

Hattuša, Stadt der Götter und Tempel: Neue Ausgrabungen in der Hauptstadt der Hethiter. By PETER NEVE. Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie, Bd. 8. Mainz am Rhein: VERLAG PHILIPP VON ZABERN, 1992. Pp. 88 (including 239 color and black and white illustrations), 1 corrigenda sheet (loose). DM 39.80.

For more than eighty years German archaeologists have been active at Boğazköy/Hattuša, capital of the Hittite empire of the second millennium B.C., initially concentrating their efforts on the citadel of Büyükkale and on the Lower City with its Great Temple. Since 1978, however, the expedition has been excavating the large tract known as the Upper City, where a number of unexpected finds have been made. These include more than a dozen temples, several containing important epigraphic material (twenty-eight tablets and thousands of sealed bullae), an elaborate building complex linked to the citadel by a substantial viaduct, and a cultic installation focused on a large man-made pool. The last, which incorporates a shrine dedicated to the final Hittite Great King, Šuppiluliuma II, is shown by a lengthy Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription to have had chthonic associations.

In this small volume, which originally appeared as a fascicle of *Antike Welt*, the current director of work at Boğazköy presents these exciting discoveries, accompanying his discussion with a plethora of plans and photographs, quite a few of the latter in color. He gives an English version of some of the same material in *Proceedings of the British Academy* 80 (1993): 105–32, but with far less extensive illustration there. This work should find a place in every library of ancient Near Eastern archaeology.

GARY BECKMAN
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

Berichtigungsliste der griechischen Papyrusurkunden aus Ägypten, vol. 8. Edited by P. W. PESTMAN and H.-A. RUPPRECHT. Leiden: E. J. BRILL, 1992. Pp. x + 626. Hfl 350, \$200.

The *BL*, as it is familiarly known to papyrologists, has since the first volume (published in fascicles 1913–22) been one of the cornerstones of the orderly edifice of this discipline and a central tool of bibliographic control. It records for all Greek papyri (and similar objects, like ostraka) published in distinct bibliographic units (generally indexed volumes) the reeditions, proposed textual corrections, and discussions put forth since the appearance of the base text. Scholars can thus use it to trace the fortunes of any text and in this way hope not to have missed anything crucial when citing or studying the papyrus in question.

The usefulness of such a volume depends upon its completeness, accuracy, and availability. No such tool can hope to be

free of omission and error; usage has shown that volume 2 (1929–1933) is less reliable than volume 1, for example. The transfer of the project to Leiden after Bilabel's death and the accumulated files and expertise of several decades now have given the more recent volumes a very high degree of reliability and usefulness. Volume 8 has been prepared by F. A. J. Hoogendijk, with a significant contribution of items missing from older volumes provided by Peter van Minnen. Though only time will tell, it gives an initial impression of high quality work in compilation and presentation.

Availability is quite another matter. Once volume 3 had cleared away the backlog of twenty-two years, succeeding volumes have covered six to eight years each. The amount of material to be covered, however, has grown considerably, a fact that exercises the editors' arithmetical skills in the preface to the newest volume. Where volume 3 required 12.5 pages of material per year elapsed since the last volume's cutoff, volume 7 requires 50.5 pages per year and volume 8 requires 67.6 pages. The progression is nearly linear, but the user hefting the 541 pages of corrections required by the output of 1979–1986 can hardly help but echo the editors' amazement. The great growth of critical work on papyri in the 1970s and 1980s, mirrored in these figures, reflects in part the success that the late Herbert Youtie had in making such work more fashionable; in part the greater accessibility of collections, thanks to modern air travel and communications, along with a universalization of photography; and perhaps also in part the gradual decline in the numbers of well-preserved unpublished papyri in collections, making it more attractive to improve and rework already published pieces.

The bulk has a second consequence, however, in the increase in the time lag between the period covered and the appearance of the volume: once three to four years, now six to eight for the two most recent volumes. Toward the end of a preparation cycle, the gap is very large indeed: in 1991, there were thirteen years of corrections not yet recorded in a published volume. Of this, too, the editors are conscious. Participants in the XX International Congress of Papyrology received a "B. L. Bulletin: Liste von Neudrücken und vollständigen Textausgaben von 1987–1992," prepared by N. Kruit (with assistance from K. A. Worp), in the preface to which the time lag is deplored. At least for those texts completely republished we now have a more current tool. (It can be obtained from the Papyrologisch Instituut, Witte Singel 27, 2311 BG Leiden, Netherlands.)

A third consequence is the high cost of acquiring the latest volume, which is priced well beyond the means of most individuals. With a relatively small but captive audience, a very high cost of typesetting, and a lack of in-house automation, one might be surprised that Brill has not set the price still higher. But \$200 is certainly a deterrent even to most serious papyrologists.

The solution to these problems of availability—quantity, cost, speed—will surely have to come from automation. I can

hardly do better than quote the words of Deborah Hobson (reviewing the concordance to volumes 1–7 of the *BL* in *BASP* 28 [1991]: 78): “If one could find any fault with this publication, it would be only to question the utility, in this day of technology, of producing in hard cover a reference work which would be more usable, and probably cheaper to produce and to purchase (not many will be able to afford to have this expensive volume at home), in a database format which could be updated as new corrections are published. The very nature of this kind of reference work virtually guarantees its obsolescence at the moment of its publication, whereas we now live in a world where information can be collected and distributed in a mode which allows for continual incorporation of new material.”

ROGER S. BAGNALL
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Life in a Multi-Cultural Society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and Beyond. Edited by JANET H. JOHNSON. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, no. 51. Chicago: THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, 1992. Pp. xxvii + 514 (including 32 plates, 9 figures, and 5 tables) + 1 errata sheet (loose). (Paper.)

This volume publishes the proceedings of a symposium held in Chicago in September 1990 as a prelude to the Fourth International Congress of Demotists. It comprises forty-four contributions (“chapters”), representing most of the papers given; a few have been published elsewhere and/or appear only in abstract form. Revision in the light of discussion at the symposium and subsequent reflection was allowed up to September 1991. References follow the Harvard system, with a collective bibliography at the end. The indexes are extensive.

It is a splendid volume and an important move towards a more integrated picture of a fascinating period of Egyptian history. In her preface, Janet Johnson emphasizes the richness of the extant sources and the importance, given the existence of numerous cultures in Egypt, of bringing different specialists together. It is pleasing to see demotic studies, despite their natural tendency towards the hermetic, leading the way in bringing this about. Any reader versed in earlier periods of Egyptian history must be struck by the volume and diversity of the evidence available. The contributions reflect this, ranging from administration to agriculture, economy to education, law to literacy, taking in art and religion along the way. Greek and demotic naturally dominate. Some papers address the multicultural question directly; others are content to present research on specific problems within the period covered.

In a brief review of a conference volume, it is always invidious to single out individual contributions. Approaches to the evidence are critically important, however, and for that reason

one deserves special mention. Robert Ritner’s paper, enticingly subtitled “A Question of Noses, Soap and Prejudice,” is as concerned with modern preconceptions as with ancient evidence. In it, he vigorously pronounces *both* the “biological model,” which still infects Egyptology, and according to which everything after the New Kingdom is moribund, *and* the distasteful yet apparently ineradicable notions of Greek cultural and racial superiority which pervade even disturbingly recent and otherwise distinguished Classical scholarship. An adequate understanding of Ptolemaic Egypt and the interrelationship of its diverse cultures will only be possible when scholars rid themselves of such prejudices.

One cause for regret is that there are so few “archaeological” contributions. The index of “Papyri, Ostraca and Inscribed Objects” is not a failure on the part of the indexer; *uninscribed* objects scarcely figure in the 500 pages of this volume, which is essentially a collection of essays on what texts can tell us about a particular millennium of Egyptian history. Texts do provide insights into cultural interrelationships that other sources cannot. Egypt had been a multicultural society long before Cambyses, as is shown by the recent discovery of a Minoan presence at the Palestinian settlement of Avaris in Egypt’s eastern Delta in the middle of the second millennium B.C. What is different about the later period is partly a higher survival rate of papyrological evidence, but principally the spread of literacy to new languages. Neither the Minoan nor the Palestinian inhabitants of Avaris spoke languages which found literary expression, nor did the many Nubians, Asiatics, Libyans, and others who had settled in Egypt over the millennia. Although there had been foreign troops in Egypt since the Old Kingdom, and glimpses of the importance of some—such as the New Kingdom Sherden—occasionally filter obliquely through the sources, the only well-known garrison community is the Jewish one at Elephantine, precisely because some of its members could write and because a cache of their papyri happens to have survived.

But texts alone are not enough: they exclude both significant aspects of society which were not written about and the mass of any ancient population. The general absence of other studies here is not a criticism of the symposium organisers—although the demotic environment may have exacerbated it—but rather of the divisions within modern scholarship. If Greeks and Egyptians could talk to each other, and modern students of their respective writings are beginning to do so, why cannot archaeologists and philologists? Perhaps the next multicultural symposium should set itself the Herculean task of achieving this.

Johnson’s preface voices some fundamental beliefs—in the interest of the later phases of Egyptian history for their own sake, and in the importance of the contribution that the Egyptian evidence has still to make to understanding. I would add the further point that the abundant sources of the period can inform, however indirectly, our view of earlier times, particularly on aspects underrepresented in earlier records. Egyptian agricultural