

on a gladiator. Bilinguals are **134** (third-century family gravestone), **270** (a column identifying an estate's owner), and **292** (A.D. 1426), on the restoration of a church by the Latin archbishop. The latest text, **293**, in Greek, appears to commemorate an eighteenth-century Jewish synagogue.

This is an exemplary presentation of an epigraphic corpus.

University of Leicester

GRAHAM SHIPLEY

DOCUMENTS OF HERAKLEOPOLIS

E. SALMENKIVI: *Cartonnage Papyri in Context. New Ptolemaic Documents from Abū Šīr al-Malaq*. (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 119.) Pp. 182, pls. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 2002. Paper. ISBN: 951-653-319-1.

The title says it all. This edition of papyrus texts from the Berlin collection does not just present the edition of twenty fragmentary and sometimes illegible late Ptolemaic texts found during the excavations by Rubensohn of the cemetery of Abusir al-Malaq in the early twentieth century. It is also the study of how such texts survive from their original drafting to their current condition, rescued out of the mummy casing ('cartonnage') for which they were used in antiquity. There is an important lesson here for the historian; the names by which papyrus collections are known can be misleading. Texts said to come from a particular collection (Berlin, in this case) or cemetery, here termed 'provenance', only came there late in their lives; their 'origin' was elsewhere. In the current volume the 'origin' of these texts, where they were actually written, was probably the nome capital of Herakleopolis, where some of them were pasted together for reference in long rolls, known as *tomoi synkollésimoi*, in the royal scribe's office. The texts in this volume all derive from one piece of cartonnage, which is here interestingly interpreted as a form of archaeological context. Similarly, Tebtunis is the 'provenance' of the Tebtunis papyri whose 'origins' were different and varied. And, as is the case with the Tebtunis crocodiles, knowledge of which particular cartonnage a text is from can often help the papyrologist to understand a text more fully.

The twenty texts of this volume, studied within the wider context of other Berlin texts from the same cemetery including many originally from Alexandria (see the helpful Appendix), once belonged to the papers of two royal scribes from the Herakleopolite nome: texts **1–16** from the 'archive' of Peteimouthes and **17–20** from that of Harchebis, officials who were separated in office by some ten years in the first quarter of the first century B.C. They have links with other texts already published in *BGU* VIII, XIV, and particularly XVIII; they provide new information on geography (both physical and administrative), land tenure, agriculture, grain prices, and the workings of the granaries and royal bank.

The first two texts treat the payment of soldiers' wages in cash (**2**) and in kind (**1**). **3** and **4** concern the delivery of seed, showing the bureaucracy at work. Seed loans had to be paid for, and seed from the nearby Arsinoite nome was used for loans in the Herakleopolite (**4.17**). **3.13** would benefit from a note; 'standing surety for one another for the payment in full' suggests an interesting degree of corporate responsibility among the crown farmers. In **3.4–5** 'crown farmers', 'farmers of the queen's land' and those 'of all other revenues' seem separate rather than overlapping categories

(cf. 15.5; 20.10–11). Land of Kleopatra III is known from the Herakleopolite land registers of *BGU XIV*, for which Scholl, *Corpus der ptolemäischen Sklaventexte*. (1990), 977, suggested a second-century B.C. date. Here the specification of queen's land as that 'previously of the mother of the king', 15.6, suggests that, like some *klêroi*, 'queen's land' also became a 'fossil' category. If so, when at a later date 'land' and 'farmers of the queen' are mentioned (3.6; 6.2; 15.5; 20.11), the reference would be to land which once belonged to Kleopatra III rather than land of the current queen (as implied in Index I). In 4.19 'royal revenues' (*ta basilika*) are probably mentioned rather than the 'royal farmers'. 5–7, where some of the figures are repeated, again treat crops. 5, 8, and 20 all record emmer (Egyptian *olyra*) still cultivated in the first century B.C. (The argument from silence made by Thompson in Bowman and Rogan, *Agriculture in Egypt* [1999], 128–30, now needs modification.) 8 records the payment in kind of the annual *syntaxis* to the priests of a local temple, and in 9 the orphaned son of a cleruch requests a seed loan for the land once held by his father and a vineyard now held by his mother; grain might be cultivated among the vines. The claim of 'weakness' (l. 7) made here recurs in a broader context in 20.8 as a reason for special treatment; the frequent occurrence of *asthenês* or *astheneia*, cf. 5.4, 15, and *BGU VIII* index, suggests that such claims should not always be taken at face value. 10–16 are payment orders made to the *antigraphais* in the granaries of different toparchies of the Herakleopolite nome, providing information on the organization of the granary and the transport of wheat to Alexandria. 17–20 record seed orders and (20) a tax reduction.

All in all, this is an interesting set of texts, well presented and accompanied by some excellent discussion. The close consideration of the rôle of the cartonnage adds an important dimension to this study.

Girton College, Cambridge

DOROTHY J. THOMPSON

LAW IN THE POPYRI

H. J. WOLFF: *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens in der Zeit der Ptolemaer und des Prinzipats. Erster Band. Bedingungen und Triebkräfte der Rechtsentwicklung. Herausgegeben von H.-A. Rupprecht.* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 10.5.1.) Pp. xix + 276. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 2002. Cased, €76. ISBN: 3-406-48164-7.

In the book under discussion the great legal historian Hans Julius Wolff, in his usual *lucid* style—italicizing the key terms—discusses the background of the 'law of the Greek papyri'. Where is it coming from? What were the politics, if any, behind it? How does it relate to other legal systems that were valid in late period Egypt, in particular native Egyptian and Roman law? In discussing these matters, W. confines himself to Egypt, to the Greek and Roman period (roughly 300 B.C.E.—C.E. 300), and to judicial, private, and penal law (pp. 4–7). The present book is the first of W.'s projected three-volume set describing the 'law of the Greek papyri'. The second volume in the set, dealing with the organization of the private law in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt, appeared in 1978, and the third will be published (see p. IX), but it is not stated when. The present book was left unfinished by W. upon his death in May 1983, and was brought to completion between 1997 and 2000 by adding a paragraph

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved