

irreperibile? - 162: *pediseq(ua)*, non *pediseq(uo)*. - 171: si legga *C. Licinius C.l. Trupo*, Di Stefano Manzella, *Boll.Mon.Musei e Gallerie Pontif.* 7 (1987) 55 n. 7. - 193: il manomissore può essere stato anche Claudio. - 219: *Sy-*, non *Si-*. - 222: il commento mi è rimasto incomprensibile. Altrettanto misterioso è il rimando a Volpe. Ometto molte altre cose simili. Nonostante questi rilievi, in parte gravi, si tratta di un libro molto utile ed interessante.

*Heikki Solin*

*Henrik Mouritsen: Elections, Magistrates and Municipal Elite. Studies in Pompeian Epigraphy.* *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici, Suppl.* 15. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1988. 224 p., 10 pl. ITL 100.000.

The first of the four main chapters by Mouritsen, who must be one of the foremost experts on Pompeian inscriptions, is dedicated to "Pompeian epigraphy". Few earlier authorities come off well under the examination of this young Danish scholar, a prime target being Matteo Della Corte, whose method in the well-known *Casa e abitanti di Pompeii* is severely criticized. Many identifications of house-owners were based on seal-impressions, but Mouritsen now convincingly shows that such evidence must be treated with great care, and that Della Corte's identifications often cannot be correct.

In the second chapter the author presents a brief two-and-a-half page overall treatment of "Political institutions in Pompeii", which does not really differ much from the picture given by his predecessors. It seems that we still lack an exposition of what is known about *Pompeii itself*, without all the embellishment provided by comparative material (cf. R.P. Duncan-Jones, *JRS* 1977, 196).

The third chapter, "Programmata recentiora", contains several interesting points, it is e.g. argued that these electoral inscriptions were painted in daylight, not at night as is sometimes maintained, and that the house façades were considered part of the public street and were at the free disposal of the scribes, who were for the most part professionals. A general conclusion is that practically all electoral inscriptions originated on the candidates' own initiative; they were not spontaneous manifestations of the citizens' political interest. Mouritsen also thinks that the number of candidates per year was so large that there was real competition also between the *duumviri* candidates (while admitting that we know only two from A.D. 79). Therefore the *duumviri* were not selected beforehand by the *ordo*, as claimed by J.L. Franklin, *Pompeii: the Electoral Programmata, Campaigns and Politics* (1980).

Chronology plays a large role in this chapter, for one thing because Mouritsen tries to prove that practically all these later electoral inscriptions can be dated to exactly the period 62-79 A.D. That almost no inscriptions from before A.D. 62 should have survived does

not depend solely on the earthquake, but also on the assumption that walls were regularly redecorated and repainted. Here, as elsewhere, Mouritsen's reasoning is acute but while the result is, for the most part, convincing, he sometimes carries his criticism of earlier views too far. This is evident when he tries to disprove the conflicting results of P. Sabbatini Tumolesi, *Gladiatorum paria* (1980), who has argued that most of the *edicta munerum* are from *before* the earthquake. Mouritsen makes some good points, but he also "categorically rules out" that the inscriptions where D. Lucretius Satrius Valens is *flamen Neronis Caesaris Augusti filii perpetuus* should belong in A.D. 50-54, after Nero had been adopted but before he became emperor (p. 35; the title is given as *flamen Neronis filii Caesaris perpetuus* in n. 434 and n. 452, which is not the same thing). This will not do. Claudius was deified after his death, and one would clearly expect "Divus" if the inscriptions were later than A.D. 54, when Nero ought to have been called "Nero Claudius Caes. Aug." (On *divus* see A. Chastagnol, *Un chapitre négligé de l'épigraphie latine: la titulature des empereurs morts*, REL 62 [1984] 275ff.).

The argument is indeed sometimes marred by incomplete knowledge of Roman history in general. The mention on p. 66, for instance, of "very rare examples in Roman history of ... interference by private organizations in public affairs" sounds bewildering. What were the *publicani* if not private organizations?

Mouritsen's second chronological point is negative in character. He argues (against Franklin) that one can establish no absolute, nor even very much of a relative, chronology for the Pompeian magistrates, not even for the period 62-79. Franklin thought that by studying which election posters were found to overlap with others, a chronology could be established. Mouritsen argues that many candidates must have been running for the same office several times, and that overlays were produced during the same campaign. If this is the case then it brings havoc to all chronological attempts.

Much space is devoted to the *rogatores*, i.e. those persons who recommend candidates in the inscriptions. Here the investigations embrace larger portions of Pompeian society than just members of the *ordo* and candidates. Mouritsen reasonably enough concludes that most of the *rogatores* were clients and *amici* of the candidates, who by appearing in the *programmata* sought to enhance the candidates' reputation (But only 5.5% are expressly called *libertus* or *cliens*).

Onomastics plays an important role in the identification and social categorization of the *rogatores*, and it is here that Mouritsen is at his weakest. On p. 62f. he presents the stunning conclusion that 80% of the Romans known from sepulchral inscriptions must have been freedmen, but he misunderstands the onomastic results reached by H. Solin and I. Kajanto, since he does not include those which are *incerti* as to their social standing, and his calculations are better forgotten. Solin's conclusions (*Beiträge zur Kenntnis der griechischen Personennamen in Rom I*, 1971) have been turned into the virtual certainty that "Greek names were a sign of servile origin in the first or second generation" (p. 61, cf. 14f.), and moreover, Solin dealt only with Rome. There seems to be work left to do

on Pompeian onomastics, even if we have I. Kajanto, *Cognomina Pompeiana*, *Neuphil.Mitt.* 66 (1965) 446-60 and an Appendix with name statistics in P. Castrén, *Ordo Populusque Pompeianus* (*ActaIRF VIII*, 2nd ed. 1983) 262-64. The figures do not tally because Kajanto was using the *inscriptiones parietales*, while Castrén based his statistics only on persons carrying a *cognomen* combined with a family name.

The fourth chapter is a general discussion of "Pompeian magistrates and magisterial candidates in the period 80 B.C. - 79 A.D.". This is the main chapter, to which Castrén's book is the predecessor. Mouritsen is very much aware of this fact, and holds a very critical, sometimes exaggeratedly so, attitude towards Castrén's views. But in several cases his conclusions do make better sense. So, for instance (in n. 358) he rightly disposes of Castrén's (p. 95f.) interpretation of the Pompeians who had been *praef. fabrum* as similar to Nazi "Gauleiter", dispatched throughout Italy by the Augustan regime. This theory can probably be explained by the fact that Castrén here drew solely on J. Suolahti, *Junior Officers ... in the Republican Period* (1955), esp. 208f. Here as in Castrén's work one misses references to the fundamental study by B. Dobson, *The praefectus fabrum in the Early Principate*, in: *Britain and Rome*, Kendal 1967, to which now should be added D.B. Saddington, *Praefecti Fabrum of the Julio-Claudian Period*, *Festschr. A. Betz*, Wien 1985, 529-46.

Another of Castrén's theses, that of a "Claudian crisis" in Pompeian society in A.D. 40-52, is now also disposed of with good arguments. With the "Gauleiter-theory" and the "Claudian crisis" discredited, the development of Pompeian society looks much less "exciting", and appears rather to have been a steady process. That changes will have taken place among the ruling families during a period of 150 years is a priori clear, but how is one to describe and explain these changes without recurring to commonplaces in a work which is epigraphical and prosopographical, but leaves out other aspects of social history? Mouritsen concludes (p. 123) that while a few families managed to maintain their influence, "the structure of the upper class was accordingly characterized by a process of controlled change", where new families rose to relative prominence.

This book is an important contribution to many fields (scholars will wellcome the appendices: the "Catalogue of programmata recentiora" and the "Catalogue of individual and collective rogatores"), but the recent works by Castrén and others are still valuable in several respects when future research sets out to answer the open questions of Pompeian history.

*Christer Bruun*