

the inclusion of names of Latin origin in the Lexicon of Greek Personal Names is a cultural not linguistic choice.

To conclude this reasoning: a name is Greek only if it is familiarised and included in the Greek grammar by making required phonological and morphological changes, if needed, so that it can be inflected in a Greek grammatical system. A typical system of Hellenising names from a language that is not suitable as such for Greek inflection can be found in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt. This familiarising has other consequences as well. When a name is Hellenised, it can be accentuated using general accentuation rules, but otherwise it should be left without diacritical marks, regardless of its whereabouts.

The method is not simple, but it is linguistically solid. The Lexicon has entries that are very problematic. A few examples should be sufficient: there are three successive entries Σανόκας, Σανόχας, and Σάνχος – all from Cimmerian Bosphoros. How do we know that they are different names? It is clear that they are not Greek personal names, and it is equally unclear whether they are totally Hellenised even if they exist in inscriptions. Naturally, they do not have foreign elements as regards Greek phonotaxis, but what should we think about Σαουαίων from the same region? It is difficult to see a Greek personal name in that format.

The chronological limit of this volume has been altered in comparison with the previous volumes. The onomastic material from Constantinople, i.e., from 330 onwards, has been excluded with the exception of names of individuals whose time of birth is unknown but who probably have lived through the turn of the third century, from the reign of Aurelian to that of Constantine. Outside Byzantium/Konstantinoupolis, however, names up to the 6th century are included. This decision has its good points since the onomastic material from early Konstantinoupolis is extensive and belongs, in many respects, to a totally different age than before. However, it also has several weaknesses as there never was an abrupt change in reality. The inclusion, therefore, could cover the period to the reign of Justinian in every part of the included area since, after his reign, the change was much more extensive than before.

In spite of my methodological critique, I am first to admit that this volume is a great achievement and will become a main reference book for many important studies in the future.

*Martti Leiwo*

MASSIMO MORANDI TARABELLA: *Prosopographia Etrusca. I Corpus. 1. Etruria Meridionale*. Studia Archaeologica 135. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 2004. ISBN 88-8265-304-8. 804 pp. EUR 450.

This is the first volume in an ambitious project, planned to comprise a *Corpus* in three volumes followed by *Studia* in six volumes. Of course, one has to welcome such a scholarly investment towards our better knowledge of Etruscan *gentes*, and to wish all luck and persistency to its young and remarkably efficient author. But simultaneously, one has, just because of the immensity of the project, to ask certain questions.

Everyone understands that an Etruscan prosopography looks quite different when compared with its Roman or Greek counterparts. There are extremely few historical facts or, in general, persons who play any role in "history", and practically no accurate dates. From whence comes a prosopography? The author has decided to include *all* Etruscan people

known by their family name in any of the sources – a really democratic choice. This line chosen, one could naturally ask, why has the family name been taken as the criterium? Is a person for whom we know only the *praenomen* and *cognomen* somehow of less worth, even if we cannot reconstruct his/her possible family connections?

But the first real question is: Is this work useful, is it worth the effort? The answer is undoubtedly yes; *Prosopographia Etrusca* will certainly be referred to in all coming epigraphical editions and many other Etruscan studies. It will be a practical aid to find data about *gentilicia* and families. In spite of that, one has also to ask how much new evidence it yields; here we must wait for the *Studia* volumes. The first *Corpus* volume was, I must say, somewhat disappointing in this respect. It was more a kind of annotated *gentilicium* index than what one normally expects from a prosopography.

The second question is: How accurate has the author been in his work? I must admit it is unfair to be very critical in a short review like this. I had not had the time to do extensive checking, nor is there space here for sufficient argumentations of the criticism. Even if the work seems generally competent and reliable, all solutions are not convincing; there seem to be too many omissions without good reasons, and all details (starting with the mixture of Latin and Italian in the title of the book) are not accurate enough. Taking into account the huge amount of data, this is more than understandable, but it necessarily decreases the usefulness of the work.

Perhaps my most severe criticism concerns the criteria of the choice of material. The author confirms that all persons up to the full Romanization (1st century BC–1st century AD) are included (pp. 12, 18); but clearly he excludes hundreds of Etruscans who happen to have their epitaphs written in Latin, presuming they are not buried in a family grave, where the dominant language is Etruscan (e.g., *A. Tarna M.f.* from the Caeretan *Tomba delle Iscrizioni*, p. 516). Consequently, a Caeretan lady by the name of *Tania Orculnia* (CIE 6187) is not included, and, moreover, she has not even had a chance to intrude into the *Corpus*, because the author has elected to use the Etruscan alphabetical order, which does not recognise *O* as an initial letter; with *Orculnia*, he also omits the *gens Urgulania*, which would have given real prosopographical evidence.

Surprisingly also *I*, although a good Etruscan letter, is unknown to the author as an initial letter; luckily, there are not so many *I*-names in Southern Etruria, but, e.g., the interesting *Iulnial* (CIE 6063) from Caere is missing. I found a lot of other omissions in this inscription group (the often modest Etruscan *cippus* inscriptions of Caere) I chose for checking purpose. The author may have good arguments for excluding, e.g., *Vatenal* (CIE 5982, *ET Cr.* 1,65), but he does not share them with the reader. The use of the work is also made more difficult by the fact that the different variants of the family names (often quite far from each other in alphabetical order) do not get any cross-references; on the other hand, good concordances of epigraphical publications greatly help the search.

Perfection can hardly be expected from a work of this volume. In the current day, the best publishing format for a work of this type is debatable. I cannot see that this finely printed book would ever get revised editions; the coming volumes will hopefully include corrections to the previous ones, but once finished, new findings will always make it deficient. In this case, I would recommend digital publishing with organized upkeep.