

*Greek and Latin Papyrology*. By ITALO GALLO. Pp. xii + 153, pls. 16. University of London, Institute of Classical Studies, Classical Handbook 1. London, 1986. ISBN 900587 50 4. Price £9.00.

Italo Gallo, known for his contributions to literary papyrology and particularly to the biographical papyri, aimed to offer a handbook 'for students and scholars alike'; the Institute of Classical Studies, we are told by J. P. Barron, sponsored the English version of an 'indispensable' work 'with the needs of graduate students in mind'. The reader acquainted with Eric Turner's *Greek Papyri* may wonder why this volume is needed for an anglophone audience: according to Gallo, Turner 'differs in outlook from the present handbook, which is more broadly based'. This appears to mean that Turner did not give undue attention to the Herculaneum papyri. It certainly does not prevent Gallo from distilling whole chapters (see p. 101, n. 1) from Turner.

The volume offers nine chapters, with 97 pages of text and 28 of notes, followed by bibliography, indices and plates. Documents get only 15 pages of text (and derisory notes), while literary papyri occupy 31 pages (chapters 4-5), with more copious notes. The remaining chapters treat definitions, writing materials, the history of papyrology, dating and palaeography, editorial procedures, and the future.

The book's programme is predominantly literary. From the first chapter (straw-man polemic against Wilcken and others), through the chapter on dating (one insubstantial paragraph on documents, seven pages on literary texts), to the plates (12 of 16 literary), emphasis is consistent. This is natural enough, for Gallo actually knows something about literary papyri; the rest is potted scholarship, full of errors and omissions. A book which claims to be 'more broadly based' has no excuse for such a lack of balance. It is truly bizarre to read the gloomy portrait (pp. 79-81) of the disorderly state of documentary papyrology, surely the best-organized discipline of classical antiquity! The reader should also be warned that the blatant nationalism of the author (p. 31) permeates much more than his survey of papyrology by nation in chapter 3. The index of modern authors, for example, gives more citations for the trio of Cavallo, Gigante, and Montevicchi than to the combination of Preisigke, Wilcken, Grenfell, Hunt, Youtie and Schubart. In a primer for Italian undergraduates, this makes some sense; in a textbook for English-speaking graduate students, it makes none.

Twenty years ago I had my first instruction in papyrology (from a gifted trio of teachers, of whom Eric Turner was one) beginning with *Greek Papyri*, and for many years that book has introduced my own students to the field as it did me. It has its shortcomings, as any introductory book is bound to, but it also has originality, grace, substance, and balance, like its wide-ranging author. Gallo's primer, condensed and unbalanced as it is, cannot be a respectable substitute. Nor is it a satisfactory reference manual. For that the student wants Montevicchi's *La papirologia*, which despite some faults has demonstrated its usefulness abundantly by now, and of which a new, corrected, and expanded version is expected imminently. What need Gallo's book in English will fill, I cannot see.

ROGER S. BAGNALL

*Le camp romain de Louqsor (avec une étude des graffites gréco-romains du temple d'Amon)*. By M. EL-SAGHIR, J.-C. GOLVIN, M. REDDÉ, E. HEGAZY, G. WAGNER. Pp. viii + 122, figs. 71, pls. 22. Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire, 83. Cairo 1986. Price not stated.

In this book our knowledge of the Roman military establishment in Upper Egypt in the late empire is enlarged by the results of work done under the aegis of the French Institute in Cairo. The report of the investigation of the military fort at Luxor is a collaborative one. After a preface by J. Leclant, there are sections on the history of excavations, a description of the remains, and the installation of the military at Thebes, all unsigned but apparently by Golvin; on the place of the camp in Roman military architecture (Reddé), the end of military occupation (Wagner), the reused Pharaonic blocks (El-Saghir, Hegazy), and the graffiti (Wagner). Excavation by the team was

limited to two three-week seasons, and the observations are otherwise based on remains *in situ* above ground.

After a long history as a temple of the first rank, the sanctuary apparently fell out of use in the mid-third century AD; at a later date (under Diocletian, Golvin argues on the basis of the inscriptions on the *tetrakionia* inside two of the gates), the Roman army constructed an almost trapezoidal fort in which the temple ran from one end to the other, not quite centred but in perfect alignment with the walls. First interpreted as city walls, these were recognized as military and late imperial by Monneret de Villard, who spotted the representation of the tetrarchs on the wall of a reused room in the temple. The usable area (apart from the temple) was about 3.72 ha, which Golvin thinks could have held in barracks only about 1500 men.

The date rests on imperial dedications on the *tetrakionia*; the earlier is (if the various dating criteria are all correct) of December, 301, the later around 308. Golvin argues that since that inside gates I and II is aligned both with them and with the streets linked to them, it must come from the same time as they do. Logically, of course, it could only follow them, since it seems designed to fit them; but there seems no reason to suppose much lapse of time. The gates were built of stone reused from Pharaonic buildings, the circuit walls, with their horseshoe-shaped towers, of unbaked bricks. Golvin rejects the hypothesis (repeated most recently as fact by W. A. MacDonald, *The Architecture of the Roman Empire*, II (New Haven, 1986), 88) that the western *tetrakionion* 'was located at the intersection of two colonnaded streets'; there is no evidence of such colonnades. The second, eastern, *tetrakionion* is at a plaza in front of gate V where streets meet. Otherwise, the surviving or photographed remains inside the walls are of very diverse eras and one cannot reconstruct the plan with confidence even from aerial photographs; extensive excavations would be needed.

Though this is not a long work, it is rich in interest and particularly in illustration. Collaboration has here and there not been joined to coordination (Wagner's discussion of the late evidence for the camp is well-informed and seemingly unknown to Golvin in his history of military occupation, for example). But the treatment is in general clear, easy to follow on plans and photographs, and sensible.

The final section (by Wagner) publishes or republishes the 'inscriptions et graffiti grecs du Temple de Louqsor'. Its rich photographic documentation is welcome, though occasionally a plate is virtually unusable. But as has already been pointed out by J. Bingen (*CdE* 61 (1986), 330-4), almost none of these texts has anything to do with the Roman military camp; most date from a period when Amun was still venerated here. Wagner tries to make a case for assigning 37-39 and 50-52 (the latter group all Latin) to the period of military occupation, but 37 certainly dates to a period when the temple was still functioning and hence (despite the mention of a cohort) has nothing to do with the Diocletianic camp. Nor is there anything in 38 and 39 to warrant so late a date. And while 50 may be tetrarchic, 51 and 52 are both certainly considerably earlier. On the other hand, the Coptic 49 (where Wagner omits two crosses visible in the lower inscription) and the certainly Christian 40 (*εἰς θεός*) must belong to a later period, when a church was constructed in part of the temple.

Regrettably, there is much deficient about this publication, apart from its unclear *raison d'être*. Many of the inscriptions were published before by H. Riad. Wagner gives a list of them in his introduction but no references in the editions of the texts and, with one exception, no reference to any places where his readings differ from those of Riad, not to mention those of J. Bingen in his review of Riad in *CdE* 45 (1970), 405-6. An example: 38 is a graffito by one *Ἀμερῶς Ἀθαοῦτος*, according to Wagner. Now Bingen had proposed *Ἀραοῦτος* for the patronymic, but this suggestion is not mentioned here. It is, in fact, clearly impossible, as one can see from the plate. But, as Wagner admits, the name *Ἀθαοῦς* is otherwise unknown. On the plate, it seems to me that *Λολοῦτος*, an extremely common name at Thebes, would be satisfactory; the stroke crossing the first lambda is not as straight as those of the other alphas in this hand, and Riad in fact read it as lambda. The cross-strokes in the next two letters can be seen to be parts of damage to the surface. Wagner has also omitted two inscriptions included by Riad which could not be relocated, making the present edition fall short of a complete publication of the building's inscriptions (Riad's no. 18 (p. 290) is described as 'tout près' to Wagner's 45; since the latter is not illustrated, the reader cannot judge how close.) More remarks of detail could be offered (cf. Bingen's review for several),



but one will have to suffice here. In 26 there appears Heron, son of Ammonios, Ἀρσινοεΐτης. Wagner comments, 'On ne peut savoir de quelle Arsinoé il s'agit, mais le patronyme indique une origine égyptienne et la plus connue des villes de ce nom est Crocodilopolis-Arsinoé, la métropole de l'Arsinoïte'. On the contrary, only the Arsinoïte can be meant, for the ethnic of cities named Arsinoe is always Ἀρσινοεύς.

ROGER S. BAGNALL

*Les ostraca grecs de Douch (O. Douch)*, Fascicule I (1-57). Ed. H. CUVIGNY and G. WAGNER. Pp. xi + 47, pls. 8. Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, Documents de fouilles, 24. Cairo, 1986. Price not stated.

The first fascicle of Greek ostraka from Dush contains the publishable items from the excavations of 1976; those of the three seasons carried out in 1978-81 are yet to come. Since the finds of the various seasons overlap considerably, it is not clear that it was a good idea to publish them in separate fascicles. The reader is repeatedly irritated by cross-references to texts which cannot be consulted. The texts are given in order of inventory numbers (with the unnumbered ones at the start); this is a very bad idea, as it separates similar texts in favour of an arbitrary numbering. The explanation that a chronological or thematic sequence was impossible because new finds continue is silly; each fascicle (if they must be so published) could at least have its own coherence. Despite the title, we are given snippets of three Coptic ostraka, but only the opening lines in each case; for 44 and 49 there are plates, and for 49 we have a translation of the rest but no text! This procedure is indefensible. The concordance is given in the order publication-inventory rather than the logical reversed order and is thus useless. The photographic documentation is substantial once one gets to the texts with inventory numbers, covering 28, 30-9, 41-3, 45-57, but of the N. N. ostraka, only 19B and 27 are illustrated; no explanation is given. Were no photographs available to the editors? A fascicle of this size is hardly so large that a few more plates would make it too big. [A valuable set of addenda and corrigenda to this fascicle, the work of H. Cuvigny, appears now in fascicle 2, along with the welcome information that ostraka 1-27 have now been found again and photographed. Cuvigny has been able to make significant improvements in the texts of these ostraka. Fascicle 2 also remedies many of the defects of organization mentioned above.]

The ostraka all come from the interior of the late Roman fortress at the ancient Kysis, in the large oasis, and they will eventually have a great deal to contribute to our understanding of military life in the later fourth and early fifth century (the editors' date for the material). There is abundant evidence for military posts and ranks, for the onomastics of the garrison (later survival of some common Theban names than the ostraka from Thebes attest), for the foodstuffs and other items needed and supplied, and for language and formulas.

On details, I limit myself to one text, 54, described as 'Compte en espèces' by the editors, who resolve a χ-shaped symbol as that for talents. In line 2, the number read as nu (50) is in fact upsilon (400). Line 5 is the sum of 2 and 3. Lines 6 and 7 are apparently further additions, leading up to a sum in line 8 (where for ὄμο(ίως) read ὄμοῦ, as Klaas Worp points out to me) of 1,900. The talents in previous lines, however, add up to 1,800, plus 16 and 9 νοῦμ(μοι) in lines 5 and 7. I cannot see when 25 nummi could have equalled the missing 100 talents; if the nummus after 350 was worth a myriad of denarii, it was worth 6 $\frac{2}{3}$  talents, not 4 talents. Line 10 appears to offer a meat price of 5 lbs. for 750 talents, a price which would point to gold at about 1,382,400 talents/lb. and to the time from the 350s to the 370s (cf. Bagnall, *Currency and Inflation in Fourth Century Egypt* (Atlanta, 1985), 4, 46-7). I must record some uneasiness about the symbol resolved as talent, as it does not resemble the usual form; an interpretation as ξέστης, sextarius, however, does not seem to lead to any viable results.

This is an interesting collection of documents and will eventually be an important one. I look forward to further instalments.

ROGER S. BAGNALL