

z.B. im Fall der Inschrift Nr. 61: der Patronus wird mit dem Konsul von 3 n.Chr. identifiziert (S. 57), aber wegen *d.m.*, *Ponponie Priscille* und *cun qua* möchte man diese Inschrift eher etwas später datieren.

Im ganzen handelt es sich in jedem Fall um eine Edition, die allen modernen Ansprüchen gerecht wird. Nun erhebt sich aber die Frage, was man damit eigentlich anfangen soll. Die einzelnen Inschriften sind ja nicht besonders interessant, und die meisten waren ja sowieso schon längst bekannt. Es ist vielmehr das grosse Material im ganzen, das Anspruch auf Interesse erheben kann, einerseits, weil Alles aus dem selben Kolumbarium stammt, andererseits, weil Alles ungefähr datiert werden kann. Hier hat man nun den Eindruck, dass der Verfasser sich ein interessantes Material mühsam zusammengestellt hat, ohne dieses richtig ausbeuten zu können. Denn wenn in der Presentazione von F. Castagnoli versprochen wird, dass man aufgrund des Materiales zu "conclusioni della massima importanza" kommen würde, so scheint mir das doch etwas übertrieben. Über den Wert des archäologischen Teils der Zusammenfassung kann ich mich freilich nicht äussern; aber sonst ist jedenfalls in dem analytischen Teil nur ziemlich wenig Analyse zu finden. Verschiedene Erscheinungen sprachlichen, paläographischen usw. Charakters werden einfach ohne Kommentar aufgezählt. Der onomastische Teil besteht aus einer Liste von Namen. Kein Wort wird dagegen über andere wichtige Fragen verloren. Hier hätte man doch viele Beobachtungen machen können, z.B. über die Namengebung der Kinder der Freigelassenen oder über die Bezeichnung der Patroni. Warum heisst ein Mann M. Volusius Hyla (Nr. 24), während alle anderen Volusii Lucius oder Quintus heissen? Warum wird ein Patronus *Volusius Torquatus Luci filius* genannt (Nr. 111)?

Mit dem vorliegenden Material hätte man also doch wohl etwas mehr anfangen können. Trotzdem wird man dem Verfasser sehr dankbar sein, da er das Material in mustergültiger Weise der Forschung zugänglich gemacht hat.

*Olli Salomies*

*Inscriptiones Italiae*. Vol. I, regio I, fasc. I: Salernum. Curavit *Victorius Bracco*. Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, Roma 1981. LXXV, 172 p. Lit. 80.000.

In 1976 in this same journal I reviewed V. Bracco's publication of *Inscriptiones Italiae* III regio III. He has now completed another volume of this rather slowly appearing series, covering Salernum and Ager Salernitanus. The principles of editing are the same. All the material is given, whether it has earlier been published in CIL X and elsewhere or not. In fact, only 43 out of the 241 inscriptions from Salernum were not found in CIL X. Photographs of all extant stones are provided. In the case of lost inscriptions, the text is copied in capital letters from earlier publications. In both cases, the inscriptions are also transcribed. All of them are

furnished with comments in Latin, some of them of considerable length. In the introduction, the author describes Salernum and its ager, discusses the epigraphical material and gives an index auctorum. Very complete and detailed indices complete the work.

Bracco's publication has almost the same virtues and defects as the earlier one. His Latin, sorry to say, is rather pedestrian and in places almost unintelligible. In my opinion, use of the modern languages would also be preferable in contemporary epigraphy. Some of the photographs seem to be too small and indistinct. In many cases it has not been possible to compare the inscribed text with its transcription. The author's comments are somewhat uneven. His discussion of the anaglyphs is one of the best sides in the publication. Historical and topographical comments are also of good quality. He has approached the difficult task of dating with due caution. Datings based upon the style of anaglyphs seem convincing. Otherwise he bases his datings upon formulas, e.g. the appearance or absence of D.M., which is not always reliable criterion, upon onomastics, etc. In the detailed discussion below, I shall comment on some of his datings. On the other hand, he has taken little interest in paleography. Apart from such trivial remarks as "litterae sequioris aetatis" or "litterae bonae" he mostly passes lettering in silence. Nomenclature has been given more attention, though one may sometimes disagree with the explanations, or miss them altogether.

Here are some observations I have made when reading the publication. The numbers refer to the inscriptions.

1. ]neri c[ may be *Ve]neri C[aelesti]*, but this is of course merely a guess.
6. *Signo Eumenis* should be *signo Eumenius*.
8. *quae ... pertinet* for *pertinent* is explained as a Greek interference, but no references are given. In many other cases as well the author remains content to register a linguistic peculiarity without explaining it.
11. Bracco gives Dessau's cautious *videtur* as *profecto libertus*.
21. *Leontius* is an old Greek name, not an agnomen unless specially used as one. *Cum* with the genitive is not an archaic form. It is not explicable from Latin linguistics.
25. The supplements proposed by the author are more than uncertain.
34. *Ascia*, probably mentioned by the original editor as an anaglyph.
51. Connecting the name *Ursus* with Ovid's *Halieutica* is odd. But the author has probably not succeeded in expressing himself clearly enough here.
53. In the transcription, against the original text, *qui*.
54. ONISII transcribed as *Di]onisiu[s]*, a misprint?
70. The abbreviated gentilicium suggesting republican times should have been explained. *Mari(us)* is of a quite different type as are the later *Flav.*, *Iul.*, etc.
79. Not certain whether we here have a manumitted slave. Again, geographical cognomina do not always show the origin of their bearers.
80. Dating to the republican times contradicted by the abbreviated gentilicia *Pom.*

84. *d(ies) I* pro *d(iem) I* in the transcription.
91. *fecer.* transcribed as *fecerunt* without the abbreviation signs.
92. *T. Claudii* are not necessarily freedman of Claudius and Nero. They may be their descendants.
104. The name *Agripina* cannot be used as a dating criterion.
105. The word *rebbis* should have been commented upon.
111. The frequency of *Lucilla* as a woman's name is due to the hypocoristic suffix *-illa*, which is almost ten times more frequent in women's than in men's names. It has nothing to do with the significance of the name.
131. The author seems to have given too free rein to his imagination in interpreting the significance of *mercator vinar(ius)*.
132. The author does not comment upon the interesting double cognomen *Carpus Superbus*.
145. The name *Zantiala* should have been discussed.
146. *Teutumenus*, origin not discussed.
154. *vibo* (pro *vivo*) and *monimentum* (pro *monumentum*) are not criteria of an early date.
156. The text of the inscription, *dominam Florentiam Luxurius maritus*, cannot possibly be attributed to confusion between the accusative and the dative. Clearly this was due to Greek influence. In Greek epitaphs, especially in Asia Minor, the name of the deceased was frequently set in the accusative. This was rare but not quite unknown in Latin epigraphy, especially in some honorary inscriptions. I have, however, found two epitaphs of this type in Rome, thus VI 19020 *Gentius Superam uxorem rari exempli feminam* (see my A Study of the Greek Epitaphs of Rome, Acta IRF 1963, p. 19). The epitaph from ager Salernitanus is similarly interpretable.
168. The author has not commented upon an interesting case of the transmission of names: father *Petrus*, daughter *Petronia*.
172. Misprints or mistakes in the transcription.
177. "Cognomina", a mistake for "gentilicia".
187. III VIR, mistake for IIIIVIR.
191. The emendation of the transmitted text seems bold.
198. *Felicula*, the frequency as women's names explicable similarly to No. 111.
211. The cognomen *Parthinus* as such does not justify the author's conclusions.
218. The abbreviation *c.*, solved as *c(ognomento)*, would have required a comment.
222. The author's remarks upon *Rarus* and *Frequens* are somewhat puerile.
- 24\*. *Flavia* is too common a gentilicium to justify conclusions as to its bearer's origin.

Despite these and other criticisms, the author can be given credit for having produced a painstaking edition of all the epigraphical material from Salernum. Both his transcriptions and the majority of the comments are reliable. Use of the edition is greatly facilitated by the meticulous indices.