

SVENSKA INSTITUTEN I ATHEN OCH ROM
INSTITUTUM ATHENIENSE ATQUE INSTITUTUM ROMANUM REGNI SUECIAE

Opuscula

Annual of the Swedish Institutes at Athens and Rome

13
2020

STOCKHOLM

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Prof. Gunnel Ekroth, Uppsala, Chairman
Dr Lena Sjögren, Stockholm, Vice-chairman
Mrs Kristina Björkstén Jersenius, Stockholm, Treasurer
Dr Susanne Berndt, Stockholm, Secretary
Prof. Christer Henriksen, Uppsala
Prof. Anne-Marie Leander Touati, Lund
Prof. Peter M. Fischer, Göteborg
Dr David Westberg, Uppsala
Dr Sabrina Norlander-Eliasson, Stockholm
Dr Lewis Webb, Göteborg
Dr Ulf R. Hansson, Rome
Dr Jenny Wallensten, Athens

EDITOR

Dr Julia Habetzeder
Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies
Stockholm University
SE-106 91 Stockholm
editor@ecsi.se

SECRETARY'S ADDRESS

Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies
Stockholm University
SE-106 91 Stockholm
secretary@ecsi.se

DISTRIBUTOR

eddy.se ab
Box 1310
SE-621 24 Visby

For general information, see <http://ecsi.se>
For subscriptions, prices and delivery, see <http://ecsi.bokorder.se>
Published with the aid of a grant from The Swedish Research Council (2017-01912)
The English text was revised by Rebecca Montague, Hindon, Salisbury, UK

Opuscula is a peer reviewed journal. Contributions to *Opuscula* should be sent to the Secretary of the Editorial Committee before 1 November every year. Contributors are requested to include an abstract summarizing the main points and principal conclusions of their article. For style of references to be adopted, see <http://ecsi.se>. Books for review should be sent to the Secretary of the Editorial Committee.

ISSN 2000-0898
ISBN 978-91-977799-2-0
© Svenska Institutet i Athen and Svenska Institutet i Rom
Printed by TMG Sthlm, Sweden 2020
Cover illustrations from Aiopoulou *et al.* in this volume, p. 48.

the antiquarian tradition is more or less ignored in *Classical heritage*.

The theoretical framework which is outlined in the introduction is pertinent. The authors have produced a conceptual framework which they use consistently in the case studies. This is admirable. *Classical heritage* is anchored in a theoretical framework which consists of Jeff Malpas' theory about place and space, and a modified version of Benedict Anderson's concept "imagined communities". Fine, this works. Yet, why do we classicists tend to be eager to be up-to-date when it comes to research on the analytical evidence, but find it acceptable to relate to theoretical concepts belatedly? That is, we often use adequate theoretical concepts which have been around for a while, but ignore the ensuing discussion of the original concept. In *Classical heritage*, *habitus* is mentioned, but Pierre Bourdieu's study is not. Nor does *Classical heritage* address the issues concerning *habitus* that have been raised in archaeology and several other academic disciplines. Mentioning a theoretical concept without explication is inadequate.

Notwithstanding my criticism, I find this to be an excellent book and I hope that the authors will continue to explore further facets of classical reception. *Classical heritage* will hopefully be followed by further studies on Danish and Nordic classicisms.

JOHANNES SIAPKAS

Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies, Stockholm University
106 91 Stockholm, Sweden
johannes@siapkas.se

J.-L. Fournet, *The rise of Coptic. Egyptian versus Greek in Late Antiquity* (The Rostovzeff Lectures), Oxford & Princeton: Princeton University Press 2020. 224 pp.
ISBN 9780691198347. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvktrvz1>

<https://doi.org/10.30549/opathrom-13-14>

The four chapters of this book, originating from lectures its author held at Princeton University in late 2017, unravel the story of how Coptic expanded in Late Antiquity into the domain of law and jurisdiction, thereby partly replacing Greek, which had dominated administration in Egypt for many centuries.

In Chapter 1 'An Egyptian exception?', the author examines the linguistic situation in Egypt during the Late Roman Empire, noting how slow it was for Egyptian language to be used again for legal transactions after the Demotic script had been ousted from administration in the 1st century AD. The use of Coptic, as Egyptian in its revived alphabetic shape is known as, remained restricted for a long time. Next to Christian key texts, Coptic seems to have been used only for non-regulated written exchanges, to wit letters, although Jean-Luc

Fournet himself identifies one exceptional Coptic loan receipt from Kellis in the Dakhla oasis dating to the 4th century (p. 19). Claims that Coptic was already used in this early period in summaries or chancery notes to Greek legal documents are dispelled through the author's review of the extant documents. He demonstrates convincingly that in all known instances Coptic portions in these early texts (readily at hand in Appendix I) have been subsequently added. The situation in Egypt appears, indeed, to be an exception, since, as Fournet shows in an interesting regional outlook, unlike Coptic, Syriac was used both for legal documents and in public epigraphy. The dissimilar status of the two languages is also reflected in the fact that Syriac-speaking participants in the Ecumenical Councils could put their signature in Syriac to the Greek documents, whereas not a single instance is known of an Egyptian bishop having subscribed in Coptic.

Chapter 2 is titled 'Why was Greek preferred to Coptic?'. A decisive factor was certainly the prestige of Greek, which had been in place as a legal language in Egypt since the Ptolemaic period, and possessed a highly elaborate legal vocabulary. In addition, the use of Greek was furthered by its role in the Church. Its prestige is reflected in the Greek influence on Coptic (c. 20% of words in any text are Greek), but also in the format and appearance of documents (i.e. diplomatics). More speculative is the suggestion that the inability to present *one* written standard was an impediment for Coptic to develop use for administrative or legal acts. To me it seems that the idea of the "handicap of multidialectism" (p. 48) is exaggerated. Likewise, I do not see that Coptic is more "artificial" (p. 47) than other written standards (as Ferdinand de Saussure said: "*Langue et écriture sont deux systèmes de signes distincts*"). By all means, the differences between the different written standards are not so great that they would have hindered effective communication. Moreover, I think one can make the point that Coptic did eventually develop into a legal language at a time when different written standards still persisted although fewer than in the beginning of written Coptic. An image emerges of culturally profoundly Hellenized individuals from urban milieus who elevated their vernacular into a "prestige variety" to complement Greek, and not to compete with it. It might well be, as the author suggests, that they did not even intend a more extended use of (written) Coptic precisely due to their bicultural background.

Chapter 3, 'The rise of legal Coptic and the Byzantine state', describes the gradual advance of Coptic into the legal domain starting from the second half of the 6th century AD. Still, the dependency on Greek legal texts is evident in the 16 datable legal acts preserved from the period before the Arab Conquest (detailed in Appendix 3). Fournet's analysis reveals that they are not signed by notaries in the strict sense of the term; rather, they can be classified as "pseudonotarial private acts". In this first phase, Coptic was used for temporary trans-

actions such as leases and loans. The documents stem from southern Egypt (none from farther north than Hermopolis), an area which can be characterized as “a breeding ground for a cultural affirmation” (p. 93). Fortunately, the background of the scribes can be traced in several cases and they are shown to be bilingual individuals alias persons with bicultural competence (Fournet talks about “digraphic scribes” or “digraphs”). The author highlights the significance of the Second Persian Period (AD 619–629) for the decline of Greek written culture in Egypt, as it modified, despite its shortness, the functioning of the state institutions, probably including language use.

In Chapter 4 ‘The role of the Church and monasticism in the growth of legal Coptic’, the author revisits the image of the monastic sphere as predominantly non-Greek and concludes that one should not underestimate the presence of Greek-speaking urban elements in the monasteries. Similarly, the old cliché opposing Greek Chalcedonians against Egyptian non-Chalcedonians is an oversimplification and does not stand up to scrutiny. In this chapter, we are given a glimpse of important still-unedited documents, such as the Weill codex (to be seen on the cover), now in the Louvre, consisting of eight wooden tablets with receipts both in Greek and Coptic. The analysis of this exceptional document informs us that monks, responsible for tax collection in their local context, also issued tax receipts. The chapter also includes a discussion on the differences between the wills of two successive abbots of the monastery of St Phoebammon, the famous bishop Abraham of Armant (died in the late 610s AD) and his successor Victor (died in AD 634). The first is written in somewhat clumsy Greek, the second in Coptic, which bears the mark of Greek models. It is probably significant for the differing choice of language, as Fournet points out, that the Second Persian Period falls in the intervening years. Fournet also deals with Abraham’s extensive legal dossier on ostraca, which had, he argues against Ewa Wipszycka, full legal value. It appears that Abraham ruled on disputes also for laymen, not only clerics, and that the execution of the rulings fell upon the civil authorities.

The book is pleasantly designed and well-illustrated in black and white. One is grateful for the careful transcriptions that accompany several of the texts discussed, both in the main text and in the endmatter (Appendix 1 ‘Coptic endorsements in Greek legal texts’ and Appendix 2 ‘Five samples of fourth-century Coptic letters’). Readers unfamiliar with Coptic will be grateful for the underlining of Greek words that illustrates the degree of permeation of Coptic by Greek vocabulary. The bibliography includes many recent and still unpublished items. The indices have been compiled with care. One appreciates, especially, to find an index of text passages from ancient documents.

Imperfections are few in number: sometimes Egyptian place-names are spelt according to French norms, which I find

debatable, thus Chams el-Din for Shams el-Din, Douch for Dush, and Aïn Waqfa for Ayn Waqfa. Umlaut (p. 67) is unsuitable as a term for describing the diacritical sign marking diaeresis (two superlinear dots) as in $\text{M}\ddot{\text{O}}\ddot{\text{Y}}\text{C}\text{H}\text{C}$. Not only is the function different (umlaut is a phonological process), but also the origin—ä and ö derive from ä and ö respectively so the similarity is superficial. Also, the description of the function of the superlinear stroke in $\text{M}\bar{\text{N}}$ is misleading. The whole point is for the second consonant to form the syllabic peak, therefore the two consonants constitute a “unit”, actually the exact opposite of what is stated on p. 68. A transcription in accordance with the International Phonetic Alphabet would be $[\text{m}\bar{\text{n}}]$. In the bibliography, the year of publication for “ACO I–III 1914–1920” (p. 173) should be changed to 1927–1940. While it is true that Eduard Schwartz’s monumental edition of the Acts of the Ecumenical Councils started in 1914, the first issue to appear was a part of volume 4.

If I have any regret, it would be that the speech communities are absent although, admittedly, a few individuals flash past us, such as the 8th-century witness Jacob, son of Isaac, who put his Greek signature to a Coptic document. Fournet explains this through his Lower Egyptian origin (p. 92). One cannot help to ask to what degree the expansion of Coptic is explained by dwindling numbers of native speakers of Greek, in particular in the south, as a natural process of assimilation. Even if documents are not preserved in the north, what is the likely scenario for the abandonment of Greek in the north? It is natural that this reviewer’s curiosity on such matters is not satisfied given the author’s method of relying on facts. Overall, this is a well-balanced (detailed, but not overloaded), intimately document-based and persuasive analysis, set forth in a clear way so as to allow readers with different backgrounds to engage in the story of how Coptic turned into a language for legal use in Late Antiquity.

ÅKE ENGSHEDEN

Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies, Stockholm University
106 91 Stockholm, Sweden
ake.engsheden@antiken.su.se

G. Wiplinger, *Der Değirmendere Aquadukt von Ephesos*, 2 vols, (Babesch Suppl. 36), Leuven, Paris, Bristol, Connecticut: Peeters 2019. XVI + 686 pp. ISBN 978-90-429-3895-3.

<https://doi.org/10.30549/opathrom-13-15>

Gilbert Wiplinger’s publication of the Roman Değirmendere aqueduct is the latest comprehensive study of a such a structure. Yet, while the title puts aqueduct in the singular, in practice the work deals with two lines: an older Hadrianic line, which was later largely rebuilt under Antoninus Pius af-