

the third century A.D. The inscription is of great importance from many points of view, not least for Jewish institutions. Of all this, the editors give exhaustive information in their commentary.

To take only one point: the inscription records as a separate group θεοσεβεῖς, God-fearers. This term undoubtedly had a special significance in Jewish communities of the time. I have stressed elsewhere (ANRW II 29, 618ff) the non-technical nature of all the terms denoting "God-fearers", and pointed out that such terms could be applicable to those born as Jews as well as to converts or sympathisers. But the evidence of this inscription shows clearly that the θεοσεβεῖς of Aphrodisias must have been gentiles. This only confirms my interpretation, for in other places and circumstances this term refers to actual Jews, too. – I will not here go into the details. (One small question must suffice: could one read at *a* Σαβάθιος Νεκταρίου instead of Σαβάθιος νεκτάρης?).

I hope to give a full discussion of this remarkable text elsewhere. Until then I ask to be allowed to commend myself to the favour of the editors of this excellent edition.

Heikki Solin

Le donne in Etruria. A cura di Antonia Rallo. Studia archaeologica 52. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1989. 262 p. 94 tav. ITL 75.000.

Even though the idea of producing this book on the Etruscan women arose on the occasion of "l'anno degli Etruschi", in 1985, it is evident that the recent abundance of studies on women in Antiquity (during the past twenty years, in particular) has also been a reason for the Italian Etruscologists to put together these articles. A particularly welcome feature is an overall grasp of many questions concerning Etruscan women: not only women's coiffures and clothes, but also, and more importantly, their position and social standing in Etruscan society. It is also pleasing that some articles treat women's role in relation to the city where they lived, as it is a fact that the Etruscan territory was rather large, and individual cities could thus vary widely in their culture and society.

Among the rich contents of the volume, I find L. Gasperini's article particularly interesting: 'La dignità della donna nel mondo etrusco e il suo lontano riflesso nell'onomastica personale romana' (181–211). This study discusses the typically Etruscan style of adding a metronymicon to one's nomenclature, and its appearance in Latin inscriptions (which mostly come from regio VII). The epigraphic catalogue includes 121 cases of metronymicon (note the different

ways of indicating the mother, e.g. (simply) *Calviae / Ludniae gnata / Noborsinia (abl.) / Scarpia natus / Oglinia f.*, etc.).

In no. 13 (XI 7129, Clusium) ...*Titia Suen(ia) / cnatus*, the nomenclature is called "doppio gentilizio", which might appear slightly misleading to some readers (for the type "praenomen-gentilicium" followed by a gentilicium in cognominal function, cf. J. Kaimio, *Ousting...* 184) – No. 16 (XI 2369, Cl.): regarding ...*Lartia gnatus*, reference is made to the mother's Etruscan praenomen, but *Lartia* is more likely to be the mother's gentilicium. – No. 52 (XI 2235, Cl.): if *Maniae natu(s)* is the correct reading, this name should probably be interpreted as a gentilicium (G. suggests a praenomen). – No. 90 (XI 2044a, Perusia): should *Perca cnatus* be read as *Perc(i)a cnatus* [or *Perc(enni)a?*] (cf. Solin – Salomies, *Repert.NGCL* 140)? But cf. *Perrica gnatus* in no. 107 (XI 2066, Per.). – No. 114 (I² 2083, Per.): the praenomen of *L. Rufi(u)s Cotonia natus* is oddly solved as *L(ars)*. – No. 117 (ILS 935, Luna): G. refers to the standard opinion that Fabia Numantina married Sex. Appuleius (cos. A.D. 14) in consequence of her divorce from M. Plautius Silvanus (*praetor*, not *praefectus urbanus* in A.D. 24). But there is evidence to suggest that the order may have been the reverse: Silvanus might have married Numantina after she had been left a widow by Appuleius (R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy* [1986] 418; cf. also Raepsaet-Charlier, *PFOS* 353). But what is more relevant here is the "metronymicon" itself. The inscription from Luna, the gravestone of Numantina's young son, appears to have been set up by Numantina herself: it is evidently better to take *Fabia Numantina nato* to indicate both the dedicator (in the nominative) and the dedicatee. Albeit mostly in poetry, *natus* indeed denotes 'son' as well, and this expression could well be in keeping with the resigned yet proud words at the end of the inscription, *ultimo gentis suae*. Syme (loc.cit.) and many others (recently e.g. M.G. Angeli Bertinelli, in: *Serta historica antiqua* II [1989] 154) regard Numantina as the *persona dedicans*. Moreover, if *Fabia Numantina* stands for a metronymicon in the proper sense of the word, who, then, would be the dedicator of the monument? – No. 119 (XII 5804, Arelate): the parents of L. Annius Tullus *c.p.* are recorded in a quite normal way, so that this case is better excluded from the present catalogue (cf. also G. on p. 190).

The number of metronymica in a senatorial context would thus be reduced from three to one: the remaining instance is found in the nomenclature of *Vibia Marsi f. Laelia nata Pulchri* (ILS 964, Tibur). As G. notes (189), the Etruscan connections might explain the use of "*Laelia nata*", though one should underline that Laelia's link with the Laelii Balbi (who are often thought to be of Etruscan origin) is based solely on the same gentilicium. Vibia's father possibly came from Larinum in Apulia, but Pulcher's grandmother Urgulania presumably had her origins in Etruria.

To Gasperini's list could be added XI 2081 from Perugia: *Ar(r)o(n)s Velesius Tlabivia (natus)*, where the metronymicon seems to be preserved in a corrupt form.

A further fact of interest is that in the three examples of metronymicon from Rome (p. 192), the mother's name is always prefixed by *natus/a ex*: this style does not occur elsewhere (the order '*natus + name*', without *ex*, otherwise only in I² 2641 [Perusia] ...*gnatus Cestia*).

On p. 184ff., G. briefly discusses women's praenomina in Early Rome. He thinks that these praenomina were an "elemento di importazione culturale", which the Roman women used *Etrusco more*. Giving credit to some literary sources on female praenomina, he thinks (as many others do) that these names gradually disappeared from use (but "disappearance" is a problematic term, when it is used of something whose original existence cannot be conclusively verified in the absence of evidence!). Furthermore, G. falls into a conceptual trap when he uses the terms "praenomen", "nomen" and "cognomen" to show that in the beginning (in Rome) there was "nomen", and that the two other elements were later additions (185: "prima il *nomen*, poi il *prae-nomen* ed il *cognomen*"). Names which are conventionally called "praenomina" must have originally been individual names; after the emergence of the Roman gentile system they simply came to be recorded before the nomen. No matter whether the new gentile system was of Etruscan origin or not, it is unreasonable to claim with G. that the term "prae-nomen" would suggest by itself that "non possa essere considerato una cosa originariamente romana (o latina)".

Thus, G's discussion of female praenomina is perhaps likely to create more problems than it is able to solve; to some extent this is also true of what Antonia Rallo writes on Roman women's nomenclature on p. 22f. (referring in some notes to Peruzzi's far-fetched theories). Since our sources are most equivocal in these matters, it would be better to avoid such categorical statements as e.g. "Romans are misogynists", or "Etruscans and Sabines are more respectful to women". Female names, at least, should not be directly taken to confirm such theses. – As regards Livy's picture of Etruscan women, cf. now I. McDougall, *Anc.Hist.Bull.* 4 (1990) 24ff. (according to M., Livy's reports should not be used as evidence for Etruscan women's active political roles.) – For Etruscan women's position in religious affairs and institutions, cf. now M. Nielsen's interesting study: *Anal.Rom.Inst.Dan.* 19 (1990) 45ff.

Regrettably, there is no index rerum in this book. The general bibliography is copious, but it would have required more editorial accuracy: a cursory look at it reveals at least 80 (minor) slips.

Mika Kajava