

comparative philology of the Italic languages and their relationship to proto-IE; this is clearly and properly intended to assist readers with no background in comparative philology, but such readers might well need further help (there is no explanation of why reconstructed phonemes or words are marked with single or double asterisks). Only on p. 83 does R. refer to the theory of a special relationship between Celtic and Italic languages, which would have been relevant to the discussion on p. 81 of whether Lat. *servus* is cognate with Welsh *herw*; and although he glosses the 'Urindogermanen' as specifically a 'Sprachgemeinschaft' (p. 120), he gives no impression of seeking to represent the IE language as linked to anything other than an ethnic grouping, and shows no interest in making the reader aware of alternative explanations of linguistic diffusion such as that proposed by C. Renfrew in *Archaeology and Language* (1987).

The words he goes on to analyse are *ancilla*, which he convincingly shows is directly cognate with words for servants in Greek (*amphipolos*), Sanskrit (*abhicara-*), and Welsh (*amaeth*); *famulus*, cognate with Oscan *famel*; *servus/servire*, which R. argues derive from a common Italic root meaning 'to look out for' (hence Oscan *serevki* = Lat. *auspicio*): Sanskrit, Hittite, and Celtic cognates suggest a proto-IE word for shepherd (with *pastor* for cowherd) which in the context of Italian transhumance pastoralism developed the specialized meaning of 'persons of slave status' sometime between the seventh and the fifth centuries (pp. 86f.); and finally *libertus*, the development of which is compared with the Etruscan terms *lautnil/lautniha*. R. sees these words as sharing the meaning 'belonging to a citizen family', with Latin developing that meaning in the sixth century B.C. (the Etruscan evidence is later in date): but what is not discussed is the development of citizenship as a concept (even though he suggests an interesting link with the activities of the censor Appius Claudius Caecus: p. 117).

While many of the alternative theories subjected to rigorous philological examination only to be rejected—e.g. *servus* as an Etruscan loanword—will be of purely academic interest to social historians, there is much of wider value: R. is surely right to explain the relationship between *famulus/familia* meaning slaves and *familia* meaning (natural) family in terms of 'household' as the original meaning, with the meanings 'slaves' and 'family' the result of later specialization (p. 47); whether he is right in associating it with the IE root **dhe-*, to set or do (the household as a setting or foundation) is more problematical. R.'s discussion of *libertus* and the Etruscan terms *lautnil/lautniha* (which draws on his important earlier research going back to *Das etruskische Cognomen*, 1963) is perhaps more interesting in the light it sheds on the integration of Etruscan communities into the Roman state in the first century B.C. than with respect to the origins of Italian slavery. It might have been welcome if R. had applied his philological expertise to finding IE parallels for some other terms such as *camillus*, *peculium*, or *patromus*. R.'s feel for non-philological material is not so certain. There are weaknesses in the use of literary material (e.g. the *patresfamilia* of Cicero, *Att.* 7.14.2 are householders of Capua, not the managers of gladiatorial gangs, p. 42) as well as legal (e.g. p. 88, where women are said not to have been Roman citizens even when free). The main problem social historians will have with R.'s account is his assumption that if the meaning of words like *ancilla* and *servus* shifted from indicating function to indicating status in the period between the sixth and the third century B.C., it was because of the appearance of slavery as an objectively new 'thing' imported from the Orient, rather than as a result of the development of new juristic concepts such as citizenship, and in the context of other changes such as the abolition of debt-bondage.

University of Nottingham

THOMAS WIEDEMANN

B. TENGER: *Die Verschuldung im römischen Ägypten (1.–2. Jh. n. Chr.)*. (Pharos: Studien zur griechisch-römischen Antike, 2.) Pp. iv + 329. St Katharinen: Scripta Mercaturae, 1993. Paper, DM 58. ISBN: 3-928134-79-5.

This study of monetary debt, and hence credit, in Roman Egypt in the first two centuries A.D. on the whole follows a methodology traditional in the study of the papyri: it identifies and tries to categorize a class of documents, in this case loan contracts, then asks what these documents have to tell us about the main topic or topics common to them, in this case borrowing and lending money. T. demonstrates, against Kühnert, that the main different types of loan contract, apart from the *parathêkê*-type (deposits, often interest-free), were not specific to different types of loan. Across the period the originally unwritten *chrêsis*-type gradually

displaced the traditional written *daneion*-type, although both types were hardly standardized anyway, and many documents have to be classed as 'typeless'. T.'s analysis of the contracts, with some reference to other documents, leads him to the following main conclusions. Both the creditors and debtors in the contracts were mostly men of some wealth—metropolitans, richer villagers, soldiers, priests; the propertyless, it seems, used pawnbrokers for their petty loans. The sums borrowed were, in T.'s view, not large—around 86% were less than 1,000 dr., and 77% of the 86% were under 300 dr. (pp. 232–3). The usual stated annual rate of interest was 12%. Loans were often for a few months only, and rarely over two years. The dates of borrowing and repayment show some correlation with the agricultural cycle, that is, borrowing before sowing and repayment after the main grain harvest, but the correlation is not general. Security was normally on property worth considerably more than the loan; execution against the person was strictly illegal, although there is some evidence for it in practice. The state offered protection for the rights of creditors and debtors, and in cases of alleged default the creditor was meant to secure an official judgement. But disputed cases could drag on for years, and either side might resort to corruption, evasion, or self-help. T. argues that most borrowing was to meet immediate needs, principally to pay cash taxes or the costs of liturgic duties, rather than for investment, although he suggests, without much evidence, that *parathêkê*-type loans (deposits) were often for investment.

Papyrologists will regret that T. omits a traditional element of this type of study in that he does not give a full catalogue of published loan contracts, which, however tedious and transitory, would have been useful. Historians may feel that he has taken insufficiently systematic account of a major problem whose existence he does at several points recognize: ancient habits and choices about the use of written documents and the restricted provenance of the papyri known to us mean that the extant written loan contracts privilege particular areas of the total world of borrowing in Roman Egypt, precisely the largely urban milieu of the moderately well-to-do. What is needed to make progress is a holistic strategy which starts with historical questions rather than a dossier of documents of a specific type, and thus can, for example, put greater weight on the sparse evidence for possibly important forms of borrowing such as maritime loans, and exploit fully other types of evidence for borrowing such as contracts of sale in advance, and references in letters and accounts. The rôle of borrowing also needs to be put in the context of a wider discussion of monetization, that is, the availability and use of coin, in Roman Egypt. T.'s book shows signs of moving in this methodological direction, and is an extremely useful step towards a full historical study of borrowing in Roman Egypt. Even if subsequent work modifies some of his conclusions, he has set an agenda for it.

King's College London

D. W. RATHBONE

M. R. POPHAM (with I. S. Lemos): *Lefkandi III. The Early Iron Age Cemetery at Toumba: the Excavations of 1981 to 1994: Plates*. (BSA Supplementary Volume 29.) Pp. xi + 208, 159 pls, 3 tables, 1 map. London: British School at Athens, 1997. £62 (subscribers and friends); £69 (+ £5 post and packing) (others). ISBN: 0-904887-27-8.

Few sites in the Aegean have had such an impact on an entire era of Greek history as Lefkandi in central Euboea. Initiated by the British School at Athens in the mid-1960s, the excavations at Lefkandi have brought to light a wealth of information which has radically changed our notions of the early historic Aegean. In the three decades since the excavations were begun, Lefkandi has become something of a supernova, casting much light on the so-called Greek 'Dark Age', a pejorative term for the Early Iron Age. Continuing the series of publications of the site, this volume represents an instalment in the publication of the investigations conducted at the Toumba cemetery at Lefkandi intermittently between 1981 and 1994. As with *Lefkandi I*, the decision was taken to issue in advance of the text a comprehensive volume of illustrations. It is hoped that the text volume is not far behind; such a piecemeal approach to definitive publication is unfortunate and adds to the cost of the total set. The two unnecessarily slim volumes of *Lefkandi II: 1 and 2* should have appeared under a single cover. Nevertheless, the 'publication' of so much Middle Protogeometric through Subprotogeometric IIIa material is a matter of celebration for all scholars of the Early Iron Age.

Lefkandi III: Plates presents numerous line drawings and photographs arranged on 159 pages;