

The great mass of epitaphs appears in Chapter I ("Funerary inscriptions"), arranged alphabetically by the name. Some epitaphs, however, are presented in other chapters, depending on the office or status of the deceased, and are well hidden because there is no index included in this book that would list the different kinds of text types and indicate their locations.

A weakness of the book, one which also characterises volume I, is that the index at the end of the volume only gives names; moreover, all the names which occur in the texts are listed in the same index in alphabetical order according to their Latin form. The index of names would, however, in my opinion, be more convenient if the names were arranged by language.

I noticed some misprints and errors; e.g., p. 146, first line PROVIDENTIS, not PROVIDENTIS; p. 211, second line, add an *omicron* between *sigma* and *phi*, ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΟΝ; p. 247, second and third line, *Iulius* should be *Furius*; p. 446, majuscule text, second line, the *iota* which is in ligature with *rho* is missing at the end of the line.

Katariina Kankaanpää

*The Greek and Latin Inscriptions of Ankara (Ancyra)*. Vol. I. *From Augustus to the End of the Third Century AD*. Edited by STEPHEN MITCHELL and DAVID FRENCH. Vestigia 62. Verlag C. H. Beck, München 2012. ISBN 978-3-406-621-901. IX, 523 pp. EUR 118.

This is an important edition of the inscriptions of an important city. It is true that there have already been published collections of inscriptions of Ancyra. vol. III of the *Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes* included a notable selection of texts from this city, and then there is of course the collection of E. Bosch, published posthumously in 1967. Moreover, there is the fairly recent selection of texts published in 2003 by D. French (one of the editors of this volume), *Roman, Late Roman and Byzantine Inscriptions of Ankara. A Selection*. However, a selection is not quite the same thing as a corpus, and even Bosch's book by does not cover all the material known at the time of the death of the author, and, having been published in Istanbul in the sixties, is not available in every library.

This edition contains 315 texts from the period from Augustus to the time of the Tetrarchy (vol. II will cover the rest); there do not seem to be any inscriptions of the Hellenistic period. A notable number of the texts are of above average importance (but are also usually already known to specialists). There are about 30 unpublished texts (see p. 523) of which the most interesting is surely no. 61, an altar set up [*G*]enio provinciae Africae by a senator called [M.? U]lpus Cassius, who says he is a [*sod(alis)*] Aug(ustalis) Cl(audialis) and a legate (the rest of the stone is missing), surely, as the editors say, of Galatia. The editors wonder whether this man might have something to do with the senatorial family of M. Ulpus in Pisidia, but *Ulpus* is (of course) pretty common and I would a priori regard a man honouring the *genius* of Africa as an African rather than as a Pisidian.

245 of the inscriptions are in Greek, sixty in Latin, and nine inscriptions are bilingual (p. 27); because of the large number of Latin inscriptions (their existence to be attributed to the fact that Ancyra was the capital of the Roman province of Galatia), the editors are no doubt correct in saying (p. 29) that "aside from some of the Roman colonies ... Ankara was one of the largest Latin-speaking enclaves in the eastern provinces". As for the chronology of the inscriptions, there is a very heavy concentration on the second century (p. 7–9).

The introductory part (p. 1–45), preceding the presentation of the inscriptions, consists of several shortish chapters, the first one being an overview of the references to Ancyra in literary sources. There are also chapters, e.g., on the local "epigraphic habit", the provincial aristocracy as attested in the inscriptions of Ancyra (e.g., the Iulii Severi, p. 15), the civic and tribal organisation at Ancyra, imperial visits to the city, and, finally, a most interesting chapter on travellers and other scholars attested as having described inscriptions and other monuments at Ankara since the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

The inscriptions themselves have been divided into fourteen sections, beginning with a section on "The imperial temple"; here we have, as no. 1, the *Monumentum Ancyranum* and as no. 2 the well-known list of the priests of the imperial cult (*OGI* 533, etc.; for the dates proposed by A. Coşkun, see now also *Gephyra* 9 [2012] 124). This is followed by sections on Imperial dedications "and related texts", Provincial governors, Procurators and Roman administrative staff, the Galatian aristocracy, Senators and equestrians, Civic leaders (this meaning various local dignitaries), Festivals (etc.), Roman military officers and soldiers (including both senatorial – no. 157 – and equestrian military tribunes), Religious dedications; at the end, there are the epitaphs, divided into four sections. This classification of the inscriptions will be of great use for some scholars; it must, however, be noted that those interested, e.g., in the presence of senators in Ancyra will find that senators appear in at least four different sections, namely in that on provincial governors, in that on Galatian aristocrats (among them senators, but also equestrian officers), in that on "senators and equestrians" (cf. below) and finally in that on officers and soldiers; as noted above, we find here also senatorial tribunes, but in addition to them also somewhat surprisingly a boy labelled *c(larissimus) p(uer), patricius* (no. 156 = *AE* 1977, 811), who must have ended up in this section not because of his own status but because of that of the two soldiers who set up the monument. As for the section on "senators and equestrians", it seems to have been reserved for those who could not be accommodated in the other sections; however, we seem to be dealing mostly with local men – thus the procurator P. Aelius Sempronius Lycinus ("a native of Ankara", no. 107f.), the συνκλητικός P. Aelius Sempronius Metrophanes (no. 109), etc. – and one wonders whether these persons could not also have been defined as representatives of the "Galatian aristocracy". As for the presentation of the individual texts, most – but not all (cf. no. 37 and 51) – of the inscriptions which still exist have been furnished with photos. The abbreviations have normally not been expanded, which some readers may find a bit awkward; it must, however, be admitted that one can find the abbreviations explained either already in the commentaries (e.g., no. 176) or in the translations attached to the texts (thus "μητρ." in no. 20 appearing as *metropolis* in the translation) or at least in the index (thus βουλογρ. – not a common title – in 117 explained as βουλόγραφος, Περ. in no. 6, line 20 explained as Περ(ίλλιος) in the index). However, although I understand that leaving the abbreviations unexpanded aims at saving space, this procedure can be problematic; what is an unexperienced user of this edition to make of *fam.* in *proc. fam. glad.* in no. 52, when the phrase is translated as "procurator of the association (I wonder if this is the best translation) of gladiators", and *fam.* (i.e., *fam(ilia)*) does not seem to appear at all in the index?

As for individual texts, I hope the following observations are useful. No. 17: taking into account the fact that *Aurelius* in the nomenclature of Caracalla is often spelt *Aurellius*, it is interesting that Dousa's copy in fact does have this reading which, then, might be the correct one. No. 45: when explaining line 11 as "*o(ptime) eius m(erito)*", the editors might have made clear that *eius* defines *cornicul(arii)* in line 10 and has nothing to do with *o(ptime) m(erito)* (W. Eck,

BJ 212 [2012] 414 suggests reading *ob*, and then *eius m(erita)*, but the alleged *b* in *ob* seems to me to be based on damage on the surface of the stone, and one would in any case expect the order *ob merita eius*; furthermore, *o(ptime) m(erito)* – note also the wide spaces before and after *eius* – is a suitable expression in this context). No. 109: the editors correct the reading of Perrot, Μητροφάνη, to Μητροφάνη<ν>, and say that Perrot might have missed a small *nu* at the end; but isn't Μητροφάνη in fact the correct form (and because of that used, e.g., in *IG V 1*, 563) and as such in no real need of emendation? No. 171: *Troian-* for *Traian-* is in fact not uncommon (cf. C. C. Petolescu, *Mélanges à la mémoire de M. Le Glay* [1994] 723ff.), and should perhaps not simply be dismissed as a mistake. No. 176 and 178: perhaps rather *stip(endiorum)*. No. 207: the editors read in line 4 *do[mo --- ]*, but the photo seems to indicate that nothing was inscribed after *DO*. This inscription does seem earlyish, but I wonder if it can or should be assigned to the time of Augustus; certainly it would in that case be one of the earliest instances of the use of the abbreviation *D(is) M(anibus)*.

This volume may have been finished rather in a hurry, as there seem to be some imperfections in the use of accents in Greek texts; note, e.g., no. 42, ἀντιστρατηγόν (instead of ἀντιστράτηγον); 50, συνπάντος (instead of σύνπαντος); 72 and 73, ἀνέψιον (instead of ἀνεψιόν); 79, ἀρχιερείαν (instead of ἀρχιέρειαν); 261, Μάρκος (instead of Μᾶρκος); 278, θρέπτω (instead of θρεπτῶ).

However, these are minor matters, and a mistake or two in accents can in any case be found in any edition of Greek inscriptions. What is important is that we have at last a very solid edition of the inscriptions of Ancyra, an important city with an impressive epigraphical heritage. One can only hope that volume II, with the texts from late Antiquity, will materialise soon.

Olli Salomies

NIKOS LITINAS: *Greek Ostraca from Abu Mina (O.Abu Mina)*. Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete, Beiheft 25. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin – New York 2008. ISBN 978-3-11-020118-5. XI, 335 pp., 25 pls., 107 figs. USD 95.

Nikos Litinas has done a respectable job by meticulously editing over a thousand ostraca found in Abu Mina, a pilgrim centre populated in the 7th century by Melkite Christians, some 40 kilometres southwest of Alexandria. The ostraca, dated to the beginning of the 7th century, mostly deal with wine production; they deal with grape harvests and wine deliveries. Litinas gives decent introductions to the history of the site and the excavations and discusses the conclusions that may be drawn from the archive regarding the community in Abu Mina.

Small potsherds scribbled on only for ephemeral use and then discarded are notoriously difficult material for any wider historical conclusions. Their strength as a historical source usually comes from their numbers. This is also the case with the Abu Mina ostraca. While previously only about one hundred pieces were known (the first ten were published in 1908 and 107 more in 1971), the present collection comes from the so-called Ostraca House excavated between 1986 and 1995 by Peter Grossmann. The initial edition was prepared by Patrick Robinson and Georgina Fantoni, but in 1997 the publication work was transferred to Litinas (who worked only with photographs, the originals being kept in the Coptic Museum in Cairo). There are altogether 1446 ostraca: 1088 of them are published here with the whole text, the remain-