fresh look at the evidence aspiring to provide a modern answer to an old question: *why* Callimachus and *why* Alexandria? Drawing on their expertise in Callimachean poetry and Ptolemaic contexts, A.-H. and S. offer a book that is highly intellectual and engaging – a must read for academics and non-specialists alike.

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki EVINA SISTAKOU
sistakou@lit.auth.gr

EGYPTIAN DIGLOSSIA

VIERROS (M.) *Bilingual Notaries in Hellenistic Egypt. A Study of Greek as a Second Language*. (Collectanea Hellenistica 5.) Pp. 291. Brussels: Publikatie van het Comité Klassieke Studies, Subcomité Hellenisme, Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten, 2012. Paper. ISBN: 978-90-6569-103-3.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X13002448

This interesting study of notarial documents from the Thebaid in Upper Egypt provides an overview of the linguistic situation in Hellenistic Egypt. In addition to linguistic analysis of the documents, it touches on core topics such as bilingualism, diglossia, onomastics and ethnicity. Discussions of the *koine* and its historical context have traditionally been dogged by a failure to understand key concepts, starting with *koine* itself, but including related issues such as standard language, diglossia and even the difference between script and language (meaning, spoken language is often conceived and discussed in a framework suitable for, and derived from, writing). This book is written in a sound sociolinguistic framework, and based on clear expertise in Ptolemaic Egypt, with the result that the discussion and conclusions are useful and meaningful.

The book has seven chapters followed by 'General Conclusions' and appendixes. The first chapter is an introductory overview of the material, the location (Pathyris in the Thebaid) and the sociolinguistic method. The corpus is a relatively homogeneous corpus of notarial documents (contracts, wills, etc.) from 174 to 88 B.C., deriving from the offices of a limited number of civil servants (*agoranomoi*) in Upper Egypt about 30 km south of Thebes. The formulaic nature of the corpus allows close comparison of scribal practice, and may occasionally be part of the explanation of linguistic surprises in the documents. It is good to see V. tackle immediately the term 'non-standard' Greek; it is used as a neutral term by linguists for features which, from the perspective of Lysianic Attic, would be classified as mistakes. She asks the important question 'With what stage of Greek are we comparing the language of the notaries? What is the so-called "standard language"?' This is a question that could be asked more frequently of Greek. It would sound strange to refer to features of Sophoclean language as 'non-standard', since we do not suppose that tragedians were seeking to reproduce the syntax of Attic prose. Each period and genre has its own *koine*, and as V. notes, administrators (then as now) have a 'bureaucratic standard' of their own. So we need to distinguish, if possible, mistakes made by an individual which stem from imperfect competence in the local or generic standard, and features of the local standard itself which differ from classical literary prose.

In spite of the title, the book is a study of diglossia rather than bilingualism. Diglossia is a property of a community (society), while bilingualism is a property of an individual. A bilingual person has native competence in two languages, and may (of course) be illiterate in one or both. We cannot know whether notaries of Upper Egypt were *sensu stricto*

bilingual – V. very reasonably supposes that most were not – but we do know that Hellenistic Egypt was diglossic in a complex way. The term diglossia came into use in the mid-twentieth century to describe the situation in the modern Arabic-speaking world (and much of the research was done in Egypt), in which the speaker's native language is the vernacular they learned to speak as infants (the 'Low' variety), while the prestige standard language (the 'High' variety) is mastered through education. Modern Standard Arabic is based on the classical language, and educated speakers from across the Arab world can read and communicate in it, while the spoken varieties are not necessarily mutually intelligible. In diglossic cultures where the High and Low varieties are forms of the same language, the vernacular is typically conceived as a debased or impure version of the standard, rather than its most recent form.

The Greek-speaking world was diglossic in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, since the literary standard followed classical models, while the vernacular, in the way of all languages, continued to change and develop. The term *koine* denotes the continuum of varieties, including the highest (though language users, especially after the first century A.D., would have been affronted by this description of their attempts at literary Attic). The reason that *koine* is a tricky term is that within a diglossic culture speakers have peculiar views about language, which need to be understood, but which do not match the arid realities of the linguist.

Egypt is doubly complicated, because figures such as the notaries, who were competent in Demotic and Greek, were part of a culture that was doubly diglossic: since they were Egyptians (pp. 48, 105–6), they were competent in both vernacular Egyptian and in Demotic, which denotes a writing system and a specific written form of the language. (Egyptian had another level, hieroglyphic, which notaries in the Thebaid at least are quite unlikely to have been able to write, but which adds another level to the linguistic culture of the country.) Then they must have been able to speak some vernacular Egyptian *koine*, and wrote a good version of the bureaucratic standard. V. touches on these issues in Chapter 2, 'Linguistic Landscape of Hellenistic Egypt', in which there is also a good discussion of onomastics and ethnicity. The third and fourth chapters ('Language Use in the Pathyrite Area' and 'Notaries at Work') give further detail about the linguistic and socio-historical background of the region. These insightful chapters are a rich source of information for the non-expert in Ptolemaic Egypt. The next three chapters are linguistic, and deal respectively with phonology, morphosyntax (the inflection of nouns in the sentence) and 'syntactic transfer' (from Egyptian, the presumed first language of the notaries, to Greek). Just occasionally the discussion of phonology and spelling in Chapter 5 gives the impression of confusion. Vowel change in Egyptian *koine* is difficult: V. wavers over whether to accept S.-T. Teodorsson's early dating of key changes (*The Phonology of Ptolemaic Koine* [1977]). Most linguists now seem to accept it, in spite of some mistakes in his data. Μηθένα for μηδένα (p. 116) is a widespread feature of *koine* Greek and cannot easily be blamed on Egyptian phonology, at least not without qualification (explanation in Buck, *Greek Dialects* [1955], p. 61). For the scribes in question it was probably a feature of the orthography, anyway. V. disagrees, unwisely, with G. Horrocks (*Greek: a History of the Language and its Speakers* [1997]) on the 'alleged weakness of word final sibilants and nasals' (p. 117). She is wrong, however. For one thing, that /-s/ is maintained in Modern Greek (by which she means the standard variety based on the southern dialects), even if correct (and there are instances of loss in attested modern dialects), would not prove that loss did not happen in this or that social/regional variety of Greek in the Hellenistic period. Many varieties of Greek disappeared: standard Modern Greek is the reflex of a specific socio-historical process, and is based on specific modern varieties. Most of V.'s analysis is interesting and persuasive, however, and shows how her expertise in the history

and society of the period can illuminate the linguistic and orthographic choices of the scribes. In the chapter on syntactic transfer she makes a good case for the interference of 'Language 1' in the practice of at least some of the notaries.

V. finishes with some important conclusions, which would not be obvious without a study of this nature. Greek, for example, 'did not enjoy any particular prestige status'. Her analysis of the notarial relationship with Greek (their approach to writing high-quality *koine* reflected their training in Demotic, which was equally remote from vernacular) strengthens, to my mind, the case for Teordorsson's analysis of the phonology of Egyptian *koine*: standard spellings reflect scribal culture in Egypt, not scribal competence in the spoken language. The book gives an excellent account of the socio-historical situation for linguists, and of the linguistic situation for historians.

University College London STEPHEN COLVIN
s.colvin@ucl.ac.uk

RECOGNITION SCENES IN THE NOVEL

MONTIGLIO (S.) *Love and Providence. Recognition in the Ancient Novel*. Pp. x + 256. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013. Cased, £45, US$74. ISBN: 978-0-19-991604-7.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X1300245X

As Peter Brooks observes in *Reading for the Plot*, a man glimpsing a beautiful woman is a key trigger for the onset of desire, which in turn is the primary engine of narrative. M.'s new book explores the culmination of that initial desire – and of the story – as represented in the ancient novel: recognition scenes which tend to reunite two lovers who have been separated by the vicissitudes of the plot. Recognition in the ancient novel has been a subject thus far neglected in early modern and contemporary accounts of the motif in ancient literature; T. Cave's seminal *Recognitions* discusses only the unique final scene in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* (which, as M.'s study demonstrates, significantly departs from other novelistic treatments). In five chapters and an epilogue M. comprehensively deals with recognition scenes not only in the Greek novels, the subject of the first three chapters, but also in the two Roman novels of Petronius and Apuleius and in the lesser studied pagan, Jewish and Christian narratives *Apollonius of Tyre*, *Joseph and Aseneth* and the *Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions*. An epilogue examines the place of the ancient novel in the larger history of recognitions in Western literature, and explains the ancient novel's influence in the development of the motif in the early modern period. Throughout M. persuasively argues for the richness and uniqueness of the ancient novel, particularly the manner in which the novelists creatively engage with earlier classical texts (especially epic and drama) and how they radically depart from this literary tradition. This productive book will be useful to anyone interested in ancient Greek, Roman, Jewish and Christian narratives, as well as those concerned with the history of the novel. For readers new to the ancient novel M.'s study will provide a fascinating introduction to the genre broadly defined, whereas seasoned scholars will gain fresh perspectives on the richness and complexities of these texts.

In the introduction M. makes the case for the unique nature of recognitions in the ancient novel, which tend to be recognitions of personal identity rather than moral recognitions or scenes involving an awareness of agency (though these other types of recognitions are occasionally featured in the novels, as M. acknowledges on p. 37). A broad