

It is a well-known fact that the organization of Greek epigraphy and the accessibility of its material to historians at large are far from satisfactory. The two studies under review do not pretend to ameliorate this situation; rather they can be seen as ‘Vorarbeiten’ for a later stage of the process of epigraphic publication. Students of urban history can welcome Lettich’s study of the late Roman funerary texts from Concordia in North-Italy. There are no inedita. The book comprises 105 texts, all in CIL and IG XIV, competently republished with up-to-date bibliography and commentary. In his introduction L. briefly discusses the presence of the many military people and of a number of Syrians, on record in twelve Greek epitaphs (nos. 86-96, 101). He not unreasonably considers the soldiers as part of a system of defense-in-depth against possible intruders from the N.E., in conjunction with the fortifications in Aquileia. The presence of a *fabrica sagittaria* in C. points to the city’s logistic function. As to the Syrians, after having reviewed the various hypotheses concerning their function (soldiers, citizens, merchants), he opts for the latter. The Concordian Syrians are part of a much larger group, on record in various North-Italian cities, and L. relates their presence here to the lively demand for Oriental luxuries on the part of the military and, we may add, the court and the bureaucrats in North-Italy. Apart from that, it becomes increasingly clear that epigraphy provides much material for a general study of emigration of people to other places and of their motives (cf. e.g. *SEG* XXXII, Index VIII s.v. emigration).

The book is well produced and has very elaborate indices, but no photographs.

The second book is a pure ‘Vorarbeit’ for the planned TAM volume on Lykaonia (vol. VI, with several fascicles). It presents remarks on, or texts of, 174 inscriptions (no. 29 is a vacat), culled from the Vienna ‘Scheden’ of the Kleinasiatische Kommission. There are twenty-six inedita from the Kommission’s Skizzenbücher and thirteen new texts from an expedition of Dr. F. Hild.
in 1974, who gave his photos to the Bureau of the Kommission. There are a number of virtual inedita, i.e. texts published long ago in highly inaccessible travel-reports and as a result largely unnoticed by later scholars: seven from the Russian traveller Smirnov and eight from the Greek Diamantides; three were seen by Diamantides and are on record in the Vienna Skizzenbücher.

The remaining bulk of the texts are old ones, revised by L.-P. either on the basis of notes in the Scheden or by herself (or in combination). Those familiar with the often trivial Lykaonian epitaphs, the problems raised by occasionally widely divergent copies and the intricacies of ‘barbarian’ Lykaonian names, will find much of interest in these pages which certainly will alleviate future TAM-fascicles.

Naturally not all suggestions deserve credit. In no. 27 (= MAMA VII 475; a dedication by two brothers to a goddess ἔπὶ τῷ ἱδῷ) L.-P. suggests interpreting the latter words as the opposite of κατὰ κέλευσιν, viz. on their own initiative. She rejects ἔπὶ τῷ ἱδῷ, sc. τὸπω, “on private ground”, because the goddess is represented seated between her lions and the stone is therefore likely to come from her temenos. The logic escapes me. The stone may have been dedicated at home; cf. the numerous house-altars in antiquity. No. 28 (seen by Smirnov) is a honorary inscription put up by a son for his mother who after the death of her husband τὸ παιδίον ἐκθρέψασα εἰς Ἡλικίαν ἀγαγὼν ἀποκατέστησε. Admittedly ἀγαγὼν is careless (instead of ἀγαγοῦσα; no καὶ after ἐκθρ.), but the correction ἀγά <π> ὄν <τωξ> disregards Smirnov’s copy and introduces a rare word; a translation “she educated him, led him to maturity and handed him (e.g. to the city or to society)’’ makes good sense. Grammatical errors are common enough in such texts. L.-P. occasionally has other ingenious but very improbable suggestions, introducing weird words or names into her texts. Prominent in this catalogue of oddities are no. 32, where from a photo by Hild she derives the hapax (in the dative) ἀσυλάτης from ἀσυλάτης = ‘integrity’; no. 56 (= SEG VI 420), where she introduces in L. 2 the word τῆς λανπῆ Μαρσουλλη, λανπη supposedly being related to the Hesychian λάπος = θῆς, δουλός (in fact part of Marsulla’s name lurks under the vestiges of letters on the squeeze); and no. 107 where after some uncontrollable palaeographical manipulation we are asked to believe that the deceased Eudokia was styled μηνησπυτ = μηνηστευτη = ‘the engaged’ (‘die Anverlobte’), again a hapax.

Surely in all these cases L.-P. retrojects 20th century scholarly over-ingenuity into the distant past and the simple minds of the