

A Syntax of Forgery^a

CHRISTOPHER P. JONES

George Martin Lane Professor of Classics and History, Emeritus
Harvard University

In the field of classical antiquity, forgeries are frequent. Some go back to antiquity itself, others are very recent; some have proved very hard to detect, others are so thinly disguised that they might more properly be called frauds, fakes, or even hoaxes. Thus the series of biographies of emperors usually called the *Augustan History*, universally believed genuine until the end of the nineteenth century, is now recognized as the work of a “frivolous impostor.”¹ At the same time, artifacts now considered certainly authentic were doubted on their first appearance: an example is the manuscript from Trogir, also called Trau (Croatia), that was first published in 1664 and is the only source for a classic of Latin literature, Petronius’ *Cena Trimalchionis* (“Dinner with Trimalchio”).² In this paper I wish to suggest that forgeries tend to go through a series of recognizable stages that can be schematized into a “syntax” of forgery, from the intellectual and social situation into which the forgery is introduced, through the forger himself (woman forgers are very rare),³ his motives and materials, the positive and negative reception given to his product, down to the aftermath of continued debate.

As my primary exhibit, I will use a famous nineteenth-century forger named Constantinos Simonides. Our main source for his early life is a book published in 1859 under the title *A Biographical Memoir of Constantine Simonides, with a Brief Defence of the Authenticity of His Manuscripts*; the alleged author is one Charles Stewart, and

a This is a revised version of a paper presented at the panel *Fabrication, Verification, Authentication* held at the Spring General Meeting of the Society on 24 April 2015. I am very grateful to those who helped to make the panel possible, especially Caroline Bynum, Michael Silverstein, Pauline Yu, and Annie Westcott. In writing this paper, I have greatly benefited from the advice and criticism of Glen Bowersock, Peter Parsons, and Christopher Stray. I have drawn much of my information about Constantinos Simonides from J. K. Elliott, *Codex Sinaiticus and the Simonides Affair: An Examination of the Nineteenth Century Claim that Codex Sinaiticus was not an Ancient Manuscript* (Thessalonikē: Patriarchikon Idryma Paterikōn Meletōn, 1982; henceforth, Elliott, *Codex Sinaiticus*). A related version of this paper appeared as “The ‘Jesus’ Wife’ Papyrus in the History of Forgery,” *New Testament Studies* 61 (2015): 368–78.

because he has the same initials as Simonides, many have thought him to be a double of Simonides himself. According to this, he was born on the Aegean island of Simi about 1820 and spent some of his early years in one or more of the monasteries on Mount Athos. The first trace I have found of him is, as it happens, an affair that brought him to the notice of the U.S. Congress. An American missionary in Athens, the Reverend Jonas King, aroused the hostility of the Greek Orthodox Church, and in July 1847, Simonides published a series of newspaper articles entitled "King's Orgies." These described what King's biographer calls "shameless scenes and ceremonies, such as the very name suggests, and carried on at night in Dr. King's house, under the guise of religious observances." King was forced to flee the country, and the incident caused a diplomatic fracas between the governments of the United States and Greece. The American ambassador to Constantinople investigated the matter and, when reporting back to President Pierce, branded Simonides as "notorious throughout Turkey, Russia, and Greece as an impostor, counterfeiter, and cheat."⁴

In 1847, Simonides was only beginning his career. Between 1853 and 1864, he published a number of books containing previously unattested works of Greek literature, or works known to have existed but presumed lost. In a heated controversy with the Russian Count Tischendorf, the discoverer of the famous Codex Sinaiticus now in the British Museum, Simonides also claimed that the codex found by Tischendorf was actually a copy that he himself had made at the age of 15. After about 1865, he disappears from view.

The first component of my syntax of forgery is setting or atmosphere. A forger will usually not manage to impose on others unless his product, by accident or design, comes into a setting ready to give it a favorable reception. In 1860, Simonides gained access to the considerable papyrus collection of a Liverpool merchant named Joseph Mayer and promptly produced a papyrus scrap containing a few verses of the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew. The papyrus was said to be of the first century, thus three centuries earlier than any New Testament manuscript then known. Moreover, it contained an important variant from the accepted text in a famous passage of the Gospel according to Saint Matthew; Jesus' saying about a camel passing through the eye of a needle was due to a textual corruption, and the true text was not "camel" but "cable," not κάμηλος but κάλως.⁵

In 1861, Simonides published a volume entitled *Fac-Similes* [sic] of *Certain Portions of the Gospel of St. Matthew, and of the Epistles of Ss. James & Jude*. This volume was intended to publicize his various discoveries in Liverpool and contained not just one scrap of Matthew's Gospel but several pages, which had been "written about the fifteenth

year after the ascension of our Saviour, by the hand of Nicolaus the Deacon, that is to say, in the forty-eighth year after the Incarnation of the Divinity.”⁶ Contemporary accounts show the sensation that this discovery made in Liverpool, although it encountered immediate doubt in London. At one and the same time, it appeared to prove the antiquity of the gospel tradition and ended a debate as to whether Matthew had originally written in Greek or Hebrew. It also gave a text of the Gospel of Matthew that revealed the name of Pontius Pilate’s wife to be “Pempele”: this pious lady’s name had unluckily fallen out of all manuscripts hitherto known.⁷

Simonides’ *Fac-Similes* produced an anonymous, devastating review from a London journal, *The Athenaeum*; the author was, in fact, the great Indologist Max Müller, who began: “Is there *no* limit to public credulity? Is there *no* limit to the power of abusing this credulity? Mr. Simonides is not before the public for the first time; but he has never made a more singular appearance before it than as author of these Fac-Similes.” And so on for five closely printed columns.⁸ At the same time, two religious periodicals, *The Christian Remembrancer* and *The Literary Churchman*, began an amusing duel. *The Christian Remembrancer* concluded its satirical examination by saying:⁹

Whether, therefore, we consider these papyrus fragments of the New Testament (1) in regard to the *manner* of their introduction to the world, which must always be a point of some importance when we come to examine the genuineness of ancient writings hitherto unknown; or (2) listen to the evidence of competent scholars (men who have characters to maintain, and no sinister interest to tempt them to deceive us) as to the *external* marks of spuriousness patent on the documents themselves; or (3) note for our own satisfaction the numerous internal symptoms of fraud and interpolation they exhibit, the halting scholarship, and unsupported statements of the editor, the empty verbiage and feeble interpolations of the text; we feel ourselves entitled to draw the conclusion broadly stated by the Council of the Royal Society of Literature in reference to Hermippus’ letter to Horus (Report, p. 7) [another of Simonides “discoveries” in Mayer’s collection] that there are absolute grounds for believing these papyri to be “rank forgeries, probably of very recent date.”

The Literary Churchman replied:¹⁰

We confess that we are not proud of the tone adopted by public writers towards this Greek. “Old English fairness,” of which we have heard much, has displayed itself but little. In the last number of *The Christian Remembrancer*, in a careful article devoted to this subject, Dr. Simonides is twitted with transparent roguery

throughout. We have read that paper without being convinced of anything, except that the writer was bent on urging a foregone conclusion. Of course he may have been, and we should think he is, fully convinced of the versatility and dishonesty, the paleographical ingenuity and bad scholarship, of Dr. Simonides; but his readiness to accept the "Report" of the Royal Society of Literature, which sat in judgement on Dr. Simonides last February, shakes our confidence in this critic. We were present at that meeting to which the Report refers, and our surprise is great at the representation made of what took place. The Greek priest Nicolaides, who was brought forward as the witness to condemn Dr. Simonides, is, we suppose, still in this country; but the entire silence which has been prudently observed respecting him, and the enquiries raised in other quarters as to the trustworthiness of this "archimandrite" (so, we think, he was called), ought in fairness to be remembered, on Dr. Simonides' side. And as to the cursory glance at the papyrus being represented as a grave inspection—it is insulting to everyone who was there. In the article before us, there is, we are bound to say, the same spirit of which we complain, and complain all the more, because the ascertainment of the truth, in this matter, concerns Christian literature very deeply.

This debate over Simonides brings out another factor that can complicate these debates: that of religion. An unpersuasive forger but a brilliant manipulator, Simonides played the religious card tirelessly, praising the piety of his believers and invoking God's forgiveness on his critics. Similarly, his supporters were surely influenced by the hope that his documents would vindicate traditional accounts of Christian origins at a time when critics such as David Friedrich Straus had called them into question.

A receptive atmosphere is a necessary condition for the acceptance of a forgery but not a sufficient one: the forger must have the ability and the means to bring the imposture off. Here again Simonidis provides an example. The Joseph Mayer mentioned above was a wealthy businessman with a passion for collecting Egyptian antiquities of every kind and date. Believing Simonides an expert paleographer, Mayer had given him the free run of his collection, and in retrospect it is clear that Simonides, once let loose among Mayer's papyri, used them to fabricate new texts. Sometimes he washed the writing away; at others he used the blank backs of papyri and pasted them down to make the front side invisible.

As well as a generally receptive atmosphere, a forger may have a particular person or group of persons in mind, either because he considers him or them an easy "mark," or, as has happened with other forgers, because he nourishes a secret grudge against the establishment.

One of Simonides' motives for forging the supposedly earliest text of the New Testament was surely his jealousy of Constantin Tischendorf, whom I have already mentioned as the discoverer of the Codex Sinaiticus at St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai. Tischendorf had seen the Codex in 1844 and had removed 43 leaves, which are now in Leipzig. On a later visit in 1859, he removed 347 more leaves, now one of the prized possessions of the British Museum. In July of that same year—1859—his letter announcing this discovery appeared in an English translation. As we have seen, Simonides produced his supposed fragments of Matthew's Gospel in the very next year—1860. In that same year, he also began to claim that the manuscript was modern, a copy that he himself had made of an ancient original; paleographers now agree that Codex is, in fact, of the fourth century. This claim led to a protracted feud with Tischendorf and, like Simonides' alleged facsimiles of New Testament papyri, a long series of articles pro and con in British journals.¹¹

Forgers also forge to make money, although this is probably less true with forgeries of manuscripts than of artworks, where the potential returns are so much higher.¹² About 1855, Simonides offered to Karl Richard Lepsius, then Professor of Egyptology at Berlin and considered the founder of modern Egyptology, a Greek manuscript written by one Uranius of Alexandria and containing a history of the kings of Egypt.¹³ Delighted to find an ancient work that so precisely confirmed his own theories on the early history of Egypt, Lepsius advanced 2,000 thalers to the Prussian Academy to allow it to buy the manuscript (assuming a rough equivalency between an 1855 thaler and an 1855 dollar, that would be some \$60,000 today). Ludwig Dindorf, an indefatigable editor of Greek texts, was equally enthused and began to produce a critical edition, which he contracted with the Oxford University Press to print. Lepsius, meanwhile, after he had begun to copy out the text, concluded that it must be a forgery, whereupon he hurried back to Leipzig, recovered his 2,000 thalers, brought Simonides back to Berlin, and had him arrested. Meanwhile, Dindorf had proceeded with his edition and handed in his manuscript, but on the news of Lepsius' change of mind, the Oxford University Press destroyed the print run, and it is now a valuable rarity. This blunder largely undid Dindorf's reputation.¹⁴

The forger must have not only a receptive atmosphere, perhaps also an intended "mark," but he must also have the materials and the ability to bring off his imposture. Materials are usually not hard to find, as when Simonides had a ready supply of papyri in Mayer's Museum: the difficulty lies in making the materials resemble the intended forgery. Here Simonides ran into immediate trouble. To produce large blank

pages on which to write whole documents, he was forced to glue together papyri of different dates, as was visible even in 1860, when papyri were still comparatively unfamiliar. Sometimes he also had to remove ancient writing from the papyrus, and for this purpose, he seems to have used wet blotting paper: unluckily, small flecks of the blotting paper remained on the surface.¹⁵

Similarly, even with the most authentic-looking materials, the forger has to contend with his own human limitations. It was soon noticed that several of Simonides' forgeries, allegedly of different date and type, exhibited similar handwriting. Thus the anonymous reviewer of Simonides' *Fac-Similes* in *The Athenaeum* observed:¹⁶

That the handwriting of all of them is that of one and the same person, we appeal with confidence to every one who has any acquaintance with early MSS. Let them compare, for instance, the Us, Es, As, Ds, and they will not fail to perceive running through them all the most striking family likeness—a resemblance too remarkable to be the result of accident, and such as we nowhere find in genuine MSS differing by centuries in date.

Perhaps the hardest thing of all to forge is provenance. A forger cannot alter the past as he can alter documents or material objects, and thus it is that forgeries often break down on provenance—the establishment of a chain of evidence (location, ownership, documentary record) that will lead securely back to the alleged source. In Simonides' case, his past history of fraud, especially the forged Egyptian History of Uranius, made exposure comparatively easy. A point made against his *Fac-Similes*, “The *manner* of their introduction to the world . . . must always be a point of some importance,” is a golden rule in the detection of forgery. It is still neglected with surprising frequency, whereas scientific evidence can disprove the authenticity of ancient artifacts but very rarely prove it.

A current instance of the need to establish provenance concerns not a manuscript but a work of art. In 1999, the British Museum paid £1.8 million for the “Warren Cup,” supposed to be an almost unique example of ancient Roman silverware. The cup appeared on the Roman art market early in the twentieth century, having allegedly been found near Jerusalem. It is decorated with explicit scenes of homosexual love-making, and an American specializing in ancient erotica, Edward Perry Warren, bought it in 1911. Luca Giuliani in Berlin has recently proposed that the maker created it expressly to catch Warren's eye, in other words, that Warren was the intended “mark.” In reply, Dyfri Williams of the British Museum has stoutly, and to my mind convincingly, defended the cup's authenticity. Very recently Maria Teresa

Marabini Moevs has argued on stylistic grounds that it is the work of a celebrated Italian jeweler and craftsman, Alfredo Castellani. New, still unpublished documentation has emerged that may answer some of these questions.¹⁷

The forger's product once launched usually has to find its own way: as the case of Simonides shows, it is risky for its creators to be identified, and anonymity is the rule, although not an invariable one. Given the right atmosphere, and sometimes an adroit selection of the "mark" by whom the product is to enter the public domain, a forgery can sometimes go a long time undetected. Rarely, however, does it go unsuspected, and when that happens, personal factors come into play. Those who first believed its authenticity are unwilling to change their minds for fear of loss of face (and sometimes financial loss); those on the other side can be actuated by motives other than a disinterested desire for truth, for example by envy or rivalry.

An argument sometimes made by defenders of forgeries is that they would have been impossible to forge. In 1953, a respected Cambridge scholar, Geoffrey Woodhead, published a fragment of pottery inscribed with Greek writing. Woodhead interpreted the object as a message passed between the oligarchic conspirators who in 411 BCE overthrew the democratic government of Athens. It could not be a forgery, he argued, since "the skill and knowledge required to produce the inscriptions would surely be more than even an exceptional forger could command." Within months, the French epigraphist Louis Robert proved that the words had been copied from a printed source, a published inscription concerning the drainage of marshes in central Greece. At the same time, he mentioned having seen similar pottery fragments copied from the same published source in the late 1920s.¹⁸ Again, it is no coincidence that Woodhead published his article at a time when Cold War politics had bred paranoia about conspiracy and subversion in Britain no less than in the United States; in 1951, only a year or so before the appearance of Woodhead's article, Donald Maclean escaped to Russia and was revealed to have been spying for the Soviet Union since the 1930s. Another lesson to be drawn from Woodhead's over-confidence, which cast a shadow over the rest of his career, is that mere estimates of what is "impossible to forge" are never enough. Some forgers, although certainly not the simple swindler who created the supposed political sherd, go to immense time and trouble to create an authentic-looking object; at the end of this paper, I shall give an example of an extraordinarily clever forgery, which the perpetrator did not even try to sell but intended merely as a practical joke.

The final stage, in the case of an actual forgery, is detection, which can come in various ways. In Simonides' case, the Prussian Academy

used chemical reagents on the supposed history of the kings of Egypt, which was a palimpsest manuscript, to show that what he had claimed to be the earlier text was, in fact, the later one. These tests, when combined with philological and paleographical analyses, were overwhelming and, as we saw, led to Simonides' arrest and considerable embarrassment for Dindorf and the Oxford University Press.

Disbelief can be slow in coming, if it comes at all. A forger similar in some ways to Simonides, although one with considerable literary ability, is the poet Thomas Chatterton (1752–1770). Chatterton had access to a church in his home town of Bristol that housed a chest of neglected medieval parchments. These parchments he used to produce his so-called Rowley Poems, written by a hitherto unknown monk in the fifteenth century. Thomas Tyrwhitt, still remembered for his five-volume edition of the poems of Chaucer, was evidently intrigued by this discovery of a new, late medieval poet. He brought out the first edition of the Rowley Poems in 1777 but cautiously withheld his name from the volume. After further research, however, he recognized that the poems were forged, and the third edition, published over his own name in the next year, carried this subtitle: *The third edition, to which is added an Appendix, containing some observations upon the language of these poems; tending to prove, that they were written, not by any ancient author, but entirely by Thomas Chatterton*. In the appendix, Tyrwhitt has especial fun with the glossary that Chatterton provided for the interpretation of unusual words in the supposed Rowley. In compiling this, Chatterton had relied on Stephen Skinner's *Etymologicum Linguae Anglicanae*, but in his haste had misread certain of the entries. For example, he had glossed a word of his own invention, *alyse*, with the meaning *allow*. Tyrwhitt shows that Chatterton had found the word *alyfed* in Skinner glossed as "allowed," and drily observes, "In the Gothic types used by Skinner *f* might be easily mistaken for a long *s*." Tyrwhitt was not the only doubter: another was Dr. Johnson, who on a visit to Bristol climbed the church tower to inspect the chest that had contained Rowley's alleged poems.¹⁹

Yet Chatterton continued to find defenders. Tyrwhitt's third edition was answered 3 years later by one Jacob Bryant, who produced his own volume of more than 600 pages. Here Bryant attempts to answer every one of Tyrwhitt's criticisms in detail, spending, for example, several pages to justify the impossible *alyse* that Tyrwhitt had dismissed in a few lines. Belief in the genuineness of Rowley lasted at least until the end of the century.²⁰ So also the Ossian poems of the eighteenth-century forger George Macpherson continued to find believers, or at least appreciative readers, for about a century, although they had been immediately and publicly denounced by Dr. Johnson and others.²¹

Even Simonides has enjoyed a recent comeback. In the early 2000s, an Italian bank bought a huge papyrus, three meters long, with a geographical text that was identified as a work of the first century BCE geographer Artemidorus. It was put on display at an exhibition in Turin in 2006 and was sumptuously published in 2008 as *Il Papiro di Artemidoro* by a respected Italian group of philologists and art historians. Even before the publication, a professor at the University of Bari, Luciano Canfora, argued that it was a forgery, possibly by Simonides, and the bibliography of the controversy now extends to many thousands of pages.²² My own opinion is that the papyrus is genuine beyond a doubt, and if it were a forgery, could not be from the hand of Simonides. His forgeries and assertions—Uranus, the fragments of Matthew's Gospel, his claim to have written the Codex Sinaiticus—were exposed almost as soon as they were made, and the extant specimens of his handiwork are totally unlike the Artemidorus papyrus.

Not all forgeries follow a cycle, or what I have called a syntax, from concoction to detection. Many are never detected, and even when they are, the detection may happen in unexpected ways, just as much of what we say in ordinary conversation does not follow regular syntax. I close with an example that seems as mysterious as any so far discussed. The perpetrator took enormous care to fabricate the forgery—we should perhaps rather say hoax—and yet clearly he did not mean to be believed, at least not for long. His name (if he was, in fact, a “he”) is Batson D. Sealing.²³

In 1991 the editors of *Discussions in Egyptology*, a journal based in Oxford, England, received a communication from Mr. Sealing. It consisted of a photocopy of three pages from the *Proceedings of the New Orleans Academy of Sciences* for 1875. These pages contained a lithographic drawing of a fragment in Demotic Egyptian of the *Gospel of Thomas*, together with a transcription, translation, and commentary. A full text of this *Gospel* first appeared in a manuscript discovered at Nag Hammadi in Egypt in 1945; it consists of a number of sayings of Jesus, without any narrative framework or setting. Mr. Sealing's fragment naturally contained new sayings, and a reputable ancient historian, Robin Lane Fox, announced the discovery in a breathless report to the *Financial Times* of London. His article began: “A thunderbolt may be about to strike early Christian history.” The thunderbolt turned out to be a damp squib, since a week after the first article Lane Fox published a new one, grudgingly admitting that he had been fooled. “We had all missed the name's meaning,” he argued, “[since] we all know that Americans' names can sometimes seem curious in English.”

The mystery is not so much that Professor Lane Fox was fooled by a “curious” American name. It is rather that Batson D. Sealing, whoever

and wherever he is or was, should have taken such care to forge three printed pages of a journal allegedly published in 1875, together with a document in a very difficult language, Demotic; and yet he must also have intended that his hoax would soon be detected. So even if his document does not fit neatly into a syntax of forgery, it can, at any rate, serve to end this paper with a large exclamation mark.

ENDNOTES

1. R. Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968) 4: cf. Ch. XXI, "Other Frauds."
2. S. Gaselee, *The Bibliography of Petronius* (London: Blades, East & Blades, 1910), reprinted from *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* 10 (1910): 170–3.
3. A. Freeman, *Bibliotheca Fictiva* (London: Quaritch, 2014) 60, calls the notorious "Comtesse de la Motte" (1756–1791) "the earliest identified French female forger?"
4. F. E. H. Haines, *Jonas King: Missionary to Syria and Greece* (New York: American Tract Society, 1879): 308–9; *Senate Executive Document* no. 67, 33rd United States Congress (1854): 66.
5. Elliott, *Codex Sinaiticus*, 133–4; cf. C. Simonides, *Fac-Similes of Certain Portions of the Gospel of St. Matthew, and of the Epistles of Ss. James & Jude: Written on Papyrus in the First Century and Preserved in the Egyptian Museum of Joseph Mayer* (London: Trübner, 1861): 45–6.
6. Simonides, *Fac-similes* (n. 5), 6.
7. Simonides, *Fac-similes* (n. 5), 46.
8. Cited Elliott, *Codex Sinaiticus*, 143–7, and also accessible online. I owe knowledge of Müller's authorship to unpublished information kindly supplied by Chris Stray.
9. *The Christian Remembrancer*, July 1863, cited Elliott, *Codex Sinaiticus*, 141–2.
10. *The Literary Churchman*, 1 September 1863, cited Elliott, *Codex Sinaiticus*, 142–3.
11. Elliott, *Codex Sinaiticus*, 26–70.
12. A recent case in which a printed forgery involved large sums is Mark Hoffmann and the so-called "Oath of a Freeman"; for a summary account, see en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mark_Hofmann (accessed 21 July 2015).
13. *Uranii alexandrini De regibus Aegyptiorum libri tres. Operis ex codice palimpsesto edendi specimina proposuit Gulielmus Dindorfius* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1856). A copy of this work is in the Houghton Library of Harvard University; among the previous owners are Ingram Bywater, editor of many celebrated Greek texts, and Falconer Madan, Bodley's Librarian from 1912 to 1919.
14. For this controversy, Elliott, *Codex Sinaiticus*, 123–131.

15. Elliott, *Codex Sinaiticus* 154-55.
16. *Athenaeum*, 7 December 1861, cited Elliott, *Codex Sinaiticus*, 145.
17. D. Williams, *The Warren Cup, British Museum Objects in Focus* (2006, repr. 2007); L. Giuliani, "Ein Kelch für Mr. Warren," *Zeitschrift für Ideengeschichte* VII/3 (Herbst 2013): 77-92; M. T. Marabini Moevs, "The Warren Chalice in the Imagination of its Creator and as a Reflection of its Time," *Bullettino della Comune Archeologica di Roma* 114 (2013): 157-183; L. Giuliani, "Der Warren-Kelch im British Museum: Eine Revision," *Zeitschrift für Ideengeschichte* IX/3 (Herbst 2015): 89-110.
18. A. G. Woodhead, "A Political Sherd," *Annual of the British School at Athens* 48 (1953): 191-9, especially 191 n. 1; L. Robert, "Sur un 'Tesson politique' de la fin du Ve siècle," *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1954): 494-505.
19. First edition: [T. Tyrwhitt, ed.,] *Poems, Supposed to have been Written at Bristol, by Thomas Rowley, and Others, in the Fifteenth Century* (London: T. Payne and Son, 1777). The third edition (T. Payne and Son, 1778) appeared under Tyrwhitt's own name with the sub-title given above; this "Appendix" also appeared independently (same publisher and date). *Alyfed*: Tyrwhitt, "Appendix," 328-9. Dr. Johnson's visit: G. B. Hill, L. F. Powell, eds., *James Boswell: Life of Johnson* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934): 3:50-51 (29 April 1776).
20. J. Bryant, *Observations upon the Poems of Thomas Rowley: In Which the Authenticity of Those Poems is Ascertained* (London: T. Payne and Son, 1781): 136-139.
21. On Johnson's dispute with George Macpherson, the forger of Ossian, *Boswell: Life of Johnson* (n. 19): 2:295-298 (7 February 1775).
22. C. Gallazzi, B. Kramer, S. Settis, eds., *Il Papiro di Artemidoro (P. Artemid.)* (Milan: LED, Edizioni universitarie di lettere economia diritto, 2008); L. Canfora, *The True History of the So-called Artemidorus Papyrus* (Bari: Edizioni di Pagina, 2007). R. Janko, *Classical Review* 59 (2009): 403-10, reviewing both the 2008 publication of the papyrus and two of Canfora's book-length attacks on it from 2007 and 2008, concludes that Canfora's case is "extremely strong," and adds arguments of his own; I am not convinced. Canfora's latest contribution is "I Dipinti di Manuel Panselinos e i Disegni sul recto del 'Papiro di Artemidoro,'" *Quaderni di Storia* 81 (2015): 305-12.
23. A convenient account of the Batson D. Sealing affair is at <http://evangelicaltextualcriticism.blogspot.com/2014/04/demotic-gospel-of-thomas.html> (accessed 15 July, 2015)