

numeri del *CIL* e quelli dell'inventario. Gli indici sono un vero passo avanti nelle pubblicazioni epigrafiche. Gli indici delle datazioni, ad esempio, rendono le datazioni più controllabili e aperte alla critica. Insomma, si tratta di un volume fondamentale per gli studi futuri dell'epigrafia urbana.

Kalle Korhonen

Supplementa Italica. Nuova serie. Vol. 16, 17, 18. Edizioni Quasar, Roma 1998, 1999, 2000. ISBN 88-7140-134-4, 88-7140-149-2, 88-7140-197-2. 400 pp., 264 ill.; 208 pp., 112 ill.; 396 pp. ITL 90.000 per vol.

Epigraphists will note with considerable satisfaction the appearance of three new *Supplementa*, vols. 16, 17 and 18, in the last three years. As the first volume of the series came out in 1981, one observes an average pace of one volume per year, remarkable progress. The format and the concept of a *Supplementum* is still the same, except for the detail that, due to the recent death of Margherita Guarducci, the *presentazione* of vol. 18 (with some interesting remarks) has been signed by only Professor Silvio Panciera.

Again there is much that is of interest and even more that is of use. The three volumes under inspection here (by the way, vol. 17 seems to be a bit thinner than the other ones) concentrate on central and northern Italy, there being no cities from the Regions II and III (Aemilia in the north is also absent). The cities covered here are as follows: in Region I, Aletrium (in vol. 16, by L. Galli and G.L. Gregori); in Region IV, Reate (in vol. 18, by M.C. Spadoni); in Region V, Trea (in vol. 18, by S.M. Marengo); in Region VI (Umbria), Ameria and Suasa (both in vol. 18, by G. Asdrubali Pentiti and S. Antolini, respectively); in Region VII (Etruria), Rusellae (in vol. 16, by S. Conti); in Region IX and in vol. 17 both, Alba Pompeia (by S. Giorcelli Bersani) and Forum Fulvii Valentia (G. Mennella and E. Zanda), in Region X, Forum Iulii (in vol. 16, by A. Giavitto) and Ferrara (in vol. 17, by D. Pupillo; for the explanation of this, Ferrara not being a city with Roman origins, see p. 125f., cf. 132 on the tribes attested in the area).

Historically, the most important city is no doubt Reate, and this is reflected by the fact that, although there are fewer new texts here than in Rusellae (with altogether 135 new texts – some of them, by the way, dealt with by H. Solin in *Arctos* 34 [2000] 151ff.), the treatment of Reate is by far the longest in this group (140 pages). Ameria (an informed presentation with an up-to-date bibliography) takes up 124 pages, whereas Rusellae is dealt with in 99 pages. (The explanation for the apparent lack of a clear relation between the number of new texts and the length of the treatment is, of course, that important cities with many previously published inscriptions take up more space in the introductory sections than the more marginal cities.) If one studies the relation between the numbers of the "old" (i.e., those appearing in the old corpora) and the "new" inscriptions, one finds that a collection of the inscriptions was most sorely needed in the case of Rusellae, for here there are 135 new texts as compared to 16 old texts, a growth of 844 percent between the publication of *CIL* XI and now. Aletrium comes second with 259 percent (57 and 22), followed by Suasa (157 percent, 44 and 28) and Alba Pompeia (145 percent, 55 and 38). In the other cases the number of new texts is about the same as

that of the old texts (Trea and the two Fora) or smaller; in Bergomum the percentage is smallest, 20.8, but the number of new texts (26) certainly justifies the inclusion of Bergomum in this collection. (In general, one must, however, note that many of the new texts, duly equipped with numbers, are in fact insignificant fragments; thus e.g. in the cases of Suasa, Rusellae, and Trea.)

The structure of the individual contributions follows on traditional lines. In the beginning, there is a bibliography (I must confess that I have never really understood why some items are preceded by a "-", some by "+"); a historical introduction to the city in question follows. These introductions are of great interest and importance as they supersede all previous presentations of the vicissitudes of the same cities. (Note that at least in the case of Ferrara (p. 126) and Reate (p. 21), one learns that Mommsen had not used all available literary sources when writing the historical introductions in the *CIL*.) Then we have the addenda to inscriptions published previously, in many cases a section even more important than the presentation of the new inscriptions. If there are important addenda, old texts may be accorded a new edition in the section on new inscriptions; this is the case e.g., of *CIL* IX 4753 = *Reate* no. 17 (confirming that there should never have been any doubts about the praenomen of this man, the equestrian T. Prifernius Paetus Memmius Apollinaris) and of *CIL* V 5127 = *Bergomum* 4. The rest of contributions consist of the new inscriptions and of the indices.

In general, one can say that the contributions are of a very high quality; clearly the contributors are all very well acquainted with their subjects (although I must confess that I noticed a bibliographical omission or two in some of the contributions, e.g., in that on Reate, which is of course the most demanding city bibliographically). The only thing I am wondering about is whether it is really of any use to comment upon all the common names, and to refer to the standard onomastic repertories for the illustration of the same names. There are very many places in these volumes where one reads that (say) *Petronius* or *Rufinus* or *Valerius* are common names (references to Kajanto, etc. being given), but isn't this something we all know? I am wondering about this because I have the feeling that in some cases the authors are fairly generous in commenting upon the common names not in need of illustration, at the same time avoiding clear statements on rare names which would merit some annotation. For instance, in *Bergomum* 9, something is said on both *Marcius* and *Petronius*, but not a single word on the cognomen *Lucusta*. Similarly, in *Reate* 29, the only thing that is said on the interesting nomen *Appaeus* is that this is the first attestestation in Reate (cf. on *Carfidius* *ibid.* 31, and also *ibid.* 35, 43, 48), and in *Reate* 43 the nomen *Viblenus* (of great interest) is left without any comment.

To move on to an examination of the new texts, there are again interesting inedita, e.g., *Aletrium* 1 (*Deis Indicit(ibus)*, etc.), *Rusellae* 31 (a wonderful metrical building inscription of the 4th century), *Reate* 10 (a striking text in honour of Iulia Maesa), *Ameria* 5 (Saloninus Caesar), *ibid.* 32 (a funerary inscription with uncommon formulations). And of course there are also many interesting inscriptions (e.g., *Ferrara* 7, a veteran of the Urban cohorts) published earlier, but in journals of local and/or limited circulation and thus not readily available for use by the scholarly community as a whole. As for individual texts, I have an observation or two to make on some of them and shall proceed to this at this point.

Bergomum 14: If the commentary says that Q. Cornelius St. f. Vot. belongs to the

family of the Cornelii and to the tribe Voturia (correct, but rather obvious), should not a word on the filiation have been added? – *Alba Pompeia* 10: not *VI vir(o)* but *IIIIII vir(o)* (this is clear from the photo). – *Ferrara* 17: If the man is indeed a *classarius* (a good suggestion by the editor D. Pupillo), then he should belong to the Ravenna fleet; this, again, would be interesting inasmuch as he is a Naevius, for this nomen is surprisingly common in Misenum, but does not seem to have been attested for a Ravenna man until now (cf. *Arctos* 30 [1996] 175 with n. 35). – *Ferrara* 20: The *et* in line 6 is an interesting mistake. – *Reate* 5 (*CIL* IX 4752): It is a misunderstanding to say that Schulze also suggests the reading [*P*]esuvius, for his *ipsa verba* clearly mean that he wishes to distance himself from this suggestion. – *Reate* 12: It seems a bit misleading to say that all *curatores viae Salariae* "finora conosciuti" are from the imperial period, for this seems to imply that one could, in theory, expect to find Republican curators of the same road in new inscriptions; however, curators of a certain road represent an imperial institution. The bibliographical reference given (to an article in *Bull. arch. Algérienne* 1968) also seems inadequate. – *Reate* 17: More could have been said in the commentary on the nomenclature of T. Prifernius Paetus Memmius Apollinaris (for a few remarks cf. e.g., my *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature* [1992] 34). There is also some serious trouble in the references to the later Prifernii. Moreover, some assumptions seem to be presented as historical facts (XX was adopted by YY, etc.). – *Reate* 27 (*C. Accius C.M.I. Dio, M. Accius C.f. Qui.*): It is misleading to say that we have here a freedman father and his son "che ha acquisito la cittadinanza", for of course the father was also a citizen. Instead, something could have been said on the interesting fact that the son does not have a cognomen (for an explanation and some parallels see my *Die römischen Vornamen* [1987] 296, where this text is also mentioned).

Before I conclude, let me also add a remark or two on some of the introductory sections and on the addenda. *Alba Pompeia* p. 65 on 7601 "*Ma(nius)*" is not really a correct representation of the five-stroke abbreviation of the name (normally this is represented in print by "*M'*"). – *Reate* p. 47: the Arrii mentioned apparently as senators from Reate are in fact Africans. – *Reate* p. 61 on 4647: Perhaps one could say that *Varius* probably comes from the praenomen *Varus* (not attested as such) and is "di origine romana"; but I miss here a reference to the fact that there are two completely different nomina both spelt *Varius*, one in which the *a* is short and one where the *a* is long (see the book of Schulze, so often quoted in these volumes, p. 249). – *Reate* p. 72 on 4648: This inscription is translated by B. Campbell, *The Roman Army* (1994) no. 350, and in F. Jacques, *Les cités de l'occident romain* (1990) p. 52 no. 25d. – *Reate* p. 76 on 4694: this text is not identical with *ILS* 1363 (where in fact *CIL* IX 4964 is reproduced). – *Reate* p. 80 on 4721/22: The phrase "La gens Fonteia, che la tradizione romana, risalente a Cicerone (*Cic. Font.* 41) considera originaria di Tusculum" does not quite do justice to the clear evidence on the origin of the Fonteii in Tusculum. – *Reate* p. 82 on 4742: Some fairly surprising, and possibly not altogether correct, things are said in the commentary. I have not been able to find clear evidence for the affirmation of the author regarding the senatorial Vettuleni that "A rafforzare la sua posizione di prestigio intervenne il matrimonio con la gens Aelia, una delle più nobili di Roma", and perhaps this is based on a misunderstanding of sorts. In any case, there does not seem to be a reason for discussing senatorial Vettuleni here, as the man mentioned in this inscription, Sex.

Vettulenus Marcianus (husband of Sextia Victoria) cannot be a member of the senatorial branch of the family.

Olli Salomies

Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum. Consilio et auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Berolinensis et Brandenburgensis editum. Volumen secundum: *Inscriptiones Hispaniae Latinae*. Editio altera. Pars V. *Conventus Astigitanus* (CIL II²/5). Ediderunt A. U. STYLOW, R. ATENCIA PÁEZ, J. GONZÁLEZ FERNÁNDEZ, C. GONZÁLEZ ROMÁN, M. PASTOR MUÑOZ, P. RODRÍGUEZ OLIVA, adiuvantibus H. GIMENO PASCUAL, M. RUPPERT, M. G. SCHMIDT. Gualterus de Gruyter et socii, Berolini – Novi Eboraci 1998. ISBN 3-11-015195-2. xlii, 423 pp. EUR 348.

This is the third fascicle of the second edition of the Spanish epigraphical corpus, covering the *conventus Astigitanus* in southeastern Baetica. As the first fascicle only came out in 1995, the prospects of the Spanish project clearly look good. There are 1350 inscriptions in this corpus, divided into 55 chapters, the chapters corresponding to ancient urban territories as reconstructed by the editors. Cities included here are, e.g., Tucci, Ucubi, Ategua, Iliberri Florentia, Ilurco, Singili(a?) Barba, Urso, Astigi. Most of the city names seem pretty obscure to a reader not specializing in Roman Spain (but note the recent rise from obscurity to prominence, due to excavations in the last years, of sites such as Singilia(?), cf. p. 213), and there are many settlements the ancient name of which is still unknown. (By the way, it is notable how often in Spain one finds the phenomenon that different cities have the same name, cf., e.g., p. 366 on *Segovia*, p. 368 on *Segida*.) There is much of interest here, e.g., no. 789 (a most interesting honorific inscription from Singilia(?), *AE* 1989, 420), no. 900 (the *senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone*), no. 1022 (the *lex Ursonensis*), and note that the inscriptions of Iliberri "gravitate excellunt" (p. 165; the inscription in honour of P. Cornelius Anullinus is now no. 623). In general, one notes that there is an unusually large number of honorific inscriptions.

In the beginning, there is a "Praefatio editorum" followed (on pp. XVII-XX) by a historical introduction by A.U. Stylow and a 20-page bibliography. The inscriptions are presented on pp. 1-382. In each chapter, the edition of the inscriptions is preceded by a list of the *miliarii* pertaining to the territory in question and by the *falsi* (these sections do not, of course, appear in all chapters). There are photographs of the most interesting texts, whereas the illustrations of the other texts are to be found in microfiches included in the volume. As for the inscriptions themselves, of which there are (as already mentioned) 1350, there do not seem to be many inedita (but note e.g., 475, 901), and a considerable number of texts seem to have disappeared, being thus known only from older descriptions (cf. e.g., p. 288). Here and there one observes texts transmitted in older sources, but unknown to the first edition (e.g., no. 116).

Everything is of a very high quality, and one can only admire, and congratulate, the editors upon their achievement. It is also with great pleasure one finds that the commentaries to the individual inscriptions are kept on a sober level and stick to the essential. As for observations on individual texts, I shall present them at this point. No.