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War). She proposes that the coinage may have been struck to be used for soldiers’ maintenance pay, sitonion (some 30 specimens of the coinage have been found in Thessaly – from 1497). But that cannot be all; for she notes also from finds in the Peloponnese that many of the coins initially circulated near where they were minted, and she adds that the decentralized minting may have been intended to allow all of the participating cities to earn a profit from striking a highly fiduciary bronze coinage. The coinage thus will have served several objectives.

I wonder, though, whether an alternative explanation might not better fit the circumstances. Since the League was supported by the taxes it levied on the member cities and since these taxes were almost certainly collected in silver, the sine qua non for the hiring and retention of mercenary soldiers, might the League have devised this programme of striking bronze coins to allow the cities to exchange them for the silver coins needed for League taxation? By substituting bronze coins for silver either through a forced exchange or simply by buying up silver with the bronze, the cities could withdraw silver from the local economies and private ownership and forward it to the League treasury without causing excessive hardship or complaint. As has been suggested (Topoi 7 (1997) 123–36), a policy of exacting and replacing silver probably underlies the spate of minting in large-denomination bronze by cities of southern Greece in the third quarter of the first century BC, only at that time it was the Roman general Marc Antony who required the silver.

This is a thorough and meticulously-argued book, whose contributions extend to numerous aspects of the Achaean League as well as numismatic history. Future finds will certainly improve the record of the coinage, especially for narrowing down its absolute chronology. But given the evidence of the coins today, one could not ask for more.

**John H. Kroll**

_Wolfson College, Oxford_

john.kroll@classics.ox.ac.uk


Under review here is a long-awaited second edition of the corpus of Aiginetan inscriptions, replacing that published over 100 years ago as part of _IG IV, Inscriptiones Argolidis_ (ed. M. Fraenkel (1902)). With the addition of the Aiginetan texts to those from Epidaurus (_IG IV_ 1, F. Hiller de Gaertringen (ed.) (1929)), _IG IV_ 2 lacks only a third fascicle (inscriptions of Corinth and the Corinthia) to complete its plan.

The format of _IG IV_ 2 is similar to that of the Epidaurian fascicle, including _Fasti_ with a synopsis of historical events based on sources from antiquity to the modern day, standard indices and a concordance. In addition, a succinct ‘Index Grammaticus’, by Curbera, is a highly welcome feature. The map (on page 201), provides visual topographic references to the places of findings of inscriptions, including rupestral ones (1073, 1074, 1075); the plotting of 1040–42 (inscriptions from the Sanctuary of Aphaia) near the Oros is, however, in error, instead the rupestral 1058, not seen since 1901, should be indicated in that area.

The 464 _tituli_ of _IG IV_ 2 are numbered 746–1239 in continuation of Fascicle 1. Of these, 330 are associated with Aigina as an ancient political entity (746–1075), including 26 funerary inscriptions (976–1001) of Aiginetans who died abroad – mostly women (married to non-Aiginetans?). The remaining 164 inscriptions, collected in the ‘Appendix: _tituli alieni_’ (1076–1239), are non-Aiginetan inscriptions associated with Aigina as a modern territorial entity. The presence of multiple _tituli alieni_ on Aigina is due to the fact that Aigina was the capital of modern Greece from January 1828 to October 1829, and the first National Museum was established there. Between 1829 and 1831, many inscribed stones were transported to Aigina from other parts of Greece and stored at the site. After the venue of the National Museum was changed to Athens, in 1834, most of these stones were moved from Aigina to Athens, but some are still in the museum on the island. Thus, the ‘Appendix: _tituli alieni_’ is a major aid to epigraphists trying to sort out the non-Aiginetan epigraphic monuments on Aigina.
The total of 330 inscriptions published in the new edition more than doubles the entries of the previous corpus. The Aiginetan part of the first edition of IG IV included 216 tituli: 1–191, 676, 740, 839, 840, 848, 852, 1550–52 and 1580–95. Eleven of these were excluded from IG IV² 2 on the basis of provenance, spuriousness, material or dating (5, 91, 178, 179, 181, 182, 18, 1550–52, 1595), and 52 were tituli alieni. In addition, some tituli that were separate in IG IV have been combined in IG IV² 2, as can be seen in comparationes numerorum, on pages 166–67: 21 tituli in IG IV account for seven tituli in IG IV² 2, and, as a result, the 153 Aiginetan tituli of IG IV account for 139 out of 330 Aiginetan tituli in IG IV² 2. Not counting the 26 tituli added as an appendix of funerary inscriptions of Aiginetans who died abroad, the new fascicle presents 165 genuinely new inscriptions originally produced on Aigina and pertaining to ancient Aiginetan life.

Of the 165 new inscriptions, 67 are reported as previously published, 54 are stated to be previously unpublished (list on page 170) and 44 appear with various characterizations suggesting the circumstances of the stone’s study, for example, escrípsimus: 834; attigit: 850, 852, 859, 865, 901; commemoravit: 870, 891, 914, 930; delineavit: 896, 897; or without any remark: 965. The Inscriptiones Graecae series has taught us to expect a high degree of precision in the publications (for example, Peter Thonemann, CR 58/2, 507, assesses IG IV² 2 as ‘preternaturally accurate’), but the handsomely produced fascicle under consideration suffers from several unfortunate inaccuracies and inconsistencies that will complicate its use. The most glaring inaccuracy has crept into the correlation of references between the catalogues of Mustoxyzes and the tituli. Besides noting the omission of references to Mustoxyzes in 771–72, 779, 847, 907, 921, 957, 972, 975, 1104, 1160, 1168, 1206, 128, we must correct the published entries as follows: page xi Mustoxyzes I n. 17 applies to 1092; page xi Mustoxyzes I n. 23 applies to 1107; page xi Mustoxyzes I n. 27 applies to 1218; 835 refers to Mustoxyzes II n. 74c; 1106 refers to Mustoxyzes I n. 14; 1127 refers to Mustoxyzes II n. 9; Mustoxyzes I n. 27 applies to 1218, not 1217; 1230 should say: (inv. I n. 28 = inv. II n. 11); finally, on page 120, the subtitle should read: Ex Atheniensium auctoritate positum ss. 792–804.

Among lesser inconsistencies, Fasti 142 gives the date of 750 as 69 BC (as in IG IV 2), while sub 750 (page 23) the date is given as ‘a. 82a.?’. In Nomina Geographicca, Oith (Fasti 7) and ταλαιπίκο καλεωμένη τόλις (Fasti 24) should be added. We should also note that the editor’s choice of the epithet Panhellenicus (Contents, page 111 and on the map) instead of Hellanios for Zeus worshipped at the Oro is unfortunate because it privileges a single late source (Paus. 2.29.8) over the evidence of all Classical sources (for example, Pindar N.5.10; Arist., Equites 1253; Theophrastus, peri semeion 1.24), including inscriptions (1056 in this volume).

Among the new inscriptions in the corpus, laterculi Thearorum (805–47) merit a special mention as examples of inscribing lists of officials on the walls of a public building; their attribution to thearoi is less certain. Another remarkable category is funerary inscriptions from underground chamber tombs (for example, 848–97), a typical Aiginetan form of burial from the sixth century BC to the Roman times. Of interest is 791, possibly a boundary marker, which might be our first evidence for the existence, on Aigina, of two agoras, presumably a greater and a lesser one, at least in the Hellenistic period. Also of special note is Hallof’s extensive re-edition of 750 that rightly dismisses the reading Ἀπολλώνιος in 1.37, thus removing the datum that has previously served for the identification of the Archaic temple at Kolonna with Apollo.

IRENE POLINSKAYA
King’s College London
irene.polinskaya@kcl.ac.uk


This is a handsomely produced volume, at an accordingly handsome price, which reviews those texts first published by Hiller von Gaertringen in IG IX which are located on the rocky surfaces at the end of the beetling promontory of the Theran acropolis. The major stated aim is to locate the texts in the social development of the settlement between the late eighth and fifth centuries.

While the epigraphic review is careful and well documented, it regrettably shows the substantial deterioration of the texts since the late nineteenth century. Also unfortunate is the fact that the work should have been far more rigorously edited before publication. The catalogue runs from 1–95, including three previously unpublished texts;