

fortifications, les installations d'eau. Un développement important concerne les emplois de δημόσιος et de πολιτικός; la terminologie étant souvent imprécise, il faut recourir également aux concepts juridiques, même si la législation romaine est dans l'ensemble postérieure au III^e s. et souvent difficile à dater.

Au chap. II chacun des édifices donne lieu à une mise au point à partir des attestations papyrologiques complétées parfois par des textes juridiques et par ce que nous connaissons des mêmes bâtiments dans d'autres provinces de l'Empire. A propos du βουλευτήριον, siège des réunions du Conseil municipal (p. 53), il convient de signaler maintenant que le célèbre «petit théâtre» de Kom el Dik à Alexandrie a été reconnu comme tel (J. Ch. Balty, *Études et Travaux* XIII, t. 26, 7-12): on peut ainsi se faire une idée de ces édifices provinciaux, même s'ils étaient moins luxueux que le bâtiment frère de la capitale. Les gymnases et les bains, dont le rôle important dans la vie municipale est bien connu, occupent les p. 65 à 72. On notera le développement sur le κωμαστήριον, terme propre au grec d'Égypte dans l'état actuel de la documentation. Les fonctions de cet édifice, à la fois culturelles et économiques, restent difficiles à définir. Récemment l'archéologue D.M. Bailey a proposé d'identifier au κωμαστήριον une vaste construction proche du dromos du temple d'Hermès à Hermoupolis (*Ashmunein* 1983, p. 44 et *The Procession-House of the Great Hermaion at Hermopolis Magna*, in M. Hennig et A. King (Edd.), *Pagan Gods...*, Oxford, 1986, p. 231-7).

Le chap. III traite de l'administration et du financement des édifices publics. Le *status quaestionis* fait bien apparaître les nombreuses zones d'ombre qui demeurent, par exemple à propos du rôle des exégètes. Les papyrus montrant l'ingérence des autorités centrales (surtout le préfet) sont soigneusement analysés.

Le chap. IV s'intitule «Activité de construction des villes égyptiennes». On notera l'explication donnée à «la fièvre architecturale» du milieu du III^e s.: l'auteur résume les diverses théories émises à ce sujet en critiquant, à juste titre me semble-t-il, le vocabulaire pathologique utilisé pour caractériser ce phénomène. Il considère comme un facteur essentiel l'inflation, la dépréciation de la monnaie conduisant les municipalités à investir leurs richesses dans des bâtiments à usage public. L'explication laisse un peu perplexe dans la mesure où d'autres époques et d'autres cités ont connu un développement considérable de l'architecture publique sans qu'il coïncide avec une crise monétaire comparable. La conclusion est d'ailleurs nuancée puisqu'elle insiste sur la complexité du problème. Et n'avons-nous pas trop tendance à estimer l'ampleur de ces constructions en fonction d'une échelle économique moderne, alors que l'Antiquité n'avait sans doute pas les mêmes critères d'évaluation?

L'ouvrage achevé en 1978 devra être complété grâce aux nouveaux documents publiés depuis: par exemple aux quelques attestations de bains du prétoire (p. 50-1), il faut ajouter *CPR* IX 69, verso 11 — Le gardien d'honneur du gymnase, le παλαιστροφύλαξ, (p. 59 et n. 124), est attesté aussi dans *P. Berl. Leigh.* 39, 107 et dans *P. Strasb.* 847, II 37 et 848, II 5. Des interprétations ont été modifiées: ainsi l'on ne croit plus aujourd'hui que ἡ γυμνασιάρχης dans *P. Amh.* II 64, 6-7 désigne une femme gymnasiarque comme il est dit p. 91; le terme est considéré comme un équivalent de γυμνασιαρχία, la fonction de gymnasiarque (voir L. Casa-

rico, *ZPE* 48 (1982) 117-124). On pourra regretter que des raisons d'économie aient imposé des procédés d'impression aussi médiocres: papier de très mauvaise qualité, grec écrit manuellement, des lignes, sans doute corrigées sur le manuscrit, dactylographiées trop claires et parfois peu lisibles. Mais il aurait été dommage qu'une étude aussi utile ne soit pas mise à la disposition des antiquisants.

Université de Rouen,
Juillet 1988

G. HUSSON

* *
*

Guy WAGNER, *Les oasis d'Égypte à l'époque grecque, romaine et byzantine d'après les documents grecs. (Recherches de papyrologie et d'épigraphie grecques)*. Cairo, Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire, 1987. (27.5 cm., xxvi+435 pp., 44 pls., 5 maps). = Bibliothèque d'Étude 100. ISBN 2-7247-0050-3.

Massive though this book is, the reader is informed that it leaves out substantial parts of the original thesis: the inscriptions of Gebel Teir (D. Devauchelle and G. Wagner, *Les graffites du Gebel Teir*, *RAPH* 22, Cairo 1984), the ostraka from Doush (the first installment is H. Cuvigny and G. Wagner, *Les ostraca grecs de Doush*, fasc. 1, Doc. de Fouilles 24, Cairo 1986), and a prosopography (to appear "quelque jour" separately), along with photographs of the sites and archaeological remains. There are signs that despite updating here and there many years have passed between the last serious revision and publication (pp. 154-55, Wagner asserts that the *Dizionario geografico* of Calderini and Daris has reached only epsilon, when in fact it reached theta in 1975 and was at pi by 1983; he does not cite Pruneti's *I centri abitati dell'Ossirinchi* of 1981; see below on his redoing of work done in 1980 in *P. Genova* II). What remains after truncation and delay has still a great deal of interest to offer the reader.

Part 1 presents a summary list of the written sources used by Wagner. Despite the title, a few Demotic and Coptic texts are included (p. 6). Section 1 lists papyrological and epigraphic texts, ending with a table of contents to Part 2, where Wagner publishes "textes inédits" (pp. 19-110), while Section 2 lists Greek and Latin authors. Section 3 then presents a table of contents to Part 3, the long topographical and historical discussion that occupies pp. 111-407. The table of contents to the volume as a whole is naturally at the end. Part 1 could in fact have been eliminated, transferring the tables of contents to the start of their respective parts (where they would have been more convenient) and eliminating the bare lists, which have little use and are done inconsistently. For papyri, multiple editions are listed; for inscriptions, "la dernière publication". Apart from the Doush ostraka (the name is spelled 'Doush' in the publication and in the "Avertissement" here, 'Doush' everywhere else), two unpublished papyri used in this book but not published are listed on p. 6; but texts of both of them are in fact given (one in P.J. Parsons' transcription, with a few notes in English, on pp. 401-02; the other in J.D. Thomas' transcription on pp. 375-76 n. 3). The list of authors gives no indication of the contents of the references.

Part 2, despite its title of "Textes inédits", includes numerous previously-published texts, some known from

Wagner's own preliminary publications; the metrical inscription on pp. 48-50, however, figures in E. Bernard's *Inscriptions métriques* (1969), as Wagner notes, as no. 118. Part 2 in fact seems designed as a corpus of new and improved documentary texts from the oases except for papyri, i.e. including ostraka, graffiti, inscriptions, dipinti (oddly called 'depinti' throughout by Wagner), and wooden tablets.

The Large Oasis begins this part, and within it the Ptolemaic temple at Qasr el Ghoueita, with an inscription on the doorway to the hypostyle hall and a number of graffiti, mostly Ptolemaic. Part of these are already found in *SEG* 26.1763-1773; the inedita are nos. 3, 9, 14, and 16-18. As is customary in this volume, no apparatus is provided for differences between this edition and previous ones. (And, oddly, line numbers are never indicated.) All except 1-3, 8, and 13 are illustrated.

Next comes Chams el Din, the ancient Mounesis, a village of some 4 ha. located at a road junction, where a church yielded some graffiti, ostraka, and a wooden tablet. The photographic documentation is very uneven, with many of the graffiti shown on a single view of the ensemble of a wall, while the tablet (the writing of which is Wagner's evidence for a third-century date of construction for the church) is not illustrated at all. The date is a matter of considerable interest, and it is regrettable not to be able to confirm it, the more so as nothing else from the site seems earlier than the fourth century. Graff. 7 and 50 are similar but handled differently. In 7 Wagner reads $\mu\mu\eta\sigma\theta\eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ |\ \tau\omicron\pi\omega\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ |\ \epsilon\upsilon\sigma\kappa\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta\ \omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ |\ \text{Ἡράκλειος}$, translated "Souviens toi de ce lieu (saint) dans la maison bien ombragée de Dieu. Herakleios". $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\kappa\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta$ is taken as an error for $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, a hapax in Sophocles OC 1707. In 50, on the other hand, we find $\mu\eta\sigma\theta\eta\tau\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\pi\omega\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\theta\eta\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\upsilon\ |\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ \omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon\ |\ \text{Ἡρακλείδης}$ ('Ἡρακλείδης is presumably a misprint; the rho is clear on the plate) | A [Θεός] Ἰη(σοῦς) Χρ(ιστός) ὁ βοηθῶν τῶν πνευμάτων, translated "Souviens-toi, en ce lieu (saint), dans le kathesterion, dans la maison de Dieu, de ton esclave Herakleides. Un seul Dieu Jésus-Christ, celui qui secourt les âmes". Now in line 1 of 7, the correct reading (on the plate) is $\tau\omicron\upsilon$, and it seems that the omission of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ must be understood. At the end, I cannot see the last two letters of the name, and it seems likely that it stood (or should have stood) in the genitive, restoring the sense that 50 has. It is not that one is to remember this place when one is in the house of God, but rather that one is to remember the dedicant *here* in the house of God. What one is to make of the hapax adjective, I do not know. A simpler correction would be $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\chi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta$, but its point here eludes me (and the feminine form would equally be a solecism).

Ostrakon 2 is claimed to have a date by the era of Diocletian, but it is not clear why this must be a date at all. Ostrakon 3 is (despite Greek words) Coptic, though it is printed mostly in Greek. In Ostr. 4 we find the name Paneus, making Wagner's insistence on taking Taneus in Graff. 61 as an ethnic rather perverse.

The Christian necropolis of Bagawat (just outside Hibis, but on none of Wagner's maps) is represented by inscriptions and graffiti, but we are later told (p. 363) that this Greek material is a small fraction of what was found; the 95 percent in Coptic is being published separately. The Dakhleh oasis offers a handful of inscriptions, after which

Wagner publishes a wooden tablet, in Oxford, which lists 80 soldiers in a cohort stationed at Hibis in 326.

Next comes the Small Oasis. Fakhry reported substantial finds of ostraka, but they have not been able to be located; a few photographs have turned up. These, however, have offered one item of substantial interest, a system of dating using an era year which Wagner argues must be that of Constantius II, the first of the two years used in normal Oxyrhynchite era-year dating (the other being Julian's count). Years from 51 to 89 (374/5 to 412/3) occur. Wagner points to *PSI* 783 as another instance of the same phenomenon. The Small Oasis was heavily dependent on the Oxyrhynchite Nome; why it used its era but not in the same way is hard to say. The ostraka published from photographs here are in many cases difficult to read, with formulas neither well-known nor simple. A monk appears in O. Bahria 6 (374/5). O. Bahria. div. 1 (p. 104) is an interesting letter to an abbot; it offers a number of difficulties not satisfactorily resolved but which I cannot address here.

The massive historical section is rich in information, bibliography, and insights. A first section treats ancient images and views of the Oases, as they are seen by literary sources. Then comes a long "Géographie humaine" treating history and terminology, the desert roads, cities and villages, and population and onomastics. The third part is on administration and economy, the fourth on religion and the military. I will single out a few points of interest, but they are only a tiny sample of the wealth of material presented. Ancient writers present in general a favorable view of the oases, islands of fertility and population in a sea of sand; on the other hand, they were used for places of exile and in Christian writers have a bad image derived from this and from the desert around them. The Large Oasis because of its size (the settled parts were about 150 km. in length) had links to many places in the valley (Abydos, Lycopolis, Hermonthis, Latopolis, Apollonopolis Magna), in contrast to the Small Oasis, which is very closely tied to the Oxyrhynchite and only more distantly to the Arsinoite. It is a pity that the inadequate maps do not give us any concrete sense of the verbal description of the desert routes provided by Wagner on pp. 152-53, most of which do not figure on Map 1 (the orientation map).

The oases, particularly the Large Oasis, seem to have been very heavily fortified. Place after place, the salient physical remains are those of a fortress, even for small villages. It may be that the exposure of these villages to attack from the desert, never far away, and their isolation from the valley of the Nile, made security a far more pressing threat than elsewhere.

An extensive onomastic discussion is based largely on the unpublished Prosopography, not to mention large numbers of unpublished Doush ostraka. It is therefore hard to check assertions. Wagner points out the large number of classical Greek names reappearing in the third and fourth centuries. This is not, I think, a phenomenon peculiar to the oases. Theophoric names are extremely common, particularly those based on Apollo, Zeus (in the Small Oasis), and the Theban triad. A substantial local repertory of names compounded from Hibis is distinctive in the Large Oasis, which in general has more individuality and more hapax legomena than the Small Oasis. It must be emphasized (as Wagner points out on p. 245) that it is often difficult to tell

what persons are Oasite and what visitors or soldiers. With the heavy military presence, in fact, much of what we see may reflect the onomastic character of the valley areas linked to the Large Oasis rather than the oasis itself. There are many points of detail about which one might raise questions. For example, Wagner claims (p. 235) that Ταχῶς (SB X 10551.7) is a by-form of Τεχῶσις, the feminine name *Ta-Hnsw*. Is it impossible that we have the form Ταχῶς, attested for a king of the 30th Dynasty in Greek sources? (Cf. *Pap. Lugd. Bat.* XXI, p. 395 on Pachos/Paos). He describes Σεναμοῦνις as a variant of the masculine Ψεναμοῦνις; but it is also well known (and commoner) as the feminine counterpart ("the daughter of Amun") of Psenamounis and is listed as such in Preisigke's *Namenbuch*.

Little of the section on administration presents much novelty; the offices and their functions are well known in the Nile valley. One striking item, however, deserves notice, a πάγαρχος in an ostrakon dated to a sixth indiction which is probably 407/8 (perhaps 422/3), firmly anchored by its belonging to an archive other texts of which use the Oxyrhynchite era by Constantius II mentioned above (pp. 103, 271). Wagner variously describes this as an "assez haute mention" and "une des toutes premières mentions" of the pagarch; he assumes (apparently unaware of the long controversy over the nature of the pagarch's office) that he was simply the successor of the *praepositus pagi*. So far as I can see, this is the first attestation of the office before the sixth century; a more developed discussion would have been worthwhile.

The economy of the oases depended on irrigation from wells, a very different situation from the valley of the Nile, where the annual inundation was the central fact. Though wheat was grown, barley seems to have been more common, and there is ample evidence for import of wheat into the oases (especially the Small Oasis, from the Fayum). Wagner notes that *O. Doush* 51 provides more evidence for the growing of cotton. The unique contribution of the oases, however, was the exploitation of their alum deposits (pp. 306-09). Much of our evidence for the oases concerns travel to and from them, naturally enough given their location. (Wagner's remarks on pp. 311-12 seem to betray ignorance that the ἀνά/κατά distinction is routinely used for travel up into the desert regions from the valley and back down to it. Nor do we need to accept the claim, p. 318, n. 1, that donkey prices were twice as high in the oases; this is based on a mistaken evaluation of the price evidence). The section on the economy closes with a reedition of *P. Genova* I 20+P. Med. inv. 68.82, apparently unaware that a joining and reedition of these two pieces already appeared in *P. Genova* II, pp. 73-75, in 1980, with (for the most part) better restorations. Wagner argues that the oases were major centers for the sale of slaves, but it is hard to see that the evidence is enough to support this assertion.

In the area of religion, Amun was the preeminent god of Hibis, with a cult spread widely in the Large Oasis; at Kysis, however, Sarapis and Isis are central. The evidence for the early spread of Christianity in the Large Oasis is strong, including the evidence of *P. Grenf.* II 73 that there were Christians among the νεκροτάφοι by the late third or very early fourth century. The Oasis is in fact our best source for these specialists in the later period. The account is a bit vague on the crucial question of the date of

conversion of pagan temples into forts and of the date of the ostraka found in the temple at Doush.

The army is hardly attested with explicit documents in the oases until the time of Diocletian; but after that time our evidence is rich. The forts themselves, however, in many cases go back before the tetrarchy and even to the first century. There are interesting maps (pp. 388, 389, 393) of the links of military units, installations, and routes.

Even this lengthy review barely scratches the surface. There are certainly quirks enough to irritate any reader, along with places where the author has perhaps lost his perspective as a result of long acquaintance with the oases. But it is hard to think of any other book in which the historian of Roman Egypt finds the evidence for one region so extensively collected and analyzed, and the comprehensiveness of Wagner's interests (coupled with the sheer hard work which added so much new material to the dossier) brings us in the end to a breadth of understanding that is exemplary. It is no cause for unhappiness that the tremendous acceleration of the exploration of the oases in recent years will make parts of this book out-of-date very quickly; the foundation Wagner has provided will not soon lose its great value.

Columbia University
New York, July 1988

ROGER S. BAGNALL

ASSYRIOLOGIE

REALLEXIKON DER ASSYRIOLOGIE UND VORDER-ASIATISCHEN ARCHÄOLOGIE, Band 7, Lieferung 1/2 S. 1-160. Herausgegeben von Dietz Otto EDZARD. Berlin und New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1987 (24 cm., 160 S.). ISBN 3110104393. DM 108,-.

The first half of the *Reallexikon* stopped midway in the twelfth letter of the alphabet (cf. *BiOr* 42, 1985, 636-638) and the second half begins with volume 7 and the entry "Libation", by W. Heimpel *et al.* At 12 pages, this is one of the more substantial entries in the fascicule. Heimpel *et al.* also treat the lion (Löwe) in 14 pages. Lugalbanda is dealt with in 16 pages by C. Wilcke, who tentatively accepts my interpretation of the first Lugalbanda epic as an etiology of the carnivore diet (p. 123); on this interpretation see meantime my detailed treatment in the Frank Cross Festschrift (1987). Other divine names beginning with the element Lugal occupy the better part of 30 pages contributed by J. Bauer, M. Stol and especially W.G. Lambert. But the biggest single entry is on literature ("Literatur", 41 pp.), contributed by the editor, D.O. Edzard (Sumerian), W. Röllig (Akkadian) and E. von Schuler ("Literatur bei den Hethitern"; not considered here). The following remarks are devoted to this essay.

Edzard begins by defining literature as the corpus of linguistic works of art (das "Sprachliche Kunstwerk", p. 35), and thus excludes such genres as omens, lexical and other lists, medical texts, most prescriptive rituals, and recipes; Röllig (p. 48) adds mathematical and astronomic