

traccia tra le dense e ricche pagine dell'opera, mentre avrebbe verosimilmente meritato maggiore risalto.

I pochi rilievi svolti nulla tolgono, tuttavia, al valore della monografia di Maurizi, il quale ha meritoriamente, ed in modo pienamente condivisibile, deciso di lasciar "parlare" innanzitutto le fonti, in merito alle numerose questioni che il tema oggetto della ricerca suscita, e, con stile chiaro ed elegante, è riuscito a realizzare un lavoro capace di stimolare nuovi spunti di riflessione, il quale rappresenterà un imprescindibile punto di riferimento e confronto per le future ricerche in materia.

Tommaso Beggio

NICOLÒ GIUSEPPE BRANCATO: *Repertorium delle trasmissioni del gentilizio nel mondo romano sulla base della documentazione epigrafica*, vol. II (*Italia - Epilogus*). ARTECOM-onlus, Roma 2011. ISBN 978-88-96520-03-1. 420 pp. EUR 80.

This book is the second volume of a large study on the transmission of gentile names in the Roman world (the first volume (2009) having been reviewed by O. Salomies)⁴. As the title suggests, the material for the study consists of epigraphic documents from the Italian peninsula (the first volume pertaining to the provinces). The material is geographically divided into the Italian *regiones* and the city of Rome. A CD is also included in this volume but unfortunately, not having access to a CD-ROM drive myself, I have not been able to make use of it. I hope this has not affected my evaluation in any significant way.

The topic is promising and has the potential to be an intriguing study. Since the transmission of the gentile name in most cases followed the regular pattern of children inheriting their father's name, one would be particularly interested in scenarios where this was not the case, i.e. where children would carry a *nomen* different from their father's. Like in the first volume, the author has compiled not only the cases concerning the transmission of a non-paternal *nomen*, which are found under the subcategory "Duo gentilicia" (or sometimes "Tria gentilicia", or even "Quattuor") of each chapter, but also all other cases where the transmission of gentile names can be observed (i.e. where at least two relatives, such as father and son, are recorded). As for the topic, these latter cases are naturally rather uninteresting *per se* (in other words, the fact that the children of, say, a P. Aelius are also Aelii, is not particularly astonishing), but when taken into consideration statistically, they help us understand how common it actually was to *not* have a paternal name in the Roman world. However, one may wonder if the manner in which the data is presented (consistent, to be sure, with the first volume) is always reasonable. Whereas the geographical division of the material is understandable, one cannot help but ask why, for example, the epigraphic data of each *regio* is divided into such categories as "funerarie" and "non funerarie". To make it clear: it is rather irrelevant (as Salomies duly noted) from the point of view of the transmission of *nomina*, if the document in question was an epitaph or some other type of inscription.

There also seem to be some misinterpretations and/or errors with regard to the epigraphic data. For instance, on p. 14, "mater filio: *CIL V 7520 Rubria Varieno C. f. Secunda filio L. Mettio L.*

⁴ In *AAHG* 64 (2011) 184–188.

f. maritoque L. Attio St(f) f.", the woman ought to be called '*Rubria C. f. Secunda*' whose husband was '*L. Attius St. f. Varienus*' (the author is probably right that the son was "di primo letto"; hence the discrepancy of *nomina*); also on p. 39, "*Filia parentibus: CIL V 4755 Valeria L. f. Fabia parentibus Bittalio Epagatio et Maesiae Primae*", where Bittalio Epagatius, in fact, seems to be Valeria's *maritus*, not her father (the Clauss-Slaby database gives the following reading: *V(iva) f(ecit) / Valeria / L(uci) f(ilia) Fabia sib(i) / et Bittalio / Epagatio marit(o) / opt(i)mo Maesia / Prima parentib(us)*). The author also seems to reject the widely accepted idea that the word *frater* ought not to be taken literally in every situation, particularly in the military context. This in turn seems to lead to some unnecessary assumptions of "duo gentilicia".

A useful feature of this second volume is the inclusion of a section dedicated to a comprehensive statistical analysis of the material (the so-called "Epilogus"), which the first volume lacked. The author has not been satisfied in a purely onomastic analysis but seems to have proceeded to address several other topics as well, intending the work to be useful for "ulteriori ricerche di carattere socio/antropologico". The section is divided in four chapters: I: "Problemi onomastici"; II: "Tipologie dedicatorie nucleari"; III: "Categorie ed occupazioni"; and IV: "La repubblica. Il cristianesimo. Commiato".

The first chapter, dealing with onomastic questions, is the one that, in my view, is the most important – the chapter that should be the primary focus of such a work. Here the author addresses questions and problems regarding the cases with discrepant *nomina* and presents several statistical tables concerning, amongst other things, their geographical distribution. The first tables are apparently meant to give an over-all view of the situation, although they may not be as useful as they could be since they include all cases of discrepant *nomina*, regardless of the reason behind them. Therefore some cases included here may not be of much relevance to the problem of how and why non-paternal names were transmitted in the Roman world. For instance, the particular Gallo-German habit of deriving one's *nomen* from the father's *cognomen* may be an interesting phenomenon in itself but it does not tell much about the Roman onomastic habits on a general scale, or if we have former slaves manumitted by different patrons, it is in fact of no consequence to the question why Romans sometimes had a different *nomen* than their fathers.

What follows is a discussion on the reasons for non-paternal *nomina*. First, the author goes through the juridical reasons, including, amongst other things, adoption and various scenarios of illegitimacy – that is, reasons which more or less dictated the choice of name. After the juridical reasons, the author proceeds to "causali diverse". These include, as the author states in the opening paragraph, situations where a non-paternal *nomen* was used even if there were no legal obligations to do so. This, in my view, is a most interesting phenomenon and certainly worthy of a systematic analysis. The discussion that follows, however, leaves much to be desired. First, the term "uso narbonense", which is used throughout the book to refer to cases with a maternal *nomen* and a paternal *cognomen*, is now discussed and explained. I am not completely convinced that such a term is necessary or even particularly useful, as the reasons for such naming practices certainly vary a lot and are in no way restricted to Gallia Narbonensis; in other words the term "uso narbonense" does not really help to answer the question why a certain type of nomenclature was preferred. Furthermore, as the term quite often covers cases where the use of a maternal name was due to illegitimate birth, it is somewhat unclear why the term needs to be addressed in this particular chapter. To be sure, the author makes clear that the term sometimes also covers cases where children were born in a legal

marriage, and which thus present the transmission of a maternal *nomen* "in deroga alla norma", but it would perhaps be better if these cases alone, and no other aspects of the "uso narbonense", were discussed here. In fact, it would perhaps be better to get rid of the whole term, at least in this context, since it does not always refer to cases where maternal names were preferred over paternal ones – nor do such cases have to have anything to do with the "uso narbonense" (which the author himself points out on p. 341).

The actual discussion regarding the transmission of maternal names comes only later (under "Nomina matris aut alterius"), with – somewhat unexpectedly – a brief overview of the Gallo-German habit of deriving one's gentile name from the paternal *cognomen* in between. The way in which the whole onomastic analysis in general is structured could, in fact, be a lot simpler, as now the reader is sometimes lead to expect something that may actually follow only much later. In any event, the author now returns to the reasons for using the maternal *nomen*. Most of these are of juridical nature, and thus already discussed before under "causali giuridiche", but the author also returns to the intriguing question concerning those cases where children would receive their mother's (or in any case a non-paternal) *nomen* even if there were no legal obligations to do so. He refers to senatorial families, among which it sometimes occurred that a maternal nomenclature was preferred if that line was more prominent than the paternal one. One could for instance easily think of such cases as Nero's wife Poppaea Sabina, daughter of T. Ollius, or a certain Domitia Calvina, daughter of Calpurnius Bibulus, both of whom had their names taken from the maternal side. The problem is that the author here seems to link such cases with polyonymy, which certainly does not seem to be the case with e.g. the two above-mentioned ladies – although he also takes into consideration, and rightly so, such factors as social prestige (with reference to Cenerini and Chausson).

The second chapter of the "Epilogus" ("Tipologie dedicatorie nucleari") focuses on the different types of dedicatory groups of relatives (*alumni, fratres, parentes, filii*), as presented throughout the material. Somewhat unsurprisingly the author concludes that among the *alumni* the percentage of the discrepancy is the highest. He seems to be somewhat puzzled by the high percentage among brothers, but this could very well be due to at least two reasons: 1) brothers (or siblings in general for that matter) may obviously have different fathers, 2) the word *frater* in some cases does not necessarily refer to an actual male sibling, as pointed out above. All in all, despite the impressive statistical tables and charts, the purpose of this chapter remains somewhat obscure to me. The third one ("Categorie ed occupazioni"), on the other hand, may offer somewhat more relevant information for social-historical purposes, as the author here presents statistics regarding e.g. senators, knights, local magistrates, priests, soldiers and so on in different geographical areas.

In the final chapter of the book, the author briefly discusses republican and Christian evidence, thus attempting, it seems, to take into account the chronological evolution of names, which otherwise is practically non-existent throughout the two volumes (e.g. no approximate dates are given for the inscriptions). Such an attempt is of course welcome, but as all the "pagan" inscriptions of the imperial period are treated as one large material with no regard to chronology, a full diachronic overview remains to be hoped for. Generally speaking, it would have been interesting to see some chronological tables and charts for all the material discussed in the previous chapters, although in a work of this magnitude it would have admittedly required a tremendous amount of additional work. Still, I believe that the work would have benefitted greatly from it.

To conclude, this *Repertorium*, despite its flaws, will surely make a good addition to any reference library. The second volume, along with its statistical observations, no doubt renders the first one, too, more useful.

Tuomo Nuorluoto

The Cambridge World History of Slavery, vol. I. Edited by KEITH BRADLEY and PAUL CARTLEDGE. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2011. ISBN 978-0-521-84066-8. XI, 620 pp. GBP 110, USD 180.

This first volume of the *Cambridge World History of Slavery*, consisting of 22 informative chapters, deals with the major slave societies of classical Greece and Rome. In 9 articles, the volume tackles Roman society and 8 articles explore classical Greek society. One contribution examines slavery in the Hellenistic world briefly and another slavery in the ancient Near East. The last three chapters explore slavery and the Jews, slavery and the rise of Christianity and slavery in the late Roman World. The volume, by 22 authors and more than 500 pages, covers almost every aspect of Greek and Roman slavery. There are two types of contributions; some are chronological surveys of the development of slavery in particular periods or places. Others treat specific topics or themes which seem innovative.

Chapter 5 (pp. 91–111), by Dimitris J. Kyratas, deals with slavery and economy in the Greek world and is meant to sum up the structure of classical Greek slave economies and societies. Kyratas claims (p. 91ff) that there is no clear explanation for how slavery actually worked in the Greek world, even though it was an important element of everyday life. In classical Athens and other cities with similar social institutions, some people were born into slavery. Moreover, the offspring of slaves acquired from abroad became slaves themselves. Kyratas makes the observation (p. 94ff) that only societies that had reached a certain degree of commercialization were interested in commodification of slaves. According to the author, it is difficult to envisage a large-scale slave trade in a world that did not yet use money. It seems that there were no special tasks in which the masters of slaves felt that the employment of slaves could lead to significantly more efficient or productive results. Slaves worked in agriculture and households; they were miners, prostitutes and domestic servants. Nonetheless, the use of slaves was obviously profitable, and in many ways the masters benefited from slave ownership.

Chapter 9 (pp. 176–193), by Ian Morris, draws attention to the question of archaeology and Greek slavery. This is an interesting contribution that is also methodologically of interest. The key question is: what can archaeologists contribute to the study of Greek slavery? Morris asks some basic questions, for instance what slavery is and what are we studying when we study slavery. Interestingly, Morris sketches two ways in which archaeological evidence may make an important contribution to understanding Greek slavery. He claims (p. 177) that when both written and material culture can be combined they probably bring more information together than if the sources were examined by themselves. First Morris compares slave burial practices at Laurium to the rest of Attic burials. Morris draws two conclusions from the Laurium cemetery. First, the information is not sufficient proof to distinguish slave burials from free burials. Burial customs