

This book is most welcome because it gathers together a lot of new archaeological and epigraphic evidence and also because nothing of this scale had appeared since P. Graindor's (still useful) "Athènes sous Auguste" (1927). There is no doubt that Σεβαστῶν Σωτήρι will remain a basic work of reference for anyone dealing with Augustan Athens. Unfortunately, however, the use of the book is rendered difficult by the unjustifiable lack of indices.

*Mika Kajava*

ERIKA SIMON: *Ausgewählte Schriften*. Bd. I: *Griechische Kunst*. 271 S. ISBN 3-8053-2021-3. Bd. II: *Römische Kunst*. 266 S. ISBN 3-8053-2404-9. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1998. DEM ca. 128.00 + 128.00.

After the publication in 1996 of Erika Simon's "Schriften zur etruskischen und italischen Kunst und Religion" (Steiner Verlag), we now have another collection of her work, this time in two volumes dedicated respectively to Greek and Roman art (Vol. I: Archaische Kunst; Klassische Bauplastik; Rotfigurige Malerei; Hellenistische Kunst. — Vol. II: Dichtung und Bildkunst; Römische Porträtkunst; Griechische Mythen in römischem Umkreis; Römische Reliefkunst; Allegorien von Zeit und Ewigkeit; Spätantike Kunst). Each volume reproduces twenty contributions, the earliest one of which goes back to 1961. Both volumes conclude with useful indices. Despite this most welcome enterprise, a look at Simon's bibliography reveals that a great number of articles and other work are still waiting to be collected together, and so the reader hopes that a further project, similar to the present one, is under consideration.

*Mika Kajava*

*Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, a cura di Eva Margareta Steinby. Vol. III: *H-O*. 503 p., 221 fig. ISBN 88-7140-096-8. ITL 260.000. — Vol. IV: *P-S*. 518 p., 179 fig. ISBN 88-7140-135-2. ITL 260.000. Edizioni Quasar di Severino Tognon, Roma 1996, 1999.

The monumental Lexicon project is nearing completion. As a matter of fact, vol. V has already appeared (2000), but "Arctos" has not yet received it for review. One cannot but congratulate the editor and her staff, who, once again, have accomplished their task in an admirable manner. Like the preceding volumes, the present ones provide an immensely rich collection of material on the topography of Rome. Among the entries one may note a number of frequently occurring terms such as, in vol. III, *horrea*, *horti*, *lacus*, *monasterium*, *Muri Aureliani* (including *portae* in alphabetical order) as well as various "*muri*" and the "*Mura repubblicane*" (with their *portae*), *obelisci*, and in vol. IV, *Palatium*, *pons*, *porticus*, *portus*, *regio(nes)*, *rostra*, *scala(e)*, *schola*, *sepulchrum*, *statua(e)*, *synagogae*, etc. Many important deities with their sanctuaries and temples are also on record: Hercules, Iuno, Iuppiter, Mithra, Silvanus, etc. Vol. IV concludes with a useful map illustrating the *regiones* and *vici* of Rome.

In enterprises of this scale, errors are, of course, inevitable, and so, reading through the volumes, I have noticed some dozens of minor slips (misprints, typographical errors,

etc.), many of them occurring, perhaps not surprisingly, in Latin and Greek words. However, such things are hardly inconvenient for the reader, for they never seem to affect the argument, and the entries themselves are mostly well organized and reasonably balanced. Even minor interpretative errors (such as *Tutatorius* in the place of *Tutator* s.v. Hercules Aug.), or omitted evidence here and there, do not disturb the overall positive impression. More generally, however, one may wonder whether the present selection of entries is in every regard justifiable and, conversely, whether something may be missing. *Melius abundare*, it is true, yet I think that if this principle is adopted, it should be followed consistently. To cite an example, if three urban inscriptions record that a *nymphaeum* somewhere in Rome was restored by a Roman senator, does this mean that there should be the entry 'Nymphaeum Flavi Philippi'? Perhaps so, but then the reader would expect to find an entry for all such cases where something has been built or restored by someone in some topographical context of Rome, including various types of minor monuments set up or renewed by less conspicuous people as well. In fact, some entries have been created on the basis of inscriptions such as Vermaseren, CIMRM 433: *Invicto Soli Felicissimus et Philocurius aed(iculam?) d. d.*, and the result is 'Sol Invictus, aed(icula)'. Let it go at that. However, if the whole bulk of Roman inscriptions were checked with an eye on such cases, many new entries should be added to the Lexicon. (Note also that the dedication of an *ara*, *basis*, *signum*, etc. often suggests that these objects were either put in, or at least somehow connected with, an *aedicula*, *sacellum* or the like.) Regarding, then, the title of the Nymphaeum entry, it is somewhat misleading, as inexperienced readers may think that in Rome there was a *nymphaeum* called *Nymphaeum Flavi Philippi*. Since the only relationship between the nymphaeum and the senator is the fact that the former was restored by the latter, it would have been better to use the style 'Nymphaeum: Flavius Philippus' (or the name in brackets; this observation is valid for many similar entries). In some other cases, too, more attention should have been given to the entry title, which also concerns a case like *Heliogabalus*: the more "correct" and official form of the god's name was *Elagabalus* (the rendering of the emperors's name also fluctuates in some entries). For some inaccurate titles, cf. 'Pagus Aventin(iensis)': write *Aventin(ensis)*; 'Praedia Luceiae Earinis': rather *Earines* (note that Luceia Earine was one of the two *adfines* that served to identify the praedia of Statilius Urbicus); 'Praedia Tigellini Aemiliana': perhaps rather 'Praedia Aemiliana: Tigellinus'; 'Praenestius collis': despite Lyd. mens. ad loc., the Latin style should be *c. Praenestinus* (the same concerns 'Tiburtius collis' [probably] in vol. V); 'Schola: collegium cultores Silvani': write *cultorum*; 'Schola: collegium dendrophoriorum': write *dendrophorum*. Finally, in names of the type *Licinius*, it would be preferable to use the genitive in *-i* : e.g. 'Port(us) Lic(ini)'

Another category of questionable entries are those taken from literary sources where some place in Rome is given a quasi-topographical definition. Thus, we find the entry 'Publicum contubernium' (i.e. *meretricum*) for a brothel (perhaps) somewhere around the Amphitheatrum. To be logical, if this is not too vague an expression to be included as an entry in its own right, numerous other references of that same type could have been included as well. Moreover, one may ask whether an entry like 'Pigmentarii' should have been listed at all, for this apparent toponym seems to derive from a generic remark with little or no topographic bearing: *prodesse etiam ferunt si (equi) deambulent inter pigmentarios quia odores diversi latenter pulmonibus prosunt* (Pelagon. p. 211).

As for the *statuae* listed (cf. also *signum*, *simulacrum*), they seem to come from the Republican age, so that except for those representing emperors and their relatives, the statues set up for senators and others in the Imperial period are hardly recorded at all. I do not follow the logic of this decision. Take, for example, the entry 'Statuae: C. Aelius et C. Fabricius', where we read that these men were honoured with statues *somewhere* in Rome, or that of 'Statua: M. Tullius Cicero', affirming that a statue honouring the orator *may* have been erected in Rome. On the other hand, there is no mention of the *statua auro fulgens*, which was set up in honour of the senator Fl. Olbius Auxentius Draucus in the vicinity of the forum Traiani (ILS 1284); likewise, the remarkable *statua ex aere argentoque in rostris* of Fl. Stilicho (ILS 1278) would certainly have deserved a mention. A whole series of similar cases could be adduced. It would surely not have required excessive efforts to collect all such evidence from Imperial times under a single entry (similarly to, or even more briefly than, the epigraphic sources on Silvanus in vol. IV pp. 312 ff.). Moreover, as far as I can see, the selection of the statues of divinities to be included is not always logically founded. If 'Simulacrum Dianae', 'Simulacrum Iovis', or 'Statua: Tiberis' are listed, why is there no mention of, to cite only one example, the statue of Nemesis which, according to Plin. nat. 11,251, stood somewhere on the Capitol and which also had some religious significance?

The bibliographies given by individual authors mostly justify their inclusion, and indeed many of them seem to have been revised so as to provide as recent reading as possible (cf. the articles on 'Palatium', vol. IV pp. 12 ff.). Unfortunately, however, some entries, though not actually antiquated, seem to have been left without a recent up-date. Take, for example, 'Pax Augusta, ara' (in vol. IV from 1999), where the bibliography ends with 1988. Does this imply that, in the author's opinion, nothing relevant has been written on the Ara since the late 1980s? On the other hand, those entries in which the most recent research could not be considered, are not to be blamed for their contents. If vol. IV had appeared one or two years later, the author of 'Mars Ultor (Capitolium)' would probably have made reference to, respectively, J.W. Rich, PBR 66 (1998) 79 ff. and M. Spannagel, *Exemplaria principis* (1999) 62 ff., who both claim with powerful arguments that the Capitoline round temple never existed.

The LTUR may justly be held as the most significant achievement in Roman topographical studies, and it will surely remain an indispensable treasury not only for archaeologists and specialists on topography, but for all scholars working on Roman art, epigraphy, history, literature, mythography, and religion. Like their predecessors, the present two volumes are brilliantly edited and equipped with respectively 221 and 179 illustrations on more than two hundred pages. Considering the monumentality of the enterprise, the above (critical) observations are better taken as no more than marginal notes. (Unfortunately, I have not seen vol. V and so I have no idea whether some of the faults and omissions listed have already been noticed in the *Addenda et corrigenda*.) Let me conclude with a suggestion concerning the entry 'Portus Xysti': instead of taking *xystus* as a reference to an association of athletes (or to a storage), one could also assume that *Xystus* is here a Greek personal name.

*Mika Kajava*