dedicato al periodo che va dall’avvento al potere di Dionigi II dopo la morte del padre nel 368/7 fino all’abdication di Timoleonte nel 337/6 (non 337/7, come indicato nel frontespizio). La compilazione è stata affidata ad una vera specialista del periodo in questione, Marta Sordi, che nell’introduzione ha potuto dare una sintesi in base ai suoi precedenti lavori sulla Sicilia greca. Infatti le pagine che coprono l’introduzione, riproducono quasi interamente il testo del capitolo corrispondente nella *Storia della Sicilia* (II, 1979). Si tratta di una buona sintesi delle vicende della Sicilia in quel periodo.


*Heikki Solin*

---


There is no need for a general reappraisal of this remarkable work, whose virtues have been detected by previous reviewers; here I particularly allude to the substantial observations of Gabba, in Athenaeum 1984, 671f. Keppie’s book is a model of careful and illuminating scholarship, and it will remain for a long time the basic reference work in its field. Part two, especially, a detailed analysis of the individual communities where veteran settlements can be identified, with the epigraphic evidence on the veterans themselves, is a great achievement, the author linking a profound local knowledge to a wider historical context. The first part of the book is also very relevant as an analysis of the various, often very intricate problems connected with the sources and the historical interpretation of the known facts; especially chapter five, in which the problem of the political, and socio-economic significance of military colonisation in first century Italy is reconsidered, seems to me very important indeed.

Instead of offering a general discussion of the rich materials included in Keppie’s book, I would like to consider some minor detail I have noticed. The list of the 18 towns that were forced to give land after Philippi, tabulated on p. 63, is highly conjectural, as Keppie himself concedes. But was it necessary, in order to reach the number of 18, to include in the list towns such as Aquinum and others? We have from Aquinum only one testimony, a very uncertain one at that, Keppie’s Sylloge 1 (= CIL X 5407). Keppie might be right in
his discovery that the grave belongs to a soldier of the l(egio) III, but it is completely uncertain if the inscription belongs to the pre-Actium period (I have seen it and can only confirm an Augustan dating, perhaps from the mid-Augustan period). And even if this soldier should be one of those who were released in the aftermath of Philippi, can this isolated testimony say anything about a real settlement at Aquinum? I think on this point (as with some other cases) Keppie has overestimated the probative force of his sources. –

The title Actiacus, discussed on p. 111, is interesting. However, it cannot be defined as a cognomen; it is a pure title, as can be seen for example from Sylloge 21 and 25 (note the word order). Considering the dating there is no need to search for a real cognomen for the soldiers. In fact, the Greek cognomen Actiacus might have had a servile stamp, and indeed it was in use as a slave-name (see my Namenbuch 568). – I would have liked (in the fifth chapter, I presume) a discussion on the tribus appartenence of the settled veterans. When were the veterans inscribed in the tribus of their new settlement (as in Sylloge 59), when not (as in Sylloge 1)? Can we know something more about the practices in this respect? The elucidation of this point would be important for example in the study of local population. To the very useful list on p. 133 one could add several items. As to Teanum, I cannot agree with Keppie (p. 139f.). It is completely impossible that CIL X 4796 (4797 makes no mention of IIIIViri) and EE VIII 575 could be from the Late Republic. There was no colony at Teanum at that time, and I agree with Degrassi that there was the foundation of a colonia Claudia in A.D. 46. Keppie’s veteran C. Cabilenus Gallus is an isolated testimony and cannot show the existence of a colony in the Triumviral age – On p. 209f. Keppie speaks briefly on colonies under the Julio-Claudians, and mentions Velitrae as an uncertain example. But this town certainly did become a colony, probably under Nero, see my remarks in Suppl. It. 2, 1983, 18f.

One further consideration. Why has Keppie preferred to transcribe the inscriptions in the useful Sylloge with maiuscules and without solving the abbreviations? To give them as has been done for example by Reis in his Epigraphischer Anhang in his study of the cohortes urbanae, that is to say in minuscules and integrations, would have greatly helped the consultation.

Some further minor points: p. 15: Turin and Aosta do have Latin names; p. 49, n. 1: there is some confusion in the title of Chocholle’s book: p. 50, n. 9 ἐξεστησετευμένων ; p. 85, n. 148 should read Scarfi; p. 103, n. 15: as to the Ferentinates novani, I cannot agree with the explanation given by Keppie, see my remarks RPAA 53–54, 1980–1982 (1984) 140–143.

Heikki Solin


Campania is a book which was well-known long before it was written. Martin Frederiksen spent much time in Campania studying its geography, topography, and