



BIBLIOGRAPHY: GRAECO-ROMAN EGYPT

A. PAPYRI (1931-1932)

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, Excavations, Personal. H. I. BELL.

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

The following abbreviations have been used in quoting periodicals:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <i>A.J.A.</i> = <i>American Journal of Archaeology.</i> | <i>Cl. Quart.</i> = <i>Classical Quarterly.</i> |
| <i>Am. Hist. Rev.</i> = <i>American Historical Review.</i> | <i>Cl. Rev.</i> = <i>Classical Review.</i> |
| <i>Am. Journ. Phil.</i> = <i>American Journal of Philology.</i> | <i>Cl. Weekly</i> = <i>Classical Weekly.</i> |
| <i>Anc. Egypt</i> = <i>Ancient Egypt.</i> | <i>C.-R. Ac. Inscr. et B.-L.</i> = <i>Comptes-Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.</i> |
| <i>Ann. Serv.</i> = <i>Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte.</i> | <i>D. Lit.-Z.</i> = <i>Deutsche Literaturzeitung.</i> |
| <i>Arch. f. Rel.</i> = <i>Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.</i> | <i>G.G.A.</i> = <i>Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen.</i> |
| <i>Arch. Giurid.</i> = <i>Archivio giuridico.</i> | <i>Griffith Studies</i> = <i>Studies presented to F. Ll. Griffith, Egypt Exploration Society, 1932.</i> |
| <i>Archiv</i> = <i>Archiv für Papyrusforschung.</i> | <i>Hist. Z.</i> = <i>Historische Zeitschrift.</i> |
| <i>Arch. R. u. W.</i> = <i>Archiv für Rechts- und Wirtschaftsphilosophie.</i> | <i>Jahrb. f. Lit.</i> = <i>Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft.</i> |
| <i>Ä.Z.</i> = <i>Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde.</i> | <i>J.H.S.</i> = <i>Journal of Hellenic Studies.</i> |
| <i>B.C.H.</i> = <i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique.</i> | <i>Journal</i> = <i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology.</i> |
| <i>Boll. fil. class.</i> = <i>Bollettino di filologia classica.</i> | <i>Journ. Sav.</i> = <i>Journal des Savants.</i> |
| <i>Bull. bibl. et péd.</i> = <i>Bulletin bibliographique et pédagogique du Musée Belge.</i> | <i>J.R.S.</i> = <i>Journal of Roman Studies.</i> |
| <i>Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.</i> = <i>Bulletino del Istituto di diritto romano.</i> | <i>K.V.G.R.</i> = <i>Kritische Vierteljahresschrift für Gesetzgebung und Rechtswissenschaft.</i> |
| <i>Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.</i> = <i>Bulletin de la Société Royale d'Archéologie d'Alexandrie.</i> | <i>L.Q.R.</i> = <i>Law Quarterly Review.</i> |
| <i>Bursian</i> = <i>Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft.</i> | <i>N.G.G.</i> = <i>Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen.</i> |
| <i>B.Z.</i> = <i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift.</i> | <i>O.L.Z.</i> = <i>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.</i> |
| <i>Chron. d'Ég.</i> = <i>Chronique d'Égypte.</i> | <i>Phil. Woch.</i> = <i>Philologische Wochenschrift.</i> |
| <i>Cl. Phil.</i> = <i>Classical Philology.</i> | <i>Rech. sc. relig.</i> = <i>Recherches de science religieuse.</i> |
| | <i>Rev. arch.</i> = <i>Revue archéologique.</i> |
| | <i>Rev. belge</i> = <i>Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire.</i> |
| | <i>Rev. de phil.</i> = <i>Revue de philologie.</i> |

Bibliothèque Maison de l'Orient



073050

- Rev. d'hist. eccl.* = *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique.*
Rev. ét. anc. = *Revue des études anciennes.*
Rev. ét. gr. = *Revue des études grecques.*
Rev. hist. dr. = *Revue historique de droit français et étranger.*
Rev. hist. rel. = *Revue de l'histoire des religions.*
Rhein. Mus. = *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.*
Riv. di fil. = *Rivista di filologia classica.*
Riv. Stor. Dir. Ital. = *Rivista di storia del diritto italiano.*
Sitzungsb. . . . = *Sitzungsberichte* . . .
- Symb. Oslo.* = *Symbolae Osloenses.*
Theol. Lit.-Z. = *Theologische Literaturzeitung.*
Z. f. Kirchengesch. = *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte.*
Z. f. Numism. = *Zeitschrift für Numismatik.*
Z. f. vergleich. Rechtsw. = *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft.*
Z. neut. Wiss. = *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.*
Z. Sav. = *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung (Romanistische Abteilung).*

I. LITERARY TEXTS.

General. First of all we must greet the new series of Rainer Papyri, *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien*, under the editorship of HANS GERSTINGER. The first issue promises well, and includes: Stereometry, Homer, epic and bucolic frs., Aeolic scrap, History of the Diadochi, Demosthenes, Lysias, Isaeus, Encomia, philosophy, mythology, schoolboy essay on preliminaries to the Trojan war, grammar, metrics, notes on later dithyrambs, scholia to Pindar's *Pythian* i. 87, tragic commentary, and commentary to *De Fals. Leg.* Reviewed by POWELL in *Cl. Rev.*, XLVI (1932), 262-3.

P.S.I. x, fasc. 2 (see § 3 below), consists of literary texts, nos. 1163-81, viz.: Job, Jonah, Acts of Apostles (xxiii. 11-29, Western Text, in hand similar to Brit. Mus. Dio Chrysostom), Apocalypse, *Iliad*, Herodotus, Aristophanes (*Nubes*, 577-635), *Argonautica* (i. 1195-1221, 1 cent.), Scholia to *Odyssey*, [Corinna (*Orestas*)], Old Comedy, New Comedy, Romance (Antonius Diogenes?), Manuals of augury, Medical Receipts from Tebtunis, Odes (Bacchylides?). Nos. in square brackets already published. The richness of Oxyrhynchus as a literary site is again upheld.

A new publication, *Études de Papyrologie*, was launched in 1932 by the Soc. Royale Égyptienne de Papyrologie, forming a complement to the "Textes et Documents" of the same Society.

In *Bursian*, 236 (1932), 115-226, A. DEBRUNNER writes a "Bericht über die Literatur zum nachklass. Griechisch, 1904-29". KÖRTE continues his report on Literary Texts in *Archiv*, x, 217-37. In *Études de Papyrologie*, I (1932), 11-18, W. G. WADDELL publishes "Some Literary Papyri from Oxyrhynchus" in the Cairo collection, viz.: frs. of *Iliad*, xvii, xxiii, xxiv; *Odyssey*, xiii; Callimachus, *H. to Artemis*, 46-84 with scholia; Thucydides, I; Euripides, *Orestes*, 754-64; three texts for school use. P. COLLOMP in *Chron. d'Ég.*, VII (1932), 237-42, writes on *La Critique Textuelle et la Papyrologie*. *Ibid.*, 243-55, G. VON MANTEUFFEL discusses *Die Papyri als Zeugen Griech. Kleinliteratur*. POWELL has edited a *Third Series of New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature*, 1933, with chapters by various authors on Earlier Lyric and Elegiac, Tragedy, Comedy, Later Elegy, etc., Romance, and Appendix.

Epic and Elegiac. In *Cl. Phil.*, xxvii (1932), 151-5, BARBARA P. MCCARTHY writes on *Line Omissions in Homeric Papyri since 1925, i.e. since Bolling's External Evidence*.

P. COLLART discusses the papyri of the *Iliad* in *Rev. de Phil.*, 3 sér., VI (1932), 315-49, VII (1933), 33-61.

A. SEVERYNS writes on P. Ryl. 22 and the Little *Iliad* in *Serta Leodiensia*, 1930, 305-26.

WESSELY is represented in *Griffith Studies* by an article *De Callimacho Bibliothecario*, 38-41.

In the *Festschrift Richard Reitzenstein*, 1931, 23-69, E. REITZENSTEIN discusses passages from the *Aitia*.

R. PFEIFFER writes on *Berenikes Plokamos* in *Philologus*, LXXXVII (1932), 179-228. Rev. by G. COPPOLA in *Boll. di Fil. Class.*, N.S., II (1932), 272-5.

MILNE in *Cl. Rev.*, XLVI (1932), 250, regards *λευκάς ἡμέρας* in the *Iambi* scholia (P.S.I. 1094), l. 39, as certainly a lemma. Incidentally, is not *ἐν τῷ Ἀχέροντι* in l. 38 simply a gloss on the unusual [*μέσον Ἀχέροντος*?

R. KEYDELL in *Hermes*, LXVII (1932), 240-1, finds remains also of a *Gigantias* in the Brit. Mus. *Bassarica*.

A. WIFSTRAND edits two *Argonautica* fragments from Berlin in *Eranos*, xxx (1932), 1-6. The second consists of scholia to iii, 1075-1127, and contains interesting readings.

Tyrtaeus forms the subject of an article by F. SCHACHERMEYR in *Rh. Mus.*, LXXXI (1932), 129-42.

W. JAEGER also writes on Tyrtaeus in *Sitzungsb. Berl. Ak.*, 1932, 537-68.

T. W. ALLEN *inter alia* discusses Hesiod, fr. 96 (P. Berol. 10560) in *Cl. Quart.*, 1932, 82-7.

In *Chron. d'Ég.*, VII (1932), 256-7, G. MÉAUTIS writes on *Une réminiscence Homérique dans un Pap. d'Oxyrhynchus, i.e. P. Oxy. 1794*. Thinks the author a disciple of Callimachus.

§ 1. LITERARY TEXTS

69

SCHUBART republishes as *Posidippus Redivivus* an elegiac poem from a waxed tablet in Berlin, in *Symbolae O. A. Danielsson dicatae*, 1932, 290-8.

In *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, VIII (1932), 53-62 W. PREEK restores *Griechische Epigramme aus Aegypten*, with 6 plates.

P. MAAS in *Zeitschr. f. vergleich. Sprachforschung*, 60, 286, interprets προμήθεσαι in P. Brit. Mus. Lit. 54 as aorist imperative of προμήθεσσαι.

Lyric. B. SNELL identifies P. Oxy. 426 as a Paean of Bacchylides in *Hermes*, LXVII (1932), 1-13. MAAS, *ibid.*, 469-71, discusses the metrical aspects.

B. LAVAGNINI restores *Sappho* ε, 5 (Lobel) in *Riv. Indo-Greco-Italica*, XVI (1932), 1-5. In l. 19 υμωνεμος = υμοι ανεμος is nearer the traces than L.'s 'Υμήναος. L. has also published a *Nuova Antologia dei frammenti della lirica greca*, Turin, 1932.

A new scrap of *Corinna* is published by G. COPPOLA in his *Introduzione a Pindaro*, 1931, 231-42. The end of one poem and the first lines with title (*Orestas*) of a second are preserved. The new *Bacchylides* (?), P.S.I. 1181, consists of two fragmentary odes, the second entitled *Leucippides*. These were the wives of the Dioscuri, whose legend (or something similar) is obviously referred to in ll. 27-9 of the first ode. In ll. 13-14 read: Δι μὲν ἄκα[ιρον] λιπαρῶ | κичέταν λι[μένας], and in l. 17 εὐανθέο[ς] εἰ[ῆρο] [ς ἀνα]θέσας. The end of the poem, ll. 21-37, can be restored with practical certainty. In l. 36 read Πρι[αμίδ]ε[ς]?, and in l. 20 εὐήρατ[ον θυ]σία[ν δ]όμων?

K. LATTE in *Philologus*, LXXXVII (1932), 271-2, interprets Bacchylides xvi. 112.

In *Phil. Woch.*, 52 (1932), 87-102, K. MÜNSCHER writes on the new Hymns from Epidaurus.

Drama, etc. Three new fragments of Aeschylus have been found by the Italians at Oxyrhynchus; two, from the *Niobe* and the *Dictyoulkoi*, are published by NORSI and VITELLI in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, 28, 107-21.

G. VON MANTEUFFEL writes on *Drobne Gatunki Mimiczne w Świeltie Papyrusów* in the *Acts of the Second Congress of Slav Classical Philologists*, Prague, 1931.

I learn from *Cl. Rev.*, XLVI (1932), 145, of two studies of Menander by TSERETELI.

In *Neophilologus*, XVII (1932), 144-52, W. E. J. KNIPER makes a study of *De Verfoeide van Menander* (*Μισούμενος*).

KÖRTE in *Hermes*, LXVII (1932), 367-8, restores l. 397 of the *Περικειρομένη*, and assigns an iambic verse in *Vol. Hercul.*, XI, 160, 9, to the *Diktys* of Euripides.

Q. CATAUDELLA in *Riv. di fil.*, IX (1931), 509-11, makes restorations in the choliambics of P. Heidel. 310.

History. G. DE SANCTIS writes on the Oxyrhynchus *Hellenica* in *Atti della Reale Accad. d. Scienze di Torino*, LXVI (1931), 157-94, and A. MOMIGLIANO, *ibid.*, 29-49, argues for Androtion as the author.

A. v. PREMERSTEIN writes on *Das Datum des Prozesses des Isidoros in den sogenannten heidnischen Märtyrerakten*, in *Hermes*, LXVII (1932), 174-96. He also reviews UXKULL-GYLLENBAND's "New fragment", in *Gnomon*, VIII (1932), 201-6.

Oratory. The new *Favorinus* is treated at length by A. WIFSTRAND in *Eikola*, II (1932), 1-16. Also by G. M. LATTANZI, *Il proemio del περί φύγης*, in *Riv. di fil.*, X (1932), 499-500.

There is a long review of F. by K. PRAECHTER in *Gnomon*, VIII (1932), 561-72.

P. COLLART also writes on *Favorinus* in *Bull. Ass. Guillaume Budé*, XXXIV (1932), 23-31; B. LAVAGNINI in *Riv. Indo-Greco-Italica*, XVI (1932), 122-4.

I learn from *Cl. Rev.*, p. 145, that TSERETELI has published a papyrus of Isocrates, *Ad Demonicum*.

F. SOLMSEN in *Hermes*, LXVII (1932), 141-3, essays *Rekonstruktionen zur antiken Rhetorik und Poetik*.

Philosophy. K. v. FRITZ reviews in detail VOGLIANO's *Epicuri et Epicureorum Scripta*, in *Gnomon*, VIII (1932), 65-84.

VOGLIANO in *Festschrift zu F. Polands 75. Geburtstag* (nos. 35-8 of *Phil. Woch.*), 111-14, discusses col. 13 of P. Hercul. 1005 under the title *Vox Philodemi*.

W. G. WADDELL writes *On the Oxy. Papyrus of Philo* in *Études de Papyrologie*, I (1932), 1-6, and identifies the unplaced fragments.

In *Sitzungsb. Berl. Ak.*, 1932, 23-84, HANS LEWY writes on *Neue Philontexte in der Überarbeitung des Ambrosius* with an appendix of new Greek frs.

In *Phil. Woch.*, 1932, 1458-61, R. PHILIPPSON replies to criticisms of K. v. FRITZ on Book 28 of Epicurus, περί φύσεως.

E. ORTH in *Phil. Woch.*, 1932, 1315-17, proposes restorations in Philodemus.

R. CANTARELLA in *Riv. di fil.*, X (1932), 359-68, writes on *La Officina dei Papiri Ercolanesi dal 1923 al 1931*, with list of relative publications.

Romance. F. ZIMMERMANN in *Hermes*, LXVII (1932), 91-116, restores two columns of the *Ninos* romance.

In *Festschrift für G. Leidinger*, 1930, 102-8, A. HARTMANN publishes from a Munich papyrus of the fourth century a drawing representing a dramatic scene. Cf. § 3.

2. RELIGION, MAGIC, ASTROLOGY.

(Including Texts.)

General. The new volume of *Papiri greci e latini* (*P.S.I.* x, 1932) includes 1147, a census record of priests of the temple of Seknebtynis at Tebtunis (A.D. 202/3); 1161, a fourth-century Christian letter; 1162 (" ? 3rd cent. A.D.") a very curious oath to preserve τὰ μετὰ- (rather παρα-) δ'εδομένα μοι μυστήρια, and mentioning a πατήρ and a ἱεροκῆρυξ, clearly the oath of a cult society of an esoteric kind, not unlike the sort of society which might have arisen in connexion with Hermetic literature (the opening formula has the Jewish tinge which we find in *C.H.I.*). [For some Biblical texts, see § 1 above.—*Ed.*]

P. JOUGUET, *Inscription de Deir-Chelouit* (*Griffith Studies*, 241-4, pl. 24a), is a re-edition of *S.B.* 4023, a graffito by a *stolistes* with a notable use of εἰς αἰῶνα after the Imperial names which date it 15 June 200.

G. KLAFENBACH, *Eine Weihung an Isis* (*Archiv*, x (1932), 215-16), gives a curious text from Antinoopolis. The phrase Ἄγαθός Δαίμων κ[αὶ Ἄ]γαθή Τύχη δέξιο [. . .] τὴν κυρίαν Ἴσιν is thought by K. to indicate that these deities, perhaps represented on the relief, were regarded as interceding with Isis for the dedicant. But it is just possible, if unlikely, that Ἄ.Δ. and Ἄ.Τ. are both personal names.

FR. W. VON BISSING, *Eine "pantheistische" Bronze in der ägyptischen Sammlung zu Florenz* (*Aegyptus*, XII (1932), 339-45), publishes a puzzling Ptolemaic representation of a human-headed bird, with long tail, its feet on two small rams, a uraeus crown, etc.

J. G. MILNE, *Arsinoe and Ammon* (*Griffith Studies*, 13-15), makes the interesting suggestion that the doctrine that Alexander was son of Ammon was developed into a popular romance by Lysimachus and brought to Egypt by his widow Arsinoe.

HERBERT THOMPSON, *Eponymous Priests under the Ptolemies* (*Griffith Studies*, 16-37), is an invaluable supplement to Plaumann's article *Hiereis* in *Pauly-Wissowa*.

O. MONTEVECCHI, *Γραφαὶ ἱερέων* (*Aegyptus*, XII (1932), 317-28), deals with the personal lists annually presented to the civil authority by temples.

CH. PICARD, *Les influences étrangères au tombeau de Pétosiris: Grèce ou Perse?* (*Mélanges V. Loret; Bull. Inst. fr. arch. orient.*, xxx (1930), 201-27), confirms excellently the hypothesis of Greek influence in the relief decorating of this tomb, as against the hypothesis of Persian influence, and shows new points of contact with Hellenistic art.

L. GERNET-A. BOULANGER, *Le Génie grec dans la Religion* (Bibliothèque de synthèse historique, 11; La renaissance du livre. Paris. 1932. Pp. xlii+528. 40fr.), includes by the second of its two authors, pp. 393-517, an excellent survey of the religious history of the Hellenistic period. The warning, p. 461, against belief in the supposed Mithraeum at Eleusis will be noted.

Fritz SAXL, *Mithras, Typologische Untersuchungen* (Verlag Heinrich Keller, Berlin. 1931. Pp. xi+125 with 43 plates), is as useful and important a book as it is beautiful. It is a very serious contribution to the study of the interplay of Greek and Eastern factors as well as to art-history. The fresco from Pniferos, which is so instructive a parallel to that from Karanis, is discussed p. 21 and figured Abb. 62.

H. MATINGLY, *A Mithraic tessera from Verulam* (*Num. Chron.*, 5th ser., XII (1932), 54-7), publishes a queer disk showing the birth of Mithras from a rock (produced by altering the Tarpeia type on a denarius of Augustus), and on the other side ΜΙΘΡΑΣ ΩΡΟΜΑΣΣΑΗΣ read in a circle with ΦΡΗΝ across the circle, which indicates a curious blending of Egyptian and Persian elements.

HANS HERTER, *De Priapo* (*Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten*, xxiii (1932). Pp. 334 with 3 plates. Töpelmann, Giessen), is another admirable study, giving as it does a complete collection of the material literary and monumental, and throwing light on the general processes of Hellenistic development.

Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament in Verbindung mit . . . herausgegeben von GERHARD KITTEL (Kohlhammer, Stuttgart. 1932. 7 parts published at RM 2.90 each, 64 pp. each) is an outstanding enterprise. Intended to take the place of Cremer, it is the product of intimate collaboration by a staff of specialists, and gives a unique series of monographs on words of interest for religious history; it is already indispensable to all workers in this field. In this connexion I may mention E. VON DOBSCHÜTZ, *Zur Lexikographie des Neuen Testaments und seiner Umwelt* (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, civ (1932), 238-54), which surveys recent work and

remarks, p. 240, on the notable phenomenon of the development of specific Jewish terminology between the LXX and the N.T.

J. BIDEZ, *La cité du monde et la cité du soleil* (*Bull. acad. roy. Belg.*, 5th ser. 18 (1932), nos. 7-9, pp. 244-94; also issued separately by Les Belles Lettres, Paris), is an eloquent and illuminating study of the interpretation of Greek and Eastern idea in Stoicism. B. has also produced Vol. 1, pt. 1 of his Budé edition of Julian, including the political speeches; this fulfils a long-felt need.

FR. CUMONT, *Tête de marbre figurant la Lybie* (*Mon. Piot*, xxxii (1932), 1-10 with 1 pl. and 3 figs.), incidentally explains a torso from Cyrene as Isis or an Isis priestess and remarks on a gem signed by Lycomedes as showing a princess reigning at Cyrene with the attributes of Isis. In his *L'adoration des mages et l'art triomphal de Rome* (*Mem. pont. Accad. Rom. di Arch.*, Ser. III, 3 (1932), 81-109 with 9 pls.), he proves conclusively that a group of reliefs wrongly connected with Magi comes from a triumphal arch set up to celebrate a victory over the Parthians and decorated in a traditional style, shows the effect of this tradition on later Christian representations of the adoration of Christ by the Magi, and gives a new and illuminating discussion of the custom of veiling the hands which we know in monuments illustrating Egyptian worships as practised in the Graeco-Roman world at large (not in ancient Egypt).

H. J. ROSE, *Mithra-Phaëthon chez Nonnus* (*Rev. hist. rel.*, cv (1932), 88-101), and CUMONT's postscript, *ibid.*, 102-3, are supplementary to the paper by C. on *La fin du monde* noticed in *Journal*, xviii (1932), 81.

W. W. TARN, *Alexander Helios and the Golden Age* (*J.R.S.* xxii (1932), 135-60), argues that *Orac. Sib.*, III, 350 ff. is a prophecy relating to what was expected of Cleopatra, and notes, 139 ff., parallels with the Praises of Isis. He explains the fourth Eclogue, convincingly to my mind, as a prophecy connected with the son expected from Antony and Octavia.

G. MANTEUFFEL, *In Oraculum figuli observationes* (*Eos*, xxxiii (1930/1), 391-4), supplies parallels from the Old Testament.

B. OLSSON, *Zwei Papyrusstellen besprochen* (*Aegyptus*, xii (1932), 355 ff.), handles secondly an extra leaf of P. Holmiensis, a formula for seeing the Sungod.

L. R. TAYLOR, *The divinity of the Roman Emperor*, is reviewed by A. D. NOCK, *Gnomon*, viii (1932), 513-18; what is there said about Agathos Daimon should be supplemented by reference to the remarks of M. P. NILSSON, *Die Götter des Symposions* (*Symbolae philologicae O. A. Danielsson octogenario dicatae*, Uppsala 1932, 218-30) about Zeus Philios, whom he regards with reason as little more than a *konkretisierter Begriff*, taking shape in the time of the Peloponnesian war as an outgrowth of the rise of individualism, and about the toast of Agathos Daimon himself; also G. H. MACURDY, *The grammar of drinking healths* (*Am. Journ. Phil.*, lxi (1932), 168-71).

S. EITREM, *Zur Apotheose* (*Symb. Oslo.*, x (1932), 31-56; xi (1932), 11-34; to be cont.), is illuminating on the assumption of divine costume by rulers, etc., on the Gytheion inscription, on Caligula, and on "Die heilige Ehe".

K. SCOTT, *The significance of statues in precious metals in Emperor Worship* (*Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.*, lxxii (1931), 101-23), also bears on this topic.

G. A. S. SNIJDER, *Ein Priester der Magna Mater aus Smyrna* (*Oudheidkundige Mededeelingen uit's Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden; Nuntii ex museo antiquario Leidensi*, Nieuwe Reeks, xiii, i (1932), 1-13), deals with priestly crowns in general. His very interesting *Antique and mediaeval gems on bookcovers at Utrecht* (*Art Bulletin*, xiv (1932), 5-52) includes p. 36 remarks on Egyptian and other types of Bacchus.

O. WEINREICH's survey, *Volkskunde* (1925-31) (*Arch. f. Rel.*, xxix (1931), 44-84), should be consulted for parallels to the popular tales of the Empire, on which there are valuable observations in the brilliant paper of E. SCHWARTZ, *Unzeitgemässe Beobachtungen zu den Clementinen* (*Z. neut. Wiss.*, xxxii (1932), 151-99). On one folk-tale which comes into our period there are excellent observations by W. KROLL, *Das Märchen von Amor und Psyche* (*Pädagogisches Zentralblatt*, Heft 5 (1932), 253-6; valuable criticisms of Reitzenstein's views).

F. J. DÖLGER, *Drei Theta als Schatzsicherung u. ihre Deutung durch den Bischof Theophil von Alexandrien* (*Antike u. Christentum*, iii (1932), 189-91), treats the legend of the treasure in Alexander's tomb. In the same journal he discusses a head of an Isis priest with a cross on his forehead, and decides that it is a scar (ii (1930), 291-6).

H. KEES, *Die Himmelsreise im ägyptischen Totenglauben* (*Vorträge Bibliothek Warburg*, 1928/9, pub. 1930), 1-20, is of use to students of this period. The same volume includes R. REITZENSTEIN, *Heilige Handlung* (21-41), which sums up the *Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe* of the great scholar whom we all mourn.

In the previous volume (1927-8, pub. 1930) we may note J. KROLL, *Zur Geschichte des Spieles von Christi Höllenfahrt* (257-301).

A. D. NOCK, *Cremation and burial in the Roman Empire* (*Harv. Theol. Rev.*, xxv (1932), 321-59), argues that the change from cremation to burial which took place in Italy and the West in the second century A.D. was due not to religious changes but to the fact that the sarcophagus became fashionable and thus made burial customary. He further draws conclusions as to the character of the hellenization of Egyptian and other Eastern cults in the Graeco-Roman world.

O. LASSALLY, *Amulette u. Tätowierungen in Ägypten* (*Arch. f. Rel.*, xxix (1931), 130-8), may be mentioned although not bearing directly on these times.

A. STORCH-F. HEICHELHEIM, *Zum Traumglauben u. Traumverständnis in der Antike auf Grund urkundlicher Traumberichte aus der Ptolemäerzeit* (*Zentralbl. f. Psychotherapie u. ihre Grenzgebiete*, iv (1932), 559-60), is known to me from *Aeg.* xii (1932), 417, no. 87.

WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORF, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, I, is reviewed by FR. PFISTER, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, lvii (1932), 148-53; II by M. P. NILSSON, *D. Lit.-Z.*, 3 F., III (1932), 2065-74, which includes a reference to a stele inscribed "Ωρον found at Goritsa in Thessaly (*B.C.H.*, lv (1931), 487 ff.) near a building which may be a sanctuary.

Graeco-Jewish literature. H. LEWY, *Hekataios von Abdera περὶ Ἰουδαίων* (*Z. neut. Wiss.*, xxxii (1932), 116-32), gives a powerful defence of the authenticity of the excerpt in Joseph. *C. Ap.* 183.

R. MARCUS, *Divine names and attributes in Hellenistic Jewish literature* (*Proc. Amer. Acad. for Jewish Research*, 1931-2, 43-120), is a very valuable piece of lexicographical investigation.

J. S. BOUGHTON, *The idea of progress in Philo Judaeus* (New York, 1932. Distributed by the Jewish Publication Society of America; pp. 292. \$1.50), shows a close acquaintance with Philo and his modern interpreters, and emphasizes well the peculiarly Jewish element in his work and the definite point of view to which Philo adapts the concepts of popular philosophy. E. R. GOODENOUGH, *A Neopythagorean source in Philo Judaeus* (*Yale Classical Studies*, III (1932), 117-64), gives an excellent analysis of *quis rerum divinarum heres*, 130 ff.

BAUDISSIN, *Kyrios*, is reviewed by BERTHOLET, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, lvii (1932), 52-7; G. KUHLMANN, *Theologia naturalis bei Philon und bei Paulus* (*Neut.-Forsch.*, I, 7, 1930) by H. WINDISCH, *ibid.*, 9-12; R. TRAMONTANO, *La lettera di Aristea e Filocrate* by FÉVRIER, *Rev. ét. juives*, xcii (1932), 214-17.

Magic, etc. A. S. HUNT, *The Warren magical papyrus* (*Griffith Studies*, 233-40), is a text of the third century A.D. and has on the recto a fine amatory spell (with 20 ϕ τὸ πῦρ ἀσβεστον δι' αἰῶνος παράκειται cf. P. gr. mag. iv, 3069, ϕ τὸ ἀσβεστον πῦρ διὰ παντὸς αἰῶνος προσπαράκειται), and on the verso three horoscopes and a spell.

H. I. BELL-A. D. NOCK-HERBERT THOMPSON, *Magical texts from a bilingual papyrus in the British Museum* (Pp. 55 with facsimile. *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, xvii and separately, Oxf. Univ. Pr. 7s. 6d.), publish a document partly in Greek and partly in Demotic, probably from the Anastasi group, with translations and commentary. Reviews by H. J. ROSE, *Cl. Rev.*, xlvi (1932), 180; W. T. P., *J.H.S.* liii (1932), 166; FR. PFISTER, *D.L.Z.*, 1932, 1165-6; N. J. REICH, *Mizraim*, I (1933), 193-4.

K. PREISENDANZ, *Amuletum ineditum* (*Phil. Woch.*, 1932, nos. 35-38, 101-8, in a number described as *Festschrift für Franz Poland*, who has deserved so well of the journal) publishes a Berlin haematite probably meant to be heart-shaped inscr. with a spell and a drawing of an anchor. P. has published also *Mumien-amulett auf Papyrus* (*Études de papyrologie*, I (1932), 19-22) which is notable because ἀβλαβαναβα and ἀκραμμαχαμαρει have passed from being *nomina* to being gods. His *Papyri graecae magicae*, I, has been reviewed by K. FR. W. SCHMIDT, *G.G.A.*, cxci (1931), 441-50; II by H. J. ROSE, *Cl. Rev.*, xlvi (1932), 84-5, A. CALDERINI, *Aegyptus*, xii (1932), 80-1, FR. PFISTER, *Phil. Woch.*, 1932, 916-26, M. NORSI, *Boll. fil. class.*, xxxviii (1932), 365 ff., TH. HOFFNER, *Gnomon*, viii (1932), 393-5.

For reviews of P. OSLO. II, see § 3.

A. JACOBY, *Zu Pap. graec. mag.*, III, 479 f. (*Arch. f. Rel.*, xxix (1931), 204-5), explains what appeared to be *nomina* as Coptic. S. ETTREM emends XII, 255, XIII, 434 in his *Varia*, no. 67 (*Symb. Oslo.*, x (1932), 155). [Cf. too (*op. cit.*, XI, 112 f.), no. 70 on the lizard and frog, and (114) no. 72, partly on BELL-NOCK-THOMPSON'S *Magical Texts* and partly on HUNT'S Warren papyrus.—Ed.] K. PREISENDANZ discusses IV, 3024, in his article Tanit (*Pauly-Wissowa*, IV A, 2180).

A. DELATTE, *La catoptromancie grecque et ses dérivés* (*Bibl. fac. phil. lett. Univ. Liège*, Fasc. 48. Imp. H. Vaillant-Carmanne, Liège, and E. Droz, Paris, 1932. Pp. 221 and 13 pl.), is a most important study of this method of divination, distinguishing between it and lecanomancy, and investigating fully the Oriental connexions and medieval and modern survivals. It is a thoroughly illuminating and interesting piece of

research. The same writer in his *Faba Pythagorae cognata* (*Serla Leodiensia*, in the same *Bibl.*, XLIV (1930), 33-57) has a noteworthy explanation of that well-known superstition and *rapprochements* with magical practice. His first topic is handled also by TH. HOPFNER, *Mittel- und neugriechische Lekano-, Lychno-, Katoptro- und Onychomantien* (*Griffith Studies*, 218-32), with great knowledge.

CAMPBELL BONNER, *Demons of the bath* (*ibid.*, 203-8), gives an interesting collection and discussion of material bearing on this superstition.

In his *Liturgical fragments on Gnostic amulets* (*Harv. Theol. Rev.*, XXV (1932), 362-7), he publishes an amulet with part of the hymn which closes *Corp. Herm.* I and another of Chnubis with the phrase *ἕδωρ δαψῆς ἄριστος πῦρ βίβοι* which is presumably a series of *δδύvara*.

For an analogy to the usage of magical papyri cf. HEINRICH LEWY, *Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte und Volkskunde* (*Arch. f. Rel.*, XXIX (1931), 187-99), pp. 189-93, on naming after the mother in prayers.

A. M. KROPP, *Ausgewählte koptische Zaubertexte* (3 vols. Fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth. Brussels. 1930-1) is reviewed by W. E. CRUM, *Journal*, XVIII (1932), 115; W. BAUER, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LVII (1932), 516-17; K. PREISENDANZ, *Phil. Woch.*, 1932, 571-2. On this topic reference may be made to H. LECLERQ's articles *Magie in Dict. arch. chrét. et de lit.*, x, 1067-1114, esp. 1100-14, and *Maléfice*, 1288-92.

S. EITREM's excellent article *Moira* (*Pauly-Wissowa*, xv, 2449-97), handles, 2473-5, the relevant passages in the magic papyri.

Outside Egypt we may note K. LATTE, *Randbemerkungen* (*Philologus*, LXXXVII (1932), 265-76), for remarks, 274-6, on the section of Hippolytus against magicians; a reference which J. TOUTAIN makes, *Rev. hist. rel.*, CII (1931), 114, to new *tabellae* produced by Audolent which were put in a spring to stop its use for a bath; VIELLEFOND's edition of *Jules Africain; Fragments des Cestes* (*Les belles-lettres*; Paris; 1932); FR. PFISTER's review of L. RADERMACHER, *Griechische Quellen zur Faustsage in B.Z.*, XXXII, 82-5; and G. WALTER, *Die babylonische Gebetsbeschwörung*, reviewed by A. GUSTAVS, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LVII (1932), 481-2.

J. FREUNDORFER, *Die Apokalypse des Apostels Johannes und die hellenistische Kosmologie und Astrologie*, is reviewed by H. WINDISCH, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LVII (1932), 81-3.

C. O. ZURETTI, *Catalogus codicum astrologorum graecorum*, XI, 1 (*Codices Hispanienses: pars prior, Codices Scotienses*), published shortly after its author was taken from us, is noticed by FR. CUMONT, *Bull. (classe lettres) acad. roy. Belg.*, 5^e sér., XVIII, nos. 7-9 (1932), 241-2.

Christian. F. G. KENYON, *The Chester Beatty biblical papyri* (*Gnomon*, VIII (1932), 46-9). A. MERK, *Novi codices S. Scripturae (Biblica)*, XIII (1932), 118-20). S. NEW, *The new Chester Beatty papyrus* (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, LI (1932), 73-4). CAMPBELL BONNER, *New biblical papyri at the University of Michigan* (*Harv. Theol. Rev.*, XXV (1932), 205-6), all handle the new find, the last recording six leaves of a codex containing the latter part of Enoch and an unidentified Christian work, typological in tendency (date of writing not later than fourth century). C. SCHMIDT, *Die neuesten Bibelfunden aus Ägypten* (*Z. neut. Wiss.*, XXX (1931), 285-93), gives a very convenient survey of the contents of the find.

A. BLUDAU, *Die ägyptischen libelli u. die Christenverfolgung des Kaisers Decius* (*Röm. Quartalschr.*, Suppl. 27) is reviewed by K. HEUSSI, *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LVII (1932), 495. [Cf. also § 3.]

H. I. BELL, *A Christian stele from Qau el-Kebir* (*Griffith Studies*, 199-202, pl. 22), publishes an interesting text opening with the Trisagion and including the phrase *διαφάου(η)ς κυριακῆ(ς) τ(ῆ)ς ἀναστάσεως* of Holy Saturday, probably in A.D. 601.

S. G. MERCATI, *Osservazioni sul testo e sulla metrica di alcuni papiri cristiani* (*Chron. d'Ég.*, VII (1932), 183-201).

P. G. RABEAU, *Les enseignements des papyrus; Christianisme et sociologie* (*Rev. Thomiste*, XXXVI (1931), 865-73), discusses ARANGIO-RUIZ, *Lineamenti del sistema contrattuale*, and GHEDINI, *Lettere cristiane*.

C. SCHMIDT, *Das Kloster des Apa Mena* (*Ä. Z.*, LXVIII (1932), 60-8), publishes a Coptic legal document.

EV. BRECCIA, *Dans le désert de Nitrie* (*Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, XXVII, 17-26, pls. i-vii), H. SAWYER, *The first monasteries (Antiquity)*, IV (1930), 316-26), A. TULLI, *Ampolle inedite di S. Mena nel Museo Egizio della Città del Vaticano (Aegyptus)*, XII (1932), 230-42), may also be noted.

HERBERT THOMPSON, *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic dialect* (Cambridge, 1932) is reviewed by F. C. BURKITT, *J. Theol. Stud.*, XXXIII (1932), 441-4.

E. PETERSON, *Die Häretiker der Philippus-Akten* (*Z. neut. Wiss.*, XXXI (1932), 97-111), and *Zum Mes-salianismus der Philippus-Akten* (*Oriens Christianus*, 1932, 172-9) do not touch Egypt directly but are to be commended to the attention of all students of Christian asceticism.

3. PUBLICATIONS OF NON-LITERARY TEXTS.

(N.B. Notes on and corrections of miscellaneous documents previously published are referred to in § 9. Notes on single documents will be found here; so too all reviews, when sufficiently important for mention.)

General. I have not at the time of writing had an opportunity of seeing what is certain to prove a very important and interesting addition to the well-known Loeb series, namely a selection of the more noteworthy papyrus texts chosen and edited by HUNT and EDGAR. Apparently only the first of two volumes, by the latter, has yet appeared. *Select Papyri. With an English Translation.* By A. S. HUNT and C. C. EDGAR. 2 vols. I. Private Affairs. London, Heinemann; New York, Putnam, 1932. Pp. xx+452. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

P. OSLO. II (*Journal*, XVIII, 83) has been reviewed by H. C. YOUTIE (*Cl. Phil.*, XXVII (1932), 86-95; rather unsympathetic); K. PREISENDANZ (*O.L.Z.*, XXXV (1932), 554-5; *Phil. Woch.*, LII (1932), 227-34); K. FR. W. SCHMIDT (*G.G.A.*, CXCIV (1932), 279-86; detailed, many suggestions); and H. I. BELL (*Cl. Rev.*, XLVI (1932), 23-4; *Mizraim*, I (1933), 190-1).

BÜTTNER's edition of papyrus letters from the collection of the Giessen University Library (*Journal*, XVIII, 84) has been reviewed by B. OLSSON (*D. Lit.-Z.*, 1932, 879-80); F. ZUCKER (*B.Z.*, XXXII (1932), 158); WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 273-5); and SCHUBART (*Gnomon*, VIII (1932), 552).

During the year under review a whole new volume of *P.S.I.*, issued in two parts, has appeared, and it ranks among the most important of the series, despite the fact that, unlike several of its predecessors, it contains no texts from the Zenon archive. The second part (pp. 105-232), which included the indices and a graceful dedicatory poem in Greek elegiacs by VITELLI to WILCKEN on his seventieth birthday, consists entirely of literary or theological texts, and therefore does not fall within the scope of this section; but the first is purely documentary. There are two texts of the Ptolemaic period, but the rest are Roman or Byzantine (almost entirely the former), and they include some very interesting documents, e.g. 1100, an extract from the *ὑπομηματισμοί* of the epistrategus Vedius Faustus; 1103, in which a man of over seventy asks for relief from a liturgy on that ground and also because his eyesight is weak; 1105, a petition which throws light on the position of the *nomographos*; 1119, an interesting sale of live stock [in the subscription only ταυρικά και βοικά are mentioned, whereas δικά occur in l. 8; should we therefore read ll. 7 f. ταυ-] | ρικά and in l. 12 (e.g.) [πάντων τῶν ταυ] ρικῶν?]; 1123, important for the *εὐθέρεια* of Alexandria; 1125, a letter-book of the *procurator usiacus*; 1128, an interesting agreement for a temple oath, one party being a *ιεροπέκτης ἐξ ἐφηβείας*; 1132, an apprenticeship to a mat-maker [Mr. Tait, for the note on l. 1, refers to his note on Ostr. Petrie, 288]; 1146, important for the poll-tax of priests; 1149, a very interesting but unfortunately very imperfect document about priests; 1161, a moving Christian (?) letter; and 1162, a most notable oath of a probably pagan *mystes*.¹ A review of the second part of vol. IX by P. COLLART has appeared in *Rev. de phil.*, ser. 3, VI (1932), 77-8. The first part of X has been reviewed by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 249-59; very important as usual) and F. ZUCKER (*B.Z.*, XXXII (1932), 408).

Ptolemaic. P. Cairo Zenon, IV (*Journal*, XVIII, 84) has been reviewed by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 238-41) and P. Mich. Zenon (*Journal*, *ibid.*) by P. COLLART (*Rev. de phil.*, ser. 3, VI (1932), 411-12); W. L. WESTERMANN (*A.J.A.*, XXXVI (1932), 75-6); H. I. BELL (*Mizraim*, I (1933), 186-7) and anonymously (*J.H.S.*, LII (1932), 145). Two articles which deal with the Zenon papyri may here be mentioned. ELIZABETH GRUER (*Accounting in the Zenon Papyri*, in *Cl. Phil.*, XXVII (1932), 222-31) discusses the methods of account-keeping illustrated by some of the documents from the archive, and W. SCHUBART publishes translations of seven letters from it, with a general introduction and some explanatory comment (*Griechische Briefe aus Ägypten*, in *Die Antike*, VIII (1932), 113-37).

O. GUÉRAUD's masterly work, *Ἐντεύξεις* (*Journal*, XVIII, 84), has been completed by the appearance during the year of the second part, containing (pp. 129-296) the concluding portion of no. 52, nos. 53-113, an appendix containing four fragments which, though of a different character from the *ἐντεύξεις*, are of juristic interest, and the indices, additions, and corrections, etc. The whole volume is a work of the first importance, and its merits have been generally recognized. Part I has been reviewed by W. SCHUBART (*O.L.Z.*, XXXV (1932), 106-9); P. COLLOMP (*Rev. ét. anc.*, XXXIV (1932), 83-7); K. PREISENDANZ (*Phil. Woch.*, 1932, 609-13); P. CHANTRAINE (*Rev. crit.*, LXVI (1932), 103-5); M. HOMBERT (*Rev. belge*, XI (1932), 231-2; not seen); P. COLLART (*Rev. de phil.*, ser. 3, VI (1932), 413-14); part II by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 241-8).

C. C. EDGAR, continuing his valuable studies of the Petrie Papyri, has published much improved texts

¹ In 1126, 15, qu. ὡς δὲ κατ[ὰ (or καθ')] νό[θεσίαν] Ἰουδ[άου] ?

of four of them, viz. P. Petr. II, 4, 9 (= III, 42 C, 2); II, 4, 8 (= III, 42 C, 1); II, 4, 1 (= III, 42, C, 3); II, 4, 6 (= III, 42 C, 11). All refer to the quarrymen, and the last two were among those which were lost and only recently found again. *Four Petrie Papyri Revised*, in *Griffith Studies*, 209-13.

For WESTERMANN's *Upon Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt* see below, § 6, B. ii.

N. J. REICH comments, republishing the texts, on U.P.Z. 12 and 13: *The Τεεβήσιος νιοί and their Quarrel with Apollonios in Mizraim*, I (1933), 147-77 (seen as this goes to press). REICH also reviews U.P.Z. (*ibid.*, 191-3).

Various reviews of the Loeb demotic papyri (*Journal*, xviii, 85) have appeared. The following call for mention: by L. WENGER and E. SEIDL (*Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 430-8); E. SEIDL (*K. V.G.R.*, xxv (1932), 297-306 [see also § 6]); WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 248-9); F. LL. GRIFFITH (*Journal*, xviii (1932), 194-5); and A. CALDERINI (*Aegyptus*, xii (1932), 78-9). SEIDL has, further, published a separate article on no. 12 (see § 6 below): *Zu Pap. Strassb. dem. 12*, in *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 326-8.

A reference must here be inserted to what is evidently an important article, seen as this goes to press: N. J. REICH, *New Documents from the Serapeum of Memphis*, in *Mizraim*, I (1933), 9-129 (to be continued).

ROMAN. JOHNSON and VAN HOESEN's *P. Princ. Univ.* (*Journal*, xviii, 85) has been reviewed by H. A. SANDERS (*A.J.A.*, xxxvi (1932), 209); P. COLLOMP (*Rev. ét. anc.*, xxxiii (1931), 398-9); M. NORSA (*Boll. Fil. Cl.*, xxxviii (1932), 190-3); M. HOMBERT (*Musée belge*, xi (1932), 140-1); and H. I. BELL (*Cl. Rev.*, xlvi (1932), 22-3, and *Mizraim*, I (1933), 189-90). COLLART's *P. Achmim* (*Journal*, xviii, 85) has been reviewed by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 261-7).

P. COLLART has found among the Reinach Papyri (now belonging to the Paris Faculté des Lettres and housed in the Institut de Papyrologie) the lost beginning of P. Ryl. 178, and publishes the complete document (A.D. 26). *Un papyrus Reinach inédit et P. Rylands 178*, in *Mélanges Glotz*, I (1932), 241-7.

Reviews of LÖSCH's *Epistula Claudiana* continue to appear. In the year under review I have noted the following: by G. HOENNICKE (*O.L.Z.*, xxxv (1932), 310-11); G. GHEDINI (*Aegyptus*, xii (1932), 72); and P. DE LABRIOLLE (*Rev. de phil.*, ser. 3, vi (1932), 418-20).

H. JANNE in an article on the concluding section of the letter of Claudius (P. Lond. 1912) brings new arguments, by no means conclusive indeed but certainly interesting, in favour of S. Reinach's view of that passage as containing a reference to Christian propaganda at Alexandria. He differs from Reinach on one point: for him the "Jews from Syria" were not Christian missionaries but anti-Christian emissaries of the Pharisees. *Un passage controversé de la lettre de Claude aux Alexandrins*, in *Rev. Arch.*, ser. 5, xxxv (1932), 268-81. See also § 4 below.

UXKULL-GYLLENBAND's fragment of the *Acta Isidori* (*Journal*, xvii, 126) has been reviewed by A. VON PREMERSTEIN (*Gnomon*, viii (1932), 201-6), who attacks his view that the trial occurred in A.D. 41; for a fuller statement of the same point of view by the same scholar see § 1 above and § 4 below. The fragment published by H. I. BELL (*Journal*, xviii, 86) is the subject of an article by A. NEPPI MODONA, who reprints the text: *Il nuovo frammento di una redazione variata degli "Atti di Isidoro"*, in *Aegyptus*, xii (1932), 333-8. With which fragment A. MOMIGLIANO deals in an article, not yet accessible to me, entitled *Un nuovo frammento dei cosiddetti "Atti dei martiri pagani"* (*Rend. Pont. Acc. Arch.*, vii (1932), 119 f.; see *Aegyptus*, xii, 291, no. 9711), I am unable to say.

V. MARTIN publishes a small fragment of a land-tax register (P. Genev. Inv. no. 125) which seems to date from the end of the first century and the names in which are mostly those of Romans. *Propriétaires romains en Égypte sous l'Empire*, in *Mélanges Glotz*, 551-5.

An important volume published by W. L. WESTERMANN and C. W. KEYES is to be known as *P. Columbia*, II, vol. I being Westermann's *Upon Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt*. This volume contains the texts of a group of six papyri dating from the first half and middle of the second century and all of them, according to the editors (but see WILCKEN, *Archiv*, x, 272 f.), from Theadelphia. The first three are taxation rolls, relating mostly to poll-tax and the related taxes, the fourth is a series of receipts for payments for transport service, etc., from the same roll as FRISK's *Bankakten* (Westermann on an inserted slip explains that his and Keyes's work was done independently but that on becoming acquainted with Frisk's volume he was able to make the necessary alterations in their own transcripts in proof), the fifth is a list of donkey-drivers, the sixth is an account of taxes in kind. It will be seen that there is much material of a useful if not sensational character, and it is handled with the editors' usual care and provided with an elaborate commentary. *Tax lists and transportation receipts from Theadelphia*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1932. Pp. xi+219, 2 plates. Reviewed by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 270-3).

SANDERS's articles on birth-certificates, etc., in the American Academy's *Memoirs (Journal)*, xviii, 86) have been reviewed by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 276-8).

E. KORNEMANN publishes an interesting example of an *Elterliche Teilung für den Todesfall* (*Archiv*, x, 213-15) from the Giessen collection (P. Giss. Inv. Nr. 255). It is a notarial *homologia*, with six witnesses, from Tebtunis, and is dated in A.D. 139.

H. KORTENBEUTEL, who is working in the papyrus collection at Berlin, has published from that collection an oath document of a somewhat noteworthy character. Dated in A.D. 153, it is a deposition to witnessing the scourging of a Roman citizen by order of Hierax, strategus of the Heraclides Division. It is a double deed, with six witnesses. Kortenbeutel adds a valuable commentary on the many interesting questions which it raises. *Ein Kaisereid*, in *Aegyptus*, xii (1932), 129-40, with facsimile.

A private letter published by VITELLI seems to prove that T. Flavius Victorinus entered Alexandria as prefect on 10 July A.D. 159. It adds a new street-name to those already known at Alexandria, *ῥύμη Ὀριγένους*, and is addressed to *γραμματεὺς γερδίων*. *Lettera di Maximos a Chairemon ed Eudaimon suoi figliuoli*, in *Stud. ital. di fil. cl.*, N.S., ix (1932), fasc. iv, 4 pages of off-print. In a brief notice (*Archiv*, x, 276) WILCKEN agrees with Vitelli's inference.

The Vatican roll, edited by NORSA and VITELLI, which contains on one side Favorinus's *Περὶ φύγης* and on the other land registers from the Marmarica (*Journal*, xviii, 79, 87) has received notice from several reviewers. The following may be noted here, the first of which, as the review is not accessible to me, I take from the bibliography in *Aegyptus*, xii (1932): C. GALLAVOTTI, *Il papiro Vaticano greco II*, in *Historia*, v (1921; *sic*, l. 1931?), 644-7 (see p. 84, no. 9112); and A. G. AMATUCCI (*Boll. fil. cl.*, xxxviii (1931), 4-7). See too § 1 above, and *Aegyptus*, xii, 82, *Intorno al papiro Vaticano Greco II*.

W. L. WESTERMANN, publishing a contract between a group of professional musicians and two residents of Alabastrine, appends, besides a brief discussion of the document itself, an interesting and useful appendix on "The Pleasure Clubs of Common People in Egypt". *Entertainment in the Villages of Graeco-Roman Egypt*, in *Journal*, xviii (1932), 16-27.

A. E. R. BOAK publishes a noteworthy appeal by an Antinoite for relief from a guardianship, which offers several points of special interest. It includes copies of judgements bearing on the case. Boak takes the date as A.D. 172-3. [I may say that I cannot believe in Boak's interpretation of ll. 35-8; HUNT's view, quoted in the note, seems much more probable.] *A petition for relief from a guardianship: P. Mich. Inv. No. 2922*, in *Journal*, xviii (1932), 69-76.

An important papyrus of the Geneva collection published by V. MARTIN throws new light on the arrangements for entry among the Alexandrian ephebi. It dates from about the end of the second century and appears to be an extract from the protocol of the proceedings preliminary to such entry. It consists of a series of questions addressed to the candidate. It is interesting to note what these questions are; and furthermore the text is of value as proving that, whatever the *πλάγιον* so often mentioned in connexion with ephebi may have been, it was not the detachment to which the new ephebe was assigned, for the boy here interrogated names the *πλάγιον* to which he (already) belonged. It is further interpreted, both by the editor and by WILCKEN in a review (*Archiv*, x, 275-6), as proving that enrolment in a deme preceded, and did not follow, admission to the ephebate; but I am not convinced that this is a necessary inference. It is true that the boy is here called *Σωαικόσμος ὁ [καὶ] Ζήνει[ος]*, but these words occur in the heading. The text is an extract, and the heading may have been no part of the original protocol and may refer to the ephebe at the time (perhaps considerably later) when the extract was made. I should therefore prefer to regard the evidence of this papyrus as neutral on the point. *Un document relatif à l'éphébie*, in *Chron. d'Ég.*, vii (1932), 300-10, with facsimile.

S. EITREM contributes to the volume, *Griffith Studies (Two Greek Papyri)*, pp. 214-17, copies of two papyri from his own collection. The first is a second-century list of names, of no great importance, but offering some intriguing problems; the second, of the third century, is a customs receipt for *λιμένος Μέμφεως* issued at the *πύλη* of Philadelphia, and it gives Eitrem occasion for an interesting excursus on such receipts, on the "harbour of Memphis", and on the mysterious 'Ερμῆς which occurs in certain customs registers.

L. AMUNDSEN has published from the Oslo collection a Latin military papyrus which he regards as a *brevis* or *matricula*. The unit to which it refers was probably an *ala* but is unidentified. Amundsen takes the date as probably c. A.D. 238-42. *A Latin Papyrus in the Oslo Collection*, in *Symb. Oslo.*, x (1932), 16-30. Reviewed by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 279), who also reviews (*ibid.*, 278-9) SANDERS's *Papyrus 1804* (*Journal*, xviii, 87-8).

BLUDAU's *Die ägypt. Libelli* (*Journal*, XVIII, 88) is reviewed by E. GROAG (*Hist. Vierteljahrsschr.*, XXVII (1932), 631-3. [Cf. also § 2.]

An exceptionally interesting private letter, dating from the third century, is published by V. MARTIN from the Geneva collection. Its value lies in its pronounced literary flavour and its educational interest. The writer, after preliminary greetings, falls into a somewhat sententious reflection on the advantages of a liberal education and refers in a remarkable phrase to those τῶν Μ[ο]υσῶν τὰ μυστήρια τελο[ύ]ντες. Here unfortunately the fragment breaks off, but even what remains makes it a notable addition to the remains of ancient epistolography as revealed by the papyri. *A Greek Papyrus Letter to a Student*, in *Griffith Studies*, 245-7, plate 24b.

Roman-Byzantine. An important volume of non-literary texts comes from the University of Uppsala and illustrates the value of co-operation both between individual scholars and between institutions. During the years 1920-5 a collection of fifty-eight papyri was deposited on loan by the Staatliche Museen at Berlin in the Greek seminar at Uppsala, for the purpose of papyrological study. As explained by the general editor, T. Kalén, the original idea of publishing the whole collection in a single volume was abandoned owing to various circumstances, the literary texts in particular being reserved for later treatment. The volume now issued, which is the joint work of the seminar under the direction of Kalén (who has himself contributed very largely to the whole), contains twenty-five texts, ranging in date from the second to the fourth century. To the last century indeed (A.D. 309) only one text belongs, all the others being of the Roman period. The first four are the rolls previously published by THUNELL in his *Sitologen-Papyri*. They are published unchanged as regards the text (corrections being relegated to the commentary or the *Berichtigungen und Nachträge*) but with a new commentary (of course founded on Thunell's) by Kalén. The other texts are of various types but with a preponderance of official documents or documents of a semi-official character (returns, etc.). There are the usual indices and three excellent facsimiles. *Berliner Leihgabe griechischer Papyri*: herausgegeben vom griechischen Seminar der Universität Uppsala. I. Uppsala, A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1932. (Upps. Universitets Årsskrift 1932.) Pp. viii+363, 3 plates.

Another important publication is that of the third volume of P. ROSS-GEORG., edited by G. ZERETELI and P. JERNSTEDT, which embraces texts of the late Roman and Byzantine periods. It contains a wealth of interesting and valuable material, and the names of the editors are sufficient warrant for the merits of the commentary. The first twenty-three texts are letters, the remaining thirty-four private contracts or official documents. In the first class may be mentioned two very interesting letters to a certain Antonia, the first, from a physician named Marcus, referring to a battle (μάχη) in which the Roman army had suffered appreciable loss; and, at the other end of the series, to a letter from the well-known Arab pagarch 'Atiyah to the *riparius* of Arsinoe bidding him bring certain εἴποροι. In the second part may be mentioned nos. 28, a marriage contract of A.D. 343 or 358; 34, a receipt from the *defensor* of Antaeopolis to the *protocometae* of Aphrodito for συνθήκαι; 35, another receipt from the same to the same which furnishes the editors with the occasion for a discussion of the *ordinarius*; and 46, a receipt from a πριμικήριος τοῦ ἐνδόξου πραιτωρίου. *Papyri russischer und georgischer Sammlungen* [P. Ross-Georg.]. III. *Spatrömische und byzantinische Texte*. Bearbeitet von G. ZERETELI und P. JERNSTEDT. Tiflis, Universitätslithographie, 1930. Pp. 300, 4 plates. Reviewed by F. ZUCKER (*B.Z.*, XXXII (1932), 85-9, and WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 259-61).

FRISK's *Bankakten* (*Journal*, XVIII, 88) has been reviewed by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 267-70); M. SAN NICOLÒ (*O.L.Z.*, XXXV (1932), 464-6); K. FR. W. SCHMIDT (*Phil. Woch.*, 1932, 562-5); and P. COLLART (*Rev. de phil.*, ser. 3, VI (1932), 410).

G. ZERETELI publishes a list of corrections to vol. XX of WESSELY's *Studien: Berichtigung zu WESSELY, Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde XX*, in *Aegyptus*, XII (1932), 372-7.

Byzantine and Arab. V. CAPOCCI publishes an interesting article on the two Melitian letters, P. Lond. 1915 and 1916, reproducing the texts, with translations, and discussing the case to which these letters refer. *Alcune osservazioni sui papiri Londinesi 1915 e 1916*, in *Rend. Pont. Rom. Arch.*, VI, 1927-9 (1930), 97-107.

B. OLSSON confirms the correctness of MANTEUFFEL's explanation of δειὸν τρουθ [. .] μέγα as = ᾠδὸν <σ>τρουθ[ιδὸν] μέγα in no. 1 of his *Epistulae privatae ineditae* (*Zwei Papyrusstellen besprochen*, in *Aegyptus*, XII (1932), 355).

W. G. WADDELL has done a useful piece of work in examining some of those papyri in P. Oxy. XVI of which the texts, because the originals were at Cairo, could not be checked when the volume was being prepared, and he publishes the results of his collation (*Some Cairo Papyri in P. Oxy. xvi*) in the new *Études de papyrologie*, I (1932), 7-9.

A fragment of papyrus at Munich bears an interesting drawing which represents a woman with a Phrygian



cap led away by a man with a staff, while a second man lays hold of her; there are slight remains of a third male figure. A. HARTMAN, who publishes the drawing in facsimile, together with what remains of a sixth-century letter on the verso, thinks the drawing may represent a scene from the Trojan cycle; he inclines to date it in the fourth century, which involves an unusually (but not unprecedentedly) long interval between the use of recto and verso. *Eine Federzeichnung auf einem Münchener Papyrus*, in *Festschrift für Georg Leidingger* (1930), 103-8, Pls. xvii, xviii.

A brief reference may here be made to C. SCHMIDT's *Das Kloster des Apa Mena* (*Ä.Z.*, LXVIII (1932), 60-8), and H. I. BELL's *A Christian stèle from Qau el-Kebir* (*Griffith Studies*, 199-202, pl. 22), for which see above, § 2. Reference must also be made to a volume by A. ARTHUR SCHILLER which, though it includes only Coptic documents, is of great importance to jurists and papyrologists generally: *Ten Coptic legal texts*. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1932. Pp. xiii+103, 7 plates. Reviewed by W. E. CRUM (*Journal*, XVIII (1932), 196-7).

Lastly, A. GROHMANN's *Aperçu de papyrologie arabe* (*Études de papyrologie*, I (1932), 23-95, pls. i-ix), calls for attention here also because Grohmann publishes in it not only a Greek-Arabic protocol (p. 33, pl. iv) but (pp. 41-6) three Greek or bilingual papyri from the Rainer collection. The first is the famous receipt issued by the general 'Abdallâh in the year 22 of the Hegira, during the very conquest of Egypt; all three are of great interest, and Grohmann deserves hearty thanks for making them generally accessible.¹

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

General. M. CARY's *History of the Greek World from 323 to 146*, London, 1932, pp. xvi+448, gives due attention to the Egyptian part of the question. It is reviewed by W. W. TARN in *Cl. Rev.*, XLVI (1932), 217-18.

A review of BEVAN's *History of Egypt* (see *Journal*, XVI, 128) by J. A. O. LARSEN appears in *Cl. Phil.*, XXVII (1932), 314-15.

As last year, reference may be made to L. WENGER's *Juristische Literaturübersicht* in *Archiv*, X (1932), 279-313, for notices of many works mentioned in this and previous Bibliographies.

Political History. RADET's *Alexandre le Grand* (see *Journal*, XVIII, 89) is reviewed by P. ROUSSEL in *Journ. Sav.*, 1932, 49-60, and by W. W. TARN in *Cl. Rev.*, XLVI (1932), 16-17; and WILCKEN's *Alexander der Grosse* (see *Journal*, XVIII, 89) by ROUSSEL in the article cited, by F. SCHACHERMEYR in *Hist. Vierteljahrsch.*, XXVII (1932), 208-9, by C. A. ROBINSON in *Am. Journ. Phil.*, LIII (1932), 383-5, by J. A. O. LARSEN in *Cl.*

¹ I have considerable doubts as to the correctness of some of Grohmann's readings, extensions, or interpretations, and think it well to record them here. No. 1 (p. 41) he interprets as a receipt for supplies obtained for the army, which, instead of making them an extra charge on the inhabitants, 'Abdallâh credits to their tax quota. "En d'autres termes: le général nourrit ses soldats sur le trésor public"; and Grohmann uses the text as evidence for the humanity and clemency of the conquerors. It certainly would be if his interpretation were correct, but I can see no warrant for it in the endorsement, on which it rests. Grohmann translates this: "Document concernant la remise de brebis aux Magarites et à d'autres gens qui arrivèrent, a titre d'acompte sur les impôts de la première indiction." I should myself render it: "Receipt for sheep delivered to the Magarites and others who came up to collect the taxes of the first indiction", and explain the transaction as an instance of the use of troops (common even under Byzantine rule) to collect the taxes, their maintenance being charged on the taxpayers. The Arab invaders had taken the precaution to secure the taxes due to the government against which they were fighting.

In no. 2 (p. 44), l. 2, for Grohmann's *οὐαί(ας)* read presumably *οἶσα*: not "de mon train" but "accompanying me".

In no. 3 (p. 45) Grohmann finds evidence for the rule (agreed to by the Copts in their treaty with the Arab conquerors) by which troops passing through a district were entitled to three days' maintenance. This view rests on his reading in l. 3, *δ]απ[άν]ην τριῶν παλικ(ῶν) ἐκάστω*, which he renders "un [re]pas de trois plats" (he has to admit in another document "des repas de 4 plats chacun", which weakens the case for his version here). In the absence of a facsimile it would be rash to be dogmatic, but I feel fairly certain that the true reading is *παλλικ(ῶν)*, for which see P. Lond. 1447, 13, note. In the endorsement I suggest for Grohmann's *κωμι(τι)κ(ός)* either *κωμι(τῶν)* ("villagers") or (more probably) *κωμι(τικῶν)* ("village dues") the first *ι* being in either case for *η*; in l. 3 read *ἀρτ(ᾶ)βην*, in l. 2 *φυλ(ῆ)ς* and, possibly, for *ἐκ(ᾶ)στ(ῶ)ς*, *ἐκ(ᾶ)στ(ου)* or *ἐκ(τῶ) νομίματος* followed by *ἀρού(πας)*. The meaning of l. 2 is not entirely clear to me, but I suggest as the probable rendering of the whole: "Sell to 'Amir b. Asla' of the tribe Kouta [or is it possible to read *Κουρα* and explain as "of the Quraysh" ?] for three solidi hay at the rate of two arourae per solidus and stabling (?) and maintenance of three attendants at the rate of one artaba of bread per month to each." The endorsement may be rendered "By the people of Sophthis for village dues three solidi and (maintenance of) three attendants".

Phil., XXVII (1932), 97-9, and by T. LENSCHAU in *Phil. Woch.*, 1932, 13, 365-70. An English translation of WILCKEN's book, by G. C. RICHARDS, has been published by Chatto and Windus (London, 1932, pp. ix + 337, frontispiece and map): it is reviewed by W. W. TARN in *Cl. Rev.*, XLVI (1932), 216-17. Further contributions to the discussion on Alexander's action in Egypt are made by J. A. O. LARSEN, *Alexander at the oracle of Ammon*, in *Cl. Phil.*, XXVII (1932), 70-5, and *An additional note on Alexander at the oracle of Ammon*, *ibid.*, 274-5, and by D. COHEN, *Alexander de Groote en Egypte*, in *Tijdschr. voor Geschiedenis*, XLVI (1931), 226-34.

FR. HEICHELHEIM has discussed *Strukturprobleme des Alexanderreiches und des Reiches der ersten Kalifen*, *Chron. d'Ég.*, VII (1932), 172-82. He draws a parallel, and at the same time points out contrasts, between the two empires, finding the essential unity between them in the conception of a maritime empire round the Mediterranean and a maritime empire round the Indian Ocean connected by a land-bridge through Nearer Asia. The Khalifs can be regarded as in a sense executing the political and to some extent also the cultural testament of Alexander.

G. OLIVIERO's *La stele di Tolomeo Neoteris, re di Cirene*, Bergamo, 1932, is reviewed by E. BICKERMANN in *Gnomon*, VIII (1932), 424-30, by E. BRECCIA in *Bull. Soc. Arch. Alex.*, VIII (1932), 88-90, by C. BUZIO in *Aegyptus*, XII (1932), 271-2, and by F. CUMONT in *Journ. Sav.*, 1932, 168-71. The subject of the inscription is also treated by G. DE SANCTIS, *Il primo testamento regio a favore dei Romani*, in *Riv. Fil. Cl.*, LX (1932), 59 f., by S. FERRI, *Evergete II promise l'Egitto ai Romani?* in *Historia*, VI (1932), 422-4, by A. GITTI, *Sul rescritto tolemaico di Cirene*, in *Aegyptus*, XII (1932), 145-80, by W. SCHUBART, *Ein Testament Evergetes' II*, in *Gnomon*, VIII (1932), 283, and by U. WILCKEN, *Das Testament des Ptolemaios von Kyrene vom Jahre 155 v. Chr.*, in *Sitzungsb. Preuss. Ak., Phil.-Hist. Kl.*, 1932, 317-36.

Contributions to Ptolemaic history will be found in O. NEPPI MODONA, *Studi Diadochei, I. Chi fu il primo vero "reggente" dopo la morte di Alessandro Magno?* in *Athenaeum* (Pavia), N.S., X (1932), 22-36; B. A. VAN GRONINGEN, *Iterum de Cleomene Naucratis*, in *Mnemosyne*, LIX (1931), 366-8; G. DE SANCTIS, *Una lettera a Demetrio Poliorcete*, in *Riv. fil. cl.*, LIX (1931), 330 f.; J. G. MILNE, *Arsinoe and Ammon*, in *Griffith Studies*, 13-15 [see also § 2]; CL. PRÉAUX, *La valeur historique des papyrus de Zénon*, in *Chron. d'Ég.*, VII (1932), 291-9; A. PRIDIK, *Weiteres zum Mitregenten des Ptolemaios II Philadelphos*, in *Klio*, XXV (1932), 72-85; and A. MOMIGLIANO, *Per la data e la caratteristica della lettera di Aristea*, in *Aegyptus*, XII (1932), 161-72.

GRAINDOR's *La guerre d'Alexandrie* (see *Journal*, XVIII, 89) is reviewed by T. LENSCHAU in *Phil. Woch.*, 1932, 17, 479-82.

In the Roman period, the chief matters of interest have been the Alexandrian Senate and the Jewish question. The former is discussed by M. NORSIA and G. VITELLI, *Sul papiro della BOYAH d'Alessandria*, in *Bull. Soc. Arch. Alex.*, VIII (1932), 1-16; by H. I. BELL, *The problem of the Alexandrian Senate*, in *Aegyptus*, XII (1932), 173-84; by G. DE SANCTIS in *Riv. fil. cl.*, LX (1932), 126 f.; by P. VIREECK, *Noch einmal die BOYAH von Alexandria*, in *Aegyptus*, XII (1932), 210-16; and by A. MOMIGLIANO, *L'opera dell'imperatore Claudio* (Firenze, 1932), which is reviewed by E. GROAG in *Gnomon*, VIII (1932), 610-12, by H. LAST in *J.R.S.*, XXII (1932), 230-3, and by E. HOHL in *Phil. Woch.*, 1932, 48, 1487-90. Both subjects are noticed by P. M. MEYER in *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 370-1. Contributions to the literature on the latter are H. JANNE, *Un passage controversé de la lettre de Claude aux Alexandrins*, in *Rev. Arch.*, 5. XXXV (1932), 268-81; A. NEPPI MODONA, *Il nuovo frammento berlinese degli "Atti dei Martiri Alessandrini"* in *Aegyptus*, XII (1932), 17-24, and *Il nuovo frammento di una redazione variata degli "Atti di Isidoro"*, *ibid.*, 333-8; J. C. NABER, *De Judaeo Agrippa et Judaea Salome*, *ibid.*, 329-32; A. VON PREMIERSTEIN, *Das Datum des Prozesses des Isidoros in den sogenannten heidnischen Märtyrtrakten*, in *Hermes*, LXVII (1932), 174-96; and S. R[EINACH], *A propos de la lettre de Claude*, and *Encore la lettre de Claude*, in *Rev. Arch.*, 5. XXXV (1932), 152-3.

P. JOUGUET's paper entitled *Inscription de Deir-Chelouit* in *Griffith Studies*, 241-4, is historically useful for the reign of Septimius Severus. [See also § 2.]

Biography. More than half of GRACE H. MACURDY's *Hellenistic Queens*, Baltimore, 1932, is taken up with the Ptolemaic Queens. It is reviewed by W. W. TARN in *Cl. Rev.*, XLVI (1932), 167, and J. A. O. LARSEN in *Cl. Phil.*, XXVII (1932), 315-16.

Administration. A. CALDERINI has published *Le schede di censimento dell'Egitto romano secondo le scoperte più recenti*, Roma, 1932, pp. 26; and *Nuove schede del censimento romano d'Egitto*, in *Aegyptus*, XII (1932), 346-54.

W. SCHUBART discusses *Παρακαταίθεσθαι* in *der hellenistischen Amtssprache* in *Festschrift für Franz Poland*, 133-40.

O. W. REINMUTH, of the University of Nebraska, has written a *Thesis on the Prefect of Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*.

Further reviews of works already noticed in the *Journal* are: of JOUGUET's *Politique intérieure* (see XVIII, 89), by P. COLLART in *Rev. de phil.*, 3. VI (1932), 415; and of GOODENOUGH's *Jewish Courts* (see XVIII, 89), by M. SAN NICOLÒ in *Journal*, XVIII (1932), 116-18, and by E. SEIDL in *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 428-30. [See also § 6.]

E. R. HARDY, JR., *The large estates of Byzantine Egypt* (*Journal*, XVIII, 90) has been reviewed by H. I. BELL in *Cl. Rev.*, XLVI (1932), 236.

G. ROUILLARD, *L'administration civile de l'Égypte byzantine* has been reviewed by [J. G. MILNE] in *J.H.S.*, LII (1932), 161-2.

A. GROHMANN, *Griechische und lateinische Verwaltungstermini im arabischen Aegypten* in *Chron. d'Ég.*, VII (1932) 275-84, traces the survival of several administrative technical terms in Arabic. Two of the most noteworthy are *dimústiya* (δημόσια) and *ústiya* (apparently οὐσία). The last is particularly interesting, as it seems to indicate the survival of the great domains into the Arab period, and *Ústiya* 'Abd al-Malik may, as Grohmann remarks, be compared with (e.g.) οὐσία Τίρου.

A. GROHMANN, *Aperçu de papyrologie arabe, Études de papyrologie*, I (1932), 23-75, pls. i-ix, contains much matter of historical importance; for this see § 3.

Topography. For reviews of BOAK and PETERSON's *Karanis* (see *Journal*, XVIII, 89), see § 10.

The second part has appeared of the publication of the results of the Metropolitan Museum of Art's Egyptian Expedition to *The Monasteries of the Wádi'n Natrân: The History of the Monasteries of Nitria and of Scetis* by H. G. EVELYN WHITE edited by WALTER HAUSER, New York, 1932. Pp. xlv, 495, 8 plates. Section I. The Roman period, A.D. 315-451. (i) The origins of monasticism; (ii) The topography of the mount of Nitria and Scetis; (iii) The foundation of the monastic settlement at the mount of Nitria; (iv) The foundation and early history of Scetis; (v) The mount of Nitria and Scetis in the Arian period; (vi) The mount of Nitria during the last quarter of the fourth century; (vii) The rise of the four monasteries of Scetis and the close of the fourth century; (viii) The Origenist and the anthropomorphic strife at the mount of Nitria and in Scetis; (ix) The mount of Nitria during the first half of the fifth century; (x) Scetis in the first half of the fifth century; (xi) The monastic system during the fourth and early fifth centuries; (xii) Particular aspects of monastic life during the fourth and early fifth centuries. Section II. The Byzantine period: A.D. 451-641. (i) The Monophysite schism and the monasteries; (ii) The Gaianite heresy and the rise of the Theotokos monasteries; (iii) Scetis as the metropolis of the Monophysite church; (iv) The life and times of Daniel the Hegumen; (v) The Heraclian persecution (A.D. 631-41); (vi) The mount of Nitria, Cellia and Scetis in the Byzantine period. Section III. The early Arab period A.D. 641-880 etc. This citation of chapter headings will give some idea of the scope of this important work so far as this bibliography is concerned.

Chronology. H. THOMPSON has collected the evidence supplementary to previous lists of *Eponymous priests under the Ptolemies* in *Griffith Studies*, 16-37. [See also § 2.]

Reference may be made here to W. REUSCH, *Zur datierung des papyrus Giessensis 40. I*, in *Hermes*, LXVII (1932), 473-7.

SCOTT's *Honorific Months* (see *Journal*, XVIII, 89) is reviewed by G. CORRADI in *Boll. fil. cl.*, XXXVIII (1932), 218-20.

G. VITELLI's *Lettera di Maximos a Chairemon ed Eudaimon suoi figliuoli*, in *Stud. it. di fil. cl.*, N.S., IX (1932), fasc. iv, is of value for the chronology of the reign of Antoninus Pius. It is reviewed by U. WILCKEN in *Archiv*, x, 276. [See also § 3.]

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

General. ROSTOVITZEFF's *Social and Economic History* (see *Journal*, XVII, 129) has been published in a German translation by L. WICKERT under the title *Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft in der römischen Kaiserzeit*: the translation is reviewed by E. HOHL in *D. Lit.-Z.*, 1932, 4, 179-80.

M. GUIDI has published a useful *Bollettino Bizantino-Arabico* in *Byzantion*, VII (1932), 396-432, and P. COLLINET a *Chronique du droit byzantin*, *ibid.*, 489-94. It is serviceable to have all the papyrological articles which have appeared in the *Journal of Theological Studies* collected s. vv. *Papyrus* and *Oxyrhynchus Sayings* in the *Index to the J.T.S. vols. I-XXX* published in October 1932. 21s.

Social Life. Under this head reference may be made to W. F. EDGERTON, *Notes on Egyptian marriage, chiefly in the Ptolemaic period*, Chicago, 1931 (see *Journal*, XVIII, 95, § 6): it is reviewed by J. A. O. LARSEN in *Cl. Phil.*, XXVII (1932), 110.

A. CAMERON, writing on *The exposure of children and Greek ethics* in *Cl. Rev.*, XLVI (1932), 105-14, uses some papyrus evidence.

W. L. WESTERMANN deals with *Entertainment in the villages of Graeco-Roman Egypt* in *Journal*, xviii (1932), 16-27. [See § 3.]

C. GINI, *La pigmentazione degli abitanti dell'Egitto nell'età greco-romana*, may be noted in this connexion.

A. TULLI, *Ampolle inédite di S. Mena nel Museo Egizio della Città del Vaticano*, in *Aegyptus*, xii (1932), 230-42 publishes these "Ampolle" with photographs: they are of the "Kleiner Typ" of Kaufmann's classification save one which is of larger dimensions than any yet found. T. considers that the mysterious animals represented on the "ampolle" are to be interpreted as an attempt to reproduce the "animali orribili dal collo alto e lungo con una testa simile a quella dei camelli" of the legend "che dopo essersi inchinati davanti al Santo ripresero la loro via" (see Chaine, *Bull. Arch. Crist.*, 1909, 71 ff.). On one ampulla S. Menas is shown as a negro—"the representative of the black race" (Kaufmann).

A. STEINWENTER, *Byzantinische Mönchstestamente*, in *Aegyptus*, xii (1932), 55-64, is a very interesting paper read at the International Byzantine Congress (1930). Particularly suggestive is the treatment of the wills of Hegumenoi of monasteries which in the form of a private testament devise the monastery as a whole, and thereby appoint a successor to the headship of the monastery. [See also § 6, B, vi.] With these wills BRÜCK (*Totenteil und Seelgerät im griech. Recht*, 330 f.) has compared the wills of the heads of Greek schools of philosophy. His paper on *Das Erbrecht der byzantinischen Kirche* (brief résumé in *Actes du IIIème Congrès international d'Études byzantines*, ed. A. C. ORLANDOS, Athens, Imprimerie Hestia, 1932, 191-2) will appear in the *Studi Riccobono*. S. stresses the need for co-operation between students of history and papyrology in conjunction with jurists and canonists: only so can a new history of the Institutions of Byzantine law be constructed.

For monasticism in Egypt see also § 4, *Topography*.

Finance, Agriculture, Industry. M. ROSTOVITZEFF has an article on *Foreign Commerce of Ptolemaic Egypt* in *Journ. of Econ. and Business Hist.*, iv (1932), 728-69: it is reviewed by J. G. M[ILNE] in *J.R.S.*, xxii (1932), 246-7.

W. PEREMANS writes on *De Handelsbetrekkingen van Egypte met het Middellandsche-zeegebied in de 3^o eeuw v. C. De verhandelde waren*, in *Philologische Studien*, ii (1931-2), 3-21, 81-94.

Reference may further be made here to H. KORTENBEUTEL's study *Der ägyptische Süd- und Osthandel in der Politik der Ptolemäer und römischen Kaiser*, Hoffmann, Berlin-Charlottenburg, 1931, pp. 80, which covers the whole period of the Roman Empire down to the Arab conquest of Egypt, and to a useful bibliographical summary of recent criticism of *Les travaux de M. Henri Pirenne sur la fin du monde antique et les débuts du moyen âge*, in *Byzantion*, vii (1932), 495-509 compiled by H. LAURENT: this is important for the consideration of the extent of Egyptian trade connexions.

Other articles which have reference to Egyptian trade are M. ROSTOVITZEFF, *Seleucid Babylonia. Bullae and seals of clay with Greek inscriptions*, in *Yale Class. Studies*, iii (1932), 1-114 (with discussion of Ptolemaic parallels); R. ENGELBACH, *Myos Hormos and the Imperial porphyry quarries*, in *Ann. Serv.*, xxxi (1931), 137-43; and A. LUCAS, *The occurrence of natron in ancient Egypt*, in *Journal*, xviii (1932), 62-6.

ELIZABETH GRIER discusses *Accounting in the Zenon papyri*, in *Cl. Phil.*, xxvii (1932), 222-31. [See also § 3.]

G. MICKWITZ has published a monograph on *Geld und Wirtschaft im römischen Reich des vierten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum iv. 2. Akademische Buchhandlung, Helsingfors, 1932, pp. xv+232. It may be useful to cite the headings of the chapters: (i) Das Münzwesen bis zu Diokletians Höchstpreisdikt; (ii) Die Entwicklung des Diokletianisch-Konstantinischen Münzsystems; (iii) Der Geldwert in Ägypten nach 301 n. Chr.; (iv) Die Wirkungen der Währungskrisen in Ägypten; (v) Die Privatwirtschaft ausser Ägypten; (vi) Die staatliche Naturalwirtschaft und ihre Folgen. Beilage: Zusammenstellung der Angaben über Bodenpacht, Mieten, Anleihen und Löhne in den Papyri.

With this study should be compared the article by G. OSTROGORSKY on *Löhne und Preise in Byzanz*, *B.Z.*, xxxii (1932) 293-333: the titles of the sections of this article are (i) Arbeitslöhne; (ii) Beamten- und Offiziersgehälter; (iii) Geldstrafen. Ämter- und Titelkauf. Der Zinsfuß; (iv) Bodenpreise (Acker-, Wein- und Ölland); (v) Getreidepreise; (vi) Verschiedene Preisangaben; (vii) Preise für Haustiere.

Further reviews of works already noticed in the *Journal* are: of HEICHELHEIM's *Wirtschaftliche Schwankungen* (see xviii, 90) by T. FRANK in *Am. Journ. Phil.*, liii (1932), 181-3, and by K. REGLING in *Z. f. Numism.*, xli (1931), 117-20; of FRISK's *Bankakten* (see xviii, 88) by K. F. W. SCHMIDT in *Phil. Woch.*, 1932, 20/21, 562-5, by U. WILCKEN in *Archiv*, x (1932), 267-70, and by P. COLLART in *Rev. de phil.*, 3. vi (1932), 410; and of JOUGUET's *Dédicace de Médamoud* (see xviii, 90) by P. COLLART in *Rev. de phil.*, 3. vi (1932), 415-16.

For the administration of the great estates of Byzantine Egypt and other matters bearing on economics see § 4, *Administration*.

Education, Science, and Art. Here may be noted G. VON MANTEUFFEL's *Die Papyri als Zeugen griechischer Kleinliteratur* in *Chron. d'Ég.*, 1932, 243-55. [See also § I.]

Numismatics and Metrology. W. GIESECKE discusses *Il "trichryson" egiziano* in *Rass. Numism.*, XXVII (1931), 289-96.

E. CAVAIGNAC deals with *L'argent et le cuivre sous les derniers Ptolémées* in *Chron. d'Ég.*, VII (1932), 288-90.

J. G. MILNE writes on *The nome coins of Egypt* in *Ancient Egypt*, 1932, 73-8, and on *Coin-moulds for Egyptian Feudal currency*, *ibid.*, 1931, 73-4.

W. GIESECKE's *Ptolemäergeld* (see *Journal*, XVIII, 90) is reviewed by F. HEICHELHEIM in *D. Lit. Z.*, 1932, 20, 942-5; by E. S. G. ROBINSON in *Cl. Rev.*, XLVI (1932), 87; by S. COHEN in *Riv. Numism.*, XXVIII (1931), 393; by W. SCHWABACHER in *Phil. Woch.*, 1932, 291-5; and by V. T[OURNEUR] in *Rev. Belge de Numism.*, LXXXII (1930), 285-6.

A. SEGRÈ has articles on *Nuove misure nel P. Zen. Cairo IV* in *Stud. it. fil. cl.*, N.S. IX (1932), 337-9, and *Su alcune misure degli ostraka di Tait*, *ibid.*, 111-15.

6. LAW.

A. General.

i. *Bibliography.* P. M. MEYER, *Juristische Papyrusbericht, VII (Okt. 1929-Okt. 1931)*, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 356-411. U. WILCKEN, *Urkunden-Referat, Archiv*, X (1931-2), 237-79. L. WENGER, *Juristische Literaturübersicht IV (1914-32)*, *Archiv*, X (1931-2), 279-313. F. OLIVIER-MARTIN and R. BESNIER, *Rev. hist. dr.*, XI (1932), suppl. with fasc. 3, *Bibliographie courante—1930*, 38 pp., especially pp. 5*-13*. S. ROMANO, *Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.*, XL (1932), 253-378 (especially 302-38), completes the bibliography of Roman law, 1924-30, begun last year; very comprehensive. A. CALDERINI, *Testi recentemente pubblicati, Aegyptus*, XI (1930-1), 399-405, 497-500; XII (1932), 65-70, 256-69, 365-9. *Aggiunte, correzioni, riedizioni di papiri e di ostraka*, XI, 406-7; XII, 71, 270, 370-7, *Bibliografia metodica*, XI, 418-31 (especially 424-5), 517-21; XII, 83-110, 282-306, 408-25 (especially 99-101, 296-7, 416-17). *B.Z.*, XXXII (1932), 146-256, 395-480 (especially 157-9, 242-50, 406-9, 471-6). *Byz. neugr. Jahrb.*, VIII (1931), 387-480 (especially 408-14, 462 ff.). *Ἀρχαίων Βυζαντινοῦ Δικαίου*, I, 441-67: bibliography by G. PETROPOULOS: Roman law, 441-56; Greek, papyrological and Byzantine law, with Greek economic history, 457-67. (This new periodical, edited by I. CHR. TORNARITES, is devoted to Greek legal history from the earliest times to the present day. Foreign subscription *per vol.*: £1.) M. HOMBERT, *Bulletin pap.*, V (1930), in *Byzantion*, VI (1931), 722-36 (especially 730-3); VI (1931-2), *ibid.*, VII (1932), 433-56 (especially 446-9). P. COLLINET, *Chronique du droit byz.*, in *Byzantion*, VII (1932), 489-94. E. SACHERS has issued an elaborate Index-Volume covering *Z. Sav.*, I-L.

M. HOMBERT, *Chron. d'Ég.*, Nos. 13-14 (1932), 227-36, announces the project of a general bibliography of Egyptian papyrology widely understood. He is also responsible for a very comprehensive current card-index, which has been in circulation for about a year. Cf. L. WENGER, *Archiv*, X (1931-2), 293-4.

E. ALBERTARIO, *Arch. Giurid.*, CVII (1932), 88-95, at the end of a necrology of S. PEROZZI, gives his bibliography.

ii. *Miscellaneous reviews.* In *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 523-9, E. LEVY gives an appreciative account of FERRINI's work as contained in the five volumes of *Opere di Contardo Ferrini (Journal, XVII (1931), 130)*. *Studi P. Bonfante* (†) (*Journal, ibid.*): in *Rev. hist. dr.*, XI (1932), 516-38, J.-B. PARIS gives short summaries of the four volumes; vols. II, III, and IV are reviewed in *Arch. Giurid.*, CVI (1931), 245-56, CVII (1932), 96-111, CVIII (1932), 131-45, by G. SCHERILLO, G. GROSSO, and S. ROMANO respectively.

iii. *Legal history of antiquity.* An admirable general orientation continues to be given by L. WENGER in his above-mentioned *Literaturübersicht*. The problems of method and scientific aim are discussed by M. SAN NICOLÒ in a reply to W. ELLERS' criticism (*Journal, XVIII (1932), 91-2*), *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 328-33, and also in a *Rektoratsrede* of 23 Nov. 1931 (cf. *Forschungen u. Fortschritten*, 1931, 140 ff.). He insists on the necessity of studying as a whole the legal history, as well as the other aspects, of the cultural unity which we call antiquity. See also J. G. LAUTNER, *Die methoden einer antikrechtlichen Forschung, Z. f. vergleich. Rechtsw.*, XLVII (1932), 27-76.

Cuneiform law. It would be out of place to repeat here what can be found in the general reviews of L. WENGER, *Archiv*, X (1931-2), 283-5, and P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 379-81. The latter announces that the *Z. Sav.* will in future provide a regular *Bericht* on the literature of this department. A clear, brief and thoroughly readable account of problems and results so far reached is given by G. BOYER, *Les études*

d'assyriologie juridique, Rev. hist. dr., XI (1932), 501-15. A very interesting beginning of the study of Hittite private law has been made by V. KOROŠEC, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 156-69: *Beitr. z. helhitischen Privatrecht*.

Jewish law. We note A. GULAK, *Rechtsvergleich. Stud. zu Talmud u. Papyri, Ét. de pap.*, I (1932), 97-104 (not seen), and reviews of E. R. GOODENOUGH, *The Jurisprudence of the Jewish Courts in Egypt (Journal)*, xvii (1931), 131; xviii, 94) by E. SEIDL, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 428-30 and by M. SAN NICOLÒ, *Journal*, xviii (1932), 116-18. The former, though appreciative, thinks that the author goes too far in the view that Philo reflects the law of the contemporary Jewish courts in Alexandria; such reflection as there is, is unconscious.

Greek law. What is evidently an important book (not seen), U. E. PAOLI's *Studi di diritto attico* (Florence, 1930), containing studies of the Attic maritime loan, ὑποθήκη—ἀποτίμημα, and citizenship, is highly praised by E. WEISS, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 441-7. The reviewer, who has himself published a short characterization of Greek law in the *Encycl. of the Social Sciences* (New York, 1931-), considers PAOLI's separate treatment of Attic law to be justifiable, provided that, like him, one relates it to the laws of the other cities. V. ARANGIO-RUIZ, *Arch. Giurid.*, cvii (1932), 245-53, is equally laudatory, especially of the third study, in which a new view of Attic marriage is proposed, but differs from the author as to ὑποθήκη and ἀποτίμημα. The next volume of the *Arch. Giurid.*, 161-78, however, publishes a remarkable answer by PAOLI.

Demotic law. E. SEIDL, *K.V.G.R.*, xxv (1931-2), 219-49, continues his *Sammelbericht (Journal)*, xvii (1931), 131), the first part of which has been welcomed by L. WENGER, *ibid.*, 285-6, and P. M. MEYER, *ibid.*, 360. Here he completes and brings up to date his previous article, and then deals with public law and administration. He considers that M. SAN NICOLÒ's *Beiträge (Journal)*, xviii (1932), 91-2) have opened up to Egyptologists the best comparative material, but takes exception to his chronological table, in which the column Egypt ought to begin not with 1400 or even 710, but with the Fourth Dynasty (2720-2560). In *Zu Pap. Strassb. dem.* 12, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 326-8, E. SEIDL disagrees with W. KUNKEL's interpretation of this papyrus (*Journal*, xviii (1932), 93, 99). L. WENGER and E. SEIDL, *Z. Sav.*, LII, 430-8, and E. SEIDL alone, *K.V.G.R.*, xxv (1931-2), 297-306, review W. SPIEGELBERG's *Die dem. Papyri Loeb* (cf. F. LL. GRIFFITH, *Journal*, xviii (1932), 194-5). In both reviews attention is drawn to Pap. 43 as throwing light on the Ptolemaic ἀγγελία ἀποστασίου; both in fact lay stress on points of demotic law elucidating the Ptolemaic and Roman periods, and this is *ex professo* the aim of E. SEIDL's *Die dem. Zivilprozessordnung und die griech. Rechtsurkunden, Chron. d'Ég.*, Nos. 13-14 (1932), 210-26, to which, space forbidding details, the attention of students of the Greek Ptolemaic texts is strongly recommended. Cf. L. WENGER, *Archiv*, x (1931-2), 286; U. WILCKEN, *ibid.*, 248-9.

Coptic law. A. A. SCHILLER, *K.V.G.R.*, xxv (1931-2), 250-96, begins a general survey of the sources and literature for Coptic law (sixth to tenth centuries). He treats of the general problems, legal sources, documents, and the law of persons, property, succession, and obligations, reserving for a future article civil procedure and criminal law and procedure. Cf. *Journal*, xviii (1932), 93; W. E. CRUM, *ibid.*, 196-7, and L. WENGER, *ibid.*, 287-8.

Eastern Hellenistic law. P. KOSCHAKER's important book (*Journal*, xviii (1932), 93, 94, 96-7) is reviewed by M. SAN NICOLÒ, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 460-6 (cf. *O.L.Z.*, xxxiv (1931), 1015-18), by F. DE ZULUETA, *Law Quart. Rev.*, XLVII (1932), 275-6, and by L. WENGER, *Archiv*, x (1931-2), 289-90. The fundamental question raised by the Avroman and Dura finds, namely how far Hellenistic law took effect in the interior of Asia, which is touched on by SAN NICOLÒ in his review, is the subject of P. KOSCHAKER's Leyden address: *Die rechtsgeschichtliche Bedeutung der griech. Pergamenturkunden aus Dura, Chron. d'Ég.*, Nos. 13-14 (1932), 202-9. There is a gap of about 200 years between the earliest Greek texts and the latest cuneiform. The private law of a Greek πόλις like Dura was doubtless at first Greek (cf. P. Dura 5, *Journal*, xviii (1932), 98), but how long did it remain pure, and how far was it received by the mixed native population of the district? In P. Dura 10 and in the Avroman parchments we find, as in Egypt, Greek documentation extended to non-Greeks, but is this only form? The question is difficult, because we do not know the contemporary native law and because Greek law has not the specific, easily distinguishable quality of Roman law. From P. Dura 10 the natural conclusion is that Greek law is applied to oriental parties, but antichrestic self-pledge is also found in cuneiform sources from 2000 B.C., and probably the native institution persisted. Thus we cannot infer reception of Greek law; still, Greek juristic thought and form are dominant. But in *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 340-2, *Zu P. Dura 10*, E. SCHÖNBAUER denies the cogency of the oriental parallels, earlier by centuries, and maintains that P. Dura 10 exhibits pure Greek law, antichrestic debtor-bondage, which is a common Indo-Germanic institution, and the best parallel to which is the Roman *mancipii causa*, etc. He develops this view further in an article in *Archiv*, x (1931-2), 201-10, to which we shall return (below B ii and C); L. WENGER is not unfavourable, *Archiv*, x, 289. E. BICKERMANN, reviewing *Yale Class. Stud.*, II (1931), in *Gnomon*, VIII

(1932), 572-7, regards P. Dura 10 as a diplomatic hybrid, in form neither Greek nor Babylonian, but Parthian, like the two other Greek documents from Parthia. The witnesses are to the transaction, not to the document, which therefore, unlike the cuneiform document, is simply evidentiary. The combination with the sealed double form is due to reception. Cf. Jeremiah, xxxii, 9 f. It is suggested that the borrower, since he retains property of his own, is to be the lender's military retainer, *more Parthico*, rather than his serf.

The Berytus question. *Byzantine law.* The Milan *Conferenze (Journal)*, xviii (1932), 92 are reviewed by F. DE ZULUETA, *Law Quart. Rev.*, XLVII (1932), 272-4. See also L. WENGER, *Archiv*, x (1931-2), 291 and A. LEVET, *Rev. hist. dr.*, xi (1932), 539-43. H. F. JOLOWICZ, *Academic Elements in Roman Law*, *Law Quart. Rev.*, XLVII, 171-90, maintains that till after the end of the classical period academic influence is negligible, but that in the later period it is a factor, the results of which have in a number of points been demonstrated. F. PRINGSHEIM, *Bonum et aequum*, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 78-155, argues that the phrase was hardly ever used by the classical jurists save with reference to the *formulae* in which it occurred, whereas in interpolated texts of Justinian it appears almost always in the form *ex bono et aequo*, as an expression of the new Byzantine equity. E. LEVY, *Zur Infamie im röm. Strafrecht, Studi in onore di Salvatore Riccobono*, II, 79-100 (Palermo, 1932, offprint), shows the effect on the classical edictal principle, which made *infamia* an automatic consequence of condemnation in certain cases, first of the extension of the *cognitio* and secondly of the late imperial tendency to remove the penalty from the discretion of the judge. Incidentally he reveals a poignant page in the life of Papinian and a characteristic piece of Byzantine scholasticism. F. DÖLGER, *B.Z.*, XXXII (1932), 245-6, announces the publication (Athens, 1931, edd. J. and P. ZEPOS) of eight volumes which are mainly a reprint of ZACHARIAE VON LINGENTHAL'S scarce *Ius graeco-romanum*, but contain interesting additions. Although DÖLGER does not praise the execution of the work highly, he considers it useful, as does L. WENGER, *Archiv*, x (1931-2), 292. In fasc. 2 (1931) of the new *Arch. B.A.* (above i), 437-40, I. C. TORNARITES, reviewing G. FERRARI, *Diritto Bizantino, Encicl. Ital.*, VII (1930), 141-8 (not seen), contends that in spite of its Roman skeleton the spirit and social character of the Byzantine law is Greek. Apart from this dissent, the review is favourable. There is a discussion of the meaning of *ἐπιτέλεια* in medieval texts.

iv. *Juristic texts.* J. C. NABER, *Scholia ad Pandectas Graecas in integrum restituta tria, Studi in memoria di Aldo Albertoni*, I, 21-3 (Padua, 1932, offprint), after announcing a forthcoming demonstration that certain fragments published by SEYMOUR DE RICCI in *Ét. Girard*, I, 273 ff. (1913) give a text from the first edition of the *Cod. Just.*, attempts, by the aid of *scholia* on the *Basilica*, a conjectural restoration of other fragments published in the same place. They are Greek *scholia* on D. 19, 2, 54, 1; 55, 1.3, written later than Nov. 120 (544). The discovery of a *scholium* on L. 55, 3 is of interest, because this text is omitted by the Florentine MS. of the Digest, though its existence has been inferred from Greek sources.

v. *Diplomatic.* B. KÜBLER, *Pariculum exemplum, St. Riccobono*, I, 437-53 (Palermo, 1932, offprint), finds the clue to the enigmatic word *periculum* in the rubric *De sententiis ex periculo recitandis* of *C. Theod.* 4, 17 and *C. Just.* 7, 44, and in *Cic. II in Verrem*, III, 183. It is a mistake for *pariculum* and should properly mean duplicate (*ισότυπον* of the Novels, *ισον* of the papyri), but in the slang of the chanceries, which was inherited by the Middle Ages, it meant the final draft *sententia* drawn up by the *scribae*, which was corrected and subscribed by the magistrate and, when read to the parties, became unalterable. Parties were provided with a duplicate, *mundum*, which also was an authentic original, a duplicate as opposed to a mere copy (*exemplum, αντιγραφον*). The question of duplicate originals is further considered in relation, *inter alia*, to imperial enactments and to wills. It is unfortunate that in this fascinating study the printing of the Greek text on p. 439 seems to have gone awry.

At the very last moment W. KUNKEL kindly sends *Zur Gräko-ägyptischen Doppelurkunde, St. Riccobono*, I, 415-33 (Palermo, 1932, offprint).

B. Law of persons.

i. *Juristic persons.* New documents: P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 363. G. BESELER, *ibid.*, 284-7, *Zu dem Briefe Hadrians an Plotina vom Jahre 121*, returns to a subject recently treated of by A. STEINWENTER (*Journal*, xviii (1932), 94). He interprets Hadrian's letter as a permission to a Roman citizen, Theotimus, to make a will in Greek and according to Greek law, and thereby to regulate the succession to the headship of the Epicurean School, which was corporative owner of the School property, and as an Athenian corporation was subject to Greek law. Hadrian may or may not have doubted the capacity of a *diadochus*, who happened to be a Roman citizen, to act under Athenian law; at any rate, he removed all doubt in the present case. See below, vi.

ii. *Slavery and bondage.* E. SEIDL, *K.V.G.R.*, xxv (1931-2), 306-13, reviewing V. ARANGIO-RUIZ, *Persone e famiglia*, etc. (*Journal*, xvii (1931), 135, 136) adduces in confirmation of the author's conception of Graeco-Egyptian slavery (possibility of half-freedom) E. WEISS, *Communisio pro indiviso und pro diviso*, *Archiv*, iv (1908), 330 ff. and P. dem. Loeb 41 and 47. He also states that Egyptian law permitted sale of self and sale of one's children into slavery, a point on which P. KOSCHAKER had expressed doubt. As noted here last year (p. 94), there is a difference of opinion with regard to the effect on this question of P. Colomb. 480, published by W. L. WESTERMANN, *Upon Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt* (summarized by P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, lII (1932), 367-8, and reviewed, chiefly with reference to its fiscal side, by F. OERTEL, *Gnomon*, viii (1932), 647-56). E. SCHÖNBAUER, *Archiv*, x (1931-2), 182-5, produces very strong confirmation of KOSCHAKER'S interpretation, which is that ll. 23 ff. of the papyrus are not concerned with bondage or enslavement of free persons, but with slaves given as security. The contrast between *ὑπόχρεα σώματα* and *ἐλεύθερα* is between slaves already pledged and those clear of encumbrance (*ἀνέπαφα*). This involves that the editorial completion is wrong, and another is proposed. The royal ordinance as a whole thus dealt with the acquisition of slaves by private purchase (ll. 1-14), with auction-sales by the State and its organs (ll. 15-22), and with hypothecation and forfeiture (ll. 23 ff.). On the other hand, as noted above (A. iii. *Eastern Hellenistic law*), SCHÖNBAUER in the same article differs from KOSCHAKER with regard to P. Dura 10. See also below, C.

Colonate. F. ZUCKER, *B.Z.*, xxxii (1932), 85-9, reviewing P. Ross. Geogr. III, draws attention to the importance of Pap. 8 for the history of *patrocinium*.

iii. *Civitas.* See P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, lII (1932), 368-70; U. E. PAOLI, *Studi di diritto attico*, no. 3 (above, A iii, *Greek law*).

iv. *Family.* E. SEIDL, in the review of V. ARANGIO-RUIZ just mentioned (ii), while approving of the author's conception of the proprietary organization of the Egyptian family (children have expectant *iura ad rem*), observes that this conclusion rests on particular marriage-contracts, and that we do not know the common law. He thinks that there is demotic evidence of a far-reaching *patria potestas* (P. Louvre E. 7832 = Corp. Pap. I, 8).

With reference to the Karanis diptych published by H. A. SANDERS, *A.J.A.*, xxxii, 309-29 (*Journal*, xvi (1930), 135; xvii, 136), U. WILCKEN, *Archiv*, x (1931-2), 276-7, withdraws his own expansion of *deereebts* in favour of DITTMANN'S.

R. TAUBENSCHLAG, "Ἐνομος Ἡλικία nel diritto papyri, *Aegyptus*, xii (1932), 141-4, inquires into the age of majority in Graeco-Egyptian law, which, as A. BERGER in his important recent article *Minores in Pauly-Wissowa* (cols. 1883-4) observes, is uncertain. TAUBENSCHLAG shows that the evidence has greatly increased since his article *Die patria potestas im Recht der Papyri*, *Z. Sav.*, xxxvii (1916), 177-230, where he had concluded that the age was 18, though for *Πέρσαι τῆς ἐπιγονῆς* it was probably 20. P. Oxy. 2134 (A.D. 170) with B.G.U. 1068 (A.D. 101) perhaps reduces the former figure to 14. For Romans the 25 years of the *l. Plaetoria* were kept to: P. Oxy. 2111 (A.D. 135), but after the *Const. Antoniniana* there is trace of persistence for a time of the Graeco-Egyptian age; the Byzantine P. Lond. I, 113 (p. 201), however, shows that ultimately the official law here won the day. To the recently published documents concerning guardianship and minority recorded by P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, lII (1932), 373-4, should now be added P. Mich. Inv. 2922 (c. A.D. 172/3) published by A. E. R. BOAK, *Journal*, xviii (1932), 69-76. It is a petition for *excusatio tutelae*, on which some further slight juristic commentary might be desirable; but the most interesting point, the citation of precedents (*cf. e.g. M., Chr. 85*), is obvious.

R. TAUBENSCHLAG, *Die Alimentationspflicht im Rechte der Papyri*, *Studi Riccobono*, I, 507-18 (Palermo, 1932, offprint), contributes a systematic study of the papyri in which any sort of duty of maintenance appears. As between parents there seems to have been no such duty apart from contract in national Egyptian law, but only a social duty. After the *Const. Antoniniana* the case was altered: *e.g.* P. Lond. 1708 (A.D. 567), from which it may further be inferred that the law of Justinian imposed no duty as between brother and sister. There may have been one in respect of a wife divorced when pregnant: P. Fay. 22 (*M., Chr. 291*, first century B.C.) and P. Flor. 93 (A.D. 567). But the most frequent source of the duty is contract, either as an incident of service-contracts of all kinds, including *παραμονή*, or as a principal term in family-contracts on marriage or adoption, or parental divisions of property. We find, in particular, cases in which a parent parting with property to a child imposes a duty of *γηροβοσκεία*. Reservations of life-rents for maintenance are also common in wills. A curious case is seen in B.G.U. 1024 (fourth century): the mother of a murdered girl is awarded one-tenth of the murderer's property in lieu of her lost right to maintenance, an idea which recurs in late Byzantine law. With this study may usefully be compared *Un contratto vitalizio del tempo di Dario I, Aegyptus*, xii (1932), 35-47, in which M. SAN NICOLÒ expounds a neo-Babylonian gift of a temple-

prebend made in consideration of a defined aliment to be rendered periodically. Such agreements are common in Babylonian documents of all periods, and recall both the *γηροβοσκεία* of the Greek papyri and the demotic papyri published by W. SPIEGELBERG, *Sitzungsb. Heidelberg*, 1923, 6.

v. *Marriage*. A condensed summary of W. F. EDGERTON's *Notes on Egyptian Marriage chiefly in the Ptol. Period* (*Journal*, XVIII (1932), 95) is given by P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 374-5, and 420-8, E. SEIDL reviews the work. The principal question is of the interpretation of the demotic marriage-contracts, which EDGERTON regards as purely patrimonial, the marriage itself being in Egyptian law simply consensual. SEIDL, on the other hand, thinks that they at any rate strengthened the marriage by securing almost penal advantages for the wife in the event of undeserved divorce, and that they perhaps even indicated marriage as against concubinage. There are parallels in *Hammurapi* and the *Syro-Roman Lawbook*. But he does not regard these patrimonial contracts as essential to marriage, so that he is prepared to admit that the *γάμος ἀγγραφος* of Roman times may be a survival of national custom. At any rate the distinction *ἐγγραφος* and *ἀγγραφος* does not occur in Egyptian documents, and there is there no sure trace of grades of marriage. SEIDL ends by discussing the reading and interpretation of P. Tor. 18 (*U.P.Z.* 118). In his review of V. ARANGIO-RUIZ (above, B ii) he is of opinion that this writer's discussion of Egyptian marriage is superseded by EDGERTON'S.

F. ZUCKER, in his already mentioned (B ii) review of *P. Ross. Georg. III*, comments on Pap. 28, which is the first fourth-century marriage-contract to come to light.

vi. *Monks*. P. COLLINET, *La règle de saint Benoît et la législation de Justinien*, *Rev. hist. rel.*, CIV (1931), 272-8, draws attention to ch. 2 of Abbot CHAPMAN'S *Saint Benedict and the sixth century* (London, 1929), in which the relation of the Rule to Justinian's legislation was first observed and the conclusion drawn that the Rule must precede C. I, 3, 46 (A.D. 530). Justinian, a western Christian like Justin, was in close relations with the Pope even before the reconquest of Italy; he may have obtained the Rule from the Pope or from St. Benedict; as for jurisprudence, so for the reform of eastern monasticism, the indefatigable legislator turned to the West.

A. STEINWENTER, *Byz. Mönchstestamente, Aegyptus*, XII (1932), 55-64, develops in greater detail one of the topics of his *Die Rechtsstellung der Kirchen u. Klöster nach den Papyri*, *Z. Sav. (Kan. Abt.)*, XIX (1930), 1-50 (*Journal*, XVII (1931), 135; XVIII, 94, 96). Byzantine legislation did not entirely deprive monks of power to dispose of their property *mortis causa*, and in any case only applied to regular coenobites in the full sense. It is clear that monks did make wills, for there are precedents in the Byzantine formularies, though examples of actual practice are few. The Egyptian examples are not against the law, because they are either anterior to Justinian or made by hermits; seldom by coenobites. In the twelfth to fourteenth centuries there are many Byzantine wills of monks, but nearly all in favour of the monastery. The wills of Superiors show a patrimonial conception of their rights over the monastery, but they may also be regarded, like the philosopher's wills, as exhibiting the birth-struggle of juristic personality (see above, B i).

C. *Law of property*. See P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 391-4.

Conveyance. The most important work for papyrologists is E. SCHÖNBAUER'S *Rechtshistorische Urkundenstudien*, *Archiv*, x (1931-2), 177-210; cf. *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 340-2. Its accessibility justifies brevity here. The four sections deal respectively with P. Colomb. 480, P. Freib. III, 36/7, P. Ent. 14 and 15, and P. Dura 10, the connecting thread, apart from incidental excursus (B ii above), being the explanation of the problematic *ἀνανέωσις* by the doctrine of *καταγραφή* which was propounded by the author in his *Beitr. z. Gesch. d. Liegenschaftsrechtes im Altertum* (1924). *Καταγραφή* is based on the Greek principle that for the sale of certain kinds of property, regarded as of special social importance, the co-operation of the community through its organs was necessary. It was therefore not a mere registration of a private act, written or oral, but a registration of the seller's declarations to which the State gives its co-operation. The form is derived from the *ὁμολογίαι* of a party to a dispute made before the magistrate, which put an end to contentious procedure, but which, as P. Ent. I shows, were enforceable by execution. Compare (and contrast) *in iure cessio*. This requirement of public co-operation applied equally to hypothecation of catagraphable property, and hypothecation was at the date of P. Ent. I, 15 (P. Magd. 31) only allowed for a fixed term, probably one year. The creditor, if unpaid on the due date, could claim the thing as forfeit (*ἐπικαταβολή*) without regard to excess-value, if any. But if he failed to exercise his right, the property would be freed, and he would be remitted to the ordinary process of execution of debt. Thus, if both creditor and debtor wished to adjourn the due date, either or both might have an interest in renewing the hypothec. Renewal was *ἀνανέωσις*, which, like the original hypothecation, required an act of public co-operation in the nature of *καταγραφή*.

This would not be given without the *agoranomus* having satisfied himself of the existence of the antecedent hypothec between the parties and of the consent of both to renewal. P. Freib. III, 36–7 are documents of an *ἀνάεωσις*; the reason for the petition to the king in P. Ent. I, 15 is that there was no time for *ἀνάεωσις*, to which both creditor and debtor's heir were agreeable. P. Ent. I, 14 is a case in which *ἐπικαταβολή* had taken place upon property on which the petitioner's horse had happened to be quartered. In P. Dura 10 the hypothec of property is not general; it may be that it was of the debtor's *invecta et illata* (L. WENGER, *Archiv*, x (1931–2), 133). The *ἀνάεωσις* clause, which probably covered the *παράμωγή* as well as the hypothec of property, can be explained quite simply by this doctrine of Ptolemaic *ἀνάεωσις*. The Egyptian papyri of the Roman period suggest that the doctrine had been modified in certain respects.

In *Zur Frage der Eigentumsübergang beim Kauf*, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 195–250, E. SCHÖNBAUER uses his publicity principle for the solution of a vexed question of Roman law. F. PRINGSHEIM, as is well known, holds that the rule, that ownership of a thing sold did not pass to the buyer unless the price had been paid, was introduced into Roman law in the early Byzantine period, by reception from Greek law. As SCHÖNBAUER remarks elsewhere, the burning question of the Roman or Graeco-oriental character of Justinian's law can only be settled by further study of Greek law. Here he denies that the rule was Greek. A seller who allowed *καταγραφή* to take place before being paid must provide himself with an actionable acknowledgement of debt in the form of a fictitious loan. *Mancipatio*, like *καταγραφή*, embodied social control of alienation, but in it the exchange of the thing against *aes* weighed out was essential. But later Roman law diverged from Greek. The 12 Tables allowed *expromissio* (probably *sponsio* of a third party) as a substitute for payment; then the creation of the consensual contract of sale made the buyer debtor of the price, and the *expromissor* came to be regarded as security; *expromissio* was then generalized as any form of *satisfactio*, and finally, not later than Diocletian, property was allowed to pass if seller chose to rely merely on buyer's personal credit (*fidem emptoris sequi*). In *Inst.* 2, 1, 41 Justinian combines various strata of texts, but substantially he adopts the latest development. The original rule of the 12 Tables and its developments appear to have been applied to *traditio*.

Still more purely Romanistic are three articles on the problem of the causal or abstract character of *traditio* (cf. *Journal*, xvii (1931), 137): J. HUPKA, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 1–30 (very conservative); F. SCHULZ, *ibid.*, 535–49 (reviewing five recent works; radical); and E. SCHÖNBAUER, *K.V.G.R.*, xxv (1931–2), 136–218 (not yet digested; seems conservative).

G. FERRARI, *La donazione nei papiri di Ravenna*, *St. Riccobono*, I, 457–83 (Palermo, 1932, offprint), reacts against some of H. STEINACKER's doctrines in *Die antiken Grundlagen der frühmittelalterlichen Privat-urkunde*. In these documents, which date from the end of the fifth century, as in P. Lond. III, p. 254 (M., *Chr.*, 367, sixth century), even nominal reservation of usufruct rendered *traditio rei* unnecessary for conveyance; this is Theodosian and earlier law, not a Byzantine anomaly. When usufruct was not reserved, *traditio* was necessary, but in Justinian's sense there was *donatio perfecta* by mere agreement to give, which was enforceable by personal action (*Inst.* 2, 7, 2). *Traditio cartae* cannot be explained by the *absolutio* of Nov. 44, for it is found earlier. The fact that this act, put in high relief by the Ravenna documents, is not mentioned in eastern documents, does not prove that it did not take place in the East. It is a natural act in many cases, e.g. when the document is epistolary. Again, observance of the law of *insinuatio* at Ravenna and in Egypt does not prove that donation was perfected by *insinuatio* alone. Cf. *Journal*, xvi (1930), 138; xvii, 134.

P. T(ORELLI) also, in *Studi Medievali, nuova ser.*, 604–8 (offprint, n.d.), is decidedly critical of STEINACKER. The study of the function of writing in legal life is beyond the scope of diplomatic, which is merely an auxiliary discipline. So long as GNEIST's doctrine of the pure consensuality of Greek contract and BRANDILEONE's (*Riv. Stor. Dir. Ital.*, I and II) of the persistence of true stipulation in the West are unrefuted, the question of the dispositive nature of the Roman document is open. So also is that whether the *exceptio non numeratae pecuniae* is purely Roman or only a Roman formulation of a Greek idea (cf. J. C. NABER, *Aegyptus*, xii (1932), 247–8). There are other criticisms, but final judgement must be deferred till we have heard STEINACKER on the medieval period.

P. S. LEICHT, *Le ultime vicende della mancipatio in Italia*, *Riv. Stor. Dir. Ital.*, v (1932), 19–27, contends that the continuance of mention of *mancipatio* in Italy, according to locality, till the Bolognese renaissance, is a pure matter of routine and ignorance, and no proof that *mancipatio* and the distinction between *res Mancipi* and *nec m.* survived after their suppression by Justinian and indeed by earlier desuetude.

Real security. M. SAN NICOLÒ, *Parerga Babylonica*, I–v, *Archiv Orientalni* (*Journ. Czechoslovak Oriental Inst.*, Prague), iv (1932), 34–40, 179–92. The second of these studies (38–40) offers some material for comparison; it notes the relative rarity in late Babylonian law of real security being substituted for personal

liability; real security tends, in fact, to become mere security, additional to personal liability. Further and less remote material is supplied by the second of U. E. PAOLI'S studies in Attic law mentioned above (A iii, *Greek law*).

D. *Law of obligations.*

i. *General.* E. LEVY, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 512-23, in a review of the Freiburg collection of PARTSCH'S posthumous and smaller works (*Journal*, XVIII (1931), 91), treats chiefly of the unfinished study of *Synallagma*. A very careful account of PARTSCH'S views is given, and the conclusion is reached that the developed Byzantine theory of *synallagma* had only a very limited importance.

F. WEBER, *Untersuchungen zum gräko-ägyptischen Obligationenrecht. Modalitäten der Leistung im Recht der Papyri* (*Münch. Beitr.*, Heft 15, 1932), starts from the position (A. B. SCHWARZ'S against A. SEGRÈ'S) that in Graeco-Egyptian law performance of an obligation was a discharge of liability without further formality, and considers the question: when was performance effective? Must it be rendered to the creditor, by the debtor, and at what time and place? What was the effect of partial performance? To which of several obligations of the same debtor to the same creditor was a performance, which did not satisfy them all, to be appropriated? These *Modalitäten* form the subject of successive sections, which are preceded by a survey of sources and followed by a summary of conclusions, with excellent indexes. A cursory examination of the book makes a good impression. The conclusion is that the Gr.-Eg. law of contract was modern in character, and that the Romans found in Egypt substantially the same commercial law as their own. The solutions, for example, as to performance by a third party, or as to appropriation of payments are the same, and there is the same tendency to construe payment by a third party as purchase of the debt. In short, we have in Egypt a continuous development, to which neither the Roman conquest nor the *Const. Antoniniana* made much difference; divergences between local and imperial law are only occasional. Special attention is drawn to new conclusions in regard to *depositum* and to leases at will in late law (*Journal*, XIV (1928), 154).

The third of M. SAN NICOLÒ'S above-mentioned (C, *l.c.*, 179-88) *Parerga Babylonica* illustrates from late Babylonian documents the construction of substituted performance, *datio in solutum*, as sale, a construction which is found also in Hellenistic law, though some of the papyri, which are our chief evidence, have given rise to controversy as to what the underlying transaction really was: *datio in solutum*, sale with price prepaid, or a form of usury. Cf. F. WEBER, *op. cit.*, 14 and R. TAUBENSCHLAG, *St. Bonfante*, I, 420. The construction as sale was ultimately admitted by Justinian, and the importance of the late Babylonian documents is that they suggest a persistence in nearer Asia of Babylonian ideas even through Roman times. Hellenization was probably superficial and temporary. Cf. above, A iii, *Eastern Hellenistic law*.

ii. *Sale.* See above, C. *Conveyance*; also P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 386-8, noting new documents.

M. SAN NICOLÒ. *Parerga Bab.*, I (above, C, *l.c.*, 34-8) announces the discovery in one or two Cappadocian documents (*Eisser-Lewy*) of a word, used in connexion with pledge, related to the Hebraic 'erabon, which, in spite of the traditionally Semitic origin of ἀρραβών (*arrha*), has up to the present been the only parallel. It is suggested that the term may have been specially western Semitic.

F. WIEACKER, *Lex Commissoria. Erfüllungszwang u. Widerruf im röm. Kaufrecht* (*Freib. Rechtsgesch. Abh.*, III, Berlin, 1932). This book, treating of the very difficult subject of reservation by seller of right to call the sale off, if not paid by a certain date, has not yet been reviewed, but certainly it shows real talent and thorough training in modern critical methods. The conclusions with regard to the main lines of the Roman evolution do not appear to be revolutionary, but the handling of the embarrassing collection of texts in the *Corpus Iuris* is original. What most concerns us here is that the ultimate state of Roman law is explained as a result of Hellenistic influence (79-115). Hence a considerable treatment of Greek sale (89-103), which is mainly papyrological, but is too technically expressed for rapid summarization. The author follows PRINGSHEIM'S doctrine as to the introduction of the rule in *Inst.* 2, 1, 41, but unfortunately he could not join issue with E. SCHÖNBAUER'S article in *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 195-250 (above, C. *Conveyance*).

No papyri appear to be cited by H. SCHEUER, *Die Laesio enormis im röm. u. im modernen Recht*, I, *Z. f. vergleich. Rechtsw.*, XLVII (1932), 77-117.

iii. *Societas.* Two important articles are to be noted: R. TAUBENSCHLAG, *Die societas negotiationis im Rechte der Papyri*, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 64-77, and A. STEINWENTER, *Aus dem Gesellschaftsrechte der Papyri*, *St. Riccobono*, I, 487-504 (Palermo, 1932, offprint). The first is a systematic survey of the sources, the second raises special points. Both deal with partnership for the farming of public taxes and land, for farming private land, and for trade and handicraft. STEINWENTER differs from M. ROSTOVZEFF, *Gesch. der Staatspacht* (*Philologus*, Suppl. IX, 1902) as to the relation of the μέτοχοι of the ἀρχαίως to the Ptolemaic State,

holding that they were directly liable to the State and distinct from the *ἔγγυοι*. He also draws attention to a group of cases in which it is difficult to say whether there was partnership, *colonia partiaria*, or both. In the Byzantine partnerships between artisans he notes the express mention of *affectus societatis* and the fact that the standard of care is *culpa in abstracto*.

iv. *Depositum*. In *Phil. Woch.*, LII (1932), 1078–84 (*Festschr. Poland*, 133–40), W. SCHUBART summons the use of *παρκατατίθεσθαι* and related terms in the papyri to the aid of the interpretation of the will of Ptolemy the Younger of Cyrene (below, H). C. SPICQ, *Rev. bibl.*, XL (1931), 481–502, adopts the same course in regard to the *παράθηκη* of 1 Tim. vi, 20; 2 Tim. i, 12, 14, but carries his point too far.

v. *Dialysis*. A. STEINWENTER, *Das byz. Dialysis-Formular*, *St. Albertoni*, I, 73–94 (Padua, 1932, offprint), applies the diplomatic method recommended by H. STEINACKER to *dialysis*, which for his purpose he understands with PARTSCH primarily in the sense of contract for ending or avoiding a lawsuit. Such contracts, in sixth–seventh century papyri, agree in external form with early (Justinian) and later Byzantine law. They agree also in style with the Byzantine literary formularies (*scholia* of *Basilica*), but the coincidence does not extend equally to the substantive law. What is the source of the documentary unity? Hardly imitation by the eastern Empire generally of the practice in Egypt, as supposed by A. SÈGRÈ in sale, nor yet imperial constitutions, but rather the influence of the law schools, which is seen, for example, in the Byzantine formulary of the *stipulatio Aquiliana* (cf. P. Lond. 2017). We must omit many interesting details.

vi. *Delict*. E. RABEL, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 466–81, in the course of a dissenting but appreciative review of F. DE VISSCHER's *Études de droit romain* (*Journal*, XVII (1931), 138; XVIII, 98), differs from him both as to the interpretation of P. Hal. I and as to the development of the *actio iniuriarum noxalis*. The book is favourably reviewed by B. BIONDI, *Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.*, XL (1932), 225–41 (see 236 ff.), and by R. MONIER, *Rev. hist. dr.*, XI (1932), 161–3. The connexion between the *δίκη αικίας* and the *actio iniuriarum* (*aestimatio in bonum et aequum*) is considered by F. PRINGSHEIM, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 86 ff.

E. Law of succession.

See P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 375–7, especially for new documents; also above, B i and vi.

E. KORNEMANN, *Älterliche Teilung f. d. Todesfall*, *Archiv*, X (1931–2), 213–15, publishes P. GISS. Inv. 255 in advance of P. GISS. II. Of the reign of Hadrian, it is a division of property (*μερίτια*: cf. H. KRELLER, *Erbrechtliche Untersuchungen*, 242; M., *Chr.*, 306) made by a mother between her two sons, with effect *post mortem*. F. DE ZULUETA, *Reichsrecht ou Volksrecht dans le P.S.I. 1027?*, *Rev. hist. dr.*, XI (1932), 491–501, accepts H. A. SANDERS's view that the tablet is the first of a diptych (*Journal*, XVIII (1932), 98), and contends that the *testatio* in question is a record of proceedings which can be explained by pure Roman law. His chief point is that very young children were allowed to make *cretio*, of course with *auctoritas*, as soon as they could speak, before they could understand (D. 29, 2, 9).

M. DAVID, *Über die Form des ordenlichen, schriftlich abgefassten Privattestaments zur Zeit des Dominates*, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 314–25, deals with a neglected subject. In the legal texts of the period we find civil and praetorian wills distinguished. It is explicable by classical law that the former require 5 and the latter 7 witnesses, but what was the determining difference? Not the solemnization of the *mancipatio familiae*, which was quite dead, but possibly that the civil will was holograph and the praetorian allograph. The papyrological evidence is assembled p. 318, n. 1. The same writer's *Studien zur heredis institutio ex re certa* (Leipzig, 1930) are briefly summarized by R. MONIER, *Rev. hist. dr.*, XI (1932), 163–4, and papyrological points in them are picked out by P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 377.

F. Lawcourts and procedure.

See P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 395–407, where a full account is given of E. BERNEKER's and E. SEIDL's books (both *Journal*, XVIII (1932), 99). Attention has been drawn (A iii, *Demotic law*) above to the latter's *Die demotische Zivilprozessordnung*, etc. A point of procedural terminology is cleared up by U. WILCKEN, *Archiv*, X (1931–2), 246–7, in his *Referat* of P. Ent. II, 64 (*δίκην γράφασθαι*) and 74 (*δίκην λέγειν*).

R. DÜLL, *Der Gütegedanke im röm. Zivilprozessrecht* (*Journal*, XVIII (1932), 99), has been reviewed shortly by E. GRUPE, *Phil. Woch.*, LII (1932), 843–5, and F. J. KLEIN, *Archiv R. u. W.*, XXV (1931–2), 567–8. H. LEVY-BRUHL, *Rev. hist. dr.*, XI (1932), 777–81, is more critical; indeed the conception of the praetor's function advanced by him in various well-known studies is diametrically opposed to DÜLL's. E. SCHÖNBAUER's article, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 251–81, bears the same title as this book, and is in part a review of it. While agreeing that the original role played by the State in private suits was not that of the *bracchium saeculare* of the private interest and that cases were more often than not settled *in iure*, SCHÖNBAUER holds that the State's purpose was not conciliation (*Gütegedanke*?), but order. DÜLL carries Wlassak's doctrine of the

original nature of the *exceptio* too far and too late. There is no parallel between the intermediate arbitral sentence of the *iudex* in an *actio arbitraria* (which is the peculiar feature of such actions) and the decision of the Greek *δαιτητής*, which was final, though subject to *ἔφεσις*.

R. DÜLL, *Über die Bedeutung des Verfahrens de plano im röm. Zivilprozess*, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 170-94, combats the idea that *de plano* means simply not *pro tribunali*, and that *de plano* and *in transitu* (Gaius, I, 20) are interchangeable. The sources show that *de plano* is connected with minor matters delegated to the court-staff; it developed ultimately into the institution of *iudices pedanei* (χαμαιδικασταί, χαμάβεν, *de plano*).

P. COLLINET, *La procédure par libelle, Ét. hist. sur le droit de Justinien*, IV, Paris, 1932. This substantial volume, which is the first detailed study of the libellary procedure as a whole since BETHMANN-HOLLWEG, requires a special review. We note here the emphasis laid on the new evidence, especially the documents of P. Oxy. XVI and P. Lips. 33 and 38. The conclusions are not lacking in originality and will provoke discussion; they are the fruit of much reflexion and meticulous study of the texts. Undoubtedly the book fills a long-felt want.

G. Criminal law.

See P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 394-5, and M. SAN NICOLÒ, *ibid.*, 295-6, noting P. Oslo. II, 17 (A.D. 136) as new evidence of the application of flogging even to free persons in criminal procedure; cf. P. Oxy. 1186 (fourth century B.C.).

E. CUQ, *Le rescrit d'Auguste sur les violations de sépultures*, *Rev. hist. dr.*, XI (1932), 109-26, maintains his interpretation of the Nazareth (?) inscription against L. WENGER's (*Journal*, XVIII (1932), 100, etc.); see now the mainly summarizing article (two textual suggestions; full literature) of F. DE ZULUETA, *J.R.S.*, XXII (1932), 184-97.

H. Public law.

That the organization of the Macedonian army throws light on the early Ptolemaic constitution was maintained by E. SCHÖNBAUER, *Z. Sav.*, XLIX (1929), 345 ff. (*Journal*, XVI (1930), 134). F. GRANIER's *Die Makedonische Heeresversammlung* (*Münch. Beitr.*, Heft 15, 1931, not seen) has had several short reviews. P. TREVES, *Riv. di fil.*, LX (1932), 397-402, does not accept the contention that the original constitution survived in the orientalized monarchies of the *Diadochi*. U. KAHRSTEDT, *G.G.A.*, CXCIV (1932), 208-11, makes the same criticism, but regards the collection of materials as valuable, as does W. W. T[ARN], *J.H.S.*, LI (1931), 307.

C. OLIVERIO, *La Stele di Tolomeo Neoteros re di Cirene* (*Documenti antichi dell'Africa italiana*, I, *Cirenaica*, I. Bergamo, 1932). The interest of this inscription is political: cf. § 4, but because of its form it has an accidental legal interest. On this aspect see L. WENGER, *Zum Testamente des Ptolemaios Neoteros von Kyrene*, *St. Riccobono*, I (?) (1932), 529-48 (Palermo, 1932, offprint), E. BICKERMANN's review in *Gnomon*, VIII (1932), 424-30, and U. RATTI (†), *Note sul testamento di Tolomeo Neotero*, *Riv. di fil.*, LX (1932), 375-7. Cf. above D iii. The only substantial question is whether the *παρακαθήκη* was meant to and did take effect in Ptolemy's lifetime. The legal answer can only be negative: so WENGER, though U. RATTI, in a very sensible argument, dissents. But this is a political gesture, not a legal act.

On the βουλή-papyrus, *P.S.I.*, x, 1160, see § 4.

J. STROUX and L. WENGER's book on the Augustan Cyrenean inscription (*Journal*, XVIII (1930), 100, etc.) is the subject of a learned review by A. FLINIAUX, *Rev. hist. dr.*, x (1931), 715-24.

E. LEVY, *Zwei Inschriften auf den Jurist Maecianus*, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 352-5, draws attention to C.I.L., XIV, 5347, 5348, which confirm the fact, already practically proved by papyri, that the jurist L. Volusius Maecianus was prefect of Egypt at the end of Pius' reign and at the beginning of the next. His interesting career is commented on.

P. M. MEYER, *Z. Sav.*, LII (1932), 381, cites new documents and literature (including EHRENBERG, *Hermes*, LXV, 337 ff., not seen) on the Ptolemaic terms *διάγραμμα* and *πρόσταγμα*. Cf. E. SCHÖNBAUER, *Archiv*, x (1931-2), 199.

7. PALAEOGRAPHY AND DIPLOMATIC.

F. G. KENYON's *Books and readers in ancient Greece and Rome* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1932, pp. vii+136) is the outcome of three lectures delivered at King's College in 1932. He deals with the use of books in Greece and Rome, the history of the roll and codex, and the use of papyrus and vellum as materials. There are several good photographs.

W. WEINBERGER in *Bursian*, 236 (1932), 85-113, *Bericht über Paläographie u. Hskunde 1926-1930*, gives a detailed review of contributions to the palaeography of papyri which have been made during this period. He discusses particularly the various studies of tachygraphy. From this article I learn for the first time of C. JOHNEN, *Allgemeine Geschichte d. Kurzschrift* (Berlin, 1928), which apparently contains a section on Greek stenography.

K. OHLY's *Stichometrische Untersuchungen* is reviewed by F. ZUCKER in *Gnomon*, VIII (1932), 383-8. I have not yet been able to see this.

A. BÖMER, *Die Schrift und ihre Entwicklung* (*Handb. d. Bibliothekswiss.*, I (1931), cap. II, 27-149) is also inaccessible to me.

8. LEXICOGRAPHY AND GRAMMAR.

PREISIGKE's *Wörterbuch* is reviewed by C. J. KRAEMER in *Cl. Weekly*, XXIV (1931), 149 f. (not accessible to me). LIDDELL AND SCOTT Part VI, λ-ol, pp. 1021-1200, has appeared; Parts V and VI are reviewed by P. MAAS in *J.H.S.*, LII (1932), 150-2, Part V by P. SHOREY in *Cl. Phil.*, XXVII (1932), 177-8. GRADENWITZ's *Heidelberger Konträrindex der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* is reviewed by W. SCHUBART in *O.L.Z.*, 1932, 770-1; by H. I. BELL in *Cl. Rev.*, XLVI (1932), 44; by G. COPPOLA in *Boll. fil. class.*, XXXVIII (1932), 193 f.; by K. F. W. SCHMIDT in *Phil. Woch.*, 1932, 322-5; by P. COLLART in *Rev. de phil.*, ser. 3, VI (1932), 405-6; and by W. BAUER in *Theol. Lit.-Z.*, LVII (1932), 73. H. WUTHNOW's *Semitische Menschennamen* is reviewed by M. ENGERS in *Museum*, XXXIX (1931), 59-60. E. MAYSER's *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri I* and II 1 is reviewed by G. N. HATZIDAKIS in *Byz.-Neugriech. Jahrbücher*, LX (1932), 203-4.

A. GROHMANN's article, *Griechische und lateinische Verwaltungstermini im arabischen Aegypten*, in *Chron. d'Ég.*, VII (1932), 275-84, is not accessible to me (see § 4). D'ARCY W. THOMPSON has contributed an essay *On Some Greco-Egyptian Bird and Beast Names to Griffith Studies*, 249-53. W. SCHUBART's article, *Παρακαταίθεσθαι in der hellenistischen Amtssprache*, in the *Festschrift für Franz Poland = Phil. Woch.*, 1932, 35(8), 133-40, is a discussion of the meaning of this word in the testament of Ptolemy Euergetes II and of the purport of the whole document (see also §§ 4, 6, D iv). In *Cl. Rev.*, XLVI (1932), 12, W. B. SEDGWICK discusses the phrase πολλὰ πολλῶν (*Pap. Oxy.* 744) without being aware that his conclusions were anticipated by EINAR HEIKEL in *Eranos*, XVII (1917), 91-6.

The complete title of the dissertation by H. GLITSCH which was mentioned in *Journal*, XVII (1931), 141 is *De Ptolemaei et Apollonii, Glaucliae filiorum, chartis quaestiones linguisticae*, and it is a study of papyri contained in WILCKEN's *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, vol. I. F. ZUCKER has reviewed it in *Gnomon*, VIII (1932), 577-84.

H. LJUNGVIK, *Beiträge zur Syntax der Spätgriechischen Volkssprache* (Skrifter utg. av K. Humanist. Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala, 27: 3), Uppsala and Leipzig, 1932, is not yet accessible to me. It is favourably reviewed by G. GHEDINI in *Aegyptus*, XII (1932), 381-2; by R. M. DAWKINS in *Cl. Rev.*, XLVI (1932), 236; by P. S. COSTAS in *Cl. Phil.*, XXVII (1932), 293-4, and by A. DEBRUNNER in *Indogermanische Forschungen*, L (1932), 255.

E. C. COLWELL, *The Greek of the Fourth Gospel*, Chicago, 1931, is devoted to proving that the idioms of this gospel which have been claimed as Aramaisms are found in papyri which are free from Aramaic influence and must be admitted to be genuine Greek. The book is favourably reviewed by P. S. COSTAS in *Cl. Phil.*, XXVII (1932), 193-5.

G. GHEDINI reviews, in *Scuola Cattolica*, LVIII (1930), 81-90, LIX (1931), 315-24, several works on the Greek of the N.T. or on similar subjects.

In *Byz.-Neugriech. Jahrbücher*, VIII (1931), 317-26 the late CARL WESSELY has given a sketch of the language of the Zenon Papyri, with the object of showing that the beginnings of many modern Greek developments can be observed in them.

K. F. W. SCHMIDT mentions in *Phil. Woch.*, 1932, 323, footnote, that he has long been engaged on a *Konträrindex der griechischen Sprache* arranged on the same plan as PAPE's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*, i.e. by grammatical categories, and within these by alphabetical order beginning from the end of the word.

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

W. G. WADDELL has published a very pleasant paper on *The lighter side of the Greek papyri: A talk to the St. Andrew's Society, Cairo, Egypt* (C. F. Cutter, Low Fell, near Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1932. Pp. 21, 1 plate). J. MANTEUFFEL publishes, in Polish, another article of a general character: *Rozwój i potrzelniz papyrologji*, in

Nauki Polskiej, xv (1932), 287-90. For an article by P. G. RABEAU on *Les enseignements des papyrus: Christianisme et sociologie* see § 2, *Christian*.

Reviews of the *Konträrindex* are referred to in § 8 above.

M. HOMBERT has continued his excellent *Bulletin papyrologique in Byzantion*, vi (1931), 722-36 (part v, for 1930) and vii (1932), 433-56 (part vi, for 1931-2). The bibliography in *B.Z.*, xxxii (1932), 146-251, 395-477, is valuable as usual; papyri are dealt with on pp. 157-9 and 406-9. K. PREISANDANZ's *Zur Papyruskunde (Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft, ed. FRITZ MILKAU, I (1931), cap. v, pp. 300-31)* will be found useful not only as a general survey but in particular from a bibliographical point of view. M. HOMBERT in his *Projets de bibliographie papyrologique (Chron. d'Ég., vii (1932), 227-36)*, read to the Section of Papyrology at the Leyden Congress of Orientalists, sketches the plans formed by himself and VAN HOESSEN, with the collaboration of S. DE RICCI, for the projected international bibliography on slips, which, I am glad to be able to record, has now become a reality. See too *Bibliographie papyrologique sur fiches in Rev. belge*, xi (1932), 393-4 (not accessible to me).

BILABEL's *Berichtigungslisten*, II, 1, and *Sammelbuch*, iv, are reviewed together by E. KIESLING in *D. Lit.-Z.*, 1932, 1499-1503.

In his *Varia (Symb. Oslo., x (1932), 153-6)* S. EITREM deals with the following documentary papyri: 63. S.B. 6944; 64. B.G.U. 372; 65. P.S.I. 1055; 68. P. Oxy. 119; 72. P. Oxy. 44 = W. Chrest. 275. J. C. NABER proposes new readings for several of the Cairo Zenon papyri in *Ad papyros quosdam Cairo-Zenonianos (Aegyptus, xii (1932), 48-54, 243-9)*; but EDGAR, on the strength of an examination of the originals by GUÉRAUD, points out (*ibid.*, 371) that many of these suggestions are irreconcilable with the papyrus evidence.

10. MISCELLANEOUS, EXCAVATIONS, PERSONAL.

In *Z. Sav.*, lii (1932), 552-5, E. SEIDL publishes a *Bericht über den 18. internationalen Orientalistenkongress zu Leiden (7-12 Sept. 1931)*, following this with the *Entschliessung über die Edition koptischer Papyri und Ostraka*. The papers read in the papyrological section are published in *Chron. d'Ég.*, vii (1932), and several of them have already been referred to in their proper place. The following general surveys of work done or in contemplation call for mention here: N. HOHLWEIN, *Notes sur quelques papyrus inédits du Caire*, 317-23; H. I. BELL, *Papyrology in England*, 134-6; K. KALBFLEISCH, *Die Fortschritte der Arbeit an den Giessener Papyri*, 151-2; FR. BILABEL, *Über den Fortschritt der Arbeiten an neuen Heidelberger Papyrus-Unternehmungen*, 311-16; L. WENGER, *Mitteilung über den Stand der Münchner Papyrussammlungen*, 335-48; L. AMUNDSEN, *Papyri and papyrology in the Scandinavian countries*, 324-31; A. CALDERINI, *Proposta per la compilazione di un censimento delle persone nominate nei documenti dell'Egitto greco-romano*, 258-61; FR. HEICHELHEIM, *Bericht über ein Papyrusverzeichnis nach Gauern, Archiven und Jahrhunderten geordnet*, 137-50; A. STEINWENTER, *Ein Vorschlag zur Publikation koptischer Rechtsurkunden*, 153-6. With these articles may be classed, though it appeared elsewhere, a survey by M. HOMBERT of papyrology in the United States of America: *Les Études papyrologiques aux États-Unis*, in *Bull. des Alumni*, III (1932), 229-34.

The same number of *Chron. d'Ég.* contained (262-9) B. A. VAN GRONINGEN's *Projet d'unification des systèmes de signes critiques*, in which, following up the brochure of BIDEZ and DRACHMANN on the unification of editorial usage in the matter of critical signs and *apparatus criticus*, he outlines a scheme suitable for use alike in papyri, inscriptions and literary texts. Elsewhere in the number H. I. BELL (*Note on methods of publication*, 270-1) accepts VAN GRONINGEN's scheme and pleads for greater uniformity in certain other matters of editorial usage; and A. S. HUNT (*A note on the transliteration of papyri*, 272-4) unfavourably (and, in the present writer's opinion, very justly) criticizes the practices of (a) dotting letters within square brackets, (b) underlining broken letters. On pp. 285-7 (*Essai d'unification des méthodes employées dans les éditions de papyrus*) are stated the conclusions arrived at by the Congress. WELCKEN in *Archiv*, x, 211-12, *Das Leydener Klammersystem*, accepts the new system, and so does A. CALDERINI in *Aegyptus*, xii (1932), 276-9 (*Unificazione dei metodi usati nell'edizione dei papiri*). The proposals are also stated by VAN GRONINGEN in *Mnemosyne*, LIX (1931), 362-5 (*De signis criticis in edendo adhibendis*).

EV. BRECCIA has published a very useful survey of the museum over which he presides: *Le musée gréco-romain 1925-1931* (Municipalité d'Alexandrie, Istituto italiano d'arti grafiche, Bergamo, 1932, pp. 102, 62 plates).

BOAK and PETERSON's *Karanis (Journal, xviii, 103)* has been reviewed by J. A. O. LARSEN (*Cl. Phil.*, xxvii (1932), 420); EV. BRECCIA (*Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, 27, 78-83); D. ZUNTZ (*Gnomon*, viii (1932), 107-9); D. M. ROBINSON (*Journ. Am. Or. Soc.*, lii (1932), 63-5); and H. I. BELL (*Mizraim*, i (1933), 187-8).

EV. BRECCIA has published (*Ann. Serv.*, XXXI (1931), 19-24) a *Rapport sur les fouilles de la "Società Italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini" à Oxyrhynchos et à Tebtynis (1928-1930)*.

Several obituaries have been mentioned in § 6 above. The following call for mention here: On WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF by WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 314); on WESSELY by H. GERSTINGER (*Aegyptus*, XII (1932), 250-5), WILCKEN (*Archiv*, x, 314-15), and J. CAPART (*Chron. d'Ég.*, VII (1932), 115-16); on SPIEGELBERG by J. CAPART (*ibid.*, 116-17) and CL. P[RÉAUX] (*ibid.*, 117-18); and on DESSAU by A. STEIN (*Klio*, XXV (1932), 226-44).



