All in all, this is a thoroughly researched, insightful and thought-inspiring presentation of a little-studied topic. McGill's modern parallels are generally illuminating rather than gratuitous and serve to illustrate that the notion of authorial rights does not necessarily hinge on financial interest or the modern concept of copyright. McGill's book is much more than a specialist work: as it also reflects generally on *imitatio* and its essential idea that an author should seek to surpass his sources, it should prove to be of great interest to all scholars of classical literature.

Seppo Heikkinen

The Multilingual Experience in Egypt, from the Ptolemies to the ʾAbbāsids. Edited by Arietta Papaconstantinou. Ashgate, Farnham – Burlington 2010. ISBN 978-0-7546-6536-6. X, 240 pp. GBP 60.

The interest in multilingualism, its implications and attestations in Antiquity has recently grown and this collection of nine articles and a thought-provoking and informative introduction by Papaconstantinou is on the crest of the wave. One of its merits lies in the wide time range it covers. It goes beyond the Arab conquest of Egypt in 641 BCE, where many other studies of the Greco-Roman world stop. Yet the same languages were still used for some time after the conquest, together with the newcomer to Egypt, Arabic.

In her introduction, Papaconstantinou gives a clear account of why and how to study multilingualism, emphasizing the problems of the written material we have to rely on, and how the papyrological evidence is unique in giving us the possibility to perform socio-linguistic and socio-historical research.

The first chapter, "Linguistic Identity in Graeco-Roman Egypt", is also introductory in nature. Sofía Torallas Tovar sets the linguistic stage of Egypt covering the wide time range in which several different languages in different stages and scripts were used. She discusses on what premises we can study linguistic identity, a slippery term, and often combined with another equally slippery term, ethnic identity. Her definitions for these are broad, as they need to be, given the nature of our sources.

The next three chapters form Part I of the book "Evidence for a Multilingual Society: Documents and Archives", and are divided chronologically. Willy Clarysse's "Bilingual Papyrological Archives" gives a clear account of the concept of "archive" and the usefulness of archives in providing context information for individual texts. Clarysse also discusses the issue that obviously still needs to be highlighted, namely the black and grey market of antiquities that has spurred clandestine excavations. This, together with the ways in which excavations have been made in the old days (without decent methods and inclusive documentation), often deprives researchers of essential context information, partly because we do not know which texts were kept together as an archive in antiquity. Then Clarysse moves on to groups of bilingual Greek-Demotic archives from the Ptolemaic period presenting different kinds of bilingual documentation and discussing also the possible reasons for the use of two languages (e.g., in the archives of Egyptian priests, documents in Greek have been translated because of a legal dispute).

The next chapter, "Coptic or Greek? Bilingualism in the Papyri", is by Sarah J. Clackson, who passed away in 2003, and is annotated and edited for this publication by Papaconstantinou, based on two papers given by Clackson in 1997 and 2000. The first half is a very thorough survey of the Coptic language and its contact with Greek. Loan words are discussed from phonological and morphological points of view; she provides a list of conjunctions and prepositions borrowed into Coptic, this borrowing showing the depth of the language contact situation in Egypt. She also discusses examples of bilingual interference. The second part of the chapter takes on where Clarysse left off, dealing with bilingual archives and documents. For example, she discusses the interesting archives from Kellis in the Dakhleh Oasis representing a multilingual Manichean settlement, with widespread Coptic–Greek bilingualism with some layers of Latin and Syriac. Apparently Greek was reserved for formal and external communication and Coptic was the internal and domestic language. Another archive from the same time period is that of Apa John (who may be identified with John of Lykopolis), who is addressed with both Greek and Coptic request letters from the surrounding community members. Clackson then turns to the famous archive from the sixth century, that of Dioskoros of Aphrodito. He was a truly bilingual person, who wrote in both Greek and Coptic, worked as a notary for some time in both languages, and had a Hellenized education; his library included Homer and Menander and a Greek-Coptic glossary – very valuable for modern researchers. Dealing with Dioskoros, Clackson raises the important point that even though Coptic was written with Greek characters, there is a distinct Coptic style as opposed to Greek style (although this does apply to all writers): Dioskoros' Greek handwriting differs from his Coptic writing. This paper gives a full picture of the multilingual aspect of Egyptian life in the late Roman and Byzantine periods; although Coptic was widely used, it seems that understanding at least some Greek was expected from most people. Clackson's paper also beautifully continues Clarysse's in underlining the importance of knowing the context, usually an archive, for the wider understanding of the linguistic situation of individuals and communities.

In chapter 4, "Multilingual Archives and Documents in Post-Conquest Egypt", Petra M. Sijpesteijn studies how language use in Egypt changed after the Muslim conquest in 641 CE. Both Coptic and Greek were used up until the 8th century and Arabic gradually gained more ground. Greek was more widely used in the administrative register and Coptic in personal documents. However, in the 8th century Coptic took over some areas where Greek had dominated earlier, before it was replaced by Arabic. The field suffers from the fact that much of the Arabic material is still unpublished and that there often are problems with dating the documents; thus it is difficult to see large-scale developments.

The last five chapters form Part II of the book, that is, "Case Studies in Language Use in a Multilingual Society". Jacco Dieleman's article, "What's in a Sign? Translating Filiation in the Demotic Magical Papyri", dealing with Greek-Egyptian bilingualism, raises the important point that the bilingual corpus does not reflect bilingual speech. His case study comes from a bilingual corpus of Greek and Demotic (and Old Coptic) Magical Papyri, where several spells combine sections in Egyptian and Greek. They have been copied from Greek and Egyptian sources. When they contain linguistic interference, Dieleman speaks of "manuscript interference". In this paper he concentrates on the borrowing of one graphic symbol that is derived from the Greek word δεῖνα, combined from the capital letter *delta* and an *iota* written below it. It is used for the filiation formula in templates for spells. The place where the name of the target of the spell was to be inserted is of the type "X, son of Y", or "So-and-so, whom so-and-

so bore", in Demotic *mn r-ms mn*. Occasionally, in the Demotic spells, the symbol for Greek δεῖνα replaces the Demotic *mn*. The question is, is this to be understood as mixed writing (Greek-Egyptian-Greek), is the symbol still understood to represent a certain linguistic form in a certain language or is it merely a symbol for the idea "insert a name here"? The symbol is only used in the filiation formula and usually in cases where it is known that Greek *Vorlagen* exist, but it is still used randomly. Therefore the reasons for this graphic interference remain unanswered.

In Chapter 6, "Early Coptic Epistolography", Malcolm Choat discusses the earliest Coptic letters (from the 3rd/4th century CE) in order to see if we can trace different epistolographic traditions influencing Coptic ways of writing letters; he compares certain formulas to those appearing in Greco-Roman epistolography as well as in the letters of Paul and in (Demotic) Egyptian predecessors. Since so much of the Coptic material is literary/Biblical, it is a very welcome idea to invoke discussion on which groups of people used Coptic for non-literary purposes. Choat's material consists of 62 letters (over a 100 letters are dated to the 3rd – early fifth century CE, but since paleographic dating in Coptic is not secure, he chose only the securely dated ones). The results are interesting: there is clear influence from Greek epistolography, but also from earlier Demotic letters. The latter is extremely important because it shows a bridge over which the tradition was transferred, despite the hiatus in written Egyptian between the time Demotic ceased to be used and before Coptic had been developed. On the Greek side the influence of the New Testament letters plays only a minor part, which Choat takes as evidence that the Coptic letter writing developed as a separate tradition from the translation of the Bible into Coptic.

The next chapter makes this volume bilingual, as it is written in French whereas all the others are in English. In her article "Toujours honneur au grec? À propos d'un papyrus gréco-copte de la région thébaine", Anne Boud'hors studies the status of Greek among the Coptic texts from the monastery of Epiphanius in 7th to 8th-century Thebes. In general, the Theban area was not rich in Greek material, yet it exists, partly as a liturgical language. Bilingual manuscripts are bilingual in different ways: 1) texts where Greek and Coptic are mixed, 2) manuscripts where Greek and Coptic are not in the same function, as for example when Coptic was used for glosses, 3) manuscripts where the same text is in both languages, sometimes even on facing pages. Boud'hors provides a more detailed description for a hymn manuscript belonging to group 3 above, where two hymns are in Greek on the left page and in Coptic on the right (the manuscript also includes biblical and patristic citations in Coptic and a bilingual list of titles of hymns). The handwriting is of the Coptic documentary type, the same for both languages (not necessarily because of the inability of the writer to use Greek writing style but for the sake of uniformity). The Coptic side translates the Greek hymns. Boud'hors ponders upon who was using this manuscript and thinks it more plausible that it was meant for solitary reading and study than for recitation purposes. A bilingual reader could see the original Greek meanings while he was reading the Coptic text. A question of different original texts for the Greek version and the Coptic one has been raised; Boud'hors mentions other bilingual manuscripts where it is clear that one language is not a translation of the other, but both texts follow their own manuscript tradition. This, according to her, is one possible sign that the use of Greek was somewhat fossilized.

Tonio Sebastian Richter begins his chapter "Language Choice in the Qurra Dossier" by stating that when we study written texts, the questions differ from those of modern linguists,

who also have spoken data. Language choice is a different type of action in writing than in speech. This chapter takes us to Egypt after the Arab conquest in 641 CE. A new language, Arabic, was introduced to a country where some people were monolingual, speaking Greek or Egyptian, and some were bilingual in Greek and Egyptian. Greek was not to survive very long since Arabic was taking the place it had been holding as the language of higher administration. Egyptian was the language of the majority, but by the 12th to 14th centuries they had switched language to Arabic, and Egyptian had only a superficial existence within the Coptic Church. For this historical perspective, the documentation from the early period when Arabic is first introduced in the country, is highly important.

Richter presents us with the Qurra dossier from Aphrodito, with texts in all three of these languages. There are 200 Greek, 150 Coptic and 50 Arabic texts from the early 8th century, mostly coming from the time when Qurra ibn Sharik was the governor of Egypt. However, it is likely that some Arabic texts belonging to this dossier have not yet been published. Most of the texts of the dossier are related to taxation, an area where Arabs maintained the Byzantine Greek structures (Richter points out that otherwise in administration they aimed to centralize power as opposed to the strong decentralization of the Byzantines). The texts are mostly incoming texts of the pagarch's office in Aphrodito, some coming from the highest level of administration (i.e., the governor's office), some produced at the medium level (the pagarch's office) and some on the lowest level, by local authorities and monasteries. Richter groups the texts by their text types and carefully discusses the language choice in them (and the relatively small number of contact-induced features, such as borrowings between the languages). Richter concludes that the function of having anything written in Arabic was basically a sign of power; there were significantly fewer people who could read the Arabic in Aphrodito; Greek was used to get the message through. Although the Qurra texts reveal social trilingualism, there is no sign of individual trilingualism; Greek was the bridge, the middle stage, the *lingua franca*. As mentioned already in Sijpesteijn's chapter, it is interesting that the use of Coptic in private business and legal texts was at its widest during the first century after the Arab conquest, whereas official and public documents still continued to be written in Greek.

In the last chapter, "Aristophanes Son of Johannes: An Eighth-Century Bilingual Scribe? A Study of Graphic Bilingualism," Jennifer Cromwell presents a detailed examination of the different handwriting styles of one scribe from 8th-century Jeme. The scribe, Aristophanes son of Johannes, uses a different style when writing Greek (which is used in formulaic and extended passages within the Coptic document, not in separate documents) than in writing Coptic. His Coptic hand can be defined as a cursive hand with predominantly majuscule formations, whereas his Greek hand is more compact and resembles other Greek minuscule official hands of the period. This has important implications for our understanding of the education of scribes. Aristophanes has, moreover, made a deliberate language choice, marked by the change of hand, when using Greek amidst Coptic.

In general, this collection is well researched and well executed. Two improvements would have made it even better. First, it would have been good to offer this type of book to a wider audience of linguists, because the corpora documented here offer an exceptional time range on the development of languages in a long-standing contact situation. The reader of this book, however, needs to be able to read Greek and Coptic, since the examples are not transliterated (except for Arabic, for which only the transcription is used) or glossed. Luckily there are at least translations. The second shortcoming concerns the bibliography: it has not been collected

at the end of the book nor at the end of each article; all bibliographic references are in the footnotes. This practice may have been the wish of the publisher, but for an academic reader it is a nuisance. All in all, this set of articles is enjoyable due to the wide perspective of the first part and the detailed case studies backing them up in the second.

Marja Vierros

Siobhán McElduff: *Roman Theories of Translation: Surpassing the Source*, Routledge, New York – Abingdon 2013. ISBN 978-0-415-81676-2 (hbk), ISBN 978-0-203-58861-1 (ebk). IX, 266 pp. USD 125.

Siobhán McElduff's fascinating study of how and why Romans translated may come as a shocking revelation to those of us used to contemporary views on translation, which emphasise an objective faithfulness to the source text. Especially when it comes to literary translations of Greek works, the Roman approach seems to have been the diametrical opposite of ours: a translator was expected to assert his own personality and to contribute something of his own to the source text, the result being literary texts that hardly qualify as "translations" in the modern sense. Not only was the source text freely paraphrased, but it was usual to combine several originals, leave out portions of the source and to add new interpolations. Literary translation was seen as something completely distinct from technical translation, or the work of the professional interpreter. This was ultimately based on a class distinction: a member of the Roman literary elite was expected to affirm his persona by boldly taking command of the source text and therefore set himself apart from the menial and detail-oriented work of grammarians and interpreters, who, as salaried employees or slaves, where his social inferiors. The literary translator also competed with his source, trying to create something superior: literary translation was a form of the *aemulatio* which constitutes one of the central aspects of ancient culture. Translation as an expression of Roman elite personality had a twofold use: it could enforce the unity of the literary elite, as in the use of translated poetry as gifts between elite Romans, and it could also be used as a weapon in literary debates. Cicero's translation of Attic speakers in an attempt to undermine the efforts of his denigrators in the Atticist school of orators is a case in point (pp. 106–21).

McElduff's book, which is centred on the social role of the Roman literary translator, reflects recent advances in translation studies, and it is obvious that the older text-oriented methods that were content to compare the source text with its translation are not an appropriate tool for the analysis of Roman translation (pp. 12–5). One central aspect that must be constantly borne in mind is that the Roman literary elite was generally literate in Greek and therefore perfectly capable of reading the source texts in the original: unlike in our culture, translations were not aimed at a public that would otherwise not have had access to the translated work. Although Roman comedy is generally considered a more popular art form, even Terence's prologues to his plays imply that at least a part of his audience knew the Greek models of his plays or was at least aware of their existence (pp. 84–94).

Importantly, McElduff sees the evolution of Roman translation as a form of conquest contemporary to the Roman subjugation of the Greek East in the third to first centuries BCE. The appropriation of Greek literary capital ran parallel to the importation of slaves, artefacts