

Im Ganzen haben wir es mit einem grundlegenden Werk zu tun. Philologen, Linguisten und Historiker haben in ihm ein bisher nicht gekanntes Arbeitsmittel an die Hand bekommen. Für die milesische Prosopographie und Onomastik hat Wolfgang Günther ein Werk geschaffen, das für lange Zeit die unentbehrliche Grundlage für weitere Studien bildet.

Heikki Solin
Universität Helsinki

Colonie e municipi nell'era digitale. Documentazione epigrafica per la conoscenza delle città antiche. Atti del convegno (Macerata, 10–12 dicembre 2015). A cura di SIMONA ANTOLINI – SILVIA MARIA MARENGO – GIANFRANCO PACI. Ichnia 14. Edizioni TORED, Tivoli 2017. ISBN 978-88-99846-03-9. 799 pp. EUR 150.

Substantial and heavyish, this volume consists of the acts of a colloquium held in Macerata in 2015. From the introduction by Gianfranco Paci it appears that the colloquium was held at the conclusion of a research project referred to as “PRIN 2010–2011”, the letters PRIN standing for “Progetto di Rilevante Interesse Nazionale”, financed by the Ministero dell’Istruzione, dell’Università e della Ricerca (MIUR). Such projects are financed for a period of three years. A three-year-project can, however, be renewed, for the Marche region (with Macerata as its capital) has benefited from two preceding PRIN periods (p. 7f.). But before getting back to the relevance of the region here, it is worth observing that what the project is dealing with is evidently the compilation of the extremely useful epigraphical database EDR. Somewhat surprisingly, there is no mention of the EDR in the introduction, and it is not very often referred to explicitly elsewhere (but see e.g. pp. 301, 363, 383, 493). Moreover, references to the EDR are not necessarily used in citing inscriptions (thus e.g. in S. Sparagna’s contribution on p. 577ff.). On the other hand, the fact that we are dealing with the database and its evolution is clearly reflected in the use of the expression “era digitale” in the title of the book. To get back to Marche, the structure and the extension of the PRIN grants does not emerge clearly from the Introduction (obviously meant to be an introduction to this particular volume rather than to the nature and details of the PRIN system). On the one hand, in the beginning of the Introduction, Paci seems to speak of project PRIN 2010–2011 as being concerned with much, if not most, of Italy (the aim of this PRIN was the “informatizzazione del patrimonio epigrafico d’età romana in Italia”), and the contributions in the volume deal with many different regions of Italy. On the other hand, as mentioned above, the Marche region is said to have been accorded three successive three-year PRIN grants, and there are other mentions of individual universities or institutions as operating on

their own (the University of Florence, p. 8, cf. p. 493; the Universities of Pisa and Milano, p. 301; the University of Genova, p. 363; the “unità di Perugia”, p. 657). Moreover, in the interesting overview (p. 8) of what has been done for the EDR in regions around Italy, work in some regions, Marche and Liguria being singled out, is nearing completion, whereas work on the digitalisation of inscriptions has yet to begin, e.g. in Emilia, Calabria and Sicily (the mention of Emilia is striking, as the University of Bologna is known for its epigraphical studies). It thus seems that PRIN grants are, or at least can be, accorded to projects involving several universities but are in practice often divided into sub-grants allocated to individual universities (or, as in the case of Pisa and Milano, partnerships of two institutions) with personnel interested in doing the job.

The introduction also includes other interesting details, for instance the memorable and not easily translatable description of the digitalisation of inscriptions as a project that is “fattibile, realizzabile” and “irrinunciabile” (p. 8) – but without rendering the *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum* dispensable (p. 9).

As for the book itself, there does not seem to be much talk of digitalisation after the Introduction; in fact, the contributions seem for the most part to represent the normal type of epigraphical publications. There are altogether 28 papers and four “posters”, all in Italian and by Italian scholars; the most prominent members of the Italian epigraphical community are well represented among the authors. There does not seem to be a point in assessing all the contributions in this context, but I would like to mention here those which struck me as being of special interest from my personal point of view. S. Antolini publishes (p. 17ff.) a dedication to Mithras from Cerveteri by [*Mem*]mⁱ Placidus *heliodromus* (a rare expression denoting the “sesto grado dell’iniziazione mitraica”, p. 23) *sacratus a Curtio Iuvenale patre* (now *AE* 2017, 450). The author, noting that there are also other possibilities (*Mummius Nummius* etc.) settles for [*Mem*]mⁱ as the nomen because of early Memmii in Caere. Note also the third-century senator C. Memmius Caecilianus Placidus (*PIR*² M 460), although this man seems to be from Africa and is thus probably not relevant. P. Buongiorno studies (p. 35ff.) the senatorial Glitii from Falerii (with stemma on p. 40) and suggests that the author, perhaps called L. Glitius Gallus, of a *lex Glitia* mentioned in the *Digest*, could have been consul in AD 21 or 22. In his contribution, G. Camodeca publishes (p. 47ff.) several late Republican funerary inscriptions from Cumae (now *AE* 2017, 233ff.), many with interesting names (e.g. *Calinei(us)* no. 3, *Folceni(us)*, an archaic form of *Fulcinius*), once again adding to our knowledge of Roman Cumae, formerly a somewhat neglected site.

N. Cassieri and G. L. Gregori (re)publish (p. 89ff.) two painted inscriptions from Formiae, the first already in *CIL* X (6076). The second (published by Gregori), on a wall of a building in via Mamurra, is of great interest, as it appears to have been a list of soldiers, many of them described as centurions (but other ranks are also mentioned, e.g. *armatur(a)* in l. 14), all with the nomen

Val(erius), which fixes the date to *c.* AD 300. One of the men seems to have the cognomen *Aureliol(us)*, which is not attested elsewhere (but cf. *Fabiolus Luciolus Marciolus Valeriolus*, Catullus' *Veraniolus*, etc.). G. Di Giacomo studies (p. 127ff.) the imperial estate at Albano, observing that not everything can, as is usually the case, be attributed to Domitian. M. Giovagnoli (p. 235ff.) assigns to Cereatae Marianae three inscriptions formerly thought to have come from Rome (namely *CIL* VI 31859 recording C. Numisius Verisimus [sic], a Roman knight) or from Verulae (*AE* 1973, 197 and 196). Giovagnoli also offers useful remarks on the city in general. In their article on the epigraphy and the cults of the *ager Aricinus*, M. G. Granino Cecere, D. Nonnis and C. Ricci discuss several interesting inscriptions. Note especially p. 280–283 on the archaic inscription mentioning a gift to Hercules (*[H]eracle dedero [--- do]no(m)*) but also stressing that this happens because *plebe(s) iousi(t)* (*CIL* I2 2659). According to the authors, the document, dated to the early fourth century, could be connected with the construction of the emissary of the *lacus Albanus*, dated generally to the same period, the *plebe(s)* being that of Rome itself. F. Mainardis presents a revision of the text of the decree from Pola in honour of Q. Mursius Plinius Minervianus (*Inscr. It.* X 1, 84). As for line 26, which ends with *[---]us adfectioni* followed by a *vacat*, clearly indicating that the text will be moving on from the proposition to the decree proper, I think that the dative does not need to be corrected to a genitive as proposed by Mainardis (“*[--- ob insignia ei]us adfectioni(s)*”) but can be kept by assuming that the proposition ends with a formulation of the type *[gratias agere (or esse agendas etc.) ei]us adfectioni* (this suggestion is already cited in *AE* 2017, 494).

In a contribution also mentioning in passing the movie *Pulp Fiction*, S. Orlandi provides (p. 383ff.) an account of the background of *Italia Epigrafica Digitale*, described (p. 386) as a “periodico anomalo” because it was meant to be published “più volte nel corso del tempo” but “con cadenza non regolare” (see <https://ojs.uniroma1.it/index.php/ied/index> for the contents). G. Paci's contribution (p. 391ff.) is the definitive edition of the inscriptions found in the excavations, especially those of 1956–57, which were not previously very well documented (details of this being provided here), concerning the amphitheatre of Urbs Salvia. The most important are obviously the inscriptions of the senator L. Flavius Silva Nonius Bassus, ordinary consul in 81 and the builder of the amphitheatre, of which the best preserved two (p. 404–9 no. A[1]–[2]), mentioning Silva in the nominative, have been known since their publication by Werner Eck in 1970 (cf. p. 401 n. 18). But there were many more inscriptions set up by Flavius Silva all over the amphitheatre. Paci lists (p. 409–40 no. B [1]–[31]) 31 different fragments, some of which may, however, belong to the texts, partly fragmentary, published in 1970, or to other fragments. The original number of the inscriptions by Silva cannot be ascertained (p. 421). On p. 427, the author discusses the possibilities of restoring the nomen of Silva's wife, the cognomen of whom is known to have ended in *-milla*. Combining several fragments which seem to preserve parts of the wife's nomen, one could arrive at a name of the type **Nattiena*, which, however, does not really

seem plausible. The article also includes the edition of other inscriptions found in the amphitheatre, e.g. those inscribed on individual seats published by Paci in 2014 in *L'epigrafia dei porti* (by mistake referred to as “Paci 2006” in the bibliography), and an inscription mentioning a man with apparently the unattested nomen *Sexil[ius]* (p. 443; if one could read *Sexid[ius]*, one could compare the nomen Σεξίδιος in Metropolis in Asia, *AE* 2009, 1404–1408). There is also an edition of two inscriptions in honour of Silva from elsewhere in Urbs Salvia, one of them being previously unpublished (p. 447f.).

The subject of M. C. Spadoni's paper (p. 553ff.) is the epigraphy of Perugia in the period of the change from Etruscan to Latin, as reflected especially by nomenclature; the inscriptions referred to as unpublished (p. 556, 557) are now available in *Suppl. It.* 30 (2018). In an interesting paper, I. Tantillo, an authority on late antique epigraphy, studies (p. 615ff.) an acephalous honorific inscription from Aquinum, *CIL* X 5426, surely from the fourth century, which consists of two parts. The first is a description of the honorand of which only the last word has been preserved (*[quod* (v. sim.) ----] *iuvaberit*). The second part sets out the reactions of the *populus* of Aquinum to the same honorand's merits: *huic universus populus Aquinatium tabulam aeneam patronatus traditam, sed et statuam perpetuabilem cum pictura{m} similitudinis eius hoc in loco ad perenne{m} testimonium censuer(unt)* (note the constructio as sensum) *constituendam*. The honorand thus receives not only a *tabula*, but also (for *sed et* cf. e.g. *ILS* 1909. 6530. 6623. 7218. 7221 etc.) a statue and perhaps more (cf. below). Because of *traditam* rather than *tradendam* it seems that the *tabula* had already been presented to the honorand (but see p. 619). As for the expression *statuam perpetuabilem* (a hapax) *cum pictura{m} similitudinis eius*, Tantillo (p. 621ff.) suggests, though not excluding the interpretation that this is simply a reference to the statue (thus also B. Díaz Ariño & E. Cimarosti, *Chiron* 46 [2016] 323f.), that the phrase could be interpreted as meaning two separate objects, a statue on one hand and an “honorific portrait”, probably located close to the statue, on the other. This interpretation, which according to Tantillo himself represents an isolated and exceptional case (p. 627), does not really seem plausible to me for reasons mentioned by Tantillo himself on p. 621, but also for instance because there seems to be no point in separating the *statua perpetuabilis* from the *pictura similitudinis eius*. Not only the *pictura* but also the statue should have been a representation of the honorand's *similitudo*, i.e. his outward appearance (in this period, statues representing persons only symbolically were still unknown). In my view, *pictura* is here simply used in the sense of “rendering”, “representation”, without necessarily implying painting, the whole phrase expressing about the same idea as e.g. *statua perpetuabilis repraesentans similitudinem* (i.e. *conspectum* v. sim.) *eius*. Be that as it may, this article contains a valuable note (p. 625f. n. 46) on collecting inscriptions that refer to both statues and *imagines*.

C. Zaccaria discusses (p. 634ff.) an architrave from Aquileia (*I. Aquileia* 450) belonging to a monument in honour of Valentinian, Theodosius and Arcadius set up by the Aquileians and

mentioning (in the ablative) the governor Valerius Adelfius Bassus. A very similar architrave, dedicated to Gratianus, Valentinian and Theodosius, and set up by L. Valerius Septimius Bassus, who seems to have been Adelfius Bassus' father, is known from Rome (*ILS* 782).

The volume finishes with some contributions called “posters”. L. Benedetti presents an overview of the *signacula* in the museum of Perugia, some of them unpublished. As for the seal p. 669 no. 28 = *CIL* XI 6712, 46, the reading *Q. Pl(---) Tr(uttedi) pi(storis?)* should be corrected in *Q. Pl(ani) Tr(uttedi) Pi(i)* (cf. G. Camodeca, *Epigraphica* 81 [2019] 643ff.). A. M. Corda and A. Ibba discuss (p. 685ff.) the epigraphy of Sardinia (ca. 1600 Latin inscriptions) in general and offer a number of corrected readings based on observations during the work for the EDR (p. 699, I do not think it would be useful to correct *C. in C. Germanus Valens* to *C(laudius)*; p. 704f., a discussion of *CIL* X 7514, where I am sure Felix and Impetratus are both the sons of the freedman and that we must understand *f(iliorum)*). The contribution of A. Gallo on Luceria (p. 735ff., with a list, without references, of all attested local magistrates, 757f.) is followed by the last article of the book, an assessment, with an extensive bibliography, by F. Mainardis and C. Zaccaria of the epigraphical studies by the “laboratorio dell’epigrafia” of the University of Trieste, dealing with NE Italy east of, and including, Aquileia. This contribution, which is of great interest, includes a table illustrating the progress of the publication of the *Supplementa Italica* volumes on this area (p. 768), from which one learns that at least four separate *Suppl. It.* volumes on Aquileia are being prepared for publication, one of them, vol. II on emperors, senators and knights, mainly by German scholars connected with Heidelberg. One wonders how many volumes are planned, for the fourth volume in preparation is on the *Magistratus municipales*, and hundreds of funerary inscriptions also need to be included at some point. In any case, the fact that work is done on Aquileia is a very good thing, for the volumes published by Brusin in the early 1990s are not really adequate. An interesting table on p. 770 informs us about the progress of the epigraphic database EDR in this region; it appears that in the case of most cities, the work is almost done and that it is only Aquileia where about half of the existing inscriptions still need to be added to the database.

At the end of the book, there are useful abstracts in English of all articles (but not of the posters). To conclude, I found this volume to be of great interest, not only because of the many important contributions but also because it is a splendid illustration of the vitality of epigraphic studies in Italy.

Olli Salomies
University of Helsinki