

MARGARITAE

- VI -

ACCADEMIA FIORENTINA DI PAPIROLOGIA E DI STUDI SUL MONDO ANTICO

MARGARITAE

a cura di

Sergio Audano, Diletta Minutoli, Rosario Pintaudi

- VI -

Comitato Scientifico:

Luciano Canfora, Antonio Carlini, Anna Di Giglio, Augusto Guida,
Hermann Harrauer, Walter Lapini, Giancarlo Mazzoli,
Giovanni Salanitro, Antonino Zumbo

KLAAS A. WORP

A HISTORY OF PAPIROLOGY IN HOLLAND
(1830-2015)



ACCADEMIA FIORENTINA DI PAPIROLOGIA E DI STUDI SUL MONDO ANTICO

Firenze 2020

ISBN 978-88-908752-7-4

© Accademia Fiorentina di Papirologia e di Studi sul Mondo Antico

Finito di stampare nel dicembre 2020 dalla Tipografia “La Celere” - Messina

Prefazione

Quando il caro Klaas, con il quale ho condiviso gran parte del mio impegno in questa meravigliosa disciplina che è la Papirologia, mi ha proposto nella scorsa primavera l'edizione di una sua "Storia della papirologia in Olanda", ho subito pensato che, piuttosto che confinarlo in un articolo di rivista, sarebbe stato meglio dare al suo lavoro una veste editoriale autonoma in una delle *Margaritae* della nostra Accademia Fiorentina di Papirologia.

La risposta di Klaas è stata entusiasta ed in breve arco di tempo il progetto si è concretizzato e adesso è pronto al plauso dei colleghi e di quanti, anche soltanto leggendo dei semplici nomi, ritorneranno col pensiero alla loro giovinezza ed al loro entusiasmo.

A Berendina van Straalen la nostra riconoscenza!

Firenze, 25 novembre 2020
Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana

Rosario Pintaudi

Introduction

The genesis of this history dates back several years ago, i.e. to my participation in the international summer school of papyrology, in 2011 at Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah, U.S.A. I was invited to lecture there on a few new topics to be chosen by myself. There was no set program and I thought that the history of papyrology in the country of my origin would make, amongst others, an interesting subject. In fact, it turned out that there was a sizeable amount of material and the participants of the American summer school seemed to like it. I returned from Utah to the Netherlands, where the matter was left for a number of years, until various developments persuaded me that it would be worthwhile to come forward with a complete text.

I owe a sincere word of thanks to my colleagues P. van Minnen and H. Harrauer for making themselves available to read a first version of my manuscript. They contributed and are not to be held responsible for any remaining error made by the author. It is my special privilege to thank here also the editors – in – chief of the ‘Margaritae’ – series for their heart-warming hospitality extended to my manuscript.

And now the moment has come to publish the text of my history of papyrology in the Netherlands. I do not claim that this history is the only possible version, but I have done my best to write a complete and unbiased survey of the development of papyrology in the Netherlands.

Klaas A. Worp

A HISTORY OF PAPYROLOGY IN HOLLAND (1830-2015)

Introduction

The question “what *is* papyrology?” can be answered simply. It involves the study of texts written on papyrus, along with their content, external form, handwriting, linguistic, literary, historical content, and prospective cultural, economic, legal, and religious features, etc. But there are many kinds of papyrology, just as there were many languages and letter-forms in Ancient Egypt – from which area the vast majority of papyrus texts were saved. These languages included: Greek (Classical Greek and the so-called “post-classical” Greek), Ancient Egyptian (hieroglyphic writing, the so-called Hieratic, and the Demotic), Aramaic, Hebrew, Coptic, Latin, Meroitic, Syriac, and Arabic. Papyrology, therefore, encompasses a diverse, international, and multidisciplinary field, with a variety of different perspectives. Generally speaking, “writing/scratching” constitute actions for noting down texts, but they differ from “chiseling” characters in stone. Indeed, the latter is not part of the papyrologist’s field of study; by definition, “chiseled” and “scratched” texts fall under the category of epigraphy. Texts written on materials other than papyrus (pot shards, textiles, glass, etc.) are also important, and papyrologists are also interested in the content of inscriptions found in Egypt.

A distinction must also be made between documentary and literary texts. It should not be forgotten that “literary” papyri are primarily incorporated into the history of classical literature. Indeed, “literary papyrology” is a creation by classicists focusing on texts found on sheets/rolls of papyrus. Papyrology is mainly restricted to documentary texts including contracts, letters, administrative writings, etc., which can be positioned within their historical, legal, and socioeconomic contexts. This fundamental distinction was made in 1912 by the famous German papyrologist, Ulrich Wilcken, in his “*Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*”, Bd.I.1: Einleitung, § 1.

But it is also necessary to stress the **hybrid** nature of modern Greek papyrology, whose roots can be found in (1) classical studies (including Ancient History) and (2) legal scholarship (notably by jurists interested

in the aspects of ancient law and its development, particularly that of Ancient Greece, Rome, and Egypt). Most modern papyrologists, in fact, belong to the circle of “Hellenists”, since knowledge of the evolutionary phases of the Greek language is a prerequisite for successful papyrology.

Papyrology has traditionally been an international and multidisciplinary activity. But it warrants mention that, qualitatively speaking, there is no requirement as to what constitutes a good papyrologist. In modern Holland, moreover, this title is not legally safeguarded like those of “doctor” and “lawyer”. In other words, anyone can call themselves a “papyrologist”, and acquire international recognition from peers through academic presentations and scholarly publications.

The Beginning in Leiden: 1829-1900

The history of papyrology in Holland began in 1829 (200 years ago!) with the acquisition of a collection of papyri for the National Museum of Antiquities in Leiden¹. The purchase was made by Caspar Jacob Christiaan Reuvens (1793-1835), who had been appointed professor of archaeology and the first director of the Museum of Antiquities, by King William I². In this role, and at the King’s expense, Reuvens purchased some antiquities for the museum; this included Greek papyri from the Italian Gio-

¹ See D. Cohen, “*La Papyrologie dans les Pays-Bas*”, *Chronique d’Égypte*, 6, no. 22 (1931), pp. 403-410; B.A. van Groningen, “*La papyrologie dans les Pays-Bas en 1940-1945*”, *Aegyptus* 25 (1945), pp. 24-25; and the article by W. Peremans, “*Vijfentwintig jaar Papyrologie in Nederland en België 1945-1970*”. *Avec résumé en français: Vingt-cinq ans d’études papyrologiques en Belgique et aux Pays-Bas 1945-1970* (*Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen* Here I wish to stress that since the surrender of Antwerp by the (Northern) Dutch, in 1832, a distinction should be made between the Northern Netherlands (Holland) and the Southern Netherlands (Belgium). The separation of Belgium from Holland after 25 August 1830 (the day of the revolution in Brussels) should explain why, in the following history, developments in the field of papyrology in Belgium are completely left out.

² For its pioneer years, see Ruurd B. Halbertsma, “*Scholars, Travellers, and Trade: The Pioneer Years of the National Museum of Antiquities in Leiden, 1818-1840*” (London, 2003). See also the jubilee volume “*RijksMuseum van Oudheden Leiden. Een geschiedenis van 200 jaar*” (Zwolle, 2018). In this volume, the Greek papyri at the RMO receive only limited (almost remarkably limited) attention. As far as Greek papyrology in general is concerned, the pioneering role of the museum unfortunately is insufficiently emphasized.

vanni D'Anastasy. Reuvens even wrote a short treatise on the texts,³ but it was never published owing to his premature death. Publications of this type were rare in Europe, at that time, and there was little experience in reading ancient Greek handwriting (in “italics” or otherwise). After all, where would such texts have come from? On European soil, the excavations of Pompeii and Herculaneum had unearthed some charred, and extremely fragile, papyrus scrolls containing philosophical works, written in a “literary” hand⁴. But elsewhere in Italy, only a single Greek papyrus had been passed down from the Middle Ages⁵. More importantly, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, Napoleon had established Egypt as the primary “source” of papyri for European scholars. This was long before the year of purchase 1829, and Greek papyri from other parts of Europe became available many decades later⁶. The first editor of the Greek papyri purchased by Reuvens, his successor Conrad Leemans (28 April 1809-14 October 1983), was a pioneer. With his *Papyri Graeci musei publici Lunduni Batavi* tom. I-II (Leiden 1843, 1845), he became a true “papyrologist avant la lettre”. Leemans’ volume quickly caught the attention of an English Egyptologist. I obtained the following information from Alain Martin (Brussels) who, in response to my question in the so-called PAPPY-list, kindly replied via e-mail as follows:

“A brief presentation of *P. Leid.* I (1843) was published in “The Proceedings of the Royal Society of Literature”, 1.14 (1843), pp. 192-193.

³ See Caspar Jacob Christian Reuvens, “*Lettres à M. Letronne sur les papyrus bilingues et grecs, et sur quelques autres monumens [sic!] gréco-égyptiens du Musée d’antiquités de l’université de Leide*” (Leiden, 1830). Note that this University Museum of Antiquities is the predecessor of the RMO.

⁴ They date back to shortly before October 79 A.D. The eruption of the Vesuvius occurred in that year. For the most recent archeological news about the date of the eruption, see <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-45874858>. For papyri found in Pompeii that may be considerably older than October 79 A.D., see G. Cavallo, “*Libri, scrittura scribi in Ercolano*” (Napoli, 1983).

⁵ This literary text dates to the 10th or 11th century A.D. and was published for the first time in Italy in 1812, see *TM* 99549 = *LDAB* 10736.

⁶ See the truly exceptional “pre”-history of the *P.Pommersfelden* described in the introduction to the recent edition presented by P.J. Sijpesteijn, A.J.B. Sirks & K.A. Worp, “*Ein frühbyzantinisches Szenario für die Amtswechslung in der Sitionie. Die griechischen Papyri aus Pommersfelden*”, München, 1996; = *Münch. Beitr.* 86.

The text published there is in fact a summary of a more complete review read by the Egyptologist William Osburn during the meeting of the Society on December 14th, 1843. The preface of P. Paris (1865; which also mentions the *P. Leid.*) is an abstract from a “rapport” (apparently unpublished until 1865) read by Brunet de Presle in the meeting of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres on June 7th, 1850. It is mentioned as “Rapport sur les papyrus égyptiens du Louvre et sur le travail que M. Letronne avait enterpris sur ces monuments”, among other “lettres et communications de divers savants”, in: “Actes académiques du 1 janvier 1849 au 31 décembre 1852”, Mémoires de l’institut Impérial de France, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres 18.1 (1855), p. 354; of course the Institute was not yet Impérial when the “rapport” was read”. Three decennia later the first announcement of Leemans’ vol. II (1885) was given by the famous French chemist P.E.M. Berthelot, in the *Journal des Savants* (1886), pp. 208-222, 263-280 and 335-353”.

To be sure, Leemans’ first volume (150 “exemplaria impressa, quorum tantum 115 prostant”) was never a success. Between 1980 and 1990, the firm E.J. Brill, in Leiden, in fact, offered clearance copies that had not been sold and were stored in a large warehouse, to be retailed at an exceptionally low price as “old waste paper”. Moreover, in 1927, this first part was replaced with a new edition by Ulrich Wilcken, in his “*Urkunden der PtolemäerZeit*” (see below, pp. 9, 10, 11).

An exception to this practice, in the Netherlands, was a teacher of classical languages named Barend ten Brink⁷. He lived in Appingedam, in the province of Groningen, and had not studied with G.C. Cobet in Leiden. But in the classical journal *Mnemosyne* 2 (1853), he published a note in Dutch⁸, in which he reported the discovery in Egypt of

⁷ On ten Brink, see J. van den Branden & J.G. Frederiks, “*Biografisch Woordenboek der Noord-Nederlandse en Zuid-Nederlandsche Letterkunde*” (1888-1891) for this work, see <<http://www.dbnl.org/titels/titel.php?id=bran038biog01>>. He was born in Harderwijk, on 1 October 1803 and studied “letters” in Groningen. Without any doubt he was tutored by his father Jan ten Brink, who was a professor of “the literature of the Ancients” in Groningen since 1815. His son, Barend ten Brink, was rector at Appingedam, from 1828-1854, and thereafter *praeceptor* of the gymnasium at Utrecht until 1868, when he resigned. He then became a private teacher in Utrecht. In 1874 he moved to The Hague, where he died on 21 January 1875.

⁸ On the pp. 54-55: “*Eene Getuigenis van Priscianus, omtrent Tryphon*”, dated ‘Ap-

“a mummy wrapped in a papyrus scroll on which Tryphon’s own Grammar is the ground; truly an enviable fate for a grammarian to be deposited into the ground, literally *sua virtute involutus*. In this way, the work of Tryphon, his τέχνη γραμματική, which is important to scholarship, has come to light again in our day, along with the author who has been embalmed for more than eighteen centuries. May we soon take into our hands this opus of Tryphon!”

This message, which was intended for a specialist readership, took around three years to travel from Egypt to London. It then likely went to Rotterdam or Hamburg, to Appingedam, and then Leiden, to the editor of *Mnymosyne*. This is indeed remarkable since the first steam train was introduced in the Netherlands in 1840 (the 20 km railway line from Haarlem to Amsterdam), and the telephone and telegraph did not yet exist!

After Leemans’ pioneering edition, other collections offered their monographic publications. The papyri housed at the British Museum and the Vatican Library, for example, were published in a volume by Bernardino Peyron⁹. In a 19 August 1841 letter sent from Carel Gabriel Cobet (1813-1889), Graecus at Leiden University, to his teacher Jacob Geel¹⁰, Peyron’s publication was referred to in a manner that, for papyrology in Holland, has been somewhat “damning” (see, *loc. cit.*, note 10, p. 102):

“I have also received for you a copy of the Greek papyrus in London, translated and interpreted by Bernardino Peyron (the Abbot’s cousin who wanted to publish Simplicius), a second copy for Leemans (at the time director of the Museum of Antiquities in Leiden) and a third copy for my-

pingadam, 14 Sept.1852’. For the papyrus, which was acquired in 1849/50 by A.C. Harris [1790-1869], see *TM* # 110341 (= *P.Lond.Lit.*182) and also see Warren R. Dawson, “Anastasi, Sallier and Harris and their papyri”, *JEA* 35 (1949), pp. 158-166, especially p. 162, note 4.

⁹ “*Papiri del Museo Britannico di Londra e della Biblioteca Vaticana*”, tradotti e illustrati da Bernardino Peyron, Memorie Accademia Reale delle Scienze di Torino, 33 (1841). The papyri kept in London had been described by Joshua Forshall, in his “*Description of the Greek Papyri in the British Museum, part I, by order of the Trustees*” (London, 1839). For Peyron, see also: P. van Minnen, “A Dutch opinion of Amadeo Peyron”, *Aegyptus* 76 (1996), pp. 157-165.

¹⁰ For this correspondence, see <http://books.google.nl/books?id=dOgUAAAAIAAJ&lpq=PA650&dq=cobet%20geel&pg=PA102#v=twopage&q&f=false>.

self. I went through those things; *αὐτίκα τεθναίην* (“May I drop dead”), if I had to handle such matters. A more insignificant subject is unthinkable (you first acquainted me with it, when I received the facsimile from London); and their style and orthography compare to Greek like a letter written by a Leiden kitchen maid compares in language and style to a text written by someone who knows decent Dutch.

This judgment also reflects Cobet’s opinion on the quality of post-classical *Koine* Greek, when compared to the Classical Greek prose of authors like Plato, Thucydides, and Xenophon¹¹. And given his influence on Greek instruction in 19th-century Dutch universities, Cobet’s position was, almost inevitably, authoritative for many people in Holland¹². In a world still dominated by classical culture, and wherein Greek papyri began receiving more attention – particularly in England, France, Germany, Italy, and later the United States – Cobet’s position long prevailed in Holland, until he died in 1889, and quite possibly even after. Unfortunately, nothing is known (at least not to me) about Cobet’s opinion on the editorial work of his colleague, Leemans. But the two definitely knew each other (see Cobet’s letter of 19 August 1841), lived nearby in Leiden, and were both members of the Royal Netherlands Institute of Sciences, Literature and Fine Arts (the predecessor of the current Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences, see the “Yearbook” of 1847). Following his declaration, and for the rest of his life, Cobet’s philological interaction with texts written on papyrus was very limited. He was only interested in a single *literary* papyrus text, the *Oratio funebris* (*ἐπιτάφιος λόγος*), by the Attic orator Hypereides (*ed. princ.* by Ch. Babington, 1858). Cobet offered his own edition of the work published by E.J. Brill, in Leiden, that very same year; and it was reprinted in 1877². Incidentally, it seemed opportune to mention two pa-

¹¹ In fact, Cobet (who was obviously a “lover of prose”) did not pay much of attention to the Classical Greek poets, in particular to the three Tragedians: Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides. Within this context one only needs to compare the amount of attention paid by Cobet in his “*Variae Lectiones*” (Leiden, 1873) to these three poets; only the comedy-poet Aristophanes fared better.

¹² See the Nijmegen University dissertation of D.C.A.J. Schouten, *Het Grieks aan de Nederlandse universiteiten in de negentiende eeuw, bijzonder gedurende de periode 1815-1876* (Utrecht, 1964). This study is now available through: https://www.repository.uhn.ru.nl/bitstream/handle/2066/107515/mmubn000001_23534320x.pdf.

pyrological discoveries “made in Holland”¹³. I even get the impression that Cobet “forbade” his students from acknowledging the new and exciting discoveries made in *rebus papyrologicis* outside of the Netherlands. An exception seems to be the remarkably idiosyncratic Ernst Julius Kiehl (1827-1873)¹⁴. According to Leemans, it appears that Kiehl had prepared

¹³ Primo the booklet of Johan Cornelis Gerard Boot (later professor of Latin in the Municipal University of Amsterdam), “*Notice sur les manuscrits trouvés à Herculanum*”, Amsterdam, chez J. Muller 1841, 62 pp.). And secundo the (primarily – though not exclusively – botanical) study (in Dutch) by Willem Hendrik de Vriese, “*Proeve eener geschiedkundig-botanische Verhandeling over den Papyrus antiquorum*”, in: *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis der botanische wetenschap door F.A.W. Miquel & W. H. de Vriese = Tijdschrift voor Natuurlijke Geschiedenis en Physiologie*, vol. II.1 (Leiden, 1835), pp. 27-64, geciteerd in “*Redevoeringen over het Plantenrijk, in zijne natuurlijke afdeelingen en in verband met het Dierenrijk beschouwd; door H.C. van Hall, Hoogleeraar te Groningen. Ten gevolge op de Redevoeringen van J.A. Uilken, over de volmaaktheden van den Schepper, in zijne schepselen beschouwd, enz. 8^{vo}. XVI en 299 bl. f. 2-80*”, (Groningen, 1837) p. 238, n. 552.

¹⁴ C. Leemans states in his introduction to the Leiden papyrus Z appearing in his “*Papyri musei antiquarii Lugduni Batavi*”, vol. II (1885), pp. 263-265 (see the website https://www.archive.org/details/ldpd_10972583_002/page/270) on p. 265: “--- Vir doctissimus E.J. Kiehlus, qui annis abhinc undecim irreparabili scientiarum damno, morte ereptus est, inde ab anno hujus saeculi quinquagesimo et per quatuor sequentes Leidae degeret, in Gymnasio praeceptoris munere functus. Huic papyrus nostrum ostendi et proposui ut difficillimum inceptum adiret. Consentiebat vir doctissimus; indefessa patientia atque ardore nullis difficultatibus a proposito deterreri se sinente, laborem arduum et periculosum, saepius quoque taedium movere minitantem suscepit et quas horas interdum inter plurima muneris officia, et reliqua publicorum et privatorum negotiorum studia sibi servare poterat, operi impendit. Rem egit hoc modo, ut singula deinceps ipsius textus, signis et literis quae huic praemittuntur omissis, apographa faceret, quae deinde, nova comparatione instituta corrigebat. Literis quae dubiae manserant, aut quas nondum enucleare potuerat, sed nova cura agnoscere aut certius definire didicerat, veriores suprascribebat, quae probabili conjectura suppleri posse videbantur, uncis includebat; reliquas quae prorsus perierunt, aut nulla fere vestigia reliquerant parvis orbiculis, Ø, indicabat, quibus literas, ex saepius repetitione collata melius quodammodo apparentes suprascribebat.

Mense februario 1851 undevigesimum apographum jam paraverat, quum multitudine negotiorum obrutus per aliquod tempus ab opere desistere debuit, consilio tamen suscepto, tempore opportuno illud iterum resumendi et quantum posset ad finem quoque perducendi. Propositum adsequi ei non licuit, otio nullo inter multiplices labores concessio. Res itaque jacuit annos quatuor usque ad mensem januarii 1855 quo tempore ad cathedras Athenaei Daventriensis vocatus Leidam ad novum munus obiendum reliquit et Daventriam profec-

no less than nineteen (*undeviginti*) transcripts of papyrus “Z”, over the course of four years, beginning in 1850¹⁵. Due to his many obligations and responsibilities, Kiehl was unable to complete the task and, in January 1855, he left Leiden for the Athenaeum in Deventer¹⁶. An edition with commentary had never been discussed by Kiehl and Leemans (see *argumenti explicatio et adnotatio*), and Kiehl’s final transcript, embossed with both their seals, was kept by Leemans at the Leiden Museum. It is this final copy – no longer at the museum – that was used by Leemans for his edition of the 2nd volume of the Leiden Museum papyri.

tus est. De papyro edendo eousque numquam sermo inter nos fuerat. Textum tantummodo ex obscurissimis literarum ductibus prodere sibi proposuerat Kiehlus; argumenti explicatione et adnotatione in posterius tempus remissis, quando, saepius repetita collatione tandem de dubiis literis quoad fieri posset, certior factus fuisset. Ut autem viro doctissimo Leidam relinquenti fructus studiorum, et temporis huic labori impensi probe servaretur, apographum quod postremum scripserat, involucro inclusum resignavi utriusque nostri sigillo obsignatum in Musei Antiquarii depositum fuit. Tandem textum cum reliquis papyris Graecis Musei nondum editis in publicam lucem editurus involucrum resignavi et apographum reddendum constitui quale ultima vice redactum a viro doctissimo mihi fuerat commissum”. For Kiehl, see also <https://www.dbnl.org/auteurs/auteur.php?id=kieh001> and see below, note 16.

¹⁵ For later editions of the text, see *TM* # 23768.

¹⁶ Where Kiehl delivered an inaugural speech that caused scandal in Holland, see A.H.A. Ekker’s review “*Oratio de litteris antiquis ad instituendam iuventutem retinendis, quam habuit Ernestus Julius Kiehl, die Saturni, XII m. Maii, a. ciccicccv, cum in Athenaeo Daventriensi litterarum antiquarum professionem solenni ritu auspicaretur*. Lugd. Bat., ap. E.J. Brill, bibliopolam” published in the ‘Bibliographisch Album’ in: *De Gids* 20 (1856), pp. 830-844. Unfortunately, despite my own research (performed at local Dutch archives, in Deventer, Groningen and Middelburg) and despite the assistance of others, I have thus far not been successful in my attempts to retrieve an image of this remarkable 19th-century Dutchman (he was a stubborn opponent of no less than the “ranking” politician J.R. Thorbecke). For Kiehl, see the website of the ‘*Biographical Portal of the Netherlands*’: <http://www.biografischportaal.nl/persoon/02611379>. To be sure, around 1874 a portrait must have been available, see the advertisement of the Bookseller Boudewijnse in Middelburg in the “*Nieuwsblad voor den boekhandel*”, year 41.5, d.d. 16-01-1874 (RH column on the top of the page), for this, see: <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=dts:2732007:mpeg21:0004>. I owe this detailed information to the generous help given to me by Eric van der Linden, assistant of the “*Biographical Portal of the Netherlands*”.

A New Development Outside of Leiden, in Utrecht c. 1900

Things began to change in Leiden around 1900. This is made clear by the publications of two Egyptologists on Coptic texts, housed at the Museum of Antiquities¹⁷. Greek documentary papyri were initially ignored in Leiden. It were the foreign Egyptologists, including the Frenchman Gaston Maspero, who focused on the Egyptian texts in that city¹⁸. But in 1910 the German papyrologist, Ulrich Wilcken, visited Leiden to study the original papyri edited by Leemans in his 1843-1835 editions. Wilcken wanted to see the texts with his own eyes and planned new editions of the works (see the introduction to Wilcken's "*Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*", vol. I [1927]). He also took the opportunity to look at the famous Leiden papyrus "Z" in Leemans' edition, Vol. II, which was, according to N. Hohlwein, in his "*La papyrologie grecque: Bibliographie raisonnée*" (Louvain, 1905, p. 47; s.n. 126) – "le plus intéressant de ceux du second volume".

In 1908 the Graecus of the Leiden University, Jan van Leeuwen, and the Graecus of the Utrecht University, Henrick van Herwerden (a student of Cobet), offered a new edition of an exciting literary work by Aristotle; the text, Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, had been recently found in Egypt¹⁹. It appeared as though a change was taking place in the Netherlands, and that not only literary papyri from Egypt should be examined. The newly appointed professor of Greek language and literature, J.J.G Vürtheim, gave an inaugural lecture in Leiden in 1913 (entitled "*Eene eeuw verder*", or "*A Century Later*"), in which he focused primarily on literary papyri. But this was only one side of the papyrology coin.

The Utrecht based professor of Roman Law, Jean Charles Naber, who was working outside of Leiden, had already published his "*Observatiunculæ ad Papyros juridicæ*"²⁰. While writing this article, he was no doubt inspired by German legal historians such as Theodor Mommsen, Ludwig Mitteis, and Otto Gradenwitz, who dealt exclusively with documentary

¹⁷ Willem Pleyte & Pieter Adriaan Aart Boeser, "*Manuscripts coptes du Musée d'antiquités des Pays-Bas à Leiden*" (Leiden, 1897), and W.Pleyte & P.A.A. Boeser, "*Catalogue du Musée d'antiquités à Leide: Sous division F, Egypte, antiquités Coptes*", (Leiden, 1900).

¹⁸ In particular to RMO inv. I 383 in *RecTrav.* 1 [1879], pp. 20-40.

¹⁹ Jan van Leeuwen provided three (in 1908¹, 1908², 1919³) new editions of a literary Menander-papyrus that had been found (likewise) only shortly before, in 1905.

²⁰ In the *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, Bd. 1.2 (Leipzig-Berlin, 1900), pp. 313-327.

Greek papyri. For a relatively short time (1900-1914) Utrecht, located at the center of the country, became the hub of papyrology in Holland. Almost concurrent with the start of the First World War, Ezekiel Slijper (1874-1953), a secondary school teacher of classical languages and assistant rector of the Municipal Gymnasium in Utrecht, drew in a brochure titled “Papyri”²¹ attention to the fact that in European countries – including England, France and Germany – there was much activity in the field of papyrology. In the Netherlands, and certainly after the pioneering work of Conrad Leemans, the situation was very different. Slijper did not mention the work of Jan van Leeuwen, which focused exclusively on literary papyri, nor that of his countryman Naber. But Slijper did indicate that, shortly before 1914, two Dutch students had gone abroad to study papyrology, a new and promising branch of classical studies. He was referring to Maurits Engers²², a student from Groningen, and David Cohen, a student from Leiden²³. In 1919, Slijper published an article about documentary papyri – a topic evidently dear to his heart – in a general culture magazine²⁴. Engers and Cohen’s Dutch advisors (the Ancient History professors, Ursul Philip Boissevain, in Groningen, and Antonie Ewoud Jan Holwerda, in Leiden) remarkably had no direct experience with the extensive field of papyrology. Boissevain had made short trips to Berlin and Vienna, between 1878-1880, where papyrological studies had already begun. Their PhD students had both gone to Berlin (a papyrological center at

²¹ Published in August 1914. As far as the Dutch language is concerned the year “1914” is the birth year of the two terms “Papyroloog” and “Papyrologie”.

²² In 1909 he was promoted to Dr.phil. at the Groningen University by the professor of Ancient History U. Boissevain, after defending a “papyrologically inspired” dissertation entitled, “*De Aegyptiarum Κομῶν administratione*”. This dissertation has been superseded by Arthur M.F.W. Verhoogt’s study, “*Menches Komogrammateus van Kerkeosiris. The Doings and Dealings of a Village Scribe in the Late Ptolemaic Period (120-110 B.C.)*”, Leiden, 1997 (*Pap.Lugd. Bat.*, 29).

²³ Three years after Engers’ academic promotion in Groningen, D. Cohen defended his dissertation, “*De magistratibus Aegyptiis externas Lagidarum regni provincias administrantibus*” (Leiden, 1912). written under the supervision of the local professor of Ancient History and Archeology, A.E.J. Holwerda. The latter study has now been superseded by Roger S. Bagnall’s study “*The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*”, Leiden 1976 (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition).

²⁴ “Uit het oude Nijldal” in the Dutch periodical *Onze Eeuw* 19 (1919), pp.166-199.

the time) and acquired there the knowledge needed to write their dissertations. Slijper emphasized that the two young scholars' research would be insufficient for the expansion of papyrology in the Netherlands, unless the discipline was present in at least one Dutch university. At the time, "classical studies" appeared in the program of two universities in Amsterdam (the Municipal University and the Free University), in Leiden, Utrecht, and Groningen; the Catholic Radboud University, in Nijmegen, did not yet exist. And it would take another 10 years for Slijper's wish to be granted. In 1923 there was a remarkable change. Two universities in the Netherlands appointed lecturers of Greek papyrology: Maurits Engers (at the Municipal University of Amsterdam) and David Cohen (at the Leiden University). Modern papyrology began in Holland with the public lessons of these private university lecturers²⁵.

The Beginning in Amsterdam

The situation at the Municipal University of Amsterdam became complex when Engers gave up his private teaching position shortly after his first public lecture. Following his first appearance (in 1926/1927), a professor of Ancient History, David Cohen, was assigned as his new superior. Cohen came to Amsterdam, from Leiden, and was the successor of Engers' former advisor at the Groningen University, Prof. Boissevain. In the few years between his arrival and resignation, as a private lecturer in Amsterdam, he had not established his own "school" of papyrology. He was rector of the Gymnasium Ceeleum in Zwolle from 1922 to 1934, and then rector of the Praedinius Gymnasium in Groningen. Between serving as a private lecturer (1923) and professor of Ancient History in Amsterdam (1926/1927), Engers did little to establish himself as a researcher²⁶. Even

²⁵ Engers on 29.i with a public lecture "*Papyrologie en Oude Geschiedenis*" (Amsterdam, 1923), Cohen two days later on 31.i with a public lecture "*De Griekse Papyrologie en hare Betekenis voor de Kennis der Antieke Beschavingsgeschiedenis*" (Leiden, 1923). Also see my inaugural lecture, "*Keerpunten in de Papyrologie*" (Leiden, 2003), pp. 7-8.

²⁶ His four journal articles dating from this period are:

(1) M. Engers, "*Die staatsrechtliche Stellung der Juden in Alexandrien*", *Klio* 18 (1923), pp. 79-90;

prior to Engers' appointment, in 1923, a student in Amsterdam had become interested in Greek papyrology; in fact, Wilcken mentions a "Dr. Jan Kampstra aus Holland". Kampstra worked at the Berlin papyrus collection around 1921/1922 and was probably a *doctorandus*, who had not yet defended his dissertation. Later he spent time in Rome, where he checked the readings of several Greek Ptolemaic papyri for Wilcken's editorial work on *Urkunden der Ptoemäerzeit*²⁷. Shortly thereafter, Kampstra authored an article titled "*De rescripto imp. Severi et Caracallae Solvae reperto*", in *Mnemosyne* 2a series 51.2 (1923), pp. 218-222. This is reported by J.M. Bremer in a footnote to an article titled, "*Prussia and Holland: Wilamowitz and two Kuipers: a postscript*", jointly written with William Calder III. The article appeared in *Mnemosyne* 4a Ser. 49.2 (1996), pp. 191-195 (see p. 194, n. 17) and was inspired by a letter of condolence sent to the widow of K. Kuiper, dated "Charlottenburg, 9 II (1922): "Jan Kampstra (1893-1970) began his studies as a student of classical languages in Amsterdam, 1912; K. Kuiper had been one of his professors. Between 1914 and 1918, Kampstra served in the Dutch army (defending Dutch neutrality during the First World War, KAW). After the war, Kampstra resumed his studies and went, in 1922, like Kuiper, in 1909, to Berlin to attend the lectures of von Wilamowitz. After his semester in Berlin, Kampstra spent another semester at the British school in Rome and, in 1923, became a teacher of classical languages at the Gymnasium Erasmianum in Rotter-

- (2) M. Engers, "*Keizer Gaius en zijn opvatting over het keizerschap*", *TvG* 38 (1923), pp. 324-340;
- (3) M. Engers, "*Der Brief des Kaisers Klaudius an die Alexandriner*", *Klio* 20 (1926), pp. 168-178;
- (4) M. Engers, "*Alexandrië en de keizers uit het Julisch-Claudische huis*", *TvG* 41 (1926), pp. 113-136.

I am certain that the two articles published in 1926 were written with the inspiration of a newly found papyrus that, shortly before 1926, had been published by H.I. Bell & W.E. Crum, "*Jews and Christians in Egypt; The Jewish Troubles in Alexandria and the Athanasian Controversy*" = *P.Lond.* VI 1912 (1924) = *TM* 16850.

²⁷ See Wilcken, *Archiv* 7 (1924), pp. 64-65 and 306-307; he describes (*loc. cit.*, pp. 64-65) Kampstra's work approvingly; in Berlin Kampstra wrote his article "*Papyrus 11886 der Berliner Sammlung*", that was published in *ZRG* 43 (1922), pp. 556-559; the Greek text of the papyrus was discussed by Wilcken in *Archiv* 7 [1924], pp. 306-307 and it was reprinted in *SB* III 6663.

dam, until his retirement in 1959. In 1924, he married a daughter of one of K. Kuiper's brothers". This marriage was to Keetje Kuiper. Thus Kampstra (see also, <http://stadsarchief.amsterdam.nl/archieven/archiefbank/inventaris/1258.nl.html> sub # 4.1/#35) had been sent by his teacher, K. Kuiper, from Amsterdam to Berlin, even before Engers began as a private lecturer of Greek papyrology at the Municipal University of Amsterdam. Incidentally, I cannot help but think that (despite how enticing von Wilamowitz's lectures may have been) Kuiper was influenced by Slijper's essay from 1914 when sending his student to Berlin.

A New Beginning in Groningen

A few years later, in 1925, a third private lecturer position was created at the University of Groningen. It would be given to the classical scholar Bernhard Abraham van Groningen, who earned a doctorate in 1921, after defending his dissertation, "*De Papyro Oxyrhynchita 1380*". Thus between 1885 and 1900, in the field of papyrology in Holland, regrettably little was published, if anything at all! (1885 was the publication year the 2nd volume of Leemans' pioneering *P.Lugd.Bat.* - edition; 1900 was the publication year of Naber's article, previously mentioned) And within a short period – after 1914 – papyrology was “academically” represented in this country at three universities.

After van Groningen was appointed private lecturer of papyrology, and following his inaugural public lecture, "*Hellenism on Foreign Soil*"²⁸, more papyrological activity began at the Groningen University. Immediately after its publication, his monograph "*Les gymnasiarches des métropoles de l'Égypte Romaine*"²⁹ received a positive review from M. Hombert,

²⁸ Published in Groningen in 1925 and reprinted in: "*B.A. van Groningen: Artikelen en boekbesprekingen*", bijeengebracht door S.E.M. Meijer, (Leiden, 1990 [Uitgaven vanwege de Stichting "Het Leids Papyrologisch Instituut", part 9A], pp. 38-47; this brochure also contains a bibliography of the most interesting and important publications by van Groningen (from a papyrologist's point of view).

²⁹ Published in Groningen in 1924 (164 pp.). The choice of the subject “the gymnasiarch” is not surprising in the case of an author who, at the time of he was writing the volume, had been a former *rector* of the Gymnasium at Assen. This study is now available at: <https://www.delpher.nl/nl/boeken/view?coll=boeken&identifier=MMKB02%3A000121798%3A00001&pres%5Bpage%5D=1&pres%5Bnbuffer%5D=bottom>.

in the *Revue de Philologie et d'histoire* (1925, pp. 743-747). Later, van Groningen would also be recognized by papyrologists around the world for his articles and major editions including “*The Warren Papyri*” (Leiden, 1941) and “*A Family Archive from Tebtunis*” (Leiden, 1950). In the meantime, the Groningen University acquired a collection of around 125 papyri through the Berlin papyrologist Wilhelm Schubart³⁰. In 1933, Antoon Gerard Roos³¹ published an *editio princeps* of these *P. Gron.*, including two texts housed at the Amsterdam University Library³². He did this in collaboration with van Groningen who, in 1928, became a professor at the Leiden University. After this promising start, very little happened in the field of papyrology in Groningen. Following his retirement, in 1947, Roos was replaced by Elisabeth Visser (1908-1987), a student of David Cohen, who was professor of Ancient History Amsterdam. Visser published several articles in addition to her 1938 dissertation. But apart from these, and a public lecture, she did not remain active in the field of Greek papyrology³³.

³⁰ For this collection, see <http://facsimile.ub.rug.nl/cdm/landingpage/collection/Papyri>.

³¹ About this Groningen University professor of Ancient History and University Librarian, see https://www.de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Antoon_Gerard_Roos. He was also the author of several articles that appeared slightly later; parts of these articles covered papyrological subjects: (1) “*Lesefrüchte*”, *Mnemosyne*, 3^a series, 2 (1935), pp. 233-244, resp. *Mnemosyne* 6 (1938), pp. 172-178, and (2) another article entitled “*De Strateeg van de Her-mopolitaanse gouw Apollonius*”, *TvG* 37 [1922], pp. 1-40, 129-146.

³² For these Amsterdam papyri (acquired in 1926 by the Neotestamentician Dirk Plooi from the private papyrus collection of the Englishman James Rendell Harris, with whom Plooi maintained close contact, see my “*Keerpunten in de Papyrologie*”, p. 19, note 17. For a later edition of the Amsterdam papyrus no. 1, see my contribution in *APF* 42 (1996), pp. 235-242; also see P.J. Sijpesteijn, “*The Aeschines Papyrus Amstelodamensis No. 2: A Reconsideration*”, *CdÉ* 49 (1974), pp. 124-127; and for the *ed. princ.* of a third Amsterdam papyrus (discovered by me in the Amsterdam University Library, where I was temporarily employed) by P.J. Sijpesteijn in *ZPE* 11 (1973), pp. 171-173, see *TM* 16401. Incidentally, the Amsterdam University Library houses a Museum dedicated to the history of writing “*J.A. Dortmond!*” which contains objects featuring texts written in various cultures, in various countries and in various writing systems, including *inter alia* some Greek papyri and, last but not least, a single large Coptic ostrakon (*SB Kopt.* I 270 = *TM* 88003) published by a scarcely known (and not very productive) Dutch Coptologist M. v. Driel in collaboration with the well-known Belgian scholar Joseph Vergote in *CdE* 41 (1966), pp. 211-218.

³³ For Visser’s dissertation, see “*Götter und Kulte im Ptolemäischen Alexandrien*” (Diss.

Shortly after her appointment (1926/1927)³⁴ Visser's advisor, David Cohen, revealed his international aspirations. In "La Papyrologie dans les Pays-Bas", he wrote: "À Amsterdam nous créons, au sein de l'Institut d'Archéologie et d'Histoire ancienne un institut de Papyrologie qui sera doté par la Fondation Allard Pierson. J'espère pouvoir vous montrer dans quelques années, si vous voulez nous faire l'honneur d'une visite, que la Hollande essaie de soutenir le renom déjà ancien qu'elle a acquis dans la domaine de papyrologie, et qu'elle peut compter sur des forces Nouvelles". The Archeological-Historical Institute, at the Municipal University of Amsterdam, could therefore serve as a springboard to bring to fruition his international ambitions³⁵. To this end, Cohen participated in

Amsterdam, 1938; = *Archaeologisch-Historische bijdragen / Allard Pierson stichting*, 5); For her other papyrological contributions, see:

- (1) "Briefe und Urkunden aus der Berliner Papyrussammlung (P. Berol. Inv. 9725; 16010; 16046B; 16107; 16108; 13362)", *Aegyptus* 15 (1935), pp. 267-276.
- (2) "De Griekse papyrologie en Oud-Egyptie", *JEOL* 9 (1935), pp. 80-82;
- (3) "Iets over burgernamen te Alexandrië", *JEOL* 4 (1936), pp. 186-189;
- (4) "Een gedaanteverwisseling van Apollo?" (P. Berol. 16352), *JEOL* 6 (1939), pp. 60-62. = Pack² 1781;
- (5) "Griekse Papyrologie 1940-1941", *JEOL* 8 (1942), pp. 626-630;
- (6) "Inleiding tot de Papyrologie", *JEOL* 9 (1944), pp. 74-76;
- (7) "A Petition to Queen Cleopatra" (P. Berol. inv. 16277) in: B.A. van Groningen & E.M. Meijers (edd.), "Symbolae Julio Christiano van Oven dedicatae", (Leiden, 1946), pp. 116-121;
- (8) Elizabeth Visser und Hans Volkmann, "Orientalische Geschichte von Kyros bis Mohammed." (Leiden 1971; Handbuch der Orientalistik. Erste Abteilung. II. Band, 4. Abschnitt, Lieferung 1 A.).

Résumé: I. Elizabeth Visser, Ägypten von Kyros bis Octavian. - II. Hans Volkmann, Ägypten unter römischer Herrschaft.

³⁴ In light of later developments, it is truly a bitter and ironic twist that the Archeologisch - Historisch Institute of the Amsterdam University owed its creation to an initiative originally taken by Cohen's *collega proximus* Geerto Aeilko Sebo Snijder who, during the period 1940-1945, gained both within and outside of the University of Amsterdam a bad and "ill-perceived" reputation as an enthusiastic member of the National Socialist movement (NSB) and the local Dutch variant of the German SS. See https://www.achterhoeks museum1940-1945.nl/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=41%3Aobject-mei-2009&lang=nl.

³⁵ For them, see above and pp. 10-11. Ms. Henriette Boas (born in 1911) contributed (in a personal communication to me) a few interesting remarks (from these it appears that she knew the name "Maurits Engers" through his daughter Bertha Sophia (born in 1914),

conferences including, “Semaine égyptologique” in Brussels (1930) and the “International Congress of Orientalists in Leiden (1931). He chaired a section during which the so-called “Leidener Klammern-System” for editing new papyrus texts was devised and accepted. Just before the Second World War, Cohen had loaned a number of papyri from Berlin for an edition by Visser³⁶. She did not, however, produce an edition of the papyrus texts that were on loan. After the war, the Dutch government considered the “loan”, originally made at the Amsterdam based “Allard Pierson Foundation”, to be “spoils of war” and had it sequestered. Following her appointment as successor to Professor Roos, Visser took the original papyri from Amsterdam to Groningen. When I was working at the Amsterdam University, as an aspiring papyrologist (1975 to 1980), while my teacher Sijpestein was on sabbatical in the United States, I read about this issue in M. Hombert’s article (see note 36). I made an appointment to interview Professor Visser in Groningen, hoping to return the original papyri to the Allard Pierson Foundation, which paid the cost of the “loan” since 1939. I took the train, with a weekend bag in tow, and the papyri were sandwiched between around 40 double glass plates. The contents of these papyri connected them to another group of Berlin papyri, that were to be published by W.M. Brashear. Hence it was only natural they should be taken to Brashear, so he could edit them for publication in *BGU XIV* (Brashear was working in Berlin at the time, but also visited Amsterdam regularly). Professor Visser’s transcripts had been generously given to me and I, in turn, gave them to Brashear.

A few decades after the publication of A.G. Roos’ *P. Gron.* (1933), there was a renewal of papyrological activity at the Groningen University. This came in the form of an article, entitled “*Bemerkungen zu eini-*

“who also studied classical languages in Amsterdam; but she was a few years younger than I”); cp. the years of birth: 1911 vs. 1914! Ms. Boas also writes that she has no recollection that “professor David Cohen in Amsterdam ever lectured on Papyrology”. As far as I am concerned, it is very possible (and completely comprehensible) that after many, many, years Ms. Boas’ memory simply failed her. In any case, it is difficult to understand how Cohen attracted his Amsterdam student Elisabeth Visser to Greek papyrology *without* ever having lectured on the topic.

³⁶ See note 33, sub nn. 1, 7 and see also Marcel Hombert, “L’état des études de papyrologie au lendemain de la guerre”, *Chronique d’Égypte* 22 (1947), pp. 343-362.

gen Papyri Groninganae”, published by the “established” Amsterdam papyrologist P.J. Sijpesteijn, in *ZPE* 11 (1973), pp. 161-168. Shortly thereafter, a publication came out on the production of papyrus in antiquity, written by a scholar of ancient history from the Groningen University, Ignace H.M. Hendriks³⁷. Later on, Hendriks and I supplied an *editio princeps* of several Groningen papyri that Roos had apparently neglected to publish; this included an unknown “literary” papyrus, inv.no.66³⁸. In the late 1990s, Peter van Minnen came to Groningen to give a *privatissimum* in papyrology and managed to cultivate students’ interest in the Egypt of Late Antiquity. Jitse H.F. Dijkstra, for instance, published his first “papyrological” article on a documentary papyrus (*P. Cair. Masp I 67004*, published 1911) in “*A Cult of Isis at Philae after Justinian?*” After defending his dissertation (“*Religious Encounters on the Southern Egyptian Frontier in Late Antiquity (AD 298-642)*” Groningen, 2005) Dijkstra left the university to pursue a new career in Ottawa, Canada. For his other works, though not strictly papyrological, see <http://artsites.uottawa.ca/dijkstra/en/publications/>. Thereafter, not much happened at Groningen in terms of “documentary” papyri. But mention should be made of publications by Prof. Annette Harder, originating in Groningen, on *literary* papyri and particularly texts by Euripides, Callimachus, Posidippus, and Hellenistic poetry in general. For her editorial work, see *P. Oxy.* LII 3648, LXVI 3830, LXII 4306-4308 and *P. Oxy.* LVI 3852, which she edited with H. Baltussen. Equally deserving mention are the publications on mythographic literary papyri by Monique E. van Rossum-Steenbeek³⁹.

³⁷ “*Pliny Hist.Nat. XIII 74-82 and the manufacture of Papyrus*”, *ZPE* 37 (1980), pp. 113-114.

³⁸ For inv. no. 66^o, see the Groningen University website (see above note 30). See also the article by I.H.M. Hendriks, P.J. Parsons & K.A. Worp, “*Papyri from the Groningen Collection, I: Encomium Alexandreae*”, *ZPE* 41 (1981), pp. 71-83 (= *LDAB* 4694 = *TM* 634865); moreover, see also Hendriks & Worp, “*Papyri aus der Groninger Sammlung*”, II, *ZPE* 55 (1984) pp. 201-2013 (*SB XVI* 13060-13066).

³⁹ For a listing of her publications of mythographical papyri, see <http://www.papyri.info/biblio/63550?q=rossum>.

A Discussion of a Few Smaller Collections in Holland (Nijmegen, Utrecht, Rotterdam, Amsterdam University, Heerlen)

The Library at the Nijmegen's Radboud University (see www.trismegistos.org/collection/1218) houses five papyrus fragments that were purchased from the Leiden based dealer, Erik von Scherling, after the Second World War⁴⁰. Fragmentary papyrus texts from Egypt were also acquired from this dealer by the Leiden National Museum of Antiquities, the Leiden Papyrological Institute, and the Museum of the History of Taxation at Rotterdam, either during or shortly after the war. It is exciting to think that, from 1933 to 1955, there was a shop in Leiden where one could buy papyri "over the counter". B.A. van Groningen's students – Cornelia A(driana) van Veen-Noordegraaf (she graduated in 1938. For her contribution to Dutch papyrology, see the Greek papyrus now referred to as *TM* 64742) and his assistant at the Leiden Papyrological Institute, E.P. Wegener (see *TM* 703266) – occasionally studied the von Scherling texts, at their owner's behest, before they were sold. Wegener personally owned two papyrus texts (*TM* 25110 and *TM* 15689) and had acquired at least one from von Scherling. A few years ago, an unknown and intriguing bilingual papyrus ended up in the possession of E. Boswinkel; it was probably part of Wegener's legacy (*TM* 48588). Upon closer inspection, only two were found to be publishable (*TM* 27716 and *TM* 33002), and the publication of these two Nijmegen fragments was done by myself and R.P. Salomons. The latter taught papyrology at Nijmegen, had prepared his PhD in Amsterdam under the supervision of P.J. Sijpesteijn and had worked as a teacher of clas-

⁴⁰ About him and his private papyrus collection (intended for "trading") a number of articles were published in the *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists*, see: A.V. Bakkers, M.J. Bakker, & K.A. Worp, "Back to Oegstgeest: The von Scherling Papyrus Collection; Some von Scherling Texts in Minnesota", *BASP* 44 (2007), pp. 39-72; R. Dekker & K.A. Worp, "Missing Papyri: The von Scherling Papyrus Collection Again", *BASP* 49 (2012), pp. 183-216; K.A. Worp, "Greek von Scherling Papyri in the RMO, Leiden", *BASP* 50 (2013), pp. 15-38; K.A. Worp, "New von Scherling Papyri in Uppsala, Sweden" (with a contribution by R. Dekker), *BASP* 53 (2016), pp. 61-78.

About the purchase made by the Radboud University at Nijmegen, see R. Dekker & K.A. Worp, "Missing Papyri", *BASP* 49 (2012), p. 192, especially notes 7 and 10. For the von Scherling-collection, in general, see <https://www.trismegistos.org/collection/179>, where sub "History" the listing of the relevant distribution data is unfortunately incomplete.

sical languages in Dutch secondary schools (for his publications, see <http://www.papyri.info/bibliosearch?q=Salomons>). During his time at the university, Salomons encouraged one of his students, J.H.M. de Jong, to write a dissertation on “*The Representation and Perception of Roman Imperial Power in Greek Papyrus Texts from A.D. 238*” (Diss. Nijmegen, Radboud University, 2006). Thereafter, de Jong transformed parts of her dissertation into journal articles, conference papers, etc. (for a list, see <http://www.papyri.info/bibliosearch?q=Janneke+de+Jong>). The dissertation of Maria Johanna (Marianne) Helena van der Weiden’s, “*The Dithyrambs of Pindar: Introduction, Text and Commentary*” (diss. Nijmegen, 1991), is not really a “papyrological” work. After all, Pindar remains a Greek literary author. Van der Weiden is also the author of a journal article: “*P. Oxy. 2624: A New Fragment of Pindar*”, *ZPE* 64 (1986), pp. 15-32 (with a Corrigendum in *ZPE* 66 [1986], p. 64).

Before the Second World War, a private papyrus collection had been housed in Nijmegen and was the property of Engelbert Drerup, a professor of classical Greek; these texts were forever lost in a bombing raid, see <https://www.trismegistos.org/collection/255#collref-more-info>. The University Library at Utrecht also owns a small collection of texts from Egypt (see www.trismegistos.org/collection/346) that were acquired, through Gilles Quispel, from the German coptist Carlo Schmidt; for additional details see Roelof van den Broek, “*A Greek Iatromagical Papyrus*” (Utrecht Copt. Ms. B3.8), *ZPE* 202 (2017), pp. 208 - 213. Before the 1930s, similarly the Amsterdam University Library had obtained three Greek papyri.

In the 1970s, the Erasmus University Library in Rotterdam bought several interrelated papyri from the Austrian dealer, M. Fackelmann; this purchase was made with the intervention of Amsterdam papyrologist, P.J. Sijpesteijn. And in Heerlen, in the Dutch province of Limburg, the “Thermen” museum featured a completely unexpected display of Greek ostraka. I had gone there in the early 1980s – during a camping trip spoiled by rain – where there is a Roman bathhouse that was discovered by chance after a 1940 bombing raid. Back in Amsterdam, I received a call from the director, who informed me that the museum had a substantial collection (approximately 200 pieces) of Greek, Coptic, and Demotic ostraka. The collection had been acquired around 1920 through the German archaeologist, Karl Maria Kaufmann. For the collection, see <https://www.trismegistos.org/collection/155>; About Kaufmann, see https://www.de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Maria_Kaufmann.

Back to Leiden

Let us again turn our attention to the most important center of papyrology in Holland/the Netherlands (since 1830): Leiden. Due to unforeseen circumstances, a “traditional” situation in Holland can radically change – much like the weather – in a short period. One of the new private lecturers of papyrology, B.A. van Groningen, who began working in Groningen University in January 1925, left the university after only a few years. He went to Leiden University in 1928, where he was appointed professor of Greek language and literature. This meant there would be a new appointment to the position that Cobet had left decades early when he died in 1889.

In a relatively short period, the new professor in Leiden became an outstanding teacher of papyrology. He also managed to spark an interest in his students for this *disciplina arcana*. These included Cornelia A. Noordegraaf, who wrote an MA thesis on the first edition of an interesting von Scherling text (*TM* 64742), as well as Eefje Prankje Wegener⁴¹ and Ernst Boswinkel⁴². The latter two would both defend PhD dissertations on “papyrological” topics: an *editio princeps* of several unpublished documentary papyri from Oxford and Vienna, respectively. B.A. van Groningen’s arrival at the Leiden University led him to establish in 1935 a new, and independent, institute primarily geared to the study of documentary

⁴¹ She was born in Amsterdam on 30 November 1908 and died in Apeldoorn on 19 February 1958. As a student, she matriculated at the Leiden University in 1929. See my biographical note on Wegener appearing in Dutch in the J. Lending’s internet publication “Mainzer Beobachter” of August 2020; in this article appears *inter alia* another completed copy of an incomplete bibliography of her papyrological publications collected by E. Boswinkel; compare *JEOL* 15 [1957-1958] p. [8] and the reprint in *Pap.Lugd.Bat.*, XXIII, pp. 60-61. For Wegener’s Leiden dissertation, see “*Some Oxford Papyri (P.Oxf.)*” (defended Leiden, 19.xi.1941); next to her dissertation in monograph form one should compare the papyrus texts from the Bodleian Library (Oxford) which she published in article – under the same title! – in *JEA* 23 (1937), pp. 204-225 [these texts were later reprinted in *SB VI* 9190-9198].

⁴² Ernst Boswinkel was born in The Hague, on 18 December 1913, and died in Haarlem, on 30 December 1995. As a student, he began his study of classical languages in Leiden in 1931 where he defended his dissertation “*Einige Wiener Papyri*” on 13.xi.1941. There was hardly a week between the defenses of Boswinkel and Wegener. The defenses took place, while the University of Leiden was – for a short period of time – *not* closed by the German (occupying) authorities.

papyri. This initiative involved the founding of a “papyrological” institute, which was accomplished in collaboration with two legal historians, Julius Christiaan van Oven and Martin David. A scholar of ancient history, or Egyptologist, might also have joined them. However this did not happen. In Leiden, professors David and van Groningen became the Dutch equivalent of the English papyrologists at Oxford (B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt). In the course of time, the latter two had earned an amusing nickname, with a “classical” ring, “The Oxford Dioscuri”; one could correspondingly speak of the “Leiden Dioscuri”. Even after several decades, the Leiden Papyrological Institute and its publication series (*Payrologica Lugduno-Batava*) had weathered the storms of “budget cuts” that raged through Dutch universities; the series now consists of nearly 35 large-format volumes⁴³. Its 13th part (*P. Select.*) contains a selection of unrelated papyrus texts that were edited for the Papyrological Institute’s 30th anniversary. Its 17th part (*P. David*) was a Festschrift in honor of one of the Institute’s founders. The series is now primarily used for the publication of new Festschriften, conference proceedings, etc.

Aside from the joint establishment of a new institute and papyrological series, David and van Groningen also composed an anthology of documentary papyrus texts, which illustrates the features of the multifaceted field: *The Papyrologish Leerboek (Papyrological Textbook)*⁴⁴. Over the years, many Dutch students, as well as two PhD students from South Africa (at the time, a common academic exchange) worked at the new Institute. They then defended their dissertations at the Leiden University.

1. Philippus Villiers Pistorius (1907-1972), “*Indices Antinoopolitani*” (diss. Leiden, 1939) and
2. Elbert Lucas de Kock (1895-1972), “*Die Kosmeet in Egipte*” (diss. Leiden, 1948; written in South-African).

⁴³ On the foundation of the Leiden Papyrological Institute see, in particular, my article on the acquisition of the private papyrus collection now (currently) kept there (owned by the American collector E.P. Warren) in *BASP* 47 (2010), pp. 238-240.

⁴⁴ Published in Leiden in 1940 (in the Italian manual by O. Montevecchi, ‘*La Papirologia*’ [Milano, 1972] the Dutch noun ‘*Leerboek*’ was accidentally turned into a funny Dutch “equivalent” “*Loerboek*” or “book for peeping”). This successful anthology was later republished under the English title “*Papyrological Primer*” (Leiden, 1946², 1952³, 1965⁴); later (in 1980), in a 5th edition by P.W. Pestman, with the title “*The New Papyrological Primer*”.

They were later joined by a few Dutch students'

3. Pieter Kool (1913-1999), "*The Phylakites in Greco-Roman Egypt*" (diss. Leiden, 1954), and
4. Hendrik Willem van Soest (born 1931), "*The civil-law enguê (surety agreement) in the Papyri from the Ptolemaic Period*" (diss. Leiden, 1963). H.W. van Soest's dissertation was prepared under the supervision of M. David. For reasons unknown to me, these dissertations were not incorporated into the series *Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava* (as had previously been the case with Leiden dissertations by E. P. Wegener and E. Boswinkel). In this series there appeared the "literary" dissertation of Margaretha Werre-de Haas, *Aeschylus' Dictyulci*, Leiden 1961 (= *Pap.Lugd.Bat.*, X). There were also two studies by the Dutchman Anton Herman Reinier Everhard Paap, who had emigrated to South Africa, "*The Herodoti reliquiis in papyris and membranis Aegyptiis servati*" (Leiden, 1948 = *Pap.Lugd.Bat.*, IV), resp. "*Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyri or the First Five Centuries A.D.*" (Leiden, 1959 = *Pap.Lugd.Bat.*, VIII). Neither concerned Leiden University dissertations.

Because it may be assumed that a student from Leiden or Amsterdam was involved, I will provide here some information about Albertina/Alberdina Menkman⁴⁵. She is mentioned in B.A. van Groningen's article, "*La*

⁴⁵ From the register of burials in Amsterdam (copied and translated by me): "Menkman, Alberdina: born: 30 January 1918, in Amsterdam; date of death in Amsterdam: 1 October 1997; date of burial: 9 October 1997; grave number: 1-2-0364; entry number in the register of burials at 'De Nieuwe Ooster': NL-SAA-3240604".

Since 14 September 1949 (around 4 years after the liberation of Holland from the German occupation!) she was married to a man who had been a German citizen; in 1938 he emigrated from Germany to The Netherlands, in 1939 he became a stateless citizen and, in 1945, he "naturalized" as Dutch. While living in Amsterdam, he manufactured fountain pens (see the Dutch Staatsbl. 1945:3): Curt Contwig (born in Culmsee 1890 and died in Amsterdam on 1 September 1969); the marriage did not last very long, the differences in their backgrounds (German vs. Dutch) and age (28 years!) were "considerable". On 22 December 1955 they divorced. It is not entirely certain, but "likely" that Ms. Menkman was a *de facto* pupil of Hendrik Richard Hoetink who, before the 2nd World War, was a member of the Law Faculty of the Amsterdam University (his formal teaching assignment was "Law and

Papyrologie dans les Pays-Bas en 1940-1945”, cited above (p. 2, n. 1) and she published two articles:

1. “*The ban for soldiers during the Roman Principate and its influence on form and fate of the dos*”, *TRG* 17 (1940), pp. 311-330. (here she mentions (on p. 312, note 1) the “*Papyrologisch leerboek*” of M. David & B.A. van Groningen.
2. “*The Edict of Valerius Eudaimon Prefect of Egypt*”, in the Festschrift “*Symbolae van Oven*”, (Leiden, 1946), pp. 191-210⁴⁶. The edict comes from *P.Oxy.* II 237, col. viii.

In August 1950, several years after the Second World War, van Groningen undertook an important international project for the Leiden University. The “*Berichtigungsliste der Griechischen Papyrusurkunden*” (the

its History / History of Law and the History of the Development of Civil Law”. She may also have been a student of Martin David who, prior to coming to Leiden, had temporarily worked as a legal historian at the Amsterdam University, where he was sponsored by David Cohen; for this intermezzo, see Cohen’s biography by P.H. Schrijvers, “*Rome, Athene Jeruzalem: Leven en Werk van David Cohen*” (Amsterdam, 1999), p. 142. In any case, the legal historian Hoetink dealt with juridical aspects of the papyri (see his article “*Quelques remarques sur la vente dans le Droit Grec*”, *TRG* 9.2 [1929], pp. 253-270). Thanks to the assistance given to me by M. Haentjens and E. Koops, I can report that Mrs. Menkman is mentioned as ‘Mejuffrouw Mr. A. Menkman, Secretaresse van het ‘Directorium van de Universiteit van Amsterdam’, in the *Jaarboek der Universiteit voor 1943*, vol. 1 p. 15. Her name also appears in the “*Bestuursalmanak voor het bezette Nederlands gebied*”, (Den Haag 1943), p. 48, under ‘Advocaten en Procureurs’. At a certain point, around 1943, she was working with “Russell advocaten” in Amsterdam as a lawyer (see *Pyttersen’s Nederlandse Almanak 1988*, p. C 14), where she appears as ‘Mw. A. Menkman (42)’. Later she established herself as ‘advocaat & procureur’ = ‘lawyer & attorney’ in Amsterdam and she lived in

1944: at 34, Johannes Vermeerstraat;

1956-1962: at 8, Hectorstraat;

1963 - 1975: at 680, Keizersgracht;

1977: at 169, Beethovenstraat;

On 1 February 1974 she retired from being a “substitute court clerk” at the court in Amsterdam. It has become clear to me that Ms. Menkman (after having written her two journal articles dealing with Roman legal history) neither became nor remained a full-fledged papyrologist. Rather, her activities later in life were those of a “*iuris perita*”, who had left the academic world and scholarship.

⁴⁶ In the same volume two female students from Leiden published a papyrological contribution, namely. A.A. Burijs, ‘*Papyrus de Leyde, dénonçant un vol*’, pp. 111-115, and Ms. A. Leeman-de Ridder, ‘*Requête concernant une vente de terrains*’, pp.122-128.

“BL” shortened) was started with the support of the “Association Internationale de Papyrologues” (International Association of Papyrologists)⁴⁷. One should note the difference between “de papyrologues” and “des papyrologues”. The difference in name was adopted, during a plenary meeting of the Association, at the behest of van Groningen. After the war, he looked for ways to ensure that Nazi sympathizers would be excluded from the Association. The project was brought to Leiden because van Groningen saw the opportunity for the Leiden Papyrological Institute to earn a

⁴⁷ This project had been originally created in 1913 in Germany by Friedrich Preisigke, the then officiating director of the imperial post- & telegraph office at Straatsburg (at the time, after the Franco-German war of 1870/1871 a German town). Throughout the years, the following volumes of the *Berichtigungsliste* were published in Leiden, in cooperation with the publishing house of E.J. Brill:

- Vol. III (1956-1958), edd. M. David, B.A. van Groningen & E. Kiessling;
- Vol. IV (1964), edd. M. David, B.A. van Groningen & E. Kiessling;
- Vol. V (1969) edd. E. Boswinkel, M. David, B.A. van Groningen & E. Kiessling;
- Vol. VI (1976) edd. E. Boswinkel, P. W. Pestman & H.-A. Rupprecht;
- Vol. VII (1986) edd. E. Boswinkel, P.W. Pestman & H.-A. Rupprecht;
- Vol. VIII (1992) edd. P.W. Pestman & H.-A. Rupprecht, zusammengestellt von F.A.J. Hoogendijk;
- Vol. IX (1995) edd. P.W. Pestman & H.-A. Rupprecht; zusammengestellt von F.A.J. Hoogendijk, unter Mitarbeit von N. Kruit & A.M.F.W. Verhoogt;
- Vol. X (1998) edd. P.W. Pestman & H.-A. Rupprecht; zusammengestellt von A.M.F.W. Verhoogt & F.A.J. Hoogendijk & N. Kruit;
- Vol. XI (2002) edd. H.A. Rupprecht & Verhoogt; zusammengestellt von N.Kruit unter Mitarbeit von J. Hengstl & L.E. Tacoma;
- Vol. XII (2009) edd. H.-A. Rupprecht & K.A. Worp, zusammengestellt von F.A.J. Hoogendijk unter Mitarbeit von M.J. Bakker, & J. Hengstl;
- Vol. XIII (2017), edd. F.A.J. Hoogendijk & A. Jördens, zusammengestellt von J.M.S. Cowey & F.A.J. Hoogendijk;

and in between the other *BL* volumes appeared:

Konkordanz (I, 1989) und *Supplement* zu Band I-VII, zusammengestellt von W. Clarysse, R.W. Daniel, F.A.J. Hoogendijk und P. van Minnen;

Konkordanz II (2007) zu Bd. VIII-XI: Herausgeber: M.J. Bakker A.V. Bakkers F.A.J. Hoogendijk, N. Kruit.

The idea for producing a concordance originated *de facto* before 1989 with the American papyrologist John W. Shumaker who, in the 1980s, produced a MS, which he made available to me (working in Amsterdam) via a set of microfiches. That MS, however, was marred by an inordinate number of typos was not a reliable working tool. Therefore the work was done in Leiden all over again.

national and international reputation. This transition from Germany to Holland was due to the exceptional losses incurred during the Second World War and Germany no longer had sufficient “papyrological manpower” to undertake and maintain this project, an international papyrological “phone directory”, which remains important for the field of classical studies. During some years, the daily responsibility of the *BL* fell to Wegener who, at the Leiden University, was respected for her exceptional competence *in rebus papyrologicis*. According to her PhD advisor van Groningen, she was “*facile princeps*” among contemporary papyrologists. After her death, in 1959, her work was taken over by Boswinkel. In 1969, I got to know Boswinkel as an exceptionally amiable man, with an interesting special personal history. As a young graduate student, he rode his bicycle from Leiden to Vienna, where the Austrian papyrologist, Hans Gerstinger, allowed him to work in the Papyrussammlung of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek. This included the selection of texts used for his dissertation. He also told me that, after the Anschluß of Austria to Germany (in March 1938), he had to return to Leiden early. Thus he stopped checking the transcripts of the texts he selected and was no longer able to verify them before defending his dissertation in 1942. As a Dutch reserve officer, who had been in military service during May of 1940, from 1943-1945 he was taken in captivity to a POW camp in Poland. After his return to the Netherlands he was sent to the then Dutch East Indies, as a conscripted soldier, where he remained until 1950. Upon his return from Indonesia, he found work in Breda as a teacher of classical languages and in 1959 he joined the Leiden University from which he retired in 1978. The daily responsibilities of the *BL* occupied much of his time, and he was unable to publish papyrological studies of his own⁴⁸. After Boswinkel’s retirement the papyrologist Willy Clarysse came from Belgian Louvain to replace Boswinkel as editor of the *BerichtungsListe*⁴⁹. Following in the footsteps of Clarys-

⁴⁸ For a list of E. Boswinkel’s publications, see <http://www.papyri.info/bibliosearch?q=boswinkel>.

⁴⁹ After more than 6.5 years at the Amsterdam University, where I was predominantly regarded by outsiders as “his boss’s assistant” (this may bring to mind the well-known record label “His Master’s Voice”) I felt I needed a “change of air” and would have liked to replace Boswinkel. But Prof. Pestman (a rather “ominous” name in Dutch; I have been told that, among Leiden Rotarians, a Dutch variant was circulating that can be translated into Eng-

se, Benedicte Verbeek later came to Leiden from Belgium, as an assistant for the *BerichtigungsListe*. In Leiden, the *primum officium* of the local papyrologists was to focus on the *BL* or, under Pestman's supervision, on publishing ancient archives or a volume of texts belonging to the Institute's papyrus collection. Consequently, the publication of non-related papyri, or other papyrological articles, was given little or no priority.

It is extremely unfortunate to have to report that, a few years ago, the so-called "Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research" (NWO) decided to stop its subvention for the *BL*. This occurred after a grant to keep the project afloat had been repeatedly applied for, even by me. The application was accompanied by an array of well-formulated arguments, had international support, and had been awarded over the course of several decades. This time however, the decision was made, based on unscientific and political grounds, namely because "it's time for a new policy". I had my own negative experience with NWO, in the early 1980s, when I attempted to fund a one-year visit to the United States, as my teacher P.J. Sijpesteijn had done several times. I intended to collaborate with my colleague, Roger Bagnall, during a sabbatical. This was uncommon at the time for "mere" assistant professors, even though I had been in the position for 7 years. But because our collaboration had been effective, I planned to visit Roger Bagnall at the Columbia University, in New York City. My visit, however, proved difficult to arrange. I required the approval of my superior, Sijpesteijn, who needed to be willing to substitute in my absence; but he opposed this plan, for reasons that remain unclear. When he finally agreed, and I applied to the Netherlands Organization for Research, my application was instantly rejected. The surprising reason was communicated to me by phone: "Mr. Worp, judging by your list of publications, you have already done enough scholarship!" In other words, "you do not need

lish as "bully") decided otherwise and was biased toward W. Clarysse. After a few years in Leiden, Clarysse returned to the Leuven University where a more attractive job was offered to him. Only much later, i.e. shortly before the fall of the Berlin wall and before the end of the separation between East and West Germany in 1989 I learned that earlier Pestman had been spontaneously (!) prepared to invite an American papyrologist who used to live and work in West Berlin (W.M. Brashear who, for a long time, often felt "jailed" (restricted or trapped) in Berlin) to come over to the *Praesidium libertatis* (Leiden University), where Pestman (who was at some point Dean of the Faculty of Law) was willing to find him a job ...

NWO money and should pay for your scholarly activities out of your own pocket!” And so it continued, until enough was enough. Thanks to Roger Bagnall, my visit to Columbia, and New York City, was funded partially by a grant from the American National Endowment for the Humanities. In a year’s time (1982-1983), the successful American-Dutch collaboration resulted in the following publications: 1) *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*, (2) a monographical edition of 38 new papyrus texts, *P.Col.* VIII, (3) a re-edition of *P.Princ.Roll* and (4) a journal article presenting an edition of three new documentary papyri belonging to a collection in Philadelphia, “*Three Papyri from Fourth Century Karanis*”, *Chronique d’Égypte* 59 (1984), pp. 301-311 (= *SB* XX 14378 - 14380). All this, despite the rejected travel grant. Nearly 10 years later, I applied for a modest NWO grant to cover my 3-month trip to Vienna. This too was rejected. This frustration led me to print a statement in the preface of *CPR* XVII.A (1981), in direct opposition to the traditional formula found in scholarly publications: “I owe no gratitude to a Dutch government institution for financial support contributing to this publication”. Yet again, I paid for my research expenses out of my pocket. For a long time, my relation with the NWO was fraught with problems. The NWO preferred to dole out subventions (with taxpayer money!), totalling no less than € 1.000.000. to D. Stapel, a representative of the so-called “social sciences”, with highly questionable “research”.

P.J. Sijpesteijn

Only a few years after the war, the Dutchman Pieter Johannes Sijpesteijn copied the example given by one of the Leiden PhD students of Professor B.A. van Groningen mentioned above (cf. p. 25). And, following the example of Ernst Boswinkel, he produced a dissertation, titled “*Einige Wiener Papyri*” (diss. Leiden 1961); an expanded version of his dissertation appeared as *Pap.Lugd.Bat.*, XI = *P.Vindob.Sijpesteijn*). During his one-year stay in Vienna – where he lived in a sparsely furnished room and suffered from a bitter cold – Sijpesteijn developed a long-term friendship with the restorer of the Viennese Papyrussammlung, Anton Fackelmann, and lasting love for Vienna, the capital of the K.&K. monarchy. This love would explain his regular trips to Vienna and is made clear in the title of an article “*Wiener Mélange*” in *ZPE* 40 (1980), pp. 91-110. However, following Sijpesteijn’s PhD defense, “papyrology” hardly remained “fashionable” in the field of classical studies in Leiden. This was

particularly true in the case of van Groningen's successor, the Graecus Christiaan M.J. Sicking, who took office in 1964. After his teacher's retirement, he, unfortunately, turned out to be a "Cobet redivivus". Sicking undermined the position of the Leiden Papyrological Institute and promoted his preferences at the Ministry of Education and Research in The Hague. These may have included the so-called "literary papyrology" in Groningen, which was far from the Leiden Papyrological Institute and its objectives. In light of his initiative to develop a "Dutch Research School for Classical Studies", Sicking wrote an "official" paper aimed at "exploring the horizon of classical studies in the Netherlands", which contained a lengthy presentation of what was being done, where, and by whom. In this paper, he never once mentioned the purely papyrological work of his teacher and Amsterdam colleague, P.J. Sijpesteijn, nor that of other Dutch papyrologists. During a phone conversation, that he later initiated in response to my letter of protest, Sicking tried to talk his way out of his inexcusable omission. I abruptly ended the call, while he was attempting to "explain" himself since professor Sicking really did not have anything more to explain or tell me.

P.W. Pestman's Appointment in Leiden

An important and positive development in Leiden came in the year 1969 with the appointment of Pieter Wilhelm Pestman (1933-2010), as M. David's successor as chair of "Ancient Egyptian Legal History". Pestman had an excellent education in both Egyptology and ancient legal history (at the time the combination of the two disciplines was still a relatively rare phenomenon in the Netherlands). After graduating and spending several years in Paris, where he studied with M. Malinine, he brought a relatively new field to Egyptology in Leiden: the in-depth study of documentary papyri written in Demotic. Until Pestman's arrival, little or nothing had been done in this field by Leiden Egyptologists. At the time, Bruno Hugo Stricker (1910-2005) had mastered the Demotic language, but he focused on literary and religious texts. Pestman became a very productive researcher. Under his leadership, papyrology in Leiden stabilized and concentrated on the study of (family) archives from Ptolemaic times. In particular, see *P.Zen.Pestman* (1980 *Pap.Lugd.Bat.*, XX), resp. the *opus magnum*, the "Guide to the Zenon Archive" (1981 *Pap.Lugd.Bat.*, XXI; published in two parts) and see also "*Les Archives Privés de Dionysios, Fils de Kephalas*" =

P.Dion. (1982 = *Pap.Lugd.Bat.*, XXII; produced in collaboration with E. Boswinkel). And the following assistants worked with and under Pestman in Leiden: René L. Vos, Sven Peter Vleeming and Koenraad Donker van Heel. For his work on the *BL*, Pestman initially had some student-assistants from the Department of Classical Languages and, specifically, the Faculty of Law. But he did not encourage PhD students to choose him as an advisor. Pestman even quarrelled with his doctoral student Vos, who was scheduled to work on the “*Recueil de textes démotiques et bilingues*” (appearing in collaboration with J. Quaegebeur in Leiden 1977) and for a PhD on an edition of a Demotic text related to the ritual of embalming the Apis bull. Vos defended his edition of this text as a dissertation at the University of Amsterdam, in 1984, and published it, years later, as “*The Apis Embalming Ritual*” (*P.Vindob.Aeg.* 3873) (Leuven 1993 = *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta*, 50). And Koen Donker van Heel’s dissertation, “*Abnormal Hieratic and Early Demotic Texts Collected by Theban Choachyt (= s) in the Reign of Amasis: Papyri from the Louvre Eisenlohr lot*” (Leiden, 1996), was defended thanks to the intervention of Leiden professor of Egyptology, J.F. Borghouts. The academic promotion of the Egyptian Abdel-Halim Nur El-din, with a dissertation entitled, “*The Demotic Ostraca in the National Museum of Antiquities at Leiden*” (Diss. Leiden, 1974), was an exception. And Sven P. Vleeming’s dissertation, “*Papyrus Reinhardt: An Egyptian Land List from the Tenth Cent. BC*”, (Diss. Leiden, 1983) was supervised by the Egyptologist J.J. Janssen, with Pestman as a co-advisor. Vleeming was a lecturer in Leiden from 1977 to 1996, but then left for Trier, in Germany, to become a professor of Egyptology. In 1997, Pestman hired an American Demotist, Brian P. Muhs, as a substitute for Vleeming. But this young scholar had a poor command of the Dutch language (an important factor if one is supposed to teach a difficult foreign language at a Dutch university) and decided to return to the United States in 2011. Meanwhile, after defending his dissertation, K. Donker van Heel did not obtain a permanent position at the Leiden University; his chance finally came when Muhs returned to Chicago.

For further details about the history of the Leiden Papyrological Institute between the years 1935 and 1985, see P.W. Pestman’s survey in a collection of articles, entitled “*Vreemdelingen in the Land of Pharaoh*”. For a follow-up, I limit myself here to the most substantial developments.

Pestman turned out to be seriously ill and, after Vleeming’s departure (1986) the Leiden-trained student Peter van Minnen (who co-authored

P.Leid.Inst. = Pap.Lugd.Bat., XXV) left Leiden and defended his dissertation (on the mid-Egyptian town of Hermopolis, unfortunately still unpublished) in Leuven in 1997. Van Minnen, a truly competent scholar, left Leiden for Ann Arbor MI, USA (1990), to pursue his career and participate in the *Duke Database of Documentary Papyri*. His fellow Leiden-trained Greek papyrologist, Arthur F.M. Verhoogt, having defended his dissertation, left Holland in 2000 for Ann Arbor, Michigan. The Demoticist Muhs went back to Chicago in 2011. Two decades after his departure for the United States, Verhoogt surprisingly turned up on the Leiden Papyrological Institute's website as an "affiliated researcher". The practical meaning of this rather grandiose qualification remains unclear⁵⁰.

Developments in Amsterdam after Cohen's Arrival

Even after the 1927 arrival of the new professor of Ancient History in Amsterdam, David Cohen, (see his biography referred to below in n. 52 by P.H. Schrijvers) the relatively new field of papyrology was not attractive. The private lectureship of Engers had also not been an immediate success. In any case, Cohen began his work in Amsterdam rather promisingly and some students adored him. But between 1927 and 1933 his scholarly re-

⁵⁰ It is fitting to draw here attention to a "semi-Dutch" papyrologist, Martha Eliassen-de Kat. I met her for the first time at a "Dutch papyrologists-day" in Leiden (a "social" event for former student-assistants who had worked at the Leiden Papyrological Institute) and I then supposed (assumed) that she had received her training as a papyrologist in Leiden. But that turned out to be quite incorrect. To my surprise, she, like myself, had begun reading Classics in Amsterdam. Immediately after the Second World War she met a young Norwegian architect who took her with him to Norway. She began studying papyrology in Oslo under the guidance of Leiv Amundsen. For details about her life and her career in (at the) Oslo University etc., see I. Solemslie-Larsen in '*Neerlandica extra Muros*' (year 1981), pp. 2-3, accessible on the website https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/_nee005198101_01/_nee005198101_01_0008.php. Another "Dutch female papyrologist working in Oslo" should be mentioned here, Joanne Vera Stolk, a linguist-Classicist- who received her training first at the Leiden University and, after first passing (only after having passed) her University examinations, she went to Norway where, in 2017, she defended her dissertation "*Case Variation in Greek Papyri. Retracing dative case syncretism in the language of the Greek documentary papyri and ostraca from Egypt (300 BCE - 800 CE)*". She also published, in APF 59,2 [2013], pp. 391- 400, a contribution containing a first edition of a Greek papyrus. For her other publications, see her website <https://www.hf.uio.no/ifikk/english/people/aca/classics/temporary/joannevs/>

sponsibilities gradually conflicted with his other interests. In particular, he felt a greater obligation to do social work for the benefit of Holland's Jewish community. After the rise of Nazi Germany, a large number of Jews emigrated to other European countries, especially to neighboring Holland. During the economic crisis of the 1930s, Cohen worked tirelessly for the "Committee for Special Social Needs". In 1941, following the German occupation of the Netherlands (May 1940), Cohen felt pressed to assume the role of co-president (along with A. Asscher) of the Jewish Council, which played a key role in the efforts of the German occupiers to expel Jews from the Netherlands. David Cohen and his colleague from Leiden, M. David (who, like Cohen himself, had been deported to Theresienstadt during the war), survived. But by the time Cohen returned to the liberated Netherlands in 1945, his energy had been depleted. After being reinstated at the Municipal University of Amsterdam, he was unable to attract new papyrology students. As far as scholarship was concerned, Cohen only succeeded in publishing a brochure in Dutch. I have translated its lengthy title as, "*Sketch of the Notaries Office in Ancient Egypt in the Hellenistic Period and the first three Centuries of the Roman Imperial Period*" (Haarlem 1955; = *Ars Notariatus*, V).

David Cohen's international aspirations for promoting papyrology at the Archaeological-Historical Institute of the Municipal University of Amsterdam ended as a result of the Second World War. After 1945, David and van Groningen were able to develop activities of their own at the Leiden Papyrological Institute founded in 1935. After the war, and Cohen's exile in Theresienstadt, no one was available to immediately take over teaching papyrology. Cohen's successors, as the Amsterdam chairs of Ancient History (Dirk Loenen, Herman Tammo Wallinga, and Abraham Benjamin Breebaart)⁵¹, featured interests that had little to do with Greek papyrology.

Further Developments in Amsterdam: the Arrival of P.J. Sijpesteijn

The situation radically changed at the Municipal University of Amsterdam, in 1964, with the arrival of Pieter Johannes Sijpesteijn; he had only just received his PhD in Leiden. Sijpesteijn was a man with impressive fea-

⁵¹ For him, see in general the biography written by P.H. Schrijvers already cited p. 23, footnote 45.

tures (his height, hands, head, and voice) but he also displayed boundless energy. Aside from the Viennese papyrologist, Carl Wessely⁵², Sijpesteijn was undoubtedly worthy of the title “the most productive author of all time” in terms of book and article publications in the field. Sijpesteijn began as a temporary university employee and was also a teacher of classical languages at the Municipal Gymnasium in Arnhem. He continued as a

⁵² The Leiden papyrologist and professor of ancient Egyptian law, P.W. Pestman (for him, see in this History, *passim*; the website <http://media.leidenuniv.nl/legacy/bibliography-pwpcorr.pdf> provides Pestman’s bibliography. In the decade following his start in Leiden, appeared two separate text editions of individual documentary Greek papyri: *P. David* (1968 = *P.Lugd.Bat.*, XVII) and *P. Batav.* (1978 = *Pap.Lugd.Bat.*, XIX). He edited a collection of essays (written in Dutch by various contributors) “*Vreemdelingen in het land van Pharao*”, (Zutphen, 1985) and on pp. 111-118 appears his essay (also written in Dutch) “*50 jaar papyrologisch instituut*” or “50 years of the Papyrological Institute”. Pestman’s contribution is truly mystifying, where on p. 115 he writes: “--- twee al eerder genoemde studenten, Boswinkel en Wegener, zich volledig op de Griekse papyrologie wierpen en zich na hun doctoraal examen gingen voorbereiden op een proefschrift waarvoor zij meerdere malen in Wenen, Parijs, Londen en Oxford verbleven”. = “Two already mentioned students, Boswinkel and Wegener, began dedicating themselves completely to Greek papyrology and, after having passed their doctoral examinations, started preparing their dissertations for which they stayed several times in Vienna, Paris, London and Oxford”. To my knowledge, however, Boswinkel never visited Paris, London and/or Oxford to prepare his dissertation on Greek papyri kept in Vienna. And whether Wegener ever had an opportunity to visit Vienna is doubtful. After all, before the Second World War, she was studying at Oxford and had little opportunity to visit Vienna before 1941. After the liberation of Holland, in May 1945 and the official opening of the German borders in 1949, she may have been in a position to travel from Holland to Austria, but by then her dissertation had already been defended. Right now, the anecdote reported by P.H. Schrijvers in his biography of David Cohen (see the upper part of p. 142) SEEMS to be more or less “telling”. In fact, according to Schrijvers, Pestman was unaware of Cohen’s contribution to scholarship and, as a competent papyrologist and historian of legal practice in Ancient Egypt, he *should* have known of course, Cohen’s name, as that of the author of a small monograph dealing with notaries who officiated in Graeco-Roman Egypt. To be sure, a copy of Cohen’s monograph was present at Pestman’s “own” Leiden Papyrological Institute. In the meantime, however, one cannot reasonably expect that a teacher (= M. David) would completely disclose a “dark” period in his own past to a (mere) student/pupil (= P.W. Pestman). *Mutatis mutandis* it may be said *hic et nunc* that the “mystery” concerning the missing part of the photocopy of PGM III, that is nowadays kept at the Leiden Papyrological Institute, can now be solved (David may have played a role in this affair, see my article “*A Contribution to the Historiography of the Edition of Greek Magical Papyri*”, *Analecta Papyrologica* 29 [2017], pp. 201-216).

“private” teacher of papyrology at the University of Amsterdam. His transfer to Amsterdam had been sponsored by the Hellenist Cornelius Jord Ruijgh (trained in Amsterdam and Paris at the *École Normale des Études Supérieures*), who had met Sijpesteijn during a holiday “somewhere” in the Mediterranean. Ruijgh sponsored Sijpesteijn wholeheartedly because he was convinced that Sijpesteijn would be an asset to the Classics Department at the University of Amsterdam. Ruijgh persuaded his superior J.C. Kamerbeek to have a chat – probably within the framework of the Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences – with his colleague and fellow Academy member, van Groningen who had no papyrology position to offer to his student. And so, Sijpesteijn came to Amsterdam. A “temporary” appointment as “private lecturer” was followed by a “temporary” appointment as an “extraordinary” lecturer, and then a “normal” lectureship *ad personam*. This continued until university lecturers in the Netherlands came to be equated with “full” professors.

The two professors of Classical Greek at the University of Amsterdam (J.C. Kamerbeek and C.J. Ruijgh) recommended the new papyrology teacher to their students and encouraged them to attend his lectures. Sijpesteijn’s first lecture attracted no less than around 30 students of classical languages; at the time this large number was unprecedented. For students in Amsterdam (myself included), Sijpesteijn was an exceptionally fascinating teacher. According to rumour, before studying classical languages in Leiden, Sijpesteijn had served several months in the French Foreign Legion; he apparently deserted after being sent to the French colonial war in Algeria. After completing his studies, Sijpesteijn spent a year in Vienna and, in 1961, returned to Leiden to defend his dissertation, “*Einige Wiener Papyri*”. (see the title of the dissertation defended earlier by his teacher E. Boswinkel). Shortly after he began at the University of Amsterdam, Sijpesteijn recruited two classics students for papyrology: R.P. Salomons and me. We both decided to prepare dissertations under the supervision of the new papyrology professor who was, literally, “larger than life” and to whom “*nihil humani alienum erat*”. These dissertations were both given the unoriginal title “*Einige Wiener Papyri*” and are now cited as “*P.Vindob.Salomons*” (diss. Amsterdam, 1976) and “*P.Vindob.Worp*” (diss. Amsterdam, 1972), respectively. Sophia M.E. van Lith, also planned to write her dissertation under Sijpesteijn’s supervision. Before this, she had made several publications, including an index of scholarly articles published in the Italian papyrological journal *Aegyptus* vols. 1-50

(1920-1970), (Amsterdam 1974, = *Stud. Amst.*, vol. II). Later on, she published part of the *Corpus Papyrorum Raineri*, vol. VI.1 = *Griechische Texte*, vol. III.1, edd. Hermann Harrauer & S.M.E. van Lith, Wien, 1978. She abandoned her intentions for private reasons. Having established his position at the University of Amsterdam, Sijpesteijn was given the opportunity (around 1969) to acquire a collection of Greek papyri, Arabic papers, and Greek ostraka for the university. This collection consisted of approximately 200 papyrus fragments, 100 ostraka and 29 linen mummy wrappings and is partially published in *O. Amst.* in *P. Amst.* vol. I and in various journal articles. Sijpesteijn greatly supported the purchase of papyri by other Dutch universities, including Rotterdam, Leiden (by the Papyrological Institute) and the University of Amsterdam.

The Appointment of J.A. Ankum in Amsterdam

Also important for the evolution of papyrology in Holland was the arrival of Johan Albert Ankum at the Municipal University of Amsterdam, as Prof. Hoetink's successor. This was almost concurrent with the arrival of Sijpesteijn. Ankum's teaching assignment included "Roman law and legal papyrology", and he trained some students, whose dissertations mainly focused on Greek papyri⁵³. Ankum encouraged the publication of Greek pa-

⁵³ I mention here in particular:

(1) A.J.M. Meyer-Termeer "*Die Haftung der Schiffer im griechischen und römischen Recht*" (Zutphen 1978; = *Studia Amstelodamensia ad epigraphicam, ius antiquum et papyrologicam pertinentia*. After the defense of her dissertation Meyer-Termeer no longer kept producing papyrological or legal history publications.

(2) Philip A. Verdult wrote a dissertation in two separate volumes, "*P. Erasmiana*, = *Papyri in the Collection of the Erasmus University (Rotterdam)*" (*P. Erasm.*, I), (Brussels 1986; = *Papyrologica Bruxellensia*, 21), resp. *P. Erasm.*, II: "*P. Erasmiana*, II. *Parts of the Archive of an Arsinoite Sitologos from the Middle of the Second Century B.C.*" (Amsterdam, 1991; = *Studia Amstelodamensia ad epigraphicam, ius antiquum et papyrologicam pertinentia*, XXXII). After his dissertation defense, Verdult was employed at the Leiden Papyrological Institute for the continuation of the *Berichtigungsliste*, but eventually he left Leiden University.

(3) Adriaan Johan Boudewijn Sirks, "*Food for Rome. The Legal Structure of the Transportation and Processing of Supplies for the Imperial Distributions in Rome and Constantinople*", (Amsterdam, 1991 = *Studia Amstelodamensia ad epigraphicam, ius antiquum et papyrologicam pertinentia*. XXXI) This research project led to the defense of his disserta-

pyrus texts by Johannes Mathwich, a German historian of ancient history, who had fled the then Eastern-Germany⁵⁴, in an article entitled, “Übersendung von Akten des Konvents von 202 unter Q. Maecius Laetus an den libyschen Gau”, *ZPE* 15 (1974), pp. 69-78. P.Amsterdam Gr. inv. no. 23 = SB XIV 11774 = TM 18135. Ankum also promoted the publication of a considerable number of legal history studies in the now discontinued series *Studia Amstelodamensia ad epigraphicam, ius antiquum et papyrologicam pertinentia*⁵⁵.

tion at the Amsterdam University. Thereafter, Sirks left Holland for Frankfurt/Main, after having attempted to take over Pestman’s position at the Leiden University and he quarreled with me about the editorial work on the volume dedicated to the memory of my teacher Sijpesteijn = P. Sijp. Later, he transferred from Germany to Oxford to begin a new career as a professor of civil law. In his autobiography, in the Wikipedia, he defines himself as “papyrologist”, but that may be challenged (see my remarks above on p. 2). To be sure, Sirks NEVER became a member of the *Association Internationale de papyrologues*. And his absence from the AIP-membership directory is enough proof. For his publications (mainly in the field of Roman legal history, reviews etc.), see the *Bibliographie Papyrologique* sub “Author = Sirks”.

⁵⁴ Mathwich appears to have completely disappeared after the publication of his article in the *ZPE*. Indeed, nobody knows what happened to him and he cannot even be traced with Google (I did find him in WorldCat <http://worldcat.org.ezproxy.uindy.edu/identities/np-mathwich,%20johannes/>).

⁵⁵ Compare especially the eleven StudAmst. volumes:

III, “*The Charm of Legal History*”, by H. van den Brink. Amsterdam, 1974.

XV, “*Studien zur allgemeinen Rechtslehre des Gaius*”, by H. Wagner. Amsterdam, 1978.

XVIII, “*Gaius Noster: Plaidoyer pour Gaius*” by O. Stanojevic. Amsterdam, 1989.

XXI, “*The Roman Law of Succession in the Letters of Pliny the Younger*” I, by J.W. Tellegen. Amsterdam, 1982.

XXII, “*Testamentary Succession in the Constitutions of Diocletian*”, by O.E. Tellegen-Couperus. Amsterdam, 1982.

XXIII, “*Les triptyques de Transylvanie: études juridiques*”, by G. Ciulei. Amsterdam, 1983.

XXV, “*Error iuris nocet: Rechtsirrtum als Problem der Rechtsordnung, I: Rechtsirrtum in der griechischen Philosophie und im römischen Recht bis Justinian*”, by L.C. Winkel. Amsterdam, 1985.

XXVII, “*Opera selecta: Études de droit romain et d’histoire du droit*”, by H.R. Hoetink. Amsterdam, 1986.

XXX, “*Le Droit romain en Dacie*”, by V. Sotropa. Amsterdam, Amsterdam, 1990.

XXXVII, “*Die Fiduzia im römischen Recht*”, by G. Noordraven. 1999.

Sijpesteijn's approach to teaching was based on a method used in Leiden since around 1935. It consisted of (1) a general introduction to Greek papyrology (1 hour per week), (2) a lecture on the paleography of Greek papyri (1 hour per week), and (3) a so-called *privatissimum* lecture, of 2.5 hours per week, often given in the evening (in Leiden this took place on Saturday mornings). During a *privatissimum*, to which a student was admitted either upon request or invitation, Sijpesteijn would focus on a specific topic, like a newly published text. An instructor from another discipline could also be invited, such as an historian of ancient law. These might include Prof. Ankum or A. van Gemert from the Department of Byzantinology and Neo-Greek, who was an expert in post-classical Greek. Van Gemert made all kinds of interesting linguistic observations, particularly during a *privatissimum* in 1964. We combed through the recently published – but not very good – papyrus edition by B.R. Rees “*Papyri from Hermopolis and Other Documents from the Byzantine Period*”, and Ankum made various legal observations. But interest in Sijpesteijn's *privatissimum* gradually declined. The assistants in the Amsterdam Department of Classics pulled out for personal reasons and almost always because, “they were too occupied with other business”. Sijpesteijn's teaching responsibilities did not require much time or energy (neither did my own). Comparatively speaking, papyrological research demanded, and indeed got, considerable attention. Further collaboration between Sijpesteijn and Ankum could have been mutually beneficial. This was, however, impeded by reasons including personal differences of “character”. The exception to this was the series *Studia Amstelodamensia*, which Sijpesteijn developed in addition to meticulously training his students. He later confided to me that the supervision he received as a PhD student, from his teacher van Groningen (whom he greatly respected, and even revered) had been “meager”. Nonetheless he had engaged in extensive research abroad, particularly in Germany, Austria, the United States, and later Italy. France was instead avoided for many years, simply because he had deserted the French Foreign Legion and might be arrested at the border.

XXXVIII, “*Viva Vox Iuris Romani: Essays in Honour of Johannes Emil Spruit*”, edd. L. de Ligt, J. de Ruiter, E. Slob, J.M. Tevel, M. van de Vrugt and L.C. Winkel. Amsterdam, 2002.

My Own Beginnings as a Papyrologist

I personally ended up studying Greek papyrology in an entirely unexpected way, and as a result of the May 1968 revolution in Paris. During my studies at the University of Amsterdam (which included the traditional “classics” but also “Mycenology” and “The History of Technology), I attended Sijpesteijn’s class on “The Paleography of Greek Papyri”. The course stimulated my interest in Medieval Greek manuscripts and ancient writing. I was scheduled to graduate from the University of Amsterdam in May 1968. But in January of the same year, I applied for a French government grant to continue my education, for one year (September 1968 to September 1969), at the *École Normale des Études Supérieures* in Paris. I planned to take courses with world-renowned specialist in Greek manuscripts, Jean Irigoien. My request, however, fell flat during the May revolution, and communication had abruptly ceased between the Ministry in Paris and the French embassy in the Netherlands. Since I had no prospects, my Greek professor, J.C. Kamerbeek “arranged” a job for me as a teacher of classical languages at a secondary school in Rotterdam; but my heart was not in the education of secondary school students. I wanted to establish a scholarly career, working at a university or something similar. Teaching took little preparation and consisted of around 40 hours acting as a “guest teacher”. I was supervised by an experienced instructor, who used the time allotted to “teach” 45-minute lessons on the important topic of “How to fill out a tax form”. Naturally, this “teacher training” went nowhere, and my career as a school teacher was not a success. After a year in Rotterdam, my wife and I (we had married that same year) began looking for alternative jobs with better prospects. The State Archives School in The Hague had no place for me, and my application for a staff position, in the Manuscript Room, at the University Library in Leiden was also unsuccessful. I eventually contacted my former teacher Sijpesteijn who, I thought, might need an assistant. For this to work, I would need a PhD. It was decided I would begin working on my dissertation in Vienna, on 14 August 1969 (see plate on p. 55), as an “external PhD candidate”, i.e. at my own expense and without any guarantees. However my dissertation could be funded since my wife had found a well-paying job in Rotterdam. I was also highly motivated to obtain my degree in a short period (September 1969-May 1972) in order to begin earning my own income. On the day of the defense, my advisor Sijpesteijn broke the happy news that my position as his assistant had been approved. I began my official appointment, at the Uni-

versity of Amsterdam, as a “scientific assistant” in May 1972. The years that followed were particularly productive, and I was trained by Sijpesteijn, with whom I collaborated intensely. That collaboration was mutually satisfying and resulted in a remarkable number of high-quality publications from our trips to Giessen and Vienna. Between 1975 and 1980 Sijpesteijn and I produced almost a quarter of the world’s new editions of Greek papyri and ostraka. But our collaboration was not without complications. It was easy to quarrel with Sijpesteijn, and two “strong” characters often clash. We shared a large room in the former Netherlands National Bank, on the Oude Turfmarkt 129, and circumstances eventually led to a fierce argument; Human Resources of the University of Amsterdam intervened and established a formal “split of desk and library”. At my teacher’s insistence, I was made chair of a so-called “Department of Papyrology and Ancillary Disciplines”, consisting of three people: G.J.M.J. Te Riele, P.J. Sijpesteijn, and K.A. Worp. Te Riele had specialized in Greek inscriptions, had studied with the famous Louis Robert in Paris, and aimed to become a professor of his discipline. This ambition led him to invent the designation “Epigraphology” (cf. Papyrology), for the field traditionally called Epigraphy. But for reasons including his physical appearance and number of scholarly publications, Sijpesteijn was a “giant” compared to Te Riele – who instead seemingly disappeared into a “void”. As the chairman of the Department of “Papyrology and Ancillary Disciplines”, I felt unable to obstruct Te Riele’s ambitions, and I also believed it was important to appear “neutral”. But this was simply *not* possible and caused me to clash with Sijpesteijn, who required *absolute* loyalty from *his* assistant. This bred a very “unpleasant” and even “hostile” environment. In the big room we shared, which housed the papyrological hand library, Sijpesteijn and I ignored each other for at least six months, and there was a “graveyard silence”. And similar conflicts occurred often. Eventually, we had to be pulled apart and relocated to different places in the building at Oude Turfmarkt 129, 1012 GC Amsterdam. We were separated by a thin wall, a door, and a small hall, which contained the papyrological hand library, to be used by both. Over the years, our relationship mended, and “real” collaboration sometimes took place. But despite the intense collaboration that occurred between 1972 and 1982, this later collaboration was not the same. Incidentally, it should be noted that, Sijpesteijn could be *very* generous. He donated Egyptian papyri, ostraka, Coptic fabrics, antique gems and other objects, from his private collection, to acquaintances and friends. This is how many

small collections in the Benelux began, including the Cottry collection in Herent (see <https://www.trismegistos.org/coll/detail.php?tm=185>), or that of the Amsterdam based publisher J.C. Gieben (see <https://www.trismegistos.org/coll/detail.php?tm=8>); this collection eventually ended up at the Amsterdam Allard Pierson Museum, see its inventory no. 16749), or those in Arnhem of Henneman (see <https://www.trismegistos.org/coll/detail.php?tm=397>) and those of the publishing house Terra in Zutphen (see <https://www.trismegistos.org/coll/detail.php?tm=1095>) and that of the Amsterdam publisher Adolf M. Hakkert (see <https://www.trismegistos.org/coll/detail.php?tm=9>). The Hakkert collection was amassed during a trip to Egypt, undertaken by Hakkert and Sijpesteijn in the 1960s. During that trip, some papyri were acquired and later sold through Hakkert's catalogue 'Acta Classica' 60 (1967). Sijpesteijn also offered accommodation to foreign colleagues who visited him at his villa in Baarn. The first publication by Sijpesteijn, in OMRO, of Greek ostraka in the Leiden Museum of Antiquities collection, led to a one-year visit by a young American colleague, Roger S. Bagnall (Columbia University) and the publication of two separate Dutch ostraka collections (in Amsterdam and Leiden, see *O. Amst.* and *O. Leiden*). Bagnall's stay in Baarn led to increasing collaboration between us. At some point, we even decided to jointly study the complete papyrological documentation available for the period 284-640 A.D. This led to a series of publications that – for the sake of brevity – are now referred to as *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* (Zutphen, 1978; Leiden, 2004²), respectively *Chronological Notes on Byzantine Documents* (published in *BASP in 8 installments*), *Regnal Formulas or Byzantine Egypt* (= *BASP, Supplement 2*; replaced by *CSBE*²) and *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*. For a complete bibliographical overview of what was called 'The Byzantine Chronology project', see *CSBE*², pp. 319-320.

In contrast with the work done in Leiden on the *BL* project, close attention was paid to the editing of papyri and ostraka, from various collections in and outside of The Netherlands. At a certain point, a new siglum had to be created for the joint edition of 35 papyri in Vienna, to be published outside of the *Corpus Papyrorum Raineri*. A siglum beginning with "P. Vindob" was, of course, an obvious choice (see, *P. Vindob. Boswinkel*, *P. Vindob. Sijpesteijn*, *P. Vindob. Salomons*, *P. Vindob. Worp*). But what to do in the case of 1 volume featuring 2 different Dutch editors? Linking the names Sijpesteijn and Worp in a "chimaera" like "*P. Vindob. SijWo*" did not seem a good idea. It then became clear that we were collaborating together

as if riding a tandem bike. Since the Latin word *tandem* means “finally at long last”, its use in the siglum “*P.Vindob.Tandem*” would serve a double purpose. The 35 Greek papyrus texts from Vienna were finally published by a tandem of editors. And, in 1976, an “anonymous” papyrological siglum was launched that is still in use today. In Amsterdam, several papyrological “maxims” were formulated:

1. “*Unicum, ergo dubium*” or a dubious reading should be corroborated, by finding an alternative reading or word/name that is already known elsewhere (there is no point in further expanding the already long list of dubious new words or names) and
2. “Two independent pairs of eyes used by self-conscious, “critical” scholars always see more! Both principles remain valid to this day.

The work on Greek papyri in Amsterdam resulted in several further collaborations. In particular, I collaborated with the Leiden Orientalist Willem F.G.J. Stoetzer and some representatives of the so-called “exact” sciences. In 1974, for instance, I collaborated with the German-American “Beta” scholar, Otto Neugebauer, who generously offered to help with the publication of an original Greek horoscope in my private collection (*TM* 101278). Later on, several mathematical texts were published by Sijpesteijn and me, in collaboration with the Amsterdam mathematician Evert Marie Bruins (1909-1990)⁵⁶. I was also assisted by the Amsterdam astronomer Teije de Jonge, with whose support I prepared the publication of some 4th-century horoscopes from Kellis.

⁵⁶ E.M. Bruins was born in 1909 and died in 1990. The biographical article authored by the Amsterdam mathematician P. van Emde Boas is very informative and readable: see https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291224596_Evert_Marie_Bruins_1909-1990_intelligent_productief_en_controversieel/fulltext/569f048508aee4d26ad06269/291224596_Evert_Marie_Bruins_1909-1990_intelligent_productief_en_controversieel.pdf?origin=publication_detail. Sometimes the mathematician Bruins treated his two colleagues from the “Alpha” sciences without any mercy, because he assumed that they still had mathematical knowledge acquired long before (i.e. during their secondary school years), something that certainly was not always the case!. But he always took them seriously and tried to help them; while Sijpesteijn and Bruins found common ground in (a) rather “conservative” ideas that really stood out at the University of Amsterdam (a purportedly “progressive” institution) and (b) their interest in money.

New Developments in Amsterdam

In the 1990s, the replacement of A.B. Breebaart as professor of “Ancient History and Greek and Roman Antiquities” became imperative. The Dutch parliament had decided to reform the ranking system used in the academic world and the remuneration regulations for higher education. New professors would be classified as professors of class “A”, while full professors, who had been appointed earlier (and at a higher salary), would now be classified as professors of class “B”. At some point afterwards, lecturers were “upgraded” to the rank of “class A” professorship because their job descriptions were similar. And, since they earned the same salary, they received the title of “professor”. Sijpesteijn, who was a “lecturer”, had, therefore, become a professor of “class A” and was formally invited to take over from Breebaart, who was a full professor “B”. As a professor of “class A”, Sijpesteijn had no objection to the proposal, but he wanted a higher salary. In his view, “greater responsibilities” automatically occasioned financial promotion. This “promotion” was considered “reasonable” by the officiating Dean, F.F.J. Drijkoningen and was promised verbally. But Drijkoningen’s successor, S. Dik, did not honor the commitment, and the Dean of the Faculty of Letters gave his subordinate “professor A” Sijpesteijn an official order to take over Breebaart’s position as “professor B” immediately and without salary changes. Sijpesteijn could not ignore the official order given to him by his “superior”. In his new position, he did not offer a course for doctoral students for several years; this task he delegated to an employee of the Department of Ancient History.

An Anecdote

Another anecdote may be recounted at this point. P.J. Parsons’s (Oxford) stay at Sijpesteijn’s home in Baarn (1980), occasioned by a three-author contribution to E.G. Turner’s *Festschrift*, also occasioned an excellent dinner by Mrs. Sijpesteijn, to which my wife and I were invited. During that dinner (Mrs. Sijpesteijn was an excellent cook), the host made several malicious remarks about my wife’s profession (she was a successful child psychotherapist), which he labelled as “socially irrelevant”. Parsons rescued the awkward situation by asking the host if he had considered “how socially irrelevant Greek papyrology was”. Sijpesteijn was born in Rotterdam, on 16 September 1934 and died in Baarn on 28 May 1996. A com-

plete bibliography of his *opera omnia* (658 entries!) is available in *P.Sijp.*, pp. xv-xlii. Almost concurrent with his death, the “climate” at the University of Amsterdam became bleaker for the Humanities in general. The Department of Greek and Latin was “stripped” of its Latin professor. At the same time, the position of the specialization “papyrology” (represented by one person at the University of Amsterdam) became increasingly difficult.

Some Developments in Leiden

In Leiden, things were not much better. Pestman had become seriously ill; Vleeming had left for Trier; and a student assistant at the Papyrological Institute, Mrs. Hoogendijk left for China and Australia (permanently it seems); Arthur Verhoogt left around 2000 for the United States; the aforementioned (p. 24 in note 47) Laurens Tacoma (who had worked for the *BL*) defended his dissertation and obtained a position as an assistant in the Department of Ancient History at the Leiden University, and left the Leiden Papyrological Institute; and a remaining employee of Pestman’s ‘staff’, Nico Kruit, who had co-authored a remarkable number of important publications since the 1990s, decided to abandon the sinking ship, for personal reasons.

Various student-assistants of classical languages at the Leiden University (Frans A.J. de Haas, Gerda van Hilst, Riet van Kassen, and M. Thieme) had contributed, over the years, to the Institute’s publications (in particular, to *P. Select.*, *P. David*, and *P. Batav.*). Later on, a substantial number of papyrological contributions were presented by staff members and students of the Leiden Papyrological Institute (notably Nico Kruit, in collaboration with me, upon my arrival at Leiden)⁵⁷.

⁵⁷ To be highlighted here are the 30 papyrological articles written by various authors working in or connected with the Leiden University:

Nico Kruit & Willy Clarysse [Leuven], “Notes on *P. Princeton II 42*”, *ZPE* 82 (1990), pp. 123-125.

Nico Kruit & Willy Clarysse [Leuven], & Claudio Gallazzi (Milano), “Three Joins from the Zenon Archive”, *Ancient Society*, 30 (2000), pp. 5-27.

Nico Kruit, “*B.L. Bulletin. Liste von Neudrücken und vollständigen Textausgaben von 1987-1992*”, (Leiden, 1992).

Nico Kruit, “*Hadrianus in Egypte*”, in: “*Propaganda in de portemonnee. Catalogus van en inleiding tot de verzameling Mr. B.Kolff: biljoen tetradrachmen en bronzen munten uit*

A Comparison of Papyrological Activity in Leiden and Amsterdam

We must also note the relationship between papyrologists working at the Leiden Papyrological Institute (Pestman, in particular) and those at

- Romeins Egypte, samengesteld door (oud-)medewerkers van het Papyrologisch Instituut van de Universiteit Leiden* (Leiden, 2000), pp. 82-83;
- Nico Kruit, "Age Reckoning in Hellenistic Egypt", in: FS Pestman, *Pap.Lugd. Bat. XXX* (Leiden 1998), pp. 37-58.
- Nico Kruit, "Local Customs in the Formulas of Sales of Wine for Future Delivery" (A Supplement to P. Heid. V), *ZPE* 94 (1992), pp.167-184.
- Nico Kruit, "The Meaning of Various Words Related to Wine, Some New Interpretations", *ZPE* 90 (1992), pp. 265-276.
- Nico Kruit, "Three Byzantine Sales for Future Delivery: SB XVI 12401 + 12402, SB VI 9051, P. Lond. III 997", *Tyche*, 9 (1994), pp. 67-88.
- Nico Kruit & K.A.Worp, "Ausserhalb der P. Lond. I-VII veröffentlichte Londoner Dokumentarische Papyri (eine Liste)", *JJP* 25 (1995), pp. 96-127.
- Nico Kruit & K.A.Worp, "Metrological Notes on Measures and Containers of Liquids in Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Egypt", *ArchPF* 45 (1999), pp. 49-66.
- Nico Kruit & K.A.Worp, "Διζόγιον = 'Two-chous Jar'?", *Mnemosyne*, 4a ser. 53 (2000), pp. 343-344.
- Nico Kruit & K.A.Worp, "Geographical Jar Names: Towards a Multi-Disciplinary Approach", *ArchPF* 46 (2000), pp. 65-146.
- Nico Kruit & K.A.Worp, "An Overlooked 'Arsinoitikon'", *ArchPF* 47 (2001), pp. 99-100.
- Nico Kruit & K.A.Worp, "P. Bad. IV 55: Ein neuer Text", *ZPE* 137 (2001), pp. 215-219.
- Nico Kruit & K.A.Worp, "P. Vindob. G 31701 verso: A Prefectural (?) Hypographe", *Tyche* 16 (2001), pp. 91-102.
- Nico Kruit & K.A.Worp, "The Spathion Jar in the Papyri", *BASP* 38 (2001), pp. 79-87.
- Nico Kruit & K.A.Worp, "Two Notes on Byzantine Containers", *Münstersche [Marburger] Beiträge zur antiken Handelsgeschichte* 21 (2002), pp. 44-52.
- Nico Kruit & K.A.Worp, "A Seventh-Century List from Edfu", *BASP* 39 (2002), pp. 47-56.
- Nico Kruit & K.A.Worp, "Remarks on Some Texts from Akoris", *ZPE* 140 (2002), pp. 155-158.
- Nico Kruit & K.A.Worp, "P. Vindob. Boswinkel 5: An Expanded Re-edition", *Analecta Papyrologica* 13 (2001 [2003]), pp. 81-90.
- Nico Kruit & K.A.Worp, "P. Got. 17 Re-edited", *Eranos* 101 (2003), pp. 114-122.
- Nico Kruit & K.A.Worp, "Eine Hausmiete aus der Zeit des Kaisers Mauricius", *Tyche* 18 (2003), pp. 47-53.
- Nico Kruit & K.A.Worp, "P. Giss. I 106 Revisited", *ZPE* 145 (2003), pp. 229-230.
- Nico Kruit & K.A.Worp, "Zur Auflösung der Kürzung ἐν Ἀρ() in den Papyri", *Tyche* 18 (2003), pp. 55-57.
- N. Kruit, Brian P. Muhs & K.A. Worp, "A Bilingual Sale of a House and Loan of Money from Soknopaiou Nesos (P. Boswinkel 1)", in 'Res severa verum gaudium'. *Festschrift für*

the University of Amsterdam, at the Archeological-Historical Institute, where Sijpesteijn (educated by van Groningen and Boswinkel) had opened his own “shop”. Sijpesteijn was also involved in the 1965 publication of the 13th part of the series *Pap.Lugd.Bat. (P. Select.* whose title page mentions the following editors: “E. Boswinkel; P.W. Pestman; P. J. Sijpesteijn”). Pestman and Sijpesteijn had completely different backgrounds. Pestman was a *iuris peritus* and Egyptologist educated at the Utrecht University, whereas Sijpesteijn was a classical philologist educated in Leiden. Sijpesteijn may have wanted to take over van Groningen’s position at the Leiden Papyrological Institute, despite his past in the French Foreign Legion. But that was obviously an illusion given the climate at Leiden during the 1960s. Pestman, meanwhile, stepped into the shoes of Prof. David with no problem. It took some time before Sijpesteijn became a professor in Amster-

- Karl-Theodor Zauzich zum 65. Geburtstag am 8. Juni* (Leuven 2004; *Studia Demotica*, 6), pp. 339-368.
- B.P. Muhs, K.A. Worp & J. van der Vliet, “Ostraca and Mummy labels in Los Angeles”, *BASP* 43 (2006), pp. 9-58.
- Brian P. Muhs & K.A. Worp, “Yet more duplicate mummy labels”, *ZPE* 162 (2007), pp. 213-214.
- F.A.J. Hoogendijk, & K.A. Worp, “Drei unveröffentlichte griechische Papyri aus der Wiener Sammlung”, *Tyche* 16 (2001), pp. 45-61.
- W.C.M. Warmoeskerken, “The *λίθηθος*”, *Analecta Papyrologica* XIV-XV ([2002-2003] 2005), pp. 275-284.
- W. Warmoeskerken, Alette V. Bakkers, & Anita T.J. Kooren, “Ein Gelddarlehen aus der Zeit des Kaisers Phocas”, *Tyche* 20 (2005), pp. 1-9.
- Marja Bakker, “A Papyrus with Mathematical Problems”, *BASP* 44 (2007), pp. 7-21.
- And – last but not least! – by Alette V. Bakkers & Marja Bakker & K.A. Worp, “Back to Oegstgeest: The von Scherling Papyrus Collection. Some von Scherling Texts in Minnesota”, *BASP* 44 (2007), pp. 41-73.
- (Separate word indices of the Greek papyrus texts published in this article are now available on the website: http://media.leidenuniv.nl/legacy/minnesota-indices-pdf.pdf?_ga=2.194606637.1033451214.1553859605-382944736.1543063350).
- Alain Delattre [Brussel] & K.A. Worp, “Trois tablettes de bois du Musée de Leyde”, *Chr. d’Eg.* 87 (2012) No. 174, pp. 361-382.
- Alain Delattre [Brussel] & K.A. Worp, “Une étiquette de momie du IV^e siècle au British Museum. Réflexions sur les étiquettes tardives”, *JJP* 42 (2012), pp. 89-99.
- J. van der Vliet & K.A. Worp, “A Multiplication Table on a Tablet in Leiden”, *JJP* 41 (2011), pp. 49 - 53.
- J. van der Vliet & K.A. Worp, “Four North Nubian Funerary Stelae from the Bankes Collection”, *JJP Suppl.* 27 (Warszawa, 2015), pp. 27 - 44.

dam. He had his connections with the Vienna papyrus collection, which he had developed during the preparation of his dissertation in 1960. His students, Salomons and Worp, were later allowed to freely select papyrus texts for their dissertations. Vienna had become something of a “*chasse gardée*” for Sijpesteijn, and he made regular visits sometimes 2 or 3 times a year. We often made these trips together, after my first visit to Vienna on 14 August 1969, and after my PhD defense in 1972. During a joint visit, in the second half of the 1970s, we were surprised to find ourselves unexpectedly confronted by a young female student from Leiden. She was supposed to select papyrus texts for her dissertation from the Papyrussammlung of the Nationalbibliothek (like Boswinkel, Sijpesteijn, Salomons and Worp had done), freely and without interference, or guidance! That scenario could, of course, not be prevented. But her unexpected presence was perceived as an “un-collegial” move on the part of the student’s supervisor and their “colleague” Pestman. Indeed, Pestman could have informed his Amsterdam counterparts about his plans. At some moment, the Leiden student approached a ranking English papyrologist (who probably knew nothing about the Vienna Papyrussammlung) about publishing Vienna papyri. But she never came to see the Amsterdam papyrologists, who were available to provide important information, to broaden her knowledge. This was not beneficial and could be perceived by the two papyrologists from Amsterdam as a silent or manifest “motion of no confidence”. And it was certainly taken that way. Conversely, Sijpesteijn did not (or could not?) understand why the work on the *BL* in Leiden (executed in practice by a procession of hired student assistants working under Pestman’s supervision), was executed so clumsily. At some point in the 1980s, he took the initiative (from the onset doomed to fail) to set up a kind of “*contra-BL*”. Thus the situation in the Netherlands, a country too small for two separate papyrological centers, staffed by “strong” and competitive personalities, did not get any better. In 1990, Pestman reacted negatively to my edition of *P. Charite* – published in 1978 at the behest of Sijpesteijn – in his “*The New Papyrological Primer*” (a student manual, published by E.J. Brill). Therein, he warned that *my* editorial practice was an example of how “a certain topic should definitely *not* be approached”. This happened because I (not a lawyer, but a classical papyrologist) had overlooked a for *iuris periti* important distinction (between “archive” and “dossier” [...]) This led to a rejection, and I felt that among the world’s papyrologists, the term “archive” was commonly considered to be “loose language”. And

this difference of opinion ultimately led to a “conciliatory” article by A. Martin, “*Archives Privées et Cachettes Documentaires*”, published in the proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists (Copenhagen, 1994), pp. 569-577 (see especially the pp. 576-577: Annexe I. “Archives ou archive”? - Annexe II. “The archives of Charitè, Adelphios and Asklepiadès”) Shortly thereafter, my review of Pestman’s “*New Papyrological Primer*” appeared in *Mnemosyne* 4^a ser., 46 (1993), pp. 279-281. This was, in fact, a positive review, except for the book’s high price, which had been established by the publisher. In Leiden, it was widely known that Pestman was a major shareholder in the E.J. Brill publishing firm (which published *Mnemosyne*!). As captain of the Leiden Papyrological Institute, Pestman did not wish to cooperate with Amsterdam in organizing an international papyrological conference in the Netherlands; this was something for which Sijpesteijn strove. Upon Sijpesteijn’s insistence, Pestman – and his army of his assistants – declared himself willing to receive congress participants (around 200) for 1 day in Leiden. He decided that the rest of the congress week would be held in Amsterdam (staffed by only 2 people). That division of labour was strikingly unbalanced and, for the Amsterdam papyrologists, entirely undesirable. Thus the conference in Holland was cancelled. Fortunately, however, “doom and gloom” did not prevail in the Leiden-Amsterdam relationship. Sijpesteijn had persuaded Pestman to recruit an acquaintance, Bob Daniel, to work for 1 year on the *BL*. Daniel was a young American student from Ann Arbor, whom Sijpesteijn had met during a visit to the Michigan papyrus collection. Philip Verdult, who earned his PhD under the supervision of Sijpesteijn and Ankum, followed Daniel’s example. Moreover, several papyrus fragments, acquired by the Leiden Papyrological Institute through Sijpesteijn, from the Amsterdam publisher and antiquarian Adolf M. Hakkert, had been identified by van Groningen as Hesiodus’ *Mulierum Catalogus*. In the end, they would be published as *P. Turner* 1, by a non-Leiden triumvirate (P.J. Sijpesteijn, P. Parsons & K.A. Worp) with Pestman’s permission (which was reluctantly given). Surprisingly, in 2002, the MS of *CSBE*² was rejected for publication in the *Pap. Lugd. Bat.* series, because the volume, “lacked the typical Leiden ‘couleur’”, which was obviously required for this series. I had just been appointed professor *extra-ordinarius* in papyrology at the Leiden University in order to save the Papyrological Institute. My co-author, R.S. Bagnall was, and still is, a ranking American papyrologist. But, admittedly, neither he nor I were ever longstanding members of that very exclusive

club of “Leiden trained papyrologists”. (I ‘only’ had prepared between 1969-1972 my UoA-dissertation at the Leiden institute’s very good library; at the time the UoA had since the retirement of D. Cohen neglected its holdings as far as papyrology was concerned). Later (i.e. after my transition from Amsterdam to Leiden) a papyrus fragment kept in the LPI (inv. 185, a drawing of an Egyptian temple) could be published by myself in *P. Horak* no. 7 = *TM* 105725.

Over the years, both papyrological centers in the Netherlands had each developed their own connections with foreign colleagues. And so a kind of unofficial work division grew, i.e. the papyrologists in Leiden under Pestman focused first of all on the *BL* and the study of Demotic (and eventually also partially Greek) documents from Ptolemaic Egypt (within this context, see the already mentioned “*Guide to the Zenon Archive*” and *P. Dion.*) while in Amsterdam the interest first of all went to papyri from Roman and Byzantine Egypt, (and as regards the latter period my own interest was drawn in particular to chronological aspects illustrated by the papyri from the period 284-641 C.E.), while Sijpesteijn tirelessly kept various large and small projects going. To be mentioned here separately are a long series of his monographic editions of papyri belonging to various collections outside the Netherlands (including those in Vienna, Ann Arbor, MI and Madison, WI) that were often published in the aforementioned series *Studia Amstelodamensia*; within this series, see in particular his *P. Theon*, *P. Wisc.* II and the three volumes of *P. Mich.* XIII, XV, XX. Also to be mentioned here are his monographic publication “*Liste de Gymnasiarques*” (a continuation of such a list appearing in the aforementioned study of his own teacher B.A. van Groningen [for this, see p. 13, n. 29], which was published in two different, updated editions). Moreover, Sijpesteijn’s study and editions of a large number of customs receipts for transports within Egypt led to a major publication: *P. Customs* and earlier on, i.e. before defending his PhD dissertation, he had studied the so-called *penthemeros*-certificates (see *Pap. Lugd. Bat.*, XII) and all of the related documentation was constantly kept up to date. This activity also stimulated his study of the various title formulas used for various Roman emperors in the period 30 B.C. - 284 C.E., creating an in itself surprisingly large number of articles. Unfortunately, a summary study of those imperial titulature formulas (planned to be realized *de facto* by Sijpesteijn’s student, Wim Liesker) did not come to be realized. Wim Liesker (for whom, cf. note 59) started in Amsterdam as a student of Classical Languages and of papyrology in the aca-

demic year 1981-1982 and afterwards he developed himself further and further in the field of papyrology. Thoughts were even developed about his preparing a PhD-dissertation in the form of an edition of new Ptolemaic papyrus texts kept in Amsterdam or the study of titulature formulas of Roman emperors. However, it turned out to be a problem that simultaneously Liesker was also very much at home in field of 'automation' that was just starting up at the time through the use of computers. And he had started this own business providing him with an income. At a certain moment the conclusion was arrived at that that sector was for him and his family more profitable than Greek papyrology. A choice was made in favor of 'automation' as that would be, of course, in favor of his (understandable!) self-interest.

In contrast to their Leiden colleagues (who often stayed 'at home', though in an exceptional case they went on a study trip to Paris for their editing the texts to be published in *P. Dion*. A number of relevant original documents were kept in the Sorbonne; therefore they had to be able to inspect various Reinach papyri kept over there. Moreover, Pestman had married a wife from Italy and paid regular visits to papyrus collections in that country) both Amsterdam papyrologists regularly made international study trips *at their own expense*, e.g. to Giessen in Germany (incidentally, this contact resulted from a contact made previously by Sijpesteijn's teacher E. Boswinkel during international papyrological congresses with the Giessen based papyrologist Hans-Georg Gundel [cf. the contents of *P. Select.* and *P. David*]). Or they took the plane from Amsterdam to Cairo (once they were able to work in Cairo on Greek papyri kept in the Egyptian Museum), or to Manchester (once, for the publication of some Greek Soknopaiou Nesos papyri kept in the John Rylands Library), or they returned to the National Library in Vienna (countless times). During my own academic holidays I paid various working visits to papyrus collections in Oxford, Berlin (West & East), Leipzig and in Copenhagen. And once I accompanied my colleague J.M. Bremer to Lille for assisting him there with his reading a Stesichorus papyrus that interested him especially. On the other hand, Sijpesteijn flew several times for periods of ca. half a year vel sim. without the company of his assistant to the USA. The impact of such foreign journeys can also be found easily in the bibliographies of PJS (in *P. Sijp.*) and of KAW (in *P. Worp*). In the meantime, the papyrologists in Amsterdam were particularly strongly oriented towards developing personal contacts with colleagues abroad: e.g. books published in the West were ex-

changed with the Russian scholar I.F. Fikhman (then in Leningrad = now St. Petersburg), and with the East-German G. Poethke (Berlin). Sijpesteijn regularly visited colleagues in Cologne (in particular L. Koenen and D. Hagedorn) the Pole Z. Borkowski came from Warsaw to the Netherlands and the Austrian H. Harrauier came from Vienna to Amsterdam to visit his colleagues at home based there. And above (p. 26) it has already been reported that the American papyrologist R.S. Bagnall from New York City lived at Sijpesteijn's home in Baarn for 1 year, while Peter Parsons came from Oxford to the Netherlands to work on the publication of a contribution to *P. Turner*, to be published jointly with Sijpesteijn and Worp, which was published therein as text no. 1. And after the publication of two 4th century Hermopolitan land lists by Sijpesteijn & myself in 1978 the English papyrologist/ancient historian A.K. Bowman came to Manchester/Oxford to Amsterdam for giving a guest lecture, while later the French scholars Jean Gascoü and Denis Feissel came from Paris to Amsterdam for direct collaboration with me. And the Amsterdam papyrologists maintained warm relations with Italian papyrologists, first of all with Rosario Pintaudi and Guido Bastianini (both working in Florence) and also with Claudio Gallazzi (working in Milan). Rather exceptional was the coming of J. David Thomas from Durham (UK) to Leiden in the 1980s to lecture about recently found on the Latin writing tablets found at Vindolanda.

A PhD Defense in Amsterdam and Further Developments

As an interlude in Amsterdam around 1990, a Greek student who had 'graduated' in England, Grigorios H. Hatzitsolis, made his epiphany more or less suddenly, i.e. according to a plan made on the recommendation of a respected colleague in Oxford he was to defend a PhD thesis in Amsterdam, under Sijpesteijn's supervision, a thesis based on the edition of a number of unpublished Greek papyri from the mid-Egyptian town of Oxyrhynchos, which were preserved at Oxford. This student turned out to be a (by Dutch standards) unusually opinionated and hard learning man who in his previous education had obtained no more than a BA and that degree was insufficient for qualifying him for a Dutch academic PhD-promotion. Eventually, the promotion in Amsterdam came off, under Sijpesteijn's supervision, but not without exceptionally great difficulties after a long time in the year 1994. During the discussion at the end of his defense of his dissertation Mr. Hatzitsolis made a truly overwhelming impression with the

audience witnessing the discussion between him and the Amsterdam Professor of New Greek, when Mr. Hatzisolis in response to a ‘critical’ question about a questionable interpretation of the text produced by Hatzisolis countered the question with the remark: “Who knows here better Greek, you or I myself?”. Incidentally, for a long time the texts edited for that dissertation were not accepted for publication in the *P.Oxy.*-series by the editors of the series.

Over the years, various publications had been prepared in Amsterdam by Sijpesteijn himself (and/or myself), in collaboration with various UoA students, or sometimes by a group of students them alone⁵⁸.

⁵⁸ To be mentioned here are:

- Paul Th. J. de Wit, “*Four Amsterdam Papyri*”, *StPap* 17 (1978), pp. 77-83;
- P.J. Sijpesteijn & Paul Th. J. de Wit, “*Fragment einer spätbyzantinischen Emphyteusis-Urkunde*” (P. Vindob. Graec. Inv. 29386). *Tyche* 7 (1992), pp. 55-59.
- P.J. Sijpesteijn & Edwin Rabbi, “*Eine neue Perseiden-Genealogie in P. Vindob. G 23058?*”, *WS* 101 (1988), pp. 85-95.
- A.M. Tromp, “*A Note on P. Oxy. X 1293*”, *StPap* 21 (1982), pp. 39-40.
- E. Jonker, & R. Risselada & A. M. Tromp, “*Drei Wiener Papyri*”. *ZPE* 50 (1983) p. 127-132.
- W.H.M. Liesker & A.M. Tromp, “*Zwei ptolemäische Papyri aus der Wiener Papyrussammlung*”, *ZPE* 66 (1986), pp. 79-89.
- P.J. Sijpesteijn & W.H.M. Liesker, “*Remarks on Some Imperial Titles in the Papyri*”, III,” *ZPE* 63 (1986), pp. 281-290. 28;
- W. H.M. Liesker & A.M. Tromp, “*Unicum ergo dubium: Eine Korrektur zu einem Wiener Papyrus*”, *ZPE* 68 (1987), p. 98.
- P.J. Sijpesteijn & W. H.M. Liesker & E.M. Bruins, “*A Ptolemaic Papyrus from the Michigan Collection*”, *ZPE* 74 (1988), pp. 23-
- P.J. Sijpesteijn & W.H.M. Liesker, “*Bruchstücke antiker Geometrie*”, *ZPE* 113 (1996), pp. 183-186.
- P.J. Sijpesteijn & W.H.M. Liesker, “*Another First-Century Penthemeros-Certificate*”, *ZPE* 72 (1988), pp. 75-78.
- W. H.M. Liesker, “*The Dates of Valerian Caesar and Saloninus*”. in: *Proc. XVIII Internat. Congress of Papyrology*, vol. II, pp. 455-463.
- P.J. Sijpesteijn & W. H.M. Liesker, “*Two Spurious Titulatures of the Emperor Tiberius*”, *Chronique d’Egypte* 63 (1988) No. 125, pp. 155-156.
- Ivo J. Poll & K.A. Worp, “*Two Princeton papyri revised*”, *BASP* 33 (1996), pp. 73-76.
- Ivo J. Poll, “*Ladefähigkeit und Größe der Nilschiffe*”, *ArchivPF* 42 (1996), pp. 127-138.
- Ivo J. Poll, “*Die διάγραφον-Steuer im spätbyzantinischen und früh-arabischen Ägypten*”, *Tyche* 14 (1999), pp. 237-274.

In 1993 I myself became involved – due to a very special and fortunate stroke of luck – in an Australian excavation in the Egyptian Dakhleh Oasis⁵⁹. Now, at a certain moment in early 1996 the papyrological (*per se* ‘specialist’) research library that I had managed and further developed in Amsterdam since my appointment in 1972 was spirited away behind my back during my absence due to a stay in Egypt and while Sijpesteijn was on the verge of dying at home. This feat was performed by one R.L. Hunsucker⁶⁰, appealing to ‘instructions from above’ (i.e. instructions purportedly given by his boss, the director of the general university library) with ‘destination unknown’ (unknown at least to myself). Tellingly, the research library never come back to me. To cut a long story short, after Sijpesteijn’s departure, and after my having been employed over just 40 years (1962-2002), I was given the opportunity to leave the University of Amsterdam UoA (my ‘*alma mater*’, that in course of time had turned into a form of a municipal ‘mental asylum’) and I could obtain leave to go to Leiden as an ‘extra-ordinary’ professor of papyrology for sustaining the Papyrological Institute there. Since that departure, no papyrological activity can be detected within the University of Amsterdam.

The Aftermath of my Transfer from Amsterdam to Leiden

After my having spent there a few years on preventing (successfully) the Leiden Institute from coming down to its heels in the mud, an ex-stu-

M. Haentjens, “*Die Sonderabgaben in den Pachturkunden aus dem römischen Ägypten*”. *Tyche* 16 (2001), pp. 27-44.

E.v. Eeten, in ‘*Bemerkungen zu Papyri ’KorrTyche, X, Tyche* 12 (1997), pp. 245-258, nr. 234: “*Does an Adjective τιμάσιος Exist in Greek?*” (in fact, it is a ghost word!).

⁵⁹ A bibliography of publications resulting from my work for the Dakhleh Oasis Project excavations at Kellis appears in *P.Worp*.

⁶⁰ In the case of this American librarian (one should remember the apt American warning “Beware the librarian!” circulating among American academics; moreover, the Latin “*Nomen est omen!*” applies itself, if only one is aware of the meaning in American slang of the name elements “Hun” and “sucker”. For the origin of the family name, see <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hunziker>. At the time, the then officiating professors of Greek and Latin, acting as “managers of the Classical institute’s human resources”, were responsible for his being hired as a librarian of this Institute in the University of Amsterdam. And that was no less than “a shame”.

dent-assistant of P.W. Pestman, Ms. Francisca Alida Johanna Hoogendijk MA (who had already spent a number of years in Australia, where she had gone to, away from Academe, in the footsteps of her husband while she had never finished a PhD) at a certain moment during a short family visit to the Netherlands came to visiting me in Leiden and she used that occasion for begging me for a job at the Leiden Papyrological Institute that she had been familiar with. To cut a long story short, in collaboration with a few colleagues I managed to provide her with that requested job and in 2008 it came to her academic promotion. For being eligible for a faculty grant enabling her to participate in the 25th (2007) International Papyrological Congress in Ann Arbor, Michigan, America, Ms. Hoogendijk should have obtained a PhD, as that was a precondition for obtaining such travel grant. And indeed a dissertation was defended (with me acting as her promotor); it was titled “*Ten Papyrological Contributions to the History of Roman and Byzantine Egypt*”. This dissertation consisted of 10 separate journal articles that she had contributed to various papyrological journals already in the past, while at my instruction (and under my supervision) the articles (‘chapters’) in the dissertation were to be updated as much as possible. After the (successful) defense followed (with intervals) various disappointments (for me), e.g. in the case of my inviting her to prepare jointly a re-edition of an already published papyrus, viz. *P. Select. 6 = TM 25108* belonging to the collection of the Leiden institute (inv. no. 117) of which the *ed. princ.* had previously drawn my attention as being ‘all but satisfactory’. A MS for such a re-publication was prepared by me and after submitting this to Dr. Hoogendijk she re-wrote on her own initiative my draft MS, while introducing in the process errors which I myself considered to have been eliminated / eradicated already during preceding oral discussions of the text. Thereafter I felt compelled to withdraw – of course! – my invitation to produce a *joint* re-publication, because I was very unhappy with Dr. H.’s ‘initiative’. I also cannot suppress expressing here my sincere disappointment about the fact that after the defense of her thesis and her acquisition of the doctor’s title + a job at the LPI Dr. Hoogendijk during discussions with her about some papyrological problem (discussions that were definitely intended by me to be ‘serious’) frequently did not come beyond providing actually meaningless comments. Equally disappointing was the fact that later she did not wish to accept advice from her promotor (regardless of how ‘sensible’ or ‘well-intended’ this was). Her attitude unmistakably suggested that ‘she knew better and was able to manage every-

thing'. Rather, she would prefer not to know me as the person who had 'saved' the LPI a decade earlier. Anyway, hardly any original work of her own making followed after her PhD defense. In fact, she remained in charge as the editor of any new volumes of the *Papyrologica Lugduno - Batava*, in which series mainly other people's work appears. Dr. Hoogendijk teaches papyrology only because (and as long as) at Leiden University no one else is sufficiently qualified to take care of that teaching. For bibliographies of Dr. F.A.J. Hoogendijk, and of her colleague the Demoticist Dr. K. Donker van Heel (mentioned above) see the website (in Dutch) <https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/geesteswetenschappen/papyrologisch-instituut>. As a matter of fact, Dr. Hoogendijk owes her publication of her 2013 congress paper ("Page of an Oracle Book: Papyrus Kellis 96.150", in: T. Derda, A. Łajtar, J. Urbanik (eds.) *Proceedings of the 27th International Congress of Papyrology, Warsaw, 29 July - 3 August 2013. Journal of Juristic Papyrology Supplements*, XXVIII, Warsaw 2016) pp. 595-622) to my transferring to her the publication rights of the papyrus concerned. After all, she never had anything to do with Kellis material and I am happy to admit that thanks to the information provided to her since 1981 by a former Leiden colleague (the well-known Egyptologist Willy Clarysse [for whom, see above, p. 25] who for a long time [i.e. while he was employed by Leuven University] maintained close contacts with his former working place in Leiden) Dr. Hoogendijk knows much more than I myself about the (specialist's) subject of Egyptian oracle books.

My departure from Leiden

After my leaving Leiden University (due to obligatory retirement in 2008), a full-fledged professor specialized in Greek Papyrology is, like in Amsterdam, no longer active in Leiden. A decision to discontinue the LPI had actually been made before 2008 because the then officiating dean of the 'Humanities Faculty' Professor G.E. Booy (a 'general linguist') after consulting the local Professor for Ancient History and the local Professor for Egyptology had decided (a) not to seek further continuation of my appointment in Leiden or to attract from elsewhere a 100% papyrologist and (b) to make the LPI subordinate to the Professor of 'general' Egyptology as its 'guardian', who by definition had no real expertise in Greek papyrology. Obviously, my personal opinion about the qualities of my successor Dr. Hoogendijk *in rebus papyrologicis* or the question: 'What,

after Professor Worp's retirement, to do with the Leiden Papyrological Institute?' was not appreciated, *or* did not matter. A remarkably elegant decision, in particular where a member of the Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences is concerned. So much about various fairly recent developments at what once was an internationally renowned institute in Leiden University and so much about the long History of Papyrology in Holland.

Koudekerk aan den Rijn, 2-2-2020

K.A. Worp

“The website of the AIP ‘Ahnengalerie’ (see <https://www.2.ulb.ac.be/assoc/aip/galerie.htm>) presents photos of various (Dutch) papyrologists mentioned in this History. In particular concerned are (in alphabetical order) Martin David, Maurits Engers, Bernhard Abraham van Groningen, Martha de Kat-Eliassen, Conrad Leemans, Antoon Gerard Roos, Pieter Johannes Sijpesteijn, Cornelia Elisabeth Visser and – last but not least – Eefje Prankje Wegener. Photos of four persons mentioned by me (viz. Messrs. Jan Kampstra, Ernst Julius Kiehl, Johannes Mathwich. resp. Mrs. Albertina/Alberdina Menkman) are not available on the said AIP website, Photos of still living persons do not occur there and that absence may be compensated by a search on Google-Images”.

W. E. H. Cockle	1-II-1966	Department of Greek (Papyrology) University College, London
Edward Rochie Hardy	24-5-66	New Haven, Connecticut, U.S.A.
Alexandre Papadopoulos	2-9-66	Paris - AP U.S.A.
J. J. Clair & Mme	12.10.66	Paris
James S. Slodine	3.4.67	Nasrpal
L. Kocouca	2.5.67	Köln
Nehmet Sa Zimper	19.6.67	Berlin
Sten V. Waagbø	19.7.67	Uppsala, Schweden
H. H. Hansen	26.7.67	Leiden
J. Albrit	11.9.67	Leipzig, East
P. L. Jansen	29.5.69 11 Feb 68	Univ. College London
Lola & Aziz S. Atiya	January 2, 1969	University of Utah U.S.A.
Janz Nowak	14. Feb. 69	Stuttgart
Dr. I. O. Lehman	8 Aug. 1969	Gümnats
P. J. Sijpesteijn	14. Aug. 1969	Amsterdam
R. P. Salomons	14. Aug. 1969	Amsterdam
K. A. Worp	14 Aug 1969	Rotterdam
E. J. Sijpesteijn (Mrs)	14 Aug 1969	Bussum, Holland
B. Meesal	5. Sept. 1969	Hamburg
Regine Raffinck	5. Sept. 1969	Hamburg
Irone Tischmann	5. September '69	Hamburg
Ilona Pici	5. Sept. 69	Hamburg
Hans Ankum	20 Oct '69	Hamburg
		Ort. Prof. in Alt. u. in Jun. Papyrologie an der Universität Amsterdam

It's a copy (courtesy of Hermann Harrauer) of a page of the Register of Visitors of the Vienna Papyrusammlung. At the time, each visitor had to enter his/her name + city of origin + the date of the visit. I.e. in the year 1969 the Papyrussammlung had four (= 4) visitors Holland, i.e. 3 from Amsterdam (P.J. Sijpesteijn, R.P. Salomons, & J.A. Ankum), and 1 from Rotterdam (K.A. Worp), + 1 from Bussum (i.e. the wife of P.J. Sijpesteijn).

Index

Prefazione di ROSARIO PINTAUDI	VII
Introduction	IX
A HISTORY OF PAPHYROLOGY IN HOLLAND (1830-2015)	
• <i>Introduction</i>	1
• <i>The Beginning in Leiden: 1829-1900</i>	2
• <i>A New Development Outside of Leiden, in Utrecht c. 1900</i>	9
• <i>The Beginning in Amsterdam</i>	11
• <i>A New Beginning in Groningen</i>	13
• <i>A Discussion of a Few Smaller Collections in Holland (Nijmegen, Utrecht, Amsterdam University, Heerlen)</i>	18
• <i>Back to Leiden</i>	20
• <i>P.J. Sijpesteijn</i>	27
• <i>P.W. Pestman's Appointment in Leiden</i>	28
• <i>Developments in Amsterdam after Cohen's Arrival</i>	30
• <i>Further Developments in Amsterdam: the Arrival of P.J. Sijpesteijn</i>	31
• <i>The Appointment of J.A. Ankum in Amsterdam</i>	34
• <i>My Own Beginnings as a Papyrologist</i>	37
• <i>New Developments in Amsterdam</i>	41
• <i>An Anecdote</i>	41
• <i>Some Developments in Leiden</i>	42
• <i>A Comparison of Papyrological Activity in Leiden and Amsterdam</i>	43
• <i>A PhD Defense in Amsterdam and Further Developments</i>	49
• <i>The Aftermath of my Transfer from Amsterdam to Leiden</i>	51
• <i>My Departure from Leiden</i>	53



ACCADEMIA FIORENTINA DI PAPIROLOGIA E
DI STUDI SUL MONDO ANTICO

MARGARITAE

a cura di

Sergio Audano, Diletta Minutoli, Rosario Pintaudi

- I Emanuele Narducci, *Le vie fluviali etrusche – Gli etruschi tra Carmignano e Prato*, pp. 29, Firenze 2013, € 5,00.
- II *Giorgio Pasquali sessant'anni dopo* – Atti della Giornata di Studio (Firenze, 1° ottobre 2012), contributi di Graziano Arrighetti, Luciano Canfora, Augusto Guida, Luciano Bossina, Domenico De Martino, pp. XII, 127, Firenze 2014, € 25,00.
- III *Omaggio a Giuliano Crifò a proposito del carteggio Betti-La Pira* – Atti dell'Incontro di Studio (Messina, 13 novembre 2015), a cura di Lucietta Di Paola Lo Castro, pp. X, 120, tavv. I-IV, Firenze 2016, € 25,00.
- IV *Ricordo di Vittorio Bartoletti a cinquant'anni dalla scomparsa (1967-2017)* – Atti della Giornata di Studio (Firenze, 5 dicembre 2017), a cura di Diletta Minutoli, pp. XII, 146, Firenze 2019, € 30,00.
- V *Dell'onesto concorso. Riflessioni a margine di una sentenza*, a cura di Sergio Audano, pp. X, 58, Firenze 2020, € 10,00.

