

A brief conclusion lays out directions for future research, most notably through consideration of ‘mystery cults’ and Christianity, while appendices discuss two subjects in more detail: the sometimes malicious dead known as *Larvae* and the chronology of the *Lemuria*.

In a book this ambitious, some weaknesses can be expected. Ch. 6, on the funeral, largely abandons the idea of belief clusters, instead opting for a more traditional method that attempts to mould scattered evidence into a unified picture of ‘the’ Roman funeral. A more consistent approach might have built the argument from clusters of belief/practice by which funerals often included processions, sacrifices, incense, garlands, communal meals and other common indicators of cult, without necessitating a more complete — and significantly less trustworthy — narrative of rites. More broadly, the use of belief clusters sometimes seems to universalise the data in ways that might be counterproductive, discouraging investigations into changes through time, for example, or even into how genre might impact the ways an author discusses death and the afterlife. Nevertheless, these issues do not compromise the significance of the work, instead indicating areas where future research might expand and refine it.

*The Ancient Roman Afterlife* grew out of a dissertation completed more than two decades ago, and the many years K. has spent grappling with his question are clear throughout. The central thesis is simple and strong, leaving the reader wondering how the field could so thoroughly have overlooked such a key aspect of Roman life. As importantly, this is a book that invites questions. Its implications are far-reaching, and its conclusions cannot be ignored. It should generate discussion and debate well beyond the field of funerary studies.

Tulane University  
aemmerso@tulane.edu

ALLISON L. C. EMMERSON

doi:10.1017/S0075435822000120

© The Author(s), 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

SILVIO PANCIERA (ED.), *CORPVS INSCRIPTIONVM LATINARVM. INSCRIPTIONES VRBIS ROMAE LATINAE. VOL. VI, PARS 8, FASC. I, LIB. I.* Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018. Pp. XXXVII + 155, illus., 4 folded maps. ISBN 9783110626599. €164.95.

Silvio Panciera, a world-renowned ancient historian and one of the most talented and passionate Latin epigraphists of recent decades, was born in Venice in 1933 and died in Rome, aged 83, on 16 August 2016. This large, folio-size posthumous supplement of the *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum* may rightly be considered as one of his major achievements, and a crucial element of his remarkable legacy.

A preliminary note by Werner Eck, included at the beginning of the book, reports that the Berlin Academy of Sciences had officially entrusted P. with the publication of the supplements of the sixth volume of *CIL* on 6 January 1960, following four years of exploratory meetings and correspondence between his *maestro* Attilio Degraffi (to whom *CIL* VI.8 is dedicated) and Johannes Irmscher, then Executive Director of the Institut für griechisch-römische Altertumskunde at the Academy of Sciences of the German Democratic Republic (see also P., *Helikon* 4 (1964), 376–81; reprinted in *Epigrafi, epigrafia, epigrafisti. Scritti vari editi e inediti*, Rome 2006, 1727–31). A few years later, in 1963, P. received his first appointment as *Professore incaricato* to the chair of Latin Epigraphy at the Sapienza University of Rome (G. Gregori, *SEBarc*, 14 (2016), 13–19). Over the following decades, P. and his pupils created an enormous paper archive (*schedario*) with annexed photographs, devoted to the Latin inscriptions from the ancient city of Rome, which currently covers more than 50,000 records and is kept at the Dipartimento di Scienze dell’Antichità of the Sapienza, where it is open to the public (<https://www.antichita.uniroma1.it/epigrafia>; see V. Morizio in *Silvio Panciera (1933–2016). In memoria di un maestro. Riflessioni* (2019), 87–90).

The sixth volume of *CIL* is devoted to the Latin inscriptions of the city of Rome (*Inscriptiones urbis Romae Latinae*) written before the early seventh century C.E. (the conventional terminus is the death of Pope Gregory I in 604). It is divided into eight parts or tomes, all written in Latin, some of which comprise several fascicles. To understand what the reader should expect to find in *CIL* VI.8.1.1, it is necessary to recall briefly the whole structure of *CIL* VI, which is by far the

richest and most densely articulated volume of the whole *Corpus* (for full details, see <https://cil.bbaw.de/hauptnavigation/das-cil/baende>). Its first part was published in 1876 by Wilhelm Henzen (with the aid of Eugen Bormann) and includes sacred inscriptions, along with inscriptions mentioning emperors, magistrates, priests and soldiers. The second and third parts (1882; 1886), as well as the first fascicle of the fourth part (1894), were prepared by Henzen with the help of Bormann and Christian Hülsen and are devoted to the funerary inscriptions of ‘common people’, including craftsmen and people buried in *columbaria*. The second and third fascicles of the fourth part (1902; 1933) embrace additions (*Additamenta*) and their update (*Additamentorum auctarium*), published by Hülsen and Martin Bang and based on material already collected by Henzen. The fifth part (1885, edited by Henzen, with the aid of Bormann and Hülsen) contains over 3,600 forged epigraphic texts attributed to the ancient city of Rome (now partly available online through the Epigraphic Database Falsae: <http://edf.unive.it>). An *Index nominum* was edited by Bang in 1926 as VI.6.1; this also included the *nomina* of VI.4.3, which was only published in 1933, as well as other *nomina* mentioned in inscriptions intended for a later fascicle that never saw the light because its manuscript was destroyed during the bombings of Berlin in spring 1944. These inscriptions had already been numbered by Bang (*CIL* VI 39341–39800) and have become known as the ‘ghost-numbers’ (*Geisternummern*) of the *Corpus*, to which we shall return soon. Another victim of the war was the *Index cognominum*, which had to be redone from scratch and was only published in 1980 by Ladislav Vidman in East Berlin as VI.6.2. In 2006, the third fascicle of the sixth part, including a grammatical index of irregular word forms in *CIL* VI organised by lemmata, was published posthumously by A.E. and J.S. Gordon. Meanwhile, six mammoth fascicles of the seventh part appeared thanks to the joint efforts of the University of Western Australia, Nedlands, and the Academy of Sciences of the German Democratic Republic (1974–1975): they comprise a complete computer-generated word index of *CIL* VI. The seventh fascicle of the seventh part was published in 1989 and includes an index of the *Notae numerorum* and of enclitics by Luise Hallof, as well as a topographic index of the additions by Ursula Lehmann.

Let us now come to P.’s work. Despite being numbered as VI.8.1, this supplement actually saw the light after VI.8.2 and VI.8.3. The latter are the two exemplary fascicles dedicated to imperial inscriptions, and inscriptions mentioning magistrates of the senatorial and equestrian orders published by Géza Alföldy and a large group of international scholars in 1996 and 2000. P. had already written a *Praefatio generalis* for the first of these supplements, dated December 1993, which was followed by two short additions, dated October 1994 and February 2000, respectively. All these texts are now reprinted at the beginning of VI.8.1 and offer the necessary background for understanding the complex genesis of the whole editorial project, as well as its main methodological innovations. They are followed by a *Praefatio huius fasciculi*, written by P. in January 2016, and a short *addendum* written in May 2017 by Antonella Ferraro, Sara Meloni and Silvia Orlandi, which explains how the manuscript, handed over by P. before his death, was brought to publication.

After three lists of different abbreviations and a short guide to the diacritics used in transcriptions, the actual contents of the supplement begin with a full treatment of the ‘ghost-numbers’ of *CIL* VI (on which see S. Rebenich, in *XIV Congressus Internationalis Epigraphiae Graecae et Latinae. Akten* (2014), 53–4). P.’s painstaking investigations allowed him to assign a good many of these numbers to actual inscriptions according to Bang’s original plan. Of a total of over 460 inscriptions (*CIL* VI 39341–39800: note that some numbers refer to more than one inscription), roughly half of them have been identified with certainty, since they bear names already included in Bang’s 1926 *Index nominum*. *CIL* numbers for another 120 or so inscriptions have been conjectured by P. with a good degree of confidence (p. 4067: *coniectura recognoscere potui satis probabiliter*) and are indicated in square brackets. The remaining numbers (a few more than a hundred) were impossible to assign and are given in double square brackets without any suggested identification. For each identified or conjectured inscription, P. gives a short description of the monument, its location, if traceable, and a list of its main editions, including its entry number in the Epigraphic Database Roma (<http://www.edr-edr.it>). The concordance of the ‘ghost-numbers’ is thus a valuable and long sought-after tool, which is essential to a full appreciation of the epigraphy of the ancient city of Rome.

The following section contains the core part of the book and is devoted to *res sacrae*, i.e. inscriptions belonging to the religious sphere (including *defixiones*, which will appear in a future fascicle by Heikki Solin), from Rome and its suburbs. This section comprises two halves of approximately equal size. The first encompasses additions and corrections to inscriptions already published in earlier fascicles of *CIL* VI (*Addenda et corrigenda*); the second is devoted to

inscriptions that were previously missing from the *Corpus* (*Tituli huius editionis*). Since the latest *Additamentorum auctarium* of *CIL* VI was published by Bang in 1933 (the year of P.'s birth, one may note) and only included *tituli in solo urbano et in vicinia reperti, quotquot innotuerunt ad annum 1915 exeuntem* (*CIL* VI.4.3, *Praefatio*), it follows that this new supplement covers over a century of new discoveries. P. also points out (pp. XI, XV) that Bang's investigations had missed quite a few monuments which had come to light before 1915.

P.'s death did not allow him to publish all the sacred inscriptions from Rome in this supplement, but only those dedicated to deities whose names begin with the letters A–F. Yet this body of evidence is already incredibly rich and includes the critical edition of 319 epigraphic texts. Among these, 246 had previous entries in the *Corpus*, while seventy-three are included for the first time in *CIL*, even if only four of them were entirely unpublished. There is actually little difference as to how these two groups of inscriptions are treated. The main variation consists in the presence of photographs or drawings, which, unfortunately, are only given for the second group.

In all circumstances, the entry for each inscription offers a full account of the monument (where it still exists), including its typology, material, dimensions, lettering, iconographic features and, if available, information on its findspot and later transfers up to its current location. Subsequently, the author gives a list of bibliographic references (which may include some mentions of epigraphic manuscripts) and indicates through the standard formulas *contuli* and *descripsi* whether he had the opportunity to check the inscription by autopsy; this is the case with almost all the surviving monuments, even if a few of them were sought in vain (*frustra quaesivi*) because they became unavailable in relatively recent years. Each inscription is accompanied by a reference to its EDR entry. This is a fundamental feature, which enables the reader to connect the static information provided by the paper supplement to an online database that can constantly be updated. It is a major desideratum that all future instalments of the *Corpus* adopt a similar approach and incorporate references to permanent and reliable digital resources, such as those of the EAGLE Europea Network (<https://www.eagle-network.eu>).

After the description of the inscribed object, each entry offers a transcription of the text, which is given in lower case and follows the Krummrey-Panciera system (fully explained at pp. XXXV–XXXVII). The critical edition also includes an apparatus with palaeographic notes and variant readings. One of the most innovative features of the supplement is the presence of short historical commentaries (covering religious, topographical, prosopographical and chronological matters), which P. explicitly defends in his *Praefatio* (p. XV: *At ego et omnes titulos cura dignos duco et utilem et generosum virum puto, qui longa consuetudine nisus, quae ei est cum loci cuiusdam titulis eorumque difficultatibus, sententiam suam de his rebus non taceat*). This decision contrasts with the traditionally laconic and sometimes daunting style of the *CIL* (see Theodor Mommsen in *CIL* III, p. VII: *Explicatio titulorum ab hoc opere aliena est*) but is particularly welcome at a time when epigraphic research struggles to survive and needs to become accessible to a wider audience.

As historians and epigraphers know, each inscription has many stories to tell and, one might add, may bring more problems than solutions. Almost none of the epigraphic documents edited by P. can be considered a simple source to investigate; yet the amount and quality of information that every single entry of the supplement provides are enormous. Furthermore, the whole fascicle can be used as an up-to-date and effective resource on the cults of Roman gods and goddesses (conveniently listed in alphabetical order), as well as a tool for identifying the actors and places of religious activities in and around ancient Rome. Any future research on the history of Roman religion will have to take into account the results of P.'s work. Indeed, his monumental legacy proves yet again that epigraphy should not just be considered a traditional discipline based on philological criticism, but an ever-innovative science that investigates ancient monuments, their life-cycles and the contexts in which they were displayed, through cutting-edge and interdisciplinary approaches.

Ca' Foscari University of Venice  
lorenzoc@unive.it

LORENZO CALVELLI

doi:10.1017/S0075435822000016

© The Author(s), 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.