

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 *A Prosopografia e Aphroditopolis* had been written in 1938 by V.A. Girgis, but is now out of date.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

Kalotuchos 1 and 2 (the only attestations of this name in the prosopography) or Theodosia 3 appear in texts written in the provincial capital, Antinoopolis. Even more questionable is the integration of place-name eponyms (e.g. Alapane, Kasida) that can refer to people who had been deceased for centuries.

Despite these minor problematic aspects, this book is without question an indispensable *instrumentum*. R. had the intention to publish corrections on a blog that is no longer accessible. A web-based version of this prosopography is in preparation as part of the forthcoming online guide of Aphrodito papyri.

Universität Basel (CH)

ISABELLE MARTHOT-SANTANIELLO

imarhot@yahoo.com

HANINK (J.) *The Classical Debt. Greek Antiquity in an Era of Austerity*. Pp. xiv + 337, ills. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2017. Cased, £23.95, €27, US\$29.95. ISBN: 978-0-674-97154-7.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X18001385

H.'s title plays on two interpretations of the word 'debt': on the one hand it evokes the financial debt which has enormously burdened the nation of Greece since 2008; on the other there is the 'cultural debt' that western scholarship of recent centuries has perceived the 'western world' as owing to the civilisation of ancient Greece. This second debt, H. argues, was foisted upon the nation of modern Greece at its birth in 1828 and has put upon it wholly unrealistic expectations ever since. As a result, modern Greeks are frequently chided for not living up to the supposed examples and achievements of their ancient forebears. However, H. lays out why this is both unfair and inaccurate: ancient Greece was never any more enlightened or sophisticated than any other ancient society; the perception that it was is largely the result of myth-making which started in Athens in the fourth century BCE and picked up apace again in the eighteenth century.

H. explains in her prologue that the inspiration for the book came during a period she spent in Greece during 2014 and 2015. She saw at first hand both the country's sufferings and how pejoratively these were perceived and projected by the media abroad. She leaves the reader in no doubt that the book was written both from the head and from the heart, something that lends it a layer of depth and authenticity. She writes superbly, moving effortlessly between references to modern popular culture and to the ancient past. Readers will find much of interest and much to provoke considered thought, not least in the second chapter, 'How Athens Built its Brand', and in her analysis of how the media portrayed the Greek debt crisis with familiar ancient Greek tropes.

If the book has a weakness, it would seem to stem from the fact that it was necessarily written in haste; although this adds spontaneity, there is at times the sense that arguments and examples should have been developed or checked more carefully. Most notably, readers familiar with E. Hall's work will be surprised to see one line from her 2015 *Guardian* article on the place of Classical Civilisation in UK state schools quoted on pages 115–16 to illustrate a supposed direct link between a modern argument that Classics has something