703, 752, 917, 921): the tree planted by the *Oxford Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* is bearing fruit.

Among military curios is the earliest-known attestation of *Tarantinoi* cavalry at Athens (167: 282/1 B.C.), an inventory of equipment that includes parts of a catapult (185: 343/2 B.C.), and notably a list of soldiers who fought aboard and among four-horse chariots (2198: Cyrene, fourth century B.C.). Roman militaria include a 'pursuer of bandits' (1681: Termessos), a *praepositus custodiarum* (2055: Bostra), a Palmyrene caravan captain (1797: A.D. 144), and another case of military persecution of villagers (1620: Amastris).

Religious life is well represented by (for example) a Spartan gerousiast's dedication of a *theatron* seat (400: sixth century B.C.), a list of a priestess's perquisites (173: Attica, fourth century B.C.), manumission texts (731, 745), texts for cult associations (737, 864, listing many occupations), votives from an archaic sanctuary in Phocis (568–80), cult for a Hellenistic gymnasiarch (1721: Xanthos), pagan pilgrimage dipinti and graffiti from the shrine of the god Piyris (2087–2109: Egypt), and dedications for legendary city founders (841, 2047), while Christianity supervenes with phylacteries (1726), a porch (1411), Byzantine church mosaics (1773, 1766, 1775), and the curse of Judas invoked against tomb-robbers (365).

Epitaphs, naturally, bulk large in the collection. Of particular interest are those which shed light on belief in an afterlife. From Attica, *c.* A.D. 200, is 'Paramonos, son of Euodos, citizen of Piraeus, ephebe of Athens, having made merry many times for a few years with many, here I lie below, fallen into a deep sleep, having my abode with Castor and Pollux,—I am a new Theseus' (286). This connects, at some remove, with a sixth century B.C. Spartan *stele* for a dead *koros* who is shown sculpted as one of the Dioscuri (399). Other notabilia include a tomb possibly for a Xenophontic general (1477: Miletus), one for Metrodora, who dying in childbirth left a house full of her handiwork (1571: third century B.C., Lampsacus), and for a tough Roman gladiator from Marcianopolis (901). Gladiators are further illuminated by a remarkable body of texts from Hierapolis in Phrygia (1657–71). The editors are to be congratulated on another splendid job.

Institute of Classical Studies, London N. P. MILNER

M. Parca: *The Franchetti Collection in Rome. Inscriptions and Sculptural Fragments.* (Opuscula Epigraphica, 6.) Pp. 132, 18 pls. Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1995. Paper. ISBN: 88-7140-085-2.

L. Chioffi: *Gli* Elogia *Augustei del Foro Romano. Aspetti epigrafici e topografici.* (Opuscula Epigraphica, 7.) Pp. 92, 13 pls. Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 88-7140-091-7.

The Franchetti Collection comprised forty-eight Latin inscriptions (two republican) and one Greek; on thirteen sculptural fragments, P. reports Patrizio Pensabene's observations. Each text is followed by a detailed description of the stone (size, decoration, condition); an inventory number; and a well-referenced commentary. There are also forty-two photographs (not all useful; few show a scale).

The book is businesslike, and satisfies modern standards of epigraphic publication. Some of the inscriptions are also intrinsically very interesting (e.g. nos. 1, 3, 11, 34). Yet P.'s discussions, while thorough, rarely rise above the pedestrian, and the overall impression is dissatisfyingly bitty, in large measure a product (to be fair) of the disparate material. More importantly, new answers to old questions are wanting. The style is wearying and the English odd (the Statilii, like moneyers, apparently 'issued many consuls in the late Republic and Early Empire', p. 64). The eleven unpublished texts add little to the sum of human happiness; they should have appeared in a small article, together with such comment on the published texts as advanced debate.

The collection was originally, and carelessly, made by one Benedetto Grandi in the 1860s; the editors of *CIL* routinely disbelieved his claims as to provenance (p. 85). Grandi's collection, and his carelessness, have finally been inherited by the Italian state. Thirteen inscriptions, a quarter of

the total, have been lost since then, in the process of transfer to Via Parigi. The greatest merit of P.'s book may be the alarm bells it rings.

The title of C.'s monograph is somewhat misleading, since the inscribed *elogia* from the Forum Romanum, in some sense parallel to the more famous series in the Forum of Augustus, hardly figure. For these texts the student needs to turn instead to C.'s excellent contribution to S. Panciera (ed.), *Iscrizioni greche e latine del Foro Romano e del Palatino* (Rome, 1996), pp. 99–139.

The work is rather a contribution to the ongoing debate on the topography of the Forum Romanum. C. has produced a dense work on one small corner, between the east end of the Basilica Aemilia (C. defends [pp. 37–43], cogently in my view, the traditional identification of this building against the 'new orthodoxy' of Steinby, et al.), the Porticus Gai et Luci, and the temple of Divus Julius.

The style of the work and the organization of its argument make it hard to follow sometimes. Not all of C.'s ideas seem to have been fully worked out; when her picture ought to be sharpest in order to make clear precisely what she thinks, it can go out of focus. The argument seems to be as follows.

C., having already observed that some of the *elogia* had curved, rather than flat, inscribed faces, connects this feature to the remains of a 'modest' monument with both curved and rectilinear surfaces excavated by Lanciani in 1899, between the Porticus Gai et Luci and Divus Julius. This leads into a full study of this area. Here, not further back along the Via Sacra, she argues (not the first to do so), stood the Fornix Fabianus, erected in 121. In the most interesting part of the monograph (pp. 26–35) she examines in full the literary *testimonia* for this monument, and reconstructs its inscriptions and decoration.

The material for this topographical puzzle is familiar; another of the usual suspects now duly appears: the 'Giano', seen and sketched by Ligorio and destroyed by the triumphal way created for Charles V in 1536. For C., this monument seems to be not the Fornix Fabianus, as restored in 57 B.C., but an Augustan absorption of the arch into the Basilica Aemilia/Porticus Paulli. It is not clear when C. thinks this happened (14 B.C.? 2 B.C.? In between?), but the suggestion itself is not implausible: the groundplan of the Porticus shows that it had some sort of 'avancorpo' in this corner (Tav. XIII, top). Equally worth consideration is the idea that on *this* monumental entrance to the Forum from the Via Sacra, and not on the Actian arch, were displayed the consular and triumphal *fasti* (another idea already found elsewhere).

So far, so good. That this monument also carried (pp. 50–3) more than twenty-two *elogia* (plus busts), other inscriptions (including CIL vi.36908, to L. Caesar, and presumably its missing partner to C. Caesar) and perhaps statues, seems much less likely. Despite C.'s calculations (p. 52), the monument would have been hideously over-burdened like this. True, the remains found by Lanciani (not certainly *in situ*) shared with the *elogia* a mixture of curvilinear as well as straight surfaces; but this particular cat might be skinned in other ways. In her earlier study C. identified three new variant *elogium* types in addition to Degrassi's *titulus*/*tabella* distinction. To privilege a taxonomy based on the profile of the face at the expense of other criteria seems hasty.

C. thinks that our *elogia* predate those in the Forum of Augustus (dedicated 2 B.C.). Yet she also seems to think that the monument which housed them was part of the posthumous commemoration of L. and C. Caesar (2 A.D. at the earliest), thus post-dating the Forum of Augustus (so already J. W. Rich, *PBSR* 66 [1998], 105 n. 1 15). A useful appendix (with photographic documentation) on the major inscriptions in Rome dedicated to Augustus' grandsons (pp. 55–68) concludes the book.

C.'s procrustean thesis will probably not command much assent in its main outlines. In addition, the maps and reconstructive drawings are inadequate. Yet where it is clear, the monograph is instructive, useful, and even provocative. It not only draws attention to a very important group of inscriptions (and their accompanying busts)—too often ignored in reconstuctions of the Forum Romanum at this period—thus rendering a signal service, but attempts to set them, along with other similar manifestations of the transition from Republic to monarchy, in their historical context. Although the location of the *elogia* remains uncertain, it is good that their significance is again under discussion.

Brasenose and St Anne's Colleges, Oxford EDWARD BISPHAM