first-century Roman military camp at Mainz as an assertion of Romanness. As with the funerary portrait reliefs of early imperial freedmen at Rome, which advertise the *gravitas* of the newly enfranchised, the type of a horseman riding down an enemy favored by auxiliary cavalrymen at Mainz—Roman virtue triumphing over barbarism—stakes a claim to the citizen status that only their premature deaths denied them.

An Athenocentric focus in the contributions on the Hellenic world does little to diminish the success of the volume in illustrating a range of approaches to exploiting funerary inscriptions in order to reconstruct the social history of classical antiquity. Vestergaard and Davies address new questions of interest; Stears provides valuable synthesis and skillful analysis; and Oliver and Hope bring methodological clarity and conceptual sophistication to the interpretation of epitaphs within their original contexts.

Brown University JOHN BODEL
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni178

INSCRIPTIONS IN NAPLES

G. Camodeca, H. Solin (edd.): *Catalogo delle iscrizioni latine del Museo Nazionale di Napoli (ILMN). Vol. I: Roma e Latium.* Pp. 399, pls. Naples: Loffredo Editore, 2000. Paper, €36.15. ISBN: 88-8096727-4.

Anyone who has ventured into the bowels of Naples Archaeological Museum will gaze in wonder at this volume, which catalogues in exemplary fashion over 650 Latin (and a few Greek) inscriptions from Rome and Latium, most of which belong to the museum's Farnese and Borgia collections. The vast majority of them are epitaphs, with Jewish and Christian inscriptions from Rome's catacombs as well as pagan ones. These range from the mundane to the quirky, my favourite being a verse epitaph for a horse (no. 154). The other inscriptions range from Republican *leges* (*Lex Cornelia de XX quaestoribus* and *Lex Antonia de Termessibus*) to imperial dedications, patronal tablets, honorific statue bases, religious dedications, and *fistulae*. Modern copies and forgeries come at the end.

A few of the inscriptions in this catalogue have already benefited from modern republication in new fascicles of *CIL* VI, but two of these deserve comment. What was once thought to be a dedication by a doctor to his father (*CIL* X 1675), turns out to be a monumental dedication to Augustus (*CIL* VI 40312a = no. 20), whilst a dedication to Titus (no. 23) shows Rome's thirty-five urban tribes acting as a collective unit alongside the *plebs urbana frumentaria* (*CIL* VI 40453a).

Every text has been carefully reassessed on the basis of autopsy, correcting many minor errors in *CIL*. Other alterations are more significant: changes to names listed on *CIL* VI 200 (no. 6); lines missing from *CIL* VI 16061 (no. 232); and a much improved text is offered of *CIL* VI 32517 (no. 67), which had been compiled without having been able to locate the stone. Autopsy of the curious inscription relating to Sejanus on the Aventine (no. 159) allows for a reassessment of the various supplements on offer, and incidentally reveals that what really mattered for the speaker was his appeal to his fellow-tribesmen, inscribed in larger letters. The volume ends with a superb

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

photographic record of all the inscriptions, often including close-ups and side-views, as well as shots from the front. Together with detailed verbal descriptions, this makes possible a new appreciation of these inscriptions as monuments. Sometimes *CIL* is found to have provided misleading information, describing what is actually a plaque as a *parva basis*, *epistylium*, or *arula* (nos 18, 20, 253). More strikingly, *CIL*'s *tabula marmorea* turns out to be a 'cippo di basalto a forma amigdaloide' (no. 291). A minor quibble is that although the range of letter heights is given for every inscription, variation between individual lines is not always specified. Historical commentary and bibliography has been deliberately kept to a minimum.

This volume is not just of appeal for its epigraphic catalogue, however, since it also contains two essays on the history of the Farnese and Borgia collections. These are of general interest for the history of collecting in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, revealing, for example, the different strategies of the Farnesi and their librarian Fulvio Orsini. Whereas the former prioritized inscriptions of artistic merit, the latter showed appreciation of their historical significance (acquiring legal texts on bronze, for instance). Painstaking archival research reveals about fifty inscriptions now attributable to the Borgia collection. Consequently, several inscriptions thought to be from Puteoli have now been reassigned to Rome or Ostia (nos 125, 143, 178, 194), and some inscriptions previously published as separate entries have been reunited (nos 68, 382). Finally, a group of inscriptions from the area of the vigna Codini, thought to be forgeries by Ligorio, are now deemed authentic (nos 86–97).

This catalogue now makes possible further work on these inscriptions. Four indexes list the inscriptions by corpus, *ILMN*, inventory number, and Fiorelli catalogue number. This will help scholars to discover quickly whether or not an inscription published in the major corpora is housed at Naples. As the first of four projected volumes in the series *ILMN*, it certainly whets the appetite for more.

University of Warwick ALISON E. COOLEY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni179

GENEVA PAPYRI

P. Schubert, I. Jornot: *Les Papyrus de Genève. Premier volume, 2e édition. Nos 1–10, 12–44, 66–78, 80–81: textes documentaires*. With contributions by C. Wick. Pp. xiii + 287, pls. Geneva: Bibliothèque Publique et Universitaire de Genève, 2002. Cased, SFr 80. ISBN: 2-88220-021-8.

When Jules Nicole published the first fascicule of Volume I of the Geneva papyri in 1896, the modern study of Greek documentary papyri was very much in its infancy. The first volumes from London, Berlin, and Vienna, and the first two of Petrie papyri, had already appeared, but papyrologists were still feeling their way forward. Two main approaches to the editing of texts were emerging (leaving aside the issue of whether the Greek should be accented or not). Mahaffy, Kenyon, and Wessely favoured an explanatory mode, with an attempt to introduce each document and comment on at least some of the difficulties of reading and interpretation; Mahaffy occasionally translated a piece, but Wessely was the first to do so regularly.

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni179 Published online by Cambridge University Press