

being defined as *infatigabilis*, which is in fact an extremely uncommon combination, apparently attested otherwise only in the African inscription *CIL VIII 14344*.

As so much is being offered here, it is no wonder that there are details on which one could disagree. Let me point out some instances. Firmum 13: should one not add, in the beginning, a line with *[ossa]* (this being done in *AE 1993, 593*)? – Potentia 10 (the *fasti Potentini*): in the reading of col. II, line 14, the fact might have been taken into account that a military diploma, published several years ago and duly quoted in *AE 2003, 588*, has shown that the cognomen of the consul L. Iulius was *Frugi* (this rendering also the commentary on p. 186 obsolete). – P. 273 (on no. 5381): as this is a volume in the series *Suppl. It.*, it might have been added that the inscription referred to as *AE 1937, 119* has been later republished as *Suppl. It. 9 Amiternum 34*. – P. 280 (on no. 5391): Volcacia have something to do with Volcasia only in terms of etymology and should not have been mentioned here. (A similar case would be saying that P. Quinctilius Varus was related to the patrician Quinctii; and cf. the Tettii/Tettieni below.) – P. 321: in the commentary on no. 5511, it is most disturbing to find that the nomen *Tettius* is identified, without any mention of doubts, with *Tettienus*, this leading to the introduction, in the bizarrest of ways, into the discussion of the passage Val. Max. 7, 3, 3, where a C. (perhaps 'un errore', the praenomen *Galeo* of the Tettieni being meant) Tettius and his mother Petronia are mentioned, this again (so we are told) furnishing an Augustan date for the amphitheatre of Asisium. But *Tettienus* is not identical with *Tettius* and it would have been better not to spend almost 20 lines for the presentation of all this. Asisium 29: perhaps *Flamini[us]* should have been introduced into the text? Now we have *Plamini[us]* in the text but are told in the commentary that the reading must be *Flamini[us]*. Asisium 36: perhaps *me(n)s(e)rum* rather than *me(n)s(o)rum*? The genitive *menserum* (= *mensium*) is in fact attested (*CIL IX 820; V 2701; AE 1986, 601*). P. 433: I think the correct form is *conticesco* (rather than *contecesco*). – Gnathia 51: I must say that I very much prefer the original interpretation of this inscription (*M. Antonius Iulli* [this referring to Iullus Antonius cos. 10 BC] *l. [S]oterichus Archela[vi]anus*, the second cognomen referring to the king of Cappadocia as the former owner of the slave) to that presented here.

These are, however, minor matters, and their mention in this review should not obscure the fact that this is splendid book and a worthy addition to the by now well-established series.

Olli Salomies

SILVIO PANCIERA: *Epigrafi, epigrafia, epigrafisti. Scritti vari editi e inediti (1956-2005) con note complementari e indici*. Vol. 1-3. Vetera 16. Edizioni Quasar, Roma 2006. ISBN 88-7140-306-1. 2189 pp. EUR 270.

This is a truly grand work on a grand scale by one of the most eminent classical scholars of today. Professor Panciera is, of course, a scholar specialising in epigraphy, but epigraphy cannot normally be pursued with success if one knows only something about inscriptions, and Professor Panciera is certainly a marvellous instance of an epigraphical scholar whose writings illustrate, if not the whole field of classical philology, at least significant areas of the subject, including archaeology. (As for classical literature, one notes that the list of "fonti letterarie" cited in these volumes comprises almost 20 pages.) In view of Professor Panciera's scholarship, I think these volumes should be compulsory reading to all those who aspire to a higher

understanding of Roman life and culture as illustrated by epigraphy. Whoever first got the idea of collecting, and publishing together, Professor Panciera's articles must be congratulated, as must be all those who were in some way involved in producing these volumes, of whom there is a pretty unobtrusive list on p. 15 (note Professor Gian Luca Gregori having been responsible for the 'peso editoriale'). Professor Panciera's own contribution to the genesis of this volume is, however, most notable, since he has himself furnished immensely useful addenda to all the items republished here, often of considerable length.

As one learns from the 'Avvertenza editoriale' on p. 17, all the papers republished (or sometimes published here for the first time, as there are a number of unpublished items, listed on the same page) here have been reset, but given in the original version (with the original pages being indicated in the margin), with only a few errors having been corrected "tacitamente". There are thus no additions in the text of the individual contributions (thus we find references to works which, as we now know, will never materialize, e.g., p. 1764); I have been wondering whether it might not have been a good idea to add references of the type "[= sopra pp. xx]" whenever Professor Panciera quotes his own publications (for instance, someone observing on p. 1419, n. 17, that Professor Panciera has also published something on the same subject in a publication which seems to be dedicated to Byzantine Ravenna, might be relieved to find out that this contribution can in fact be consulted in the same volume a few pages earlier).

In any case, what one finds here is more than 2,000 pages of very solid scholarship covering 50 years starting with 1956, followed by no less than 166 pages of indexes in a separate volume. The papers appear under the following headings: "Ab initio rei publicae liberae ad aetatem Augusti" (with contributions not earlier than 1989, indicating perhaps a light shift in Professor Panciera's interests), 'Urbs Roma' (apparently, and understandably, the longest section), 'Municipia coloniaeque', 'Viri feminaeque notabiles' (in this section we find, e.g., memorable contributions on senators such as those on L. Caesonius Ovinus (etc.) Bassus and L. Pomponius Bassus Cascus Scribonianus), 'Milites', 'Magistri, sodales, itineris comites' (mainly obituaries), 'Libros iudicare aut in lucem prodere' (reviews), 'Varia cum artis epigraphicae doctrina et usu coniuncta' (a rather mixed section including, e.g., the instructive introductions to the volumes of the *Supplementa Italica*, but also a heading 'Onomastica', with, e.g., the well-known contribution on the nomenclature of the consul of AD 13). The whole collection is preceded by a chapter 'Cinquant' anni' which serves as a sort of introduction but which also includes, e.g., some interesting autobiographical details.

It is not easy to evaluate the output of a scholar whose eminence is obvious on every single page, and so it might be advisable for me to stop here. In spite of this, there is one point which I would like to touch upon. Most of the ancient Latin inscriptions, of which there are, of course, hundreds of thousands, are on the whole fairly easy to understand and to explain, though naturally always requiring some experience (the lack of which being apparent, e.g., in epigraphical commentaries one finds in some archaeological publications). But there are always troublesome texts which require more than just the normal amount of annotation. One observes, when reading Professor Panciera's work, that the number of difficult and even singular inscriptions being studied is surprisingly high (one thinks, e.g., of the inscription with *in operis publicis*, p. 825ff., but there are many similar cases); this seems to point to the conclusion that Professor Panciera is not at all reluctant to deal with complicated inscriptions, and may in fact prefer dealing with such texts, leaving the less problematic texts to others (often, it seems, his own students).

The volumes have been produced with great care, and I have been able to observe only very few misprints (e.g., p. 178 n. 19: *C.* instead of *L. Mitreius*; p. 815: *ILS* 1469 instead of 1496; p. 995 n. 48: perhaps p. 46 rather than 4446; p. 996: *Virius Lupus* seems to have been the ordinary, not a suffect consul of AD 278; p. 1040, no. 13: *Lollia* instead of *Pollia*; p. 1116: *Gau[de]ns lib.* rather than *l.*; p. 1539, last line: 1863 instead of 1853; p. 1621: my colleague Heikki Solin seems to have lost an *i*). As for details one could argue about, I am not sure the two *Aspri*, consuls in 212, should be adduced as parallels for the two *Herennii*, consuls in 85 (p. 1050 n. 21), as *Asper the Elder* was consul for the second time. These are, of course, only matters of minimal importance.

To conclude, this is a work of great importance which should be constantly consulted by all scholars and students of things Roman. Professor Panciera's elegant style (for a memorable formulation note, e.g., the observation on the importance of Professor Giuseppe Camodeca's work on p. 760, in the 'Nota complementare') will make the consultation a pleasure.

*Olli Salomies*

*Army and Power in the Ancient World*. Edited by ANGELOS CHANIOTIS and PIERRE DUCREY. HABES – Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien 37. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2002. ISBN 3-515-08197-6. VIII, 204 pp. EUR 44.

This collection of articles has its origins in the Nineteenth International Congress of Historical Sciences held in Oslo, August 2000. The collection contains twelve articles which vary greatly in their geographical and chronological subject matter, although all examine the relationship between the army and political power in the ancient world. Six of these articles are individual presentations, while the other six form three pairs, in which the second article of a pair provides a critique of the presentation preceding it.

In the first article Walter Mayer (pp. 3–23) examines the highly militarised society of ancient Assyria, where the king was responsible for leading all military campaigns in person. His survey begins with the analysis of the available sources and continues to discuss the recruiting, logistics and structure of the Assyrian army including its use of specialised troops such as archers and sappers. In the end Mayer argues that it was the over-militarising of the society that overstressed the available resources which led to Assyria's eventual downfall. The second article (pp. 25–37), written by Romila Thapar, is concerned with the relationship between the complexity of the state and the organisation of a regular army in India during the fifth and fourth centuries BCE. After examining the size and administration of the different divisions of the army (elephants, chariots, cavalry and infantry) within the limitations of the traditional caste system, Thapar argues that the army had a very limited role in the politics of the state.

The role of the military prowess in the succession of the Achaemenid dynasty is the subject of the next article by Pierre Briant (pp. 39–49). In his analysis of the difference between the theoretical process and the violent reality, Briant considers the value of royal lineage over the victories of rival claimants in the Achaemenid propaganda and expresses criticism of the interpretation of the Persian customs and laws described by later Greek sources. Pierre Ducrey