
There can be few students of Classical Antiquity who would deny the value of a comprehensive, annual synopsis of developments in Greek Epigraphy such as envisaged in the *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. For new inscriptions and novel interpretations of known inscriptions are appearing in prodigious numbers in a bewildering variety of publications and, unhappily, at the self same time the number of libraries capable of holding such an abundance of scholarly journals and books dwindles inexorably. Thus, whilst acknowledging the paramount importance of the masterly critical reviews presented by J. and L. Robert in the *Bulletin Epigraphique* (and for that matter the value of analyses such as the *Progress of Greek Epigraphy* in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*—which is to be revived in the near future) there is ample room and every justification for such an annual compilation, which provides the raw texts of all new materials and brief digests of scholarly discussions which impinge upon known documents and epigraphical matters generally. The original *SEG* admittedly came to display a number of shortcomings, but these were far outweighed by its virtues (not the least of which was its very existence), so that its demise was little short of a disaster especially for non-specialists in epigraphy and for those who had no easy access to major libraries. It is thus fervently to be hoped that after an eight year moratorium, in which the uninitiated have been left to find their way in the epigraphical jungle, the new *SEG* will be given the encouragement and continued support that it deserves to ensure fulfilment of its fundamental role in Greek Epigraphy.

Volume XXVIII of *SEG redivivus* is the third to appear in the new series, and it contains no less than 1667 entries. Most of these are in respect of work published in the year 1978, and the varied provenance of the constituents as much as the extraordinary range of content certifies admirably the value of this supplement to the existing *corpora*. As before, the entries are arranged regionally, and they may be set in two broad categories—on the one hand the texts of new or substantially emended inscriptions, and on the other hand the summaries of work pertaining to documents already published (including a separate section entitled *Varia*, containing references to broader works which have relevance to or implications for inscriptions). In the case of the first category the editors print

full versions of new texts, sometimes with minimal comment, sometimes with substantial, exegetic notes. Thus, for instance, in the case of no. 225 almost two full pages summarizing recent discussions of the Serapion Monument precede the latest version of the (rather complicated) text. By contrast the text of the Athenian decree for Kallias of Sphettos (no. 60), which has been so well published by T. L. Shear in *Hesperia Supplement* XVII, is republished without comment, as befits a text available in a readily accessible journal. This discriminating judgement over descriptive content is nicely exemplified in no. 759, where a version of a funerary epigram from an early number of a journal is appended to the main entry (from 1978) because of the obscurity of the said journal. What will perhaps prove more contentious is the decision of the editors to err on the side of generosity to the reader and to include the texts of documents from a number of quasi-corpora, such as Th. Drew Bear, *Nouvelles Inscriptions de Phrygie* (Zutphen 1978). But, on the assumption that the widest possible dissemination of epigraphical discoveries is desirable, the decision is surely sensible and entirely justifiable in view of the relative obscurity of the works in question and the consequent unlikelihood of their appearance in other than specialized libraries. The present reviewer indeed sees no force in the widely held view that such an editorial policy will inveigle readers into the perversity of failing to consult original publications. On the contrary—there is a grave danger that without the services of *SEG* many important contributions to epigraphy will fail of the wide circulation which they deserve. As for the second category of entries, these are expressed with admirable succinctness, though the editors have not hesitated to formulate quite lengthy entries where the complexity of the inscription and/or the number of relevant contributions render this appropriate (compare, for instance, nos. 33; 845; 960; 1116). It should be emphasized, however, that these disquisitions are essentially descriptive and not intended to be critical in the manner of the *Bulletin*, even though very occasionally the editors offer guidance over interpretation (cf. nos. 26; 61; 860). The use of English for the entries (in contrast to the Latin of old) has doubtless facilitated this process and it certainly renders the supplement the more widely useful (not the least for students). As is natural in a work which aims to be comprehensive, numerous entries in the second category give the impression of being somewhat nugatory—one might instance the many references (cf. nos. 244-366 *passim*) to the jottings of Wilhelm on Attic funerary inscriptions published posthumously in ZPE 29