

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXXV

2001

ARCTOS

VOL. XXXV

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXXV

HELSINKI 2001

ARCTOS – ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

Vol. 1– (1954–), annually from vol. 8 (1974). *Supplementum*, vol. 1 (1968), 2 (1985).

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), PL 4 (Vuorikatu 3A), FIN-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland.

Editorial Board:

Heikki Solin (Editor-in-Chief), Jaakko Frösén, Mika Kajava, Leena Pietilä-Castrén, Olli Salomies, Antero Tammisto, Toivo Viljamaa, Kalle Korhonen (Secretary).

All correspondence and books for review should be addressed to the Secretary of the Editorial Board at the above address.

Note to Contributors:

Submissions, written in English, French, German, Italian, or Latin, should be sent to the Secretary of the Editorial Board. One copy will suffice, but contributors should keep a further copy of anything submitted. Contributions should be printed or typed on A4 paper. Authors are asked to supply a disk together with the paper copy, or to send the text file as an e-mail attachment to the Secretary (e-mail: kalle.korhonen@helsinki.fi). Further guidelines for contributors may be found at pro.tsv.fi/kfy/arctos/guide.html.

Requests for Exchange:

Exchange Centre for Scientific Literature, Rauhankatu 15, FIN-00170 Helsinki, Finland.

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

Yliopistopaino
Helsinki

Layout by Jukka Tuominen

INDEX

| | | |
|------------------------|--|-----|
| NEIL ADKIN | <i>"I Am Tedious Aeneas": Virgil, Aen. 1,372 ff.</i> | 9 |
| JEAN-PIERRE GUILHEMBET | <i>Quelques domus ou résidences romaines négligées</i> | 15 |
| RIIKKA HÄLIKKÄ | <i>Sparsis comis, solutis capillis: 'Loose' Hair in Ovid's Elegiac Poetry</i> | 23 |
| MAARIT KAIMIO ET ALII | <i>Metatheatricality in the Greek Satyr-Play</i> | 35 |
| MIKA KAJAVA | <i>Hanging Around Downtown</i> | 79 |
| KALLE KORHONEN | <i>Osservazioni sul collezionismo epigrafico siciliano</i> | 85 |
| PETER KRUSCHWITZ | <i>Zwei sprachliche Beobachtungen zu republikanischen Rechtstexten</i> | 103 |
| UTA-MARIA LIERTZ | <i>Die Dendrophoren aus Nida und Kaiserverehrung von Kultvereinen im Nordwesten des Imperium Romanum</i> | 115 |
| LUIGI PEDRONI | <i>Il significato dei segni di valore sui denarii repubblicani: contributi per la riapertura di una problematica</i> | 129 |
| OLLI SALOMIES | <i>Roman Nomina in the Greek East: Observations on Some Recently Published Inscriptions</i> | 139 |
| WERNER J. SCHNEIDER | <i>Ein der Heimat verwiesener Autor: Anaximenes von Lampsakos bei Lukian, Herod. 3</i> | 175 |
| HEIKKI SOLIN | <i>Analecta epigraphica CXCII–CXCVIII</i> | 189 |
| | <i>De novis libris iudicia</i> | 243 |
| | <i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i> | 298 |
| | <i>Libri nobis missi</i> | 300 |
| | <i>Index scriptorum</i> | 303 |

MAARIT KAIMIO

LINGUAE LITTERARUMQUE GRAECARUM
IN UNIVERSITATE HELSINGIENSI PROFESSORI ORDINARIAE
SEXAGENARIAE
(19 IV 2001)

"I AM TEDIOUS AENEAS": VIRGIL, AEN. 1,372FF.

NEIL ADKIN

The speech in which Aeneas introduces himself to the disguised Venus with the notorious words *sum pius Aeneas* opens as follows (Aen. 1,372ff.):

*'O dea, si prima repetens ab origine pergam
et vacet annalis nostrorum audire laborum,
ante diem clauso componet Vesper Olympo.
375 nos Troia antiqua, si vestras forte per auris
Troiae nomen iit, diversa per aequora vectos
forte sua Libycis tempestas appulit oris.
sum pius Aeneas ...'*

When dealing with the first of these two sentences that precede *sum pius Aeneas* Austin's highly-acclaimed commentary¹ limits itself in connection with the phrase *annalis nostrorum audire laborum* (373) to the sole observation: '*annalis*: the word effectively suggests both the weariness of Trojan sufferings and the tediousness that might be felt by a hearer'.²

¹ R. G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber primus*, 1971, 135. For the esteem it enjoys cf. (e. g.) the review by W. S. Maguinness, *CR* 24 (1974) 207 ('learning, good judgement, sensitiveness of appreciation, and the ability to assemble a great abundance of relevant and often hitherto unnoticed illustrative material from widely diverse areas of literature and history'). Such 'sensitivity' is alleged to be especially noteworthy in this commentator's appreciation of the nuances of Virgil's language; cf. (e. g.) the review by J. Perret, *RPh* 46 (1972) 334 ('il est hors de pair ... pour apprécier le détail de l'expression [qualité des mots, phraséologie]').

² This comment is quoted with approval by G. Stégen, *Virgile: Le livre I de l'Énéide*, 1975, 166. Austin's point is however derivative; cf. (e. g.) G. G. Gosrau, *P. Virgilii Maronis Aeneis*, 1876², 32f. ('*annales* dicit, quod multos annos continuos vexatum se maeret esse laboribus'); J. Conington and H. Nettleship, *The Works of Virgil II*, 1884⁴,

Specific reference to *labores* is made by Kristol,³ who examines this text as the first of four programmatic passages indicating the thematic importance of Aeneas' 'labours' in the poem; however her discussion fails to go beyond Virgil's choice of the particular term *labor*.⁴ Here commentators should have pointed to the precept found in Fortunatianus: *ne plures genitivi plurales iungantur* (*rhet.* 3,11). Virgil's use of the homoeoteleutic genitive plurals *nostrorum ... laborum* in defiance of this aesthetic principle accordingly achieves an acoustic effect that is aptly 'laborious';⁵ here the impression is further enhanced by the prominent position of these words at the end both of the verse and of the first sentence's long protasis.⁶ No other case of the genitival collocation *-ōrum -ōrum* occurs throughout the first book; however the second one exhibits two such instances,⁷ in both of which a similarly auditive effect has again been deliberately sought. The first of these texts rounds off Sinon's tale of tribulation; once again the noun at issue is significantly *labor*: *misere laborum / tantorum*.⁸ The second describes the strangulation of Laocoon's sons: *et primum parva duorum / corpora nato- rum serpens amplexus uterque / implicat*.⁹ In each of these passages the use

repr. 1979, 45 ('suggesting the notion of a minute and rather tedious narrative').

³ S. S. Kristol, *Labor and Fortuna in Virgil's Aeneid*, 1990, 16.

⁴ The same may also be said of the treatment of this verse by A. Wlosok, *Die Göttin Venus in Vergils Aeneis*, 1967, 78, and S. Bruck, *Labor in Vergils Aeneis*, 1993, 125.

⁵ One might compare Terence, *Eun.* 297 (*taedet cotidianarum harum formarum. ecce ...*), where P. Fabia, *P. Terenti Afri Eunuchus*, 1895, 122 remarks: 'cacophonie expressive'. The 'elision' of final *m* both here and at *Aen.* 1,373 would merely appear to exacerbate the inconcinnity; cf. (e. g.) Diom. *gramm.* I 442,25ff. (*ecthlipsis est conlisio quaedam difficilis ac dura consonantium cum vocalibus asperae concurrentium, ut est 'multum ille ...'*). According to Quint. *inst.* 9,4,40 *neque enim eximitur* [sc. final *m* in *ecthlipsis*] *sed obscuratur*, while even without an ensuing vowel *m obscurum in extremitate dictionum sonat* (Prisc. *gramm.* II 29,15).

⁶ A point may also be made concerning this sentence's apodosis (374), where the MSS are divided between *componet* and *componat*. Here Austin finds the future unexceptionable. On the other hand R. D. Williams, *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books 1–6*, 1972, 188, who instead prefers *componat* in view of the subjunctives in the protasis, notes that *componet* would entail 'a feeling of awkwardness'. Such 'awkwardness' is evidently intentional.

⁷ These three passages are the only examples of such a combination in the whole of the poem's first half.

⁸ 2,143f. Here enjambment heightens the effect.

⁹ 2,213–215. Again one of the genitives stands conspicuously at the end of the line.

of the genitive plurals *-ōrum -ōrum* again creates an appropriately inconcinuous effect of laborious effort; Austin fails once again to register either.¹⁰

When Austin turns to the following sentence which stands directly before *sum pius Aeneas*, he does notice Virgil's preference for the word-order *Troiae nomen iit* instead of *nomen iit Troiae* at the start of line 376. In this connection he remarks that Virgil 'is sparing in his use of a spondaic disyllable in the first foot, which tends to slow down the rhythm'.¹¹ In the present instance he believes that Virgil's object was to attain a 'special emphasis'; however it would appear more likely that the purpose of this 'slowing down' is to increase the tedium. Nor does Austin observe that here *Troiae* has been repeated from the immediately antecedent line (375). The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* notes that, while such repetition can in certain circumstances constitute an embellishment, the usual consequence is that it *offendat animum* (4,14,20): such is evidently meant to be the effect here.¹² Austin does mention the similar repetition of *forte* (377) from the same line as *Troia* (375); however no explanation is offered.¹³ Apropos of this duplicated *forte* Poutsma affirms: 'meum ... sensum offendere repperi'.¹⁴ It would seem however that the reiteration of *forte* is in fact a similarly deliberate means to generate the same impression of tediousness. The further point may be made that the repetitions of *forte* and *Troia* respectively occupy the initial position in the two verses immediately following both words' first occurrence: the resultant prominence exacerbates the monotony.¹⁵

¹⁰ R. G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber secundus*, 1964, 78 and 135, where his commentary on the first text simply makes the inept observation that 'the assonance ... suggest[s] Ciceronian rhetoric in full flood', while in connection with the second he merely notes the 'interlacing'.

¹¹ Austin (above n. 1) 38f. and 136.

¹² For *taedium* as the result of absence of *varietas* cf. H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, 1990³, 142 (sect. 257,2b) and 515 (sect. 1072).

¹³ Cf. E. Paratore, *Virgilio: Eneide I*, 1978, 186: '*forte*: si noti la ripetizione del termine a breve distanza dal suo uso al v. 375: c'è effettivamente un intento in questa ripetizione?'

¹⁴ A. Poutsma, *Mnemosyne* 41 (1913) 400 and 417, where he refers to P. H. Peerlkamp, *P. Virgilio Maronis Aeneidos libri I–VI*, 1843, 51, who wished to emend *vectos / forte sua* (376f.) to *ventis / iactatos* because '*forte* ... ingratum est, quia proxime praecedat *forte per aures*'.

¹⁵ The first and last of the three lines in question likewise end with the virtually

This second sentence opens with the first occurrence of *Troiā antiquā* (375). Here Austin merely observes that the ablative depends on *vectos* in the next line. Again however commentators might have referred to Fortunatianus, who in the same chapter as his afore-mentioned caveat against the accumulation of genitive plurals issues the following prohibition: *ne* [sc. *structura*] *hiulca sit vocalium et maxime longarum crebra concursione* (*rhet.* 3,11). In this connection Quintilian remarks (*inst.* 9,4,33): *quod* [sc. *vocalium concursus*] *cum accidit, ... quasi laborat oratio*. Such 'laboriousness' is especially obtrusive when each of the vowels at issue is a long *a*¹⁶ and the clash occurs between the penultimate and final words:¹⁷ both of these circumstances apply to the present instance.¹⁸ The entire first book of the *Aeneid* contains only one example of such a clash of long *a*'s outside this speech;¹⁹ moreover the collocation *Troiā antiquā* would seem to be unattested elsewhere in the whole literature of antiquity.²⁰ Here such an aurally 'laborious' combination accordingly forms an aptly tone-setting exordium to the second tedious sentence of Aeneas' speech.

One final point may be made in this connection. The first of these sentences had begun: *si prima repetens ab origine pergam* (372). Here Heyne thought *pergere* semantically supererogatory.²¹ In the brief speech with which the impatient Venus then proceeds to cut short her son's

homophonous *auris* and *oris*; the popular pronunciation of *au* as *o* makes the sounds identical.

¹⁶ Cf. Quint. *ibid.*: *pessime longae, quae easdem inter se litteras committunt, sonabunt: praecipuus tamen erit hiatus earum quae ... patulo maxime ore* (here Quintilian is referring specifically to *ā*) *efferruntur*. The same is true in cases of synaloephe cf. Lausberg (above n. 12) 477.

¹⁷ Cf. Mart. Cap. 5,516.

¹⁸ The interposition of a long conditional clause immediately after *Troiā antiquā* effectively detaches this phrase from the rest of the sentence.

¹⁹ Viz. 1,479 (*interea ad templum*). It may however be noted that here *interea* is marked by a buoyantly choriambic rhythm, while *ad* is only long by position. In the tricolon *nos Troiā antiquā* on the other hand every syllable is long by nature. Significantly this brief speech of Aeneas also ends with the same clash of long *a*'s in the same sedes: *Europā atque Asiā pulsus* (385).

²⁰ Cf. Packard Humanities Institute CD ROM #5.3, 1991; Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina, 1999; Cetedoc Library of Christian Latin Texts, CLCLT-4, 2000; Patrologia Latina Database, 1995.

²¹ C. G. Heyne and G. P. E. Wagner, *P. Virgili Maronis opera* II, 1832⁴, repr. 1968, 140 ('*repetens pergam, pro, si repetam*').

jeremiad²² the verb *pergere* is found at both the beginning (389: *perge modo atque hinc te reginae ad limina perfer*) and end (401: *perge modo et, qua te ducit via, derige gressum*). This twofold deployment of the same imperative in so short a compass has troubled many commentators.²³ The view of Rau may be cited as typical: 'Non credo, Venerem sine venere, bis, in hac brevi ῥῆσι, dixisse, *perge modo*'.²⁴ These scholars accordingly wish to eliminate the first occurrence of *perge* by athetizing line 389.

Such interference with the text would seem to betray a serious underestimation of Virgil's literary art. The rhetorical figure of *copulatio* is defined by Aquila Romanus as follows: *ea figura elocutionis, in qua idem verbum aut nomen, bis continuo positum, diversa significat* (*rhet.* 28 p. 31,7f.).²⁵ Scholarship has hitherto failed to perceive that Virgil is employing the same figure of *copulatio* in the present passage: whereas Aeneas had used *pergere* 'notione perseverandi',²⁶ the same verb is now repeated shortly afterwards by Venus in a quite different sense ('notione se movendi').²⁷ Virgil has drawn attention to this figure by his carefully symmetrical arrangement. Aeneas' *pergam*, which had occurred at the start of his speech, is picked up immediately by Venus' *perge*, which likewise stands near the beginning of her own allocution.²⁸ In addition Venus' self-repetition of the imperative *perge* as first word of her speech's last line also matches Aeneas'

²² *Nec plura querentem / passa Venus medio sic interfata dolore est* (385f.).

²³ Cf. the conspectus in Stégen (above n. 2) 175.

²⁴ S. I. E. Rau, *Schediasma de versibus spuris in libro primo Aeneidos virgilianae*, 1846, 39. Disconcertment is also occasioned by the reflexive use of *perfer* (389); cf. (e. g.) A. Forbiger, *P. Vergili Maronis opera* II, 1873⁴, 97 ('*se perferre ad aliquem locum alibi non videtur inveniri*').

²⁵ This definition is reproduced by I. C. T. Ernesti, *Lexicon technologiae latinorum rhetoricae*, 1797, repr. 1983, 98, who also quotes Cic. *orat.* 135 (*cum ... continenter unum verbum non in eadem sententia ponitur*) and *de orat.* 3,206 (*eiusdem verbi crebrius positi quaedam distinctio*).

²⁶ So *Thes. Ling. Lat.* X,1 col. 1433,35f. Cf. Serv. *Aen.* 1,372 ('*pergam*': *perseverem, hoc est universa dicam*).

²⁷ So *Thes. Ling. Lat.* X,1 col. 1431,17f.

²⁸ Venus' 'disconcerting' *perfer* at the end of the same verse would appear to have been deliberately chosen in order to create a paronomastic counterpart to *perge* at its start; the two terms accordingly generate a species of metrical and syntactical *reditio* (cf. Lausberg [above n. 12] 317f.). Since *perfer* highlights *perge* in this way, it thereby alerts the reader in turn to the latter expression's echo of *pergam*.

use of the same verb as last word of his first line. It may moreover be noted that both instances of Venerean *perge* antecede the injunction to go on to Carthage: since therefore the locomotive meaning of the verb here ('notione se movendi') is only made clear by these postscripts, the reader is at first free to understand this word in the sense in which Aeneas has just used it ('notione perseverandi').²⁹ There is a deliciously piquant humour in such a seeming exhortation to Aeneas from Venus to 'carry on' with his tale, when he himself has just affirmed that, were he to do so, she would find it excruciatingly tedious and she herself has just shut him up: the piquancy is cleverly heightened by employing *perge modo* twice over. Far therefore from being 'sine venere',³⁰ Venus' repetition of these words is in fact a palmary instance of Virgil's impishly witty *venustas*.³¹

University of Nebraska, Lincoln

²⁹ This construe is further encouraged by the appendage of *modo* to *perge*. For such 'confirmatory' use elsewhere by Virgil of *modo* to endorse a foregoing instance of the same verb cf. *ecl.* 8,77f. In the present passage of the *Aeneid* this adverb is attached to both occurrences of *perge*; for such repeated employment of *modo* with the same imperative after the verb at issue has been used initially on its own cf. (e. g.) Plaut. *Cas.* 749–757; *Poen.* 424–430; *Trin.* 580–590. In thus suggesting that here *perge* might signify 'perseverare' as well as 'se movere' Virgil has accordingly achieved an adroit combination of the rhetorical figure of *copulatio* with that of *amphibolia*; for the latter cf. Lausberg (above n. 12) 514.

³⁰ So Rau (above n. 24).

³¹ In connection with the first *perge modo* (389) Austin himself merely comments lamely: 'a most natural touch (cf. "carry straight on")', while his note on line 401, which contains the second, reads simply: 'a variation and amplification of 389'. The final point may be made that an allusion to the amphiboly in the word *pergere* would seem to be contained in Aeneas' wistful reference to *verae voces* in his response to Venus' sudden self-revelation immediately after her concluding *perge modo*: '*quid natum totiens ... falsis / ludis imaginibus? cur ... / non datur ... veras audire et reddere voces?*' (407–409). For *vox* meaning 'word' cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.* 2104 (s. v. 10a: '[gram.] a word'). Here Austin does no more than repeat Conington's paraphrase of *veras*: 'without disguise on the one part or mistake on the other'. A. Sidgwick, *P. Vergili Maronis opera* II, 1890, repr. 1934, 154, who also renders *veras* as 'undisguised', finds 'a strange pathetic beauty in these lines': they would seem on the contrary to be another instance of Virgil's puckish wit. For two further cases of such verbal pawkiness in this poet cf. the present writer, "Virgilian Etymologizing: The Case of Acestes", *AC* 69 (2000) 205–207; id., "A Virgilian Crux: *Aen.* 8,342f.", forthcoming in *AJPh* 122 (2001).

QUELQUES *DOMUS* OU RÉSIDENCES ROMAINES NÉGLIGÉES

JEAN-PIERRE GUILHEMBET

Au moment même où s'achève la publication du *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, entreprise en tout point remarquable de récapitulation et de mise à jour de nos connaissances, réalisée à la fois rapidement (de 1993 à 2000) et magistralement, il peut paraître superflu de revenir sur l'inventaire des *domus* antiques de la ville de Rome. En effet, une comparaison, même purement quantitative et globale, entre les recensements effectués, respectivement, par G. Calza pour le *Dizionario epigrafico* de De Ruggiero (environ 145 entrées), par S. Platner et T. Ashby (environ 240 *domus*), ou par L. Richardson, dans son *New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (un peu plus de 250 articles) et le bilan dressé par le *LTUR* II (quelque 550 *domus*) démontre l'ampleur et la qualité du travail accompli sous l'égide de E. M. Steinby.

Toutefois, comme l'a montré ici même Ch. Bruun il y a peu d'années et comme les *addenda* du volume V du *LTUR* l'ont illustré,¹ il n'est nullement certain que les listes publiées tendent à l'exhaustivité. L'Istituto di Epigrafia Latina dell'Università di Roma "La Sapienza" ayant entrepris de son côté l'inventaire des résidences urbaines et suburbaines connues par les inscriptions, il nous paraît légitime de continuer à contribuer à la tâche immense que constitue le dépouillement des sources littéraires. En effet, la recherche informatisée n'est pas toujours à même de repérer des notices qui, parfois, ne contiennent pas de mots-clés comme *aedes*, *domus*, ou *oikia*...

Aucun des ouvrages précédemment cités, dont la visée est en théorie topographique, n'a pu s'en tenir – c'est inévitable et l'on ne saurait en faire

¹ "Missing houses: some neglected *domus* and other abodes in Rome", *Arctos* 32 (1998) 87–108; voir aussi, du même, "A city of temples and squares, emperors, horses, and houses", *JRA* 10 (1997) 396–398. Les pages 242 à 256 du *LTUR* V apportent des informations sur une quarantaine de *domus* "nouvelles", dont certaines sont localisables.

grief à leurs auteurs – à une règle fixe et stricte d'inclusion ou d'exclusion des *domus*: limiter le catalogue aux résidences strictement localisées réduirait considérablement son volume et entraînerait de très lourdes pertes d'information, l'ouvrir à l'ensemble des mentions dépasse, de toute évidence, les objectifs d'un dictionnaire de topographie. Dans ces conditions, le lecteur attentif relève, ici ou là, quelques flottements ou des entorses aux principes posés. Dans le cas des habitations, un seuil rationnel et cohérent est effectivement impossible à trouver, du fait de l'hétérogénéité extrême des données que nous octroient les sources: relever qu'un sénateur ou un chevalier romain rentre chez lui un beau soir ne présente guère d'intérêt historique! Cependant, une indication fugace peut, en quelques mots, révéler un trait de mentalité, une caractéristique de la vie publique ou privée, un détail architectural, une précision biographique...

Nous proposons donc ci-après une nouvelle liste complémentaire d'une petite cinquantaine de noms de propriétaires ou d'occupants de résidences urbaines. À notre connaissance, les lemmes qui suivent n'ont pas donné lieu à une publication groupée; nous avons préféré laisser à cet inventaire son rôle de corpus, en nous contentant d'un classement alphabétique.²

M. AELIUS (*RE* I.1 Aelius 8): Sa maison est évoquée par Cicéron en juillet 44 a.C. (*Att.* 15,29,1: *Ad M. Aelium nullus te quidem domum, sed sicubi inciderit*).

L. AFRANIUS, *cos.* 60 a.C.: On note une grande affluence dans sa maison en juin 49 a.C. (*Caes. civ.* 1,53,2) alors que lui-même est en Espagne (*magni domum concursus ad Afranium magnaeeque gratulationes fiebant*).

M. ANTONIUS, *cos.* 99, *cens.* 97 a.C.: Il n'aurait eu que huit esclaves chez lui (*Apul. apol.* 17: ... *M. Antonium consularem solos octo servos domi habuit*); il reçoit Ménédème comme hôte (*Cic. de orat.* 1,19,85: ... *is qui nuper Romae fuit, Menedemus hospes meus*).

AQUILII: Selon Plutarque (*Publ.* 4–5), c'est dans leur résidence que se prépare la conjuration destinée à rétablir les Tarquins sur le trône (cf. cependant *Liv.* 2,4,5, qui évoque la résidence des Vitellii).

C. ASINIUS POLLIO, *cos.* 40 a.C.: Il accueille chez lui Timagène d'Alexandrie chassé par Auguste (*Sen. de ira* 3,23,5–8); peut-être est-ce lui qui héberge à Rome Alexandre et Aristobule, fils d'Hérode, en 22 a.C. (*Fl. Jos. AJ* 15,10,1; il pourrait s'agir toutefois de

² De même, pour des raisons de commodité, nous avons conservé les conventions qui sont celles du *LTUR* et ne donnons le texte des citations données en référence que s'il offre un réel intérêt. Les maisons présentées ou les épisodes évoqués se rapportent à la République romaine ou au premier siècle de notre ère.

Vedius Pollio, selon R. Syme, "Who was Vedius Pollio?", *JRS* 51 (1961) 24–30 = *Roman Papers* II, 518–529).

CAFO: D'après Cicéron (*Phil.* 8,9), il recevrait d'Antoine des *aedes optimaes*. Sur le personnage, dont il n'est pas assuré qu'il soit entré au Sénat, T. P. Wiseman, *New men in the Roman Senate*, 1971, 219.

CAPITO, *sen.?* ca. 43 a.C.: Le *cognomen* de ce proscrit est trop répandu pour qu'il soit possible de l'identifier (différentes hypothèses dans F. Hinard, *Les proscriptions de la Rome républicaine*, 1985, 446, qui songe à C. Ateius Capito, *tr. pl.* 55; dans le même sens, D. Magnino, *Appiani bellorum civilium Liber quartus*, 1998, 175). Laissant la porte de sa maison entrouverte, il se défend jusqu'au moment où il est submergé par le nombre de soldats (*App. bell. civ.* 4,25,103).

L. CASSIUS LONGINUS, *praet.* 66 a.C.: Sa maison est considérée par Cicéron comme l'un des foyers de la conjuration de Catilina (*Cic. Sull.* 39).

P. CORNELIUS CETHEGUS, *sen.* (*praet. post* 87 a.C.? *RE* IV.1 Cornelius 97): Sa maison, non localisée, est dénoncée comme un lieu où l'on peut obtenir, par des intrigues, la charge d'une province (*Cic. parad.* 5,40: *Cethego homini non probatissimo servire coegit eos, qui sibi esse amplissimi videbantur, munera mittere, noctu venire domum ad eum, Praeciae denique supplicare*).

P. CORNELIUS DOLABELLA, *cos. suff.* 44 a.C.: Au printemps 44, Cicéron fait deux allusions, très vagues, à cette *domus* (*Phil.* 1,30, *Att.* 15,1,2).

L. CORNELIUS SISENNA, *praet.* 78 a.C.: Cicéron y évoque une visite de Verres (*Verr.* 2,4,33: *mane apud L. Sisennam, virum primarium cum essent triclinia strata argentumque expositum in aedibus cum pro dignitate L. Sisennae domus esset plena hominum honestissimorum...*).

Q. CORNIFICIUS, *praet.* 45 a.C.: Les manuscrits de *Plut. Caes.* 51,3 indiquent qu'un certain Korphinius aurait partagé et transformé, avec Antoine, l'une des résidences ayant appartenu à Pompée (voir *LTUR* II, *domus Pompeiorum*, et III, *horti Pompeiani*); le passage est en général supprimé par les éditeurs, du fait que cette notice est la seule à mentionner un tel partage des biens immobiliers romains de Pompée (cf. toutefois *Cic. Phil.* 13,11–12). Il pourrait s'agir du prêteur de 45 (I. Shatzman, *Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics*, 1975, 337 et n. 362).

DAMASIPPUS: Ce personnage des *Satires* d'Horace (2,3,24–25: *hortos egregiasque domos mercarier unus / cum lucro noram...*) achète des *domus* à des fins lucratives. Sur l'identification, controversée, du personnage, que les scholiastes désignent comme Iunius Damasippus (*RE* X.1 Iunius 72), voir D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Two studies in Roman nomenclature*, 1976, 46–47, *AJAH* 1 (1976) 162–163, *Onomasticon to Cicero's Letters*, 1995, 45; E. Rawson, *Roman Culture and Society. Collected Papers*, 1991, 222; F. Hinard, *Les proscriptions de la Rome républicaine*, 1985, 363–364; T. R. S. Broughton, *MRR* III, 119; K. Verboren, "Damasippus, the Story of a Businessman?", in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History VIII*, 1997, 195–217; voir *LTUR* III, *Horti Damasippi*.

L. DECIDIUS SAXA, *tr. pl.* 44 a.C.: Selon Cicéron (*Phil.* 8,9), ce compagnon d'Antoine recevrait de ce dernier des *aedes optimaes*.

L. FLAVIUS, *praet.* 58 a.C.: Ce sénateur reçoit de Pompée la garde de Tigrane le jeune, que P. Clodius contribue à faire évader (Ascon. 47 Clark: *Pompeius post triumphum Mithridaticum Tigranis filium in catenis deposuerat apud Flavium senatorem*; cf. Cass. Dio 38,30,2).

FLAVIUS SCAEVINUS, *sen. ca.* 65 p.C.: Sa *domus* est mentionnée à propos de la conjuration de Pison (Tac. *ann.* 15,54–55).

Q. FULVIUS FLACCUS, *cos.* 179, *cens.* 174 a.C.: En 172, ses esclaves le retrouvent pendu dans sa chambre (Liv. 42,28,10–11: *mane ingressi cubiculum servi laqueo dependentem invenere*).

T. FURFAN(I)US POSTUMUS, *praet. ca.* 55 a.C.: D'après Cicéron, P. Clodius aurait menacé de porter un cadavre chez ce sénateur familier de l'orateur, pour le compromettre (Mil. 75: ... *sed ausum esse T. Furfanio dicere, si sibi pecuniam quantam posceret, non dedisset, mortuum se in domum eius inlaturum, qua invidia huic esset tali viro conflagrandum*).

LABIENUS, *sen. ca.* 43 a.C.: Ce sénateur, difficile à identifier, lui-même agent de la proscription de Sylla, se trouve proscrit en 43: il décide alors de se placer sur un siège devant sa maison et d'attendre ses assassins (App. *bell. civ.* 4,26,110). Comme l'observe F. Hinard (*Les proscriptions de la Rome républicaine*, 1985, 481), le récit d'Appien n'a de sens que si la scène se situe à Rome, au tout début de la proscription. Voir aussi D. Magnino, *Appiani bellorum civilium Liber quartus*, 1998, 177.

D. LAELIUS, *tr. pl.* 54 a.C.: Fin 59 ou début 58 a.C., alors qu'il accuse L. Valerius Flaccus *de repetundis*, Cicéron, avocat de ce dernier, le soupçonne de dicter leur propos aux témoins, venus d'Asie, qu'il loge chez lui (Cic. *Flacc.* 22–24; 41; 83).

C. LICINIUS MACER, *praet.* 68 a.C.: La *domus*, non localisée, est évoquée à propos du procès et de la mort du personnage, en 66 (Plut. *Cic.* 9,2 ; cf. Val. Max. 9,12,7; voir *LTUR II, domus: C. Licinius Macer Calvus*).

L. LICINIUS MURENA, *cos.* 62 a.C.: La maison, non localisée, a été décorée pour célébrer le succès de son propriétaire aux élections consulaires (Cic. *Mur.* 88–89).

C. LIVIUS DRUSUS (*RE XIII.1 Livius 15*): La maison de cet orateur et juriste, qui ne paraît pas avoir mené de carrière sénatoriale, est remplie de tous ceux qui viennent le consulter (Cic. *Tusc.* 5,112: *C. Drusi domum compleri a consultoribus solitam accepimus*). Sur ce personnage, J.-M. David, *Le patronat judiciaire au dernier siècle de la République romaine*, 1992, 690.

T. MANLIUS TORQUATUS, *cos.* 165 a.C.: En 141, il juge dans sa *domus* son fils D. Iunius Silanus (Manlianus), gouverneur de Macédoine (Cic. *fin.* 1,24; Liv. *perioch.* 54; Val. Max. 5,8,3).

C. ou CN. MARCIUS CORIOLANUS (*RE Suppl. V Marcius 51*): Il a toujours vécu sous le même toit que sa mère, même marié et devenu père (Plut. *Cor.* 4.7; voir aussi Liv. 2,40).

MARCIUS REX, *quaest.* 46 ou 45 a.C.: Un personnage du nom de Marcius se dissimule dans sa maison, grâce à la complicité de ses esclaves, durant toute la proscription de 43 a.C., jusqu'à l'amnistie (App. *bell. civ.* 4,43,179; les manuscrits indiquent en fait Μάρκος). Il s'agit peut-être du fils de Q. Marcius Rex, *cos.* 68 a.C. (voir *LTUR II*,

domus: Q. Marcius Rex et F. Hinard, *Les proscriptions de la Rome républicaine*, 1985, 493–494).

P. MUCIUS SCAEVOLA, *cos.* 133 a.C.: Sa *domus* est le lieu où P. Rutilius se forme à la science du droit (Cic. *off.* 2,47).

Q. MUCIUS SCAEVOLA AUGUR, *cos.* 117 a.C.: Cicéron prend cette maison, non localisée, comme l'exemple même du rayonnement de la *domus* du jurisconsulte et évoque l'affluence qu'elle connaît dès le lever du jour (*de orat.* 1,200; *Phil.* 8,31).

M. OCTAVIUS, *tr. pl.* 133 a.C.: Octavius, "après sa déposition, ne voulant pas comme magistrat accepter l'idée de redevenir un simple citoyen, et n'osant plus exercer son pouvoir de tribun, demeura inactif dans sa maison (κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν οἰκίαν)" (Diod. 34/35,7,1). Voir P. Botteri, *Les fragments de l'histoire des Gracques dans la Bibliothèque de Diodore de Sicile*, 1992, 56.

C. OCTAVIUS BALBUS (*RE XVII Octavius 44*): La maison de ce proscrit de 43 a.C. est évoquée à propos de sa fuite et de l'assassinat de son fils (Val. Max. 5,7,3: *Proscriptus a triumviris, cum domo postico clam esset egressus, iamque fugae expeditum initium haberet, postquam filium intus trucidari falso clamore vicinia accepit...*; la version d'App. *bell. civ.* 4,21,84–86 est sensiblement différente). Sur le personnage, voir F. Hinard, *Les proscriptions de la Rome républicaine*, 1985, 500.

L. PEDANIUS SECUNDUS, *cos. suff.* 43 p.C., *praef. urb.*: En 61 p.C., au moment de son assassinat dans sa *domus*, celle-ci abrite un grand nombre d'esclaves (le total de 400 esclaves, qui apparaît, indirectement, dans le discours de C. Cassius au Sénat, doit être pris comme un simple ordre de grandeur; Tac. *ann.* 14,42–45).

L. PLAETORIUS, *quaest. ca.* 74–66 a.C.: Il héberge chez lui son ami le chevalier C. Vibius Capax, qui y meurt (Cic. *Cluent.* 165).

M. PORCIUS CATO, *cos.* 195, *cens.* 150 a.C.: Il vit dans une maison modeste, avec son fils et sa belle-fille (Plut. *Cat. mai.* 4,2; 24,2; voir Y. Thomas, in A. Burguière *et alii*, *Histoire de la famille I. Mondes lointains, mondes anciens*, 1986, 213–214).

PRUSIAS (Prusias II, *rex Bithyniae*; *RE XXIII.1 Prusias 2*): En 167 a.C., le Sénat décide de louer, aux frais du trésor public, une maison de qualité pour accueillir le souverain à Rome (Val. Max. 5,1,1 d: *Idem senatus cum ad gratulandum sibi Prusian, Bithyniae regem, Perse devicto venire audisset, obviam illi P. Cornelium Scipionem quaestorem Capuam misit censuitque ut ei domus Romae quam optima conduceretur et copiae non solum ipsi sed etiam comitibus eius publice praeberentur*; cf. Liv. 45,44,7 et 17).

PTOLEMAEUS (Ptolemaeus VI Philometor; *RE XXIII.2 Ptolemaios 24*): Déchu de son trône en 164 a.C., le roi, réfugié à Rome, loge d'abord chez le peintre alexandrin Demetrios (voir *LTUR V, domus: Demetrius?*, 247) puis dans une résidence publique mise à sa disposition par le Sénat (Diod. 31,18,2; Val. Max. 5,1,1 e: *...et illum e curia protinus ad publicos penates deduxit hortatusque est ut depositis sordibus adeundi ipsius diem peteret*). Voir E. De Albentis, *La casa dei Romani*, 1990, 115.

PUBLICIUS, *eq. rom.* (*RE XXIII.2 Publicius 4*): La *domus* de ce *divisor* est utilisée dans les manœuvres de corruption électorale destinées à empêcher l'élection de Cicéron à l'édilité en 70 a.C. (Cic. *Verr.* I 22). Sur le personnage, voir C. Nicolet, *L'ordre équestre à l'époque républicaine II*, 1974, 997.

Q. ROSCIUS GALLUS, *eq. rom.* (RE IA.1 Roscius 16): Il accueille et forme chez lui plusieurs comédiens (Cic. *Q. Rosc.* 26; 31).

P. RUTILIUS NUDUS, *quaest. praet.*? 74 a.C.: voir *LTUR* II, *domus*: L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus.

SALVIUS, *tr. pl.* 43 a.C.: Inscrit sur la première liste de proscription en 43 a.C., ce tribun en exercice, sûr du destin qui l'attend, organise un banquet et attend ses bourreaux en compagnie de ses proches: il est exécuté à table (App. *bell. civ.* 4,17,66–67). Voir F. Hinard, *Les proscriptions de la Rome républicaine*, 1985, 237, 240, 242, 514.

M. SALVIUS OTHO (*PIR*¹ S 109): En janvier 69 p.C., il prétexte l'achat récent d'une maison (de localisation inconnue) et un rendez-vous pris avec des architectes afin d'examiner celle-ci, pour quitter Galba et aller exécuter son coup d'État (Tac. *hist.* 1,27,3; Suet. *Otho* 6, Plut. *Galba* 24,6–7; cf. Suet. *Otho* 3).

C. SCRIBONIUS CURIO, *cos.* 76, *cens.* 61 a.C.: Cette *domus* a abrité à la fois le censeur et son fils homonyme, *tr. pl.* 50 (cf. App. *bell. civ.* 2,27) selon Valère Maxime (9,1,6: *Itaque eodem tempore et in isdem penatibus diversa saecula habitaverunt, frugalissimum alterum, alterum nequissimum*) qui insiste sur le contraste moral entre les deux personnages; d'après Cicéron, Marc Antoine aurait été chassé plusieurs fois de cette maison (*Phil.* 2,45).

C. SEPTIMIUS, *praet.* 57 a.C.?: Le proscrit Septimios évoqué par Appien (*bell. civ.* 4,23,96–97), pris alors qu'il se retrouve enfermé dans la maison de son épouse, maîtresse d'un ami d'Antoine, et que celle-ci le retient jusqu'à l'arrivée de ses meurtriers, est probablement le préteur de 57, ami de Cicéron et anticésarien notoire. Sur le personnage, voir F. Hinard, *Les proscriptions de la Rome républicaine*, 1985, 519–520, et D. Magnino, *Appiani bellorum civilium Liber quartus*, 1998, 174.

L. SERGIUS CATILINA, *praet.* 68 a.C.: Sans qu'il soit possible de la localiser, la maison de Catilina est évoquée à propos d'une réunion qu'il y aurait tenu en juin 64 (Sall. *Catil.* 20,1: ... *in abditam partem aedium secedit atque ibi, omnibus arbitris procul amotis, orationem huiusmodi habuit...*), des acteurs ou gladiateurs avec lesquels il aurait vécu (Q. Cic. *pet.* 10), de certains épisodes de la conjuration de 63 (Sall. *Catil.* 32,1; cf. aussi Cass. Dio. 37,32,1–2), et enfin d'un *sacrarium* dressé pour une aigle ayant appartenu à C. Marius (Cic. *Catil.* 1,24 et 2,24; cf. Sall. *Catil.* 59,3).

L. SESTIUS QUIRINALIS ALBINIANUS, *cos. suff.* 23 a.C.: Fils du tribun de 57 a.C., cet ancien proscrit rétabli dans ses droits conserve chez lui des images de M. Brutus, sous les ordres duquel il avait été proquesteur: loin de l'en blâmer, un jour où il lui rend visite, Auguste le félicite de sa loyauté (App. *bell. civ.* 4,51,223; Cass. Dio. 53,32,4). Voir F. Hinard, *Les proscriptions de la Rome républicaine*, 1985, 523 et D. Magnino, *Appiani bellorum civilium Liber quartus*, 1998, 202.

C. STATIUS CLARUS (SAMNIS), *sen. ca.* 82–42 a.C.: Ce proscrit de 43 (App. *bell. civ.* 4,25,102: Στάτιος δὲ ὁ Σαυνίτης...), fort riche, possède une maison, non localisée, dans laquelle il se suicide en y mettant le feu, après l'avoir livrée volontairement au pillage du *dèmos* et de ses esclaves: la scène paraît se dérouler à Rome. Sur l'identification probable du personnage avec un évergète de Pietrabbondante dont le nom serait C. Staius Clarus, voir A. La Regina, *PP* 30 (1975) 163–167; F. Hinard, *Les*

proscriptions de la Rome républicaine, 1985, 525–526.

C. TURRANIUS, *praet.* 44 a.C.: Avant même le début de la proscription de 43 a.C., il est tué dans sa maison (Oros. 5,18,9: *domi suae interfectus est*). Sur l'identification, problématique, du personnage, voir F. Hinard, *Les proscriptions de la Rome républicaine*, 1985, 534–535 et T. R. S. Broughton, *MRR* III, 207.

VETTIUS SALASSUS : Ce personnage dont l'identification n'est pas possible (il peut s'agir d'un chevalier comme d'un sénateur: voir F. Hinard, *Les proscriptions de la Rome républicaine*, 1985, 543–544), retourne dans sa maison alors qu'il est proscrit (en 43 a.C.) et que sa *domus* a été vendue. Secouru et caché dans sa loge par son ancien esclave portier, vendu avec la maison, il est dénoncé par sa femme et se jette dans le vide depuis le haut du bâtiment lorsqu'il voit cette dernière arriver avec des hommes des triumvirs (App. *bell. civ.* 4,24,98–100, cf. Val. Max. 9,11,7, beaucoup plus sommaire).

Nous espérons qu'un simple parcours des données ainsi rassemblées, à l'état brut, aura convaincu le lecteur de la possibilité de leur exploitation dans des domaines d'études tout à fait variés.³

Ecole Normale Supérieure – LSH, Lyon

³ Nous en avons nous-même exploité un certain nombre dans notre thèse de doctorat de l'Université de Provence, dirigée par P. Gros, *Habitavi in oculis (CIC. Planc. 66). Recherches sur les résidences urbaines des classes dirigeantes romaines des Gracques à Auguste: la maison dans la Ville*, à paraître dans la BEFAR (en attendant, cf. "Les résidences urbaines des sénateurs romains des Gracques à Auguste: la maison dans la Ville", *L'Information historique* 58,5 [1996] 185–197).

SPARSIS COMIS, SOLUTIS CAPILLIS:
'LOOSE' HAIR IN OVID'S ELEGIAC POETRY

RIIKKA HÄLIKKÄ

Descriptions of hair, especially women's hair, appear frequently in Ovid's poetry. The purpose of this paper is to examine descriptions of "loose", "tousled", "unkempt" or "torn" hair (e.g. phrases like *sparsis comis*, *solutis crinibus*, *neglecta coma*, *raptis capillis*) in the context of Ovid's elegiac poetry. In this paper I shall comment on the three most prominent themes in the descriptions of hair: traditional depictions of sorrow or other uncontrolled emotions, ideas about refinement and Romanness, and the tearing of hair in the typically Ovidian amatory settings. The meanings of descriptions of loose hair vary according to associations given by different generic and thematic contexts. The Roman audience of Ovid's poetry was, of course, expected to recall the previous presentations of the material within the tradition and appreciate the novel reading of it offered by the author. Therefore, Ovid's textual strategy informs readers of his literary artifice and emphasises the role of the poet as *artifex* by creating unconventional effects out of conventional material.¹ The question to ask here is not 'what' but rather 'how' do these descriptions mean?

In general, Ovid makes a wide use of cultural meanings attached to hair and their arrangement.² Some of these meanings are shared by our modern culture, some of them are distinctively Roman. For instance, the eroticism of letting one's hair fall loose is not, as a modern reader might expect considering the amatory nature of the most Ovidian poetry, a very visible, nor dominant feature in his descriptions of hair.³ Rather, Ovidian

¹ See M. Myerowitz, *Ovid's Games of Love*, Detroit 1985, 36. Myerowitz discusses the positive valuation given to artificiality: *artifex* is the creator of culture.

² E.g. poem about Corinna's hair in *am.* 1,14. See below.

³ Compared to, for instance, Apuleius. In his *Metamorphoses*, descriptions of women's hair are usually connected with the erotic. See, for instance, *met.* 2,16–17 (a woman

'discourse of loose hair' seems to aim at subtlety in the choice of context-specific associations. This is partly due to his and his audience's sensitiveness to contemporary Augustan discussion of morality, which included clothing and hairstyles in representation of Romanness and Roman ideals.⁴ Ovid's audience was thus equipped to receive a multi-faceted reading of a poetic text.

Self-evidently, most descriptions of loose hair concern women. Any woman (mythological, foreign, aristocratic, captive) in Ovid's poetry is described in terms of the Roman contemporary concepts about gender. Appropriate attending to one's appearance or lack of it communicates a woman's status, at least within Ovid's poetic universe of love. Thus the Ovidian sense for *cultus* is essentially "culture, refinement". This is highlighted in his texts by the opposing term of *rusticitas*, lack of refinement and proper order. While Tibullus and Propertius describe *cultus* as extravagant and expensive adornment of women and lay stress on the financial burden it imposes upon a lover, Ovid's concept of *cultus* differs from that of the other Roman elegists. Ovid places the emphasis on artistry rather than extravagance.⁵ The main passage dealing with the female *cultus* is *Ars amatoria* 3, 101–128 beginning with *ordior a cultu* (101) ending with the poet congratulating himself on the felicity of his own time (122–128) : *gratulor: ... quia cultus adest, nec nostros mansit in annos rusticitas, priscis illa superstes avis*.⁶ The female adornment is seen as an integral part of the

prepares for sex by letting her hair fall down); 2,8 (hair as essential for a woman's appearance, unattractiveness of bald women); 2,9 (eroticism of hair)

⁴ See K. Galinsky, "Ovid's Metamorphoses and Augustan cultural thematics", in *Ovidian Transformations. Essays on Ovid's Metamorphoses and its reception*, eds. P. Hardie et al., Cambridge 1999, 103–11. Galinsky, 102, notes that in Ovidian scholarship there has been an unfruitful tendency to read Ovid only in terms of alluding to or deviating from Augustan 'ideology', and warns against this methodological pitfall.

⁵ P. Watson, "Ovid and *cultus*: *Ars Amatoria* 3.113–28", *TaPhA* 112 (1982) 237–44, 238f.

⁶ Cf. *Ov. am.* 1,8,26 *dignus corpore cultus abest*. Watson (above, n. 5), 237 n. 2, notes that "it is unclear how far the section on *cultus* extends, since the precepts of behaviour (281–380) might be viewed as a development of the same theme". Myerowitz (above, n. 1), 198–99 n. 2, observes that Ovid's use of the verb *colo* and its derivatives (*cultor*, *cultus*) in the *Ars Amatoria* covers a whole range of meanings from e.g. habitation, agriculture and worship to dress, intellectual pursuits and care of the body. She concludes that "while different shades of meaning of *cultus* doubtless predominate according to context, I see no reason to assume that Ovid intends to exclude the general idea of culture

female *cultus*, though Ovid does not say or imply that the female *cultus* consists only of the arts of make-up and coiffure.⁷ However, the hairdo seems to be the most important part of it as Ovid begins his presentation of the *cultus* with different hairstyles in *ars* 3,133–168.

Women in trouble

Untied, disheveled hair serves as a stock feature for women in trouble in Roman poetry. The notion of one being *sparsis comis* or *dissolutis capillis* or *effusis crinibus*, adequately summarizes both the situation and the psychological state of a character.⁸

This sort of description is especially applied to women of myth. Ovid makes the mythological material from different genres work in terms of Roman culture by visualizing the mythological world and characters as Roman. Their bearing, dress, even rhetoric make them essentially Augustan literary figures, and this, in turn, makes it possible for Ovid to discuss contemporary matters through these characterizations. Sometimes, however, he seems to opt for a different approach, which underlines the fact that much of the mythological material is derived from other, neither contemporary nor Roman, traditions. On these occasions Ovid's stance is often pejorative.

In the *Heroides* the abandoned women almost without exception are said to let their hair loose to demonstrate their grief. Furthermore, abandonment has left many of them exposed in a hostile, even barbaric environment. Without their lovers, they lose their status and their connection with the civilised world. Thus, untied hair simultaneously communicates both their mental state and their status. A woman with *sparsis comis* is a woman without a protector, a prey for beasts.⁹ This aspect perhaps attracted

or civilization from any specific context" (p. 199).

⁷ Myerowitz (above, n. 1), 127 notes on the *Ars Amatoria* that "while amatory *cultus* for the male is the taming and the handling of the female, for the female it is, to a great degree, the taming and handling of herself."

⁸ Cf. M. Levine Myerowitz, in *Off with her Head! The Denial of Women's Identity in myth, religion, and culture*, ed. H. Eilberg et al., Berkeley 1995, 85: "As a signifier, hair operates both metonymically and metaphorically. In its metonymic mode hair stands for the 'whole person'".

⁹ E. Greene, "Travesties of Love: Violence and Voyeurism in Ovid Amor. 1,7", *CW* 92 (1999) 409–18, 414 makes an important point, which can be applied to Ovid's female

a moralistic and exemplary reading among the Roman audience (either intended by the author or not), as the women had brought the shame upon themselves by leaving their families and homelands for their lovers. In *Heroides* 10, Ariadne writes to Theseus after he has abandoned her on the island Dia. One of the things signalling her desperate situation is the description of her hair. Ariadne (16), who has found herself left alone, pulls her hair in despair, which is described as already tangled after sleep: *utque erat e somno turbida, rupta coma est*.¹⁰ Later, in lines 47–48, she wanders around the island, her hair resembling that of a Bacchant:¹¹

*aut ego diffusis erravi sola capillis
qualis ab Ogygio concita Baccha deo.*

Finally, a typical image of a grieving woman is *aspice demissos lugentis more capillos* (137).¹² The poem ends with a description of Ariadne's hair (147) which produces a tragicomic effect: all the pulling and tearing of her hair has made them sparse: *hos tibi, qui superant, ostendo maesta capillos*. It is as if too extensive a grief makes Ariadne a laughing stock for the audience.

The descriptions of hair in *Heroides* 10 are commonplace in Roman poetry: hair tousled by sleep or by an amorous encounter, loose hair of the

characters in general, namely, that "although these women are abused and abandoned by men, it is all worth it because they are 'seen' as beautiful objects of desire and, on the top of that, they receive *fama* as a result of their liaisons with men who abuse and/or degrade them".

¹⁰ See P. Knox, *Ovid: Heroides. Select Epistles*, Cambridge 1995, 167 and 237 for *rupta coma*. The phrase is found in *her.* 3,15 and *met.* 10,722–23.

¹¹ Ariadne's depiction of herself as resembling a devotee of Bacchus seems to refer to her future as Dionysus's lover. On the future of a mythological character as an intertextual tool see A. Barchiesi "Future Reflexive: Two Modes of Allusion and Ovid's *Heroides*", *HSCP* 95 (1993) 333–65.

¹² Cf. Ps-Sen. *Oct.* 720–21 *resolutis comis matres Latinae flebiles planctus dabant*; Ov. *her.* 7,69 (Dido) *tristis et effusis sanguinolenta comis*. In Seneca's *Troades* Hecuba urges the chorus to join her in mourning (83–5): *HEC. Fidae casus nostri comites, soluite crinem; per colla fluant maesta capilli*, and 98–100 *CHO. Soluimus omnes lacerum multo funere crinem; coma demissa est libera nodo*. The repetition of the words (*crinem* – *capilli* – *crinem* – *coma*) seems to be echoing Ovid's use of the image of loose hair (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3,65 *et circum Iliades crinem de more solutae*).

Bacchants, and letting one's hair loose and pulling it in mourning.¹³ Ariadne's unkempt hair simultaneously communicates her relationship with Theseus, her despair and sorrow, her sudden placement outside the civilised world and loss of status and, finally, her deranged mental state.¹⁴

As Ovid promotes love as *cultus*, culture to be learned and mastered, the mythological heroines become in every aspect barbaric as soon as they lose their love. Or, to put it in another way, their failure in the matters of love (that is, their *rusticitas*, since they actually belong to a world that is not Roman) has caused them to lose their lovers.¹⁵ The heroines have doubts about their barbarism, or *rusticitas*: for instance, Penelope fears that she appears *rustica* to Odysseus (*her.* 1,77–78) and by her words (*her.* 12,107) *quae tibi sum nunc barbara facta* Medea claims that she has become a barbarian to Jason since he does not love her anymore.

The depiction of sorrow as a departure from culture and the overlapping of meanings are seen in other parts of the *Heroides*, too. The author¹⁶ of *Heroides* makes Sappho describe to Phaon how she neglects her appearance, since she has lost her love (15,73–78). Disheveled hair, rejection of luxurious dress and jewellery actually signal Sappho's loss of female culture (77–78 *cui colar?... mei cultus*). A woman's effort to attend to her looks is futile, if there is no one (that is, no man) to show herself to.

¹³ Cf. *rem.* 593–4 *ibat, ut Edono referens trieterica Baccho ire solet fuis barbara turba comis*. E.g. *Prop.* 1,15,5; 1,15,11; 2,1,7; 2,3,13; 2,8,34; 3,6,9; 3,13,18; 4,8,61; *Tib.* 1,3,8; 1,4,4; 1,8,10; 1,10,62; 3,2,11; *Hor. carm.* 1,12,41; *Verg. Aen.* 3,65; 4,509; 6,48; 7,394.

¹⁴ See *ars* 3,40: Phyllis flees to the woods *depositis comis*. Similarly *rem.* 606. Cf. also *am.* 3,6,55–56 about Ilia: *quo cultus abiere tui? quid sola vagaris, vitta nec evinctas impedit alba comas?* On the other hand, a woman who ties her hair takes the situation in control. An illustrative example, though from a very different genre, is the *Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas*. In 20,5 Perpetua, already tossed by a mad cow and wounded, gets up and asks for a pin to tie her hair *dehinc acu requisita et dispersos capillos infibulavit; non enim decebat martyra sparsis capillis pati, ne in sua gloria plangere videretur*.

¹⁵ Ovid claims in *ars* 3,33–42 that Medea, Ariadne, Phyllis and Dido were all doomed because they did not know the *ars* of love.

¹⁶ Knox (above, n. 10) suggests that *her.* 15, *epistula Sapphus*, is not written by Ovid. See esp. 12–14. The author of the poem nevertheless adopts the Ovidian stance when it comes to representations of loose hair. Also G. Rosati in his article "Sabinus, the *Heroides* and the Poet-Nightingale. Some observations on the Authenticity of the *Epistula Sapphus*", *CQ* 46 (1996) 207–16 asserts that the poem has distinctive Ovidian characteristics in its compositional technique.

Sappho articulates her sorrow through visual signs, and the absence of her lover is communicated by the absence of adornment:

*Ecce, iacent collo sparsi sine lege capilli,
Nec premit articulos lucida gemma meos.
veste tegor vili, nullum est in crinibus aurum,
non Arabum noster dona capillus habet.
Cui colar infelix, aut cui placuisse laborem?
ille mei cultus unicus auctor abes.*

Loose hair can also signal a deliberate departure from the civilised world.¹⁷ In performing magical rituals the hair and dress of the witch should be unbound. So Medea in *her.* 6,89 is *passis discincta capillis*. Loose hair in portrayal of Medea both connects her with magical arts and communicates her barbarian origin.¹⁸ Yet Medea mentions in *her.* 12, 155–158 how she restrains herself from tearing her locks in grief, when she witnesses Iason's and Creusa's wedding. Her self-control is the exact opposite of what a reader familiar with stock characterization of Medea would expect. By controlling herself (and her hair) despite her pain she presents herself as powerful and capable of revenge.

Signs of Romanness

Ovid's idea of *cultus* opposes the traditional view that an ideal Roman woman is adorned only by her virtuous behaviour. As already noted above, one of Ovid's main preoccupations in all his works is to promote the idea of *cultus* as opposed to *rusticitas*. The Ovidian term *cultus* stands for culture as a whole, the practices belonging to the civilized world, while *rusticitas* relates to things that lack refinement and proper order.¹⁹ Ovid discusses

¹⁷ Seneca seems to adopt this view in *Phaedra* 393–96 where Phaedra orders to untie her hair and let it fall freely as an Amazon's hair as a part of her fantasy of fleeing to the woods to accompany Hippolytus.

¹⁸ See also *her.* 5,113–14; *met.* 7,182–83 and *met.* 7,257–58 *passis Medea capillis bacchantum ritu flagrantis circuit aras*.

¹⁹ Thus Corinna's maid Cypassis, who creates amazing hairdos for her *domina* is described in *am.* 2,8,1–4 as possessing some *cultus* despite her low status: *Ponendis in mille modos perfecta capillis comere sed solas digna Cypassi deas, et mihi iucundo non*

adornment, such as jewellery, coiffure and clothing as an integral part of the female *cultus*.²⁰ A woman with untied, tousled hair may be categorized either being with or without *cultus* (cf. *neclecta decens*, *am.* 1,14,21). Eventually, the author-lover is the one to pass judgement. In an appropriate situation, a woman can be seen with unkempt hair. In *Ars amatoria* 3,341–32 loose hair to demonstrate sorrow at a funeral is considered attractive:

*funere saepe viri vir quaeritur: ire solutis
crinibus et fletus non tenuisse decet.*

Though Ovid makes it clear that the appropriate degree of adornment is required, he does not often elaborate the theme of too excessive finery in his works. An exception is *am.* 1,14, where Corinna's hair falls out as a result of too extensive dressing.²¹

Also the idea of what is fashionable influences Ovidian representations of female hair. The instructions for women given in the *Ars amatoria*, which, although it does not belong to the elegiac genre, are perfectly comparable with Ovid's elegies in its subject matter.²² Undone, natural looking hair suits many women, though there clearly is a distinction between the natural look and negligence:

*huic decet inflatos laxe iacuisse capillos,
illa sit adstrictis impedienda comis* (*ars* 3,145–46);

Nec mihi totius numero comprehendere fas est

rustica cognita furto, apta quidem dominae sed magis apta mihi.

²⁰ Cf. *ars* 3,107–9 *corpora si veteres non sic coluere puellae, nec veteres cultos sic habuere viros*. Rhetorical skills are an essential part of the male *cultus*, while they do not belong to Ovid's definition of the female *cultus*: *fast.* 4,111–12 *Eloquiumque fuit duram exorare puellam, proque sua causa quisque disertus erat.*

²¹ Myerowitz (above, n. 1), 137–140, discusses the idea of appropriateness (*decorum*) in the context of female adornment and notes that "To be successful art must be unobtrusive. Art, claims the *praeceptor*, must seem to be an accident; the finished product must counterfeit chance." (p. 140).

²² This comparability is probably meant also by J. C. McKeown, *Ovid: Amores. Text and Prolegomena* I, Liverpool 1987, 26 when he mentions that "love-elegy, with its devotion to an idle life of *furtivus amor*, was inevitably at odds with the Augustan programme of social and moral reform and a subsequent work in the same genre, the *Ars Amatoria*, was ultimately to contribute to Ovid's relegation".

*adicit ornatus proxima quaeque dies
et neglecta decet multas coma: saepe iacere
hesternam credas, illa repexa modo est. (ars 3,153–54)*

The attractiveness of a seemingly natural hairdo is still achieved through *ars*.²³ This view seems to be present everywhere in Ovid's poetry and it emphasizes the fact that female *cultus* cannot exist apart from the male *cultus*, since products of the male *cultus*, such as Ovid's instructive literary work *Ars Amatoria*, dictate what the female *cultus* entails.

In *Amores* 1,14,19–22 Ovid applies the image of a Bacchant with loose hair to Corinna, who lies on her bed in the morning before her hair is combed. At first it seems that it is only the description of loose hair that draws a parallel between the peaceful image of Corinna, semisupine on her purple couch, and a Bacchant lying on green grass fatigued by the divine frenzy. The elegiac context of the poem informs the reader further: it has been a passionately erotic encounter comparable with the Bacchant fury that has left her hair in disarray:

*saepe etiam nondum digestis mane capillis
purpureo iacuit semisupina toro;
tum quoque erat neglecta decens, ut Thracia Bacche,
cum temere in uiridi gramine lassa iacet.*

Here the distinctively contemporary Roman setting and the barbaric setting are not contrasted, but rather assimilated by means of aesthetic evaluation and visualising depiction offered by the narrator. Corinna's loose hair, which is not yet combed and set, makes it possible to compare her with the un-Roman figure of a Bacchant.

Ovid even applies the analogy of *cultus* and *rusticitas* to the literary genres in *Amores* 3,1,7–14, where personified Elegy and Tragedy are

²³ E. Downing, "Anti-Pygmalion: The *Praeceptor* in *Ars Amatoria*, Book 3", in *Constructions of the Classical Body* (ed. J. Porter), Ann Arbor 1999, 235–51 proposes an interesting view of how the female *cultus* in Ovid is produced by immobilizing a living woman into statue-like state to please men and notes (p. 238): "Since natural attractiveness is assumed not to be the lot of most women, he devises the dictum *cura dabit faciem* (105): 'care' will shape their features into an acceptable form: *cultus* will prepare them for equally, if otherwise, 'cultured' men. The *praeceptor* illustrates the kind of care and *cultus* he would impose on women with the preliminary precept, '*non sint sine lege capilli*' (133): the arrangement of hair should be carefully regulated by rule."

compared:

*venit odoratos Elegia nexa capillos,
et puto pes illi longior alter erat.
forma decens, vestis tenuissima, vultus amantis
et pedibus vitium causa decoris erat.
Venit et ingenti violenta Tragoedia passu
fronte comae torva, palla iacebat humi
laeva manus sceptrum late regale movebat
Lydius alta pedum vincla cothurnus erat.*

Elegy is described in terms of an attractive young woman similar to *puellae* in Roman elegy, with an elegant coiffure, while Tragedy with her hair loose on her grim forehead (*fronte comae torva*), regal posture and Lydian footwear appears as distinctively un-Roman and uncontemporary figure, an unfashionable genre even. The personified Elegy's graceful appearance is suited for the subject matter of Ovidian elegy, that is, a sophisticated representation of love and urban life. She attracts the poet both by her looks and by her words. Yet in *am.* 3,9 (the poem on Tibullus's death) the poet urges Elegy to let her hair loose, because the subject matter of the poem is essentially tragic: *flebilis indignos, Elegia, solve capillos!* Coiffured, elegant hair in this context would be unfitting, even offending.

One of the most innovative descriptions of loose hair in Ovid has virtually nothing to do with gender. In the opening lines of *Tristia*, Ovid describes his book:

*Nec fragili geminae poliantur pumice frontes,
hirsutus sparsis ut videare comis (tr. 1,1,11–12)*

The book is unpolished and unkempt (*hirsutus*) and appears to be *sparsis comis*, 'with its hair loose'. The unusual metaphor conveys two obvious meanings. First, it echoes the main theme of the whole book, the sorrow of exile. The book is described in terms of a grieving woman with loose hair. Second, it refers to Ovid's place of exile, Tomi, as a barbaric, uncivilised place that makes the poet's work barbaric as well.²⁴

²⁴ Loose hair is mentioned in *tr.* 5,10,32; 5,7,18; 5,7,50 (barbarism of the Getans, sorrow). In *tr.* 3,14,25–52, Ovid complains that his poetic *ars* is weakened by his isolation in the barbaric land, away from Rome. This in part explains why he introduces his book as *hirsutus*, without the polish that Roman environment would bestow.

Between love and hate

In *Amores* 1,7 Ovid describes a lovers' quarrel, which ends up in a violent scene of rape.²⁵ Elegiac violence (and violence in general) in Ovid is taken further than in the work of his predecessors. The pulling and tearing of Corinna's hair is mentioned repeatedly as a justified action on the part of the lover.²⁶ The whole scene is constructed as a lovers' game despite Corinna's obvious fear and hurt. Actually, female suffering contributes to the pleasure of the text, as it renders the man powerful, in control, and the *domina* helpless.²⁷ The narrator remains playful throughout the poem, even his remorse at the end seems a bit ironic. Even the effects of physical violence towards Corinna are seen as ornamental, as adding to her beauty, and thus insisting on the elegiac setting of the poem:

*ergo ego digestos potui laniare capillos?
nec dominam motae dedecuerere comae
sic formosa fuit (am. 1,7,11–13)*

As the scene develops further, the *domina* becomes *captiva* with her loose

Myerowitz (above n. 1), 105–11 discusses the passage and notes that "the creative artist involved in an ongoing struggle with his own crudeness, his own *rusticitas*, finds himself distracted by the *rusticitas* of his environment as he strives to create the poem, the embodiment of all that is *cultus*" (p. 105).

²⁵ J. V. Morrison "Literary Reference and Generic Transgression in Ovid, *Amores* 1.7.: Lover, Poet, and *Furor*", *Latomus* 51 (1992) 571–589, esp. 577–583, notes that description of loose hair (*motae comae*) connects the elegiac situation of *am.* 1,7 with non-elegiac models. The mistress's disheveled hair is compared to those of Ariadne (echoing Catullus 64) and Cassandra (Verg. *Aen.* 2,403–6) and Atalanta (whose hair is actually not mentioned at all, as also Morrison notes). Morrison's analysis of the Ovidian technique of reference seems convincing. However, he does not elaborate on the meaning of hair, but concludes that "Ovid compares the beauty of his mistress with three mythological heroines" (p. 583).

²⁶ On elegiac violence, see D. Fredrick, "Reading Broken Skin: Violence in Roman Elegy" in *Roman Sexualities* (eds. J. P. Hallett – M. B. Skinner), Princeton 1997, 172–193. Tibullus 1,10,61–66 suggests that it is not suitable to hit a woman, but it is acceptable to tear her dress, pull her hair (*sit satis ornatus dissoluisse comae*) and make her cry to punish her. Fredrick also analyses Prop. 2,5,21–26 where the poet considers similar acts of violence towards his mistress but finds them (in Fredrick's words) to be "poetically incorrect" (p. 181).

²⁷ Greene (above n. 9), 411, notes that the poem shows "the pleasure and self-enhancement he derives from subjugating his mistress."

hair and bruised cheeks. The lover treats her like a slave-girl, though reminds his audience in 49–50 that she is free-born (he claws her *ingenuas genas*).

*ante eat effuso tristis captiva capillo,
si sinerent laesae, candida tota, genae. (am. 1,7,39–40)*

*at nunc sustinui raptis a fronte capillis
ferreus ingenuas ungue notare genas (am. 1,7,49–50)*

The narrator starts to feel guilty only when the woman is *exanimis* and silently weeping and trembling.²⁸ To compensate for his actions, he offers his own face and hair for Corinna to tear. The effect is probably intended as comic to the Roman audience, since the narrator mentions Corinna's weak hands, *infirmas manus*. The poem closes by the narrator's hortation to Corinna to set her hair in order, so there would be no sign of his crime. Tousled, loose hair serves as a sign (Ovid even uses the word *signa*) of male dominance over the woman and woman's submission to his power.

*nec nostris oculis nec nostris parce capillis
quamlibet infirmas adiuvat ira manus.
neve mei sceleris tam tristia signa supersint,
pone recompositas in statione comas. (am. 1,7,65–68)*

The shame of being beaten up is projected on the woman, not on the man, even though the last two lines (67–68) might somehow suggest such a reading.²⁹ The narrator's actual *scelus* in line 67 seems to be a poetic one: he has overstepped the boundary of genres by treating his material (or his *puella*) in discord with the typical elegiac mode.³⁰ However, Ovid still keeps

²⁸ Fredrick (above n. 26), 185–86 discusses the passage (49–58) and notes that the mistress's body is suddenly described as a graceful landscape to restore the erotic emphasis of the narrative. Cf. Myerowitz (above n. 1), 127 "Feminine emotions are assumed to be as much a part of her corporeal nature as are physical attributes and are governed, therefore, by the same rules of aesthetics." This shows in *am. 2,5,43–46*, as the becoming beauty of the mistress's sorrowful appearance placates the poet's anger, and he chooses not to tear her hair and claw her cheeks: *spectabat terram: terram spectare decebat / maesta erat in vultu: maesta decenter erat / sicut erant (et erant culti) laniare capillos / et fuit in teneras impetus ire genas*.

²⁹ Cf. *am. 3,4,37*: the poet dismisses the punishment of adulterous wives. A husband who hurts his wife is *rusticus*. See also E. Greene, *CPh* 89 (1994) 347.

³⁰ Morrison (above n. 25) analyses *am. 1,7* and notes that by using mythological *exempla*

his poem within the bounds of the elegiac world by featuring only a temporary reversal of *servitium amoris*, a lover's pledge to his *puella*. At the end of the poem the "normal" elegiac situation is restored, both by setting Corinna's torn hair in order and by the poet's jocose submission to his mistress's retaliation.

As shown above, the lover can exhibit his power over his *puella* by marking her in one way or another. Tousled hair, bruises and bitemarks exhibit passionate lovemaking, but sometimes also acts of violence towards a woman. It is not important whether these marks are produced as a consequence of mutual consent or not; the point is the fact that a woman is marked, either by her lover or by someone else³¹:

*cur plus quam somno turbatos esse capillos
collaque conspicio dentis habere notam? (am. 3,14,33–4)*

Concluding remarks

Ovid employs the textual image of loose hair in various descriptions, such as acts of love, violence, sophistication, barbarism, adornment or sorrow. The meanings given to these descriptions overlap and interact in Ovid's texts. Descriptions of loose hair seem to assert male dominance over the female. Ovid's Roman (aristocratic, male) audience took pleasure in the image of a woman with her hair loose, although for the modern reader many of these descriptions seem violent, even brutal. Furthermore, Ovid's descriptions of loose hair are used to communicate his ideas of *cultus*. In the Roman setting the female *cultus* is constantly evaluated and censored by the poet, who in turn invites his readers to do the same. The male *cultus* is seen as a prerequisite for the female *cultus*. In mythological settings descriptions of loose hair communicate the boundary between the civilised world and the barbaric wild.

University of Turku

to highlight the topos of *furor*, Ovid is able to transgress the generic boundaries (here especially the appropriate subject matter of elegy), which he elsewhere in his poetry has defined as limits for his own *ars* (for example, *am.* 1,1,19–20).

³¹ Cf. Sen. *Phaedr.* 731–32 *crinis tractus and lacerae comae ut sunt remaneant, facinoris tanti notae*. Phaedra points to her disheveled hair as a proof of her supposed rape by Hippolytus.

METATHEATRICALITY IN THE GREEK SATYR-PLAY

MAARIT KAIMIO *ET ALII**

In a famous fragment of Pratinas, described as a *hyporchema* by Athenaeus (4 F 3, Athen. 14,617b), a chorus of satyrs pours a torrent of indignation on the increasing role of the music of *aulos* in a choral performance. The exact target of their hostility, the literary genre of the poem and the identity of the Pratinas in question are under scholarly debate.¹ One argument for the view that the fragment cannot be from a satyr-play, let alone from an early one, has been the metatheatrical theme of the song: open discussion among the performers of the suitability of their music to the context of performance. Similar arguments have been expressed in connection with a late satyr-play, too: In a fragment of the satyric *Heracles* by the fourth-century author Astydamos, we find a discussion of the "varied feast" which a good poet must offer to his spectators (Astydamos II 60 F 4, Athen. 10,411a). This kind of metatheatrical discussion is seen to be influenced by the *parabasis* of Old

* This paper is written by a team studying satyr-play in the University of Helsinki spring 2001 under the guidance of Maarit Kaimio. The other contributors are Marke Ahonen, Matias Buchholz, Pirkko Haikala, Saara Kauppinen, Sanna Kittelä, Päivi Lammi, Essi Miettinen, Nicola Nykopp, Kirsi Sysmäläinen and Vesa Vahtikari.

¹ Opposite views have been presented lately by R. Seaford, *Maia* 29/30 (1977/78) 81–94, and B. Zimmermann, *MH* 43:3 (1986) 145–154. Seaford considers that the fragment comes from a satyr-play of Pratinas and reflects opposition against the dithyrambic style of Lasus of Hermione, while Zimmermann sees in the song an example of the neo-Attic dithyramb from the second half of the fifth century, supposing another, later poet by the same name. See the discussion by J. Schloemann in R. Krumeich, N. Pechstein and B. Seidensticker (eds.), *Das griechische Satyrspiel*, Darmstadt 1999, 83–87 (hereafter: *GS*), who takes a cautious stand against the origin of the fragment in a satyr-play. However, it is generally admitted that the speaker of the lines must be a chorus of satyrs (Zimmermann 1986, 151–152 denies this, but relaxes his position in his book *Dithyrambos: Geschichte einer Gattung*, Göttingen 1992, 126 n. 27). For literature on the discussion of the genre of the fragment, see now *GS* 84 n.17; 86 nn. 32, 33.

Comedy.² Metatheatricality is thus seen as foreign to the character of the Greek satyr-play.

The concept of metatheatre – or metatheatricality, metatragedy – and its application to Greek drama have themselves been much discussed lately. Such theatrical self-reference, in the form of expressions referring to different aspects of the context of the actual performance in the festival, has generally been recognized as a characteristic feature of Old Comedy, and it has been seen as one of the distinguishing marks between Greek tragedy and comedy.³ Recently, possible metatheatrical references in tragedy have been much discussed, especially the interpretation of passages connected with the god Dionysus himself.⁴ Anton Bierl has emphasized the lack of clarity of the concept of metatheatre as the main reason behind the sharp oppositions. As the concept has been transferred, in the realm of Greek literature, from comedy to tragedy, it has often been interpreted as bringing with it notions of the rupture of illusion or conscious play with fictionality, sometimes with anachronistic reference to the *Verfremdungseffekt* of Bertold Brecht.⁵ In his recent book about the chorus of Greek comedy, Bierl urges that a more clear distinction be made between the concepts of self-referentiality and metatheatre: the former should be used of the self-referential act of speech, where the speaker (mostly the chorus) refers to its own acting (often in a ritual act) during the here and now of the performance, while the latter refers to the problematizing, reflexive speech in the theatre about the aesthetic

² D. Bain, *CQ* 25 (1975) 24–25; T. Günther, *GS* 572–73. On the fragment of Astydamos, see below pp. 59–60.

³ See especially Bain 1975 (above n. 2), 13–25; idem, *Actors and Audience: A Study of Asides and Related Conventions in Greek Drama*, Oxford 1977; O. Taplin, *JHS* 106 (1986) 163–174. Both have later somewhat softened their original contrasting of the two genres, Bain in *BICS* 34 (1988) 1–14, Taplin in *Comic Angels and Other Approaches to Greek Drama through Vase-Painting*, Oxford 1993, 26. On satyr-play, cf. F. Lissarrague: "None of this [sc. play with theatrical illusion as in comedy] appears in satyric drama, which follows tragedy in its complete respect for the fiction of the stage" (in J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin [eds.], *Nothing to Do with Dionysus? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*, Princeton 1990, 236).

⁴ See especially C. Segal, *Dionysiac Poetics and Euripides' Bacchae*, Princeton 1982, ch. 7, and the chapter "Metatragedy" in the Afterword of its new edition 1997, 369–378, followed by the review article by R. Seaford, *BMCRev* 98.3.10 and Segal's reply *BMCRev* 98.5.26.

⁵ See A. Bierl, *Dionysus und die griechische Tragödie: Politische und 'metatheatralische' Aspekte im Text*, Tübingen 1991, 115–16.

phenomenon of theatre.⁶ The conceptual distinction, however, is not easy to keep in the realm of Greek drama, nor is it in our opinion necessary. As Bierl himself continues, both concepts overlap, and it depends on the point of view, which of them is preferable in a certain context. As the reason for this, Bierl sees the fluctuating boundaries of ritual and theatre. In his recent book on the metafictional poetics of Greek drama, G. W. Dobrov⁷ emphasizes that both Greek tragedy and comedy fundamentally employ the same phenomenal modes to reveal their own theatricality, though the openness and measure in which these 'figures of play' are employed may differ from one genre to the other. Thus, surface play with explicit reference to an element of performance is typical of comedy, but very veiled in tragedy; similarly, it is easy to point out the mode termed 'contrafact' by Dobrov in the many cases where a scene in comedy is based on extensive use and comic modification of a certain scene in tragedy, while in tragedy the technique is more elusive. The third mode employed by Dobrov in his analysis of the metafictionality of Greek drama, '*mise en abyme*', defined by him as "a metarepresentational strategy whereby a miniature theatrical situation is embedded within a larger, similarly structured dramatic framework" (15), is well attested in both genres.⁸ Dobrov leaves satyr-play out of his discussion on the basis of lack of sufficient evidence due to the scarcity of the material of this genre.⁹

In this article, we use the term 'metatheatricality' both of the self-referential and the self-reflexive expressions found in the satyr-play. We do not imply a 'rupture of illusion' with this term, but try to interpret the expressions in their context. As will be seen, many of the instances, especially in the fragmentary plays, are very difficult to interpret with certainty, and thus a definite answer to the question of the extensiveness of

⁶ A. Bierl, *Der Chor in der alten Komödie: Ritual und Performativität*, München – Leipzig 2001, 44. The concept of self-referentiality in Greek poetry has been discussed especially by A. Henrichs, *Arion* Third Series 3.1 (1994/1995) 56–111; see also C. Calame in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge 1999, 125–53.

⁷ G.W. Dobrov, *Figures of Play: Greek Drama and Metafictional Poetics*, Oxford 2001.

⁸ On the similarities and differences between the two genres, see Dobrov (above n. 7), 14–20, 158–160.

⁹ See Dobrov (above n. 7), 7. In his note 29 to p. 7 (166) he states: "We simply do not have sufficient evidence to fully assess the degree of self-representation and intertextuality in the satyr-play."

metatheatricality in the satyr-play cannot be expected. However, as the satyr-play is often seen as something between tragedy and comedy,¹⁰ we consider it worthwhile to have a closer look at the existence of this feature in it. This scrutiny may also be helpful in understanding the role and function of the chorus of the satyr-play – a theme which in the long-standing and extensive discussion about the chorus in Greek drama has hitherto been neglected to a surprising degree.¹¹ As a chorus with a fixed identity – the half human, half theriomorphic companions of Dionysus – the chorus of the satyr-play differs fundamentally both from the chorus of tragedy and that of comedy, and deserves therefore serious attention in the discussion of the choruses of Greek literature. Thus, in the first part of this article, we shall discuss different types of possibly metatheatrical expressions in the satyr-play, considering references to choral dancing, music, costumes, masks and the audience, as well as examples of transtextuality. In the second part, we make a few preliminary observations about the function of the chorus of the satyr-play.

I

Choral Dancing and Singing

Passages containing references to the chorus' own dancing appear both in tragedy and comedy. In the extant fragments of satyric drama, such self-referential passages are frequent enough to allow us to think that they belong to the conventional expressions of this genre, too. Fragment F 204b from the satyric *Prometheus Pyrkaeus* of Aeschylus¹² contains a lyric song,

¹⁰ Beginning with Demetrius' definition of the satyr-play as τραγωδία παίζουσα (*De eloc.* 3,169).

¹¹ Bierl (2001 [above n. 6], 64–65) emphasizes the deficiency of a thorough study of the chorus of comedy (and satyr-play), which would take into account the performative aspects. His own monograph of the comic chorus goes a long way towards filling this gap; he does not, however, go into the satyr-play except in some very limited examples, on the grounds of which he comes to the conclusion that the chorus of the satyr-play is very near the comic chorus (e.g. 65, 103).

¹² E. Fraenkel's suggestion (*PBA* 28 [1942] 245 f.) that F 204a–d (*P. Oxy.* 2245) come from this drama is widely accepted. – The fragments of satyr-plays are quoted according to R. Kannicht, S. Radt, and B. Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta* (= *TrGF*) I–IV,

probably performed by the chorus of the satyrs, in which they celebrate the fire just brought to earth by Prometheus and praise him as a benefactor of humankind. The satyrs first state that Charis sets them dancing (1: μ' εὐενῆς χορεύει χάρις), whereupon they affirm that they are sure that also the nymphs will dance in a chorus and sing a ὕμνος in praise of Prometheus (6 ff.). This is a good example of the technique of choral self-referentiality combined with choral projection.¹³ While actually dancing themselves in the orchestra, the satyrs, after their first self-referential announcement about their dance, speak only (as far as our text goes) about the imaginary dance of the nymphs which will take place in the future. Thus they are projecting their own dance from the here and now of the actual performance to another time and place in fiction. Choral self-referentiality (with or without choral projection) has firm roots in the ritual character of all choral performance. In the same way as the dithyramb of the cult of Dionysus, choral dance in drama is, of course, also a ritual in honour of Dionysus, not least in satyr-play.¹⁴ Bierl emphasizes that the chorus functions as a mediator between the cultic action and the world of the drama, since it has both a ritual and a dramatic role. Choral self-referentiality is used in order to integrate the ritual dancing into the play.¹⁵ In such cases, we can speak of metatheatricality, but this does not mean breaking the so-called dramatic illusion.

Göttingen 1971–85 (used in *GS* with some omissions of minor fragments).

¹³ The concepts of choral self-referentiality and choral projection are discussed meritoriously by Henrichs 1994/1995 (above n. 6), 56–111 and *Philologus* 140 (1996) 48–62, who treats the use of these devices in tragedy. Although Henrichs notes that choruses addressing their own performance as dancers can also be found in satyr-play, even mentioning this particular fragment as an example (Henrichs 1994/1995, 58 with n. 14), he does not draw attention to the fact that, in addition to choral self-referentiality, choral projection is also used here. In fact, Henrichs speaks only about Sophoclean and Euripidean choruses using the technique of choral projection (cf. Henrichs 1994/1995, 68; 75; 86; Henrichs 1996, 49).

¹⁴ This is emphasized by Bierl 2001 (above n. 6), 21: "Der Chor *ist* im antiken Drama weitgehend Ritual. Komische wie auch satyrhafte Chortanzlieder stehen einem Ritual sehr viel näher als tragische." For the ritual meaning of tragic choral songs, see Henrichs 1994/1995 (above n. 6), 68 ff. and Henrichs 1996 (above n. 13), 53. He proposes that ritual performance, dramatized by the tragedians, underlies all instances of choral self-reference in tragedy (Henrichs 1994/1995, 69).

¹⁵ Bierl 2001 (above n. 6), 64. He adds that ritual even seems to need self-referentiality in order to be understood and to be carried out successfully. See also *ibid.* 365.

In addition to the concrete ritual of dancing, dramatic choruses often simultaneously perform other rituals, too, which can be inserted in the plot of the play. As A. Henrichs has observed, choral self-referentiality often functions as a prelude to other ritual activities.¹⁶ In the case of F 204b, we could think of the song as a paean,¹⁷ which is clearly located within the world of the drama, since it is performed in honour of Prometheus for what he has done earlier in the play (bringing the fire to the earth). Nevertheless, it is at the same time also a part of the actual performance in the orchestra of the real world. Particularly interesting from this point of view is the fact that the imaginary song of the nymphs is quoted by the chorus literally (11–12), in a way which brings into mind the speech-act theory of John Austin. If we were to describe this passage as 'performative' in the sense of this theory, this would mean that it actually represents the accomplishment of an action, i.e. the ritual paean which the satyrs cite in an 'illocutionary' way.¹⁸ Just as the dance is only projected on the nymphs, but in reality performed by the chorus themselves, this applies also to the paean and so the chorus perform this ritual themselves. Thus, if we join the *communis opinio* which ascribes this fragment to *Prometheus Pyrkaeus*, we have to acknowledge that the techniques of choral self-referentiality, choral projection and performative expressions in a ritual context are also used in Aeschylean satyric drama.¹⁹

References to dancing can also be found in another satyr-play of Aeschylus, namely in *Theoroi* or *Isthmiastae*. In F 78a,32 ff. and F 78c,

¹⁶ Henrichs 1994/1995 (above n. 6), 63 (speaking about tragedy).

¹⁷ The word used by the chorus is ὕμνος; this word is generally applied to all kinds of songs to or about gods or heroes (see L. Käppel, *Paian: Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung*, Berlin and New York 1992, 83). The song has been defined as a paean, e.g., by D. F. Sutton, *The Greek Satyr Play*, Meisenheim am Glan 1980, 25. The expression of gratitude and the use of the word χάρις are common features of a paean (cf. Käppel 150–151).

¹⁸ On the definition of 'performative', see J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things With Words*, Cambridge MA 1962, 4–7 and on the definition of 'illocutionary' *ibid.* 99. The *epithymion* of the chorus (6–8, 15–17) can be interpreted as an exhortation leading to the hymn of the nymphs.

¹⁹ Another reference to dancing can be found in the badly mutilated fragment F 204c from the same play, which contains the word χορεύμασ[ιν (line 3). This is also of importance for the discussion about the date of the Pratinas fragment F 3, since it refutes Zimmermann's assertion that the word χορεύματα (which occurs in the Pratinas fragment) cannot be found before the late plays of Euripides (Zimmermann 1986 [above n. 1], 151). Cf. also the *Pyrkaeus* fragments F 204d 4,3 χορεύεις, 5,3 ὀρχημ[α].

37 ff. Dionysus scolds the satyrs because they engage in athletics instead of sticking to their normal activities, such as dancing: F 78a,33 τοῦρρημα μάλλον εἰκὸς ἦν σε.[.....]εἶν, F 78c,37 f. κούδεις παλαιῶν οὐδὲ τῶν νεωτέρω[ν] / ἐκὼν ἄπεστι τῶνδε διστοίχω[ν] χορῶν.²⁰ It has been proposed that the word δίστοιχος in F 78c,38 could be interpreted as an analogy to the arrangement of the tragic chorus in three rows (στοῖχος) described by Pollux (4,108 f.). Thus the expression would represent a direct comment on the way in which the chorus of satyrs entered the orchestra.²¹ Others find it more probable that Dionysus speaks about dance as an element of Dionysiac cult only on a rather general level instead of referring to the actual dance in the play.²² But even in this sense, the use of such a defining adjective is surprising; it must refer to some generally known feature of Dionysiac choruses. One way or another, what interests us most about these passages, is the fact that they thematize dance and the ritual role of the satyrs who form the chorus. Thus we have here a good example of metatheatrical self-reflexion about the *raison d'être* of the satyric chorus and the significance of ritual dance for the cult of Dionysus.

In the satyr-plays of Sophocles, self-referential remarks about choral dance – or at least about some movements of the chorus – can be found in *Ichneutae* and also in the fragment F 269c from *Inachus*. The latter one, though badly preserved and in many respects dubious (e.g., the distribution of the verses to the different characters is not quite certain), contains an interesting scene, in which apparently Hermes, who is invisible thanks to the Cap of Hades he is wearing, frightens the chorus of satyrs who are moving around the orchestra trying to evade him. Vivid movement of the chorus can be inferred from the whole scene, especially from expressions like the lyric verses 36 f. ἐπί με πόδα νεμει. / ἔχε με· πόδα νέμει.²³ It seems that the

²⁰ Text as supplemented by E. Lobel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XVIII*, London 1941, no. 2162, p. 21.

²¹ J.C. Kamerbeek, *Mnemosyne* 8 (1955) 10.

²² A. Wessels and Krumeich, *GS* 139 n. 36; 145 with n. 65.

²³ Compare also 26 πόδ' ἔχειν (lyric) and the trochaic tetrameters, probably spoken by the chorus as well, 23 αὐτὸν εἶπας, αὐτόν, ὅς μοι δεῦρ' ἀνέστρεψεν πόδα and 43 ποῦ δὲ χρῆ πόδα στατίζε[ιν]. A similar expression might have been also in F 269d from the same papyrus, where we find the word ποδί in line 1. Also F 287 from the same play deals with stamping on the ground: ἐπίκρουμα χθονὸς Ἀργείας.

chorus disintegrates into small groups,²⁴ but it is hard to draw any further conclusions concerning the satyrs' movements.

In *Ichneutae* F 314,217–220, the satyrs, who are trying to find out who has produced the mysterious sounds they have heard, declare that they will force the producer in his underground hiding-place to hear them by their noisy steps: ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τάχα / φ[έρ]ων κτύ[π]ον πέδορτον ἐξαναγκάσω / π[η]δήμασιν κραιπνοῖσι καὶ λακτίσμασιν.²⁵ The fact that this announcement is made in a passage in iambic trimeter does not necessarily imply that there is no dancing in this scene.²⁶ On the contrary, it seems that the satyrs perform a dance right after it, whereupon the local nymph Cyllene appears. Her complaint about the shouting (222) and ποδῶν λακ[] (237; probably a form of λάκτισμα²⁷) produced by the satyrs proves that they have indeed danced or at least made some agitated, trampling movements. Cyllene wonders why the satyrs have come to disturb her instead of remaining in their normal service of Dionysus (221 ff.), and so there is also in this scene some metatheatrical reflexion about the role of the satyrs, as in Aeschylus' *Isthmiastae*.

Let us now turn to Euripides' *Cyclops*. In this play, numerous instances of choral self-referentiality as well as choral projection can be found, which are all set in a distinct, Dionysiac ambience. In fact, the references to dancing in *Cyclops* are the most Dionysiac in all of extant satyric drama. At the end of the prologue, Silenus announces the arrival of the satyrs and wonders if their stamping is the same *sikinnis*²⁸ as at the time when they went together with Bacchus in a κῶμος to the house of Althaea

²⁴ Cf. R. D. J. Carden, *The Papyrus Fragments of Sophocles*, Berlin 1974, 54; D. F. Sutton, *Sophocles' Inachus*, Meisenheim am Glan 1979, 30.

²⁵ According to Bierl, πηδάω is, among others, a typical expression for the dancing movements of the chorus in comedy and satyr-play (Bierl 2001 [above n. 6], 102 n. 214).

²⁶ Other examples of iambic speech passages with references to the chorus' dancing or at least some kind of agitated movements apparently performed at the same time are found in Eur. *Cycl.* 37–40, 94, 204; similarly Silenus refers to his own dance steps in *Cycl.* 156 βαβαί: χορεῦσαι παρακαλεῖ μ' ὁ Βάκχιος – note the similarity of this expression with Aesch. *Prom. Pyr.* F 204b,1 cited above. Cf. Seidensticker, *GS* 21 n. 107.

²⁷ See *TrGF* IV, 291 ad loc.

²⁸ A dance typical of the satyr-play (see below pp. 44–45). According to Seaford, this is the only certain reference in satyric drama to this dance (R. Seaford, *Euripides: Cyclops*, Oxford 1984, 104). He adds, though, that the dance is probably meant in Soph. *Ichn.* 218–219.

(37–40). In this clear reference to the satyrs' dance, the actual dance in the orchestra, which the chorus perform as they are coming into the orchestra for their lyric *parodos*, is projected on a past mythological event, namely the love affair between Dionysus and Althaea.²⁹ It is possible that we have here an intertextual reference to an earlier satyr-play which dramatized this myth.³⁰ At any rate, the fictional κῶμος of the mythical story goes hand in hand with the ritual dance of the actual performance, and it is at once secular and religious.³¹

After this announcement, the satyrs begin their *parodos*, in the course of which we can find yet another example of choral projection, which functions as a self-referential articulation of their dance, even though it is expressed in a negative way: 63–72 οὐ τὰδε Βρόμιος, οὐ τὰδε χοροὶ κτλ.³² In an ironic way, their statement that there is no Dionysus and no dance is, of course, true for the fictive setting on the island of the Cyclops, but at the same time these dances are performed in the orchestra of the real world. The song is full of Dionysiac elements, and as Bierl has pointed out, it is Dionysus who functions here as the crucial link between fiction and reality and makes it possible for these two levels to exist side by side.³³ A comparable pattern of negative reference to choral dance occurs when the Cyclops enters the stage and scolds the satyrs for dancing in a bacchic way, although Dionysus is not present: 204 τί βακχιάζετε; οὐχὶ Διόνυσος τὰδε.

²⁹ This suits well Bierl's view that whereas Sophocles mentions Dionysus mostly in cultic contexts, Euripides emphasizes more the mythical aspects (Bierl 1991 [above n. 5], 126).

³⁰ See below p. 66.

³¹ As Seaford explains, secular κῶμοι would seek entrance to the house of a lover (as in the Althaea myth), and religious κῶμοι are appropriate to the worship of Dionysus (as the actual performance in the orchestra). This combination of secular and religious aspects is also otherwise symptomatic of the satyrs' position between man and god (Seaford 1984 [above n. 28], 105).

³² This has been well recognized by Bierl 2001 (above n. 6), 78–79. Seaford pays special attention to the fact that the satyrs mention here (and also at verse 205) τύμπανα and argues that their statement of the absence of these instruments must be true, because they were used exclusively in cult and only exceptionally in the theatre; in vase-paintings of theatrical satyrs, no percussion instruments appear (Seaford 1984 [above n. 28], 143–144). But Seaford cannot be right in supposing that at 40, Silenus might have actually heard αἰδαὶ βαρβίτων: it is in no way probable that the satyrs would have herded their goats towards the cave with instruments in hand!

³³ Bierl 2001 (above n. 6), 79.

It seems evident that the satyrs are, in fact, dancing in the orchestra. From such passages³⁴ we can conclude that the members of the satyr choruses apparently were moving around quite a lot in the orchestra, even outside the choral songs proper.

Thus we can say that choral self-referentiality, choral projection, and metatheatrical comments on dancing are used in satyr-play from Aeschylus through Sophocles to Euripides often and in similar ways as in tragedy and comedy, adapted to the situation of the drama, but at the same time evoking in the audience an awareness of the Dionysiac ritual of the performance in the theatre festival of the god. In some cases, the aspect of the actual performance seems to rise rather strongly to the fore. Such are the few passages where technical dance terms are used, or else a certain type of dance is clearly referred to. Aristoxenus (fr. 104, 106 Wehrli) mentions σίκιννις as the characteristic dance of satyric drama, as ἐμμέλεια of tragedy and κόρδαξ of comedy. We have already mentioned Silenus' entrance announcement of the chorus at Eur. *Cycl.* 37 ff., where Silenus refers to the entrance dance of the chorus with κρότος σικινίδων³⁵ comparing it to a former mythological occasion. Vase-paintings with theatrical scenes show a characteristic step of *sikinnis*. For example, in the Pronomos vase (ARV² 1336,1) we see a satyr standing on the toes of his right foot, with the knee of his bent left leg raised high. The left arm is extended and the right hand is on his hip. As this painting presents the cast of a satyr-play apparently preparing for the performance and not a scene of a satyr-play, we may expect that the dancing satyr is practising the *sikinnis*. The dance is further described in this passage of *Cyclops* with the words κρότος (37) and σαυλούμενοι (40). The former must refer to the stamping of feet, while the latter connotes lasciviousness which is a typical satyric feature.³⁶ Probably the *sikinnis* is also described by κτύπος πέδορτος, πηδήματα κραιπνά and λακτίσματα of Soph. *Ichn.* 218 f. Similarly, Pratinas 4 F 3,15 δεξιᾶς καὶ

³⁴ Cf. Soph. *Ichn.* 217 ff. discussed above and the examples cited in n. 26.

³⁵ The spelling σίκιννις occurs only here and may be a haplography. For the dance, see Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 103 f. Of course, other kinds of dance may have been used in satyr-plays, too (cf. L. Lawler, *The Dance of the Ancient Greek Theatre*, Iowa 1964, 91). Therefore it is not necessary to interpret all references to satyric movements, which contain leaps, as a depiction of the *sikinnis*.

³⁶ According to *LSJ* σαυλόομαι denotes 'to swagger, to dance affectedly' (cf. Luc. *Lexiphanes* 10); the adjective σαῦλος is used 'of the loose, wanton gait of courtesans or Bacchantes' (*LSJ*) by Anacr. 458 and 411b *PMG*.

ποδὸς διαρριφά could be a reference to the specific dance-movement of the *sikinnis*: at least the words fit well together with the depiction of the dancing satyr on the Pronomos vase. Eur. *Cycl.* 220 f. ἐπεὶ μ' ἂν ἐν μέσῃ τῇ γαστέρι / πηδῶντες ἀπολέσαιτ' ἂν ὑπὸ τῶν σχημάτων may also be a reference to the gestures and movements of the *sikinnis*. The Cyclops' words presuppose that he means movements which are very characteristic of the satyrs: he cannot think of eating them, since they would surely cause him a stomach-ache with their antics. σχῆμα appears early as a technical term of dance,³⁷ and the use of the word can thus direct the audience to link it with the actual performance.

Fr. 79 of Aeschylus' *Isthmiaeae* (Athen. 14,629f) καὶ μὴν παλαιῶν τῶνδ' εἰ σοὶ σκωπευμάτων most likely refers to another characteristic movement of the satyr-play, as Photius explains with a reference to Aeschylus (*Lex.* 527,7). Lawler calls this 'peering-schema', a movement where the dancer shaded his eyes with his hand and looked out as if at a distance.³⁸ It is probable that F 339 ὑπόσκοπον χέρα refers to this movement, whether the fragments are from the same context or not.³⁹

Although such references to special dances and dance-movements are not frequent in the extant fragments of satyr-play, they nevertheless exist, perhaps even in a more clear form than in tragedy and comedy, where references to dance movements are frequent but technical terms are generally not used.⁴⁰

³⁷ L. Lawler discusses the meaning and use of the word σχῆμα in *TAPhA* 85 (1954) 148 f. She points out that the attested names of *schemata* are not homogeneous: some of them denote gestures, others a pose or a characteristic movement or action (ibid. 151 ff.).

³⁸ Cf. Hesychius s.v. σκωπευμάτων. Pollux 4,103 explains that the dance was named after the little horned owl, σκώψ, with its characteristic movements of the head; cf. *Ael. nat.* 15,28. Lawler speculates that from the use of the 'peering-schema' in the dances of satyr-plays there went a corresponding development of plot involving searching or peering, usually on the part of the chorus, but sometimes on the part of Silenus or one of the characters (L. Lawler, *TAPhA* 70 (1939) 485, eadem 1964 [above n. 35], 114–116).

³⁹ Musurus' emendation for †ὑποσκεπόν†. See H. J. Mette, *Der verlorene Aischylos*, Berlin 1963, 169; E. K. Borthwick, *CQ* 18 (1968) 48–50; S. Radt, *TrGF* III, 411 ad loc.

⁴⁰ See M. Kaimio, *The Chorus of Greek Drama in the Light of the Person and Number Used*, Helsinki 1970, 121–150; for comedy, see Bierl 2001 (above n. 6), 107–150.

Instrumental Music

Some references to instrumental music can be discussed from the point of view of metatheatricity. The most clear examples would be references to the official *auletes*, who provided the accompaniment for the singing parts of the drama, while references to instruments belonging to the action of the drama itself are much more ambivalent in this respect. References to *aulos* are naturally very common in Greek drama, regardless of the genre, but they usually reflect the general importance of this instrument in Greek life⁴¹ and hardly emphasize the metatheatrical experience of the audience, although the Dionysiac ambience of the theatre festival is especially characteristic of this instrument. In comedy, there are some direct addresses to the official *aulos*-player, the clearest passage being Ar. *Eccl.* 890–92 where the Old Woman asks the *aulos*-player to accompany her song.⁴² Such direct references to the *aulos*-player are not found in the fragmentary evidence of satyric drama, but there are some passages where the *aulos*-player could be involved.⁴³

In Sophocles' *Ichneutae*, Silenus, who himself has not yet heard the peculiar new sound of the lyre, blames his sons for cowardice and urges them to keep tracking the cattle-thief: F 314,172 f. ἐγὼ πα[ρ]ῶν αὐτός σε προσβιβῶ λόγῳ, / κυνορτικὸν σύριγμα διακαλούμεν[ος]. It has been proposed that this whistling sound was actually made by the *aulos* accompanying the following choral song,⁴⁴ in which case this would be a

⁴¹ On the subject see P. Wilson in Goldhill and Osborne (above n. 6), 58–95.

⁴² See Taplin 1993 (above n. 3), 67–78. There are also several vases apparently depicting actors who are "playing at playing the *aulos*", which Taplin discusses *ibid.*, 70–75. In Appendix ii (105–110), he lists and briefly discusses possibly corresponding passages in comic texts.

⁴³ On the problems of interpretation inherent in such passages, cf. Taplin's remarks on comedy (Taplin 1993 [above n. 3], 75): "This is not entirely a matter of bad luck or of unfortunate textual transmission – – – These problems are the product of the very phenomenon which I am documenting here: the intermediate metatheatrical position of the official piper."

⁴⁴ N. Ch. Churmuziadis, *Σατυρικά*, Athens 1974, 94; S. Scheurer and R. Bielfeldt follow this suggestion (*GS*, 300 n. 38). G. Conrad's suggestion that Silenus himself accompanies the following choral song with his whistling (*Der Silen: Wandlungen einer Gestalt des griechischen Satyrspiels*, Trier 1997, 115–116) is improbable: as the choral song in any case was accompanied by the *aulos*-player, it seems most natural that the 'whistling' – which well might accompany the excited cries of the chorus like a *cantus firmus*, as

veiled exhortation to the *aulos*-player. In the fragments of Ion's *Omphale*, there are several lines which refer to a feast apparently given by Omphale in honour of Hephaestus. In 19 F 22 she asks (female) Lydian harpists, singers of ancient hymns, to honour the guest, and in F 23, apparently in the same context, she gives an exhortation to the accompanying instrument: Λυδός τε μάγαδις ἀὐλὸς ἠγείσθω βοῆς. It is uncertain which instrument is meant: *magadis* is everywhere else in ancient sources used of a stringed instrument, and M. L. West has suggested correcting the text to < > τε μάγαδις Λυδὸς ἠγείσθω βοῆς.⁴⁵ It is probable that, after these exhortations, there followed a 'Lydian' choral song, and it is an attractive suggestion that the satyrs performed this song dressed as females.⁴⁶ A transvestite satyr-chorus singing an Oriental melody with harps in their hands⁴⁷ would surely have made a spectacular effect! We must ask ourselves how the *magadis* fits into this scene. If it refers to a harp, it surely is the instrument in the hands of the ψάλτριαι (F 22,1). In this case, the singers could play themselves, or they could play at playing the harp, and the sound could have come from behind the *skene*.⁴⁸ Would the *auletes* have stood silent in such a case, or performed in an 'orchestra' of *aulos* and harps?⁴⁹ Again, if the *magadis* is an

Conrad suggests (116) – was produced by the *aulos*-player.

⁴⁵ M. L. West, *BICS* 30 (1983) 79. In *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford 1992, 91, however, he suggests that this 'Lydian *magadis-aulos*' possibly consisted of an unequal pairing of 'male' and 'female' pipes designed to sound an octave apart.

⁴⁶ Pechstein and Krumeich in *GS* 490. They point out that the address παρθένοι in F 20 would add to the comic effect.

⁴⁷ Cf. the chorus of old silens/satyrs accompanying their song with the *kithara* on the bell-krater painted by Polion (see below p. 50).

⁴⁸ It seems improbable that the music so expressly described as coming from harps would have been in reality performed by the *auletes*. This is, of course, the speculation of 21st century readers. It is possible that the convention of accompaniment by the *aulos* was so strong in the theatre that the audience would not have thought imaginary sounds of the harp performed by the *aulos* unrealistic. Also, the *aulos* was considered to have very versatile mimetic qualities, and Plato (*Rep.* 397a2–7) criticizes the modern virtuoso *aulos*-music for imitating, e.g., the sounds of all kinds of animals. Cf. Wilson in Goldhill and Osborne (above n. 6), 92 f.; Zimmermann 1986 (above n. 1), 150.

⁴⁹ Such combinations occur in Greek literature, especially in descriptions of wedding scenes (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 18,491 ff.; [Hes.] *Sc.* 273 ff.; Sappho 44,24 ff. *PMG*; Pindar is especially fond of such ensembles, e.g. *O.* 3,8 ff.; *P.* 10,38 f.), but we have no evidence of the practice of the theatre in this respect. On the occasional use of the lyre in the theatre and *synaulia* as an agonistic performance, see Wilson in Goldhill and Osborne

aulos, the line must be an exhortation to the official *aulos*-player, such as we have seen in comedy.

A satyr-play which could well have contained metatheatrical references to the *aulos*-player is Iophon's *Aulodoi*. Unfortunately, we know next to nothing of this play. Clement of Alexandria, who quotes the only fragment we have (*Strom.* 1,3,24,3), mentions that Iophon says "of rhapsodes and other such people": 22 F 1 καὶ γὰρ εἰσελήλυθεν / πολλῶν σοφιστῶν ὄχλος ἐξηρτυμένος. 'Sophist' is probably used here in the sense 'expert in art', and it may be that the meeting, perhaps in the context of a competition, of these experts and the satyrs, aspiring to the same status, was part of the action in this drama.⁵⁰ The title gives us some more clues. It probably refers to the chorus, as the titles giving a noun in the plural generally do,⁵¹ and the activity it denotes must be central to the play. The activity, however, is not playing the *aulos*,⁵² as ἀλωδός regularly means 'singer to the accompaniment of the *aulos*'.⁵³ It is common to sing and play the *kithara* at the same time, as κιθαρωδός does, but it is not possible to sing and play the *aulos* at the same time. Thus it is probable that the satyrs try to attain success as virtuoso singers, and their accompanist is the official *aulos*-player. If this is the case, metatheatrical expressions are almost bound to appear in this play.

In Sophocles' satyr-plays, we have a few references to musical instruments which are part of the dramatic action. Strictly speaking, they are not metatheatrical; on the other hand, the presence of these instruments in the theatre is so important that references to them may direct the audience's attention to the actual musical performance at the same time. In *Ichneutae*, the invention of the lyre by Hermes is one of the main themes of the play. The satyrs (and the audience) apparently hear the sound of the lyre between lines 123–124, as the satyrs' frightened reaction and odd crouching move-

(above n. 6), 76, 78.

⁵⁰ So Schloemann and Krumeich in *GS* 549 n. 3, 551. Their alternative explanation, that the satyrs took part in a competition and that σοφιστῶν ὄχλος ironically refers to them, seems less plausible considering that the sophists are "many and well-prepared".

⁵¹ A known exception is Aristophanes' *Frogs*, where the title refers to an additional chorus; cf. E. W. Handley, *BICS* 29 (1982) 115.

⁵² As Schloemann and Krumeich surmise, translating the title *Die Flötenspieler* (*GS* 549–550); similarly Sutton 1980 (above n. 17), 75 n. 250 translates the title *The Flautists*.

⁵³ Cf. A. Barker, *Greek Musical Writings I: The Musician and His Art*, Cambridge 1984, 50; West 1992 (above n. 45), 18 n. 23.

ments are commented on by Silenus in 124 ff. In this context, the sound heard must be the sound of a real lyre, played probably behind the *skene*. We can only speculate as to how much lyre music was heard during this drama. At least between lines 327 and 328, one would suppose some sweet music was heard, as Cyllene has just revealed how Hermes has constructed the instrument and delights in making music, and then the chorus describes the sounds which spread all over the place like flowers.

In *Inachus*, the satyrs hear a shepherd's pipe: F 269c,7 σῦριγγο[ς] δὲ κλύω. Hermes, invisible under his cap of Hades, is coming to lull Argos into sleep with his syrinx, to kill him and liberate Io. The satyrs do not see him – much of the humour of the scene comes from the fact that the audience does – but recognize their tormentor by the noise he makes: F 269c,22 εἰκάσαι πάρεστιν Ἑρμῆν π[ρὸς] τὰ σὰ ψοφήματα. The last word has been explained in various ways, either as referring to the words of the preceding line, to the noise Hermes makes when moving or to the sound of his syrinx.⁵⁴ We believe that the last one is the probable explanation, as ψόφος is not uncommonly used of musical sounds (as in Eur. *Ba.* 687, *Cycl.* 443), and suggest that all references to something heard in this context reflect the maddening sound made by the invisible Hermes. No wonder the satyrs are harassed (F 269c,27 μανία τάδε κλύειν), as they are at the same time tripping all over his feet! L. 32 ψιθυραν μάλ' αἰολα[ν] (either acc.sg. or gen.pl.) can well be a description of the sound of the syrinx.⁵⁵ The interesting question is whether the official accompanist played the music or whether the actor himself played the shepherd's pipe. In connection with comedy, it is usually thought that when a character played the *aulos*, he/she mimed the playing and the sound was produced by the *aulos*-player.⁵⁶ In this case, there would be a difference between the sounds of the instruments, the syrinx of the drama and the *aulos* of the performance, but it probably would not have been too disturbing.

⁵⁴ In the first case, the speaker of l. 21 is supposed to be either the chorus (A. S. Hunt in *The Tebtunis Papyri* III, London 1933, 10 at 692 col. II 1–15) or Hermes (Carden 1974 [above n. 24], 85). Ψοφήματα (l. 22) could mean 'your words' or 'what you say' referring to the previous verse (Carden *ibid.*). Hunt presumes that Ψοφήματα could also describe the noise made by the invisible Hermes (11 at col. II 7). C. Heynen and Krumeich, *GS* 327 nn. 57, 62 consider both movement and syrinx as possible suggestions.

⁵⁵ So R. Pfeiffer, *SBAW* 1938, 44, and Heynen and Krumeich in *GS* 327 n. 63.

⁵⁶ Taplin 1993 (above n. 3), 74.

The presence of the official *aulos*-player along with satyrs in vase-paintings (either in theatrical costume or in their 'natural' guise) is a clear indication that the painting is depicting a theatrical performance.⁵⁷ The *aulos*-player is always male, wears an ornate long-sleeved robe, is never masked, is often garlanded, and wears often the *phorbeia*. Usually he is standing aside, detached from the actors. Oddly enough, sometimes he is not even playing his instrument: the red-figure dinos by the Painter of Athens Dinos shows four dancing satyrs and four 'civilians' around the *aulos*-player, who has apparently just taken the pipes from his mouth, and the fragments of a red-figure bell-krater in Bonn by the same painter present the *aulos*-player and three satyrs in very similar positions to the dinos.⁵⁸ Such scenes are usually interpreted as presenting the moments before or after a performance, perhaps a rehearsal situation.⁵⁹ However, the explanation for the passivity of the *aulos*-player may not necessarily be similar in every case. In the Attic red-figure bell-krater by Polion,⁶⁰ three old satyrs covered with white tufts are seen with *kitharai* in their hands, singing, while a young *aulos*-player stands passive, his hands with the pipes hanging down by his sides. The text ΟΙΔΟΙ ΠΑΝΑΘΕΝΑΙΑ has led to the supposition that this illustrates a satyr-clad chorus performing dithyrambs, but this is unlikely.⁶¹ The scene could be connected with a satyr-play where the chorus took part in the competition in the Panathenaia singing a song and accompanying themselves on their instruments, either playing or playing at playing, in which case the sound of the *kithara* could be supplied from behind the *skene*. It might be considered natural that the official *aulos*-player did not take part in this performance, and is therefore standing idle.

⁵⁷ Krumeich, *GS* 47–48.

⁵⁸ Athens, N. M. 13027 and Bonn 1216.183 = *ARV*² 1180,2–3 = *GS* pl. 6 b and a (420 B.C.). Cf. also the volute-krater in Taranto (Taranto 4358 = *GS* pl. 14b, late fifth century), where in the lower range an *aulos*-player with his pipes and *phorbeia* in his hands stands between *kalathiskos*-dancers, some of whom are dancing and some not. In the upper range, Perseus is shown terrifying satyrs with Medusa's head; both scenes may commemorate the same Karneia-festival (J. D. Beazley, *Hesperia* 24 [1955] 315–316).

⁵⁹ So e.g. A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, Oxford 1968, 185; J. R. Green, *Theatre in Ancient Greek Society*, London and New York 1994, 44.

⁶⁰ New York, Metropolitan Museum 25.78.66 = *ARV*² 1172,8 = *GS* pl. 15b (ca. 425 B.C.).

⁶¹ See the discussion by H. Froning, *Dithyrambos und Vasenmalerei in Athen*, Würzburg 1971, 25; cf. also Beazley (above n. 58), 314–315.

At this point, we return to the famous Pratinas fragment 4 F 3. We cannot, in the scope of this article, discuss the numerous problems connected with this 'hyporchema', nor do we wish to take any definite stand as to the date or to the genre of the fragment. Our intention is to look at the metatheatrical aspects of this lyric passage against the background provided by our observations so far. The metatheatrical tone is very pointed in almost every line of the fragment. It is obvious that the object of the attack of the chorus is the too dominant position taken by the *aulos* accompaniment, which overshadows the singing of the chorus. It is obvious, too, that something must have preceded this reaction – either something related about the supremacy of the *aulos* (if this is from a dithyramb or other non-dramatic poem) or something performed in the theatre (if this is from a satyric drama): F 3,1 τίς ὁ θόρυβος ὄδε; τί τάδε τὰ χορεύματα; τίς ὕβρις ἔμολεν ἐπὶ Διονυσιάδα πολυπάταγα θυμέλαν; If from a drama, this need not be the entrance song of the chorus, nor is it necessary to think that there is another chorus who is causing the 'racket' – χορεύματα may refer to the music of the *aulos* as does the corresponding verb in l. 5. The mention of the *thymele* is a clear link to the place of the performance. In the following lines, the chorus proclaim their righteous position as singers in the Dionysiac thiasos – "it is for me to shout and stamp".⁶² These expressions contain nothing very dissimilar from the self-references to choral singing and dancing discussed above. More disturbing are the following abuses hurled against the *aulos* (4–14), with the imperatives of attack (10–12 παῖε – – – φλέγε) familiar from the antagonistic choruses of comedy⁶³ and the long adjectives made up for the occasion (12–13 ὀλεσιαλοκάλαμον λαλοβαρύοπα <πα>ραμελορυθμοβάταν) which are very suggestive of Aristophanic diction. They may be connected with the dithyrambic style,⁶⁴ but taking into account the hostile tone and the metrical peculiarities of the very passages describing the *aulos*, Seaford's suggestion that the style is a

⁶² Translations are by D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric III*, Cambridge, Mass. – London 1991.

⁶³ Cf. Kaimio 1970 (above n. 40), 130–131.

⁶⁴ As both Seaford and Zimmermann believe, although the former connects the style with the extravaganza of Lasus of Hermione (Seaford 1977/78 [above n. 1], 88–93) and the latter with the late fifth century dithyramb (Zimmermann 1986 [above n. 1], 149–153).

parody of dithyrambic style is attractive.⁶⁵ But it must be said that we have no parallels for such stylistic parody in the extant remains of satyr-play. The last three lines again (15–17), with their reference to dance movements ("Here is how to fling out hand and foot!") and invocations to Dionysus, have nothing which, on the evidence presented above, could not be said by the chorus of a satyr-play.

It is very clear that the chorus who is speaking consists of satyrs – along with the Naiads, they are part of the Dionysiac *thiasos*, they dance and stamp, they throw their limbs in movements resembling *sikinnis*, and there may be an obscene reference to the *aulos* as phallus (14 δέμας).⁶⁶ However, it is not certain that the lines are from a satyr-play.⁶⁷ We find it probable that fragment F 3 is by the known Pratinas of Phleius, as Athenaeus says,⁶⁸ and this would speak for a dramatic origin, as Pratinas was known especially for his satyr-plays. The possibility that Pratinas wrote other kinds of poetry cannot, however, be ruled out. His other, very scanty fragments do not offer any clues as to their genre (except F 1 quoted from his *Dymaenae* or *Caryatids*, which very likely is either tragedy or satyr-play). Many of them deal with music (F 4, F 6–9), which shows that whatever the genre, the theme of F 3 is not unique in the context of Pratinas.

There is one odd feature in F 3 which has not attracted the notice of scholars: how does it fit into the Dionysiac performance context of the poem – be it a dithyramb or a satyr-play – that the *aulos*, which is the most Dionysiac of all instruments, is so heavily abused? Even if Pratinas were deprecating the dominance of the music of the *aulos*, the violent language used by the satyrs fits badly with a performance in the Dionysiac festival and its traditional accompaniment by an *auletes*. But we must remember that we know nothing of the literary context of the fragment. It can hardly have

⁶⁵ Seaford 1977/78 (above n. 1), 93. Zimmermann, too, emphasizes the difference of rhythm between the regular choral metres of the lines describing the chorus and the irregular metres of the lines abusing the *aulos*, but he finds this a feature typical of the New Dithyramb and the late lyric of Euripides, without considering the parodic effect (Zimmermann 1986 [above n. 1], 148–149).

⁶⁶ See Seaford 1977/78 (above n. 1), 84–85; cf. J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*, New York – Oxford 1991², 115.

⁶⁷ Zimmermann 1992 (above n. 1), 126 n. 27 suggests a direct speech by satyrs forming a part of a dithyramb.

⁶⁸ Seaford rightly emphasizes the reliability of the Peripatetic tradition behind Athenaeus (Seaford 1977/78 [above n. 1], 82 n. 3).

been an independent little poem, but is a part of a larger whole. One possible explanation is that after the situation described in the fragment, the satyrs came somehow to be reconciled with the *aulos*, and a common harmony was found. This would certainly suit a plot of a satyr-play, perhaps also a narrative dithyramb.

Costume and Mask

The costume and mask of stage-satyrs is in keeping with the image of 'real' satyrs as half human, half bestial creatures. Their appearance is made clear from vase-paintings with theatrical subjects, which began in Athens between 520 and 510 B.C. and show satyrs with equipment atypical of their 'natural' environment or with the *aulos*-player of the theatre. The typical costume of the choristers included bearded, long-eared masks with a snub nose and bald forehead, and short pants (περίζωμα) with a phallus in front and a horse-tail in the back. It seems that in the early days of satyr-play, the pants were made of cloth with spots or cross-like decoration, while later the furry tights seen, e.g., on the Pronomos vase became popular. The Papposilenus had the white hair and beard of an old man, and from the middle of the 5th century onwards, a white-tufted tightly-fitting costume which covered the whole body.⁶⁹

Most references to the appearance of the satyrs found in the texts apply to their baldness, beard or phallus (but none, we may note in passing, to their tail, which, however, is so characteristic of both their 'real' and stage habitus). Such references are naturally quite in harmony with their dramatic role, denoting both their outer and inner nature.⁷⁰ At the same time, however, by pointing out a detail of the costume which is very clearly seen by the audience in the theatre, such passages emphasize their awareness of the performance.⁷¹ So, in Aeschylus' *Prometheus Pyrkaeus*, Prometheus warns

⁶⁹ On the history of the satyr costume, see Pickard-Cambridge (above n. 59), 183–187; Krumeich, *GS* 53–55 with further literature. E. Simon in D. Kurtz and B. Sparkes (eds.), *The Eye of Greece: Studies in the Art of Athens*, Cambridge 1982, 142–143 argues that the origin of the white-tufted costume of Silenus lies in the comedy, whereas dotted long tights were in use for the satyr choruses in the early fifth century, as the stamnos by the Eucharides Painter in Louvre (Louvre c 10754 = *ARV*² 228,32) shows.

⁷⁰ This comes through well in Silenus' tirade to his good-for-nothing sons in Soph. *Ichn.* F 314,150–151 σώματ' εἰ[σ]ιδ[ε]ῖν μόνον / κα[ὶ] γ[ὰρ] λῶσσα κα[ὶ] φάλητες.

⁷¹ In this respect, the satyr-play is nearer to comedy than tragedy. Cf. the remarks on

the satyrs who try to kiss the fire to mind their beards (F 207). In *Dictyulci*, Papposilenus points out how Danae's baby laughs in delight when seeing his bald head, or, as others have it,⁷² his erect phallus: F 47a,787–788 λιπαρόν / [μ]ιλτ[ό]πρεπτον φαλακρόν. In any case, the baby does look at the phallus at 794–795, when Silenus notes] προσθοφιλῆς ὁ νεοσσός. In between, there is an interesting fragmentary word in 790: if we can read in ποικιλονω[a form of ποικιλόνωτος, we could perhaps have a reference to Silenus' costume, whatever it was at this time.⁷³ In Soph. *Ichn.* 368 there has been similar controversy in the interpretation of φαλακρόν: 366–368 ἀ[λλ'] αἰὲν εἶσὺ παῖς· νέος γὰρ ὢν ἀνήρ / π[ώγ]ωνι θάλλων ὡς τράγος κνηκῶ χλιδαῖς / παύου τὸ λείον φαλακρόν ἡδονῇ πιτνάς. As the comparison with a he-goat creates the impression of lasciviousness, one might think that this train of thought would be continued.⁷⁴

In several plays, satyrs take roles that differ from their usual ones. Sometimes these individual plays require them to wear special costumes. Surely the appearance of satyrs with some clothing additional to their usual short pants would attract the attention of the audience. There are, however, not many references to such clothing in our extant material, but this may be due to the few fragments of such plays. In Aeschylus' *Isthmiastae*, Dionysus reproaches the satyrs for having phalluses that are short, like mouse-tails (F 78a,29), as well as for wearing pine wreaths (F 78c,39) – both deviations from their usual attire as servants of Dionysus and marks of their new athletic interests. In the parodos of Euripides' *Cyclops*, the satyrs complain

comedy by Green (above n. 59), 27–28: "What we can be certain of, however, is that this style of comedy with its very outspoken self-referentiality must reflect a style of theatre in which both poet and audience share and enjoy this mutual exchange about what is going on in the performance itself. – – – This is a suggestion which has strong support from scenes on vases."

⁷² So R. Cantarella, *I nuovi frammenti eschilei di Ossirinco*, Napoli 1948, 46 f.; H. Lloyd-Jones, *SIFC* 12 (1994) 142; cf. Henderson (above n. 66), 245, whose remarks are, however, a bit confused: Aesch. *Dict.* 787–788 cannot refer to the penis of young Perseus, but Silenus speaks of himself, and the double-entendre in Soph. F 171 is doubtful.

⁷³ A tight-fitting dotted or tufted costume would be a good candidate for such a description. Wessels and Krumeich translate "(mit buntem Rücken?)". Lobel suggests that the satyrs are represented as wearing the skin of the roe-deer (*P. Oxy.* XVIII, London 1941, 12 at col. I 26), but there seems to be no reason for that kind of dress here.

⁷⁴ So Lloyd-Jones (above n. 72), 142; he translates "Cease to expand your smooth phallus with delight!" (*Sophocles Fragments*, Cambridge, Mass. – London 1996, 173).

of the shabby goatskins they are wearing: 80 σὺν τᾶδε τράγου γλαίνα μελέα. They cannot be complaining about their own regular appearance, i.e., the furry pants which represent nudity, but probably have special shepherd's costumes as the Cyclops' slaves.⁷⁵ It may be, however, that Euripides is making a little metatheatrical joke here, as the usually goat-like satyrs complain that they must wear goatskins.

Aeschylus' *Prometheus Pyrkaeus* F 204b,2 presents a problem, as the singers seem to refer to a chiton they are wearing: σία⁷⁶ δέ μ' εὐμενῆς χορεύει χάρις / φ[α]εγν[ὸ]ν < ∪ – > / χιτῶνα παρ πυρὸς ἀκάματον αὐγάν. Terzaghi has claimed that satyrs do not wear chitons, and that for this reason we are not dealing here with the satyr-play *Prometheus Pyrkaeus*, but with a tragedy with a chorus of divine females, either *Prometheus Lyomenos* or *Pyrphoros*.⁷⁷ But we must also consider that satyrs are sometimes shown on vase-paintings dressed in chiton or himation. In these cases the chorus-leader may have a special dress or the whole chorus be dressed in non-satyr clothes.⁷⁸

A good example of satyrs taking unlikely roles and dressed accordingly is presented by the so-called Fujita hydria, an Attic red-figure hydria which is dated around 470/460 B.C. and which, as Erika Simon has shown, represents Aeschylus' satyr-play *Sphinx* from the Theban tetralogy presented in 467 B.C.⁷⁹ The vase shows a satyr-chorus, reduced to five, of old silens trying to find an answer to the riddle presented by the sphinx

⁷⁵ See Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 118.

⁷⁶ Νυ]/σία Fraenkel, ἐκου]/σία Terzaghi, see *TrGF* III, 322 ad loc.

⁷⁷ M. Terzaghi, *RFIC* 82 (1954) 348–349.

⁷⁸ The Pronomos vase shows the chorus-leader in an ornate short chiton and himation, while the other choristers appear in satyr pants. On an oenochoe in London (private collection, Pickard-Cambridge [above n. 59], fig. 37, last decade of the 6th cent.) there is, besides a naked satyr, a dancing satyr clothed in chiton and himation (and yet his tail showing!). On an Attic red-figure cup in Cambridge (Fitzwilliam Museum GR 2.1977 = Green [above n. 59], 41, fig. 2.16a–b) there is a group of seven satyrs clothed in cloaks, one in a long one, the others in short ones; they have no chitons underneath. At least the latter one may well be connected with a satyr-play (Green [above n. 59], 42). The word χιτῶν is sometimes used of garments which are not chitons in the strict sense: Pollux explains (4,119) that Silenus' costume, χορταῖος, is "a shaggy chiton" (χιτῶν δασύς), and Dionysius of Halicarnassus mentions its alternative name μαλλωτὸς χιτῶν (*ant. Rom.* 7,72,10); cf. Ael. *var. hist.* 3,40.

⁷⁹ Tokyo, Coll. Fujita, in E. Simon, *SHAW* (1981) 28 pl. 7 = *GS* pl. 22b. See also Simon in Kurtz and Sparkes (above n. 69), 141–142.

crouching on a rock before them. They are seated on well-upholstered *klismoι*, wearing diadems, sceptres and ornate cloaks. How they have come to have such attire in the play we cannot know,⁸⁰ but it seems very plausible that their dressing-up was somehow commented on the text itself.

There are a few instances of possible references to masks in the satyr-plays. The most extensive fragment that can be thus interpreted is F 78a of Aeschylus' *Isthmiastae*, but despite the fact that ca. 70 lines are extant, the exact meaning of the fragment remains enigmatic. The satyrs are at the Isthmian games, outside the temple of Poseidon, to whom they bring votive gifts. Of the many suggestions as to what these gifts actually were, the most likely are that they are either masks or votive tablets (*pinakes*).⁸¹ Since the votive gifts are referred to many times and with different words, we should be able to deduce something about their nature, but the words used are inconclusive. The satyrs start off by saying (l. 1) that somebody (probably visitors or competitors in the Isthmian games) shall see εἰκοῦ[ς] οὐ κατ' ἀνθρώπους['the likeness not of human [making]' ⁸², and a little later (l. 6–7) the lifelikeness is emphasized: εἶδωλον εἶναι τοῦτ' ἐμῆ μορφῇ πλέον / τὸ Δαιδάλου μ[ί]μημα· φωνῆς δεῖ μόνον 'this image is more [like] my own form, this Daedalic representation, it lacks only a voice'. The votive function is brought out in ll. 11–12: εὐκταῖα κόσμον ταῦτ[α] τῷ θεῷ φέρω / καλλιγραπτὸν εὐχάν 'I'm bringing these votives, an ornament, to the god as a beautifully-painted dedication'. The chorus goes on to say that the likenesses are true enough to scare their own mother, who would think the image is her son.⁸³ Then the satyrs turn to the temple of Poseidon and exhort themselves (ll.19–20): κάπιπασσάλευ' ἕκαστος τῆς κ[α]λῆς μορφῆς .[] / ἄγγελον, κήρυκ' [ἄ]γουδον, ἐμπόρων κωλύτορ[α 'Let each of you nail up [the image] of your own beautiful form as a messenger, a voiceless herald, a

⁸⁰ See Germar and Krumeich, *GS* 193 n. 13, 195.

⁸¹ Wessels and Krumeich argue (*GS* 132; R. Krumeich, *Philologus* 144 [2000] 176–192) that the objects are wooden or ceramic tablets with a painted full-length figure of a satyr. Most scholars have accepted Fraenkel's suggestion of masks (Fraenkel [above n. 12], 245) without much explanation; recent bibliographies on the subject in P. O'Sullivan, *CQ* 50 (2000) 357, n. 21; Krumeich 2000, 178 n. 12.

⁸² The translations of the fragment are by H. Lloyd-Jones from vol. II of the Loeb edition of Aeschylus (Cambridge, MA, 1956) with the alterations of O'Sullivan (above n. 81), 356 f.

⁸³ These realistic images have often been thought to represent a new tendency in Greek art, see M. Stieber, *TAPhA* 124 (1994) 85–119; C. H. Hallett, *JHS* 106 (1986) 75–76.

warder-off of travellers'.

To support his view that the objects are masks, E. Fraenkel points out that it was customary to model antefixes of temples in the shape of apotropaic heads of Gorgons or satyrs. J. R. Green, instead, refers to the common custom of dedicating one's mask to the god after a victorious performance by placing it in the temple of Dionysus, and adds evidence of vase-painting showing the use of satyr-masks for apotropaic purposes.⁸⁴ R. Krumeich, who favours the interpretation of *pinakes*, thinks that *καλλίγραπτος εὐχά* is more likely to describe a wooden or ceramic *pinax* than a plastic work of art; a mask, though painted, is more likely to be perceived and described as a three-dimensional object than as a painting.⁸⁵ This may be true, although Krumeich's argument is problematic: he argues that since the objects of the plastic arts were always painted, it was not likely that this fact would be specially emphasized with such an adjective. But why would it be more natural to emphasize the fact that a painting is painted? However, since *καλλίγραπτος* is, surprisingly, a *hapax*, it is impossible to say what kind of objects could be thus termed. The reference to a Daedalic representation speaks rather for a plastic object: Daedalus was known as a many-faceted artisan, but especially as a sculptor, not a painter.⁸⁶ Krumeich also employs the repeated use of *μορφή* as an argument for the images representing the whole satyr, not just the head, and points out that *pinakes* regularly represent the whole body.⁸⁷ However, *μορφή* is a remarkably vague word;⁸⁸ for instance, Aeschylus employs it in *Su.* 496 *μορφῆς – – – φύσις* with reference to the dark skin of the Danaids. Attractive as the evidence for *pinakes* presented by Krumeich is, he fails to answer the question why such wooden tablets should be so strongly apotropaic as they are here presented. This function would be better explained if the votive gifts were masks.

⁸⁴ Fraenkel (above n. 12), 245; Green (above n. 59), 45–46 with n. 60 and 78–79 with fig. 3.16. Cf. Krumeich 2000 (above n. 81), 177.

⁸⁵ Krumeich 2000 (above n. 81), 178; cf. Hallett (above n. 83), 76.

⁸⁶ See O'Sullivan (above n. 81), 358 with n. 30; S. Morris, *Daedalos and the Origins of Greek Art*, Princeton 1992, 221–237. In visual arts, Daedalus is often represented with the tools of the sculptor's or carpenter's trade (see J. E. Nyenhuis in *LIMC* [= J. Boardman and others (eds.), *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae*, Zürich – München 1981–] 3:1, 313–21).

⁸⁷ Krumeich 2000 (above n. 81), 185.

⁸⁸ E.g. in Eur. *Alc.* 1063 and *Pho.* 162 it is used of a human form not clearly seen because of a veil or of the distance.

Another consideration in favour of masks is that Aeschylus repeatedly emphasizes that the likenesses only lack voice – and even then fulfill the function of a messenger (ll. 7, 20). This could point to the possibility that the μορφή in question is represented by the head only, i.e. the mask. Another point worth making is the presumable effect of the scene in the performance: the full-length figures of satyrs on smallish wooden tablets would hardly be visible and identifiable to the audience, while the joke of masked satyrs carrying identical masks could be easily appreciated. However, since this passage is so crucial for the theme of metatheatricality, it is best to leave the question open.

Other possible references to masks are not without problems either. In Sophocles' *Inachus*, Io may have appeared on stage in a mask of a cow's head after her transformation, but we have no evidence on whether she actually was one of the cast of persons in this play. The transformation of Io is referred to at least in F 269a, 36 ff. and F 295a, and possibly also in F 279.⁸⁹ In the first passage, Io's metamorphosis is described with references to her head and neck on her shoulders changing into a cow's head and her feet changing into hooves. It is probable that if she later appeared on stage, she wore the head of a cow, but retained her human body.⁹⁰ H. Maehler has plausibly suggested that a change of iconography in vase-paintings of Io ca. 460–450 B.C. is due to an appearance onstage of the heroine wearing a cow-mask. Before this period, Io is represented as a cow in all respects, whereas afterwards she retains her human body, and only her head is that of a cow.⁹¹ If Io did appear on stage after her transformation in *Inachus*, the earlier description of her head would have prepared the audience for what to expect.

In Euripides' *Cyclops*, Silenus has probably changed his mask between his going to the cave after l. 197 and his reappearance around l. 222 in order to look as if he were beaten when bravely defending the Cyclops'

⁸⁹ On this fragment, see Heynen and Krumeich, *GS* 333 n. 80; M. L. West, *CQ* 34 (1984) 300–301; W. Luppe, *Philologus* 120 (1976) 296–299; 128 (1984) 303–304.

⁹⁰ Heynen and Krumeich point to the comparison of Io with a sphinx, another mixed being, in l. 42 (*GS* 322 f. nn. 39 and 40).

⁹¹ H. Maehler, *AAntHung* 40 (2000) 321–329. Maehler argues that the only fifth-century play where we know that Io appeared on stage is *Prometheus Vincetus*. He does not take a stand on the question of the authorship of this play, but argues that on the basis of vase-paintings, it can be dated between 460–450 or even 460–455.

property against Odysseus and his men:⁹² the Cyclops sees (l. 226 f.) γέροντά τε / πληγαίς πρόσωπον φαλακρόν ἐξφθήκοτα, 'the old man with his bald head swollen with blows'. It may well be that the poet deliberately employs the expression πρόσωπον meaning both 'face' and 'mask' in order to insert a metatheatrical reference calling the audience's attention to the change of mask.⁹³

Audience Address

It is characteristic of Old Comedy to pay regard to the audience, but it seems that in tragedy such a thing as straightforward audience address does not exist at all.⁹⁴ Satyr-play is usually seen as following the convention of tragedy in this respect.⁹⁵ However, we have already mentioned one clear example of metatheatrical reference to the audience, namely the fragment ascribed by Athenaeus to the satyr-play *Heracles* by the fourth-century tragedian Astydamos II (60 F 4). The ascription has been doubted, mainly because of the Eupolidean metre of the fragment and its metatheatrical content, which do resemble the *parabasis* of Old Comedy; emendations to the text of Athenaeus surrounding the quotation have also been suggested.⁹⁶ It may be that satyr-play and comedy come closer to each other in the fourth century, but this does not mean that Astydamos must have included in his satyr-play a real *parabasis* or a section much resembling the *parabasis* of comedy, although it has some features reminiscent of one.⁹⁷ One can also not state outright that because the passage is metatheatrical, it must be so due to the influence of comedy. The fragment is interesting not only because it contains unambiguous references to the poet, the spectators and

⁹² So R. G. Ussher, *Euripides: Cyclops*, Roma 1978, 82; Seaford, too, mentions this as a possibility (1984 [above n. 28], 149).

⁹³ So V. de Falco, *Euripides: Il Ciclope*, Napoli 1936, 69. J. Diggle accepts Tyrwhitt's emendation μέτωπον in his edition (Oxford 1984), and Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), follows him, although in his note ad loc. he seems to prefer to keep the MSS. text. On possible metatheatrical uses of πρόσωπον in comedy, see Taplin 1993 (above n. 3), 68 n. 2.

⁹⁴ See the discussion by Bain 1975 (above n. 2), 17–23; Bain 1988 (above n. 3), 1–14; Taplin 1986 (above n. 3), 166–167.

⁹⁵ So explicitly Bain 1975 (above n. 2), 23–25.

⁹⁶ See Bain 1975 (above n. 2), 25 with n. 2; Taplin 1986 (above n. 3), 166 n. 16.

⁹⁷ In fact, it would be rather strange if the *parabasis* of comedy were imitated by an author of satyr-play in a period when *parabasis* was fallen out of favour in comedy itself.

music/poetry, but also because of the way it sketches the relationship between the poet and his audience:

ἀλλ' ὥσπερ δείπνου γλαφυροῦ ποικίλην εὐωχίαν
 τὸν ποιητὴν δεῖ παρέχειν τοῖς θεαταῖς τὸν σοφόν,
 ἴν' ἀπίη τις τοῦτο φαγὼν καὶ πιὼν, ὅπερ λαβὼν
 χαίρει (τις), καὶ σκευασία μὴ μί' ἢ τῆς μουσικῆς...

T. Günther remarks that here one can see tendencies which become characteristic of the Hellenistic period: a well-educated and competent public, who is able to choose and is not prepared to accept whatever is offered, and a poet who is willing to present a well-polished literary work to his public.⁹⁸ We do not see the verses in this way; rather they seem to imply that the good poet must offer to the audience such a play that – as at a generous banquet consisting of many different dishes – everybody finds something to enjoy. Instead of emphasizing the refinement of the public, the verses demand versatility on the side of the poet. And this is something that the fifth-century poets mastered very well – one need only think of the humour of Aristophanes, ranging from buffoonery and slapstick to refined literary jokes. As a matter of fact, Astydamas' verses do not postulate any refinement on the side of the audience.

The appearance of the word θεωρός in Achaëus' *Athla* or *Athloi* (20 F 3) has roused the suggestion that here might be a reference to the spectators sitting in the theatre. The word means both 'spectator', a person who is viewing something, e.g. a festival – in this sense, also θεατής is used – and, in a more institutional sense, an ambassador sent by the state to consult an oracle, to present an offering or to be an official representative at a festival. S. Goldhill points out that the latter function was funded by liturgy, and so the word θεωρός has a more formal sense than the related θεατής.⁹⁹ In Achaëus F 3,1 a person asks: πότῃ θεωροῖς εἴτ' ἀγωνισταῖς λέγεις; It is very likely that ἀγωνισταῖς refers to the satyrs, who appear in this drama, as often in satyr-plays, as athletes, taking part in the competitions of a certain festival. The following lines make clear that these athletes are both gluttons – as athletes were generally thought to be – and Boeotians, who were notorious for their appetites, too, but in this context the ethnicity of the satyrs is

⁹⁸ *GS* 573.

⁹⁹ S. Goldhill in Goldhill and Osborne (above n. 6), 6.

meant – as servants of Dionysus they can be termed Boeotians.¹⁰⁰ But in which sense is the word θεωροί used here? Schloemann and Krumeich state that the word means official delegates sent to the games,¹⁰¹ but as we do not know the context, the word can equally well refer here to the spectators of the games in general. As regards the metatheatrical sense sometimes suggested,¹⁰² it is clear that the words are used primarily referring to the situation of the drama. Whether the actual public in the theatre sensed in them an underlying reference to themselves and the competitors on stage, is very difficult to say.¹⁰³ The spectators in the theatre are usually called θεαταί, but they are also θεωροί in the more institutional sense of the word. The official term for the competing actors in the fifth century is ὑποκριτής, but it is not out of the question that ἀγωνιστής – as also πρωταγωνιστής, etc. – could have been employed of actors in current speech.¹⁰⁴

A very similar pair of words is found in the double title of Aeschylus' Θεωροὶ ἢ Ἴσθμιασταί. The second term may be an alternative title coined by later grammarians on the basis of the contents of the drama, as I. Gallo has suggested.¹⁰⁵ Θεωροί must refer to a function the satyrs have in the

¹⁰⁰ B. Snell, *TrGF* I, 116, note to 3.1: "ἀγωνισταί sunt satyri servi Bacchi Thebani." Another interesting point in this line is the dative form. According to Schloemann and Krumeich (*GS* 513 n. 3), there are two possible explanations for that. The first one is to assume that a dative has been already used in the preceding verse and the datives in this verse would be related to that. The other interpretation is that these datives are connected to word λέγεις. Schloemann and Krumeich assert that the former is more likely.

¹⁰¹ *GS* 515. Similarly Bain 1975 (above n. 2), 23 with n. 3, who, however, adds that they are possibly a group of satyrs. But as stated before, in this play the satyrs must be the competitors. Therefore 'the delegates' can refer to the satyrs only if the speaker is asking whether the satyrs appear in the role of spectators or of competitors.

¹⁰² See Schloemann and Krumeich, *GS* 513 n. 4.

¹⁰³ In a performance, such an ambivalent meaning could well be emphasized by a gesture. Let us suppose – to indulge in wild speculation – that the previous line of speaker B has been something like the suggestion of Schloemann and Krumeich (*GS* 513 n. 3) 'Ich muss meinen Schützlingen zu essen geben' – perhaps more vaguely 'I must give them something to eat', at which point A asks 'do you mean to the spectators or to the competitors?' with a gesture to the audience, thus implying that B may mean that he is going to throw some titbits to the public, in a comedy-like fashion. It is, of course, unsound to suggest such a thing in earnest, as we have no evidence of such a practice outside comedy – but what if we do not see the evidence because of our prejudices?

¹⁰⁴ For the use of these terms, see Pickard-Cambridge (above n. 59), 132–135.

¹⁰⁵ I. Gallo, *Ricerche sul teatro greco*, Naples 1992, 68 (originally published in *Studi*

play, but what way? G. Conrad thinks that the double title reflects the conflict between Dionysus and Poseidon apparent in the play.¹⁰⁶ This may be so, but we agree with Gallo that the satyrs can hardly have arrived at Isthmus as an official delegation, neither alone nor with Dionysus.¹⁰⁷ Rather they have come on their own initiative after abandoning the service of Dionysus and, posing at first as spectators, they soon acquire the desire to pose as competitors.

A passage from the same play deserves attention. In F 78c,37–38 Dionysus (?) declares: κούδεις παλαιῶν οὐδὲ τῶν νεωτέρω[v] / ἔκων ἄπεστι τῶνδε διστοίχω[v] χορῶν. We have already discussed the last adjective in the connection of possible references to special forms of dancing (above p. 41), but now we draw attention to the first part of the expression 'nobody, neither old or young, is willingly absent from these two-line (?) [choruses]'. Probably the older and younger people (or former and present generations) referred to must be understood quite generally as worshippers of Dionysus, but when the expression is heard in the context of a Dionysiac festival, the audience must feel they are included in this group. In this sense the expression has a metatheatrical flavour. This kind of vague identification between the situation of the drama and the situation of the performance is not alien to tragedy either, as we have seen. Tragic parallels can also be found for Sophocles' *Ichneutae* 83–85, where Silenus asks anyone who has seen the stolen cattle to kindly report to him. As the satyrs are already aware of Apollo's similar proclamation, this passage has been taken as an audience address. Bain, however, compares Sophocles' *Ajax* 879 ff. and claims that Silenus makes his proclamation to whoever might be listening.¹⁰⁸ We agree that such expressions can hardly be considered metatheatrical.

Thus, the examples where one can possibly see metatheatrical references to the audience are very few, and on the basis of our evidence, we cannot conclude that audience address was a conventional element of satyr-play, as it was of comedy. However, one should not explain away the few instances we do have.

Salernitani in memoria di R. Cantarella, Salerno 1981).

¹⁰⁶ Conrad (above n. 44), 58 f.

¹⁰⁷ Gallo (above n. 105), 69.

¹⁰⁸ Bain 1975 (above n. 2), 24.

Transtextuality

Transtextuality – to use G. Genette's term¹⁰⁹ – is characteristic of most genres of Greek literature and certainly of Greek drama. The great majority of tragedies and, to judge from the titles and existing fragments, a fair share of satyr-plays were based on mythological stories usually well-known for the public from Homer or other previous literature. In Old Comedy, transtextuality usually appears in a more strictly metatheatrical form, either as quotations from and allusions (e.g. verbal, stylistic or metrical) to tragedy or in the form of more extensive comic passages inspired by a certain scene of a tragedy.¹¹⁰ In tragedy, this kind of transtextuality is more veiled, but by no means non-existent.¹¹¹ As regards satyr-play, most of our examples come from Euripides' *Cyclops* – this may be due simply to the scarceness of material from other plays.

The main hypotext of the play is, of course, the ninth book of Homer's *Odyssey*. As this text was so wellknown to the public, the similarities and differences in Euripides' treatment of the story must have been noticed by them.¹¹² There is also the possibility of more strictly metatheatrical interference between this drama and the previous dramatizations of the story of the Cyclops: Epicharmus wrote a *Cyclops*, and, in Attic comedy, the theme is represented by Aristias' *Cyclops* and Cratinus' *Odysseis*.¹¹³

The thematic and verbal resemblances between *Cyclops* and *Hecuba*, especially after the blinding, have often been noted.¹¹⁴ D. F. Sutton even concludes that these plays were parts of the same tetralogy, the satyr-play

¹⁰⁹ G. Genette, *Palimpsests. Literature in the Second Degree*, Lincoln and London 1997 (orig. in French 1982), 1.

¹¹⁰ The former type would correspond to Genette's use of the term 'intertextuality' and the latter of 'hypertextuality', by which he means any relationship uniting text B (hypertext) to an earlier text A (hypotext), upon which it is grafted in a manner that is not that of commentary (Genette 1–2, 5). Of the latter type, Dobrov uses the term 'contrafact' (Dobrov [above n. 7], 16–17, 33–53).

¹¹¹ See the remarks of Dobrov (above n. 7), 18–19.

¹¹² These are analyzed by W. Wetzel, *De Euripidis fabula satyrica quae Cyclops inscribitur cum Homericis comparata exemplo*, Wiesbaden 1965; Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 51–59.

¹¹³ See Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 52 with n. 157.

¹¹⁴ See G. Arnott in *Antidosis: Festschrift für Walter Kraus*, Wien 1972, 22–27; Ussher (above n. 92), 196–197.

taking up the themes presented earlier in tragic form.¹¹⁵ However, the dating of *Cyclops* to the year of *Hecuba* (424) is improbable,¹¹⁶ and one can ask whether such ridiculing of a previous tragedy of the same tetralogy would have had the desired effect on the public. Would it not have undermined the effect of the tragedy in question, instead of presenting a hilarious conclusion to the tetralogy? As we do not have a single whole tetralogy left, it is impossible to make any certain conclusions as to the internal echoes between the different parts.¹¹⁷ Seaford argues that such resemblances are likely to result, consciously or unconsciously, from the treatment of similar scenes.¹¹⁸ However, in the case of such a powerful scene and such obvious parallelity as the entrance of a blinded person in *Hecuba* and *Cyclops*, it is possible that the author has counted upon the audience's memory. In this case, the similarity would not have the same effect as in the performance of a tetralogy, but could be a positive reminder of a previous impressive play.

Similarly, although Euripides certainly often used stock phrases, some verbal echoes are so clear and at the same time such uncommon phrases that they seem to be conscious references to either his own or other tragedians' works. Seaford agrees with Milman Parry's suggestion that in *Cycl.* 222 ἕα· τίν' ὄχλον τόνδ' ὀρώ πρὸς αὐλίοις; Euripides is answering Aristophanes' mockery *Thesm.* 1105 (413 B.C.) ἕα· τιν' ὄχθον τόνδ' ὀρώ καὶ παρθένον of his own *Andromeda* fr. 125 (412 B.C.) ἕα, τίν' ὄχθον τόνδ' ὀρώ περίρρυτον / ἀφρῶ θαλάσσης; παρθένου τ' εἰκῶ τινα κτλ. by mocking himself.¹¹⁹ But what lies behind such self-parody? The extensive

¹¹⁵ D. F. Sutton, *Arethusa* 4 (1971) 58–67. He argues similarly on the basis of resemblances in theme, structure, and the verbal similarity of some passages that Sophocles' *Ichneutae* and *Ajax* were also written and produced together.

¹¹⁶ See Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 48–51; idem, *JHS* 102 (1982) 163–172.

¹¹⁷ However, in his survey of thematically connected and inconnected tetralogies, Seaford notes (1984 [above n. 28], 26–29) that there is no clear case of a satyr-play cohering with part of an incoherent tetralogy, and that after Aeschylus, the satyr-play tends to be separate from the tragedies. The evidence we have of the thematically linked tragedies and satyr-plays does not speak for such a close parallelism as, for instance, the blinding-scenes of *Hecuba* and *Cyclops*.

¹¹⁸ Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 48–49.

¹¹⁹ M. Parry, *The Making of Homeric Verse*, Oxford 1971, 319 = *HSCP* 41 (1930) 140–141; Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 49. Seaford sees another possible case of self-parody in *Cycl.* 203 = *Tro.* 308 ἄνεχε πάρεχε. The exact meaning of the phrase and thus the sense of the parody is, however, problematic (see Seaford 1984, 142–143).

Andromeda-scene in *Thesm.* 1009 ff. is, as well as a humorous literary parody and a witty example of the metatheatrical mode of contrafact according to Dobrov, a tribute to Euripides, as it recalls in the minds of the audience his play of the previous year. Euripides, for his part, pays tribute to Aristophanes by reminding the audience of this parody – and at the same time he reminds them of his own play. The quotation may thus act as a reminder of his previous career.

Another clear verbal allusion is *Cycl.* 707 δι' ἀμφιτρῆτος τῆσδε προσβαίνων ποδί – this time to Sophocles' *Philoctetes*, possibly presented in the previous year (409 B.C), 1. 19 δι' ἀμφιτρῆτος ἀυλίου πέμπει πνοή.¹²⁰ Seaford sees the mention of the cave's second entrance as a neat solution of the problem that Polyphemus cannot throw stones at the departing Greeks on the stage – thus, he says he is going through his cave to the hilltop to perform this task.¹²¹ In our eyes, the problem solved is not so much what can be done on the stage, but how the poet wishes to end his drama: not with Polyphemus throwing stones or pursuing the Greeks and the satyrs out of the theatre, but by showing how the satyrs return to the service of Dionysus, as they say in the last two lines of the play (708–709). As we have seen above (p. 42), in satyr-plays there apparently is often dancing on the stage even in connection with iambic trimeters, and it would certainly be in harmony with the Dionysiac festival if this play would end with the satyrs skipping out in lively steps of *sikinnis*.¹²² The fact that the Sophoclean allusion comes as the last line of Polyphemus, at the end of the play, gives special emphasis to the quotation. We can only guess why Euripides wanted to do this. Perhaps there had been lively discussion about Sophocles' staging, and Euripides thought that a reminder of that would rouse a final laugh from the audience to close his play.¹²³

¹²⁰ The allusion is suggested by A. M. Dale, *Collected Papers*, Cambridge 1969, 129 = *WS* 69 (1956) 106. Seaford suggests that *Cycl.* 60 †ἀμφιβαίνεις† may be restored to ἀμφίθυρον, comparing Soph. *Phil.* 159 (Seaford 1984 [above n. 28], 112). This would, however, spoil the surprise effect at the end of the play (see below n. 123). For the dating of the plays, see Seaford 1984, 48–51.

¹²¹ Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 225.

¹²² "A spirited display of happy dancing" is suggested by Ussher (above n. 92), 193.

¹²³ Cf. O. Zwierlain's remarks (*Gnomon* 39 [1967] 453–4 with n. 2) about the comic effect of suddenly bringing forth the detail that the cave has two entrances and, thus, all the fears of Odysseus and his mates have been vain.

Another example of allusions to another author's tragedies may be found in Sophocles' *Inachus*, where several Aeschylean words can be found. Sutton suggests that the use of such words appears calculated to impart an Aeschylean coloration to the style of the play; especially κάρβανος, λάτρις and τρόχισ invite comparison with Aeschylus' two plays in which Io figures prominently. Sutton suggests that such features might be intended to draw attention to the thematic similarity of the plays.¹²⁴

An example of metatheatrical reference to another satyr-play may be found in Eur. *Cycl.* 37–40, where Silenus refers to a former time when the satyrs accompanied Dionysus to Althaea's house, singing to the accompaniment of their *barbita*.¹²⁵ In the context of *Cyclops*, the reference emphasizes the difference of the current situation of the satyrs from their normal, joyous existence – a theme that is picked up by the satyrs themselves at the end of their *parodos* (64 ff.). We have no evidence for a satyr-play with a theme connected with Oeneus and Althaea except maybe Soph. F 1130, though the story would be well suited to the genre.¹²⁶ The special mention of the *barbiton* as the accompanying instrument of the satyrs may point to a spectacular musical scene in a recent satyr-play which Euripides here wishes to call into the minds of the audience. The metatheatrical allusion appears veiled to the readers of today, but it may have been quite clear to the contemporary audience. The technique of reference used here strongly recalls the way in which Aristophanes helps his audience to identify a tragedy referred to by him: besides the straightforward mentioning of the title of the play, he often mentions the name of the hero (which may have been used as the title, too) or another character prominent in the play in question.¹²⁷

The Athenian dramatists apparently wove a web of literary references and allusions into their plays. In comedy, the metatheatricality of such allusions is obvious, as their origin is often plainly shown. However, many such allusions escape us even in comedy, since we do not know the text of

¹²⁴ Sutton 1979 (above n. 24), 38–39; 46–48. κάρβανος Soph. *Inach.* F 269a,54 is used in Aesch. *Su.* 118 = 129 and 914 and in Aesch. *Ag.* 1061, τρόχισ in *Inach.* F 269c,21 and in Aesch. (?) *PV* 941, λάτρις in *Inach.* F 269c,35, F 269d,22, F269e,2, and λατρεία in Aesch. (?) *PV* 966.

¹²⁵ Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 105 finds the reference to a satyr-play probable, while Ussher (above n. 92), 44 does not.

¹²⁶ Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 105.

¹²⁷ See M. Kaimio, *Classica Cracoviensia* 5 (2000) 62–64.

the tragedies referred to. It is only natural that the existence and interpretation of such allusions in tragedy is more controversial, since they are used in a less evident way. Euripides' *Cyclops* shows that they are quite frequent in satyr-play, too. The titles of the satyr-plays show that, as in tragedy, the same mythological stories were used by different poets.¹²⁸ The high degree of hyper- and intertextuality raises the question about the literary competence of the audience – were they able to pick up and appreciate the allusions and the changes in the plot compared with earlier plays about the same myth? The evidence of comedy seems to show that although the audience in the Dionysiac festivals naturally was not homogeneous, it was in the interest of the author that a maximum of the audience should derive enjoyment from it, be it on different levels.¹²⁹

In summing up the evidence for metatheatricality in satyr-play, we must emphasize the meagreness of the extant material and the difficulty of interpretation brought about by its fragmentary state. Many of the passages discussed above are such that no definite interpretation is possible. It seems rather clear, however, that self-referential and even self-reflexive choral expressions prompted by the dancing and singing common to the dramatic situation and the performance are frequent in satyr-play, as they are in tragedy and comedy. The lively dancing characteristic of satyr-play may even have favoured such expressions in the texts of the plays. Similarly, the popular theme of the invention of different musical instruments, as well as the themes of such plays where the satyrs themselves try their hands as musicians, seem to have brought with them expressions which point both to the dramatic action and to the performance. The same can be said about the references to the satyrs' costumes, both in their normal guise and in strange dresses required by the plot. The metatheatricality is usually not of the blatant kind typical of comedy, but consists of the audience's appreciation of both the drama and the performance at the same time. Audience address

¹²⁸ In the fifth century, we find, e.g., the following titles of satyr-plays which are used by different playwrights: Ἄμυμώνη (by Aeschylus and Nicomachus I; a comedy by Nicochares), Κύκλωψ (by Aristias and Euripides), Μῶμος (by Achaeus and Sophocles), Ὀμφάλη (by Achaeus and Ion), Σίσυφος (by Aeschylus, perhaps twice, Critias? and Euripides; by Sophocles either tragedy or satyr-play) and Τήλεφος (by Agathon and an anonymous writer).

¹²⁹ See Kaimio 2000 (above n. 127), 56–57 with references to discussion in n. 12.

does not seem to be characteristic of satyr-play, although some possible cases can be found. Transtextuality in its different forms is present in satyr-play, though in a more veiled form than in comedy.

In this summary, we have left out the most apparent cases of possible metatheatricality, such as Pratinas 4 F 3, the votive gifts in Aeschylus' *Isthmiastae* or the audience address of Astydamas 60 F 4, since their relevance to the metatheatricality of satyr-play has been heavily doubted. But even without these examples, one can see that metatheatricality is not completely foreign to satyr-play. There is no good reason to systematically explain away all possible metatheatrical flavour and, on the basis of this, to deny out of hand the possibility of the more obvious examples. When discussing the metatheatricality of satyr-play, we have noted many similarities with tragedy, and some with comedy. However, it is more helpful to the understanding of satyr-play to examine the relevant passages in the frame of the genre of satyr-play than to try to calculate whether satyr-play more resembles tragedy or comedy in this respect.

II

Satyr-play is often characterized as being a form of drama situated somehow between tragedy and comedy. This is in many respects true. It was closely linked with tragedy by the fact that for ca. 150 years, satyr-plays were produced by tragic poets and performed by the same actors and the same chorus as in the preceding tragic trilogy.¹³⁰ Mythological themes were characteristic of both genres. The structure of Euripides' *Cyclops* shows remarkable similarity to tragedy, but in earlier satyr-plays the structure may have been looser as, for instance, the fragments of Sophocles' *Ichneutae* and Aeschylus' *Theoroi* suggest.¹³¹ Language and the metre of iambic parts were near to those of tragedy, although the vocabulary included non-tragic elements for humorous purposes, and there may have been greater liberties with the metre in the speech of the satyrs and Silenus compared with the other roles. The metre of the choral songs of *Cyclops* is relatively simple, as

¹³⁰ In the fourth century, a new system was adopted, with a single satyr-play presented at the beginning of the programme. The first evidence of the new system preserved to us is from the years 341–339 (*IG II/III*² 2319–2333).

¹³¹ See Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 16–18.

in Old Comedy, but the astrophic songs accompanied by lively action in, for instance, *Ichneutae* show that satyric choral songs were far from uniform.¹³² A significant resemblance between satyr-play and comedy is that one of the functions of both was to amuse. The laughter of the comedy was, however, more critical and biting, and the allusions to contemporary phenomena, political attacks and critical personal jokes which were typical of comedy were not familiar to the classical satyric drama.¹³³ The audience of comedy was expected to react to what happened on the stage by laughing, shouting and applauding, but the audience of the severe tragic drama, even if emotionally moved, was probably not expected to express its reactions as freely.¹³⁴ One might surmise that the audience's outward reactions to the satyric performance were similar to those to comedy.

We must also bear in mind that choruses of satyrs existed in comedy, too. This is not surprising, considering the widely different creatures which can appear as a comic chorus, ranging from human beings to cities or elements of nature, from animals to all kinds of partly theriomorphic mythical beings, such as centaurs or sirens.¹³⁵ We know comedies with the title *Satyroi* by Ecphantides, Cratinus, Callias and Phrynichus.¹³⁶ The material

¹³² On metre and language, see Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 44–48.

¹³³ Such features are found in some later satyr-plays, as in Python's *Agen* (326 or 324 B.C.) and Lycophron's *Menedemus* (third cent. B.C.); this is generally seen as a tendency towards the mixture of the dramatic genres (see Seaford 1984 [above n. 28], 19–20).

¹³⁴ Although there are numerous anecdotes, e.g., of the audience's reactions to some provocative lines of Euripides (see Pickard-Cambridge [above n. 59], 272–275).

¹³⁵ G. M. Sifakis remarks that their origin might not be the pre-dramatic animal choruses, but their appearance must have been influenced by them (*Parabasis and Animal Choruses: A Contribution to the History of Attic Comedy*, London 1971, 77).

¹³⁶ In addition, *P. Oxy.* 1801,7 (= C. Austin, *Comici Graeci in papyris reperti*, Berlin – New York 1973, nr. 343) mentions after the lemma βδύλλειν [a comedian] ἐν Σατύροις. A. Meineke, *Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum*, Berlin 1839–1857, I 36–37 points to the possibility that the title could refer to licentious people, comparing Hermippus F 47, 1, where Pericles is addressed as "king of the satyrs" (cf. *PCG* [= R. Kassel and C. Austin (eds.), *Poetae comici Graeci*, Berlin – New York 1983–] 5, 127). Similarly Meineke (II:1 396) explains Timocles' *Demosatyroi* as referring to demagogues, comparing Ar. *Ran.* 1085 where they are called δημοπίθηκοι. But it seems improbable that at least four comedies would have the title *Satyrs* without having a chorus of satyrs. The play *Satyrs* assigned by *Suda* to Ophelio probably refers to Phrynichus (*PCG* 7, 97 Ophelio test. 1). It is uncertain whether Timocles' *Ikarioi Satyroi* was a comedy or a satyr-play; since we know only a comic poet named Timocles, the former view is safer (cf. *PCG* 7, 766).

consisting of titles and meagre fragments does not give us much information about these plays. We know more about Cratinus' *Dionysalexander*, the hypothesis of which is mainly preserved in *P. Oxy.* 663. The comedy apparently combined mythological travesty with contemporary satire, making fun of Pericles by indirect means (δι' ἐμφάσεως col. II 46 f.). The text of the papyrus has been interpreted so that the chorus of satyrs (cf. col. II 42) addressed the audience in the *parabasis* in the metatheatrical convention typical of Old Comedy "on behalf of the poet" (col. I 6 ff. π(ε)ρὶ τῶν ποιη(τῶν) Koerte, pap. πῶποη), but as E. W. Handley has shown, a very different interpretation is possible.¹³⁷

Among vase-paintings with satyric scenes, probably connected with performances on stage, there is one which E. Simon tentatively connects with comedy, not satyr-play: According to her interpretation, a bell-krater in Syracuse shows two satyrs as *propompoi* of Dionysus and his (mortal) bride, possibly the wife of the *archon basileus*. As the satyrs, although clearly dressed up, do not wear the typical costume of satyr-play satyrs or Papposilenus, but close-fitting, full-length, mud-coloured garments with tufts, and because of their ungraceful movements very different from the dancing satyrs of satyr-play scenes, Simon has suggested that the scene is inspired by a comedy with a chorus of satyrs.¹³⁸

However, the occasional satyric chorus of comedy and the chorus of satyrs in satyr-play are two different things. One difference, pointed out, for instance, by Simon in connection with the vase just discussed, was the nature and extent of their movements during the performance. Although satyrs are presented in a humorous light and although their faces are not beautiful (except in their own eyes), neither in vase-paintings connected with theatre nor in the dramatic texts themselves are they presented as comically clumsy. Their movements are lascivious, but at the same time swift, varied, skilful – and in the vase-paintings, whatever they are doing, they are very graceful. In the texts, one gets the impression in many choral passages that the chorus is divided into groups with different movements and lively action. Such passages may be found in comedy and even in some cases in tragedy, but apparently this is a feature characteristic of satyr-play. There are also several passages where the satyrs seem to be moving or

¹³⁷ π(ε)ρὶ ὑῶν ποιή(σεως), see Handley (above n. 51), 110–111. Handley, however, shares the common assumption that satyrs formed the main chorus (111 with n. 6).

¹³⁸ Simon in Kurtz and Sparkes (above n. 69), 133–134.

dancing even when not singing, as e.g. when Silenus *Cycl.* 94 orders his sons ἀλλ' ἥσυχτοι γίγνεσθ'¹³⁹ or when the Cyclops when entering asks τί βακχιάζετ'; pointing out that there is no Dionysiac music either (203–205). The element of vigorous dancing seems to be much more prominent in satyr-play than in tragedy or in comedy where the choruses probably stood still (or at most made suitable gestures) during the long *rheseis* of the actors. The satyrs seem to be constantly moving.¹⁴⁰ It is probable that part of the effect of satyr-play on the audience consisted in the enjoyment created by the continuous flow of rapid movement of the satyrs. This may have been a characteristic feature preserved intact in the satyr-plays of fourth and third centuries, too – at least we can see it in *Cyclops* at the end of the fifth century as clearly as in the fragments of Aeschylus and Sophocles. It is thus no wonder that the strong element of dancing also produced such references to the satyrs' own dancing and singing as we have seen above, which we can call metatheatrical in the sense that they draw the audience's attention to the dance being performed on stage as well as to the function of the dance in the drama itself.

An even greater difference from the chorus of both tragedy and comedy is inherent in the fact that the identity of the chorus of satyr-plays remained unchanged from play to play. This brought the satyr-chorus much nearer to the performing chorus. In a certain sense, they had no 'dramatic' identity: from play to play, they retained their 'real' identity as companions of Dionysus, the patron god of the festival. The Athenian satyr-play probably had its origins in rituals where the participants of a Dionysiac *komos* or *thiasos* were dressed up as satyrs,¹⁴¹ but a stronger link to ritual than obsolete customs connected with religious events prior to the dramatic festivals of Athens was probably formed by contemporary living traditions of dressing up as satyrs in certain rituals and, most of all, by the Dionysiac context of the dramatic festival itself. Because of these, a stronger feeling of witnessing a real ritual may have been present in the minds of the spectators

¹³⁹ As Seaford remarks (1984 [above n. 28], 121), ἥσυχτοι here obviously means 'still' rather than 'quiet'.

¹⁴⁰ See Seidensticker's discerning comments on the dance of satyr-play in *GS* 21–23. F. Lissarrague remarks on the satyrs in vase-paintings that "satyrs are represented in perpetual movement, as if they were incapable of controlling their movements" (in T. H. Carpenter, C. A. Faraone [eds.], *Masks of Dionysos*, Ithaca 1993, 212).

¹⁴¹ See Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 7–14.

when following satyr-play with its chorus of companions of Dionysus than when following tragedy or comedy with their choruses of various dramatic roles. But the same feature entails the spectator being aware of the subordination of mimetic fiction inside the play to something else – the presence of the satyr chorus always refers to something outside the dramatic plot, as the real motive for satyrs being on the stage lies in the demands of the literary genre. The spectators cannot fail to recognize this; they are necessarily aware of the play being a play.

The plot of most satyr-plays seems to have had a mythological basis,¹⁴² which has certain consequences for the specimens of the genre, as satyrs play a definitely minor role in Greek mythology. In many cases, the satyrs had to be introduced into stories they originally did not belong to at all. Euripides' *Cyclops* shows that even a very famous story could serve as a plot for a satyr-play – clearly the fact that everyone in the audience already knew the myth in a form containing no satyrs did not cause the poets to avoid such themes. Two questions naturally arise: Was the presence of satyrs somehow explained in the play? Did the satyrs have an active part in the mythological events, or were they more like spectators of actions performed by someone else?

Mostly on the evidence of the only complete surviving satyr-play, Euripides' *Cyclops*, it has been argued that an explanation for the presence of satyrs was usually offered in the prologue of the play. In the prologue of *Cyclops* Silenus informs the audience of the events that had caused him and his sons to become slaves of Polyphemus, and the theme of satyrs being held in captivity has been regarded as a typical one, serving as an explanation for their presence. It is possible that finding some kind of explanation – perhaps most preferably a witty one – was a characteristic of the genre, but it is also possible that no explanation was normally offered. The prologue of *Cyclops* follows a typically Euripidean model of opening a tragedy, while the openings of tragedies by the other tragedians show remarkable variation.

The second question is closely connected with the first one: the satyrs' active participation in the plot would at least reduce the need for a specific explanation. Again, the evidence is extremely meagre. In *Cyclops*, the satyrs are definitely present in the action taking place at the cave of Polyphemus

¹⁴² In others, the mythological connection seems to be rather slight, as, e.g., in Aeschylus' *Isthmiastae*, although the extant fragments are scanty and we cannot have any idea of the whole of the drama.

and communicate with actors who duly react to their comments and suggestions; yet they have no real effect on what happens. In fact, the satyr chorus of *Cyclops* does not seem to differ in this respect from the chorus of tragedy, as in both cases the members of the chorus are mostly spectators of action taking place independently of them. Yet *Cyclops* need not be a typical example, for, for instance, in Sophocles' *Ichneutae* the satyrs seem to carry out most of the action themselves. On the other hand, the satyrs are often concretely affected by the action of the drama in a different way from either tragedy or comedy. In neither of these is the status and wellbeing of the chorus generally affected by the fate of the principals (although their emotions are), while in satyr-play, the status of the chorus is apparently often materially changed: they become free of alien slavery, or they return to Dionysus from alien activities entered into by them voluntarily. Although the ending of satyr-play is happy, one should note that the satyrs do not get what they want if they want something other than to dance and sing in the service of Dionysus. They do not succeed in their courtship of Danae in Aeschylus' *Dictyulci*,¹⁴³ they do not guess the riddle of the Sphinx in his *Sphinx*, they do not become winners in the Isthmian games in his *Isthmiasstae*, and they do not attain the heights of artistic ability after which they probably aspire in such plays as Iophon's *Aulodoi*.

In view of the necessity of always having a chorus of satyrs in a play and of the scarcity of mythological stories originally including satyrs, it is natural that satyrs in satyr-plays often appear in situations and functions which are alien to their natural pursuits. A merit grows out of this necessity: a great deal of the genre's humour is due to the incompatibility of the satyrs and the situation where they find themselves, as well as to the incompatibility of the mythological heroes to the satyrs as their helpers or rivals.¹⁴⁴ This is also relevant to the discussion of the metatheatrical aspects of Greek drama: often in satyr-play, a traditional myth is metamorphosed into a burlesque, and the audience must have been aware of this kind of transformation. Because of the scarcity of our material, we do not know how far we can speak of hypertextuality in the sense that a satyr-play toyed with a story presented previously by a tragedian. By this transformation we do not mean that the satyr-play of a tetralogy would have ironically turned the themes of

¹⁴³ Seidensticker emphasizes their failure in sexual matters in *GS* 31.

¹⁴⁴ F. Lissarrague's 'recipe' is often quoted: "take one myth, add satyrs, observe the result" (Lissarrague 1990 [above note 3], 236).

the preceding tragedies into parody¹⁴⁵ – we have no evidence for that, even in the case of a thematically connected tetralogy, as noted above. But the audience, not to speak of the poets themselves, can hardly have been unaware that similar themes had been treated by different poets in earlier years in the same festival, and this fact must have created an atmosphere favourable to the observing of transtextuality in one form or another.¹⁴⁶

We conclude with a few words about the function of the satyr-play in the program of the Great Dionysia in the fifth century B.C. – or rather the functions, since no single interpretation can offer an exhaustive explanation. Aristotle, when speaking of tragedy in the *Poetics*, concentrated upon the οἰκεία ἡδονή of tragedy, while recent scholarship has centered its attention on the political aspects of the Dionysiac festival.¹⁴⁷ The political function and the experience of the audience are naturally connected: no political aim can be reached if the audience experience does not form a basis for it, and no audience experience in Athens is without political significance. We look at the satyr-play mainly from the Aristotelian viewpoint, emphasizing the experience of the audience. The pleasure brought by the different artistic aspects of the play – the words, the music, the dance – is one part of the effect, and in connection with satyr-play, we have emphasized the preponderance of lively dancing. The fruitful tension between convention and novelty is another, which, although characteristic of all Greek drama, is perhaps especially prominent in satyr-play with its consistent chorus always set in different situations. The sheer amusement brought by the hilarious

¹⁴⁵ Pfeiffer warns against such an interpretation of satyr-play (*SBAW* 1938, H. 2, 61 = *Wege der Forschung* 579 [1989] 115); similarly Seidensticker, *GS* 36–37 and Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 32 against D. F. Sutton, *The Date of Euripides' Cyclops*, Ann Arbor 1974, 192.

¹⁴⁶ Pfeiffer's criticism of seeing satyr-play as travesty of a heroic tale does not, in fact, mean a removal of the idea of transtextuality, since he himself sees satyr-play as moulding something new on a traditional basis: "Das Satyrdrama selbst aber gestaltet die überlieferten Geschichten von Danae oder von Io zum einfachen, unbeschweren, problemlosen Spiel." (Pfeiffer 1938, 61 = 1989, 115–116.)

¹⁴⁷ This aspect is in the forefront e.g. in many recent collections of essays: Winkler and Zeitlin (above n. 3); S. Halliwell, J. Henderson, A. Sommerstein, and B. Zimmermann (eds.), *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis*, Bari 1993; R. Scodel (ed.), *Theater and Society in the Classical World*, Ann Arbor 1993; R. Osborne and S. Hornblower (eds.), *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Festschrift D. M. Lewis*, Oxford 1994; C. Pelling (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*, Oxford 1997; P. E. Easterling (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, Cambridge 1997.

plot and the antics of the libidinous, boastful but cowardly satyrs is also one of the functions. All these work together to form a relieving contrast to the preceding three tragedies of the tetralogy,¹⁴⁸ but a more important function of this fourth and last play was its obvious link with the cult of Dionysus celebrated in the festival. It is probable that the emphasis laid on this was the incitement behind the development of satyric drama by Pratinas and its institutionalization in the Dionysiac festivals where tragedies had, for the most part, lost their connection with Dionysiac myths.¹⁴⁹ Seaford rightly emphasizes the importance of the komastic ending of satyr-play as reinstating the joyful reunification of the *thiasos* with their god.¹⁵⁰ The satyrs are freed from alien oppression or return from temporary novel activities to their own sphere, the service of Dionysus.

Seaford also emphasizes the daemonic nature of the satyrs: they are immortal, not human, and they represent a wild, primordial existence with no ties to the political culture of human beings.¹⁵¹ He does not, however, articulate how these facts form the key to the problem of the function of satyr-play, unless he means simply the return to the Dionysiac world.¹⁵² But surely it is not the detachment of Dionysus and the satyrs from the human world which formed the concluding effect, but on the contrary, the audience felt that at the end of the tetralogy they experienced something with a special concern for themselves as spectators and human beings. The prevalent view, presented, for instance, by Seidensticker on the basis of articles by F. Lasserre and F. Lissarrague, is that this is achieved by the satyr-play through confirming *ex negativo* the prevalent values of the *polis* and of its citizens by presenting satyrs as their antitypes.¹⁵³ This view of

¹⁴⁸ Seidensticker remarks (*GS* 37 n. 180), in our opinion rightly, against Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 26–27, that the common view of seeing 'comic relief' as at least *a* function of satyr-play is justified by the fact that satyr-play was introduced into the Dionysiac festival before comedy.

¹⁴⁹ So Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 13–15, 30–32, Seidensticker, *GS* 8–9, 38.

¹⁵⁰ Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 31.

¹⁵¹ Seaford 1984 (above n. 28), 32–33.

¹⁵² P. Burian in his recent review of *GS* in *BMCRev* 00.11.05 elaborates the thoughts presented by Seaford: "...they [sc. satyrs] precede (and thus transcend) the division of tragic and comic, and they bridge the gap between gods and mortals. Their perspective restores a sense of that wholeness and offers a comforting closeness to Dionysus in his most benevolent and joyful aspects."

¹⁵³ Seidensticker, *GS* 38–39; F. Lasserre, *Wege der Forschung* 579 (1989) 252–286

comprehending satyr-play as a tool in the hands of the city-state to educate its citizens to accept the prevailing values has, in our opinion, misguided emphasis. The question of how much the poet, whether a tragic or a comic one, wished to educate his audience by his dramatic performance has been extensively discussed; it certainly has no simple answer, since the drama and its performance at the festival have so many different facets. Lasserre presents, starting from vase-paintings and proceeding to literature, a picture of satyrs as being in every way the antitypes of fifth-century virtues and good conduct crystallized in the concepts ἀνδρεία, εὐσέβεια, εὐταξία, εὐσχημοσύνη, εὐκοσμία.¹⁵⁴

We do not at all wish to deny the importance of those virtues in the Athens of Aeschylus' and Sophocles' time, but we consider it inconsistent to explain the function of satyr-play using them. True, satyrs are traditionally drunk, indecent and fond of music, and the two first characteristics do not belong to the strict code of good conduct in Athens. Lasserre even makes music a bad habit, pointing to the ethical contrast created in the first half of the fifth century between *aulos* and lyre, exemplified by the story of Athene rejecting the *aulos* and Marsyas picking it up and by its representations in the fine arts of the period.¹⁵⁵ But this story has 'nothing to do with Dionysus'. Although Marsyas is a satyr, the story does not relate to the worship of Dionysus, where music, and the music of the *aulos* in particular, plays a central part.¹⁵⁶ In following the performance of a satyr-play, however, the spectators are in the middle of a Dionysiac celebration where Athene plays a marginal role. Even a satyr-play which apparently had as its theme the story of Athene and Marsyas, as the anonymous play from which we have the fragment F 381 (where a satyr advises Athene to reject the instrument as not suitable to her), can hardly have ended otherwise than with

(original in *RFIC* 101 [1973] 273–301); Lissarrague 1990 (above n. 3), 228–236.

¹⁵⁴ Lasserre (above n. 153), 256 ff., especially 261; cf. Seidensticker, *GS* 38–39.

¹⁵⁵ Lasserre (above n. 153), 257–258; 263–266. The ambivalent position of the *aulos* in Athenian culture is further discussed by Wilson in Goldhill and Osborne (above n. 6), 58–95.

¹⁵⁶ Wilson, when discussing the group of Athene and Marsyas by Myron, situated on the Acropolis, tries in passing to reconcile the role of the *aulos* in the Dionysiac context with its rejection by Athene (Wilson in Goldhill and Osborne [above n. 6], 62): "Yet this process also, and in the same gesture, incorporates it, with all its disruptive and useful powers, into the heart of civic life, in a realm (that of the Dionysiac) where it can indeed find its 'proper' place."

satyrs dancing and rejoicing to the music of the *aulos*. It is clear that the *aulos* was perfectly acceptable in the Dionysiac context in fifth-century Athens. Similarly, the drunkenness and the uninhibited sexuality of the satyrs were essential parts of their Dionysiac nature. Thus, it is odd how Lasserre interprets the development of the plot of satyr-play: in *Isthmiastae*, Silenus and the satyrs "werden schliesslich, man ahnt es schon, jämmerlich auf den ihnen zukommenden Rang als Diener des Gottes zurückgestuft", "er [sc. Silenus] wird schmäählich kapitulieren, und mit ihm werden die Satyrn zu ihrem wahren Stand zurückkehren."¹⁵⁷ We have argued above that the return of the satyrs and, with them, of the whole tetralogy and its spectators, to the service of Dionysus is the expression of a central function of satyr-play. However little satyrs fit the ideals of *καλοκάγαθία*, in the Dionysiac context of the festival their return to the service of their god cannot be a wretched and shameful degradation. It is good and honourable to be a slave of Dionysus. It is a relief from false pretences, a return to the satyrs' own nature, however humble.

In this sense, we would like to look at the effect of satyr-play in the tetralogy. In following the tragedies, the audience has been forced to look at and to reflect upon the most horrible possibilities of human life, which can fall upon everybody, regardless of status, education and character. Such admission may do good, even be a liberating experience, but it is also oppressing. In following the satyr-play, the audience, in addition to the fun created by the hilarious story and the lively performance, follows a humorous presentation of the vices of the satyrs and mankind – boastfulness, cowardice, licentiousness, impiety, unruliness of every kind. These vices, when taken to excess, are by no means harmless, but fortunately, the satyrs are not allowed to succeed in their infamous plans. The glory of attaining one's goal goes to the hero or to the god, but in the end, the satyrs can enjoy their normal existence as servants of Dionysus. The satyrs may be antitypes of ideals, but they are not antitypes of man, rather an only too true image of the weakness of mankind.¹⁵⁸ Luckily, the satyrs' return to the control of Dionysus liberates them from every responsibility save obedience to him. After the weighty problems of tragedy, the acceptance by Dionysus, who

¹⁵⁷ Lasserre (above n. 153), 267, 269.

¹⁵⁸ The growing similarity of the satyrs with the ordinary Athenians during the fifth century – both in the plays and in vase-paintings – is a feature often noticed; see e.g. Lissarrague 1993 (above note 140), 216–217; Krumeich, *GS* 68–69.

does not demand καλοκάγαθία, is sheer joy. From the point of view of the *polis*, this may be explained as the phase of Dionysiac liminality, after which the worshippers return to the sobriety of everyday life.¹⁵⁹ But the effect of satyr-play as the end of the tetralogy, as it is experienced by the audience, lies in this relief from ordinary morality. At this moment, they hardly think of being good citizens. The end of the tetralogy is the moment of Dionysus, and it is good to be his servant.

University of Helsinki

¹⁵⁹ For the model of dissolution and re-establishment of the normal order in connection with Greek drama, see A. Brelich, *Dioniso* 39 (1965) 82–94, J. Aronen, *Arctos* 36 (1992) 19–37.

HANGING AROUND DOWNTOWN

MIKA KAJAVA

Though not among the great of the Greek literature, Hesychius provides a lot of interesting reading. The evidence listed by him is so abundant and diffuse that one often encounters lexicographical points for further discussion. The following reports one such case.

Recently, while studying the location of the ancient harbour of Eresus on Lesbos,¹ I noticed the following entry in Hesychius' work: λιμὴν· ἀγορά, καὶ ἐνδιατριβή. Πάφιοι. In other words, it would have been customary in (Nea) Paphos, on Cyprus, to use the word *limen* 'harbour' of the *agora*. This is conceivable, because the same practice is also known elsewhere. Thus the Thessalians used the word *limen* of the market, as, reportedly, they used *agora* of the harbour.² Significantly, the use of *limen* for *agora* is confirmed by the third-century politography inscription IG IX 2, 517, 42–3 from Larissa: τὸς ταγὸς ἐ[γ]γρά[ψαν]/τας ἐν λεύκουμα ἐσθέμεν αὐτὸς ἐν τὸν λιμένα. This example shows that the *limen* need not have been located on the sea, for the city of Larissa was an inland settlement, with a commercial harbour, on the river Peneios.³ In fact, considering that in Thessaly there was only one seashore town of significance (Iolcus), the question of where

* This research has been carried out within the framework of the project "Interaction Between the Greek and the Roman World in Antiquity" (Academy of Finland).

¹ "Eresian Memories", forthcoming in *ZPE*.

² D. Chr. 11,23: οἶονεὶ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐκάλει λιμένα, Θετταλῶν ἀκοῦσας; Gal. *Thras.* 3,2 (5, 868, 6–7 K): ἀλλὰ Θετταλοὺς γ' ἔφην τὴν ὑφ' ἡμῶν προσαγορευομένην ἀγορὰν οὕτως (scil. λιμένα) ὀνομάζειν; Theon, *Prog.* 81, 24 [*Rhet. Gr.* II]: ὡς εἶ τις ἀγορὰν ὀνομάζει τὸν λιμένα, καθάπερ Θετταλοί; Hsch. ἀγορά: ὄνομα τόπου, ἢ λιμένος· Θετταλοὶ δὲ καὶ τὸν λιμένα ἀγορὰν καλοῦσι (similarly, *Lex. Seguer.*, *Gloss. Rhet.* [Bekker, *Anecd. Gr.* I, p. 210, 9], and Phot. s.v.).

³ For some attempts to locate the market place called *limen* in Larissa, see L. Büchner, *RE* XII (1925) 870. Cf. further N. Verdélis, *Prakt. Arkh. Hetair.* 1955, 147 ff.; *BCH* 1956, 308 f.

the harbour was located seems to have been of secondary importance. Moreover, one may note that, instead of referring to Thessalian cities, the literary sources (listed in n. 2) only record the Θεσσαλοί (and their way of speaking). Those living in Thessaly may well have used the word *limen* of any *agora* in the Greek world.

As far as I can see, such evidence implies coexistence of, and organic unity between, harbours and markets. It is hardly imaginable that a city *agora* situated far from harbours could have been called *limen*. Not even the Thessalians would have referred by that term to a city *agora* somewhere in the mountains of Central Greece. But if *limen* and *agora* were neighbouring, or amalgamated, the local people could well have called them by interchangeable names.⁴ I say 'could', because one should not assume that the use of *limen* for *agora*, or *agora* for *limen*, was a rule constantly observed for centuries. As a matter of fact, (even early) inscriptions show that the word *agora* was commonly used of 'market (place)' in Thessalian cities, including Larissa (the above-mentioned inscription IG IX 2, 517 also mentions the institution of *agoranomia*). Similarly, *limen*, of course, also denoted 'harbour' in Larissa and elsewhere in Thessaly. It follows that the use of *limen* for *agora*, and vice versa, may not have been a purely language/dialect-specific feature; it was rather an optional habit based on topographical reality.⁵ Though the terminological juxtaposition of *limen* and *agora* is described as typical of Thessaly and Paphos, there is no reason to think that the phenomenon was regionally limited to these cases.⁶ For surely

⁴ Of course, this also applies to modern times. Since the Market Place of Helsinki is bordered by the sea, one may go to buy fish and other provisions "at the harbour".

⁵ Fr. Bechtel, *Die gr. Dialekte* I, Berlin 1921, 208, held the appearance of λιμήν = ἀγορά in Thessaly as a dialectal feature. Moreover, he seems to have thought that all the evidence adduced above should be taken to refer to *limen* in the meaning 'market place'. Following this view, the evidence for *agora* standing for 'harbour' should be corrected in favour of *limen* = 'market'. Note, further, the interesting hypothesis suggested by F. Gschnitzer, *Innsbrucker Beiträge z. Kulturwiss.* 23 (1985) 123 ff. = *Kleine Schriften zum griechischen und römischen Altertum* I (Historia Einzelschr. 149), Stuttgart 2001, 331 ff.: before obtaining the specific meaning 'harbour', λιμήν, together with the related λειμών, would also have denoted '(moist) grass, meadow'. This early meaning of *limen* (which was lost later on) would have survived in Thessaly where the word began to be used of the market place (p. 124 = 332: "Denn es liegt in der Natur der Dinge, daß die in der feuchten, zeitweise vielleicht noch überschwemmten Niederung gelegene Wiese sich zum Versammlungs- und Marktplatz gut eignet").

⁶ According to Gschnitzer (above n. 5) 123 = 331, the evidence from outside Thessaly is

one should not expect that writers recorded every possible site in the Mediterranean where people used expressions departing from the standard.

What, then, should be done with καὶ ἐνδιατριβή of the Hesychian entry? This word is not recorded in *LSJ* (not even in the *Revised Supplement*) nor is it commented on by the editors; ms. variants are not reported. According to the *TLG* cd-rom, no other attestations are known. As such, ἐνδιατριβή would be perfectly plausible besides the verb ἐνδιατρίβω 'to spend (time) in', 'to dwell upon' (cf. διατρίβω : διατριβή). However, I wonder whether the entry should be understood as follows: λιμὴν· ἀγορά, καὶ ἐν <αὐτῇ> διατριβή. Πάφιοι. If this is so, the Paphians used the word *limen* not only of the market (place) itself but also of what many people did there, i.e., shopping, business, sauntering about, or just promenading. The people of Paphos attending the market, or going downtown, would have been "at the harbour". Perhaps they even used a verb for this activity, deriving from λιμὴν, and comparable to ἀγοράζω 'to frequent the market', 'to do business (there)', 'to lounge (there)'. An expression referring to the harbour would have been apposite, as the local agora was in fact situated close by. Recent field surveys, and discoveries of fragments of sea walls on dry land, suggest that the Hellenistic and Roman harbour basin extended inland as far as about 150 m north of the modern shoreline of Kato Paphos.⁷

The *agora*, the centre of Greek city life, is often described as the place par excellence of διατριβή 'pastime'. In his *Clouds*, where the two Arguments are trying to outstrip each other, Aristophanes, lines 1055–57,⁸

dubious (including the Hesychian Paphos example, *ibid.* n. 2). This is certainly true of *Ditt. Syll.*³ 731, a first-century B.C. decree from Tomi, lines 24–25: παραπραθῆναι δὲ αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων [ν / ἐ]ν τῷ λιμένι τῶν ἐφ' ἱερέω Ἀριστοφάνου. Emending the engraved ΤΩΙ after λιμένι to ΤΩΝ, Dittenberger thought of *arkhontes* of the harbour (= *agora*) in office under the priesthood of Aristophanes. However, I. Stoian, *I.Scyth.Min.* II 2, retaining the reading τῶι, understood the phrase as a reference to an occasional *limen* (= market/fair) which took place when A. was priest. A further – and better – possibility would be to consider the officers as *limenarkhai*, see Ph. Gauthier – G. Rougemont, *REG* 101 (1988) 298; Gschnitzer (above n. 5) 125 = 333 n. 2: "Hafenmagistrate".

⁷ See E. Herscher, *AJA* 99 (1995) 284 f. (figs 27–8); *ibid.* 102 (1998) 343. While in Old Paphos there had been only a mooring-place (ὑφορμος; Strabo 14,6,3), the new city, founded towards the late fourth century B.C., was famous for the remarkable harbour installations. The harbour itself is described as "triple" in Stad. 297,2 (*GGM* I, p. 502, cf. tab. XXVI).

⁸ Transl. J. Henderson (Loeb ed. 1998).

makes the Worse one play with the changed meaning of *agora* (in Homer, 'place of assembly' or 'public speech', in A.'s time, mostly, 'market' or 'city centre'):

Then you scorn time spent in the agora [ἐν ἀγορᾷ τὴν διατριβὴν ψέγεις], while I encourage it. If it were something bad, Homer would never have called Nestor and every other sagacious person, "man of the agora".

However, markets were not only places where people could do some business or shopping, for various dangers could lurk there. In his book on *Virginity*, Basilus of Caesarea advised young maidens to avoid walking around unsafe lanes and market places because disreputable loiterers often gathered there (ἀκόσμων ἀνθρώπων ... τὰς διατριβὰς).⁹ On the whole, *diatribe* is frequently coupled with *agora*, whatever the social implications of people attending the market may have been in individual cases.

It is not surprising that *limen* and *agora* often appear together in the literary sources, as if forming an organic unity. The two places had a lot in common, constituting, in fact, the commercial and social backbone of a Greek city. Many political and religious institutions were also located in the *agora*, just as altars, statues and temples could be dedicated around harbours. The connection between *agora* and *limen* was especially strong when the two were situated close to each other or even side by side.

The word *diatribe*, suggesting 'lounging' or 'spending time', also occurs jointly with the combination of *limen* and *agora*. When the narrator of Lucian's *True Story*, describing the Lamptown (1,29), told that "On landing, we did not find any man at all, but a lot of lamps running about and loitering in the public square and at the harbour",¹⁰ the writer would have had before his eyes the image of crowds of people wandering about the market and loafing around the harbour. In Greek there was even a specific term for such people, that is, *spermologos* 'one who picks up scraps of knowledge', 'idle babbler' (cf. the explanation of *Etym. Gud.* s.v.

⁹ Bas. Caes. 637, 22 (Migne, *PG* 30, p. 713): μηδαμοῦ μὲν ἐν ἀπρεπέσι στενωποῖς, ἢ ἀγοραῖς, ἔνθα ἀκόσμων ἀνθρώπων συμβαίνει τὰς διατριβὰς συγκροτεῖσθαι, ...

¹⁰ Ἀποβάντες δὲ ἄνθρωπον μὲν οὐδένα εὔρομεν, λύχνους δε πολλοὺς περιθέοντας καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ καὶ περὶ τὸν λιμένα διατρίβοντας (transl. A. M. Harmon, Loeb ed. 1913, vol. I, p. 283).

σπερμολόγος [ed. Sturz p. 510, 43]: ἐκ μεταφορᾶς δὲ ἔλεγον τοὺς παρὰ τὰς ἀγορὰς καὶ τοὺς λιμένας διατρίβοντας). Many of those attending the market and the harbour would have belonged to this category of people.

"Doing the *limen*", or "frequenting the harbour/market", might recall the still so common habit on the Greek islands, and elsewhere in the Mediterranean, of people promenading in city squares and along waterfronts before and after dining. However, the Paphians may not have been as extravagant as the fourth-century B.C. Byzantians, or the weak-willed Calchedonians. Of these, Theopompus of Chius says in the eighth book of his *History of Philip*:¹¹

The Byzantians had by this time long had a democratic government; also their city was situated at a trading-post, and the entire populace spent their time in the market-place and by the water-side [καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἅπαντα περὶ τὴν ἀγορὰν καὶ τὸν λιμένα διατρίβειν]; hence they had accustomed themselves to dissipation and amours and drinking in the taverns. As for the Calchedonians, before they all came to have a share with the Byzantians in the government, they devoted themselves unceasingly to the better pursuits of life; but after they had once tasted of the democratic liberties of the Byzantians, they sank utterly into corrupt luxury, and in their daily lives, from having been the most sober and restrained, they became wine-bibbers and spendthrifts.

Something similar may now be happening in Ag. Napa on the east coast of Cyprus. According to many, this old fishing village has become Europe's No. 1 party spot...

University of Helsinki

¹¹ Ath. 526 e-f = *FrGrHist* II B 115 F 62, transl. C. B. Gulick (Athenaeus, Loeb ed. 1933, vol. V, p. 377).

OSSERVAZIONI SUL COLLEZIONISMO EPIGRAFICO SICILIANO

KALLE KORHONEN

1. Aspetti della formazione della collezione Biscari

Molto problematica appare la ricostruzione dei processi di formazione delle due grandi collezioni epigrafiche catanesi, create nel Settecento: la collezione dei Benedettini e la collezione Biscari. La prima, fondata verso il 1740, aveva sede nel convento di S. Nicolò l'Arena; il Museo Biscari fu fondato da Ignazio Paternò Castello, principe di Biscari (1718–1786), e inaugurato nel 1758. Visto che la terra siciliana non era fertile di ritrovamenti epigrafici, per la formazione delle collezioni vennero importate iscrizioni, soprattutto da Roma. I materiali epigrafici delle due collezioni sono poi confluiti nel Museo Civico di Catania a Castello Ursino, e le iscrizioni che vi si conservano ancora saranno ripubblicate prossimamente.¹

A. *La testimonianza poco nota del Cod. Vat. lat. 7935*²

A Roma, il fornitore principale delle due grandi collezioni catanesi era il priore Placido Scammacca (intorno al 1700 –1787), lo zio del principe di Biscari. Diventato monaco Benedettino a Catania, si era trasferito nel

¹ Si tratta di un'edizione critica di tutte le iscrizioni antiche del museo: K. Korhonen – G. Salmeri, *Le iscrizioni antiche del Museo Civico di Catania a Castello Ursino*. Sulle due collezioni catanesi, vd. ultimamente G. Salmeri, in D. Sestini, *Il Museo del principe di Biscari*, Catania 2001, 22-26. Ringrazio cordialmente la Dott. Anna Lucia D'Agata per avermi affidato lo studio del materiale epigrafico delle collezioni del Museo Civico di Castello Ursino. Lo studio è stato finanziato parzialmente dall'Accademia di Finlandia.

² Per questa sezione, vorrei ringraziare il Dott. Marco Buonocore, della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, e i Proff. Silvio Panciera e Gian Luca Gregori dell'Istituto di Epigrafia romana dell'Università di Roma "La Sapienza", per la possibilità di utilizzare lo schedario bibliografico delle iscrizioni urbane.

convento romano di S. Paolo fuori le Mura. Ovviamente non esiste alcun carteggio sistematico dell'acquisizione e dell'esportazione delle iscrizioni. La testimonianza più significativa dell'attività di Scammacca è il Codice Marucelliano A 77, che pertiene soprattutto alle iscrizioni dei Benedettini. Per la formazione della collezione Biscari, il testimone chiave è Ridolfino Venuti (1705–1763), allora a capo della Commissione dei monumenti antichi per lo Stato Pontificio.³

Una parte delle iscrizioni che Scammacca fece trasportare da Roma a Catania furono registrate da Venuti. Chi utilizza il *CIL* VI, trova ogni tanto l'indicazione seguente: "Apparteneva al P. Scammacca, monaco Benedettino Siciliano, che l'anno 1748 con la mia permissione mandò in Sicilia a Palermo per arricchirne un museo".⁴ Per gli editori del *CIL*, fonte di questa informazione furono le schede inviate ad Aurelio Guarnieri Ottoni a Osimo. Queste schede erano raccolte nel manoscritto guarnieriano segnato con la lettera *F*, ormai forse perduto.⁵ Nei primi volumi del *CIL* VI, l'autore del commento viene identificato come "Guarnieri auctorve Guarnierii" e soltanto a partire dalla metà del vol. 3 (1886) come Ridolfino Venuti.⁶

Esiste, comunque, un'altra fonte simile alle schede inviate a Guarnieri Ottoni, e consultabile ancora oggi. È il codice Vaticano latino 7935, che non viene citato nel *CIL* VI. Viene invece segnalato nelle *ICUR*, ma con informazioni parzialmente erranee,⁷ che vengono ripetute nella letteratura.⁸ Il codice è stato attribuito interamente a Pier Luigi Galletti, l'autore del *Diario lapidario* ricco di falsificazioni. Comunque, il codice è miscelaneo,

³ Su Scammacca e Venuti, vd. soprattutto M. P. Billanovich, "Falsi epigrafici", *IMU* 10 (1967) 25-110, partic. 60-63.

⁴ Citato come in *CIL* VI 17603.

⁵ Molti codici della biblioteca di Guarnieri Ottoni, appartenuti nell'epoca più recente alla famiglia Balleani di Iesi, sono andati dispersi nel Novecento; vd. G. Billanovich, *IMU* 5 (1962) 130-31 e M. P. Billanovich, cit. a nota 3, 62.

⁶ *CIL* VI 18928: "Guarnieri auctorve Guarnierii"; 19950: "R. Venuti".

⁷ Per notizie sommarie, vd. A. Silvagni, *ICUR* I (1922) p. LII nn. 110-11; cfr. *ICUR* 8723, dove i fogli vengono attribuiti a Galletti.

⁸ Cfr. Billanovich, cit. a nota 3, 80: "In appendice al codice di S. Paolo [= *Diario lapidario*] il Galletti trascrisse le lapidi che lo Scammacca aveva inviato a Catania. E anche le copiò nel suo Vaticano lat. 7935", con riferimento a Silvagni (vd. nota precedente); in realtà, le iscrizioni segnalate nel codice di S. Paolo del *Diario lapidario* sono diverse da quelle nel Vat. lat. 7935. Un simile malinteso in A. Ferrua, "Osservazioni sulle iscrizioni cristiane catanesi", *Bollettino storico catanese* 3 (1938) 60-74, partic. 65.

con scritti del Galletti, ma anche altro materiale.

Per quanto riguarda le collezioni catanesi, la parte più importante è la prima (ff. 1-111), che si deve tutta alla stessa mano, e soprattutto i fogli 38-39 e 41-42.⁹ La scrittura è molto diversa da quella di Galletti, che si distingue facilmente nel panorama degli studiosi dell'epoca.¹⁰ I fogli 38-39 e 41-42 contengono un gruppo di iscrizioni e un titolo, nel quale il materiale viene definito in una maniera molto simile alle schede di Osimo: "Queste retro scritte iscrizioni appartenevano al P. Scammac(c)a, monaco Benedettino siciliano, che l'Anno 1748 mandò in Sicilia p(er) arricchire un Museo" (f. 39v). I fogli contengono praticamente la stessa raccolta di iscrizioni che conosciamo dalle schede di Osimo. Quindi, è molto verosimile che l'autore di questa parte sia proprio Ridolfino Venuti. Il contenuto delle testimonianze viene sintetizzato nella seguente tavola.

Concordanza delle due testimonianze di Ridolfino Venuti

| <i>CIL VI</i> | X 1088* | Schede Guarnieri, f.¹¹ | Cod. Vat. lat. 7935, f. |
|----------------------|----------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 12516 | 50 | 331 <i>g</i> | 41r |
| 12669 | 52 | 227v <i>d</i> | 41v |
| 12890 | 56 | 227 <i>c</i> | 42r |
| 13960 | 1089*, 59 | 216 | 39r |
| 14686 | 81 | 331 <i>f</i> | 41r |
| 15738 | 94 | 215v <i>a</i> | 38v |
| 16353 | 114 | 215v | 39r |
| 17603 | 138 | 216 <i>b</i> | – |
| 17728 | 142 | 227 | 42r |
| 18928 | 159 | 331 <i>e</i> | 41r |
| 19950 | 180 | 215 | 38v |
| 20647 | 200 | 227 | 42r |
| 20791 | 204 | 215v | 39r |
| 20953 | 207 | – | 41v |
| 20958 | 209 | – | 41v |
| 22558 | 243 | 227v | 41v |
| 23363 | 262 | 215 | 38v |
| 24172 | 276 | 331 | 38v, 41r |
| 24895 | 295 | 227 | 42r |
| 24980 | 297 | 215 | 38v |

⁹ Il f. 40 non va con i ff. 38-39 e 41-42, perché fa parte di un quinterno insieme con il f. 37.

¹⁰ Molti codici scritti interamente da Galletti si conservano nella Biblioteca Vaticana; si veda ad es. Vat. lat. 8607.

¹¹ Le mie notizie delle perdute schede di Osimo si basano sulle indicazioni del *CIL VI*.

| <i>CIL VI</i> | X 1088* | Schede Guarnieri, f. | Cod. Vat. lat. 7935, f.) |
|-------------------------|---------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| 25091 | 300 | 216 | 39r |
| 25103 | 301 | 216 | 39r |
| 25973 | 314 | 227v | 41v |
| 26145 | 318 | 215, 331 | 38v, 41r |
| 26621 | 330 | 216 | 39r |
| 26988 | 337 | 215v | 39r |
| 27355 | 345 | 215v | 39r |
| 28755 | 367 | 331 | 41r |
| 28868 | 370 | – | 41v |
| 29619 | 395 | 215 | 38v |
| (altre) | | | |
| <i>ICUR</i> 8723 | 458 | ? | 39r |
| <i>CIL X</i> 1089*, 133 | | ? | 39r |

Si nota subito che le successioni delle notizie sulle iscrizioni concordano in parte nel codice vaticano e nelle schede di Guarnieri Ottoni. D'altra parte, è notevole che per alcune iscrizioni del codice vaticano non è stato trovato confronto nelle schede di Guarnieri, e vice versa. Così, dalle schede di Osimo non sono emerse testimonianze riguardanti *CIL VI* 20953, 20958 e 28868, incluse nella parte inferiore della pagina 41v del codice vaticano. Venuti è, in effetti, l'unica testimonianza anteriore al trasferimento a Catania di queste tre iscrizioni, e quindi l'unica prova che abbiamo della loro provenienza urbana.¹² *CIL VI* 17603, invece, non viene segnalata nel codice vaticano. Le iscrizioni elencate nella tavola furono tutte trasportate a Catania, e – con le eccezioni di *CIL VI* 20791 e 24980 – si conservano ancora nel Museo Civico della città.

Chi confronta le due testimonianze, vede anche che il riferimento a Palermo nelle schede di Guarnieri Ottoni deve essere un malinteso; nel codice vaticano, la destinazione è "Sicilia". Inoltre, è interessante che la frase "con la mia permissione" manca nel codice vaticano.

Sappiamo che più di una metà delle iscrizioni portate da Roma a Catania non erano antiche, ma copie di iscrizioni autentiche.¹³ Le pagine qui discusse del codice vaticano contengono soltanto iscrizioni autentiche – forse non serviva un permesso per il trasporto delle copie. Come ha ben detto la Billanovich, sicuramente Scammacca, e forse anche Venuti,

¹² Comunque, Mommsen le collocò tra le urbane a ragione, evidentemente già per l'aspetto esterno: tutte sono tabelle colombariali, che finora non sono attestate a Catania.

¹³ Anche queste, ca. 180, verranno pubblicate e discusse nella prossima edizione (vd. nota 1). Su esse, lo studio fondamentale è Billanovich, cit. a nota 3.

sapevano distinguere tra copie e autentiche.¹⁴ In ogni caso, la segnalazione nel Cod. Vat. 7935 è importante soprattutto per tre iscrizioni, *CIL* VI 13960 (*CIL* X 1089*, 59), *CIL* X 1089*, 133 e *ICUR* 8723, perché la loro autenticità è stata messa in dubbio. Mommsen considerava le prime due delle copie, e quindi la prima veniva segnalata nel *CIL* VI come l'unica testimonianza diretta di un'iscrizione perduta; la seconda è rimasta al di fuori del *CIL* VI. Comunque, a mio avviso tutte e due sono probabilmente autentiche; dal punto di vista paleografico, sono molto diverse dalle copie importate a Catania. Dell'iscrizione *ICUR* 8723, vista per intero soltanto da Boldetti, si sa che la parte destra si conservava nella chiesa di S. Maria in Trastevere.¹⁵ Questa parte, conservata a Catania, è stata considerata una copia, perché non sembrava plausibile che Scammacca l'avesse portata via dalla chiesa.¹⁶ In effetti, almeno un'altra iscrizione, secondo quanto dice lo Scammacca, gli fu donata dal Canonico Umiltà di S. Maria in Trastevere;¹⁷ quindi, lo stesso è successo nel caso in questione.

Per quanto riguarda la destinazione delle iscrizioni, sembra evidente che Scammacca le abbia acquistate su ordine del principe di Biscari, perché quasi tutte sono arrivate al Museo Biscari, che fu inaugurato un decennio dopo il trasporto. Ci sono tre eccezioni: *CIL* VI 20791 (*CIL* X 1088*, 204), 25103 (X 1088*, 301) e *CIL* X 1089* 133, che arrivarono nel Museo dei Benedettini. Mi sembra che almeno la prima e la terza siano state acquistate appositamente per i Benedettini, perché sono le uniche iscrizioni segnalate da Venuti, che Scammacca aveva copiato nel Codice Marucelliano A 77.¹⁸ Questo codice è, in effetti, un inventario quasi completo delle iscrizioni portate da Roma nel Museo dei Benedettini. Le prime due rimanevano nel Museo dei Benedettini fino al Novecento, ma la terza fu spostata nel Museo Biscari prima del 1829.¹⁹ La trentina di iscrizioni incluse nelle due testimonianze di Venuti costituiscono circa la metà di tutte le iscrizioni

¹⁴ Billanovich, cit. a nota 3, 63.

¹⁵ G. Marangoni, *Acta S. Victorini episcopi Amiterni et martyris illustrata*, Romae 1740, 126.

¹⁶ A. Silvagni, *ICUR ad loc.*

¹⁷ P. Scammacca, Cod. Maruc. A 77 f. 5v, a proposito di *ICUR* 4024 (= *IG* XIV 1508).

¹⁸ *CIL* VI 20791: Cod. Maruc. A 77 f. 3v, 13v; *CIL* X 1089*, 133: cod. cit., f. 15r.

¹⁹ F. Ferrara, *Storia di Catania sino alla fine del secolo XVIII*, Catania 1829, 364 n. 4; Mommsen, *CIL* X 1089*, 133; G. Libertini, *Il Museo Biscari*, Milano – Roma 1930, 76 n. 162 (pubblicata come inedita).

urbane nella collezione Biscari.

Negli altri fogli del codice vaticano scritti da Venuti è inclusa ancora un'iscrizione finita a Catania, *CIL* VI 13326 (f. 29r). Viene commentata così: "In villa Feronia in columbario invento, et continuo clauso 1735". Venuti spedì il testo dell'iscrizione anche al Muratori, con una più esatta indicazione del luogo di ritrovamento, e a Guarnieri Ottoni.²⁰

Concludendo questa parte, voglio sottolineare che dai codici attribuiti a Galletti possono ancora emergere nuove notizie su iscrizioni, dovute a figure più attendibili.

B. Da Monteverde a Catania

La provenienza di molte iscrizioni appartenute alle due grandi collezioni catanesi è disperatamente incerta. Nel *CIL* X, Mommsen preferiva collocare le epigrafi latine in genere tra le urbane, se non ne era stata provata la provenienza catanese. Di queste, alcune verranno ricollocate tra le catanesi nella nuova edizione, perché ci sono argomenti a mio avviso sufficienti per ritenerle catanesi.²¹ Ma per quanto riguarda la maggioranza delle epigrafi greche, esse furono pubblicate tra le catanesi dall'editore del volume XIV di *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Georg Kaibel, tranne alcune poste – direi – arbitrariamente tra le urbane, dove sono rimaste anche nel corpus del Moretti.²²

La provenienza catanese dell'iscrizione greca giudaica *IG* XIV 543 è stata messa, comunque, in dubbio da Antonio Ferrua. Il commento di Ferrua sulla provenienza si trova soltanto nell'aggiornamento della raccolta delle iscrizioni giudaiche di J.-B. Frey, a cura di B. Lifshitz: "the slab may have come from the Monteverde catacomb, as A. Ferrua was kind to write me".²³

²⁰ L. A. Muratori, *Novus thesaurus veterum inscriptionum* III, Mediolani 1740, 1641 n. 10. Per Guarnieri Ottoni, *CIL* cita le schede pesaresi, f. 33v, che non ho potuto consultare.

²¹ *CIL* VI 10614 (= *AE* 1989, 341 f), 11858, 12068, 12092, 12111, 12384, 12386, 12622, 12942, 13274, 13792, 16977, 17226, 18132a, 21194, 22103, 23320, 24510, 25488, 26818, 26838, 28340, 28864; 30629, 2, 4-5, 8, 12-14, 16-18; 30630, 2; *CIL* X 1088*, 199.

²² Moretti, *IGUR* 670, 787, 865, 923 (= *IG* XIV 1745, 1852, 1919, 1981). Tutte sono a mio avviso catanesi.

²³ In J.-B. Frey, *Corpus inscriptionum Iudaicarum* I [ristampa; originariamente pubblicata nel 1936] with a Prolegomenon by B. Lifshitz, New York 1975, 51 n. 650a.

Sfortunatamente i motivi non vengono specificati. Nel 1938, lo stesso Ferrua aveva pubblicato l'iscrizione, e allora non espresse i suoi dubbi sulla provenienza.²⁴ *IG XIV 543* è inclusa anche nella recente edizione delle iscrizioni giudaiche, a cura di David Noy (*JJWE*); è il n. 146 del vol. I. Comunque, il Noy non è andato a fondo su questo problema molto spinoso, preferendo la provenienza catanese.²⁵ La lastra è nel Museo Civico di Catania.²⁶

Le testimonianze degli autori siciliani non aiutano per stabilire la provenienza. L'iscrizione fu segnalata nel Museo Biscari nella grande raccolta del principe di Torremuzza,²⁷ che – come al solito – non si sofferma sulla provenienza, ma indica soltanto il luogo di conservazione. Successivamente, Francesco Ferrara la pubblicò nella sua sezione dedicata alle iscrizioni catanesi, con il commento "si conserva nel biscariano, e catanese anch'essa",²⁸ dopo aver discusso *IG XIV 496*, che non apparteneva alla collezione Biscari. Ho studiato le espressioni dello storico catanese in maniera più approfondita nell'introduzione alla prossima edizione.²⁹ Mi risulta che Ferrara è affidabile soltanto quando specifica il luogo di ritrovamento; un'espressione inesatta come in questo caso rende la provenienza dubbia.

²⁴ Ferrua, cit. a nota 8, 72 n. 2. Nella sua recensione della raccolta di Frey, Ferrua segnalava ancora l'iscrizione tra le catanesi: *Epigraphica* 3 (1941) 44.

²⁵ Noy commenta: "a local origin seems likely as there was clearly a substantial Jewish community at Catania – ἐνθάδε κείται was widely used in Sicily as well as at Rome". C'era anche una consistente comunità di latinofoni nella Catania antica, iscrizioni latine comunque furono trasportate a Catania nel Settecento; per il secondo argomento, vd. sotto, nota 31. Inoltre, secondo Noy, Guido Libertini, l'editore del catalogo del Museo Biscari (vd. nota 18) "regarded the Greek inscriptions in the collection as being almost all from Catania". Questo può essere vero, ma in realtà il Libertini non fece mai uno studio approfondito sulla provenienza dei pezzi della collezione Biscari, e non può essere citato come autorità in questa problematica.

²⁶ Il testo è: Ἐν/θάδε / κίτε λε/οντία ἐτῶ(ν) γ' · ἐνθάδε κί/τε Καλλι/όπη ἐτῶ(ν) / η'. La lastra è triangolare, con le misure di 20 x 31 x 3,5; alt. lett. 1,1-2,1. Negli angoli inferiori, candelabri a sette bracci su tripodi; nell'angolo destro anche una figura conica, forse *ethrog* o un'anfora (o uno *shofar*?).

²⁷ G. L. Castelli principe di Torremuzza, *Siciliae et objacentium insularum veterum inscriptionum nova collectio*, Panormi 1769, 174 n. 61; 2. ed., Panormi 1784, 185 n. 73. Torremuzza legge solo le prime quattro righe.

²⁸ Ferrara, cit. a nota 18, 351 n. 2.

²⁹ Vd. nota 1.

Il formulario della lastra, del tipo ἐνθάδε κεῖται ἢ / ὁ δείνα ἐτῶν (*tot*) è molto frequente a Monteverde,³⁰ ma in sostanza inattestato a Catania.³¹ C'è un'attestazione cristiana, *IG XIV 523*, in cui, comunque, il formulario non è così semplice, e dove viene usata la forma ἐτέων. Inoltre, c'è *IG XIV 1529 = IGUR 1187*, di provenienza incertissima; a mio avviso, è forse l'unica iscrizione che Kaibel colloca a ragione tra le urbane.³² Quanto alla paleografia, la forma triangolare e l'abbreviazione "nasale" ετῶ per ἐτῶν, non ho trovato paralleli né a Monteverde, né a Catania.³³

La catacomba giudaica di Monteverde fu scoperta nel 1602, ed era conosciuta nel Settecento. Veniva visitata proprio negli anni centrali del secolo, e Ridolfino Venuti, che abbiamo incontrato nel capitolo precedente, la conosceva.³⁴ È noto che alcune iscrizioni dalla catacomba finirono nella collezione Borgia.³⁵

In ogni caso, è necessario trovare qualcosa di più concreto dell'opinione di Ferrua. Lasciamo ora per un attimo *IG XIV 543*, per considerare un'altra iscrizione conservata nel Museo Civico di Catania, proveniente dalla stessa collezione Biscari. Visto che il testo è molto semplice, non ha attirato attenzione, se non per la commovente parola νήπιος. Si tratta di *IG XIV 461*: Ἐνθάδε κεῖ/τε Ἀστέ/ρις νήπιος. Le misure sono 31,5 x 30; lo spessore è tra 0,7 e 2,2.³⁶ Non contiene alcuna

³⁰ Noy, *JWE II* 11, 28 (Λεοντία), 30, 32, 55, 90, 102, 113, 117, 168, 171, 172, 188, 191. Nella maggior parte di questi casi, il formulario contiene attributi dopo il nome, e alla fine una frase come ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἢ κοίμησις αὐτῆς /-οῦ.

³¹ È troppo superficiale il commento di Noy, "ἐνθάδε κεῖται was widely used in Sicily as well as at Rome" – gli altri elementi del formulario non sono ben attestati in Sicilia.

³² Voglio già in questa sede correggere la lettura della r. 6, che non è Φρόντων εἰατήρ, come nelle edizioni, ma Φρόντων πατήρ.

³³ Nella frammentaria *JWE II* 55, che Noy pubblica con ἐτῶ(v), l'ultima lettera poteva anche essere nella riga seguente. Non c'è alcuna indicazione dell'abbreviazione.

³⁴ Vd. la sua "Dissertazione sopra due antiche greche iscrizioni", *Giornale de' Letterati di Roma*, 1748, 147 s. Purtroppo non ho potuto controllare il riferimento, ma devo citare Frey, cit. a nota 23, 206 e Noy, *JWE II* (1995) p. 1.

³⁵ Vd. Frey, cit. a nota 23, 206-8; Noy, *JWE II* (1995) pp. 1-2. Sulla catacomba, vd. anche C. Vismara, in *Società romana e impero tardoantico II* (a c. di A. Giardina), Roma – Bari 1986, 361-67; sulla collezione Borgia, ultimamente F. Nasti, in *Le iscrizioni latine del Museo Nazionale di Napoli [= ILMN] I*, Napoli 2000, 45-54.

³⁶ Non è stato possibile misurare lo spessore esatto, perché la lastra è stata spezzata in due frammenti (nn. inv. 275 e 302), che sono stati inseriti in due tavole di gesso.

modanatura, ornamenti o simboli religiosi; il testo è stato inciso nell'estremità superiore del campo epigrafico.

Per quanto io sappia, la segnalazione più antica dell'iscrizione risale a Ferrara, che la pubblicò tra le iscrizioni trovate a Catania, senza commentare sulla provenienza.³⁷ La collocazione di Kaibel tra le iscrizioni pagane è stata giustamente corretta da Ferrua,³⁸ ma la provenienza non è stata messa in dubbio.

In ogni caso, mi pare fortissima la somiglianza di questa iscrizione con molti epitaffi dalla catacomba giudaica di Monteverde a Roma. Tale somiglianza si riscontra non solo al livello paleografico e della forma esterna, ma anche a quello del formulario, soprattutto a causa della semplicità, della grafia κείτε e dell'uso della parola νήπιος.³⁹ Mancano i paralleli catanesi.⁴⁰ Inoltre, il nome Ἀστέρι(ο)ς è attestato nella catacomba, e assai frequente a Roma, ma non in Sicilia.⁴¹

Quindi, credo che *IG XIV 461* provenga dalla catacomba di Monteverde. Con questo passo in avanti, sembra ancora più verosimile che anche *IG XIV 543 = JIWE I 146* possa provenire dallo stesso luogo. Allora, ci sono altre iscrizioni da Monteverde nelle collezioni catanesi? Noy ha ricordato che anche l'origine del frammento giudaico *JIWE I 147*, proveniente dalla collezione Biscari, è incerta.⁴² A mio avviso, l'iscrizione non appartiene alla catacomba di Monteverde. Il testo, che finora non è stato integrato in

³⁷ Ferrara, cit. a nota 18, 342 n. 2.

³⁸ A. Ferrua, *Note e giunte alle iscrizioni cristiane antiche della Sicilia* (Sussidi allo studio delle antichità cristiane 9), Città del Vaticano 1989, 114 n. 429.

³⁹ Vd. Noy, *JIWE II* 38, 115, 116, tutte paleograficamente simili alla nostra, con ἐνθάδε κείτε + nome + νήπιος; altre lastre simili: *JIWE II* 45, 123 e 133 (fotografie in Frey, cit. a nota 23, nn. 388, 342 e 326; 406, 344 e 436 rispettivamente); inoltre, *JIWE II* 8 (Frey, cit. n. 305), con Ἐνθάδε κείντε / Ἀστέρις καὶ Νου/μήνις νήπια. Tutte queste lastre sono senza simboli religiosi e quasi tutte hanno forma verticale, con la parte inferiore non iscritta, secondo un modello attestato anche in altre iscrizioni della catacomba.

⁴⁰ *NSA* 1918, 62 n. 3, "Σωκράτης / πάντων (*chrismon*) / φίλος ἐνθά/δε κείται" è confrontabile per la semplicità, ma altrimenti troppo diverso.

⁴¹ Per quanto io sappia, l'unica iscrizione siciliana con un nome *Asteri-* è *ILTermini Imerese* (cit. a nota 67) 140, con *Asterin* (cfr. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* [= *LGPN*] IIIA [a c. di P. M. Fraser – E. Matthews], Oxford 1997, 81). Catacomba di Monteverde: Noy, *JIWE II* 8 (Ἀστέρις); altre attestazioni urbane, 33 casi, in H. Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom*, Berlin – New York 1982, 1122-23.

⁴² Il primo editore fu G. Libertini, cit. a nota 18, 318 n. 8; è stata ripubblicata da Ferrua, cit. a nota 8, 72 n. 3, e da altri.

un modo soddisfacente, consiste di una frase semplice, di cui la fine non mi è intelligibile: [--- Πρ]ῖσκα / [ἔζ]ησεν / [ἔτ]η δέκ[α] / [---]ΤΩ (*menorah*).⁴³ Il frammento non è stato segnalato prima di Libertini (1930). In effetti, un problema di principio che riguarda tutta la collezione Biscari è se il principe fosse propenso ad acquistare dei frammenti. Dopo uno studio globale della sua collezione, mi sembra che abbia preferito una bella copia intera al frammento di un'iscrizione autentica.⁴⁴ Quindi, è preferibile lasciare *JIWE* I 147 tra le iscrizioni giudaiche catanesi.⁴⁵

Ad ogni buon conto, le acquisizioni di Scammacca dalla catacomba di Monteverde dovettero essere sporadiche. Le iscrizioni poterono arrivare nelle sue mani attraverso i monaci benedettini di S. Paolo fuori le Mura, il suo convento. In effetti, alcune iscrizioni dalla catacomba di Monteverde si conservano a S. Paolo, tutte ritrovate negli anni Quaranta del Settecento.⁴⁶ Inoltre, alcune epigrafi della collezione catanese dei Benedettini provenivano da S. Paolo.⁴⁷

2. La breve storia della collezione Recupero

Alla fine del Settecento una collezione di antichità fu costituita a Catania da Alessandro Recupero (1740–1803). L'unico testimone delle iscrizioni nella collezione è lo storico Francesco Ferrara. Al proposito, vale la pena citare un suo passo: "Alessandro Recupero per il suo lungo soggiorno a Roma riconosciuto da per tutto per dotto archeologo alla sua morte mandò la sua vasta raccolta di medaglie, e di preziosi antichi monumenti, e di opere di Belle Arti al di lui fratello Giuseppe Recupero morto poco fa."⁴⁸ Ferrara fa

⁴³ La lastra è mutila a sinistra e a destra (di poco). Misure: 19,5 x (13) x tra 1 e 5; alt. lett. 1,8-3,0.

⁴⁴ Questo problema verrà trattato nell'introduzione dell'edizione, cit. a nota 1.

⁴⁵ Le altre sono *JIWE* I 145 e 148-150, ripubblicate ultimamente – ma con il greco senza accenti – da S. Simonsohn, in *Sicilia Epigraphica. Atti del convegno Erice, ottobre 1998* (a cura di M. I. Gulletta) (ASNP ser. IV: Quaderni 1-2), Pisa 1999, 518 n. 1, 519 nn. 5-7. Inoltre, c'è *JIWE* I 144 da Acireale.

⁴⁶ *JIWE* II 186-188, 193.

⁴⁷ *CIL* VI 8146, 11624, 15429, 18907, 20707, 22728, 24492, *ICUR* 5050. Vd. anche G. Filippi, *Indice della raccolta epigrafica di San Paolo fuori le mura* (Inscriptiones Sanctae Sedis 3), Città del Vaticano 1998, 77-78.

⁴⁸ F. Ferrara, *Storia di Catania sino alla fine del secolo XVIII*, Catania 1829, 508-9.

cenno a 31 iscrizioni conservate nel museo.⁴⁹ In questa sede, vorrei prendere in considerazione la provenienza di queste iscrizioni. Per cominciare è interessante notare che come i precedenti collezionisti catanesi, anche Recupero acquistò almeno quattro copie moderne.⁵⁰

Le iscrizioni autentiche contenevano esemplari catanesi e urbani, se possiamo credere Ferrara. Per capire meglio i problemi relativi alle notizie date da quest'ultimo, presento rapidamente il suo metodo nel raggruppare le iscrizioni. Nella sua opera, che contiene molte centinaia di epigrafi, esse sono divise in tre gruppi, 1) iscrizioni trovate a Catania, 2) "iscrizioni di vario genere che conservansi in Catania", che possono essere importate, ma anche locali, e 3) "altre iscrizioni sepolcrali latine".⁵¹ Delle iscrizioni di Recupero, cinque si trovano nel primo gruppo, otto nel "gruppo misto" (2), e il resto nel gruppo "altre iscrizioni sepolcrali latine" (3).⁵²

Delle due greche nella prima sezione, Ferrara scrive "sono sopra marmi trovati a Catania" – l'espressione poco precisa rende il lettore sospettoso. In effetti, la prima è la copia moderna di un'iscrizione urbana, come vide già Georg Kaibel;⁵³ la seconda è a mio avviso catanese.⁵⁴ Per due delle tre epigrafi latine nella stessa sezione (*CIL* X 7048 e 7049), i luoghi di ritrovamento vengono indicati esattamente, ma per *CIL* X 7090 così: "[trovata] in un altro sito della città". Purtroppo, *CIL* X 7090 è perduta, e Ferrara ne è l'unico testimone.⁵⁵ Credo che possa anche essere di provenienza urbana, ma i criteri interni non aiutano a risolvere il problema, perché sono poco distintivi. Le iscrizioni nel gruppo (2) sono state divise in due insiemi, evidentemente in pagane e cristiane. Le due pagane, *CIL* X 7095 e *CIL* X 7103, risultano come "marmi trovati a Catania"; qui non

⁴⁹ Ferrara, cit. a nota 48, 347 nn. 1-2, 358 nn. 1-2 e 5, 380 nn. 8-9, 383-84 nn. 15-20, 434-37 nn. 1-18.

⁵⁰ Ferrara, cit., 347 n. 1 e 435 nn. 1, 4 e 5 sono copie di Moretti, *IGUR* 523 (*IG* XIV 1586), di *CIL* VI 3234, di *CIL* VI 15585 e di *CIL* VI 20975, rispettivamente. Di *CIL* VI 3234 si conoscono almeno sette altre copie a Roma, Napoli e Perugia (vd. *CIL* VI p. 3384 e *ILMN* I p. 180 nn. 621-22).

⁵¹ Ferrara, cit., 335-86, 386-413 e 413-38.

⁵² (1): Ferrara, cit. 347 nn. 1-2 (due greche), 358 nn. 1-2 e 5 (tre latine); (2): 380 nn. 8-9, 383-84 nn. 15-20; (3): 434-37 nn. 1-18.

⁵³ È la copia di *IG* XIV 1586 = *IGUR* 523 (vd. anche sopra, nota 50).

⁵⁴ È *IG* XIV 478, di cui Ferrara è l'unica testimonianza.

⁵⁵ Il testo era: *D(is) M(anibus). / L. Silius Dius / fecit Siliae / Tychen<i>, ma/tri carissime / b(ene) (foglia di edera) m(erenti).*

dubiterei sulla correttezza dell'informazione. Per le sei iscrizioni che rimangono, Ferrara è la sola testimonianza anteriore a Kaibel; una di queste si conserva ancora nel Museo Civico.⁵⁶ Lo storico le descrive (p. 385): "Le sei ultime sopra bei marmi ma rotti trovati a Catania, ed acquistati dal barone Recupero sono stati da me copiati sopra gli originali". Tutte sono greche; malgrado l'imprecisa informazione di Ferrara, credo che siano di provenienza catanese.⁵⁷

Delle 15 iscrizioni autentiche nell'ultimo gruppo (3), almeno cinque erano state a Roma nella collezione Casali; di queste, una era stata scoperta a Todi, e le altre erano urbane.⁵⁸ Altre tre erano state segnalate a Roma: *CIL* VI 10781 era stata vista da Gaetano Marini presso un venditore di antichità,⁵⁹ 22043 era appartenuta a molte collezioni a partire dal XVI secolo, e 21917 era stata nella collezione Mattei, ma il Recupero la acquistò dalla bottega di Bartolomeo Cavaceppi.⁶⁰

Per le sette iscrizioni che rimangono, Ferrara è la testimonianza più antica, e anche l'unica per tutte tranne una.⁶¹ Per le loro caratteristiche, mi pare verosimile che tutte siano urbane. Nessuna ha le caratteristiche tipiche

⁵⁶ Quattro furono pubblicate da Kaibel: *IG* XIV 462 (Ferrara n. 16), 520 (n. 19), 521 (n. 20) e 552 (n. 15). Il frammento Ferrara 384 n. 17 si conserva ancora nel Museo Civico; fu pubblicato soltanto nel 1989 da Ferrua, cit. a nota 38, 113 n. 427. Il frammento perduto Ferrara 384 n. 18 è rimasto inedito; il testo non è comprensibile: ΓΡΟCΒΥ / ΕΙΝΕΑC (con Ε e Σ lunate).

⁵⁷ Secondo Kaibel, *IG* XIV 552 sarebbe "fortasse Syracusana". Comunque, Ferrara non indica che la collezione abbia contenuto iscrizioni siracusane, e il termine ἀγορασία della riga 1 era in uso anche a Catania, vd. A. Ferrua, *RAC* 18 (1941) 238-39, dove l'iscrizione viene integrata.

⁵⁸ Sono *CIL* VI 145 = 30701 (R. Santolini Giordani, *Antichità Casali. La collezione di Villa Casali a Roma* [Studi miscellanei 27], Roma 1989, 161 n. 127); *CIL* VI 8688 (cit. 168 n. 151), *CIL* VI 10134 e *CIL* VI 22648 (cit. 194 n. 281) e la tudertana *CIL* XI 4637 = *CIL* VI 101 (cit. 161 n. 126).

⁵⁹ "Apud propolam". I riferimenti sono nel *CIL* VI.

⁶⁰ Vd. G. Mennella, *IMU* 19 (1976) 406 nota 4, 409. Mennella accenna a Giuseppe Recupero, ma il collezionista fu il fratello Alessandro.

⁶¹ Sono *CIL* VI 11945, cfr. p. 3509 (Ferrara, cit. a nota 18, 436 n. 12), 15512 (437 n. 16), 24707 (435 n. 13), 24722 (436 n. 17), 26649 (436 n. 7), 27909 (435 n. 18) e 27864 (437 n. 14). La prima è riemersa nella collezione Reina, vd. sotto, nota 65. – *CIL* VI 26649 (*D. M. / Fecit Soteri / ----- ?*) è abbastanza simile a *CIL* X 7091 (*D. M. / Soteri*), ma non credo che si tratti della stessa iscrizione, anche perché X 7091 fu vista da G. Alessi nella collezione Gruffa–Moschetti e pubblicata nel 1834.

di un'iscrizione funeraria catanese. Quattro potrebbero essere tabelle colombariali, una tipologia inattestata a Catania; due di queste provengono forse dallo stesso monumento.⁶²

Il periodo della fioritura della collezione fu breve. Già un decennio dopo il libro di Ferrara, il duca di Carcaci scrisse che la collezione "contiene una esile parte delle molte preziosissime cose proprie un tempo della famiglia", senza menzionare iscrizioni.⁶³ In seguito, probabilmente verso 1880, una parte delle iscrizioni di Recupero arrivarono nei locali del Museo dei Benedettini, ormai *Antiquarium* comunale. Mommsen, studiando le collezioni catanesi, non le segnalava ancora, ma *CIL X* 7103 e un altro frammento furono viste da H. Dessau e C. Stevenson nel museo nella prima metà degli anni Ottanta dell'Ottocento.⁶⁴ Le iscrizioni della collezione Recupero che noi abbiamo trovato nelle collezioni del Museo Civico sono cinque: *CIL X* 7103, l'iscrizione pubblicata da Ferrua (cit. a nota 38) 113 n. 427, *CIL VI* 21917 e 22648, e la copia moderna di *CIL VI* 15585.

La parte più notevole della collezione dovette, comunque, finire nel mercato antiquario. Così, alcune iscrizioni sono arrivate alla collezione catanese Reina, dove nel 1892 Paolo Orsi le trascrisse, e comunicò agli editori del *CIL VI*.⁶⁵ È interessante notare che un quarto di secolo più tardi, nel 1918, lo stesso Orsi acquistò a Taormina una delle iscrizioni appartenute alla collezione Recupero. Non ricordando più la possibilità di una provenienza urbana, la pubblicò come inedita e tauromenitana.⁶⁶ Essa, comunque, è certamente urbana, *CIL VI* 22043; le più antiche testimonianze dell'iscrizione a Roma risalgono al Cinquecento, quando apparteneva alla collezione Colonna.

⁶² *CIL VI* 11945, 15512, 24707, 24722; le due ultime menzionano liberti di un L. Pontius, e possono quindi provenire dallo stesso monumento.

⁶³ [F. Paternò Castello, duca di Carcaci,] *Descrizione di Catania e delle cose notevoli ne' dintorni di essa*, Catania 1841, 83.

⁶⁴ Per *CIL X* 7103, vd. Dessau, *CIL X* p. 993; per X 7103 e il frammento Ferrua, cit. a nota 38, 113 n. 427, vd. C. Stevenson, *Cod. Vat. lat. 10574 f. 170r.* Sul codice di Stevenson, vd. M. Buonocore, *Epigraphica* 48 (1986) 179-80.

⁶⁵ Si tratta di *CIL VI* 8688 (cfr. *CIL VI* p. 3461), 10134 (cfr. p. 3492) e 11945 (cfr. p. 3509).

⁶⁶ *NSA* 1920, 340-41, fig. 25 = Ferrara, cit. a nota 18, 435 n. 10. Visto che fu acquistata da Orsi, si troverà nei magazzini del Museo archeologico di Siracusa, a lui intitolato.

3. Termini Imerese, Walther e Fabretti

Termino con una nota che riguarda le iscrizioni di Termini Imerese, l'antica *Thermae Himeraeorum*. In confronto con molte città siciliane, anche più importanti, la città possiede un consistente patrimonio epigrafico, soprattutto della prima età imperiale. Una delle ragioni è la cura dei Termitani nel conservare il proprio patrimonio epigrafico, lodata da Mommsen, nel *CIL X* (p. 761): "Hoc municipium et olim titulos suos in curia collocare consuevit et nuper museum condidit pro re satis locuples, neque altera est inter urbes Siculas, quae curam monumentorum antiquorum pari studio hodie agat." Ciò è ancora visibile nella recente edizione delle iscrizioni di Termini Imerese, a cura di Livia Bivona:⁶⁷ pochissime sono le perdite.

In rapporto con *CIL X*, l'edizione di Bivona contiene una nuova sezione: iscrizioni aliene (pp. 265-66), con due epigrafi, B1 (*CIL X* 7396 = VI 16196) e B2 (*CIL X* 7400 = VI 16999).⁶⁸ Il lettore si chiede, allora, sorpreso: anche i Termitani hanno importato iscrizioni da Roma?

A mio avviso è facilmente dimostrabile che entrambe non sono aliene, ma termitane. La testimonianza più antica dei due epitaffi risale a Georg Walther (= Gualt(h)erus, Gualtieri) che vide la prima "Termini domi Laurentii Locaschi" e la seconda "Termini in pariete praetorii" nella prima metà degli anni Venti del Seicento.⁶⁹ Poi, nel 1766, B2 fu vista dal palermitano Francesco Tardia.⁷⁰ Il Torremuzza incluse i due epitaffi nelle

⁶⁷ *Iscrizioni latine lapidarie del Museo civico di Termini Imerese* (Supplementi a Κώκκαλος, 9), Palermo 1994 (*ILTermini Imerese* qui). Si tratta di un'edizione di tutte le iscrizioni della città, non soltanto del Museo Civico. Per correzioni essenziali, vd. M. Kajava, *Arctos* 29 (1995) 203-6.

⁶⁸ B1: *D(is) M(anibus). / Cornelius / Epafruitus / vix(it) an(nis) VIII. B2: Domitia Chimenna A. Aemilio / Aristomeni et suis. / H(oc) m(onumentum) / h(eredem) n(on) s(equetur).*

⁶⁹ G. Gualtherus, *Siciliae obiacentiumq. insular. et Bruttiorum antiquae tabulae cum animadversionibus* (prima edizione incompiuta senza titolo) [Palermo 1622-24 ca.], nn. 117 e 89; 2. ed., Messanae 1624 [1625], nn. 280 e 249. L'esemplare della prima edizione che ho utilizzato si conserva nella Biblioteca Vaticana (collocazione: *Capponi IV 36*). Sulla datazione, vd. Mommsen, *CIL X* p. 714-16; B. Lavagnini, *RömHistMitt* 27 (1985) 344 e A. M. Prestianni Giallombardo, in *Sicilia epigraphica* (cit. a nota 45), 561-62.

⁷⁰ Mommsen cita "Tardia, ms.", che si deve riferire al codice di Palermo E 171 (cf. Mommsen, *CIL X* p. 742 e il commento al n. 7346). Per questa nota, non ho potuto controllare il codice.

sue raccolte, avendo come fonte, evidentemente, Walther.⁷¹ Oggi, B2 si trova nel Museo civico di Termini Imerese. B1 è perduta, come tutte le iscrizioni collocate dal Walther "in domo Laurentii Locaschi" (*CIL* X 7359, 7388, 7431).

B1 e B2 sono incluse anche nel *CIL* VI come nn. 16196 e 16999, e qui la fonte è la silloge di Raffaele Fabretti. Secondo lui, B1 si trovava "In Vinea Brunona Via Appia", B2 "Hortis Perettis".⁷² Per B1, c'è anche la testimonianza di C. C. Malvasia: "Extra Romam, vinea Brunona".⁷³ Comunque, il Malvasia dipende probabilmente dal Fabretti, anche se la sua opera fu pubblicata prima della silloge fabrettiana, perché la fonte per molte iscrizioni nella sua collezione furono le schede di Fabretti. È utile il confronto con la termitana *CIL* X 7414, pubblicata prima da Walther, che passò dal Fabretti al Malvasia.⁷⁴ Quest'ultimo la pubblicò senza provenienza, ma indicando la sua fonte, le schede di Fabretti. Da Malvasia, l'iscrizione è finita nella raccolta del Muratori, che la definisce semplicemente romana.⁷⁵

Dell'identità di *CIL* VI 16999 e X 7400 (= B2) si è accorto Heikki Solin, che ha incluso l'iscrizione nel suo *Namenbuch*;⁷⁶ quindi, anche Bivona l'ha collocata tra le urbane. Inoltre, quest'ultima ha anche notato che *CIL* VI 16196 e X 7396 sono identiche, preferendo la provenienza urbana. È impossibile che si tratti di due iscrizioni diverse con testi identici.

In ogni caso, un punto di partenza abbastanza sicuro è la testimonianza di Walther, secondo il quale tutte e due le lapidi si trovavano negli anni 1620 a Termini Imerese. Il Fabretti tace delle sue fonti. Comunque, è praticamente impossibile che le lapidi siano state trasferite da Roma a Termini Imerese nel Cinquecento o nei primi anni del Seicento; non

⁷¹ Torremuzza, cit. a nota 27 [1769], 170 n. 40 e 171 n. 43; cit. a nota 27 [1784], 181 nn. 46 e 49. I due epitaffi sono inclusi anche nella sua opera *Le antiche iscrizioni di Palermo*, Palermo 1762, 305-6 nt. c e 318-19 nt. c.

⁷² R. Fabretti, *Inscriptionum antiquarum quae in aedibus paternis asservantur explicatio et additamentum*, Romae 1699, 749 n. 564 e 93 n. 199.

⁷³ *Marmora Felsinea innumeris non solum inscriptionibus exteris hucusque ineditis*, Bononiae 1690, 418.

⁷⁴ Malvasia, cit. a nota 73, 545-46. L'iscrizione manca nella silloge di Fabretti.

⁷⁵ Muratori, cit. a nota 20, 1662 n. 14: "Ibidem [= Romae], ex Malvasia"; 1783 n. 10: senza provenienza, tra altre iscrizioni provenienti dal Malvasia. Muratori utilizzava Walther anche direttamente, ma non lo fece in questo caso.

⁷⁶ Solin, cit. a nota 41, 26.

siamo ancora ai tempi del collezionismo vero e proprio. Non è plausibile neanche che le due iscrizioni siano giunte da Termini a Roma dopo Walther, ma B2 sia tornata a Termini già nel secolo seguente.

Probabilmente la fonte di Fabretti è lo stesso Walther, come anche per *CIL X 7345, 7347, 7426 e 7432*. Nei due casi qui trattati, le sue indicazioni sui luoghi di ritrovamento devono essere erranee. Qui bisogna sottolineare che una certa cautela è sempre necessaria nei confronti delle indicazioni dei luoghi date da Fabretti, anche se spesso non abbiamo alternative. Dobbiamo poi evitare di supporre troppi movimenti per le iscrizioni prima del Settecento.

È interessante che, come per B2, un simile viaggio di andata e ritorno è spesso stato supposto per *IG XIV 331*, anche se l'iscrizione sembra essere rimasta dal Cinquecento fino ad oggi a Termini Imerese. Causa della confusione fu il Muratori, che ebbe la notizia dell'iscrizione da Francesco Ficoroni. Muratori dovette credere che l'iscrizione facesse parte della collezione di quest'ultimo, ma è verosimile che il Ficoroni l'avesse copiata dal libro di Walther.⁷⁷

Sarebbe, comunque, importante capire perché il Fabretti accenni a luoghi come "Vinea Brunona" e "Hortis Perettis". In base ad uno spoglio non sistematico della sua opera, le restanti notizie di iscrizioni viste negli "Horti Peretti" sembrano confermate dagli altri autori.⁷⁸ Nella villa era conservata un'importante collezione epigrafica. Il caso di "Vinea Brunona" è invece meno semplice. Per *CIL VI 22303*, segnalata da Fabretti due volte, egli stesso dà anche un'altra collocazione fuori Roma: "Marini apud abbatem

⁷⁷ Fu vista da T. Fazello e Walther a Termini Imerese; oggi si trova nel museo della città, vd. A. Brugnone, *Κώκαλος* 20 (1974) 233-34 n. 7. Secondo il Muratori (cit. a nota 20, 1722 n. 4), si trovava "Ibidem [= Romae], apud Ficoronium"; osservò anche che il Walther la dava come esistente in Sicilia. Il Torremuzza sembra essere il primo a dire che la lapide era stata trasportata a Roma (cit. a nota 27 [1769], 178 n. 83; cit. a nota 27 [1784], 189 n. 98); forse interpretava così le due collocazioni contraddittorie. A mio avviso, aveva ragione già B. Romano (*Antichità termitane*, Palermo 1838, 110-11 n. 30) che notò che la lapide era stata inglobata nel muro di un edificio pubblico termitano per secoli, e propose che Ficoroni l'avesse copiata da Walther. Deve trattarsi di una delle iscrizioni non urbane copiate dai libri e mandate dal Ficoroni al Muratori (vd. W. Henzen, *CIL VI* p. LXII).

⁷⁸ Vd. ad es. le iscrizioni Fabretti, cit. a nota 72, 94 n. 203, 122 n. 22, 144 n. 164, 550 n. 15, 551 n. 25, 604 n. 47 e 625 n. 213; sono *CIL VI* 16965, 20480, 22704, 22027, 14290, 28845 e 19021.

de Bolis"; gli altri autori parlano della Via Flaminia.⁷⁹ *CIL* VI 17999 viene collocata da Malvasia "penes abbatem de Bollis".⁸⁰ Fabretti indica due collocazioni anche per *CIL* VI 18179, che fu segnalata nelle vicinanze di Marino da lui e da altri autori.⁸¹ Evidentemente, le collocazioni diverse possono essere motivate dai trasferimenti. L'indicazione di Fabretti è completamente erronea per l'iscrizione brindisina *CIL* IX 159, che viene collocata in "Vinea Brunona" insieme con *CIL* VI 23682.⁸²

Stabilita la provenienza termitana, chiudo con qualche parola sulle caratteristiche più interessanti delle due iscrizioni all'interno del contesto locale. In B1, troviamo un'interferenza a livello grafico (*Epaφruitus*) e in B2, il cognome femminile *Chimenna*. I gentilizi nelle due iscrizioni sono già noti nell'epigrafia termitana.⁸³

Il cognome *Chimenna* è attestato, per quanto mi risulta, soltanto in un'altra iscrizione, *CIL* X 7394 (= *ILTermini Imerese* 79), la cui provenienza termitana è sufficientemente sicura. Anche qui il portatore del nome è una donna. A causa del suffisso *-enna*, la sua classificazione linguistica non è chiara.⁸⁴ Il suffisso è molto comune nell'onomastica dell'area etrusca, ma soprattutto nei gentilizi maschili, e qualche volta anche femminili,⁸⁵ e non nei cognomi. Nell'onomastica greca, il suffisso comune fonologicamente

⁷⁹ "Vinea Brunona": Fabretti, cit. a nota 72, 151 n. 214; "Marini ...": cit., 81 n. 104. Gli altri riferimenti sono in *CIL*.

⁸⁰ Fabretti, cit., 151 n. 211; Malvasia, cit. a nota 73, 423.

⁸¹ Fabretti, cit., 166 n. 307 e 383 n. 211 ("Villa Bevilaqua apud Marinum").

⁸² Fabretti, cit., 636 n. 309. Cfr. *CIL* IX p. 652. Fabretti è l'unica testimonianza per *CIL* VI 23682.

⁸³ *Aemilius*: vd. Bivona, *ILTermini Imerese* p. 154; *Cornelius*: cit., p. 182; *Domitius*: cit., pp. 85, 191. A proposito della mancanza del prenome in B1, devo notare che il motivo non può essere "la giovane età" del defunto, come suggerisce la Bivona (p. 265), ma piuttosto la datazione dell'iscrizione in un'epoca in cui i prenomi già erano diventati rari.

⁸⁴ Manca in Solin, cit. a nota 41. Nel *LGPN* IIIA, cit. a nota 41, 476, *Coponia Chimenna* da *CIL* X 7394 viene registrata sotto Χίμεννα (potrebbe anche essere Χείμεννα), ma questa non è una presa di posizione sulla classificazione linguistica del testo, perché il volume contiene molti nomi non greci. – È da escludere la derivazione dalla forma participiale χυμένη (da χέω) proposto da V. de Vit (*Totius Latinitatis onomasticon* II, Prato 1868, 258), in base alla lettura erronea *Chimena*.

⁸⁵ Ad es. *Perpenna*, *Sisenna*, *Vibenna*; per l'elenco completo, vd. H. Solin – O. Salomies, *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum*², Hildesheim 1994, 219. Non pare plausibile un collegamento con il cognome latino *Cimina*, derivato dal nome del *mons Cīmnīus* nell'Etruria (vd. I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki 1965, 190).

vicino dei nomi femminili è -ιννα (ad es. *Corinna*, *Erinna*, *Glycinna*).⁸⁶ La parte iniziale potrebbe forse essere collegata con le parole greche che significano "freddo invernale", "inverno" ecc., presenti in nomi come Χείμαρος, Χειμεύς, Χειμίας, Χείμων e Χίμαιρα.⁸⁷ A mio avviso, il cognome può ben essere un raro rappresentante dell'onomastica indigena sicula.

L'interferenza linguistica è un fenomeno molto raro nelle iscrizioni latine di Termini Imerese. La cultura epigrafica locale può essere definita abbastanza monolingue. L'unico caso paragonabile a Termini è la scrittura *Eyporistus* in *CIL X 7368 (ILT Termini Imerese 37)*, ma la nostra B1 è l'unico caso in cui una lettera non esistente nell'alfabeto latino è stata inserita nel testo latino.

Università di Helsinki

⁸⁶ In *CIL III 9364* (Salona) il cognome *Glycinna* compare sotto la forma *Glycenna*.

⁸⁷ Si tratta di due radici con la stessa origine, χειμ- (ad es. χειμα e χειμών) e la più rara χῖμ- (χίμετρον), basate sulle radici indoeuropee *gheim- e *ghim-, vd. P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris 1968, 1250-51.

ZWEI SPRACHLICHE BEOBACHTUNGEN ZU REPUBLIKANISCHEN RECHTSTEXTEN

PETER KRUSCHWITZ

Die folgenden Ausführungen gelten zwei syntaktischen Komplexen in den inschriftlich überlieferten Rechtstexten aus der Zeit der römischen Republik.¹ Rechtstexte – ein wohl weder zeitlich noch hinsichtlich der Sprache der Abfassung auf die lateinisch-republikanischen Dokumente beschränktes Phänomen – weisen eine in höchstem Maße standardisierte, stilisierte und sorgsam konservierte Syntax auf, die als für die juristische Fachsprache spezifisch und diese sogleich auch konstituierend gelten darf.² Bis in welche Details hinein eine Stilisierung, d. h. eine freiwillige Selbstbeschränkung auf eine von mehreren semantisch gleichwertigen Ausdrucksformen,³ stattgefunden hat, belegen die beiden im folgenden betrachteten Phänomene, die – wie Inkonsistenzen innerhalb einzelner Texte sowie des gesamten Textmaterials zeigen – doch in ihrer (zumindest über einen gewissen Zeitraum) rigorosen Einhaltung fern der Sprachwirklichkeit sind.

¹ Textgrundlage für die Untersuchungen ist das in *CIL I*² publizierte epigraphische Material; nach den Einträgen in *CIL I*² richtet sich auch die angegebene Zählung der Texte. Wofern die Texte in der Edition von M. H. Crawford (Hrsg.), *Roman Statutes I* (BICS Suppl. 64), London 1996 berücksichtigt wurden, habe ich mich auf diese Edition gestützt. Die *Lex coloniae Genetivae Iuliae* zitiere auf der Grundlage der Edition in *CIL II*²/5, 1022, das *SC de Asclepiade Polystrato Menisco* nach der Edition in *CIL VI* 40890. Die übrigen Texte habe ich in der Textgestaltung in *CIL I*² untersucht.

² Zur juristischen Fachsprache vgl. weiterführend insbes. C. de Meo, *Lingue tecniche del latino*, Bologna 1986², dazu aber auch etwa die linguistischen Beobachtungen von D. Daube, *Forms of Roman Legislation*, Oxford 1956 und dems., *Roman Law. Linguistic, Social and Philosophical Aspects*, Edinburgh 1969.

³ Zum Stilbegriff allgemein vgl. neben M. Landfester, *Einführung in die Stilistik der griechischen und lateinischen Literatursprachen*, Darmstadt 1997 insbes. das 1. Kapitel ('Form and Content') von K. Dover, *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style*, Oxford 1997.

Der erste Aspekt, der von Interesse sein soll, betrifft die Struktur der Verbformen des passivischen Perfekts bzw. – im Falle der Deponentien – des aktivischen Perfekts. Diese Formen werden bekanntlich durch eine Periphrase bestehend aus Partizip Perfekt Passiv und dem Hilfsverb *esse* gebildet. Klassische Prosa weist eine Indifferenz gegenüber der Abfolge dieser beiden Konstituenten auf, wenn diese nicht im Rahmen einer Art Hyperbaton weiter voneinander getrennt positioniert sind, weil *esse* sich etwa an einen fokussierten *host* anlehnt.⁴ Entgegen der üblichen Meinung der Handbücher⁵ ist, wie an anderer Stelle gezeigt werden wird, auch die Sprache der republikanischen Inschriften durchaus nicht auf den Stellungstyp 'Partizip vor Hilfsverb *esse*' beschränkt, sondern zeigt beinahe die gesamte Bandbreite der aus der Literatur bekannten Stellungsmuster. Dies gilt jedoch nicht für die juristischen Texte (auf denen mir das Urteil der Handbücher im wesentlichen zu gründen scheint).

Daß Sätze, bei denen die Stellung von *esse* durch z. T. erhebliche 'Deplazierung'⁶ (d. h. räumliche Trennung vom Partizip) zur Fokussierung oder Topikalisierung genutzt wird, in den juristischen Texten nicht anzutreffen sind, verwundert kaum. Gesprochene und (aufgrund fehlender Möglichkeiten, durch Heben oder Senken der Stimme Akzente zu setzen beinahe mehr noch) prosaisch-literarische Sprache⁷ legen in der Regel auf Prägnanz und Eindeutigkeit des Ausdrucks sowie die Binnengliederung besonderes Gewicht. Dies liegt daran, daß sie – wenn nicht, gewissermaßen als Sonderfall, Vieldeutigkeit der Aussage intendiert ist⁸ – Spekulationen bezüglich der intendierten Aussage auszuschließen suchen bzw. eben umgekehrt die Aussage besonders deutlich und gelungen formuliert hervortreten zu lassen

⁴ Vgl. zur Stellung von *esse* grundlegend J. N. Adams, *Wackernagel's Law and the Placement of the Copula esse in Classical Latin* (PCPhS Suppl. 18), Cambridge 1994.

⁵ Vgl. etwa J. B. Hofmann – A. Szantyr, *Lat. Syntax und Stilistik*, München 1965, 405.

⁶ Ich möchte 'Deplazierung' hier und im folgenden ohne negative Konnotation, die dem deutschen Begriff anhaftet, verstanden wissen. Es geht mir allein darum, den Sachverhalt zu bezeichnen, daß etwas nicht an der Stelle steht, die dafür in unmarkierter Syntax vorgesehen ist. Daß dies sprachlich nicht fehlerhaft ist, wie die Bezeichnung als Deplazierung nahelegen könnte, steht außer Frage.

⁷ Dies gilt im Prinzip auch für 'gute' Poesie, d. h. Poesie, die von Autoren verfaßt ist, die über Verszwang und sprachliches Unvermögen erhaben sind.

⁸ Zu einem Spiel mit Mißverständlichkeit des Ausdrucks gerade durch eigentlich fokussierende Wortstellung vgl. P. Kruschwitz, "Ein Mißverständnis, seine Ursachen und seine Beseitigung. Zu Plaut. Curc. 314–316", *Hyperboreus* 6 (2000) 425–429.

wünschen. Es kommt hier also bei der Formulierung der Sätze ganz regelmäßig zur Rhematisierung eines bestimmten Themas. Eben dies gilt aber für juristische Texte nicht: Sie zeigen in der Regel⁹ Sätze, die in ihrem Bau einer unmarkierten Standardsyntax folgen, so daß selbst bei äußerst präziser Formulierung und Beschreibung einzelner Sachverhalte Spielraum für Auslegung bleibt: Aufgabe juristischer Interpretation ist es, den durch das Gesetz allgemein zur Verfügung gestellten Rahmen so zu reformulieren (also zu rhematisieren), daß er auf konkrete Fälle anzuwenden ist. Wäre durch die Wortstellung bereits ein Fokus oder ein Thema festgelegt, gäbe es keinen Spielraum für Ermessensfragen und Interpretation.

Dies erklärt jedoch nur, warum in Gesetzestexten die Formen von 'Deplazierung' etwa des Hilfsverbs *esse* nicht anzutreffen ist, obwohl sie in zeitgenössischer Prosa epigraphischer wie literarischer Natur manifest ist.¹⁰ Anders verhält es sich aber im Falle des hier zu betrachtenden Phänomens, der Abfolge der beiden Konstituenten der Passivperiphrase bei fehlender 'Deplazierung', denn wie eingangs festgestellt läßt sich prinzipiell kein semantischer Unterschied zwischen den beiden möglichen Abfolgen der Konstituenten konstatieren. Dennoch zeigen die Rechtsurkunden in diesem Fall, der in der literarischen Sprache indifferent zu sein scheint, keine Flexibilität, wie man dies erwarten sollte. Daß die Texte in diesem Punkt – allenfalls unterbrochen durch dazwischentretende Negation – zunächst, anders als zeitgenössische Inschriften und Literatur, ausschließlich die Abfolge 'Partizip vor Hilfsverb' zeigen, erachte ich als fachsprachliche Konvention, als Eingrenzung auf eine von zwei Alternativen – wobei die vorgezogene Alternative möglicherweise aufgrund des Voranstehens des semantisch relevanten Bestandteils des Verbalausdrucks als 'normaler' oder 'natürlicher'

⁹ Hiervon weicht jedoch die Initialposition solcher Syntagmen ab, die als Themenangabe für bestimmte Passagen, Abschnitte, Rubriken o. ä. fungieren. Vgl. E. Fraenkel, "Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus", *Hermes* 67 (1932) 369–396, 371 Anm. 2 (= *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* II, Rom 1964, 447–475, 449 Anm. 2): "Auf die rubrikartige Voranstellung des für die jeweilige Bestimmung zentralen Begriffs sei ein für allemal aufmerksam gemacht; die Inschrift weist mehrfach diesen in der gesamten Amts- und Gesetzessprache so gut wie in der technischen Rede verbreiteten Stellungstypus auf."

¹⁰ Abwegig schiene mir angesichts der vorgeschlagenen Erklärung ein Gedanke daran, daß die juristischen Texte einen 'Urzustand' der Syntax in konservativer Manier bewahren könnten. Sie zeigen m. E. lediglich eine Form von unmarkierter 'Normalstellung', die mit der dargestellten Absicht zu rechtfertigen ist.

empfunden worden sein mag. Belege für die beinahe allein vorherrschende Praxis anzuführen, erscheint mir müßig.

Die Beleglage für diese Form der Wortstellung ist so erdrückend, daß es zu Verwunderung führen muß, wenn in juristischen Inschrifttexten Abweichungen davon festzustellen sind. Es läßt sich nun eine Handvoll Stellen zusammentragen, die vom Standard abweichen. Der wohl früheste Beleg findet sich in der *Lex agraria* (111 v. Chr.):

- [1] 585, § 70 *[quod eius p]ecuniae adsignatum discriptum adsignatumve in tabuleis publiceis est eritv[e]*

Die auf alle drei Partizipien der Periphrase bezüglichen Hilfswörter *est eritv[e]* werden von diesen durch die Präpositionalphrase (PP) *in tabuleis publiceis*, die das zweite *adsignatum* im Gegensatz zum ersten spezifiziert, getrennt. Warum der Ausdruck nicht in der Form *inve tabuleis publiceis adsignatum* etc. angeschlossen wurde, ist nicht ohne weiteres ersichtlich, vielleicht ist am ehesten das Streben nach geschlossener Wortstellung dafür verantwortlich zu machen.

Wohl aus etwa derselben Zeit stammt ein *Fragmentum Tarentinum*, das zwei Belege für Trennung von Partizip und Hilfsverb bereithält:

- [2] 2924, 16 *tota scripta apud forum siet*
 [3] 2924, 24 *[prosc]ripta propositaque apud forum fuerit*

Wie im Falle der *Lex agraria* kommt es zur Trennung von Partizip und Hilfsverb durch eine PP, obwohl – wie in der *Lex agraria* – ansonsten weder grundsätzlich Trennung von Partizip und Hilfsverb noch Folgen der PP auf das 'regierende' Verbum (bzw., wie hier, auf dem semantisch relevanten Teil des Verbs) zu beobachten ist. Es handelt sich also um 'echte' Auffälligkeiten. Dennoch ist hier die Reihenfolge 'Partizip vor Hilfsverb' gewahrt. Erst etwa 50 Jahre später findet sich in *Leges* auch Abweichung von diesem Satzbauprinzip, zum einen in einem Tempelgesetz von Furfo, zum anderen in der *Lex Gabinia Calpurnia de Delo insula* (beide 58 v. Chr.):

- [4] 756, 11–12 *quae pecunia ad eas | res data erit, profana esto, quod d(olo) m(alo) non erit factum*

- [5] 2500, 5–7 *quom res publica pop[ulei Romanei deorum immortalium / opib]us ac consilieis sit aucta q[uomque in populum R(omanum) fides Athenens]ium cl]arissumae ceivitatis sit confirma[ta]*
- [6] 2500, 8–9 *in quo numero fanum A[pollinis in insula Delo anti]quissum]um ac religiosissimum sit constitutu[m]*
- [7] 2500, 17–18 *sedes Apollinis ac Dianae in antei]quom statum et / splendor]em sit resti]tu]ta*

Die Stellen fallen nicht nur aus dem allgemeinen sprachlichen Rahmen der Rechtstexte, sondern sind auch jeweils innerhalb ihres eigenen Kontexts exzeptionell oder (im Falle der *Lex Gabinia Calpurnia de Delo insula*) zumindest ebenso häufig vertreten wie der ansonsten konventionelle Stellungstypus.

Schließlich zum jüngsten und letzten Beleg; er stammt aus der *Lex de Gallia Cisalpina* (42 v. Chr.):

- [8] 592, II 33–34 *obligatumve se eius rei noxsiaeve esse confessus erit*

Die Syntax dieser Passage mit enklitischem *se* als Subjektsakkusativ der Infinitivkonstruktion ist durch die weite Sperrung von *obligatumve* und zugehörigem *esse* sehr auffällig. Vom Prinzip her scheint mir ein ähnlicher Fall wie bei den Textstellen 1–3 vorzuliegen: Bei dem mehrgliedrigen Prädikatsausdruck bilden die Bestandteile Partizip und Hilfsverb gewissermaßen die Klammer, innerhalb derer die übrigen Glieder angeordnet sind, um so eine Art geschlossene Wortstellung zu erreichen.

Es läßt sich zunächst folgendes festhalten: Obwohl es fachsprachliche Konvention der Rechtstexte zu sein scheint, daß bei den periphrastischen Formen des passivischen (resp. aktivischen) Perfekts (i) die Reihenfolge 'Partizip vor Hilfsverb' eingehalten wird und (ii) deren unmittelbares Aufeinander-Folgen allenfalls durch eine Negation unterbleibt, finden sich Ausnahmen von dieser Regel. Ein Abgehen von Bestandteil (ii) dieser Regel findet sich in wenigen Fällen (Belege 1–3 und 8), wobei diese allesamt damit zu erklären sein könnten, daß ein mehrgliedriges Prädikat in geschlossener Wortstellung erscheinen sollte. Ein Abgehen von Teil (i) dieser Regel findet sich ebenfalls nur spärlich (Belege 4–7), eine äußere Ursache für diesen Konventionsverstoß läßt sich nicht ausmachen. Während die Aus-

nahmen von Teil (ii) sich zeitlich nicht eingrenzen läßt, finden sich Ausnahmen von Teil (i) nur (bzw. erst) in Texten aus der Mitte des 1. Jh. v. Chr.

Nun gilt es, auch die zweite Beobachtung vorzustellen. Sie betrifft Relativsätze, die aus drei Konstituenten bestehen: Relativpronomen (RPron), Präpositionalphrase (PP) und einer Form von *esse*.

Relativsätze sind ein elementarer Bestandteil der Sprache römischer Rechtstexte, weil durch die durch Relativsätze mögliche verbale Umschreibung eines Nomens eine wesentlich exaktere Beschreibung von Personen, Orten, Sachverhalten usw. möglich ist – und spezialisierte Bedeutungen z. B. einzelner *nomina agentis* resp. *actionis* umgangen werden können.¹¹ Die hier vorzustellenden Fälle betreffen jedoch im wesentlichen Relativsätze zur Angabe lokaler oder temporaler Sachverhalte.

Prinzipiell sind im Lateinischen drei Kombination der drei Elemente RPron, PP und *esse* denkbar, da grundsätzlich RPron vor *esse* stehen muß, um die syntaktische Struktur eines Relativsatzes erkennbar und grammatisch werden zu lassen; es ergeben sich also die folgenden drei Kombinationsmöglichkeiten:

- (i) RPron – PP – *esse*.
- (ii) RPron – *esse* – PP.
- (iii) PP – RPron – *esse*.

Während Variante (iii) dazu dient, die PP durch Inversion des RPron und dadurch zustande kommende Initialposition zu fokussieren, ist zwischen (i) und (ii) schwerlich ein semantischer Unterschied auszumachen, das Rhema scheint in beiden Fällen dasselbe zu sein. Das bedeutet, daß die Bevorzugung einer der beiden Varianten mit Fug und Recht als eine stilistische Eigenheit aufgefaßt werden darf.

Wie bereits oben zum ersten Phänomen festgestellt, neigt die Sprache der juristischen Texte (mit der in Anm. 9 genannten Ausnahme) nicht dazu, Fokussierungen vorzunehmen. Dementsprechend ist es nicht verwunderlich, daß sich für den Stellungstyp (iii) kein einziger Beleg in den untersuchten Texten nachweisen läßt. Was nun aber die Verteilung der Belege für die Rubriken (i) und (ii) angeht, ergibt sich auf der Grundlage dessen, daß beide Varianten semantisch gleichwertig sind, ein auffälliger Befund. Die

¹¹ Vgl. dazu Daube, *Roman Law* (Anm. 2) 2 ff.

Gesetzestexte des 2. Jh. v. Chr. zeigen einheitlich die Bauweise nach Schema (i). Folgende Wendungen finden sich:

Lex repetundarum (122 v. Chr.):

- [9] 583, § 13 *queive in senatu siet fueri{n}t<v>e*
 [10] 583, § 13–14 *[queive trans / mar]e erit*¹²
 [11] 583, § 20 *queive in eodem conlegio siet*¹³
 [12] 583, § 37 *quei <in> eam rem erunt*

Lex agraria (111 v. Chr.):

- [13] 585, § 3 *quod non i/n eo agro loco est*
 [14] 585, § 3 *quei ager publicus populi Romanei in terra Italia P(ublio) Muucio L(ucio) Calpurnio co(n)s(ulibus) fuit*¹⁴
 [15] 585, § 5 *quod eius extra urbem Roma<m> est, quod eius in urbe{m} oppido vico est*
 [16] 585, § 11 *quei in terra Italia sunt*¹⁵
 [17] 585, § 21 *quei trans Curione est*
 [18] 585, § 28 *[quae viae publicae p]er terram Italiam P(ublio) Mucio L(ucio) Calpurnio co(n)s(ulibus) <f>uerint*
 [19] 585, § 29 *qu[ei in Ita]lia sunt*
 [20] 585, § 31 *quei in trientabule[is est]*
 [21] 585, § 48 *[q]uei ager locus in Africa est*¹⁶
 [22] 585, § 49 *quod eius agri locei extra terra Italia est*
 [23] 585, § 60 *[quei in Africa est]*¹⁷
 [24] 585, § 68 *quei ager in Africa est*¹⁸

¹² S. noch § 17. 23.

¹³ S. noch § 25.

¹⁴ S. noch § 4. 6. 11. 13. 19. 22. 27. 28. 33. Während ansonsten in dieser Inschrift die Relativsätze regelmäßig nach dem Schema *quae res ... ea res* gebaut sind, d. h. mit Nennung desjenigen Begriffs, an den sich der Relativsatz anbindet, in Relativ- und übergeordnetem Satz, finden sich abweichende Baumuster dieses speziellen Satzes in § 15. 29. 30. 35.

¹⁵ S. noch § 29–30.

¹⁶ S. noch § 51. 55. 65–66. 67. 75.

¹⁷ S. noch § 82.

¹⁸ S. noch § 69. 78. 89.

- [25] 585, § 79–80 *quei ager intra finis populorum leiber<o>rum Uticensium H[adrumentinorum T]ampsitanorum Leptitanorum Aui<l>itanorum Usalitanorum Teu<d>alensium, quam in ameicitiam p//opulei Romanei ⁷⁸⁰ [venerunt, fuit]*
- [26] 585, § 87 *[quaequomque] publica populi Romani in Africa sunt eruntve vectigalia*
- [27] 585, § 89 *quae vectigalia publica populi Romani in Africa sunt*
- [28] 585, § 89 *[quae viae publicae itinerave publica in eo] agro, antequam Cartago capta est, fuerunt*

Vom Übergang des 2. zum 1. Jh. v. Chr. (105 v. Chr., wengleich die Inschrift selbst nur als kaiserzeitliche Kopie erhalten ist) stammt eine *Lex parieti faciundo* aus Puteoli. Hier begegnen erstmalig Abweichungen von der Syntax des Schemas (i), die ich als standardisierte Syntax der Gesetzestexte bezeichnen möchte, jedoch sind diese – gebaut nach Schema (ii) – gleich stark vertreten wie die Standardsyntax. Den Formulierungen gemäß Schema (i)

- [29] 698, II 14 *quae in pariete propter eam aream sunt*
- [30] 698, III 2–3 *quae in campo sunt*

stehen folgende Wendungen gemäß Schema (ii) gegenüber:

- [31] 698, I 9 *qui est propter viam*
- [32] 698, II 15–16 *qui nunc est propter viam*

Der Befund spricht m. E. zum einen dafür, daß die Varianten (i) und (ii) tatsächlich semantisch gleichwertig sind (eine inhaltliche Begründung für die Entscheidung zugunsten der einen oder anderen Variante sehe ich jedenfalls nicht), zum anderen dafür, daß der Verfasser des Texts – vielleicht kein professioneller Jurist? – keine wie auch immer geartete Notwendigkeit sah, sich durchgängig auf eine Variante festzulegen. Die im Vergleich zu den zuvor behandelten Texten geringe Bedeutung des Gesetzes sowie die provinzielle Herkunft könnten als mögliche Ursachen für diese sprachliche 'Nachlässigkeit' veranschlagt werden.

Daß die in der *Lex repetundarum* und in der *Lex agraria* beobachtete Sprachregelung mit dem Beginn des 1. Jh. v. Chr. noch nicht allgemein, also

auch etwa bei gewichtigeren staatsrechtlichen Regelungen, außer Kraft gesetzt ist, zeigt – für die 1. Hälfte des 1. Jh. v. Chr. – ein Beleg aus der *Lex Antonia de Termessibus* (71 v. Chr.):

- [33] 589, I 12–14 *quei agrei quae loca aedificia publica preivatave / Thermensium Maiorum Pisidarum intra fineis | eorum sunt fueruntve L(ucio) Marcio Sex(to) Iulio co(n)s(ulibus)*¹⁹

Zwar könnte man einwenden, daß dieser vereinzelt Beleg nicht hinreichend aussagekräftig sei, jedoch scheint es mir signifikant, daß eben dieser einzelne Beleg in seiner Struktur der Standardsyntax (i) entspricht.

Fortschreitendes Abrücken von der starren Syntax dieses Satztypus läßt sich erst in caesarischer und nachcaesarischer Zeit beobachten, wie die Belege aus den drei abschließend zu behandelnden *Leges* dokumentieren. Noch weitestgehend der Standardsyntax entspricht der Befund in der *Lex Iulia municipalis* (45 v. Chr.):

- [34] 593, 20 *quae viae in urbem Rom(am) propiusve u(rbem) R(omam) p(assus) m(ille) ubei continente habitabitur sunt erunt*
- [35] 593, 27 *quae in ea partei erunt*
- [36] 593, 29 *quae via <int>er aedem sacram et aedificium locumve publicum et inter aedificium privatum est erit*
- [37] 593, 123–124 *quei adversus ea in municipio colonia praefectura{ve} foro conciliabulo <in senatu> decurionibus conscripteisve <fuerit> sententiamve dixerit*
- [38] 593, 142 *quae municipia coloniae praefecturae c(ivium) R(omano-rum) in Italia sunt erunt*

Zu diesen Belegen, insbes. als Kontrast zu Beleg 34, gesellt sich immerhin ein einzelner, der – mit doppelter PP – gleichzeitig Schema (i) und (ii) zu folgen scheint:

- [39] 593, 56 *quae viae in u(rbem) R(omam) sunt erunt intra ea loca ubi continenti hab<i>tab<i>tur*

¹⁹ Man vergleiche zur Syntax insbes. Text 14.

Ähnlich dem Befund der *Lex Iulia municipalis* verhält sich der der *Lex coloniae Genetivae Iuliae* (44 v. Chr.). Drei Belege folgen der Standardsyntax:

- [40] 594, col. 20, 9 *quicumque post coloniam deductam erunt*
 [41] 594, col. 20, 38–39 *qui in quoque eorum collegio | erunt*
 [42] 594, col. 38, 16–17 *quive pro quo imperio potestateve tûm | in col(onia)*
 Gen(etiva) erit

Diesen Wendungen steht ein einzelner nach Schema (ii) gegenüber, dessen Bauweise sicherlich damit zu begründen ist, daß die darin enthaltene PP durch einen weiteren Relativsatz erläutert wird:

- [43] 594, col. 23, 39–24, 1 *qui fluvi rivi fontes lacus aquae stagna paludes |*
 sunt in agro, qui colon(is) h[u]iusc(e) colon(iae)
 divisus || erit

Vollends beliebig scheint die Wortstellung dieser syntaktischen Einheit schließlich in der *Lex de Gallia Cisalpina* (42 v. Chr.) gehandhabt:

- [44] 592, II 3 *quae sunt eruntve in Gallia Cisalpeina*
 [45] 592, II 26 *quae sunt eruntve in Gallia cis Alpeis*

Dagegen gemäß der Standardsyntax:

- [46] 592, II 53–54 *quae in Gallia Cisalpeina sunt erunt*

Hinsichtlich des zweiten Phänomens, das vorgestellt wurde, läßt sich festhalten, daß eine Entwicklung hinsichtlich des Satzbaus zu erkennen ist: Ursprünglich zeigen die Gesetzestexte starr eine Abfolge RPron – PP – *esse*. Während eine weniger bedeutende und provinzielle Rechtsvorschrift wie die *Lex parieti faciundo* aus Puteoli bereits um 100 v. Chr. von der rigorosen Stilisierung abrückt, weisen die bedeutenderen Rechtstexte erst nach und nach im Verlaufe des 1. Jh. v. Chr. Abweichungen davon auf, die sich jedoch zunächst noch auf Sonderfälle (doppelte PP, Erläuterung der PP durch einen Relativsatz) beschränken. Erst in der *Lex de Gallia Cisalpina* (42 v. Chr.) ist zu erkennen, daß die Konvention vollends aufgegeben bzw.

außer Acht gelassen wurde.

Die beiden besprochenen syntaktisch-stilistischen Phänomene belegen exemplarisch m. E. hinreichend, daß sich die Sprache der römischen Rechtstexte im Laufe des 1. Jh. v. Chr. von ursprünglich selbst auferlegten Restriktionen befreit hat, die in ihrer starren Handhabung fern der Sprachwirklichkeit lagen. Die Ursachen, die im einzelnen dazu geführt haben mögen, solche Restriktionen zu lockern, sind schwer auszumachen. Denkbar erschiene etwa, daß z. B. die Geschwindigkeit, mit der aufgrund der Eroberungen während der ausgehenden Republik immer neue Stadtgesetze verfaßt werden mußten, für eine gewisse Nachlässigkeit verantwortlich zu machen ist. Ebenso ließe sich aber auch etwa mutmaßen, daß die Sprache einer 'neuen Generation' von Juristen, die auf solcherlei Stilistica keinen gesteigerten Wert mehr legte, diese daher nicht weiter beherzigte, zumal sie inhaltlich funktionslos waren. Was aber letztlich tatsächlich Ursache für den Wandel gewesen ist, bleibt ungewiß.

*Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften
Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*

**DIE DENDROPHOREN AUS NIDA
UND KAISERVEREHRUNG VON KULTVEREINEN
IM NORDWESTEN DES IMPERIUM ROMANUM***

UTA-MARIA LIERTZ

Im Zusammenhang mit den Forschungen zum Kaiserkult in den germanischen Provinzen und der Gallia Belgica fiel mir auf, dass an zwei Stellen der Superior, die sonst nichts mit einander zu tun hatten, *dendrophori Augustales* auftraten. Eine dieser Inschriften ist besonders interessant wegen ihrer Kombination von verschiedenartigen Elementen der Kaiserverehrung mit einem starken Vereinsbewusstsein. Es handelt sich um die Inschrift BRGK 58 (1977) 104: *Salu[ti] Aug(ustae) / dendrophori Aug(ustales) / consistentes Med(---) / it(em)q(ue) Nidae sc(h)olam / de suo fecerunt / loc(o) adsig(nato) a vic(anis) Nid(ensibus)*.

Sie wurde 1961 in Heddernheim in einem rechteckigen Kellerraum gefunden, der aufgrund eben dieser Inschrift als die in ihr genannte *schola* der Dendrophoren identifiziert wurde, und stammt, wie aus gemeinsam damit gefundenen kleineren Stücken hervorgeht, aus der Wende vom 2. zum 3. Jh.¹ Sowohl der Vereinscharakter als auch der Kaiserbezug sind in der Inschrift doppelt bezeugt: Der Verein nennt sich nicht nur selbst, sondern spricht von seiner *schola* und unterstreicht, dass diese öffentlich ratifiziert ist, indem nämlich der Platz von der Dorfversammlung zugewiesen worden ist. Die Kaiserverehrung wiederum wird durch das doppelte Epithet,² einmal bei der verehrten Gottheit und auch beim Vereinsnamen ausgedrückt. Ob

* Dieser Artikel ist im Rahmen des Forschungsprojektes "Interaction between the Greek and Roman World in Antiquity" der Akademie von Finnland entstanden.

¹ E. Schwertheim, *Die Denkmäler orientalischer Gottheiten im römischen Deutschland* (EPRO 40), 1974, S. 90 ff., Nr. 68. M. Vermaseren, *CCCA VI*, 52 spricht von der Mitte des 2. Jh.

² Zur Funktion des Epithets in dieser und anderen Inschriften in diesem Bereich vgl. U.-M. Liertz, *Kult und Kaiser* (AIRF XX), 1998, bes. 163–188.

Salus hier als Bezeichnung für Kybele oder eine andere Gottheit zu verstehen ist, soll an dieser Stelle nicht weiter erörtert werden. Interessant ist vielmehr die Frage, ob es einen regelrechten Zusammenhang zwischen Kultvereinen und Kaiserverehrung gibt und, wenn ja, wie er sich ausdrückt, ob also Kaiserkult außer auf persönlich-individueller und auf administrativer Ebene auch den nicht unmittelbar betroffenen Bereich des freien gesellschaftlichen Lebens durchdringen konnte. Dies ist insofern von Bedeutung, als ja Kultvereine per definitionem sich zur Verehrung einer bestimmten Gottheit zusammengefunden haben, auch wenn natürlich das Vereinsleben als solches ebenso andere soziale Bedürfnisse befriedigt. Dennoch scheint der Kaiser nicht nur legale Fragen regulierend, im Vereinswesen präsent zu sein sondern sozusagen auf Götterseite teilnehmend.

Zunächst sollten wir uns einen Überblick darüber verschaffen, welche Kultvereine in den germanischen Provinzen und der Belgica, die den folgenden Untersuchungen zugrunde gelegt sind, überhaupt auftreten, um dann die eigentlich zur Debatte stehenden Fragen näher zu betrachten. Dabei müssen sowohl soziale Strukturen als auch eventuelle geographische Tendenzen in Betracht gezogen werden.³ Schließlich bleibt, nach den Implikationen und Konsequenzen für Kaiserkult einerseits und für die spezifischen Kulte der jeweiligen Vereine zu fragen.

Ausschließen aus der Betrachtung können wir in gewisser Weise die Sevirkollegien, deren Hauptzweck ja gerade der Kaiserkult war. Dennoch mag es dienlich sein zu sehen, wie sich ihr Kaiserkult außer im Namen des Vereins in den Inschriften sonst ausdrückt. Und – erstaunlich oder nicht – er drückt sich nur selten aus, obwohl in unserem Untersuchungsgebiet, den germanischen Provinzen und der Gallia Belgica Sevirkollegien für fast alle *civitates* belegt sind.⁴ Dies liegt unter anderem freilich daran, dass ein Großteil der Inschriften, nämlich 24 Grabsteine bzw. Ehreninschriften sind, aber auch in den 18 Weihungen liegt nur in 8 Fällen ein gewisser Kaiserbezug vor, und zwar durch die Formel *in h(onorem d(omus) d(ivinae)*⁵ in *CIL XIII*

³ Nicht ergiebig ist der Versuch, zeitliche Tendenzen zu suchen, da sowohl die geringe Inschriftenzahl als auch die epigraphischen Gewohnheiten in diesem Bereich leicht zu einem verzerrten Bild führen können.

⁴ Vgl. ausführlich Liertz (Anm. 2) mit einer Liste der Inschriften, 216.

⁵ A.a.O. 151 ff. Vgl. allgemein auch M.-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier, *Diis deabusque sacrum. Formulaire votif et datation dans les Trois Gaules et les Deux Germanies – Gallia*

4325, 4192, 6366, 8499, durch eine Weihung *pro salute Imperatoris*⁶ u.ä. in *CIL* XIII 5026, 5042 und durch das Epithet *Augustus/a* beim Götternamen⁷ in *CIL* XIII 5174 und 5260. Weihungen an den *genius* des Kaisers oder sein *numen* treten nicht auf. Es handelt sich also insgesamt eher um eine indirekte Verehrung, eigentliches Kultobjekt auch der *Seviri Augustales* in unseren Provinzen sind außer Jupiter vor allem lokale und regionale Götter und Götterpaare.⁸ Der Bezug zum Kaiserkult drückt sich im Titel des Kollegiums aus und definiert eher die Kaiserfeste des Kalenders als Anlässe zur Kultausübung und zum Feiern, als dass eine besondere "persönlich-religiöse" Beziehung zum Kaiserhaus bestehe.

In diesen Provinzen sind keine *Augustales*-Kollegien ohne den Zusatz *sevir* belegt, vielmehr scheint das Umgekehrte der Fall zu sein: Alle *Sevir*-kollegien bezeichnen sich als *seviri Augustales*. Damit kann es sich auch bei unseren *dendrophori* nicht um die Mitgliedschaft in zwei unterschiedlichen Kollegien handeln. Es scheint also eine bewusste Annahme dieses Epithets vorzuliegen und somit eine ganz eigene Form der Kaiserverehrung sich entwickelt zu haben. Auf diese Frage kommen wir unten eingehender zurück. Zunächst nun zu den Kultvereinen.

Wenn wir von Kultvereinen sprechen, meinen wir Kultvereine im engeren Sinne, also solche, deren primäres Ziel die Verehrung eines bestimmten Gottes oder Götterkomplexes und seine Förderung ist, auch wenn dies, wie Nilsson sagt,⁹ "sehr oft nur die äußere Einkleidung eines anders gearteten Zweckes" sein sollte. Andererseits ist selbstverständlich ein Verein welcher Art auch immer ohne eine religiöse Basis in der antiken Welt nicht denkbar.¹⁰ So weihen natürlich z.B. das *collegium fabrorum*

Romana I, Paris 1993.

⁶ Liertz (Anm. 2), 158 ff. Vgl. Raepsaet-Charlier a.a.O.

⁷ Liertz a.a.O. allgemein 163 f., speziell zu *Mercurius Augustus* 173 ff.

⁸ IOM und Iuno 2x, IOM und Matronae 1x, Mercurius und Rosmerta 2x, Mercurius Aug. 2x, Nehalennia 2x, Aventia 1x, Varneno 1x, Silvanus 1x, Sol Genius Luna 1x, Diana 1x, Fortuna 1x.

⁹ M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* 2, 1961², 117.

¹⁰ Vgl. in neuerer Zeit die eingehenden Untersuchungen von O. M. Van Nijf, *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*, Amsterdam 1997, sowie F. M. Ausbüttel, *Untersuchungen zu den Vereinen im Westen des Römischen Reiches* (Frankfurter Althistorische Studien 11), 1982.

dolabrariorum aus Trier u.a. dem einheimischen *deus Intarabus*¹¹ und die Moselschiffer ihrem *genius*,¹² Domitius Condollus in Marbach am Limes für das *collegium iuventutis peregrinorum* eine Victoria-Statue¹³ und zwei *liberti* für die *medici et professores*¹⁴ aus Avenches einem Sammelsurium von Gottheiten – diese Liste könnte beliebig fortgesetzt werden.

Zu Kultvereinen sind dagegen die normalerweise als orientalisch eingestuften *dendrophori* und *hastiferi* zu rechnen. Die oben bereits erwähnten *dendrophori* als Kultgemeinde der Magna Mater mit spezifischen Funktionen in ihrem Kult sind in unseren Provinzen außer in der Heddernheim-Inschrift auch in Amsoldingen, was zur *civitas Helvetiorum* gehört, belegt. Die Inschrift, *CIL XIII 5153*, sieht folgendermaßen aus: *D(is) M(anibus) / Severi Com/mendati den/[d]rophor(i) Aug(ustalis) A/sinula coniu(x) / f(aciendum) c(uravit)*. Auch hier vermutlich ein *dendrophorus Augustalis*, allerdings bietet sie als Grabinschrift für eine einzelne Person keinen Beleg dafür, ob das *Augustalis* zur Bezeichnung des gesamten Dendrophoren-Kollegiums in dieser Gemeinde gehörte oder ob es sich um eine persönliche Äußerung handelt. Ersteres ist freilich wahrscheinlicher, da die Bezeichnung Titel-ähnlichen Charakter hat und entsprechende Funktion zu erfüllen scheint.¹⁵ Klar ist jedenfalls, dass es keine zwei verschiedenen Mitgliedschaften in unterschiedlichen Kollegien sind, weil in der *civitas* ein wohl funktionierendes *Sevir Augustalis*-Kollegium breit belegt ist.¹⁶ Obwohl der Magna Mater-Kult in diesen Provinzen und speziell auch in der *Germania Superior*, aus deren geographischen Extremen beide Inschriften stammen, mit 16 (*Belgica 1* und *Germania Inferior 7*) Inschriften und einer Reihe archäologischer Fundstücke¹⁷ breit belegt ist, sind dies die einzigen

¹¹ *CIL XIII 11313 = ILS 9418 = CSIR Dtl. IV 3, 179*, s. auch Liertz (Anm. 2), 130.

¹² *BRGK 58 (1977) 1*. Vgl. dazu A. Büttner, "Eine Bronzeprora aus der Mosel bei Trier", *TZ 27 (1964) 139–147* und dies. "Eine Prora aus der Mosel bei Trier", *Germania 42 (1964) 66–72*. Vgl. auch Liertz (Anm. 2), 129 f.

¹³ *CIL XIII 6453*.

¹⁴ *CIL XIII 5079 = ILS 7786 = Musée Romain d'Avenches, 1996, Les inscriptions Nr. 4*.

¹⁵ Als Titel ist *dendrophorus Aug(ustalis)* auch in der *Lugdunensis* belegt: *CIL XIII 1961* und *2026*.

¹⁶ Vgl. Liertz (Anm. 2), 43 ff.

¹⁷ Leicht zugänglich für den deutschen Bereich bei Schwertheim, *Denkmäler*, 1974 und Vermaseren, *CCCA VI*, 1989. Inschriftlich in der *Belgica CIL XIII 11352*, in *Germania Inferior CIL XIII 7865, 8193, 8249, 8513, BRGK 40 (1959) 238; BRGK 17 (1927) 363*, in *Germania Superior CIL XIII 5358, 5451, 6292, 6385, 6443, 6664, 7400, 7458, 7531*,

Zeugnisse für traditionelle Kultvereine, und gleichzeitig enthalten beide im Vereinsnamen das Augustalis-Epithet und darin einen gewissen Kaiserkultbezug. Einen solchen findet man auch in der *pro salute*-Formel der folgenden Inschrift, in der man außerdem möglicherweise einen weiteren Magna-Mater-Kultverein sehen könnte. Die Inschrift *CIL XIII 7865 = CCCA VI, 35* aus Pier (Altenburg/ bei Düren) stammt aus dem militärischen Bereich in der Inferior: *Pro salut[e] / Imperator[is] / Augusti M[a]ter(!) Magnae / consacrani / l(ibentes) m(erito)*. Die Bezeichnung *consacrani* kann allerdings auch nur zufällig, also nicht im Sinne von einem festen Zusammenschluss, wie es ein Verein ja nun ist, aufgefasst werden.¹⁸ In ähnlichem Kontext wie hier tritt sie mehrmals in Aquitanien auf.¹⁹

Als verwandt oder doch sehr nahe sind die Kollegien der *hastiferi* anzusehen, die sich im Kreise des Bellona-Kultes bewegen, der aber wiederum nicht sehr deutlich vom Magna Mater-Kult unterschieden zu sein scheint und nach Fishwick²⁰ immer mehr in diesen mit einbezogen wird. Auch hierfür liegen vier Zeugnisse vor, von denen drei dasselbe Kollegium betreffen.

CIL XIII 7281 aus Wiesbaden:

In h(onorem) d(omus) d(ivinae) deae Virtuti Bello/n(a)e montem Vaticanum / vetustate conlabsum / restituerunt hastiferi ci/vitatis Mattiacorum X Kal(endas) / Sep(tembres) Imp(eratore) [[d(omino) n(ostro) Maximin[o] Au[g(usto)]]] / et Africano co(n)s(ulibus) hi quorum no/mina i(nfra) s(crip)ta sunt: / G(aius) Meddignatius Severus cur(ator) bis, / L(ucius) Levinius Qu(i)etus, / T(itus) Vitalinius Peregrinus, / Co(n)stantius Marcianus, / Crixsius Adnamatus, / Giamillius Crescens, / Titius Belatullus, / Iulius Severus, / I[---]cnius Co(n)sta(n)s, / [S]a[---]atius Victor, // Tertinius Abrosus, / Marcri-

11606, *BRGK* 27 (1937) 75; *BRGK* 27 (1937) 78; *BRGK* 40 (1959) 156; *BRGK* 40 (1959) 157. Die meisten der Inschriften ebenfalls bei Vermaseren und Schwertheim.

¹⁸ Der *ThLL* IV 378 gibt als Erklärung für *consecran(e)us* nur: *i. q. iisdem sacris initiatus*. Van Nijf (Anm. 10), 10, weist jedoch darauf hin, dass die präzise Terminologie für die Vereinsmitglieder nicht Priorität besaß und daher verschiedene Varianten nebeneinander ohne inhaltliche Unterschiede auftreten konnten. Daher ist die Möglichkeit, dass es sich um einen Verein handelt, nicht ganz auszuschließen.

¹⁹ *CIL XIII* 147, 397 und 1561 als gemeinsame Verehrer verschiedener – überwiegend einheimischer Gottheiten.

²⁰ "Hastiferi", *JRS* 57 (1967) 142–160, bes. 153 ff.

nius(!) Perpetu(u)s, / Atreptius(!) Cupitianus, / Perrius Iustinus r<e>tor(?), / Attonius Asclepius, / Ursius Maturus, / Statutius Secundinus, / Servandius Senurus.

CIL XIII 7317 aus Mainz-Kastell:

[I]n h(onorem) d(omus) d(ivinae) / n[u]min(i) Aug(usto) / hastiferi{i} / sive pastor(es) / consistent/es kastello / Mattiacorum / [d]e suo posue/[r]unt VIII Kal(endas) / Apriles / [I]uliano et Crispino co(n)s(ulibus).

CIL XIII 7250 Mainz-Oberolm:

[v]icanis h[astif]e/ris castelli Mat/tiacorum Aur(elius) / Candidus corni/cularius Mat(t)i(a)c(o)/rum Gordianor(um) / al(l)ectus inter [i]p[sos].

Die vierte schließlich, *CIL XIII 8184*, ist sehr wortkarg und stammt aus Köln: *Genio / hastiferum*. Schon hier sei festgehalten, dass, während die kleine Kölner Weihung auf einem Statuettensockel und die Mainzer Ehrung des Kollegiums aus Dankbarkeit – schon aus ihrem Anlass her verständlicherweise – keine Kaiserverehrungselemente aufweisen, das *hastiferi*-Kollegium²¹ der Mattiaker doch wohl ganz bewusst als solches Bezug auf den Kaiser nahm: In beiden Inschriften wird die *In h.d.d.*-Formel vorangestellt, in der zweiten aber außerdem eine Weihung an das *numen Augusti*,²² gewissermassen die reinste Form von Kaiserkult, vorgenommen und zwar am 24. März 224, einem der Hauptfesttage der Magna Mater.

Als weiteres Kollegium – zumindest Waltzing spricht von "collèges de Mithra",²³ auch wenn der Begriff als solcher nicht eindeutig überliefert²⁴

²¹ Auf die vielfach diskutierte Frage nach der Bedeutung von *pastores* wird hier nicht eingegangen, da sie zum einen in diesem Zusammenhang nicht von Bedeutung ist und offensichtlich auch von den Weihenden selbst als ein sich weitgehend mit *hastiferi* überschneidender Begriff angesehen wurde, wie *sive* einerseits und das Fehlen in den anderen beiden Inschriften andererseits ausdrückt. Eingehend sind die Möglichkeiten der Interpretation behandelt im "Appendix: *Hastiferi sive pastores*" bei Fishwick, a.a.O. 158–60.

²² In den hier untersuchten Provinzen liegen in der Superior 10, in der Belgica 19 *numen*-Weihungen vor. Eine Aufstellungen der Inschriften und Einzelheiten in Liertz (Anm. 2), 218 und 125 ff.

²³ Z.B. *Études historique sur les corporation professionnelles chez les romains* IV, 195 f.

ist, könnte man die Kultgemeinden um den Mithraskult in Betracht ziehen. Diese zwar wohl nicht geheimen, aber doch nur Eingeweihten zugänglichen Gemeinden, sind ihrem Charakter als Mysterienkult entsprechenden nicht als solche aufgetreten, zumindest haben sie nicht als Verein Inschriften errichtet. Selbstverständlich haben aber einzelne Mithrasverehrer und Mysten viele Zeugnisse inschriftlicher Art hinterlassen, in denen sich auch verschiedene Aspekte der Kaiserverehrung feststellen lassen, vor allem in den formelhaften Wendungen *in honorem domus divinae* und *pro salute Imperatoris*.²⁵ Auch die bewusste Zuwendung einiger Kaiser zum Mithras-Sol-Kultkomplex fügt dem das Seinige hinzu. Die starke Verankerung des Kultes im militärischen Bereich und die damit verbundene Herausnahme aus dem Kontext des alltäglichen Lebens in der Provinz stellt dies allerdings etwas außerhalb des hier zu behandelnden Zusammenhangs.

Nach spezifischen Kultvereinen der Verehrung traditioneller römischer Götter sucht man eigentlich vergebens, da ihr Kult, von den entsprechenden Priestern oder Priesterschaften gepflegt, wohl so allgemein verbreitet war, dass eine Vereinsbildung von Seiten einfacher Verehrer eher selten ist und möglicherweise als überflüssig empfunden wurde. In einem zudem recht schwach mit Inschriften bestückten Gebiet sinkt die Wahrscheinlichkeit Spuren zu finden noch mehr. Außerdem wurde ja die Vereinsbildung von offizieller Seite her stark überwacht.²⁶ Ob die recht häufig belegten *collegia iuventutis* als Kultvereine der *dea Iuventus* anzusehen sind, wie beispielsweise D. Ladage²⁷ nahezu legen scheint, dürfte wohl fraglich sein. M. Jaczynowska, die sich eingehend mit diesen Kollegien auseinandergesetzt hat, kommt zu dem Schluss, dass die Quellen erlauben, gewisse Verbindungslinien zwischen der Entwicklung des Iuventus-Kultes

²⁴ Vermaseren bemerkt zu der stadtrömischen Inschrift *CIMRM* 331, in der als einziger überhaupt (...) *collegio sanctissimo* (...) erscheint, "This inscription may refer to a Mithras-community" (Unterstreichung von mir).

²⁵ Eingehend behandelt und belegt sind diese Aspekte in Liertz (Anm. 2), 181 ff., in *h.d.d.* 15x eine Zusammenstellung a.a.O. Anm. 109; bezügl. der *pro salute*-Formel stellt M. Clauss, "Sol Invictus Mithras", *Athenaeum* 68 (1990) 423–450 eine Liste von 34 Mithras-Weihungen zusammen, hinzu kommt Vermaseren, *CIMRM* 1223.

²⁶ Schon Waltzing, *Etudes historique* I, 114 ff. behandelt die entsprechende Gesetzgebung und ihre Anwendung ausführlich. S. 118 Beispiele für Dendrophoren. Vgl. auch Ausbüttel (Anm. 10), 14.

²⁷ D. Ladage, "Collegia iuvenum – Ausbildung einer municipalen Elite?", *Chiron* 9 (1979) 319–346, insbes. 339 ff.

und der *collegia iuventutis* herzustellen, die in der Kaiserzeit – wohl auch mit Blick auf ein dynastisches Denken (man erinnere sich an den *princeps iuventutis*) eine Wiederbelebung erfahren habe.²⁸ In den *collegia iuventutis* ist also sicher kein reines Kultkollegium zu sehen, auch wenn, wie bereits oben erwähnt, natürlich eine Kulttätigkeit selbstverständlich zum Tätigkeitskreis gehört. Ebenso lässt sich Kaiserverehrung in diesem Zusammenhang in ihren verschiedenen Formen nachweisen.²⁹ Bisweilen wurden auch zwei Weihungen eines *collegium convenarum*³⁰ in Öhringen aus dem Jahr 232 n. Chr. als Zeugnis für einen Kultverein der Diana und des Hercules angesehen auf gleicher Ebene wie etwa die *cultores Dianae et Antinoi* aus Lanuvium.³¹ Da jedoch jeder Verein Götterweihungen vornahm und eventuell in Stein verewigte, ist dies wohl kaum hinreichend, einen Kultverein im eigentlichen Sinne aus den *convenae* zu machen. Vielmehr wird das Wort hier eher synonym zu *peregrini* gebraucht und fügt sich somit in die Reihe der *collegia peregrinorum* wie etwa das des Nachbarortes Marbach³² ein.

Sofern überhaupt in der für uns gewohnten römischen Inschriftentradition fassbar, ist als letzter möglicher Kultvereinbereich der um die

²⁸ M Jazcynowska, "Le culte de la déesse Iuventas et les associations de la jeunesse romaine", in: *Actes du VIIe congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine*, Bukarest 1979, 384 f.

²⁹ Z.B. *CIL* XIII 6549, Öhringen: *[pro] sa[l]u[t(e)] im[p(eratoris) Sev]eri colle/[giu]m iuvent/[ut]i(s) devotissi/[m]i numini eiu/[s] ...* am 1.11.222 n. Chr., zu Einzelheiten vgl. Liertz (Anm. 2), 139. Die Lokalisierung der Inschrift am Limes und ihre Formulierung zeigen im übrigen den oft mit den *collegia iuventutis* assoziierten praemilitärischen Charakter, vgl. z.B. *KIP* 3, 28 Stichwort "iuvenes".

³⁰ *BRGK* 58 (1977) 40 = *AE* 1978, 522 und *BRGK* 58 (1977) 41 = *AE* 1978, 523. Der Text lautet – abgesehen vom Namen des Gottes: *In h(onorem) d(omus) d(ivinae) / deo Her/culi col/legium / convena/rum Lupo / et Maximo / co(n)s(ulibus) Id(ibus) Dec(embribus)* (40), in 41: *deae Dianae. ThLL* IV 820 zu *convena* noch stärker "speciatim de peregrinis, adventiciis casu, non per ius et leges, congregatis".

³¹ *CIL* XIV 2112 et al.; dieses *collegium* benutzt gleichwertig die Begriffe *cultores*, *collegium* und *corpus*. Vgl. Ausbüttel (Anm. 10), 19. Das *collegium convenarum* als Kult- und gleichzeitig Berufsverein z.B. in *Die Römer in Baden-Württemberg*, hg. von Ph. Filtzinger – D. Planck – B. Cämmerer, Stuttgart 1976, 440, oder noch spezifischer im Salzhandel, in: *Der Limes in Südwestdeutschland*, hg. von W. Beck – D. Planck, Stuttgart 1980, 65 f.

³² *CIL* XIII 6453 und 6451. Herz, *Untersuchungen zum Festkalender der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Diss. Mainz, 1975, 308, versteht das *coll. convenarum* als einen Verein von Händlern im Grenzhandel.

einheimischen Götter in Betracht zu ziehen. Seit Rügers Forschungen zu den Matronenbeinamen³³ könnte man in gewissem Sinne die niedergermanischen *curiae* als Kultverein ansehen. Rüger spricht von einer Doppelfunktion als einerseits "religiöse Vereinigungen, wohl Männerbünde, die mit dem Kult der mythischen Eltern verbunden sind".³⁴ Die zweite sei in der sozialen Funktion als Sippenverband bzw. als personales Äquivalent zum *pagus* zu sehen. Zudem haben sich auch Versammlungslokale – die Parallele zu der *schola* der *hastiferi* ist nicht zu übersehen – nachweisen lassen,³⁵ aber die Forschungsergebnisse stehen in der üblichen niedergermanischen Inschriftenkargheit auf wackeligen Beinen. Kultpersonal wie bei den römischen oder auch Vereinsvorsteher wie bei einigen der orientalischen Vereine lassen sich ebenfalls nicht fassen.³⁶ Ebenso scheinen zwei der Inschriften mögliche Bauinschriften³⁷ von *curiae* zu sein, und somit auch keine direkten Bezüge der *curiae* zur Kaiserverehrung. In den hunderten von Matroneninschriften in Niedergermanien,³⁸ die auf persönliche Initiative hin errichtet wurden, spiegelt sich aber auch dieser Aspekt der Beziehung zum römischen Staat und seinem Garantem, dem Kaiser, in den üblichen römischen Formen wieder, also in der vorangestellten Formel *in honorem domus divinae* (z.B. Galsterer, *ES* 12 [1981] Nr. 3) und *pro salute Imperatoris* und seine Varianten (z.B. *CIL* XIII 8492, 11984).

Als Ergebnis der Bestandsaufnahme kommen wir also zu dem Schluss, dass Kaiserverehrung durch Kultvereine als solche eigentlich nur beim Magna-Mater- und Bellona-Kult fassbar ist, während sowohl römische als auch einheimische Götter von Individuen, die zwar Teil einer Kultgemeinde sind, aber deren Gemeinde nicht als solche öffentlich dem Kaiser

³³ Rüger, "Gallisch-germanische Kurien", *ES* 9 (1972) 251–260.

³⁴ A.a.O. 260.

³⁵ Vgl. Rüger, "Beobachtungen zu den epigraphischen Belegen der Muttergottheiten", Beihefte der *BJ* 44 (1987) 18f.

³⁶ Zum Kultpersonal a.a.O. 21; ein *praefectus dendrophorum* z.B. *CIL* XIV 2634, ein *patronus trium collegium*, welches die Dendrophoren einschließt in *CIL* XI 5749.

³⁷ Rüger (Anm. 33), 258 interpretiert sie als solche und verweist auf die Parallele in *CIL* XIII 3632.

³⁸ B. H. Stolte, "Religiöse Verhältnisse in Niedergermanien", *ANRW* II 18,1 (1986) 642 spricht von mehr als 1100 Matres/Matronae-Inschriften. Ein zweiter Bereich mit einer großen Anzahl von Matroneninschriften, allerdings im Gegensatz zu Niedergermanien praktisch ohne Beinamen findet sich in Norditalien. Dazu eingehend Rüger (Anm. 35), 4–6.

wie auch der spezifischen Vereinsgottheit huldigt, zu Adressaten von Weihungen mit oder ohne Elementen der Kaiserverehrung werden. Weiteren Aufschluss für unsere Fragestellung kann uns die Betrachtung der sozialen Strukturen wie auch der geographischen Verteilung geben.³⁹

Beides ist sehr genau umgrenzt im Fall der Matronen-Kurien. Wenn es sich nämlich tatsächlich um religiös motivierte Sippenverbände handelt, ist die regionale Begrenzung auf das Gebiet der Ubier und die soziale Vielfalt innerhalb der Sippen keine Frage. Außer den Besonderheiten um den Bonner Aufanienkult, der bis in die höchsten Rangklassen des römischen Militärs Wiederhall findet, sind auf dem Land römische Bürger aber eines "sprachlich, ethnisch, familiär, sozial wie religiös indigenen Substrates", wie Rüger es ausdrückt⁴⁰ die Weihenden, allerdings wie gesagt als Individuen.

Geographisch auf einen engen Raum konzentriert sind die orientalischen Kollegien: Sowohl die *hastiferi* als auch die *dendrophori* scheinen östlich des Rheines in nächster Nähe von Mainz eine besondere Anziehungskraft zu genießen und zwar die *hastiferi* in der Hauptsiedlung der Mattiaker und die *dendrophori* noch weiter nordöstlich in Nida. Dass dies aber möglicherweise dem Zufall der Überlieferung zuzuschreiben ist, wird in beiden Fällen durch die jeweils weitere Inschrift bestätigt, nämlich die des *hastiferi*-Kollegium in Köln⁴¹ und die des Dendrophoren bei den Helvetiern.⁴² Was lässt sich nun zur sozialen Einordnung sagen?

Bei den *hastiferi* zeugen zwei der Inschriften, *CIL* XIII 7317 und 8184, zumindest von einer Vereinskasse und deren Gebrauch für gemeinsame Aktionen, in diesen Fällen Errichtung der Votivinschriftenplatte bzw. der Statuette. Etwas deutlicher wird der soziale Rahmen des Wiesbadener

³⁹ Die vielzähligen Mithrasverehrer entlang der Grenze des römischen Reiches werden hier nicht mehr in diese Betrachtung aufgenommen, da sie nicht als Verein im üblichen Sinne angesehen werden können und auch nicht als solcher Weihungen errichten. Es sei jedoch angemerkt, dass bei ihnen gerade die soziale Vielfalt eines der Hauptcharakteristika ausmacht. Auch das *collegium convenarum* wird wegen der Unwahrscheinlichkeit seines Kultvereincharakters nicht mit betrachtet.

⁴⁰ Rüger (Anm. 35), 25. Zum Aufanienkult und seinem Hintergrund ebenda 22 ff.

⁴¹ *CIL* XIII 8184.

⁴² *CIL* XIII 5153. Die Inschrift der *consacrani*, *CIL* XIII 7865, wird aus den weiter oben beschriebenen Gründen nicht weiter berücksichtigt. Es sei hier jedoch angemerkt, dass der grammatische Fehler (*Mater* statt *Matri*) auf ein eher bescheidenes soziales Niveau hinzuweisen scheint.

Kollegiums in den anderen beiden Inschriften: *CIL XIII 7281* gibt nicht nur Auskunft über die Restauration des "mons Vaticanus" – die Bedeutung dieses Begriffs ist noch weithin unklar, es scheint sich jedenfalls um ein Gebilde im Zusammenhang mit dem Bellona-Kult zu handeln⁴³ – sondern fügt eine Liste der beteiligten *hastiferi* hinzu. Die 18 Personennamen sind fast ausschließlich indigenes Namensgut.⁴⁴ In *CIL XIII 7250* ehrt der *cornicularius* Aurelius Candidus auf Grund seiner *adlectio* in das Kollegium⁴⁵ dieses und gibt damit gleichzeitig Auskunft u.a. über die Tätigkeit desselben. Es ist anzunehmen, dass das Kollegium keinesfalls Mitglieder aus sozial weniger angesehenen Ständen rekrutieren würde, sondern sich vielmehr auf der eigenen gesellschaftlichen Ebene bewegt, so dass uns auch die Stellung des *cornicularius* weiteren Einblick verschafft. Er war vermutlich in einem der zivilen *officia* eingesetzt. Als Teil der kaiserlichen Verwaltung, was in nächster Nähe zum Statthaltersitz nicht weiter verwundert, empfand er es dennoch offensichtlich als Ehre, unter die eindeutig ortsansässigen *hastiferi* aufgenommen zu werden, was seinerseits wiederum als Hinweis auf die respektable Rolle des Kollegiums innerhalb ihres Gemeinwesens gedeutet werden könnte. Ein Blick auf den Organisationsgrad der Mattiaker bestätigt, dass die *civitas* nach dem üblichen Schema mit Dekurionen ausgestattet war,⁴⁶ und dass sie auch über ein Sevirkollegium verfügte, welches den öffentlichen Kaiserkult der Gemeinde von Amts wegen übernahm.⁴⁷ Außer unserem *hastiferi*-Kollegium ist sonst nur noch ein

⁴³ Schon Dessau, ad *ILS 3805* "*sic mons ille – sive aedificium fuit (...) – sine dubio appellatus propter montem Vaticanum urbis Romae, in quo sacra Matris deum praecipuam sedem suam in urbe videtur habuisse. Bellona igitur haec cognata Matris*". Fishwick (Anm. 20), 145 interpretiert ihn als Kultplatz für das *taurobolium*.

⁴⁴ W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, Berlin 1904, 56 bemerkt zu dieser Liste: "Es wird sicherlich nicht gelingen, aus irgendeinem Theile der römischen Welt eine Namensliste nachzuweisen, die dem Verzeichnis der *hastiferi civitatis Mattiacorum* Brambach 1336 an Fülle junger Bildungen vergleichbar wäre". Nach Schulze sind 6 der Namen keltisch, 8 lateinisch und in "dieser Masse modernster Formen nur ein einziger Titius Belatullus, dessen Gentilicium altrömisch ist oder doch sein kann".

⁴⁵ Vgl. Schwertheim (Anm. 1), Nr. 107.

⁴⁶ Zu Einzelheiten G. Rupprecht, *Untersuchungen zum Dekurionenstand in den nordwestlichen Provinzen des römischen Reiches* (Frankfurter Althistorische Studien 8), 1975, 231 f.

⁴⁷ *CIL XIII 7271* und *7061*. Vgl. Liertz (Anm. 2), 57 ff.

Kollegium von *negotiatores civitatis Mattiacorum*⁴⁸ bekannt. Die *hastiferi* waren also ein eigenständiger, unabhängiger Verein mit spürbarem Selbstbewusstsein und fest in der *civitas* verankert. Die von ihnen benutzten Elemente des Kaiserkultes beruhen auf eigener Initiative. Vor allem die Inschrift *CIL XIII 7317* scheint durch die Weihung an das *numen Augusti* am Festtag der Magna Mater, also in einem gewissen Zusammenhang mit dem eigenen spezifischen Kultkreis, der Verbundenheit des Kollegiums mit dem Staat Ausdruck verleihen zu wollen. Personale Überschneidungen mit offiziellen Einrichtungen, etwa den Dekurionen oder auch den *Seviri* lassen sich leider nicht feststellen. Die *adlectio* eines *cornicularius* ist jedoch Anhaltspunkt dafür, dass von einem sozialen Standpunkt her solche Überschneidungsmöglichkeiten nicht ausgeschlossen wären.

Hier scheint es nun zunächst so, dass dies bei den *dendrophori* anders sein könnte. Zumindest macht der einfache Grabstein des Severius Commendatus⁴⁹ gemessen an den Verhältnissen in der *civitas Helvetiorum* einen sehr bescheidenen Eindruck. In Nida dagegen ist die Situation anders. Im Zuge der Reorganisationen um 110 n. Chr. wurde die *civitas Taunensium* etwa gleichzeitig mit der der Mattiaker als neue Verwaltungseinheit errichtet. Der Dekurionenstand ist gut belegt⁵⁰ und auch hier gibt es organisierten Kaiserkult unter der Leitung von *sacerdotes*.⁵¹ Es fehlen aber völlig Hinweise auf ein *sevir*-Kollegium, was zu der Annahme verleitet, dass das Dendrophorenkollegium hier auch diese Funktion wahrgenommen hat. Dem würde durch das *Augustalis*-Epithet Rechnung getragen.⁵² Auch die Ausgrabungsbefunde und Beifunde⁵³ stützen die Annahme eines

⁴⁸ *CIL XIII 7587*. Sie weihen übrigens auch *In h(onorem) d(omus) d(ivinae) pro perpetua incolumitate Imp(eratoris)*.

⁴⁹ *CIL XIII 5153*, s.o. S. 118 f. Vgl. zur Person auch K. Schillinger, *Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung des Magna Mater-Kultes im Westen des Römischen Reiches*, Diss. Konstanz 1979, S. 230 Nr. 573.

⁵⁰ Belege bei Rupprecht (Anm. 46), 227 ff.

⁵¹ Zu Einzelheiten vgl. Liertz (Anm. 2), 57 ff.

⁵² Es sei an dieser Stelle nochmals betont, dass es sich um ein Kollegium handelt und *Augustalis* als Epithet zu sehen ist. Die Annahme, die Bauinschrift sei die eines Dendrophoren-Kollegiums und eines damit identischen Augustalenkollegiums, wäre völlig unsinnig.

⁵³ In ihrem Ausgrabungsbericht, "Eine Dendrophoreninschrift aus Heddernheim", *Germania* 40 (1962) 73–84, sprechen U. Fischer und W. Schleiermacher von mehreren Bauphasen in Holz und dann Stein, und diversen Bronze-, Stein-, Glas-, Eisen- und

finanziell wohl-situierten und repektierten Kollegiums, so wie ebenfalls die gute handwerkliche Qualität und sorgfältige Interpunktion der Bauinschrift, die uns das Kollegium und seine Schola bezeugt. Übrigens sind zumindest einige der Dendrophoren in Lugdunum gleichzeitig auch Sevirn,⁵⁴ so dass die Dendrophoren in Heddernheim wohl ohne zu grosse Zugeständnisse zu machen auf die gleiche soziale Ebene gestellt werden können, also eine Art zweiten Stand bilden, wohlhabend und bereit, für die eigene Ehre Opfer zu bringen. Andererseits bot sich der Kultkreis um Magna Mater offensichtlich besonders dazu an, Loyalitätsäusserungen für den Kaiser und damit den Staat auch gewissermassen institutionell miteinander zu verknüpfen.

Zum Schluss sollten wir uns die Frage nach den Konsequenzen für das eingangs umrissene Problem stellen. Die Befunde ergeben zunächst folgendes: Kaiserverehrung bei Kultvereinen drückt sich in der selben Weise aus wie bei einzelnen Weihenden oder anderen Gruppierungen, nämlich in Formeln der Verehrung wie *in h(onorem) d(omus) d(ivinae), pro salute Imperatoris* und ähnliches und durch das Augustus-Epithet bei der jeweiligen Gottheit. Nicht beschränkt auf Vereine, aber doch dem Akt einer Weihung ein feierlicheres Profil verleihend ist die Wahl des Datums: An einem Kaiserfest wird der eigenen Gottheit geweiht oder an einem Festtag der Gottheit dieser mit besonderem Bezug auf die Familie, die Macht oder das Wohlergehen des Kaisers eine Weihung dargebracht. Als spezifisch für Vereine ergibt sich außerdem die Möglichkeit durch ein Augustalis-Epithet in der Vereinsbezeichnung einen weiteren Bezug zum Kaiserhaus herzustellen. Dadurch wird eine längerfristige Wirkung erreicht. Es ist aber auch möglich, dass dies auf zusätzliche kultische Funktionen des Kollegiums hinweist. Sonst müsste man auch bei anderen – nicht-kultisch motivierten Vereinen dieses Epithet finden.⁵⁵ "Kaiserkult" schafft es also auch, im Bereich der Kultvereine mit ihrem spezifischen Kultobjekt wenigstens oberflächlich allgegenwärtig zu sein. Wirklich durchdringen kann er diesen

Beinfunden und anderen Resten u.a. ein möglicherweise vorher bemalt gewesener Sandsteinaltar.

⁵⁴ Z.B. *CIL* XIII 1961 war Mitglied und Curator beider Kollegien; *CIL* XIII 1751.

⁵⁵ Die Indices des *CIL* XIII kennen nur *sodales Augustales*, *seviri Augustales*, *dendrophori Augustales* und *Augustales* als eigenständige Bezeichnung, XIII 5, 127, 155 f., unter den *collegia*, 157 f. gibt es außer den *dendrophori* keine *Augustales*. Waltzing, der im übrigen die Dendrophoren unter die "Corporations professionnelles" aufnimmt, weil er vor allem ihre mutmassliche "Feuerwehrfunktion" im Auge hat, hat keine anderen Kollegien mit dem Epithet.

freiwilligen und daher wohl aus einem religiösen Bedürfnis erwachsenen Bereich jedoch nicht. Aber er war auch nicht nur "Aushängeschild", sondern die Besorgnis um den Kaiser – oder vielleicht die Kontinuität der bestehenden Ordnung war echt. Vielleicht erklärt sich damit auch zumindest zum Teil die geographische Konzentration auf den rechtsrheinischen Teil der Germania Superior, wo die Bedrohung im Gebiet zwischen Mogontiacum als Statthaltersitz und Feindesland unmittelbarer wahrzunehmen war. Einen weiteren Faktor für die Konzentration stellt sicher die relativ spät einsetzende Zivilverwaltung dar: Die Kulte sind bekannt und die Formen der Kaiserverehrung etabliert, beides braucht nur noch angewandt und verbunden zu werden. Die Dendrophoreninschrift aus Nida gibt davon gewissermassen ein Konzentrat an indirekter Kaiserverehrung bei direkten Magna Mater-Kultaspekten mit administrativer Absegnung.

Universität Helsinki

**IL SIGNIFICATO DEI SEGNI DI VALORE
SUI DENARII REPUBBLICANI**
Contributi per la riapertura di una problematica*

LUIGI PEDRONI

In una recente nota dedicata alla simbologia "secolare" sulle monete repubblicane¹ sono state analizzate le emissioni su cui si ritrovano associati i simboli di Sole e Luna. In quell'occasione, un gruppo di tre denarii curati dai "monetarii" *Mn. Aquilius* (RRC 303/1), *A. Manlius* (RRC 309/1) e *Cn. Cornelius Sisen(n)a* (RRC 310/1) è stato attribuito al 149 a.C. La datazione proposta, che prevede un notevole rialzamento della cronologia tradizionale finora concordemente indirizzata verso la seconda metà o la parte finale del II sec., è stata consentita dall'identificazione del valore simbolico dell'accostamento iconografico Sole/Luna. In particolare, la presenza del mito di Giove che sconfigge il gigante anguipede Tifone sul denario di *Sise(n)na*, tipo monetale che si ritrova soltanto su un denario di *Valerius Acisculus* (RRC 474/4), sempre unito alla simbologia Sole/Luna, toglie ogni dubbio circa il significato e la datazione di quella moneta. Il mito di Tifone² richiama l'*aition* valeriano dell'istituzione dei *Ludi Saeculares*, tematica che è rafforzata dalla presenza congiunta dei tipi Sole/Luna. Di conseguenza, anche gli altri due denarii, curati da *A. Manlius* e *Mn. Aquilius*, strettamente legati a quello di *Sisen(n)a* per evidenti motivi stilistici e tipologici, sono stati assegnati allo stesso momento storico.

* Ringrazio sentitamente i Proff. H. Solin e T. Sironen per i consigli preziosi. Naturalmente, ogni eventuale errore è attribuibile solo alla mia responsabilità. – RRC = M. H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage*, Cambridge 1974.

¹ L. Pedroni, "Saecula e Ludi Saeculares sulle monete repubblicane. Nuovi elementi per un'ipotesi dimenticata", *RIN* 90 (1999) 93–112.

² O. Tochefeu-Meynier – I. Krauskopf, "Typhon", in *LIMC* VIII,1, Zürich 1997, 147–152; cfr. inoltre L. Pedroni, "Mito e esaltazione gentilizia sui denarii di *M. Plaetorius Cestianus*", *AIN* 44 (1997) 301–320.

Una controprova della loro datazione "alta" al 149 è parsa venire anche dal segno di valore presente su tutte e tre le emissioni, X, cioè 10 assi, che ben potrebbe collocarsi anteriormente alla riforma monetaria che portò il denario a valere 16 assi avvenuta intorno alla metà del II sec. a.C.³

In quella sede, il problema più generale della presenza e del significato del segno di valore sui denarii di II sec. a.C. è stato tenuto in secondo piano essendo preminente lo studio del fenomeno tipologico. Tuttavia, appare opportuno ritornare sulla questione per approfondirne alcuni aspetti metodologici e quindi storici.

Com'è noto, sui denarii romani repubblicani compaiono tre simboli diversi: X, XVI e X̄. Tutta la tradizione degli studi ha accolto senza particolari obiezioni la tesi di un "caos di segni di valore" sui denarii posteriori alla ritarriffazione, problema che non è stato più affrontato, tanto che si ha l'impressione che la dottrina lo consideri ormai definitivamente risolto.

Pare opportuno, perciò, ripercorrere brevemente le tappe dell'evoluzione dell'indicazione del "segno di valore" sui denarii repubblicani, così come si evince dall'opera del Crawford ma che fondamentalmente ricalca le posizioni "canoniche".⁴

In origine sul denario d'argento era indicato in modo esplicito il suo valore: X, cioè 10 assi di bronzo; questo simbolo comparve regolarmente fino al momento della ritarriffazione, la riforma che portò il denario a valere 16 assi di bronzo, sul quale per uno o due anni fu indicato il nuovo valore con il numerale cardinale XVI. Dopo quel momento, che il Crawford colloca al 141 a.C.,⁵ si aprirebbe una lunga stagione in cui sulla moneta

³ Secondo una recente proposta la riforma sarebbe databile al 147 a.C.: L. Pedroni, *Asse romano e asse italico. Momenti di un'integrazione difficile*, Napoli 1996, 79–87. Cfr. *infra* nota 5.

⁴ Cfr. ad es. E. Babelon, *Traité des monnaies grecques et romaines I. Théorie et doctrine*, Paris 1901, 545–547; H. A. Grueber, *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum I*, London 1910, xli; E. Sydenham, *The Coinage of the Roman Republic*, London 1952, xxvii–xxix; inoltre: H. Zehnacker, *Moneta. Recherches sur l'organisation et l'art des émissions monétaires de la république Romaine*, Roma 1973, 448; P. Marchetti, "Paie des troupes et dévaluations monétaires au cours de la deuxième guerre punique", in *Les "dévaluations" à Rome I* [Actes du colloque, Rome 1975], Roma 1978, 197–199. Comunque, il Göbl accettava l'ipotesi della successione dei segni: R. Göbl, *Antike Numismatik I*, München 1978, 73.

⁵ *RRC* 611–613; M. H. Crawford, *Coinage and Money under the Roman Republic*, Berkeley 1985, 145. Cfr. R. Thomsen, *Early Roman Coinage II*, Copenhagen 1961, 214; idem, "From libral aes grave to uncial reduction", in *Les "dévaluations" à Rome I* [Actes

d'argento comparvero alternativamente, senza alcuna differenza, i segni X e X⁶ in maniera regolare fino alla fine del II sec. periodo in cui a poco a poco essi scomparirono dalla moneta.

In particolare, come si può osservare, l'alternanza di simboli diversi dopo la ritariffazione a 16 assi è quasi imbarazzante e addirittura alcuni esemplari del denario *RRC* 228, che per il Crawford rappresenterebbe l'ultimo della serie contrassegnata da XVI, mostrano il vecchio segno X.

In ogni caso, dopo la riforma si annoverano 10 emissioni con segno X, 2 con X, 3 ancora contrassegnate dal vecchio simbolo, poi un lungo periodo di denarii connotati dal nuovo segno X (27 emissioni) intervallato da un denario privo di segno di valore. Dopo questa fase si aprirebbe un periodo di alternanza tra i segni, mentre sarebbe cominciata la loro definitiva scomparsa affermatasi solo a partire dal 105 a.C. (*RRC* 316/1) con l'unica eccezione delle emissioni di A. (*Postumius*) *Albinus*, L. (*Caecilius*) *Metellus* e C. (*Publicius*) *Malleolus* (*RRC* 335) datate agli inizi del I sec.

Secondo lo Zehnacker, che segue il Sydenham⁷ nel porre la ritariffazione all'età dei Gracchi, il ritorno al segno X e poi a quello X avrebbe un significato ideologico, rappresentando una reazione alla politica graccana. Se si ammettesse, però, una data del *retariffing* più alta, intorno al 140, verrebbe a mancare ogni possibilità di spiegare il fenomeno. Il Marchetti, che pone la riforma del valore della moneta argentea in età annibalica, non solo accoglie senza eccessivi sussulti l'incongruenza dell'alternanza indiscriminata dei due simboli, ma interpreta la comparsa dei denarii con XVI, come "*essai infructueux*".⁸

La ricostruzione basata sull'intercambiabilità tra X e X dopo la riforma della metà del II sec. forse è stata favorita dalla constatazione dell'esistenza di alcuni denarii connotati dal segno X databili per vari motivi ben oltre la data del mutamento di valore del denario e difficilmente

du colloque, Rome 1975], Roma 1978, 22 propende per il 145. La datazione alla metà del II sec. è accolta anche da E. Lo Cascio, "Ancora sui censi minimi delle cinque classi 'serviane'", *Athenaeum* 1988, 292. Marchetti, invece ha ipotizzato una data ben più alta, in età annibalica, alla fine del III sec.: Marchetti, cit. a nota 4, 198–199; idem, *Histoire économique et monétaire de la deuxième guerre Punique*, Bruxelles 1978, 302–305. Più recentemente: K.W. Harl, *Coinage in the Roman Economy 300 B.C. to A.D. 700*, Baltimore – London 1996, 47.

⁶ Questo "segno di valore" comparirebbe solo a partire dal 136 a.C.: *RRC* 238/1.

⁷ Zehnacker, cit. a nota 4, 448.

⁸ Marchetti, cit. a nota 4, 198.

spiegabile altrimenti.

La totale anarchia di segni che scaturisce dalla ricostruzione canonica per il periodo posteriore alla ritariffazione è motivata dagli studiosi facendo ricorso ad una motivazione che suscita profondi interrogativi. Secondo la "vulgata", nel II sec. il segno X non avrebbe avuto il compito di indicare il valore della moneta, bensì sarebbe stato usato per tradizione essendo consuetudine marcare i denarii con quel simbolo. In tal caso la sua funzione si sarebbe avvicinata a quella del segno X nell'indicare la denominazione corrente della moneta, assumendo il significato generico di *denarius*. I due simboli sarebbero divenuti, quindi, equivalenti ed intercambiabili tanto che il Crawford⁹ definisce il loro uso "casual".

In tal modo, si potrebbe concludere che la scelta dell'uno o dell'altro sarebbe semplicemente attribuibile all'estro creativo dell'incisore o del magistrato monetario di turno. Poteva essere lasciato al caso proprio uno dei segni che rappresentavano l'elemento più palese della politica finanziaria di uno Stato sovrano?

Seguendo la sistemazione cronologica canonica, si trovano nel 140 a.C. denarii con il nuovo segno di valore esplicitamente indicato in cifre cardinali, XVI (*RRC* 224–228), e invece l'anno seguente monete con il vecchio X (*RRC* 229–237). Se nel 142 – sempre per la classificazione crawfordiana – il denario valeva ancora 10 assi e sulle emissioni compariva in modo evidente il simbolo X che bisogna ritenere allora pienamente funzionale, come spiegare non solo la sua ripresa dopo la ritariffazione, ma soprattutto la sua defunzionalizzazione visto che, almeno fino alla Guerra Sociale, il denario continuò a valere 16 assi?

La presenza sui denarii posteriori al *retariffing* della cifra XVI, che in modo incontestabile sembra mantenere la medesima funzione dello X originario indicando il valore della moneta, porta ad ammettere che da un anno all'altro il segno X abbia mutato radicalmente significato: in modo repentino da segno di valore avrebbe assunto quello generico di *denarius* oppure si sarebbe ridotto a mero segno decorativo. Se il numerale XVI rappresentava ancora il segno di valore, come avrebbero fatto i cittadini a capire che il segno X usato l'anno successivo non indicava più il valore della moneta, bensì il suo nome, essendo rimasto immutato il valore? Si trattava di una misura che avrebbe potuto sortire una generale confusione in una materia tanto delicata quale quella del valore della moneta.

⁹ *RRC* 299 a proposito dei denarii della "zecca di Narbona".

Pur non volendo affrontare ancora il problema dell'equivalenza e del significato del segno X , l'idea che il numerale X possa essere stato usato negli anni appena successivi alla riforma solo per tradizione o col significato generico di "denario" pur essendo la moneta passata nel frattempo a valere 16 assi potrebbe sembrare alquanto irrazionale. Non è agevole ammettere che su un documento ufficiale che rivestiva un'importanza politico-ideologica primaria come la moneta, il segno di valore, elemento fondamentale per la funzione stessa della moneta, fosse soggetto a variazioni grafiche talmente forti e incontrollate. Inoltre, si può osservare come non ci fosse alcuna necessità di indicare sul principale nominale argenteo un nome che non avesse connotazioni di valore.

In altri termini, non solo non è chiaro perché mai dovesse essere ripreso l'antico segno di valore ormai totalmente defunzionalizzato, ma non si comprende nemmeno la necessità di specificare il nome generico della moneta, operazione che non trova paragoni nell'antichità. Infatti, tale modello interpretativo non trova altri confronti: nessuna moneta antica o moderna, dopo che lo Stato ne ha modificato il valore ufficiale, ha conservato il vecchio simbolo.

Sulle monete l'informazione principale posta sotto la garanzia dello Stato è stata sempre il valore – che spesso è dato dal semplice rapporto titolo/peso – ma certo non il suo nome comune soprattutto quando ha perso ogni legame etimologico con il valore. In altri termini, poco importava ai cittadini romani se la moneta argentea si chiamasse *denarius*: era vitale, però, sapere quanti assi di bronzo valesse un *denarius*. A maggior ragione dopo il mutamento tariffario era indispensabile l'indicazione del valore della nuova moneta argentea.

Per tentare un paragone: è come se sui tetradrammi ateniesi fosse stato apposto il termine $\gamma\lambda\alpha\upsilon\delta\xi$, nome con il quale veniva chiamata popolarmente la moneta,¹⁰ e non eventualmente l'indicazione del suo valore. Una similitudine più calzante, sebbene con emissioni a noi più vicine, potrebbe essere tentata con la monetazione borbonica del Regno delle due Sicilie. In quel sistema il nominale maggiore d'argento valeva 120 grana ed era chiamato comunemente "piastra", la sua metà da 60 gr. era detta "mezza piastra", il pezzo da 20 gr. si chiamava volgarmente "tarì" ecc.¹¹ Orbene, su

¹⁰ Babelon, cit. a nota 4, 505–506.

¹¹ V. D'Incerti, "Le monete borboniche delle Due Sicilie (periodo 1799–1860)", *RIN* 61 (1959) 28–50; M. Pannuti – V. Riccio, *Le monete di Napoli*, Lugano 1984, 213–214.

quelle monete è indicato esplicitamente il valore in grana e mai il nome comune che essa assumeva tra il popolo.

Questa considerazione, oltre a confermare l'assunto iniziale, induce a una riflessione di ambito giuridico. Infatti, è vero che a fini pratici era più importante che sulla moneta comparisse il valore e non il nome con la quale generalmente era designata, tuttavia era proprio il valore che lo Stato s'impegnava a garantire presso i fruitori e non il nome della moneta o un valore ormai desueto. Piuttosto che ridursi a garantire il nome comune della moneta ormai disgiunto dal suo valore oppure un valore non più in vigore, sarebbe stato meglio eliminare quell'indicazione dalla moneta, espediente che Roma adottò realmente, ma solo verso la fine del II sec. a.C.

Certamente, dopo la riforma della metà del II sec. continuarono a circolare vecchi denarii con il segno X giacché non era pensabile ritirarli tutti, ma da ciò a giustificare che lo Stato continuasse ad emettere nuove monete con il vecchio segno di valore ormai privo di significato o con un diverso significato, ce ne corre. L'adozione di un segno di valore non rientrava nell'ambito di un esperimento che poteva avere successo o essere respinto dal giudizio popolare; essa era il frutto di una necessità politico-finanziaria che sottostava a regole ferree e non al capriccio del momento.

Dunque, il segno X sembra sia stato sempre un numerale e finora non è stato mai attestato con il significato di "denario" né numismaticamente né epigraficamente. Pertanto, non si scorgono elementi decisivi per sostenere l'ipotesi di un suo uso sui denarii anche dopo la riforma del valore della moneta, fondata esclusivamente sulla constatazione dell'esistenza di denarii posteriori al *retariffing* della metà del II a.C. contrassegnati dalla X e dall'analisi – naturalmente soggettiva – dei dati forniti dai tesoretti.

Invece, sappiamo per certo – e lo testimoniano proprio alcuni denarii repubblicani – che il segno X ha assunto il significato generico di *denarius*,¹² ma gli esempi epigrafici che illustrano segni "monetali" barrati¹³ non sono anteriori alla metà del II sec. a.C. ed anche il denario su cui è

¹² Maecian. *distrib.* 45 (p. 66 Hulstsch); Prisc. *gramm.*, *fig. num.* 9 (p. 83 Hulstsch).

¹³ Cfr. ad es. il *S. C. de Narthaciensium et Melitaeensium litibus*, del 141 (o 146?) a.C. e la *lex repetundarum* del 123–122 a.C. su cui si legge la sigla ~~HS~~: Sherk, *RDGE* 9, 1. 69 e *CIL* I² 583 l. 4. C. Nicolet, "Mutations monétaires et organisation censitaire sous la République", in *Les "dévaluations" à Rome I* [Actes du colloque, Rome 1975], Roma 1978, 261.

menzionato un *curator X flandorum* sarebbe della prima metà del I sec.¹⁴ Come dimostra un brano di *Volusius Maecianus*,¹⁵ quel segno assunse il significato di "16 volte" in composti formati con altri simboli.

Inoltre, è curioso osservare che le più antiche attestazioni epigrafiche dell'uso di una nuova unità di conto, il sesterzio invece di assi o libbre di bronzo per esprimere cifre ufficiali si datano non prima del 147–141 a.C.¹⁶ Allo stesso tempo è interessante che Livio¹⁷ la introduca solo a partire dal 138 a.C. e comunque non prima del 167 anno in cui cessa la sua narrazione completa.

Come ha dimostrato lo Zehnacker,¹⁸ l'uso di esprimere cifre in sesterzii appare già nel *de agri cultura* di Catone, morto nel 149 a.C. e si deve ritenere che quella pratica sia cominciata già qualche anno prima in ambito regionale, divenendo forse ufficiale solo in seguito alla riforma del 147 a.C. La coincidenza con il momento della ritariffazione del denario a 16 assi è troppo calzante¹⁹ per essere casuale: per lo Stato romano si sarebbe trattato di un'occasione molto propizia per adottare una nuova unità di conto più pratica ai fini contabili.

Si può immaginare che quest'innovazione contabile abbia comportato la necessità di distinguere i numerali delle cifre da quelli con cui si indicava il valore della moneta di conto che, quindi, furono barrati; ovviamente accanto al sesterzio indicato con **HS** anche gli altri nominali argentei, quinario e denario, subirono il medesimo trattamento. Non c'è bisogno di sottolineare che proprio l'adozione dei segni di valore precedenti alla riforma del 147 a.C. (X, V e IIS) invece che i nuovi (XVI, VIII e III, oppure IV) potrebbe confermare la proposta dello Zehnacker testimoniando che l'introduzione della nuova unità di conto sia cominciata poco prima del *retariffing*, quando Catone scriveva il suo trattato *de agri cultura*.

¹⁴ *RRC* 393/1b lo data al 76–75 a.C.

¹⁵ Maecian. *distrib.* 45–63 (pp. 67–68 Hultsch). Cf. E. Babelon, *Description historique et chronologique des monnaies de la République romaine* II, Paris 1886, 190, nota 1.

¹⁶ Cfr. *SIG* 674; *SIG* 688; *CIL* I² 583; *RRC* 624; H. Zehnacker, "Monnaies de compte et prix à Rome au IIe siècle avant notre ère", in *Les "dévaluations" à Rome* II [Actes du colloque, Gdansk 1978], Roma 1980, 31.

¹⁷ Liv. *perioch.* 55; cfr. Frontin. *aq.* 1,7 sui costi dell'*Aqua Marcia* intorno al 140 a.C.

¹⁸ Cit. a nota 16, 42–47.

¹⁹ Coincidenza che non era sfuggita al Crawford: *RRC* 624. Cfr. inoltre Thomsen, "From libral ...", cit. a nota 5, 9; Nicolet, cit. a nota 13, 260 ss.

Pochissimo tempo dopo la riforma monetaria – esistono infatti solo 5 serie di monete con valore XVI (*RRC* 224–228) – il nuovo segno fu adottato correntemente sui denarii non solo perché occupava meno spazio di XVI, ma anche perché poteva essere interpretato agevolmente come l'abbreviazione di quel numerale.²⁰

L'assenza di emissioni del quinario e del sesterzio proprio negli anni della riforma ci priva di un riscontro definitivo circa la funzione del simbolo X: infatti se avessimo avuto quinarii²¹ e sesterzii contrassegnati dal vecchio segno di valore barrato avremmo avuto la certezza che i segni barrati mantenevano anche sulle monete il significato di indicare il nome generico della moneta e non il suo valore. In tal caso, scomparendo il segno di valore, sarebbe stato possibile ipotizzare un medesimo significato generico per il vecchio segno X. Tuttavia, non esistono indizi per sostenere che il simbolo X abbia avuto sulle monete un significato diverso da quello del valore, infatti esso – come dimostra il testo di *Maecianus* già ricordato – poteva essere interpretato come un'abbreviazione del segno di valore XVI.

In conclusione, ricapitoliamo i principali ostacoli che incontra l'ipotesi dell'uso del segno X sui denarii repubblicani dopo la ritariffazione del II sec.:

1. essa è poco sostenibile sul piano giuridico essendo il valore una garanzia ufficiale la cui indicazione non poteva essere lasciata al caso, al capriccio della moda o della tradizione;
2. l'uso del numerale X dopo il *retariffing* al posto del nuovo valore XVI avrebbe potuto generare confusione;
3. il numerale X non è mai attestato altrove con il significato di *denarius*;
4. esisteva un simbolo specifico per indicare il *denarius*.

Ammissa, dunque, l'assenza di prove inconfutabili non numismatiche della coniazione di denarii con numerale X dopo l'introduzione del nuovo

²⁰ In tal senso già Babelon, cit. a nota 4, 546.

²¹ Su alcuni quinarii tardo-repubblicani compare la lettera Q che da alcuni è interpretata come l'indicazione del valore *Quinarius* (ad es. Babelon, cit. a nota 15, 531) e da altri, forse più correttamente, come l'iniziale di *Quaestor* (ad es. *RRC* 326/2).

valore di 16 assi, si sarebbe tentati di concludere che nella monetazione romana potrebbe non essere mai esistito un caos di simboli, un'anarchia difficilmente comprensibile, bensì una sequenza ordinata e coerente secondo cui l'originario X si sia trasformato prima in XVI quando ci fu bisogno di esplicitare nei primi momenti della riforma il nuovo valore, e poi in X̄, simbolo epigrafico del denario che poteva essere interpretato come la rappresentazione tachigrafica del valore 16 assi e che non occupava molto spazio sulla moneta.

A sostegno dell'uso del numerale X dopo la riforma del 147 a.C., in fin dei conti, gioca soltanto l'esistenza indiscutibile di alcune emissioni posteriori a quella data che mostrano ancora il vecchio segno di valore. Infatti, l'analisi dei tesoretti – altro argomento usato per sostenere l'ipotesi dell'emissione di monete argentee con il simbolo X dopo la riforma valutaria del II sec. – appartiene all'ambito dell'interpretazione e può produrre solo ipotesi di lavoro da vagliare e confermare. Inoltre, anche l'idea che sulla moneta non fosse indicato il segno di valore, ma il nome generico della moneta, non trova conferme ed è indimostrata.

Sulla scorta dell'esame dei denarii degli insorti italici è stata proposta²² l'esistenza di una nuova ritariffazione avvenuta durante la Guerra Sociale, momento che avrebbe potuto agglutinare le rare emissioni romane con segno di valore X databili dopo il 147 a.C. La serie Campana 7,²³ infatti, mostra l'uso di segni di valore diversi X e XVI che possono aver avuto piena funzionalità testimoniando, così, un mutamento di valore del *denarius*. Anzi, è interessante notare che il denario romano preso a modello dai ribelli per quella emissione firmato congiuntamente da A. (*Postumius*) *Albinus*, L. (*Caecilius*) *Metellus* e C. (*Poblicius*) *Malleolus* (RRC 335/1–2) non reca alcun segno di valore, tuttavia le emissioni a proprio nome di *Albinus* (RRC 335/10a) e *Malleolus* (RRC 335/3) sono connotate rispettivamente il segno X e X̄. Dunque, sembrerebbe possibile scorgere l'eco nella monetazione della Guerra Sociale di una nuova riforma del valore del denario, sicuramente temporanea,²⁴ che potrebbe giustificare l'emissione

²² L. Pedroni, "Iactabatur, enim, temporibus illis, nummus" (Cic. *De off.* 3,80). Denari italici e manipolazioni finanziarie romane nella guerra sociale", *Samnium* 70 (1997) 62–65.

²³ A. Campana, *La monetazione degli insorti italici durante la guerra sociale (91–87 a.C.)*, Modena 1987, 90–96.

²⁴ Verosimilmente, la grave crisi finanziaria ebbe fine solo nell'86–85 con l'editto del

di denarii con il segno X pienamente funzionale. In tal modo verrebbe a cadere anche l'ultima argomentazione a favore dell'uso simultaneo e indiscriminato di segni di valore diversi dopo il *retariffing* del II sec.

Naturalmente, non può sfuggire l'importanza di una tale presa di posizione che comporterebbe un totale stravolgimento della classificazione "canonica" dei denarii repubblicani, ma sembra metodologicamente corretto tentare anche questa strada interpretativa senza preclusioni preconcrete per spiegare un fenomeno che le ipotesi "tradizionali" faticano a chiarire. In fin dei conti, il fatto che nelle classificazioni finora proposte il problema dei segni di valore sui denarii repubblicani non venga più sollevato non significa che sia stato completamente risolto. Al contrario, ad un'analisi scevra da condizionamenti di sorta, esso sembra ancora fin troppo presente ed ingombrante.

University of British Columbia

pretore *M. Marius Gratidianus* (Cic. *off.* 3,80, Plin. *nat.* 33,46) che potrebbe aver ristabilito il vecchio sistema unciale: Pedroni, cit. a nota 22, 74–77 con ulteriori fonti e bibliografia.

ROMAN NOMINA IN THE GREEK EAST

Observations on some Recently Published Inscriptions

OLLI SALOMIES

In the last few years, quite a few collections of Greek inscriptions have been published, all of them of great interest and merit. As many of these collections deal with areas such as Macedonia and Asia Minor, where in general (there are of course exceptions) the inscriptions of the Roman period tend to dominate, this material is of great interest also to the student and scholar focusing on Rome, and of course especially to those dealing with the Greek East in the Roman period. All the corpora also include previously unpublished material, which is no doubt their main attraction, but certainly one can say that also in the case of texts which were known earlier (but often only by having been published in not very accessible journals) it is more than useful to find them collected and edited in a satisfactory way; one thinks especially of inscriptions published some 60 or 50 years ago in the journal *Spomenik*, in which Serbian is used, and now published anew in a new volume of *Inscriptiones Graecae*.

Talking of the *Inscriptiones Graecae*, as I wish to pass in quick review some of the (from my point of view) more important new epigraphic editions, this series is no doubt where one must begin. It is with the utmost satisfaction that one observes the recent appearance of not only one but two new volumes of this series, namely vol. X 2, 2, of 1999, edited by F. Papazoglou, M. Milin and M. Ricl, and of vol. XII 6, 1, of 2000, edited by K. Hallof and covering Samos. There is a lot of Roman material in the latter volume (e.g. new inscriptions in honour of senators), but in the case of vol. X 2, 2, covering the western part of that part of Ancient Macedonia which is situated within the borders of the former Yugoslavia, there are very few inscriptions earlier than the Roman period.

To move on to the other series, there are also some recently published volumes of the series *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*. Vol.

54, of 1999 and published by S. Sahin, is the first part of a corpus covering Perge (the number of new and interesting texts is quite spectacular); the rest were published in 2000: vol. 55 I and II (by D. Berges & J. Nollé) is on Tyana, vol. 56 (by M. H. Sayar) on Anazarbus (only part I, but even here there are 657 texts, a very large number of them unpublished), vol. 57 (by G. R. Horsley & S. Mitchell) on 'Central Pisidia' (i.e., Cremna and other cities in the area), vol. 58 (by A. Lajtar) on Byzantion. In the area of modern Greece, two new corpora deal with the important city of Beroea and its territory, namely *Επιγραφές κάτω Μακεδονίας. Τεύχος α'. Επιγραφές Βέροιας* (1998) by L. Gounaropoulou and M. B. Hatzopoulos, and *Inscriptions du sanctuaire de la Mère des Dieux Autochtone de Leukopétra (Macédoine)* (Meletemata 28, 2000) by Ph. Petsas, M. B. Hatzopoulos, L. Gounaropoulou and P. Paschidis. To move from here back to the east, Perinthus is covered by M. H. Sayar, *Perinthus/Herakleia und Umgebung* (Österr. Ak. d. Wiss., Denkschriften 269, 1998; here there do not seem to be many previously unpublished inscriptions, and many of those published earlier seem to have been lost); many new texts from Miletus are included in P. Herrmann, *Inchriften aus Milet. Teil 2* (Milet VI:2, 1998); N. P. Milner, *An Epigraphical Survey in the Kibyra-Olbasa Region conducted by A. S. Hall* (Regional Epigraphic Catalogues of Asia Minor III, 1998) publishes material from the area indicated in the title; in another book adducing material collected by a deceased scholar, new inscriptions from western Cilicia were published by K. Tomaschitz, *Unpublizierte Inschriften Westkilikiens aus dem Nachlaß T. B. Mitfords* (Österr. Ak. d. Wiss., Denkschriften 264, 1998).¹ These corpora will normally be referred to in the following by the use of an "I." followed by a key word (e.g. *I. Beroia*). Note finally that there are also some recent archaeological publications with material of interest to the epigraphist.²

One sees, then, that there is a lot of action in the field of Greek epigraphy. In this paper, my aim (a quite modest aim) is to contribute to the

¹ Note also St. Hagel – K. Tomaschitz, *Repertorium der Westkilikischen Inschriften* (Österr. Ak. d. Wiss., Denkschriften 265, 1998), mainly devoted to collecting texts previously published in more or less scattered publications.

² Note e.g. O.W. von Moock, *Die figürlichen Grabstelen Attikas in der Kaiserzeit* (Beiträge zur Erschließung hellenistischer und kaiserzeitlicher Skulptur und Architektur 19, 1998); M. Lagogianni-Georgakarakos, *Corpus signorum imperii Romani Griechenland III:1* (1998). *Die Grabdenkmäler mit Porträts aus Makedonien* (here, there are also unpublished inscriptions, e.g. no. 50 from Dion).

interpretation of the recently published texts by commenting upon some more or less interesting Roman names, especially nomina, appearing in some of these texts, obviously leaving out names and persons who have been dealt with by other scholars.³ The fact that in most cases the editors of the inscriptions have nothing, or almost nothing, to say on these names may (I hope) be adduced as a justification for presenting these remarks in this paper. I shall begin with some general remarks, and then move on to the nomina taken into consideration here, these being presented in alphabetical order. In addition to material in the recent corpora, texts published in various journals have also been taken into consideration.

However, before I enter into details, I must point out that, when encountering people using Roman nomina in the east (who are, one is allowed to assume, normally Roman citizens), one is in fact dealing with two kinds of persons, on one hand with Romans who had come to the east from Italy or possibly from some other province and who had settled there, and, on the other hand, with eastern Greeks and other provincials who only became Romans (though normally they would not call themselves Romans) by receiving the Roman citizenship. These are the two principal groups. However, things are complicated by the fact that people of both groups normally produce both descendants and freedmen, which again produces some confusion, inasmuch as local-born freedmen of Italian settlers must be regarded as provincials, but have the same family name as the Italian immigrants. Also, with time the Italian families normally became Hellenized and at the end present only onomastic traces – that is, the nomen – of their forefathers' origin. The fact is, then, that although we are used to speaking of Roman families in the east, and of people belonging to these families, we are in fact speaking of various kinds of persons with varying ties to the original Italian settlers or to the people who originally started to use a Roman nomen as new citizens. However, there is not much one can do about this and in any case there is the fact that the nomina, whether used by the original settler or the new citizen or by their descendants, can be used for

³ I am here thinking mainly of M. Feridius P. f. in *I. Perge* 66, illustrated by C. P. Jones, *EA* 31 (1999) 8 ff. Note also that the frequency of the nomen *Rutilius* and the cognomen *Propinquus* (with derivatives) in Cremna has lead S. Mitchell (in: *XI Congresso Internazionale di Epigrafia Greca e Latina ... 1997. Atti* II 429) to propose, very plausibly, an origin from Cremna for the senator L. Rutilius Propinquus, consul in AD 120 (*PIR*² R 256).

various onomastic and historical observations and there seems to be no reason why this material should not be put into some kind of use. But let us now go on to look at the material.

Any larger group of inscriptions of the Roman period from the Greek east tends to produce instances of locals of varying background with nomina which have been derived from Roman officials.⁴ In the new material, there are some interesting instances. In Cibyra, we find a certain Ἐπριος Ἀγαθεῖνος (*AE* 1997, 1473 f. and *SEG* XLVII 1810 f. from *EA* 28 [1997] 54 no. 1–2), who is clearly to be connected with T. Clodius Eprius Marcellus, legate of Lycia in the mid-fifties and proconsul of Asia in the early seventies.⁵ In theory one could, of course, also think of connecting this Eprius with the only other Eprius attested in the East, a certain L. Eprius Tertullus of Philippi (*BCH* 57 [1933] 370 ff. no. 28, 5), but the presence of the senator in the East makes the first possibility seem much more plausible. Another instance of a provincial or one of his ancestors assuming the name of a governor is no doubt Cn. Arrius Apuleius Aurelianus, the owner of a φαμίλια μονομάχων, in Phrygian Hierapolis (*AE* 1998, 1363 from *MAL* 10, 4 [1998] 447 ff. no. 1). The combination *Cn. Arrius* is extremely rare,⁶ but one finds it in a senatorial family which produced Cn. Arrius Antoninus cos. 69, Cn. Arrius Augur cos. 121, and Cn. Arrius Cornelius Proculus cos. 145.⁷ As Arrius Antoninus is known to have held the proconsulate of Asia,⁸ it seems plausible to assume that the family of the Arrius in Hierapolis had

⁴ Cf. on this phenomenon my paper on 'Römische Amtsträger und römisches Bürgerrecht in der Kaiserzeit. Die Aussagekraft der Onomastik (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der kleinasiatischen Provinzen)' in W. Eck (ed.), *Prosopographie und Sozialgeschichte* (1993) 119–145.

⁵ In this case, the connection between this man and the senator is duly pointed out by the editors in *EA*, T. Corsten, G. H. R. Horsley, and R. A. Kearsley. As this man is not exactly datable and as Cibyra, normally belonging to Asia, was for a while (from about the forties till about the end of the first century) assigned to the province of Lycia-Pamphylia (see D. Erkelenz, *EA* 30 [1998] 81 ff. and the summary, with additions, by B. Puech in *AE* 1998, 1374), one cannot say whether the man in Cibyra is to be connected with the activities of Eprius Marcellus (for *Eprius* being the main nomen see my *Adoptive & Polyonymous Nomenclature* [1992] 93) in Asia or in Lycia.

⁶ See *Adoptive Nomenclature* (previous note) 98 n. 23.

⁷ For the praenomen of Arrius Antoninus see G. Camodeca, *Cron. Erc.* 23 (1993) 115 ff. (*AE* 1993, 461)

⁸ See B. Thomasson, *Laterculi praesidum* I (1984) 216 no. 69.

received its name from this senator (rather than from the consul of AD 145, who is also known to have governed an eastern province, although not Asia but Lycia-Pamphylia). – For further probable instances of new citizens taking over governors' names see below on Lusicii (at n. 56), Pedanii (at n. 71), Satrii (at n. 86), Vicrii (at n. 105).

In Anazarbus (in Cilicia) one is surprised to find the tomb, dated to AD 90, of a certain Ap. Annus Fuscus (*I. Anazarbos* 6, no comment being added). The combination *Ap. Annus* makes it quite certain that this man is somehow connected to the senatorial family of Ap. Annii from Iguvium, of which some members are attested in about this period.⁹ As no offices are attested in the east for members of this family in this period, and as the nomenclature of the man in Anazarbus does not really suggest that he is a Cilician who had recently been equipped with Roman citizenship, it may be advisable to regard this man as an Italian connected with the senatorial family (e.g. by being the descendant of a freedman) who had moved to the east.

Of course there are also nomina which seem to be attested for the first time. To this category of names belong at least the nomina of Μάρκος Ὀπῆνιος Ὀνήσιμος of Beroea (*I. Beroia* 112), of Γ. Πούμμιος Ἀγρίππας in Pelagonia (*IG X 2, 2, 232*),¹⁰ and of Τ(ίτος) Σοτιολᾶνος in *I. Anazarbos* 115 (of AD 65).¹¹ These are fine names which can be added to the repertory of Roman nomina without hesitation; unfortunately, the same cannot perhaps be said of the nomen of another character attested in Anazarbus, Μάρκος Διουμίσι(ο)ς Πρόκλος (*I. Anazarbus* 447). Although it is true that

⁹ Ap. Annus Gallus, cos. c. 66–67; Ap. Annus Marsus (Flavian); Ap. Annus Trebonius Gallus, cos. 108 (*PIR*² A 653. 670. 692). On this family see Chr. Settapani, *Continuité gentilice et continuité familiale dans les familles sénatoriales romaines à l'époque impériale* (Oxford 2000) 472 f.

¹⁰ There is no comment on the nomen by the editors. It may well be connected with *Pumidius* and *Pummidius* (the latter form being attested in *CIL IX 3547*). Cf. *Nummius* ≈ *Numidius* (a respectable nomen not to be connected with a country in Africa), and many other pairs of names of the type *Decius/Decidius*, *Orfius/Orfidius*.

¹¹ Though the man is attested without a cognomen, *Sotiolanus* is no doubt to be interpreted as a nomen; for its formation, cf. e.g. *Novius / Noviolanus*, *Pet(t)ius / Petiolanus* (*AE* 1985, 325 f.). As the nomina in *Sot-* seem to have a long *o* (at least this is known in the case of *Sotarius* and *Sotidius*; cf. *JÖAI* 15 (1912) 54 no. 27 for *Sotarius* and *SEG XXV 1352* for *Sotidius*), it seems advisable to assume that the *o* in Σοτ- is a rendering of short *u* and that this name is to be connected with *Sut(t)ius*.

one could perhaps adduce, as parallels, *Diuccius* and *Diurrius*,¹² the fact is that *Diumisius* does not quite make the impression of being an impeccable nomen, and before I see a photo of the text (there is no illustration in *I. Anazarbus*) I do not feel prepared to add it to the canon of Roman nomina.¹³ As for the nomen Σεγοῦννος, attested in *I. Beroia* 280, see *Arctos* 34 (2000) 115–7.

In the recently published material, there are of course also new instances of the nomenclature of famous Romans being imitated.¹⁴ At Anazarbus, one observes a new Statilius Taurus, this time equipped with the praenomen *Marcus* (*I. Anazarbos* 449), and in Heraclea Lyncestis there is a new politarch called Μάρτι(ος) Κλαύδ(ιος) Ποῦλχος (*IG X 2, 2, 73*, dated by the editors to the early second century). Note also a certain Plotina in Anazarbus, whose daughter is called Sabina (*I. Anazarbos* 626), these names suggesting a certain familiarity with the imperial families of the early second century.

To go on with a few general observations: as there are many inscriptions from Macedonia in the new material, it is clear that one will have to expect many nomina ending not in *-ius* but in *-ianus*, a phenomenon attested here and there in the Greek east, but with a concentration in Macedonia. I studied these nomina a long time ago (*Arctos* 18 [1984] 97–104), reaching the conclusion that at least in the eastern lands these nomina should be explained as being normal nomina in *-ius* which had been equipped with the ending *-ianus* for some reason, in many cases no doubt simply because of a misunderstanding or because the forms ending in *-ianus* somehow sounded better. That this is the correct interpretation of these nomina emerges very clearly from a series of inscriptions from Leukopetra from the year 211, in which the same man is called both Αὐρήλιος Ἀμυντιανός and Αὐρηλιανός Ἀμυντιανός (*I. Leukopetra* 57 ff.); similarly, in another series, from the

¹² See H. Solin & O. Salomies, *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum* (1988; 1994²) ss. vv.

¹³ There is also the fact that, without a photo which would settle the problem, one cannot help suspecting that the correct reading should in fact be Νουμίσι(ος), the reading ΔΙ instead of Ν being due to the carelessness of the stonecutter.

¹⁴ For this phenomenon see e.g. my *Die römischen Vornamen* (1987) 201 n. 133; A. Andermahr, *Totus in praediis. Senatorischer Grundbesitz in Italien in der frühen und hohen Kaiserzeit* (1998) 29 f.; H. Solin, in: G. Angeli Bertinelli & A. Donati (eds.), *Varia epigraphica. Atti del Colloquio Internazionale di Epigrafia* (Bertinoro 2000), 2001, 411–27; also Settiani, op. cit. (n. 9) 28 n. 6 (with some further references).

time of Gordian, we find a priest who normally figures as Ἰουλιανὸς Δημήτριος once called Ἰούλιος Δημήτριος (*I. Leukopetra* 87ff; *Iulius* in no. 95). But there are also cases in which only the form in *-ianus* is attested; thus one finds an Ἀραβιανὸς Μάρκος and a Γαλεριανὸς Εὐκτῆμων in Beroea (*I. Beroia* 55; 319), where the nomina *Arabius* and *Galerius* are so far unattested. Beroea also otherwise furnishes most of the new material, there now being also Scirtiani and Statiani.¹⁵ On the other hand, northern Macedonia is not completely alien to this category of nomina, and there are in fact some new Aeliani in Styberra (*IG XII* 2, 2, 334).

Let us now move to observations regarding individual nomina attested in the new material.

Agusius. K. L. Zachos, *AD* 47 (1992), *Chron.* (1997) p. 292 (*AE* 1996, 1382; *SEG XVII* 827) publishes a new funerary inscription from Nikopolis, that of a certain Λούκειος (sic) Ἀγούσιος Λεωνᾶς. Now this is an interesting nomen for which there are some attestations in Italy¹⁶ but which is mainly found in the eastern parts of the Roman empire. As the attestations start in the late Republic, a good guess might be that we are dealing with another family with commercial interests in the East, members of which started to move there during the Late Republic.¹⁷ Let us have a look at the evidence. The earliest attested members seem to be two men appearing in the correspondence of Cicero, both of them in an eastern context. First there is T. Agusius, a man mentioned in *Cic. fam.* 13, 71; in this letter, he is said to have been Cicero's *comes* during his exile in the early fifties, and this should mean that Agusius was then residing in Thessalonica (or just possibly in Dyrrhachium, where Cicero spent the latter part of his exile); in this letter, of 46 BC, this man is recommended to P. Servilius Isauricus, who was proconsul of Asia at that time, this no doubt indicating the sphere of activities of T. Agusius in this period. So it seems we are dealing with a businessman who was either based in Thessalonica (or possibly in

¹⁵ *I. Leukopetra* 120; 82. For further new Aureliani see *ibid.* 42, 52. ('New' in the case of Beroea means not simply 'new' inscriptions, but also inscriptions which are not registered in A. B. Tataki, *Ancient Beroia. Prosopography and Society* (Meletemata vol. 8, 1988).

¹⁶ *CIL* VI 2626 (Agussius [sic] Veratianus, an *evocatus* of the praetorian guard); *CIL* XIV 2804 (Gabii; Agusia T. f. Priscilla); *CIL* IX 5067 = *ILS* 5666 (Interamnia Praetuttiorum, L. Agusius Cn. f. L. n. Mussus).

¹⁷ So one might think of adding this *gens* to the lists in J. Hatzfeld, *Les trafiquants italiens dans l'Orient hellénique* (1919).

Dyrrhachium) but also operating in Asia or with a man who in the meantime had moved his business from Thessalonica to somewhere in Asia. Another Agusius is mentioned in Cic. *Att.* 11, 23, 2 (dated to July 9, 47 BC), where *Agusius quidam* (thus clearly not identical with the *comes*) is said to have come, bringing some news, to Brundisium (where Cicero was at the time) from Rhodes. In *RE* I 909 no. 1 he is registered (by E. Klebs) as "ein Rhodier", but this seems a bit misleading, unless a Roman who had settled in Rhodes is meant. In any case, the impression one gets of the man is that of someone doing business in Rhodes or (more probably) in Asia (and using Rhodes as a place to stop over), and possibly also residing somewhere in this area. From the letter it appears that the man is on his way from Brundisium to Rome, but the schedule of a businessman settled in the East may well have included a visit now and then to the capital.

To go on, in the area of modern Greece, we now find L. Agusius Leonas attested in Nikopolis (cf. above), who must have had something to do with Οὐλπία Ἀγουσία, attested a bit later on the Ionian island of Cephallenia, not too far from Nicopolis (*IG* IX 1, 652 cf. *SEG* XXX 516). This is where the attestations from Greece and the Aegean end, for the remaining Agusii are scattered in the eastern provinces of Anatolia, the inscriptions from which they are known all making the impression of being fairly early (that is, not later than the first or the mid-second century). In Comana in Cappadocia, one observes a certain Μ(ἄρκος) Ἀγούσιος Οὐρβᾶνος (whose wife is a Socellia);¹⁸ moving from Cappadocia to Cilicia, at a place the ancient name of which is uncertain (it being reconstructed e.g. as Kanygelleis, Kanytelides or Kanytelis¹⁹), there is Ἀγουσία Τεπρία Μάρκου θυγάτηρ, the wife of a certain Τίτος Μαιτέννιος (*IGR* III 868 = Hagel – Tomaschitz [n. 1] 156 Kizilbag no. 6). At Olba-Diocaesarea (about 20 km to the west from the site mentioned above), one finds the tomb of the veteran Λούκιος Ἀγούσιος Μαρεῖνος (*MAMA* III 105 = Hagel – Tomaschitz 338, Olba-Diokaisareia no. 81).

It is of course not possible to write a family history of the eastern Agusii on the basis of this material; however, as the name is so extremely rare in Italy, it seems almost certain that all the above Agusii represent various manifestations of the presence, in the East, of members of the same

¹⁸ R. P. Harper, *AS* 18 (1968) 126 no. 6,06 (an inscription quoted from a publication of 1911).

¹⁹ Thus in the *Barrington Atlas*.

family (the term being used in a broad sense), no doubt involved in some kind of business (whichever its exact nature), notable for its members being attested only in Greece and in more distant places in Cappadocia and Cilicia, not also in those areas of Asia Minor where one is more used to find Roman businessmen. The fact that three different praenomina are attested among members of the family suggests the observation which is confirmed by the existence of Agusii in Cicero, namely that we are dealing with a family representatives of which started to move to the eastern parts fairly early.²⁰

Allidius. An Ἀλλιδία, married to a certain Πετρόνιος, is now attested at Anazarbus (*I. Anazarbos* 439). Now it is perhaps not altogether correct to call this person a member of the *gens* of the Allidii, as the name is here used not as a nomen but as a single personal name; however, these names usually presuppose the existence of the same name used as a nomen in the same area,²¹ and the attestation of the name here may be used as a pretext of sorts for having a quick look at the rest of the attestations of this rare nomen²² in the East. Unlike *Agusius*, this is a name belonging to the category of nomina which one finds on Delos; here, the praenomen is *Quintus*.²³ The next instance of this nomen seems to be an inscription from Thyatira which one may perhaps attribute to the first century AD, mentioning (so it seems) a Παυλὰς Ἀλλειδία, the wife of Πόπλιος Στατεΐλιος (*TAM V* 2, 1124). At about the same time, a L. Allidius is mentioned in an inscription from Amastris, but only as a centurion in an inscription of soldier, so that he may well never have been in or near Asia (*AE* 1993, 1429).²⁴ On the other hand, M. Ἀλλίδιος Βανα[---] in Thessalonica in the second century (*IG X* 2, 1, 251) is no doubt a resident. When one adds, moving a bit to the north from what one normally considers as constituting the "Greek east" of the the Roman empire, the existence in Tomoi in Moesia

²⁰ Cf. my observation on the praenomina of the Avii and Vellaei in Macedonia in A. D. Rizakis (ed.), *Roman Onomastics in the Greek East. Social and Political Aspects* (Meletemata 21, 1996) 115.

²¹ Cf. A. Tataki, in op. cit. (n. 20) 106; O. Salomies, *ibid.* 113 with n. 6. Cf. also e.g. *Antistius*, *Pontius* and *Vettius*, all attested also as nomina in Macedonia, being used as single names in *I. Leukopetra* 52; *IG X* 2, 2, 20 and 181; and the attestations of *Atin(n)ius* in Anazarbus, below at n. 31.

²² There are some instances in Italy and also in Gallia Narbonensis.

²³ J. Hatzfeld, *BCH* 36 (1912) 12 f. (the name is once spelled Ἀλλίδιος, once Ἀλεΐδιος; Q. Alidius Q. f. is probably identical with the patron of Antiochus Allidius).

²⁴ Cf. M. P. Speidel, in: *Festschrift H. Lieb* (1995) 123–7.

inferior of both Allidii using the praenomen *Gaius* and of Allidii with the praenomen *Quintus* (*ISM* II 302 and 196, respectively), and of course the new Allidia in Anazarbus, one is at the end of the list of eastern Allidii. It is hard to say how these people should be connected with each other, but no doubt there is a connection, as the name is so rare. The Allidii may thus serve as another example illustrating the variety of directions in which a family earlier based on Delos could spread after its decline.

Aquinius. In Miletus, there is an inscription mentioning, alongside a Λεύκιος Γερελλᾶνο[ς ---] (the nomen making one think of Ephesus), the mother (the name has disappeared) of a certain Ἀκύνιος (*I. Milet* 773). This seems to be the nomen *Aquinius* being used as a single name (for single names reflecting the existence of the same names being used as nomina cf. above on *Allidius*). Now as this is a very rare nomen any new attestation would be of some interest; but this inscription is interesting also because it illustrates another text from Asia, namely J. Keil – A. von Premerstein, *Bericht über eine zweite Reise in Lydien* (Öst. Ak. d. Wiss., Denkschr. 54:2, 1911) no. 278 from Blaundos. Here we find a couple, Φοῖβος and Ἀκυνέα Εὐτέλεια. Now it is true that the editors suggested that we have here a transcription of the nomen *Aquinius*, but one might have also thought of other possibilities, and the rendering of the ending with ε instead of the normal ι might have been thought of as disturbing. But the inscription from Miletus now confirms the suggestion of Keil and von Premerstein. Except for a soldier attested in Oescus, there are no other instances of this nomen anywhere east of Italy.²⁵

Aquius/Acuvius. A new inscription from Ephesus, from about the time of Augustus, produces a man called Αὐλος Ἀκούιος Πολύβιος, the husband of Scaptia Macaria (D. Knibbe, in: Id. & H. Thür, *Via Ephesiaca* II. *Grabungen und Forschungen 1992 und 1993* [Öst. Arch. Inst., Berichte und Materialien 6, 1995] 14 f. = *SEG* XLV 1588). It seems that we are here dealing with locals (and not with immigrants) who had acquired Roman citizenship e.g. as freedmen. Now in the original publication and in *SEG*, the

²⁵ Oescus: *ILBulg.* 13 (no doubt a soldier). Otherwise, this nomen is attested as follows: *RE* II 333 no. 1–2 and *TLL* II 379 (Republican Aquinii); *CIL* VI 12277; *CIL* X 5441 (in Aquinum); *CIL* IX 1677 (Beneventum); *CIL* XI 3164 (Falerii); P. Castrén, *Ordo populisque Pompeianus* (1975) 137 (Pompeii); *NSA* 1883, 177 (Larinum); in Spain: *HAE* 2354 (a); *AE* 1995, 938 = J. Gómez Pallarès, *Edición y comentario de las inscr. sobre mosaico de Hispania* (1997) 111. In the northern provinces: *CIL* XIII 1833. 4344. 6687, ii, 7; 27. *BRGK* 166.

nomen of the husband, taken to be a transcription of *Acuvius*, is accentuated as above. But one might also assume that this is a transcription of *Aquius*, in which case it should be accentuated as Ἄκουιος. In any case, as far as I can see, this is only the second attestation of *Acuvius* / *Aquius* in the east; the other is in another earlyish inscription, *IG IX 2, 845* from Larisa in Thessaly, where we find a Λεύκιος Ἀκούιος (or Ἄκουιος) Ἰλαρος.²⁶ So one sees another Italian *gens* involved in some way or another in the east slowly emerging from obscurity. But are we dealing with *Acuvii* or *Aquii*?²⁷ As the praenomen attested in Ephesus is *Aulus*, a rarish one, this might settle the question. However, it turns out that this is the first time when this praenomen is attested in combination with either *Acuvius* (including the variants *Acubius Acuius Aquvius*) or *Aquius*.²⁸ So the praenomen is not of any use for defining the exact nature of the name in question (at least until a new inscription mentioning either an A. *Acuvius* or an A. *Aquius* turns up). But as the name is written as ΑΚΟΥΙΟΣ (and not e.g. as Ἀκούουιος, Ἀκούβιος) in both cases when we have the Greek transcription, I am rather disposed to think of *Aquius* as the more probable original form of the name. On the other hand, there are numerous instances of Latin *uv* being transcribed with simply *ov* (e.g. Ἰουενάλι(ο)ς, Οὐίτρούιος), and the question cannot be regarded as having been settled.

Asel(l)ius. *I. Anazarbos* 455, dated (as practically all of the inscriptions from the city) by the editor to the first or the second century AD, is the funerary inscription of a certain Κόνιντος Ἀσέλιος Οὐίτλος (i.e. *Vitulus*). I shall not dwell at length on the nomen, as *Asel(l)ius* is not that rare in general; however, it may be of some use to point out here that this is, as far as I can see, the first, and so far the only, attestation of this nomen in

²⁶ Cf. B. Helly, in: M. Cébeillac Gervasoni (ed.), *Les "bourgeoisies" municipales italiennes aux IIe et Ier siècles* (1983) 368. – The accentuation Ἀκούιος is used in the index to the *IG* volume (by F. Hiller von Gärtringen).

²⁷ Clearly there is no connection between the two nomina. *Acuvius* can be compared with *Acuvilius* (*CIL VI 10564*) and names like *Acurius Acusius Acutius Acutilius*, whereas *Aquius* should be studied combined with *Aquilius Aquinius* etc.

²⁸ Here are the attestations of both nomina (the praenomina being mentioned when appearing in the inscriptions): *Acuvius* (*Acubius Acuius Aquvius*): *CIL VI*: 5 instances (C. 3148); *CIL X* 812 (M.); *CIL IX* 591; *CIL XI* 3805 (P.); *CIL III* 8852; *CIL VIII* 3320 (L.). – *Aquius*: *Epigrafia della regione dei Marsi* 113; *NSA* 1894, 67 no. 40 (Tarentum, L.); *CIL XI* 148 (Q.); *CIL XII* 1782 (Q.); *AE* 1966, 252 (Lugdunum; Ti.).

the Greek east.²⁹ Furthermore, the praenomen is also of some interest. There are many praenomina attested for the Asel(l)ii whom one finds all around the Roman world,³⁰ namely A. C. L. M. N. Q., but *Quintus* is not very common. In fact, it is not found at all in Italy, and outside of Italy its use is limited to the city of Narbo (with a sufficient supply of Q. Asellii: *CIL* XII 4356. 4627. 5233) and to a couple of sites in Mauretania Caesariensis (*CIL* VIII 8985. 9801). It is thus striking to find this praenomen used in Anazarbus; it remains to be seen whether this can be used for establishing a link between the man in Anazarbus and Narbo.

Atin(n)ius. Among the many surprises offered by the corpus of inscriptions from Anazarbus is the number of persons using the name *Atin(n)ius*. It is of great interest to note that the name is used both as a nomen and as a single name (in one case as a cognomen), both uses in a way illustrating each other. As a nomen, the name is found in *I. Anazarbos* 123 (funerary stele, dated to AD 92, of a certain Ἀτίνιος Φρόντων) and in *ibid.* 639, the funerary inscription of Γάιος Ἀτίνιος Μοντανὸς Οὐαλεντιανός, set up by the man's wife Valentilla. In *ibid.* 497 (Μάρκος Οὐαλερία Ἀτινία τῆ θυγατρὶ), the name (not referred to in the index s. v. Ἀτίνιος) seems to be used as a cognomen (one wonders about the full nomenclature of the father). In the rest of the examples, the name is used as a single name: *ibid.* 294 (Ἀτίνις, husband of Ἰόλλα); 301 (a family consisting of the mother Ἰουλία and the children Μαρκία and Ἀτίνις); *ibid.* 399 (Ἀτίνιος Μέμορι τῷ υἱῷ τῷ καὶ Ἀτινίῳ). What one sees, then, is that, by the time of Domitian, the use of the nomen *Atin(n)ius* had established itself in Anazarbus. This makes one wonder about Atinii in the east in general. Now in the case of Atinii, one is not dealing with an extremely rare name, and so one does not have to assume that the Atinii one finds in the east are

²⁹ Remembering that governors sometimes produce new citizens using their name, note that the senator Asellius Aemilianus (*PIR*² A 1211) had been legate of Thracia and Syria and proconsul of Asia.

³⁰ In addition to the main corpora (*CIL* VI. X. IX. XI. V. XII. III. VIII) note the following instances: Rome: *Mem. Am. Ac. Rome* 9 (1931) 93 no. 2; Rostowzeff, *Tessararum sylloge* 1137. Italy: P. Poccetti, in: *Miscellanea L. Gasperini* (2000) 762 (a Samnite in Bruttium); P. Castrén, *Ordo populusque Pompeianus* (1975) 138 (Pompeii); *AE* 1980, 337 (Lupiae). 1989, 281 (Mevania). 1991, 417 (Fregellae). 1996, 341 (Aquinum). 1997, 754 (Sardinia); *I. Aquileia* 1549. Spain: J. M. Abascal Palazón, *Los nombres personales en las inscripciones latinas de Hispania* (1994) 85. 86. Dacia: *IDR* III 4, 49 (?). Africa: *BACTH* 1902, 379 no. 11; *Uchi Maius* I (1997) 287 no. 4.

all manifestations of the existence of a single *gens* representatives of which had moved their activities to the east. On the contrary, on the basis of the material it appears that there may well have been several types of Atinii among those attested in the east. There is a Republican governor of Asia of this name who may have been the source of some Atinii; on the other hand, there are Atinii in the colony of Lystra, possibly descendants of early colonists. And an early Atinius in Thessaly points to the existence of early independent immigrants. This variety is reflected by the variety of praenomina attested for the Atinii. But let us now move on to the enumeration of the attestations. The earliest Atinius in the east may have been C. Atinius C. f. Labeo, who is now known to have been governor of Asia in 122/121 BC.³¹ At about the time, the name is also attested for a Λεύκιος Ἀτίσιος Γα[ίου] in Larisa.³² Moving from there to the east, and to a somewhat later period, one observes a [Τιβέ]ριος Ἀτίνιος [Ὀν]ήσιμος on Andros (*IG XII Suppl.* 285). In Ephesus, an A. Atinnius No(v)ember, the husband of Novellia Pyrallis, appears in *CIL III* 6087 = *I. Ephesos* 1636, an inscription which does not seem to be from the earliest imperial period. This seems to be all one can find in Greece and in western Asia. But if one moves on to the Roman colony of Lystra in south-western Lycaonia, there are Atinii in two inscriptions. In *MAMA VIII* 30,³³ one finds the couple Γάιος Ἀτίσιος Ἀβάσκαντος and Ἀτινία Ὑγεία, and another, bilingual, inscription produces Ἀτινία Κλεοπάτρα, the wife of Ὀπ(π)ιος Κόσμος (*CIL III* 14400d = *JHS* 24 (1904) 117 no. 164 = *IGR III* 1484). One observes that the praenomen attested here is *Gaius*, which also happens to be the only praenomen attested in Anazarbus, a fact possibly (but because of the frequency of the praenomen, not at all necessarily) of significance. In any case, to find further Anatolian Atinii one has to move on to Cilicia. Here the name is attested not only in Anazarbus, but also at Hamaxia in Rough Cilicia (Ἀτινία Κουαλεως θυγάτηρ in Hagel–Tomaschitz, op. cit. [n. 1] 112 Hamaxia 32). Furthermore, the Cilician material can no doubt be illustrated by the existence of an Atinia [---] attested in Seleucia Pieria in the nearby province of Syria (*IGLS* 1158).

³¹ T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic III* (1986) 27 f.

³² B. Helly, op. cit. (n. 26) p. 364.

³³ Also in G. Laminger-Pascher, *Die kaiserzeitlichen Inschriften Lykaoniens I* (1992) no. 201.

It is not a coherent story which emerges from the above material, but one sees that, in addition to stray attestations in various places, one is dealing with a *gens* with a striking emphasis on Cilicia, the Cilicians possibly being somehow in contact with people of the same name attested in the colony of Lystra. The material regarding the Atinii also illustrates the phenomenon of the use of Roman nomina also as single names by people no doubt not entitled to the use of a Roman nomen but interested in the use of the same names as the local Roman citizens. In fact, in the case of the name *Atinius* attestations such as that in Hamaxia and some of those in Anazarbus have made me think of the possibility that this could in fact be a name of local origin; but the instances in which it is used as a regular Roman nomen seem to rule out this possibility.

Atrilius. Miletus produces a new funerary inscription set up by Ἀτριλία Ρούφιλλα for her brother Ξέστος (sic) Ἀτρίλιος Ἰουλάδης Νάρκισος (sic) (*I. Milet* 514). We thus have a new attestation of an extremely rare nomen (no doubt in an etymological relationship to *Atrius*), this time combined with the praenomen *Sextus*. In the commentary, the reader is referred to an African inscription, already quoted by Schulze,³⁴ *CIL* VIII 4576, which is a votive inscription set up in Diana Veteranorum in Numidia by a certain L. Atrilius L. f. Felix. But there may be a third instance of the nomen, for A. Ferrua, *Note al Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (1986) 133 quotes an unpublished inscription from the Via Latina near Rome, mentioning a M. Atrilius Sabinus. So we seem to have altogether three Atrilii, all with different praenomina. But there is a catch: I have no idea how this can be explained, but the inscription from Rome mentioned by Ferrua seems to be identical with an inscription now in Bordeaux, said to have been found at Saint-Médard-en-Jalles, a locality in the region of Bordeaux (Wuilleumier, *ILTG* 142, from *Gallia* 1955, 199 f.).³⁵ However, here the reading is *Matrilius*, as there is reportedly nothing between the *m* and the *a*. So possibly we shall have to content ourselves with only two Atrilii. On the other hand, the fact that *Matrilius* is completely unknown makes one think whether the reading of Ferrua might not be preferable. However, it is clear that before the inscription from Rome/Saint-Médard can be put into serious scholarly use, there are some serious questions to which answers are needed.

³⁴ W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (1904 and many later reprints) 269.

³⁵ The identity has been noticed by H. Solin.

Babudius. This is another nomen now found for the first time in the east, namely in the funerary inscription of a certain Λούκιος Βαβούδιος Βάσσοϛ at Miletus (*I. Milet* 519). In the commentary it is said that the name is found in Umbria, and the fact is that it is indeed found in two inscriptions from Vettona, both mentioning persons of freedman status and manumitted by a L. Babudius (perhaps the same person in both cases), the praenomen thus being the same as in Miletus (*CIL* XI 5185; 5185). With not too much effort one can produce a further instance, namely the centurion Babudius Severus attested in Britain (*RIB* 256 from about the second century). In any case, I think one could conclude that we have here a *gens* from Vettona which in spite of its small size can produce members which in a nice way reflect the fortunes of a normal Italian family in the imperial age, there being, in addition to people who stayed in the home city, a soldier attested in a military province on one hand, and on the other a businessman (I think this is fairly probable) attested in a major centre in Asia.

Blossius. From the inscription from Heraclea Lyncestis, *IG* X 2, 2, 73 one learns that the honorific monument to which the inscription belongs was set up by the city at the proposal of a certain Γ. Μάρ(ιοϛ) Βλοσσιανὸϛ Θράσσων. In the commentary it is said that *Blossianus* is rare, which is of course true, although, the existence of Blossiani depending entirely on the availability of suitable Blossii, a word or two on the nomen *Blossius* might also have been of use. In any case, I think that the cognomen implies the presence of at least one Blossius in Heraclea or at least in the area (of could e.g. think that the father of this man had married a Blossia from Heraclea or from a neighbouring city), and what is interesting is that, as far as I can see, this is only the third attestation of the nomen, very clearly of Campanian origin, in the east. One of the instances is, moreover, not very interesting, as we seem to be dealing not with a resident but with a visitor in the case M. Blossius M. f. Ter., *mil. coh. Cypr(iae)*, buried in Sinope (*EA* 6 [1985] 99).³⁶ But Αὐ[λ]ιοϛ Βλόσσιοϛ Αὔλου υἱὸϛ Ῥοῦφοϛ νεώτεροϛ on Cos (*I. Cos* ED150, Ca, lines 1–5; no doubt ca. Augustan) is a relevant person. Since one can probably deduce from νεώτεροϛ that already this man's father resided on Cos, we thus have Blossii on Cos between the later Republic and the time of Augustus, and in Heraclea Lyncestis in the second century. I think that there is a good chance that the Blossii are somehow connected and

³⁶ This inscription does not seem to have found its way to *AE* 1985 (in other cases registering inscriptions in *EA* vol. 6).

that we have here another instance of a family moving at some point from the Aegean area to Macedonia.³⁷ There is one more thing to be said, namely that the praenomen *Aulus* is also of some interest, as it is very rarely attested in combination with the nomen *Blossius*; in fact, although this is not an extremely rare nomen, I can find only one further instance, namely *CIL VI 34393* from Rome.

Cercenius. Altogether three persons using the name *Cercenius* are found in Anazarbus; as in the case of some other nomina (cf. above on *Atinius*) this name, too, is used both as a nomen and (in one case) as a single name: in *I. Anazarbos 314* we find a Κερκηνία Πῶλλα, in *ibid. 598* there is a Κερκηνία Ῥηγείνα; on the other hand, in *ibid. 604* a Κερκήνιος is the brother of a Μᾶρκος. (All the inscriptions are dated by the editor to the first or the second century AD.) In the third inscription, the cognomen of the brother, in general a banal one, is useful in this case, because it seems to establish the connection of these Cercenii with a Cercenius attested in the neighbouring Cilician city of Hierapolis Castabala, where we find a Μᾶρκος Κερκήνιος Τήρης (*OGI 753, I = IGR III 901*). In addition to this concentration of Cercenii in Cilicia, a stray Γ. Κερκήνιος, husband of Ἐλουία Παῶλλα, can be extracted from an inscription from a site described as being 7 hours SW of Dorylaeum in Phrygia (*AM 27 (1902) 271*). There must be a connection between this Cercenius and the Cilician namesakes, as these are the only attestations of the name in the whole of the Roman Empire outside Italy.³⁸ So we seem to have here reflections of another Italian *gens* moving to the east during (probably) the later Republic and concentrating (as e.g. the Agusii, cf. above) on the eastern rather than on the western parts of Asia Minor.

Cincius. The publication, in *I. Milet 572*, of the funerary inscription of a certain Μᾶρκος Κίνκιος Στράβων may provide an excuse for a quick enumeration of the Cincii (this is not a common nomen) attested in the eastern parts of the Roman Empire. (In all cases, the name is spelled Κίνκ-, not Κίγκ-.) First of all, the name is found, combined with the same praenomen *Marcus*, on Delos (*ID 2109*).³⁹ The rest of the attestations are from Athens on one hand, and (as in the case of the new inscription) from

³⁷ Cf. e.g. my paper quoted in n. 20 (e.g. p. 117 n. 28).

³⁸ All the Italian instances (found between Patavium in the north and Minturnae in the south) are enumerated by Schulze, *op. cit.* (n. 34) 172.

³⁹ Registered by J. Hatzfeld, *BCH 36 (1912) 26*.

the eastern coast of the Aegean. The Athenian instances are from the late first and from the second century.⁴⁰ On the other side of the Aegean, we have another M. Cincius, namely Μάρκος Κίνκιος Νιγρέϊνο[ς], στρατιώτης χώρτης ένδεκάτης όρβάνης, attested in Byzantium (or Selymbria?) and no doubt a local man (*IGR* I 779 and other publications = *I. Byzantion* p. 284 S. 31, an inscription datable because of its decoration to the Trajanic period).⁴¹ A certain Κινκία ΚΑΙ(?) (unless we have a καί here, by mistake not being followed by another name) is known in a place called *Bulduk* a bit to the NE of Vetissus in western Galatia (*MAMA* VII 461). The survey of eastern Cincii is rounded off with the new man in Miletus and with Δησιδιήνη Κινκία (the wife of the procurator and philosopher Appius Alexander), who seems to have been of eastern, possibly Ephesian, origin (*I. Ephesos* 617; *PIR*² D 51).⁴² In this case, then, we have a *gens* fairly well represented in the east but apparently only rarely leaving the area of the Aegean.

Curvius. This nomen appears in an inscription from Perge, inscribed on the plinth of a statue, where we find the brothers Κ. Κούρβιος Σανκτιανός Κῦπος καὶ Κ. Κούρβιος Καλπουρνιανός Σάνκτος (*I. Perge* 276). No commentary is added, although it might have been useful to note that the nomen is attested also in another (fragmentary) inscription from Perge mentioning a Κούρβ(ιος) Καλλίκαρπο[ς] (*EA* 11 [1988] 148 no. 93; not in *SEG* XXXVIII). Outside Perge, the name seems to be attested in the east only once, in the case of a certain Τίτος Κούρβιος Κήρινθος in Ephesus (*I. Ephesos* 1687, (7), a list of subscriptions of ca. Augustan date).⁴³ In addition to the fact that this is only the third document mentioning eastern Curvii, the new inscription is interesting also because the

⁴⁰ In addition to *IG* II/III² 10615 mentioning a Κίνκιος Αἴσωπος and dated "s. II p.", there is the inscription of a certain Λούκιος Κίνκιος Ἑρμῶν from the Ceramicus, referred to (and dated to the later first century) by J. Stroszeck in a presentation of finds from the site in the German Archaeological Institute at Athens on Dec. 16, 1999.

⁴¹ In *I. Byzantion*, the inscription is published among those from Selymbria, but in the introduction, the view that it is in fact from Byzantium (J. and L. Robert, *Bull. ép.* 1968, 342, in their turn quoting N. Firatli) is quoted with no sign of disapproval.

⁴² This seems to be implied by the formulations of the inscription (see above) in her honour, set up by a priestess of Artemis and ἀρχιέρεια Ἀσίας ναῶν τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ to her εὐεργέτις. Her husband is also clearly an eastern man (cf. also *PIR*² A 954).

⁴³ But in Egypt one finds Κούρουτιος Ῥοῦφος, centurion of the legio XXII Deiotariana (*SEG* XXIX 1622 = *AE* 1980, 757).

two Curvii have the praenomen *Quintus* which on a closer look at the praenomina used by Curvii (otherwise A. C. Cn.⁴⁴ M. P. Sex. T.) turns out to be almost unparalleled; in fact, there seems to be only the patron of A. Curvius A. Q. I. Pape(...?) in a Republican inscription from Caere (*CIL* I² 2734). *Titus*, the praenomen of the man in Ephesus, is rare, too; the only other T. Curvius I am able to find is a man in Ulubrae in Latium (*CIL* X 6493).

Dellius. In the sanctuary at Leukopetra, a man called N. Δέλλιος Ἐπίγονος makes an offering in AD 171/2 (*I. Leukopetra* 7, an inscription previously unpublished). The man has an interesting nomenclature; his nomen, familiar to readers of Horace but otherwise rather rare,⁴⁵ was not attested in these parts before the publication of this inscription, but if one moves on to the other side of the Aegean, one finds a Δελλία Ἀντωνία and her husband Menophanes (who is thus not a citizen himself) setting up a statue of their daughter Ἀφία in the city in Mysia later known as Hadrianeia (*I. Hadrianoi und Hadrianeia* 141); the inscription because of the reference to the *boule* and the *demos* of the Abretteni seems to predate the Hadrianic foundation but is clearly of imperial date. In any case, I think that one could postulate a connection of sorts between these Dellii, the only two east of Italy. As for the possible origin of the *gens*, it is very good that the man is equipped with the praenomen *Numerius*. This was a popular Oscan praenomen of which one finds instances mainly in the parts of Italy once inhabited by Samnites, and finding a Numerius normally means that one is dealing with a man from somewhere in Samnium (especially in and around Beneventum) or Campania. Now studying the praenomina of the Italian Dellii one observes that, in addition to an inscription from Rome (*CIL* VI 16779), one can locate only one N. Dellius in Italy, namely the patron of a N. Dellius and a Dellia in Capua, a most suitable city (*CIL* X 4108). So as a result we not only see another Italian *gens* practising emigration to the east slowly emerging from obscurity but also that this family seems to be another representative of the Campanians, so well attested on the sector of emigration to the east.

Fundilius. Anazarbus, apparently a real repository of rare Roman

⁴⁴ Cn. Curvius Bithus, *AE* 1979, 151 = 1988, 278 (Fabrateria Nova).

⁴⁵ For instances outside *CIL* and the *AE* note e.g. *NSA* 1953, 283 (Ostia); *I. Aquileia* 2793; *NSA* 1899, 45 = T. Schäfer, *Imperii insignia* (1989) 339 f. no. 59 (Venetia); *AE* 1998, 591 (Verona); *Boll. Mus. Civ. Padova* 7 (1904) 155 (Patavium).

nomina, is able to produce also a representative of the *gens* of the Fundilii, in the form of Φονδειλία Πρεισκίλλη who is mentioned in connection with a Πόπλιος [...] (*I. Anazarbos* 619), the name of the latter person following upon that of Fundilia. Now here we have a real surprise, for this is not only the first instance of this nomen in the east, but also almost the first instance of this nomen outside Italy, for except for one African inscription (*CIL* VIII 8956, mentioning a Q. Fundilius Saturninus) the nomen is found only in Italy, and almost exclusively in Central Italy.⁴⁶ If the Πόπλιος of the inscription is a Πόπλιος [Φονδείλιος] (as he is mentioned after Priscilla he may then have been a son rather than the husband), then one could add the observation that in Italy, P. Fundilii are attested only twice (P. Fundilius Ibycus, *CIL* XV 8232, a *signaculum*, and P. Fundilius Lupulus in brick stamps from N. Italy, see n. 46).

Galerius. Though the nomen *Galerius* has a familiar ring, it is in reality not very common.⁴⁷ Beroea now produces Γαλεριανός Εὐκτήμων (*I. Beroea* 319), who seems to be the first *Galerius* so far attested in Macedonia (for *Galerianus* representing *Galerius* cf. above at n. 15). There are some further attestations of the name in the east, in Athens and on Cos,⁴⁸ but (as far as I can see) this is all, the nomen thus being notable for (apparently) not appearing at all in inscriptions from mainland Asia Minor.⁴⁹

Hosidius. This nomen, the attestations of which concentrate on

⁴⁶ As the attestations are not very numerous, let me enumerate them here. Republican personalities: *RE* VII 294 no. 1 (praenomen: C.), 2 (from Varro, *Ling.* 1, 2, 11, L.; possibly thought of as another man from Reate, cf. the Fundilii from Reate, below). – Rome: *CIL* VI: 10 instances (C. M.); *CIL* XV 1166; H. Bloch, *The Roman Brick Stamps* etc. (1947/48 = 1967) 313 (A.); *CIL* XV 8232 (*signaculum*, P.). – Area of *CIL* XIV: *CIL* XIV 4199 f. 4273 (Fundilia C. f. Rufa and her freedman [*RE* Suppl. X 241 no. 3], *Nemus Dianae/Aricia*). – Area of *CIL* X: Pompeii: P. Castrén, *Ordo populusque Pompeianus* (1975) 170 (C.). *Rend. Linc.* 1971, 437 no. 23 (*Casinum*, L.); *Inedita* from *Tarracina* (M.) and *Venafrum*. – Area of *CIL* IX: *CIL* IX 4673, 4691 (Reate, T.); 5054 = *CIL* I² 1902 (*Interamnium Praetuttiorum*, D. – N.I.). Area of *CIL* XI: *AE* 1993, 695 (Veii). – Area of *CIL* V: *CIL* V 8110, 254 (brick stamps in *Opitergium* and *Patavium*, P.).

⁴⁷ See *Arctos* 32 (1998) 214, in Group 'B'.

⁴⁸ *IG* II/III² 2038, 7; 2059, 66 (M. Woloch, *Roman Citizenship and the Athenian Elite A.D. 96–161. Two Prosopographical Catalogues* (1989) 49 no. 1–2); cf. *ID* 2537. Cos: *IGR* IV 1045 (mid-first century). Note also *IOSPE* I² 236 from *Olbia* on the N. coast of the Black Sea.

⁴⁹ In the Latin inscription *CIL* III 7091 = *I. Pergamon* 637 (of somewhat uncertain interpretation) one seems to be dealing with the tribe, not with the (abbreviated) nomen.

Histonium on the E. coast of Central Italy, the home of the senatorial Hosidii Getae, is otherwise fairly rare, scattered attestations appearing here and there. Given the fact that Anazarbus has so many rare Roman nomina on offer it is perhaps not a huge surprise to find here a certain Ὅσιδία Κρισπίνα, the wife of Claudius Eutyclus (*I. Anazarbos* 227), but it is certainly notable that this seems to be only the third attestation of this nomen in the eastern lands. There is not much one can do about a fragmentary text from Mytilene in which one seems to recognize, among other names and (possibly) a reference to an embassy, Ὅσιδίωι Π[---] (*IG XII 2*, 66), but there is an interesting Hosidius in Aphrodisias, a splendid character indeed, although limiting his operations to the local level, namely Γάιος Ὅσιδιος Ἰουλιανός. The man, founder of an *agon* and honoured by at least two statues, seems to belong to the second century.⁵⁰ One wonders whether there could be a connection between the Hosidii in Mytilene and in Aphrodisias and the woman in Anazarbus, and, moreover, whether the use of the praenomen *Gaius* by the Hosidii Getae (*PIR*² H 217, attested as legionary legate in Britain in AD 43) could be introduced into an eventual discussion of the origin of C. Hosidius Iulianus' Roman citizenship.

Laberius. This is a fairly common nomen which is not really entitled to special attention; however, the appearance of two Aurelii Laberii, Τρεβών[ιος] Μέμων and his son Μέμων Τρεβωνία[νός], in an inscription from a site (the ancient name of which seems to be unknown) in Cilicia,⁵¹ and the publication, not too long ago, of a funerary inscription from Hierapolis Castabala of a certain Λαβέριος Πομπηϊανός (*SEG XXXIX* 1513), makes one think of another inscription from Hierapolis, namely *CIL* III 12117 = *ILS* 1036 = *IGR* III 902, set up in the time of Trajan by Αὐλός Λαβέριος Καμερῖνος and his son of the same name (no doubt he also had the praenomen *Aulus*, although it is omitted in the inscription), centurion of the legion V Macedonica, in honour of the senator Q. Pompeius Falco, sometime legate of the same legion. In earlier years, there has been some discussion of the interpretation of the fact that this inscription was set up in Hierapolis, some thinking that Falco was a Cilician, some saying that it is the centurion and his father who were from Hierapolis. But it now seems

⁵⁰ C. Roueché, *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias* (1993) 166 no. 51; *ibid.* 176 f. no. 55 (a) and (b).

⁵¹ Tomaschitz, *Westkilikien* 12 ff. no. 5 = Hagel – Tomaschitz, *Repertorium* 347 Sarnıçbeleni 7 (cf. above n. 1 for these publications) = *AE* 1998, 1413.

that Falco's home was somewhere in Sicily,⁵² and so it is good to see Cilician Laberii multiplying, as this renders the attribution of the centurion to Cilicia unproblematic und persuasive. So we have here a man of local standing setting up a monument to his former superior, the monument no doubt being meant not really to advertise the achievements of the senator (with no connections to Cilicia) but rather the social status of the dedicator and his family, who are thus making themselves recognized as people moving in senatorial circles. But there is one more thing to be said on the centurion and his father, namely that their praenomen, *Aulus*, is of some interest. Among the Laberii in Asia Minor and in Greece,⁵³ one cannot find another A. Laberius, and also among the western Laberii, there seem to be very few traces of Auli. In fact, the only A. Laberii I have been able to trace so far are a man in Rome and another in Thubursicu in Numidia.⁵⁴

Lardius. I. Milet 628 is the inscription belonging to a ἡρώων of several people, these including a certain Λάρδιος Αἰμίλιος, his wife Ῥουτιλία Κιανίς and another Rutilius, Ῥουτίλιος Εὐπόριστος, who will have been a relative of Rutilia Cianis. Now *Lardius* is interesting as this is only the second attestation of this nomen in the Roman world; the only other *Lardius* known to me is a man attested in Rome, namely Sex. Lardius Eros Asiaticus, *mag(ister)*, *q(uaestor)*, *tribun(us)* (no doubt of a *collegium* of sorts) in *AE* 1928, 11.⁵⁵ One wonders whether *Asiaticus* could refer to connections to, or activities in, Asia.

Luscius. This is a very rare nomen, the attestations of which seem to concentrate on Latium and Central Italy. It comes as a little surprise to observe it in an inscription from Antandrus in the Troad, where a certain Λούσκιος Ταρσικός seems to be mentioned (*AE* 1996, 1434; *SEG* XLVI

⁵² See O. Salomies, *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature* (1992) 124 f.; W. Eck, *ZPE* 113 (1996) 109 ff.; *PIR*² P 602.

⁵³ For Laberii in Greece see e.g. J. Hatzfeld, *BCH* 36 (1912) 45 (Delos); Woloch, *op. cit.* (n. 48) 61 no. 1–5 (Athens); *IG* VII 2181 (Thespiae). 4152 (a man with both Corinthian and Thespian citizenship); *IG* XII 8, 387 (Thasos). Laberii in Asia Minor: four attestations in Ephesus (see the index, p. 120; *CIG* 3664, 64 (Cyzicus); *I. Priene* 114 (1st century BC); *I. Prusias ad Hypium* 98 (from Heraclea Pontica); *Studia Pontica* III (1910) 49 no. 35 (Neoclaudiopolis); *TAM* III 573 (Termessus); *SEG* XVII 614 (Attaleia, Pamphylia).

⁵⁴ *CIL* VI 20965: A. Laberius Agathopus; *ILAlg.* I 1723: A. Laberius A.l. Gratus.

⁵⁵ Visitors to the American Academy in Rome may inspect this inscription with ease, as it is now affixed on the western wall of the courtyard.

1559).⁵⁶ This seems to be the first time a Luscius is found residing in the eastern provinces.⁵⁷ However, this is not the first time a Luscius is attested as having spent shorter periods in the east, for the senator L. Luscius Ocrea (*PIR*² L 431) is known to have been both legate of Lycia-Pamphylia (in the time of Vespasian) and proconsul of Asia in c. 90.⁵⁸ I think there is a fair chance that the Luscius in Antandrus, who can easily be dated to a period later than Ocrea, is a product of Ocrea's Asian proconsulate.⁵⁹

Mussenus. A votive inscription, now worn and partly fragmentary, was set up in Perge by a certain T. Μουσσῆν[....] Φλαου[...]. (there follow uncertain letters probably belonging to a cognomen; *I. Perge* 247). What we have here is no doubt a Greek transcription of the nomen *Mussenus*, that is, Μουσσῆνος. This is the first time this nomen is found outside Italy, and even in Italy the instances are extremely rare. Written *Mussenus*, the name is found once in Septempeda in Picenum (*CIL* IX 5612: C. Mussenus (mulieris) l. Aesopus); written with a single *s* the name appears in a Greek inscription from Rome, correctly interpreted by H. Solin,⁶⁰ where the name is written as Μουσένα Ἰρήνη (*ICVR* 15755). But names ending in *-enus*

⁵⁶ From E. Schwertheim, in: *Die Troas. Neue Forschungen zu Neandria und Alexandria Troas II* (Asia Minor Studien 22, 1996) 109 f. no. 11. I think that we are dealing with three men altogether in the formula ἐπιψηφίσαντος Ἀγαθανγέλου τοῦ β' καὶ Ἀγαθανγέλου Καττιαναῦ, Λουσκίου Ταρσικοῦ καὶ ἱερέως etc., although one could in theory think of dealing with only two men, an Agathangelos son of A., and with Agathangelos Kattianos Louskios Tarsikos. But a name of this length is not really plausible in this context. Of course, one wonders about the missing τοῦ before Καττιανοῦ, and one would perhaps also like to have an additional καὶ before Λουσκίου. Note also the use of the singular ἐπιψηφίσαντος, this giving the impression of the other names coming as an afterthought.

⁵⁷ For provincial Luscii in Dalmatia see *ILJug.* 614 and in Risinium *ibid.* 634 and 1855A; the latter is a Greek inscription mentioning Λούκιος Λούσκιο[ς] Εὔκαρπος, ἀρχια[τρός] κλεινικός, the choice of language possibly pointing to eastern origin. Note that the man has the same praenomen as the senator with eastern offices to be mentioned shortly.

⁵⁸ B.E. Thomasson, *Laterculi praesidum* I (1984) 276 f. no. 7; 218 no. 77.

⁵⁹ For new citizens taking the nomina of provincial governors, this no doubt pointing to certain common interests, see my paper referred to in n. 4. Note that the appearance of a Luscius in Antandrus now moves Luscius Ocrea from column 'A' (governors not producing new citizens) to 'B' or 'C' on p. 130. (The same process should possibly be applied also to Eprius Marcellus, see above at n. 4.)

⁶⁰ H. Solin, *Analecta epigraphica* (1998) 389 f. (originally in *Arctos* 30 [1996] 243 f.).

normally have a parallel variant form ending in *-ienus* (cf. *Passenus/Passienus* etc.) and so we have to take into consideration also *Mussienus* and *Musienus*, names which are attested in *CIL* IX 146 (Brundisium: two M. Mussieni) and *CIL* V 5160 (Bergomum, a Musiena [---]), respectively. This is, as far as I can see, all. Note that the Mussenus in Perge has the praenomen *Titus* which is not attested among the Mu(s)s(i)eni in Italy; on the other hand, it is possible that the praenomen goes with *Flavius*, not with the man's first nomen.⁶¹

Novius. In Cibyra, a new inscription makes one acquainted with the architect Ὀλως Νόουιος Κλάρος, the husband of Licinnia Marcella (Milner, op. cit. [above at n. 1] 12 no. 17). As such, the two nomina are not especially interesting, as *Licinius* is extremely common in Asia Minor and *Novius* is also well represented in both Greece and Macedonia and in Asia Minor.⁶² However, when one combines *Novius* with *Aulus*, things get a bit more interesting, and this combination seems to deserve a short annotation. Now, if one studies the Novii whom one finds in inscriptions from the western parts of the Roman empire, one observes that there seem to be very few traces of A. Novii, whether in Italy or in the provinces; in fact, I can locate only two A. Novii in Rome (*CIL* VI 37749; *NSA* 1914, 382⁶³) and the *sevir Augustalis* A. Novius Phlegon(?) in an inscription, now lost, from Volaterrae (*CIL* XI 1747). On the other hand, inscriptions from Delos have a number of references to A. Novii, although they may all refer, in one way or another, to a certain Ἀύλος Νόουιος Λευκίου Ῥωμαῖος (*ID* 1687 [= *CIL* I² 2232]. 1690/1691).⁶⁴ But in any case, I think that, because of the rare combination of praenomen and nomen one is allowed to assume that there is a connection between the A. Novii on Delos and the man in Cibyra, and so the new inscription from the latter city may be taken as another testimony for the movements from Delos by the Italians who once were settled there. Cibyra was a centre of some importance, where Italians are attested from the

⁶¹ Names such as that of T. Vibius Varus = T. Clodius Vibius Varus (*Adoptive Nomenclature* [n. 5] 99 f.) could then be adduced as a parallel.

⁶² The name does not, however, appear in J. Hatzfeld, *Les trafiquants italiens dans l'Orient hellénique* (1919).

⁶³ The latter inscription, mentioning a certain [A.] Novius A.l. Philargyrus, appears also in the indices of *CIL* VI, equipped with the (non existent) number 39554.

⁶⁴ Freedmen of an A. Novius: *ID* 1755. 1764; [--- N]ούιος Αύλου (a son of A. Novius L. f.?) in *ID* 1765. On the Novii on Delos cf. also J. Hatzfeld, *BCH* 36 (1912) 55 f.

late Republican period onwards.⁶⁵ Possibly there were also Novii on Delos who moved to Egypt; certainly an Αὔλος Νόου[ιος] Φαῦστος is attested in Philae in AD 2 (*IGR I* 1305).

Ocratius. The appearance in Anazarbus of a family using the nomen *Ocratius* (*I. Anazarbos* 431: Μάρκῳ Ὀκρατίῳ καὶ Ὀκρατίῳ Σεκούνη τοῖς γονεῦσιν Μ. Ὀκράτιος Λονγεῖνος) is no doubt a good excuse for having a quick overview of this *gens* as attested in the east.⁶⁶ Here, the name is attested once in Macedonia,⁶⁷ once in Athens, three times in Phrygia, and now also in Anazarbus. In Macedonia, the name is attested only indirectly in the cognomen of a certain Π. Φάριος(?)⁶⁸ Ὀκρατιανός (*I. Beroia* 142, apparently an earlyish text⁶⁹), though of course this is enough to show that there were Ocratii in Beroea or at least in the area. In Athens, we find Ὀκρ(άτιος) Κρήσκης (*IG II/III²* 1817, 22, Severan). On the other side of the Aegean, there are Ocratii scattered within a smallish area in SW Phrygia between Blaundos and Laodicea on the Lycus. In Blaundos, one observes, probably in the time of Philip, the archon Ὀκράτιος, of whom apparently only the nomen is mentioned (ἐπὶ Ὀκρατίου ἄρ(χοντος) F. Imhoof-Blumer, *Lydische Stadtmünzen* [1897] 52). Only about 20 or 25 km. to the southeast from there, in a site identified in *MAMA* with Pepouza,⁷⁰ one finds a Σεκούνηδα Ὀκρατία Γαίου θυγάτηρ, the daughter of Titia Ofellia, in an

⁶⁵ Hatzfeld, op. cit. (n. 62) 123; A.J.N. Wilson, *Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome* (1966) 137, 197.

⁶⁶ Though this name may sound unfamiliar, it is in fact, although not at all common, not extremely rare in Italy and is also attested in some provinces, these including Africa.

⁶⁷ Note also P. Ocratius, the name on a seal found among numerous other seals pertaining to other persons in a private house on Delos (*AE* 1993, 1409); but it is not certain that this man was a resident of Delos.

⁶⁸ The nomen is published as Φάβιος in *I. Beroea*, but an earlier reading was Φάριος (cf. Tataki, op. cit. [n. 15] no. 1260), which is more interesting and which, to judge from the photo, in fact seems to be the correct one. *Farius* is extremely rare; it is found a few times in Rome (*CIL VI* 12865. 17722; *ICUR* 23917) and once in Africa (*ILAlg.* II 2598 from Castellum Celtianum); whether this African instance (one hopes that this is indeed the correct reading) can be combined with the fact that there are also Ocratii in Africa to provide some illustration for the man in Beroea, remains to be seen.

⁶⁹ This inscription (a catalogue of names) is dated to the first century, either BC or AD, by both Tataki and in *I. Beroea*, but I would say that some names (especially *Receptus*, in the nomenclature of Pontius son of Receptus) seem to point to the later date; I think that the first century AD seems a fairly accurate dating.

⁷⁰ But this identification is uncertain (cf. W. Leschhorn, *Antike Ären* [1993] 277 n. 1).

inscription which is clearly to be dated much earlier than the archon in Blaundos (*MAMA* IV 317). Moving from there a bit to the southwest, there are, in Laodicea in the middle of the second century, two Sex. Ocratii, namely Sex. Ocratius Sacerdos and his son Sex. Ocratius Publicianus (Πουπλικιανός) (L. Robert, in: *Laodicée de Lycos. Le Nymphée* [1969] p. 300). The attestations in and around Phrygia must somehow belong together; as we find here at least the praenomina *Gaius* and *Sextus*, we may conclude that we are dealing with a family emigrating to the east fairly early, and moreover, that there is no reason not to assume a connection between these Ocratii and the M. Ocratii in Anazarbus. I would be inclined to add also the Ocratii in Beroea to this eastern branch of the *gens*.

Pedanius. Recent epigraphical publications produce new Pedanii both in Perge and in Anazarbus. In Perge, we find two excellent persons, Γν. Πεδάνιος Οὐαλεριανός, of equestrian status and a man of great merit locally, honoured by (at least) two statuary monuments (*I. Perge* 180, 181), and Γν. Πεδάνιος Σατορνείλος Φιλώτης, apparently not an equestrian but himself, too, a man of a high social standing in his home town (*ibid.* 182; note that, as δημιουργός, he was ὑπερβαλόμενος πάντας τοὺς πρὸ αὐτοῦ δημιουργούς). These two men seem to about Antonine. Again, the collection of inscriptions from Anazarbus makes one acquainted with Πεδανία, the wife of a certain Clemens (*I. Anazarbos* 229). There is no comment on this by the editor, which is somewhat surprising, as this inscription might have received some most useful illustration by a reference to the existence, in the middle of the first century, of the medical author Pedanius Dioscurides of Anazarbus.⁷¹ At about the same time, a Pedanius is mentioned on coins of Mostene-Caesarea in Lydia.⁷² The fact that we find first-century Pedanii around Asia shows that one must distinguish between several branches of the *gens*, for the Cn. Pedanii in Perge are because of their rather striking praenomen most probably not descendants of

⁷¹ See now *PIR*² P 197; cf. *I. Anazarbos* p. 14 (where the man is called "Dioskurides aus Anazarbos").

⁷² A. Burnett – M. Amandry – P.P. Ripollès, *Roman Provincial Coinage* I (1992) no. 2461 f. (between AD 50 and 54), ἐπὶ Πεδανίου. Normally this man is identified with L. Pedanius Secundus cos. 43, who is thought to have been proconsul of Asia (thus Thomasson, *op. cit.* [n. 8] 212 n. 45; *PIR*² P 202), but there seems to be no good reason for thinking that this is a proconsul and not a local man (this interpretation is suggested in *Roman Prov. Coinage*), and certainly there is no other evidence for the proconsulate of Pedanius Secundus (the inscription cited by Thomasson must refer to some other person).

immigrants but must be connected to the senatorial Cn. Pedanii *PIR*² P 199–201,⁷³ among whom there is a person with service in Asia Minor, namely (Cn.) Pedanius Fuscus Salinator, proconsul of Asia in 98/99 (*PIR* no. 199).⁷⁴ With the Pedanii in Perge one must no doubt connect another Pamphylian Pedanius of about the same date, namely Πεδάνιος Σατορνείλος⁷⁵ in nearby Attaleia (*CIG* 4341b, a funerary inscription). On the other hand, Pedanii in Cyzicus from about the middle of the second century onwards⁷⁶ can also with some probability be attached to the proconsul. So what we have here is a number of Pedanii whose existence may well be due to the Asian proconsulate of Cn. Pedanius Fuscus Salinator, and, on the other hand, earlier Pedanii in both Lydia and Cilicia, who may be reflections of immigration to Asia Minor (unless one wants to create a proconsulate of Asia of L. Pedanius Secundus to explain the Pedanius in Lydia). Παιδανία (sic) Μοδεράτα in Thessalonica in the earlier third century and belonging to the local nobility (*IG* X 2, 1, 211) probably also represents a population with an immigrant background, although she too has been connected with the proconsul of Asia.⁷⁷

Percennius. In Tyana in Cappadocia, a new inscription records the

⁷³ As for the praenomen *Cn.*, note that not a single Cn. Pedanius can be found in Barcino (a city well equipped with various L. Pedanii) where both the Cn. and L. Pedanii are supposed to come from (see the index in G. Fabre & al., *Inscriptions romaines de Catalogne II. Barcino* [1997]). Possibly one should, then, reconsider the connection of the Cn. Pedanii with the Pedanii from Barcino.

⁷⁴ I think there is not a problem in seeing the Cn. Pedanii from Perge as products of Salinator's Asian proconsulate, for their ancestors might have moved from Asia to Pamphylia, but possibly one might also think that a Cn. Pedanius had at some point been governor of Lycia-Pamphylia.

⁷⁵ The cognomen is transmitted in the form Σατορνείδος, which is no doubt a misreading of Σατορνείλος, not of Σατορνείνος.

⁷⁶ [-] Πεδά[v](τος) Εὐτυχιανός in *CIG* 3664, line 13 (too bad the praenomen has not been preserved); Ναίβιος Πλώ(τος) Πεδ(άνιος) Αὐρ(ήλιος) Σατορνίνος in *CIG* 3665, line 15.

⁷⁷ D. Samsaris, *Makedonika* 26 (1987–88) 347. – Note furthermore that there is also a Pedanius Theophrastus somehow connected with Amastris, for the inscription from Panticapaeum, *IGR* I 887 = *CIRB* 54 (of AD 221) was set up by the *boule* and the *demos* of Amastris in Panticapaeum διὰ ἐπιμελείας Πεδανίου Θεοφράστου. As the Amastrian ambassadors are also mentioned, this man leaves the impression of not belonging to the group of men coming from Amastris to Panticapaeum to take care of the erection of the statue.

existence, in a period which seems to be hard to define exactly (but we are hardly dealing with the earliest imperial period),⁷⁸ of Πούβλιος Περκέννιος and his sons Γάιος and Χίλων (*I. Tyana* 87). Two observations can be made here; on one hand, it should be noted that this seems to be only the second Percennius so far attested in the east, the other one being a soldier from Philippi, M. Percenni[ius - . f.] Voltinia Ph[ilippis] (*CIL* III 14933). On the other hand, one could note that *Publius* is not very often attested among western Percennii; for instance, there are no P. Percennii in *CIL* IX, X, XI.⁷⁹ The only ones I can find are a certain P. Percenni(us) in *CIL* VI 8327 = *CIL* I² 1131, another one in *CIL* V 3241, and an instance in Africa (*CIL* VIII 15445).

Peticius. A new inscription from Messene and inscriptions now published in a new corpus add interesting details to the dossier on Peticii in the east, a gens the representatives of which are somewhat strikingly attested only in Greece and Macedonia, not in Asia. The members of this gens are attested here from the middle of the first century onwards. First there is a certain Peticius, who is attested in a literary source (*Plut. Pomp.* 73, 4 ff.) as running, in 48 BC, a shipping business in the area of the northern Aegean (*RE* XIX 1131 f.). Moving from there to the more southerly parts of the Aegean, one finds a number of Peticii on the island of Cos, the praenomen, if attested, here being *Gaius* (*IGR* IV 1101; *IGR* IV 1084 = *I. Cos* EV 102bis; Paton–Hicks, *The Inscriptions of Cos* 201). Leaving these parts and turning to the Peloponnese, there is now a Peticius in a new inscription from Messene, where we find that two persons, Ἡρακλείδας καὶ Λούκιος Πετίκιος Γάλλος ὁ υἱός, are building a temple in (probably) the first century AD.⁸⁰ It is very interesting that this is not the only Peticius attested

⁷⁸ The fact that the man here does not seem to have a cognomen cannot be adduced as a dating criterium in these parts, for in a place like Cappadocia this is to be explained by a certain ignorance of Roman onomastics rather than as a reflection of normal onomastic practices.

⁷⁹ For other Italian inscriptions recording Percennii see *AE* 1983, 53 (Rome); *CIL* I² 3201 (Aesernia); *AE* 1996, 477 (Bovianum); *NSA* 1896, 155 no. 31 (Bononia; not in *CIL* XI). For Samnites with this nomen see E. Vetter, *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte* (1953) no. 29; *IG* XIV 2402, 1 (and *NSA* 1921, 484); Cato, *agr.* 151, 1. Cf. also *RE* XIX 588 f.; *PIR*² P 230 ff.; Cic. *Verr.* 2, 4, 5 (at Messana); *CIL* X 444.

⁸⁰ P. Themelis, *Prakt. Arch. Eter.* 150 [1995] 79 f.; Id., in: O. Salomies (ed.), *The Greek East in the Roman Context* (2001) 125 f. (*SEG* XLVI 419; *AE* 1998, 1254). The inscription will be edited in a publication of the inscriptions from Messene by Dr.

in the Peloponnese, for there is in about the same period also Λούκιος Πετίκιος Πρόπας, a Stoic philosopher from Corinth, the subject of an honorific monument set up by his mother Occia Prisca in Olympia (*I. Olympia* 453). From here, one must move to Styberra in Macedonia, where the name is attested in the time of Vespasian used as a single name (Δίκαιος Πετικίου and Εὐλαῖος Πετικίου, *IG X 2, 2*, 325, 16. 28; 326, 14, from AD 74/5).

So what we have here are fragments of the family history of a gens active in Greece from the later Republic onwards. Now at this point one must note that, by combining various sources, these including inscriptions from Italy and one from Egypt (*CIL III 29 = I. Koptos* 121), A. Tchernia has arrived at the conclusion that certain Peticii, apparently based in central Italy, were active in the wine trade, and that their operations extended to the eastern Mediterranean.⁸¹ In this paper, Tchernia does not adduce much of the evidence from Greece; in fact, he mentions only the man attested in 48 BC, but I think that it can be suggested that also the other Peticii are, in some way or other, manifestations of the activities in the East of the family. It is good to see that at least one exponent of the gens decided to devote himself not to business but to Stoic philosophy.

Petronius. This nomen, common everywhere in the Roman world, is attested all around the east from the Republican period onwards,⁸² and as such a new inscription mentioning Petronii would not be worthy of special attention. But a new inscription mentioning a Petronius with the praenomen *Manius* deserves a comment, and there is such an inscription from the Roman colony of Olbasa, a votive inscription set up by Μάνιος Πετρώνιος Πραΰτης (Milner, *op. cit.* [above at n. 1] 64 no. 142, dated to the second or

Androniki Makris. Dr. Makris, whom I wish to thank here for her help, has been kind enough to discuss this text with me. She assures me that there is nothing missing in the beginning of the text (and this seems in fact to emerge from photographs of the inscription), and so it seems that one will have to try to cope with the fact that the first man uses only one name instead of a name of the Greek type or of one of the Roman type (if one could restore something in the beginning, [Λούκιος Πετίκιος] Ἡρακλείδας would be my suggestion).

⁸¹ A. Tchernia, *Le dromedaire des Peticii et le commerce oriental*, *MEFR* 104 (1992) 293–301.

⁸² For Delos see J. Hatzfeld, *BCH* 36 (1912) 66. Cf. *Id.*, *op. cit.* (n. 17) 399. For an early Petronius from Mopsuestia in Cilicia, a military man, see *ILS* 9138 (*C. Petronius C. f. domo Mopsisto*).

third century). Now what should be said on the combination of praenomen and nomen here is that, in the whole of the Roman world, only one parallel can be found, namely an earlyish inscription from Aquileia mentioning M'. Petronius M'. f. *dec(urio)* (*CIL* V 1002 = *I. Aquileia* 49). So this may point to a northern Italian background – in some way or other – for the man in Olbasa, especially as the praenomen *Manius* in general has a northern Italian ring.⁸³

Praecilius. A funerary inscription from Anazarbus, already quoted above (at n. 14) because of the mention of a certain Μάρκος Στατεΐλιος Ταῦρος, was set by this man for Πραικικιλία (sic) Κρισπεΐνα, who is not defined more closely but whom one could easily imagine to be the wife (*I. Anazarbos* 449). The nomen is edited in this form (there is no photo of the inscription), but in the heading she is called "Praecilia Crispina", and in any case this must be the correct form of the nomen. Now *Praecilius* is a rare name, most instances of which are found in Rome and in Central Italy.⁸⁴ As for the eastern parts of the Roman empire, this seems to be only the third instance of the name, and possibly the earliest (this inscription is dated to the first or the second century AD). In Cyzicus, a certain Γ. Πραικίλιος Λιβανός is found in a Hadrianic list of names (*SEG* XXXIII 1056, C, 32), and, although the nomen is written *Praecilius*, C. Praecilius Apollonides of Ephesus, *cliens* of the senator Sex. Sentius Proculus (*I. Ephesos* 718, after Hadrian) must no doubt be attached to the two Praecilii. As the name is rare, there is fair chance that the Pr(a)ecilii are all somehow connected (note that the praenomen is *Gaius* both in Cyzicus and in Ephesus), although the exact nature of these connections must remain to be seen.

Rubellius. S. Mitchell, *Archaeological Reports for 1998/99* (1999) 145, refers to an inscription of a certain Rubellia Helione from near Sardis. This seems to be only the second Rubellius attested in the Greek East, the first being ῥουβέλλιο[ς ---] in an inscription from about the middle of the second century from Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia (Chr. Marek, *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia* [1993] 139 f. no. 14).⁸⁵ Coming from Lydia, this new attestation may be even more interesting than the earlier one, for it may well (as noted by Mitchell)

⁸³ Cf. *Die römischen Vornamen* (n. 14) 37.

⁸⁴ Cf. H. Solin in L. Gasperini (ed.), *Rupes loquentes* (1992) 372–4.

⁸⁵ *Rubellinus*, attested in Asia in Saettae (*TAM* V 1, 110), is a different nomen and only etymologically, not historically connected with *Rubellius*.

illustrate a passage of Tacitus. From Tacitus, *ann.* 14, 22, 3 (cf. 57) one learns that Rubellius Plautus (*PIR*² R 115), who had been relegated to Asia in AD 60, being killed there in 62, had *per Asiam avitos agros*. It is unclear how these had been acquired (certainly no Rubellius is attested in an office in Asia), but it seems probable enough that Rubellia Hermione is a member (or a descendant of a member) of Plautus' *familia*; this, again, may be an indication that at least some of the possessions of the Rubellii should be placed in the area of Sardis.

Satrius. Of this nomen, not extremely rare, there are scattered attestations all the around the east, although not (as it seems) from the earliest period of Italian immigration.⁸⁶ In Macedonia, one finds a Sex. Satrius C. f. Vol. Pudens in Philippi (*AE* 1935, 50)⁸⁷ and a Satria C. l. Cupita near Dyrrhachium (*AE* 1955, 77 = 1966, 414). Now there is a new Satrius in the form of Μαρκία Σατρία in *IG* X 2, 2, 25 (from a village called Suvodol in the Lyncestis). The combination of Μαρκία with *Satrius* here may indicate that we are not dealing with a person with an immigrant background but rather with a person who can be attached to a Roman magistrate, for *Marcia* is often not the feminine form of *Marcus* but rather of *Marcus*.⁸⁸ If this is the case here, one turns one's thoughts to M. Satrius, who was active in the east in 44–43 BC as C. Trebonius' (then proconsul of Asia) legate.⁸⁹ This man seems to have left onomastic traces behind him in the area of the northern Aegean, in a similar way as another person of the triumviral period, M. Insteius, who must be in some way or another responsible for the existence of the M. Insteii whom one finds all around Macedonia.⁹⁰ First of all, there is in about the Augustan time in Adramyttium a certain Μάρκος Σάτριος Μάρκου υἱὸς Πωλλίων, who took

⁸⁶ *SEG* XIX 230 (a P. Satrius in Athens; Woloch, op. cit. [n. 48] 99 no. 1); *I. Ilion* 127 (Λούκιος Σάτριος); *I. Smyrna* 371 (Σατρία Ἐπικαρπία); used as a cognomen: *AE* 1995, 1624 (probably Cnossus); *AE* 1995, 1632 (Cyrenae). There are also some instances in Egypt.

⁸⁷ P. Pilhofer, *Philippi* II (2000) no. 250.

⁸⁸ Cf. M. Kajava, *Roman Female Praenomina* (1994) 110. 166 ff. 270. If *Marcia* here would be seen as representing the praenomen rather than the nomen, then the nomenclature of Marcia Satria should be compared with the instances enumerated by me in *Die römischen Vornamen* (1987) 164 (add *AE* 1990, 152: Marcia Antonia, the wife of M. Antonius Doles; cf. *CIL* XIV 1321).

⁸⁹ Cic. *ad Brut.* 1, 6, 3 (*RE* IIA 190 no. 1).

⁹⁰ P.M. Nigdelis, *BCH* 118 (1994) 214 ff.

care of the erection of an honorific statue (*I. Adramytteion* II 21).⁹¹ The combination of praenomen and uncommon nomen makes me think that this man might be a local whose father had been given the Roman citizenship rather than a resident Roman.⁹² In another city of northwestern Asia Minor, namely in Parium, one finds a certain Σάτριος Μαρκιανός (*SEG XV 713*), whose nomenclature may well be of the same type as that of the many Flavii Titiani (with a cognomen no doubt connected with *Titus*, the normal praenomen of Flavii). This man, again, makes one think of Σατρί(α) Μαρκία in Cabyle in Thrace (*IGBulg. III 1777*). And finally we now have Marcia Satria from Lyncestis. I think that a case can be made for combining all these eastern (M.) Satrii to build a picture of the legate M. Satrius' eastern operations.

Scirtius. Of this interesting nomen there is one new attestation in Macedonia, Σκιρτιανή Δ[---] in Beroea (*I. Leukopetra* 120; for the suffix in *-ianus* see above at n. 15), and a new, and final, edition of another Macedonian instance, the inscription mentioning Λ. Σκήρτιος (sic) Τίτος, husband of Livia Petillia, in Pelagonia (*IG X, 2, 2, 180*).⁹³ Now as far as I can see, this nomen is attested exclusively in Macedonia, in Athens and in Italy. In Macedonia, there is another attestation from Beroea, Demitsas 72 = *I. Beroea* 339, with Γ. Σκίρτιος Ἀγάθων and his mother Σκιρτία Ζωσίμη.⁹⁴ In Styberra, again, one finds, in 87/8 AD, the epebe Γάιος Σκίρτιος Πρόκλος (*SEG XXXVIII 681 = IG X 2, 2, 325, line 75 f.*). Outside Macedonia, but in Greece, the name is attested in Athens, where we find, in AD 154/5, the two Scirtii Σωτᾶς and Ἰάσων (*IG II/III² 2067, 65 [= 218], 66*).⁹⁵ Now the Macedonian instances, combined with other evidence, make one think of the possibility that this is a nomen with local origins. W. Schulze, *op. cit.* (n. 34) 32 points out that (according to the *Itinerarium Antonini*) there is a place called *Scirtiana* in the Lyncestis, and that there is a Dalmatian tribe Σκίρτορες,⁹⁶ there no doubt being a connection with the

⁹¹ *SEG XLII 1088; AE 1993, 1450.*

⁹² On the other hand, it is true that resident Roman businessmen are attested in this period in Adramyttium (*ibid.* no. 19; for an earlier period cf. Wilson, *op. cit.* [n. 65] 125).

⁹³ This text was first published in *Spomenik* 71 (1931) 157 no. 44 (cf. *SEG XXXII 648*).

⁹⁴ Tataki, *op. cit.* (n. 15) no. 1188 f.

⁹⁵ Woloch, *op. cit.* (n. 48) 99 no. 1 f.

⁹⁶ See *RE* IIA 825 f. This is the form used in Ptolemy (and possibly also in *CIL XVI 100*); other name forms attested for this tribe are Σκίρτιοι (Phlegon) and *Scirtarii* (Pliny

nomen. As for *Scirtiana*, attested only in a late source, this place name can be explained as being derived from the nomen,⁹⁷ but this is obviously not what can be said of the *Scirtones*, and there is thus a possibility that this is in fact a nomen of local origin. On the other hand, names of local origin used as Roman nomina are not at all common in these parts (things are quite different in, say, the Germaniae) and there are Italian nomina which apparently just happen to sound the same as the names of tribes in the Balkans;⁹⁸ there is thus also the possibility that *Scirtius* is in fact a Roman or Italian nomen which was imported to Dalmatia by immigration. Attestations of the nomen in Italy make one think of this possibility. Here we find low-class Scirtii in Rome and in Tarracina⁹⁹ and (more interestingly) a certain C. Scirtius T. [f.] Qui. Cal[--] in Aveia in the land of the Vestini (*NSA* 1907, 27 from Bagno, obviously an earlyish text). Now I am prepared to accept that Dalmatians with local nomina could have moved to Rome, but it seems a bit hard to believe (although of course anything can happen) that such a person would have ended up in an Italian country town during the early empire. So I must say that I prefer to consider the Scirtii in Macedonia as a result of immigration from Italy; perhaps this is a gens originally coming from the land of the Vestini. But one seems in any case to observe a connection between the Italian and the Macedonian Scirtii: if a praenomen is attested, it is *Gaius* with one exception; and the only Lucius (the man in Pelagonia) has the cognomen *Titus*, a name which also happens to be the early C. Scirtius' father's name.

Septenus. Although used here as a single name, the name of Σεπτήνα, daughter of Demetrios, in *I. Anazarbos* 237 is no doubt to be identified with an Italian nomen, the origin of which is because of its ending no doubt to be placed somewhere in or around Umbria. Now one wonders how this name could have found its way to Cilicia; certainly there is only one other instance of this nomen, namely in the case of a certain Q. Septenus Rufus, who

the Elder).

⁹⁷ Thus F. Papazoglu, quoted in the annotation to *IG* X 2, 2, 180.

⁹⁸ Thus no doubt in the case of *Liburnius*, which cannot be explained simply by assuming that it derives from the name of the tribe of the Liburnii (H. Krahe, *Die alten balkanillyrischen geographischen Namen* [1925] 27), cf. Schulze, op. cit. (n. 34) 523 n. 5.

⁹⁹ *CIL* VI 8003 (C. Scirtius Ascula [?], Scirtia C.I. Kalliste) and 26010 (Scirtia (mulieris) l. Izmaragdis); *CIL* X 8264 (Scirtia Sp. filia Primigenia). – Note also Scirtius, *v(ir)p(er)fectissimus*), attested in 384 AD (*PLRE* I 820).

appears in brick stamps which have been found in Venetia in an area including Verona and Vicetia (*CIL* V 8110, 293).¹⁰⁰ As the man appears in the genitive, it is also possible that he in fact used the parallel "romanized" form ending in *-ius*, which form is in fact attested in the case of the Severan soldier of the *vigiles*, Septenius Priscus (*CIL* VI 1064, i, 3, with the vocative *Septeni Prisce*). On the other hand, besides nomina in *-enus -enius* one always finds parallel forms in *-ienus -ienius* (cf. above at n. 61 on *Mus(s)(i)enus*), and this is very well illustrated in this case by the fact that the same man calls himself Septenius Priscus in *CIL* VI 1056, iv, 118. The series is rounded off with an instance of the form in *-ienus*, materializing in the nomenclature of a certain Septiena Mar(cia?) attested in Salonae (*ILJug.* 2739). Possibly this Dalmatian case may be a reflection of a stepwise eastward movement of members of this gens, this movement in one case ending as far as Cilicia.¹⁰¹

Serius. A certain Σέρειος (i.e. *Serius*)¹⁰² Ῥοῦφος is now attested in Beroea in AD 248 (*I. Beroea* 53). This seems to be only the second attestation of this name in the east, the one known earlier being a man in Thessalonica in about the time of Trajan, Γ. Σέριος Σεκοῦνδος (*IG* X 2, 1, 69 line 39). This being a rare nomen,¹⁰³ there is clearly a connection of sorts between the two men. As the man in Thessalonica has the praenomen *Gaius*, one's thoughts are directed to the senatorial *Serii*, two of whom (the consuls of 132 and 156, *RE* IIA 1734 f. no. 1–2) are also C. *Serii*. However, at least for the moment it does not seem advisable to suggest that the existence of Macedonian *Serii* could result from the activities of the senators, as the careers of the senators (with possible hints to connections with Macedonia) are completely unknown except for the fact that the consul of 156 held the proconsulate of Africa.

¹⁰⁰ Also in E. Buchi, *Atti Acc. Roveretana degli Agiati* 229 (1979) 162 no. 27. On the other hand, this stamp does not seem to appear in C. Zaccaria (ed.), *I laterizi di età romana nell'area nordadriatica* (1993).

¹⁰¹ Cf. the examples of rare nomina found both in Dalmatia and in Macedonia referred to by me in the paper mentioned above in n. 20, p. 124.

¹⁰² For this orthography cf. e.g. Ἰούλειος Κλαύδειος Λούκειος (above at n. 16) etc. The name is correctly identified with *Serius* in the index, p. 443.

¹⁰³ There are scattered instances in each of the Italian volumes of *CIL* except for volume X. For other attestations see e.g. *IG* XIV 965 = *IGUR* 147; *AE* 1989, 277 (Mevania, the third attestation from this city with two instances in *CIL* XI); *Arch. Vest.* 38 (1987) 172 no. 157 (a brick stamp from Histria); *ILAfr.* 592; *RE* IIA 1735 f. no. 1–4.

Ven(n)idius. In Tyana, a certain Οὐεννιδία Λόνγα is attested as setting up the funerary monument of her husband Lucilius Marcellus (*I. Tyana* 122). There are two things to be said of the nomen, on one hand that this may well be the first time this nomen is attested as being spelt as *Vennidius* instead of the normal *Venidius* (one sees thus that the *e* must have been short), and on the other that this nomen is otherwise found in the East only in Aphrodisias, where there are two third-century instances.¹⁰⁴

Vicrius. A votive inscription was set up in Anazarbus by Γ. Οὐίκριος Καπίτων who does not define himself more closely (*I. Anazarbos* 39, dated to the first or the second century AD). Now this is not the first time one finds this rare nomen in the East, for there are four instances of the name in Amblada and one in Ancyra, all of them apparently being latish, from about the Severan period.¹⁰⁵ The appearance of the nomen in inscriptions within the province of Galatia was tentatively explained by me by assuming that one of the only two Vicrii who are known to have been of senatorial status, P. Vicrius [---] and C. Vicrius Rufus, consuls in AD 145 and no doubt brothers (*RE* Suppl. XIV 853 no. 1 and 2), could have governed Galatia, at the same time producing new Roman citizens, at some point before the consulate. Now I know that Anazarbus is not in Galatia, but no doubt the man in Anazarbus must be connected with the Vicrii in Amblada and Ancyra, on one hand because this is a very rare nomen, and on the other because the man in Anazarbus has the same cognomen *Capito* as a person attested in Amblada.¹⁰⁶ Perhaps we have here a man from Galatia operating in Anazarbus. Now if one is allowed to connect the Galatian Vicrii with the senators, the new inscription may add a further detail to this reconstruction, for until now no praenomen was attested for the Vicrii.¹⁰⁷ Now we have a C. Vicrius, and so C. Vicrius Rufus would seem to be the more likely candidate for the governorship of Galatia, proposed here.

¹⁰⁴ C. Roueché, *Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity* (1989) no. 6, Μάρκος Ἀντώνιος Οὐενίδιος Ἀπελλῶς (*SEG* XXXI 909; *AE* 1989, 769); Ead., *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias* (1993) p. 167, referring to an unpublished inscription mentioning a certain Septimius Aurelius Flavius Venidius Hypsicles.

¹⁰⁵ *AS* 18 (1968) 76 ff. nos. 21, 26, 27, 29; E. Bosch, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Ankara* (1967) 186 = L. Vidman, *Sylloge inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Serapiacae* (1969) 334.

¹⁰⁶ *AS* 18 (1969) 80 no. 29, Οὐίκριοι Μακεδὼν καὶ Καπίτων ἀδελφοί.

¹⁰⁷ *Marcus* in the nomenclature of the man in *AS* 18 (1968) 76 no. 21 goes with *Aurelius*, nor with *Vicrius*.

Visellius. A new instance of the fairly uncommon nomen *Visellius* appears in Panemoteichos in Pisidia, this time used by a local notable as a cognomen; we find here a certain Γάιος Ἰο[ύλ]ιος Σεμπρόνιος Οὐισέλλιος, designated as ἀρχιερεὺς τῶ[ν] Σ[ε]βαστῶν, οὐετρανὸς ἀπὸ β(ενε)φ(ικιαρίου), υἱὸς πόλεως, δεκάπρωτος, γένους ἀρχαίου, σ[υ]γγνῆς ὑπατικῶν καὶ συνκλητικῶν etc., honoured by the local *demos* (I. Central Pisidia 105, dated to the mid-third century).¹⁰⁸ The appearance of this new instance can no doubt be used as a pretext for having a quick look at the *Visellii*, representants of an interesting gens, as attested in the East. Members of this family are attested here between the late Republic and the third century, and in this case we are dealing with a family which is already attested, probably in the late second century BC, on Delos through the person of Κόιντος Οὐισέλλιος Γαίου [...] (*ID* 1741). Q. *Visellius* L. f., attested on Samothrace in about the same time (*Samothrace* 2, 1, 29 (a))¹⁰⁹ is no doubt somehow connected. Once arrived in N. Greece, one finds members of this gens spreading both to the west (*Visellia Marcia*, *Visellia Prima* and *Visellius* [--] in *Dyrrhachium*, *AE* 1978, 758) and to the east, where there are *Visellii* both in *Apamea* in *Bithynia* (two *Viselliae* with uncertain cognomina in *I. Apameia und Pylai* 32) and, further to the east, in *Sinope* (*Visellia* L. f. [--], *AJPh* 27 (1907) 217 n. 1). On the other hand, to the southeast of Delos there is Πο. Οὐισέλλιος Βαβυλλιανός on *Cos* in the first century AD (*I. Cos* ED 228, line 11), probably also a reflection of the presence on Delos of *Visellii*.

Moving from Delos to Asia Minor, one observes a concentration of *Visellii* in and around Pisidia. In addition to the attestation in Panemoteichos (see above), there is a certain Τίτος Οὐισέλλιος Μάξιμος in *Pisidian Antioch* (*AS* 20 [1970] 48 no. 27). Very close to Antioch, but within the province of Asia, there is the city of *Philomelium*, the home of Λ. Οὐισέλλιος Ζώσιμος Βηρυλλιανός (*MAMA* VII 199, about Severan). A bit to the east from there, but already in *Lycaonia*, we find Οὐισελλία Ἀλεξανδρία, the wife of an *Aurelius*, in *Laodicea Combusta* (*SEG* XXXIV 1365). Finally, in another *Lycaonian* city, in *Iconium* a little to the south of *Laodicea*, there is Φλ[αβ.] Οὐισελλία (*MAMA* VIII 327, probably second century).

¹⁰⁸ The inscription was published for the first time in 1994 (*AS* 44 [1994] 139; *SEG* XLIV 1110; *AE* 1994, 1743).

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Hatzfeld (n. 17) 59 n. 2.

So what we have here is a number of Visellii spread around the east. This time, it seems advisable to assume that we are dealing with (at least) two groups of Visellii, for the appearance of Visellii in and around Pisidia seems to suggest that we are dealing with descendants of colonists moving to the Augustan colonies in this area, and it seems wise to keep them apart from the late Republican *trafiquants* and their descendants. So I suggest that, in dealing with eastern Visellii one should distinguish between the people in central Anatolia with a colonist background, and those with a *trafiquant* background found on Delos and vicinity and in coastal cities along east-west line between Dyrhachium and Sinope.¹¹⁰

University of Helsinki

¹¹⁰ Note also M. Οὐισέλλιος Γαίου υἱὸς Κολλίνα Πρεῖσκος of Laodicea in Syria (a colony, but only from the time of Severus onwards) in AD 132 (*IG II/III*² 3299).

EIN DER HEIMAT VERWIESENER AUTOR

Anaximenes von Lampsakos bei Lukian, *Herod.* 3

WERNER J. SCHNEIDER

Welcher Weg führt am schnellsten zu literarischem Ruhm? Wie und wo erreichen schriftstellerische Talente ein möglichst großes Publikum in kürzester Zeit? Diese durchaus zeitgemäße Frage wirft in der Epoche eines nur mäßig medialisierten Literaturbetriebs Lukian auf und zwar in einer seiner kurzweilig-spleenigen Vorreden, *Prolaliai* genannt, mit denen der 'Konzertredner' sein Publikum auf den eigentlichen Vortrag, die *Epideixis*, einzustimmen trachtet. Eine Antwort auf die Frage findet Lukian – wie könnte es in der hochgradig ritualisierten kaiserzeitlichen Erinnerungskultur auch anders sein – in den klassischen Jahrhunderten Griechenlands, welche die Gegenwart mit einem glanzvollen Repertoire vorbildhafter Geschichten Motive Gestalten illuminieren.

I

Man mache es, empfiehlt der Redner, so wie Herodot, der nach den Perserkriegen vor den Augen und Ohren der olympischen Festgesellschaft aus seinen *Historien* vorgetragen und es damit schlagartig zu außerordentlichem Renommee in der hellenischen Kulturkoine gebracht habe. Lukian kann für die Nachahmung der geglückten Strategie Herodots bereits auf eine Reihe von Intellektuellen der alten Zeit (σοφισταί, συγγραφείς, λογογράφοι) verweisen, die diese 'Abkürzung' auf dem Weg zum Ruhm erfolgreich beschritten hätten (*Herod.* 3/4):

ὅπερ ὕστερον κατανόησαντες, ἐπίτομόν τινα ταύτην ὁδὸν ἐς γνῶσιν, Ἰππίας τε ὁ ἐπιχώριος αὐτῶν σοφιστῆς καὶ Πρόδικος ὁ Κεῖος καὶ Ἀναξιμένης ὁ Χίος καὶ Πῶλος ὁ Ἀκραγαντίνος καὶ

ἄλλοι συχνοὶ λόγους ἔλεγον ἀεὶ καὶ αὐτοὶ πρὸς τὴν πανήγυριν, ἀφ' ὧν γνώριμοι ἐν βραχεῖ ἐγίνοντο.

Unter den hier von Lukian genannten Geistesgrößen springt als pièce de résistance Anaximenes in die Augen – und zwar nicht so sehr seiner deutlich jüngeren Zeitstellung¹ als vielmehr der unzutreffenden Herkunftsangabe als Chier wegen. Es sind grundsätzlich verschiedene Erklärungsmuster für das verwunderliche Ethnikon des Lampsakeners an dieser Stelle im Text denkbar:

- 1) es gab in der Tat einen uns nicht mehr geläufigen Autor dieses Namens, der es, aus Chios gebürtig, in Olympia zu einem großen Popularitätsgewinn gebracht hat;²
- 2) nur an dieser Stelle ist von einem zweiten Bürgerrecht des Lampsakeners die Rede, welches dieser im Laufe seines Lebens irgendwelcher Verdienste wegen von Chios zuerkannt bekam und neben dem seiner Heimatstadt wahrnehmen konnte;
- 3) es handelt sich um eine pure Erfindung, ein Autoschediasma Lukians, der sein Publikum mit einem weiteren Namen verblüffen, seine antiquarischen Kenntnisse auf die Probe stellen und die Gebildeten darunter mit einem intrikaten Vexierspiel unterhalten wollte;³

¹ Lukian unterscheidet drei Zeitstufen: 1) Herodot, 2) ὕστερον die Sophisten gegen die Wende zum 4. Jh. v.Chr. hin, 3) τὰ τελευταῖα ταῦτα Aëtion. Lukian zählt mithin Anaximenes zu den παλαιοί, von denen Aëtion als ein Vertreter der Alexander-generation abgesetzt wird (zum Sinn dieser Periodeneinteilung Verf., "Gegenwärtige Vergangenheit. Zu einer mißdeuteten Wendung bei Martianus Capella [9, 928f.]", *RhM* 142 [1999] 93ff. hier 102f.). Während die genannten Personen der zweiten Stufe alle eher noch ins ausgehende 5. Jh. fallen, würden wir heute Anaximenes chronologisch in die Alexanderzeit setzen – auch seiner persönlichen Kontakte zum Makedonen wegen. Doch erscheint er auch bei anderen späteren Autoren im zeitlichen Zusammenhang mit Männern früherer Generationen: Diod. Sic. 15,76,4 nennt ihn als Zeitgenossen von Xenophon und Platon, die schon eine Rolle am Ende des 5. Jhs. gespielt haben.

² Eine ganze Reihe von nicht sehr bekannten Literaten der Zeit vor dem Peloponnesischen Krieg nennt Dion. Hal. *de Thuc.* 5. – Der ältere Anaximenes, der Vorsokratiker, hatte mit Olympia, soweit wir wissen, nichts zu tun und fiel zeitlich aus der Riege der übrigen Genannten in der anderen Richtung heraus. Auch wäre solch ein Auftritt eines Intellektuellen im archaischen Olympia bisher ohne Parallele.

³ Ich werde bei anderer Gelegenheit darlegen, daß mit dieser Möglichkeit in Lukians

- 4) es liegt ein Überlieferungsfehler der Handschriften vor;⁴
- 5) ein lapsus memoriae des Autors Lukian ist die Ursache: gemeint ist Anaximenes aus Lampsakos;
- 6) es handelt sich um eine gezielt lancierte Inkongruenz der historischen Prosopographie, einen 'bewußten Fehler', den der Autor mit Bedacht in seinen Diskurs integriert hat.

- - - - -

Zu 1) Diese Möglichkeit⁵ empfiehlt sich nicht, da es dem argumentativen Bemühen des Redners um *viri illustres* geht, mit deren Namen (oder Olympiabesuch?) das Publikum eine Vorstellung verbinden konnte.

Zu 2) Hier gilt der gleiche Einwand wie bei 1).

Zu 3) Es müßten gute Argumente beigebracht werden, um zu dieser Lösung, die nur eine *ultima ratio* sein kann, seine Zuflucht nehmen zu dürfen.

Zu 4) Zu entscheiden bliebe dann, ob die Korruptel das *Nomen proprium*⁶ oder das *Ethnikon*⁷ befallen hat oder aber dazwischen ein weiterer

Schriften im Einzelfall durchaus zu rechnen ist.

⁴ Hierfür spräche zunächst einmal der Umstand, daß die mss. Ἀνάξις bieten, was erst von jüngerer Hand zu Anaximenes korrigiert worden ist. Es könnten sich also auch andere Namen hinter dem offenbar zusammengeschrumpften "Anaxes" verbergen, Namen wie Anaxarchos (der Paras. 35 genannte demokriteische Philosoph und 'Parasit' Alexanders des Großen [?]: H.-G. Nesselrath, *Lukians Parasitendialog. Untersuchungen und Kommentar*, Berlin – New York 1985, 386f. ad locum) oder Anaxibios etwa, deren Verkürzung vor dem Ethnikon dann als eine erweiterte Form der Haplographie zu erklären wäre. In diesem Sinn hat sich zuletzt H.-G. Nesselrath, "Lucian's Introductions", in: D. A. Russell (Hsg.), *Antonine Literature*, Oxford 1990, 118 Anm. 13 ausgesprochen.

⁵ Für die Jacoby, *FGrHist* 442 Kommentar Noten 1 eingetreten ist.

⁶ Müller, *FHG* II 43 vermutete Xenomedes von Chios, dessen Lebenszeit in diesem Kontext gut passen würde. Diese Konjektur ist aber vom Tisch, seit U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff die wahre Herkunft des Xenomedes aus Keos (gegen die Überlieferung der Hss. bei Dion. Hal. *de Thuc.* 5) erkannt hatte: H. Gärtner, "Xenomedes", in *RE* IX A 2 (1967) 1534.

⁷ Eine Parallele dafür wäre die gerade in der vorigen Anm. genannte Klassifizierung des Xenomedes als *Xίος* anstelle von *Κεῖος* – eine paläographisch leicht nachvollziehbare Verschreibung.

Eigenname ausgefallen ist, so daß als Chiot nicht Anaximenes, sondern ein anderer (für uns anonym bleibender) Sophist von Lukian bezeichnet worden wäre.⁸

Zu 5) Ein solcher Gedächtnisfehler⁹ ist natürlich auch bei der großen Gelehrsamkeit unseres Autors hinsichtlich der klassischen Paideia und den mit ihr verbundenen Antiquaria und Realien¹⁰ nicht runderaus auszuschließen,¹¹ sollte indessen immer nur dann als probates Erklärungsmuster bemüht werden, wenn alle anderen denkbaren Lösungen zu nichts geführt haben.

Zu 6) Ein solches Postulat steht und fällt mit der Plausibilität der hierfür in Anschlag zu bringenden Erklärung.

Wir wollen uns hier für die letzte der genannten Alternativen, die Möglichkeit des bewußten sachlichen Fehlers, der auf Autorintention beruht und im Dienst einer literarischen Gestaltungsabsicht steht, stark machen und dartun, welcher Kalkül Lukian bewogen haben mag, Anaximenes von Lampsakos mit der neuen Heimat Chios zu versehen.

II

Blicken wir zunächst historisch zurück, so stellen wir fest, daß mitunter in der Tat Unsicherheit hinsichtlich der geburtsmäßigen Herkunft

⁸ In diesem Sinne F. Jacoby in *FGrHist* 72 T 10: Ἀναξιμένης (ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς καὶ Θεόπομπος) ὁ Χίος.

⁹ In diesem Sinne bereits G. G. Nitsch, *De historia Homeri* II, Hannover 1837, 87f. und neuerdings M. D. MacLeod, *Luciani opera* III, Oxford 1980, 347 ad locum: "noster nutare visus est, cf. D. S. 15,76 etc."

¹⁰ J. Delz, *Lukians Kenntnis der athenischen Antiquitäten* (Diss. Basel / Freiburg i. d. Schw. 1950).

¹¹ Davor sind Gelehrte der Antike nicht weniger gefeit als ihre modernen Adepten – so erscheint etwa der berühmte Architekt und Städteplaner Hippodamos von Milet bei B. Seidensticker, "Alexandria. Die Bibliothek der Könige und die Wissenschaften", in: A. Demandt (Hsg.), *Stätten des Geistes. Große Universitäten von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, Köln – Weimar – Wien 1999, 15ff. hier 18 als Samier – allerdings hat dieser Fehler bereits eine versprengte antike Nachricht als Vorläufer: *Schol. Arist. eq.* 327 (zum Hintergrund für diese tendenziöse Abweichung von der gängigen Version s.u. mit Anm. 15).

eines Dichters oder Literaten aus dem griechischen Kulturraum herrschte. Nicht nur im Falle Homers! Auch andere erstrangige Zelebritäten der Literaturgeschichte waren mit einer fraglichen Herkunft behaftet. Kam Alkman nun aus Lakedaimon oder nicht doch aus dem lydischen Sardes?¹² Selbst der Sänger erzspartanischer Tugenden Tyrtaios wurde mitunter als Athener in Anspruch genommen!¹³ Eine Art Vereinnahmung oder Usurpation stellt es dar, wenn man eine Persönlichkeit von überregionaler Geltung auf dem Wege der Herkunftsangabe den eigenen lokalen Interessen dienstbar macht. Später sind solch renomnistische Rangeleien unter rivalisierenden Poleis um den geistigen Besitz an den literarischen Größen der klassischen Jahrhunderte nicht mehr in gleicher Weise möglich. Dennoch ist auch jetzt nicht alles restlos klar, notorisch etwa der Streit um das Ethnikon, mit dem der Vater der Geschichte die Publikation seiner *Historien* einleitete.¹⁴ Wieder ein Fall von geistiger Usurpierung ist es, wenn man in den pythagoreischen Kreisen Unteritaliens den berühmten und angesehenen Architekten und Städteplaner Hippodamos von Milet urplötzlich für einen Samier erklärte, um seine Herkunft und damit anscheinend auch seine Leistungsbilanz mit dem Geburtsort und der ersten geistigen Wirkungsstätte des Pythagoras verknüpfen zu können.¹⁵

Eine gewisse Rolle spielen in diesem Zusammenhang schließlich fiktive Herkunftsangaben, die entweder frei erfunden oder aus tatsächlichen abgeleitet sind, um eine spezifische Aussage über die genannten Personen zu treffen. Sie kommen gar nicht so selten vor und sind auch nicht auf die Komödie¹⁶ oder das skoptische Epigramm¹⁷ beschränkt,¹⁸ zwei literarische

¹² M. R. Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, London 1981, 34f.

¹³ Lefkowitz a.O. 38f.

¹⁴ F. Jacoby, "Herodotos 7", in *RE Suppl.* II (1913) 205ff.

¹⁵ E. Fabricius, "Hippodamos 3", in *RE* VIII (1913) 1734.

¹⁶ Ich erinnere nur an den Paphlagonier (παφλάζω = aufbrausen) in Aristophanes' *Rittern*. Das ist ein Fall reiner Fiktion – die witzige Umbildung des wahren Ethnikons zu einem im komischen Sinne aussagekräftigen beobachten wir beim Platonschüler Herakleides Pontikos, der seines üppig-schwülstigen Habitus wegen Herakleides Pompikos titulierte: Athen. 4,134b.

¹⁷ E.g. *AP* 12,174 (Fronto): Μῆδος und ebd. 5,63 (M. Argentarius): Αἰτωλή, Μῆδος.

¹⁸ Hier genügt es, an Platons Er-Mythos zu erinnern (τὸ γένος Παμφύλου *rep.* 614b) oder Homers Handwerkertechniten Tychios aus Hyle (*Il.* 8,219ff.): demnächst Verf., "Phidiae putavi. Martial und der Hercules Epitrapezios des Novius Vindex", *Mnemosyne* 55 (2002) (im Druck).

Gattungen, die sich das semantische Potential redender Toponyme gerne zunutze machen.¹⁹

Sachliche Fehler topographischer Art kann ein Autor sonst etwa *dramatis personae* in den Mund legen, um sie dadurch zu charakterisieren, indem sie solchermaßen ihren eingeschränkten Wissenshorizont²⁰ oder ihre wahrheitswidrigen Absichten kundtun. Da in unserem Fall der Autor in eigener Person spricht, muß die Erklärung in anderer Richtung gesucht werden.

III

Damit komme ich zu meiner These. Die bizarre Rubrizierung des Anaximenes als Mann aus Chios könnte nämlich gut mit den verwickelten Fragen der Autorschaft des *Trikaranos* zusammenhängen,²¹ der im späteren 4. Jh. v.Chr. unter dem Namen des Theopomp von Chios verbreitet wurde, in Wahrheit aber von Anaximenes stammte, der dieses gegen die drei früheren Hegemonialmächte der griechischen Geschichte (Athen, Sparta, Theben) gerichtete Pamphlet unter dem Namen seines Rivalen publiziert hatte, um diesen vor der griechischen Öffentlichkeit bloßzustellen.²² Die

¹⁹ Der später noch erwähnte Autor Wezel wurde seiner schrulligen Charakterphysiognomie wegen und mit klärllichem Bezug auf seinen thüringischen Heimatort als "Sonderling von Sondershausen" bespottet in Herrmann Marggraffs aus dem Jahre 1837 stammendem Essay *Johann Karl Wezel, der Sonderling von Sondershausen*.

²⁰ Diese prosopopoetische Dimension des sachlichen Fehlers wird nicht immer erkannt, die Gestaltungsabsicht des Autors nicht gebührend gewürdigt – so wenn es von Napoleons Verbannungs- und Todesort in Heinrich Heines *Buch Le Grand IX* heißt: "Der Kaiser ist tot. Auf einer öden Insel des Indischen Meeres ist sein einsames Grab, und Er, dem die Erde zu eng war, liegt ruhig unter dem kleinen Hügel, wo fünf Trauerweiden gramvoll ihre grauen Haare herabhängen lassen und ein frommes Bächlein wehmütig klagend vorbeirieselt." Anstatt mit dem Apparat der Historisch-kritischen Gesamtausgabe VI, Hamburg 1973, 825 ad locum altklug zu bemerken "Sankt Helena liegt nicht im Indischen, sondern im Atlantischen Ozean. Erst 1840 wurden Napoleons Gebeine nach Paris überführt und im Invalidendom beigesetzt", wird man besser daran tun, ein paar Seiten zurückzublättern, wo der Sprecher in Kapitel VII bekannt hatte: "... wenn ich von der Geographie so wenig lernte, daß ich mich späterhin nicht in der Welt zurechtzufinden wußte ..."

²¹ Die Trümmer des *Trikaranos* bei *FGrHist* 72 F 20f.

²² Zum *Trikaranos* und der Feindschaft der beiden Literaten F. Blass, *Die attische*

gewissermaßen doppelte resp. gespaltene Identität, welche die Autorinstanz dieses eigenartigen Pseudepigraphons kennzeichnet, bildet nun die Junktur vom Eigennamen des Lampsakeners mit der Herkunftsangabe des Chioten adäquat ab. Das hybride *mixtum compositum* aus *Nomen proprium* und *Ethnikon* wäre dann ein raffinierter Kunstgriff des Autors Lukian, das Ausmaß seiner Bildung zu demonstrieren und sich augenzwinkernd der Komplizenschaft von den Teilen seines Publikums zu vergewissern, die ihm auf die verschlungenen Pfade der literarischen Spurensicherung zu folgen vermochten.

Diese Erklärung der schwierigen Stelle hätte den doppelten Vorteil, einerseits ohne eine Textänderung oder die Annahme eines auktorialen Versehens auszukommen, zum anderen mit den bekannten Elementen der historischen Überlieferung im Einklang zu stehen.

So bliebe zunächst die Rolle zu klären, die Theopomp und Anaximenes sonst im Werk Lukians spielen.²³ Anaximenes kommt bei Lukian lediglich an dieser Stelle im *Herodotus sive Aëtion* namentlich vor. – In den als echt angesehenen Schriften²⁴ trifft Theopomp einmal ein scharfer Tadel, da er generell das *ἱστορεῖν* durch das *κατηγορεῖν* ersetzt habe, die Geschichtsschreibung mithin durch die Invektive (*hist. scrib.* 59). An anderer Stelle (*fug.* 32) erwähnt Lukian den *Trikaranos*, um sogleich einen Witz mit *Τριφάλης* anzuschließen! Im *Pseudologista* schließlich kommt Lukian in einem Referat fremder Rhetorenpraxis auf Theopomp als den Verfasser des *Trikaranos* zu sprechen. Hier geht es dem Autor um die Bloßstellung der fehlgeleiteten Beredsamkeit eines konkurrierenden Sophisten durch eine Aufzählung von dessen penetrantesten Stilblüten; u.a. wirft er dem Opfer seines Spotts auch vor (*pseud.* 29): τὸν δὲ Θεόπομπον ἐπὶ τῷ Τρικάρανῳ κρίνοντα φάναι τριγλώχινι λόγῳ καθηρηκέναι τοὺς προϋχούσας πόλεις; καὶ πάλιν ἐκτριαινῶσαι αὐτὸν τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ εἶναι Κέρβερον ἐν τοῖς λόγοις; Ist es nun wirklich so, wie man gesagt hat, daß hieraus hervorgehe, Lukian habe Theopomp für den tatsächlichen Autor des *Trikaranos* gehalten? Mit Bestimmtheit ist das aus dieser Stelle m.E. kaum abzuleiten, hatte Lukian doch im Zusammenhang dieser Diffamierung

Beredsamkeit II, Leipzig 1892², 380, zu Anaximenes 378ff.

²³ Cf. den Index Scriptorum und den Index Rerum im IV. Band der Edition von C. Jacobitz, *Lucianus*, Leipzig 1841, 276, 338, 344, 346 sub nominibus.

²⁴ In den Lukian abgesprochenen *Makrobioi* 10 = *FGH* 115,310 kommt Theopomp vor als Quellenautor für einen 92 Jahre alt gewordenen Odrysenkönig.

seines Rivalen kaum Anlaß, auf die verwickelten Fragen der Autorschaft näher einzugehen, ja im Gegenteil: in der referierten, aber unzutreffenden Zuweisung dieser Schrift an Theopomp liegt eher ein weiterer maliziöser Seitenhieb auf die wenig fundierte Bildung seines Gegners!

Als ein σοφιστής erscheint Anaximenes bei Pausanias auf seinem Rundgang durch die Altis von Olympia und wird vom Periegeten bei dieser Gelegenheit ausdrücklich seiner Fähigkeiten im Improvisieren wegen gerühmt, einem Talent, in dem er niemandem nachgestanden habe (6,18,5). Anlaß für diese Erwähnung ist eine Bildnisstatue des Lampsakeners, die ihm seine dankbaren Mitbürger dorthin gestiftet hatten.²⁵ Solche Denkmale für Intellektuelle bleiben in der Altis neben all den Athletenbildnissen doch recht selten.²⁶ Das Monument des Anaximenes könnte also unter Absehung von seiner ursprünglichen und später in Vergessenheit geratenen Motivation mit einer tatsächlichen oder vermuteten Vorlesetätigkeit des Literaten zusammengebracht worden sein, der sich in der Vorstellung der Nachwelt der Publizität des Platzes in derselben Weise bedient hätte, wie es vor ihm Herodot und einige Sophisten getan hatten. Irgendwie mußte jedenfalls die Verbindung des Anaximenes mit Olympia einen Rückhalt in der Tradition haben. Die Frage, aus welchen Werken Anaximenes dort vorgetragen haben mag, muß offen bleiben.²⁷ Immerhin drängt sich im Kontext unserer Überlegungen die Vermutung auf, daß eben der *Trikaranos* selbst mit Olympia zu tun gehabt haben könnte, dergestalt daß er eine Redesituation vor der olympischen Panegyris fingiert hätte. Angesichts der Tatsache, daß er gleich gegen drei griechische 'Großmächte' Front machte, als Adressaten mithin das Totum der übrigen griechischen Poleis und Koina im Auge gehabt haben wird und seine literarische Strategie im Interesse des Makedonen Philipp übte,²⁸ dessen Bestrebungen, in Olympia Präsenz zu demonstrieren,

²⁵ Cf. außerdem Val. Max. 7,3 ext. 4.

²⁶ Immerhin gab es Portraits von Gorgias und angeblich auch von Aristoteles: Paus. 6,4,8 und 17,7.

²⁷ An "epideiktische Reden (oder Geschichtswerke?)" denkt J. Brzoska, "Anaximenes 3", in *RE I* (1894) 2088.

²⁸ Jacoby hatte im Kommentarband bemerkt: "auch der gedanke liegt nahe, daß A(naximenes) zugleich mit dem streich gegen Theopompos die geschäfte Philipps besorgen wollte, indem er die unfähigkeit der drei großen hellenischen mächte zur hegemonie aus der geschichte nachwies".

nur zu bekannt sind,²⁹ liegt die Vermutung eines olympischen Rahmens nicht so ferne.

IV

Wenn es stimmt, daß Plagiate im allgemeinen die aufrichtigsten Komplimente sind, so liegen die Dinge hier ganz offensichtlich anders. Anaximenes hat mit dem *Trikaranos* einen sehr eigenen Fall eines Plagiats kreiert.³⁰ Im Wortsinne trifft die Bezeichnung Plagiat hier nur bedingt das Richtige,³¹ handelt es sich doch nicht um den Diebstahl eines literarischen Produktes, das dann unter eigenem Namen publiziert worden wäre. Vielmehr ging es umgekehrt darum, einem Rivalen ein eigenes Elaborat zu dessen Nachteil unterzuschieben. Die Schädigung erfolgt nicht durch ein *furtum*, sondern kraft eines *mala fide* gemachten 'Geschenks', einer Art literarischem Kuckucksei! Nicht Diebstahl, κλοπή, lautet der Vorwurf, sondern um ein untergeschobenes 'Kind' erhebt sich die Klage.³²

Wir stehen hier vor einem Phänomen, wo sich Plagiat und Pseudepigraphon miteinander berühren.³³ Da indessen auch die Nachahmung / μίμησις eines anderen, meist früheren Autors, soweit sie in

²⁹ B. Hintzen-Bohlen, *Herrscherrepräsentation im Hellenismus. Untersuchungen zu Weihgeschenken, Stiftungen und Ehrenmonumenten in den mutterländischen Heiligtümern Delphi, Olympia, Delos und Dodona*, Köln – Weimar – Wien 1992, 26ff. Abb. 2.

³⁰ Im Zuge des unter hellenistischen Gelehrten beliebten Gesellschaftsspiels der Plagiat-schnüffelei sind beide Autoren in anderem Zusammenhang immer wieder mit ähnlichen Vorwürfen belastet worden: zu den antiken Vorwürfen gegen Theopomp als Plagiator und Anaximenes als Opfer von Plagiatoren vice versa E. Stemplinger, *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur*, Leipzig – Berlin 1912, 46ff. und 70ff.

³¹ Außer der gerade genannten Arbeit von Stemplinger seither zur Geschichte des Phänomens vor allem K. Ziegler, "Plagiat", in *RE* XX (1950) 1956ff.

³² Im Einleitungsbrief zu Anaximenes' *Ars rhetorica*, die sich als ein Widmungsschreiben des Aristoteles an Alexander den Großen gibt, wird dieser Vergleich der literarischen mit der natürlichen Nachkommenschaft deutlich ausgesprochen: ἔγραψες δέ μοι διακελεύόμενος, ὅπως μηδεὶς τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων λήψεται τὸ βιβλίον τοῦτο, καὶ ταῦτο εἰδώς, ὅτι καθάπερ τοὺς ἐξ αὐτῶν γεννηθέντας οἱ γεννήσαντες τῶν ὑποβαλλομένων μᾶλλον φιλοῦσιν, οὕτως οἱ εὐρόντες τι τῶν μετεχόντων· οὕτως γὰρ ὑπὲρ τέκνων, οὕτω τῶν λόγων ὑπεραποτεθνήκασιν (1421^a 28ff).

³³ Zur Abgrenzung von der Pseudepigrapha-Literatur H. Peter, *Wahrheit und Kunst. Geschichtsschreibung und Plagiat im klassischen Altertum*, Leipzig – Berlin 1911, 427ff.

betrügerischer Absicht geschieht, um den Leser zu täuschen, der Antike als eine Form von κλοπή gilt und der Tatbestand der Verschleierung einer solchen Stilkopie entscheidend ist,³⁴ darf auch unser Fall als eine spezifische Randerscheinung des Plagiats apostrophiert werden. Parallelen für ein derartiges Stilplagiat sind nicht leicht zu nennen.³⁵ Die Motive von Literaten, Produkte ihrer eigenen Kunstfertigkeit nicht unter dem eigenen Namen zu publizieren, sondern unter einem Pseudonym, einem nom de plume herauszugeben, können ganz verschieden sein. Uns muß hier nur der Sonderfall interessieren, daß nicht ein beliebiger neuer Name erfunden wird, sondern der eines hinlänglich bekannten Schriftstellers,³⁶ noch dazu eines Zeitgenossen gewählt wird. Die Fälschung kann dann entweder mehr auf die Person des vermeintlichen Autors zielen, um diesem am Zeuge zu flicken,³⁷ oder aber dessen Namen als Vehikel zur Propagierung irgendwelcher Ansichten instrumentieren. Im ersten Fall wird es in der Regel auf eine Vernichtung der Autorität des Autors hinauslaufen, im zweiten auf eine Dienstbarmachung seiner bestehenden Autorität für die Zwecke des Fälschers.

Über einen solchen Fall von Mißbrauch des 'guten (Autoren)Namens' ereifert sich Martial, der Vater der Wortschöpfung vom literarischen Plagiat (1,52), wenn er verschiedentlich nicht nur gegen Leute Front macht, die seine Epigramme als ihre eigenen ausgeben,³⁸ sondern sich auch gegen solche verwahrt, die ihre eigenen – und zwar offensichtlich verletzenden – Epigramme unter dem Namen Martials an die Öffentlichkeit bringen (7,72,12ff.).³⁹ Doch muß hier offen bleiben, ob der primäre Antrieb dieser

³⁴ Stemplinger a.O. (Anm. 30) 169. Auf den *Trikaranos* geht Stemplinger in seiner Monographie, soweit ich sehe, nicht ein.

³⁵ Genau umgekehrt lägen die Dinge, wenn man etwa Klopstock als den 'deutschen Homer' (oder: den 'deutschen Horaz') und Camoes als den 'portugiesischen Vergil' bezeichnen wollte. Hier stimmt die Herkunftsangabe, während der Eigenname denjenigen des Stil- oder Gattungsvorbildes aufnimmt – nur hat das nichts mit Plagiatintention oder Verschleierung der wahren Autorschaft zu tun.

³⁶ So ließ etwa auch Dionysios Metathemenos seinen *Parthenopaios* als ein Werk des Sophokles gelten: Diog. Laert. 5,9. Zur Fälschung von Werken auf den Namen der Alten, der Pythagoreer etwa oder der Orphiker, Stemplinger a.O. (Anm. 30) 32f.

³⁷ Cf. zu einem möglichen Sonderfall literarischer Rancune Stemplinger l.c.: "Ob nicht auch dem Leukippos ... erst später die unter Demokrits Namen gehende Schrift μέγας διάκοσμος untergeschoben wurde, um den Demokritos zu verkleinern?"

³⁸ Vgl. nur den Fidentinus-Zyklus im ersten Buch (29; 38; 53; 72) und auch 52 und 66.

³⁹ "Anonyme Schmähdgedichte, die Martial zugeschrieben wurden" (Friedländer); hier

Poetaster die Diskreditierung Martials gewesen ist und nicht eher die Hoffnung auf eine besondere Popularität ihrer Attacken durch den berühmten Namen, der ihren Angriffen mithin gesteigerte Schlagkraft zu geben versprach.

Nicht immer ist sich die Literaturwissenschaft in ähnlichen Fällen klar über die tatsächliche Verfasserschaft. So ist bis heute offen, um ein Beispiel aus der Neuzeit heranzuziehen, "ob das lange Zeit Wezel zugeschriebene Werk *Gott Wezel Zuchtruthe des Menschengeschlechts. Werke des Wahnsinns von Wezel dem Gottmenschen* (Erfurt 1804) tatsächlich von Wezel stammt oder nicht. Es spricht einiges dafür, daß Becker [d.i. Johann Nikolaus Becker, Anm. Verf.] selbst der Verfasser ist und daß sein Bericht über den Besuch bei Wezel diese *Zuchtruthe* vorbereiten sollte".⁴⁰ Wezel war im späten 18. Jh. eine ähnlich gut gehaßte oder doch schillernde Figur wie Theopomp zur Zeit der makedonischen Expansion, und das vermutlich doch von Becker stammende Werk machte sich das Renommee dieses enfant terrible zunutze, indem es den Autor zu einer Legende seiner selbst stilisierte und an der Verstärkung der Affekte gegenüber dieser polarisierenden Persönlichkeit strickte.⁴¹

V

Das Splitting von Eigennamen und Herkunftsbezeichnung eines Literaten ist ein eigener Fall und spiegelt die gespaltene Identität eines Autors auf angemessene Weise wider, der unter der Maske eines anderen publiziert hat. Im Akt der Fälschung und der Anverwandlung des fremden Stils wird der Autor aus Lampsakos zu einem anderen. Wenn hier mithin die

handelt es sich aus dem Blickwinkel Martials um Elaborate, die gerade durch ihren Geifer und Pesthauch von den echten Werken leicht zu unterscheiden seien. Hierher gehören auch die Epigramme 10,3, 5 und 33.

⁴⁰ L. Prütting, "Nachrichten aus der Strafkolonie. Einige Anmerkungen zu Johann Karl Wezels philosophischem Roman 'Belphegor'", in: Johann Karl Wezel, *Belphegor oder die wahrscheinlichste Geschichte unter der Sonne*, Frankfurt a.M. 1984⁴, 457f.

⁴¹ Mitunter trifft man den Fall, daß einem bekannten Literaten aus Kalkül dezidierte oder gar brisante Auffassungen in den Mund gelegt werden, wie es Gotthold Ephraim Lessing geschehen ist, der in den Briefen Friedrich Heinrich Jacobis als ein Vertreter des Spinozismus erscheint: E. J. Engel, "Relativ wahr? Jacobis Spinoza-Gespräch mit Lessing", *Euphorion* 93 (1999) 433ff.

historische und kulturgeschichtliche Identität einer Person von einem Nomen proprium und einem Ethnikon bezeichnet werden, die als einzelne Bausteine keine prosopographische Einheit bilden, so scheint ein solches Verfahren literarisch zunächst singulär dazustehen. Doch käme eine derartige literarische Strategie bei einem Autor wie Lukian nicht gänzlich unerwartet, versteht er doch auch die von ihm gepflegte Gattung des komischen Dialogs insgesamt als seine ureigene Erfindung und definiert sie als ein hybrides Wesen, welches er im Bilde des mythischen oder bildkünstlerischen Mischwesen des Kentauren / ἵπποκένταυρος und ähnlicher Hybriden zu visualisieren beliebt.⁴² Zur Genese dieses mixtum compositum haben der philosophische Dialog und die Komödie als gemeinsames Elternpaar beigetragen.

Es gehört darüber hinaus zur Technik der novellistisch konzipierten *Prolaliai* Lukians, mit stupenden Nachrichten die Aufmerksamkeit des Publikums zu fesseln oder überhaupt erst zu gewinnen. Dabei kommt es immer wieder vor, daß genau recherchierte Antiquaria von kühnen Autoschediasmata kaum mehr zu unterscheiden sind, Fiktion und Fakten sich wundersam verschlingen. Hierin liegt m.E. ein hauptsächlichlicher Charakterzug dieser Schriften, der von der Forschung bisher nicht in gebührender Weise herausgestellt worden ist – und auch nicht herausgestellt werden konnte, solange nämlich die fiktiven Nachrichten kulturgeschichtlicher Art als solche von den genuinen Zeugnissen nicht geschieden worden sind.⁴³

Man kann sich gut vorstellen, daß eine Überlieferung wie die von der doppelbödigen Autorschaft des *Trikaranos* dem literarischen Temperament Lukians nur zu gut entsprochen haben dürfte. Hätten wir mit unserer

⁴² Vgl. *Zeuxis sive Antiochus* mit E. Braun, *Lukian. Unter doppelter Anklage. Ein Kommentar* (Studien zur Klassischen Philologie 85), Frankfurt a.M. 1994, 346, 349f.

⁴³ Ich hoffe das für die Nachrichten von den antiken Kunstwerken an anderer Stelle nachholen zu können. – Zumindest aber in einem weiteren Fall der Autorenprosopographie stehen die Chancen nicht schlecht, Lukian einer 'literary fabrication' überführt zu haben. *Scyth.* 8 nennt als Quellenzeugen für die erstaunliche Überlieferung, daß Anacharsis als einziger Nichtgriecher in die Eleusinischen Mysterien eingeführt worden sei, einen ansonsten völlig unbekanntem Autor Theoxenos: F. W. Householder, *Literary Quotation and Allusion in Lucian*, New York 1941, 38 s.v. Theoxenos mit Anm. 24; weitere "false references" im Lukian-Corpus nennt Householder a.O. 26. Zu Lukians Vexierziten auch Verf., "Homers Helden und die Tyrannenmörder von Athen. Zum Text von Philostrat, ep. 56 (57) p. 251. 26/27 Kayser²", *Philologus* 142 (1998) 181ff. hier 184 mit Anm. 25.

Vermutung, welcher Art Kalkül zur zweiten Beheimatung des Anaximenes geführt hat, das Richtige getroffen, so handelte es sich um einen urbanen Scherz, der mit einem kenntnisreichen Publikum rechnet, welches den prosopographischen Fehler erkennt und die literarische Strategie des Redners im Interesse der subtilen Pointe zu schätzen weiß.

Freie Universität Berlin

ANALECTA EPIGRAPHICA

HEIKKI SOLIN

CXCII. WEITERE NEUE LATEINISCHE COGNOMINA

Wie im vorigen *Arctos*-Band versprochen, werde ich in regelmässigen Abständen Nachträge zum Repertorium lateinischer Cognomina liefern. Da schon jetzt, nur ein Jahr nach der letzten Auslese (*Arctos* 34 [2000] 149–151), mehrere neue Bildungen zu notieren sind, gebe ich hier die mir in der Zwischenzeit bekannt gewordenen Novitäten. Auch manche bisher selten belegte Namenbildungen werden verzeichnet (solche Bildungen sind jedoch nicht systematisch berücksichtigt worden). Besondere Mühe habe ich verwendet, um seltene Namenbildungen aus dem griechischen Osten zusammenzustellen, wobei interessante Einzelheiten aufgetaucht sind, wie etwa zahlreiche Neubildungen auf *-ianus -iana*, die ein übliches Namenbildungsmittel in vornehmen Familien in manchen Griechenstädten waren, oder die Verwendung von orthographischen Varianten wie die Geminierung von Konsonanten (etwa Τρεβωννιαύος neben *Trebonianus*). – "Rep." meint das *Repertorium nominum et cognominum Latinorum* von Salomies und Solin (1988, 2. Aufl. 1994); "Kajanto" I. Kajantos *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki 1965. – Neue Namen (bisher nicht belegte feminine [oder gegebenenfalls maskuline] Formen mitgerechnet) sind fett gesetzt.

Adventinus -a: Kajanto 349 mit drei Belegen. Dazu *AE* 1996, 1595 (Bostra) *Ulpia Adventina*, Tochter und Frau eines Legionscenturionen. Der neue Beleg erhärtet die Annahme, dass *Adventinus -a* kaum nur eine ortho-

* Marco Buonocore hat auf bewährte Weise meine Handschriftenstudien unterstützt. Mika Kajava, Olli Salomies und Kalle Korhonen haben ebenfalls in bewährter Weise meinen Text durchgelesen und mit Bemerkungen bereichert. Erja Salmenkivi war bei ägyptischen Personennamen, Martti Leiwo bei linguistischen Fragen behilflich. Einen ganz besonderen Dank schulde ich Manfred G. Schmidt für die sprachliche Durchsicht des Textes.

graphische Variante von *Aventinus* sei, wie in *ThLL* I, 835 angenommen.

Αἰφικιανός: *TitCal* 250, 9 (3. Jh. n. Chr.). Das Gentilicium *Aeficius - ia* ist auf Kos als Einzelname belegt: Paton – Hicks 186a. Als Gentilname im griechischen Osten aus Athen (*IG* II² 4243, 2. Hälfte des 1. Jh. n. Chr.) und Knidos (*I. Knidos* 386) bekannt.

Aelias: *Rep.*² 289. 497. Dazu *HAE* 1523 *Aelias, vivas in <Christo>* (Sexus bleibt unbekannt).

Αἰτερνιανή: M. H. Sayar, *Perinthos-Herakleia* (Marmara Ereğlisi) und Umgebung. Geschichte, Testimonien, griechische und lateinische Inschriften (DAW 269 = Veröff. Kleinasiat. Komm. 9), Wien 1998 = *I. Perinthos-Herakleia* 89. Der Männername *Aeternianus* lässt sich nicht mit Sicherheit belegen; der in *OPEL* I 47 dafür angeführte Beleg aus *CIL* XIII 3323 lautet *Etenianus*, wohinter ein selbständiger Name stecken kann: s. weiter unten.

Agrippiana: Kajanto 175. Dazu Ἀγριππιανή *SEG* XXIX 425 (Patrai, 4./5. Jh.).

Anguilla. Dieses in *Rep.*² 497 aus *I. Aquileia* 894 gewonnene Testimonium bleibt unsicher. Eine neue Bestandsaufnahme hat ergeben, dass in der Inschrift möglicherweise eher *Angulata* zu lesen sei.¹

Anicianus. Den wenig zahlreichen von Kajanto 140 verzeichneten Belegen sind hinzuzufügen *ILTG* 6; *I. Ephesos* 1238.

Ἄπελινάριος: *I. Perinthos-Herakleia* 309 Ἀὐρ. Ἄ. Interessante Nebenform von *Apollinaris*: dem Namengeber schwebte als Ausgangspunkt Ἀπελλῆς Ἀπελλᾶς vor.

Apro: Kajanto 325 mit zwei sicheren Belegen.² Dazu *ICUR* 19432 *ab Aprone*; *SEG* IX 491 (Taucheira in Cyrenaica, 1. Jh. n. Chr.) Ἄπρων.

Aproniana: Kajanto 140. Dazu *I. Beroia* 419 *Publicia T. fil. Aproniane*; *I. Ephesos* 3467.

Aprunc(u)la: *HAE* 1242 (*Apruncula*); C. Castillo – J. Gómez Pantoja – M. D. Mauleon, *Inscr. rom. del Museo de Navarra* (1981) 41 (*Apruncla*). Kajanto kennt nur den Männernamen *Aprunculus* (325 mit drei Belegen aus der vorgerückten Kaiserzeit; dazu noch ein älterer Beleg in *CIL* II 4581 vgl.

¹ Vgl. H. S., "Spigolature aquileiesi", in *Atti del Colloquio Ceti medi in Cisalpina* (Milano 2000), Milano 2002 (im Druck).

² Von den vier bei Kajanto angeführten Belegen sind auszuschneiden *CIL* III 6010, 15, ein Ziegelstempel mit dem Text OF APRO, wo was auch immer stecken kann; und *CIL* VI 35979, wo eher der Frauename *Aphro* vorliegt.

I. Barcelona 190).

Ἄρβουξηνανός: I. *Ephesos* 2055, 16 (kaiserz.) Λ. Κ[αλπούρν]ιος Ἄρβουξηνανός, ein Koer, Apollonpriester. Der Gentilname *Arbuxeius* ist nur aus *CIL* I² 1436 (Nemi) bekannt.

Armentius: Kajanto 325 mit drei Belegen. Dazu *CIL* XV 8325 L. *Maesi Armentivi*.

Ἄρρηγιανή: *ArchDelt* 45 (1990) Chron. 257 Nr. 5 (Nicompolis in Epeiros). Kajanto 140 verzeichnet nur den Männernamen mit zwei Belegen. In Epeiros könnte der Name auch als griechisch gedeutet werden.

Asellinus: Kajanto 326 mit zwei Belegen. Dazu *AE* 1995, 397 (Iuvanum); *ILBulg.* 89.

Asprianus: Kajanto 141 = 265 mit zwei Belegen. Dazu *AE* 1983, 371 (Fanum Fortunae). Wessel *IGCVO* 1358 (Syracusae).

Ἄττικιανή: eine ἀρχιτέρεια in Hierapolis, *AE* 1998, 1363 (1. Hälfte des 3. Jh. n. Chr.). Bisher war nur der Männernamen *Atticianus* belegt (Kajanto 203); überraschend bleibt dabei, dass neben den recht zahlreichen Männernamenbelegen (Kajanto verzeichnet deren insgesamt 23) Frauennamenbelege bisher gänzlich fehlten.

Ἀττίκων: A. Brugnone, *Κώκαλος* 20 (1974) 235 Nr. 8 (Thermae Himeratae, nach der Herausgeberin 1. Jh. n. Chr.). Nach dem Photo zu schliessen scheint die Lesung sicher. Ist dieser Name, der sonst nicht belegt zu sein scheint (das Suffix *-o(n)* neben dem viel üblicheren *-io(n)* war in der griechischen und lateinischen Anthroponymie nicht sehr gebräuchlich), als griechisch oder lateinisch aufzufassen? Diese Frage (die auch den vorigen Namen berührt) ist nicht nur theoretisch, denn die römischen Namengeber haben *Atticus* doch wohl als ein lateinisches Cognomen identifiziert, wie aus seiner Frühgeschichte hervorgeht, die in Rom beginnt. Aber wie steht es mit diesem Ἀττίκων in einer griechisch geschriebenen Urkunde in Sizilien im 1. Jh. n. Chr., – freilich in einer Stadt, wo die Stellung des Lateinischen stärker war als sonst auf der Insel? Dabei ist es wichtig, sich zu vergegenwärtigen, dass im griechischen Bereich die Verwendung von Ἀττικός und seiner Sippe erst in der Kaiserzeit einsetzt (mit einer einzigen Ausnahme: *Ath. Agora* XVII 739 aus dem 2. Jh. v. Chr.³). Wie ich andernorts dargelegt habe, ist es durchaus möglich, die Verbreitung dieses Namens mit einigen

³ Ἀττικός fehlt bei Bechtel *HPN*, muss aber dort aus dieser Inschrift nachgetragen werden.

berühmten Namensträgern zu verbinden,⁴ d. h. ihn als lateinischen Namen zu identifizieren;⁵ besonders solche Derivative wie Ἀττικιανή oder Ἀττίκιλλα würde man eher dem lateinischen Namengut zurechnen.⁶

Auctianus: Kajanto 350 mit drei Belegen. Dazu *CIG* 3844 (Aezani) Αὐκτιανός(?).

Auspicius. Zu den wenigen von Kajanto 318 verzeichneten Belegen kommt hinzu Αὐσπίκιος *I. Ephesos* 1821.

Avidianus: Kajanto 141 mit zwei Belegen. Dazu *I. Pisid. Cen.* (IK 57) 28 Π. Οὐλ. Ἀουιδιανὸς Ῥοτεΐλιος Πρόπινκος.

Birianus: *IGLS* 9174 (Bostra) *Biriano de numero M(aurorum) Ill(yricorum) Constan(tium)*. Vgl. *Virianus* Kajanto 159.

Blandianus: Kajanto 282 mit zwei Belegen. Dazu *SEG XX* 56 (Hamaxia) Αὐρ. Βλανδιανὸς Κόνων (Sohn Αὐρ. Ἀνθέστιος Κωνωνιανὸς Βλάνδος).

Blossianus: Kajanto 142 mit einem Beleg. Dazu Γ. Μάρ(ιος) Βλοσσιανὸς Θράσων *IG X* 2, 2, 73 (Heraclea Lyncestis). Das Auftauchen von *Blossianus* in Heraclea Lyncestis setzt eine dort angesiedelte Familie der Blossii voraus (s. Salomies, oben 153), sofern *Blossianus* selbst nicht als zweiter Gentilname des C. Marius zu werten ist, gemäss einer besonders in Makedonien verbreiteten Sitte, neue Gentilnamen auf *-ianus* zu bilden.⁷

Caelina: Καλεΐνα *I. Anazarbos* I 550. Auch *Caelinus* bisher nicht belegt. Die Wahl dieses Cognomens setzt nicht eine in Anazarbos angesiedelte Familie der Caelii voraus, obschon morphologisch *Caelinus -a* aus dem Gentilicium gebildet ist. Ebenso gut mag dem lokalen Namengeber

⁴ H. S., "Latin Cognomina in the Greek East", in *The Greek East in the Roman Context. Proceedings of a colloquium organized by the Finnish Institute at Athens, May 21 and 22, 1999*, edited by O. Salomies (Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 7), Helsinki 2001, 197f.

⁵ Eine andere Sache ist, dass das Ethnikon selbst seit jeher weit verbreitet war und dass mehrere Derivate entstanden, darunter auch Ἀττικίων in der Bedeutung 'kleiner Athener', belegt in Aristophanes' Frieden 214.

⁶ Erst recht ist es unzulässig, solche Namenbelege aus lateinischen Urkunden wie *Atticus* aus Luceria oder Puteoli oder Pompeji oder *Atticilla* aus Puteoli der griechischen Onymie zuzurechnen, wie es in *LGPN III A*, 83 geschieht (und warum gebraucht man in diesem Lexikon in Bezug auf Puteoli ständig die Bezeichnung "Dikaiarchia-Puteoli", obwohl die eher imaginäre Gründung von Dikaiarchia nichts mit der historischen Überlieferung puteolanischer Inschriften zu tun hat?).

⁷ Vgl. O. Salomies, *Arctos* 18 (1984) 102.

(sofern es sich nicht um fremdes Namengut handelt) als Namenwort etwa *caelum* vorgeschwebt haben.

Καλανδαρία: *I. Ephesos* 2277 δ. Bisher war nur der Männernamenname *Calendarius* bekannt (Kajanto 219 mit einem einzigen Beleg). Die Schreibung auf -ανδ- ist, wie bekannt, in griechischen Inschriften die überwiegende.

Calaviana: Kajanto 143 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *I. Philippi* 222. 226 (1. Jh. n. Chr.) *Maecia C. f. Auruncina Calaviana*.

Calidianus: Kajanto 143 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *CIL* VI 14062 (Sklave). XII 3712; *I. Prusa ad Olympum* 33 Τίτος Φλάουιος Δίωνος υἱός [---] Καλειδιανὸν υἱόν.

Calvanus: *I. Cilicie* 47 (2./3. Jh.) *Calventius C[a]lvanus veteran(us) ex numero equitum Batavonum natione Pannonius domo Sirmi*. Lesung und Deutung scheinen sicher. *Calvanus* gesellt sich zur grossen Namensippe *Calvus* (Kajanto 235); auch wenn das Suffix *-anus* an sich nicht produktiv war, liegt kein Grund vor, eine sekundäre Schreibung für ein sonst nicht belegtes **Calvianus* anzunehmen, auch nicht keltisches Substrat.

Capio(?): *CIL* XIV 617a (Ostia, 2./3. Jh.). Einmalige Bildung, wahrscheinlich steht sie nur für *Capito* (möglicherweise ist ein Nexus von I und T verkannt worden). Doch sei darauf hingewiesen, dass die *gens Capia* in Ostia belegt ist: *CIL* XIV 769. 1213. *Cappius* 5088.

Καπιτῶς: *I. Anazarbos* I 319. Das griechische Suffix -ῶς wurde, wie bekannt, auch mit lateinischen Namenstämmen verbunden. Gebildet aus *Capito* durch Verkürzung des Stammes, wie auch in ähnlichen okkasionalen Bildungen wie *Capitinus* (Kajanto 235) oder *Capitulla* (*Rep.* 308: καπίτυλλα).

Καπιτωλία: *Καπιτωλία IG* XIV 196 + 199 + *NSc* 1895, 514 Nr. 248 (= Wessel *IGCVO* 238) vgl. A. Ferrua, *CivCatt* 92, 2 (1941) 376 (Syracusae). Vgl. *Καπετώλιος Rep.* 308 aus *I. Smyrna* 777, dazu noch *Καπιτώλιος* in Chios (s. *LGPN* I 251, zweimal, 2. Jh. n. Chr.).

Καπιτωνιανή: *AnatStud* 12 (1962) 206 Nr. 208 (Corycus) Αὐρ. Καπιτωνιανήν Αἰλουῦν. Der entsprechende selten belegte Männernamenname *Capitonianus* (Kajanto 143 = 235) wird aus *I. Ephesos* 929 und *I. Pisid. Cen.* (IK 57) 34–41 um zwei Belege bereichert.

Cascellianus: Kajanto 143 mit einem Beleg. Dazu Varro *ling.* 9, 71 (doch kaum ein wirkliches Cognomen, wie man im *ThlL Onom.* II 225, 5–8 meint, sondern eher Adjektiv, vgl. *Cascellianum iudicium*); *CIL* XIV 5347

(Ostia) *L. Munatius C.* (1. Hälfte des 2. Jh.).

Καστριανός: *SEG* III 334, 34 (Chios, ca. 160 n. Chr., Vater und Sohn). Wohl aus dem Gentilicium *Castrius* gebildet, das aus Milet bekannt ist: *RA* 1874, 109, wo ein kaiserlicher Procurator Castrius Cinna (*PIR*² C 546) aus dem 3. Jh. erwähnt wird.

Καστρικᾶς(?): *CIG* 9222 (Seleucia in Kilikien, christl.) Καστρικᾶ βιρ(σοποιοῦ?); in *CIG* wird Καστρ[ηνσίου] vorgeschlagen. Vgl. *Castricus* (*Rep.* 311), dessen Bildungsweise etwas unklar ist: zu *castrum* oder dem Gentilnamen *Castrius* oder aber durch Abkürzung des Stammes aus dem üblichen Gentilnamen *Castricius*. *Castricas* ist aber sicher aus *Castricius* gebildet. Das griechische Männernamensuffix –ᾶς wird lateinischen Namen auf –*ius* zuweilen ohne *i* angehängt: zu Praenomina wie Λουκᾶς Ποπλᾶς Τιβεραῶς, zu Gentilnamen wie Ἰουλᾶς Οὐαλερᾶς Πετρωνᾶς.

Catellus -a: Kajanto 326. Dazu *RAC* 44 (1968) 154 (m., Rom, 508 n. Chr.) *C. ebur[arius]*; Wessel *IGCVO* 1354 (f., Syracusae).

Κατιάνιλλα: Kajanto 144 mit einem Beleg (jetzt *ICUR* 20749). Dazu Κατιάνιλ{α}λα Strazzulla, *Museum epigraphicum* (1897) 308 (Syracusae, christl.).

Catulianus: Kajanto 326 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *Epigraphica* 42 (1980) 95 (Timgad).

Celeria: Kajanto 248 mit einem Beleg für den Frauennamen. Dazu *I. Klaudiu polis* 146 (Vater *Celer*).

Cervilla: Kajanto 327 mit zwei Belegen. Dazu *AE* 1985, 355 (Ricina); *CILA* II 143 (christl.) *Cervella*.

Claudilla: Kajanto 168 mit zwei Belegen. Dazu Κλαυδίλλης (Gen.) *I. North Galatia* (Regional Epigraphic Catalogues of Asia Minor II, ed. St. Mitchell) 234. Es mag überraschen, dass dieses Cognomen nicht öfter belegt ist. Launen der Namengebung.

Cognitus -a: Kajanto 278 zufolge 5mal als Männername, 2mal als Frauennamen belegt. Dazu Κόγνιτος *I. Ephesos* 2290 dreimal in drei Generationen; Κογνίτα ebda. 2307c.

Comentiolus: zwei hohe byzantinische Beamten an der Schwelle des 6. zum 7. Jh. (*PLRE* III 321–326 Nr. 1–2; der erstere stammt aus Thrakien). Der Name ist nahezu ausschliesslich in gr. Form Κομεντίολος überliefert (lat. nur *Comenciolus* in *CIL* II 3420). Ferner *AE* 1994, 1551 aus Hadriano-
polis (575/577 n. Chr.). Zu den Personen vgl. D. Feissel, *BCH* 119 (1995) 379–386, bes. 382. In klassischem Latein sollte der Name wohl –*mm-*

geschrieben werden; zugrunde liegt wohl der Name *Commentus* (Kajanto 350), der freilich sehr selten ist, so dass eher an eine direkte Anknüpfung an die Wortsippe *commen-* zu denken ist.

Comitiolus: Kajanto 306 mit zwei christlichen Belegen. Dazu Greg. M. *epist.* 13, 47 = *PLRE* III 329 Nr. 2, der nicht mit dem von Kajanto aus Greg. M. *epist.* 8, 19 angeführten Namensvetter identisch sein kann.

Commentiolus: s. *Comentiolus*.

Κομμόδιλλα: I. *Anazarbos* I 369 Κομόδιλλα. *Commodus* mit Sippe (Kajanto 256; dort hinzuzufügen *ICUR* 25078 *Commodiana*) war nicht sehr verbreitet, so dass der Name des Kaisers Commodus seit dem Ende des 2. Jh. teilweise als Namensvorbild, auch in der Bildung von Suffixableitungen, gewirkt hat.⁸ Commodus war eine bekannte Figur im römischen Bewusstsein, und besonders seit seiner Divinisierung durch Severus konnte sich auch die Verwendung seines Namens weiter entfalten.

Communis: Kajanto 256 (ein üblicher Name). Kann Κομμοῦνος *SEG* XLII 545 (Nicomolis in Epeiros) hierzu als eine Nebenform angesehen werden?

Copiola: Kajanto 281 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *CIL* VI 19057; *HAE* 1914 (Carthago Nova).

Κορβουλίων: [Κ]ορβουλίων I. *Apollonia* 239 vgl. *SEG* XXIII 486. Zu *Corbulo* (der bei Kajanto fehlt) *Rep.* 318.

Cornicinus: Kajanto 319 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *AE* 1989, 875 (Soldat unbekannter Herkunft, hadrianisch).

Cornutinus: *AE* 1997, 909 (Conventus Caesaraugustanus, etwa 2. Jh. n. Chr.) *Corneliae Cornutini f(iliae)*. Wenn Lesung und Auflösung stimmen (das Fehlen des Cognomens der Cornelia verwundert), haben wir hier ein neues Cognomen. Angenommen die Auslegung der Editoren stimmt, hiess sein Urenkel Cornutus.

Crispianus: Kajanto 223 mit drei Belegen. Dazu *RIU* 436; I. *Prusias ad Hypium* (IK 27) 11 II 28: Μ. Αὐρήλ(ιος) Κρισπιανὸς Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ καὶ Κύριλλος.

Decimiana: Kajanto 145, der neben dem üblicheren *Decimianus* nur einen Beleg von *Decimiana* verzeichnet. Ein weiterer in synkopierter Form kommt aus dem Osten: Δεκμιανή I. *Kyzikos* 358.

Decrianus: Kajanto 145 mit drei Belegen. Dazu *AE* 1966, 276

⁸ Der Editor datiert die Inschrift ins 1./2. Jh., sicher falsch. Sie ist augenscheinlich viel jünger, vom Ende des 2. oder aus dem 3. Jh.

(Noricum); *RIU* 54; Δεκριανός Luc. *asin.* 2, ein Sophist aus Patrai;⁹ *I. Klaudiu polis* 121 mit einer abenteuerlichen Bemerkung des Herausgebers zum Namen.¹⁰

Delicatus: Kajanto 270 mit vier Belegen. Dazu Μάριος Δηλικᾶτος *I. Beroia* 20 (2. Jh. n. Chr.).

Deusdedit. Zu den in *Arctos* 32, 1998, 239 angeführten Belegen aus Italien kommen mehrere kirchliche Würdenträger hinzu, in *PCBE* 2, 552–557 Nr. 1–14 verzeichnet.

Domnentiolus: Es sind uns aus dem Ende des 6. und Anfang des 7. Jh. eine Reihe von spätrömischen Beamten bekannt, deren Namen (fast ausschliesslich auf griechisch geschrieben) *Domnentiolus*, *Domnentiolus*, *Domnitiolus* überliefert sind (s. *PLRE* III 413–414 Nr. 1–2. 417 Nr. 1–2). Das führt zu einem Namen *Domnentiolus*, der zu der grossen Namensippe von *dom(i)nus* gehört und mittels des zweifachen Suffixes *-entius* und *-iolus* von der Sippe *dom(i)nus* gebildet ist. Der Gebrauch des Suffixes *-antius -entius* erweiterte sich auch ausserhalb der Präsenpartizipien oder anderer Bildungen auf *-ans -ens*. Von der Kombination dieser beiden Suffixe gibt es mehrere Beispiele wie *Constantiolus Vincentiolus Viventiolus*, und mir ist ein Fall bekannt, der ebenfalls kein Partizip voraussetzt, nämlich *Maxentiolus*, der auch aus dem Osten stammt (*Procop. bell. Goth.* 2, 8, ein Beamter im Jahre 537 n. Chr.).

Dossenus: Kajanto 226 kennt zwei Belege, den spätrepublikanischen Münzmeister und *CIL* V 2256; hier ist aber eher *Dossennus* zu lesen, vgl. Pais 1235. Beide Formen sind also als Cognomina beglaubigt. Ferner *Fabius Dossennus*, Quelle des Plinius für Buch 14 und 15. Die sprachliche Herkunft des Namens ist nicht sicher (vgl. Schulze *ZGLE* 283; ungenau W.-H. I 373); seine Geschichte beginnt nunmehr in vorrömischer Zeit, nachdem eine in die Jahre 410–350 v. Chr. zu datierende Münze aus Poseidonia-Paestum diesen Namen bezeugt: *LGPN* IIIA 134 Δόσσηννο(ς).

Etenianus(?): *CIL* XIII 3323 (Remi). Die Lesung dürfte feststehen. In *OPEL* I 47 wird dafür ohne Not *Aeternianus* (sonst nicht belegt) konjiziert. Zugrunde könnte ein sonst nicht bekannter Gentilname *Etenius* liegen; vgl. ähnliche Namen *Rep.* 75.

⁹ W. Schmidt, *RE* IV 2306 Nr. 2 fragt sich unnötigerweise, ob nicht eher *Decirianus* zu verstehen sei.

¹⁰ "Das Gentilicium *Decrianus*, das hier als Eigenname gebraucht wird", als sei ein Gentilicium kein Eigenname.

Fabaria: *ILAlg.* II 870. Kajanto 335 kennt nur den Männernamen *Fabarius* (vier Belege).

Φαβατίων: *SEG XXIII* 666 (Soloï auf Kypros, 2./3. Jh.). Ableitung von *Fabatus*, das als Cognomen einigermassen Verwendung fand.

Fabricianus: Kajanto 146 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *IAM* II 307, 2 (ein Fabius); *IG X* 2, 2, 72; *I. Beroia* 11.

Fadus: Kajanto 178 mit drei Belegen. Ein interessanter Fall kommt aus Prusias ad Hypium: in *I. Prusias ad Hypium* 22 und 54 führen Vater und Sohn den Namen Φάδος, die Mutter heisst Φαδιλλιανή und die Tochter und die Enkelin Φάδιλλα.¹¹ Zu notieren ist hier, dass Mann und Frau Φάδος und Φαδιλλιανή heissen; die zu dieser Sippe gehörenden Namen waren also bei mehreren lokalen Familien gebräuchlich. Wie die Sippe nach Prusias kam, ist eine andere Sache, was aber diesen Fall interessant macht, ist, dass hier die Ableitungen *Fadilla* und *Fadilliana* auf *Fadus* bezogen worden sind, so dass sie in der Tat eher als Ableitungen von *Fadus* zu betrachten sind, während Kajanto 178 *Fadus* zu einem etwas obskuren alten Praenomen stellt und 168 *Fadilla Fadiliana* aus dem Gentilnamen *Fadius* ableitet, wenn es sich denn bei unserem *Fadus* nicht um eine nachträgliche Rückbildung handelt (eine ältere Verwandte kann etwa *Fadilla* geheissen haben). – *Fadilla* noch *NSc* 1927, 303 (Rom). *RPAA* 33 (1960–1961) 214 (Rom, christl.); *MAMA IX P* 71 (Aizanitis, 3. Jh. n. Chr.).

Φαλερῖνος: *IG XII* 6, 1, 420 (Samos, 154–161 n. Chr.). Ist entweder eine Erweiterung von *Falernus*, auch als Cognomen einigermassen verbreitet, oder Ableitung aus dem Gentilnamen *Falerius*, ganz wie *Falerianus*.

Fannianus: Kajanto 146 mit drei Belegen. Dazu M. Ὀψιος Νάουιος Φαννιανός *IG XIV* 719. 795 = *IGrNapoli* 6. 133 (1. Jh. n. Chr.).

Φατάλιος: *I. chrét. Macédoine* 64 = *I. Beroia* 441 (492 n. Chr.) μ(εγαλο)π(ρεπεστάτου) κόμ(ητος) Φαταλίου. Kajanto 214 kennt nur den Frauennamen *Fatalia* (mit einem Beleg).

Φαυστάς: G. E. Bean – T. B. Mitford, *Journeys in Rough Cilicia 1964–1968* (DAW 102 = Ergänzungsbd. zu TAM 3), Wien 1970, 266 Φαυστᾶτι τῇ μητρί. Als Nominativ kann Φαυστάς (nicht Φαυστᾶς mit den Editoren) festgelegt werden, denn das griechische Suffix -άς wurde

¹¹ Zu den Verwandtschaftsverhältnissen vgl. W. Ameling, ad *I. Prusias ad Hypium* 22. Aber seine Behauptung, "im Kaiserhaus der Antonine wurde er (d. h. diese Namen) des öfteren gebraucht", bleibt unverständlich.

einigermaßen in rein lateinischen Cognomina verwendet. In Rom werden die mit diesem Suffix versehenen Namen mit *-ad-* flektiert; die *-t*-Flexion wird für Frauennamen der ersten Deklination verwendet. Aber im griechischen Osten, besonders in Kleinasien tritt *-τ-* oft an die Stelle von *-δ-*.

Φαυστώ (?): *SEG XXXI* 1353 aus *RDAC* 1981, 195 (Amathus, um 100 n. Chr.) Δημήτριος Φαυ<σ>τοῦς. Die Lesung bleibt etwas unsicher, aber mit der gebotenen Vorsicht kann man den Namen dem lateinischen Cognominarepertoire wohl hinzufügen. Zur Bildung vgl. unten Μαρκώ. – Dagegen ist aus den Namenlexika auszuschneiden die vermeintliche Bildung Φαυστοῦς, in dieser Form im *LGPN I* 456 verbucht, doch vertritt sie einen falschen Namen, denn die Namenquelle ist nichts anderes als eine Dublette der hier oben zitierten Inschrift.¹²

Felica (m.): Kajanto 273 mit drei Belegen. Dazu kommt ein Beleg in richtiger griechischer Schrift und Endung: Φηλικᾶς *ArchDelt* 26 (1971) Chron. 335 (Nicopolis, kaiserz.).

Felico: *Arctos* 32 (1998) 240 aus *AE* 1991, 1667 (nahe Thugga). Jetzt kann aus Africa ein weiterer Beleg hinzugefügt werden: *AE* 1996, 1744 *Cornelius Fel[i]co* (nach dem Photo zu schliessen, scheint die Lesung sicher zu sein). Ferner *IG V* 2, 54, 23 aus Tegea (2. Jh. n. Chr.).

Flamma: Kajanto 341. Sodann ist der Name belegt auf Delos (*ID* 1631, ein Audius, wohl Italiker), auf Kos (s. *LGPN I* 475, 1. Jh. n. Chr.), in Cyrenaica (zweimal, s. *LGPN I* 475, 1.–2. Jh.), in Ephesos (*I. Ephesos* 1546, ein Gerellanus).

Φλαμμεάτης: *I. Beroia* 388 (2./3. Jh.) Φλαμμεάτης ὁ τὸ πρὶν Ζώσιμος, Gladiator. Die Bildung des Namens bleibt obskur. Doch sei mir folgende hypothetische Erklärung gestattet. Als Ausgangspunkt könnte das Wort *flamm(e)arius* dienen, das *infector flamm(e) coloris* bedeutet (Paul. Fest. p. 89).¹³ In griechischer Umgebung könnte eine Suffixvertauschung stattgefunden haben,¹⁴ und *-arius* wäre dann durch *-άτης* ersetzt worden.

¹² *LGPN I* 456 schöpft aus *RDAC* 1983 (muss sein 1982), p. 261 n. 18, aber die Inschrift, auf welche hingewiesen wird, muss die aus Amathus sein. Die Art und Weise, wie die Herausgeber mit tralazistischem Gut arbeiten, ist also verhängnisvoll geworden.

¹³ Zu den zwei Wörtern, die im Grunde dasselbe bedeuten, vgl. Bacherler, *ThLL* VI 870, 44–56. Georges übersetzt *flammearius* (aus Plaut. *Aul.* 510, wo aber eher an der hsl Tradition *flammarius* festzuhalten ist) "Verfertiger von Brautschleiern", wofür der Kontext nicht spricht. Besser an diesem Punkt *OLD*.

¹⁴ Ähnliches kommt in griechischen Urkunden vor: κηκουλάς *PSAAthen.* 34, 7 (3./4. Jh.) aus *circulator*, κολληγιᾶς *ebda.* 67, 9 (3./4. Jh., überliefert τοὺς κολληγιᾶτες) aus

Das so entstandene Wort hätte die Funktion des Eigennamens eingenommen, was in diesem Fall um so leichter gewesen wäre, als es sich um den Zunamen eines Gladiators handelt, welcher ihn erhalten hätte, weil er seine Gegner 'blutrot' machte.

Fontanus: Kajanto 308 mit fünf Belegen. Dazu *C. Vindilicius C. f. Pub. Fontanus ex equite* Devijver, *PME* V 114bis.¹⁵

Fonteanus: Kajanto 146 mit einem Beleg (aus Rom). Jetzt hat sich die Zahl vervierfacht: *AE* 1996, 334 (Interamna Lirenas); *AE* 1919, 81 (Ratiaria); *IGrNapoli* 235 (3./4. Jh.); *I. Klaudiu polis* 61 Φοντειανός.

Formilla. Dieser Name liegt höchstwahrscheinlich in der Inschrift FORMELLA auf einem Goldring, anulus aureus vor (die Inschrift wird in dem letzten von Heinrich Dressel hinterlassenen, von M. G. Schmidt zu bearbeitenden den Ringen und Gemmen gewidmeten Faszikel des *CIL* XV enthalten sein). Wenn hier *Formilla* zu verstehen ist, wird man die neue Bildung am besten neben *Formianus -a* (Kajanto 181, dazu *AE* 1993, 759a) zum Städtenamen Formiae stellen, ungefähr so, wie sich *Carnuntilla* (Kajanto 205) zu *Carnuntinus* oder *Hirpil(l)a* (Kajanto 188; die Deutung des Namens ist nicht über alle Zweifel erhaben) zu *Hirpinus* verhält; Kajanto stellt freilich *Hirpil(l)a* zu *Hirpi*, zum Namen einer Gilde unter den Faliskern; doch angesichts der hier angeführten analogen Fälle ist es vorzuziehen, *Hirpil(l)a* zu dem viel besser beglaubigten Hirpinernamen zu ziehen, dies um so mehr als *Hirpinus* auch als Cognomen auftritt (Kajanto 185). Auch *Veientilla* (Kajanto 189) kann zu *Veientanus* gestellt werden, obschon es auch direkt auf das Ethnikon *Veiens* bezogen werden konnte. (An griechische Namen wie Φόρμος und Sippe [Bechtel HPN 600] ist hier kaum zu denken, denn sie treten in der römischen Namengebung höchst selten auf.) Die Schreibung *-ella* für *-illa* ist verbreitet in der Kaiserzeit, besonders in der Zeit des ausgehenden Altertums; zum Beispiel *Petronella*, zum ersten Mal bei Greg. M. *epist.* 4, 6 belegt, wird in nachantiker Zeit ein üblicher Name gerade in dieser Form.

Formosa: Kajanto 231 mit einem Beleg (*Formonsa*). Dazu *IG* XII 2, 434 (kaiserz.) Φορμῶσα (überliefert ΦΟΡΜΟΣΑ).

Φορνικᾶς; *I. Ephesos* 3715 Αὐρ(ηλίω) Κοίντω Φορνεικᾶ. Die Lesung des Namens dürfte feststehen. Die Bildung ist nicht ganz durch-

collegiatus.

¹⁵ Devijver (im Supplement) plädiert für Herkunft aus Verona, aufgrund der Tribus, was gut stimmen kann.

sichtig, könnte aber zu *fornix fornicatus* gestellt werden. Aber aus dieser Sippe sind keine Eigennamen gebildet worden (ob *CIL* II 5227 *Furnus* hierher gehört, stehe dahin); notiere auch die peiorative Bedeutung, die vielen aus *fornix* gebildeten Wörtern innewohnt. Andererseits sind in der lateinischen Namenbildung Cognomina nicht unbekannt, die mittels verschiedener Suffixe aus Bezeichnungen von Gebäuden oder kleineren Gegenständen abgeleitet sind: etwa *Naucellio* zu *naucella*, *Scammatus* zu *scamma*, *Turrio* zu *turris*. Unter Verwendung des üblichen griechischen Suffixes -ᾶς wurden besonders im griechischen Osten nach Belieben neue lateinische Namen gebildet, und eine Bildung *Fornicas* wäre, wenngleich recht kühn, so doch nicht ganz auszuschliessen bei einem mit dem römischen Bürgerrecht bedachten Ephesier.

Fortinus: Kajanto 257 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *CIL* III 10903 = *RIU* 318 vgl. *AE* 1996, 1239.

Fortunalis: Kajanto 273 mit drei Männernamen- und zwei Frauennamenbelegen, Dazu *CIL* II² 14, 757a. *AE* 1997, 780 (Emerita). Der von Kajanto aus Marini, *Vat.* 9072 p. 489 Nr. 2 (auch 9076 f. 278 sched. Nr. 316) zitierte Beleg jetzt *ICUR* 18423.

Fortunatio: *Rep.* 334. *Arctos* 32 (1998) 241. Dazu *JournGlass Stud* 2 (1960) 74 (Acrillae in Sizilien, 3./4. Jh.).

Frugiana: Ἰουλία Φρουγιανὴ Ἀλεξάνδρα *SEG* XXXIV 633 = *AE* 1998, 1212 (Dium). Bisher war nur der Männername *Frugianus* bekannt, von dem Kajanto 253 einen Beleg anführt. Dazu noch Λούκιος Κλαύδιος Φρουγιανός *I. Ephesos* 461. 1128–1129a, Gymnasiarch in Ephesos Ende des 1. Jh. n. Chr.; Π. Δουκῆνιος Φρουγιανός *Alt. Hierapolis* (1898) 923 Nr. 166; Φρουγιανός *MAMA* IX 541 (Aezanitis).

Φρούγιλος: *AE* 1998, 1323 (Maionia in Lydien). Bisher war nur der Frauennamen *Frugilla* bekannt.

Gabinilla: Kajanto 169 = 182 mit einem Beleg aus Africa. Dazu *AE* 1995, 1740 (Theveste).

Γαίως: *BGU* 71, 2 (189 n. Chr.). *Tax Rolls* 223, 1306. 224, 631 (2. Jh. n. Chr.).

Gaio: *Britannia* 27 (1996) 451 Nr. 27 = *AE* 1996, 951, Amphoren-graffito *Gaionis* [---]; *OGIS* 196 = *I. Philae* I 63 (32 v. Chr.) Γάιος Ἰούλιος Πάπειος ... ὑπὲρ Γαίωνος τοῦ ... υἱοῦ; *P. Mich.* 191, 1 (1. Hälfte des 2. Jh. n. Chr.) Γαίων. Diese Belege scheinen auf einen sonst nicht belegten Namen *Gaio* hinzuweisen, der jedoch eine regelrechte Bildung darstellt, vgl.

etwa *Marcio* zu *Marcus*. In dem ersten Fall könnte epichorisches Namengut vorliegen, woher auch immer der Namensträger stammt. Dasselbe trifft für die zwei uns bekannten Belege von *Caio* zu (*CIL* III 10795. 11592). Vgl. M. W. C. Hassall – R. S. O. Tomlin, *Britannia* cit. 451 Anm. 47.

Galeo: Kajanto 342. Dazu *Suppl. It.* 18 (2000) Suasa 1.

Gallicianus: Kajanto 195 mit einem Beleg. Dazu Γ. Κλώδιος Ἀρτεμίδωρος Γαλλικιανός *I. Kyzikos* I 265.

Γαλλιπιανός: *Rep.*² 499. Dazu *CIG* 4153 = Chr. Marek, *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia* (Istanb. Forsch. 39), Tübingen 1993, 139 Nr. 12 (Pompeiopolis).

Gargonillus. Bisher war nur der Frauename *Gargonilla* (Γαργώνιλλα) bezeugt (*Rep.* 337, Senatorenfrau aus Ephesos). Der entsprechende Männername könnte in einem ebenfalls aus Ephesos kommenden Beleg vorliegen: Γαργόνιλος *I. Ephesos* 1285, 5 (christlich).

Gavilla: Kajanto 169 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *I. Anazarbos* I 571 Γάουιλλα.

Γεμνίων: *Rep.*² 499. Dazu Chr. Marek, *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia* (Istanb. Forsch. 39), Tübingen 1993, 141 Nr. 17 (Pompeiopolis).

Gillo. Ein altes Cognomen der Fulvier, noch in der Kaiserzeit in Gebrauch (Kajanto 344 verzeichnet drei Senatoren, zwei davon aus der Kaiserzeit). Es ist aber auch beim gemeinen Volk belegt: *CIL* VI 10358; II 3437; *I. Ephesos* 617a (römischer Bürger mit dem Gentilnamen [---]υιλώνιος). Der letztere könnte sein aussergewöhnliches Cognomen den zwei Fulvii Gillones verdanken, die Statthalter der Provinz Asia waren. Freilich meint der Editor, es handele sich bei [---]υιλώνιος um ein bisher unbekanntes Gentilicium des einen der zwei bekannten Statthalter der Provinz Asia. Das bleibt recht unsicher, auch weil wir nicht wissen, wie viel vom Namen in der fragmentarischen Inschrift fehlt. (Man könnte übrigens auch an einen Sohn eines der Statthalter denken, denn die Söhne von Provinzialbeamten waren in Asien oft polyonym.¹⁶) – Den Gentilnamen ergänzt der Herausgeber zu [Ἀκ]υιλώνιος, doch ist *Aquilonius* ein äusserst seltener Name [und sicher unpassend für einen Senator], nur einmal bei einem Patavinier belegt (*Rep.* 20), so dass vielmehr an den einigermassen verbreiteten Gentilnamen *Vilonius* zu denken ist.

Γναίς: *I. Kyzikos* I 275 = II 83. Das griechische Frauennamensuffix

¹⁶ Freundlicher Hinweis von Olli Salomies.

-is wird nicht selten lateinischen Namen angehängt, so etwa *Firmis*, *Lucianis*, *Montanis*, *Pisonis*. *Gnais* statt dem zu erwartenden *Gnaeis* ist leicht verständlich. Griechisch kann der Name nicht sein, und ein kleinasiatisches Etymon steht auch nicht zu Gebote.

Granilla: Kajanto 169 mit zwei Belegen. Dazu Γράνιλλα I. *Klaudiu polis* 9 mit einer abenteuerlichen Bemerkung des Herausgebers zur Bildung des Namens (er meint, Γρανίλλα (sic!) sei Deminutiv zu *granus*, der Zopf, "Zöpfchen"!).

Gratilliana: Kajanto 282 kennt nur *Gratillianus* (ein Beleg). Dazu I. *Andalucia* I 68 *Gratillia[na]*; *IGRR* IV 631 (Alia in Phrygien) Μάρ. Ούλπιος Γρατιλλιανός.

Gratissima(?): Γρατισήμης (Gen.) I. *chrét. Macédoine* 60 = I. *Beroia* 447 (5./6. Jh.). Vgl. *Gratissimus Rep.* 340 (*praepositus sacri cubiculi* im Osten).

Grattianus: Kajanto 147 mit drei Belegen. Dazu *RIT* 205; *AE* 1995, 902 = 1996, 906 (Hispanien) C. *Grattius Grattianus Ilvir*.

Hibernalis: Kajanto 218 mit drei Belegen, alle aus gallischen und germanischen Provinzen. Dazu *AE* 1996, 1158 (Osterburken, ein *beneficiarius consularis*).

Homobonus. Den von mir in *Vir bonus dicendi peritus. Festschrift für A. Weische*, Wiesbaden 1997, 389–398 gesammelten Belegen kommt noch hinzu *AE* 1996, 1792 (Africa, etwa 3. Jh. n. Chr.) *Concordius Homobonus*. Es ist freilich nicht völlig sicher, dass *Homobonus* hier ein Cognomen ist, denn *Concordius* kann auch Cognomen sein, wobei *homo bonus* zu verstehen sei – und dieses Wortpaar war üblich in heidnischen Grabinschriften.¹⁷ Die Entscheidung fällt schwer. Für das Epitheton spricht, dass *Concordius* als Cognomen üblicher ist denn als Gentilname, für *Homobonus* das Fehlen eines Trennpunktes zwischen HOMO und BONVS, während der Steinmetz sich sonst der Punkte als Worttrenner bedient, sowie die Tatsache, dass *homo bonus pius* als Pleonasmus nicht sehr stilvoll anmutet.

Hortensis: Kajanto mit drei Belegen. Dazu gesellt sich vielleicht Ὀρτήσιον (Akk.) I. *Lykaonien* I 377 (so nach der Auslegung der Editorin, die aber Ὀρτήσιον akzentuiert). Sein Bruder ist ein Valerius, so dass, wenn jener auch ein Valerius sein sollte, *Hortensis* an Wahrscheinlichkeit gewinnen würde. Die früheren Editoren haben hier den Gentilnamen *Hortensius* erkennen wollen, was nicht ganz ausgeschlossen werden kann; in dem Fall

¹⁷ H. S., in *Vir bonus* 394.

hätten wir die abgekürzte Flexionsform ohne o.

Insulanus: Kajanto 308 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *AE* 1965, 326 (Antiochia ad Cragum, trajanisch) Κόιντος Μάρκιος Εἰσουλανὸς Κρής Γορτύνιος, aus der lokalen Aristokratie. Vom Frauennamen *Insulana* verzeichnet Kajanto ebenfalls einen Beleg; dazu *JHS* 9 (1888) 259 = *BSA* 42 (1947) 225 vgl. G. E. Bean – T. B. Mitford, *Journeys in Rough Cilicia in 1962 and 1963* (DAW 85); Wien 1965, 41, 64 (Paphos auf Kypros, 1. Jh. n. Chr.) Λικιννία Ἴσουλᾶνα.

Ἰοβινιανός: *I. Prusias ad Hypium* (IK 27) 125 (christl.). Geminierte Variation von *Iovinianus* Kajanto 212, der sieben christliche Belege kennt.

Iudex: *Arctos* 32 (1998) 242 (ein Duovir von Utica). Jetzt kann ich einen weiteren Beleg anführen: *Suppl. It.* 18 (2000) Reate 25 (etwa 2. Jh. n. Chr., kaiserlicher Sklave).¹⁸

Ἰουλιάδης: Σέξτος Ἀτρίλιος (zum Gentilnamen s. Salomies, oben 152) Ἰουλιάδης Νάρκις(σ)ος *Milet* VI 514 (1./2. Jh.); ferner *IG* XII 5, 667 (Syros, 251 n. Chr.). 755 (Andros, 1. Jh. n. Chr.). [Zweifelhaft *I. Iasos*, 274, 13; s. unten 230.] Zur Bildung vgl. *Planciades* bei einem vir clarissimus, Schriftsteller aus dem 6. Jh. (*PLRE* II 488 s.v. Fulgentius 3). Anders steht *Scipiades* mit der Bedeutung 'einer aus der Familie der Scipionen', öfters in der römischen Literatur belegt.

Ἰουλιάς: H. Malay, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in the Manisa Museum* (DAW 237 = Ergänzungsband zu TAM 19), Wien 1994, 325 (unbek. Herkunft, 2./3. Jh.) Ἰουλιάδι.

Iulio: Kajanto 164 mit einem Beleg. Dazu Wessel *IGCVO* 760 (Syracusae) Ἰουλίων.

Ἰούλι[σ]σα: *I. Anazarbos* I 115. Zur Bildung vgl. *Scribonissa* aus *Scribonius* (auch sonst wird -issa rein lateinischen Namen angehängt).

Iulitta: Kajanto 171. Dazu *BCH* 115 (1991) 322 (Argos); *IG* V 2, 463f. (Megalopolis); *I. Anazarbos* I 311.

Iulla: *Rep.* 346. Dazu *AE* 1996, 1033 (Narbo); *I. Anazarbos* passim und sonst im griechischen Osten.

Iullinus: *Rep.*² 500 und öfters in den gallischen Provinzen. Vgl.

¹⁸ Die Inschrift kann aber eher stadtrömisch sein: M. Buonocore, "Il capitolo delle *Inscriptiones falsae vel alienae* nel *CIL*. Problemi generali e particolari: l'esempio della regio IV Augustea", in *Varia epigraphica. Atti del colloquio internazionale di epigrafia, Bertinoro 8–10 giugno 2000*, a cura di G. Angeli Bertinelli e A. Donati, Faenza 2001, 85.

Iullina Rep. 346.

Iunonia: Kajanto 212 mit zwei Belegen aus Africa (*Iunonius*: *Rep.* 347). Jetzt kommt ein weiterer Beleg aus Africa: *AE* 1996, 1737a.

Iuvatus. Ich habe in *Arctos* 32, 1998, 242 darauf hingewiesen, dass die Existenz dieses Namens fraglich sei. Doch sei es gestattet festzustellen, dass es neben dem umstrittenen Beleg bei Mart. 12, 24, 4 einen anderen einwandfreieren gibt: *CIL* VI 5747 C. *Iulius divi Aug. l. Felix I(u)vatianus*, wo aus dem Agnomen des Freigelassenen auf einen Vorbesitzer namens *Iuvatus* geschlossen werden kann (zu diesem Fall vgl. H. S., "Appunti sulla presenza di Africani a Roma", in *L'Africa romana* 14, 2002 (im Druck)).

Iuvenca: *I. Philippi* 279. Kajanto 300 kennt nur den Männernamen *Iuvenca* mit wenigen Ableitungen.

Iuventiana. Kajanto 148 kennt nur den Männernamen *Iuventianus*, aber auch der Frauename lässt sich nunmehr belegen: Ἰουουεντιανή *I. Ephesos* 2204. – Weitere Belege für den auch nicht sonderlich üblichen Männernamen: der Priester *P. Licinius Priscus Iuventianus* aus Korinth (*PIR*² L 232, 2. Jh. n. Chr.), dessen Agnomen in griechischen Inschriften entweder Ἰουουεντιανός oder Ἰουβεντιανός wiedergegeben wird;¹⁹ *I. Prusias ad Hypium* 8. 51; *I. Carie* II 60 Π. Ἄλιος Ἰουβεντιανός (zweimal, Vater und Sohn; es kann sein, dass der Vater, der das Bürgerrecht unter Hadrian erhalten hatte und so ein P. Aelius war, sein Cognomen dem Proconsul von Asia 129/130 P. Iuventus Celsus verdankt).

Lauricius. Den von Kajanto 334 verzeichneten Belegen ist hinzuzufügen *PLRE* I 497 *Bassidius L.*, comes et praeses Isauriae in 359; *P. Tjäder* 1 (445/6 n. Chr.); *I. chrét. Macédoine* 252 = *I. Philippi* 112 (ca. 4. Jh.).

Libellus: Kajanto 344 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *Milet* VI 903 Νίκη Αὐ(ρηλίου?) Λιβέλλου.

Liburnianus: s. im folgenden unter *Liburnus*.

Liburnus: Kajanto 185 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *IGUR* 742 (Λίβυρνος); *ILJug* 825; *ICret* I S. 216 Nr. 122 (Lytto, Λίβυρν[ο]ς Σωτάδα, 2. Jh. v. Chr. [also kein echter lateinischer Name]). Die Zahl der Belege hat sich seit Kajanto also verdreifacht. Ferner soll in *AE* 1967, 511 (Antiochia Pisidiae) dieser Name vorliegen; die Inschrift ist aber fragmentarisch, und es ist vorzuziehen, dort etwa *Liburni[ano]* zu lesen. Stimmt dies, so hätten wir

¹⁹ Zu ihm vgl. D. Geagan, The Isthmian dossier of P. Licinius Priscus Juventianus, *Hesperia* 58 (1989) 349–360. Die Nachweise von ihm werden in *LGPN* III A 220 unkritisch geboten.

hier einen neuen Namen, eine der unzähligen neuen Bildungen auf *-ianus*, die nur im Griechischen vorkommen.

Litoria: *ICUR* 25326; *AE* 1973, 339 (Lugdunum, christl.). Kajanto 308 kennt nur den Männernamen *Litorius*.

Lolliana: Kajanto 149 mit drei Belegen für den Frauennamen (als Männernamen üblich). Dazu Λολλιανὰ Strazzulla, *Museum epigraphicum* (1897) 413 (Syracusae, christl.).

Λογγιδιανός: Chr. Marek, *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia* (Istanb. Forsch. 39), Tübingen 1993, 163 Nr. 18 (Amastris) Λογγιδιανός Ῥούφου ἐφηβαρχήσας.

Λόγγιλλα: *I. Pisid. Cen.* (IK 57) 38 (Kremna, 3. Jh. n. Chr.) Οὐλ. Ῥοτ. Λόγγιλλα (ein naher Verwandter heisst Λογγιλλιανός); *MAMA VIII* 129 = *I. Lykaonien I* 303 [Aúr.] Λόνγιλλα.

Longinia: *CIL* II 2534 (aus Muratori!) *Longinia Longini filia*; *I. Lykaonien I* 372 Ἰουλία Λογγινία. Es besteht kein Grund, in dem letzteren Fall den Gentilnamen *Longinius* in der Funktion eines Cognomens zu erblicken (auch ihr Bruder ist ein Iulius), zumal die Inschrift recht spät zu sein scheint, was den Gebrauch des Suffixes *-ius -ia* verständlicher macht. Der Erstherausgeber W. M. Ramsay datierte den Text ins späte 4. Jh.; die neue Editorin Laminger-Pascher bestreitet dies und setzt die Inschrift ins 1. Jh., und zwar wegen des Gebrauchs des Praenomens im Namen des Bruders, doch das ist kein triftiger Grund für eine so frühe Datierung (warum es sich übrigens um Veteranenkinder handeln soll, wie L.-P. geltend macht, versteht man nicht).

Lucas: *Rep.* 353. Dazu Λουκάς *IG V* 2, 55 (zweimal, 2. Jh. n. Chr.); *IGB* 667 (Nicopolis ad Istrum) Λουκάς Ζήνωνος Νεικαιεὺς καὶ Νεικοπολείτης; *SEG XXVII* 1156b (Apollonia in Cyrenaica, 1. Jh. n. Chr.?). Christliche Belege werden nicht aufgezählt.

Lucensia: *AE* 1996, 1341 (Montana in Moesia inf.). Kajanto 189 kennt nur einen späten Beleg von *Lucensius*.

Lucerianus: *AE* 1905, 110 = 1997, 1743 (Caesarea Mauretaniae) *Sex. Cornelio Lucaeriano municipium Hadrianum Drobotense ex Dacia*. Die Herkunft des Namensträgers bleibt vorerst offen. Der neue Name steht neben *Lucerinus* (Kajanto 193) und stellt eine direkt auf das Toponym bezogene Suffixbildung dar, wie etwa *Faventianus* (*Rep.* 330) neben *Faventinus* (die aus diesem gebildete Suffixerweiterung heisst *Faventinianus*: Kajanto 196) aus dem Stadtnamen *Faventia* gebildet ist; auf ähnliche Weise

Laurentianus aus *Laurens* neben *Laurentinus* (Kajanto 182). Ferner *Setianus* neben *Setinus* (aus *Setia*) (Kajanto 155 zufolge ist *Setianus* eine Ableitung aus dem Gentilnamen *Setius*, was auch eine richtige Erklärung sein kann) oder *Amerianus* (*Rep.* 292) neben *Amerinus* (aus *Ameria*) oder noch *Canusianus* (Kajanto 143) neben *Canusinus* (aus *Canusium*) und *Venusianus* neben *Venusinus* (aus *Venusia*), wenn nicht zu den Gentilnamen *Amerius*, *Canusius* und *Venusius*.²⁰ Vgl. ferner *Aventianus* (von Kajanto 357 kaum richtig auf ein spätes Gebilde *Aventius* bezogen) neben *Aventinus*; hier liegt eine Art Kürzung statt **Aventinianus* vor.

Lucernio. Den von Kajanto 343 verzeichneten zwei heidnischen und vier christlichen Belegen sind eine Wandinschrift aus Rom, herausgegeben von P. Castrén, *Mem.Pont.Acc.Arch.* XI 1 (1972) 77 Nr. 17 und *AE* 1998, 946 (Lugdunensis) hinzuzufügen.

Lucilliana: Kajanto 149 = 173. Dazu Λουκιλλιανή *IG* XII 2, 443 (Mytilene, kaiserz.).

Lunie(n)sis: *CIL* XIV 1608 *M. Aemilius P. f. Luniesis*. Nebenform von *Lunensis*; Formen auf *Luni-* sind mir aus dem Toponym oder Ethnikon nicht bekannt.

Λουπαρίων: *SEG* XXIX 477 + XXXVIII 551 (Illyrien, kaiserz.). Zu *Luparius* Kajanto 323 aus *CIL* XI 752.

Lurianus: Kajanto 149. Dazu *ILJug* 634 (Dalmatia); Le Bas – Waddington III 356 = *I. Mylasa* 371 (aus Lampsakos).

Magnentia: *HAE* 1673 (christl.). Kajanto 275 kennt nur den Männernamen *Magnentius* aus *Amm. Marc.* 14, 5, 6 (es handelt sich um den Usurpator, der öfters bei *Ammian* und sonst erwähnt wird).

Μαγνιανή: *I. Selge* 15. 16 aus der vornehmen lokalen Familie der *Plancii Magniani*. Bisher war nur der Männernamen *Magnianus* (in derselben Familie beim Vater und Bruder unserer *Magniana* belegt) bekannt: Kajanto 149.²¹

Malacitanus: *CIL* XIV 4778 (Ostia) *M. Aemilius M. f. M.* Geogra-

²⁰ So Kajanto 143 von *Canusius*, 158 von *Venusianus*. Unsicher bleibt die Gleichung *Pl[ace]ntianus(?)* in *ICUR* 24375 : *Placentinus* Kajanto 197.

²¹ Kajanto betrachtet den Namen als Ableitung aus dem Gentilicium *Magnius*, ob mit Recht steht dahin. Etwa im griechischen Osten, wo das Cognomen *Magnus* in der fortgeschrittenen Kaiserzeit nicht selten auftritt, wurde *Magnianus* eher mit ihm assoziiert. Vgl. etwa die senatorischen *Planciae Magnae* aus Perge (*PIR*² P 444 und 445, die letztere durch Adoption pergeisch und so *Magna* geworden).

phisches Cognomen. Abgesehen von dem beliebten *Hispanus*, sind die auf Hispanien hinweisenden geographischen Cognomina nicht sonderlich üblich, weder in Hispanien noch in Italien.

Mamercus (Kajanto 176) und *Mamertinus* (Kajanto 212) vertreten altes oskisches Namengut und sind in Sizilien seit dem 7./6. Jh. belegt; s. *LGPN IIIA*, 287. Ähnlich bei *Dossennus* oben.

Marcelio: *ILJug* 2962 (Dalmatia). Nebenform von *Marcellio*. Vgl. z. B. *Marcelus* *CIL* VI 2447. 12739. *Marcela* 28229 (Vater *Marcellinus*). *Marcelinus* 32520 VI, 44.

Μαρκελλίων: Μαρ[κ]ελλίωνος (Gen.) *IGRR* IV 889 vgl. N. P. Milner, *An Epigraphical Survey in the Kibyra-Olbasa Region conducted by A. S. Hall* (Regional Epigraphic Catalogues of Asia Minor 3), London – Ankara 1998, 48 Nr. 114 (Kibyra, 205/206 n. Chr.). Mit diesem Beleg wird die Existenz von *Marcellio* sichergestellt. Kajanto 173 kennt davon nur einen fragmentarischen Beleg. Vgl. auch *Marcelio* oben.

Μαρκῶ (f.): Μαρκῶ Διονυσίου χῆρε *IG* XII 8, 530 vgl. Chr. Dunant – J. Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos 2: De 196 avant J.-C. jusqu'à la fin de l'Antiquité* (Etudes thasiennes 5), Paris 1958, 180 Nr. 347, wo die richtige Lesung festgelegt worden ist.²² Hier liegt der einzige ganz sichere Beleg dafür vor, dass das griechische Frauennamensuffix -ῶ einem lateinischen Namenstamm angehängt wird. Weniger sicher Φαυστώ (s. oben); über einige vermeintliche Fälle vgl. unten 230-231.

Mariscus: Kajanto 334 mit zwei Belegen. Dazu *I. Beroia* 384 (2. Hälfte des 2. Jh. n. Chr.). 497 (2. Hälfte des 2. Jh.) Πόπλις ὁ καὶ Μαρίσκοκ Ἄρπεϊνος (aus Arpi in Apulien?)²³ Gladiator; Paton – Hicks, *I. Cos* 138, auch ein Gladiator. Bei den Gladiatoren kann es sich um ein nomen artis handeln; diese Möglichkeit ist besonders bei dem ersteren in Erwägung zu ziehen, da es hier als ein Supernomen gebraucht ist.

Μαριτίνος (?): A. C. Headlam, *Ecclesiastical Sites in Isauria*, London 1893, 26 Nr. 11 [π]αρά Μαριτίνο[υ Ἰα]τρ[ο]κλέος (?). Ein Cognomen *Maritinus* ist sonst nirgends belegt, wäre aber eine mögliche Bildung. Doch kann man dem Verdacht nicht entgehen, hier sei der Name

²² Dagegen ist es nicht zulässig, den Vatersnamen Διονύσιος als Beweis für den Dionysoskult zu werten, wie die Autoren zu denken scheinen (freilich sind sie an diesem Punkt etwas obskur).

²³ Die Einwohner von Arpi hiessen *Arpani* (Plin. *nat.* 3, 105) oder *Arpini* (Liv. 24, 47, 2. 34, 45, 3).

Maritimus verkannt worden.

Maritus. Den wenigen bei Kajanto 305 registrierten Belegen hinzuzufügen ist *I. Ephesos* 3019 *L. Manlius L. f. Col. Maritus* (sicher ein Cognomen). *Marita*: *RIT* 21.

Marracinus: Paul. Nol. *epist.* 22, 1. Dieser Name gehört zu einer grossen aus dem Substantiv *marra* abgeleiteten Namensippe; hierzu siehe meine Bemerkungen in "Spigolature aquileiesi", in *Atti del colloquio sui ceti medi in Cisalpina* (Milano 2000), im Druck.

Μασκελλίς: *I. Beroia* 172 (3. Jh. n. Chr.). Die Namensippe *Mascellus* (Kajanto 307. *Rep.* 359) hat mehrere Ableitungen, auch in griechischer Schrift, aufzuweisen; so bereitet es keinerlei Schwierigkeiten, eine neue Bildung in Beroia anzunehmen. Die Lesung und Deutung sollten in Ordnung sein.

Matidianus: Kajanto 150 mit einem Beleg für den Männernamen (und einem für den Frauennamen). Dazu *SEG XXXVIII* 1493 (Syedra) Αὐρ. Τυδιανὸς Κόνων ὁ καὶ Ματιδιανὸς Συεδρεύς.

Matronilla: Kajanto 305 mit vier Belegen. Dazu *I. Anazarbos* I 606 *Ματρώνιλλα*. Der Beleg könnte an sich auch als griechisch gedeutet werden (Namen auf *Ματρ-* lassen sich unschwer auch in Kleinasien belegen: z. B. *Ματρέας* in Ephesos und Smyrna, oder *Ματρόδωρος* für einen Bürger von Iasos, freilich in einer rhodischen Inschrift).

Maurentius -ia: Kajanto 206. Dazu *ICUR* 13587 (m.). 17086 (m. und f.); *AE* 1976, 241 = *PCBE* 2, 1433 Nr. 1 (Concordia, *presbiter*); *Μαυρέντιος μ(εγαλο)π(ρεπέστατος)* *I. chrét. Macédoine* 224 = *I. Philippi* 528 (5./6. Jh.).

Maximula: Kajanto 276. Auszuscheiden aber **Μαξιμοῦλα* *SicGymn* 14 (1961) 196 (Catina), vgl. A. Ferrua, *Κώκαλος* 28-29 (1982-83) 7f. n. 15.

Medulla: Kajanto 340 mit einem Beleg. Der Name findet sich wahrscheinlich noch bei *Cic. dom.* 81 (aus Anagnia), wo ich dieses Cognomen für das überlieferte *Menulla* habe festlegen wollen: *Gnomon* 64 (1992) 502.

Memorialis: Kajanto 255. Dazu *Suppl. It.* 15 Ateste 604 (Freige-lassener).

Mercurianus: *Arctos* 32 (1998) 244 aus *AE* 1991, 1236. Dazu noch Αὐρ. Εὐτόχ[ους] Μερκουριαν[οῦ π]ολεΐτου usw. *IGRR* III 154 = *I. North Galatia* 181 (145 n. Chr.).

Mestrianus: Kajanto 150. *Rep.*² 501. Dazu *IMS* VI 38; *IGBulg.* 518. 587; ein interessanter Fall kommt aus Pelagonien: *Μέστριος Μεστριανός*

IG X 2, 2, 254, interessant insofern, als das Cognomen des Mannes aus dem Gentilnamen seiner Familie gebildet wurde, dass aber gleichzeitig Μέστριος ein epichorischer Name war (wenigstens tritt er in Nordmakedonien als Individualname auf).

Μινῶτος: Kajanto 176 aus *IG XIV 637*. Weitere Belege in *LGPN IIIA*, 301f.

Mitalianus: *NSc* 1953, 302 Nr. 69 (Ostia, 2. Jh. n. Chr.) *ex concessione P. Aeli Mitaliani*. Die Lesung bleibt etwas unsicher, aus der Wiedergabe der Inschrift in *NSc* zu schliessen, doch ist sie wohl plausibel (oder muss *Vitalianus* verstanden werden). Dem Namengeber hat wohl ein an sich nicht belegtes Gentilicium *Mitalius* vorgeschwebt, vgl. *Mitilius*, *Mitulleius* u. ä.

Muciana: Kajanto 151. Neben dem verhältnismässig häufig auftretenden *Mucianus* verzeichnet Kajanto einen einzigen Frauennamenbeleg. Dazu *ICUR* 14495; *I. Sestos* (IK 19) 65 (Madytos; Vater *Mucius*).

Mudianus -a. Dieses Cognomen fehlt bei Kajanto, es ist aber in Ephesos nachgewiesen: (Οὔλιος) Μουδιανός und Οὐλπία Μουδιανή, ἰέρεια τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος, Vater und Tochter: *I. Ephesos* 989. Es scheint eine Ableitung aus dem Gentilnamen *Mudius* zu sein (eine griechische oder kleinasiatische Anknüpfung stehen nicht zu Gebote; wohlgemerkt sind aber alle anderen Cognomina in der Familie griechisch), der allein in Africa belegt ist (*Rep.* 122). Stammte ein Familienmitglied also aus Africa?

Mummianus: Kajanto 151 mit zwei Belegen. Dazu *P. Mummius Mummianus Ilvir munic(ipii) Segoviensium*, von G. Alföldy in der Inschrift des Aquäduktes von Segovia glänzend wiederhergestellt.²⁴ Ferner Ὠρανὸς Μομμιανός *I. North Galatia* 22; Ποπλικιανὸς Μομμιανός *IGRR III* 412. 413 + 1493 (Olbasa); Αὐρή(λιος) Μομιανός ebda. 333 (Bischof, 4. Jh.). Es existiert in der kleinasiatischen Anthroponymie eine Lallnamensippe auf *mom-*, es ist aber besser, mit Zgusta die hier verzeichneten Belege davon fernzuhalten und als Derivative aus dem Gentilicium anzusehen.²⁵ Das Lateinische kennt *Mommius* (*Rep.* 121), doch ist es aus vielen Gründen zu empfehlen, die galatischen Belege auf *Mummius* zurückzuführen.

Μουνδίων: *CIG* 4366w (Pisidien); *I. Kibyra-Olbasa* (s. oben zu Μαρκελίων) 114, und sonst im phrygisch-pisidischen Raum. Vgl. L.

²⁴ G. Alföldy, *Die Bauinschriften des Aquäduktes von Segovia und des Amphitheaters von Tarraco* (Madr. Forsch. 19), Berlin 1997, 1ff.

²⁵ L. Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Personennamen* 329.

Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Personennamen* 336, der den Namen richtig für lateinisch hält. Auch der Grundname *Mundus* (Kajanto 232) kommt in Kleinasien vor: *IBM* 924 (Branchidai). Neben anderen Ableitungen wie *Mundinus* und *Mundilla* (*Rep.* 365) eine weitere Bildung *Mundio* anzunehmen bereitet keinerlei Schwierigkeiten.

Munitus. Zu den von Kajanto 280 verzeichneten zwei Belegen (einmal als Männername, einmal als Frauenname) kommen drei weitere hinzu: *T. Statilius Maximus Severus L. Iuventius Munitus augur, Xvir stlitibus iudicandis, quaestor Aug., trib. pleb., praetor* [---], ein aus der heliopolitanischen Inschrift *IGLS* 2795 bekannt gewordener Senator aus der ersten Hälfte des 2. Jh. n. Chr.; *CIL* II² 14, 9; *AIJ* 168 (Emona).

Murredianus: Ineditum aus Ostia, vgl. A. Licordari, *ArchClass* 37 (1985) 345. Gebildet aus dem Gentilicium *Murredius*, das nur spärlich in Italien belegt ist.

Musonianus: Kajanto 151 mit einem Beleg. Dazu Αὐρήλ(ιος) Μουσωνιανὸς Εὐκράτης *I. Prusias ad Hypium* 7 II 25. Das Auftauchen dieses Namens im Osten ist an sich keine Überraschung. Der Gentilname *Musonius* wird in Athen seit dem 2. Jh. n. Chr. des öfteren als Einzelname gebraucht (hier liegt vielleicht eine Erinnerung an den Philosophen C. Musonius Rufus vor, wobei auch eine eventuelle Assoziation mit dem Musennamen zu seiner Verwendung verhalf).²⁶ Von Athen breitete er sich weiter nach Osten aus, so dass auch neue Belege von Derivaten durchaus zu erwarten sind.

Mutatus: Kajanto 353. *Rep.*² 366. 591. Dazu Μουτᾶτος *FD* III 4, 82 (aus Argos, 2. Jh. n. Chr.).

Natalia: *AE* 1966, 85 = 1978, 163 (Brundisium) *Pinnia Natalia*, Schwester eines *Pinnius Natalis*.²⁷ Kajanto 290 kennt nur den Männernamen *Natalius* aus einer karthagischen christlichen Inschrift, aber bemerkenswerterweise ist die brundisinische *Natalia* viel älter.

Navus: Kajanto 259. Dazu *AE* 1991, 1538 *Curio Navus*, Legat von

²⁶ Dazu H. S., "Latin Cognomina in the Greek East", in *The Greek East in the Roman Context. Proceedings of a colloquium organized by the Finnish Institute at Athens, May 21 and 22, 1999*, edited by O. Salomies (Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 7), Helsinki 2001, 198f.

²⁷ *OPEL* III 96 verzeichnet aus *CIL* XIII 2221 *Natalia* als Cognomen, es kann aber ebenso gut der Gentilname vorliegen; ausserdem bleibt der erste Buchstabe des Namens unsicher.

Lycia-Pamphylia 138 n. Chr.; *I. Catalogue* I 25; *I. conventus Pacensis* 306. – Von *Navina* kennt Kajanto einen Beleg; dazu *CIL* II² 7, 60a.

Νεμωνᾶς: *SB* 7591 (Ostrakon aus Elephantine, 100/101 n. Chr.) Νεμωνᾶς Πέτρος. Wie Νεμωνιανός, auch in Ägypten belegt, aus dem Gentilnamen *Nemonius*. Zur Bildung vgl. oben zu Καστρικᾶς.

Nemonianus: *Rep.* 368. Dazu Νεμωνιανός *I. Caesarea Maritima* 158 (s. weiter unten).

Νεπτούνιος: S. L. Agnello, *RAC* 36 (1960) 23 Nr. 8 (Syracusae, christl.) Νεπτούνειος. Kajanto 213 kennt nur den Frauennamen *Neptunia* (mit einem Beleg).

Neronianus: Kajanto 176 mit vier Belegen. Aus gut verständlichen Gründen taucht *Nero* wie auch die Ableitung *Neronianus* (als reines Cognomen) sehr selten in der kaiserzeitlichen Anthroponymie ausserhalb des julisch-claudischen Hauses auf;²⁸ die meisten der wenigen Belege kommen aus dem griechischen Teil der Mittelmeerwelt. Ich habe andernorts dieses Phänomen behandelt, mit Belegen für *Nero* aus dem griechischen Bereich.²⁹ Von der Ableitung ein freilich etwas unsicherer Beleg aus Beroia: *I. Beroia* 144 [---] Νηρωνιανός. Trotz der Schreibweise mit *eta* statt *epsilon* dürfte *Neronianus* gemeint sein, denn andere Namen auf *-nero(n) -neronianus* sind nicht bekannt. Die Inschrift wird von Herausgebern ins 2./3. Jh. angesetzt, in eine Zeit, aus der auch die übrigen griechischen Belege stammen.

Nerullinus: Kajanto 176 mit zwei Belegen. Dazu *CIL* III 7071 = *I. Alexandria Troas* 22 [---] *Neryllinus*, ein Flamen Augustorum und Duovir quinquennalis.

Nigrinianus: Kajanto 228. Dazu *I. prov. Lugo* 81; *AE* 1929, 168 (Asseria in Dalmatien). 1997, 1265 (Solva).

Νοκερία: τόπος Νοκερίας Wessel *IGCVO* 874. Dies ist zweifellos die griechische Transliteration von *Nuceria*. Der Ethnikonname *Nucerinus*

²⁸ Unkritisch ist die Zusammenstellung in *OPEL* III 99: von den dort angeführten Belegen sind auszuschneiden wenigstens *CIL* II 800 (verdächtig) und XIII 3097k (nicht einmal im Cognominaindex des *CIL* XIII unter *Nero* verzeichnet). Andererseits fehlen *ILGN* 40 = *AE* 1976, 380 = 1986, 483 *Neroni civi Batavo*. *AE* 1992, 1439 (Pannonia superior, 2. Jh. n. Chr.) *Nero Sab[i]ni mil. coh. I Ael. sag.*

²⁹ "Ancient Onomastics: Perspectives and Problems", in *Roman Onomastics in the Greek East. Social and Political Aspects. Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Roman Onomastics, Athens, 7–9 September 1993*, edited by A. Rizakis (Μελετήματα 21), Athens 1996, 9.

(Kajanto 191) ist einigermaßen belegt; daneben ist eine freiere Bildung *Nucerius* aus *CIL* VIII 13499 (christl.) bekannt, aber der Stadtname selbst war bisher nicht als Cognomen belegt; dazu stimmt, dass die Stadtnamen nur selten metonymisch als Cognomina verwendet wurden.

Νομεντίνος: Τ. Δομίτιος Νομεντεῖνος *I. Klaudiu polis* 132. Bisher war nur der Frauename *Nomentina* (Kajanto 184 mit einem Beleg aus Africa) bekannt: Auch die morphologisch regelrechte Form *Nomentanus* ist selten (Kajanto 182 verzeichnet vier Belege, dazu *CIL* X 7490;³⁰ *HAE* 2046).

Nominatus: Kajanto 279. Dazu Chr. Marek, *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia* (Istanb. Forsch. 39), Tübingen 1993, 149 Nr. 47 (Pompeïopolis) Κλαύδιος Νωμινᾶτος (der Editor scheint den Namen für epichorisch zu halten, daraus zu schliessen, dass er ihn nicht akzentuiert, doch handelt es sich um eine einwandfreie lateinische Namensbildung).

Norbulla: *CIL* IV 1973 *Norbulla abi* (die Lesung scheint sicher zu sein). Kajanto, *Cognomina Pompeiana*, *Neuphilol. Mitt.* 66 (1965) 459 vermutet hier einen keltischen Namen, verweist aber auf den Städtenamen *Norba* in Latium (dass er den Namen doch letzten Endes dem Keltischen zuwies, geht daraus hervor, dass dieser in *Latin Cognomina* fehlt). Mir scheint die Ableitung aus dem Städtenamen viel wahrscheinlicher; verglichen werden könnten Bildungen wie *Trebulla* (Kajanto 171), die zum Ortsnamen *Treba* (vgl. auch *Trebula*) gestellt werden kann, gleichen Rechtes freilich auch zum Gentilnamen *Trebius* (so Kajanto mit Schulze, *ZGLE* 461, 4), oder Μάρσυλλα (*SEG* VI 420, Iconium, überl. Dat. Μαρσύλλη), womit *Marsillus Marsianus Marsicus* (Kajanto 185) zu vergleichen sind. Sachlich nahe kommt *Narbulla* aus dem Städtenamen *Narbo* (s. *Arctos* 32 (1998) 253f.), wenn es auch morphologisch anders steht.

Ocellina: Dieses seltene, bei Kajanto 239 nur für eine Senatorenfrau belegte Cognomen lässt sich nunmehr auch aus dem griechischen Osten belegen: *SEG* XL 555 (Thessalonike, ca. 150–200 n. Chr.) Πετρωνία Ὀκελλείνη; *SEG* XXXVI 615 (ca. 200 n. Chr.) Κλαυδία Ὀκελ[λίνα], ἰέρεια θεοῦ πατρίου Διονύσου καὶ ἀρχιέρεια τῆς Ἐδεσσαίων πόλεως.

Ocriculanus: *T. Furius Ocriculanus*, Gesandter *ex provinc(ia)*

³⁰ In *CIL* X 7490 liegt zweifellos *Nomentanus* vor (daran sei eigens erinnert, da Mommsen im Index irreführend *Noment[a]nus* abdruckt), denn überliefert ist *NOMENTRNVS*.

Lusitania colonia Augusta Emerita: M. G. Granino Cecere, *RPAA* 59 (1996–1997 [2000]) 239 (Tusculum, 1. Hälfte des 1. Jh. n. Chr.). Zu beachten ist das neue, auf Mittelitalien hinweisende Cognomen bei einem Hispanier. Diese Kategorie von Cognomina war beliebt in Hispanien; z. B. *Tuscus* ist dort verbreitet, bei der einfachen Bevölkerung stammt mehr als die Hälfte der Belege aus den hispanischen Provinzen.

Oppidanus: *Rep.*² 372. 501. Dazu ein Ineditum aus Ostia: A. Licordari, *ArchClass* 37 (1985) 346. Kajanto 311 kennt nur den Frauennamen *Oppidana* (mit drei Belegen).

Optatilla: Kajanto 296 mit zwei Belegen für den Frauennamen (einmal männlich). Dazu *I. Philippi* 151.

Πακατιανή: *IG X* 2, 2, 264 aus dem Ritterstand (auch der entsprechende Männername war in ihrer Familie in Gebrauch). Bisher war nur dieser Männername *Pacatianus* bekannt (Kajanto 261).

Paetianus: Kajanto 239 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *CIG* 3421 = *IGRR IV* 1631 (Philadelphia, 2. Hälfte des 2. Jh.) Φλ. Αὐρ. Ἡφαιστίων Παιτιανός.

Pagilla: *AE* 1998, 1202 (Dium) *Herennia M. f. Pagilla*. Es handelt sich wohl um einen lateinischen Namen; eine griechische Erklärung steht kaum zu Gebote (die von Bechtel *HPN* 355 erwähnten zu -πάγης gehörenden Bildungen Πάγων Παγώνδης helfen nicht weiter). Wie sich *Urbilla* (Kajanto 170) zu *urbs Urbanus* verhält, könnte *Pagilla* zu *pagus* (Kajanto 365) *Paganus* (Kajanto 311) gestellt werden. Freilich leitet Kajanto *Urbilla* aus dem Gentilnamen *Urbius* aus, der aber, wie auch *Urvius* (s. H. S., *Analecta epigraphica* 356) ein höchst selten auftretendes Gentilicium darstellt, so dass man *Urbilla* eher mit der überaus beliebten Namensippe *Urbanus* verbinden möchte.

Palatinus. Der Grossteil der Belege kommt aus Rom. So sei auf einen interessanten Fall als Supernomen aus Hypaipa hingewiesen: Αὐρ(ήλιος) Ἀπολλώνιος Περιγένους ὁ καὶ Παλατεῖνος *I. Ephesos* 3817.

Palma: Kajanto 335 mit drei Belegen. Dazu *CIL XIII* 607 *Palme* (hierher gehörig?); *IMS II* 112 *Fl. Palma b(ene)f(iciarius)*; *CIL III* 12464 *Palmas* (gräzisiert?); *IGLS* 9270. 9318 (Bostra) Πάλμας;³¹ oder liegt

³¹ 9270 lautet Αἰνείας Πάλμας, λζ', der Mann hat also zwei Namen; kaum ist Πάλμας Genetiv (diese Form könnte Genetiv nur von einem Frauennamen *Palma* sein, der aber nur als Männername bezeugt ist). 9318 wiederum beginnt [Ἀ]μμία Πάλμα Βά[σσ]ου, und auch hier liegt Männername, diesmal im Genetiv vor (der Versuch, hier einen Frauennamen zu sehen, scheitert daran, dass *Palma* nun einmal Männername und dass

epichorisches Namengut vor?

Pascentia: Kajanto 358 mit zwei Belegen für den Frauennamen. Dazu Πασκεντία Wessel *IGCVO* 661 (Syracusae).

Pastus. Kajanto 353 verzeichnet nur einen Beleg (*CIL* VI 31140 c 24). Dazu kommt noch *CIL* VI 14843. Es kann sich aber auch um den griechischen Namen Πάστος (Bechtel *HPN* 363) handeln.

Patientia. Bisher war der entsprechende Männernamen *Patientius* bekannt (Kajanto 259 mit einem Beleg für einen Bischof aus dem 5. Jh.), der aber in Bezug zu *Patientia* sekundär ist. Jetzt kennen wir jedoch den Frauennamen von einer britannischen Vasenscherbe aus christlicher Zeit: *RIB* II 2, 2417, 29 vgl. R. S. O. Tomlin – M. Hassall, *Britannia* 29 (1998) 443f. (= *AE* 1998, 808 b).

Patulus. Bisher nur einmal belegt (*NSc* 1911, 148 aus Interamna Lirenas, vgl. *Rep.*² 502). Kajanto 245 verzeichnet den Frauennamen *Patula* aus *CIL* XII 2734 (doch fragmentarisch und mit unsicherer Deutung). Ein weiterer Beleg für den Männernamen kommt aus Faustinopolis in Kappadokien: *C. Minucius C. f. Patlus* – Γάιει Μενύκιε Γαίου υιὲ Πάτλε *I. Tyana* (IK 55) 124.

Persianus: ein Centurio in Carnuntum: *AE* 1995, 1266a. Wohl eine Ableitung vom Gentilnamen *Persius*.

Plancianus: Kajanto 153 = 241. Dazu *I. Ephesos* 2597a (ein Asiarch). 1548 aus Rhodos.

Plautiana: Kajanto 153 mit einem Beleg für den Frauennamen. Dazu *I. Leukopetra* 79 (230/232 n. Chr.) παιδίον Πλαυτιανή.

Plotilla: Kajanto 169 = 242, Dazu Πλώτιλα Μαξίμου *I. Ephesos* 2544 b.

Πλουμάτος: *I. Parion* 48. Ist wohl aus *plumatus* gebildet, kein unpassendes Namenswort. Falsch der Herausgeber, der *Plumatius* mit Hinweis auf *Bull. ép.* 1972, 363 ansetzt; der Stein aber hat -άτος,³² und ein Name *Plumatius* ist sonst nirgends überliefert und wäre nur als Weiterbildung von *Plumatus* erklärlich.

Pollittianus: Kajanto 171 mit drei Belegen; dazu Κόγνιτος Πολλιπτιανός *I. Ephesos* 2290.

Potentilla: Kajanto 247: dazu *PIR*² J 686 aus Ephesos; *I. Ephesos* 980 (wohl verwandt mit der vorigen).

Ammia hier sicher kein Gentilicium vertreten kann.

³² So auch die editio princeps in *AM* 9 (1884) 64.

Potentius: Kajanto 247 mit zwei christlichen Belegen. Dazu *CIL* II² 5, 267a. Von *Potentia* verzeichnet Kajanto einen Beleg; dazu *CIL* II 4313 = *RIT* 442.

Praestantius: Kajanto 276 mit einem (christlichen) Beleg. Dazu *I. Byzantion* 296 Αὐρ. Πολύτειμος ὁ καὶ Πρεστάντιος.

Praetorina: Kajanto 317. Dazu *AE* 1996, 1209 (Salona, 3. Jh. n. Chr.).

Πριμαρία: *BCH* 20 (1896) 343 Nr. 1 (Kition, ca. 1. Jh. n. Chr.) Πριμαρία. Kajanto kennt nur den Männernamen *Primarius* (290 mit einem Beleg).

Principinus: Kajanto 291 mit drei Belegen. Dazu T. Ritti – S. Yilmaz, in *MemLincei* 10, 4 (1998), 465 Nr. 4 (Hierapolis in Phrygien) Πριγκιπέϊνος (Gladiator). Der entsprechende Frauename (Kajanto 291 mit einem Beleg) liegt wahrscheinlich vor in Πρικειπεΐνα *SEG* XXXVIII 543 (Illyrien).

Procillianus: Kajanto 177 mit einem Beleg. Dazu Προκιλλιανός *I. North Galatia* 168.

Proculanus: Kajanto 177 mit zwei Belegen. Dazu *I. Lykaonien* I 181 *P. Annius [P]roculanus*.

Professus: Kajanto 354 mit vier Belegen (alle aus Gallia cisalp. oder aus den gallischen und germanischen Provinzen). Dazu *AE* 1996, 1144 (Germ. sup.).

Profuturus. Ist der sonst schwerlich erklärbare Name Προπετοῦρος *I. North Galatia* 316 (christl.) eine griechische Nebenform von diesem durchaus üblichen Cognomen? Der Editor St. Mitchell hält ihn für epichorisch, daraus zu schliessen, dass er ihn unakzentuiert wiedergibt.

Publicianus: Kajanto 153 mit zwei Belegen. *Rep.*² 502. Dazu *AE* 1969/1970, 34 (Rom); *I. Beroia* 20. 36 Λ. Βρούττιος Ποπλικιανός (ein Priester).

Πουπλίων: *SB* 6007, 5 (3. Jh. n. Chr.). Ein Cognomen *Publio* scheint sonst nicht belegt zu sein.

Rupianus: Kajanto 153: dazu Πουπιανός *I. Ephesos* 2927.

Quadratianus: Kajanto 232. *Rep.* 388. Dazu *IMS* III 2, 4; *I. Kibyra-Olbasa* (s. oben zu Μαρκελλίων) 144 Μ. Λικινιανός Ἰουλιανός Κοδρατιανός.

Quinquatralis. Neben dem Kajanto 220 zufolge zehnmal belegten *Quinquatralis* kennen wir nunmehr die Form *Quinquatralis*: Z. Benzina

Ben Abdallah – L. Ennabli, *Epigraphica* 60 (1998) 137–140 (Carthago) = *AE* 1998, 1539 (aus dem Photo zu schliessen, in dem gerade dieser Teil des Namens weniger gut sichtbar ist, scheint die Lesung plausibel). Die beiden Formen sind mittels des Suffixes *-alis* aus dem Festnamen *Quinquatrus* abgeleitet (ein Adjektiv *quinquatr(i)alis* existiert nicht). Bei der Bildung der neuen selteneren Form stand wohl die Variante *Quinquatria* des Festnamens Pate.

Refector(?). Diese Bildung kann in einer stadtrömischen Fluchtafel etwa aus dem 4. Jh. n. Chr. vorliegen: G. Bevilacqua, *Epigraphica* 60 (1998) 114–132 (= *AE* 1998, 210) Ῥεφεκίτορος καταδείνο φακτωναρουσι. Bevilacqua 126 übersetzt "Io lego *Refecitoros factionarius*" und postuliert einen Namen *Refecitoros*. Wenn hier aber überhaupt ein Name zu suchen ist, dann liegt wohl ein sonst bisher nicht belegter Name *Refector* vor (wenn denn nicht an eine missgeglückte Schreibung für *Refectus* zu denken ist, welcher Name aber auch eine Augenblicksbildung darstellt – Kajanto 355 kennt nur einen Beleg). Könnte man in Ῥεφεκίτορος einen griechischen Genetiv und in φακτωναρουσι einen fehlerhaft wiedergegebenen (-ρουσι für -ρίους) Akkusativ Plural sehen? Also "Ich verfluche die *factionarios* des *Refector*"? Cognomina aus nomina agentis sind in der lateinischen Namensbildung üblich, besonders in der vorgerückten Kaiserzeit (ein Auslese gibt Kajanto 360–362; seine Listen können beliebig erweitert werden).

Restatus. Dieser Name liegt vor in *I. Aquileia* 3117 (= Pais 1186). Die Lesung ist sicher. Es handelt sich um eine etwas überraschende Bildung, einen okkasionellen Namen, der vielleicht mit dem Suffix *-atus* aus *restis* gebildet wurde; mit diesem Suffix können Namen auch von anderen als von *a*-Stämmen gebildet werden, wie etwa *Passaratus* (Kajanto 331) aus *passer passar Passar* (vgl. auch das Adverbium *passeratim*).

Rhenicus: Kajanto 202 mit drei Belegen (aus Rom und aus dem Bereich des *CIL* XIII). Dazu *AE* 1996, 1143 aus Augusta Raurica.

Ῥουφινάκιος: *I. Assos* (IK 4) 69 (byzantinisch, wohl nachantik). Zur Bildung vgl. etwa *Paulacius Ursacius Emptacius*.

Rufulus -a: Kajanto 230 mit drei bzw. vier Belegen. Dazu *I. Ephesos* 1800 *Rufulus*.

Rusellanus. Dieses sonst gänzlich unbekanntes Cognomen scheint in der rusellanischen Inschrift *Suppl. It.* 16 (1998) *Rusellae* 71 = *AE* 1998, 487 vorzuliegen, so wenigstens nach der gängigen Auffassung (Cognomina-Indices von *Suppl. It.* und *AE*), der auch ich mich in meinem Interpretations-

versuch *Arctos* 34 (2000) 154f. anschliesse. Es sei mir jedoch, angesichts der Einmaligkeit des Personennamens *Rusellanus*, erlaubt, auf eine weitere Interpretationsmöglichkeit hinzuweisen. *Rusellanus* könnte hier ein echtes Ethnikon sein und wäre hinzugefügt worden, um zu zeigen, dass dieser Eubius, in Kontrast zu dem peregrinen Patron *Eubius Eubi (filius)* in Rusellae geboren war. Wenn dem so wäre, dann wäre auch nicht *Eubia*, der erste Name der Mutter, notwendigerweise als Gentilname zu deuten, es könnte sich auch um eine Namenformel mit zwei Cognomina handeln; *Eubia* wäre der Sklavin von seinem Patron aufgrund seines eigenen Namens zugelegt worden. Doch würde ich an meiner ersten Interpretation festhalten. – Die in *AE* 1998, 487 angeführten Erklärungen von Corbier und Gascou sind nicht ganz zutreffend.

Russus. Dieser Name, an dessen lateinischem Charakter ich nicht zweifeln würde, war nur als Cognomen von Ap. Claudius, Konsul 268 v. Chr., bekannt (Kajanto 230); dazu gesellen sich freilich die Ableitungen *Rusilla* und *Russinus* (Kajanto 230 mit 1 bzw. 2 Belegen). Eine zu *russus* gebildete Namensippe existierte also seit der republikanischen Zeit; das Adjektiv *russus* (das freilich nur sparsam in archaischer Zeit und im Spätlatein belegt ist) muss seinerseits im Vulgärlatein ein gebräuchliches Wort gewesen sein, da es panromanisch geworden ist (siehe z. B. *REW* 7464–7466. *FEW* X [1962] 588–592). Aus irgendeinem Grund blieb aber die Verwendung des Cognomens *Russus* okkasionell; hatte vielleicht *Rufus* den Boden erobert, oder liegt der Grund darin, dass *russus*, aus der literarischen Überlieferung zu schliessen, nicht so sehr von Menschen gebraucht wurde, während *rufus* mit der Bedeutung 'rothaarig' oft auf Menschen bezogen wurde? Es ist auch in Betracht zu ziehen, dass *russus* negative Konnotationen innewohnen konnten, während *rufus* in dieser Hinsicht eher neutral war: rothaarig konnten viele sein; wer hätte sich aber gern 'fleischrot' benennen lassen? Vereinzelt Beispiele sind jedoch jederzeit zu erwarten, und freilich hat die Durchsicht neuerer Publikationen einen interessanten Beleg ans Licht gebracht,³³ der aus Messene kommt: 'Ροῦσσοϛ *Praktika Arch. Het.* 150, 1995, 70 = *AE* 1998, 1253 b.³⁴ Ich weiss nicht, wie dieser Name sonst erklärt werden könnte. Sein Auftauchen in Griechenland

³³ Der von Kajanto aus *CIL* I² 2394/5 zitierte L. Planus Russinus auf mehreren Bleibarren kann aus Hispanien stammen; er wird des öfteren in *AE* ohne Hinweis auf *CIL* angeführt: 1983, 450. 1989, 349. 1992, 862 g. 863 c. 864. 1995, 958.

³⁴ Die Lesung ist sicher. Freundliche Mitteilung von Denis Feissel.

wird dadurch verständlicher, dass *russus* als Lehnwort im Griechischen der Kaiserzeit weiterlebt (ῥούσιος), sogar noch im Neugriechischen; auch die Bezugnahme auf die Zirkuspartei kann zur Verwendung des Namens beigetragen haben.

Ῥουστικιλλιανή: *I. Pisid. Cen.* (IK 57) 28 (Kremna) Φλ. Ῥουστικιλλιανὴ Ῥοτειλία.

Rusticula: Kajanto 311 mit drei Belegen für den Frauennamen. Dazu *AE* 1967, 595 (Cuicul). 1995, 677 (Mediolanum, christl.).

Sacerdotianus: Kajanto 319 mit einem Beleg. Dazu ein Σακερδωτιανός, ἀρχιερεύς usw. in Thyatira: *TAM* V 2, 976. 979. 980. 1180(?).

Σαλλουστιανή: *I. Leukopetra* 95. 96 (241 n. Chr.) Αὐρηλία Σ. Kajanto 154 kennt nur den Männernamen *Sallustianus*.

Sarnus: Kajanto 192 mit zwei Belegen. Dazu *ILAlg* II 6531 (soweit nicht epichorisches Namengut vorliegt).³⁵

Satriana: Kajanto 154 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *I. Byzantion* 387 Σατριανή.

Scaurianus: Kajanto 242 mit zwei Belegen. Dazu *IGLS* 9303 Σκαυριανός aus Bostra (dort auch ein Σκαῦρος 9439; ob einheimisch?).

Secundia: Kajanto 292 mit zwei Belegen für den Frauennamen. Dazu Νεικόλεος Σεκονδίας(?) *NSc* 1913, 279 (Syracusae, 2./1. Jh.). Dies ist die in *LGPN* III A, 391 präsentierte Lesung und Datierung. Wegen der frühen Zeit des Belegs fragt man sich, a) ob die Lesung richtig ist, b) ob hier der Gentilname als Einzelname gebraucht ist (dagegen spricht jedoch, dass *Secundius* als Gentilicium eher ein später Name ist). Hinzuzufügen ist folgendes: Es ist gar nicht sicher, dass die Datierung ins 2./1. Jh. das Richtige trifft (im Ausgrabungsbericht in *NSc* findet sich nichts Positives zu einem solchen Ansatz); nach wie vor beliebt die Datierung offen.³⁶ Zweitens wundert der Frauename als Patronymikon. Drittens ist die Lesung selbst, trotz der Versicherung des Editors P. Orsi, nicht über alle Zweifel erhaben: *delta* ist als *alpha* wiedergegeben, und *nu* ist umgekehrt geschrieben.

Sementina. Kajanto 221 kennt nur *Sementinus* mit einem Beleg. Der

³⁵ Vgl. *ILAlg* II 2945 *Sarniosi* (Gen.) und ähnliche Bildungen bei K. Jongeling, *North African Names from Latin Sources*, Leiden 1994, 128f. Dies trifft auch für den von Kajanto angeführten Beleg *CIL* VIII 20028 zu.

³⁶ R. J. A. Wilson, *Sicily under the Roman Empire*, 1990, 133f. datiert die fraglichen Gräber in die Zeit nach der augusteischen Kolonisation (etwa die Feuerbestattung wurde in Sizilien vor den römischen Zeit überhaupt nicht gebraucht).

Frauennamen sind nunmehr aus Hypaipa belegt: *I. Ephesos* 3862 *Baebia Sementina*.

Sempronilla: Kajanto 170 mit einem Beleg. Dazu *I. Beroia* 360 (2. Jh. n. Chr.) Ποπλικία Σεμπρωνίλλη.

Senilla: den in *Rep.* 400 angeführten Belegen hinzuzufügen ist Paul. *dig.* 49, 14. 47. Wie aber in *Rep.* bemerkt, kann es sich um den gut griechischen Namen Ξένιλλα handeln.

Σικουλία: G. Manganaro, *Helikon* 2 (1962) 488 (Catina, kaiserz., wohl vorgerückte Kaiserzeit). Stellt nicht etwa eine Nebenform von *Sicilia* dar (als Cognomen: Kajanto 194), sondern ist mit dem für die spätere Kaiserzeit typischen Suffix *-ius -ia* gebildet und gesellt sich so zu *Siculus Sicula Siculinus -a* (Kajanto 193. 342. *Rep.* 403).³⁷

Silianus: Kajanto 155. Dazu *AE* 1952, 227 = *I. Philippi* 720.

Silvanio: Kajanto 214 mit vier Belegen. Dazu *CIL* IX 315; *I. Buthrotos* 193 (3. Jh. n. Chr.) Γάλλιος Σιλβανίων.

Σωσφίτιλλα (überl. Dat. -ίλλη) *AE* 1997, 1481 (Iconium) vertritt wohl den sonst nirgends belegten Namen *Sospitilla*; vgl. M. Corbier und O. Salomies ad loc.

Sparsus: Kajanto 356. *Rep.*² 504. Dazu *Sex. Iulius Sparsus*, Suffektkonsul 88 n. Chr. (*PIR*² J 586), wenn nicht identisch mit den von Kajanto angeführten Freunden von Martial (Mart. 12, 57) und Plinius (Plin. *epist.* 4,5. 8,3).

Spedianus: Kajanto 156 mit einem Beleg. Dazu M. Τάδιος Σπεδιανός *IG* V 2, 463 (Megalopolis).

Sponsianus: Kajanto 305 mit einem Beleg als Sklavenagnomen (dasselbe Agnomen noch *CIL* VI 8901). Als richtiges Cognomen (Σπωσιανός) belegt in Patrai (*SEG* XXIX 424) und Korinth (s. *LGPN* III A, 401; 2./3. Jh.).

Spurcio(?): *RIB* I 863 (Grabinschrift) [---]PVRCIO (voraus geht ein winziger Buchstabenrest, den man am ehesten als den oberen Teil eines S deuten möchte; ausserdem bietet sich keine andere vernünftige Ergänzung an). – Σπουρκίων στρατιώ(της) *I. chrét. Macédoine* 268 = *IG* X 2, 2,150 (Heraclea Lyncestis, 5./6. Jh.). Die Deutung des Namens ist nicht unmittelbar einleuchtend. Mir sind sonst keine Namenbildungen aus der Sippe *spurcus* bekannt, aber in der griechischen wie in der römischen Anthro-

³⁷ Kajanto 342 stellt *Sicula* zu *Sica*, es ist aber vorzuziehen, hierin die feminine Form von *Siculus* zu sehen.

nymie gab es aus Spitznamen hervorgegangene, unverblünte Personennamen vom Typ *Turpio* oder die wohlbekannten und oft behandelten Namensippen *Stercorius* und Κοπρο-.³⁸ Im Rahmen dieser Namengebungsgewohnheit lässt sich das Auftauchen von *Spurcio* in der kaiserzeitlichen Namengebung wohl rechtfertigen. Zu notieren ist noch, dass der Namens-träger als Soldat von wo auch immer stammen kann, d. h. sein Name nicht im Osten entstanden sein muss.

Studiosus: Kajanto 259. Dazu *CIL* VI 20675; Στουδιῶσος *SicGymn* 16 (1963) 63 vgl. *MEFRA* 106 (1994) 103 (Centuripae, vorgerückte Kaiserzeit).

Summus: Kajanto 277 mit vier Belegen. *Rep.*² 504. Dazu *I. Beroia* 113 (2. Jh. n. Chr.) Σέξ. Ποπίλλιος Σούμμος νεώτερος. 408 (2./3. Jh.) Σούμμος.

Tabernarius: Kajanto 322. Dazu Sotgiu 268; *ILAlg.* II 2183.

Tamudianus: *CIL* IV 1493 *Vesbius Tamudianus*. Die Lesung scheint sicher zu sein (anhand der Abschrift von Zangemeister in tab. XXX 28 könnte neben *Tamudianus* auch *Tamudanus* gelesen werden, indem I als der linke Strich von A gedeutet werden könnte, doch fordert schon der morphologische Befund *Tamudianus*, und ferner wird I sichergestellt aus tab. XVI 5 in Ritschls *Priscae Latinitatis monumenta epigraphica*). *Tamudianus* ist zweifellos aus dem Gentilnamen *Tamudius* abgeleitet. Mehrere Forscher haben das Cognomen mit arabischen oder hebräischen Städtenamen verbunden,³⁹ doch das ist abenteuerlich. Das Richtige wurde schon von Schulze, *ZGLE* 240 gesehen.

Ταρουτίνοϛ: *IG* IV 98 = *I. Rhénée* S. 356 Nr. 20 (unbekannter Herkunft, Vater und Sohn, kaiserz.). Ist wohl vom Gentilnamen *Tarutius* abgeleitet.

Tegula stellt einen interessanten Fall dar. Um 200 v. Chr. wirkte in

³⁸ Zu solchen römischen aus beleidigenden Bezeichnungen hervorgegangenen Namen s. z. B. I. Kajanto, "On the Problem of 'Names of Humility' in Early Christian Epigraphy", *Arctos* 3 (1962) 45–53; zu Namen auf Κοπρο- S. Pomeroy, "Copronyms and the Exposure of Infants in Egypt", in *Studies in Roman Law in memory of A. A. Schiller*, Leiden 1986, 147–162.

³⁹ So C. Giordano – I. Kahn, *Gli Ebrei in Pompei, in Ercolano e nelle città della Campania Felix*, Pompei 1965, 40f.; W. O. Moeller, *The Wool Trade of Ancient Pompeii*, Leiden 1976, 102; A. Varone, *Presenze giudaiche e cristiane a Pompei* (Quaderni della Società per lo studio e la divulgazione dell'archeologia biblica 1), Napoli 1979, 84.

literarischen Kreisen in Rom ein P. Licinius Tegula, dessen Cognomen mit dem des ebenfalls zeitgenössischen Komödiendichters Licinius Imbrex zu vergleichen ist. Es kann sein, dass beide Cognomina ursprünglich Spitznamen waren, die den zwei Literaten möglicherweise gleichzeitig seitens des Theaterpublikums verliehen wurden.⁴⁰ Jedenfalls waren sie für die republikanische Namengebung typische okkasionale Bildungen, die später nicht mehr auftreten. Von *Tegula* sind aber zwei wenngleich unsichere Fälle aus der Kaiserzeit ans Licht gekommen: *AE* 1995, 872 (Hispanien, die Lesung steht nicht ganz sicher fest) und *I. Lykaonien* I 429 (ca. 1. Jh. n. Chr.) [---]ν θυγατέρα τοῦ Τεγούλα (die Lesung keineswegs sicher, aber nicht ausgeschlossen). An sich ist diese Kategorie von Cognomina in der Kaiserzeit nicht ganz unbekannt; vgl. etwa einen Namen wie *Columella*.

Terentulla: Kajanto 171. Dazu *AE* 1997, 1637 (Amaedara); *I. Byzantion* 171 Τερέντυλλα.

Terracine(n)sis: Ineditum aus Ostia (s. A. Licordari, *ArchClass* 37 [1985] 346). Diese Inschrift liefert den ersten Beweis dafür, dass die heutige Form des Stadtnamens, *Terracina*, neben *Tarracina* schon in der Antike existierte.⁴¹ – Auch *Tarracinensis* ist als Cognomen einmalig.

Titinniana. Ein neuer Name (auch nicht der entsprechende Männernamen lässt sich belegen): Πομπηία Τιτιννιανή *I. Ephesos* 710a. Selten ist ebenfalls *Titinianus -a*: Kajanto 157. *Rep.*² 504.

Τιτιανός: *IGLS* 9391 (Bostra) Δέξτρος Τιτιανοῦ. *Titianus* war üblicherweise in Gebrauch.

Torquatianus: Kajanto 346 mit drei Belegen. Dazu *I. Selge* 46–48. 50 Αὐρ. Οὐαλέριος Τορκουατιανὸς Κασσιανός, Agonothet.

Traianus: Kajanto 157. Seine Verwendung geht vornehmlich auf das Namensvorbild des Kaisers Trajan zurück (*Traianus* war als Cognomen vor Trajan praktisch unbekannt). Die von Kajanto angeführten Belege lassen sich einigermaßen vermehren. Etwa das dritte Jh. kennt ausser Decius (der nach seiner Ankunft als Kaiser in Rom seinem Namen *Traianus* beifügte,

⁴⁰ Zu den zwei Namen vgl. meine Ausführungen in *Namenpaare. Eine Studie zur römischen Namengebung*, Helsinki 1990, 62. (Schulze *ZGLE* 355 verbindet *Tegula* mit *Decula*; das kann sein, aber andererseits ist anzumerken, dass *Tegula* und *Imbrex* als Vertreter unterer Stände von der Geburt her wohl cognomenlos waren, dagegen aber bekannte Figuren in der zeitgenössischen Unterhaltung; so ist man leicht zu erklären, dass ihnen spitznamenartige neue Cognomina zugelegt wurden.)

⁴¹ Was Mommsen, *CIL* X p. 623 sagt ("*Terracina* forma quae hodie obtinet antiqua auctoritate destituta est"), wird also hinfällig.

um so künstlich Anschluss an die Vergangenheit zu suchen) einen Traianus Mucianus, vir ducenarius gegen Ende des 3. Jh., der übrigens aus Traiana gebürtig war (*PLRE* I 609). Aus der Spätantike sind zahlreiche weitere Beamte bekannt (*PLRE* I 921f. Nr. 1–3. III 1333–1335 Nr. 1–5), die meisten von ihnen Orientalen. Ferner aus dem Orient *I. Beroia* 285 (3. Jh.) Αἴλιος Τραιανός; *MAMA* VIII 60 = *I. Lykaonien* I 246 Λούκιος Ἄννιος Τραιανὸς Λουκίῳ Ἄννίῳ Τραιανῶ πατρὶ; *AE* 1991, 1580 (Abila in der Dekapolis); 1997, 1479 (Laodicea Combusta, christl.). Weitere späte Belege aus dem Westen: *RMD* 78 (306 n. Chr., Prätorianer); *ICUR* 18066 (fem.). 18067. 19409. 27364 (523 n. Chr.). Der interessanteste Fall kommt aber aus Italica, *CILA* II 383, ein Duovir namens *L. Blattius L. f. Traianus Pollio*, dessen Datierung umstritten ist (tiberisch oder späthadrianisch?). Wenn die Inschrift vortrajanisch ist, dann liegt eine Bezugnahme auf den aus Hispanien bekannten Gentilnamen *Traius* vor, und in der Tat will der Editor im Namen des anderen Duovirn *Traius* ergänzen.

Τρεβωνιανός: *I. Perge* 45 Γάιος Ἰούλιος Κορνοῦτος Τρεβωνιανός. *Kajanto* 157 registriert nur *Trebonianus* mit drei Belegen.

Treccianus: *AE* 1996, 1248 (Pannonia sup.). Wenn nicht epichorisch, dann zu einem nicht belegten Gentilnamen *Treccius* zu stellen, sofern nicht eine orthographische Variante für *Triccianus* vorliegt. Dieser ist freilich auch ein Hapax (*Kajanto* 157), aber *Triccius* existiert.

Tuscianus: *Kajanto* 157 = 188 mit drei Belegen. Dazu *I. Carie* II 78. 143 (2. Jh. n. Chr.) Λ. Ἀβούρνιος Τουσκιανός; Münsterberg *Beamtennamen* 168 (Laodicea am Lykos, mit Bildern von Philippus I und Otacilia).

Umbrinus. *Kajanto* 163 = 188 verzeichnet nur drei senatorische (Grossvater, Vater, Sohn) Petronii (jetzt *PIR*² P 319. 320; der dritte von *Kajanto* angeführte Namensträger heisst eher *Umber*: *PIR*² P 318). Nunmehr kommt ein neuer Beleg aus Kappadokien: Ὀμβρεῖνος τραπεζεΐτης *I. Tyana* (IK 55) 37. Warum dieses seltene Cognomen plötzlich in Tyana auftaucht, bleibt Erraten verlassen, jedenfalls ist eine Verbindung mit Umbrien weniger wahrscheinlich. Schon von der Herkunft der drei Senatoren kann nichts Sicheres eruiert werden,⁴² es sei aber darauf hingewiesen, dass als

⁴² Nach M. Torelli, *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio* II, Roma 1982 (ersch. 1984), 290 soll die Herkunft in Volaterrae gesucht werden, was recht unsicher bleibt. Zum Aussagewert der geographischen Cognomina im allgemeinen vgl. H. S., "Zur Tragfähigkeit der Onomastik in der Prosopographie", in *Prosopographie und Sozialgeschichte. Studien zur Methodik und Erkenntnismöglichkeit der kaiserzeitlichen Prosopographie*, hrsg. von W.

ihre Herkunftsort Attaleia in Pamphylien erwogen worden ist.⁴³

Urbanio: Kajanto 311 mit zwei Belegen. Dazu Οὐρβανίων IG XIV 510 (Catina). – Der von Kajanto aus Armellini zitierte Beleg *Urbanion* mit gräzischer Endung ist ICUR 21220.

Οὐαλεντιάς: *P. Merton* 25, 2. 28 (3. Jh. n. Chr.).

Valentilla: Kajanto 247. Dazu Οὐαλέντιλλα I. *Anazarbos* I 639.

Οὐαλεριᾶς: *P. Mich* 201, 1 (99 n. Chr.). *SB* 7572, 1 (2. Jh. n. Chr.).

Οὐαλγιανός: *MAMA* VIII 111 = I. *Lykaonien* I 330. Zweifellos aus dem Gentilnamen *Valgius* (nicht aus *Valgus*) gebildet, der im isaurisch-lykaonischen Gebiet belegt ist.

Varanus. Ein weiterer Beleg für diesen bei Kajanto 205 nur einmal verzeichneten Namen könnte in I. *Ephesos* 951 Αὐρήλιος Βαρανός vorliegen; doch bleibt die Zuweisung recht unsicher.

Velleianus: Kajanto 158 mit einem Beleg aus dem Senatorenstand. Dazu I. *Philippi* 229. 230 L. *Velleius Velleianus*, Freund eines Senators.

Βενουστίων: *RAC* 18 (1941) 195 Nr. 63 (Augusta, moderne Ortschaft zwischen Catina und Syracusae, christl.).

Veriana. Kajanto 158 = 253 kennt von dem Frauennamen nur einen Beleg. Dazu tritt ein zweites Cognomen einer Senatorenfrau aus Ephesos: *RE Suppl.* XIV 103 Nr. 413a.

Vestigator: Kajanto 362 mit zwei Belegen; *Rep.*² 505 (dort jetzt so zu zitieren: *Suppl. It.* 18 [2000] Reate 15). Dazu *AE* 1995, 395 *Vestigator p(ublicus) Iuvan(ensium)*.

Vetillianus: *Rep.* 421. Dazu Βετιλλιανός I. *Cilicie* 125 (spät).

Vetulla: *Rep.* 421 mit drei Belegen aus Gallia cisalp. und den nördlichen Provinzen (teilweise kann Einfluss epichorischen Namengutes vorliegen). Dazu noch I. *Beroia* 125 (1. Jh. n. Chr.) Τορπιλία Ούέτυλλα.

Veturianus: Kajanto 158. Dazu Ούετουριανός I. *Anazarbos* 542.

Vigelio: *AE* 1997, 1704 (Uchi Maius). Vgl. *Vigellio* Kajanto 165 mit einem Beleg.

Vigilantia: Wessel *IGCVO* 947; Schwester Justinians, von Procop. *bell. Vandal.* 2, 34, 3 in Form Βιγλεντία überliefert, *Vigilantia* bei Coripp. *Iust. praef.* 21. 1, 8. Der Männernamen *Vigilantius:* Kajanto 364. *Rep.*² 505; dazu noch *AqN* 38 (1967) 68 (Cantianum, *tosor*, 5./6. Jh.); I. *chrét. Macédoine* 39 (5./6. Jh.) Βιγελέντιος, sowie ein Metropolit in Illyricum um

Eck, Köln – Wien – Weimar 1993, 1–33.

⁴³ So W. Eck, *EpAnat* 21 (1993) 45–54.

die Mitte des 5. Jh. (*RE* VIII A 2131 Nr. 2) und ein Presbyter in Barcelona, geboren in Gallien um 370 (*RE* VIII A 2132 Nr. 3).

Villiana: *Epigraphica* 47 (1985) 99 = *AE* 1985, 317 (S. Giovanni di Ruoti auf dem Territorium von Potentia). Kajanto kennt nur den Männernamen *Villianus* (158 mit einem Beleg).

Vindemiolus. Bisher war nur der Fraunname *Vindemiola* bei Kajanto 364 ein paarmale aus späten Belegen aus den gallischen Provinzen bekannt. Nunmehr lässt sich der Männernamen belegen: Βινδημίουλος διάκονος Beševliev, *Spätgr. und spätlat. Inschr. aus Bulgarien* 171 (Aquae Calidae, 6. Jh. n. Chr.).

Virbonus: Ein *Virbonus episcopus civitatis Tuscanensis* wird angeführt in der Liste der bei dem im Jahre 595 n. Chr. in S. Petri abgehaltenen Konzil anwesenden Bischöfe (Greg. M. *epist.* 5, 57a; vgl. *PCBE* 2, 2316). Ein zweiter Beleg scheint in einem Instrumentumstück hispanischer Herkunft (*AE* 1997, 1746) vorzuliegen. An der Glaubwürdigkeit der Überlieferung und somit des Namens können kaum Zweifel gehegt werden. Diese Bildung, die ich also für einen einwandfreien Personennamen halte, stellt ein interessantes Gegenstück zu dem häufiger belegten, wenngleich selten gebliebenen Männernamen *Homobonus* dar; zu dieser Bildung vgl. H. S., "Homobonus", in *Vir bonus dicendi peritus. Festschrift für A. Weische*, Wiesbaden 1997, 389–398 (leider waren mir bei der Abfassung des Beitrages diese zwei Belege von *Virbonus* nicht gegenwärtig, denn es wäre schön gewesen, auch sie dem *vir bonus* zu widmen). Dieser Typ von Cognomina, in denen Substantiv und Adjektivattribut zu einem Namen verschmolzen sind, ist sehr selten und eigentlich nur durch *Homobonus* vertreten. Wir haben es mit deutlich christlich gefärbten Namen zu tun: von *Homobonus* sind nur ein paar heidnische Belege aus dem 2. und 3. Jahrhundert bekannt (ein neuer Beleg oben 202), und von *Virbonus* nur die hier verzeichneten. Auch kenne ich von dem letzteren (anders als von *Homobonus*) keine weiteren Belege aus der nachantiken Zeit, was aber damit zusammenhängen mag, dass *vir* aus den romanischen Sprachen gänzlich verschwindet.

Volussianus. Kajanto 159 verzeichnet nur *Volusianus*; von den in seiner Belegzahl enthaltenen Belegen finden sich einige mit der Schreibung *Voluss-*, was man als selbständiges Cognomen anzusetzen erwägen könnte: *CIL* III 640 aus Philippi (ein Volussius Volussianus). 7437 I, 30 (Nicopolis, 227 n. Chr.). VIII 5675. 11139. 16782. XIV 246 VII, 29.

Vopiscus: Kajanto 295. Dazu *CIL XVI 6 = AE 1995, 1217* (Kommandant von Auxiliartruppen in Noricum) *Vopi[scus]*; *I. Philippi 227* (Ortsbewohner, aus der Tribus Voltinia zu schliessen).

Ich lasse noch einen rückläufigen Index von allen in *Arctos* 32 (1998) 235–251. 34 (2000) 149–151 und hier oben verzeichneten Namen folgen.

| | | |
|---------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Scaenica | Κλαύδιλλα | Bucula |
| Iuvenca | Pagilla | Tegula |
| Calida | Λόνγιλλα | Μαξιμοῦλα |
| *Agenda | Formilla | *Nummula |
| Abeddea | Κατιάνιλλα | Anula |
| Λουπερκία | Γράνιλλα | Garrula |
| Σεκονδία | Senilla | Gratissima(?) |
| Iuvenalia | Gabinilla | Ἄττικιανή |
| Natalia | Σεμπρόνιλλα | Muciana |
| *Crescentilia | Ματρώνιλλα | Οὐμμιδιανή |
| Καπιτωλία | Caprilla | Μουδιανή |
| Σικουλία | Fabatilla | Φρουγιανή |
| Longinia | Optatilla | Ῥουστικιλλιανή |
| Iunonia | Σωσφίτιλλα | Λουκιλλιανή |
| Turpia | Οὐαλέντιλλα | Villiana |
| Fabaria | Potentilla | Λολλιανά |
| Καλανδαρία | Plotilla | Δεκμιανή |
| Πριμαρία | Sollertilla | Ἄρρηνιανή |
| Νοκερία | Γάουιλλα | Μαγνιανή |
| Litoria | Cervilla | Τιτινιανή |
| Lucensia | Norbulla | Aproniana |
| Vigilantia | Medulla <i>m.</i> | Καπιτωνιανή |
| Πασκεντία | Iulla | Αἰτερνιανή |
| Patientia | Οὐέτυλλα | Ἄγριππιανή |
| Βιγλεντία | Terentulla | Φιλοβαλεριανή |
| Magnentia | Silvicola | Veriana |
| Currentia | Malliola | Σατριανή |
| Aurentia | Vinniola | Πακατιανή |
| Bonavia | Copiola | Eventiana |
| Apruncla | Ferriola | Ἰουουεντιανή |
| Κομόδιλα | Γρατίολα | Σαλλουστιανή |
| Πλώτιλα | Miracula | Πλαυτιανή |
| Formella | Viticula | Calaviana |
| Fenestella | Rusticula | Φουλβιανή |
| Cervella | Apruncula | Καλεῖνα |
| Fadilla | *Ascula | Ὀκελλεῖνη |
| Κομμόδιλλα | Fuscula | Πρικειπεῖνα |

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|----------------|
| Praetorina | Lucernio | Quinctilis |
| Πομητεῖνα | Passario | Lunie(n)sis |
| Sementina | Cicerio | Martiensis |
| Adventina | Maurio | Ἵορτῆνσις |
| Navina | Augurio | Sapiens |
| Libarna | Asturio | Parens |
| Vafra | Calvisio | Aequidicus |
| Laura | Natio | Buccellicus |
| Φορμῶσα | Fortunatio | Rhenicus |
| Ἰούλισσα | Minutio | Varicus |
| Angulata | Gillo | Κίρκος |
| Conservata | Apro | Vopiscus |
| Invenita | Φαυστώ | Φάδος |
| Invita | Calvo | Φιλοκόμμοδος |
| Aperta | Vestigator | Tardus |
| Supersta | Refector | Abeddeus |
| Ἰούλιττα | Φηλικᾶς | Ἵρουφινάκιος |
| Salvitta | Φορνικᾶς | Αὐσπίκιος |
| Cedoalteram | Καστρικᾶς | Lauricius |
| Σπουρκίων | Λουκᾶς | Φατάλιος |
| Μουνδίων | Tigridas | Firminianius |
| Μαρκελλίων | Γαιᾶς | Favonius |
| Πουπλίων | Μαρκίας | Νεπτούνιος |
| Κορβουλίων | Aelias | Cubicularius |
| Ἰουλίων | Ἰουλιάς | Ἴπελινάριος |
| Δεκμίων | Οὐαλεριᾶς | Tabernarius |
| Οὐρβανίων | Πάλμας | Maurius |
| Γεμνίων | Φλάμμας | Parisius |
| Λουπαρίων | Firmas | Persius |
| Φαβατίων | Νεμωνᾶς | Consultius |
| Βενουστίων | Barbaras | Laetantius |
| Ἀττίκων | Καπιτᾶς | Πρεστάντιος |
| Ἴαπων | Οὐαλεντᾶς | Vicentius(?) |
| Felico | Φαυστάς | Βιγελέντιος |
| Μαρκώ | Ἰουλιάδης | Maurentius |
| Galeo | Heres | Potentius |
| Gaio | Φλαμμεάτης | Φρούγιλος |
| Marcelio | Γναίς | Γαργόνιλος |
| Vigelio | Sodalis | Λίβελλος |
| Vernacellio | Memorialis | Catellus |
| Pellio | Quinquatralis | Gargonillus |
| Cruscillio | Initialis | Caesullus |
| Titullio | Hibernalis | Vindemiolus |
| Decimio | Fortunalis | Comitiolus |
| Silvanio | Μασκελλίς | Com(m)entiolus |

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Domnentiolus | Silianus | Volcasianus |
| Patlus | Petilianus | Σπωσιανός |
| Globulus | Curtilianus | Parsianus |
| Buculus | *Ustilianus | Persianus |
| Rufulus | Cascellianus | Βλοσσιανός |
| Βινδημίουλος | Προκιλλιανός | Volussianus |
| *Nummulus | Gratillianus | Quadratianus |
| Patulus | Βεττιλλιανός | Κοδρατιανός |
| Baetulus | Fabullianus | Τορκουατιανός |
| Pientissimus | Tabullianus(?) | Αύκτιανός |
| Σοῦμμος | Saesolianus | Παιτιανός |
| Mariscanus | Catulianus | Σακερδωτιανός |
| Oppidanus | Mummianus | Negotianus |
| Mammaeanus | Canianus | Apertianus |
| Treccianus | Tullenianus | Grattianus |
| Αίφικιανός | Etenianus | Γαλλιτιανός |
| Publicianus | Ἄντωνεινιανός | Πωλλιτιανός |
| Γαλλικιανός | Nigrinianus | Τιττιανός |
| Ποπλικιανός | Urvinianus | Rusellanus |
| Anicianus | Φαννιανός | Feliculanus |
| Fabricianus | Ἰοβιννιανός | Ocriculanus |
| Plancianus | Τρεβωννιανός | Proculanus |
| Mariscianus | Falconianus | Insulanus |
| Τουσκιανός | Νεμωνιανός | Varanus (Βαρανός) |
| Σπεδιανός | Κονωνιανός | Malacitanus |
| Murredianus | Μουσωνιανός | *Lurritanus |
| Λογγιδιανός | Vetonianus | Calvanus |
| Calidianus | Liburnianus | Dossenus |
| Caridianus | Crispianus | Marracinus |
| Ματιδιανός | Πουπιανός | Cornicinus |
| Ἄουδιανός | Octobrianus | Paludinus |
| Μουδιανός | Vacrianus(?) | Petelinus |
| Tamudianus | (ΟΥΑΚΡΙΑΝΟΣ) | Aemilinus |
| Velleianus | Decrianus | Asellinus |
| Siculeianus | Lucerianus | Iullinus |
| Campuleianus | Materianus | Nerullinus |
| Fonteianus | Birianus | Vitullinus |
| Ἄρβουξηιανός | Σεπτωριανός | *Culinus |
| Cethegianus | Asprianus | Πρινκιπεῖνος |
| Οὐαλγιανός | Καστριανός | Ἵμβρεῖνος |
| Φρουγιανός | Mestrianus | Egerinus |
| Mitalianus | Σκαυριανός | Φαλερῖνος |
| Ampelianus | Mercurianus | Κακορῖνος |
| Velianus | Λουριανός | Παλατεῖνος |
| Racilianus | Οὐετουριανός | Servatinus |

| | | |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Μαριτίνος | Campus | Tectus |
| Νομεντίνος | Προπετοῦρος | Architectus |
| Frequentinus | Σαπηδῶσος | Redimitus |
| Nepotinus | Studiosus | Munitus |
| Fortinus | Sparsus | Maritus |
| Cornutinus | Professus | Apertus |
| Ταρουτίνος | Ῥουσσος | Venutus(?) |
| Salvinus | Δηλικᾶτος | Navus |
| Dossennus | Armatus | *Finitivus |
| Homobonus | Πλουμᾶτος | Protervus |
| Virbonus | Μινᾶτος | Deusdedit |
| Nonus | Νωμινᾶτος | Ispesindeu |
| Sarnus | *Invitatus | Iudex |
| Avernus | Restatus | Nutrix |
| Liburnus | Μουτᾶτος | |
| Κομμοῦνος | Iuvatus | |

CXCIII. FALSCH E NAMEN

Aermianus. Dieses Cognomen soll in einer ostiensischen Namenliste enthalten sein (D. Nuzzo, *VetChr* 33 [1996] 89, Anm. 24 mit blosser Minuskeltranskription = *AE* 1996, 307a): [- ---]s *Aermianus*. Das ist aber sicher eine fehlerhafte Schreibung. Der Mann hiess zweifellos *Hermianus*. Entweder liegt hier eine, durch die Aussprache bedingte, gut bekannte orthographische Variante AE für HE vor (das kurze *e*, das offen war, wurde in der Schrift mit dem ebenfalls offenen *ae* leicht verwechselt), oder aber der Steimetz hat die zwei sich ähnelnden Buchstaben A und H verwechselt, oder aber Nuzzo hat falsch gelesen.

Faber in *AE* 1996, 994 (Arelate) soll dem Index zufolge ein Cognomen sein. Dies wurde aber nur okkasionell gebraucht (Kajanto *Latin Cognomina* 322 verzeichnet fünf Fälle, und auch von ihnen ist in *CIL* I² 685 = X 3782 eher *faber* zu verstehen). *AE* 1996, 994 ist wie folgt überliefert: T VIBIVS VICISON [---] / VCONTIVS FABER [---]. Verdächtig ist *Vicison*, und auch *Ucontius* ist nicht richtig abgeschrieben (es muss wohl *Vocontius* verstanden werden). Bei der Lage der Dinge kann auch in FABER was auch immer innewohnen (wie etwa *Faber[ianus]* o. ä.); auch die Berufsbezeichnung ist nicht ausgeschlossen. Jedenfalls empfiehlt es sich, hierin

keinen weiteren Beleg für das seltene Cognomen *Faber* zu sehen.⁴⁴

Felicides. Dieses neue Cognomen wird in *Suppl. It.* 15 (1997) Ateste 30 festgelegt (so auch *AE* 1997, 603). Eine solche Bildung wäre aber ein Unicum. Ich kenne keinen Fall, in dem das griechische Suffix *-ides* einem lateinischen Namenstamm angehängt worden wäre (die Editorin Bassignano spricht von einem griechischen Namen, aber hier könnte nur eine Ableitung aus dem rein lateinischen *Felix* vorliegen). Mit dem oben besprochenen Typ *Iulides Planciades* steht es ganz anders. Zweifellos ist *Felicides* ein falscher Name. Zu lesen ist einfach *Felici* gefolgt von DE[---] oder DE+[---], was auch immer dahinter stecken mag.

Figellus. So wird *AE* 1997, 449 *d* FIGELLI (Aesernia, Ziegelstempel) im Cognominaindex wiedergegeben. *Figellus* wäre aber ein falscher Name und schwer zu rechtfertigen. Zweifellos liegt das Gentilicium *Figellius* vor, das u. a. in dem benachbarten Histonium belegt ist. Dass in Ziegelstempeln ein Gentilname allein gebraucht wird, ist nichts Einmaliges (u. a. *CIL* IX 6078, 158 aus der regio II).

Ἰουκονδάς. Diesen Namen, der neu wäre, wollen die Herausgeber des *LGPN* I 235 aus *IG* XII 9, 972 (Chalkis, kaiserz.) gewinnen. Der Text lautet ΑΓΑΘΩ ΙΟΥΚΟΝΔΑΣ. Der Editor Ziebarth druckt Ἀγαθὸ Ἰουκόνδας, und es besteht kein Grund, davon Abstand zu nehmen (auf dem Relief ist nur ein Mädchen abgebildet). Dass die Tochter Agatho mit dem Metronymikon und nicht mit dem Patronymikon angeführt wird, bereitet keine unüberwindlichen Schwierigkeiten, vgl. in derselben Gruppe von Stelen 1027 Ζώσιμος Ἀμβροσίας aus dem 2. Jh. n. Chr.

[Ἰ]ουλιάδης *I. Iasos* 274, 13 aus Th. Reinach, *REG* 6 (1893) 192 Nr. 39 aus dem Jahre 27 v. Chr. (?) ist sicher eine unnötige Ergänzung für Οὐλιάδης, welcher Name des öfteren in Iasos vorkommt. Reinach bietet eine blosse Majuskeltranskription, und es geht nicht hervor, ob es notwendig war, eine Lücke vor ΟΥΛΙΑΔΟΥ anzusetzen; wahrscheinlich aber nicht. Der jetzige Herausgeber hat Reinachs Wiedergabe gedankenlos übernommen, ohne zu bedenken, dass eine derartige Bildung wie Ἰουλιάδης für eine so frühe Zeit nicht sehr wahrscheinlich gewesen wäre, und dass andererseits

⁴⁴ Die Zusammenstellung der Belege von *Faber* in *OPEL* II 132 ist bezeichnend für die Kritiklosigkeit des Werkes. Zum einen vertreten mehrere der verzeichneten Belege nicht das Cognomen (*CIL* V 2328 und 3306 enthalten eher Berufsbezeichnungen, und auch 7487 und Pais 442 dürfen nicht ohne weiteres als Cognomina gedeutet werden), zum anderen fehlen Belege, die deutlich Cognomina sind (*CIL* V 4225).

Οὐλιάδης ein Modename nicht nur in Iasos war; er ist überall in der griechischen Welt bestens belegt (vgl. J. Benedum, *RE Suppl.* XIV 912–931). An sich existiert aber Ἰουλιάδης als Name: vgl. oben 203.

Καيسάρεια Καيسάρειος. Die Existenz eines solchen Namens ist öfters angenommen worden. Eine Dame, die bei Joh. Ant. *frg.* 214 *b* 2 (*FHG* vol. V p. 30) Καισαρία heisst, wird in *LGPN* III A, 227 zu Καισάρεια umgetauft, doch ohne Not. Noch schlimmer ist es, wenn Forscher von der Qualität Keils und Wilhelms in *MAMA* III 530*b* σωματοθήκη Κεσαρ(ε)ίου schreiben.⁴⁵ Doch der Name war *Caesarius -ia* (daneben ist *Caesareus* bekannt: *CIL* VI 32480), der sich einer gewissen Verbreitung in der Spätantike erfreute, aber Καισάρεια ist nur der Stadtname, und ohne eindeutige Belege für seinen Gebrauch als Frauennamen darf er nicht der antiken Anthroponymie zugewiesen werden.

Liberta aus *AE* 1995, 1786 (Choba in Mauret. Sitif.). Aus gut verständlichen Gründen kam im römischen Westen ein Cognomen *Libertus* überhaupt nicht in Gebrauch (s. meine Ausführungen in *Analecta epigraphica* 354f.). Deswegen ist in diesem verschollenen Fragment eher *liberta* o. ä. zu verstehen. Belege aus dem griechischen Osten habe ich a.a.O. verzeichnet. Dazu noch ein Beleg aus Centuripae, also aus dem Westen, aber aus griechischem Milieu: *MEFRA* 106 (1994) 85 Nr. 3 mit dem Text Λείβερτε, χρηστέ, χαίρε, also höchwahrscheinlich ein Name.

Μαξιμώ. Dieser Frauennamen soll in *I. Beroia* 261 (L. Gounarapoulou – M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Επιγραφές κάτω Μακεδονίας. Α': Επιγραφές Βεροίας, Αθήνα* 1998) (2. Jh. n. Chr.) vorliegen. Die Editoren drucken den Text folgendermassen: Μαξιμὸν Μαξίμα τῷ γλυκυτάτῳ τέκνῳ κτλ., sie hätten aber besser mit Tataki, *Ancient Beroea. Prosopography and Society*, Athens 1988, 853 Μαξίμω Μαξίμα schreiben sollen. Das Frauennamensuffix -ώ wird auch im griechischen Bereich lateinischen Namen kaum angehängt (mir ist ein einziges, einigermaßen eindeutiges Beispiel bekannt, der oben 207 behandelte Name Μαρκώ; weniger sicher Φαυστώ oben 198). Übrigens ist die von Tataki gegebene Textform ganz natürlich, und man versteht nicht, warum man daran Anstoss nehmen sollte. – Zwei weitere vermeintliche Beispiele eines dem lateinischen Stamm angehängten Suffix -ώ(ι): 1) Πουβλιώι, aus *CIG* 1806 (Ambrakia) hergeholt;⁴⁶ doch dürfte es

⁴⁵ Ähnlich St. Hagel – K. Tomaschitz, *Repertorium der westkilikischen Inschriften* (DAW 265 = Ergänzungsband zu den TAM 22), Wien 1998, 261 Korykos 407*b*.

⁴⁶ So *LGPN* III A, 373 aus P. M. Fraser – T. Rönne, *Boeotian and West Greek*

sich um einen falschen Namen handeln. Überliefert ist ΠΟΥΒΑΙΩΙΑΡΙΣΙΩΝΟΣ, und die nächstliegende Erklärung ist doch allemal, dass hier der Männernamen Πούβλιος vorliegt. – 2) *ICret* I p. 311 Nr. 3h ΒΑCΘΩ, von der Editorin ohne Not als Βασσώ gedeutet, doch liegt kein Grund vor, warum nicht einfach Βάσσω aufgefasst werden soll; ebenso ist die nachfolgende Inschrift Nr. 3i ΑΒΑCΚΑΝΤΩ eher Ἀβασκάντω zu verstehen.

Hier sei noch auf die Auslegung eines anderen Namens in derselben Edition hingewiesen: *I. Beroia* 453 (6. Jh. n. Chr.), wo die Herausgeber den Namen *Lupercia* gewinnen wollen; sie geben den Text "[Memoria(;) L]upercia I" wieder. Nach dem im Abbildungsteil publizierten Photo zu schliessen bleibt die Lesung der Anfangsbuchstaben unsicher, doch wäre *Lupercia* (mit erhaltenem L) vertretbar. Nun ist ein Name *Lupercius -ia* sonst nicht mit Sicherheit belegt; *CIL* III 9209, worauf die Editoren hinweisen, gibt uns den fragmentarischen Beleg *Lupercia[---]*, ohne dass es mit Sicherheit hervorgeht, ob *Lupercia* ein Gentilname oder ein Cognomen wäre;⁴⁷ ausserdem kann hier auch *Lupercia[nus]* (Kajanto 318) stecken. In der Zeit des ausgehenden Altertums wäre aber ein aus dem üblichen Cognomen *Lupercus* mit dem Suffix *-ius -ia* abgeleitetes Cognomen plausibel. Was den Namenbeleg aus Beroia betrifft, zeigt der auf LUPERCIA folgende Vertikalstrich, dass entweder *Luperciae* (oder gegebenenfalls *Luperciai*) oder aber *Lupercian[us]* verstanden werden sollte.

Πράτα. Diesen Namen wollen die Herausgeber in einer Inschrift des Heiligtums von Leukopetra (Ph. M. Petsas – M. B. Hatzopoulos – L. Gounaropoulou – P. Paschidis, *Inscriptions du sanctuaire de la Mère des Dieux autochthone de Leukopetra (Macédoine)*, Athènes 2000, 93 Nr. 17 als

Tombstones (Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae, ser. in 4°, 6), Lund 1957, 169 mit Hinweis auf A. Wilhelm, *Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* (Sonderschriften des ÖAI 7), Wien 1909, 68f.; aber Wilhelm hat nur diesen Namenstyp in rein griechischen Namen festgelegt, über mit diesem Suffix versehene lateinische Namen sagt er nichts; bei der Erklärung von Πουβλιώι vergleichen Fraser und Rönne unvorsichtigerweise lateinische Namen mit griechischen Endungen wie Ἰουλιᾶς (der gar nicht existiert, denn in der von Cavenaile [auf den die Autoren verweisen] herangezogenen Stelle *P. Mich.* 203, 23 steht Ἰουλιᾶς), Πουπλίων, die doch ganz anders stehen (*-as* und *-o(n)* sind auch lateinische Suffixe).

⁴⁷ Als Gentilname aufgefasst in G. Alföldy, *Die Personennamen in der römischen Provinz Dalmatia*, Heidelberg 1969, 95, in *Rep.* 108 und in *OPEL* III 38; als Cognomen im Cognominaindex des *CIL* III.

Namen der freizugebenden Sklavin festlegen; die Lesung Γράτα (sic!) weisen sie ab. Die Inschrift stammt aus dem Jahr 184/5 n. Chr. Γράτα soll die zu erwartende Form für Πρώτη in einem nordwestlichen Dialekt sein. Man versteht aber nicht, wie gegen Ende des 2. Jh. n. Chr. in Makedonien eine so charakteristisch dorische Form hätte auftauchen können. Auf dem im Abbildungsteil publizierten Abklatsch liest man viel eher ΓΡΑΤΑΝ; ΠΡΑΤΑΝ würde einen Nexus von Π und Ρ voraussetzen (anhand der etwas unscharfen Wiedergabe des Abklatsches fragt man sich ausserdem, ob die zwei letzten Buchstaben des vorausgehenden Wortes einen Nexus mit dem Anfangsbuchstaben unseres Namens haben), was an sich möglich wäre, denn der Steinmetz scheint gelegentlich Nexus zu verwenden, soweit dies der Abbildung des Abklatsches entnommen werden kann (in Z. 2 scheint Ω in Ἀρτεμιδώρα in Nexus mit den umgebenden Buchstaben geschrieben zu sein, und in θεῶν stehen Ω und Ν ebenfalls in Nexus; in Z. 3 stehen Π und Η von ὑπηρετοῦσαν in Nexus). Die von den Editoren eingebrachten Einwände, den Sklaven seien sehr selten lateinische Namen in Leukopetra zugelegt worden und *Grata* sei sonst nicht in Makedonien belegt, zählen wenig. Im Ganzen sind lateinische Sklavennamen in Griechenland, zudem in der späteren Kaiserzeit, nicht unbekannt und konnten beliebig verwendet werden,⁴⁸ und was speziell *Gratus Grata* Γράτος Γράτα betrifft, so ist es als Anthroponym im griechischen Bereich einigermaßen verbreitet;⁴⁹ dass er gerade als Sklavename nicht belegt ist, beruht auf Zufall.

Viatoirelius. Nur im Vorbeigehen sei auf ein wahres Monstrum hingewiesen, das in der neuen Edition philippischer Inschriften von Pilhöfer stehen geblieben ist:⁵⁰ *I. Philippi* 80 *Viatoirelius Liciniani* aus P. Lemerle, *BCH* 62 (1938) 476 = *AE* 1939, 45, wo im Index richtig *Viator filius Liciniani* steht; der Stein hat ein deutliches E statt eines F (wie man dem in *BCH* publizierten Photo entnehmen kann), und Pilhöfer hat Lemerles Transkription einfach übernommen, ohne zu sehen, dass in *AE* das Richtige

⁴⁸ Dazu vgl. H. S., "Griechische und römische Sklavennamen. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung", in *Fünfzig Jahre Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei an der Mainzer Akademie 1950–2000* (Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei 35), Stuttgart 2001, 307–330.

⁴⁹ Eine flüchtige Sondierung hat Belege etwa aus Athen, der Peloponnes und Kleinasien ergeben.

⁵⁰ P. Pilhöfer, *Philippi II: Katalog der Inschriften* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 119). Tübingen 2000 (die Inschriften aus diesem Band werden im vorliegenden Aufsatz mit *I. Philippi* zitiert).

schon geboten worden war. Ein anderes Monstrum in 391: *Tatinia Eniceni* mit der köstlichen Bemerkung, ein Name *Enicenus* sei nirgends nachzuweisen. Zu lesen ist einfach *Tatiniae Niceni*. Weiter 513 = *CIL* III 13707: der Name der Verstorbenen ist in der Abschrift eines lokalen Gewährmannes *IVLIE·EPINI·VXORI* überliefert. Die Inschrift ist voll von schweren Korruptelen, dieser Name aber lässt sich ohne grosse Mühe in *Iuli(a)e E<l>pini* verbessern. Flexionsformen auf *-n-* sind bei *Helpis* überaus häufig. Und noch 87: in *Iuli Fidei* soll *Fideius* vorliegen; hier hat in Irre geführt, dass *Fideius* in Philippi tatsächlich als Gentilnamen bekannt ist (209. 220),⁵¹ hier wird aber ein Cognomen benötigt. Warum also nicht *Fides*, als Männernamen bestens bekannt?⁵²

CXCIV. VERKANNTEN NAMEN

Chrysodice. Dieser Name liegt vor in *AE* 1998, 517 aus Dertona, wie aus dem von L. Mercado – G. Paci, *Stele romane in Piemonte* (MonAnt 57 Misc. 5), Roma 1998, 185 Nr. 111 publizierten Photo hervorgehen dürfte (die Editoren haben seit jeher *Chrysodia* gelesen, was kein Name ist). *Chrysodice* ist auch sonst in Italien bekannt, aus Venusia (*AE* 1981, 261). In der Anthroponymie des griechischen Mutterlandes kann ich ihn zur Zeit nicht nachweisen, doch bereitet es keinerlei Schwierigkeiten, *Χρυσοδίκη* neben zahlreichen anderen Vollnamen auf *Χρυσο-* und vor allem auf *-δικος* *-δίκη* anzusetzen (den von Bechtel *HPN* 135f. verzeichneten Bildungen können noch *Ἄγνοδίκη* und *Ἄστυδίκη* aus Athen hinzugefügt werden). Semasiologisch verwandt ist der einigermaßen verbreitete Name *Χρυσόθεμις*.

Dioga. Die Endklausel der nur durch alte Gewährsleute bekannten, aber einhellig überlieferten philippischen Inschrift *CIL* III 645 = *I. Philippi* (Pilhöfer) 429 lautet *curantib(us) Albio Vero mil(ite) et Diogan lib(erto)*. Mommsen hat den letzten Namen nicht verstanden, im Kommentar gibt er nur *et Dio... lib(erto)*, und im Cognominaindex schreibt er **Diogan.....* Noch schlimmer Pilhöfer, der in dem kürzlich erschienenen Katalog der

⁵¹ Ist aber sonst nirgends belegt, vgl. O. Salomies, in *Roman Onomastics in the Greek East*, Athens 1996, 117.

⁵² Vgl. H. S., "Spes", in *Utriusque linguae peritus. Studia in honorem T. Viljamaa*, Turku 1997, 3.

Inschriften von Philippi einen monströsen Namen *Diogan(tes)* geschaffen hat. Doch der Text ist in Ordnung,⁵³ und die Namen sind nicht abgekürzt geschrieben. Der Mann hiess *Dioga*. Für den Ablativ *Diogan* liefern eine perfekte Parallele *CIL VI 1159 b = XIV 461* (239 n. Chr.) *curatore C. Annio Basiliden* und *CIL VI 30998* (hadrianisch oder etwa später) *cum D. Valerio Chaerean iun(iore) fil(io)* (sein Vater heisst in derselben Inschrift *D. Valerius Chaereas*); nicht fern bleibt *CIL VI 1063, 8* (212 n. Chr.) *Fulvio Socraten*. Auch andere naheliegende Parallelen aus Rom lassen sich anführen: *CIL VI 12626* (ca. 2. Jh.) *ex Atilia Agnen*; 20025 (ca. 2. Jh.) *cum Cominia Atalanten*; 25683 (hadrianisch oder später) *a Vibia Euprepen*;⁵⁴ 35308 (Ende 1. Jh. / Anfang 2. Jh.) *cum Laudicen sorore*.⁵⁵ Keine dieser Inschriften hat Abkürzungen (ausser den üblichen) oder andere Besonderheiten aufzuweisen (nur in 12626 finden sich einige Entgleisungen im Text). Vgl. noch *CIL VI 27615 Traeboniae Calitychen* (Dativ). Umgekehrt bietet 6027 (augusteisch) *Terentia C. l. Prognen* ein parasitäres *n*.⁵⁶ Was die Frauennamenbelege betrifft, so fällt es schwer, sie allesamt als abgekürzte Ablative aufzufassen, z. B. *cum Cominia Atalanten(e)*,⁵⁷ da die Inschriften sonst keine Abkürzungen aufweisen. Erst recht geht diese Erklärung für *Chaerean* und *Diogan* nicht an, denn eine *n*-Flexion *Chaereas Chaereanis* wäre recht sonderbar (dagegen ist die Flexion *Socraten-* einigermaßen bezeugt). Eher liegt hier Verwechslung von Ablativ und Akkusativ vor; warum aber der Gentilname regelrecht im Ablativ steht, während das Cognomen die Akkusativendung *-an -en* erhält, ist schwieriger zu bestimmen. Vielleicht liegt der Grund darin, dass das auslautende *m* schwach geworden war (die romanischen Sprachen haben ja, von winzigen

⁵³ Ganz unnötigerweise definiert Reisch, *ThlL Onom.* III 166, 12f. die Inschrift als einen 'titulus male lectus'.

⁵⁴ Vidman will im *Cognominaindex* zu *CIL VI* als Nominativ *Euprepes* feststellen, schwerlich zu recht, denn *Euprepes* ist Männername. *Euprepe* ist eine plausible Bildung (vgl. z. B. *Asphale* neben *Asphales*), und tatsächlich auch belegt: *ICUR 7202*).

⁵⁵ Nichts zu diesen Formen bei P. Frei, *Die Flexion griechischer Namen der 1. Deklination im Latein*, Diss. Zürich 1958.

⁵⁶ Die Inschrift wurde von Editoren des *CIL VI* nicht gesehen, doch dürfte *PROGNEN* feststehen; *PROGEN* von Lanciani ist eine Art *lectio facilior*, die aber zu nichts führt, denn Namen auf *Proge-* gibt es nicht.

⁵⁷ Nach E. Diehl, *De M finali epigraphica* (FleckJb Suppl. 25, 1), Leipzig 1899, 23 sei dies die nächstliegende Erklärung, da nach dem Namen *benemerenti* im Dativ folge! Andere der hier angeführten Fälle kennt Diehl nicht.

Ausnahmen abgesehen, keine Spur von ihm bewahrt), während das auslautende *n* sich besser bewährte. So wurde im lateinischen Gentilnamen der auslautende Nasal weggelassen, aber im griechischen Cognomen bewahrt. Andererseits kann in vulgären Inschriften der Autor in einem Präpositionalausdruck korrekt mit Ablativ anfangen, um dann im zweiten Glied in den Akkusativ überzugehen: z. B. *TPSulp* 45, 3, 6f. (37 n. Chr.) *ab aeodem Euno*; *CPL* 193, 12 *aeadem diem*.⁵⁸ Auch in unseren Fällen könnte demnach eine pure Verwechslung zwischen Ablativ und Akkusativ vorliegen.

Florentia. In *MAMA* III 538 (Korykos) *σοματοθήκη ... καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ συνβίῳ Φλορέννας* + liegt zweifellos Genetiv von *Florentia* vor (im Index verkannt).

Pudens. M. H. Sayer, *Perinthos-Herakleia* (Marmara Ereğlisi) und Umgebung (DAW 269 = Veröff. Kleinasiat. Komm. 9), Wien 1998, 286f. Nr. 109 publiziert als Erstherausgeber folgenden Text: *[Pr]udentiu[s /] ARKAG[* usw. Als Datierung wird 1./2. Jh. vorgeschlagen. Keine Einwände werden in *AE* 1998, 1177 erhoben, nur wird die Datierung aufs 2. Jh. eingeeengt. Diese Auslegung ist aber unmöglich. Denn *Prudentius* ist ein später Name, der vor dem 3. Jh. undenkbar wäre (ausserdem müsste von dem vermeintlichen R vor V etwas vom Schwanz der abfallenden Haste sichtbar sein). Auch andere Namen auf *-udentius* stehen nicht zur Verfügung, weder Gentilicia noch Cognomina: alle mit dieser Endung versehenen Cognomina sind späte Gebilde, und für die wenigen Gentilnamen trifft dasselbe zu; sie sind ausserdem allesamt nur in den nordlichen Provinzen belegt. Die Inschrift, nach den Buchstabenformen zu schliessen, gehört aber der guten Prinzipatszeit an: sie muss spätestens aus dem 2. Jh. stammen. Nun erkennt man auf dem Photo zwischen VDENTI und V einen Trennpunkt, so dass die Lesung *[--- P]udenti* sich von selbst ergibt. Die zweite Zeile liest der Editor ARKAG und vermutet darin *Akrage[nsis]* durch Metathese. Ein sonderbarer Einfall. Nach ARK ist ein deutlicher Trennpunkt sichtbar, also etwa *ark(arius)*, gefolgt vielleicht von *ac(tarius)* o. ä. Sowohl *arcarii* als auch *actarii* waren z. B. im Militär beschäftigt, und *Pudens* ist ein beliebtes Cognomen in Soldatenkreisen.

Pythidoris in *RendLincei* 1979, 47 Nr. 35 = *AE* 1979, 58: siehe unten unter "Varia urbana".

⁵⁸ Weitere Belege bei J. N. Adams, *ZPE* 82 (1990) 243.

CXCIV. VARIA URBANA

1. *CIL* VI 2261, von Henzen aufgrund älterer Gewährsleute publiziert, existiert noch heute in der Villa Altieri, dort von St. Fox, *Xenia Antiqua* 5 (1996) 207 Nr. 76 (= *AE* 1997, 157) gesehen und als Ineditum publiziert. Henzen druckt die Namen der Mutter und des Sohnes *Galene* und *Galenus*, während Lupi und Maffei *Calene* und *Calenus* gelesen hatten; so jetzt auch Fox. Ohne Autopsie fällt die Entscheidung schwer; für *Gal-* könnte die griechische Endung des Namens der Mutter sprechen, sowie die Tatsache, dass *Galenus* und *Galene* viel üblichere Namen in Rom waren, besonders in den Kreisen, aus denen die Personen kommen.

2. *CIL* VI 8936 (gesehen von de Rossi und Gatti) wurde von S. Frascati, *La collezione epigrafica di Giovanni Battista de Rossi presso il Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia cristiana* (Sussidi allo studio delle antichità cristiane 11), Città del Vaticano 1997, 170 Nr. 126 (= *AE* 1997, 161) als Ineditum publiziert. Wenn de Rossi und Gatti die letzte Zeile richtig gelesen haben, muss dort [---] *Felicula* gestanden haben.

3. *CIL* VI 29022 beginnt in der Abschrift des einzigen Zeugen, des im 16. Jh. in Ferrara wirksamen Florentiner Humanisten Alberto Lollio *d. m. Viriae Aristocletae*.⁵⁹ Das Cognomen der Verstorbenen wird von Henzen ohne Not in *ARISTOCLEAE* geändert (so auch Vidman in seinem *Cognominaindex*). *Aristocleta* lässt sich gut vertreten. Ἀριστόκλειτος wäre ein gut griechischer Name, freilich zur Zeit nicht belegbar (der bei Bechtel *HPN* 70 zitierte Beleg ist hinfällig).⁶⁰ Andererseits sind Ἀριστοκλής und Ἀριστόκλεια sehr beliebte Namen überall in der griechischen Welt; in Rom aber kommt der Fraunname nur okkasionell vor (s. *GPN*², im Druck). Wie -κλεια in Rom sowohl mit *-clea* wie *-clia* wiedergegeben wird, so konnte man gelegentlich analog dazu *-cleta* statt *-clita* schreiben, sofern es sich nicht um eine Verschreibung oder Verlesung handelt.

4. Unter *RendLincei* 1979, 47 Nr. 35 (S. Silberstein Trevisani) = *AE* 1979, 58 findet sich eine Namenliste, deren Inhalt mich schon längere Zeit beschäftigt. Vor allem die Lesung der ersten Zeile, von der Herausgeberin

⁵⁹ An sich kann nichts Genaues vom Wert der Abschriften von Lollio gesagt werden, denn er hat nur von anderen geschöpft.

⁶⁰ Der von Bechtel zitierte Beleg ist *IG* IX 2, 522, aber dort ist Ἀριστοκλεῖ τῷ Νικωνίδου statt Ἀριστοκλείτῳ Νικωνίδου zu lesen: A. Wilhelm, *Griechische Inschriften rechtlichen Inhalts*, Athen 1952, 37–43.

Pithioordeu[s] wiedergegeben, ist mir ein Dorn im Auge. Jetzt glaube ich das Rätsel gelöst zu haben. Ich lese PYTHIDORISEV[---] und lege dort den Namen *Pythidoris* fest, der neu ist. Der obere Teil der Buchstaben dieser Zeile ist abgebrochen, und so bereitet es keinerlei Schwierigkeiten, als zweiten Buchstaben ein Y statt I anzunehmen. Alle anderen Buchstaben dürften sicher sein, ausser D, das aber vielleicht nur schlecht gelungen ist, oder aber sein runder unterer linker Bogen ist von der Unziale beeinflusst worden – solche Formen sind in der späten Zeit, der die Inschrift angehört, nicht erstaunlich. Eine Datierung etwa ins 4. Jh. n. Chr. scheint naheliegend, wie aus den Buchstabenformen und dem onomastischen Befund ersichtlich wird; dazu mehr unten. EV, das auf *Pythidoris* folgt, kann zum zweiten Namen der *Pythidoris* gehören oder einen neuen Namen anfangen oder aber ein Appellativ vertreten. Im Griechischen sind neben zahlreichen Vollnamen auf Πυθο- einige Bildungen auf Πυθιο- bekannt, wie Πυθιόνικος aus Athen (Bechtel *HPN* 389, wo noch Πυθιογείτων *SEG* XIX 359c [Thespiiai, 4./3. Jh. v. Chr.] nachgetragen werden kann), ganz wie die zwei Vollnamenssippen auf Διονυσο- und Διονυσιο- nebeneinander stehen (Bechtel *HPN* 137f.).⁶¹ Die Namen auf Διονυσιο- und Πυθιο-, die zu den Festnamen Διονύσια und Πύθια gehören, werden im Griechischen oft zu Διονυσι- und Πυθι- verkürzt; in Rom aber schrieb man regelmässig *Dionysiodorus*, der in stadtrömischen Urkunden sechsmal neben *Dionysodorus* (fünfmal) belegt ist (dazu eine *Dionysodoris* in *ICUR* 22417 = *CIL* VI 16890);⁶² hier hätten wir die verkürzte Form. Frauennamen auf *-doris* sind keine Seltenheit in Rom, dafür bürgt *Pythodoris* selbst, für Rom aus *CIL* VI 18413 gesichert. Aber Πυθιόδωρος lässt sich auch in Griechenland belegen (er fehlt bei Bechtel): der Philosoph Pythiodoros aus Ägypten, erwähnt zum Jahre 362 n. Chr. (*RE* XXIV 550 = *PLRE* I 756).⁶³ – Sonst genügen wenige Worte zum Text. Eigenartig ist der Name *Ferrucio*, der zu der grossen Sippe *Ferr-* gehört

⁶¹ Bei Bechtel nachzutragen Διονύσιππος, Διονυσόφιλος, Διονυσοφῶν, alle aus Athen (die Belege in *LGPN* II) und Διονύσερμος, belegt aus Jonien (L. Robert, *RA* 1966, 216–222 vgl. G. Daux, *BCH* 91 [1967] 491–493: Statue aus dem 6. Jh., unbekannter Herkunft, aber in jonischem Stil), in Massalia (*ParPass* 37 [1982] 360–370 vgl. O. Masson, *JS* 1985, 20 = seine *Onomastica Graeca selecta* II 478) und in Olbia (*IPE* I² 216 Διονυσέρμ[ου]); auch in Rom: *AE* 1985, 220 (falsch unter Ostia).

⁶² Die Zahlen sind der im Druck befindlichen Neuauflage meines griechischen Namenbuches entnommen.

⁶³ In *LGPN* III B, 366 wird ihm unverständlicherweise Herkunft aus Thebai in Boiotien zugeschrieben.

(*Rep.*² 78. 331. 483. 499) und dessen Bildung vielleicht an einem an sich unbelegten Gentilnamen **Ferrucius* orientiert ist (sonst s. die Bemerkungen der Editorin). *Herculis* (wenn so zu lesen) ist nicht mit der Herausgeberin als Variante von *Hercules* zu nehmen, denn dieser ist eine höchst seltene Namenbildung, vielmehr ist *Herculius* zu verstehen mit der für die späte Zeit charakteristischen Auslassung von *u*. Die Namenliste besteht aus lauter Cognomina, denn die akephal erhaltenen Namen in der linken Kolumne können nicht Gentilicia sein, wie aus Zeile 3 hervorgeht. Männer- und Frauennamen werden gemischt dargeboten, und in der erhaltenen Kolumne wechseln sie regelmässig ab. Der zweimal vorkommende Name *Scintilla* ist wohl Frauenname, wenigstens ist er nur als solcher belegt; freilich handelt es sich um keinen verbreiteten Namen, ausser Habinnas' Frau etwa zehnmal in Rom, Hispanien und Africa belegt.⁶⁴ Was die Datierung der Inschrift betrifft, gehört sie sicher der späteren Kaiserzeit, etwa dem 4. Jh., an, wie die Buchstabenformen und die Namen zeigen (Gebrauch nur eines Namens, charakteristisch späte Bildungen wie *Herculius*).

CXCVI. MINIMA CYZICENA

Κούλκιε καὶ Δεκμιανὴ τῷ τέκνῳ Μοδέστῳ μνήμης χάριν. So publiziert E. Schwertheim als Erstherausgeber *I. Kyzikos* I 358. Kein Wort über den Textverlauf im Kommentar. Die Form des ersten Namens macht jedoch stutzig. Im Namenindex steht nur Κούλκιος, ein Name, der auch sonst in Kyzikos vorkommt. Nun bediente sich der Steinmetz lunarer Buchstabenformen, so dass sich der Verdacht aufdrängt, auf dem Stein habe ΚΟΥΛΚΙΕ gestanden (also Verschreibung oder Verlesung). Wenigstens muss hier so verstanden werden (-ις statt -ιος ist eine ganz übliche Schreibung).

Schwertheim ergänzt sodann den Namen des Verstorbenen in *I. Kyzikos* I 389 = II 121 ohne Vorbehalt [Οὐα]λεντιανός. *Valentianus* ist jedoch ein recht selten belegter Name, weswegen auch andere Ergänzungen in Frage kommen wie etwa *Lentianus*, auch dies selten, oder *Pollentianus*, ein Name, der an sich nirgends belegt ist, doch neben *Pollentinus* eine plausible Bildung vertritt.

⁶⁴ Kajanto *Latin Cognomina* 341 verzeichnet fünf Belege. Dazu noch mehrere weitere hispanische Belege: *AE* 1934, 25. 1987, 635. *IRLeón* 171.

CXCVII. ÄGYPTISCHES IN CAESAREA MARITIMA?

C. M. Lehmann und K. G. Holum, *The Greek and Latin Inscriptions of Caesarea Maritima* (The Joint Expedition to Caesarea Maritima. Excavation Reports 5), Boston 2000 publizieren unter Nr. 158 eine Grabinschrift, die sie als ein "Egyptian Epitaph for Priskos Nemonianos and Isidora" betiteln. Diese Auslegung ist irrig. Der zweite Name des ersten verstorbenen Kindes Νεμωνιανός soll ein in Ägypten gebrauchter Name gewesen sein; zu diesem Schlußsatz kommen die Editoren aufgrund der in Preisigkes *Namenbuch* stehenden Angaben. In Wirklichkeit schrumpfen die zahlreichen bei Preisigke (und Foraboschi) aufgelisteten Belege auf einen einzigen Namensträger zusammen, einen Beamten der Steuererhebungsverwaltung in Syene in der zweiten Hälfte des 2. Jh., namens Μάρκος Ἄννιος Νεμωνιανός, samt seinem gleichnamigen Sohn; alle Belegstellen aus den zahlreichen Ostraka beziehen sich auf die beiden; der Sohn, der zum Unterschied vom Vater νεώτερος genannt wird, war in derselben Verwaltung in der ersten Hälfte des 3. Jh. tätig.⁶⁵ Sonst sind aus Ägypten das Gentilicium Νεμώνιος als Einzelname belegt (Wilcken *Ostraka* 276, 186/187 n. Chr.; *SB* 243 [Grabinschrift aus römischer Zeit]⁶⁶), sowie die oben 211 angeführte Ableitung Νεμωνᾶς bekannt (sonst nirgends belegt). *Nemonius* war ein römischer Gentilname, besonders in Campanien (aber auch sonst, etwa in den gallischen Provinzen) verbreitet,⁶⁷ hat aber wenige Derivate zustandegebracht, ja nur die hier oben genannten, von denen *Nemonianus* nur für die Steuererhebungsmännern und das Kind aus Caesarea belegt ist. Zum Schluss sei noch erwähnt, dass *Nemonius* im Osten als Einzelname noch auf Thasos vorkommt (*IG* XII 8, 325, Suppl. 445, 2. Jh. n. Chr.). Dies macht *Nemonianus* doch noch nicht zu einem für Ägypten typischen Namen;⁶⁸ um von allem anderen zu schweigen, sei daran erinnert,

⁶⁵ Die Belege sind: Wilcken *Ostraka* 291. 297–300. 1460. *O. Strassb.* 286. *SB* 9545, 24, 3. 9604, 24, 3. *AE* 1996, 1652. 1654.

⁶⁶ Hier ist Νεμόνιος und nicht mit den Editoren Νεμωνίς zu schreiben, denn Νεμόνιος stellt eindeutig die abgekürzte maskuline Nominativendung dar.

⁶⁷ Ausser den in *CIL* X publizierten Inschriften: *MGR* 2 (1968) 369 Nr. 24 (Formiae); *MonAnt* 24, 1 (1917) 180 (Messana); Inedita aus Ulubrae und Puteoli.

⁶⁸ Erst recht ist eine sprachliche Herleitung aus dem Ägyptischen auszuschliessen; einheimische Namen, die *Nemoni(an)us* zurunde liegen könnten, sind nicht vorhanden, aus den Listen bei W. Brunsch, Untersuchungen zu den griechischen Wiedergaben ägyptischer Personennamen, *Enchoria* 8 (1978) 131 zu schliessen.

dass besonders Ableitungen auf *-ιανός* und *-ᾶς*, die uns hier begegnen, in der Bildung neuer Cognomina aus lateinischen Namenstämmen gerade im griechischen Osten benutzt wurden. Dasselbe trifft für den Namen des zweiten Kindes zu; ob er nun *Ἰσίδωρος* oder *Ἰσιδώρα* war,⁶⁹ als typisch ägyptisch darf er nicht gewertet werden, denn dieser Name ist ja überall in der Mittelmeerwelt modisch geworden.⁷⁰ Was endlich die Formel *δοῖ σοι ὁ Ὅσειρις τὸ ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ* betrifft, ist auch sie kein Beweis für ägyptische Herkunft der Familie, denn sie ist auch ausserhalb von Ägypten verbreitet; hier nur die Belege aus Rom: *IGUR* 432. 628 (= *CIL* VI 20616). 720. 836. In all diesen Fällen ist nichts von ägyptischem Einfluss nachzuweisen (im Gegenteil, der Errichter von 836 könnte aus Kleinasien stammen, nach seinem Cognomen *Ἡλεῖς* zu schliessen). Osiris war ja ein viel verehrter Gott überall in der Mittelmeerwelt geworden.

CXCVIII. NOCHMALS VERKANNTEN CHRISTLICHE INSCRIFTEN

Ich habe in den zwei vorigen Jahrgängen des *Arctos* 33 (1999) 201f. 34 (2000) 186–192 mir bekannte Fälle von seit jeher bekannten altchristlichen stadtrömischen Inschriften zusammengestellt, die aus dem einen oder anderen Grund in dem römischen altchristlichen Inschriftenwerk fehlen. Hier seien noch zwei weitere Inschriften ans Licht gebracht, auf die ich bei der Durchsicht des zweiten, Italien gewidmeten Bandes der kürzlich publizierten *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire* (Paris 1999) gestossen bin. Marco Buonocore hat mich auf bewährte Weise bei der Suche nach älteren Gewährsleuten unterstützt.

Marini, *Cod. Vat. Lat.* 9076 f. 251 Nr. 279 hat aus den Scheden des Suaresius mit der Herkunftsangabe "Romae in vinea monasterii SS. Iohannis et Pauli in ambitu sarcophagi" folgenden Text abgeschrieben:

⁶⁹ Der Name steht im Text in Vokativ *Ἰσίδωρε*, was auf einen Männernamen schliessen liesse. Die Herausgeber haben aber einige Gründe dafür genannt, wonach hier an ein Steinmetzirtum für *Ἰσιδώρα* zu denken sei. Die Entscheidung fällt schwer, jedenfalls ist die von den Editoren vorgenommene Konjektur etwas gewaltsam.

⁷⁰ Zur Verbreitung von Isis-Namen in der griechischen Welt neuerdings R. Parker, "Theophoric Names and the History of Greek Religion", in *Greek Personal Names. Their value as evidence*, edited by S. Hornblower & E. Matthews (Proceedings of the British Academy 104), Oxford 2000, 74f.

+ *ic req(uiescit) in pace Anast(asius) subdi(aconus) reg(ionarius)
s(an)c(ta)e eccle(siae) Rom(anae), qui bixit anno(s) plus minus [---].*

Derselbe Text kehrt nochmals bei Marini, *Cod. Vat. Lat. 9072* p. 406 Nr. 7 wieder (diesmal aus Filippo Rondinini, *De sanctis martyribus Johanne et Paulo, eorumque basilica in urbe Roma*, Romae 1727, 169f., der den Text wiederum aus Fioravanti Martinelli hat, *Roma ex ethnica sacra*, Romae 1653, 130, freilich schlecht kopiert; Marini korrigiert stillschweigend). Der mit einem hochinteressanten Titel beladene Mann hat – zum Glück – aus Marini seinen Weg in die Pariser Prosopographie gefunden (120 Nr. 22). Die Inschrift trägt keine Datierung, sie gehört aber augenscheinlich der Zeit des ausgehenden Altertums an (die Editoren der Prosopographie denken ans 6./7. Jh.). – Aus der Wiedergabe des Textes bei Marini zu schliessen, folgte nach PLVS MINVS eine sehr kurze Altersgabe, mit einer oder höchst zwei Ziffern. zum Beispiel L oder LX o. ä.

Derselbe Marini, *Cod. Vat. Lat. 9079* f. 6 Nr. 1002 = 9072 p. 421 Nr. 3 gibt folgende Inschrift "ex coem. Priscillae" wieder:

Calepodius XPI / famulus decessit / Non(is) Februarii(s).

Der Text fehlt im achten und neunten Band von *ICUR*, in denen die Priscilla-Inschriften stehen. Der Mann steht in der Pariser Prosopographie 378 Nr. 2 (in die Angabe der Folie bei Marini 9072 hat sich ein Versehen eingeschlichen: 421, nicht 412) mit einem Datierungsansatz ins 4./5. Jh.

Universität Helsinki

DE NOVIS LIBRIS IUDICIA

GIOVANNA ALVONI: *Altertumswissenschaften digital. Datenbanken, Internet und e-Ressourcen in der altertumswissenschaftlichen Forschung*. Mit Beiträgen von ULRICH RAUSCH. Olms Studienbücher Antike, Band 5. Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim 2001. ISBN 3-487-11248-5. 191 S. EUR 15,80.

The aim of Giovanna Alvoni's convenient handbook is to remove the lack of an up-to-date manual in German on the use of electronic resources. The book is addressed to scholars and students alike. Here, I must point out that the overall title of the book is slightly misleading: in my opinion, instead of *Altertumswissenschaft*, the authors might have used the term *Klassische Philologie* because very little information about electronic resources in classical archaeology or ancient history is included.

That such a manual has appeared in printed form is very admirable because publications of this kind hardly advance the careers of the authors, not being "scientific" in the strict sense. The printed form has, however, one unfortunate aspect: the delay between the finishing of the book (the *Redaktionsschluß* was 31st March 2000), and its appearance in printed form in 2001. In the field of electronic resources such a delay certainly means that all the information cannot be up-to-date. However, as the "Lesehinweise" inform us (p. 10), an updated list of the internet links can be found at the web page of the publisher (www.olms.de/buchtips/alvoni/www-adressen.html), which is extremely useful. (But at the time of the writing of this review, in November 2001, the most recent update was from 15th October 2000.) In any case, some stability seems to have been reached even in the world of URL addresses, as great majority of the links given in the book were still functioning when this review was written.

The first chapter of the book is a concise introduction to the principles of computers. The main chapters are 2, 3, and 4, entitled "Bibliographische Forschungen", "Textdatenbanken", and "Wissenschaftliche Diskussion", respectively. Chapter 5 contains a glossary of the terms, a bibliography, addresses of data banks, and an index. Parts of chapters 2, 3, and 5 have been written by Ulrich Rausch.

In the first part of Chapter 2, Alvoni presents some bibliographic resources on CD-ROM: *The Database of Classical Bibliography*, *Gnomon Bibliographische Datenbank*, and *Dyabola*. Basic information, such as system requirements, and users' instructions are given. What follows is a general discussion of the various aspects of the Internet as a global data bank (p. 44-70), written by U. Rausch. The content is informative, even for a reader who is to some extent familiar with the internet. The section also contains information about some of the most important search engines. As the information is from the year 2000, one could now add, e. g., the efficient search engine www.google.com (for a collection of search engines, see also www.researchville.com). In addition, Rausch lucidly discusses some security questions and explains significant terms in internet jargon, such as *cookies*. As far as the most important problem with the internet

is concerned, i. e., how to distinguish between correct and false information, he delivers some words of caution, and concludes: "Das Internet hat die Antwort auf viele – vielleicht sogar auf alle Fragen. Die Kunst besteht aber darin, die richtige Frage zu formulieren, damit man die Antwort auch findet" (p. 44). This is partly true, but on the net, even with the right questions, one can certainly receive wrong information because of the facility of spreading information through internet. At the moment, this is a universal problem, and no solution is discernible. In my view, it is possible that in the future, webmasters of important classics link sites will increasingly be responsible for the reliability of information as they choose whether to include a link on their list or not.

Bibliographical resources, library catalogues, periodicals, and institutes are presented in the final parts of Chapter 2. Unlike the other sections, the library section concentrates on the German-language areas of Europe. However, some of the links extend the opportunities of research to other libraries, such as the apparently very useful *Karlsruher Virtuelle Katalog* (but the URL address given in the book has changed; in November 2001, the site was accessible at www.ubka.uni-karlsruhe.de/kvk.html). One could naturally add other libraries, such as the catalogue of the *Unione Romana delle Biblioteche Scientifiche* (URBS, www-urbs.vatlib.it).

Chapter 3 presents the most important data bases of ancient texts. Even if the publishing of printed books certainly does not seem to be diminishing, the amount of ancient text material available in electronic form is slowly becoming more and more complete. Like the previous chapters, this one is a very useful introduction to the resources. The approach is PC oriented; it seems, indeed, that few of these resources are available for Macintosh users. In my view, both PC and Macintosh users interested in Greek texts will miss a discussion of Greek fonts in the chapter. Some advice should have been given on how to acquire various Greek fonts, how to type them easily, and if the conversion problems can be solved at all. Chapter 4, by Alvoni, begins with an explanation of the principles of e-mail; in the following part, the reader is introduced to some mailing lists in the field of classical antiquity. Surprisingly, the Papyrus research discussion list (PAPY) is missing here. In Chapter 5, the glossary is very precise. The bibliography contains many useful items, even if some of them, from the early 1990's, may be more relevant to the cultural history of Classics and electronic resources. In all, the volume works very well as an introduction to the subject. Furthermore, it is a good aide-mémoire when, e. g., a bookmark file has been lost and the search engine produces hundreds of useless results.

Kalle Korhonen

HEINZ BELLEN: *Politik – Recht – Gesellschaft. Studien zur Alten Geschichte*. Hrsg. von LEONHARD SCHUMACHER. Historia Einzelschriften 115. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 1997. ISBN 3-515-07150-4. 323 S. mit 24 Tafeln. DEM 138.

Der weitumfassende Titel des vorliegenden Bandes spannt einen globalen Rahmen und vereint, wie man sogleich bemerkt, unter einem Einband eine Sammlung von Aufsätzen und Studien. Der Band ist für Heinz Bellen zu seinem 70. Geburtstag zusammengestellt

worden. Die drei Begriffe des Titels sind zugleich die grobe Gliederung des vielseitigen Materials in fassbare, aber nicht als umfassend beabsichtigte Einteilungen. Schon ein Blick auf die Überschriften im Inhaltsverzeichnis zeigt sowohl die historisch-zeitliche und quellenmässige Weite von Bellens Forschungstätigkeit als auch die Spanne und Spannung zwischen Reichs- und Provinzialgeschichte und zwischen grossen Entwicklungslinien und konkreten Einzelbetrachtungen. Leonhard Schumacher hat so als Herausgeber einen gelungenen Gesamteindruck von Bellens bisheriger Tätigkeit geben können.

Zeitlich umfasst der Band rund 900 Jahre, angefangen beim Rachegedanken in der griechisch-persischen Auseinandersetzung bis hin zu Theodosius, aber mit einem eindeutigen Schwerpunkt auf dem 1. Jh. n. Chr.. Methodisch ist eine Neigung zur Numismatik nicht zu übersehen. Vor allem die im Kapitel "Politik" zusammengetragenen Gedanken stützen sich immer wieder auf die Interpretation von Münzen, egal ob es sich um die Bedeutung der Eroberung Ägyptens für die Prinzipatsideologie handelt oder um das Säkularbewußtsein Hadrians. Auch die intensive Auseinandersetzung mit antiken Schriftstellern wird deutlich, sowohl als unmittelbares Zeugnis wie im Aufsatz, der sich mit Ciceros Einschätzung und Einstellung zu Octavians Aufstieg beschäftigt, als auch als zeitnahe Aussagen antiker Historiographen zu diversen Themen von der Rolle der Alexanderideologie in Pompeius' Triumph bis zur Krise der italischen Landwirtschaft unter Tiberius. Recht selten dagegen und nur sporadisch sind als Aussagequelle die Inschriften herangezogen.

Viele der Aufsätze sind seit langem anerkanntes "Gemeingut" unter den Fachleuten und bedürfen keiner weiteren Kommentierung im Rahmen einer Buchbesprechung. So etwa sind seine Beobachtungen zum Drususdenkmal und dem Ehrenbogen in Mainz nicht aus der Erörterung dieser Fragen wegzudenken. Auch die Betrachtungen zu prinzipiellen Fragen wie etwa die des Königtums im Geschichtsbewusstsein der späten Republik oder der Christianisierung der Kaiserideologie in der Spätantike geben bei erneutem Lesen neue Denkanstöße. Aber auch zu neuen bzw. vielleicht in der Forschung neu in Mode gekommenen Fragen wie die Sklavenforschung bringt Bellens in vielen Jahren gereifte Gedanken in mehreren im Teil Gesellschaft zusammengefassten Aufsätzen zwischen 1963 bis 1989. In dem bewußt ans Ende des Bandes gestellten Artikel "Antike Sklaverei als moderne Herausforderung" wird zudem die Reflexion eines gründlichen Wissenschaftlers und aufrichtigen Historikers bezüglich wissenschaftsgeschichtlicher Implikationen deutlich, und diese Ausführungen runden das Buch gewissermassen als Testament und gleichzeitig Würdigung des Jubilars ab.

Uta-Maria Liertz

Grenzen der kritischen Vernunft. Helmut Holzhey zum 60. Geburtstag. Hrsg. von PETER A. SCHMID und SIMONE ZURBUCHEN. Schwabe & Co. Verlag, Basel 1997. ISBN 3-7965-1039-6. 314 S. CHF 75.

Obwohl vorliegendes, uns vom Verlag zugeschickte Werk sich nicht mit der klassischen Antike beschäftigt, sei es hier kurz angezeigt.

Die Werke Kants und des Neukantianismus stehen exemplarisch für den Versuch, die Philosophie als Wissenschaft zu begründen. Diese Arbeit hat ihre Grundlage in der kritischen Begrenzung der Vernunft, die ihrer Natur nach zu Grenzüberschreitungen verleitet und den Philosophen im metaphysischen Schein blendet. Der Band sammelt Beiträge zur Problematik dieser kritischen Begrenzung der Vernunft. Im ersten Kapitel stellen drei Spezialisten für das 18. Jh. methodologische Vorüberlegungen zu Begriff und Geschichte der Philosophie vor. Das zweite und dritte Kapitel haben ihren Schwerpunkt in der Marburger Schule sowie in der Auseinandersetzung des Neukantianismus mit der zeitgenössischen Entwicklung der Wissenschaften. Das Ernst Cassirer gewidmete vierte Kapitel zeugt von dem grossen Interesse, welches seine Ausweitung des neukantianischen Begründungskonzepts auf die Kulturphilosophie derzeit genießt. Im fünften Kapitel werden ausgewählte Aspekte von Kants und Leibniz' Philosophie einerseits auf ihre Relevanz für wissenschaftstheoretische Diskussionen der Gegenwart geprüft, andererseits auf ihre metaphysischen Grundlagen hin befragt. In dieser Thematik spiegelt sich der philosophische Werdegang von Helmut Holzhey wieder, zu dessen 60. Geburtstag dieser Band erscheint. Verspätete Glückwünsche!

Heikki Solin

ROSALIND THOMAS: *Herodotus in Context. Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2000. viii, 321 pp. GBP 45.

There was a long time when Herodotus was seen as a kind of relic, an archaic figure more properly belonging to the 6th century, with no idea of the intellectual discussion of his own time. He was presented as a sort of puppet, only capable of compiling from earlier sources (and from only one at a time), without any shade of original thought. Why, the man did not even understand what history writing should be like. All this is now put into proper perspective by R. Thomas. From the detailed comparison of the *Histories* with early medical authors and to a lesser extent with natural philosophers and sophists, a new picture of Herodotus emerges. Not a remnant of the archaic period emulating authors writing a hundred years earlier, he was taking up numerous topics actual in the beginning scientific discussion of his own time. The very term ἱστορίη is not an Ionian archaism, but a contemporary term for observation and enquiry. With numerous examples mainly – but not always – taken from the four first books, Thomas analyses both the content and the form of exposition and thus presents Herodotus as a representative of a Ionian intellectual tradition, best preserved in early medical works such as the *Airs, Waters, Places, On the Sacred Disease, On Art*, and a few others. Some of the chapters, like those discussing the use of argument and persuasion, and the role of performance, contain also many pertinent observations about the medical authors and about the general intellectual milieu of the latter half of the fifth century. Among the many consequences of this, I would like to point out, how Hecataeus, deprived of the uncritical compilation of Herodotus, vanishes back into the archaic mist with his few and uninformative authentic fragments.

Klaus Karttunen

XENOPHON: *Hiero the Tyrant and Other Treatises*. Translated by ROBIN WATERFIELD, with introductions and notes by PAUL CARTLEDGE. Penguin Books, London – New York 1997. ISBN 0-14-044682-6. xxxi, 248 pp. GBP 7.99 / USD 13.95.

Waterfield had previously published, together with H. Tredennick, the *Memoirs of Socrates* in 1990 in a volume entitled *Conversations of Socrates* in the same Penguin Classics. Now he presents a new translation of *Hiero, Agesilaus, Hipparchicus, De re equestri, Cynegeticus, and Poroi*. The six treatises are translated from Marchant's Oxford edition from 1920 (he would have had some more recent editions at his disposal, but neglecting them may not have caused any great harm); at the end of the volume the reader is offered some textual notes. Waterfield's translations seem to be – if a non-native speaker of English be permitted to judge – clear and accurate. The volume is opened by Paul Cartledge's succinct and well-written Introduction.

Heikki Solin

MELISSA S. LANE: *Method and Politics in Plato's Statesman*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1998. ISBN 0-521-58229-6. 229 pp. GBP 35.

Until quite recently, the interest in Plato's so-called late dialogues has been considerably weaker than in the dialogues considered earlier. In the latter, language, style and drama are often more elaborate, and thus they are more enjoyable to read as well as, sometimes, easier to understand. Even among the less entertaining late dialogues, the *Statesman* has sometimes been judged as exceptionally dull. With the new interest in the philosophical content of the late dialogues, several studies have shown that an assiduous inquiry into this neglected side of Plato has much to offer. Melissa Lane's book on the *Statesman* belongs to this significant new wave of study.

The aim of the author is to give an account of the *Statesman* in which the remarks on methodology are combined with the politics presented. The dialogue is not merely a discourse on the method of dialectic. In Lane's view, Plato is attempting to do something much more challenging. The *Euthydemus* raises the question of what could be the subject matter of political expertise. The *Republic* champions the view that rulers ought to base their rule on a pervasive understanding of the Good. The *Statesman* presses a question: What counts as political knowledge? *How* does the statesman rule? (275a.) The new emphasis is on the political. Does not a good ruler or politician need something more genuinely political and practical than philosophical understanding of the Good?

The answer Lane finds in the dialogue has two sides. Political expertise is partly knowledge of the relation between other forms of knowledge – i.e., the capacity to coordinate the work of different experts – partly knowledge of temporal demands of the right moment of action – i.e., *when* different expertise ought to be performed. With the last demand Plato brings an important dimension to the discussion: that of time.

The first part of the book argues that in the *Statesman* dialectic is complemented by a method of example. The different steps in the method of division seem to rely on the slippery notion of similarity. How to decide which similarities are relevant? This difficulty is displayed by the unsuccessful divisions of different kinds of shepherding in

the beginning of the dialogue. Too much is spoken of the different kinds of objects of shepherding, whereas the factors pertaining to the special features of human objects as well as those internal to the act of rule have been omitted. The right kind of example, *paradeigma*, is offered as something that makes up for this deficiency.

A successful *paradeigma*, like weaving in the dialogue, establishes the axis of similarity that is relevant. An example displays the goal of the inquiry, leading to a division which is provisional and relative to the *telos* targeted. Lane compares this to Kuhn's modern views about science. Kuhn's paradigms are concrete problem solutions which become used as examples for other scientific problem solving. Thus they fix certain similarity and difference relations and teach them as relevant. As Lane points out, Kuhn's paradigms follow one another, sometimes wholly replacing the previous paradigm, whereas Plato's examples should tell us something of the real and natural way of things. They should map reality. Together with the method of division, they should help us in moving from belief to knowledge.

As Lane suggests, this difference need not make the comparison unfruitful. But it is connected to another possibly more problematic difference. Where Kuhn's paradigms are, presumably, generated as working solutions in the daily practice of science, and should thus be suited at least to the proximate areas of research, Plato's philosopher chooses an example radically different from the object of the inquiry. The seemingly different example should, granted, be in relevant ways similar to the object itself. But how to know which will turn out to be relevant similarities? In other words: why exactly was weaving and the divisions conducted within that context a better example for statesmancraft than something else? Because it made evident a division already considered central.

Lane does confront this line of criticism, and it does seem to be the case that by conducting a division in a less complicated context, and by testing different examples before arriving at the right one, something genuinely new surfaces. But to which extent does the example contribute to the quest for relevant divisions? A more thorough answer would have supported the author's confidence in the method as able to "drastically revise ordinary assumptions about similarities and differences in the process of guiding inquiry to a specified end" (p. 97).

The second part of the book is an inquiry into the story of the divine rulers situated in the middle of the dialogue. The story has often been treated as separable from the rest of the dialogue, but Lane shows how it continues the discussion of example, as well as stresses the temporal and changing character of the realm of human action, and the need for political art.

In the third and last part of the book, statecraft is described as a second-order control, a weaving together of arts and citizen factions into a unified whole. Moreover, it is the knowledge of right timing, the knowledge of *kairos*. The politician's knowledge of the Good must be able to deal with the ever-changing flux of the temporal realm, that is, to answer the questions when this or that art or action should be performed. It is also shown how Plato raises the question of political authority and its relation to laws. Laws are necessary tools of authority, but compared to the dynamic rule of a man in possession of the knowledge of *kairos*, laws strictly tied to tradition are often stagnant.

Because of the admirably comprehensive nature of the chosen scope and the

concise and comprehensible format of the book, Lane is forced to tackle several difficult questions, all of which may not get the treatment they deserve. This does not diminish the value of her account of the method of division or the importance of the inquiry in *paradeigma*. The book displays the intricate ways in which method and the topic of the philosophical discussion are intertwined in Plato. Equally significant is the novel picture of the Platonic art of politics which enriches the common view based on the utopian *Republic* and the heterogeneous *Laws*.

Lane's rich reading of the politics of the *Statesman* is accompanied by an acknowledgement of its shortcomings. Plato offers no practical or theoretical suggestions as to how a ruler could actually know in each case which is the right moment, nor, for example, how they could predict the future to a sufficient extent to help in deciding the right kind and time for action. Moreover, although the dialogue moves into the direction of practical questions about political rule, good rule remains, as Lane says, a purely intellectual achievement.

Pauliina Remes

Das Corpus Hermeticum Deutsch 1-2. Clavis Pansophiae 7,1; 7,2. Frommann – Holzboog, Stuttgart – Bad Cannstatt 1997. ISBN 3-7728-1530-8, 3-7728-1531-6. 665 S. DEM 218, DEM 218.

Dies ist die erste vollständige deutsche Übersetzung (die Übertragung von D. Tiedemann vom Jahre 1781 hat nur Kuriositätswert) des *Corpus Hermeticum*, der zwischen dem 1. Jh. v. Chr. und dem 4. Jh. n. Chr. in Ägypten entstandenen Sammlung gnostischer Schriften, die dem Wundersamsten rechnen, was uns aus der kaiserzeitlichen Literatur erhalten ist. Es war schon an der Zeit, eine deutsche Übersetzung zu produzieren, nachdem solche auf Englisch, Französisch, Holländisch, Spanisch und sogar auf Japanisch während der letzten Jahrzehnte erschienen waren. Merkwürdigerweise wurde nur zwei Jahre nach dem Erscheinen von Holzhausens Übersetzung eine weitere deutsche publiziert: *Das Corpus Hermeticum einschliesslich der Fragmente des Stobaeus*, aus dem griechischen übertragen von K.-G. Eckart, hrsg. von F. Siegert, Münster 1999. (Eine lateinische Übertragung wurde seinerzeit von Cosimo de' Medici veranlasst.)

In den zwei Bänden bietet Jens Holzhausen die Übersetzung aller zur Zeit bekannten Traktate (seine Sammlung umfasst einige Texte, die in der massgeblichen Ausgabe von Nock und Festugière noch fehlen: Fragmente aus Wiener Papyri, Exzerpte aus dem Codex Clarkianus in Oxford und vor allem Schriftstücke aus dem sechsten Kodex von Nag Hammadi). Den einzelnen Traktaten und Exzerpten gehen kurze einleitende Bemerkungen voraus, und zahlreiche Anmerkungen geben Auskunft zur Grammatik und Kritik des Textes, der auf der massgeblichen Edition Nocks basiert. Ein eingehendes Register und eine Bibliographie runden den zweiten Band ab. In einem dritten Band wird Carsten Colpe die literarische und religionsgeschichtliche Problematik näher beleuchten.

Soweit es einem Nicht-Deutschen erlaubt ist, ein Urteil darüber zu fällen, scheint mir die Übersetzung gelungen, gut und dem Urtext gegenüber getreu, doch gleichzeitig

lesbar. Alles in allem handelt es sich um einen wichtigen Beitrag zur weiteren Erschliessung der Sammlung, deren Wirkungsgeschichte seit jeher bis in unsere Tage wirklich höchst beeindruckend ist.

Heikki Solin

CLAUDIUS PTOLEMAEUS: *Opera quae exstant omnia*. Vol. III 1: Ἀποτελεσματικά. Post F. Boll et Æ. Boer secundis curis edidit WOLFGANG HÜBNER. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. In aedibus B. G. Teubneri, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1998. ISBN 3-519-01746-6. lxxv, 439 p. EUR 112.

Die erste Ausgabe der Apotelesmatica erschien 1535 aus der Hand von Camerarius; sie wurde zweimal nachgedruckt. Es vergingen über 400 Jahre, bevor die nächste – und die erste kritische – Ausgabe das Licht erblickte: die im Jahre 1940 erschienene Teubneriana von Franz Boll, die von Emilie Boer zu Ende geführt und für den Druck bearbeitet wurde. Das Schicksal wollte, dass im selben Jahr noch in der Loeb-Serie die mit englischer Übersetzung versehene Edition von Robbins in die Welt kam. (Die Edition von Feraboli von 1985 kann man besser vergessen.) Nach 400 Jahren Pause zwei Ausgaben gleichzeitig. Die Teubneriana wurde nach dem Kriege zweimal mit Addenda et corrigenda nachgedruckt, so dass der Markt gut mit Ausgaben der Apotelesmatica ausgestattet ist. So ist die erste Frage, die einem in den Sinn kommt: war es notwendig, noch eine Teubneriana zu produzieren? Die Antwort ist eine unbedingt bejahende, und zwar nicht nur wegen des viel grösseren Umfangs: aus XVIII + 213 Seiten sind es LXXV + 439 geworden. Die Ausgabe von Boll und Boer war nicht vollständig und hat im Schatten des Krieges und der Nachkriegsverhältnisse zu leiden gehabt. Ausserdem hat sich neuerdings herausgestellt, dass das von Boll und Boer hergestellte Stemma gewissen Einwänden ausgesetzt ist, auf die G.B. Alberti, *Problemi di critica testuale* (1979) hingewiesen hat: ihr fünfzweigiges Stemma sollte aufgegeben werden, indem aus dem Archetyp nur zwei Familien stammten; ausserdem sollte der Kontamination eine viel grössere Rolle zugerechnet werden. Bedauerlicherweise kennt Hübner Albertis Ausführungen nicht, er hat aber eine bessere textgeschichtliche Grundlage als Boll-Boer geschaffen mit seinen drei Familien und gibt ausserdem der Kontamination viel mehr Gewicht. Wenn man noch bedenkt, dass erst Hübner alle Handschriften gewissenhaft kollationiert hat und von seinen Ergebnissen sowohl in der Einleitung als auch im Text selbst (der umfassende Apparat mitgerechnet) gebührend Rechenschaft gibt, kann seine Ausgabe als bahnbrechend bezeichnet werden. Ob sie die endgültige bleibt, wird die Zeit zeigen.

Heikki Solin

PETER RIEMER: *Das Spiel im Spiel. Studien zum plautinischen Agon in Trinummus und Rudens*. B.G. Teubner Verlag, Stuttgart – Leipzig 1996. ISBN 3-519-07624-1. 216 S. EUR 42.

Peter Riemer's book is a welcome addition to the debate on the relationship between Plautus' plays and their Greek originals. Riemer has singled out two Plautine plays for closer scrutiny, the *Trinummus* and the *Rudens*, both of which have received new titles that differ considerably from the original ones. (*Trinummus* is, of course, an adaptation of Philemon's Θησαυρός, and the original of *Rudens* is an unknown play by Diphilus; Riemer nevertheless considers it certain that the Greek title has been changed.)

After a short introduction (pp. 1-27), Riemer turns to the *Trinummus* (pp. 28-132), the *Rudens* (pp. 133-161), and, in an excursus, to Terence's *Phormio* (pp. 162-181). The results are summarized on pp. 182-187, and the rest of the book consists of a bibliography and indices.

Riemer's analysis of the *Trinummus* starts from the undoubtedly funniest scene of the play, the sycophant scene (843 ff.), to which the title alludes. Instead of meeting Lesbonicus, to whom he is to deliver a letter supposedly from Lesbonicus' father, the sycophant meets the father himself, unexpectedly returned home, and not impressed by the forgery. Riemer points out several discrepancies (e.g., despite careful coaching, the sycophant knocks on the wrong door) and other unusual elements (e.g., the deception of Lesbonicus is carefully foreshadowed, Lesbonicus' reactions are anticipated and care is taken that he will be convinced the letter is from his father even though it does not bear the correct seal, but despite all the preparation, the deception is never even attempted since it is forestalled by the return of Charmides). Riemer concludes that the sycophant is an invention of Plautus, and that in Philemon's play the deception was in fact carried out by the slave Stasimus. This would make the sycophant scene, to which the title alludes, entirely Plautine.

In the *Rudens*, Riemer finds similar grounds for considering the rope scene (906 ff.) and the character Gripus Plautine: Gripus is introduced very late in the play, he is the only major character not mentioned in the prologue or the first act, he has been out fishing even though there has been a terrible storm etc., all of which make it unlikely that the scene and character in question derive from Diphilus' play.

In the excursus, Riemer suggests that Terence has changed the title of *Phormio* because he has made extensive changes in the play itself by enlarging *Phormio*'s role; Riemer also suggests, that the protagonist of the Greek play was Geta, not *Phormio*. If this is right, it would mean that a change of title in itself indicates changes made by the Latin dramatists, and even point to exactly what has been changed: the *Trinummus* and *Rudens* as interpreted above support the claim.

Riemer's most inspiring suggestion is that, by the changes he has made, Plautus presents himself as a rival of the Greek playwrights rather than as a translator: he is competing in an *innerdramatisches Agon* with Philemon, Diphilus or Menander.

Although I concur with most of Riemer's contentions, it should be pointed out that any inconsistency in a play cannot be used as evidence of revision since we have only fragments of most of New Comedy: it is true that one would be very surprised to find the kinds of inconsistencies dealt with here in a play of Menander, but there is no

reason to suppose that Philemon and Diphilus were as scrupulous or resembled Menander more than Plautus does Terence. All in all, this is a well-researched and thought-provoking book on an endlessly fascinating topic.

Nicola Nykopp

GODO LIEBERG: *Caesars Politik in Gallien: Interpretationen zum Bellum Gallicum*. Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer, Bochum 1998. ISBN 3-8196-0564-9. 186 S. DEM 34,80.

Der Untertitel dieses kleinen Buches gibt am besten Auskunft über die Intention seines Autors. Nachdem Caesars Werk vielleicht durch seine ganze Geschichte, aber besonders in den letzten 200 Jahren unter immer wieder anderen Aspekten immer wieder neu analysiert und interpretiert wurde, kann es sich kaum um wirklich neue Interpretationen handeln. Vielmehr geht es dem Autor um die Auseinandersetzung mit einigen besonders verwurzelten, markanten Ansichten, vor allem der letzten 50 Jahre, wie schon ein Blick auf die angesichts der Forschungslage allerdings äußerst sparsame Bibliographie zeigt.

Nach einem ersten Kapitel zu grundsätzlichen Fragen, Prooem, Entstehungszeit, Titel und Darstellungsweise, geht es im zweiten und dritten Kapitel, die fast zwei Drittel des Gesamten ausmachen, um eine überwiegend philologische Analyse des ersten Buches des *Gall.* Dabei werden nacheinander die Thesen einzelner Autoren der bei Caesar geschilderten Handlung folgend und die jeweiligen Interpretationsfragen aufnehmend widerlegt, und zwar im zweiten Kapitel im Zusammenhang von Caesar und den Helvetiern (*Gall.* 1,7-28) und im dritten Caesar und Ariovist (*Gall.* 1,30-2,5). Beim Helvetierkapitel geht es Lieberg meistens um die Motivation Caesars für bestimmte Entscheidungen oder chronologische Abläufe, also v.a. historisch interessante Fragen, die zunächst von ihrer textinternen Logik und, wenn diese für das Gegenargument nicht ausreicht, mit Hilfe von antiken Parallelen, insbesondere Dio, Appian, Plutarch und auch Sueton behandelt werden. Der Ariovistpassage liegt eine eingehende inhaltliche und getrennt davon stilistische Analyse zugrunde, in der besonders die Kapitel 1,44-46 intensiv "seziert" und mit der Parallelüberlieferung so wie mit modernen Ansichten konfrontiert werden, gefolgt von der vergleichenden Stilanalyse der Passagen 1,47 mit 1,39. Abschliessend zu Caesars Gallienpolitik bemerkt Lieberg, dass man wohl kaum von "einem konsequenten Imperialismus Caesars" sprechen könnte, sondern die Ereignisse von "Konflikten genährt" wurden, "die Caesar von Fall zu Fall zu lösen hatte" (146). Das Verhältnis Caesars und der Häduer nach der Ariovistniederlage schließt nach einer wieder eher globalen Behandlung mit einigen Gedanken zu Caesars Einstellung gegenüber der Freiheit der Gallier. Lieberg scheint sich der Meinung des Tacitus in der in den Historien wiedergegebenen Rede des Cerialis Petilius an aufrührerische Gallier anzuschließen. In einem Anhang geht der Autor schließlich noch kurz auf ein textkritisches Problem in der Praefatio des 8. Buches ein und stellt die Thesen Canforas bezüglich der Autorschaft für den sog. Balbusbrief und *Gall.* 8 in Frage.

Angesichts des anspruchsvollen Titels und des geringen Umfangs des Buches fragt man sich, ob diesem Anspruch mit der sicher anregenden Analyse einiger Passagen

des ersten Buches Genüge getan wird. Man fragt sich, ob denn die übrigen Bücher des *Gall.* nicht auch zu dieser Politik Caesars in Gallien gehören, ob die Bibliographie, auch wenn nicht direkt zitiert, was im übrigen meist kritisiert heißt, doch wenigstens einige grundlegende, weiterführende Werke enthalten sollte, ob der philologische und historische Aspekt bei den einzelnen Themen wirklich genügend verknüpft sind, um eine vollständigere Interpretation zu erreichen. All diese Fragen sind sicher diskutabel. Trotz allem kann das vorliegende Buch sicher frische Anstöße zu neuen Diskussionen geben.

Uta-Maria Liertz

The Cambridge Companion to Virgil. Edited by CHARLES MARTINDALE. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1997. ISBN 0-521-49885-6 (pb). xvii, 370 pp. GBP 14.95 (pb).

The aim of this Cambridge *Companion* is to offer guidance to the readers of Virgil. Though mastering Latin is not required, one assumes – and hopes – that those who consult this book have some knowledge of Virgil in translation, or, at least, a basic idea of his poetry and the world where it was composed. The contributions are hardly recommendable for absolute beginners. The themes discussed in the individual essays are very wide-ranging, with special emphasis put on Virgil's singular heritage (translations, receptions in antiquity and later, reflections in art, literature and politics, etc.), the literary genres in which he wrote (pastoral poetry, *Georgics*, epic, together constituting a paradigm of a "poetic career"), contextualisation of Virgil's work (with an important essay on intertextuality in Ch. 3), and various issues concerning form and contents (characterisations, narrative techniques, stylistic questions, etc.). Generally, this is not a collection of unanimous views about Virgil and his poetry, but a ramified series of both traditional and innovative perspectives that are often in disagreement with each other. (This, of course, is not to say that traditional discussion implies lack of freshness.) Diversity may be a good approach, for at best it makes the reader understand that there are as numerous ways of responding to Virgil now as there were in antiquity.

The introductory chapter (1) on 'the classic of all Europe' by the editor of the volume is followed by twenty-two essays (written by seventeen scholars) which are divided into four main sections: Part 1: Translation and reception. (2) C. Burrow, Virgil in English Translation; (3) D.F. Kennedy, Modern Receptions and Their Interpretative Implications; (4) R.J. Tarrant, Aspects of Virgil's Reception in Antiquity; (5) D. Fowler, The Virgil Commentary of Servius; (6) C. Burrow, Virgils, from Dante to Milton; (7) M.J.H. Liversidge, Virgil in Art. – Part 2: Genre and poetic career. (8) C. Martindale, Green Politics: the *Eclogues*; (9) W. Batstone, Virgilian Didaxis: Value and Meaning in the *Georgics*; (10) D.F. Kennedy, Virgilian Epic; (11) E. Theodorakopoulos, Closure: the Book of Virgil. – Part 3: Contexts of production. (12) R.J. Tarrant, Poetry and Power: Virgil's Poetry in Contemporary Context; (13) J.E.G. Zetzel, Rome and Its Traditions; (14) S. Morton Braund, Virgil and the Cosmos: Religious and Philosophical Ideas; (15) J. Farrell, The Virgilian Intertext. – Part 4: Contents and forms. (16) J.J. O'Hara, Virgil's

Style; (17a) D. Fowler, Virgilian Narrative: Story-Telling; (17b) A. Barchiesi, Virgilian Narrative: Ecphrasis; (18) A. Laird, Approaching Characterisation in Virgil; (19) E. Oliensis, Sons and Lovers: Sexuality and Gender in Virgil's Poetry; (20) P. Hardie, Virgil and Tragedy; (21) F. Cox, Envoi: The Death of Virgil.

Mika Kajava

HORATIUS: *Opera*. Editio quarta. Edidit D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. In aedibus K. G. Saur, Monachii et Lipsiae 2001. ISBN 3-598-71234-0. x, 372 p. EUR 29.

Shackleton Baileys zum ersten Mal 1985 erschienene Stuttgarter Horaz ist jetzt bis zur vierten Auflage gekommen, hat also nach der Wende in buchhändlerischer Hinsicht ihre Leipziger Rivalin von Borzsák in den Schatten gestellt. Und zwar zurecht. Freilich gilt Horaz seit jeher als ein besonders schlecht geeignetes Objekt für Konjekturekritik, deren vollblütiger Vertreter Sh. B. ist, aber Borzsák wiederum hat mit seiner extrem konservativen Haltung dem Horaztext eher geschadet. Und jedenfalls zeigt der Vergleich der zwei Ausgaben, dass eine kritische Neubewertung des Horaztextes nötig ist. Diese Umwertung gilt auch für unsere Einstellung zu Bentley's Einsatz am Horaztext. Und gerade in dieser Hinsicht ist Sh. B's Ausgabe wichtig, indem sie zeigt, dass der Pendel wieder in die Bentleyische Richtung schwingt. – Im vorliegenden Abdruck sind einige Druckfehler ausgemerzt worden. Sonst bemerke ich nur, dass Sh. B. neue von Borzsák ans Licht gezogene Lesarten der hsl Tradition nicht der Erwähnung wert hält, so findet sich keine Notiz von der von Borzsák in einer Handschrift in Queen's College, Oxford gefundenen neuen Lesart *tunsa* in der Drususode 4, 4, 57, die m. E. vorzuziehen wäre. – Eine Unstimmigkeit ist in dem neuen Abdruck geblieben: auf S. X liest man die veraltete Angabe "vide quae in *HSCP* 89 (1985) prolaturus sum".

Heikki Solin

TACITUS: *Dialogus de oratoribus*. Edited by ROLAND MAYER. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2001. ISBN 0-521-46996-1 (pb). ix, 227 pp. GBP 15.95.

This is a welcome introduction and commentary on the least studied Tacitean writing, the *Dialogus de oratoribus*. The introductory part contains a concise presentation of the relevant issues (Tacitus' career, the cultural discussion about oratory that lies behind the *Dialogus*, the lay-out of the work and its date). As regards the date, Mayer argues convincingly for a late composition (the early first decade of the second century), the work being thus posterior to the *Agricola* and *Germania*. (I personally remember having been taught that the *Dialogus* is Tacitus' earliest surviving work.) I am not quite sure if this volume is addressed to students and scholars alike. A student would probably at times expect more rudimentary explanations, while a scholar may find the comments unsatisfactory for other reasons (e.g., sometimes a little bit too brief and not very deep).

For instance, since there is no apparatus criticus (obviously according to the rules of the series) one might profit from more detailed arguments on textual matters in the commentary. Many times I fail to see the reason for various additions or deletions.

Jaakko Aronen

JUVENAL: *Satires. Book I*. Edited by SUSANNA MORTON BRAUND. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1996. ISBN 0-521-35667-9 (pb), 0-521-35566-4 (hb). viii, 323 pp. GBP 14.95 / USD 22.95 (pb), GBP 40 / USD 64.95 (hb).

"I suppose that anyone who has worked on Juvenal for a decade or more must be rather odd. Whether this is cause or effect, I cannot say. But it seems to me that immersion in *indignatio* is not necessarily good for the soul, even if it sharpens the tongue...". Thus Morton Braund writes in her Preface. However it may be with the destiny of the soul, a sharp tongue may be profitable if reasonably used. If it also implies sharp reasoning, it is one of the characteristics of this book.

This new commentary provides an integrated reading of Book I which comprises *Satires* 1-5 (written in the second decade of the second century A.D.). Many recurrent themes within these poems suggest that Juvenal wrote Book I as an organic whole. In particular, one may note the following: Rome (providing both setting and subject for Book I), the degradation of the patron-client relationship, corruption at the core of Roman society, escaping from the city, the invasion of foreigners and immigrants, the power of food in Roman society. Juvenal's treatment of such topics is characterised by strong indignation. *Indignatio* is indeed typical of Juvenal's early satires, but instead of regarding him as an angry champion of morality, Morton Braund and some others have observed that Juvenal's choice of anger as his mode was closely connected with the epic and rhetoric tradition. This means that he wrote in 'the grand style', an old expression used of Juvenal's work, and alertly revived by Morton Braund.

All recent editions of Juvenal's text (Knoche 1950, Clausen 1959 [rev. 1992], Courtney 1984, Martyn 1987) are much dependent on Housman's masterly edition from 1905 (1931²). In fact, since then few significant differences have appeared except in punctuation. Morton Braund bases her own text upon Clausen's *OCT* (1959, rev. 1992) with only a few departures (listed on p. 40 ff.); these mostly concern breaks, paragraphs, punctuation, spelling, etc.

The commentaries are well-balanced and easy to consult. Particular emphasis is put on Roman thought and culture as well as literary, linguistic and stylistic matters. These are illuminated by references to Juvenal's own work, to other Roman satirists and to post-Augustan literature in general. What is especially pleasing is that the book may be recommended not only to established scholars of Roman literature but also to students reading Juvenal. The needs of the latter have been considered throughout the book, which provides many handy introductions to, and succinct surveys of, various aspects of Juvenal's poetry and the genre of Roman verse satire. The commentary on each poem is followed by a brief interpretative essay that gives a synthesis of the *Satire's* argument,

structure and significance, and also guides the reader through modern scholarship. As a practised lecturer on Juvenal, Morton Braund knows what to offer to her audience: focussing on the essential, and omitting overloaded commentaries, she provides many mature discussions relevant to the understanding of Juvenal's work.

Mika Kajava

ANTHONY R. BIRLEY: *Onomasticon to the Younger Pliny. Letters and Panegyric*. K. G. Saur Verlag, München – Leipzig 2000. ISBN 3-598-73001-2. xi, 111 pp. DEM 128.

As Birley says in his Preface, this onomasticon was commissioned "in the hope that it might supply for the younger Pliny something comparable to those for Cicero by D.R. Shackleton Bailey" (viii). The idea of producing full onomastic indices to prosopographically rich authors is indeed highly welcome. The work of a writer like the Younger Pliny is so imbued with names, persons and identities that a normal reader would inevitably be lost without a competent guide. What is clear is that Birley's *Onomasticon* provides a necessary substitute for the list of persons included in A.N. Sherwin-White's commentary to the *Letters* of Pliny (1966).

The *Onomasticon* itself is preceded by four introductory chapters on (1) Pliny's family, (2) career, (3) correspondents, and (4) his practice in naming Romans. The first chapter recapitulates what we know about Pliny's family. The question of the number of Pliny's marriages is wisely left open, though, as Birley admits, there is evidence which may suggest that Pliny was married twice altogether (2 f.). As for Ch. 2, one may note the detailed discussion of the date of Pliny's praetorship, traditionally put at A.D. 93; Birley dates, with good grounds, this office to A.D. 89/90 (pp. 10 ff.). He also plausibly argues that Pliny became prefect of the military aerarium only after Domitian's 'terror' phase (14 ff.). Ch. 4, especially pertinent to the scope of the book, catalogues the various onomastic styles used by Pliny (the most popular one being the combination of gentile name and cognomen) and discusses the reasons for their choice (archaism, onomastic traditions, omission of very widespread elements, official forms, 'aristocratic' forms). As a rule, perspicuity and practicality counted most. As an interesting parallel to the naming practice in Pliny, Birley also gives a brief account of the use of personal names in the Vindolanda tablets from northern England and in Fronto's *Letters* (32 ff.).

Birley's work is not a simple list of names but a rich collection of entries with all the necessary information on the persons' identity and origin (known or assumed), and the (relevant) family connections. The entries are not loaded with unnecessary prosopographical details and references, however, but provide a balanced selection of evidence which is likely to match the needs of most readers. In prosopographical and other discussions, Birley often – and justly – differs with the views of Sherwin-White, much more rarely with Ronald Syme (to whose work he is much indebted), or others. Whatever the primary or secondary sources, they are always treated with sound critique and witty argument.

As may be expected from a full onomasticon, not only persons are listed but also the names of deities; a separate index is devoted to the geographical names. As for the

'Miscellaneous' items at the end of the book, some of them might have been included in the preceding indices. The vast majority of the almost 500 entries included in the first index (Persons and Deities) are names of persons (historical or living, including a number of emperors, poets, variously famous persons, etc.). Those persons who are not named but are clearly identifiable have also been given entries, with their names in brackets, e. g., Pliny's mother (Plinia) and his natural father (L. Caecilius Secundus). The geographical index shows 165 entries (with many subentries), many of them referring to places relevant to Pliny's career (Bithynia/Pontus, Syria), or to his origins and the places where he had landed property (Northern Italy, Umbria), though many other regions are also represented.

There is very little to be criticised in this book. For some observations, and suggestions, see my on-line review in *BMCR* (2001.07.13). What we have here is a well-documented book, written in plain style and easy to consult. Birley's work will not only provide an indispensable tool for anyone reading or studying the Younger Pliny, but also a new, handy companion to Roman onomastic studies. Those interested in the history and prosopography of the Flavian and Trajanic periods in general are likely to find it equally profitable.

Mika Kajava

JÖRG RÜPKE: *Die Religion der Römer. Eine Einführung*. Verlag C. H. Beck, München 2001. ISBN 3-406-47175-7. 264 S. mit 23 Abb. im Text. DEM 39,80 / EUR 19,90.

In dem vorliegenden Band will J. Rüpke eine neue Einführung in die römische Religion als Religion, nicht als Ansammlung von Mythen und / oder Handlungen geben. Schon ein Blick auf das Inhaltsverzeichnis zeigt, dass es sich nicht um die übliche Struktur von "Religionsgeschichte" handelt. Rüpke teilt seine zwölf Kapitel nach einer allgemeinen Einleitung und dem in klarem Zusammenhang mit dem letzten Kapitel etwas provokativen Titel "von der Wölfin zu Caesar: historische Grundlagen" in drei Blöcke ein: Im ersten unter der Überschrift "Strukturen" geht es um Götter und Menschen, religiöses Handeln und religionsphilosophische Fragen. Hierbei wird das Thema unter einem theologisch-philosophischem Aspekt gleichermaßen eingekreist. Nicht nur Rüpkes eher unkonventionelle Behandlung des Götterbegriffes philosophischer Schulen und des "gemeinen Mannes", auch Vergleiche wie "Aussagen über Götter sind Aussagen über Defizite von Menschen" bei Statuen oder Magistrate und Götter im römischen "Wirken versus Sein" geben zu denken. Interessant sind auch die Bemerkungen zur Rolle beziehungsweise "Nicht-Rolle" von Theologie, was am Beispiel des "Freizeitphilosophen" Cicero im Gegensatz zum christlich geprägten Theologiebegriff deutlich gemacht wird: Kulturausübung und Reflexion stehen in keiner lehrenden-lernenden Beziehung. Ciceros theoretisch-kritische Reflexion steht für ihn in keinem Widerspruch zu seiner Divination als Augur.

Der zweite Block "Leistungen" umfaßt soziale Ordnungen, Gelübde und Flüche – "Entstören und bewußtes Stören" – sowie räumliche und zeitlich-kalendarische Perspektiven unter den Titeln "Orientierung" und "Koordinierung". Als Hauptthesen Rüpkes

kristallisieren sich zwei heraus: nämlich die Dominanz der Führungsschicht, die sich darin äussert, daß ihre "Privatreligion" als Staatsreligion angesehen wird und die die sakrale Landschaft in Folge von Konkurrenz um Ruhm bestimmt. Als zweites Ergebnis wird die Konkretetheit des anthropomorphen Götterbegriffs verdeutlicht, etwa in den Konsequenzen, die das Eigentum der Götter – räumlich in Tempelbezirke aber auch zeitlich in *feriae* und in räumlich-zeitlicher Kombination etwa bei Prozessionen – mit sich bringt.

Im dritten Block "Soziale Realität", der sich mit Großstadtreligion, mit religiöser "Arbeitsteilung" beschäftigt, wechselt die Perspektive. Aus der Sicht des Individuums stehen nun die Wahlmöglichkeiten des Einzelnen, die Rolle von Kultvereinen, und konkrete Fragen wie Kultmahl, Raumorganisation und die mit Religion verbundenen Berufe und Spezialisierungen im Vordergrund. Das Buch endet wie in einem Rundumschlag bei "Von Caesar zum Lamm: historische Perspektiven". Hier wird die bei fortschreitender Lektüre sich stellende Frage, was denn mit der Kaiserzeit und seiner Religion passiere, mit einem begründeten "nicht viel neues" beantwortet. Unter Rückgriff auf verschiedene Modelle u.a. aus der Sozialwissenschaft rückt Rüpke das eigentlich Neue des Christentums in ein adäquateres Licht und zeigt gleichzeitig frische Ansätze zur Bewältigung der großen Komplexität im römischen Reich auf.

Es schließen sich eine Bibliographie sowie ein umfassendes Register an. Daß es sich tatsächlich um eine Einführung handelt, zeigt schon das Fehlen von Anmerkungen, einschlägige Literatur findet sich der Buchstruktur folgend in der Bibliographie am Ende. Dies beeinträchtigt jedoch in keiner Weise eine ernsthafte Lektüre mit wissenschaftlichem Anspruch. Denn andererseits stellt die Struktur des Buches hohe Anforderungen an ein Grundwissen über die römische Geschichte und ihre Methoden. Außer der Souveränität und Eigenständigkeit, mit der Rüpke die verschiedenen Inhalte einschließlich divergierender Thesen bearbeitet – als Beispiel sei verwiesen auf seine prägnante Behandlung von Ritualen und die Auseinandersetzung mit den Ansichten W. Burkerts (S. 87ff.) –, gibt dem Buch die organische Verknüpfung der Methoden und Denkweisen der Altertumswissenschaften mit denen der modernen Religionswissenschaft einen besonderen Reiz. Es bietet viele neue Anstöße und Perspektiven für die Auseinandersetzung mit der römischen Religion.

Uta-Maria Liertz

JAMES H. DEE: *A Lexicon of Latin Derivatives in Italian, Spanish, French, and English. Volume I: Introduction and Lexicon; Volume II: Indices.* Alpha-Omega, Reihe A, CXC.1-2. Olms-Weidmann, Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 1997. ISBN 3-487-10558-6; 3-487-10559-4. xlvii, 585 pp.; vii, 498 pp. EUR 258.

The scope of of this two-volume work is "to present, in a plain multiple-column format, a broad selection of the etymologically connected families of derivatives from Classical Latin bases that are found in Italian, Spanish, French, and English" (XI). The first volume comprises the Lexicon proper, preceded by an introduction. The second volume consists of an alphabetical index of all words according to the language (Latin, Italian, Spanish, French, English).

This bulky work might be of some use for students of Romance languages and of English. But it is good to bear in mind that it is not a Meyer-Lübke, which considers only those inherited words that show a continuing existence and evolution through the late classical and medieval periods, labelling any later borrowing a *Buchwort* or omitting it altogether, whereas Dee also takes into account these later developments. Thus, it can serve as a sort of supplement to Meyer-Lübke, but its scholarly value does not seem to be considerable.

I have no desire to go into details here. Sometimes I have wondered about the criteria of the selection of the words to be treated. To take one example of the proper names just from the first page, the town name *Abella* has an own entry (why? because of *Abellana nux?*), whereas many other much more important towns have not found their way into the *Lexicon*, e.g., some place-names of the neighbourhood like *Abellinum*, *Nola*, *Salernum*; not even *Neapolis* has succeeded in catching the attention of the author, in spite of Naples' multifarious importance also in vocabulary.

Heikki Solin

ROLAND HOFFMANN: *Lateinische Verbalperiphrasen vom Typ amans sum und amatus fui. Valenz und Grammatikalisierung (Primäres Textkorpus: Ovid)*. Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XXI, Linguistik; Bd. 175. Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main 1997. ISBN 3-631-49473-4. xvi, 465 S. CHF 95.

Based on his dissertation in 1994, this book by Roland Hoffmann examines thoroughly the difficult problem of a certain type of verbal periphrasing in Latin, i.e., the types *amans sum* (PPA) and *amatus fui* (PPP). The aim of this research is twofold: First, to find means to keep verbal periphrases separate from adjectival participles and secondly, to use the method to show that verbal periphrasing was a grammaticalized device even in classical Latin. This contrasts strongly with views adopted by earlier scholars, notably Sten Eklund.

The book is divided into four parts. The first section introduces the problem of defining verbal periphrases and adjective + copula constructions. To argue for the existence of the periphrasis, one should be able to tell whether a syntagm participle + *esse* functions as a verbal form, or whether it is to be seen as simply the copula combined with an adjectival participle. Earlier research has approached the question from a morphological (e.g., comparative formation) and contextual (e.g., co-ordination with an adjective) viewpoint. Hoffmann considers these approaches inadequate. For him, the solution lies in valency analysis, originally developed by Lucien Tesnière, and adapted for Latin mainly by Heinz Happ (*Grundfragen einer Dependenz-Grammatik des Lateinischen*, Göttingen 1976). Hoffmann stresses that a sharp dichotomy between periphrases and adjectival constructions is not necessary and perhaps not even possible. This unclear state of affairs already emerges from the original definition problem and suggests that the shift from periphrases to adjectival constructions is gradual.

In short, the decision whether a participle is of verbal or adjectival nature is made by examining the valency status of the compound and by comparing it to the valency of synthetic forms of the same verb. The working hypothesis is that adjectivization results

in changes of the valency structure. With this method one should be able to answer the question, whether the participle + *esse* construction forms a grammaticalized functional unity and, therefore, belongs to the same paradigm as the simple verb. A simple example of valency difference is that of the genitive case (instead of the accusative) with frequently used participles, e.g., *amans* and *metuens*. It should be noted, however, that for Hoffmann the mere change from the accusative to the genitive is not an adequate criterion to take the participle as an adjective.

The second part, devoted to the description and evaluation of the chosen method, begins with a short introduction to the theoretical framework, which is helpful to a reader not acquainted with this syntactical theory. The basic idea is to regard the verb as a central node in the clause, on which all other elements are, in one way or another, dependent. In this, the valency analysis has much in common with Functional Grammar, the latter however making semantics a more prominent part of the discussion. By using a distinct method, Hoffmann wants to avoid making conclusions intuitively, as has sometimes been the case in earlier studies. A series of important issues is discussed, including grammaticalization and different realizations of the function agent. The most important point Hoffmann makes concerning agenthood is that the agent can be implicit, inferrable from the immediate or more general context. To put it in other words, the agent can be present in the argument structure although it is not visible on the surface level as an actual word. Here he takes a position quite different from that of Elseline Vester. Also other arguments, e.g. objects, can be left out elliptically, which is the so-called absolute use. Here semantic and pragmatic factors occupy a prevalent place. This discussion is relevant for the valency analysis in the next chapter.

The third part puts the theory into action. Hoffmann analyzes all instances of both (PPA and PPP) types in the Ovidian corpus (chosen because of suitable time period and adequate, but not too large, size of corpus). The syntactic contexts are recorded and the valency status of each participle determined. After that, the argument structure with normal forms of each verb is stated, including close parallels whenever possible. If the valencies are equal, the decision is in favour of the periphrasis. If not, then there is probably an adjectival use at hand.

Hoffmann finds 23 certain PPA-periphrases (of 66 instances) and 95 PPP-periphrases (of 122 instances). In a handful of cases, the judgment is left open, which was only to be expected on the basis of the author's initial remarks about a continuum. In these instances (usually monovalent present participles and comparatives), the author acknowledges that the method is not an adequate tool. In quite a few cases, additional semantic criteria are used to corroborate the valency analysis. Often it seems to be the case, as the author himself notes, that frequent use correlates with adjectival status. The valency analysis, however, does seem to be a suitable method to solve this problem, even if additional criteria are sometimes needed.

Because the existence of the PPA-type as a grammaticalized syntagm has been thought to be especially doubtful, the fourth part consists of comparative data concerning PPA-periphrasis, from Plautus, Cicero and Vitruvius. Hoffmann offers some interesting observations regarding the sociolinguistic status of this type. Apparently, it was not a colloquialism but rather a technical expression. For example, Cicero favours it more in his philosophical and rhetorical treatises than in the orations or letters.

In general, this work is an ambitious attempt to solve a difficult definition problem and the results are, for the most part, convincing. Although marginal when compared to normal verb forms, the periphrastic usage does indeed seem to form a part of the Latin morphosyntactical apparatus. This applies particularly to the PPP-type. The PPA-type, on the other hand, continues to raise more problems. Hoffmann claims that the relative infrequency of the construction does not prevent considering it a grammaticalized pattern because other established verb forms, like future imperative and future perfect are, likewise, relatively infrequent. Still, further arguments would be needed to make this conclusion plausible.

The bibliography is comprehensive as is the detailed general index. More discussion about the function and motivation of periphrasing in Latin would, of course, have been interesting but that, understandably, does not belong to the scope of this work.

Hilla Salovaara

XI Congresso Internazionale di Epigrafia Greca e Latina, Roma, 18-24 settembre 1997. Atti I-II. Edizioni Quasar, Roma 1999. ISBN 88-7140-152-2. 889, 797 pp. ITL 390.000.

The *Atti* of the Epigraphic Congress held in Rome in September 1997 have been published with remarkable speed, as the two volumes came out exactly two years after the congress. No editor is mentioned on the front page, but from the Prefazione in vol. I, p. 11, one learns that the editorial work was done by Dr. S. Evangelisti and Dr. L. Galli with the help of Dr. M. G. Macciocca, Dr. D. Nonnis and Dr. E. Zappata, "sotto la guida di scrive" (it seems a 'chi' must be added); there is no signature under the Prefazione but I think that one cannot be too wrong if one suspects that this means Professor Silvio Panciera. In any case, clearly we have here an instance of team work at its best.

Vol. I starts with a section containing, besides other introductory items, the programme of the congress, a list of papers presented at the congress but not published in the *Atti* (in some cases some other publication is mentioned), a list of the participants with their addresses (which have for no obvious reason been modified; certainly my professional address is not given in the form it was communicated to the editors). This is followed by speeches held at the opening and closure of the congress, including M. Mayer's invitation to the participants to the next congress in Barcelona in 2002.

The papers themselves are presented in eight sections ("parti") beginning with section II, the last three of them in vol. II. The arrangement of papers into sections follows pretty much the lines of previous congresses. Sections II and III deal with Greek epigraphy (II with inscriptions down to the end of the 5th century, III with Hellenistic epigraphy); sections IV and V are consecrated to Latin epigraphy, IV to the more conventional texts, V to those "in scrittura usuale", this referring to inscriptions using "normal" writing as contrasted with "lapidary" writing (here we find papers on the Vindolanda Tablets, etc.). Section VI is on "Varia", a fairly varied collection indeed. Sections VII, VIII and IX all deal with both Greek and Latin inscriptions; section VII is on the period between Augustus and the Antonines, VIII on the period between the Severans and Constantine, and IX on Late Antiquity after Constantine. Perhaps the

organization into sections covering certain periods is not an ideal one; this organization into sections seems to exclude papers dealing with topics demanding a broader vision; for instance, it would be hard to incorporate into this scheme papers on (say) the development of the epigraphy of a certain area or that of certain linguistic features. Of course there is the section "Varia", but this seems to be devoted to observations on details rather than to papers of a more ambitious scope.

Normally, when congresses are arranged, some speakers, usually persons of some scholarly reputation, are invited to present papers on topics suggested by the organizers; on the other hand, other speakers who feel they have something to say, or must say something in order to have their travel costs covered by their universities, step forward themselves. As a result, it is a normal feature of congresses that there are, in addition to important papers by well-known scholars of interest to all or most of the participants, papers which seem to be dealing with questions of a more limited scope and interest. Of course I have nothing against this but must at the same time point out that since all speakers have the right to have their papers published in the *Acta*, this produces massive and expensive volumes which to some may seem monuments celebrating congresses rather than books serving definite purposes such as normal monographs or even *Acta* of colloquia with specific themes. There are 1686 pages in these volumes and to tell the truth, I do not feel I have the strength – and the need – to read them all. Moreover, I am not sure having a copy at home would be worth the money I would have to spend on this. On the other hand, epigraphical congresses should be attended by as many scholars as possible, and of course it is good to have all, or at least most of, the papers which were delivered actually published in the *Acti*.

But in any case there are certainly some marvellous things to be found here. The papers on more general subjects by the (assumed) invited speakers, apparently distinguishable from the others by the fact that at least in vol. I there is an empty space between these and the rest in the 'Contents' section, all seem to me to be of very great interest (although I would like to single out A. Mastino's and his collaborators' paper on 'I Severi nel Nord-Africa' in vol. II, p. 359-417 as a particularly well-researched and useful piece). But there is also much of interest in those papers which deal with more specific subjects; for instance, a new inscription from Hierapolis in honour of the later emperor Pius as proconsul of Asia is presented by T. Ritti in vol. II p. 291ff. I also read with much profit, e.g., the paper by F. Nasti on *CIL X 3732* (vol. II p. 533ff.).

At the end of vol. II, there is an index of contributors and a detailed 46-page index of "luoghi e cose notevoli". This index, the genesis of which is explained in the Prefazione, p. 11, will be of great service to scholars. The editorial work also seems impeccable. (But in vol. I, p. 452, line 3, a Spanish 'y' seems to have been converted into an Italian 'e'; *ibid.* 553, line 3, someone must have changed the author's expression 'extinction' into 'distinction', meaningless in the context; and was there really no one who would have had the courage to rise against *Chersonesus* being used as a masculine, vol. II p. 213ff., this use already appearing in the *Preatti*?). So as a result we have two magnificent and useful volumes dealing with a wonderful variety of epigraphical topics. This variety may perhaps not be to the taste of all, but certainly it reflects the fact that the term "epigraphy" covers a vast field indeed.

Olli Salomies

Inscriptiones Graecae Epiri, Macedoniae, Thraciae, Scythiae consilio et auctoritate Academiae scientiarum Berolinensis et Brandenburgensis editae (IG X). Pars II: Inscriptiones Macedoniae. Fasciculus II: Inscriptiones Macedoniae septentrionalis. Sectio prima: Inscriptiones Lyncestidis, Heracleae, Pelagoniae, Derriopi, Lychnidi. Ediderunt FANULA PAPAZOGLU, MILENA MILIN, MARIJANA RICL adiuvante KLAUS HALLOF. Gualterus de Gruyter et socii, Berolini – Novi Eboraci 1999. EUR 298.

It is with great pleasure and satisfaction one observes this new volume having been added to the *Inscriptiones Graecae*. This is, after the volume on Thessalonica published in 1972, the second fascicle of the series covering Macedonia (*IG X 2*). Originally, this fascicle was meant to cover all of that part of Macedonia which is included in (former) Yugoslavia, but (as one learns from the Preface, p. V) in 1995 it was decided that the eastern parts of this area (including, e.g., the important city of Stobi) would be dealt with in a later fascicle. One hopes that this will materialize as soon as possible for many reasons, but especially because the appearance of this fascicle would mean that practically all of ancient Macedonia north of modern Greece would be covered by epigraphical corpora, Macedonian Former Yugoslavia by *IG* and the smallish Macedonian sector around Sandanski in modern Bulgaria by *IGBulg* (vol. IV with addenda in V).

Covering the western parts of N. Macedonia, this volume deals with the regions of Lyncestis (with the city of Heraclea), Pelagonia and Derriopus (with Styberra) and with the city of Lychnidus and its territory. The inscriptions of Styberra are included in the section on Derriopus, whereas Heraclea, no doubt because of the large number of inscriptions, has a section of its own. As for the definition of 'Macedonia', the authors do not really explain themselves on this detail, but apparently they regard whatever was included in the Roman province of the same name as belonging to Macedonia; however, there seems to be some trouble about the Macedonian identity of Lychnidus (see p. 175; and note that on the map, it is placed not in Macedonia but in Illyricum), although it is true that the city certainly belonged to the Roman province. Well, I am certainly glad to see that Lychnidus is included here and is not being reserved for a hypothetical future volume on Illyricum, but at the same time I cannot help thinking that perhaps it would not always be a good idea to identify the Roman province with 'Macedonia', for the province included regions which one should keep apart from Macedonia 'proper' (for instance, a good case can be made for including Samothrace within the limits of the province).

As one could expect, the accent is very heavily on the Roman period. There are altogether 411 inscriptions; as far as I can see, only 10 of them – 2.4 per cent – can be dated to the Hellenistic period. (The number of Christian inscriptions also seems to be 10.) The largest section is that on Pelagonia with 142 texts, but if one combines the sections on Heraclea (107 texts) with that on the other parts of the Lyncestis (50), one arrives at the slightly larger number of 157. It is a bit surprising that the corpus of Styberra, a well-known city in epigraphical circles, consists of only 29 texts, but it must be admitted that the texts are in general of great interest.

There is a great number of inedita (e.g., the emperor Decius in no. 363, Aurelian in no. 70; of other interesting inedita note, e.g., no. 17 with the formulation ἐκ τῆς

Ἄνεικήτου τεμῆς the meaning of which still offers material for further thoughts; no. 308, an 'agonistic' inscription mentioning games in Heraclea, Beroea, Neapolis τῆς Ἰταλίας and, interestingly, ἐν Ἴσθμῳ τῆς Ἑλλάδος). But this volume is most useful because it collects, and comments upon in a language understood by the majority of *savants*, a great number of inscriptions previously published, but published in not very accessible Yugoslav journals, especially in the 1930s and 1940s volumes of the *Spomenik* of the Serbian Academy, a journal in which Serbian is used. Among these texts, I may mention an inscription in honour of Gallienus (no. 173) and one set up by Iulius Pacatianus, an equestrian in the service of Severus and Caracalla (no. 264). But also in the case of familiar texts, it is good to find them in a definitive publication of high standards; for instance, one now finds that the praenomen of the proconsul Pontius Verus in no. 71 is not *Aulus* but *Lucius*, which is useful (and already taken into consideration in *PIR*² P 829), and that his wife is a Fonteia, not a Pontia (a detail which will have to be corrected in *PIR*² M 165). Also, one is happy to be reminded of the existence of such attractive texts as no. 371 (previously available as *AE* 1971, 305), honouring Aurelius Crates, the ἐνδοξότατος ἐπὶ παιδείᾳ σχολαστικός from Lychnidus, οὗ καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνδριάντα ἀνεστάκασιν ἐν Ἀκροπόλει, this addition making a detailed assessment of the level of the man's παιδεία superfluous.

As the material has now been collected, one can make observations of a more general nature, e.g., on the language used in the inscriptions; the great majority are, of course, in Greek, but there are also quite a few Latin texts, often referring to soldiers (nos. 38, 47, 54, 67, 77, 79-82, etc.); there are also bilingual inscriptions (no. 45, 309; cf. 76 and 78, inscriptions using both Greek and Latin letters). To mention another detail, one can observe a striking stylistic phenomenon in many of the funerary texts, namely name(s) in the nominative being followed by names not in the expected dative but in the genitive (e.g., 179, 225, 240, 273, 305). Reading the whole, and concentrating on personal names, one also gets a very good picture of the level of romanization in this area; in addition to Roman names of Roman citizens (note a Philo son of Philo becoming M. Vettius Philo in the middle of the first century, no. 324 adn.), one finds a great variety of Roman names used as single names by the locals (*Appius*, *Celer*, *Gaius*, *Helvius*, *Peticus*, etc.; note also [Λ]υσίμαχος ὁ καὶ Κάτων no. 44).

The level of scholarship is generally high (note e.g., the curt, but justified, dismissal of a wrong theory in the note on no. 82, line 3), and the whole leaves an impression of quality and solidity. There is just one detail I am not altogether satisfied with, namely the accentuation of Roman nomina of the type Μηούιος Σηούιος Φλαούιος, for *Mevius* (no. 75) *Sevius* (no. 75, 355) *Flavius*. These names are accentuated as above in this volume, but this is in my opinion incorrect, as the *ou* in these cases represents a consonant (often represented by β), not a vowel, and as it does not seem a good idea to accentuate the same name in two ways (Φλαούιος ≈ Φλάβιος); the correct accentuation cannot, then, be anything but Φλάουιος.

At this point, I shall make an observation or two on some of the inscriptions. No. 7: *Receptus* is not altogether unknown in Macedonia (see *I. Beroea* 142). – No. 15: for some parallels for the abbreviation of Roman praenomina used as single names (Γ(άιος) Θάλλου, as in this text), see my *Die römischen Vornamen* (1987) 147 (where this inscription is also cited). – No. 20 (Ἄδυμος Ποντίου): "nomen gentile loco patronymici"

does not seem to be an adequate description of the simple fact that the man was a son of a man called Pontius. – No. 53: for *Paulus* ("de Παύλου nomine dubitavit Papazoglu") cf. the parallels in *Vornamen* 321. As for *Caelidius*, it is said in the commentary that the name is found in Scupi, but there is in fact another instance in this corpus (no. 101), and one could have added that the man in Scupi (*IMS* VI 62; the woman in 97 is no doubt connected) in fact comes from Stobi, this taking us back to Macedonia. – No. 71: what is said in the commentary on the origins (probably from Africa) and the distribution (later mainly in Thessalonica) of the *gens Pontia* does not quite match the facts. – No. 73: Marius Claudius Pulcher has an interesting name. – No. 75: there is no need to correct the transmitted ΜΑΡΚΟΣ to Μάσκλος (line 9), as there is nothing wrong about the praenomen *Marcus* being used as a cognomen (cf. M. Stertinius Quintus in 88). – No. 111: the natural interpretation of *Ter.* is that one is dealing with the tribe. – 124: the proposed date (2nd cent.) seems too early (this is perhaps a mistake). – No. 161: [Κ]άσσανδρος [Κ]ασσίας makes one think about the origin of the names of the Cassii and the Cassiani in Macedonia. – No. 166: for the ῥοδοφόρια cf. now R. MacMullen, *Romanization in the Time of Augustus* (2000) 26f. – No. 218: one wonders about "F. Altheim miles" who made a copy of the text in 1917. Could this be a man of the same name who later turned to Classical Studies with some success? – No. 300: I think that the conclusion that Bolanus was proconsul of Macedonia is inevitable. – No. 320: it is certainly not only W. Eck who thinks that τὸ β' preceded by the names of the consuls of 209 is an error, for it is absolutely certain from all other sources that this is the first consulate of both consuls (note that τὸ β' cannot refer to only the latter consul, but must have been meant to refer to both of them).

The indexes (also taking into account the praenomina) are of a very solid quality. The only thing I miss here is ὀψώνιον in no. 369 (in [π]ρεσβεύσαντα ... ἀκντ' ὀψωνίο[v]) in the Index verborum (p. 246). The whole is written in a fluent and readable Latin. I am only a bit unhappy about the use of *quoque* where one should use *etiam* (e.g., 67, 75, 367). Moreover, I am wondering about the use of *arridere* for *placere* or something on these lines (e.g., 112, 307), that is, in a context in which it is not at all suitable. Who or what could be behind this? Be that as it may, this is a very fine and useful book.

Olli Salomies

Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten. Hrsg. von R. MERKELBACH und J. STAUBER). Band 2: *Die Nordküste Kleinasiens (Marmarameer und Pontos).* K. G. Saur Verlag, München – Leipzig 2001. ISBN 3-598-77447-8. 399 S. EUR 110.

Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten. Hrsg. von R. MERKELBACH und J. STAUBER). Band 3: *Der "Ferne Osten" und das Landesinnere bis zum Tauros.* K. G. Saur Verlag, München – Leipzig 2001. ISBN 3-598-77448-6. 416 S. EUR 110.

Mit ständig steigendem Tempo wird die geographisch geordnete Herausgabe der zahlreichen Steinepigramme aus den östlichsten Teilen des Mittelmeerraums von Reinhold Merkelbach und Josef Stauber fortgesetzt: nach dem Erscheinen des ersten

Bandes vor etwa drei Jahren folgen jetzt dicht aufeinander der zweite und dritte Band. Während der erste Band (*Die Westküste Kleinasiens von Knidos bis Ilion*) mit seinen 647 Seiten und 747 Epigrammen noch eine Vielseitigkeit an Zeit und Themen darbot, bleiben die folgenden zwei Bände dünner (mit 454 bzw. 442 Epigrammen) und einseitiger: Ehrungen und Orakelsprüche werden selten, es sind vorwiegend späte Grabepigramme. Die Zahl der archaischen, klassischen oder hellenistischen Epigramme wird geringer: im ersten Band noch sogar rund 26 Prozent, im zweiten und dritten Band aber nur etwa 8 bzw. 2 Prozent. Aber endlich – nach mehr als 120 Jahren – können wir auf griechische Epigrammcorpora zurückgreifen, die einen Gesamtüberblick über die epigrammatische Kultur der östlichsten Gegenden ermöglichen, mit Einbezug der gelegentlichen lateinischen Texte und der *Anthologia Graeca*. Wie zeitraubend das Sammeln einzelner Epigramme sein kann, wird sich nur derjenige vorstellen können, der damit persönliche Erfahrungen hat. Wegen der Menge archaischer, klassischer und hellenistischer Epigramme in Griechenland versteht man, warum gerade Kleinasien und der Nahe Osten gewählt worden sind: P.A. Hansen (1983/1989) hat mit seinen frühen Epigrammcorpora besonders Griechenland bis zum 300 v.Chr. ausgebeutet. Dennoch erkennt man die Lücke im Ausbleiben einer Ausgabe der nachklassischen Epigramme der Balkanhalbinsel.

Im zweiten Band (*Die Nordküste Kleinasiens: Marmarameer und Pontos*) kann man eine Stadt und Provinz mit besonders vielen Epigrammen finden: Nikaia und Bithynien mit 66 bzw. 190 Texten. Die Zahl der literarisch überlieferten Texte ist noch ziemlich hoch mit 55 Epigrammen (im dritten Band nur 5 Texte). Die Kommentare sind ungleichmässiger als die Texttypen – hier unnötig eingehend, dort allzu dürftig – oder sie fehlen gänzlich. Ab und zu werden orthographische und metrische Unregelmässigkeiten im Kommentar angegeben, aber inkonsequent. Es ist jedoch angenehm, dass 101 Photos vorhanden sind (man findet Verweise auf rund 140 andernorts publizierte Photos), obwohl die Hälfte davon leider unlesbar ist. Das Photo von 10/02/22 und viele andere hätten vergrössert werden sollen. Auf Grund besserer Photos möchte ich hier einige neue Lesungen bieten: 08/01/30, Vers 2 heisst Ἀριστένοτος (nicht Ἀριστένετος); 08/01/43, Vers 5 ist ἐπιμέμπτη (nicht ἐπιπέμπτη); 08/04/01, Vers 6 soll εἰσαπέστειλεν heissen; 09/04/12, Vers 3 ist τῷς (nicht ὄς); 09/05/16, Verse 7 und 16 sollten eher τῶ ediert werden (nicht τῷ); 10/02/29, Vers 6 soll Ματρῶνά τε ἦ heissen, wie er auch übersetzt wird; 10/05/03, Vers 2 lässt sich einfacher mit dem Buchstaben auf dem Stein πᾶσι φίλος θνητοῖς ἵνεκα σωφροσύνης verstehen als mit verändertem Text πᾶσι φίλος θνήτοισι, ἐκ δὲ <ε> σ<αο>φροσύνης; 11/15/01, Vers 1 sollte eher ῥητήρ ediert werden (nicht ἦτηρ). In erstaunlich vielen Fällen ist die Textform schlechter bzw. nachlässiger als diejenige in dem alten Buch von Werner Peek, *Griechische Versinschriften* vom Jahre 1955. Die Textform von Epigrammen aus der *Anthologia Graeca* weicht mehrmals von Beckbys Ausgabe ab, aber meistens mit Recht. Dennoch sind die Fehler in Akzenten, in *iota subscripta* und in Bemerkungen der Elision zu zahlreich, um aufgezählt werden zu können; diese können z.B. als Material zu philologischen Übungen für Studenten aufgespart werden. Es ist aber belastend, dass der Itazismus willkürlich gehandhabt wird: z.B. 08/05/01, Verse 4 und 7: τ(ε)ῖρ(ε)ι ... (ε)ῖης. Oft werden auch solche Pentameter eingerückt, die auf dem Stein nicht eingerückt worden sind (z.B. 08/01/30, 08/01/31, 08/01/35).

Im dritten Band (*Der "Ferne Osten" und das Landesinnere bis zum Tauros*)

kommen die meisten Texte aus Phrygien, besonders Dorylaion mit 289 bzw. 44 Epigrammen. Das Band besteht fast ausschliesslich aus kaiserzeitlichen Grabepigrammen: es gibt überhaupt keine klassischen Inschriften, nur 10 als hellenistisch datierte Epigramme neben den 432 mehr oder weniger genau datierten kaiserzeitlichen Texten. Aber dies vermindert den Wert des Bandes keineswegs: die späten Grabepigramme aus dem inneren Phrygien sind kulturhistorisch sehr interessante Beispiele für die Hellenisierung und die Übernahme der poetischen griechischen Sprache. Die Kommentare werden noch mehr nach Belieben kurz oder lang geschrieben. Das kurz zusammenfassende Lemma – des öfteren teilweise auf Englisch – am Ende eines jeden Textes (Bibliographie der früheren Ausgaben, Forschungsliteratur, Photo, Datum, Fundort, Verwahrung) gibt Angaben über die Datierung noch seltener als es im zweiten Band geschehen ist. Dies ist besonders bedauerlich, weil eben die Datierung der Inschriften die grössten Probleme für den Anfänger bereitet. Eine kleine Auswahl von neuen Lesungen: 14/07/03, Vers 1 καὶ (nicht κἔ; umgekehrt in 15/02/07, Vers 3); 15/02/02, Zeile 3 Ἀσειανός (nicht Ἀσιανός), ebenda Vers 3 μείτων (nicht μίτων); 15/02/08, Vers 1 ἐνθάδε [...] (ebenso fehlerhaft ἐνθάδε | in der *editio princeps*), ebenda Vers 4 εὐσεβέ{ι}ως ... βιότ{ι}ου (nicht verwirrend εὐσεβείως ... βιότιου); 16/25/03, Vers 1 ποσάξι (warum denn ποσάξ(ε)ι?); 16/31/10 A, Zeile 27 bzw. B, Zeile 5 ἔτε{τε}κε bzw. τύνχανος (nicht ἔτετεκε (sic) bzw. τύγγανος); 16/41/06, Vers 5 ἐπελευσάμενος (nicht ἐπελευσόμενος). Es gibt nur verhältnismässig wenige Photos (83 Stück, mehr als ein Drittel davon unlesbar), aber z. B. das Photo von 16/25/02 und viele andere Photos hätten vergrössert werden sollen.

Es bleibt noch zu hoffen, dass möglichst wenige Epigramme in diesem gross angelegten Vorhaben fehlen werden. Ich habe einige Auslassungen von späteren Epigrammen aufspüren können, z.B. *SEG XXXVII* 1049–1050 (Bithynien), *SEG XIII* 538 (Pontos), *SEG VI* 66 (Galatien), *SEG XXX* 1477 (Phrygien).

Trotz aller Kritik kann man mit den schon herausgekommenen Bänden arbeiten. Ich erwarte mit grossem Interesse den vierten und fünften Band: die Südküste Kleinasiens und der Nahe Osten dürften uns manche vergessene Epigramme bieten.

Erkki Sironen

Iscrizioni greche e latine del Foro Romano e del Palatino. Inventario generale – inediti – revisioni. A cura di SILVIO PANCIERA. Tituli 7. Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Roma 1996. 446 pp., 256 ill. in 43 tavole, 2 carte topografiche. ITL 150.000.

Supplementa Italica: Imagines. Supplementi fotografici ai volumi italiani del CIL. Roma (CIL, VI) 1: Musei Capitolini. A cura di GIAN LUCA GREGORI e MARINA MATTEI. Presentazioni di SILVIO PANCIERA, EUGENIO LA ROCCA, GIAN LUCA GREGORI, MARINA MATTEI. Schede di MARIANGELA ALFIERO, DANIELE BEVILACQUA, ASTRID CAPOFERRO, STEFANO CASTELLANI. Unione Accademica Nazionale – Edizioni Quasar, Roma 1999. ISBN 88-7140-139-5. 632 pp. ITL 740.000.

I due volumi sono una dimostrazione del produttivo spirito di gruppo che ormai caratterizza molte pubblicazioni della sezione di Epigrafia e antichità romane

dell'Università di Roma "La Sapienza".

Il volume delle epigrafi del Foro Romano e del Palatino "rappresenta il pagamento di un debito morale contratto in una nevosa giornata del 1965", come lo definisce Silvio Panciera (p. 7). Dopo l'Introduzione – già interessante per la storia degli studi epigrafici in Italia – la prima sezione contiene l'inventario generale di tutte le iscrizioni lapidarie provenienti da o conservate nella zona (pp. 39-79), in tutto 2366. Comunque, apparentemente alcune centinaia sono frammenti di poche lettere e rimangono inedite; saranno pubblicate nei prossimi fascicoli supplementari del *CIL* VI. Inoltre sono inclusi conguagli bibliografici utili. L'edizione vera e propria comincia con gli *elogia* del Foro Romano, i predecessori degli *elogia* del Foro di Augusto. Sono inclusi tutti i testi; segue una limpida discussione di Laura Chioffi sulla problematica generale (pp. 131-39). Nella terza sezione, "Altri inediti", le iscrizioni edite per la prima volta sono 138. Anche se i contributori sono stati in tutto 54, il livello dei commenti rimane alto e lo stile è abbastanza uniforme. Come è evidente nei luoghi centrali dell'antica Roma, sono incluse molte iscrizioni pertinenti ai ceti dirigenti urbani, ma non mancano le iscrizioni funerarie, finite per diverse ragioni nel centro urbano. Purtroppo, le iscrizioni greche sono soltanto due (nn. 56B e 75); nel n. 75, è interessante l'accento a un personaggio proveniente da una delle città di nome Cesarea. Anche le iscrizioni funerarie cristiane sono pochissime. Il volume è corredato da indici, buone fotografie di tutte le epigrafi pubblicate per la prima volta e piante del Foro Romano e del Palatino, per facilitare le indicazioni sui luoghi di ritrovamento. Visto che il volume è già stato recensito da molti competenti studiosi, voglio fare solo un piccolissimo commento al n. 64, dove è opportuno collegare i due frammenti con l'epigramma greco *IG* XIV 888, da *Suessa*. Comunque, perché assumere che il dedicante sia proprio la comunità di *Suessa* (*Suessani*)?

Il primo volume della collana *Supplementa Italica: Imagines* è indispensabile, ma non acquistabile, per chiunque si interessi di epigrafia latina, data l'importanza della collezione dei Musei Capitolini. Ad avviso di chi scrive, è molto utile l'ordinamento del materiale secondo la tipologia monumentale, perché facilita il ritrovamento dei paralleli. Le didascalie sono precise e contengono tutte le informazioni rilevanti. Vengono aggiornate le notizie pertinenti alla descrizione, provenienza, datazione, inventariazione, collocazione e bibliografia delle iscrizioni. L'unica cosa che manca, però, sono le correzioni di letture del *CIL*. La terminologia è coerente, e credo che servirà come fondamento per la terminologia epigrafica italiana nel futuro. Ad esempio, almeno al sottoscritto (che non è, però, di madrelingua italiana) sembra veramente preferibile l'aggettivo "marmoreo" alla designazione "di marmo bianco".

Le fotografie sono buone e contribuiscono a facilitare la lettura del testo; inoltre testimoniano la versatilità dell'arte lapidaria urbana. La loro utilità ha molti aspetti: ad esempio, con la nuova documentazione diventano più comprensibili anche i testi delle copie settecentesche "gallettiane", abbondanti soprattutto nei musei siciliani. Un dettaglio spiacevole – lo ammettono gli stessi editori a p. 15 – è l'eliminazione di quasi tutte le scale metriche dalle fotografie, evidentemente nella fase di inquadramento e per motivi estetici.

Notevoli sono gli indici del volume, organizzati secondo tipologia, supporto – la sezione è sottodivisa secondo tipi di ornamentazione, trattamento delle superfici, tipi di oggetti raffigurati, ecc. –, scrittura, topografia e datazioni. Seguono i conguagli con i

numeri del *CIL* e quelli dell'inventario. Gli indici sono un vero passo avanti nelle pubblicazioni epigrafiche. Gli indici delle datazioni, ad esempio, rendono le datazioni più controllabili e aperte alla critica. Insomma, si tratta di un volume fondamentale per gli studi futuri dell'epigrafia urbana.

Kalle Korhonen

Supplementa Italica. Nuova serie. Vol. 16, 17, 18. Edizioni Quasar, Roma 1998, 1999, 2000. ISBN 88-7140-134-4, 88-7140-149-2, 88-7140-197-2. 400 pp., 264 ill.; 208 pp., 112 ill.; 396 pp. ITL 90.000 per vol.

Epigraphists will note with considerable satisfaction the appearance of three new *Supplementa*, vols. 16, 17 and 18, in the last three years. As the first volume of the series came out in 1981, one observes an average pace of one volume per year, remarkable progress. The format and the concept of a *Supplementum* is still the same, except for the detail that, due to the recent death of Margherita Guarducci, the *presentazione* of vol. 18 (with some interesting remarks) has been signed by only Professor Silvio Panciera.

Again there is much that is of interest and even more that is of use. The three volumes under inspection here (by the way, vol. 17 seems to be a bit thinner than the other ones) concentrate on central and northern Italy, there being no cities from the Regions II and III (Aemilia in the north is also absent). The cities covered here are as follows: in Region I, Aletrium (in vol. 16, by L. Galli and G.L. Gregori); in Region IV, Reate (in vol. 18, by M.C. Spadoni); in Region V, Trea (in vol. 18, by S.M. Marengo); in Region VI (Umbria), Ameria and Suasa (both in vol. 18, by G. Asdrubali Pentiti and S. Antolini, respectively); in Region VII (Etruria), Rusellae (in vol. 16, by S. Conti); in Region IX and in vol. 17 both, Alba Pompeia (by S. Giorcelli Bersani) and Forum Fulvii Valentia (G. Mennella and E. Zanda), in Region X, Forum Iulii (in vol. 16, by A. Giavitto) and Ferrara (in vol. 17, by D. Pupillo; for the explanation of this, Ferrara not being a city with Roman origins, see p. 125f., cf. 132 on the tribes attested in the area).

Historically, the most important city is no doubt Reate, and this is reflected by the fact that, although there are fewer new texts here than in Rusellae (with altogether 135 new texts – some of them, by the way, dealt with by H. Solin in *Arctos* 34 [2000] 151ff.), the treatment of Reate is by far the longest in this group (140 pages). Ameria (an informed presentation with an up-to-date bibliography) takes up 124 pages, whereas Rusellae is dealt with in 99 pages. (The explanation for the apparent lack of a clear relation between the number of new texts and the length of the treatment is, of course, that important cities with many previously published inscriptions take up more space in the introductory sections than the more marginal cities.) If one studies the relation between the numbers of the "old" (i.e., those appearing in the old corpora) and the "new" inscriptions, one finds that a collection of the inscriptions was most sorely needed in the case of Rusellae, for here there are 135 new texts as compared to 16 old texts, a growth of 844 percent between the publication of *CIL* XI and now. Aletrium comes second with 259 percent (57 and 22), followed by Suasa (157 percent, 44 and 28) and Alba Pompeia (145 percent, 55 and 38). In the other cases the number of new texts is about the same as

that of the old texts (Trea and the two Fora) or smaller; in Bergomum the percentage is smallest, 20.8, but the number of new texts (26) certainly justifies the inclusion of Bergomum in this collection. (In general, one must, however, note that many of the new texts, duly equipped with numbers, are in fact insignificant fragments; thus e.g. in the cases of Suasa, Rusellae, and Trea.)

The structure of the individual contributions follows on traditional lines. In the beginning, there is a bibliography (I must confess that I have never really understood why some items are preceded by a "-", some by "+"); a historical introduction to the city in question follows. These introductions are of great interest and importance as they supersede all previous presentations of the vicissitudes of the same cities. (Note that at least in the case of Ferrara (p. 126) and Reate (p. 21), one learns that Mommsen had not used all available literary sources when writing the historical introductions in the *CIL*.) Then we have the addenda to inscriptions published previously, in many cases a section even more important than the presentation of the new inscriptions. If there are important addenda, old texts may be accorded a new edition in the section on new inscriptions; this is the case e.g., of *CIL* IX 4753 = *Reate* no. 17 (confirming that there should never have been any doubts about the praenomen of this man, the equestrian T. Prifernius Paetus Memmius Apollinaris) and of *CIL* V 5127 = *Bergomum* 4. The rest of contributions consist of the new inscriptions and of the indices.

In general, one can say that the contributions are of a very high quality; clearly the contributors are all very well acquainted with their subjects (although I must confess that I noticed a bibliographical omission or two in some of the contributions, e.g., in that on Reate, which is of course the most demanding city bibliographically). The only thing I am wondering about is whether it is really of any use to comment upon all the common names, and to refer to the standard onomastic repertories for the illustration of the same names. There are very many places in these volumes where one reads that (say) *Petronius* or *Rufinus* or *Valerius* are common names (references to Kajanto, etc. being given), but isn't this something we all know? I am wondering about this because I have the feeling that in some cases the authors are fairly generous in commenting upon the common names not in need of illustration, at the same time avoiding clear statements on rare names which would merit some annotation. For instance, in *Bergomum* 9, something is said on both *Marcus* and *Petronius*, but not a single word on the cognomen *Lucusta*. Similarly, in *Reate* 29, the only thing that is said on the interesting nomen *Appaeus* is that this is the first attestation in Reate (cf. on *Carfidius* *ibid.* 31, and also *ibid.* 35, 43, 48), and in *Reate* 43 the nomen *Viblenus* (of great interest) is left without any comment.

To move on to an examination of the new texts, there are again interesting inedita, e.g., *Aletrium* 1 (*Deis Indicit(ibus)*, etc.), *Rusellae* 31 (a wonderful metrical building inscription of the 4th century), *Reate* 10 (a striking text in honour of Iulia Maesa), *Ameria* 5 (Saloninus Caesar), *ibid.* 32 (a funerary inscription with uncommon formulations). And of course there are also many interesting inscriptions (e.g., *Ferrara* 7, a veteran of the Urban cohorts) published earlier, but in journals of local and/or limited circulation and thus not readily available for use by the scholarly community as a whole. As for individual texts, I have an observation or two to make on some of them and shall proceed to this at this point.

Bergomum 14: If the commentary says that Q. Cornelius St. f. Vot. belongs to the

family of the Cornelii and to the tribe Voturia (correct, but rather obvious), should not a word on the filiation have been added? – *Alba Pompeia* 10: not *VI vir(o)* but *IIIIII vir(o)* (this is clear from the photo). – *Ferrara* 17: If the man is indeed a *classarius* (a good suggestion by the editor D. Pupillo), then he should belong to the Ravenna fleet; this, again, would be interesting inasmuch as he is a Naevius, for this nomen is surprisingly common in Misenum, but does not seem to have been attested for a Ravenna man until now (cf. *Arctos* 30 [1996] 175 with n. 35). – *Ferrara* 20: The *et* in line 6 is an interesting mistake. – *Reate* 5 (*CIL* IX 4752): It is a misunderstanding to say that Schulze also suggests the reading [*P*]esuvius, for his *ipsa verba* clearly mean that he wishes to distance himself from this suggestion. – *Reate* 12: It seems a bit misleading to say that all *curatores viae Salariae* "finora conosciuti" are from the imperial period, for this seems to imply that one could, in theory, expect to find Republican curators of the same road in new inscriptions; however, curators of a certain road represent an imperial institution. The bibliographical reference given (to an article in *Bull. arch. Algérienne* 1968) also seems inadequate. – *Reate* 17: More could have been said in the commentary on the nomenclature of T. Prifernius Paetus Memmius Apollinaris (for a few remarks cf. e.g., my *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature* [1992] 34). There is also some serious trouble in the references to the later Prifernii. Moreover, some assumptions seem to be presented as historical facts (XX was adopted by YY, etc.). – *Reate* 27 (*C. Accius C.M.I. Dio, M. Accius C.f. Qui.*): It is misleading to say that we have here a freedman father and his son "che ha acquisito la cittadinanza", for of course the father was also a citizen. Instead, something could have been said on the interesting fact that the son does not have a cognomen (for an explanation and some parallels see my *Die römischen Vornamen* [1987] 296, where this text is also mentioned).

Before I conclude, let me also add a remark or two on some of the introductory sections and on the addenda. *Alba Pompeia* p. 65 on 7601 "*Ma(nius)*" is not really a correct representation of the five-stroke abbreviation of the name (normally this is represented in print by "*M'*"). – *Reate* p. 47: the Arrii mentioned apparently as senators from Reate are in fact Africans. – *Reate* p. 61 on 4647: Perhaps one could say that *Varius* probably comes from the praenomen *Varus* (not attested as such) and is "di origine romana"; but I miss here a reference to the fact that there are two completely different nomina both spelt *Varius*, one in which the *a* is short and one where the *a* is long (see the book of Schulze, so often quoted in these volumes, p. 249). – *Reate* p. 72 on 4648: This inscription is translated by B. Campbell, *The Roman Army* (1994) no. 350, and in F. Jacques, *Les cités de l'occident romain* (1990) p. 52 no. 25d. – *Reate* p. 76 on 4694: this text is not identical with *ILS* 1363 (where in fact *CIL* IX 4964 is reproduced). – *Reate* p. 80 on 4721/22: The phrase "La gens Fonteia, che la tradizione romana, risalente a Cicerone (*Cic. Font.* 41) considera originaria di Tusculum" does not quite do justice to the clear evidence on the origin of the Fonteii in Tusculum. – *Reate* p. 82 on 4742: Some fairly surprising, and possibly not altogether correct, things are said in the commentary. I have not been able to find clear evidence for the affirmation of the author regarding the senatorial Vettuleni that "A rafforzare la sua posizione di prestigio intervenne il matrimonio con la gens Aelia, una delle più nobili di Roma", and perhaps this is based on a misunderstanding of sorts. In any case, there does not seem to be a reason for discussing senatorial Vettuleni here, as the man mentioned in this inscription, Sex.

Vettulenus Marcianus (husband of Sextia Victoria) cannot be a member of the senatorial branch of the family.

Olli Salomies

Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum. Consilio et auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Berolinensis et Brandenburgensis editum. Volumen secundum: *Inscriptiones Hispaniae Latinae*. Editio altera. Pars V. *Conventus Astigitanus* (CIL II²/5). Ediderunt A. U. STYLOW, R. ATENCIA PÁEZ, J. GONZÁLEZ FERNÁNDEZ, C. GONZÁLEZ ROMÁN, M. PASTOR MUÑOZ, P. RODRÍGUEZ OLIVA, adiuvantibus H. GIMENO PASCUAL, M. RUPPERT, M. G. SCHMIDT. Gualterus de Gruyter et socii, Berolini – Novi Eboraci 1998. ISBN 3-11-015195-2. xlii, 423 pp. EUR 348.

This is the third fascicle of the second edition of the Spanish epigraphical corpus, covering the *conventus Astigitanus* in southeastern Baetica. As the first fascicle only came out in 1995, the prospects of the Spanish project clearly look good. There are 1350 inscriptions in this corpus, divided into 55 chapters, the chapters corresponding to ancient urban territories as reconstructed by the editors. Cities included here are, e.g., Tucci, Ucubi, Ategua, Iliberri Florentia, Ilurco, Singili(a?) Barba, Urso, Astigi. Most of the city names seem pretty obscure to a reader not specializing in Roman Spain (but note the recent rise from obscurity to prominence, due to excavations in the last years, of sites such as Singilia(?), cf. p. 213), and there are many settlements the ancient name of which is still unknown. (By the way, it is notable how often in Spain one finds the phenomenon that different cities have the same name, cf., e.g., p. 366 on *Segovia*, p. 368 on *Segida*.) There is much of interest here, e.g., no. 789 (a most interesting honorific inscription from Singilia(?), *AE* 1989, 420), no. 900 (the *senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone*), no. 1022 (the *lex Ursonensis*), and note that the inscriptions of Iliberri "gravitate excellunt" (p. 165; the inscription in honour of P. Cornelius Anullinus is now no. 623). In general, one notes that there is an unusually large number of honorific inscriptions.

In the beginning, there is a "Praefatio editorum" followed (on pp. XVII-XX) by a historical introduction by A.U. Stylow and a 20-page bibliography. The inscriptions are presented on pp. 1-382. In each chapter, the edition of the inscriptions is preceded by a list of the *miliarii* pertaining to the territory in question and by the *falsi* (these sections do not, of course, appear in all chapters). There are photographs of the most interesting texts, whereas the illustrations of the other texts are to be found in microfiches included in the volume. As for the inscriptions themselves, of which there are (as already mentioned) 1350, there do not seem to be many inedita (but note e.g., 475, 901), and a considerable number of texts seem to have disappeared, being thus known only from older descriptions (cf. e.g., p. 288). Here and there one observes texts transmitted in older sources, but unknown to the first edition (e.g., no. 116).

Everything is of a very high quality, and one can only admire, and congratulate, the editors upon their achievement. It is also with great pleasure one finds that the commentaries to the individual inscriptions are kept on a sober level and stick to the essential. As for observations on individual texts, I shall present them at this point. No.

31: Perhaps the editors should have specified what exactly is transmitted in line 2 where we now read *honorem VI<vi>r(atus)*. – No. 106: The editors say that, when Wiegels suggested, pretty vaguely, it is true, that the man, because of the tribe *Voltinia*, might have come from the Narbonensis, this was "sine idonea causa", but in fact there is something else that speaks for the Narbonensis, namely the fact that he is a Sex. Valerius Sex. f., the praenomen *Sextus*, if combined with *Valerius*, strongly pointing to that province (cf. my *Die römischen Vornamen* 50, 202ff.). – No. 489: The abbreviation *pup.* stands for *pup(illus)*, not for *pup(us)*, a vague expression not meaning very much (cf. op. cit. 62ff.). – No. 740: *Propinquus n(oster)* makes one think of the Valerii Propinqui, of senatorial status from the early second century onwards (R. Syme, *Roman Papers* V [1988] 577ff.); on the other hand, it must be conceded that there are also other Hispanic instances of *Propinquus* (Syme, *ibid.* 599). – No. 780: One wonders whether one could not interpret *d(ecurionum) d(ecreto)* instead of *d(ono) d(at)*, because honorific statues are not very commonly referred to as 'gifts' to the honorand. – No. 840: In the commentary, it might have been added that this is one of the latest inscriptions in which suffect consuls are used for dating. – No. 1036: If the man is an adoptee, the adoptive father must have been D. Cornelius, not Virguleius Eutyclus (not *Euty chius*). – Nos. 1102 and 1153: There seems to be a lack of coordination between these two editions of the text. – No. 1126: Could this be Etrilia Afra (625)? On the other hand, *Afra* is also attested for Lucretia Afra (1326). – No. 1307: It seems a bit hard to believe that L. Ful[vius] M. I. Philomusus could or should be dated to the early third century.

At the end, detailed indexes (p. 385ff.) and a map form the conclusion of a magnificent book which will be of great service to a variety of scholars. – The Latin used in this book (if I may touch upon this subject) is admirably clear and almost impeccable. The only solecism which struck me is "de concilio ... consideravit" (in the commentary on no. 69), where the author must have begun the sentence thinking that he was going to end it with "cogitavit". I am also a bit unhappy about the causal ablative of the type "lectione certa ... priorum errores omisi" (e.g., nos. 3, 25, 736, 780), which does not seem to be as clear as the use of a preposition. Finally, although there are some parallels, even from Cicero, for the use of *insolenter* in the meaning "contra consuetudinem" (*TLL*; used in this sense in the commentary on 772), I think that for most readers this expression has a somewhat different meaning and should thus possibly be avoided in the above sense.

Olli Salomies

GÉZA ALFÖLDY: *Die Bauinschriften des Aquäduktes von Segovia und des Amphitheaters von Tarraco*, mit einem Anhang von PETER WITTE. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Abteilung Madrid. Madrider Forschungen 19. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin – New York 1997. ISBN 3-11-014418-2. vii, 110 S., 32 Fig., 27 Taf. DEM 196.

Yet another compelling contribution to the reconstruction of Latin inscriptions by Géza Alföldy, this time dealing with epigraphic materials from Spain: the inscription of the aqueduct of Segovia (p. 1-55) and two building inscriptions from the amphitheatre of Tarraco, modern Tarragona (p. 57-92). Some might say that dedicating an entire book to

only a couple of inscriptions is exaggeration. In most cases, this would be superfluous waste of paper, but the texts and monuments discussed by Alföldy are so extraordinary that they well deserve the thorough study of almost one hundred pages. The inscriptions studied are not only of enormous size (the podium text of the amphitheatre measuring at least 147 m in length) but they are also of conspicuous historical interest. Moreover, they were engraved on monuments that may be regarded as among the most precious and best known archaeological objects in the whole Iberian Peninsula.

Ch. 1 provides a full discussion of the two identical aqueduct texts, on both sides of the Segovian construction, of which only some of the dowel holes for letters in gilded bronze are preserved. This particular point has led Alföldy to a very thorough and useful analysis of the techniques applied for the production of monumental inscriptions with letters of precious metals, bronze or gold (p. 26 ff.). If the new reconstruction of the text is accepted – there do not seem to be any reasons to distrust it – the people of Segovia could once admire the following inscription (p. 39): *Imp(eratoris) Nervae Traiani Caes(aris) Aug(usti) Germ(anici), p(ontificis) m(aximi), tr(ibunicia) p(otestate) II, co(n)s(ulis) II, patris patriae iussu / P. Mummius Mummianus et P. Fabius Taurus, Ilviri munic(ipii) Fl(avii) Segoviensium, aquam restituerunt* (cf. *AE* 1997, 882 = 1993, 856 = 1992, 1034). The inscription itself is Trajanic, dating from late A.D. 98. This means that the building project was Flavian and that the work must have been completed – at the latest – by the time of Domitian's death in A.D. 96. To explain the post-Flavian text, there seem to be two possibilities (p. 48): 1) Some time after the aqueduct was finished, perhaps very soon, a part of it (with the original building inscription) collapsed. This part was repaired and re-inscribed by Trajan soon after his accession; 2) The building of the aqueduct was completed under Domitian. However, at the moment of the emperor's murder, the final touch, the inscription, was still lacking, thus leaving the structure without a "signature" until Trajan had a text inscribed on it, possibly in connection with some repairs or renovations. – One of these hypotheses should be right.

The significance of Alföldy's re-edition lies in the fact that now we have a precise date for the aqueduct: it belongs to the late first century A.D. which is otherwise known as a period of remarkable social and economic development in the Spanish provinces. Alföldy's analysis also provides hard evidence for those who try to date other aqueducts constructed with a similar technique. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the gorgeous inscription, with the statues of the emperor in adjacent niches, would have served for promoting the imperial and Roman ideology. "Wer die goldenen Buchstaben der 17 Meter langen Inschrift auf dem an dieser Stelle 30 m hohen Aquädukt, dessen Bögen hier im Altertum möglicherweise ähnlich wie heute eine Art von Stadttor Segovias bildeten, in der spanischen Sonne glühen sah und den schlichten, jedoch höchst aussagekräftigen Text las, konnte vor der Größe Roms nur in Ehrfurcht erstarren." (p. 51). Ch. 1 concludes with an intriguing account (by Peter Witte) of the manifold problems involved with the conservation of the Segovian monument. Local bureaucracy and high traffic density around the aqueduct were not among the easiest problems to overcome.

Among the numerous epigraphic documents coming from the amphitheatre of Tarraco, there are two building inscriptions that have a direct bearing on the history of the whole building. These are the subject of Ch. 2. Alföldy has observed that a minute fragment, discovered in 1990 in the arena (cf. *AE* 1997, 882 = 1990, 653), most probably

refers to the man who sponsored the building of the whole complex: he was a provincial priest (*flamen Romae, Divorum et Augustorum provinciae Hispaniae citerioris*) who must have spent an enormous sum of money for the project. With the aid of various evidence, Alföldy dates the inscription between c. A.D. 100 and 120/130.

The second amphitheatre document, the podium inscription, is considerably later (cf. *AE* 1997, 882 = 1990, 654). It is a huge puzzle of 79 separated blocks showing what remains of the name and titlature of Elagabalus. That the text mentions this emperor was already recognised by Alföldy in his *Die römischen Inschriften von Tarraco* (1975) No. 84. However, since then excavations have brought to light many new blocks of the podium which have helped in suggesting a number of modifications to the text. Above all, the emperor's titlature now probably shows that the inscription is datable to a year later than A.D. 218, perhaps A.D. 221. Moreover, the end of the inscription seems to record a number of specific objects within the amphitheatre which the emperor had restored (cf. p. 77: *[a]m[phit]h[eatru]m [cum] po[rt]i[s pul]pit[o] g[radib]us [p]o[di]o arena restitu[it]*). On the whole, the podium text provides further important evidence for the building propaganda of the Syrian emperor (he also restored the Amphitheatrum in Rome and other public buildings elsewhere). However, the inscription did not survive long, not even a year, for after Elagabalus' fall in March A.D. 222, the majority of the letters were obliterated. "Es ist jedenfalls anzunehmen, daß 'die größte Inschrift der Iberischen Halbinsel' zugleich eine der kurzlebigsten antiken Inschriften war." (p. 85). While the amphitheatre still functioned in the fourth century, the inscription may not have been restored or remodified for other emperors after its obliteration. The remaining letters were perhaps covered by plaster or they were simply painted so as to make them the same colour as the podium (*ibid.*).

The volume concludes with two abstracts in Spanish, an index, and a selection of wonderful plates with very detailed information, graphic and photographic, on the monuments discussed. The quality of the illustrations could not be better.

Summing up, this book nicely brings together some of Alföldy's interests and the abilities he is known for: Hispania and Spanish epigraphy, remarkable knowledge of inscriptions in their historical and archaeological context, admirable intuition. Though a number of conclusions proposed by Alföldy in this book may remain more or less hypothetical, one must say that every conjecture makes sense. And the fact remains that good hypotheses are among the backbones of good research.

Mika Kajava

CLAUDIA LEGA: *Le iscrizioni cristiane di Roma conservate nei Musei Vaticani: Indice dei vocaboli*. Inscriptiones Sanctae Sedis 4.1. Tipografia Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 2000. 511 pp. ITL 190.000.

La serie delle pubblicazioni sulla collezione epigrafica dei Musei Vaticani viene completata dall'*Indice* – o piuttosto concordanza – delle iscrizioni cristiane, a cura di Claudia Lega. Si tratta di un lavoro notevole e senza dubbio di un utile strumento per gli studiosi di epigrafia paleocristiana.

Chi prepara una concordanza simile, deve affrontare molteplici problemi, come il trattamento delle varianti grafiche che abbondano nelle iscrizioni cristiane, l'ordinamento delle abbreviazioni, ecc. Nel trattamento delle varianti grafiche, la soluzione adottata dall'autrice è stata intelligente: ogni forma non-standard viene segnalata esattamente com'è, ma seguita dalla grafia normativa, in parentesi tonde. Così si possono trovare le varianti grafiche, ma facilmente anche tutte le attestazioni di una parola specifica. L'ordine alfabetico segue, comunque, la forma grafica. Quindi, chi cerca delle frasi deve in ogni caso prendere in considerazione le varianti grafiche: ad esempio, sotto *die Veneris* viene menzionata un'iscrizione (p. 94), ma ci sono quattro casi di *die Beneris* (p. 93). La forma normativa può anche essere problematica. Ad esempio, nella frase (*re*)*quiescit in pace* (pp. 259, 263), troviamo molto spesso anche la forma in *-et*, che formalmente è il futuro. Nel libro, le varie grafie in *-et* sono state standardizzate in *quiescet*, ma con un punto esclamativo. Evidentemente viene inteso che il significato non possa in alcun caso essere quello del futuro. Per quanto riguarda le abbreviazioni, la soluzione adottata nella concordanza del *CIL VI* di Jory (1974-75) era l'ordine alfabetico, senza sciogliere le abbreviazioni. Qui, le abbreviazioni vengono sciolte. Ad esempio, per le diverse abbreviazioni delle parole *annus / mensis / dies* nelle espressioni dell'età (*a.*, *an.*, *m.*, *mens.*, ecc.), l'autrice ha preferito la soluzione seguente: le abbreviazioni vengono sciolte in modo coerente, preferendo il caso ablativo, se non è presente l'accusativo.

La consultazione dell'*Indice* è resa alquanto difficoltosa dalle poco chiare indicazioni delle fonti. Il numero dell'iscrizione (nelle *ICVR*) segue nell'ultima posizione della riga, o nella penultima, se l'iscrizione è datata; le colonne non sono diritte. Per una maggiore leggibilità, sarebbe stato utile stampare il numero dell'iscrizione ad es. in grassetto. Il maggiore difetto dell'opera è la concordanza greca (pp. 353-89). Le lettere greche sono state traslitterate, senza neanche fare la distinzione tra ϵ / η ϵ o / ω ; inoltre, l'ordine alfabetico è quello della lingua latina. Questo è dovuto ai limiti del programma EPIGLOSSA (vd. p. 13). Comunque, concordanze epigrafiche dei testi greci elaborate al computer si pubblicano ormai da alcuni anni. Fortunatamente, una concordanza delle epigrafi cristiane greche urbane esiste già, a cura di A. Felle, 1997.

Per concludere, una cosa ovvia, cioè, sarebbe molto utile pubblicare l'opera come CD-ROM, per facilitare le ricerche. Comunque, chi scrive ammette che raramente nelle biblioteche la consultazione di un CD-ROM è così facile come quella di un libro stampato.

Kalle Korhonen

ANNA MARIA ROSSI ALDROVANDI: *Corpus Titulorum Figulorum*. Manuali & Antologie. Cooperativa Libreria Universitaria Editrice Bologna, Bologna 1997. ISBN 88-8901-276-3. 287 pp. ITL 35.000.

The title of the book, especially for an epigraphically orientated reader, may appear somewhat misleading. Whatever the expectations, *Corpus Titulorum Figulorum* is a selection – not a *corpus* proper – of passages in literary and epigraphical texts of certain words related to *figulinae* and their products. The author has concentrated on seven terms

– *amphora, creta, fingere* (with derivatives *fict-, fig-*), *later, lucerna, tegula, vas* – and their derivatives (e.g. *vasarius, vasclarius, vasculum, vasclarius* from *vas*), and different kinds of variants (separately e.g. *feglina, ficeina, ficilina, ficlina, ficulina, figilina, figilinea, figina, figolina, figulina*). But one notes the absence of many central terms, as e. g. *bessalis, bipedalis, sesquipedalis, tessera, fornax, officina* and *officinator*, not to mention *dolium* or *doliaris*.

The presentation of the passages concerning each entry is divided into two main categories, literary texts (ordered alphabetically according to the authors) and inscriptions. The latter group is subdivided into "iscrizioni su pietra", *instrumentum*, and *variae*, with further subdivisions. In most cases, the scheme works well, but, e. g., the large number of brick stamp texts under the title word *figlina* (*lateres* p. 79-101, and *tegulae* p. 102-111) would be more usefully ordered according to different abbreviations (*f., fig., figl.*, etc.) and cases.

As such, the scheme of the work is quite interesting: for an epigraphist, a survey of the appearances of such terms as e. g. *figlinae* and *tegula* outside the usual brick stamp context is a highly acceptable tool. Unfortunately, the presentation of the brick stamp texts (I leave other categories aside here) is not very successful. Some examples may suffice:

1. Bogus words:

P. 48: FICEINA (*CIL* X 8043,77 [= XV 2272 = XIV 4090,13!]) should be read *figlina* or *figlin. A(uli)*. – P. 74: FIGILINEA (*CIL* XV S. 431): the stamp reads *figilineis / C. Iuli Neicei*. Ablative ending *-eis* naturally from *figilina* and not from **figilinea*. – P. 74: FIGINA (*CIL* III 5764, XIV 4089,21 [= XV 2158!]): in both cases the abbreviation *fig.* is erroneously interpreted as *fig(ina)* without any reason. – P. 75: FIGLA (*CIL* XIV 4090,16 [= XV 1800!]): the fragment is defectively reported by Giorgi, *sched. Casanat.* XVI, and the second line reads FIGLAFILLIANAS. E.M. Steinby has proposed (*BCAR* 84 (1974-75) 77 n. 11; *ead.*, *Indici complementari ai bolli doliari urbani (CIL. XV, 1)* [Acta IRF 11], Roma 1987, 328) that the stamp might read *Fig. Publilianas*, which is quite probable. Another possibility is *Figl. Aemilianas* or the like. In any case, *Figla Fillianas* is wrong. – P. 75: FIGLARIS (*CIL* IX 6078,4 [= XV 1019 a.8!]): the interpretation *opus fig(lare)* is inconceivable. – P. 112: FIGLINEA (*AE* 1911, 209) is actually the same stamp as *CIL* XV S. 431 mentioned above under the heading FIGILINEA, this time under the heading *Vasa*, cited from another source with the spelling *figlineis*.

2. Other notes:

The text of the brick stamps published in *CIL* XV.1 is usually faithfully quoted from *CIL*. Later completions and corrections (which are numerous and easily found, e. g., using Steinby, *Indici*) are not taken into consideration. The dating of the stamps is that proposed by Dressel, even if Steinby has thoroughly modified it in the *BCAR* article.

The division of the brick stamp texts into *lateres* and *tegulae* is quite misleading, which is clearly seen e. g. on p. 103ff. The author presents the urban stamps published by Mommsen in *CIL* X (*Tegulae Latinae*: X 8043.10, 11, 12, etc.) under the heading *Tegulae* with reference to *CIL* X only, but the very same stamps with reference to *CIL* XV (159, 166, 219 = S. 51 etc.) are also to be found under the heading *Lateres* (where

abbreviated words in the same stamp may have been opened in a different way, not without too many errors). The same procedure is applied to brick stamps published under heading *Tegulae* in other volumes of *CIL*, thus artificially multiplying the number of the stamps and unfoundedly suggesting their use in *lateres* or in *tegulae*.

Three different terms are taken under the same title word TEGULARIUS (p. 213f.): the substantive *tegularius*, the adiective *tegularius*, *-a*, *-um*, and the substantive *tegularium*, which should be clearly distinguished.

It is questionable if it is correct to include under the heading TEGULA such stamps that have the name of the *figlinae* in feminine but without the word *tegula* (e. g. *CIL* XV 53: *Caep[ioniana] sc. tegula] Euchar[i] Isaur[icae]*).

The sources used for the collection are not clearly stated in the introductions. The mention of "*CIL, AE, CVarr., Callender ecc.*" seems to point to the almost total omission of other publications, at least when it comes to the brick stamps. Only a small minority of new stamps published after Bloch's *Supplement* have found their way into *AE*, which is not the principal point of reference. The author should at least have had a look at E. M. Steinby, *Appendice a CIL. XV, 1, Bull. Com.* 86 (1978-79), 55-88, and works mentioned there on p. 56, including e. g. *Lateres Signati Ostienses* with about one hundred *inedita*; Id., *Indici with Aggiunte, completamenti e correzioni a CIL. XV. 1* (p. 31-50). They cover most of the material up to 1987, but naturally several new stamps have been published in various monographies and articles after that.

All in all, the part concerning brick stamps is in need of thorough revision. One might ask if the work would be more useful and coherent if the number of the terms included were increased and the passages quoted were mostly from literary sources. The *instrumentum* could be treated quite differently, viz. concentrating on the analysis of different word-forms and abbreviations without presenting all their appearances in stamp texts.

Pekka Tuomisto

A. DAMSGAARD-MADSEN, *Grækenlands historie indtil 336 f.Kr.* Aarhus Universitetsforlag / Aarhus University Press, Århus 1997. ISBN 87-7288-650-1. 206 s. DKK 198.

This History of Greece, in Danish, is a brisk presentation of the subject. From the Preface one learns that this is, in fact, a second edition of a book originally published in 1993; some differences between the two editions are noted *ibid.* (It is possible that the book has a longer history, for on p. 40 the Cyrillic alphabet is illustrated by the abbreviation CCCP, familiar to the older generation but probably unidentifiable to the student of today.) On the cover, the name of the book is rendered simply as '*Grækenlands historie*', the specification '*indtil 336 f. Kr.*' (that is, to the founding of the League of Corinth) becoming evident only to those who open the first page. This is, then, another of those histories of Greece which end with the aftermath of Chaeronea. In older times, this procedure could be justified by the fact that after 338, Greek history was seen mainly as a sorry tale of decline and decay (see S. Alcock, *Graecia capta* [1993] 3 with a marvellous

quotation from Grote), this allegedly rendering a narration of these times superfluous. On the other hand, it may be argued that even "classical" pre-338 Greece, admired and favoured by historians, was not a period without faults (note the summing up by the emperor Nero, a keen observer of historical evolution, of the main points of the history of Greece in its most happy period, "ἢ γὰρ ἀλλοτρίοις ἢ ἀλλήλοις ἐδουλεύσατε", *SIG*³ 814, line 16), and certainly many today would not expect a modern history of ancient Greece to stop with Chaeronea without some explanation being offered for this (what is said here on p. 11 does not really amount to an explanation). But it is true that although life went on in the Greek city states even after 338, the activities and operations of Alexander introduce new accents into Greek history which necessitate some modifications of the scope of the narration of the historian, and personally I have absolutely nothing to say against historians ending a history of Greece (as opposed to, say, a history of Greeks) at 338 (or 336) BC.

On the other hand, ending at 338 BC does not mean that what comes before this is accorded equal attention in this book. As the author says (p. 10), his main interest lies in the "classical" period, defined (on p. 11) as 600-300 (sic) BC, and this is certainly reflected in the result, for up to the beginning of the colonisation period the exposition is fairly brief (although not at all without interesting and instructive points of view), and some periods now much studied by archaeologists, such as the so-called "Dark Age" (mentioned on p. 11), are barely touched upon. Some aspects, most notably (and somewhat surprisingly) the linguistic situation depending on the existence of various Greek dialects, seem to have been omitted altogether. The narrative becomes more expansive with the onset of the colonisation period which is accorded fairly thorough attention. This part is followed by sections on archaic Sparta and Athens, these leading to a detailed description of the fifth century from the Persian wars down to 404. The interest of the author seems to become less keen at this point, for the fourth century is narrated rather hastily.

Thus, the main core of the book clearly consists of a description of Greek history in the early classical and classical periods. The result seems to me to be a competent and commendably succinct treatment of this subject. In addition to political history, various aspects of Greek life and society are also dealt with; we thus find sections on agriculture, economy, the position of women, various constitutions, etc. 'Cultural' aspects are also noted here and there (e.g., mention of sophists on p. 123), and some phenomena are criticised (e.g., pp. 117f.). Of course, limited space does not allow the author to dwell at length on these topics, and in some cases the exposition seems too brief to be of any real use (thus, e.g., p. 102 on "kvindelīg [female] homoseksualitat"). Furthermore, in the traditional (but also understandable) way the narrative is pretty much focussed on Athens and Sparta, so that places such as (say) Arcadia or Acarnania do not figure at all, except on maps, in this book. (On the other hand, the organisation of the Persian empire is described on pp. 69-71.)

The exposition is interspersed with diagrams, maps and quotations from ancient sources. The sources (with a very clear accent on the literary sources) are touched upon both in the beginning of the book and in the end in a section on the use of sources. There is also a section on "posterity's view of ancient (i.e., classical) Greece" and a 23-page commented bibliography. There seem to be few clear errors (but although Megara may

have had many contacts with the Peloponnese, it is not correct to say that Megara was located in the Peloponnese [p. 54]; and something seems to have happened to the Greek cities on the western coast of Asia in the lower map on p. 72). The conclusion must be that this is a handy and useful volume, especially for those in need of concise historical information on classical Greece.

Olli Salomies

RONALD MELLOR: *The Roman Historians*. Routledge, London – New York 1999. ISBN 0-415-11773-9 (hb), 0-415-11774-7 (pb). 212 pp. GBP 12.99 (pb).

The author of *Tacitus* (1993), Ronald Mellor from the University of California, Los Angeles, has written a useful general outline of Roman historiography, intended to be used as a textbook in universities. A similar textbook on Greek historiography, T.J. Luce's *The Greek Historians* was published by Routledge in 1997. Mellor's aim is to introduce Roman historians and their books in their political and literary context, in order to understand why and how these histories were written. He has succeeded in composing a concise and accessible survey, even though this compactness has its regrettable limits; the author sometimes makes annoying generalizations such as "the Romans were not by nature a speculative people" (p. 27).

In *The Roman Historians*, Mellor shows how we in fact remain dependant on historical reconstructions by a handful of Roman historians. Roman historiography has, for the most part, moulded our ways of perceiving and structuring ancient Roman history; Sallust, for example, has shaped our gloomy picture of the end of the Republic while it is to Ammianus Marcellinus that we owe the rather dark-coloured history of the fourth century. The central themes of Tacitus' narrative of the first century of imperial Rome, growth of tyranny and decline of Roman morality, tend still to dominate our views of the Principate; Tacitus, for example, divides the reigns of Tiberius and Nero into positive and negative phases which is still often taken for granted in modern research.

The Roman Historians introduces the origins of Roman historiography, Sallust, Livy, Tacitus, Ammianus Marcellinus as well as Roman biography (particularly Suetonius, *Historia Augusta*) and autobiography (especially Caesar). Mellor shows how the works of historians are connected with their own lives, e.g., how Sallust, after being driven from public life, channelled his own disappointment and bitterness into examining the political pathology of the Roman Republic. For Mellor, Tacitus is the greatest historian that the Roman world ever produced. He extols Tacitus' works with such words as 'psychological penetration', 'acute political analysis', 'moral grandeur', and 'literary genius'. Although Mellor admires Tacitus and Ammianus Marcellinus, he also shows some appreciation and understanding for the much despised 'salacious scandalmonger' Suetonius, calling him 'the ancestor of the modern scholar' with 'formidable research skills' for Suetonius used archives, acts of the Senate, pamphlets, histories, monuments, inscriptions and oral tradition. Mellor points out that because "the *Lives of the Caesars* is a book written by and for the equestrian ... class" (p. 152), such political issues as the loss

of political power and freedom (of the small senatorial elite) did not interest Suetonius and his readers as much as it worried Tacitus and other senatorial writers.

Mellor pays special attention to the rhetoric in Roman historiography and shows how Roman historians were deeply bound to the ancient literal and rhetorical tradition. All Roman historical writers were well educated in literature and rhetoric and they clearly display their training in their works, not only in speeches composed as part of the narration, but also in the structures of the histories and in methods of analysis and strands of narrative, digressions and parallels. Historians brought drama into their histories since the characters with their motives resemble the familiar ancient stereotypes learned in the rhetorical schools: there is a tyrant, a collaborator, a philosophical martyr, a noble barbarian, etc. As Mellor rightly points out, a Roman historian was above all a literary artist – in Cicero's words an 'embellisher of events' – a circumstance that is often forgotten or overlooked. Even the most scrupulous of Roman historians – in Mellor's opinion – Tacitus and Ammianus, did not avoid these literary techniques, and Livy's histories seem to be akin to a historical novel or 'a poem in prose' as Quintilian called history.

The moral dimension is linked to this conspicuous literary element in Roman historiography. The Roman historians used history as a medium to address the moral and political issues of their time, such as freedom versus tyranny, the corrupting effect of individual or civic power, the decline of political and social institutions. Tacitus particularly was a pessimistic moralist who related the loss of *virtus* to the loss of political freedom in Rome and also saw a connection between the private morality and the public actions of the emperors. Senatorial historians themselves were sometimes involved with various political factions which their works often quite clearly reflect. In Ch. 8, "Historical writing at Rome", Mellor treats the role of history and historians (e.g., public readings by historians and their audience) as well as the function of history in public life and the craft of writing history, and I find this discussion the most interesting contribution of his book. Throughout his book, Mellor problematizes the accuracy and credibility of Roman historiography, often comparing the ancient craft of history with modern research. An ancient historian used *inventio* to find appropriate material to illustrate his story which was made plausible, probable and credible. Mellor states that this is "different from the modern idea of historical truth as an absolute" (p. 27). One begins to wonder what this modern idea of historical truth might be which Mellor regards as uniform and absolute. However, in the theoretical discourse, history and its epistemology has been under constant lively discussion in modern times; one should rather speak of various modern ideas of 'historical truth'.

Maijastina Kahlos

GERHARD HORSMANN: *Die Wagenlenker der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Forschung zur antiken Sklaverei, Band XXIX. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 1997. ISBN 3-515-07234-9. viii, 339 S. DEM 96.

Es fehlte bisher eine eingehende sozialhistorische Studie zu den römischen Wagenlenkern, die zu den wenigen Berufsgruppen der römischen Gesellschaft gehören,

von denen umfassende Quellen verschiedener Art vorhanden sind und die auch im allgemeinen Bewusstsein ausserhalb der Zunft der Altertumswissenschaft herausragen. Die vorliegende Monographie erfüllt die Lücke auf ausgezeichnete Weise. Ein zentrales Anliegen des Verfassers ist es, dem Widerspruch zwischen der niedrigen sozialen Stellung der römischen Wagenlenker und ihrer Rolle "als umjubelte Götter oder Könige der Rennbahn" nachzugehen. Durch eingehende Analyse aller zur Verfügung stehenden Quellen schildert er die soziale Lage dieser Berufsgruppe. Es wird hier nützlich sein, seiner Prosopographie der Wagenlenker einige Bemerkungen beizusteuern. Nr. 8: lies *CIL* X 8053, 10; ob aber diese Inschrift etwas mit dem Wagenlenker Anicetus zu tun hat, bleibt dahingestellt. – Nr. 53: *Erylus* ist ein falscher Name, zu ergänzen ist wahrscheinlich [*C*]erylus. – Nr. 112: *Koίρανος* ist doch wohl nicht Name des Wagenlenkers, sondern eines Kaisers; Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca* III 191ff (auf die H. nicht verweist) denkt an Commodus; ferner vgl. die Edition von Moretti, *IGUR* 1214. – Nicht alle vom Verf. vorgenommenen Identifizierungen sind dingfest. Und gelegentlich schliesst er etwas vorschnell auf libertinen Status, auch wenn dieser nicht eindeutig aus den Quellen hervorgeht, so vermutet H. in Avillius Teres (Nr. 204) einen Freigelassenen, da dies aber nicht mit Sicherheit hervorgeht, ist es vorzuziehen, ihn als *incertus* einzustufen.

Heikki Solin

Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire. Tome 2. Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne (313-604) 1-2, sous la direction de CHARLES PIETRI (†) et LUCE PIETRI, par JANINE DESMULLIEZ, CHRISTIANE FRAISSE-COUÉ, ÉLISABETH PAOLI-LAFAYE, CHARLES PIETRI, LUCE PIETRI, CLAIRE SOTINEL. École française de Rome – CNRS, Rome 1999-2000. ISBN 2-7283-0538-2 (vol. 1), -0613-3 (vol. 2). xl, 2435 p. EUR 198, EUR 191.

Prosopographies are always difficult to review if you are unable to compile long lists of missing persons or misspelt names. This is the case here, either because the reviewer is not competent enough, or because the book is too carefully produced, and probably both. I limit myself to a few general remarks.

The late Roman world was initially divided in two prosopographies: the secular *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire I-III (PLRE)*, and the *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire (PCBE)*, which included people with a predominantly ecclesiastical background. While *PLRE* was divided chronologically (284-395, 396-527, 528-641), *PCBE* adopted a geographical division, beginning with Africa (1982) and continuing with the present two volumes on Italy. The chronological limits of the latter are 313 and 604, that is, the first officially recognized church council in Rome and the death of Gregory the Great, "dernier représentant, sur le siège de saint Pierre, du monde antique" (vii).

I have chosen to look at the letter M, to form an idea of the coverage of *PCBE* and of the possible overlap with *PLRE*. The African volume of *PCBE* presents on 113 pages 239 persons whose name began with M (2.1 / page), the Italian volume 402 persons on 187 pages (2.2 / p.). For a comparison, *PLRE* I gives 485 persons (5.3 / p.),

PLRE II 252 persons (3.4 / p.) and *PLRE* III 400 persons (3.7 / p.). Such figures do not directly mean anything because both the geographical and chronological coverage are different. It also turns out that *PLRE* includes many more entries which only cross-refer to other entries in the same or other volumes. This may be more typical of a work divided chronologically and perhaps also is due to the fact that the persons included in *PLRE* (secular aristocracy) more often had more than one name.

It is hard to identify a typical entry in either *PCBE* or *PLRE* because their length varies so much depending on the information available for a person. The difference can mainly be seen in the longest entries. The two first volumes of *PLRE* rarely devoted more than two pages to any one person. For example, a writer like Ammianus Marcellinus, who has been characterised by some (justifiably or not) as the greatest literary genius between Tacitus and Dante, was discussed on one page in *PLRE* I, while Sidonius Apollinaris received three pages in *PLRE* II. In contrast, *PCBE* 2 devotes five pages to Marius Mercator, fifteen pages to Rufinus, twenty-three pages to Pelagius and twenty-four pages to Paulinus of Nola, awarding also a deacon, Petrus (Petrus 70), with nine pages, to take only a few random examples. However, the contrast is not as marked with the last volume of *PLRE*, which presents Procopius on seven pages, the praetorian prefect Solomon on nine pages, Narses on seventeen pages and Belisarius on forty-two pages. The trend thus seems to be generally towards a Pauly-Wissowa-type treatment of important personalities.

The criteria of selection are, of course, quite different in *PLRE* and *PCBE*. While the former concentrates on imperial aristocracy, the latter includes practically everyone possibly linked with the church. Thus, in addition to the bishops and clergy, it covers ordinary monks, grave-diggers, and even *coloni* and slaves owned by the church. Secular notables involved in ecclesiastical affairs may also receive a summary treatment (Belisarius two and Narses three pages). Still, the overlap with *PLRE* remains limited. Of the 402 persons in my sample from *PCBE* 2, thirty-four (8 %) appear in *PLRE* I-III. It might be noted, however, that although *PCBE* aims to refer to the corresponding entries in *PLRE*, it does not always succeed: the cross-reference is missing in six cases out of those thirty-four, and once it is incorrect (Magetia = *PLRE* II Megetia 2, Maria 1 = *PLRE* II Maria 4, Martius = *PLRE* III Martius[?], Mastallo 2 = *PLRE* III Mastalo, Matheus = *PLRE* III Matheus, Moderatus = *PLRE* II Moderatus and Maximus 20 = *PLRE* II Maximus 16, not 17). In general, there is little difference between the corresponding entries in *PCBE* and *PLRE*, the former normally giving somewhat fuller bibliographical details for primary sources.

The proportion of women in the works is surprisingly similar: 9 % in *PCBE* Africa, 15 % in *PCBE* Italy, 9 % in *PLRE* I, 15 % in *PLRE* II and 10 % in *PLRE* III (in each case counting the letter M). Female members of the aristocracy in *PLRE* have little counterpart among the bishops in *PCBE*, but that is balanced by the presence of two main types of Christian women. First, there are females who alone or together with their spouses donate mosaic floors in Italian churches, and second, there are gravestones which record persons characterised as *puella Dei*, *vidua Dei*, *sacra virgo* or similar. The inclusion of such cases well reflects the wide coverage of *PCBE*. Three well-known female personalities of the age, Marcella and the two Melanias, receive together seventeen pages in *PCBE* (only two in *PLRE*), so there does not seem to be any marked

male bias in the expansion of individual entries.

It must be a constant problem for Late Roman prosopographers how to spell names. I would question the decision to treat, e.g., *Eraclius*, *Erennios*, *Ioannes*, *Ioannis*, *Iobianus* and *Iobinus* separately from *Heraclius*, *Herennius*, *Iohannes*, *Iovianus* and *Iovinus*, as these are only different graphic variants of the same name. The practice does not seem to be quite uniform throughout the work. One may also be surprised to find an entry for Ouesperion, with no trace of an entry for Vesperion. More similar cases might be found. Finally, I note that the correct reference for Victorina 1 should now be *ICUR X 27330*.

As far as I can see, this is a carefully produced book and extremely useful for a number of further studies on onomastics, prosopography, social and ecclesiastical history, and gender studies, among others. It will take its place as the basic reference work alongside *PLRE*.

Antti Arjava

KARL SCHEFOLD: *Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker*. Neubearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage, unter Mitarbeit von ANNE-CATHERINE BAYARD, HERBERT A. CAHN, MARTIN GUGGISBERG, MIRJAM T. JENNY und CHRISTOPH SCHNEIDER. Schwabe & Co. Verlag, Basel 1997. ISBN 3-7965-0997-5. 599 S., 331 Abb. CHF 128.

The first edition of this book appeared almost sixty years ago, in 1943. Karl Schefold (1905-1999), though assisted by collaborators, was himself responsible for the majority of the revisions and additions. This point might not have deserved mention except that the author had done this work in his nineties. Schefold's profound knowledge of all forms of ancient art, acquired through painstaking research over many decades, is clearly recognisable in this as in so many other contributions. The revised version of *Die Bildnisse* is considerably larger than the original one: numerous new illustrations have been added (while some from the 1943 edition have been omitted), new materials are included (statuettes in terracotta and reliefs), and more space is given to the photographs of coins. As a result, the catalogue displays 329 illustrations from archaic representations of musicians and singers to a statuette of Christ from the fourth century A.D. What is more, recent scholarship and research on ancient portraits are duly discussed. This is partly reflected in the essays which have been essentially rewritten. Many discussions of individual pieces are also more solid than before, and chronological issues have been thoroughly rethought. In fact, now the portraits are arranged not according to the period in which the persons represented lived (or were thought to have lived), but according to the period in which the specific portrait type was established.

The book focusses on poets, orators and thinkers. However, the contents are sometimes beyond what is suggested by the title, for besides a number of poets who may not be poets in the proper sense of the word, one also encounters portraits of politicians, doctors, historians, and even a relief representing a priestess (identified as Diotima). The inclusion of the last-named (fig. 39) is somewhat artificial, as the necessary link with literature is created only by Diotima's appearance in Plato's *Symposium*. What is more,

too much imagination may be required to agree with Schefold (and some others) that the funerary relief from Mantinea shows none other than the Platonic Diotima. As a matter of fact, the identification of the persons represented constitutes a major problem in Schefold's work. Though a number of attributions of the first edition have been revised, many questionable entries remain. In general, it seems that Schefold is too optimistic about the possibilities of identification. Some proposals are based on no more than what have been traditionally regarded as typical attributes of a philosopher or of a poet. Even inscribed pieces are often problematic, for an epigraphic label may be of secondary, even spurious origin. To cite an example, despite the fact that his name is displayed, can we be sure that fig. 244, and thus also fig. 243, really represent Seneca? But even if Seneca could be thus established, it may be too simplistic to postulate a connecting link between him and the Socrates represented on the opposite side of the double herm: the reason why such a herm was erected would be that both figures were known to have committed suicide. Another case (fig. 245): a man on a funerary relief (now in Basle) is identified as Phaedrus, the writer of fables, because a mouse is represented to the left of his head: interesting rather than convincing (note that animals, including mice, are not an uncommon topic in Roman funerary art). To be sure, Schefold is well aware of such difficulties, and so he has frequently added a question mark after the person's name.

The essays, accompanied by 177 endnotes, provide a great deal of pertinent reading (see, respectively, within Ch. 1 [Einleitung: Geschichte der Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker] and Ch. 4 [Ergebnisse]). Among the many important insights into ancient portraiture, one may note the following: One and the same individual could be represented in stylistically varying versions in many different periods. A good example is, of course, Homer who was portrayed in most periods of antiquity. As a further case, one may cite Aristophanes (provided that the attributions are correct): While the Late Classical fig. 50 (+ 64), regarded as belonging to the comic poet's funerary relief, portrays a spiritually tense figure, the famous (High) Hellenistic bronze head fig. 149 f. shows a fairly serious drunkard (note that, according to Ath. 10, 429 a, not only Alcaeus but also Aristophanes composed his pieces in a state of intoxication). Regarding the differences between Greece and Rome, it is interesting to observe with Schefold that Roman poets were generally not represented in plastic art before Trajanic Classicism.

Mika Kajava

CHRISTIAN ZINDEL: *Meeresleben und Jenseitsfahrt. Die Fischteller der Sammlung Florence Gottet*. Von Sammlern und Stiftern 3. Akanthus, Verlag für Archäologie, Kilchberg – Zürich 1998. ISBN 3-905083-13-2. 207 p. CHF 98.

In this book, Chr. Zindel publishes 36 fish plates from a Swiss collection. 'Fish plate' is traditionally used to denote a certain type of shallow and circular ceramic ware on which fishes were often depicted. Early interpretations of the application of fish plates were obvious: they would have served as plates for fish dishes.

Unfortunately, since the Gottet pieces come from the antiquarian market, the

exact places of discovery and the finding conditions are totally unknown. However, analysis of material, style and imagery suggests that their origin is in the following areas: Attica, Sicily, Campania, Paestum, Apulia (Tarentum and Canusium). The last of these is an interesting case, for it seems that the Apulian fish plates were manufactured especially for funerary use. So it may be that the motif of fish (and of other sea animals) is to be explained as a symbol of Okeanos, the sea by which it was possible to get to the life beyond. This is one of the main conclusions of the book.

Not only is the text factual, but the volume also abounds with high quality illustrations that make it aesthetically enjoyable reading. Though probably meant as funerary symbols, I should add that some scenes with mullets and sepias are very appetizing. In one case, however, the expression in the eye of a fish is so touching (p. 75), that I would let it swim into the Ocean together with the departed.

Mika Kajava

KLAUS GREWE: *Licht am Ende des Tunnels. Planung und Trassierung im antiken Tunnelbau*. Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1998. ISBN 3-8053-2492-8. 218 S. DEM 78.

When looking at the achievements of ancient technology, the question that often comes to mind is "How did they do it?" Finding an answer to this question can be puzzling as most often no plans or written descriptions of their construction are available. Klaus Grewe has taken up the formidable task of recreating the process of planning and quarrying tunnels in the entire ancient world. The work is also his doctoral dissertation and a result of his almost lifelong interest in the making of ancient tunnels. The volume is part of the *Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie* which is very fortunate as the text is greatly illuminated by the huge amount of photographs, plans, and sections mostly taken or drawn by Grewe himself.

The ten chapters first treat terminology and technological aspects of tunnelling and then move on to describe a large number of ancient tunnels chronologically starting from the Qanat tunnels of the Iron Age Near East. The water tunnels of ancient Israel are also examined. Most of the book is dedicated to Roman tunnel building and this long chapter is divided into several subsections by the function of the tunnels: drainage tunnels, tunnels for lowering water in lakes, river diversions, road tunnels, and aqueduct tunnels. The last two chapters are very short and describe the use of tunnels in warfare and the continuation of Roman tunnel building in later periods.

For the benefit of the non-specialist reader (such as myself), the technical part is fairly clearly written and covers the most important techniques. Perhaps the two pages devoted to the meaning of the term "tunnel" as defined in German is a bit exaggerated, but otherwise most terms are explained concisely and clearly. After the terminological chapter, the strategy of tunnel building is explored, both for the two-end technique and for the Qanat (or light-hole) technique. In the later various descriptions, these theoretical explanations are seen at work in the actual tunnels. The technical chapters also include a description of ancient measuring equipment.

As emphasized by Grewe, we have only few descriptions of tunnels and their construction surviving from ancient times, and so the main source for the study of their making is the tunnel itself. For this type of study, it is paramount to enter a tunnel, to go through it, and simultaneously document different features of test tunnels, test shafts, mistaken tunnel directions, etc. in the walls and roofs of the tunnel. Grewe himself has done the detailed documentation for many of the tunnels – often previous researchers have not paid attention to small details. This is probably behind the selection of tunnels featured in the book. In some cases it is clear that Grewe has very little to say on the actual remains, but they have nevertheless been included, for example the few meagre paragraphs treating the tunnels of Rome's aqueduct system. He does, however, include reference literature where the interested reader can find more information. Sometimes it is slightly difficult to see the relationship between Grewe's and previous researchers' results.

The geographical range of sites is impressive, reaching from Central Europe to the Near East. Most attention is given to some of the more famous ancient tunnels: Eupalinos' tunnel on the island of Samos and the drainage of the Fucine lake by the emperor Claudius. Less known, but very interesting tunnels include the drainage of a lake at Fontvieille in France or the Saldae aqueduct in modern Algeria, where additional information is provided by a long inscription.

Many questions still remain open, in some cases even the actual function of the tunnels. Such is the case, for example, with the Etruscan *cuniculi* in the areas around Rome: drainage, irrigation, or both? Dating the tunnels is also an interesting question which remains mostly outside Grewe's treatment, although in some cases he is able to provide a relative dating of the working process in individual tunnels, such as the *emissarium* of Lake Nemi near Rome.

On the whole, the book provides an interesting insight into one aspect of ancient tunnel making. The catalogue of tunnels is comprehensive enough for other researchers interested in various regions to find reference points for their own work.

Eeva-Maria Viitanen

Deliciae Fictiles II. Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Archaic Architectural Terracottas from Italy held at the Netherlands Institute in Rome, 12-13 June 1996. Edited by PATRICIA S. LULOF and ERIC M. MOORMANN. Scrinium 12. Thesis Publishers Amsterdam, Amsterdam 1997. ISBN 90-5170-441-0. 274 pp., 199 photographs. NLG 170.

PETER DANNER: *Westgriechische Akrotäre.* Salzburger Studien zur Archäologie. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1997. ISBN 3-8053-2002-7. 163 S., 40 Taf. DEM 148.

PATRIZIO PENSABENE: *Terracotte del Museo Nazionale Romano I. Gocciolatoi e protomi da sime.* Studia Archaeologica 101. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1998. 469 pp., 47 ill., 145 tavole. ITL 400.000.

CARLO RESCIGNO: *Tetti Campani, età arcaica: Cuma, Pitecusa e gli altri contesti.* Pubblicazioni scientifiche del Centro di Studi della Magna Grecia dell'Università degli

Studi di Napoli "Federico II", 3. ser., vol. 4. Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Roma 1998. ISBN 88-7689-137-4. 414 pp., 37 plates, 205 figures. ITL 300.000.

Roofs are, for most archaeologists, things that can only be dreamed of: organic materials do not usually survive. For the classical archaeologist, the situation is much easier. Tiled roofs and wooden roofs decorated with terracotta plaques are common for most areas and time periods. When surveying an area pieces of roof tiles are often the most visible part of a site. Given the large quantity of material it is surprising how little attention is given to roofs at all. These four mighty volumes all deal with roofs and their decorations but each has its own unique take on the matter.

The first *Deliciae Fictiles* conference was held in Rome in 1990 and its purpose was to promote the study of Archaic architectural terracottas. Special emphasis was given to technical, functional and regional features as well as to the study of whole roof assemblies instead of the traditional stylistic and iconographic studies. The current volume consists of an introduction by Riemer R. Knoop and 23 papers given at the second conference with two additional papers by Bruno D'Agostino and Lucia Scatozza.

The articles have been arranged alphabetically (and the editors make no excuses for it) by the author's name instead of thematically, which is slightly confusing when reading the book. Some articles, for example the ones by D'Agostino and Scatozza which deal with the archaic temples of Pompei, would benefit from being placed one after the other so that easy comparison of the materials would be possible. The abstracts at the end of the book have been arranged thematically. Some comments made during the conference have also been included. The many photographs and drawings are of good quality and add to the texts in a meaningful way.

The main topics are publication or re-examination of terracottas from various sites and iconography based on finds from one or more sites. The papers by Francesco Maria Cifarelli on Segni, Concetta Ciurcina on Syracuse, Elena Epifanio Vanni on Himera, Maria C. Lentini on Naxos, and Anna Maria Moretti Sgubini (with Maristella Pandolfini) on Vulci represent the traditional publication of finds from single sites. The vast collections of the world's museums still hide many old and new pieces and these "scavi di magazzino" are represented by the articles of Mariëlle De Reuver on the materials at the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford, Giovanna Greco on Poseidonia and Cumae (strangely, with different titles in the table of contents and at the beginning of the article), and Patricia S. Lulof on a new piece from the collections of Princeton University. Carlo Rescigno's paper is based on his studies of the Campanian roofs in general.

Iconographic themes are varied. Giorgio Aversa examines the historical and iconographical development of depicting rams in Etruscan architecture, an important and probably domestic decorative motif in Italy beginning at least from the 6th century BC. Simonetta Stopponi's paper is on a similar theme, based on a ram protome from the sanctuary of Cannicella in Orvieto. The Etruscan theme is continued by Volker Kästner in his paper on the ends of the decorated simas. Margit von Mehren has studied composite motifs on Etruscan frieze plaques, especially those of cavalry, chariot races, and Heracles. She traces the beginnings of the cavalry theme to its Assyrian origins and cites Greek influences as well emphasizing the pan-Mediterranean character of the

decoration scheme.

Mythological themes of the archaic temple of S. Omobono in Rome are studied by Madeleine Mertens-Horn and Claudio Parisi Presicce. The acroterial group of Heracles and Athena has been interpreted as the scene of Heracles' apotheosis to Olympus. Mertens-Horn offers a new interpretation as Milo of Croton's (dressed as Heracles) triumph over Sybaris, thus connecting the statues to the friendship between Etruria and Sybaris, the Greek origins of the Tarquinii, and as symbols of the Roman hegemony at the end of the 6th century BC. The second topic she addresses is the reconstruction of two acroterial fragments generally interpreted as Eos holding Kephalos in her arms. Mertens-Horn's interpretation is Ino-Leukothea, the goddess of the sea and seamen, as well as the Greek equivalent of Mater Matuta, and in her arms, her son Palaimon-Melikertes, Portunus in the Roman sphere. Parisi Presicce interprets a vertical plait as a vine support and other fragments as a Dionysiac scene. The third mythological article is by Maria José Strazzulla on the late archaic temple of Segni and its terracottas.

Ninina Cuomo di Caprio's article examines the extent of technical studies in a sample of recent publications on architectural terracottas. Silvia Ciaghi and Ingrid E.M. Edlund-Berry write about the technical aspects of the study of terracottas. Ciaghi has used digital image processing, i. e. correlation of digital images, in comparing similar motifs on terracotta reliefs and tries to determine the differences in the production of the plaques. Edlund-Berry presents methods of documenting and analyzing the profiles of terracotta (and other) moldings, also based on digital and statistical techniques. Charlotte Wikander emphasizes the importance of proper comparative studies of large groups of material in her article about the raking simas in Central Italy. The techniques of terracotta production in Morgantina have also been studied by John F. Kenfield. Two different techniques have been found, a Greek and an Italic, and through these, to a certain extent, the hellenization of the area can be examined. Kenfield also proposes a cult of the nymph Kypara. Nancy A. Winter's short contribution is on the progress and themes of her work on a synthesis of Etruscan architectural terracottas.

The last article to mention is Knoop's paper on terracotta material from Satricum which clearly illustrates the problems of studying and publishing excavated finds. The quantity of the material is so huge that not all can be properly published. The paper also illustrates the number of methods applied to the study of terracottas ranging from petrographical to typological studies.

The three other volumes at hand can be described mostly as catalogues, but they are also studies of different types of entities. The most traditional catalogue is Patrizio Pensabene's work on the lion, canine, and other motif groups of waterspouts and protomes from lateral simas. The material comes from the formidable collections of the *Museo Nazionale Romano*. The catalogue is preceded by short historical and typological articles on each motif group. The typology is mostly based on stylistic analysis of the manes and fur of the animals. Most of the pieces come from unknown places and the only larger collections from known proveniences come from the Temple of Diana in Norba and from the villas of Livia and Q. Voconius Pollio in the vicinity of Rome. Each piece is presented in one or more photographs. For the most part, it seems that these pieces have not been published before as there are hardly any bibliographical references, but at least for the known sites, a reference to a general publication of other materials

could have been useful in connection with the individual pieces. In addition to the waterspouts and protomes, the volume includes 81 antefixes as an addition to the catalogue published in 1983 by P. Pensabene and R. Sanzi Di Mino (*Il Museo Nazionale Romano, Le Terrecotte III, 1: Le Antefisse.*)

Peter Danner has already studied Greek acroters (*Griechische Akrotere der archaischen und klassischen Zeit* [RdA Suppl. 5, 1989]) and now his attention is focused on the western Greek acroters. The book consists of a short introduction including the definition and problems of identifying acroters, which is followed by a catalogue of pieces arranged by decorative motifs (discs, volutes, animals, Nikes, groups of figures, female figures, and horsemen) and divided into certain and uncertain ones. He also describes the roof decorations of tombs, sculptures which are only partly at the roof's edge, pieces that have been falsely identified as acroters, as well as roof elements depicted in other arts. The entries are concise and often accompanied by a photograph or a drawing. The catalogue is then followed by a typological discussion for each group presenting most general types, their geographical distribution and dating. The types are also placed in wider contexts as their influences are traced back to Italic and Greek architectural models – it is interesting to note the probably very strong Italic influence in the early archaic styles and motifs. The book is delightful to read with its very clear style and very logical progress from one issue to another, and it offers good reference material for further studies.

In his introduction Carlo Rescigno confesses to have started with an idea of a cultural and social study on the Campanian revetment plaques, but noticed that a large number of technical and typological studies were necessary before even beginning other types of inquiry. H. Koch's studies on the Campanian roof at the beginning of the 20th century have been supplemented with a large amount of new excavation material. Rescigno aims at creating a new *corpus* with a special emphasis on the Cuman and Pithecusan materials. The main part of the volume consists of two catalogues. The first is the typological one preceded by an explanation of the rather complicated typological system based on function, compositional and decorative elements. The other catalogue is geographical, listing finds from various cities and pulling together the separate pieces in order to see the whole decoration schemes even in separate buildings (as with the Pompeian temples). In the conclusions, Rescigno discusses the decorative systems and the workshops which produced them. His appendix on the mounting marks found on some pieces is also interesting.

For anyone interested in roofs and their decorative systems, these books offer important material collections as well as studies and ideas. Their bibliographies certainly cover most of the literature in this field. The emphasis is on earlier periods, but at least Pensabene's catalogue, material of which is mostly from the 1st century BC and 1st century AD, shows that later periods offer material for study as well.

Eeva-Maria Viitanen

Defining Ancient Arkadia. Symposium, April, 1-4 1998. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 6. Edited by THOMAS HEINE NIELSEN and JAMES ROY. Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 78. Copenhagen 1999. ISBN 87-7876-160-3. 491 p., 4 maps. DKK 620.

The papers presented at the Copenhagen symposium were a logical continuation to a number of studies on the *polis* structure of Arcadia which the remarkably active Copenhagen Polis Centre had produced earlier. However, here the focus is not on individual cities, but on the Arcadian region as a whole. Within this general theme, the contributors discuss identities, regional and local, temple-building, and various questions concerning infra-structures, settlement patterns, and economy. After an introductory chapter by the editors of the volume on the progress of research on Arcadia, the contents are as follows: T.H. Nielsen, "The Concept of Arkadia – The People, their Land, and their Organisation"; M.H. Hansen, "Aristotle's Reference to the Arkadian Federation at *Pol.* 1261a29"; M. Pretzler, "Myth and History at Tegea – Local Tradition and Community Identity"; M.E. Voyatzis, "The Role of Temple Building in Consolidating Arkadian Communities"; J. Forsén & B. Forsén & E. Østby, "The Sanctuary of Agios Elias – Its Significance, and Its Relations to Surrounding Sanctuaries and Settlements"; M. Jost, "Les schémas de peuplement de l'Arcadie aux époques archaïque et classique"; Y.A. Pikoulas, "The Road-Network of Arkadia"; J. Roy, "The Economies of Arkadia"; C. Morgan, "Cultural Subzones in Early Iron Age and Archaic Arkadia?". The volume concludes with abundant indices and four maps.

Mika Kajava

ARMIN WIEGAND: *Das Theater von Solunt. Ein besonderer Skenentyp des Spät-hellenismus auf Sizilien.* Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Rom. Sonderschriften 12. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1997. ISBN 3-8053-2035-3. xi, 78 S., 47 Tafeln, 30 Beilagen. DEM 98.

Die Bearbeitung der vorliegenden Monographie wurde im Rahmen des Forschungsvorhabens "Die Agora von Solunt" des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts in Rom ausgeführt. Das Theater von Solunt gehört zur urbanistischen Anlage der hellenistischen Stadt, die auf dem Monte Califano lag. Nach einleitenden Bemerkungen und Bibliographie folgt die Baubeschreibung. Dabei kommen das Bühnengebäude, die Orchestra, und das Koilon und der Aussenbereich zur Sprache. Den Bauphasen, Rekonstruktionen und der Datierung werden eigene Kapitel gewidmet. Am Ende steht ein Katalog der erhaltenen Monumente. Ein wichtiger Beitrag zur Erschliessung der Architektur und Urbanistik von Solunt.

Heikki Solin

RITA PERRY: *Die Campanareliefs*. Aufnahmen von DIETER JOHANNES sowie HUBERT VÖGELE. Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Katalog der Sammlung antiker Kleinkunst des Archäologischen Instituts der Universität Heidelberg 4. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1997. ISBN 3-8053-1827-8. ix, 71 S., 11 Tafeln. DEM 98.

Die Sammlung Campana ist ein Begriff auch für Nichtarchäologen. Dagegen ist die Gattung der Campanareliefs in ihrer Bedeutung als kunst- und kulturhistorisches Dokument bis in die Gegenwart unterbewertet worden, trotz ihrer Bedeutung als wichtige Quelle für die Erforschung architektonischer römischer Tonreliefs. Die Heidelberger Sammlung nimmt einen wichtigen Platz in dem Corpus dieser Gattung ein, und so begrüsst man freudig die vorliegende Edition, die aus einer Magisterarbeit aus dem Jahre 1967 entstand, aber für den Druck von der Verfasserin vollständig überarbeitet wurde.

Den zentralen Teil des Bandes bildet der ausgezeichnet bearbeitete Katalog, worauf allgemeine Beobachtungen und Überlegungen zu den Stücken der Sammlung folgen. In der Schlussbetrachtung wird auf die schwierige Datierungsfrage eingegangen mit einem Ansatz zwischen dem 2. Viertel des 1. Jh. v. Chr. und dem 2. Jh. n. Chr. Trotz ihres nicht grossen Umfangs bietet die Heidelberger Sammlung interessante und wichtige Gesichtspunkte zur Erforschung dieser Gattung von Denkmälern.

Heikki Solin

Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae, a cura di EVA MARGARETA STEINBY. Vol. V: *T-Z. Addenda et corrigenda*. ISBN 88-7140-162-X. 370 p., 114 fig. – Vol. VI: *Addenda et corrigenda. Indici*. ISBN 88-7140-172-7. 142 p.. Edizioni Quasar di Severino Tognon, Roma 1999, 2000. ITL 260.000, ITL 120.000.

The last two volumes of *LTUR* appeared almost ten years after the whole enterprise was projected. Though a decade is more than was originally planned, such a lapse of time is reasonable considering what is now available to the reader: a set of six precious volumes on the topography of ancient Rome. Anything good is always worth waiting for, and it mostly happens that results become more refined with time. As before, the editorial work of Eva Margareta Steinby is superb and the volumes are beautifully printed. Many important entries are listed under the final letters of the alphabet, e. g. *taberna(e)*, *Tabularium*, *theatrum*, *thermae*, *Tiberis*, *Transtiberim*, *tribunal*; *Velabrum*, *Velia*, *Venus*, *Vesta*, *via*, *vicus* (many a *vicus* being known from the "Base Capitolina", Dessau, *ILS* 6073), *xenodochium*. Note that two entries are written in Latin (s. v. "Vivarium", by A. La Regina). The reader is pleased to find that numerous addenda and corrigenda with updated bibliographies have been added to these volumes (by Nigel Pollard, vol. V, p. 221-292 and vol. VI, p. 7-9). It could not have been otherwise, though. What is especially delightful is that the *Lexicon* also includes copious indices, both topographical and prosopographical, concluding with a list of popes, which have been compiled in an exemplary way by Marco Buonocore. The topographical index also serves as a repertory of deities and mythological figures.

The entries from T to Z and the addenda are well balanced, mostly taking into consideration what is relevant to the argument. Very few misprints catch the eye (but

there are problems in some Greek citations). Instead of entering into details (cf., e. g., the restoration by F. Coarelli of a fragment of the fasti Amit. [*Inscr.It.* XIII.2, 187, 461] which is reported in two different ways in the entries VENUS, AEDES and VENUS CALVA, respectively, or vol. VI add. TRITON(ES) where one should note that *CIL* VI 8684 comes from Misenum, cf. *AE* 1990, 151), I should bring forth HERCULES, AEDICULA (add.) as an example of a somewhat problematic entry. It is created on the basis of *CIL* VI 293 (add *ILS* 4834): ...*Herculi Eponae S[ilvano aedi]culam*, etc. It is true that the inclusion may be justified, but to know this, the reader should be guided to the article on Silvanus (vol. IV p. 313). More generally, however, besides the fact that a reference to "Epona, aedicula" is missing (Silvanus is registered in vol. IV p. 313), one may ask if and to what extent private dedications or restorations of *aediculae*, and similar, should be considered? For if they are listed consistently, a considerable bulk of urban inscriptions should be re-read, with the obvious result of many new additions to the Lexicon (cf. *Arctos* 34 [2000] 307 where I noted that the dedication of an *ara*, *basis*, *signum*, etc., often implies the existence of an *aedicula*, etc.). Understandably, while some small sanctuaries known from inscriptions can be put in a more or less precise topographical context, other *aediculae* remain totally isolated cases, and perhaps they could be omitted. To solve the problem of inclusion, it might have been reasonable to produce entries comparable to that by L. Chioffi on Silvanus, listing a great deal of evidence for the cult of this god in Rome. Popular gods like Hercules could have been dealt with in a similar way.

As for the numerous *domus* entries in the addenda (and in vol. II), my personal opinion is that the criteria for inclusion should have been more strict. (I know that there are conflicting opinions.) If an ancient source reveals that some person is somehow related to a *domus*, or any residence, somewhere in Rome, does this mean that there should be an entry in its own right? If Cicero says in passing that senator X has something to do with an urban *domus* but does not give similar information about senator Y, there may have been no factual differences between the housing conditions of the two. Surely the latter also had an abode in Rome, the capital being the legal as well as the practical residence for Roman senators. Of course, listing senator Y would be an absurdity, but how much more sense is there in creating an entry for a *domus* only vaguely related to senator X, and with no topographical context? – For *domus* and related issues, see now also L. Chioffi, "Sulle case delle élites a Roma e dintorni. Supplemento al *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*", *Bull. Com.* 100 (1999) [2001] 37 ff.

The catalogue ends with an entry dedicated to the *aedes* of the goddess [---]PEVIA. This mysterious name, [---]peviae, is found in *CIL* VI 36836 which I republished many years ago (*Lacus Iuturnae* I [1989] 39 f. No. 4). A welcome suggestion has been made by T.P. Wiseman. In his view, the text might belong to the sanctuary of the goddess Volupia whose name would have been spelled *Volupevia* (*JRS* 82 [1992] 230). As a further piece of evidence supporting this hypothesis, one might adduce Varro in *Prob. Verg. ecl.* 6,31 (Hagen p. 343) where *Deviana* is introduced as an ancient form of *Diana* (cf. also Varro *ling.* 5,68: *Diviana*). In any case, since VI 36836 must be of imperial date, the form *Volupevia* for *Volupia* would provide interesting evidence for the revival of archaic language.

Some epigraphic additions to the sources mentioning Roman monuments may be found in *AE* 1998: No. 1056 *aedes thensarum* (in a new Pannonian military diploma),

No. 207 *area carruces* (Rome, inscr. *Exiit / [---] in domo propr[ia / de] area carr(u)c(es)*), No. 1611 *thermae Neronianae* (inscription of unknown origin, perhaps urban), No. 230 *titulus Byzanti* (inscription from Rome).

Mika Kajava

JÜRGEN J. RASCH: *Das Mausoleum der Kaiserin Helena in Rom und der 'Tempio della Tosse' in Tivoli*. Spätantike Zentralbauten in Rom und Latium 3. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1998. ISBN 3-8053-1851-0. ix, 119 S., 118 Tafeln. DEM 198.

The countryside to the east of the Tiber is (or, rather, used to be) a veritable treasure trove for most branches of ancient studies. Ruins of Roman villas and tombs offer rich material for the student of epigraphy, Roman art, architecture, topography, etc. There is also an abundance of literary material from ancient authors. Considering all this, the study of the Roman *suburbium* and the adjacent areas has been surprisingly subdued until quite recently. The basic archaeology outside modern Rome's Great Ring Road has been documented in the *Forma Italiae* and *Latium Vetus* volumes from the 1960's onwards and it is being implemented by new surveys, at least in the area north of Rome. The area inside the *Grande Raccordo Anulare* is more problematic. In most areas, the basic documentation is only available in the publications of Thomas Ashby and Giuseppe Tomassetti from the beginning of the 20th century. An important contribution has been made recently by Lucrezia Spera with her 1999 book *Il paesaggio suburbano di Roma dall'età tardoantica al medioevo. Il comprensorio tra le vie Latina ed Ardeatina dalle mura Aureliane al III miglio* (Bibliotheca archaeologica 27).

Jürgen Rasch's research on the Late Antique round buildings has resulted in three mighty volumes on four important monuments in the area around Rome. The first volume published the documentation of the mausoleum at Maxentius' villa on the Via Appia, and the second the tomb called *Tor de' Schiavi* on the Via Prenestina. Rasch's work continues and supplements the research of other two German scholars, Friedrich Wilhelm Deichmann and Arnold Tschira, who documented many of the buildings a half a century ago. The volume at hand offers us documentation and research on two buildings: the mausoleum of the empress Helena by the Via Labicana and the so-called *Tempio della Tosse* on the Via Tiburtina just outside Tivoli.

The main emphasis is on documentation, reconstruction, and dating of the buildings, but there is also discussion on the dating of the building techniques and on the meaning of the buildings to the topography of their immediate surroundings. As such, they supplement our knowledge of Late Antiquity in the Roman *suburbium* in a very meaningful way, also offering easily available comparative material for further research. The research on ancient sources and earlier documentation is admirable and accurate, but there are some rather surprising omissions when new research could have been used, especially in discussions of topography.

The volume has been divided into two parts, the first dealing with the Helena monument and the second with the *Tempio della Tosse*. The chapters concerning the first monument have partly been written by Deichmann and Tschira and offer a supplement to

their 1957 article on the same subject which was published in *JbDAI*. Their texts, descriptions, and bibliography in the footnotes are supplemented and commented on by Rasch. A quick comparison shows that the two publications seem to complement each other, the earlier one concentrating more on the historical and religious side of the monument and the current one being more specific on the documentation of the building. The text has, in each case, been supplemented by a vast amount of photographs and plans, ranging from early drawings to excavation photographs and reconstruction drawings. The discussion is begun by a general description of the site and its known history followed by the building documentation and ending with a comparative discussion on the typology and chronology of the *mausolea* as annexes of churches of martyrs.

The Late Antique imperial complexes around Rome are a very interesting feature in the topography of the area. They seem to form a semi-circle round the city at a distance ca. three miles from the centre, and usually consist of a villa and a tomb: starting from the north with S. Agnese on the Via Nomentana, then followed by the villa of the Gordiani and *Tor de' Schiavi* on the Via Prenestina, the Helena mausoleum annexed to the basilica of Saints Marcellinus and Petrus (the villa being perhaps the building complex in the area of the former Centocelle airport?), and ending with the Maxentine complex on the Via Appia. This picture (quite visible, for example, on the map on Plate 69) cannot be supplemented by more precise information on the other Late Antique sites, which is very unfortunate. In the case of these imperial complexes, we also have information on their ownership and even on the extent of their territory in the case of the Helena monument. The extent of the *fundus* has been drawn by Deichmann and Tschira to cover the area between the Aurelian Wall, *viae* Praenestina and Latina and in the east *fosso di Centocelle*. Rasch has not discussed, not even in footnotes, Filippo Coarelli's suggestion that a passage in *Liber Pontificalis* (*vita Silvestri*, p. 182 Duchesne) might mean smaller parcels of landed property ranging from the walls all the way to Monte Cavo (published in Coarelli's 1986 article "L'urbs e il suburbium" in *Società romana e impero tardoantico* II). In order for us to better understand the topography and, perhaps, the true extent and significance of these imperial complexes, a very thorough survey in the archives, libraries and perhaps in the field as well would be needed! At this stage of research, both suggestions remain plausible, but cannot be verified.

The second monument is situated near Tivoli and differs in some aspects from the other buildings dealt with by Rasch. First, it is situated just outside Tivoli, just below the platform of the temple of Hercules Victor. Secondly, the only written document that could be connected to the building is the inscription *CIL* XIV 3582 from the middle of the 4th century AD recording the leveling of the road leading to the town of Tibur, the *clivus Tiburtinus*. This inscription was found ca. 200 metres downhill from the building and the building opens on to the *clivus Tiburtinus*. The little round building rising above the adjacent plantings has been interpreted as a temple (of the Cough, as the later Italian name suggests) or a tomb. The original research by Deichmann suggested a new interpretation as a vestibule to a villa. Other visible remains are few, but include a terrace wall to the southwest, a cistern to the northeast and some remains of walls and vaulted spaces in the middle of the terrace. Later documentation of the building has affirmed the interpretation as a vestibule, as parts of the earlier entrance, an *atrium*, to the building

have been found. The *Tempio della Tosse* has survived, probably only due to the fact that sometime in the 10th or 11th century AD it was turned into a church – the building's documentation includes analysis of the medieval frescoes by Beat Brenk.

The main emphasis is, of course, on the round building itself, but, as before, Rasch also discusses the topography of the area. The meticulous documentation of the building's research history probably lists all surviving drawings from the past centuries, drawing again attention to the importance of Tivoli to past travellers and artists admiring a huge range of ancient remains in the area. Rasch's bibliography of the Tiburtine topography seems to end with C. F. Giuliani's 1970 *Forma Italiae* publication (Reg. I,7) of the archaeological remains in and just outside the town of Tivoli. This includes the basic facts on some of the most important buildings in the *Tempio della Tosse's* vicinity, for example the temple of Hercules Victor as well as the so-called villa of Quintilius Varus on the other side of the river Anio. Giuliani's 1966 *Forma Italiae* volume (Reg. I,3) features mostly remains to the east of Tivoli, but includes also the so-called villa of Cassius south of the villa.

The most obvious comparative and topographical information on the various villas filling the slopes west of Tivoli can now be found in the same series written by Zaccaria Mari, published in 1991 (Reg. I,35). His discussion on the different types of villas, also including information from the written sources, is the most thorough one of the material so far. This book would have provided Rasch with plenty of further information on other villas in the area and could have filled some of the gaps in the topographical maps (for example Plate 95). Mari has also re-studied some of the buildings published by Giuliani, including the villa of Quintilius Varus (published in *Boll. Arch.* 10 [1991]). Reading the last article could have saved Rasch from claiming his villa as the largest known in the area (p. 59), as Mari's research reveals the size of the Varus villa to be nearer to 7 hectares compared to the *Tempio della Tosse's* ca. 5 hectares. Mari's research would also have revealed some sites still used during Late Antiquity, which include the so-called villa of Ventidius Bassus to the north (Mari 1991, No. 225) and also the villa of Cassius to the south (Giuliani 1966, No. 214 as well as Z. Mari: "La villa tiburtina detta di Cassio: nuove acquisizioni", *RIA* ser. 3, 6-7 [1983-1984], 97-131).

The dating of the earlier building phases is based on building technique (*opus incertum* in the substructures, according to Giuliani, and *opus reticulatum* in the atrium under the later building, according to Rasch) and this, of course, gives us only a very wide range of dates within which to place the building. Without proper excavation, more precise dating remains uncertain. Rasch suggests that the existing villa substructures have at least in part dictated the lines of the two roads leading to the town, *Strada degli Orti* below (more or less the *clivus Tiburtinus*) and *Strada del Tartaro* above. These roads have since been discussed by Giuliani in 1992 ("Il Clivus Tiburtinus ed il sistema stradale connesso", in *Tecnica stradale Romana. Atlante Tematica di Topografia Antica* 1), and he suggests that the upper road was the natural road up to the town and that the lower road would have been constructed later, as the monumental entrance to the town through the temple. Rasch perhaps overestimates the importance of the villa in this respect, as he also suggests (p. 59 n. 586) that the temple platform would have been oriented to accommodate for the earlier villa platform. Considering the importance of the temple to Tibur, I do not find this a very plausible suggestion.

The date of the monumental temple and of the urban restructuring in the late Republican period has since Giuliani's *Forma Italiae* publication been re-considered by Filippo Coarelli in his 1987 book *I santuari del Lazio in età repubblicana* (pp. 92-98). Giuliani dates the building according to the building techniques which really cannot give a very precise date. Coarelli uses both building techniques and inscriptions to form a sequence of dates (though, partly even here based on matters of faith) that would place the building of the temple very near the time of Tibur becoming a *municipium* ca. 89 BC. This has also been accepted as the building era in the new guide to the building, *Tivoli. Il santuario di Ercole Vincitore*, published in 1998 by the Soprintendenza archeologica del Lazio and edited by Anna Maria Reggiani.

Lastly, when considering the various villa remains in the Tiburtine territory, it is hard not to consider also their owners. Rasch has suggested that the 4th/5th century AD owners of the villa could be the *gens Turcia*. This is not a wholly new idea, as Thomas Ashby suggested in 1927 that the *Tempio della Tosse* could be family tomb of the Turcii (*The Roman Campagna in Classical Times*, p. 111, not mentioned by Rasch) The inscription recording the leveling of the *clivus Tiburtinus* was set up by L. Turcius Secundus Apronianus, *corrector Flaminiae et Piceni* AD 339-350. The other known round monuments have been erected on imperial properties, which would give reason to believe that the owner and builder of any such building would be of considerable wealth and importance. The attribution remains plausible, but nevertheless unattested – Turcius was acting as an official of the state and nothing really can be said of his personal relationship to the town.

But Rasch's observation gives interesting support to another suggestion by Coarelli (*I santuari*, pp. 102-103). Based on Suetonius (*Aug.* 72,2 and 82,1), we know that Augustus spent time in Tibur and probably had property there. The cult of Hercules was made part of the imperial cult very early and, based on inscriptions, Coarelli suggests that the villa of the *Tempio della Tosse* could have been Augustus' place in Tibur. Could it still have been imperial property as late as the 4th/5th century AD? Conjecture upon conjecture, it has to be admitted, but an interesting idea.

Eeva-Maria Viitanen

INDEX LIBRORUM IN HOC VOLUMINE RECENSORUM

| | |
|--|-----|
| Alföldy, G.: <i>Die Bauinschriften des Aquäduktes von Segovia und des Amphitheaters von Tarraco</i> , 1997 (M. Kajava) | 273 |
| Alvoni, G. – U. Rausch: <i>Altertumswissenschaften digital</i> , 2001 (K. Korhonen) | 243 |
| Bellen, H.: <i>Politik – Recht – Gesellschaft. Studien zur Alten Geschichte.</i> Hrsg. von L. Schumacher, 1997 (U.-M. Liertz) | 244 |
| Birley, A. R.: <i>Onomasticon to the Younger Pliny. Letters and Panegyric</i> , 2000 (M. Kajava) | 256 |
| <i>The Cambridge Companion to Virgil.</i> Edited by C. Martindale, 1997 (M. Kajava) | 253 |
| <i>XI Congresso Internazionale di Epigrafia Greca e Latina (Roma 1997). Atti I-II</i> , 1999 (O. Salomies) | 261 |
| <i>Das Corpus Hermeticum Deutsch 1-2</i> , 1997 (H. Solin) | 249 |
| <i>Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum</i> , vol. II, editio altera. Pars V: <i>Conventus</i> <i>Astigitanus (CIL II²/5)</i> , 1998 (O. Salomies) | 272 |
| Damsgaard-Madsen, A.: <i>Grækenlands historie indtil 336 f.Kr.</i> , 1997 (O. Salomies) | 278 |
| Danner, P.: <i>Westgriechische Akrotere</i> , 1997 (E.-M. Viitanen) | 287 |
| Dee, J. H.: <i>A Lexicon of Latin Derivatives in Italian, Spanish, French, and English</i> , 1997 (H. Solin) | 258 |
| <i>Defining Ancient Arkadia (Symposium, 1998)</i> , 1999 (M. Kajava) | 291 |
| <i>Deliciae Fictiles II. Proceedings of the Second International Conference on</i> <i>Archaic Architectural Terracottas from Italy (1996)</i> , 1997 (E.-M. Viitanen) | 287 |
| <i>Grenzen der kritischen Vernunft. Helmut Holzhey zum 60. Geburtstag.</i> Hrsg. von P. A. Schmid und S. Zurbuchen, 1997 (H. Solin) | 245 |
| Grewe, K.: <i>Licht am Ende des Tunnels. Planung und Trassierung im antiken</i> <i>Tunnelbau</i> , 1998 (E.-M. Viitanen) | 286 |
| Hoffmann, R.: <i>Lateinische Verbalperiphrasen vom Typ amans sum und amatus fui.</i> <i>Valenz und Grammatikalisierung</i> , 1997 (H. Salovaara) | 259 |
| Horatius: <i>Opera</i> . Editio quarta. Edidit D. R. Shackleton Bailey, 2001 (H. Solin) | 254 |
| Horsmann, G.: <i>Die Wagenlenker der römischen Kaiserzeit</i> , 1997 (H. Solin) | 281 |
| <i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> vol. X, pars II, fasc. II, sectio I: <i>Inscriptiones Lyncestidis,</i> <i>Heracleae, Pelagoniae, Derriopi, Lychnidi</i> , 1999 (O. Salomies) | 263 |
| <i>Iscrizioni greche e latine del Foro Romano e del Palatino</i> , 1996 (K. Korhonen) | 267 |
| Juvenal: <i>Satires. Book I</i> . Ed. by S. Morton Braund, 1996 (M. Kajava) | 255 |
| Lane, M. S.: <i>Method and Politics in Plato's Statesman</i> , 1998 (P. Remes) | 247 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Lega, C.: <i>Le iscrizioni cristiane di Roma conservate nei Musei Vaticani: Indice dei vocaboli</i> , 2000 (K. Korhonen) | 275 |
| <i>Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae</i> , a cura di E. M. Steinby. Vol. V: <i>T-Z</i> , 1999; Vol. VI: <i>Indici</i> , 2000 (M. Kajava) | 292 |
| Lieberg, G.: <i>Caesars Politik in Gallien: Interpretationen zum Bellum Gallicum</i> , 1998 (U.-M. Liertz) | 252 |
| Mellor, R.: <i>The Roman Historians</i> , 1999 (M. Kahlos) | 280 |
| Pensabene, P.: <i>Terracotte del Museo Nazionale Romano I. Gocciolatoi e protomi da sime</i> , 1998 (E.-M. Viitanen) | 287 |
| Perry, R.: <i>Die Campanareliefs</i> , 1997 (H. Solin) | 292 |
| <i>Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire 2: Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne (313-604) 1-2</i> , 1999-2000 (A. Arjava) | 282 |
| Claudius Ptolemaeus: <i>Opera quae exstant omnia</i> . Vol. III 1: Ἀποτελεσματικά. Edidit W. Hübner, 1998 (H. Solin) | 250 |
| Rasch, J. J.: <i>Das Mausoleum der Kaiserin Helena in Rom und der 'Tempio della Tosse' in Tivoli</i> , 1998 (E.-M. Viitanen) | 294 |
| Rescigno, C.: <i>Tetti Campani, età arcaica: Cuma, Pitecusa e gli altri contesti</i> , 1998 (E.-M. Viitanen) | 287 |
| Riemer, P.: <i>Das Spiel im Spiel. Studien zum plautinischen Agon in Trinummus und Rudens</i> , 1996 (N. Nykopp) | 251 |
| Rossi Aldrovandi, A. M.: <i>Corpus Titulorum Figulorum</i> , 1997 (P. Tuomisto) | 276 |
| Rüpke, J.: <i>Die Religion der Römer</i> , 2001 (U.-M. Liertz) | 257 |
| Schefold, K.: <i>Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker</i> . Neubearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage, 1997 (M. Kajava) | 284 |
| <i>Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten</i> . Bände 2-3, 2001 (E. Sironen) | 265 |
| <i>Supplementa Italica</i> . Nuova serie. Vol. 16, 17, 18, 1998-2000 (O. Salomies) | 269 |
| <i>Supplementa Italica: Imagines. Roma (CIL, VI) 1: Musei Capitolini</i> , 1999 (K. Korhonen) | 267 |
| Tacitus: <i>Dialogus de oratoribus</i> . Edited by R. Mayer, 2001 (J. Aronen) | 254 |
| Thomas, R.: <i>Herodotus in Context</i> , 2000 (K. Karttunen) | 246 |
| Wiegand, A.: <i>Das Theater von Solunt</i> , 1997 (H. Solin) | 291 |
| Xenophon: <i>Hiero the Tyrant and Other Treatises</i> . Translated by R. Waterfield, with introductions and notes by P. Cartledge, 1997 (H. Solin) | 247 |
| Zindel, C.: <i>Meeresleben und Jenseitsfahrt. Die Fischteller der Sammlung Florence Gottet</i> , 1998 (M. Kajava) | 285 |

LIBRI NOBIS MISSI

Scholia in Aeschinem. Edidit M. DILTS. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, Lipsiae 1992. ISBN 3-8154-1011-8. xxii, 182 S. DEM 98.

Ars Ambrosiana. Commentum anonymum in Donati Partes maiores. Digesserunt EDDY GOUDER et PAUL TOMBEUR. Corpus Christianorum: Instrumenta lexicologica Latina, fasc. 6, ser. B – Lemmata. Curante CETEDOC. Brepols, Turnhout 1986. ISBN 2-503-71332-7. 27 p., 4 microfiches.

F. ASPESI – C. CONSANI – M. NEGRI: Κρήτη τις γὰρ ἔστι· *Studi e ricerche intorno ai testi minoici.* A cura di CARLO CONSANI. Università di Macerata: Quaderni linguistici e filologici 8 (1993). Editrice "Il Calamo", Roma 1996. ITL 50.000.

Die Lieder des BAKCHYLIDES 1: Die Siegeslieder. Edition, Übersetzung & Kommentar von HERWIG MAEHLER. Mnemosyne, Suppl. 62. E. J. Brill, Leiden – New York – Köln 1997. ISBN 90-04-10761-4. ISSN 0169-8958. 307 S. NLG 270,50 / USD 169,50.

ANTHONY R. BIRLEY: *Locus virtutibus patefactus? Zum Beförderungssystem in der Hohen Kaiserzeit.* Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vorträge G 318. Westdeutscher Verlag, Opladen 1992. ISBN 3-531-07318-4. 54 S. DEM 16.

LORENZO BRACCESI ET AL.: *L'Alessandro di Giustino (dagli antichi ai moderni).* L'eredità dell'antico. Passato e presente 3. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1993. ISBN 88-7062-820-5. 146 pp.

LEONHARD A. BURCKHARDT: *Bürger und Soldaten. Aspekte der politischen und militärischen Rolle athenischer Bürger im Kriegswesen des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* Historia Einzelschriften, Band 101. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 1996. ISBN 3-515-06832-5. 300 S. DEM 118.

IOANNES CABALLINUS: *Polistoria de virtutibus et dotibus Romanorum.* Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. In aedibus K. G. Saur, Stuttgartiae et Lipsiae 1995. ISBN 3-8154-1128-9. lxii, 375 S. DEM 158.

SILVIO CATALDI: *Prospettive occidentali allo scoppio della guerra del Peloponneso.* Studi e testi di storia antica 1. ETS Editrice, Pisa 1990. ISBN 88-7741-464. ITL 20.000.

ANGELOS CHANIOTIS: *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Poleis in der hellenistischen Zeit.* Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien, Band 24. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 1996. ISBN 3-515-06827-9. 523 S., 7 Taf. DEM 148.

Demokratie in Rom? Die Rolle des Volkes in der Politik der römischen Republik. Hrsg. von MARTIN JEHNE. Historia Einzelschriften 96. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 1995. ISBN 3-515-06860-0. 141 S. DEM 62,58 / EUR 32.

WERNER ECK – ANTONIO CABALLOS – FERNANDO FERNÁNDEZ: *Das senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre*. Vestigia, Band 48. Verlag C. H. Beck, München 1996. ISBN 3-406-41400-1. 329 S., 20 Taf. DEM 142.

SESTO EMPIRICO: *Contro gli etici*. A cura di EMIDIO SPINELLI. Bibliopolis, Napoli 1995. ISBN 88-7088-350-7. 450 p. ITL 50.000.

Estudios de prehistoria y arqueología Madrileñas 10 (1995/1996). Ayuntamiento de Madrid, Museos Municipales, Madrid. ISSN 0213-0246.

EURIPIDES: *Electra*. Edidit G. BASTA DONZELLI. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. In aedibus K. G. Saur, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1995. ISBN 3-8154-1325-7. 83 S. DEM 42.

Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum. Post W. MOREL et K. BÜCHNER edidit J. BLÄNSDORF. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. In aedibus B. G. Teubneri, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1995. ISBN 3-8154-1371-0. xxxvi, 494 S. DEM 195.

Hellenica Oxyrhynchia. Edidit MORTIMER CHAMBERS. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. In aedibus B. G. Teubneri, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1993. ISBN 3-8154-1365-6. xlviii, 96 S., 4 Tafeln.

WOLFGANG HÜBNER: *Grade und Gradbezirke der Tierkreiszeichen*. Band I, Edition. Band II, Kommentar. B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart und Leipzig 1995. Band I: ISBN 3-598-74286-X. 265 S. DEM 165. Band II: ISBN 3-598-74287-8. 272 S. DEM 175.

LORETANA DE LIBERO: *Die archaische Tyrannis*. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 1996. ISBN 3-515-06920-8. 479 S. DEM 118.

M. MANILIO: *Astronomica*. A cura di DORA LIUZZI. Testi e studi 4-5, 7-9. Congedo Editore, Galatina. Libro I, 1995. ISBN 88-8086-109-3. 275 pp. – Libro II, 1991. ISBN 88-7786-480-X. 269 pp. – Libro III, 1992. ISBN 88-7786-542-3. 195 pp. – Libro IV, 1994. ISBN 88-8086-037-2. 227 pp. – Libro V, 1997. ISBN 88-8086-169-7. 233 pp.

STEFAN MÜLLER: *Das Volk der Athleten. Untersuchungen zur Ideologie und Kritik des Sports in der griechisch-römischen Antike*. Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium 21. Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, Trier 1995. ISBN 3-88476-152-8. DEM 58,50.

OVIDIUS: *Tristia*. Edidit J. B. HALL. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. In aedibus B. G. Teubneri, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1995. ISBN 3-8154-1567-5. xxx, 263 S.

PHILODEMUS: *On Choices and Avoidances*. Edited with Translation and Commentary by GIOVANNI INDELLI and VOULA TSOUNA-MCKIRAHAN. Bibliopolis, Napoli 1995. ISBN 88-7088-343-4. 248 p.

Pro populo Arimenesi. Atti del Convegno internazionale "Rimini antica – una respublica fra terra e mare" (Rimini, ottobre 1993). A cura di ALDA CALBI e GIANCARLO SUSINI. Epigrafia e Antichità 14. Fratelli Lega Editori, Faenza 1995. 594 pp.

Rome and the North. Papers of a Symposium Arranged by the Göteborg University, 18-19 November 1993. Editors: ALVAR ELLEGÅRD and GUNILLA ÅKERSTRÖM-HOUGEN. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology and Literature 135. Paul Åströms förlag, Jonsered 1996. ISBN 91-7081-104-0. 123 pp. USD 18.40.

JÖRG RÜPKE: *Kalender und Öffentlichkeit. Die Geschichte der Repräsentation und religiösen Qualifikation von Zeit in Rom.* Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 40. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin – New York 1995. ISBN 3-11-014514-6. 740 S., 1 Falttafel. DEM 338.

GÜNTHER SCHÖRNER: *Römische Rankenfriese.* Beiträge zur Erschließung hellenistischer und kaiserzeitlicher Skulptur und Architektur, Band 15. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 1995. ISBN 3-8053-1733-6. 198 S., vii + 87 Tafeln, 5 Beilagen.

Studii clasice 28-30 (1992-1994). Editura Academiei Române, București 1997. ISSN 0081-8844. ROL 6000.

ANTONIO FRANCESCO SPADA: *Storia della Sardegna cristiana e dei suoi Santi. Il primo millennio.* Editrice S'Alvure, Oristano 1994.

GIANDOMENICO SPINOLA: *Le sculture nel Palazzo Albertoni Spinola a Roma e le collezioni Paluzzi ed Altieri.* Archaeologica 115. Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Roma 1995. ISBN 88-7689-121-8. 129 pp., xlii tavv. ITL 400.000.

Symbolae philologorum Posnanensium 8 (1991). Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu, Poznań 1991. ISBN 83-232-0325-3. ISSN 0302-7384.

LUIGI TODISCO: *La scultura romana di Venosa e il suo reimpiego.* Archaeologia Perusina 13; Archaeologica 121. Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Roma 1996. ISBN 88-7689-143-9. 179 pp., lxxvii tavv. ITL 500.000.

Τριφιοδώρου Ἰλίου ἄλωσις – TRIPHODOR: *Die Einnahme Ilios.* Ausgabe mit Einführung, Übersetzung und kritisch-exegetischen Noten von UWE DUBIELZIG. Classica Monacensia 15. Günter Narr Verlag, Tübingen 1996. ISBN 3-8233-4874-4. viii, 321 S. DEM 78.

STAFFAN WAHLGREN: *Sprachwandel im Griechisch der frühen römischen Kaiserzeit.* Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 60. Göteborg 1995. ISBN 91-7346-279-9. 220 p. SEK 180.

GERHARD ZIMMER: *Etruskische Spiegel. Technik und Stil der Zeichnungen.* 135. Winckelmannsprogramm der archäologischen Gesellschaft zu Berlin. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin 1995. ISBN 3-11-014949-4. iv, 43 S. DEM 42.

INDEX SCRIPTORUM

| | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Neil Adkin: | nadkin3489@aol.com |
| Antti Arjava: | antti.arjava@helsinki.fi |
| Jaakko Aronen: | jaakko.aronen@helsinki.fi |
| Jean-Pierre Guilhembet: | jean-pierre.guilhembet@wanadoo.fr |
| Riikka Hälikkä: | riihali@utu.fi |
| Majastina Kahlos: | majastina.kahlos@helsinki.fi |
| Maarit Kaimio: | maarit.kaimio@helsinki.fi |
| Mika Kajava: | mika.kajava@helsinki.fi |
| Klaus Karttunen: | klaus.karttunen@helsinki.fi |
| Kalle Korhonen: | kalle.korhonen@helsinki.fi |
| Peter Kruschwitz: | kruschwitz@bbaw.de |
| Uta-Maria Liertz: | uta-maria.liertz@helsinki.fi |
| Luigi Pedroni: | luipedro@tin.it |
| Pauliina Remes: | pauliina.remes@helsinki.fi |
| Olli Salomies: | olli.salomies@helsinki.fi |
| Hilla Salovaara: | hilla.salovaara@helsinki.fi |
| Erkki Sironen: | erkki.sironen@helsinki.fi |
| Heikki Solin: | heikki.solin@helsinki.fi |
| Pekka Tuomisto: | pekka.tuomisto@helsinki.fi |
| Eeva-Maria Viitanen: | eeva-maria.viitanen@helsinki.fi |

ISSN 0570-734-X
Helsinki 2002
Yliopistopaino