

Berichtigungsliste der griechischen Papyrusurkunden aus Ägypten, vol. 9. Edited by P. W. PESTMAN and H.-A. RUPPRECHT. Leiden: E. J. BRILL, 1995. Pp. x + 476. Hfl 230, \$148.50.

In reviewing the previous volume of this series I described its general characteristics and use: the *BL* records for all Greek documentary papyri and similar objects the reeditions, corrections, and interpretations put forth since the appearance of the text in its original or subsequent edition. It is thus a cornerstone of scholarly work, allowing scholars to trace a text through the scholarly literature, to avoid using "evidence" that has already been shown to be different, doubtful, or wrong, and to have the most current thinking available (see *JAOS* 114 [1994]: 517-18, where a fuller description is given).

Over the years the volume of critical writing about papyrological texts has grown enormously, and in the preface to volume eight the editors called attention to the growth in the number of pages required on average to contain the material from a year's publications, from 12.5 pages in volume three to 67.6 in volume eight. Some of this growth, it should be said, reflects the editors' more ambitious scope, fuller entries, and better coverage. The trend line has accelerated for the current volume, with 418 pages required for four years' work, over one hundred pages per year. This growth poses severe challenges to the editors and their staff (F. A. J. Hoogendijk has primary responsibility for this volume, with N. Kruit and A. Verhoogt also credited on the title page; a fuller list of contributors is given on p. vi), not only of keeping up with the publications in the field, but of publishing their volumes in a timely and affordable fashion.

The ninth volume is a remarkable tribute to the entire *BL* team's ability and willingness to respond realistically and responsibly to these challenges. The time lag between the last year of publications covered and the year of the volume's appearance has actually been cut from six years to five, despite the fifty percent increase in material, and we are promised (p. v) that the tenth volume, scheduled for the next papyrological congress in 1998, will reduce the lag to three years. The drop in the maximum gap (in the year before a volume's publication) is equally dramatic, from thirteen years in 1991 to six years in 1997. It should also be noted that another provisional *BL Bulletin*, prepared by N. Kruit, listing complete reeditions of texts (for the years 1991-95) was published in time for the Berlin papyrological congress in August, 1995. This, too, is welcome. (As with its predecessor, it is available from the Papyrologisch Instituut, Witte Singel 27, Leiden, Netherlands.) Indeed, volume nine itself includes numerous references to publications after its official cutoff date (especially where a text was reedited in its entirety) and a very large number of corrections communicated orally or by letter, even as late as 1994.

Although the price remains high, it is actually about fifteen percent cheaper (thus about twenty-five percent cheaper in real terms) per page than the preceding volume. This reduction, like the closing of the time gap, results in considerable part from the use for the first time of computer technology in the preparation of the manuscript, which was printed from camera-ready copy. The reproduction of the traditional format of the *BL* has been extremely skillful, and the appearance of the volume is excellent.

The contents, naturally, are of the miscellaneous nature dictated by the flow of publications, and one can hardly describe them in a review; one does, however, see some "masses" of corrections and reeditions generated by major projects concerning whole categories of documents (the most visible in this volume is probably Sijpesteijn's *P. Customs*; quite a few also derive from the creation of the general register of documents in progress in Heidelberg). The editors do not express opinions about proposed readings, although they do point out (almost stealthily) a certain number of contradictions and problems; the work of compilation is certainly anything but mechanical.

One new feature has been introduced at the beginning of the volume, a rubric "Allgemeines," in which items that recur frequently are dealt with. Instead of being organized by references to the documents in which the word appears, as the rest of the volume is, these are given by alphabetical order of the Greek word or name concerned. There is just one page of them, but one may well imagine the rubric growing. The usefulness of the section, paradoxically, may well depend on its being relatively short, as scholars are unlikely to use it the same way that they use the rest of the volume, by checking a reference: no one will think to look up in the *BL* every Greek word in a text! This is, rather, a section for reading, and for some of the entries it does give in brief the basis for the statements made. As such it should be very useful; I suppose most people have had the experience of remembering that somewhere there is a discussion of why one should resolve an abbreviation one way rather than another, but of forgetting just where it appeared. These entries seem to me, however, in the end to remind us that we do not have a modern encyclopedic dictionary of the significant Greek vocabulary of the documentary papyri, a replacement for Preisigke's *Fachwörter* along more ambitious lines, and the entries point up just how valuable such a thing would be.

I hope it will not seem ungrateful to repeat here that it would be highly desirable to have the *BL* not merely created using electronic means but also available to the user in electronic form. The editors' very success in bringing out more frequent and punctual volumes to cover the growing bulk of material will over time make the task of managing the multiple, non-cumulative, tomes that much more burdensome for the user. For scholars use the linkage of the entries of the *BL* with the electronic texts themselves (all of the papyri are now in machine-readable form

in the Duke Data Bank of Documentary Papyri) would be optimal. The obstacles to such a linkage are not technical, but they are no less real for that. It is very much hoped that they can be overcome.

We should close, however, by congratulating the editorial team, not only for doing an essential and altruistic task very well, but also for their successful efforts to do so more swiftly and efficiently, and for the beginnings of their move into the era of electronic information.

ROGER S. BAGNALL

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Ptolemy of Egypt. By WALTER M. ELLIS. London: ROUTLEDGE, 1994. Pp. xix + 104. \$49.95.

Readers of this slender volume, attracted by a jacket blurb promising the story of a "leader of prophetic insight, extraordinary intellect and keen administrative ability," may well be disappointed. For the Ptolemy described herein is a cautious and level-headed soldier, epitomizing the type of "plain, blunt man that loved my friend" immortalized in Shakespeare's *Antony*. Concisely written, *Ptolemy of Egypt* is not so much a biography of the founder of the Ptolemaic kingdom and empire as a discussion of the political struggles of the *diadochoi*, Alexander's successors. In this respect, the author closely follows the narratives of Arrian and Diodorus Siculus—inevitably prompting the query, why read Ellis if one has the ancient literary sources at hand? Since little is known of Ptolemy's early years—he was forty-four when he settled in Egypt in 323—Ellis speculates on Ptolemy's involvement in the relatively well-documented details of Alexander's life; but such reconstructions, however imaginative, lack conviction.

Failure to address fundamental questions significantly weakens this study. Notable among omissions is how Ptolemy viewed himself and the dynasty that he founded and his reasons for passing over Keraunos in favor of Philadelphos as his successor. Why did Ptolemy cultivate fledgling Alexandria rather than the venerable Egyptian town of Memphis or the city of his own foundation, Ptolemais? The consequences proved to be momentous, for at no time before the Macedonian or after the Arab conquests did Egypt have a Mediterranean focus. Proximity to the sea was a quintessentially Greek desideratum, furthered by Macedonians who were content to maintain the southern boundary of Egypt at the First Cataract, yet eager to control coastal cities and islands off Syria and Asia. Ptolemais is not mentioned at all and the considerable Athenian influence on the organization of Alexandria, noted merely in passing, remains

unprobed. Ptolemy is credited with inheriting a fully developed Egyptian administrative system to which he made changes as necessary; but at no point does the author attempt to distinguish the Egyptian legacy from Macedonian innovations. Statements such as, "there can be no doubt . . . that Jews, Asians and native Egyptians were, at best, second-class citizens. We could compare Ptolemaic Egypt to segregated South Africa and find there a reasonable metaphor" (p. 66), mislead the general reader by failing to reveal that citizenship was a Greek concept ineluctably linked with the Greek city—in which individual Jews, Asians, and native Egyptians might obtain the franchise, though not en masse. In this respect, Egypt differed little from the rest of Alexander's empire. At no point does the author demonstrate familiarity with the documentary sources—admittedly sparse for this Ptolemy's reign—which might have caused him to wonder, for example, how much of the mid-third-century law code of Alexandria preserved as *Papyrus Halensis* or the *Revenue Laws* derive from Ptolemy Soter. The author is likewise silent about Ptolemy's wooing Macedonian mercenaries from the armies of his opponents and the opportunities they had to become part of the privileged class of cleruchs—though the connection between the two was convincingly demonstrated by Roger S. Bagnall more than a decade ago ("The Origin of Ptolemaic Cleruchs," *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 21 [1984]: 7–20).

Ellis makes much of Ptolemy's epithet, *Soter* (Savior), but fails to consider how many other deliverers of Greek cities were similarly designated. To this epithet he links divine honors and sovereignty without assessing the degree to which the role of kingship—as distinct from the person of the king—formed the basis of ruler cults, not only among Egyptians, but also among Alexander's hellenized successors. Likewise neglected is how Ptolemy was viewed by his subjects—Greeks, Egyptians, Jews, and others—and how Egyptians, in particular, reacted to the imposition of Macedonian rule.

Much is said about the cult of Sarapis—which would spread throughout the Mediterranean in the course of ensuing centuries. But it is naive to attribute subsequent developments to prophetic foresight. Philadelphos, not Soter, first promoted the affinities of the Sarapis-Isis-Harpokrates triad with the royal family as an aspect of dynastic cult. Moreover, along with the absence of evidence that Egyptians ever worshipped Sarapis in their temples is the fact that they perpetuated the traditional cult of Osiris without apparently associating the two. Likewise Ptolemy Soter cannot possibly have envisioned the extent to which his library and museum would prosper; the enduring success of these enterprises clearly owes more to the bibliomania and avarice of his progeny than to the founder's prescience. On the location of the Library and Museum and their relation to the Serapeum, Ellis would have benefitted from consulting my article, "From Romance to Rhetoric: The Alexandrian Library in