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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 fulfills 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 'Lemma 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 ὀγγραπωκω is a graphic form of ὀγγαρϊκαί εύω (for the *anaptyxis* see F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* i.310ff.), cf. e.g. ἄβι(ι) ἀλλακ. It is not clear why there are separate entries for ἀκίκλα and ἀκίκλος (<aeiculus), instead of their appearing as a single lemma, a practice followed for ἄβερτη and ἄβολλης. 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.Abinn. 55.1 print ἐξ ἀποπροτήκτωρ; but articulations such as ἐκ ἀπο προτητήρων (ἐξ is an influence from the underlying ex protectoribus; we possess several examples of the construction without ἐξ), or even ἐξἀπο προτητήρων (Doppelpräposition) are equally possible. (There may be a further occurrence of the construction in the newly published POxy. LXIII 4367.2, but the context is damaged.) ὅ μέγα ἀναγνωστευτικον, attested in P.Princ. II 82.9 alone, probably does not refer to the 'Büro des
Augustalis’, but rather to his court (cf. 1.13 of the same text), and the use of μέγα in conjunction with courts (see now P.Oxy. LXIII 4394.21–2, 29–30 ευνήγορος τοῦ Ἀὐγουστιαλιανοῦ φόρον). It is doubtful whether the Coptic ΑΠΟΤΡΠΙΒΟΥΝ provides secure evidence for the existence of the word *ἀποτρπβοῖνος, or whether one should understand ἀπὸ τρπβοῖνων to be the prototype; compare ΠΑΠΟΔΟΥΚΩΝ in R.-G. Coquin, BSAC 30 (1991), 5. On the other hand, the deletion of the lemma ἀπονομηράμος is rash. To the literature on archistatores add H.-G. Pflaum, Scripta Varia i.155ff. For the dux et augustalis see also CPR V 18 introd. No bibliography is given on the augustalis of the Arab period; one should consult Grohmann’s works cited by F. Morelli, ZPE 115 (1997), 199 n. 5. P.Lond. III 1135 and 1322, said to be unpublished (p. 79), have been edited by G. M. Parássoglou, Hellenika 38 (1987), 31, 38.

But these are minor quibbles that in no way tarnish this splendid work. The Lexikon will be invaluable to papyrologists, philologists, historians, Byzantinists, and other scholars for many decades to come. C.-E. and D. deserve our warmest congratulations and thanks; and we look with anticipation to the future fascicles (‘Faszikel II’ [β–η] is planned to appear in 1998).
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