart p. 34).

<sup>35</sup> κοιδ'εστ pap.

<sup>36</sup> νοιτιας pap.

<sup>37</sup> αναγγελε[ις] pap., perhaps intending the future ἀναγγελεῖς.

<sup>38</sup> Schubart (1913: 33) and Kramer (2010: 565) make lines 78–9 the beginning of the messenger's reply, i.e. 'Everything is fine ...'. But this passage is closely related to a passage in the Colloquium Montepessulanum (section 4; see Dickey 2012–15: vol. 2 or Goetz 1892: 655), and there these words are clearly the end of the question to the messenger rather than the beginning of his reply.

	te vult <sup>39</sup>	σε [β]ούλεται <sup>40</sup>	wants to greet you.
	salutare.	ἀσπάσασθ[αι].	
	ubi est?	ποῦ ἐστίν;	<i>Master:</i> Where is he?
	foras	ἔξω	<i>Servant:</i> He's standing outside.
85	stat.	ἵσταται.	
	veniat	ἐλθάτω	<i>Master:</i> Let him come in.
	intro.	ἔνδον.	
	bene	καλῶς	Welcome!
	venisti. <sup>41</sup>	ἦλθας.	
90	salutant	ἀσπάζονται <sup>42</sup>	<i>Visitor:</i> The children send you greetings,
92	te infantes,	σε τὰ βρέφη,	
94	et parentes	καὶ οἱ γονεῖς	and so do their parents.
95	istorum.	αὐτῶν.	
	miserunt	ἔπεμψάν	They sent
	tibi autem	σοι δὲ	you
	hanc	ταύτην	this
	epistulam	τὴν [ἐπι]στολήν	letter
100	per puerum	[διὰ τοῦ παιδὸς	via the servant,
102	signatam:	[ἔσφραγισμένην].	sealed:
103	et valde	[κ]αὶ πάνυ	<i>Letter:</i> I have been greatly
104–5	consternatus sum,	ἐλυπήθην, <sup>43</sup>	upset,
	frater,	ἀδελφέ,	brother,
	quod	ὅτι	because
	multo	πολλῶ	for a long time
	tempore	τῷ χρόνῳ	
110	litteras	γράμματα	I have not received letters
	a te	ἀπὸ σου	from you.
	non accēpi.	οὐκ ἔλαβον.	
	post multum	μετὰ πολὺν	After [so] much time,
	?		
115	ergo	τοιγάρτοι	therefore,
	tempus	[χρόν]ον	
	mitte m[ihi]	[ἀπόσ]τειλόν <sup>44</sup> μοι	send me
	[epistula]m,	ἐπιστολήν,	a letter,
119	[ut hil]arius	ἵνα ἰλαρὸς	to make me happy!
121	fia[m.]	[γε]νηθῶ.	
122	⟨saluta⟩ <sup>45</sup>	ἄσπασαι	Give my greetings to
123	omnis tuos.	πάντας τοὺς σοῦς.	all your household.
			<i>Fragmentary scene</i>
125	veniat	ἐλθάτω	Let him come
	intro.	ἔνδον.	in.
	?		

<sup>39</sup> βουλ pap.

<sup>40</sup> [β]ολεται pap.

<sup>41</sup> βενιστις pap.

<sup>42</sup> The papyrus has σε here as well as on the next line.

<sup>43</sup> ελυπηθη pap.

<sup>44</sup> [αποσ]τιλον pap.

<sup>45</sup> The Latin is missing from the original here.

	?		
	?		
130	sicut [p]eregrini. ? ?	[κα]θώς οἱ ξένοι.	. . . like foreigners.
	vigilas <sup>46</sup> ?	ἀγρυπνεῖς;	. . . are you awake?
135	necessitas fecit me vigilare.	ἡ ἀνάγκη ἐποίησέν με ἀγρυπνήσαι.	Necessity forced me to be awake.
138	pro[dea]mus	προέλθωμεν	Let's go out
140	[in lum]en;	εἰς ὕ[παιθ]ρον·	into the open;
142	curre	δράμε	run
143	in domum.	εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν.	home.

Readers wanting a linguistic commentary on this text are referred to the excellent one by Kramer (1983: no. 15), which discusses all three languages and pays particular attention to the light shed on late Latin by this text; there are also briefer discussions of the text's interesting linguistic features by Schubart (1913: 36) and Dickey (2012–15: vol. 2 section 4.1).

#### References

- Ammirati, S., and Fressura, M. (forthcoming) Towards a Typology of Ancient Bilingual Glossaries: Palaeography, Bibliology, and Codicology, in T. Derda, J. Urbanik, A. Łajtar, and G. Ochała, *Proceedings of the XXVII International Congress of Papyrology* (Warsaw).
- Beltz, W. (1978) Katalog der koptischen Handschriften der Papyrussammlung der staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, *Archiv für Papyrologie* 26: 57–119.
- Brunsch, W. (1985) Randbemerkungen zum koptischen Teil des Papyrus Berolinensis 10582, *Archiv für Papyrologie* 31: 43–5.
- Cavenaile, R. (1958) *Corpus papyrorum Latinarum* (Wiesbaden).
- Dickey, E. (2012–15) *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* (Cambridge).
- (forthcoming) Columnar Translation: an Ancient Interpretive Tool that the Romans Gave the Greeks, *Classical Quarterly*.
- Dionisotti, A. C. (1982) From Ausonius' Schooldays? A Schoolbook and its Relatives, *Journal of Roman Studies* 72: 83–125.
- Goetz, G. (1892) *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* (vol. III of *Corpus glossariorum Latinarum*; Leipzig).
- Hasitzka, M. R. M. (1990) *Neue Texte und Dokumentation zum Koptisch-Unterricht*, with H. Harrauer (*MPER* 18; Vienna).
- Kramer, J. (1983) *Glossaria bilinguia in papyris et membranis reperta* (Bonn).
- (2010) Neuedition des lateinisch-griechisch-koptischen Gesprächsbuchs von Berlin (P. Berol. inv. 10582, LDAB 6075), in H. Knuf, C. Leitz, and D. von Recklinghausen (edd.), *Honi soit qui mal y pense: Studien zum pharaonischen, griechisch-römischen und spätantiken Ägypten zu Ehren von Heinz-Josef Thissen* (Leuven) 557–66 with plates 106–9.
- Schubart, W. (1913) Ein lateinisch-griechisch-koptisches Gesprächsbuch, *Klio* 13: 27–38.

Eleanor Dickey, University of Reading  
E.Dickey@reading.ac.uk

<sup>46</sup> βιγίλιας pap.