

North & S.R.F. Price (edd.), *The Religious History of the Roman Empire* (2011), pp. 175–250.

King's College London

HUGH BOWDEN
hugh.bowden@kcl.ac.uk

GÜNTHER (W.) *Inscriptionen von Milet. Teil 4: Eine Prosopographie*. (Milet 6.4.) Pp. xviii + 676. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2017. Cased, £122.99, €149.95, US\$172.99. ISBN: 978-3-11-045484-0.
 doi:10.1017/S0009840X18000343

This enormous volume, at 9.75 lbs considerably heavier than a new-born Milesian baby, is a prosopography of all attested Milesians from the Archaic period to the sixth century AD. There are around 10,000 entries, the majority drawn from the abundant epigraphy of Miletus and the sanctuary of Apollo at Didyma, which presumably accounts for the curious designation of the volume as Part 4 of *Inscriptionen von Milet*. The volume includes Milesians attested outside Miletus (including the c. 1,850 Milesians attested as foreign residents at Athens) and a selection of non-Milesians known to have had some connection with the city, whose names are given in italics to distinguish them from bona fide Milesians. Each entry is equipped with basic biographical information (chronology, offices held, familial relations) and very full scholarly bibliography.

There are some infuriating idiosyncrasies. When an individual is attested as the parent of two or more children, he or she is listed twice or more, as parent of each separate child. So, for example, *I.Milet* VI 2, 476 (third century BC) is the tombstone of three brothers: Theodotos, Basileides and Myrmidon, sons of Zenodotos. The *Prosopographie* includes three separate entries for Zenodotos father of Basileides, Zenodotos father of Theodotos and Zenodotos father of Myrmidon. Conversely, when an individual carries the same name as his father, the *Prosopographie* includes only one entry, not two: so there is a single entry for Boutas son of Boutas (*Milet* I 3, 138 III 44), but no entry for the elder Boutas. These bizarre editorial choices make it unnecessarily difficult to extract statistical information about the prevalence of particular personal names at Miletus.

Readers will wish to know how the coverage of the *Prosopographie* compares with the treatment of Milesians in the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* (essentially in *LGPN* V.B, plus the Milesians at Amorgos listed in *LGPN* I). By way of example, the *LGPN* has 44 entries for the name Ἀλέξανδρος at Miletus, while the *Prosopographie* has 56. Of the 56 entries in the *Prosopographie*, seven are for non-Milesians with links with Miletus, some of them intimate (Alexander III of Macedon, who held the eponymous magistracy at Miletus in 333/2 BC), some considerably less so (Alexandros son of Hikesios of Chios, one of 50 foreign judges who adjudicated a dispute between Miletus and Myous around 390 BC).

Of the remaining 49 entries for Ἀλέξανδρος in the *Prosopographie*, three are highly speculative restorations of fragmentary names such as Ἀλ[έξανδρος] or [Ἀλεξάν]δρος (rightly excluded from *LGPN*); two entries result from editorial misunderstandings of the relatively rare name Alexas (correctly registered as Ἀλεξᾶς (5) and (6) in *LGPN* V.B); two entries result from the perverse 'double-counting' of fathers mentioned above; and one entry is an outright error (false duplication of Alexandros son of Artemon in *I.Milet*

VI 2, 798, lines 2 and 4). Conversely, the *Prosopographie* has only one entry apiece for two individuals called Alexandros son of Alexandros, where the *LGPN* rightly includes two entries apiece (one for the son, one for the father). The *LGPN* also includes one further entry that is absent from the *Prosopographie*, for an Alexan(dros) who appears on undated early imperial bronze coins of Miletus (*RPC I* p. 450).

In summary, this huge volume is a tremendous resource for historians of Miletus, but should be used with some caution; it is best treated as a bibliographic supplement to the relevant parts of the *LGPN*.

Wadham College, University of Oxford

PETER THONEMANN
peter.thonemann@wadham.ox.ac.uk

RUFFINI (G. R.) *A Prosopography of Byzantine Aphrodito*. (American Studies in Papyrology 50.) Pp. xiv + 634. Durham, NC: The American Society of Papyrologists, 2011. Cased, £59. ISBN: 978-0-9799758-2-0. doi:10.1017/S0009840X18001610

This book is a major tool for any scholar working on Byzantine Egypt. It gathers the available information on all the individuals mentioned in the texts, around 700, from the sixth and early seventh centuries found in the village of Aphrodito, in Middle Egypt, the best-documented village of Late Antiquity. This documentation has attracted the interest of numerous scholars because of its size and variety: papyrus and ostraca, literary, paraliterary and documentary texts that are written in either Greek or Coptic. In such a large amount of data one could easily get lost. *A Prosopografia e Aphroditopolis* had been written in 1938 by V.A. Girgis, but is now out of date. R. had the opportunity to spot all the weaknesses of Girgis's work while he was writing his first book, *Social Networks in Byzantine Egypt* (2008), in which Aphrodito is one of the two case studies used for network analyses. In the present book, R. undertook the painstaking work of carefully scrutinising all the material that was available, even texts whose publication was still in preparation, in order to produce a new massive prosopography.

The book contains a four-page preface, one page of corrections, abbreviations and citations and, at the end, nine stemmata, two appendices (a list of new individuals in texts about to be published and a discussion on disambiguation between personal names and place names), a bibliography and an index of titles, status designation or offices. The core of the book is constituted by almost 600 pages of catalogue, providing 6,800 notices of individuals mentioned in Aphrodito's texts. Each entry contains the main elements regarding the person: filiation and family, profession or title, action in the document and other people involved. To achieve such an ambitious goal, editorial decisions had to be taken, to which R. alludes in the preface. In order to avoid hasty identifications, R. established the demanding rule that two characteristics are required besides homonymy (e.g. patronym and function) to consider that two mentions refer to the same individual. This leads to many cross-references in italics, sometimes with explanations, sometimes without, leaving to the reader the task of finding the common point and giving the general impression of over-caution. A stricter definition on whom to include or not would have been valuable: R. is right not to limit himself to residents of Aphrodito proper, but he should have made a clear indication of outsiders. For example, nothing indicates that