

man früher behauptet hat, räumt indes ein, daß auch vereinigte Interpretationen möglich sind. Der Fall des Apollotempels lag schon anders: als er im Jahre 28 eingeweiht wurde, war solch eine ostentative Herrscherpropaganda weder mehr Mode noch nötig, und der Tempel wurde so ein andachtsvolles Zeichen einer wirklichen Devotion.

Die augusteische Revolution des Jahres 27 wird mit großartigen Zügen geschildert: es fallen einem leicht die modernen konservativen „coups d'états“ der Obersten ein, die oft gleiche oder ähnliche Ziele gehabt haben. Unter dem Vorwand der *securitas* begünstigen ja auch sie die vermögenden Schichten der Gesellschaft und behindern so eine normale soziale Entwicklung. Augustus aber war bedeutend schlauer: Auch die weniger Bemittelten sowohl in Rom als auch in den Kleinstädten hatten den Eindruck, daß sie jetzt einen größeren Anteil an der Regierung des Staates und an den staatlichen Ehren hatten als früher. Und wenn die Leute dies vermeinen, ist ja das Ziel der Propaganda glänzend erreicht worden.

Die augusteische Propaganda hat den Sinn und die Bedeutung der altrömischen Tugenden *fides*, *pietas*, *virtus*, *publica magnificentia*, *gravitas*, *mos maiorum*, usw. richtig verstanden und diese geschickt sowohl schriftlich als auch bildlich genutzt: Die verfallenen Tempel wurden ausgebessert, die Priesterschaften erneuert und die gesunkene Moral der Bevölkerung gehoben, allerdings mit wechselndem Erfolg. In der Propaganda wurde jedoch alles Begonnene schon als völlig Ausgeführtes dargestellt, eine Tatsache, die viele Antikforscher irreführt hat.

Wir müssen Paul Zanker sehr dankbar sein, daß er uns seine fast unübersehbaren Kenntnisse der römischen Kunstgeschichte, aber auch der Numismatik und der relevanten Literatur in so einer praktischen Form zur Verfügung gestellt hat. Nur ein Einwurf: Ein genauer Sachindex wäre unentbehrlich.

Paavo Castrén

M. Fabbri - A. Trotta: Una scuola-collegio di età augustea. L'insula II di Velia. Archaeologia Perusina 7. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1989. 129 p. 71 pll. ITL 280.000.

The book is about a building complex generally known as the 2nd *insula* of Elea/Velia. This building has given cause to a long discussion which began in the early sixties, when a series of inscriptions and statues was found. The inscriptions were closely related to each other sharing at least one common detail: the name Οὐλῖς, the hapax φώλαρχος, or the title ἱατρός. Most of the statues seem to belong to the Julio-Claudian imperial

family; there are also a statue in a toga and two acephalous herms which belong to φώλαρχοι, a herm of Parmenides, and some others.

After a review of the research on the 2nd *insula* at Elea/Velia (pp. 15-23) the book is divided in two parts: the monument (pp. 27-63), and the epigraphical and statuary material (pp. 69-118). Then follow the conclusions (119-128) and a short general index (129).

The monument itself is given a detailed examination and description, and the photographs are generally well chosen to illustrate the details. The structure is rectangular, and the dimensions are 71 x 35,50 and 36,70 metres. The access was in the north-eastern short side. The ground floor is wholly conserved with remains of walls up to three metres high. The *insula* consists of two different spaces: the first is a courtyard (c. 25 x 14 m) with columns on three sides, and the second comprises an elevated open-air garden surrounded by a *cryptoporticus* forming a U, the floor of which is about three metres lower than the garden. Chronologically the first phase of the walls is constructed in *opus incertum*, but other techniques are present in the later phases. The description of the structure is, as far as I can judge, done with care, but tends to be even too detailed, without actually adding to the final information.

In dating the *insula* the authors rely mainly on the brick stamps (p. 119). But here one must make some critical remarks. Unfortunately, M. Fabbri, who is responsible for this part, has a somewhat oversimplifying attitude towards brick stamps and prosopography. When he dates the bricks which have the name *M. Arri* stamped on them to the Augustan period, he refers (p. 63-64, fn. 95) to M. Steinby (1975, p. 19-20). It is true that these stamps seem to be rather early, but Steinby gives very rough datation for this type (i.e. a rectangular stamp with a name written in one line), and it cannot be used as definite evidence for an Augustan date: "Più a lungo sono rimasti in uso tipi...rettangolari; il tipo ad una sola riga e lettere grosse compare per le ultime volte all'inizio del II sec. (Steinby, op. cit.). A more serious point, however, is that the author definitely identifies (p. 64) this Velian M. Arrius with a M. Arrius Max(imus) attested in two stamps at Pompei, and one at Ponza. This is by no means certain. Further, he connects these with the two stamps in the Museo Nazionale di Napoli, which bear the same name but are written without abbreviation. At most I would accept that the M. Arrii Maximi in these stamps may really be one and the same person. However, it is more audacious to connect this probably one single M. Arrius Maximus with a namesake attested in an inscription from Anagni (CIL X 5011, where we must read l. 4: *pro prae(tore)* not *pro prae(tori)*, as the author does, and PIR² A 1099, not referred to by the author). This cannot be more than a guess, because the *gens Arria* is not very well known (see e.g. J. Andreau,

Les affaires de monsieur Jucundus (1974), and P. Castrén, *Ordo populusque Pompeianus* (1975), which are not included in the bibliography). There are also several M. Arrii mentioned in the indexes of CIL X. They are certainly not all identical, although they can sometimes be relatives. Furthermore still, the author connects all these Arrii with a text in Tab. Herc. ed. Maiuri, PP 1954-55, p. 79, which he cites: *A[ct] in Pompeiano in figlinis Arrianus Poppeae*... The text must be *in figlinis Arrianis Poppeae*. The name is a derivative of Arrius, but this person is hardly to be linked with one mentioned in a stamp on a *dolium* with a text *C. Arriani [A]mphiones*, or with a person in a text on an amphora from Pompei *de Arriano Dol. XV* (p. 64-65).

The group of inscriptions is discussed on pp. 69-77. Some comments are in order. The author (now A. Trotta) claims that the name Οὐλις is a hapax in the Greek nomenclature. Other examples exist, however, at Olbia in the territory of Massalia (Marseille) published by J. Coupry and M. Giffault in PP (1982); see now also O. Masson, *Le culte Ionien d'Apollon Oulios d'après des données onomastiques nouvelles*, JS 1988, 173-181. It is remarkable that Massalia, like Elea, was a colony of Phocaea. So that rather than being merely possible in Ionia, this form of name was most probably used at Phocaea, and had a genitive Οὐλιος, attested at Olbia, too. Moreover, the name need not be originally Carian (Masson, art.cit. 178).

The dates of the inscriptions of φώλαρχοι are discussed in pp. 72-73. Here one should stress that although Plato mentions Parmenides visiting Athens, it is purely a literary scene, and cannot be taken as a basis for dating Parmenides. I feel that the way the author speculates with the dates suggests only hypotheses. But later these dates are presented almost as facts (e. g. p. 125).

On p. 77 the inscription AE 1966, 108 (now lost) has some curious details. The deceased has a filiation, his *tribus* is mentioned, but is without a praenomen. His other gentilicium (or cognomen) is usually read as *Caepilio* or *Caepilioni* and his daughter's name has come to us as *Valeria Caepilia*. The problem is that *Caepilius/ialio* is not attested as a gentilicium or a cognomen (see H. Solin – O. Salomies, *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum*, 1988). My suggestion is that we should read *Caepilioni* and *Caepil'la* (see M. Leiwo, *Arctos* [1982] 47).

There are other small details which could be discussed, but I turn to the conclusions. Unfortunately, this study fails to give anything particularly new concerning the term φώλαρχος, and its meaning. The building itself is evidently a typical Hellenistic gymnasium which was used as they were in the Greek world. But why call the head of it a φώλαρχος? There is

one Latin inscription at Velia which mentions a *gymnasiarchus* (ed. Dito, Velia, colonia focese, 1891, p. 95; again Mingazzini, Velia. Atti e mem. Soc. Magna Grecia, 1954). But the inscription is problematic, because this part with the title has been written over the older text which was erased. If the building was used as a place for a medical school or a collegium, we have to depend totally on glosses in explaining the word *φώλαρχος*. So if the building itself was for some reason called a *φωλεόν*, the head of it was evidently a *φώλαρχος*. We have to be satisfied with that.

Martti Leiwo

Daniele Manacorda: Archeologia urbana a Roma: il progetto della Crypta Balbi. – AA.VV., Un "mondezzaro" del XVIII secolo. Lo scavo dell'ambiente 63 del Conservatorio di S. Caterina della Rosa (Archeologia urbana a Roma: il progetto della Crypta Balbi, t.2). – AA.VV., Il giardino del Conservatorio di S. Caterina della Rosa (Archeologia urbana a Roma: il progetto della Crypta Balbi, t.3.1-2). Biblioteca di Archeologia Medievale 2-4. Edizioni all'Insegna del Giglio, Firenze 1982, 1984, 1985. 125, 179, 633 p.

Quest'opera si colloca nella corrente di rinnovamento dei metodi di indagine archeologica per l'età classica in Italia, con l'applicazione di questi metodi a periodi più recenti. La sua originalità sta nel fatto di rappresentare il primo esperimento di "archeologia urbana" a Roma. Il progetto è volto a chiarire l'evoluzione topografica del quartiere e dei suoi monumenti chiave (teatro di Balbo e criptoportici) dai primi insediamenti fino ai giorni nostri. Questa iniziativa prevede anche, a scavo ultimato, un "recupero" urbano di tutta l'area degli scavi.

Il primo volume, quasi interamente opera di D. Manacorda, è dedicato a questioni di metodo, alla problematica storico-archeologica del cantiere di lavoro e sui primi dati riportati nel saggio del 1981 nonché ad aspetti organizzativi dello scavo.

Nel secondo volume viene dato un resoconto dello scavo dell'ambiente 63 del Conservatorio di S. Caterina della Rosa, con un'analisi di vari reperti che vanno dall'età romana all'età rinascimentale (monete, vetri, oggetti metallici, reperti osseologici, ecc.).

Il terzo volume è diviso in due parti. Nella prima le considerazioni generali sui metodi e risultati dell'indagine dello scavo nel giardino del Conservatorio di S. Caterina ad opera di D. Manacorda sono seguite da un'appendice "Forma e rappresentazione. I contributi della matematica alla sintesi della forma" di M.L. Conforto. Nella seconda parte vengono analizzati i ricchi reperti dello scavo.

Heikki Solin