

le pain des oblations ou du sacrifice, ce qui suggère que βρέπιων (= βρέβιον) καθαρ( ), l. 1, se référerait à des καθαρ(ων; sc. ἄρτων) ou à la καθαρ(ουργίας), pains blancs ou fabrication de pains blancs, plutôt qu'à la καθάρ(σεως) au sens de Reinigungsarbeiten. N° 69, comptes de matériaux de construction pour une église et des établissements de bains; noter le mot de dérivation obscure στοιλλάριον, se rapportant à une quantité fixe de briques. N° 70: une résolution τῶν ὀφειλ(όν)τ(ων) δ(ο)θ(ήναι) paraît plus «naturelle» que ὀφειλ(ημά)τ(ων) δ(ο)θ(έντων). N° 74,1: lire ἄββ(ᾱ) Βάνου α[ au lieu de Βανᾱ[. Le contexte, notamment la l. 3, laisse à penser qu'il y a là une allusion au monastère hermopolite de ΑΠΙΑ ΒΑΝΕ (Βάνος) déjà attesté par Ryl. 320, situé dans la bordure désertique à l'ouest de Hūr, et portant encore le nom de Dayr Abū Fānā, ou, alternativement, celui de Dayr al-Sulbān, d'après sa magnifique décoration de croix peintes (voir M. Martin, *BIFAO* 71 (1972), 119-24). N° 76, le haut d'un rouleau fiscal; je lis, col. iii,1, τὰ ἀνυσθ(έντα) δ(ι) ἐμοῦ et non τὰ αὐτὰ δο(θέντα) Μ(ε)χ(εῖρ); de même, col. iv,a, ligne qui paraît avoir été en fait le titre de l'ensemble du document, je crois qu'il convient de substituer λόγο(ς) σὺν θ(εῶ) τῶν ἀνυσθ(έντων) δημο(σίων) ἱε ἰ(ν)δ(ικτίονοσ) à τῶν ἀγγ(ώνης) ἐκ( ) δημο(σίων) κτλ. En v,1, après δο(θέντα) ou δό(σις) (cf. *P.Lond.* V 1673 *pass.*) [Α]θύρ, lire ἀνυσθ(έντα) δ(ι)[ἐ]μ[ι](οῦ) au lieu de ἀνυ( ) δ( ) ἰ[. Le verbe ἀνύω au sens de «lever les impôts» est surtout attesté dans des textes de l'époque arabe ce qui fournirait un élément de datation pour notre document. N° 77, distributions de Kollouthos aux ἀλλόφυλοι, Fremdstämmigen, et aux cuisiniers. L. 3, νο(μίσματα) β π(αρά) η (sc. κεράτια) et non π(αρά) κ(εράτια) ε; l. 5 νο(μ.) η π(αρά) κδ et non β π(αρά) κ(εράτια) δ; l. 8 νο(μ.) ς π(αρά) κδ et non κ(εράτια) δ; trois lignes omises, dont je ne peux transcrire que les deux premières τῶ ἱματιοπώλ(η)<sup>10</sup>νο(μ.) θ π(αρά) κζ. Ces «minorations» de 3 ou 4 carats par *solidus* invitent à placer notre texte vers la fin du 5<sup>e</sup> ou le début du 6<sup>e</sup> s. (voir les tableaux de Frösen, *CPR* VII, p. 158). Le caractère de l'écriture, d'autre part, autorise cette datation. N° 78: l'éd. a relevé dans cette quittance la première attestation papyrologique de la plante aromatique κόστος. N° 79, un ἐπίσταλμα τοῦ σωματισμοῦ, ou demande de transfert de bases d'imposition à la suite d'une mutation foncière, attribué au 6<sup>e</sup> s. et adressé, comme il est d'usage à Hermopolis, au διαστολεύς. Ce document est le plus ancien que nous ayons pour Hermopolis. Il fait encore état de la vieille catégorie cadastrale de l'ἰδιωτικὴ γῆ. Noter aussi que le bien est grevé d'une quantité proportionnée de terre ἡπειρος (μετὰ τῶν<sup>7</sup> αἰρούτων τῆς ἡπείρου). L. 3, des deux lectures proposées par l'éd., je crois que la mieux adaptée serait μονάζ(ων) et non μονα(χός).

Je remercie vivement Diethart d'avoir bien voulu relire mon manuscrit.

Paris-CNRS, septembre 1985

JEAN GASCOU

\* \*

André BERNAND, *Les portes du désert. Recueil des inscriptions grecques d'Antinooupolis, Tentyris, Koptos, Apollonopolis Parva et Apollonopolis Magna*. Paris, Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 1984 (28 cm., x + 348 pp., 68 pls.). Price: 480 F. ISBN 2 222 03416 7.

With this volume, the corpus of the Greek inscriptions of Egypt undertaken 32 years ago by the Bernand brothers reaches a formidable 14 volumes<sup>1)</sup>. Previous installments covered the western Delta, the Fayum, the Upper Egyptian desert, the Colossus of Memnon, and Philae, plus the metrical inscriptions from all of Egypt. Even with the exclusion of those sites covered by monographs by others,<sup>2)</sup> E. Bernand looked forward, eight years ago, to another 14 or so volumes covering Alexandria, the central and eastern Delta, and four valley stretches: the apex of the Delta from Terenouthis to Memphis; from Memphis to Lykopolis; the Theban region; and from Thebes to Syene.<sup>3)</sup> *Les portes du désert*, conceived by André Bernand as a kind of companion to the three desert volumes, stands curiously outside of the basic geographical conception of the corpus: unjustifiably so, I believe, for the inscriptions of this volume are as much a product of these towns as valley metropoleis as they are of them as desert gateways. Inclusion of them in the proper section would have made more sense.

The prospect of a 28-volume corpus of Greek inscriptions of Egypt (not counting non-Bernand volumes) is a bit daunting in bulk and cost. It raises, for me, the question of the *raison d'être* of the corpus. The principal justification must of course be to place inscriptions in a series, in a context of their place of origin and its culture — language, institutions, names, and environment. Secondarily, though not trivially, corpora allow the reader to find texts more conveniently than by reading scattered publications, especially if the editor provides good indexes. (The more volumes produced, of course, the more indexes to be checked, not a negligible drawback.) From the second point of view, even a mediocre corpus can render services, and while the organization of the index to this volume is not to my mind felicitous, the index is at least reasonably full.

But what of the context? Egypt is certainly a land for which the grand comprehensive corpus of everything is an impossibility: to include travellers' reports, excavations, coins, and all of the documents would be beyond the powers of any scholar, so great is the mass of papyri. A. Bernand has (reasonably enough) not included the papyri (and there are no coins). But while an epigraphic corpus of Egypt can scarcely be expected to include papyri, it is more perplexing that they are scarcely cited or used. This singular failing, noted by Jean Bingen,<sup>4)</sup> in dealing

<sup>1)</sup> So E. Bernand in his general account of the project in *ZPE* 26 (1977) 95-117 at 115; A. Bernand, in the preface to the present volume, counts the same works as 15, "sans vouloir faire entrer dans cette évaluation le livre sur *Alexandrie la Grande*."

<sup>2)</sup> See E. Bernand (above, n. 1) 105-07; they include Gebel Silsile, the Memnoneion of Abydos, the Valley of the Kings, the Temple of Hatshepsut, the graffiti of Medinet Habu, Hibis, and the Nubian temples.

<sup>3)</sup> (Above, n. 1) 115-16. He was already counting the present volume as finished but not yet published.

<sup>4)</sup> In his magisterial review in *Cd'E* 59 (1984) 359-70 at 360. The reader is referred to this review for many texts not discussed in the present review. One may compare the description of Letronne's work by L. Robert in *Op.Min.Sel.* III 1676-77.

with a land where the inscriptions are only a small part of the Greek documentary evidence, makes the commentaries here unprofitable reading for the most part. Epigraphy is isolated and thus deprived of its proper usefulness.

If the volume brought us a substantial harvest of unpublished texts, we might look on the failings of the commentaries with more equanimity. The concordance, however, alleges only six unpublished texts, and one of these has been shown by Bingen not to be so.<sup>5)</sup> Of the remaining five, one (10) is part of the ephobic dossier discussed later; one (41) is a fragment of no value; and a third is a block with the inscription ἡ πόλις ἡ Τεντυριτῶν, about which Bernard comments (I quote in full), "C'est avec une inscription de ce genre que fut identifiée la ville de Naucratis dans le Delta." True after a fashion: the Naukratite text (*Les confins libyques* II, p. 751) is a statue base, as the Tentyrite stone no doubt also was (though Bernard does not say so), but the rest of it survives intact, unlike the Tentyrite.

The other two new texts are of some real interest: 15 is a dedication (no dimensions given, for some reason) from Antinoopolis to a dioiketes by M. Aurelius Sarapion alias Hierakapollon, agonothetes, gymnasiarch, prytanis, and councillor.<sup>6)</sup> And 62 is a dedication from Koptos to Isis, from the reign of Nero (as Bingen has shown<sup>7)</sup>), which ends with three lines of Demotic (mentioned in the description but not in the text: there is no indication that any Demotist was consulted).

The new texts, then, are scarcely worth the price of admission. But surely, it will be suggested, just having these texts, carefully checked and reedited, between one pair of covers is worthwhile. And that is true to a great extent. But is regrettable to have to say that the texts are often unreliable in detail, occasionally in larger matters. To the examples discussed in Bingen's review I shall add only a few from the dossiers of ephobic inscriptions which, as Bingen points out, include not only 5-10 but also 16-18, 21-22 (which Bernard did not recognize as such) and even *SB* I 4962 and 4965, which Bernard omitted entirely (though *SB* I 4961 appears as 69).<sup>8)</sup> P. Cauderlier (cited by Rigsby [n. 8] 240 n. 7) adds *SB* I 4982 and 5980, also not included in this corpus.<sup>9)</sup>

A check of 5 against the clear plate shows (1) that Bernard rarely uses dots under letters even where needed; (2) that square brackets are used erratically (omitted often, with vague dashes representing loss; put at left

sometimes even where the margin is unknown but as if it were known); (3) that diaereses and separators are omitted from the text and reported (incompletely) only in quotations (in the physical description) from earlier editors, while in no. 9 separators are printed in the text, and (4) that there are several other small inaccuracies.<sup>10)</sup>

More such small errors, and less excusable still, come in 9, where all that was necessary was to reproduce the extremely precise text of Rigsby published in 1978.<sup>11)</sup> Rigsby's restorations at left, carefully calculated, are dumped with abandon in favor of supplements which provide wildly uneven line lengths.<sup>12)</sup> Letters invisible on the photograph are printed,<sup>13)</sup> superfluous letters are inserted,<sup>14)</sup> what Rigsby read is omitted,<sup>15)</sup> brackets are omitted or misused,<sup>16)</sup> there is no indication of text now lost on the Marseille fragment (shown by Rigsby with underlining), there is no apparatus (this on the grounds "ne voulant empiéter ni sur l'article de K. Rigsby, ni sur la thèse de Patrice Cauderlier.") In short, no progress, only a lot of little steps backward. Such examples could be multiplied, but the results would not be very interesting.

André Bernard closes the preface to this volume with these words: "Connaissant les défauts et peut-être les erreurs de notre œuvre, nous demandons à nos critiques de nous reconnaître à tout le moins une qualité: la persévérance." No one can deny that, nor the enormous amount of work (much of it in Egypt) that has gone into these volumes. If it were only a matter of a few defects or errors, it would be not only uncharitable but unjust to criticize, for even the best scholars make plenty of mistakes. But one is not required to praise the results of perseverance when they are not good. This volume brings together sites which belonged in different volumes; it provides texts which are unreliable, commentaries swollen with repetition and banality but vitiated by ignorance of the papyri, and an abundant photographic documentation, all at a huge cost in time, effort, and money. The gain in convenience is of some benefit, but in other respects little of the profit to be derived from a good corpus is to be had from this volume.

Columbia University  
New York

ROGER S. BAGNALL

\* \*  
\*

<sup>5)</sup> *Cd'E* 59 (1984) 355-58; it is no. 103 here.

<sup>6)</sup> In line 2, read ]ρον, in line 6, πρύτανις. The M. Aurelius name is not an infallible indicator of a post-212 date (as Bernard claims). In a truly bizarre remark, Bernard (p. 99) blames P.J. Sijpesteijn for not including this man Sarapion in his 1967 list of gymnasiarchs: "plus soucieux de dénigrer les travaux d'autrui que de rechercher les textes inédits, ignore évidemment notre gymnasiarque." Just how Sijpesteijn was to guess that these fragments were in the Cairo Museum is hard to say, but this *ad hominem* remark (born of resentment over Sijpesteijn's review of *Pan du désert* in *Cd'E* 52 [1977] 375-77) could hardly have a less appropriate target than such an indefatigable editor of papyri!

<sup>7)</sup> *Cd'E* 59 (1984) 366.

<sup>8)</sup> *Ibid.*, 361-62. I am not wholly persuaded that two distinct dossiers are involved, preferring (with K.J. Rigsby, *GRBS* 19 [1978] 224) to see them all as "pieces of the revetment of a wall of the gymnasium at Antinoopolis" (in Rigsby's words), no doubt inscribed over a period of time.

<sup>9)</sup> It is a sad irony that it was by A. Bernard that Rigsby was directed to Cauderlier.

<sup>10)</sup> There are traces before νης in line 1; in 2 read Κολλ[ο]ύ[θου]; in 3, Ἀρειος has only one rho, not two; cf. Bingen (above, n. 4) 361 on line 6, where I see part of the upsilon: Τρ]υφαίνης. On p. 75, Bernard claims that Πασίων is an Egyptian theophoric name on Isis, "typiquement Egyptien." It is not, but rather a good Greek name (one of many Πασι-derivatives). The superficially similar Πάσις is Egyptian, but it is a diminutive of Πετοσίρις, not an Isis name: cf. P.W. Pestman, *Pap. Lugd. Bat.* XX, p. 47, citing H. De Meulenaere in *Cd'E* 38 (1963) 215.

<sup>11)</sup> *GRBS* 19 (1978) 239-49; text at 241, with a plate far clearer (though smaller) than the washed out one in *Portes*, pl. 12 (he does not, unlike Rigsby, present a handy photo-collage).

<sup>12)</sup> E.g. line 2, omitting ἐπί at the start of the date (yielding some peculiar syntax), or line 8, where the name [Ἀντί]ν[ο]ς is restored rather than its more likely compounds.

<sup>13)</sup> Line 4, upsilon of [ἔ]τους; line 9, nu in Σαραπάμω[φο]ς.

<sup>14)</sup> Line 14, Ἀφροδείσιου and Δημητριούτος; the plate shows clearly that they are phantoms.

<sup>15)</sup> Line 18, trace before εσιων; iota at end of line.

<sup>16)</sup> Line 19 is seriously misrepresented.