ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XLI

2007

ARCTOS

VOL. 41

ARCTOS

Acta Philologica Fennica

VOL. XLI

HELSINKI 2007

ARCTOS – ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

Arctos has been published since 1954, annually from vol. 8 (1974). The Editorial Board of *Arctos* welcomes submissions dealing with any aspect of classical antiquity, and the reception of ancient cultures in mediaeval times and beyond. *Arctos* presents research articles and short notes in the fields of Greek and Latin languages, literatures, ancient history, philosophy, religions, archaeology, art, and society. Each volume also contains reviews of recent books. The web site is at *pro.tsv.fi/kfy/arctos*.

Publisher:
Klassillis-filologinen yhdistys – Klassisk-filologiska föreningen (The Classical Association of Finland), c/o Department of Classical Philology, PO BOX 4 (Kluuvikatu 7), FIN-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland.

All correspondence and books for review should be addressed to the Secretary of the Editorial Board at the above address (e-mail: arctos-secretary@helsinki.fi).

Note to Contributors:
Submissions, written in English, French, German, Italian, or Latin, should be sent to the Secretary of the Editorial Board. One printed copy will suffice, but contributors should keep a further copy of anything submitted. Authors are asked to supply a disk together with the paper copy, or to send the text file as an e-mail attachment. Further guidelines can be found at *pro.tsv.fi/kfy/arctos/guide.html*.

Requests for Exchange:
Exchange Centre for Scientific Literature, Mariankatu 5, FIN-00170 Helsinki, Finland.
– e-mail: vaihtokeskus@tsv.fi.

Sale:
Bookstore Tiedekirja, Kirkkokatu 14, FIN-00170 Helsinki, Finland.
– Tel. +3589 635 177, fax +3589 635 017, internet: *www.tsv.fi/tiedekirja*.

ISSN 0570–734–X

Helsinki

Layout by Maija Holappa

INDEX

MANIBUS

PATRICK BRUUN

HISTORIAE

IN ACADEMIA ABOENSI

PROFESSORIS EMERITI

(17. 4. 1920 – 30. 6. 2007)

ROLF WESTMAN

LITTERARUM GRAECARUM ET ROMANARUM
IN ACADEMIA ABOENSI PROFESSORI
OCTOGENARIO
AMICI COLLEGAE DISCIPULI
21. 6. 2007

TOIVO VILJAMAA

LITTERARUM GRAECARUM ET ROMANARUM
IN UNIVERSITATE TURKUENSI PROFESSORI
SEPTUAGENARIO
AMICI COLLEGAE DISCIPULI
4. 7. 2007

Arctos 41 (2007) 9–20

OSTIENSES AND OSTIANS IN THREE INSCRIPTIONS FROM ROME'S PORT[1]

CHRISTER BRUUN

In this paper I discuss three Ostian inscriptions that have caught my attention recently, while I have been engaged in research on the "middle class" of Rome's port, in this case municipal and other freedmen and the *Augustales*. The first inscription presents a previously misunderstood *libertus coloniae*, while a new reading of the second text shows that the successful *decurio* whose achievements it records was after all not called Ostiensis and therefore has no connection to municipal freedmen. The third text, again fragmentary, was erected by a woman for her husband (a *sevir Augustalis*), her daughter, and several freedmen. A new interpretation of the text shows the woman as patron of one of the freedmen. The *gentilicium* of the *Augustalis* is unknown; a suggestion based on onomastic probabilities is presented.

1. The public freedman Euanthes

D. M.
L·Euan·Then
liberto·colo-
niaes·fecit·
coiugi·san-
ctis·si·mo (*CIL* XIV 440)

[1] The current study was carried out as part of a project entitled "The Civic Identity of Roman Ostia", supported by a Standard Research Grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. This support is gratefully acknowledged. I am indebted to my Research Assistant Jaclyn Neel for improving my English, and to Mika Kajava and Heikki Solin for helpful suggestions; remaining errors of language and substance are my own. The two photos were provided by the Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici di Ostia, and I am most grateful to the Soprintendente ad Interim Maria Antonietta Fugazzola for the permission to publish them. Many thanks are due to Paola Germoni, Paola Olivanti, Elvira Angeloni, and Maria Letizia Caldelli, who assisted me in procuring the photographs. Abbreviations: *IPO* = H. Thylander, *Inscriptions du Port d'Ostie*, Lund 1952; *ScO* = *Scavi di Ostia*.

The above Ostian inscription does not seem to have been properly interpreted so far. In the most recent treatment, by Alexander Weiß in his commendable monograph on municipal slaves and freedmen in the Roman world, the text is published precisely as given above, without comment, in the list of municipal freedmen.[2] Thus this particular *coloniae libertus* seems to bear the *gentilicium* Euan(-), which seems odd for a municipal freedman. The usual pattern is that *liberti* of Roman towns adopted a *gentilicium* that was directly derived either from the name of the town (*Aquileiensis*, *Ostiensis*, *Saepinius*) or from the full name of the *colonia*, as is the case with the Venerii in Pompei (*colonia Cornelia Veneria Pompeianorum*). Another solution, quite widespread, was to adopt the family name *Publicius* (from *servus/libertus publicus*).[3]

Euan(-) does not fit this pattern, and in fact a Latin family name beginning with Euan(-) is unknown.[4] In reality, we must be dealing with the Greek cognomen *Euanthes*, which appears in nine inscriptions at Rome.[5] In one of these texts, the name appears in the form *Euantheni* (*CIL* VI 17521), which agrees completely with what we have in the Ostian inscription. We ought therefore to read *D(is) M(anibus) Euanthen(i) liberto coloniaes…*

The fact that the text apparently includes a marker of word division between *Euan* and *then* may have led previous observers astray, but clearly such markers were placed erroneously in the text, as indeed two markers divide the word *sanctissimo* in three parts.

Therefore we are likely dealing with someone called L. Ostiensis Euanthes (the family name *Publicius* cannot be excluded but is much less likely). Indeed, a number of Lucii Ostienses appear in Ostian inscriptions, for instance in *CIL* XIV 1428 and 1432.[6]

---

[2] A. Weiß, Sklave der Stadt. Untersuchungen zur öffentlichen Sklaverei in den Städten des römischen Reiches, Stuttgart 2004, 236. A similar reading was given already by L. Halkin, Les esclaves publics chez les Romains, Bruxelles 1897, 244: L. Euan ... Then ... libertus publicus. The man is listed in the same fashion, under the letter E, in the index of gentilicia in CIL XIV, p. 512.

[3] Weiß (above n. 2), 236–45 for freedmen of Roman towns; for *gentilicia* derived from the names of towns, i.e. probably originating from municipal freedmen, see W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, Göttingen 1904 (repr. Zürich – Hildesheim 1991), 524–28.

[4] H. Solin – O. Salomies, *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum*², Mainz 1994.

[5] H. Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom. Ein Namenbuch* II², Berlin – New York 2003, 1161–62.

[6] On public freedmen in Ostia and Ostienses in general see my "La *familia publica* di Ostia antica", to appear in M. L. Caldelli, G. L. Gregori, S. Orlandi (eds.), *Epigrafia 2006,* Roma 2008.

We now have a much clearer understanding of the inscription, although there seems to be something missing, namely the subject of *fecit*. The rest of the inscription is clearly in the dative, and although the word order is somewhat awkward, with *fecit* among the epithets referring to the deceased, the best solution seems to be to postulate the name of the spouse on a missing line. [7]

2. A decurion but hardly an Ostiensis

Some years ago Alfredo Marinucci presented a rich crop of previously unedited Ostian inscriptions, among them the following epitaph, inscribed on a fragmentary marble plaque intended as the cover of a funerary niche ("lastra di loculo") (see Fig. 1):[8]

[…] Ost. Atia-
[no d(ec.) co]l. Ost. hono-
[rib. f(uncto)] dee (ensori) rei p.
[Laur(entium)] vic. Aug(ustano)
[-]to qui vixit
[---]

Fig. 1. The inscription published by Marinucci (below n. 8), 203 no. 31 = Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici di Ostia, inv. no. 749 (published by permission).

---

[7] A similar structure, in which *fecit* precedes the dedicator and subject of the sentence, is found in, for instance, the following inscriptions: *[---] / classe praetoriae (sic) / Misenensium / militavit ann. XL fecit / coniunx sua* (*CIL* XIV 243); *D. M. M. Ulpi Victoris vixit an. I m. I d. XII fec. Ulpius Apollonius pater* (*CIL* XIV 1791).

[8] A. Marinucci, "Ostia, iscrizioni municipali inedite", *MGR* 13 (1988) 181–216, esp. 203 n. 31. The text is not included in *AE* 1988–2003.

We are clearly dealing with a member of the local elite, someone who had been a decurion, for *Ost. hono-* in l. 2 must refer to decurional status in Ostia.[9] Marinucci rightly pointed out that the man in the inscription also had exercised a function in the neighbouring community called Vicus Augustanus (l. 4 *vic. Aug.*).[10] The rest of the editor's comments concerned l. 3: "*dee* per *def(ensori)*, cioè patrocinatore di un processo civile degli interessi di una comunità. In tal caso il *titulus* appare anteriore alla riforma radicale promossa da Valeriano (sic) I nel 364."[11] Marinucci evidently interpreted the office in the inscription as that of a *defensor civitatis*, an office which underwent considerable changes in the 360's under Valentinian I (not Valerian) and Valens. The two emperors stated in an edict from 364, which concerned the protection of commoners (*ut plebs omnis Inlyrici officiis patronorum contra potentium defendatur iniurias*, *CTh* 1.29.1), that those in charge (here in fact called *patroni*, not *defensores*), should not be chosen from among the decurions but from persons of higher rank.[12] The fact that our man is a local dignitary therefore indeed points to a date before 364, even though he is not called *defensor civitatis* but *defensor rei publicae*. There are less than a handful of other *defensores rei publicae* known from Italy and the West, they are all of merely local distinction, and they seem to be precursors to the later *defensores civitatis*.[13] One *defensor r. p.* is attested in Brixia (Brescia) already during the

---

[9] A more common formula is *omnibus honoribus functus* (*CIL* XIV 294, 335, 354, 359, 4653), which R. Meiggs, *Roman Ostia*, Oxford 1973[2], 179, 513 considered to include local offices up to and including the duovirate. Meiggs 179 is probably right that a mere *honoribus functus* indicates a less illustrious career which did not include the duovirate; the expression occurs in *CIL* XIV 401, with a new case in Marinucci (above n. 8), 191 no. 14 = *AE* 1988, 188. The latter (*ibid*., 192) seems to regard *honoribus functus* as merely an abbreviation of the longer expression, which is doubtful.

[10] For epigraphic references to Vicus Augustanus, see G. Simonazzi Masarich, "Vicus Augustanus Laurentium", *MonAnt* 48 (1973) 287–307, esp. 292–93. Marinucci pointed out that this inscription provides the first instance of the term *res publica* used in relation to the locality.

[11] Marinucci (above n. 8), 203, with reference to G. Mancini, *DizEp* II.2 (1910) 1554–58 s.v. "defensor civitatis". The emperor who reformed the office of *defensor civitatis* was of course Valentinian I.

[12] See Mancini (above n. 11), 1555; O. Seeck, *RE* IV.2 (1901) 2365–71 s.v. "defensor civitatis", esp. 2366; R. M. Frakes, *'Contra potentium iniurias'. The 'defensor civitatis' and later Roman Justice*, München 2001, 87–88. F. Pergami, "Sulla istituzione del *defensor civitatis*", *SDHI* 61 (1995) 413–31, suggested that the date of the edict in *CTh* 1.29 be changed to 368 CE; for our purposes that makes little difference.

[13] See *CIL* IX 2354 (Allifae), V 4559 (Brixia), XI 4389 (Ameria). They are listed by Mancini (above n. 11), 1557–58; while Frakes (above n. 12), 21 takes his data from Seeck. There are also a number of other epigraphically attested *defensores*, who do not add the formula *rei publicae*

second century CE (if not before),[14] and thus one can cannot exclude that our Ostian *defensor* belongs to a period much earlier than the 360s.

Less convincing is Marinucci's reading of the name of this man. As is evident from the photo, there is no word division between the letters on the fragmentary first line; the text simply reads OSTATIA. While it is not unheard of to abbreviate a common *gentilicium*, and Ostiensis/ius must be considered one in this local context, I wonder whether there might not be a more satisfying reading of the name. The name Ost(iensis) Atia[nus] might at first sight seem beyond criticism, but if one focuses on the cognomen Atianus some doubts appear.

There are in fact several reasons for instead suggesting to read the beginning of the preserved text as

[-]o Statia-/[no]

First, there is the question of names. The first publisher read "Atianus", which happens to be a very unusual name. Kajanto in his standard work on Latin cognomina in fact does not register *Atianus* at all, while his investigations turned up *Attianus* 40 times.[15] Both cognomina are derived from *gentilicia*, from *Atius* and *Attius*, respectively. *Atius*, to be sure, is a respectable *gentilicium* (Augustus' mother was an Atia, for instance), but it is not widespread. That both *Atius* and *Atianus* are so rarely seen may also be due to ancient stonecutters who through assimilation wrote the names with two Ts, and to modern scholars who in their indices tacitly include *Atianus* under *Attianus* assuming an orthographic error. Be that as it may, the computer index to *CIL* VI shows no case of *Atian-* among the thousands of inscriptions from Rome, but *Attianus* occurs in a handful of cases.[16] In the indices to *CIL* XIV and XIV Suppl. the cognomen *Atianus* does not appear, nor does *Atius* turn up in Ostia at all (there are however some twenty Atii in *CIL* XIV 2179–80 from the *ager Albanus*).[17] *Statius*, on the contrary, is found about ten times in Ostia.[18]

---

to their titles; they may have had identical tasks. The *defensores civitatis* known from Italy are distinct from the *defensores r. p.*, as they are consistently of higher rank; see the discussion in Frakes (above n. 12), 63–66 and the Appendix on p. 231–33.

14 G. L. Gregori, *Brescia romana. Ricerche di prosopografia storia sociale* II. *Analisi dei documenti* (Vetera 13), Roma 1999, 245, 329 on M. Publicius Sextius Calpurnianus, *defensor rei publicae* in *CIL* V 4559 = *Inscr. It.* X 996.

15 I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki 1965, 141.

16 See *CIL* VI 7.1.

17 There is no Atius, Atianus, or Attianus in *IPO* or in *ScO* III or *ScO* XII. In *NSA* 1953, 289 no. 50 one C. Attius Attianus is recorded.

18 *CIL* XIV 249.2, 895, 1293, 4569 dec. x.19, 4669, 4874, 5125–26; in addition the name

That the stonemason intended to write *Atianus* can obviously not be excluded, but reading the name as *Statianus* is surely much more plausible. Kajanto recorded the latter name 29 times in his survey,[19] and while the name does not appear in *CIL* XIV, one instance is known from the Isola Sacra cemetery (*IPO* A 90: Sentius Statianus[20]). *Statius*, from which it is formed, is not uncommon in Ostia, as we just saw.

Second, considering the composition of the inscription, the reading *[-] Ost. Atia-* on line 1 is unsatisfactory. If we assume that the space reserved for the inscription was fully used on every line, we simply need to be able to include more text on l. 1. In Marinucci's version, all that can possibly come in the gap to the left is, perhaps, *D(is) M(anibus)*, and a one-letter praenomen (Ostienses normally use the praenomina *Gaius*, *Lucius* or *Publius*, but never *Sextus*[21]). On l. 2, in a space of similar length, one needs to find room at least for the end of the cognomen, NO, the abbreviated word COL which plausibly preceeds *Ost.* in Marinucci's reading, and probably something denoting the man's position in the *colonia* – a mere D for *d(ecurio)* is suggested in the first edition.[22] Conceivably that office may be left out, so that *col. Ost.* takes on a locative function instead and goes with *hono[rib. functo]*, but in any case we must count with five letters, and possibly with six or more (*f.* for *functo* is rather minimalistic). This should be compared with the three letters we had in Marinucci's version for l. 1.

Similar problems of space will appear on l. 3, where the tight space of l. 1 demands the abbreviation *hono- / [rib. f(uncto)]*, which is possible, but by no means necessary or particularly convincing.

The fragmentary plaque which contains the inscription does not provide certainty about the original width of the inscribed space. Marinucci's restoration tends to make the space more narrow than it is high; a somewhat wider text would reverse these proportions and make the inscribed area more in line with what one

---

appears as cognomen a few times.

[19] Kajanto (above n. 15), 156.

[20] The inscription has now been republished, see H. Solin, "Zum Akkusativ als Universalkasus im Lateinischen", in J. Härmälä *et al.* (eds.), *L'art de la philologie. Mélanges en l'honneur de Leena Löfstedt*, Helsinki 2007, 251–56, esp. 254–5 with further bibliography.

[21] As stated by O. Salomies, "People in Ostia: Some Onomastic Observations", in C. Bruun – A. Gallina Zevi (eds.), Ostia *e* Portus *nelle loro relazioni con Roma* (Acta IRF 27), Roma 2002, 135–59, esp. 147.

[22] *Decurio* is not superfluous in this context, although one might consider it to be included in *honoribus functo*, as is shown by *CIL* XIV 294: *... equiti Romano decurioni omnibus honoribus functo in colonia Ostiense*; and *ScO* XII, A 28. *... omnibus hono[rib. functo] dec. coloniae Ostie[nsis ...]*.

would expect. There are in fact a few comparanda which have a central inscribed space flanked by reliefs on both sides. In almost every case the text occupies either a square field or one which has larger horizontal dimensions.[23]

An alternative reading of l. 1 is presented below which, in my view, makes better sense onomastically and permits a more sensible text on the following lines. T. Flavius is inserted *exempli gratia*; C. Iulius, for instance, would be another common combination of *praenomen* + *gentilicium* of similar length:

D M T FLAVI]OSTATIA	15 letters
NO DEC CO]LOST HON O	14 + 1 letter in margin
RIB FVNCT]DEE REIP	15
LAVRENT]VIC AVG	13
BENEMERI]TO QVI VIX	16

It is likely, then, that the inscription does not present us with a man bearing the family name *Ostiensis* who was a city councillor in Ostia. This is the issue which triggered my interest in the first place. Our man would have been the first Ostiensis among the decurions in Ostia, but as it turns out, the only man by that name known to have advanced to the local elite remains that enigmatic Ostiensis Macedo, the *pontifex Volkani* who died in 105 CE.[24] He seems to appear from nowhere and – to judge from the currently known inscriptions – does not really leave behind anyone, descendant or freedman, even remotely as successful.[25]

23 To my knowledge, there are relatively few "lastre di chiusura di loculo" of the type under discussion here fully preserved, but N. Agnoli, "Officine ostiensi di scultura funeraria", in C. Bruun – A. Gallina Zevi (eds.), Ostia *e* Portus *nelle loro relazioni con Roma* (Acta IRF 27), Roma 2002, 193–212, esp. 206 fig. 27, shows one in which the epigraphic space forms a square. Moreover, Agnoli (*ibid*., 205) concludes that sarcophagus covers and "lastre di chiusura" were manufactured by the same workshops and that the plaques were heavily influenced by the sarcophagi: "al punto da poter definire la lastra una imitazione vera e propria della fronte di un sarcofago." Therefore, in order to better understand the aesthetics of the "lastre", it becomes relevant to study sarcophagi as well. Almost all the evidence shows that the inscribed space is either square or with wider horizontal dimensions; see, e.g., *IPO* II, A 150, A 247, B 216, B 249; *ScO* XII A28, B 38, B 39, B 42, B 43, B 44 (but the opposite dimensions in B 46).

24 B. Bargagli – C. Grosso, *I Fasti Ostienses documento della storia di Ostia*, Roma 1997, 27, 35.

25 For some thoughts on Macedo's origin see Bruun (above n. 6).

Fig. 2. Funerary inscription published by Marinucci (above n. 8), 194-85 no. 17 = Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici di Ostia, inv. no. 39970 (published by permission).

3. A *sevir Augustalis* freed by Aulus and Gaius

Among the many previously unknown *seviri Augustales* presented by Marinucci in 1988, one appears in the following inscription, a funerary plaque ("lastra funeraria") damaged at the top and on both sides (see Fig. 2):[26]

[-]lib(erta) N[--]
[fe]cit sibi et
[-]lio A. et C. lib. Euchro
[sevir]o Augustali coniugi et
[collib.] suo bene merenti et
[--] Bassillae f. et Secundae lib. et
[--] Stephano Hermetis lib. mei lib.
[et Eutyc]hiae lib. et Speratae lib. et Nomadi lib.

---

[26] Marinucci (above n. 8), 194–5 no. 17 = *AE* 1988, 191. After an empty space, suitable for two or three further lines, two more lines of text follow: *[lib. li]b<e>rtabus posterisque eorum in fr. p. X[-] / in agr. p. XXVs*. This part of the inscription seems irrelevant for the present discussion.

The inscription is incomplete but the content is comparably easy to establish. A freedwoman – *lib.* can be read on l. 1, which contains her name – has erected the funerary inscription for herself and her *coniunx* who is also, as Marinucci plausibly suggests, her *collibertus* (which ties in with *lib.* in l. 1). The missing space to the left can be estimated from l. 4, where clearly *[sevir]* but nothing more needs to be inserted. Therefore it becomes impossible to insert, in l. 5, anything but the six letters in *collib.* – something like, for instance, [name + *filio*] *suo* is not possible – and moreover, if another person were mentioned, one would expect the plural *bene merentib.* to follow.

Other persons are mentioned in ll. 6–8. Marinucci does not make it clear how he thinks these individuals are related, except that he inserts two commas in l. 7 (see next paragraph) which are not likely to be correct.[27] In l. 6 the letter F for *f(ilia)* can be read, which means that the lost text must have contained her *gentilicium*, obviously the same as that born by her father and her mother (who were *colliberti*). The same *gentilicium* applies to the freedwoman Secundae as well, who seems to have been freed by the woman who commissioned the inscription.

Marinucci inserted two commas in l. 7, making the text read *[-] Stephano, Hermetis lib., mei lib.* It seems that he considered three individuals to have been mentioned there: Stephanus, an anonymous freedman of Hermes, and a likewise anonymous freedman of "myself" (i.e. the author or the text). More likely the text in l. 7 begins by giving the *gentilicium* of the freedman Stephanus, and continues by identifying his manumittor and patron, called Hermes.[28] The patron Hermes, in turn, was a freedman of the author of the inscription; she refers to him as *Hermes libertus meus*. Thus the full nomenclature of the deceased in l. 7 is "*[nomen]* Stephanus *Hermetis liberti mei libertus*".[29]

---

27 The text was printed with identical punctuation in *AE* 1988, 191.

28 The use of the manumittor's *cognomen* is not unknown in the nomenclature of freedmen in Ostia; it can be found in some 35 instances in *CIL* XIV: 53, 326–7, 329, 358, 361, 415, 482, 581 (2), 730, 819, 918, 943, 964, 986, 1138, 1242, 1290, 1608, 1641, 1647, 1748, 1804, 1810, 4563,1a–b (6), 4865, 5062, 5165, 5322 (cf. *NSA* 1953, 499 no. 67), 5389 (2); *ScO* III, 155 no. 33; Marinucci (above n. 8), 190 no. 13. Many of these texts belong to the first century CE, but the same formula is often used by *seviri Augustales* (e.g. six times in *CIL* XIV 4563), and in these cases the date seems to be much later.

29 The word order of *libertus meus* is the opposite of what normally occurs in inscriptions, where one finds *praenomen* + *lib.*, as well as *Aug. lib.*, etc. Perhaps, for some reason, the possessive pronoun caused a change of word order. A different interpretation would be to separate *Hermetis lib.* and *mei lib.* and argue that we are dealing with multiple ownership. and that what the author of the text intended to express was "Stephanus *Hermetis libertus et meus libertus*". The connective *et* is often left out in similar contexts, but in order to explain

Finally, in l. 8 it is clear that three individuals are mentioned; in each case the name is followed by the status indicator *lib.*, although no manumittor is referred to.

The *sevir Augustalis* of the inscription is previously unknown, for there is no Euchrus known from Ostia, as Marinucci pointed out. Even if the name Euchrus were known, though, it would be difficult to suggest an identification, as the *gentilicium* of the man is unknown, and *gentilicia* are altogether absent from the preserved text.

If one were to speculate, however, there are two likely possibilities for the *gentilicium*, due to the fact that Euchrus' two patrons are called Aulus and Gaius by *praenomen.* The key here is that the *praenomen Aulus* is rare in most families in Ostia,[30] and although it is found combined with some forty *gentilicia*, it is common in relatively few.[31] If we rely on Marinucci's reading of the family name as *-lius*, with the partially preserved letter being an L, the two *gentilicia Egrilius* and *Manlius* are by far the most probable. If we assume that the second man called Gaius did not bear the same *gentilicium*, which is possible, then *Egrilius* is definitely the most likely name. It is the most common family name in Ostia, and the Egrilii are known to have used one *praenomen* only, *Aulus* (there are also two senatorial Q. Egrilii; see *PIR*² E 46 and 49).

If we assume that both former owners bore the same family name, the occurrence of the *praenomen Gaius* in combination with the same *gentilicium* becomes another necessary condition for an identification. This reduces the

---

mei instead of *meo*, which the grammar of the inscription requires, influence from Greek needs to be postulated, cf. G. Galdi, *Grammatica delle iscrizioni latine dell'impero (provincie orientali). Morfosintassi nominale*, Roma 2004, 316, 409–11 (similar errors appear in *CIL* III 3355, 14306.5, and in half a dozen other cases). All in all, the suggestion above in the text seems to be the simplest.

30 O. Salomies, *Die römischen Vornamen. Studien zur römischen Namengebung*, Helsinki 1987, 158 shows that in Latium (and Etruria), *Aulus* represents 10% of the *praenomina,* while in other regions the percentage is under 5%. The proportion of *Auli* in Latium must partly depend on the many *Auli Egrilii* and *Auli Livii* from Ostia.

31 See Salomies (above n. 21), 141, 147–50 for statistics relating to many of the most common family names in Ostia. From an inventory of the Ostian inscriptions in *CIL* XIV and several of the later publications of substantial collections of Ostian inscriptions, I am aware of *Aulus* being combined with the following *gentilicia* (the list is likely not exhaustive): *Aemilius, Annius, Atilius, Atinius, Avillius, Baebius, Caecilius, Caedicius, Caesennius, Caesius, Considius, Cornelius, Decimius, Decius, Egrilius, Fabius, Fabreinius, Fabricius, Fescennius, Gavius, Genucius, Granius, Herennuleius, Hortensius, Hostilius, Larcius, Livius, Manlius, Metilius, Mucius, Nonius, Ogulnius, Ostiensis, Petronius, Plotius, Pompeius, Rutilius, Sergius, Terentius, Vallius, Vestorius, Vitellius*, or 42 names in total.

gentilicia that can be considered considerably, from some forty who use *Aulus* to less than fifteen who use both *Aulus* and *Gaius*.[32] Among bearers of these *gentilicia*, *Aulus* is particularly common among the Fabii and Manlii of Ostia, as is evident from the statistics compiled by Salomies. Among Fabii with a *praenomen*, 26.9% use *Aulus*, while 10.9% are called *Gaius*. Among the Manlii, the figures are 22.4% and 2.0%.[33] *Manlius* is the better fit if we take into account the traces of the letter L where the stone has been broken off.[34]

When *Egrilius* or *Manlius* is inserted in the spaces where the *gentilicium* is required, the inscription on the whole takes on a rather symmetrical appearance.[35]

MANLIA A?]LIB N[---
FE]CIT SIBI ET
MAN]LIO A ET C LIB EVCHRO
SEVIR]O AVGVSTALI CONIVGI ET
COLLIB] SVO BENEMERENTI ET
MANLIAE] BASSILLAE F ET SECVNDAE LIB ET
MANLIO] STEPHANO HERMETIS LIB MEI LIB
ET EVTYC]HIAE LIB ET SPERATAE LIB ET NOMADI LIB

[32] We are obviously dealing with an *argumentum e silentio*, and the following exploration must be considered tentative. The fact that *Aulus* so far has not been found combined with a certain *gentilicium* at Ostia obviously does not exclude that future discoveries could turn up such cases. In any case, the argument below will focus on common names frequently associated with *Aulus*. *Aulus* and *Gaius* are found combined with the following family names: *Aemilius*, *Annius*, *Baebius*, *Caecilius*, *Caesius*, *Considius*, *Cornelius*, *Fabius*, *Granius*, *Manlius*, *Ostiensis*, *Petronius*, *Plotius*, *Terentius*.

[33] Salomies (above n. 21), 141. Among the bearers of two other common *gentilicia*, which would fit the fragmentary inscription, both names are found as well, but the proportions are the opposite: among the Aemilii, there are 2.6% who are named *Aulus* and 15.8% *Gaius*, among the Cornelii the corresponding numbers are 2.8% and 17.3%.

[34] For what it is worth, several Egrilii and Manlii appear among the roughly four hundred *Augustales* known from Ostia; the author is currently completing a study of this part of the Ostian "Mittelschicht" (see my "The *Augustales* of Ostia", in progress). The complete list of family names which are known to be combined with both *Aulus* and *Gaius* and which appear among the *Augustales* includes all the names in note 32 except *Caesius*. In total some 145 *gentilicia* are encountered among the *Augustales*.

[35] The letter sizes as given by Marinucci are as follows, from lines 2 to 7: ca. 3.3 cm – 3.1 – 2.6 – 2.3 – 2.6 – 2.3. The letters in l. 8 are clearly smaller at 1.9 cm, which means that more text can be accomodated. An alternative would be to assume that no *gentilicium* was mentioned in ll. 6–7.

The restoration proposed here would result in all free individuals possessing the same *gentilicium*. Some of the *cognomina* mentioned in the inscriptions are quite rare, in particular *Bassilla* and *Nomas*, and so a search for other occurrences of the names could in theory be fruitful, if Egrilii, Manlii or bearers of some other suitable name turned up bearing these *cognomina*. Unfortunately this is not the case,[36] and thus the proposed restoration of the family name as *Egrilius* or *Manlius* has to remain hypothetical; a new discovery may bring a solution one day. What ought to be clear, though, is that the woman who was the author of the inscription was the patron (and former owner) of Hermes, who in his turn had freed his slave Stephanus.[37]

University of Toronto

[36] I have searched the indices of *CIL* XIV, *IPO*, *NSA* 1953, *ScO* III and XII and any other Ostian inscription or epigraphic collection known to me. There is a Fulcinia Bassilla in *IPO* A 121, a Valeria L.f. Bassilla in *CIL* XIV 1710 and *IPO* A 265, and a Pompeia Nomas in *CIL* XIV 899 and *IPO* B 54.

[37] She can thus be added to the list of women owning property in Ostia, which is currently being compiled by the present author (for first results I refer to my presentation at the annual convention of the American Philological Association in Chicago on January 5, 2008).

Arctos 41 (2007) 21–29

CITIES AND COURTESANS

MIKA KAJAVA

In an elegant note,[1] Richard Janko has recently suggested that the two "proverbs" in iambic trimetre cited separately by Strabo[2] in his discussion of Corinth might form a couplet:

οὐ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἐς Κόρινθον ἔσθ᾽ ὁ πλοῦς·
Μαλέαν δὲ κάμψας ἐπιλάθου τῶν οἴκαδε.

As the first verse (well known as rendered in Latin by Horace: *non cuivis contingit adire Corinthum*[3]) is, on the authority of Hesychius,[4] attributable to Aristophanes, we would be confronted with a passage from a comic play, labelled by Janko "a wry discussion of the painful choice of routes around the Peloponnese faced by poor and rich travellers alike – either a tedious and risky journey round Malea, or the financially ruinous short cut via Corinth".

Janko may very well be right.[5] Why I tackle this detail is because it brings to mind some other proverbs or similar expressions referring to the oddities and dangers lurking in Greek cities or to anything abnormal observable in them. In

1 CQ 57 (2007) 296–7.

2 Geog. 8,6,20: ἀφ᾽ οὗ καὶ παροιμιάζονται / καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἡ παροιμία φησίν.

3 *Epist*. 1,17,36.

4 Hsch. *o* 1799 = Ar. *fr*. 928 (Kassel – Austin, vol. III,2).

5 He does not exclude that a third "proverb" about Corinth appearing shortly afterwards in Strabo (*geog*. 8,6,23: Κόρινθος ὀφρυάζει τε καὶ κοιλαίνεται) could be from the same play. Note that this verse is also recorded by Erasmus (*adag*. 2,4,42) as are the other two cited by Strabo (*adag*. 1,4,1 [οὐ παντὸς, etc.] and 2,4,46 [Malea]). Of these, the former also appears at the very beginning of Erasmus' *De duplici copia verborum ac rerum commentarii duo* (also in 1,50 and 1,154). Many variants in Latin emerged in the 16th century and later (e.g., *paucis est adire Corinthum*, etc.); the same idea, though expressed in different terms, still survives in many modern languages. – Various Greek epigrams inspired by Corinth have been collected by Βασ. Λαζανάς, Ἀρχαία ἑλληνικὰ ἐπιγράμματα ἐμπνευσμένα ἀπὸ τὴν Κόρινθο καὶ τὴν περιοχή της, Ἀθήνα 1990².

such cases, deviation (in some respect) from the norm and standard is the usual *sine qua non*. There is not much to be related or remembered about average cities and their people. What is likely to become proverbial is bad behaviour, strange habits or anything against the established norms. This generally concerns the jokes told by people of one city (or nation) about those living in another, and this is why many of the Greek verbs derived from toponyms have negative connotations. It is true that many such verbs referred either to the speaking of a dialect or language (δωρίζειν, θρακίζειν, etc.) or to military and political alliances (ἀρκαδίζειν 'take the side of the Arcadians')[6], or described some local habits (like ἐνθετταλίζεσθαι 'to dress in the Thessalian manner'). However, while many verbs of this type were predominantly negative (αἰγυπτιάζειν, κρητίζειν, φοινικίζειν, etc.), there seems to be none that would indicate a favourable view of the people and their habits in any city.[7] Such is human nature.

The city of Corinth is a prime example of a prosperous and luxurious city with a wide range of attractions available to travellers. In addition to products "made in Corinth" (like the top quality vases), the city offered other enticements as well. Corinthian prostitutes were notorious all over the Mediterranean. There was a strong tradition of this sort of activity in Corinth, and indeed the phenomenon might partly go back to the ritual promiscuity at the local sanctuary of Aphrodite Porne. In the course of time, however, the practice would have developed into an expensive prostitution against which Greek travellers might well be warned (as in the "proverb" cited above).[8]

---

6 Μηδίζειν 'to side with the Medes' seems to be the earliest known verb of this type (Hdt. 4,144; Thuc. 3,62, etc.; μηδισμός occurs in the same authors).

7 The evidence has been collected by María Teresa Amado Rodríguez, 'Verbos denominativos derivados de gentilicios y topónimos', *Myrtia* 10 (1995) 67–103. For a number of similar verbs, cf. M. Casevitz, '*Hellenismos*: formation et fonction des verbes en –ΙΖΩ et de leurs dérivés', in S. Said (ed.), ῾ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΜΟΣ. *Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 25–27 octobre 1989* (Travaux du Centre de recherche sur le Proche Orient et la Grèce antiques 11), Leiden 1991, 12 ff. For the well-known case of ποινικάζεν (cf. φοινικίζειν), see G.P. Edwards – R.B. Edwards, 'The Meaning and Etymology of ποινικαστάς', *Kadmos* 16 (1977) 131–140.

8 Such warnings are explicitly reflected in lexicographers' comments on the verse οὐ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς, etc. (see Ar. *fr*. 928 K-A comm., and cf. κορινθιάζεσθαι in Ar. *fr*. 370 K-A 'to practise fornication', and many related terms deriving from the toponym; J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse. Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*, Oxford 1991, 175). Note also that, according to Aulus Gellius (1,8,3–4), the verse οὐ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς, etc. had been explained by Sotion, a Peripatetic of uncertain date, as referring to Lais, a legendary prostitute active in Corinth around the mid-4th century (a homonymous courtesan, the elder Lais, had died some decades earlier; epigrams related to 'Lais': Λαζανάς, *cit*. n. 5, 78 ff.). Those curious about the

Numerous Greek courtesans are mentioned by name (and by nickname), and we even know that considerable lists of them were produced in antiquity. The names included in those of Athenian courtesans amounted to hundreds.[9] Many famous prostitutes permanently or temporarily based in Corinth are also on record: Cyrene, Lais (see n. 8), Leaina, Myrrhine, Sicyone, Sinope, etc., all interesting names, and perhaps interesting persons, too. For various reasons, I shall concentrate on one of them, namely Sinope. Thracian by origin, she was primarily active in Athens where she had come from the island of Aegina bringing with her an establishment of harlots.[10] But since Sinope also appears in reference to Corinth, the impression is that she was one of those expensive courtesans who were frequently on the move, so ensuring her availability to well-to-do clients.

Greek toponyms and geographic names in general were not unusual as personal names in antiquity.[11] However, in the case of Sinope, a double origin for her name might be conceivable: Sinope was an early Paphlagonian colony founded by Miletus in 631 BC (now Sinop at the midpoint on the northern coast of Turkey), thus named, according to ancient tradition, after one of the daughters of the river-god Asopus. A variant of the story (fully developed in Diodorus[12]) goes that Apollo took this Naiad nymph from Boeotia to Paphlagonia where she gave birth to Syrus (whence the Syrians) and where the city of Sinope was named after her.

---

appearance of the "Lais Corinthiaca" may wish to have a look at the imaginary painting by Hans Holbein the Younger from 1526 (Kunstmuseum, Basle). – Regarding the alleged existence of sacred prostitution in Corinth, see now S.L. Budin, in: C.A. Faraone – L.K. McClure (eds.), *Prostitutes & Courtesans in the Ancient World*, Madison (Wisc.) 2006, 84 ff., warning against overinterpretation of the evidence (esp. Pind. *fr*. 122); for a sound evaluation of the sources, see also M. Beard – J. Henderson, 'With this Body I Thee Worship', *Gender & History* 9 (1997) 480 ff. (republished in: M. Wyke [ed.], *Gender and the Body in the Ancient Mediterranean,* Oxford 1998, 56 ff.).

9 Evidence in Ath. 583d-e. A comprehensive "Prosopographia meretricum" is clearly a desideratum (cf. also J. Linderski, *RhMus* 140 [1997] 162 = *Roman Questions* II, Stuttgart 2007, 332).

10 Jacoby, *FGH* 115 F 253 (Theopompus of Chius), from Ath. 595a.

11 See, most recently, H. Solin, 'Mobilità socio-geografica nell'impero romano. Orientali in Occidente. Considerazioni isagogiche', in: *Acta XII congressus internationalis epigraphiae Graecae et Latinae*, Barcelona 2007, 1374.

12 Diod. Sic. 4,72,2, but cf. already Corinna, *PMG* 654, col. 2,39 and 3,21 (on which see B. Gentili – L. Lomiento, 'Corinna, Le Asopidi (PMG 654 col. 3.12–51)', *QUCC* n.s. 68 [2001] 7 ff., republished in A.F. Basson – W.J. Dominik [eds.], *Literature, Art, History: Studies on Classical Antiquity and Tradition in Honour of W.J. Henderson*, Frankfurt am Main 2003, 211 ff.; for Asopus' daughters in general, cf. H. Maehler, *Die Lieder des Bakchylides* 1: *Die Siegeslieder*, Leiden 1997, 145 ff.).

Whatever the model and the exact origin of the courtesan's name, she need not, of course, have had any personal connections with the city of Sinope. But an indirect link between the two emerged later on through the Greek verb σινωπίζειν, explained by late lexicographers as having taken its meaning from the unseemly behaviour of Sinope (Hsch. σινωπίσαι· τοῦτο πεποίηται παρὰ τὴν ἑταίραν Σινώπην. ἐκωμῳδεῖτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τῷ ἀσχημονεῖν). The explanatory phrase given by Hesychius seems to break off, but it may be supplemented on the basis of later sources. In Suda's version, the comment goes as follows: Σινωπίσαι τοῦτο πεποίηται παρὰ τὴν ἑταίραν Σινώπην· ἐκωμῳδεῖτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τῷ κατασχημονῆσαι, καθάπερ Ἄλεξις ἔφη.[13] A further explanation of unknown but clearly late date, preserved in the *Appendix proverbiorum*, claims that Sinope the courtesan came from Sinope (4,72 [*CPG* I p. 451]: Σινωπίσαι· ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀσχημονῆσαι· ἀπὸ ἑταίρας τινὸς ἐκ Σινώπης).

When and by whom the verb deriving from Sinope's name was coined remains unknown, but the testimony of the lexicographers makes it likely that it was adopted, perhaps even first introduced, by the comic writer Alexis (c. 375–270 BC) whose poetry is unfortunately known only from fragments. We know that Alexis "mentions" Sinope in his *Cleobouline*, and it is in fact this mention that seems to date the play to the first half of Alexis' career, before c. 320.[14] This is because of what is otherwise related of Sinope's chronology: she appears together with another courtesan in Demosthenes' speech against Androtion (from 355): "he [A.] distrained upon Sinope and Phanostrate, who were prostitutes certainly, but owed no property-tax".[15] Other mentions (in comedy) of Sinope allow the collocating of her *floruit* to c. 360–330.[16] She may but need not have been dead when Alexis attacked her indecency, and it is probably in such a context that the verb σινωπίζειν was used (in *Cleobouline* or in another play).

---

13 Similarly Phot. *lex.* (the form of the entry "σινωπῆσαι" ms. was emended long ago), cf. also Apost. *paroem.* 15,50: Σινωπίζεις: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀκολασταίνεις· τοῦτο πεποίηται παρὰ τὴν ἑταίραν Σινώπην· ἐκωμῳδεῖτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τῷ κατασχημονῆσαι, καθάπερ Ἄλεξις.

14 W. Geoffrey Arnott, *Alexis: The Fragments. A Commentary*, Cambridge 1996, 293–4, *fr.* 109 (from Ath. 586a: μνημονεύει).

15 Dem. 22,56, transl. J.H. Vince, Loeb ed. 1964.

16 T.B.L. Webster, 'Chronological Notes on Middle Comedy', *CQ* n.s. 2 (1952) 21 (many references to Sinope are collected in Ath. 586a: add Amphis *fr.* 23,3 K-A and Anaxilas *fr.* 22,12 f. K-A; cf. Arnott, *cit.* n. 14, 294).

This verb is the sort of popular expression that would have been easily diffused in Athens and elsewhere. However, as most of the verbs in -ίζω deriving from place names were negatively (and sexually) loaded, one may assume that σινωπίζειν began to be associated not only with prostitution and loose morals in general but also with those prevailing in the city of Sinope in particular. Those not familiar with the origin of the verb might have thought of the city in the first place. Like many similar verbs, σινωπίζειν would have referred to the seemingly flourishing immorality and the rampant vice in Sinope. If this is so, the decent people of Sinope would not have been very pleased to hear the term pronounced. As far as I know, ancient sources do not report anything particularly sensational about Sinope and its people.[17]

At any rate, it seems that the verb σινωπίζειν came to be known early on, perhaps even in the courtesan's lifetime. If still alive, Sinope was evidently not a young lady when the verb was coined, and this point is clearly relevant, as may be inferred from a nickname given to her. Sinope was called *Abydos* "because of being an old hag" (διὰ τὸ γραῦς εἶναι).[18] Why is that? Obviously there is something here that escapes us, however one may assume that (the Hellespontic city of) Abydus was chosen so as to create a contrast to (the city of) Sinope. While the former appears to have been in a state of decay, the latter was prospering in the late 4th century. Moreover, various sources clearly suggest that Abydus was considered an unpleasant place to visit, and indeed a Sodom when compared with a city like Sinope.[19]

---

[17] Diogenes, the famous Cynic, is perhaps the exception that proves the rule. But he was an itinerant *kosmopolites*, based in Athens and elsewhere after having left Sinope in consequence of a problem involving the adulteration of local coinage.

[18] This information goes back to Book VI of the Κωμῳδούμενα by Herodicus of Babylon (second century BC), cited by Ath. 586a and Harp. 273,6–7. The explanation is also reported (without source) by later lexicographers. – Cf. below n. 26 for a possible association between Alcibiades and *Abydos*.

[19] The very ancient city of Abydos in Egypt does not play a role here. One may note, incidentally, that in the absence of distinguishing epithets, deciding between homonymous cities would have been a difficult task. Regarding the case of Abydos, this is nicely shown by a papyrys (*P.Louvre* inv. 7733 v.; second century BC) where a commentary on a cryptic epigram helps to choose between the two homonyms (ὁμωνυμία pap.). The clue is provided by the oysters mentioned in the epigram: ἀδύνατον γὰρ ἐν τῆι Θη[βαΐ]δι ὄστρεια εἶναι (whereas the oysters of the Hellespontic Abydus were well known in antiquity), cf. *Suppl. Hell*. adesp. papyr. no. 984, lines 14–7; D. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams*, Cambridge 1981, no. CLIII (p. 469 ff.). – Note also Ἄβυδον (*sic*; "ἡ οὐδετέρως λέγεται") in the territory of the Peucetii in southern Italy (Steph. *ethn*. s.v. Ἄβυδοι· τρεῖς πόλεις, quoting from earlier sources).

Besides showing an interesting history, the old (Milesian) colony of Abydus enjoyed a most strategic position due to its location (it was here that Xerxes bridged the Hellespont in 480; another famous enterprise was undertaken in 1810 when Lord Byron swam the strait from Abydus to Sestus, thus following in the steps of the mythical lover Leander). But a good location can sometimes be exploited: the local harbour-dues were proverbially vexatious, being sometimes called Ἀβυδηνὸν ἐπιφόρημα, "Abydene dessert".[20] This expression was further taken to refer to the extortion and slandering of foreigners and strangers in general; similarly, a sycophant anywhere could earn the epithet of *Abydokomes* (as early as Aristophanes).[21] However, a further (original?) context from which the expression "Abydene dessert" may have derived was the peculiar "dessert" the Abydenes used to offer after a dinner or a feast: small boisterous children with their nurses were brought in with the consequence that a terrible noise was created, which would have been most annoying to the guests. This explanation is given by Zenobius (second century) after his affirmation that the phrase was used of anything unpleasant (ἐπὶ τῶν ἀηδῶν τάττεται ἡ παροιμία). "Abydene dessert" was clearly an old proverb because, according to the sophist, it had been adopted by Eudoxus (of the Middle Comedy) in his *Hypobolimaios*.[22] One may assume that in comedy, in particular, Ἀβυδηνὸν ἐπιφόρημα was used of those unpleasant situations when someone appeared in the wrong place at the wrong time (cf. Suda s.v. ὅταν ἀκαίρως τινὸς ἐπιφανέντος ἀηδία τις ᾖ).

20 Thus Ath. 641a (from Aristides, a collector of proverbs; cf. Müller, *FHG* IV 326, *fr*. 31; *CPG* I, xii): τέλος τί ἐστι καὶ ἐλλιμένιον. Cf. Suda *s.v.* δεκατευτήριον: τὸ ἐν τῇ Ἀβύδῳ πορθμεῖον. ὡς εὐθὺς τὴν Ἄβυδον (scil. εἰσιόντα) λυμανεῖται καὶ τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ δεκατευτήριον. Note, interestingly, that when Zabergan, leader of the Kutrigur Huns, attacked Abydus in the late 550s, the local customhouse is explicitly reported as having been affected (Agath. *hist*. 178,24–5 Keydell).

21 Abydenes as sycophants: Diog. *paroem*. 1,1; Zenob. *epit*. 1,1; Hsch. *s.v.* – Ἀβυδοκόμης: Ar. *fr*. 755 K-A (cf. J. Taillardat, *Les images d'Aristophane. Études de langue et de style*, Paris 1962, 425); Paus. *Att. s.v.* Ἄβυδος· ἐπὶ συκοφάντου τάττεται ἡ λέξις διὰ τὸ δοκεῖν συκοφάντας εἶναι τοὺς Ἀβυδηνούς· καὶ Ἀβυδοκόμαι οἱ ἐπὶ τῷ συκοφαντεῖν κομῶντες. τίθεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ εἰκαίου καὶ μηδενὸς ἀξίου. κωμῳδοῦνται δὲ <οἱ> Ἀβυδηνοὶ καὶ εἰς ἀκολασίαν (similarly Phot. *lex. s.v.*; in Eusth. *comm. Il.* 357,1–4 [vol. I p. 559], the comment closes as follows: κωμῳδοῦνται δέ, φασί, καὶ εἰς μαλακίαν οἱ τῆς Ἀβύδου).

22 Zenob. epit. 1,1: Αβυδηνὸν ἐπιφόρημα ἐπὶ τῶν ἀηδῶν τάττεται ἡ παροιμία. Μέμνηται δὲ αὐτῆς Εὔδοξος ἐν Ὑποβολιμαίῳ. Φασὶ δὲ ὅτι τοῖς Ἀβυδηνοῖς ἔθος ἦν μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον καὶ τὰς σπονδὰς προσάγειν τοὺς παῖδας μετὰ τῶν τιτθῶν τοῖς εὐωχουμένοις· κεκραγότων δὲ τῶν παίδων καὶ θορύβου γινομένου διὰ τὰς τίτθας, ἀηδίαν εἶναι πολλὴν τοῖς δαιτυμόσιν (this explanation is followed by Erasm. adag. 2,5,23). – Zenobius continues by saying that the proverb was also used of the extortion of strangers, typical of the Abydenes.

Note, finally, that the place name itself, *Abydos*, could stand for excessive foolishness as well as for disordered and reckless speech.[23]

Hosting, like Corinth, a temple dedicated to Aphrodite Porne, Abydus was also widely known for its prostitution.[24] Though the story may be false, it is no wonder, therefore, that Alcibiades was reported in some abusive orations to have sailed to Abydus either to learn new methods of licentiousness from the local women or because he was desperately in love with Medontis, an Abydene courtesan, based on the mere reports of her charms.[25] Considering, moreover, the claims of Alcibiades' exceptional effeminacy, his alleged Abydene adventures might have provoked comments such as: "Have you heard that "Abydus" is now a man?"[26] An elderly prostitute, or an "old hag" like Sinope, might well be imagined as working in such a milieu.

When exactly Sinope had earned the sobriquet *Abydos* is unknown. However, the mention of the nickname in Herodicus' work on the stuff of comedy (see n. 18) as well as the additional information provided by Athenaeus on Sinope in (seven) comic writers (see n. 16), make it very likely that the literary ambience in question was Middle Comedy. The verb σινωπίζειν and the nickname *Abydos* may have been introduced around the same time. What is more, the verb *ἀβυδίζειν, derived from the place name, and with negative connotations, may plausibly have existed in some work unknown to the lexicographers.

---

23 *Anecdota Graeca e codd. mss. bibl. reg. Parisin*. I, ed. L. Bachmann, Lipsiae 1828, 5: Ἄβυδον: φλυαρίαν τὴν πολλήν; Ἄβυδος: ἐπὶ ταραχῇ καὶ εὐχερείᾳ λόγου.

24 Jacoby, *FGH* 84 F 9 (Neanthes of Cyzicus), providing an *aition* for the sanctuary (Ath. 572e).

25 Antiph. *fr*. 67 (Thalheim) and Lys. *fr*. 4 (Thalheim): R.J. Littman, 'The Loves of Alcibiades', *TAPhA* 101 (1970) 264–5. He also points out (p. 264) that Alcibiades and Abydus may have been connected in Aristophanes' *Triphales* (aimed at Alcibiades), which mentions Abydus as a place to sell young boys (Ar. *fr*. 556 K-A). This information comes in the same passage in Athenaeus (525b) where Antiphon's attack is cited.

26 From a passage in the *Soldiers* by Hermippus of Old Comedy (Herm. *fr.* 57 K-A, lines 6–7: ᾔσθου τὸν Ἄβυδον ὡς / ἀνὴρ γεγένηται; preserved in Ath. 525a). On this interpretation (already suggested by Bergk and Kaibel), τὸν Ἄβυδον would be an allusion to Alcibiades (cf. Sinope = *Abydos*); reserves are expressed by D. Harvey in: D. Harvey – J. Wilkins (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes. Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*, London 2000, 280 ff.; cf. also M.L. Gambato, in: *Ateneo, I deipnosofisti*, vol. III, Roma 2001, 1306 n. 2.

High duties and inhospitality, worldly pleasures and costly courtesans, all elements that would have made Abydus a risky place for an imprudent traveller. The meaning of the exclamatory phrase ἔρρε εἰς ὄλεθρόν τε καὶ Ἄβυδον in Lysias' second speech against Alcibiades (*fr*. 5a Thalheim) would have been clear to anyone listening to the orator.[27] Visiting Abydus meant running a risk, and so it was definitely a place to be avoided, but if you went there rashly and heedlessly, it was all your own responsibility. This is the sense of the proverb μὴ εἰκῇ τὴν Ἄβυδον,[28] which was generally used of those taking unnecessary risks[29] as well as of any hasty and worthless actions.[30]

If travelling to Abydus was considered a risk, the city was very much like Corinth. Indeed the proverb μὴ εἰκῇ τὴν Ἄβυδον recalls the (Aristophanean?) verse introduced at the beginning of this article (οὐ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἐς Κόρινθον ἐσθ᾽ ὁ πλοῦς). Though, unfortunately, the extant sources do not provide any clue as to the origin of the Abydus expression, one may not be wrong in assuming that the idea, if not a similar phrasing, goes back to Middle Comedy or even earlier. It is worth noting that a passable metric sequence might be produced with the spelling μηδ᾽ (instead of μὴ): μηδ᾽ εἰκῇ τὴν Ἄβυδον. If so, we would probably be dealing not with what was originally an autonomous proverb but with a citation from a composition in metre. It may not be a coincidence, then, that the style μηδ᾽ εἰκῇ τὴν Ἄβυδον is precisely the one given by both Stephanus (*ethn*. 10,3) and Eustathius (*comm. Dion*. 513,34). These learned scholars may have quoted (word for word?) from some metric piece.[31]

---

27 Cf. *Lex. Patm*. 153 (Latte, *LGM* p. 163): ἔρρε ἀντὶ τοῦ φθάρητι, ὡς Λυσίας, etc.

28 Scil. πατεῖν Steph. *ethn*., Eustath. *comm. Dion*.; παραπλεῖν Diog. *paroem*., Apost. *paroem*., Suda *s.v*. εἰκῇ; διαφοιτᾶν Suda *ibid*.

29 Cf. Suda *s.v*. λέγεται δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν διακινδυνευόντων.

30 Paus. *Att*. *s.v*. Ἄβυδος·... ᾗ ἐχρῶντο ἐπὶ τῶν εἰκαίων καὶ οὐδαμινῶν.

31 To be precise, however, both scholars have "μηδ᾽ εἰκῇ τὴν Ἄβυδον πατεῖν". But the verb may be simply an additional explanation (cf. above n. 28), unless this is shorthand for a verse (or for an interlinear sequence), something having been omitted before the final πατεῖν (or a suitable form of the same verb). It is obviously useless to dwell on this point, however, though giving some trouble, a mix of anapaest and iamb could perhaps be considered, e.g., μηδ᾽ εἰκῇ τὴν Ἄβυδον ἐπιχείρει πατεῖν / μηδ᾽ εἰκῇ τὴν Ἄβυδον συμφέρει πατεῖν. The verse, if such, or a variation, may not have survived in Byzantine poetry; at least it is not registered among the *initia* (cf. Io. Vassis, *Initia carminum Byzantinorum* [Suppl. Byz. 8], 2005).

The similarity between the two phrases was duly observed by Erasmus in his remarkable collection of *Adagia* (1,7,93: "*non dissimile sit illi*").[32] However, the proverbs were and remained autonomous, and if Corinth and Abydus had been coupled together in some *collectanea proverbiorum* earlier than the 16th century, the sharp-eyed humanist would probably have noticed it. But an amalgamation of the two arrived later on, perhaps based on Erasmus' observation or derived from later scholarship. Without having looked at the sources in any detail, I find that Jacob Masen, a learned Jesuit, poet and historian, registered in his *Palaestra Styli Romani* (Cologne 1659) the following proverb:

"ne temere Abydum *vel* Corinthum : *ubi corrupti mores*".[33]

University of Helsinki

[32] For the appearance of new comments on the Abydus phrase in the editions subsequent to the Paris ed. pr. of 1500, see R.A.B. Mynors, *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 32: *Adages I vi 1 to I x 100*, Toronto 1989, 328.

[33] J. Masen, *Palaestra Styli Romani, Quae Artem & praesidia Latinè ornatèque quovis styli genere scribendi complectitur, Cum Brevi Graecarum & Romanarum antiquitatum compendio, Et Praceptis Ad Dialogos, Epistolas, & Historias scribendas legendasque necessariis*, Coloniae Agrippinae 1659, p. 403 (under the subtitle 'discrimen'). The version "*ne temere Abydum naviges*" in Iosephus Albertatius, *Epitome adagiorum ex Graecis Latinisque scriptoribus*, Romae 1574, 860, may draw on Apost. *paroem*. 11,52 and Suda *s.v.* εἰκῇ: in both cases the explanatory verb is παραπλεῖν. But Albertatius would have known Erasmus' collection as well. The "sailing" phrase also occurs in Johann Hilner's *Gnomologicum Graecolatinum*, Lipsiae 1606 (cited by H. Walther, *Lateinische Sprichwörter und Sentenzen* [Carmina med. aev. post. Lat. II/8], Göttingen 1983, 551), obviously taken from earlier collections. Since, in contrast to the Horatian "*non cuivis homini*", there seems to be no trace of "*ne temere Abydum*" in what is known about mediaeval Latin proverbs, the phrase will have been first translated from the Greek at a relatively late date, perhaps by Erasmus himself.

Arctos 41 (2007) 31–49

THE POMPEIAN WALL INSCRIPTIONS AND THE LATIN LANGUAGE: A CRITICAL REAPPRAISAL[1]

PETER KRUSCHWITZ & HILLA HALLA-AHO

Introduction

Publications on the language of the Latin wall inscriptions (especially, but not exclusively) from the Vesuvian settlements of Pompeii, Herculaneum, Stabiae, and Oplontis have traditionally been restricted in their focus to a relatively small range of subjects. There has been considerable interest in aspects of historical phonology and morphology,[2] in the so-called vulgar Latin (not always distinct from the previous aspect),[3] and – of course – in the abundant attestations of abusive, obscene insults and the sexual vocabulary in general.[4] Moreover, there is a certain amount of research on the question of whether the Latin of the Pompeian wall inscriptions might reveal features of a regional variety of Latin, a Latin that somehow is influenced by the Oscan language originally spoken in this region.[5]

---

1 Earlier versions and parts of this paper were presented by us in Pisa in April 2007, and by P. K. at the ICS Latin Seminar Series in London in March 2007 and the International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy in Oxford in September 2007. We are extremely grateful to our audiences for their very helpful and inspiring comments and contributions. Last but not least, we would like to thank Laura Cox (Reading) for correcting our English.

2 The most influential and important publication on this matter still is Väänänen, Le latin vulgaire[3] (cf. also Väänänen, Introduction[3]). In addition one could also mention e. g. Lazzeroni, Composti nominali (on the formation of compound nouns), cf. also Lindner, Lateinische Komposita and Sblendorio Cugusi, L'uso stilistico). Baldi, Foundations[2] 235 ff. offers a sample of graffiti in order to provide inscriptional evidence for colloquialisms and "popular speech of the time" (236).

3 See inter al. Pulgram, *Italic, Latin, Italian*, Herman, *Du Latin*, and Iliescu – Slusanski, *Du Latin*.

4 In addition to the magisterial study of Adams, *Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, see e. g. Opelt, *Schimpfwörter*.

5 See e. g. Eska, *Oscan Substratum*, Cooley, *Survival of Oscan*, and most recently Adams, *Bilingualism* 145 ff.

Only very rarely, however, are there also studies on phenomena on or above the sentence level.[6]

Given the fact that there are some 10,000 wall inscriptions known from these places, and these offer text types that are only sparingly (if at all) attested elsewhere, the number of aspects covered by scholarly research appears to be surprisingly low and leave a lot to be desired (even if not all the texts may be of much use for linguistic research). We intend to cover a whole range of matters regarding the language of the Pompeian wall inscriptions in a book in a few years' time. Before this, however, some more general issues need to be identified and discussed, and some particularly prevailing (pre-)conceptions in this field need to be challenged. The aim of this paper, then, is to present some more general considerations concerning the peculiar nature of the textual corpus, to provide a firm basis and sound methodology for future linguistic research on the Pompeian wall inscriptions, and to show in what directions this future research may develop.

The Corpus of Texts: Some Basic Considerations[7]

This paper must start with a restriction: this is not a study of *Roman* wall inscriptions, it is a study of *Pompeian* wall inscriptions – and in fact only deals with the Latin wall inscriptions from Pompeii. While the first aspect – Latin – will be the subject of most of this paper later on, it is essential to make some remarks regarding the other implications first.

We shall begin with the aspect 'wall inscriptions'. Epigraphic methodology underwent considerable changes over the last decades, as can be seen clearly from the appearance of the volumes of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. What had started as a meagre collection of texts transmitted on material other than papyrus, parchment, and the like, is now a huge, multi-purpose edition and commentary of monuments that are inscribed. This is a considerable shift, as the focus has now widened. It is no longer narrowed down to the text itself, but takes into account the micro-context and macro-context as well, knowing that only such a broad approach to the material will result in a proper appreciation and understanding

6 But see e. g. Magni, *L'ordine delle parole*.

7 This section headline is deliberately replicating the subtitle of the very sound and useful article by Hernández Pérez, *Inscripciones parietales latinas*, which (as published in a somewhat remote place) unfortunately does not receive the attention it really deserves; the scope of this section, however, is somewhat different from his article.

of an inscriptional text as part of a monument and as part of an dedicatory act, according to standards of design of urban space, and so on.

When it comes to Pompeian inscriptions, however, one will still come across popular and non-popular work entitled "Decius war hier. Das Beste aus der römischen Graffiti-Szene" or "Erotica Pompeiana", to mention only two of the more recent and noteworthy publications in this field;[8] and without meaning to offend the authors of these very useful collections, one must admit that the Pompeian wall inscriptions are still usually dealt with in a surprisingly out-of-context manner. In a series of articles Peter Kruschwitz recently has argued that it is about time for a general shift in attitude towards these texts.[9] Moreover, one also ought to ask whether it is actually possible to define such a thing as an epigraphic habit of writing on the wall in general (whether restricted to Pompeii or not).[10]

A change in attitude, however, is not only needed in general terms, but also in linguistic approaches to the material.[11] It may seem to be a mere trifle, yet it cannot be overemphasised: linguistic research on the Latin language is always and exclusively research on a corpus of texts and verbal effusions that are

- limited in their number and therefore definite (without any chance of an indefinite increment),
- subject to various forms of transmission from antiquity to our times, and
- written (and whence a priori not manifestations of oral communication).[12]

---

8 Cf. Weeber, *Decius war hier* and Varone, *Erotica Pompeiana*.

9 See Kruschwitz, *Dossier*, Kruschwitz, *Edition*, and Kruschwitz, *Bedeutung*, cf. also Kruschwitz, *Romanes eunt domus* [forthcoming]

10 As there are virtually no sources which could be considered and evaluated in this matter, one might be tempted to jump to conclusions from the fact that such an enormous amount of inscriptions existed and that writing on walls (even in form of *graffiti*) might not have been seen as an act of vandalism, but was socially accepted. One will not find a general answer, as there is a considerable range of text types appearing in the form of wall inscriptions, and in some cases it in fact may be true that these were not seen as a form of vandalism. On the other hand, to draw a parallel with modern practice, it would be wrong to assume that *graffiti* these days are commonly accepted, because a pub owner might write part of his offers on the walls of his venue. What remains is the necessity to assess every instance carefully and without preconceptions and generalisations, which may lead to incorrect wholesale assumptions.

11 Aspects of the communicative potential and perspective of these texts have been addressed earlier by Kruschwitz, *Dossier* 30–34.

12 To be sure, even when texts are overtly *mimicking* a certain 'orality', they still are *written* texts.

These aspects – as well as the fact that most of the texts (the non-literary ones in particular) were designed for a certain purpose in a certain context – must be considered, if one intends to carry out research on wall inscriptions worthy of the name; and in some cases that will mean that quite a lot extra-textual information surrounding the actual text will have to be included in the considerations (the most obvious information being the actual nature of the inscription: is it a *graffito* or a *dipinto*?).

The remaining aspect – *Pompeian* wall inscriptions – will lead immediately to the first decidedly linguistic topic of this paper, because it is a crucial, yet commonly neglected problem that when dealing with the language of the Pompeian wall inscriptions, there is no such thing as 'the language of the Pompeian wall inscriptions' – unless one is looking for a rather heterogeneous collection of observations. The diversity of the material becomes evident already when considering the range of different types of texts written on the walls. But even when focusing on only just one text type, one will have to take into account that 'the Pompeian wall inscriptions' are the result of what a heterogeneous, yet specific, distinct, unique group such as the *Pompeian* people (and their visitors) felt they should write. It follows that the quality and amount of writings on the walls in Pompeii is closely related to the special character of the city. Already in a nearby place such as Herculaneum things were considerably different due to differences in the town's history and social composition and the number of non-residents (tourists, etc.) passing through.[13] For this very reason, however, it seems to make good sense to restrict the focus of this study to one place only – and this will be Pompeii.

Who Were the Writers? Sociolinguistics, Linguistic Varieties of Latin, and the Language of the Pompeian Wall Inscriptions

Our preconceptions about the language(s) of the *graffiti* are intimately related to our preconceptions about the people who wrote them. The forwarding of unevidenced impressions about 'the' social status of the writers of Pompeian wall inscriptions has a remarkable history in Classical scholarship. Sometimes it is simply a repetition of what was found elsewhere, but in quite a few cases it is actually the premise and conclusion of linguistic research on the wall inscriptions

13 Solin, *Die herkulanensischen Wandinschriften* 97–99. According to Solin, those graffiti which are comparable to Pompeian ones were most probably written by visitors in Herculaneum, and the written output of the actual population of Herculaneum was small and uninteresting.

as well. The following citation (from Rex E. Wallace's *Introduction to Wall Inscriptions from Pompeii and Herculaneum*) summarises well this common conception:[14]

> [1] "The Latin of the wall inscriptions from Pompeii and Herculaneum is distinct from the Latin of Roman authors such as Cicero, Caesar, Horace, and Vergil in important respects. Whereas the Latin of those authors reflects a tradition of carefully crafted composition, based on Latin as it was spoken by educated (and therefore in large part) aristocratic Romans, the language of wall inscriptions, particularly the graffiti, reflects the Latin of less educated social orders (working classes, slaves, freedmen, etc.) as it was used during the first century A. D. This variety of Latin is generally known as 'Vulgar' Latin, a label derived from the Latin adjective *vulgaris, -e* meaning 'of the common people'."

One might raise many objections to this statement.[15] It is decidedly wrong regarding the nature of literary Latin. Literary Latin certainly was not directly based on the way the upper classes spoke – it had a life of its own, with traditions and innovations rooted in the written, literary level of the language. Naturally literary Latin affected the speech habits of those who learnt to master it (typically upper class), but it was nobody's vernacular; no literary language is. Moreover, literary Latin is not the same everywhere – not even inside textual corpora as loosely defined as 'prose' or 'poetry' –, and of course it is not even necessarily aristocratic Latin: Plautus and Terence are only the more obvious examples for that, popular authors who were neither members of the aristocracy themselves nor exclusively interested in appealing to the members of the aristocracy in particular (even if, like Terence, they did).

But what concerns us here is the overall picture given of the language of the wall inscriptions. One aspect that requires special attention is the ubiquitous implication that 'the' Pompeian wall inscriptions reflect the Latin of less educated social orders. Is there any evidence at all for this hypothesis, especially when stated in this very generalised way? At any rate, it would have to be proved by those who wish to maintain this claim.

Those people who wrote on the walls may have been less educated than those orders of the society where the literary figures usually came from – although one may find it very hard to rule out the mere possibility that even Cicero wrote

14 Wallace, *Introduction* xxiv; Tanzer, *Common People* has the notion of 'the common people' writing such texts even turned into the title of her study of the *graffiti*. The list could easily be expanded, but this shall suffice to prove the point.

15 See also Kruschwitz, *Romanes eunt domus* [forthcoming].

on a wall.[16] No matter, the fact that people wrote on a wall, and that they wrote at all, reveals that they quite obviously must have learned how to write, quite possibly had gone to school, and also, for all we know, read literary texts as part of their schooling – a fact evident to everyone, but usually forgotten, especially when it comes to the evaluation of the language. Taking into account the fact that in ancient times and also in Pompeii literate skills were the property of a more restricted class of people than in modern western societies, this consideration already removes the average *graffito* writer from the illiterate *uulgus*[17] whose speaking habits the *graffiti* usually are thought to reflect.[18]

On the other hand, the sheer amount of inscriptions, the variety of topics, as well as the large amount of deviations from standard spellings may also indicate that literacy was rather wide-spread.[19] Or to put it in another way: the level of literacy we assume for Pompeii in the first century A. D. is relevant when we try to say something about the writers of wall inscriptions – if we think that the lowest classes produced them, then we are also assuming a considerably high literacy rate. But, in any case, it is the wide range of topics and text types and the amount of *graffiti* in the first place that should lead us to this conclusion, not the obscene content of many of the texts.

The traditional approach, as it is formulated by Wallace, implies that there is one variety of Latin (a system which consistently differs from other varieties) and that all the wall inscriptions testify to this same variety – and consequently, that the persons writing there were also a more or less homogeneous group. However, merely the fact that somebody wrote something on the wall does not tell us anything essential about this person. For the most part, we simply do not know who these people were, whether they were working class, freedmen, slaves – or not. Two more general questions ought to be asked:

- Are uneducated people more likely to write on walls than educated ones?
- Does a misspelling *necessarily* hint towards a (substandard) phonological feature?

---

[16] And once again considering modern parallels might be helpful: restrooms of institutions of higher education only very rarely look considerably different from those of pubs. Why should there have been such a distinction in antiquity then?

[17] If one ought to rely upon such an arrogant conception at all.

[18] Cf. Coleman, *Poetic Diction* 25: "Even the most vulgar Pompeian graffiti were after all written by literates and subject to conventional literary pressures" – even if not exactly 'literary' pressures, at least 'standard written', one might note.

[19] One should also take into account the picture of education in Pompeii as created, for example, in the very useful study of Gigante, *Civiltà*.

The first question is particularly important, and one may doubt that without empirical data there can be a conclusive answer for any given period of time and / or any place in the world. However, there are ways to approach this problem, and here a proper distinction between the *dipinti* and the *graffiti* is essential, and we would like to concentrate on the *graffiti* here. So: what do we know about writers of *graffiti*? If one believes in certain human constants throughout the ages (like 'we all walk upright, from a certain age onwards'), it seems justified to say that even in antiquity it will have been the *young* rather than the *old* who wrote obscenities and witticisms on the wall (never mind the education of either group), and it was more likely to happen in urban centres than in the countryside (maybe due to some sort of a social control mechanism and population density).[20]

That means: in case of the *graffiti*, there still will be a sociolect (*Gruppensprache*) to be found, however the social group is not to be determined by their level of education, but by their age in the first place. This immediately poses the question whether then it is not only a *Gruppensprache*, but also a *Sondersprache*, i. e. a variety of the language used by a certain (peer) group to distinguish themselves from other groups of a community / society – a feature that is very common in all kinds of youth languages or slangs (*Jugendsprachen*) nowadays.[21] Just one example: it is a tradition throughout the ages to state that one has been … somewhere. A Pompeian example can be seen in this inscription:[22]

[2] *Aufidius hic fuit. Va(le).*

An equivalent English *graffito* of this type could read:

[3a] *Kilroy was here.*

Very often, however, one would find it in a different spelling:

[3b] *Kilroy woz 'ere.*

---

20 For more general and modern graffiti-research see Reisner, *Two Thousand Years of Wall Writing*, Abel – Buckley, *Handwriting on the Wall*, Kreuzer, *Graffiti-Lexikon*, Bosmans – Thiel, *Guide*, Bauer, *Toiletten-Graffiti*, and Beck, *Graffiti*.

21 This would in fact make the whole issue even more interesting. In general nowadays features of slangs do not have a particularly long lifespan, but often appealing elements can be found in common language of later generations – i. e. youth language, a language variety, can in a good deal of cases be seen as the origin of a language change; it often is adopted into common language. (For references see Neuland, *Jugendsprache*.) Would it be too radical to assume that also 'youth language' in antiquity might have been the source of certain language changes?

22 *CIL* IV 6702.

One cannot deny that this is a phonetic spelling – and if in three hundred years' time there is a shift from *was* to *woz* and from *here* to *'ere* in the orthography of the standard language, our colleagues in two thousand years in the future will be happy to find an inscribed predecessor somewhere. For the historical linguist that will be enough. For us it is not, because the reason for the spelling (which by no means is accidental and result of missing knowledge) can be determined: in English the phonetic *woz 'ere* does not indicate unawareness of the correct spelling, but first of all it is an intended display of 'coolness'. Can we exclude similar phenomena for Pompeii – where forms like *ic* are well attested[23] – to stay in keeping with the examples mentioned above?[24] The difference is essential, however, if one wishes to say something about the level of education of the writer, and the question might have to be addressed individually in every single case where there is something that deviates from what is supposed to be the norm.

On vulgar Latin and other things vulgar

These considerations suggest to challenge another highly popular term dominant in this field: vulgar Latin. The term vulgar, in the context of Latin studies, potentially has three meanings: it can mean a linguistically vulgar phenomenon (spelling / form / construction), a vulgar (i. e. obscene) content, or a vulgar person (i. e. an ignorant member of the lowest social orders). There certainly are people that one would sometimes be tempted to call vulgar, and there are things, words and even word forms which, when said aloud, written down, or used in the wrong situation, strike us as vulgar. But these have nothing to do with what is meant by vulgar Latin. In Pompeii all these three meanings seem to form a delightful mess:

- first, the suspicious act of writing on walls, done by the vulgar *vulgus*
- second, the vulgar, i. e. obscene, content of many of the wall inscriptions,
- and finally, vulgar Latin as a sort of a technical term in the study of variation and change in Latin

This multiple meaning of the term 'vulgar' is behind statements like these:

[4] "We can see a similar phenomenon in a (doubly!) vulgar graffito from Pompeii" (Mackay, *Expressions* 233 on [6], below)

23 Cf. Väänänen, *Latin vulgaire*^{3} 58.

24 We are not alleging that this is true for the case of *ic*.

This supposedly means that both the content is obscene and that there is a construction not known to us from literary sources.

[5] "The writer who uses a 'vulgar' spelling need not himself be 'vulgar'" (Adams, *British Latin* 24)

This then can be taken to mean that the fact that somebody uses a phonetic spelling does not necessarily mean that he belonged to the lowest social stratum.

We are neither the first nor the last scholars to criticise the term vulgar Latin,[25] and one might ask what Väänänen's study and the other numerous studies addressing the problem of vulgar Latin are about if there is no such thing as vulgar Latin – as we argue here – and if the average *graffito*-writer was not the vulgar and ignorant semiliterate person he was once thought to be? Instead of attempting to define what vulgar Latin is, we approach the problem by asking exactly what the study on vulgar Latin is concerned with. For it appears that vulgar Latin is a term used to describe scattered bits of what more accurately should be called "variation and change in Latin".

The efforts in finding a new definition for vulgar Latin are usually the result of discontent with the traditional definition "spoken language of the illiterate *uulgus*", which usually is accompanied by the obvious observation that, strictly speaking, there cannot be such thing as a vulgar Latin text. By Kiesler, for example, the term is defined as follows: "Wir schliessen uns demgegenüber der weiten Auffassung an und betrachten das Vulgärlatein als zu allen Zeiten der Latinität existierende, diastratisch und diatopisch variable Umgangssprache aller Mitglieder der lateinischen Sprachgemeinschaft."[26] He adopts more or less the view which has been presented by J. Herman and V. Väänänen.[27]

This broad definition thus comprises social and regional variation, all through the history of Latin, emerging mainly in the spoken language. What does

[25] See e. g. Adams, *The Language of the Vindolanda Writing-Tablets* 131–132.

[26] Kiesler, *Einführung* 13.

[27] Cf. the following definitions of Herman and Väänänen: "Taking all these considerations into account, in this book the term "Vulgar Latin" (henceforth regularly used without these inverted commas) is used to refer to the set of all those innovations and trends that turned up in the usage, particularly but not exclusively spoken, of the Latin-speaking population who were little or not at all influenced by school education and by literary models" (Herman, *Vulgar Latin* 7). "Le latin vulgaire au contraire, tel que nous le concevons, comprend les états successifs depuis la fixation du latin commun, à l'issue de la période archaïque, jusqu'à la veille des premiéres consignations par écrit de textes en langue romane; it n'exclut ni les variations sociales, ni même régionales" (Väänänen, *Introduction*^{3} 6). See Kiesler, *Einführung* 8–14 for a useful summary of the different definitions and opinions regarding this problematic term.

this mean then? Is this not what the study of language variation and change is all about? We claim that vulgar Latin, as defined above, is used as an noun standing for "variation and change in Latin". This is why there is no meaningful definition of the term; after all, we do not try to capture the whole picture of variation and change in modern languages by calling it vulgar German, English, or Finnish.[28]

The changes in the spoken language take place, as always, behind the written form of the language, which is conservative by its very nature. The texts have a varying relationship to spoken language. However, within one language the different forms, both written and spoken, still form a continuum, and there is no justification in positing in Latin a situation with two macro-registers, as it were, 'literary Latin' and 'vulgar Latin'. The whole scope of variation was, even in Latin, much more complex than this. Insisting on these concepts will lead to an incorrect interpretation of the texts we have.

Väänänen in his classic study on the language of the Pompeian wall inscriptions was one of the first researchers to combine genuine Latin evidence with the later Romance development. We do not have many attestations this early of those tendencies that were taking place in the language, which is why the Pompeian inscriptions are so important for the historical linguist. Even if the wall inscriptions do not testify to one linguistic stratum, they do tell us much about linguistic variation and change. A person can be literate on many levels, and literacy below the social élite of course existed (this élite naturally formed only a small minority of the society), showing its own forms of writing, and containing much variation within the group. Furthermore, to connect this to a point made earlier in this paper: even if a text tells us something about language variation and change (such as giving a phonetic spelling, or using a syntactic construction avoided in literary texts), it does not follow that the writer of the text is an uneducated person representing the lowest strata of Roman society.

Historical linguistics, especially phonology, is that aspect of the language of the Pompeian wall inscriptions which has, by far, received the most attention by philologists and linguists so far.[29] After going through all the aforementioned issues, however, it should by now be clear that this is another field which finally deserves reconsideration in terms of the methodological problems addressed above.

[28] For a more thorough discussion on this topic, see Halla-aho, *The Non-literary Latin Letters* [forthcoming], ch. 2.

[29] From the high number of publications on this issue it shall suffice to mention the magisterial studies by Veikko Väänänen (*Latin vulgaire*[3]; *Introduction*[3]). But see also the bibliography gathered above in n. 2 and 3.

What do phonetic spellings tell us about language variation and change?[30] The answer depends to a great degree on the phenomenon in question. In some cases the wall inscriptions only attest in overwhelming abundance, in writing, to a feature that undoubtedly was common in all spoken Latin of the period, such as the weakness or dropping of the final /m/, or the monophthongisation of /ae/ – changes that had already happened in the phonological system, but were not attested in literary texts (undergoing a manuscript tradition).[31] In others, it is more a question of variation according to the speaker and the situation – and, of course, in yet others the *graffiti* may testify to a feature that was a clear social marker, something which the upper classes would have tried to avoid in their speech.

It is also important to keep the different levels of language separate. Even if a *graffito* contains a phonetic spelling, this does not mean that every linguistic feature in it is a spontaneous reflection of spoken language.[32]

Also sometimes the spread of a substandard phenomenon attested in a *graffito* will be something other than what the context (here: a Pompeian brothel) would at first suggest. To give an example of an interesting case of linguistic (syntactic) variation from Pompeii, consider the following *graffito*:[33]

[6] *Hic ego cum uenì, futuì | deìnde redeì domì.*

When I came here, I had sex, then I went back home.

The locative *domi* is used here to express goal of motion, in place of *domum*. This text (with parallels from inscriptions and other non-literary texts) has been discussed in some detail by Mackay.[34] He explains it as a matter of variation in case syntax and cites examples from various documents from different parts of the empire, thus showing that the phenomenon was in all probability common to substandard (and spoken) Latin throughout the Empire.

On the other hand, Adams – in his discussion of a similar case from Vindolanda[35] – connects this phenomenon to "the tendency in substandard Latin

30 This implies that there are a lot of meaningful 'mistakes' and variants to be found (see e. g. Solin, *Entstehung und Psychologie* on this matter). But how to determine these and to separate them from merely 'accidental' errors which also will have occurred?

31 See also Adams, *The Language of the Vindolanda Writing-Tablets* 87–88.

32 For more on this point, see Halla-aho, *Linguistic Varieties* [forthcoming].

33 *CIL* IV 2246.

34 Mackay, *Expressions*.

35 Adams, *The New Vindolanda Writing-Tablets* 551 (on *tab. Vindol.* III 617).

for adverbials expressing the idea 'place to' to be replaced by adverbials with the sense 'place at' as complements of verbs of motion". When citing the Pompeian example he also draws attention to *hic* at the beginning – used for *huc* – and thus exemplifying the same phenomenon as *domi* in the same text.[36] The second reason behind this phenomenon, according to Adams, is the fossilization of place names in one commonly used case form.[37]

In Pompeii, in addition, there is some evidence for an 'opposite' type of confusion, i. e. expressions of direction used with stative verbs.[38] There are thus potentially three different tendencies behind the use of *domi* and *hic* in [6]:

- a use of the locative case indicating goal of motion,
- confusion in directional and locatival uses and adverbials generally, and
- the fossilization of place names in one case – *domi* might well be included in this group.[39]

At any rate, one of the most interesting aspects in this use of the locative concerns its social distribution. Useful additional information comes from Vindolanda, where there are altogether three examples of this phenomenon: all three concern names of the 2nd declension where the ablative is used as the locative. One case (*tab. Vindol*. II 343, 15–17 *coria que scribis esse Cataractonio scribe dentur mi*) stems from the letter of Octavius which usually is thought to contain many

[36] See Mackay, *Expressions* 236–238 and Adams, *The New Vindolanda Writing-Tablets* 551 (also Adams, *The Language of the Vindolanda Writing-Tablets* 110–111, differently on *tab. Vindol*. II 266). For further examples elsewhere, see Mackay, *Expressions*. See also the editors' discussion on *tab. Vindol*. III 611, i, b, 4–5.

[37] E. g. the locative *Alexandrie* in the letters of Claudius Terentianus (*P. Mich*. VIII 467–472) which is used also to indicate goal of motion, see Adams, *The New Vindolanda Writing-Tablets* 551.

[38] Väänänen, *Latin vulgaire*[3] 119–120 under "Confusion des notions 'ubi' et 'quo' (locatif et accusatif)" lists the following three types (i) one case of *quo bibet [sc. vivet] (.?.)ossa cinisque tegunt* 6825, (ii) *foras* pro *foris,* which is clearly a special (lexical) case, as it appears in Cicero, too (Cic. Q. fratr. 3, 1, 19 *cum Pomponia foras cenaret* – both *foras* and *foris* are continued in Romance), and (iii) temporal expressions with *posteru* = *posteru(m)* pro *postero* = *postridie,* but as a temporal expression *posteru* might not be comparable to actual expressions of direction. Väänänen also refers to the general character of this confusion (citing Apul. Met. 9, 39 *ubi ducis asinum istum*).

[39] Mackay, *Expressions* 239 points out that what the Pompeian example tells us is that there is no need to connect this use of the locative with the army (the other documents where this phenomenon is found stem from military context). It must be stressed, however, that seeing an example of military *Sondersprache* in a syntactic feature like this would not be a very attractive interpretation in the first place.

substandard features.[40] Another case (*tab. Vindol*. II 266 *uolọ ueniat ad me Coṛis*) is in a letter written to Flavius Cerialis, the prefect of the Ninth cohort of Batavians, but we have no information on the writer. But the third example (*tab. Vindol*. III 617 *festinabitis Coris*) is from a letter most probably written by Flavius Cerialis himself, thus attesting the phenomenon also in the language of the officer class.[41] Flavius Cerialis had clearly received a thorough education in Latin, as his elegant language use elsewhere shows.[42]

This type of construction is a good example of variation in Latin – variation which did not lead to language change, because other changes were overshadowing it.[43] Now that new non-literary evidence has been – and is still – coming to light, there are suddenly parallels for many of the phenomena found in Pompeii. This confirms the fact that they (in most cases) are general Latin tendencies, current on many social levels.

What Is in a Text Type?
Text Typology, Technical Language, and the Pompeian Wall Inscriptions

We have claimed that part of the diversity of the Pompeian wall inscriptions stems from the range of different text types incorporated the material. We should like to shed a little more light on this aspect here. A major branch of current linguistics that is regrettably only very slowly shifting towards Classical scholarship[44] deals with non-literary text types, technical text types, their structure and their (technical) language. A text type is a non-literary group of texts which forms a unit due to a cluster of shared features, resulting in what might be called a certain isomorphy of each text type.[45] One may rightfully say that it is the non-literary equivalent to a literary genre. The shared features may typically be structural, formal, contextual, visual, or language-related.

---

[40] See Adams, *The Language of the Vindolanda Writing-Tablets* 127.
[41] See the editors, introduction for *tab. Vindol*. III 616 and 617.
[42] See Adams, *The Language of the Vindolanda Writing-Tablets* 129.
[43] Also Mackay, *Expressions* 239.
[44] But see now Langslow, *Medical Latin* and Fögen, *Antike Fachtexte*.
[45] A very useful introduction to the theoretical framework may be found in Roelcke, *Fachsprachen*[2] (with further references). For a more general documentation see the authoritative volumes by Hoffmann – Kalverkämper – Wiegand, *Fachsprachen*.

Just some very obvious examples: bus timetables, letters of recommendation, parking tickets, food labels, instruction manuals, election posters, or commercial advertisements. We are all familiar with these text types, in fact so well-acquainted with them that we do not normally realise we are dealing with them – unless something unexpected happens. Then they immediately require attention and cause hesitation and / or confusion. A parking ticket, written for a change on an A3-sized pink piece of paper, with a garland of flowers surrounding it, written in a feminine handwriting, and smelling of perfume, would still be a parking ticket. Yet it would not fulfil our expectations of a certain text type, and may cause us wonder if either a parking attendant has gone crazy, or if it is just a nice practical joke.

Apart from a specific lexicon (the technical language) one of the foremost requirements for the constitution of a technical text type is, as was said previously, the isomorphy of the texts.[46] This means that for each text type, there is a specific, typical, limited, and almost invariable number of formal or functional macrostructural patterns. The individuality of a text is constituted by:

- inclusion / omission,
- sequence / order / arrangement, and
- individual filling of these macrostructural patterns.

As far as the wall inscriptions of Pompeii and Herculaneum are concerned, there are several technical text types to be found. The most prominent cases are the electoral *programmata*[47] and the advertisements for gladiatorial games.[48] We will exemplify the point focussing only on the former.[49] Here is a very typical example:[50]

[7] *P(ublium) Paquium | Proculum IIv(irum). d(ignus) r(ei) p(ublicae). o(ro) v(os) f(aciatis). | dignus est.*

Publius Paquius Proculus as duumvir. He is worthy of public office. I entreat you to elect him. He is worthy.

---

46 This elaborates an aspect which has been dealt with only very briefly in Kruschwitz, *Romanes eunt domus* [forthcoming].
47 More recent general studies on this subject include Mouritsen, *Elections* and Chiavia, *Programmata*.
48 A useful basis for the study of these texts is provided by Sabbatini Tumolesi, *Gladiatorum paria*.
49 On ancient advertisements more generally see Kruschwitz, *Werbeinschriften.*
50 *CIL* IV 7208.

There are five basic macrostructural patterns to be determined:

- Name of the candidate;
- office applied for;
- name of the supporter;
- appeal to elect/support the candidate; and (optional)
- remarks regarding the worthiness of the candidate.

An extensive examination of all the *programmata* would show that these macrostructural patterns recur in almost every single text, and even in the very same sequence. (Hence even reconstructing fragmentary ones is, to a certain degree, quite easy.)

In each specific case the name of the supporter must be ascertained from the context. Normally the supporter is the inhabitant of the house where the *programma* has been painted on the wall, but in quite a few cases they are also explicitely mentioned. The name of the candidate is archetypically put in the accusative, the supporter in the nominative. The typical recommendation phrase is, in abbreviation, O. V. F., *oro vos faciatis*, sometimes also *rogo* – but rarely anything else. Names of additional supporters may have been supplied in form of X *rogat* or similar acclamations. (However, the variety of verbal phrases is very small.)

In the following example, the verb was exceptionally *fave* (which regularly would be construed with the dative):[51]

[8] *Ti. Claudium Verum | IIvir(um) Obelli(us?) cum patre fave scis Vero favere.*

Since in electoral *programmata* the name of the candidate in the first position of the text (and often also written in larger letters so that it was the most visible part of the text) was invariably in the accusative, this is the way it appears here as well. It should *not* be taken as the object of *fave*, erroneously put in the accusative instead of the dative (*favere* with the acc. in this meaning is unattested) for two reasons:

- A structure such as *Ti. Claudium Verum | IIvir(um) Obelli(us?) cum patre* alone is widely attested.
- Also, the final part of the text, *scis Vero favere*, shows the same verb used correctly with the dative.[52]

---

51 *CIL* IV 3828.

52 Cf. Solin, *Storia* 32 n. 177 ("Vota per Claudio Vero, favoriscilo").

Certainly, the accusative was used in Pompeii (and other non-literary texts) in a wider range of functions than in literary texts – but that clearly is not the reason why it is used here.[53] A dative would have been totally out of place in the beginning of an electoral advertisement, as this text type always had the name of the candidate in the accusative. So, the text should be understood as follows: *Ti. Claudium Verum | IIvir(um)* considered as independent (whether or not we want to say that there is an ellipsis of *ovf* in this type of structures or not), then *Obelli(us?) cum patre* as the recommenders, after which independently follows the verb *fave*. This text shows nicely how technical texts work: only a minimum of information is needed, as the reader will be familiar with the macrostructural patterns and understanding will be possible even with much of the information left unexpressed.

Conclusions

We hope to have made a strong case for several methodological changes, adjustments, and refinements in the study of Pompeian wall inscriptions – and also more generally in the study of non-literary texts. All of our points could easily have been exemplified by many texts from the walls of Pompeii, but we deliberately decided to limit the number of examples, in order to make room for the methodological discussion which is urgently needed. Our most important claims are:

- It is important to include as much context and data in the study of these texts as possible, as only consideration of the macro- and micro-context will allow for a proper, just, and adequate appreciation and interpretation of the texts. (One may wonder if there is actually a very genuine difference between literary and non-literary material – or if, in the end, this applies for the literary texts as well.)
- A new and more appropriate understanding of the Pompeian wall inscriptions, and the Latin language, will become possible after abandoning the term vulgar Latin with its implications, and futile discussions on whether a linguistic phenomenon, or a whole text, is to be classified as vulgar or not.
- Only with an adequate interpretation of the language will it then be possible to attempt to deduce information concerning the sociological background of the writers of Pompeian wall inscriptions.

[53] See Väänänen, *Latin vulgaire*^{3} 115–117 for accusatives in Pompeii.

- Virtually everything remains to be done in the field of technical text types and technical language, as far as the Pompeian material is concerned. It should now be clear that research in this field will yield useful results – and will also allow for a proper understanding of synchronical variation and diachronical change in specific text types.

University of Reading
University of Helsinki

Bibliography

Abel – Buckley, *Handwriting*: E. Abel – B. Buckley, *The Handwriting on the Wall: Toward a Sociology and Psychology of Graffiti*, Westport, Conn. 1977.

Adams, *Bilingualism*: J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge 2003.

Adams, *British Latin*: J. N. Adams, "British Latin: the Text, Interpretation and Language of the Bath Curse Tablets", *Britannia* 23 (1992) 1–26.

Adams, *Language of the Vindolanda Writing-Tablets*: J. N. Adams, "The Language of the Vindolanda Writing-Tablets: An Interim Report", *JRS* 85 (1995) 86–134.

Adams, *Latin Sexual Vocabulary*: J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, London 1982.

Adams, *New Vindolanda Writing-Tablets*: J. N. Adams, "The New Vindolanda Writing-Tablets", *CQ* 53 (2003) 530–575.

Baldi, *Foundations*^{2}: P. Baldi, *The Foundations of Latin*, Berlin – New York 2002^{2}.

Bauer, *Toiletten-Graffiti*: M. Bauer, *Toiletten-Graffiti im Lauf der Zeit. Die Entwicklung politischer und geschlechtsspezifischer Unterschiede*, Vienna 2002.

Beck, *Graffiti*: H. Beck, *Graffiti*, Stuttgart 2004.

Bosmans – Thiel, *Guide*: B. Bosmans – A. Thiel, *Guide to Graffiti-Research*, Gent 1996.

Chiavia, *Programmata*: C. Chiavia, *Programmata: manifesti elettorali nella colonia romana di Pompei*, Turin 2002.

Coleman, *Poetic Diction*: R. Coleman, "Poetic Diction, Poetic Discourse and the Poetic Register", in J. N. Adams – R. G. Mayer (edd.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, Oxford 1999, 21–93.

Cooley, *Survival of Oscan*: A. E. Cooley, "The Survival of Oscan in Roman Pompeii", in A. E. Cooley (ed.), *Becoming Roman, Writing Latin? Literacy and Epigraphy in the Roman West*, JRA Suppl. 48, Portsmouth, RI 2002, 77–86.

Eska, *Oscan Substratum*: J. F. Eska, "The Language of the Latin Inscriptions of Pompeii and the Question of an Oscan Substratum", *Glotta* 65 (1987) 146–161.

Fögen, *Antike Fachtexte*: T. Fögen (ed.), *Antike Fachtexte / Ancient Technical Texts*, Berlin – New York 2005.

Gigante, *Civiltà*: M. Gigante, *Civiltà delle forme letterarie nell'antica Pompei*, Naples 1979.

Halla-aho, *Linguistic Varieties*: H. Halla-aho, *Linguistic Varieties and Language Level in Latin Non-Literary Letters*, in: D. Obbink – T. V. Evans, *The Language of the Papyri*, Oxford 2008 [forthcoming].

Halla-aho, *The Non-literary Latin Letters*: H. Halla-aho, *The Non-literary Latin Letters. A Study of Their Syntax and Pragmatics*. Helsinki [forthcoming].

Herman, *Du Latin*: J. Herman, *Du Latin aux langues romanes. Études de linguistique, historique*, Tübingen 1990.

Herman, *Vulgar Latin*: J. Herman, *Vulgar Latin*, University Park, Penn. 2000 (transl. by Roger Wright).

Hernández Pérez, *Inscripciones parietales latinas*: R. Hernández Pérez, "Las inscripciones parietales latinas. Consideraciones básicas para su interpretación", *Scripta Philologica Valentina* n. s. 3 (2002–2003) 247–279.

Hoffmann – Kalverkämper – Wiegand, *Fachsprachen*: L. Hoffmann – H. Kalverkämper – H. E. Wiegand (edd.), *Fachsprachen – Languages for Special Purposes. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Fachsprachenforschung und Terminologiewissenschaft – An International Handbook of Special Languages and Terminology Research*, voll. I–II, Berlin – New York 1998–1999.

Iliescu – Slusanski, *Du Latin*: M. Iliescu – D. Slusanski (edd.), *Du Latin aux langues romanes. Choix de textes traduits et commentés (du II^e siècle avant J.-C. jusqu'au X^e siècle après J.-C.)*, Wilhelmsfeld 1991.

Kiesler, *Einführung*: R. Kiesler, *Einführung in die Problematik des Vulgärlateins*, Tübingen 2006.

Kreuzer, *Graffiti-Lexikon*: P. Kreuzer, *Das Graffiti-Lexikon. Wandkunst von A–Z*, Munich 1986.

Kruschwitz, *Bedeutung*: P. Kruschwitz, "Die Bedeutung der Caupona des Euxinus für die epigraphische Poesie Pompejis (und darüber hinaus)", *Riv. Stud. Pomp.* 17, 2006, 7–13.

Kruschwitz, *Dossier*: P. Kruschwitz, "Carmina latina epigraphica Pompeiana: Ein Dossier", *Arctos* 38 (2004) 27–58.

Kruschwitz, *Edition*: P. Kruschwitz, "Die Edition und Interpretation metrischer Kursivinschriften: Eine Methodenkritik am Beispiel von CLE 354", in C. Fernández Martínez – J. Gómez Pallarès, *Temptanda viast. Nuevos estudios sobre la poesía epigráfica latina*, Bellaterra 2006 (CD-ROM).

Kruschwitz, *Romanes eunt domus*: P. Kruschwitz, "Romanes eunt domus! Linguistic Aspects of the Subliterary Latin in the Roman Wall Inscriptions", in: D. Obbink – T. V. Evans, *The Language of the Papyri*, Oxford 2008 [forthcoming].

Kruschwitz, *Werbeinschriften*: P. Kruschwitz, "Römische Werbeinschriften", *Gymnasium* 106 (1999) 231–253.

Langslow, *Medical Latin*: D. R. Langslow, *Medical Latin in the Roman Empire*, Oxford 2000.

Lazzeroni, *Composti nominali*: R. Lazzeroni, "Su alcune composti nominali nelle iscrizioni pompeiane", *L'italia dialettale* 29 (1966) 123–132.

Lindner, *Lateinische Komposita*: T. Lindner, *Lateinische Komposita. Morphologische, historische und lexikalische Studien*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Innsbruck 2002.

Mackay, *Expressions*: C. S. Mackay, "Expressions to Indicate Goal of Motion in the Colloquial Latin of the Early Empire", *ZPE* 126 (1999) 229–239.

Magni, *L'ordine delle parole*: E. Magni, "L'ordine delle parole nel latino pompeiano: sulle tracce di una deriva", *AGI* 85 (2000) 3–37.

Mouritsen, *Elections*: H. Mouritsen, *Elections, Magistrates, and Municipal Elite: Studies in Pompeian Epigraphy*, Rome 1988.

Neuland, *Jugendsprache*: E. Neuland, *Jugendsprache. Studienbibliographie Sprachwissenschaft im Auftrag des Instituts für deutsche Sprache*, Heidelberg 1999.

Opelt, *Schimpfwörter*: I. Opelt, *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter und verwandte sprachliche Erscheinungen: Eine Typologie*, Heidelberg 1965.

Palmer, *Latin Language*: L. R. Palmer, *The Latin Language*, London 1954, 148–180 ("Vulgar Latin").

Pulgram, *Italic, Latin, Italian*: E. Pulgram, *Italic, Latin, Italian*, Heidelberg 1978.
Reisner, *Two Thousand Years of Wall Writing*: R. G. Reisner, *Two Thousand Years of Wall Writing*, New York 1967.
Roelcke, *Fachsprachen*[2]: T. Roelcke, *Fachsprachen*, Berlin 2005[2].
Sabbatini Tumolesi, *Gladiatorum paria*: P. Sabbatini Tumolesi, *Gladiatorum paria. Annunci di spettacoli gladiatorii a Pompei*, Rome 1980.
Sblendorio Cugusi, *L'uso stilistico*: M. T. Sblendorio Cugusi, *L'uso stilistico dei composti nominali nei Carmina Latina Epigraphica* (Quaderni Inv. Luc. 25), Bari 2005.
Solin, *Die herkulanensischen Wandinschriften*: H. Solin, "Die herkulanensischen Wandinschriften. Ein soziologischer Versuch", *Cron. Erc*. 3 (1973) 97–103.
Solin, *Entstehung und Psychologie*: H. Solin, "Zur Entstehung und Psychologie von Schreibfehlern in lateinischen Inschriften", in H. Solin – O. Salomies – U.-M. Liertz (edd.), *Acta colloquii epigraphici Latini Helsingiae 3.–6. sept. 1991 habiti* (Comm. Hum. Litt. 104), Helsinki 1995, 93–111.
Solin, *Storia*: H. Solin, "Storia degli studi epigrafici in Finlandia", in H. Solin (ed.) *Epigrafia e studi epigrafici in Finlandia* (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 19), Rome 1998, 1–71.
Tanzer, *Common People*: H. H. Tanzer, *The Common People of Pompeii. A Study of the Graffiti*, Baltimore 1939.
Väänänen, *Introduction*[3]: V. Väänänen, *Introduction au latin vulgaire*, Paris 1981[3].
Väänänen, *Latin vulgaire*[3]: V. Väänänen, *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes*, Abh. dt. Akad. Wiss. Bln., Berlin 1966[3].
Varone, *Erotica Pompeiana*: A. Varone, *Erotica Pompeiana: Love Inscriptions on the Walls of Pompeii*, Rome 2002 (orig. Ital. 1994).
Wallace, *Introduction*: R. E. Wallace, *An Introduction to Wall Inscriptions from Pompeii and Herculaneum*, Wauconda, Ill. 2005.
Weeber, *Decius war hier*: K.-W. Weeber, *Decius war hier... Das Beste aus der römischen Graffiti-Szene*, Zürich 1996.

Arctos 41 (2007) 51–58

NOTES D'ÉPIGRAPHIE LATINE RÉMOISE: AU SUJET DE DEUX INSCRIPTIONS DU MUSÉE SAINT-RÉMI (REIMS)[1]

FABRICE POLI

Le corpus épigraphique latin de Reims, riche de presque deux cent cinquante textes, est rassemblé pour son immense majorité dans le *CIL* XIII.[2] Les découvertes ultérieures se sont en revanche révélées numériquement moins fournies, puisque l'on dénombre à peine trois inédits dans les *ILTG*[3] et une petite quinzaine de documents publiés dans *L'Année Épigraphique* entre 1898 et 1976.[4] Une partie des inscriptions funéraires rémoises a par ailleurs fait l'objet, il y a désormais presque trente ans, d'un mémoire très intéressant de la part de Mme Misciatelli, à visée cependant plus artistique que linguistique.[5] Aux fins de compléter le dossier épigraphique rémois, pour ainsi dire en sommeil depuis un trop long temps, nous nous proposons d'étudier ici deux inscriptions funéraires (dont une totalement inédite), qui, nous allons le voir, ne sont pas dépourvues de *notabilia*.[6]

---

1 Je tiens à remercier très chaleureusement, comme chaque année désormais, les Professeurs H. Solin et O. Salomies pour les remarques si précieuses dont ils m'ont fait part et l'accueil toujours bienveillant qu'ils ont réservé à cette nouvelle contribution. Il m'est agréable d'adresser aussi mes remerciements à M. Marc Bouxin, Conservateur en Chef du Musée Saint-Rémi de Reims, pour m'avoir autorisé à publier l'inscription inédite et pour toutes les informations précieuses dont il m'a fait part.

2 Cf. *CIL* XIII 3253 à 3444; 10021, 78; 11288 à 11295.

3 Cf. P. Wuilleumier, *Inscriptions latines des Trois Gaules*, Paris 1963, n. 351 (= *AE* 1935, 64), 352, 353, 354, 355 (= *AE* 1923, 20) et 547 (= *AE* 1931, 45). Seuls les numéros 352, 353 et 354 sont des inédits.

4 Cf. *AE* 1898, 92; 1901, 88–89; 1903, 28–29; 1908, 251; 1910, 18 et 57; 1946, 21; 1976, 460–463.

5 Cf. E. Misciatelli, "Les monuments funéraires de Reims gallo-romain. Catalogue des monuments figurés du Musée Saint-Rémi et d'autres collections", *Bulletin de la Société Archéologique Champenoise* 4 (octobre-novembre 1981) 3–48.

6 Les deux inscriptions auxquelles nous allons nous intéresser sont absentes de l'étude de Mme Misciatelli, parce que cette dernière ne s'est intéressée, comme l'indique explicitement son titre, qu'aux inscriptions présentant un bas-relief avec représentation humaine.

Section 1: inscription inédite.

Bloc de calcaire (hauteur: 107; largeur: 63; épaisseur: 62), de forme rectangulaire et dont aucune partie ne semble perdue. L'objet est massif, comme l'indique son extrême largeur qui égale son épaisseur. Ses dimensions remarquables donnent à ce bloc l'aspect d'un cippe.

L'objet a été découvert en 1974 lors des fouilles conduites à Reims sur le site de la Porte Bazée (secteur de la rue de l'Université et de la rue de Contrai); le bloc avait été réutilisé, comme matériau de remploi, dans le rempart daté du Bas-Empire. L'objet est entré la même année au musée Saint-Rémi de Reims (inv. 978.30942) et se trouve actuellement exposé au rez-de-chaussée (salle 3) où j'ai pu le voir en juin 2005.

Le bloc présente une inscription latine gravée avec soin sur six lignes: les lettres (hauteur 4.5–6.5 cm) sont régulières et d'égale dimension dans l'ensemble. Cette inscription fait incontestablement partie de celles qui sont le mieux conservées du musée Saint-Rémi. Le lapicide a usé de la *scriptio continua*, sans faire usage de signe d'interponction. Quelques mots ont été coupés, d'autres sont réduits à des abréviations, alors que l'espace demeuré anépigraphe permettait un plus grand déploiement du texte. La partie inscrite a été dépolie avec soin, comme l'indique le trait rectiligne qui sépare l'inscription de la partie supérieure du bloc laissé à l'état brut. Les lettres sont parfaitement lisibles et les quelques lacunes que l'on relève ne sont pas de nature à faire douter de la lecture du texte. L'on note en effet que des ébréchures ont, à la ligne 4, quelque peu masqué la partie inférieure des quatre lettres *nnis*; de la même façon, le *u* de *coniux*, à la ligne 5, a perdu son trait oblique de droite.

La translittération interprétative du texte et la traduction que nous en proposons sont les suivantes:

D(is) M(anibus) et m(emoriae)
Iul(ii) Marciani
ex ce(nturione) coh(ortis) II cu-
rauit Nonnis-
so coniux
uiua.

"Aux Dieux Mânes et à la mémoire de Iulius Marcianus, ex-centurion de la deuxième cohorte. Nonnisso, son épouse, a pris soin, de son vivant, [de faire élever cette stèle]".

La lecture de cette inscription appelle les remarques suivantes:

Datation

En raison de l'absence de tout contexte archéologique, la datation précise de cette inscription s'avère délicate. Quelques indications peuvent toutefois être fournies. Le rempart de la ville, où le bloc a été découvert comme matériau de remploi, date du Bas–Empire et a été élevé au IVe siècle ap. J.-C. C'est aujourd'hui dans le secteur de la Porte Bazée, d'où provient précisément notre inscription, et dans celui de la médiathèque centrale de Reims, que l'on peut le mieux l'étudier. Par ailleurs, l'on note la présence de la formule *Dis Manibus* dont nous avons déjà rappelé qu'elle ne se diffuse en province qu'à partir du règne des Flaviens, et donc dans le dernier tiers du Ier siècle ap. J.-C.[7] Compte tenu de ces deux *termini* temporels, mais aussi de l'absence de toute marque de respect réservée à cette inscription, nous sommes assez enclin à la dater de la fin IIe ou même plutôt de la première moitié du IIIe siècle ap. J.-C., datation que l'étude onomastique permettra peut-être, comme nous allons le voir ci-dessous, de confirmer.

[7] Cf. F. Poli, "Une inscription latine inédite d'Auch (Aquitaine)", *Arctos* 40 (2006) 88.

Onomastique et anthroponymie

La formule anthroponymique du défunt est privée de son prénom et il ne subsiste des *tria nomina* que le gentilice *Iulius* et le *cognomen Marcianus*, tous deux très fréquents et n'appelant aucune remarque particulière. Quant à l'absence du prénom, l'on sait que c'est vers la fin du IIe siècle ap. J.-C. que le système des *tria nomina* commence à se fissurer, le premier de ses trois membres touché étant précisément le prénom, ce qui permet par ailleurs d'étayer la proposition de datation que nous avons formulée plus haut, à savoir que l'inscription ne peut être antérieure à la fin du IIe siècle ap. J.-C.[8] Le corpus des inscriptions latines conserve par ailleurs quelques attestations d'individus portant le même nom et le même *cognomen* que le défunt et qui, coïncidence digne d'être notée, ont eux aussi servi dans l'armée romaine.[9] Mais l'existence d'autres *Iulii Marciani* – appartenant ou non au métier des armes – en d'autres points de l'Italie ou de l'Empire[10] tend à prouver qu'il n'y a aucunement à tenter d'établir de rapprochements entre ces différents individus. Ils sont seulement la preuve du caractère fréquent de ces deux anthroponymes, de surcroît souvent associés.

Mais un élément particulièrement important de cette inscription est sans doute l'acquisition de l'anthroponyme féminin gaulois *Nonnisso*, la veuve de *Iulius Marcianus* qui constitue une nouvelle acquisition au sein du stock celtique. La forme *Nonnisso* est le nominatif singulier d'un thème en *-n*, correspondant pour la forme au type latin *Cicerō, -ōnis*. En gaulois, comme en latin, le *-n* final du thème s'amuït au nominatif singulier, au profit de la voyelle longue de timbre *-ō*, dont la présence compense l'impossibilité d'adjoindre au cas de ce thème en nasale la désinence animée *-s*. Toutefois, à la différence du latin, la voyelle longue est de timbre *ū* en gaulois; l'on a ainsi pour les anthroponymes des nominatifs

[8] Sur l'omission du prénom, l'on consultera notamment: O. Salomies, *Die römischen Vornamen*, Helsinki 1987, 390–413; H. Solin, "Zur Entwicklung des römischen Namensystems", in *Person und Name. Methodische Probleme bei der Erstellung eines Personennamenbuches des Frühmittelalters*, hrsg. von D. Geuenich – W. Haubrichs – J. Jarnut, Berlin – New York 2002, 4–9; P. Corbier, *L'épigraphie latine*, Paris 2002, 28.

[9] Dacie: *AE* 1934, 116 (Alba Iulia: *Soli Invicto / Mythrae(!) / C(aius) Iulius / Marcian(u)s / signif(er) leg(ionis) XIII Gem(inae) / libens posuit*); Rome: *CIL* VI 2486: *Iulius Marcianus*.

[10] Cf. *CIL* VI 20792 (*M. Iulius Marci f(ilius) Marcianus*); *CIL* XI 4742, p. 1372 (San Giovanni del Pantano: *L. Iulius Marcianus et Iulius Marcianus*); *CIL* XII 36 (Vence: *Iulius Marcianus*), 2621 et 2625 (Genève: *M. Iulius Marcianus*), 3479 (Nîmes: *Iulius Marcianus*); *AE* 1946, 145 (Vérone: *Iulius Marcianus)*; *AE* 1977, 154 (Rome: *C. Iulius Marcianus*); *ILAlg.* II 1, 1273 (Constantine: *P. Iulius Marcianus*); *ILAlg.* II 1, 3483 (Mechta Nahar: *Iulius Marcianus*); *ILAlg.* II 1, 3786 (Tiddis: *Q. Iulius Marcianus*); *ILAlg.* II 3, 9522 (Bou Foua: *L. Iulius Marcianus*); *ILGN* 353 (Menthon–Saint-Bernard: *M. Iulius Marcianus*).

du type *Frontu*, masc. (L-3),[11] κοννου, masc. (G-184), δολου, masc. (G-149).[12] Lorsque le nom **Nonnissu* a été translittéré en latin, il a donc reçu une finale conforme à cette langue, mais conforme aussi au type flexionnel gaulois original.[13] Cette inscription intéressera donc les celtisants, parce que ce nom constitue une nouvelle acquisition anthroponymique.[14]

Autres notabilia

La fonction d'officier subalterne de *Iulius Marcianus* au sein de l'armée romaine est clairement indiquée, comme l'atteste le syntagme *ex centurione cohortis secundae* (II). Il s'agit naturellement d'une cohorte d'auxiliaires et non d'une cohorte d'une légion romaine, parce que dans ce dernier cas les centurions se somment 'centurions de la légion *x*' (la cohorte pouvant de façon facultative être ajoutée après). Il est d'autre part certain que *Iulius Marcianus* était un romain de naissance et naturellement de condition libre, comme le prouve son grade subalterne de centurion qui faisait de lui un officier à la tête d'une unité de fantassins. Il n'en demeure pas moins que ces troupes auxiliaires (appelées *cohors* ou *ala*) possédaient une dénomination précise qui ici fait défaut.[15] Enfin, dernière interrogation: quel âge avait *Iulius Marcianus* au moment de sa mort ? À cette question il est difficile de répondre avec précision. L'on rappellera seulement pour mémoire

---

11 Les sigles du type L-3 ou G-184 renvoient au *Recueil des Inscriptions Gauloises* (RIG), publié sous la direction de P.–M. Duval: G = M. Lejeune, V*olume 1. Textes gallo-grecs,* Paris 1985; L = M. Lejeune, *Volume 2.1. Textes gallo-étrusques, textes gallo-latins sur pierre*, Paris 1988; P.–Y. Lambert, *Volume 2.2. Textes gallo-latins sur instrumentum*, Paris 2002.

12 L'on notera dans ces deux derniers exemples gallo-grecs mentionnés l'usage de la fausse diphtongue ου pour noter la voyelle longue.

13 Nous rappellerons seulement pour mémoire que le nominatif *Nonnisso* ne peut en aucune façon relever de la flexion en *-eh_2 parce que la voyelle de timbre *a* qui en résulte se conserve toujours en gaulois, à la différence de ce que l'on peut observer par exemple en germanique (gotique) et en italique (osque). L'on a ainsi en gaulois des anthroponymes *Buscilla* (L-79), Ελουισσα (G-121), Μαγεσιλλα (G-193), etc. Cf. P.–Y. Lambert, *La langue gauloise*, Paris 2003, 57 et 62 et X. Delamarre, *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise. Une approche du vieux-celtique continental*, Paris 2003, 342 –343.

14 La forme demeure toutefois immotivée et il n'est pas possible de l'analyser en une base et un suffixe. Il s'agit probablement d'un anthroponyme à classer dans la catégorie des "uncompounded names", pour reprendre la terminologie de D. Ellis Evans, *Gaulish Personal Names*. *A Study of some Continental Celtic Formations*, Oxford 1967, notamment 296–297.

15 Nos recherches ne nous ont pas permis de trouver la trace d'une *cohors secunda* stationnée dans l'immédiate proximité de Reims. La seule que nous ayons repérée est la *cohors secunda Lingonum* (les Lingons étaient les habitants du plateau de Langres, au sud de Reims) qui servit notamment en Grande-Bretagne (cf. notamment *AE* 1997, 1001).

que les soldats étaient incorporés entre 18 et 21 ans en moyenne et que le service était fort long (entre 16 et 20 ans pour les légionnaires et entre 26 et 28 ans pour les auxiliaires). Attendu que Nonnisso a pris soin de faire préciser que son époux était vétéran,[16] l'on peut postuler que *Iulius Marcianus* avait au moins 40 ans, mais sans doute davantage, au moment de sa mort.

Section 2: revision d'une inscription éditée.

Bloc de calcaire (dimensions résiduelles: hauteur 65; longueur 86; largeur 61) de forme parallélépipédique. L'objet présente deux cavités carrées, entourant le mot *coniunx*, qui ne sont pas originelles mais qui ont été effectuées à l'occasion de la réutilisation de la pierre. La partie supérieure, qui comportait les mots *Dis Manibus*, a disparu, au moment de la deuxième taille de l'objet. Ce dernier est, dans l'ensemble, dans un assez bon état de conservation.

Le bloc a été mis à jour, en même que le précédent, en 1974 lors des fouilles conduites à Reims sur le site de la Porte Bazée (secteur de la rue de l'Université et de la rue de Contrai); il avait été réutilisé, comme matériau de remploi, dans le rempart daté du Bas-Empire. L'objet est entré la même année au musée Saint-Rémi de Reims (inv. 978.30941) et se trouve actuellement exposé au rez-de-chaussée (salle 2) où j'ai pu le voir en juin 2005.

Le bloc présente une inscription gravée sur six lignes (hauteur des lettres: 4–6 cm) réparties dans deux champs épigraphiques bien distincts. Le premier est, comme nous l'avons dit plus haut, lacunaire et il n'en subsiste que *et memor(iae)*. Le second, comportant cinq lignes, est délimité de façon très distincte par un cadre. D'une façon générale, l'inscription semble avoir été effectuée de façon précipitée et sans grand soin: les ligatures, nombreuses, sont présentes presque à chaque ligne; la mauvaise gestion du champ épigraphique a également obligé le lapicide a inséré par deux fois la voyelle *i* à l'intérieur d'une lettre ou à réduire la taille d'un caractère, comme dans le cas du *n* de *Marcian(i)* à la ligne 1. Si l'on y ajoute enfin la graphie *Mrcian(i)* pour *Marcian(i)*, tout concourt à faire de ce bloc une inscription peu soignée, qui demeure néanmoins fort bien lisible, malgré la légère lacune qui touche le dernier mot *parauit*.

Sauf erreur ou omission de notre part, les précédentes éditions de ce bloc sont les suivantes: Frézouls, 1975, 411; *AE* 1976, 460.[17]

[16] Il arrive quelquefois aussi que l'on trouve l'expression redondante *ueteranus ex centurione*: *CIL* III 225, 10314; *AE* 1934, 205; 1938, 96; 1951, 140; 1977, 606; etc.

[17] Les deux éditeurs donnent la translittération suivante: *D(is) M(anibus) / et memor(iae) /*

Leur translittération est la suivante:

D(is) M(anibus)
et memor(iae)
Prisc(i) Marcian(i)
Prisc(i) Marcian(i) lib(erti)
Priscita Calliope
coniunx
viva paravit.

Suite à l'examen de l'inscription, les révisions, au demeurant mineures, que nous proposons sont les suivantes: 1) la formule *Dis Manibus* est totalement perdue. 2) La deuxième mention du *cognomen Marcianus* est graphiée *Mrcian(i)* avec omission – involontaire ou non – de la voyelle *a*. 3) En ce qui concerne le nom de l'épouse, il est à lire non pas ∗*Priscita* mais *Priscia*. L'épouse de l'affranchi *Priscus Marcianus* était donc la fille d'un *Priscius*. Cela rend donc en partie caduque la remarque de *L'Année Épigraphique* (1976, p. 133: "L'onomastique de son épouse est, elle aussi, remarquable; elle porte deux surnoms, *Priscita* (rare) et *Calliope* (très courant)".[18] En réalité, l'épouse a une onomastique des plus courantes: gentilice du père féminisé, suivi d'un surnom. Mais la forme que nous restituons, *Priscia*, n'est jusqu'à présent guère attestée[19] et cette nouvelle occurrence est donc la bienvenue. Le masculin *Priscius* n'est pas davantage usité.[20]

Notons enfin, que le défunt, *Priscius Marcianus*, porte le même *cognomen* que son patron. Il est donc très probable qu'il ait été aussi le fils naturel de son ancien maître, ce qui se rencontre parfois dans nos textes.[21]

Prisc(i) Marcian(i) / Prisc(i) Marcian(i) lib(erti) / Priscita Calliope / coniunx / viva paravit.

18 Le qualificatif de "rare" appliqué à **Priscita* nous semble inapproprié, parce que, sauf erreur ou omission de notre part, cette forme ne se trouve nulle part, ni sur la présente inscription, ni sur aucune autre. Notons par ailleurs que *Calliope* n'est pas seulement un surnom féminin, mais également un nom, dont les attestations sont nombreuses (cf. *exempli gratia CIL* VI 12499, 13091, 14088, etc.).

19 Cf. notamment (en excluant les attestations mutilées) par ordre chronologique de publication: E. Pais, *Corporis inscriptionum Latinarum supplementa Italica*, Roma, 1884, n. 780 (Côme); CIL XII 4390, p. 846 (Narbonne); E. Weber, *Die römerzeitlichen Inschriften der Steiermark*, Graz 1969, n. 126 (Landscha); M. Hainzmann, P. Schubert, *Inscriptionum Lapidarium Latinarum Provinciae Norici usque ad annum MCMLXXXIV repertarum indices* (CIL - Auctarium) 623 (Toltschach / Virunum); *AE* 1993, 1245a (Zollfeld / Virunum).

20 Cf. notamment (en excluant les attestations mutilées): *CIL* III 4951, 13520; *CIL* VI 32523, p. 3832; *CIL* XI 6736 (Ravenne); *CIL* XIII 2026 (Lyon); *AE* 1998, 1016 (Zollfeld / Virunum).

21 La mention d'une filiation hors mariage ne constitue nullement un tabou et, partant, l'utilisation des expressions *pater/filius/filia naturalis* est en effet assez fréquente. Dans le

[Dis Manibus]
et memor(iae)
Prisc(i) Marcian(i)
Prisc(i) M<a>rcian(i) lib(erti)
Priscia Calliope
coniunx
uiua parauit.

Bibliographie et abréviations

X. Delamarre, *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise*. *Une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental*, Paris 2003.
E. Espérandieu, "Reims", *Revue Épigraphique* 100 (1901) 145–148.
E. Frézouls, "Informations archéologiques. Circonscription de Champagne-Ardennes. Marne. *Reims* (Durocortorum, Remi)", *Gallia* 33 (1975) 407–412.
ILAlg. = *Inscriptions latines d'Algérie*, Paris puis Alger 1922.
ILGN = E. Espérandieu, *Inscriptions latines de Gaule* (Narbonnaise), Paris 1929.
P.–Y. Lambert, *La langue gauloise*, Paris 2003.
M. Reddé (sous la direction de), *L'armée romaine en Gaule*, Paris 1996.

---

cas plus précis d'un *patronus* qui est aussi le *pater*, l'on citera *exempli gratia* les inscriptions suivantes: *CIL* III 14777, 1 (Salona): *L(ucius) Egnatius / L(uci) l(ibertus) Maximus / v(ivus) f(ecit) sibi et Egnatis / amico patri eidem / patrono Myrin(a)e matri / Liberali sorori Lucensi / fratri et Iuliae Proculae / uxori suis in f(ronte) p(edes) XXXX / in a(gro) p(edes) XXX / h(oc) m(onumentum) h(eredem) n(on) s(equetur)* [Comme dans notre texte le *patronus* est aussi le *pater*]; *CIL* VI 19827: *Ti(berius) Iulius Andronicus / sibi et Iuliae Urbanae f(iliae) / vix(it) ann(os) VI / et Iuliae Fortunatae libertae / eidem coniugi carissimae / et Iulio Andronico filio* [Ici l'affranchie est devenue l'épouse de son *patronus*; même schéma en *CIL* VI 17588, 19859, 24677, 25108, etc.].

Arctos 41 (2007) 59–74

ASINNII, LICINNII, ETC. IN THE EAST

OLLI SALOMIES

Most scholars dealing with Greek inscriptions of the Roman period will no doubt have observed that Roman nomina ending in *-inius -ilius* etc. in Latin inscriptions are sometimes written with a geminate in Greek inscriptions, the best-known instance surely being Λικίννιος for *Licinius*. It is my aim in this article to present some observations on this phenomenon.

The earliest observation in print concerning the type Λικίννιος, etc., seems to be that of W. Dittenberger, *Hermes* 6 (1872) 152f. (in an article on 'Römische Namen in griechischen Inschriften und Literaturwerken'). Not much other than a few examples are offered here, and the section is introduced with the observation that the doubling of the consonant is attested above all in names ending in *-ilius* and *-inius*, "ohne Unterschied der Quantität des i". However, later scholars (e.g., W. Schulze)[1] normally attribute the presence of a double consonant to the fact that the vowel preceding the double consonant is short (as it is, e.g., in *Licinius/ Licinnius*). I shall return to this question after a presentation of the material.

1. Nomina in *-inius*

In the case of the following nomina in which we find the variation *-inius/-innius,* we know that the *i* preceding the *n* was short:

- *Asinius*. Short *i*: Catull. 12,1.
- *Cosinius Cusinius*. *Cusin-* ◡◡ : *CIL* IX 6417 = *CLE* 1131.[2]

[1] W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (1904 and later printings). Note also Pape–Benseler = W. Pape – G. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* ([3]1884) and, in the case of papyri, Preisigke = F. Preisigke, *Namenbuch* (1922); Foraboschi = D. Foraboschi, *Onomasticon alterum papyrologicum. Supplemento al Namenbuch di F. Preisigke* (1971).

[2] Cf. *Cusenius CIL* VI 16775. (The variation *i* ~ *e* in accentuated syllables of nomina usually

- *Licinius*. *Licin*- ◡◡ : Catull. 50, 1. 8 and elsewhere (see Schulze [n.1] 108 n.1).
- *Papinius*. *Papin*- –◡ : Sidon. Apoll. *carm*. 9, 226.[3]
- *Stertinius*. Short *i* attested by Horace (*sat*. 2, 3, 296; *epist*. 1, 12, 20).
- *Titinius*. *Titin*- ◡◡ : Seren. Sammon. *lib. medic*. 1037.[4]

For remarks on the attestations of these nomina being furnished with the suffix -ίννιος, see below.[5]

Then there are some other nomina in -*inius* for which forms in -*innius* are also attested in Greek inscriptions, in the case of which it is not a certain, but a plausible assumption that the *i* is short. As these are not very common nomina, I shall give the references at this point.

- *Cerinius* (extremely rare);[6] Κεριννία Φηλεῖκλα in *Klio* 52 (1970) 51f. no. 2 (Dion).
- ?*[C]uspinius*: possibly in *IG* V 2, 1054 (Laconia), restored as [Κ]οσπίννιος; the nomen is not otherwise attested, but plausible (cf. *Cuspius*, *Cuspidius*).
- *Fulcinius* (no instances of **Fulceinius*, *Φολκείνιος, etc.; cf. Φουλκεννία, below, with ε deriving from a short *i*). The spelling Φολκίννιος is found on a Macedonian coin mentioning L. Fulcinius, quaestor of Q. Metellus Macedonicus between 148 and 146,[7] but one could also note the inscription from Thessalonica, *SEG* 49, 814 = *AE* 1999, 1430 = P.M. Nigdelis, Ἐπιγραφικὰ Θεσσαλονίκεια (2006) p. 103. One finds here a certain Φολκιλλία Βενερία. However, taking into account the fact that **Fulcil(l)ius* is not otherwise attested and that, on the other hand, Fulcinii are not uncommon in Macedonia, I cannot help suspecting

indicates that the vowel was short.)

3 Note also that there is no instance of *Papeinius* in Latin inscriptions. It is true that the name of the husband is written Παπείνιος in an inscription from Dion, *Klio* 52 (1970) 51f. no. 2, but this must be based on a misunderstanding of sorts. (Cf. Γεμείνιος for *Geminius* – with short *i* before the suffix -*nius* – , below n. 23.)

4 Possibly also in Lucilius 169 M. (as restored by Marx; accepted, e.g., by F. Charpin in the Budé edition of 1978, 4,14). Schulze (n. 1) also observes (p. 243) that there is no instance of an *I longa* in this name in the inscriptions from Rome.

5 One might also note at this point that Caecina (with short *i*) Sabinus, one of the consuls of AD 316, is often called Καικίνιος in papyri (cf. R.S. Bagnall & K.A. Worp, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* [2004] 178), among which there is one which uses the form with the geminate Καικίννιος (*P. Oxy*. 19, 2232).

6 *CIL* X 4595; *CIL* VIII 4698 = *ILAlg*. I 2323. Things get a bit complicated (but cf. below on *Afinius*, etc.) if this nomen is identical with *Cerrinius*, for in this nomen the *i* was certainly long (Schulze 430; cf. the spelling Κερρείνιος attested several times in Ephesos).

7 H. Gaebler, *Die antiken Münzen Nordgriechenlands* III, 1 (1906) 65; B.V. Head, *Historia Numorum* ([2]1911) 239 (ταμίου Λευκίου Φολκιννίου; cf. *RE* VII 221 no. 2; T.R.S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* I [1951] 461).

that the name that was to be inscribed was in fact Φολκιννία (note also that the reading of this nomen given in the index of *AE* 1999, p. 724, is in fact " Φολκιννία?"). In addition to these instances, there is also Φουλκεννία Φαύστα in *IG* IX 12 1056 (Paxos). Otherwise, this nomen (found in Greek inscriptions mainly in Macedonia) is spelled Φο(υ)λκίνιος.

- *Lisinius* (instances in Schulze [n. 1] 180; also, e.g., *Suppl. It.* 16 Rusellae 51): Λισιννία Αὐρ(ηλία) Χρυσίον in *IG* XII 2, 562 = *IGR* IV 17 = G. Labarre, *Les cités de Lesbos* (1996) n. 88 (Eresos; the only instance of this nomen in the East).
- ?*Lucinius*. This rare nomen (cf. Schulze 85 and 183, with addenda in *Repertorium*[8] 107) is written Λουκίννιος in *IG* X 2, 1, 929, which might be interpreted as pointing to the fact that the *i* was short; on the other hand, if Λυκείνιος, the nomen of Τι. Λυκείνιος Ι(---?) Ἑρμῆς in Ancyra (E. Bosch, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Ankara im Altertum* [1967] 225 no. 174), has something to do with *Lucinius*, the *i* may rather have been long.
- *Rasinius* (Schulze [n. 1] 91f.; cf. *Rasenius CIL* XI 5788): *Rasennius*/Ῥασέννιος, *ID* 1771 = *CIL* I^2 2235 (no doubt from *Rasinius* via *Rasenius*); Λ. Ῥασίννιος Ἕρμιππος, *I. Ephesos* 2053 (approximately Severan).[9]
- *Safinius* (no instances of **Safeinius*, *Σαφείνιος, etc.). Of Σαφίννιος, we find the following instances: *IG* II^2 1961, line 23 = *SEG* 34, 153: [Λ]εύκιος Σαφίννιο[ς] Ἀθμονεύς (c. 40 BC; cf. S. Byrne, *Roman Citizens of Athens* [2003] 423); Πόπλιος Σαφίννιος Ποπλίου υἱὸς Οὐελλίνα *IG* xii 6, 2, 709 (Samos); *SEG* 33, 956 (= R.A. Kearsley, *Greeks and Romans in Imperial Asia* [*IK* 59] no. 22) from Ephesos (the name being spelled here also Σαφίνιος and *Safinius*). In other cases, this nomen, not common and attested mainly on Samos,[10] is spelled Σαφίνιος. – *Safinnius* is found in a Latin papyrus of AD 157, *CPL* 223.
- *Sicinius*: spelled Σικίννιος in some inscriptions of the legate of Thrace in AD 202, Q. Sicinius Clarus (*IGBulg.* 1690, 1999, 5407). Since Sicinii are attested in some numbers during the early Roman republic, this spelling is also found in some Greek authors (see Pape–Benseler; e.g., Dion. Hal. 6, 45, 3).

On the other hand, one also finds some instances of nomina with apparently, or at least probably, a long *i* before the *n* being equipped with a geminated ν in Greek inscriptions:

---

[8] H. Solin – O. Salomies, *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum* (1988; ²1994). Note that the reference there (p. 107 s.v. *Lucinius*) to *IGR* III 759 is a mistake, cf. *TAM* II 1194. On the other hand, one might add Lucinius Fronto, Damigeron *de lapidibus*, in R. Halleux & J. Schamp, *Les lapidaires grecs* (Budé, Paris 1985) 231, although this must be an invented character.

[9] Further Rasinii (with just one ν) in the East *AE* 1939, 44 (Philippi; cf. C. Vetidius Rasinianus from Philippi *CIL* XVI 10; *RMD* IV 203); *SEG* 39, 1338 (from the Caicus valley).

[10] Cf. M. L. Lazzarini, *RFIC* 112 (1984) 327–330.

- *Afinius*: this nomen is spelled Ἀφείνιος in Sherk, *RDGE*[11] no. 12 = G. Petzl, *I. Smyrna* 589 (the *s. c. de agro Pergameno* of 129 or possibly 101 BC), lines 28 and 34, and in *FD* III 4, 114 ([Ἀ]φείνιος Σωτίων of Nicopolis, end of the first century AD), and this seems to be a pretty clear indication that the *i* was long; in spite of this, the name is written Ἀφίννιος in *I. Perge* II 401 (Τερτία Ἀφιννία Λουκίου θυγάτηρ, clearly an early text) and in *I. Ephesos* 1048 (Λούκιος Ἀφίννιος Λ. υἱὸς Παλ. Παυλεῖνος).[12]
- *Atinius*. The *i* is long in a Greek metrical inscription from Rome, *IG* XIV 1437 = *IGUR* III 1165 = *GVI* 1596 (acc. Ἀτινίαν ∪–∪∪), cited already by Schulze p. 68, and if one excludes the possibility that this is just metrical licence,[13] one must perhaps conclude with Schulze that the *i* seems to have been long. However, there are a number of Greek inscriptions in which the name is spelled Ἀτίννιος; this is the case in at least the following inscriptions: *IG* XII Suppl. 285 (Andros: [Τιβέ]ριος Ἀτίννιος [Ὀν]ήσιμος), *CIL* III 14400d = *IGR* III 1484 (Ἀτιννία Κλεοπάτρα; Lystra); *I. Anazarbos* 639 (Γάιος Ἀτίννιος Μοντανὸς Οὐλεντιανός).[14] There is also the Latin inscription from Ephesos, *CIL* III 6087 = *I. Ephesos* 1636 = R.A. Kearsley, in *IK* 59, 29 (A. Atinnius No(v)ember).[15]
- *Carminius*. The *i* may well have been long, as two inscriptions have, or at least are reported to have, an *I longa* before the *n*, *I. Aquileia* 140 (with photo) and *CIL* VIII 3074 cf. p. 1740.[16] (The Carminii thus seem to have had nothing to do with *carmina* …) However, in a Latin papyrus of AD 150 from Egypt, *CPL* 117, the nomen of one of the consuls mentioned in the date is spelled *Carminnius*.
- *Verginius*. There is enough evidence to show that the *i* was long (see Schulze p. 100; cf. Οὐεργείνιος in *REG* 15 [1902] 313 no. 4 from Komana in Pontus; *RPh* 36 [1912] 53 no. 5 from Iconium). In spite of this, one observes a Οὐεργιννία Ἀσκληπία in a inscription from somewhere in Galatia (*RECAM* II 224).

---

[11] R. Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (1969).

[12] The spelling *Afinnius* is found also in *ICVR* IX 24635.

[13] One wonders whether "*Ateini*" in Pais 1080, 85 (a "patella Aquileiae rep.") could also be quoted here.

[14] The existence of this person shows that non-citizens attested at Anazarbos who have the name Ἀτίννιος or Ἀτίννις (*I. Anazarbos* 294, 301, 399; the feminine form used as a cognomen in 497) indeed have a Latin (and not a barbarian) name. The same goes no doubt for Ἀτιννία Κουαλεως θυγάτηρ in S. Hagel – K. Tomaschitz, *Repertorium der westkilikischen Inschriften* (1998) 112 Hamaxia 32.

[15] Schulze p. 68 quotes this inscription and the one from Lystra as instances of the spelling *Atinnius*; as he cannot explain this spelling by saying that the *i* must have been short, he says that the explanation must be that the name was of Etruscan origin.

[16] On the other hand, an inscription from Luceria, *AE* 1996, 455, with *C]armeniu[s*, might be adduced to show that the *i* was in fact short (for the variation between a short *i* and and short *e* in accented syllables, cf. above n. 2). But we may in fact be dealing with the nomen *Armenius*.

- There is also *Lucinius*, once written Λουκίννιος, but the quantity of the *i* is not certain (cf. above).[17]

In the majority of the instances of names in -*inius* written with geminates, we are at any rate dealing with names with a short *i* before the *n*, and even in the cases of those names referred to above in which there is evidence for the *i* having been long, the evidence at least for *Atinius* and *Carminius* does not seem to me to be above suspicion. One observes, for example, that not a single instance of *Atinius* having been written as *Ἀτείνιος, *Carminius* as *Καρμείνιος can be found whereas it is normal to find names such as *Aninius* and *Caninius* written with the long *i* reproduced with ει.[18]

It seems clear that, at least originally, the gemination of the ν in nomina ending in -*inius* was due to the fact that the *i* preceding the *n* was short. This was seen by Schulze (n. 1) who refers to this explanation in several places (e.g., p. 108 n. 1 on *Licinius*, p. 129 on *Asinius*, p. 231 on *Sicinius*); the same view is taken by H. Solin, in *Delo e l'Italia* (*OpuscIRF* 2, 1982) 108f. One could also note that, in the earlier period (say, up to the end of the first century BC), the gemination is attested exclusively in names with a short *i*, and that these names always form the majority of the instances. Moreover, the gemination of consonants following after short vowels with a stress is in general a development not completely unheard of; in Greek, one could perhaps refer to the existence of "Kurznamen" with a "Verdoppelung" of the consonants as, e.g., in Σθέννις (~ σθένος),[19] On the other hand, it must be admitted that, at least in Greek, there are not very many parallels which one could adduce here.[20] That the phenomenon of the *Licinnii*, etc., has not been the subject of much scholarly attention may be due to the fact that stu-

---

17 Σαβίννιος in *IG* II^2 1961, line 23 (c. 40 BC), the *i* in *Sabinius* being long, in fact turns out to be a Σαφίννιος (*SEG* 34, 153: [Λ]εύκιος Σαφίννιο[ς] Ἀθμονεύς; cf. above).

18 For Κανείνιος, cf., e.g., *CID* IV 160; *SEG* 47, 284 (somewhere in the Peloponnese); *IG* XII 1, 95 (Rhodes); *IG* XII 2, 88 (Mytilene, earlyish); *I. Ephesos* 635C, 639, 648, 892; etc. Ἀνείνιος: e.g., *I. Pergamon* 374, 485; *MAMA* VII 282 (Amorion; further instances of Ἀνείνιος – but also of Ἀνίνιος – at Amorion are referred to in the commentary on *MAMA* I 430).

19 See E. Fraenkel, 'Namenwesen', *RE* XVI (1935) 1641f. (Σθέννις e.g., *IG* II^2 3829, 4902, *I. Oropos* 371f., 383, *IG* XIV 1149 = *IGUR* 1491). One could perhaps also note, e.g., the fact that Latin *Lupus* is often rendered as Λ(ο)ύππος (e.g., Πόντιος Λούππος *IG* X 2, 1, 578; the *PHI* database offers 42 matches for 'Λουππ'). From other languages, note perhaps Italian *Lucca* for *Luca*, etc.

20 Cf., e.g., R. Kühner & F. Blass, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* I (^{3}1890) 268ff. on 'Vordoppelung der Konsonanten'. Note that in some of the "Kurznamen" with gemination mentioned by Fraenkel the stress is in fact not on the syllable preceding the gemination.

dents of Latin view this as a Greek phenomenon whereas students of Greek have ascribed the gemination of the consonant to Latin influence,[21] the result being that neither Latinists (but note the contribution of H. Solin referred to above) nor Hellenists have felt that the phenomenon should be addressed in some way.

As for the forms in -ίννιος in names in which the *i* was long, I think that they could be explained by assuming that the orthography with a geminate was based on an imitation of the orthography of names in -ίννιος in which the *i* was short (of which especially Λικίννιος was quite frequent);[22] it may, however, also be that, with the passing of time, the quantity of the *i* in some of the names in -*inius* had become uncertain.[23]

It may be of interest to note that there are some nomina in -*inius* (with a short *i*) for which I have not been able to trace any instances of the spelling -ίννιος (or possibly -έννιος); thus, e.g., *Cominius Geminius* and *Flaminius*. In the case of *Flaminius*, one could assume that this comes from the fact that most of the instances of this nomen seem to be rather early;[24] as for *Cominius* (attested mainly in Macedonia) and *Geminius*, perhaps one could assume that some Greeks had started to pronounce them with a long *i* (cf. n. 23).

---

[21] Thus Th. Eckinger, *Die Orthographie lateinischer Wörter in griechischen Inschriften* (Diss. Zürich, München 1892) 112f.; L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* I [1980] 326. Note also, e.g., the curt dismissal of the need to explain the phenomenon by Greek epigraphists by labelling spellings with a geminate as 'errors' or the like (e.g., M. Segre on Στερτίννιος in *I. Cos* EV 43 ['errato raddoppiamento'] and 301 ['un N superfluo']).

[22] It should, however, be noted that there seem to be no occurrences at all of the spelling -ίννιος in the case of nomina with a long *i* such as *Albinius Aninius Caninius Graecinius Sabinius Varinius*.

[23] But this can, I think, be demonstrated only in the case of nomina in which a short *i* seems to have been treated as a long one; e.g., *Cominius*, in which the *i* is short (Schulze 108 n. 1; add Κομένιος *I. Leukopetra* 23, 25, 35), in spite of which one observes the spellings Κομείνιος (D. Samsaris, Ἡ Ἀκτία Νικόπολη (1994) 51 no. 6) and Κομήνιος (*I. Leukopetra* 22, this nomen also being spelled Κομίνιος, ibid. 26f., 29–34, 36f., 39–41, 107; I am, however, not sure whether the spelling Κομήν- is of any real significance). Note also *Geminius* (with a short *i*, Schulze 108 with n. 5) being written Γεμείνιος in Thessalonica (*IG* X 2, 1, 181, 187; *AE* 1996, 1368 = *SEG* 46, 815; also in Preisigke, where one also finds Καικείλιος); cf. Γέμε[ι]να *Fouilles de Xanthos* VII 40 (also in Preisigke).

[24] For *Flaminius* on Delos, see *Les Italiens dans le monde grec* (*BCH* Suppl. 41, 2002) 196 no. 1–2; for Athenian instances leaving the impression of being early cf. *IG* II^2 10146, 10166, 10941, 11674a (p. 888), for similar instances from Megara and Eretria, see *AE* 1991, 1452 = *SEG* 39, 414 cf. 41, 424; *AE* 1991,1451 = *SEG* 41, 425; *IG* XII 9, 851, 853, 858 (note that the spelling is often Φλαμένιος).

Let us now move on to some observations regarding individual names with the suffix -ίννιος, starting, however, with an overview of the earliest instances in each case:

- Ἀσίννιος. The earliest attestation of this spelling seems to be J. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (1982) no. 8, line 7 (*senatus consultum* concerning the *asylia* of Plarasa/Aphrodisias, 39 BC, Γναῖος Ἀσίννιος Γναίου υἱὸς [---]).[25]
- Κο(υ)σίννιος. *AE* 1993, 1469 = *SEG* 43, 766 (Ephesus, in a letter of the proconsul P. Petronius, AD 30/31).
- Φο(υ)λκίννιος. This spelling is on a coin from the middle of the 2nd century (cf. above n. 7).
- Λικίννιος. Sherk, *RDGE* (n. 11) no. 12 = G. Petzl, *I. Smyrna* 589 (the *s. c. de agro Pergameno* of 129 or possibly 101 BC), line 29: Γάιος Λικίννιος Γαίου [--]. Further instances from the Republican period: *OGI* 436 = Sherk, *RDGE* (n. 11) no. 13 = T. Drew-Bear, *Nouvelles inscriptions de Phrygie* (1978) 1ff. no. 1 (C. Licinius Geta as praetor in *c.* 119 BC [?]); J. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (1982) no. 8 (*senatus consultum* of 39 BC, cf. above; two T. Licinnii); *IGR* IV 701 = *MAMA* IV 52 (Synnada) and *I. Ephesos* 2941 (Lucullus); *IG* II^2 1961 = *SEG* 34, 153, line 68 (an Αὖλος Λικίννιος Ῥω[μ]αῖος of *c.* 40 BC); *I. Perge* 376 = *AE* 2004, 1514 (apparently the latter part of the 1st century BC).
- Παπίννιος: *AE* 1990, 918 = *SEG* 39, 1176, B, F (Ephesus, in a list of contributions from the time of Tiberius).
- Σαφίννιος. Attested at Athens in c. 40 BC (see n. 17).
- Στερτίννιος. Attested in a list of names from Thespiae which seems earlyish, perhaps from the Julio-Claudian period,[26] *IG* VII 1777, line 9. This orthography is also used in some inscriptions from Cos of C. Stertinius Xenophon (*PIR*² S 913), the emperor Claudius' personal physician (Segre, *I. Cos* EV 43, 301).[27] However, there are also some Republican instances from Delos, the spelling in these cases being Στερτέννιος (for the variation *i/e* in short accentuated syllables cf. above n. 2 and *Rasinius/Rasenius* at n. 9):[28] *I. Delos* 2616, i 25, 2622 ii 22; M.-Th. Couilloud, *Les monuments funéraires de Rhénée* (1974) no. 372.
- Τιτίννιος. There do not seem to be very early occurrences of this spelling.

[25] It should be noted, however, that most of the documents in Aphrodisias were inscribed in the early third century, which may have had an influence on the orthography. (On the other hand, it is hard to see why an editor of the documents or a stonecutter would have wished to "correct" Ἀσίνιος to Ἀσίννιος.)

[26] C. Müller, in *Les Italiens* (n. 24) 95f. dates it to the 1st century AD, but this date seems a bit too broad (cf., e.g., the presence of a certain Κόιντος Λόξιος in line 14).

[27] On the inscriptions regarding Xenophon from Cos, cf. W. Eck, in S. Demougin & al. (eds.), *H.-G. Pflaum. Un historien du XXe siècle* (2006) 486–8.

[28] Cf., on Delos, Στερτίνιος (common) ~ Στερτένιος (*ID* 2378).

Let us now proceed to a more general examination of the attestations of some of the more common nomina for which forms in -ίννιος are attested.

Asinius. The *PHI* database gives 23 matches for *Asinni-*, 32 for *Asini-*, but if one ignores those cases in which the reading is uncertain or based only on a restoration of the text, one arrives at the figures 17 for *Asinni-*, 14 for *Asini-*; if one adds inscriptions not in the database (*SEG* 43, 865 = *AE* 1993, 1506 from Sardis, 3rd century AD; *SEG* 44, 1117 = *AE* 1994, 1747 from Termessos, both with Ἀσίννιος), one might conclude that the form in -ίννιος was, during the Empire, possibly a bit more popular, although one observes, on the whole, that earlier inscriptions more often have Ἀσίνιος (e.g., *IG* V 2, 26; *IG* XII 6, 1, 367, B I [Asinius Pollio cos. AD 23]; *IGR* IV 1462 = *I. Smyrna* 362, clearly an earlyish text),[29] later ones Ἀσίννιος. However, Ἀσίνιος is not unheard of in the 3rd century AD.[30] It does not seem to be possible to discern differences between different areas (e.g., in Smyrna, one finds both Ἀσίνιος and Ἀσίννιος).[31] – Preisigke and Foraboschi have 5 instances of Ἀσίννιος, none of Ἀσίνιος.

Cosinius Cusinius.[32] The *PHI* database gives 11 matches for Κοσίννιος, 6 for Κοσίνιος, and 1 for Κουσίννιος, 6 for Κουσίνιος, but these numbers do not quite tell the whole story, as the same Cosinnius Gaianus appears in several inscriptions from Ephesus, his nomen being written consistently with a geminate. Κο(υ)σίννιος is found in the following inscriptions: *AE* 1993, 1469 = *SEG* 43, 766 (Ephesus, AD 30/31, letter of the proconsul P. Petronius, the same person, ὁ ἐμὸς φίλος, being called both Κοσίννιος and Κουσίννιος); *I. Ephesos* 1034–39, Λ. Κοσίννιος Γαιανός, a ἱερὸς σαλπικτὴς ὀλυμπιονείκης in the time of Hadrian; *I. Ephesos* 1044, Γα. Ἰούλ. Κοσίννιος Τρυφωνᾶς, βουλ(ευτής); in a funerary inscription also from Ephesos, *AE* 1993, 1489 = *SEG* 43, 825, both Κοσίννιος and Κοσίνιος are found. Moreover, there is a further example of Κοσίννιος in a verse inscription from Caesarea Hadrianopolis in Pontos, C. Marek, *Stadt, Ära*

29 Cf. also Γάλλωι Ἀσινίωι τῶι ἐμῶι φίλωι in a letter of Augustus, J.H. Oliver, *Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors* (1989) no. 6, line 11.

30 E.g., *I. Olympia* 356 (Asinius Quadratus, proconsul in around AD 200); *IG* XII 7, 53 (the consul of AD 242 in a consular date). *Altertümer von Hierapolis* 167 also seems fairly late. – Both Ἀσίνιος and Ἀσίννιος are used in *Fouilles de Delphes* III 4, 48 (early 2nd century AD).

31 There are also some instances of *Asinnius* in Latin inscriptions (*CIL* VI 12529, 25907).

32 That these are alternative spellings of the same name is clear, e.g., from the fact that the tribe *Velina*, on the whole not at all common, is attested in Asia both for Cosinii (*AE* 1993, 1489 = *SEG* 43, 825) and Cusinii (*I. Ephesos* 4119f.; *AE* 1941, 144); moreover, the same person is called both Κοσίννιος and Κουσίννιος in the same inscription (*AE* 1993, 1469 = *SEG* 43, 766 from Ephesus). The *o/u* was thus short. *Cosinius* is sometimes (on Kos normally) written *Cossinius*, this variation being observable also in Latin inscriptions from Italy (Schulze 159).

und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia (1993) 200 no. 49. There is also an instance of *Cusinnius* from Rome, *CIL* VI 16679.

Licinius. The *PHI Greek Inscriptions* database gives 320 matches for Λικίννι-, 160 for Λικίνι-, this clearly meaning that the spelling with a geminate was more popular than the spelling with a simple ν (in Preisigke and Foraboschi, too, the number of occurrences of Λικίννιος is larger than that of Λικίνιος). But the differences between the number of attestations of both spellings are greater if one has a look at certain regions. In Lycia, the nomen *Licinius* was, as a result of the activities of C. Licinius Mucianus, governor in the time of Nero (*PIR*^{2} L 242), extremely common, and even a quick look at a collection of Lycian inscriptions from the Roman period will show that the form used is normally that with a geminate. The *PHI* database confirms this impression by producing 89 matches for Λικίννι- and only 9 matches (appearing in 5 inscriptions) for Λικίνι-.[33] On the other hand, in regions in which the inscriptions tend to be earlier, and in which Licinii appearing in inscriptions include Republican senators (Crassi, Luculli, Murenae, etc.), the differences are smaller (in Attica, Λικίννι- 36 matches, Λικίνι- 15; in the Peloponnese, we are given 11 matches for Λικίννι-, 10 matches for Λικίνι-).

It was observed above that the earliest attestations of Λικίννιος with a geminate were from the late second century BC, and that there were several further instances of this orthography from the Republican period. It is, however, clear that, during the early period, the form without the geminate still dominated. If one studies the inscriptions set up in honour of Lucullus, one observes that Lucullus' nomen is written as Λικίννιος in two inscriptions, one from Ephesus and one from Synnada (both referred to above), whereas the form Λικίνιος is used in 7 inscriptions, 5 from Greece, 2 from Asia Minor.[34] In the case of L. Licinius Murena, only the form Λικίνιος seems to be attested.[35] But from the early Empire onwards, the form with a geminate seems to be the more common form almost everywhere, although one observes interesting cases of the the persistence of the orthography with just one ν; for instance, in the inscriptions in honour of the consular M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus from Thyatira, attested in the period between

[33] One of these being an inscription in honour of the legate Mucianus himself, *IGR* III 486 = *OGI* 558 = *ILS* 8816. For Asia Minor in general, the numbers are 202 matches for Λικίννι-, 62 matches for Λικίνι-. – On Λικίνιος / Λικίννιος, cf. also H. Solin, art. cit. (at n. 19) 108f.

[34] *IG* II^2 4104, 4233; *IG* X 2, 38 (Hypata); *ID* 1758; *IG* XII 1, 48 (Rhodes); *TAM* V 2, 918 (Thyatira); *AE* 2000. 1386 = *SEG* 51, 1588 (Klaros); *Bull. ép.* 1970, 441 (Andros).

[35] *IG* V 1. 1454 = *AE* 2000, 1336 (Messene); *I. Olympia* 321; *IG* XII 1, 48 (Rhodes); *I. Kaunos* 103 (similarly in the case of C. Murena the son, ibid. 104).

the late Severans and 238, the spelling is more often Λικίνιος than Λικίννιος.[36] On the other hand, the spelling with just one ν is extremely uncommon, e.g., in the case of the emperor Licinius Valerianus and his family[37] and in that of the still later emperor Licinianus Licinius.[38] Pape–Benseler (s. v.) also cite some instances of Λικίννιος in Greek authors (especially Plutarch). There are also a number of examples, most of them latish and from the Greek East, of the spelling *Licinnius* in Latin inscriptions.[39]

Papinius. As observed above, the earliest attestation of the spelling Παπίννιος is in a list of contributions from Ephesus from the time of Tiberius (*AE* 1990, 918 = *SEG* 39, 1176, B, F). The same form is used in similar list of about the same date (*I. Ephesos* 1396 cf. *SEG* 37, 883). The other occurrences, much later, come from Philadelphia in Lydia (*SEG* 17, 52 and 53). Παπίνιος, with just one ν, is found in earlyish inscriptions from Athens (*IG* II^2 3919) and from a place called *Karahallı* in Lydia,[40] and in some inscriptions of somewhat later date.[41]

---

36 Λικίνιος: *TAM* V 2, 985, 986; *I. Beroea* 101; cf. the abbreviation Λικίν., no doubt representing Λικίνιος rather than Λικίννιος: *TAM* V 2, 984; *SEG* 47, 1656 = *AE* 1997, 1425 (also from Thyatira). Λικίννιος: *TAM* V 2, 987; *IG* X 2, 1, 142 (Thessalonica). The inscriptions are all quoted by F. Millar, *JRS* 89 (1999) 92–5 = Id., *Government, Society & Culture in the Roman Empire* (2004) 439–443.

37 Examples of the spelling with just one ν: *IGBulg.* III 883; *Gerasa* 159.

38 *IG* VII 2504; both Λικίνι- and Λικίννι- are used in *TAM* V 2, 1182 (milestone from Apollonis).

39 See Schulze 108 n. 1 (ascribing this correctly "griechischem Einfluß"), citing, from Rome, *CIL* VI 13341 and 21347. Further instances from the West: *ICVR* VI 15535; AE 1978, 630 (Carnuntum, a soldier from Savaria). Earlyish instances from the East: *CIL* III 7110 = *I. Smyrna* 383 (with *sueis*, etc.); cf. *Licinnianus* in *AE* 1984, 893 (Caesarea, Cappadocia, the son of a certain C. Coesius C. f. Fab. Florus). Further instances: the legate of Cappadocia under Maximinus, Licinnius Serenianus (*CIL* III 6932, 6945, already cited by Schulze; *AE* 1985, 813); inscriptions of Valerian and his family (*CIL* III 184 = *ILS* 540, already in Schulze; *AE* 1981, 750, Tomi). There are also many milestones of the emperor Licinianus Licinius in which the names are written with geminates, mostly from Asia Minor but also from Epirus (*AE* 1984, 814) and Macedonia (L. Gounaropoulou & M.B. Hatzopoulos, *Les milliaires de la voie Egnatienne* [1985] no. viii, B). Note also, e.g., *IDR* III 5, 1, 389; *IGLS* I 71; *CPL* 156 (AD 148; *C. Iuli Licinniani*).

40 H. Malay, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in the Manisa Museum* (1994) no. 31 (13/12 BC: Γάιον Παπίνιον Γαίου υἱὸν Αἰμιλία Ῥᾶον [= *Ra(v)um*]).

41 *IGR* IV 1403 = *I. Smyrna* 725; *Altertümer v. Hierapolis* 175. (For the incorrect spelling Παπείνιος in an inscription from Dion cf. n. 3). Cf. also H. Solin, art. cit. (at n. 19) 109.

Stertinius (cf. H. Solin, art. cit. [at n. 19] 109). As noted above, there are a few Republican instances of Στερτέννιος on Delos and some early imperial attestations of Στερτίννιος. The spelling with a geminate never became common (the contrast with Λικίννιος etc., is striking); the *PHI* database gives 7 matches for Στερτίννιος, but 102 matches for Στερτίνιος. However, this figure does not tell the whole story, as 64 of the 102 inscriptions cited there are inscriptions from Cos (or, in two cases, from the neighbouring island of Calymnos) honouring, or at least referring to, the physician Xenophon. Among the rest of the examples of Στερτίνιος, there are six further inscriptions from Cos, all earlyish (to these one can now add five more Stertinii from Cos, not identical with the doctor, in *Iscrizioni di Cos* vol. II)[42] and 11 attestations on Delos. Then there are inscriptions referring to Stertinius Maximus cos. AD 23 (*IG* XII 6, 1, 367, B II) and to Stertinius Quartus, proconsul of Asia in 126/7.[43] In addition, there are a few further instances, mainly from Ephesus, but also from some other places, most of them early.[44] The only attestations which are or, at least seem to be, a bit later are *IG* X 2, 2, 87 from Heraclea Lyncestis and *I. Ephesos* 1540 (*ILS* 8833), an inscription set up by Στερτίνιος Μάξιμος Εὐτύχης, ἱππικὸ[ς] Ῥωμαίων, in honour of the legate of Asia Attidius Tuscus, no doubt in the third century.[45] Some of the attestations of the form with a geminate also seem later than the first century AD (cf. below). It seems in general that *Stertinius* was a nomen which, in the early period of Roman overseas emigration, made a spectacular entry into the eastern lands, but which then somehow succeeded in fading away, leaving only a few traces datable later than the first century AD. And this may well be the explanation of the domination, in Greek inscriptions, of the form without the geminate.

As for the forms with the geminate, in addition to those referred to above, I seem to be able to locate only the following: A. Maiuri, *Nuova silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos* (1925) nos. 628 (clearly not very early) and 631, both from Cos,[46]

---

42 M. Segre, *Iscrizioni di Cos* (edited by M. L. Lazzarini & G. Vallarino; Monografie della Scuola Archeologica di Atene etc. VI,2, 2007).

43 *Sardis* 7, 1, 52, I; *IGR* IV 1156; *SEG* 28, 1169 = *AE* 1978, 800 (Metropolis).

44 For the date of Δέκμος Στερτίνιος Εἰσίων in *IG* VII 1826 (from Creusis, the port of Thespiae) cf. Chr. Müller in *Les italiens* (n. 24) 98 (approximately Augustan).

45 This man must be either identical with M. Nummius … Attidius … Tuscus cos. ord. 258 (cf. now *CIL* VI 41225b) or at least closely related. (Note also the formulations of the inscription, pointing to the third century.) The date suggested by R.A. Kearsley, *Greeks and Romans in Imperial Asia* (*IK* 59, 2001) no. 117, "AD I–early II", is incorrect.

46 One should perhaps also consider reading not Στερτίν/[ι]ος but Στερτίν/[νι]ιος in the recently published inscription from Cos, *Iscrizioni di Cos* (n. 42) 645, as suggested by the *ordinatio* of the inscription.

and *I. Iznik-Nikaia* 100 (2nd century AD or later)[47] and 230 (vol. II 1 p. 315).

Titinius. It was noted above that there do not seem to be very early examples of this nomen written with a geminate. The *PHI* database gives 5 matches for Τιτίννιος, 17 for Τιτίνιος; the explanation may be that this is one of the nomina appearing early in the East, and of which quite a few of the attestations are early.[48] In any case, one can find the form with a double ν in (at least) the following inscriptions: *IG* XII 8, 471 (Thasos; note the presence of M. Ulpii); *I. Ephesos* 710A; and P.M. Nigdelis, Ἐπιγραφικὰ Θεσσαλονίκεια (2006) p. 152 (clearly not very early). There is also a papyrus, *P. Leit.* 8 (Τιτίννιος Κλωδιανός, 3rd century AD), the only attestation of the nomen *Titin(n)ius* cited in Preisigke and Foraboschi.[49] Moreover, there are also instances of the cognomen Τιτιννιανός –ή: *I. Ephesos* 710A (second century AD?) and *IGR* III 803 = *CIL* III 231 (A. Curtius Auspicatus Titinnianus, one of the builders of the spectacular theatre at Aspendos, mid-second century, the name being written with a geminate both in the Greek and the Latin text).[50] There are also some further examples of the orthography with the geminate in Latin inscriptions: *CIL* VI 1908 and 32303 (the same persons).

2. Some other suffixes

There are also nomina with other suffixes (*-cius -lius -sius*, etc.) preceded by a short vowel in the case of which one observes the suffix now and then being written with a geminate. Of course, this is something which is not altogether unknown in Latin inscriptions from the West; for instance, *Sosius* (with short *o*) is sometimes is written *Sossius*, especially in inscriptions of a somewhat later date.[51] On the other hand, there are names where the forms with a geminate seem

47 In this inscription, the person called [Στ]ερτίννιος has the cognomen Κουᾶρ[τος], without any doubt (although this is an inscription from Bithynia) inspired by the nomenclature of the proconsul of Asia in 126/7, P. Stertinius Quartus (n. 43); this person must thus be dated later than the proconsul.

48 For early attestations cf., e.g., *ID* 2622, a, II, 6; *IG* VII 416 = *I. Oropos* 523, line 51; *I. Smyrna* 381.

49 Τιτίννιος is also the reading in Plut. *Mar.* 38.

50 For the Curtii mentioned in this inscription and the consulate of one of them in 159, cf. P. Weiß, *Chiron* 29 (1999) 162–5 (with a bibliography on this inscription p. 162 n. 20).

51 Note, e.g., consular dates of 107, 149, 169 and 193, when a Sosius held the consulate: *CIL* VI 31142 (107); *AE* 2000, 344 (Misenum, 149); *CIL* XIV 2408 = *ILS* 5196, *CIL* XI 405, *AE* 1993, 1783 (Caesarea, Mauretania; 169); *CIL* VI 1173, *Suppl. It.* 4 Trebula Suffenas 35, *CIL* X

to be more or less independent names and where the existence of two forms may be due to the regional and/or dialectal origins of the names in question; one thinks of names such as *Titius / Tittius*.[52] Moreover, there are forms which seem to be variants of the same name but which are actually different names; for example, I do not think that *Atius* (with a long *a*) should be connected with *Attius*. However, this phenomenon cannot be studied at length in this article dealing with mainly Greek habits, and even in the case of these, I shall content myself with pointing out a few names in which one sometimes observes the gemination of a simple consonant preceded by a short vowel on which the accent lies.

A. Names in -ilius:

- *Aemilius*: in a few cases written Αἰμίλλιος.[53]
- *Caecilius*: there are some instances of Καικίλλιος / Κεκίλλιος.[54]
- *Cartilius*: Καρτίλλιος is attested in a papyrus (*P. Marm.*).[55]
- *Hostilius* (the *i* was probably short):[56] a few times written Ὁστίλλιος[57]
- *Otacilius*: sometimes written Ὠτακίλλιος.[58]

4760 = *ILS* 6296 (193). For Σόσσιος in Greek consular dates, cf. *IG* XII 3, 325, 17f.; *IGR* I 23; III 705, 1275 (149); *BGU* 7, 1655; *I. Konya Mus.* 66 (169).

52 One might adduce here, e.g., the disposition of Oscan to use geminates instead of simple consonants before an *i* (C.D. Buck, *Elementarbuch der osk.-umbrischen Dialekte* [1905] 65), perhaps more common in genitves, e.g., *dekiis* (Lat. '*Decius*') ~ gen. *dekkieís* (thus Rix Cm14C 9, 10), but also in nominatives (cf. now *dekkiis* Rix Sa59 [p. 85]).

53 *AS* 18 (1968) 104 no. 2,08 (Comana in Cappadocia); *IGLS* II 448 (AD 195), 472; *IGLS* III 2, 1138; *IGLS* XIII 9109 (AD 282/3); three instances in Preisgke. (For Αἰμιλλιανός cf. H. Solin, *Repertorium nominum et cognominum Latinorum* [1994] 289.) Also in two Latin inscriptions from Italy: *CIL* X 3428 cf. *Puteoli* 11 (1987) 68; *AE* 1980, 335 (near Otranto).

54 *SEG* 46, 818 (Thessalonica); *IGBulg.* I^2 86; *I. Perge* 454 (also in a Latin inscription from Perge, ibid. 202); *IGR* IV 802 (= III 29); I. *Philae* 317; cf. also Κεκιλλιανός (used as a nomen) *I. Leukopetra* 87 and *Caecillius* in a bilingual inscription from Prymnessus (*CIL* III 7043 cf. 14192,3 = *ILS* 976 = *IGR* IV 675. There are also a handful of occurrences of *Caecillius* (and *Caecillianus*) in Latin inscriptions outside Italy.

55 M. Norsa, G. Vitelli, *Il papiro vaticano greco 11* (Studi e testi 53, 1931). *Cartillius* in a Latin inscription: *CIL* VI 12428. The *i* was probably short (Schulze 335 n. 2).

56 See O. Salomies, *Die römischen Vornamen* (1987) 135 n. 381.

57 Cf. previous note. In my note in *Vornamen*, I also quote examples from Greek authors. To the inscriptions cited there, add *I. Hadrianoi* 11; also in *P. Phil.* 35. *Hostillius* in a Latin inscription: *CIL* XI 4139 = V 8928 (the same text).

58 *IGBulg.* II 732, III 900, 1710; *SEG* 46, 843 (the empress Otacilia Severa); *IG* XIV 2112 = *IGUR* 1059. For the *i* being short, cf. Schulze 131 (with n. 3). Note that the initial *o* should be short, not long (the normal spelling of this name thus being Ὀτακίλιος).

- *Rupilius*: in a few cases written Ῥο(υ)πίλλιος.[59]
- *Turpilius*: there are two instances of Τουρπίλλιος from Macedonia.[60]
- *Vergilius*: Οὐεργέλλιος (sic) *SB* 9016 (Cn. Vergilius Capito, prefect of Egypt under Claudius).

It must be observed that the fact that a name normally ending in *-ilius* is written with a geminate in Greek inscriptions cannot be used to show that the *i* preceding the suffix must have been short, for nomina with a long *i* are also attested as having been sometimes spelled with geminates; one thinks, e.g., of Λουκίλλιος, a poet often appearing in the *Anthologia Palatina* (*PIR*² L 376).[61] Other nomina with a long *i* preceding the suffix *-lius* sometimes found spelled with a geminate are *Catilius*, *Pacilius*, *Rutilius* (only in late inscriptions) and *Servilius*; from Greek authors, one can add *Acilius*, *Atilius* and *Manilius*.[62]

---

[59] *IG* X 2, 1, 171; *SEG* 49, 814 = Nigdelis, op. cit. (at n. 7) p. 103 (with two instances of Ῥουπιλλία and one of Ῥουπιλία); *I. Ephesos* 698, 714; many occurrences on Cos, where the spelling Ῥο(υ)πίλλιος is much more common than Ῥο(υ)πίλιος (see now *Iscrizioni di Cos* [n. 42] p. 218).

[60] *IG* X 2, 1, 713; Demitsas, Μακεδονία 821 (Serrhae). This is also the reading in Plut. *Mar.* 8, 1. Instances of *Turpillius* in Latin inscriptions: *CIL* VI 27790; *CIL* IX 1455, 2, 56; I. *Aquileia* 1568. Cf. also Οὐεργιλλιανός *P. Lond.* II 196 = Wilcken, *Chrest.* II 87, col. I (c. 141).

[61] Λουκίλλιος also in *BMC* Phrygia 374 no. 32 (Sebaste, Phrygia); two instances in Preisigke and Foraboschi. This is also the reading in Plut. *Pomp.* 54, 2; *Brut.* 50, 1; *Ant.* 69, 1. In a Latin inscription: *AE* 1991, 456 (Abella). It should be observed that the cognomen Λουκιλλιανός –ή must normally be regarded as being derived from Λουκίλλα (cf., e.g., *Maximus* > *Maximilla* > *Maximillianus*), not from Λουκίλλιος; it cannot thus be used to illustrate the spelling of the nomen with a geminate.

[62] Κατίλλιος: attested mainly in Nicaea (where *Catilius* was one of the most common nomina) or in the case of persons from Nicaea: *I. Iznik (Nikaia)* 756, 1204, 1323, 1372; *FD* III 2, 102 (AD 129); *IG* XIV 790 = *IGI* Napoli 128. In other places: *I. Kios* 105; *IG* XII 8, 600 (Thasos); *TAM* V 2, 1142. There is also one instance of Κατίλλιος (and one of Κατιλλιανός) in Preisigke, both from the 3rd century AD. The spelling Κατίλιος does not seem to have been very much more common than that with a geminate. There are also a handful of attestations of *Catillius* in Latin inscriptions, but this spelling is attested only once in Italy (*CIL* VI 14587) and is any case much less common than *Catilius*. Πακίλλιος: *P. Princeton* II 23 (Theadelphia, AD 13). Ῥουτίλλιος: *IGBulg.* III 897, IV 2021, 2040; *IGR* III 1033 = *OGIS* 640 (all these inscriptions referring to the third-century governor of Thrace and Syria Phoenice Rutilius Pudens Crispinus). Σερουίλλιος: *P. Ryl.* II 78; *SB* 6952 (AD 195). Authors: Ἀτίλλιος: the reading in Plut. *Brut*. 39,10 and *Galba* 26, 4; Ἀκίλλιος: Dion. Hal. 3, 67, 5; Μανίλλιος: a number of significant manuscripts in Plut. *Cato min.* 17, 6. Cf. also Μετιλλιανός, *AE* 2003, 1674 (Smyrna; I do not seem to able to locate an instance of *Μετίλλιος). – On the spelling *Aurellius* in inscriptions of Caracalla, see now M. Christol & T. Drew-Bear, in S. Golvin (ed.), *The Greco-Roman East* (*YCS* 33 [2004]) 89.

B. Some instances with other suffixes (-cius, -rius, -sius):

- *Decius*: this nomen is now and then spelled Δέκκιος.[63]
- *Herius*: written Ἕρριος in *Altert. von Hierapolis* 304 (and, but as a praenomen, in *EAD* 30, 402).[64]
- *Serius*: the nomen of the Roman senator M. Serius M. f. is written Σέρριος in Sherk, *RDGE* no. 12 = G. Petzl, *I. Smyrna* 589 (the *s. c. de agro Pergameno* of 129 or possibly 101 BC); the form with the geminate is also used in a consular date of 156 (with the consul Serius Augurinus) from Cyaneae (*IGR* III 705).[65] There are no certain examples of the spelling *Serrius* in Latin inscriptions.
- *Volusius*: the normal spelling of this nomen in Greek inscriptions of the later period (written Οὐολόσιος, etc. in early inscriptions)[66] seems to have been that with a geminate (Οὐολούσσιος, Βολόσσιος, Βολούσσιος, Οὐλούσσιος, etc.).[67]

Before I conclude, I would still like to point out that the geminate in names of the type Δέκκιος, etc. can sometimes be observed to have been introduced in similar names in which the geminate is not preceded by a syllable carrying the accent; thus we find, in addition to Δεκίμιος, also Δεκκίμιος (*IGLS* VII 4034), and *Volusenus* normally spelled Οὐολοσσηνός, etc.[68] Furthermore, one wonders

[63] *IG* II^2 2102, ii, 141; 2113, 63; 2132, 55–6; *Agora* XV 406, 13; *SEG* 26, 176, 185 (Athens, all examples being from the later second century AD); *IGBulg.* II 640 (*c.* 234, C. Messius Q. Decius Valerinus, legate of Moesia Inferior). There are also some early cases in which Δέκκιος, used in the genitive, is the Oscan praenomen used as a single name (*IG* XIV 282, Πασίων Δεκκίου Ἐγεσταῖος; *ID* 1417 A, col. II, 139–41, Βάχχιος Δεκκίου Τήνιος; this person must have had Oscan ancestors [cf. Τρέβιος in line 150]); in these cases, the gemination may be due to Oscan influence. – There is also Σέκκιος Τρόφιμος from Side, a sophist (*IG* XIV 1702 =*IGUR* 626), the only Sec(c)ius in the East; but although *Secius* is the normal form of this nomen, *Seccius* is also attested, although only outside Italy, and is clearly of barbarian origin (cf., e.g., *Acceptus Secci f.*, *CIL* III 5057), and this form, not the Italian *Secius*, may have found its way to the East for some reason.

[64] But it must be noted that although the normal form of this name is *Herius*, *Herrius* is not completely unknown even in Italy (see *CIL* VI 8816, X 2517, etc.).

[65] Cf. possibly also Σέρριος· ὄνομα κύριον, Suda Σ 250 (but this might be anything).

[66] E.g., *ID* 1624; *EAD* 30, 276; *IG* IV 1573; *I. Byzantion* 260; *SEG* 33, 835. From the Severan period: *AE* 2001, 1938 = *SEG* 49, 1951 (a senatorial lady in Elaioussa Sebaste).

[67] *IG* II^2 2897; *I.Perinthos* 99; *I. Apamea u. Pylai* 24 (= *AE* 1991, 1464), 43 (=*I. Kyzikos* 394); *I. Prusa ad Ol.* 181; *I. Selge* 20; *SEG* 42, 1211A (Etenna); *IGR* III 829 (Syedra); *AE* 1999, 1635 = *SEG* 49, 1931 (Patara); two instances of Βολ(ο)ύσσιος are cited in Preisigke. *Volussius* is not totally unknown in Latin inscriptions (quite a few occurrences in *CIL* VI, etc.). – As for the suffix *-tius* being spelled *-ttius*, cf. Σουβαττιανός in *BGU* II 484 (201/2).

[68] *IG* IV^2 1, 681; *IG* V 1, 233, 295, 490, 581; *IG* V 2, 544; *I. Smyrna* 438; *I. Perge* 467 ([Οὐολ]ουσσιηνός). (Cf. also Οὐολοσσιανός *IGR* IV 534.) I seem to able to find the spelling

whether one could also mention at this point the fact that *Matidius*, never written *Mattidius* in Latin inscriptions, is sometimes rendered Ματτίδιος in Greek inscriptions;[69] or that *Atilius* is a few times rendered Ἀττ(ε)ίλιος, once in an early text from Delos.[70] Note also Ὀσσίδιος for *Hosidius* in Aphrodisias.[71]

University of Helsinki

Οὐολοσηνός only in *IG* V 1, 68. Cf. also H. Solin, art. cit. (at n. 19) 109 n. 40.

69 *I. Ephesos* 278, 850, 3056 (?); Ματτιδιανός *I. Ephesos* 627.

70 *I. Delos* 1540 (140/139 BC); *CIG* 3665, line 41 (Cyzicus); *IG* XIV 242. In a Latin inscription from Corinth: *Corinth* VIII 3, 285. Ἀττίλιος is also the reading in Diod. Sic. 23, 15, 1 and 7 (M. Atilius Regulus). Cf. also Κουσσώνιος for *Cusonius P. Ryl.* II 165 (a prefect of Egypt, AD 266). Οὐεττόυριος in *BGU* I 24 (cited as such in Preisigke) seems to me most uncertain.

71 C. Roueché, *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias* (1993) 166 no. 51, line 19. *Hossidius* is also attested in a Latin inscription from Africa (*CIL* VIII 9000).

Arctos 41 (2007) 75–88

POLYBIUS ON THE CONSULS: AN INTERPRETATION OF *HISTORIES* 6,12,4

KAJ SANDBERG

The Sources for Political Life in the Republic: Introductory Note

Our knowledge of the conditions of political life in republican Rome derives mostly from sources originating in and pertaining to the last decades of the Republic, a short but exceptionally well documented period in Roman history. Scholars devoting their efforts to the history of these years can turn to original documents such as decisions of the popular assemblies (*leges* and *plebiscita*) and *senatusconsulta*, as well as letters and edicts of Roman magistrates. Though most of this epigraphical material is fragmentarily preserved, it does include some quite valuable testimonia. The evidence for the era also comprises material that is close to unparalleled in the sources concerning Ancient Rome. Some of the key protagonists of the political process supply rare first-hand information. We are in possession of Caesar's *commentarii* on the wars he waged as well as a good part of Cicero's extensive production; the speeches the latter delivered before the Senate or the Roman people give us unique insights into the political and judicial matters of his day, whereas his vast correspondence allows us to follow the events at Rome almost on a daily basis over several crucial decades.

In comparison with the rich sources for the post-Sullan period the evidentiary material for earlier periods is very different, in both quantitative and qualitative terms. Epigraphic texts, along with all other kinds of contemporary or near-contemporary written documentation, are exceedingly rare before the beginning of the last century of the Republic. The Roman historiographical tradition, providing the general chronological and contextual frameworks for our data, only commences in the closing years of the third century BC. There is, accordingly, a hiatus of three centuries between the beginning of the Republic and the first writers setting out to reconstruct the history of the Romans. This obvious problem is further enhanced by the poor survival of the oldest Roman historiography. With the sole exception of Polybius of Megalopolis (c. 200–118 BC), with whose work this paper will be concerned, none of the historians writing on Roman affairs before the late first century BC is known beyond a more or less limited number of quotations, paraphrases or occasional references in later authors. Very little is known about what sources the pioneer historians used, and how they used them. Therefore the relationship between whatever evidence there was and the surviving historical accounts remains unclear.

Our knowledge of Roman history prior to the last century BC rests mainly on literary sources long postdating the events they recount, not rarely even by hundreds of years. The 'annalistic tradition', denoting the knowledge (or, better, notions) concerning the Roman past preserved by a succession of annalistic writers, is practically identical with the information provided by Livy, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Plutarch and a few other writers of the Late Republic and Early Empire.

Introducing Polybius

As noted above, the extant parts of Polybius' *Histories*, written in the middle of the second century BC, constitute nothing less than the first account of Roman history that survives in substantial form.[1] A former official of the Achaean League, Polybius belonged to a group of one thousand prominent Achaeans who, after the Roman victory at Pydna (168 BC), were deported to Rome as hostages. However, as a tutor to the sons of the victor at that battle, L. Aemilius Paullus, Polybius entered high society at Rome. One of his pupils – and

---

[1] Of Polybius' work, known to have comprised 40 books, the first five survive in their entirety; of the rest numerous fragments remain. The standard commentary on Polybius' text is F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* I–III, Oxford 1957–1979. Another fundamental study by Walbank is *Polybius* (Sather Classical Lectures 43), Berkeley–Los Angeles 1972 (repr. 1990). Among important surveys of Polybian studies we should note, at least, the following items: D. Musti, "Problemi polibiani (Rassegna di studi 1950–1964)", *Parola del passato* 20 (1965) 380–426; Id., "Polibio nello studio dell'ultimo ventennio", *ANRW* I.2 (1972) 1114–1181; F. W. Walbank, "Polybian Studies, c. 1975–2000", Id., *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic World. Essays and Reflections*, Cambridge 2002, 1–28, and J. Thornton, "Polibio e Roma. Tendenze negli studi degli ultimi anni, I–II", *Studi Romani* 52 (2004) 108–139, 508–525.

subsequently a close friend – was Scipio Aemilianus, who became one of the leading members of the Roman aristocracy. From the central vantage point of Scipio's inner circle Polybius witnessed Roman history in the making, *domi* as well as *militiae*.[2]

The central theme of Polybius' work was, as is expressly stated in the very beginning of the first book, Rome's rise to world dominion. "How and by what kind of constitution" this was accomplished so swiftly, "within a period of not quite fifty-three years", is the big question he proposes to address.[3] Recognizing the political system of Rome as a vital factor in explaining the prowess of her arms, Polybius – much like Alexis de Tocqueville visiting the United States in the early 19th-century – was deeply intrigued by a society he came to know in a New World.[4] His provision of systematic and in-depth analyses of Roman society, typologically rare features in any surviving historiography concerning ancient Rome, adds to the singular worth of Polybius' work. An entire book, the sixth, is dedicated to an analysis of the πολιτεία of the Romans; though this book does not survive in its entirety, it does provide a wealth of explicit statements about Roman military and social institutions as well as a lengthy survey of the constitution of Rome.[5]

---

[2] The *testimonia* on Polybius' life are collected and discussed, for instance, in Walbank, *Historical Commentary* I, 1–6.

[3] Pol. 1,1,5: τίς γὰρ οὕτως ὑπάρχει φαῦλος ἢ ῥᾴθυμος ἀνθρώπων ὃς οὐκ ἂν βούλοιτο γνῶναι **πῶς καὶ τίνι γένει πολιτείας** ἐπικρατηθέντα σχεδὸν ἅπαντα τὰ κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην **οὐχ ὅλοις πεντήκοντα καὶ τρισὶν ἔτεσιν** ὑπὸ μίαν ἀρχὴν ἔπεσε τὴν Ῥωμαίων, ὃ πρότερον οὐχ εὑρίσκεται γεγονός. Actually covering all of the period 264–146 it is evident that Polybius reckoned the formative period of Roman world dominion, finally achieved with the victory over Macedonia in 168, from the outbreak of the Second Punic War.

[4] A. de Tocqueville, *De la démocratie en Amérique* I–II, Paris 1835–1840.

[5] For a commentary of book six, see Walbank, *Historical Commentary* I, 635–746. Walbank deals with matters pertaining to this book also in "Polybius on the Roman Constitution", *CQ* 37 (1943) 73–89; "The Sixth Book", Walbank 1972 (n. 1), 130–156; "Polybius' Perception of the One and the Many", in I. Malkin and Z. W. Rubinsohn (eds.), *Leaders and Masses in the Roman World: Studies in Honor of Zvi Yavetz*, Leiden – New York 1995, 211–222 and "A Greek Looks at Rome. Polybius VI Revisited", *SCI* 17 (1998) 45–59; the last two studies have been re-published in F. Walbank, *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic World* (n. 1), 212 ff. and 277 ff. Other important studies concerning the testimony of book six include T. Cole, "The Sources and Composition of Polybius VI", *Historia* 13 (1964) 440–486; C. Nicolet, "Polybe et les institutions romaines", *Polybe. Neuf exposés suivis de discussions* (Fondation Hardt: Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 20), Vandoeuvres–Genève 1974, 209–258 (with discussion, 259–265); L. Troiani, "Il funzionamento dello stato ellenistico e dello stato

It is, first and foremost, as a work of political theory that Polybius' constitutional digression has captured the interest of modern scholarship, which has largely been concerned with the idea of *anacyclosis* (the cyclical nature of constitutional development) (Pol. 6,1–10) and,[6] above all, the representation of an elaborate system of checks and balances in a mixed constitution (Pol. 6,11–17).[7] The latter was, as is well known, an important source of inspiration both

---

romano nel v e nel vi libro delle *Storie* di Polibio", L. Troiani et al., *Ricerche di storiografia antica* I. *Ricerche di storiografia greca di età romana* (Biblioteca di studi antichi 22), Pisa 1979, 9–19; and A. Lintott, "Polybius and the Constitution", Id., *The Constitution of the Roman Republic*, Oxford 1999, 16–26.

[6] See, for instance, H. Ryffel, Μεταβολὴ πολιτειῶν. *Der Wandel der Staatsverfassungen*, Bern 1949 (repr. New York 1973); A. Díaz Tejera, "Análisis del libro VI de las *Historias* de Polibio respecto a la concepcion ciclica de las constituciones", *Habis* 6 (1975) 23–34; J. M. Alonso-Nuñes, "The *Anacyclosis* in Polybius", *Eranos* 84 (1986) 17–22; S. Podes, "Polybius and His Theory of *Anacyclosis*: Problems of Not Just Ancient Political Theory", *History of Political Thought* 12 (1991) 577–587; Id., "Polybios' Anakyklosislehre, diskrete Zustandssysteme und das Problem der Mischverfassung", *Klio* 73 (1991) 382–390); W. Blösel, "Die Anakyklosistheorie und die Verfassung Roms im Spiegel des sechsten Buches bei Polybios und Ciceros *de re publica* Buch II", *Hermes* 126 (1998) 31–57; and D. E. Hahm, "Kings and Constitutions: Hellenistic theories", C. Rowe & M. Schofield (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*, Cambridge 2000, 457–476 .

[7] See, for instance, K. von Fritz, *The Theory of the Mixed Constitution in Antiquity. A Critical Analysis of Polybius' Political Ideas*, New York 1954; D. Musti, "Polibio e la democrazia", *Annali della Scuola normale superiore di Pisa* 36 (1967) 155–207; G. J. D. Aalders, *Die Theorie der Gemischten Verfassung im Altertum*, Amsterdam 1968; E. Graeber, *Die Lehre von der Mischverfassung bei Polybios* (Schriften zur Rechtslehre und Politik 52), Bonn 1968; H. H. Schmitt, "Polybios und das Gleichgewicht der Mächte", *Polybe. Neuf exposés suivis de discussions* (Fondation Hardt: Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 20), Vandoeuvres–Genève 1974, 65–102; W. Nippel, *Mischverfassungstheorie und Verfassungsrealität in Antike und früher Neuzeit* (Geschichte und Gesellschaft 21) Stuttgart 1980; Id., "Ancient and Modern Republicanism: 'Mixed Constitution' and 'Ephors'", B. Fontana (ed.), *The Invention of the Modern Republic*, Cambridge 1994, 6–26; D. E. Hahm, "Polybius' Applied Political Theorie", A. Laks & M. Schofield (eds.), *Justice and Generosity. Studies in Hellenistic Social and Political Philosophy: Proceedings of the Sixth Symposium Hellenisticum*, Cambridge 1995, 7–47; C. Schubert, "Mischverfassung und Gleichgewichtssystem: Polybios und seine Vorläufer", C. Schubert & K. Brodersen (Hrsg.), *Rom und der griechische Osten. Festschrift für Hatto H. Schmitt zum 65. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart 1995, 225–235; A. Lintott, "The Theory of the Mixed Constitution at Rome", J. Barnes & M. Griffin (eds.), *Philosophia Togata* II. *Plato and Aristotle at Rome*, Oxford 1997, 70–85; P. A. Tuci, "La democrazia di Polibio tra eredità classica e federalismo", C. Bearzot et al. (a cura di), *Gli stati territoriali nel mondo antico*, Milano 2003, 45–86; and L. Polverini, "Democrazia a Roma? La costituzione repubblicana secondo Polibio", G. Urso (a cura di), *Popolo e potere nel mondo antico*, Pisa 2005, 85–96.

for Montesquieu (in *De l'esprit des lois*, 1748) and the drafters of *The United States Constitution* (adopted by the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia on September 17th of 1787).[8]

As a source for the state machinery of republican Rome Polybius' account has attracted considerably less attention. Certainly, it is not as helpful as one might wish in providing information on technicalities involved in political life. Not only is Polybius' Greek notoriously incapable of rendering adequate equivalents of many Latin technical terms and concepts.[9] Specifics are consistently lost in his overall endeavour of representing the Roman state as an example of the ideal constitution, that is, as a perfect blend of the three basic types of political systems: monarchy (βασιλεία), aristocracy (ἀριστοκρατία) and democracy (δημοκρατία). In accordance with this perception of the political system Polybius' attention is directed exclusively to the institutions he identified as the chief embodiments of these three systems, i.e. the consuls (ὕπατοι), the senate (σύγκλητος), and the people (δῆμος).[10]

---

[8] See, in particular, G. Chinard, "Polybius and the American Constitution", F. Shuffelton (ed.), *The American Enlightenment*, Rochester, NY 1993, 217–237 but also, for more general considerations of the impact of Rome and the the Classical World on the US Constitution, R. A. Ames & H. C. Montgomery, "The Influence of Rome on the American Constitution", *CJ* 30 (1935) 19–27; C. F. Mullet, "Classical Influences on the American Revolution", *CJ* (1939) 92–104; R. M. Gummere, "The Classical Ancestry of the Constitution", in Id., *The American Colonial Mind and the Classical Tradition. Essays in Comparative Culture*, Cambridge 1963, 173–190; C. J. Richard, "The Classical Conditioning of the Founders", in Id., *The Founders and the Classics. Greece, Rome, and the American Enlightenment*, Cambridge, MA 1994, 12–38 and M. N. S. Sellers, *American Republicanism: Roman Ideology in the US Constitution*, New York 1994.

[9] That Polybius' representation of Roman institutions is characterized by "un rejet conscient de la terminologie latine", has been demonstrated by M. Dubuisson, *Le latin de Polybe. Les implications historiques d'un cas de bilinguisme*, Paris 1985. For another important consideration of Polybius' language, focusing on the political vocabulary of book six, see Nicolet, "Polybe et les institutions romaines" (n. 5), 222–231. For Latin political terminology in Greek guise, more generally, see H. J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions* (American Studies in Papyrology 13), Toronto 1974, 126 and Id., "The Roman Government in Greek Sources. The Effect of Literary Theory on the Translation of Official Titles", *Phoenix* 24 (1970) 150–159. D. Magie, *De Romanorum iuris publici sacrique vocabulis sollemnibus in Graecum sermonem conversis*, Lipsiae 1906, is by now largely antiquated; the study of Greek documentary material that has surfaced since Magie's day has brought about significant corrections of detail.

[10] Polybius is himself aware that his survey, on account of the omission of certain details, might seem somewhat imperfect to those familiar with the political system, see Pol. 6,11,3:

There has also been a strong tendency to dismiss Polybius' constitutional digression as a work of abstract political theory with only limited bearing on the actual constitution of republican Rome. Indeed, this stance has become part of current orthodoxy. The scholarly community is largely adhering to Mommsen's view that the political system of Rome, by the end of the third century BC, was essentially an oligarchic regime, in which a small number of consular families (*nobiles*) controlled the major political institutions – including the popular assemblies – by means of networks of personal relationships with individual citizens (*clientelae*) and factional alliances (*amicitiae*).[11] Polybius' strong emphasis of the opposite – in stating that the people's share in the government was immense and that the constitution (under certain conditions, obviously) could be perceived as a democratic one (6,14,12: ὥστε πάλιν ἐκ τούτων εἰκότως ἄν τιν' εἰπεῖν ὅτι μεγίστην ὁ δῆμος ἔχει μερίδα καὶ δημοκρατικόν ἐστι τὸ πολίτευμα) – has usually been treated as an awkward piece of evidence.[12] In the period between the appearance of Gelzer's highly influential work of 1912 on *Die Nobilität* and the famous "heretics" of recent years,[13] there are very few significant examples of scholars professing a belief in the

---

οὐκ ἀγνοῶ δὲ διότι τοῖς ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς πολιτείας ὁρμωμένοις ἐλλιπεστέραν φανησόμεθα ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἐξήγησιν, ἔνια παραλιπόντες τῶν κατὰ μέρος.

[11] Good overviews of the current scholarly discussion concerning the nature of the political system of republican Rome are provided by M. Jehne, "Zur Debatte um die Rolle des Volkes in der römischen Politik", Id. (Hrsg.), *Demokratie in Rom?*, Stuttgart 1995, 1–9; E. Gabba, "Democrazia a Roma", *Athenaeum* 85 (n. s. 75, 1997) 266–271, and A. M. Ward, "How Democratic Was the Roman Republic?", *NECJ* 31 (2004) 101–119. See also K.-J. Hölkeskamp, "The Roman Republic. Government of the People, by the People, for the People?" (review article on F. Millar, *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*, Ann Arbor 1998), *SCI* 19 (2000), 203–223 and Id., *Rekonstruktion einer Republik. Die politische Kultur des antiken Rom und die Forschung der letzten Jahrzehnte* (Historische Zeitschrift, Beihefte 38), München 2004.

[12] For a recent example, see H. Mouritsen, *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*, Cambridge 2001, 5 ff.

[13] M. Gelzer, *Die Nobilität der römischen Republik*, Leipzig 1912 (= Id., *Kleine Schriften* I, Wiesbaden 1962, 17–135; note also Id., *Die Nobilität der römischen Republik*, 2. durchges. Auflage mit Vorwort von J. von Ungern-Sternberg, Stuttgart 1983), the views of which were further elaborated by F. Münzer, *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien*, Stuttgart 1920. Both works have appeared in English translation: M. Gelzer, *The Roman Nobility*, Oxford 1969 (transl. by R. Seager, repr. Oxford 1975) and F. Münzer, *Roman Aristocratic Parties and Families*, Baltimore 1999 (transl. by T. Ridley).

democratic nature of the Roman Republic.[14] Polybius' representation of the monarchic element in the political system, embodied in the dual consulship, meets with much more general approval. While much effort has been invested to show how mistaken Polybius was in identifying a strong democratic element in Roman politics (or that he in fact was actually describing an aristocratic system),[15] it has not been noted that a statement concerning the role of the consuls, taken at face value, clearly poses a problem that deserves our full attention.

The Problem

In a series of earlier studies I have argued that current views of the political system of republican Rome – which clearly entails an element of historical evolution not always accorded to it in due extent – are based too extensively on sources concerning the last decades of the Republic. It is, of course, no wonder that a material so rich and varied (as we have seen) has continued to exert a strong attraction on scholars, but from a methodological point of view I consider it very unfortunate that it has been allowed to condition, quite excessively, the interpretation of historical data pertaining to earlier periods. It seems to me that far too much weight has been assigned to conditions attested for only in the troubled period witnessing the collapse of the republican system

[14] Among these exceptions we should note, at least, W. Enßlin, "Die Demokratie und Rom", *Philologus* 82 (1927) 313–328; T. R. Glover, *Democracy in the Ancient World*, Cambridge 1927 (repr. New York 1966), 150 ff.; and A. Guarino, *La democrazia a Roma* (Società e diritto di Roma 4), Napoli 1979. The most important exponent of the new "heretic" movement, which seems to have lost some of its initial impetus, is Fergus Millar: "The Political Character of the Classical Roman Republic, 200–151 BC", *JRS* 74 (1984) 1–19; "Politics, Persuasion, and the People before the Social War (150–90 BC)", *JRS* 76 (1986) 1–11; "Popular Politics at Rome in the Late Republic", I. Malkin & Z. W. Rubinson (eds.), *Leaders and Masses in the Roman World. Studies in Honor of Zvi Yavets* (Mnemosyne Supplements 139) Leiden — New York 1995, 91–113 and *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic* (n. 11).

[15] See, for instance, C. Nicolet, "Polybe et la 'constitution' de Rome: Aristocratie et démocratie", C. Nicolet (ed.), *Demokratia et aristokratia. A propos de Caius Gracchus: Mots grecs et réalités romaines*, Paris 1983, 15-35 and K.-W. Welwei, "Demokratische Verfassungselemente in Rom aus der Sicht des Polybios", Jörg Spielvogel (Hrsg.), *Res publica reperta. Zur Verfassung und Gesellschaft der römischen Republik und des frühen Prinziapats: Festschrift für Jochen Bleicken zum 75. Geburstag*, Stuttgart 2002, 25–35 (= Id., *Res publica und Imperium*, Wiesbaden 2004, 139–149).

itself.[16] There is no need here to restate a position set forth in full detail elsewhere, but a short synthesis of my methodological contentions is essential for the purposes of the present paper.[17]

Professing a stance that takes consistently into account, firstly, the fact that there are many recorded instances of violations and anomalies in the realm of public law during the final phase of the Republic, and, secondly, the well-known yet much overlooked constitutional reforms of Sulla, I contend that the study of the political system of the pre-Sullan Republic must be more firmly based on the evidence for the period preceding the last century BC. Within this category of sources Polybius holds a special place, being a unique contemporary witness of pre-Sullan conditions. Equally important, Polybius made his observations well before the political turbulence that was heralded by the tribunate of Tiberius Gracchus in 133 BC.

One might observe that Polybius, in dealing with the monarchic and aristocratic elements in the political system, provides data that are generally clear and reasonably self-contained. The two consuls were at the apex of a carefully defined hierarchy of annually elected curule magistrates who, as a group within which there was a strong element of vertical control (*maius imperium*), had inherited the executive powers of the kings.[18] Also the senate, in Polybius' account, constitutes a political element with a natural and clear-cut institutional extension. This cannot be said of the people. His description of popular participation in the political process is, with regard to its institutional structure, notoriously short of detail. Referring to the people as a political entity Polybius almost invariably uses the all-inclusive term δῆμος. There is no allusion to the peculiar co-existence of at least three different popular assemblies, based on the division of the citizenry into *curiae*, *centuriae* and *tribus*.[19]

---

[16] Cf. J. North, "Democratic Politics in Republican Rome", *P&P* 126 (1990) 4.

[17] See, in particular, K. Sandberg, *Magistrates and Assemblies. A Study of Legislative Practice in Republican Rome* (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 24), Rome 2001, 21 f. and Id., "Re-constructing the Political System of Republican Rome. A Re-consideration of Approach and Methodology", *Arctos* 39 (2005) 137–157.

[18] I note that there is nowadays very little support for the view of G. De Sanctis (*Storia dei Romani* I, Torino 1907) – later re-invented by K. Hanell (*Das altrömische eponyme Amt* [Acta Instituti Romani Regni Sueciae II.8], Lund 1946), who is curiously ignorant of the former's work (cf. F. E. Adcock, *JRS* 38 [1948], 105) – that it was a gradual evolution of the kingship, rather than a revolution, that accounts for the emergence of the consulship as we know it.

[19] Laelius Felix ap. Gell. 15,27,5: *Cum ex generibus hominum suffragium feratur, 'curiata' comitia esse; cum ex censu et aetate, 'centuriata'; cum ex regionibus et locis, 'tributa'*. For

Moreover, it is evident that the popular element in Polybius' model cannot be equated solely with the people, formally assembled. The popular vote was essential to the operation of the Roman state; only the people could confer magistracies (and bestow *imperium*), pass judgement on capital crimes, and make law. Yet there was no mechanism by which the people could even convene, let alone make formal decisions, on its own initiative. The popular assemblies had to be summoned, and this could be done only by a magistrate duly invested with the *ius cum populo/plebe agendi*. If the summoner was a tribune of the plebs it can be argued, as it actually has been done, that the tribunate was a subdivision of the popular element in the constitution.[20] If the people convened under consular presidency there was, in effect, a fusion of the monarchic and the democratic elements. This imperfection of Polybius' model has not been much noted. This is all the more appalling as this latter practice seems to be indicated by him as the normal way for the people to convene.

In a well-known passage Polybius states that it was the responsibility of the consuls to see to it that the state matters which were subject to popular discretion were put before the people. We are told that it was the consuls who a) summoned the assemblies, b) introduced the propositions and c) executed the people's decisions (6,12,4):

> καὶ μὴν ὅσα δεῖ διὰ τοῦ δήμου συντελεῖσθαι τῶν πρὸς τὰς κοινὰς πράξεις ἀνηκόντων, τούτοις καθήκει φροντίζειν καὶ **συνάγειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας**, τούτοις **εἰσφέρειν τὰ δόγματα**, τούτοις **βραβεύειν τὰ δοκοῦντα** τοῖς πλείοσι.

The problem with this passage is that, despite its appearance of being a generalization, it gives a very poor description of actual political practices in mid-republican Rome. It is certainly not true that it was solely the consuls who dealt with the popular assemblies. As is well attested, also the tribunes of the plebs regularly convened the people for various purposes, including legislation.

---

the *contio*, as opposed to *comitia*, see Messalla ap. Gell. 13,16,2–3: *manifestum est aliud esse 'cum populo agere', aliud 'contionem habere'. Nam 'cum populo agere' est rogare quid populum, quod suffragiis suis aut iubeat aut vetet, 'contionem' autem 'habere' est verba facere ad populum sine ulla rogatione.* The fundamental treatises on the Roman popular assemblies are two older studies: G. W. Botsford, *The Roman Assemblies. From their Origin to the End of the Republic*, New York 1909 (repr. 2005) and L. R. Taylor, *Roman Voting Assemblies. From the Hannibalic War to the Dictatorship of Caesar*, Ann Arbor 1966 (repr. 1990).

[20] A. Lintott, "Democracy in the Middle Republic", *ZRG* 104 (1987) 37.

It is, at any rate, evident that the passage quoted above should not be construed as a statement as to the normal conduct of legislation in Rome because, plainly, such a claim would be heavily at odds with a political situation that is amply documented in other sources for the Middle Republic. It is all clear that the bulk of legislation of this period was passed by tribunes of the plebs. This observation, which is also consistent with the fact that it was only after Sulla that the consuls tended to spend their year in office at Rome,[21] is firmly based on widely recognized facts and requires no additional demonstration here; even if we were to admit into consideration the entire group of poorly known laws that have been attributed to consuls only by modern scholars, and all the consular statutes found among Rotondi's many altogether conjectural laws, it can be easily observed that consular laws are heavily outnumbered by tribunician ones.[22] This means that Polybius' statement constitutes a problem that warrants serious attention.

A Possible Solution

Polybius provides remarkably little information on the tribunes of the plebs (δήμαρχοι) in his work. Their invisibility is, of course, mainly due to the work's focus on military history. Their relative absence from Polybius' constitutional digression is more striking. The tribunes are referred to in passing merely a few times. In the account of the consuls' powers it is recorded that all other magistrates (ἄρχοντες), except the tribunes, are under them and take their orders.[23] In dealing with the senate Polybius refers to the obstructive powers of the tribunes, stating that the senators not only are unable to pass a decree, but cannot even hold a meeting, if a single member of the tribunician college

[21] See, in particular, Sandberg, *Magistrates and Assemblies* (n. 17), 116 ff. Cf. F. Millar, "The Last Century of the Republic. Whose History?", *JRS* 85 (1995) 239.

[22] Lists of Roman statutes, with references to classical sources and modern scholarship: G. Rotondi, *Leges publicae populi Romani*, Milano 1912 (repr. Hildesheim 1990); D. Flach, in Zusammenarbeit mit S. von der Lahr, *Die Gesetze der frühen römischen Republik. Text und Kommentar*, Darmstadt 1994 and M. Elster, *Die Gesetze der mittleren römischen Republik*, Darmstadt 2003. Evidence for legislation can also be found with the aid of T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* I–II, New York 1951–1952 (+ *Supplementum*, Atlanta 1986). – For the large presence of conjectural laws in the 'canon' of republican laws, see Sandberg, *Magistrates and Assemblies* (n. 17), 41 ff.

[23] Pol. 6,12,2: οἵ τε γὰρ ἄρχοντες οἱ λοιποὶ πάντες ὑποτάττονται καὶ πειθαρχοῦσι τούτοις πλὴν τῶν δημάρχων.

interposes his veto;[24] in the same context it is recorded that the tribunes are always obliged to act as the people decrees and, above all things, to pay heed to its wishes.[25] In addition to these three passages, found in the constitutional survey, there is a reference to the constitutional position of the tribunes in book three, where it is reported that all Roman magistrates, except the tribunes of the plebs, are deprived of their powers once a dictator is appointed.[26]

There are, thus, very few explicit statements about the tribunes in Polybius, but I contend that his silence is a consequence of his theoretical conception of the political system he describes. We already noted that his model is apt to obscure the many details in this system. Polybius no doubt saw the tribunician college as an integral part of the popular assembly with which it was associated. For sure, much of what he says about the people's role in the political system must in effect pertain also to the tribunes – simply because the people could neither convene nor prepare motions independently. But then, again, also the consuls could convene the people and put matters before it.

We would certainly have wanted Polybius to provide details on the division of labour, in the field of legislation, between consuls and tribunes of the plebs. This question, intertwined with the problem of whether there was a distribution of competence between the various assemblies, has been my main concern in a number of earlier studies. The details of my argumentation need not detain us here, but a short re-capitulation of my main contentions is essential for the purposes of the present discussion. It is usually thought that there was no division of competence between the various popular assemblies.[27] I have challenged this view and attempted to show that the passage of legislation, just like the election of the various magistrates, was subject to rules and conventions. In a re-appraisal of the significance of the *pomerium* (the sacral city boundary of the city of Rome) for all elements in the political system, and

---

[24] Pol. 6,16,4: τὸ δὲ συνέχον, ἐὰν εἷς ἐνίστηται τῶν δημάρχων, οὐχ οἷον ἐπὶ τέλος ἄγειν τι δύναται τῶν διαβουλίων ἡ σύγκλητος, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ συνεδρεύειν ἢ συμπορεύεσθαι τὸ παράπαν.
[25] Pol. 6,16,5: ὀφείλουσι δ' ἀεὶ ποιεῖν οἱ δήμαρχοι τὸ δοκοῦν τῷ δήμῳ καὶ μάλιστα στοχάζεσθαι τῆς τούτου βουλήσεως.
[26] Pol. 3,87,8: οὗτος δ' ἔστιν αὐτοκράτωρ στρατηγός, οὗ κατασταθέντος παραχρῆμα διαλύεσθαι συμβαίνει πάσας τὰς ἀρχὰς ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ πλὴν τῶν δημάρχων. For the factual inaccuracy of this statement, see Walbank, *Historical Commentary* I, 422.
[27] See e.g. E. Meyer, *Römischer Staat und Staatsgedanke*², Zürich 1961, 192; J. Bleicken, *Lex publica. Gesetz und Recht in der römischen Republik,* Berlin 1975, 101 f. and F. P. Casavola, "La legislazione comiziale e l'editto", *Storia di Roma* II.1. *La repubblica imperiale,* Torino 1990, 524.

not merely the magistracies, I have proposed that there was an intrinsic connection between the competence of an assembly and the situation of its meeting place. The two legislative assemblies in regular use in the Middle Republic, were the centuriate assembly (*comitia centuriata*) and the tribal assembly (*plebs*, *concilium plebis* or *comitia tributa*) – reflected in the phrase *populus plebesque*. The former assembly, which met under consular presidency on the Campus Martius, *extra pomerium*, could decide only upon matters concerning war, peace and foreign relations. All legislation on civil, or intrapomerial, matters was passed by the *plebs*, which was summoned by tribes, *intra pomerium* and, before the last century BC, by none but tribunes of the plebs. This kind of division of labour is consistent with the use of technical terminology in Latin writers; before the last few decades of the Republic only tribunes are associated with the actual technical passage of laws (*promulgatio* and *promulgatio legis*), unless we deal with declarations of war (*leges de bello indicendo*).[28]

Already a consideration of the fact that most laws of the Middle Republic are certainly tribunician measures permits us to establish that Polybius' statement discussed here cannot be referring primarily to legislation on civil matters. If the only popular assembly at the disposal of the consuls in this period was the *comitiata centuriata*, and if the competence of this body did not comprise civil matters, comitial decisions that had been put to the vote by consuls would indeed be rare – though by no means non-existent. It would have been the consuls' task to take all bills on extrapomerial matters – such as questions concerning war and peace, alliances, terms of peace and treaties – to the *comitia centuriata*. It is interesting to note that all these matters are listed by Polybius himself as examples of the people's legislative powers, but that they

[28] K. Sandberg, "The *concilium plebis* as a Legislative Body during the Republic", U. Paananen et al., *Senatus populusque Romanus. Studies in Roman Republican Legislation* (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 13), Helsinki 1993, 74–96; "Tribunician and Non-Tribunician Legislation in Mid-Republican Rome", C. Bruun (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic. Politics, Religion and Historiography, c. 400–133 BC. Papers from a Conference at the Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, September 11–12, 1998* (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 23), Rome 2000, 121–140 and, in particular, the monograph Sandberg, *Magistrates and Assemblies* (n. 17). I have dealt with the problem also in a work on consular legislation: "Consular Legislation in Pre-Sullan Rome", *Arctos* 38 (2004) 133–162.

are specified separately after the initial, and more general, reference to "the power of approving and rejecting laws".[29]

The consuls dealt directly with the people also in elections. The *populus*, assembled by centuriae, elected all *magistratus cum imperio* and appointed certain military commanders. Of course, the centuriate assembly also convened under consular presidency when it appeared as a judicial body.

It is well documented that the consuls also dealt with the people indirectly, that is, through the formal intermediation of the tribunes of the plebs. There are several instances recorded in which consuls – not infrequently at the instigation of the senate – ask the tribunes to take a measure to the *plebs*, or the *populus*, as the assembly is sometimes (no doubt inaccurately) called.[30] I have demonstrated elsewhere that there are compelling reasons to believe that many a similar passage, also when devoid of an explicit reference to tribunician intermediation, is in fact implying the same procedure of co-operation between consuls and tribunes; in such cases it is all clear that *populus* stands for the entire political organization headed by, and inclusive of, the tribunes of the plebs.[31]

---

[29] Pol. 6,14,10–11: ἔχει δὲ τὴν κυρίαν καὶ περὶ τῆς τῶν νόμων δοκιμασίας, καὶ τὸ μέγιστον, ὑπὲρ εἰρήνης οὗτος βουλεύεται καὶ πολέμου. καὶ μὴν περὶ συμμαχίας καὶ διαλύσεως καὶ συνθηκῶν οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βεβαιῶν ἕκαστα τούτων καὶ κύρια ποιῶν ἢ τοὐναντίον.

[30] For a few examples, see Liv. 30.27.3 (202 BC): *consules iussi cum tribunis plebis agere ut, si iis videretur, populum rogarent*, 31.50.8 (200 BC): *senatus decrevit ut ... consules si iis videretur cum tribunis plebis agerent uti ad plebem ferrent*, 39.19.4 (186 BC): *senatus consultum factum est ut ... consul cum tribunis plebis ageret ut ad plebem ... ferrent*, 45.35.4 (167 BC): *mandatumque ... praetori cum tribunis plebis ageret ex auctoritate patrum rogationem ad plebem ferrent*; Val. Max. 7.6.1: *senatus auctore Ti. Graccho consule censuit uti ..., eaque de re per tribunos pl. apud populum lata rogatione.* For discussion of this practice, see Sandberg 1993, 90 and, in particular, Sandberg, *Magistrates and Assemblies* (n. 17), 97 ff.

[31] A good example is Livy's account of how the Senate in 216 directed the consul designate Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, as soon as he entered office in the following year, to effect a popular vote authorizing Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus to dedicate a temple to Venus Erycina (Liv. 23,30,14): *Exitu anni Q. Fabius Maximus a senatu postulavit ut aedem Veneris Erycinae, quam dictator vovisset, dedicare liceret. Senatus decrevit ut Ti. Sempronius consul designatus, cum magistratum inisset, ad populum ferret, ut Q. Fabium duumvirum esse iuberent aedis dedicandae causa*. Not only is there a manifest structural resemblance with the examples cited in the previous footnote; in this particular case there is strong support for the view that the popular decree was obtained through tribunician assistance: we know from Cicero (*dom.* 127) that there was a *lex vetus tribunicia* that prohibited *iniussu plebis aedis, terram, aram consecrari*. For discussion, see Sandberg 1993, 90 f. and Sandberg, *Magistrates and Assemblies* (n. 17), 98 f. In his review of the latter study Michael Crawford (*CR* 54

I contend that the solution to the problem considered here is that Polybius' use of the term δῆμος is very similar to that of Latin writers referring to the *populus* in the non-technical manner suggested above. That is, in providing the details on the consuls' dealings with the people, he is thinking primarily of the consuls' formal contacts with the organization lead by the tribunes of the plebs – and not of their direct dealings with any of the popular assemblies.

Conclusion

Polybius' constitutional digression in book six has been the subject of an immense amount of scholarly attention, but mainly from the point of view of abstract political theory. As a source for the actual operation of the state machinery of republican Rome his account has attracted considerably less interest, because technical details are notoriously difficult to recover from Polybius' Greek and because they are consistently subordinated his overall zeal in representing the Roman constitution as the perfect blend of the three basic political systems that he distinguishes: βασιλεία, ἀριστοκρατία, and δημοκρατία. Moreover, some of Polybius' judgements about the nature of Roman politics have been regarded with scepticism; above all his emphasis of the significance of the people as a strong counterweight to the power of the Senate and the chief magistrates has been vehemently contested. In this study it has been argued that it is not so much his representation of the role of the people, but that of the consuls' formal relationship with the people that is problematic and requires more study. Here it has been suggested that Polybius' δῆμος often denotes the political organization controlled by, and inclusive of, the tribunes of the plebs – as opposed to the people itself formally assembled.

Institutum Romanum Finlandiae

[2004], 171) rejects this argument on the ground that *consecrare* is not the same as *dedicare*, but this is clearly wrong. Although not the same thing in a strictly technical sense, the *dedicatio* and the *consecratio* were inseparable parts of the ritual by which a temple (or any other object) was made a *res sacra*, see R. Nisbet, *M. Tulli Ciceronis De domo sua ad pontifices oratio*, Oxford 1939, 209–212 (Appendix VI).

* I am greatly indebted to professors Ronald T. Ridley (University of Melbourne) and Jyri Vaahtera (University of Turku), who provided most valuable comments on an early draft of this paper.

Arctos 41 (2007) 89–115

ANALECTA EPIGRAPHICA

HEIKKI SOLIN

CCXXXVII. WIEDER WEITERE COGNOMINA

Neue Namenbelege und kein Ende: hier wieder eine weitere Auslese. Zu den im folgenden gebrauchten Abkürzungen und diakritischen Zeichen s. *Rep.*^{2} 475. *Arctos* 35 (2001) 189.[1]

Aciliana: Kajanto 139 mit einem Beleg aus dem *CIL* (dagegen verzeichnet er *Acilianus* 13mal). Der Frauenname erscheint aber öfter im *CIL*: II 2060 (= II^2 5, 713). 4210. XIV 2484. Außerdem *AE* 2004, 751 (Celti), eine *Arv(ensis)*. *CILA* II 4, 1220 (Callet). *HEp* 4, 773 = 10, 558 (Celti, eine Celtitana). Im Senatorenstand verzeichnet Kajanto den Namen einmal aus *CIL* II 111; dazu noch *PIR*^{2} A 37, Tochter des Konsuls 152 M'. Acilius Glabrio Cn. Cornelius Severus *PIR*^{2} A 73.

Agrippiana: Kajanto 175. *Arctos* 35 (2001) 190. 38 (2004) 164. Dazu *I. Stratonikeia* 538.

Amata: Kajanto 284. *Arctos* 38 (2004) 164. Dazu *RECAM* IV104 (Iconium). Zu dieser Namensippe gehörende Bildungen sind öfters in Kleinasien belegt, doch besteht kein Grund, hier epichorisches Namengut zu sehen.[2]

Anicianus: Kajanto 140 mit vier Belegen. *Rep.*^{2} 497. *Arctos* 35 (2001) 190. Dazu *AE* 1983, 686 (Burdigala). – Der in *Rep.* aus *I. Ephesos* 1238 zitierte

[1] Peter Kruschwitz hat auf gewohnte Weise meinen deutschen Ausdruck verbessert, wofür ihm herzlich gedankt sei. Matthäus Heil hat mir Information aus den noch nicht erschienenen PIR-Bänden mitgeteilt. Olli Salomies und Mika Kajava haben den Text ebenfalls auf gewohnte Weise durchgesehen und wertvolle Bemerkungen beigesteuert.

[2] Dass Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Personennamen* (1964) derselben Meinung zu sein scheint, geht (außer der Tatsache, dass Namen, die mit Ἀματ- beginnen, in seinem Verzeichnis fehlen) aus einer Bemerkung in Anm. 66 (S. 54) indirekt hervor.

Namensträger stammte aus Antiocheia in Pisidien und wird in zahlreichen anderen Inschriften Kleinasiens angeführt.

Ἀντωνιάς: *Rep*. 293 mit drei Belegen aus griechischen Urkunden des Ostens. Dazu *NSER* 679 (Kos). *SEG* LIII 1536 (Phrygien, Tembristal, 176/7 n. Chr.).

Aponianus: Kajanto 140 mit fünf Belegen. Dazu *CIL* III 8396 (Sexus bleibt unbestimmt). VI 32687 (= 3893) (Prätorianer aus Mailand). *AE* 1955, 125 (Simitthus). J. R. S. Sterrett, *An Epigraphical Journey in Asia Minor*, Boston 1888, 192 Nr. 198 (Iconium; Lesung bleibt etwas unsicher; der Editor liest Ἀ[ντ]ωνιανός, doch lassen sich die Buchstabenreste zwischen A und Ω eher als Π deuten).

Atianus: vgl. Kajanto 141 *Attianus* mit 45 Belegen, ohne zwischen *Attianus* und *Atianus* zu entscheiden, wie aus dem Hinweis auf *CIL* IX 5061 *T. Attius T. l. Atianus* hervorgeht. Doch ist es vorzuziehen, die Gentilnamen *Atius* und *Attius* auseinander zu halten,[3] so auch die Cognomina *Atianus* und *Attianus*, trotz solcher Fälle wie *CIL* XII 4231 *[A]ttiae Feliclae ... T. Atius Vitalis miles*. Eine Handvoll Belege für *Atianus* sind in *ThLL* II 1171f registriert. Dazu können noch weitere angeführt werden, so etwa *AE* 2004, 1062 (Castra Regina).

!*Atinas*: Kajanto 181 mit zwei Belegen. Auszuscheiden ist jedoch der Suffektkonsul 134 T. Haterius Nepos Atinas Probus Publicius Matenianus (*CIL* XI 5212 vgl. *PIR*^{2} H 30), in dessen Namen *Atinas* eher ein weiteres Gentilicium vertritt. Der Mann scheint eine dreigliedrige Namensequenz zu führen, in deren Mitte *Atinas Probus* steht. Das passt gut damit zusammen, dass *Atinas* im Grunde ein Gentilname ist. – Dagegen füge hinzu *ILJug* 636 *L. Purtisius Atinas*, zweifellos ein naher Verwandter (Sohn?) des von Kajanto angeführten C. Purtisius Atinas mit imponenter munizipaler und militärischer Laufbahn. In diesem Fall handelt sich um eine Art vererbliches Cognomen.

Aucellus(?). Zum Ausgangspunkt für die Betrachtung dieses Namens nehme ich einen kürzlich von G. Manganaro Perrone aus einer sizilianischen Sammlung herausgegebenen Bronzestempel unbekannter Herkunft: *Epigraphica* 68 (2006) 25 Nr. 35 mit Photo (Inschrift linksläufig) *Victor / Auceli* (Lesung scheint sicher zu sein).[4] Die einzig mögliche Auslegung scheint mir die zu sein, dass hier ein Victor, Sklave oder Sohn eines Aucel(l)us, seinen Namen gestempelt hat (unverständlicherweise will der Editor *Victor(i)* verstehen, als sei *Victorius* der Gentilname des Aucellus). Von der zu *aucella*

[3] Derselben Meinung ist auch O. Salomies, oben 71.

[4] Auffallend ist nur L mit dem Querstrich oben.

gebildeten Namensippe registriert Kajanto 330 nur *Aucellio*, doch lohnt es sich zu prüfen, ob andere zu derselben Namensippe gehörende Bildungen erkannt werden können. Vor allem aber: Gehört *Aucellus* überhaupt zu derselben Namensippe? Die Frage ist berechtigt, denn dieser Name, mit anderen Bildungen auf *Aucell-*, ist nur ausnahmsweise außerhalb der keltischen Gebiete belegt und könnte deswegen dort prinzipiell epichorisches Namengut beinhalten.[5] Die Belege sind nicht sonderlich zahlreich: *Aucel[lus]* o.ä. in Mediolanum Santonum (*ILA Santons* 1005, 12 mit irreführenden onomastischen Bemerkungen) und *Aucella* in der Lugdunensis (*AE* 1967, 317; der Sexus bleibt unbestimmt, es kann sich aber um einen Frauennamen handeln).[6] Außerdem noch in Afrika: *CIL* VIII 24354 *M. Apocidius Aucella* (die Lesung scheint plausibel). Doch können alle auf *Aucell-* bezeugten Namen formal auch lateinisch erklärt und zu *aucella* gesetzt werden. Der Vogelname war eigentlich feminin, *aucella*, daneben existierte auch *aucellus*, das zur lebendigen Sprache gehört haben muss, es lebt ja in romanischen Sprachen weiter (z. B. it. *uccello*, fr. *oiseau*),[7] und daraus wurde *Aucellus* metonymisch als Personenname in Gebrauch genommen. Der Männername *Aucella* aus Afrika ist direkt zu *aucella* gebildet wie *Aquila* und *Cornicula* zu *aquila* und *cornicula*, beides Männernamen. – Ferner fragt man sich, ob Namenbelege auf *Aucil-* hierher gehören; auch sie sind besonders in keltischen Gebieten bezeugt: abgesehen vom Gentilnamen *Aucilius* (*CIL* VIII 12181 [hier in cognominaler Funktion]. XII 2376. XIII 906. 2453. *Suppl. It.* 17 Ferrara 27) kennen wir das Cognomen *Aucilo* (*CIL* XII 1411), das aber epichorisch anmutet.[8] – Fernzuhalten sind die Namen *Ocella -io -ina* (zu ihnen s. weiter unten).

Bibulus: Kajanto 270 mit vier Belegen außerhalb des Senatorenstandes. Dazu *AE* 2004, 1418 (Hierapolis, 2. Jh. n. Chr.) Αὐρρ(ηλίων) Ἀπελλίδου καὶ Ἀπολλωνίου τῶν Ἀπολλωνίδου Βειβούλου. Also neben guten griechischen

---

[5] Freilich fehlen Namen auf *Aucell-* in der neuen Zusammenstellung von X. Delamarre, *Nomina celtica antiqua selecta inscriptionum (Noms de personne celtiques dans l'épigraphie classique)*, Paris 2007; andererseits nimmt der Verf. solche Bildungen wie *Auctilla* auf, ohne zu berücksichtigen, dass dieser Name der rein lateinischen Onymie gehört (den lateinischen Charakter hebt auch K. H. Schmidt, Die Komposition in gallischen Personennamen, *ZCPh* 26 [1957] 142 hervor).

[6] Schon in *Arctos* 37 (2003) 174 notiert.

[7] Vgl. *REW* 828.

[8] In *CIL* VIII 12181 scheint mir eher *Sextilia Lucilla* als *Sextilia Aucilla* (wie die Editoren verstehen) zu lesen zu sein.

theophoren Namen eine unübliche lateinische Bildung in der Familie. Notiere den Diphthong ει trotz des kurzen *ĭ*.

Blandina: Kajanto 282 mit drei Belegen. Dazu *AE* 2004, 796 (conventus Carthaginiensis). *CILA* III 1, 78 (Castulo).

Blandinus: Kajanto 270 mit zwei Belegen. Dazu *RIB* 305 *Flavius Blandinus armatura* (wohl ein Terminus des Militärwesens; wenn so, war der Mann im Militärdienst tätig und demnach möglicherweise nicht lokaler Herkunft).

Bolanus: Kajanto 181. *Arctos* 38 (2004) 166f. Dazu *SEG* LII 1300 (Aizanoi, 2. Jh. n. Chr.).

Βωλᾶς: *Arctos* 38 (2004) 167. Dazu *SEG* LII 1276 (Aizanoi, 3. Jh. n. Chr.).

Bulla: Kajanto 346 mit je einem Beleg für den Gebrauch als Männer- und als Frauenname. Dazu *CIL* XV 7173 (4. Jh. n. Chr.) auf einer Halsfessel mit dem Namen des Sklaven (s. die Bemerkung von Dressel ad loc.).

Caietanus: Kajanto 181 mit zwei Belegen. Dazu Mart. 8, 37, 1 (mag fiktiv sein). *AE* 2004, 1780 (Limisa in der Byzacena) *[---]us Q. f. Pa[p(iria)] Kaieta[nus]*; so zu lesen statt *Kaleta[nus]* des Editors (s. unten 105).

Calvisianus: Kajanto 143 mit zwei Belegen (und einem Beleg für *-iana*). Dazu *OGIS* 489 = *IGRR* IV 1323 vgl. *PME* F 82 (Phocaea, 2. Jh. n. Chr.) Τίτος Φλάουιος Οὐᾶρος Καλουησιανὸς Στρατονείκου ὑὸς Κυρείνᾳ Ἑρμοκράτης; militärische Laufbahn, zuletzt Legionstribunat. Woher *Calvisianus* rührt, bleibt ungewiss (von P. Calvisius Ruso, *procos. Asiae* Ende 1. Jh.?).

Cervilla: siehe unter *Servilla*.

Corbulo: *Rep*. 318. *Arctos* 38 (2004) 169. Dazu noch etwa *NSc* 1917, 311 besser *AE* 1992, 155 (Rom, 1./ 2. Jh., ein Sklave aus Tarraco). Öfters in Kleinasien belegt.

Cottanus: *CIL* XIV 2298 = *CLE* 990. So hieß der Sohn von M. Aurelius Cottae Maximi l. Zosimus, *accensus patroni,* des Konsuls 20 n. Chr. Dieser (M. Aurelius) Cottanus, dessen Cognomen eine Weiterbildung aus dem des Herrn seines Vaters ist, wurde Tribun einer Prätorianerkohorte. Der Name fehlt bei Kajanto aus denselben Gründen wie *Cotta*, weil nämlich nichtlateinisch. Doch als altes senatorisches Cognomen ist dieser sozusagen lateinisch geworden, und eine mit einem lateinischen Suffix versehene Ableitung wie *Cottanus* muss den zeitgenössischen Sprachteilhabern um so mehr als lateinisch erschienen sein. Die Ableitung mit dem Suffix *-anus* gehört nicht zu den üblichen onomastischen Bildungen,[9] existiert aber auch sonst und ist hier (etwa statt -*ianus*) durch das Metrum sichergestellt (an sich existiert der Typ *Cottjanus* in der epigraphischen Poesie, wäre aber doch etwas hart).

Crassianus: Kajanto 244 mit einem Beleg aus Rom. Dazu *AE* 2004, 375 (Rom oder nächste Umgebung) *Primio Crassianus*; wenn nicht einfach ein zweites Cognomen, vielleicht als Agnomen des Sklaven Primio deutbar (dieser wäre also früher Sklave eines Crassus gewesen). Deutlich liegt ein Agnomen in *AE* 1978, 41 (Rom) vor: der Dedikant heißt *[---]ius Crassianus [pub]licus curionalis*.

Cucullus: *AE* 2004, 1850 (Uthina, 4. Jh.) *M(---) Cuculli h(onestisimi) v(iri)* (Lesung aus dem Photo zu schließen sicher). Das Wort *cucullus* bedeutet Kapuze, da aber Namen von Kleidungsstücken eher selten zu Personennamen wurden, könnte man als Namenwort auch *cuculus*, den Kuckuck, mit Gemination von *-l-*, sehen (auch dies nicht als Personenname belegt); Vogelnamen wurden ja nicht selten auf Menschen übertragen. Vgl. *Cuculla* Kajanto 345 aus *CIL* IV 7841, der den Namen zu den Kleidungsnamen stellt. Der im Komm. von *AE* erwähnte Beleg *Cucula* aus *CIL* XIII 2575 kann auch epichorisches Gut in sich tragen.[10]

Δεκμίων: *Arctos* 34 (2000) 150 mit einem Beleg aus Boiotien. Dazu *I. Cos* (2007) *EF* 17 Δεκμίων Δέκμου (1. Jh. n. Chr.).

Domitiana: Kajanto 145 mit vier Belegen neben dem üblichen *Domitianus*. Dazu *AE* 2002, 285 = *SEG* LII 967 (Ostia). Audollent 271 (Hadrumetum). *TAM* IV 1, 278.

Domnilla: Kajanto 362. *Rep.*[2] 499. *Arctos* 37 (2003) 176. 38 (2004) 171. Dazu *RECAM* IV 69. K 101 (Iconium).

Domninus: Kajanto 362. *Arctos* 37 (2003) 176. 38 (2004) 171. 39 (2005) 164. Dazu *SEG* LII 639 (Emesener, 3./ 4. Jh.).

Domnio(n): Kajanto 362. *Arctos* 38 (2004) 171. Dazu *IGUR* 1676. *IGI Porto* 21 (Alexandriner). *Suppl. It.* 2 Teate 18. *AE* 1919, 67 (Numidien). *BHL* 2268–2272 (Märtyrer aus Salona, gest. 299, als Namensform wird auch *Domnius* überliefert). *Nadpisi Olbija* 47. Sterrett, *The Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor* (1888) 375 (Metropolis). *Anat. Stud.* 17 (1967) 116 Nr. 38 (Antiocheia in Pisidien). *RECAM* IV 86 (Iconium).

---

9 Zu diesem Suffix vgl. Kajanto 107–109.

10 So auch Delamarre (zit. in Anm. 5) 78.

Egregius: Kajanto 275 mit zwei Belegen. Dazu *NSc* 1919, 318 Nr. 55 (Rom, Ende 2. Jh. n. Chr.). *AE* 2004, 1887 (Mauretania Caesariensis); Lesung bleibt etwas unsicher.

Flamma: Kajanto 341. *Arctos* 35 (2001) 198. 37 (2003) 177 mit griechischen Belegen. Auch sonst in griechischen Osten belegt, etwa in Istros (*ISM* I 67–69), und öfters in Kleinasien: Pamphylien, Pisidien, Lykaonien (z. B. *RECAM* IV 83 aus Iconium).

Florius: Kajanto 234 mit drei Belegen für den Männernamen und zwei für den Frauennamen aus *CIL*, sowie einem christlichen Beleg. Dazu Männername *ICUR* 20424; Frauenname *ICUR* 20423.

**Fortunus* verschwindet; *Rep*. 334 aus *AE* 1975, 228 muss in Wirklichkeit *Fortunatus* gelesen werden: *Suppl. It*. 20 Venusia 205. Dagegen war der Frauenname *Fortuna* einigermaßen in Gebrauch, da er ja direkt auf die Gottheit bezogen werden konnte. Kajanto 273 stellt ihn mit *Fortunatus* usw. zusammen, es ist aber zu erwägen, ob der Name nicht eher zu den metonymisch als Anthroponymen gebrauchten Götternamen gehört; da ist dann wiederum interessant zu notieren, dass *Fortuna* und *Fortunata* aufeinander bezogen werden konnten: in *CIL* X 664 = *CLE* 1440 = *ILCV* 170 steht der Name der verstorbenen *Fortunata cl(arissima) fem(ina)* am Anfang der Inschrift aus metrischen Gründen in der Form *hic Fortuna iaces casu prostrata ruinae*.

Φρουγιανή: *SEG* XXIV 633 (Dion in Makedonien) ἡ πόλις Ἰουλίαν Φρουγιανὴν Ἀλεξάνδραν, gehörte also möglicherweise zur lokalen oder allenfalls regionalen Oberschicht.

Frugianus: Kajanto 253 mit einem Beleg. *Rep*. 335 aus Hierapolis. Dazu *SEG* XLI 1202 (ebenfalls aus Hierapolis, 2. Jh. n. Chr.). Ferner ein Gymnasiarch L. Claudius in Ephesos (*I. Ephesos* 461. 1128. 1129). Phrygien: *MAMA* VI 335a. IX 541 (Aizanoi).

Φρούγιος: *Rep*. 335. *Arctos* 38 (2004) 173. Dazu *IG* XII 6, 233. *I. Ephesos* 1018. *TAM* IV 1, 91 (2mal). *MAMA* IV 354. 355 (Phrygien). Öfters in Lykaonien belegt: *CIG* 3989 (Laodicea Combusta). *MAMA* I 11. 12. VII 57 (ebenda). *AM* 13 (1888) 265 (ebenda). Sterrett, *An Epigraphical Journey* 198 Nr. 208 (Iconium).

Gaudens: Kajanto 260 mit zwei Belegen (Männername). Dazu *CIL* VI 41179 (1. Hälfte des 3. Jh.; Freigelassener).

Gratil(l)ianus: Kajanto 282 (= 147) mit drei Belegen. *Rep*.^{2} 500. Dazu *AE* 2004, 1243 mit einem neuen Statthalter von Moesia inferior (222 n. Chr.), von dessen Namen *[---]lius Gratilianus V[---]* erhalten ist. – Vgl. noch *Arctos* 35 (2001) 202.

Gutta: Kajanto 348 mit drei Belegen aus der republikanischen Zeit (meist Senatorencognomina) und fünf aus dem *CIL* (davon ein Frauenname). Dazu *IPO* A 300 *[---] Gutta* (der Name scheint links vollständig) *CIL* IV 1839 aufgrund der neuen von mir wiederhergestellten Lesung *sa(lve), Gutta* statt ...VITA von Zangemeister. Es sei noch hinzugefügt, dass die von Kajanto hierher gestellte Form *Guttini* (Dativ) aus *ICUR* 3323 auch die Nominativform *Guttis* voraussetzen kann (obwohl es nicht ungewöhnlich wäre, in altchristlichen Inschriften Dative auf *-ini* aus *-a*-Stämmen zu finden) und so was anderes vertreten wird. Und die Ableitung *Guttilla* mag besser zum Gentilnamen *Guttius* oder dem üblicheren *Cuttius* gestellt werden. Ferner wird in *Gutulus* (*CIL* VIII 2847) eher autochthones Namengut vorliegen; in diesem Sinn auch K. Jongeling, *North African Names from Latin Sources*, Leiden 1994, 55. Überhaupt erscheinen in lateinischen Inschriften Afrikas des Öfteren Namen auf *Gut*-, und man fragt sich, ob auch einige andere von Kajanto hierher gestellte Bildungen afrikanisches Namengut beinhalten können; auch der stadtrömische Beleg *Guttini* könnte eine solche Herkunft haben (afrikanische Namen gibt es ja eine ganz Reihe in stadtrömischen altchristlichen Inschriften).

Hortata: *I. Aquileia* 3144 (christl.) *Ortata*. Kajanto 352 registriert nur *Hortatus* mit einem Beleg.

Ingenianus -a: Kajanto 314 mit zwei Belegen für den Männernamen und einem Beleg für den Frauennamen. Dazu *IAM* II 108 vgl. *AE* 1985, 989*b* (ein vir egregius). *I. Aquileia* 3090 (christl.) *Inginianus*.

Iugalio: *CIL* V 8651 (dort *Iuc*-) = *AE* 2004, 600 (Iulium Carnicum, 1. Jh. n. Chr.) *L. Cantenius L. f. Iugalio*. Zu *iugalis*, das u. a. die Bedeutung 'Gatte' hat. Der Name wurde mittels des Suffixes *-io* direkt aus dem Appellativ *iugalis* gebildet (ein Cognomen **Iugalis* ist nicht belegt), ein Vorgang, der auch sonst bekannt ist.

Iulitta: Kajanto 171. *Arctos* 35 (2001) 203. 39 (2005) 170. Dazu *CIG* 4056 (Ancyra). *RECAM* II 387 (ebd.). *MAMA* VIII 234 = *RECAM* IV 120 (Iconium).

Iuvenca: *AE* 1993, 651 (Perusia). *I. Philippi* 279. Kajanto 300 verzeichnet nur den Männernamen *Iuvencus* mit 7 Belegen; dazu noch ein Duovir in Korinth: *Corinth* VIII 2, 81. 3, 154 und ein kaiserlicher Freigelassener in Tarraco: *RIT* 248.

Iuvencius. Dieser sonst unbelegte Name lässt sich nunmehr als Signum nachweisen: *CIL* IX 6268 (Abellinum) *Iuvenci, have,* auf einem Sarkophag links von der Hauptinschrift (den frühren Editoren entgangen, von uns 2007 notiert).

Liberata: Kajanto 353 mit drei heidnischen und sechs christlichen Belegen. Dazu heidnisch *Inscr. It.* IV 1, 348; christlich *AE* 1989, 345*b* (Lilybaeum). *I. chr. Haïdra* 308. *I. chr. Carthage* (Ennabli) 61. 366. *IRT* 301.

Liberatus: Kajanto 353 mit drei christlichen Belegen. Dazu heidnisch *AE* 1968, 136 (Beneventum); christlich *AE* 1971, 501 (Sufetula). 2000, 1684 (Mididi). *I. chr. Haïdra* 53. *ILAlg* I 2760 (Madauros).

Liberianus: Kajanto 280 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *Mart. Just.* 4, 9 (im Jahre 167 n. Chr. in Rom enthauptet).[11]

Λόγγιλλα: *Arctos* 35 (2001) 205. 38 (2004) 176f. Dazu ein weiterer kleinasiatischer Beleg: *Nouvelles inscriptions d'Antioche de Pisidie* (IK 67, 2006) 84 Αὐρ. Λόνγιλλα.

Lucas: *Rep*. 353. *Arctos* 35 (2001) 205. 38 (2004) 177. 39 (2005) 171. Dazu noch folgende nichtchristliche Belege: *CIL* VI 11802 (2. Jh. n. Chr.). 17685 (2. Jh. n. Chr.). *SEG* LII 1288 (Aizanoi, 2. Jh. n. Chr., geschr. Λωυκᾶς). Der Name, zunächst im griechischen Osten belegt, lässt sich als mit dem griechischen Suffix -ᾶς versehene Ableitung aus *Lucius* deuten, aber bei den stadtrömischen Belegen kann als Namenquelle auch der lukanische Begriff *Luca bos* gewirkt haben.

Lucetius: Kajanto 215 = 288 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *AE* 2004, 1441 (Mylasa) Λουκήτιος Ζωφύτου (geschr. ΛΟΥΚΙΙΤΙΟΥ). Deutung des Namens wie auch des Belegs nicht ganz sicher.

Λουππία: *MAMA* VIII 240 = *RECAM* IV 122. Kajanto 328 hat einen Beleg für *Lupia* (dazu noch *Arctos* 37 (2003) 181 aus *ICUR* 17916).

Lustricus: *AE* 2004, 1898,[12] Militärdiplom, durch welches wir erfahren, dass der Suffektkonsul 108 n. Chr., der früher als *Lustricius Bruttianus* bekannt war, tatsächlich *[---]tius Lustricus Bruttianus* hieß,[13] also zwei Cognomina

[11] Zu diesem Martyrium und seiner Datierung vgl. z. B. H. Gülzow, *Christentum und Sklaverei in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Bonn 1969, 128–130.

[12] Aus W. Eck – A. Pangerl, *REMA* 1 (2004) 103–115.

[13] Zur Namensform vgl. die Bemerkungen von Eck – Pangerl 108f. Der Mann war früher nur aus Plin. *epist*. 6, 22, 2 in der Form *Lustric(i)us Bruttianus* bekannt, wo die hsl. Überlieferung zwischen *Lustricius* und *Lustricus* schwankt. Die erstere Lesart hat sich eingebürgert, wohl weil der Mann so ein Gentile erhielt. Dass Plinius einen Mann nur mit

hatte, von denen das erste ein Novum darstellt. Seine sprachliche Herkunft ist nicht eindeutig zu bestimmen. Eine Verbindung mit dem onomastischen Element *Lustrostaius* bei einem Magistraten der Stadt Noviodunum, worauf Syme hingewiesen hatte,[14] bleibt recht hypothetisch. Nun wenn wir wissen, dass *Lustricus* ein Cognomen war, können wir eher ein lateinisches Etymon suchen. Dabei bietet sich von selbst als Ausgangspunkt das Adjektiv *lustricus*: unserem Mann oder einem seiner Vorväter ist dieser Name etwa in Anlehnung an den *dies lustricus*, an dem die Söhne den Namen bekamen, oder aus einem anderen uns verborgenen Grund zugelegt worden. Derselbe Wortstamm hat auch ein anderes Cognomen zustande gebracht, nämlich *Lustralis* (auch *lustralis* wird, von einer Ausnahme abgesehen, nicht auf Menschen bezogen).[15]

Malus: Kajanto 266 mit einem Beleg für den Männernamen und einem Beleg für den Frauennamen. Dazu *AE* 2003, 263 (vermutlich Rom, Lesung sicher). Kajanto stellt den Namen zum Adjektiv *mălus* und vergleicht für den Männernamen das Substantiv *mālus*. Es können aber auch andere, zum Teil nicht-lateinische Assoziationen dahinter liegen. Das Adjektiv *malus* ist jedenfalls kein passendes Namenwort in der hohen Prinzipatszeit.

Mammula: Kajanto 303 mit einem sicheren und einem unsicheren Beleg. Dazu *NSc* 1919, Nr. 16 (Rom). *I. Aquileia* 3120 (christl.) *Mamula*.

Marcianinus: *AE* 2004, 1840 (Uthina, 4. Jh.) *Q.* (oder ist Ꝗ Zeichen eines Theta nigrum?) *Grani Marcianin(i)* aus der lokalen Führungsschicht (anhand des Photos könnte man erwägen, ob der Name nicht *Marcianini* ausgeschrieben war).

Μαρσιλιανός: *SEG* LIII 1612 (Termessos, 3. Jh. n. Chr.) πρεσβευτοῦ Κλαυδίου Μαρσιλιανοῦ. Wenn die Lesung stimmt, haben wir ein neues Cognomen, das man aus einem sonst unbelegten Gentilnamen *Marsilius* ableiten möchte; vgl. aber *Marsidius* usw. Wenn nicht zu *Marsilla*, auch in der Senatorenschicht belegt (siehe gleich den nächsten Namen). Leider ist der Kontext sehr obskur (der Erstpublikation sind keine Photos beigefügt), und etwa die Deutung von πρεσβευτής bleibt in der Luft hängen.

---

zwei Cognomina, ohne Gentile anführt, ist zwar nicht üblich, aber durchaus bezeugt; vgl. L. Vidman, Die Namengebung bei Plinius dem Jüngeren, *Klio* 63 (1981) 587–589; A. Birley, *Onomasticon to the Younger Pliny. Letters and Panegyric*, München – Leipzig 2000, 27; Eck – Pangerl 108.

[14] R. Syme, *JRS* 58 (1968) 149 = *Roman Papers* II 719 aus *ILS* 7005 = *CIL* XIII 5011. Dieser Deutung sind auch Eck – Pangerl 109 zugeneigt, freilich zögernd.

[15] Kajanto 220 mit einem Beleg.

Marsilla: Kajanto 185 mit zwei Belegen (nebst drei für den Männernamen *Marsillus*). Dazu *NSc* 1919, 207 Nr. 1 *Tullia P. f. Marsilla Quentinia Rossia Rufina Rufia Procula*, eine *clarissima femina*, aus Volsinii (ist sie Tochter des kürzlich aufgetauchten Konsuls 206 n. Chr. P. Tullius Marsus *RMD* 189?). *ICUR* 21899*a*. Möglicherweise hierher zu stellen ist auch *CIL* IX 3231 *Annia Marsilia* (man hat den Verdacht, dass in der verschollenen Inschrift -*illa* zu verstehen sei) (vgl. Ap. Annius Marsus *PIR*^{2} A 670).

Marsinus: *AE* 2004, 1857 *b* (Uthina), ein Venator. Zum Suffix -*inus* vgl. oben *Marcianinus*.

Mascolianus: *I. Aquileia* 3126.[16] Das ist natürlich *Masculianus*. Kajanto 150 kennt *Masclianus* aus *CIL* VIII 1336, 666. 1337, 49 (patellae), das er aus dem Gentilnamen *Masclius* ableitet. Eher gehören alle drei Formen zusammen zu *Masculus*.

Maternianus: Kajanto 150 = 304 mit sechs Belegen. Dazu *AE* 2004, 1087 (Flavia Solva). Aus der Spätantike Proconsul Africae Mitte 4. Jh. (*PLRE* I 567) und Bischof von Reims im 4. Jh. (*RE* XIV 2193 Nr. 2).

Mensurius: Kajanto 364 mit zwei Belegen, einem Signum aus dem 3. Jh. (*CIL* VIII 12421), einem christlichen aus Rom (jetzt *ICUR* 9813 zu zitieren), dort zweimal als Name derselben Person in der Form *Mesurius* geschrieben. Dieselbe Graphie noch in *CIL* X 4922 (Venafrum);[17] VIII 26765 (Thugga). Alle Belege gehören der fortgeschrittenen Kaiserzeit an: *ICUR* 9813 ist sicher spät, vielleicht sogar vom 5., wenn nicht vom 6. Jh.; von den afrikanischen Belegen kann 12421 wegen des Signums nicht vorseverisch sein; 26765 ist nicht näher datierbar,[18] doch dürfte auch er wegen des Suffixes -*ius* kaum vorseverisch sein, denn dieses Suffix ist ja charakteristisch für die spätantike Namengebung.

---

[16] Kürzlich von G. Vergone mit gutem Photo publiziert: *Le epigrafi lapidarie del Museo paleocristiano di Monastero (Aquileia)*, Trieste 2007, 172 f. Nr. 60.

[17] Mommsen im Cognominaindex von *CIL* X S. 1080 hält **Mesurius* ohne Grund für korrupt. Mommsen kannte den Text nur aus einer alten Abschrift, die Inschrift existiert aber noch und ist von mir 2006 gesehen worden: die Lesung steht fest.

[18] In der neuen Ausgabe *Mourir à Dougga. Recueil des inscriptions funéraires*, sous la direction de M. Khanoussi et L. Maurin, Bordeaux – Tunis 2002, p. 148 n. 179 plädieren die Editoren für eine Datierung zwischen 51 (sic) und 150, aufgrund des Fehlens der Formel *Dis manibus*. Die Inschrift ist verschollen, so dass keine Beobachtungen zu den Buchstabenformen möglich sind. Doch weist das Suffix -*ius* entschieden auf eine spätere Zeit hin.

Mettianus: Kajanto 150 mit drei Belegen. Dazu *I. Ephesos* 1548 (2. Jh. n. Chr.) Μεττιανὸς Καύνιος. *I. Kaunos* (2006) 138 (Mitte 2. Jh. n. Chr.) Τίτ[ος Φλάουιος] Τίτου Φλαουίου Τι[τιανοῦ υἱὸς] Κυρείνᾳ Μεττιανό[ς].

Minicianus: Kajanto 150 mit zehn Belegen. Dazu ein Lampenstempler aus dem griechischen Osten (zahlreiche Belege in *Corinth* IV 2, 310 Nr. 560 verzeichnet). *TAM* II 677 Καδυανδεὺς και Καύνιος.

Naevianus: Kajanto 151 mit 7 Belegen. Dazu zwei Belege aus Phrygien: *MAMA* VI 318 (Akmonia) Ναιβιανός. *AE* 2004, 1414 (Hierapolis, Ende 2. Jh. n. Chr.); er hatte Brüder namens Ῥοῦφος, Πτολεμαῖος und Ἀντίφιλος, also eine halbromanisierte Familie.

Nobilior: Kajanto 279 mit zwei Belegen außerhalb der senatorischen Fulvier. Dazu *AE* 1976, 206 (Bononia, Freigelassener). 2004, 601 (Iulium Carnicum). Problematisch bleibt *Corinth* VIII 3, 120 *Q. Fulvio Q. f. [-] n. Ouf. Nobilior(i) [orna]ment(is) [honorato?]*: der Editor hält ihn für einen Nachkommen des römischen Adelsgeschlechts, eher wird es sich aber um die Gewohnheit munizipaler Familien handen, sich das Cognomen eines großen Vertreters der eigenen gens anzueignen.

Nomentana: *CIL* VI 18973 *Gelliae Noment[anae]*.

Nomentanus: Kajanto 182. *Arctos* 39 (2005) 174. Dazu *I. Lipara* 795 (der Stein ist möglicherweise verschleppt). *IGRR* III 905 (Hierapolis Cast. in Kilikien) Νουμέριος Λούσιος Νουμερίου υἱὸς Κορνηλίᾳ Νωμεντανὸς ἔπαρχος τεχνειτῶν.

Numerius: *Rep*. 370. *Arctos* 39 (2005) 174. Ferner *AE* 2004, 648 (Sizilien).

Ocella: Kajanto 239 mit 4 Belegen außerhalb des Senatorenstandes. Dazu *CIL* IV 7993. *AE* 2001, 749 (Tarracina); vgl. die senatorischen Livii Ocellae, die aus Tarracina stammen.[19]

Optatio: Kajanto 297 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *SIRIS* 533*a* = *AE* 2004, 365 (Ostia).

Optimus: Kajanto 275 mit 10 heidnischen und einem christlichen Beleg. Dazu Bischof von Antiocheia in Pisidien 375–387 n. Chr. (*SEG* VI 580. 581; *RE* XVIII 1, 805 Nr. 2); Schriftsteller im 5./ 6. Jh. (ebda. Nr. 3).

Oriclo: *CIL* V 3805. 7450. VIII 13821 (christl.). *ILAlg* II 4907. *AE* 2004, 1711 (aus dem Photo zu schließen scheint die Lesung sicher) (Limisa in der Byzacena) und

---

[19] Vgl. W. Eck, *LF* 114 (1991) 97.

Oriculo: In Africa: *CIL* VIII 1720. 13821. 19561. Beide Formen fehlen bei Kajanto, scheinen aber ein gutes lateinisches Cognomen zu vertreten, das bald mit, bald ohne Synkope geschrieben wird; an epichorisches afrikanisches Namengut zu denken besteht kein Anlass. Sonstige Namensträger *CIL* V 3267; A. Rizakis, *Achaïe* II: *La cité de Patras*, Athènes 1998, 200 Nr. 152 *[P. Do]mitius Trom. Oriculo*, Legionär (Ende des 1. Jh. v. Chr./ 1. Jh. n. Chr.). Kajanto 224 registriert nur den Grundnamen *Auricula Oric(u)la* als Männername (hinzuzufügen *AE* 1979, 116 *Auricula* [Sexus bleibt unbestimmt]), doch scheint auch *Oric(u)lo* eher lateinisch zu sein.[20] Vgl. auch *Oriclio* aus Lusitanien *Arctos* 37 (2003) 183.

Otacilianus: Kajanto 152. *Rep.*^{2} 501. *Arctos* 38 (2004) 180. Dazu noch *CIL* VI 23626 (Mutter *Otacilia Onesime*). Silius O., Hymnode in Pergamon unter Hadrian (*I. Pergamon* II 361. 362. 274. III 22).

Ὀτάκιλλα: *AE* 2004, 1551 [= *GVI* 1914] (Kition, 3. Jh. n. Chr.). Muss zum Gentilnamen *Otacilius* gestellt werden, vielleicht als Haplologie für **Otacililla* deutbar. An Ableitungen aus dem Gentilnamen war bisher *Otacilianus* bekannt (siehe gleich oben). Die zu erwartende Länge des *ā* (wie auch die Kürze des *ŏ*) ist von Mart. 10, 79 bezeugt (viermal am Ende des Pentameters), aber hier fordert das Metrum ∪ ∪ − X. Eine solche metrische Lizenz ist in griechischer Umgebung verzeihlich; andererseits steht die Endung -ιλλα metrisch fest, so dass eine selbständige Namenbildung vorliegen dürfte.[21] Sofern es sich nicht um eine Koseform wie *Tulliola* von Ciceros Tochter handelt.

Παπιρίων: *TAM* II 957 Εὐτύχης Παπιρίωνος Ὀλυν[πη]νός. Die gens Papiria ist in Kleinasien gut belegt.

Placentina: Kajanto 197 mit zwei Belegen (und mit 7 Belegen für *Placentinus*). *Arctos* 38 (2004) 180. Dazu *ILN* V (Vienne) 339 = *AE* 2004, 892 (2. Jh. n. Chr.).

Placidiana: *AE* 2004, 1811 (Ammaedara, 6. Jh. n. Chr.). Kajanto 262 verzeichnet nur den Männernamen *Placidianus* mit 8 Belegen.

---

[20] Holder II 877 registriert *Oriclo* als keltisch (aber *Oriculo* fehlt in seinen Listen!). Aber eine ansprechende keltische Herleitung lässt sich nicht finden; parallele Formen fehlen bei K. H. Schmidt, Die Komposition in gallischen Personennamen, *ZCPh* 26 (1957) 31–301; X. Delamarre, *Nomina Celtica antiqua selecta inscriptionum* (2007; s. Anm. 5).

[21] Th. Oziol, in M. Yon, *Kition-Bamboula* V: *Kition dans les textes. Testimonia littéraires et épigraphiques et Corpus des inscriptions*, Paris 2004, 281 Nr. 2086, die den Text neu gelesen und die richtige Lesung des Namens festgelegt hat, erklärt ihn als "adaptation d'*Otacilia*".

Platanus: Kajanto 335 mit 4 Belegen, alle aus Italien.[22] Dazu noch *CIL* VI 24240. *AE* 1962, 120 (Aquincum, aus der munizipalen Führungsschicht). 1988, 199 = 1989, 129 (Ostia, Freigelassener). *IRCatal* IV 234 (= *CIL* II 4598). Die Belege aus der griechischen Welt gehören natürlich der griechischen Onymie an, auch wenn sie alle aus der Kaiserzeit stammen.[23] Griechisch zu beurteilen natürlich auch Πλατάνιος im Namen von Fl. Platanius Serenianus, vir perfectissimus, dux Orientis ca. 325 – ca. 350 (*PLRE* I 825 Nr. 3).

Pol(l)ianus: Kajanto 153 mit 9 Belegen. *Arctos* 38 (2004) 180. 40 (2006) 137. Dazu H. Malay, *Greek and Latin Inscr. in the Manisa Museum* (1994) 322 Πωλιανὸς Μηνοδότου. *SEG* LII 1179 (Alexandria Troas, 2. Jh. n. Chr., Asiarch).

Πομπᾶς: *SEG* LII 1286 (Aizanoi, ca. 50–150 n. Chr., Vater und Sohn). Man wird zunächst an eine Ableitung aus *Pompeius* (wie etwa Λουκᾶς aus *Lucius*) mittels des griechischen hypokoristischen Suffixes -ᾶς denken, das ja bekanntlich häufig lateinischen Namen angehängt wurde, ohne eine griechische Erklärung innerhalb der Namensippe Πεμπε-, -πομπος von der Hand zu weisen; doch fehlen anderweitige Belege für eine solche Bildung.[24]

Ποπλᾶς: *Rep.* 381. *Arctos* 38 (2004) 181. Ein weiterer Beleg liegt möglicherweise in *SEG* LIII 603 (Drama in Makedonien) Πουμπλᾶς vor (Lesung bleibt aber unsicher).

Poplicola: Kajanto 256. Dazu *CIL* VI 32115. *IG* XII 1, 643 (ein L. Cornelius L. f. Quir.).

Primigenes: *Rep.* 383 mit mehreren Belegen. *Arctos* 37 (2003) 184 mit weiteren Belegen. Dazu noch etwa *EpigrAnat* 37 (2004) 30 Nr. 51 = *AE* 2004, 1442 (Mylasa).[25]

Quinquennalis: Kajanto 220 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *AE* 2004, 322 (Centurio der cohors VIII praetoria Commodiana). Kajanto stellt das Cognomen zu Namen von Festlichkeiten, aber wenigstens in unserem Fall würde man als Namenwort doch eher den munizipalen Verwaltungsterminus sehen wollen.

Regulinus: Kajanto 317 mit einem Beleg (und einem anderen für den Frauennamen). Dazu *SEG* LII 1116 [= *CIG* 2941] (Tralleis, spätes 3. Jh.).[26]

---

[22] In Kajantos Liste hat sich ein Druckfehler eingeschlichen: statt IX 1336 ist IX 5336 zu schreiben.

[23] *I. Beroia* 379 (2. Jh.). *I. Smyrna* 414. *I. Tralleis* 250, 35 (Ende 3. Jh.).

[24] Keine Belege in *LGPN* I–IV oder in Bechtel *HPN*.

[25] Der Mann hieß nicht Primigenus, wie der Editor princeps meinte (richtig im Index der *AE*).

!Ῥωμανιανή(?): *IG* XIV 2034 Ῥωμανιανῇ oder aber Ῥωμανίλλῃ; überliefert ist ΡΩΜΑΝΙΑΛΗ. Kajanto registriert nur den Männernamen *Romanianus* (dazu gleich unten).

Romanianus: Kajanto 154 = 182 mit 7 Belegen. *Arctos* 38 (2004) 183. Dazu *AE* 2004, 1685 (Limisa in der Byzacena).

Rufo: Kajanto 229 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *Epigraphica* 28 (1966) 30 Nr. 20 (Rom, scheint aber modern). – Falsche Ergänzung in *RECAM* IV 62 für [Τρ]ύφων.

Rufonianus: Kajanto 229 mit einem Beleg. *Rep.*[2] 393. 503. Dazu *AE* 1984, 87 (Rom). *BCH* 25 (1901) 36 Nr. 182 (Amastris). Marek, *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia* (1993) 183 Nr. 101 (Amastris).

Rusticula: Kajanto 311 mit drei Belegen (samt drei für *Rusticulus*). *Arctos* 35 (2001) 218. Dazu *AE* 2004, 741 (Baetica, Anfang 3. Jh. n. Chr.). Vgl. *Rep.*[2] 503 *Rusticola* aus Hispanien (chr.).

Rutilianus: Kajanto 154 mit 6 Belegen außerhalb des Senatorenstandes. *Arctos* 38 (2004) 183 (zur östlichen Verbreitung). Dazu *AE* 2004, 212 (Rom). *RECAM* IV 52 (Iconium, 2. Jh. n. Chr.).

Saenianus: Kajanto 154 mit drei Belegen (einer davon gehört dem Suffektkonsul 89 M. Peducaeus S.). Dazu ein Rhetor wohl aus der frühen Kaiserzeit (*PIR*[2] S 55; in der hsl. Überlieferung auch *Sen*- geschrieben); *CIL* XV 7741 *Saenia(nus) Aug. lib. procur(ator)* von 161–169 n. Chr.[27]; *Epigraphica* 68 (2006) 355 Nr. 3 (Brundisium, von den Editoren ins 2. Jh. datiert) *Senianus Peducei Flaviani filius* (auch hier vertritt *Senianus* wohl nur eine sekundäre Graphie von *Saen*-). Interessanterweise gehört er zu derselben Gens wie der Suffektkonsul. – *SEG* XXXVI 1150 (Krateia in Bithynien). – Vgl. unten *Senio*.

Sassula: *CIL* XI 3254 *P. Matrinius Sassula*. Als Frauenname in XIII 5913 (= *I. Lingons* 202 mit gutem Photo) *Vitalia Sassula*. Kajanto hat den

---

[26] Der verschollene schwierige Text ist von M. Christol – Th. Drew-Bear, *Tyche* 17 (2002) 31–38 neu herausgegeben worden. Sie lesen das Cognomen Ῥ[ε](γυλ)λῖνος, mir scheint aber aufgrund der vorhandenen Kopie von Pococke der Schluss möglich, dass es mit nur einem Lambda geschrieben wurde. Außerdem sollte eher Ῥ[η]γ- ergänzt Ῥ[η]⌜γυ⌝λῖνος geschrieben werden.

[27] Zur Lesung vgl. auch G. Barbieri, *NSc* 1953, 138. Chr. Bruun, *The Water Supply of Ancient Rome* (1991) 296.

Namen nicht, wohl weil er ihm nicht als lateinisch erschien. Kann aber zum Städtenamen gestellt werden.[28]

Sassulanus: *CIL* XI 3314.

Satrianus: Kajanto 154 mit fünf Belegen. Dazu *RECAM* IV IV 4 (Iconium, 2. Jh. n. Chr.).

Senio: Kajanto 165 mit zwei Belegen (davon einer christlich). Dazu *CIL* IV 3886; der Editor Mau fasst das Wort als Appellativ *senio* auf. Das Graffito lautet VA SENIO VA; darunter frontal stehende Figur eines Mannes. Wie *va(le), senio, va(le)* erklärt werden kann, bleibt ganz dunkel; *senio* bezeichnet ja die Sechs als Würfelzahl, aber eine Würfelzahl kann man ja nicht begrüßen. Man wird eher *Senio* als Namen des in der Figur abgebildeten Mannes erklären.[29] Kajanto stellt ihn zum Gentilicium *Senius*, was ohne weiteres einleuchtet. Es sei nur angemerkt, dass *Saenius* ein viel besser belegter Gentilname ist als *Senius*, so dass es letzten Endes vorzuziehen ist, hier eine sekundäre Graphie für *Saenio* zu sehen. *Saenio* wäre ein neues Cognomen, vgl. aber *Saenianus Saenias*. Kajanto vergleicht kelt. *Senis*, aber unnötig, da wir uns in Süditalien befinden.

Sequens: Kajanto 358 mit 9 Belegen (hauptsächlich aus den gallischen und germanischen Provinzen). Dazu *AE* 2004, 756 (Baetica).

Serenianus: Kajanto 261 mit insgesamt 9 Belegen. Dazu *PIR*² A 258 aus Hist. Aug. *Alex*. 68, 1. Epistrateg in Ägypten im Jahre 174 Ulpius S. (*P. Mich*. IX 431; *P. Cornell* 47; *SB* 11341). *AE* 1893, 122 (Concordia). 1997, 1219 (Virunum). Bei spätantiken Beamten: *PLRE* I 825 Nr. 1–3. II 993 (Römer). Christl.: *ICUR* 20722. *Fouilles de Conimbriga* II 108 (541 n. Chr.).

Servilla: Kajanto 170 mit 4 Belegen. *Arctos* 39 (2005) 178. Dazu *AE* 2004, 826 [= *CIL* II² 14, 177] *[S]ervilla* (möglich auch *[C]ervilla*): Kajanto mit zwei Belegen, wozu *Arctos* 35 [2001] 194. 37 [2003] 175).

Sora: *CIL* V 5442. Fehlt bei Kajanto, kann aber zum Städtenamen gestellt werden.[30]

Sospes: Kajanto 232 mit zwei Belegen aus dem Senatorenstand und zwei sonstigen. *Arctos* 38 (2004) 186 mit zahlreichen östlichen Belegen und Versuch einer Erklärung zur dortigen Verbreitung des Namens. Diesen östlichen

---

[28] So auch Schulze, *ZGLE* 577.

[29] So meint auch M. Langner, *Antike Graffitizeichnungen: Motive, Gestaltung und Bedeutung* (Palilia 11), Wiesbaden 2001, 111 und Nr. 688 (nur auf der beiliegenden CD).

[30] So auch Schulze, *ZGLE* 577. Auch Gentilicium: Schulze 371.

Belegen kann noch hinzugefügt werden *RECAM* IV 164 (Iconium, wo der Name auch sonst vorkommt) Gen. Σώσπιτ[ος]. Vgl. unten *Sospita, Sospitianus*.

Sospita: *CIL* VI 23685 *Pacilia Sospita*. *ILAlg* II 3317 *Sospita Asparitana*. Feminine Form zu *Sospes*.

Sospitianus: *CIL* VI 2162 *L. Caesennius Sospitianus, ex ordine haruspic(um)*.[31] Vgl. den Senator L. Caesennius Sospes (jetzt *PIR*^{2} S S. 300).

Strippio: s. *Arctos* 40 (2006) 163f.

Teatina: *AE* 2004, 494 (Pinna, 2. Jh. n. Chr.). Aus dem Namen der Einwohner der Stadt Teate Marrucinorum abgeleitet.

Terentulla: Kajanto 171 mit drei Belegen. *Arctos* 35 (2001) 221. Dazu *I. Ephesos* 788. *Roman Provincial Coinage* II 1 (1999) 211 Nr. 1388 eine Claudia (Sohn der in *Rep*. angeführte Terentullianus).[32]

Τερεντυλλιανός: *Rep*. 411. Dazu *SEG* LII 1342 Μᾶρκος Φλάουιος Οὐαλεριανὸς Τ. (Hierapolis, ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας, verwandt mit dem in *Rep*. angeführten).

Traianus: Kajanto 157. *Arctos* 35 (2001) 221f. Dazu noch P. Herrmann – H. Malay, *New Documents from Lydia* (DAW 340), Wien 2007, 70 Nr. 46 (288/9 n. Chr., Vater und Sohn).

Ustus: *CIL* XII 2545 (= *ILHSavoie* 12) *T. Iulio Usto T. Iulius Volt. Ustus Pollio*. Der erstere ist möglicherweise identisch mit dem Tribun einer Prätorianerkohorte und Neros Prokurator in 61 *PIR*^{2} J 632; wenn so, dann wohl in der Narbonensis beheimatet, wofür auch die Tribus Voltinia spricht. Der Name, der kaum keltisch deutbar ist, ist möglicherweise aus einem Spitznamen hervorgegangen.

Valentilla: Kajanto 247. *Arctos* 35 (2001) 223. 38 (2004) 188. Dazu *CIG* 3996 (Iconium). *RECAM* IV 75 (ebda, 3./ 4. Jh.) 201 (ebda, 4. Jh. n. Chr.).

Veneriosus: Kajanto 214 mit zwei Belegen aus den heidnischen, acht aus den christlichen Inschriften. Dazu *AE* 2004, 670 [= *CIL* X 1130*] *Beneriosus* (4. Jh.).

Venusia: Kajanto 195 mit einem Beleg. *Rep*. 505. Dazu *I. Canosa* 203 (wohl Sklavin).

Vibianianus: *AE* 2004, 1836 (Uthina, 4. Jh. n. Chr. (?)). Weiterbildung aus dem üblichen *Vibianus*.

---

[31] Vgl. M.- L. Haack, *Prosopographie des haruspices romains*, Pisa – Roma 2006, 37 Nr. 17.

[32] Verbesserte Lesung bei P. Weiss, *Chiron* 30 (2000) 236–239. Vgl. auch E. Miranda, *Mediterraneo antico* 5 (2002) 39–48.

Vincetdeus: Kajanto 216 mit einem Beleg aus Africa. Dazu ein Bronzestempel aus einer sizilischen Sammlung unbekannter Herkunft, publiziert von G. Manganaro Perrone, *Epigraphica* 68 (2006) 27 Nr. 40 mit Photo. Der Editor versteht *Vincet Deus*, man fragt sich aber, ob hier nicht eher der christliche Personenname *Vincetdeus* vorliegt. Da der Stempel linksläufig ist und die Buchstaben die aus anderen Stempeln derselben Art bekannte Form aufweisen, liegt doch eher ein Personenname vor, d. h. der Name des Mannes, der mit dem Stempel verderbliche Materialien stempelte, während man bei der Nennung des Gottes doch rechtsläufige Schrift erwarten würde, so wie ein ähnlicher Stempel Nr. 45 (S. 27) rechtsläufig Χριστὸ/ς νικᾷ aufweist.

Viticula: Kajanto 335 mit drei Belegen. *Rep*.[2] 505. *Arctos* 32 (1998) 251. Dazu *AE* 2004, 216 (Rom, 1. Jh. n. Chr.) *Alfia Ɔ. l. Viticula*. Eine Mitfreigelassene heißt *Alfia Ɔ. l. Arbuscula*.

CCXXXVIII. FALSCHE NAMEN

Atina. Unter den von Z. Benzina Ben Abdallah, *Ant. Afr*. 40–41 (2004–2005) 99ff publizierten Inschriften aus Limisa in der Byzacena hat die Autorin 74 (S. 151), freilich zögernd, für die verstorbene Frau den Namen *Min[u]cia Atin/a Valentin[a]* festgelegt (= *AE* 2004, 1738 mit der Bemerkung, *Atina* sei ein Hapax). Auffallend ist *Atina*, denn der Name der im latinisch-samnischen Grenzgebiet gelegenen, von Vergil als *potens* besungenen Stadt ist sonst nirgends zu einem Personennamen geworden. Anhand des beigelegten Photos würde ich statt *Atin/a* eher *Atini/a* lesen: nach N sieht man Reste einer vertikalen Haste, die man als I deuten wird. Die Frau hätte demnach zwei Gentilnamen. *Atinius* hat übrigens nichts mit Atina zu tun.

Caletanus. In derselben Gruppe von neuen Inschriften will der Autor in 117 (S. 171) *Kaleta[nus]* als Cognomen eines *[---]us Q. f. Pa[p(iria)]* erkennen (in *AE* 2004, 1780 ohne Widerspruch akzeptiert). Anhand des beigebrachten guten Photos liest man jedoch eher CAIETA[---], was wohl zu nichts anderes ergänzt werden kann als zu *Caietanus*. Dies ist formal ein Herkunftsname, so hieß ja das aus *Caieta* (heute Gaeta) abgeleitete Adjektiv. Das Cognomen ist kein geläufiges, lässt sich aber hie und da belegen: *CIL* VI 28961 (mit falscher Lesung) = X 3114. IV 1690; auch literarisch: Mart. 8, 37, 1. Auch ist *Caletanus* als Cognomen nicht sicher überliefert, denn *hominem Caletanum* Scaev. *dig*. 36, 1, 80, 12 vertritt schwerlich ein Cognomen.

Μυλασώ. In der Weihung an Damater und Kora *IG* V 1, 229 lautet der Name der Dedikantin Κληἱνίκη Μιλαῶς καὶ Ὀβρίμω; die Lesung der ganzen Inschrift soll Tod zufolge absolut sicher sein, und nach seiner ansprechenden Deutung folge auf den Namen der Dedikantin das Metronymikon und das Patronymikon.[33] Seit Bourguet pflegt man den Nominativ des Namens als Μυλα(σ)ώ festzulegen.[34] Das ist sicher ein falscher Name. Man soll an der sicheren Lesung festhalten, ich vermute als Namen der Mutter einfach Μιλαῴ, d. h. Μιλασώ, in der Koine Μιλησώ, abgeleitet aus Μιλήσιος, der als Personenname belegt ist. Nähere Begründung in der Festschrift Matthews (im Druck).

Tyrallis. Dieses Monstrum ist wieder auferstanden. Ich hatte *Arctos* 12 (1978) 147 moniert, dass in *CIL* XIV 1056 = Thylander, *IPO* B 75 im Namen der Verstorbenen *Pyrallidi* für das überlieferte TYRALLIDI zu verstehen sei. T für P ist leicht als eine Verschreibung oder Verlesung verständlich. Nun haben J.- P. Bost und G. Fabre, in *Au jardin des Hespérides. Histoire, société et épigraphie des mondes anciens. Mélanges offerts à A. Tranoy*, Rennes 2004, 118 eine Ehrenrettung für den Namen *Tyrallis* versucht, indem sie in einem Graffito aus Périgueux (Vesunna in Aquitanien), das sie *Tyralis* lesen, eine Stütze für die alte Lesung der Inschrift aus Ostia blicken.[35] Da es aber sonst keinerlei Belege für einen Namen *Tyral(l)is* gibt, der außerdem unerklärbar bliebe, ist es vorzuziehen, auch in dem Graffito aus Vesunna *Pyrallis* zu verstehen; in einem Graffito gehen Buchstaben wie P und T leicht durcheinander. *Pyrallis* ist ein üblicher Name griechischer Herkunft, überall in der römischen Welt verbreitet.[36]

---

33 M. N. Tod, *BSA* 47 (1952) 118. Tod hat den Text 1903 sorgfältig abgeschrieben.

34 E. Bourguet, *Le dialecte laconien*, Paris 1927, 117f. *LGPN* III A 307.

35 Bost und Fabre haben die Geschichte von *CIL* XIV 1056 missverstanden: Thylander hat keine Neulesung vorgelegt, sondern nur die alte im *CIL* wiedergegebene Lesung von de Rossi und Dessau wiedergegeben.

36 Allein in Rom 33mal belegt (s. mein Namenbuch^2 1147f.). Bestens auch in Ostia bezeugt: *CIL* XIV 382. 411. *AE* 1985, 162. 235. Unter den westlichen Provinzen sind die afrikanischen die einzigen, in denen der Name nicht belegt ist.

CCXXXIX. VARIA URBANA

1. *CIL* VI 4230. Die dritte Zeile, in der Form NVNNIA·TYCHE·DAC[---] überliefert (Henzen hat den Text nicht gesehen), muss eher *Nunnia Tyche dat* verstanden werden. Sie war nicht eine Dakierin, wie mitunter vermutet worden ist.[37] Die Wendung *ille/illa dat* im Ende des Inschrifttextes ist üblich im Kolumbarium der Livia,[38] woher die Inschrift stammt, und kommt auch sonst in Epitaphen armer Leute der frühen Kaiserzeit vor.

2. *CIL* VI 12816 aus der alten Abschrift von Sirmond lautet *[L.] Aufidius L. l. Eperastus / [a]b iano primo / natus / Mylasa Aufidia / [---]*. Der Text scheint zu besagen, dass L. Aufidius Eperastus aus Mylasa in Karien stammte und seine Arbeitsstätte bei ianus primus hatte. Was die servile Herkunft aus Mylasa angeht, ist sie nicht ganz sicher, doch plausibel.[39] Die Inschrift ist links leicht abgebrochen, wie Henzen ansprechend vermutet, doch in der letzten erhaltenen Zeile scheint vor MYLASA nichts zu fehlen. Man kann also vorzüglich *natus Mylasa* verbinden. Theoretisch könnte *Mylasa* das Cognomen der Aufidia, mutmaßlich Gattin des L. Aufidius Eperastus, sein (mit Nomen und Cognomen in umgekehrter Ordnung), doch ist kein Personenname *Mylasa* in der antiken Anthroponymie überliefert. Uns sind sonst keine aus Mylasa gebürtigen Sklaven oder Freigelassene bezeugt, aber karische Sklaven/Freigelassene waren nicht unbekannt in Rom.[40] Die Wendung *natus* + Abl. Sep. findet sich auch sonst bei der Angabe der Heimat eines Sklaven oder Freigelassenen: *CIL* VI 241 *[natus] Laudicia Syria C[oele]*; mit Lokativ oder *in* und Abl.: *CIL* V 7451 *natus in Asia*; VI 700 *natus in Suria Nisibyn(e)*; 23454 *Rom(ae) natus*; *AE* 2003, 567 (Interpromium) *in Asia nata*. Die Angabe der Heimat durch den Ablativ ist üblich auch bei Soldaten und Zivilpersonen nicht

---

37 So D. Noy, *Foreigners at Rome. Citizens and Strangers*, London 200, 297. Der Beleg fehlt glücklicherweise bei M. Bang, Die Herkunft der römischen Sklaven, *RM* 25 (1910) 237 unter Dacien.

38 *CIL* VI 3960. 3970. 4093. 4098. 4126. 4155. 4180. 4206 (*dat* scheint festzustehen). 4235. 4242.

39 Das hat man bisher nicht deutlich gesehen. Der Sklave fehlt im Verzeichnis von M. Bang, Die Herkunft der römischen Sklaven, *RM* 25 (1910) 236 unter Karien.

40 S. die Listen in M. Bang, Die Herkunft der römischen Sklaven, *RM* 25 (1910) 236; von den dort aufgezeichneten Zeugnissen auszuscheiden freilich *CIL* IV 4874 *Vitalio valeat, Car est*, wo *car* (= *quare*) *est* zu verstehen ist. Andererseits füge hinzu den Buntschriftsteller und Freigelassenen Hadrians Phlegon aus Tralleis und *CIL* VI 38461a *Hygiae Stratonices Tralianae*.

serviler Herkunft: z. B. *CIL* VI 2497 *nata Convena Aquitania*; 2544 *natus castello vixillo*; VIII 3278 *natus Berito*. Die Mylasener werden auch in römischen Quellen erwähnt: *CIL* XIII 8343 = Galsterer, *I. Köln* 303 *Ruphi natione Greco Mylasei choraule*,[41] gestorben im Alter von 16 Jahren; in II^2 14, 1308 (Tarraco) wird der korrupte Text in 5–6 von Alföldy in *hic iaceo Myl⌜a⌝s⌜e⌝n⌜si⌝s ⌜in C⌝aria natus* geändert, eine recht kühne Konjektur.[42] Die Angabe, Aufidius Eperastus sei bei dem *ianus primus* beschäftigt, muss in Beziehung gesetzt werden mit *CIL* VI 5845 und 10027, in denen der Gewerbetreibende als *a(b) iano medio* charakterisiert wird.[43] Dagegen ist *CIL* VI 3047* *b*, den Gebeinen eines *C. Iulius C. l. Nicomachus á iano prim. Pal.* gewidmet, zweifellos eine ligorianische Fälschung.[44]

3. *CIL* VI 13176/7. R. Barbera, *Bollettino. Monumenti, Musei e Gallerie Pontificie* 20 (2000) 98 schlägt für die letzte Zeile der Inschrift zwei Alternativen vor: entweder *donatu(s) a M(arcis) Manlibus* oder *donatu(s) a M(arco) Man(---) Libus*. Die erste ist recht künstlich (auch die Autorin hält sie nicht für sehr wahrscheinlich, aber eine Abkürzung MAN für *Manlius* wäre an sich nicht ausgeschlossen). Was die zweite Alternative angeht, denkt die Autorin an den griechischen Namen *Libys*, hier *Libus* geschrieben. Dabei hat sie übersehen, dass *Libus* Nominativ wäre, während ein Dativ erforderlich ist.

4. In der das erste Mal von P. Brandizzi Vittucci, *La collezione archeologica nel casale di Roma Vecchia*, Roma 1981, 26. 94 Nr. 219 mit Foto publizierten altchristlichen Inschrift soll ein Name *Pardales* vorliegen: *D(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) Pardales in pace* (= *AE* 2000, 225). Diese Lesung wird von V. Cipollone, *RAC* 76 (2000) 98f (= *AE* 2000, 225) wiederholt; sie gibt auch das alte Foto der inzwischen verschollenen Inschrift wieder. Anhand dieses Photos liest man aber ohne Zögern *Pardalis*. So braucht man nicht als Ausweg an einen Genetiv von *Pardale* zu denken (zudem ist dieser Name nicht mit Sicherheit in Rom belegt, vgl. mein Namenbuch^2 1146). *Pardales* wäre auch

[41] Vgl. H. Solin, *Analecta epigraphica* (1998) 76. 403. Notiere den Dativ *Greco*.

[42] Vgl. G. Alföldy, Grabgedichte in Tarraco: Der sozialgeschichtliche Hintergrund, in *Die metrischen Inschriften der römischen Republik*, hrsg. von P. Kruschwitz, Berlin – New York 2007, 337 Nr. 8.

[43] Zu den Zeugnissen und zur Lage von *ianus* (*primus/medius*) s. F. Coarelli, *Il Foro Romno* II: *Periodo repubblicano e augusteo*, Roma 1992, 180–189.

[44] Coarelli 183 glaubt die Inschrift als echt vindizieren zu können, doch entpuppt sich die Inschrift, die noch im Museum von Neapel existiert (*ILMN* I 641), auf den ersten Blick als ligorianische Fälschung.

eine etwas überraschende Graphie, obschon sie in einer Inschrift vom Jahre 409 n. Chr. überliefert ist (*ICUR* 9378). Aber *Pardales* ist nichts anderes als eine sekundäre Graphie von *Pardalis*; dies sei wegen der etwas obskuren Bemerkungen von Cipollone eigens festgestellt.

5. Nachtrag zu *Arctos* 40 (2006): in der 162–164 behandelten Inschrift kann die von mir für II 1 festgelegte Lesung *Kappa(dox)* durch neue, von M. Dondin-Payre mir zur Verfügung gestellten Photos weiter erhärtet werden: man sieht an den Aufnahmen beide obliquen Striche von K, die kurz sind und weder oben noch unten bis zu derselben Höhe reichen wie die Haste; dies ist eine alte Form des Buchstabens. Warum aber der Name abgekürzt wurde, obwohl da Raum gewesen wäre, bleibt weiterhin dunkel; vielleicht war der Urheber der Inschrift hinsichtlich der richtigen Form des Namens, ob *Kappadox* oder *Kappadocus*, unschlüssig und schrieb daher nur mehr KAPPA.

6. Zwei Quisquilien zu den von L. Spera, *Il complesso di Pretestato sulla Via Appia. Storia topografica e monumentale di un insediamento funerario paleocristiano nel suburbio di Roma* (2004) 134 Anm. 856 publizierten altchristlichen Inschriften: 1 (= *AE* 2004, 298): *Cyriacae, dulcis anima, vivas in (Christo) ... dep(o(sita) ...*: der Vokativ *Cyriacae* kann ebenso gut den Männernamen *Cyriacus* vertreten; 2 (= *AE* 2004, 300): *Decenti(us) et Gaude parentes in p(ace)*: der zweite Name ist ohne den geringsten Zweifel abgekürzt geschrieben: *Gaude(ntia)*. Auch der Name des Vaters ist abgekürzt! Der Hinweis auf *CIL* VI 18887 nützt nichts, denn hier liegt entweder eine sonst unbekannte Bildung vor, oder aber gleichfalls eine Abkürzung für *Gaude(ntia)* oder *Gaude(ntiana)* o. ä. *Gaudentia* als spätantike Bildung ist freilich nur selten in nichtchristlichen Urkunden belegt (*CIL* VI 13080 aus dem 3. Jh.), stellt aber eine regelrechte Bildung der fortgeschrittenen Kaiserzeit dar (und *Gaudentius* ist üblich in nichtchristlichen Inschriften). *Gaudentiana* dagegen wäre eine mögliche Bildung schon im 2. Jh., aber 18887 könnte auch noch später sein.

CCXL. IONICUS

In Rom erfreute sich der Personenname *Ionicus -e* einer gewissen Popularität; er ist zur Zeit als Männername 22mal und als Frauenname 31mal in stadtrömischen Urkunden von der frühen Kaiserzeit bis in das christliche

Altertum hinein belegt.[45] Gut bezeugt ebenfalls in Italien und den westlichen Provinzen. Auch in der griechischen Welt war Ἰωνικός als Personenname in der Kaiserzeit in Gebrauch.[46] Daneben sind auch andere Bildungen wie *Ion, Ionis, Ione, Ionius -ia* in Rom belegt; in nicht-stadtrömischen Urkunden finden wir noch *Ionicianus*.[47] Die Popularität dieser Namensippe liegt an der vielfältigen Bedeutung des Gebietes von Jonien und der Jonier im griechischen Leben. In der römischen Zeit war Jonien aber keine geographische geschweige denn administrative Einheit mehr, und damit steht in Einklang, dass im Latein der Begriff *Ionicus* als Herkunftsangabe von zeitgenössischen Personen nicht in Gebrauch war.

Die epigraphische Überlieferung bietet jedoch ein paar Fälle, in denen *Ionicus -e* möglicherweise als Herkunftsangabe verwendet wurde. Sie sind:

1) *CIL* IV 2393 (bessere Lesung auf S. 221), Wandkritzelei aus Pompeji lautet folgendermaßen: *Dap(h)nus Asiaticus cum sua Apra Ionice hic et ubique*. Man hat seit jeher *Ionice* als Vokativ des Männernamens *Ionicus* oder als den Frauennamen *Ionice* erklärt; im letztgenannten Fall hätte Apra also einen zweiten Namen gehabt.[48] Das ist möglich (wenn auch nicht ganz normal), doch würde ich hier eher *Ionice* als die Herkunftsangabe der Apra erklären, als eine Art Pendant zu *Dapnus Asiaticus*. Das Ethnikon *Asiaticus* wurde bei römischen Sklaven üblicherweise zur Angabe des Sklaven aus Kleinasien, insbesondere aus der Provinz Asia gebraucht; dabei wäre es nicht ausgeschlossen, dass seine Geliebte Apra eine ähnliche Herkunftsangabe führte, die zwar nicht im allgemeinen Gebrauch war, doch okkasionell im Namen einer Personen gebraucht werden konnte, die aus einer Griechenstadt des einstigen ionischen Gebiets stammte.

---

[45] S. mein Namenbuch 627f.

[46] Etwa in Athen, Thrakien, Kleinasien belegt. Frühere Belege seltener: aus Salymbria *I. Byz.* S 30 (doch ist die Datierung umstritten, vgl. E. Pfuhl – H. Möbius, *Die ostgriechischen Grabreliefs* I, Mainz 1977, 269 Nr. 745).

[47] *CIL* III 8177 (Ulpiana) *M. Ulpius Ionicianus*; die Eltern hießen *M. Ulpius Ionicus* und *Ulpia Ionice*.

[48] So Mau im Cognominaindex des *CIL* IV S. 750 und spätere Editoren der Inschrift: E. Montero Cartelle, *Priapeos. Grafitos amatorios Pompeyanos. La velada de la fiesta de Venus. Reposiano, El concúbito de Marte y Venus. Ausonio, Centón nupcial* (Biblioteca clásica Gredos 41), Madrid 1981, 134 Nr. 137.

2) Die kürzlich publizierte stadtrömische Inschrift *AE* 2001, 374 lautet wie folgt: *Ionice Hero / coniugi / bene merenti / Diadumenus / Caesaris et sib(i) / et suis*.
Schon der Erstherausgeber M. Mancini, in *La collezione epigrafica dell'Antiquarium comunale del Celio* (2001) 228 Nr. 160 meint, die verstorbene Frau habe zwei Cognomina, *Ionice* und *Hero*, geführt; ebenso die Editoren von *AE* und Solin, *Namenbuch*[2] 594. 628. Das kann gut das Richtige treffen. Doch könnte man sich auch denken, dass *Ionice* hier die Herkunft der Sklavin Hero angebe. Doppelnamen bei Sklav(inn)en sind in der römischen Nomenklatur nicht üblich, und wenn solche Fälle vorkommen, dann zunächst bei Sklaven, die einen so populären Namen trugen, dass zur Unterscheidung von Mitsklaven ein zweiter Name nötig wurde. Nun sind aber weder *Ionice* noch *Hero* besonders populär, so dass sich der Verdacht aufdrängt, *Ionice* sei wirklich eher ein Ethnikon. Auffallend wäre nur die Wortstellung, das Ethnikon vor dem eigentlichen Namen. Endgültige Sicherheit ist also nicht zu erreichen. Ein paralleler Fall kommt aus Pompeji: *CIL* IV 10024 heißt *Ionicus Longinus*. Doch bleibt die Deutung unsicher: eher handelt es sich wohl um zwei verschiedene Personen.

In der römischen Literatur begegnet *Ionicus Ionica* in Ausdrücken wie *Ionica gens* bei Plin. *nat*. 6, 7, wo drei griechische Stämme, der dorische, der ionische und der aiolische den barbarischen gegenübergestellt werden; die Stelle spiegelt klassische Zustände wieder, so dass man sich letzten Endes fragt, ob zeitgenössische Einwohner des einstigen ionischen Gebiets von den Römern wirklich *Ionici* genannt wurden – das stimmt noch in größerem Maße für die *Dorica* und die *Aeolica gens* zu, welche Bezeichnungen nirgends in der römischen Literatur (auch nicht in den Inschriften) sich auf zeitgenössische Personen beziehen. Aber andererseits war die Bezeichnung *Ionicus* – wie auch aus der Plinius-Stelle hervorgeht – ehrenhaft im Vergleich mit den barbarischen Stämmen. Als Fazit lässt sich sagen, dass der Gebrauch von *Ionicus* für zeitgenössische Personen, die aus einer Griechenstadt Ioniens stammten, nicht a priori ausgeschlossen werden sollte. Eine andere Wortverbindung ist *Ionica lingua* Quint. *inst*. 8, 3, 59 (Text korrupt, *Ionica* oder *Iadica* Edd.); Isid. *orig*. 9, 1, 5; Serv. *Aen*. 3, 51. Noch wichtiger ist die Verwendung im Zusammenhang mit Dingen des alltäglichen Lebens wie etwa dem Frankolin-Huhn *attagen Ionicus* (Hor. *epod*. 2, 54; Plin. *nat*. 10, 133 [*Ionius*]; Mart. 13, 61; Hier. *in Zach*. 3, 14 l. 361; *epist*. 79, 7, 6); wenn also ein zeitgenössischer Huhn ionisch bezeichnet wird, warum nicht ein Sklave? Der Begriff des Ionischen war den

Römern also geläufig, und wenn sie aus den Griechenstädten der Westküste Kleinasiens stammende Sklaven okkasionell *Ionici* nannten, so mag das nicht verwundern. *Ionicus*, anders als manche andere Herkunftsbezeichnungen im östlichen Bereich des Reiches, rief bei den Römern auch positive Assoziationen hervor, und da man wusste, dass etwa Milet eine ionische Stadt gewesen war, konnte man aus solchen Städten stammenden Sklaven die Bezeichnung *Ionicus* zulegen, die auch der Wert des Sklaven erhöhen konnte. Auf dem Sklavenmarkt musste ja die Herkunft des Sklaven angezeigt werden (Ulp. *dig*. 21, 1, 31, 21), und dem Verkäufer lag es nahe, den Sklaven zu preisen. Wenn die Anzeige, der zu kaufende Sklave stamme aus einer ionischen Stadt, den Preis erhöhen konnte, dann versteht man, wenn okkasionell eine solche Herkunftsbezeichnung gewählt und noch weitergeschleppt wurde.

CCXLI. FABRETTIANA

P. Kragelund, *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 29 (2003) 155–173 hat die Frage der Geschichte des Gebrauchs von Abklatschen beleuchtet und besonders Raffaele Fabrettis Rolle in derselben aus der Vergessenheit ans Licht gebracht. Dabei hat er auch für epigraphische Kritik einen bedeutenden Beitrag geleistet. Unten ein paar Bemerkungen zu den hier nach Ussings alter Abhandlung vom Jahre 1866 nirgends behandelten, nur durch die betreffenden Abklatsche bekannten Texten (*AE* 2003, 31. 261–263).

Kragelund S. 166 = Rostgaard Nr. 10. Kragelund, der nach Diehl *ILCV* 4275A (welcher aus Fabretti schöpft) zitiert, hat nicht erkannt, dass der Text schon seit langem im römischen christlichen Inschriftenwerk steht: Silvagni *ICUR* 4374, der ihn in Urbino im Palazzo Ducale aufgenommen hat, wo noch immer aufbewahrt. Interessant ist der Name *Anagius*, sonst nirgends belegt. Wenn griechisch, dann mag das Namenwort ἀναγής sein, woraus mittels des späten Suffixes *Anagius* gebildet wurde; interessant ist, dass die Bedeutung von ἀναγής normalerweise mit 'unrein' wiedergegeben wird (so die moderneren *LSJ*, *DGE*, Lampe). Ungefähr derselbe Sinngehalt ergibt sich, wenn der Name auf ἀνάγιος bezogen wird, ein seltenes Wort, nur in Greg. Naz. *epist*. 79 belegt.

S. 167 = Rostgaard Nr. 11. Ein neuer Text, der allen Anschein hat, stadtrömisch zu sein (so auch in *AE* 2003, 261 beurteilt).

S. 168 = Rostgaard Nr. 16 CN POM(peius?) ARIGNO(tus) ist in Wirklichkeit der gut bekannte Ziegelstempel *CIL* XV 1094 von *Cn. Domitius*

Arignotus. Kragelund hat den Nexus von M und I nicht erkannt und den von T und I als eine Art Kreuz missverstanden. Es muss also *Cn. Domiti(us) Arigno(tus)* gelesen werden, wenn nicht sogar *Arignot(us)* (das Photo des Abklatsches lässt keine sichere Entscheidung zu). Fabretti hat nämlich diesen Stempel in seiner Edition in der Form ARIGNOT: 515, 204; daraus Dressel, *CIL* XV 1094, 12.

CCXLII. MINIMA NUCERINA

CIL X 1093 ist nur in der Abschrift eines Anonymen bei Marini, *Cod. Vat. Lat.* 9131 f. 291 mit der Provenienzangabe *trovata a Nochera de' Pagani* überliefert.[49] Mommsen in *CIL* verbesserte den korrupten Namen des Mannes zu *L. ⌜F⌝u⌜l⌝vio M. f. Men. Cano*. Diese Vermutung ist nicht ohne weiteres aus der Hand zu weisen, mit noch weniger Änderungen an der anonymen Abschrift kommt man aber mit der Lesung *L. Iunio* aus: es ist sehr leicht anzunehmen, dass N in der Abschrift als IV wiedergegeben wurde. Die Abschrift ist auch sonst fehlerhaft; Mommsen emendiert ansprechend PAOVIA zu *Paquia* und den Schlussteil IRENNI·O·F·FL·FAVSTI / C·F· zu *L. Renni Q. f., f(ilii), L. Fausti C. f.* Dabei fällt auf *f(ilii)*: wessen Sohn?; man vermisst den Vater, der doch vorher erwähnt worden sein sollte. Die Stelle ist schwer zu heilen. Vermutungsweise sei vorgeschlagen, dass der Anonyme E falsch als F wiedergegeben hat; so hätten wir das passende Syndeton *e(t)* als abgekürzt (oder könnte man gar an einen Nexus von E und T denken?). G. Forni schlägt vor,[50] hier die Erwähnung der Pseudotribus Flavia zu sehen: *L. Renni Q. f. Fl(avia) Fausti c(oniugi) f(ecit)*. Forni zufolge hätte seine Deutung den Vorzug, dass die Zahl der ausführenden Personen auf eine einzige beschränkt bliebe, doch gibt es in Grabinschriften eine Unzahl von Fällen, in denen nach *arbitratu* auch Namen von zwei Ausführenden aufgelistet sind. Vor allem aber wird seiner Deutung der Boden dadurch entzogen, dass die Bezeichnung der Pseudotribus erst seit Mitte des 2. Jh. in Verwendung kommt, während unsere Inschrift deutlich aus der frühen Kaiserzeit stammt.[51]

---

[49] Wiederholt in Marinis *Gli Atti e monumenti de' fratelli arvali*, Roma 1795, I 269.

[50] *Annali Fac. Lettere Filosofia, Univ. Macerata* 15 (1982) 699f.; *Le tribù romane*, III 1: *Le pseudo-tribù*, Roma 1985, 84 Nr. 217. Die Deutung wurde in *AE* 1983, 209 akzeptiert.

[51] Dazu vgl. O. Salomies, *Arctos* 20 (1986) 287.

Copyright Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana

CCXLIII. ZU EINEM SARKOPHAG IN NEAPEL

In ihrer verdienstvollen Sammlung stadtrömischer und italischer Girlandensarkophage hat Helga Herdejürgen ein campanisches Stück publiziert, das sich im Archäologischen Museum von Neapel befindet.[52] In der Tabula ist eine Inschrift aufgebracht, die die inzwischen verstorbene Autorin folgendermaßen publiziert hat: VETU / NIPO PIL UMO.

Wir, Mika Kajava und ich haben den Text am 17 Mai 1982 im Cortile Orientale des Museums gesehen und aufgenommen (36 x 124 x 61; Buchstabenhöhe 1,5–2; Trennpunkt in 3 zwischen den zwei Wörtern). Der Text ist folgendermaßen zu lesen:

---

[52] *Stadtrömische und italische Girlandensarkophage*, Erster Faszikel: *Die Sarkophage des ersten und zweiten Jahrhunderts* (ASR VI 2, 1), Berlin 1996, 170 Nr. 170. Ein Photo (aber ohne den Text) wurde schon von P. Pensabene, in *Società romana e impero tardoantico*, III: *Le merci. Gli insediamenti*, a cura di A. Giardina, Bari 1986, 339f. publiziert. Er meint, dass es sich um aus Ephesos als Halbfabrikat exportiertes, in Italien nur vollendetes Werk handele. Kritisch dazu Herdejürgen.

Ṿẹ++[---]
Vetuṛ[ius] +++[---]Ṿ+
nepoti piissimo.

Es scheint sich um eine Grabinschrift der gens Veturia zu handeln. Der Text könnte folgendermaßen gelautet haben: *Vetu[rio ---] / Vetur[ius ---]us / nepoti piissimo*.

Universität Helsinki

Arctos 41 (2007) 117–127

TIBERIUS ON CALIGULA THE SNAKE AND OTHER CONTEXTUAL PROBLEMS

DAVID WOODS

Suetonius alleges that the emperor Tiberius had allowed Caligula to indulge in singing and dancing in the hope that these would soften his savage nature. He then supports his allegation that Tiberius had spotted the true savage nature of Caligula even before he had succeeded him to the throne by referring his reader to several statements that he was supposed to have made in reference to this savagery (*Calig*. 11):

> *Quod sagacissimus senex ita prorsus perspexerat, ut aliquotiens praedicaret exitio suo omniumque Gaium uiuere et se natricem populo Romano, Phaethontem orbi terrarum educare*.
>
> This last was so clearly evident to the shrewd old man, that he used to say now and then that to allow Gaius to live would prove the ruin of himself and of all men, and that he was rearing a viper for the Roman people and a Phaethon for the world.[1]

It is clear that Suetonius himself believed that Tiberius had intended these remarks in severe criticism of Caligula, but he does not provide us with the full and proper context for any of them so that it is difficult to check whether he is correct in so believing. As far as the alleged comparison of Caligula to a snake is concerned, it is all too easy to interpret this as a hostile remark, both because of the generally negative depiction of snakes within Greek and Roman literature as a whole and because of the same generally negative attitude towards them within modern western culture also.[2] Certainly, modern commentators have not expressed any

[1] All text and trans. will be taken from J.C. Rolfe, *Suetonius I* (Loeb Classical Library 31), Cambridge MA 1913, 418–19.

[2] See e.g. Plut. *De sera num. vind.* 567f. where it is argued that even the emperor Nero deserved better than to be reincarnated as a viper (ἔχιδνα). Instead, he is depicted reincarnated as a frog.

great reservations as to the interpretation of the comparison in this way, but seem to have been generally content to accept the significance of the remark almost exactly as presented, to the point that it has been deemed to require little, if any, explanation.[3] Yet Suetonius preserves an account of an omen that Tiberius is alleged to have experienced shortly before his death where he lets slip that Tiberius had actually possessed a pet snake (*Tib*. 72):

> *Bis omnino toto secessus tempore Romam redire conatus, semel triremi usque ad proximos naumachiae hortos subuectus est disposita statione per ripas Tiberis, quae obuiam prodeuntis submoueret, iterum Appia usque ad septimum lapidem; sed prospectis modo nec aditis urbis moenibus rediit, primo incertum qua de causa, postea ostento territus. Erat ei in oblectamentis serpens draco, quem ex consuetudine manu sua cibaturus cum consumptum a formicis inuenisset, monitus est ut uim multitudinis caueret. Rediens ergo propere Campaniam Asturae in languorem incidit, quo paulum leuatus Cerceios pertendit.*

> Twice only during the whole period of his retirement did he try to return to Rome, once sailing in a trireme as far as the gardens near the artificial lake, after first posting a guard along the banks of the Tiber to keep off those who came out to meet him; and again coming up the Appian Way as far as the seventh milestone. But he returned after merely having a distant view of the city walls, without approaching them; the first time for some unknown reason, the second through alarm at a portent. He had among his pets a serpent, and when he was going to feed it from his own hand, as his custom was, and discovered that it had been devoured by ants, he was warned to beware of the power of the multitude. So he went back in haste to Campania, fell ill at Astura, but recovering somewhat kept on to Circeii.

---

[3] J. A. Maurer, *A Commentary on C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita C. Caligulae Caesaris Chapters I–XXI*, Philadelphia 1949, 43 merely notes that this is the only occasion where Suetonius uses the term *natrix*. H. Lindsay, *Suetonius: Caligula*, London 1993, 72 does not comment at all on the comparison of Caligula to a snake, perhaps because he thinks that it speaks for itself. D. W. Hurley, *An Historical and Historiographical Commentary on Suetonius' Life of C. Caligula* (APA American Classical Studies 32), Atlanta 1993, 31 emphasizes the poisonous nature of snakes and draws attention to the frequent association of Caligula with poison by Suetonius, this despite the fact that there is no explicit reference to poison here. D. Wardle, *Suetonius' Life of Caligula: A Commentary* (Collection Latomus 225), Brussels 1994, 143 refers us briefly to the hydra of Phaedrus 1,2,24. Similarly, Caligula's modern biographers tend simply to repeat Suetonius' allegations rather than to pursue the question of their proper context, although they do so in such a way as to avoid committing themselves fully to his presentation of events. See e.g. J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *The Emperor Gaius (Caligula)*, Oxford 1934, 19; A. A. Barrett, *Caligula: The Corruption of Power*, London 1989, 38.

The revelation that Tiberius had used to keep a pet snake ought to be enough in itself to caution us against any simple assumption that he would necessarily have intended any comparison of Caligula to a snake in a hostile fashion.[4] More importantly, this anecdote may even preserve the original context of the apparent comparison of Caligula to a snake. It is important to note here that Suetonius does not explain what exactly Tiberius understood by the fact that he was to beware of the power of the common people. The temptation is to assume that he probably interpreted this omen as a warning against a threat to his own life, and that is why he suddenly turned back again from Rome.[5] It is equally possible, however, that he interpreted it as a warning against a threat to someone within his entourage instead, someone near and dear to him, and that this is why he turned back. The death of a pet snake which he had used to feed with his own hand would easily have lent itself to interpretation as a symbol of the death of someone near to him whom he had used to feed at his own table, a 'pet' in the sense of a dear favourite, although not necessarily the only favourite. It is my suggestion, therefore, that Tiberius fled Rome because he interpreted the death of his pet snake as the warning of a threat to the life of one of his current favourites and intended successors, Caligula, rather than to his own life.[6] His claim that he was rearing Caligula as

---

4 He seems to have been the only emperor to keep a pet snake. On the keeping of animals as pets, see e.g. F. D. Lazenby, "Greek and Roman Household Pets", *CJ* 44 (1949) 299–307; M. M. Innes, "*Deliciae Meae Puellae*", *G&R* 62 (1952) 78–85.

5 See F. B. Krauss, *An Interpretation of the Omens, Portents, and Prodigies Recorded by Livy, Tacitus, and Suetonius*, Philadelphia 1930, 110–15 on animal prodigies involving snakes. Unfortunately, he merely paraphrases Tacitus' text, 114, and does not attempt to analyse who it was that the snake represented in this instance. Nor does B. Levick, *Tiberius the Politician*, Beckenham 1976, 217 attempt to explore the symbolism of the snake. She suggests that the prophecies of the astrologers (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4,58) prevented Tiberius from returning to Rome, although Suetonius does not mention any astrologers in this particular context. Since it is highly unlikely that any type of ant in Italy could really have killed or devoured the snake, she correctly points out that the snake was probably already dead when the ants swarmed over it. H. Lindsay, *Suetonius: Tiberius*, London 1995, 183 rightly dismisses the implication that some astrologers had been plotting to keep Tiberius from Rome, for whatever reason, but fails equally to explore the symbolism of the pet snake. A. Vigourt, *Les présages impériaux d'Auguste à Domitien*, Paris 2001, 279, interprets the snake as the divine protector of Tiberius himself and draws attention to the story that Tiberius Gracchus had died shortly after killing a male snake which he had found in his bed (Plut. *Tib. et C. Gracchus* 1). On ants as a symbol of the Roman people, see also Suet. *Nero* 46,1.

6 It is often the name of a deceased pet which lends its death a special meaning. E.g. Lucius Aemilius Paulus interpreted the death of his daughter's puppy Persa as a sign that he would defeat Perseus of Macedon (Cic. *Div.* 1,45,102); the emperor Julian interpreted the death of his

a snake for the Roman people ought to be interpreted in this context, as his own explanation of the symbolism of the death of his pet snake, that the snake represented Caligula, and the ants the people of Rome, so that he concluded that the omen signified that he was rearing Caligula as a snake for the people of Rome, that is, as a victim for them. Yet Suetonius, or perhaps the author of his immediate source, has torn Tiberius' words from their original context so that they appear to depict Caligula as the threat rather than the victim.

The realisation that Suetonius may seriously misrepresent the original intent of any comments that he attributes to Tiberius concerning Caligula, whether deliberately or not, urges caution when one attempts to understand his allegation also that Tiberius claimed that he was rearing Caligula as a Phaethon for the world. Here one must turn to the parallel passage within Tacitus where he also claims that some of Tiberius' remarks had suggested a foreknowledge of the type of ruler that Caligula would become (*Ann*. 6,46):

> *Mox incertus animi, fesso corpore, consilium, cui impar erat, fato permisit, iactis tamen vocibus, per quas intellegeretur providus futurorum; namque Macroni non abdita ambage occidentem ab eo deseri, orientem spectari exprobravit. Et Gaio Caesari, forte orto sermone L. Sullam inridenti, omnia Sullae vitia et nullam eiusdem virtutem habiturum praedixit. Simul crebris cum lacrimis minorem ex nepotibus conplexus, truci alterius vultu, "Occides hunc tu" inquit "et te alius."*

> Soon, mentally irresolute, physically outworn, he left to fate a decision beyond his competence; though remarks escaped him which implied a foreknowledge of the future. For, with an allusion not difficult to read, he upbraided Macro with forsaking the setting and looking to the rising sun; and to Caligula, who in some casual conversation was deriding Lucius Sulla, he made the prophecy that he would have all the vices of Sulla with none of the Sullan virtues. At the same time, with a burst of tears, he embraced the younger of his grandsons: then, at the lowering looks of the other: "Thou wilt slay him," he said, "and another thee."[7]

---

horse Babylonius as a sign that he would conquer Persia (Amm. Marc. 23,3,6). It is unfortunate, therefore, that Suetonius does not preserve the name of Tiberius' snake. It was probably this that led him to identify the snake as a symbol of his eldest grandson and heir, Caligula, rather than of Tiberius Gemellus. As Tiberius' will suggests (Suet. *Tib*. 76), he seems to have intended his two grandsons to rule together in some way, even if the Senate did not actually respect this (Suet. *Calig*. 14; Dio 59,1,1–3).

[7] Text and trans. from J. Jackson, *Tacitus IV* (Loeb Classical Library 312), Cambridge MA 1937, 234–35. This passage has usually been accepted entirely at face-value. See e.g. R. Seager, *Tiberius*, London 1972, 244, who describes Tiberius' apparent conviction that Caligula would kill Gemellus as 'lucidly fatalistic'.

The similarities between the accounts by Tacitus and Suetonius of the last days of Tiberius encourage the belief that they relied on the same main source for this period, or some edition of the same source at least.[8] Hence one is immediately struck by the similarity between Suetonius' allegation that Tiberius had compared Caligula to Phaethon, that is, to the son of the sun-god Helios, and Tacitus' allegation that he had referred to himself as the setting sun and to Caligula as the rising sun. In the context, it is a distinct possibility that their two accounts preserve separate fragments from the the same anecdote preserving a fuller account of the original remark that Tiberius had made to Macro. It is not difficult to imagine Tiberius declaring to Macro that he had noticed how he preferred the rising to the setting sun, but then adding, in continuation of the solar imagery, that he should beware that his new sun did not turn out to be a Phaethon instead. In such a context, Tiberius' criticism would have been aimed at Macro rather than at Caligula. The moral of the story of Phaethon is not that he was an evil or unusually incompetent person, but that his youth inclined him to over-confidence in his abilities.[9] Hence Tiberius may have been warning Macro against premature action in support of Caligula, and therefore against himself, rather than declaring a belief that Caligula would never be ready to succeed him because of some innate flaw. He may have intended to declare merely that Caligula could turn out to be a Phaethon in certain circumstances, if entrusted with too much power prematurely, and not that he would definitely turn out to be a Phaethon.

The fact that Tacitus turns from a description of how Tiberius had criticized Macro for looking to the rising rather than the setting sun, that is, for paying more regard to Caligula rather than to Tiberius himself, to a description of how Tiberius had criticized Caligula by claiming that he would have all of Sulla's vices, but none of his virtues, is particularly interesting here because of the fact that the young Pompey the Great was supposed to have reminded the dictator Sulla that more people worshipped the rising than the setting sun when Sulla had initially refused to grant him a triumph in 81 BC.[10] This raises the suspicion that Tiberius' criticisms of both Macro and Caligula had formed part of a single larger conversation between all three figures during which Macro had supported

---

8 Dio 58,28,4 also preserves Tiberius' remark to Macro about forsaking the setting sun in favour of the rising sun, so confirming the much closer relationship between Dio and Suetonius than between Dio and Tacitus. For a more detailed discussion of the relationship between the three, see D. Woods, "Nero, "Doryphorus", and the Christians", *Eranos* 104 (2006), forthcoming.

9 On Phaethon, see Ov. *Met*. 2,1–366; Lucr. 5,400.

10 Plut. *Pomp.* 14.

Caligula in some request to which Tiberius had been refusing to accede. Now, if this had been the case, it is difficult to understand why Caligula should have criticised Sulla because Sulla had actually granted his request to the young Pompey the Great. The obvious suggestion, therefore, is that he did not criticize Sulla so much as Tiberius by declaring that he was no Sulla, that is, that he was not displaying the same greatness of spirit or generosity as Sulla had displayed when he had granted his request to Pompey. Unfortunately, Tacitus' source seems to have misunderstood this claim – 'You are no Sulla !'– in flattery of Tiberius and, therefore, in criticism of Sulla, perhaps partly because of a tendency to exaggerate the sycophancy of Caligula in the assumption that he was in such a dangerous position that he dared never openly disagree with or criticize Tiberius, and partly because of his own negative attitude towards Sulla as a bloody tyrant. Tiberius' reply seems to have been that Caligula would prove himself no Sulla either, and that while he himself did not possess all of Sulla's virtues, Caligula would possess none of them, only his vices.

It is my argument, therefore, that Tacitus and Suetonius preserve partial and misleading fragments from a single rather heated exchange between Tiberius and Caligula during which Macro had spoken in support of Caligula. Tiberius had invoked a perhaps common solar metaphor in criticism of Macro, this had reminded Caligula of a previous famous occasion when a disputant, Pompey, had used such a metaphor in support of his successful request from Sulla, and he had then proceeded to compare Tiberius unfavourably with Sulla, who had replied in like manner. Unfortunately, neither Tacitus nor Suetonius seem to realise that the remarks which they preserve had in fact formed part of a single original exchange, so that it is clear that neither had access to a full account of this exchange. Instead, they seem to have relied upon a common source which had summarized Tiberius' remarks alone during this exchange and in such a way as to conceal their connected nature. Since Tacitus records that Tiberius burst into tears and embraced his youngest grandson, Tiberius Gemellus, at the same time as his declaration that Caligula would possess none of Sulla's virtues, it is clear Tiberius Gemellus must have been present throughout the whole of the exchange also. Fortunately, Josephus (*AJ* 18,211–23) allows us to identify the occasion of this exchange. He claims that, shortly before his death, Tiberius sought to decide who should succeed him, Caligula or Tiberius Gemellus, by means of augury. In particular, he sent orders to each to visit him the following morning, and decided that he would interpret the identity of the first to arrive to see him as an omen and appoint him to succeed him. According to Josephus, Tiberius secretly hoped that his natural grandson Gemellus would be the first to arrive, but it was actually his grandson by adoption Caligula who arrived first. He was then extremely upset and angry with himself, and warned Caligula as follows:

> My son, although Tiberius is closer akin to me than you are, by my own decision, and with the concurrence of the gods, it is to you that I convey and entrust the Roman empire. I ask you, when you grow familiar with the office, not to forget either my kindness to you in appointing you to such an exalted rank or your bond of kinship with Tiberius. Bear in mind that it was by the help of the gods and after consulting them that I took my stand to bestow such felicity upon you. Let my cordial gift of it inspire the same feeling in you. At the same time give thought to Tiberius too because he is your kinsman, and above all because you see that if Tiberius remains alive he will be a wall of defence for your empire and for your personal safety, but that if he departs, this will be the prelude to misfortune. Indeed, it is dangerous for those who have reached such a pinnacle of power to be isolated; nor will the gods allow to go unpunished any acts that are contrary to justice and that annul the law with its injunction to the contrary.[11]

In sentiment, this is exactly what Tacitus claims that Tiberius declared to Caligula following his heated exchange with him, 'Thou wilt slay him and another thee'. Indeed, Josephus proceeds to treat this speech as if it had been a straighforward prophecy that Caligula would indeed kill Tiberius, exactly as reported by Tacitus, although this is not the case at all. It had clearly been intended as a warning rather than a prophecy. Furthermore, Tacitus' claim that Tiberius 'left to fate' (*fato permisit*) the decision concerning the succession may well be read in specific reference to the way in which Tiberius had tried to elicit an omen concerning the succession, exactly as described by Josephus again. It is arguable, therefore, that Tacitus (*Ann*. 6,46) preserves an extremely abbreviated version of the same basic account best preserved by Josephus (*AJ* 18,211–23), and that they draw on the same ultimate source in this matter. When read in conjunction, these different versions of the same ultimate tradition cast new light upon one another. In particular, it seems that Tiberius rebuked Macro as one who looked to the rising rather than the setting sun because he suspected that he had revealed the nature of the test to Caligula and ensured that he had reached Tiberius first the morning following the summons. This did not invalidate the result, however, because such treachery on the part of Macro in conspiring to foil Tiberius's wish that his natural grandson would succeed him would itself have been regarded as part of 'fate'.

---

[11] Trans. L. H. Feldman, *Josephus XII* (Loeb Classical Library 433), Cambridge MA 1965, 135–37.

The recognition that Suetonius – and even Tacitus ! – may preserve alleged imperial quotations in such a way as to distort their original meaning and intent almost beyond recognition requires a much more open mind when it comes to the interpretation of quotations attributed to various other emperors also, not just Tiberius. Consider one of the most famous quotations attributed to Caligula, his alleged declaration that he wished that the Roman people had only a single neck. Three different authors preserve some account of this alleged declaration, all interpreting it in a hostile fashion. Hence Suetonius reports (*Calig*. 30):

> *Infensus turbae faventi adversus studium suum exclamavit: "Utinam p. R. unam cervicem haberet!" cumque Tetrinius latro postularetur, et qui postularent, Tetrinios esse ait.*
>
> Angered at the rabble for applauding a faction which he opposed, he cried: "I wish the Roman people had but a single neck," and when the brigand Tetrinius was demanded, he said that those who asked for him were Tetriniuses also.

In a long description of the growing antagonism between the emperor and the Roman mob at various public events, Dio preserves a similar account, which he appears to date to AD 39, while Seneca also preserves a rather vaguer description of the same outburst.[12] Again, modern commentators seem generally content to accept this as a reasonably accurate account of an angry outburst by Caligula while attending the games one day.[13] There is, however, another possibility. One needs to remember, first, that the emperors sometimes busied themselves with other matters as they sat in attendance at the games. For example, the reputation of Julius Caesar had suffered when he was seen to be conducting business at the games rather than paying due attention to them.[14] The second point to bear in mind is that the job of emperor involved a lot of paperwork (as we would now call it), to the extent that the emperor himself was even required to sign individual death warrants. Indeed, Suetonius records it among the good deeds of the early reign of Nero that he had wished not to have to sign such documents (*Nero* 10). My suggestion, therefore, is that when Caligula declared that he wished that the people had only one neck, he had been commenting in exasperation at the amount of paperwork that he was having to complete even at the games. He had probably intended his comment in reference to the subjects of a specific group of death

---

[12] Dio 59,13,6; Sen. *Dial*. 5,19,2.

[13] Lindsay (above n. 3) 122; Hurley (above n. 3) 124; Wardle (above n. 3) 258.

[14] Suet. *Aug*. 45.1.

warrants, because they were distracting him from the games, rather than in reference to the general public at the games, because of something that they had said or done. Unfortunately for him, a courtier or servant overheard his remark, failed to note the distinction between these two groups of people, and misrepresented its significance, therefore, as he transmitted it to others subsequently.

A final point. Suetonius occasionally preserves enough contextual detail to create the impression that his understanding of the context and significance of an alleged imperial comment differs from that preserved by other sources. For example, Suetonius clearly understands that Nero made his famous comment about being sustained by his 'humble art' sometime before the revolt by Julius Vindex in March AD 68. Hence he describes the beginning of Vindex's revolt in the perfect tense, and the occasion of Nero's alleged remark in the pluperfect. He also presents the remark as if he made it in direct response to a prediction by some astrologers (*Nero* 40,1–2):

> *Talem principem paulo minus quattuordecim annos perpessus terrarum orbis tandem destituit, initium facientibus Gallis duce Iulio Vindice, qui tum eam provinciam pro praetore optinebat. Praedictum a mathematicis Neroni olim erat fore ut quandoque destitueretur; unde illa vox eius celeberrima:* τὸ τέχνιον ἡμᾶς διατρέφει, *quo maiore scilicet venia meditaretur citharoedicam artem, principi sibi gratam, privato necessariam. Spoponderant tamen quidam destituto Orientis dominationem, nonnulli nominatim regnum Hierosolymorum, plures omnis pristinae fortunae restitutionem.*

> After the world had put up with such a ruler for nearly fourteen years, it at last cast him off, and the Gauls took the first step under the lead of Julius Vindex, who at that time governed their province as propraetor. Astrologers had predicted to Nero that he would one day be repudiated, which was the occasion of that well known saying of his: "A humble art supports us," doubtless uttered to justify him in practising the art of lyre-playing, as an amusement while emperor, but a necessity for a private citizen. Some of them, however, had promised him the rule of the East, when he was cast off, a few expressly naming the sovereignty of Jerusalem, and several the restitution of all his former fortunes.

In contrast, Dio, or rather the surviving epitome of Dio by Xiphilinus, clearly understands that Nero made his famous remark during his very last days, immediately before his final flight and suicide on 9 June AD 68, when Nero did not need any astrologers to tell him that his reign was about to come to an end (63,27,2):

> Ὑπὸ πάντων δέ ὁμοίως ἐγκαταλειφθεὶς ἐβουλεύσατο μὲν τούς τε βουλευτὰς ἀποκτεῖναι καὶ τὴν πόλιν καταπρῆσαι ἔς τε τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν πλεῦσαι, ὑπειπών ὅτι "ἂν καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐκπέσωμεν, ἀλλὰ τό γε τέχνιον ἡμᾶς ἐκεῖ διαθρέψει·" ἐς τοῦτο γὰρ ἀνοίας ἐληλύθει ὥστε καὶ πιστεῦσαι ὅτι ἄλλως τε ἰδιωτεῦσαι καὶ προσέτι καὶ κιθαρῳδεῖν δυνήσεται.

> Now that he had been abandoned by everybody alike, he began forming plans to kill the senators, burn down the city, and sail to Alexandria. He dropped this hint in regard to his future course: "Even though we be driven from our empire, yet this little talent shall support us there." To such a pitch of folly, indeed, had he come as to believe that he could live for a moment as a private citizen and especially as a lyre-player.[15]

It has been argued that the most probable explanation of these different opinions as to when Nero delivered his comment about the usefulness of his art is that their ultimate common source in this matter did not date it precisely so that Suetonius and Dio each felt free to transfer it where they thought most appropriate.[16] It has also been suggested that Suetonius is more likely to be at fault here since Dio tends to follow their common source more closely.[17] In fact, one cannot exclude the possibility that their common source had included both version of events, an initial description of the first delivery of this remark at some unspecified date before Vindex's revolt, and a second description of the final delivery of a slight variant of the same remark just before Nero's flight and death. This would have appealed to the sense of humour of the author of their common source who seems to have enjoyed depicting the imperial end in such a way that it recalled previous imperial misbehaviour and appealed to the reader's sense of poetic justice. In brief, their previous words are shown to return to haunt the emperors at their deaths. So just as he seems to have depicted the bystanders at the death of Caligula recalling his alleged wish earlier that the Roman people had only one neck and gloating that it was he that had only one neck, but that they had many hands,[18] so he seems to have depicted the emperor who had apparently once boasted that

---

15 Text and trans. from E. Cary, *Dio Cassius: Roman History VIII* (Loeb Classical Library 176), Cambridge MA 1925, 184–87.

16 G. B. Townend, "The Sources of the Greek in Suetonius", *Hermes* 88 (1960) 98–120, at 104.

17 K. R. Bradley, *Suetonius' Life of Nero: An Historical Commentary*, Brussels 1978, 247.

18 Dio 59,30,1c. It was probably the same author who claimed that the assassins of Caligula deliberately avoided killing him with one blow (Jos. *AJ* 19,106), an allusion to Caligula's alleged saying, 'Strike so that he may feel that he is dying (Suet. *Calig*. 30,1).

he could live by his 'humble art' reduced to such a state that it seemed for a short while at least that he might really have to prove his previous boast.

Be this as it may be, it is clear that the ultimate common source for Suetonius and Dio had presented Nero's alleged remark concerning his 'humble art' as if he had intended it in reference to his skill as a lyre-player. Yet if Suetonius is correct when he presents Nero's remark as a response to the prediction by some astrologers that he would one day be deposed, then he may well have intended it in oblique reference to his reputation as a skilled druggist or poisoner rather than as a lyre-player. Hence his apparent use of the present tense. His lyre-playing did not in fact sustain his reign, whether one understands this in a political or in a financial sense, but his skill as a poisoner did, or was thought to do so at least. He was rumoured to have had his step-brother Britannicus poisoned in AD 55, and his praetorian prefect Afranius Burrus poisoned in AD 62.[19] Whether he did or not is irrelevant. What matters here is only that he was widely suspected of having poisoned them, not least because of his continued close association with an alleged poisoner Lucusta.[20] Given the recent history of the dynasty, Nero would naturally have assumed that any threat to his rule would come from someone close at hand, a member of the court, and therefore someone amenable to poison in the manner of previous perceived threats. Hence when the astrologers predicted that he would be deposed one day, his deliberately ambiguous reply that his 'humble skill' sustained him may have alluded to his reputation as a skilled amateur poisoner, schooled by Lucusta, rather than to his skill at the lyre. A quick gesture or glance towards his golden medicine-box would have been sufficient to indicate the true meaning of his words to his immediate audience.[21] Unfortunately, such casual allusiveness did not easily lend itself to the full and accurate transmission of his word and deed subsequently.

University College Cork

---

19 On the death of Britannicus, see Dio 61,7,4; Suet. *Nero* 33; Tac. *Ann.* 13,16. On the death of Burrus, see Dio 62,13,3; Suet. *Nero*. 35; Tac. *Ann.* 14,51.

20 There may well be an entirely innocent explanation as to the close association of Lucusta with Agrippina, then Nero, that she provided a medicine believed to be effective against Nero's epilepsy rather than that she provided him with poisons for use against his enemies. However, the secrecy and shame surrounding Nero's condition meant that her true role could not be disclosed. See D. Woods, "The Consequences of Nero's Ill-Health in AD64", *Eranos* 102 (2004) 109–16.

21 See Suet. *Nero* 47,1 where Nero places some 'poison' in a golden pyxis.

DE NOVIS LIBRIS IUDICIA

The Edinburgh Companion to Ancient Greece and Rome. Edited by EDWARD BISPHAM, THOMAS HARRISON and BRIAN A. SPARKES. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh 2006. ISBN 978-0-7486-1629-9. XII, 604 pp. GBP 120.

As is stated in the "Introduction", the book under review here – ably edited by Edward Bispham, Thomas Harrison and Brian A. Sparkes – is intended as a reliable, accessible and up-to-date source of practical reference for students of classics and ancient history, and one which their teachers may also find valuable. It aims to impart basic information, clearly and concisely, and to introduce its target readership to the contrasting perspectives and methods of the various disciplines that are concerned with the world of ancient Greece and Rome (p. ix).

It is certainly no easy task for a reviewer to do justice to a volume consisting of 70 chapters by 57 different hands. It is inevitable that the focus will be on the organizational structure of the book at the expense of the efforts of the individual contributors. But, let it be noted at the very outset of this assessment that the authors, drawn mainly from the UK (presented on pp. 582–587), in most cases have succeeded in providing concise but well-informed overviews of the topics assigned to them.

The book is organized in four main parts, the first of which, "Part One: Classics and the Classical World", is further divided into three broad sections (A–C). Section A, "Classics and the Twenty-First Century", consists of eleven chapters providing an overview of the history of Classical Scholarship (ch. 1, pp. 3–8) as well as more detailed presentations of the main areas of current research: "History", "Archaeology", "Religion", "Economy", "Gender", "Philology and Linguistics", "Literature", "Philosophy", "Art History and Aesthetics", and "Classical Legacies", the study of the transmission and reception of classical culture (chs. 2–11, pp. 9–63). Section B, "The Regions of the Ancient World", comprises three chapters dealing with the "Ancient Near East" (of the pre-classical era), "Iron Age Europe" and the Classical World (chs. 12–14, pp. 67–83). The last one, entitled "Regions of Antiquity" and authored by Nicholas Purcell, is a superb discussion of conceptual geography in antiquity as well as in modern historical scholarship (pp. 78–83). The six chapters of section C, "Periods", provide chronological surveys of the historical developments during the various periods of classical antiquity, conventionally conceived, from "The 'Dark Age' of Greece" to "Late Antiquity" (chs. 15–20, pp. 87–120).

The topics covered by the fourteen chapters constituting "Part Two: Material Culture" (chs. 21–34, pp. 123–274), are more varied than some readers would expect from such a title. Ranging from the geographical setting itself, in the chapters "Landscape" and "Sites and Features", through "Buildings and Architecture" to "Gems, Jewellery and Glass" at the other end of the scale, the subjects of this part of the book do not only include marine archaeology (in a chapter thus entitled), arts and crafts such as "Sculpture", "Painting, Stucco and Mosaics", "Pottery and Metalwork", "Dress and Textiles" and "Arms and Armour", but also "Coinage" as well as, even more notably, "Papyri", "Manuscripts" and "Inscriptions" as historical documents.

In most standard introductions to the study of the Ancient World, such categories are dealt with in a separate survey of the written sources. There is no such survey in this book, but the written heritage (including formal literature) and other forms of immaterial culture is the subject matter of the third part.

The twenty-five chapters that make up "Part Three: Texts and Genres" (chs. 35–59, pp. 277–444) discuss the whole range of literature of classical antiquity beginning with poetry. After two chapters on epic (Greek and Roman), two on tragedy, two on drama, two on lyric poetry, there are discussions of "The Novel", "Letters", "Rhetoric", "Literary Criticism", "Grammar and Linguistics", "Philosophy", Greek and Roman historiography (in separate chapters), "Geography and Ethnography", "Mythology", "Christian Literature", "Science and Mathematics", "Music", "Medicine", Greek and Roman legal texts (separately) as well as of "Technical Writing" (agriculture, architecture, civil engineering, land surveying, mechanics, warfare and encyclopedias). There is not, as might have been expected, a discussion devoted specifically to metre in connection with the overview of Greek and Latin poetry, but such a feature is included in the last part of the volume.

"Part Four: Essential Information and Systems of Reference" contains eleven thematically, and typologically, very varied contributions (chs. 60–70, pp. 447–581). It is difficult to avoid the impression that we are here dealing with leftover texts that did not fit into the structure of the previous sections of the book. However, this is not to say that these contributions are not essential features of a book that aims to be a work of reference on the ancient world. The chapters on "Politics", "Names and Naming Systems", "Writing Systems", "The Ancient Calendar" and "Metre" constitute thorough treatises of their topics whereas the remainder of the contents is made up of tables, lists and maps: "Measures, Weights and Money", "Time-charts", "Maps" (containing nine maps), "Glossary of Ancient and Modern Terms", "Resources" (featuring information on libraries, museums, classical societies, classical departments in British universities, reference volumes and other literature on various aspects of the classical world, as well as websites, software and databases) and "Abbreviations".

Each chapter of the book is accompanied by a bibliography of further reading, which enhances the book's value as an introduction to classical studies. However, it can be observed that titles in languages other than English are heavily underrepresented. It should also be noted that the book is profusely illustrated with well-captioned, black-and-white photographs, line drawings and figures, but there is no list of these illustrations.

This accessible and attractively produced book, representing an outstanding effort to present the materials and methods of classical scholarship in one single volume, deserves many readers and is a must for every scholarly library.

Kaj Sandberg

Saggi in onore di Paolo Verzone. A cura di Daria De Bernardi Ferrero. Hierapolis, Scavi e ricerche 4. Archaeologica 137. Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Roma 2002. ISBN 88-7689-201-X; ISSN 0391-9293. 286 pp., 280 figg. nel testo. 280 EUR.

A Paolo Verzone, emerito del Politecnico di Torino, scomparso nel 1986, è stato dedicato, in occasione del centenario della nascita (2002), il quarto volume della serie "Hierapolis di Frigia.

Scavi e ricerche". Grazie ai suoi ottimi rapporti con la Turchia, sua seconda patria, è stato infatti Verzone negli anni '50 a dare lo spunto agli scavi italiani a Hierapolis, di cui fu direttore egli stesso fino al 1981. Gli scritti raccolti in questo volume costituiscono un dovuto omaggio al maestro da parte di amici, allievi e collaboratori. Ecco il contenuto del volume, dove sono felicemente combinati più settori di studio: D. De Bernardi Ferrero: Architettura e decorazione di età flavia a Hierapolis di Frigia; G. Bejor; Il teatro di Hierapolis: stratigrafia dell'iposcenio; F. Ceresa, Geometrie formali per il rilievo del teatro di Hierapolis; D. Attanasio – P. Pensabene: I marmi del teatro di Hierapolis; T. Ritti: Miliari di Hierapolis di Frigia; E. Miranda: Acclamazioni a Giustiniano I a Hierapolis di Frigia; H. Vanhaverbeke – M. Waelkens: The North-Western Necropolis of Hierapolis (Phrygia). The Chronological and Topographical Distribution of the Travertine Sarcophagi and Their Way of Production; A. De Bernardi: Il martyrion ottagono e le geometrie euclidee; G. Ciotta – L. Palmucci: La cattedrale e il battistero; N. Gullino: La basilica sopra il teatro; P. Arthur: Hierapolis tra Bisanzio e i Turchi; A. Spanò: Le ragioni dell'intervento di natura topografica a Hierapolis; M.L. De Bernardi: Le terme-chiesa a Hierapolis di Frigia: problemi di rilievo a fini restaurativi. Concludono il volume gli indici e una planimetria di Hierapolis del 1999.

Mika Kajava

JOHANN JOACHIM WINCKELMANN: *Schriften und Nachlass*. Band 4, 2: *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums. Katalog der antiken Denkmäler.* Herausgegeben von ADOLF H. BORBEIN, THOMAS W. GAETHGENS, JOHANNES IRMSCHER (†) und MAX KUNZE. Bearbeitet von MATHIAS RENÉ HOFTER, AXEL RÜGLER UND ADOLF H. BORBEIN u.a.; Band 4, 3: *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums. Allgemeiner Kommentar.* Herausgegeben von ADOLF H. BORBEIN, THOMAS W. GAETHGENS, JOHANNES IRMSCHER (†) und MAX KUNZE. Berabeitet von MAX KUNZE, MARIANNE KREIKENBOM, BRICE MAUCOLIN, AXEL RÜGLER. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 2006–2007. ISBN 978-3-8053-3745-8; ISBN 978-3-8053-3746-5. 614, 574 S. EUR 82, EUR 72.

Im Jahre 2002 erschien im Rahmen der kritischen Winckelmann-Gesamtausgabe der Text der Geschichte des Altertums (vgl. diese Zeitschrift 38 [2004] 224f). Die zwei hier angezeigten stattlichen Bände bilden dazu einen willkommenen Nachtrag. Stichproben im Katalogteil haben ergeben, dass die Autoren mustergültige Arbeit geleistet haben. Das trifft auch für die Inschriften zu, deren Notizen ich genau überprüft habe. – Nur zwei Kleinigkeiten: Warum wird unter Nr. 1312 "IG^2 XIV Nr. 1227" geschrieben? Es geht ja nicht um eine zweite Auflage. Der epigraphischen Gewohnheit gemäß hätte man "IG XIV 1227" schreiben sollen. – Nr. 1318 wird etwas irreführend unter den Künstlerinschriften eingereiht.

Heikki Solin

WALTHER LUDWIG: *Miscella Neolatina: Ausgewählte Aufsätze 1989–2003*. Vols. 1–3. Edenda curavit ASTRID STEINER-WEBER. Noctes Neolatinae, Neo-Latin Texts and Studies, Bde. 2.1–3. Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim 2004; 2004; 2005. ISBN 978-3-487-12533-6. XII, 582 S.; VIII, 624 S.; X, 614 S. EUR 264.

These three massive volumes include 66 articles on German humanism and Neo-Latin literature, written in the fifteen years between 1989–2003 by the German grand old classicist and Neo-Latin scholar Walther Ludwig. He has published extensively on ancient and Neo-Latin literature, Latin in everyday life of the early modern scholars and also on the use of Latin as the language of sciences, such as medicine. The author himself has selected the articles and revised most of them for the present publication which was edited by Astrid Steiner-Weber for his 75th birthday. The articles give a representative view of German Neo-Latin literature and its different genres, uses and contexts, studied from a philological perspective. The book is loosely arranged into twelve thematic sections, which focus, for example, on humanism and Christianity, university history, Greek studies, different literary genres and humanistic activities in various parts of early modern Germany. The third volume includes a complete list of Ludwig's publications from 1944 to 2003.

The collection opens with an introductory view of Latin as a language of literature, communication, religion and science in Renaissance and early modern Germany, but also in Italy, France and the Netherlands. Ludwig also draws attention to the under-studied use of ancient mythical figures as personal symbols and emblems, for example, in book printers' seals. The subsequent articles concentrate on specific texts or authors whose writings illuminate the variety of Neo-Latin literature. For example, they deal with controversies over maculate/immaculate conception and disputes over the causes of melancholy and prophetic visions – be the reason for these phenomena demons, as certain theologians and Luther argued, or natural courses, as the medical view maintained. Ludwig shows how the classical literary traditions helped early modern authors, for example, to celebrate Christian and contemporary figures in the classical bucolic form, to compose consolatory literature in times of private distress (Wolfgang Reichart's poems and letters on the death of his two-year-old son), or in the traditional epideictic mode to praise universities (Jacob Locher praising the university of Ingolstadt in order to attract new students to the town after a plague epidemic had swept through it in the 1520's). Nearly all major German Neo-Latin authors are somehow mentioned in the articles. Delightfully, the volumes do not concentrate only on major literary genres but also deal with minor forms, such as erotic poetry (Jean Bonnefons's lovely *Pervigilium veneris*), parodic learning (*Ius potandi*), satire and invective (*Epistolae obscurorum virorum*) and the dialogue form. One of the aims of the selection clearly is to cover as many literary genres as possible, from encomia and epigrams to epitaphs and epicedia.

Most of the articles focus on individual sixteenth-century German scholars or poets and their texts composed under specific circumstances. Frequently, the author deals with less known texts of famous authors, like Nicodemus Frischlin's wedding epic or Castiglione's elegiac poem and fictitious letter written in the manner of Ovid's *Heroides*. Thus, the articles enrich the common view of these well-known authors and their literary activities. The articles are written in a strict, scholarly style and have a clear structure, usually beginning with biographical data and then concentrating on the texts, letters or poems that are included both in Latin and in

German translation. The discussion usually includes a summary of the main contents of the texts, analysis of their rhetorical structure and careful identification of classical influences and quotations. The articles are always heavily annotated with references – even though I detected some predilection for references to male scholars – and thus best approached by scholarly and philologically-oriented readers. Ludwig follows the adaptations of individual ancient motifs (e.g., the motif of the kiss in Plato's epigrams) and later imitations of ancient authors (e.g., the reception of Horace and Isocrates), underlining the importance of knowledge of the classics for scholars working on early modern texts, both Latin and vernacular. Frequently, Ludwig shows how classical traditions and humanistic learning were combined with other intellectual and religious traditions (e.g., Lutheran or Protestant Christianity) that likewise shaped the thinking and writing of early modern intellectuals, as well as how Christian views were expressed by imitating classical genres, and how the coexistence of different intellectual traditions and world views at times led to intellectual and political controversies.

The third volume closes with an interesting and partly polemical section on the present situation of Latin and Neo-Latin studies, the latter still being even more neglected at today's universities than classical studies. The first article in this section offers a somewhat pessimistic perspective on the future, complaining and warning about the decreasing knowledge of classical languages. Ludwig underlines the importance of reading Neo-Latin texts in comparison with both ancient and early modern primary sources to avoid misinterpretation and speculation. In looking back to the glorious past compared with the present 'Lateinarmut', this is also the most monumental part of the three volumes. Characteristically, the third volume ends in two homages, describing the lives and scholarly activities of two scholars of the Renaissance and Neo-Latin periods, Paul Oskar Kristeller and Josef IJsewijn. We can only hope that the future will bring new scholars to continue the work of these men in various countries and also in other disciplines, such as literary studies, philosophy, history, theology and sciences. Ludwig wisely emphasises the importance of interdisciplinary co-operation in reading Neo-Latin texts and contextualising them in the early modern intellectual climate. Among several suggestions for improving Neo-Latin scholarship Ludwig mentions, for example, the production of bilingual editions of Neo-Latin texts, the study of letter collections as sources for early modern thinking and everyday contexts, the composition of Neo-Latin dictionaries, and the study of the role of Neo-Latin literature in various countries and in relation to their "national" literatures. Along with Ludwig and as a scholar living far in the northern darkness I warmly welcome open-access on-line editions. Since all texts can with good reason be studied from different perspectives, I also welcome speculation as long as it means a fruitful and thought-provoking interpretation of Neo-Latin texts and discussion about their relevance to the present world.

It is impossible to analyse the individual articles in detail here. It goes without saying that the three heavy volumes are highly useful to anyone working on German Neo-Latin literature. By drawing attention to unstudied poems, pointing out previously unnoticed connections between texts and offering access to unpublished letters as historical documents, Ludwig's large oeuvre with its extreme scholarly precision fundamentally contributes to the writing of a history of Neo-Latin literature. It illuminates the reception of the classics in early modern Germany and offers ample material for further studies.

Sari Kivistö

Antiphon the Sophist: The Fragments. Edited by GERARD J. PENDRICK. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 39. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002. ISBN 0-521-65161-1. XII, 472 pp. GBP 55.

The earlier editions of Antiphon present some problems common to the older fragment corpora, among which the most conspicuous is the brevity of citations and comments. This tends to leave the laborious construction of the frame of reference to the – often casual, non-expert – reader. Pendrick's aim has been to correct these shortcomings by offering a more comprehensive selection of testimonia and fragments presented with a more extensive context and by providing translations and detailed commentary on the material. The readings of the texts depend on existing editions.

The texts are preceded by an introduction carefully contextualizing the material. The testimonia are treated in the chapter on the identity of Antiphon, the fragments in the following chapters discussing first the division of the works, then the individual works and finally the thought of the sophist in its context. The testimonia and fragments follow, accompanied by critical remarks and translations. The texts are followed by a commentary that concentrates on further details of interpretation, context and text history.

Pendrick wanted to preserve as far as possible the numbering of fragments established in the earlier editions. Hence, he uses letters to identify both independent fragments (*e.g.*, F81A) and text material concerning one fragment (*e.g.*, F80(a–b)). The system is clear once explained, and without doubt conceived for the benefit of the user, but a question arises whether the material should have been reidentified and rearranged more drastically. The fragments are arranged under the titles of the works of Antiphon: Περὶ ἀληθείας (F1–44), Περὶ ὁμονοίας (F45–71), Πολιτικός (F72–77) and the "dream-book" (F78–81B). In the present layout, the uncertain attribution of a fragment to a work is not indicated. In the case of the shortest citations lacking the name of the work, some uncertainty remains. In many cases (*e.g.*, F40, 62), Pendrick expresses his doubt in the commentary.

The direct quotations of Antiphon's texts are typographically indicated by printing in bold. This shows once again how small a percentage of cited text can be regarded as cited "verbatim" and works as a sound argument against the puristic definition of the fragment as a "direct citation". Most of the preserved citations paraphrase original text on various levels of accuracy. Pendrick's definition of direct quotation seems quite broad since he presents in bold even parts of Galen's text in Arabic (F29A), although usually translation is seen as a subspecies of paraphrase.

The commentary is supplemented by a list of works cited and indices of passages cited, subjects and Greek words. The reader would benefit from a separate, chronological summary of cited authors and a list of the sources of the fragments although this information is included in the index of passages. In all, Pendrick's is a welcome and valuable addition to the growing number of up-to-date fragment commentaries.

Ulla Laitakari

Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram. Edited by PETER BING and JON STEFFEN BRUSS. Brill, Leiden 2007. ISBN 978-90-04-15218-2. XXI, 657 pp. EUR 199.

P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309, the magnificent collection of over 100 Hellenistic epigrams (generally attributed to Posidippus of Pella), published by G. Bastiniani and C. Gallazi (in collaboration with C. Austin) in 2001, is no doubt the most important papyrus find in the last decades. Although interest in the Greek epigram was already increasing before the publication of the Milan papyrus, research on the subject practically exploded after it and it is worth noting that the majority of the articles in this book somehow refer to this new material. The reason for the interest in the Greek epigram also has something to do with the fact that research on epigrams both triggers and requires research in several other fields of classical studies. The epigram has its roots in epigraphy; it is transmitted to us both as embedded in literature and in papyri, as well as in manuscripts, the *Codex Palatinus* having its own interesting history. Epigrams can be studied in an epigraphical, papyrological, codicological, philological, archaeological and religious context. A list of the literary environments in which an epigram can be placed is, in practice, endless. When we add to this that the epigram is also the only form of literature to which we might assume an "ordinary" man or woman in antiquity also contributed, it is no wonder that it fascinates modern scholars. There are also exceptionally good electronic resources on epigrams, which can be used by researchers and students, e.g., the web site maintained by the University of Leiden (http://athena.leidenuniv.nl/letteren/ opleiding/klassieketalen/index.php3?m=184&c=86), which makes it easy and convenient to follow the flow of the study. However, this certainly does not render the present volume on Hellenistic Epigram by any means superfluous; on the contrary, this is a most welcome publication which will be of great use to scholars and which will contribute to the understanding of the whole genre of the epigram.

The present volume is a collection of papers written mostly by experienced scholars, and this results in a sophistication characteristic of the whole book. All the different aspects of the genre are well taken into account. The inscriptional epigrams and the literary models of the Hellenistic epigram are discussed in the first part of the book. A. Bettenworth has written an excellent contribution on the complicated issue of the interaction between inscriptions and literary epigrams. Describing this interference, she uses a metaphor of the two faces of the moon which I found both illuminating and intelligent. E. Bowie's topic is the meaning of symposium culture to early Hellenistic writers and to the circulation of their poems. D. Sider discusses the influence of the lost collection(s) of epigrams by Simonides on Hellenistic epigram collections, thus touching upon problems concerning Meleager and his sources. N. Krevans writes about the arrangement of Hellenistic epigram collections, the main focus of her article being on the Milan papyrus. Meleager and Philip, the earliest sources of the *Greek Anthology*, are the topic of the contribution of L. Argentieri, in which the author illustrates the lost but reconstructed Στέφανοι. E. Magnelli discusses the metric aspects of the Hellenistic epigram. He offers two tables illustrating the relationship of metrical rules and the degree to which they were obeyed by the poets, these tables being a useful tool in this otherwise very literary book.

The second and third parts of the book concentrate on epigrams as literature and they introduce the genres of epigram as well as various methods of research. Of these articles, which are all outstanding, I would like to mention especially G. Zanker's article "Characterization in Hellenistic epigram", in which the author points out how the writers of the epigrams were also keen to describe different types of personalities, in the same manner as New Comedy and, e.g., the Mimiambi. This has become evident most recently with the title τρόποι in the Milan papyrus, preceding a set of epitaphs, which, however, are grouped together to illustrate something more than just funerary epigrams.

Part four focuses on the intertextual aspects of epigrams, the stress being on epic and archaic poetry but it also includes useful contributions on the question of how theatre and philosophy are reflected in Hellenistic epigrams. As one would expect, the book ends with the subject of the "reception" of the epigram, both in Roman time, and in more recent literature. I found the highlight of the volume in this section: G. Nisbet's article "Roman Imperial Receptions of Hellenistic Epigram" convinces the reader that there are still fresh and new angles to be found in the study of ancient literature. N. shakes and dusts off our concepts of the epigram and the stereotypes that have been maintained, e.g., in the studies of epigrams "by emperors" compared to those "about emperors". His colourful and fresh language is something one seldom reads in scholarly works and even the Hellenistic poets would probably have been pleased with it.

This book is most useful for those who want to get a general view of the *status quaestionis* of this literary genre, which is in constant motion. It has also a lot to give to a more advanced reader, e.g., because of the excellent indexes and, of course, because of the expertise of the contributors. The one (compulsory) complaint I have is the total absence of illustrations; one or two photographs of epigrams, either on a stone or in a papyrus, would not have harmed the book; not even the (admittedly beautiful) cover has a picture illustrating the topic in some way.

Tiina Purola

Dionisio di Alessandria: *Descrizione della Terra abitata*. Prefazione, introduzione, traduzione, note e apparati di EUGENIO AMATO, con un saggio di FILOMENA COCCARO ANDREOU. Testi a fronte 93. Bompiani, Milano 2005. ISBN 88-452-3372-3. 374 pp. EUR 12.

La Περιήγησις τῆς οἰκουμένης, un poemetto di 1185 esametri (cfr. p. 51 nt. 1), di Dionisio d'Alessandria, vissuto all'epoca adrianea, può essere letta e valutata sotto diversi profili: oltre ad essere un manuale di geografia, nonché un'opera didattica, la *Periegesi* potrebbe considerarsi anche come un inno al mondo (composto del resto in occasione del soggiorno di Adriano in Egitto) oppure come la descrizione verbale di una carta geografica (*pinax*). Un'opera multidimensionale, insomma, che rimane indubbiamente una notevole testimonianza della cultura greca della Seconda Sofistica.

Il presente volume non costituisce una nuova edizione critica, ma offre un testo attendibile (quasi identico a quello di Isabelle Tsavari, Ioannina 1990) corredato da una traduzione moderna e scorrevole. Tuttavia il vero valore del libro resta nei capitoli introduttivi, ampi e pieni di dottrina, che servono a contestualizzare il poema di Dionisio all'interno della cultura e della letteratura greca. Particolarmente interessante il saggio sulla lettura della *Periegesi* (di Coccaro Andreou, pp. 11–50), in cui vengono analizzati lo statuto della disciplina geografica presso gli antichi, il contesto e i contenuti dell'opera dionisiana, il rapporto fra l'*ekphrasis* e il *pinax* cartografico ad esso sotteso (la *Periegesi* è ispirata al modello di Eratostene) nonché i caratteri epico-didascalici del poema. L'ampia introduzione (di Amato, pp. 51–181) getta luce sull'autore della *Periegesi*, su questioni di lingua e stile, sul problema del destinatario (che rimane anonimo) e dell'ambiente alessandrino. Molto utili anche gli apparati: alle testimonianze antiche (qui raccolte per la prima volta in maniera completa, pp. 284 sgg.) segue la raccolta delle allusioni ed imitazioni dionisiane (pp. 307–317). Con il terzo apparato viene offerta al lettore la possibilità di essere guidato visivamente, nel suo viaggio alla scoperta dell'ecumene antica, attraverso varie ricostruzioni delle carte geografiche antiche (pp. 319–348).

Gli autori possono giustamente congratularsi con se stessi per l'esito altamente positivo del loro progetto che aiuta molto alla comprensione dell'opera dionisiana.

Mika Kajava

MASSIMO RAFFA: *La Scienza Armonica di Claudio Tolemeo*. Saggio critico, traduzione e commento. Introduzione di PAOLA RADICI COLACE. Lessico e cultura 5. Edizioni Dr. Antonino Sfameni, Messina 2002. ISBN 88-7820-177-4. 515 pp. EUR 34.

Gli *Harmonica*, forse, costituiscono il testamento scientifico di Claudio Tolemeo, trattandosi di una sintesi epistemologica dedicata al suono non solo nei suoi aspetti più minuziosi e tecnici, ma anche come espressione dell'armonia e delle simmetriche corrispondenze tra il microcosmo umano e il macrocosmo celeste. Il trattato si basa su matrici pitagorica, platonica e aristossenica, tuttavia avendo come materiale la totalità dell'universo, in esso vengono proposte soluzioni originali in un'indagine che riguarda i nessi tra scienze diverse: fisica, matematica, geometria, filosofia, ecc. Tradurre e commentare un lavoro come questo non è affatto facile, ma il risultato mi pare impressionante. Nella traduzione (la prima in italiano), condotta sul testo critico edito da Düring (1930), per ragioni di chiarezza e per evitare confusioni, alcuni termini non vengono tradotti né traslitterati. Sembra, insomma, che Raffa riesca a superare le difficoltà nel combinare la fedeltà all'originale con la leggibilità del testo dal punto di vista della lingua italiana. Il suo volume s'inserisce felicemente nell'ambito degli studi messinesi sulla letteratura scientifica e tecnica del mondo antico.

Mika Kajava

EBERHARD RUSCHENBUSCH: *Die frühen römischen Annalisten. Untersuchungen zur Geschichtsschreibung des 2. Jahrhunderts v.Chr.* Philippika, Marburger altertumskundliche Abhandlungen 2. Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden 2004. ISBN 3-447-05015-2. 154 pp. EUR 48.

The study of Roman historiography is concerned with both (more or less) extant works and the *testimonia* for lost ones. In recent years, lost historians have received an ever increasing share of scholarly attention; this is particularly true for the study of republican historiography, of which little remains. New comprehensive editions of fragments have appeared both in France and Germany (M. Chassignet, *L'annalistique romaine* I. *Les annales des pontifes et l'annalistique ancienne (Fragments)*, Paris 1996; H. Beck & U. Walter, *Die frühen römischen*

Historiker I. *Von Fabius Pictor bis Cn. Gellius,* II. *Von Coelius Antipater bis Pomponius Atticus,* Darmstadt 2001–2004), whereas in Britain a team consisting of T. J. Cornell, C. Smith and E. Bispham is currently preparing a new edition of the old standard collection, *HRR* (= H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae* I^2–II, Leipzig 1914/1906; the 1967 reissue of vol. I includes a bibliographical appendix, pp. 385–395). This scholarly industry has also produced works on the fragments of individual historians (e.g., M. Chassignet, *Caton*: *Les Origines (Fragments)*, Paris 1986; G. Forsythe, *The Historian L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi and the Roman Annalistic Tradition*, Lanham, MD 1994; C. Santini, *I frammenti di L. Cassio Emina*, Pisa 1995; S. Walt, *Der Historiker C. Licinius Macer*: *Einleitung, Fragmente, Kommentar*, Stuttgart – Leipzig 1997).

The volume under review here is concerned with the so-called 'older annalists', with a chronological scope ranging from c. 200 BC and the birth of historical writing among the Romans to about 120, at which time a significant expansion of the sheer volume of individual annalistic works heralds the emergence of the later annalists. The material Ruschenbusch deals with, the Greek and Latin *testimonia* along with the fragments of the historians of the period – listed as: 1) Q. Fabius Pictor, 2) L. Cincius Alimentus, 3) A. Postumius Albinus, 4) M. Porcius Cato, 5) C. Acilius, 6) L. Cassius Hemina, 7) L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi and 8) C. Sempronius Tuditanus (pp. 9ff.) –, is included *in extenso* in chapter XVI: *Testimonien und Fragmente* (T 1–5, pp. 67–68; F 1–328, pp. 69–154); the fragments, of which many are in fact anonymous, take their numbering from a chronological arrangement based on the dates of the events they refer to (and not the date of the work). There is also a synopsis of all the material – in the form of a tabulary overview – with details as to the contents and provenance of the individual fragments, in chapter XV: *Testimonia und Fragmente. Übersicht über die Fragmente und deren Inhalt* (pp. 54–66). This table also facilitates the identification of the fragments of R. according to the the arrangement of Peter in *HRR*.

The overview and the edition of the material make up more than two thirds of the text pages of R.'s book. Two of the preceding chapters read as mere catalogues of pertinent facts: II. *Die Darstellung der Königszeit bei den frühen Annalisten* (pp. 13–15) and XI. *Viri illustres, res memorabiles* (pp. 43 ff.). In the rest of the chapters, between the introduction (I. *Das Problem*, pp. 9–12) and the epilogue (XIV. *Epilog*, pp. 49–53), the author discusses – very briefly – a series of problems relevant to his material: III. *Buchzahl und Stoffverteilung bei den frühen Annalisten* (pp. 16ff.), IV. *Clodius' "Chronologische Untersuchungen" (HRR I*^{2} *S 178)* (pp. 18ff.), V. *Diodor, Claudius Quadrigarius und Claudius, qui annales Acilianos ex Graeco in Latinum sermonem vertit* (pp. 20–23), VI. *Die Fasten* (pp. 24–26), VII. *Sempronius Asellio frg. 1 und 2* (pp. 27–33), VIII. *Die Origines des M. Porcius Cato und die Tabula apud pontificem maximum* (pp. 34–37), IX. *Die Darstellung des Pyrrhoskrieges in der frühen Annalistik* (p. 38), X. *Innere Auseinandersetzungen* (pp. 39–42), XII. *Der Aussagewert der Zeugnisse* (pp. 45ff.), and XIII. *Bemerkungen zur Sammlung der Zeugnisse* (pp. 47ff.).

Though the author is clearly competent and, undoubtedly, fully conversant with earlier scholarship on the material, a feature of his book that stands out as striking is the paucity of references to other scholars and the complete absence of a bibliography. Scholars specialized in republican historiography will no doubt find something of value here, but the book is not very useful – or even accessible – for anyone outside this particular readership.

Kaj Sandberg

HANS GROTE: *Petrarca lesen*. Legenda 7. Frommann-Holzboog, Stuttgart 2006. ISBN 978-3-7728-2424-1. 194 pp. EUR 39,80.

This small, red (the colour is not unimportant) book invites the reader to enter into the world of Petrarch's (1304–1374) oeuvre, focusing especially on texts other than the *Canzoniere* – his sonnets and love lyrics in Italian. Grote's book is written in a clear, pleasant style, his footnotes are sparse and the bibliography offering further reading is short as well, which tells us that the intended audience consists of general readers rather than Petrarch scholars. Prior to this volume, the *Legenda* series has included similar titles on, for example, Homer and Plato. The title and approach are thus largely dictated by the series and do not refer to Grote's own personal reading experiences.

Grote's book is easy to approach and it has a delightful aim to widen the general view held of this crucial Italian poet and to balance it by giving an overview of Petrarch's various writings. The modern world mainly remembers Petrarch for his relationship with Laura and as a wistful love poet. Instead of discussing Petrarch as a solitary "Herz-Schmerz-Dichter" of unfulfilled, idealised love, Grote introduces him as an aggressive polemicist, politically engaged discussant and moral philosopher – the different roles he was known for in his own age.

Grote's book begins with conventional biographical information about Petrarch's life, mainly constructed from his personal letters that he carefully polished and edited for publication. Thus Grote rightly emphasises their literary character. The discussion then proceeds to Petrarch's works: biographies and historical writings offering portraits of famous ancient men as moral models, epic poetry, Latin tractates on the good life written from a Stoic-Christian perspective, widely-read dialogues that also offered practical wisdom on life, polemical invectives which defended humanistic learning and were directed against scholasticism, mechanical arts and ignorance, large letter collections as a means of self-representation, and, finally, the famous lyrics. Grote gives brief summaries of each individual work and comments on its role in forming and presenting Petrarch's ethical, humanistic and educational ideals. The last section collects together some central philosophical concepts and key issues from the texts, including *fortuna*, *virtus*, *imitatio*, *allegoria* and *studia humanitatis*, and assesses their meaning in Petrarch's thinking.

The book is a good, brief introduction to Petrarch's writings. It does not offer deeper or detailed analyses of the texts but nevertheless nicely summarises their main contents for a general reader. The book discusses texts that have received less scholarly attention and emphasises their meaning in light of Petrarch's ideas about the good life and humanistic education. Grote notes how Petrarch introduced his own persona into the dialogues and other writings. For example, *Secretum*, his trilogy of dialogues, combines intellectual autobiography and literary fiction, and his letters construct an idealised portrait of a cultured, learned humanist. Grote also draws special attention to Petrarch's invectives and verbal attacks written against named opponents, and briefly notes, for example, some words of abuse applied in this connection. Although Petrarch's ethical ideas and political activities are interesting, I would have welcomed "love" among the key terms discussed in the final chapter, since Petrarchan love is world-famous and interestingly equates love and virtue. All in all, Grote's book shows us that our modern world has good reason to remember Petrarch.

Sari Kivistö

Letters from Sir James Spens and Jan Rutgers. Edited by ARNE JÖNSSON. The Works and Correspondence of Axel Oxenstierna II:13. The Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquites in co-operation with The Swedish National Archives. Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien, Riksarkivet, Stockholm 2007. ISBN 978-91-7402-367-1. 643 p. SEK 285.

Axel Oxenstierna, Chancellor of Sweden under King Gustav II Adolf (1611–32), the regency of 1632–44, and Queen Christina (1644–54) is internationally best known as the leader of Swedish foreign policy during the Thirty Years' War. The Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities has, since 1888, published Oxenstierna's collected works in two series: series I comprises Oxenstierna's historical and political works and his letters, series II contains letters written to Oxenstierna. The process of editing came to a stop in 1977, but in 1999 it was continued by the Academy in cooperation with the Swedish National Archives. The present volume contains diplomatic correspondence from the Scottish adventurer and officer Sir James (Jacob) Spens (d. 1632) and the Dutch humanist and jurist Jan Rutgers (1589–1625). Both were diplomats in Swedish service; the former was also entrusted with a number of important charges by British rulers. Rutgers received an excellent education; he was taught by some of the greatest scholars of the time, such as Gerhard Johann Vossius, Dominicus Baudius, Joseph Justus Scaliger and Daniel Heinsius.

The 86 letters written by Sir James Spens and the 185 letters by Jan Rutgers are chronologically arranged. Each letter is provided with an English summary of the contents. This enables those who are unable to read Latin to follow the correspondence. The letters are carefully edited according to editorial principles which mainly serve the purpose very well. The biographical notes, the reduced but well-focused selection of literature and the index assist the reader in surveying the letters that open a fascinating view of the European politics of the time. The volume is a valuable contribution to the studies of Neo-Latin epistolography, showing, once again, the importance of letters in the research on early modern times.

Raija Sarasti-Wilenius

ROGER WRIGHT: *A Sociophilological Study of Late Latin*. Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 10. Brepols, Turnhout 2002. ISBN 2-503-51338-7. VIII, 389 pp. EUR 65.

This book is a collection of twenty-five (mostly recent) articles by the author. They have originally been published in various places, and most of them have been revised or abbreviated to suit the needs of the collection at hand. The term sociophilology that appears in the title is defined by the author as "an approach to the linguistic study of texts from the past which attempts to combine traditional philological analysis with the insights of modern sociolinguistics". This definition immediately invokes interest in the reader, as does Wright's definition of Late Latin, "the language which, when written, is traditionally regarded as a kind of Latin, but when spoken, is often regarded as being 'Early Romance'". The articles have been arranged in choronological order of subject matter and grouped in six sections (Section A: Late Latin, Medieval Latin and Romance, Section B: Texts and Language in Late Antiquity, Section C: The Ninth Century, Section D: Italy and Spain in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries, Section E:

Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Spain, Section F: Sociophilology and Historical Linguistics), followed by a general conclusion, bibliography and index.

Wright's central point concerning Late Latin and Early Romance is that, in Late Antiquity, people did not have a separate pronunciation for reading texts aloud, but they, including the highly literate ones, used the same phonological system both in their vernacular and for reading Latin aloud. Because morphosyntactic and syntactic change is always slow compared with phonological, and old forms can easily remain passively intelligible for centuries, the result is that even illiterates were able to understand contemporary written texts when they were recited. He connects the appearance of Donatus' grammar in the 4th century with the ever-growing need to check the correct written forms of one's vernacular, forms that had largely already disappeared from speech due to phonological and morphosyntactic changes (something that is well in accordance with the reconstructions of proto-Romance). Wright stresses that the linguistic variation between 400 and 800 was of an essentially normal kind, complex but still monolingual – a view others have found too optimistic, as the author himself notes. The author shows overall a valuable insight into the nature of linguistic variation and change, based on the awareness of the difference between different language levels in these linguistic processes. He, probably correctly, sees changes in the lexicon and semantics as most profound for the loss of intelligibility.

Wright claims, in contrast to many previous studies, that, in the Late Roman period, the direction of change was in fact towards greater convergence. He makes a particularly interesting case in using the concept of interdialect, developed by the sociolinguist Peter Trudgill, that refers to the convergence in immigrant societies of the various contributing dialects to the effect that the new, common dialect reflects the highest common denominator of the divergent input. He traces the conceptual split between Latin and Romance back to the Carolingian reforms initiated by Alcuin and welcomed by Anglo-Saxon speakers. Latin was then turned into a foreign language for everyone.

The author argues forcibly for the view that, in the 9th century, despite a great amount of variation, there was no correlation between the various features according to geographical areas, and that for a considerably long time, up to the 13th century, we cannot really speak of separate Romance languages in the minds of the people speaking them (with the probable exception of Rumanian). He sees the subsequent conceptual split into different languages as resulting from nationalistic ideologies and conscious language planning in the later Middle Ages.

Wright further points out that the historical-comparative method cannot be applied to the reconstruction of Proto-Romance in the same way it is used in the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European because of the limited time span in question and the fact that Romance speakers had frequent contacts with each other during the formative period. Moreover, what the reconstructions represent is, in fact, spoken Latin, not Romance, as the author acutely observes. That is why historical sociolinguistics is needed in this field. His analysis (on pp. 246–248) of different types of texts written in 12th century Spain serves as a illuminating illustration of the variation on the written level. He identifies three types of written language: 1) Late Latin, i.e., Ibero-Romance written with Latin orthography, 2) Medieval Latin texts written by mainly French writers who were in command of the archaic way of writing, and 3) at the end of the period, there appear texts written with a reformed (i.e., Romance) orthography in an attempt to write the vernacular in a new and more appropriate manner. As Wright stresses, the scribes writing Early Romance naturally had first learnt to write Latin and their educational and social context should be considered when making a philological analysis of the texts they wrote.

I found the parallels drawn between the Early or Medieval Romance world and modern western societies less convincing. This is due to the fact that while drawing parallels with present day English or French (for example, in his discussion on p. 90 on the passive knowledge of verbal forms that had long since disappeared from speech), Wright does not make allowance for the decisively different role of literacy in the respective time periods and societies – and this despite the fact that he elsewhere explicitly points out the necessity of appreciating the role played by writing and literacy in a given society when carrying out linguistic research solely on the basis of texts (on p. 310). There is also a slightly confusing discussion (on pp. 142–145) about the meaning of *transferre studeat in rusticam Romanam linguam aut thiotiscam* (as formulated in the Canons of the Council of Tours in 813) where the parallelism between *rusticam Romanam linguam* and *thiotiscam* (Germanic) as the objects of the same verb does not seem to leave room for Wright's interpretation that *transferre in rusticam Romanam linguam* here would only refer to the vernacular pronunciation and not to any actual act of translating (his argument at this point is in keeping with his general view that, in the 9th century, people did not think about the linguistic situation in terms of two different languages, between which 'translation' would have been possible).

That said, there can be no doubt that this is a book of great importance, for latinists, romanists, and historical linguists alike.

Hilla Halla-aho

P. M. NIGDELIS: Ἐπιγραφικὰ Θεσσαλονίκεια. Συμβολή στην πολιτική και κοινωνική ιστορία της αρχαίας Θεσσαλονίκης. University Studio Press, Thessaloniki 2006. ISBN 960-12-1550-6. 646 pp. EUR 40.

The author, of the University of Thessaloniki, is a well-known authority on Greek epigraphy, especially on that of the Roman period in Macedonia and N. Greece in general (but note also, e.g., his monograph on Πολίτευμα καὶ κοινωνία τῶν πόλεων Κυκλάδων of 1990). It was a very good idea of his to publish this collection of papers, some of them dedicated to the publication of new inscriptions (most of them, as one would expect in Thessalonica, from the second and the third centuries AD) and others to the examination of texts already published (normally not too long ago). The inscriptions of Thessalonica, almost all of the Roman period and very numerous, have already established the status of Thessalonica as one of the most important Greek-speaking cities of the Roman period; this collection of papers, admirably indexed and with very good photos, certainly does much to confirm this status. One must also note that the commentaries are of a very solid quality.

From the Preface (p. 16), one learns that the inscriptions (among which there are some Latin ones) dealt with here come, for the most part, from emergency excavations dating from after 1960, and that the same year was the 'terminus ante quem' for the texts published by C. Edson in the *IG* volume of 1972. The inscriptions are presented in six chapters, I, 'Ἀπό τή δημοσία ζωή τής πόλης', II, 'Ἰδιωτικοί σύλλογοι τής πόλης' (Thessalonica being a city with many various associations), III, 'Ἀπό τόν κόσμο τών ἐπαγγελμάτων', IV, 'Ἡ πόλη καί πληθυσμός της', V, 'Ταφικό λεξιλόγιο καί ταφικές πρακτικές' (with many interesting formulations), VI, 'Testimonia epigraphica' (mentions of Thessalonica, etc. in inscriptions found elsewhere). Within these chapters, the individual contributions have been furnished with separate numbers.

There is of course much of interest. Among those inscriptions which are published for the first time, note, e.g., an inscription in honour of Livia (I 1); an association of muleteers (II 10, a text also interesting because of the use of Latin terms transcribed into Greek, μουλίων and κολλήγας [the first attestation of this word in Macedonia: p. 186]), a συνήθεια ἥρωος Αἰνεία (II 15, Liv. 40, 4, 9 being quoted on p. 208 for illustration), the *[bes]tiari(u)s* Maximinus being killed by a leopard (III 6), an *arc(arius) XX her(editatum) pr(ovinciae) Mac(edoniae)* (III 10), the term ἐκκτράνις = *extraneus* (V 1), a sarcophagus being dedicated τῷ ἄττῃ καὶ τῇ νίννῃ (according to Nigdelis, to the father and the grandmother; however, I would be prepared to accept that the grandfather, rather than the father, is meant). A new instance of a person adding, after the *constitutio Antoniniana*, the nomen Αὐρήλιος to his nomenclature but also mentioning his former filiation prefixed by ὁ πρίν in V 14. There are also (as one would expect) many instances of interesting nomina, e.g., Ἀλλίδιος (V 12), *Apponius* (IV 19), Ὅστιος (II 7), Νεμετρώνιος (= *Numitronius*, IV 7), Ῥούββιος (IV 6), Ῥουστικείλιος (II 12 and V 2), Σαλάριος (again with the praenomen *Manius*) and Σεπτιμήνιος (IV 1). Note also *Caechilius* (sic) IV 12 and the appearance for the first time in Thessalonica of *Titonius* (IV 16), attested in Philippi; there is also a nomen appearing for the first time ever, Κιτέρειος (or perhaps rather Κιτερέιος?) in II 14. The onomastic commentaries are very well informed (e.g., that on Rupil(l)ii p. 126ff.).

Inscriptions already published receiving a new treatment here are the following: *IG* X 2, 1, 14 (I 4), 16 (II 16), 138 (I 6), *139 (I 9), *226 (I 8, with a new interpretation),558 (V 5), 638 (V 10); *SEG* 24, 569 (V 11); 45, 815-7 = *AE* 1999, 1425-7 (I 10: the interesting dossier of Claudius Rufrius Meno), 827 (I 5); 47, 960 (I 7); 49, 814 = *AE* 1999, 1430 (II 1, a very thorough analysis on pp. 101–128). Altogether 66 'testimonia' are included in section VI, e.g., the military diploma *CIL* XVI 1, mentioning a man from Thessalonica among the witnesses.

There is practically nothing I might complain about (perhaps one should write *P(ublius)* rather than *P(oplius)* in Latin inscriptions; and the numbering of the photos seems awkward, as the numbers are not identical with those used elsewhere) and therefore I conclude by congratulating the author for this splendid publication.

Olli Salomies

Inschriften von Milet. Teil 3: *Inschriften n. 1020-1580* von Peter Herrmann (†), Wolfgang Günther, Norbert Ehrhardt, mit Beiträgen von Denis Feissel und Peter Weiss. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut - *Milet*, Bd. VI, Teil 3. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin 2006. ISBN 978-3-11-018966-7. XIV, 337 S., 45 Taf. EUR 128.

Questo straordinario volume rappresenta un passo importante nel percorso verso l'edizione definitiva dei materiali epigrafici di Mileto (sono ora rese note, con l'omissione di un numero di frammenti, almeno 90% delle iscrizioni venute alla luce fin dall'inizio degli scavi tedeschi nel 1899). Anima e motore del progetto durante gli ultimi decenni è stato il compianto Peter Herrmann (1927–2002), allievo di Josef Keil, che va indubbiamente considerato uno dei più insigni epigrafisti del nostro tempo. Il suo enorme impegno per l'epigrafia dell'Asia Minore è destinato a rimanere basilare per le future generazioni.

Herrmann era un ottimo conoscitore dei territori greci e delle epigrafi che essi producevano, ma fra tutte le città greche, forse gli stava più a cuore Mileto, dove egli aveva lavorato fin dal lontano 1962. Il grande merito dei tre volumi di *Inschriften von Milet,* ideati da Herrmann, risiede nel fatto che le numerosissime epigrafi milesie sono ora comodamente accessibili ed edite con rigidi criteri epigrafici, mentre prima esse erano state pubblicate nel loro contesto archeologico, e spesso senza indici, in vari volumi della serie *Milet* (I 2 [1908], nn. 1-30, le epigrafi del *bouleuterion*; I 3 [1914], nn. 31–186, quelle provenienti dal *Delphinion*; i testi editi nei volumi *Milet* I 5–II 3, cioè i nn. 187–406, furono ripresi e commentati, insieme ai nn. 1-186, da Herrmann nel primo volume delle sue *Inschriften* del 1997). Con i volumi VI 2 (1998) e VI 3 (2006) delle *Inschriften* si arriva complessivamente a ben 1580 epigrafi, e se, inoltre, consideriamo quelle di Didima, edite nel 1958 a cura di Albert Rehm, grande predecessore di Herrmann, si raggiunge il totale di circa 2200 epigrafi milesie / didimee finora pubblicate. Così Mileto figura tra le città più ricche di documenti epigrafici in tutta l'Asia Minore.

I doveri editoriali del presente volume erano stati divisi anni fa; mentre Herrmann stesso si era dedicato alle lettere imperiali nonché a nuove iscrizioni sepolcrali, frammenti e "varia", i settori più significativi dell'edizione sono il frutto dei lavori di Wolfgang Günther (decreti, iscrizioni onorarie e agonistiche, c. 250 testi) e di Norbert Ehrhardt (*leges sacrae,* dediche a divinità e imperatori, oracoli, c. 140 numeri). Oltre ad alcuni altri gruppi di materiali curati dai due editori principali, sono presenti nel volume brevi ma importanti contributi di collaboratori ben noti: Denis Feissel (nn. 1575–80: testi cristiani e bizantini), Rudolf Haensch (nn. 1387-88 [quest'ultimo con Herrmann]: miliari), Peter Weiß (nn. 1392–94: pesi), Michael Wörrle (n. 1031 [& Herrmann]: decreto riguardante l'asylia bilaterale tra Mileto e l'Etolia).

Sono centinaie le epigrafi inedite, tra cui numerose di grande rilievo storico. Riguardo ai decreti, si possono segnalare il primo (n. 1020), ateniese, del V sec., con la commissione di συγγραφεῖς, oppure un altro, ellenistico, mirante a onorare un milesio che si era reso benemerito aiutando alcuni compatrioti a liberarsi dalle mani dei pirati (n. 1027). Nel n. 1026 troviamo non solo un interessante dettaglio concernente il ruolo dei locali βασιλεῖς, ma anche la rarissima espressione τοῦ ἀνδριάντος χαλκουργία, e nel n. 1030 occorre un'importante prescrizione sulla pubblicazione del decreto (rr. 9-10: [ἀναγράψαι τ]όδε τὸ ψήφισμα εἰς τ[ὴμ] / [παραστάδ]α τοῦ να[ο]ῦ τοῦ Τ[ερμινθέως], forse da intendere come il tempio di Apollo Termintheus a Myus). Nel gruppo delle lettere imperiali è incluso un frammento (n. 1079) riguardante i τεχνῖται dionisiaci, con la menzione di ᾿Αμφικτύονες locali. Molte inedite anche tra le iscrizioni onorarie e le dediche: nel n. 1089 sembrerebbe apparire il nome Προσέταιρος; e nell'epigrafe di un ambasciatore milesio a Roma (n. 1091) appare l'insolita espressione di πολειτικὸν σύνστημα, evidentemente nel senso "Volksversammlung" (Günther); tra le epigrafi indirizzate ai personaggi romani possiamo menzionare quella di L. Valerius Flaccus, probabilmente da identificare con il proconsole del 62/61 a.C. (n. 1122), oppure quelle di M. Appuleius della nota famiglia senatoria, questore nel 45 a.C. e zio di Sex. Appuleius, cos. 29 (n. 1123) e dei due Arrii, forse patroni di Mileto (n. 1124). Nel frammento n. 1174 spicca la presenza della carica di ὑποχρήστης (cfr. n. 1145) in una dedica pubblica (posta dalla *boule* e *gerousia* di Mileto).

Molto impressionante la sezione delle "Kultinschriften" (Ehrhardt), di cui la maggioranza prima erano o inedite o scarsamente note (per varie vicende storiche, molte sono ora conservate non solo a Mileto ma anche a Smirne, Istanbul, Berlino e Parigi). I calendari rituali e le *leges* *sacrae* di Mileto risultano importanti soprattutto per la loro terminologia relativa al sacrificio, ma anche per il dialetto ionico sopravvissuto nelle leggi fino all'età ellenistica. Tale materiale è seguito dalle dediche, tra cui ancora molte inedite, divise secondo le divinità (Apollo, Artemis, Zeus, Atena, Afrodite, Hermes, Demeter, Dioniso, Ninfe, divinità egizie, e molte altre ancora, quasi tutti venerati con più epiteti: tra i tanti esempi ricordo l'uso di Βασιλίδες al plurale, forse attribuibile alla coppia di Demeter e Kore, n. 1305). La sezione delle dediche si conclude con quelle a re ellenistici e imperatori romani: interessanti, per esempio, l'ara in onore di Arsinoe, sorella-moglie di Tolemeo II (n. 1323, con utili commenti sull'organizzazione del culto) e la lunga serie di dediche ad Adriano (nn. 1324 sgg.), di cui molte finora ignote, qui discusse, con la solita competenza, da Ehrhardt. La nostra comprensione della vita cultuale di Mileto si arricchisce considerevolmente con i nuovi testi commentati.

Nel volume, inoltre, si trovano felicemente riediti numerosi documenti notissimi e di considerevole rilievo, molti dei quali, in precedenza dispersi in varie riviste e pubblicazioni: nn. 1031 (l'asylia tra Mileto e l'Etolia, cfr. sopra), 1039 (decreto in onore di Eirenias, noto politico milesio del II sec. a.C. – strettamente pertinenti anche i nn. 1040–41), 1051–54 (vari decreti dei Milesi ritrovati in altre città), 1075 (lettera di Marco Aurelio e Commodo), 1130–31 (dediche in onore di C. Iulius Epikrates, eminente politico sotto Augusto, ben noto anche da altri documenti), 1142 (onori per Στρατονεῖλα, sacerdotessa di Atena, con un oracolo del dio didimeo, peraltro il più lungo finora noto in versi esametrici), 1218 (prescrizioni sul culto di Poseidon Helikonios, del 437/6 a.C. [datazione di Herrmann], importantissime non solo per la conoscenza del culto ma anche per la storia politica di Mileto; il testo presenta anche alcune notevoli forme dialettali), 1219–21 (*leges* riguardanti parti delle vittime sacrificali), 1222 (notissima legge sull'acquisto dei sacerdozi di Dioniso, con regole sui *thiasoi* dionisiaci), 1225 (decreto del popolo riguardante il culto di Artemis Boulephoros Skiris – in occasione dell'istituzione del nuovo culto doveva essere consultato il dio oracolare, come pure nel caso del n. 1224). L'elenco potrebbe continuare a lungo, ma concludo riferendomi al n. 1575, un rescritto di Giustiniano del 539/542 d.C., concernente la chiesa dell'arcangelo Gabriele a Mileto, splendidamente ricostruito e discusso da Feissel.

Gli indici sono pertinenti e redatti con grande cura. Anche le fotografie sono di ottima qualità (solo che quella del n. 1357 appare capovolta). A chi scrive non resta che esprimere agli autori un grande apprezzamento e la più viva soddisfazione per la positiva conclusione di un lungo *iter*, che rende giustamente onore ai lavori precedenti di Rehm, Herrmann, e altri.

Mika Kajava

WILLY CLARYSSE and DOROTHY J. THOMPSON: *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt*, Volume 1: *Population Registers* (*P.Count*.), Volume 2: *Historical Studies*. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 0-521-83838-X; ISBN 0-521-83839-8. XXIV, 694 pp.; XX, 395 pp. GBP 120 (vol. 1); GBP 65 (vol. 2); GBP 175 (both volumes).

Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt is composed of two substantial volumes of which the first (*Population Registers*) is an edition of altogether 54 documents written either in Greek or in demotic Egyptian. These documents are lists that deal with taxation drawn up mainly in two different categories, those according to household (*kat' oikian*) and those according to occupational group (*kat' ethnos*). Some of these texts have been published before, but the way they are treated here is unparalleled: for the first time, the data from both Greek and Demotic sources are brought together and the lists that are often "seen as rather boring tax lists" (Vol. 2, p. 341) come to life both in the detailed and erudite commentaries in the first volume and especially in the broader approach of Volume 2 (*Historical Studies*).

There is little to be added to the first volume that was not noted by the editors themselves in the corrections to the printed text at http://pcount.arts.kuleuven.be. The texts are arranged roughly chronologically, and the first forty-four texts all derive from the Arsinoite nome and date to the third century BC. Text number **45** is from the Herakleopolite nome (see corrections) from the third century, and **46–48** are from the Oxyrhynchite nome, also dating to the third century. Texts **49–54** are from the second century and derive from the Arsinoite and the Lykopolite nomes. The texts numbered **22–44** are re-editions of the extremely difficult tax-registers in Vienna, first published in 1987 (*CPR* XIII, *Griechische Texte* IX). Despite the fact that the editors have been able to make further joins and improve the readings of these texts, they acknowledge their debt to the *editio princeps* and refer to the origal notes of *CPR* XIII (Vol. 1, p. 318).

The solution of providing the translation alongside the text is helpful for the reader and it gives the reader a chance to follow the transcripts, both Greek and demotic, easily. This indicates the fact that both volumes are meant to be consulted not only by specialists using papyrus documents in either language as a source for socio-economic studies in Greek or demotic, but also by a broader audience, too. One thing that one might have considered adding to the first volume is a concordance of the texts which have been re-edited.

Both authors had already worked on this material before they decided to join forces in 1991. These 15+ years of research are now presented to us in an edition and study which, in my opinion, together present an excellent example of the advancement and potential of papyrological research. This is defined by the authors themselves (Vol. 2, p. 59): "In papyrology, the publication of new texts, the definition of typologies, the collation of similar texts written in Greek and demotic, and their recognition among both published and unpublished collections, all combine to further understanding."

The authors keep their feet on the ground and remind the reader constantly about the problems of the sporadic survival of the sources and the fact that many of the topics discussed can vary according to time and place. The documents are mostly written in the Arsinoite nome during the second half of the third century BC, and this nome and this period are consequently scrutinised in this study. As an example of the authors' accuracy, however, the dating of any text referred to in the second volume is always given in parenthesis after the locus. It is good that the reader is reminded of the date, since the ratio of the salt-tax, for example, changed quite dramatically within a few decades only, and this is one of the factors which is thoroughly discussed in a wider perspective, too: The Ptolemies needed to do something about the fact that even though the capitation charges were low, they were probably not popular as the newly settled Greeks were those who got tax concessions from even the smallest obligations like the obol tax.

In Volume 2 (*Historical Studies*), Chapter 1, **Ptolemies, taxes and papyri**, summarises the information on the texts edited or re-edited in Volume 1, the proveniences, the datings and the origins of the papyri. The bilingual nature of the administration of Ptolemaic Egypt is noted, and one of the strengths of this study is that the data from the demotic sources are incorporated in it. Chapter 2, **The census**, first justifies the use of the term 'census' which is based on the listing of various capitation charges. Further, the authors conclude that: "it is also clear that this census involved both a listing and a classification of the total adult population of the country, not just those who were subject to these taxes; tax-exempt categories did not escape the record" (Vol. 2, p. 12). Then follows a discussion on various aspects of the census and the role of the officials involved in this operation, for example, and how some groups like the army appear to have undergone a separate census. The chapter characterising the census is wrapped up with a note on the Greek administrative language which developed on the basis of demotic equivalents. This "somewhat stilted vocabulary" is retained in the translations of Volume 1 "as an important indication of a special language, the use of which would serve to mark and set apart the bureaucratic class of scribes and other officials involved" (Vol. 2, p. 34).

Chapter 3 discusses **The salt-tax and other taxes**. The salt-tax lay at the centre of the Ptolemaic tax-structure, and all adults, both male and female, were liable to this tax. As a rule of thumb, male tax payers paid twice the sum of that of the female tax payers. Changes in the rates of the salt-tax enable the corrections of the dating of some of the re-edited texts. Furthermore, the special categories of those who paid a reduced rate and the very few exceptions to the liability of the salt-tax are discussed. Chapter 4, **Settlement in the Fayum**, turns to broader questions on which these tax-lists shed light, such as the population of the Arsinoite nome and that of Egypt in the third century BC. The villages and hamlets formed the basic units for a tax-collector, and a number of villages made up a tax-district, "the area perhaps that constituted the responsibility of an individual tax-farmer (*telônês*)" (Vol. 2, p. 113). The mean size of a tax-district was ca. 2,000 adults, and ca. 10,000 adults formed larger tax-areas. The terminology of this administrative topography is, again, elusive, but in the Arsinoite nome, both *topoi*, toparchies and *merides*, played a part in the system. The number of toparchies known from other nomes most likely reveals to some degree their sizes at a given time.

After discussing the problems of administrative geography and the topographical features of the Arsinoite nome, the authors, in chapter 5, **The people counted,** turn to the men and women who paid the salt-tax and the different occupations they held. One of the interesting features in this chapter is the fact that the classification of population was based not only on ethnicity but also on occupation, and either of these may have led a person to a priviledged tax-status. Thus, the authors talk about tax-Hellenes, for example, and from the prosopographic evidence, it is sometimes clear that a tax-Hellene, Persian or Arab was not an ethnic designation but meant a priviledged tax-status. After a thorough discussion of the people counted, the authors turn to the animals in Chapter 6, **Counting the animals**. Just like people, all animals were also taxed in various ways. As an example of the difficulties in the terminology, I found interesting (as a non-native English speaker) the various terms for different kinds of pigs in modern English as an illustration of the elusive terminology of both demotic and Greek.

The demographic Chapter 7, **Family matters**, is, as the authors say: "a long chapter with much detailed information" (Vol. 2, p. 314). The problem of the lists providing information on adults only is well recognised, and yet, the authors are able to set this information into the demographic framework developed by Peter Laslett and colleagues for work on family history in Europe and adopted by Roger Bagnall and Bruce Frier in their study of census returns from Roman Egypt. This chapter is certainly one of the prime interests of the authors, and I believe that the writing of this chapter has begun at an early stage of the study: One of the very few inconsistencies in the whole of Volume 2 that I have noticed is the fact that information on the translation of *The instruction of Ankhsheshonq* is given on page 231 even though there are quotations from this text earlier.

Finally Chapter 8, **Naming the people**, discusses the prosopographical information that the population registers edited in Volume 1 reveal. The onomastic information reveals that, among some Egyptian families, there were hellenising tendencies, and that the onomastic hellenisation was probably more widespead in the second century BC than in the third. Furthermore, the family traditions in name-giving both in Egyptian and Greek society led to the repeated use of the same name from one generation to another. There were homonymous siblings and, even more surprisingly, the homonymy or near-homonymy of married couples or in-laws. Finally, the theophoric names of (mostly) the Egyptian population and their connection to the local cults of Egypt are discussed. Volume 2 is rounded up with concluding Chapter 9, an appendix dedicated to the classification of the salt-tax registers and logeutic records, bibliography and index.

The two volumes supplement each other in an outstanding way, and the easily readable second volume rests firmly on the hard facts of the first. The texts touch upon a variety of topics of the socio-economic life of Hellenistic Egypt, and the extensive bibliographies help to find further information on things (seemingly) as far away from taxation as salt production or literacy in the ancient world. The concluding Chapter 9 of Volume 2, however, outlines this work as only a beginning towards an even broader understanding of Hellenistic monarchies and the ways their administration functioned. Papyrologists are often asked whether papyri can be used as a source for the whole (eastern) Mediterranean in Antiquity or do they only reveal information restricted to Egypt. The answer given to this question in this study is clearly the former. Even though papyri rarely survive outside Egypt, in comparison with inscriptions, seals and clay tablets, for example, they reveal information that can be used to draw conclusions that are valid not only for Egypt but for the whole Hellenistic eastern Mediterranean world.

Erja Salmenkivi

Usi e abusi epigrafici. Atti del Colloquio Internazionale di Epigrafia Latina (Genova 20–22 settembre 2001). A cura di Maria Gabriella Angeli Bertinelli e Angela Donati. Serta antiqua et mediaevalia VI – Storia antica vol. III (Università degli Studi di Genova – DISAM). Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Roma 2003. ISBN 88-7689-197-8. 534 pp. EUR 130.

Il volume riunisce gli Atti del Colloquio Internazionale di Epigrafia Latina, tenutosi a Genova tra il 20 e il 22 settembre del 2001 e organizzato da M. G. Angeli Bertinelli e A. Donati, le stesse persone alle quali si devono i Colloqui Borghesi di Bertinoro. Di seguito il contenuto: M. G. Angeli Bertinelli, Prefazione; M. G. Granino Cecere, La carriera di *T. Prifernius Paetus Rosianus Geminus* in un'iscrizione onoraria di *Trebula Mutuesca*; L. Bivona, Presenze femminili nella società della Sicilia occidentale in età romana; G. Vanotti, Denominare il tiranno: usi o abusi epigrafici dalla Sicilia antica?; A. Russi, Sull'organizzazione politico-amministrativa dei *Marsi* in età romana; E. Paribeni – S. Segenni, Iscrizioni su manufatti semilavorati delle cave lunensi; M. G. Angeli Bertinelli, Una dedica frammentaria a un duoviro da Luni; M. G. Arrigoni Bertini, L'uso epigrafico dei militari parmensi. Carriera, mobilità sociale, evergetismo; G. L. Gregori, Iscrizioni ed interpretazioni abusive? A proposito di alcune iscrizioni bresciane per i giulio-claudi (IIt X V, 86, 638, 736, 1188); M. S. Bassignano, Uno schiavo atestino di condizione agiata; A. Valvo, *Unata/Otacilius*: usi e abusi onomastici nelle iscrizioni bilingui etrusco-latine; J. d'Encarnação, Euge, Victores! – Ou le culte de l'ambigüité; Y. Le Bohec, Les lingons et Rome. Relations politiques; A. Sartori, Un abuso epigrafico originario: monumentalità su intonaco in una novità milanese; S. Giorcelli Bersani, Il cippo bilingue latino-celtico di Vercelli: nuove osservazioni; C. Letta, Novità epigrafiche sul culto del *Genius Augusti* in Italia; C. Zaccaria, *Scriptor*: lo scrittore che non deve scrivere; M. Mayer, usos epigráficos singulares: la epigrafia para una ocasión; H. Solin, Abuso dell'onomastica nella ricerca epigrafica; J. González, El *S.C. de Pisone Patre*: problemas textuales; L. Sensi, A proposito del restauro dell'epigrafe di Domizio Lucano *CIL* XI, 5210; G. Mennella, La copia in marmo della tavola di Polcevera: un abuso ideologico della repubblica di Genova nel XVI secolo; E. Weber, Usi ed abusi epigrafici – Alcuni esempi; A Buonopane, Abusi epigrafici tardo-antichi: i miliari dell'Italia settentrionale (*Regiones X* e *XI*); S. Panciera, Domus a Roma. Altri contributi alla loro inventariazione; G. Manganaro, Bollatura fiscale dei laterizi per la vendita; S. Roda, I pericoli di una storia senza memoria e senza verità: l'epigrafia fra dogmatismo interpretativo e affabulazione incontrollata; M. Khanoussi – A. Mastino, il culto imperiale a *Thibaris* e a *Thugga* tra Diocleziano e Costantino; R. Zucca, Una dedica a Valeriano da *Neapolis* (*Sardinia*), F. Cenerini, I *Papirii* di Faenza; A. Arnaldi, Dediche a divinità in memoria di defunti nell'Italia romana; G. Di Vita-Evrard, Un «nouveau» proconsul d'Afrique: *Cn. Pinarius Aemilius Cicatricula*; P. Ruggeri, Una nuova testimonianza tra *Sarditas* e *Romanitas*: la *cupa* di *Lucius Valerius Torbenus* ad Ula Tirso (Oristano); A. Donati, *Lutatio, Damnatio, Restitutio*: tre momenti della memoria; M. Corbier, Conclusioni.

La prima considerazione va rivolta alla tematica del colloquio: usi e abusi epigrafici. Nella prefazione di una delle editrici degli atti (Angeli Bertinelli), il titolo "fa riferimento principalmente all'iscrizione come mezzo di comunicazione diffuso e comune nell'antichità e, come tale, soggetto ad un uso proprio e improprio". Di usi epigrafici è comune parlare in quanto, come nelle parole di Mireille Corbier a conclusione delle sessioni di studio, questi "permettono di cogliere le regole di presentazione, di formulazione, di localizzazione e di scelta del materiale utilizzato" e quindi consentono all'epigrafista di individuare norme ed eccezioni all'interno delle quali il linguaggio epigrafico si muove, da applicare in seguito all'interpretazione di altri documenti appartenenti ad uno stesso ambito. Al contrario, ha colpito la curiosità e destato l'interesse di chi scrive l'accostamento del termine "abuso" al documento epigrafico e, in modo particolare, l'idea di farne la tematica di un incontro di studi. Il tema era sufficientemente ampio da aver permesso la partecipazione di un nutrito gruppo (33 sono i contributi che affluiscono nel volume) di studiosi delle discipline epigrafiche e storiche, i quali hanno affrontato la problematica ciascuno dalla prospettiva del proprio ambito di specializzazione. Hanno colpito l'attenzione di chi scrive soprattutto gli interventi riguardanti gli abusi, o presunti tali, che si dividono in due categorie. La prima consiste negli abusi, per così dire, "originari", cioè i casi in cui un monumento epigrafico, in quanto mezzo di comunicazione, viene usato (o abusato) dal suo autore distorcendone la funzione tradizionale, al fine di diffondere un determinato messaggio. Questo tipo di abuso, o uso improprio, si realizza in vari modi: mettendo in evidenza alcune informazioni e tacendone altre, destinando ad un testo epigrafico dati e informazioni che, altrimenti, non farebbero parte del repertorio dei soggetti trattati da una certa tipologia, adoperando la lingua e il lessico in modo da ottenere determinati effetti semantici, o affidando determinati messaggi a supporti epigrafici normalmente destinati ad accoglierne altri (vedi gli studi di Vanotti, Valvo, Sartori, Zaccaria, Mayer, Buonopane, Arnaldi e Donati). La seconda categoria è invece rappresentata dagli abusi interpretativi (in alcuni casi solo errori a ben vedere), cioè dall'interpretazione distorta, a volte a fini strumentali, del documento epigrafico nella sua fase di studio e catalogazione, a partire dal Rinascimento (vedi gli articoli di Sensi, Mennella e Weber) fino all'epigrafia moderna (Gregori, Solin e Roda).

Si segnalano di seguito, in ordine sparso, altri contributi che hanno attirato l'attenzione di chi scrive.

Per gli studi sulla classe senatoria in età imperiale si sottolineano i contributi di Granino Cecere e Di Vita-Evrard. Si tratta in entrambi i casi di senatori già noti. Granino Cecere pubblica con grande perizia un nuovo ritrovamento da *Trebula Mutuesca,* una lastra, parte di un monumento onorario di grosse dimensioni interpretato come una biga o quadriga. Nell'iscrizione, posta da un'ignota città dell'Africa proconsolare, compare il *cursus honorum* di *T. Prifernius Paetus Rosianus Geminus*, cos. ca. 125. Basandosi sul ritrovamento, l'a. fornisce anche una nuova lettura della lastra onoraria da Patrasso dedicata allo stesso senatore (AE 1989, 660) e della sua iscrizione sepolcrale (pubblicata in M. Torelli, *RAL* 18 (1963), pp. 256–7). Di Vita-Evrard, analizzando un miliario africano datato al 79–80 (*CIL* VIII, 22060), menzionante il senatore d'età flavia *Cn. Pinarius Aemilius Cicatricula,* propone una nuova datazione al 70 del consolato del personaggio, andando a ritoccare i fasti consolari degli anni tra il 70 e il 72. Contemporaneamente l'a. rivede la teoria, generalmente accettata negli studi prosopografici, secondo cui *Cicatricula* avrebbe proceduto ai lavori stradali, e quindi alla messa in opera del miliario, in qualità di legato consolare straordinario, vedendolo, più semplicemente, come il proconsole d'Africa del 79–80 e colmando la lacuna nei fasti proconsolari d'Africa.

Si segnala inoltre agli interessati di studi sulla topografia di Roma, il contributo di Panciera che, sulla base di ritrovamenti epigrafici, individua 14 nuove *domus* con un proprietario identificabile e 6 attribuibili ad anonimi. Questo articolo va considerato come un'aggiunta alla voce "*domus*" nel *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae*. Sul culto del *genius Augusti*, di grande interesse è parso l'intervento di Letta, che, ribadendo sulla base di testimonianze epigrafiche la natura pubblica del culto a livello municipale, ne restituisce la menzione nell'iscrizione pompeiana *CIL* X, 816, abusivamente attribuita ad un supposto *genius coloniae,* attribuendo la funzione proprio di tempio del genio di Augusto al c.d. "tempio di Vespasiano" del foro di Pompei.

Due osservazioni per concludere. Il tema del colloquio era talmente ampio da aver permesso a studiosi di presentare ricerche su temi che vanno dal *S. C. de Pisone patre* alle *note lapicidinarum* incise nelle cave durante la lavorazione preliminare dei manufatti di marmo, passando per le attestazioni epigrafiche delle donne nella Sicilia occidentale. Già organizzare un colloquio sugli "usi epigrafici" significa in pratica indire un congresso sull'epigrafia in generale. Sommando agli usi anche gli abusi, pare a chi scrive che non sia percepibile una minima uniformità tematica (se non per gli abusi) comune ai diversi interventi, tanto da non comprendere più quale sia il filo conduttore che avrebbe dovuto collegare le varie parti. La seconda osservazione è che andando a coprire così tanti dei settori, a volte di confine, della disciplina epigrafica (ad es. Mayer sull'epigrafia rupestre e Giorcelli Bersani sulle bilingui latino-celtiche) e affrontandoli spesso anche dal punto di vista della critica metodologica, questo libro si presenta come una riflessione a tutto tondo sulle vicende e sui progressi della disciplina epigrafica dall'Umanesimo fino ai suoi ultimi sviluppi, oltre a ricordare, ancora una volta, quanto ampio e vario sia il campo d'indagine dell'epigrafia.

Luca Maurizi

Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum. Consilio et auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Berolinensis et Brandenburgensis editum. Voluminis sexti pars sexta. Indices. Fasciculus tertius. Grammatica quaedam erroresque quadratarii er alias rationes scribendi notabiliores. Composuit ARTHUR ERNEST GORDON† adiutante [sic] JOYCE STIEFBOLD GORDON†. Auxerunt et edenda curaverunt ULRIKE JANSSSON et HANS KRUMMREY. Gualterus De Gruyter et Socii, Berolini, Novi Eboraci MMVI. ISBN 3-11-012152-2. 333 pp. EUR 168.

'Indices, quos ante oculos habes, suo genere singulares sunt, nam antea numquam formae anomale scriptae in volumine quodam *Corporis* occurentes [sic] extra indicem grammaticum, ubi in genera digestae inveniuntur, etiam in litteram [i.e., in ordine alphabetico, ut p. 7 *aggro agru Agurina Agusto* etc.] digestae collectae sunt'. Ita editores Jansen et Krummrey in praefatione p. V. Hos indices in suo genere singulares esse non nego; quaerendum tamen mihi videtur, quae eorundem sit utilitas.

Volumen hoc constat ex tribus capitibus: 'I. Formae nominum et vocabulorum in litteram digestae. 1. Errores et aliae formae quae a norma discrepant' (p. 1–161; de mendorum generibus cf. p. V–VI), '2. Nomina et vocabula quae anomale scripta occurrunt' (p. 163–250; e.g., sub voce *ABSENTIA* invenimus formam 'anomale scriptam' *apsentiam*); 'II. Formae nominum et vocabulorum in genera digestae' (p. 251–333). Hoc caput ultimum eiusmodi est, ut sunt indices grammatici quos invenimus in aliis *Corporis* voluminibus, et sine dubio ii, qui hoc volumen in manibus suis habebunt, hoc praesertim capite utentur, rarissime aliis duobus.

Caput enim hoc ultimum omnia continet, quae desiderare possis, et non solum ea, quae continentur aliis huius voluminis capitibus (i.e. formas praesertim 'anomalas') sed multo plura, e.g. res ad syntaxin pertinentes (e.g. p. 325, 'praepositiones cum casu non suo'; p. 326–333, 'syntaxis'). Quod ad capita duo prima attinet, quamquam erunt sine dubio qui etiam his uti velint, tamen eorundem utilitatem non ita facile perspicere possum, praesertim cum capita haec paginas plus minus 250 sibi vindicent. Nam multo plures putaverim esse eos, qui scire volunt, num (e.g.) casus genetivi declinationis I finientes in *-aes* in universum inveniantur saepius, quam eos, quibus satis sit scire formam eiusmodi inveniri in nomine *Iunia* (cf. *Iuniaes* p. 82); et etiam hi formam *Iuniaes* in capite III facile invenient (p. 306).

Quod ad caput I attinet, etiam id paululum miror, quod diversae formae et abbreviationes eiusdem vocabuli in lemmata plura sunt divisa; e.g. p. 99 invenimus lemmata 'moni.', 'monim.' (inter 'moni.' et 'monim.' sunt 'Moniani' et 'Monice'), 'monimen.', 'moniment.', '[mo]niment.', etc. (cf. e.g. p. 160 formas diversas vocabuli *uxsor*); at ei, qui scire vult e.g., num *monumentum* inveniatur scriptum *moniment-*, satis esse putaverim, si sciat hanc scribendi rationem in universum, si omnes casus et abbreviationum genera respicis, inveniri septies vel novies vel sim.

Erunt sine dubio etiam qui quaerant, num scriptores 'formam anomalam' recte definiverint; nam inter lemmata non solum formae variae modo quodam aut vetusto aut vulgari scriptae inveniuntur (ut *Abentinus* pro *Aventinus* p. 1, *Septumius* et sim. p. 135), sed etiam menda qui non linguam Latinam, sed habilitatem lapicidarum (aut fortasse etiam imperitiam epigraphicorum) illustrant (e.g. *eerox* pro *ferox* p. 50). Quod ad me attinet, observavi inter nomina hominum adduci formas quae nullo modo 'anomalae' possunt haberi; nam satis bene constat nomina quaedam gentilicia inveniri quae varie terminantur (e.g. *Passenus Passienus Passenius Passienius*), et ego certe nullam de his formis 'anomalam' dici velim. Ita nescio, num p. 49 recte dicatur *Durdenus* scriptum esse pro *Durdenius*, p. 131 *Salvidena* pro *Salvidiena*, p. 13 *Apicato* pro *Apicatio* (nam *Apicatus* videtur esse huius nominis forma usitata). P. 181 (cf. 69) videtur dici praenominis *Gnaei* formam rectam esse *Cnaeus*. P. 52 nescio quo errore affirmetur in titulo 2030 (in Actis Arvalium) *Ennius* positum esse pro *Annius*.

Etiam alia quaedam inveni, quae mihi minus placebant (e.g. p. 51, ubi primum dicitur in titulo 1406 scriptum esse *Egnatis* pro *Egnatiis* – illam formam ego certe non dixerim 'anomalam' – et paulo post additur in titulo re vera inscriptum esse *Egnatiis* littera *i* alteri superimposita; p. 151, ubi inter formas 'anomalas' adducitur *Sal.*, compendium usitatius praenominis *Salvius*). At in universum fatendum est agi de opere utilissimo, praesertim si partem II respicis, in quo, cum agatur de opere satis amplo, menda vel errores aliquot minores deesse non possunt.

Olli Salomies

Supplementa Italica. Nuova Serie 21. Indici dei volumi 15-20 a cura di Claudia Lega e Simona Crea. Edizioni Quasar, Roma 2006. ISBN 88-7140-291-X. 290 pp. EUR 46,48.

Supplementa Italica. Nuova Serie 23. Edizioni Quasar, Roma 2007. ISBN 88-7140-317-7. 526 pp. EUR 46,48.

Volume 21, by Claudia Lega and Simone Crea, is again one consisting of indexes (cf. vols. 7 and 14), this time covering vols. 15 to 20. There is also a section on 'correzioni' to the same volumes (for instance, the index of names to Bergomum in vol. 16 seems to have been redone). As for the indexes, the longest one is that on 'Parole in contesto' (which also functions as an index of names, although one must remember that, in indexes of this type, there can be something between the feminine and the masculine forms of the same name; cf., e.g., Iuniae and Iunii being separated from each other by the name of the month), this being followed by 'Numerali', 'Tipologia dei supporti' (with sections, e.g., on 'anello', 'cinerario', 'erma', 'stele', etc.), 'Materiali' ('pietra', 'marmo', etc.), 'Tecniche di scrittura' ('a solchi', 'a punti', etc.), 'Datazioni' (starting with 'III/II sec. a. C.' and ending with 'VIII/IX sec. d. C.'). At the end, there are substantial 'Conguagli bibliografici' (p. 267–290), listing, e.g., all inscriptions in *CIL* which are mentioned in vols. 15–20. The use of these indexes, of impeccable quality, is so great that this does not have to be pointed out by me.

As for vol. 23, this *Supplementum* is, as observed by Professor Silvio Panciera in the (again interesting) Presentazione (p. 7), the longest of those published so far. In a certain sense, it is more reminiscent of the 'normal' *Supplementum* than the previous volume 22 published in 2004, for that volume consisted of one 'supplementum' and several 'supplementorum supplementa', a category introduced in the same vol. 22. In this new volume, there are five contributions on cities not previously included in the series, whereas the category 'supplementorum supplementa' is represented by the contribution by M. Chelotti on Gnathia. The other contributions are as follows: from regio II, there is Butuntum (Bitonto, only a few kilometres from Bari) by C. S. Fiorello; from regio V, there are Firmum by F. Squadroni and Potentia by S. Antolini; from regio VI, there is Asisium by G. Asdrubali Pentiti (responsible for the new inscriptions), M. C. Spadoni (responsible for the historical instroduction) and E. Zuddas (responsible for the 'aggiunte'), the texts already in *Epigrafi ... di Assisi* of 1987 also being republished (this publication is, by the way, referred to in a possibly correct, but in a not very transparent way, since the author of which there seem to be quite a few of each contribution, rather than the collection as whole, is quoted; it took me some time to realize that references such as 'Bonamente 1987', 'Manca 1987', etc. all refer to the same book); and finally, there is, in regio VI, Matilica by S. M. Marengo. At the end of the volume, there is a second instalment of the extremely useful 'repertorio bibliografico' (a heading also introduced only in vol. 22) by G. L. Gregori.

The individual contributions are, of course, of varying length. In the case of Assisium, the introductory section is more than 100 pages long, and there are 112 texts, whereas Butuntum is introduced in 12 pages and the numbering of the texts presented here (some of them already in *CIL* or *EE*) ends at 10. The relation of the introductions to the sections with the new texts also varies; Firmum has 74 pages of introduction but only 21 new texts, whereas Potentia has 48 new texts (including, e.g., the *fasti* published a few years ago) but 'only' 11 pages of introduction. It must be noted that the length of a contribution has nothing to do with its importance; for instance, if there are only 10 texts from Butuntum, this must be compared not with the size of other contributions but with the fact that, in the time of the *CIL*, practically nothing was known from the place (p. 18). And although the material, as we have it now, does not really give the impression of representing that of a major centre, at least we now know that there were imperial possessions in the area (nos. 4, 5, 6).

Among the inscriptions presented in this volume for the first time, none seem to be of exceptional interest, though there is of course the odd new nomen: *Lacurius* or *Lagurius* in Firmum 8, *Tebedanus* in Asisium 22 (one wonders why there is no reference in the commentary to what is said on p. 329 (on no. 5546) and on p. 335 (on no. 5573)). On the other hand, readings of inscriptions published earlier have in some cases been corrected; e.g., in Firmum 1 (*AE* 1975, 353) F. Squadroni now reads *Noniae He[--]* instead of *Noni A. f. He[--]*, a reading which of course cannot be accepted (as pointed out by me in *Die römischen Vornamen* [1987] p. 418); in Asisium 19 (*AE* 1989, 290), we now read (in a reference to the consuls of 7 BC) *Nerone* and *Pisone* (instead of *Neroni* and *Pisoni*), this eliminating the possibility that someone might get the grotesque idea of thinking this was a dedication 'to the consuls'. This reading must also be taken into consideration in the interpretation of *CIL* XI 5424 (cf. p. 295).

In general, one must say that the quality of scholarship is high. To say nothing of the historical introductions and the sections with 'aggiunte', of great importance and extremely useful, the readings of the inscriptions seem impeccable. Everything is said to elucidate the individual texts in the commentaries. It must, however, be added that sometimes one has the feeling that a bit too much is being offered; one wonders, e.g., whether it was really necessary to say (on p. 86), in the case of a person called T. Appalius Alfinus Secundus, that *Secundus* might also be used as a praenomen; or (on p. 177) that the 'gens Iunia à ben nota a Roma'. On the other hand, there are cases in which a bit more could have been said; e.g., in Butuntum 3 (*AE* 1990, 202) we are given references for both *pietas* and *infatigabilis*, but not for *pietas* being defined as *infatigabilis*, which is in fact an extremely uncommon combination, apparently attested otherwise only in the African inscription *CIL* VIII 14344.

As so much is being offered here, it is no wonder that there are details on which one could disagree. Let me point out some instances. Firmum 13: should one not add, in the beginning, a line with *[ossa]* (this being done in *AE* 1993, 593)? – Potentia 10 (the *fasti Potentini*): in the reading of col. II, line 14, the fact might have been taken into account that a military diploma, published several years ago and duly quoted in *AE* 2003, 588, has shown that the cognomen of the consul L. Iulius was *Frugi* (this rendering also the commentary on p. 186 obsolete). – P. 273 (on no. 5381): as this is a volume in the series *Suppl. It*., it might have been added that the inscription referred to as *AE* 1937, 119 has been later republished as *Suppl. It.* 9 Amiternum 34. – P. 280 (on no. 5391): Volcacii have something to do with Volcasii only in terms of etymology and should not have been mentioned here. (A similar case would be saying that P. Quinctilius Varus was related to the patrician Quinctii; and cf. the Tettii/Tettieni below.) – P. 321: in the commentary on no. 5511, it is most disturbing to find that the nomen *Tettius* is identified, without any mention of doubts, with *Tettienus*, this leading to the introduction, in the bizarrest of ways, into the discussion of the passage Val. Max. 7, 3, 3, where a C. (perhaps 'un errore', the praenomen *Galeo* of the Tettieni being meant) Tettius and his mother Petronia are mentioned, this again (so we are told) furnishing an Augustan date for the amphitheatre of Asisium. But *Tettienus* is not identical with *Tettius* and it would have been better not to spend almost 20 lines for the presentation of all this. Asisium 29: perhaps *Flamini[us]* should have been introduced into the text? Now we have *Plamini[us]* in the text but are told in the commentary that the reading must be *Flamini[us]*. Asisium 36: perhaps *me(n)s(e)rum* rather than *me(n)s(o)rum*? The genitive *menserum* (= *mensium*) is in fact attested (*CIL* IX 820; V 2701; *AE* 1986, 601). P. 433: I think the correct form is *conticesco* (rather than *contecesco*). – Gnathia 51: I must say that I very much prefer the original interpretation of this inscription (*M. Antonius Iulli* [this referring to Iullus Antonius cos. 10 BC] *l. [S]oterichus Archela[vi]anus*, the second cognomen referring to the king of Cappadocia as the former owner of the slave) to that presented here.

These are, however, minor matters, and their mention in this review should not obscure the fact that this is splendid book and a worthy addition to the by now well-established series.

Olli Salomies

SILVIO PANCIERA: *Epigrafi, epigrafia, epigrafisti. Scritti vari editi e inediti (1956-2005) con note complementari e indici*. Vol. 1-3. Vetera 16. Edizioni Quasar, Roma 2006. ISBN 88-7140-306-1. 2189 pp. EUR 270.

This is a truly grand work on a grand scale by one of the most eminent classical scholars of today. Professor Panciera is, of course, a scholar specialising in epigraphy, but epigraphy cannot normally be pursued with success if one knows only something about inscriptions, and Professor Panciera is certainly a marvellous instance of an epigraphical scholar whose writings illustrate, if not the whole field of classical philology, at least significant areas of the subject, including archaeology. (As for classical literature, one notes that the list of "fonti letterarie" cited in these volumes comprises almost 20 pages.) In view of Professor Panciera's scholarship, I think these volumes should be compulsory reading to all those who aspire to a higher understanding of Roman life and culture as illustrated by epigraphy. Whoever first got the idea of collecting, and publishing together, Professor Panciera's articles must be congratulated, as must be all those who were in some way involved in producing these volumes, of whom there is a pretty unobtrusive list on p. 15 (note Professor Gian Luca Gregori having been responsible for the 'peso editoriale'). Professor Panciera's own contribution to the genesis of this volume is, however, most notable, since he has himself furnished immensely useful addenda to all the items republished here, often of considerable length.

As one learns from the 'Avvertenza edizionale' on p. 17, all the papers republished (or sometimes published here for the first time, as there are a number of unpublished items, listed on the same page) here have been reset, but given in the original version (with the original pages being indicated in the margin), with only a few errors having been corrected "tacitamente". There are thus no additions in the text of the individual contributions (thus we find references to works which, as we now know, will never materialize, e.g., p. 1764); I have been wondering whether it might not have been a good idea to add references of the type "[= sopra pp. xx]" whenever Professor Panciera quotes his own publications (for instance, someone observing on p. 1419, n. 17, that Professor Panciera has also published something on the same subject in a publication which seems to be dedicated to Byzantine Ravenna, might be relieved to find out that this contribution can in fact be consulted in the same volume a few pages earlier).

In any case, what one finds here is more than 2,000 pages of very solid scholarship covering 50 years starting with 1956, followed by no less than 166 pages of indexes in a separate volume. The papers appear under the following headings: "Ab initio rei publicae liberae ad aetatem Augusti" (with contributions not earlier than 1989, indicating perhaps a light shift in Professor Panciera's interests), 'Urbs Roma' (apparently, and understandably, the longest section), 'Municipia coloniaeque', 'Viri feminaeque notabiles' (in this section we find, e.g., memorable contributions on senators such as those on L. Caesonius Ovinius (etc.) Bassus and L. Pomponius Bassus Cascus Scribonianus), 'Milites', 'Magistri, sodales, itineris comites' (mainly obituaries), 'Libros iudicare aut in lucem prodere' (reviews), 'Varia cum artis epigraphicae doctrina et usu coniuncta' (a rather mixed section including, e.g., the instructive introductions to the volumes of the *Supplementa Italica*, but also a heading 'Onomastica', with, e.g., the well-known contribution on the nomenclature of the consul of AD 13). The whole collection is preceded by a chapter 'Cinquant' anni' which serves as a sort of introduction but which also includes, e.g., some interesting autobiographical details.

It is not easy to evaluate the output of a scholar whose eminence is obvious on every single page, and so it might be advisable for me to stop here. In spite of this, there is one point which I would like to touch upon. Most of the ancient Latin inscriptions, of which there are, of course, hundreds of thousands, are on the whole fairly easy to understand and to explain, though naturally always requiring some experience (the lack of which being apparent, e.g., in epigraphical commentaries one finds in some archaeological publications). But there are always troublesome texts which require more than just the normal amount of annotation. One observes, when reading Professor Panciera's work, that the number of difficult and even singular inscriptions being studied is surprisingly high (one thinks, e.g., of the inscription with *in operis publicis*, p. 825ff., but there are many similar cases); this seems to point to the conclusion that Professor Panciera is not at all reluctant to deal with complicated inscriptions, and may in fact prefer dealing with such texts, leaving the less problematic texts to others (often, it seems, his own students).

The volumes have been produced with great care, and I have been able to observe only very few misprints (e.g., p. 178 n. 19: *C.* instead of *L. Mitreius*; p. 815: *ILS* 1469 instead of 1496; p. 995 n. 48: perhaps p. 46 rather than 4446; p. 996: Virius Lupus seems to have been the ordinary, not a suffect consul of AD 278; p. 1040, no. 13: Lollia instead of Pollia; p. 1116: *Gau[de]ns lib.* rather than *l.*; p. 1539, last line: 1863 instead of 1853; p. 1621: my colleague Heikki Solin seems to have lost an *i*). As for details one could argue about, I am not sure the two Aspri, consuls in 212, should be adduced as parallels for the two Herennii, consuls in 85 (p. 1050 n. 21), as Asper the Elder was consul for the second time. These are, of course, only matters of minimal importance.

To conclude, this is a work of great importance which should be constantly consulted by all scholars and students of things Roman. Professor Panciera's elegant style (for a memorable formulation note, e.g., the observation on the importance of Professor Giuseppe Camodeca's work on p. 760, in the 'Nota complementare') will make the consultation a pleasure.

Olli Salomies

Army and Power in the Ancient World. Edited by ANGELOS CHANIOTIS and PIERRE DUCREY. HABES – Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien 37. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2002. ISBN 3-515-08197-6. VIII, 204 pp. EUR 44.

This collection of articles has its origins in the Nineteenth International Congress of Historical Sciences held in Oslo, August 2000. The collection contains twelve articles which vary greatly in their geographical and chronological subject matter, although all examine the relationship between the army and political power in the ancient world. Six of these articles are individual presentations, while the other six form three pairs, in which the second article of a pair provides a critique of the presentation preceding it.

In the first article Walter Mayer (pp. 3–23) examines the highly militarised society of ancient Assyria, where the king was responsible for leading all military campaigns in person. His survey begins with the analysis of the available sources and continues to discuss the recruiting, logistics and structure of the Assyrian army including its use of specialised troops such as archers and sappers. In the end Mayer argues that it was the over-militarising of the society that overstressed the available resources which led to Assyria‘s eventual downfall. The second article (pp. 25–37), written by Romila Thapar, is concerned with the relationship between the complexity of the state and the organisation of a regular army in India during the fifth and fourth centuries BCE. After examining the size and administration of the different divisions of the army (elephants, chariots, cavalry and infantry) within the limitations of the traditional caste system, Thapar argues that the army had a very limited role in the politics of the state.

The role of the military prowess in the succession of the Achaemenid dynasty is the subject of the next article by Pierre Briant (pp. 39–49). In his analysis of the difference between the theoretical process and the violent reality, Briant considers the value of royal lineage over the victories of rival claimants in the Achaemenid propaganda and expresses criticism of the interpretation of the Persian customs and laws described by later Greek sources. Pierre Ducrey (pp. 51–60) discusses the relationship between political power and military command in Greece from the Bronze Age to Alexander the Great. In this general survey he examines how military success could be turned into political power and stresses the counterweight provided by the army against the political ambitions of their commanders and kings.

In the first article pair, Hans van Wees (pp. 61–82) discusses the relationship between the ownership of specific types of weaponry, compulsory military service and political rights in the Classical Greece. Theories expressed already by Aristotle that there was a connection between different types of government (tyranny, oligarchy, and democracy) and different types of armed forces (cavalry, hoplites, and navy) and adopted as such by modern scholars, raise objections from van Wees, who prefers to see the alterations in the form of government as a work of small independent groups who were attached to each other through political preferences or personal friendship. In response to this Vincent Gabrielsen (pp. 83–98) agrees to the main points expressed by van Wees, but disagrees on certain details. He also provides more specific examinations of the hoplite *katalogos* and the Solonian property classes which were mentioned by van Wees in his argumentation, but not elaborated on.

In the second article pair Angelos Chaniotis (pp. 99–13) examines the boundaries between foreign garrisons and local citizens in Greek cities during the Hellenistic period. In this he does not concentrate only on the fears caused by these garrisons, but also on the events of civic life in which the members of the garrison participated and the monarchical ideology that was spread through their actions. In his response, John Ma (pp. 115–122) wholeheartedly agrees with the argumentation presented by Chaniotis and further emphasizes the economical factors caused by foreign garrisons. He also takes a closer look at the cases where the soldiers of the garrisons were billeted amongst the town people thus creating closer contacts and exchange of customs between the two groups.

In the next article Géza Alföldy (pp. 123–150) examines the possibilities of social mobility provided by the Roman army. Not content to merely present the general patterns of social advancement in the Roman army, Alföldy also examines the ways in which Roman emperors were able to manipulate the channels of advancement to their own advantage by promoting ambitious men and thus earning their loyalty. Yann Le Bohec (pp. 151–165) in his turn examines the maintenance of order in Gaul during the civil war of 69 CE. In his analysis he attempts to clarify whether the Gallo-Germanic uprising had some nationalistic aspirations as suggested by Tacitus or whether it was merely another military uprising occasioned by the turbulent period of civil wars.

In the final article pair Brian Campbell (pp. 167–180) provides an examination of the Roman army as a force of occupation. Although he does discuss the role of the army as protector of frontiers and internal security, he concentrates more on the negative phenomena in the conduct and behaviour of the Roman soldiers. In his response, Benjamin Isaac (pp. 181–191) does not provide much criticism of the arguments expressed by Campbell, but instead focuses on the known instances when the Roman army or its personnel individually resorted to personal aggrandizement and terrorisation of the civilian population. Although undoubtedly the Roman army occasionally behaved in a rather oppressive and high-handed manner towards the civilians, the description as a brutal occupying force keeping the provincial population under control provided by Isaac seems a rather one-sided image of the Roman army.

Although all these articles are quite valuable on their own specific subject it is the three pairs of articles that provide the most interesting aspect in the publication. The sense of real debate evolving between the authors provides a deep and occasionally multifaceted image of the subject at hand.

Kai Juntunen

NEVILLE MORLEY: *Trade in Classical Antiquity*. Key Themes in Ancient History. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-63416-8. XIV, 118 pp. GBP 40.

In this book, Neville Morley (hereafter M.) continues with the themes familiar from his previous work. The book is an introduction to the central themes and questions in research on the ancient economy, concentrating on various aspects of trade in the classical world. The first chapter ("Trade and the ancient economy") begins appropriately with a description of a shipwreck found off the coast of Italy. This introduces the reader to M.'s theme in the chapter: the new approaches to the study of the ancient economy. Most new questions seem to arise from archaeological contexts, and these have led to redefinitions of old problems. M. questions the ahistorical nature of certain basic assumptions in modern discussions of the ancient economy, especially the assumed universality of economic rationality, and proposes alternative approaches, which he proceeds to explore in the subsequent chapters.

The second chapter ("Ecology and economics") analyses trade in the context of geographical diversity in the Mediterranean region. M. begins with the main problem of resource acquisition, which ranges from forceful acquisition by conquest to trade, and shows how the ancient sources already show an understanding of the necessities of resource distribution: everything was not available everywhere, and even though it might have been available, it might be less expensive or of higher quality elsewhere. Uncertainty and costs were the downside of the prolonged routes of resource acquisition, and M. nicely demonstrates how the need for security combined with a need for money could result in strategies that might seem primitive for us, but were still perfectly valid responses to the demands of the environment.

In the third chapter ("Commodities and consumption") M. takes this model beyond pure ecological determinism by introducing the cultural practices of consumption. This is a long chapter, as it deals with many themes, such as a) consumption as a social practice of display and competition for social status and power; b) the position of luxury items in long-distance trade in the economic theories of the 18^{th} century and Egyptian papyri; c) the amount of resources that could be allocated to conspicuous consumption by peasant farmers; and d) the role of cities and armies as sources of demand. The chapter is by necessity quite superficial, but achieves its aim in showing the heterogeneous nature of consumption in Roman culture. M. convincingly demonstrates that consumption does not equal simply meeting basic material needs, but is a practice used to position oneself in one's culture.

In the fourth chapter ("Institutions and Infrastructure"), M. switches the focus to traders and commerce. He concentrates on the policies of states regarding commerce and the institutions needed for a functional trade system. At first, he briefly analyses ancient Athens and its commercial policy and then turns to the institutions of concern to the individual traders – the standardised and state-guaranteed weights and measures and procedures for enforcing agreements and resolving disputes. In the end, he analyses the role of institutions, both public (state) and private, in investments in commerce. His conclusion in this chapter is that even though states did not have active commercial policies in the modern sense of the concept, they still played an important role in the development of commerce through their position as regulatory authorities, and – above all – their role as consumers and creators of demand.

The fifth chapter of the book ("Markets, merchants and morality") has a slightly misleading title, as it concentrates on the functions of markets and trade on a more concrete level. M. introduces three separate themes: the functioning of the actual market places; commercialising the surplus of villas in a elite culture dominated by a strong distaste for trade and commerce; and the relation of the elite cultures both in Greece and Rome to the new commercial practices that replaced the old, gift-exchange based redistribution of products.

The sixth chapter concludes the study with the concept of "Globalisation". M. points out the limits of this process, and how most of the Greek and Roman people still lived in near-subsistence economies. Markets did exists and surplus was traded, but this formed only a limited part of the economy of small farmers; M. argues that even though the members of the Roman state perhaps shared a surprisingly global view of themselves as members in a large Empire, this was well in advance of the commercialisation of this global identity. The limits set by the slowness of travel and cost of transport limited the globalisation of the economy to trade in luxury products and state-sponsored food staples.

In a book of this size, most of the interesting questions presented cannot be accessed with adequate detail – a deficiency which M. himself acknowledges. In fact, this is not a full-scale monograph on the subject, but – as the series title suggests – an introduction to a key theme in ancient history, and this purpose the book fulfils perfectly. Research on ancient economies has become a labyrinth of discussions, where different scholarly traditions collide, often resulting in incomprehensibility. M. has produced a book that serves as a good introduction to these collisions.

Harri Kiiskinen

Greek and Roman Actors. Aspects of an Ancient Profession. Edited by PAT EASTERLING and EDITH HALL. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002. ISBN 0-521-65140-9. XXXII, 510 pp, 2 maps. GBP 65.

This collection of 20 articles addresses the topic of ancient actors: all aspects of their art (singing, dancing, gesturing) as well as their social standing and attitudes towards actors and acting in the ancient world. The time span covered reaches from classical Athens to the Byzantine period. Approaches range widely, from the publication of new pictorial graffiti to rather philosophical essays. All writers are acknowledged experts in their field. Following the table of contents, the first pages are taken up by lists of illustrations, contributors and abbreviations as well as an informative preface by the editors and two very useful maps of the ancient Mediterranean world. Of the contributions in the first part ("The art of the actor"), each tries to answer a specific question around this fascinating and controversial profession by taking into account all possible sources of information – which is understandable as, for the most part (of what still at best remains our approximation of) the complete picture has to be put together from little bits of scattered and very heterogeneous information, especially regarding the actual art of the actor, the way he performed, gestured, moved, spoke and sang on the stage. This evidence consists mainly of an odd combination of elite attitudes of the philosophers and other literary authors, and representations on vase paintings and other pictorial sources. Especially interesting is the contribution of Hall on the important but half-forgotten aspect of much of ancient theatre: singing actors. Other rewarding chapters in this part are that of Csapo's on the limits of realistic acting in classical times and that of Handley's on action and language in Menander. Sifakis offers an outline of Aristotle's views on acting, and Green a careful analysis of vase paintings and terracotta figurines in a search for a reconstruction of performance style. The second part ("The professional world") deals with the practicalities in the social life and organisation of actors and dancers. In this chapter, the evidence is also divided between the more or less prejudiced elite testimonies and anecdotes, and the documentary material (inscriptions, papyri, paintings, reliefs, etc.). The contributions of Lightfoot, Brown and Webb are particularly interesting (on the *technitai* of Dionysos in the Hellenistic age, on actors and management in the plays of Plautus and Terence, and on female performers in Late Antiquity, respectively). There is also highly interesting material published by Roueché (pictorial graffiti from Ephesus). The last part ("The idea of the actor") takes the discussion onto the level of subjective experiences and ideas. Of these contributions, that of Fantham, on the often made comparison between the actor and the orator (concentrating on Quintilian), is the most interesting. The volume closes with a glossary of theatrical terms in Greek and Latin, a bibliography and two indices (major ancient passages cited and a general index).

Hilla Halla-aho

Myth and Symbol I. Symbolic phenomena in ancient Greek culture. Edited by SYNNØVE DES BOUVRIE. Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 5. The Norwegian Institute at Athens, Bergen 2002. ISBN 978-82-91626-21-5, ISSN 1105-4204. 332 pp. GBP 25.

Myth and Symbol II. Symbolic phenomena in ancient Greek culture. Edited by SYNNØVE DES BOUVRIE. Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 7. The Norwegian Institute at Athens, Bergen 2004. ISBN 978-82-91626-22-2, ISSN 1105-4204. 391 pp. GBP 40.

These two volumes contain collections of papers delivered at three international symposia arranged by The Norwegian Institute at Athens in 1998, 2000, and 2004. The proceedings of the first symposium, which was held at the University of Tromsø, were published in the first volume (14 papers), while the second volume contains contributions of the second and the third symposia held in Athens (17 papers). The then director of the Norwegian Institute at Athens, Synnøve des Bouvrie (hereafter B.), contributed both as the editor and by writing not only introductions for both volumes but also two other papers. In all, these two volumes include studies on varied subjects from 23 scholars, some of them contributing to both volumes.

B's introductory paper in the first volume ('The definition of myth. Symbolic phenomena in ancient culture') serves as an explanation for the name of the Symposium. B. gives a good synopsis of the basic earlier concepts of myth or mythical tales (Vol. I pp. 22–25), but on the whole, her identification of mythical tales with symbolic tales seems not to be succesful. While B. leans on insights from the field of anthropology concerning the concept of symbol, it does not become quite clear what she means by "symbolic phenomena". Furthermore, if mythical tales are "manifestations of the 'symbolic' phenomena" (Vol. I p. 16), and these phenomena "includes narratives, which we may call 'symbolic tales'" (op.cit. p. 60), we seem to have two new concepts to define and a *circulus vitiosus* as well. But then, if "symbolic tales" are seen to be effective means of reflecting on, maintaining, but also revising collective experiences and cultural patterns along with values, as B. seems to think, what does this notion add to our concept of myths (or mythical tales)? When moving to the individual level, she strives to clarify the concept of *pensée mythique* with psychological views, which results in classifying the features of "symbolic tales" with the obscure language of popular psychology, e.g., as "nothing less than verbal magic, created by the dominance of the right hemisphere processes" (op.cit. p. 61). In the second volume, B. states that it is "the specific social context that may cause so-called 'mythical' [...] tales to function as 'symbols', in the sense of collective expressions or mobilising force" (p. Vol. II, p. 7). However, if we put 'traditional tales' and 'myths' in place of 'mythical tales' and 'symbols', the sentence reveals its flatness.

In spite of this discussion, the concept of myth varies from paper to paper in both volumes and the concept of 'symbol' is hardly treated at all. Nonetheless, one possible connection between these two concepts is more or less presented in two papers in the first volume, namely that a different culture's (e.g. our own) interpretation of myths (e.g., Greek myths) is always "symbolical": the interpreter cuts the myths off from their complex context and then we have symbols, not myths. Furthermore, while myths are deep-rooted in the culture where they are born, symbols can pass from culture to culture more or less intact (see Marjatta Nielsen's 'Greek myths – Etruscan symbols' and Kirsti K. Simonsuuri's 'Rethinking Sisyphos' in the first volume).

The papers in the first volume are described and reviewed, e.g., by E. Anagnostou-Laoutides and B.B. Powell (*The Classical Review* 56.2, 2006: 496–498 and *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2004.01.16, respectively). Because these reviews are easily accessible via the Internet, I summarise here only the papers in the second volume arranged according to common thematic aspects. In both volumes, the papers are not put in any particular order.

In the second volume, several writers discuss orality and/or performance of myths – this results from the subtitle of the third symposium ('Myth and symbol. Their occasion, audiences, and performance in ancient culture'). William Hansen contributed two short papers: 'Cognition and affect in oral narration', which is mostly concerned with the modern tradition of the story of 'The Sailor and the Oar', which occurs in the *Odyssey* and appears again, e.g., in the legend of St. Elias. Hansen's other paper ('Reading embedded narrative') gives examples of the myths in narrative contexts, sometimes framed by the narrator's comments, e.g., Achilles' unexpected (for a modern reader) use of the myth of Niobe when meeting Priam at the end of the *Iliad*. Jan Bremmer concentrates on the performance situation of myths ('Performing myths. Women's homes and men's *leschai*'), clearly showing by the length of his reports that our knowledge of women performing myths is very scarce compared to that of men. One example of the former presented by Bremmer is to be found in a fragment of Euripides, where a woman relates an Orphic cosmogony myth, which she has learned from her mother. Minna Skafte Jensen's point of view towards orality is the recording process and its possible influence on the narrative ('Myth and poetry in Archaic Greece. A comparative approach'). She reports the results of Finnish folklorist Lauri Honko and his research team, which taped a poem of over 16,000 verses performed by a narrator in 1990 in South Kanara, India. The singing took over a week's time. Skafte Jensen compares the situation with Homeric diction, pondering the division of the epics into books, whether it reflects the process of dictation or performance.

Several writers present iconographical material. Marjatta Nielsen gives new interpretations to two funerary reliefs, one Etruscan and one Greek. The latter one is the famous 4th century BC *naiskos* relief found in the Ilissos river bed, and the title of her paper ('The three ages of man') refers to the interpretation of this work of art. John Henderson handles images of a much later age, namely of nineteenth-century Danish neoclassicism ('Myth embedded in culture. The murals of Thorvaldsen's Museum, Copenhagen'). Henderson shows how the frieze of the museum by the famous Danish artist portrays the mythical themes of Thorvaldsen's work, but also the myth of the artist himself. David Jordan also has iconographical elements as a starting-point in his analysis of the descriptions of the initiation into the mysteries, but the main point in his paper is the striking interpretation of Plato's *Protagoras* and the traveller's tale in the opening of Apuleius' *Golden Ass* as latent tales or parodies of purification and initiation ('Two descriptions of *myêsis*'). Jordan uses Plato's *Phaedrus* and one of the tales of the Brothers Grimm (*The Goose Girl*) as intertextual references. Hélène Whittaker analyses both iconographical and textual material in her paper on board games as symbols of the game of life ('Board games and funeral symbolism in Greek and Roman contexts'). Jutta Stroszeck also presents several illustrations of the visible symbols of Greek victories erected either immediately or some time after a battle ('Greek trophy monuments').

In addition to the introduction, des Bouvrie contributed a paper successfully combining the genre of the victory ode with the athletic contests, focusing especially on the Olympic festivals and Olympia as a "summarising symbol" ('Olympia and the epinikion. A creation of symbols'). Pierre Vidal-Naquet's paper also reflects on the symbolic and mythic values of places which, in his examples, are culturally widely apart: the utopian country of Atlantis and the Jewish historical fortress town of Masada, both of which suffered catastrophic destruction ('De l'Atlantide a Masada. Réflexions sur querelle, mythe, histoire et politique'). He argues that both places have had a powerful impact on nationality, the stronger one being, of course, Masada on Jewish identity. Vidal-Naquet mentions some curious revivals of the Atlantis myth, e.g., the notions of the seventeenth centure Swedish scholars that the Swedes were the descendants of the Atlantic race.

Pierre Ellinger begins with the name Pausanias and its etymology ("the end of evils") and then discusses the same kinds of phrases (e.g., *anapaula kakôn*), which sometimes refer to death; he concludes with phrases in which the end of all evils can be seen as the most evil thing ('La fin des maux. Un nom – Pausanias – et un symbole (d'Homère à Pausanias le Périégète, en passant par Platon)').

Three papers place special attention on gender roles. Christoph Auffarth deals with Aristophanes' *Women at the Ecclesia* ('Let women speak in the Assembly. Symbolic reversals in Aristophanes' *Ekklesiazousai*'). According to Auffarth, Aristophanes' later comedies have "certain mythical elements" due to their occurrences in festivals with their ritual actions. The rules of the festival function in a different way than the rules of everyday life and thus made possible an inversion of gender roles. Louise Brut Zaidman's concern about Euripides' *Hippolytos* is the opposition between two ideas of sexuality manifested by two goddesses: Artemis and Aphrodite. Hippolytus' extreme chastity is contrasted with Phaidra's *amour fou* and incestuous sexual drives ('Mythe et symbole religieux dans l'*Hippolyte* d'Euripide. Hippolyte entre Artémis et Aphrodite'). The notion of gender and the relationship between generations is also under scrutiny in Virgilio Masciardi's paper on Hypsipyle ('Hypsipyle et ses sœurs. Notes d'analyse structurale et historique'). Masciardi's approach is Lévi-Straussian, and he compares the myth of Hypsipyle to three other myths by constructing binary oppositions inside and between them: the Pelasgians, the Danaids and one Hittite myth of a queen, who bore thirty sons and thirty daughters and drowned the former in a river. The myths tell the story of massacre conducted by women, but also a denial of it, displayed by one woman (Hypsipyle, Hypermnestra).

The myth of the Pelasgians is also the subject of the most substantial contribution to this volume, the paper written by Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood ('Reading a myth, reconstructing its constructions'). First, she discusses the definition of myth and why myths are especially vulnerable to reductionist approaches – in this case, to political explanations. Sourvinou-Inwood has also elsewhere argued for the concept of myth as the constructions of mythic schemata, that is, of categories of assumptions, which occur modified in different myths. As the results of her insightful analysis, she presents some of the mythical schemata of the Pelasgian myth (e.g., "perceptions pertaining to a community's vulnerability through its women", "the importance of legitimate sons").

As such, both volumes contain many stimulating studies of myths in their cultural, literal and social context.

Tua Korhonen

SIMON GOLDHILL: *Who Needs Greek? Contests in the Cultural History of Hellenism*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002. ISBN 0-521-01176-0. VIII, 326 pp., 20 figs. GBP 15.95.

In his introduction, G. informs us that this book is "not a history of classical scholarship [...]. Nor is it a history of the 'reception' of Greek texts in the West [...]. Nor is it a history of education, nor a plea for a place for Greek in the modern curriculum" (p. 3). The book consists of five chapters, five intense contests about Greek and "Greekness", which, however, due to G.'s interdisciplinary and anti-chronological approach – and meandering style – contains less than clear-cut "cases". G.'s essayist and associative mind leaps easily back and forth from the first century BC to Victorian scholars. He has an eye for bizarre and delightful details and the history of passion for Greek and Greekness certainly includes many eccentric personalities. We may question G.'s choice of cases or examples as especially telling, of which he is aware since he also lists other contests which should be included in the full history of this area of study (p. 9) – an area whose terminology is still arbitrary: we speak about Hellenism or Greekness, and of Greekomania or Grecomania and sometimes even Philhellenism as a broader term.

G. begins with Erasmus who stimulated knowledge of Greek as a translator of the New Testament but also as an advocate of the new educational system including Greek. Despite the heading ('Learning Greek is heresy! Resisting Erasmus'), this chapter is concerned more with Erasmus' own Grecomania than a detailed analysis of the opposition he met when trying to promote Greek learning. What I felt especially missing in G.'s account was the contest between the advocates and adversaries of "eastern" Greekness (the Greekness of the former Byzantine Empire). This controversy was acute during the Renaissance, but also continued into the sixteenth and even to the seventeenth century in some parts of Europe. It turned up not only in the way in which Greek was taught, but also, e.g., in the conflict over correct

Greek pronunciation, a subject which G. deals with. When speaking about the resistance to Greek education in the sixteenth century, one could have also discussed the contest between the vernacular and Latin: Greek was sometimes paired with the vernacular (especially in France) when the hegemony of Latin was called into question. Part of this chapter was later published in G.'s *Love, Sex, & Tragedy. How the Ancient World Shapes Our Lives* (2004), which addresses a larger public.

Erasmus' admiration for Lucian functions as a link to the next chapter ('Becoming Greek, with Lucian'). First, G. discusses the way in which the constant "I" speaker in Lucian's works constructs for us a picture of this author. Then he picks up passages of Lucian's satires from the standpoint of a Syrian whose "education in Greekness" was necessary in order to have the career of an intellectual in the Greco-Roman world. This education entails all the social discomfort of a *homo novus* who has to pay keen attention not only to how to speak and write Attic Greek, but also how to behave in the sophisticated manner of the time. G. also discusses the later re-evaluation (or rather devaluation) of Lucian towards the end of the nineteenth century, especially in Germany. An author, whose works had been used as basic texts in schools from the Renaissance onwards, was later devalued as an imitator of "pure" Greekness and lacking originality. As reasons for this, G. presents the influence of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, but also the once influential, now forgotten anti-Semitic work by a certain Chamberlain (1899), which was positively cited even in the Pauly-Wissowa article on Lucian.

The hostile reception of the first performance of Richard Strauss' opera *Elektra* in London in 1910 is the core of G.'s third case ('Blood from the shadows: Strauss' disgusting, degenerate *Elektra*'). G. describes how the "oriental" and expressive staging and acting of this performance as well as the image of Electra as a hysterical, mad woman revolted Victorian Classicism's image of glorious Greece. The libretto of this opera was adapted from Hugo von Hofmannsthal's *Electra*, which, for its part, was based on Sophocles. The new notions of Greekness are expressed in Hofmannsthal's distress at the inability to feel any Winkelmanian sublimation when visiting the Acropolis: "This was Athens. Athens? So this was Greece, this antiquity. A sense of disappointment overwhelmed me..." (p. 144). Hofmannsthal's modernity is contrasted with the traditional concept of the idealizing Hellenism of Richard Wagner along with the discussion already started in the previous chapter about the importance of "the divine Hellenes" (especially the Dorian race) to German national identity. In this context, G. ranges over Nazism, but fails to mention that Hitler also advocated "the ideal of Hellenic culture" (*Mein Kampf*, Vol. 2, chapter 2).

The fourth chapter ('Who knows Greek') is the largest in the book. It concentrates on Greekness in the Victorian and Edwardian eras, when Greek was still part of cultural "knowingness", but was already declining and defending its privileged status as part of the curriculum. G. begins with Thomas De Quincey's bold assertions of his excellence in Greek (he translated newspaper articles into Greek while reading them), and why this excellence was so important to De Quincey – or the lack of knowledge of Greek so movingly lamentable for John Keats. However, the main concentration is on three men: the politician Robert Lowe, the writer Matthew Arnold and a Cambridge Don, Walter Hedlam, who all expressed not only educational but political arguments about the role of Greek in English and American culture, especially the reasons why Greek was necessary for an educated man in an age where science and professional specialising was beginning to have more place. That knowing Greek indicated privileged class and high social status which differentiated those having this knowledge from the unsophisticated masses was no longer an adequate reason to promote Greek learning.

The fifth part is about 'cultural forgetting', as G. put it, namely "how personal and institutional interests work to refashion and to silence the authors" (p. 299), in this case Plutarch ('The value of Greek. Why save Plutarch?'). G. argues how Plutarch himself had to "reinvent" his Greekness at the beginning of the dominance of Greece by the Roman Empire. By listing some texts from *Moralia* as well as from *Lives*, G. emphasises how Plutarch – like Lucian – was part of the educational curriculum since the Renaissance. For some reason, G. ignores the pseudo-Plutarchean *De liberis educandis*, which was one of the most common Greek texts for beginners from Byzantine times to the Age of Enlightenment. According to G., Plutarch was also seen as an apostle of liberty during the French revolution, and an important author for such different authors as Montaigne and Rousseau. However, like Lucian, his works experienced a drastic withdrawal from the curriculum at the end of the nineteenth century. G. puts the blame on academic criticism which saw Plutarch as "an incoherent collector of other people's knowledge" and the re-evaluation of the Victorians who dismissed him as a "small-town antiquarian" (p. 288). If earlier Plutarch was seen as a revolutionary, he was now seen as a petit bourgeois, a second-rate mind. This chapter also functions as a warm apology for Plutarch, giving reasons why he should be more widely read than he is today.

In all, this book is mostly a delightful reading experience. Goldhill is a storyteller and the book is valuable as a source for ideas for a more thorough investigation within a theoretical framework (e.g., imagology). The details which G. provides are, however, overwhelming – an index rerum would have been very useful – and the place of some anecdotes is certainly in the footnotes. G. offers a reasonable picture of how the answers to the questions "Who knows Greek?" and "What has it meant to know Greek?" have varied in different times. Although he often bases his argumentation in earlier research, he also frequently manages to provide unfamiliar evidence (re-reading Lucian, Plutarch, Erasmus' letters) and new connections. His central argument about Greekness as not only a constructed quality, but also as a self-formative act for western intellectuals is – if not altogether new – at least unfamiliar while discussing the debate about cultural and national identities. And why have these passionate, past conflicts about Greek usually escaped our notice? Maybe because "Greekness" means much less for us than all these Grecomaniacs presented in this book.

Tua Korhonen

PAUL. W. LUDWIG: *Eros & Polis. Desire and Community in Greek Political Theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002. ISBN 0-521-810365-5. XIII, 398 pp. GBP 47.50.

At first sight, the title of Ludwig's book is startling since one would not spontaneously connect such concepts as *eros* and *polis*. On the other hand, the title fits well with concepts of 21st-century society, according to which everything can be associated with sex, and when sizing this book, I was waiting (hoping?) for some kind of version of an ancient "Sex and the City". But, of course, "sex and the city" is not the correct way to read the title, and if *eros* and *polis* are interpreted as "sex" or "love" and "politics", the name of the book becomes less astonishing. In fact, the same year as Ludwig published his book, another work with very similar subject matter appeared: Victoria Wohl: Love Among the Ruins: The Erotics of Democracy in Classical Athens (Princeton 2002). Today, thanks to the rapid flow of information, everyone is very well informed of the latest sex scandals of Anglo-American politicians (extra-marital adventures of political figures are not as quickly labelled as scandals in France and Italy, it seems), and the connection between political power and sex seems to be self-evident. Ludwig's book, however, is not simply about "sex and politics" either, but a more complicated study on ancient Greek political discourse and different aspects of "love". Despite the raffish title, the book is also very much a study on the Platonic theory of love and ideal society as portrayed in the *Symposium* and *Republic*.

My difficulty in fully digesting the book had a lot to do with the title itself, or rather, the definition of *eros*. Although it is true, of course, that it is difficult to separate and define exactly the different Greek words meaning love (ἔρως, φιλία, ἀφροδίσια plus derivative nouns and verbs), most people would probably agree that, e.g., parental love, sexual attraction, love of one's country or hometown, and love of food are not same things. Ludwig admittedly tries to define his usage of *eros*, e.g., as compared to K.J. Dover's (*Greek Homosexuality*, 1989), but in a way, the reader remains confused: should different forms of *eros* be seen as representations of the same "feeling" and be traced back to the same source or not? To me, L. seems to argue that there is basically only one *eros*, with the limitation that higher (political) *eros* can be felt only when the basic needs are satisfied (thus, love of food is left out of the definition of *eros*). L. also supports the use of the term "political eros" by stating that in ancient thinking, *eros* formed a bridge between the private and public spheres.

The aim of the study (p. 3) is to find out whether there are suggestions of *eros* being political or made political. It also asks what is the significance of homoeroticism within the Athenian democratic system and how sexual desire in its different forms is reflected in political life. The cases studied are rivalry between lovers, relationship between older and younger lover, *eros* as *hybris* (*i.e.,* aggressiveness connected with or caused by *eros*), and the "sublimation" of *eros*. The method of the study is literary-philological, but it also makes use of sociology and psychology, and even post-modern theories of *eros*.

To make the task even more ambitious, the author wants to "bring the ancient political discourse into dialogue with modern political thinking and selected contemporary authors". The author, however, has found himself in a situation where the material under investigation grew extensively, so he has narrowed it down (to Plato's *Symposium* and *Republic*, Aristophanes' *Knights*, *Birds* and *Clouds* and Thucydides for the most part), which has led to some oddities: I found it surprising that Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazousae* and *Lysistrata* have been left out. In fact, I found it strange that L. takes the trouble to explain the inclusion of Aristophanes "in the ranks of serious political thinkers".

The study is divided into three main sections, progressing from "individual love" to patriotism and imperialism. There are some recurring themes throughout the study; e.g., does *eros*, especially political *eros*, always represent some form of "love of one's own" (οἰκειότης)? Or does it contain higher tones, is it an equivalent with love of goodness and beauty? Much of the book is also about the status and importance of homosexuality and educational pederasty, which seem to be embedded in ancient Greek culture.

The first two chapters concentrate on Plato's *Symposium*, which introduces "the ladders of levels of love" in speeches by different persons. L.'s starting point is the speech of Aristophanes, the famous myth of first "race", creatures in globular form. These creatures were cut into two parts by Zeus as a punishment, and after that, were looking for their other halves. One of the questions put to the reader is, should we understand Plato's Aristophanes as favouring homosexual love which, according to the myth, is said to result in work, activity and success in politics. Or does the fact that the myth is put into Aristophanes' mouth, a comedian and a satirist, mean that Plato in fact favours heterosexual love, which concentrates on family? L.'s discussion on the matter is fascinating and versatile and makes good observations on Aristophanes' position in the speech: we do have an ironic portrait of Socrates in Aristophanes' plays, hence Aristophanes' speech must be put in context in Plato's works respectively and thus, we could have an equally ironic portrait of Aristophanes and his ideas in the *Symposium*. L. also indicates that Aristophanes' speech functions as a transition between Phaedrus' and Pausanias' views, according to which homosexual *eros* creates strength in communities, and Socrates' speech in which *philosophia* is represented as the highest form of *eros*. In his plays Aristophanes, criticizes political pederasty as a system, where one climbs in political hierarchy not because of talent or devotion, but by having sex with the right men. Thus, L. looks further into Aristophanes' character and position in the *Symposion* and compares his views as represented in his plays. He concludes that the comedian's pacifist tendency could also be linked with his support for heterosexual love, homosexual love being based hevily on *philotimia* and creating aggressiveness. L. explores in a credible way the relationship between irony, satire and the concept of political pederasty. L. shows in his discussion on the argumentation on *pro* and *contra* the "naturalness" of homosexuality that the apparently favourable attitude of Aristophanes' speech towards homosexuality should be put in proper context both in the Platonic and Aristophanic world. At this point, L. poses the central question: does love of one's own mean narrow (but safe) heterosexual *eros*, which is consummated in producing a child, or the higher, homosexual *eros*, which produces social activity but aggressive behaviour as well?

L. finishes the first part of the book by placing the results of his study in the context of modern discourse. Interestingly, L. points out the problem of modern, tolerant democracy that makes it difficult to maintain unconventionality, and which, little by little, tames, e.g., the creative force of homosexuality, bringing it into line with middle-class, conventional family life. Homosexuality is not condemned, it is made part of the sameness. According to the Platonic view, male lovers in antiquity would have concentrated on spiritual and political achievements, whereas today they must think about mortgages, succession rights and possible adoptions, in quite the same manner as those living in heterosexual relationships. Today, I think, the place to look when searching for unconventionality and "otherness", would be the virtual worlds (e.g., "Second Life", where the laws of normal life are not valid and where people apparently are free of certain material obstacles.)

The second part of the book (chapters 3–5) concentrates on the concept of political *eros* and, in addition to Plato and Aristophanes, it also discusses Thucydides' history, in which one might detect proper political *eros*: love of "honour, empire and fatherland" as well as *hybris*. Before entering into Thucydides' concept of political *eros* (3.5), L. illustrates the tradition (archaic poetry, Aeschylus and Sophocles, natural philosophy, sophistic history) of using the word *eros* and its cognates in non-sexual contexts. L. then analyses Thucydides' account of the Sicilian expedition and points out that Thucydides begins his narrative of the incident describing how Athenians fell in love with the disastrous plan: ἔρως ἐνέπεσε τοῖς πᾶσι. L. points out that the megalomanical desire of the Athenians to enlarge the empire is described in analogous terms to a daring sexual escapade. The core of Thucydides' political erotic theory is in the concept that the Athenians' love for their city is meritocratic by nature: Athens must be loved because it is good and beautiful, not simply because it is the home of the Athenians. Thus, Thucydides shows political *eros* to be as uncontrollable as *eros* between individuals.

Chapter 4 is about the negative side of *eros,* that is, aggression and *hybris*, an essential concept in Greek culture, roughly meaning deliberate humiliation of another person or getting pleasure in shaming others. The humans desire to dominate other people and the potential sexual pleasure it gives (L. makes also an excursion into modern theories about rape) leads L. to ask how, or whether, *eros* results in creating aggression. The question is discussed further in chapter five, where L. uses the somewhat odd term "thymoeidetic", transferred to English from the Greek θυμοειδής, found also in the *Republic*. "Thymoeidetic" is a derivative of the word θυμός, which can roughly be interpreted as meaning the part of the soul which creates emotions. Thus, *thymos* is also understood as the part of the soul by which we also feel φιλία. *Philia* can, if misused, become anger, envy or hatred; hence, *thymos* is also a synonym for anger, ὀργή. L. indicates that in Platonic erotic theory, the irascible part of the soul, θυμός, is the one, which causes political activity through envy. After a lengthy and complicated discussion, L. concludes that Plato does not hold that *eros* itself could cause aggression, but it originates from *thymos*. Since *philia* is also from *thymos*, jealousy and vindictiveness do not occur unless related to things that are considered one's own, *philoi,* and are thus objects of *eros*.

Chapter 5 raises the interesting question of sublimation, i.e., the transfer of sexual desire to a non-sexual (higher) level: L. argues that sublimated love was more common or prevalent in Greek society that favoured homosexual relations and that sublimation was a part of the lengthy adolescence of the Greek youth. Sublimation was also an essential part of the idea of political pederasty, the delicate relationship between older *erastes* and the younger *eromenos*. L. draws attention to the ambivalent attitude to homosexuality in classical Athens: homosexual desire was accepted and encouraged, but not the actual act. L. also points out that sublimation was not something that was generally considered a good thing: according to Cynic philosophy, man is an animal and sublimation disguises the true nature of a human being. Stoics chose sex over love because sex was a lesser evil on the path to *ataraxia*. In connection with the complex and problematic field of sublimated love, the author himself confesses that he is not altogether happy with the term, and he says he retained it only in lack of a better word: philosophers do not "sublimate" their love when they understand that intellectual apprehension is the "real" form of *eros*, and sex is only an image of it. Rather, the rest of us, the ordinary people, "profane their natural, philosophic *eros*". L. also compares Freudian and Platonic ideas of sublimated *eros* and concludes that, although these are not identical, abstaining from sex might result in achieving higher spiritual and creative levels in both theories.

The discourse concerning political *eros* ends with an attempt to see signs of sublimation outside Platonic texts. L. discusses the views of the Better Argument in Aristophanes' *Clouds*: whether his rosy picture of the students could be considered sublimation and whether Aristophanes consciously connects "erotic" vocabulary with political? The discussion is interesting and the note that sublimation "is a house of cards" which is destined to last only a short time struck me as a clever insight. On the other hand, L., perhaps, might have tied up the loose ends of his argumentation rather better: as it is now, it leaves the reader somewhat confused whether one can see any kind of political theory in Aristophanes' production.

The question of sublimation functions as a bridge to a wider *eros*, love of common good and patriotism and the last part of the book, entitled "The Polis as a School for *Eros*", concentrates on the idea of how *eros* was "educated" to rise above sex in Athenian society. L. observes how the Greeks tried to train the sexual desire to become harnessed for the common good. I found the first subtitle "Civic nudity" somewhat strange. L. owes the term to an article by L. Bonfante, "Nudity as a Costume in Classical Art" (*AJA*, 1989) and "civic nudity" is used to separate it from "ritual nudity", nudity in initiation rites. To be honest, I also expected the discussion to be on a more metaphorical level, and was somewhat astonished to find out that L. indeed discusses nudity in the meaning of athletes not wearing clothes. The basis of the discussion is Thucydides who connects athletic nudity with the high level of Greek culture as opposed to barbarians who find nudity unacceptable. L. refers to modern ideas of nudism, according to which actual nudity functions as a restriction on erotic feelings. In Plato's ideal society, nudity is indeed a factor which is meant to dampen sexual feelings: hence, the goal would be male-female nudity which would create strong bonding between all citizens, as homosexuality (moderated by male-male nudity) brings men together and thus create a strong state.

In the third and final part of the book "Patriotism and Imperialism as Eros", L. attempts to give a synthesis of the political erotic theories found within the works of Plato, Thucydides and Aristophanes. The starting point of the discussion is the recurring theme: love for one's family is the most narrow and selfish genre of "love of one's own". The political version of it is love of one's fellow-citizens and country. According to erotic theory, Athenian citizens had a *philia*-based family-like bond. L., then, discusses the nature of patriotic love. Considering the often aggressive forms of love of one's country, it is asked if it is erotic in nature or rather thymic, i.e., based more on ambition and love of glory than love of fellow citizens. L. strives to show that Thucydides (especially in the Funerary speech) compared the Athenians' relationship to their city with that of an *erastes* to the beauty and magnificence of an *eromenos* and used erotic terminology accordingly. The Athenians' love affair with their city becomes evident when Thucydides sets the Athenians' and the Spartans' patriotic motives side by side: Athenians love their city not only because it is externally beautiful but because it is objectively worth loving. The Spartans, on the other hand, did not have an alternative or any other object of love, not even a family (in Spartan society, e.g., the parent-child bond was broken at the age of seven). The goodness of Athens is based on the very freedom it gives to its citizens. Thus, the Athenians' love for Athens is on a higher level than that of the Spartans, as it is based on a free choice, on love between citizens bonded to each other and creating communities based on *philia*.

In the last chapters of the book, L. both sums up and collects the aspects he has put forward in the course of the study but, at the same time, turns the argumentation upside down. The peak of political *eros* can be seen as the desire to conquer and colonize new places; in Athens' case this means the Sicilian expedition. But the result of this political erotic adventure is defeat. Accordingly, in a political erotic context, it can be read that the result of imperialism (connected to the desire to see new places) is cosmopolitanism. A cosmopolitan, then, loses one's own, a cosmopolitan can no longer be a patriot, and "the coloniser becomes colonised by the foreign land he falls in love with" (p. 371).

As L. himself acknowledges, his study does not answer the question "what is love", but it shows that there are two separate aspects in *eros*, "the need to possess and response to beauty" (p. 378). Despite the complex structure of the book and wide range of topics, *Eros and Polis* manages to prove that political science can be a "sexy" topic. As a subjective comment, I would like to note that the book is extremely demanding: it mixes texts from Greek authors with modern cultural and political theories, as well as theoretical language with examples taken from modern everyday life. There were moments when I could not see the relevance of the comparisons made (e.g. civic nudity, striptease and unwrapping gifts). On the other hand, there are many thoughtprovoking ideas and observations concerning both ancient and modern culture and one must admire the huge amount of literature referred to. I also enjoyed enormously the colourful and witty language but I also have to admit that as a non-native English speaker I learned a lot of new (to me) words, and that digesting the book took a long time.

Tiina Purola

KATJA LEMBKE: *Ägyptens späte Blüte. Die Römer am Nil.* Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie. Unter Mitarbeit von C. FLUCK und G. VITTMANN. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 2004. ISBN 3-8053-3276-9. 131 S. EUR 38,32.

Ägyptens späte Blüte is a contribution to the *Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie*, a series in which have been published, *inter alia*, books on the archaeology of both ancient Egypt and many of the Roman provinces. This book continues in both veins, finding its focus in the fusion of the Nilotic traditions with the western innovations after the annexation of Egypt to the Roman Empire, concentrating more on the material testimonies of the cultural contacts than the direct workings of the Roman government on the banks of Nile.

Lembke stresses the unique nature of Egypt as a Roman province, the great prestige of its own ancient civilization and the rare scale of its influence on the culture of the rulers. Hence, after a brief historical account of the reign of Augustus onwards, she proceeds to present the reception of Egyptian culture by the Romans and the resulting interpretations in the Egyptizing art that found its way into both public and private spheres. Then follow accounts of the Roman influence on the Egyptian traditions of town planning, religion and culture of death. The culture of the frontiers, the oases, the eastern desert and the upper course of the Nile, are treated in a separate chapter.

Lembke's work has been augmented by the texts of a Coptologist and an Egyptologist. A philologist greets with joy Vittmann's chapter on writing and administration, a theme complementing the otherwise archaeological focus of the book. The closing chapter by Fluck sketches the life and thought in late-antique Egypt in the context of early Christianity. The appended timeline and glossary are without doubt useful aids for non-specialists and students, while the lists for further reading offer an up-to-date summary of literature on the themes discussed.

The book presents in detail the results of the meeting of two strong traditions and discusses both Egyptian influences in Rome and the Roman ones in Egypt, a well-founded juxtaposition. Although the earlier cultural contacts fall outside the scope of the book, the later developments would have been contextualized by a fuller account of the pre-Augustan ones, such as the arrival of Egyptian cults in Rome.

Lembke's experience as a classical archaeologist and an Egyptologist, in fieldwork, teaching and museums alike, is reflected with enjoyable results in her book. It is a handsomely illustrated guide to the material manifestations of the Roman rule of Egypt likely to appeal to its intended wide readership. The choice of material and the discussion of themes are well suited to the needs of students of classics or archaeology and offer insights for experts in neighbouring fields as well, while the text is clear and accessible even to laymen interested in the topic.

Ulla Laitakari

Poverty in the Roman World. Edited by MARGARET ATKINS and ROBIN OSBORNE. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 0-521-86211-6. XIII, 226 pp. GBP 50.

The origins of this collection by Margaret Atkins and Robin Osborne lie in a conference given in honour of Peter Garnsey in 2003, and the authors contributing to the volume are all former pupils of his. The papers published in the volume are reworked versions of the papers given at the conference.

The ten contributions (excluding the introduction) of the book can be roughly divided in two categories: the historico-archaeologically oriented, which feature approaches and questions already familiar to classical scholars; and the theologico-historically oriented, where the sources used are mostly early Church Fathers, and the questions pertain more to Christianity. Both categories have important bearing on the question of poverty.

In his introduction ("Introduction: Roman poverty in context") Robin Osborne reminds us that "poverty" in the Roman sense was a relative concept, not an absolute one. This is in strong contrast to our current concept of poverty as an absolute state. In the ancient world, poverty was more the lack of something than only having very little. As a consequence, the social category of "poor" was not well defined, and it could signify persons who in our view were relatively well-to-do – they were poor only relatively, because they did not have enough of something. This point of Osborne's summarises well a recurrent theme in the articles.

Neville Morley in his paper ("The poor in the city of Rome") tackles especially the contrast between our modern conception of poverty and the meaning of the corresponding Roman concept. His analysis of poverty in the economic writings of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries shows how the concept of "poverty" was formulated then, and how the "common sense" meaning of the word we share actually derives from these discussions. Morley uses the triad of "vulnerability", "exclusion" and "shame" to try to find and position the poor in Roman society, and through these, proposes a basic idea of how the history of poverty in Rome might be written.

Walter Scheidel proposes a very different approach to the question in his chapter ("Stratification, deprivation and quality of life"). He looks at poverty with two different concepts: asset and income distribution in the society, and quality of life. Scheidel wants to be able to compare Rome to other historical societies, and he proposes these two measures for that purpose. Based on the evidence of land ownership, he challenges the common binary division of Roman society into haves and have-nots, and suggests that the scale of property and resources might actually be much more nuanced; the problem lies in our uncritical acceptance of the division *honestiores*/*humiliores* as the basic structuring principle for that society. He convincingly argues that the sizes of the propertied classes could have been much larger than is usually assumed, and that this would lead to the existence of a "solid middle-class". In the "quality of life" approach Scheidel shows how difficult it is to relate GDP to the overall quality of life; he then proposes other schemes to assess the quality of life, but in this case, does not take the analysis further.

Anneliese Parkin ("'You do him no service': an exploration of pagan almsgiving") very interestingly shows how the meanings given to almsgiving actually might promote its practice. Her starting point is an analysis of Stoic "giving", where Cicero and Seneca are shown to write in the language of patronage when writing about giving. The recipients of their gifts were not worthless beggars, but worthy poor, who could be assumed to be thankful and be able to give something in return. Still, the beggars were to be given alms, although without pity, as pity was a weakness of the soul – many Romans tended to disagree with this, though, and pity was also considered a virtue. Parkin's paper then presents some of the strategies exercised by the beggars to ensure alms and shows how they profitably used the images of filthiness associated with beggars.

Greg Woolf in his chapter ("Writing poverty in Rome") explores the literary use of the word "poor", especially in Seneca's *Controversiae* and the epigrams of Martial. Seneca seems to apply "poverty" to the moral analysis by distancing the reader from his well-to-do position by putting him in the position of an impoverished individual; Martial, on the other hand, alienates himself with poverty, and presents himself as a poor, humble poet, perhaps for purposes of entertainment. Woolf's analysis shows the varied uses of the concept, and the distance the authors and their readers actually had from real "poverty".

The question of "real poverty" is aptly addressed by Dominic Rathbone in his paper on Roman Egypt ("Poverty and population in Roman Egypt"). He comes to the shocking conclusion that it is very difficult to find any large numbers of really poor people in Egypt. He argues that in the documentary material, poverty is used as a topos, and in many cases it remains on that level; even with careful reading of the sources Rathbone has had to come to the conclusion that he cannot find hordes of destitute beggars – not even in the last years of Byzantine Egypt.

Sophie Lunn-Rockliffe's paper ("A pragmatic approach to poverty and riches: Ambrosiaster's *quaestio* 124") moves us to the second part of the collection, with the emphasis on Christian sources and late antiquity. She situates Ambrosiaster's discussions of poverty in the wider context of his time, when the Church fathers were defining the position of the Church to the idea of absolute poverty easily deduced from the Bible. She presents Ambrosiaster's view as a synthesis of the most extreme notions on the subject, and finds his originality in his emphasis, how each man should be judged according to relevant standards, so that where a poor man might commit a minor sin, the same act by a rich man would be a grave sin, and *vice versa*. This she sees to reflect the problems the Church fathers had in trying to make Christianity more acceptable to the old Roman values – an outright denial of property would not generate positive reactions in some of the audience.

Richard Finn, O.P., follows a similar theme in his article ("Portraying the poor: descriptions of poverty in Christian texts from the late Roman empire") in analysing the figure of the "poor" in the sermons of Augustine and two saints' lives. Here he comes to similar conclusions as Lunn-Rockliffe in the sense that the texts do not emphasise the characteristics of the individual poor in order not to make their destitution too obvious and visible.

The difficulties of integrating the poor and the needy to the social reality of unequal distribution of property without antagonising anyone are apparent also in Lucy Grig's paper ("Throwing parties for the poor: poverty and splendour in the late antique church."). Through a detailed study of two different parties given to poor people Grig is able to demonstrate how different attitudes towards the poor could be in the writings.

One might question, however, whether these images of the poor in the texts really depict the reality or not, especially because of the strong ideological position of poverty in Christianity. These three papers share the same limitation, which is also their strength: the argumentation stays inevitably within the Christian tradition, and while the articles illuminate the Christian way of thinking about and with the poor, they do not tell much about the other sectors of society.

A different approach is adopted by Cam Grey in his article ("Salvian, the ideal Christian community and the fate of the poor in fifth-century Gaul"). His examination of Salvian's ideal Christian community and its contrast with his presentation of the poor brings the reader to an appraisal of the new logic regulating the relations between the rich and the poor. According to Grey, the traditional values defining the relations between social classes were replaced by a "market-place logic", and bases this on Salvian's recurrent usage of commercial terminology in describing these relations.

Partly in the same vein, Caroline Humfress's article ("Poverty and Roman law") analyses the disputes regarding the legal position of the "poor" and whether it was to be interpreted as similar to the "low and degraded". She does not come to any definite conclusion, but it seems apparent that the attitudes towards the poor were changing. With many examples Humfress shows how in many cases poverty became secondary to the fact of whether one was born free or not, when it came to defining social position.

This collection brings out very clearly that the poor had a very different position in the Christian way of thinking that had been the case in the "pagan" Rome. Most of the authors acknowledge this difference, and what emerges from these papers is two very different images of poverty: one of destitution and endemic beggary from the Christian writings, and one of relative affluency from the pagan sources, documents and archaeological material. The question remains, whether the increased visibility of the poor is a result of a changing mentality with the introduction of Christian ethics, or whether it reflects a real change for worse in the living conditions over time. Although Rathbone's results do have some implications also for late Antiquity, otherwise this question still remains open.

Harri Kiiskinen

SUZANNE DIXON: *Cornelia, Mother of the Gracchi*. Routledge, London – New York 2007. ISBN 978-0-415-33148-7 (pb). 95 pp. GBP 18.99.

L'opuscolo di Dixon s'inserisce nella collana "Women of the Ancient World", che mira a presentare biografie concise di alcune figure femminili del mondo antico. Benché tutte le donne scelte come oggetto di studio (Olimpiade, madre di Alessandro Magno; Giulia, figlia di Augusto; Giulia Domna, l'imperatrice) siano personaggi notissimi, le loro vite hanno sicuramente meritato di essere studiate da esperti in grado di contestualizzarle alla luce di nuove scoperte e con bibliografie aggiornate. Il presente libro è una bella introduzione alla straordinaria figura di Cornelia, nota successivamente come "madre dei Gracchi". Dixon offre un'affascinante visione della fama e dell'afterlife di Cornelia nel turbulento periodo tardorepubblicano e più tardi (fino ai nostri giorni). Cornelia, certo, divenne un mito (per i suoi scritti, la sua calma filosofica e la sua fertilità, ecc.), ma era anche una donna come tutte le altre. Molto utilmente infatti Dixon discute il rapporto tra mito e realtà. Il mito di una nobile donna icona, ovviamente poteva essere utilizzato per diversi scopi, tuttavia tale attività, la mitizzazione, doveva essere in un certo qual modo organizzata. Secondo l'autrice, sarebbe stata Sempronia, l'unica sopravvissuta dei dodici figli di Cornelia, a tener vivo il mito non solo della madre ma anche della famiglia. Gli argomenti di Dixon, sempre convincenti, sono espressi in uno stile chiaro e facilmente accessibile.

Mika Kajava

JASPER BURNS: *Great Women of Imperial Rome. Mothers and Wives of the Caesars*. Routledge, London – New York 2007. ISBN 978-0-415-40898-1 (pb). XXVII, 348 pp. GBP 27.50.

Questo simpatico volume, scritto in un modo attraente, offre una piacevole lettura, non solo per il grande pubblico, ma anche per gli studiosi. Le undici biografie (da Livia a Giulia Mamea) non presentano grandi novità ma sono capitoli concisi e ben documentati. Burns deriva le sue informazioni da studi anteriori ma anche direttamente dagli autori antichi; pertinente anche la documentazione numismatica. Il libro conclude con un breve epilogo su imperatrici tardoantiche nonché con un'appendice sulla cronologia dell'impero romano. Gli indici mi sembrano accurati. Buona lettura, dunque, per chiunque si interessi delle vicende delle donne delle case imperiali romane dei primi due secoli.

Mika Kajava

JASON KÖNIG: *Athletics and Literature in the Roman Empire*. Greek Culture in the Roman World. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2005. ISBN 978-0-521-83845-0 (hb). XIX, 398 p. GBP 55.

Athletics in antiquity, viewed from different angles, has aroused scholarly interest in the last decades. Jason König's (hereafter K.) book is a welcome contribution to this vast general theme. According to the title, the focus is on Imperial literature which might imply that other textual sources, especially inscriptions, are not systematically handled. The reader will soon realize, however, that even though literature is in the spotlight, other sources are not omitted: throughout the book it becomes evident that the author is well acquainted with inscriptions as well as pictorial sources for athletics. K. in fact states that literature and inscriptions have to be studied together if one wants to gain a complete picture of either (p. 8). K.'s discussion on pp. 51–55 of the Hellenistic Beroia inscription (gymnasiarchal law) serves as a good example of his careful way of using inscriptions as evidence for ancient practices. He concludes the Beroia passage with a remark on the importance of being cautious of taking the Beroia degree as presenting standard practices in "the Hellenistic, yet alone Imperial period" (p. 55). The versatile nature of K.'s study is shown in the impressive bibliography which presents different scholarly areas, from sociology to many specialist fields in ancient history. The author's comprehensive familiarity with, e.g., the research tradition of individual ancient authors becomes evident throughout the book.

K. sets two main aims in the framework of "*texts* of athletics" (p. 8, italics original). The first is "to show how textual portrayals of athletics ... were often entangled with much broader debates about contemporary culture, and used as vehicles for powerful strategies of elite self-representation" (p. 8). The second aim is "to show how very different types of text often have striking overlaps in their performance of those functions" (p. 8). K. fulfils both aims in a very enjoyable way, where the reader is invited to explore the many-sided nature of athletics and its position(s) in the ancient societies in general and in the Imperial period in particular. The close reading of literary passages on athletics seen in the framework of the whole literary output of each discussed author and in the wider socio-cultural framework is extremely interesting and revealing in regard to the elite's self-representation as a whole. Athletics as well as other "performative activities" that involve public display of the body and especially in agonistic contexts – such as, e.g., acting or dancing – are of primary importance when we want to investigate matters of gender, body or the ideals of being a man or a woman. I was especially pleased to find several references to, e.g., Lada-Richards' excellent article on Lucian and pantomime dancing (2003) where these questions are discussed with male dancers in mind.

K. has chosen six authors as representatives of as many themes, each discussed in their own chapters. After the introduction (chapter 1) chapter 2 centres on Lucian and Anacharsis with the subtitle "*Gymnasion* education in the Greek city" (pp. 45–96). This may be slightly misleading since only 16 pages out of 50 deal explicitly with Lucian's *Anacharsis*, although Lucian's essay does run through the chapter. Chapter 3, entitled "Models for virtue", concentrates on Dio and his "Melankomas" orations (pp. 97–157). In this chapter, the pictorial representations are also discussed in the framework of viewing the athletic body. Chapter 4 is on Pausanias and the Olympics (pp. 158–204), chapter 5 on Silius Italicus – the only representative of an author writing in Latin in this book – and on Greek athletic activity spread to the west (pp. 205–253). Chapter 6 discusses athletes and doctors, especially through Galen (pp. 254–300), and, before the conclusions, chapter 7 takes up Philostratus' *Gymnasticus* and the rhetoric of the athletic body (pp. 301–344).

Some details drew my attention. In the introductory chapter (chapter 1), K. mentions that the functions of athletics in antiquity and in the modern world are somewhat different, e.g., in regard to the role of athletics in the political and educational spheres (p. 23). I would be more cautious in stating this kind of generalization, which, I think, reflects more the practices and manifestations of the contemporary western world than a general "fact". Athletics and sports may have important political and educational functions in some societies, functions that are quite compatible with those manifested in antiquity. On p. 27, K. mentions that the *gymnasion* became an important marker of Greek identity shown at the civic level in concrete ways and that this is demonstrable in Egypt where the membership of a *gymnasion* brought with it exemptions from tax. To be precise, members of the gymnasial class were not totally exempt from tax but enjoyed lower rates of poll-tax. The inclusion of a discussion of pictorial representations of athletics is an excellent choice and the discussion itself, once again, shows K.'s profound acquaintance with the subject matter and research literature and his awareness of the difficulties and pitfalls of the chronology of the objects (pp. 102–132). There are some moments, though, where the reader may be misled in expecting that some of the objects that are provided as examples for a certain aspect, date from the Imperial period, such as on p. 115 where the centre paragraph begins with a phrase mentioning Imperial-period contexts, yet the examples date from the 4th century BC and 2nd/ 1st centuries BC.

In conclusion, K.'s book delivers even more than it promises in the title. It is not only about athletics and literature but about identities, ideals, (self-)representations in the Roman Empire approached with a careful and insightful analysis of the ancient sources on athletics. A final positive remark concerns the Greek: it is very considerate to provide both the English translation and the original text of the cited Greek passages and delightful to read the Greek terms in transliterations, i.e., *gymnasion* and not gymnasium, *stadion*, not stadium.

Marjaana Vesterinen

Religion and Law in Classical and Christian Rome. Edited by CLIFFORD ANDO and JÖRG RÜPKE. Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 15. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, 2006. ISBN 3-515-08854-7. 176 pp. EUR 42.

The idea of this volume of the *Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge* is to examine the relationship between religion and state through developments in Roman law from the late Republic to late antiquity. A thematic book such as this one serves both novices and initiates in the field. For the novices, it provides an excellent introduction into some of the most important existing source material and ever-interesting questions concerning Roman legislation; for the initiates, it offers new perspectives on the very same questions.

Before going into a more detailed analysis of the chapters, I should, however, give credit to the excellent introduction written by the editors. In the introduction, the editors list some of the most interesting *loci* from ancient literary corpus (be it law or commentaries on law) that illuminate how and what the Romans thought about *sacra* in legal terms. The first impression is indeed how little the theme seemed to have bothered Roman jurists and how vague the formulations concerning religious matters were in comparison to the meticulousness in other fields of law. The state did not bother about *religiones* as long as the *religiones* did not bother the state.

The editors also introduce – almost nonchalantly – insights that should – no doubt inspire further studies about the cultural role of Roman legislation. They say (p. 7): "… the Romans themselves naturalized the dynamism and instability of their world by advocating adherence to an enormous cultural conservatism", law being one of the cornerstones of this attitude. Clifford Ando elaborates this point in his article 'Religion and *ius publicum*' (Chapter 8) when saying: "… the reliance of both late-antique codifications of the *edictum perpetuum* testifies the unwillingness or inability of their compilers and the authors of their contents alike to imagine a whole-scale restructuring of the legal basis for social order" (p. 133). Despite the fact that the world had changed from 'pagan' to 'Christian' (or so we think), Roman law reflected changes in social order with only minimal adjustments.

Karl Leo Noethlichs' article 'Revolution from the top? "Orthodoxy" and the persecution of heretics in imperial legislation from Constantine to Justinian' (Chapter 7) explains partly why Ando's point based on social theory makes so much sense. As long as religious strifes did not threaten to crumble the social basis for functional governance of the empire, emperors did not interfere. When they did threaten, emperors showed more willingness to negotiate Christian doctrine, label heresies and enforce orthodoxy – matters that they saw even then mostly in pragmatic terms. As Noethlichs says, Christianity being given a priority in the Roman Empire, 'social order' and 'true worship' were in constant conflict (p. 119). Noethlichs also points out that at least in the fifth century the battle between orthodoxy and heresy was so hot that theological struggles momentarily displaced "the more strictly political desire for law and order" (p. 120). Emperors were urged to throw in a theological word, but only after their initial campaign for social quiet had been hopelessly lost. On the other hand, preventive measures had been taken, e.g., in *Cod. Theod.* 16,4,2, published in June 388, forbidding any public debate on questions of faith (p. 124).

Dorothea Baudy's article 'Prohibitions of Religion in Antiquity: Setting the Course of Europe's Religious History' (Chapter 6) serves as a good summary on religious conflicts in the Roman Empire to students of ancient history. The second half of her title remains, however, mostly unaddressed, apart from a long introduction into the topic.

Andrew S. Jacobs argues in his article '"Papinian Commands One Thing, Our Paul Another": Roman Christians and Jewish Law in the *Collatio Legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum*' (Chapter 5) that the *Collatio* could be interpreted as "a Christian attempt to seize exegetical control of the mass of legal materials" used by contemporary Jewish religious authorities (p. 93). Jacobs' conclusion sounds ingenious: the kidnapping of Jewish legal material by Christians allowed them to speak with the authority of ancient Jewish Law against pagans (i.e., Romans), while at the same time "claiming solidarity with Rome in speaking *adversus Iudaeos*" (p. 97).

Elizabeth DePalma Digeser makes also an interesting case in her article 'Religion, Law and the Roman Polity: The Era of the Great Persecution' (Chapter 4) when saying that Neoplatonist philosophy implanted itself as a political theory in the imperial court for some time in the beginning of the fourth century. Neoplatonists claimed that Christians were dangerous to the empire. Christians' teachings jeopardized the Neoplatonists' big plan to "divinize the citizen body" as Christians did not believe in the "path of *political* virtue" (p. 78, my italics). This ideology was exhausted by both Roman "persecuting" emperors and the "first Christian" emperor, Constantine. For Constantine, true divinization came through the divine law of God's heavenly city, of which he himself, being emperor, was keeper (p. 82).

John Scheid continues in his article 'Oral tradition and written tradition in the formation of sacred law in Rome' (Chapter 1) along the lines of argumentation that have become his trademark in the previous years, yet again in a new context. According to Scheid, Roman religious tradition consisted of two elements: "a ritual savoir-faire?, orally transmitted from father to son, from public officer to public officer, relying on written formulas of prayer and orally-enacted calendar" and "isolated decisions adapting these ritual rules to new situations" (p. 19) (cf. his article 'Quand croire c'est faire' which made the characterization of Roman religion as ritualism blatantly clear to modern historians of religion). Scheid forces modern readers to accept the fact (which many generations of scholars persistently refused to do, as Scheid illustrates in pp. 15–17) that Roman religious tradition was mainly oral and never systematized into a corpus.

Jörg Rüpke tackles similar issues in his article 'Religion in the *lex Ursonensis*' (Chapter 2) when explaining what the *lex Ursonensis* said about *sacra*. It consisted of rituals such as *ludi circenses* (games), *scaenici* (plays), *gladiatores* (gladiators), *sacrificia* (sacrifices) and *pulvinaria* (meals prepared for the statues of the gods), i.e., rituals that depended on public authorities and public financing (p. 37). As Rüpke concludes, in the *lex Ursonensis*, legal techniques were used to limit the possibilities of independent religious action, but without interfering with time-honoured religious traditions of Rome (p. 45).

J. B. Rives' article 'Magic, Religion, and Law: The Case of the *Lex Cornelia de sicariis et veneficiis*' (Chapter 3) discusses in what ways and for what reasons certain concepts and phenomena related to magic were made legally defined terms and legally sanctioned actions in the Roman empire. He deals separately with the definition of *veneficium* (poison), *carmina* (chants), *devotiones* (promises of an offering to the gods of the underworld in return for the fulfilment of a request, e.g., that something bad would happen to an enemy) and *mala sacrificia* (rituals meant to consign people to the gods of the underworld and thus destroy them), and finally with *magi* and *ars magica*. Rives' article is full of interesting examples, and his conclusion ties up the threads with legal developments. He says that the *lex Cornelia* was not necessarily the basis for Roman legal actions against magic and magicians and suggests that "the new criminal category of magic" as religious deviance was actually employed more freely in the provinces, neglecting the word of law in the *lex Cornelia*.

This book shows that, in ancient Rome, religious traditionalism and ritualism reduced the need for religious legislation and departures from convention (such as Christianity and magic) increased it. Roman religious laws were reactive and pragmatic. This study neatly deflates the old myth of Roman law as something carved in stone, unchangeable.

Ulla Lehtonen

VALERIE M. WARRIOR: *Roman religion*. Cambridge introduction to Roman civilization. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 978-0-521-53212-9 (pb). XVIII, 165 p. GBP 11.90.

There has been a considerable increase in general introductions to Roman religion published over the last ten years. Mary Beard, John North and Simon Price started the boom with their *Religions of Rome 1–2* in 1998 (Cambridge University Press). Just to mention a few other works on Roman religious life, there is a collection of republished articles titled *Roman Religion* edited by Clifford Ando (Edinburgh University Press, 2003), Jörg Rüpke's *Die Religion der Römer* (C.H. Beck, 2001), Robert Turcan's *Rome et ses dieux* (Hachette littératures, 1998) and James B. Rives' *Religion in the Roman Empire* (Blackwell, 2007).

Valerie M. Warrior continues the trend with *Roman religion* in the series *Cambridge introduction to Roman civilization* that is marketed at students without prior knowledge of the classical world. The aim of the series is to offer clear, jargon-free language. For a researcher it is not easy to write without jargon but Warrior successfully avoids it. Warrior also published *Roman religion: A Sourcebook* in 2002.

Roman Religion consists of ten chapters in which different aspects of Roman religious life such as deities, rituals, family, state, war, festivals and games, foreign cults, magic, emperor cult, Jews and Christians are discussed. Both public and private aspects of Roman religion are surveyed. Warrior writes about the rituals in family life and surveys the cults of women in particular. She explains the pragmatism of Roman religion as well as the close connection between religion and politics in Rome – aspects that may feel strange to a modern beginner.

Warrior aptly warns us, her readers, "of a risk being influenced by our own preconceptions about a religion" (p. xiv).

Since Warrior's *Roman religion* is an introduction, it is understandable that each aspect is discussed in a very concise manner. However, essential elements are surveyed and a coherent image is given of the Roman religious world. Naturally, the book does not cover changes over the course of centuries or local differences very thoroughly.

Warrior brings her narrative to life with a number of fascinating extracts from Roman literature and inscriptions. There is also an abundance of informative illustrations in the book.

Maijastina Kahlos

JÖRG RÜPKE (Teil 1–3) – ANNE GLOCK (Teil 2): *Fasti sacerdotum. Die Mitglieder der Priesterschaften und das sakrale Funktionspersonal römischer, griechischer, orientalischer und jüdisch-christlicher Kulte in der Stadt Rom von 300 v. Chr. bis 499 n. Chr.* Teil 1: *Jahres- und Kollegienlisten*. Teil 2: *Biographien*. Teil 3: *Beiträge zur Quellenkunde und Organisationsgeschichte. Bibliographie*. Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 12. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2005. ISBN 3-515-07456-2. 1860 S. + CD-ROM. EUR 140.

In diesem monumentalen Werk werden die zwischen 300 v. Chr. und 499 n. Chr. bezeugten Mitglieder der Priesterschaften und das sakrale Funktionspersonal der verschiedenen Kulte in der Stadt Rom zusammengestellt. Der Begriff des Funktionspersonals ist dabei denkbar weit gefasst. Das Nebeneinander von römischen Priestern jeder möglichen Gattung und orientalischen sowie christlichen Funktionsträgern aller Art mag wundern, denn inhaltlich haben die altrömischen Priester und etwa die christlichen Amtsträger doch wenig miteinander zu tun; unter die letzteren werden sogar die Fossores aufgenommen, was zeigt, wie weit die Autoren den Begriff des Kultpersonals gefasst haben. Andererseits begrüßt man die Tatsache, dass wir nun in einem Werk alle diese wenn auch disparaten Materialien zusammengestellt finden. – Warum das Werk gerade mit 499 n. Chr. abschließt, wird nicht mitgeteilt; wäre es nicht vorzuziehen gewesen, es bis ans Ende des 6. Jh. gehen zu lassen, ganz wie es die Autoren der christlichen Prosopographie machen?

Es ist unmöglich, in dem von der Redaktion dieser Zeitschrift zur Verfügung gestellten knappen Raum das Werk näher zu würdigen. Stattdessen möchte ich einige kleinere Beobachtungen eines dankbaren Lesers beisteuern. Stichproben haben ergeben, dass die Quellen vorzüglich erschlossen worden sind. Das trifft auch für epigraphische Quellen zu. Wenn man hie und da etwa die Datierungen beanstanden kann (z. B. Nr. 2155 auf S. 1089 wird ins 1. Jh. datiert, sie gehört aber in die Mitte des 2. Jh.: Spinola, *Museo Pio-Clementino* 2, 1999, 27), so ist das kein Vorwurf. Aber die Personen, deren Namen eine von der regelrechten Orthographie abweichenden Namensform aufweisen, sollten doch besser mit der normalen Namensform angeführt werden: z. B. Nr. 479 *Paetinus* statt *Petinus* (das wirkt auf die alphabetische Ordnung des Belegs); Nr. 862 besser *Prepelaus* statt *Praepelaus*; Nr. 751. 752 *Aster-*; S. 1025 *Habund(ant)ius* sollte unter *Ab-* stehen (dagegen regelrecht *Adiutor* Nr. 445 statt Αἰούτωρ des Steines); *Benerosus* Nr. 939 sollte unter *Venerosus* stehen. – Ein Teil der römischen Kaiser wird merkwürdigerweise unter *Caesar* verzeichnet.

Ein paar Einzelbeobachtungen. Nr. 877: der Mann hieß *Aurelius Tarula*: *Arctos* 1992,

125. – Nr. 1139: der Mann führte mit Sicherheit das Cognomen *Epulo*: Solin, *Anal. epigr*. 404 zu 145). – Nr. 1369: H. Etcheto, *Athenaeum* 2003, 445 ff. will in ihm und im Konsul von 328, Dictator 306 und Oberpontifex 304 denselben Mann sehen, kaum zu Recht (dazu demnächst in den Akten eines 2002 gehaltenen Kongresses für antike Onomastik). – Nr. 1843: der Name bleibt völlig in der Luft hängen (das wird auch in *AE* bemerkt). – Die Erschließung jüdischer Amtsträger scheint nicht ganz lückenlos zu sein; ich habe das Fehlen des Archigerusiarches Anastasius (*JIWE* II 521) notiert. – Nr. 2265: man darf nicht Livia Augusta sagen, sondern entweder Livia oder Iulia Augusta. – Zu den römischen Bischöfen: ihre Namen werden bald in griechischer (Nr. 567), bald in lateinischer Form (Nr. 3585) gegeben; sogar bei demselben Namen wird geschwankt (Nr. 3579–3581 wird ohne ersichtlichen Grund sowohl *Xystos* als auch *Xystus* geschrieben); amüsant ist die für Nr. 1039 gewählte Form *Calixtus* mit der Bemerkung "Weitere Namen Calixtus I", während die richtige Namensform doch *Callistus* war (in antiken Urkunden erscheint *Cal(l)ixt*- nur in *ICUR* 13480. 18640; ferner wird der Name des römischen Bischofs und eines römischen Presbyters vom Ende des 5. Jh. [Avell. 103, 2] in der hsl. Überlieferung zuweilen *Calixt*- geschrieben, es wird sich aber um eine mittelalterliche Praxis handeln); und unter *Xystus* wird als weiterer Name *Sixtus* angeführt, der aber mittelalterlich ist (*Arctos* 1991, 143). – Die Haruspices haben eine neue Monographie erhalten, die Rüpke noch nicht kennen konnte: M.- L. Haack, *Prosopographie des haruspices romains* (2006). – Zwei Kleinigkeiten: S. 324: Ulpiales, nicht Ulpialis; S. 631: was ist 'Matrona imagini dedicandi'?

Trotz solcher Beanstandungen sei am Ende mit Nachdruck festgestellt, dass wir es mit einem grundlegenden Quellenwerk zu tun haben, das für viele Forschergenerationen gute Dienste leisten wird.

Heikki Solin

JÖRG RÜPKE unter Mitarbeit von ANNE GLOCK: *Römische Priester in der Antike. Ein biographisches Lexikon.* ISBN 978-3-515-09086-5. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2007. 256 S. EUR 34.

Wer nicht imstande ist, sich das oben angezeigte große dreibändige Werk zu schaffen, wird sich freuen, diesen handlichen Band leichter für seine Privatbibliothek kaufen zu können. Vieles ist gekürzt oder weggelassen, darunter viele römische Bischöfe, die in dem großen Werk verzeichnet sind. Trotzdem kann man den Band all denjenigen empfehlen, die einen raschen Überblick vorziehen.

Heikki Solin

JOCHEN HAAS: *Die Umweltkrise des 3. Jahrhunderts n.Chr. im Nordwesten des Imperium Romanum. Interdisziplinäre Studien zu einem Aspekt der allgemeinen Reichskrise im Bereich der beiden Germaniae sowie der Belgica und der Raetia*. Geographica Historica 22. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2006. ISBN 3-515-08880-6. 322 S. EUR 52.

In this monograph, Jochen Haas (henceforth H.) investigates the evidence pro and contra a large-scale ecological crisis in the northwestern parts of the Empire, which would have paralleled the statewide crisis in the 3rd century AD. This hypothesis is not new, and H. has set out to make a conclusive analysis of the evidence that might support or invalidate the hypothesis. His aim is ambitious, but the book does not quite live up to expectations.

As the title of the study suggests, his approach is interdisciplinary. The argumentation of the book is contained in four major chapters: pagan sources ("Nichtchristliche Quellen des 1. bis 3. Jahrhunderts", 26 pp.), Christian sources ("Naturkrisen bei christlichen Autoren", 83 pp.), the environment in the north-west of the Roman period ("Zu den römerzeitlichen Umwelten im Nordwesten des *Imperium Romanum*", 49 pp.), and the archaeological and natural science sources ("Naturwissenschaftliche und archäologische Quellen", 127 pp.). The amount of source material in the different categories is very different, as is shown by the sizes of the chapters; this becomes even more apparent when reading the book.

The "pagan" literary sources are relatively few, so the argumentation is lucid and enjoyable to read. H. has time and space to analyse the sources, and as a result, he is able to create vivid images, and the thematic sub-divisions work well. In addition, the number of Christian sources is manageable, so here, too, the argumentation can still be followed, but contrary to the previous chapter, this is no longer divided thematically. H. has divided the chapter according to types of source, and into further subsections by author. This results in a piecemeal catalogue, and the argument tends to get lost.

In these first two chapters, the author endeavours to understand the Romans' way of seeing natural phenomena. He concludes that Romans were able to conceive of nature as processual, i.e., development led from one phase to another, and the environment changed constantly.

The fifth chapter, on the physical environment of the region, once again works better, as the approach is thematic. Here the author tries to give some idea of what the physical environment of the area in question was like in Roman times, and devotes much attention to the ancients' own perspective. It is no surprise that a diachronic development of nature in the northern provinces cannot be reconstructed based on the classical authors. As H. already demonstrated in the first two chapters, the ancients did not investigate nature *per se*, but used it as a means of conveying other messages. In order to understand the natural environment, we are left with the often very stereotypical characterisation of these areas as semi-barbarous by means of strange natural phenomena.

The sixth chapter is the most problematic of all. There is no question that H. has mastered a huge number of archaeological and scientific sources. The main problem is that the chapter lacks meaningful structure: the chapter is first divided into sections according to the type of source ("natural science", "archaeology", "palynology", "architecture"). These sections are then further divided geographically until we reach the individual studies, conducted on a local level. This structure makes the argumentation impossible to follow – and even to present. Each sub-sub-section draws minor conclusions, usually in the form of citations to existing research, but the results are not followed up in the later discussions, and the whole chapter remains little more than an ordered list of research and data. One wonders whether some kind of quantitative or classificatory approach might have worked better to keep the argumentation alive.

In principle, the analysis done by H. seems valid. The combination of historical and archaeological material with results of natural science studies is always interesting, and there are no obvious faults in the way the types of sources are integrated. It is also obvious that the temporal precision of both archaeological material and scientific results often are too crude to establish any kind of causality with the phenomena known from historical sources.

The results of H. are therefore not altogether surprising: the scientific studies do show changes in the environment, but they do not provide a single, unified picture. Rather, they indicate some changes in the environment, but starting already in the late 2nd century AD. The ambiguity of these results and their chronological imprecision makes it impossible to combine these results with the historical data so that any significant correlation could be seen. The same is not quite true for the archaeological sources – including architecture – as in some cases, the chronology can be quite accurate. It is a pity that especially the archaeological material is presented in the geographically organised mini-sections in such a way that no coherent picture emerges. This is not helped at all by the fact that there is not a single map in the entire book.

In addition to the lack of maps, other editorial problems abound. Too many items are missing from the bibliography (like Demand 1984, which is cited many times on the first page of the second chapter). The quotations from Latin and Greek sources are inconsistent: in some cases we have nothing but the Latin passage, in others it is followed by the translation, either in the text or in a footnote; sometimes the translation comes first, with the original is in the footnote, in the text, or missing altogether.

Overall, the book would have profited from a rewrite. The data and the results are interesting, and the archaeological part is a good source for studies on settlement archaeology in Germania, but H.'s argumentation is never made clear. The main problem of the book lies in its structure. The book looks more like a list of data organised by categories than a structured study, and this weakens H.'s argument and readability of the book considerably.

Harri Kiiskinen

FRANCESCO PAOLO RIZZO: *Sicilia cristiana dal I al V secolo*. Voll. I, II.1, II.2. Supplementi a "Kókalos" 17. Testimonia Siciliae antiqua I, 14. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 2005, 2006. ISBN 88-7689-191-9; 88-7689-229-X. XII, 265; 268; 371 pp. EUR 85; 170.

Nella nuova, elegante veste dei *Supplementi a Kókalos* escono due bei volumi (il secondo in due tomi) sui primi secoli del Cristianesimo in Sicilia, a cura di F. P. Rizzo.

Il primo volume, *Gli studi sull'antico cristianesimo di Sicilia. Percorsi acquisizioni prospettive*, offre un ampio sguardo sugli studi relativi alla Sicilia paleocristiana. L'autore, già noto per altri percorsi nella storia della mentalità antica, si concentra soprattutto sugli studiosi del Novecento, a partire dal 1935. Una noterella, intitolata "Dall'erudizione alla scienza (Tra Seicento e Novecento)", è dedicata agli studiosi anteriori. A mio avviso, è troppo breve: vengono segnalati troppi studiosi in pochissime pagine. L'Orsi, naturalmente, avrebbe meritato una monografia a sé, visto che si tratta di uno studioso che cento anni fa pubblicò, in modo si potrebbe dire scientifico, la maggioranza delle iscrizioni siracusane a noi note (ma si veda ora, ad esempio, il volume *Magna Græcia: Archeologia di un sapere*, a cura di S. Settis e M. C. Parra, Milano 2005). Il viaggio continua fino al 2004, ed è senz'altro utile per chi vuole capire la storia della ricerca in questo campo nella seconda metà del Novecento.

Il secondo volume, in due tomi, è un corpus di testimonianze relative ai Santi siciliani. La prima parte, *Testimonianze agiografiche*, comprende saggi interessanti sulla storia della Sicilia tardoantica. Un contributo notevole all'opera è stato offerto da Alessandro Pagliara, che ha compilato la seconda parte del vol. II: *Testimonia hagiographica, testimonia quae ad* *liturgiam praecipue pertinent, testimonia quae aliter atque aliter in memoriam redacta sunt*. Non si tratta di un'edizione critica, ma il lettore è grato agli autori per aver raccolto insieme molti testi le edizioni originali dei quali sono praticamente irreperibili.

Nel vol. II.1 è stata inclusa anche una noterella epigrafica (pp. 179–85), nella quale l'autore constata la mancanza di un vero *corpus* epigrafico della Sicilia paleocristiana. In attesa di un'impresa del genere, mi sia permesso di segnalare il volume *Le iscrizioni del Museo Civico di Catania. Storia delle collezioni – cultura epigrafica – edizione,* di chi scrive (Helsinki 2004), con una testimonianza riguardante il culto di S. Ilarione, anteriormente non riconosciuta come tale (nr. 189), e la più antica iscrizione cristiana datata della Sicilia finora conosciuta (nr. 164, dell'anno 341).

In un'opera complessivamente così ricca sorprende la mancanza di indici analitici. C'è, però, una bibliografia di grande utilità, a cura di Rosaria Cicatello, che occupa le ultime 100 pagine del primo volume.

Kalle Korhonen

ERNEST METZGER: *Litigation in Roman Law*. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2005. ISBN 0-19-829855-2. XI, 213 pp. GBP 50.

In this book, Ernest Metzger seeks to revise a too "regular and orderly picture of litigation before the magistrate". In a short introductory chapter (1–6) he explains that the Roman jurists' writings fail to give a living and historically valid picture of classical legal procedure; they are given to abstraction, are generally shy of procedure, and were manipulated by the Digest compilers under Justinian. The discovery of the Institutes of Gaius, however, at the beginning of the 19th century, and that of the municipal charter of Irni at the end of the 20th, have shed important new light on procedural rules, in addition to which litigation documents found in the Vesuvian area have provided much-needed evidence for legal practice. The sixteenth-century legal humanists who wrote on the legal process did not yet have the benefit of this evidence, and the great strength of the book is a clear understanding of how it has subsequently changed the picture of litigation in Roman law, especially the role played in it by postponements.

The main argument of the book is that although the picture has been considerably revised, even contemporary accounts of procedure reiterate out-dated, and even invented, ideas about Roman litigation. The principal one of these is that the old civil law summonses (*in ius vocatio*) were replaced with voluntary contracts for appearance on a fixed date (*vadimonium*) as the means to initiate litigation in the magistrate's tribunal (*in iure*); this allowed both parties to arrive before the magistrate well-prepared, so there would have been little need for postponements before the joinder of issue (*litis contestatio*) and assignment of the case to a private judge (*apud iudicem*). Although the evidence still remains scanty and often very difficult to interpret, Metzger builds a coherent case for arguing that 1) the voluntary *vadimonium* to introduce lawsuits never emerged as a regular praetorian institution to replace *in ius vocatio*; 2) postponements were normal *in iure* before the *litis contestatio* when negotiation and preparation of the case took place; and 3) postponements did not require a personal audience with the magistrate.

The second chapter on "Bail" (7–17) provides a discussion of various forms of *vadimonia* and the relevant doctrinal developments. The so-called "judicial" *vadimonia* were made under magisterial compulsion and used either to postpone hearings to a later date in the same local court (*Vertagungsvadimonium*) or to transfer hearings to a competent remote court (*Verweisungsvadimonium*), for example, from a municipal to a praetor's or governor's court. The legal humanists, however, devised by analogy another form of contract for appearance (*Ladungvadimonium*) the praetor provided in his edict. This *vadimonium* would have worked as a courteous alternative to initiating litigation with a rough and ready civil law summons by *in ius vocatio* that required the defendant to follow the plaintiff at once to the tribunal. When the discovery of Gaius' Institutes made it clear that the only alternative the praetor's edict provided for *in ius vocatio* was the sending of a representative (*vindex*), the institution was reinvented as a voluntary "extra-judicial" *vadimonium* which the praetor chose to maintain in practice.

The third chapter is devoted to "Bail in Cicero" (19–44). The evidence for extra-judicial *vadimonium* was found especially in Cicero's speeches that, moreover, showed no clear instances of *in ius vocatio*. Thus it seemed that, by the time of Cicero, voluntary *vadimonium* had entirely replaced *in ius vocatio*. Metzger correctly holds that the *argumentum ex silentio* does not prove that extra-judicial *vadimonia* were used to introduce lawsuits but positive evidence is called for. In close examination, *in Verrem* 2.5.34 indeed appears to be a judicial *vadimonium*, and *pro Tullio* 20, although voluntary, a representative example, at best, of collusive lawsuits. An extensive discussion of *pro Quinctio* suggests that the *vadimonia*, taking place before and after Naevius secured *missio in possessionem* of Quinctius' goods, would have been judicial.

In the fourth chapter, Metzger turns to "Bail in Herculaneum and Puteoli" (45–64). When found in the 1930's, the first century wax-tablets from Herculaneum were naturally interpreted as extra-judicial, like the many *vadimonia* in documents relating to banking activities of the *Sulpicii* in Puteoli that came to light in 1959 near Pompeii. According to Metzger, practically all *vadimonia* in the tablets are in fact judicial, and the passive construction of the relevant edict by Gaius accommodates the fact that it may be the party or his representative who promises to appear but "conceals the fact that the magistrate is ordering the *plaintiff* to do something". The wording of the stipulations has been interpreted to show an initiative taken by the plaintiff; but given that the tablets are merely 'declatory' "there is no point in reconstructing the tablets' meaning so as to restore the constitutive effect of the stipulation/promise". The fact that appearances are promised near – not at – the tribunal does not prove that *vadimonium* was extra-judicial because this way the parties avoided the problem of not finding the magistrate where he was supposed to be holding court; it shows, however, that *vadimonium* could not have replaced, but worked in tandem with, the *in ius vocatio* still needed to take the defendant to court.

The argument that *vadimonia*, if they are judicial, ought to mention the magistrate's decision (*decretum*) is refuted in the fifth chapter: "How Cases are Postponed" (65–94). "If the documents are records of judicial vadimonia", Metzger suggests, "they could serve as evidence that the parties performed as they were ordered to perform." While it was the magistrate under whose order the parties promised to appear, the latter decided themselves whether to include a penalty. This, according to Metzger, explains why the promise of appearance (what the magistrate ordered) and the promise of penalty (what the parties agreed) are stated in the tablets in separate sentences. The defendant had an interest in proving his compliance (refusal was seriously punished) and in proving the penalty he had promised for non-appearance (otherwise he was liable for *quanti ea res erit*). The plaintiff might need to demonstrate that the penalty he demanded does not exceed statutory limits (100,000 sesterces) and was not vexatious (for more than one-half).

The sixth chapter deals with "Returning After a Postponement" (95–135). In addition to the penalty, the decision on a day for reappearance rested with the parties; only in default of agreement did the magistrate fix the "day-after-the-next" (*intertium*). As long as the parties were not ready either for a private settlement or a *litis contestatio*, a cycle of reappearances ensued *in iure* (postponements could also be needed to ensure that the judge is present in the magistrate's court when the *litis contestatio* took place, and to fix a date when he is ready to judge). Indeed, Metzger suggests that the magistrate in charge of jurisdiction was not only under obligation to publish the "day-after-the-next", or the next day when a trial and a *litis contestatio* could take place according to the ritual calendar, but also ordered without scrutiny a reappearance on that day for all cases pending at the end of the sitting.

Chapter seven (137–154) sets out to explain the little-known act of "Giving Notice of the Postponement". A fragment of Ulpian preserved in an Antinoopolis papyrus (*P.Ant.* 22) reveals how such a notice could influence the outcome: if the defendant had been notified well in advance of the day when proceedings *in iure* resumed, if he passed over the opportunity to appear before the magistrate on that day, he was denied a *restitutio in integrum*. Metzger argues that the tablets of the *Sulpicii* archive indeed contain two documents produced to prove the giving of notice of the postponement (*TPSulp* 32 and 33). The notice was of importance especially when the promise was made on behalf of the principal defendant by his representative; this would indeed have been the normal case whenever the defendant preferred not to follow *in ius vocatio* to the tribunal at once but sent a *vindex* or *cognitor* instead.

The eighth chapter (155–173) explores "Three Cases" of 1) Petronia Iusta; 2) Quinctius and Naevius; 3) Horace's satire 1.9. These cases, discussed in light of the main findings of the book, pave the way for "Concluding Remarks on Roman Litigation" in ninth chapter (175–178). Scholars have imagined that litigation was conducted in too orderly a fashion, beginning with a voluntary contract that sent well-prepared adversaries before the ready magistrate who assigned the case to a private judge. With the new evidence on the *vadimonium* (the inscriptions and papyri are usefully listed and described in an appendix: 179–192) it seems clear that cases "sometimes" began before the parties were ready with their actions, and in order to negotiate and prepare their cases, they might have to return again and again to the magistrate's court. It appears that, with the postponements, the procedure was organised to accommodate all that coming and going, wheeling and dealing, into the magistrate's tribunal, not to keep it away from there. In all, Metzger's book is an example of a meticulous and challenging reading of ancient sources integrated with modern research tradition, and it should be of great interest to both specialists and students of Roman legal procedure.

Janne Pölönen

CAROL L. LAWTON: *Marbleworkers in the Athenian Agora*. Picture Book No. 27. The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Athens 2006. ISBN 0-87661-645-7. 52 pp., 58 figs. EUR 4,95.

CRAIG A. MAUZY: *Agora Excavations 1931–2006. A Pictorial History*. With contributions by JOHN MCK. CAMP II. The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Athens 2006. ISBN 0-87661-910-3. 128 pp, 267 figs. EUR 15.

SUSAN I. ROTROFF and ROBERT D. LAMBERTON: *Women in the Athenian Agora*. Picture Book No. 26. The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Athens 2006. ISBN 0-87661-644-9. 56 pp., 71 figs. EUR 4,95.

Most archaeological projects usually produce only one kind of publication, the results of the work in articles and/or monographs. Very large and long projects might also try to popularize their work. The excavations of the Athenian Agora by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens has published its scholarly work mainly in the Athenian Agora Monographs series and as Supplements of Hesperia, the journal of the School, and also naturally in many other monographs and countless articles. The three books reviewed here belong to the category of "other publications". Life in Athens in the times of classical antiquity is made easily available for everyone in the Picture Books series represented here by two examples: one on Athenian women (Rotroff & Lamberton) and the second on marbleworking (Lawton), and the history of the excavations is visualized in the third volume by Craig A. Mauzy.

Writing popular archaeology or science in general is not necessarily very easy. The public has great interest in archaeology and there is a real demand for good popular books, but many archaeologists look down on such efforts. The reason for the negativity is hard to understand. Maybe it is felt that the results are difficult to explain in less-than-academic terms or that the results are not spectacular enough for popularization. Or perhaps there is a reluctance to make such interpretations of the material that would make it alive for those whose main interest in life is not stones or pottery. Another, very good reason maybe that preparation of a popular volume is not counted in the project's budget and few archaeologists have the time or energy to work on such books. This makes the popular book series from the Agora excavations all the more valuable.

The volume by Susan I. Rotroff and Robert D. Lamberton is on women in the Athenian Agora, or rather on women's lives in Athens in general during the heyday of Athens, in the 5th and 4th centuries BC. The various aspects of the daily life of women is examined through texts and archaeological findings starting with women's status in society in general, their rights and obligations. This is followed by glimpses of life at home, responsibilities and tasks. There is also a section on women as companions as well as depictions of women in terracotta statuettes. The text is easy and interesting to read and the pictures illustrate the points well. There is even space for discussing the differences between what the texts and what the archaeological material tell, well illustrating the difficulties of recreating societies from more than two millennia ago. The book ends with a few pages on the women who have been integral to the work of the Agora excavation, mainly from the first generation of Agora scholars. As has been noted many times by studies into archaeological research processes and history of the discipline, women tend to be the ones who keep the records and patiently study the pottery. Lucy Talcott was responsible for the creation of the recording system and keeping the records straight for the excavations for decades and this possibly earned her a reputation for being overtly conscientious and detailed about it. Anyone who has had to work with frequently chaotic excavation archives would appreciate the neat organization and details of the Agora system. Archaeology is much about the pleasure of finding new things and making exciting interpretations, but behind this is really a need for rigorously keeping the details straight and archival discipline in that is very important. It is delightful that the ancient women have been connected to the modern women.

The other Picture Book is on the marbleworking at the Agora and written by Carol Lawton. The booklet begins by presenting the history of stone sculpture in Greece and then continues by displaying the archaeological evidence and the find locations in the Agora area. The most important stoneworking tools and methods are described next. The last part is dedicated to famous sculptors and their works related to the Agora. As with the other volume, the text is clear and informative and the many photographs and drawings handsomely complement the text.

The book by Craig A. Mauzy deals with the history of the project. Every archaeological excavation or survey leaves behind a considerable legacy of material that usually will not be published. This material includes the work conducted and other things not directly related to archaeology. Letters, e-mails, photographs, videos, drawings, plans, notes, etc. They form the basis for studying the history of the project and could contribute to the more general study of the history of archaeology. Few projects have been going on as long as the Agora excavations and for this reason, it is wonderful to see the volume of photographs and notes collected by the current site photographer.

The main emphasis of the book is not on archaeology, but rather on the process of the project and how many of its relevant infrastructures were created. The book starts with reminiscences of the first season in 1931 with photographs and notebook pages. It then proceeds to record the reconstruction of the Stoa of Attalos in the 1950's, which is now the excavation house, the main storage space and the museum of the Agora. The photographs and short notes record the various phases of planning and building the structure, giving a tangible idea of the effort (and cost) put into the project. This feat is made even greater considering that at the same time the Church of the Holy Apostles was being studied and then reconstructed to its 11th century appearance. After the building projects, the archaeological area also needed to be made into an archaeological park and this landscaping work is recorded in the next section.

The book finishes with photographs and lists of the past and present excavation staffs, the people responsible for the digging, cleaning, recording and maintenance of the archaeological record. Apart from some obligatory work photos, the archaeologist tends to not to write him/herself into the results – perhaps in an attempt to be scientifically objective? Seeing photographs of the teams at work and leisure is thus always interesting and intriguing. The excavation work itself was done by Greek workers until 1980, when they were mostly replaced by volunteer students from American universities. The educational value of the excavation is also very great! Two names and one institution could perhaps be added to the lists of participants for 1997: the current author and Petro Pesonen from the University of Helsinki had a unique opportunity to participate in the excavations by the generosity of the project's director, John McK. Camp II. We also have the photographic record as proof (not to mention the inscribed trowels)!

Eeva-Maria Viitanen

Il santuario di Portonaccio a Veio. A cura di GIOVANNI COLONNA. 1: *Gli scavi di Massimo Pallottino nella zona dell'altare (1939– 1940)*. Con contributi di G. Colonna et al. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei: Monumenti Antichi, ser. Miscellanea, vol. VI– 6 (= 58). Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Roma 2002. ISBN 88-7689-209-5. 295 pp., 80 tavv. EUR 150.

It sometimes happens that the results of an archaeological excavation are published – for various reasons – only decades after its completion. This is also the case of Massimo Pallottino's research in 1939–1940 in the area of the altar, at the sanctuary of Portonaccio in Veii. Without delay, the epigraphical material, architectural terracottas and fragmentary terracotta statues, the famous goddess with the child and the male torso, had been noted. But it was only in 1947 that the major part of the finds could be addressed in a scholarly manner by Pallottino's assistant, Valeria Martelli. The work, however, was interrupted, and the catalogue of the finds was finally ready in the 1980s, but bibliographically brought up to date even later. By the combined efforts of several scholars, among others, the pupils of Pallottino and their pupils, the final publication came out in 2002. Before its appearance, a summary of Pallottino's research was included in the exhibition catalogue *Veio, Cerveteri, Vulci – città d'Etruria a confronto*, in 2001, pages 45–56.

The publication consists of the catalogue of finds, altogether 1255 pieces, of a short presentation of some of the material originating from Pallottino's excavation, but which had gone astray in the meantime, and of the republication of the epigraphical material in the light of recent studies. For the most part, the finds cover several groups of pottery, both imported and locally made, but also weaving implements, votive terracottas, statuettes of bronze, ivory and bone, jewellery and decorations, among which scarabs used as signets or amulets, were brought to the sanctuary. The range of the material strongly recalls the many votive caches, which have likewise been published belatedly, and presented so meritoriously in the series *Corpus delle stipi votive in Italia*. The finds show that, from the archaic period through the third century BC, the object of the cult at the sanctuary of Portonaccio was Minerva, also supported by other deities. The finds now analyzed to the full show the contacts in the Apennines and beyond in different times.

The finds together with Pallottino's diaries and notes have enabled the publishers to reconstruct the old excavation. The text is complemented with photos and plans of different periods, and also Pallottino's sketches and pages of his diaries. Besides shedding light on an important Etruscan sanctuary, the publication is an honour to the famous etruscologist's early work, and a reward of the persistence of later generations of etruscologists.

Leena Pietilä-Castrén

LAUREN HACKWORTH PETERSEN: *The Freedman in Roman Art and Art History*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 978-0-521-85889-2. 294 pp., 140 figs. GBP 50.

Petronius' Trimalchio is the quintessential image of the Roman freedman: a newly franchised member of Roman society desperately trying to make sense of his new status and failing at every attempt. His imaginary personality has been used in studies of Roman history and art history to create such well-known phrases as "freedman mentality" and "freedman taste". The undertone is usually that of failure: the freedman tried to be a member of the free Roman society and, like Trimalchio, did poorly. Lauren Hackworth Petersen's volume is an attempt to study this preconception, to see whether it is true and to even unravel it by trying to interpret the freedmen and their monuments as expressions of a more general, Roman, not merely freedman, mentality.

The contents of the book are arranged in two parts: the first deals with freedmen and how they represented themselves in public. The main part of the material discussed comes from Pompeii, concerning the rebuilding of the Temple of Isis and the presence of the Augustales, but an analysis of the Tomb of Eurysaces in Rome ends this section. The second part of the book concentrates on family and social life as expressed in the Roman house, and, again, the examples come from Pompeii. In addition, this section and the whole book end with burial monuments and an analysis of the monuments of Isola Sacra at Ostia. The book is well written and the illustrations contribute handsomely to the text.

Hackworth Petersen builds her sociological analysis mostly on recent studies on and interpretation of freedmen and then applies these to archaeological material. The choice of examples somewhat reflects the general problems of these types of studies. The persons are known from inscriptions and their status recognized by either explicit mention or then by their nomenclature. Hackworth Petersen questions many generalizations of attributions of freedman status, attempting to show also how the persons portrayed themselves more as Roman citizens in general, than as new Roman citizens. The monuments, burials, and houses are connected to these persons through inscriptions, and more often than not, the attribution has to be regarded as uncertain. With public buildings and burials, the situation is slightly better: the connection between the monument and the inscription is usually clear. Regarding the houses of Pompeii, the situation is far more complicated, but the author manages to find some fairly good examples. The second issue is then how to evaluate the art commissioned by freedmen and this happens mostly by looking at the wider context, placing the freedmen in the Roman society and seeing if they blend in; Hackworth Petersen finds that they blend in.

The "Trimalchio Vision", as the author calls the overpowering interpretative model derived from Petronius' text, does affect how freedmen have been regarded in most previous research. Trimalchio's social climbing and attempts at showing off his position in society and his belief in the power of wealth have been used to interpret every aspect of what freedmen have left behind for modern scholars to see in that negative way. The "freedman taste" evokes images of poor taste, imitation of the society's true upper echelons and their good taste. The freedman monuments have been singled out and discussed with Trimalchio in mind, even though – if they had been set in a wider context – the result might have been different. One of the classic examples is the rebuilding of the Temple of Isis in Pompeii. The inscriptions indicate that it was due to the benefaction of N. Popidius Celsinus, a six-year-old who was then accepted as member of the decurions despite his age. It is obvious that the rebuilding was done by the boy's family and not by the boy himself. The most common interpretation has been that his status-hungry freedman father did the deed to promote his and his son's status in Pompeian society. The worship of Isis has also been connected to social inferiors, further accentuating the slightly negative tone of the discussions of the temple. Hackworth Petersen's point of view is rather that of assimilation: she points out how family benefaction and commemoration is generally used in Roman society for public advancement, and how Egypt and Isiac imagery is common in all kinds of contexts in Pompeii. The freedman, rather than blatantly promoting himself and his newly acquired status, participated in the functioning of the society in quite a similar manner to everyone else. Trimalchio is an image created by the Roman elite in Rome, maybe even a satire of the Roman upper classes or Emperor Nero himself; he does not necessarily have much to do with reality in towns outside Rome.

The Roman *domus* and its decoration is also given a large role in the book. The first example used is the Pompeian House of D. Octavius Quartio (II 2,2). This is a large "miniature villa" on the eastern side of Pompeii. The property covers more than 3/4s of a city block and features one of the more elaborate and fantastic gardens in the whole of Pompeii with fountains, huge fish ponds and statuary. It has also been described as the "Disney World of Pompeii" and used as an emblem of "freedman taste": imitating the large buildings and fine decorations of villas and doing it with rather poor results, cramming as much as possible into a small space; trying too hard and failing. The owner of the house remains unknown, but the decorations and the Isiac imagery found there have been connected to a rich freedman. If the house could be connected to the *gens* Octavia, it could be noted that members of that family had lived in the city since the establishment of the Roman colony and thus could not be described as of libertine status. The decorations are associated with a more common desire to include glimpses of art combined with nature in Pompeian houses.

The second domestic example is the House of L. Caecilius Iucundus (V 1,26), one of the few houses in Pompeii where the owner is known by way of an archive found in the house. At least two generations of the Caecilii family are known and they are of freedman stock. Hackworth Petersen associates the phases of extension and decorations to the two generations and argues how the freedman family created itself an ancestry by employing subtle indications that they shared a common history with the house. Although her analysis is quite plausible, the uncertainties of dating the changes and connecting a person to specific changes in the house make it slightly problematic. The case is so unique, even in Pompeii, that comparisons cannot be made.

Hackworth Petersen's book is a welcome fresh look at freedmen, their status and how they projected themselves in Roman society. It is also a welcome deconstruction of a stereotype created by modern scholarship, which affects interpretations of many kinds of evidence.

Eeva-Maria Viitanen

GEOFF W. ADAMS: *The Suburban Villas of Campania and their Social Function*. BAR International Series 1542. Archaeopress, Oxford 2006. ISBN 1-84171-974-9. IX, 175 pp., 72 Figs., 13 Tables, 42 Graphs. GBP 38.

Roman villas have been studied from many different points of view, although publications of excavation results and typology tend to be the most common ones. This volume by Geoff Adams is based on his doctoral dissertation and it concentrates on architectural analysis and social interpretations. The principal idea is very simple: to recognize spaces potentially used for entertainment in villas and compare their ground areas to the total ground area of the complex. In this way, it is hoped that the possible intended social uses of spaces and types of villas can be identified. The data set consists of the villas located near the ancient towns of Pompeii, Herculaneum and Stabiae, where the good preservation of architecture and other types of material culture provide good opportunities for identifying uses of space. The premises are interesting and the results are promising, but, unfortunately, the book is riddled with so many flaws that it is difficult to truly appreciate these.

The slim volume is divided into an introduction, five main chapters and conclusions. After presenting the basic principles and methods, Adams starts the discussion by examining the literary evidence concerning *villae suburbanae*. Then he examines the Pompeian cases in two chapters. The following two discuss the villas around Herculaneum and Stabiae as well as making a small detour to Baiae in the Campi Flegrei area. Tables and figures are found at the end of the book. The figures are all maps or ground plans, readable as such, but, unfortunately, there are problems in indicating sites and rooms. The numbering of the villas in the text and on the general maps does not match – in some cases, it is possible to match the site and the number, but not always. In addition, in many cases, the numbering of rooms on plans and in the text is different and the descriptions are not accurate enough to recognize the spaces. Indicating all the rooms mentioned in the text and not just the entertainment spaces, would also have been beneficial for understanding the argument, as now it remains unclear which rooms are discussed. There are also many typographical and other errors – in general the book needed rigorous editing. The most embarrassing error is perhaps mistaking the poet Martial (Marcus Valerius Martialis) for Iulius Martialis, who had a villa on the Janiculum in Rome (4,64), which Adams compares at length to Martial's descriptions of his suburban estate located in Nomentum.

The first part of the book concerns the concept of the *villa suburbana*, its definition and uses. The treatise of literary evidence is limited to the specific cases of the words *suburbium* and *suburbanus* in all forms that they have been used in Latin literature, and particularly in connection with the word *villa*. In the end, the *villa suburbana* is defined as a villa located close to an urban centre, with a certain amount of luxury and possible productive parts, a complex suited for the intended lifestyle of the owner. Adams also concludes that the term can be applied to all urban centres and their surroundings. This latter part is problematic: can the term really be applied with confidence to other areas than the surroundings of Rome? Rome was the *urbs* and the terms discussed are used in connection to its surroundings by an overwhelming majority of references. Adams would also regard *surburbanus* as a concrete geographical term as opposed to the ideological significance it has also been given (cf. the article by E. Champlin in Ancient Society 1982 or J.W. Meyer's Imus ad villam. *Studien zur Villeggiatur im stadtrömischen Surburbium in der späten Republik und frühen Kaiserzeit*. Geographica Historica 20, 2005). *Suburbium* was not only a specific region, but also a certain kind of region, where the landowner was truly free of all obligations, both to Rome as well to possible local ones. The surroundings of Rome were such for many aristocratic Roman landowners: they usually had no legal, social or kinship ties to the region and were able to use it for pure recreation.

In addition, limiting the search to the terms discussed creates problems: most of the villas in the surroundings of Rome are not called *suburbanae* at all. In order to understand the uses of the villa, one should perhaps look at all the texts regarding villas in the area of Rome to see the possible similarities and differences, to set the suggested specific type in a wider context. Cicero's or Lucullus' famous Tusculan villas are never called *suburbanae*, but nevertheless they were, at least geographically. In some cases, Adams also discusses references to such villas, e.g., Horace's Sabinum, defining them himself as *suburbana*. Adams also seems not to see the difference in the uses of terms for an estate and its buildings. *Praedium* and *fundus* tend to be the ones used for the whole estate and *villa* is generally used when only the buildings are mentioned. Taking this difference into consideration more actively might have changed some of the interpretations he presents.

The villa was used as an instrument of social promotion and as such, the *villa suburbana* in the surroundings of Rome was of importance. The Roman elite retired to the countryside and it was important to own a property there. The area of the Bay of Naples, including Adams' research area, was another similar zone in Central Italy. This raises another question concerning the use of the term *villa suburbana* as a concrete geographical term in that region. Who owned the villas in the surroundings of Pompeii, Herculaneum and Stabiae? If they were locals connected with local social competition, it could perhaps be said that having a *villa suburbana* near their own town might work in a similar way as one in the Rome region worked for the Roman aristocrat. Were the *villae suburbanae* owned by locals or Romans? Were they used to promote career and status locally or in Rome? In the latter case, the vicinity of Pompeii or Herculaneum would have been irrelevant; the most important thing would have been having an estate in the most popular resort area in Central Italy. In archaeological terms, discerning the villas owned by locals or the Roman aristocracy is impossible without the benefit of graffiti or other kinds of written sources and they are very rare.

The second part of the book concentrates on the description and analysis of various excavated villas. Most villa sites in the region have been included despite the limitations posed by the extent to which the buildings were excavated or what the level of data available for them is. A definition as a villa is also questionable for some buildings, particularly some of those located close to the gates of Pompeii. Most of the sites are located in the surroundings of Pompeii, which is easy to understand considering the ease of excavating the loose ashes and pumice gravel covering the area. The Herculanean region is most poorly represented, probably owing to the difficulty of excavating the hardened mud and also to dense modern habitation over the ancient remains. These considerations naturally limit the possibilities for interpretation. As comparative material particularly for Pompeii, the region of Puteoli would have been of interest, but, unfortunately, the level of data there is particularly poor. A number of town houses from Pompeii and Herculaneum have also been included in the discussion as comparative material. The buildings, of which only a small part have been excavated, could have perhaps been excluded from the analysis, since insufficient knowledge of the ground plan, use of space and total area make them unsuitable for the methods used by Adams. The town houses of Pompeii could have also included the series of buildings south of the *forum* area that are very similar in style and location to those of *Insula Occidentalis* on the western edge of the town. The region around Pompeii is divided into inner and outer suburban areas, but their difference is not specified very clearly; at least it is not based on distance from the city walls. The inner parts include the zones towards the coast as well as the villas located by the roads leaving Pompeii. The outer zone stretches to a 4–5 km distance from the city walls, but some of these villas are actually located closer to the city walls than the inner region sites. The division could perhaps better be described as "coastal" and "inland" rather than inner and outer.

The method is based on recognizing entertainment spaces in the villa. Entertainment space is defined as "an area of a residence that could be used for either relaxation or the receipt of visitors by the residents of the household" (p. 1). This definition is very general and if it is compared to what is indicated of use of space for most room types known from literary sources, potential entertainment space could cover most rooms in the building. The discussion on how to recognize the uses of space archaeologically is relatively short and mostly based on P. Allison's analysis of Pompeian town houses (*Pompeian households: an analysis of the material culture*, Cotsen Institute of Archaeology at UCLA Monograph 42, 2004). Her architectural types are, in turn, based on the *atrium*-peristyle town house and connections to these two main spaces define many of the entertainment spaces. Unfortunately, this typology is rather difficult to apply to villas. A discussion of villa architecture in general as well as a comparison to the architecture of a town house would have benefited the argument. Of the ca. 40 villa ground plans Adams presents, only a minority have either main space clearly defined. Thus, the identification of space in the villas is usually based on the presence of lavish decorations and the size of the room, but not on its architectural type. Other types of material culture are rarely available for determining use of space. What is included in the end are not all potential reception and entertainment spaces, but rather the more private and larger spaces usually called *triclinia*, *oeci* or *exedrae*. Decorative gardens, usually in colonnaded courtyards, are also included in entertainment spaces and they serve as an indicator of an open, villa-style ground plan.

The main method is comparison of the amounts of entertainment space to the whole ground area of the complex. In general, the amount of potential entertainment space in larger and well-appointed villas is at least 25% and this is generally used as a determining point in defining a villa as *suburbana*. There are some exceptions to the rule, e.g., the Villa of the Mysteries at Pompeii, which is defined as *suburbana* because of its decorations despite the very low percentage of entertainment space. Adams has also calculated proportions of entertainment space with and without open spaces. The open areas have been excluded, particularly if their productive purposes seemed obvious, and Adams does not discuss these percentages if the villa seems to be otherwise suitable as a *suburbana*. The difference between a *villa maritima* and *villa suburbana* is also difficult to distinguish, e.g., which is the Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum? What are the lavish villas lining the Roman coastline between Ostia and Antium? Is there really a difference between the two types? Both were intended more for the leisure of the owner than for productive purposes, so the appointments of the buildings would have been very similar. This further reflects the difficulty of classifying villas.

What emerge from Adams' analysis are perhaps the different trends of the villas in the Campanian coastal areas rather than definitions of types. The villas closer to the coast tend to be larger and the largest complexes can be found near Herculaneum and Stabiae. The latter sites also exhibit the largest amounts of entertainment space. Pompeii might be a commercial centre and a lively town, but it certainly did not attract the greatest villas to its neighbourhood. In fact, the largest and most spectacular sites are found near Stabiae, which was unimportant as an urban centre. This perhaps again indicates that the *villa suburbana* is a more complicated term than what Adams conceives. The vicinity of a town is recommended by Roman agronomists for all villas for having a market for products of the villa. In addition, an urban centre also served for services and provisions for the villa, if they should be needed. The size of the town did not have that great an importance in the latter case, but could be significant in the first, for the productive villa. The reason for building the most elaborate and fantastic villas at Stabiae was not Stabiae itself, but something else. The reason could have been the spectacular location on top of the ridge overlooking the bay area.

The results of the analysis of the amount of entertainment space are interesting with regard to house and villa design. In the large Pompeian and Herculanean town houses, the amount of entertainment space is remarkably uniform, at close to 30%, compared to the more varied villas. The town house sample is perhaps more consistent and uniform than that of the villas, but the results probably indicate the more rigid and traditional design of the *domus* compared to the *villa*. The villa ground plans are hard to categorize because of their great variation (cf. L. Romizzi, *Ville d'*otium *dell'Italia antica*, 2001). In the countryside, there was always more space, the building did not have to reflect traditional values, and it could be opened up to the surrounding nature. In addition, the locations often feature extreme relief – cliffs, steep slopes, etc. – that required unique architectural solutions.

The archaeological villas form a continuum from the simplest agricultural establishments to the most elaborate residential complexes; dividing them into classes will always be arbitrary. The difference between the opposite ends of the continuum is easy to see, but for the rest, the situation is more complicated. Finding trends in villa architecture is difficult and Adams' graphs show this with the great variety that is striking with almost every aspect he examines. Adams' statistical analysis does not define an archaeological *villa suburbana* in any way, but does perhaps provide a useful tool for analysing various aspects of Roman domestic architecture.

Eeva-Maria Viitanen

INDEX LIBRORUM IN HOC VOLUMINE RECENSORUM

LIBRI NOBIS MISSI

J.N. ADAMS: *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC–AD 600*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-88149-4. XIX, 828 pp. GBP 110.

JOEL ALLEN: *Hostages and Hostage-Taking in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 0-521-86183-7. XIV, 291 pp. GBP 48.00.

Altertum und Mittelmeerraum: Die antike Welt diesseits und jenseits der Levante. Festschrift für Peter W. Haider zum 60. Geburtstag. Herausgegeben von ROBERT ROLLINGER und BRIGITTE TRUSCHNEGG. Oriens et Occidens 12. Franz Steiner Verlag, München 2006. ISBN 3-515-08738-9. 878 S. EUR 69.

TAKESHI AMEMIYA: *Economy and Economics of Ancient Greece*. Routledge, Abingdon – New York 2007. ISBN 978-0-415-70154-9. XIV, 184 pp. GBP 70.

ANUBIO: *Carmen astrologicum elegiacum*. Recensuit DIRK OBBINK. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. K. G. Saur Verlag, Monachii et Lipsiae 2006. ISBN 978-3-598-71228-9. 79 pp. EUR 58.

Approches de la Troisiéme Sophistique. Hommages à Jacques Schamp. Édité par EUGENIO AMATO. Collection Latomus 296. Éditions Latomus, Bruxelles 2006. ISBN 2-87031-237-7. XXVIII, 614 pp. EUR 89.

Art and Inscriptions in the Ancient World. Edited by ZAHRA NEWBY and RUTH LEADER-NEWBY. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-86851-8. XVII, 303 pp. GBP 65.

WOLFRAM AX: *Text und Stil. Studien zur antiken Literatur und deren Rezeption*. Herausgegeben von CHRISTIAN SCHWARZ. Franz Steiner Verlag, München 2006. ISBN 3-515-08825-3. 316 EUR 54.

PHILIP P. BETANCOURT: *The Chrysokamino Metallurgy Workshop and Its Territory.* Hesperia Supplement 36. The American School of Classical Studies at Athens 2006. ISBN 978-0-87661-536-2. XXII, 462 pp. USD 65.

REINHOLD BICHLER: *Historiographie – Ethnographie – Utopie. Gesammelte Schriften, Teil 1. Studien zu Herodots Kunst der Historie.* Herausgegeben von ROBERT ROLLINGER. Philippika, Marburger altertumskundliche Abhandlungen 18,1. Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden 2007. ISBN 978-3-447-05616-8. 274 S. EUR 48.

Bohuslaus Hassensteinius a Lobkowicz: Opera poetica. Herausgegeben von M. VACULÍNOVÁ. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. K. G. Saur, München – Leipzig 2006. ISBN 3-598-73056-X. XL, 328 S. EUR 88.

Brill's Companion to Propertius. Edited by HANS-CHRISTIAN GÜNTHER. Brill, Leiden 2006. ISBN 978-90-04-13682-3. XII, 476 pp. EUR 207.

Brill's Companion to Thucydides. Edited by ANTONIOS RENGAKOS and ANTONIS TSAKMAKIS. Brill, Leiden 2006. ISBN 978-90-04-13683-0. XIX, 947 pp. EUR 249.

JON STEFFEN BRUSS: *Hidden Presences. Monuments, gravesites, and corpses in Greek funerary epigram.* Hellenistica Groningiana 10. Peeters, Leuven 2005. ISBN 90-429-1641-9. XIV, 202 pp. EUR 40.

KOSTAS BURASELIS: ΘΕΙΑ ΔΩΡΕΑ. *Das Göttlich-Kaiserliche Geschenk. Studien zur Politik der Severer und zur Constitutio Antoniniana*. Akten der Gesellschaft für griechische and hellenistische Rechtsgeschichte 18. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien 2007. ISBN 978-3-7001-3725-2. XII, 181 S. EUR 39,20.

ROSS BURNS: *Damascus. A History*. Routledge, Abingdon 2005, 2007. ISBN 978-0-415-41317-6 (pb), 978-0-415-27105-9 (hb). XX, 386 pp. GBP 19.99 (pb), GBP 70 (hb).

B. BÄBLER – H.-G. NESSELRATH: *Ars et Verba. Die Kunstbeschreibungen des Kallistratos.* Einführung, Text, Übersetzung, Anmerkungen und archäologischer Kommentar. K. G. Saur Verlag, München – Leipzig 2006. ISBN 3-598-73056-X. IX, 105 S. EUR 58.

The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece. Edited by H. A. SHAPIRO. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-52929-7. XVIII, 303 pp. 42 fig. GBP 16.99.

The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre. Edited by MARIANNE MCDONALD and J. MICHAEL WALTON. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-54234-0. XVI, 365 pp. GBP 17.99.

The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus. Edited by C. DEWALD and J. MARINCOLA. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 0-521-53683-9 (pb), 0-521-83001-X (hb). XXII, 378 pp. GBP 17.99 (pb), GBP 45 (hb).

The Cambridge Companion to Horace. Edited by STEPHEN HARRISON. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-83002-7. XIII, 381 pp. GBP 55.

The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Pericles. Edited by LOREN J. SAMONS II. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-00389-6. XX, 343 pp. GBP 17.99.

FILIPPO CANALI DE ROSSI: *Filius publicus.* ΥΙΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΛΕΩΣ *e titoli affini in iscrizioni greche di età imperiale*. Studi sul vocabolario dell'evergesia 1. Herder Editrice e Libreria, Roma 2007. ISBN 978-88-89670-24-8. VIII, 272 pp. EUR 40.

LUCIANO CANFORA: *Julius Caesar. The People's Dictator*. Translated by MARIAN HILL and KEVIN WINDLE. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh 2007. ISBN 978-0-7486-1936-8. XVI, 392 pp. GBP 24.99.

MALCOLM CHOAT: *Belief and Cult in Fourth-Century Papyri*. Studia Antiqua Australiensia 1. Brepols, Turnhout 2006. ISBN 2-503-51327-1. XIV, 217 pp. EUR 40.

MATTHEW R. CHRIST: *The Bad Citizen in Classical Athens*. Cambridge University Press, New York 2006. ISBN 978-0-521-86432-9. XI, 250 pp. GBP 48.

Ciceroniana n.s. XII. Atti del XII Colloquium Tullianum. Salamanca, 7-9 ottobre 2004. Dir. LEOPOLDO GAMBERALE, Red. DONATELLA FOGAZZA e SALVATORE MONDA Centro di studi Ciceroniani, Roma 2006. 247 pp. EUR 50.

JAMES CLACKSON and GEOFFREY HORROCKS: *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language.* Blackwell, Oxford 2007. ISBN 978-1-4051-6209-8. VIII, 324 pp. GBP 50.

SUSAN D. COLLINS: *Aristotle and the Rediscovery of Citizenship*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 0-521-86046-6. X, 193 pp. GBP 45.00.

Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum Pannonicarum. Editio III. aucta. Edidit PÉTER KOVÁCS. Hungarian Polis Studies – PAN (HPS) 15. Pan libri, Debrecen – Budapest 2007. ISBN 978-963-473-045-3. 167 pp. EUR 29.

KARSTEN DAHMEN: *The Legend of Alexander the Great on Greek and Roman Coins*. Routledge, Abingdon – New York 2007. ISBN 978-0-415-39452-9. XV, 179 pp. GBP 19.99.

EVE D'AMBRA: *Roman Women*. Cambridge University Press, New York 2007. ISBN 0-521-52158-0. xxi, 215 pp. GBP 12.99, USD 18.99.

Deleto paene imperio Romano. Transformationsprozesse des Römischen Reiches im 3. Jahrhundert und ihre Rezeption in der Neuzeit. Herausgegeben von KLAUS-PETER JOHNE, THOMAS GERHARDT und UDO HARTMANN. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2006. ISBN 978-3-515-08941-8. 446 S., 16 Taf. EUR 72.

JÜRGEN DUMMER: *Philologia sacra et profana. Ausgewählte Beiträge zur Antike und zu ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte*. *Festschrift für Jürgen Dummer.* Herausgegeben von MEINOLF VIELBERG. Altertumswissenschaftliches Kolloquium 16. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2006. ISBN 978-3-515-08663-9. 408 S. EUR 62.

ANNE DUNCAN: *Performance and Identity in the Classical World.* Cambridge University Press, New York 2006. ISBN 978-0-521-85282-1. VIII, 242 pp. GBP 45.

CARLO EBANISTA: *La tomba di D. Felice nel santuario di Cimitile. A cinquant'anni dalla scoperta*. Coemeterium 4. LER Editrice, Napoli 2006. ISBN 88-8264-424-3. 239 pp. EUR 20.

DOROTHEE ELM VON DER OSTEN: *Liebe als Wahnsinn. Die Konzeption der Göttin Venus in den Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus.* Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 20. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2007. ISBN 978-3-515-08958-6. 204 S. EUR 49.

DAVID ENGELS: *Das römische Vorzeichenwesen (753-27 v. Chr.). Quellen, Terminologie, Kommentar, historische Entwicklung.* Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 22. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2007. ISBN 978-3-515-09027-8. 877 S. EUR 98.

Eran ud Aneran. Studien zu den Beziehungen zwischen dem Sasanidenreich und der Mittelmeerwelt. Herausgegeben von JOSEF WIESEHÖFER und PHILIP HUYSE. Oriens et Occidens 13. Franz Steiner Verlag, München 2006. ISBN 3-515-08829-6. 288 S. EUR 56.

MALCOLM R. ERRINGTON: *Roman Imperial Policy from Julian to Theodosius*. Studies in the History of Greece and Rome. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill 2006. ISBN 0-8078-3038-0. XII, 336 pp. USD 45.

Ethne e religioni nella Sicilia antica. A cura di P. ANELLO, G. MARTORANA e R. SAMMARTANO. Kokalos supplementi vol. 18. Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Roma 2006. ISBN 88-7689-190-0. XII, 435 pp., 19 tavv. EUR 200.

EURIPIDES: *Andromache*. With an introduction, translation and commentary by MICHAEL LLOYD. Second Edition. Aris & Phillips Classical Texts. Oxbow Books, Oxford 2005. ISBN 0-85668-770-7. VIII, 196 pp. GBP 18.

EURIPIDES: *Helen*. With Introduction, Translation and Commentary by PETER BURIAN. Aris & Phillips Classical Texts. Oxbow Books, Oxford 2007. ISBN 0-85668-651-4. X, 309 pp. GBP 18.

VINCENT FARENGA: *Citizen and Self in the Greek City State*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 0-521-84559-9. IX, 592 pp. GBP 55.00.

GARY D. FARNEY: *Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome.* Cambridge University Press, New York 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-86331-5. XX, 337 pp. GBP 48.

ANNE GANGLOFF: *Dion Chrysostome et les mythes. Hellénisme, communication et philosophie politique*. Éditions Jérôme Millon, Grenoble 2006. ISBN 2-84137-195-6. 428 pp. EUR 28.

PHOEBÉ GIANNISI: *Récits des voies. Chant et cheminement en Grèce archaïque*. Éditions Jérôme Millon, Grenoble 2006. ISBN 2-84137-202-2. 190 pp. EUR 25.

C.M.C. GREEN: *Roman Religion and the Cult of Diana at Aricia.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-85158-9 (hb). XXX, 347 pp. GBP 48.

Gregory of Nazianzus. Images and Reflections. Edited by JOSTEIN BØRTNES and TOMAS HÄGG. Museum Tusculanum Press, Copenhagen 2006. ISBN 87-635-0386-7 349. pp. DKK 395.

NICOLAE GUDEA – THOMAS LOBÜSCHER: *Dacia; Eine römische Provinz zwischen Karpaten und Schwarzem Meer.* Orbis Provinciarum. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 2006. ISBN

3-8053-3415-X. IV, 115 S. m. 37 Farb-, 14 SW- u. 32 Strichabb. EUR 24,90.

MARIE-LAURENCE HAACK: *Prosopographie des haruspices romains.* Biblioteca di "studi etruschi" 42. Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali, Pisa – Roma 2006. ISBN 88-8147-425-5 (b.), 88-8147-424-7 (r.). 217 pp. EUR 195 (b), 295 (r).

JENS HALFWASSEN: *Der Aufstieg zum Einen. Untersuchungen zu Platon und Plotin*. Zweite, um einem Forschungsbericht erweiterte Auflage. K. G. Saur, München – Leipzig 2006. ISBN 3-598-73055-1. 440 S. EUR 58.

A Handbook of Ancient Religions. Edited by JOHN R. HINNELLS. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-84712-4. XI, 610 pp. GBP 80.

EDWARD M. HARRIS: *Democracy and the Rule of Law in Classical Athens. Essays on Law, Society, and Politics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 0-521-85279-X. XXXII, 486 pp. GBP 55.

HEINZ HEINEN: *Antike am Rande der Steppe. Der nördliche Schwarzmeerraum als Forschungsaufgabe.* Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz – Abhandlungen der Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse Band 5/2006. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2006. ISBN 3-515-08921-7. 91 S., 23 s/w Abb. EUR 17.

GABRIEL HERMAN: *Morality and Behaviour in Democratic Athens: A Social History*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 978-0-521-85021-6. XXI, 472 pp. GBP 60.

Herrschen und Verwalten. Der Alltag der römischen Administration in der Hohen Kaiserzeit. Herausgegeben RUDOLF HAENSCH und JOHANNES HEINRICHS. Böhlau, Köln – Weimar – Wien 2007. ISBN 978-3-412-23806-3. XIV, 465 S. 24 Taf. EUR 69,90.

A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity. Edited by A.-F. CHRISTIDIS. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-83307-3. XLI, 1617 pp. GBP 140.

JÜRGEN HODSKE: *Mythologische Bildthemen in den Häusern Pompejis. Die Bedeutung der zentralen Mythenbilder für die Bewohner Pompejis*. Stendaler Winckelmann-Forschungen 6. Verlag Franz Philipp Rutzen, Ruhpolding 2007. ISBN 978-3-938646-13-7. 328 S. mit Abb. + CD-ROM. EUR 75.

WOLFGANG HÜBNER: *Crater Liberi. Himmelspforten und Tierkreis*. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 2006, Heft 3. Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, München 2006. ISBN 978-3-7696-1638-5, ISSN 0342-5991. 69 S. EUR 8.

WILLIAM HUTTON: *Describing Greece. Landscape and Literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias*. Greek Culture in the Roman World. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2005. ISBN 978-0-521-84720-9. XIII, 372 pp. GBP 59.

FAHRI ISIK: *Girlanden-Sarkophage aus Aphrodisias*. Mit einem Beitrag zu den Inschriften von JOYCE M. REYNOLDS und CHARLOTTE ROUECHÉ. Sarkophag-Studien 5. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 2007. ISBN 978-3-8053-3729-8. XVI, 202 S. 112 Taf. EUR 94.

GORDON P. KELLY: *A History of Exile in the Roman Republic*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 978-0-521-84860-2. X, 260 pp. GBP 40.

KORDOSI, M. S.: Η ΟΜΗΡΙΚΗ ΙΘΑΚΗ. (ΝΗΣΟΣ-ΑΣΤΥ) σέ σχέση μέ τή μεταγενέστερη ἀρχαία καί βυξαντινή ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΝΗΣΙΑ ΑΣΤΕΡΙΣ - ΣΑΜΗ - ΔΟΥΛΙΧΙΟ. ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΩΝ ΜΕΛΕΤΩΝ 286. ΒΙΒΛΙΟΠΩΛΕΙΟ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ ΝΟΤΗ ΚΑΡΑΒΙΑ, Athens 2007. ISBN 978-960-258-101-8. 375 s. EUR 25.

T. KORKUT: *Girlanden-Ostotheken aus Kalkstein in Pamphylien und Kilikien. Untersuchungen zu Typologie, Ikonographie und Chronologie*. Sarkophag-Studien, Band 4. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 2006. ISBN 3-8053-3563-6. IX, 129 S., 38 Abb., 64 Taf. EUR 69,50.

ANGELA KÜHR: *Als Kadmos nach Boiotien kam. Polis und Ethnos im Spiegel thebanischer Gründungsmythen*. Hermes Einzelschriften 98. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2006. ISBN 978-3-515-08984-5, ISSN 0341-0064. 377 S. EUR 76.

HEIKE KUNZ: *Sicilia. Religionsgeschichte des römischen Sizilien*. Religion der Römischen Provinzen, Band 4. Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen 2006. ISBN 978-3-16-149085-9. XX, 424 S. EUR 109.

ISMENE LADA-RICHARDS: *Silent Eloquence: Lucian and Pantomime Dancing*. Classical Literature and Society Series. Duckworth, London 2007. ISBN 978-07156-3491-2. 240 pp. GBP 16.99.

ADRIAAN LANNI: *Law and Justice in the Courts of Classical Athens*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 0-521-85759-7. X, 210 pp. GBP 35.

JERZY LINDERSKI: *Roman Questions II. Selected Papers*. HABES – Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien 44. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2007. ISBN 978-3-515-08134-4. XI, 726 S. EUR 100.

Littera legitera. Testi grammaticali latini dell'Alto Medioevo. Presentazione e edizione critica a cura di LUIGI MUNZI. AION – Annali dell' Università di Napoli ‘L'Orientale'. Quaderni 11. Istituto Universitario Orientale, Napoli 2007. ISSN 1128-7217. 180 pp.

POLLY LOW: *Interstate Relations in Classical Greece: Morality and Power.* Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-87206-5. X, 313 pp. GBP 50.

STUART LYONS: *Horace's Odes and the Mystery of Do-Re-Mi (with full verse translation of the Odes)*. Aris & Phillips, Exeter 2007. ISBN 978-0-85668-790-7. VIII, 244 pp. GBP 19.95.

C. W. MARSHALL: *The Stagecraft and Performance of Roman Comedy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 0-521-86161-6. XIII, 320 pp. GBP 50.

MYLES MCDONNELL: *Roman Manliness:* Virtus *and the Roman Republic*. Cambridge University Press, New York 2006. ISBN 0-521-82788-4. XXI, 481 pp. GBP 50, USD 90.

NINA MEKACHER: *Die vestalischen Jungfrauen in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Palilia 15. Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden 2006. ISBN 978-3-89500-499-5. 272 S. EUR 45.

GARY S. MELTZER: *Euripides and the Poetics of Nostalgia*. Cambridge University Press, New York 2006. ISBN 978-0-521-85873-1. XI, 266 pp. GBP 45, USD 80.

GLORIA S. MERKER: *The Greek Tile Works at Corinth: The Site and the Finds.* With a Contribution by CHARLES K. WILLIAMS II. Hesperia Supplement 35. The American School of Classical Studies at Athens 2006. ISBN 978-0-87661-535-5. XIII, 185 pp. USD 55, GBP 35.

DIETER MERTENS: *Città e monumenti dei Greci d'Occidente: dalla colonizzazione alla crisi di fine V secolo a.C.* Disegni di MARGARETA SCHÜTZENBERGER. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 2006. ISBN 88-8265-367-6. 464 pp., 752 Ill. B/N, Ill. Color. EUR 170.

LUCRETIU MIHAILESCU-BÎRLIBA: *Les affranchis dans les provinces romaines de l'Illyricum*. Philippika. Marburger altertumskundliche Abhandlungen 12. Harrassowitz Verlag, Göttingen 2006. ISBN 987-3-447-05380-8. X, 370 pp. EUR 78.

FERGUS MILLAR: *Rome, the Greek World, and the East. Volume 3: The Greek World, the Jews, and the East*. Studies in the History of Greece and Rome. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill 2006. ISBN 0-8078-5693-2. XXVII, 516 pp. USD 70.00 (hb), 29.95 (pb).

ROBIN MITCHELL-BOYASK: *Plague and the Athenian Imagination. Drama, History, and the Cult of Asclepius*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2008. ISBN 978-0-521-87345-1. XIV, 209 pp. GBP 50.

A. D. MORRISON: *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-87450-2. XII, 358 pp. GBP 55.

BRENDAN D. NAGLE: *The Household as the Foundation of Aristotle's Polis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 0-521-84934-9. XII, 352 pp. GBP 45.

TAMARA NEAL: *The Wounded Hero. Non-Fatal Injury in Homer's Iliad*. Sapheneia Contributions to Classical Philology, vol. 11. Peter Lang, Bern 2006. ISBN 3-03910-879-4. VIII, 344 pp. EUR 58.

G. NÉMETH: *Kritias und die Dreißig Tyrannen. Untersuchungen zur Politik und Prosopographie der Führungselite in Athen 404/403 v. Chr.* HABES – Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien Band 43. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2006. ISBN 3-515-08866-0. 203 S. EUR 39.

THOMAS HEINE NIELSEN: *Olympia and the Classical Hellenic City-State Culture*. Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 9. The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, Copenhagen 2007. ISBN 978-87-7304-309-7, ISSN 0106-0481. 139 pp. DKK 120.

Onomasticon Provinciarum Europae Latinarum. Vol. 12: ABA-BYSANVS. Composuit et correxit BARNABÁS LÖRINCZ. Editio nova aucta et emendata. Martin Opitz Kiadó, Budapest 2005. ISBN 963-217-946-3. 153 pp. EUR 35.

The Origins of Theater in Ancient Greece and Beyond: From Ritual to Drama. Edited by ERIC CSAPO and MARGARET C. MILLER. Cambridge University Press, New York 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-83682-1. XXI, 440 pp. GBP 50, USD 90.

PAULINUS PELLAEUS: *Carmina. Accedunt duo carmina ex Cod. Vat. Urb. 53*3. Edidit CARLO M. LUCARINI. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. K. G. Saur Verlag, Monachii et Lipsiae 2006. ISBN 978-3-598-71323-1. XXIX, 38 pp. EUR 48.

MARK PAYNE: *Theocritus and the Invention of Fiction.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-86577-7. VIII, 183 pp. GBP 50.

THOMAS PEKÁRY: *Phidias in Rom. Beiträge zum spätantiken Kunstverständnis*. Philippika, Marburger altertumskundliche Abhandlungen 16. Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden 2007. ISBN 978-3-447-05516-2. XVI, 173 S. EUR 48.

THEODORE J. PEÑA: *Roman Pottery in the Archaeological Record*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge – New York 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-86541-8. XVIII, 430 pp. GBP 55, USD 95.

Philosophie und Dichtung im antiken Griechenland. Akten der 7. Tagung der Karl und Gertrud Abel-Stiftung am 10. und 11. Oktober 2002 in Bernkastel-Kues. Herausgegeben von JOCHEN ALTHOFF. Philosophie der Antike, Band 23. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2007. ISBN 978-3-515-08824-4. 156 S. EUR 30.

PLATO: *Republic 1–2.368c4*. With Introduction, Translation and Commentary by CHRIS EMLYN-JONES. Aris & Phillips Classical Texts. Oxbow Books, Oxford 2007. ISBN 978-0-85668-757-0. VI, 194 pp. GBP 18.

PLAUTUS, TITUS MACCIUS: *Amfitryon* (Amphitruo). F.f.g.i. svensk metrisk tolkning med inledning och anmärkningar av ALF ÖNNEFORS. Klassiker 20. Paul Åströms förlag, Sävedalen 2007. ISBN 987-91-7081-222-4; ISSN 1104-3180. 113 s. USD 31.50.

PLUTARCHOS: *Djurens rätt och vegetarism. Fyra skrifter ur Moralia*. Översättning med introduktion och noter av SVEN-TAGE TEODORSSON. Klassiker 21. Paul Åströms förlag, Sävedalen 2007. ISBN 978-91-7081-236-1, ISSN 1104-3180. 165 s. USD 31.20.

Pragmata. Beiträge zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Antike im Gedenken an Harald Winkel. Herausgegeben von SVEN GÜNTHER, KAI RUFFING und OLIVER STOLL. Philippika. Marburger altertumskundliche Abhandlungen 17. Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden 2007. ISBN 978-3-447-05536-9. IX, 191 S. EUR 48.

PROCLUS: *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus. Vol. III. Book 3, Part 1: Proclus on the World's Body.* Edited and translated by DIRK BALTZLY. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-84595-3. XII, 205 pp. GBP 45.

PROPERTIUS: *Elegies Book IV*. Edited by GREGORY HUTCHINSON. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 0-521-81957-1 (hb), 0-521-52561-6 (pb). XI, 258 pp. GBP 50 (hb), 18.99 (pb).

BABETTE PÜTZ: *The Symposium and Komos in Aristophanes*. Second Edition. Aris & Phillips, Oxford 2007. ISBN 978-0-85668-772-3. XII, 243 pp. GBP 24.

Res publica Veleiatium. Veleia, tra passato e futuro. A cura di NICOLA CRINITI. Monte Università Parma Editore, Bologna 2006. ISBN 88-7847-019-8. X, 380 pp. EUR 16.

Rethinking Revolutions through Ancient Greece. Edited by SIMON GOLDHILL and ROBIN OSBORNE. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 0-521-86212-4. XV, 319 pp. GBP 55.

P. J. RHODES: *The Greek City States. A Source Book.* Second Edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-61556-3. XIII, 339 pp. GBP 45.

VICTORIA RIMELL: *Ovid's Lovers. Desire, Difference and the Poetic Imagination.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 0-521-86219-1. VIII, 235 pp. GBP 50.

SUSAN I. ROTROFF: *Hellenistic Pottery: The Plain Wares.* The Athenian Agora. Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, vol. XXXIII. The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Princeton 2006. ISBN 978-0-87661-233-0. XXXVII, 441 pp. + figures. USD 150, GBP 95.

DAVID RUHNKENIUS: *Elogium Tiberii Hemsterhusii*. Edidit H. NIKITINSKI. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. K. G. Saur Verlag, Monachii et Lipsiae 2006. ISBN 978-3-598-71322-4. IX, 41 pp. EUR 32.

NORMAN RUSSELL: *Theophilus of Alexandria*. The Early Church Fathers. Routledge, Abingdon – New York 2007. ISBN 978-0-415-28915-3. X, 222 pp. GBP 17.99.

Sanctuaires, pratiques cultuelles et territoires civiques dans l'Occident Romain. Édité par MONIQUE DONDIN-PAYRE et MARIE-THÉRÈSE RAEPSAET-CHARLIER. Le Livre Timperman, Bruxelles 2006. ISBN 90-77723-45-6. XXVI, 514 pp., 93 cartes et ill. EUR 48.

PETER SARRIS: *Economy and Society in the Age of Justinian.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. ISBN 978-0-521-86543-2. XI, 258 pp. GBP 45

EVELYN SCHERABON FIRCHOW: *Wege und Irrwege der mittelalterlichen Textausgaben: Ausgewählte Aufsätze*. S. Hirzel Verlag, Stuttgart 2007. ISBN 978-3-7776-1486-1. XIX, 272 S. EUR 49.

H. SCHUBART und G. MAASS-LINDEMANN: *Toscanos. Die Phönizische Niederlassung an der Mündung des Río de Vélez. Lieferung 2: Grabungskampagnen in der Siedlung von Toscanos (1967 und 1978), an den Befestigungen des Alarcón (1967, 1971 und 1984) und in der Nekropole Jardín (1967-1976).* Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Abteilung Madrid. Madrider Forschungen 6:2. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin 2007. ISBN 978-3-11-018210-1. V, 375 S. EUR 198.

RICHARD SEAFORD: *Dionysos*. Gods and Heroes of the Ancient World. Routledge, Abingdon 2006. ISBN 978-0-415-32488-5. XII, 158 pp. GBP 14.99.

MARIO SEGRE: *Iscrizioni di Cos*. Monografie della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente VI, 2. Edizioni Quasar, Roma 2007. ISBN 88-7140-325-8. 405 pp. EUR 65.

SEXTUS EMPIRICUS: *Against the Logicians*. Edited by RICHARD BETT. Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2005. ISBN 0-521-82497-4 (hb), 0-521-53195-0 (pb). XLIII, 207 pp. GBP 45 (hb), 14.99 (pb).

DARIEN SHANSKE: *Thucydides and the Philosophical Origins of History*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-86411-4. XII, 268 pp. GBP 48.

PAULI SIVONEN: *Being a Roman Magistrate. Office-holding and Roman Identity in Late Antique Gaul*. SKS, Helsinki 2006. ISBN 951-746-806-7. 178 pp. EUR 29.

SJÖKVIST, PETER: *The Early Latin Poetry of Sylvester Johannis Phrygius*. Edited, with Introduction, Translation and Commentary. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Latina Upsaliensia 31. Uppsala Universitet, Uppsala 2007. ISBN 978-91-554-7031-9. 408 pp.

R.R.R. SMITH: *Roman Portrait Statuary from Aphrodisias. Aphrodisias II.* Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 2006. ISBN 3-8053-3527-X. XIV, 339 pp. w. 27 figs., 136 plates. EUR 76,80.

SOPHOCLES: *Electra*. Edited with Introduction and Commentary by P. J. FINGLASS. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 44. Cambridge University Press, New York 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-86809-9. XI, 646 pp. GBP 85.

EFTYCHIA STAVRIANOPOULOU: *"Gruppenbild mit Dame". Untersuchungen zur rechtlichen und sozialen Stellung der Frau auf den Kykladen im Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. HABES – Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien, Band 42. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2006. ISBN 3-515-08404-5. 375 S. EUR 48.

ANNE STEINER: *Reading Greek Vases.* Cambridge University Press, New York 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-82522-1. XVII, 346 pp. GBP 48, USD 85.

Stephani Byzantii Ethnica. Volumen I: Α-Γ. Recensuit germanice vertit adnotationibus indicibusque instruxit MARGARETHE BILLERBECK. Adiuvantibus JAN FELIX GAERTNER, BEATRICE WYSS, CHRISTIAN ZUBLER. Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae XLIII/1. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin 2006. ISBN 978-3-11-017449-6. X, 441 S. EUR 148.

FLORIAN STILP: *Die Jakobsthal-Reliefs. Konturierte Tonreliefs aus dem Griechenland der Frühklassik*. RdA Supplementi 29. Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Roma 2006. ISBN 88-7689-211-7. XII, 281 S., 85 Taf. EUR 248.

Συγχάρματα. *Studies in Honour of Jan Fredrik Kindstrand*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 21. Uppsala Universitet, Stockholm 2006. ISBN 91-554-6665-6. VIII, 222 pp. SEK 215.

Terentius Poeta. Herausgegeben von PETER KRUSCHWITZ, WIDU-WOLFGANG EHLERS und FRITZ FELGENTREU. Zetemata, Heft 127. Verlag C.H. Beck, München 2007. ISBN 978-3-406-55948-8. XII, 235 S. EUR 54,90.

MELISSA M. TERRAS: *Image to Interpretation. An Intelligent System to Aid Historians in Reading the Vindolanda Texts.* Oxford Studies in Ancient Documents. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2006. ISBN 978-0-19-920455-7. XII, 252 pp. GBP 50.

Texte als Medium und Reflexion von Religion im Römischen Reich. Herausgegeben von DOROTHEE ELM VON DER OSTEN, JÖRG RÜPKE und KATHARINA WALDNER. Potsdamer

Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 14. Franz Steiner Verlag, München 2006. ISBN 3-515-08641-2. 260 S. EUR 49.

CORNELIS VAN TILBURG: *Traffic and Congestion in the Roman Empire*. Routledge, Abingdon – New York 2007. ISBN 978-0-415-40999-5. XXI, 237 pp. GBP 55.

Le tribù romane IV. Scripta minora. A cura di GIOVANNA MARIA FORNI. Historica 6. Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Roma 2006. ISBN 88-7689-227-3. VII, 657, 18 tavv. EUR 230.

"*Troianer sind wir gewesen" – Migrationen in der antiken Welt. Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur Historischen Geographie des Altertums 8, 2002.* Herausgegeben von ECKART OLSHAUSEN und HOLGER SONNABEND. Geographica Historica 21. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2006. ISBN 3-515-08750-8. 431 S., 59 s/w Abb. EUR 78.

Uchi Maius 2. Le iscrizioni. A cura di ANTONIO IBBA. Collana diretta da MUSTAPHA KHANOUSSI e ATTILIO MASTINO. Edes editrice, Sassari 2006. ISBN 88-6025-024-2. 751 pp. EUR 95.

RAYMOND VAN DAM: *The Roman Revolution of Constantine*. Cambridge University Press, New York 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-88209-5. XV, 441 pp. GBP 45, USD 85.

What's in a Name? The Significance of Proper Names in Classical Latin Literature. Edited by JOAN BOOTH and ROBERT MALTBY. The Classical Press of Wales, Swansea 2006. ISBN 978-1-905125-09-8. IX, 196 pp. GBP 45.

Le vie della storia. Migrazioni di popoli, viaggi di individui, circolazioni di idee nel Mediterraneo antico. A cura di M. G. ANGELI BERTINELLI e A. DONATI. Serta Antiqua et Mediaevalia 9. Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Roma 2006. ISBN 88-7689-230-3. XIV, 405 pp., 6 tavv. EUR 160.

DAVID WILES: *Mask and Performance in Greek Tragedy: From Ancient Festival to Modern Experimentation.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-86522-7. XII, 320 pp. GBP 50.

The World of Herods. Vol. 1 of the International Conference The World of the Herods and the Nabateans held at the British Museums, 17.-19. April 2001. Edited by NIKOS KOKKINOS. Oriens et Occidens 14. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2007. ISBN 978-3-515-08817-6. 327 S. EUR 62.

The World of Pompeii. Edited by John J. Dobbins and Pedar W. Foss. Routledge, Abingdon and New York 2007. ISBN 978-0-415-17324-7. XLI, 662 pp. +CD. GBP 135.

Xenophon on Government. Edited by Vivienne J. Gray. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-58859-1. X, 231 pp. GBP 18.99.

INDEX SCRIPTORUM

Christer Bruun	christer.bruun@utoronto.ca
Hilla Halla-aho	hilla.halla-aho@helsinki.fi
Kai Juntunen	kai.juntunen@helsinki.fi
Maijastina Kahlos	maijastina.kahlos@helsinki.fi
Mika Kajava	mika.kajava@helsinki.fi
Harri Kiiskinen	harri.kiiskinen@utu.fi
Sari Kivistö	sari.kivisto@helsinki.fi
Kalle Korhonen	kalle.korhonen@helsinki.fi
Tua Korhonen	tua.korhonen@helsinki.fi
Peter Kruschwitz	p.kruschwitz@reading.ac.uk
Ulla Laitakari	ulla.laitakari@utu.fi
Ulla Lehtonen	ulehtone@mappi.helsinki.fi
Luca Maurizi	luca.maurizi@helsinki.fi
Leena Pietilä-Castrén	leena.pietila-castren@helsinki.fi
Fabrice Poli	marrucin@libertysurf.fr
Tiina Purola	tiina.purola@helsinki.fi
Janne Pölönen	jpolonen@hotmail.com
Erja Salmenkivi	erja.salmenkivi@helsinki.fi
Olli Salomies	olli.salomies@helsinki.fi
Kaj Sandberg	sandberg@irfrome.org
Raija Sarasti-Wilenius	raija.sarasti-wilenius@helsinki.fi
Heikki Solin	heikki.solin@helsinki.fi
Marjaana Vesterinen	marjaana.vesterinen@helsinki.fi
Eeva-Maria Viitanen	eeva-maria.viitanen@helsinki.fi
David Woods	d.woods@ucc.ie

ISSN 0570-734-X
Vammala 2008
Vammalan Kirjapaino Oy