

letterarie greche e latine nonché sulla diffusione dei mortai nell'Impero romano. Seguono considerazioni generali sui bolli iscritti nei mortai, dopo di che viene presentato, nella parte centrale dell'opera, il catalogo dei bolli. Questa edizione mi ha fatto un'ottima impressione. Il volume si chiude con un capitolo intitolato "Produzione e rapporti di produzione" nonché con due appendici dove vengono raccolte le menzioni di mortai nelle fonti letterarie; a fine libro stanno gli indici.

Nella parte centrale, nel catalogo dei bolli, questi non solo vengono pubblicati con grande cura e informazione completa, ma vengono offerte anche ampie considerazioni sullo sfondo sociale e geografico delle persone i cui nomi si ricordano nei bolli. Con ricerche comparative la Palleschi cerca di trovare punti fermi per stabilire la provenienza delle persone e così dei bolli. Per lo più le sue considerazioni sono sensate e ben fondate, anche se qualche volta restano ipotetiche (per prendere solo un esempio, a pp. 93–95 viene discussa l'origine sociale, giuridica e geografica degli Aquilii, in particolare di C. Aquilius Felix, ma *Felix* è un cognome troppo diffuso per permettere identificazioni all'interno l'industria figlinaria).

Mi sia concesso di finire offrendo un nuovo bollo, finora inedito, scritto sul labbro di un mortaio frammentario di provenienza ignota (ma proverrà dal territorio della romana Antium), da me visto nel 1996 a Villa Adele ad Anzio (l'attuale Museo civico della città). Diametro massimo cm 55, all'interno 33; l'altezza si conserva per cm 14; bollo misura cm 3,4 x 6,4; le lettere sono alte cm 1,2–1,3. Il bollo, in due righe, dice:

Augustâlis
Saturnin(i).

Questo Augustalis, schiavo di Saturninus, finora dunque ignoto, potrebbe essere un Anziato attivo in una figlina locale.

Heikki Solin

Ἰ. Κ. Σβέρκος: *Συμβολή στην ιστορία τῆς Ἄνω Μακεδονίας τῶν ῥωμαϊκῶν χρόνων (πολιτικὴ ὀργάνωση - κοινωνία - ἀνθρωπωνυμία). Διατριβὴ ἐπὶ διδασκαλία. Ἀριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, Φιλοσοφικὴ Σχολή. Θεσσαλονίκη 2000. 241 pp.*

This doctoral dissertation of the University of Thessaloniki deals with a subject suggested to the author, I. K. Sverkos, by Professor I. S. Touloumakos (p. 9), namely various aspects of the history of Upper Macedonia (a concept which does not seem to receive a definition here) in the Roman period. In the introduction, the author notes (p. 25) that research on this area is made difficult because of the paucity of epigraphical sources; he also reminds the reader (*ibid.*) that there is almost no material from the period preceding imperial times, which makes it impossible to make comparisons between this period and earlier ones (p. 26). The author then goes on (26f.) with a discussion of the epigraphical sources (here one must note that he was able to use the new Macedonian *IG* volume of 1999 but not the edition of the texts from Leucopetra, in the *Meletemata* series, of 2000) and (27ff.) with an overview of the secondary literature (note the

interesting characterization of the book of F. Papazoglou on the *Villes de Macédoine* of 1998 on p. 27f.).

The first part of the book deals with the political organisation of the area. In a largely non-urban area, the κῶμοι played an important role, and the author starts with an overview of what is known of them. The author points out (p. 35) that the names of the κῶμοι in Upper Macedonia are known above all from manumission records from Leucopetra (p. 35), the complete publication of which he was not yet able to use. The cities are treated next (p. 45ff.). There are some obscure places which are attested as cities in this period in an inscription or two (e.g., Aeane, p. 47, n. 97; for a list of places attested earlier as cities but disappearing later from our sources, see p. 32f.), but the main cities are Heraclea (Lyncestis), Styberra, Stobi (not covered by the new *IG* volume); and then there is also Pelagonia, a problematic case. Sverkos notes (46 n. 94) that this place is known as a city only from Latin inscriptions in which it is mentioned as the *patria* of soldiers, and its site has not been identified (p. 25). The first part of this statement does not seem to be altogether correct, for in Diod. 31.8.8 Pelagonia is certainly referred to as a πόλις, but it is true that normally there is talk only of a region called Pelagonia, and of Pelagonians. This peculiar scenario furnishes the explanation for the suggestion of M.B. Hatzopoulos, *Bull. ép.* 2000, 451, that the πόλις of Pelagonia is in fact to be identified with Heraclea. This proposition, which would solve quite a few problems, will have to be studied with care, the study taking into account the fact that soldiers naming Pelagonia as their *patria* have the tribe *Maecia*, whereas people from Heraclea tend to have the *Fabia* (for one instance, see 144 n. 638; cf. in the Prosopography under 'Cornelius' and 'Saufeius'; generally speaking, the question of Roman tribes does not receive much attention here). A careful analysis of all the attested urban institutions follows. From the section on ἔθνη and κοινά, it seems to emerge that the two expressions were used more or less synonymously (cf. p. 60 with n. 165f.); the ἔθνη would normally have a centre in a πόλις (cf., e.g., n. 168). This chapter (ending with a note on the term πολιτεία, 64ff.) is followed by one on civic life (69ff.). Here we find sections on the more prominent citizens (those producing acts of "euergetism", etc.; note, e.g., a well-known figure, M. Vettius Philo, p. 70ff.; manifestations of interest in rhetoric, etc.: p. 89), on other freeborn persons (p. 90ff.; resident foreigners: p. 92f.; manumission acts and the term παραμονή: p. 93ff.; soldiers: p. 99ff.), freedmen (103ff.) and slaves (107ff.).

The third chapter (115ff.) is dedicated to nomenclature. It is divided into sections on "Greek" (divided into Macedonian and other names) and "foreign names" (divided into "Roman" and other – mainly Thracian and Illyrian – names). The section on Roman names, of great interest and use, begins with Roman names used by peregrines. Here the author divides the material into 7 groups (139f.: both son and father have a Roman *praenomen* or *cognomen*; the son uses a Roman *praenomen* or *cognomen*, the father a Greek name; etc.), a division which may be a bit too subtle (except for the useful category of the ὁ καί names); I do not think the people using Roman names made a difference between the various types of names (*praenomina*, *nomina*, *cognomina* – they were simply Roman names), and as for the distinction between the types Ἀμύντας Πρεΐμου and Γέμελλος Ἀλεξάνδρου, this does not seem very useful, as any Amyntas son of Primus might well have had a son called Primus, and members of the same family would then be in different categories. The important thing seems to be that Roman names

attested as real *nomina* in the area are also often attested as individual names (thus, e.g., *Alfidius*). The author then moves on to the names of Roman citizens (144ff.); here, too, the division into categories (144f.) seems too subtle (any T. Flavius Orestes might at some point be referred to as 'Flavius Orestes'; moreover, something seems to be seriously wrong with the category (στ), where the author cannot really mean what he seems to be saying), but the exposition is in general interesting and useful. – After the conclusion (157–62), we have (163ff.) a list of all attested names, divided among names of *peregrini*, *nomina* of Roman citizens (but the Aburnius [p. 196] surely comes from Heraclea Salbake, not from Macedonia, and no doubt *Stertinius* rather than *Sertinius* should be read on p. 210; as for possible additions, note the soldier of the 7th legion called Mestrius and with the tribe *Maecia* in *IGR* iii 1476, who looks like another man from Pelagonia), *cognomina* and names in filiations. After this section, there are very detailed indices (223ff.) and, at the end of the book, a 5-page summary in English.

The author is to be congratulated for having chosen a rewarding subject for his dissertation and for having done a good job in dealing with that subject (note also the very detailed bibliography on p. 11–23). Clearly, this is a very significant contribution to the study of Roman Macedonia. However, a map would have been useful.

Olli Salomies

FRANCIS X. RYAN: *Rank and Participation in the Republican Senate*. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 1998. ISBN 3-515-07093-1. 394 pp. EUR 96.

This is a dense book which is of interest to all who are seriously interested in the working of the Roman senate, especially during the late Republic. Before the publication of the book, the author was already well known for his numerous shorter articles on Roman Republican political life. In this work, on the contrary, Ryan shows his skills in advancing a substantial argument of considerable length. The book is divided into two main sections. The first part discusses the situation of the least important senators in the senate (13–136), while the second part focuses on the other end of the power structure and discusses the role of the *princeps senatus* (137–356). An Appendix on "Senators attested speaking in the Senate 219–43 B.C." (357–75, listing some 630 certain or probable interventions) concludes the book.

How much influence did the less prominent senators have? This is the first question Ryan sets out to answer. As a preamble the author clarifies the context: what were Senate meetings like; how many members were in fact usually present? Ryan concludes that the attendance in the Senate must normally have been quite low, as the quorum needed for certain less important matters (which he specifies) was only 1/3 of the members. A definite novelty (surely based on a CD-ROM search) is the realization that the expression *frequens senatus* in the sources is a "terminus technicus" that indicates a meeting for which the quorum was both required and fulfilled ("a quorate session" is Ryan's suggested translation).

The quorum, the function of which obviously was to prevent a small minority from hijacking the state, is surprisingly low, and means that as few as c. 1/6 of the Senate