Marcus Ziemann

Assyria Grammata: How Did Greeks Encounter Near Eastern Literature in the Orientalizing Period?

A vexing problem for scholars of the so-called Orientalizing Period (ca. 750-600 BCE) is trying to determine what was the nature of the intense influence of the Near Eastern literatures and mythology on the Greeks. In particular, did Greeks know the literatures and stories of the Near East directly or were they influenced by some indirect means? At the center of this problem is the question of whether Greeks regularly learned Near Eastern languages. By investigating some select Aramaic literary works (Papyrus Amherst 63; The Tale of Ahiqar), I will argue in this paper that the linguistically diverse Cilico-Syro-Levantine zone was an important crucible for transmitting Near Eastern literature in Phoenico-Aramaic to the Greeks.

Generally, Mesopotamian literature (e.g., *Epic of Gilgamesh*, *Enuma eliš*) share the most literary parallels with Archaic Greek poetry, which is reflected in the scholarship on this topic. Indeed, I have previously argued that these parallels are due to the Assyrian kings' propagandistic appropriation of such texts. Although we have access to these texts chiefly through clay cuneiform tablets written in Akkadian, we know that the Assyrians used Aramaic as a lingua franca, especially in the western parts of their empire, such as the Cilico-Syro-Levantine zone where we know Greeks interacted closely with the Assyrian Empire. Scholars have suspected that Aramaic was the vector through which Greeks encountered Near Eastern literature and mythology, but it remains a hypothesis.

Later Aramaic literary texts that retain traditions from the high Neo-Assyrian period (745 BCE – ca. 612 BCE) help to suggest its validity. For example, Papyrus Amherst 63 (4th cent. BCE Egyptian papyrus written in Egyptian Demotic signs but in the Aramaic language) contain this diasporic Assyrian-derived community's narratives about Assyria that are independent of but thematically and content-wise cognate with Greek texts. For instance, the death of Šamaš-šum-ukin in Ashurbanipal's siege of Babylon is preserved as part of this Aramaic-speaking community's traditions. This story parallels the death of Sardanapallos (=Ashurbanipal) in Greek literature (e.g., Diodorus Siculus).

Aside from the literary parallels, the names here are important – especially Ashurbanipal's. In this papyrus, his name is rendered Sarbanabal, very close to the Greek version Sardanapallos. Interestingly, we have Ashurbanipal's name preserved in Aramaic in the Bible as Osnapper (Ezra 4:10). The version preserved in Pap.Am. 63, however, betrays influence from Luwian, an Anatolian language spoken in the Cilico-Syro-Levantine zone during the Neo-Assyrian period but not after. Indeed, local royal inscriptions contemporaneous with the Neo-Assyrian Empire are frequently composed in both Luwian and Phoenico-Aramaic. Given this, these languages seem to have mediated Assyrian imperial material in this area. Since we know that Greeks were intensely engaged with the Assyrian Empire in this area, later Aramaic texts that independently contain Assyrian-derived narratives found also in later Greek texts suggest that Greeks initially encountered Assyrian/Mesopotamian material translated in the multilingual environment of Luwian and Phoenico-Aramaic. In short, we have an important key for better

understanding the intensely multilingual and multicultural milieu in which the Orientalizing Period was forged.

Shoni Lavie-Driver

When the Rabbis spoke Greek: multilingualism and multiculturalism among the Jews of Roman Caesarea

Roman Palestine was a thoroughly multilingual society; all of Aramaic, Greek, Hebrew and Latin had a substantial presence. At Caesarea, the provincial capital, however, one almost exclusively finds Greek and Latin. This is despite the diverse ethnic and religious profile of the metropolis, home to Greeks, Jews, Romans, Samaritans, and more.

I wish to focus on the use of Greek by Jews. Nearly every Jewish inscription in Caesarea is in Greek, and we have sources for ethnic Greeks conversing in Greek with Jews. The prominence of Greek at Caesarea is very different to other Jewish communities in Palestine, for whom Aramaic and Hebrew have much more currency. Meanwhile, the Jews of Caesarea also differ from their non-Jewish neighbours by not using Latin, otherwise a common language in Roman Caesarea until the 4th century CE.

Rabbinic literature, however, indicates the true complexity of the situation. A number of important rabbis from Caesarea are often represented in deep dialogue with rabbis from all across Roman Palestine – as well as sometimes visitors from the Sassanid Empire. These dialogues are all represented in a mixture of Aramaic and Hebrew, as is generally used for rabbinic literature. But the use of Aramaic and Hebrew over Greek cannot be put down simply to the compilers of the rabbinic texts, since numerous matters hinge on precise nuances that would not make sense in Greek.

The Caesarean rabbis are, then, presented as deeply embedded in a wider Jewish culture that prized and required profound knowledge of both Aramaic and Hebrew. But at the same time, the importance of Greek to the rabbis of Caesarea comes out on a number of occasions. They defend the use of Greek for prayer, and the most prominent Caesarea Rabbi, Rabbi Abbahu, says that Greek 'is like a piece of jewellery. Most intriguingly, Rabbi Abbahu makes Greek puns to reinforce his exegesis of Jewish law more than once. They are, on one level, designed to show off his erudition; but they also show his affiliation with Greek language and culture.

Examining such instances of multilingualism, I shall analyse the complexities of the relationship between culture and language for the Jews of Caesarea. It seems that there is a real sense in which the Jews of Caesarea identified with Greek; yet Greek was also conceived at times as belonging to 'the other'. This had two faces: it could be a prestigious other, one whose cultural cachet they admired and wished to exploit, but it could also be a despicable other – an empire that oppressed them. I shall argue, finally, that this latter aspect was even more prominent in the case of Latin, which, it seems, the Jews of Caesarea never had any interest in adopting.

Minqi Chu

Spelling and pronouncing the Greek alphabet in Byzantine Italy

In several Greek grammatical manuscripts of the Byzantine period, a short passage entitled "πῶς χρὴ μερίσαι τὰ ΚΔ´ γράμματα εἰς τρία μέρη ἰσόψηφα; πῶς χρὴ κατ᾽ ορθοῦ ἐκφωνῆσθαι τὰ ΚΔ´ στοιχεῖα εἰς τὸν ἄλφα τῶν ἀριθμῶν;" was transmitted, showing the mystery of the 24 Greek letters: first, when the 24 letters are divided into three specific groups, the numerical values of each group add up to 1333, and the sum total is 3999; then, when the 24 letters are pronounced and spelt in the standard way, adding up the numerical value of each letter used in the spelling yields exactly 10,000:

πῶς χρὴ μερίσαι τὰ ΚΔ´ γράμματα εἰς τρία μέρη ἰσόψηφα;

Α Β Γ Ζ Κ C Τ Ω ͵ατλγ

Ε Η Ι Μ Ο Ρ Υ Ψ ͵ατλγ

Δ Θ Λ Ν Ξ Π Φ Χ ͵ατλγ

φέρει δὲ ὁ ψῆφος τῶν ΚΔ´ στοιχείων ͵γϠϙθ

πῶς χρὴ κατ᾽ ορθοῦ ἐκφωνῆσθαι τὰ ΚΔ´ στοιχεῖα εἰς τὸν ἄλφα τῶν ἀριθμῶν;

ἄλφα βῆτα γάμμα δέλτα ͵ασξη

εἶ ζῆτα ἦτα θῆτα γίνονται ͵ϡνη

ἰῶτα κάππα λάμδα μῦ ὁμοῦ ͵αωθ

νῦ ξῖ οὖ πῖ γίνονται ͵απ

ῥῶ σίγμα ταῦ ὖ γίνονται ͵βσνε

φῖ χῖ ψῖ ὦ γίνονται ͵βχλ

ὁμοῦ α′

In fact, behind the numerical mystery, the main knowledge conveyed in this short text is the correct pronunciation and spelling of the Greek alphabet: if any of the 24 letters are "wrongly" pronounced and spelt, the final sum will not be 10,000.

Apart from the manuscript Paris.BnF.gr.1630 copied in the 14th century in the Constantinopolitan monastery *τῶν Ὁδηγῶν*, this text was mainly transmitted in three Italo-Greek manuscripts produced in the Greek-speaking area of Byzantine Italy: Paris.BnF.suppl.gr.920 (on fol.1v) copied probably in 10th-century Calabria, Vat.reg.gr.Pio II 47 (on fol.73v) produced in a monastery of S. Neilos at the end of the 10th century or at the beginning of the 11th century, and Messan.S.Salv.gr.156 (on fols.5v-6v) transcribed probably in 11th-century Calabria or Sicily.

In the transcription of these three Italo-Greek manuscripts, there are numerous "errors" in the spelling of the Greek alphabet, for instance, the letter ξ was "correctly" spelled ξῖ in

Paris.BnF.suppl.gr.920, while it was "wrongly" spelled *ξε* in Vat.reg.gr.Pio II 47 and *ξη* in Messan.S. Salv.gr.156. Some of these errors reveal specific features of linguistic mutations/variations in the Greek-speaking area of Byzantine Italy, a marginal province distant from the centre of the empire.

This paper will first introduce the socio-cultural context of Byzantine Italy at the crossroads of the Byzantine-Greek, Latin-Western European and Arab-Islamic worlds, where multilingual practices were not uncommon, and then point out the relationships between the three Italo-Greek manuscripts through philological research. Finally, the analysis will concentrate on the "errors" in these three Italo-Greek manuscripts to illustrate mutations/variations in the pronunciation and spelling of the Greek alphabet in this remote borderland.

Edoardo Nardi

The linguistic competence of the New Testament writers: a study in Greek-Hebrew bilingualism

Edoardo Nardi

The linguistic competence of the authors of the New Testament books is a long-debated issue. It is widely discussed if Luke, Matthew and the others spoke or at least knew, besides Greek, Aramaic and/or Hebrew varieties (among others, cf. Vorster 1990; Garbini 2017; Ehrman 2018): bar the exception of Paul (*Acts* 21:40-22:2), the sources do not provide direct or sound evidence in this respect.

In relation to this debate, we may also mention the fact that several scholars have variously put forth the existence of Aramaic or Hebrew originals underlying the New Testament texts, which would be entire or partial Greek translations from the Semitic originals (among many others, cf. Burney 1922; Torrey 1958; Carmignac 2009; Garbini 2017): if such originals truly existed as models for the Greek version, the New Testament writers had to be competent to a certain degree in those Semitic languages; however, demonstrating the existence of a Semitic original model on the basis of a Greek text is a really complicated issue.

This paper intends to give a contribution to this long-standing debate: in fact, an analysis of theNew Testament in a combined philological-comparative and linguistic perspective may shed new light on the linguistic competence of these authors. Specifically, I will compare the Old Testament quotations (including a few formulaic expressions) that occur in the New Testament with both the original Hebrew version and the Septuagint, in order to verify which is the source of the quotations.

This line of analysis, which has never been carried out extensively, but only incidentally (Raurell 1983: 266), shows that in several cases the New Testament authors translated directly from the Hebrew text, rather than quoting from the Septuagint (this also holds for Luke in some cases, although his reliance on the Septuagint as a model is widely acknowledged; cf. Wifstrand 2005; Drinka 2011: 43ff.). The direct Hebrew-Greek correspondences suggest that the New Testament

writers occasionally drew from the Hebrew Old Testament, and that, thus, they were acquainted with Hebrew, at least with a written competence.

References

Burney C. F. (1922), *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Carmignac J. (2009 [1984]), *Nascita dei vangeli sinottici*. Milano: San Paolo.

Giulio Iovine

'Dull, plodding, pedantic – much like yourself'. Late Latin Prose in Egyptian Documents.

More than 50 Egyptian papyri from Diocletian to mid-6th century AD are currently known to us, which feature either a fully Latin text or a text where a relevant portion is in the Latin language. Only <u>eleven</u> of them – dated between 293 and 505 – are preserved in a state that allows significant inquiries in their verbiage, syntax and content; <u>nine</u> of them, despite their fragmentary state, still show some noteworthy syntagm or passage. This specific set of evidence can be examined through three different frames, the last two of them specifically linguistic. First, one can appreciate the artificial and convoluted syntax and verbosity of these specimens and compare them with the coeval stylistic developments in Latin epistolography – for all these documents are in letterform – and chancery style, in the wake of Norden's considerations on the triumph of Asianism in Latin literature. Secondly, one can put the change of Latin documentary prose from Early to Late Roman Egypt in the wider contest of the evolution of Greek and Latin prose in the same time and place, and the insurgence of what Zilliacus called 'Byzantinismus'. Lastly, in a multi-linguistic prospect, one can extract from these Latin texts all the innumerable clues of the sometimes imperfect knowledge of Latin in Greek and Coptic-native speaking scribes. Mistakes in orthography, morphology and syntax, and constant interference from Greek alphabet and language, can determine whether the set of companions and grammar-books those scribes could count on, was effective – and to what degree – in the discharge of their duties within the provincial chanceries of Egypt. The first frame more properly belongs to the history of Latin literature; the last two aspects will be investigated in the paper. The research discussed here has been

Pantelis Charalampakis

MULTILINGUALISM IN BYZANTIUM THROUGH THE EVIDENCE OF LEAD SEALINGS

   Multilingualism in the Eastern Roman Empire, conventionally called Byzantium, was a common phenomenon, naturally developed within a State stretching over a vast geographical territory and encompassing various ethnic, cultural, and linguistic groups.

   Although there is no major systematic work on languages and multilingualism in Byzantium, several studies touch upon particular topics related to this subject, based mostly on literary (historical) accounts and, occasionally, epigraphic monuments. Aside from these two types of sources, a third, less explored one, are the lead seals – in fact the sealings – issued by people of various origins and backgrounds, who were active within the Byzantine Empire. Lead seals are small, metallic discs but despite their minute size, they have the potential to present an invaluable (and often unexpected) insight on life of the past. On their two surfaces were imprinted images and extremely short inscriptions related to the issuer. Even in this concise form of representation, both visual and textual evidence has much to reveal about the ethnic and linguistic background of the issuer, and opens productive discussion. For example, we can see a person with Germanic / Gothic name having a seal with a Greek inscription; or someone with an Armenian name having a bilingual seal, in Greek and Armenian; or issuers with seals in Greek and Arabic, or Greek and Syriac; or a person with a seal whose inscription is written half in Latin and half in Greek.

   The information that can be obtained from this type of monuments is not limited to the use of one language or another, but also goes beyond to show methods of translation of the time, and also sheds light on spelling, the use of formulas, and last but not least, the pronunciation of the issuers' names when written in another language.

   Despite the fact that sigillographic material is scattered – since seals are kept in numerous State and private collections or are sold in auctions, all around the world –, and very often the condition of their surface is poor due to natural corrosion or other type of damage, the research potential is

vast nevertheless. This paper will therefore demonstrate the rich information that can be provided by such sources along with some noteworthy examples, and will propose a more complete, systematic approach to this type of evidence.\

Charles Westfall Oughton

Multilingualism in the *Alexiad* and the Historiographic Tradition

This project analyses Anna Comnena's *Alexiad* with a lens situated toward her multilingual sources and the ways in which she engages with a multilingual historiographic tradition. I examine how Comnena uses physical space and intertextual nodes in her narratives of the Battles of Dyrrachium (4.6-8) and Larissa (5.5-7) to draw upon narratives of Julius Caesar's own battles in these locales (Dyrrachium and Pharsalus, respectively) as well as to connect her work to the larger Classical historiographic tradition. In so doing, I build upon recent work on mnemotopes in historiography (Van Rookhuijzen 2017 and 2019), as well as upon scholarship on the Classical tradition in Byzantium generally and Comenena's work specifically (e.g. Scott 1981, Gouma-Peterson 2000, Quandahl and Jarratt 2008, Buckley 2014, Grünbart 2019, Quandahl 2019). A particular point of emphasis has been on the relationship between the author and her subject and how that impacts our understanding of the text (Cresci 2011 and 2013). The question of authorial impartiality is also of particular interest to Caesarian scholars (e.g. Batstone and Damon 2006, Chlup 2018), with Caesar's narrative of Dyrrachium itself serving as a valuable case study (Grillo 2011). While the reception of the Plutarchan corpus – itself a tapestry of multilingual sources – in the time of Comnena has been of recent interest (e.g. Kampianaki 2017, Humble 2013 and forthcoming), the impact of historiographic sources on the *Alexiad* has been understudied in favor of its epic qualities.

In the narrative surrounding Alexios' Battle of Dyrrachium in the *Alexiad*, I argue that Comnena draws upon a wide range of ancient historiographic episodes and tropes that ultimately are derived from both Greek and Latin sources. A character sketch of Alexios and an explicit mention (1.1.3) likens the emperor to earlier portrayals of Hannibal and Scipio (Livy 21.4 and Polyb. 10.2-5, respectively). Several Byzantine leaders behave like the tireless generals of the Classical tradition (e.g. Sall. *BC* 5, *BJ* 6; Plut. *Mar.* 7, *Pyrrh.* 8). Alexios' plan and advance mirror language from Herodotus' Thermopylae narrative (7.223-224). During the battle itself, Comnena portrays Alexios' heroic defense of his position with various anecdotes of his bravery that mirror – in description and in topology – episodes that unfolded at Caesar's Dyrrachium (Caes. *BC* 3.41-77, Dio 41.50-51, Plut. *Caes.* 38-41, Appian 2.60-61). Additionally, throughout the *Alexiad*, Comnena frequently labels the Norman opposition as "Celts" (Κελτοί) and includes ethnographic notices of them (11.6, 13.10, 14.4) which mirror Caesar's ethnography of the Gauls (*BG* 6.11-20) and other Latin sources. While Alexios and Caesar ultimately lose their battles at Dyrrachium, their responses and their subsequent victories at Larissa and Pharsalus in Comnena (5.5-7) and Plutarch (*Caes.* 39-40), respectively, demonstrate how each learns to set up expectations of victory after a crushing defeat. Comnena engages with the multilingual historiographic tradition to enhance her text, and consequently her father's military reputation, by incorporating the best of both her Latin and Greek predecessors.

Batstone, W. and C. Damon. 2006. *Caesar's* Civil War. Oxford UP: 2006.

Buckley, P. 2014. *The* Alexiad *of Anna Komnene: Artistic Strategy in the Making of a Myth*. Cambridge UP (2014).

Chlup, J. 2018. "Collective Memory, Authorial Authority, and Civil War: Caesar on Dyrrachium (*Bellum Civile*, III,47-49)." *Eirene: Studia Graeca et Latina* 54.1-2 (2018): 131-54.

Cresci, L. 1993. "Anna Comnena fra storia ed encomio." *Civiltà classica e cristiana* 14 (1993): 63-90.

Cresci, L. 2011. "Μάρτυρες e μαρτυρία nei prologhi di Anna Comnena e di Procopio." *Nea Rhome: Rivista di Richerche Bizantinistiche* 8 (2011): 129-35.

Cresci, L. 2013. "Come e perché venivano letti gli storici greci a Bisanzio" in F. Gazzano and G. Ottone, eds., *Le età della trasmissione: Alessandria, Roma, Bisanzio: atti delle Giornate di studio sulla storiografia greca frammentaria, Genova, 29-30 maggio 2012*. Tivoli: Tored (2013): 61-94.

Dyck, A. 1986. "*Iliad* and *Alexiad*: Anna Komnene's Homeric Reminiscences." *GRBS* 27 (1986): 113-20.

Gouma-Peterson, ed. 2000. *Anna Komnene and Her Times*. London: Garland (2000).

Grillo, L. 2011. "*Scribam ipse de me:* The Personality of the Narrator in Caesar's *Bellum Civile*." *AJP* 132.2 (2011): 243-71.

Grillo, L. 2012. *The Art of Caesar's* Bellum Civile*: Literature, Ideology, and Community*. Cambridge (2012).

Grünbart, M. 2019. "Plutarch in Twelfth-Century Learned Culture" in Xenophontos, S. and K. Oikonomopoulou, eds., *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plutarch*. Leiden: Brill (2019): 265-78.

Humble, N. 2013. "Imitation as Commentary? Plutarch and Byzantine Historiography in the 10th Century" in G. Pace and Volpe Cacciatore, P., eds., *Gli scritti di Plutarco: Tradizione, traduzione, ricezione, commento*. Naples: D'Auria (2013): 219-25.

Humble, N. forthcoming. "Plutarch in Byzantium" in Titchener, F. and A. Zadorojnyi, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Plutarch.* Cambridge UP (forthcoming).

Kambylis, A. 1975. "Zum Programm der byzantinischen Historikerin Anna Komnene" in *Δώρημα Hans Diller zum 70. Geburtstag. Dauer und Überleben des antiken Geistes*. Athens (1975): 127-46.

Kampianaki, T. 2017. "Plutarch's *Lives* in the Byzantine chronographic tradition: the chronicle of John Zonaras" *BMGS* 41.1 (2017): 15-29.

Pelling, C. 2011. *Plutarch:* Caesar. Oxford UP: 2011.

Quandahl, E. and S. Jarratt. 2008. "'To Recall Him…Will be a Subjuct of Lamentation': Anna Comnena as Rhetorical Historiographer." *Rhetorica* 26.3 (2008): 301-35.

Quandahl, E. 2019. "Afterlives of Anna Komnene: Moments in the History of the History of Byzantium" in L. Gaillet and H. Bailey, eds., *Remembering Women Differently: Refiguring Rhetorical Work*. Univ. of South Carolina Press (2019): 73-88.

Rigsby, K. 2015. "Alexander's Lysimacheia: Anna Comnena 15.7.8." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 64.3 (2015): 301-305.

Scott, R. 1981. "The Classical Tradition in Byzantine Historiography" in M. Mullett and R. Scott, eds., *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition*. University of Birmingham (1981): 61-74.

Van Rookhuijzen, J.Z. 2017. "Thetis in the 'Ovens': A Reconsideration of Herodotus' Topography of Magnesia" *JHS* 137 (2017): 24-41.

Van Rookhuijzen, J.Z. 2019. *Herodotus and the Topography of Xerxes' Invasion: Place and Memory in Greece and Anatolia*. De Gruyter.

Westfall, R.W. 2018. *Caesar's Civil War: Historical Reality and Fabrication*. Leiden: Brill (2018).

Piruza Hayrapetyan

The Changing Faces of the *Apocalypse of the Theotokos* in Byzantium and Beyond: Translation, Adaptation, and Rewriting

Originally composed in Greek (ca. 7th century),1 the *Apocalypse of the Theotokos* deserves scholarly attention for two reasons. First, it is a key source for studying the Marian cult in Byzantium. Due to the creative freedom of apocryphal writers, it presents a more dynamic and multilayer image of Mary, developing aspects that were (deliberately) overlooked in Marian canonical writings. Second, the text has rich potential to enhance our understanding of various aspects of the religious and social life of the medieval Byzantine people (religious perceptions, experiences, and feelings; moral codes, family values, modes of interaction within and among communities, etc.). The Armenian version of the *Apocalypse of the Theotokos* (hereafter, *ArmAT*) was one of the widely spread Apocrypha in medieval Armenia. Having begun its life as a translation from Greek (ca. 8th-10th centuries), it continued its way as a relatively independent text. The present paper explores the new life cycle of the text within the Armenian environment. Based on a multilevel (structural, thematical, linguistic, etc.) comparison of Byzantine and Armenian versions, it examines what kind of changes it underwent to accommodate new cultural, religious, and linguistic realities.

The paper focuses on two Armenian versions which capture different phases of *ArmAT*'s journey, one presenting a close translation from an/the early Greek original version (hereafter, *ArmV1*) and the other, a relatively later version of the text (hereafter, *ArmV3)*. Through a comparative and contextualized reading of the two versions, the paper aims to trace the journey

of the *Apocalypse* within the Armenian environment from translation to adaptation. *ArmV3* underwent profound changes (both structural and thematical) and even genre transformation. The paper demonstrates how the compiler(s) deliberately introduced homiletic elements transforming the *vision* into a *homily*. This genre transformation, consequently, created a profoundly different climate in the version, a more canonical context, which affected almost all components of the text - the language and style, the content, and, importantly, the character of Mary. As a result, the text that was initially intended for ordinary believers expanded its reception scope by targeting more learned and theologically aware audiences.

Daniel Sutton

Josephus and Historiographical Traces of Collaborative Multilingualism

Recently, there has been a surge of interest in unacknowledged contributors to Ancient Greek and Roman texts, in physical production and in authorship (e.g. Padilla Peralta 2020; Moss 2021; Flower 2022). That scholarship, however, has given little attention to ancient historiography. This paper argues that i) multilingual labour in Greco-Roman historiography often relied on unacknowledged contributors, who had fluency in or specialist knowledge of languages that the named author did not; and ii) that where these texts engage with languages unfamiliar to the named author, we get a unique window into how extensively they relied on unacknowledged contributors. Hence, where a historiographical text may *appear* to show one multilingual author, we sometimes find traces of a hidden, collaborative process.

This paper takes Josephus' work as its primary example. First, Josephus' *corpus* is particularly rich in multilingual resonances: the *Jewish Wars* is presented as a translation into Greek (1.3), for instance, and *Against Apion* claims to present material from Egyptian, Phoenician, and Chaldean sources (1.68-160). Second, Josephus admits in *Against Apion* that certain συνεργοί assisted him with his Greek style in the *Jewish Wars* (1.50)—an admission he had neglected to make at the time. Recent scholarship has downplayed the importance of this remark, arguing that Josephus was referring to literary correspondents and was capable of writing without extensive assistance (e.g. Rajak 1983; Jones 2005; Barclay 2007; Almagor 2016). This paper questions the assumptions underpinning these conclusions, arguing—as older analyses such as Thackeray's (1929) suggest—that the συνεργοί were almost certainly slaves or freedmen, and had a larger, initially veiled role in the composition of the Greek text. Comparison with Suetonius' remarks on Sallust's and Asinius Pollio's reliance on Ateius Philologus (*De Gramm.* 10.6-7) in matters of Latin style suggest that this practice was common—even when negotiating different registers *within one* language—but was only acknowledged when the quality of the history was questioned.

The role of Josephus' συνεργοί in the *Jewish Wars* becomes especially clear in passages with rich intertextual links. Modern scholarship—again, unlike older studies—has taken Josephus' claims about his Greek learning at face value (esp. *Ant*. 20.263), exercising an overabundance of interpretative charity. As close reading of Josephus' Thucydidean account of *stasis* in Book Four (addressed by Price 2011) shows, a single author view fails to explain: i) how a translation could

include such extensive and complex allusions to multiple texts in multiple languages; ii) why they are so unevenly distributed; and iii) how Josephus, if working alone, could have *practically* incorporated so many in such detail. Again, Josephus cannot be unique: Sallust's allusions to Thucydidean *stasis*, for instance, raise similar questions. Like Sallust (*BJ* 17), Josephus highlights the use of translated material when the original sources were clearly inaccessible (e.g. *C. Ap.* 1.73, 1.130; *Ant.* 8.144). However, when alluding to or translating texts in familiar languages, or when making choices about register in composition, Josephus—like Sallust—was unwilling to indicate collaboration, because that would detract from his authority as a multilingual historian. (500 words)

Select Bibliography

Almagor, Eran (2016). 'Josephus and Imperial Greek Literature', in Howell Chapman, Honora and Rodgers, Zuleika (eds.). *A Companion to Josephus*. Chichester.

Barclay, John (trans. and comm.), Mason, Steve (ed.) (2007). *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary Volume 10*: *Against Apion*. Leiden.

Flower, Harriet I. (2022). 'The most expensive slave in Roma: Quintus Lutatius Daphnis'. *Classical Philology* 117:99-119.

Jones, Christopher (2005). 'Josephus and Greek Literature in Flavian Rome', in Edmondson, Jonathan, Mason, Steve and Rives, James (eds.). *Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome*. Oxford.

Moss, Candida (2021). 'Between the lines: Looking for the contributions of enslaved literate laborers in a second-century text (*P. Berol.* 11632)'. *Studies in Late Antiquity* 5:432-52.

Padilla Peralta, Dan-el (2020). 'Epistemicide: The Roman case'. *Classica* 33:151-86.

Price, Jonathan (2011). 'Josephus' Reading of Thucydides: A Test Case in the *Bellum Iudaicum*', in Rechenauer, Georg and Possou, Vassiliki (eds.). *Thucydides – A Violent Teacher? History and its Representations*. Göttingen.

Rajak, Tessa (1983). *Josephus: The Historian and His Society*. London.

Thackeray, Henry St. John (1929). *Josephus: The Man and the Historian*. New York.

Tiziano Ottobrini

Greek language and *Hebraica ueritas*: specific investigations on the phenomena of linguistic *adstratum* between the Hebrew of the Old Testament and the Greek of the Church Fathers in Genesis

THE Greek translations of the Old Testament from Hebrew constitute a privileged point of view for investigating interlinguistically and diacronically the behavior of Greek in contact with a language endowed with no less antiquity and prestige (given that Hebrew is the language of divine Revelation); nevertheless, the analytical and systematic study of the critical attitude by

which the Fathers of the Church questioned the possibility of the Greek language to fully embrace the meaningfulness of a language as diverse in structure as Hebrew is currently neglected. To remedy this gap, the present contribution intends to concentrate on the case offered by Genesis (both because of the comments on this biblical book we have today the critical edition of the respective *Chain* by Procopius of Gaza and because, exceptionally, of the first part of this book – hexameron – we have the exegesis of John Philoponus, who in the mid-sixth century explicitly reflected on the Greek translation of the original Hebrew):

I. it will be appropriate to systematically investigate for the first time the explicit references that the Greek Fathers of the Church, commenting on the Genesis letter, make to the original Hebrew text; in fact, there are frequent references to the original biblical text by means of spy-terms such as ἑβραιστί and equivalents, without, however, a relative taxonomy currently available. The typological *ratio* of the references to the Hebrew lexicon translated into Greek will then be investigated, illustrating above all the semantic and lexical aspects of those Hebrew terms which – even if translated into Greek – must have shown that they could not find adequate rendering in Greek, so much so as to induce ancient exegetes to refer to the Hebrew *substratum*. In this way it will be possible to point out how and which authors (*e.g.* whether of oriental origin or not) should feel more intensely the insufficiency of Greek in translating certain Hebrew terms and which were the semantic fields of biblical Hebrew that were most resistant to their Greek translation.

II. On the basis of the previous investigation, the role played by the Greek hexaplars translations of the Old Testament (the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, saved in Origen's *Hexapla*) could be compared to the actual reception by the Greek language. These hexaplar translations, in fact, were born in the middle of the 2nd century AD by the need to overcome the version of the Septuaginta which was perceived as inadequate to transfer biblical revelation into Greek. However, today there is no organic investigation capable of explaining how the ecclesiastical writers criticized its *lexis* while using it, semasiologically and exegetically for the hardest semitisms.

The arrival point of this path will be John Philoponus' *De opificio mundi*, because this commentator approaches with his subtlety of grammarian the problem of the possibility of rendering the *genius* of Hebrew in Greek, making explicit the requests of many ancient commentators on the relationship between Greek and Hebrew.

Dries De Crom

Code-switching as literary experiment in the *Graecus Venetus* version of Daniel

The manuscript known as *Graecus Venetus 7* (Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. Z. 007), dated to the late 14th century CE, contains a one-of-a-kind translation of several Old Testament books from Hebrew into Greek (ed. Gebhardt 1875) . One of the most striking features of both the manuscript and the translation it contains is the mixture of Christian and Jewish elements. Thus, the manuscript belongs to a multicultural context at the crossroads of rabbinical Judaism, Byzantine education and early humanism. The identity of the translator is unknown, although the translation is often associated with the name of Simon Atumanus, a Byzantine humanist of

uncertain descent who converted to Roman Catholicism and was appointed archbishop of Thebes in 1366 (Mercati 1916; Blanchet 2016).

The language of the translation is a late Byzantine blend of classical Greek idiom (including Homerisms and other elements of poetic diction; Aslanov 2012), the biblical tradition (both the Septuagint and the Jewish Minor Versions; De Crom 2009), and interference from the Hebrew source text (e.g. the revived use of the optative to represent *yiqtol* verb forms; Aslanov 1999). Interestingly, in the book of Daniel, parts of which are written in Aramaic rather than in Biblical Hebrew, the author has created an artificial version of the ancient Doric dialect to represent the Aramaic portions of the biblical text.

In this paper, I will analyze the translation of the book of Daniel contained within this intriguing manuscript, specifically its use of different dialectal features of Greek, as an example of code-switching in humanistic Greek. The topic of code-switching in humanistic writings has seen a recent upsurge in scholarly attention, but so far this has been largely limited to Latin-Greek code-switching (but see Van Rooy 2020). In the *Graecus Venetus* manuscript, we have an example of code-switching between varieties of Greek as part of a literary experiment conditioned by the code-switching that is already present in the Semitic source text.

Topics to be discussed include:
-the precise nature and the sources of the translator's reconstructed 'Doric' dialect
-an evaluation of the thesis that the peculiar idiom of the translation is the result of a conscious attempt to mimic the structural features of Hebrew/Aramaic (Aslanov 1999)
-the implications of this particular use of code-switching for any reconstruction of the translator's identity, background and intended readership

Ekaterina Dikova

Cicadas, Roses, and a Swan Song… or How Medieval South Slavonic Translators Rendered Byzantine Realia in a Poetic Cycle

In the eleventh century, Christopher of Mytilene adapted the ancient genre of epigrams to compose a memorable cycle of iambic distichs accorded with the Church year. Its twenty-four-syllable iambic stories successfully "capsulated" much information in a few words in relation to the saints and feasts celebrated on a date, by means of numerous associations with various aspects of Byzantine life. This dodecasyllabic calendar has remained popular up to nowadays because of its incorporation in the Verse Synaxarion and, partly, in other books used for the church office. Those iambic distichs are still pronounced at the morning office of the Orthodox Church (after the sixth ode of the *kanon*) throughout the Orthodox lands. But the earliest two translations of the Verse Synaxarions were made directly from Greek by South Slavonic scribes in the fourteenth century. The first one is associated with Bulgarian centers – Tarnovo or Athos (and it gave rise to a rich manuscript tradition, both South Slavonic and East Slavonic), and the

second translation has been lately associated with a Serbian environment (it came down to us in just a couple of manuscripts, besides, not in full but just for the summer half of the year).

The author of the verses was an erudite and professional poet of the intellectual elite close to the Byzantine court, while his later South Slavonic translators were most probably humble people entirely dedicated to God, who were foreign to the sea and to many of the aspects of the Greek secular life (like specific foods, smells, clothes) and to ancient culture realia (also part of the Byzantine world view). In addition, they worked with constant thought about their Slavonic audience and tried to avoid any elements that would unnecessarily puzzle them (like ancient Gods or other references they could not possibly understand). Therefore, it is extremely interesting to find out how realia were translated in this cycle – why in one of the cases the rose was rendered as 'rosehip' twice and once as 'gift', while as 'apple' in the other; the cicada was designated as some clicking creature in one of the renderings but a 'bird' in the other and the dying swan was a 'chirping bird' in one of the translations but a 'singing animal' in the other. How much of the intended was lost in these translations and how much was kept (and how)?

Some "erroneous" renderings are also studied in the context of poetry and the mechanism of telling much in concise messages, which is probably the most characteristic feature of the synaxarial verses. It turns out that not everything that might seem erroneous is indeed such in the translations considered, and that the general sense, sometimes also rhythmical peculiarities, seem to prevail over the literal meaning of a distich. The non-poetic context of the vitae in the synaxarion is also studied as a factor for the translators' choices in some cases.

Jorge Wong

Reconsidering Milman Parry's Aeolic Default: The Dialectal Competence of the Homeric Poets

Homeric poetry is composed in a remarkable poetic language that appears to admit lexemes and morphemes of distinct chronological and dialectal provenance. The dialects most prevalent in Homeric diction are Aeolic and Ionic, and Ionic and Aeolic forms often appear in Homeric verse side by side. Scholars have accounted for this linguistic variation differently, yet the *communis opinio* remains Milman Parry's hypothesis: "There thus ceases to be anything surprising in the fact that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* can be turned into Aeolic almost word for word: the formulaic diction was learned by the Ionians from the Aeolians, and through under the stress of habit of their own speech, they made it Ionic wherever that could be done without harm to the technique of its use, they otherwise kept it almost without change, since the way in which verse is orally made forced them to do so." (*HL*: 45)1 This paper examines three case studies: genitives in –οιο, datives in εσσι and aorists in -σσ- i to better understand the complementary distribution between Aeolic and Ionic forms in Homeric diction. My investigation suggests that whether an Aeolic or Ionic variant is deployed is dependent on the metrical structure of the root and its preferred localization in the verse. In other words, it is conditioned by meter rather than obvious historical factors. A few conclusions may be drawn from this finding. First, that Ionic and Aeolic variants of the same word are almost always in complementary distribution, that is, in metrically distinct

environments, does not guarantee the retention of metrically irreplaceable inherited Aeolic forms. Aeolicisms in Homeric diction can instead reflect the selective integration of metrically distinct variants into an Ionic epic diction, which could have taken place all at once (Phase Model) or over sustained interaction between several generations of speakers and poets of East Ionic and Lesbian Aeolic (Diffusion Model). Moreover, if it can be shown that the process of Aeolicizing in Homeric diction is at least partially synchronic, then the scholarly practice of 'reconstructing' Aeolic prototypes of Ionic phrases in Homeric diction becomes even more problematic. Last, and perhaps most exciting, studying the synchronic variation between Aeolic and Ionic forms in Homeric diction and the poetic language of the Lesbian lyric poets may offer new insight into the **dialectal competence** of poets in Asia Minor and the way that they conceived of other dialects and their utility in poetic composition.

Works Cited

Fick, A. 1883. *Die homerische Odyssee in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt.* Göttingen.

Nagy, G. 2011. "The Aeolic Component of Homeric Diction." In Jamison et al., edd. *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*. Pp. 133-179.

Bremen. Parry, M. 1932. "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making: II. The Homeric Language as the Language of an Oral Poetry." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 43: 1–50.

Edward Nolan

Dialect and Herodotus' *Histories*

Greek dialects, language contact, and the origins of speech: Herodotus' *Histories*, as scholars have shown, contain insightful, revealing, and sometimes absurd observations about all of these phenomena (Campos Daroca 1992; Harrison 1998; Miletti 2008; Munson 2007; Nolan 2021). What about the author's own language, however? This paper will investigate whether Herodotus' interest in language colors his own linguistic choices in composing the *Histories*. More specifically, I would like to draw a connection between the diversity of Herodotus' language and his work's inclusion of the entire Greek world.
This question is complicated by the difficulties of the textual tradition. Different manuscripts frequently treat morphological and phonological phenomena in contradictory ways. At times Herodotus prefers epic forms over more contemporary Ionic variants, and Attic forms occur both in the transmission of the *Histories* and in citations by ancient authors (Miller 2014; Tribulato 2016, 171). For instance, verbs in -εω are not treated in a uniform fashion. Infinitives alternate between contracted forms like ἀγνοεῖν (Hdt. 2.162.19) and uncontracted forms like εὐδοκιμέειν (Hdt. 1.37.7). Scholars disagree about the degree to which these oscillations result from a composite authorial language versus ancient editorial choices (Buck 1928; Rosen 1962; Smyth 1894; Wilson 2015).
Ultimately, I am most interested in how ancient audiences perceived Herodotus' language. The considerable interest that the *Histories* generated among lexicographers and grammarians like Phrynichus and Moeris as well as the way authors like Hermogenes and

Demetrius comment on the use of poetic language in Herodotus are thus also of relevance to this topic (Hermog. *Id.* Rabe 411, Demetr. Eloc. 112). In my talk, I will briefly review the evidence of the Herodotean textual tradition and discuss the ancient reception of Herodotus in order to chart the relationship between Herodotus' dialect and the interpretation of the *Histories.*

Bibliography

Bowie, Angus M. 2007. *Herodotus: Histories Book VIII*. Cambridge: Cambdridge University Press.

Buck, Carl Darling. 1928. *The Greek Dialects: Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Glossary*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Campos Daroca, Javier. 1992. *Experiencias del lenguaje en las* Historias *de Heródoto*. Almeria: Instituto de Estudios Almerienses.

Colvin, Stephen. 2010. "Greek Dialects." In *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, edited by Egbert J. Bakker. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Chichester; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Erbse, Hartmut. 1979. *Ausgewählte Schriften zur klassischen Philologie*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Hainsworth, J. B. 1967. "Greek Views of Greek Dialectology." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 66 (1): 62–76.

Harrison, Thomas. 1998. "Herodotus' Conception of Foreign Languages." *Histos* 2: 1–45.

Mansour, Karim. 2007. "Sequences dactyliques dans la prose d'Herodote. Hexametres, homerismes, formules." In *Procédés synchroniques de la langue poétique en grec et en latin*, edited by Alain Blanc and Emmanuel Dupraz, 151–62. Langues et cultures anciennes 9. Bruxelles: Editions Safran.

Marincola, John. 2006. "Herodotus and the Poetry of the Past." In *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, edited by Carolyn Dewald and John Marincola, 13–25. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mickey, K. 1981. "Dialect Consciousness and Literary Language: An Example from Ancient Greek." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 79 (1): 35–66.

Miletti, Lorenzo. 2008. *Linguaggio e metalinguaggio in Erodoto*. Pisa: Fabrizio Serra.

Miller, D. Gary. 2014. *Ancient Greek Dialects and Early Authors: Introduction to the Dialect Mixture in Homer, with Notes on Lyric and Herodotus*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter.

Morpurgo Davies, Anna. 2002. "The Greek Notion of Dialect." In *Greeks and Barbarians*, edited by Thomas Harrison, 152–71. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Munson, Rosaria Vignolo. 2005. *Black Doves Speak: Herodotus and the Languages of Barbarians*. Washington, DC; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Center for Hellenic Studies; Distributed by Harvard University Press.

Nolan, Edward. 2021. "Athenians, Amazons, and Solecisms: Language Contact in Herodotus." *American Journal of Philology* 142 (4): 571–96.

Rodriguez Adrados, Francisco. 1998. *La dialectología griega, hoy: 1952-1995*. Madrid: Ediciones Clasicas.

Rosen, Haiim B., and Haiim B. Rosen. 1962. *Elze Laut- Und Formeniehre Der Herodotischen Sprachform*. Integermanische Bibliothek. 1. Reihe:Lehr- Und Handbucher. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Tribulato, Olga. 2016. "Herodotus' Reception in Ancient Greek Lexicography and Grammar: From the Hellenistic to the Imperial Age." In *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and beyond / Ed. by Jessica Priestley, Vasiliki Zali*, edited by Jessica M. Priestley and Vasiliki Zali, 6:169–92. Brill's Companions to Classical Reception. Leiden ; Boston (Mass.): Brill.

Wilson, Nigel Guy. 2015a. *Herodotea: Studies on the Text of Herodotus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———, ed. 2015b. *Herodoti historiae*. Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Dalia Pratali-Maffei

Multi-dialectalism and the vernacular in a Coan epigram

IG XII 4,3,2147, a recently edited fragmentary epigram from the island of Kos, dated to the 2nd century BC, commemorates an individual from Oxyrhynchos, Egypt, who moved to Kos. As in many other cases, the poem consists of a dialogue between the deceased and the passer-by. Since contemporary epigraphy from Kos suggests that Doric was still spoken on the island in this period, I ask how far the use of different dialectal features in the epigram corresponds to the vernacular.

My analysis shows that the dialectal variation in this epigram does go some way towards acknowledging both the presumed koine dialect of the person commemorated and the Doric of the location of the memorial, although the presentation of dialect is not straightforward. In the second part of this paper, I compare the presence of dialectal variants in *IG* XII 4,3,2147 more broadly with the dialect situation of Hellenistic epigrams from Kos and Egypt, and with the dialectal variation found in Hellenistic literary epigrams.

Much recent scholarship has focussed on the language of Hellenistic literary epigram; epigrams were written mostly in Ionic, sometimes in Doric, and sometimes in a mixture of the two—

especially with regards to the presence of both <α>/<η> for inherited */a:/. This multi-dialectal landscape has been interpreted as typical of the new literary genre (Hunter 2022), and even as a reaction to the spread of Koine (Horrocks 2010). Less work has been done on variation in inscribed epigram. I demonstrate that the situation revealed by *IG* XII 4,3,2147 is not exceptional, but actually common in inscribed epigrams from the Hellenistic age, in particular in cases where the dialect of the deceased does not correspond with the dialect of the community where they died. This suggestion agrees with recent work on literary epigrams, where some scholars have suggested that different dialects were sometimes chosen to indicate the speech of the characters featured (Sens 2004; Gutzwiller 2014; Bowie 2016).

I will argue that, in contrast to what was previously thought, dialectal choices in inscribed epigrams were still influenced by contemporary vernacular, and even by Koine Greek. I will further suggest that this might have had an impact on the dialect of literary epigrams. Hellenistic inscribed epigrams may have been more influential for the development of the genre than has generally been realised.

Bowie, E. (2016) 'Doing Doric', in E. Sistakou, A. Rengakos (eds.), *Dialect, Diction, and Style in Greek Inscribed Epigram*, Berlin-Boston, 3-22.

Gutzwiller, K. (2014). 'Poetic Meaning, Place, and Dialect in the Epigrams of Meleager', in R.L. Hunter A. Rengakos, E. Sistakou (eds.), *Hellenistic Studies at a Crossroads: Exploring Texts, Contexts and Metatexts*, 25, 75-95.

Hunter, R.L. (2022). *Greek epitaphic poetry : A selection*, Cambridge.

Horrocks, G. (2010). *Greek. A history of the language and its speakers,* Chichester.

Sens, A. (2004), 'Doricisms in the New and Old Posidippus', in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou, and M. Baumbachs (eds.), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309)*, 65-83.

Maria Chiara Scappaticcio

LATIN LITERATURE FROM EGYPT: MULTILINGUALISM, MULTICULTURALISM, AND THE FORTHCOMING CORPUS OF LATIN TEXTS ON PAPYRUS (CLTP)

The paper will discuss the contribution offered by the forthcoming *Corpus of Latin Texts on Papyrus (CLTP)* to the knowledge we have of the forms in which Latin literature circulated (or was even originated) in the most peripheral areas of the empire. The *Corpus of Latin Texts on Papyrus (CLTP)** gathers c. 1,500 texts (both Latin and bilingual Latin–Greek) transmitted on papyrus, dating from the 1st BCE to 7th century CE, and mainly coming from the Eastern empire. The paper will focus on literary texts of an Egyptian provenance known from *CLTP*. *CLTP* includes c. 300 fragmentary texts of a literary nature. They can be split into two main groups, as, while some of them basically consist in fragments from rolls or codices of an Eastern provenance and transmitting well-known texts of well-known authors (e.g. Terence, Cicero,

Sallust, Virgil), many of them properly are new texts, otherwise unknown from both direct and indirect transmission. While in the first case a new contribution certainly comes in terms of circulation and readership of the *auctores* — and thus on the way in which they were culturally absorbed in foreign environments —, in the second case the contribution is even more exceptional for dealing with texts of an uncertain (Eastern/Greek-speaking? Western/Latin-speaking?) paternity and of a difficult dating. A peculiar group of 'paraliterary' texts also consists of (otherwise unknown, and mainly bilingual Latin– Greek) grammars, lexica, and, more in general, educational tools evidently destined to a Greek-speaking readership approaching to Latin language (and literature, as Cicero and Virgil) and, through Latin language (and literature), to Roman culture. The paper will offer a critical overview of these texts and of their peculiar contribution to a refreshed analysis of the circulation of Latin language and literature in the Eastern empire and to framing such a contribution within the multicultural Mediterranean web between Antiquity and Late Antiquity.

Arianna D'Ottone Rambach & Francesca Potenza

GREEK-ARABIC/ARABIC-GREEK – FROM CONTACT TO TRANSITION: PALAEOGRAPHIC AND TEXTUAL OBSERVATIONS

Multilingual witnesses in Greek-Arabic/Arabic-Greek include a vast array of material: from epigraphs to documents, from manuscripts to mosaics as well as coins. This evidence mirrors multifarious forms of written coexistence: from translations – as attested by the Psalms in Arabic – and independent messages in each language – as in pre-reform Islamic coins; to transliterations – in the case of allographic texts, the most famous of which is the so-called Violet fragment; passing through *lexica*. This panoply of cases and their changing layouts – as shown by the Qurra b. Sharik bilingual correspondence on papyri or by Arabic texts with some *rubricae* in Greek in Christian-Arabic codices – attest various stages in the process of Arabization and Islamization of the Middle Eastern regions during the pre-Islamic and early Islamic period.
In this contribution two specialists of the written culture in Greek (F. Potenza) and Arabic (A. D'Ottone Rambach) will explore, via an on-going dialogue, strategies of bilingual communications approaching translations, textual hierarchy, symbolic and religious meaning linked to the use of a specific alphabet/language, as well as graphic and linguistic choices and contents of marginalia. In particular, the vast production of the *Bilād al-Shām* and Egyptian areas will be investigated and both Christian-Arabic and Islamic written evidence considered to study, in a two-way voice, the rich, and yet unexplored, relation between Greek-Byzantine and Arabic languages and writing practices.

Selected bibliographical references

Francesco D'Aiuto, *La 'scrittura mista' maiuscolo-minuscola d'area mediorientale: Breve storia degli studi*, in *Griechisch-byzantinische Handschriftenforschung: Traditionenm Entwicklungen, neue Wege*, edited by Ch. Brockmann, D. Deckers. D. Harlfinger, St. Valente, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 2020, pp. 145-170.

Arianna D'Ottone Rambach e Francesca Potenza, *Un lezionario greco-arabo e i suoi disiecta membra fra Londra, S. Pietroburgo e Cambridge*, «Nea Rome» 17 (2020), 99-153 e tavv. 1-8: 104-106.

From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East, edited by H.M. Cotton, R.G. Hoyland, J.J. Price and D.J. Wasserstein, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Frank Trombley, *Some Greek and bilingual Arab-Byzantine bronze coins of Damascus and Hims-Emesa: some new examples of iconography and palaeography, with reference to some Byzantine issues of the late 6th and 7th centuries*, in *3rd Simone Assemani Symposium on Islamic Coins*, edited by B. Callegher, A. D'Ottone, Trieste, EUT, 2012, pp. 58-76.

Rachel Stroumsa, *Greek and Arabic in Nessana*, in *Documents and the History of the Early Islamic World*, edited by A.T. Schubert and P.M. Sijpesteijn, Leiden, Brill, 2015, pp. 143-157