

THE STATUS QUAESTIONIS OF THE ARTEMIDORUS PAPYRUS

Jürgen Hammerstaedt¹

The famous papyrus edited in 2008 by Claudio Gallazzi, Bärbel Kramer and Salvatore Settis is called the Artemidorus papyrus because the first fourteen lines of its summarizing description of Spain offer the slightly amplified version of a fragment of this late Hellenistic geographer². Besides this, the papyrus contains a comparison between geography and philosophy³ ; it also contains a hitherto unidentified map, and drawings of human heads and limbs. The entire verso is filled with a series of drawings of animals (some real, others imaginary). No similar papyrus is known, and, starting with Luciano Canfora, its authenticity has been challenged. It has been regarded as a XIXth-century fake made by the notorious Konstantinos Simonidis⁴.

My contribution summarizes the most frequent arguments for and against the authenticity of the papyrus. Owing to limited space, only one very decisive philological argument will be treated in greater detail. As a result, I cannot include a discussion about the important consequences of Giambattista d'Alessio's convincing recomposition of the papyrus fragments, which inverts the sequence of the two geographical texts and reopens the question of the authorship for the comparison between geography and philosophy in columns i–iii⁵.

First of all, I will briefly mention three supposed proofs against authenticity which in one way or the other go beyond the competence of philology. The most striking and immediate proof of Simonidis' forgery, at least according to Canfora, consists in the textual parallels which the art historian Maurizio Calvesi sees between the beginning of the papyrus text and the introduction of Karl Ritter's *Erdkunde* in the French translation of 1835⁶. Canfora gave the following synopsis of the relevant parts of the two texts⁷ :

Ritter p. 1–2 : <i>Dans l'introduction à un ouvrage, qui a pour but de réunir en un corps intimement uni dans ses parties et plus scientifique les notions diverses sur la terre il est indispensable avant d'exposer le plan d'indiquer ce qui dans cette science a rapport à l'homme (...) l'homme qui veut agir d'une manière efficace doit avoir la conscience intime de ses forces</i>	P.Artemid., i 1–8 (Canfora) : τὸν ἐπιβαλλόμενον γεωγραφία τῆς ὅλης ἐπικτήμης ἐπίδειξιν ποιεῖσθαι (γεωγραφία) δεῖ (πρὸ) (ἐπίδειξιν ποιεῖσθαι) τευκτικωτέρα (ἢ ἢ) νικητικωτέρα) τῆ θελήσει πρὸ ταλαντεύσαντα τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

¹ I would like to thank my colleague John Lundon who helped me to write my contribution in correct English.

² See Gallazzi / Kramer / Settis (2008) ; P.Artemid. iv 1–14 ; Artemid. fr. 21 Stiehle.

³ P.Artemid. col. i–iii.

⁴ The articles which Canfora wrote on this subject in *Quaderni di Storia*, starting in 2006, have been republished in Canfora (2007), (2008) and Canfora / Bossina (2008).

⁵ See D'Alessio (2009) ; Gallazzi / Kramer (2009) 218–242 ; Porciani (2010).

⁶ See Canfora (2008b) XV ; Calvesi (2008) ; Ritter (1835).

⁷ Canfora (2008b) VII–VIII.

(...) *pour ne pas manquer son but, doit connaître aussi ses forces intérieures et extérieures, c'est l'accord de la volonté avec la force.*

p. 7

Il n'appartient [pas] à un seul homme d'accomplir une telle œuvre.

p. 9

nous allons nécessairement de l'individu à ses rapports avec le tout.

τευκτικωτέρα τῇ θελήσει πρὸ
ταλαντεύσαντα (οννερο
προπλαστεύσαντα) τὴν ψυχὴν
ἑαυτοῦ
κατὰ τε τὴν τῆς ἀρετῆς
δύναμιν.
col. i 10–12

οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ τυχὼν κόπος ὁ
δυνάμενος τῇ ἐπιτήμη αὐτῆ
συναγωνίσασθαι.
col. i 39–40

ἀπλοῦται γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῷ
κόσμῳ.

Does this comparison prove that the writer of the papyrus text was inspired by Ritter? Let us look at the first lines of Ritter's plain text⁸. « *Dans l'introduction à un ouvrage qui a pour but de réunir en un corps intimement uni dans ses parties et plus scientifique les notions diverses sur la terre, il est indispensable, avant d'exposer le plan, la méthode et les sources, d'indiquer ce qui, dans cette science, a directement rapport à l'homme, car c'est ce point de vue qui donne à cette étude son importance et sa valeur. Ce point de vue, qui touche les rapports de la nature à l'histoire, de la partie au peuple, et surtout, de l'individu à l'univers, ne sera ici que légèrement indiqué, seulement pour attirer l'attention sur le but dernier de nos recherches. L'homme moral, pour accomplir sa fin, l'homme qui veut agir d'une manière efficace, doit avoir la conscience intime de ses forces, connaître ce qu'il reçoit du dehors, ce qui l'entoure, et les rapports qui l'unissent avec ce qui n'est pas lui: toute association d'hommes, tout peuple, pour ne pas manquer son but, doit connaître aussi ses forces intérieures et extérieures, celles de ses voisins, et la place qu'il occupe au milieu des rapports qui agissent sur lui du dehors. Des efforts aveugles, une volonté instinctive, ne peuvent donner à l'homme, malgré toute la tension et l'énergie possibles, cette puissance qui fait être, qui fait agir ; ce sont des efforts plus réfléchis, plus sentis, c'est l'accord de la volonté avec la force, qui là où la clarté s'unit à la vérité, se manifestent en actes éclatants, sublimes et éternels.* »

Now let us compare this with the first eight lines of the plain papyrus text as constituted by Canfora⁹ : τὸν ἐπιβαλλόμενον γεωγραφ[ίᾳ] | τῆς ὅλης ἐπιτήμης ἐπίδε[ιξιν] | ποιεῖσθαι ἑαυτοῦ δεῖ πρὸ [ταλ]αν|τεύσαντα τὴν ψυχῆ[ν εἰς ταύ]|την τὴν πραγματείαν [νι]|κητικωτέρα τῇ θελήσει| κατὰ | τ' ἐπα|γγελίαν αὐτὴν κατ[ά τε τὴν] | τῆς ἀρετῆς δύναμιν [ποιεῖν]. I do not see the immediate evidential value which Canfora attributes to the linguistic analysis given by the art historian¹⁰.

The second proof proceeds the other way round. Richard Janko believed that a head of Matthew incised in the frontispice of a book published by Simonidis in 1861 « is remarkably similar to a head of the Artemidorus papyrus (...) except for the latter's heavy brow-ridges »¹¹. These heavy brow-ridges are explained by Janko as an idealized self-portrait of Simonidis, quoting the description which Simonidis gave of himself in a pseudonymous letter : « [i]mmense black whiskers, moustache and imperial ; huge black eyebrows ; an enormous mass of jet-black and glossy hair (...) ; deep-sunk but fiery and piercing eyes ;

⁸ Ritter (1835) 1. The words which appear in Canfora's synopsis are underlined.

⁹ This text differs in several points from the *editio princeps* in Gallazzi / Kramer / Settis (2008) where the offset images on the other side were taken into account. See also Canfora (2009a).

¹⁰ See Canfora (2008b) XV.

¹¹ See Janko (2009) 407.

dark swarthy visage ; massive lips and strongly marked mouth make up a face not easily forgotten. »¹² In a second drawing, Janko believed that he could recognize Simonidis' profile.

Richard Janko is a philologist. I gave these images to Uwe Westfehling, an art historian and specialist of XIXth century drawing, who became famous for discovering fakes in German museums. He wrote to me that there are great differences, and that the common features are so conventional that the incision of Matthew cannot prove that Simonides drew the papyrus heads.

In 2009 a worrying accusation was made. Silio Bozzi, an Italian police officer, analysed the published photo which shows pieces of the Artemidorus papyrus still joined with other documentary papyri of the late first century AD. Bozzi claimed that this photo had been manipulated on the computer and that the writing of the Artemidorus papyrus had been later added to an existing convolute, clearly in order to defend the authenticity of the papyrus by criminal means¹³. First of all, I wonder why this police investigation, concerning a papyrus bought by an Italian institution for 2 750 000 euros, has not led to any legal proceeding¹⁴.

Moreover, I am not convinced by the logic of some of the conclusions contained in Bozzi's publication. I contacted specialists at the German Bundeskriminalamt in Wiesbaden, who recommended Dr. Hans Baumann as the best specialist in this field¹⁵. Baumann's analysis definitely rules out that the writing on this photo was added later or that there was any criminal manipulation. He also rejects the more recent accusations by the Neapolitan police officer Salvatore Granata¹⁶. Besides, Granata's conclusions are incompatible with Bozzi's theory. Baumann presented his results in a workshop at Cologne University on 20 September 2010. An English version is being prepared and will be published, together with a short introduction written by myself, in 2012¹⁷.

We should now turn to the very few facts which are agreed on by those who believe that the papyrus is a fake and those who consider it as genuine. Carbon-14 analysis has dated the papyrus material to the late first century BC or early first century AD¹⁸. Two further facts agreed on lead to opposing conclusions. On the one hand, the spectral analysis of ink revealed that its composition matches that of ancient non-metallic ink¹⁹. But admittedly, similar ink can be produced in modern times. On the other hand, Daniel Delattre has shown that the handwriting of the papyrus matches modern *disegni* of Herculaneum papyri, published from 1862 onwards. The forger Simonidis probably was aware of them. However, as Delattre remarks himself, the *disegni* reproduce the handwriting of real ancient papyri of the first century BC, not dissimilar to that of the Artemidorus papyrus²⁰.

Three general considerations make a modern fake very unlikely. First of all, it would have been very difficult to find such a large unwritten piece of papyrus²¹. Furthermore, the ink of the recto has left offset images on the verso, and there are also some traces of the verso on the recto. The regular distances between the original writing and drawings on one side and the offset images on the other show that this incident happened when the papyrus

¹² Richard Janko, in the discussion at the Geneva congress, believed that I had misunderstood him. But he wrote in (2009) 407 : « This figure is, I suspect, an idealised self-portrait. »

¹³ See Bozzi (2009) ; also Bozzi (2010).

¹⁴ Gallazzi / Kramer / Settis (2008) 54.

¹⁵ More information can be found in the internet presentation of the journal *DOCMA* which is edited by Hans Baumann : <<http://www.docma.info>>.

¹⁶ See Granata (2010).

¹⁷ See Baumann (2012) and Hammerstaedt (2012).

¹⁸ See Gallazzi / Kramer / Settis (2008) 66–70 ; also Mandò (2009) 249–256.

¹⁹ See Gallazzi / Kramer / Settis (2008) 71–78 ; also Mandò (2009) 256–258.

²⁰ See Delattre (2009) 8. A thorough analysis of the writing is offered by Marcotte (2010) 339–343.

²¹ See most recently Gallazzi / Kramer (2010).

was rolled²². Would it have been possible for a modern forger to roll such fragile ancient papyrus material so tightly? Finally, is it just coincidence that not only the form of writing and the other documentary papyrus pieces contained in the convolute, but also the carbon-14 analysis point unanimously to the same period²³? No forger, not even Simonidis, could foresee this.

Canfora published several pictures of Konstantinos Simonidis' uncontested fakes, which are kept in Liverpool, so that it is now easier to get an idea of this kind of forgery²⁴. As far as we know, Konstantinos Simonidis was born between 1820 and 1824. After the most astonishing vicissitudes, he must even have forged the announcement of his death in 1867, since we know about his later activities and an obituary was published in 1890. At that time Simonides would have been between 66 and 70 years old.

At any rate, he did not live up to the time when, starting in 1896, the French epigraphist Bernard Haussoullier discovered the inscriptions in the Didymaion near Miletus which revealed a rare method of indicating the number 1000 and its multiples. This hitherto unknown method employs the so-called *sampi*, which in the normal Ionian numeric system is used as a sign for 900, while 1000 and its multiples are normally rendered by the letters A-Θ, preceded by some additional mark of varying shape. Now, in some of the new Didymaion inscriptions, the same sign was used with a further alphabetic modifier on top of it to indicate 1000 and its multiples. We know that Haussoullier spoke in 1897 about this discovery at a conference in Paris²⁵. But the first published explanation of these rare numerals was given by Bruno Keil only in 1907 in his appendix to Otto Rubensohn's edition of the Elephantine papyri, who made use of a private communication by Haussoullier.

It is a surprising fact that the same method occurs in the passage of the Artemidorus papyrus which enumerates the distances between places on the Spanish coast and which had not been taken into consideration by Canfora before the *editio princeps* appeared²⁶. The editors of the papyrus pointed out that this use of the sign was unknown in Simonidis' lifetime, so that he could not have forged the papyrus²⁷. Canfora and his pupil Giuseppe Carlucci disputed this²⁸; recently they announced that, on the basis of Haussoullier's unpublished papers, they could refute some of my further remarks where I assert that Simonides did not live long enough to understand and to falsify this numeric system²⁹. I decline here to respond to their most recent criticism and prefer to await the publication of their announced investigations. These will in any case improve our knowledge of the course of the epigraphic discoveries at Didyma³⁰.

I prefer now to deal with the most important and fundamental controversy. Are the differences between the new papyrus text and Artemidorus fr. 21 Stiehle, indirectly transmitted by Constantine Porphyrogenetos, as Canfora believes, due to the work of a modern forger who reveals himself by using inappropriate modern conjectures and giving anachronistic geographical information³¹? Or does the new text rather offer a splendid confirmation of the results of modern philological work, and fill, in one case, the lacuna of a corrupt passage which no philologist had been able to heal, and certainly no forger could have emended?

²² This phenomenon was an important clue for recomposing the fragments of the papyrus roll. See now D'Alessio (2009) and Gallazzi / Kramer (2009) 217–220.

²³ On the writing, see Gallazzi / Kramer / Settis (2008) 62.

²⁴ See Canfora (2008a) fig. 14–16.

²⁵ See Carlucci (2009) 302–303.

²⁶ P.Artemid. v 20–40.

²⁷ See Gallazzi / Kramer / Settis (2008) 58.

²⁸ See Carlucci (2008) and (2009), Canfora (2009b) 121–125.

²⁹ See Hammerstaedt (2009a).

³⁰ Announced in Canfora (2009b) 118–119 and n. 16.

³¹ Const. Porph. *Admin. imp.* 23.

Canfora tried to restore the mediievally transmitted Artemidorus quotation without adopting three modern philological emendations and operations³². I have argued that in all three cases the medieval text is corrupt³³. Canfora replied in the same volume, but his response does not address the most important problems³⁴:

1. the awkward word order of ἕως τῶν κατὰ Γάδειρα τόπων ἐνδοτέρω in the medieval tradition of Artemidorus fr. 21³⁵;
2. the difficulty of supplying a suitable subject to καὶ (understood as « also ») συνωνύμως Ἰβηρία τε καὶ Ἰσπανία καλεῖται³⁶. Canfora proposed « Iberia ». But this would mean that « Iberia is also called synonymously Iberia and Spain »;
3. the impossible break in the syntax after διατείνουσα ἀπὸ τῶν πυρηνναίων ὀρῶν ἅπασα, which leaves διατείνουσα ἀπὸ without the necessary μέχρι³⁷.

For the moment I leave this to the judgement of the readers³⁸; let us consider the expression which for Canfora forms an insurmountable obstacle to attributing the papyrus text to Artemidorus more closely. According to P.Artemid. iv 11–14, the second of the two Roman provinces contains the lands up to Gadeira and τὰ κατὰ τὴν Λυσιτανίαν πάντα. The medieval quotation of Artemidorus displays instead μέχρι Γαδείρων καὶ Λυσιτανίας.

Canfora has pointed to a historical inconsistency in the papyrus³⁹. In Artemidorus' time, the late second century BC, the geographical notion of Lusitania went well beyond the power of the second Roman province. If col. iv 13–14 is translated with « and all the land in Lusitania », meaning « the whole of Lusitania », this would for Canfora be an anachronism. On the other hand, he points out that it would even be wrong to exclude Lusitania from the second province completely.

The territories south of the Tagus were at that time certainly under Roman control⁴⁰. In the Rovereto proceedings, Canfora gave a sarcastic review of the different attempts at interpretation of this expression⁴¹. At the same time he emphasized the historical accuracy of the medieval tradition of Artemidorus which just reads « up to Gadeira and Lusitania »⁴². But is the medieval Artemidorus excerpt as it is preserved in Constantine Porphyrogenetos historically exact? What does « up to Gadeira and Lusitania » mean? Is Lusitania included by μέχρι, like Gadeira? Or does Lusitania serve as an indication for the frontier and is excluded? And what about the regions south of the Tagus which – as Canfora stresses – were under Roman control? The medieval tradition offers the same historical problems as the papyrus⁴³; the only difference is that, in the case of the papyrus text, a solution can be found.

Let us first consider the meaning of κατὰ in P.Artemid. iv 13. Some lines later there is a mention of the « sea belonging to the Ocean » (P.Artemid. v 2: [τῷ] κατὰ τὸν Ὀκεανὸν πελάγει) which touches the North coast of Spain. Κατὰ obviously means that the πέλαγος belongs to the Ocean. It is not as large as the Ocean but is part of it. Likewise, τὰ κατὰ τὴν Λυσιτανίαν can easily indicate territories which belong to Lusitania without having the

³² The three relevant articles are published together in Canfora (2008a) 211–217 (from *Quaderni di Storia* 64 [2006]); 227–254 (*QuadStor* 66 [2007]); and 271–298 (*QuadStor* 65 [2007]).

³³ See Hammerstaedt (2009b) and (2009c); also West (2009).

³⁴ See Canfora (2009b) 115–116.

³⁵ This is to be found in lines 5–6 of the text constituted by Canfora (2008a) 234.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 6–7.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 9–10.

³⁸ See now also the critical remarks against the arguments which I put forward in Hammerstaedt (2009b) by Bossina (2009) 140–142 and Condello (2010) 503–507. I will come back to this topic in due time on a later occasion, in *Historia* 61 (2012) Heft 3.

³⁹ Moret (2010) 116, n. 12, lists the numerous places where Canfora made this point.

⁴⁰ See also Moret (2010) 119, n. 34.

⁴¹ See Canfora (2009b) 108–109.

⁴² See Canfora (2009b) 110.

⁴³ Moret (2010) 124 has made a similar observation.

same extension⁴⁴. They can be identified with the territories south of the Tagus which Canfora misses in the description offered by the papyrus.

I agree that this interpretation leaves two problems open which Canfora was right to point out. The first is the meaning of πάντα in this context. Why should the author stress that all the territory in Lusitania belongs to the second province? The second problem is that the province is described as encompassing the coast up to Gadeira and the territory belonging to Lusitania south of the Tagus, but its most important part, Baetica, is omitted.

So we should adopt Benedetto Bravo's proposal to read τῶν κατὰ τὴν Λυσιτανίαν instead of τὰ κατὰ τὴν Λυσιτανίαν⁴⁵. This easy emendation solves both the problem of πάντα and of the missing mention of Baetica. Πάντα would now refer to the remaining τὰ in P.Artemid. iv 12, meaning that « all the land up to Gadeira and up to the territories in Lusitania » belongs to the second region. The emended expression τῶν κατὰ τὴν Λυσιτανίαν depends on μέχρι and indicates the outermost extension of the province to the North: there is no need to mention Baetica in this context.

By these words, the author, whom we can confidently call Artemidorus, reflects the gradual seizure of Lusitanian territory by the Romans in his time. When the Artemidorus excerpt of the medieval tradition was made, this fine differentiation was no more understood, so that it was abridged into an anachronistic μέχρι Γαδεΐρων καὶ Λουσιτανίας⁴⁶.

I hope to have given some insight into the Artemidorus question and to have shown that, in spite of the sometimes harsh and disrespectful tone of the debate, the ongoing discussion has led to some definite progress. I thank all those who have contributed to this, regardless of their opinion about the papyrus, with their various observations and proposals.

Bibliography

- Baumann, H.D. (2012, in print), « The Convolute Photo: A Digital Fake? Arguments against a Montage », in Gallazzi, C. / Kramer, B. / Settis, S. (ed.), *Intorno al Papiro di Artemidoro II. Geografia e cartografia* (Milano).
- Bossina, L. (2009), « Riconosciuto che non è Artemidoro, che cos'è? Tre osservazioni e un'ipotesi », in Canfora, L. (ed.), *Il papiro di Artemidoro (Atti della Accademia Roveretana degli Agiati 259, ser. VIII, vol. IX A, fasc. II, 2, Rovereto)* 133–147.
- Bozzi, S. (2009), « Indagine tecnica sul Konvolut. Nuove prospettive di analisi sul Papiro di Artemidoro », *Quaderni di Storia* 70, 3–46.
- Bozzi, S. (2010), « Il gioco delle tre stelle », in Canfora, L. (2010), *La vera storia del papiro di Artemidoro* (Catania) 106–111.
- Bravo, B. (2009), « Artemidoro di Efeso geografo e retore. Per la costituzione e l'interpretazione del testo del Papiro di Artemidoro », *ZPE* 170, 43–63.
- Calvese, M. (2008), « Quel papiro non è Artemidoro », in *Corriere della Sera*, 7 aprile 2008, 1 e 25.
- Canfora, L. (2007), *The True History of the So-called Artemidorus Papyrus* (Bari).
- Canfora, L. (2008a), *Il papiro di Artemidoro* (Bari / Roma).
- Canfora, L. (2008b), « Prologo che è anche un epilogo. In origine era Ritter », in Canfora, L. / Bossina, L. (ed.), *Wie kann das ein Artemidor-Papyrus sein? – Ma come fa a essere un papiro di Artemidoro?* (Bari) VII–XVIII.
- Canfora, L. (2009a), *Artemidorus Ephesius. P.Artemid. sive Artemidorus personatus. Edidit brevis commentario instruxit Societas emunctae naris* (Bari).
- Canfora, L. (2009b), « Sarà Simonidis? Certo non può essere Artemidoro », in Canfora, L. (ed.), *Il papiro di Artemidoro (Atti della Accademia Roveretana degli Agiati 259, ser. VIII, vol. IX A, fasc. II, 2, Rovereto)* 105–132.
- Canfora, L. / Bossina, L. (2008), *Wie kann das ein Artemidor-Papyrus sein? – Ma come fa a essere un papiro di Artemidoro?* (Bari).

⁴⁴ Moret (2010) 123, on the other hand, proposes to understand κατὰ τὴν Λυσιτανίαν as « dans toute l'étendue de » and explains the whole expression καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν Λυσιτανίαν ἅπαντα (without emending τὰ) in a sense which would be very close to the simple καὶ τὴν Λυσιτανίαν.

⁴⁵ See Bravo (2009) 60.

⁴⁶ The change made by the *epitomator* in Artemidorus fr. 21 Stiehle is also explained by Settis (2008) 58 and Moret (2010) 13.

- Carlucci, G. (2008), « Sampi ? », in Canfora, L. / Bossina, L. (ed.), *Wie kann das ein Artemidor-Papyrus sein ? – Ma come fa a essere un papiro di Artemidoro ?* (Bari) 229–235.
- Carlucci, G. (2009), « Sampi e dintorni », *Quaderni di Storia* 69, 297–312.
- Condello (2010), « Artemidoro come vero », *Eikasmos* 21, 491–524.
- D'Alessio, G. (2009), « On the “Artemidorus” Papyrus », *ZPE* 171, 27–43.
- Delattre, D. (2009), « L'écriture du papyrus dit “d'Artémidore” et les dessins gravés de quelques papyrus d'Herculaneum », in Canfora, L. (ed.), *Il papiro di Artemidoro* (*Atti della Accademia Roveretana degli Agiati* 259, ser. VIII, vol. IX A, fasc. II, 2, Rovereto) 7–14.
- Gallazzi, C. / Kramer, B. (2010), « Il P.Artemid. e i sacchi di papiro bianco di J. de M. Johnson », *APF* 56, 232–238.
- Gallazzi, C. / Kramer, B. (2009), « Fünfzehn Monate Diskussion über den Artemidor-Papyrus », in Gallazzi, C. / Kramer, B. / Settis, S. (ed.), *Intorno al Papiro di Artemidoro I. Lingua, stile e contesto culturale* (Milano) 169–242.
- Gallazzi, C. / Kramer, B. / Settis, S. (2008), *Il papiro di Artemidoro* (Milano).
- Granata, S. (2010), « La stampa fotografica riprodotte il Konvolut del Papiro di Artemidoro », in Canfora, L. (ed.), *La vera storia del papiro di Artemidoro* (Catania) 89–105.
- Hammerstaedt, J. (2009a), « Warum Simonides den Artemidorpapyrus nicht hätte fälschen können. Eine seltene Schreibung für Tausender in Inschriften und Papyri », *Chiron* 39, 323–337.
- Hammerstaedt, J. (2009b), « Artemidoro di Efeso nella tradizione indiretta e nel papiro di Torino », in Gallazzi, C. / Kramer, B. / Settis, S. (ed.), *Intorno al Papiro di Artemidoro I. Lingua, stile e contesto culturale* (Milano) 43–56.
- Hammerstaedt, J. (2009c), « Come fa a essere un papiro falsato ? », in Canfora, L. (ed.), *Il papiro di Artemidoro* (*Atti della Accademia Roveretana degli Agiati* 259, ser. VIII, vol. IX A, fasc. II, 2, Rovereto) 53–103.
- Hammerstaedt, J. (2012, in print), « The relevance of the dispute about the photograph of the Konvolut for the debate about the Artemidorus papyrus », in Gallazzi, C. / Kramer, B. / Settis, S. (ed.), *Intorno al Papiro di Artemidoro. II. Geografia e cartografia* (Milano).
- Janko, R. (2009), « The Artemidorus Papyrus », *CR* 59, 403–410.
- Mandò, P.A. (2009), « A proposito di analisi fisico-chimiche », in Gallazzi, C. / Kramer, B. / Settis, S. (ed.) *Intorno al Papiro di Artemidoro I. Lingua, stile e contesto culturale* (Milano) 243–258.
- Marcotte, D. (2010), « Le papyrus d'Artémidore. Le livre, le texte, le débat », *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* n.s. 5, 333–371.
- Moret, P. (2010), « La Lusitanie d'Artémidore », *Palaeohispanica* 10, 113–131.
- Porciani, L. (2010), « Il Papiro di Artemidoro : per un'interpretazione della sequenza testuale », *APF* 56, 207–231.
- Ritter, K. (1835), *Géographie générale comparée (...), traduit de l'allemand par E. Buret et Edouard Desor*, t. I (Paris).
- Settis, S. (2008), *Artemidoro. Un papiro dal I secolo al XXI* (Torino).
- West, M.L. (2009), « All Iberia is Divided Into Two Parts », in Brodersen, K. / Elsner, J. (ed.), *Images and Texts on the “Artemidorus Papyrus” : Working Papers on P.Artemid.* (*Historia Einzelschriften* 214, Stuttgart) 95–101.