

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 Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part II *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part II.; edited with translations and notes by B. P. Grenfell, M.A., Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, and A. S. Hunt, M.A., Senior Demy of Magdalen College, Oxford. With eight plates. (Egypt Exploration Fund, Graeco-Roman Branch, 1899.) 25s.

F. G. Kenyon

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 02 / March 1900, pp 132 - 134
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00079531, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00079531

How to cite this article:

F. G. Kenyon (1900). The Classical Review, 14, pp 132-134 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00079531

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

in the line above : on p. 239 the heading is APPOLONIOS : on p. 254, n. 1. read Susemihl ii. for S. i. : on p. 540 line 23 read Paroemiographorum for—irum. The names of Ger-

man scholars do not always escape unhurt : p. 347, line 8 from bottom, we have Shaefer.

J. A. NAIRN.

THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, PART II.

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part II.; edited with translations and notes by B. P. GRENFELL, M.A., Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, and A. S. HUNT, M.A., Senior Demy of Magdalen College, Oxford. With eight plates. (Egypt Exploration Fund, Graeco-Roman Branch, 1899.) 25s.

IN spite of the exceptional interest which attached to the first instalment of the publication of the papyri discovered at Oxyrhynchus, the second volume can well bear comparison with its predecessor. It is true that it contains nothing so well calculated to tickle the popular palate as the *Logia* fragment, nothing which can claim the name of Sappho, nothing which serves so handily as a brick to hurl at the head of a rival critic as the Thucydides ; nor, among the non-literary fragments, is there anything which the reviewers of the daily papers can light upon with such unanimous delight as the boy's letter to his father which was the popular plum of Part I. Nevertheless Part II. has an ample provision of documents, literary and non-literary, of the first importance and interest, and conclusively shows that all the big strawberries were not put at the top of the box when the Graeco-Roman branch of the Egypt Exploration Fund commenced its operations. The theological fragments include a sheet of a papyrus codex of St. John, of the third century, containing portions of chapters i. and xx., showing apparently that the whole Gospel was written in a single quire of twenty-five sheets—a remarkable and unparalleled bibliographical phenomenon ; a schoolboy's copy of a few verses of the Epistle to the Romans ; and a fragment which is classed as theological, but which has (especially in ll. 17–21) a suspicious resemblance to a work of magic. Among the new classical fragments, the most important contains over fifty lines of Menander's *Περικειρομένη* ; while in addition there is a comic fragment with an unedifying resemblance in topic to the sixth

mime of Herodas ; a possible fragment of Sophocles ; and epic, philosophical, rhetorical, historical, and quasi-lyrical scraps which still await identification. More important and more extensive than these last are the portions of a metrical treatise ; not that it is at all likely to allay the dissensions between modern metricists, but because it contains some new fragments of lyric verse among its quotations. But best of all (after the Menander) are the scholia on *Il.* xxi., for the light which they throw on our existing collections of scholia, and the precious scrap of an Olympic register, containing the names of the victors from 480 to 468, and 456 to 448. It is exactly the period which we should have chosen (though we should have liked more of it), covering as it does the age of Pindar and Bacchylides ; and not only does it go far to fix the chronology of these poets, but it also provides valuable evidence as to the artistic activity of the sculptors Polyclitus, Naucydes, Pythagoras, and others.

On all the more important of these papyri, and especially on the last two, there will no doubt be ample discussion in the *Classical Review* and elsewhere ; hence they may be the more lightly passed over in a general review. The same may to some extent be said of the fragments of known literary works, among which are included a long Homer papyrus (*Il.* v.), and small portions of Euripides, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato (again the *Phaedo* and the *Laches* !), and Demosthenes. The non-literary papyri, as before, are far more perfect than the literary, including many complete documents (nearly all of the first century after Christ) of considerable importance in their own sphere. The huge document embodying the complaint laid by one Dionysia before the prefect Faustinianus in A.D. 186 alone bristles with questions of legal interest ; while several papyri which relate to the periodical census, the poll-tax, the *ἐπίκρισις*, the registration of property, the system of dowries and marriage contracts, and to various details of taxation and the

monetary system, are not only important in themselves, but give rise to really valuable notes and excursions by the two editors.

To pursue all these topics in detail within the limits of a review is obviously impossible, and the reviewer's best service is merely to call his readers' attention to the principal contents of the volume. It need hardly be said that Mr. Grenfell and Mr. Hunt have done this work admirably. Both are experienced and careful editors, and they enjoy the enormous advantage of working in collaboration, which greatly increases the chances alike of successful decipherment and of detection of oversights. In addition, with regard to the more important literary fragments they have again had the benefit of considerable assistance from Prof. Blass, who is responsible, in particular, for most of the conjectural restorations. On the whole, then, although the plan of the work admits of but few facsimiles (what there are, are excellent), and the originals will not be generally accessible for some time to come, the reader may be fully confident of the substantial accuracy of the texts which the editors have laid before him, and may congratulate them on the punctual and successful accomplishment of this second instalment of their great task.

A few words may be allowed on some palaeographical points, since the editors have been good enough to point out, from time to time, the bearing of their new evidence on the statements made in my *Palaeography of Greek Papyri*. Where they adduce new facts (as, e.g. an example of the systematic use of the high and low dots in punctuation with different values), there is, of course, nothing to do but to register the addition to our knowledge; and where they express divergent views, their opinions are, of course, entitled to the fullest consideration. In some instances I have evidently failed to make my meaning understood, and would gladly alter my mode of expression; but on the whole the amount of difference between us is not great, and much of it is covered by the statement that Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt are generally disposed to date doubtful MSS. somewhat later than I do, sometimes dragging them down, with what seems excessive caution, to the latest possible point. It is rather curious to notice that, while they think the later of the alternatives suggested by me for the Herodas MS. (first century or first half of the second) is alone probable, Mr. Smyly

(in *Hermathena*, No. xxv.) not only prefers the first century but pleads for the possibility of the first century B.C.; and Prof. Blass, who recently showed symptoms of carrying it into the Ptolemaic age, is now content to return to the earlier part of the first century, but would by no means descend later.

With regard to the use of the codex form in papyri, the truth of my statement that it is characteristic of the close of the papyrus period depends, no doubt, on the point to be assigned for the close of that period. According to the evidence hitherto available, well-written papyrus rolls practically cease with the third century, and well-written vellum codices begin in the fourth century. In the transition period (that is, in the third century) papyrus codices make their appearance, and they continue to be found for some centuries later; but they appear to hold a secondary rank, being comparatively rough and inelegant in style. They were especially used for Christian literature, a fact which points in the same direction, since the Church in early days was neither rich nor literary. But from the calligraphic point of view, the supremacy seems to pass from papyrus to vellum after the third century. Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt take a higher view of the importance of papyrus for literary purposes during the Byzantine period (fourth to seventh centuries), and it may be that their future volumes will bear them out; but at present the evidence has still to be produced. I should, however, be the last to deny that a sketch of a period so imperfectly known as that of papyrus palaeography must require modification from time to time, and from no one may authentic evidence to supplement and correct it be expected so confidently as from Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt.

A few brief notes in conclusion. On p. 26 'dark,' as translation of δῶργος, is presumably a misprint for 'dank.' It is a pity that a facsimile could not be given of No. cexv., the writing of which appears to be of an older type than that of the other literary MSS. The possibility must not, of course, be forgotten of isolated Ptolemaic MSS. being found in a collection predominantly Roman. In the queer fragment, No. cexix., the intact lines approximate (more than can be accounted for by chance) to the form — — — | — — — — | — — — — | — — — — |. In No. cexxii. col. 2, l. 16 the form Ἀρίστον for Ἀριστήριον should interest those who remember how an Armenian MS. attributes the last twelve verses of St. Mark to 'the elder

Ariston,' and who would identify him with the elder Aristion mentioned by Papias as a disciple of our Lord. P. 97. My remark as to accentuation being applied only to works intended for sale or for large libraries referred mainly to early MSS., as accentuation becomes commoner in the third century. At the same time, the occurrence of so well written a copy of Homer as that contained in No. ccxxiii. on the *verso* of already used papyrus is undoubtedly surprising, and the editors may be right in supposing that such a copy may have been intended for sale, no doubt at a cheap rate. On p. 318 Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt recur to the question of the date of the Bacchylides papyrus, as to which I only wish to add one word. They demur to attaching weight to Ξ as a test letter, and I admit most freely that exceptions occur to all palaeographical rules; but when we find that (so far as the extant evidence goes) no literary MS. of undoubtedly Ptolemaic date has Ξ written continuously (the Herculanean papyri, of which

I recently had an opportunity of examining the originals, have scores of instances of Ξ written in two or three strokes, but none in one), and that no literary MS. undoubtedly of the first two centuries has Ξ written otherwise than continuously, it would surely be foolish not to attach considerable (I do necessarily say decisive) weight to this indication. The reference to Pap. ccxxxiii. is beside the point, since that is of the third century, when, as I have myself pointed out, a discontinuous Ξ begins to reappear; but it would be difficult to maintain that the Bacchylides is of the third century. It may be worth adding that Blass, in his second edition, expresses his willingness to accept the latter part of the first century B.C. as the date of the MS.; and though evidence to the contrary *may* still be forthcoming, at present I do not think that it has been produced. This, however, is a divergence on to a side issue, and cannot be pursued here.

F. G. KENYON.

POHLENZ'S *POSIDONIUS*.

De Posidonii libris περὶ παθῶν. Scripsit Maximilianus Pohlenz. Lipsiae (Teubner) 1898. From the 24th Supplement to the 'Neue Jahrbücher,' pp. 535-634. M. 3.60.

THIS interesting essay examines the relations between Posidonius and Galen in the treatise *De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis*, more especially Books IV. and V. There is no adequate collection of the fragments either of Posidonius or of Chrysippus, and any one who in the future undertakes to make one will find this work of great assistance. The results obtained are exhibited in the final section, partly in the form of actual fragments of Posidonius, partly by a summary of his argument, so far as it can be recovered from Galen, which serves to string these fragments together. Galen is presumed to be following Posidonius as his main authority, even when he does not ostensibly quote him. The grounds for this presumption are given fully. Most convincing is the reasoning in the excursus entitled 'Quemadmodum Galenus aliorum auctorum verbis uti solet,' where an instructive illustration is furnished by the manner in which in this same treatise Galen has cut up into four sections (pp. 471,

474, 477, 480), interrupted by his own comments and paraphrase, and yet in the main reproduced *verbatim* nearly the whole of a well-known passage of Plato (*Rep.* 439 A-440 D). The conclusion is that Galen's habit is 'alterius auctoris orationes modo ad verbum adferre, modo verbis in suum usum commutatis adscribere.' No one will object to this moderate inference; but for the immediate purposes of 'Quellenuntersuchungen,' such as the present, everything depends upon the application of the principle. There is really a triangular duel. Posidonius deserted orthodox Stoicism on the important issue, whether the emotions are to be referred to the same faculty as other manifestations of mental life, or whether the irrational element in emotion, which Zeno and Chrysippus recognise, should compel us to assume a distinct, irrational faculty of soul. Galen in his loyal endeavour to prove Hippocrates and Plato right, and consequently the Stoics wrong, found in Posidonius a welcome ally. His object in borrowing from Posidonius is simply to refute Chrysippus: so that several times there is the greatest difficulty in deciding whether Galen is urging objections of his own or simply following his