

# 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](#)



---

**Giessen Papyri P. A. Kuhlmann: *Die Giessener literarischen Papyri und die Caracalla-Erlasse; Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar.* (Berichte und Arbeiten aus der Universitätsbibliothek und dem Universitätsarchiv Giessen, 46.) Giessen: Universitätsbibliothek, 1994. Pp. xvi + 270, 15 pls. Paper, DM70.**

Herwig Maehler

The Classical Review / Volume 47 / Issue 01 / April 1997, pp 177 - 180  
DOI: 10.1093/cr/47.1.177, Published online: 16 February 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X0030107X](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0030107X)

## How to cite this article:

Herwig Maehler (1997). Review of P. A. Kuhlmann 'Die Giessener literarischen Papyri und die Caracalla-Erlasse; Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar' The Classical Review, 47, pp 177-180 doi:10.1093/cr/47.1.177

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

## GIESSEN PAPYRI

P. A. KUHLMANN: *Die Giessener literarischen Papyri und die Caracalla-Erlasse; Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. (Berichte und Arbeiten aus der Universitätsbibliothek und dem Universitätsarchiv Giessen, 46.) Giessen: Universitätsbibliothek, 1994. Pp. xvi + 270, 15 pls. Paper, DM70.

This re-edition of thirty-three literary texts (thirty-one Greek, one Latin, and one bilingual Latin–Gothic) from three different collections (*P.Iandanae*, *P.Giss.*, and *P.bibl.univ.Giss.* = *PbuG*) plus the famous *P.Giss.*40 with three edicts of Caracalla, all now kept in the Giessen University Library, was a PhD thesis supervised by Professor M. Landfester. It is in six parts: (1) Introduction, including a brief history of the Giessen collections, (2) Homeric texts, (3) Texts of known authors, (4) Unknown texts, (5) Theological texts, and (6) Caracalla's edicts, followed by the customary indices and plates. K. has carefully checked the readings on the originals, as far as they have survived. (Three texts [2.6 = *P.Iand.*74 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 1080, 5.3 = *P.Iand.*70 = van Haelst 1139, 5.9 = *PbuG* 18 = van Haelst 1205, the Latin–Gothic NT parchment] are now lost; some others, especially parchment fragments like the Thucydides 3.1 = *PbuG* inv.12 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 1515 and the Christian prayer 5.6 = *PbuG* 35 = van Haelst 912, were badly damaged by floodwater in February 1945 and are now mostly illegible. See H. G. Gundel, *Aegyptus* 33 [1953], 249–51.) The texts of five of the Homeric papyri, which had only been described by earlier editors, are here fully published for the first time; for *P.Iand.*74 (*Od.*9. 194–235) = 2.6 K. this has not been possible as not even a photograph of the lost original exists. *PbuG* 38 (*Od.*7. 112–24 = 2.5 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 1068) is now dated, convincingly, to around A.D. 200 (instead of I B.C.). To have these texts now assembled and available in a reliable new edition with updated bibliography is certainly very welcome. However, this edition does not, as the title suggests, contain *all* the literary papyri in Giessen; there are at least twenty more, listed in H. G. Gundel's *Katalog der literarischen Papyri* (Kurzberichte aus den Papyrussammlungen 39, 1977), and although some of these are not strictly 'literary' (such as horoscopes: *P.Iand.*88 and 89 = Gundel 43–44; astronomy: *P.Iand.*84 = G.45 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 2012; magical: *P.Iand.*87 = G.48; astrology: *P.Iand.*3 = G.42 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 2040; a recipe for paint [?]: *P.Iand.*84 = G.47 Pack<sup>2</sup> 2001; a list of months: *P.Iand.*inv.654 = G.49a = Pack<sup>2</sup> 2013), one wonders why K. did not include the medical texts (Gundel 26–27, 29–30), grammatical texts (Gundel 23–25), the text on metre *PbuG* 43 (Gundel 15 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 2171), the mythological fragment *PbuG* 42 (Gundel 41 = Pack 2458), the prose fragment *PbuG* 41 (Gundel 12 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 1665), the theological fragment *P.Giss.*107 (Gundel 40a with pl. 9b = van Haelst 1131), and, above all, the interesting *Deuteronomy* fragments *PbuG* inv.13, 19, 22, 26 (Gundel 32 = van Haelst 58) and *P.Iand.*4, a codex fragment of the *Pastor Hermae* (identified by J. Lenaerts, *Chr.d'Ég.*54 [1979], 356–8)? There is no indication why these texts have been excluded, or whether they will be re-edited in a second volume. The numbering system is irritating: instead of counting his texts consecutively, K. has numbered them separately in each of sections 2–5, wasting the opportunity to make their citation easier. One interesting feature of literary papyrus texts is their accents, punctuation and other critical signs. In this respect, *P.Iand.*75 (not *PbuG* 75, p.13) is unusually interesting, but unfortunately, instead of giving only those signs which are in the papyrus, K. presents his texts with full modern accentuation, thus making it unnecessarily difficult for the reader to work out from the notes what exactly the

papyrus has. On the first of the Homeric papyri, *P.Iand.73* (2.1), nothing is said about accents, and as there exists no published photograph, except in a completely inaccessible local newspaper of 1957, there is no way of checking. The discussion of readings in papyri of Homer suffers from the fact that they have not been collated with the critical editions of Ludwich, La Roche, or Allen. This has led to some incorrect statements; in *Iliad* 1.168, Aristarchus' reading *ἐπει* (which the scholia call ἡ συνήθης ἀνάγνωσις) is found in *PbuG* 36, not, as K. says, 'zum ersten Mal gegen die Tradition der Kodizes', for the Venetus Marc.A has it as a suprascript variant; on line 170, where this papyrus has *ἰων*, K. says that most MSS have *ἴμεν*, implying that some MSS read something else, which is not the case. On *Il.4.456* (*P.Iand.1*), K.'s note 'φόβ[ος] τε wie die Kodizes' is misleading: (i) there is no accent in the papyrus; and (ii) Aristarchus' preferred reading *πόνος* is found not only in the scholia but in at least eight other MSS listed in Allen's edition of 1931; three others have *φόνος*. In *Od.12.45* (*P.Iand.75*) K.'s text has *ἀμφιῖδόςτεοφιν*, his note has *ἀμφιῖδόςθεόφιν*: in fact, the papyrus (plate 2) has *ἀμφι.ῖδόςθεόφιν* (confusion with *θεόφιν*?); it shares the wrong accent with four MSS, not mentioned in van Thiel's edition.

These inaccuracies may seem trivial, but they are irritating for anyone who wants to study either scribal errors or accentuation in papyri.

K. lists other papyri which share the Homeric passages with the Giessen papyri; add the following: p. 24 *P.Oxy.3825*, *P.Köln 70*; p. 27 *P.Köln 21*; p. 35 *P.Amsterdam inv.79* is now *P.Amst.1 2*; p. 38 add *PSI inv.566 = Papiri dell' Odissea* ed. M. Manfredi (1979) no. 8, contemporary with *PbuG 38*.

*P.Iand.79* (3.3) with Isocrates, *Paneg.18–19*, 21–2 forms part of the same roll as *P.Fackelmann 8* (see P. Pruneti, *Aegyptus* 64 [1984], 27–9); the fragment in Alexandria which K. (p. 70) quotes as 'unpublished' = *P.Carlini 13* (*Papiri letterari greci* ed. A. Carlini [Pisa, 1978]). *P.Iand.78* (4.3 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 1754 = *SH* 960), elegiac fragment: in line 6, K.'s supplement *χλοῦβιον* ('little basket?') deserves attention; he compares *P.Tebt.413.14* ('cage?') and *P.Oxy.936.5 κλούιον ῥῶν* ('crate'): add *P.Fay.72.4 χλοῦβιον* ('basket') and *Sammelbuch VIII 9921.24 χλοῦια σχ[οι]νία* ('baskets of palm fibre'). In line 13, if *νεάρωσι*ν were the last word, there would be a violation of the rule stated by P. Maas, *Greek Metre* § 97 'Word-end after both the seventh and ninth elements of the same line is avoided'; K. does not mention the metrical problem to which the editors of *SH* draw attention. As for *P.Giss.3* (4.4 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 1748), the poem on the accession of Hadrian, K. rejects the suggestion that it is part of a mime; he argues for a dramatic dialogue between 'Apollo' and the crowd, performed at an official ceremony in Egypt in August 117. *P.Iand.80* (4.6 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 1233) is not, according to K., in the same hand as the Hypereides papyrus *P.Lit.Lond.132*; its attribution to Hypereides is therefore uncertain. In presenting *PbuG 46* (4.7 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 2218, *Acta Alexandrinorum*), now combined with *P.Yale 107*, K. follows Musurillo and rejects the far-reaching conclusions of earlier commentators. The interesting scholion *PbuG 40* (4.8 = Pack 2810), badly damaged by water and mould, is now much less legible than when first published in 1935; D. Page (*Corinna*, pp. 43–5) once claimed that verso col.II 2 *υκτρ* must be a 'late Boeotian spelling of *οἰκτρας*' and therefore a quotation from Corinna. K. rejects this; he prefers to regard *υκ-* as a misspelling for *οἰκ-*, which seems likely. *PbuG 17* (5.1 = van Haelst 694), a leaf apparently separate and self-contained, seems to come from a collection of sermons rather than a commentary; K. rejects the attribution to Origen's commentary on *Genesis*, leaving the question of authorship open. *P.Iand.69* (5.2 = van Haelst 648) is re-edited with shorter supplements of line-ends than in ed. pr.; K. thinks the author may be Didymus the Blind. The amulet *PbuG 34* (5.5 = van Haelst 220), dated to the

fourth century, seems to me much later; for this type of hand, cp. Cavallo & Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period* (London, 1987), no. 54a–c and the parallels discussed there. The codex fragment *P.Iand.71* (5.10 = van Haelst 1140) has been identified as part of the *Sortes Astrampsychi* by J. Lenaerts, *Chr.d'Eg* 58 (1983), 191–5. K.'s translation does not always match his text: in verso 4, read 'deinen Herren', in 6 'du versöhnst dich nicht' (οὐ καταλλάσσει] restored for reasons of space).

K.'s most interesting contribution is his commentary on *P.Giss.40* (6.1–3), the three edicts of Caracalla. Col.I 2 may echo the Emperor's speech in the Senate in which he tried to justify Geta's assassination (cp. Herodian 4.5.3; Dio Cass. 77.2.3). K.'s full discussion of the difficult line 6 ὁσάκις ἐὰν (= ἂν) ὑπείσελθ[ωσι]ν εἰς τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἀν[θρ]ώπους remains inconclusive; it is impossible to say who joins (secretly?) my people', or who is meant by the latter ('my subjects' in general, or 'my Roman citizens', or rather 'my officials?'). K. gets rid of a number of wrong readings and/or supplements, such as συν[ε]νεργκ- (P. M. Meyer) in line 7 and τῆ[ν] μεγαλ[ει]άν (H. Wolff) in 8 where π[ο]λει[τ]ε[ί]αν seems certain as there is a horizontal trace before ε which looks right for τ. In 8, the phrase beginning with μένοντος must be, as K. has seen (229f.), a *Salvationsklausel*, meaning 'other (older) regulations/ agreements remaining in force', unaffected by the preceding. This fits Oliver's [τοῦ δικαίου τῶν πολιτευμάτων], which is the right length for the lacuna and is supported by a Latin parallel, the *Tabula Banasitana* which K. quotes from J. H. Oliver, *AJPh* 93 (1972), 337: ...*his civitatem Romanam dedimus, salvo iure gentis* etc. In 9, χωρ[ί]ς τῶν [..]δετικίων must relate, as K. rightly argues, quoting parallels from papyrus documents (235), not to the main clause (δίδωμι...π[ο]λει[τ]ε[ί]αν) but to the *Salvationsklausel* (μένοντος etc.) which therefore does not apply to what follows χωρ[ί]ς. The implication is that *nobody* was excluded from Roman citizenship, but existing obligations to *civitates* (πολιτεύματα) were not affected by this measure (i.e. the new citizens continued to pay taxes), nor were the [..]δετικίων: this troublesome Latin term need not be masculine—forget the *deditici!* K. (p. 237) makes a strong case for neuter *additicia* = 'additional regulations', such as exemptions from those *iura* (δίκαια, 'obligations') mentioned in lines 8–9. This makes excellent sense: as K. argues, Caracalla would not have abolished privileges granted, for example, to cities or to veterans and their families.

Col.II 1–15: another copy of this amnesty decree is *P.Oxy.2755*, which has helped K. to fill gaps in *P.Giss.40*, as have two Latin paraphrases (Ulpian, *Dig.50.2.3.1* and *Cod.Just.10.61*). Col.II 16–29, the third edict which bans Egyptians from Alexandria, is rightly placed in the context of successive but unsuccessful attempts by governors of Egypt to stop immigration from the countryside into the city. Why the 'true Egyptians' can easily be told apart from the linen weavers by their voice (φωνῆ, line 27) is puzzling: surely the latter were Egyptians too? Did they speak with a different accent? This raises interesting questions about cultural identity. K. thinks (p. 255) that the linen weavers of Alexandria may have been culturally assimilated to the point of speaking only Greek. By A.D. 215, the farmers who had migrated to the capital probably did too, but, to judge from letters, petitions, and contracts written by Egyptians in the countryside, their written Greek was mostly poor, so their spoken Greek may have been worse.

K. deserves our gratitude; his careful re-examination of *P.Giss.40* has provided a firmer basis and contributed to a much better understanding of this important text; there is real progress here. His notes on the 'theological' texts in Section 5 are well informed and helpful, and his re-editions of Homeric and other 'classical' papyri in Sections 2–4 are, on the whole, reliable. Their shortcomings are relatively minor; in

fairness, K. should not be held solely responsible for them: it would have been his *Doktorvater's* job to advise him on matters of textual criticism and editorial technique. Let us hope that the remaining literary and sub-literary papyri in the Giessen University Library can be re-edited in a similar volume in the not too distant future.

University College London

HERWIG MAEHLER

## KELLIS

K. A. Worp (ed.): *Greek Papyri from Kellis: I: (P.Kell. G.)* Nos 1–90. (Dakhleh Oasis Project: Monograph No. 3; Oxbow Monograph 54.) Pp. ix + 281, ills, 90 pls. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1995. £45. ISBN: 0-946874-97-2.

The Dakhleh Oasis project and the excavations at Ismant el-Kharab, the ancient Kellis, have aroused a great deal of interest. The discovery of large numbers of papyri and wooden writing tablets in three houses on the site offers the prospect of relating documentary sources to a properly excavated site. Further interest was aroused when preliminary readings showed Manichaean influences.

This volume contains an introduction to the site, ninety texts with plates, a full and informative commentary, and translations of most texts. The texts are mainly fourth-century and most come from house 3 with smaller numbers from houses 2 and 1. The texts begin to illuminate the fascinating social relationships of the probable inhabitants of these three houses, provide a valuable insight into fourth-century Kellis, and suggest that Kellis may have been a rather unusual village.

The site plan shows that rooms that would more naturally seem to be part of house 1 were built into house 2. It seems possible that the owner of house 2 ceded land at the rear of house 3 to the owner of that house (*P.Kell. G.38*) and the location of this land may indicate that the owner of house 2 originally owned all three houses. One of the main people attested in the house 2 documents is a Pausanias, who (*P.Kell. G.38*) is described as a former magistrate of the *metropolis* and, according to a certain Gena (*P.Kell. G.5*), is a *kurios* displaying 'good birth'. The relationship between Pausanias and others attested in the documents remains unclear.

*P.Kell. G.63* of house 3 has clear Manichaean elements and *P.Kell. G.69* may also attest a Manichaean official. Apparently, at least 21 of the Coptic letters have similar elements. Other letters do not suggest a religiously unusual community. *Presbuteroi* of the Catholic Church appear in three texts (*P.Kell. G.24, 32, 58*), suggesting that at least some of the inhabitants regarded themselves as part of mainstream Christianity. In *P.Kell. G.48* (dated to 355) a slave-owner manumits his slave woman by Zeus, Ge, and Helios on account of excess of Christian spirit. Apart from the nomenclature, which shows strong local characteristics, there is little evidence for paganism.

The main family of House 3, that of Pamouris, held property in Aphrodito in the Antaeopolite nome in the Nile valley and were at various times resident in that village. It was common for villagers to hold property in several different locations, but the connection between Aphrodito and Kellis seems unusual since several residents of Kellis seem to have formed a separate community in Aphrodito (*P.Kell. G.30, 32, 42, 43, 44*). This is mainly attested in loans between members of the family of Pamouris and others registered in Kellis, but the preservation of these texts at Kellis shows the continued use of the Kellis houses.