

as we know (nos. 6, 7, 11-13). However, these officers were not merely legionary legates, but also provincial governors. This in itself was a reason for appointing senior figures. In the later period only three legates are sufficiently known: the anonymous no. 15 may have been tribune before commanding the legion; Annius Fabianus (no. 16, p. 43) held the obligatory tribunate before he became legate of *X Fretensis* and, finally, C. Popilius Carus Pedo (no. 17, pp. 44f.) was tribune of *III Cyrenaica* and fought in the Bar Kokhba war before his appointment as commander of the *X Fretensis*. It may be noted, however, that he did not take up this appointment, and yet this did not prevent him from being appointed governor of Germania Superior at a later stage. He thus obtained a major military command elsewhere, in the west, without any further army experience. I would therefore conclude that the importance of previous military experience for legionary commanders has to be left an open question at this stage. There is no doubt, however, as to the duration of the legateship: the table on p. 52 clearly shows, and D. observes that this ranged from three to five years in the Flavian period and thereafter was three years on average.

The six *tribuni laticlavii* (pp. 55-64) obviously had no previous military careers to discuss. The thirteen *tribuni angusticlavii* (pp. 65-80) followed the regular career pattern of equestrian officers and the majority came from the western provinces and from Italy. There is no space here to go into the various exceptions and details discussed by D. A total of 43 centurions are recorded. It is not always easy to determine their origin, as may be illustrated by the case of A. Instuleius Tenax (no. 19, p. 89), who was *primipilaris* of the *legio XII Fulminata* in AD 65. It is perhaps significant that Instuleius Tenax is not described as a *primipilaris* on a later inscription from Ascalon which mentions him as a plain centurion of the *X Fret.* The explanation may well be that he first served in the *XII Fulm.* which suffered disgraceful defeat under Cestius Gallus at Beth Horon and was banished to Melitene in Cappadocia after the war (Jos., *BJ* vii 1, 3 (18)). It is therefore quite possible that Instuleius Tenax was on the same occasion demoted to a lower centurionate in another legion. In the winter of 67-8 Vespasian placed (temporary?) garrisons in Judaea, commanded by decurions in villages and by centurions in towns (*BJ* iv 8, 1 (442)). If Instuleius Tenax was one of these there is no reason to assume that Ascalon was his place of origin, as suggested by D. A similar case may be Aurelius Marcellinus, centurion of the *legio X Fretensis*, buried by his spouse at Tiberias (no. 5, p. 82). Again, it is clear that Herennius Moschus (no. 17, p. 87) buried his daughter at Philadelphia (Amman), but it is not clear whether this was his home town or whether he settled there later. In short, we cannot always distinguish between centurions who settled somewhere during or after their army service and became honoured citizens there, and those who returned as distinguished citizens to their home towns. There is no doubt, however, that L. Gerellanus Fronto and L. Valerius Celer were recruited at Heliopolis (Baalbek) (no. 16, pp. 86f.) in the reign of Nero at the latest. This is of interest because they were clearly descendants of the veterans established by Augustus in the Roman colony - or colonies - of Berytus and Baalbek. As regards the origin of the centurions, D. reaches the following conclusion: AD 30-70: 2 came from Italy, 3 from the east. AD 70-117: 1 from Italy, 1 from Pannonia Superior and 1 from Spain. After 117: from a total of 17 centurions 7 were from Italy, 2 from Spain, 1 from Gaul, 1 from Africa and 4 from the east. I am not certain what can be deduced from these figures.

Another question of interest is the matter of the previous military experience of the centurions who, as is generally known, were the backbone of the Roman legion. The centurions listed in the present study usually started their military career as centurions, apart from those promoted from the ranks of the praetorian or urban cohorts. D., however, is clearly right in observing that the *legio X Fretensis* was usually not the first posting for those centurions whose career can be followed. Eight of these served first in other legions while only four began their career in this legion. Moreover, three of the four belong to the second half of the second century and the first half of the third, when Judaea was a less problematic province. It is thus quite possible that there was a tendency to post experienced centurions to the legion from AD 70 till the second half of the second century. So far these general comments. If I disagree with D. in some of my conclusions this merely shows that his work provides a sound and useful basis for the discussion of real issues.

A few points of detail may be mentioned here. The map on p. 6 is copied from B. Isaac & I. Roll, *Roman Roads in Judaea*, i (1982), figs. 1-2. Through an oversight no reference is made to the source. I do not believe that Tiberius turned the Euphrates into a defensive line against Parthia (p. 12). The evidence for unrest in Judaea under Antoninus Pius is unreliable (p. 17, n. 47, referring to *SHA*, Ant. Pius 5, 4). D. is rightly hesitant in accepting countermarked coins and stamped bricks as evidence for garrisons in cities (p. 19f.). One stamped brick in Jaffa does not prove that there was an army base there, although, of course, there may have been one, and countermarks on coins from Tyre and Sidon should not be construed as indicating that vexillations of the legion were sent to Phoenice. I am not sure why D. describes Flavius Silva as one of the most popular people during Vespasian's reign (p. 30). The identification of the legate of AE 1978.825 (n. 8, p. 31) is a brilliant conjecture by Ronald Syme, but in no way an established certainty. However, these are matters of minor importance. D. has given us a useful tool which will render good service to many scholars.

Benjamin Isaac

Tel Aviv University

Joseph Méléze Modrzejewski, *Statut personnel et liens de famille dans les droits de l'Antiquité. Variorum Collected Studies* 411. Aldershot, Hants, 1993, pp. x + 298.

It is not often that one can express a desire in a book review and have it fulfilled almost instantly. In reviewing Joseph Méléze Modrzejewski's first volume of collected articles, *Droit impérial et traditions locales dans l'Égypte romaine* (Aldershot 1990) in *Scripta Classica Israelica* 12, 1993, 209-10, I noted that this volume omitted M.'s articles on Ptolemaic Egypt, on family law, and on Jews and Greeks in Egypt, and that collections of these important contributions would also be most welcome. This new volume, also from Variorum, collects ten articles on the Greek and Hellenistic side of M.'s work, fulfilling one of these desiderata admirably. (Another volume, *Les Juifs d'Égypte de Ramsès II à Hadrien* [Paris 1991], which I had not yet seen when I wrote the earlier review, provides an elegantly produced and illustrated synthesis of his work on Jews in Egypt, rather than just a collection of published articles. An English version is to be published shortly, and it will no doubt have wide use in university teaching.)

The formal characteristics of the new volume are like those of its predecessor. The articles are reproduced from the original publications and have the original pagination (no continuous pagination is added, but article numbers are put in the upper margin). Brief addenda give subsequent bibliographic or documentary references pertinent to the subject or documents treated, and occasionally a return to some substantive issue. These are, happily, richer than in the Roman volume. There is a substantial index of literary and documentary sources cited, but, as normal, no subject index. The introduction to the volume gives brief summaries of the individual articles and links them to the theme of the volume. The same excellent portrait of M. is given at the head of the volume. The price is as usual unaffordable for most individual scholars.

Of the original articles reproduced here, six come from major journals in ancient law or classics (*BIDR*, *ZSS*, *RIDA*, *RHD*, *REG*) and four from conference proceedings or *Festschriften*. They were thus on average somewhat less difficult of access than those in the Roman volume. On the other hand, they mainly represent a slightly earlier period of M.'s work (three are from the 1960s), which may account for the fuller bibliographic additions here. All of them are substantial pieces, most devoted to broad topics of great importance. Four are categorized under "statut personnel", four under "mariage et famille", and the remaining two concern succession and foundations.

Singling out particular articles from these must largely be a matter of individual interest. M. has stressed the continuing Hellenic character of the Greek societies implanted in Egypt and elsewhere in the conquests of Alexander, never more forcefully and importantly than in the classic article on "Le statut des Hellènes dans l'Égypte lagide" reprinted here. As the addenda point out, the conclusions of that article may need some nuancing for the later Ptolemaic period; the same is true for the discussion of mixed marriages that takes off from the case of Dryton, where recent work (especially by Willy Clarysse) has brought quite a lot of new evidence to bear. And I must confess to being as yet unpersuaded that any treatment of brother-sister marriage is entirely satisfying (see R.S. Bagnall and B.W. Frier, *The Demography of Roman Egypt* [Cambridge 1994] 127-34 for a different approach to the problem). But these articles will all the same remain fundamental for our understanding of personal status and family life in the Hellenistic world, and the addenda here will happily extend their life.

As always with M., acuteness of reasoning is married to complete documentation to offer compelling arguments, presented with vigor and grace. These articles are as pleasant as profitable to read, and despite the quirks and cost of the Variorum format the volume is most welcome.

Roger S. Bagnall

Columbia University

Hans-Albert Rupprecht, *Kleine Einführung in die Papyrskunde*. Série: *Die Altertumswissenschaft. Einführungen in Gegenstand, Methoden und Ergebnisse ihrer Teildisziplinen und Hilfswissenschaften*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1994, pp. 272, 1 carte de l'Égypte et 4 planches.*

Le livre est sorti de la plume d'un des plus éminents représentants de la papyrologie moderne: Président de l'Association Internationale de Papyrologues (depuis 1989), Directeur de l'Institut für Rechtsgeschichte und Papyrusforschung de la Philippsuniversität Marburg où il a succédé à Emil Kiessling, éditeur des grandes oeuvres de référence fondées par Friedrich Preisigke,¹ auteur de deux monographies² et d'un grand nombre d'articles concernant différents aspects de la documentation papyrologique et du droit de l'Égypte gréco-romaine.³

Le titre et les dimensions du livre induisent en erreur. Ce n'est pas une "petite introduction", similaire au livre récent d'Italo Gallo⁴ mais une introduction générale détaillée, munie d'une bibliographie judicieusement choisie mais abondante (jusqu'à 1993, partiellement). Plus de deux tiers du livre sont "en petit texte" et fournissent au lecteur une information multilatérale, bien systématisée et facile à manier.⁵ L'auteur aborde tous les aspects et les problèmes de la papyrologie documentaire et littéraire avec une maîtrise parfaite mais, comme on devait s'attendre tenant compte de ses intérêts scientifiques, la papyrologie juridique, l'étude de la documentation papyrologique occupe la part du lion⁶ dans cette introduction à la papyrologie, modèle de clarté et d'exposition dense et laconique. Partout, à une exception près (voir infra: Judaïca), l'auteur présente d'une façon succincte mais bien formulée le *status quaestionis* des problèmes controversés ou non résolus.

Le livre se compose d'une *Table des matières* (très détaillée, pp. v-ix), d'une *Préface* où H.-A. Rupprecht mentionne l'aide de M^{me} Andrea Jördens qui a lu le manuscrit et a fait maintes remarques (pp. xi-xii) et de 6 chapitres. *Ch. I. Partie générale* (pp. 1-42) consacrée au papyrus, à sa fabrication et conservation, aux défini-

* L'auteur tient à remercier le Prof. H.M. Cotton qui a mis à sa disposition son exemplaire du livre de H.-A. Rupprecht.

¹ *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten im Auftrag der Strassburger wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft begonnen von F. Preisigke, fortgeführt von F. Bilabel und E. Kiessling*, hrsgb. von H.-A. Rupprecht, depuis le vol. 12, 1976; *Berichtigungsliste der griechischen Papyrusurkunden aus Ägypten* (en collaboration avec les collègues hollandais, depuis le vol. 6, 1976; *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluss der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienbilder usw.*, begründet von F. Preisigke, bearbeitet von E. Kiessling, le vol. 4 fasc. 5 fut édité par H.-A. Rupprecht, 1993, de même que le Supplément 2, 1967-1976, 1991, préparé par A. Jördens.

² *Untersuchungen zum Darlehen im Recht der graeco-ägyptischen Papyri der Ptolemäerzeit*, München, 1967 (*MBPAR*, 51); *Studien zur Quittung im Recht der graeco-ägyptischen Papyri*, München, 1971 (*MBPAR*, 57).

³ Voir I.F. Fikhman, *Vvedenie v dokumental'nuyu papirologiyu* (Introduction à la Papyrologie documentaire), 1987, 434-435, 508, 512, 513, 517 (la liste, bien entendu, n'est plus complète aujourd'hui).

⁴ I. Gallo, *Avviamento alla papirologia greco-latina*, Napoli, 1983. Version anglaise: I. Gallo, *Greek and Latin Papyrology*, trans. M.R. Falivene and J.R. March, London, 1986.

⁵ Voir pp. 8-10, 11-14, 47-53, 57-61, 67-72, 76-82, 84-87, 88-90, 97-102, 144-147, 159-171, 172-174, 176-178, 179-183, 186-191, 193-198, 199-202, 204-209, 212-213.

⁶ I. Gallo, au contraire, prête une attention spéciale à la papyrologie littéraire, chose aussi explicable par son orientation professionnelle.