

A. Scantius A. f. Ael. Larcianus *proc. prov. Maur. Ting.* usw. Da die Inschrift dieses Mannes aus Formiae stammt, einer Stadt, deren Einwohner in die Tribus Aemilia eingeschrieben waren, und da bei dem Mann eine Heimatangabe fehlt, und noch aus anderen Gründen scheint mir die Emendation *Aem.* sehr wahrscheinlich. — S. 84 Nr. 217: L. Rennius Q. f. Fl. Faustus. Die Interpretation des Verfassers scheint mir ganz unmöglich. Eine Inschrift, in der alle Männer ein anderes Pränomen haben als ihre eigenen Väter, und in der eine Frau bloß als *Paquia uxor* (so, mit *xs*) bezeichnet wird, kann nicht aus der Zeit stammen, in der Pseudotribus bezeugt sind. Die Mommsensche Restitution des handschriftlich überlieferten inschriftlichen Textes, die von der von Forni in mehreren Details abweicht, scheint mir nach wie vor überzeugend. Seltsamerweise haben die Editoren der *Année épigraphique* die Interpretation des Verfassers übernommen (AE 1983, 209). — S. 85 Nr. 220 (vgl. S. 26): G. Iulius Fl. Ingen [uus], *mi [l.] leg. VI [p.] f.* Da der angeblichen Pseudotribus *Fl.* nicht durch eine Heimatangabe entsprochen wird, möchte ich *Fl.* doch eher für einen Gentilnamen halten. Von gemeinen Leuten, die zwei Gentilnamen haben, wimmelt es in den Inschriften des 2. und 3. Jh. (aus den letzten Bänden des AE notiere ich mir rasch AE 1973,187. 576; 1975,23. 46; 1976,540; 1979,339; 1980,767; 1982,292. 681; 1983,960). Auch in dem Namen des Val. Cl. Quintus (S. 129 Nr. 146) scheint mir *Cl.* eher ein Gentilname zu sein.

*Olli Salomies*

*Hélène Jouffroy: La construction publique en Italie et dans l'Afrique romaine.* Groupe de recherche d'Histoire romaine de l'Université des sciences humaines de Strasbourg. Études et Travaux II. Association pour l'étude de la civilisation romaine, Strasbourg 1986, 537 p. Fr. 280.—.

The Author has done a vast amount of work in trying to study the Roman public construction in Italy and in the African provinces and arrange it according to typology, chronology and geography. The private buildings are not included in this book for obvious reasons: an exhaustive study would not be possible. She does not handle Rome, either, and that is acceptable, because her aim is to study the building activity of the towns in general. But the conditions in Rome, in the Capital, were different, and therefore one understands that Rome deserves a totally specific study.

The chronology covers the time from the beginning of the Republic to the end of the Empire, and is divided as follows: Republic, Julio-Claudian and Flavian periods, 2nd century, 3rd century, from the Severi to the Tetrarchy, and 4th century. Except for the 1st period the subdivisions in the African provinces are the same. Under these subdivisions all constructions that can be dated are grouped.

The construction is divided into the following classes: walls, buildings of cult worship, administrative buildings, commercial and utility buildings, spectacular monuments, memorial arches and large constructions of public interest like aqueducts etc. The chosen classes are sufficiently distinctive, and the reader can follow well the evolution of the different types.

The material has been collected mainly from the epigraphical and literary sources. Archaeological evidence is used when the building types can be identified. In this material

dated constructions comprise 73% of the total in Italy and 68% in Africa. Generally the material is well collected, although there are little gaps, too. The building of the so-called agora of Velia (= gymnasium?) in the 2nd century B.C. is not mentioned (cf. Johannowsky, PP 204—207 [1982] 235). Should we, also, consider IG XIV 742 (dat. I/II cent A.D.) from Naples a public construction, although the word ἀγορευτήριον is problematic? It is not even cited here. Some unknown consul did, moreover, restore the baths of Naples (IG XIV 749). This inscription should be included at least among the non-dated. Besides, there was an imperial *macellum* and a *moles* which was built in the year 202 A.D. (for these see e.g. Napoli antica, Sopr. arch. per le prov. di Napoli e Caserta, 1985).

One wonders, also, that so few Greek inscriptions from Italy are cited (SEG is totally lacking). Should we believe that among them there are no inscriptions concerning the building activity of the Romans? (see, however, at least IG XIV 637, although it is very fragmentary).

Some minor points: p. 341, still under Naples: CIL X 1481 = IG XIV 729 is most probably connected with the restaurations of the baths by the emperor Titus, see SEG IV 95. P. 86 fn. 112 and p. 88 under Puteoli: the editions of the Tablets of Murecine by C. Giordano and F. Sbordone are now proved to be totally useless, cf. the new editions by G. Camodeca in Puteoli 6 (1982) 3—53. P. 341: the *chalcidicum* mentioned under Naples (AE 1956, 20) belongs better to Puteoli, see Camodeca, Puteoli 3 (1979) 22, fn. 24.

My remarks only concern these few cities, but I think that a study of this kind definitely includes a certain amount of superficiality. However, if the accuracy is as high everywhere as in those cases I have studied, this book is a very useful aid to anyone who needs this kind of information. This book has good indexes and a bibliography that is arranged according to the cities, and so gives a general picture easily. A book that should have been included is Les "Bourgeoisies" municipales italiennes aux IIe et Ier siècles av. J.-C., 1983, which has some very important information concerning esp. Latium and Campania. Concerning Fregellae, two works could have been cited: Fregellae. La storia e gli scavi by F. Coarelli, 1981 and G. Colasanti: Fregellae. Storia e topografia, pres. di F. Coarelli (1904) 1983. But I believe that the bibliography is not intended to be exhaustive.

*Martti Leiwo*

*Frank Brommer: Odysseus. Die Taten und Leiden des Helden in antiker Kunst und Literatur. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 1983. X, 132 S. 48 Tafeln. DM 60.—.*

F. Brommer has utilized his 'Vasenlisten' (3 1973) and 'Denkmälerlisten' III (1976) in this well-illustrated handbook concerning Odysseus in ancient art. References to the hero in early Greek literature and in some later sources are also given, but there is no actual discussion of the treatment of the Odysseus theme in ancient literature, nor of the problems of the relations between literature and art. The book seems to be addressed to non-specialists in the first place; the documentation attempted in the footnotes is not consistent, and all readers will miss a bibliography.

*H. Thesleff*