according to their origin or etymology. This principle of division occurs in other onomastica, too. From a purely onomastical point of view, it is well motivated. But if we consider the typical case in which the work will be consulted, a different solution would probably have been preferable. I am sure that 90% of the users of the work are interested either in the occurrences of a special name in Rome or in the etymological explanation given for a special name, not in all names connected with e.g. "Himmelsrichtungen und Winde". Now, the typical user must first refer to the third volume with the index. He must remember that the general index follows the Latin alphabetical order, while the presentation itself (unnecessarily, I think) follows the Greek alphabetical order. Then he must guess, in which of the three volumes a certain page occurs, as the index does not include the volume numbers. He must observe that in the discussion the alphabetical order is rejected when a name has both a male and a female form, Xanthippus precedes Xanthippe. When he has found his name, he must guess or try to find under which section the name is presented; the headline for each page gives 1200 times only "II. Hauptabschnitt: Die übrigen Namen", instead of the etymological category of each section. Finally, he must remember the complicated (and wrong?) chronological sequence of the occurrences: on what grounds is '2./4. Jh. n.Chr.' considered earlier than '2./3. Jh.', this again earlier than '2. Jh.', and this earlier than '1. Hälfte des 2. Jh.'?

Jorma Kaimio


Kajanto's Latin Cognomina was first published in 1965. The book was sold out within a few years, and has also been offered by the antiquarians extremely rarely. As a fundamental reference work it has been, however, much in demand. So it is with great pleasure that we announce the publication of a reprint of this first systematic and comprehensive survey of the Latin cognomen, which has already become a classic. Unlike many unnecessary reprints which are nowadays in vogue in the classical field, this is indeed most useful. It is also a great personal relief that I need no longer give a negative answer to the numerous colleagues who for years have asked me to try to find a copy of Kajanto for them. Now, every scholar who can and is willing to pay some 90.000 lire may provide his own library with this indispensable tool. But, in spite of the reprint, we all hope that some day Kajanto will present us with a renewed edition of his Latin Cognomina.

Heikki Solin