

haben nach und nach ein kohärentes Managementsystem entwickelt, das auf eine Mehrung des jeweiligen Vermögens abgestellt war. Die Buchführung lieferte dabei ein getreuliches Abbild des jeweiligen Besitzstands zu einem gegebenen Zeitpunkt. Dies galt sowohl für das öffentliche als auch private Rechnungswesen, das letztlich eine Reduktion des ersteren dargestellt habe. Die Art und Weise der Buchführung hat dabei für die prinzipiellen ökonomischen Ziele der Römer grundsätzlich ausgereicht, insbesondere, um Fakten festzuhalten, dieselben zu klassifizieren, die Fakten zu quantifizieren, Daten zu formalisieren, die Abrechnungen gegenüber Dritten vorzeigbar zu machen, die Dokumente für Schlußabrechnungen zu nutzen, die eigenen wie die Aktivitäten von Agenten zu kontrollieren und Entscheidungen vorwegzunehmen (349–352).

Manches an der Monographie ist eher gewöhnungsbedürftig. Dies gilt etwa für die eigenwillige Art und Weise der Gliederung der Arbeit, die neben Kapiteln und Unterkapiteln eine Durchnummerierung einzelner Schritte der Darlegung von 1–626 enthält, unter der jeweils einzelne oder mehrere Absätze zusammengefaßt werden. Auch der Umgang mit den Quellen hinterläßt bisweilen Unbehagen, werden doch gänzlich verschiedene Gattungen, die öfters auch noch aus sehr unterschiedlichen Zeiten stammen, ohne Bedenken in einen Argumentationsgang miteinbezogen. Insgesamt gilt aber dennoch zu konstatieren, daß M. als Spezialist für Buchführung eine Arbeit über das römische Abrechnungswesen vorgelegt hat, die das Interesse der wirtschaftsgeschichtlichen Forschung verdient. Dies gilt um so mehr, als in der Vergangenheit gerade auch die Buchführung als ein Argument für die vermeintliche Primitivität der antiken Wirtschaft genutzt wurde. M.s Monographie liefert allen Anlaß, solches kritisch zu überdenken.

Marburg

Kai Ruffing

Friedhelm Hoffmann, Martina Minas-Nerpel, Stefan Pfeiffer: *Die dreisprachige Stele des C. Cornelius Gallus*. Übersetzung und Kommentar. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter 2009. XI, 225 S. 14 Abb. 14 Taf. (Archiv für Papyrussforschung. Beiheft. 9.).

It is Cornelius Gallus the political figure, not the poet, who is at the center of this study, and in particular the stele he had erected on the island of Philae in 29 B.C. to commemorate his military successes while serving as the first prefect of Egypt after the Roman conquest the previous year. The stone was found in 1896 during official excavations and published the same year by Adolf Erman and Otto Hirschfeld in a short article. Although it has been the object of study by some distinguished scholars, it has not had a proper republication and commentary by an interdisciplinary team until now. (Indeed, there is hardly any relevant bibliography from 1902–1966, as it seems.) The editors have studied the original (Egyptian Museum, Cairo), photographs, and squeezes. The difficulty of their task is plain from the photos, which show how miserably difficult the poorly-preserved granite surface is to read (see www.uni-trier.de/index.php?id=25981&L=0, not the address given on p. viii, for these); the hieroglyphs are particularly difficult – also because of their «mangelhafte Qualität». The results are presented in an introduction, three major chapters, and a short conclusion, followed by very full and welcome indexes (not always found in the APF Beihefte) and a massive bibliography. One can only echo the conclusion of Giovanni Geraci's valuable review (BMCR 2010.11.03): «This is an outstanding and completely reliable work on one of the most important documentary sources on the beginning of Roman rule in Egypt.»

The introduction discusses the historiography of the stele, the career of Gallus and particularly his fall from grace and eventual suicide, and the archaeological context of the stele's discovery. Gallus' self-glorification and lack of respect for Augustus, as reported by Suetonius and Cassius Dio, have tended to induce a hindsight-driven interpretation of the stele as showing these characteristics – a major

obstacle to sober understanding of its contents, as it turns out.

The first chapter treats the relief in the upper part of the stone, long a subject of controversy. The precedents for the depiction of a victorious rider (essentially Greek and Hellenistic) and the defeated enemy beneath him (essentially Egyptian in inspiration) are traced in detail, the hieroglyphic inscription to the side reread, and a convincing argument presented that the rider is to be taken as Gallus. The parallels of the Satrap Stele of Ptolemy I and of the Raphia Decree are adduced. The scene would have different resonances to different audiences, and anyone attentive to the later career of Ptolemy son of Lagos might well wonder what message was being sent, but it is far from clear that Gallus' contemporaries would have been aware of the parallels (as the authors seem to suggest on 174). In the end, Gallus seems to be Octavian's agent, and the portrayal is not obviously disloyal.

In any case, the central question is one of agency: Whose representation of Gallus is this? The answer emerges from the meticulous analysis of the hieroglyphic text and its language in the next chapter: the priests of Isis at Philae. It is they who used familiar language drawn from 1500 years of 'historical' inscriptions about pharaonic deeds to produce this idealizing, abstract, «litaneiarartig» text. One misses here a citation of Willy Clarysse's article 'Ptolémées et temples,' in D. Valbelle and J. Leclant, *Le décret de Memphis* (Paris 2000) 41–65, showing that the trilingual decrees from priests under the Ptolemies were drawn up by the priests, not by the monarchs.

It was otherwise with the Latin text, on which the Greek seems to depend, analyzed at length in chapter 4. From it the authors conclude that here too we should see Gallus as well within the bounds of propriety and competence, imitating Octavian but clearly subordinate to him. They bring out similarities between the Latin text and the later *Res Gestae* of Augustus. (This commentary might have cited A. K. Bowman's remarks on Borexis in *BASP* 21 (1984) 34–35; and one would now cite Paul Heilporn's *Thèbes et ses taxes* (Paris 2009) for the sections of Thebes itself.)

It is curious that the synthesis (chapter 5) thus says of Gallus «beschloß er, seine

Siege mittels einer Stele auf Philae im Süden Ägyptens zu verewigen» (173). I would rather suppose that the priests took the decision, even if Gallus supplied the Latin (and Greek) text to be used, and drew up the hieratic *Vorlage* of the hieroglyphic text and the overall shape of the stele themselves. If the initiative had come from Gallus, surely the execution at least of the Latin and Greek inscription would have been better. The primary place and longer length and substantive independence of the hieroglyphics from the Latin also speak to the role of the priests in the project. One can more readily accept the authors' view that the inscription does not represent excessive arrogation of authority at Octavian's expense by Gallus, something easy to suggest in hindsight but unlikely to have been the reaction of the various audiences who might have seen this inscription on the southern border of Egypt in the few years that it stood before being reused; one wonders if it was in fact pulled down by the Meroite invasion a few years later. This fine edition places this important inscription in its proper context and will be of great service to future research on this period.

New York

Roger S. Bagnall

Markus Handy: *Die Severer und das Heer.*

Berlin: Verlag Antike 2009. 283 S. (Studien zur Alten Geschichte. 10.)

This book deals with the relationship of Septimius Severus and his successors with the army. The history of this period, which ended with the murder of Severus Alexander in 235, has always been a source of great interest to scholars and some believe that it was a turning point in the history of the empire, marking a move towards a kind of military monarchy after the principate established by Augustus, and in a sense preparing the way for the decline of the empire. This is exaggerated but undoubtedly these years had a significant impact on the Roman world, and the relationship of Septimius Severus with his army is crucial, especially if one version of his last words and advice to his sons is genuine: 'Enrich