

REVIEWS

Papiri della Società Italiana, volume sedicesimo (PSI XVI) n° 1575-1653, a cura di Guido Bastianini, Francesca Maltomini, Gabriella Messeri. Edizioni dell'Istituto Papirologico "G. Vitelli," 1. Firenze: Firenze University Press, 2013. xxviii + 346 pages, 56 plates. ISBN 978-88-6655-382-3.

The volume under review contains both (para)literary texts (nos. **1575-1617**) and documents (nos. **1618-1653**); some of these texts are re-editions of previously published papyri. **1575** (LXX, Amos, 6, 9-10) appears to be a fragment of a book-roll and may derive from a Jewish rather than a Christian milieu. **1576**, the re-edition of PSI inv. 3779, contains a fragment of Cyril's ὁμιλίας ἑορταστικάι (no. 9), read during the celebration of the Epiphany, in which he announces the date of Easter for the year 421. Given that the first column is complete, the text of this homily can be reconstructed as comprising ca. 20 columns. Other points of interest: in 1.2 τὰ οἴσπερ is preferable to οἴσπερ of the manuscript tradition; at 1.3 the reading ἔχει confirms Burns' emendation (against Migne's ἔχειν); at 1.4 the papyrus clearly transmits αὐτόμαρτυς, a word found elsewhere in Cyril's writings, as against αὐτὸς μάρτυς of the tradition; at 1.5 the papyrus transmits the correct εἰσβήσεται instead of the corrupt εἰσρήσεται; at 1.19 the papyrus offers a different word-order (τὰ τοιαῦτα φαίη τις ἂν ἀρρωστήματα) that is to be preferred to φαίη τις ἂν τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀρρωστήματα of the tradition.

1577, the re-edition of inv. 295, transmits *Physiologus Graecus* 41-2. It probably derives from a roll and was written *transversa charta*. This papyrus is the oldest preserved testimony of this text. The part preserved in **1577** can be compared with that of the *redactio prima* (second-fourth centuries CE), but does not follow any of the five classes of manuscripts corresponding to this *redactio*. The editor (Marco Stroppa) provides detailed comparisons with these five manuscript classes as well as the ancient translations (Latin, Ethiopian, Syriac, Arabic), and offers an *exempli gratia* reconstruction at p. 25.

A few shorter pieces of archaic epic poetry follow. **1578** contains *Il.* 2.850-65 and presents some (not unusual) corruptions of proper names or other scribal errors, while it is possible that a variant may be lurking at verse 861: the papyrus transmits πα[, whereas the vulgate has καὶ ἄλλους.

The *recto* of this text contains a documentary text (not published). **1579**, whose *recto* also preserves a documentary text (not published), offers another fragment from the *Iliad* (6.486-97). Contrary to the previous text, this one contains *prosodiai*, *diãreseis*, and *stigmai*. The scribe is the same as the one who copied *PSI* 11.1185 (from Kom Ali el-Gamman at Oxyrhynchus) that preserves *Il.* 6.498-529. Furthermore, this hand appears similar (if not identical) to that of *PSI* 11.1188 + *PSI* inv. 1621 and 1870 *verso* (= *PSI* *Il.* 21), preserving *Il.* 10.9-18, 550-79 and also written on the *verso* of a roll found at Kom Ali el-Gamman; on onomastic grounds both must be of Arsinoite origin. The editor suggests that the two rolls may be associated with Sarapion *alias* Apollonianus, an Oxyrhynchite citizen who functioned as strategos of the Arsinoite, and later of the Hermopolite in the first half of the third century CE. **1580** consists of two fragments deriving from a parchment codex containing *Il.* 16.394-406 and 435-48. There are *prosodiai* and a *diãresis*. Traces of writing are visible on the top margin of the *recto* (*variae lectiones?*), but are not clear enough so as to determine their content. The same is true for the top margin of the *verso*. Verse 402 has been omitted. **1581**, a small fragment of a book-roll, gives the ends of *Il.* 327-31 of *Od.* 22. Part of Hes. *Th.* 7-13 with a few lectional signs is found in **1582**.

Historical prose is found in **1583–1595**. **1583** preserves part of Herodotus 7.1.2; it may derive from an edition of Herodotus made at Oxyrhynchus and seems to have been copied by scribe A7.¹ In l. 4 *καὶ πλοῖα* may have been omitted as in C. **1584** is a fragment of a roll and contains Thucydides 1.23.6 (*verso*) and 1.26.3 (*recto*); the *verso* is a mirror-text caused by traces of ink, the papyrus having been rolled after the text had been written. The hand is the same as in *P.Oxy.* 57.3879, three papyrus fragments containing parts of Book 1 of Thucydides; our text is to be placed a little before fr. 2 of *P.Oxy.* 3879. The left margin of the *verso* contains a note that refers to the text of the preceding column (1.25.4 or thereabouts). Parts of Thuc. 2.4.4-5 are preserved on **1585** that, as far as one can surmise based on its extreme fragmentary state, does not depart significantly from the medieval tradition, apart from *ἔριψ[αν* at l. 3 and *ἄλ]λος* at l. 11. Also of interest is the reading *οὐ* at l. 9 found also in ABFGM³, adopted by modern editors instead of *οἱ* (C). **1586** transmits part of Thuc. 2.85.3. **1587** consists of three fragments that contain parts of Thuc. 4.12.3 (fr. 1, col. 1), 4.13.3 (col. 2), 8.96.5 (fr. 2), and 8.109.1

¹ For this scribe see W.A. Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus* (Toronto 2004) 21-22 and 260-262.

(fr. 3), copied by the Oxyrhynchite scribe B5.² Part of Thuc. 4.133.3-4 is preserved on **1588**; the hand is identified with that of the scribe of *P.Oxy.* 18.2181, an edition of Plato's *Phaedo*. Of interest is the reading ὄτ' ἔφυγεν transmitted by the papyrus in l. 12, which is considered superior to ὄτε ἐπεφύγει of the medieval tradition; and l. 13 presupposes the variant τοῦ θέρους τούτου instead of the medieval tradition's τοῦ θέρους ἡδῆ. **1589** (Thuc. 5.42-43) belongs to the same roll as *P.Erl.* 9 that contains 5.47.4-6. **1590**, possibly by the same scribe who copied *P.Oxy.* 61.4110 (Thuc. 8.73), transmits Thuc. 6.2.2-3. More Thucydides (part of 7.86.3-4, 87.2) is preserved in **1591**, a re-edition of inv. 1862. It is noteworthy that at 1.8 the papyrus must have agreed with B against the rest of the tradition by reading δ]ιὰ (τοῦτο). **1592** is another re-edited piece that contains traces of seven lines of text from Thuc. 8.50.4-5.

1593 preserves three fragments that together with *PSI* 11.1197, fr. C and *P.Oxy.* 2.226 derive from a roll that contained book 6 of Xenophon's *Hellenica*. **1593** transmits parts of 6.2.28, 3.5-6, and 5.7-8. The same scribe also copied *PSI* 11.1197 fr. A-B (from a different bookroll of a similar format), containing Book 5. **1593** fr. b col. 1, l. 11 gives πρῶ]τοις against πρῶτος of all the codices. **1594** is a fragment from Xen. *Cyr.* 5.5.44-5. It agrees for the most part with the manuscripts of the *y* family, while it presents a hitherto unattested variant in l. 12 (συνδόξη instead of συνδόξαι in all codices except the *z* family that offers συνδοκῆ). Lectional signs (accents, breathings, quantities, hyphens and *hypodiatolai*) were added at a later stage with different ink. Xen. *Cyr.* 8.2.6 is preserved on **1595**, which does not show any divergences from the manuscript tradition.

Three papyri containing Isocrates follow. **1596** preserves part of Isoc. *Ad Nic.* 16.3 and does not present any new variants. **1597** (which transmits part of *Paneg.* 58-9) and **1598** containing *Hel.* 11 are re-edited with minor improvements made possible through restorative work on the papyri and their examination under a microscope.

The following seven pieces contain fragments of Demosthenes. In **1599**, a fragment of Dem. *Ol.* 1.2-4, l. 4 may preserve in the form of correction a variant (χρήσασθαι) that is not attested elsewhere in the tradition. **1600** is a papyrus scrap containing a few letters from Dem. *Chers.* 31-2. Some letters from Dem. *Chers.* 51 (= *In Phil.* 4.27) are preserved in **1601**. A few letters, distributed over seven lines, are also preserved from *Cor.* 29 in **1602**. **1603** preserves part of *Adv. Lept.* 126 and is notable for the fact

² Johnson (n. 1) 31-32 and 64.

that a) it transmits in ll. 7-10 a different word order than that of the *paradosis* (πῶς οὐκ ἀσεβέστατον καὶ | δεινότατον ἔργον | πράξουσιν); and b) in l. 11 it transmits ξμοιγε with F, in contrast to the entire *paradosis* that offers γοῦν ἔμοι. A few letters from Dem. *Adv. Lept.* 131, distributed over nine lines of text, are transmitted in **1604**. **1605** contains part of Dem. *In Andr.* 15. This fragment, which belongs together with PSI 11.1203, does not offer any variants with respect to the *paradosis*. **1606**, another re-edited text, preserves a fragment of Dem. *In Timocr.* 83-4; in l. 4 the papyrus offers the variant ἠνέχθη, which is to be rejected in favor of εἰσήχθη from the medieval *paradosis* and BKT 9.71, the other papyrus that (in part) transmits the same oration. The oldest testimony of Plu. *De coh. ira* (1, 452f) is **1607**, dated to the second century CE. Together with *P.Harrauer* 1 it attests the diffusion of Plutarch's works outside of mainland Greece even during the author's lifetime. No new readings are offered by this papyrus; of note are l. 7, where the text agrees with all the manuscripts (ἀφιστάντες) against L (ἐφιστάντες), and l. 8, where the word-order (πολλάκις τῆ κρίσει) agrees with G against the rest of the tradition (τῆ πολλάκις κρίσει). More Plutarch (*Quaest. Conv.* 4.660-71) is found in **1608**. The two new fragments published here (PSI inv. 1960, 1995 = **1608**, fr. 7-8) belong to the same roll as *P.Oxy.* 78.5156 fr. 1, PSI inv. 2055a, *P.Oxy.* 78.5156, fr. 2, *P.Oxy.* 28.2481, fr. 6, PSI inv. 2055b, and *P.Oxy.* 28.2481, fr. 7 (= **1608**, fr. 1-6, respectively). Fr. 8 now allows a reconstruction of the column distribution of the text, while the preservation of a title in col. i of the same fr. raises questions regarding the articulation of the text and the antiquity of the titles.

The remains of two columns from a work on the Ionic dialect are preserved in **1609**. The first column transmits the rules for the nominative and genitive singular endings of first-declension masculine nouns. The importance of this papyrus lies in the fact that the formulation of these rules can be shown to resemble closely those found in some Byzantine dialectological treatises (family II), which indicates that some of the rules found in these medieval treatises had already been formulated by the second century CE. The treatise to which these fragments belong may have discussed other dialects as well. **1610** contains two small fragments from what appears to be a *Logos Basilikos*, with a possible reference to the Tetrarchs and Diocletian. **1611** is too fragmentary to allow any certain identification; nevertheless, its editor carefully advances the hypothesis that it might be part of a commentary. Fragments from a parchment codex containing a doxographic account akin to the *placita philosophorum* wrongly attributed to Plutarch are transmitted in **1612**. The vocabulary

and the topics treated are reminiscent of Aristotle. The *recto* contains a discussion on the forms of generation that departs from that found in Aristotle, *Metaph.* 1032^a12-30, since it states that a τέχνη can generate plants or animals, which in Aristotle is possible only ἐκ φύσεως. On the *verso* we find part of a discussion on the αἴτια: l. 4-9 (or 10) contain the αἴτιον ποιητικόν and may have been preceded by the discussion of the αἴτιον ειδικόν, with the ὕλικόν preceding at the end of the *recto* and the τελικόν following after l. 9 (or 10) of the *verso*; for these cf. Arist. *Ph.* 194^b23-35 = *Metaph.* 1013^a24-35.³ **1613** contains the fragment of another parchment codex. Titles or offices starting with ἀρχ- are listed from at least l. 6 of the *recto* on; the *verso* contains proper or place names beginning with β-. With the exception of l. 4 and 11 *verso* (possibly also l. 16 *recto*) the words appear in alphabetic order. Dots separate the columns in ll. 7-17 *verso*. The traces in ll. 1-5 *recto* and 12-17 *verso* appear to represent Coptic; also the word ἀρχήπλασμα (*recto*, l. 10) is attested only in a Coptic text. The text probably derives from an educational context, and it must have been an exercise or notes (explanations) following literary texts, some Greek and others Coptic. Fragments of two works concerning stenography are contained in **1614** and **1615**, a stenographic commentary and a stenographic glossary, respectively. Part of a glossary of words denoting body parts in Greek and Demotic is transmitted in **1616**. The section of the volume containing literary and paraliterary texts concludes with the re-edition of a wooden tablet inscribed with the letters of the Greek alphabet arranged vertically in six columns (**1617**).

Nos. **1618-1653** contain documentary texts. Of these **1618-1625** are from the Hermopolite nome and belong to the archive of the house of Kom Kassum, as is argued chiefly on paleographical and onomastic grounds. **1618** preserves the beginning of a petition by Nearchos son of Eudaimon from Hermopolis to Antammon, the *strategos* of the Hermopolite. **1619** and **1620** preserve parts of letters, **1620** being written on the *verso* of **1619**, probably as a short reply to it. The author of **1619** must be Eudaimon Sr. or Eudaimon Jr., son of Hermaios. Noteworthy in **1620** is the presence of a large letter resembling a Θ (double in size with respect to the rest of the writing) after the concluding ἔρρωσο; is it perhaps a monogram? **1621** is a register of (tax) payments, and **1622** is the beginning of a contract of purchase of land, which in l. 5 preserves a hitherto unattested place name of the Hermopolite (Ἄννις). **1623** is a fragment of a receipt for the payment

³ On p. 137, at “*in Ph.* IX, p. 10, 35 -11,2 Diels” read “*cause matérielle*” after ὡς ἡ ὕλη.

of ἐκφόρια. The beginning of a private letter by Hermaios to his father Eudaimon containing the προσκύνημα-formula is transmitted in **1624**, while **1625** offers a private letter from Hermaios or Hermas, possibly belonging to the archive of Sarapion, in which the addressee asks the letter's author to send him hay for his cows.

Nos. **1626-1629** contain parts of petitions. In **1626** Antoninos Soterichos denounces in a petition (in the form of a *hypomnema*) to the *strategos* of the Themistos and Polemon districts of the Arsinoite nome some unknown characters who invaded his courtyard and treated him violently. Part of a *hypomnema* addressed to the *bibliophylakes* of Oxyrhynchus is preserved on **1627**. A fragment of a petition to the *praeses* of Aegyptus Herculia is transmitted on **1628**. In **1629** we have part of a petition to Flavius Ioseph, the πατήρ πόλεως of Oxyrhynchus, regarding some money owed to Aurelius Origenes by a certain Isak from the same city.

1630 contains fragments of minutes of official proceedings; given that a large portion of the text has been lost, it is impossible to reconstruct its contents. That we are dealing with minutes is suggested by the abbreviation εἰπ(). This may have been either a single sheet of papyrus written on both sides or may have formed part of a papyrus roll, the *verso* used when the scribe ran out of space on the *recto*. A document containing summaries/accounts pertaining to seven χρηματισμοί, in this case the transfer of real estate, is preserved in **1631**. This document has a previously unattested personal name (Τανγεῖνος, l. 6) and place name (Θέμις, l. 10). **1632** is a receipt for the payment of the *laographia*-tax, written by the same scribe as *P.Hamb.* 3.204-205 and *P.Harr.* 2.180-186, 189. **1633** contains an order to the *sitologoi* of the village Tholthis to transfer a quantity of barley from the private amount of a certain Apollonius *alias* Chosion to the *hydroparchoi* of Kerkeurosis. **1634** preserves part of a receipt of grain. On account of the mention of μέτρον παραλημπτικόν the document is thought to have been drafted in the Oxyrhynchite or Hermopolite. **1635**, written on the *recto* of **1627**, is the registration record of a slave purchase.

1636 contains a contract of lease between a monk from Oxyrhynchus and a carpet-weaver, who rented from the former two contiguous rooms and an *aithrion* at the Nemesios quarter, possibly to be used for conducting his trade. The beginning of a contract drafted in Oxyrhynchus is preserved in **1637**. The son's name of one of the contracting parties (Ioseph) and the name of the other party (Aurelia Sophia) are preserved, but nothing is known about the topic it concerned. A receipt for the payment in kind of ἐκφόρια is the content of **1638**. Part of another receipt, possibly

for the payment of salary in two installments by a *praktor* (?) named Philippos, is preserved on **1639**.

Two receipts from the dossier of the monastery of Apa Sabinos follow (**1640** and **1641**). In **1640** Horos acknowledges receipt of forty-five myriads for private use. **1641**, addressed to Ioulianos the *diakonetes*, acknowledges receipt of eighty-five *artabai* of grain; the first five (rather than six, as mentioned on p. 243) lines of the document were crossed out. **1642** contains a list of payments and **1643** an encrypted list of clothing items and foodstuffs. The title of the latter document is written in Latin (*Breuium [Jation = ἱματίων*), while the letters of the alphabet are substituted as follows: (a) the letters from α to θ are substituted by their numerical values, but backwards (from 9 [θ] to 1 [α]), skipping 4 (δ) and supplying ζ instead; (b) the letters ι to π are substituted by the symbols of the decades, from 90 to 20, omitting 10 (ι) for which *koppa* is used; and (c) for ρ to ω 900 to 200 are used, replacing 100 (ρ) with *sampi*. The inclusion of perishable food items suggests that this list was not simply an inventory but a catalogue of items that were going to be shipped or, alternatively, that they were part of luggage to be taken on a journey along with provisions.

1644 is a report of grape harvest. It consists of two parts, of which the first contains incomplete notes, while the second is the final draft of the document; both parts were kept and joined by means of a connecting papyrus strip on the *verso*. The further interest of this piece lies in the occurrence of the terms φακτωνάριος (cf. πακτωνάριος ‘cargo boat’) and the hitherto unattested φαντωνάριον. **1645** contains a private letter, while **1646** (written on the *recto* of **1642**) transmits part of the beginning of a letter of a soldier of the *legio II Traiana fortis* to a certain Aurelius son of Apollonius of Oxyrhynchus. Of interest is the nomenclature of the legion (Τραϊανή, Γαλλιηνή?, Ουαλεριανή Ἴσχυρά). **1647** contains part of a business letter (its opening and conclusion are missing). Some workers, whose number and degree of specialization remain unclear, are asked to assist a previously named man. They are to send two *kraters* of wine to the mistress of the family (οἰκοδέσποινα), when they “open” (ἀνοιξ[ητε, l. 6) the χωρίον, presumably an enclosed plot of land in which the vineyard mentioned in the letter must have been located. The mention of water before the papyrus breaks off may hint at the instruction to the men to wash the implements used in the production of wine. An extremely fragmentary private letter is transmitted in **1648**. Of some interest is the presence of ἀποπληροῦν (l. 9) and πρυταν[(l. 10). **1649** is a note containing the wishes of a schoolmaster (Paulos, son of Silvanos) addressed

to a student of his who completed his studies. A fragment of a letter addressed to a *presbyteros* is preserved on **1650**. There are several errors and linguistic particularities, while little can be made of its contents. **1651** contains part of a letter of complaint for the failure of the delivery of some goods by the agreed upon deadline. In **1652** we have part of a business letter. Of interest is the abbreviation $\pi()$ at the beginning. Another business letter, in which a certain Phoibammon asks his brother to keep apart 50 *artabai* of grain is the content of **1653**; the letter also mentions the *speculatores*.

The usual set of indices rounds off the volume. These are followed by a series of appendices containing an updated list of the inventory numbers of all the *PSI* papyri published outside of the *PSI* series, the publications in which these editions appeared, a list of the editors of these texts, as well as an index of the identified literary authors and the libraries or museums housing the papyri edited in *PSI* 1-16. As expected, the editions are of high quality and the accompanying introductions and commentaries extremely illuminating.

Newcastle University

Athanassios Vergados

Iain Gardner, Anthony Alcock, and Wolf-Peter Funk, *Coptic Documentary Texts from Kellis, Volume 2: P. Kellis VII (P. Kellis Copt. 57-131)*. Dakhleh Oasis Project: Monograph 16. Oxford and Philadelphia: Oxbow, 2014. 366 pages + 18 plates + CD-ROM. ISBN 978-1-78297-321-6.

This second volume of texts, translations, commentaries, and images from the well-known discoveries at Kellis completes the publication of Coptic documentary materials found there.¹ Taken together, these two volumes represent the vast majority of all fourth-century Coptic letters discovered to date. Moreover, the Coptic materials from Kellis offer different perspectives than most other extant Coptic letters, which are mostly related to monastic contexts. Scholars have already shown how these texts shed light on the Manichaean community in Kellis, affording “a unique insight into the social and economic relations of a sectarian group within a Late Antique village” (14).² The introductions and commentaries on the new volume’s materials also supplement our historiography by “redressing the imbalance caused by reading the history of fourth-century Egypt from [only] Greek, male, urban or monastic sources Here there is a voice for the indigenous population, women are very visible, and the experience of life on the (supposed) periphery, i.e., the Oasis and the village, weighs against the preponderance of sources from metropolitan centres and seats of authority, whether ecclesiastical or secular” (15).

The volume is excellently produced, reliable in transcription and translation, and user-friendly. Its introduction is a bit short (12 pages) but does address a number of questions and difficulties raised by the collection: writing surfaces, Greek-Coptic bilingualism, determination of genre, indicators of Manichaeism, the relatively abundant presence of women in the documents, and the perhaps related focus on textile production in Kellis. The editors confidently date most of the materials to the quarter century from 355-380 CE, while the half century from 340 – 390 CE would cover a few outliers from one part of the site (“Group 3”). The relatively limited time frame “gives a satisfying and rather tight chronological context, and one that corresponds to broader historical changes during the decades leading up to the accession of Theodosius” (6).

¹ The first volume is I. Gardner, A. Alcock, and W.-P. Funk, *Coptic Documentary Texts from Kellis, Volume 1: P. Kellis V (P. KellisCopt. 10-52; O. KellisCopt. 1-2)*, Dakhleh Oasis Project: Monograph 9 (Oxford 1999).

² Cf. J.-D. Dubois, “Greek and Coptic Documents from Kellis: A Contribution to the History of a Manichaean Community,” *Journal of Coptic Studies* 15 (2013) 21-28.

Each of the 75 entries contains inventory number, location of discovery, details about the state of preservation, a short summary of content, a list of personal names therein, Coptic text, English translation, and commentary on matters of restoration, orthography, syntax, or vocabulary. The book's back matter includes selected plates and a CD-ROM of photographs for all items, along with abundant indices (with individual Coptic words translated even in the index, for the sake of those consulting the book without lexica at hand).

Many who use this collection will do so in order to study Manichaeism in Egypt. Both volumes include "authors who expressed their Manichaean faith explicitly" along with those whose Manichaean "connection" can be inferred from certain terms or phrases.³ Though there are fewer Manichaean letters overall in volume 2, the "prize letter" of the collection is written by "the Teacher" (61), whom the editors reasonably interpret as "the leader of the Manichaean community in Egypt" (29).⁴ While the content of the letter is not especially memorable, the sender's identity is noteworthy and fills out the collection of Manichean documents from Kellis.

Other groupings of texts show familial relationships that can be fairly well understood in conjunction with the prosopography of the Coptic materials in volume 1 and the Greek papyri from Kellis. As with most familial letters from the period, the authors are primarily concerned with news about health (or its loss), the sending of goods (and complaints about goods that did not arrive), requests about relatives (or demands that relatives be dispatched), fretting about untrustworthy couriers, and other details of business. Yet amid these quotidian domestic and economic matters, there are flashes of spiritual language that distinguish some of the letters from other documentary papyri of the period. For example, the letters of Pamour and Maria are primarily concerned with setting the price for certain commodities and other business dealings, but they also include invocations to "the Father, the God of truth" to keep the author(s) "healthy in the body, flourishing in the soul, and rejoicing in spirit, safe from all the temptations of Satan and the adversities of the evil place" (71, cf. 65). At the same time, a letter of condolence from Philammon to Theognostos, concerning

³ On the challenges of determining religious identity of authors and recipients in documentary papyri, see M. Choat, *Belief and Cult in Fourth-Century Papyri* (Turnhout 2006).

⁴ Covered earlier in I. Gardner, "A Letter from the Teacher: Some Comments on Letter-Writing and the Manichaean Community of IVth Century Egypt," in L. Painchaud and P.-H. Poirier (eds.), *Coptica – Gnostica – Manichaica. Mélanges offerts à Wolf-Peter Funk* (Louvain 2006) 317-323.

a death in the family, does not display any particularly spiritual sensibility about salvation or hope for resurrection, where we might expect it (80, cf. 115).

Overall, the Coptic archive from Kellis is impressive for its state of preservation (with many almost complete letters), the distinctive religious content of its materials, the abundant number of female senders and recipients (about 40% of the letters include a woman's name), and the relatively secure date of the collection. With volume 2 of the collection, the editors have completed a signal contribution to the field of Coptic papyrology and the history of fourth-century Egypt.

Fordham University

Michael Peppard

Malcolm Choat and Iain Gardner, *The Macquarie Papyri I: A Coptic Handbook of Ritual Power (P. Macq. I 1)*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013. xiv + 146 pages and CD-ROM. ISBN 978-2-503-53170-0.

In *A Coptic Handbook of Ritual Power* Malcolm Choat and Iain Gardner provide an edition of a lengthy invocation that is accompanied by drawings and twenty-seven different prescriptions or spells. In total, these (Sahidic) Coptic texts comprise sixteen pages and are preserved in a twenty-page parchment codex that was acquired by the Museum of Ancient Cultures at Macquarie University (Sydney) in 1981.

The edition begins with forty some pages of introduction. They first thoroughly describe the parchment codex itself. After briefly detailing the acquisition of the codex, Choat and Gardner provide an insightful discussion of the codicological features of the object that includes a diagram of how the codex was assembled as well as a discussion of the binding. This is followed by a detailed assessment of the paleography, date, and provenance of the codex as well as its dialect and orthography. Recognizing some of the inherent problems with Coptic paleography, Choat and Gardner judiciously date the codex to the seventh or eighth century CE and cautiously propose that the dialect suggests an origin in Upper Egypt in the vicinity of Hermopolis.

The introduction next seeks to explain and situate the different texts preserved in the codex. The principal ritual text of the codex, which forms a distinct unit and occupies the first twelve pages, is generically identified as the “Invocations Text” by Choat and Gardner. It begins with an invocation to the mysterious Baktiotha, but also invokes a host of diverse figures that include Abrasax, Jesus, Abraham, Moses, and David as well as various angels and archangels and *nomina barbara*. To help elucidate this rather enigmatic invocation Choat and Gardner compare it to ms. British Library Or. 5987 (= *P.Lond.Copt.* 1.1008) and P.Berol. inv. 5527 (= *BKU* 1.23) because they include a number of distinct parallels. Even though these two texts are considerably shorter, it is clear that they emanated from a similar milieu as they share distinct terminology and phraseology and also begin with an invocation to Baktiotha.

As part of this analysis Choat and Gardner further note that portions of the “Invocations Text” manifest distinct Christian elements, which lead them to cautiously speculate that a monastic context is a logical candidate for the production of the text. Yet they are quick to point out that the text appears to have undergone various recensions and that Christian elements appear to overlay earlier elements. Therefore, they postulate that

underneath the later Christian accretions is an earlier “‘more gnostic’ original” (p. 31), but admit that there are terminological and theoretical problems with such a categorization. Consequently, they identify some of the latent features of the text as Sethian and proceed to point out various parallels that the text shares with Sethianism in terms of its general cosmology. This is of course quite significant as it is thought that Sethianism had effectively died out centuries earlier.

From here, the discussion and analysis shifts from the “Invocations Text” to the twenty-seven numbered prescriptions that follow and stretch from the end of page twelve through page sixteen in the codex. According to Choat and Gardner the “Invocations Text” was at some point combined with a set of ritual prescriptions and a new product was brought about, that is, the ritual handbook. Thus, by combining the “Invocations Text” with the prescriptions the handbook became, “a more complete instrument of ritual power.” The twenty-seven spells at the end of the handbook are generally quite pithy and cover a wide range of purposes. A number of the spells deal with cures for maladies, and include demonic possession, sickness, warts, spleen problems, or the staunching of blood. While some of these prescriptions are strictly material as they instruct the practitioner to apply or ingest a particular substance (oil, wine, water, rose oil, and so on), others stipulate that some ritual act is to be performed or some verbal invocation is to be uttered.

The edition of the text that follows the lengthy introduction is skillfully presented and there is a facing English translation on the opposite page. On page twelve of the codex there are a series of drawings that take up most of the page and in the transcription these are skillfully reproduced with the Coptic carefully inserted at various places so as to reproduce as well as possible the appearance of the actual codex page; the same is done for the English translation. Following the transcription and translation Choat and Gardner provide a “Continuous Translation” of the text followed by a line-by-line commentary. This is followed by two appendices where a new transcription (and translation) is given for ms. British Library Or. 5987 and P.Berol. inv. 5527 and then a series of comprehensive indices. The book concludes with photographic plates of the parchment codex in color and there is also a CD-ROM in the back cover that includes high-resolution digital images.

Choat and Gardner have produced an exemplary edition, and this volume has much to offer beyond the presentation of a previously unpublished text. The depth and breadth of the scholarship found in this volume will surely make it attractive to many working on texts of “ritual power”

(that is, magic) because it synthesizes such a wide range of scholarship and advances the discussion in various ways. Power words, esoteric terms and phrases, and enigmatic figures are treated with proficiency and depth, and previous scholarship is succinctly presented and treated. This is certainly the case with the discussion of the mysterious figure Baktiotha, who is invoked at the start of the text; while the conclusions reached by Choat and Gardner might not appear convincing to everyone, every effort was made to elucidate this figure. On this latter point it may be noted that when suggestions are put forward regarding some aspect of the text that is not entirely certain or is open to alternative points of view, Choat and Gardner, to their credit, advance such suggestions with caution and restraint.

Another strength of this volume that will certainly appeal to many is the number of parallels from other texts that are constantly invoked throughout to help elucidate a reading or some feature of the text. Choat and Gardner are to be commended for the thorough treatment of this text and the copious parallels they provide. On this front their new editions of ms. British Library Or. 5987 and P.Berol. inv. 5527 in the appendices are certainly welcome as they improve upon previous editions. Additionally, having access to high-resolution digital images of the codex via the enclosed CD-ROM will be beneficial to many who want to take a closer look at the text.

Despite the many exemplary features of the overall edition, there are a couple of places where some improvement could still be made. For example, the series of drawings on page twelve of the codex could probably have been given a little more explanation and analysis in the commentary and the reference to "Antioch" in the "Invocations Text," the only toponym mentioned in the entire treatise, could have benefitted from more discussion. Nevertheless, these are fairly minor points and overall this is an exemplary edition both in terms of its contents and overall aesthetic presentation. Because of the way Choat and Gardner examine and clearly present these texts both scholar and student will certainly be able to glean much from this useful volume.

Brigham Young University

Lincoln H. Blumell

James G. Keenan, J.G. Manning, and Uri Yiftach-Firanko (eds.), *Law and Legal Practice in Egypt from Alexander to the Arab Conquest: A Selection of Papyrological Sources in Translation with Introductions and Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. xxix + 598 pages. ISBN 978-0-521-87452-6.

This volume offers a source-based introduction to the world of legal papyrology. The goal is twofold: to integrate the study of legal papyri into the wider field of ancient history and to introduce legal historians of other periods to this rich body of source material. With both broad thematic overviews and in-depth discussions of individual texts, this work is a landmark achievement and a much-needed guide to the intricacies of law and legal practice in Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Egypt.

The volume consists of ten chapters, including an introduction and nine thematic chapters in which 221 documents are translated and discussed. Each thematic chapter opens with a jointly-authored introduction before individual authors discuss particular topics pertaining to the broader theme. In order to cover as much ground as possible, the editors enlisted the support of 33 scholars, in addition to their own substantial contributions. Since the contributing scholars were given free rein to address their respective topics, the volume is marked by a diverse array of styles, ranging from essay-like to encyclopedic.

The introductory chapter contains a brief historical sketch of the Ptolemaic, Roman, and Byzantine periods, and a longer overview of the key legal developments during this time. Sandwiched in between is a section devoted to the historiography of legal papyrology, from L. Mitteis and U. Wilcken's *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie* volumes to the more recent work of H.J. Wolff and P.W. Pestman in the respective fields of Greek and Demotic law. With the exception of a brief reference to ongoing research based on papyrus archives, this section misses the opportunity to highlight current projects in the field and their possible impact. Overall, the introduction treads ground familiar to the papyrologist (as one would expect), but students and newcomers to the field will find here a handy guide to the development of the legal papyrology and its key areas of research.

Chapter two concentrates on how the “form, content, and administration of legal documents” developed over the millennium of Egyptian history covered by the volume. This topic has been one of U. Yiftach-Firanko's key areas of research, and he accordingly provides a well-informed summary of the evolution of certain types of Greek contracts in Egypt (2.1),

amply illustrated by 11 documents.¹ Next come shorter sections devoted to describing the key Demotic contract types (sales, cessions, and loans) and Greek loans (2.2-2.5). T. Kruse then provides a guide to the key sources on archives and registration procedures in Roman Egypt (2.6).² The closing section by T.S. Richter is nominally devoted to Byzantine sales but is actually a more wide-ranging discussion of the form and style of contracting in Late Antique Egypt – both in Coptic and in Greek – including remarks on the rhetorical quality of Byzantine records, which the author insists must be connected “to contemporary social realities.”

Chapter three is headed “The Languages of the Law” but tackles a wider array of topics than the title implies. In 3.1, K. Vandorpe provides an accessible overview of the Dryton archive, whose depth and variety provide one of the rare opportunities to peek behind the veil of Ptolemaic legal ethnicity and attempt to grasp the complexity of ethnic identity in this period. In the next section, Brian Muhs draws on his extensive experience with the legal environment of early Roman Soknopaiou Nesos and Tebtynis to introduce three bilingual contracts. Roman law in Egyptian documents is the subject of a skillfully-constructed contribution from J.G. Keenan, headed by the famous will of C. Longinus Castor. Keenan uses a series of documents produced in the context of Roman law to illustrate the “implications of the will itself, in effect constituting a commentary on the will.” Finally, in another essay-like and engaging section, Richter examines the socio-linguistics of Greek and Coptic in the Byzantine period, taking a thematic rather than a document-based approach.

Chapter four focuses on family law, with sections on marriage, divorce, Romanization, the category of “fatherless” persons, deeds of last will, and intestate succession. The chapter opens with a nod towards family archives, but not much use is made of them here. Following a short section on marriage contracts, J. Urbanik offers a lengthy discussion of divorce, which discusses the normality of divorce, the format of divorce settlements, and the relationship between practices found in the papyri versus imperial legislation. The selection of documents, mostly of the Byzantine period, includes not only settlements themselves, but also petitions and a courtroom speech. A. Arjava’s section on Romanization focuses on guardianship and *patria potestas* and includes a variety of documents from the transitional third century CE.

¹ The author notes the omission of bank contracts (*diagrapheis*) and Alexandrian *synchoreseis* from his discussion but does give a reason.

² Note the new interpretation of the εἰκονιστάι in 2.6.1 (= *P.Oxy.* 1.34 v^o); see M. Depauw, “Physical Descriptions, Registration and εἰκονίζεσθαι with New Interpretations for P. Par. 65 and P. Oxy. I 34,” *ZPE* 176 (2011) 189-199.

Chapter five concentrates on contracts of loan under the general heading of “capital management.” The first section, by the late T. Markiewicz, is devoted to an overview of the Egyptian tradition of loan documents (5.1), which is complemented by Vandorpe’s discussion of Greek loans of the Ptolemaic period (5.2). Next, F. Lerouxel draws on his recent body of work to introduce a diverse set of loan documents from the Roman period. Noteworthy here is the inclusion of a private letter – an underexploited type of document in this volume – in which a son writes to his mother about the repayment of a debt and the redemption of pawned clothing. The next and longest section of this chapter is H.-A. Rupprecht’s overview of real security in the papyri. As Rupprecht notes, our understanding of real security (and other aspects of Greek law) is hindered by a lack of theoretical precision in the Greek legal tradition, but this did not thwart the development of a complex legal tradition and set of practices shaped largely by “documentary scribes who were able to deal directly with the changing requirements of economic life,” rather than jurists (5.4). Of great service in this section is Rupprecht’s detailed exposition of the procedures for execution against a debtor’s property, which draws on *BGU* 14.2376 (5.4.6).³ The final section brings together a group of documents that are technically loans, but which most scholars agree served other purposes: e.g. antichretic arrangements, whereby the occupation of a building or use of land is granted in lieu of interest, or the so-called *paramone* contract, which provides for personal service to the creditor. Only one document in this chapter is later than the third century CE, and Byzantine-period developments only receive brief mention in the introduction.

Chapter six moves to the realm of sale, with a full array of documents from the early Ptolemaic period to the Byzantine and even Islamic period. The introduction includes brief remarks on the evolution of Egyptian sales and the form and content of sales in the Greco-Roman period. M. Depauw and J.G. Manning introduce the distinctive Demotic “sale” and “cession” document types, which could be used flexibly for a range of transactions (6.1 and 6.2). É. Jakab then turns to the different forms of Greek sales of real property, including agoranomic instruments, *grapheion* contracts, and *cheirographa*. Not mentioned is the fact that the sale of a house 6.3.2 (= *P.Oxy.* 4.719.13-29) is embedded within an application for registration (δημοσίωσις) of the deed in the Archive of Hadrian in Alexandria. The next section moves on to sales of movables, with R.S. Bagnall rightly questioning the motivation for drawing up such documents, which is not

³ For a late witness to this procedure, see now P. Heilporn, A. Martin, N. Sojic, and N. Vanthieghem, “Papyrus du Musée du Caire. VIII,” *CdÉ* 89 (2014) 113-123 (no. 19).

always apparent. Another peculiarity is the near absence of such documents from the Ptolemaic period, a bias most likely due to uneven survival of the evidence rather than indicative of underlying developments. Included in this section are five sales of animals (6.4.1-5) and three more unusual sales: of a loom, a dining couch, and wood (6.4.6-8). Before moving to later periods, Yiftach-Firanko offers an overview of the *katagraphe*, or state registration of sales, a procedure which the Ptolemies inherited from rapidly-evolving Greek legal practice of the fourth century BCE. Each document in this section is explained in detail and well contextualized. 6.5.1 is confusingly titled “sale of land,” even though the author of this section makes it abundantly clear that the contract itself was not a conveyance (cf. also 6.5.3); “agreement to sell” would be more appropriate. Finally, Richter collects a group of sales in Greek, Coptic, and Arabic spanning the sixth through eleventh centuries CE.

Chapter seven turns to the topic of leases, which are preserved in abundance from all periods under discussion – about 1,500 in Greek alone, to which can be added over 40 Demotic contracts on papyrus, 60 Coptic leases, and 62 Arabic leases, not to mention rent receipts and other documents that offer further evidence. The introduction to this chapter is the most in-depth of the volume and provides an excellent orientation to the historical development of leasing arrangements in Egypt. The corpus of Demotic leases is given a thorough treatment by C.J. Martin, with discussion of the documents’ key features and circumstances under which they were drawn up, along with four examples. Although somewhat out of place in this chapter, the next section, by D.J. Thompson, nicely illustrates the transition from limited tenure to full ownership of cleruchic land.⁴ Greek leases of the Ptolemaic and Roman periods are abundantly illustrated by eleven documents introduced by J. Rowlandson and R. Takahashi. These include straightforward leases of land but also documents that demonstrate the flexibility of the Greek *misthosis*, such as the earliest *misthapoche* (7.3.8 = *P.Turner* 25) and the lease of a pottery (7.3.10 = *P.Oxy.* 50.3597). Richter closes the chapter with a selection of Greek, Coptic, and Arabic leases from the seventh to tenth centuries. While Coptic leases are closely modeled on their Greek counterparts, Arabic leases evince a much different tradition, which comes to eventually influence

⁴ On 7.2.5 (*P.Haun.* inv. 407), see now K. Ryholt, “A Greek-Demotic Temple Archive from Edfu Dating to the Reign of Ptolemy VIII,” *ZPE* 190 (2014) 173-187, and D.J. Thompson and K. Vandorpe, “Prostima-Fines and Crop-Control under Ptolemy VIII. BGU VI 1420 Reconsidered in the Light of the New Schubart-Column to P. Haun. inv. 407,” *ZPE* 190 (2014) 188-198.

Coptic contracts as well (7.4.7 = *P.Lond.Copt* 1.487). Noteworthy in some leases of this period is reference to verbal arrangements that complemented the sparse terms of the written contract (7.4.2 = *O.Crum Ad.* 15; 7.4.7 = *P.Lond.Copt.* 1.487).

The subject of the following chapter is labor, or rather “the contractual relationship between laborers and employers.” Oral or customary arrangements are obviously much more difficult to track in the surviving record, although it is not quite true that they “escape us entirely” – private accounts, for instance, give us some insight into the tasks and remuneration of day laborers. Nevertheless, the world of written contracts, even if it represents a small slice of all labor arrangements, is rich and varied. Ptolemaic labor contracts (8.1.1, S. von Reden) generally concern agricultural work, although the contract for the manufacture of a wagon yoke and a basket is an interesting outlier (8.1.2 = *P.Corn.* 4). A. Jördens’ selections from the Roman and Byzantine material include contracts for vineyard irrigation, labor in an oil mill, tending pigs, transporting manure, making tapestries, wet-nursing, and flute-playing during the vintage. The liturgical demands of the Roman state could even be contracted out, as 8.2.7 = *P.Oxy.* 38.2859 illustrates. A special case of dependent labor, the Oxyrhynchite *enapographoi georgoi (coloni adscripticii)* of the Byzantine period, is well presented by B. Haug with four examples, including a Roman contract that anticipates some of the features of the later labor arrangements (8.3.1 = *P.Oxy.* 14.1692).

Slavery is the topic of chapter nine. The Ptolemaic section (9.1, R. Scholl) focuses on state regulations concerning slaves and includes excerpts of civic laws and royal decrees regarding registration of house-born slaves and taxes to be paid on sales of slaves. J.A. Straus highlights continuities in the Roman period but notes that the Romans’ new status divisions directly affected slaves, who followed the status of their master (thus a slave of a metropolite would be charged a lower poll tax than a free villager in the same nome). The selected documents illustrate some standard administrative procedures regarding status, the *anakrasis* to determine slave status before sale and the *epikrasis* needed to admit a slave into the privileged fiscal group of his master, as well as an interesting household arrangement in which a free woman and a slave have three children together. Y. Rotman argues for the continued importance of Egyptian slavery into the Byzantine period, in line with K. Harper’s recent monograph.⁵ The documents selected, including the famous case of Martha in

⁵ K. Harper, *Slavery in the Late Roman World, AD 275-425* (Cambridge 2011).

sixth-century Aphrodito (9.3.3 = SB 18.13274), offer an intimate and emotional look at the blurry boundary between freedom and slavery in the Byzantine period.

The final chapter examines “the relationship between state institutions and the administration of justice.” The judicial systems of Egypt are marked by their diversity: no ruler attempted to unify the diverse set of laws governing the land, settling rather for clarification and expansion. Ptolemaic contributions to law were mainly in the realm of fiscal and administrative matters, supplemented by the common law of Greeks, Egyptians, and other social groups (*politeumata* are discussed in 10.2). J.M. Modrzejewski illustrates various stages of judicial action before the *chrematistai* (royal judges) and discusses the famous royal order demarcating their jurisdiction from that of the native judges (*laokritai*) (10.1.4 = *P.Tebt.* 1.5.207-220). B. Palme provides an excellent overview of legal proceedings under the Romans, a topic much in need of a new synthesis. The selected texts highlight the variety of officials, both civilian and military, who could be granted authority to conduct a trial, and each is preceded by a detailed introduction. In order to illustrate criminal procedure in the Roman period, Keenan constructs a “virtual” case through the compilation of documents stemming from different stages of a complaint, from the petition to a hearing before a magistrate. The intermediate stages are represented by an application for medical examination, a doctor’s report, and warrants. This artificial dossier is instructive as to procedures, but, as Keenan notes, does not reflect the balance of evidence, which comes mostly from petitions. In the final two sections, G. Schmelz and C. Kotsifou discuss the role of clerics and monks as judicial arbiters and mediators.

The back materials include a concordance of texts translated, a short reading list of introductions to papyrology in English, a fairly extensive glossary of technical terms, and bibliography. A subject index is lacking, which is only partially compensated for by the detailed table of contents. An *index locorum* of texts discussed but not translated would also have been helpful.

Difficult editorial decisions come with a volume of this magnitude. Certainly, the “legal practice” of the volume’s title takes precedence over “law.” On the whole, contracts comprise the great bulk of evidence that the editors draw upon to demonstrate “how people used legal texts in ‘negotiating daily life’” (p. XXII). The limited inclusion of state regulations is justified on the grounds that the editors wish to deal “less with the normative than with the actual functioning of law on the ground” (p. 4). Even within the category of “legal practice,” however, sacrifices had to

be made. The relatively few reports of legal proceedings are surprising, since this was surely the most dramatic display of how law functioned “on the ground.” Reasons of space, however, kept the editors away from famous cases like the trial of Hermias, despite its being “one of the most remarkable legal documents from the pre-modern world” (1.5, p. 19), and we must presume that similar reasons prevented a full discussion of the extraordinary nine-column petition of Dionysia.⁶ Petitions and reports of legal proceedings, moreover, are often among the most complex and difficult documents, and for this reason alone their presence in greater numbers is missed.

The thematic and document-oriented approach also prevents much engagement with family archives, with the notable exception of the Dryton archive, mentioned above. For example, two documents from the archive of the auxiliary soldier C. Iulius Apollinarius (Trismegistos, archID 566) are discussed without revealing that they form part of a larger group of texts (4.2.1 and 5.5.4). Somewhat related to this issue is the longstanding problem of defining the socio-economic position of those encountered in the papyri. Terms such as “middle class” and “simple people” are used without definition and perhaps even without much reflection. Hickey has warned of the “treacherous ... perception (probably enhanced by the immediacy of the texts) that papyri give access to the ‘masses’ or to ‘ordinary people.’”⁷ Certainly there would be no way to get all the contributors to agree on this point, but the editors could have signaled the problem to readers in the introduction.

Some ideas are presented with more precision than the evidence warrants. In 2.1.3, for instance, we read “after the reform of 125 BC, the *grapheion* official became involved in the composition of the document itself,” which eventually lead to “the reform of AD 14” introducing the Roman *grapheion* contract. One would be forgiven for thinking that we must have evidence of decrees or official instructions regarding such reforms (like the instructions for registering Demotic documents, *P.Par.* 65), but we do not.⁸ Similarly, in Kruse’s discussion of archives,

⁶ *P.Oxy.* 2.237 (after 27 June 186 CE). The embedded edict of Mettius Rufus is discussed and translated in 2.6.2, while other references can be found in the introduction to Chapter 3 (pp. 97 and 99), in 4.2 (p. 161), and 4.3 (p. 181).

⁷ T. Hickey, “Papyrology,” in E. Jeffreys and J. Haldon (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies* (Oxford 2009) 123.

⁸ Earlier, the phrasing is more reserved: “c. 125 BC” (2.1.1) or “around 125 BCE” (2.1.2). The notion of a Ptolemaic reform ca. 125 stems from Yiftach-Firanko’s convincing analysis of contract diplomatics in an important 2008 article, which is oddly not cited in this discussion: U. Yiftach-Firanko, “Who Killed the Double Document in Ptolemaic Egypt?” *APF* 54 (2008) 203-218. The supposed “reform of AD 14” also stems from this article, but

we read that the Nanaion, a central record office in Alexandria, was established in the reign of Augustus (2.6.1, p. 66), while on the previous page it was admitted that we lack unequivocal data about the founding of the archives in Alexandria.

Errors of fact are few. There was no “abrogation” of priestly privileges at the beginning of the Roman period (1.2), since qualified priests were free from the poll tax and the dike corvée, but rather a series of restrictions on temple personnel and revenue. In 6.4 it is stated that there are no sales of granite millstones, but *P.Athen.* 25 and *P.Mich.* 9.550 record such transactions. Typos generally do not impinge on one’s understanding of the text.

These quibbles and more substantive criticisms should not detract from the overall success of the volume, which will have a place in the classroom and scholars’ shelves for a long time to come.

Appendix: E-Reading

I read this volume partially in its print version, partially as an E-book on a Kindle Fire HDX, and offer here some comments on the latter reading experience. The E-book, it should be pointed out immediately, is not distinguished from its print counterpart in any substantive way, such as through new or expanded content. Even some straightforward advantages of the digital format are left unexploited. Hyperlinking, for instance, is only used internally between sections and documents in the book, and not to external data (e.g. one still finds “image at Papyri.info” rather than a link to the record), and the handful of images accompanying the volume have the same low quality as the print version. While the print version distinguishes translated documents by a slight indent, the E-book offers no visual clue that the author’s introduction has ended and the document itself has begun. Finally, the publisher did not provide page number equivalents, perhaps less of an issue for a handbook with minute partitions into sections and subsections, but still a hindrance to citation. The primary advantages of the E-book are the ability to search through the volume and its portability.

Hunter College, CUNY

W. Graham Claytor

the diplomatic changes mentioned both here and in the article – the disappearance of the inner script, witnesses, and *syngraphophylax* – are already evident in most *grapheion* contracts from Augustus’ reign.

Lincoln H. Blumell and Thomas A. Wayment, *Christian Oxyrhynchus: Texts, Documents, and Sources*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2015. xxi + 756 pages. ISBN 978-1-60258-539-3.

Oxyrhynchus and its papyri have attracted sustained interest since their discovery in the early twentieth century. Various monographs on the city have been published,¹ and countless articles have appeared in different venues. Above all, the annual publication of volumes with Oxyrhynchus papyri in the *Graeco-Roman Memoirs* of the Egypt Exploration Society has continued to provide scholars and students with an astonishing array of texts.

Rather than being an interpretative essay on the rise of Christianity in Oxyrhynchus, the volume here reviewed is a sourcebook relying on the abovementioned tradition of studies, which the two authors demonstrate to know in depth. It brings together 175 texts from earlier publications and for each gives extensive bibliography, an introduction, the Greek text, a translation (if appropriate), and notes commenting on the important aspects of the text involved. Overall this is a handy and helpful publication, which can be used not only for teaching purposes, but also for introducing Oxyrhynchus and its papyri to readers from various disciplines. As the authors rightly point out, the importance of Christian Oxyrhynchus as a case study and the dispersion of Christian papyri in sometimes hard-to-find publications made their enterprise worthwhile.

With regard to the organization of the sources, the volume follows a traditional approach in terms of both categories (Christian vs. non-Christian; canonical vs. extra-canonical, literary vs. documentary) and periodization (up to and including the fourth century CE, with a few exceptions from the fifth). The texts included are divided into three larger sections: “Christian Literary Papyri from Oxyrhynchus,” nos 1-105 (subdivided into *New Testament Texts*, *Extracanonial Texts* and *Other Christian Literary Texts*), “Documentary Papyri and Christianity at Oxyrhynchus,” nos 106-162 (opened with *Decian libelli*, followed by *Christian References in Third-Century Documentary Texts*, *Christian References in Fourth-Century Documentary Texts*, and *Letters Written by Christians from the Third and Fourth Centuries*), and finally a generalist (and thinner) section, “Patristic, Coptic, and Other Sources on Christians and Christianity at Oxyrhynchus.”

¹ E.g., P.J. Parsons, *City of the Sharp-Nosed Fish: Greek Lives in Roman Egypt* (London 2007); A. Luijendijk, *Greetings in the Lord: Early Christians and the Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (Cambridge, MA 2008).

nos 163-175, collecting the main literary sources on the establishment of Christianity in the city and its territory. The volume is opened by a brief introduction (pp. 1-16) where the authors outline the history of the city and its archaeological discovery, then describe the quality of the material collected, and explain the criteria and aims that guided their choices. Given the variety of topics discussed in the book, I will focus only on those that I found either problematic or interesting.

As mentioned above, the book looks at the Oxyrhynchus evidence in a traditional way, and in so doing does not really add particularly innovative interpretations. As an example let us consider the opening remarks in the section "Christian Literary Papyri from Oxyrhynchus" (pp. 17-20). The discussion rightly emphasizes the extraordinary number and quality of early Christian literary texts coming from the site, but does not attempt to give any explanation of the reasons why this is the case. Readers – especially those who are not specialists of Egypt and papyri – are left with unanswered questions: was Oxyrhynchus the most Christian town of Egypt? Does the amount of evidence have to do with the archaeology of the finds? Or is there any other possible account for Oxyrhynchus being so different from other Egyptian sites?

It should also be added that because of how the book is structured, the literary Christian material is isolated from other, non-Christian evidence and this could generate the false impression that early Christians too were separated from the surrounding non-Christian society, which is far from true. Moreover, I wonder what a reader would think, if, after reading this book, she goes through the Greek and Egyptian late antique magical papyri: how would one explain the mixture of practices and texts found in that material in the light of the literary Christian papyri as presented by Blumell and Wayment? Although mostly dated to a later period than that considered by the two authors, this evidence is actually based on more ancient traditions, and in this respect the fourth century as a chronological limit poses a problem, if the aim is to enable the readers to fully understand the early Christian Egyptian environment. Again, how do we explain the later emergence of Christian magical papyri? Does it reflect a "development" in practices and beliefs? Or is this again a distortion of the sources due to the nature of the finds?

The section introduction for the Christian literary papyri also does not address the current debate about the perils of using palaeography as an unproblematic and secure method for attributing dates to manuscripts when no other dating criterion is available. In the last decade papyrologists and students of early Christianity have debated the problematical methods used

in the palaeographical dating of Christian literary papyri, especially in light of the abuses the earliest copies of the Bible receive in the popular press.² It is unfortunate that the authors have not fully engaged with some works that they cite on this topic.³ This said, it is certainly useful to have the selected literary papyri reprinted in one volume with up-to-date bibliography and notes.

The documentary section includes texts that are traditionally considered as the earliest references to Christianity from Oxyrhynchus. I found the choice of including the Decian *libelli*, introduced by sensible remarks based on recent bibliography, appropriate and again useful in view of the targeted audience. This section made me think about a number of questions, so I am really grateful to the authors. For one thing, were I to read this section without any knowledge of other evidence, I would be led to conclude that early Christians in Oxyrhynchus were well behaved men and women following their bishops and doing what normative Christian leaders would have expected in terms of practices and beliefs. The image this section conveys is therefore far from the diversified and not fully “orthodox” community depicted by Christian authors of the period considered. Again, some interesting questions arise: how do we reconcile the two pictures? Why do Manicheans, Gnostics, and others seem to be mostly absent from the documentary evidence here collected? If we read the sources carefully, including pagan philosophers such as Alexander of Lycopolis, uniformity does not seem a typical quality of early Christianity. At the end of the third century, Alexander defines Christianity as a very basic philosophy, mainly concerned with ethical preoccupations, and divided in many sects among which the Manicheans, in his view, were the most unreasonable (*Contra Man.* 1-2). Not to mention the Christian anti-heretical literature starting more or less in the same period. How do Blumell and Wayment explain the discrepancies between extant papyri and contemporary literary sources? As for the Manicheans, a sentence in the general introduction (p. 13) shows that the authors believe that they were not Christian, a statement that should have been more carefully argued since this is not

² E.g., B. Nongbri, “The Use and Abuse of P52: Papyrological Pitfalls in the Dating of the Fourth Gospel,” *Harvard Theological Review* 98 (2005) 23-48; W. Clarysse and P. Orsini, “Early New Testament Manuscripts and Their dates: A critique of Theological Palaeography,” *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 88/4 (2012) 443-474 is absent from the bibliography.

³ E.g., K. Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* (Oxford 2000); R.S. Bagnall, *Early Christian Books in Egypt* (Princeton 2009), esp. chapter 1.

the opinion of all modern scholarship, and more importantly of ancient authors, such as the one just mentioned.

Moving to another issue, as Blumell has very well shown in his volume dedicated to early Christian letters and education,⁴ it is often difficult to decide if writers and addressees of private correspondence were Christian or not. The notes added to explain key terminology occurring in the papyri collected in this section are intelligent and well-informed discussions of formularies and words, which have been taken as Christian identity markers by previous and current scholarship; see, e.g., ἀγαπητός ἀδελφός discussed at **130** (*P.Alex.* 29), note on line 2, belonging to the dossier of Sotas, bishop of Oxyrhynchus. In this respect, these re-editions really are a precious tool for all those who are going to work on this material in the future. They present different interpretations and views, providing full and easy access to the current state of the question.

To conclude: although the book is not particularly innovative in the choice of topics and texts and in the way it organizes the sources, it certainly is an invaluable teaching and research tool, apart from being a solid introduction to the early Christian papyri from Oxyrhynchus.

University of Manchester

Roberta Mazza

⁴ L.H. Blumell, *Lettered Christians: Christians, Letters, and Late Antique Oxyrhynchus* (Leiden 2012).

Yanne Broux, *Double Names and Elite Strategy in Roman Egypt*. *Studia Hellenistica* 54. Leuven: Peeters, 2015. viii + 317 pages. ISBN 978-90-429-3125-1.

The central argument of this book is that the two elements of the title belong together; that is, for the most part double names of the most common type, expressed with PN ὁ/ῆ καὶ PN, form for two centuries an element in the self-representation of the elites of the *metropoleis* of Roman Egypt. The case is founded in large part on quantitative analysis of data extracted from Trismegistos (TM) Names and deriving from the Duke Databank of Documentary Papyri. (The Demotic evidence is canvassed conscientiously, but it is exiguous and plays a small role.) The numbers are interpreted in light of a well-informed synthesis of scholarly work on these urban elites. The conclusions are always stimulating and mostly persuasive, although I shall express some reservations.

The book is organized in an introduction and seven chapters. The introduction describes previous work on the subject, then explains TM Names and how it has been used to supply data for this investigation. A synopsis of the chapters follows. The first chapter is devoted to the question of elite formation in Roman Egypt. Broux argues persuasively that the metropolites were, although privileged, not really an elite, because they included many people of modest means. The overlapping, but not identical, body of members of the gymnasial order gradually in her view becomes something more exclusive. She sees it as declining in the third century; similarly (p. 45) the urban “middle class” is seen as starting to disappear in the mid-fourth century (no documentation or bibliography is cited for this view). The concept of an elite is never fully explicated (pp. 49-50 try, not very convincingly): is it a matter of relative or absolute standing? The latter, one might think; but no one in Egypt was an elite if compared with Roman senators, and it may be better to think of multiple elites.

Chapter 2 is about names and related personal descriptors; it sets forth the various naming systems encountered in the papyri, including the Roman *tria nomina*. Broux sees the use of the *tria nomina* by non-citizens as a “persistent problem,” and this view colors later chapters. But it is not clear that this is right. It is worth reflecting on *P.Oxy.* 7.1022 = Cugusi, *C.Epist.Lat.* 140, a letter dated 103 CE in which the prefect communicates to the commander of one of the Ituraean cohorts the names of six approved recruits, all supplied with the *tria nomina*. And yet these are auxiliaries at the start of their term of service, surely not yet citizens. They had almost certainly just received their Roman names, almost without

exception banalities, and from none other than the prefect. Claiming to be a Roman citizen when one was not certainly merited punishment. But Egypt had thousands of men in the military using Roman names without being citizens.

In chapter 3, the documentary base of the book is acutely examined. Broux points out the difficulties that the documents pose. Double names are used most consistently in public documents like *epikrisis*, census, and taxation records. Individuals known to have double names appear often in private documents without the second name; contracts, where formality and clarity were needed, are the exception. As a result, even the high-suction vacuum cleaner used here inevitably misses many people who in fact had double names. The problem is even more acute with women than men, because they are less represented in public documents, although in fact persons with double names are a slightly higher percentage of women than of men. Although 42 percent of *epikrisis* documents contain double names, only 1.9 percent of the total identifiable population bore such names. Broux shows that double names begin to become more popular from the third quarter of the first century on, peaking in the early third century and then declining.

Chapter 4 is devoted to a technical analysis of the formulas of double names. There is a considerable range of ways of marking second names, but most are vanishingly rare. The standard PN δ/η καὶ PN occupies 88 percent of the terrain, with a mere 6 percent for the various forms of $(\epsilon\pi\iota)\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (heavily concentrated in the second century) and the rest vestigial. Scribal failure to decline names makes many seemingly unmarked double names uncertain.

In chapter 5 we turn to the names themselves. Unlike Ptolemaic double names, so overwhelmingly combinations of a Greek and an Egyptian name, the Roman variety are dominantly Greek + Greek (54 percent) or Greek + Latin (15 percent); only 18 percent are Greek + Egyptian, and even fewer (9 percent) double Egyptian names. So far things are fairly straightforward. Looking for coloration within the Greek names is more complicated. Broux adopts a typology of theophoric, dynastic, literary, and personal characteristics, which she apparently regards as more objective than other means of analysis, although she acknowledges the porousness of the categories. (She does not seem very alert to the emergent Christianization of onomastics, perhaps because of her third-century emphasis.) More puzzling is her supposition that some Egyptian names (Amois and Thoonis are her examples) came to be regarded as Hellenic; that they appear commonly in the double-named population in Oxyrhynchus is true,

but we have no access to the thinking of those who used these names, and the argument seems circular.

Several archives offer case studies in chapter 6, in an attempt to get below the quantitative surface and see how double names worked in particular settings. Among them are Tryphon the weaver (first century), completely lacking in double names; the *P.Fam.Tebt.* archive, rich in them in a second-century katoikic (and then Antinoite) family; Sarapion son of Apollonianus (perhaps surprisingly few double names in a high-status family); and eventually Petaus, where the raw material is not family archives but public registers.

Chapter 7 brings the conclusions. Broux convincingly shows that ἐπι-καλούμενος *et al.* belong to a different society from the majority PN ὁ/ἡ καὶ PN, being rural and Egyptian, and typically introducing what she calls “bynames” rather than official double names. Otherwise, we are dealing with a self-consciously Hellenic urban population, many of whom have clear markers of elite status (table, p. 262). The central tendency of PN ὁ/ἡ καὶ PN in the documents is gymnasial, she argues. The less wealthy and hellenized metropolitans are not part of the phenomenon. Double names were in her view a means by which families asserted their identity as such and expressed a connection with Roman power. “They [double names] are the local elite’s answer to imperial policy on nomenclature, which prohibits the emulation of Roman-style polyonymy by non-citizens” (p. 277). This strikes me as most implausible. It is precisely after the Antonine Constitution that the double names become most popular, at a point when no one was prevented from using a Roman name, because everyone was a citizen. The elite of Egypt could have added as many *cognomina* as they wanted to the base of (M.) Aurelius, and some certainly did (as Broux notes).

Despite that disagreement, most of the analysis seems to me sound. The book should encourage others to think of ways to use the (relatively) big data made available by TM’s aggregation and (partial) analysis of information from the papyri. There is much more to be done with the names of the papyri of the Roman period, and the term “path-breaking” is for once appropriate.

Stefanie Schmidt, *Stadt und Wirtschaft im römischen Ägypten. Die Finanzen der Gaumetropolen*. Philippika 76. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2014. x + 320 pages, 1 plate, 19 tables. ISBN 978-3-447-10276-6.

In this publication of her 2013 dissertation at Marburg, Schmidt (S.) tackles the finances of the *metropoleis* of Roman Egypt, that is their income and expenditure, how those were managed (which is the focus of her study), and with what impact on the general economy. A brief introduction on aims and problems is followed by two weighty chapters that form the core of the book. Chapter 2 reviews what is known about the local financial administration, that is, officials, documentation, and procedures, before and after the AD 200 introduction of town councils (*boulai*), with much discussion of terminology. Chapter 3 presents the various types of civic income which are attested, and how they were categorised and recorded. There follow three increasingly brief chapters: 4 on known cases of expenditure to fulfil demands of the provincial government, 5 on attested types of local civic expenditure, and 6 reviewing the system of management and its apparent aims and efficacy. A few concluding remarks rephrase the findings of chapter 6 in modern theoretical terminology.

It is a rare pleasure to see other scholars taking a serious interest in the state finances and fiscality of Roman Egypt, and this is the first book-length study devoted to metropolite finances.¹ Following the distribution of the extant and published evidence, S.'s focus is on Hermopolis and Oxyrhynchus and the third century of bouletic management, although an important exception is the early second-century account of the running costs of the water-supply system at Arsinoe.² Although S. has broader economic aims, chapters 2 to 4 contain a traditional dissertation-like presentation of the evidence, methodically and thoroughly analysing one text after another, which leads to a fair amount of repetition of common points. For the more important documents the Greek text is given in the discussion, with a translation in a footnote; the translations are normally those of the editors, so in various languages. Regrettably this is not best practice in today's world: we want to know what S. understands these documents

¹ Earlier treatment can be found in sections in P. Jouguet, *La vie municipale dans l'Égypte romaine* (Paris 1911) and A.K. Bowman, *The Town Councils of Roman Egypt* (Toronto 1971).

² Magisterially republished by W. Habermann, *Zur Wasserversorgung einer Metropole im kaiserzeitlichen Ägypten. Neuedition von P.Lond. III 1177. Text – Übersetzung – Kommentar* (München 2000).

to say, which translation by the author clearly reveals, and the demotion of the translations does not encourage use of the book by non-papyrologists. Indeed the approach is rather wearisome for any reader. Of course S. had to study all these texts carefully, as she clearly has, and probably was expected to present them like this in her dissertation, but if a book on a difficult subject of this nature is to attract readers, a more user-friendly approach is essential: the author could, for instance, make assertions and then explain, without full citation of each document, what the main evidence for each assertion is and the limits of its reliability and applicability.

On the whole S. provides a full, careful, and usually sensible survey of the evidence. Normally her views follow those of previous scholarship. Where she does diverge, such as her suggestion that “private” persons, that is, non-councillors, could be nominated as *exegetai* (pp. 44-50), her interpretation of the texts often raises doubts. But her common refrain, and main problem of making progress in the field, is that even for Oxyrhynchus and Hermopolis the evidence is woefully thin, and for Hermopolis concentrated in the so-called *boule* archive of the later third century. Thus certainty about what a financial official was meant to do, or whether a sales tax went to this or that account, and so on, is not achievable, let alone a clear picture of developments. It also seems that we have gained little new evidence of real importance or novelty since 1971, perhaps not because there is none to publish but because it takes a particular type of papyrologist to want to devote time to impenetrable texts about civic finances. The problems of S.’s approach come to a head in chapter 5 on civic expenditure, a mere 22 pages with only one discussion of a text. S. points out, quite correctly, that the evidence for expenditure, though equally restricted, is enough to show that Hermopolis, and also Oxyrhynchus and Arsinoe, were from the second century engaged in massive capital projects and recurrent commitments, whose known costs are enormously greater than the attested sums for items of income. S. discusses one text to show that building costs could be estimated before work began, and later just asserts that the *exetastes* (see chapter 2) would have had the information to balance expenditure with income. This just sidesteps what could have formed the focal question to engage the interest of readers: the *metropoleis*, even before AD 200, were spending massive amounts of money; can we begin to solve the mystery of where they got the income?

Although her title, *Stadt und Wirtschaft*, and introductory comments claim an interest in the economic impact of civic finances in Roman Egypt, this is covered only by a handful of assertions in chapter 6 such as that athletic games will have been good for business, and that civic loans and

employment of craftsmen promoted economic stability. I suspect it would be worth investigating how the elite used civic finances to bolster their own position, by taking cuts out of building projects (comparing Pliny's letters from Bithynia), by making themselves loans at favourable terms (as attested from the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus at Arsinoe), or by awarding themselves pensions as victorious athletes. However, what really concerns S. in this study is the management systems. Some attempt is made to situate this in modern theory and terminology – notably her concern with whether they could calculate their “IST-Zustand” (running balance), and the closing allusions to New Institutional Economics – but these are just throwaway sentences which do not inform the bulk of her discussion. There is also no comparison with civic and municipal finances in the rest of the empire, which would probably help us understand what we are missing in the Egyptian evidence. We also might be able to understand some aspects of civic finances better if we had a better grasp of general taxation in Roman Egypt; the second most important question, after the income-expenditure problem, is when and how metropolite finances became entangled with central taxation. In sum, for scholars interested in the finances of the *metropoleis* S. has provided a very useful collation of the evidence, and an up-to-date review of the attested officials and institutions for their management. There are, however, big historical questions still to be addressed.

King's College London

Dominic Rathbone

Katherine Blouin, *Triangular Landscapes: Environment, Society, and the State in the Nile Delta under Roman Rule*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. xxv + 429 pages. ISBN 978-0-19-968872-2.

This book is the first attempt to systematically analyze the various papyri from the Nile Delta (in particular the carbonized papyri from Thmouis) and use them in combination with archaeological data to create a social and environmental history of this region in the early Roman period. The Nile Delta was much different from other Egyptian regions where papyrologists more regularly ply their trade (Fayum; Thebaid; Eastern and Western Desert). As such the book is a welcome addition to recent studies that continue to stress the different microcosms that make up ancient Egypt, even within regions such as the Fayum that have up till recently been happily treated as one.¹

After an introduction that sets out the parameters of the book, nine chapters follow as well as two appendices (1: Mendesian papyrological corpus, 298-300; and 2: Mendesian fiscality in Roman times, 301-335), a Glossary (336-337), a Bibliography (pp. 339-396), and the usual indices (sources and subjects).

The first three chapters are clustered as Part I, “The Mendesian Nome in Context.” Chapter 1 (“Hydrological Context”) gives a brief overview of the hydrological development of this part of the Nile Delta from predynastic times to the Arab period. One of the important features of this region is the sheer force and speed of the Nile flood, which can seriously impact the lives and livelihoods of the people who live here. In this light, it is not surprising to find that people of old have tried to manage the water flow and to limit the negative consequences here. Similarly, Blouin also stresses the fluidity of the Nile Delta over the course of this long period with branches and canals changing course, opening up, or silting up completely. In trying to assess the human hydrological activity in this region it is important to take this into account. One of the noteworthy conclusions is that there was a “more dense and complex hydrological network than has traditionally been assumed” (27).

The second chapter (“Evidence”) discusses the archaeological and papyrological evidence that is available for the Mendesian nome. Blouin gives a detailed history of archaeological activity in two main sites,

¹ E.g., B.J. Haug, *Watering the Desert: Environment, Irrigation, and Society in the Premodern Fayyūm* (Berkeley PhD diss., 2012); A. Monson, *From the Ptolemies to the Romans: Political and Economic Change in Egypt* (Cambridge 2012).

Mendes and Thmouis. In addition, she provides an overview of all papyri from the Mendesian nome (tabulated in Appendix 1). The third chapter (“The Pre-Roman Mendesian Nome”) provides a narrative that introduces the history of the nome from the Old Kingdom to the Ptolemaic period. It appears that the city of Mendes was quite prosperous during those periods for which information is available with peak prosperity in the Saite period. The papyri from the Ptolemaic period, seventeen at current count, all from the mid to late third century BCE, show a thriving metropolis that has overcome numerous destructions during the Persian conquest (343/342 BCE).

Chapters 4 and 5 form the second part of the book (“The Mendesian Landscape under Roman Rule”) and introduce the topography and administration of the nome during early Roman times. Central to the discussion in the first section of Chapter 4 (“Topography and Administrative Geography”) are three maps that are unfortunately not included in the chapter but given separately on pp. xxiii-xxv. They give a visual overview of the nome, its topographic features, and the placement of sites within the nome. The second section of Chapter four tries to give an indication of settlement and population density by using comparative evidence from elsewhere in late period Egypt. The last two sections of this chapter deal with administration (which follows the pattern known from other nomes) and in particular the water management (surveillance, distribution, etc.). Chapter 5 (“Land Categories”) gives what its title tells us, and lists and discusses the different administrative categories of land that are known for the Mendesian nome. This chapter is an expanded version of an earlier paper, including a rather useless repetition of a table (5.1) that indiscriminately lists all land categories in transcribed Greek.²

The third part of the book (“‘Le beau risqué;’ Society, the State, and the Land”) again consists of two chapters with almost poetic titles. Chapter 6 (“How Many Baskets for One’s Eggs? Agricultural Diversification and Fiscalilty”) addresses the question of agricultural diversification and aims to see whether this was used as a strategy by landholders in the Nile Delta like it was elsewhere in ancient Egypt. The documents show that in the Mendesian nome wheat cultivation was predominant, but that there was ample opportunity for diversification for other crops in areas that were not suited for wheat cultivation. The ubiquitous wetlands in the Delta also allowed hunting, fishing, and gathering to add to the diet. Chapter 7

² K. Blouin, “Between Water and Sand: Agriculture and Husbandry,” in C. Riggs (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt* (Oxford 2012) 22-37.

(“In the Heart of the Fringe: The Socio-economics of Marginal Land”) centers on areas in the Mendesian nome that were marginal in terms of agricultural production (e.g., semi-arid, wet, submerged plots), but that played their own unique role in the agricultural economy of the Nile Delta.

The final two chapters form the fourth part of the book (“Autopsy of a Region in Crisis”). Both focus on one specific event that took place in the Mendesian nome during the second century CE. Chapter 8 (“‘Ruined they took flight:’ Mendesian Anachôrêsis”) focuses on *anachoresis*, the practice of farmers leaving behind their fields. The documents from the Mendesian nome show that several villages lost a major part of their population between 159/160 and 169/170 CE, and that taxes were suspended in such villages. Blouin puts these numbers against the background of economic ruin for landholders in the Mendesian nome that was the result of both environmental dynamics (e.g. desiccation) and Roman fiscal policies in the course of the second century CE. Chapter 9 (“The Boukoloi Uprising”) gives a reconstruction of this famous uprising in the late 160s CE by using not only known literary sources but also the economic data from the papyri. Blouin offers “a socio-environmental analysis of the uprising,” and points out that many of those involved in the uprising were not so much the “barbarians” of our literary sources, but rather villagers who saw no other way out of their economic situation than to take part in an uprising.

As a rule, most papyrologists are happy to leave the Nile Delta aside, other than to point to the fact that almost no papyri were found in this part of Egypt. This book shows that they do so at their own peril. The Nile Delta is an important region to study, especially when compared and contrasted with the other regions that make up the whole of late period Egypt.

University of Michigan

Arthur Verhoogt

John Gaudet, *Papyrus: The Plant that Changed the World: From Ancient Egypt to Today's Water Wars*. New York: Pegasus Books, 2014. xix + 300 pages. ISBN 978-1-60598-566-4.

A persuasive argument can be made that few plant species have played such an important role in the development of human civilization as the papyrus plant (*Cyperus papyrus*). This extraordinary species is the focus of the book under review that explores not only the myriad ways in which humans have used papyrus in their lives, but also how human activities have shaped the fate of papyrus wetlands in Africa and the Middle East throughout the millennia.

Starting with the rise of the first complex societies in the Nile Valley, the book traces the close and intricate relationship between early humans and the papyrus plant. Drawing on a diverse range of historical and archeological sources, the author elucidates not only the critical role that the papyrus plant played for early Egyptian material culture, but also how humans utilized ancient papyrus ecosystems. The book is therefore not a papyrology study *sensu stricto*, but rather provides a critically important ecological and societal context that will help inform serious scholars of papyrology. For example, the book discusses in rich detail how pre-dynastic societies were shaped by the ecology of local papyrus wetlands and how papyrus insinuated itself in a variety of ways – with uses ranging from building materials and rope to boats and life preservers, and, of course, as a writing medium – into the life of early Egyptian societies.

In the second half of the book, Gaudet transitions from an analysis of the cultural importance and material benefits of papyrus in traditional Egyptian and African societies to a broader discussion of how humans benefit from papyrus wetlands in general. Integrating diverse lines of evidence, he masterfully demonstrates how the most important benefits that humans receive from papyrus today are not the physical goods, but rather the tremendously important ecosystem services of wetland flow regulation, water filtration, and detoxification. In a wide-ranging consideration of various locales in sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East, often illustrated with personal experiences, he reveals how sustainable use of papyrus wetlands can enrich local residents, and how overexploitation has repeatedly resulted in catastrophic consequences for local societies. For example, in a vivid example from the Hula wetlands of northern Israel, the book illustrates how a well-intentioned, but short-sighted development scheme resulted in the conversion of a lush papyrus wetland oasis into a barren ecological wasteland and a source of polluted air.

The scope of the work is truly sweeping, not only in the historic period it considers, but also in the range of disciplines it includes. Gaudet switches effortlessly from analyses of historical events and discussions of experimental archaeological methods to easily accessible explanations of wetland ecology and the geopolitics of water use in present-day sub-Saharan Africa. The author is trained as an ecologist and has worked for much of his life in African wetlands – as a result this work is informed by an exceptionally deep knowledge of the subject under study. The central arguments of the book are illustrated with numerous line drawings and a central color-plate section. If there is any place where the book can be improved, it is in the quality of the graphics, which at times appear pixelated and unrefined.

The book is written for a broad audience and is easily accessible to the non-specialist, yet at the same time it does an admirable job of maintaining high academic standards: the author documents the sources of the book carefully and provides a balanced discussion of the chief arguments put forward. Furthermore, the text is supported with a detailed reference section.

In summary, Gaudet has written an important book that should be read by anyone interested in understanding the cultural, ecological, economic, and societal context in which papyrus has been used by humans; it deserves a place on every papyrologist's book shelf.

University of Michigan

Johannes Foufopoulos