

undoubted ability to break the mould they do so within the parameters of their own social circumstance and the cultural reading of what it meant to be a woman in the later Roman empire.

The early chapters give a good survey of the position of women in the period and factors that affect their lives and gives a précis of current thinking on such matters as age at marriage and the legal position of women within the family. Chapter two is also good on the tension for the Church Fathers in advocating celibacy and the ambiguity surrounding this in some writings. This is picked up in the subsequent chapter which examines the problems adopting a life of celibacy can bring to a woman: tension between two opposing views—on the one hand, the needs, particularly of wealthy families, to maintain prestige through marriage and the transference of wealth, and on the other, the holiness and spiritual prestige that comes with the ascetic lifestyle, but which denied those essential familial and civic responsibilities. One of the great advantages of the book is that it offers a number of women as examples. Readers familiar with the subject will find Paula, the Melanias, Marcella, Demetrias et al. all well treated and examined. The chapters follow the pattern of Jerome's dictum of a hierarchy of holiness in Christian female rôles in that they are divided into one each on virgins (the hundredfold), widows (the sixtyfold), and mothers (the thirtyfold—only really good for creating more virgins). These three central chapters are of a similar format: they present good surveys of the pre-Christian situation, followed by what patristic writers thought of it. As such they are full of information and would serve as an excellent springboard for those who wanted to study particular areas in more depth. The final chapter, which presents much of the theoretical framework absent from the rest of the book, is good. Here C. rightly suggests that to see religion as 'liberating' for women of this period and that women saw themselves as particularly restricted, is anachronistic (p. 161), but the discussion of theoretical matters is limited. What is both good and bad about this book is that it is an overview. It suffers from poor copy-editing, a strange mix of referencing in the first chapter and the establishment of the Harvard system by the third—and the endnotes are mostly such that they could have been incorporated in the text, but that is not the fault of the author. All in all, a welcome addition to the growing bibliography on the history of late antiquity and women's history.

University of Birmingham

MARY HARLOW

G. C. PAPANASTASSIOU: *Compléments au Dictionnaire étymologique du grec ancien de Pierre Chantraine (A–Ω)*. Pp. 149. Thessaloniki: Éditions Magia, 1994. Paper. ISBN: 960-7244-09-5.

There are two tasks which confront the compiler of an etymological dictionary: to collect the theories which have been put forward about each item of the vocabulary, and to evaluate them, emphasizing what is certain, rejecting the implausible, and discussing the more promising. We must never forget that etymologies are theories, not facts, but they need to be founded on a sound factual basis.

This small book is presented as a continuation of the volume *Compléments au Dictionnaire étymologique du grec ancien de Pierre Chantraine; Tome I*, published in 1977 by Guy Jacquouis and Bernard Devlamminck in the Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain. This covered only the first half of the alphabet (A–K), and although basically a supplement to Chantraine's magisterial work, also referred to other etymological dictionaries. The second volume then promised has never appeared, and P. has therefore collected the relevant material for the second half of the alphabet. He has also added some material for the earlier part of the alphabet which had appeared too late for the previous volume.

It was a laborious task to collect all the reviews of Chantraine and index the comments of the reviewers, and the authors of both these volumes have earned our gratitude by making it easy to find where new theories are advanced. P. does not seem to have gone much further in his search for new etymological ideas, and there must be more material to be gleaned from a thorough search of the literature since Chantraine's dictionary appeared. But it is extremely useful to have this volume at hand. The names of Szemerényi and Ruijgh figure largely, as the authors of lengthy reviews replete with new ideas.

The second task of the composer of such a dictionary is to evaluate the various suggestions that have been made, and it is this which gives Chantraine's work its immense value. Instead of listing a long series of dubious theories, he often has the courage to dismiss them all

with the terse comment: *etymologie inconnue*. Wisely, no attempt is made here to evaluate the ideas listed.

One of the areas in which progress has been possible is the evaluation of the Mycenaean evidence, and here Chantraine was rightly conservative in his approach. He used extensively the list of vocabulary items which I drew up with the assistance of Lydia Baumbach (*Glotta* 41 [1963], 157–271). This was later supplemented by a further article of hers (*Glotta* 49 [1973], 151–90), and the whole subject is now under review by R. Plath. Many of the entries in this volume report suggestions based upon the interpretation of Mycenaean forms, some of which are too implausible to have been admitted to my collection. There is still a great deal to do in this field.

University of Cambridge

JOHN CHADWICK

I.-M. CERVENKA-ËHRENSTRASSER, J. DIETHART (edd.): *Lexikon der lateinischen Lehnwörter in den griechischsprachigen dokumentarischen Texten Ägyptens mit Berücksichtigung koptischer Quellen* (*Lex. Lat. Lehn.*: Faszikel I (Alpha)). (Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek (Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer), NS 27.) Pp. 132. Vienna: Hollinek/Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 3-85119-264-8.

This is the first fascicle (*a*) of a lexicon of the Latin loanwords (hereafter *Lexikon*) which occur in Greek documentary texts from Egypt; Coptic sources have also been reviewed—a welcome novelty. The *Lexikon* appears not long after the second edition of S. Daris, *Il lessico latino nel greco d'Egitto* (1991), which has served as the standard work of reference since its first edition in 1971, but is little more than an *index locorum*. The bulk of the evidence derives from texts of the fourth to eighth centuries. Not surprisingly, administration, law, and army are heavily represented, but everyday-life items also receive a fair share. One of the aims of the *Lexikon* is to show that these loanwords are not isolated to Egypt, but can, as they should, be viewed within the context of the continuous exchange between Latin and Greek in the Greek-speaking East.

The *Lexikon* delivers much more than its title indicates. Each lemma is followed by translation(s), the Latin equivalent, graphic variants (including the Coptic ones), abbreviations, etymologically related words, Greek synonyms, all known examples arranged chronologically and cited verbatim, bibliography, and (sometimes very detailed) discussion of individual points. All this more than fulfils two primary desiderata of any lexicon: clarity and ease of reference. The editors noted that their decision to reproduce the references in full aims to facilitate its use by non-specialists. This, coupled with the generous layout, has increased the size of the volume; but any user of the *Lexikon* would be grateful. However, one feels that a good deal of the treatment of details should preferably have appeared elsewhere (the 'Lemmata Delenda' is one such case). Apparently for the sake of comprehensiveness even the most banal shortcomings of other works are meticulously recorded; sometimes this is useful, but not in the case of Daris's lexicon, the recipient of most of the criticism, set to be replaced by the *Lexikon*.

Some suggestions on points of detail. It would have been worth considering whether *ἀγγαριεύω* is a graphic form of *ἀγγαρ{ι}εύω* (for the *anaptyxis* see F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* i.310f.), cf. e.g. *ἀβ{ι}όλλας*. It is not clear why there are separate entries for *ἀκίεκλα* and *ἀκίεκλος* (<*acisculus*>), instead of their appearing as a single lemma, a practice followed for *ἀβερρή* and *ἀβόλλης*. On loanwords stemming from Latin feminine nouns but appearing in Greek as masculine see L. R. Palmer, *A Grammar of the Post-Ptolemaic Papyri* (1945), pp. 67ff.; but we need a more systematic discussion of the phenomenon, which receives very short shrift in the *Lexikon*. It is not entirely certain whether the term **ἀποπροτήκτωρ* ever existed: the editors of P.Abin. 55.1 print *ἐξ ἀποπροτηκτόρων*; but articulations such as *ἐξ* ἀπὸ προτηκτόρων (*ἐξ* is an influence from the underlying *ex protectoribus*; we possess several examples of the construction without *ἐξ*), or even *ἐξ* ἀπὸ προτηκτόρων (*Doppelpräposition*) are equally possible. (There may be a further occurrence of the construction in the newly published P.Oxy. LXIII 4367.2, but the context is damaged.) *τὸ μέγα ἀγγοσταλιανόν*, attested in P.Princ. II 82.9 alone, probably does not refer to the 'Büro des