

greco sarebbe un normale congiuntivo tematico dell' aoristo sigmatico (originariamente atematico), mentre il futuro indoiranico e baltico costituirebbe una derivazione secondaria di presente -o nella visione dell' autore, 'imperfettivo' - in \*-je/o basata su di esso. A conclusione del capitolo viene proposta anche una connessione con i presenti in \*-sĕ/o, reinterpretati come \*-s- + \*-ĕ -altro suffisso imperfettivo per l' autore-, che rimane però molto meno convincente.

Ci saremmo aspettati un capitolo (o almeno qualche paragrafo) dedicato all' aoristo passivo (intransitivo) in -η/-θη. Benché questo non abbia paralleli diretti nelle altre lingue indoeuropee e costituisca una innovazione interna al greco, ciò non giustifica la sua assenza in una discussione dedicata alle origini (scil. Indoeuropee) del verbo greco, essendo in qualche modo formato su materiale ereditario e giocando un ruolo tutt' altro che marginale nel sistema verbale greco. Riguardo ad esso invece viene fatto solo un brevissimo accenno in 1.10 (p. 15).

Gli ultimi due capitoli (9: "From Proto-Indo-European to Pre-Proto-Indo-European", 10: "From Pre-Proto-Indo-European back to Greek") sono di minore interesse da un punto di vista strettamente greco. Essi rappresentano in larga misura una speculazione certamente plausibile, ma non dimostrabile sull' evoluzione del pre-Proto-Indoeuropeo, cioè della fase linguistica (non meglio definibile) precedente all' ultimo stadio indoeuropeo comune dal quale si suppongono derivare in ultima analisi tutte le lingue indoeuropee storicamente attestate (Proto-Indoeuropeo appunto). In particolare nella prima parte del capitolo 9 (9.1–20) si mettono a confronto varie ipotesi di allineamento morfosintattico alternative al sistema nominativo-accusativo del proto-indoeuropeo, per giungere ad una sostanziale adesione all' ipotesi ergativa, con le conseguenze che essa comporta nella ricostruzione delle desinenze verbali. La parte più originale ed interessante del capitolo (9.28–32) è però costituita dall' ipotesi di una reinterpretazione dell' elemento \*-s da marca opzionale di 3<sup>^</sup> p. ergativa (cfr. il pronome \*so erg.> nom.m.) a marca di alta transitività e quindi di perfettività (aoristo e futuro sigmatico). Se da un lato tale ipotesi non può essere incontrovertibilmente dimostrata -né negata-, dall' altro bisogna tener presente che non esiste un' ipotesi alternativa che spieghi l' origine delle varie forme sigmatiche nella morfologia verbale indoeuropea. Il cap. 10, infine, offre un' analisi dettagliata dell' evoluzione delle desinenze personali (della serie \*-mi dell' attivo, e della serie in \*-h<sub>2</sub> del perfetto e del medio originario) e della formazione dei vari tipi di coniugazione (tematico, atematico, a raddoppiamento ecc.) seguendo questa volta l' evoluzione cronologica dal pre-proto-indoeuropeo al proto-indoeuropeo e quindi al greco.

Nel complesso, dunque, ci sentiamo di esprimere un giudizio sostanzialmente positivo sull' opera, che è comunque lodevole per l' ampiezza dei temi trattati e per la sistematicità del lavoro svolto, ciò indipendentemente dall' adesione alle singole ipotesi che in essa vengono esposte.

*Andrea Sesoldi*

*A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names. Volume V.C: Inland Asia Minor.* Edited by JEAN-SÉBASTIEN BALZAT – RICHARD W. V. CATLING – ÉDOUARD CHIRICAT – THOMAS CORSTEN. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2018. ISBN 978-0-19-881688-1. XLIX, 477 pp. GBP 125.

The Oxford lexicon has now come to the end of the design of its originally planned first series. There is a plan to proceed with further volumes eastwards (see R. Parker, in the volume under review, p.

XXXV), and Richard Catling tells me that the équipe dealing with the continuation of the Lexicon are currently close to completion of vol. VI covering Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia and the further parts of the East (Persia, Bactria and so on). There remains Egypt, a major task, not to speak of unassignable individuals (they form a large and varied class, where, among others, most of the slaves [but the exclusion of practically all slaves was not an entirely happy decision], or bishops of late antiquity have been relegated) who should find their way into the sixth volume (so vol. I p. VII, where also on p. IX the rest of the contents of this planned – and much-needed – volume is discussed).

But now to the present volume. It covers the regions of Inland Asia Minor, among them such important ones as Galatia and Phrygia. The introduction gives an account of the geographical setting, which is not at all unproblematic; note also that in some cases the boundaries might have varied over time. Normally the decisions of the editors seem to be sensible. But there are a few borderline cases. The authors assign Oinoanda to Kibyrtis by reason of the cultural ties with Kibyra, Boubon and Balboursa (p. XI f.); now, Oinoanda was part of the province of Lycia established in 43 AD, and we do not know with certainty if it really can be said to be part of what we are used to calling Kibyrtis before 43 AD (see, however, the arguments put forward by J. J. Coulton, *The Balboursa Survey and Settlement in Highland Southwest Anatolia* [2012] 78); and note that the best-known eminent local citizens lived in centuries I/II. A map would have been helpful. The alphabetical ordering of the regions is susceptible to a certain criticism, as it means that neighbors get detached, such as Galatia and Phrygia, or provinces wide apart, such as Pisidia and Pontos, are attached in the Lexicon.

Due to its prosopographic character, the Lexicon strives for material completeness in each of its volumes. The authors of this particular volume have indeed succeeded in putting together practically all the persons known from the regions in question. Their successful efforts are all the more praiseworthy, as the epigraphic materials of many of these regions are scattered and dispersed in publications in part poorly accessible. Indeed, it would be pointless to complain about gaps. I have, in fact, found for the moment only a few missing persons, especially from the Roman epigraphical documentation, such as *CIL* VI 17130 *Egnatuleia* *Ἰ. Ἰ. Urbana* from Phrygia; 34466 *Apollonius* from Phrygia *IGUR* 527 *Εὐανγελίς γένει Γαλάτισσα*; 987 *Τρύφων Λαδικὸς τῆς πρὸς Λύκον*; *CIL* X 3565 (Misenum) *C. Claudi Isaurici ... natione Phryx* (naval seaman); *IGLS* 1162 mentions a *Bassus, mil(es) cl(assis) praet(oriae) Mis(enensis), [nat(ione) P]hryx*; *CIL* III 6380 (Salona) *Ulpus Andronicus* from Phrygia; *Studia epigraphica Pannonica* 9, 72 (Aquincum) *C. Cornelio Cl. Eutycho nat. Phryg.*

On the whole, we have here a volume of utmost importance. To emphasize my admiration of, and my interest in, this volume, I would like to conclude with a few comments on the entries of individual names. But first some introductory remarks. The accentuation of Greek names has been an Achilles heel for many previous volumes; in the last fascicles, fortunately, the editors have succeeded in using the accents more correctly. But the accentuation of Latin names remains problematic in a few cases. The authors as well as the editors of Greek inscriptions and papyri in general write *Ἰουκοῦνδος Σεκοῦνδος* (as authors of editions of literary texts also tend to do), but as the *u* in the middle syllable in *Iucundus Secundus* is short, it would be preferable to write *Ἰουκοῦνδος Σεκοῦνδος*; however, in the final analysis, I would rather prefer to establish here a recessive accent and write *Ἰούκοουνδος Σέκοουνδος* (on this question, see P. Probert, *Ancient Greek Accentuation* [2006], 135). Similarly, the authors, like most editors of inscriptions and papyri, regularly print

Φῆλιξ, but the  $\bar{i}$  in *Felix* is long. Besides, the authors write Πρίσκοξ, but in Latin the  $\bar{i}$  of *Priscus* was long (see *ThLL* X 2, 1372, 35–41); moreover, the spelling Πρεῖσκ- is frequently attested. The authors have decided to omit, in addition to the accent, the *spiritus* in non-Greek and non-Latin names, a welcome practice, but at p. 49f. one can add a *spiritus lenis* to the names beginning with  $\Lambda\phi\phi$ - without hesitation, as we know from Latin *Nebenüberlieferung* where *Apphe*, *Apphin*, etc. without the initial *h* was the regular spelling (in the onomastic material of the city of Rome there is not one spelling with *H*-).

I finish with a few remarks on individual names: P. 89 Βικαριξ from Selge (*ISelge* 25). The inscription gives Βικαρεωξ, which the authors have probably interpreted as a genitive, as the name of the father of the wife of the deceased. If so, they have failed to explain why the nominative of this name should run just Βικαριξ. Less probably Βικαρεωξ would be a nominative, a second cognomen of the woman. P. 94 Γάιος n. 287 seems to be rather a gentilicium. If so, it must be struck from the Lexicon. It is also to be omitted if the authors explained Γ(άιος) as a praenomen). P. 237 Κυρικοξ: The authors consider the name as indigenous. According to the editors of *ANkara* 123 ‘we may be confronted with a Greek-Galatian name’, but this is not convincing. There are no Celtic names in *Cyrice*- or *Curice*-; not a murmur in Holder or Schmidt, *ZCPH* 1957, or Ellis Evans. And must we really complement in 57 Κυρ[ικ]κο[ξ] instead of Κύρικοξ? P. 273 Μάτρων n. 4: I do not understand why Ματρωνιανός in *Studia Pontica* III 2, 337A (see the Lexicon, p. VI) should be a patronymic adjective of Μάτρων (to be silent on everything else, the Latin cognomen *Matrona* was popular in our regions). But it is preferable to abstain from a final judgement, as long as the wording of the unpublished inscription is not known. P. 446 Φροῦγιξ is nothing but a variant of Φροῦγιος and should be accentuated Φροῦγιξ.

A more extensive review will appear elsewhere.

Heikki Solin

*Supplementa Italica. Nuova serie* 29. UNIONE ACCADEMICA NAZIONALE. Edizioni Quasar, Roma 2017. ISBN 978-88-7140-821-7. 430 pp. EUR 46.

The preceding volume (no. 28, published in 2016) of the admirable *Supplementa Italica* series covered only one city, Patavium, and volume 30, published very recently in 2019 and covering Perugia and its territory, another important city, is of the same type. Volume 29, to be reviewed here, represents the more familiar *Supplementum*, covering as it does several Italian cities between *regio* II and *regio* X of which Aeclanum (in *regio* II), by S. Evangelisti (also the author of the “Repertorio bibliografico, 8” on p. 429, with some interesting details), is by far the most important. The other cities are Genusia (II) by C. S. Fiorello and A. Mangiatordi, Numana (V) by G. Paci, Trebiae (VI) by G. Asdrubali Pentiti, Arilica and Sirmium (X) by R. Bertolazzi and V. Guidorizzi, and finally Vada Sabatia and Albingaunum (IX) by E. Fiodi, these two chapters being supplements to earlier supplements published in 1983 and 1988.

Some of the cities included in this volume seem to have been pretty insignificant places with a poor epigraphical heritage. In the following I shall focus on the more notable cities, although Genusia (now Ginosa 43 km to the west of Taranto) cannot have been much of a place, and of the