

8<sup>M</sup>

BIBLIOGRAPHY: GRAECO-ROMAN EGYPT  
A. PAPYRI (1930-1931)

*Reprinted from*

THE JOURNAL OF EGYPTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY

Volume XVIII, Parts I and II, 1932

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN



## BIBLIOGRAPHY: GRAECO-ROMAN EGYPT A. POPYRI (1930-1931)

The work is again divided as follows:

- § 1. Literary Texts. H. J. M. MILNE, British Museum.
- § 2. Religion, Magic, Astrology (including texts). A. D. NOCK, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
- § 3. Publications of non-literary texts. H. I. BELL, British Museum.
- § 4. Political History, Biography, Administration, Topography and Chronology. J. G. MILNE, 20 Bardwell Road, Oxford (Ptolemaic and Graeco-Roman Periods), and N. H. BAYNES, Fitzwalters Northwood, Middlesex (Byzantine and Arab Periods).
- § 5. Social Life, Education, Art, Economic History, Numismatics and Metrology. J. G. MILNE (Ptolemaic and Graeco-Roman), and N. H. BAYNES (Byzantine and Arab).
- § 6. Law. F. DE ZULUETA, 37 Norham Road, Oxford.
- § 7. Palaeography and Diplomatic. Miss M. E. DICKER, 21 Elm Bank Mansions, London, S.W. 13.
- § 8. Lexicography and Grammar. R. M<sup>c</sup>KENZIE, St. John's College, Oxford.
- § 9. General Works, Bibliography, General Notes on Papyrus Texts. H. I. BELL.
- § 10. Miscellaneous, Excavations, Personal. H. I. BELL.

The authors wish jointly to express their gratitude to all those scholars who have sent them off-prints of their articles, a kindness which has greatly facilitated the work of compiling this bibliography.

The following abbreviations have been used in quoting periodicals:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>A.J.A.</i> = <i>American Journal of Archaeology.</i>  | <i>Cl. Quart.</i> = <i>Classical Quarterly.</i>  |
| <i>Am. Hist. Rev.</i> = <i>American Historical Review.</i>   | <i>Cl. Rev.</i> = <i>Classical Review.</i>   |
| <i>Am. Journ. Phil.</i> = <i>American Journal of Philology.</i>                                    | <i>Cl. Weekly</i> = <i>Classical Weekly.</i>   |
| <i>Anc. Egypt</i> = <i>Ancient Egypt.</i>  | <i>C.-R. Ac. Inscr. et B.-L.</i> = <i>Comptes-Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.</i> |
| <i>Ann. Serv.</i> = <i>Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte.</i>                          | <i>D. Lit.-Z.</i> = <i>Deutsche Literaturzeitung.</i>  |
| <i>Arch. f. Rel.</i> = <i>Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.</i>                                    | <i>G.G.A.</i> = <i>Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen.</i>   |
| <i>Arch. Giurid.</i> = <i>Archivio giuridico.</i>  | <i>Hist. Z.</i> = <i>Historische Zeitschrift.</i>  |
| <i>Archiv</i> = <i>Archiv für Papyrusforschung.</i>  | <i>Jahrb. f. Lit.</i> = <i>Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft.</i>  |
| <i>Arch. R. u. W.</i> = <i>Archiv für Rechts- und Wirtschaftsphilosophie.</i>                      | <i>J.H.S.</i> = <i>Journal of Hellenic Studies.</i>  |
| <i>Ä.Z.</i> = <i>Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde.</i>                        | <i>Journal</i> = <i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology.</i>   |
| <i>B.C.H.</i> = <i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique.</i>                                      | <i>Journ. Sav.</i> = <i>Journal des Savants.</i>   |
| <i>Boll. fil. class.</i> = <i>Bollettino di filologia classica.</i>                                | <i>J.R.S.</i> = <i>Journal of Roman Studies.</i>   |
| <i>Bull. bibl. et péd.</i> = <i>Bulletin bibliographique et pédagogique du Musée Belge.</i>        | <i>K.V.G.R.</i> = <i>Kritische Vierteljahresschrift für Gesetzgebung und Rechtswissenschaft.</i>           |
| <i>Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.</i> = <i>Bulletino del Istituto di diritto romano.</i>                     | <i>L.Q.R.</i> = <i>Law Quarterly Review.</i>   |
| <i>Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.</i> = <i>Bulletin de la Société Royale d'Archéologie d'Alexandrie.</i> | <i>N.G.G.</i> = <i>Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen.</i>                       |
| <i>Bursian</i> = <i>Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft.</i> | <i>O.L.Z.</i> = <i>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.</i>  |
| <i>B.Z.</i> = <i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift.</i>  | <i>Phil. Woch.</i> = <i>Philologische Wochenschrift.</i>   |
| <i>Chron. d'Ég.</i> = <i>Chronique d'Égypte.</i>   | <i>Rech. sc. relig.</i> = <i>Recherches de science religieuse.</i>   |
| <i>Cl. Phil.</i> = <i>Classical Philology.</i>   | <i>Rev. arch.</i> = <i>Revue archéologique.</i>  |
|  | <i>Rev. belge</i> = <i>Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire.</i>  |
|  | <i>Rev. de phil.</i> = <i>Revue de philologie.</i>   |
|  | <i>Rev. d'hist. eccl.</i> = <i>Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique.</i>  |
|  | <i>Rev. ét. anc.</i> = <i>Revue des études anciennes.</i>  |

*Rev. ét. gr.* = *Revue des études grecques*.

*Rev. hist. dr.* = *Revue de l'histoire du droit français et étranger*.

*Rev. hist. rel.* = *Revue de l'histoire des religions*.

*Rhein. Mus.* = *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*.

*Riv. di fil.* = *Rivista di filologia classica*.

*Riv. Stor. Dir. Ital.* = *Rivista di storia del diritto italiano*.

*Sitzungsb.*... = *Sitzungsberichte*...

*Symb. Oslo.* = *Symbolae Osloenses*.

*Theol. Lit.-Z.* = *Theologische Literaturzeitung*.

*Z. f. Kirchengesch.* = *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*.

*Z. f. Numism.* = *Zeitschrift für Numismatik*.

*Z. f. vergleich. Rechtsw.* = *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*.

*Z. neut. Wiss.* = *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*.

*Z. Sav.* = *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung (Romanistische Abteilung)*.

#### I. LITERARY TEXTS.

*General.* A fresh instalment (the last was in *Archiv*, VIII, of 1927) of KÖRTE's invaluable reports on *Literary Texts in Papyri* appears in *Archiv*, x (1931), 19-70.

For the years 1928-9 S. DE RICCI publishes his *Bulletin papyrologique*, x, in *Rev. ét. gr.*, XLIII (1930), 404-46.

S. EITREM and L. AMUNDSEN have issued *Papyri Osloenses*, fasc. II, 1931, containing (nos. 7-14) the following literary pieces, viz.: [*Il.* VI, 196-276], [*Od.* IV, 483-92], [Plato, *Politicus*, 308 E-309 C], [Dem., *De Corona*, 200-4], [Septuagint, frs. of *Gen.* and *Is.*], Vocabulary of *Il.* I, 5-24, 2nd cent. A.D., similar to P. Berl. 5014; Grammar, 2nd cent. A.D., largely coinciding with the *Technē* of Dionysius Thrax, [Sibylline Oracles]. Nos. in brackets already published.

*Les Papyrus Grecs d'Achmêm*, edited by P. COLLART in *Bull. Inst. fr. d'arch. or.*, XXXI (1930), 35-111, includes Epitome of *Il.* I and Glossary of *Il.* I, 1-21; Hes., *Theogony*, 75-144; Euripides, *Rhesus*, 48-86; *Anth. Pal.* XIV, 10; all previously published by Wilcken.

*Epic.* In *Aegyptus*, XI (1931), 169-78, A. BATAILLE and P. COLLART publish Homeric Papyri from the Reinach collection presented to the Institut de Papyrologie. In one of them the syllables are marked off, obviously for the use of a pupil.

F. M. DEBATIN mentions a 4/5th cent. codex of *Il.* XIII, 512-560, in the Papyrus collection at Washington University, Saint Louis, in *A.J.A.*, XXXV (1931), 62.

A. WIFSTRAND in *Eranos*, XXVIII (1930), 102-4, identifies Dionysius Periegetes as the author of the Brit. Mus. *Dionysiaca*, unaware of Keydell's previous discovery in *Phil. Woch.*, 1929, 1101.

The evidence of papyri is used by E. DELAGE in his *Biographie d'Apollonios de Rhodes* (1930), and by P. COLLART in his important work, *Nommos de Panopolis: Études sur la composition et le texte des Dionysiennes* (1930). The latter is reviewed by CALDERINI in *Aegyptus*, XI (1931), 508-9.

HUNT and JOHNSON's *Two Theocritus Papyri* receives an important review by M. POHLENZ in *G.G.A.*, 1931, 361-76. Other reviews by E. BIGNONE in *Boll. fil. class.*, IX (1931), 177-80, and by P. COLLART in *Rev. de phil.*, 1931, 390-1.

G. VOLGRAFF emends idylls XIV, 33 and XXVI, 28 in *Mnemosyne*, LIX (1931), 315-6.

*Elegiac.* The *Cambr. Univ. Reporter*, 2 June 1931, 1151, gives a summary of a lecture by POWELL on "Some recent additions to Greek Elegy and Lyric Poetry from the 4th cent. B.C."

J. M. EDMONDS has edited for the Loeb series *Elegy and Iambus* (2 vols., 1931), excluding the choliambic writers but otherwise including the poets from Callinus to Crates, and the Anacreontea.

An important article by A. D. KNOX in *Philologus*, XLI (1932), 18-39, on the metrics of "The Early Iambus" uses the evidence of papyri.

R. KEYDELL reports on *Die griech. Poesie der Kaiserzeit* up to 1929 in *Bursian*, CCXXX (1931), 41-161.

Reconstructions of Tyrtæus are essayed by W. KLINGER in *Bull. Ac. Polon.* (Sc. et Lettres, 1929), 35-9.

In the Brit. Mus. scholia of Callimachus I now read *ai κατὰ λεπτόν*, thus supporting ROSTAGNI's proposal. A. WIFSTRAND in *Eranos*, XXVII (1929), 116-8, makes important suggestions for restoring these scholia.

*Lyric.* LOBEL's dating of Corinna is opposed by BOWRA in *Cl. Rev.*, XLV (1931), 4-5.

MAAS has a few notes on Corinna in *Z. f. vergleich. Sprachforschung*, LVIII (1931), 268-9.

In *Cl. Phil.*, XXVI (1931), 153-65, S. E. BASSETT on *The Place and Date of the First Performance of the Persians of Timotheus* gives the date as 412-408 B.C., and the recipients as the Athenians.

A. TURYN'S *Studia Sapphica* is reviewed by P. CHANTRAINE in *Rev. de fil.*, LVI (1930), 403.

I propounded some of the following readings in *Sappho* before the Cambr. Philolog. Soc. on 28 Jan., viz.: *Ode to the Nereids*: ὀνίαν δὲ λύγραν | [ἐξέλοιτ]ο τοῖσι etc. [θῦμον ἐδά]μνα="May he remove the bitter grief from those whose hearts he broke"; τὸ κέγχρῳ | [... ἄλ]λ' ἐπᾶγ(αγ') [ῥ]α πολίταν | [ἐν λύαισ' ἄλ]λας, [ἐπὶ]νῆκε δ' αὐτ' οὔ-[τω διὰ μί]κρω="Which (as) by a single millet-seed swayed (his thoughts) now this way, now that (ἄλλο ἄλλως) and again righted them"; [Νῆρεος γ]όναι, κ[οῖλαισι ναῦ]σι | [πέμπετ' ἄψ]ερ[ο]ν· σὺ δὲ Κύπ[ρ]ι σ[έ]μνα | [λώπε' αἴψα περ]θεμ[έν]α κάκαν [ἐ-|ρην διά]λυσα; *Anactoria Ode*: τὸν ἄνδρα | [πρω]λίπ', ἄρι]στον | [φαῖσα καὶ] σέβας Τροῖ[ς] ἔ]λεσθαι="Abandoned her husband, thinking best (so to do) and to choose the cynosure of Troy (i.e. Paris)"; παρ[ά]γαγ' αὐταν | [αὔτικ' ἴ]δοισαν or [αὔψ' ἐπ]ίδοισαν | [ῥ]ωρος· εὐκ]αμπτον γάρ [ἔτεινε τόξον | μειδίας] κούφως τ[ὸ] ἐχάλα β]ήγον="And softly released the string", cf. νεῦρα βόεια | [ὄς] με νῦν etc.; κὰν ὄχοισι for κὰν ὄπλοισι="And among the chariots"; A new ode after *πεσδομάχεντας*, viz. [ῥ]ολβίων] μιν etc. | [πάντ' ὄ]ν ἀνθρώποις; *Ode to Hera*: πλάσιον δὴ μ[ὲ]ν εὐχομένη παρείη, τὰν ἀράταν Ἄτ[ρ]εῖδ(αι) ἔσκεθον δίτ-]ροι; πρίν σε καὶ Δ[ι]ὸ ἀντ[ό]μεν(οι) ἰλάσασθαι; l. 19 κ[ε]ῖμμε ν[ῦ]ν; l. 20 Ἡ]ρ' or ἐ]ξ ἀπ[ί]κασθαι. Cf. *Cambr. Univ. Reporter*, 16 Feb., 1932.

The Hymn to Demeter by *Philikos* has been re-edited with additional fragments by GALLAVOTTI in *Stud. ital. di fil. class.*, IX (1931), 37-60, and after him by KÖRTE in *Hermes*, LXVI (1931), 442-54.

*Drama*. Vol. CCXXXIV (1932), 107-74, of *Bursian* is devoted to a *Bericht über die Literatur zur griech. Komödie von 1925-1931* by E. WÜST.

J. BORGERHOFF publishes a thesis on *Satyros et sa biographie d'Euripide* (Brussels, 1929).

JENSEN'S *Menandri Reliquiae* receives a detailed review from G. COPPOLA in *Riv. di fil.*, IX (1931), 247-54, 391-7.

E. FRAENKEL in *Philologus*, XLI (1932), 117-20, identifies Menander's *Συναριστώσαι* as the original of the *Cistellaria*.

V. COULON discusses Menander readings in *Rev. ét. gr.*, XLIV (1931), 26-8.

In *Mnemosyne*, LIX (1931), 239-48, W. E. J. KUIPER identifies the "Incerta Fabula" of Menander (Jensen, pp. 84-7) with the "Canephorus," and *ib.*, 165-83, develops ideas on the "Colax."

The Monostichs of Menander in TAIT'S *Ostraca* (nos. 405, 449) are restored by P. COLLART in his review of Tait in *Rev. de phil.*, V (1931), 349-50, and also in his article "A propos de quelques exercices scolaires" in *Bull. Inst. fr. d'arch. or.*, XXX (1930), 417-23. Tait's *Ostraca* is also reviewed by K. FR. W. SCHMIDT in *Phil. Woch.*, 1931, 535-42.

In *Cl. Rev.*, XLV (1931), 24-8, EDMONDS reviews KNOX'S Herodas.

R. M. RATTENBURY reviews in *Cl. Rev.*, XLV, 38-9, URSING'S *Studien zur griech. Fabel*.

PASQUALI writes on the new *Hipponax* fragment in *Stud. ital. di fil. class.*, IX (1931), 307-11.

*Grammar*. LOBEL re-edits P. BOURIANT'S on the Aeolic dialect in *Archiv*, X (1931), 1-4.

An article by F. MÜNZER on *Das Konsulpaar von 139 v. Chr.*, in *Klio*, XXIV (1931), 333-8, draws its evidence from the Oxyrhynchus *Livy* epitome.

*History*. "A New Fragment of the Acta Isidori" is edited by BELL from P. Lond. Inv. No. 2785, with plate, in *Archiv*, X (1931), 5-16. [See too § 3.]

A. NEPPI MODONA writes on *Il nuovo frammento berlinese degli "Atti dei Martiri Alessandrini"* in *Aegyptus*, XII (1932), 17-24. [See § 3.]

G. DE SANCTIS in *Riv. di fil.*, IX (1931), 330-4 would assign P. Oxy. 13, a letter to Demetrius Poliorcetes, to the "History of the Diadochoi" by Hieronymus of Cardia.

In *Riv. di fil.*, LVIII (1930), 449-66, G. COPPOLA edits a Florence papyrus of Philistus *Περὶ Σικελίας*, and MOMIGLIANO adds a note, 467-70. In *Studi ital.*, VIII (1931), 311-5, G. PERROTTA discusses the same text.

*Music*. In *Chron. d'Ég.*, 1931, 441-55, C. DEL GRANDE writes on the musical papyri discovered in Egypt.

The oldest Greek musical document extant, a Cairo papyrus, is discussed by J. F. MOUNTFORD in *J.H.S.*, LI (1931), 91-100. Acquired with the Zenon papyri, it dates *circa* 250 B.C.

*Oratory*. A new discourse of *Favorinus*, *Περὶ φυγῆς*, more or less complete, is published by NORSA and VIFELLI as vol. 53 of *Studi e Testi*, with transcript, text, and plates. Numbered Pap. 11 in the Vatican, and dating *circa* 215 A.D.

Rev. by MAAS with many suggestions in *D. Lit.-Z.*, 1931, 1210-3, and by AMATUCCI in *Boll. fil. class.*, 1931, 4-7.

BOLLING restores ll. 106-8 of the Brit. Mus. Dio. Chrysostom in *Cl. Phil.*, XXVI (1931), 315-6.

In *Charisteria A. Rzuch*, 1930, 5-10, M. ADLER re-edits, under the title "Der Arkesilaos-Papyrus," a rhetorical fragment first published in *Archiv*, III, 151-7.

*Philosophy.* SANDBACH reviews EDMONDS' *Theophrastus* (Loeb series) in *Cl. Rev.*, XLV (1931), 23-4.

*Romance.* LAVAGNINI'S *Eroticorum Graec. fragg. papyraea* receives a long and important review from FR. ZIMMERMANN in *Phil. Woch.*, LI (1931), 193-202, 225-34.

Finally we may here mention "A Fragment of a Greek Illustrated Papyrus from Antinoë" by S. J. GASIOROWSKI in *Journal*, XVII (1931), 1-9.

## 2. RELIGION, MAGIC, ASTROLOGY.

### (Including Texts.)

*General.* K. PREISENDANZ, *Zur Papyruskunde* (ch. 5 of MILKAU, *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft*, 300-31: Leipzig, Hartasowitz, 1931), gives an admirable survey of papyrology as a whole, in which we may here remark pp. 319-21 on religious and magical papyri.

O. WEINREICH, *Allgemeine Religionswissenschaft* (*Arch. f. Rel.*, XXVIII (1931), 318-79), gives a valuable account of recent work on the study of religions in general. FR. PEISTER, *Die Religion der Griechen und Römer*, is reviewed by W. BAUER, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LVI (1931), 409; O. WEINREICH, *Gebet und Wunder*, by H. SCHLINGENSIEPEN, *ib.*, 75-8; F. CUMONT, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, ed. IV, and the German translation (which has *addenda* by C.) by M. P. NILSSON, *D. Lit.-Z.*, III (1931), 2065-6, and E. BICKERMANN, *O.L.Z.*, XXXIV (1931), 210-13; the German translation by W. BAUER, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LVI (1931), 195-6; W. PEEK, *Isishymnos von Andros*, by O. WEINREICH, *D. Lit.-Z.*, II (1930), 2025-30 (with valuable remarks).

K. LATTE, *Synkretismus*, in GUNKEL-ZSCHARNACK, *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*<sup>2</sup>, v, 952-9, is brief and good.

W. SCHUBART, *Orakelfragen* (*Ä.Z.*, LXVII (1931), 110-15), collects the texts on papyrus containing questions to oracles and discusses in an interesting and suggestive commentary the practice and procedure of consulting oracles in Egypt.

S. EITREM, in his *Varia* (*Serta Rudbergiana*, 1931, 18-23), has notes on P. Berol. 1026 and P. Bouriant I, p. 21.

O. WEINREICH, *Zur hellenistisch-ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte* (*Aegyptus*, XI (1931), 13-22), well connects Menander's *σεμνὸς ὁ Σάραπις θεός*, P. Oxy. 1803, with Ptolemy's invitation to Alexandria, and has instructive remarks on the paeon from Ptolemais and on P. Oxy. 1381.

S. EITREM, *A Greek Papyrus concerning the sale of a slave* (*Journal*, XVII (1931), 44-7), is noticed in § 3, but we may here remark the street-names *ἀγ(υῖας) Ἀρωῶνς*, *ἀγ(υῖας) Ἀρωῶνς Νείκης*, still in use in A.D. 154, and E.'s suggestion that each street had a chapel.

W. OTTO, *Zusätze*, printed after W. SPIEGELBERG, *Die demotischen Papyri* Loeb, col. 107-16 (volume not yet accessible; see § 3), has valuable remarks on royal titulature, e.g. the avoidance of an early designation as *θεός* of kings who were minors, the use of cult names for the ruler's parents, but not for the ruler in early Ptolemaic *Aktpräskripte*.

J. G. TAIT, *Greek Ostraka*, I, 24, no. 144, records an *οἰνολογία* which is, he suggests, perhaps to be identified with the tax called *σπονδὴ Διονύσου* and to be connected with the Dionysiac policy of Philopator.

L. R. TAYLOR, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Philological Monographs published by the American Philological Association, I, edited by JOSEPH WILLIAM HEWITT, 1931. Pp. xv+296), includes a sketch of Hellenistic ruler worship and a discussion of the cult of Agathos Daimon at Alexandria.

A. D. NOCK, *ΣΥΝΝΑΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ* (*Harv. Stud. Class. Phil.*, XLI (1930), 1-62), discusses the inclusion of Ptolemies in the worship of existing Egyptian deities and the relations of this to earlier Egyptian practice, also the probable abandonment of the custom by the Roman rulers. On the chronology of the worship of the Theoi Adelphoi and the Theoi Soteres reference should be made to OTTO's important remarks, pp. 414 f. of his article, *Zu den syrischen Kriegen der Ptolemäer* (*Philol.*, LXXXVI (1931), 400-18).

CH. PICARD, in his *Chronique de la religion grecque: sur quelques cultes primitifs à Délos* (*Rev. hist. rel.*, CI (1930), 223-50), raises, pp. 242-4, the question of possible Egyptian influence on Delos long before the Hellenistic period.

A. DEGRASSI publishes in *Notizie degli scavi*, Serie sesta, VI (1930), 430-2, a statuette of Isis-Fortuna found at Salvo in Sardinia; G. BRUSIN, *ib.*, 437, a small basalt base from the statue of a priest of Thot, ca. 700-500 B.C., found at Aquileia; A. TARAMELLI, *ib.*, VII (1931), 118-23, a votive cippus to Isis with a

female human-headed serpent, a dog, and a crocodile, all adorned with lotus flowers, and a headless statue of Isis, found at Porto Torres in Sardinia, and refers to excavations now being conducted by C. ANTI in the sanctuary of the crocodile-god of Tebtunis (see § 10).

I gather from W. BAUER's review, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LVI (1931), 75, that J. KEIL, *Ephesos*<sup>2</sup>, 75 ff., describes the remains of the large building at Ephesos thought to have been a Serapeum.

*Chron. d'Ég.*, no. 11 (Jan. 1931), 95-9, reprints an important communication by G. MEYER to *Le Journal du Caire*, 4 Oct. 1930, on the French excavations at Medamûd and gives, pp. 103-6, an equally interesting account by G. ROEDER of the German excavations at Hermopolis (see too § 10).

J. AMANN, *Die Zeusrede des Ailios Aristides* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1931. Pp. viii+112. *Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft*, XII. 7 M. 50) is a contribution of rare excellence to the religious history of the Antonine age. A. argues that the speech was delivered in Egypt; this is attractive, but I doubt his suggestion that ἀποπάρωρ in § 9 points to local speculation such as we find in Hermetism and Valentinianism: the Orphic parallels, αὐτοφυής and αὐτογένεθλος in the Clarian texts discussed by me, *Rev. ét. anc.*, 1928 (they have much in common with Aristides), and αὐτογένεθλος in the Chaldaic Oracles (W. KROLL, *De oraculis Chaldaicis*, 25), all suggest that Aristides learnt the idea in Asia Minor. Incidentally it may be remarked that the scheme of an encomion on a deity discussed in ch. I of this work has influenced the Imuthes-aretagy in P. Oxy. 1381 (the τόποι of (1) the impossibility to a mortal of worthy treatment of the theme, (2) the fulfilment of a vow by a literary offering).

E. BICKERMANN, *Zur Datierung des Pseudo-Aristeas* (*Z. neut. Wiss.*, XXIX (1930), 280-98), makes a strong case for a date between 145 and 127 B.C.

L. RADERMACHER, *Zur Charakteristik neutestamentlicher Erzählungen* (*Arch. f. Rel.*, XXVIII (1930), 31-41), has interesting parallels for the Alexandrian parade of the mock Agrippa.

J. GROSS, *Philons von Alexandria Anschauungen über die Natur des Menschen* (Diss. Tübingen, 1930. Druck: Tübinger Chronik. Pp. 91), is a careful study of Philo's sources and mode of thinking.

H. LEWY, *Sobria ebrietas*, is reviewed by G. VAJDA, *Rev. études juives*, xc (1931), 109-12.

R. REITZENSTEIN, *Eros als Osiris. Ein Nachtrag* (*Nachr. Gött. Ges.*, 1930, 396-406), publishes a jug with a representation of Eros giving a drink to Psyche as she rises from the ground, and returns to the question of the origin of the tale.

*Hermetism.* F. CUMONT's most important *La fin du monde selon les mages orientaux* (*Rev. hist. rel.*, CIII (1931), 29-96) includes, p. 61, n. 3, remarks on the prophecy in the *Asclepius*. In this context should be noted E. BICKERMANN's instructive review, *Gnomon*, VII (1931), 277-9, of H. WINDISCH, *Die Orakel des Hydaspes*.

R. BULTMANN, *Untersuchungen zum Johannesevangelium, Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε* (*Z. neut. Wiss.*, XXIX (1930), 169-92), includes valuable illustrations of the idea, found in the *Corpus*, of God's providence seen in his εἰκόων, the universe, and an indispensable discussion of the meaning of γνῶσις in Paul.

CARL H. KRAELING, *The Apocalypse of Paul and the "Iranische Erlösungsmysterium"* (*Harvard Theol. Rev.*, XXIV (1931), 209-44), is of interest for the Anthropos myth: on this cf. also J. SCHEFFELOWITZ, *Der göttliche Urmensch in der manichäischen Religion* (*Arch. f. Rel.*, XXVIII (1930), 212-40).

A. D. NOCK, *A diis electa: a chapter in the religious history of the third century* (*Harvard Theol. Rev.*, XXIII (1930), 252-74), bears on the doctrine of divine right in *Corpus* XVIII.

As the *Koivantes* professes to be a work of Hermes, we should here mention M. WELLMANN, *Der Physiologos, eine religionsgeschichtlich-naturwissenschaftliche Untersuchung* (*Philol. Suppl.*, XXII, i (1930) pp. 116). W. shows the connection of the *K.* with the *Phys.* (pp. 35 ff.), concluding that both have used a first century A.D. work, based in the main on Bolos-Democritus and the Neopythagorean Anaxilaus of Larissa, and comparable with the magic books of the Essenes (on whom cf. F. CUMONT, *Esséniens et Pythagoriciens, d'après un passage de Josèphe* [*C.-R. Ac. Inscr. et B.-L.*, 1930, 99-112], where the Pythagorean character of their eschatology is shown: it localized the Islands of the Blest in Heaven, the Ocean to be crossed being identified with the atmosphere); the ultimate source was perhaps a *Physica* current under the name of Solomon, the immediate source possibly the *Physica* of Didymus of Alexandria. Reviewed by FR. PFISTER, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LVI (1931), 196-7.

REITZENSTEIN-TROJE, *Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe*, is the subject of an instructive review by M. DIBELIUS, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LVI (1931), 128-33.

*Magic.* The event of the year is the publication of *Papyri magicæ graecae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri herausgegeben und übersetzt von KARL PREISENDANZ. II. Unter Mitarbeit von ERICH DIEHL, SAM EITREM, ADOLF JACOBY.* Mit drei Lichtdrucktafeln. (Leipzig: Teubner, 1931. Pp. xv+216.) This completes the collection of magic papyri and kindred documents already published and includes certain

*inedita*. Further *inedita* and full indexes should fill a third volume, the appearance of which will be most eagerly awaited. The character of the editing is beyond praise: it is not too much to say that PREISENDANZ has opened up this literature to non-specialists, and for specialists he has made it far more easy to use. There is not a page of the work on which one does not find clear improvements in the text which are due to his penetrating ability and devoted application. Volume I has been reviewed by FR. ZUCKER, *B.Z.*, xxxi (1931), 355-63.

PREISENDANZ has also in his review of P. Iand. v in *Phil. Woch.*, LI (1931), 985-90, drawn attention to the identity of the text preserved in no. 87 (= *P. mag. gr.*, II, pp. 186 f., no. lviii), a fragment of an illustrated treatise, with a *defixio* (Audollent 188). His *Deux papyrus magiques de la collection de la Fondation égyptologique (P. Bruxelles Inv. E. 6390 et 6391 in Chron. d'Ég.*, VI, no. 11, janvier 1931, 137-40) gives us a small incomprehensible text with magical signs, the letters probably forming magical words, and another amulet fragment. On these and other recent discoveries he reports in *Die neuen Zauberpapyri (Forsch. u. Fortsch.*, VII (1931), 121-2) and *Neue griechische Zauberpapyri (Gnomon*, VII (1931), 271-3).

S. EITREM and L. AMUNDSEN, *Papyri Osloenses*, fasc. ii, is noticed in § 3. This magnificent volume, dedicated to H. I. BELL, includes as no. 15 (pp. 29 ff.) a revised text with commentary of the magical ostrakon previously published by AMUNDSEN, *Symb. Oslo.*, VIII. [In this volume we may note also the remarks on *συνειδησις καθάρη*, p. 42, and pp. 112 f. on an *Ἀφροδείτη*, or figure of the goddess, mentioned in an inventory and of interest for domestic cult, and P. HEGAARD's observations, pp. 146-51, on the horoscope earlier published as P. Oslo. 6.]

TH. HOPFNER, *Orientalisch-religionsgeschichtliches aus den griechischen Zauberpapyri Aegyptens (Archiv Orientalní*, III (1931), 119-55 and 327-58), gives a full and admirable account of the pantheon of the magic papyri. His *Apollonios von Tyana und Philostratos (Seminarium Kondakovianum*, IV (1931), 135-64) is another careful study (note p. 143, on the impossible statements in Phil.'s account of the visit to Egypt).

R. MOUTERDE, *Le glaive de Dardanos. Objets et inscriptions magiques de Syrie (Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph, Beyrouth (Liban)*, xv, 3 (1930), 53-137, with 3 plates), publishes a gem at Beyrouth conforming with slight variants to the directions given in the "Sword of Dardanus," a charm contained in *P. mag. gr.*, no. iv, l. 1716 ff. and discussed in *Journal*, XI, 154-8 [the inscription IACIAM H|MA on the side showing Eros and Psyche embracing is puzzling. Perhaps *ημα* is the Hebrew name for the sun mentioned by Epiphanius, *Panarion*, XVI, 2], other gems from Syria with magic words and various deities including Anubis in military dress and Abraxas, various amulets, a *defixio* directed against all the horses and charioteers of the Blue faction at Berytus, and another *defixio* from Damascus. This is an admirable work, giving much new material with full commentary and opening up important possibilities of investigating the place of Graeco-Egyptian magic in the world of the time at large. [In this connection I may draw attention to a find on the Via Nomentana, *Notizie degli scavi*, 1908, 352: *αβλαναθαλαβα* written in a cruciform schema, indicating that the user of the palindrome was a Christian, on one side of a stone on the back of which is a magical formula which I cannot parallel.]

ERICUS DIEHL, *Magica Bosporana (Acta universitatis Latviensis: filol.-filos. Fak. Serija*, I, 7 (1931), 391-400), publishes what is probably a magic lead wheel and a square lead tablet with an inscription also no doubt magical, both from Panticapaeum.

A. AUDOLLENT, *Note sur une plaquette magique de Carthage (C.-R. Ac. Inscr. et B.-L.*, 1930, 303-9), publishes a representation of a serpent-headed personage with a scorpion in his right hand, a palm in his left, *ωμ|ε|λαμ|φα|ρω|κ* on his body, and under him *Ἀρποκρατίων ὁ καὶ Νείλος*, and discusses a very similar object published by DELATTRE and MERLIN (*ib.*, 33-6), with the name *Πρόκλος*.

A. JACOBY, *Ein Berliner Chnubisamulett (Arch. f. Rel.*, xxviii (1930), 269-85), is of far-reaching importance for the interpretation of magic words. J. is clearly the man with the right linguistic equipment for this much needed work.

C. WESSELY's *Synopsis Florae magicae (Bull. Inst. fr. d'arch. or.*, xxx (1930), 17-26) is a valuable collection of plants prescribed for magic use in the papyri.

Reference may be made to V. LARÖCK, *Essai sur la valeur sacrée et la valeur sociale des noms de personnes dans les sociétés inférieures (Rev. hist. rel.*, CI (1930), 27-67, 101-201: esp. 119 ff., on the change of names in magic).

*Christian*. F. G. KENYON in *The Times*, 19 Nov. 1931, has made a public announcement of a most important new group of Biblical papyrus *codices*, most of which are in CHESTER BEATTY's possession. They range from the 2nd century to the 5th, indicate the spread of Christianity southwards in Egypt,

and are significant textually. *Chron. d'Ég.*, no. 11 (Jan. 1931), 162, mentions a dictionary of Hebrew proper names with Greek equivalents discovered by HUNT.

EITREM-AMUNDSEN, *Papyri Osloenses*, II, includes as no. 10 (pp. 10 f.) four fragments from Genesis and Isaiah previously published by RUDBERG.

P. COLLART'S *Les papyrus grecs d'Achmîm*, for which see § 3, *Roman*, contains (no. 1) a fragment of the homily in P. Bour. 3, which Collart publishes along with columns I and III of the Bouriant papyrus, of which he has found some further small scraps.

C. SCHMIDT, *Ein Berliner Fragment der alten ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ* (*Sitzungsber. Pr. Ak.*, 1931, 37-40, pl. i), publishes a 4th-century fragment so well written as to confirm the idea that those *Acta* had a quasi-canonical standing in Egypt.

L. VAGANAY, *L'évangile de Pierre*, is highly praised by E. B. ALLO, *Rev. Biblique*, XL (1931), 434-42, and M. R. JAMES, *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, XXXII (1931), 296-9. Another review by R. DRAGUET appears in *Rev. d'hist. eccl.*, XXVII (1931), 854-6.

M. R. JAMES, *The Rainer Fragment of the Apocalypse of Peter* (*ib.*, 270-9), gives a restoration and discusses its relation to the Ethiopic text.

G. OSBORN, *Note on P. Oxy. 655* (*ib.* 179), identifies this fragment as Mt. x. 16.

P. L. HEDLEY, in reviewing the new edition of KITTEL, *Biblia Hebraica*, in *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, XXXII (1931), 302-7, gives revised readings of P. Lond. 37 for the Psalms.

H. C. YOUTIE, *Gothenburg Papyrus 21 and the Coptic Version of the Letter to Abgar* (*Harvard Theol. Rev.*, XXIV (1931), 61-5), shows the striking agreement of the two forms.

G. SCHOLEM, *Über eine Formel in den koptisch-gnostischen Schriften und ihren jüdischen Ursprung* (*Z. neut. Wiss.*, XXX (1931), 170-6), argues that the scheme "real name *x*, explanation *y*" in the Book of Jeu, I, 47-8 is based on the Jewish "real or secret name *x*, speakable name *y*."

R. P. CASEY, *Two Notes on Valentinian Theology* (*Harvard Theol. Rev.*, XXIII (1930), 275-98), discusses Valentinian mythology and the differences between the Eastern and Western forms of that sect. His *Greek manuscripts of Athanasian Corpora* (*Z. neut. Wiss.*, XXX (1931), 49-70) sums up the results of much work. Students of Athanasian history should not miss E. SCHWARTZ, *Der griechische Text der Kanones von Serdika* (*ib.*, 1-35).

*Serapion of Thmuis against the Manichees* by ROBERT PIERCE CASEY (*Harvard Theol. Stud.*, No. XV, Harv. Univ. Press and Humphrey Milford, London, 1931. Pp. vi+80) gives the first text based upon the Genoa and Athos MSS., with a valuable introduction.

F. HALKIN, *L'Histoire Lausaque et les vies grecques de S. Pachôme* (*Anal. Bolland.*, XLVIII, 257-301), is approved by H. KOCH, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LVI (1931), 161-3; J. QUASTEN, *Musik und Gesang in den Kulturen der heidnischen Antike und christlichen Frühzeit*, by W. BAUER, *ib.*, 133-4.

TH. HOFFNER has produced fascicules 2-4 of the first volume of his invaluable *Index locupletissimus* to MIGNÉ'S *Patrologia graeca*: fascicule 1 was noticed in *Journal*, XVI, 126.

### 3. PUBLICATIONS OF NON-LITERARY TEXTS.

(N.B. *Notes on and corrections of miscellaneous documents previously published are referred to in § 9. Reviews, when sufficiently important for mention, are noticed here. I am greatly indebted to my colleague, Mr T. C. Skeat, who, as I was occupied with other pressing work, has kindly relieved me of the task of reading the periodicals for which I am responsible.*—H. I. B.)

*General.* The year under review witnessed the publication of an unusually large number of important volumes of papyrus texts. Unfortunately, the undertaking of a piece of special research, which compelled me to lay aside all other work, made it necessary to defer detailed study of several among them to a later time.

TAIR'S Greek Ostraca has been reviewed by P. COLLART (*Rev. de phil.*, 3 S., v (1931), 349-50; chiefly on the literary texts); M. ROSTOVITZEFF (*Gnomon*, VII (1931), 21-6; important); W. SCHUBART (*O.L.Z.*, 1931, 336-7); K. FR. W. SCHMIDT (*Phil. Woch.*, LI (1931), 535-42; many suggestions); and in *Ancient Egypt*, 1931, 56.

The second part of P. Oslo has appeared during the year, edited by S. EITREM and L. AMUNDSEN. Unlike the first, which contained only magical or allied texts, this is miscellaneous in character. Nos. 7-14 are literary (see §§ 1, 2), no. 15 magical (see § 2), and in an Appendix P. Oslo 6 is republished with an astronomical commentary by P. HERGAARD; the remaining texts, 16-64, are documentary and range in date from 261/60 B.C. to the 5th century of our era; but the great majority are of the Roman period. They include several very noteworthy and valuable legal documents, and an interesting series of

private letters. Needless to say, the editing is excellent, the commentaries (in English) full and learned, and the reading, so far as can be judged, accurate; and some good facsimiles are a particularly useful feature of the volume. The editors are warmly to be congratulated on their accomplishment of a task which offered many difficulties, since not a few of the papyri were clearly hard to decipher. *Papyrus Osloenses*, fasc. II. Oslo, Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo (on commission by Jacob Dybwad), 1931. Pp. xi + 182, 9 plates (separately bound). Reviewed by F. Z[UCKER] (*B.Z.*, XXXI (1931), 416); WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 83-7; important, as usual); and W. SCHUBART (*D. Lit.-Z.*, 3 F., II (1931), 1163-5).

Another part of the series of texts from papyri in the Giessen University Library (P. bibl. univ. Giss.) has recently been edited by H. BÜTTNER. It consists entirely of private letters, ranging in date from the 2nd century B.C. to the 6th century of our era; only the first letter, a small fragment, belongs to the Ptolemaic age. So far as can be judged from a hasty examination, this series of letters contains much material of interest, and the texts are furnished with an ample and careful commentary. No. 20, a letter referring to the disappearance of some legal documents and written in a particularly fine hand, is specially notable. There are four excellent facsimiles. Prof. HUNT kindly sends me the following emendation of no. 22, 3-5, which he authorizes me to publish here. For the editor's τρία κνίδεια σταλ(έντα) Ἡρώδε[ι, | τ]ῷ δὲ λοιπὸν κνίδειον ἐν πλ(οίῳ) ἡμῶν read τρία κνίδεια στατήρων, [τ]ῷ δὲ λοιπὸν κνίδειον ἐν νοίμμων. *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek. III. Griechische Privatbriefe* (P. bibl. univ. Giss. 18-33). (*Schriften der Hess. Hochschulen*, 1931, Heft 3.) Giessen, A. Töpelmann, 1931. Pp. 40, 4 plates.

*Ptolemaic.* M. NORSA's *Papiri greci delle collezioni italiane* (*Journal*, xvii, 124) has been reviewed, among others, by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 77-8) and M. HOMBERT (*Rev. belge*, x (1931), 611-2).

C. C. EDGAR's great catalogue of the Cairo Zenon papyri, one of the most important collections of non-literary texts published for many years, is completed by the appearance of vol. IV. There still remain indeed, as Edgar explains in his preface, a number of fragments, but they are too small to be worth publishing in so sumptuous a form as the official catalogue necessitates. Even the texts here assembled are in the nature of a *Nachlese*, but besides many fragmentary papyri there are a fair number of comparatively complete ones and much valuable material; indeed, if I can judge from a preliminary inspection, the volume shows far less falling off in interest from the standard of its predecessors than might have been expected from a final instalment. As before, there is a fine series of collotype facsimiles, most of which are admirably clear. They include the musical papyrus (see § 1) and an interesting drawing on the verso of an account (59706). *Catalogue Général des Antiquités Égyptiennes du Musée du Caire*, Nos. 59532-59800. *Zenon Papyri*, vol. IV. Le Caire, Impr. de l'Inst. fr. d'arch. or., 1931. Pp. v + 291, 24 plates. £2. 2s. Od.

The same year which witnessed the completion of the Cairo catalogue saw also the publication of the Zenon papyri in the University of Michigan, also by C. C. EDGAR; see *Journal*, xvii (1931), 125. This volume has been reviewed by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 72-6); HUNT (*Journal*, xvii (1931), 263); EV. BRECCIA (*Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, No. 26, 301-11); A. C. JOHNSON (*Am. Journ. Phil.*, LII (1931), 285-7); and H. I. BELL (*Cl. Rev.*, XLV (1931), 180-1; quotes extracts from a recently acquired Zenon papyrus in the British Museum which throws light on the subsequent employment of Zenon's predecessor Panacestor).

W. L. WESTERMANN'S *Regarding Receipts in the Zenon Archive* (*Journal*, xvii, 1931, 125) is reviewed by WILCKEN in *Archiv*, x, 77. Westermann has now published four further receipts of the same class and regnal year, on which he gives a commentary, with some observations supplementary to his previous remarks. *Four Double Receipts from the Estate of Apollonius*, in *Seminarium Kondokorianum*, IV (1931), 205-10.

For a reference to an article on the Zenon archive by CL. PRÉAUX see § 9.

WESTERMANN'S *Upon Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt* has been reviewed by V. EHRENBERG (*Hist. Z.*, CXLIV (1931), 406-7) and in *Ancient Egypt*, 1931, 56-7. See also §§ 5, 6, B ii.

O. GUÉRAUD has begun the publication of a work of the first importance. This is a complete edition of the petitions (ἐντεύξεις) found among the mummy cartonnage of Magdola and Ghorân. Those from Magdola include the 42 petitions edited, after a first publication by JOUQUET and LEFEBVRE, by the late JEAN LESQUIER in vol. II of the Lille Papyri. Some of these have now received additions by the identification of detached fragments once forming part of them, and the whole are included in Guéraud's masterly work, along with further texts from Magdola and those from Ghorân. The first fasciculus, which is all that has at present appeared, contains 52 texts, besides an elaborate introduction by the editor, and facsimiles. This is the first publication of the recently founded Société royale égyptienne de papyrologie. ENTEΥΞΕΙΣ: *Requêtes et plaintes adressées au roi d'Égypte au III<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.-C.* Premier fascicule.

Le Caire, Impr. de l'Inst. fr. d'arch. or., 1931. Pp. xciv+128, 13 plates. Reviewed by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 96-8); A. CALDERINI (*Aegyptus*, xi (1931), 413-4); and EV. BRECCIA (*Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, No. 26, 297).

F. ZUCKER publishes a papyrus (P. Jena Inv. 75 in the Seminar für klassische Philologie) which furnishes a new instance of a village gymnasiarch. It is a document of the 2nd century B.C., but of unknown origin, concerning a case arising out of a theft of jewellery, which was tried before a village gymnasiarch and five *katoikoi*. Zucker adds a list of known cases of such gymnasiarchs in villages and discusses the question of village gymnasia. ΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΑΡΧΟΣ ΚΩΜΗΣ, in *Aegyptus*, xi (1931), 485-96.

One of the last undertakings of W. SPIEGELBERG, whose death is such an irreparable loss to Demotic studies, was the preparation of an edition of the Loeb Demotic papyri, which I believe has now appeared, though I have not seen the volume itself. W. OTTO contributes (cols. 107-116) addenda and corrections from his wide knowledge of Hellenistic history. The papyri, which date from the 6th century B.C. to the end of the Ptolemaic period, many of them belonging to the reign of Alexander, the son of Alexander the Great, include letters and returns, contracts, accounts, and receipts, from both Upper and Lower Egypt. *Die demotischen Papyri Loeb*. (*Papyri der Universität München*, herausgegeben von W. Otto, W. Spiegelberg und L. Wenger, I<sup>tes</sup> Heft.) Pp. xvii+68, 38 plates, RM. 120.

*Ptolemaic-Roman*. F. BILABEL publishes a Demotic ostrakon, probably of 97/6 B.C., from a place called Pentacomia, apparently near Thebes, which is now recognized as occurring in WILCKEN, *Griech. Ostr.* II, 713, and appends to it transcripts, supplied by J. G. TAIT, of three Bodleian ostraca of the Roman period (A.D. 106, 136, and 150) which mention the same place. *Aegyptiaca*. I. *Ein demotisches Ostrakon aus Pentakomia*, in *Aegyptus*, xi (1931), 386-8.

KRÜGER's *Ptolemäische und frühromische Texte* (*Journal*, xvii, 125) is reviewed by WILCKEN in *Archiv*, x, 78-82.

*Roman*. A hearty welcome—the more hearty because the decipherment of cursively written tax-registers is a particularly thankless task—is to be extended to a volume of papyri of the early Roman period from Philadelphia in the Princeton collection, edited by A. C. JOHNSON and H. B. VAN HOESEN. Fourteen registers, several of which are of considerable length, are here published. They are all (except perhaps no. 13) concerned with taxes, chiefly with the *syntaximon*; and having seen them before they were assigned to Princeton I can testify that they offer many difficulties of decipherment, as also of interpretation. The editors have done excellent work in both respects, though naturally there are many points, alike in texts and in commentaries, where their results are open to question and will receive (or have already received) correction. *Papyri in the Princeton University Collections*. (The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 10.) Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1931. Pp. xxiii+146. Reviewed by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 87-8); HUNT (*Journal*, xvii (1931), 263-4); A. E. R. BOAK (*Cl. Phil.*, xxvi (1931), 438-9); C. W. KEYES (*Am. Journ. Phil.*, lii (1931), 288-9); W. L. WESTERMANN (*Cl. Weekly*, xxv (1931, 14 Dec.), 68-71); and anonymously in *J.H.S.*, li (1931), 308. The reviews by Keyes and Westermann are particularly important. Both reviewers dispute the conclusion of the editors that the *syntaximon* was distinct from the *λαογραφία*, and hold rather that it was the latter *plus* some minor taxes. [I may point out that J. G. TAIT, *Gr. Ostr.*, Petr. 79, takes a similar view, though the taxes he associates with the *λαογραφία* to form the *syntaximon* are different; and that in a review of the Princeton volume which will probably have appeared before this Bibliography I have myself questioned the editor's view. Apart from other considerations, I find it well-nigh incredible that the same taxpayer should have been required to pay both *syntaximon* and *laographia*.]

The Akhmim papyri, first bought by U. BOURIANT, acquired by the Bibliothèque Nationale in 1887, and in large measure published by WILCKEN in the same year, have now been re-edited with indices in a single series by P. COLLART, who explains in a preface the curious manner in which they have been preserved, namely through the use, some two centuries later, by Christian monks of old papyri first used on the recto only at Panopolis about the end of the 2nd century. Nos. 1-5 are literary or theological (see §§ 1, 2); the other four are administrative in character. *Les papyrus grecs d'Achmim à la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris*, in *Bull. Inst. fr. d'arch. or.*, xxxi (1930), 35-111.

J. C. NABER re-edits, with attractive corrections, the petition first published by SCHUBART as B.G.U. 1105. *Ad papyrum Graecum lepidi argumenti* (B.G.U. 1105), in *Aegyptus*, xi (1931), 179-84.

The papyrus referring to a senate, probably at Alexandria, published by M. NORSA and G. VITELLI (*Journal*, xvii, 126) has continued to attract attention. W. SCHUBART, reprinting the text (*Die BOYAH von Alexandria*, in *Bull. Inst. fr. d'arch. or.*, xxx (1930), 407-15), maintains his view that it refers to a request for a (non-existing) senate, not to a senate already in existence, and is inclined to identify the Emperor

with Claudius rather than Octavian. He goes on to examine the well-known passage of Dio Cassius on the senate, for which he suggests a quite new interpretation, namely that Dio was referring not to the Alexandrian but to the Roman senate. The passage is certainly very ill expressed, and Schubart's view, though not entirely free from difficulties, is without doubt suggested by the way in which Dio introduces the subject of the senate. The remainder of Schubart's case, even the attribution to Claudius, is strengthened by an article on *The BOYAH papyrus* contributed by JAMES H. OLIVER, a pupil of ROSTOVITZEFF, to *Aegyptus*, XI (1931), 161-8. In this he points out that certain expressions and references in the text of the new papyrus would be anachronistic at the time of the conquest of Egypt, and impose a later date, when Roman government had become familiar. He also makes suggestions for the interpretation and improvement of the text, including a brilliant and most convincing emendation of *καταβαρ-βαροῖτο* to *καταβαροῖτο* (dittography).

A. NEPPI MODONA comments on the new fragment of the *Acta Isidori* published by UXKULL-GYLLENBAND (*Journal*, XVII, 126). He inclines to adhere to A.D. 53 as the date of the trial, and defends the thesis that the Jews were citizens of Alexandria. *Il nuovo frammento berlinese degli "Atti dei Martiri Alessandrini"* (P. 8877), in *Aegyptus*, XII (1932), 17-24. A further fragment of this text, the *Acta Isidori*, has been published by H. I. BELL. It coincides in part with col. II of the Berlin fragment (*W. Chrest.* 14) but does not clear up as many of the doubtful points as might have been hoped, while it raises fresh problems; but it does provide new information, the most important fact being (if Bell's supplement is correct) that the death of Macro, the prefect of the praetorian cohorts, was due (or at least attributed) to Isidorus, and it corrects some of the supplements proposed for the Berlin fragment. [I may add that my doubts as to the correctness of the supplement *ὑπερθε[τρικόν]* grow with further consideration; but I do not think any suggestion which involves a different reading of the last two letters of p. 11 can be considered. Prof. CRÖNERT favours *ὑπερ θε[ωνος]*, which I considered but rejected; but this seems to me improbable, among other reasons because a reference to Theon is hardly relevant to the context. More attractive is a suggestion by Mr H. J. M. MILNE, *ὑπερ θε[σιν]*, "off the point," "irrelevant"; but I am not sure whether the phrase is attested.] *A New Fragment of the Acta Isidori*, in *Archiv*, x, 5-16, with facsimile.

LÖSCH'S *Epistula Claudiana* (*Journal*, XVII, 126) has attracted a good deal of attention, having been reviewed by E. BICKERMANN (*D. Lit.-Z.*, 1931, 320-2); W. WEBER (*Z. f. Kirchengesch.*, 3. Folge, I (1931), 225-7); W. BAUER (*Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LVI (1931), 151-3); M. J. LAGRANGE (*Rev. biblique*, XL (1931), 270-6); and H. I. BELL (*Cl. Rev.*, XLV (1931), 146). All the reviewers, while recognizing the useful service done by the author in his monograph, call attention to the too frequent errors and misconceptions which disfigure it. W. SESTON, in an interesting article, *L'empereur Claude et les chrétiens* (*Rev. d'hist. et de phil. relig.*, 1931, no. 3, 32 pp. of offprint), comes to the same conclusion as LÖSCH and his reviewers: that there is no reference to Christianity in Claudius's letter. He seeks further to date, by their relationship to the letter, Philo's *In Flaccum* and *Legatio ad Gaium*, placing the former between January and July of A.D. 41, the latter after 10 Nov. 41, probably during 42 and certainly before 49. His arguments are perhaps a little forced and over rigid, but they certainly deserve attention.

STROUX'S re-edition of B.G.U. 611 (*Journal*, XVII, 126) has been followed up by an elaborate article from the pen of F. v. WOESS, who, emphasizing the great importance of Stroux's work on the text and cordially accepting his main conclusions, amplifies or modifies them in detail. He places the speech in A.D. 42, or, preferably, 43, rather than, with Stroux, in 47. *Die oratio des Claudius über Richteralter, Prozessverschleppung und Anklägertyrannei (BGU. 611)* in *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 336-68. [See also § 6, F.]

A. E. R. BOAK'S *Select Papyri from Karanis* (*Journal*, XVII, 127) is reviewed by WILCKEN in *Archiv*, x, 89-91.

In two articles published together HENRY A. SANDERS, who has for some time devoted his attention specially to Latin tablets and papyri, does a great service by editing some fragments from the rich papyrus collection of Michigan. In the first he publishes, with a detailed and valuable commentary, two waxed tablets containing birth-certificates in Latin; in the second, three Latin papyrus fragments. The problems presented are many and puzzling, and Sanders's attempted solutions are not always acceptable, but his discussion, in which he summarizes with great fairness the existing evidence, and on several points definitely advances our knowledge, is of real value even when the final conclusion does not command assent. *Two Fragmentary Birth-Certificates from the Michigan Collection*, in *Mem. of Amer. Acad. in Rome*, IX (1931), 61-80, plates 1, 2; and *Some Papyrus Fragments from the Michigan Collection*, *ibid.*, 81-8, plates 3, 4. Reviewed by H. I. BELL, *Journal*, XVII (1931), 268-9.

SANDERS has further published an article on the waxed tablet published as P.S.I. 1027, maintaining that the editors were wrong in supposing that it is the last tablet of a triptych. This error was due, he points out, to a misapprehension as to the arrangement of such documents; and he holds that the tablet is really the first of a diptych. *The wax tablet PSI. ix, 1027*, in *Aegyptus*, XI (1931), 185-9. [See also § 6, E.]

G. VITELLI has published an extract from the archives (*μεραδόσιμα*) of the strategus of the Heraclides Division of the Arsinoite nome, A.D. 132, which is of interest from several points of view: diplomatically, as illustrating the procedure with regard to petitions, which would appear to have been returned in a copy with the Prefect's reply to the strategus; administratively, inasmuch as the mother of a deceased son, who was to have been gymnasiarch, asks that his son (an infant) may be cosmetes; and legally, since we find property hypothecated to safeguard the *ἐπιτροπή* of sons under age. *Estratto dall' archivio di uno strategos dell' Egitto romano*, in *Bull. Inst. fr. d'arch. or.*, xxx (1930), 59-63. Reviewed by WILCKEN in *Archiv*, x, 88-9.

H. HENNE has revised the edict of Hadrian published by JOUGUET from Cairo 49359, 49360 in the *Rev. ét. gr.*, xxxiii, and made the subject of an article in the *Raccolta Lumbroso* by V. MARTIN. He makes various corrections, mostly of a minor kind, to Jouguet's text, which he describes as on the whole remarkably correct, the most important change being in respect of the date, which, it appears, is 6 Payni 20 Hadrian, not 16 Payni of the 21st year; and he agrees with Martin as to the sense of the edict, which is now seen to be less "philanthropic" than it professes to be. *Sur un édit d'Hadrien*, in *Bull. Inst. fr. d'arch. or.*, xxx (1930), 152-60.

S. EITREM publishes a distinctly interesting summary of a contract for the sale of a slave, which the street names show to have been made at Alexandria, and which is dated in A.D. 154. He discusses the various problems presented by the text. *A Greek Papyrus concerning the Sale of a Slave*, in *Journal*, xvii (1931), 44-7, pl. vi.

The late Prof. GRENFELL was preparing an edition of the Warren papyri, a small but by no means unimportant private collection. His lamented death put an end to this scheme, as to so many others, but A. S. HUNT is proposing to publish the more interesting texts singly, and one of them has now appeared. It is a petition to Lucius Silius Satrianus, *vir egregius*, very likely the Idiologus, from an Antinoite, with a copy of an earlier petition dated 12 May 164. A new deme-name of the tribe *᾽Οσειραντινοίς* occurs. *Lucius Silius Satrianus*, in *Bull. Inst. fr. d'arch. or.*, xxx (1930), 477-80. Reviewed by WILCKEN in *Archiv*, x, 94.

HOMBERT'S *Une famille nombreuse* (*Journal*, xvii, 126 f.) is reviewed by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 93).

The long roll, edited by M. NORSA and G. VITELLI, which bears on the verso the copy of Favorinus, *Περὶ φωνῆς* (see § 1), has on the recto extensive portions of a land register from the Marmarica, which is not only of interest as coming from a district hardly represented in papyri but makes very valuable additions to our knowledge in many respects; *inter alia*, it shows that the Marmarica was in the time of Commodus, as when Ptolemy wrote, a nome of Egypt. Naturally the novelty of the text, introducing us to a district which clearly differed in many points of organization from the nomes familiar to us, offered many difficulties; and the editors are to be congratulated on a remarkable achievement in producing in so short a time so masterly an edition of the two long texts which occupy a roll acquired by the Vatican as recently as 1930. *Il papiro vaticano greco 11: 1. ΦΑΒΩΡΙΝΟΥ ΠΕΡΙ ΦΥΓΗΣ. 2. Registri fondiari della Marmarica*. Città del Vaticano, Bibl. Apost. Vaticana, 1931. Pp. xxiii+70 (registers on pp. 49-70), 15 plates. Reviewed by WILCKEN in *Archiv*, x, 94-6. See too § 6; A v.

By an oversight A. SEGRÈ'S *Tre papiri giuridici inediti* (*Studi Bonfante*, III, 421-36), though the last of these papyri was documentary, was omitted from this section in last year's Bibliography (it was recorded in §§ 1, p. 119, and 6, p. 133). It concerns a petition to the exegetes of Alexandria, asking for the *ἀπογραφή* of the goods of Sabina Apollonaria and enclosing a copy of her will, made *per aes et libram*. Reviewed by WILCKEN in *Archiv*, x, 93.

A Greek inscription found at Medamūd which P. JOUGUET has published with a valuable commentary (*Dédicace grecque de Médamoud*, in *Bull. Inst. fr. d'arch. or.*, xxxi (1931), 1-29, with plate) really belongs to Mr Tod's bibliography of inscriptions but must be referred to, as it is of considerable interest and importance from several points of view. Jouguet dates it 2nd-3rd century.

JOUGUET'S *Lettre sur l'enregistrement des libelles* (*Journal*, xvii, 127) is reviewed by WILCKEN in *Archiv*, x, 92-3.

HENRY A. SANDERS, to whose edition of various Latin fragments reference has been made above, has

also published separately another Latin papyrus from the Michigan collection. It is a list of officers (in large rustic capitals), with the record of each added in cursive, and as the dates appended to each name show that the list was drawn up soon after A.D. 242 the papyrus is very useful palaeographically. [On p. 2, l. 1 for "Bell" read "Hunt"; so too p. 18, l. 17. In l. 20 of the text Sanders reads  $\zeta$ [al]EFOFES, and that this is not a misprint is shown by his note on p. 7 ("efofes is read clearly"); but in the facsimile FOTES seems to me clear.] *Papyrus 1804 in the Michigan Collection*, in *Class. Studies in Honor of John C. Rolfe* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Press), 19 pages, 1 plate.

The following work, to which I have been given a reference, should be important, but is at present inaccessible to me: A. BLUDAU, *Die ägyptischen Libelli und die Christenverfolgung des Kaisers Decius* (= *Römische Quartalschrift*: 27. Supplementheft), Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1931. Pp. vii + 79.

L. AMUNDSEN has published, primarily for its philological interest, a Michigan ostrakon of A.D. 288 from Karanis, in which  $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$  is used as equivalent to  $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\chi\omicron\nu\sigma\omicron\nu$ . He quotes instances of similar compound prepositions and essays an explanation.  $\Sigma\Upsilon\text{ΜΠΙ}\alpha\text{Ρ}\alpha$ , in *Serta Rudbergiana* (1931), 85-7.

A posthumous publication of W. SPIEGELBERG is that of two Demotic mummy labels in the Michigan collection which show an unusual formula, the deceased being described as entered in "the book of the  $x$  quarter." To illustrate these he publishes two bilingual labels in the Greek part of which the quarter is indicated by  $x\ \lambda(\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma\ ?)$ , and a Demotic label, in which a number occurs alone. *Zur Bestattung der Mumien in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, in *Ä.Z.*, LXVI (1930), 39-41.

In an article in *Chron. d'Ég.*, VI (see § 10), G. K. GARDICAS refers to an article of his own in  $\lambda\theta\eta\nu\acute{\alpha}$  ( $\Delta\Gamma.$   $\sigma\epsilon\lambda.$  52) in which he makes a suggestion for the reading of the description of a branding mark in a sale of a camel in B. G. U. 100 ( $\phi\upsilon\ \beta\acute{\omega}$ , i.e.  $\Phi\text{P}$ , for  $\phi\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}$ ); but the periodical referred to is not accessible to me.

*Roman-Byzantine.* H. FRISK has published an interesting little volume, in which he edits a number of papyri from the Berlin collection. The *pièce de résistance* is a long roll of receipts for payments from the public bank of Arsinoë during Mecheir of the year A.D. 155; the payments were mostly to donkey-drivers. To this series of documents he adds: 2, a fresh document in the Drusilla case; 3, the beginning of a petition of about A.D. 211-2; 4, a petition of the 4th or 5th century; 5, a lease of hypothecated land, A.D. 510; 6, a letter of A.D. 710 from Qurrah b. Sharik to Basilius of Aphrodito. All these texts have features of special interest, and they are admirably edited, with most valuable commentaries. *Bankakten aus dem Faijûm nebst anderen Berliner Papyri.* Göteborgs Kungl. Vetenskaps- och Vitterhets-Samhälles Handlingar, 5 F., Ser. A, Band 2, No. 2. Göteborg, Wettergren och Kerber, 1931. Pp. 120, 1 plate. Kr. 6:--. Reviewed by F. Z[UCKER] in *B.Z.*, xxxi (1931), 414-5, and H. I. BELL, *Cl. Rev.*, XLV (1931), 244.

*Byzantine and Arab.* Reference must be made in passing to a note, primarily of legal interest (see § 6), by R. TAUBENSCHLAG on P.S.L., VII, 767: *Zum gerichtlichen Moratorium im röm. Provinzialrecht*, in *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 403-4. A reference may also be made to P. COLLART'S *À propos de quelques exercices scolaires* (*Bull. Inst. fr. d'arch. or.*, xxx (1930), 417-23); see §§ 1 and 5.

W. HENGSTENBERG, whose *Die griech.-kopt. μουσλιον-Ostraka* (*Journal*, xvii, 127) is reviewed by F. Z[UCKER] (*B.Z.*, xxxi (1931), 416-7), has followed up that article by another, in which he publishes 49 more ostraca of the same type, partly in the Coptic Museum of Cairo, partly in the Seminar für Ägyptologie at Munich, while one was seen at a dealer's in Cairo. The texts of those in the Coptic Museum are published from transcripts in part by C. SCHMIDT, in part by G. SOBHY. Hengstenberg accompanies them with a detailed and valuable discussion; and at the end he adds a note, stating that according to information given by C. Schmidt the provenance has been identified as the neighbourhood of a large Coptic settlement in the extreme west of the Fayyûm. *Nachtrag zu "Die griechisch-koptischen μουσλιον-Ostraka,"* in *Ä.Z.*, LXVI (1930-31), 122-38.

Finally, I may refer to a publication by C. SCHMIDT of a Coptic ostrakon (dated by the editor as 6th-8th century) containing a contract for the hire of a workman by an unidentified monastery of Apa Mena: *Ein koptischer Werkvertrag*, in *Ä.Z.*, LXVII (1931), 102-6.

#### 4. POLITICAL HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, ADMINISTRATION, TOPOGRAPHY AND CHRONOLOGY.

Most of the books and articles noted in this section, and many of those in § 5, of the Bibliography for this and previous years are mentioned in L. WENGER'S *Juristische Literaturübersicht* for 1914-1931 in *Archiv*, x, 142-76.

*General.* U. KAHRSTEDT reviews the second edition of W. W. TARN'S *Hellenistic Civilization* in *G.G.A.*, 193 (1931), 399-400.

The review of DESSAU, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, II, 2, by E. GROAG, in *Hist. Vierteljahrsh.*, XXVI (1931), 380-6, is largely concerned with Egyptian topics.

*Political History.* The relation of Alexander the Great to Egypt (see *Journal*, XVII, 128) has reached a new stage in the works of G. RADET, *Alexandre le Grand* (reviewed by S. R[EINACH] in *Rev. arch.*, XXXIII (1931), 354) and U. WILCKEN, *Alexander der Grosse*.

Questions of Ptolemaic history are discussed by W. OTTO, *Zu den Syrischen Kriegen der Ptolemäer*, in *Philologus*, LXXXVI (1931), 400-18; by W. W. TARN, *The date of Milet I. iii. no. 139* (on the struggle of Ptolemy II with Antiochus) in *Hermes*, LXV (1930), 446-54; and by R. HERZOG, *Griechische Königsbriefe* (on a letter of Ptolemy III to Kos) in *Hermes*, LXV (1930), 455-71. Here also should be noted W. OTTO's *Zusätze* to SPIEGELBERG's *Die demotischen Papyri Loeb*, which are important for chronology, and E. BICKERMANN's *Zur Datierung des Pseudo-Aristeas* in *Z. neut. Wiss.*, XLIX (1930), 280-98.

In *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, no. 26, pp. 300-1 E. BRECCIA reviews P. GRAINDOR's *La guerre d'Alexandrie*.

On the Jewish troubles in Alexandria (see *Journal*, XVII, 128) the most important contribution is H. I. BELL's *New Fragment of the Acta Isidori*, in *Archiv*, x, 5-16. A. NEPPI MODONA writes on *Il nuovo frammento berl. degli "Atti dei Martiri Aless."* in *Aegyptus*, XII (1932), 17-24; and S. LÖSCH's *Epistula Claudiana* is reviewed by H. I. BELL in *Cl. Rev.*, XLV (1931), 146 and by C. WEYMAN in *Hist. Jahrbuch*, LI (1931), 241-2. [See § 3, where an important article by W. SESTON, received as this Bibliography goes to press, is also noted.]

In W. REUSCH's *Der historische Wert der Caracallarita* (Beiheft XXIV, N.F. XI, of *Klio*, 1931), pp. 44-7 and 58 deal with Egypt.

*Administration.* In *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, no. 26, pp. 347-8, E. BRECCIA reviews P. JOUGUET, *La politique intérieure du premier Ptolémée*.

F. ZUCKER analyses the evidence as to the office of the *γυμνασιάρχος κόμης* in *Aegyptus*, XI (1931), 485-96. [See § 3.]

Reference for the Roman period may be made to A. CALDERINI, *La più antica scheda di censimento romano proveniente dall' Arsinoite* in *Rend. R. Ist. Lomb.*, LXIV (1931), 551-8; to C. W. KEYES, *Syntaximon and Laographia in the Arsinoite Nome*, in *Am. Journ. Phil.*, LII (1931), 263-9; and to A. S. HUNT, *Lucius Silius Satrinus*, in *Bull. Inst. fr. d'arch. or.*, xxx (1930), 477-80. [See § 3.]

Some information on military recruiting is given by H. A. SANDERS, *Some papyrus fragments from the Michigan collection*, in *Mem. Amer. Acad. in Rome*, IX (1931), 81-8.

The Giessen dissertation by O. HORNICKEL on *Ehren- und Rangprädikate in den Papyrusurkunden* (see *Journal*, XVII, 129) is reviewed by P. COLLART in *Rev. de Phil.*, 3, v (1931), 391; by A. STEIN in *Gnomon*, VII (1931), 172-4; and by G. SOYTER in *Phil. Woch.*, 1931, 29, 885; it contains an index of honorary titles of persons and cities.

GOODENOUGH's *Jewish Courts* (see *Journal*, XVII, 128) is reviewed by N. HOHLWEIN in *Bull. bibl. et péd.*, XXXIV (1930), 9-10, and by P. COLLART in *Rev. de Phil.*, 3, v (1931), 147-8.

V. MARTIN has studied *L'état actuel des archives de Flavius Abinnaeus et la biographie de cet officier*, in *Chron. d'Ég.*, VI (1931), 345-59. He discusses (i) the correct spelling of the name and decides for Abinnaeus, not Abennäus, (ii) the chronology of the career of Abinnaeus, and in particular (iii) the problems raised by the Latin petition P. Lond. 447 which was published in *Journal*, XIV (1928), 320-2.

For the part played by the great feudal estates in the organism of Byzantine Egypt see the notice of E. R. HARDY's book in § 5 below.

ADOLF GROHMANN, *Probleme der arabischen Papyrusforschung*, in *Archiv Orientalní*, III (1931) 381-94 + Tabelle: *Übersicht über die Einteilung Oberägyptens nach Al-Maqrizi und Al-Qudā'i* is a paper studying the administrative organisation of Upper Egypt in the early period of Arab rule; the *Kāras* of the lists of Arab geographers correspond in general with the pagarchies of the Byzantine period, though the boundaries of the *Kāras* are often changed to meet administrative convenience.

*Topography.* A. E. R. BOAK and E. E. PETERSON have issued *Karanis: topographical and architectural report of excavations during the seasons 1924-28*; it is reviewed by V. COCCO in *Aegyptus*, XI (1931), 408-10. [See § 10.]

The *Illustrated London News* of 2 May 1931, pp. 724-6, contains an article on the tracing of Roman aqueducts and photographing the Kharga Oasis from the air.

*Chronology.* The fourth section of KENNETH SCOTT's article on *Greek and Roman Honorific Months* in *Yale Classical Studies*, II, 201-78 deals with the Egyptian material.

## 90 BIBLIOGRAPHY: GRAECO-ROMAN EGYPT (1930-1931)

E. STEIN, in his article *Konstantin d. Gr. gelangte 324 zur Alleinherrschaft*, in *Z. neut. Wiss.*, xxx (1931), 177-85, bases his argument upon P. Oslo. II, 44.

## 5. SOCIAL LIFE, EDUCATION, ART, ECONOMIC HISTORY, NUMISMATICS AND METROLOGY.

*General.* A paper by J. PARTSCH on *Die griechische Kultur in Aegypten* is included in the collection *Aus nachgelassenen und verstreuten Schriften von J. Partsch: Freiburg. Rechtsgesch. Abh.* I, Berlin, 1931.

There has reached us as we go to press a monograph by E. R. HARDY, JR., on *The large estates of Byzantine Egypt* (=Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, no. 354), Columbia University Press, New York, 1931, pp. 162. \$3. The frontispiece reproduces the consular diptych of Apion II. The evidence is mainly derived from the Apion papyri, but the author studies the general problems of feudalism, serfdom, and estate management and the part played by the large estates in the social and economic life of Byzantine Egypt. In the bibliography reference is made to an article by the author which has not previously been noted here: *New Light on the Persian Occupation of Egypt*, in *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*, XIII (1929), 185-9.

*Finance, Agriculture, Industry.* HEICHELHEIM'S *Wirtschaftliche Schwankungen* (see *Journal*, xvii, 129) is reviewed by U. KAHRSTEDT in *G.G.A.*, 193 (1931), 78-80; by F. OERTEL in *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 572-85; by H. I. BELL in *O.L.Z.*, 1931, no. 7, cols. 620-3; by W. W. TARN in *Economica*, Nov. 1930, 315-8; by F. GEYER in *Phil. Woch.*, LI (1931), 475-80; and by A. C. JOHNSON in *A.J.A.*, xxxv (1931), 353.

P. JOUGUET, in an article entitled *Dédicace grecque de Médamoud*, which deals with a dedication by two women and a man engaged in the Red Sea shipping trade, discusses that trade and the routes from the Nile valley to the Red Sea: *Bull. Inst. fr. d'arch. or.*, xxxi (1931), 1-29, with a supplementary note by P. GRAINDOR, pp. 31-2.

WESTERMANN'S *Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt* (see *Journal*, xvii, 129) is reviewed by K. F. W. SCHMIDT in *Phil. Woch.*, 1931, 211-2; by N. HOHLWEIN in *Bull. bibl. et péd.*, xxxiv (1930), 10; and in *Ancient Egypt*, 1931, pp. 56-7. See also B ii. §§ 3, 6.

N. HOHLWEIN writes on *L'économie égyptienne* in *Chron. d'Ég.*, vi (1931), 225-33.

ETHEL H. BREWSTER contributes a paper on *A weaver's life in Oxyrhynchus* to *Classical studies in honour of John C. Rolfe* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1931). Pp. 19-45.

ADOLF GROHMANN, *Zum Weizenpreis im arabischen Ägypten*, in *Bull. Inst. fr. d'arch. or.*, xxx (1930), 541-3, concludes that during the first three centuries of the Islamic era the prices for wheat vary within the same limits as during the Byzantine epoch. It is only in later centuries of economic decline that prices fall to such an extent as to show that there was a grain surplus in Egypt.

*Education, Science, and Art.* P. COLLART writes *A propos de quelques exercices scolaires* in *Bull. Inst. fr. d'arch. or.*, xxx (1930), 417-23. [See also §§ 1 and 3.]

CASPER J. KRAEMER, JR., deals with *A Greek element in Egyptian dancing* in *A.J.A.*, xxxv (1931), 125-38.

W. SPIEGELBERG'S article *Zur Bestattung der Mumien in der römischen Kaiserzeit* in *A.Z.*, LXVI (1930), 39-41, should be noted here. [See also § 3.]

G. RODENWALDT has a useful note *Zur polychromie des Petosirisgrabes* in *Jahrb. Deut. Arch. Inst. (Arch. Anz.)*, XLV (1930), 262-5.

In the same volume, pp. 503-16, A. L. SCHMITZ discusses *Die Formengeschichte der ägyptischer Menapolis*.

E. PFUHL'S *Ikongraphische Beiträge zur Stilgeschichte der Hellenistischen Kunst* is reviewed by E. BRECCIA in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, no. 26, pp. 313-23.

L. TH. LEFORT, *La Littérature égyptienne aux derniers siècles avant l'invasion arabe*, in *Chron. d'Ég.*, vi (1931), 315-23, concludes that the year A.D. 699 when the Arabic language was rendered obligatory in public use "marque le terminus final des littératures grecque et égyptienne sur le sol d'Égypte." After that date the era of translation of Coptic works into Arabic begins.

*Numismatics and Metrology.* W. GIESECKE has formulated his views on the currency of Egypt under the Ptolemies in *Das Ptolemäergeld*: the book is reviewed by G. SEURE in *Rev. de Phil.*, 3, v (1931), 177; and by AGNES B. BRETT in *A.J.A.*, xxxv (1931), 360.

A. DIEUDONNÉ describes a specimen of the so-called gold *exaugium* in an article on *La donation Rockefeller* [sic] in *Rev. Num.*, xxxiii (1930), 151-3.

G. F. HILL publishes a list of *Alexandrian and Ptolemaic coins found in England* in *Num. Chron.*, x (1930), 335-8.

J. G. MILNE deals with *Egyptian leaden tokens* in *Num. Chron.*, x (1930), 300-15.

There is an article (not seen) by C. O. CASTELIN on *Die Bedeutung der griech. Papyri für die antike Numismatik* in *Der Münzensammler* (1929), 16, 18-24.

## 6. LAW.

## A. General.

i. *Bibliographies and collected works.* S. ROMANO, *Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.*, xxxix (1931), fasc. iv-vi, 63-104, continues that journal's bibliography; period 1924-30 inclusive, but rubric *Epigrafia-Papirologia—Diritti orientali* not yet reached. A. CALDERINI, *Aegyptus*, xi (1931), 103-27, 233-54, 418-31, continues his *Bibliografia metodica (Diritto e amministrazione)*, 115-7, 245-6, 424-5, to which, 517-21, he supplies an *Indice degli autori*. The lists of *Testi recentemente pubblicati* are also continued, 76-84, 202-12, 399-405, 497-500, with *Aggiunti, Correzioni, Riedizioni di papiri e di ostraca*, 85-8, 213-6, 406-7. *J.R.S.*, xx (1930), Part 2, supplies *Consolidated Indexes* to the first 20 vols. (little papyrology).

In *Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.*, xxxviii (1930), 291-4, P. BONFANTE gives S. PEROZZI's (†) bibliography. *Josef-Kohler-Bibliographie* (Berlin, Rothschild, 1931, 10 M., very extensive) is commended by L. ADAM, *Z. f. vergleich. Rechtsw.*, xlvi (1930-1), 473-4.

The first volume of the *Freiburger Rechtsgesch. Abhandlungen: Aus nachgelassenen u. kleineren verstreuten Schriften von Josef Partsch* (Berlin, 1931), is both appropriate and welcome. Its five *anecdota* include (besides those mentioned below, A v and D i) continuations of *Studien z. Negotiorum Gestio* and *Die Lehre vom Scheingeschäfte im röm. Rechte*. Among the reprints of importance to us we note: *Neue Urkunden zum justinianischen Reskriptenprozesse*, *Die demotischen Papyri Hauswaldt*, and the long reviews of PREISIGKE's *Girouesen* and KOSCHAKER's *Babyl.-assyrl. Bürgerschaftsrecht*. A general bibliography was given by W. KUNKEL, *Z. Sav.*, xlvii (1927), 586-94.

ii. *Miscellaneous reviews.* E. LEVY, *Z. Sav.*, li (1931), 543-67, reviews *Studi Bonfante* (*Journal*, xvii (1931), 130), as does U. RATTI, *Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.* xxxix (1931), fasc. i-iii, 349-67, while E. V., *Arch. Giurid.*, cvi (1931), 231-45, gives a careful résumé of Vol. I. RATTI is selective; LEVY deals with all the contributions, unequally of course, but so as to make "cf. LEVY" advisable as a general note to the four volumes. Short notices of *Opere di Contardo Ferrini* (*Journal*, xvii (1931), 130), Vols. III-V, are given by P. COLLINET, *Rev. hist. dr.*, x (1931), 359-61, and M. SAN NICOLÒ, *Z. f. vergleich. Rechtsw.*, xlvi (1930-1), 449-50; an analytical account of Vols. I-II is given by G. FERRARI, *Gnomon*, vii (1931), 320-3.

Reviewing favourably E. LEVY's *Ergänzungsindex zu Ius u. Leges* (*Journal*, xvii (1931), 132-3), M. SAN NICOLÒ, *K. V.G.R.*, xxiv (1930-1), 321-4, compares its letters *A* and *R* with those of the *Indexes to Codd. Theod. and Just.* He also notes Greek words not to be found even in PREISIGKE's *Wörterbuch*. G. SEGRÈ, *Arch. Giurid.*, cv (1931), 245-7, is equally favourable. E. LEVY, *Z. Sav.*, li (1931), 567-8, supplies corrections for O. GRADENWITZ's *Ergänzungsband zum Heidelb. Index zum Theodosianus* (Berlin, 1931), and, *ibid.*, 568-9, welcomes P. COLLINET's bibliography of French works on Roman law (*Journal*, xvii (1931), 130).

P. KOSCHAKER, *Z. Sav.*, li (1931), 541-3, is highly appreciative of É. CUQ's *Études sur le droit babylonien* etc. (Paris, 1929); shorter in the same sense is M. SAN NICOLÒ, *O.L.Z.*, xxxiv (1931), 227-8.

G. SEGRÈ, reviewing P. DE FRANCISCI's *Storia del diritto romano*, I, II, 1 (Rome, 1926-9), in *Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.*, xxxviii (1930), 272-84, draws attention to the author's definition of the relation of Egypt to the emperor.

iii. *Legal history of antiquity.* L. WENGER's marvellous *Literaturübersicht*, III (1914-31), *Archiv*, x (1931), 98-176, is on the same plan as last year (*Journal*, xvii (1931), 130), though the proportions of the subdivisions are altered. Items coming within our scope are referred to below. Here we cannot refrain from chronicling the thorough account (pp. 103-13) of M. SAN NICOLÒ's *Beitr. z. Rechtsgesch. im Bereiche der keilschriftlichen Rechtsquellen* (Oslo, 1931), of which WENGER justly remarks that its constant comparative reference to Egypt and her papyri "macht die Lektüre auch für den Neupapyrologen notwendig." It is a fascinating book, but we must be content to refer to WENGER's account. A. CALDERINI, also, has brief notes on it in *Aegyptus*, xi (1931), 227, and its own *Register* carries one readily to the papyrological passages. The book is written from the point of view of WENGER's programme of *Antike Rechtsgesch.* (cf. M. SAN NICOLÒ's *Zum Problem einer antiken Rechtsgesch., Forschungen u. Fortschritte*, vii (1931) 140-1), a programme which W. EILERS, reviewing the book in *O.L.Z.*, xxxiv

(1931), 922-37, holds to be impracticable, because between the world conquered by Greek culture and that of the secular Sumerian tradition there exists, at least in the sphere of law, no community. But to be just, EILERS' point is rather that the East remained unaffected by Hellenism than that late Hellenism remained unaffected by the East. WENGER (p. 123) mentions another excellent orientalist work, *Hethitische Staatsverträge. Ein Beitr. zu ihrer juristischen Wertung* (Leipzig. *Rechtswiss. Studien*, Heft 60, 1931), by V. KOROŠEC. This includes a study of the treaty of 1292/1 B.C. between Hattušili III and Ramesses II, which exists both in a Hittite and an Egyptian (*Journal*, vi (1920), 179-205) version.

iv. *Legislative and juristic texts. Editions and comments.* The second volume of the charming pocket Digest edited by P. BONFANTE and others has now appeared (*Libri XLIX-L*, Milan, 1931. Lire 60). The editorial principles, apparently unchanged, are expounded by P. BONFANTE in *Conferenze per il XIV Centenario delle Pandette* (Milan, 1931), a book in which are collected addresses by twelve leading Romanists affording a vivid picture of the state of critical studies of the Digest. S. RICCOBONO defends his position on the Berytus question in an admirably written article; against him, on the whole, are P. DE FRANCISCI, P. BONFANTE, F. PRINGSHEIM, E. ALBERTARIO and, one gathers, others. But the exceptionally weighty judgement of B. KÜBLER is substantially on his side. Notable among the several studies devoted to the discovery of post-classical compilations which may have been the guides of Tribonian, is V. ARANGIO-RUIZ's *Precedenti scolastici del Digesto* (cf. his *Di alcune fonti postclassiche del Digesto, Atti Acc. Sci. Mor. e Pol. Napoli*, LIV (1931)), which adopts a line suggested (but not to him) by P. COLLINET some years ago. The strictly papyrological article is *Il diritto dei papiri nell'età di Giustiniano* (pp. 215-33) by L. WENGER. Their discovery of non-Roman legal currents has led papyrologists perhaps to underrate the force of the main Roman stream. The numerous Roman texts found in Egypt show that Roman law was studied there, and good fortune may bring us more of them. But even now fresh light would be derivable from a study of the constitutions, down to Justinian's Ed. XIII, addressed to Egypt. The papyri are only snapshots of life, but this defect is corrected by their numbers and especially by their occurrence in groups, e.g. the Zenon and Apion documents. We have learnt that from the 5th century the centralized state was being ousted by feudalism, a process which led to the national Coptic reaction against the foreigner. In private law the impression that we get is not one of sharp conflict between imperial and popular law: the Roman law of the higher tribunals had seen a fusion of *ius civile* and *ius gentium*, whilst the small local courts would be tolerant of departure from Roman principle. In fact, there remained something national, which in the East as in the West defied the unifying power of Roman law. Still, late papyri give some good Roman illustrations: thus, the proceedings against the runaway wife in P. Masp. Cair. III, 67295, the will in 67312, the sale in P. Munich 9. Egyptian conditions in the middle of the 6th century are vividly illustrated by the story of Dioscorus, poet and lawyer, *μυζοβάρβαρος καὶ μὲλλην*.

*Ein Blatt aus einem antiken Exemplar des Codex Justinianus*, *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 417-21, by F. SCHULZ, shows that no real reason has as yet been given for the attribution of the fragment published by A. SEGRÈ, *Studi Bonfante*, III, 429-30, to the first edition of the *Codex*. Where its text probably differed from our modern text, the latter is conjectural, and early corruption is possible.

C. A. NALLINO's study of the *Syro-roman Lawbook* in *Studi Bonfante*, I, 201-61 (*Journal*, xvii (1931), 133), is subjected to a searching analysis by L. WENGER, *Archiv*, x (1931), 138-41. The question which one would wish to hear authority speak is: of what value as evidence of non-Roman customary law can a work be, the local origin of which is not determinable? E. LEVY, *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 550, has some reassuring words, as has E. SEIDL, art. *Syrisch-römisches Rechtsbuch* in *Paulys Realencyklopädie* (excellent). R. HARTMANN, *O.L.Z.*, xxxiii (1930), 1012-3, finds NALLINO convincing.

G. SCHERILLO, *Sui "Tractatus de gradibus cognationum," Studi Fac. Giur. Cagliari*, xviii (1931), and the same, reviewing E. VOLTERRA on the *Collatio* in *Arch. Giurid.*, civ (1930), 255-65, can barely be mentioned. On the *Collatio*, SCHERILLO agrees in the main with E. LEVY (*Journal*, xvii (1931), 132), but he has some original points.

*Textes et documents pour servir à l'enseignement du droit romain*, by A. LEVET, E. PERROT, A. FLINIAUX, Paris, 1931, 25 frs. is announced (not seen).

v. *Documents and comments.* Taking U. WILCKEN's *Urkunden-Referat*, *Archiv*, x (1931), 70-98, as read, we mention here some publications which do not fall readily under one of our systematic subheads. M. NORSA and G. VITELLI have edited the recto of the Vatican papyrus, the verso of which has given us Favorinus *Περὶ πυγῆς* (above § 1): *Registri fondiarii della Marmarica. Il papiro Vaticano greco 11. Studi e Testi 53*. (Città del Vaticano, 1931. Lire 100.)=P. Marmarica. C. GALLAVOTTI and

G. LA PIRA, *Un registro catastale e un libro processuale dalla Marmarica*, *Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.*, xxxix (1931), fasc. iv-vi, 19-39, address themselves to what U. WILCKEN in a preliminary notice (*Archiv*, x (1931), 94-6, cf. 81) declares to be the chief question, namely that of the purpose of this collection or selection of cadastral entries. The entries are not uniform. Those of cols. ix-xii form a distinct block, being of properties in one district in topographical order with two valuations: first a higher, evidently that of the time of writing, and then a lower, that of the *lustrum* 175/6-179/80. They appear to be extracts from the *ἐπίσκεψις* of 188/9, intended to serve as a basis for the prefect to raise the taxes. Both for the system of *ἐπίσκεψις* and for economic history this is valuable material. In cols. i-viii, though the properties are grouped topographically, the purpose is not cadastral, but processual. Some of these entries illustrate the authority of the *strategus* to procure settlement of disputes (*Grundz.* II, 10); against the recalcitrant he uses freely the weapon of interim sequestration of revenues. Other entries show declaration of some irregularity in the legal situation, of which the *strategus* is requested to take note (*Grundz.*, II, 33), and though the matter may eventually be for the *Idios logos*, meanwhile the *strategus* can sequester. Lastly, there are simple entries of proprietor and cadastral inventory—cases under suspicion, perhaps. It is suggested that what we have is a general clearing up of outstanding questions for the purpose of presenting to the prefect the results of the *ἐπίσκεψις* of 188/9. The date Jan. 191 in col. xii, 12 is explained on the supposition that the process of cleaning the sheet took two years or more.

*Anhang 2* to W. KUNKEL's article in *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 229-76 (below, F), discusses (pp. 269-70) the interpretation of the ostraca which appears as 110 A in *Chrest.*, I; *Anhang 3* (pp. 270-3) the interpretation of various points in SPIEGELBERG's demotic book of civil procedure (*Journal*, xvi (1930), 137), on which KUNKEL differs from E. SEIDL; *Anhang 4* (p. 273, by R. HARTMANN) concerns the Aramaic P. Cowley 44; *Anhang 5* (pp. 274-6) contains a new translation by DR POLOTSKY of P. Strasb. dem. 12. On *Anhang 3* see further L. WENGER, *Archiv*, x (1931), 125-7.

*Coptic Law* (*Juridical Rev.*, XLIII (1931), 211-40), by A. A. SCHILLER, describes, and discusses from the legal point of view, ten Coptic business documents from Jeme-Thebes, which the author will shortly publish (possibly has published) in *Papers of the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York).

L. WENGER, under the title *Der röm. Kognitionsprozess* (*Aus nachgelassenen etc. Schr. von Josef Partsch*, pp. 1-2; above, A i), publishes interesting comments, found in a set of PARTSCH's papers, on P. Oxy. 2, 237, P. Fay. 21 and P. Lond. II, 359 (p. 150); also textual suggestions for P. Tebt. 434 (*Chrest.*, II, 51), B.G.U. IV, 1042, P. Flor. 36 (*Chrest.*, II, 64) and P. Lond. II, 354 (p. 164). P. COLLART, *Rev. de phil.*, LVI (1930), 411-2, emphasizes the juristic interest of the first two documents in S. MÖLLER's *Griech. Papp. aus dem Berliner Museum* (Göteborg, 1929), the first being a *ὁμολογία περιλίσεως* of A.D. 300, the second the missing beginning of P. Oxy. 1203.

In *Aegyptus*, XI (1931), 179-84, J. C. NABER suggests new interpretations and readings of B.G.U. 1105; incidentally, in B.G.U. 993, III, 11 he would read *ἐνενεχυρον* for *ἐπενεχυρον*, i.e. *ἐνέχυρον* without the dittography. The same writer, continuing his *Observatiunculæ* in *Mnemosyne*, LVIII (1930), 339-68, offers a harvest of novel textual suggestions too rich to be detailed here. Thus (pp. 358-9) for MOMMSEN's correction *ποίημαι* of B.G.U. 140, 16-17 (*Chrest.*, II, 373) *προειναι* he proposes *προσίεμαι*, which is better sense. And in his final section (pp. 360-8), observing on the interest of B.G.U. 361, he points out that DARESTE's re-edition in *Nouv. Rev. hist. dr.*, XVIII (1894), 584-6, is not noticed in PREISIGKE's *Berichtigungsliste*.

vi. *System of documentation*. In *Anhang 1* (pp. 265-9) to his above-mentioned (v) article W. KUNKEL discusses *χειρογραφία*, *χειρογραφείν* and *ὑποχειρογραφείν*. Though *χειρογραφία* and *χειρογραφείν* regularly refer to the written royal oath (*Chrest.*, I, 113), *χειρογραφείν* sometimes indicates autograph writing, either of the whole document or of the *subscriptio*, in which latter case *ὑποχειρογραφείν* is more exact. This suggests that the royal oaths were autograph, at least in their *ὑπογραφαί*, though there are objections. Autograph *ὑπογραφή* may have been a legal requisite in taking a royal oath.

The question of *ἀνανέωσις* (*Grundz.*, II, 91, n. 3; 163) has arisen again out of a Dura parchment of A.D. 121 published by M. ROSTOVITZEF and BRADFORD WELLES in *Yale Class. Stud.*, II (1931), 1-78, but we seem not much nearer a solution: P. KOSCHAKER, *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 429 and *Abh. Phil.-Hist. Kl. Sächs. Ak.*, XLII (1931), Nr. 1, 65-68; L. WENGER, *Archiv*, x (1931), 134-5.

In connection with textual suggestions for B.G.U. 8, J. C. NABER, *Mnemosyne*, LVIII (1930), 357-8, discusses the effect of *δημοσίωσις* (cf. A. B. SCHWARZ, *Die öffentl. u. priv. Urkunde im röm. Ägypten*, 271 ff.). We may not do more than just mention the following recent articles in *Paulys Realencyklopädie*: *Subscriptio* (B. KÜBLER), *Syngrapha* (W. KUNKEL), *Συμβολαιογράφος* (E. SEIDL), K. STARITZ, *Z. neut.*

*Wiss.*, xxx (1931), 157-70, explains βιβλίον in *Apocalypse*, v, 1, as a *Doppelurkunde*. On the scheme of diptychs see below, E.

B. *Law of persons.*

i. *Juristic persons.* In *Byz.-neogr. Jahrb.*, viii (1931), 377-8, C. WESSELY shortly approves of A. STEINWENTER's *Die Rechtsstellung der Kirchen u. Klöster nach den Papyri* (*Journal*, xvii (1931), 135). A. STEINWENTER, *Zur epistola Hadriani v. J. 121*, *Z. Sav.*, li (1931), 404-8, observes that Hadrian's permission (GIRARD, *Textes*<sup>5</sup>, 196; RICCOBONO, *Fontes*, i, Nr. 67) to the head of the Epicurean school at Athens to make his will in Greek and to choose a peregrine successor should be brought into connection not only with the philosophers' wills in Diogenes Laertius, but also with certain wills of heads of monasteries in cents. vi-xii. What is illustrated is the utilization of the forms of private law for the purpose of keeping alive a corporate body which has not yet achieved full legal personality.

ii. *Slavery.* H. LÉVY-BRUHL, *Esquisse d'une théorie sociologique de l'esclavage à Rome*, *Rev. gén. dr.*, 1931, 1-17, maintains that in the primitive and basic conception *civitas* and *libertas* were one, so that every slave was an alien, and every alien a slave. Slavery was thus an absolute status (cf. *servus sine domino*), something permanent and almost ethnic. Conversely, it was impossible for a citizen to become a slave under Roman law. These ideas, true for Roman law, the writer is inclined to generalize, citing (p. 11, n. 2) P. Hal. i, 219. But we must distinguish between primitive law and ancient law. Of W. L. WESTERMANN, *Upon Slavery in Ptol. Egypt* (*Journal*, xvii (1931), 135) there are favourable, but very short, reviews by N. HOHLWEIN (*Bull. bibl. etc. du Musée Belge*, xxxiv (1930), 10) and K. FR. W. SCHMIDT (*Phil. Woch.*, li (1931), 211-2). C. C. EDGAR, *Journal*, xvii (1931), 160-1, gives an approving account of some of the chief points of the book, but has some criticisms: thus in l. 11 of P. Columbia 480 read τὰζῶνται for παζῶνται. This papyrus (198-7 B.C.) is claimed by F. v. WOESS (*Z. Sav.*, li (1931), 426) as decisive in favour of his doctrine (*Asylwesen*, 82 ff.) that under the Ptolemies an insolvent debtor might come to real slavery, and L. WENGER, *Archiv*, x (1931), 134, unhesitatingly agrees.

But this interpretation of P. Columbia 480 is resisted by P. KOSCHAKER, p. 59 of *Über einige griech. Rechtsurkunden aus d. östl. Randgebieten des Hellenismus* etc. (*Abh. Phil.-Hist. Kl. Sächs. Ak.*, xliii (1931), Nr. 1). This is emphatically the book of the year (cf. *Z. Sav.*, li (1931), 427-30); largely it is occupied with two of the Dura-Europus parchments, in regard to which see the literature collected by, and the valuable comments thereon of, L. WENGER, *Archiv*, x (1931), 128-37. Here (see above, A vi, and below, C and E) we are concerned with P. Dura 10 (Ch. 2 of KOSCHAKER's book), a contract of loan published by M. ROSTOVITZEFF and BRADFORD WELLES in *C.-R. Ac. Inscr. et B.-L.*, 1930, 158-81, and, with full commentary, in *Yale Class. Stud.*, ii (1931), 1-78. Executed A.D. 121 near Dura, on the Euphrates on the Parthian side of the frontier, the contract contains, besides other security, an antichrestic self-pledge of debtor to work for creditor, expressed in terms of ἀ παραμονή. Successive sections of the book study παραμονή in the papyri and in the Delphic manumissions, and its cuneiform parallels. The general conclusion is that the person in παραμονή is subjected to some sort of *potestas*, and that the position in manumission-παραμονή is one of half-freedom (contrast the Roman *statuliber*) and in debt-παραμονή is one of divided ownership (contrast the Roman *ius in re aliena*). In spite of its Greek dress the παραμονή in P. Dura 10 cannot be attributed solely to Greek law; the nationality of the parties suggests rather the application of the parallel cuneiform institute. It is a case neither of reception nor of simple parallelism, but of the Greek scribe absorbing the indigenous custom and expressing it in his own forms. A similar combination is found (ch. 3) in a Susa inscription (a manumission by dedication, ca. 175 B.C.) pieced together by F. CUMONT, *Mém. de la mission archéol. de Perse*, xx (1928), 84-8.

iii. *Civitas.* E. R. GOODENOUGH, *The Jurisprudence of the Jewish Courts...under the early Roman Empire* (*Journal*, xvii (1931), 131), maintaining that Philo's four books *De specialibus legibus* give us the actual jurisprudence of the contemporary Alexandrian Jewish courts, has had several reviews. P. COLLART, *Rev. de phil.*, lvii (1931), 147-8, thinks it a useful work, but showing too much bias. J. G. MILNE, *J.H.S.*, l (1930), 353, suggests that Philo's intention was indeed practical, but in the sense that his object was to prove to the Romans that Jewish law could be made to harmonize with Roman principles; there is no evidence that what Philo preached the Jewish courts at Alexandria practised. S. KRAUSS, *O.L.Z.*, xxxiv (1931), 451-3, thinks that GOODENOUGH has proved his point, which however is not entirely novel, but that in certain matters he has neglected the rabbinical evidence. He has thrown an important sidelight on the organization of the contemporary Jewish courts at Jerusalem. N. HOHLWEIN, *Bull. bibl. etc. du Musée Belge*, xxxiv (1930), 9-10, regards the work as an excellent contribution to the difficult subject of the status

of the Alexandrian Jews. They certainly had their own courts, but were they competent in all the matters dealt with by Philo, and is it safe to see in him a reflection of their jurisprudence? On the whole, GODENOUGH has proved his point. Another review (analytical): P. D(HORME), *Rev. biblique*, XL (1931), 466.

E. SCHÖNBAUER, *Reichsrecht gegen Volksrecht? Studien über die Bedeutung der Constitutio Antoniniana für die röm. Rechtsentwicklung*, *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 277-335, is stimulating. He shows (I, pp. 278-85) that MITTEIS' denunciation of the *Const. Ant.* receives no support from subsequent ancient writers, even those hostile to Caracalla; on the contrary, praise is universal. Discussing the modern controversy as to P. GISS. 40 (II, pp. 286-98; cf. *Journal*, XIII, 114-5; XIV, 151-2; XV, 131; XVII, 135), he rejects E. BICKERMANN'S view that the papyrus does not give the *Const. Ant.*, on the ground that BICKERMANN'S meritorious proof that the *Const.* covered Egyptians of the *χώρα* involves that it did not exclude *dediticii*. To G. SEGRÈ'S interpretation he objects that, even if the completion *πολιτευμάτων* (I. 9) were palaeographically allowable, *civitates dediticiae* never existed. Still, SEGRÈ was right in saying that the exception of *dediticii* must refer to the saving clause which immediately precedes it. SCHÖNBAUER'S own reconstruction (III, pp. 298-320) of the sense of that clause is extremely plausible: what could not be saved for *dediticii* was what they had not got, namely appurtenance to their own *πόλεις*. But in his textual reconstruction at the critical point: *μ]ένοντος [πολιτικού σφισι ἀπαραβ]άτως* (II. 8-9), it is questionable whether *πολιτικόν* can bear the sense put upon it. The preparatory development for the *Const.* (IV, pp. 320-32), by which Greek *πολίται* acquired *Ῥωμαϊότης* without losing their own *πολιτικόν* (in SCHÖNBAUER'S sense), is illustrated by the double *civitas* of the Cyrenean Edicts, and most instructively from the *Encomium* of Aelius Aristides, the Polybius and Panaetius of the Antonines. The *Const.* is the fulfilment of Augustus' policy, with an extension, on account of military necessities, to *dediticii*. Its result (V, pp. 332-5) was a unified, but not unitary, constitution of the empire: the numerous *πόλεις* remained, "*die auch weiterhin einen selbständigen—wenn auch bescheidenen—Lebens- und Rechtskreis bilden*" (p. 333). We presume that this means, amongst other things, that the Greeks preserved their own private law; otherwise the article disposes of MITTEIS' rhetoric rather than of his legal doctrine. But we are promised further enlightenment, and look forward to it.

iv. *Family*. In *Journal*, XVII (1931), 268-9, H. I. BELL gives an account of H. A. SANDERS' *Two fragmentary Birth-certificates and Some Fragments from the Michigan Collection* (*Mem. Amer. Ac. Rome*, IX (1931)). SANDERS keeps to his own expansion of *q. p. f. c. r. ad K* (*Journal*, XV (1929), 131), but BELL thinks that U. WILCKEN'S objections (*Archiv*, IX (1928), 101) have the better of it.

P. FREZZA (BREZZA in the *Index*), *Aegyptus*, XI (1931), 363-85, *La capacità delle donne all' esercizio della tutela nel diritto romano classico e nei papiri greco-egizi*, makes a technical point against G. LA PIRA (*Journal*, XVII (1931), 136), who in his article (*Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.*, XXXVIII (1930), at pp. 56-7) assumed that Roman law, which did not allow a mother to be tutor, but came to allow her to administer, subject to indemnity to the official tutor, gave the pupil in the latter case an *ao. tutelae* against her. The possible proceedings against her were, according to FREZZA, *ao. neg. gest.* by pupil and *ex stip.* by tutor. The *ἐπακολουθήτρια* of the papyri is not copied from the Roman *gestio materna*, neither is the Roman practice copied from the Egyptian. In the first 30 years of the 2nd century local magistrates realized that they must not appoint a woman *ἐπίτροπος*, the official version of *tutor*, and so hit on the idea of respecting the official terminology while giving her the substantial position as *ἐπακολουθήτρια*, which is simply *tutrix* camouflaged. Thus, in P. Loret (cf. U. WILCKEN, *Archiv*, X (1931), 88-9) the mother, who is *ἐπακολουθήτρια* with full control, gives security, not as at Rome to the nominal tutor, but presumably, like a tutor proper, to the magistrate. See also below, E.

v. *Marriage*. P. E. CORBETT, *The Roman Law of Marriage* (Oxford, 1930), is favourably reviewed by E. VOLTERRA, *Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.*, XXXVIII (1930), 259-71 (valuable criticisms); also, shortly, by J. C. v. OVEN, *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis*, XI (1931), 97-8. L. WENGER, *Archiv*, X (1931), 127, has a short note on W. F. EDGERTON'S *Notes on Egyptian Marriage chiefly in the Ptol. Period* (*Stud. in Ancient Or. Civilisation*, Chicago, 1931). The multifariousness of national Egyptian marriage is denied; it rested on formless agreement with consummation. The distinction, *γάμος ἄγραφος* and *ἔγγραφος*, whatever it may mean, belongs to the Roman period (not seen).

S. G. HUWARDAS' *Beitr. z. griech. u. gräko-äg. Eherecht der Ptol.- u. frühen Kaiserzeit* (*Leipz. Rechtswiss. Stud.*, 64, 1931) is a clear and thorough work, whose careful definition of technical terms borrowed from Germanistic literature is particularly commendable. He holds that the two Greek Ptolemaic forms, i.e. the full marriage with *συγγραφή συνοικεσίου* and the free, or pre-, marriage (*enchoric*

ὁμολογία and Alexandrian συγχωρήσεις), are distinguished by the full marriage setting up a *Hausgemeinschaft* in the family property, and the free not, though it is provisional and looks forward to a *συγγραφὴ συνοικεσίου*. Though the *συγγραφὴ* is to take place in these cases before certain officials, official co-operation may not have been necessary when the marriage was "full" *ab initio*. The later Graeco-Egyptian γάμος ἔγγραφος, though the *Hausgem.* created by it is in a weakened form, is taken to be descended from the Ptolemaic full marriage, and so ultimately from the home Greek. But the derivation of the contemporary γάμος ἄγραφος, without *Hausgem.*, is still a mystery. It does not seem to come from the native alimentary (τροφίτις) marriage, which imposes markedly heavier duties on the husband, but is more like the Greek free marriage, except that it is not provisional. Possibly, or probably, the Roman marriage without *manus* contributed to the evolution. Full account is taken of previous literature (cf. *Journal*, xvii (1931), 136), but only at the last moment of G. PETROPOULOS, *Τὴνὰ περὶ γάμου ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, κατὰ τοὺς ἑλληνο-αἰγυπτιακοὺς παπύρους* (Πρακτ. Ἀκ. Ἀθ., vi, 1931), as to which I rely on the notes of a friend and the review by F. ZUCKER, *B.Z.*, xxxi (1931), 477-8. PETROPOULOS rejects both WILCKEN-PARTSCH's view (P. Freib. III) that the two Ptolemaic forms are derived from Egyptian varieties of marriage-contracts, and that of V. ARANGIO-RUIZ (*Journal*, *l.c.*) that they were not two forms, but that the *συγγραφὴ συνοικεσίου* is a later step in documentation, taken for the purposes of publicity and taxation. It is fatal to the second view that the execution of the *συγγραφὴ* is made by the previous contract to depend on demand by one or other party. The truth is that Egyptian women marrying Greeks wished to secure the rights, especially in property, which the native forms gave them, and therefore insisted on a contract providing for the future execution, in terms settled in advance, of a *συγγραφὴ συνοικεσίου*. Ἄγραφος and ἔγγραφος of the imperial period describe respectively Greek or Roman marriage, for which no document was required, and Egyptian, which required writing. Thus in *Chrest.*, II, 84 (A.D. 124), the marriage is taken to be Roman *sine manu*, and in P. Oxy. 237 (A.D. 186) the decision that Dionysia cannot be divorced by her father against her will, because not under his *potestas*, is based on the fact that she married by γ. ἔγγρ., i.e. under Egyptian law. ZUCKER is not convinced.

E. ALBERTARIO, *Alcuni referimenti al matrimonio e al possesso in Sant' Agostino*, *Arch. Giurid.*, cvii (1931), 28-44 (no papyri), offers valuable illustration of the contrast between classical Roman and Christian ideas of marriage.

vi. *Soldiers*. P. COLLINET, *Rev. hist. dr.*, x (1931), 189-90, has a useful note on new military *diplomata*, throwing important light on the legality of soldiers' marriages. P. M. MEYER, *Z. f. vergleich. Rechtsw.*, xlvi (1930-1), at p. 444, analyses A. DEGRASSI's article, *Il papiro 1026 della Soc. Ital. e i diplomi militari romani, Aegyptus*, x (1929), 242-54, which was omitted here last year. MEYER withdraws his objection to the reading *Vibius Kadus* (*Z. Sav.*, l (1930), 521) in the P.S.I. Cf. J. C. NABER, *Mnemosyne*, lviii (1930), 352 ff., on P. Bad. 72, and U. WILCKEN, *Archiv*, x (1931), 91.

vii. *Clerks and monks*. *Z. Sav.*, li (1931), 598-9, briefly notes a paper read by A. STEINWENTER to the International Byzantine Congress, Athens, 1930: *Byzantinische Mönchstestamente*. The same writer in *Die Ordinationsbitten Koptischer Kleriker, Aegyptus*, xi (1931), 29-34, compares the proceedings (παράκλησις and ἀσφάλεια) leading up to ordination in the Coptic Church at the end of the 6th century, as shown by certain ostraca, with the Benedictine *petitio* and *promissio*; a difference is that the Coptic ordinands made use of the forms of profane law. Probably the clothing of a Coptic monk would be nearer the Benedictine form: cf. P. Lond. 1917 (330-40). In *B.Z.*, xxxi (1931), 61-9, B. GRANIĆ, *Das Klosterwesen in der Novellengesetzgebung Kaiser Leons des Weisen*, carries the study mentioned last year (*Journal*, xvii (1931), 137) to a later date. The chief changes from Justinian are that, while Leo was more liberal to the monk's proprietary capacity, he made the conditions of entering and especially of leaving the monastic state more stringent. No papyri. See also above, B i.

### C. *Law of property* (see also below, D ii).

We have mentioned above (B ii) that P. KOSCHAKER's study of *παράμωή* leads him to conclude that Greek lawyers, like English (a comparison which KOSCHAKER does not fail to make), saw nothing unacceptable in the idea of divided or double ownership. The idea of pledge, conceived of as a *ius in re aliena*, which is the obvious Roman category under which to bring *παράμωή*, will not fit the manumission case; moreover, even the papyri referring to debt-*παράμωή* show an avoidance of the terminology of hypothec and ἐνέχυρον. The reason for that avoidance might be that it was desired to avoid the implication of a *ius in re aliena*, but KOSCHAKER doubts this explanation. He suspects that for the Greeks the idea underlying real security was not *ius in re aliena*, but, once more, divided ownership. If that be

so, we should understand why the Greek law of real security is at once more plastic and less definite than the Roman. It is with reluctance that we leave this book, which is, of course, dealing with ideas immanent in Greek law, never expressly formulated because Greek jurisprudence never reached maturity.

In a rather stiff article, *Ἐδδότησις u. Kauf mit fremdem Geld*, *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 408-17, F. WIEACKER follows W. KUNKEL (cf. *Journal*, xv (1929), 131-2) in regarding *Ἐδδότησις* as the subsidiary approval given by a second party to a principal act, which without such approval would be void. It corresponds to an ancient Greek concept, which is expressed in varying terms. After an elaborate classification of the cases of *Ἐδδότησις* and its Greek equivalents, he examines one in which the *Ἐδδοκῶν* waives the lien which, as F. PRINGSHEIM has shown, arises in favour of the lender over a thing bought by the borrower with the borrowed money. This occurs in C.P.R. 1 of A.D. 84 (*Chrest.*, II, 220), where the purchaser, Maron, pays the seller, Ptolemais, with money borrowed from one Proclus. Hence Proclus gives his *Ἐδδότησις*. To this case there is no true parallel in the papyri, and it must be read in the light of native Greek consents of mortgagees to sales by mortgagors. Under a system of registration of land this kind of lien, when attaching to land, would either take the more substantial form of a registered hypothec or would not affect third parties; hence in Egypt it is generally submerged.

To be noted (pure Roman law): B. KÜBLER, arts. *Submissio* and *Superficies* in *Paulys Realencyklopädie*; E. ALBERTARIO, *Le derivazioni dai fiumi pubblici in diritto Romano*, *Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.*, XXXVIII (1930), 197-214, combated by G. GROSSO, *Atti R. Acc. Torino*, LXVI (1931), 369-91.

#### D. Law of obligations.

i. *General. Das Dogma des Synallagma in röm. u. byz. Rechte* is one of the *anecdota* in the Freiburg collection of J. PARTSCH'S studies (above, A i, pp. 3-95). The specifically papyrological points can readily be found in the *Quellenverzeichnis*. See also E. SEIDL, art. *Συνάλλαγμα* in *Paulys Realencyklopädie*. F. PRINGSHEIM'S contribution to the Milan *Conferenze* (above, A iv) at pp. 205-6 points out that the Roman *fides* is not *πίστις*, and that *καλή πίστις*, a mere translation, is first found in the papyri in the *Gnomon*. In *Z. f. vergleich. Rechtsw.*, XLVI (1930-1), 445-7, P. M. MEYER gives a close analysis of A. SEGRÈ'S rather difficult *Note sulla ἐγγύη greco-egizia* (*Journal*, XVI (1930), 136).

ii. *Sale*. P. M. MEYER, *ibid.*, also analyses A. SEGRÈ'S *Note sulla compravendita etc. in diritto greco e romano* (*Journal*, XVII (1931), 138). A. SEGRÈ continues in *Aegyptus*, XI (1931), 129-44, with *Note sui formulari della compravendita in diritto greco e romano*. The early Ptolemaic Greek formularies are pure Greek, and they survive intact into the empire with the addition of some indigenous clauses, others of which disappear. The *ἀπέδοτο—ἐπρίατο* form passes into *ὁμολογεί πεπρακέναι*, a formulation *a lotere venditoris* which spreads west in the Byzantine period. Contrast *emit mancipioque accepit*. Thus in Egypt the Greek formulary developed under the influence of the indigenous without any decisive Roman influence, and from the 1st century remained substantially unchanged. Clauses which appear for the first time in Egypt in the 4th or 5th centuries are (apart from those introduced by general imperial law) due to the notarial practice of Constantinople. The scanty remains of that practice show that in the East generally the Greek formularies had followed an evolution analogous to the Egyptian, but under the influence of Roman law. This fusion of Roman and Hellenistic formularies took place in Egypt only in the 5th century, a century later than elsewhere. On a wider canvass A. EHRHARDT, *Byz. Kaufverträge in Ost u. West*, *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 126-87, traces the development of sale-formularies in both halves of the empire, reaching the conclusion, contrary to the dominant view (STEINACKER), that the early medieval document is not in part descended from the Egyptian. The study being unsuitable for short summarization, we mention a few notable points. The sale-homologies of Byzantine Egypt are not, as v. DRUFFEL maintains, governed by central ideas from Constantinople, though after the *Const. Ant.* they are no longer provisional, looking forward to the redaction of the contract in public form, but become final, and therefore more formal and closer to the public contracts, whose function they now perform. The scanty papyri for the 4th century, studied according to locality, reveal disorganization: in some districts there is development of the earlier forms, in others a fusion with Byzantine elements. In the 4th-5th centuries we see a development of the old Graeco-Egyptian forms, Roman influence being confined to the law of persons. The altered agricultural conditions in the 5th century leave some marks on the formularies. EHRHARDT argues that the sale-homologies of this period are dispositive, and that sales of land had to be written. There is no evidence of conveyance by handing over documents. The concluding sections of the article (p. 164 ff.) deal with the western material of the Byzantine period (parallelism rather than interdependence of East and West), and with Roman influence upon early German law (sale-documents in the past, donations in the present tense; writing not obligatory for donation).

Reviewing E. CARUSI's study of *Arra* (*Studi Bonfante*, IV, 503-64; *Journal*, XVII (1931), 138), L. WENGER, *Archiv*, x (1931), 137-8, advances important considerations, especially in regard to oriental influences in Justinian's law. M. SAN NICOLÒ, *Der Kauf des Pfandes durch den Gläubiger im Lichte des neubabylonischen Rechtes*, *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 421-6, illustrates from Babylonian documents of the 6th and 5th centuries B.C. the use of suspensively conditioned sale to the creditor as a form of mortgage, a practice which, according to P. KOSCHAKER, is also found in Assyrian documents of the late 2nd century. It occurs occasionally in Roman legal texts, and Constantine's prohibition of the forfeiture clause in mortgages was regarded in the West as applying also to it: C.T. 3, 2, 1, *interpretatio*.

iii. *Novation*. R. TAUBENSCHLAG, *Die Novation im Rechte der Papyri*, *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 84-91, subjects the papyrological instances of substitution of one contract for another to a Romanistic classification. In general the old obligation is a loan, and the new obligation, for which the old is *causa praecedens*, is either another loan or else an abstract contract. The most interesting special question is that of *novatio inter eandem personas* resulting from change of ground of obligation. No novation results from reduction of *mutuum* to writing, the writing being merely for proof; nor again even where a six-witness contract of loan with hypothec is subsumed into the agoranomic document necessary for the hypothec.

iv. *Inheritance of contractual liabilities*. V. KOROŠEC, *Die Erbenhaftung nach röm. Recht*, I (Leipzig, 1927), is criticized by H. KRELLER, *Gnomon*, VII (1931), 375-9, chiefly on the ground that it is wrong to speak in general terms of transmissibility in primitive times. Each case has to be considered apart; thus we cannot generalize from Gaius 4, 113. The tradition of the Twelve Tables is clear that liabilities did descend, and that tradition at any rate represents the law not later than the end of the period of pure civil law. But KOROŠEC's is a good book.

v. *Delict*. F. DE VISSCHER's comparative study of the Alexandrine and Roman law of *iniuria* committed by a slave (*Journal*, XVII (1931), 138) appeared in *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis*, XI (1931), 39-55, and has also been included in his *Études de dr. rom.* (Paris, 1931), a collection of excellent articles dealing chiefly with early Roman law.

#### E. Law of succession.

R. BESNIER, *Un nouvel acte de "cretio": le P.S.I. 1027*, *Rev. hist. dr.*, x (1931), 324-38, agrees with the received (*cf.* P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, L (1930), 517-8) interpretation of the relations to each other of the parties to that document, and develops the consequent mingling of Roman and Egyptian practice of which it is evidence: *cretio* by a *sua heres*, made on her behalf by her mother, probably as her *tutrix* appointed by the father's will, with the *auctoritas* of the mother's *tutor*, which, if given to the *testatio* and not to the *cretio*, is entirely out of place. BESNIER also agrees with the received view (*cf.* P. M. MEYER, *l.c.*; U. WILCKEN, *Archiv*, IX (1928), 81) that the tablet is the last of a triptych. The document begins in stylus on the waxed side and, after a gap of about a line, continues in ink on the wood of the other side: the two pages are supposed to give the greater part of *scriptura exterior*. But H. A. SANDERS, *The wax tablet*, *P.S.I. IX, 1027, Aegyptus*, XI (1931), 185-9, shows that it is the first tablet of a diptych. The scheme of diptych which he propounds (*cf.* *A.J.A.*, XXXII (1928), 309-29) is that the interior writing begins on p. 2, lengthwise, and ends on p. 3, while the exterior begins on p. 4, on the left of and at right angles to the seals and names of witnesses, and ends on p. 1. Thus here we have the beginning of the interior (p. 2) and the end of the exterior (p. 1) writing. He thus dissents from the scheme given in BRUNS, *Fontes*<sup>7</sup>, p. 274, and elsewhere. The perfect Bodleian diptych (GRENFELL, *Bodl. Quart. Record*, II, 259-62) supports him.

J. C. NABER, *Mnemosyne*, LVIII (1930), 351-5, is noteworthy on the question of the succession of a legionary's children (above, B. vi), and *ibid.*, 360-8, on that of the opening of wills (above, A. v, *in fin.*).

P. KOSCHAKER (with F. CUMONT's adhesion), *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 427, and also in Ch. I of his book (above, B. ii), and L. WENGER, *Archiv*, x (1931), 130-1, unreservedly accept the textual corrections made by D. PAPPULIAS (Συμβολή εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τῆς ἐξ ἀδιαθέτου κληρονομικῆς διαδοχῆς ἐν τῷ Ἑλληνικῷ δικαίῳ, Πρακτ. Ἀκ. Ἀθ., 1929, 418 ff.; not seen; *cf.* *Journal*, XVII (1931), 133) in the Dura-Europus law of intestate succession, P. Dura 5, first published by B. HAUSSOULLIER, *Rev. hist. dr.*, II (1923), 519, and republished, with some doubts, by P. KOSCHAKER, *Z. Sav.*, XLVI (1926), 297. The corrections are: in l. 6 for *ἐὰν δὲ μηθεῖς*, τοῦ νόμου read *ἐὰν δὲ μηθεῖς τούτων ἤ*, and in l. 8 for *ἀδελφοὶ* read *ἀδελφαί*.

U. WILCKEN, *Archiv*, x (1931), 93, praises A. SEGRE's edition of a fragmentary will in *Studi Bonfante*, III, 430 (*Journal*, XVII (1931), 133). On monks' wills, see above, B. i.

F. *Lawcourts and procedure.*

E. SEIDL's dissertation *Der Eid im ptol. Recht* (*Journal*, xvi (1930), 137) has received the compliment of very serious criticism. H. I. BELL, *Journal*, xvii (1931), 152-3, is on the whole favourable, and so is M. SAN NICOLÒ, *K. V. G. R.*, xxiv (1930-1), 107-12. The latter draws attention to a parallel cuneiform evolution, from which, as from the Ptolemaic, the institution of oath-helpers is absent. Though the line between the royal and the temple oaths cannot as yet be drawn, the royal, he agrees, was usable in private as well as public affairs before the Ptolemaic period; he agrees, also, that in national Egyptian procedure the oath was a method of formal conclusive proof. It is notable that there is no indication of the oath being used in private law to make obligations binding. W. KUNKEL, *Griech. u. äg. Elemente im Eidesrecht der Ptolemäerzeit*, *Z. Sav.*, li (1931), 229-76, treats of the subject from a wider point of view. While appreciating the merit of E. SEIDL's dissertation, he differs from it on many points, on some of which L. WENGER, *Archiv*, x (1931), 125-7, defends SEIDL's view. Setting aside the Alexandrian oath as pure Greek, KUNKEL finds in the *χώρα* two types, the temple and the royal, the latter essentially written (*ἄρκος γραπτός, χειρογραφία*). He doubts SEIDL's view that the oath was usable in private affairs, save perhaps exceptionally. SEIDL exaggerates the Egyptian element in the royal oath; this, though pre-Ptolemaic, became so hellenized as to be a new thing. The important section on the decisory oath in Egyptian law (pp. 245-57) must be read in the original. (New documents are provided by TAIT, *Ostr. Bodl.*, 273-5.) It is held to be native Egyptian, so that Diodorus, i, 79, is confirmed. But Greek ideas (cf. LATTE, *Heiliges Recht*) were so close as to be readily absorbed. A Greek form of processual oath may have existed in the *χώρα* in the 3rd century: P. Hibeh 31 (a textual correction, p. 259). The Appendices to this article have been mentioned above (A. v and vi).

Reviewing, by no means unfavourably, E. BERNEKER's dissertation: *Zum Gesch. der Prozesseinleitung im ptol. Recht* (Ansbach, 1930), M. SAN NICOLÒ, *K. V. G. R.*, xxiv (1930-1), 315-20, gives a summary, with some criticisms: as that the treatment together of the introduction of civil and criminal cases is, if not incorrect, at least a rash conclusion from our haphazard material; that the delivery of a plaint *διὰ τῆς θυρίδος* deserves more serious consideration in view of an early Babylonian parallel; that it is overlooked that *προσαγγέλματα* leading to process before the *ἐπιστάτης τῆς κώμης* or the local police officials are practically confined to penal law. BERNEKER could not use E. BICKERMANN's article *Ἐντευξίς und Ὑπόμνημα*, *Archiv*, ix (1930), 155-82, and he fails to notice two important papyri published by C. C. EDGAR in *Journal*, xiv (1928), 288-93. With regard to one of these, now P. Mich. Zen. 70, U. WILCKEN, *Archiv*, x (1931), 75-6, rejects M. SAN NICOLÒ's suggestions (*B. Z.*, xxx (1929-30), 158-62; cf. *Journal*, xvii (1931), 139), and keeping to EDGAR's insertion between ll. 8 and 9, would himself also insert both there and in l. 13 *ὑπὸ* or *διὰ* before *ὑπερημερίας*.

That P. Marmarica contains procedural matter is maintained by C. GALLAVOTTI and G. LA PIRA in the article on it mentioned above, A. v. J. C. NABER, *Περὶ ἐνοικίου δίκης* (*ad P.S.I. 940*), *Aegyptus*, xi (1931), 40-4 (cf. the same, *Mnemosyne*, lviii (1930), 349-51), observes that in the matter of recovery of damages for use and occupation in a real action there is a contrast between Greek and Roman law. The more liberal Greek provision is, in the case of a house, covered by the *δίκη ἐνοικίου*, which, as Ptolemaic papyri show, gave plaintiff so much per month of occupation. The stricter Roman rule was not relaxed till Diocletian at the earliest, but that the Greek idea survived the *Const. Ant.* is shown by the true reading of P.S.I. 940, ll. 20 ff. (a very ingenious correction).

R. DÜLL, *Der Gütegedanke im röm. Zivilprozessrecht*, etc. (Munich, 1931), insists very strongly on the importance of the idea of peaceful settlement in Roman civil procedure, and incidentally throughout the ancient world. Hence (pp. 112-23) a section on the idea in Greek law and in Hellenistic, as illustrated by Ptolemaic papyri, and a special subsection (pp. 118-23) on the *διάλυσις* institute. This is all that directly concerns us, but we may say that Part I is a valuable contribution to the explanation of the *actiones arbitrarie*: their common feature is that they contain a clause directing the judge to seek in the first place a peaceful or semi-peaceful settlement. The rest of the book, though containing much interesting suggestion, rides a good horse too hard.

G. DONATUTI, *Le Praesumptiones Iuris in Diritto Romano* (Perugia, 1930), reopens an eternally attractive theme, with good fruit (no papyri). The misprints are excessive.

Two excellent and justifiably appreciative articles on J. STROUX, *Eine Gerichtsreform des Kaisers Claudius* (*B. G. U. 611*) (*Journal*, xvii (1931), 132) come from F. v. WOESS, *Z. Sav.*, li (1931), 336-68, and A. FLINIAUX, *Rev. hist. dr.*, x (1931), 509-19. In the main v. WOESS (from whom FLINIAUX hardly differs, though he considers some of the proposals very hypothetical) presents STROUX's results from the juristic

point of view. With some reason he prefers to date the *oratio* A.D. 42 or 43 (STROUX 47); he holds that the lowering of the age in its first part must have been confined to civil suits, but that the second part refers to criminal cases as well, in spite of the singular *iudicem* l. 11. The third part was not a severer anticipation of the *SC. Turpillianum* (STROUX, p. 52), but only gave the praetor discretion to condemn an absentee accuser for *calumniā*; the *SC.* may thus be a codification of praetorian practice. The *oratio* was not, at this date, the equivalent of the *SC.*, as it later became, to the detriment of legislative style; hence the rhetoric of our *oratio* is not inappropriate. The draft *SC.* would come in the *relatio* of the *consul designatus*.

A. STEINWENTER, *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 460-4, renders a service by reviewing in a profane place *Der Prozess des Eutyches*, by E. SCHWARZ (*Sitzungsb. Bay. Ak.*, 1929, Heft 5). This little book makes accessible to all the account of the proceedings for heresy in 448 against Eutyches. The reviewer points to the parallels with the contemporary Oxyrhynchus libellary documents (*Journal*, XIV (1928), 155); it is indicated that ecclesiastical procedure was much influenced by civil law, though a preponderant influence has been claimed for Jewish law by a recent Polish work by B. WILANOWSKI (rev. H. SCHMID, *Z. Sav.* (*Kan. Abt.*, XIX), L (1930), 834-41).

#### G. Public law.

In *Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.*, XXXVIII (1930), 295, tidings are given of an early publication in *Africa Italiana* of an inscription recording the testament whereby Ptolemy Euergetes II bequeathed Cyrenaica to Rome.

A. v. PREMERSTEIN, *Zu den kyren. Edikten des Augustus (Literaturübersicht u. Nachträge)*, *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 431-59, gives a complete bibliography (*Journal*, XVII (1931), 140), recommending for a short orientation on essential points the articles of J. C. ANDERSON and V. ARANGIO-RUIZ, but according the front place to the monograph of J. STROUX and L. WENGER, of which the article is substantially a detailed review. The writer holds out against L. WENGER's doctrine that both the phrases *θανατόφοροι δίκαι* and *ὑπόδικοι κεφαλῆς* refer here to the death penalty, but he had not the benefit of E. LEVY's *Die röm. Kapitalstrafe (Sitzungsb. Heidelb. Ak.*, 1930-1, Abh. 5), which, pp. 40 ff. and 73, proves that WENGER is right. LEVY's study is well summarized by its author in *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 569-71. J. L. STRACHAN-DAVIDSON's well-known criticism of MOMMSEN's *Strafrecht* on this matter is shown to be justified, though it was itself too much under MOMMSEN's influence. In criminal law *caput* and the connected expressions never meant anything but the death penalty, except that from the very end of the Republic for a certain period some of the expressions, e.g. *capitalis causa*, but never *capitis poena*, connoted the alternative penalty of exile. Where the classical jurists speak of interdiction as *poena l. Corneliae*, this is interpretation; these statutes said and meant death. But this curious terminological aberration only concerned *cives*, never *peregrini*; moreover, execution of *cives* was reintroduced in practice from the beginning of the empire, and as the empire went on, *capitalis causa* gradually returned to its old connotation of *capitis poena*. Papyrological points pp. 62 and 72-3.

An example of the death-penalty for *peregrini* is the Nazareth (?) *διάταγμα Καίσαρος* against violation of sepulchres. Its possible connection with the Holy Sepulchre has provoked an enormous literature: see J. TEILLER, *Rech. sc. relig.*, XXI (1931), 570-6. If the inscription comes from Galilee, it cannot date from before 44, when direct Roman rule was introduced there: V. CAPOCCI, *Per la data del rescritto imperiale sulla violazione di sepolero recentemente pubblicato*, *Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.*, XXXVIII (1930), 215-53. But J. CARCOPINO, *Encore le rescrit impérial sur les violations de sépulture*, *Rev. hist.*, CLXVI (1930), 77-92, points out that FRÖHNER's note says "envoyée de" not "découverte à Nazareth." From the juristic point of view L. WENGER's admirable article, *Eine Inschrift aus Nazareth*, *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 369-97, is to be preferred to É. CUQ's, mentioned here last year (*Journal*, XVII (1931), 137).

W. H. BUCKLER, *Un discours de consulaire sous Justinien, Byzantion*, VI (1931), 365-70, studies an inscription from Sardis published long ago (*C. I. Gr.*, 3467), of which he gives an improved text, with translation, comment and facsimile. It records an address by the governor of the eparchy of Lydia, exhorting to the observance of certain laws, published in his *πρόγραμμα*, which BUCKLER shows to be *Nov. Just.* 8 and 17. The *πρόγραμμα* is doubtless the publication of the *ισότυπον*, while the address reported was delivered to the assembly of notables—both being measures of divulgation ordered by the laws themselves (*Nov.* 8, 14, 17, 16). Besides throwing light on the process of promulgation under Justinian, the article contains useful linguistic points.

F. G. SAVAGNONE, *Studi sul Diritto Romano Ecclesiastico*, *Ann. Sem. Giurid. Palermo*, XIV (1929)

(not seen), is reviewed, not very favourably, by A. STEINWENTER, *Z. Sav. (Kan. Abt., XX)*, LI (1931), 616-22, more favourably by F. MAROI, *Arch. Giurid.*, CV (1931), 94-5, and by O. ZILNO, *Riv. Stor. Dir. Ital.*, III (1930), 398-401. The work, so far as it has gone, appears to treat of the State legislation regarding the Church from Constantine to Justinian, the sources used being *Codd. Theod.* and *Just.* and the ecclesiastical writers. ZILNO gives an analysis of the first chapter, on Caesarism.

#### 7. PALAEOGRAPHY AND DIPLOMATIC.

E. GROHMANN in *Zur Paragraphos (B.Z., xxx (1929-30), 163-5)* discusses the development of the paragraphus from a simple line or hook to a bird form, as in the Timotheos papyrus, or a human face, as in a 9th-10th century paper literary fragment in the Schott-Reinhart collection at Heidelberg. He refers also to other examples in Coptic and Greek MSS. of the 11th century.

A. MENTZ has written three articles on ancient shorthand, *Römische u. griechische Stenographie (Nunquam Retrorsum, 1930, 67-70)*, *Die Entstehungsgeschichte der römischen Stenographie (Hermes, LXVI (1931), 369-86)*, and *Beiträge zu den tironischen Notizen (Arch. f. Urkundenforsch. XI (1930), 2, 153-75)*, of which unfortunately only the last is at present accessible to me. These should be of considerable importance for the study of Greek as well as Latin shorthand.

K. PREISENDANZ contributes an article *Zur Papyruskunde* to the *Handbuch d. Bibliothekswesen*, I, 300-31.

I know only by reference CH. WESSELY'S *Comment j'enseigne les cursives grecques et latines* in *Chron. d'Ég.*, VI (1931), 411-3.

#### 8. LEXICOGRAPHY AND GRAMMAR.

PREISIGKE'S *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* has been completed by the publication of vol. III, part 3, which contains the remainder of the 25 special lists to which reference is made in vols. I and II. The longest of these is the list of geographical names, which is offered as a substitute for the late B. P. Grenfell's projected "Geography of Egypt." In this and several others of the lists the *Wörterbuch* approximates more to an encyclopaedia or gazetteer than to a lexicon, and users who are more interested in things than in words will be correspondingly grateful.

Two other classes of proper names have received attention. *Die Personennamen der Kopten, I (Untersuchungen)*, by G. HEUSER (= *Studien zur Epigraphik und Papyruskunde*, edited by F. BILABEL, Band I, Schrift 2, Leipzig, 1929) is a discussion based on the still unpublished "Schrift 3" of the same series, which will contain the same author's alphabetical list of the names, with references to the places in which they occur. SPIEGELBERG, reviewing the work in *Gnomon*, VII (1931), 222, expresses a wish that there had been more points of interrogation. *Die Semitischen Menschennamen in griechischen Inschriften und Papyri des vorderen Orients*, by HEINZ WUTHNOW, Leipzig, 1930, forms Band I, Schrift 4, of the same *Studien*. It consists of two alphabetical lists, one according to the Greek, the other according to the Semitic forms, of the names, each name being followed by the references to the places in which it occurs. It is reviewed by M. HOMBERT in *Rev. belge*, X (1931), 641-5, by C. BROCKELMANN in *O.L.Z.*, Nov. 1931, col. 959, and by H. LEWY in *D. Lit.-Z.*, 1931, 593-7.

A Greek counterpart to GRADENWITZ'S *Literculi Vocum Latinarum* has appeared: *Heidelberger Konträrindex der griechischen Papyrusurkunden*, by F. BILABEL, E. PFEIFFER, and O. LAUER, under the direction of O. GRADENWITZ, Berlin, 1931. It is reviewed by M. ENGERS in *Museum*, XXXVIII (1931), 281-2. See also § 9.

The *ἀπρος ἐπιούσιος* controversy is very clearly and concisely summarized by ANTON FRIDRICHSEN in *Symb. Oslo.*, IX (1930), 62-8.

L. AMUNDSEN publishes in *Serta Rudbergiana* (1931), 85-7 (inaccessible to me) an ostrakon from Karanis with the words *τῶν συμπαρα αὐτῶν, = τῶν μετόχων*. [See also § 3.]

Three lexicographical works have appeared which, though not dealing with papyri, may be of importance to papyrologists. The first of these is *Cassii Diois Cocceiani Historiarum Romanarum Index Graecitatis quem composuit* W. NAWIEN, Berolini, 1931, which forms the fifth volume of U. P. BOISSEVAIN'S monumental edition. The second is the first part of a *Lexicon to Josephus* by the late H. ST. J. THACKERAY (pp. 1-80: A to ἀργός, Paris, 1930). Finally, mention may be made of E. LEVY, *Ergänzungsindex zu Ius und Leges*, Weimar, 1930, which contains 3½ pages of Greek words, mostly from the scholia Sinaitica published in the fourth volume of the *B.C.H.*

## 9. GENERAL WORKS, BIBLIOGRAPHY, GENERAL NOTES ON PAPYRUS TEXTS.

The "contrary index" to papyrus texts which GRADENWITZ long ago projected has now appeared. It includes not only all words found in papyri which occur in PREISIGKE's *Wörterbuch* but also all those not in that work which appear in any text published up to 1928, with a few from unpublished papyri. These additional words are separately collected, in alphabetical order, at the end. The work will be of immense utility to all editors and even to philologists generally, and hearty thanks must be accorded to Gradenwitz himself and to the three scholars on whom the arrangement of the material fell, F. BILABEL, E. PFEIFFER, and A. LAUER. *Heidelberger Konträrindex der griechischen Papyrusurkunden*. Berlin, Weidmann, 1931. Pp. x+127. Reviewed (*inter alios*) by M. HOMBERT, *Rev. belge*, x (1931), 616-7. See also § 8.

CLAIRE PRÉAUX has published two interesting articles of a general nature on papyrus texts, both in the *Chron. d'Ég.*, vi (1931): *Recherches sur les papyrus de Zénon* (pp. 363-6) and *Quelques réflexions sur les sentences retrouvées dans les papyrus* (pp. 140-8).

W. L. WESTERMANN gives a pleasant account of the Columbia collection, with reflexions on papyrus collecting in general, in a paper, *The Columbia Collection of Greek Papyri*, contributed to the *Columbia University Quarterly*, xxiii (1931), 276-85, 1 plate.

The late C. WESSELY (see § 10) read to the Congress of Papyrology at Brussels in 1930 an account of some papyri of his own collection, which has since been published: *Quelques pièces récemment publiées de ma collection papyrologique* in *Chron. d'Ég.*, vi (1931), 367-9.

Two instalments of the bibliography in *B.Z.* have appeared, *viz.* in xxxi (1931), 119-230 (papyri pp. 129-33) and 408-79 (papyri pp. 413-7); and another is to be found in *Byz.-neugr. Jahrb.*, viii (1931): *Paläographie, Papyrus-, Handschriften- und Bücherkunde*, pp. 408-14. For S. DE RICCI's *Bulletin papyrologique*, see above, § 1, *General*.

In *Serta Rudbergiana* (1931), 18-23, among *Variā* by S. EITREM, are the following notes on papyri: 52. P. Berol. 1026, xxii, 24 (magic); 53. *ib.*, no. 923, 27 (not *σοὶ πάντες* but *σοῖ πάντες = σοῖ(μ) πάντες*); 54. P. Bouriant I, p. 21; 55. P. Oxy. 119, 8; 120, 2; 114, 7; 744, 9; 1674, 7; 1677, 8; 56. P. Hib. 93, 8; S.B. 7032, 7031; 61. P. Oslo. 17, 8, 12-13 and B.G.U. I, 248, 29.

## 10. MISCELLANEOUS, EXCAVATIONS, PERSONAL.

The personnel of the Comité international de Papyrologie is specified in the *Rev. belge*, x (1931), 315. Accounts of the new Société royale égyptienne de papyrologie (see *Journal*, xvii, 141) will be found in *Chron. d'Ég.*, vi (1931), 197-200 (by P. JOUQUET) and *C.-R. Ac. Inscr. et B.-L.*, 1930, 206-7.

The Congress of Papyrology at Brussels in 1930 was made the occasion for a general review of the state of papyrological studies in the various countries of Europe, and the papers then read by scholars representing those countries have since been published in *Chron. d'Ég.*, vi (1931). The following are the titles of the articles, with the page references: E. WEISS, *Die Papyrusforschung in der Tschechoslovakei*, 343-4; C. WESSELY, *Quelques pièces*, etc. (see § 9), 367-9; N. TERZAGHI, *Lo stato attuale della papirologia in Italia*, 370-4; A. CALDERINI, *L'opera della scuola di papirologia di Milano nelle sue direttive e nei suoi propositi*, 375-82; H. B. VAN HOESEN, *Papyrus Studies in the United States*, 383-91; A. E. R. BOAK and C. BONNER, *The Papyrological Work at the University of Michigan*, 392-5; A. S. HUNT, *Papyrology in England*, 396-7; P. JOUQUET, *L'état actuel de la papyrologie en France*, 398-402; D. COHEN, *La papyrologie dans les Pays-Bas*, 403-10; S. WITKOWSKI, *De papyrologia in Polonia*, 416-7; F. BILABEL, *Neue Heidelberger Arbeiten zur Förderung der papyrologischen Studien*, 420-8; V. MARTIN, *La papyrologie en Suisse*, 429-31; G. K. GARDICAS, Η ΠΑΠΥΡΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΕΝ ΕΛΛΑΔΙ, 432-4; M. HOMBERT, *La papyrologie en Belgique*, 435-40; K. PREISENDANZ, *Das Studium der griechischen Zauberpapyri*, 456-9; G. ZERETELI, *La papyrologie grecque en Russie*, 460-3; H. GERSTINGER, *Die Wiener Papyrussammlung (Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer) 1915-1930*, 464-70.

At the same Congress A. CALDERINI gave a preliminary account of a scheme which will be as valuable to all papyrologists as PREISIGKE's *Namenbuch*: *Intorno al "Dizionario dei nomi geografici e topografici dell'Egitto greco-romano"*, in *Chron. d'Ég.*, vi (1931), 360-2. The publication is shortly to be commenced by the Royal Geographical Society of Cairo; and this dictionary is to be followed by one for Coptic and one for Arabic names.

I may mention here that work has been commenced on Vol. vi of the British Museum *Catalogue of Greek Papyri*. This volume, which will consist entirely of Ptolemaic texts, mainly from the Zenon archive,

has been entrusted to the editorship of Mr. T. C. SKEAT, recently appointed to the staff of the Department of Manuscripts.

A. E. R. BOAK and E. E. PETERSON have published in a handsome and splendidly illustrated volume their first report on the important excavations at Karanis (Kôm Washim). A study of the excellent photographs and the accompanying letterpress will do much to make the life lived by the people whose fortunes and business transactions we follow in papyrus texts more vivid and actual. *Topographical and Architectural Report of Excavations during the Seasons 1924-28*. (Univ. of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. xxv.) Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1931. Pp. vii+69, 42 plates, 1 map, 19 plans. Reviewed in *Ancient Egypt*, June, 1931, 53 (it is surely unfair to say that after Prof. Kelsey's lamented death "the inspiration of the scheme ceased"; on the contrary, the excavations have been steadily and systematically continued to the present year. Nor is it quite just to complain of omissions in this Report, which is confessedly only partial and provisional, and will be followed by others which will, it is to be hoped, deal with matters not touched upon here); by EDGAR (*Journal*, xvii (1931), 267-8); and by V. COCCO (*Aegyptus*, xi (1931), 408-10). PETERSON has also published a brief *Report on the Excavations of the University of Michigan at Karanis 1929-1930*, in *A.J.A.*, xxxv (1931), 65-6.

A preliminary report on the important Italian excavations at Umm el Breighât (the name adopted by the expedition for the site of Tebtunis, better known in England as Umm el Baragât) is given by C. ANTI, *Gli scavi della Missione archeologica italiana a Umm el Breighât (Tebtunis)*, in *Aegyptus*, xi (1931), 389-91. It is clear that the results so far are exceedingly valuable. The approaches and surrounding wall of the temple of the crocodile god, with its annexes, have been examined, and though the excavation of the temple itself is reserved till the next campaign, the expedition has already obtained not only much information as to the topography and lay-out of the block of buildings but many objects and texts, some of which are likely to be of great importance. Among them is a long Hieratic graffito, which appears to be a hymn to Suchos; but perhaps even more striking is the discovery of part of the temple library, including many Hieratic and Demotic texts of a religious character, and some Greek papyri, among them a fragment of a medical treatise and many medical recipes. [The discovery of the last increases the probability that the British museum papyrus of Theophrastus (?), *De Animalibus* (MILNE, *Cat. of the Lit. Pap. in the B.M.*, no. 164), which was acquired along with a mass of papyri all of them from Tebtunis, was also found on that site.] ANTI also contributed an account of his dig (*Excavations at Tebtunis*), with excellent photographs, to the *Illustr. London News*, 30 May 1931, 908-10.

The German excavations at Hermopolis are described by G. ROEDER in two articles: *Deutsche Ausgrabungen in Hermopolis*, in *Forschungen und Fortschritte*, vi (1930), 385-6, and *Deutsche Hermopolis-Expedition*, *ibid.*, vii (1931), 353-4.

Dura-Europos is a site so important for our knowledge of the mixed Hellenic and Oriental culture of the Nearer East and from the legal and palaeographical value of the documents found there that it is hardly necessary to apologize for a reference to two articles dealing with it: M. ROSTOVITZ and C. BRADFORD WELLES, *La "Maison des Archives" à Doura Europos*, in *C.-R. Ac. Inscr. et B.-L.*, 1931, 162-88; and JOTHAM JOHNSON, *Dura Studies*, doctoral thesis, Philadelphia, 1932, pp. vii+47, 3 plates (I. *The Dura Horoscope and the Seleucid Calendar*, pp. 1-15; II. *The Hereditary Strategos*, pp. 17-34; III. *A Revision of Parchment II*, pp. 35-47).

I may mention here that in the present economic situation the Papyrusinstitut at Munich finds it very difficult to purchase books and so to maintain the library without which its work must inevitably be hampered. The institute has rendered such valuable service to our science that probably many scholars will be willing to assist by sending copies of their works, a gift which will be very greatly appreciated.

The year under review was marked by the death of a great scholar, ULRICH VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, whose many-sided activity had left traces on almost every department of Greek studies. I had the good fortune (if a personal reminiscence may be pardoned), as a student at Berlin in the winter semester of 1901-2, to hear his course of public lectures on Athens of the age of Pericles. The memory these lectures left with me is ineffaceable: the spare ascetic figure, the fine features lit up with some secret fire of inspiration, the daemonic yet restrained energy, the marvellously modulated voice, responding like a delicate instrument to every change of mood, made up a total effect which gave, more than any other in my experience, the impression, not merely of learning or conspicuous ability but of genius. Nearly thirty years later, at the centenary celebrations of the Staatliche Museen at Berlin, I heard him speak once more. He was greatly aged and his figure shrunk, though not bowed. In that post-war gathering, listening to a democratic speech by a Socialist Kultusminister, the old Junker seemed like a

*revenant* from some vanished age. When he rose to speak his feebleness was obvious, and his voice, though distinct, was low and weak; but with every sentence his utterance grew stronger, the old fire returned to his eloquence, and as he spoke of the gifts of the Muses and the eternal value of the things of the spirit I was conscious again of the magic which had thrilled me long since and felt as if I had sprung thirty years backward. Certainly, in him we have lost one of the great ones of the earth. E. SCHWARTZ has published an obituary notice of him in *Forschungen und Fortschritte*, VII (1931), 403-4.

WILAMOWITZ had contributed much to papyrology, as to so many other branches of classical study; but C. WESSELY, whose death occurred on 21 November, was far more closely associated with the science. He was indeed one of its founders, and his name will always be inseparably connected with papyrus studies, and particularly with the great Rainer collection. His interests were, however, far wider than this one sphere; he was a true polymath, of a type which grows yearly scarcer, and delighted in curious learning of every kind. As an editor he was, it must be confessed, rather exasperatingly unmethodical, so that it is often difficult to trace his successive publications of single papyri, and he would begin ambitious schemes, like his corpus of Hermopolite documents, which were never completed; but his skill as a decipherer was great, his learning vast, and his energy untiring; and he enriched papyrology, and particularly our knowledge of the Byzantine age, incalculably. I never had the happiness to meet him, but I could cite several instances of generous kindness shown by him to myself and others. He was buried on 25 November in the Centralfriedhof, Vienna, and speeches were made at the graveside by Professors KAPPELMACHER, HUSSAREK, and GERSTINGER.

L. WENGER has contributed a notice of SPIEGELBERG to *Z. Sav.*, LI (1931), 606-8, and a special memoir, *Zum Andenken an Wilhelm Spiegelberg* (pp. 16, 1 portrait), has been published.

P. VIERECK publishes a notice of PREISIGKE in *Jahresb. f. Altertumswiss.*, 233 B, Nekrologe 1931, 78-102.