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tends to presuppose the representative nature of the evidence and introduces spurious confidence, whatever the intentions of the historian. This is a problem at the heart of the debate on conversion, where Wipszycka's doubts concerning B.'s linkage between nomenclature and religious affiliation and the 'certainties' of the measures can hardly be overcome by statistical means. Such issues will become an increasing problem as social and economic historians struggle with data even less suitable for quantification. B.'s discussion asserts a case but ultimately fails to grapple with the fundamental issue of what the historian does when forced to work with masses of obviously imperfect data.

B. concentrates on 'theories of the middle range', holding to the view that there is no acceptable 'substantive theory of history' (p. 3) and that a difference of approach affirms and celebrates the diversity of historians (p. 5), though it becomes progressively clear that B. would align himself with the so-called *Annales* school of thought, which emphasizes social materialism. B. describes this group as the 'cutting-edge [of] scholarship in twentieth-century historiography' and lauds their commitment to 'total history' (p. 112). It is clear how his work contributes to this school in its concerns with the 'deep structures' of societies and synchronic analysis of the extended period. Indeed, many ancient social and economic historians would affiliate themselves with this school. This cultural enterprise is, however, only one strand of current historiography; historians deriving inspiration from Foucault and others and represented most clearly in the historiography of the ancient world by Peter Brown are asking different questions of their material and offer answers less from quantification than cultural linkage and impressionistic treatments. B. does not face the challenges of this school or ask how papyri can contribute to their debates. The postmodern agenda is not easily addressed from papyrological data, but then neither, ultimately, is that of the *Annales* school. Yet these texts, these representations of people to the outside world, should allow us access to their cultural world, even if we must reconstruct it image by image and individual by individual, and even if the official nature of many of these texts presents substantial technical problems.

B. uses examples to illustrate what he regards as 'good practice' in the discipline and in so doing provides an accurate and useful snapshot of the work of a particular group of mainly British and American historians and makes the theoretical basis for their work explicit. This is a confident book, confident (justly) of the importance of the author within the discipline, confident of the approaches adopted, and confident of the direction of the discipline. But by concentrating on the 'theories of the middle range', B. avoids discussion of more fundamental issues. This is not a manifesto for change and I doubt whether it will alter the way people write history from texts.

*Royal Holloway, London*  
RICHARD ALSTON

THE STATE OF PAPYROLOGY


This volume contains 95 of about 120 papers read at the congress. Their arrangement in sections follows more or less that of the congress programme, which was divided into Thematic Sessions, Round Tables, Open Sessions, and Workshops. Each of the four Thematic Sessions was summed up by its chairman:
(1) History of Papyrology and Directions for the Future: J. Bingen, 'D’avant-hier à demain' (pp. 42–7), starting with the Charta Borgiana, first pays tribute to the very first pioneers of what was much later called ‘papyrology’: Champollion, Letronne, and Peyron, whose achievements are highlighted by O. Montevecchi (pp. 25–34); he then replies to P. van Minnen, 'The Origin and Future of Papyrology: From Mommsen and Wilamowitz to the Present, from Altertumswissenschaft to Cultural Studies' (pp. 35–41) (a more detailed version of this paper has been published as 'The Century of Papyrology (1892–1992)' in RASP 30 [1993], 5–18), who stresses the need for papyrologists to pay more attention to the Egyptian environment which has produced the documentary and the literary papyri (and to add subject indices to their editions). Bingen agrees: unless papyrologists themselves see their texts ‘dans un contexte différentiel et même conflictuel de traditions,...d’insertion sociale et d’implication économique’ they will continue to be sidelined and largely ignored by traditional classicists, epigraphists, and historians, as they were at the FIEC congress in 1974.

(2) Papyrology and the Study of Greek Language: S. Ebbesen (pp. 95–7) adds the name of A. Jannaris to the pioneers of ‘Papyrologie und Sprachwissenschaft (1891–1906)’ discussed by J. Kramer (pp. 71–80); with G. H. J. Horsley’s ‘Abecedarius of Desiderata for Future Study’ (pp. 48–70), who stresses the need for editors of papyri to bear the interests and needs of specialists in other disciplines in mind, he disagrees on two points: (i) he would give the study of Christian and Jewish usage much lower priority; and (ii) he rejects the suggestion that editors should print supplements of gaps in italics or in a smaller font, advocating instead, in line with most editors’ practice, ‘a diplomatic transcription for the specialist, and a transcription in standardized orthography and with a minimum of critical squiggles for the rest of mankind’ (p. 96). Taking up F. Montanari’s amusing (depressing?) examples of ghost-words creeping into dictionaries (‘Parole greche: le vie dai papiri ai dizionari’, pp. 81–8), he draws attention to the lexicographical opportunities now offered by computers; he also argues that the present indicative is not the most suitable entry form for verbs, given that many verbs are only used in the aorist. H. Cadell, who was to have chaired this session but was unable to attend, had sent her responses in advance (pp. 89–94); she supports Horsley’s suggestion for editors to add grammatical indices and does not share Ebbesen’s reservations about Christian usage, but insists that an editor of papyri does not have to address all the linguistic, administrative, economic, social, or legal questions raised by his/her texts. She adds that more attention needs to be paid to semantic changes in the usage of words in papyri.

(3) The Contribution of the Papyri to the Study of Greek Literature: M. W. Haslam, 'Archaic and Hellenistic Poetry' (pp. 98–105), surveys the main discoveries. While our picture of early epic ‘is still more of a blank than a picture’, papyri of lyric poets, especially of Stesichorus, have deeply affected our perception of early Greek poetry. The other area of significant papyrological discoveries has been Hellenistic poetry; we can now see the relationship between Hellenistic and Latin poets in a new light. W. Luppe, ‘Neue Erkenntnisse aus verlorenen Komödien, Tragödien und Satyrspielen’ (pp. 106–10), draws attention to the numerous finds of papyri of Menander and Euripides and singles out the hypothesis to Cratinus’ Dionysalexandros as particularly interesting. M. Manfredi, ‘I papiri e la letteratura greca in prosa’ (pp. 111–17), discusses philosophical texts and novels and points out how, for instance, papyri of Thucydides and Aeschines have altered our perception of the manuscript tradition. P. J. Parsons, 'Summing Up' (pp. 118–23), assesses the impact of literary papyri with regard to (i) textual criticism and the manuscript
transmission; (ii) the interpretation of texts; and (iii) literary history. He sees the papyrologist’s trade like that of Goethe’s wonder-dog: ‘to eat broken glass and excrete diamonds’.

(4) Papyrology and Archaeology: T. Derda, ‘Polish Excavations at Deir El-Naqlun 1986–91: Interdependence of Archaeology and Papyrology’ (pp. 124–30), reports on the monastery Deir El-Naqlun in the Fayum. The excavation demonstrates impressively how fruitful close cooperation between archaeologists and papyrologists can be. It has yielded a substantial number of texts on papyrus, parchment, and paper in Arabic and Coptic, but predominantly in Greek, ranging from the fifth to the eighth century and later. C. Gallazzi, ‘Trouvera-t-on encore des papyri en 2042?’ (pp. 131–5), launches an appeal to the foreign institutes and the Egyptian authorities to speed up excavations of sites which may hide papyri: the Assuan High Dam has led to a rise in the water table which now threatens to destroy all papyrus and other organic materials still buried in the ground. (On 29/8/1992, the Association Internationale de Papyrologues endorsed his recommendations and decided to use its resources ‘to accelerate and encourage excavations in Egypt with the specific purpose of finding Greek and other papyri’.) D. W. Rathbone, ‘Settlement and Society in Greek and Roman Egypt’ (pp. 136–45), outlines a comprehensive programme for cooperation between archaeologists and papyrologists which could lead to a fuller understanding of the socio-economic contexts of the sites; he also stresses the need to compare the results with those from other areas of the Mediterranean and Near Eastern world. Summing up the session and endorsing its recommendations, H. Heinen, ‘Papyri und Archäologie’ (pp. 146–59), adds examples of papyri which have a bearing on archaeological topics (BGU 423, P. Lond. 1912, CPR XVII 19).

Two ‘Round Table’ sessions focused on ‘Literacy and Education’ (pp. 160–92), with contributions by C. Lada, B. Legras, K. McNamee (with a new interpretation of the sixth century commentary on Pind. Pyth. 1 in P. Rain. I 23 = Pack2 1356), and S. P. Vleeming and W. J. Tait (both on the training of Demotic scribes), and on ‘Egyptian Villages’ (pp. 193–218): W. Clarysse on ‘Jews in Trikomia’, M. R. Falivene on the borders of the Heracleopolite nome, and A. E. Hanson on topography and the tax archive of Philadelphia.

There were rich pickings in the section on ‘Documentary Texts’ (pp. 219–83), most of them Ptolemaic: shipping documents (R. R. E. Cook), a second century prosangelma (N. Gonis), five texts from Theadelphia connected with the Ibis cult (H. Koskenniemi), more second century B.C. documents from two mummy cartonnage heads in Geneva (P. Schubert), a note on P. Tebt. 33 (A. M. F. W. Verhoogt), and the first mention of the notorious Rabirius Postumus as dioiketes in a first century papyrus in Milan (C. Balconi). There are ostraca of the late first and second centuries A.D. in Strasbourg (P. Heilporn) and a list of names from the eastern desert (H. Cuvigny) as well as an intriguing private letter of the fourth century from the Dakhleh Oasis, mentioning the supply of a πινακίδιον of ten wooden tablets to a ἐλημνώτης...καὶ ἀναγγώνσε ς πανοικί ας (J. Whitehorne), and two fifth-century documents: a receipt from the ύποδιδίκτης ἀνανωνίων [ἐπί] τόπων Μάιρων from Hermopolis (F. Mitthof) and a revised edition of P. Col. VIII 242, a fascinating letter highlighting the difficulties of collecting taxes in Karanis (J. R. Rea).

In the section on ‘Literary Texts’ (pp. 284–343), only two contributors offered new texts: W. Brashear, ‘Literary and Sub-literary Papyri from Berlin’, and A. Hurst, ‘Un nouveau papyrus du premier hymne homérique’—this text, P. Gen. inv. 432, from the same Ptolemaic mummy cartonnage as the documents described by P. Schubert, is perhaps the most exciting new text presented at this congress! The other contributions

Another 'Round Table', chaired and introduced by M. Gigante, dealt with 'Papyri from Herculaneum' (pp. 344-409), with contributions by M. Capasso, J. Hammerstaedt, G. Indelli, R. Janko, K. Kleve, S. Laursen, F. Longo Auricchio, C. Militello, and A. Monet.

'Palaeography and Codicology' (pp. 410-27) gets four entries: I. Andorlini on medical texts in early codices and parchment notebooks; R. Barbis Lupi on paragraphos; J.-L. Fournet on apostrophes, accents, and breathings in sixth century documents; and W. A. Johnson questions whether oratory was written in narrower columns than other prose texts: in Oxyrhynchus, at least, this was not the case.


'Egyptological Studies' (pp. 508-16) get a small slot: M. S. Ali on P.Boulaq 19 = P.Cairo 58096, and K. S. Kolta on Egyptian medical papyri.

Inevitably, any large congress of this kind will generate a number of papers that do not fit neatly into the prescribed categories. Those are grouped together under the heading of 'General Papyrology' (pp. 517-60): R. Alston on violent crime, I. Chapa on P.Mich.inv.3724, F. Colin on P.Petr.1, I. F. Fikhman on papyri in Israel, P. Glare on BGU 362 and the Imperial cult, W. Huss on Ptolemaios Eupator, R. Katzoff on P.Yadin 19, A. Lukaszewicz on P.Gen.1, re-dated to 9 June 213, and Dio Cass.78.21.2-4, A. Martin on the definition of 'archives', D. Montserrat on the dating of mummy portraits, R. L. B. Morris on bishops from A.D. 304 to 663, J. F. Oates on machimoai, combining P.Cair.Zen.IV 59590 and P.Mich.182, S. B. Pomeroy on Ptolemaic census lists, Z. Tawfik on Alexander's σημα and σομα, and J. K. Winnicki on the transfer of soldiers and the archive of Dryton in the second century B.C.

Progress in the area of 'Papyrology and Computer Technology' (pp. 604-31) is heralded by Th. F. Brunner on the TLG, J. M. S. Cowey on the Heidelberg database of dated documentary papyri, N. E. G. Lövestam on how to make vanished ink visible under ion beams, J. H. Johnson on how to 'scan' texts for the Chicago Demotic Dictionary, G. Menci on how to put tachygraphic texts into an Apple Mac, and W. H. Willis on the progress of the Duke Data Bank of documentary papyri.

This heavy and handsomely produced volume is impressive proof that papyrology—Greek, Latin, Demotic, and Coptic—is flourishing: scholars in other areas of our Altertumswissenschaft who ignore its discoveries do so at their peril. The editor, Adam Bulow-Jacobsen, deserves our thanks for seeing it through the press with commendable speed.
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