The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

R. Accademia Scientifico-Letteraria in Milano R. *Accademia scientifico - letteraria in Milano: Studi della Scuola Papirologica* I., II. Milano: U. Hoepli. 1915, 1917.

B. P. Grenfell

The Classical Review / Volume 32 / Issue 5-6 / August 1918, pp 112 - 114

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00011604, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00011604

How to cite this article:

B. P. Grenfell (1918). The Classical Review, 32, pp 112-114 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00011604

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

REVIEWS

R. ACCADEMIA SCIENTIFICO-LETTERARIA IN MILANO.

R. *Accademia scientifico-letteraria in Milano: Studi della Scuola Papirologica* I., II. Milano: U. Hoepli. 1915, 1917.

A WELCOME sign of the marked progress in the study of Greek papyri in Italy is the establishment of a school of papyrology at Milan, under the energetic leadership of Professor A. Calderini, assisted by Professor P. de Francisci and Dr. G. Castelli. The first-fruits of the new school, which, like the Florentine *Società Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri*, numbers several ladies among its members, are two handsome volumes, each divided into four sections, of which the first consists of unpublished texts. The times are of course unpropitious for obtaining papyri from Egypt, and at present Professor Calderini and his helpers are dependent for new material upon the generosity of the Florentines, who fortunately have a large collection, or upon papyri passed over by previous editors. Thus *P. Fay.* 204, a briefly described fragment of a collection of maxims, was cleverly identified by Calderini as belonging to the *Aphorisms* of Hippocrates, and is published in full (No. 1). A third-century letter (No. 2), for which the same editor is responsible, clearly requires considerable revision, the text being untranslatable as printed. In l. 4 *καὶ ἔστι δ' ἐν ποσίν, πραχθήτω* should probably be *καὶ εἴ τι δέον ἐστίν, πρ.* The following sentence (ll. 5-6) *μάθε Διονυσίου τ[ὰς] βουλευτὰς πράξ[εις] περὶ τοῦ κατ' αὐτόν* can hardly be right: *τ[ὴ] βούλεται πράξ[αι]* is expected. In l. 7 *ἀ[σ]κ[ω]ν* is an unlikely restoration: the context suggests *ἀ[ν]τ[ὶ]ω* or a proper name in the dative. *καὶ ἅπαντος ἐγράφησ[α] φροντιστ[ῆ] ἡμῶν* in ll. 9-10 is unsatisfactory, especially since *ἐγραψα* occurs in l. 13, and the divisions of words between two lines are elsewhere correct. If the initial *a* in l. 10 is right, *ἀφροντίστ[ως]* suggests itself, and some-

thing like *καὶ ἅπαντα δὲ γράψον ἀφ. ἡμεῖν* would be appropriate. *προσαγόρενε τῷ παιδὶ τὰ ἡμῶν καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἡμετέρους* is an impossible construction, and *τὰ παιδία ἡμῶν* must have been meant, whatever was written. *ἀριστοὺς* in l. 13, *ὥστε τοῖς περὶ αρ.*, is probably a proper name, 'Ἀριστοῦς, not ἀρίστους. The next sentence (ll. 14-6) is unintelligible, but apart from the original can hardly be restored. In l. 19 *Πάσις εὐχομαι*, which follows *ἰ' ἔτους* after the conventional salutation *ἐρρῶσθαί σε εὐχομαι πανοικησία*, is presumably a misreading of *Παῦνι* (or *Παχῶν*) *ἐβδόμη*. The other texts in Part I. are Byzantine, the most interesting being No. 5, edited by Francisci, of which a facsimile is given. This is a badly spelled petition to a *comes* from the inhabitants of the Arsinoite village of *Δίνεως* (cf. *P. Tebt.* ii. p. 375), as appears from ll. 4-5, where l. *πα[ρὰ τῶν ἀπὸ (κώμης) | Δίν'νεως* for *πα[ρὰ τῶν ἀπὸ (κώμης) | Δυνάμεως*. The preceding clause belongs to the titles of the *comes*, and after *κώμ[ε]τι* a word like *βοηθῶ* is to be restored before *τῶν σου δουλων* (sic: the *υ* of *δουλων* was written above the line, not omitted). The loss of the right-hand half of most of the lines obscures the sense throughout; but apparently the villagers were in difficulties as regards both food and water (*χρεία* is to be supplied at the end of l. 25), and wanted the *comes* to appoint a person called Solomon (ll. 7, 10) to look after them, and to come himself (*περπατησεν* and *φρωντισεν* in ll. 17 and 19 seem to represent *περιπάτησεν* and *φρόντισεν*). *θαυμάζ[ο]μεν τὴν σὴν | μεγαλωπρέπ[ει]αν* is a probable restoration of ll. 5-6, and the following word was most likely *φρω[ν]τισεν* as in l. 19. *των* in l. 7 is for *τόν*. In l. 11 *πάλη(ν) τὰς* for *παψίας*, and similarly *πάλ[ι] (ν) for παψίας* in l. 10. The restoration *κυρι[α]κού* in l. 13 is unsatisfactory, for a letter visible after *ι* seems to be *ζ*. In l. 18 *ειδηνατε προτευνσε* means *εἰ δύναται πρωτεύσαι* (sc. Solomon). The papyrus has *ἐξὺς* not

ἐξῆς in l. 20, where *μνή[σεω]ς* is a possible reading (traces of several letters at the end of this line are ignored); but the supposed references in this letter to Christian religious ceremonies are all very uncertain. In the curious sentence (ll. 22-3) *θέλομεν αὐτὸν* (sc. Solomon) *ἕως τοῦ σώματος τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμῶν*, the *δεσπότης* is more likely to be the *comes* himself than the Deity; cf. l. 29, where l. *δέσποτα ἡμῶν* followed by a cross, marking the conclusion of the petition. Line 25 is to be read -*αν* (the *α* was a later insertion) *εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰ (=ῆ) δύλωσον (=δήλωσον) α[ὐτῷ]*. That the corrupt *μωσησα* at the beginning of l. 27 contains a reference to the Jewish law-giver is improbable: Moses and Solomon were common Byzantine names in Egypt. In l. 28 l. *καὶ τὸν θεόν σου, χάρισε* (i.e. *χάρισον*) *ἡμῖν τὰ φο[—]*. In No. 4, an account of barley, in which several passages have still to be deciphered, *μεσορῆς* in ll. 9 and 12 should be divided *Μεσορῆ ε*, as is shown by l. 13, where *Μεσορῆ ιδ* occurs. The members of the school would do well to revise each other's copies to a greater extent than they seem to have done. Few cursively written papyri can be deciphered quite accurately by a single pair of eyes until much experience has been obtained.

The second section consists of articles by various members of the school, chiefly commenting upon literary fragments published in *P. Soc. Ital.* I.-II. (17 epigrams, 55 index of the *Digest*, 120 collection of aphorisms, 131 epic, 136 comedy), a few dealing with juristic points (*βιβλίον* and *βιβλίδιον, συνεστῶς* and *συμπαρών*). The third section, which is much the longest, is a *lexicon suppletorium* to the papyrus fragments of Sophocles (soon to be increased by the fragments of the *Inachus* in *P. Tebt.* iii.), with a collection of the various restorations which have been proposed—a very useful piece of work, which reflects great credit on the industry of the new school. Reviews of recent papyrological publications conclude the volume.

Part II. is mainly concerned with private letters, elaborate classifications and indices of the existing material being provided by Professor Calderini

and Signora M. Mondini; while three interesting articles deal with some more general aspects—Calderini on 'Thought and Sentiment,' Signora Mondini on 'Women's Letters,' and G. Ghedini on 'Pagan Religious Elements.' The new texts are also letters, being three British Museum papyri published by Calderini from photographs. Having revised the originals of these, I append my copies of two of them, which differ somewhat widely from the editor's readings (e.g. in No. 6. 3-4 he 'has *ἔχει Ἰλαρίων σου ἐπιστολὴν ὡς ὑπαινέεις καὶ Ἡλιοδώρος Σύμωνος ? . . .*'). 6 (*P. Lond.* 852), as he rightly points out, belongs to the same series as *P. Amh.* 88 and 131-5, and was written about 130. 7 (*P. Lond.* 853a) is contemporary with 6, and, though the hand is apparently different, very likely refers to the same two individuals. Another papyrus belonging to this group is *P. Lond.* 840 (Kenyon-Bell, *Catal.* iii. 169).

6. ¹ *Εὐτυχίδης Ἡλιοδώρῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ* ² *χαίρειν.* ³ *ἔχάρη(ν) λαβὼν σου ἐπιστολὴν ὡς ὑγιαίνει* ⁴ *καὶ ἀπρόσκοπος γέγονας* (or *-νός*). *παρακα-* ⁵ *λῶ οὖν σε συνεχῶς ἡμεῖν ὃν (?) διεσ-* ⁶ *τειλάμη(ν) ? σω . η () .* ⁷ *ἔρρωσο.* On the verso ⁸ *Ἡλιοδώρῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ.* For *ἀπρόσκοπος* in the sense of 'unharmful' cf. *P. Giessen* 17. 7, etc. The reading of the four words before *ἔρρωσο* is uncertain; but *ἡμεῖν* is preferable to *ἡμέραν*, and though *διε|τει* is possible, the preceding word is not *ἐν*. One of the last two words must be an infinitive, but *σῶσαι* is not satisfactory, and in both words the final letter seems to be a large *η* above the line, like that of *ἔχάρη(ν)*.

7. ¹ [*Εὐτυχίδης(?)*] ² *Ἡλιοδώρῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ* ³ *χαίρειν.* ⁴ [8 l.] *λεις (?) ἐπιλελησμένος ἡμῶν* ⁵ [8 l.] *οὐδὲν ἡττόν σε [νῦν] ἀσπά-* ⁶ [*ζομαι. σ]υνεχέστερον δ' ἂν ἦν τοῦτο, εἰ μὴ* ⁷ [11 l. π] *ἐρὶ τὸ σῶμα συμβέβηκε.* ⁸ [12 l.] *οὐδεν[δ]ς (?) ὠλιγόρῳσα,* ⁹ [12 l.] *μανικὰ (?) ἀπὸ μέρους, καθῶς* ¹⁰ [12 l.] *προσαντιβέβληκα* ¹¹ [9 l.] *ρα πλοίων περὶ τῶν η-* ¹² [6 l.] *ερ[.]ν μόγισ αἶρω (?) σοι τὴν τετάρ-* ¹³ [τῇ] *ν (?), καὶ ἥδη ἡ <α> ? γορὰ ἦν καὶ ἀπεστάλκειν* ¹⁴ [ἀν] *εἰ (?) μὴ ἐμελλεν διορθοῦσθαι πρὸς τὴν* ¹⁵ [5 l.] *εἰαν. καὶ γὰρ ἐμάντῳ κατασκευ-* ¹⁶ [8 l.] *ε εμ . . . ν μέχρι τοῦ* ¹⁷ [13 l.] *μενου[.]ς ἔχω σπον-* ¹⁸ [δ 12 l.] *ὑπερ*

(?) [. . .] *τικώτερον* ¹⁸ [13 l.]. *προε*[.] . *ν* *ι* (= *ει*?) .[.] *ς* *παρὰ* ¹⁹ [14 l.] .[. . .] .[.] *ατα*, with traces of another line before the papyrus breaks off. The length of the lines is fixed by the tolerably certain restorations at the beginnings of ll. 5 and 12. For *προσαντιβάλλειν* ('compare'; l. 9) cf. *B.G.U.* 970. 4. The second *α* and the *υ* of *κατασκευ-* have been corrected, the former from *ε* (unless *κατεσ-* corrected from *κατασ-* be read). While both Nos. 6 and 7 are rather difficult, No. 8 (*P. Lond.* 963) is clear. In l. 11 *Δημήτριος*, not *Δημητρίφ*. *Πλουτίων Βάκχω* is for *Πλουτίωνι Βάκχου*, as appears from the address on the verso, which seems not to have been supplied to Calderini. This runs *ἀπόδος ἱς* (= *εἰς*) *Ἀπο() Πλουτίωνι Βάκχου*, but the place-name is uncertain, *π* having been corrected, and there being perhaps another letter after *ο*. Possibly (*ε*)*ἱς*

πόλ(ιν) was intended. The provenance of the papyrus is unknown. In l. 3 l. *ι* (= *ει*) *δὲ μή, πέμψον ἐφ' ὑμᾶς* (= *ἡμᾶς*) for *ιδῶ(ν) ἡ πεμ. ἐφ' ὑμ.* The letter is doubtfully assigned in Kenyon-Bell's *Catalogue* to the third century, but more probably belongs to the Domitian-Trajan period.

A valuable juristic article by G. Castelli is the re-edition with a full commentary of the Latin will of A.D. 131 published in 1914 by de Ricci, and there is an excellently arranged bibliography of recent papyrological publications, which is very complete for 1915, but necessarily less so for 1916. The volume concludes with obituary notices, among which we regret to see recorded the death of one of the most promising members of the school, Attilio Cosattini, who fell at Cima Lana in December, 1915.

B. P. GRENFELL.

A GRAMMAR OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH.

A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research.
By Professor A. T. ROBERTSON.
One vol. 10" x 8". Pp. xl + 1360.
London: Hodder and Stoughton.
No date. 20s. net.

THIS massive and monumental volume should have received earlier notice, had not imperious duties caused by the present war made it impossible to give to the work the consideration it demanded. The delay has not been unproductive of good: it has allowed many readers to test by experience what its worth is. Interchange of opinions has served to confirm the reviewer's single judgment.

It is something to have at hand a work which has taken account of modern grammatical researches and of the material hurled upon us from the Press since Egypt began to yield up her buried treasures. But when this has been said, it has first to be deplored that the work should have been produced as a ponderous single tome instead of as two handy volumes. The

large print is welcome and the ample margins, but it remains that the book is not a delight to the user. This regret is accentuated by two defects in the Index. There the columns of references do not have at the top of every page the name of the particular book in the New Testament which is in question. As a result the reader turns over *e.g.* the ten pages of references from the *Acts* uncertain what book it is that the figures concern, and time and patience are lost. More than that, when a passage is run to earth there is nothing to distinguish a page of the text which deals casually with a problem from those pages which fully discuss it. Further there is considerable repetition, and even discrepancy, in different parts of the book—a natural failing in so large a work, but none the less irritating. Some who have used the book have summed up these criticisms by saying frankly that they can never find what they want.

So much for complaint, or rather for deploring that the author has not given us more than he has. But in the other