

*sodalibus.*

In the commentary of 2953 where the rare passive form *fruniscarus* (for *fruniscaris*) is attested there is no reference to J. N. Adams, *Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC – AD 600* (2007), 445–50, where an up-to-date discussion of the phenomenon is provided. For the text 7807 H. Solin (*Arctos* 43 [2009] 179–83) has, on the basis of the photograph published in A. Varone – G. Stefani, *op. cit.*, proposed restoring the first name as *[Pa]mphilus* (if not *[Herm]aphilus*) but there is no reference to this article. The same article by Solin offers new suggestions also for texts 7425, 9839 and 9895. For example, in 9839 the correction of *ferramenta perdensa furatus* to *ferramenta per geni[um] iuratus*, was proposed by Solin already in 1973 (*Gnomon* 45, 275), as mentioned in the supplement, but this reading has now been confirmed by his consultation of a better photograph. In the commentary of 2993y, which is a Latin text written in Greek letters, the supplement does not mention Solin's comments in his review of A. Varone – G. Stefani, *op. cit.*, in *Arctos* 44 [2010] 325, where it is pointed out that the traditionally given text form Ὅ[γ]ουστ- (supposedly for Αὐγούστ-) and Νηρ- (supposedly for Νερ-) are not likely to have existed in the original text.

Occasional inaccuracies, missing references, or material that is superfluous in one reviewer's eyes cannot be avoided in a massive work such as the present volume. Being the result of decades of scholarship, it is an impressive effort and a useful reference tool for future scholars. Above I have taken a rather critical view on certain of its features. The aim has been to provide readers of this supplement volume with information about the problems one may encounter in using it. However, the most important evaluation to be given is that in most cases the useful and relevant information is there and can be found, but that sometimes this may be difficult due to the problems described above.

*Hilla Halla-aho*

*Supplementa Italica*. Nuova serie 27 (*Terventum, Urvinum Hortense, Arna, Laus Pompeia*). A cura di GERARDO FRATIANNI – ENRICO ZUDDAS – LORENA ROSI BONCI – MARIA CARLA SPADONI – PAOLA TOMASI. Edizioni Quasar, Roma 2013 (2014). ISBN 978-88-7140-548-3. 344 pp. EUR 46.

Unless my memory fails me, about one new volume per year was promised when this marvellous series was started in 1981. In 2014, we should, then, in theory be arriving at vol. 33. However, clearly the editors were in the beginning a bit too optimistic, and although some might perhaps assume that the pace of publication has become slower in the last few years, for instance because of the economic situation in Italy, the fact is that even during the first decade between 1981 and 1990 only six volumes – vols. 1–6 – were published. The pace became faster in the 1990s, when altogether 12 volumes appeared between 1991 and 2000, but in the following decade between 2001 and 2010 the number of published volumes fell to seven. With two volumes published during the present decade, we have arrived at 27 published volumes. But even if this number is a bit lower than one would expect on the basis of what was initially promised, I do not think that anyone with a serious interest in epigraphy will complain, especially as the publication of this new volume in any case means good news for the epigraphical community.

Up till now, the *Suppl. It.* volumes have been preceded by a "presentazione" by Silvio Panciera, but in this volume, Panciera's introduction is called "commiato" ('leave-taking', or something on these lines), and he ends – after some very interesting observations on the publication of the *Suppl. It.* and, e.g., on the funding of the humanities in Italy in general – accordingly by announcing that he will give up, after 43 years of service, his chairmanship of the Commissione responsabile, within the Unione Accademica Nazionale, for the publication of the *Supplementa* (also of the *Imagines*) and of the series *Iscrizioni greche d'Italia*. This does not, of course, mean that this would be the end of the series, for, as Panciera observes, the series will in good hands after his resignation; it appears that Maria Lazzarini is Panciera's successor as chairman of the Commissione.

As for the contents of the *Supplementum*, we have here four contributions covering one city in Samnium, two in Umbria and one in N. Italy: Terventum by G. Fratianni (pp. 13–93; 39 new inscriptions); Urvinum Hortense by E. Zuddas (pp. 95–199, the most substantial contribution with 89 new texts); Arna by L. Rosi Bonci & M. C. Spadoni (pp. 201–35, with eight "new" inscriptions, of which no less than four were already registered in *CIL* XI); Laus Pompeia by P. Tomasi (pp. 237–331, with 28 new texts).

Most of the "new" inscriptions included here have of course been published earlier in various journals and were as such already known, e.g., though the *Année épigraphique*. But there are also previously unpublished texts, e.g., Urvinum no. 1 (an interesting Republican inscription set up in honour of the goddess Minerva by four *mag(istri)* of an *opifi(cum) conl(egium)*, two of them freedmen and both without cognomina) and Arna no. 6. However, it is of course not only the new (or "new") inscriptions in the *Supplementa Italica* volumes that are interesting, but also the addenda to the inscriptions already included in the *CIL* and, of course, the introductions to the individual cities.

As usual, the commentaries both to the inscriptions in the addenda and to the new texts tend to be pretty profuse. This is, of course, good inasmuch as the reader can be sure, e.g., that all readings of a difficult inscription have been registered in the commentaries. On the other hand, in the case of unproblematic inscriptions one wonders whether it is really of any use to record all false readings and various misunderstandings by (say) 19th-century local men; for instance, a certain B. Martani, active in the 1880s and 1890s, is said have read "male" several times in the contribution on Laus Pompeia (e.g., "male Martani" p. 294 on no. 6362), but I wonder if this information is really needed. I also wonder if the references to onomastic handbooks are, in the case of very common names, really needed (note, e.g., *Rufus* being illustrated by the citation of eight different pages in Kajanto's *Latin Cognomina* on p. 295). I also wonder if anyone turns to this volume in order to find information on (say) the etymology of the nomen *Marius* (said to be derived from the "nome osco Marhais [sic]" on p. 52 on no. 2784).

On the other hand, sometimes there is something that could have been added to a particular commentary. For instance, in the commentary of almost a full page to *CIL* IX 2597 from Terventum on pp. 40f., it might have been added that the title *flaminalis* is in fact extremely rare (*Arctos* 44 [2010] 222f.). Moreover, the policy of not quoting the text of the inscriptions in the addenda section (a policy I would like see changed) sometimes results in the situation where the reader is left uncertain about the interpretation of the editor in question. For instance, the commentary on p. 225 on *CIL* XI 5615 from Arna does not in my view make it sufficiently clear that what we have here is not a "mention" of the consuls of AD 150, but an inscription being dated by these consuls. As there is a *vacat* after *M. Gavio*, it seems probable that the

consul was referred to by only one cognomen, the correct reading thus perhaps being *M. Gavius* [*Squilla* (or *Gallicano*)], / *Sex. Carminius* [*Vetere co(n)s(ulibus)*]. In the addenda to *CIL* V 6350 on p. 287, it would have been interesting to know what the editor thinks of the letter *f* following on *T. Allius Naevianus*.

Terventum (Trivento) in Samnium is the subject of G. Fratianni. From the map on p. 23 it appears that some places familiar to those dealing with Samnites and Oscan inscriptions – e.g., Agnone and Pietrabbondante – belong to the territory of this town which, by the way, seems to lack a proper museum (p. 35). Most of the new inscriptions here were already known through the author's 2010 publication *Terventum. Carta archeologica della media valle del Trigno* (*AE* 2010, 373ff.). Reading this contribution, I could not in the beginning help wondering about the frequent use of the accusative absolute in the inscriptions of this city. The numerous references to my colleague A. Helttula's book on this phenomenon start on p. 40 (on *CIL* IX 2596, followed by the commentaries on nos. 2603, 2604, 2610, 2614), but when I observed this book being quoted as an illustration also to no. 23 (*CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 3207), where the *ipsa verba* were added, namely "*C(aius) Mamius Mar(aei) filius* / *heic situs est*", where I could not see an accusative, not to speak of an accusative absolute, I understood that something must have gone wrong. Having studied the matter I found out that all references to Helttula's *Studies on the Latin Accusative Absolute* are in fact to another book published in 1987, namely to my book on the Roman praenomina (*Die römischen Vornamen*). It would be most interesting to know how this error could have originated. In any case, the author does quote the *Vornamen* also using its real name; however, on p. 53 (on no. 2789), instead of the reference to p. 129, where I enumerate some instances of the name *Pupus* in Northern Italy, it would have been better to quote pp. 62–5, where I show that within a nomenclature like this – *pup. Pontius T. f. Vo[l.] Proculus* – *pup.* is not to be considered a name at all (not to speak of a Northern Italian name), but the abbreviation of the term *pupillus*. As for individual inscriptions, in no. 13 (*AE* 1991, 436) the reading of line 7 is given as *cum quo vixit ann(is) [---]*, but there does not seem to be any space for the number of years, and instead of *cum quo* I cannot help seeing *Clemens* and thinking that this must be the brother of Pudens in line 8 (the rest of line 7 escapes me).

As mentioned above, the contribution by E. Zuddas on Urvinum Hortense (between Vettona and Mevania, close to the medieval village of Collemancio) contains the largest number of new inscriptions in this volume. However, although there are interesting texts (e.g., the trapezophori nos 21 and 22), many of the inscriptions are only small fragments – although in the case of nos. 82–87 even "fragment" sounds a bit too grand, for in these texts not a single letter can be identified (no wonder each of them is said to be "inedito"). This is a learned contribution with references also to, e.g., recently published military diplomas in order to establish the date of *CIL* XI 5178 (p. 134). On p. 140 the author correctly points out that the inscription *CIL* XI 5196 is "eccezionale" inasmuch as it mentions two sons of a freedman both inheriting the father's cognomen (this is in fact the only attestation of this scenario in the whole of the Roman empire). However, the reference should not have been to my book on *Adoptive Nomenclature*, but to that on the *Vornamen*.

As mentioned above, the contribution on Arna does not contain many new inscriptions, but that on Laus Pompeia is a more substantial chapter with 28 new texts (many of them Christian), although no. 28 consists in fact only of "osservazioni preliminari" (by G. Bevilacqua) on a *defixio* yet to be published. Perhaps the most interesting text is no. 5, a decree of AD 166 of the local *collegium centonariorum* regarding the choice of a patron. The first six

lines have been known since 1987 (*AE* 1987, 464), but an unpublished fragment, with another seven lines, is added here. The new fragment offers some familiar expressions, e.g., *ut ad ei]-us praesidium confugiamus* (for *praesidium* cf., e.g., *CIL* V 532 = *ILS* 6680 = *Inscr. It.* X 4, 31, for *confugiamus* cf. *AE* 1992, 301 with *ut ad clientelam tuam refugire [sic] debeamus*). As for the already published fragment, the text is here presented as [*referentibus --- R]ufino et etc. --- [v(erba) f(ecerunt)]*, but it is perhaps more common to begin in this context with *quod* (for *quod referentibus* etc. see, e.g., *CIL* XI 970 = *ILS* 7216; *AE* 1991, 713). With this construction, with everyone (as in this text) appearing in the ablative, the phrase *verba facere* must be in the passive because otherwise the subject would be missing. I thus suggest that the text should run as follows: [*quod referentibus --- R]ufino et etc. --- [v(erba) f(acta) s(unt)]*, the contents of the *verba* being expressed as an *accusativus cum infinitivo* (cf. *equi]tem Romanum* in line 7, *adornasse* in line 8).

In spite of these observations on some details, I would like to point out that this is a fine book which I have already used with profit.

Olli Salomies

GIOVANNA CICALA: *Instrumentum domesticum inscriptum proveniente da Asculum e dal suo territorio*. Biblioteca di studi antichi 91. Fabrizio Serra editore, Pisa – Roma 2010. ISBN 978-88-6227-180-6. 437 pp. EUR 145.

Si tratta di un catalogo dell'*instrumentum inscriptum* proveniente dal territorio della romana Asculum, nato da una tesi di dottorato discussa a Pisa nel 2006. Precedono considerazioni su questa categoria di scritti, sulla loro consistenza e sulla storia di varie collezioni di reperti. Il catalogo stesso è molto minuzioso, descrivendo i pezzi con grande puntigliosità. D'altra parte esso lascia molto a desiderare. I testi stessi non sono sempre stati editi con dovuta accuratezza; per es. nell'uso dei segni diacritici regna una certa imprecisione. Già all'inizio, n. 26 si legge "M^A", ma non si capisce che cosa voglia dire (dalla foto si potrebbe concludere che l'a. voleva indicare un nesso di M e A; questo segno ^ tra due lettere si ripete poi spesso e sembra appunto indicare nessi di lettere; ora, l'a. avrà probabilmente voluto mettere il segno ^ sopra la prima lettera di un nesso, come si suole fare in edizioni epigrafiche, ma avrebbe dovuto essere più attenta nella lettura delle bozze e cercare di mettere il segno ^ al suo posto giusto). Inoltre, un largo numero di pezzi subito all'inizio del catalogo, bolli su ceramica a vernice nera, non contengono iscrizioni propriamente dette; *cui bono* dunque la loro estesa trattazione? Poi salta agli occhi la bassa qualità delle riproduzioni fotografiche, in base alle quali è spesso impossibile un controllo delle letture (l'editore non poteva permettersi una carta migliore per le foto?). Già all'inizio, il n. 24 dovrebbe recare graffita la scritta *Aria*, ma dalla foto non si distingue niente. È specialmente irritante il fatto che i numeri del catalogo e delle riproduzioni fotografiche non sempre concordino (così è almeno dal n. 178 in avanti); l'a. doveva essere più attenta nella preparazione del libro per la stampa: ora il lettore riesce a trovare nel catalogo le foto relative a una determinata iscrizione solo con una certa fatica.

Di seguito mi limito a segnalare alcune false o sospette letture o interpretazioni che mi sono capitate sotto gli occhi nell'esame dell'opera: n. 31 dovrebbe contenere la scritta CHOE/RIO. Dalla foto non si distingue assolutamente niente. Dal minuzioso lemma non risulta chi