

Pompili Erotis tale nomen Germanicum nullo modo invenire potuisse manifestum est. Probabiliter hoc cognomentum ex *adigere* deductum est; id accepit propter occupationem odiosam negotiatoris qui adigit, cogit aliquem iurare. Ita etiam Kajanto, *Supernomina*, 1966, 20sq. - Scribe *an(norum)*, *m(ensium)*.

232. Ex im. del. editionis principis legere ausim [-] *Varius T.f.* [---] *a Dertona*. [*ille* ---] *onus* [---] *patri suo* etc. Militem fuisse Verum probabile est; milites autem Dertonenses saepe in titulis occurrunt. Varii Dertonae CIL V 7395. Varius cognomen breve ut *Sawa* vel aliud quod habuit.

233. 4 *Anterotis* coniecerim.

250. Titulum esse anni 165 editores priores, quibus Šašel Kos assensa est, mihi non persuaserunt. Compluribus argumentis, de quibus nomino gentilicium *Septimium*, omissa praenomina, formulam *Augustor(um) verna*, titulum posteriorem esse manifestum est. Probabiliter agitur de quodam consule saeculi II exeuntis vel saeculi III. Etiam nomina, quae plus quam semel male lecta sunt, digna sunt quae amplius tractentur. Per litteras novam photographiam ex editoribus quaesivi ac spero me ea accepta de titulo alibi fusius disputare posse.

253. Mihi videtur sine dubio de titulo sepulcrali agi.

Ad indices variis mendis, magnam partem minoris quidem molis, afflictatos haec fere, priusquam recensum nimis longum ad exitum adducam, annoto: *Agathonis* potius esse videtur *Agathon*; *Aneros* est *Anteros*; *Bractice* sine dubio est *Practice*; *Divus* delendum est; *Helpinis* esse debet *Helpis*; *Minatus* non est cognomen, sed praenomen; pro *Niconeus* scribe *Nicon*; *Pilo* sine dubio est *Philo*; *Pragmaticus* non est nomen proprium sed appellativum; de cognomine *Syria* valde dubito. Desideravi inter alia indicem grammaticum.

Finiam. Ut desit hic illic ars critica, praesertim in rebus onomasticis, tamen est voluntas laudanda. Dixi.

*Heikki Solin*

*Maria R.-Alföldi: Antike Numismatik. I: Theorie und Praxis, II: Bibliographie. Kulturgeschichte der antiken Welt 2-3. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1978. XLV & XXIX, 323 p., 410 fig., 6 maps, 20 plates. DM 112.-. - Robert Göbl: Antike Numismatik. Vol. I-II. Battenberg, München 1978. 284 & 283 p., 176 plates, 19 tables, map. DM 240.-.*

Numismatics as a branch of academic research is becoming increasingly popular. Scientifically, new methods of metallurgical and chemical research have added to the mass of exact data yielded by the coins, particularly with regard to the possibilities of evaluating the monetary functions of the coins. An increasing general awareness of the usefulness, or at least the possibilities of the coins as source material, is spreading to affiliated fields of research, and numismatics as an academic subject is taught today in most western countries, although chairs are few and the research centres as a rule formed around the nuclei of the great national coin collections.

It goes without saying that the coins as scientific source material are of great importance for studies of the ancient and

medieval worlds, periods of time otherwise not sufficiently documented by literary sources.

The importance of this corner of the numismatic field is, in a sense, mirrored by the almost simultaneous publication of two introductions to ancient numismatics, *Antike Numismatik I-II* by Professors Maria R.-Alföldi (Frankfort a.M.) and Robert Göbl (Vienna), respectively. Academically, neither is a full-time professor of numismatics. Prof. Alföldi's chair is of the Hilfswissenschaften of Ancient History. In addition, she is the active head of the huge project *Fundmünzen der römischen Zeit in Deutschland*. Prof. Göbl occupies a chair in numismatics at the University of Vienna (founded in A.D. 1774 for the famous Joseph Eckhel) but he also lectures in ancient history with Byzantine, Sassanian and Kushan history as his special field.

The two books under review are undoubtedly more ambitious undertakings than any I remember from the post-war period. Prof. Göbl in his Preface speaks of a *Nova Doctrina Nummorum* with reference to the epoch-making *Doctrina Nummorum Veterum* of his earliest predecessor, and the blurb appends attributes such as "umwälzend" and monumental to his opus. Prof. Alföldi is far more modest in her approach. Compared with her work, the Austrian numismatist excels more with regard to size, spacious typing and number of illustrations than to scope and actual information provided.

Nevertheless, there are differences, some of which may make the reader decide in favour of one of them. Both books are written by scholars of international renown, both books have matured over the years and, I assume, grown out of several decades of academic teaching. The general orientation of Prof. Göbl towards the easternmost parts of the empire of Alexander - including their continuation under very different auspices in the early Middle Ages - gives him a wider perspective and allows him to apply the method of comparative research on a broader basis. Prof. Alföldi concentrates on the Greeks and the Romans with a brief chapter on the Celts and short concluding chapters on Byzantium and the Migration Period. This gives her a chance to devote more space to the historical development of the coinages.

Both books contain substantial sections on methodology. They define *Numismatik* differently, but discuss the same problems under more or less the same headings. *Numismatik* comprises *Münzkunde*, *Münzgeschichte*, *Geldgeschichte* and *Methodenlehre*, writes Prof. Göbl, whilst Prof. Alföldi regards *Numismatik* as "der übliche Fachausdruck für *Münzkunde*." This, of course, is a very minor matter; more important is the highly competent presentation of the subject matter in both cases.

If asked to express an opinion on which *Antike Numismatik* should be regarded as superior, I would refuse to comply. Only very extensive use of the books can reveal basic strengths and weaknesses.

It is easier to pronounce on the usability of the books. Prof. Göbl's two volumes resemble a monument, vol. I containing the text spaciouly set in beautiful type, vol. II with an equal number of pages plus 176 plates and 19 diagrams comprising the 900 notes and the bibliography (in small type). A perusal of Göbl consequently implies having two large size volumes in front of one the whole time.

In addition, digesting all the useful information of the, at times, quite extensive notes, requires checking the numerous (and *per se* important) cross references, list of abbreviations and illustrations.

The volumes of Maria Alföldi are much handier (as regards size, too) without, I would think, giving less textual information (set in small type). Vol. I contains *Theorie und Praxis*, vol. II the bibliography. The over 400 illustrated items accompany the text, the footnotes are footnotes, short and to the point, the 20 plates (in vol. II) constitute enlargements of particularly important specimens. Generally speaking, here one is required to use one handy little volume at a time, and to acquire all the available information in the process.

Both bibliographies cover the field of research roughly up to 1975, but the items recorded for the early seventies cannot be said to cover the whole ground. Prof. Göbl's bibliography (about 2000 entries, 48 pp.) is arranged in strict alphabetical order, Prof. Alföldi's (about 2800 entries, 105 pp.) in accordance with the subject matter, with occasional insertions of some words of guidance.

Usability also means being able to find the information collected by the authors and their research centres. The complex built up by Prof. Göbl's volumes could have been compensated for by indexes accounting for both text and footnotes, but now, alas, the 900 notes with their wealth of precious information are excluded from the *Stichwortverzeichnis*.

I will conclude by making two points, one in favour of Robert Göbl, the other in favour of Maria Alföldi.

(1) The Austrian scholar has a magnificent grasp of the didactic requirements of his subject. The 176 plates, illustrating (and commenting on) some 3600 coins represent a unique documentation not easily accessible to those not working on the large specialized collections. Of uniform excellence is his presentation and reconstruction of an issue (cf. Taf. 174-175) or of the die linkages (Taf. 176), and further the diagrams showing the working of a mint or the process of coin production.

(2) Maria Alföldi approaches her subject with considerable detachment. She endeavours to account for different points of view, for diverging trends, whereas Robert Göbl appears to be rather hidebound by the proud traditions of the Viennese school, and forces upon us arguments in favour of its methods and its approach to certain coinages. It is not a slant rather than a distortion, but unnecessary nonetheless.

To sum up: We have been given two new exceptionally exhaustive introductions to ancient numismatics, interestingly different in approach and therefore not mutually exclusive. I would say that any library or research centre dealing with Antiquity in a broader (Göbl) or geographically narrower (Alföldi) sense will find them indispensable, but should also, considering the dynamic developments of recent years, take steps to ensure a continuous follow-up of the qualified basic knowledge provided by Professors Alföldi and Göbl.

*Patrick Bruun*