

115sgg.; sullo stesso tema cfr. ora F. Delpino, *Rend.Pont.Acc.Arch.* 57 (1984-85) 191sgg.). La storia delle ricerche a Veio è veramente affascinante, qui portata alla luce con una grande varietà di illustrazioni (acquarelli, incisioni, pitture a olio, schizzi) che raffigurano, oltre alle vedute puramente topografiche, sia le vicende degli scavi che i loro protagonisti. Tra i personaggi che in qualche modo stavano in rapporto con le ricerche dell'antica Veio, si menzionano per esempio il Cardinale Chigi, Gavin Hamilton, Andrea Giorgi, Maria Cristina di Borbone delle Due Sicilie, la regina di Sardegna, Giovanni Pietro Campana, Antonio Nibby e William Gell. Con l'aiuto del materiale archivistico l'autore ha anche potuto individuare dispute e dissidi tra gli scavatori.

In questo suo studio Delpino ha messo in evidenza l'importanza delle ricerche svolte nei musei e negli archivi, talvolta pieni di documentazione sulle antichità da lungo tempo caduta in oblio.

Mika Kajava

Diana E.E. Kleiner: Roman Imperial Funerary Altars with Portraits. *Archaeologica* 62. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1987. 320 p. 69 pll. ITL 650.000.

The scope of the present volume is to collect and study all known examples of Roman funerary altars with one or more portraits (the Republican period is excluded). This is a worthwhile and interesting project because this special type of Roman funerary art has not so far received the attention it deserves. Since Altmann's still useful *Die römischen Grabaltäre der Kaiserzeit* appeared in 1905, not much systematic work has been done (there are, however, some extensive studies on other types of Roman altars).

Kleiner has catalogued 130 monuments in all. The material is limited to the city of Rome (there are also some examples from Ostia). It would naturally be interesting to know more about other Italian regions, too. An exhaustive analysis of various stylistic trends between different production centres might be of use when monuments of unknown provenance are studied. It is also a well-known fact that since the time of antiquity a huge number of objects have been transferred to new places, museums, private collections, etc., and the circulation continues. The number (130) of Kleiner's altars may seem relatively small, but this is all that she has found. However, there are obviously many altars in various collections outside of Rome which still remain unidentified because their origin has not been reported. It seems somewhat strange that in Kleiner's material there is e.g. only one exemplar from the National Museum of Naples, and when leafing through some recent

museum catalogues, I have noticed a number of Roman monuments that the author has not observed (e.g. in the Musei Capitolini).

In the introductory section (19-93) Kleiner delineates the origin and function of altars (Ch. 1), their typology and chronology (Ch. 2), the honorees and dedicants (Ch. 3) and finally, funerary altars and funerary art in general (Ch. 4). The first chapter describes various types of Roman altars, their basic elements and their relation to the environment. The author also discusses the places where altars were originally collocated. In the second chapter the material is somewhat schematically divided into seven basic types and into several subtypes. The classification is based on the treatment of the upper part of the altar and on the portrait itself. From p. 45 onwards Kleiner tries to describe the relationships between different persons recorded in the inscriptions (parents and children, husbands and wives, patrons, freedmen, etc.) as well as their social, ethnic and professional backgrounds. Unfortunately, this part of Kleiner's study remains rather modest and at times even misleading. She is not particularly familiar with Roman people's nomenclature, people's professions and social relations between masters and slaves or patrons and freedmen. The evidence of personal names and of the contents of the inscriptions is often exaggerated as regards their relation to the decorative motifs of the altars. The social function of the names is in many cases misunderstood. It is also strange that Kleiner regards many inscriptions as "illegible", which has caused a number of troublesome errors (cf. e.g. nr. 76). In two cases the author has not noted that the altars (55, 79) were dedicated by persons of senatorial rank. However, one of her main conclusions was that these types of funerary monuments were not in use among the members of aristocracy. The position of the equestrian *ordo* in Roman society and the presence of equestrians on funerary altars are not clearly described (70f. and *passim*). Roughly the same reservations also concern the fourth chapter.

In sum, my criticism is mainly directed against the author's treatment of names and their "significance" and her considerations of the persons' social background. Kleiner's epigraphic knowledge also shows considerable gaps. Despite this criticism the work will certainly be a useful repertorium of Roman funerary art. In the following I will present some observations on the material:

3. The inscription is not totally illegible, as the author believes. From the photo I am able to discern a fair number of letters and even some entire words, e.g. l. 4: ...*Maximo v. ann. V*] and l. 5 ...*Euhodiae matri*...

4. The altar is reported in Boll. dei Musei Comunali di Roma 4 (1957) 30.

5. VI 34776. MANIBVS (not MANIVBVS). Cantinea M.f. Procla was not of course a "freeborn daughter of Marcus Proclus".

7. VI 15003. Inscr. of the funerary relief, l. 4: POSTERISQVE (not POSTERISQE).

9. VI 33796. The name of the deceased woman was not [---]onnlia *Delicata*. The gentilicium was [---]onneia, to be restored as e.g. [T]onneia or the like. L. 3: *p]lura*; l. 4: his office was not "Aug. tabularius" (thus on p. 111). He was rather *Aug. (lib.), tabularius*.

10. VI 13948. According to the photo the praenomen *Marcus* seems to have been abbreviated to *M̄a*.

11. It is by no means certain that it was Postumus (PIR² I 483) who commissioned and erected the altar to his freedman Philetus, even if they both might be represented in the relief scene.

13. VI 10069. Line 3 (on the right): SECVDAS (not SECVNDAS). On the last line the letters N V should be noted. Claudia Helice's name does not suggest that "she came from Achaia." The gentilicium *Claudia* does not automatically point to the Claudian period.

14. VI 22560. It is somewhat imprudent to maintain that P. Sextilius Campanus was perhaps from Campania. If the daughter was called Minucia Suavis and the father Ti. Claudius Suavis, it does naturally not follow that the mother's and daughter's name was the same.

16. VI 9183. Ti. Claudius Aug.l. Apelles could be Nero's freedman as well (Kleiner prefers Claudius). The inscription itself should probably be dated to the sixties, because it refers to the Macellum Magnum, which was dedicated in 59 AD. The small inscription above the three figures represented in the inferior panel is problematic: CAY (hedera) DAPISCE (hedera?) CAY (not AD PISCES, as the author believes). The central text above the head of Calpurnius Daphnus has usually been read as DA PISCEN, but it seems to me that the so-called N is in fact a hedera. The inscription tells that Calpurnius worked as an *argentarius* in the Macellum Magnum. The attributes depicted, a fish in his outstretched right hand and a box in the left, suggest that he was somehow responsible for selling fish in the Macellum. The two other figures are carrying heavy baskets on their shoulders, and the man on the left holds a number of fish in his right hand. It might be that DA PISCE refers to the act between Daphnus and one of the merchants, as it is represented in the scene: *da pisce(s)* "give me the fishes" [or *pisce(m)*]; Mommsen opted for "*da pisce(m)*" (cf. CIL ad loc.). Of course, these words may very well be a later addition.

17. VI 15314. One of the alternative cognomina of the deceased was not "Victoris", but *Victor* instead. That *Nebris* would be a play on the word *ebria* is a far-fetched idea. The inscription should be restored as follows: *Ti. Claudio V[ital]i Antonia[e] / Divi Claudi [f. li]b., v. a. XV / Claudia Nebris mate[r Ti.] Claudius Herma pat[er] / filio piissim[o] / fecerunt* (perhaps also ...*mater et Claudius...*). As regards the interpretation of the second epitaph, the

author seems to have misunderstood its contents and the relation between the two texts. A statement like “perhaps both couples are honoured” is not clear to me. The second text is a dedication by *Philetus p(ater)* and *Calliste m(ater)* to their son as well as *sibi et suis*. The name of the son is not recorded, perhaps because he died so young.

19. VI 19022. L. 2: *Epaphrodit* (ligature): The analysis of the social and family relations between Epaphroditus and Grapte is incorrect (p. 127). A more careful look at the text itself might have been profitable (*libertus* is not the same as *liberta*).

21. VI 8468. That the cognomen *Musaeus* of the deceased would suggest that he had been a poet or musician, as the author thinks, is a very strange affirmation. The words of the fifth line *mancipi viae Appiae* do not mean that “the altar was erected on family property on the Via Appia”. *Musaeus* was *manceps viae Appiae* (for this inscription and *mancipes* in general, see P. Ørsted, *Roman Imperial Economy and Romanization*, Copenhagen 1985, 98ff.).

22. VI 28960. “All those mentioned in the inscriptions have Greek names”. Is *Castus* Greek? Do the maenads represented on the altar really mean that Tyche and Corinthus were adherents to the cult of the Dionysiac mysteries? Finally, *Corinthus* does not suggest that M. Vinicius Corinthus was “from the Greek city of Corinth”.

26. VI 12938. That Aulia Eutychia and A. Aulius Cerdo had the same gentilicium, does not indicate that they were *conliberti*. The inscription clearly shows that Eutychia was Cerdo's freedwoman. The name *Eutychia* does not refer to an eastern origin. And finally, what does the author mean by stating that “Cerdo's cognomen suggests that he was a workman or an artisan, a profession befitting someone of his social class”? An explanation such as “a well-known Cerdo is attested as architect” is naive and useless.

27. VI 16399. Amelung's idea of *Glyce* standing for *Glycera* is unnecessary. He even thought that this name would be illustrated by the dates and palm trees decorating the corners of the altar, and that the same concept of sweetness would be expressed by the epithet *dulcissima*.

29. VI 7388. The onomastic analysis is not particularly rewarding, e.g. “Valen's (sic) cognomen implies that he was a powerful man”, etc.

32. The author should have tried to read the inscription (“almost illegible”). The altar was obviously dedicated by the husband to his wife.

36. The analysis of VI 7535 is full of errors (p. 149).

38. VI 18168. The cognomen of the woman was not “Alcimenis”, but *Alcime* instead.

39. VI 20546. L. 4: EYTYCHO (not EVTYCHO). The nominative is not “Eutyches”, he was called ‘Ti. Iulius Eutychnus’. *Alexander et Hilarus lib(erti)*

were not Eutychus' sons, as the author thinks. They dedicated the altar to their patron Eutychus and to Iulia Lais, probably Eutychus' daughter.

40. VI 23293. The praenomen *Titus* in the name of 'Mevia T.f. Casta' does not by itself suggest a date in the second half of the 1st century.

42. VI 23393. That the sons of Cn. Ofillius Successus were called Cn. Ofillii Piso and Frugi, is not necessarily an indication of some connection between them and the Calpurnii Pisones. This is rather an example of onomastic imitation. Further, Piso and Frugi were inscribed in the Quirina tribe, but one cannot possibly claim with the author that the tribe itself, being also that of the Claudian and Flavian Emperors, would point to a Flavian date.

43. VI 29088a. Cleopatra did not come from the East because of her name (p. 160). The name *Vitellius* is not a good criterion to suggest a Flavian or early Trajanic date.

45. The inscription is also in Moretti, IGUR 1336.

48. VI 20819. Pharnaces was not a native of Pontus because of his name.

49. VI 18911. The name *Musicus* does not by itself mean that the deceased was a musician or a music teacher.

50. VI 19698. L. 6: EPAPHRODITVS (not EPAHRODITVS). It might have been mentioned that the master of Epaphroditus was a *p(rimi)p(ilaris)*.

52. VI 37974. It is true that the name *Urbana* may suggest that the daughter was born in Rome, but one should be careful with such names. *Urbanus/a* may have other connotations, too.

54. The author's ideas concerning Festa's "old-fashioned" coiffure (p. 178) seem to me somewhat unclear.

55. XIV 3994. The inscription is also VI 1485. It is regrettable that Kleiner seems to be totally unaware about the identity of the persons mentioned in this inscription. A little more knowledge about the title '*praetor*' might have revealed that Hirrutus and Pollio (father and son) were both senators. And the fact that Lucilius Pollio was consul in 158 AD renders the author's dating ("ca. 100 AD") unthinkable. This undermines one of Kleiner's main conclusions, that members of Roman nobility did not commission funerary altars with portraits (p. 90).

56. VI 20667. L. 3: according to the photo CLVTO (not CLYTO). The woman mentioned on line 4 was not called 'Iulia Musaris' (*memoriae Iuliae MVSARI*), the nominative of the cognomen being *Musario/-um*. It might be that MVSARI is an abbreviation for *Musari(onis)*. On p. 181 footnote 7) is missing.

57. VI 20304. In the present case the gentilicium *Iulius* is not a reliable criterion for dating (p. 183).

58. VI 19159. L. 6: SIBI ET SVIS (not SIBI SVIS; so on p. 183).

61. VI 24011, 2/3: *C. Petronio C.f. Cam. / Liguri Viriano Postumo*. The author states that he belonged to the Camilia tribe in Liguria. But *Ligus/Ligur* was one of his cognomina. Kleiner also states oddly that “Under Augustus, *equites* had to possess the property of a senator” (the reference to Millar is not correct). And finally, Postumus' equestrian status is not referred to in the epitaph, even if the author thinks it is.

62. VI 17557. The name of the deceased should not be written in the form 'Q(uintus) Fabius Q(uintii) F(ilius)'. Claudia Spendusa was not “his aunt” (*nepoti fecit*). Ll. 2-4 could have been commented on: *Q. Fabio Q.f. Fabio Proculo* (*Fabio* written instead of *Fabia*).

63. VI 21531. The name *Ionis* does not indicate that Luceia Ionis was “probably a Greek from Ionia”.

64. If the author had known that this inscription had been published e.g. by Moretti in IGUR 931, her interpretation of the Greek text would not have been so desperate. The name of the son is not “Secundus Glycytatus”, but *Secundus* (Σεκούνδω / ὑῶ γλυκυτά/τω). So any talk about “Glycytatus' Greek cognomen” is incorrect. The names do not show that “the patrons who commissioned this monument were probably ex-slaves of Greek origin”. And who were these “patrons”?

71. VI 18442. The name of the woman on l. 2 is not absolutely certain, but *Flaviae TAELETE* may be the correct reading. Thus the cognomen would be *Telete*. The last line VALERIA PRIMA MATER is here interpreted erroneously. She is not “*prima mater*” nor “an initiate at the rank of *mater* in one of the Isiac colleges”. Her name was, of course, 'Valeria Prima' and she was *mater* of the two daughters mentioned on ll. 2-4. Consequently the author is led astray in her analysis of the sculptural ornament of the altar. The gent. *Flavia* is not a good dating criterion in the present context.

72. The inscription is published in CIL VI 23130. The deceased was not called “Numisia Neopte”. Her name was Numisia Heorte, and on ll. 4-5 her age at the moment of death is recorded (not “BENE MERENTIS / V”).

75. VI 20990 should be restored as follows: *D M / Laberia[e] / Daphnes, v. a. [---] / M. Laberius Daph[nus et] / Fl. Horaea parente[s ---?] / fil. dulcissi[mae]*.

76. Kleiner states that the text is “in Greek and almost illegible”. It is in Greek indeed, but not illegible. And the provenance is not unknown, as she believes. In fact, the monument does not belong to the present catalogue at all. It is a dedication by L. Licinius Hermias for the safety of the Emperor Hadrian (= Moretti, IGUR 122, with bibliogr.).

79. VI 16431: *Corneliae / Piae / libertae karissimae / Cornelia Cethegilla / Aemilia Plancina*. The author's interpretation of this epitaph is totally absurd. She thinks “that the altar was put up by two different

women...in honor of *the* (not *their*) freedwoman, Cornelia Pia". "Cornelia Cethegilla" and Pia would be *conliberti* (sic) and Plancina would also be a freedwoman. Moreover, Kleiner assumes that "Pia, Cethegilla and Aemilia Plancina may have been sisters". The dedicator is naturally 'Cornelia Cethegilla Aemilia Plancina' and Pia was her *liberta*. It would have been useful for Kleiner to know that Plancina was a senatorial lady, member of the highest aristocracy of the time (see now M.-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier, PFOS 281).

80. The reading of the text, as proposed by Kleiner, is very suspect (VERECVND on l. 3 seems to be correct).

82. The text is also published by Moretti, IGUR 1305.

83. VI 1975. P. 215: the deceased was not "*promensor aedificiorum*" (...*Apro, mensori*...).

85. VI 8575. That *ark.* and *karis.* were written with a kappa, does not show "that the man who carved the epitaph was a Greek" (so p. 219, n. 4).

89. VI 27790, 2-5: *Turpilliae / Eutythiae / Gnesi / lib. / Primus conservae*. Kleiner maintains that the monument was set up by "Gnesus Primus" (sic) to his *conserva* and wife, Turpillia Eutythia. She continues: "Primus states that he is a *libertus*, but Eutythia appears to have died before she received her own freedom". This is not correct. Primus erected the altar to his *conserva* Turpillia Eutythia, freedwoman of Gnesius (not "Gnesus").

93. Thylander, IPO A 146: The name 'Iulia L.f. Apollonia' does not, of course, mean that she was "the daughter of Lucius Apollonius" (stated on p. 229).

95. VI 29238. One cannot possibly say with Kleiner that the name *Maternus* (M. Ulpus Maternus) refers to his close relationship with his mother.

98. VI 8725, 2: AVLIAE (not AVLLIAE).

99. VI 10818. The name *Urbicus* does not by itself mean that C. Aelius Urbicus was born in Rome (cf. above nr. 52).

100. VI 2365. The name of the dedicator was not "Granius Papias", as Kleiner thinks. The text implies that *Papi. ser. publicus* was *contubernalis* of Grania Faustina.

101. VI 18088. The name of the deceased son was not "Alcis", but *Alcides* (l. 5: *Alcide filio*). The mother's cognomen was of course *Hedone* (the stone gives EDONE). Kleiner's thoughts concerning the elements 'T. Flavius' (p. 238) are very strange.

103. I would read this fragmentary inscription as follows: [*Dis*] *Manibus* / [---] *Epaeni* / [---] *one lib. eadem* / [*in front*] *e p. XIIX, in agro* / [---]. The dedicator appears to have been a freedwoman with a Greek name (type 'Hermione').

105. VI 22073, 8: IVLIIVS or IVLLIIVS (not IVLIVS). On ll. 6/7 AD / QET seems to be a contamination of *adque* (= *atque*) with *et* (not to be interpreted as AD / Q · ET). ADQ might also be an addition of a second hand.

107. XIV 429 (Ostia). The correct name is not 'Fyrmus' (= a graphic variant of *Firmus*).

108. It is not true that "the father is not named". On l. 2 of the inscription ET PIVS PATER is to be read as *Ethus pater* (cf. H. Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom*, 1310).

112. VI 20595a. C. Marius Alcibiades was not "of Greek origin" because of his cognomen.

116. VI 26417. The name *Aesopus* does not suggest that "the family came to Italy from Greece".

117. The text is also published by Moretti, IGUR 798.

118. VI 20970. Kleiner's idea that Diadumenianus could have later achieved senatorial status (because of the *fasces* represented in the relief) is pure fantasy.

119. XIV 1521 (Ostia) is to be read as follows: *D M / Quartus Ca[es.] / n̄. ser. Al[---] / [v]erna[e] suo [---]*. The name of the *verna* thus begins with *Al-* (*Ai-* is also possible).

121. VI 2488. The many ligatures should be noted. The name 'M. Aurelius' does not necessarily refer to Caracalla, but clearly does refer to some Emperor with these names.

122. The inscription is now published by P. Sabbatini Tumolesi, *Mus. Naz. Rom. I*, 7, 148 (nr. V, 20).

123. The inscription VI 20679 does not show that Severus was a freedman of one of the Severan Emperors (*Severus Aug. lib.*, husband of Iulia Severa). Unfortunately Kleiner's dating is based just on the onomastics.

125. Vitalis' altar is recently published by M.G. Cranino Cecere, *La collezione epigrafica dei Musei Capitolini (Tituli 6)*, Roma 1987, 55ff., nr. 15.

126. It is not true that "all three are designated by single names and were thus all probably of servile origin". The father is called 'Bassaeus Felicissimu[s]'. On line 5 *et Rufa* (not SERVEA), cf. M. Bertinetti, *Mus. Naz. Rom. I*, 8, 332 (nr. VII, 3).

127. VI 20413 (= 37875a). The name *Iulius* does not necessarily point to a 1st century date (but the use of a praenomen suggests a date earlier than the 3rd cent.). As a criterion for dating the altar could have also considered the row of acanthus leaves and the astragal motif. The altar cannot possibly date from the 3rd century.

128. Kleiner does not date this altar. The format of the monument and the inscription VI 20712 (letter forms, names) seem to permit a general datation to the 2nd century, the first half being by no means excluded.

129. It is not true that Ursus had to be 50 years old to be elected as a *curio*. This age requirement was observed in much more ancient times. Consequentially, Kleiner's observations concerning Ursus' age are unnecessary, but she could have noted that a *curio* was often of equestrian rank.

130. The inscription has been published in *Epigraphica* 5-6 (1943-44) 6, nr. 71.

Mika Kajava

Friederike Sinn: Stadtrömische Marmorurnen. Beiträge zur Erschließung hellenistischer und kaiserzeitlicher Skulptur und Architektur 8. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1987. 315 S., 3 Tabellen, 104 Tafeln. DEM 198.

The “workshop” under the guidance of Paul Zanker and Klaus Fittschen seems to be specialized in producing volumes apparently as equally luxurious as are many of the objects studied. The most recent of these “luxurious Hellenistic studies” is Friederike Sinn's work about Roman funerary marble urns. In the introduction she deals with the rather scarce former studies made on this subject. The author states that her own work – of which a short summary was published in 1982 in Koch & Sichtermann's work on sarcophagi – is not intended to be a complete corpus, but a collection of material to study stylistic and iconographical development. Therefore poorly decorated urns lacking criteria for dating are excluded (being included only if they can be dated by other, mainly epigraphical criteria). The 685 excluded (and the 38 uncertain) urns are carefully listed according to their provenance (a list is given on pp. 267-280). This together with the catalogue of 714 urns arranged according to a chronological order proposed by the author shows the collecting of material to have been diligently carried out. As far as I can judge no relevant material seems to be ignored.

In Chapter I “Zum Bestattungsbrauch – allgemeines zu Urnen” (pp. 4-16) the general features relevant for this group of material considered as a “stadtrömische Gattung” are briefly discussed. Also its relation to other groups of urns (and cinerary altars), as well as the question of local workshops is treated here. Applying stylistic criteria Sinn suggests that some urns are of local production. Their number is indeed not very high, but why could not more qualified and “stadtrömisch-looking” urns from Sicily or Etruria also have been produced by local workshops? The question of local workshops, or the question of how local the “stadtrömische” workshops in fact were remains open. Be this as it may, it would not relevantly change the content of Chapter II “Die chronologische Ordnung der stadtrömischen Marmorurnen und ihre