



Universiteit  
Leiden

The Netherlands

## A Latin Papyrus from the Vienna Papyrus Collection

Worp, K.A.; Sijpesteijn, P.J.

### Citation

Worp, K. A., & Sijpesteijn, P. J. (1977). A Latin Papyrus from the Vienna Papyrus Collection. *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik*, 24, 91-94. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/9171>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/9171>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

## A LATIN PAPYRUS FROM THE VIENNA PAPYRUSCOLLECTION

Among its many Greek papyri the Vienna papyruscollection also preserves some Latin papyri (cf. H. Klos, *Chron. d'Eg.* XXVIII, 1953, pp.362ff. *P.Vindob. Lat. Inv. No.125* is now CPR V 13). It is a well-known fact that, in comparison to the huge number of Greek papyri, only a very few Latin ones have been found in Egypt or elsewhere. Each Latin papyrus, therefore, is greeted with great enthusiasm, even if it is only for palaeographical reasons. We wish to dedicate this article to Prof. A.D. Leeman on the occasion of the 25th year of his professorate at the University of Amsterdam. We realize that his literary taste will find little to admire here, but we hope that his philological acumen will further the understanding of this papyrus.

In l.2 of the papyrus there is a question of centurions and principales; soldiers are referred to in ll.5 and 8; in l.7 *kastra* is mentioned. It is obvious, therefore, that this papyrus has a military content. This is not surprising, for most Latin papyri and ostraca from Egypt deal with the Roman army.

The many deletions and interlinear additions indicate that we are dealing with a rough draft. It is furthermore possible that we have two different texts, though written by the same hand: ll.1-7 and ll.8-13. For there is a larger distance (1.5 cm.) between ll.7 and 8 than between the other lines, and l.7 ends at some distance from the right side. As the papyrus is broken off at the bottom, the second text might have been considerably longer. The possibility should not be completely excluded that still a third, or perhaps still more texts, followed. It cannot be ascertained how many letters are lost at the left-hand side.

The content of the text(s) is obscure. The second person in *praeceperis* (ll.1 and 11) and *praeceptis tuis* in l.10 implies that a subordinate writes to a person of higher rank. The references to the absence of soldiers (ll.5 and 10; cf. note on l.10) taken into consideration with the statement in l.9 *praeceptis tuis non parverit* recalls the situation depicted in R.O. Fink, *Roman Military Records on Papyrus nos.90* (Letters demanding restoration of discipline) and 91 (Requests for enforcement by the tribune of the XX Palmyrenorum). In l.3 two kinds of grain (*hordeum* and *frumentum*) are mentioned and *vel* at the end of this line seems to imply another sort of grain or at least some kind of food. *Advehitur* in line 7 may possibly refer to the grain. It does not seem unreasonable to summarize as follows:

in the two preserved sections a subordinate reports to his superior on the insubordination and absence of soldiers and also on an affair concerning food.

On palaeographical grounds (cf. R. Seider, *Paläographie der lateinischen Papyri I*, Stuttgart, 1972, no. 46 [233 A.D.] and no. 44 [1st half of III A.D.]) the papyrus has to be placed in the first half of the IIIrd century A.D. The writing is a specimen of the so-called older Roman cursive (cf. J. Mallon, *Paléographie romaine*, Madrid, 1952, § 45ff.). Although some letters (e, d, l and r) sometimes have a "private" character, on the whole the hand gives the impression of "official" writing. The fourth century A.D. is certainly excluded as the papyrus shows the older form of the a(λ) which was no longer used by this time.

P. Vindob. Lat. Inv. No. 126 (originally G 39952). A medium-brown papyrus of coarse quality. At the right-hand side and at the top where 2 cm. have been left blank, the papyrus has been regularly cut off. At the other sides it has regularly broken off along folds. Five vertical and one horizontal fold are still visible. The writing is across the fibres. The verso is blank. 13.2 x 13.5 cm. (Taf. III a)

= CEL 207  
= Charal  
Lafosse 45.1333

4  
]erposito meo ea, quae praeceperis  
]st ne ordinatis et principalibus  
].t ad hord(eum) siye frument(um) vel  
] iusso suo in adiutorio meo  
] milites absentari .. in .....  
]. .. go.ia.ores per te ad ...  
]ese et ad kastra advehitur.

- 8 ]...um `ers` illum mil(item) hab.. `ret` qu...um  
]culos praeceptis tuis `non` paruerit se. alieno [p]ericulo  
]st lucri sui causa etiam multis absentationis  
] quae [non] `sine iussu n]` fieri `non` [iussisti] `praeceperis`  
12 ].... p[er]fero ad [magnitudi] ne `notitiam` tua..d perfero `cum e...d`  
]t...enio traces

We wish to thank our colleagues Jan-Olof Tjäder (Uppsala, = T); Alan K. Bowman (Manchester) and David J. Thomas (Durham, = B/Th) with whom we discussed many a problem and who willingly let us have the benefit of their profound knowledge of Latin palaeography. Robert O. Fink (Albany) also gave some useful advise.

Notes:

- 1) int̄erposito (T). There are, however, other possibilities, e.g. sup̄erposito.
- 2) The r of ordinatis from corr.
- 3) Iut? (T); T thinks it possible to read fr̄ument̄q, but we agree with B/Th that the a is not on the papyrus. frument has, like hord in the same line and mil in l.8, been abbreviated by means of a dot-like stroke above the line to the right.
- 4) This line was inserted by a corrector between ll. 3 and 5.
- 5) It is impossible to read the letters after in (at the end of the line: er̄is̄ with much hesitation T). There seems to have been a correction; there are unreadable traces of 2 (or 3) letters before in.
- 6) At the beginning of this line T proposes with hesitation: 'ne' gōiatiōres. As B/Th point out the first t seems to be a c (cf., however, et and katra in l.7) and the second t a p. It is also difficult to see ne in the interlinear letters which we interpret with B/Th as either ses or sus; after ad at the end of the line, T thinks st̄u possible; B/Th propose sq. l̄ or sr. l̄.
- 7) T thinks advehi tua preferable "in view of the contents". We cannot agree as the contents of this document are not clear to us.
- 8) We do not know what the letters er̄s̄ or er̄e (added above the line by another hand) are supposed to mean; it is not certain if the letter after hab (h from corr.) have been deleted. Possibly haberet was meant; at the end of the line perhaps qūi cum.
- 9) Perhaps set̄ instead of sed; perhaps periclo (B/Th) instead of periculo (cf., however, Iculos at the beginning of this line).
- 10) Although absentatio does not occur in classical Latin (cf. Thes. Ling. Lat. where the only reference is to Desider. Caducensis [7th cent. A. D.]. epist. i, 11=Migne 87, 254) the word is attested in several texts of later and medieval Latin (cf. Du Cange, Glossarium, s. v.). The verb absento (cf. absentari in l.5), however, is attested in the III/IV century A. D.; at the beginning of this line Ies̄t̄? (T); multis might mean "fines" here.

cf. Tab. Vindob.  
II, p. 234

12) The letters at the beginning of this line seem to have been corrected. The 3rd letter might be an o; although the deletion stroke does not run through the p of the first *perfero* (the f is especially very uncertain) nor through the ne of *magnitudine*, we think that it was the intention of the scribe to delete both words totally; *tua. .d.*: there has been a correction. There are several possibilities: e from m, s from m, m from e or s. It is imaginable that the scribe wanted to write *tuam sed.*

13) *It̄ p̄r̄v̄n̄īo* (T); *It̄. .genio* (B/Th). Following *enio* are traces of several more letters of which one probably is a b.

University of Amsterdam

P. J. Sijpesteijn-K. A. Worp

#### THE PROPER NAME ΧΡΩΜΑΤΙΟC

The recently published BGU XIII 2352 is a letter *π(αρά) Χρωματίου* to a daughter *Satornila*. Lines 3 - 5 run as follows: τὸν Ἄρποκράν παρὰ τοῦ διαδάρχου ἀξιῶσας ἔλαβον. The editor changes ἀξιῶσας to ἀξιῶσας<a> and then creates a hitherto unknown female name *Χρωμάτιον*. Methodologically it is better to take the text of the papyrus as it stands and to see a masculine proper name *Χρωμάτιος*. *Harpokras* might have been *Satornila's* husband or brother. In view of the Egyptian conditions it seems more probable that a man rather than a woman succeeded in asking and taking back a person detained. The same proper name can now be restored in SB III 6014 also. This text is a *proscynema* from the IIIrd century A. D. which runs as follows: πρὸς Ἰὺνῆμα Εὐαγρίου καὶ Χρωματί[.]. The last name has without reason be supplemented as *Χρωματί[δου]* and the female proper name *Χρωματίς* appears in W. Pape/G. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* and in D. Foraboschi, *Onomasticon Alterum Papyrologicum*. I propose to strike the name *Χρωματίς* from the *onomastica* and to supplement the end of SB III 6014 as *Χρωματί[ου]*.

University of Amsterdam

P. J. Sijpesteijn