

Y M
T

BIBLIOGRAPHY: GRAECO-ROMAN EGYPT
A. PAPYRI (1929-1930)

Reprinted from

THE JOURNAL OF EGYPTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY

Volume XVII, Parts I and II, 1931.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

7 M

[REPRINTED FROM

THE JOURNAL OF EGYPTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY, VOL. XVII, PARTS I AND II, MAY 1931]

BIBLIOGRAPHY: GRAECO-ROMAN EGYPT A. PAPYRI (1929-1930)

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^cKENZIE, St. John's College, Oxford.
- § 9. General Works, Bibliography, General Notes on Papyrus Texts. H. I. BELL.
- § 10. Miscellaneous and 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>Journal</i> = <i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology.</i> |
| <i>Am. Hist. Rev.</i> = <i>American Historical Review.</i> | <i>Journ. Sav.</i> = <i>Journal des Savants.</i> |
| <i>Am. Journ. Phil.</i> = <i>American Journal of Philology.</i> | <i>J.R.S.</i> = <i>Journal of Roman Studies.</i> |
| <i>Anc. Egypt</i> = <i>Ancient Egypt.</i> | <i>K.V.G.R.</i> = <i>Kritische Vierteljahresschrift für Gesetzgebung und Rechtswissenschaft.</i> |
| <i>Ann. Serv.</i> = <i>Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte.</i> | <i>L.Q.R.</i> = <i>Law Quarterly Review.</i> |
| <i>Arch. f. Rel.</i> = <i>Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.</i> | <i>N.G.G.</i> = <i>Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen.</i> |
| <i>Archiv</i> = <i>Archiv für Papyrusforschung.</i> | <i>O.L.Z.</i> = <i>Orientalistische Litteratur-Zeitung.</i> |
| <i>Arch. R. u. W.</i> = <i>Archiv für Rechts- und Wirtschaftsphilosophie.</i> | <i>Phil. Woch.</i> = <i>Philologische Wochenschrift.</i> |
| <i>Ä.Z.</i> = <i>Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde.</i> | <i>Rech. sc. relig.</i> = <i>Recherches de science religieuse.</i> |
| <i>B.C.H.</i> = <i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique.</i> | <i>Rev. arch.</i> = <i>Revue archéologique.</i> |
| <i>Boll. fil. class.</i> = <i>Bollettino di filologia classica.</i> | <i>Rev. belge</i> = <i>Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire.</i> |
| <i>Bull. bibl. et péd.</i> = <i>Bulletin bibliographique et pédagogique du Musée Belge.</i> | <i>Rev. de phil.</i> = <i>Revue de philologie.</i> |
| <i>Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.</i> = <i>Bulletin de la Société Royale d'Archéologie d'Alexandrie.</i> | <i>Rev. d'hist. eccl.</i> = <i>Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique.</i> |
| <i>B.Z.</i> = <i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift.</i> | <i>Rev. ét. anc.</i> = <i>Revue des études anciennes.</i> |
| <i>Chron. d'Ég.</i> = <i>Chronique d'Égypte.</i> | <i>Rev. ét. gr.</i> = <i>Revue des études grecques.</i> |
| <i>Cl. Phil.</i> = <i>Classical Philology.</i> | <i>Rev. hist. dr.</i> = <i>Revue de l'histoire du droit français et étranger.</i> |
| <i>Cl. Quart.</i> = <i>Classical Quarterly.</i> | <i>Rev. hist. rel.</i> = <i>Revue de l'histoire des religions.</i> |
| <i>Cl. Rev.</i> = <i>Classical Review.</i> | <i>Rhein. Mus.</i> = <i>Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.</i> |
| <i>Cl. Weekly</i> = <i>Classical Weekly.</i> | <i>Riv. di fil.</i> = <i>Rivista di filologia classica.</i> |
| <i>C.-R. Ac. Inscr. et B.-L.</i> = <i>Comptes-Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.</i> | <i>Sitzungsb.</i> = <i>Sitzungsberichte.</i> |
| <i>D. Lit.-Z.</i> = <i>Deutsche Literaturzeitung.</i> | <i>Symb. Oslo.</i> = <i>Symbolae Osloenses.</i> |
| <i>G.G.A.</i> = <i>Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen.</i> | <i>Theol. Lit.-Z.</i> = <i>Theologische Literaturzeitung.</i> |
| <i>Hist. Z.</i> = <i>Historische Zeitschrift.</i> | <i>Z. f. Kirchengesch.</i> = <i>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte.</i> |
| <i>Jahrb. f. Lit.</i> = <i>Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft.</i> | <i>Z. f. Numism.</i> = <i>Zeitschrift für Numismatik.</i> |
| <i>J.H.S.</i> = <i>Journal of Hellenic Studies.</i> | <i>Z. newt. Wiss.</i> = <i>Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.</i> |
| | <i>Z. Sav.</i> = <i>Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung (Romanistische Abteilung).</i> |

1. LITERARY TEXTS.

General. Many new readings, the result of personal inspection of the papyri, are collected by G. MANTEUFFEL, *De opusculis Graecis Aegypti e papyris ostracis lapidibusque collectis*, forming no. 12 of *Travaux de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Varsovie*, 1930. The work is divided into four chapters, viz.: Texts from inscriptions; Hymns, aetologies, etc.; Mimica, etc.; Lyrica, etc. Full bibliographies are attached to each text, but unfortunately no translation is given. An ineditum is printed at p. 150 (P. Berol. 13876, recto), a fragment of mime. See also § 2.

A fresh instalment (the last, fasc. 4, was published in 1914) of the *Papyri Iandanae* has appeared, entitled *Literarische Stücke und Verwandtes*, 1931, edited by JOSEF SPREY. Included are: *Il.* I, 94-112; *Od.* IX, 194-235; XII, 31-57; Iambics; *Μενάνδρου γνῶμαι* already published; Parthenius?, Elegiacs; Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, 18-22; Hyperides, part of Brit. Mus. Lit. Pap. 132; Scrap of Isaeus?; Work on parts of body, 1st cent. B.C.; Grammatical; De Sphaera; Colour and veterinary recipes; Cicero, *In Verrem*, II, 2, the oldest Latin papyrus found in Egypt, beginning of 1st cent. See also § 2.

TAIT's newly published volume of *Greek Ostraca* (see § 3) contains two literary pieces from the Flinders Petrie collection, no. 408, *Il.* I, 1-127; no. 405, Gnomai Monostichoi of Menander.

MANTEUFFEL also writes in Polish on "Papyrologja jako Nauka Pomocnicza Historji" in *Przegląd Historyczny*, VIII (1929), 70-90.

POWELL and BARBER, *New Chapters* (2nd ser.), is reviewed by J. GEFFCKEN in *Phil. Woch.*, 709-14.

Epic. BOLLING reviews in *Cl. Phil.*, XXV (1930), 193-201, CANTABELLA'S *L'edizione polistica di Omero*. Important.

A new edition of Hesiod's *Theogony* by F. JACOBY, reviewed in *J.H.S.*, L (1930), 368-9, uses the papyrus material.

The long-awaited publication of the Antinoe papyrus of *Theocritus* has at last taken place: HUNT and JOHNSON, *Two Theocritus Papyri*, Egypt Exploration Soc., 1930. The second papyrus is P. Oxy. 2064. Unfortunately the text fails us just where we most need it, e.g. in the Aeolica and in the recovered ending to the Heracliscus. However, the results are extremely important and are clearly brought out by MAAS in *Gnomon*, VI (1930), 561-4. Reviews also by GOW in *Cl. Rev.*, XLIV, 228-30, and CESSI in *Aegyptus*, XI (1931), 88-91. Also *Times Lit. Suppl.*, 1931, 115.

W. MOREL makes restorations of Brit. Mus. *Bassarica* in *Archiv*, IX (1930), 222-3. A further identification is made by MAAS in *B.Z.*, XXIX, 383.

Elegiac. Sensational results have followed LOBEL'S examination of the *Iambi* papyrus (P. Oxy. 1011) under ultra-violet light, published in the *Bodleian Quarterly Record*, VI (1930), 138-42. Large tracts of the poem are now made intelligible for the first time.

In *Aegyptus*, X, 152-79, F. AGENO examines the various suggestions for the restoration of l. 2 of the *Coma Berenices*. LAVAGNINI'S translation of Catullus's poem is reviewed by E. DIEHL in *Phil. Woch.*, 1930, 227-8.

W. E. J. KUIPER restores in *Studi ital. di fil. class.*, VII, 127-9, *Βουπόρος Ἀρσινόης* [ε̅ δυρού]σσεο, while, on the same tack, KALINKA in *Anzeiger Wien. Ak.*, 1929, 267-9, proposes Ἀρσινόη [ε̅ γγύ]σσεο and [θρηῖσσα Κ]ατωπίτου ναίετις δ[εγαλοῦ]. In the same poem ROSTAGNI would read [ίππεύς] ἰοζώνου Λοκρικὸς Ἀρσινόης in *Riv. di fil.*, VII (1929), 522-3. See also LENCHANTIN DE GUBERNATIS, *Catullo e la Chioma di B.*, in *Studi ital. di fil. class.*, VII, 113-26.

W. MOREL writes on "Die Gründung von Messina" in *Italien*, III, 334-5.

G. COPPOLA on "Callimachus Senex" in *Riv. di fil.*, LVIII (1930), 273-91, deals with the epilogue to the *Aitia* and the Epinicia for Berenice and for Sosibius.

In *Cl. Quart.*, XXIV (1930), 109-12, W. M. EDWARDS discusses "The Callimachus Prologue and Apollonius Rhodius." He finds the latter's poem referred to in the words [δρῶν] πολὺ τὴν μακρῆν, while the rest of the line, ἄμπνια Θεσμοφόρος, alludes to the poem *Demeter* by Philetas. If we read νῆον instead of δρῶν, as VOGLIANO suggests to me, the likelihood would become a certainty. EDWARDS, in the same article, also makes important readings in the Brit. Mus. scholia to the *Aitia*. Review by ROSTAGNI in *Riv. di fil.*, VIII, 257-8.

In *Riv. di fil.*, VII (1929), 457-77, E. BIGNONE finds echoes of Callimachus in Vergil and Horace—*Nuovi spunti di poesia ellenistica in Orazio*.

I have not seen COPPOLA'S *Archiloco o imitazione ellenistica?* in *Studi ital. di fil. class.*, VII, 155-68.

Lyric. An important article by LOBEL in *Hermes*, LXV (1930), 356-65, subjects to scrutiny the *Corinna* papyrus. L. distinguishes three poems, and would assign Corinna herself to the period 350-250 B.C. in accordance with the orthography of her poems.

LOBEL'S *Alcaeus* is reviewed by R. PFEIFFER in *Gnomon*, VI, 316-21, and by BOLLING in *Language*, V (1929), 276-82.

In *Rend. Ist. Lomb.*, 1929, 827-38, L. A. STELLA writes on the new *Erinna* fragments.

Drama. An important review by KÖRTE of JENSEN'S *Menandri Reliquiae* appears in *Phil. Woch.*, 1930, 833-42.

Other reviews are in *Rev. de phil.*, IV, 409-10, by COLLART, and in *Am. Journ. Phil.*, 1930, 83-4, by L. A. POST.

New scraps of Menander's *Georgos* are published by MILNE in the *Journal*, XVI (1930), 187-92, from a 4th cent. papyrus book, P. Loud. Inv. No. 2823 a. VOGLIANO informs me it is a quite different MS. from P.S.I. 100.

In *Rev. ét. anc.*, XXXI (1929), 314-26, P. BOYANCÉ in "Deux remarques sur L'Eunuque" uses evidence of Menander papyri.

Fourteen lines of a "Frammento della Commedia Antica" are published by NORSA and VITELLI in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, 25 (1930), 1-9. GALLAVOTTI in *Riv. di fil.*, VIII (1930), 209-15, would assign it to the Middle Comedy, perhaps the *Διὸς γοῶναι* of Philiscus. So too KÖRTE in *Hermes*, LXV, 472-6.

There is an appendix on "Euripides in the Papyri" in W. N. BATES, *Euripides*. Reviewed in *J.H.S.*, I, 365.

MANTEUFFEL, in *Hermes*, LXV, 123-8, interprets l. 57 of the *Charition* mime, P. Oxy. 413, as stage directions, and gives new readings in the London mime, ll. 1-8 (Brit. Mus. Inv. No. 1984). Cf. also MANTEUFFEL in *Eos*, XXXII (1929), 40-2.

A list of stage properties for mimes is edited by MANTEUFFEL from Berlin Pap. 13927 in *Eos*, XXXII, 27-33, followed, 33-40, by remarks on the Brit. Mus. *Περαζομένη* (Lit. Pap. 52).

VOGLIANO re-edits in *Gnomon*, VI, 113-5, the "new comedy" fragments published by VITELLI last year in *Studi ital.*

A dissertation (Lund University) by URBAN URSING, "Studien zur griechischen Fabel," is commended by A. HAUSRATH in *Phil. Woch.*, 1931, 41-4.

The text of *Babrius* is discussed by O. IMMISCH in *Rhein. Mus.*, LXXIX (1930), 153-69, who compares the Bouriant papyrus with the Codex Athous to the advantage of the former.

In *Aegyptus*, X, 255-6, W. A. OLDFATHER sees in P. Grenf. II. 84 a variation of the Aesopic fable called 'Ανδροφόνος.

A work on "Il papiro Golenischef," i.e. the Vita Aesopi, by F. POTENTE (Napoli, Cimmaruta, 1930), is reviewed unfavourably by A. HAUSRATH in *Phil. Woch.*, 1931, 65-7.

A fragment of the Vita Aesopi in Uigur from Central Asia is published by L. RÁSONYI NAGY in *Byz.-Neogr. Jahrb.*, VII (1930), 429-43.

KNOX reviews F. JUNG'S *Hipponax Redivivus* in *Gnomon*, VI, 321-4.

History. A. W. GOMME reviews F. HOMMEL, *Heliaia: Untersuchungen zur Verfassung und Prozessordnung des athenischen Volksgerichts, insbesondere zum Schlussteil der 'Αθ. Πολ. des Aristoteles*, in *Cl. Rev.*, XLIV, 64-6.

In *Atene e Roma*, X (1929), 145-53, MOMIGLIANO writes on P. Oxy. 1365, "La genealogia degli Ortagoridi."

The 2nd volume of JACOBY'S *Fragmente der griech. Historiker* includes P. Oxy. 12, 1613, 2082 and other papyri.

In *Cl. Phil.*, XXV, 183-4, L. A. POST restores Phlegon (P. Oxy. 2082).

A. REHM in *Philologus*, LXXVI (1930), 118-22, makes textual suggestions for 'Αθ. Πολ. 47, 48.

Mathematics. In *Cl. Phil.*, XXV (1930), 373-5, K. VOGEL writes on "Die algebräischen Probleme des P. Mich. 620."

Music. In *Chron. d'Ég.*, V (1930), 278-85, C. PRÉAUX writes on "Quelques Échantillons papyrologiques de Musique grecque."

Oratory. The first papyrus of *Dio Chrysostom* is published by MILNE in *Journal*, XVI (1930), 187-92, from a 4th (?) cent. codex, P. Lond. Inv. No. 2823. It contains parts of ORR. XIV and XV with unknown fragments. BOLLING, in a letter to me, restores ll. 106-8 from *Od.* XII, 184-5.

A. REHM restores Lysias (P. Oxy. 1606, ll. 149-52) in *B.Z.*, XXX, 155-7.

In *Cl. Rev.*, XLIV, 62, D. TARRANT proposes to read *ἀπεριδείκτους* in Hyperides, *Epitaphios*, § 20.

Law. SEGRÈ publishes in *Studi Bonfante*, III (1930), 421-36, "Tre papiri giuridici inediti."

Philosophy. MOMIGLIANO quotes papyri in his article "Sul Pensiero di Antifonte il Sofista" in *Riv. di fil.*, VIII (1930), 129-40.

In *N.G.G.*, 1930, 1-32, PHILIPPSON continues his "Neues über Epikur und seine Schule," commenting on VOGLIANO's *Epicuri Scripta*. Cf. ROSTAGNI in *Riv. di fil.*, VIII, 256-7.

A crux in Epicurus' letter to Menoikeus is treated by PHILIPPSON in *Phil. Woch.*, 1931, 61-4.

The author of P. Oxy. 1367 is identified by PHILIPPSON with Heracleides the epitomator of Sotion—*Nachtrag zu den Panaetiana* in *Rhein. Mus.*, LXXIX (1930), 406-10.

The fragment of Logic, P.S.I. 1095, is related to Aristotle's *Topica* by PHILIPPSON in *Riv. di fil.*, VII (1929), 495-506. SOLMSEN and VOGLIANO develop the argument, *ib.*, 507-10, 511-12.

A lucid account of the Library of Herculaneum is given by JENSEN in *Bonner Jahrbücher*, CXXXV (1930), 49-61.

In *Phil. Woch.*, 1930, 593-9, J. BLATT reviews C. F. KUMANIECKI, *De Satyro Peripatetico* (Cracow, 1929).

Romance. F. ZIMMERMANN examines anew the *Chione* fragments in *Aegyptus*, XI (1931), 45-56.

Chariton is the subject of a study by B. E. PERRY in *Am. Journ. Phil.*, 1930, 93-134.

2. RELIGION, MAGIC, ASTROLOGY.

(Including Texts.)

General. FR. PFISTER, *Die Religion der Griechen und Römer mit einer Einführung in die vergleichende Religionswissenschaft. Darstellung und Literaturbericht* (1918-1929/30. *Bursians Jahresberichte*, 229, 1930. Pp. viii+424), is a survey of uncommon interest and penetration, full of constructive criticism and suggestive synthesis. The special field of this bibliography is admirably handled.

H. GRESSMANN, *Die orientalistischen Religionen im hellenistisch-römischen Zeitalter* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1930. Pp. 179, 58 Abb., 1 Karte. 3 M.), published posthumously by A. VON GALLING, is a general treatment of the field, in which Graeco-Egyptian syncretism receives due attention. Reviewed by W. BAUER, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LV (1930), 434-5.

KLEINKNECHT—G. KITTEL—WEINREICH, ΠΑΝΘΕΙΟΝ, is reviewed by H. KITTEL, *ib.*, 386-7.

WERNER PEEK, *Der Isishymnos von Andros und verwandte Texte* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1930. Pp. vi+159. 9.50 M.), fills a long-felt want and fills it excellently: we have an assured text, the parallels, and a good linguistic commentary (e.g. the remarks, pp. 33 f., on the omission in the Andros hymn of *alles rein Referierende, vom Pathos oder Ethos aus nicht zu erfassende*). *A propos* of the problem of the repetitions (p. 158), we should perhaps compare the curious way in which texts in the magic papyri repeat a refrain with monotonous emphasis: they afford excellent parallels to the hymn's predilection for long words. HERMANN FRÄNKEL, in a review *G.G.A.*, CXCII (1930), 198-201, reads *χαράξαι* in l. 11 of the Andros text, *ἀνθε[σων ἤβας]* in l. 17, and in ll. 158 ff. *ἴσις ἐγὼ πολέμω κρυερὸν νέφος ἔρκεσι(ν ἐργω), | ἀμφέβαλον (δ' ἀστοῖσι κακῶν ἀκτῆρια) μόχθων. | (πάντες ἐμὲ) κλήζουσι πολυκτεάνων βασιλείαν*. I suspect some serious corruption in 41-4. The Cyme hymn has been discussed by A. SALAČ, *Listy filologické*, LVI (1929), 76-80, known to me from *Phil. Woch.*, L (1930), 1194: it would appear that S. maintains that the spirit of the inscription is Hellenistic not Egyptian (as is no doubt substantially true), and that it is a literary product of the end of the 2nd or beginning of the 1st century B.C. It is however quite possible that the version in Diodorus Siculus, I, 27, is due to Hecataeus of Abdera (as SCHWARTZ maintained, *Rhein. Mus.*, XL, 229): it suited his theory and may well belong to the early formation period of Graeco-Egyptian syncretism.

We may here mention F. LEVY, *Der Geburtstag des Freundes, eine Studie zu Tibull* I, 7 (*Studi ital. di fil. class.*, VII (1929), 101-11, 169-70), on the praises of Osiris in that poem. Thanks to Messalla, Tibullus knew the religion in its native land.

E. PETERSON, ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ, is warmly praised by O. WEINREICH, *Phil. Woch.*, L (1930), 1088-90, W. E. CRUM, *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, XXXI (1930), 415-8, both giving addenda: another in TH. SCHNEIDER, *Die Amväs-Inschrift und Irenäus, Elenchos*, IV, 22, 3 (*Z. neut. Wiss.* XXIX, 155-8).

BILABEL, *Die gräko-ägyptischen Feste*, is warmly praised by WILCKEN, *Archiv*, IX, 241 (cf. § 3) in the course of his *Urkunden-Referat*. We may note therein p. 239 on no. 4 of the Demotic Zeno papyri with the royal oath "By the Pšai of the Pharaoh Ptolemaios" and the relation of the Pšai to *δαίμων*, and p. 247 on a document from Lycopolis (the first of the Berliu papyri edited by S. MÖLLER) by Emperors, consuls, and two eponymous priests of the Emperor. This text should be added to the evidence discussed by L. R. TAYLOR, *Alexander and the Serpent of Alexandria* (*Cl. Phil.*, XXV (1930), 375-8), with a revised translation (by R. C. Blake) of the Armenian Alexander-romance, I, 32.

N. GREIPL, *Über eine Ptolemäerinschrift* (*Philol.*, LXXXV (1930), 159-74), gives an important new restoration of O.G.I. 16 and removes thereby our one dedication to Sarapis under Soter. U. WILCKEN,

Zur Sarapisinschrift von Halikarnass (*Archiv*, IX (1930), 223-5), gives substantive approval to the restoration, but points to indisputable evidence for the cult at the time.

FR. W. VON BISSING, *Silberfigürchen eines Sarapis* (*Bulletin van de vereeniging der kennis van de antieke beschaving*, V, 6-9), publishes a figure bought in Egypt in 1908. On the connexion of the art type of Christ with Sarapis cf. THULIN, *Röm. Mitt.*, XLIV, 219 (not yet accessible). *A propos* of the "footprint of Sarapis," cf. O. WEINREICH, *Ein Spurzauber* (*Arch. f. Rel.*, XXVIII (1930), 183-4).

M. ROSTOVZEFF, *L'empereur Tibère et le culte impérial* (*Rev. hist.*, CLXIII (1930), 1-26; cf. § 4), throws incidental light on the meaning of εἰκόν in Egyptian texts.

O. MICHEL, *Was spricht der Aristeebrief über Gott?* (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, CII (1930), 302-6), well characterizes the unaggressive piety of this document, its failure to use κύριος save in an O.T. quotation (§ 155), and its recognition of Stoic affinities. G. STÄHLIN, *Josephus und der Aristeebrief* (*ib.*, 324-31), is interesting on J.'s use of this source.

S. LURIA, *Die Ersten werden die Letzten sein* (*Klio*, XXI (1929), 405-31), throws light on the "Potter's Oracle."

F. J. DÖLGER, *Die Bedeutung von βαπτίζεσθαι in einem Papyrustext des Jahres 152-151 v. Chr. Der Text kein Zeugnis für eine ägyptische Taufe* (*Antike und Christentum*, II (1930), 57-62), discusses the well-known Serapeum τότε βαπτίζόμεθα, and supports the view that β. and σωθῆναι are both used in a secular sense, giving an excellent parallel from Rufinus, *Historia Monachorum* (Greek text), c. 34, p. 96 Preuschen. In his *Die Gottesweihe durch Brandmarkung oder Tätowierung im ägyptischen Dionysoskult der Ptolemäerzeit* (*ib.*, 100-6), he discusses the tradition about Philopator and the Jews.

P. JOUGUET, *Dédicace grecque de Médamoud* (*Bull. Inst. fr. d'arch. or.*, XXXI (1930), 1-29), is inaccessible to me.

P. COLLART, *Le sanctuaire des dieux égyptiens à Philippi* (*B.C.H.*, LIII (1929), 70-100), describes a sanctuary on the acropolis at Philippi (with five cellae: dedications to Horus, Apollo, Harpocrates; Harpocrates, Isis and Sarapis; θεοίς; table and four benches, the latter *ex imperio* by a doctor, dedicated *Isidi reginae*. Isis is emphasised: Kallinikos calls himself in one inscription "priest of Isis and Sarapis," in another simply "priest of Isis." No dedication to Anubis. A statuette of Telesphorus. C. urges that the cult of the Egyptian deities was here directed to them largely as deities of healing, and remarks that the presence of the cult at Philippi shows again the importance of the highways of commerce in the spread of religions. A good study).

T. L. SHEAR, in his *Excavations in the theatre district and tombs of Corinth in 1929* (*A.J.A.*, 2nd ser., XXXIII (1929), 515-46), mentions (p. 519) the discovery on the piece of a shaft of a small marble column in the theatre of an incised dedication to Isis and Sarapis.

L. ROBERT, *Isis Eleuthera* (*Rev. hist. rel.*, XXVIII (1928), 56-9), reads ἐν Μύροις τῆς Λυκίας κεδνήν Ἐλευθε[ρ]ῆσαν in P. Oxy. 1380, 79 f., explaining it as an identification with the local deity Eleuthera, for whom he gives valuable material. *A propos* of this text, I may refer to P. MONTET's observations, *Rev. bibl.*, XXXIX (1930), 11, 15, 20, in his *Tanis, Avaris, et Pi-Ramsès* (pp. 1-28), on the Egyptian habit of adding to the name of a deity that of the city appertaining to him or her *even outside that city*. The papyrus gives a generalisation resulting from contact with Greeks, like the generalisation of the admission of rulers to a place in the existing temples of the land.

E. PETERSON, *Die Einholung des Kyrios* (*Zeitschr. system. Theol.*, VII (1929), 682-702), *à propos* of 1 Thess. iv. 13 ff., gives a most interesting collection of papyrus and other texts describing the welcoming of a ruler and makes excellent use of them for New Testament exegesis.

The Loeb Philo by F. H. COLSON and G. H. WHITTAKER, vols. I, II, is deservedly praised by O. STÄHLIN, *Phil. Woch.*, I (1930), 225-7, as is also M. ADLER, *Studien zu Philon von Alexandria*, *ib.*, 867-71 (on the development of the allegorical method in Philo), and by H. WINDISCH, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LV (1930), 509-10. O. STEIN, *Die allegorische Exegese des Philo aus Alexandria*, is reviewed by F. H. COLSON, *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, XXXII (1930), 108-9, [A.], *Rev. bibl.*, XXXIX, 142-3, O. MICHEL, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LV (1930), 55-6; H. LEWY's excellent *Sobria ebrietas: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der antiken Mystik* (*Z. neut. Wiss.*, Beih. 9), by H. KOCH, *ib.*, 339-42 (disputing, as does LEBRETON, *Rech. sc. relig.*, XX (1930), 160-2, Lewy's thesis that Cyprian has Philo's phrase *via* Origen and holding that Cyprian may have used Philo directly), and NOCK, *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, XXXI (1930), 308-10.

Hermetism. M. E. LYMAN, *Hermetic Religion and the religion of the fourth Gospel* (*Journ. Bibl. Lit.*, XLIX (1930), 265-76), notes parallels and differences, but does not go deep. In this connexion we may mention C. H. KRAELING, *The fourth Gospel and contemporary religious thought* (*ib.*, 140-9), MILLAR

BURROWS, *The original language of the Gospel of John* (*ib.*, 95-139: judicious and admirable. We are nowhere near the end of the discussion, but I may be allowed to express the conviction that the Gospel is Semitic but not Jewish), H. ODEBERG, *The fourth Gospel interpreted in its relation to contemporaneous religious movements in Palestine and the Hellenistic Oriental world* (Pt. I, 1929. Pp. 336. Reviewed with his *3 Enoch* by LAGRANGE, *Rev. bibl.*, XXXIX, 452-8), and E. BÖKLEN, ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, CI (1929), 55-90. He makes out a good case for the meaning ἐκ μόνου γεννηθείς as well as μόνος γεννηθείς. Cf. his discussion, p. 75 of the symbolism of the phoenix, 76 of the scarabaeus, 77 of primal bisexual beings).

R. REITZENSTEIN, *Noch einmal Eros und Psyche* (*Arch. f. Rel.*, XXVIII (1930), 42-87), in the course of his argument for an Indian origin of the story, returns (pp. 66-71) to the place of ψυχή in *C.H.*, X, the Abraxas cosmogony and the *Mithrasliturgie*.

W. B. KRISTENSEN, *De goddelijke heraut en het woord van God* (*Meded. kon. Akad. Amsterdam, Afd. letterk.*, Deel 70, Serie B, No. 2, pp. 26), is probably interesting, to judge from a review by H. WINDISCH, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LV (1930), 602-3.

R. REITZENSTEIN, *Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe*, mit Beiträgen von L. TROJE (Leipzig u. Berlin: Teubner, 1929. Pp. viii+399. 14 M.), is an important work, the significance of which lies largely outside this bibliography. We must, however, here remark on the very interesting parallels to *Corp. Herm.*, I and XIII, and to the end of the *Asclepius*, afforded by a passage of Philo, *Quaest. in Exodum*, II (à propos of the ascent of Moses on the mountain), discussed by him in ch. 3; we have here the transmutation of human nature, and the passing into the divine by an ascent. To an interesting review by H. H. SCHAEFER, *Gnomon*, V (1929), 353-70, REITZENSTEIN replies *Arch. f. Rel.*, XXVII (1929), 241-77: both should be read.

W. THEILER, *Die Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus* (*Problemata*, I. Berlin: Weidmann, 1930. Pp. x+166), a solid contribution to philosophic history, includes, pp. 125-34, a discussion of the relation of Hermetic thought to Posidonius.

Astrology. CUMONT, *Cat. codd. astr. gr.*, VIII, 1, is highly praised by W. KROLL, *Phil. Woch.*, L (1930), 433-5.

J. FREUNDORFER, *Die Apokalypse des Apostels Johannes und die hellenistische Kosmologie* (*Biblische Studien*, XXIII, 1929. Pp. xiv+148. 6 M.) is reviewed by E. NESTLE, *Phil. Woch.*, L (1930), 97-9 (with praise and agreement in F.'s criticisms of some of Boll's conclusions), and E. B. ALLO, *Rev. bibl.*, XXXIX (1930), 599-602.

Papyri Iandanae, fasc. V, by J. SPREY, includes no. 88, pp. 207-9 (4th cent.: two horoscopes); 89, pp. 209-10 (horoscope: date of birth 3 Dec. 227 A.D.).

Alchemy. Catalogue of Latin and vernacular alchemical Manuscripts of Great Britain and Ireland dating from before the XVI century by DOROTHY WALEY SINGER, assisted by ANNIE ANDERSON and by ROBINA ADDIS. Vol. II (Brussels: Lamertin, 1930. Pp. viii+331-755) continues this important survey.

Magic. P. COLLART, *Une nouvelle tabula defixionis d'Égypte* (*Rev. de phil.*, 3^e Sér., IV (1930), 248-56), publishes a new text in a writing which he associates with the 5th century A.D.: it includes familiar nomina, starting with a conjuration by Brimo reminiscent of the Hekate hymn in the great Paris Papyrus. The spell is intended to check the anger of one Origen. The most interesting phrase is l. 36 ὅτι σε ἐπικαλοῦμαι τὸν μέγαν σωματοειδῆ ἀσώματον, τὸν τὸ φῶς καταπῶντα, τὸν κύριον τῆς πρώτης γενέσεως ἰασημαί οὐαββορ. Σαβαωθ. I suspect that σωματοειδῆ ἀσώματον is due to pleasure in combining antithetic attributes of deity, as in *Corp. Herm.*, V, 11, and to Jewish ideas (man is made in God's image, but God has no body), rather than to the philosophic analogies discussed by Collart, p. 255.

I am informed that *Papyri Iandanae*, fasc. V (1931), by J. SPREY, not yet accessible to me, includes no. 72, pp. 172-5 (6th century), model for Christian epitaph or amulet; no. 87, pp. 203-7 (4th century, first half), a piece of magic to do harm, very like Audolent, *Defixionum tabellae*, no. 188.

K. PREISENDANZ, *Unbekannte Zauberpapyri in Deutschland* (*Forsch. u. Fortsch.*, VI (1930), 63-4), describes P. Berol. 11737, 13895 (very interesting Jewish element, and final prayer like the Mimaut papyrus prayer and the Anaphora of Serapion), P. Lips. 9418, 46429.

He has reviewed A. S. HUNT's *Incantation in the Ashmolean Museum* in *Phil. Woch.*, L (1930), 748-50, suggesting (probably rightly) that Θερπη is to be read as a proper name, and (what is more open to doubt) that the text is a δῆλοποιος, written by a third person (can συνακαταμείζων be so interpreted?).

CAMPBELL BONNER, *The numerical value of a magical formula* (*Journal*, XVI (1930), 6-9), very cleverly settles some problems of the isopsephic equivalents of nomina barbara.

In his *Notes on the Paris Magical Papyrus* (*Cl. Phil.*, xxv (1930), 180-3) BONNER reads l. 2329 *καὶ Σφριγγὸς ἀνάγκη* and interprets *ἀντίχειρά σου κρατῶ*.

TH. HÖFFNER, *Das Diagramm der Ophiten* (*Charakteria Alois Reuch zum achtzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht*. Reichenberg: Gebrüder Stiepel, 1930, 86-98), reconstructs and explains with his great knowledge the queer cosmic diagram described by Celsus and discussed by Origen in his rejoinder.

E. PETERSON, in reviewing L. JALABERT—R. MOUTERDE, *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*, I (*Theol. Lit.-Z.*, lv (1930), 254-5), conjectures Ἀρκύλ for Ἀρηύλ in no. 221, recognises 225 as a familiar magical formula, and explains 230 *μέγιστον ὠπ θεῶν* from Irenaeus, I. 15. 5 (*ωπη* isopsephy).

K. PREISENDANZ, *Papyri graecae magicae*, is reviewed by J. KROLL, *D. Lit.-Z.*, III F., II (1930), 214-9 (high praise); LEXA, *La Magie*, by S. DE RICCI, *Rev. Ég. anc.*, II (1928-9), 278-9; BÄCHTOLD-STÄUBLI, *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, I, 7-II, 11, by A. OSTHEIDE, *Phil. Woch.*, L (1930), 847-55, and U. BOMM, *Jahrb. f. Liturgiewiss.*, IX (1930), 196-8; *Symbolae Osloenses*, VII, VIII, by A. KLOTZ, *Phil. Woch.*, L (1930), 755-7 and 1186-8, v by A. D. NOCK, *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, XXXI (1930), 314; J. PH. VOGEL, *Het sanscrit woord tejas (=gloed-vuur) in de beteekenis van magische Kracht* (*Med. Ak. Amsterdam*, 70, Ser. B no. 4, pp. 43), by H. WINDISCH, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, lv (1930), 603-4.

Christianity. I am informed that *Papyri Iandanae*, v, includes no. 69, pp. 165-9 (4th cent., last leaf of a papyrus codex, parts of 16 lines), a Christological fragment, possibly by Didymus the Blind; no. 70, pp. 169-70 (3rd cent.), a discussion of Exod. xvii. 3 ff. and Num. xx. 5 ff.; no. 71, pp. 170-2 (mid. 4th cent.), a possibly Christian fragment; no. 72 has just been mentioned.

C. SCHMIDT, *Ein neues Originaldokument aus der Diokletianischen Christenverfolgung* (*Theol. Lit.-Z.*, lv (1930), 227-9), is a republication of the eleventh text in Frisk's collection (noticed *Journal*, xvi (1930), 127-8), cleverly so interpreted. K. F. W. SCHMIDT, *Phil. Woch.*, L (1930), 234-40, restores no. 21 as a new version of the apocryphal letter of Jesus to Abgar (it was recognised as that by BELL in his review. Cf. now another restoration by H. C. YOUTIE, *Harv. Theol. Rev.*, xxiii (1930), 299-302).

W. SCHUBART, *Christliche Predigten aus Ägypten* (*Mitt. d. deutsch. Inst. f. Äg. Altertumskunde in Kairo*, I (1930), 93-105), is not accessible to me.

R. DUNKERLEY, *The Oxyrhynchus Gospel Fragments* (*Harv. Theol. Rev.*, xxiii (1930), 19-37), urges that P. Oxy. I is part of a genuine Treasury of Sayings gathered from canonical Gospels and other sources (including oral tradition), probably made for private use, 654 being rather part of a secondary Gospel, 655 perhaps another fragment thereof, 840 something incorporating early and valuable material, 1081 early Gnostic and unhistorical: the fragments of 1224 he rearranges 3, 4, 1, 2. On no. 840, cf. F. J. DÖLGER, *Der Durchzug durch das Rote Meer als Sinnbild der christlichen Taufe* (*Antike u. Christentum*, II, 63-9).

A. DEBRUNNER, in reviewing PREISIGKE-BILABEL, *Sammelbuch*, III, 2 (*Theol. Lit.-Z.*, lv (1930), 337-8), remarks on no. 7265 (from a marble table) *ὕμναιων φάγε κυρι(α)κοῦς* as referring to Eucharistic meals.

GLAUE, *Bruchstück des Origenes*, is reviewed by W. SCHUBART, *O.L.Z.*, xxxiii (1930), 455-6; F. LL. GRIFFITH, *Christian Documents from Nubia*, by F. C. BURKITT, *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, xxxi (1930), 209-11; F. J. DÖLGER, *Antike u. Christentum*, I, I, by A. D. NOCK, *ib.*, 308; SANDERS-SCHMIDT, *Minor Prophets*, by A. LODS, *Rev. hist. rel.*, xcvi (1928), 111-3 (and see list of reviews given by M. HOMBERT, *Byzantion*, v, 659).

For M. J. LAGRANGE, *Un nouveau papyrus évangélique*, *Mt. xxvi. 18-52* (*Rev. bibl.*, xxxviii (1929), 161-77), and J. M. BOVER, *Dos papiros egipcios del N.T. recién publicados* (*Estudios Eclesiásticos*, IX (1930), 289-320), see the Bibliografía Metodica in *Aegyptus*, x, nos. 7625, 7631.

KARL PRÜMM, *De genuino Apocalypsis Petri textu* (*Biblica*, x (1929), 62-80), urges that the Ethiopian text is to be preferred to the Achmim fragment and uses the Rainer fragment published by WESSLEY in 1924. Reviewed by E. HENNECKE, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, lv (1930), 175-7 (reading c. 14 init. *δε]ίξομαι* and supporting the Achmim arrangement of the two great visions).

G. DE JERPHANION, *La vraie teneur d'un texte de saint Athanase rétablie par l'épigraphique: l'Epistula ad Monachos* (*Rech. sc. relig.*, xx (1930), 529-44), discusses one of three letters preserved in a Latin translation after the works of Lucifer of Cagliari in Vatic. Regin. 133, in a defective Greek text published by MONTFAUCON and in an inscription found in 1820, lost, and rediscovered by the Metropolitan Museum Expedition and published by EVELYN WHITE and CRUM. This last text contains one of the passages of the *vetus Latina* absent from MONTFAUCON'S text.

A. D'ALÈS, *La doctrine d'Origène d'après un livre récent* (*Rech. sc. relig.*, xx (1930), 224-68), examines carefully the third volume of DE FAYE'S *Origène*; volume I is reviewed also by H. JEANMAIRE, *Rev. hist. rel.*, xcvi (1928), 132-7.

R. CADIOU, *Origène et les reconnaissances élémentines* (*Rech. sc. relig.*, xx, 506-28), accepts the view that the two citations in Origen are genuine and so give a *terminus ante quem* for the *Grundchrift*.

F. HALKIN, *Les vies grecques de S. Pachôme* (*Anal. Boll.*, XLVII (1929), 376-88), is reviewed by H. KOCH, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LV (1930), 352.

W. E. CRUM, *Colluthus, the Martyr and his Name* (*B.Z.*, xxx (1930), 323-7), explains the name as derived from that of an animal and discusses the martyr's cult and legend.

Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft, IX (1930), has its usual admirable bibliography: *n.b.* especially pp. 187-200.

At the moment of going to press I have received two important volumes. G. MANTEUFFEL, *De opusculis Graecis Aegypti e papyris ostracis lapidibusque collectis* (*Travaux de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Varsovie*. Classe I, 1930. No. 12. Warszawa: Nakladem Towarzystwa Naukowego Warszawskiego z Zasilku Funduszu Kultury Narodowej. Pp. v+203), puts together a large number of texts of religious importance, such as P. Oxy. 1380-2 and the Potter's Oracle, and fragments of mimes, in a form based on new collations and accompanied by an apparatus and valuable prolegomena. For the first time students have this scattered material in a handy form. There is much to note in detail, *e.g.* the treating of P.S.I. 760 as parallel to the Potter's Oracle and an ineditum (P. Berol. 13876, a mime fragment). The volume deserves a wide circulation and should do much to promote the study of the religion and culture of Graeco-Roman Egypt. *Cf.* also § I. The other technically falls into the next report but must be mentioned for its interest. *Karanis, Topographical and architectural report of excavations during the seasons 1924-28*, by ARTHUR E. R. BOAK and ENOCH E. PETERSON (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, vol. xxv. Pp. viii+69, with 42 plates, 19 plans, and 1 map. 1931. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 2 dollars). Here for the first time is a methodical excavation of a Graeco-Roman town in Egypt for its own sake. For this section we must note in particular pp. 32-4 describing the rectangular niches with religious paintings, one of a figure who is almost certainly Mithras and very like figures in the Mithraeum at S. Maria di Capua, *Notizie* 1924, one in an adjoining house of the Thracian rider god, one in the second of Isis and Harpocrates, and p. 56, a most interesting painting of Harpocrates on a lotus-adorned chair, with the beast of Sarapis by his side and a bull and altar on either side below.

3. PUBLICATIONS OF NON-LITERARY TEXTS.

(*N.B.* *Miscellaneous notes on and corrections of documents previously published are referred to in § 9. Reviews, when sufficiently important for mention, are noticed here.*)

General. F. BILABEL'S *Sammelbuch*, III, 2, is reviewed by A. DEBRUNNER (*Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LV (1930), 337-8). BILABEL has now published the first half of the second volume of the *Berichtigungslisten*, which, on PREISIGKE'S death, he undertook to continue. It consists entirely of corrections to the ostraca, which were excluded from Preisigke's work, while the second half will contain corrections to texts on papyrus. Bilabel has had the ungrudging help of J. G. TAIT, who in the course of his edition of the Bodleian and other ostraca has made very numerous corrections of texts previously published. *Berichtigungsliste der Griechischen Papyrusurkunden aus Aegypten*. Zweiter Band, Erste Hälfte. Selbstverlag des Verfassers (Heidelberg, Handschuhsheimerlandstr. 31), 1931. Pp. 145.

TAIT'S own long-expected work has appeared during the year, at least in part, for vol. II, which will contain the indices, is to be issued later. The present volume contains the ostraca of the Ptolemaic period in the Bodleian Library and all those worth publishing in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, the Cambridge University Library, the Flinders Petrie collection at University College, London, and some small collections. The second volume will contain, besides the indices to the whole work, the ostraca of the Roman and Byzantine periods in the Bodleian. It is greatly to be hoped that this will not be too long delayed, but the time which the editor can devote to this laborious and exacting work is exceedingly limited, and publication cannot be expected for some years. *Greek Ostraca in the Bodleian Library at Oxford and various other Collections*, vol. I. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1930. Pp. ix+181. £2. 2s. Reviewed by H. I. BELL, *Cl. Rev.*, XLIV (1930), 201.

P. Bouriant has been reviewed by WESSELY (*Byz.-Neugr. Jahrb.*, VII (1930), 466-7).

Ptolemaic. M. Norsa has published the first fascicule of what will be a most valuable collection of facsimiles of papyri in the Florentine collection. This first part contains exclusively (with the exception of the last document, which is of the year 5 B.C.) papyri of the Ptolemaic period, and is therefore best noticed here. The plates are admirable, and they are preceded, very conveniently for the student, by

transcripts with brief descriptions and references to the previous publication. Pubblicazioni della Scuola di Filologia Classica dell'Università di Roma. Serie II: Sussidi e materiali. *Papiri greci delle collezioni italiane: Scritture documentarie*, Fasc. Primo. Roma: Giovanni Bardì, 1929. Pp. 15, 10 plates.

Vols. I-III of P. Cairo Zenon are reviewed by P. VIREEK in *Gnomon*, VI (1930), 115-21, and vol. III alone by WILCKEN in *Archiv*, IX, 229-34.

As this goes to press I have received C. C. EDGAR's edition of the Zenon Papyri in the Michigan collection. There is time only to call attention to this very important volume—important not only for the intrinsic value of the texts here contained and Edgar's commentary on them, but for the Introduction, in which, from his unique knowledge of the Zenon archive, he sums up the facts of Zenon's life and some of the problems raised by his papers. *Zenon Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1931. (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, XXIV.) Pp. xiv + 211, 6 plates. \$3.50.

W. L. WESTERMANN, publishing three receipts from the Zenon archive, discusses this group of documents, with interesting remarks on the methods of development of the $\delta\omega\pi\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$, the rates of wages, etc. He distinguishes two types of receipt, according as the payment was for wages or a loan. Of the three published by him, he assigns two to the former, one to the latter type. *Regarding Receipts in the Zenon Archive*, in *Journal*, XVI (1930), 24-30. The third of WESTERMANN's receipts is bilingual, and W. SPIEGELBERG publishes the Demotic portion separately: *Der demotische Text des Papyrus Columbia No. 2[1]5*, in *Aegyptus*, XI (1931), 73-5.

I have not been able to see W. PEREMANS, *De Zenon-Papyri. Inventaris van de tot nu toe verschenen publicaties*, in *Rev. belge*, IX (1930), 1182-91.

The late E. NORMAN GARDINER, in a posthumously published article, discusses P. Cairo Zenon 59060; see also § 5 below. *A School in Ptolemaic Egypt*, in *Cl. Rev.*, XLIV (1930), 211-3.

SPIEGELBERG's *Dem. Urk. des Zenon-Archivs* (*Journal*, XVI, 126) is reviewed by WILCKEN in *Archiv*, IX, 238-9. Other reviews of Ptolemaic papyri are: POWELL and BARBER's *New Chapters* (*Journal*, XVI, 126) by H. J. R[OSE] in *J.H.S.*, XLIX (1929), 300-1; EDGAR's *Three Ptolemaic Papyri* by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, IX, 235-6); KRAEMER's *Nomarch Nicanor* by the same (*ibid.*, 236-7); P. LILLE, I, iv, by the same (*ibid.*, 237) and G. ROUILLARD (*Rev. de phil.*, IV=LVI (1930), 289); WESTERMANN's *Upon Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt* by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, IX, 252-3), C. PRÉAUX (*Chron. d'Égypte*, V (1930), 274-8), H. I. BELL (*Cl. Rev.*, XLIV (1930), 200), and P. COLLART (*Rev. de phil.*, LVI (1930), 410-1); SPIEGELBERG's *Aus einer äg. Zivilprozessordnung* (*Journal*, XVI, 126) by L. WENGER (*Neues zur "ägyptischen Zivilprozessordnung,"* in *Z. Sav.*, I (1930), 500-2); and KUNKEL's *Über die Veräusserung von Katoekenland* by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, IX, 237-8).

A reference must be made here to another discovery of a document at Dura-Europus, which bids fair to be quite an important source of information about extra-Egyptian law and documentary forms. This is a loan with service in lieu of interest. It is dated by both the Parthian and the Seleucid eras, and is important in several ways. It was found on 12 Feb. 1929 by the Yale expedition in a tower to the southwest of the Gate of Palmyra. A communication on it appears in the *C.-R. Ac. Inscr. et B.-L.*, 1930, 158-81 (M. ROSTOVITZ and C. BRADFORD WELLES, *Un contrat de prêt de Van 121 ap. J.-C. trouvé à Doura*), and it is published by the same two scholars in the *Yale Classical Studies*, II. *A Parchment Contract of Loan from Dura-Europus on the Euphrates*. Pp. 78, 1 plate.

Ptolemaic-Roman. The most important publication of non-literary papyri during the year is Part II of P. ROSS-GEORG. This is a collection of documents of the Ptolemaic and Early Roman periods, admirably edited by O. KRÜGER. The papyri are in various collections and of various kinds. Some are extremely fragmentary but others are in good or even fine preservation. They are edited with ample commentaries with indices, and with facsimiles of two of them, nos. 11 and 18. The texts number 43 in all; only 10 are Ptolemaic. Of these 1-3 are perhaps from Hibeh (KRÜGER raises the question whether 1 and 2 belong to the same document; may they not be parts of a "double deed," one from the scriptura interior, the other from the scriptura exterior?); 6-7 belong to the collection published in P. Reinach, and indeed to fragments edited there; and 10 is the letter of Plato to the priests of Pathyris which appeared in the *Raccolta Lumbroso*, here republished with a most valuable commentary. The documents of the Roman period, many but not all of which are from the Arsinoite nome, are of various kinds—returns, petitions, contracts, accounts, and one letter. Among those which deserve special mention are 18, an interesting but very fragmentary roll of bank diagraphai, and a small group of documents (16, 21, 23, 24, 30?, 42) from Memphis. *Papyri russischer und georgischer Sammlungen*. II. *Ptolemäische und frühromische Texte*. Tiflis: Universitätslithographie, 1929. Pp. v + 255, 2 plates.

Part I of *Papiri Milanesi* (*Journal*, xvi, 127) is reviewed by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, ix, 240).

M. NORSA's *Scrittura documentaria*, which includes one papyrus of the Roman period, has been noticed above, under *Ptolemaic*.

Roman. A very important papyrus referring to Alexandria has been published by M. NORSA and G. VITELLI. This is an account of an Alexandrian embassy, apparently to Augustus, probably part of a literary or semi-literary work (of the same class as the "pagan Acts of the Martyrs") rather than of an official report, which refers throughout to the βουλή. Alexandria is indeed nowhere mentioned, but it can hardly be doubted that it is the city concerned, and the editors conclude that, if the city is indeed Alexandria, this is evidence for the existence of an Alexandrian senate. *Da Papiri greci della Società Italiana* (*Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex. Suppl. du fasc. 25*), 2^a. *Resoconto di una πρεσβεία di Alessandrini ad Augusto*, pp. 9-12, 1 plate. WILCKEN accepts the view of the editors (*Archiv*, ix, 253-6), and concludes, "So wird denn die alte Streitfrage, wann die Alexandriner ihre βουλή verloren haben, ob durch Octavian oder schon vorher durch einen Ptolemäer, definitiv im ersteren Sinne entschieden." The matter is however by no means certain. G. DE SANCTIS (*La bule degli Alessandrini*, in *Atti R. Acc. di Torino*, lxxv (1930), 513-5) inclines to think "che la bule nel momento in cui si presenta la richiesta non exista e che si tratti di reintegrarla"; hence, he concludes, the document does not resolve the old question whether Octavian found a senate when he entered Alexandria. Even more positively does W. SCHUBART take up a view hostile to the editors' interpretation (*Der Rat von Alexandria*, in *Forsch. u. Fortschr.*, vi (1930), 274-5). He holds that the petitioners are not speaking of an existing institution but pleading for the establishment (or re-establishment) of a βουλή; and he even queries whether Augustus is the "Caesar" referred to; whether the embassy may not have been to Claudius. I may perhaps venture to add that I share, very decidedly, SCHUBART's main view; the whole wording of the text suggests to my mind an argument in favour of granting the petitioners something which they do not possess. The character of the hand seems to indicate a date later than 30 B.C., hardly perhaps earlier than the reign of Tiberius; and even if one accepts the identification of "Caesar" with Augustus, one cannot be certain that the embassy took place immediately after the Roman occupation of Egypt.

S. LÖSCH has devoted to the letter of Claudius to Alexandria (P. Lond. 1912) an elaborate monograph which I have not yet had time to read, since it arrived as this Bibliography was being prepared for press, but which appears to be of considerable importance. *Epistula Claudiana: Der neuentdeckte Brief des Kaisers Claudius vom Jahre 41 n. Chr. und das Urchristentum, Eine exegetisch-historische Untersuchung*. Rottenburg a. N. (Württ.): Bader'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1930. Pp. 48.

C. WESSELY reviews BELL's *Jews and Christians in Egypt* in *Byz.-Neugr. Jahrb.*, vii (1930), 496-9.

WOLDEMAR Graf UXKULL-GYLLENBAND has published an important new fragment of the *Acta Isidori* (P. Berol. 8877). Its place in the proceedings seems to fall between the Berlin and the Cairo fragments, and it is couched in dialogue form, the speakers being Isidorus, Agrippa, and Balbillus, whom UXKULL-GYLLENBAND identifies, no doubt rightly, with the envoy mentioned in the letter of Claudius to Alexandria. On this ground and on others he argues for the dating of the trial, not in 53 but in 41; and his arguments seem to me very cogent. In any case this new fragment is of the utmost importance and value, and its editor is to be congratulated on the skill with which he has edited it and his reconstruction of the events. *Ein neues Bruchstück aus den sogenannten Heidnischen Märtyrerakten*, in *Sitzungsb. Pr. Akad.*, 1930, 664-79.

I must refer here to an important monograph by J. STROUX on B.G.U. 611, for which see § 6: *Eine Gerichtsreform des Kaisers Claudius (B.G.U. 611)*. (*Sitzungsb. Bayer. Akad.*, 1929, Heft 8.) München, 1929. Pp. 96. Also to WOLDEMAR Graf UXKULL-GYLLENBAND's *Zum Gnomon des Idioslogos*, in *Archiv*, ix, 183-206, for which see §§ 5 and 6.

KEYES's *Petition of a State Farmer* is reviewed by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, ix, 244-5), who also reviews SANDERS's *A Birth Certificate of the Year 145 A.D.* (*ibid.*, 242-3). E. CUQ publishes a note on the abbreviated formula found in SANDERS's tablet and elsewhere, *C.-R. Ac. Inscr. et B.-L.*, 1929, 269-70.

A. DEGRASSI discusses P.S.I. 1026 and military diplomas generally. *Il papiro 1026 della Società italiana e i diplomati militari romani*, in *Aegyptus*, x (1929), 242-54.

M. HOMBERT, who has shown the most praiseworthy activity in organizing the papyrological section of the Fondation Reine Élisabeth at Brussels, has published a census return which is of rather unusual interest for the study of population and the composition of the family in Roman Egypt. It is of the 14th year of Marcus Aurelius and comes from Thebonthon Siphtha in the Prosopite nome. It shows four brothers and their families living in a single house. HOMBERT analyses the evidence of the document.

(In ll. 58-9 read presumably $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ (πρόκειται) (or π(ρόκειται)?) 'Ιερακίων Παντβ(εὔτος) κ.τ.λ.) *Une famille nombreuse en Égypte au I^{er} siècle*, in *Mélanges Paul Thomas* (Bruges, 1930), 440-50. See also *Chron. d'Égypte*, v (1930), 271-4.

BILABEL'S *Die gräko-ägyptischen Feste* (*Journal*, xvi, 127) is reviewed by WILCKEN in *Archiv*, ix, 241.

J. C. NABER discusses the Oxyrhynchus papyrus published as P.S.I. 940. ΠΕΡΙ ΕΝΟΙΚΙΟΥ ΔΙΚΗΣ (*ad P. Soc. Ital.* 940), in *Aegyptus*, xi (1931), 40-4.

A. E. R. BOAK publishes in *Ann. Serv.*, xxix, 47-63, *Select Papyri from Karanis*. These papyri were all found in the season 1924/25. They are: 1. Contract of service in lieu of interest on a debt of three talents, A.D. 277-282 (in l. 25 *ou* is probably the end of the numeral); 2. Notification of death to the village scribe, A.D. 112; 3. Application to the village scribe to remove one holding from the register of taxable land and transfer three from the ἀγγυρική τάξις to the σισοφόρα, A.D. 214; 4. Petition by land-owners and tenants of Kerkesoucha to the epistrategus, complaining of the neglect of the κατασπορείς, A.D. 211/2; 5. Certificate of the epicrisis of a Roman veteran, A.D. 188.

WILCKEN reviews in *Archiv*, ix, 244, EITREM-HOLST'S *Three Greek Papyri in Oslo*, and *ibid.*, 243-4, BELL'S *Family Dispute concerning Hypothecation*.

Reference must be made here to the publication by P. W. TOWNSEND of a Yale papyrus (P. 156) dated 26 Payni of the reign of the first two Gordiani. For its significance in relation to chronology see § 4 below. *A Yale Papyrus and a Reconsideration of the Chronology of the Year 238 A.D.*, in *Am. Journ. Phil.*, li (1930), 62-6.

As this goes to press I have received: *Une lettre sur l'enregistrement des libelles*, by P. JOUGUET, from *Mélanges Paul Thomas* (1930), 474-80. JOUGUET here publishes a 3rd cent. letter concerning the subscription (ὑπογράφειν) of libelli with a view to their registration (καταχωρίζειν). It is of considerable interest and is furnished by the editor with a useful discussion of the process of registration.

Roman-Byzantine. P.S.I. ix, fasc. 2 (*Journal*, xvi, 127), has been reviewed by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, ix, 245-6) and F. Z[UCKER] (*B.Z.*, xxix, 392); FRISK'S P. Got. (*Journal*, xvi, 127 f.) by SCHUBART (*Gnomon*, vi (1930), 609-11), WILCKEN (*Archiv*, ix, 249-50), and K. FR. W. SCHMIDT (*Phil. Woch.*, l (1930), 235-40); MÖLLER'S *Gr. Papyri a. d. Berl. Museum* (*Journal*, xvi, 128) by SCHUBART (*Gnomon*, vi (1930), 612-4), WILCKEN (*Archiv*, ix, 247-8), K. FR. W. SCHMIDT (*Phil. Woch.*, l (1930), 674-7), P. COLLART (*Rev. de phil.*, iv=lvi (1930), 411-2; not yet accessible to me), and B. OLSSON (*D. Lit.-Z.*, 3. Folge, i (1930), 830-1); VAN HOESSEN-JOHNSON'S *Five Leases in the Princeton Collection* by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, ix, 248-9); and FRISK'S *Vier Papyri a. d. Berl. Sammlung* (*Journal*, xvi, 128) by the same (*ibid.*, 248).

Byzantine. C. SCHMIDT calls attention to P. Got. 11, which he reprints as a letter referring to the great persecution by Diocletian and his successors. *Ein neues Originaldokument aus der diokletianischen Christenverfolgung*, in *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, lv (1930), 227-9.

An interesting list of "properties" for mimes (which are named) is published by G. v. MANTEUFFEL from a Berlin papyrus (P. Berl. 13927, bought in 1924) of the 5th/6th century. *Apparatus mimici libellus* (*Studia Papyrologica*, ii, 4), in *Eos*, xxxii (1929), 27-32.

WILCKEN reviews ZERETELI'S *Eine griech. Holztafel* in *Archiv*, ix, 251, and MARTIN'S *Letter from Constantinople* (*Journal*, xvi, 128), *ibid.*, 251.

I referred last year (*Journal*, xvi, 128) to MALLON'S publication of some Coptic ostraca with the formula $\epsilon\tau\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\eta\eta$. W. HENGSTENBERG has followed this up with a further collection of similar ostraca, and has in several respects advanced beyond the interpretations given by MALLON. He questions the Theban provenance of these ostraca and inclines to put them later than MALLON, perhaps to the early part of the 7th century. A comparison of the hands seen in his facsimiles with those of the Wadi Sarga ostraca makes me think that he is right. By using the Wadi Sarga texts to elucidate his own and conversely he is able to throw further light on some of those in the Wadi Sarga volume. $\epsilon\tau\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\eta\eta$ he explains as "to the mill." *Die griechisch-koptischen $\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\eta\eta$ -Ostraka*, in *A.Z.*, lxxvi (1930), 51-68.

Byzantine-Arab. C. WESSELY reviews P. Lond. iv and v (*Byz.-neugriech. Jahrb.*, vii (1930), 496-9).

Arab. GRIFFITH'S *Christian Documents from Nubia* is reviewed by A. SCHARFF in *O.L.Z.*, xxxiii (1930), 28-9.

Postscript. The following reference which has been given me I cannot place in its appropriate section, as the periodical referred to is not accessible to me, and I do not know what papyrus is referred to: E. MINDT, *Ein griechischer Papyrus aus Ägypten*, in *Die Leibesübungen*, vi, 343-4.

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

General. There are matters of Egyptian interest in O. STEIN, *Indien in den griechischen Papyri*, published in *Indologia Pragensis* (*Schr. d. phil. Fak. d. deutsch. Univ. Prag 2*), 1929, 34-57.

ERNST STEIN, *Geschichte des spätromischen Reiches*, I, has been reviewed by W. ENSSLIN, *Byz.-neugriech. Jahrb.*, VII (1930), 514-8; in *Gnomon*, VI (1930), 496-505; and in *Klio*, XXIII (1930), 479-83.

F. LOT, *La Fin du monde antique*, etc., is reviewed by NORMAN H. BAYNES in *Journ. Rom. Stud.*, XIX (1929), 224-35, and a reference may be made to BAYNES'S paper, *Some Aspects of Byzantine Civilisation*, *op. cit.*, XX (1930), 1-13.

Political History and position of nationalities. U. WILCKEN'S paper on the visit of Alexander to Siwa (see *Journal*, XVI, 129) has roused much discussion. It is criticized by H. BERVE in *Gnomon*, 1929, 370-86, and by G. PASQUALI in *Riv. di fil.*, VII (1929), 4, to whom WILCKEN replies in *Alexanders Zug zum Ammon: ein Epitog* in *Sitzungsb. Pr. Akad.*, 1930, x, 159-76, maintaining his previous view: also by E. BRECCIA in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, VII (1930), 152-65, by HANS LAMER in *Klio*, XXIV (1930), 63-9, and by C. F. LEHMANN-HAUPT in *Klio*, XXIV (1930), 169-90 and 376-80, who all cling to the religious view. On the other side there is J. G. MILNE'S article in *Anc. Egypt*, 1929, 74-8.

A. ANDRÉADÈS takes a more favourable view of Cleomenes of Naukratis than has been usually adopted by historians: see pp. 10-18 of *Antimène de Rhodes et Cléomène de Naukratis* in *B.C.H.*, LIII (1929), 1-18.

NELLY GREIPL discusses O.G.I. 16, which she dates under Philadelphus, in *Philologus*, LXXXV (1929), 159-74, *Über eine Ptolemäerinschrift*; her view is contested by U. WILCKEN in *Archiv*, IX, 223-5—*Zur Sarapisinschrift von Halikarnass*. See also § 2 above.

A. MOMIGLIANO has an article on *Il decreto trilingue in onore di Tolomeo Filopatore e la quarta guerra di Cesiria* in *Aegyptus*, x (1929), 100-9.

In *Ä.Z.*, LXV (1930), 53-7, W. SPIEGELBERG publishes *Eine neue Erwähnung eines Aufstandes in Oberägypten in der Ptolemäerzeit*, dealing with a reference to troubles in the Pathyris district in year 24 of an unnamed king: he thinks it is probably of the Soter II and Alexander period.

An important document dealing with the history of the Senate at Alexandria is published by M. NORSA and G. VITELLI in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex., Suppl. du fasc. 25* (1930), 9-12, *Resoconto di una πρεσβεία di Alessandrini ad Augusto*, which supports the view that Augustus abolished the Senate: it is reviewed by U. WILCKEN in *Archiv*, IX, 253-6. See also W. SCHUBART, *Der Rat von Alexandria*, in *Forsch. u. Fortschr.*, VI (1930), 274-5, and G. DE SANCTIS, *La bule degli Alessandrini*, in *Atti R. Acc. di Torino*, LXV (1930), 513-5.

The interest of C. F. LEHMANN-HAUPT'S article on the *Germanicus Papyrus* in *Klio*, XXIII (1929), 140-3, is mainly historical.

M. ROSTOVITZEFF, *L'empereur Tibère et le culte impérial*, in *Rev. hist.*, CLXIII (1930), 1-26, should be noted here: see also § 2.

Contributions to the literature on the Jewish question in Imperial Egypt are made by S. LÖSCH, *Epistula Claudiana: Der neuentdeckte Brief des Kaisers Claudius vom Jahre 41 n. Chr. und das Urchristentum*, Rottenburg a. N., 1930, pp. 48; by S. HEINEMANN, *Ursprung und Wesen des Antisemitismus im Altertum*, in *Hist. Z.*, CXLI (1930), 176; and by WOLDEMAR Graf UXKULL-GYLLENBAND, *Ein neues Bruchstück aus den sogenannten Heidnischen Märtyrerakten*, in *Sitzungsb. Pr. Akad.*, 1930, 664-79. See § 3.

F. SCHEHL in *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Antoninus Pius*, in *Hermes*, LXV, 177-208, (1) discusses B.G.U. VII, 1564 in its relation to the Parthian war, and (2) points out that the greater part of the passages in Malala xi concerning Antoninus and Alexandria really refer to Caracalla.

Administration. The Cyrene inscriptions continue to excite interest: V. EHRENBERG has an article *Zur Verfassungsurkunde von Kyrene* in *Hermes*, LXV (1930), 332-55, and L. ROBERT in *Rev. ét. anc.*, XXXII (1930), 202-3, notices one by PAOLA ZANCAN, *Il diagramma di Cyrene*, in *Atti R. Ist. Veneto*, LXXXVIII (1929), 1291-1305.

A. WILHELM, *Inscript aus Theben*, in *Archiv*, IX, 214-7, should be noted in connexion with Ptolemaic military organization, and C. C. EDGAR, *A Greek Inscription*, in *Ann. Serv.*, XXIX, 77-80, in connexion with Roman local government.

E. R. GOODENOUGH has made a study of Philo's account of Jewish legal practice at Alexandria in *The Jurisprudence of the Jewish Courts in Egypt*. New Haven, 1929. Pp. ix+268. It is reviewed by M. RADIN in *Cl. Phil.*, xxv (1930), 294-7. See § 6.

Articles to be mentioned here, which belong mainly to other sections, are E. BICKERMANN, *Beiträge*

zur antiken Urkundengeschichte. III. Ἐντευξις und ὑπόμνημα, in *Archiv*, IX, 155-82 (see § 7); A. DEGRASSI, *Il papiro 1026 della Società italiana e i diplomi militari romani*, in *Aegyptus*, x (1929), 242-54 (see § 3); and O. STEIN, Ἐπίσκεψις, in *Charisteria*, 176-80 (see § 8).

It may be mentioned that among the theses for the doctorate, 1929-30, at the University of Brussels, is that of Mlle. SIMONE DEMETS on *Les Préfets d'Égypte et leurs édits*. Reference may also be made to JOUGUET's publication of a letter concerning the registration of *libelli* referred to in § 3.

On Byzantine administration, the only work which has appeared during the year would seem to be a dissertation of the University of Giessen by OTTO HORNICKEL, *Ehren und Rangprädikate in den Papyrusurkunden: Ein Beitrag zum römischen und byzantinischen Titelwesen* (Universitätsverlag von Robert Noske in Borna-Leipzig), 1930. Pp. x, 39+Lebenslauf. This is designed as a supplement to the *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* of PREISIGKE-KIESSLING. The student of administrative history has every reason to be grateful for self-denying work such as this.

G. ROUILLARD, *L'administration civile de l'Égypte byzantine* has been reviewed by C. WESSELY, *Byz. neugriech. Jahrb.*, VII (1930), 475-9; by E. STEIN, *Gnomon*, VI (1930), 401-20 (cf. *Hist. Z.*, 141, 412-3); by L. BRÉHIER, *Journ. Sav.*, 1929, 425-7; by E. BRECCIA, *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, no. 25, 171-9; and by M. BESNIER, *Rev. ét. anc.*, XXXII (1930), 70-1.

Topography. Le Comte du MESNIL DU BUISSON gives his *Compte rendu sommaire d'une mission à Tell-el-Yahoudiyé* in *Bull. Inst. fr. d'arch. or.*, XXIX (1929), 155-78.

FR. ZUCKER reviews F. W. VON BISSING's *Tine* (see *Journal*, XVI, 130) in *D. Lit.-Z.*, 1930, 602-4.

E. BRECCIA reviews E. DARESSY's *Mendais et l'embouchure de la branche Canopique* in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, VII (1930), 166-71.

Chronology. A. E. R. BOAK has found a new Caligulan month-name: *The Month Ἀγριππείος* in *Archiv*, IX, 225-6.

MARY E. DICKER deals with the genesis of *The Antinoopolite Calendar* in *Archiv*, IX, 226-7.

T. E. PEET reviews KUBITSCHKE's *Grundriss* (see XV, 125) in *Journal*, XVI (1930), 165; E. CAVAINAC notices FOTHERINGHAM's *The Calendar* (see XVI, 130) in *Rev. ét. anc.*, XXXII (1930), 88.

P. W. TOWNSEND discusses the chronology of the year A.D. 238 in the light of a new papyrus fragment: *A Yale Papyrus and a Reconsideration of the Chronology of the Year 238 A.D.*, in *Am. Journ. Phil.*, LI (1930), 62-6 (see § 3).

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

General. A. M. ANDRÉADES has published *Ἱστορία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς δημοσίας οἰκονομίας. Τομ. β'. οἱ Ἑλληνομακεδονικοὶ χρόνοι. μέρ. α'.* Ἡ δημοσία οἰκονομία τοῦ μεγάλου Ἀλεξάνδρου. Athens, 1930. Pp. 104.

J. VOOT's *Herodot in Aegypten* (see XVI, 130) is reviewed by H. I. BELL in *Journal*, XVI (1930), 266; and P. VIERECK's *Philadelphieia* (see XV, 125) by C. PRÉAUX in *Chron. d'Ég.*, V (1930), 133-8, by E. BRECCIA in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, VII (1930), 161-5, and by F. ORTEL in *Hist. Z.*, CXLIII (1930), 98-9.

ROSTOVZEFF's *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* has been reviewed by NORMAN H. BAYNES in *Journ. Rom. Stud.*, XIX (1929), 224-35.

Finance, Agriculture, Industry. The article by A. ANDRÉADES on Cleomenes of Naukratis mentioned in § 4 should be noted here.

There is a valuable collection of Egyptian material in F. HEICHELHEIM, *Wirtschaftliche Schwankungen der Zeit von Alexander bis Augustus*, Jena, 1930, pp. 142: it is reviewed by S. R[EINACH] in *Rev. arch.*, XXXI (1930), 384-5, by A. BLANCHET in *Journ. Sav.*, 1930, 228-9, by J. G. MILNE in *Journal*, XVI (1930), 267-8, and by A. CALDERINI in *Aegyptus*, XI (1931), 93-4.

G. GLOTZ has republished his article on *Le prix du papyrus dans l'antiquité grecque*, noticed in *Journal*, XVI, 130, in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, VII (1930), 83-96.

W. L. WESTERMANN's *Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt* (see *Journal*, XVI, 130) is reviewed by U. WILCKEN in *Archiv*, IX, 252-3, by C. PRÉAUX in *Chron. d'Ég.*, V (1930), 274-8, by H. I. BELL in *Cl. Rev.*, XLIV (1930), 200, and by P. COLLART in *Rev. de phil.*, LVI (1930), 410-1.

W. L. WESTERMANN gives a useful survey of *Warehousing and Trapezite Banking in Antiquity* in the *Journal of Economic and Business History*, III (1930), 30-51.

Various questions relating to the Gnomon are discussed by WALDEMAR GEF UXRULL-GYLLENBAND, *Zum Gnomon des Idioslogos*, in *Archiv*, IX, 183-206. See also §§ 3, 6.

V. MARTIN, *La fiscalité romaine* (see *Journal*, XIII, 112), is reviewed by S. R[EINACH] in *Rev. arch.*, XXX (1929), 350.

A. SEGRÈ writes on *Circolazione e inflazione nel mondo antico* in *Historia*, III (1929), 369-80.

A paper by K. WILHELMSON, *Zum römischen Fiskalkauf in Aegypten*, is published in *Acta et Comm. Univ. Tartuensis*, B. XVIII, 5. See also § 6.

C. WESSELY discusses *jus lapides transportandi* in *Studi Bonfante*, II (1930), 17-8 (see *Journal*, xv, 121).

The first part of a paper by MARIA MERZAGORA on *La navigazione in Egitto nell'età greco-romana* appears in *Aegyptus*, x (1929), 105-48.

H. A. THOMPSON discusses the references to *Syrian Wheat in Hellenistic Egypt* in *Archiv*, IX, 207-13.

S. ZEIVIN deals with *The Ptolemaic System of Water-Supply in the Fayyûm* in *Ann. Serv.*, XXX (1930), 27-30.

Education, Science, and Art. In *A School in Ptolemaic Egypt*, E. N. GARDINER deals with the training of boys in the palaestra mentioned in the Zenon papers: *Cl. Rev.*, XLIV (1930), 211-3. See also § 3.

E. BRECCIA notices MARIA KOBYLINA's *Zur Geschichte der Alexandrinischen Skulptur* (see *Journal*, XVI, 131) in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, VII (1930), 192-4.

Numismatics and Metrology. M. C. SOUTZO gives *Un nouvel exposé du système monétaire des Lagides* in *Chron. d'Ég.*, v (1930), 263-9.

J. G. MILNE discusses a numismatic problem in the Gnomon in *The Roman regulation of exchange values in Egypt* in *Journal*, XVI (1930), 169-70.

6. LAW.

A. General.

i. *Bibliographies and collected works.* We regret that for a second consecutive year the *Rev. hist. dr.* does not contain E. PERROT's bibliographical bulletin. We record: P. M. MEYER, *Juristischer Papyrusbericht*, VI (Okt. 1927 bis Okt. 1929), *Z. Sav. L.* (1930), 503-50; U. WILCKEN, *Urkunden-Referat, Archiv*, IX (1930), 228-56; L. WENGER, *Juristische Literaturübersicht*, II (1914-30), *ibid.*, 257-314; A. CALDERINI, *Bibliografia metodica degli studi di Egittologia e di papirologia, Aegyptus*, x (1929), 329-73 (*Diritto e amministrazione*, 353-5); *Testi recentemente pubblicati, ibid.*, 297-300; M. HOMBERT, *Bulletin papyrologique, Byzantion*, IV (1927), 1-25 (extract), and *ibid.*, v (1929-30), 655-70; the same in *Chron. d'Ég.*, IV (1929), 329-36, v (1930), 156-62. P. COLLINET has supervised the compilation of *Bibliographie des travaux de droit romain en langue française* (Paris, 1930, vi+42 pp.), going up to the end of 1928. In *Arch. giurid.*, XIX (1930), 229-31, F. MAROI gives a necrology of A. ALBERTONI, accompanied by his bibliography. Bibliographical matter will also be found in *B.Z.*, XXIX (1929-30), 391-3, 473-8.

The republication of FERRINI's shorter works has now been completed (*Opere di Contardo Ferrini*, vols. I-V, Milan, 1929-30) under the most competent editorship. The fifth volume contains valuable indexes of subjects and texts (papyri, pp. 522-3). The volume of most direct importance to us is the first, on Romano-Byzantine law, but the quality of FERRINI's work in all branches of Roman law makes the complete set desirable in any library. In a review of the first two volumes E. SEIDL, *K. V.G.R.*, XXIV (1930), 75-88, contributes an excellent critical account of FERRINI's work in three subjects, the Paraphrase of the Institutes, the Syro-Roman Lawbook and the Institutes. A collection of a totally different kind is *Studi in onore di Pietro Bonfante*, I-IV, Milan, 1930, with supplementary *Indice delle fonti*, in which last papyri occupy pp. 764-70. It is a mirror of Romanistic studies all over the world. A number of the contributions, issued separately, have been mentioned in this section in the last two years; others are referred to below.

ii. *Legal history of antiquity.* L. WENGER's *Juristische Literaturübersicht*, II (A. i) maintains the point of view of his previous instalment (*Journal*, xv (1929), 127. Cf. *Journal*, XVI (1930), 131); we are still under the rubric *Allgemeine Darlegungen*, and not till the next instalment shall we reach the monographic literature which is papyrological in the strict sense. What we have before us is not a bibliography proper, though the literature cited is exhaustive, but an article, dealing chiefly with scientific methods and aims, in the form of a series of reviews of more or less recent works. Two main topics are treated: the history of ancient law generally, more particularly oriental (pp. 258-98), and the problem of the evolution of Roman law from the end of the classical period till Justinian (pp. 298-307); there is an appendix on a number of general works not falling under either of the two main headings (pp. 307-14). Most of the literature mentioned under the first heading has already been registered here (*Journal*, xv and XVI, 11. c.); what has not would carry us beyond our present scope, with the exception perhaps of E. WEISS's

review of WENGER's *Der heutige Stand*, etc. (*Journal*, xv (1929), 127), in *Arch. R. u. W.*, xxii (1929), 292-302 (not seen). WENGER's pp. 269-83 give an invaluable survey of the modern literature of oriental law, including Jewish. Various particular items of the article will be mentioned in the course of the section. In the second part of the *Übersicht* will be found an account of the Berytus controversy, in which S. RICCIBONO and P. COLLINET are protagonists. The position, moderately eastward, taken up by WENGER himself is naturally most important. To the works mentioned in this connexion in *Journal*, xvi (1930), 131-2, add a sharp attack on RICCIBONO's position by E. ALBERTARIO, *La crisi del metodo interpolazionistico*, *St. Bonfante*, I, 609-72; a criticism of the other side by L. CHIAZZESE, *Nuovi orientamenti nella storia del dir. rom.*, *Arch. giurid.*, xix (1930), 87-115, 165-228; and two contributions by S. RICCIBONO, *Nihilismo critico-storico nel campo del dir. rom. e medioevale* (extr. *Ann. R. Univ. Palermo*, 1930, a. VIII), stating his position in a popular manner, and *Lineamenti della dottrina della rappresentanza diretta in dir. rom.* (*Ann. Sem. Giurid. Palermo*, xiv (1930), 389-447), proving that the developments of the law of agency found in the *Corpus Juris* were already known in substance to the classical jurists. A similar result with regard to the doctrine of *dolus*, *culpa* and *casus* (apart from the Byzantine distinction *culpa lata* and *levis*) is reached by B. KÜBLER, *Der Einfluss der griech. Philosophie auf die Entwicklung der Lehre v. d. Verschuldensgraden im röm. Recht* (extr. *Rechtsidee u. Staatsgedanke*, ed. K. Larenz, 63-76, Berlin, 1930). He concludes: "It is noteworthy that influences of Greek philosophy and rhetoric on the development of Roman law can in this case be shown with probability for the early classical period, but not for the period of degeneration." A salutary douche of rationalism is administered by W. W. BUCKLAND, *Dig. xlvii, 2 (De Furtis) and the methods of the compilers*, *Tijdschr. v. Rechtsgesch.*, x (1930), 117-42. We have also to note F. PRINGSHEIM, *Die archaische Tendenz Justinians*, *St. Bonfante*, I, 549-87, and W. KUNKEL, *Methodische Gesichtspunkte z. Interpolationsforschung*, *Z. Sav.*, I (1930), 725-7 (a summary), both extremely interesting. Lastly, B. KÜBLER, *Phil. Woch.*, I (1930), 73-8, after describing the modern methods of discovering interpolations, and pointing out the dangers of the linguistic and rhythmic (RECHNITZ) tests, awards the highest praise to the work under review, E. LEVY and E. RABEL's *Index interpolationum quae in Iustiniani Digestis inesse dicuntur* (I, libb. i-xx, *Suppl.* I, libb. i-xii. Weimar, 1929). But he observes that the *Index* shows that more than half the Digest is under suspicion, and asks how the compilers could have done so much in three years. It is time for philologists to criticize and for jurists to self-criticize.

Yielding a little to WENGER's influence, we may mention E. SEIDL's very useful *Sammelbericht: Übersetzungen u. Abh. z. vortol. Rechte Ägyptens* (1903-29), *K. V. G. R.*, xxiv (1930), 37-73, suitable for non-specialists, vouched for by L. WENGER, *Archiv*, ix, 258, n. 1, 282; G. FURLANI, *Leggi dell' Asia anteriore antica* (*Ist. per l' Oriente*, Rome, 1929, not seen), on which see P. COLLINET, *Rev. hist. dr.*, ix (1930), 176-7, and P. KOSCHAKER, *Z. Sav.*, I (1930), 687-9. Add A. ALBERTONI, *Dir. biz., dir. balcanici, dir. ital.* (*Ist. per l' Europa Or.*, Rome, 1930), which is recommended particularly for its bibliography by P. FOURNIER, *Rev. hist. dr.*, ix (1930), 564; also G. BESELER, *Z. Sav.*, I (1930), 439-40, contesting P. KOSCHAKER's view of the passing of property in middle-Assyrian sale, and B. VALORI, *Il dir. del sepolcro nell' antico Egitto*, in *Arch. giurid.*, xix (1930), 59-86 (pre-Ptolemaic). Finally, in *Cl. Phil.*, xxv (1930), 294-7, M. RADIN reviews E. R. GOODENOUGH, *The Jurisprudence of the Jewish Courts in Egypt...under the early Roman Empire...*, New Haven, 1929 (not seen). He holds unnecessary and unproven the main contention of the book, that Philo's four books, *De specialibus legibus*, do not set forth an abstract system based on the Pentateuch, but the actual law of the Jewish courts in Alexandria. Reflections of that law there may be in Philo, but to detect them requires special qualifications.

iii. *Miscellaneous reviews.* There have been the following notices of L. WENGER, *Aus Novellenindex u. Papyruswörterbuch* (Munich, 1928. See *Journal*, xv (1929), 132, and xvi (1930), 132, iii): P. COLLINET, *Rev. hist. dr.*, ix (1930), 336-7; P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, I (1930), 509-10, 517; B. KÜBLER, *ibid.*, 619-23; M. SAN NICOLÒ, *O. L. Z.*, xxxiii (1930), 508-9; E. GRUPE, *Phil. Woch.*, I (1930), 46-8. All are favourable, but most are quite short. KÜBLER's contains interesting suggestions for further word-studies of the same nature as WENGER's on *ἄγραφος* and *ἔγραφος*. SAN NICOLÒ observes the importance of Greek patristic literature of the Justinian period, and notes the publication of the first parts of a systematic index to MIGNÉ's Greek Patrology by HOPFNER (not seen).

In *Museum* (Leyden), xxxviii (1930), no. 2, D. COHN reviews F. VON WOESS, *Untersuchungen über das Urkundenwesen*, etc. (Munich, 1924). (Dutch. Not seen.) In a careful review of A. LEVET, *Le bénéfice de compétence* (Paris, 1927), E. SEIDL draws attention to the possibility that some features of that institution are of Hellenistic origin: *K. V. G. R.*, xxiv (1930), 88-101; cf. H. SIBER, *Z. Sav.*, XLIX (1929), 560-8.

iv. *Juristic texts, and studies of juristic texts. Zum Gnomon des Idioslogos*, by W. Graf UXRULL-GYLLENBAND, is so accessible to papyrologists (*Archiv*, ix (1930), 183-206) that the briefest account of its main conclusion will suffice. It is that the *Gnomon* is an extract from a much larger *Gnomon*, made with the special object of providing, probably for a subordinate of the *LL.*, a summary statement of the position in matters where the law had recently been altered or was in flux (τὰ ἐν μέσῳ κεφάλαια of the *pr.* meaning "doubtful points"). Hence the topics are by no means the most important parts of the *LL.*'s competence. Points to which U.-G. gives special attention are the *LL.*'s position in sacral matters (substantial agreement with H. STUART JONES), the sepulture regulations (*Gnomon*, §§ 1 and 2) as showing a reversion by M. Aurelius to Trajan, the Alexandrian law of intestate succession (§ 4) as showing an un-Roman, but perhaps Hellenistic, limitation of the circle of possible inheritors, and restrictions on the commercial capacity of state-debtors (§ 70. *Ed. Tib. Iul. Alex.*, §§ 2 and 3). A new edition of the well-known *Oratio(nes) Claudii de decuriis iudicum*, etc. (BRUNS, *Fontes*⁷, p. 198) has been published with commentary by J. STROUX, *Eine Gerichtsreform des Kaisers Claudius* (*B.G.U.* 611), *Sitzungsb. Bay. Ak. ph.-hist. Kl.*, 1929, 8. He gives some new textual readings and conjectures, one of which (ll. 2-3) would, on his interpretation, remove the difficulty as to the *l. Plaetoria*. He argues that the *Oratio* (not *Orationes*) down to II, 11 concerns civil suits, and only thereafter criminal. In regard to the latter he makes an interesting point on the *curiosum consilium* of II, 13. Very brief notice by L. BORETTINI, *Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.*, xxxviii (1930), 195-6; longer by F. DE ZULUETA, *J.R.S.*, xix (1929), 248-9. Hidden away in a note to a review of F. BOZZA's *Sulla competenza dei Centumviri* (Naples, 1928, not seen) are some valuable remarks by P. KOSCHAKER on STROUX's views: *Z. Sav.*, l (1930), 681. The question is of the meaning of *subscripto iudicio* in the *Oratio Claudii*, I, 10, which, if we accept STROUX's contention that I, 8-II, 11 deal with civil cases, is only paralleled by Pliny, *ep.* v, 1, 7: *subscribere centumvirate iudicium cum adversario*. This, KOSCHAKER agrees, creates the likelihood that Claudius too was concerned with centumviral (STROUX, 47-8). But KOSCHAKER sees difficulties in STROUX's main contention, and thinks that the sharp transition marked by *Nam quidem* in II, 11 may indicate a passing from measures against manœuvres requiring only provisional to those admitting of definite repression, not, as STROUX holds, from civil to criminal cases.

E. VOLTERRA, *Mem. Acc. Lincei*, III, fasc. I (1930), has published what is evidently an important study (not seen) of the mysterious *Collatio legum Mosaeicarum et Romanarum*. P. FOURNIER, *Rev. hist. dr.*, ix (1930), 174-6, gives a short account of the study, but, while admiring it, thinks that the fragmentary character of the *Collatio* renders results uncertain. A fuller and weighty discussion is given to it by E. LEVY, *Z. Sav.*, l (1930), 698-705. He welcomes the fact that at last a lawyer has been found competent to deal also with the theological evidence, and, in spite of some partiality and omissions, he regards VOLTERRA's work as a great advance. But he does not agree with its conclusions, which are that the *Collatio* is a 4th cent. work (after 324, *Cod. Hermog.*), an apologetic by a Jew who is defending, against the now dominant Christians, the Mosaic law as being in manifold harmony with the Roman, and to that extent its forerunner. LEVY agrees that it is a Jewish apologetic, but holds that it is addressed to heathen rulers, not Christian. Had it been addressed to the latter, it would, instead of ignoring their laws, have insisted on the harmony of the Mosaic law with Christianity, and on their common antithesis to Roman law. Plenty of examples would have been found in the *Cod. Theod.* Hence the *Collatio* must have been written in the heathen period, and the true *terminus ante quem* is the Edict of Milan (question of date of *Cod. Hermog.*). The *terminus post quem* is furnished by the Edict *de Manichaeis*, *Coll.* xv, 3. The review ends on the question of the transmission, which LEVY says was Jewish till the 9th cent., and that of the interpolation of the text (none of the Roman parts), and concludes that the *Collatio* reflects Roman law of the beginning of the 4th cent., and that such scholastic influence as it shows is Western and pre-Constantine.

In *Paulus und der Sentenzenverfasser*, *Z. Sav.*, l (1930), 272-94, E. LEVY maintains, one may say proves, that Paul's *Sententiae* are really an anthology made from Paul's works in the 3rd century, at latest before *Cod. Theod.*, I, 4, 2 (327?), with the object of rendering Paul available in practice. There are abbreviations, combinations and rearrangements of passages, but not intentional alterations. The hand of the compiler is shown by unconscious linguistic variations, and by simplifications rendered necessary by the decay of jurisprudence, and possibly by the abandonment of the *formula*. The article is a fine first-fruit of its author's *Ergänzungsindex zu Ius und Leges*, Weimar, 1930, which covers a number of sources not within the scope of the various existing indexes: details in *Z. Sav.*, xlvi (1926), 287-9 and l (1930), 727. The sources include several classical fragments recovered by papyrology too late for

inclusion in the *Vocab. Iurispr. Romanae*, but the chief importance of the work, which is considerable, is in regard to the legal speech of the post-classical West: see P. COLLINET, *Rev. hist. dr.*, IX (1930), 832-3.

A. SEGRÈ, *Tre papiri giuridici inediti*, *St. Bonfante*, III, 419-36, publishes (a) a very fragmentary 5th-6th century papyrus containing Greek *scholia* explaining Latin law terms. They cite Modestinus, Paul and Papinian, but do not coincide with D. 50, 16, *De V. Sign.* That the *scholia* begin with $\delta\tau\iota$ suggests that they are lecture-notes, perhaps a relic of the very elementary teaching of the Alexandrian law-school (*Omniem*, § 7). (b) Fragments of a small sheet, written on both sides, containing *Cod. Just.*, 7, 16, 41...*quod idem* to 7, 17, 1, 2 *nilominus per...*, but reasons of space, e.g. ll. 3-6, suggest departure from our text, so that this may be another trace of the first edition of the *Codex*; but the hand does not appear to be the same as that of P. Oxy. 1814, though it is of the same type. (c) A fragmentary petition, of the reign of M. Aurelius and Commodus, to the $\xi\eta\gamma\eta\rho\eta\varsigma$ of Alexandria, asking for $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\eta}$ of the *bona hereditaria* of Sabinia Apollonaria in the $\beta\epsilon\beta\lambda. \epsilon\gamma\kappa\tau.$ of Heracleopolis. It is accompanied by a copy of her will, made *per aes et l.*, translated into Greek. The *heredes* are her two sons, the petitioners. The lacunae of this very fragmentary papyrus are in part restorable from the three parallels, B.G.U. 326, P. Hamb. 73, and B.G.U. 1655.

In *Riv. di Storia del Dir. It.*, III (1930), 179-84, E. VOLTERRA gives a useful analysis of C. A. NALLINO, *Sul libro siro-romano e sul presunto diritto siriano*, *St. Bonfante*, I, 201-61 (not yet read). The two chief points, according to VOLTERRA, are first that the Law-book cannot be regarded as a source for a common Syrian law, because the cultural conditions and religious divisions of the Aramaic communities negative the possibility of a common law, and secondly that, though the book was composed, as BRUNS also held, about 476-80 (by a Greek *civis*, for scholastic purposes, with very defective knowledge, possibly at Constantinople), the Syriac version is not earlier than the 8th century, when it was made for the use of Syrian ecclesiastics, who were forced by the conditions of Mussulman domination to become legislators and judges. But it had no practical importance, and its literary importance is the quite modern one of having turned the attention of Romanists to the fusion of Roman and Eastern laws. If NALLINO'S conclusions are accepted, and they come with great authority, much that has been written on this subject will have to be revised.

G. LA PIRA, *Frammenti papiracei di un κατά νόδα del Digesto*, *Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.*, XXXVIII (1930), 151-74, publishes three fragments recently acquired by the *Soc. Ital.* of the outside double folio of a quaternion belonging to a translation of the Digest. The matter is from tit. 8, 9 and 11 of Dig. II. The work seems to be of the age of Justinian; the translator has a tendency to interpret, and disregards the rules for copying (*Tanta*, § 22), but so does the *index* preserved in P.S.I. 55. The editor rejects the idea that it may be a trace of a pre-Digest, and he thinks it is not Alexandrian. No direct evidence as to its authorship is obtainable from the *Basilica*, but LA PIRA argues that the style of Dorotheus, whose *index* may be regarded as a *κατά νόδα*, is recognizable. The text (pp. 172-4) follows an interesting comparison of the passages in translation with the original.

F. H. LAWSON, *The Basilica*, I, *L.Q.R.*, XLVI (1930), 486-501, gives, what is welcome, a clear and succinct account of the *Basilica*, treating specially of their tradition, object and arrangement, and making with regard to the last point the suggestion that the common subject of the section constituted by books 11-27 is contentious law. Cf. the same author's article in *Z. Sav.*, XLIX (1929), 202-29. F. DÖLGER has continued the edition of *Titulicetus* begun in 1914 by FERRINI and MERCATI: *Μ. Κριτοῦ τοῦ Πατρίῃ, Τυποῦκετος. Librorum lxx Basilicorum summarum. Libros xlii-xliii*, ed. *Franciscus Doelger (Studi e Testi*, 51), Rome, 1929. Favourable review by J. JUNCKER, *Z. Sav.*, L (1930), 713-21. *Lex Rhodiorum nautica e codice rescripto bibl. Ambrosianae*, ed. J. L. Perugi, Rome, 1929 (not seen), is mentioned in *Gnomon*, VI (1930), *bibl. suppl.*, p. 30.

v. *Documents and comments.* We have little to add to P. M. MEYER'S *Bericht* and U. WILCKEN'S *Referat* (A. i above). M. HOMBERG, *Une famille nombreuse en Égypte au 11^e siècle*, in *Mél. Paul Thomas*, 440-50 (Bruges, 1930), publishes a sample from a series of *κατ' οἰκίας ἀπογραφαί* contained in a large papyrus recently acquired by the Royal Museum of Brussels, with an introduction on the history and significance of these returns, and reflections on the large number of persons living in a presumably miserable habitation. Cf. P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, L (1930), 514. In *Riv. di fil.*, VIII (1930), 118, G. D. S. notes a study by D. P. PAPPULIAS of the Greek law of intestate succession published from a Dura parchment by B. HAUSSOULLIER, *Rev. hist. dr.*, II (1923), 515-53, and P. KOSCHAKER, *Z. Sav.*, XLVI (1926), 290-304. G. D. S. reproduces PAPPULIAS'S text (*Πρακτικά τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν*, 1929, fasc. 8—not seen).

vi. *Diplomatic*. On E. BICKERMANN, *Beitr. z. antiken Urkundengesch.* III. "Ἐντευξις und ἰπόμνημα, *Archiv*, IX (1930), 155-82, see § 7. Besides P. M. MEYER's section on *Urkundenwesen* in *Z. Sav.*, I (1930), 519-24, we have, *ibid.*, 689-98, a review by E. SCHÖNBAUER of H. STEINACKER, *Die antiken Grundlagen der frühmittelalterlichen Privatarkunde* (*Journal*, XVI (1930), 133). The reviewer doubts the line of derivation from one ancient national system to another, and from antiquity to the early Middle Ages, except in the external sense of imitation of the practice of putting legal matters in writing. To establish legal reception, it would be necessary to determine in each system the function of documentation, and to compare the systems. It is an error of STEINACKER's, though not consistently maintained, to confine the present volume to the purely private document; account must also be taken of public institutions for the documentation of private business. For example, *καταγραφή*, comparable in its oldest form to the comitial will rather than to the classical conveyance, represents the cooperation of the community, by virtue of which buyer got title, though seller may have lost his by virtue of the *ἀπογραφή* on the basis of which the *καταγραφή* took place. WILCKEN's researches (U.P.Z. 126), showing that merely evidentiary registration is represented by *ἀναγραφή*, came too late for STEINACKER. Again *καταγγ.* is not derived from the demotic renunciation document (PARTSCH-KUNKEL), but became an individualistic private document only when the common life of the Greek communities had become submerged in the native population. On the question of *insinuatio* the reviewer goes further than A. STEINWENTER (*Journal*, XVI (1930), 133), maintaining a pre-Constantine independent Roman practice of keeping a register of acts of *jurisd. voluntaria*. But Constantine's law marks a return to Greek conceptions. As to BRUNNER's doctrine, STEINACKER has shown that *traditio cartae*, widespread though it was, was not a legal essential in late Roman law; consequently its essentiality in Germanic law cannot have been derived from Roman law. But the latest formulation of BRUNNER is consistent with *tr. cartae* having been derived in an external sense from late Roman practice, and having been transformed by early Germanic custom into a symbolic necessity. To be noted is the discussion of the terms *complere* and *absolvere*, pp. 697-8. In *B.Z.*, XXIX (1929-30), 324-9, F. DÖLGER examines the same book from the Byzantine side. *Cod. Just.*, 4, 21, 17 shows that *completio* and *absolutio* were only features in a special kind of sale, that, namely, where the parties went to a *tabellio*, not when they made their own document (Byzantine examples) or contracted *sine scriptis* (WENGER's *ἄγραφος*). Hence, though the decay of writing made the tabellionary contract prevail, *completio* and *absolutio* cannot have had dispositive effect (BRUNNER). There follows an important contribution to the vexed question of the meaning of *partibus absoluta* in Justinian's constitution, to which we cannot do justice here. DÖLGER's opinion, based on Byzantine practice, is that *absolutio-ἀπόλυσις* means the delivery of a completed document. *Partibus* is a true, not a Greek, dative, so that the *absolutio* was by one party to the other. *Nov.* 44, 1 *pr.* made the notary's *completio* come after that act, so that he had to make a fresh *absolutio* himself, back to the party from whom he got the document for the purpose of *completio*. This explains the double *absolvi* note found both in East and West. Thus DÖLGER denies late Roman *traditio cartae* only in the dispositive sense. See also C. and D. ii below.

G. BESELER, in the course of *Miscellanea Graecoromana, St. Bonfante*, II, 51-83, maintains (53-4) that *καταγραφή* means a declaration that one subjects a thing to another, and (54) that *ἀναγραφή* means publication, e.g. registration. J. C. NABER, in *Mnemosyne*, LVIII (1930), 166-206, continues his *Observationum de iure Romano*. The section *De chirographis et syngraphis* (180-91) is important for us: chirograph and syngraph are general names for documents, the one for such as are neither committed to a *συγγραφοφύλαξ* nor executed with the intervention of an official or a banker, the other for such as are, in both cases excluding special types with special names, such as in the one case *ἰπόμνημα* or *ἐπίσταλμα*, in the other *συγχώρησις* or *διαγραφή*. The Ciceronian usage and Gaius 3, 134 are considered, and with MITTEIS against BRANDILEONE the existence of a formal Greek written contract is defended.

vii. *Reception of Roman Law*. R. TAUBENSCHLAG's fine contribution to *St. Bonfante*, I, 367-440, on this subject (*Journal*, XVI (1930), 134) receives appreciative notices from P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, I (1930), 506-9, and L. WENGER, *Archiv*, IX (1930), 288-95 (important). The latter, *ibid.*, 295-8, welcomes A. J. BOYÉ's *Le droit romain et les papyrus d'Égypte* (*Journal*, XVI (1930), 133).

B. Law of persons.

i. *Juristic persons*. In *Rev. hist. dr.*, IX (1930), 616-8, J. PIRENNE summarizes an address to the *Soc. d'hist. du dr.: La personne civile sous l'ancien Empire égyptien*. Full civil personality was attributed to priestly colleges and temples. The application of the concept of corporation to the family group was the means whereby family property and solidarity were restored under Dyn. V and VI, and was an essential factor in effacing individualistic law at the end of the ancient Empire. P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*,

L (1930), 511-2, draws attention to interesting documents. A. STEINWENTER, *ibid.* (*Kon. Abt.*), XIX (1930), 1-50, *Die Rechtsstellung der Kirchen u. Klöster nach den Papyri*, is an important article, contrasting the official law of Church and State (notably Justinian), which recognized the full juristic personality of pious institutions generally, was hostile to private ownership and lordship, and admitted founder's right only grudgingly, with the picture revealed by the papyri of the 6th-8th centuries. The official law having already been fully studied, we have here careful analysis and discussion of the Graeco-Egyptian and Coptic documents. Briefly, in spite of Justinian's legislation, we find in this period churches under the lordship of the episcopal church or of the pagarch, the latter without founder's claim; even in private ownership churches, which can hardly have been merely private oratories, and though this is in Arab times, the title is traced far back. Similarly, over monasteries from their beginning (P. Lond. 1913, H. I. BELL, *Jews and Christians*, 45 ff.), we find heritable and transferable rights of founders, and pagarchs with various rights of lordship. Evidently Justinian's prohibitions were not aimed at nothing. So far as documents have been published, this sort of thing seems to have been common in the East, but of course we have also evidence of proper observance of the law. To the evidence for later Byzantine conditions given at the end of the article we might add the will of the Monk Cesmas of 1005, transmitting to successors an embryonic monastery, published by G. ROBINSON, *History and Cartulary of the Greek Monastery of Carbone (Orientalia Christiana, Rome, 1928-30)*, II, 1, 133-7. But, as STEINWENTER observes, special considerations apply to cases where corporate personality had not been fully achieved. P. FOURNIER, *Rev. hist. dr.*, IX (1930), 567, draws the conclusion from this article that we have in the East the same conflict as in the Carolingian empire, between official canon law, which held churches, etc. to be public institutions, and a tolerated practice of applying the conceptions of private law to them.

ii. *Slavery*. W. L. WESTERMANN, *Upon Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt* (New York, 1929. Not seen), which includes the publication of an early Ptolemaic *δύραμμα* on the tax on sales of slaves, P. Columbia 480, is evidently an important work: P. COLLART, *Rev. de phil.*, IV (1930), 410-1; G. D. S., *Riv. di fil.*, VIII (1930), 118-9; U. WILCKEN, *Archiv*, IX (1930), 252-3. Besides this, we have two general studies which are in a way complementary: R. TAUBENSCHLAG, *Das Sklavenrecht im Rechte der Papyri*, *Z. Sav.*, L (1930), 140-69, and the first chapter of V. ARANGIO-RUIZ, *Persone e famiglia nel diritto dei papiri* (Milan, 1930). TAUBENSCHLAG gives a methodical exposition, backed by his usual rich documentation, ARANGIO-RUIZ (reproducing lectures) brings the main points into sharp relief, and abounds in suggestions and parallels. In both, the main theme is the contrast of the Graeco-Egyptian system with the Roman, in the Graeco-Egyptian a certain dualism, in the Roman severe logic. Thus, though the Egyptian slave was the property of his master, registered as such, subject to chastisement, exploitation, and alienation (but limits on export), yet he could own property, not merely enjoy *peculium*; there is self-enslavement and manumission by self-purchase, marriage with free persons, processual capacity (for example as delinquent, P. Hal. I and P. Lille 29). An instructive case of contrast is that of the partial manumission of a *servus communis*, possible in Egypt, impossible in Roman law (TAUBENSCHLAG, 166-7; ARANGIO-RUIZ, 9 ff.; WENGER, *Archiv*, IX (1930), 279). On the subject of patron-rights, which occurs at the end of TAUBENSCHLAG's article, see also G. LA PIRA, *Precedenti provinciali della riforma Giustiniana del diritto di patronato*, *St. ital. di filol. cl.*, VII, fasc. 2 (1929), 145-54 (not seen. Noticed by L. WENGER, *Archiv*, IX, 287).

iii. *Civitas*. P. M. MEYER's section on this subject in his *Papyrusbericht*, VI, *Z. Sav.*, I (1930), 512-6, contains many notable points: a summary of the literature on the Cyrenean *δύραμμα*, last words on the *Const. Antoniniana* (*Journal*, XV (1929), 131), the divergent views of E. BICKERMANN and E. SCHÖNBAUER on the status of Greeks in Egypt (*ibid.*, XVI (1930), 134), a dissent from A. SEGRÈ's theory that legionaries might retain Egyptian nationality (*ibid.*). The fundamental questions are brilliantly discussed in the second chapter of V. ARANGIO-RUIZ's *Persone e famiglia* (above, ii). He criticizes E. BICKERMANN's views (*Journal*, XIV (1928), 151; XV (1929), 129-30, 130-1). The Ptolemies dealt with the problem of private law substantially as the Romans did, leaving the natives to their own law, and keeping Greek law for the Greeks. True the Greeks, coming from different *πῶλεις*, had no proper common law, but there was an underlying unity of legal ideas which royal *δύραμμα* and judicial practice could cement. The difference of laws is obvious: thus, before the Romans came, only Greeks made proper testaments. The regard shown by Augustus for common Greek nationality in the Cyrenean edicts is inconsistent with the pretended fusion of Greeks and Egyptians under the early Empire. On the contrary, the policy was to associate the Greek nation, regardless of its political divisions, with the Romans as a governing class (p. 32, n. 1). In fact up to 200 there are clear signs of Greek privilege, though the Alexandrians may have been still more favoured. Pp. 37-8 give important developments on double *civitas*, the *Gnomon* and

BICKERMANN's interpretation of *ἀστοί* (*Journal*, xv (1929), 130-1). Proofs of these doctrines are to be sought in the foundation of Antinoopolis and the position of the Arsinoite *κάτοικοι* as revealed by BICKERMANN. The Greeks were held together and distinct by the gymnasium. But intermarriage with natives was probably not forbidden, and, the racial qualifications for the gymnasium being strict, *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς μητροπόλεως* took the place of *οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ γυμνασίου* in the course of the first three centuries. Greek ideas govern even τὰ ἐγχώρια νόμιμα, and Egyptian ideas do not begin to dominate until the disappearance of Greek corporate life in the Byzantine period.

iv. *Family*. In *Z. Sav.*, L (1930), 450, n. 5, M. SAN NICOLÒ finds parallels to the Egyptian *ἀναρπεῖν ἀπὸ κοπίας*. CH. B., *Rev. Hist.*, CLIX (1928), 179-80, has a short note on J. CARCOPINO, *Le droit d'exposition d'enfants et le gnomon de Vidiologie*, *Mém. de la Soc. nat. des Antiquaires de France*, LXXVII (1928) (not seen).

P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, L (1930), 514-5, discusses the notifications of birth mentioned in *Journal*, xv (1929), 131; xvi (1930), 135. The Karanis diptych is commented on by U. WILCKEN, *Archiv*, ix (1930), 242-3, the suggestion being made that the expansion may be: *d(e) e(a) r(e) e(xemplum) e(ditum)*—or *e(datur)*—*b(eneficio) t(utoris) s(upra) s(cripti)*, *beneficio* meaning "through the mediation of." V. ARANGIO-RUIZ, in chapter 3 of his *Persona e famiglia* (above, ii), considers that in native Egyptian law the cohesive function of the *patria potestas* was performed by joint interest in family property founded on marriage contract, a very interesting system, the existence of which can be proved up to the beginning of the Roman period. In Roman terms it means usufruct to the father or parents, *nuda proprietas* for the offspring, but this is too definite. The father (eldest son) can alienate, but requires the concurrence of the children (brothers). There is thus an organ of the family corporation. The vesting of the deferred interests leads to an extreme *morcellement*, prolonged in a state of indivision for generations, though the author thinks that some of the more incredible fractions may represent some legal artifice to accommodate native custom to Roman conceptions. Under such a system sons cannot have had much property in their parents' lifetime. But the dismembered Greek family, the precursor of Justinian's, also occurs, e.g. P. Oxy. 1208 of 291, an anticipation of Constantine's *bona adventicia*. At the beginning of this chapter ARANGIO-RUIZ holds it to be a mistake to speak of *materna potestas* (*Journal*, xvi (1930), 135), the semblance of which may be due to the *de facto* supervision naturally assumed by older relations, e.g. also the grandmother, a brother, even a sister. Similarly, the mother as *ἐπακολουθήτρια* by the side of the tutor of her fatherless children (*ibid.*) may not be much more than an attempt to give effect to practical considerations, of which the existing law of tutorship took no notice. The same system is found in late classical Roman law—the mother as *administratrix* of the property, but alongside of a male tutor—but when G. LA PIRA, *Riflessi provinciali nel diritto tutelare classico romano*, *Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.*, xxxviii (1930), 53-73, on the strength of a papyrus putting back the date of the appearance of this system in Egypt to 132 A.D. (G. VITELLI in *St. in onore di V. Lorel*, not seen), argues that the Romans may have borrowed the idea from Egypt, one is inclined to reflect that the same causes may have produced the same results in both cases. On *tutela*, see also P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, L (1930), 516.

v. *Marriage*. In chapter 4, V. ARANGIO-RUIZ recognizes in Egyptian custom two types of marriage, the lower being probably derived from morganatic unions, and in Greek marriage two stages of documentation, the second of which, *συγγραφή συνοικεσίου*, he suggests was for publicity in the matter of immovable property. In the Roman period the lower Egyptian marriage fused with the first phase of the Greek, to form a new institution, the *γάμος ἄγραφος*, which again was readily open to interpretation as identical with the classical Roman marriage. We can barely refer to the very interesting study of P. Oxy. 237 (76 ff.) and to the concluding remarks on *Nov.* 74.

P.S.I. IX, 1075 (458 A.D.) is a wife's petition (for what, is not clear) in connexion with a *repudium* made or, according to WILCKEN, threatened by her husband: P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, L (1930), 517; U. WILCKEN, *Archiv*, ix (1930), 246; G. SCHERILLO, *Riv. di Storia del Dir. Ital.*, II (1929), 457-506, III (1930), 69-95. Part of her grievance is connected with her *φθόρον ἔδνον*, an expression hitherto unknown, but certainly meaning a *donatio* from the husband, and therefore *pretium pudicitiae*. The first of SCHERILLO's *Studi sulla donazione nuziale* (*ibid.*) enters exhaustively into the papyrological evidence from the 4th century onwards, concluding that from the husband's side there may be (i) *arrha sponsalicia*, perhaps a relic of bride-purchase, (ii) *ἔδνον*, the chief gift, which seems to have provided widow's dower, but is conceived of as *pretium pudicitiae*; (iii) *ιδόπρικοον* or *ἀντίπρικοον*, a name perhaps suggested by *Nov.* 97, generally of furniture, distinct from (ii) because found given even to a woman remarrying. The second article considers how far the practice of the papyri corresponds to Roman law, pre-Justinian,

Justinian's, and later. The materials are very well set out, and interesting conclusions are reached. A. MOMIGLIANO, *Riv. di fil.*, VIII (1930), 264-5, mentions cognate studies by E. VOLTERRA, *Studi sull'Archia Sponsalicia*, *Riv. ital. per le scienze giur.*, II (1927), and IV (1929), completed by a separate publication under the same title. Rome: Grafia, 1930, pp. 96 (not seen).

vi. *Colonate*. P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, L (1930), 533, mentions an article published by M. ROSTOV-TZEFF in *Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics: The problem of the origin of serfdom in the Roman Empire* (see *Journal*, XVI (1930), 130).

vii. *Monks*. In *B.Z.*, XXX (1929-30) (*Festgabe Heisenberg*), 669-76, B. GRANIĆ writes on *Die privatrechtliche Stellung der griech. Mönche im v. und vi. Jahrh.* The monk in spirit said good-bye to this world and its law, but the secular law had to regulate his position, and the legislation of Justinian consolidates the practice of more than 200 years. One may say that the State entered, as far as possible, into the monastic ideals of poverty, chastity and obedience. The collection of materials is welcome, but papyri are not among them.

C. Law of property.

Very high praise is given by U. WILCKEN, *Archiv*, IX (1930), 237-8, to W. KUNDEL's article on the alienation of catoecic land, *Z. Sav.*, XLVIII (1928), 285-313 (*Journal*, XV (1929), 131-2). É. CUQ, *Un rescrit d'Auguste sur la protection des res religieuses dans les provinces*, *Rev. hist. dr.*, IX (1930), 383-410, maintains against F. CUMONT that the recently published Augustan inscription from Nazareth (?) is in full agreement with the accepted civilian account of the protection of graves in Roman law. Text pp. 391-2. There is nothing of special interest to papyrologists, however. *Iusta causa traditionis*, *Romanist. Beitr. z. Rechtsgesch.*, Heft 4 (Berlin u. Leipzig, 1930. viii + 208 pp.), by A. EHRHARDT, is an attempt to determine how Roman law up to the *Corpus Iuris* conceived of conveyance. It is probably impossible for an English lawyer to do justice to the directly papyrological part (ch. xvi, 156-84) in isolation. With this reserve we summarize the writer's position there. The sharp distinction between contract to convey and performance by conveyance is only inchoate in classical law, its clear formulation being Byzantine, and therefore in the Digest due to Justinian. Justinian's doctrine is probably a reception from Byzantine Egypt, where *καταγραφή* had come to mean *traditio cartae*, and involved a sharp line between the contract of sale and the conveyance. This evolution of *καταγραφή* is, according to the author, who follows PARTSCH rather than SCHÖNBAUER, a very natural one, but we cannot appreciate his arguments here. It has not escaped him that the same distinction is involved in classical law by the requirement of mancipation, but mancipation, apart from its early obsolescence in the Byzantine period, is primarily the act of the alienee, whereas Byzantine *traditio*, like *καταγραφή*, is that of the alienor. The sale of Byzantine Egypt is *πῶσις*, not *ὄνη*, and *ὁμολογῶ πεπρακέναι καὶ καταγεγραφήκέναι* is not the counterpart of *emit mancipioque accipit*—a very happy illustration. Thus the *tr. cartae* of later Byzantine law may be a derivation from *καταγραφή*, facilitated by the stress laid in pre-Justinian law (Ravenna documents) on *traditio* by the seller. See A. vi above and D. ii below. E. BETTI, *Il dogma bizantino della φύσις τῆς παραδόσεως*, *St. Bonfante*, I, 303-34, studies a closely allied subject. He too holds that the preponderance of the will of the alienor in *traditio* is Byzantine and, where supported by the Digest, interpolated. Should parties not be agreed as to *causa*, *traditio* can only pass ownership if it be regarded as an abstract conveyance. Thus Julian D. 41, 1, 36 is interpolated. The same conclusion is reached by R. MONIER, *Le malentendu sur la causa traditionis*, *St. Bonfante*, III, 217-31. Julian is clearly interpolated, and the classical view must be sought in the *l. contraria*, Ulpian D. 12, 1, 18, though there too is interpolation. B. KÜBLER, *Res mobiles u. immobiles*, *St. Bonfante*, II, 345-61, after pointing out that this distinction is not classical, studies the assimilation to land of certain chattels and of other rights (*panes civiles*) by fiction in later law. Greek influence is probable: compare the treatment of the alienation of slaves and ships, analogous to that of land, in Egypt (pp. 349, 361).

In *Phil. Woch.*, L (1930), 678-82, W. SCHUBART, reviewing E. SCHÖNBAUER, *Beitr. z. Gesch. d. Bergbaurechts* (*Journal*, XVI (1930), 135-6), gives a careful analysis, but refrains from criticism.

D. Law of obligations.

i. *General*. Useful points of Greek commercial law are raised by F. OERTEL reviewing in *Z. Sav.*, L (1930), 565-76, especially 573-4, E. ZIEBARTH, *Beitr. z. Gesch. des Seeraubs u. Seehandels im alten Griechenland*, Hamburg, 1929. There have been a number of reviews of V. ARANGIO-RUIZ, *Lineamenti del sistema contrattuale nel diritto dei papiri*, Milan, 1928 (*Journal*, XV (1929), 132): P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, L (1930), 524-5, a compact summary; G. A. PETROPOULOS, *Byz.-neugriech. Jahrb.*, VII (1930), 480-5, in Greek;

M. SAN NICOLÒ, *O.L.Z.*, xxxiii (1930), 355, appreciative; and W. KUNKEL, *Gnomon*, vi (1930), 421-5, analysis with criticism. Of course various items in P. M. MEYER'S and U. WILCKEN'S surveys (above, A. i) are relevant; in the latter note p. 230, on the papyri published by C. C. EDGAR, *Journal*, xiv (1928), 288-93.

ii. *Sale*. P. M. MEYER'S *Bericht*, vi (A. i), p. 526, notes sale documents in P.S.I. ix; also (p. 525) gives an account of work, mentioned *Journal*, xv (1929), 130, by A. SEGRÈ, who continues on the same subject in *Note sulla compravendita e il pagamento del prezzo in diritto greco e romano, Aegyptus*, x (1929), 207-41. He denies that Greek law knew consensual sale, or indeed the contract as distinct from the reciprocal conveyances, though in sales of catagraphable objects *arrha* bound the seller to make *καταγραφή* against full payment, and punished a withdrawing buyer by its forfeiture. The effect of *καταγγ.* without payment would depend on whether the non-payment was expressed on its face or not; in the latter case payment would be secured by fictitious sygraphic loan, but third parties would get good title from the buyer. The fully developed procedure in a catagraphic sale seems (P. Oxy. 227) to have been that the vendor drew up, it might be *ἐν ἀγυῖᾳ*, a document of sale, the buyer paid the *ἐγκύκλιον*, and the tax-farmer applied to the *agoranomus* (later also banker, *καταλογεῖον*) for *καταγγ.*, which process involved the transformation of the document into an agoranomic one and its registration. Thus *καταγγ.* was a *transcriptio* in the sense of the Ravenna documents: *vendo, mancipio et ex iure meo in vestro iure dominioque transcribo*. In the East *καταγγ.* became simply a document drawn by a *tabellio*, or signed by three credible witnesses, and the distinction (*Cod. Iust.* 4, 21, 17) between sale *cum* and *sine scriptis* is the same as that between sale of catagraphable and non-catagraphable objects. Roman law failed to impose *traditio* of land in the East, and even in the West the document tends to supersede it, but not entirely (Paul, *Sent.* 5, 12, 2). On the question of the rule in *Iust.* 2, 1, 41, SEGRÈ follows E. ALBERTARIO: it is classical only for mancipation. F. PRINGSHEIM maintains once more in *Eigentumsübergang beim Kauf, Z. Sav.*, I, 333-438, that the rule is entirely interpolated. He notes, p. 347, the Egyptian practice of handing title-deeds to the buyer, and, pp. 387-9, considers the papyrological counterparts of the *fidem sequi* of the Institutes passage, and the effect of *καταγγ.* on the ownership in the absence of payment of price. See P. M. MEYER, *ibid.*, 531 ff., and A. EHRHARDT'S recent work (above, C). Some remarks by L. WENGER, *Archiv*, ix (1930), 267-8, on the development of sale as a contract should also be noted. See also above, A. vi.

In *Sull' Arra della Vendita in Diritto Giustiniano*, *St. Bonfante*, iv, 503-64, E. CARUSI, after giving a careful *résumé* of G. CORNIL'S recent article (*Journal*, xv (1929), 132) and a rich bibliography on the oriental side, considers the evidence of the Syro-Roman Law-book (534 ff.), and then studies the meaning of Justinian's legislation (548 ff.). This he holds was a compromise, which saved the Roman principle of irrevocability of consent in theory, but made concessions to Eastern custom which, limited as they appear, are far-reaching. The *ius poenitendi* was allowed for not yet perfected written contracts, but denied for oral; then by a side wind *arrha* was introduced as a penalty of *poenitentia* in all cases, oral as well as written contracts, and perfected written as well as not yet perfected written. M. RICCA-BARBERIS, *L'evizione obbligo-limite del venditore romano, St. Bonfante*, II, 127-84, contends, against the received opinion, that the Roman seller was bound to make good title; in particular that *vacuum possessionem tradere* meant conveyance. The term *παραχωρεῖν* in 2nd and 3rd cent. papyri is witness of this (pp. 171-2). In the Byzantine period transfer of ownership is of the very essence of sale.

A very recent arrival is *La garantie contre les vices cachés dans la vente romaine*, Paris, 1930, xvi + 216 pp., by R. MONIER. The Introduction treats of Babylonian and Greek sale, but, to judge by the table of texts, there is not much papyrology.

iii. *Guarantee*. L. WENGER, *Archiv*, ix, 285-7, gives close consideration to É. CUQ'S *Cautionnement mutuel et solidarité, Mém. Cornil*, I, 155-80 (*Journal*, xiv (1928), 154).

iv. *Delict*. There is no special papyrological interest in F. DE VISSCHER'S *La nature juridique de l'abandon noxal, Rev. hist. dr.*, ix (1930), 411-71, unless perhaps an excursion into primitive Greek law (pp. 445-8), but this is not true of the summary which he gives, *ibid.*, 606-8, of his *Le délit d'iniuria commis par un esclave: Droit romain et droit alexandrin, Rev. belge*, ix (1930), 702 (not seen). When the delict committed by a slave is *iniuria*, we learn from Ulpian D. 47, 10, 17, 4, that his master, instead of accepting the noxal action, condemnation in which would leave him still free to surrender the slave, might hand him over without ado for *verberatio*. P. Hal. I, 188 sq. makes the alternative to summary *verberatio* the acceptance of full liability by the master. Thus for *iniuria* there was no noxal action at Alexandria, and J. PARTSCH, *Archiv*, vi (1913), 67, is wrong on this point. The suggestion is that the praetor first copied the Alexandrian system, and that the noxalization of the action against the master was introduced later, in the interest of uniformity.

E. *Law of succession.*

Recently published testamentary documents of the Roman period are mentioned by P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, I (1930), 517-8. Add that edited by A. SEGRÈ in *St. Bonfante* (above, A. iv). *Ricerche di diritto ereditario romano*, Rome, 1930, 132 pp., by the same, appears on a superficial examination to be a lively and stimulating study of the Roman law of succession, the special characteristics of which are brought out by contrast with Germanic, Greek and Hellenistic law. The evidence for the last-named is naturally mainly from Egypt; papyrological points which occur are the system of κληροί pp. 16-7, the right to *legitim* p. 31, *hereditas ex certa re* p. 33, the meaning of κληρονομείν in the *Gnomon* p. 34, entry of heir by ἐμβάδεια pp. 91-2, unlimited liability for hereditary debts, tempered by a *ius abstinendi* p. 96.

F. *Law of procedure.*

L. WENGER, *Z. Sav.*, I (1930), 500-2, has a further *Miszelle* on the new demotic procedural code discovered by W. SPIEGELBERG. He regards E. SEIDL's interpretations of the document (*Journal*, XVI (1930), 137) with high favour, and emphasizes its importance as being, or pointing to, a possible Egyptian source of Diodorus, I, 79, 1. See further: M. SAN NICOLÒ, *D.L.Z.*, 1930, 184-7; P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, I (1930), 536.

At the last moment *Zur Gesch. der Prozesseinleitung im ptol. Recht*, a Munich dissertation by E. BERNEKER, Ansbach, 1930, 112 pp., comes to hand.

A detail of Ptolemaic procedure is dealt with by M. SAN NICOLÒ, *B.Z.*, xxx (1929-30) (*Festgabe Heisenberg*), 158-62: "Ἐγγυος παραμονῆς. He rightly claims that P. Mich. 3106 of 287 (C. C. EDGAR, *Journal*, XIV (1928), 291 ff.) proves that ἐγγύη παρ. in P. Hal. I, 46 ff. means security for production of a person in court, not, as the editors proposed, security for satisfaction of judgement. The general effect of the πρόσταγμα of P. Mich. is that an ἔγγυος παρ., provided he does produce his man, though late, is to be freed from his bond. It decides this in a particular case: ἀφείσθω τῆς ὑπερημερίας (ll. 8-9), and as a general principle: ἀφείσθωσαν τῆς ἐγγύης καὶ μὴ ἐκκλειέσθωσαν τῆς ὑπερημερίας (ll. 11-13). To get rid of the obvious difficulty created by the variation of phrase, EDGAR proposed to insert between ll. 8 and 9, after ἀφείσθω: τῆς ἐγγύης καὶ μὴ ἐκκλειέσθω, and to translate μὴ ἐκκλ. τῆς π.: "shall not be debarred from exceeding the time." SAN NICOLÒ proposes a translation which has the merit of making the insertion between ll. 8 and 9 unnecessary: "shall not be precluded on account of having exceeded the term." U. WILCKEN, however, approves the insertion: *Archiv*, IX (1930), 235-6 (other points also). Philologists must decide whether the use of the genitive suggested by SAN NICOLÒ is too harsh. EDGAR's translation might, perhaps, be improved if we make ἡ ὑπερημερία mean "the days of grace," in reference to some established system of granting extension of time, which would help to explain the mysterious royal indulgence to ἔγγυοι παραμονῆς.

U. WILCKEN, *Archiv*, IX (1930), 232, comments on the very interesting P. Cair. Zen. III, 466 (*forum*, asylum).

Reviewing L. WENGER's *Praetor u. Formel* (Munich, 1928) in *Rev. hist. dr.*, IX (1930), 794-6, H. LÉVY-BRUHL gives a very lucid account of the positions reached by recent studies of the formulary procedure.

A. FLINIAUX, *La postulatio simplex: Contribution à l'histoire des modes de citation au bas-empire*, *Rev. hist. dr.*, IX (1930), 193-223, gives a historical study of the first step taken by plaintiff in a normal action, as it appears both in legislation (*Cod. Theod.*, post-Theod. Novels, *Corpus Iuris*) and in Romano-Egyptian practice under the later empire. This act is an *ex parte* (*simplex*, *μονοπέρης*) application (*postulatio*, *ἐντροχία*) by plaintiff to the court demanding, for reasons stated, citation of defendant. Service would appropriately be by an officer of court, but under the principate, and perhaps later, there is the possibility of participation in service by plaintiff, as is illustrated by the Egyptian system of παραγγελία. Anyhow, from 322 onwards (*Cod. Theod.* 2, 4, 2) *postulatio simplex*, which in writing would amount to a *libellus actionis*, followed by an interlocutory order for or refusal of service (*interlocutio iudicis*), was the normal first stage in an action, the parallel step in rescript procedure being *allegatio rescripti*. This initial step is a constant up to and including Justinian. Thus the author maintains that in the important series P. Oxy. XVI, 1876-81 (*Journal*, XIV (1928), 155), we must see nothing exceptional, but just the normal opening of Theodosian *litis demeratio*, i.e. *postulatio simplex* and *interlocutio*. Incidentally (pp. 207-10) he rejects the view of P. COLLINET and E. ANDT that the *post. in iudicio deposita* of *Cod. Theod.* 4, 14, 1, belongs to rescript procedure.

A. STEINWENTER, *Die Litiskontestation im Libellprozeesse*, *Z. Sav.*, I (1930), 184-211, enquires what the classical term *litis contestatio* means in early Byzantine procedure, especially to Justinian's compilers. In

the *Cod. Theod.* its primary and proper meaning (confusion is created by allied usages) is the moment at which *conflictus partium de principali negotio* (*Cod. Theod.* 4, 14, 1) is reached: cf. P. Lips. 38 of 390 (pp. 190-1). What is ἡ τοῦ δικαστηρίου προκάρσις of P. Oxy. 67 (338; cf. P. Lips. 33 of 368)? It must be the *lis coepta*, etc., *litis exordium*, etc. of *Cod. Theod.*, and STEINWENTER holds that these phrases cover the whole initial oral proceedings, and are therefore wider than *lit. cont.*, which in *lit. denuntiatio* procedure occurs when the defendant has put in his defence orally. The same conception appears in the libellary procedure: *Cod. Theod.* 2, 4, 6; *Nov. Val.* 35, 13; P. Oxy. 1881; P. Princeton 55. *C. Gl. L.* II, p. 124², fixes *lit. cont.* or δίκη ἀρχθεΐσα as ἀντικατάστασις ἐν δικαστηρίῳ, i.e. as the joinder of issue in court, therefore orally. Justinian (*Cod.* 3, 1, 14, 4) merely sharpens the somewhat misty Theodosian conception: *lit. cont.* is *narratio* plus *responsio*, and the moment was doubtless registered by some act of court. It is hard to see why the moment of the oral declarations was preferred to that of the delivery of the contradictory *libelli*. STEINWENTER suggests the influence of rhetoric as the explanation, and observes that we are wrong to think of the libellary procedure as mainly in writing. S. RICCOBONO, against M. WLISSAK, maintains that this conception of *lit. cont.* is derived from the classical *cognitio extra ordinem*, but STEINWENTER, citing P. Mich. 1320, considers the connexion not proved. What the article perhaps does not bring out sufficiently is that a joinder of issue is a natural necessity of all formal debate, especially legal, and that if the conception of *lit. cont.* had not existed, it would have had to be invented. From the functional point of view, at least, the connexion between classical and Byzantine *lit. cont.* is plain.

G. Public law.

K. WILHELMSON, *Zum röm. Fiskalkauf in Aegypten*, Tartu, 1930, 20 pp. (*Acta et Commentt. Univ. Tartuensis (Dorpatensis)*, B. XVIII, 5), draws attention to a peculiarity of sales and leases by the fisc: they were revocable on a better offer being made. This suggests a possible origin of the system of *in diem addictio* in private sales, and explains *Cod.* II, 32, 1 and II, 71, 2. See also § 5.

There have been a number of reviews of *Die Augustus-Inschrift auf dem Marktplatz von Kyrene* by J. STROUX and L. WENGER (*Journal*, XVI (1930), 137): J. G. C. ANDERSON, *J.R.S.*, XIX (1929), 219-24, a very close study, appreciative, but with dissents; V. ARANGIO-RUIZ, *Riv. di fil.*, VIII (1930), 220-30, noting a general approximation of views between the leading commentators, and citing a study of the *repetundae* procedure by G. LA PIRA, *St. ital. di fil. cl.*, VII (1929), 59 ff. (not seen); W. Graf UXKULL-GYLLENBAND, *Gnomon*, VI (1930), 121-32, a comprehensive and rather critical review, embracing also A. VON PREMERSTEIN'S and V. ARANGIO-RUIZ'S articles.

La répression de la magie et le culte des gentils au iv^e siècle, *Rev. hist. dr.*, IX (1930), 669-701, by F. MARTROYE, argues that Constantine and his earlier successors did not persecute the ancient Roman religion, but that the laws which have been taken in this sense were really directed against magical divination. No papyrological material is used. Cf. *Journal*, XIV (1928), 155, i.f.

7. PALAEOGRAPHY AND DIPLOMATIC.

K. OHLY'S *Stichometrische Untersuchungen* is reviewed in some detail by TH. BIRT (*Phil. Woch.*, I (1930), 297-317). The reviewer, though appreciative, disagrees with some of OHLY'S conclusions.

E. BICKERMANN'S *Beiträge zur antiken Urkundengeschichte* (III. "Ἐπιτεξις und Ὑπόμνημα, *Archiv*, IX, 155-82) discusses the formulae of these documents.

JOUGUET publishes a letter concerning the registration of *libelli*; see § 3, *Roman*.

E. GERSTINGER in *Ein neuer Beitrag zur Geschichte der griechischen amtlichen Kanzleischrift* (*Wiener Studien*, XLVII (1930), 168-72) publishes P. Vindob. 24473, an official letter of the second century from Soenopaei Nesus, with a photograph and a discussion of Chancery Hand. This is a useful addition to the material for the study of this type of hand. The date is probably about the time of Hadrian. (See *Journal*, XVI, 127.)

TH. BIRT, *Zur Tachygraphie der Griechen* (*Rhein. Mus.*, LXXIX (1930), 1-6), discusses the origin of Greek shorthand. He suggests that its antiquity goes back at least to the time of Plato and that it was the chosen medium of the Sibyls.

H. J. VOGEL'S *Codicum Novi Testamenti Specimina* (Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1929) gives photographs of two papyri, P. Mich. 1571 and P. Lond. 1532.

8. LEXICOGRAPHY AND GRAMMAR.

V. MARTIN argues convincingly in *Archiv*, IX, 218-21, that *παπυλίον* in *Sammelbuch* 1 (= *P. Gen. ined.* 255), 7247. 26, 7248. 3 and the Edict of Diocletian is the Latin *papilio* in its later sense of "tent" (whence French *pavillon*), and adds this to the other reasons for assigning *Sammelbuch* 1 to the third century. FR. ZUCKER's article, *Über Sprache und Stil frühbyzantinischer Urkunden*, in *B.Z.*, XXX (1930), 146-55, is a discussion, with ample illustrative quotations, of the style of some late papyri. S. KAUTSCHISCHWILI says in *Phil. Woch.*, L (1930), 1166-8, that the Georgian version of *ἐπιούσιος ἄρτος* means "Brot für den morgigen (oder: von dem morgigen) Tag."

Four works are not yet accessible to me: A. FRIDRICHSEN, ΑΡΤΟΣ ΕΠΙΟΥΣΙΟΣ; *Eine Nachlese*, in *Symbolae Osloenses*, IX (1930), 62-8.—H. GLITSCH, *De Ptolemaei et Apollonii, Glauciae filiorum, quaestiones linguisticae*. Weidae Thuringorum, 1929 (mentioned in *Aegyptus*, x, 352, no. 7730, where the title is given in this impossible form).—O. HORNICKEI, *Ehren- und Rangprädikate in den Papyrusurkunden: Ein Beitrag zum römischen und byzantinischen Titelwesen*. Dr.-Diss. Giessen. Giessen, 1930. Pp. x+41.—A. STEIN, ΕΠΙΣΚΕΨΙΣ, in *Charisteria (Alois Rzach zum achtzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht)*, Reichenberg, 1930, 176-80.

During this year Part v of the new edition of LIDDELL and SCOTT appeared (*θησαυροποιέω—κῶψ*, pp. 801-1020, Oxford, 1930).

The following reviews of works already mentioned in these bibliographies have appeared: F. PREISIGKE, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden*, reviewed by W. SCHUBART in *O.L.Z.*, 1931, 17-18 (not yet accessible to me), and by F. BILABEL in *Phil. Woch.*, L (1930), 1389-93; MOULTON and MILLIGAN, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, VIII, reviewed by P.-L. CORREHOUD in *Rev. hist. rel.*, XXVIII (1930), 136-8 (inaccessible); L. WENGER, *Aus Novellenindex und Papyruswörterbuch*, reviewed by A. GRUPE in *Phil. Woch.*, L (1930), 46-8; B. LAUM, *Das Alexandrinische Akzentuationssystem*, reviewed by E. HERMANN in *Phil. Woch.*, L (1930), 228-33; F. M. ABEL, *Grammaire du grec biblique suivi d'un choix de papyrus*, reviewed by A. DEBRUNNER in *B.Z.*, XXIX (1930), 346-7, and by E. DRERUP in *Oriens Christianus*, 3. S., III/IV (inaccessible); LIDDELL and SCOTT, new edition, Parts III and IV, reviewed by PAUL SHOREY in *Cl. Phil.*, XXV (1930), 82-3.

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

The English version of DEISSMANN's *Light from the Ancient East* is reviewed by C. J. KRAEMER in *Cl. Weekly*, XXIII (1930), 140-2.

J. (=G. V.) MANTEUFFEL publishes an article in Polish on the science of papyrology and its results: *Papyrologja jako nauka pomocnicza historii*, in *Przeglądu Historycznego*, VIII (1929), 70-90. A Polish article on the social relations of the inhabitants of Kerkeosiris by J. R. LUKEŠ I know only from the Bibliography in *Aegyptus*, x, 360, no. 7862: *Sociální poměry obyvatelstva v Kerkeosiris*, in *Sborník filol. fak. Univer. Komenského*, IV, Bratislava (1926) (rev. *Listy Fil.*, LIV (1927), 282-7, by G. HEJZLAR). The same remark applies to two other general articles on the papyri and the light thrown by them on life in Egypt: A. DIRKING, *Griechischen (sic) Leben in den Papyri*, Paderbo[r]n, 1929 (*Aegyptus*, x, 360, no. 7861); and A. B. HAWES, *Light reading from the papyri*, in *Cl. Journ.*, XXV (1930), 535-44 (*Aegyptus*, x, 336, no. 7457).

M. HOMBERT continues his *Bulletin papyrologique* (IV, 1929) in *Byzantion*, v (1929-30), 655-70. In the *Bibliographische Beilage* of *Gnomon* in 1930 references to papyrology and allied subjects are to be found as follows: 2, p. 15; 3, p. 24; 4, p. 29; 5, p. 37; 6, pp. 44-5. P. M. MEYER continues his *Juristischer Papyrusbericht* (VI, Oct. 1927-Oct. 1929) in *Z. Sav.*, L (1930), 503-30. For other bibliographies see *B.Z.*, XXIX (1930), 391-3 (*Papyruskunde*), and *Byz.-neugriech. Jahrb.*, VII (1930), 248-57 (*Paläographie, Papyrus, Handschriften und Bücherkunde*).

H. HENNE publishes some additions and corrections to *Papyrus Graux N^{os} 3 à 8 et papyrus du Caire N^o 49427* in *Bull. Inst. fr. Arch. Or.*, XXVIII (1929), 11-14. M. SAN NICOLÒ in his ΕΓΓΥΟΣ ΠΑΡΑΜΟΝΗΣ in *B.Z.*, XXX, 158-62 (see also § 6), deals with P. Hal. 1, *δίκη ψευδομαρτυρίου*, and P. Mich. Inv. No. 3106, edited by EDGAR in *Journal*, XIV, 291 ff.

10. MISCELLANEOUS AND PERSONAL.

Reference must be made to the recently founded *Société royale égyptienne de papyrologie*, a body which promises to play a most useful part and to which I take this opportunity of extending a cordial welcome. An account of it is given by GEORGES MEYER in *Le Temps*, 8 June, 1930; see, too, *Rev. belge*, IX (1930), 697, and *Aegyptus*, XI (1931), 102.

The "Semaine égyptologique et papyrologique" at Brussels, 14-20 Sept. 1930, which the present writer was unfortunately unable to attend, was a great success and did much useful work. Accounts of it are given in *Chron. d'Ég.*, vi (1931), 148-54 (an announcement in advance, *Rev. belge*, ix (1930), 698-9), in *Aegyptus*, xi (1931), 97-101, and in *Rev. belge*, ix (1930), 1095-1100. Two communications made to the Congress by A. CALDERINI are published in *Aegyptus*, xi (1931), viz. *L'opera della scuola di papirologia di Milano*, pp. 3-9, and *Intorno al "Dizionario dei nomi geografici e topografici dell'Egitto Greco-Romano"*, pp. 10-12.

M. HOMBERT gives an account of the small papyrus collection of the Fondation Reine Élisabeth (*Les papyrus de la Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth*) in *Chron. d'Ég.*, v, 269-71. The Greek papyri seem to be for the most part very fragmentary.

F. BILABEL, in a review of the *Wörterbuch* (*Phil. Woch.*, l (1930), 1390), mentions that GRADENWITZ'S *Conträrindex* is in the press under his supervision, and that he is himself preparing an historical prosopography of Hellenistic-Roman-Byzantine Egypt.

A. C[ALDERINI] gives an account of the Italian excavations at Tebtunis. The plan of the town, which was partly native Egyptian of the usual type, partly Greek, on a regular plan (two quarters), was laid bare. Some papyri were found, forming a family archive. These are to be edited by VITELLI: *Scavi della Missione Archeologica Italiana a Tebtunis (Fayyum)* in *Aegyptus*, x (1929), 295-6. P. KOSCHAKER describes the excavations at Dura: *Ausgrabungen in Dura-Europos*, in *O.L.Z.*, xxxiii (1930), 162-71. It appears from a note in *C.-R. Ac. Inscr. et B.-L.*, 1929, 47 that papyri have been found at Dura. This opens up new and exciting possibilities.

H. I. BELL calls attention to the rediscovery of some of the missing Petrie Papyri in *Archiv*, ix, 227, and *Aegyptus*, x (1929), 302.

A very serious loss to almost every branch of Egyptian studies, and not least to those concerned with the Graeco-Roman period, is the unexpected death of WILHELM SPIEGELBERG, which occurred last December. His immense energy and many-sided versatility were combined with a rare philological acumen; and the problems upon which he threw new light are many. The removal of such a worker from the already small band of Demotic scholars is an irreparable blow. There is a short notice of him by W. SCHUBART in *Forsch. u. Fortschr.*, vii (1931), 46.

Another great scholar whose loss must be recorded here is AUGUST HEISENBERG (died 22 Nov. 1930). His work was done mainly in the sphere of general Byzantine studies, but he collaborated with L. WENGER in the important volume of Byzantine papyri at Munich, and he was always awake to the importance of papyrology. A notice of him by FR. DÖLGER appears in *Forsch. u. Fortschr.*, vii (1931), 14-15.

A bibliography of LUMBROSO'S works is given by V. SCIALOJA in *Commemorazione del socio Giacomo Lombroso*, Acc. Naz. dei Lincei, pp. 38.

A *propos* of O. GRADENWITZ'S seventieth birthday, E. KIESSLING publishes a biographical note: *Otto Gradenwitz zum 70. Geburtstage*, in *Forsch. u. Fortschr.*, vi (1930), 191.

