

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

all, however, the edition exhibits wavering judgement in the treatment of the various pieces. Before passing on to the individual inscriptions, some general comments are called for. The editors seem to have a strange conception of how to judge the authenticity of an inscription. On p. 3, and in the respective commentaries, three stones (1418 = no. 1. 1448 = 44. 1545 = 87) are cleared as forgeries, because they exhibit unusual and suspicious characteristics. But 'unusual characteristics' show rather the opposite. As to no. 1, the onomastic formula may be unusual, but one cannot understand how a modern forger could have invented it; moreover, the letter forms, to judge from the photography, seem to be ancient. Perhaps the text could be understood *L. Flavius Sal(vius) Pom(peianus)* or *pom(arius)*. In the first century AD *Salvius* is better taken as a cognomen. The possibility that no. 44 was a forgery is completely excluded. We have here a funerary poem in fragmentary condition, unintelligible, as is often the case. No. 87 is more difficult to judge; perhaps the possibility of a forgery could not be completely ruled out.

The majority, if not all, of the inscriptions are from Rome, apart from no. 54, which cannot possibly be Roman, although the editors regard it as such and date it to the second century AD. The piece must have come to the Roman antiquary market from some part of the Greek world. Bearing in mind the manner of indicating homonymity by means of the adverb of frequency *δίς*, one would think first of Asia Minor where the use of *δίς* etc was common, or of the islands of the Aegaeon where these adverbs were also used, even if not as commonly as in some of the towns of Asia. M. J. Glasser, the editor of the inscription, has not understood it very well. From his expansive commentary one learns that Dositheos was one of the two or more heirs, *κληρονόμοι* but the article before the name shows that Dositheos was the grandfather of the anonyme of whose name only ---ος is preserved (to this type cp. Koerner, *Die Abkürzung der Homonymität in griechischen Inschriften*, SB Akad. Berlin 1961,2, passim). It seems to be a funerary inscription; could one construct at the end a formula like *εἰ τίς τῶν κληρονόμων ἀποκοσμήσει γραμμάτα* (of the inscription)? Or could *γράμματα* mean 'document' (cp. ex.gr. I. Magnesia Sip. 25)?

As for the plan of the edition, the order of the individual texts is implemented in a surprising way, probably in accordance with the accession numbers of the Museum (as a result of this, different fragments of one and the same stone are strangely separated from one another: 20 and 88). An epigraphical edition should follow other criteria. As for technical details, I note only that in normal practice brackets are used around letters which have totally disappeared. However, in the text, partially preserved letters have often been bracketed. Further, I note that the double numbering, in accordance with the accession numbers and the catalogue numbers, is inconvenient, since the user must constantly refer to the concordance. Also, the editors fail to give in the lemma exact references to the plates.

We should now take a look at the remarks to the individual inscriptions. No. 2. What is *Iuno Successa*? One should be petrified by such a statement, repeated on p. 98.

3. "*Creste*, or *Chreste*, is common", says the commentary. But the basic form is *Chreste*.

4. *Tyndaris* is not a 'female patronymic' of *Tyndareos*!

5. Romulus is primarily not master of Lepida, but her 'husband'. Note that *Romulus* is a typical slave-name. The datation on palaeographical grounds to the early second century AD is arbitrary.

8. I cannot understand why Iunia Paramythia should be the daughter of a Iunius Paramythius. The editor dates the stone to the third century, but the second cannot be ruled out.

9. The most interesting thing is the place of the indication of the domicile before the cognomen. It is not mentioned at all in the commentary.

11. The editor reads *Lieterius P.l. Florentinu(s)* and tries to explain the strange gentilicium comparing *Lit(e)rius*, *Liternius*. But *Lie-* remains unexplained. Given the slight difference of many letters (ex. gr. F and L), the stone-cutter was probably an analphabet. Perhaps in the draft worked out for him, the stone-cutter did not always notice the horizontal strokes. If so, the first two vertical strokes, read by the editor as LI, could form an H with the cross line omitted. This would give us *Heterius*. A gentilicium *Hetereius* is common in Rome, and one could even read *Hetereius* if a nexus of R and E is allowed, but more probably, as the CIL editor states, an original E was corrected to R. Further, the editor claims that the upper left corner is intact. But I doubt it, for we need the praenomen for Heterius (incomprehensibly the editor states that the man seems not to have borne a praenomen himself). Thus [*P.*] *Heter(e)ius P.l. Florentinu(s)*.

15 (= CIL VI 34557). *Atilio L.f. ---ae* is impossible. Filiation cannot be expressed if there is no praenomen. Dressel in CIL quite correctly reads LE. I read *Atilio Le/[o]nae*. The Greek name *Leonas* was common in Rome.

18. Or *Onesimus*!

19. [*Pb*] *ilista* is good. The name does occur in Rome: NSc. 1920, 37 cf. RAL 1973, 286. NSc. 1923, 370.

20+88. The reconstruction proposed by the editor cannot be accepted. *Maecentianus* (which is certain, in fact I think I can distinguish from the photo *Maece-*) is not the name of a second person, but the second cognomen of our *horrearius*, indicating that he was a former slave of Maecenas. Further, the supplements in the two last lines are not Latin, and, moreover, *es[t]* does not fit: the second letter seems to be A. I would like to propose the following restitution: [*--- emit* (or another verb)] *sibi his ea[m] qua olla ossa sua c[on]sita sint*. "Here he bought himself the jar, in which his bones should be lain". For *consita* cf. *ossua in olla consita* CIL VI 21200.

22. The dedicator could just as well have been the son.

23. For many reasons, it is better to read *Claudiae* instead of *Claudia f(ilia)*.

25. *Thalla* does not exist.

28. *l.* is doubtful.

30. The editor dates the stone to the third century AD, because of the use of single names, as well as on paleographic grounds; but the letter-forms do not speak in favour of such a late date. And the brothers lack the gentilicium either because they may have been slaves or because they died young (it was common to omit the gentilicia of young children in familiar connections). — *Saec(u)laris* occurs more than 6 times in VI.

31. The stone belongs rather to the first century AD; note especially *diis* with the I longa.

32. One cannot call *Prima* a praenomen under the Empire!

34. [---] *ius* D.L. *Hilarus*. The editors constantly use paleographical criteria in dating their stones, even if not always with success. The datation of this stone is totally incomprehensible. One is amazed to be informed that it dates from the late second to the early third century AD! But everything speaks for a first century datation, both the nomenclature, the letter forms and the ornamental style.

37. Perhaps K(λαυδία) Ἀθ[ηναίς? By the way, we know a Sulpicia Triaria from CIL XV 7550.

39. Better *ann[is]*.

40. Not [*libert*]abus[*que*], but [*libert*]abus or [*libert*]abus[*(que)*].

41. The inscription patently belongs to the first century BC, if it is, as is to be assumed, coeval with the other inscriptions of the columbarium.

44. See above. 2 [*pl*]orent *nimi[s]*. The last two lines, with taller letters, probably contain the name or names of the persons involved. 5 ex. gr. *Noe Pronoe Theonoe Arsinoe*.

45. This is an interesting text. The names show that the family comes from a Northern province like Gaul (The evidence for Noricum, suggested by the editor, is not stronger than that for any other province; that we even know an Aphobus from Noricum may be a coincidence; moreover, the custom of forming new gentilicia from cognomina is typically Gaulish). According to the editor, Costitutia Concordia would be the mother of Costitutia Apra and Iulius Afobianus husband of the latter. This is not very probable. The man is clearly indicated as *filius*, and, given the young age of the mother, 25 years, he must be her son. The kinship of the two ladies is not specified; they could have been sisters, for instance. As to the suspension at the end, I would like to read *b(ene) m(erenti) f(e)c(e)r(unt)*. An abbreviation of this kind (troncamento misto of Cencetti) is introduced in inscriptions during the third century.

46. I read [---] *lib. Octa[vi---]*.

50. *Domnio* is also common in Christian inscriptions of Rome. This fact, among others, points to a late datation.

64. Rather *f(e)c(erunt)* instead of *f(aciundum) c(uraverunt)*.

75. The editor has not understood that *supra aedificia* contains the indication of the man's occupation.

77. ...*ia* is doubtful.

79. Perhaps *Ka[l.]* and Christian.

80. Probably [- -]nus V Non(a)s S[eptembres].
81. Another Sulpicia Petale in Rome: BullCom. 53 (1925) 229.
83. I suspect a nexus of P and H in *Philematium*.
86. *Daphinus* is not derived from *Daphnus*, but represents this name itself. *Pius* is not a supernomen, but an adjective.
89. Why not [*dis*] *man*.?
91. The numeral is not 31 1/2, but 36. I would opt rather for the fifth than the fourth century.
92. In my opinion, it is most likely that the master of Philargyrus is the consul of 33 AD.
93. The inscription is certainly earlier than from the third century.
94. (*centuria*) *Nicomedes* stands for *Nicomedis*. The editor states that "there is no reference in VI to this centurion connected with the tenth praetorian cohort". But precisely the same Nicomedes does appear in CIL VI 2760.

*Heikki Solin*

*G. Capecchi, G. de Marinis, A. Gunnella, L. Lepore, V. Saladino: Palazzo Peruzzi. Palazzo Rinuccini. Collezioni Fiorentine di antichità II, Archaeologica 12. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1980. XIV, 238 p., tav. I—LXXIII, A—F. Lit. 100.000.*

In questo volume si trovano pubblicate due vecchie ed importanti collezioni di antichità fiorentine, quella Peruzzi e quella Rinuccini, formatesi lungo il Settecento. Le abbondanti descrizioni sono accompagnate da una completa documentazione fotografica. Eccone il contenuto: G. de Marinis tratta le antichità etrusche di tutte e due le raccolte, V. Saladino i loro ritratti virili e i sarcofagi, G. Capecchi tutti i rilievi nonché le teste ideali femminili della collezione Rinuccini. La parte più rilevante è formata dalle iscrizioni delle due collezioni, trattate da A. Gunnella. Lasciando a più competenti di me il giudizio sulle altre parti, farò qui qualche osservazione sull'edizione delle iscrizioni, la quale è bene informata ed al corrente. Fortunatamente le descrizioni e soprattutto i commenti non sono (salvo qualche rara eccezione) troppo lunghi, come spesso accade nei cataloghi delle collezioni epigrafiche che tanto sono in voga in questi tempi. I testi vengono offerti in minuscole; l'uso dei segni diacritici lascia alquanto a desiderare (si scriva ad es. nell'iscrizione cristiana 170 *Marcana*, non *Marc<i>ana*, o *vius*, non *vi<v>us*), ma nel complesso la forma testuale si presenta molto bene. Sulle singole iscrizioni: Nr. 22 da Roma, una delle poche inedite, è notevole quale epitaffio di un Diodoro, figlio di Eliodoro ἀπὸ Συριακῆς Δεκαπόλεως Γαδάρων. Il termine ταφῶν si trova più spesso: Eus. vita Const. 3, 26, ecc. — 29: non c'è alcuna garanzia che Furnia Lucifera fosse una liberta come pensa la Gunnella sulle orme del Boulvert che pecca spesso nel giudicare casi simili. Il fenomeno di donne libere ingenue come mogli di schiavi e liberti imperiali non è affatto raro. — 38: l'integrazione [*Hy*] *menaeo* del CIL è sicura.