direction from which shamanism is believed to have come, as attested in the ancient sources, makes it probable indeed that it was introduced from the North, not that it was inherent in Mycenaean civilisation, as Butterworth supposes. Or must we assume two waves of shamanism, one prehistoric, the other during the 7th and 6th centuries? The popularity of shamanism during the latter period may be explained by the gradual discovery of the human mind/soul as such, which made such voyages of the soul of the shaman understandable to some extent. It is remarkable in this connection that Homer did not conceive of anything that was able to leave the human body (without loss of consciousness) in order to reach ecstasy.
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In this volume Prof. Paap evaluates the papyrological evidence for the textual tradition of Xenophon. To be sure, A. W. Persson, Zur Textgeschichte Xenophons (Lunds Univ. Arsskrift, N.F. I, ro, no. 2, 1915), already devoted considerable attention, not only to the indirect transmission, but to the papyri as well (pp. 16-51: 16 papyri). Still, the information supplied by previous editors concerning the readings preserved by these papyri has not always been full and precise (cf. J. Bingen, CE 37, 1962, 334, n. 2). Often the conclusions which should have been drawn from these documents were simply not taken into account (cf. H. Erbse, Geschichte der Textüberlieferung I, 1961, 272). And yet Xenophon is the historian "whose text has in some respects been most affected by papyri" (B. P. Grenfell, JHS 39, 1919, 26).

P. discusses the extant papyri of the Anabasis (nos. 1-4), the Cyropaedia (nos. 5-13), the Cynegeticus (no. 14), and De Vectigalibus (no. 15). He has provided an authoritative new edition of the various papyri, making all previous editions wholly superfluous.

The principal results of his thorough palaeographical and bibliographical research, and any changes with respect to the editio princeps, are summarized in the introduction to each text. In the commentary the readings of the papyri are discussed in detail and compared with the MSS. and later conjectures. Material for comparison is drawn chiefly from Xenophon himself. P., however, constantly warns against the incompleteness of F. W. Sturz's Lexicon Xenophonteum (1801-1804).

A few remarks. According to P. (p. 13, n. 1), his dating of P. Oxy.

Mnemosyne, Vol. XXVII, Fasc. 1
2750 (= no. 5) to the end of the 3rd or the beginning of the 4th century A.D. is due to a suggestion by E. G. Turner. Also ascribed to Prof. Turner is the intimation that this papyrus and P. Oxy. XVII 2101 (= no. 7) belonged to one and the same roll. "In this case", writes P. (p. 13, n. 2), "its (scil. P. Oxy. 2750) date might be the second half of the fourth century. Cf. No. 1515" (= P. Oxy. XVII 2101). But further on (p. 16) he dates P. Oxy. XVII 2101 "about A.D. 250" and only mentions G. Cavallo's proposal (2nd half of the 4th century) in a footnote (p. 16, n. 1). The inconsistency is presumably due to the fact that the commentary was written before the appearance of G. Cavallo's Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica (Firenze 1967), while the notes (p. 13, n. 2 and p. 16, n. 1) were perhaps only added later on without revising the main text. In vol. XXXVI of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri (London 1970, 19-21) P. Oxy. 2750 is dated, after comparison with P. Oxy. IV 661 [= Pack 2 223] (II) as well, to the later 2nd century. In a special note (ibid. p. 19) E. G. Turner points out that "the assignment to the late fourth century credited to me in the publication of this text by Dr. Paap ... rests on a misunderstanding".

P.S.I. XI 1106 (= no. 2) is dated by P. (p. 2) to the 2nd century B.C. In the editio princeps the papyrus was assigned to a 2nd century A.D. hand. P., who edited the text from a photograph, offers no explanation for this change in date. An oversight? At any rate, further on (p. 12, n. 2), in his discussion of the papyrological evidence for the Anabasis, he still bases his conclusions in part on his dating of P.S.I. XI 1106 to the pre-Christian era.

As already mentioned above, P. has confined himself to the papyri of four of Xenophon's works. Yet the papyrological evidence is also extremely important for the textual criticism of the other writings. The (6) papyri of the Hellenica have recently been discussed by D. F. Jackson, The Papyri of Xenophon's Hellenica, Bull. Amer. Soc. Pap. 6 (1969), 45-52, who concludes that the deterioration of the text already commenced in the early years of the Christian era and that the text offered by the MSS. is essentially the same as the one read in antiquity. For the Memorabilia (Pack 2 1557-1561) we have an important text dating from the 3rd century B.C., P. Heid. Siegm. 206 [inv. 435] (= Pack 2 1557); its significance for the transmission of Xenophon is the same as that of the early-Ptolemaic papyri of the Iliad and Odyssey for the textual criticism of Homer (cf. St. West, The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer, Köln-Opladen 1967, 11 with n. 4 and H. R. Breitenbach, RE 9 A, 1967, col. 1907). For the Symposium there is P. Ant. I 26 (= Pack 2 1564) (II), which provides true variants (cf. J. Bingen, CE 37, 1962, 334-337) and P. Lit. Lond. I 52 + P. Giss. I 1 (inv. 175) (= Pack 2 1565)