

consistent distinction maintained between ^ʿaleph and ^ʿayin (e.g., *baʿal* and *kh ʿmr yhw* dominate). These, among other similar features (one may consult the index, pp. 339–40, for a representative listing of curious forms), not only make the text difficult to read (as does a bewilderingly unsystematic use of italics, underlining, and bold type) but draw into question the author's competence. This is not an inappropriate question, since his research depends primarily on *ANET* and works from the first four decades of this century (e.g., Gadd's *Sumerian Reading Book* [1924], Baikie [1925], Peet [1931], Breasted [1906–1907], Harper [1904]). The repeated authority for the Persian period is Bright's *History of Israel* (second edition!), while the source for Hittite texts is Gurney's *The Hittites* (again not the most recent edition). Relying upon translations of texts leads Greene to unfortunate conclusions, as when *ANET*'s translation of Akkadian *rakbû* as "(personal) messenger" leads him to deduce unwarranted social features which are not distinctive of the *rakbû* (pp. 14–15). Greene relies not only upon these dated translations but also upon their commentaries, and this almost exclusive reliance upon scholarship largely two generations old may account for archaic formulations such as a date of 2400–1580 B.C. for the Egyptian Middle Kingdom (p. 26) or the mis-identification of a Neo-Assyrian letter as coming from Mari (p. 236). The method of text citation is arcane and quite simply a nightmare (no Amarna text is cited with Knudtzon's numeration; no Mari text is provided with an *ARM* number; *CTA* and *KTU* are ignored in favor of Gordon's *UT* numeration).

It would have been advisable for the author to have indicated that a dissertation (Boston University, 1980) lies behind the present work, for it would help explain why only two books after 1978 were used (Gottwald's *The Bible and Liberation* [1983], Friedman's *Who Wrote the Bible* [1987]). Even so, both his dissertation and book were incomplete without Valloggia's *Recherches sur les messagers (wpwtyw) dans les sources égyptiennes profanes* (1976), and one would expect some interaction with material which appeared in the past decade (e.g., my dissertation on messengers [1987], which has now been published in revised form by Scholars Press). Awareness of Pardee's *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters* (1982) and the bibliography it contains would have saved Greene much grief (such as an embarrassing discussion of greeting formulas on p. 48 or his identification of only three message ostraca at Arad on p. 60, when there are, in fact, many more). Avoidance of informed sources in Near Eastern and biblical studies cripples the work.

One may, nevertheless, still ask whether the data available to scholars two generations ago will support the primary conclusion of the author. The data employed are lamentably incomplete even given these parameters, as one may judge by the space devoted to the messenger in Sumer (pp. 9–12), Babylonia (pp. 12–14), Assyria (pp. 14–17), Hatti (pp. 17–20),

and Ugarit (pp. 20–21). This reviewer has privately compiled notes on hundreds of named messengers in Akkadian sources alone, yet Greene feels he has exhausted the Mesopotamian data in six pages, erroneously affirming, "the number of examples of messengers in Egyptian texts far outnumber those found in texts from her ANE neighbors" (p. 21). The author's grasp of form-critical issues within biblical scholarship is less than adequate, and one suspects that the scholars with whom he grapples would not be pleased with the caricatures of their positions (e.g., Koch, p. 182; Jacob, p. 181; Lindblom, pp. 155–56, 198). In sum, little in this book can be trusted, and what can be is already available elsewhere.

SAMUEL A. MEIER

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Inscriptions grecques et latines d'Akôris. By ÉTIENNE BERNAND. Bibliothèque d'Étude 103. Cairo: INSTITUT FRANÇAIS D'ARCHÉOLOGIE ORIENTALE, 1988. Pp. 175, 64 pl.

The present volume is a part of a long-term project by Étienne and André Bernand for a corpus of the Greek and Latin inscriptions of Egypt. Akoris, or Tenis (its older name, which has survived in the modern toponym Tehneh), was a large village in the northern part of the Hermopolite Nome in Middle Egypt, a center of military and police activity and of the exploitation of quarries (cf. no. 3). Bernand's corpus takes the familiar form. An introduction describes early visitors to the site and the series of excavations, resumed in the past decade by the Japanese. The texts themselves are divided into two parts, dedications and epitaphs; for each there is a bibliography, information on finding and present conservation, text, critical apparatus, translation, and commentary. At the end is a chronological table, a concordance with previous publications, thirteen indexes, and a full illustration in 64 plates.

All of the inscriptions have been published before. A detailed perusal of the contents, indeed, shows that the overwhelming majority of the material comes from the French excavations of 1903–4, virtually all published at least five decades ago and mostly incorporated into the *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten*. Of the dedications 1–28, for example, nos. 5–9, 13, 15–19, and 22–28 (a total of 18) come from those excavations (on p. 139, correct '18' to '13' in the concordance for *ASAE* 6 (1905): 151, no. 8; and no. 27 has been omitted from the concordance to the *Sammelbuch* on p. 145; it is no. 1536 in that collection). The entire group of 29–41 was copied and published in 1921. Of the 132 epitaphs, 127 (all but nos. 44–45, 159, 172, and 173)

come from Lefebvre's 1903-4 excavations, and only no. 173 (with one name) is a recent discovery. The reader looking for new discoveries will find only the handful of finds from the recent Japanese excavations (nos. 2, 11, 14, 173). One hopes, of course, that the excavations in progress will produce new finds, and no doubt some improvements will be able to be made in the texts included here; but this volume should remain the standard edition of these texts for the foreseeable future. Bernand's essential work, therefore, apart from the very helpful introduction, has been one of compilation, revision, documentation, and commentary. In all of these respects, the volume is a substantial gain.

The first 28 texts are a heterogeneous group of dedications ranging from the early second century B.C. (one text) to the first part of the third century of our era. They are of interest for the local cults. Ammon and Souchos were the principal divinities, but others appear also: Zeus Helios Great Sarapis, Hermes, Hera, and Isis. Equally helpful is the information about the military. Centurions of two legions (III Cyrenaica and XXII Deiotariana) are found, in inscriptions datable to the late first and early second centuries (nos. 3, 20, 21, 172), no doubt in command of detachments supervising quarrying and communications. A second group is constituted by the naval officers, four trierarchs and a nauarch, found in nos. 12, 14, 16, 18, and 19. Of these, no. 12 is datable to the years 203-6. Bernand is very cautious about the dates of the remainder, which bear datings to years 3, 5, 6, and 8 without the mention of any emperor's name, but he classes them with two other datable texts of similar style, nos. 11 (A.D. 202) and 13 (A.D. 217). In my view, his implied dating is correct; such dates by year, month, and day (but without imperial titulature) are characteristic in the papyri and ostraka of the Severan period, and years 3-8 seem very likely to be those of Septimius Severus. The appearance of the *nomen* Aurelius with the trierarch Alexandros in no. 16 suggested to the editor a date after 212, but naval officers of this rank surely did not wait until the *Constitutio Antoniniana* to receive citizenship, and no. 12 in fact shows us a trierarch named Aurelius Avitianus in 203-6. Bernand discusses the fleet's role on pp. 23-24 and 33-34, emphasizing a policing role. It is impossible to say if this dossier represents a fundamentally new dimension of operations in the Severan period, or if this is just a matter of chance in the discovery of inscriptions.

Nos. 29-41 record the high-water mark of the Nile flood. Nos. 29-39 come from the period of Diocletian and the Tetrarchs, while 40-41 are from the late fourth century (K. A. Worp argues in *ZPE* 78 [1989]: 137, that no. 40 dates from the reign of Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius [379-83]). The Diocletianic group is homogeneous and clearly written over a short period. Those exactly datable are nos. 29 (284), 30 (286), 34 (290) and 35 (292). Bernand cautiously allows a date of 292-305 for many of the rest, placing the last, no. 39, in 305. The basis for this is a partly

preserved dating formula, "[. . . and year.] of our lords Constantius and Maximianus the most noble Caesars, Pii, Felices, Augusti." The presence of *Sebaston*, or Augustorum, leads Bernand to suppose that the text must follow the elevation of Constantius and Galerius to the rank of Augustus on the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian in 305. That argument, however, does not take account of the continued presence of *Kaisaron* in the titulature (hence the rejection of a date to 305 or 306 in Bagnall and Worp, *Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt* [Missoula, 1979], 14, which is not cited by Bernand). One can, in fact, parallel the titulature here precisely from two papyri of A.D. 295, in which the phrase *Eusebon Eutuchon Sebaston* is added at the end of the imperial titulature (*P.Oxy.* XLIII 3137 and *P.Lips.* 29, dated to 4 July and to somewhere in the period January-August). A date in 295 would close out the series and leave us with approximately one inscription for each year in the period 284 to 295; there is no reason to suppose that any of this group is later than 295.

The epitaphs are, as Bernand says, interesting principally for onomastics, where they have much to tell us about a region otherwise not well documented. In this respect I call attention to the excellent study of Jean Bingen, "Akôris: épigraphie et onomastique," *Chronique d'Égypte* 63 (1988): 165-72, where many valuable observations on this corpus are found. Those reflections, like these, point up how helpfully this corpus volume facilitates the further study of this material by the historian, and Étienne Bernand deserves our thanks for this latest service to scholarship.

ROGER S. BAGNALL

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Essai sur la théologie du temple d'Horus à Edfou. By SYLVIE CAUVILLE. Two vols. Bibliothèque d'Étude, 102. Cairo: INSTITUT FRANÇAIS D'ARCHÉOLOGIE ORIENTALE, 1987. Pp. xv + 269; viii + 63 + 2 maps (paper).

The present volume continues the series of articles and studies on Edfu temple published by Cauville since 1980 (listed in the bibliography, p. 252), which derive from her work as a copyist at the site. Her role in the re-edition and correction of Edfu text publications has afforded her a great familiarity with the temple's decorative program as well, and it is the complex schema of relief correspondences that forms the primary focus of this state thesis first presented at Lyon. Eschewing studies of individual rites or stereotypical scenes common to Ptolemaic temples, Cauville desires "to provide a view of the temple as a whole, to orient it upon its doctrinal