

Youtie's "Guidelines"

Among the papers left behind by my teacher and colleague, the late Pieter J. Sijpesteijn (†1996), I came across a note unmistakably written by the hand of the late Herbert C. Youtie (†1980).¹ There is no date on it. The paper is inscribed on both sides with black ballpoint ink, some words being underlined with red.² On the "front" side the name of Piet in the first line stands out in *ekthesis*. On this side two words have been cancelled visibly (cf. ll. 4, 14),³ while on the "back" another word has been corrected in a similar manner (cf. l. 16). In the transcript given below I have copied Youtie's blank lines. I think that the text may date from the time of Piet's first visit to Youtie in Ann Arbor in the year 1975, where he started working, among other projects, on his edition of the Aphrodite papyri in the University of Michigan Collection (*P. Mich. XIII*).⁴ It may, however, also have been written slightly earlier, i.e. in the previous year 1974;⁵ in that case the sheet came to Piet via correspondence with Youtie.⁶

It is no secret that Piet was deeply impressed by Youtie's productive and learned scholarship.⁷ After his teacher at Leiden University, Prof. Bernhard A. van Groningen (Piet's "Doktorvater"),

¹ I am very grateful to Piet's wife, Mrs. E.A. Sijpesteijn-Moen, who kindly invited me to help her sorting out Piet's papers and gave me permission to publish this item.

² The relevant words in question are underlined below.

³ This is indicated below by the use of [] familiar to papyrologists.

⁴ There and then he also prepared for the first time some Michigan papyri for publication in article form; cf. his paper, "Two Papyri from the Michigan Collection," *BASP* 12 (1975) 93-6.

⁵ Compare the last paragraph in Youtie's note with the publication year of Piet's first article on the subject of mummy labels, i.e. his, "Four Mummy-Labels in the Museum of Antiquities at Leiden," *OMRO* 55 (1974) 221-4.

⁶ Cf. the preface to *P.Theon*, vi [dated "December 1974"].

⁷ For Piet—and not only for him—Youtie's *Scriptiunculae* and *Scriptiunculae Posteriores* (published by A.M. Hakkert [Amsterdam 1973-5] and by R. Habelt [Bonn 1981-2], respectively) formed a continuous source of information and inspiration. Of course, these works retain their value today as well.

he came to regard Youtie as his second most influential teacher.⁸ Apparently, Piet was much inspired especially by Youtie's long running series of critical notes on papyri and ostraka.⁹ One gets the impression that, on his own initiative, Piet made a first attempt to write a similar type of paper and presented a draft to Youtie for critical advice. Youtie then kindly wrote a set of guidelines for the benefit of his pupil from the Low Countries. These guidelines provide, of course, insight into what Youtie¹⁰ regarded essential for this kind of scholarly paper.

("Front" side):

"Piet: Some guidelines for the construction of critical notes.

- Critical notes should take the reader by the hand and guide him like a child through all the steps that he must make
- 4 in order to move [from] ^{with} intelligence from what is false to what is true. It should in no instance be necessary for the reader to consult the edition in order to understand one of your notes. You should in each note say enough about the
- 8 nature of the text to be discussed so that the reader feels that he has a sufficient background to grasp the significance of your correction. Each note should have a literal citation of the passage for which you will propose a correction. And

⁸ Cf. the dedication of *P. Mich.* XIII printed on p. vii, and the "Preface" to the volume, esp. pp. xi-xii. At the same time, one should not underestimate the importance of the first instruction "in rebus papyrologicis" given to Piet especially by van Groningen's collaborator, the late Dr. Ernst Boswinkel. In later years, Piet was rather (perhaps one should say: "too") silent about Boswinkel's role as his teacher. I have seen, however, a few post cards sent by Piet from Vienna (working there on papyrus texts for his dissertation) to Boswinkel at Leiden University. From these it appears that Boswinkel played a substantial role in Piet's development as a future papyrologist (I am grateful to Boswinkel's wife, Mrs. G. Boswinkel-Huizinga, for making this material available to me).

⁹ See, e.g., the "Table of Contents" printed in Youtie's *Scriptiunculae* I, 7-8.

¹⁰ Surely one of the most authoritative papyrologists working during the half century 1930-1980.

- 12 wherever a parallel exists, it should be used to confirm your correction.

You should [it] make it quite clear to the reader whether the
(over)"

("Back" side)

"correction has been verified on the papyrus, and by whom.

- 16 The reader requires this (corr. < "the") guarantee of competence.

When you cite passages from papyrus texts, be sure to give the line-reference. The reader will cool off quickly if he has to search texts of 50, 60 or more lines in order to locate a few words.

- 20 Make sure of your accents at all times. Nothing so quickly repels a Greek scholar as false accents.

Anyone who attempts to correct a mummy label, must check Boyaval's numerous notes in ZPE."

If any additional comment to these guidelines is needed, a lapidary "Praecepta manent" should suffice. Some of the instructions given by Youtie may look now rather self-evident (especially with the benefit of hindsight); obviously, however, they were not so at the time of Piet's first encounter with Youtie.

In general it would seem to me that for every papyrologist interested into the history of our discipline this "glimpse behind the veil" is interesting. Moreover, it will *always* be useful to keep these guidelines of a great, experienced papyrologist in mind; hence, their posthumous publication.

KLAAS A. WORP

University of Amsterdam

Pref: Some guidelines for the construction of critical notes.

Critical notes should take the reader by the hand and guide him like a child through all the steps that he must make in order to move ~~from~~^{with} intelligence from what is false to what is true. It should in no instance be necessary for the reader to consult the edition in order to understand one of your notes. You should in each note say enough about the nature of the text to be discussed so that the reader feels that he has a sufficient background to grasp the significance of your correction. Each note should have a literal citation of the passage for which you will propose a correction. And where a parallel exists, it should be used to confirm your correction.

You should ~~make~~ make it quite clear to the reader whether the
(over)

corrector has been verified on the papyrus, and by whom.
The reader requires the guarantee of competence.

When you cite passages from papyrus texts, be sure to give the
line-references. The reader will cool off quickly if he has to
search texts of 50, 60 or more lines in order to locate a few words.

Make sure of your accents at all times. Nothing so quickly
repels a Greek scholar as false accents.

Anyone who attempts to correct a running label, must check
Boissac's numerous notes in ZPE.