

Ennia è attestata più volte nell'Oriente greco, per es. *CIL* III 266, 12141; *I.Ephesos* 664B, 1183. Cfr. *Arctos* 39 (2005), 168.

*Heikki Solin*  
*Università di Helsinki*

EDOARDO VOLTERRA: *Senatus Consulta*. Edited by PIERANGELO BUONGIORNO – ANNAROSA GALLO – SALVATORE MARINO. *Acta Senatus* B 1. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2017. ISBN 978-3-515-11370-0. 222 pp. EUR 79.

*Il senatus consultum de Plarasensibus et Aphrodisiensibus del 39 a. C. Edizione, traduzione e commento*. Edited by ANDREA RAGGI – PIERANGELO BUONGIORNO. *Acta Senatus* B 7. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2020. ISBN 978-3-515-12637-3; ISBN (e-book) 978-3-515-12640-3. 205 pp. EUR 83.

*Die senatus consulta in den epigraphischen Quellen. Texte und Bezeugungen*. Edited by PIERANGELO BUONGIORNO – GIUSEPPE CAMODECA. *Acta senatus* B 9. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2021. ISBN 978-3-515-12604-5; ISBN (e-book) 978-3-515-13037-0. 458 pp. EUR 104.

The three volumes reviewed here are a part of an interesting series *Acta senatus*, described on the Steiner Verlag homepage (<https://www.steiner-verlag.de/brand/Acta-Senatus>) as having come into existence as part of a project “Palingenesie der Römischen Senatsbeschlüsse” (“Palingenesis of the Roman Senate Decisions”), based at the Institute for Legal History at the University of Münster. The publications of this series are divided into two sections, A and B. Section A (“Palingenesis”) is meant to host those volumes that consist of “an annotated palingenesis of the Roman Senate resolutions from 509 BC to 284 AD”; section B (“Studies and Materials”) “collects essays, monographs, conference proceedings, and other publications on the Roman Senate and its normative, administrative, political and judicial activities”. Volumes belonging to section A are (at the time of writing this review) still in preparation (no details are revealed), but there are already ten volumes, published between 2017 and 2021, in section B. Three of them, numbers 1, 7 and 9, will be discussed in this review.

The first volume in the series consists essentially of the reproduction of the two entries on *Senatus consulta* by Edoardo Volterra, an eminent Roman law scholar (1904–1984), for the *Nuovo Digesto Italiano* of 1940 and the *Novissimo Digesto Italiano* of 1969. The articles have been printed in reverse order, that of 1969 on p. 77–185, that of 1940, much shorter, on p. [187]–[208] (in this entry, the page numbers shown, and used below, 1–20, are those of an offprint from the original edition,

where the page numbering was 25–44; there was apparently no room on the individual pages for the addition of the page numbers in this new edition). The reason for the reversed order is the fact that the 1969 entry (“dalle dimensioni quasi monografiche”, p. 7) is Volterra’s main contribution on the subject, whereas the 1940 entry has been added in order to illustrate the evolution of Volterra’s aims and methods (cf. p. 7). From the point of view of the aims of the series *Acta senatus* it should be noted that Volterra himself was working on an “edizione completa dei *senatusconsulta*” both in 1940 (p. 2 n. 1, where Volterra says that he wishes to “poter presto dare alla stampa” the book he has been busy with “for some years”) and in 1969 (p. 81 n. 1 and p. 85, with similar expressions, including “presto”; cf. P. Buongiorno’s contribution, below). In any case, both articles consist of an introduction to various aspects of the *senatus consulta* followed by an annotated list of all decrees, collected from all possible sources. In the *Digesto* entry of 1940 there are 191 *senatus consulta*, while in the 1969 entry there are altogether 201. In addition to the reproduction of Volterra’s two articles, this book also contains two substantial introductory chapters, both of great interest, that by P. Buongiorno on Volterra’s plans for an edition of the *senatus consulta* (p. 11ff.) and that by A. Gallo. Gallo’s chapter consists of a comparison of the two *Digesto* entries, with detailed observations on various modifications introduced by Volterra between 1940 and 1969. The differences in the numbering of individual paragraphs are illustrated by three comparative tables by S. Marino (p. 73–76). At the end of the book, there are detailed indexes, again by S. Marino, with references to both versions of Volterra’s *senatus consulta* and with a number of interesting footnotes pointing out some of the differences, e.g. mistaken references corrected in the later version, etc.

Volume no. 7 of the series is a new edition, by Andrea Raggi and Pierangelo Buongiorno, of an important document inscribed on the so-called “archive wall” in the Carian city of Aphrodisias. This inscription is the *senatus consultum de Plarasensibus et Aphrodisiensibus* of 39 BC, some parts of which were described for the first time in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century. However, it was essentially published only in 1982 by Joyce Reynolds in *Aphrodisias and Rome* as no. 8 (the double designation of the inhabitants referring to the sympolity of the two neighbouring cities of Plarasa and Aphrodisias, cf. *Aphrodisias and Rome* p. 1). This particular document, unfortunately only partly preserved, is of interest because because of the light it sheds on Rome’s handling of Asian cities seen as allies, but it is also significant because of its date in the turbulent years following the murder of Caesar, the reference to the opinion of the triumvirs Antony and Octavian, and the list of senators “present” at the drafting of the resolution of the senate.

Chapter 1 is an introduction to the historical background of the document, while chapter 2 consists of a very detailed exposition of the earlier descriptions of different parts of the text and of the document itself as inscribed on the “archive wall”. Chapter 2 also provides the edition proper, including translations into Italian and Latin and a line-by-line commentary. Some aspects are dealt

with in more detail in chapter 3, where there is a section on the consular date, the mentions of the consuls in the text and on the prosopography of the senators taking part in the drafting of the resolution. There are also further sections on the document itself and its *propositio*, on the *asylia* of temple of Aphrodite and on the nature of the *libertas* of Aphrodisias. Finally, chapter 4 contains editions of two related documents, namely *Aphrodisias and Rome* no. 6 (the letter of Octavian) and no. 9 (here, ἄκροντες seems to have been omitted from the translation of lines 7–9 on p. 145 n. 213 and p. 162). At the end, there is a bibliography including works published as late as 2019 (but not “Ries, *Prolog und Epilog*”, cited p. 64 n. 95) and remarkably detailed indexes. As for the text itself, one can observe progress both in some larger issues and in some details. Concerning larger issues, Raggi and Buongiorno have now replaced the consuls with the Aphrodisian legate Solon son of Demetrios as the presenter of the *relatio* (l. 16, cf. the commentary p. 106–8 with references to other cases in which foreign ambassadors are attested as authors of *relationes*); and Raggi and Buongiorno now see lines 36/7–39, which deal with the *asylia*, as belonging, as its last component, to the section expounding the *sententiae* of Antony and Octavian (cf. p. 133f.). There is also an interesting discussion concerning the fact that some subjects seem to turn up for the second time in lines 55ff. of the document (see p. 115f.). As for minor innovations in the text, note e.g. that the man’s tribe in l. 11 has now been corrected from *Aniensis* to *Arn(i)ensis*, and that the nomen of the other man on the same line has been corrected from *Sedius* to *Hedius* (following E. Badian’s suggestion). The result is a remarkable piece of solid scholarship and a book that will be used with profit by all those interested in Rome’s dealings with eastern allies in the triumviral and early Augustan periods.

It must, however, be said that there are also some details that I am not altogether happy with, mainly in the case of names and the Latin translation. Concerning the presentation of the text, I think many would prefer to have the translation – either the Italian or the Latin – on the pages opposite to the corresponding sections in Greek. As it now stands, the original Greek text is on p. 48–56, followed by the Italian translation only on p. 57–60 and by the Latin one on p. 60–62. Moreover, it might have been a good idea to place the useful synopsis of the contents of the text, now somewhat unexpectedly coming at the end of section 3:2 on p. 120f., immediately before (or perhaps after) the Greek text. As for prosopography and names, I found the references to modern literature in some cases less than satisfactory; e.g. in the case of M. Valerius Messalla Rufus (p. 93), a reference to *PIR*<sup>2</sup> V 148 would have been more useful than that to Broughton’s *MRR*. The nomen *Ateius* should surely be transcribed as Ἀτίϊος (thus e.g. Plut. Crass 16.3; cf. Πομπήϊος etc.) rather than as Ἄτειος (p. 48). As for the accentuation of the tribes *Anie(n)sis* and *Arn(i)e(n)sis*, I think that they should be accented Ἀνιῆνσις Ἀρνιῆνσις. We do find Ἀνιῆνσις on p. 98 – but it is presented as a variant of Ἀνιῆσις, and the accentuation with the acute is found in all other mentions of these tribes on p. 48, 49 and 64. On p. 63, it is said that the name of one of the urban quaestors, mentioned in line 2 in the genitive as

(ἐπι) Μάρκου Μαρτι[ --- ], could be either Μαρτίου or Μαρτιάλου (in the latter case, according to the authors either the nomen or the praenomen – if one assumes that Μάρκου could be corrected in Μαρκίου – would have been omitted by the lapicide). However, Μαρτιάλου is certainly not a correct genitive of Μαρτιάλις, and *Martialis*, a name that is only found during the empire, is not really a suitable cognomen for a senator in 39 BC. As for the alleged difficulty arising from the use of the “variante ortografica” Μαρτίου which is said to be “non molto diffusa rispetto al più comune Μαρκίου”, there is nothing wrong with the quaestor being called *Marcus Martius*, as *Martius* (which is of course not a “variant” of *Marcus* but a different name altogether) is a nomen that is also attested for imperial senators. Where the Latin translation (p. 60–62) is concerned, I observed a number of slips and errors: line 32: *ne quem magistratum pro[ve magistratum ... ]* (for *magistratum*); line 56: *quo iure quaeque* (for *quaque*) *religione*; line 74: *urbanibus* (for *urbanis*) *quaestoribus* (I would prefer the order *quaestoribus urbanis*); line 76ff. in *[patrum ordinibus (for gradibus) ... sedere]* (speaking of rows in the theatre); line 80f. *referrent uti [senatus eis datus sit (for daretur); placet ... eis senatus (for senatum) dari*; line 90ff. *utique ... in Capitolio pro[ponantur, itemque eas?] tabulas ... [proponere licet]et* (for ... *proponantur et uti eas tabulas ... proponere liceat*); line 91: *in se]natu hoc consulto decreto* (for e.g. *cum hoc senatus consultum factum est*) *fuertunt patres CCC (senatus consultum cannot be the object of *decernere*; instead, *facere* s. c. is not uncommon*; line 92: *foedere*. Finally, there is the translation of the clause in lines 73f. (p. 61) *Quod L. Marcius Censorinus, C. Calvisius Sabinus consules verba fecerunt, d(e) e(a) r(e) i(ta) c(ensuerunt): uti consules* etc. I wonder here about *quod*, for there does not seem to be any other decree of the senate or of some other institution in which *quod* followed by *verba facere* would have been used in this way, without any further specification. Normally we find in this position a summary of what is being proposed formulated either as an *AcI* or with *de* + ablatives (including normally a gerundive). Now *quod* is meant to be a translation of *περί (δὲ) ὧν* (... ὕπατοι λόγους ἐποίησαντο, περί τούτων τῶν πραγμάτων ...), and, seeing that there seems to be no space for further elaboration of the nature of the proposal of the consuls, a more suitable translation of *περί ὧν* could be (if followed by *de ea re*) *de qua re*. However, that phrase does not seem to be attested in this context, and the whole passage should perhaps be subjected to a new scrutiny. For one thing, it is surely notable that, as far as I can see, in the *senatus consulta* in Greek collected in R. K. Sherck’s *RDGE*, the formulation *περί ὧν* is, unlike in this case, always followed by some specification (see e.g. *RDGE* 2. 5. 9. 10B. 11 [with ὑπὲρ]. 18. 22. 23. 26 c).

The third volume discussed here, no. 9 in the series, is a multi-authored one consisting of the following contributions (on the Steiner Verlag homepage, the contributions are said to be in German and Italian, but there is in fact also Famerie’s contribution in French):

- P. Buongiorno and G. Camodeca, *I senatus consulta nella documentazione epigrafica dall’Italia* (p. 9–53);

- W. Eck, *Senatus consulta* in lateinischer Sprache auf Inschriften in den Provinzen (p. 55–81);
- K. Harter-Uibopuu, Die Publikation von *senatus consulta* in griechischen Inschriften (p. 83–105);
- Gallo, *Senatus consulta de Bacchanalibus*. Normenpluralität in der Tafel von Tiriolo und in der livianischen Überlieferung (p. 107–145);
- V. Walser, Das sogenannte *Senatus Consultum Popillianum* (p. 147–169);
- É. Famerie, Le sénatus-consulte relatif au règlement des affaires de Phrygie (RDGE 13): Nouveau texte, nouveau contexte (p. 171–185);
- S. Saba, Riflessioni sui trattati fra Roma e le città greche (p. 187–197);
- S. Viaro, Note sul cd. «*senatus consultum de pago montano*» (p. 199–244);
- S. Marino, Centro e periferia in età sillana: il *sc. de Stratonicensibus* (p. 245–293);
- D. Bonanno, Riconoscere un dio ‘*ex senatus consulto*’: La disputa tra gli abitanti di Oropo e i *publicani* romani (73 a. C.) (p. 295–312);
- A. Raggi, Prolegomena a una nuova edizione del *sc. de Aphrodisiensibus* (p. 313–330);
- S. Lohsse, Zum *SC. Calvisianum* und der Strafgerichtsbarkeit des Senats (p. 331–342);
- A. Terrinoni, *Ludi, lucar, memoria*: un contributo allo studio dei *senatus consulta* nei commentari augustei dei *ludi saeculares* (p. 343–368);
- M. Rizzi, Il *senatus consultum de nundinis saltus Beguensis* e lo *ius nundinarum* nell’Africa romana (p. 369–395);
- A. Parma, *Decreta decurionum* epigrafici: Esempi di registrazione delle delibere dell’*ordo decurionum* (p. 397–410);
- R. Wolters, *SC* und *EX SC* auf Münzen der Römischen Republik und Kaiserzeit (p. 411–437).

In P. Buongiorno and G. Camodeca’s instructive contribution of on *senatus consulta* (abbreviated in the following as “SC” or in the plural as “SCta”) in Latin found in Italy, the authors present an overview of e.g. the structure and the contents of SCta, the relation of the inscribed versions with their “archetypes” as filed in the senate archives, and of their publication. The exposition is based on observations on various documents (e.g. p. 21ff. on *AE* 1978, 145 from Larinum, a city that has also produced a yet unpublished fragment of a SC, quoted on p. 24f.; p. 26ff. on *CIL* X 1401) and also takes into account inscriptions that only mention SCta without quoting them. (On the other hand, note p. 31 on the inscription of the arch of Claudius *ILS* 216 – not 219 –, apparently quoting from the relevant SC without pointing that out). The contribution ends with a useful appendix (p.

33–50) listing, on the one hand, all inscriptions found in Rome and Italy quoting at least in part SCta (only 14 documents between 186 BC and Hadrian). On the other, we are given all the inscriptions found in Rome and Italy mentioning SCta without actually quoting them. The items in this section are divided into various categories (dedications to emperors, public works, etc.). In the next chapter by W. Eck, the author studies the SCta in Latin found outside Italy, none of them being datable to the Republican age (p. 58; on the same page, Eck observes that Greek versions of SCta are more common than Latin ones, referring to the contribution of Harter-Uibopuu). Altogether thirteen different SCta have been at least partially preserved, some of them in more than one version from different places, the result being that we know of SCta found in 24 provincial cities (p. 59f.). There is also a section on SCta referred to, but not quoted, in provincial inscriptions in Latin. The individual SCta are discussed in two groups. There are those dealing with events related to the *domus Augusta* (p. 68ff., e.g. the SC *de Cn. Pisone patre* discussed at length; cf. p. 73f. on AE 2011, 1809) and those dealing with practical matters (p. 74ff.; e.g. the SC *de nundinis saltus Beguensis* of AD 138, the only SC found in the West inscribed on stone rather than on bronze, p. 75; cf. below the contribution on this text by M. Rizzi). At the end of this contribution, there is a reference to a fragmentary new document from AD 14, apparently part of a SC, now published by P. Rothenhöfer in *Gephyra* 19 (2020).

K. Harter-Uibopuu studies the SCta in Greek inscriptions, especially from the point of view of their publication. This contribution contains interesting observations on several documents, e. g. on that of 105 BC from Astypalaea (*RDGE* 16; cf. S. Saba, p. 187ff.), unfortunately lost, containing a SC followed by the treaty between Rome and the island state. In a remarkable contribution, A. Gallo studies the documents concerning the repression of the *Bacchanalia* in 186 BC, consisting of SCta and the consuls' edicts, as reproduced in Livy and in the well-known inscription. The inscription contains both extracts from the SC of October 7 and a consular edict referring to other SCta in this matter (p. 126). Note on the same page the useful summary of all documents in chronological order with references to Livy (cf. p. 133f. in more detail) and the inscription (note the text, with “normalized” forms in brackets, on p. 138f. and the detailed analysis of its contents on p. 140ff.) and to the “Parallelüberlieferung”.

A. V. Walser deals with the SC *Popillianum* (referred to several times as such, but with the addition of “the so-called” in the heading and e.g. on p. 148) dealing with matters following the death of King Attalus in 133 BC (*RDGE* 11, found in Pergamum). The praenomen of the person in l. 3 who “consulted” the senate was established as [Πό]πλιος by M. Wörrle in 2000 (cf. also É. Famerie on p. 181). We now know that this is P. Popillius C. f. (Laenas), and that the date is thus 132 when he held the consulate. As for the exact date, Walser suggests reading [No]εμβριών in l. 5. This document seems to have been the decree that dealt with the recommendations of the senatorial commission that had been sent to Asia in 133 in order to find out what should be done about the king's bequest of Asia

to the Roman people (p. 148). There is a new edition, with translation, of the inscription on 161ff.; the two fragments of the same decree found in Synnada and published by T. Drew-Bear in 1972 have been incorporated. On p. 148, the author observes that this edition is an “anticipation” of the edition of the same text in a supplement to the *Inscripfen von Pergamon* currently under preparation. The document (RDGE 13, found in Synnada and dealing with the “règlement des affaires de Phrygie”) studied by É. Famerie belongs to the same historical context. The inscription was published in 1886, then lost until 1978, when T. Drew-Bear published a fragment of it he had found, and in addition a new fragment containing parts of approximately the same text. The document, as preserved, contains the end of the SC *Popillianum* (see above) and the beginning of a SC *Licinianum*. The praenomen of the *relator* called Δικίνιος Ποπλίου [υίός] has now been established as [Πό]πλιος, and the person is thus not, as previously thought, C. Licinius P. f. (Geta) consul in 116, but P. Licinius P. f. (Crassus Dives Mucianus), consul in 131.

Having begun with a presentation of the Astypalaeon dossier (RDGE 16) consisting of the SC dealing with the renewal of the treaty between Astypalea and Rome, then of the treaty itself, and finally of the decree in honour of the Astypalaeon ambassador, S. Saba moves on to discuss some treaties between Rome and Greek cities attested indirectly. The exact point of this short paper is not immediately obvious to the reader. Back in Rome, S. Viaro studies the fragmentary SC known as *de pago Montano*, found near the porta Esquilina and dealing with topics such as *ustrinae* and *stercus* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 591), taking of course into account related documents such as the well-known edict of the praetor L. Sentius (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 838 etc.). Though only consisting of a few lines, the inscription is of interest from several points of view (see p. 200). In spite of this, this contribution of more than 40 pages, written very much in the style of Italian legal historians, seems a little overlong. This is especially due to the author’s inclination to cite long extracts of ancient sources rather than summarizing the points essential for her argument (e.g. various authors on *puticuli* in n. 24; almost a page of citation of the *tabula Heracleensis* in n. 50). I cannot find “Hope, *Contempt*” (n. 84) in the bibliography (where the scholar Grelle appears between his colleagues Panciera and Pareti on p. 241).

S. Marino deals with the SC *de Stratonicensibus* and the documents attached to it (RDGE 18) and presents the text on the whole identical with RDGE except for the addition of the fragment published in 2002 (AE 2002, 1423) and a few modifications (p. 247). The author then goes on to discuss in great detail the two letters of Sulla preceding the SC (with observations e.g. on the titles Ἐπαφρόδιτος and *Felix* and on many other things, some of which in my view are less relevant, as e.g. in nn. 44 and 48) and then the SC itself. The discussion of this SC is a most informative analysis of the lengthy text. At the end, the author discusses the decree that is attached to the preceding documents (OGI 441, lines 129ff.) but is not connected with them and is omitted in RDGE. In an instructive contribution, D. Bonanno deals with the SC *de controversiis Oropiorum et publicanorum* of 73 (RDGE

23). Embedded in a letter addressed to the Oropians by the consuls of 73, this is a complex document that includes references to three earlier SCTa and to other “atti normativi” (for a useful summary, see p. 303). Unfortunately the author was unable to use the article on the same document by C. Müller, in A. Heller & al. (eds.), *Philorhōmaios kai philhellèn. Hommage à Jean-Louis Ferrary* (2019) 391–417 (with text, translation, photo, etc.), which must have appeared too late for her to know about it.

A. Raggi’s contribution on the SC *de Aphrodisiensibus* is in fact of earlier date than the edition of the same document by Raggi and Buongiorno (cf. above), which is not mentioned in the bibliography (p. 330). Its presence in this volume is explained by the wish of the editors to retain this contribution as a trace of an earlier phase in the study of the document (p. 313 n. \*); in any case, note the useful summary of the contents of the SC on p. 324 (in some ways better than the summary in the edition Raggi and Buongiorno, p. 120f.). St. Lohsse discusses the SC *Calvisianum* on *repetundae* of 4 BC (*RDGE* 31), cited in one of the edicts of Augustus found in Cyrene. Regarding the passage χωρίς τοῦ κεφαλῆς εὐθύνειν τὸν εὐληφότα etc., the author observes (p. 340) “Die Kläger sollten nicht erwarten dürfen, dass der Senat sich in irgendeiner Weise mit Vorwürfen befasste, die die Verhängung einer Kapitalstrafe nach sich ziehen mussten”. In general, this SC promoted the move from *quaestiones* to the jurisdiction of the senate (p. 341).

In her contribution, A. Terrinoni discusses the SCTa cited in the acta of the *ludi saeculares* of 17 BC, beginning by presenting the text (p. 346f.). The author suggests two modifications in the text of fragment a+b, *qua summa soliti [sint facere ludos] saeculares XVvir(i) sacr(is) faciund(is)* instead of *locare ludos* (l. 2f.) and *[In comitio in curia I]ulia* instead of *[Eodemque die in curia I]ulia* (l. 8). However, she does not introduce these modifications into the text (in which the phrase *q(uod) d(e) e(a) r(e) f(ieri) p(lacuerit)*, appearing several times, must of course be corrected to *q(uid) d(e) e(a) r(e) f(ieri) p(laceret)*), discussing both suggestions separately on p. 350f. and 358ff. The article also contains an interesting section (p. 352ff.) on the meaning of the term *lucar*. M. Rizzi’s contribution on the SC *de nundinis saltus Beguensis* (in Numidia) of AD 138 is essentially a line-by-line commentary of the text which exists in two practically identical exemplars. The text of version A is quoted on p. 371f. (in line 12, correct *desiderio* in *de desiderio*), version B in n. 10. In the commentary on the opening lines, the author discusses the documents (none earlier than the first century AD) dealing with the modalities of *nundinae*, for which authorization is known to have been given either by the senate or a provincial governor or, from the Severan period onwards, the emperor himself (cf. the summary on p. 380). There are also observations on the handling and the archiving of senate documents. The commentary on the SC proper is divided into sections on the *praescriptio*, the *relatio* and the short decree (repeating much of what was proposed in the *relatio*). I observed some curious errors in the Latin (e.g. *Nigrus* for *Niger* p. 382) but also in other details (e.g. the author “Rank” being cited on p. 383 where the reference should in fact be to [F. X.] Ryan’s book on *Rank and Participation*).



The following contribution by A. Parma is on municipal decrees, a subject on which Parma is a well-known authority. This is a short but informative overview of the contents and the formulations of the decrees as preserved to us. Parma is surely right in assuming that the decrees we have are in most cases heavily edited summaries or even mere extracts of what was in fact said at the meetings of the decurions (p. 406). In any case, one hopes that Parma's much-awaited corpus of the decrees will soon materialize. Finally, there is R. Wolters' contribution on the formula (*ex senatus consulto*) found on a large number of Roman coins, both republican and imperial. The use of this formula had several functions, its use being in no way stipulated by law (p. 427).

The volume is concluded by remarkably detailed indexes.

Olli Salomies  
University of Helsinki

ORNELLA SALATI: *Scrivere documenti nell'esercito romano. L'evidenza dei papiri latini d'Egitto tra I e III d.C.* Philippika 139. Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden 2020. ISBN 978-3-447-11451-6; ISBN (e-book) 978-3-447-39025-5. 244 pp. EUR 64.

The Roman army operated its basic communications in written form. As can be expected, this communication included official as well as more private documents. The official dealings were written mainly in Latin, even if in Egypt Greek was also used, especially in more private relations. The contents and themes of army files have been studied earlier, but the layout and other technical details of the documents have not been tackled so far. In addition, the general production and archiving of army information have been defectively studied. This production and archiving forms the main focus of this book.

Many kinds of texts were needed for Roman soldiers: commands, instructions, reports, passwords, various lists of personnel, provisions, correspondence and so on. All this documentation shows clearly that the Roman army was enormously organised in striving to register every activity in its units, which implies, moreover, that the daily production of various written documents must have been extraordinary. The practice also suggests that the output was, at least partially, archived. However, only a tiny part of these documents are extant, mainly in the few climatically suitable conditions where papyrus or wood has survived.

Ornella Salati (S.) has collected and analysed all the accessible Latin documents written on papyrus together with a few ostraka from Egypt from the 1<sup>st</sup> to the 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries. S. has also chosen comparative data from Bu Njem, Dura Europus and Vindolanda, if similar types of documents