



THE LATIN ORIGINS OF A BILINGUAL LETTER COLLECTION (*SPECIMINA EPISTVLARIA = P.BON. 5*)*

ABSTRACT

P.Bon. 5 preserves the only known collection of ancient Latin model letters, accompanied by a Greek translation. This article argues that the Latin is the primary version and dates the composition to before the early third century. Comparisons with other model letter collections, principally ps.-Demetrius' Epistolary Types and ps.-Libanius' Epistolary Styles, locate the text within a wider literary genre. A new reconstructed text is provided in the Appendix at the end of this article.

Keywords: Latin epistolography; bilingualism; model letters; ps.-Demetrius; ps.-Libanius

A papyrus bookroll from Egypt preserves the only known collection of ancient Latin model letters, a genre otherwise known from Greek sources.¹ Although no title survives, for ease of reference we call it the *Specimina epistularia* (abbreviated *Spec.*). The surviving portion contains thirteen anonymous letters, each written in both Latin and Greek in parallel columns and arranged by named epistolary genres. These include: advice on receiving tiny bequests (*[de exigu]is legatis suasor[ia]e*), congratulations on receiving inheritances (*gratulato[ri]a[e] hereditatium acceptarum*), and congratulations on manumission (*gratulato[ri]a[e] acceptae libertati[s]*). Despite the fascinating glimpse these letters offer, especially into the social interactions of *clientes* and freedmen, the work has attracted little attention outside papyrology since its first publication in 1947.² Interest in

* This research has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Program (Grant agreement no. 636983), specifically for the ERC-PLATINUM Project, led by Maria Chiara Scappaticcio as Principal Investigator at the University of Naples 'Federico II'. For help on Latin prose rhythm the writers would like to thank Dr Nigel Holmes.

¹ *P.Bon. 5* = Mertens-Pack³ 2117; Leuven Database of Ancient Books ID 5498; Trismegistos 64278; cf. E.A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores: Supplement* (Oxford, 1971), no. 1677. The text was first published by O. Montevecchi and G.B. Pighi, 'Prima ricognizione dei papiri dell'Università di Bologna', *Aegyptus* 27 (1947), 162–70 (signed by Pighi); and by A. Vogliano, 'Papiri Bolognesi', *Acme* 1 (1948), 199–216 (commentary by L. Castiglioni and *corrigenda* by P. Maas on pages 407–8). Other publications: O. Montevecchi, *Papyri Bononienses*, vol. 1 (Milan, 1953), no. 5; R. Cavenaile, *Corpus papyrorum Latinarum* (Wiesbaden, 1958), no. 279; J. Kramer, *Glossaria bilingua in papyris et membranis reperta* (Bonn, 1983), no. 16; and P. Cugusi, *Corpus epistularum Latinarum* (Florence, 1992), no. 1. A reconstructed version of the Latin text on its own is found in R. Merkelbach, 'Lateinische Musterbriefe auf Papyrus', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 16 (1956), 127–8 (repr. in R. Merkelbach, *Philologica: Ausgewählte kleine Schriften* [Stuttgart, 1997], 585–7). An English translation is found in A.J. Malherbe, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists* (Atlanta, 1988), 44–57; letter 3 is translated in M. Trapp, *Greek and Latin Letters: An Anthology* (Cambridge, 2003), no. 49; letters 3–5, 12 in E. Dickey, *Learning Latin the Ancient Way: Latin Textbooks from the Ancient World* (Cambridge, 2016), 149–51 and letters 6–11 on pages 75–80.

² The papyrus was acquired by A. Vogliano for the University of Bologna on the antiquities market in 1931, but was not published until 1947, by G.B. Pighi. Vogliano published his own edition in 1948, based on his preliminary drawings and notes produced in the 1930s without any subsequent access to

the work has been further diminished by its characterization as a ‘glossary’, produced by someone not fully competent in either Latin or Greek.

In fact, most of the infelicities of the transmitted text can be attributed to secondary stages of transmission. Building on previous scholarship, we argue that it originated as a monolingual Latin work produced before the early third century—and perhaps even earlier—which was only later equipped with a Greek translation. One can therefore distinguish between an initial phase of composition and later bilingual adaptation. This would make the original anonymous letters roughly contemporary with other better-known letter collections from the Early Empire, such as those by Pliny the Younger and Fronto. The paper then explores the significance of this document for ancient epistolography, in particular its connection to two Greek model letter collections, ps.-Demetrius’ *Epistolary Types* (Τύποι Ἐπιστολικοί) and ps.-Libanius’ *Epistolary Styles* (Ἐπιστολιμαῖοι Χαρακτήρες). The comparison supplements the near total silence of Roman grammarians and rhetoricians about epistolographic theory.³

In order to make this text more accessible, the Appendix contains a new reference edition of the Latin text. It aims to reconstruct the original state of the Latin collection as far as possible before it became a bilingual document. It therefore differs from, and provides a necessary supplement to, the authors’ forthcoming edition of the papyrus text in the *Corpus of Latin Texts on Papyrus (CLTP)*, which presents the complete text in its surviving state.⁴ Our citations of the text give the letter and sentence numbers from the Appendix, followed by a parenthesis containing the column and line numbers from Kramer and Cugusi.⁵

1. RECONSTRUCTING THE LATIN ORIGINAL

The high-quality format of the bookroll, which survives in three contiguous fragments, suggests a professional copy. A single scribe produced both the Latin text and the Greek text—in semi-literary minuscule and Greek capitals respectively—on the *recto* of the document. The *verso* was later reused for writing two Greek accounts (*P. Bon.* 38).⁶ Based on the script and the documents on the *verso*, the original document can be dated to the end of the third or to the beginning of the fourth century.⁷ Seven double columns survive, with the Latin on the left and the Greek on the right, and the bilingual

the document. Vogliano’s avowedly tentative readings influenced all subsequent editions, including those by Montevocchi (1953), Kramer (1983) and Cugusi (1992) (see n. 1 above). These editors reproduce Vogliano’s readings in several sections of the text that they themselves report to be illegible. Our autopsy of the text, conducted in June 2019, has sometimes confirmed and sometimes corrected Vogliano’s impressions (e.g. col. 1.14; 2.7, 9–11, 25, 26; 3.1–2, 15, 27–30; 7.14–20).

³ The only extended discussion of epistolography in Latin sources is Julius Victor, *Rhet.* page 105.10–106.20; other relevant epistolographic comments are collected in Malherbe (n. 1).

⁴ The edition in *CLTP* (Cambridge University Press) presents full papyrological documentation of the document in its surviving form along with an English translation. By contrast, the aim of the Appendix at the end of this article is to reconstruct more fully the Latin text in the version that we argue lies behind this surviving witness. This also provides an opportunity to present the text in a format that respects the division into letters and sentences, as is typical of literary texts but not often used for papyri.

⁵ E.g. 8.1 (= 4.13) refers to letter 8, sentence 1, which is found on column 4, line 13 (Kramer).

⁶ On the script and the dating, see S. Ammirati, *Sul libro latino antico: Ricerche bibliologiche e paleografiche* (Pisa, 2015), 47 and S. Ammirati and M. Fressura, ‘Towards a typology of ancient bilingual glossaries’, *The Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 47 (2017), 1–26, at 13.

⁷ The script resembles that of the Livy Epitome from the same period: Ammirati (n. 6), 46–7.

headings centred between the columns. The use of such double columns for translation is typical of ancient bilingual pedagogy.⁸

1.1 Errors and infelicities in the Greek

Despite the suggestive placement of the Latin in the left column, editors have disagreed about the relationship between the versions or the linguistic competence of the composer(s). According to Castiglioni, linguistic imperfections in both versions suggest simultaneous composition.⁹ While Kramer accepted the primacy of the Latin text, he concluded that the composer was most likely a speaker of Greek or Coptic, who produced the work relying mechanically on bilingual or trilingual glossaries, a view that has persisted in more recent scholarship.¹⁰

In fact, most of the apparent Latin errors can convincingly be explained as errors of transmission rather than errors of linguistic competence. This was rightly perceived by R. Merkelbach and recently defended by C.M. Lucarini.¹¹ When these mechanical errors are removed, the Latin text achieves an impressive degree of fluency and syntactic complexity, which generally enables it to stand on its own. By contrast, the Greek text closely follows the idiom of the Latin version, even where this produces Greek that is sometimes unidiomatic and even unintelligible without the Latin.

The strongest evidence for the Greek's secondary status are several errors best explained as misunderstandings of the Latin.

- *Spec.* 8.1 (= col. 4, lines 8–16) *multum tibi, frater, p[r]oficere reuerentiam, qu[a] semper amicos intueris et plenissima ueneratione [c]onseruas memoriam [R]utili amici* (~ πολὺ σοι, ἀδελφέ, προκόπτειν [τῆ]ν πολυφορίαν, ἦν ἀεὶ φίλοις παρέχῃ καὶ πληρεστάτ[η] **ἐπαφροδεδείσῃ** συντηρεῖς μνήμην Ῥουτιλίου φίλο[υ]). The context demands the meaning 'reverence' for *ueneratio*, but *ἐπαφροδεδείσῃ* (read

According to Montevecchi (n. 1), the prices recorded on the *verso* (*P. Bon.* 38) cannot be later than the first two or three decades of the fourth century.

⁸ Cf. E. Dickey, 'Columnar translation: an ancient interpretative tool that the Romans gave the Greeks', *CQ* 65 (2015), 807–21.

⁹ See Vogliano (n. 1), 210: 'A volte all'autore è riuscito di trovare una più acconcia voce greca, altra volta una latina ..., ma ha sostanzialmente, per l'una e l'altra parte, lavorato su lessici; se non erriamo su di un lessico trilingue, cioè copto – greco – latino.'

¹⁰ Kramer (n. 1), 109 regarded the following linguistic difficulties in the Latin text as indicative of non-native composition: 'illogical construction' (*Spec.* 4.1 [= 2.14–18] *quod aliter quam meruisse te scimus remuneratus non es a Publio amico tuo*; and 4.1 [= 2.23] *parum ingrata*); lack of agreement (*Spec.* 12.4 [= 7.27] *ornamentum ... non datam ... sed redditam*); and unclear syntax (*Spec.* 8.2 [= 4.19–22] *uidebatur ... [p]rocesse*). Similarly, Montevecchi (n. 1), 20: 'è certo che l'autore non possiede bene neppure questa lingua (latina)'; Malherbe (n. 1), 4: 'the artificiality and ... incomprehensibility of both versions make it likely that the author was at home in neither language'; J.-L. Fournet, 'Esquisse d'une anatomie de la lettre antique tardive d'après les papyrus', in R. Delmaire et al. (edd.), *Correspondances: Documents pour l'histoire de l'Antiquité tardive* (Lyon, 2009), 23–66, at 58: 'les fautes qui truffent les versions latine et grecque pourraient être dues à un travail de compilation'; and C. Poster, 'A conversation halved: epistolary theory in Greco-Roman antiquity', in C. Poster and L.C. Mitchell (edd.), *Letter-Writing Manuals and Instruction from Antiquity to the Present* (Columbia, SC, 2007), 21–51, on 38: 'mistakes in spelling and syntax characteristic of student or other relatively inexperienced writers'.

¹¹ See Merkelbach (n. 1); before this was published in 1956, some of his emendations were incorporated in Montevecchi (n. 1) in 1953. His opinion has been persuasively defended by C.M. Lucarini, 'Zu den lateinisch-griechischen Musterbriefen (*P. Bonon.* 5)', *ZPE* 216 (2020), 73–7, which provides outstanding discussion of several textual problems. The present authors finalized their text before having access to this publication and in some passages reached similar conclusions independently.

ἐπαφροδίσια) is only attested with the meaning ‘loveliness, elegance’ (LSJ). Presumably the translator recognized the root *Venus* in *ueneratio* and produced a quasi-calque, ἐπαφρεδεισια, whose meaning is intelligible only in relation to the Latin original.

- 12.4 (= 7.20–2) *hic enim demum speciosus est titulus* (~ αὐτή [γάρ] οὕτως εὐμορφός ἐστιν στήλη). *titulus* here probably has the figurative meaning ‘claim to glory or fame, distinction’ (OLD s.v. 7; for the collocation, see ps.-Quint. *Decl.* 9.22 *specioso titulo bene uita pensatur* ‘life is well compensated by a brilliant reputation’), here referring to the act of manumission described in the letter. By contrast, στήλη has the sense ‘monument, gravestone’ (LSJ). The translator has been misled by the more familiar meaning of *titulus* as ‘tablet’ or ‘inscription’, perhaps not recognizing the figurative meaning or relying uncritically on an ancient bilingual glossary (for example *CGL* 2.437.50).

Such errors suggest that the translator did not understand the Latin original or was not fully competent expressing himself in Greek.¹²

The translator also produced Greek expressions that are idiomatic for Latin but unusual or unattested in Greek. One recurring Latin word is the substantivized *suprema*, -orum ‘last wishes’, first certainly attested in this sense in ps.-Quintilian’s *Declamationes* (1.2 *neque ... patrem suprema sua iuueni iactasse crediderim*) and several times in the *Digest*.¹³ It occurs in three different letters (3.3 [= 2.11] *tabulas ... suppremorum [h]omines quidem faciunt, [s]et ordinant fata* ‘humans may make the documents of their last intentions, but Fate validates them’; 5 [= 3.1] *in [s]uppr[e]m[i]s [s]u[is]*; 9.1 [= 5.2] *in suppre[m]is suis*).¹⁴ All three occurrences are rendered into Greek as (τὸ) ἔσχατα, which looks more like an *ad hoc* calque than an established usage.

Other Latinisms are:

- 3.2 (= 2.6) ὀλίγον ‘slightly’ translating *parum* ‘hardly’; 3.2 (= 2.8–9) μὲν ... ἄλλὰ instead of μὲν ... δέ, translating *quidem ... sed*;
- 10.2 (= 6.3) ὑπόστασις ‘property’ as a calque on *substantia* rather than classical οὐσία; 12.1 (= 7.3–4) ἐλευθερία ... σπουδάζομ[εν] imitating the syntax of [*lib*]ertati ... *fauemus*;¹⁵
- 12.2 (= 7.8) καθ’ ἰδίαν for *pecu[li]ariter* ‘in particular’.

By contrast, there are no clear cases where the Greek version must have influenced the Latin construction.

¹² Other convincing mistranslations are discussed by Lucarini (n. 11): at *Spec.* 10.1 (= 5.23) passive *int[elle]gi* is translated by deponent οἰσθάνεσθαι (an active ἐσθάνετε is first attested at *P.Oxy.* 48.3417.10, mid fourth century; cf. *DGE* s.v.); at *Spec.* 8.2 (= 4.22) a form of the verb *procedere*, here used as a euphemism for death (*TLL* 10.2.1496.74–1497.5), is translated with προβαίνω, which does not have this sense.

¹³ Cf. Forcellini s.v. 11 (Tac. *Ann.* 1.8.1 is better taken as ‘last rites’); also found at Papinian, *Dig.* 29.1.36.1; Paulus, *Dig.* 28.2.25.1; Modestinus, *Dig.* 13.7.39. This meaning fits the context slightly better than ‘last moments’ (OLD s.v. 4c).

¹⁴ The phrase at *Spec.* 3.3 plays on two different senses of *ordinare*: a general sense ‘command’ (compare Sen. *Dial.* 10.7.9 *fors fortuna, ut uolet, ordinet*; cf. *TLL* 9.2.942.3–29); and a legal sense ‘finalize’, ‘render valid’, used specifically of wills (*TLL* 9.2.939.83–940.19; e.g. Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.92 *ordinare suprema iudicia* and *Decl.* 332 *ita suprema tabulas ordinauit*). Here *tabulas ... suppremorum* appears to be periphrasis for the more usual *supremae tabulae* (OLD s.v. *supremus* 4d).

¹⁵ Lucarini (n. 11), 74 defends *libertati fauemus* as poetic syntax.

Another notable Latinism is the connecting relative, a construction not usually found in Greek.¹⁶ The clearest example of this is 3.1–2 (= 2.3–8) *Licinn[i]um amicum tibi carum obisse compertus sum. quem parum memorem obsequi tui fuisse doleo*. The construction has been carefully imitated in Greek: ὄν ... ἐμνημονευσ[κέ]ναι ... λυποῦμαι. Perhaps related to this is the author's abundant use of relative pronouns, sometimes to append lengthy subordinate clauses that overshadow the main clause (for example 8.1 [= 4.8–10] *multum tibi ... p[r]oficere reuerentiam, qu[a] semper ...*; 8.2 [= 4.19] *[q]ui etiam uidebatur*). On this basis we have tentatively restored an additional connecting relative at 2.2 (= 1.11) [*cuius rem*], where the Greek can be punctuated as οὗ τὸ πρόγμια.¹⁷

1.2 Mechanical corruptions in Latin

By contrast, most cases where the Greek appears to be more intelligible than the Latin are plausibly explained as mechanical errors of transmission, consistent with prolonged transmission in a Greek-speaking milieu.¹⁸ On this hypothesis, such corruptions would have affected the Latin column only after it was translated into Greek and began to circulate in bilingual form.

The most common type of error is the omission of entire words or word parts, whose presence can typically be inferred from the Greek.

- At 5 (= 3.6–7) the Latin has *tam pr[os]peras quam aduersas ... non es[se] in tua [potes]ta[t]e* (τὰ κρείττονα ἢ τὰ φαῦλα ... μὴ εἶναι ἐν τῇ σῆ ἐξουσίᾳ). A substantive is needed in Latin to justify the feminine form of the adjectives *prosperas* and *aduersas*. A straightforward correction is *prosperas <res>*, with the noun *res* omitted by near haplography.
- At letter 10 (= 5.25–6), the scribe wrote *quod ta[ntu]m quod boluit, set quo[d] potuit* (οὐ μόνον τὸ ἠθέλησεν ἀλλὰ ὃ ἠδυνήθη). The duplication of *quod* is a scribal error of anticipation, which can be easily corrected from the Greek to *<non>*.

In two additional cases entire Latin words appear to have dropped out that must be restored based on the Greek:

- The first sentence of letter 5 (= 2.26) is missing an infinitive verb in indirect statement, which must correspond to the accusative subject. An infinitive is clearly recorded in Greek (ὀλιγορηκέναι), which can be used to restore the Latin.¹⁹ Notably, the Latin line here is considerably longer than the corresponding Greek

¹⁶ On the *coniunctio relatiua*, see J.B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich, 1972), 569–72.

¹⁷ Previous editors punctuated οὗτο πρόγμια, understanding οὗτο for τοῦτο, and supplemented the Latin as [*hanc rem*]. However, the form οὗτο for τοῦτο is apparently confined to the Boeotian dialect (cf. E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik* [Munich, 1953], 1.611), and the Greek translator, though he does sometimes omit the article, does regularly use it after demonstratives (e.g. 2.4 [= 1.24] τοῦτου τοῦ ὀφλήματος). Additionally, the start of a new sentence without a conjunction is unusual in these letters.

¹⁸ See Ammirati (n. 6), 47, where an eastern origin of the roll is suggested. For a comprehensive overview of Latin in Egypt, see J.N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge, 2003), 527–641 and A. Garcea and M.C. Scappaticcio, 'Per una geografia della circolazione letteraria in Egitto (V–VII s.): il contributo dei testi latini su papiro', *Philologia Antiqua* 12 (2019), 37–50, at 40–4.

¹⁹ We suggest *<remunerasse>* because of the author's fondness for this verb (2.3 [= 1.19]; 4.1 [= 2.17]; 10.1 [= 5.22]), but other supplements are possible.

line, which suggests that it might have been omitted or overlooked partly because of lack of space.

- A similar issue of space perhaps contributed to the omission of <fortunam> at 12.3 (= 7.19), which can be restored from the Greek τύχην. Here, by contrast, the two Greek lines (7.18–19) are much longer than the corresponding Latin.

A more complicated but revealing compound error has probably occurred at 4.1 (= 2.22), where the middle syllable of the verb *commutet* was omitted: *nihil ex moribus tuis cum<mut>et parum ingrata sententia* (μηδὲν οὖν ἐκ τῶν σῶν ἀλλαξέτω οὕτως ἀχάριστος ἀπόφασις). The papyrus has *cum · et*, with an interpunct in place of the middle syllable. Conceivably the archetype had *com · mutet*, with a word-internal interpunct separating the prefix from the verb stem. The scribe's eye skipped over the middle syllable *-mut-* and he wrote *com · et*. This was 'corrected' at a later stage to *cum · et* when it was realized that *com* alone is nonsensical. This explanation posits at least two stages of error: first a mechanical omission, then a correction by someone whose Latin was good enough to identify an error but without access to the archetype. Alternatively, the archetype may have had the form *cummutet*, a spelling of the prefix sporadically attested in antiquity (*TLL* 4.1341.3–8).

In comparison, the Greek text looks relatively free of more than superficial corruption. This is consistent with it being a younger text that was copied and read with greater attention. Characteristic mistakes include the omission of word endings or the accidental insertion of an incongruous particle: 10.1 (= 5.27) καταλειπέν<α>; 11.1 (= 6.8) μέ<ν>. ²⁰ Other peculiarities, such as the hapax legomenon ὑπεικία (3.2 [= 2.7] rendering *obsequium*) and the occasional omission of a definite article, are more likely to reflect features of contemporary Greek or the methodology of translation rather than textual corruption. ²¹

1.3 Latin idioms misidentified as errors

Furthermore, several passages have been misidentified as errors or interference, when in fact there are good, though rare, Latin literary parallels. These examples provide important clues for dating and locating the composition within a literary milieu.

The first is a case of pleonastic negation. At 4.1 (= 2.23) the phrase *parum ingrata sententia* (οὕτως ἀχάριστος ἀπόφασις) must mean from the context 'a very ungrateful judgement', as the Greek translation attests, though logically it means the opposite ('a not at all ungrateful judgement' = 'a very grateful judgment'). Merkelbach proposed deleting the prefix *in-* as a later insertion (*parum {in}grata*), and Kramer regards it as Coptic interference. However, such pleonastic negation, specifically before *in-* compounds, is attested after *haud* in Sallust (*Hist. fr.* 4.41 M. *haud impigre neque inultus occiditur*) and possibly in Livy (32.16.11 *oppidani haud impigre tuebantur moenia*). ²²

²⁰ Lucarini (n. 11), 75 suggests deleting μέ entirely. He also persuasively argues for the deletion of μέν before γάρ at 3.3 (= 2.11) *enim*. The Greek text is also almost certainly corrupt at 2.2 (= 1.15–17); see n. 31.

²¹ On the absence of the article in Greek translations from Latin, see Adams (n. 18), 516 and L. Koenen, 'Die *Laudatio funebris* des Augustus auf Agrippa auf einem neuen Papyrus', *ZPE* 5 (1970), 217–83, at 232 n. 21. The nature and style of the Greek translation requires more extensive discussion than is possible here.

²² Pleonastic negation is discussed by Hofmann and Szantyr (n. 16), 806 and by E. Löfstedt,

The pleonastic construction with *parum*, used as a polite alternative to *haud*, can be tolerated as a small logical oversight on the part of the author.²³

In another case involving negation, Merkelbach bracketed the *non* in a complicated subordinate clause at the beginning of letter 4 (4.1 [= 2.14–18]): *quod aliter quam meruisse te scimus remuneratus non es a Publio amico tuo* (ὅπερ ἄλλως ἢ ἠξιῶσθαί σε οἶδαμεν οὐκ ἀντεδωρήθης ἀπὸ Πουβλίου τοῦ φίλο[υ] σου). We punctuate the phrase *aliter quam meruisse te scimus* as a parenthetical remark and translate: ‘although—differently than we know you deserved—you were not rewarded by Publius’. Although the deletion of *non* might produce a less abrupt parenthesis (‘although you were rewarded by Publius otherwise than we know that you deserved’), the negation is clearly attested in both the Latin and the Greek. If the *non* is a later insertion, either it entered the Latin text before the Greek translation was made or, less plausibly, the negation was added later to both the Latin version and the Greek version.

Merkelbach also wanted to change *etiam* at 8.2 (= 4.19) into *etiam<si>*, since a subordinating conjunction is required that is later answered by *tamen* (4.23).²⁴ However, *etiam* on its own is attested as a subordinating construction, beginning with Columella (12.52.2): *locus ..., etiam descriptus est priore uolumine, pauca tamen ad rem pertinentia commemoranda sunt*.²⁵ The usage is also found in Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.1.89) and Frontinus (*Aq.* 128), and becomes more common after Tertullian (*TLL* 5.2.952.76–953.10).

Even more remarkable is a series of unusual genitives:

- 2.2 (= 1.15–17) [*et uer*]ecundia[e] tuae [*et modestia*]e ... [*gaudeo*] (καὶ ἡ αἰδημοσύνη ἢ σὴ καὶ ἐνκράτεια τέρπομαι);
- 10.1 (= 5.15–19) *memoriae Sulpici auctum te ... gaudeo* (μνήμη Σουλπικίου ἡ[ξ]ιμένον σε ... χ[αί]ρω);
- 11.1 (= 6.16–20) *quod candoris [an]imi tui ornamentum [li]beralitatis [ac]cessit* (καὶ τῆς λα[μ]πρότητος σῆς ψυχῆς ἐπειφόρη[μ]α{ι} [ἐ]λευθεριότητος [π]ροσῆθεν).

It is tempting to emend these peculiarities away. The first two passages can be understood as datives or emended to the ablative (*uerecundia{e} tua{e} et modestia{e} ... gaudeo*; *memoria{e} Sulpici auctum te ... gaudeo*); the third reads more smoothly as a dative (*candori{s} animi tui ornamentum liberalitatis accessit*). However, the

Syntactica: Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins (Lund, 1933–42), 2.209–18. The construction at Sall. *Hist.* fr. 4.41 M. is most recently defended by R. Funari, *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiarum fragmenta* (Amsterdam, 1996), 2.718–19. The text of Livy 32.16.11 has been widely debated. J. Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy Books XXXI–XXXIII* (Oxford, 1973), 195–6 deletes *haud*, following Drakenborch and Madvig (supported by S.P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy Books V–X* [Oxford, 1997–2005], 448–9 on 9.34.25). By contrast, Löfstedt (this note), 215, following Heraeus, accepts it as ‘ein kleinsches logisches Versehen des Autors’.

²³ On the conversational register of *parum*: J.B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache*³ (Heidelberg, 1951), 146. The transmitted text, *parum ingrata*, was accepted along these lines also by the *TLL* (‘per pleonasmum negationis’): 10.1.573.8–10. Lucarini (n. 11) suggests *tam ingrata*.

²⁴ The passage ([*q*]ui *etiam uidebatur non exiguo numero [p]ropinquorum relicto [p]roccesserit*) presents additional difficulties. We suspect that *proccesserit* is corrupted from an original infinitive *processisse* (or *proresse*? cf. Turpilium, *CRF* fr. 137 R. [*prodesse* sim. trad.]) in the rare sense ‘depart’ from life (*TLL* 10.2.1496.74–1497.5), probably supported by confusion with *praecedo*, commonly attested in this sense. *uideri* would then have the pleonastic sense ‘be deemed (to have)’ in imitation of legal style (e.g. Celsus, *Dig.* 50.17.187 *si quis praegnatem uxorem reliquit, non uidetur sine liberis decessisse*).

²⁵ Cf. *TLL* 5.2.952.76–953.10.

Greek unambiguously supports the genitive in the last case (τῆς λαμπρότητος).²⁶ If the Latin genitive is a corruption, it must have occurred before the Greek translation was made, unless the Greek translation was later ‘corrected’ (προσέρχουμι does not appear to govern the genitive idiomatically).

In fact, all three can be retained as genitives of cause, a rare construction but one sporadically attested in Latin literary texts.²⁷ For the last passage there is a striking parallel, with the same verb *accedere*, in *Rhet. Her.* 4.38.50: *utrum auaritiaē an egestatis accessit ad maleficium?* This is arguably the reading of the archetype and it has been persuasively defended by E. Löfstedt, though some manuscripts insert *causa*.²⁸ Likewise, there is a parallel for *gaudeo* with the genitive in Apuleius (*Met.* 1.24.7): *quid istud? uoti gaudeo*, a construction also found in later authors.²⁹ Another likely genitive of cause in a different construction is also found in the correspondence of Fronto.³⁰ The transmitted Latin genitives should therefore be retained and not be regarded as incompetent.³¹ Furthermore, the occurrence of the same unusual genitive in three different letters suggests unity of style, perhaps even unity of authorship, across the collection.

1.4 Stages of Transmission

The transmitted Latin text is thus both worse and better than has been previously appreciated: worse, in the sense that it is more deeply marred by mechanical errors; but also better, in the sense that the linguistic competence of the Latin has been consistently underrated. Indeed, once textual errors are removed, the remaining peculiarities can be explained without invoking bilingual interference from Greek or Coptic.³²

²⁶ The Greek is not very helpful in the first two passages: in the first, it appears to be corrupt; in the second, one may read either μνήμη or μνήμη (iota ad- or subscriptum is never written in the document).

²⁷ The *genetiuis causae* is regarded as an internal development of the *genetiuis relationis* (‘Genitiv des Sachbetroffs’) by Hofmann and Szantyr (n. 16), 75 (cf. 83); cf. H. Pinkster, *The Oxford Latin Syntax* (Oxford, 2015), 906. More discussion in E. Löfstedt, ‘Genetiuis causae im Latein’, *Eranos* 9 (1909), 82–91 and Löfstedt (n. 22), 1.169. Note also its occurrence on inscriptions: e.g. *CIL* 10.9 *conseruo pietatis fecit* and 13.1782 *salutis dedicauit*.

²⁸ Cf. Löfstedt (n. 27), 86–7, accepted by G. Calboli, *Cornifici Rhetorica ad C. Herennium* (Bologna, 1993²). Marx prints a lacuna before *auaritiaē* (Leipzig, 1894). By contrast, the Budé edition of G. Achard (Paris, 1989) prints *causa auaritiaē*, following MSS FE. However, other manuscripts insert *causa* at different places in the sentence (P²B²V, differently C), which rather suggests a secondary intervention.

²⁹ E.g. Tert. *Apol.* 1.13 *quid hoc malum est, cuius reus gaudet*; cf. *TLL* 6.2.1707.41–5 (but ps.-Jer. *Expos. in Math.* is no longer regarded as ancient). The Latinity of such genitives of cause is also discussed and defended by J. van Geisau, ‘Syntaktische Gräzismen bei Apuleius (Fortsetzung und Schluß)’, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 36 (1916), 242–87, on 250–3 (especially with *uerba affectuum*).

³⁰ Fronto, *Laudes fumi et pulueris*, page 215.21–3 van den Hout *hoc genus orationis non capit defendendi nec suadendae legis ... scribitur, sed facetiarum et uoluptatis*. On which, see Löfstedt (n. 27), 89–90; the other example he cites from Marcus Aurelius’ correspondence to Fronto (*M. Aur. Fro.* 1.4, page 8.5 *fiduciaē*) must be rejected as a dative based on van den Hout’s edition (parallel to *amorei*, not *amore*).

³¹ If the genitives are retained, the Greek in the first two examples require explanation. In the first case (2.2 [= 1.15–17]), the translator possibly did not understand the construction or the Greek text has been corrupted (Lucarini [n. 11], 76 attractively corrects to <τ>ῆ ἀϊδημοσύνη <τ>ῆ σῆ καὶ ἐγκράτεια). In the second case (10.1 [= 5.15–19]), the Greek has μνήμη, which we punctuate as a dative with instrumental sense.

³² The case for Coptic interference in the Latin has never been based on extensive evidence; it seems rather to be an inference arrived at by excluding Greek as the author’s native language on

Where the Greek translation is more intelligible than the Latin text, we can usually suppose that this is because the translator worked from a more accurate Latin text than what survives. Accordingly, one or more stages of copying must have intervened between the production of the bilingual version of the text and the surviving copy. A compound error like *cum<mu>et*, which most likely involved two independent stages of corruption, strengthens this conclusion. The following three stages of textual history can therefore be tentatively outlined:

- Stage 1: the composition of the *Specimina epistularia* as a monolingual Latin text;
 Stage 2: the state of the *Specimina* when it was translated into Greek (at this point or soon after the text was arranged in parallel bilingual columns);
 Stage 3: the state of the combined bilingual text as preserved on *P.Bon. 5*.

This scheme helps to distinguish ‘errors’ of composition, which occurred at Stage 1 and therefore reflect the composer’s command of Latin, from later errors that crept into the text during its transmission. In only a few cases, where both the Latin text and the Greek text present difficulties, do we suspect corruption occurring between Stages 1 and 2.³³ Most other corruptions seem to have occurred between Stages 2 and 3. The Latin text in the Appendix aims to reconstruct the Latin composition as close to Stage 1 as possible; in practice, however, it is rarely possible to conjecture far beyond what the Greek translator received at Stage 2.

2. DATING THE LATIN COMPOSITION

As this account emphasizes, the document underwent a series of transformations before it reached the form in which it survives. The composition must therefore be older than the papyrus itself, which dates to the end of the third or to the beginning of the fourth century. But how much older? This section offers several lines of evidence for locating the original composition more precisely in time and social context. That such a collection might be a patchwork composed by different hands at different times is entirely possible. In that case, one might expect a wide range of variation. However, as we will show, similar lexical and stylistic peculiarities tend to recur across different letters, thus favouring a unitary composition. We return to this question in the conclusions (section 3.4 below).

the basis of unidiomatic features in the Greek translation and assuming a unitary composition. Castiglioni (in Vogliano [n. 1], 211–12) cites Coptic influence to explain the genitives *memoriae* (10.1 = 5.15) and *uerecundia[e]* ... [*modestia*]*e* (2.2 [= 1.15–17]), which we have argued are found in native-speaker Latin texts. Kramer (n. 1) cites Coptic twice in his commentary vis-à-vis the Latin: to explain the pleonastic negation *parum ingrata sententia* (4.1 [= 2.23]), which is a native Latin construction, as we have argued; and to explain the simplified geminate in *narant* (4.1 [= 2.20]), which is in fact a learned spelling attributed to Varro, found in ancient grammarians, and attested in the *Codex Ambrosianus* of Plautus (*TLL* 9.1.67.22–32). The possibility of Coptic interference in the Greek translation is a separate question requiring investigation.

³³ In particular, 8.2 (= 4.22) [*p*]*rocesserit*, which seems to require an infinitive *processisse* (see n. 24). We also suspect early corruption at 9.2 (= 5.12) *per processorum tuorum*, where the use of *per* with a genitive is unparalleled (perhaps an accusative object was omitted), and in an extremely difficult passage at 12.3 (= 17.13–19). Our text in the Appendix does not attempt to resolve all these difficulties.

2.1 Content

The content of the collection implies writers and addressees who belong to a relatively prosperous upper-class Roman milieu. Characteristically Roman preoccupations include: the exchange of *beneficia* (*Spec.* 1–2), the naming of friends as heirs and legatees (*Spec.* 3–11), and manumission (*Spec.* 12–13).³⁴ Many of the addressees must be assumed to be Roman citizens since only full citizens could legally be named as heirs. Furthermore, there is a striking reference to *clientes* (9.2 [= 5.13]), who expect to benefit when their patrons receive inheritances. The patron–client system was a peculiarly Roman institution, for which there was no fixed Greek vocabulary.³⁵

There is also no unambiguously Christian material in the content of the letters. The reference to *fata*, possibly personified as *Fata*, might point towards a pre-Christian background: 3.3 (= 2.11–13) *tabulas ... suppremorum [h]omines quidem faciunt, [s]et ordinant fata*. However, the presence of pre-Christian material is not a reliable criterion on its own. The model letters of ps.-Libanius, for example, which can be assigned with some confidence to the fifth century, continue to show pseudo-pagan elements.³⁶ By contrast, there is a potentially Christian turn of phrase in the Greek translation of a vexed passage, *Spec.* 12.3 (= 7.14–16) *uti perpetuū[ta]s uitae omni uitae tuae spat[iose] detu[r]* ('that longevity of life be granted to your entire life extensively'). We understand *perpetuitas* as referring to 'longevity' or 'continuity' of life, since a wish for immortality would be out of place in the context.³⁷ However, the Greek translation seems to interpret this as a wish for salvation, using an expression common in patristic authors (ἴνα ἡ διηνεκής αἰὼν πάση [τῆ] ζωῆ σου ἐπὶ πλ[εῖ]στον δοθῆ).³⁸

2.2 Interpuncts

One of the text's most striking graphic features is its preservation of several word-internal interpuncts, which separate a prefix from its lexical stem: 1 (= 1.3) *in-ertes*; 3.1 (= 2.5) *com-pertus*; 8.1 (= 4.14) *[c]on-seruas*; and 10.2 (= 6.5) *absum-pserat*. In one case, it has been suggested that a word-internal interpunct contributed to textual corruption (see section 1.2 above on *cum-et*, which we restore to *com(mut)et*). Interpuncts are also found more regularly at word boundaries throughout the text. Word-internal interpuncts are a palaeographical peculiarity only known from ancient Latin books, which began to be employed less regularly and eventually disappeared over the course of the second and third centuries.³⁹ Therefore, the scribe of *P.Bon. 5* most likely copied these interpuncts from an older archetype.

³⁴ See E. Champlin, *Final Judgments: Duty and Emotion in Roman Wills, 200 B.C.–A.D. 250* (Berkeley, 1991).

³⁵ Here translated as π[ροσῆκο]ντες; other equivalents include πρόσφυξ (e.g. *CGL* 2.102.7), πλάτης (*CGL* 3.276.67), θεράπων (e.g. *CGL* 3.304.68) and συνέστιος (*CGL* 3.79.22). A survey of Roman patronage into Late Antiquity is found in P. Garnsey, 'Roman patronage', in S. McGill, C. Sogno, E. Watts (edd.), *From the Tetrarchs to the Theodosians* (Cambridge, 2010), 33–54.

³⁶ V. Weichert, *Demetrii et Libanii qui feruntur Τύποι Ἐπιστολικῶι Ἐπιστολιμαῖοι Χαρακτήρες* (Leipzig, 1910); cf. e.g. 33.5 νῆ τοὺς θεοὺς. On this text and its dating, see section 3.1 below.

³⁷ Arguably the first *uitae*, which looks like a genitive modifying *perpetuitas*, should be deleted as an error of anticipation. The sense of a long duration of time is well attested for *perpetuus* (*TLL* 10.1.1646.10–19) but less clearly for *perpetuitas*. Alternatively, if *uitae* is deleted, *perpetuitas* might refer to the perpetuity of the grant of freedom (*TLL* 10.1.1636.27–35).

³⁸ The phrase is especially common in John Chrysostom, e.g. *Homil. in gen.* 36.5 (Migne, *PG* 53, page 340.29) τὴν ἐν διηνεκεῖ αἰὼνι ἀπόλαυσιν; 40.1 (page 369.5) διηνεκεῖ τῷ αἰὼνι; etc.

³⁹ Cf. Ammirati (n. 6), 32–3, 113.

2.3 *Lexicon*

The lexical evidence also clusters around a date in the first or second century. The substantive *suprema*, *-orum* ‘last wishes’, discussed above (1.1), is first attested in the *Declamationes* of ps.-Quintilian. Furthermore, its spelling with geminate *p* may suggest a learned context.⁴⁰ Another frequent item of vocabulary is *remunero(r)*, which occurs three times in three different voices: once as a deponent (2.3 [= 1.19] [*gen*]um tuum [*nos rem*]uneratur), once as a passive (4.1 [= 2.17] *remuneratus ... es a Publio*) and once in an active form (10.1 [= 5.22] *remuneravit*). The perfect active form is first attested in Festus (page 372 M. *remunerasse*; cf. Petron. *Sat.* 140.8 *remunerabat*); the passive is first attested doubtfully in the ps.-Quintilianic declamations (4.2 *remunerare*) and certainly in Apuleius (*Met.* 7.14.4 *quo ... facto ... remunerarer*) and frequently afterwards. There is an even more striking coincidence with Apuleius, who is the earliest source that attests the use of all three diatheses of this verb, exactly as found in the *Specimina*.⁴¹

Another peculiarity is the use of *praestantia* to mean ‘generosity’ or ‘act of generosity’ (10.1 [= 5.21] *praestantiam tuam sic remuneravit* ~ τὴν σὴν παροχὴν οὕτως ἀνταμείψατο). Although Castiglioni regarded this as imperfect Latin, the meaning is first attested in a decree from Trieste of Antonine date (*Decret. decur. Tergest. [Inscr. Ital.* 10.4.31] 27): *cum Fabius Seuerus ... tanta pietate ... rem p(ublicam) n(ostram) amplexus sit ... atque omnem praestantiam <s>uam <e>xerat (= exserat)*.⁴² Within literary texts, it is found in the ps.-Quintilianic *Declamationes* (6.14 *ut natus ... in rebus aduersis praesidium parenti labore atque praestantia solueret lucis usuram*).

Lastly, the concessive use of *etiam* (for *etiamsi*, discussed at 1.3) is first attested in Columella, Quintilian and Frontinus.

2.4 *Onomastics*

The names found in the letters are exclusively Latin and suggestive of the *tria nomina* exclusive to Roman citizens. There are two *praenomina*: Publius (4.1 [= 2.18]) and Quintus (2.1 [= 1.10]); three *gentilicia*: *Licin(n)ius* (3.1 [= 2.3], 5 [= 3.2], 9.1 [= 5.3; the only occurrence with single *n*), *Rutilius* (8.1 [= 4.16]) and *Sulpicius* (10.1 [= 5.15]); and one *cognomen*: *Fabianus* (11.1 [= 6.7]). The mere occurrence of such names is inconclusive, since many continued to be used long after the *tria nomina* system ceased to function.

More instructive is the way in which these names are used: specifically, none ever occurs in the vocative as part of direct address. Instead, direct address occurs exclusively with the vocative *frater*.⁴³ This reflects a well-documented chronological trend, in which

⁴⁰ The geminate spelling is apparently transmitted in several scholarly works, including Festus page 396.29 M. (*supp(remum)*), Porphyrio on Hor. *Carm.* 1.13.17, and throughout *CGL*; also transmitted at Apul. *Met.* 3.23 and in Plautus (*Capt.* 425, 768, 976), as well as in inscriptions, e.g. *CIL* 6.30156 (between the middle of the first century and the third century C.E.).

⁴¹ Deponent at *Met.* 9.33.2 *remunerari benignum hospitem cupiens*; active at *Met.* 3.15.5 *simplicitatem relationis meae tenacitate taciturnitatis remunerare*; and passive at *Met.* 7.14.4 *consilium datur, quo ... facto ... remunerarer* (cf. *quod ... promitterent honores ... mihi*).

⁴² This sense of the noun *praestantia* ‘generosity’ (as opposed to ‘excellence’) derives from *praestare* ‘give’. Cf. *TLL* 10.2.900.61–901.33 (the occurrences in *Decl.* 6 and the *Spec.* seem ambiguous between 1 ‘qualitas ... praestantis, ... indulgentia, benignitas, largitas’ and 2 ‘praestatio; respicitur actio ... beneficentis’).

⁴³ Three occurrences of the vocative *frater*: 2.1 (= 1.8); 6 (= 3.16); 8.1 (= 4.8). Cf. E. Dickey, *Latin Forms of Address* (Oxford, 2002), 123–6.

proper names began to disappear from direct address over the course of the first century C.E., replaced by polite terms such as *domine*, *carissime* and *frater*.⁴⁴ In keeping with this development, the *Specimina* aligns much more closely with the letters in the Vindolanda Tablets and in Fronto than with those in Cicero's correspondence. Of course, it is possible that direct address by proper name was avoided in these letters precisely because they were meant to be used as models.

2.5 Prose rhythm

One overlooked feature is the presence of quantitative clausulae at the end of most sentences. To facilitate comparison, we use the scansion methodology outlined by T. Keeline and T. Kirby, who provide valuable comparative data.⁴⁵ Of the twenty-six sentences ending in full stops in our proposed punctuation of the text, twenty-three (88.46%) end in identifiable 'artistic' clausulae, of the sort common in literary prose from Cicero to Apuleius.⁴⁶ In fact, every letter concludes with such a clausula, where there is no ambiguity about a sentence boundary and where greater rhetorical emphasis is expected. Among the 'artistic' clausulae, the following patterns are found in decreasing order of frequency: seven cretic trochees (26.92% of all sentences), five double trochees (19.23%), five molossus cretics (19.23%), three hypodochmiacs (11.54%) and three double cretics (11.54%). Of the remainder, three are double spondees (11.11%).⁴⁷

The twenty-six full sentences from the *Specimina*, admittedly a small corpus, do permit some tentative comparisons. Strikingly, the *Specimina* has an overall higher proportion of 'artistic' clausulae (88.46%) than in other, more famous, letter collections. In particular, it aligns with collections that were composed with a view to publication or for addressees with whom the writer was on formal terms: for example Cicero's *Ad familiares* (75.41%), Seneca's *Epistulae* (80.92%) and Pliny's *Epistulae* Books 1–9 (84.87%). By contrast, letters written to intimate friends, as in Cicero's *Ad Atticum* (69.68%), or to subordinates, such as Trajan's letters to Pliny in *Epistulae* Book 10 (67.55%), have lower concentrations of clausulae. It therefore seems that the *Specimina* was written in a more formal and less intimate epistolary style.

The presence of quantitative rhythm is itself significant evidence for the text's date of composition. A new system of quantitative-accentual prose rhythm, sometimes unhappily called *cursum mixtus*, began to appear in several late treatises of Apuleius (*De Platone*, *De mundo*), whose authenticity has sometimes been called into question, and in the works of Minucius Felix and Cyprian, namely around the end of the second

⁴⁴ Cf. Dickey (n. 42), 44–5.

⁴⁵ Cf. T. Keeline and T. Kirby, 'Auceps syllabarum: a digital analysis of Latin prose rhythm', *JRS* 109 (2019), 161–204. Their definition of 'artistic' clausulae includes four types: cretic + trochee (– ∪ – – ×), double cretic or molossus + cretic (– ∪ – – ∪ × or – – – – ∪ ×), ditrochee (– ∪ – ×) and hypodochmiac (– ∪ – ∪ ×). Within each clausula at most one resolved long syllable is permitted (and an epitrite substitution is allowed within a molossus + cretic): – ∪ – – – ∪ ×; cf. D.H. Berry, *Cicero Pro Sulla oratio* (Cambridge, 1996), 51.

⁴⁶ Of the three sentences not ending with an 'artistic' clausula, two are double spondees (3.1, 12.1 [if *-e* counts as long before *s impura*; otherwise, a triple trochee]). Out of textual uncertainty we also exclude 2.3 ([*rem*]uneratur [*habeo ingratum*]). Note, however, that one of the double trochees is in fact a triple trochee (2.1; perhaps also 12.1), an effect avoided by Cicero; cf. N. Holmes, 'Metrical notes on Vegetius' *Epitoma rei militaris*', *CQ* 52 (2002), 358–73, on 370 n. 69. Keeline and Kirby do not exclude triple trochees in their data.

⁴⁷ Cretic and trochee: 1, 3.3, 5, 9.1, 9.2, 10.1, 11.1; double trochees: 2.1, 2.4, 6.1, 7.2, 8; molossus + cretic: 4.2, 7.1, 11.2, 12.3, 12.4; hypodochmiac: 3.2, 11.3, 12.2; double cretic: 2.2, 4.1, 10.2.

century.⁴⁸ Though this system is not purely accentual like the later *cursus*, word boundaries and accents place greater constraints on the favoured clausulae. As a result, certain patterns that are freely distributed in earlier authors, such as Cicero, become proportionally much rarer. For example, in a double trochee, an accent on the first trochee is avoided (˘ ˘ – ×), part of a general tendency to avoid accents separated by only one syllable; and when the final word is itself a double trochee it is usually preceded by a proparoxytone (˘ × × . – ˘ – ×).⁴⁹

Several such disfavoured patterns of accent and word boundary are found in the *Specimina*. For example, two of the double trochees contain an accent on the first trochee (6 *respondere laetor*; 7.2 [*so*]láciūm fit), and the previous word is not required to be a proparoxytone (8.2 *suos* [d]ignūm iu[d]icaui<ɫ>). Two of the three hypodochmiacs do not have the usual word break after the cretic (11.3 *desiderandus* [e]st; 12.1 *con[s]ecu[t]us es*). Such patterns are not absolutely forbidden in *cursus mixtus*, but they become rarer in relation to the favoured clausulae. Accordingly, in so far as there are quantitative clausulae in the *Specimina*, there is no sign that the constraints of *cursus mixtus* are yet operative. Though the precise date and circumstances of this transition need more investigation, it seems unlikely that purely quantitative clausulae would be written after the end of the second century.

2.6 Dating conclusions

Several lines of evidence converge on a date between roughly the middle of the first century C.E. and the beginning of the third. On the one hand, a *terminus post quem* is provided by several rare words and constructions that are not attested before early imperial sources: the perfect active stem *remuneraui* (Festus); passive forms of *remuneror* (ps.-Quintilian and Apuleius); the concessive *etiam* (Columella); *praestantia* ‘generosity’ (Antonine inscriptions, ps.-Quintilian); and the substantive *suprema* (ps.-Quintilian). The absence of names in direct address fits well with a period from the second half of the first century onwards. On the other hand, there are *termini ante quem* provided by the presence of word-internal interpuncts, which would have been a palaeographic feature of the exemplar, and the system of quantitative prose rhythm, which is unlikely to have been produced by any writer after the end of the second century. Of course, it is hazardous to rest too much weight on any particular piece of linguistic evidence, and it must be kept in mind that the earliest surviving occurrence of a linguistic feature might be younger by centuries than its earliest occurrence.

⁴⁸ For the identification of this metrical system in the two works of Apuleius, see B. Axelson, ‘Akzentuierender Klauselrhythmus bei Apuleius: Bemerkungen zu den Schriften *De Platone* und *De Mundo*’, in A. Önnfors and C. Schaars (ed.), *Kleine Schriften* (Stockholm, 1987), 233–45; for Minucius Felix, see K. Müller, ‘Rhythmische Bemerkungen zu Minucius Felix’, *MH* 49 (1992), 57–73. In general, see N. Holmes, ‘Metrical words and accent in late Latin prose rhythm’, in P. Poccetti (ed.), *Latinitatis Rationes: Descriptive and Historical Accounts for the Latin Language* (Berlin, 2016), 65–78 and Holmes (n. 46), 358. Tertullian, whose work straddles the boundary between the late second and the early third centuries, also shows some traces of accent-based rhythm, according to V. Ugenti, ‘Norme prosodiche delle clausole metriche nel *De idololatria* di Tertulliano’, *Augustinianum* 35 (1995), 241–56. J. Stover and M. Kestemont have recently defended the authenticity of the *De Platone* and the *De mundo*: ‘Reassessing the Apuleian corpus: a computational approach to authenticity’, *CQ* 66 (2016), 645–72.

⁴⁹ For such patterns of word division, see Holmes (n. 48) and Holmes (n. 46), 366–7; cf. R.G. Hall and S.M. Oberhelman, ‘Rhythmical clausulae in the *Codex Theodosianus* and the *Leges nouellae ad Theodosium pertinentes*’, *CQ* 35 (1985), 201–14, on 206.

Nevertheless, it is suggestive that several independent lines of linguistic evidence are consistent with an Antonine date range.

3. GENRE AND CONTENT

3.1 Greek model letter collections

Comparing the *Specimina* with the two Greek model letter collections that survive complete provides additional information about its structure, audience and rhetorical context.⁵⁰ Specifically, it helps to show that the Latin composition was considerably more ambitious than student exercises. This accords with the textual and linguistic discussion, which has shown that the Latin is of higher quality than typically regarded.

As mentioned, only two Greek model letter collections survive in manuscript tradition, both with pseudonymous attributions: ps.-Demetrius' *Epistolary Types* (Τύποι Ἐπιστολικοί) and ps.-Libanius' *Epistolary Styles* (Ἐπιστολιμαῖοι Χαρακτῆρες).⁵¹ Intriguingly, the Egyptian *Book of Kemit* (extant texts from the late second millennium B.C.E.) contains several epistolary formulas, hinting at more ancient, local roots of the genre.⁵² A fragment of a Greek epistolary manual on a sixth-century papyrus codex has also been identified (*P.Berol.* inv. 21190), which appears to be typologically distinct.⁵³ Ps.-Demetrius is clearly the older of the two, although estimates of its date vary considerably. It is usually thought to have Ptolemaic origins, but later composition or revision is possible as late as the fourth century.⁵⁴ An Egyptian origin is undisputed.⁵⁵ After a theoretical preface, it discusses twenty-one epistolary genres, each prefaced by a short description and followed by a single illustrative letter.

⁵⁰ On epistolographic theory and model letter collections in general: Poster (n. 10); Malherbe (n. 1), 1–11. Useful discussion in A. Brinkmann, 'Der älteste Briefsteller', *RhM* 64 (1909), 310–17 and H. Koskenniemi, *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefs bis 400 n. Chr.* (Helsinki, 1956).

⁵¹ The standard edition of both works is Weichert (n. 36), cited here by page and line number. The latter also circulates in an enlarged Byzantine recension under the name of Proclus (Weichert [n. 36], 37–66), on which see D.A. Chernoglazov, 'Die byzantinische Fassung des spätantiken Briefstellers: Überlieferung und Textgeschichte', *Antiquitas Perennis* 12 (2017), 188–205. A more recent edition of ps.-Libanius appears in R. Foerster, *Libanii opera*, vol. 9 (Leipzig, 1927). Translations are found in: Malherbe (n. 1) (English); P.-L. Malosse, *Lettres pour toutes circonstances: Les traités épistolaires du Pseudo-Libanius et du Pseudo-Démétrios de Phalère* (Paris, 2004); and J.A. Artés Hernández, *Pseudo-Demetrio: Tipos de Cartas; Pseudo-Libanio: Clases de Cartas* (Amsterdam, 2005).

⁵² See C. Peust, 'Das Lehrstück Kemit', in B. Janowski and G. Wilhelm (ed.), *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments*, New Series III: *Briefe* (Gütersloh, 2006), 307–13.

⁵³ See R. Luiselli, 'Un nuovo manuale di epistolografia di epoca bizantina (*P.Berol.* inv. 21190): Presentazione e considerazioni preliminari', in B. Kramer (ed.), *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin 1995* (Berlin, 1997), 1.643–51; the text was published in G. Iannidou (ed.), *Catalogue of Greek and Latin Literary Papyri in Berlin (P. Berol. inv. 21101–21299, 21911)* (Mainz, 1996), no. 94. It appears to give advice and phrases to use for specific kinds of addressee rather than complete model letters.

⁵⁴ An earlier date was defended by Weichert (n. 36), partly on the basis of titles wrongly believed to be exclusively Ptolemaic (στρατηγούς, ἐπιστρατηγούς, διοικητάς at 2.23–4); cf. Artés Hernández (n. 51), 32 n. 56. Other linguistic arguments for an early date have been undercut by subsequent papyrological finds: cf. C.W. Keyes, 'The Greek letter of introduction', *AJPh* 56 (1935), 28–44, on 28–30. Luiselli (n. 53), 646 suggests 'non anteriore al IV sec.' on the basis of language and content.

⁵⁵ Cf. Weichert (n. 36), xviii, noting the reference to sailing to Alexandria (10.2 καταπλεύσας

Ps.-Libanius' *Epistolary Types* originates in a later milieu, perhaps the middle of the fifth century, under the influence of Libanius.⁵⁶ It circulates in two recensions, the first under the name Libanius, regarded as the older and more authentic of the two, and a second under the name Proclus, with a slightly different structure and many Byzantine interpolations, including additional genres and model letters. In ps.-Libanius, the number of genres (χαρακτῆρες) has doubled to forty-one, with seven additional types found only in the Byzantine recension.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, the model letters themselves tend to be shorter and simpler than in Ps.-Demetrius, with fewer sentences and less hypotaxis. Usually there is only one model letter for each type, although the Byzantine recension adds multiple, more elaborate and Christianized model letters.

In addition, ps.-Libanius follows a slightly different arrangement than ps.-Demetrius: after a brief theoretical definition of ἐπιστολή (Weichert 13.1–14.9), all forty-one letter types are listed by name (14.10–15.4) and then individually defined (15.5–19.6), there are general recommendations about epistolographic style (19.7–21.15), and finally the actual letter models are presented at the end (21.16–34.5).⁵⁸ Among the forty-one letter types of ps.-Libanius, only twelve are also found in ps.-Demetrius.

The preface of ps.-Demetrius, addressed to an unknown Heraclides, provides some information on the audience and function of such a treatise. It refers to the haphazard way in which letters are composed by 'those who undertake service for men engaged in politics' (Weichert 1.5–6 [sc. ἐπιστολῶν] γραφομένων ... ὡς ἔτυχεν ὑπὸ τῶν τὰς τοιαύτας τοῖς ἐπὶ πραγμάτων ταττομένοις ὑπουργίας ἀναδεχομένων), and it characterizes Heraclides as an educated young man with intellectual ambition (1.13–14). Whereas this treatise supposes a professional audience, there are also suggestions that the composition of letters occurred as a rhetorical exercise, specifically in connection with προσωποποιία.⁵⁹

3.2 Comparing letter collections

Compared to the genres in the Greek letter collections, those in the *Specimina* show a tendency to greater generic elaboration.⁶⁰ Although only three genres can be reconstructed with confidence ([*de exiguis legatis suasor[i]ae* ~ συνβουλευτικά καὶ ἐλαχίστων καταλελειμμένων; *gratulato[ri]ae hereditatium acceptarum* ~ [συνχ]οριστ[ι]καὶ κληρονομῶν καταλελειμμένων) [ἐ]π[ι]στ[ο]λαί; and *gratulatoria[e acceptae libertati]s* ~ συναριστικά [ἐπὶ ἐλευθερί]α), two of them are in fact subgenres of the same single genre, *gratuloriae*. By contrast, neither of the Greek collections subdivides any genre in this way.

Furthermore, the *Specimina* illustrates each subgenre with multiple letters, ranging from three (*de exiguis legatis suasoriae*) to six (*gratuloriae hereditatium acceptarum*).

ἤμην εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν) and 'ships in public service' (9.3–4 οὕτε ... πλοῖόν ἐστιν εὐπορήσαι πάντων εἰλκυσμένων πρὸς τὰς λειτουργίας).

⁵⁶ Cf. Weichert (n. 36), xx–xxix; and more persuasively Foerster (n. 51), 1 'post medium V saeculum'; cf. Chernoglazov (n. 51), 189: '5. Jh.'. A solid *terminus ante quem* is provided by the quotations of this work by Maximus Confessor in the sixth century (cf. Foerster [n. 51], 2 n. 4).

⁵⁷ A conspectus is found in Chernoglazov (n. 51), 200–3.

⁵⁸ Chernoglazov (n. 51), 189 notes that the Proclus recension differs in arrangement, and it is an open question as to which is more original.

⁵⁹ Nicolaus, *Prog.* 67.2–8 and Theo, *Prog.* 115.22 Spengel (= 70 Patillon).

⁶⁰ Cugusi (n. 1), 2.3–4.

By contrast, in the Greek collections, each genre is illustrated by only one model letter as a rule (though the Byzantine recension of ps.-Libanius shows a tendency to add additional versions). If the *Specimina* addressed other genres as well, in its complete form it would have been larger than anything that survives in Greek.

Both of these Greek letter collections contain two elements that are not attested in the surviving portion of the *Specimina*: first, a theoretical preface of some kind, which in ps.-Demetrius also includes a named dedicatee; second, descriptions of each epistolary genre that complement the model letters themselves. In ps.-Demetrius, these descriptions directly precede each model letter; in ps.-Libanius, all the genres are described in one section, followed by all the model letters separately.⁶¹ Conceivably, these two elements are standard features of ancient model letter collections and were also part of the complete *Specimina*. If so, the genre descriptions must have been placed in a separate section preceding the model letters themselves, as found in ps.-Libanius.

The two epistolographic ‘super-genres’ securely attested in the *Specimina* are also found in both Greek collections but with some terminological variation. What are called *suasoriae* (συμβουλευτικά) in the *Specimina* corresponds to the τύπος συμβουλευτικός in ps.-Demetrius (*Ep.* 11 = 7.3–11). It is also found in an interpolated branch of the older recension of ps.-Libanius (*Ep.* 42 = 34.1–4).⁶² The *gratulatioes* (συγχαριστικά) in the *Specimina* are paralleled by the τύπος συγχαρητικός in ps.-Demetrius (*Ep.* 19 = 10.16–11.5) and the συγχαρητική in ps.-Libanius (*Ep.* 16 = 26.8–11). There is thus a very general overlap between the generic framework of the *Specimina* and the Greek collections, even though the terminology does not consistently align with one or the other collection.

There is one remarkable point of linguistic overlap: the adjective συ(γ/ν)χαριστικάί, twice used in the *Specimina* (*tit.* 6 [= 3.13]; *tit.* 12 [= 7.2]), is only attested in one other ancient source: the Byzantine or Proclan recension of ps.-Libanius. Here it has been included as a genre along with a model letter (*Ep.* 103 συγχαριστική = 61.12–20). There is also a loose resemblance in content between this Byzantine letter and one of the corresponding *Specimina* letters, in so far as both stress the mutuality of benefits from friendship.⁶³ If the word was not coined independently, which is conceivable, it suggests a distant connection: perhaps the Greek translator of the *Specimina* was familiar with a lost epistolographic source also known to the Byzantine redactor; or perhaps the *Specimina* itself was known in some form to the early Byzantine epistolographic tradition.

The genre of the first two letters in the *Specimina* does not survive, and their fragmentary state makes it difficult to reconstruct. One attractive possibility is that it corresponds to the τύπος ἀπευχαριστικός of ps.-Demetrius (*Ep.* 21 = 11.14–12.2).⁶⁴ This is called εὐχαριστική in ps.-Libanius (*Ep.* 6 = 23.5–8). In the Latin tradition no clear terminological equivalent is attested, but possible names include *gratifica*,

⁶¹ At least, this is the structure found in the older recension of ps.-Libanius, which is typically taken to be more authentic; cf. Chernoglazov (n. 51), 189. The Byzantine recension has rearranged this material so that the descriptions and models appear together, as in ps.-Demetrius.

⁶² Since other genres are known to have fallen out of the older recension (cf. *Ep.* 13 ὀνειδιστική; *Ep.* 21 παραμισθητική; *Ep.* 22 ὑβριστική) and must be reconstructed based on the later Byzantine recension, it is perhaps conceivable that συμβουλευτική also belonged to the original collection.

⁶³ Compare 61.12–13 ἢ τῶν φίλων εὐδοκίμησις χαρὰν τοῖς φίλοις μεγίστην ἐργάζεται with *Spec.* 9.2 (= 5.11–14) *omnes per processorum tuorum <...> clientes tui augentur*.

⁶⁴ Suggested by Kramer (n. 1) and Cugusi (n. 1), 2–3, which accords with the persuasive account offered by Lucarini (n. 11), 76.

gratatoria, or *eucharistica*.⁶⁵ This identification is made plausible because of the overall resemblance in content and tone between the uncertain reconstruction of the second letter in the *Specimina* and the corresponding model in ps.-Demetrius (23.5–8).⁶⁶

To sum up, there are some general resemblances between the *Specimina* and the two Greek model letter collections, particularly in terms of genre, since all three of its ‘super-genres’ (*suasoriae*, *gratulatoariae* and—though the precise Latin terminology is uncertain—perhaps *gratificae*) are attested in the Greek collections. There are also a few very distant similarities in content, though nothing that can be called a direct borrowing or allusion. At the same time, the *Specimina* differs strikingly from any Greek collection in its degree of elaboration, showing multiple subgenres (at least of *gratulatoariae*) and multiple model letters for each. The content too shows considerable independence from any known Greek collection. Even if it was loosely inspired by a Greek collection that no longer survives, the density of references to Roman content shows that the anonymous composer was working with considerable artistic freedom.

3.3 Modified private letters as models?

While some ancient model letter collections appear to have been composed as such, others were produced by adapting pre-existing correspondence for pedagogical use. The latter method is illustrated by two Greek private letters that survive as part of a Ptolemaic administrative collection copied onto the *verso* of the Eudoxus papyrus (*P.Paris* 63).⁶⁷ Their function as models is suggested by their personal content, which differs from the surrounding administrative material, their careful punctuation and the absence of a named addressee or date. Some of the content of the letter has also been omitted, which the copyist indicated by writing *μετὰ τὰ λοιπά* (144.46).⁶⁸ At around fifty continuous lines, each of the letters is much longer than any letter in the other model collections, and the content seems both too specific and too complex to fall under the heading of a single epistolographic genre.⁶⁹ The best explanation for these features is that they were originally genuine letters, later adapted for use as models within the Ptolemaic chancellery, specifically by removing the prefatory and concluding sections and the omission of less relevant passages. A similar method can be detected in other sources. Dioscorus of Aphrodito in the sixth century appears to have copied several letters into his archive for this purpose.⁷⁰ Books 6 and 7 of Cassiodorus’ *Variae*

⁶⁵ The adverb *eucharistice* is sporadically attested in Latin rhetorical sources as a generic title for poems by Horace, Statius and Paulus of Pella (*TLL* 10.2.1004.77–1005.2).

⁶⁶ The similarity is especially striking in the conclusions: *Spec.* 2.4 (1.22–5) [*quid ergo es?*] [*spero ut breui tibi huius deb[itu] tui [sim] comput[ator]*] (‘What is it? I hope that in a short while I may be the reckoner for you of this your debt’) compared to τῶν κατ’ ἐμὲ δὲ ὅ τι βούλει, μὴ γράφει παρακαλῶν, ἀλλ’ ἀπατῶν χάριν. ὀφείλω γάρ (‘If you wish anything in my power, do not write and request it, but demand a return. For I am in your debt’). On the reconstruction of this letter, see Lucarini (n. 11), 76–7.

⁶⁷ The items are numbered 144 and 145 in U. Wilcken, *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1927; henceforth *UPZ*). On the entire collection of administrative documents and its papyrological context, see no. 110. Wilcken persuasively refutes W. Schmid, ‘Ein epistolographisches Übungsstück unter den Pariser Papyri’, *Neue Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie* 145 (1895), 692–9, who suggested that the compositions were model letters of the same kind as found in ps.-Demetrius and ps.-Libanius.

⁶⁸ So Wilcken (n. 67), 622.

⁶⁹ Wilcken (n. 67), 623.

⁷⁰ The first letter retains the name of its author, the philosopher Horapollon (composer of the *Hieroglyphica*); see the edition in the *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini* (Florence, 2008),

contain anonymous *formulae* granting administrative positions, which originated as actual letters.⁷¹ Later examples can also be found, such as a tenth- or eleventh-century anthology of Alcuin's letters, in which the names of some addressees have been replaced by their generic titles or simply by *illi*.⁷²

The distinction between tailor-made model letters and those adapted from real correspondence is a delicate one. Genuine correspondence could be written with a view towards imitation, as in Pliny's *Letters*, and model letters might be composed out of intertextual segments recalled from 'real' correspondence. Nevertheless, the *Specimina* clearly aligns more closely with ps.-Demetrius and ps.-Libanius than it does with the Paris letters, both in terms of the relative brevity of its model letters and through the lack of reference to external content. Of course, it is possible that the letters had a much more complex prehistory before they were brought together in the *Specimina*, but there is nothing in the surviving portion that indicates this.

3.4 Conclusions

The study has aimed to establish a few basic parameters about the origin and nature of the *Specimina*, so that it can be investigated as an epistolary composition in its own right rather than as a bilingual glossary or an impromptu exercise. First, the basis of the collection appears to have been a document composed in Latin before the first quarter of the third century C.E. 'Composed' rather than 'assembled' or 'adapted' because the comparative evidence suggests that they were written as epistolary models rather than as letters that were retroactively adapted for pedagogic use. As compositions they show rhetorical training, as evidenced by the prose rhythm, and a willingness to elaborate the generic system found in Greek manuals.

Second, there is no unambiguous evidence of second-language interference from Greek or Coptic. When the multistage transmission history of the text is correctly understood, the strongest evidence for imperfect Latin at the composition stage disappears. That is not to say that the text contains only the purest Ciceronian Latin or that no textual difficulties remain (see *Spec.* 2.2, 9.2, 12.3), but there is no strong evidence that the composer spoke Latin as a second language.

Third, assuming that what survives is only a fragment of a larger collection, it would have been longer and generically more elaborate than any surviving Greek model letter collection. Indeed, given the wide range of date estimates on ps.-Demetrius, it is not entirely out of the question that the *Specimina* is the earliest witness to this genre that survives in either language. It presupposes an educated and relatively well-off Roman audience who could participate in the exchange of financial favours and testamentary bequests. Though it is not itself a legal treatise, there is a striking affinity to legal topics, including inheritance and manumission. Such topics might have been especially

1.2 n. 19. The second and third letters contain headings which suggest that the relationship between author and addressee is of more interest than their identities: 3.20 Ν[οτά]ρ(ιος) ἐμπαίδευτος *uacat* πρ(ός) ἐταίρον. Cf. Fournet (n. 10), 61–3.

⁷¹ Cassiodorus' *formulae* are official grants that bequeath specific *honores* to the recipient, with the name *formulae* suggesting their legal character (cf. *TLL* 6.2.1117.53–60 'i. q. institutio magistratum, dignitatum'). Thus they differ from the kind of model letters found in the *Specimina*. Cassiodorus claims that he has produced these *formulae* on the basis of letters he had written to real people (*Var.* praef. 14).

⁷² C. Chase, *Two Alcuin Letter-Books* (Toronto, 1975), especially 8–11.

appealing in a Greek-speaking milieu to an audience of new citizens after the *Constitutio Antoniniana* in 212.

Furthermore, there are several hints of unitary authorship, such as recurring vocabulary (*remunero*, *suprema*) and recurring constructions (genitive of cause). It would be normal for a collection such as this to be changed and adapted over time, with new genres or letters added, and the language lightly modernized, as perhaps occurred in the case of ps.-Demetrius. Nevertheless, nothing in the evidence we have examined suggests creative interventions into the Latin text by multiple hands at widely disparate periods. This tentatively favours speaking about a single anonymous epistolographer responsible for the surviving Latin text.

Ideally one would like to assign a name to the anonymous composer of the Latin original. There are indeed several ‘known unknowns’ within the history of Latin epistolography, writers of letter collections that have not survived in direct transmission but are mentioned and occasionally quoted in other sources.⁷³ Among the most prominent of these is Varro, known to have composed Latin and Greek letters and a treatise *Epistolary Issues* (*Epistolicae Quaestiones*).⁷⁴ Brutus was also highly regarded as an epistolographer, and Greek letters circulating under his name were known to Plutarch.⁷⁵ The language of the *Specimina* tentatively speaks against such an early date, but it stands as a representative of a larger, mostly lost tradition of Latin literary correspondence that circulated in the Greek-speaking portions of the Roman East.

APPENDIX: RECONSTRUCTED LATIN TEXT OF THE *SPECIMINA* *EPISTVLARIA* (P.BON. 5)

This Appendix tentatively reconstructs what the *Specimina* might have looked like before it was converted into a bilingual format. We also propose here a new system of reference according to units of sense and structure rather than the lines and columns of the document used by Kramer and Cugusi (we give columns and line numbers in parenthesis). Leiden conventions are used to indicate supplements and deletions, and every departure from the transmitted text is indicated in a selective apparatus criticus (an extensive apparatus criticus and translation are found in *CLTP*).

⁷³ For ‘known unknowns’ used in a discussion of no-longer extant historiography, see T. Cornell, ‘Roman historical writing in the Age of the Elder Seneca’, in M.C. Scappaticcio (ed.), *Seneca the Elder and his Rediscovered ‘Historiae ab initio bellorum ciuiliū’: New Perspectives on Early-Imperial Roman Historiography* (Berlin and Boston, 2020), 9–28, at 18.

⁷⁴ The fragments from Varro’s letters are collected in P. Cugusi, *Epistolographi Latini minores* (Turin, 1979), 2.1.291–6; cf. P. Cugusi, ‘Le epistole di Varrone’, *Quaderni della Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medievale* 9 (1967), 78–85.

⁷⁵ Cf. Plut. *Vit. Brut.* 2.5. The fragments from the letters by Brutus are collected in Cugusi (n. 74 [1979]), 2.1.161–86 (with Greek letters among the *falsa*: nos. 76–114); cf. P. Cugusi, ‘L’epistolografia: modelli e tipologie di comunicazione’, in G. Cavallo et al. (edd.), *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica II: La circolazione del testo* (Rome, 1993)², 379–419. The authenticity of Brutus’ Greek letters has recently been defended by C.P. Jones, ‘The Greek letters ascribed to Brutus’, *HSPH* 108 (2015), 195–244.

Spec. 1 (= 1.1–4)

[... ingratum habebit aut uel]ut inertes nos [sit exp]ertus.

habebit *suppleuimus* e gr. αἰσθήσεται coll. TLL 7.1.1560.19 (cf. Spec. 2.3) : sentiet *edd.*

Spec. 2 (= 1.5–25)

1 [Grate te obsecutu]m [commendati]oni meae, [frater, grat]ulor [in expli]catione {m} [Quint]i. **2** cuius rem eo modo qu]i [te deceret explicata]m esse didici, [set et uer]ecundia[e] tuae [et modestia]e [gaudeo. **3** quod gen]ium tuum [nos rem]uneratur, [habeo ingratum. **4** quid ergo es]t? [spero ut bre]ui tibi [huius deb]iti tui [sim comput]ator.

I [obsecutu]m *suppl. Vogliano, quem coll. TLL 9.2.186.29 sqq. sequimur* : [subsecutu]m *Lucarini 2* [cuius rem eo modo qu]i [te deceret] *suppleuimus dubitanter* : [hanc rem quo modo te decuit] *edd. 3* [habeo ingratum] *significare uocem ingratum 'sine compensatione' illustrat e.g. Catull. 64.103 (cf. Spec. 1)* : [abhorreo uel caueo i.] *Lucarini*

[De exigui]s legatis suasor[i]ae

Spec. 3 (= 2.3–13)

1 Licinn[i]um amicum tibi carum obisse compertus sum. **2** quem parum memorem obsequi tui fuisse doleo quidem, [s]et hortarem te, ut fortiter feras. **3** tabulas enim suppremorem [h]omines quidem faciunt, [s]et ordinant fata.

Spec. 4 (= 2.14–25)

1 Quod—aliter quam meruisse te scimus—remuneratus non es a Publico amico tuo, quem defunctum narant litterae, nihil ex moribus tuis c(o)m(mut)et parum ingrata sententia. **2** omnes enim homines inaeq[ua]l]es sumus.

I non pap. : {non} *Merkelbach* c(o)m(mut)et *correximus* : cum et *pap.* : com(mut)et *uel* *mutes Merkelbach* p. ingrata *pap.* : p. {in}grata *Merkelbach* : < tam > i. *Lucarini*

Spec. 5 (= 2.26–3.11)

Parum grate merita tua <remunerasse> in [s]uppr[e]m[i]s [s]u[is] Licinnium, amicum quondam [co]mmunem, mirabar qui[d]em, nisi [puta]rem tam pr[os]peras <res> [q]uam a[duer]sas, quae mo[rt]alibus adscri[ptae] sunt, non es[se] [i]n tua [potes]ta[t]e.

<remunerasse> *suppleuimus exempli gratia* <res> *falso legit Vogliano* : [res] *Montevecchi, Kramer* : (-era(s)) res *Cugusi*

Gratulato[ri]ae hereditatium acceptarum

Spec. 6 (= 3.15–26)

M[er]itiss[i]mo tib[i], frater, heredita[t]em cum summo [hon]ore <ue>[nis]se grat[ulo]r, et iudic[iu]m amico[ru]m tuoru[m] usque [ad] suppre[m]am suime[t m]em[or]iam obsequis tuis [g]rate respondere laetor.

<ue>[nis]se *correximus, an baetisse?* : bae[. . .]se *pap.*

Spec. 7 (= 3.27–4.7)

1 [Qua]mquam [fas te] hereditate ac[cep]ta [gaudere,] tam[en gratari ti]bi no[n] audeo. **2** noui enim animi tui propositum: cum numquam par est desiderio amici, [e]x iudicio eius [so]llacium fit.

Spec. 8 (= 4.8–27)

1 Multum tibi, frater, p[r]oficere reuerentiam, qu[a] semper amicos intueris et plenissima ueneratione [c]onseruas memoriam [R]utili amici aliquando commun[i]s [s]um expertus, **2** [q]ui etiam uidebatur non exiguo numero [p]ropropinquorum relicto [p]rocess[isse], parte tamen te non minima hereditati[s] in[te]r suos [d]ignum iu[d]icauit[.].

2 [p]rocess[isse] *correxit Kramer (an [p]rocesse[rit] coll. TLL 10.2.1494.59?), nisi lacunam ante uerbum posueris : [p]rocesserit pap. iu[d]icauit[.])* *correxit Vogliano*

Spec. 9 (= 4.28–5.14)

1 Me{a}m[ore]m [...]e mihi tuo[r]um fu[i]sse in suprem[is] suis Licinium g[r]atulor tibi set et eis pariter, quos amas, id est nobis. **2** quando enim obsequia [tu]a remunere[ntur], omnes per processorum tuorum [...] clientes tui augentur.

I Me{a}m[ore]m correximus dubitanter 2 remunere[ntur] correximus post processorum tuorum lacunam statuimus (fort. <fructus uel commoda> Castiglioni), nisi corrigas process[us] tuorum

Spec. 10 (= 5.15–6.5)

1 Memoriae Sulpici auctum te, pauperis quidem set amici tui, gaudeo, quod uol[un]tas eius praestantiam tuam sic remunerauit, ut int[elle]gi possit eum ti[bi] (non) ta[n]tu[m] quod (u)oluit, set quo[d] potuit reliquisse. **2** diurnus enim languor et senect[us], [quae] s[ae]pe etiam [langu]ore deterior est, [uniu]ersam [s]ubstantiam eius absumpserat.

I memoria[e] Merkelbach (non) ta[n]tu[m] correxit Castiglioni e gr. οὐ : quod ta[n]tu[m] pap. boluit pap.

Spec. 11 (= 6.6–27)

1 Honesto titulo te Fabiani amici tui obiti honoratum quamquam tu moleste feras, [eg]o tamen dupliciter gaudeo, quod et iudicia e[i]us, qualis in eum fueris, [os]tendunt et quod candoris [an]imi tui ornamentum [li]beralitatis [ac]cessit. **2** [s]uadeo ergo dolori desinas. **3** amicus enim [qui] i[ta] testatur [non] lacrimis set animo [de]siderandus [e]s[t].

2 dolori pap., *def. Lucarini : doleri coniecit Merkelbach (an dolore an doloris?)*

Gratulatoria[e] acceptae libertati[s]

Spec. 12 (= 7.3–27)

1 [Lib]ertati quidem [o]mnes fauemus, mer[it]issimo autem tibi cont[ig]isse scimus. **2** ego [c]erte pecu[n]iariter gaudeo, quod eam tam iudicio domini tui qua[m] meritis tuis con[s]ecut[us] es. **3** sequens est ergo, uti perpetui[ta]s uitae omni uitae tuae spa[tio]se detu[r], suaue [t]emp[eramento] <fortunam> conse[qui]. **4** hi(c) enim demum speciosus est titulus, ut illud libertatis ornamentum constet inter om[n]es non datam tib[i] sed reddita[m].

3 uitae¹ *tamquam duplicatum fort. deleas conse[qui] dubitanter an infinitiuus finalis sit an sententia gnomica uoce est subaudiendo (sed asyndeton stilo non bene quadrat); fort. lacuna sententiam interrumpit <fortunam> suppleuimus e gr. τύχην 4 hi(c) : his pap.*

Spec. 13 (= 7.28)

Semper quidem [fortuna] ...

Thesaurus linguae Latinae, Munich

ADAM GITNER
agitner@thesaurus.badw.de

University of Naples 'Federico II'

MARIA CHIARA SCAPPATICCIO
mariachiara.scappaticcio@unina.it