Mimesis’ bereits in ein System zusammengebunden sind? Dazu hätte freilich klar gesagt werden müssen, daß Aristoteles in Kap. 1 mit λόγος als einem der Mittel der Mimesis keineswegs nur «that which is said by the characters» meint (32), was etwas anderes wäre als λέξις, sondern schlichtweg die «sprachliche[,] Gestaltung» (Übers. Schmitt) literarischer Texte. Vernachlässigt außerdem Malms Fassung der Dichotomie von «what is said» und «how it is said» nicht die Kategorie des mimetischen Modus? An sich wäre dieser unter ‘representation’ neben der λέξις mit zu bedenken. Die Frage nach der poetischen Vermittlungsinstanz und damit nach dem sog. Redekriterium läßt Malm aber unter den Tisch fallen (übrigens ebenso den Fragmentstatus der ‘Poetik’).

Die Kapitel über Averroës, über Mathias, über Batteux und Schlegel sowie etliches aus dem appendixhaften letzten Großabschnitt (vor allem das Kapitel zur Frontstellung des Symbols gegen die rhetorischen Tropoi) sind die lehrreichsten Teile an diesem Buch. Kenner der rinascimentalen Rezeptionsgeschichte der ‘Poetik’ werden hingegen nach der Lektüre von Malm ihre bisherigen Standpunkte nur partiell retuschieren müssen, was durchaus auch eine höhere Aufmerksamkeit für Rekurse der frühneuzeitlichen Theoriebildung auf Averroës mit einschließt.

Berlin

Bernhard Huß

---


This study is an excellent up-to-date examination of the cavalry-settlers in Egypt under the Ptolemies. Scheuble-Reiter (afterwards S.) gathered all the documentation, mainly papyrological but also epigraphic, literary and at times archaeological on the cavalry-settlers in order to better understand their role, composition and organization within the new Ptolemaic state. Her main argument (p.3–6) is that the katoikoi – one of the terms used for cavalry-cleruchs – were not an ethnically and socio-economically homogeneous group throughout the period. When Egyptians obtained certain military ranks, they apparently adopted a Greek name and a fictive ethnic (such as ‘Macedonian’) and belonged to the fiscally and legally privileged category of the Hellenes. This is a very important contribution of the present study, which demonstrates more systematically how some Greek names were favored by the katoikoi of Egyptian origin. Even if the phenomenon varied by region and cannot be quantified, the slow but perceptible interpenetrations of the cavalry-cleruchs with the Egyptian population can be connected to the new situation in Egypt after the loss of most territories outside of Egypt in the second century BC. In contrast to these developments, S. sees little change in the military organization of the cavalry-cleruchs over time, except for purely formal modifications and for the standardization of the cavalry regiments (hipparchies) in the late third-early second century. Similarly, even the legal status of the klēroi (land granted to cleruchs in exchange for military service) was not significantly modified and did not develop into private property as is often thought. The account that follows, though detailed, cannot do justice to the amount of material presented in this study.
After a general introduction (chapter 1) where S. presents the nature of the sources, her argument about the lack of homogeneity of the group and previous scholarship, chapter 2 describes the cleruchic system and its origin. S. raises the problem of representativeness of the sources concerning the katoikoi, which include about 1300 individuals in 700 texts unequally distributed over time and place (more than half come from the third and second century Arsinoite). Yet this probably corresponds to an historical reality of their geographic distribution. She notes that it is not necessary to assume that under the first Ptolemies, soldiers came from areas under Ptolemaic control (contra Bagnall (1984) who suggested that soldiers coming from outside of these areas were soldiers from Alexander’s army who had followed Ptolemy.)¹ S. dates the earliest settlement of cleruchs to 314 BC but emphasizes the importance of settlement under Ptolemy II and their connections with the ends of wars and royal visits in the chora in the third century. Promotion to the katoikia (that is, the group of cavalry-cleruchs) was also connected with internal political events (revolts and dynastic conflicts). S. explains how cleruchs were often settled according to ethnic groups and formed rather closed communities especially in the third century and were also settled according to their so-called eponymous officers, who had civilian functions and who served to identify cleruchs (in contrast, Clarysse and Fischer-Bovet 2012 argue that eponymous officers had military functions).² Most importantly, S. convincingly argues against the idea supported by Bingen and generally accepted that the cleruchs, especially cavalry-cleruchs, were absentee landlords. Functions that cleruchs had within the villages, village gymnasias, the supervision of cultivation as well as relationships with the Egyptian population and even their involvement in assaults and disputes suggest that they lived in the villages rather than in the metropolis. She emphasizes that the Ptolemies seem to have prioritized economic interests over military efficiency, although the case study of Phanias, γραμματεὺς τῶν ἱππεῶν (255–238 BC) demonstrates that at that time, the military efficiency was still more important to the Ptolemies.

In chapter 3 S. examines in detail the organization of the cavalry. She summarizes previous scholarship on military hierarchy and estimates the number of cavalrymen, both katoikoi and mercenaries (mistophoroi hippeis), at around 5000 as at the battle of Raphia (217 BC) according to Polybius. In the third century there were five numbered hipparchies and six ‘ethnic’ hipparchies, the latter named after population groups from regions famous for horsemanship from which some members had initially originated. There were in fact only five ethnic hipparchies (see Fischer-Bovet (2014)³ and Scheuble-Reiter’s forthcoming publication of P. UB Trier S 77–43). The two systems were unified, probably around 179/178 BC, into ten numbered hipparchies that included both heavy and light cavalry. She convincingly explains that the term katoikos was preferred to the designations ‘100-aroura-cleruchs’ in areas where the size allotments were not uniform, and that katoikoi and katoikoi hippeis were equivalent terms for caval-

rymen. Indeed, the few attestations of katoikoi pezoi (infantrymen) were misread and should be rejected. The author continues by examining a series of special units, organized as small dictionary entries, starting with a list of attestations for each and a discussion of their basic function and organization. Especially important is her discussion of two elite troops, the ἄγημα and the τῶν πρώτων. S. finally turns to cavalry equipment and depletes that so little is known from our sources. Weaponry and equipment was probably not homogenous, and beyond the heavy and light cavalry there must have been considerable variations. Abundant references to inspectors (ἱπποσκόποι) and veterinarians (ἱππιατροί) show the great care devoted to horses by the state, as the Ptolemies provided horses (and weapons) for free or at advantageous prices.

Chapter 4 turns to the traditional but still appealing question of the origin of the cavalry-settlers by analyzing the so-called ethnics (‘Ethnika’, Greek patrides) found in official documentation. S. provides graphics for the provenance of katoikoi hippeis following the periodization of Bagnall (see now Stefanou (2013) for an update of Uebel and Bagnall’s lists).1 Her investigation of the ethnics and names of the cavalry-cleruchs challenges the idea that this group was exclusively Greek. The ethnics show that in the third century, the Ptolemies recruited men from areas where they had active foreign politics, including Macedonia, Thrace and Thessaly. The center of gravity of recruitment moved to the cities of Asia Minor in the second century. S. reminds us that the diversity and numbers of the origin markers shrank in the second and first century BC. Some lost their meaning, becoming fictive ethnics, in particular the ethnic ‘Makedon’ but also Perses, Thraikes, Musos, and Thessalos (for a slightly different view on the last three, see Fischer-Bovet (2014)).2 S. cautiously concludes that the extent to which the loss of external territories had an effect on recruitment in these regions cannot be known with certitude. In the last section, S. offers the first systematic onomastic analysis of the katoikoi, with results that are essential to her argument, especially two of them: first, theophoric names increased at the end of the third century, which could reflect an inclusion of Egyptians in the katoikia in the second century because theophoric names were common in Egyptian onomastic; second, Egyptian names were sometimes attested in the cavalry, mostly among misthophoroi, but there are ways to detect Greek names often borne by Egyptians, which provide a clue that in the second and first century BC there were Egyptians in the katoikia who could hide behind these Greek names.

In chapters 5 and 6, S. examines the most discussed questions regarding the cavalry-settlers and their economic status and role, those related to their klêros. Chapter 5 is the longest and the most difficult for readers who are not papyrologists. S. first investigates the complicated legal status of the klêroi in the katoikia in the second century because theophoric names were common in Egyptian onomastic; second, Egyptian names were sometimes attested in the cavalry, mostly among misthophoroi, but there are ways to detect Greek names often borne by Egyptians, which provide a clue that in the second and first century BC there were Egyptians in the katoikia who could hide behind these Greek names.

In chapters 5 and 6, S. examines the most discussed questions regarding the cavalry-settlers and their economic status and role, those related to their klêros. Chapter 5 is the longest and the most difficult for readers who are not papyrologists. S. first investigates the complicated legal status of the klêroi and argues that it hardly changed throughout the period, contrary to previous views of gradual

2 C. Fischer-Bovet (2014), p. 177-195 [see above p. 711 n. 3].
privatization (for a similar argument, see Fischer-Bovet (2008) and (2014)). The facts that klēroi generally passed from fathers to sons or could be administered by a woman belonging to the family until a male heir was old enough were not only advantageous for the cavalry-cleruchs but also for the kings, who maintained a stable supply of soldiers and could tax the land. S.’s other most significant observations can only be mentioned in passing here: fathers and sons often cultivated the klēroi together and sons must have been recorded as heirs in the register before their father’s death; the state retained the right to take the klēros back throughout the period, for instance during campaigns or when the klēros could not be managed properly. Concerning the size of the klēroi, S. confirms that smaller klēroi were allocated to the new cavalry-cleruchs who entered the katoikia in the second and first century BC. Even if the old families of cavalry-cleruchs may have kept their large klēroi and their economic advantages, she stresses that the katoikoi were not an economically closed milieu. She could in fact use her discussion of the so-called fossil klēroi (i.e. named after an original owner no longer serving), which are divided into smaller plots, to support this point. The last section turns to the different officials involved in the administration of the klēroi and tries to establish their main functions and possible hierarchy. Yet S. warns us that we cannot expect a perfectly coherent and fixed hierarchy in ancient states. Many similar terms, such as ἐπιστάται and γραμματεῖς τῶν κατοίκων ἱππέων were used in different areas of the administration and at different levels.

Chapter 6 focuses on the economic implications of holding a klēros for one particular group of cleruchs: the katoikoi. In their publication of P.Count Clarysse and Thompson have shown that in the third century the katoikoi and other soldiers belonged to a special fiscal category whose taxes were calculated separately. Like civilians marked as ‘Hellenes’ in the register, soldiers were exempted from the obol-tax, above all a symbolic measure. Cleruchs who were also στρατευόμενοι had a reduced rate of 1/10 instead of 1/6 on the ἀπόμοιρα (vineyard tax), so S. suggests that the participle does not mean ‘who are soldiers’ but implies that they were on campaign or on military duty in garrisons away from their villages. She does not address the question of whether the cleruchs’ land was taxed like royal land but Monson is now showing that it was (at a slightly lower rate), at least in the third century BC. Most importantly, S. demonstrates that the klēros was the basis of the economic prosperity of the katoikoi but could fulfill this function in ways other than traditional grain production, in particular through breeding livestock and selling animals. Her comparison of the best-documented land surveys from three nomes, despite their diversity through time and space, suggests that when large sections of klēroi were not cultivated, it did not necessary imply the deterioration of the economic situation of the katoikoi because they could be active in other economic sectors. From the second century BC on, the katoikoi were neither ethnically nor economically homogeneous yet still their economic situation was strong. However, it weakened under Ptolemy

XII, as implied by special state loans for borrowing seeds and the increased number of transfers of parts of kléroi.

Finally, chapter 7 engages with religious aspects of the cavalry-settlers’ daily life in order to explore processes of rapprochement between the immigrants and the local population and between the immigrants and Egyptian culture. S. first notes that, perhaps surprisingly, there is only one sanctuary dedicated by the katoikoi to the royal cult (in Hermopolis). Yet many dedications by katoikoi were made to the royal family and thus showed the desire of the katoikoi to display their loyalty to the king. While Greek cults and other foreign cults (Atargatis and Hero) are represented only rarely in inscriptions, Egyptian gods are omnipresent in the lives of katoikoi. For S., most dedications were made out of personal religious conviction and show the true appeal of Egyptian animal cults to them, which does not exclude that in many cases katoikoi also wanted to appear as benefactors and play the role of intermediaries with the government in Alexandria. She also alludes to the fact that some katoikoi probably married Egyptian women, thus integrating Egyptian culture and traditions in their household. Finally, a particularity of Ptolemaic Egypt was village gymnasia, built on private initiative but of public interest (see now Paganini’s dissertation). The archaeology is limited but S. infers from a couple of examples that they were rather rudimentary constructions, although baths are at times attested. The author proposes that Egyptians who entered the army and took a Greek name and ethnic may have had access to the gymnasion but also explains that the dedications by former ephebes to the local crocodile gods do not automatically imply their Egyptian ethnic background. There was no contradiction, in the second and first century BC, in being a member of a gymnasion and worshiping the crocodile gods. The katoikoi formed a group whose identity had become cultural and relied on their common loyalty to the king and on their belonging to a privileged class.

This was a long-awaited study for anybody working on ancient armies, more particularly on socio-economic aspects of them, and an admirable one. The main results are succinctly presented at the end of some of the chapters and in the conclusion (chapter 8). Yet, because of the many detailed papyrological analyses offered in each chapter, the general argument concerning the katoikoi sometimes gets lost and therefore the book may not be accessible to a readership beyond specialists in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt. For such readers, more emphasis would have to be given to changes over time and explaining it and to what is specific to the small privileged group of katoikoi vis-à-vis other groups of soldiers. Some sections read more like encyclopedic entries on many topics related to the katoikoi and their administration, yet they are very useful and complemented by valuable appendices, in particular the list of titles of cavalry-officers and cavalry-cleruchs. Chapters 4 (on ethnicity) and 7 (on religion) are the most original chapters on which S.’s argument on ethnic heterogeneity is based. S. and Fischer-Bovet (2008 and 2014 [see n. 6]) obtained fairly similar results regarding the integration of Egyptians in the katoikia and its – at least partial – role as a tool of social and economic equalization from the second century on. In addition, S.’s examination modifies past views by demonstrating that katoikoi were

most often not absentee landlords, that cleruchs and the king benefited from the fact that _klêroi_ would normally pass from fathers to sons, and finally that _klêroi_ were also used for livestock breeding and, though the basis of the _katoikoi_’s economic comfortable situation, probably not the only one. In conclusion, S.’s study is an up-to-date and first-rate papyrological investigation on the cavalry-cleruchs in Hellenistic Egypt and has already become an indispensable reference.

Los Angeles

Christelle Fischer-Bovet

---

_Ch. Fischer-Bovet: Scheuble-Reiter, Die Katökenreiter im ptolemäischen Ägypten_


Le troisième ouvrage paru dans la série du _CIIP_ constitue le second tome du volume consacré à Jérusalem et à ses environs immédiats, à la suite d’un premier qui rassemblait les inscriptions antérieures à 70 apr. J.-C. (_CIIP_ I/1, 2010), et après le volume dédié à Césarée, à Dôra et aux sites voisins (_CIIP_ II, 2011). Alors que le premier tome réunissait pour l’essentiel quelques inscriptions de fondations avec les très nombreux textes des ossuaires trouvés dans les tombeaux à la périphérie de la ville, celui-ci est beaucoup plus diversifié. Plusieurs auteurs se répartissent la tâche, en fonction des diverses langues des textes, selon une organisation qui distingue les huit éditeurs des sept contributeurs occasionnels.

Les documents antérieurs à Constantin (n° 705 à 783), où dominent les inscriptions latines publiées par Werner Eck, sont classés selon l’ordre traditionnel des corpus latins, en débutant par les divinités et en terminant par l’_instrumentum_ et les fragments. En revanche, l’épigraphie de l’Antiquité tardive (n° 784 à 1087), largement confiée pour le grec à Lea Di Segni, est ordonnée de manière différente et les deux principaux types de textes chrétiens, c’est-à-dire les inscriptions religieuses et les épitaphes, se rangent à juste titre selon leur lieu de provenance. Viennent ensuite des addenda au volume I/1 (n° 1088–1120) ainsi qu’une page de corrigenda (p. 498), puis un index des noms de personnes des deux tomes de Jérusalem.

Le tout est complété par un appendice de 54 entrées (App. 1 à App. 54), rédigé par L. Di Segni et muni de son propre index des anthroponymes. Un article récent de W. Eck, dans la revue _Rationes rerum_ 1/1, 2013, p. 17–38, explique, p. 27–28, la logique qui a présidé à la constitution de ce sous-ensemble où se mêlent les textes datables de périodes variées, en grec et en latin et sur des supports divers. Il s’agit de documents qui n’auraient pas eu leur place dans ce volume ou dans le corpus – ou parce que leur provenance hiérosolymitaine n’est pas assurée, ou parce que leur datation est postérieure à 640, ou encore parce qu’ils sont des estampilles de productions en série – mais qui ont dû y être intégrés à la suite de péripéties judiciaires résultant de désaccords au sein de l’équipe de rédaction. D’autres inscriptions, dont la présence dans ce volume ne s’impose pas, ont pourtant été conservées dans la numérotation continue, comme le n° 876 daté par l’ère...