

performances and their audience and us, contemporary readers of ancient plays and modern scholarship. In the concluding chapter, the author brings everything together, the tradition of scapegoating, the rites of transmission and ostracism, and, moreover, he does not disappoint the reader who is still waiting for the Aristotelian idea of tragic *κάθαρσις* to be connected to this study.

The main arguments in this well executed study are easy to accept: the introduction of the cult of Asclepius to Athens had surely a lot to do with the atrocious plague epidemic which was reflected in the dramas of the time, too. The collocation of the shrine of Asclepius next to the theatre of Dionysus was not a coincidence, but showed that the idea of the healer god's presence was an essential flavor in dramatic performances in times of *λοιμός* and *λίμος*, terrible escorts of the Peloponnesian War. In the dramas of the late 5th century, there seems to be a growing interest in disease imagery as well as in allusions to the cult of Asclepius. This probably has a connection to the plague that killed a great part of the population in Athens between the years 430–426. If Dionysus and Asclepius are compared, they do have a lot of common features and the cult of Asclepius (to which music and dancing always belonged) is well established in a dramatic context. As has long been acknowledged, there is a connection between drama and medicine. M-B successfully demonstrates that the slope of the Athenian Acropolis was a place of therapy for the whole polis: both Dionysus and Asclepius were worshipped there side by side.

Tiina Purola

SIMONA MARCHESINI: *Prosopographia Etrusca* II,1 *Studia. Gentium mobilitas*. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, *Studia Archaeologica* 158, Roma 2007. ISBN 978-88-8265-448-1. 186 pp. EUR 110.

The massive project *Prosopographia Etrusca* introduces its *Studia* series with this study by Simona Marchesini. Looking only at the title of the work, the connection with prosopography remains unclear, but, to be sure, the study concerns archaic onomastics of Southern Etruria, which is naturally basic for prosopographical work in a culture where practically all biographical information is missing.

Marchesini's focus is on the *Vornamengentilizia* appearing in the archaic inscriptions of Southern Etruria; thus, she completes the gap left by H. Rix in *Das etruskische Cognomen*, concentrating on late Etruscan onomastics. Through her study of 65 name forms, the author then approaches the question of ethnic and social mobility in early Etruscan societies. As is well known, the Etruscan usage of individual name gentilicia is connected with families of either unfree origin or immigrants.

The material is very limited, and, as the author is well aware, the criteria for identifying an individual name gentilicium are not unambiguous. The author starts from the maximal corpus of names, and comes to her list by cutting from it all typically Etruscan gentilicium formations such as *-na*, *-ra* etc. (p. 35). This method is acceptable, probably even the only possible, but in a way presumes that the gentilicium formation of old Etruscan families was rather strictly regulated. Some expansion of the material comes from a list of praenomina of non-Etruscan origin and gentilicia with Etruscan formation, but non-Etruscan stem.

If the material is limited – with regard to the theme of ethnic mobility, so much studied and discussed in recent times – it is compensated by the author's methodological sharpness and wide knowledge of earlier literature, both linguistic and etruscological. Nevertheless, she can add rather little to our knowledge about mobility in archaic Central Italy, though clearly more to the onomastical studies – she considers that the existence of individual name gentilicia even in the earliest Etruscan inscriptions shows that the gentilicium system must be earlier than most scholars have thought. As thorough as the study on her material is, I would have liked her to discuss more deeply such questions as: when and how did an individual name gentilicium become hereditary? Was it chosen because an Etruscan formation was prohibited by a new-comer, or for some other reason?

Jorma Kaimio

DAVID ENGELS: *Das römische Vorzeichenwesen (753–27 v. Chr.). Quellen, Terminologie, Kommentar, historische Entwicklung*. Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 22. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2007. ISBN 978-3-515-09027-8. 877 pp. EUR 98.

The religious culture of prodigies in the Roman Republic has, undoubtedly parallel to a general growth of interest in ancient divination, attracted its share of recent attention (V. Rosenberger, *Gezähmte Götter. Das Prodigienwesen der römischen Republik*, Stuttgart 1998 and S.W. Rasmussen, *Public Portents in Republican Rome*, Roma 2003, to name the most prominent recent monographs). The present monograph of impressive scale by D. Engels (hereafter E.) begins by criticising the previous studies for operating with an excessively narrow and *a priori* definition of what constitutes a prodigy, and with incomplete lists of prodigies, based on a restricted number of sources. E. himself approaches his material with a general and open definition of what constitutes a prodigy (given on pp. 43–59), and sets out to map all (22) "historisch konkret verorteten Vorzeichen" between 753 and 27 BCE, between Aeneas and Augustus, connected with Roman history in ancient sources.

After thus explaining the frankly ambitious scope of his study, E. embarks on a consideration of the source material, beginning with the problems of the Pontifical record (pp. 60–86), and general questions on the transmission of information about prodigies in the extant texts. While J. Rüpke has argued for the beginning of reliable pontifical note-taking in 249 (J. Rüpke, *Fasti sacerdotum. Die Mitglieder der Priesterschaften und das sakrale Funktionspersonal römischer, griechischer, orientalischer und jüdisch-christlicher Kulte in der Stadt Rom von 300 v. Chr. bis 499 n. Chr. Teil 3: Beiträge zur Quellenkunde und Organisationsgeschichte; Bibliographie; Register*, Stuttgart 2005, e.g., 1490), E. argues that since we have records of prodigies, often attested to in more than one source, from long before this date, this information has to be based on some form of public or private record extending beyond the 3rd century BCE (p. 64). Having distanced himself from the *Annales maximi* debate (pp. 85–86), E. proposes that information on prodigies could be based on the senate archives, the archives of the pontifical colleges, or private archives (pp. 87–92). All of this is naturally plausible, even probable, but problematic as a judgement on the reliability of records on prodigies, as we ultimately lack sufficient information on the state of the survival of these archives at the point when their information first entered, say, the annalistic tradition,