

Supplementa Italica. Nuova serie 30: *Perusia – Ager Perusinus*. MARIA CARLA SPADONI – LUANA CENCIAIOLI – LUCIO BENEDETTI. Unione Accademica Nazionale. Edizioni Quasar, Roma 2018. ISBN 978-88-7140-931-3. 331 pp. EUR 46.

As is well known at least in the epigraphical community, most of the volumes of the invaluable *Supplementa Italica* series cover several cities, but there are also some volumes dedicated to a single city, normally a more important one. Unless I am mistaken, there have been volumes covering just one city, namely Ateste (vol. 15), Venusia (20) and Patavium (28); this volume on Perusia, i.e. modern Perugia, is, then, the fourth volume of this type. Perusia was an important city which was able to produce a Roman emperor in the third century and thus certainly deserves a volume of its own. The interest of the epigraphical material from Perusia lies in its variety rather than in the number of important inscriptions, for the number of public inscriptions of a more general interest is not really spectacular (there are for instance no inscriptions in honour of senators). On the other hand, there is much of interest in the many funerary inscriptions which at least in the early period in many ways reflect the Etruscan past of the city and thus require some special skills. Having just mentioned the early period, I might add that the epigraphy of Perusia in general seems earlyish. There are of course inscriptions of the imperial period including some inscriptions in honour of emperors, but I do not recall having seen inscriptions which would clearly be later than that honouring the great son of the city, the emperor (in AD 251–3) Trebonianus Gallus, *CIL* XI 1928. This could perhaps have something to do with the “fasi di abbandono di III–IV sec.” observable in archaeological finds, p. 67.

Taking into account the variety of the inscriptions of Perusia, it is little wonder that the volume is the result of the collaboration of three scholars. All three are said to be the authors of the historical introduction (section C; cf. below), whereas section D with the addenda to the inscriptions published in *CIL* is contributed by M. C. Spadoni only. In the section on the “new” inscriptions (E), the individual contributions are signed with the initials of their authors, of which there seem in fact to have been more than just those mentioned in the title of the book. Hence, in section E, the inscriptions 32–37 are ascribed to “A.E.F.”, who must be identical with A. E. Feruglio, well represented in the bibliography. On the other hand, the signature “P.B.” in no. 30 is perhaps a mistake for “L.B.”. As for the structure of the book, it is of course identical with that of the previous volumes. In addition to section C, D and E, already mentioned, there is a note on the earlier editions which are being updated (A), the bibliography (B, once again with a “+” or “-” added to each item the meaning of which escapes me) and, at the end of the book, a six-page index. This is followed on p. [331] by S. Evangelisti’s statement that the Repertorio bibliografico, attached to some earlier volumes, is now published online.

This book is obviously most welcome from the point of view of Latin epigraphical studies in general and from that of studies regarding Perusia in particular. The addenda to the texts published earlier (some of them republished in section E) are extremely useful, and the same goes for all commentaries on individual texts. There are also many inscriptions whose readings have been corrected (e.g. *CIL* XI 1991, 2004, 2007, 2040, 2044a, 2052). In the section of “new” inscriptions, of which there are 95 (but no. 79ff. are just fragments), there are very many either unpublished (at least nos. 27. 40. 41. 44. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 55. 57. 61. 66. 67. 72. 73. 74. 75. 78. 79. 81) or published (often in publications of a more local nature) but practically unknown texts as they have

not been reproduced in the *Année épigraphique* (at least nos. 28. 32ff. 42. 43. 52. 59. 64. 65. 69. 70. 71. 82. 83). This is, then, a worthy addition to the *Supplementa Italica* series, and warm thanks are due to the editors.

On the other hand, it must be admitted that there are some things I am not altogether pleased with and I hope the editors do not mind if I point some of them out. Let me start with the introductory items. First, the “Sommario”. It says basically that the volume contains, besides a “Presentazione” and, in the end, the “Repertorio epigrafico” (cf. above), on pp. 9–328 a *Supplementum* on Perugia by the three authors. As mentioned above, the supplement is in fact divided into five sections or chapters ABCDE, and I wonder whether this could not have been revealed on the contents page, possibly with the addition of the page number of each section (A and B p. 9, C p. 33, D p. 130, E p. 214, index p. 323). I also think there should be subsections in the case of section C (cf. below). In addition, the bibliography (section B), although more than 25 pages long, does not include all items that are cited in the book. I know what is meant by “Salomies, Vornamen”, cited several times (a more detailed bibliographical reference is given on p. 283 no. 68), and I also know “Schulze, Eigennamen”, “Solin – Salomies, Repertorium”, “Solin, Sklavennamen” and “Solin, Personennamen”, but the point of omitting these, and other (e.g. “SIRIS” p. 130 on 1916; “ET²”) publications from the bibliography is not clear to me. In the case of “Lebel 2004”, cited p. 82 and elsewhere and clearly an interesting publication, this is a real problem, for the author cannot be identified with the help of the *Année philologique*.

Section C is said to be just an update of the “notizie storiche” in earlier publications, but will in practice be regarded and quoted as the standard publication on the archaeology and history (in the broadest of senses) of Perugia. As in earlier *Supplementa Italica* volumes, this chapter of almost 100 pages that deals with very many topics is not divided into subsections. This makes it difficult to use at least to those who wish to consult it on a detail rather than to read it from beginning to end. The problem of the absence of subsections is well illustrated by those cases in which when dealing a detail (often a name) the editors refer the reader to “supra C”, i.e. to pp. 33–130. Thus e.g. on p. 142 on no. 1940, the reader in need of information on the *gens Annia* in Perugia is directed to C (similarly e.g. in 1953. 1957. 2008. 2048. 2061. 2065; E no. 89). Likewise, on p. 147, no. 1946 is said to be “non pertinente” and the reader is directed to “supra C”, but who will have the time to read almost 100 pages in order to find out what is wrong with this inscription? (A hint: see p. 120!). Dividing this chapter into subsections would, then, have been very good idea, especially as the contents are so varied, as the following overview may show. Beginning with the origins of Perugia, the chapter goes on with later historical events up till around AD 600 (p. 45). We then have a bit on administrative matters followed (p. 46ff.) by a description of the territory of Perugia (cf. maps on p. 79f.), with notes on archaeological finds etc. (the city of Perugia itself is discussed on p. 53ff.). Names, especially those of Etruscan origin, are treated on p. 82ff., followed by an overview of prominent Perugian families on p. 87ff. (e.g. Vibii, including the consul of 43 BC and the emperor Gallus, on p. 88ff.; Volcacii Tulli on p. 92ff., Afinii on p. 97f., ending in a curious passage, where the “antica nobiltà senatoria” of the Afinii is illustrated with the observation, in my view not really pertinent, “infatti, in territorio catanese sono noti praedia Afiniana sin dal I–II sec. d. C.”). A quick alternation of short sections of varying content follows on p. 98–103: Perugians with a career outside the city; nomina in inscriptions not yet in *CIL*; gods mentioned in local inscriptions; equestrian notables from Perugia; soldiers and veterans attested in

Perusia (with the pretty vague reference, p. 100, “di cui si è già detto” to observations 60 pages earlier, on p. 41f., on soldiers attested *outside* Perusia); priests and similar persons; and the society of Perusia between the fourth and the first century BC and after the Perusine war of 41–40 BC (p. 101ff.). A section on the epigraphy of Perusia, with notes on scholars active in this field, follows (p. 103ff.), and this chapter is rounded off by a section on the findspots and the collections of the inscriptions which can be attributed to Perusia.

As for individual inscriptions, some interpretations or commentaries could, and in some cases perhaps should, be modified. I begin with the inscriptions already in *CIL*. 1921: “nonno o zio”: but the normal meaning of *nepos* before late Antiquity is ‘grandson’, not ‘nephew’. 1941: I’m not sure this man should be identified as an adoptee; the additional names could come from his mother’s family. I would date this inscription to the second century (the date suggested by Torelli, the early first century, can surely not be taken seriously). 1942: in the commentary it is said that L. Norb(anus) A. lib. (*CIL* XI 6715, 7; the reading seems more than suspect) could be the freedman of C. Norbanus, consul in 83 BC, but how could someone apparently saying that he is the freedman of a certain Aulus be the freedman of a Gaius? 1952: according to the commentary, the name *Nomicus* is “non registrato nei Repertori” (the rather vague reference to “Repertori” also appears in other commentaries); but this particular name is in fact cited by H. Solin in *Die griechischen Personennamen*² – I think this book could be called a «Repertorio» – on p. 1089f. As for *Postimius*, it is certainly (and not only “forse”) a variant of *Postumius* (cf. e.g. *Septimius* ~ *Septumius*, etc.). 2000: in the Latin quotation “a more Etruscorum abhorreat, non dubito”, *quin* seems to be missing. 2033: “Felicla (= Felicia)”. *Felicla* is in fact a common syncopated form of *Felicula* (the Clauss-Slabby database registers 164 instances), whereas *Felicia* is a different name altogether. 2049: it is not altogether correct to say that there is another attestation of the nomen *Iatrinia* in *AE* 1926, 81, for in this latter inscription *Iatrina* (perhaps corrupt) is the *cognomen* of Clodia Iatrina, the wife of a legate of Galatia. And Schulze (p. 134) does not say that *Iatrinia* would be a “variant” of *Catrinia* or *Latrinia* (not “Latrina”) but that it should perhaps be corrected, these names being possible corrections. 2073: although *Publicius* is sometimes used as the nomen of manumitted public slaves, it was also the nomen of senatorial *gentes*, and A. Publicius Iustus should thus not automatically be seen as a “servo pubblico e poi liberto”. As for Iustus’ wife’s nomen *Citronia*, it is said to be “sconosciuto ai Repertori”, but it is registered in Solin’s and my *Repertorium* p. 56. I would not myself see the name as a variant of *Caetronius*. 7092: *Festius* should be interpreted as *Festivus* (with *V* having been inscribed instead of *VV*; cf. *Iu(v)entius* in 1958). 7108: this inscription begins as follows: *Gaetulicae / have! / D. M / Cn. Postumi / Gaetulici* etc. In the commentary it is said that we have here a “schiava, di nome Getulica” and the boy Gaetulicus (no explanation being given for the use of the genitive or the dative in combination with *have*). To me it seems more than obvious that *Gaetulicae* is an incorrect form of the vocative *Gaetulice* and that the addressed person is the boy himself. I cannot see a significant difference between the palaeography of the first two lines and the rest. 7 (among the new inscriptions, = *AE* 1991, 666): according to the new reading presented here, the *C* n line 4 should stand for *c[onditoribus]*, the result being *Imp. Cae[sari] divi f. Augusto / Perusini [municipes Augustani] / Ti. Claud[io] Ti. f. Neroni / c[onditoribus]*, but to me it does not seem permissible to assume that the name of the *Perusini* could have been placed *between* the names of the two *conditores*. 16: instead of *a[u]ru(s)pex* I suggest reading *aurufex*; the photo seems to permit the reading *FEX* rather than *PEX*.

The commentaries on the individual texts are normally substantial and informative, but sometimes I missed a comment or two. Considering that comments on names are common and that the reader is often directed to H. Solin's and my *Repertorium* for information on a certain name, a practice which seems pretty pointless as we normally just register the existence of a name, it is striking that in the commentary on 2060 (where we are offered information about the nomen *Magius*) there is nothing on the remarkable cognomen *Verona* of the other son. And the editors could have said a word or two about a curious phenomenon in connection with the expression *gnatus*, used to indicate the mother, namely that the mother's name is sometimes, as expected, in the ablative (e.g. 32. 33. 35. 36), but sometimes in what looks like a genitive (e.g. 2084; 23. 25 *Esq[uili]niae gnatus*). This phenomenon might merit further study, possibly combined with a study of indications of someone's *domus*, in which the genitive is often used instead of the ablative (e.g. *domo Brixiae CIL III 14946*). However, that will have to happen in the future. For the time being I wish to repeat my thanks and my congratulations to the editors for the appearance of this book.

Olli Salomies
University of Helsinki

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum VI 8,1. Inscriptiones urbis Romae Latinae. Tituli numeris notati a 39341 ad 39800. Inscriptiones sacrae deorum quorum nomina litt. A-F incipiunt. Edidit SILVIO PANCIERA. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin – Boston 2018. ISBN 978-3-11-062659-9. XXXVII, 155 pp. EUR 159.95.

Silvio Panciera, de studiis epigraphicis Romanis optime meritus, mense Augusto a. 2016 diem supremum obiit. Per multa decennia operam dederat, ut novi supplementi inscriptionum urbis Romae volumine sexto Corporis inscriptionum Berolinensis comprehensarum fundamenta iaceret. Nunc demum eius ultimum opus, supplementi inscriptionum sacrarum urbis Romae libellus primus cura collegarum et discipulorum publici iuris factus est.

Sed iam videamus de conspectu operis. Incipit W. Eck paucis verbis de ratione, quam Panciera cum Academia Berolinensi de hoc supplemento edendo sustinuit; deinde habemus praefationem generalem (quae igitur ad totum novum supplementum pertinet), praefationem huius primi fasciculi vel libelli, compendia operum laudatorum, explicationem diacriticarum q. d. notarum (a H. Krummrey compilatam). In fine praefationis ad praesentem fasciculum pertinentis A. Ferraro, S. Meloni, S. Orlandi brevier de schedis a Panciera retractatis referunt. Sequitur ipsa editio titulorum, quam praecedunt tituli numeris notati a 39341 ad 39800, sed a M. Bang in supplemento suo a. 1933 publici iuris non facti, q. d. *Geisternummern*, arduo labore a Panciera praecipue ex indice nominum a Bang a. 1925 edito congesti (haec pars titulos uniuscuiusque generis complectitur, non solum sacros; omnes Panciera in animo erat posterius loco suo inter titulos eiusdem generis edendos esse). Editio inscriptionum huius libelli, quae continet titulos sacros deorum quorum nomina litt. A-F incipiunt, in duas partes divisa est. Primum praebentur addenda et corrigenda ad titulos in fasciculis prioribus huius voluminis editos, additis notitiis variis, ut de origine inscriptionis, de monumenti descriptione (quae praesertim accurata est, si monumentum adhuc extat), addendis bibliographicis