

Le fotografie delle iscrizioni sono abbastanza nitide e in genere la lettura della Sacco si può controllare facilmente. A nostro avviso essa è sempre fatta con diligenza e non dà adito ad alcuna critica rilevante. Le integrazioni, invece, sono talvolta forse troppo speculative. Crediamo che sia meglio evitare espressioni come: «si potrebbe anche ipotizzare...» (p. 42, n. 19) e (n. 21) «probabilmente... forse... se si tratta, come suppongo...» etc.). È verosimile che queste ipotesi, basate su integrazioni più o meno incerte, divengano con massima probabilità, fra qualche anno, una verità assoluta, quando le iscrizioni verranno usate come fonti dai non-epigrafisti.

Nel settore giudaico si discutono anche le argomentazioni proposte da H.J. Leon, *The Daughters of Gadias*, *TAPhA* 84 (1953) 67—72. Questi voleva eliminare Porto dalla lista delle città antiche che vedessero la presenza di una comunità giudaica. L'autrice ritiene invece di poter dimostrare senza alcun dubbio che esisteva una comunità giudaica ben organizzata non soltanto a Ostia ma anche a Porto. Ipotesi che ci pare plausibile, benchè il carattere e l'integrazione di alcuni frammenti giudaici siano incerti.

Infine alcuni piccolissimi commenti. P. 11 fr. 1c può essere anche [... ]ανὸς ἐπί... Il tratto nella linea 5 fr. 1a, p. 11, non mi sembra un A. P. 15, n. 3 lin. 10, anche qui ἐπιμελητῆς può essere *curator*. L'autrice scrive «si tratterebbe invece di un funzionario dell'annona...». Ma ciò non esclude un *curator* nella terminologia latina. P. 20, n. 20, lin. 6 εὐσεβεῖ[ας], direi piuttosto, che si tratti di una frase ellittica, sc. (ἔνεκεν) anzichè un genitivo causale. P. 42, n. 19, lin. 3 pure KHNCQ[...] con un O invece di un Ω è possibile. — Su 31 e 92, vedi Solin in questo stesso volume, *Analecta epigraphica* CXIII. 17.

In questo contesto non verranno trattate le integrazioni e neanche le pochissime correzioni al testo fatte con segni diacritici. È naturalmente importante dare il testo in una forma «corretta», ma ogni tanto gli sbagli stessi ci conducono alle variazioni linguistiche o sociolinguistiche. Tenendo conto anche di questo, i commenti dell'autrice insieme con le fotografie rendono questo fascicolo molto utile.

*Martti Leiwo*

*Roma — Via Imperiale. Scavi e scoperte (1937—1950) nella costruzione di Via delle Terme di Caracalla e di Via Cristoforo Colombo. Contributi di Lucia Avetta e del Seminario di Epigrafia a Antichità Romane editi a cura di Lucia Avetta. Titoli 3. Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Roma 1985 (1986). 304 p. 73 tavv. ITL 90.000.*

This book is essentially an edition of the inscriptions found during the excavations indicated in the title of the book — though some later finds are occasionally included, e.g. no. 46, said to have been found in 1966 —, but there are also two introductory chapters, one on the building of the Via Imperiale in the late thirties and the early forties and one on the ancient topography of the area. At the end of the book there is a chapter labelled “considerazioni conclusive”; one of the conclusions is that, unlike in the zone of the Via Appia (provided that the well-known thesis of D. Manacorda, *Un'officina lapidaria sulla Via Appia*, 1979, is accepted), it is not possible to assume that all the gravestones in this area came from one single “officina lapidaria”. — Despite the importance of the other chapters it

is, of course, the chapter in which the inscriptions are published that epigraphists will consider the most interesting, and I shall accordingly concentrate on this chapter.

It is only with mixed feelings that one starts to read a book like this, where the job of publishing inscriptions is done not by an established epigraphist but by a group of younger scholars, some of whom — the reader might assume at the outset — might well still need some more knowledge to master the secrets of the epigraphical science. One is reminded, for example, of eloquent and verbose comments on trivial matters, a phenomenon not unknown in modern epigraphical publications. The reader of this book will, however, be quite content; the readings of the inscriptions are for the most part acceptable and the commentaries attached to the individual inscriptions by the 13 students participating in the “seminario” — named on p. 8f. — are usually sober and concentrate on the essentials. In fact, some of the commentaries are almost too sober: in some cases the absence of comments on some details makes one suspect that the editor in question has not totally understood the text of the inscriptions. Not much is, for example, said on inscription no. 148, a poem of 13 verses, which surely would have merited some more annotation. The reader is led to suspect that the editor has missed at least some of the contents of the poem also by the very annoying fact that no commas and full stops are used, which is all the more striking when one considers that in shorter inscriptions commas and full stops are used very — in fact, in my opinion, too — generously (note e.g. no. 218, which is published as follows: *d(is) m(anibus). Callicarpus, Nicotyche, alumnae, fecit*; other texts with quite useless and even distracting commas and full stops are, e.g., nos. 2, 4, 62, 191, 211, 259, 260). Another text which would have profited from a more generous use of commas, full stops and comments is no. 128.

Most of the texts in this book are quite short funerary inscriptions of the normal type, but there are also some longer and more interesting texts; e.g. no. 66 (the senator Tursidius . . . Manilianus Tituleius Aelianus), 69 (a new fragment of the inscription CIL VI 1337 mentioning the senator M. Annaeus Clodianus Aelianus), 112 (a long text of A.D. 6 mentioning in detail the furnishings inside a large family tomb), to mention only inscriptions not previously published (though most of the 304 inscriptions — including fragments — in this book are *inedita*, some were already known from older publications). But, of course, even simple funerary inscriptions can offer something of interest. One is well reminded of the stereotyped character of funerary texts when one finds that even a two-year-old baby is described as *b(ene) m(erens)* (cf. Diehl, *Inscr. Lat. christ. vet.* 2969A) and that the phrase *posterisq(ue) eorum* is used also in a text where it is syntactically not correct (no. 256). The construction *sibi bene meritus* (no. 253; not in the index) is unusual (cf. TLL VIII 809, 70f.).

It is time to proceed to the details, concentrating on the details of more or less importance being a normal feature of reviews of epigraphical publications. I have the following observations to make on individual inscriptions. 66: it should have been stressed that Pflaum’s dating has no foundation. — 100: *vix. ann. LXV* (not *XLV*). — 102: *vixit ann. XL* (not *XI*), according to the photograph. — 115: instead of *Aucti li., Murrani l.* I think it is better to read *Aucti et Murrani l.* and to assume that the stonecutter had missed some horizontal strokes. — 128, 1.2: *antequa*  $\Gamma$   $m$   $\sqcap$  (*antequan* on the stone). — 130, 1.7: *perti[net]*. — 131: I do not think the interpretation offered is acceptable, as in my opinion it is impossible to connect *Aeliae Secundinae* with the word *gratia* following after *quondam vice sororis* and to

translate “per beneficio di Aelia Secundina”, whereas it should be obvious that any Roman reader of the text would connect *ex donatione* with the immediately following genitive *Aeliae Secundinae*. With this interpretation there remains, of course, the problem of *quondam vice sororis gratia*, where *gratia* seems hard to explain, unless one assumes that *vice . . . gratia* is here only a pleonastic expression for simple *vice*; there are some other rather odd and pleonastic expressions in this text, cf. *cubiculi puri monumentum* and *in hoc cubiculo munimento* (sic, not *monim-* as printed; cf. TLL VIII 1461, 7f.). — 132: the date proposed, “fine IV—V sec. d.C.”, seems a bit late. — 143: in the first line some space is needed for the name, which will have been something like *C. T[ullius C.f. Man]cia* or *C. T[ullius C.f. Mae]cia (tribu)*, or possibly even *C. T[ullius C.f. Mae. Man]cia*, and so it is better to assume that, in the second line, not only the consuls of the year but also the day and the month of the dedication were recorded. — 149: *Novebres* (not *Novembres*) in both places. Nothing is said on *rederit VIII i<sup>o</sup> d<sup>o</sup>us Novebres*, but in the index (p. 284) *rederit* is classed as a form of *redeo*, which is, of course, hard to believe. The *r* should be corrected to *d* as in the word *irus*, and *rededit* stands for *reddidit (animum)*; on this absolute use of *reddere* see Diehl, *Inscr. Lat. christ. vet.* III (1928) 395 (Index); E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica* II (1933) 257. — 150: the comment “*I longa in Titinius*” is not at all helpful; it should also be specified which *i* is meant (likewise e.g. in nos. 173, 206, 235). *Gaii* certainly refers to the two C. Titinii. — 153: the name *Aefidius* should not be corrected to *Alfidius*; *Aefidius* is attested (IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 2097, 137 Αἰφίδιος Χρυσόγονος). — 185: *XVIII* (not *XVIII*). — 205: *san<c>tissimae* (not *san<sup>r</sup>c<sup>t</sup>tissimae*). — 206: examining the photo I cannot help seeing a small *o* after *ci* in the third line and so I would very much prefer the reading *Meroe C. Mini/cio Isidoro fil.* The photo also suggests that the words *C. Mini/cio* were added to the original text at some later stage and that, accordingly, the original text ran *d.m. / Meroe / Isidoro fil. / etc.* — 233: *Genialis f(ilius)* (not *f(ecit)*). — 235: the construction is indeed “inconsueta”, but there are parallels, e.g. CIL XI 6131 *Q. Fadio Q.f. Rufo sex viro, sibi et Egnatiae Filarae uxori*; CIL V 4182 = *Inscr. It.* X, 5, 924 etc. — 250: *Staphylo* (not *Staphilo*; this should be corrected in the index, too). — 258: from the photo it is clear that the reading offered by the editor in line four, *fecerunt L.L.L. Grani*, is not correct; in the photo one can see, between *fecerunt* and *Grani*, three vertical strokes followed by an *l* which has a point on both sides. The correct reading is thus *fecerunt III* (i.e. *tres*) *L. Grani*.

There are also some misprints (e.g. no. 66: RE Suppl. XIV, 1974 col. 937 — should be 973 —; 69: *l(eg(ionis))*; 210: *Calocareus* — should be *-caerus* —; 231: *me ]/rentibus[s]*). The indexes are copious and quite satisfactory, though there are some mistakes. The following names have been omitted: Anni[a - ], 147; D]omitia Tro[phime, 32; C. Minicius (Isidorus), 206 (see my note on this inscription above); M. Pontiu[s - - ] and M. Pon[tius] M.f. Alexander, 147. The praenomina of M. Sedatius Myro (in 246) and L. Sergius Xantus (75) do not appear in the index, and then there are some minor mistakes, e.g. Tuccia Pannychidis (p. 275, instead of *Pannychis*), *Letois* (p. 278, instead of *Letoides* — cf. H. Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom* I 554; *Letois* is a feminine name and as such not suitable for a T. Flavius), *Threptes* (p. 279, instead of *Threpte*).

Despite some minor shortcomings — we all make mistakes — it is clear that what we have here is a good and useful book and a welcome addition to the series of collections of

inscriptions from the capital of the Roman Empire; the team of editors deserves our thanks. A philosophically-minded reader of this book, knowing that even after the publication of these inscriptions there are still hundreds and maybe even thousands of unpublished inscriptions in Rome, may well start wondering how it is possible that so many inscriptions can stay unpublished for such a long time in the capital of modern epigraphical studies, where there is certainly no shortage of competent epigraphists. One is reminded of the old times when new finds were made known annually in the *Bullettino comunale* or in the *Notizie degli Scavi*. But it is perhaps useless to ponder on such things; it is only to be hoped that the long-awaited supplement to CIL VI, probably the most important of all the supplements to the different volumes of the Corpus, will be published soon; smaller collections of inscriptions, like this one, do not really do the same job as one corpus that includes all the material.

*Olli Salomies*

*Inscriptiones Italiae*. Vol. X, regio X, fasc. V: *Brixia*. Partes II, III. Curavit *Albinus Garzetti*. Istituto poligrafico dello Stato, Roma 1985, 1986. Pp. 205—501; 503—775.

Inscriptionum Italiae voluminis X fasciculi V pars prima, de qua pauca dixi *Arctos XIX* (1985) 289, a. 1984 edita est; nunc etiam partes alteram et tertiam in manibus habemus. Pars II titulos sepulchrales in ipsa urbe et in suburbio ad III lapidem repertos continet, pars III titulos agri Brixiani et “instrumentum praeter figlinum et latericium”, additis titulis Graecis falsis alienis incertis lapidibus miliariis. “Ager” intellegendus est ager Brixianis attributus populorum Alpinorum, ad quos in hoc opere accedunt etiam Camunni, quamquam hi quandam rem publicam suam atque etiam tribum suam a Brixianorum Fabia diversam habebant. — Praeterea parti III indices totius fasc. V insunt.

Fasciculus V totus continet titulos 1281, ex quo numero colligas Brixiam fuisse urbem haud parvi momenti; quod etiam ex aliis indiciis, e.g. ex numero senatorum Brixianorum (G. Alföldy, *Tituli* 5 [1982] 346sqq.), efficitur. Quae cum ita sint, quaerenti, quaenam urbes imp. R. dignae sint, quarum tituli in unum corpus (ut dicimus) colligantur, facile respondeas Brixiam certe hoc loco habendam esse, cum etiam accedat, multos titulos Brixianos adhuc ineditos aut certe non bene notos in musaeis vel aliis locis iacuisse (v. p. 775). Neque hoc satis: concedendum enim est editorem huius fasciculi, A. Garzetti, munere suo functum esse ita, ut singula tantum, et haec quidem minimi momenti, in hoc libro a legentibus vituperari possint. Lectiones inscriptionum, commentarii ad singulas inscriptiones, in quibus G. admirabili brevitate usus est (brevitas enim laudanda est cum de hoc agitur, res maximas a vulgaribus discernere), indices omnia necessaria continentes, omnia haec maxima laude digna sunt. Neque omittendum est titulos, quotquot extant, imaginibus photographis depictos esse (quae tamen non omnes bonae sunt; etiam titulorum hodie perditorum imagines phot. plerumque praebentur, factae scilicet ex libris manu scriptis per quos tituli hi nobis traditi sunt). Ita fit, ut hic novus *Inscriptionum Italiae* fasciculus a rei epigraphicae studiosis inter exoptatissimos huius temporis novis libris habendus sit. — Ceterum valde placet, ut hic minima quoque attingam, *C.* et *Cn.* praenominum novus — ut mihi certe videtur — perscribendi modus hic, (*Gaius*), (*Gnaeus*), non, ut saepe fit, *C(aius)*, *Cn(aeus)*; nam “*Cai*”