

The entries are arranged as in the previous volume (*JIVE* I), the given text is followed by a critical commentary, a translation into an English-like language, and two different bibliographies, the first of which is comprised of previous editions and publications, and the second one tries to give further reading connected to that particular inscription or subject. This division is not always clear, and some omissions and overlapping can be found (for minor omissions, cf. no. 185 which is also published in *IG* XIV 1606; no. 197 also published in *CIL* X 948\*, 25; no. 198 the beginning of which is also published in *CIL* X 948\*, 33.). Sometimes Noy's new readings seem strange, as in, e.g., no. 287 where he reads Εἶρεναῖο, whereas from the picture provided by Frey (*CIJ* I 266) it is possible to read without any doubts Εἶρηναῖο.

The language of the inscriptions is very interesting, as we already know from earlier corpora. It is good that Noy gives the texts as they are, and refrains from "correcting" the language. This is important, because the texts as such offer a great variety of registers, which makes it possible to study the linguistic interference scrupulously. The study of language as a general, universal system has shown that all languages, and all dialects, whether they be geographical or social, are equally 'good' as linguistic systems. All varieties of language are structured, complex, rule-governed systems which are wholly adequate for the needs of their users. It follows that non-standard varieties are not linguistically inferior, but they may be considered socially inferior. With texts like these, therefore, it is possible to study the non-standard language of the bi- or multilingual society of Jews in Rome, and the interference in the Jew's use of language. Naturally the language of the Jews has been studied in the past by several scholars, but there is a lot of work still waiting to be done. Particularly interesting are the texts of the following type: (no. 204 Vigna Randanini) *Esidorus eterus en irene quimesis su.*; no. 199 (Monteverde) *veritas amor anestase titulos*; and no. 195 (Monteverde) *λοκου Βεσουλες ανουρο ρεκεσητ κε'*. There are also linguistic differences between the catacombs, which seem to reflect some topographical or perhaps social variation in the use of language.

The book is furnished with ample indexes which are of great help to readers.

*Martti Leiwo*

ANTONIUS E. FELLE: *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae, n.s. Concordantiae verborum, nominum et imaginum. Tituli Graeci*. Edipuglia, Bari 1997. ISBN 88-7228-173-3. XXXIV, 449 p. ITL 150.000.

The large corpus of the Christian inscriptions of Rome (ICUR), edited in 10 volumes between 1922 and 1992, soon to be completed with the final 11th volume, has received a (*key-word-in-context*) computer concordance of the texts in Greek lettering at the hands of A.E. Felle. Because full indices will be published in the final volume, this book may have been intended as a reference work to identify the texts. Otherwise I cannot see the utility of a project like this.

Of a total of more than 45,000 inscriptions, as many as 3,859 are in Greek lettering (for comparison, the whole of Attica has less than 350 texts). The problem is that most of the texts in the ICUR remain in majuscules, without a Greek transcription or interpretation. Obviously, partly due to this reason, the Greek texts have not been edited properly for the

concordance. I could give a long list of mistakes in accentuation and breathings, but the following – in the order of the Concordance (*Lexicon; Onomasticon; Geographica*) – will have to do: ἀγείον (for ἄγιον), ἀπλουστάτη (for ἄ-), αὐ (for αὐ̄), γέα (for γ(αῖ)α), δίκαιαν (for δικαίαν), ἐβδόμαδι (for -άδι), εἶλ' (for εἶλ'), εἶσον (maybe for εἶσον), ἐλε{υ}ῖσον (for ἐλέ-), ἐνθάδε (for ἐνθά-), ἐπτά (for ἐπτά), ἐτεῶν (for ἐτέ-), ἐτοίμασε (for ἐ-), ἐτυφλώσας (for ἐτύ-, but 16915d does not feature it), εὐσεβεία (for εὐσέ-), ευψύχει (for εὐ-), ἐῶν (for ἐών), ἠῖθεον (for ἠί-), ἦν (for ἦν), θείω (for θείω), ἴνα (for ἴνα), ἰρῶτα (for ἰρώτα), κάκας (for κακὰς), κακομηχανη (for -ίη), καλανδαῖς (for καλάνδαις), κεῦθει (for κεύθει), κίτη (for κίτη), κύτε (for κῦτε), λυπίσθε (for -ῖσθε), μεμελήμενος/ν (for -μένος/ν), μέν(ας) (for μ(ῆ)-), μονή (for μό-), ξειν' (for ξειν'), οἴη (perhaps for οἴη), οἰκειοῖς (for οἰκεί-), οὖτος (for οὖ-), πασιφιλήτος (for -φί-), πιτυτᾶ (for πιτυτᾶ), πότνιας (for -ίας), προτερήν (for προτέ-), σεπτένβριες (for -ίες), συνεζέκοτι (for -κότι), σῶσι (for σώσι), ταλαιπῶροι (for ταλαί-, but 16915d does not feature it), τεύξ' (for τεύξ'), τί (for τί), τούτω (for τοῦτ(ον), found in the edition), υἰοῖς (for υεί-), ὑπατοῖς (for ὑπά-), φιλαδελφίσσα (for φιλαδέλ-), φρονήσιν (for φρό-), φωτε (for φῶτε), χώρον (for χῶ-), ὦ (for ὦ), ὄδαι (perhaps for ὄδαί); Ἀγάπητος (for -τός), Ἀγατοκλία (for -όκλια), Ἀριστογενία (for -γένια), Ἀρκάδις (for -δής), Ἄττικός (for -ός), Βικτώρι (for Βί-), Γεωργηός (for Γεώ-), Ἐγκρατία (for Ἐγκράτια), Ἐρμαῖς (three syllables), Ἐρύθρις (for Ἐ-), Ἐρώτι (for Ἐ-), Εὐγενεία and Εὐγενία (for -γένεια), Ἐρακλία (for Ἐρά-), Θαιδῶρε (for Θαί-), Θαλεία (for Θά-), Καλλιοπέα (for -όπεια), Κορνῆλιος (for -ήλιος), Μαρίνα (for -ίνα), Παυλείνους (for Παυλείνους), Πρειμεγενεία (for Πρειμεγένεια), Πρωτογενία (for Πρωτογένια), Ῥεδέμπα/Ῥεδῆμπα (one accentuation), Σιλβίννε (without accent, as it is Latin), Φαυστίνα (for -τίνα, found in the edition); Ἀλεξάνδρεως/εος (instead of -έως/έος), Ἀφροdisίευς (for -εύς), Ἐγύπτου (for Ἐ-, found in the edition), Κωνσταντινουπολιτίσσα (for -λίτισσα).

There are also some more serious mistakes: αἰμίμηστος (for αἰμίμηστος), αὐτοκασικνήτην (for -γν-), εἰρή(να) (for -νη), εἰς ὁ θεὸν (for εἰσόθεον, adjective in 26236), ἔμειν (for ἡμείν), εὐρίνι (for εἰρίνι), ζέσας (ζ(ή)σ(η)ς or rather ζέσα(ι)ς), ζωοίει (for ζωοῖ(σ)ι), ἡμήρας/ἡμηρῶν (to be restored with ἡμε-), κάμδον (for participle καμδόν), κασιγνέτου (to be restored as κασιγνήτου), μῆνας (for μῆ(νας) in 4228, because it is abbreviated; I do not know how many other equally untrustworthy examples remain), ὀρχιστής (for ὀρ(κ)ιστής), φαωθί (for φαωφί), φιλία (for φιλια without accent, because this is Latin); Ἀλεξάνδρεος must be moved into the section of *Geographica*, Ἀντιοχεία (perhaps pertaining to games, cf. the preceding Καπιτώλ-), Σεπτιμία (for -α), Συμπλικίω (for Σι-). I regard the edition of 12901 as a major error with its ghost name Μηκετίο, to be read τῷ θανάτῳ μηκέτι ὀφιλομένη (= IGVR 1180, cf. similar wordings in IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 12514.12984, XIV 1512). I do not know how many other readings need to be amended, but I do hope it gets done before the full *indices* are published. A glance at words such as αὐγουστος (confusing the emperor and the month) εἰς-εἶς, ἐξ-ἔξ, ἦ-ἦ-ἦ, ου-οὐ-οὐ̄, ω-ω-ὦ-ὦ̄, enumerated in a mishmash, goes to show how mechanically the concordance has been compiled; emperors, consuls, Venus, Christ etc. are featured among the personal names.

The sigla indicating bilingualism (^) or metric texts (#) are used by no means consistently because they are also indicated in the Latin and prosaic segments of the

inscriptions. It would have been very useful to include a concordance of the ICUR texts utilized for this work, and note which of them are bilingual and metric.

Nowadays everything is allegedly done more efficiently than before, but diligence and patience are still useful, so that the work published would be more trustworthy.

The concordance has, however, a merit besides serving as a first starting point for the compilation of an index: the introduction on pages vii–xxxiv, which by far excels the work itself.

*Erkki Sironen*

E. BADIAN: *From Plataea to Potidaea*. Studies in the History and Historiography of the Pentecontaetia. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London 1993. ISBN 0–8018–4431–2. 264 p. USD 39.

It is always a great pleasure to read E. Badian's writings, and this book is no exception. *From Plataea to Potidaea* consists of five previously published essays and one which is new. The essays are as follows: "The Peace of Callias" (1987), "Toward a Chronology of the Pentecontaetia down to the renewal of the Peace of Callias" (1989), "Plataea between Athens and Sparta" (1989), "Thucydides and the Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War" (1990), and "Athens, the Locrians, and Naupactus" (1990). The previously unpublished essay is "Thucydides and the *Arche* of Philip". The essays have been revised by the author and thus the earlier published versions are now obsolete.

All the essays concentrate more or less on problems which are related to each other, and it is good to have them all together in the form of a book. The importance of the book lies in the new results and suggestions based on careful reading and interpretation of Thucydides (T.) especially. Badian has, naturally, a profound knowledge of the difficult period of the Pentecontaetia, and especially of Thucydides. To put it in Badian's own words: 'Practically throughout the history of the Pentecontaetia T. was writing as an impassioned Athenian patriot and ... his interpretation of that history must be read as critically as we read ancient forensic speeches' (p. X–XI).

Badian is at his best in the contextual analysis of different historical events. Of this a good example is his treatment of the King's Peace (41 ff.) and the chronology provided by Diodorus (48). The discussion is always very rewarding to a conscientious reader, either regarding minor details, or in respect to the chronology of the Pentecontaetia in general (73–107). Badian emphasizes that T. did not consider monuments or inscriptions as sources for historical information, and that interviewing older men and politicians, or this kind of 'oral tradition', was all that T. and others had to go on when they tried to write the history of this period. Therefore, it is understandable that T. could not supply precise dates for the actions he knew had taken place.

Another major problem is technical: How to write down facts and reasoning from the available material? For T. this was a fundamental problem as he tried to put events in strict chronological order. He did not, however, succeed in doing that, and Badian provides a clear example of that (79–80). He is also able to point out several other misinterpretations connected with T. both in his sequential narrative and in his linguistic output. It is once again demonstrated how extremely important for an ancient historian a good knowledge of Greek (and Latin, of course) is.