

BOOK REVIEWS

Rosario Pintaudi, *I papiri Vaticani di Aphrodito*. Città del Vaticano. 2 vols. (Text and Plates). L. 70.000.

Just three years after the appearance of Sijpesteijn's *P. Mich.* XIII, Rosario Pintaudi has produced another contribution to our dossiers from sixth century Aphrodito, the source of so much of our knowledge and theories about Egypt in this period. The archives of Aphrodito need a great deal of work still before they can be fully exploited, and a modern synthesis written, however; most notably, the Cairo papyri edited by Maspero more than 60 years ago badly need a complete revision on the originals by someone who knows the whole material as intimately as Maspero himself did. Still more, perhaps, the Coptic papyri of the archive need editing, for without them any synthetic study of the world of Dioskoros would be a farce. Pintaudi's introduction reveals that the Vatican also acquired a substantial quantity of Coptic papyri from Aphrodito along with the Greek ones published here.

A comparative glance at the plates of *P. Mich.* XIII and of *P. Vatic. Aphrod.* is sufficient to show that Pintaudi's task was very different from Sijpesteijn's. No virtually perfect texts of 363 lines here, but instead a mass of fragments, pieced together to a considerable degree with painstaking work but still, in the end, mostly fragments. At times one has the feeling that the restorer's task was so great as to leave the same scholar, as editor, with little energy for going beyond transcription.

The edition consists of a paperbound book of 73 pages containing texts, translations (where possible), notes, and indices; and a board portfolio containing the folded but unbound plates in a format (unfolded) of 46 x 70 cm. In only a few cases was the large format actually useful; in most it serves to contain several smaller papyri. The detached format is indeed helpful in verifying the texts. Unfortunately the same cannot be said of the quality of the plates. The papyri are in many cases inherently difficult; the photographer

has usually done a competent job (though no. 1 suffers from uneven focus), but the printer has applied such a coarse dot pattern as to make verification of details impossible in many cases. The plates promise more than they deliver, alas: was such luxury (and expense) really needed for such results?

The volume is divided into two parts: 14 texts published in full, and 12 numbers covering papyri reproduced on the plates, described, and in some cases fully or partially transcribed. I must confess some unhappiness with this latter section, where at least some pieces deserved a full edition, most notably no. 25, one of the most extensive--if frustrating--texts in the volume and one where the 'description' in fact consists of a full text--but no notes.

Let us turn now to the individual texts (all from Aphrodito and all of the sixth century but not exactly datable, unless otherwise specified.)

1. Lease of land (23.iv.598). The invocation is lost save for traces, but at this date it can be only the Christ invocation; contrary to the suggestion in the note, the Trinity invocation is excluded, as it occurs first under Phocas (see Bagnall-Worp, "Christian Invocations in the Papyri," *Cd'E* 56 [1981] 112). The indiction (2nd) conflicts with the regnal and consular dates and is, as Pintaudi says, probably wrong. The correct explanation is no doubt that with the change only three days away, and the crops already harvested, the scribe anticipated. The restoration then of δευτέρα in line 8 with reference to the *coming* indiction, however, seems clearly wrong: if the scribe thought it was now the second indiction, he presumably thought that the next one was the third--as indeed the *next harvest* was. I prefer τρίτης, therefore, which, Pintaudi suggests in a note, "*non è da escludersi del tutto.*" It is not correct to treat the lease as being simply of a vineyard, for it is perfectly clear that cereals would occupy much of the land (cf. line 22; why else the provision in line 17 for free choice of crop, and grain as the rent?). The acreage was in fact clearly mixed vineyard, fruit orchard, and grainland, a situation very similar to that in *P. Mich.* XIII 666, a good parallel which Pintaudi repeatedly adduces. The rent is substantial, at 5 artabas per aroura, plus a grab bag of extras. The provisions are of considerable interest, preservation is good, and Pintaudi's notes are full and useful.

2 is also a lease of land which forms part of the missing section of *P. Köln* II 104. Pintaudi reprints only the pertinent part of the text, not its entirety, which is something of a pity. Fragment D looks as if it is part of the dating formula, but I cannot make it out from the plate. 3 has similar but very scrappy bits of a lease.

4-6 are sales of houses, in order of decreasing preservation. Prices of 3 and of 1 1/2 solidi are preserved, but in no case the description of the property which would allow an intelligent evaluation of the prices.

7 is a woman's will (before 546/7: Dioskoros' father Apollos is a witness). It is poorly preserved, but the plate suggests that patient work on the original or a good photograph may make further progress possible. The work would be worthwhile, given the evident interest of the document.

8 is a loan of money and wheat, evidently on security of real property (in line 7 I think ἐπάναγκες can be read before φυλάξω). 9 is a loan of wine, preserved only along the left edge and with only unread traces of a date remaining. 10 is a well-preserved section from the middle of a dialysis; 11 a receipt evidently for rent; 12 a list of tax payments and disbursements therefrom. 13 lists distributions by the monastery of Apa Apollos.

14. Beginning of a document. Since the consular date (23.x. 524) is given only as preserved and the restorations on which the date rests are not printed, it may be worth quoting lines 2-3:

[ὄπατείρας τοῦ δεσπότη] ἡμῶν Φλαυίου Ἰουστίνου τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου
αὐτοκράτορος τὸ δεῦτερον
[καὶ Φλαυίου Ὀπιλιανοῦ] τοῦ λαμπροτάτου Φαῶφι // κς // τρίτης ἰνδικ-
(τίτου)

In each line 19 letters must be restored (the break is vertical at this point). The same sort of length is indicated at the start of line 4:

[Αὐρηλία - - - θυγατήρ] τοῦ τῆς μακαρίας μνήμης Ἰσιδώρου μη(τρὸς)
Ἀντωνίας ὀρωμένης ἀπὸ κόμης

Allowing 5-7 letters for a name, one would get 18-20 letters. In

lines 5 and 6, however, where the lacuna should again be the same size, the editor restores:

[Ἀφροδίτης τοῦ Ἀνταιοπολίτου] νομοῦ βραδέως ὑπογ[ρ]άφων συν[εσ-
 τῶτος] κ[αί] συνευδοκοῦντος καὶ συμπειθομένου
 [ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ Φλαοῦ]ου Σαμουηλίου Κολλοῦ[θο]υ κτλ.

F1. Samuel is of course well-known, as the editor points out. But the woman is not, and her origin is unknown. Restoration of 25 and 24 letters raises doubts. And in line 7, where about 4 or 5 more letters are lost than in the preceding lines, the restoration (securely based on parallels) is 22 letters. Shortening line 6 is not hard: omit ἐπὶ (συμπεῖθομαι can be used either with or without it), omit the first omicron in Φλαοῦλου (cf. line 2), replace ὁμολογία with something shorter (πράσει?). In line 5, however, one wonders if the restoration of Aphrodite is correct: can we tell what the woman's origin was, given that restoring Aphrodite gives too long a restoration? At the end of line 6, the papyrus has ὀρωμένου, as grammar requires, not ὀρώμενος.

Of the descripta, I can comment on only a few.

15, 21B, 23, and 24: the description includes these four accounts which the editor assigns to the sixth century along with the rest of the contents of the volume. But one glance at the plates shows that these belong palaeographically much later--at the end of the seventh or the start of the eighth century when the later Aphrodito archives come; and in the commentary to no. 15, Pintaudi cites an eighth century parallel to the contents.

17. Various fragments, one belonging in Pintaudi's judgment to *P. Mich.* XIII 659 (upper left fragment in Tav. II, not identified by number).

25. Extensive remains (136 lines, few complete) of an agreement concerning the division of inherited property. I have remarked above on the unfortunate lack of notes. The text will repay further study. One note: in B.27 there is a toponym transcribed as Πιασῶ .. In fact, those are not sigmas: we have Πιας̄ ̄... (no supralinear line over Πιας̄). On these toponyms beginning in Πιας̄ ("field") cf. *P. Mich.* XIII 671.6n. 26 has similar fragments, which the editor considers not to belong to 25 but to a similar text.

It will be evident that this volume contains interesting, albeit frustrating, raw material for the social history of the sixth century, not yet fully digested and requiring more work within the context of the Aphrodito archives to be fully usable. The work that remains to be done, however, should not be allowed to obscure the enormous contribution which the editor has made: he has brought the texts a long way from the intractable mass of fragments he received, and our debt to his devotion and competence, in restoration and in editing, is very large indeed.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

ROGER S. BAGNALL