

be expected to be in command of the whole range of sources at our disposal.

This is a very well produced book – I observed misprints only at L 40 (surely *v(ir) ornatus* rather than *ortus*), L 195, M 184, P 361, and P 422 – and should be acquired by every scholarly library meant to cover the fields of epigraphy and Roman institutions.

Olli Salomies

JÖRG RÜPKE: *Fasti sacerdotum. A Prosopography of Pagan, Jewish, and Christian Religious Officials in the City of Rome, 300 BC to AD 499*. Translated by DAVID M. B. RICHARDSON. Oxford University Press, Oxford – New York 2008. ISBN 978-0-19-929113-7. VIII, 1107 pp. GBP 335.

This is the English translation of the same author's *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.*, published in three volumes in 2005. As the subtitle indicates, only officials "in the City of Rome" are included, but the net is cast wide to include, e.g., *Laurentes Lavinates* and a *sacerdos Caeninensis* operating in Mantua (no. 1601). The net is cast wide also in the case various Christian "religious officials"; I find it hard to imagine that there will be someone who is interested both in republican patrician *pontifices* and Christian fifth-century *fossores* (e.g., no. 1249, 1636) or *ostiarum* at the *coemeterium Marcellini et Petri* (no. 1562), but certainly it is good to have all this information collected and digested and furnished with good indexes. All persons recognized as having been "religious officials" have a number (the numbering ends, as in the original German edition, at 3590), but there are also many persons (and Caligula's horse, p. 667) without numbers, either because these persons cannot be regarded as having held a religious office, or because they held one outside the capital (e.g., Gabbesius in *ICVR* 23005 on p. 703). Many fictional? persons are also listed.

In the beginning, there are some chapters of introductory material, in part reproducing *mutatis mutandis* Rüpke's earlier articles (e.g., nos. 6, 7). There is much of interest here, e.g., chapter 6 on the *calatores* (reflecting senatorial priests) in AD 101 and 102 and the section dealing with the question "Was the *pontifex maximus* a priest?" (p. 61ff.). What is somewhat striking is that these chapters – i.e., nos. 5–8 (sections 1–4 are of another type), occupying altogether 42 pages – represent only a selection of the material that one finds in vol. 3 of the German edition, with more than 250 pages of observations of varying length dealing with a great number of questions related to priests and religion. One wonders why only a small part of all this was considered worthy of being translated.

The core of the work consists of the annual lists, beginning in 300 BC (priests and others attested before that date are listed in the beginning on p. 69, and have entries of their own, without numbers, in the biographical section) and ending in AD 499. This takes up almost 400 pages, and a further 500 pages are taken up by biographies of the individuals attested as priests (*vel sim.*), the numbering of the entries ending (as mentioned above) at 3590 (but there are in fact more entries, cf. above). This section is followed by the extremely useful "Membership tables" (with lists, e.g., of all known augurs). At the end, there is a bibliography and very detailed indexes.

In the annual lists, there is an entry for each year, each entry furnishing a list of religious officials attested in that particular year, the *rex sacrorum*, if known, apparently always coming first, followed by the *pontifex maximus*. The earliest Christian official mentioned here seems to be the presbyter Pios (i.e., Pius I, traditionally regarded as the ninth pope), appearing in the lists from 136 onwards (his successor Anicetus, listed from 151 onwards, is the earliest pope referred to as "episcopus"). Obviously, there are very often problems in attaching a certain person to a certain year, especially in the imperial period, and so the exact dates supplied here can in very many cases only be regarded as conjectural; for those for whom no certain year can be suggested there are, however, also entries of the type "Second quarter of the 1st century BC / Late Republic" (p. 119), "High Empire (mid 2nd to the beginning of the 4th century AD)" (p. 270), or even "3rd/4th century AD" (p. 331).

As for the biographies, these normally contain a date, a mention of the religious office and other biographical data, references to the sources and to secondary literature (mainly to literature – e.g., prosopographical works – dealing with priests); sometimes various problems are discussed in footnotes. Polyonymous persons are normally listed not under their "main" *nomen*, but under the first *nomen* (cf. p. 20); thus we find a consul usually known as "Pompeius Falco" listed (no. 2920), and referred to (p. 371 n. 1), as a Roscius. In the case of fragmentary names, the fact that they are fragmentary is not always indicated. From this it follows that some of the persons listed have names which seem fairly implausible (e.g., no. 1539, "Eronius C. f. Varus" coming between Erasinus and Eros; surely we are rather dealing with, e.g., a [C. F]erionius; for another man without praenomen but with filiation see no. 2723). Names are normally listed in the form they appear in the sources which means that "vulgar" forms may turn up in unexpected places, e.g., "Habundantius" and "Habundius" appearing not under A but under H; similar cases are, e.g., Iubentius, Klemens, Pascasius (separated by Pascentius from Paschasius), Serbusdei (coming between Serapion and Serenus), Suaetrius. Aurelius Biaturinus (no. 811) comes after M. Aurelius Bassus, with a note saying that *Aurelius* has been abbreviated; one wonders whether it might not have been added that what we have here is in fact a vulgar form of *Viatorinus*.

The translation in general seems solid (although some items seem to have been left untranslated, e.g., "Diana-Tempel" on p. 69); but there are cases in which the English seem a bit awkward or even misleading. Note, e.g., p. 521 n. 5, a note explaining "suffect consulate", "This [= the consulate, apparently] is favoured with first position in the inscription" (etc.), which corresponds to "Das [the consulate] erscheint in der chronologisch absteigend geordneten Inschrift vorgezogen an erster Stelle", where "vorgezogen" seems to mean not "favoured" but "placed first" (*vel sim.*). Note also, e.g., no. 995 "Aurelian period" (i.e., that of the emperor Aurelian; cf. "post-Diocletian period" no. 2982); no. 2071 "from a Pergamum consular family". One also wonders about "saliat" in no. 664. On the other hand, sometimes an obscure formulation is a rendering of an obscure expression in the original (e.g., no. 573, "A praetorian and *praefectus* was co-opted" standing for "Kooptiert wurde ein Prätorier und Praefectus frumenti dandi", where the words "er als" seem to have been omitted by mistake after "wurde"; no. 1326 n. 4, "Final honorific inscription" corresponding to "Letzte Ehreninschrift", where "späteste" might have been more clear).

In a work of this scale it is obviously not possible to avoid all mistakes or misformulations (for a misspelling, note that the famous Italian epigraphist Borghesi is constantly referred to as "Borghese"). Let me point out here a few details which I think might need to be corrected

or reformulated. No. 704 n. 3 "Membership of the *tresviri stlitibus iudicandis* indicates that the career belongs to the last years of the third century" (similarly in the German edition); this is mysterious, for *triumviro* (sic, not *tresviro*) in the inscription must be a mistake, and certainly cannot be used to date the inscription in this way (although the date may in fact be correct). No. 746: in the *Fasti Septempedani* (*AE* 1998, 419, not quoted here), the consul of 81 appears as "*M. (not C.) Asinius Pollio Verruc(osus)*". No. 1021: if this man was *salius Palatinus*, he should have been labelled a patrician (similar cases in no. 2084 and in no. 2723, a *salius Collinus*; on the other hand, Pliny the Younger in no. 2730 is not designated as plebeian; and there is also L. Pinarius Natta, member of a rather obscure patrician *gens*, but called a plebeian in no. 2711). No. 1252: scholars nowadays agree that the associate of P. Clodius was called Sex. Cloedius, not "Clodius" (as demonstrated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey; no trace of this in the entry). No. 1255: shouldn't it be *sodalis Titius* rather than *sodalis Titii* (this expression also in no. 2788)? No. 2722: a man known as "A. Platorius Nepos" cannot be identified with someone referred to as "C. Licinius Pollio" even if his full nomenclature might have included the sequence "C. Licinius Pollio" (n. 4 to this entry is, by the way, fairly obscure). No. 3239 (Galeo Tettienus Severus) n. 6: "older ('ältere' in the original; I think that 'earlier' might have been better) inscriptions do not mention the pontificate"; but the "older" inscriptions pertaining to this man are Greek inscriptions from Asia referring to this man as proconsul and cannot be expected also to have mentioned the pontificate, and besides these, there is (in addition to *ILS* 1027 used in this entry) only one inscription which can be furnished with a date of sorts, namely *CIL* V 5813 (set up after the proconsulate of Asia) which, though not cited here, does mention the pontificate as well (the first line must be *consul(i), po[nt(ifici)]*). No. 3466: in n. 2, there is an obscure reference to an "above identification".

Of course these are only minor details, and the fact that I am pointing out a few such details should by no means not be interpreted as implying that I am unhappy with this book. On the contrary, I consider it a major achievement and a milestone in prosopographical studies. No doubt this book will be of great service to an equally great number of scholars and students.

Olli Salomies

MARIE-LAURENCE HAACK: *Prosopographie des haruspices romains*. Biblioteca di "Studi Etruschi" 42. Istituto nazionale di studi etruschi ed italici. Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali, Pisa – Roma 2006. ISBN 88-8147-425-5 (b.), 88-8147-424-7 (r.). 217 pp. EUR 195 (b), 295 (r).

Marie-Laurence Haack has published her doctoral thesis (Université Paris IV Sorbonne, 2000) on the Roman *haruspices* in two important volumes, *Les haruspices dans le monde romain*, (*Scripta Antiqua* 6; Bordeaux: Ausonius 2006), offering the necessary historical introduction and conclusion to this prosopography. In this volume, after a short introductory note, she lists 110 (plus 11 without preserved name) *haruspices* known from literary or epigraphical sources. For all of them, she gives the full text of the source and its translation, extensive bibliography, analysis of the text, possible (but very rare) other references to the person and his career, and finally the approximate date for the person. She still gives a list of 21 other persons, for whom