

Φῆλιξ, but the ī in *Felix* is long. Besides, the authors write Πρίσκοξ, but in Latin the ī 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 Ἀπφ- 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 *IAnkara* 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 But it is preferable to abstain from a final judgement, as long as the wording of the unpublished inscription is not known.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

four inscriptions attributed to Genusia in *CIL*, three are here considered as not being pertinent. But there is *CIL* IX 259 (*ILS* 6115), a *tabula patronatus* of AD 395 which is republished here with a photo and a useful commentary as no. 1. This *tabula* is in the Naples museum, but, to judge from the observation “Non vidi”, the editor Mangiardi was not able to inspect it; one wonders why. Two “new” inscriptions are added here, no. 2 (= *AE* 1999, 501) being a Republican inscription mentioning quattuorviri.

The section on Aeclanum is a very substantial contribution of more than 200 pages on a city which was one of the “centri più importanti del Sannio Irpino” (p. 44). In the *Corpus*, there are more than 300 inscriptions from this city; around 100 are added here, most of them either unpublished or, having been published in more or less obscure publications, practically unpublished. Among the unpublished texts, there are several of more than just local interest (e.g. no. 53 referring to a girl designated as *nutrita* and no. 64 with the very rare nomen *Filistius*). The importance of Aeclanum is illustrated by the fact that the historical introduction (section C, pp. 44–71) is more than 25 pages long. Unfortunately, it is a bit complicated to use this section as it is, for instance, not divided into paragraphs or the like. Seeing that many readers may not have a very clear idea of the site, this section, which now begins with a reference to the earliest mention of the city in literary sources (surprisingly, Appian narrating events of 89 BC), might have gained by beginning with a few words on the geography of the city and its territory (now discussed only on p. 55ff.), and, e.g., pointing out that ancient Aeclanum was located at the modern village of Passo di Mirabella (a detail also left unmentioned on p. 53). The question of the status of Frigento about 10 kilometers to the southwest of Aeclanum and possibly, as suspected by many scholars, the site of an independent municipality is discussed on p. 57f., the outcome being that the inscriptions found in or around Frigento (except for those clearly originating from Aeclanum) are not included in this collection (p. 58). The maps are not very satisfactory: In the larger map (p. 79) of the “Città”, it might have been added that this is the village of Passo di Mirabella. That of the territory (p. 82f.) is miserable; in this map, the reader has to find out that the two villages which are highlighted on p. 82 are Mirabella Eclano (to the left) and Grottaminarda.

The section, in this particular case consisting of more than 70 pages, with addenda to the inscriptions in the *Corpus*, is of great interest, as there are many important texts; the bibliography provided by the author seems most up to date (note, e.g., p. 101 on no. 1132 on the *cohors Flavia Commagenorum*). Unfortunately, many inscriptions still existing at the time of the *Corpus* seem to have been lost, for there are quite a few texts defined as “irreperibile” (e.g., 1153, 1154, 1157, 1163; for an inscription lost only after 1982, see p. 91 on no. 1091, and for an important inscription lost after 1981 see in the section of “new” texts p. 171 no. 14).

As for individual texts in the section on “new” inscriptions, I would like to make the following observations. No. 2: This is an inscription set up by a certain *C. Aurelius Probus*; in the commentary, it is said that *Aurelius* (sic) is attested in Aeclanum (not surprising) but that the combination of *Aurelius* with the praenomen *C.* is “meno comune”. But the interesting detail here is the orthography with a double *L*, and a few words on this might have been more pertinent (see, in addition to the classic paper on this phenomenon by A. Degrassi, *Scritti vari* I [1962] 467ff., now R. González Fernández & P. D. Conesa Navarro, *Athenaeum* 105 [2017] 137ff.). No. 35: In view of the fact that the author often provides information on common and uninteresting names (e.g. in nos. 37 and 64 on *Caecilius* and *Fabius*), one wonders whether the fact that *Praefectus* seems to

be a cognomen here might not have merited a few words of comment (there is the reference “vd. Solin – Salomies, *Repertorium*, p. 381”, but this is not very informative). No. 37 is dated “seconda metà del I sec. d.C.”, but the palaeography and everything else in this inscription point to a much later date, say in the later second century. No. 54: There is no comment on the cognomen *Felicianus*, although this is the first and only attestation of this name in the whole of the Roman world. (Contrast no. 62 where we find out that the cognomen *Romanus* is “molto diffuso”, with a reference to Kajanto’s *Cognomina*, p. 182.) No. 64: In explaining the cognomen *Clytianus* the author says that the name is “probably” derived from *Clytus* but adds “non escluderei però l’influenza del cognomen latino Clutianus (derivato dal gentilizio Cluttius secondo Kajanto ...)”; it is obvious, however, that *Clytianus* is derived from *Clytus* in the same way as *Epictetianus* is derived from *Epictetus*, *Eutychianus* from *Eutyclus*, etc., and there seems to be no point in introducing a Latin name into the discussion. No. 78: This inscription mentioning freedmen Quinctii, of some interest but “irreperibile”, has, according to the author, who correctly dates it to the end of the first century BC or the beginning of the first century AD, been transmitted in two publications referred to as follows: “Jannachini 1889, I, p. 196; Graziano 2000, p. 7”. Now, had C. Graziano seen the inscription, which must, then, still have existed in 2000, or did he just copy the text from Jannachini? I find that this is a detail which the author should have clarified. But there is something else: the inscription ends with the words *M. Quinctius M. l. Protus / vivens sibi et suis*, where the use of *vivens* instead of the normal *vivus*, not pointed out in the commentary, is striking and would in my opinion have merited some annotation.

In the contribution on Trebiae, the author, G. Asdrubali Pentiti, says (p. 276) that the tribe of the city remains unknown, as the two magistrates of the city with tribes have different tribes; however, the two attested tribes are the *Aemilia* and the *Palatina* of which the latter, an “urban” tribe, cannot really come into question, and so one could perhaps consider the *Aemilia*, which is in any case the tribe of neighbouring Mevania. On p. 294, the author observes on *CIL XI 5017*, in my view correctly, that *Longurio* must be the nominative of a cognomen, not the dative of a nomen (this should be corrected in the *Repertorium*). As for the section of new inscriptions, the nomen *Vesentrio* in no. 6, now only said to be that of a “gens del tutto sconosciuta”, could have been commented upon, for this name belongs to an interesting small group of nomina ending in *-tro* (*Cacastro*, *Calastro*, *Commeastro*, etc.) which seems to be typical of Umbria and Etruria (the feminine forms end in *-tronia*; the form *Commatronius* in *CIL XI 31*, which must be a “vulgar” form of *Commeastro* *Commeatronia*, seems to indicate that forms in *-tro* could be “Romanized” by the addition of the suffix *-onius*, and this takes one’s thoughts to names such as *Maristronius* and *Obultronius*). In no. 8, the author says that the letters *PS* in *Clodia C. l. Advena C. Clodio Sex. l. Chrysog(ono?) PS et L. Rufrio ... viro suo* should be understood as *p(ecunia) s(ua)* and that this Clodius was Advena’s “colliberto e probabilmente fratello”. But how could a freedman of a Sextus be the “colliberto” of a woman manumitted by someone called Gaius? Moreover, the expression *p(ecunia) s(ua)* belongs to the context of building rather than funerary inscriptions. The solution is of course that we have to understand *p(atrono) s(uo)*; Gaius Clodius Chrysog(onus) thus becomes the patron of Clodia Advena, freedwoman of Gaius.

The contribution on Arilica and Sirmio deals not with a particular city and its territory, but with a stretch of the southern shore of modern lake Garda roughly between Desenzano and Peschiera, with Sirmio in about the middle; if I understand the exposition on p. 317 correctly, most scholars

consider this area as having belonged to the territory of Verona. This contribution begins on p. 309, but it is only on p. 320 that we find out that Arilica, not a very familiar place (but with some interesting inscriptions especially because of the presence of *nautae* operating on the lake), is identical with modern Peschiera. In the section of additions to the inscriptions already in the *Corpus*, I wondered about no. 4017 (p. 336), where it is said that *Virucate* (in *P. Virucate P. f. Maximi*) has been inscribed instead of “*Virucatae*”, this being due to “monophthongization”, but I’m pretty sure that this nomen is indeclinable and that, even if it were declinable, the genitive would not be “*Virucatae*”. As for no. 4029 (p. 345), I would not say that the cognomen of Quintia Horestilla is without “*altri riscontri*”, for surely we are dealing with a “vulgar” orthography of the name *Orestilla*.

As mentioned above, the volume is finished off by two “*Supplementorum supplementa*”, by E. Fiodi, on the two Ligurian cities Vada Sabatia and Albingaunum. Although I observed some details I was not altogether happy with (and it is of course these details one focuses upon in a review), I must conclude by observing that this is a splendid volume which will be of great service to all those who are interested in ancient Italy and its epigraphy.

Olli Salomies

HANS-ALBERT RUPPRECHT: *Beiträge zur juristischen Papyrologie. Kleine Schriften*. Herausgegeben von ANDREA JÖRDENS. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2017. ISBN 978-3-515-11684-8. XIII, 408 S. EUR 68.

The name of Hans-Albert Rupprecht does not need an introduction to anyone who has ever dealt with the relatively specialized field of legal papyrology. However, as should be well known, the often groundbreaking work of this “grand old man” of his field is also significant for many related disciplines, not only papyrology and the study of Graeco-Roman Egypt more generally, but also fields such as ancient legal and social history at large.

The book discussed here is a collection of Rupprecht’s most important articles, selected and arranged by himself and edited by Andrea Jördens. They all deal with the contribution of the papyri to various aspects of ancient legal history and originally appeared between 1981 and 2016, thus reflecting 35 years of scholarship. While the book includes, laudably, some later additions and updates (e.g., p. 197–8, “*Nachtrag 2012*”), even the older writings can still be counted, without hesitation, among the most authoritative contributions to the topics in question. There are 32 articles in all, one of them in Italian and the rest in German. They cover an impressive array of sub-topics and have been arranged into nine thematic sections: general papyrology (3 articles), law of obligations (7), property law (5), family and inheritance law (6), contract law (2), documentary practices (2), delict law (2), trials (2), and public law (3).

A serious discussion of the actual contents of the articles within the limits of a book review is impossible. I will also not give a synopsis of the articles’ contents, as this can already be found in R.A. Kugler’s review published in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* (2018.08.32). The present review focuses more on the merits of the collection itself, vis-à-vis the original, dispersed articles.

It goes without saying that it is convenient to have all these articles in one place. But that is not all. In addition to the articles themselves, the book contains a foreword by Andrea Jördens,