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](#)

The Berlin Papyri *Aegyptische Urkunden aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin, herausgegeben von der Generalverwaltung. Griechische Urkunden, Hefte 1—3* (Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1892). Each Mk. 2.40.

F. G. Kenyon

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 03 / March 1893, pp 108 - 111
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00197082, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00197082

How to cite this article:

F. G. Kenyon (1893). The Classical Review, 7, pp 108-111 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00197082

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

times. But like the rest of us he has often introduced it when the order of the words makes it impossible—*e.g.* Υ 340 : ὡς *ἑταῶν* λῦπε *ἦ* αὐτόθ'. (See Monro *H.G.* § 365 2nd ed.)

These instances will be enough to show

that it will be as impossible to neglect Brandreth as Knight. It is no small satisfaction to me to be the means of rescuing from undeserved oblivion a Fellow of my own College, *ad maiorem Trinitatis gloriam.*

ARTHUR PLATT.

BUSTS OF JULIUS CAESAR.

I NEED hardly say that I entirely agree with Mr. Tilley in his remarks on the portraits in my *Life of Caesar*. In justice however to my good friend Mr. Putman,—the most obliging of publishers, save in this one matter of illustrations,—I must take blame to myself for not having alluded in the preface or elsewhere to the very doubtful evidence in favour of other portraits besides that on page 78. I would myself have preferred to limit the illustrations to two or three portraits of Caesar himself, and as a consequence failed to take sufficient trouble about the others that were pressed upon me.

Mr. Tilley's note however gives me an opportunity of drawing attention to an omission which neither he nor any of my reviewers seems to have noticed. The Berlin basalt bust of Caesar, to which I made allusion in the preface, does not appear in the volume; it was unaccountably omitted after the sheets had gone out to New York, and the bad representation of the Vatican bust seems to have been substituted for it. Of all the so-called busts of Caesar this is the most singular and in some ways the most interesting. Bernoulli is very sceptical about it, and no doubt justly so, but it appears to me to have at least one or two points in common with the coins, and the exceeding hardness of the basalt may, I suppose, possibly account for some of the points of difference. I have not seen the

original, but I was greatly attracted by a fine cast of it shown me by Professor Michaelis in his gallery at Strassburg, and a letter which he afterwards very kindly wrote to me on the subject, quoting Conze's somewhat doubtful opinion and at the same time giving me his own, made me wish to include it in my book, with the word of warning which does actually appear in my preface.

If this strange and realistic bust is not a portrait of Caesar, it must at least be a portrait of some remarkable man. It is in fact so striking that it would be a great boon to all who are interested in Caesar's personality if the question as to its genuineness could be even approximately settled by experts. What Bernoulli says of it is certainly not the last word that can be said. And I take advantage of Mr. Tilley's remarks to invite specialists to concentrate their attention on a question of such real and lasting interest; for if it be Caesar at all, it must, I think, be the one real and unidealized portrait of him; while if it must be reckoned altogether doubtful, we should at any rate be able to rid our minds of an impression which it is not easy to shake off, so long as the strange features of this bust are even dimly associated in our minds with the Dictator.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

THE BERLIN PAPYRI.

Aegyptische Urkunden aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin, herausgegeben von der Generalverwaltung. Griechische Urkunden, Hefte 1—3 (Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1892). Each Mk. 2.40.

OF the four great collections of papyri, in London, Paris, Berlin, and Vienna (Leyden

does not seem to have maintained its position of late years), that at Berlin has hitherto been the least generally available. It is true that no official publication of this class of manuscript (with the exception of those containing texts of classical authors) has been made by the British Museum since 1839, or by Paris since 1865, and that the

Rainer collection at Vienna is only represented by a catalogue containing brief descriptions of a small selection from its possessions; but these volumes have been supplemented by the publication of a considerable number of texts in various ephemeral journals, chiefly through the industry of Dr. Wessely of Vienna. The Berlin papyri, on the other hand, have remained unknown, with the exception of a few texts published or referred to by Wilcken, and students of the papyrus literature have laboured under the unpleasant sense that their conclusions might be refuted out of this extant but unpublished material. Now, however, the want is being made good by the gradual issue of what promises to be a complete *corpus* of the papyri contained in the Berlin museums. The first three parts have just appeared simultaneously, and subsequent parts are promised at the rate of about ten a year; but no indication is given of the number of years over which the publication is likely to extend. The editors of the three published parts are Wilcken, Krebs, and Viereck, one part being undertaken by each. Dr. Wilcken's work has for several years been known to those engaged in the same field for its soundness and carefulness, and the only complaint that could have been made was that there was too little of it. His colleagues have not hitherto made their mark in this department of research; but if this is their first appearance it is an eminently creditable one.

The mode of publication adopted by the Berlin authorities is open to some criticism. The editors' transcripts of the texts are reproduced in autograph, with no introductions except an official advertisement of the whole series and brief statements of the dimensions and place of discovery of each document. No notes are given except explanations of the symbols employed in the MSS. Dates are interpreted in the margin; but in many instances in the second part and a few in the third, where precise dates are not stated in the documents themselves, no indication is given of the probable age of the writing. This is a serious omission, since the inferences which can be drawn from the documents naturally depend largely on a knowledge of the period to which they belong. No order is observed, either of date or subject or official numeration; the latter at least one would have thought possible, and it would have facilitated references. Finally, no facsimiles are given, so that the interests of palaeography

are in no way furthered by this publication. This is the more to be regretted, since the published materials for fixing the palaeography of the early centuries of our era are still very scanty. On the other hand, this mode of publication has the great advantage of cheapness. Each part (containing thirty-two large pages and, on an average, twenty-seven separate documents) costs little more than two shillings, so that the texts are easily accessible to all who may require them. The absence of system and classification permits of greater rapidity of production, and enables the more important documents to be brought forward at once, if so desired. And the advantage of the actual publication of the texts, in whatever form, is sufficient to counterbalance the fact that the method of publication is not ideally perfect.

Of the accuracy of the transcripts it is of course impossible to speak positively in the absence of facsimiles; but a study of the texts leaves little room for doubt that the work has been most carefully and faithfully executed. The errors which one can be fairly certain are such are few. In no. 14, l. 15, ἐγλόγου should perhaps be printed *divisim*, the same phrase ἐγ (for ἐκ) λόγον τοῦ δαίμονος μηνός occurring more than once in Brit. Mus. Pap. cxxxi. In 36, l. 9 for ὕβριν οὕτην (where Krels conjectures ταύτην) τυχοῦσαν, read ὕβριν οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν. In 38, ll. 17—19, where Krels reads ἵπαγω παρὰ | Σεραπιάδα τὴν ζῆτω | πολεῖν, explaining πολεῖν as = πωλεῖν and leaving ζῆτω unaccented, apparently as uncertain, probably the word really intended is τὴν ζῆτόπωλον. In 55, l. 16 the 14th year of Aurelius should be interpreted as A.D. 173/4, not as 174/5. In 71, l. 9 for οὐ[σ]ι τὸν ἐς νότον read οὐ γ(ε)ίτονες νότου (or <ἐς> νότον), according to the phrase common in describing the situation of a house. In 72, l. 12 συχολικηνβλαβην presumably stands for οὐκ ὀλίγη βλάβη rather than οὐ χολικὴ βλάβη. Lastly in 73, ll. 9—11, where Viereck gives εἰς οὖν τὰ δι' αὐτοῦ δεδηλωμένα ἀχρηθῆ ἢ καὶ μηδὲν ἐμποδίζῃ, explaining ἀχρηθῆ as = ἀχθῆ, the real reading intended must be ἀληθῆ ἢ καὶ κ.τ.λ. This is not a very large catalogue of lapses in a work of this nature, and as a whole the work of all three editors inspires confidence. The danger is lest the absence of facsimiles, which would show where the work of transcription is easy and where difficult, should deprive them of the credit due for their careful and conscientious work.

Of the contents of the documents now published it is not possible to speak at

length within the limits of a review. A few of them have been published previously, but the majority are new. There is nothing in them sensational or of first-class importance, but they contain the material out of which the history of the administration of Egypt under the Roman Empire can be reconstructed. A few of them belong to the Byzantine period, but by far the greater number are dated in the second and third centuries of our era. Only one is as early as the first century (A.D. 51). The official hierarchy of Egypt is largely revealed in these and similar documents. The present publication includes the following officers: the *ἐπιστράτηγος* (of the Heptanomis), the *στρατηγός*, the *ἡγεμών*, the *βασιλικὸς γραμματεὺς* and the *νομογραμματεὺς* of the nome (or, in the case of the Arsinoite nome, of one of the districts into which it was divided), the *ἐπιτηρηταὶ τελωνικῶν*, *ἐπιτηρηταὶ γενημάτων*, *πράκτορες ἀργυρικῶν*, *κωμογραμματεὺς*, *πρεσβύτεροι*, *ἀρχέφοδοι*, *βιβλιοφύλακες*, *χωματεπιμεληταί*, *ὕδροπάροχοι*, *δεκάδαρχος*, *λαογράφοι* (such is probably the proper expansion of *λαογρ.* in 53, l. 4 and elsewhere, rather than *λαογραφοῦμενοι*, which, when written at full length, is always passive), *γραμματεῖς τιτολόγοι*, *κριτής*, *ἀρχιδικαστής*, *λογοθέτης*, and (in a fourth century document) the *πραιπόσιτος πάγον*, *πραιπόσιτος τοῦ λεγεῶνος*, *κώμαρχος*, *κοναδάρχιος*, *ἐξάκτωρ*, *ἐκατόνταρχος*, and *τρίβωνος*. To classify and arrange these functionaries would require a treatise, and is not to be attempted here; but Dr. Wilcken would do good service if he would expand and continue the dissertation on Egypt as a Roman province in which he has already touched upon part of this subject.

The matters dealt with in these documents are very various, and include census returns, appeals against false registration, certificates of deaths since the last register, official correspondence on points of law and administration, an *ἀργυρικὸς λόγος* or bailiff's account, similar in nature to the British Museum MS. on the back of which the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* is written but very much shorter, an official wiggling from the *ἐπιστράτηγος* to all the *στρατηγοί* of the Heptanomis with one exception, a report by five *πρεσβύτεροι ἱερεῖς πενταφυλίας θεοῦ Σοκνοπαίου* on an information laid against one of their colleagues for letting his hair grow long and wearing woollen garments, private letters, leases, sales, accounts of expenditure, petitions for redress of injuries, and so on. The mention of the month *Νεὸς Σεβαστός* (pap. 1) is interesting in connection with the appearance of the same

unusual name in the British Museum bailiff's account, just referred to. The reference to a *παράδεισος* and a *φουνικὸν* in a deed of sale (pap. 50) may also be paralleled among the Museum papyri. On the vexed question of the existence of a fifteen-year cycle of taxation in Egypt under the Romans, before the adoption of the indiction in A.D. 312 as the official method of reckoning dates, some light of a valuable nature is thrown. So far as it goes, the evidence contained in these papyri tends to show that there was some such cycle, but that its duration was for fourteen, not fifteen, years. In nos. 53—59 mention is made of a *κατ' οἰκίαν ἀπογραφή*, in which details are given of the members of the household and all real property held by them, in the 16th year of Hadrian, the 9th, 23rd, and 25th of Antoninus Pius, and the 14th and 28th of Marcus Aurelius (the latter year really falls in the reign of Commodus, but his regnal years were reckoned from the accession of Marcus). But the references to the 25th year of Antoninus must be mistaken, since that emperor did not live to complete his 24th year; and it is therefore probable that in the two passages where this figure occurs (54, l. 5, 55, l. 16) the letters *κε* have been either mis-written or mis-read (in the absence of facsimiles it is impossible to say which is most probable) in place of *κγ*. If this is so, we then have references to *ἀπογραφαί* in the years 131/2, 145/6, 159/60, 173/4, and 187/8. This would be very cogent evidence for a fourteen-year cycle if it stood alone; but it is reinforced by the fact that in two instances (both in no. 55) the individual making the return refers back to a previous census, and in the one case the reference is from the census of the 23rd year of Antoninus¹ to that of the 9th, in the other from the 14th of Aurelius to the 23rd (written 25th) of Antoninus. If returns were made yearly, such references would be senseless; and we consequently have strong reason to suppose that in the Roman period a revision of the census-lists took place every fourteen years. Why this cycle was replaced by one of fifteen years in the Byzantine period it is impossible to tell; and the view here taken may of course have to be modified by the publication of new material. It should be added that the

¹ The year is not so described in the text, the papyrus being mutilated; but it is evidently the year preceding the 1st of Aurelius (which consists of the latter part of the twelvemonth which began as the 24th of Antoninus).

existence of an *annual* register of the live stock in the possession of private individuals seems clearly to be established by nos. 51 and 52; but, so far as appears from the Berlin papyri already published, there is no indication of an annual revision of the general census-lists.

It is one of the drawbacks of the method of publication adopted by the Berlin authorities that the editors have no oppor-

tunity allowed to them of expressing their opinions on these and other points raised by the texts which they have transcribed. It is to be hoped that this want may be made good, either in the form of excursus attached to the volumes themselves, or, if that is impossible, at least in the multitudinous columns of the academic press in Germany.

F. G. KENYON.

RICHTER'S *DRAMA OF AESCHYLUS*.

Zur Dramaturgie des Aeschylus, von P. Richter. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1892. Mk. 6.50.

THIS is a book which well repays the easy task of reading it. The author is indeed curiously German in the limits of his horizon. He discusses for instance the views of blood-guilt propounded in the *Eumenides*, without so much as mentioning McLennan, and in a manner which shows that the light thrown on the subject by McLennan's enquiries is wholly unknown to him. Paley and Conington, Patin and Leconte de Lisle, all and every who do not write in the privileged tongue, appear to be ignored: while on the other hand there is much polemic against some German critics who have not at present excited much interest in the world at large and, if we were to judge by Mr. Richter's citations, have not done much to deserve it. Nevertheless Mr. Richter himself is far from repellent to a foreigner. He writes in a clear, simple style: and above all there is in him a straightforward candour, a desire to state the facts and his opinion on the facts, rather than merely to 'score,' which are qualities everywhere rated highly, and will make his discussions as useful to those who may not accept this or that conclusion, as to those who may. Within his circle he appears to be well read; and we have always at any rate the satisfaction of feeling that what lies before us is a real *bona fide* impression, and not a device wrought out to serve some ulterior purpose.

Nothing for example can be more instructive in its way than Richter's account of the *Agamemnon*, which (much as I think it wants, to be even approximately complete) I should, for my own part, like to commend to as many readers as possible. It is needless to say that he, like every one, admires

the play profoundly. His conception of the plot is the traditional conception: and so far is he from any suspicion with regard to it, or any desire to impugn it, that, alone perhaps among those who have handled the subject, he passes without remark the familiar difficulty as to the time of the action. And yet, from his notable candour, from his habit of stating, without reserve and without calculation, his actual feeling and opinion in relation to the particular thing then and there before him, he shows what the traditional theory cannot do, as well as what it can, better and more impressively than any defender of a thesis.

In a final review of the *Agamemnon* Mr. Richter says, that 'it exhibits almost throughout a lively and exciting movement' and that 'the interest of the spectator nowhere flags.' But if we turn back to the details, we find that in this 'almost' are comprised reservations so large as practically to change the main sense of the proposition. First, with regard to the description of the beacons, 'it is,' says the author, 'tedious for us, though it might be not without charm for the Athenian public.' That this as a psychological fact is true, that the unprepared reader does in truth begin to feel impatience in this part of the play, may be ascertained by any one who will experiment upon such readers. And why is this so? Assuredly not for any want of skill in the composition. On the contrary there are few passages of Aeschylus which, detached from the context, would more impress a reader with admiration for the vigour and grandeur of the style. Mr. Richter, without insisting on the point, reveals the cause sufficiently. The only visible or ostensible purpose of Clytaemnestra, in her description of the beacons, is to convince her sceptical hearers 'that her information respecting the fall of