

Serena Ammirati, Marco Fressura

**Towards a Typology of Ancient
Bilingual Glossaries : Palaeography,
Bibliology, and Codicology**

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 47, 1-26

2017

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Serena Ammirati
Marco Fressura

**TOWARDS A TYPOLOGY
OF ANCIENT BILINGUAL GLOSSARIES:
PALAEOGRAPHY, BIBLIOLOGY, AND CODICOLOGY***

1. INTRODUCTION

THE CONSOLIDATION OF ROMAN RULE over the Hellenised countries of the eastern Mediterranean region did not signify, as is well known, the rapid and widespread use of the Latin language in those areas.¹ However, papyrological findings do testify to a relatively early appearance of learning instruments which were made for the benefit of either Latin-speaking immigrants interested in the study of Greek, or local Greek-

* The preliminary results of this joint research were presented on the occasion of the 27th International Congress of Papyrology in Warsaw (29 July – 3 August 2013) and due to some editorial issues could not be included among the congress proceedings; we offer here a lightly revised text which takes into consideration newly discovered evidence and updated bibliography. This paper is intended as co-written, however, Serena Ammirati is mostly responsible for §§ 1–3.6 and § 7 and Marco Fressura for §§ 3.7–6.

¹ See, among others, B. ROCHETTE, 'L'enseignement du latin comme L² dans la *Pars Orientis* de l'Empire romain: les *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*', [in:] F. BELLANDI & R. FERRI (eds.), *Aspetti della scuola nel mondo romano. Atti del Convegno. Università di Pisa, Dipartimento di Filologia Classica, 5-6 dicembre 2006* [= *Supplementi di Lexis* 51], Amsterdam 2008, pp. 81–109, at 85–87, and J. N. ADAMS, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge 2003, pp. 527–544.

speakers interested in the study of Latin.² In fact, a notable amount of fragments are associated with different typologies of Latin-Greek or Greek-Latin bilingual glossaries which were formerly part of rolls, *codices*, or even single sheets; some of them provided word-lists with a translation organised in various ways, or anonymous and often continuous texts of low quality, while others were literal translations of very popular works of Greek and Latin literature.³

2. THE OLDEST EXTANT GLOSSARIES (1ST–3RD CENTURIES AD)

(i) The oldest extant glossaries (1st–3rd cent. AD) testify to only Greek semi-literary hands or informal scripts, which is also the case in rendering

² See, among others, Raffaella CRIBIORE, ‘Latin Literacy in Egypt’, [in:] *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Ancient Mediterranean World — held on 16th–18th April 2004 at the University of Tokyo* [= *Kodai* 13–14], Tokyo 2007, pp. 111–118, and EADEM, ‘Higher education in early Byzantine Egypt: Rhetoric, Latin, and the law’, [in:] R. S. BAGNALL (ed.), *Egypt in the Byzantine World, 300–700*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 47–66, at 57–63; P. SWIGGERS & A. WOUTERS, ‘Latin as a language of acculturation in the Graeco-Roman world: The testimony of the papyri. Some afterthoughts’, [in:], Maria Chiara SCAPPATICCIO (ed.), *Artes grammaticae in frammenti. I testi grammaticali latini e bilingui greco-latini su papiro. Edizione commentata* [= *Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker* 17], Berlin – Boston 2015, pp. 507–515.

³ See P. RADICIOTTI, ‘Manoscritti digrafici grecolatini e latinogreci nell’antichità’, [in:] M. CAPASSO (ed.), *Ricerche di papirologia letteraria e documentaria* [= *Papyrologica Lupiensia* 6], Galatina 1998, pp. 107–146, and IDEM, ‘Manoscritti digrafici grecolatini e latinogreci nella tarda antichità’, [in:] M. CAPASSO (ed.), *Da Ercolano all’Egitto. Ricerche varie di papirologia* [= *Papyrologica Lupiensia* 7], Galatina 1999, pp. 153–185. On texts of ancient bilingual glossaries of generic content, see C. *Gloss. Biling.* I and II (for further revisions of single texts see *ad loc.*); for a typological framework, see J. KRAMER, ‘I glossari tardo-antichi di tradizione papiracea’, [in:] Jacqueline HAMESSE (ed.), *Les manuscrits des lexiques et glossaires de l’antiquité tardive à la fin du moyen âge. Actes du Colloque international organisé par le Ettore Majorana Centre for Scientific Culture* (Érice, 23–30 septembre 1994) [= *Fédération internationale des instituts d’études médiévales. Textes et études du Moyen Âge* 4], Leuven 1996, pp. 23–55, also in IDEM, ‘Essai d’une typologie des glossaires gréco-latins conservés sur papyrus’, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 50 (2004), pp. 49–60, and IDEM, ‘Les glossaires bilingues sur papyrus’, [in:] Marie-Hélène MARGANNE & B. ROCHETTE (eds.), *Bilinguisme et digraphisme dans le monde gréco-romain: l’apport des papyrus latins. Actes de la table ronde internationale* (Liège, 12–13 mai 2011) [= *Papyrologica Leodiensia* 2], Liège 2013, pp. 43–56. Bibliographical references of glossaries of literary content will be quoted *ad loc.*

Latin. The fragments, mostly from rolls, have a layout of separate columns for lemmata and glosses in common with the words usually well aligned to the left margin of each respective column (see *P. Bon.* 5, § 3.7). Every section of thematically arranged word-lists might begin with a title (also bilingual) and sometimes highlighted by a projection in *ekthesis*. This is the case for: *P. Oxy.* XXXIII 2660, ll. 12, 26 (1st–2nd cent. AD; Greek-Latin list of vegetables and fishes);⁴ *P. Oxy.* LXXVIII 5162, ll. I 14, II–III 6, 32 (2nd half of 1st – 2nd half of 2nd cent. AD; Greek-Latin word-list on sky, stars, and winds);⁵ *P. Oxy.* LXXVIII 5163, l. I 4 (1st–2nd cent. AD; Greek-Latin list of insects and furniture),⁶ which has a further section divider, namely a complete line of oblique strokes descending from left to right; *P. Mich. inv.* 2458 (2nd–3rd cent. AD; Greek-Latin list of deities)⁷ and *P. Oxy.* XXXIII 2660a (3rd cent. AD; Greek-Latin list of vegetables and fishes).⁸ In *P. Oxy.* LXXXII 5302 (2nd cent. AD),⁹ Greek-Latin alphabetical list of conjugated verbs beginning with ζ and η, the passage from one verb to the following is marked by a diagonal descending stroke written on the left side of the first couple of every new verb. Conjugation of each verb shows first, second, and third persons of the singular of the present in reverse order, as well as the first person singular of the future and the third person plural forms of present and future. In the second pair, line 1, due the exceeding length of the first Greek lemma, lemma and gloss are separated by a middle dot. This device is used with similar function in later evidence (see below, §§ 3.3, 5–7).

⁴ *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 6 = LDAB 4497 (TM 63291) = MP³ 2134.1. See also Serena AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico. Ricerche bibliologiche e paleografiche* [= *Biblioteca degli 'Studi di Egittologia e di Papirologia'* 12], Pisa – Rome 2015, pp. 41, 48.

⁵ LDAB 171907 (TM 171907). See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 41.

⁶ LDAB 171908 (TM 171908). See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 41.

⁷ *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 12 = LDAB 5062 (TM 63848) = MP³ 2685.1. See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 41.

⁸ *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 7 = LDAB 5382 (TM 64163) = MP³ 2134.2. See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 41.

⁹ LDAB 653487 (TM 653487) = MP³ 2134.704. See SCAPPATICCIO, *Artes grammaticae* (cit. n. 2), pp. 255–287.

The absence of section dividers is likewise attested, as in *P. Oxy.* XLVI 3315, l. 6 (1st–2nd cent. AD; Greek-Latin list of zodiac signs and winds),¹⁰ and *P. Oxy.* XLIX 3452 (2nd cent. AD; Greek-Latin list of words beginning with π , ρ , ς).¹¹

(2) On the basis of the current form of *P. Lund* 5 (2nd cent. AD; a Greek-Latin list of animals),¹² it is not possible to determine if dividing devices were originally used to highlight thematic sections of the glossary. The Greek-Latin list of months in *P. Fay.* 135 v^o (4th cent. AD)¹³ appears to be an extemporaneous one (the text is written across the fibers on a papyrus sheet, the other side of which contains a private letter), and therefore cannot be taken into consideration for typological analysis.

(3) The oldest remains of bilingual glossaries, formerly part of papyrus or parchment codices, do not possess innovatory features. Either two or four columns can be found on each page: in each pair, the left column is for lemmata, the right for glosses. A two-column layout is attested by *P. Laur.* IV 147 (2nd half of 2nd cent. AD; parchment; Greek-Latin list of fishes)¹⁴ and *P. Lond.* II 481 (4th cent. AD; papyrus; Greek-Latin list of words and everyday expressions);¹⁵ *P. Stras. inv. G* 1175 (3rd–4th cent. AD; papyrus; Greek-Latin alphabetical list of conjugated verbs beginning with α , β , γ)¹⁶ has four columns per

¹⁰ *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 8 = LDAB 4498 (TM 63292) = MP³ 3004.2. See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 41.

¹¹ *C. Gloss. Biling.* II 7 = LDAB 4812 (TM 63603) = MP³ 2134.7. See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 41. The initial letter of the first ς -lemma is enlarged and repeatedly inked over, although this may well be an exceptional case.

¹² *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 9 = LDAB 4741 (TM 63532) = MP³ 3004. See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 41.

¹³ *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 11 = LDAB 7680 (TM 66430) = MP³ 2013.1.

¹⁴ *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 5 = LDAB 4675 (TM 27520) = MP³ 2134.3. See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 41.

¹⁵ *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 13 = LDAB 5678 (TM 64454) = MP³ 3005. New edition by Eleanor DICKEY, *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*, II: *Colloquium Harleianum, Colloquium Montepessulanum, Colloquium Celtis, and Fragments* [= *Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries* 53], Cambridge 2015, pp. 284–287. See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 41.

¹⁶ *C. Gloss. Biling.* II 3 = LDAB 9217 (TM 67946) = MP³ 2134.71. See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 48, and SCAPPATICCIO, *Artes grammaticae* (cit. n. 2), pp. 288–369.

page, while the original layout of P. Stras. inv. G 1173 is still undetermined (3rd–4th cent. AD; papyrus; Greek-Latin glossary *de mercibus* and *de militibus*).¹⁷ The latter also testifies to the enduring use of the *ekthesis* to mark the beginning of new sections (ll. 4, 24), while in P. Stras. inv. G 1175 *paragraphoi* are inserted (not necessarily added by the first scribe) in order to distinguish some alphabetical sequences (ll. 5–6, 11–12, 14–15, 47–48, 50–51, 80–81). Except for the uncertain case of *P. Laur.* IV 147, which only bears some names of fishes, the use of dividers is less likely to be found in *P. Lond.* II 481, which contains a heterogeneous, non-thematically arranged word-list.

(4) P. Berol. inv. P 21246¹⁸ should be considered an exceptional case. Dated by editors to the end of the first century BC (after 31 BC), it is, however, palaeographically comparable to items dating to the first century AD and seems to be the oldest extant fragment of a Greek-Latin glossary.¹⁹ It is written on the back (↓) of a reused papyrus roll and contains models of conjugations and declensions, the verbs sometimes contained in syntagms. Unlike the items examined so far, however, there is no division into separate columns for lemmata and glosses. In fact, the Greek lemma and the Latin gloss alternate in consecutive lines in the same column, the gloss being regularly indented. Given that the bilingual text is – as usual – rendered only by Greek script, the purpose of the indentation must have been for highlighting different contents. P. Berol. inv. P 21246 is believed to be the oldest bilingual Greek-Latin glossary and its layout represents a unique case for this type of bilingual material; nevertheless, there is no reason to believe that such a layout is the oldest kind, or any earlier than those more frequently

¹⁷ *C. Gloss. Biling.* II 6 = LDAB 9218 (TM 67947) = MP³ 2134.61. See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 48. For a two-columns-per-page layout seems to be inclined SCAPPATICCIO, *Artes grammaticae* (cit. n. 2), pp. 289–290. *C. Gloss. Biling.* II 2 erroneously considers this to be a parchment fragment, and the error is reduplicated in LDAB and MP³.

¹⁸ *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 1 = LDAB 6764 (TM 65514) = MP³ 2134.5. See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 32.

¹⁹ Besides Kramer in *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 1, see W. M. BRASHEAR, 'A Greek-Latin vocabulary', [in:] *Pap. Congr.* XVI, pp. 31–41, and BKT IX = Grace IOANNIDOU, *Catalogue of Greek and Latin Literary Papyri in Berlin* (*P. Berol. inv.* 21101–21299, 21911), Mainz am Rhein 1996, n. 150, and SCAPPATICCIO, *Artes grammaticae* (cit. n. 2), pp. 438–443. For a palaeographical comparison with later items, see, e.g., *P. Oxy.* VI 878 (Thucydides, 1st cent. AD) and *P. Oxy.* XLV 3250 (freight contract, 63 AD).

attested by other bilingual items. Indeed, in P. Berol. inv. P 9965,²⁰ a fragment of papyrus roll from the mid-third – mid-second century BC containing a Greek-Greek glossary on literary authors (Homer, and contents also attested much later in Hesychius), every single column has lines consisting of the lemma followed by a short blank space and then the corresponding gloss. Another extremely old fragment has the same layout except for an absence of the blank space between lemma and gloss: P. Heid. inv. G 414 v^o,²¹ a fragment of a papyrus roll ascribed to the 3rd century BC. This is even more typical since it contains a bilingual Greek-Demotic glossary where the Greek script is used for both languages. The last two examples seem to indicate that, at least in the case of bilingual glossaries, the double-column layout developed directly due to a regular separation of glosses from lemmata, together with a simultaneous alignment of the former with a certain left margin. Therefore, the layout attested by P. Berol. inv. P 21246 should not be considered as an intermediate step, but – more reasonably – as an alternative to the one usually adopted in later bilingual glossaries.

(5) Considered as a whole from a palaeographical perspective, the glossaries examined so far, being ascribed to the first three centuries AD, display a predictably wide range of scripts, yet it is worth noting that these scripts, always Greek even for the Latin sections, are mostly informal or, in a few instances, semi-literary. For this reason, all these extant items, both from *volumina* and *codices*, could be seen as manufactured for private use or short-range circulation. In addition, most of the fragments are from reused rolls, while others, given their present condition, cannot be ascribed with certainty to any definite book form.

²⁰ LDAB 7028 (TM 65774) = MP³ 2121.01. Besides G. POETHKE, 'Fragment einer alphabetisch geordneten Wörterliste (P. Berol. 9965)', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 39 (1993), pp. 17–20, see CLGP I 1.4 = Elena ESPOSITO, 'P. Berol. inv. 9965', [in:] G. BASTIANINI *et alii* (eds.), *Commentaria et lexica Graeca in papyris reperta (CLGP)*, I: *Commentaria et lexica in auctores*, 1/4: *Aristophanes–Bacchylides*, Berlin – New York 2011 (2nd ed.), pp. 235–236, and G. UCCIARDELLO, *Hypomnemata papiracei e lessicografia. Tra Alessandria e Bisanzio* [= *Quaderni di Orione* 1], Messina 2012, pp. 11–35.

²¹ LDAB 6962 (TM 65708) = MP³ 2131.02. The papyrus is now lost; the latest available edition is given by H. QUECKE, 'Eine griechisch-ägyptische Wörterliste vermutlich des 3. Jh. v. Chr. (P. Heid. Inv.-Nr. G 414)', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 116 (1997), pp. 67–80.

(6) Moreover, physical features should be linked to the contents of the glossaries, the bulk of which bear the names of everyday items, such as goods or natural phenomena.²² This leads us to surmise that this kind of instrument could help people to acquire a rudimentary grasp of the language, and – in the case of Latin at least – was particularly aimed at the daily practice of oral communication, as the absence of Latin script in these papyri seems to suggest.²³

(7) It is also true that it is to the third century (and possibly to the late second) that the oldest extant bilingual and digraphical glossaries can be assigned: the rolls *P. Oxy. XXXII 2624 v^o* (2nd half of 2nd cent. AD),²⁴ *P. Berol. inv. P 21244* (2nd–3rd cent. AD),²⁵ and *P. Sorb. inv. 2069* (3rd cent. AD).²⁶ The first is briefly described alongside a cropped photograph in *CLA Suppl.* 1791;²⁷ the layout seems to be structured in two columns, the two scripts being very different from each other: an ancient sloping cursive

²² See KRAMER, ‘I glossari’ (cit. n. 3), pp. 27–30, IDEM, ‘Essai’ (cit. n. 3), pp. 51–55, and IDEM, ‘Les glossaires’ (cit. n. 3), pp. 47–49.

²³ See RADICIOTTI, ‘Manoscritti digrafici (i)’ (cit. n. 3), pp. 110–113.

²⁴ LDAB 4876 (TM 63667) = MP³ 3004.I. See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 40. Edition of the recto has been given in *P. Oxy. XXXII*, while edition of the verso is currently under preparation.

²⁵ LDAB 4980 (TM 63767) = MP³ 3004.OI. See *BKT IX 148* and AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 40.

²⁶ *C. Gloss. Biling. I 2* = LDAB 5438 (TM 64219) = MP³ 3006.5. Revised editions are in ELEANOR DICKEY & R. FERRI, ‘A new edition of the Latin-Greek glossary on *P. Sorb. inv. 2069* (verso)’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 175 (2010), pp. 177–187, DICKEY, *The Colloquia* (cit. n. 15), pp. 288–294, and SCAPPATICCIO, *Artes grammaticae* (cit. n. 2), pp. 445–460, 467–471; see also ELEANOR DICKEY, ‘The creation of Latin teaching materials in Antiquity. A re-interpretation of *P. Sorb. inv. 2069*’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 175 (2010), pp. 188–208, MARIA CHIARA SCAPPATICCIO, ‘Sull’*unde* del *PSorb. inv. 2069* (lin. 84–87)’, *Maia* 63 (2011), pp. 552–565, and AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), pp. 41, 49. Some further observations in ELEANOR DICKEY, ‘Word division in bilingual texts’, [in:] G. NOCCHI MACEDO & MARIA CHIARA SCAPPATICCIO (eds.), *Signes dans les textes, textes sur les signes. Érudition, lecture et écriture dans le monde gréco-romain. Actes du colloque international (Liège, 6–7 septembre 2013)* [= *Papyrologica Leodiensia* 6], Liège 2017, pp. 159–175.

²⁷ E. A. LOWE, *Codices Latini antiquiores. A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century. Supplement*, Oxford 1971.

for the Latin and upright majuscule for the Greek.²⁸ P. Berol. inv. P 21244 bears the remains of an unidentifiable, perhaps continuous Latin text with Greek translation. Remnants show a barely discernible double column layout with blank intercolumniation; however, in a few lines the Latin part exceeds the width of its column and thus it is followed uninterruptedly by its translation, which might also proceed onto a new line directly under the following Latin part (ll. II 4, 6–7). Written on the external side (↓) of a reused roll, P. Sorb. inv. 2069 contains a list of words in alphabetical order beginning with *s*, *t*, *u* with inflectional information and the Greek translation. In this case, we do not find a layout structured in couples of columns, but a sequence of single and wider columns with continuous text: the Latin lemma is followed, after a blank, by its Greek gloss (or glosses), which is followed by a blank then the next Latin lemma and so on. When an entire Latin or Greek entry cannot be written fully within the end of a line due to lack of space, it carries onto the next line, which, in this case, is indented.²⁹ *Interpuncta* are to be found frequently between Latin words; similar signs can be seen in the Greek parts, where the *scriptio continua* is interrupted by blanks separating different glosses corresponding to the same lemma.³⁰ In this papyrus, too, Latin and Greek scripts do not appear homogeneous, the former being an ancient cursive sloping to the right, the latter an upright rounded majuscule.³¹ Although they appear very different, the two scripts could very well be attributed to the hand of the same scribe,³² but this cannot be proven definitively. Indeed, the irregular width of the blanks after the last Latin word of a lemma, and especially after the last Greek word of a gloss, together with an occasional compression and shrinking of the Greek script at the end of an entry, could be the

²⁸ Since the fragments are still unpublished, further analysis of the manuscript cannot be made here; nevertheless, see RADICIOTTI, ‘Manoscritti digrafici (I)’ (cit. n. 3), p. 116.

²⁹ DICKEY & FERRI, ‘A new edition’, (cit. n. 26), p. 178, and DICKEY, ‘The creation’ (cit. n. 26), p. 190, explain indentation as a symptom of the rearrangement of the text from a columnar layout model (be it the direct antigraph or not) to a continuous one. We will return to this later (below, §§ 5–7).

³⁰ See DICKEY & FERRI, ‘A new edition’ (cit. n. 26), p. 179.

³¹ See RADICIOTTI, ‘Manoscritti digrafici (I)’ (cit. n. 3), p. 116.

³² See RADICIOTTI, ‘Manoscritti digrafici (I)’ (cit. n. 3), p. 116 n. 18.

result of copying a certain number of Latin entries before their Greek correspondences which were perhaps added later.

3. CHANGES IN FORMAT, LAYOUT, AND SCRIPT (3RD–4TH CENTURIES AD)

(i) These last three papyri – especially P. Sorb. inv. 2069 that contains a text of unusual complexity – testify to the first stages in a change in the composition and draft of bilingual glossaries which was already taking place by the third century; in fact, it is at the beginning of the fourth century that the most important innovations and developments occur. At that time, as is well known, the knowledge of Latin as a language of culture and social advancement began being more widespread in the *pars Orientis*, becoming part of some school *curricula*.³³ Thus, the demand for adequate learning tools in the Hellenised provinces would have increased to such an extent that it could not have been fulfilled, both in terms of quantity and quality, by the mere reduplication of tools already in circulation, likely to be of the same kind as those findings from the first–third centuries in Egypt.³⁴ Modestly produced glossaries continued to exist,

³³ A brief but detailed update on this controversial topic, especially regarding the Egyptian context, is to be found in J.-L. FOURNET, ‘The multilingual environment of Late Antique Egypt: Greek, Latin, Coptic, and Persian documentation’, [in:] R. S. BAGNALL (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, New York 2009, pp. 418–451, at 421–430; in general, see B. ROCHETTE, ‘*Latinum est: non legitur*. Lire le latin et traduire le latin en grec en Orient’, [in:] *Scrivere e leggere nell’Alto Medioevo. Spoleto, 28 aprile – 4 maggio 2011*, vol. I [= *Settimane di Studio della Fondazione Centro Italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo* 59], Spoleto 2012, pp. 317–348. On language learning practices at school, essential references are CRIBIORE, ‘Latin literacy’ (cit. n. 2), EADEM, ‘Higher education’ (cit. n. 2), pp. 57–63, and ROCHETTE, ‘L’enseignement’ (cit. n. 1); the detailed picture in L. MIRAGLIA, ‘La didattica del greco e del latino nell’impero romano: aspetti tecnici e culturali’, [in:] S. M. MEDAGLIA (ed.), *Miscellanea in ricordo di Angelo Raffaele Sodano*, Naples 2004, pp. 207–238, especially 225–227, is taken up in some comments by P. RADICIOTTI, ‘Palaeographia papyrologica. 6 (2005)’, [in:] M. CAPASSO (ed.), *Da Ercolano all’Egitto, V: Ricerche varie di papirologia* [= *Papirologica Lupisensia* 15], Galatina 2007, pp. 241–263, at 249–250.

³⁴ See M. FRESSURA, *Vergilius Latinograecus. Corpus dei manoscritti bilingui dell’Eneide. Parte prima (1–8)* [= *Biblioteca degli ‘Studi di Egittologia e di Papirologia’* 13], Pisa – Rome 2017, pp. 9–24.

but alongside more refined instruments, composed and manufactured with greater care as regards graphics, material, and contents. Therefore, some bilingual glossaries became proper books, and in most cases, completely digraphical:³⁵ the use of Latin script to render the Latin language goes hand in hand with the gradual and mutual graphic harmonisation with the Greek script on the side, the same scribe always responsible for both.³⁶ Furthermore, extant glossaries are consistent with the general transformation in the history of handwritten book which was occurring by the end of the third century and the beginning of the fourth when the *codex*, superseding the *volumen*, became the predominant book form.

(2) A first group of fragments from the fourth–fifth centuries is very similar in style and content to the bulk of the older evidence. It consists of remnants of poorly manufactured and informally written *codices*, where we find the layout on each page consisting of one or two double columns.

(3) PSI inv. 1734 (1st half of 4th cent. AD; papyrus; Latin–Greek glossary *de moribus humanis*),³⁷ arranged in four columns per page, written in fully cursive writing, sometimes has long Latin lemmata extending over the space for the Greek part and finishing up on the next line; this also con-

³⁵ See RADICIOTTI, ‘Manoscritti digrafici (1)’ (cit. n. 3), pp. 112–115; a definition of ‘digraphism’ in its historical context can be found in IDEM, ‘Il problema del digrafismo nei rapporti fra scrittura latina e greca nel medioevo’, [in:] *Ἀμπελοκήπιον. Studi di amici e colleghi in onore di Vera von Falkenhausen*, III [= *Νέα Τόμη* 3], Rome 2006, pp. 5–55, at 6–11 (§ 1). The term ‘digraphism’ is also used by palaeographers to mean a *duplex manus* (i.e. when the same scribe is capable of using at least two different kinds of script in the same graphic and linguistic context): see in particular Maria Luisa AGATI, ‘ΠΑΛΑΙΟΓΡΑΦΙΚΑ. Supplemento ai copisti della Turcocrazia (1453–1600) e digrafismo metabizantino’, *Scripta* 5 (2012), pp. 11–29, at 15.

³⁶ Obviously, this phenomenon involves not only manuscripts with glossaries, but the whole extant late-antique manuscripts of literary, semi-literary, and documentary content in the eastern part of the Roman Empire; above all, see G. CAVALLO, ‘La κοινή scrittoria greco-romana nella prassi documentaria di età bizantina’, *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 19 (1970), pp. 1–31, reprinted in IDEM, *Il calamo e il papiro. La scrittura greca dall’età ellenistica ai primi secoli di Bisanzio* [= *Papyrologica Florentina* 36], Florence 2005, pp. 43–71, and IDEM, *La scrittura greca e latina dei papiri. Una introduzione* [= *Studia erudita* 8], Pisa – Rome 2008, p. 175; see also RADICIOTTI, ‘Manoscritti digrafici (1)’ (cit. n. 3), pp. 119–120.

³⁷ *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 10 = LDAB 5631 (TM 64407) = MP³ 3007. See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 50.

tains the whole gloss in its expected position (ll. 16–17, 31–32). The scribe of *P. Sorb.* I 8 (5th cent. AD; papyrus; list of words beginning with *l* and *m* with translation)³⁸ tended to keep the two columns on every page separate, but sometimes he was not successful and the space for writing was not wide enough to contain certain long Latin lemmata: when the Latin lemma occupies the space intended for the corresponding gloss, a raised dot is used to separate the last Latin word from the first Greek word (ll. 2, 4);³⁹ long extending Greek parts may continue onto the next line and modify the extent of the interlinear space between the Latin lines, thus determining a blank in the left column where we would expect to find a Latin lemma (ll. 2–3, 4–5, 14–15).⁴⁰ ζ-shaped marks are regularly found at the side of every Latin line, perhaps meant as *paragraphoi*.⁴¹ P. Vindob. L 150 (5th cent. AD; papyrus; glossary *de moribus humanis*)⁴² bears on the → side remnants of a Greek column, while on the ↓ side traces of Latin. It is not possible to determine from the text whether the page was originally divided into two or four columns.

(4) Continuous prose texts which are more elaborate than those examined so far, are also attested in scraps of codices copied by semi-literary hands. It is likely that the original layout of *PSI VII 848* (4th cent. AD; papyrus; Latin-Greek fragments of Aesopic fables)⁴³ had two columns, and

³⁸ *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 3 = LDAB 5439 (TM 64220) = MP³ 3008. As far as dating is concerned, we agree with RADICIOTTI, 'Manoscritti digrafici (i)' (cit. n. 3), pp. 117–118; see also AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 51.

³⁹ See *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 3, p. 41, n. 2.

⁴⁰ This fact is also attested in *P. Ness.* II 1: see FRESSURA, *Vergilius* (cit. n. 34), pp. 13–14.

⁴¹ Other interpretations of these signs (ticks; a recurring tachygraphical note) are presented in *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 3, p. 41, n. 2, RADICIOTTI, 'Manoscritti digrafici (i)' (cit. n. 3), p. 118, and Giovanna MENCI, 'Latinismi nei papiri tachigrafici', [in:] M. CAPASSO & S. PERNIGOTTI (eds.), *Studium atque urbanitas. Miscellanea in onore di Sergio Daris [= Papyrologica Lupiensia 9]*, Galatina 2001, pp. 277–295, at 292, n. 40.

⁴² *C. Gloss. Biling.* II 5 = LDAB 6053 (TM 64815) = MP³ 2134.6.

⁴³ *C. Gloss. Biling.* II 10 = LDAB 138 (TM 59043) = MP³ 52. See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), pp. 49, 50, 51, 53, 66, and Maria Chiara SCAPPATICCIO, *Fabellae. Frammenti di favole latine e bilingui latino-greche di tradizione diretta (III–IV d.C.) [= Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 128]*, Berlin – Boston 2017, pp. 167–188.

there is now a text division marked by a *paragraphos* not necessarily made by the first scribe (ll. 1–2).⁴⁴ The column pattern does not seem to be strictly observed on the verso (↓) where what remains of the Greek column has an irregular left margin, maybe because of the exceeding length of the Latin lines. On the contrary, the two columns of *P. Prag.* II 118 (4th–5th cent. AD; papyrus),⁴⁵ a Latin-Greek portion of the so-called *colloquium Harleianum*, and *P. Vindob.* L 158 a (5th cent. AD; papyrus),⁴⁶ a Latin-Greek portion of the prologue of the *Hermeneumata Monacensia-Einsidlensia*, are regular in form; this is also the case, albeit with less precision, for the columns in *P. Berol. inv.* P 21860 (4th cent. AD; papyrus),⁴⁷ also fragments from a *colloquium*. Their narrowness, moreover, suggests that the original layout had four columns.

(5) *P. Oxy.* LXXVIII 5161 (4th cent. AD; papyrus),⁴⁸ an alphabetical Greek-Latin list of inflected verbs beginning with ρ , ς , τ , υ , φ , has *paragraphoi* to mark the different sections (ll. I–II 12–13, 30–31, III–IV 3–4, 21–22); according to the first editor’s speculation, the original manuscript is a *unicum* among the typologies of bilingual glossaries, having eight columns per page.

(6) The text of the late *P. Louvre inv.* 2329 (late 4th cent. AD; papyrus)⁴⁹ was certainly contained in a single sheet; written in Latin script and with

⁴⁴ *P. Amb.* II 26 (end of 3rd – beginning of 4th cent. AD; LDAB 434 [TM 59335] = MP³ 172; AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* [cit. n. 4], pp. 49, 51) contains a Babrius fable in both Greek language and script, followed by a translation in Latin language and script; the two texts are written in long lines, one after the other, and therefore not in glossary form. The latest edition is in SCAPPATICCIO, *Fabellae* (cit. n. 43), pp. 99–166.

⁴⁵ *C. Gloss. Biling.* II 8 = LDAB 6007 (TM 64769) = MP³ 3004.22. A new edition has been provided by ELEANOR DICKEY & R. FERRI, ‘A new edition of the *Colloquium Harleianum* fragment in *P. Prag.* 2.118’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 180 (2012), pp. 127–132. See also AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 52.

⁴⁶ This text has been recently discovered, and not yet published; see M. FRESSURA, ‘*P. Vindob. L 158 b* identificato (Verg. *Aen.* IV 11–17, 41–52), [in:] Paola DAVOLI & Natascia PELLÉ (eds.), *Πολυμάθεια. Studi classici offerti a Mario Capasso*, Lecce 2018, pp. 35–45.

⁴⁷ *C. Gloss. Biling.* II 9 = LDAB 8897 (TM 67628) = MP³ 3004.02. New edition by DICKEY, *The Colloquia* (cit. n. 15), pp. 280–283. See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), pp. 50, 62, 66.

⁴⁸ LDAB 171906 (TM 171906). See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 50, and SCAPPATICCIO, *Artes grammaticae* (cit. n. 2), pp. 370–422.

⁴⁹ *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 14 = LDAB 6486 (TM 65244) = MP³ 3003. Republished in J. KRAMER, *Vulgärlateinische Alltagsdokumente auf Papyri, Ostraka, Täfelchen und Inschriften* [= *Archiv für*

a very irregular layout, it bears a heterogeneous list of Latin-Greek terms, maybe taken from different glossaries.

(7) The oldest extant bilingual and digraphical glossary in proper book format is *P. Bon. 5* (end of 3rd – beginning of 4th cent. AD)⁵⁰ which are roll fragments of a considerable size. The scripts are well-formed: a primitive semi-literary minuscule for the Latin and a biblical majuscule for the Greek, with a strong tendency towards graphic harmony.⁵¹ The texts are a collection of Latin-Greek epistolary models arranged in two columns. Larger sections on specific themes are marked by bilingual titles placed in the middle of the two columns, the Greek below the Latin. In such sections, the single epistolary models are highlighted by the projection of some letters of the first Latin word and of the corresponding Greek word; the initial letter is also slightly enlarged. A *paragraphos* is placed in both columns between the end of one block of text and the beginning of another (not necessarily added by the first scribe). Very similar to those of *P. Bon. 5* are the scripts of the parchment codex P. Vindob. L 27 (2nd half of 4th – 1st half of 5th cent. AD),⁵² whose extant fragment carries a Latin-Greek list of only *co-um* words (it is not easy to say whether the page originally had one pair of columns or two). However, the glossary most likely contained a certain number of different word-groups perhaps labelled with some sort of *rubricae*, since the flesh side has traces of a poorly readable couple of lines in red ink.⁵³ Another glossary in book form

Papyrusforschung. Beiheft 23], Berlin – New York 2007, pp. 145–156. See also AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 51.

⁵⁰ *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 16 = LDAB 5498 (TM 64278) = MP³ 2117. See also *C. Epist. Lat.* I = P. CUGUSI, *Corpus epistularum Latinarum papyris tabulis ostracis servatarum (CEL)* [= *Papyrologica Florentina* 23], Florence 1992, I pp. 79–84 + II pp. 3–7, and AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 47.

⁵¹ See RADICIOTTI, ‘Manoscritti digrafici (I)’ (cit. n. 3), p. 117.

⁵² *C. Gloss. Biling.* II 4 = LDAB 5755 (TM 64528) = MP³ 3004.21. First edition in J. KRAMER, ‘Lateinisch-griechisches Glossar’, *Tyche* 5 (1990), pp. 37–39; see also AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 51.

⁵³ I am currently working on a new edition of the text. According to the available editions (see n. 52), the flesh side (actually the hair side) of the parchment should have had a list of disparate words related to the everyday life of the tavern (but most of them have been completely misread), while the other side carried no text (M.F.).

must date from a later period; this is a finely manufactured papyrus codex: Cologne, Historisches Archiv der Stadt Köln, Bestand 7020 (W*) 352 + Göttingen, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Diplom. Apparat. 8 C–D (6th cent. AD),⁵⁴ which contains an alphabetical list of words, with at least one Latin-Greek one and a Greek-Latin one, the latter also with conjugated verbs. The Latin script is a BR-uncial (although sometimes minuscule and angular forms of *m* and *r* do occur); the Greek script is the rounded majuscule typical of some late-antique manuscripts of legal content.⁵⁵ The layout is two columns per page: in the lemma-columns the left margin is strictly observed, while in the gloss-columns irregularities occur.

4. BILINGUAL GLOSSARIES OF LITERARY CONTENT

(i) From the fourth century onwards, bilingual glossaries of literary authors start to be found. As regards graphic features, layout, and manufac-

⁵⁴ *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 4 = LDAB 6279 (TM 65038) = MP³ 2134.4. See R. FERRI, 'I frammenti lessicografici bilingui di Colonia e Göttinga e la tradizione dei dizionari greco-latini nell'antichità', [in:] Gabriella ALBANESE et alii (eds.), *Il ritorno dei Classici nell'Umanesimo. Studi in memoria di Gianvito Resta*, Florence 2015, pp. 257–278. According to J. KRAMER, 'Lateinisch-griechisches Glossar: Celtis' Abschrift aus einem Papyruskodex', [in:] J. M. S. COWEY & Bärbel KRAMER (eds.), *Paramone. Editionen und Aufsätze von Mitgliedern des Heidelberger Instituts für Papyrologie zwischen 1982 und 2004* [= *Archiv für Papyrusforschung. Beibef. 16*], Munich – Leipzig 2004, pp. 43–62, a later copy of a fragment (now lost) belonging to the same book can be found in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Suppl. Gr. 43, ff. 18–45 = *P. Paramone* 5 (AD 1495–1500; LDAB 6287 [TM 219269]); this reconstruction has been called into question by R. FERRI, 'Hermeneumata Celtis. The making of a late-antique bilingual glossary', [in:] IDEM (ed.), *The Latin of Roman Lexicography* [= *Ricerche sulle lingue di frammentaria attestazione* 7], Pisa – Rome 2011, pp. 141–169. See also B. ROCHETTE, 'Vtriusque sermonis cognatio. La lexicographie bilingue à la fin de l'Antiquité', [in:] L. MARTORELLI (ed.), *Greco antico nell'Occidente carolingio. Frammenti di testi attici nell'Ars di Prisciano* [= *Spudasmata* 159], Hildesheim – Zurich – New York 2014, pp. 3–31, at 14–16.

⁵⁵ See AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), pp. 52, 70, and M. FRESSURA, 'PSI XIII 1306: note codicologiche e paleografiche', [in:] N. PELLÉ (ed.), *Spazio scritto e spazio non scritto nel libro papiraceo. Esperienze a confronto. Atti della Seconda Tavola Rotonda del Centro di Studi Papirologici dell'Università del Salento, 9 ottobre 2014* [= *Edaphos* 2], Lecce 2016, pp. 77–128, at 120–121.

turing characteristics, these are fully comparable to glossaries of generic or semi-literary content.

(2) Greek literature is only represented by Isocrates in P. Berol. inv. P 21245 (4th cent. AD), two fragments of a papyrus codex containing parts of *Ad Nicoclem* and *Ad Demonicum* with Latin translation.⁵⁶ Each page must have had two columns, with lemmata and glosses, both properly aligned to the corresponding left margin; nonetheless, the graphic style of the Greek script (an informal majuscule, vertically compressed, with slight variations in the width of the letters but without any contrast in the thickness of strokes) is strikingly different from the Latin one (a formal primitive minuscule with a contrast between thick and thin strokes).

(3) On the other hand, Latin literature is represented by a larger number of fragments, of both poetry and prose, namely eleven fragments of Vergil's *Aeneid*, one of *Georgics*, and four fragments of Cicero's *Catilinarians*, all with Greek translation. All these fragments originally belonged to *codices*. Even in this case, each page has one or two pairs of columns (lemmata/glosses), where the text, subdivided and lemmatised, normally follows the author's *ordo uerborum*; as for *Aeneid* glossaries in particular, a typical edition appears to have contained the complete text of the first three books, but only a selection of words at least from the fourth and the fifth books.⁵⁷

(4) According to extant evidence, books of poor quality, which always feature cursive scripts, are made of papyrus. Furthermore, their texts have no division marks, such as *ekthesis* and *paragraphoi*. In this group we can include: *Aeneid* glossaries P. Berol. inv. P 21138 (2nd half of 4th cent.

⁵⁶ LDAB 2528 (TM 61384) = MP³ 1251.02. First edition, without identification, in BKT IX 149; a revised text has been provided by K. A. WÖRPER & A. RIJKSBARON, 'Isocrates bilinguis Berolinensis', *Mnemosyne* IV 51 (1998), pp. 718–722, and more recently, by Paola PRUNETI & Mariella MENCHELLI, '116T *Ad Dem.* 47; 48', [in:] *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini (CPF). Testi e lessico nei papiri di cultura greca e latina*, I.2: *Cultura e filosofia (Galenus–Isocrates)*, vol. II, Florence 2008, pp. 947–951, and Paola PRUNETI & S. MARTINELLI TEMPESTA, '119T *Ad Nic.* 7; 8', *ibid.*, pp. 953–956. See also AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), pp. 52–53.

⁵⁷ A comprehensive study on *Aeneid*-glossaries is in FRESSURA, *Vergilius* (cit. n. 34); for Cicero-glossaries see D. INTERNULLO, 'Cicerone latinogreco. *Corpus dei papiri bilingui delle Catilinarie di Cicerone*', *Papyrologica Lupiensia* 20–21 (2011–2012), pp. 25–150.

AD; *Aen.* I–II)⁵⁸ and *P. Fouad* 5 (5th cent. AD; *Aen.* III),⁵⁹ with four columns per page, and the Cicero-glossary *PSI Congr.* XXI 2 (5th cent. AD; *Cat.* I),⁶⁰ with two columns per page.

(5) A second group has the same features of manufacture, but show semi-literary non-cursive scripts. It consists of: Cicero-glossaries P. Vindob. G 30885 a+e (= *P. Rain. Cent.* 163) + P. Vindob. L 17 (end of 4th – beginning of 5th cent. AD; *Cat.* I),⁶¹ with four columns per page; *P. Ryl.* I 61 (5th cent. AD; *Cat.* II)⁶² and P. Vindob. L 127 (end of 5th cent. AD; *Cat.* III),⁶³ with two columns per page. The Vergilian *PSI* VII 756 (1st half of 5th cent. AD; *ex Aen.* II),⁶⁴ with four columns per page, has the same characteristics, but it cannot be attributed with certainty to a proper codex and for this reason it is very difficult to place in any group.

(6) Only among Vergilian glossaries are there papyrus and parchment fragments from above-average or high quality *codices* and these always have a two-column layout written by literary hands. Latin is written in primitive minuscule, either upright (*P. Ryl.* III 478 + P. Cair. inv. 85644 + *P. Mil.* I 1; P. Vindob. L 102 f) or sloping (*P. Ness.* II 1; P. Vindob. L 62; Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, L 120 sup., ff. 113–120), and also in uncial, which is either of normal type (P. Allen s.n.) or in BR type (*P. Oxy.* VIII 1099; *P. Oxy.* L 3553; P. Vindob. L 24). All Latin scripts are harmonised with the corresponding Greek scripts, among which the biblical majuscule is found most frequently, although the ogival sloping majuscule is always adopted beside the Latin sloping minuscule.

(7) It should be pointed out that it is unlikely that ancient glossaries of literary content, such as the Vergilian ones, were read as proper books

⁵⁸ LDAB 4149 (TM 62957) = MP³ 2939.I. See FRESSURA, *Vergilius* (cit. n. 34), pp. 27–58.

⁵⁹ LDAB 4145 (TM 62962) = MP³ 2948. See FRESSURA, *Vergilius* (cit. n. 34), pp. 59–68.

⁶⁰ LDAB 556 (TM 59457) = MP³ 2921.OI. See INTERNULLO, ‘Cicerone’ (cit. n. 57), pp. 107–120.

⁶¹ LDAB 554 (TM 59455) = MP³ 2922 + 3026.2. See INTERNULLO, ‘Cicerone’ (cit. n. 57), pp. 37–79, and IDEM, ‘P. Vindob. L 17 identificato: Cicero, *In Catilinam* I, 14–15 + 27’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 199 (2016), pp. 36–40.

⁶² LDAB 4135 (TM 316150) = MP³ 2923. See INTERNULLO, ‘Cicerone’ (cit. n. 57), pp. 79–94.

⁶³ LDAB 559 (TM 59460) = MP³ 2923.I. See INTERNULLO, ‘Cicerone’ (cit. n. 57), pp. 94–106.

⁶⁴ LDAB 4155 (TM 62963) = MP³ 2946. See FRESSURA, *Vergilius* (cit. n. 34), pp. 69–82.

with continuous texts, even when they were luxury editions. On the contrary, the principal text was read in a normal (i.e. not bilingual) edition and the glossary was only occasionally used when translation was needed. In this case, lemmata only helped to identify the equivalent part in the Greek version. The division of a poetic text into lemmata, placing words of the same verse on different lines, could make it rather difficult to find a specific passage, so that some bilingual manuscripts of *Aeneid*, again luxury editions, were provided with division marks made either by later hands or by the original scribes themselves.⁶⁵

(8) *P. Ryl.* III 478 + *P. Cair.* inv. 85644 + *P. Mil.* I 1 (4th cent. AD; papyrus; *Aen.* I)⁶⁶ and *P. Vindob.* L 62 (6th cent. AD; papyrus; *Aen.* II)⁶⁷ share the same two-column layout and the lines are regularly aligned on the left margin. Nonetheless, only the first was provided with *paragraphoi* by a reader. These are added above the first word of an original verse of Vergil, if the word itself is to be found at the beginning of a line in the papyrus; however, if a line of the papyrus contains both the end of a verse and the beginning of the next, the *paragraphos* is added above the first word of that line, while a middle dot separates the last word of the first verse and the first word of the next. The palimpsest Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, L 120 sup., ff. 113–120 (6th cent. AD; parchment; *Aen.* I)⁶⁸ attests to a sim-

⁶⁵ See FRESSURA, *Vergilius* (cit. n. 34), pp. 17–21.

⁶⁶ LDAB 4146 (TM 62954) = MP³ 2940. See FRESSURA, *Vergilius* (cit. n. 34), pp. 83–112.

⁶⁷ LDAB 6194 (TM 64953) = MP³ 2944.1. See Maria Chiara SCAPPATICCIO, *Papyri Vergilianae. L'apporto della papirologia alla storia della tradizione virgiliana (I–VI d.C.)* [= *Papyrologica Leodinsia* 1], Liège 2013, pp. 95–96, 179–291 (*passim*), but we also refer the reader to the *editio princeps* in M. FRESSURA, 'P. Vindob. L 62 identificato (Verg. *Aen.* II 130–139, 142–150, 152–160, [160]–?, con traduzione greca)', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 168 (2009), pp. 83–96, and in IDEM, 'Ancora su P. Vindob. L 62 (Verg. *Aen.* II, con traduzione greca)', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 197 (2016), pp. 46–50.

⁶⁸ LDAB 4156 (TM 62964) = MP³ 2943. Ff. 115–116 are lost; see M. FRESSURA, 'I perduti ff. 115–116 del palinsesto L 120 sup. della Biblioteca Ambrosiana di Milano', [in:] M. CAPASSO & M. DE NONNO (eds.), *Studi paleografici e papirologici in ricordo di Paolo Radiciotti* [= *Papyrologica Lupiensia. Supplemento al nr. 24/2015*], Lecce 2015, pp. 239–273. For the text, see SCAPPATICCIO, *Papyri Vergilianae* (cit. n. 67), pp. 81–86, 179–291 (*passim*), and EADEM, 'Appunti per una riedizione dei frammenti del Palinsesto Virgiliano dell'Ambrosiana', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 55 (2009), pp. 96–120. The coffin-manuscript L 120 sup. is a so-called

ilar use of *paragraphoi*, regularly written at the margin of every line with the first word of a new verse (in this case, it is always the first word of the line too), most likely inserted by the copyist himself.⁶⁹ The same mark with the same function occurs in P. Allen s.n. (5th cent. AD; parchment; *georg. I*),⁷⁰ but not having examined the item directly, we are unable to ascertain whether the *paragraphos* was inserted by the copyist or by later users. Other fragments of Vergilian glossaries bear witness to the projection in *ekthesis* of the first letter of a lemma (and of its gloss), which is also the first word of the original verse, similar to what we have already observed with *P. Bon. 5*.⁷¹ This procedure applies to Latin and Greek parts containing the complete text of the *Aeneid* (books I–II and probably III), but not for parts containing selected lemmata (books IV–V). An example

paterikon in Arabic (10th–11th cent. AD), whose description can be found in J.-M. SAUGET, ‘Le *Paterikon* arabe de la Bibliothèque Ambrosienne de Milan L 120 sup. (SP II. 161)’, *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Memorie. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 29 (1987), pp. 469–516, C. PASINI, *Codici e frammenti greci dell’Ambrosiana. Integrazioni al Catalogo di Emidio Martini e Domenico Bassi* [= *Testi e studi bizantino-neoellenici* 9], Rome 1997, pp. 1–9, IDEM, ‘Un frammento greco-arabo delle odi bibliche nel palinsesto ambrosiano L 120 sup.’, *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* 39 (2002), pp. 33–53, and Colette STRAT *et alii*, ‘Vingt manuscrits (hebreux, grec, latin-grec, grec-arabe, arabes) pour un seul palimpseste’, *Scripta* 1 (2008), pp. 145–156. We cannot agree with SCAPPATICCIO, *Papyri Vergilianae* (cit. n. 67), p. 81, who maintains that the whole Arabic palimpsest was manufactured and written by monks after their conversion to Islam, as the upper text of the manuscript famously is of Christian content.

⁶⁹ I infer this from direct examination of the manuscript (November 2012; July 2013); an alternative conclusion is presented in SCAPPATICCIO, *Papyri Vergilianae* (cit. n. 67), p. 83 (M.F.).

⁷⁰ LDAB 4159 (TM 62967) = MP³ 2936. See SCAPPATICCIO, *Papyri Vergilianae* (cit. n. 67), pp. 169–170, 179–291 (*passim*), and AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), p. 69.

⁷¹ The same use of the *ekthesis* is to be found in P. Vindob. G 26221 (6th cent. AD; papyrus codex; LDAB 2235 [TM 61098] = MP³ 1169.1), a Homeric paraphrase; see Lucia M. RAFFAELLI, ‘Repertorio dei papiri contenenti *Scholia minora in Homerum*’, [in:] *Ricerche di Filologia Classica*, II: *Filologia e critica letteraria della grecità* [= *Biblioteca di studi antichi* 45], Pisa 1984, pp. 139–177, at 173, J. SPOONER, *Nine Homeric Papyri from Oxyrhynchus* [= *Studi e testi di papirologia. Nuova serie* 1], Florence 2002, pp. 21–22, and J. LUNDON, ‘P. Vindob. G 26221: *Scholia Minora* or Paraphrase?’, [in:] *Pap. Congr.* XXIII, pp. 407–414. For the possible relation between the composition and the writing of Homer lexis and bilingual glossaries of literary content, see FRESSURA, *Vergilius* (cit. n. 34), p. 17, with further bibliography.

of this arrangement is *P. Ness.* II 1 (6th cent. AD; papyrus),⁷² fragments of *Aen.* I, II, IV, while of similar importance are *P. Vindob.* L 102 f (2nd half of 4th – 1st half of 5th cent. AD; papyrus)⁷³ and *P. Oxy.* L 3553 (6th cent. AD; parchment),⁷⁴ both fragments of *Aen.* I, which show identical use of the *ekthesis*. *P. Oxy.* VIII 1099⁷⁵ and *P. Vindob.* L 24 (both 6th cent. AD; parchment),⁷⁶ for they are *excerpta* from *Aen.* IV–V and from *Aen.* V, contain no cases of *ekthesis*. Nonetheless, their scripts and formats look so similar to those of *P. Oxy.* L 3553 that we are inclined to believe that all these *codices*, when they were in their complete form, did share the same arrangement which is now only seen with certainty in *P. Ness.* II 1.⁷⁷

5. THE CHRISTIAN-COPTIC ENVIRONMENT

(i) Of the late antique bilingual and digraphical manuscripts of Christian content, the only one that seems to be a proper glossary⁷⁸ is the papyrus codex Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, AC 1499 (end of the 4th – beginning

⁷² LDAB 4166 (TM 62974) = MP³ 2939. See SCAPPATICCIO, *Papyri Vergilianae* (cit. n. 67), pp. 61–77, 179–291 (*passim*), and M. FRESSURA, ‘Problemi di attribuzione di *P. Ness.* II 1 fr. VII’, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 59 (2013), pp. 154–160.

⁷³ LDAB = TM 704169. See FRESSURA, *Vergilius* (cit. n. 34), pp. 113–115.

⁷⁴ LDAB 4160 (TM 62968) = MP³ 2943.1. See FRESSURA, *Vergilius* (cit. n. 34), pp. 116–122.

⁷⁵ LDAB 4162 (TM 62970) = MP³ 2950. See FRESSURA, *Vergilius* (cit. n. 34), pp. 123–133.

⁷⁶ LDAB 4161 (TM 62969) = MP³ 2951. See FRESSURA, *Vergilius* (cit. n. 34), pp. 134–137.

⁷⁷ See FRESSURA, *Vergilius* (cit. n. 34), p. 18.

⁷⁸ These bilingual manuscripts are all parchment *codices*: *PSI XIII 1306* (LDAB 3024 [TM 61687] = MP³ 9911; end of 5th – beginning of 6th cent.; Paul, Eph.); *Codex Bezae* = Cambridge, University Library, Nn. II 41 (LDAB 2929 [TM 61777]; 5th cent.; Gospels and Acts); *Codex Claromontanus* = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Par. gr. 107+107A+107B (LDAB 3003 [TM 65887]; 5th cent.; Paul, Epistles); *Codex Laudianus* = Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud. gr. 35 (LDAB 2881 [TM 61729]; 6th cent.; Acts). Of all these, only the *Codex Laudianus* has a layout similar to that of the bilingual glossaries, being arranged in two columns per page (the Latin on the left side, the Greek on the right) with very short lines; see FRESSURA, ‘*PSI XIII 1306*’ (cit. n. 55), with further bibliography, and A. LAI, ‘Nuove osservazioni a proposito dell’origine romana del ms. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud. gr. 35’, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 110 (2017), pp. 673–690, at 677–679.

of the 5th cent.), and in particular frg. 11–15, a Greek-Latin word-list based on Pauline Epistles (2 Cor., Gal., Eph.) followed by a Greek-Latin word-list taken from a text of some legal content.⁷⁹ The layout is unusual: the bilingual text is not arranged in two columns but on the full page in long lines, where lemmata and glosses follow each other in sequence; a so-called *dicolon* (:) is used to separate the lemma from the corresponding gloss/glosses, while an accessory mark consisting of two oblique strokes (∴) normally distinguishes the gloss from the lemma that follows.⁸⁰ It is likely that this layout was preferred to the columnar one in order to make full use of the writing surface. As for Chester Beatty codex, if we presume the list was compiled by the scribe himself, we can assert that the long line layout is the original one;⁸¹ on the contrary, if we hypothesise that the compiler and the scribe were not one and the same, we cannot rule out that the long line layout derives from a copy of a model originally arranged in columns.

(2) Of the glossaries showing a text not arranged in columns but in long lines, there is also the aforementioned P. Sorb. inv. 2069.⁸² A derivation from a columnar model has been suggested for this; a similar assumption can be made for P. Berol. inv. P 10582 (5th–6th cent.; papyrus),⁸³ a frag-

⁷⁹ LDAB 3030 [TM 61873] = MP³ 2161.I. See A. WOUTERS, *The Chester Beatty Codex AC 1499. A Graeco-Latin Lexicon on the Pauline Epistles and a Greek Grammar* [= *Chester Beatty Monographs* 12], Leuven – Paris 1988, and AMMIRATI, *Sul libro latino antico* (cit. n. 4), pp. 58–60. Unlike other late antique digraphic manuscripts of Christian content (especially the *Codex Laudianus*; see n. 78), the Chester Beatty codex is not a complete continuous text with two versions of the same work, but only a selection of words and expressions; it occasionally presents translation alternatives and does not follow the *ordo verborum*.

⁸⁰ WOUTERS, *The Chester Beatty Codex* (cit. n. 79), pp. 82–83, rightly remarks that occasionally the scribe mixes the signs up, or omits them where expected. See also DICKEY, ‘Word division’ (cit. n. 26), pp. 169–170. A brief summary of the use of *dicolon* in papyri is provided by E. G. TURNER & P. J. PARSONS, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* [= *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies. Supplement* 46], London 1987 (2nd ed.), pp. 8–9.

⁸¹ This is the option preferred by WOUTERS, *The Chester Beatty Codex* (cit. n. 79), pp. 105–106.

⁸² See above, n. 29.

⁸³ *C. Gloss. Biling.* I 15 = LDAB 6075 (TM 64837) = MP³ 3009. See also P. Rain. *Unterricht Kopt.* 270, with a reedition in J. KRAMER, ‘Neuedition des lateinisch-griechisch-koptischen

ment of a Latin-Greek-Coptic conversation handbook from a codex where the three languages are in Greek script (with the additions, in the case of the Coptic, of typical Coptic graphic signs). Some of the current editions show the text arranged in six columns, Latin-Greek-Coptic/Latin-Greek-Coptic; nonetheless, the papyrus clearly evidences a layout based on two main columns, where the three languages (Latin, Greek, Coptic) are positioned on each line without any intercolumnar space, separated only by a *dicolon* (exceptions to this can be explained by the fact that some entries go beyond their allotted space).⁸⁴ If P. Berol. inv. P 10582 is, as it seems, a copy,⁸⁵ its model could have had a layout with, for example, three columns per page, one for each language. In this case, the rearrangement of the text would have provided the chance to condense the content of two pages of the hypothetical model to just one page, thus saving a significant quantity of ‘paper’.

(3) A few Greek-Coptic findings can be successfully compared to the Berlin trilingual glossary and the Chester Beatty codex:⁸⁶ the same long line layout of bilingual content can be found, for example, in *P. Rain*.

Gesprächsbuchs von Berlin (P. Berol. inv. 10582, LDAB 6075), [in:] H. KNUF, Ch. LEITZ, & D. VON RECKLINGHAUSEN (eds.), *Honi soit qui mal y pense. Studien zum pharaonischen, griechisch-römischen und spätantiken Ägypten zu Ehren von Heinz-Josef Thissen* [= *Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta* 194], Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA 2010, pp. 557–566; a new edition of the text with some new observations consistent with our conclusions is provided by Eleanor DICKEY, ‘How Coptic speakers learned Latin? A reconsideration of P. Berol. inv. 10582’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 193 (2015), pp. 65–77, and EADEM, *The Colloquia* (cit. n. 15), pp. 270–279.

⁸⁴ Other minor inconsistencies have been discussed by DICKEY, ‘Word division’ (cit. n. 26), pp. 168–169.

⁸⁵ See, e.g., l. 89: βενυτι: ηλθαc. If we presume that P. Berol. inv. P 10582 is not a copy, and if we assume that the Latin (today on the extreme left) was the text to be translated, the erroneous lemma *venistis* would not have been given the Greek translation ηλθαc and the Coptic ακει, both consistent (see KRAMER, ‘Neuedition’ [cit. n. 83], p. 89) with the true lemma *venisti*.

⁸⁶ For the probable Coptic environment of the finding of the Chester Beatty codex, see A. WOUTERS, ‘From papyrus roll to papyrus codex: Some technical aspects of the ancient book fabrication’, [in:] *The Role of the Book in the Civilization of the Near East. Proceedings of the Conference Held at the Royal Irish Academy and the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, 29 June – 1 July 1988* [= *Manuscripts of the Middle East* 5], Leiden 1991, pp. 9–19.

Unterricht Kopt. 257a (3rd–4th cent.; word-list from Old Testament books of Amos and Hosea),⁸⁷ where Greek and Coptic versions are separated by a *dicolon*, and in *P. Rain. Unterricht Kopt.* 269 I (6th–7th cent.)⁸⁸ and II (5th–6th cent.),⁸⁹ fragments of two different codices containing *Menandri sententiae* with a Coptic translation. P. Berol. inv. P 10582 has parallels with Greek-Coptic glossaries: *P. Rain. Unterricht Kopt.* 256 (2nd half of 6th cent.),⁹⁰ 264 (11th cent.),⁹¹ 266 (1st half of 7th cent.),⁹² and *P. Clackson* 35 col. II (7th–8th cent.).⁹³ There are no separate columns for each language in these manuscripts, and on every line of every column, a lemma and its gloss are written one after the other, divided by a *dicolon*.⁹⁴

6. SOME USES OF THE *DICOLON*

(i) If we refer specifically to glossaries, we can presume that the *dicolon* is usually used to separate lemma from gloss (even when they consist of more than one word), and this principal meaning is much more evident

⁸⁷ LDAB 3141 (TM 61982). See Monika R. HASITZKA, in *P. Rain. Unterricht Kopt.*, pp. 191–192, and A. BENAÏSSA, ‘The provenance of the Greek-Coptic glossary to Hosea and Amos’, *Chronique d’Égypte* 91 (2016), pp. 175–179.

⁸⁸ LDAB 2452 (TM 61310) = MP³ 1583. See HASITZKA, in *P. Rain. Unterricht Kopt.*, pp. 202–207, and C. PERNIGOTTI, *Menandri sententiae* [= *Studi e testi per il ‘Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini’* 15], Florence 2008, pp. 44–45, and *passim*. For a broader discussion on the use of Menander in school see Francesca Romana NOCCHI, ‘Lettura di Menandro alla scuola del *grammaticus*’, *Segno e testo* 10 (2012), pp. 103–134.

⁸⁹ LDAB 2719 (TM 61570). See HASITZKA, in *P. Rain. Unterricht Kopt.*, pp. 207–208.

⁹⁰ LDAB 818 (TM 59714) = MP³ 0351. See HASITZKA, in *P. Rain. Unterricht Kopt.*, pp. 181–190.

⁹¹ LDAB 10974 (TM 107238). See HASITZKA, in *P. Rain. Unterricht Kopt.*, pp. 198–199; for datation see W. E. CRUM, in *P. Ryl. Copt.*, pp. 61–62, 241.

⁹² LDAB 6416 (TM 65174). See HASITZKA, in *P. Rain. Unterricht Kopt.*, p. 200.

⁹³ LDAB (TM 119280). See J. CLACKSON & Sarah CLACKSON, ‘*P. Clackson* 35. A Greek-Coptic glossary from the Beinecke Collection’, [in:] *P. Clackson*, pp. 52–60.

⁹⁴ Layouts and general features of glossaries from the Coptic environment are examined by Eleanor DICKEY, ‘Columnar translation: An ancient interpretative tool that the Romans gave the Greeks’, *The Classical Quarterly* 65 (2015), pp. 807–821, at 829–830.

when the sign is pleonastically written in the intercolumnar space in glossaries with a double column layout, such as the Greek-Coptic *P. Rain. Cent.* 12 = *P. Rain. Unterrichts Kopt.* 262 (7th cent.),⁹⁵ *P. Rain. Unterrichts Kopt.* 260 (10th–11th cent.),⁹⁶ and *P. Rain. Unterrichts Kopt.* 267 (7th–8th cent.).⁹⁷

(2) Furthermore, in a double column layout, a *dicolon* is used to separate lemma and gloss only when the lemma, being too long, exceeds its allotted space and invades the space intended for the gloss (e.g. in *P. Ness.* II 1 and Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, L 120 sup., ff. 113–120).

(3) However, as regards glossaries with the text not arranged in double columns, but on the full page in long lines, if we presume the existence of a model divided into separate columns, the *dicolon* could also provide information about the original position of the entries on the lines of that model. This means that every block of words separated by a *dicolon* was a distinct line in the model with a columnar layout. This function of the *dicolon* is clearly different from the basic one discussed above and only detected in glossaries which are representative of an intermediate stage between the original model, arranged in columns, and one with a full page layout; this is the case with the Vergilian glossary in the Ambrosiana Library palimpsest. The codex has thirty lines per page, each with ten verses of Vergil and each verse distributed over three lines. The strict uniformity of this layout, undoubtedly planned before the manuscript was copied, could only be the result of a rearrangement of the content of a model (it is impossible to say how close this model might have been to the stage of textual transmission testified by the Milan codex),⁹⁸ which likely had a different allocation of the text.⁹⁹ Indeed, the glossary of the

⁹⁵ LDAB 6614 (TM 65368) = MP³ 2133.2. See J. M. DIETHART & H. SATZINGER, 'Eine griechisch-koptische Wörterliste', [in:] *P. Rain. Cent.*, pp. 206–213, and HASITZKA, in *P. Rain. Unterrichts Kopt.*, p. 196.

⁹⁶ See HASITZKA, in *P. Rain. Unterrichts Kopt.*, pp. 194–195. Here the accessory mark ∷ is also attested after the glosses in order to separate them from lemmata in the following column (occasionally this mark and the *dicolon* are interchangeable); see above regarding Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, AC 1499.

⁹⁷ See HASITZKA, in *P. Rain. Unterrichts Kopt.*, pp. 200–201.

⁹⁸ See FRESSURA, *Vergilius* (cit. n. 34), pp. 21–22.

⁹⁹ See *ibidem*, pp. 17–19.

Ambrosiana Library often shows a *dicolon* between Latin lemmata positioned on the same line¹⁰⁰ and another *dicolon* in the corresponding position in the Greek line; the lemmata and glosses now on the same line must therefore have been on different lines in the model.¹⁰¹

7. DOSITHEUS' *ARS GRAMMATICA*

Finally, we will now devote our attention to a text which certainly dates from Late Antiquity and originates from the *pars Orientis* of the Roman Empire, but of which only some western medieval manuscripts are extant: the bilingual grammar attributed to Dositheus.¹⁰² Of the three manuscripts, all copied in the Abbey of St. Gall, two (with an incomplete text: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, CLM 601, ff. 67–82 [end of

¹⁰⁰ We have to distinguish this use of the *dicolon* from another attested elsewhere in the same manuscript and illustrated above (§ 6.2).

¹⁰¹ A different opinion is given by Maria Chiara SCAPPATICCIO, *Accentus, distinctio, apex. L'accentazione grafica tra Grammatici Latini e papiri virgiliani* [= *Corpus Christianorum. Lingua patrum* 6], Turnhout 2012, pp. 252–253: 'L'unico dato cui è possibile approdare, allo stato attuale della presente ricerca, è che questo segno [scil. *dicolon*] non aveva semplicemente una funzione divisoria tra parole, ma piuttosto una legata all'interpretazione e alla conseguente *performance* del testo'.

¹⁰² See H. KEIL, 'Dosithei ars grammatica', [in:] IDEM, *Grammatici Latini*, VII: *Scriptores de orthographia*, Leipzig 1880 (repr. Hildesheim 1961), pp. 363–436; I. [J.] TOLKIEHN, *Dosithei ars grammatica*, Leipzig 1913; G. BONNET, *Dosithee. Grammaire latine*, Paris 2005. An analysis of the bilingual text can be found in V. REICHMANN, *Römische Literatur in griechischer Übersetzung* [= *Philologus, Supplementband* 34.3], Leipzig 1943, pp. 88–100; for an account of the history of the text, see Eleanor DICKEY, *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*, I: *Colloquia Monacensia-Einsidlensia, Leidense-Stephani, and Stephani from the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* [= *Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries* 49], Cambridge 2012, p. 13, EADEM, 'Who used the *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*? Evidence for Greek speakers in the medieval West', [in:] *I Graeca nei libri latini tra Medioevo e Umanesimo. Atti della giornata di studi in ricordo di Alessandro Daneloni. Messina, 28 ottobre 2015* [= *Studi medievali e umanistici* 14], Messina 2016, pp. 47–71, and EADEM, 'The authorship of the Greek version of Dositheus' grammar and what it tells us about the grammar's original use', [in:] R. FERRI & Anna ZAGO (eds.), *The Latin of the Grammarians. Reflections about Language in the Roman World* [= *Lingua patrum (CCLP 8)*], Turnhout 2016, pp. 205–235.

9th – beginning of 10th cent.]; London, British Library, Harley 5642, ff. 9r – 23v, 34r, 35r, 39v [end of 9th – beginning of 10th cent.) have a double column layout (the Greek on the left, the Latin on the right), consistent with all other ancient bilingual manuscripts considered so far; therefore, it is likely that the Dosithean text circulated with this layout at least from the moment it was provided with a Greek translation.¹⁰³ The only manuscript with a complete text, St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 902, pp. 8–43 (2nd half of 9th cent.), has, on the other hand, the Latin-Greek text in long lines with a continuous succession of small portions of Latin text immediately followed by the corresponding Greek text, the latter being by this time of subordinate status.¹⁰⁴ To date, it is difficult to say if this arrangement is an exact reproduction of an antigraph (more or less similar to the late-antique model) or the result of a later initiative on the

¹⁰³ Even if the order of the columns was later inverted. A critical edition should also take into consideration how the text appeared in ancient manuscripts: KEIL, ‘Dosithei ars’ (cit. n. 102), provides both Latin and Greek texts in sequence, the former on the upper half of the page, the latter on the lower; also in TOLKIEHN, *Dosithei ars* (cit. n. 102) texts are in sequence and separated, but on two facing pages (Greek on the left, Latin on the right); on the contrary, BONNET, *Dosithée* (cit. n. 102), opts for an interlinear arrangement which he believes to be ‘probable historiquement’ (see pp. xxxii–xxxv), despite the fact that neither extant evidence attests it, nor can it be presumed from any hypothetical model.

¹⁰⁴ Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that the general arrangement of the manuscripts is in double columns on each page with continuous text. For the three Dosithean examples, see Bernice M. KACZYNSKI, *Greek in the Carolingian Age. The St. Gall Manuscripts* [= *Speculum Anniversary Monographs* 13], Cambridge, MA 1988, pp. 43–56, 107, 120–122, and BONNET, *Dosithée* (cit. n. 102), pp. xx–xxiv; for the St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 902, see also A. VON EUW, *Die St. Galler Buchkunst vom 8. bis zum Ende des 11. Jahrhunderts*, I: *Textband* [= *Monasterium Sancti Galli* 3], St. Gallen 2008, pp. 446–449. Part of a wider reconsideration of the role of Greek in the West during the Middle Ages, these manuscripts are mentioned by W. BERSCHIN, *Griechisch-lateinisches Mittelalter: von Hieronymus zu Nikolaus von Kues*, Bern – Munich 1980, pp. 176, 191 n. 84, and Anna Carlotta DIONISOTTI, ‘Greek grammars and dictionaries in Carolingian Europe’, [in:] M. W. HERREN & Shirley Ann BROWN (eds.), *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks. The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages* [= *King’s College London Medieval Studies* 2], London 1988, pp. 1–56, at 22, 28. More general references can be found in B. BISCHOFF, ‘Das griechische Element in der abendländischen Bildung des Mittelalters’, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 44 (1951), pp. 27–55, republished in IDEM, *Mittelalterliche Studien. Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte* II, Stuttgart 1967, pp. 246–275.

part of a western scribe.¹⁰⁵ Nonetheless, it may not be a mere coincidence that in the St. Gall 902 the Latin text is separated from the Greek by a central dot; this dot, though not necessarily derived from an original *dicolon*, at least fulfils the same role as a division marker.¹⁰⁶

Serena Ammirati

Marco Fressura

Università degli Studi Roma Tre
 Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici
 via Ostiense, 234
 I-00146 Rome
 ITALY

e-mails: serena.ammirati@uniroma3.it
marco.fressura@uniroma3.it

¹⁰⁵ No final conclusions are made in KACZYNSKI, *Greek in the Carolingian Age* (cit. n. 104), p. 53.

¹⁰⁶ A secondary use of the middle dot is also attested, albeit rarely, in the same manuscript where it is used to separate words of the same language (perhaps resulting from the zeal of the scribe himself?).