

meglio consultare (se un rinvio era necessario) la raccolta fondamentale di H. Krahe, *Die Sprache der Illyrier*. Una ultima considerazione: la sigla V non sarebbe consigliabile scrivere nel testo con minuscola invece di maiuscola? V. in maiuscola si confonde facilmente con un prenome.

Lo spazio impedisce un'ulteriore analisi del volume (ecco il resto dei contributi: G. Bevilacqua, Bolli anforari rodii dal centro sannitico di Monte Vairano; E. Miranda, Stele ed iscrizioni erroneamente attribuite a Napoli; I. Di Stefano Manzella, L. Nonio Asprenate quinquennale di Falerii Novi; H. Solin—R. Volpe, I graffiti della Domus Aurea; R. Mancini, Deo-Deae nelle iscrizioni di Roma; P. Lombardi, Iscrizioni greche extra-urbane nel Museo Nazionale Romano; M. L. Lazzarini, Due iscrizioni greche di Ostia; G. Sacco, Iscrizioni greche inedite di Porto). Per finire noto solo l'ultimo contributo sui criteri di edizione e segni diacritici di S. Panciera e H. Krummrey. Si tratta di una proposta molto importante, e sarebbe vivamente da raccomandare che ogni epigrafista militante sperimentasse nella sua pratica quotidiana l'applicabilità di questo sistema che ci sembra buono e ben pensato (anche se un po' complicato, specie per le tipografie minori); tra qualche tempo, si potrebbe confrontare le varie esperienze e tentare un bilancio. Qui solo una piccola quisquilia: si dovrebbe usare *vac(at)* assai prudentemente; per es. nelle iscrizioni sepolcrali, quando l'impaginazione del testo comporta delle righe centrate, questa sigla non si dovrebbe in alcun caso usare diversamente da come fanno alcuni epigrafisti.

*Heikki Solin*

*Supplementa Italica*. Nuova serie 1. Unione Accademica Nazionale. Edizioni di storia e letteratura, Roma 1981. 205 p. Lit. 40.000.

This is the first fascicle of a new series designed to fill a well-known gap. The volumes of CIL covering Italy were — with the exception of IV (Pompeii) — completed 50—90 years ago, while the progress of *Inscriptiones Italiae*, launched in 1931, is lamentably slow. New inscriptions are, however, found in smaller or greater numbers every year. To make the new finds available to epigraphists and other scholars without undue delay, Professor Silvio Panciera, occupier of the chair of Latin epigraphy at the University of Rome, has initiated the present series, which will include both new inscriptions as well as supplements and corrections to those already published. The material will be presented on a geographical pattern, and several epigraphists may contribute to each volume. In the first fascicle there is material from Ferentinum in Latium, edited by H. Solin, from Pisaurum in Umbria, edited by G. Mennella and G. Cresci Marrone, and from Falerii Novi in Etruria, edited by U. Di Stefano Manzella, with an onomastic supplement for the Alpes maritimae by G. Mennella.

Since this is the first volume, it may be useful to discuss the general editorial principles presented by Prof. Panciera in his Introduction. In comparison with CIL and other older collections, there are certain substantial innovations. Thus Latin

is replaced by Italian, a change no doubt necessitated by the general decline of Latin as a means of communication, although perhaps regretted by some people. An unavoidable consequence of this trend, observable in other countries as well, is the multiplication of languages in epigraphical publications. Apart from Latin, English, French, German, Italian and also Spanish are now used, in some works even Flemish. All this naturally imposes additional demands upon the linguistic abilities of epigraphists and other classical scholars.

Again, because photographs are nowadays rather accurate, majuscules have been abandoned, except of course for inscriptions subsequently lost, and the text is given only in minuscules. Comments have been cut down to a minimum. On the other hand, the indices are designed to be as complete as possible.

In editing the texts, a new system of diacritical signs is used, also presented by Prof. Panciera. In reality, the Leiden system is somewhat incomplete since it does not have signs for all possible cases. For example, in the Leiden system < > is used both for *litterae errore omissae* as well as for *litterae quas editor correxit*. In the new system, the former are shown as before by < > whereas the latter are indicated by new signs, †abc‡. A very elaborate system is suggested for *litterae erasae*, etc. I have only one minor objection. Supplements taken from earlier publications for parts of inscription later lost are underlined, e.g. Iunoni Reginae. Another possibility might have been to print the supplements in Roman type, *Iunoni Reginae*.

The indices are an indispensable part of every epigraphical publication. Without them, the works would be wellnigh useless for those looking for a particular piece of information. In this series, the indices follow the system of *Année épigraphique*. One may, however, note that while students of onomastics, religion and history are excellently served, linguists are treated in more niggardly fashion. There is certainly a section on *Parole notevoli*, but this seems to list both *res* and *voces notabiliores*, to use an old expression. Thus e.g. in the index for Falerii Novi, one misses the Vulgar Latin varieties *cocnitio* No. 13, *Censurinus* (For *Censorinus*) No. 20, *primes* No. 21, *esit* for *est* No. 31 (unless cutter's mistake?), *idemque* for *eademque* No. 31, *messibus* No. 31, *suo* (for *suum*) No. 40, *vivs* (for *vivus*) 53, *filibus* (for *filiis*) No. 54. I think the philologists would be grateful for a separate section on 'Grammatica'.

The comments are deliberately brief, usually providing only the minimum for the proper interpretation of an inscription. Otherwise the fascicles would be excessively lengthy. Studies will be published elsewhere, e.g. H. Solin's work on the epigraphy of Ferentinum. Nevertheless, some points may have merited more attention. In addition to the grammatical irregularities discussed above, the criteria for dating an inscription are sometimes insufficiently expressed, e.g. p. 89 No. 6 (Pisaurum) 'l'età non anteriore al II sec. d.C.', although the reasons are not given. Similarly p. 149 No. 27 (Falerii Novi), p. 162 No. 46 (*ibid.*), p. 166 No. 53 (*ibid.*), while in others the reasons are clearly stated, e.g. p. 128 No. 2 (*ibid.*), paleography and the physical appearance of the stone. Considering the importance of dating undated

inscriptions, one might even express the hope that in future the indices would include an entry, 'datazione degli epigrafi'.

I shall not deal here with the material published in the volume. Suffice it to say that especially in the section on Falerii Novi, there are some interesting inscriptions, e.g. p. 127sq. No. 2 on the history of religion, p. 136 No. 13 on history, p. 151 No. 31 on onomastics, all of them adequately interpreted.

All in all, a very welcome series, which one may wish a successful future.

*Iiro Kajanto*

*Latin Inscriptions in the Kelsey Museum. The Dennison Collection. Edited by Martha Welborn Baldwin and Mario Torelli. The University of Michigan. Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, Studies 4, Ann Arbor 1979.*

The Kelsey Museum houses a remarkable collection of Latin inscriptions. Its contents are derived from two major groups of stones from Rome and Puteoli, respectively. The aim of the present catalogue is to publish the inscriptions of the Dennison Collection which is made up of inscriptions of urban provenance.

The book under review, the team-work of several scholars, consists of introductory remarks and a catalogue with indices and 19 plates of photographs. Nowhere is it explained what the contribution of Torelli (he has merely put his signature to a brief Preface) is beside that of Mrs Welborn Baldwin (her part in the whole conception of the work also remaining unclear). Hence, we assume that each editor is responsible for his or her part.

It is very difficult to give a balanced judgement of this edition. On the one hand, one willingly concedes the great zeal and diligence in the emphasis on various peculiarities ranging from the usually skillful physical description of the stones to explanations of every kind. The reader is given complete information of the basic features of the stones, and for this one should be very grateful. On the other hand, however, the edition's many weaknesses cannot pass without comment. The interpretative eagerness of the authors is too often a source of weakness. The commentaries and other explanations contain much useful material, but the authors have not succeeded in grasping the essence of the contents of an inscription. One example may suffice. 73 runs *v. P. Appuleius P.l. Barnaeus*. The editor notes with great accuracy all kinds of observations as to physical description and text, noting the times of appearance of *Appuleius* and of *Barnaeus* in the inscriptions of Rome. But she neglects to note the only really important point in the inscription, namely, that *Barnaeus* is a Semitic name and the person thus of Syrian origin, come to Italy and Rome with Syrian or Italic slave-dealers at the beginning of the Christian era, when the slavetrade still played an important part as a source of the slave-demand. This also applies to many other inscriptions: the commentaries are full of useless observations, so that the essential points are either lost among these pointless observations or are missing altogether. Above