

de Simone, L'iscrizione latina arcaica di Satricum: problemi metodologici ed erme-
neutici, GIF 12 (1981 [ma 1982]) 25—56, e H. S. Versnel, Die neue Inschrift
von Satricum in historischer Sicht, Gymnasium 89 (1982) 193—235. (Il contributo
di R. Bloch, Latomus 42 [1983] 362—371 non ha valore autonomo).

Heikki Solin

John P. Bodel: Roman Brick Stamps in the Kelsey Museum. The University of
Michigan. Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, Studies 6, Ann Arbor 1983. 93
p. XXVIII pl. \$ 22.50.

The Kelsey Museum continues the publication of its valuable epigraphical col-
lections. The first volume, on epitaphs of urban provenance, appeared in 1979.
Unfortunately I had to give it a rather unfavourable review (Arctos 15 [1981] 149
—153). The second volume, reviewed here, is, I am pleased to say, of a much
higher quality. And it is an important edition, too. The Kelsey Museum houses the
largest known collection of ancient brick stamps outside Italy. Moreover, it contains
many new stamps and other examples that complete previous readings; also, it
spans a period from the end of the Republic to the beginning of the sixth century
A.D. So it was a most welcome idea to publish a selection of the Michigan col-
lection in the form of a Catalogue including all those stamps that had not
previously been photographed, and not only the new stamps.

The presentation of the material is excellent. The edition is preceded by pre-
liminary remarks on the study of brick stamps which offer nothing new for a
specialist and are too short for non-specialists. The edition itself contains much
useful material with full photographic documentation. The texts are followed by
comments on diverse topics; in particular, those on the dates of the brick stamps
and on prosopographical aspects (however, the bibliographical references are not
up-to-date; as for the authoritative names of modern prosopographical research,
not a murmur) are most welcome beside the highly technical approach of many
modern brick stamp editions. One example may suffice. How to conciliate the new
datations of brick stamps, arrived at by means of minute typological analysis, with
the reality of onomastic and prosopographic criteria? 71, the stamp of an *Anti-*
machus Cl. Itonici Caesaris Augusti l., should be from the Traianic period. Bodel
refers to a discussion on the status designation *Caesaris Augusti libertus* between
Chantraine and Weaver, but fails to notice that a firm basis for a terminus post
quem non is offered by the fact that Itonicus must have been manumitted before
68 A.D. Theoretically, he could have been still alive under Traian, but in practice
this is not very probable, for slaves were not normally manumitted at an early
age. It seems evident to me that the stamp belongs to the Julio-Claudian period.
Or at least I would not unconditionally surrender to the typological criteria which

have recommended the new Traianic datation. Another example that illustrates how onomastic criteria can be used to corroborate a new datation reached on typological grounds: 72 is now dated in the last Republican or the first Imperial time, and indeed an early date imposes itself, as *Apol(lonius)* is indicated as *Ant(oni) L.s.* A status indication of this kind practically disappears in the Augustan age, but still more interesting is the fact that the same (as argued by Bloch and Bodel) Apollonius recurs in two further stamps as a slave of an M. Antonius, who must no doubt be a representative of the upper classes. Now, we know from Plutarch (Cic. 49, 4) that after Mark Antony's death the Senate ruled that no Antonius should have the first name of *Marcus*. If our Antonius is a relative of Mark Antony and if *Apollonius Luci servus* and *Marci servus* are one and the same slave, we need not assume a change in the ownership of Apollonius (an assumption not easily justified): our Marcus Antonius had to change his praenomen in 30 B.C. If so this would be the first case in which an Antonius already bearing the first name *Marcus* was forced to change it (we know that no Antonius born after 30 was called *Marcus*). To end with an intricate case: under 124 we are told that the stamp of an Aelius Diphilus belongs to the first century. Naturally, there have always been Aelii in Rome, but an Aelius with a Greek cognomen and moreover without a praenomen would suggest rather Imperial freedman or their descendants in the second century. Being no expert in brick stamps myself, I would like to ask the specialists to check once more their criteria for a first century datation.

Some minor comments are called for. 8: One cannot say that *Mucciis* would be a carver's mistake for *Mucius*, for we have many pairs with a geminate name beside a normal one, like *Deccius Moccius* and others. But on the photo I would rather read *Muci*. — 9: *Serapio* and *Serapion* are one and the same name. — 17: The connection of Plotia (Servilia) Isaurica with the republican Servilii Caepiones remains open, for the nomenclature shows clearly that this lady was a descendant of the great general Isauricus. — 23: The reasoning concerning the carver's errors is not very convincing. — 32: BIPIDALE is not really an error, but a graphic variant, caused by close *e* (cf. It. *piede*). On the other hand, one cannot say that DOLLARE in 35 should be accepted as a genuine linguistic variant. That is absolutely excluded. — 63: Bloch's identification of Iulia Fadilla and Arria Lupula cannot stand. — 82: Why must Clemens be a freedman? — 89: It is interesting to notice that in ANSO for *Anto(nino)* the carver has confused two subsequent letters of the alphabet. Could this point to the use of mobile letters? Cf. a fresh case from ager Tiburtinus: ANEREA in a clay stamp for *Andrea* (Forma Italiae reg. I 17 Tibur III p. 46). — 94: The basic form is *Amarantus*. — 96: ASC need not necessarily lead to an Asclepiades. — Misprints are rare; I have noticed 19 [Cae] and 89 Anto(nino), both in the minuscule text.

Heikki Solin