

GIOVANNI FORNI: *Le tribù romane*. I. Tribules. Volume primo (A–B), volume secondo (C–I). Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Roma 1996, 1999. ISBN 88–7689–173–0. 461 p. ITL 500.000 (A–B), 630.000 (C–I).

Professor Forni, the eminent authority on Roman tribes, published a first volume of an intended many-volume *opus magnum* in 1985. This volume was dedicated to the so-called "pseudo-tribes". As the book was equipped with the notation "Le tribù romane III.1", one could see that much more on the subject was to be expected in the future. However, Prof. Forni died unexpectedly in 1991, leaving the future of the whole project somewhat uncertain. It now appears that the manuscript for part I on the *tribules* was almost complete at the time of Prof. Forni's death. The manuscript was prepared for publication by his daughter Giovanna Maria Forni, and here we have the first results. It seems probable that at least the rest of part I will appear in the near future. However, I do not seem to be able to locate any indications on the status (and planned contents) of part II and of part III, vol. 2, and perhaps we shall have to try to do without them.

There is a preface and an introduction, followed by a very detailed bibliography, in vol. 1. The preface, written with some personal touches, offers us some interesting things (e.g. the observation on the status of Italian, p. viif.). And one learns that Forni was able to use W. Kubitschek's annotated copies of his own work on the tribes. On the other hand, not much of substance is said here to explain the history of the vols. under review here (cf. below). The introduction is most useful, but pretty heavy reading for classicists not familiar with tribal – I hope I am allowed to use this expression – studies. Here one finds, among many other details, lists of tribes omitted in indexes of various publications from CIL I<sup>2</sup> to Epigraphica 46 (1984) (p. xi ff.); lists of tribes which scholars have treated as names, and of names which scholars have mistakenly interpreted as tribes (p. xv ff.; it is with great sorrow that one finds Prof. Jaakko Suolahti, a regular contributor to this journal, mentioned as an exponent of this class of scholars on p. xviii n. 35); criticism of scholars who speak of cities (instead of persons) inscribed in tribes (p. xix ff.); and observations on many other points, such as literary authors mentioning tribes (p. xxix). All this is very useful reading, although it is true that some of the observations seem to lack nuance; it may be true that less than one per cent of the inscriptions "of senators" mention the tribe (p. xxvii); but is it really meaningful to speak of a group of inscriptions "of senators", when this includes an enormous variety of texts from honorific inscriptions to provincial building inscriptions making a reference to the governor? No scholar would expect to find tribes in the latter group of texts after the earliest empire, whereas tribes are often found in honorific inscriptions almost up to the end of the third century. (I may perhaps also be allowed to point out that on p. xxxv, n. 61, where some details in my review of vol. III.1 in *Arctos* 1986 are not very convincingly criticized, I am mistakenly described as advocating the reading *Fl(avius)* instead of the "pseudo-tribe" *Fl(avia)* in CIL X 1093; what I was saying was that this inscription was ca. Augustan, and thus about 150 years earlier than the institution of the "pseudo-tribes", and one would have liked to see how this fact can be explained away.)

But what I am really wondering about is the scale and the scope of the whole of part I. Both in the "premesse" by Giovanna Forni, and in the introduction by Forni himself (p. vii), it is said that the original plan was a "rifacimento" of Kubitschek's classic *Imperium Romanum tributim discriptum*. However, what we have here is a very different kind of book. Kubitschek's book was arranged according to cities, its aim – a most useful aim

indeed - being the identification of the tribes attested for the citizens of the same cities; Forni, on the other hand, here presents a list of people with tribes, arranged according to the alphabetical order of the nomen, the Republican instances (vol. I p. 3-90 nos. 1-638) being separated from the rest. So what we have here are lists of Acilii, Aconii, Aelii etc. whose tribe is known. There are many uses for this. For instance, Asian Munatii with the tribe Cam. (p. xxi) illustrate the activities of the Planci from Tibur (who thus are in the same tribe); finding a man called Fusidius in a city in the tribe Velina would shed some light on L. Fusidius L. f. Vel. Cogitatus attested at Rome (F no. 628). Also, one learns a lot by reading e.g. the lists of Barbii (with tribes pointing to the area N and NE of Aquileia) and of the Cassii (with the accent on tribes common in N. Italy). On the other hand, the endless lists of African Caecilii in the Quirina make pretty dull reading and do not seem to illustrate very much except for the fact that *Caecilius* and the tribe Quirina were common in Africa (a fact not really in need of illustration), and, to tell the truth, considering the whole I am not really convinced the approach based on persons is the most useful one. Forni does not really seem to explain why he chose to use this approach, but one sees that he lays great stress on the fact that a tribe is something personal (cf. p. p. xxv). But, since the truth is that certain tribes are attested for the citizens, or the majority of the citizens, of a certain city (and of course we mean this when we say that a certain tribe is the tribe of a certain city), the Kubitschekian approach through cities still seems the most useful (and a "rifacimento" of this work is in fact sorely needed). However, studies using the approach through the tribes themselves are also to be advocated; for instance, a study on the tribe Collina in the East could produce interesting results.

But of course, it cannot be denied that the lists, based on persons with tribes, which we find here can be used for further research, and so the bottom line must be that this is a most welcome work, although perhaps a bit grand in scale and certainly much too expensive to secure a wide circulation. The lists themselves are of a solid quality (although there seems to be some trouble at B no. 120-121 and although the tribe Stellatina of L. Dasumius Tullius Tuscus at D no. 5 should have been combined with *Tullius*, not with *Dasumius*), a familiar phenomenon in the work of Prof. Forni.

*Olli Salomies*

JULIANE C. WILMANN: *Der Sanitätsdienst im Römischen Reich. Eine sozialgeschichtliche Studie zum römischen Militärsanitätswesen nebst einer Prosopographie des Sanitätspersonals* (Medizin der Antike 2), Hildesheim - Zürich - New York 1995. DEM 98.00

Die Hauptquellen für das Sanitätswesen im römischen Heer während der Kaiserzeit stellen die Inschriften des im Sanitätsdienst beschäftigten Personals dar. Dieser Tatsache entsprechend stehen in einer Untersuchung über das Militärsanitätswesen vor allem sozialgeschichtliche Fragen und Probleme der Dienststellung des im Heer beschäftigten medizinischen Personals im Vordergrund, während die eigentliche Medizingeschichte, d. h. diagnostische Verfahren und Behandlungsmethoden, nur am Rande berührt wird. Die Autorin der vorliegenden, auf ihrer Habilitationsschrift basierenden Monographie geht jedoch über eine Darstellung der aus den Inschriften erhältlichen Informationen hinaus,