

Die Einführung erfüllt meiner Meinung nach diese Aufgabe gut.

Warszawa

Hanna Szelest

*Salamine de Chypre XIII. Testimonia Salamina*, 2: Corpus épigraphique. Par Jean Pouilloux, Paul Roesch et Jean Marcillet-Jaubert. Avec la collab. de Laurence Darmezin. Paris: de Boccard 1987. 151 S. 3 Abb. 23 Taf. 4° (GS Maison de l'Orient méditerranéen [CNRS - Université Lyon II]. ER 309 du CNRS 'Chypre et le Levant'. Publ. de la mission archéologique française de Salamine de Chypre.)

The epigraphical record of Salamis is unimpressive for a city known to have been as large and important as this one was. The editors of this corpus argue that despite the various excavations on the site, including their own, this situation may be no more than the result of what has been found so far. They therefore think that no sweeping conclusions about the city's institutions should be drawn from silences in the record. That record includes 21 syllabic texts,<sup>1</sup> 20 public documents, 20 dedications to divinities,<sup>2</sup> 24 concerning the Ptolemaic rulers and their governors, 46 'public consecrations and private dedications' (including most notably the dossier of Servius Sulpicius Pancles Veranianus, nos. 106-122), 41 texts concerning emperors,<sup>3</sup> 29 funerary, one Jewish inscription, 38 texts from the period after the refoundation of Salamis as Constantia, 59 small fragments, and 118 inscriptions on ceramic and small objects. We are told that «une trentaine de fragments» were published in 'Salamine de Chypre' VIII and are not reproduced here. Then (97) we are informed that «l'équivalence avec les inscriptions syllabiques du chapitre I se présente comme suit», followed by a list from 1 = 297 to 34 = 329, in order. Since there are not 34 syllabic inscriptions, something is awry. In fact, this table of equivalences is with the fragments in 'Salamine' VIII, as the concordance shows, and has nothing to do with the syllabic texts. What use it serves in either case I cannot see; one might as well have assigned 'publication' numbers to the small fragments in Mitford-Nicolaou listed on p.96 but not republished here. Further, we learn that «la série des anses d'amphores

timbrées a été publiée par Y. Calvet dans 'Salamine de Chypre III: Les timbres amphoriques'...; elle n'a pas été reprise ici». This is only partly true, since (as the concordance on p.127 shows) 18 stamps from 'Salamine' III *have* been reproduced here.

This volume makes Salamis the second Cypriot city to receive an epigraphic corpus, Kourion having been the first.<sup>4</sup> It includes for the most part inscriptions published by earlier editors, but I count 34 inedita, of which only a handful are of any substance. An inadequate concordance (124-27) to earlier publications is provided.<sup>5</sup> The editors are silent about what they mean spatially by 'Salamis'. Thus their no.91, from Drositis (near Sinda, 17 km. from Salamis) suggests an attempt to include the chora, but we are nowhere told what the editors conceive the limits of the chora to have been. Temporally, the volume includes material as early as the ninth century B. C. (Phoenician inscription A) and as late as the seventh after Christ (the 'inscriptions de Constantia' form a separate section, nos. 201-238). In material base, the editors have included inscriptions on small objects and on ceramic, which indeed occupy a considerable part of the corpus (nos. 297-414, more than half of them already published in previous volumes of 'Salamine de Chypre'). The edition of each text includes information about finding,

<sup>1</sup> Nos. 1-20 (there is a 1 bis); but no. 17 actually consists of 4 lines in Greek alphabet plus an *unread* line of syllabic.

<sup>2</sup> Actually, two other texts are added, a dedication to Artemis Paralia (23) which surely does not come from Salamis, and a label of the river-god Eurotas in a mosaic (30). It is not obvious why either was included, and the editors show their lack of conviction by not numbering either one.

<sup>3</sup> Nos. 131-170, plus 156 bis.

<sup>4</sup> The originally planned IG XV for Cyprus never materialized. For Kourion, see T. B. Mitford, 'The Inscriptions of Kourion' (MemAmPhilSoc 83, Philadelphia 1971), with the review of R. S. Bagnall and T. Drew-Bear in Phoenix 27, 1973, 99-117. 213-44; T. Drew-Bear, BASP 9, 1972, 85-107.

<sup>5</sup> Only one previous publication for each text seems to be included; one cannot, for example, find that Le Bas-Waddington 2756 is no. 88, because the 'primary' publication of that is Pouilloux's reedition in RA 1966.

physical description, lemma, text, apparatus, and sometimes a commentary (rarely more than perfunctory). One praiseworthy feature is the fairly consistent provision of a date (even if approximate) for the inscriptions. Another is the large number of translations provided.<sup>6</sup> There are indices for Greek and Latin names, Salaminians found in other sources, Greek and Latin words, ethnics, divinities, kings and emperors, imperial titulature, and chronology. Practice with acephalic words is inconsistent. The 23 plates include a generous provision of illustration, but it is sometimes baffling to find that it is the *inedita* which are not reproduced (as with public documents, where the only unpublished texts are nos. 31 and 33, neither illustrated). The abundant illustration in Mitford and Nicolaou's 'Inscriptions of Salamis', added to what is offered here, makes Salamis one of the best documented sites from the standpoint of epigraphical photography – almost in inverse proportion to its poverty of finds, perhaps.

It is, thus, primarily by illustration, indexing, collection, and consistent presentation, rather than by new information, that this corpus marks an advance over the state of our knowledge beforehand. The editors, however, quite justifiably point out that they have had to cleanse the texts at innumerable points of gratuitous or wrong restorations introduced by the late T. B. Mitford, who dominated Cypriot epigraphy for over four decades.<sup>7</sup> They have, moreover, reread the original stones as far as possible and improved the texts at many points. It is all the more regrettable that they have departed from normal usage in presentation in one salient way. In most cases, the breaking point of a stone is not indicated by square brackets (in the universal usage of documentary editing) but by running a line of dashes up to or away from the point. Sometimes, to be sure, there are brackets, but mostly not. Since there is no explanation of editorial method in the volume, one cannot tell what specious reason underlay this practice.

The volume, which is exceedingly handsome in presentation, was produced in-house at the Maison d'Orient. One normal benefit of such composition is that several stages of printer's work are skipped and revision is possible until late in the production process. Here, however, this seems not to have been true. The volume was apparently printed in early 1987 (deposited in the sec-

ond quarter), but in the introduction we are told that Mitford's long article on Roman Cyprus in ANRW II. 7.2 (1980) was available to them too late to be cited in the lemmas. In fact, virtually nothing after 1980 is cited at all, except for a few works by the editors themselves. Even for the 1970s scholarly literature other than that produced by the Maison d'Orient is virtually ignored,<sup>8</sup> save for the works of Mitford and Nicolaou, which formed useful targets for criticism.<sup>9</sup> A particularly distressing case is no. 76, where a statue base of the Ptolemaic governor Seleukos, first published in 1850, is said to be 'introuvable' in the museum of Turin (i.e., the Egyptological Museum). In 1980, however, appeared an article in which M. Lazzarini reported, from examining the stone in Turin, that the last two letters of the stone in fact read EΘ, not (as Strack had conjectured) KO; the correct restoration, therefore, is Lumbroso's ἔθ[υος], not Strack's κο[ινόν].<sup>10</sup> The reference is therefore not to the royal benefactions to the soldiers themselves but to their countrymen in Crete.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Although these are not without their oddities, such as the «gymnasiarques des Césars» in no. 131, where Καισά[ρων] is surely to be taken with the preceding imperial names, not with γυμνασιαρχῶν.

<sup>7</sup> A typical example is no. 24. One can at times, however, find Mitfordian reasoning here too, as in no. 86, where a restoration printed in the text is defended in the commentary with «on peut donc songer à...», all too reminiscent of Mitford's perennial *exempli gratia* and hardly a compelling brief for printing something as a restoration.

<sup>8</sup> There are, to be sure, some exceptions, like no. 122.

<sup>9</sup> Even there they miss some targets. No mention of Mitford's contribution to the 1978 Lyon colloquium, published in 1980, is made in the discussion of no. 26, even though Mitford extensively reedited it (cf. SEG 30, 1641).

<sup>10</sup> RivFil 108, 1980, 137–41, with a photograph; reproduced in SEG 30, 1640.

<sup>11</sup> In no. 235, the lemma gives no hint that Feissel's article cited there is in fact the first real edition of the text. In no. 78, the commentary shows no sign of having understood the remarks by Koenen cited in the lemma, which effectively demolished

Equally unfortunate is the treatment of nos. 223 and 224, for both of which the editors cite (apart from the *ed. pr.*) editions by Mitford in 1950 and by Sodini in 'Travaux et Mémoires' 4 (1970). What Sodini showed, however, is that these are no more than two copies (Oberhammer and Tubbs) of the same inscription! His conclusion is clearly registered in the BullEp 1971, 707. No. 224 comes closest to reproducing Sodini's text (482); no. 223 should be deleted. Sodini is likewise cited for no. 225, but the indiction number is given as 6 where Sodini had 4, which can be verified on his plate (p. 485; not mentioned in the lemma).

Space does not permit me to go into further detail about problems in the presentation of particular inscriptions; much could be said, especially about inadequacies in the commentaries. This corpus is, for all that, an improvement over what we have had heretofore; it is a pity that it is not better.

Columbia University Roger S. Bagnall

Roesch's chronology for Theodoros; cf. my 'Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt' (Leiden 1976) 260, a work known to the editors but perhaps not read, since they print in no. 91 [οἱ κατοικοῦντες without any mention of my remark in 'Admin.' 59 n. 90 that an examination of the original showed that a kappa was not possible.

**Herbert Grziwotz:** *Das Verfassungsverständnis der römischen Republik*. Ein methodischer Versuch. Frankfurt/Main/Bern/New York: Lang 1985. 395 S. (Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe 3: Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften. 264.) 73 sfr.

Die bei Hatto H. Schmitt in München angefertigte Dissertation stellt sich als ein äußerst anspruchsvolles und nicht wenig gewagtes Unterfangen dar. Das Studium der Rechtswissenschaften hat dem Verf. offenbar ein solides Selbstvertrauen in die eigene Urteilskraft vermittelt und langjährige publizistische Tätigkeit die Sprache genügend gelokert, um sich ausreichend gewappnet zu fühlen, der verstaubten Altertumswissen-

schaft auf einem zentralen Gebiet der römischen Geschichte die Leviten zu lesen. Zwar wird im Vorwort festgestellt: «die häufig notwendige Kritik sollte konstruktiv sein und nirgendwo besserwisserisch, polemisch oder bloß negativ» (5). Die Lektüre vermittelt dann freilich den Eindruck, daß es sich dabei nur um ein Lippenbekenntnis in immunisierender Absicht handeln kann.

Um die Rezension nicht allzu polemisch ausfallen zu lassen, soll im folgenden versucht werden, die Hauptlinie der Argumentation herauszupräparieren. «Im Zentrum der Fragestellung stehen die Beziehungen von Verfassungsrecht und Politik» (5).

In der Einleitung (17–30) geht der Verf. auf assoziativem Wege der Frage nach den Ursachen für die Größe und den Verfall Roms nach, um bei dieser Gelegenheit «mit einer leicht polemischen Zuspitzung» festzustellen: «Man ist sich weitgehend einig, daß Rom keine Verfassung hatte, daß diese aber – beispielsweise – von Caesar wie eine moderne Verfassung fortwährend gebrochen, umgangen und in politischen Auseinandersetzungen zum eigenen Vorteil mißbraucht wurde» (30). So erscheint die Notwendigkeit unabweisbar, einen auf Rom anwendbaren Verfassungsbegriff zu erarbeiten, der «von den römischen Institutionen, der römischen Wirklichkeit und den Vorstellungen der Römer über ihre Geschichte» ausgeht (30).

Im ersten Hauptteil (31–41) wird zunächst über das Problem einer anachronistischen Begriffsbildung belehrt, wobei sich der Verf. dem «Wagnis» stellen will, «mit Hilfe der modernen Jurisprudenz rechtliche Begriffe» zu entwickeln «und dann ihre Anwendbarkeit auf antike Vorgänge zu erproben» (35). Überlegungen zum Verfassungsbegriff und seiner Anwendung auf Rom führen zu der Erkenntnis, daß der moderne Begriff modifiziert werden muß. Nach modernem Verständnis sei Verfassung «derjenige Teil der Rechtsordnung, der die Zusammensetzung der Staatsgewalt sowie die wechselseitigen Beziehungen zwischen Staatsgewalt und Bürgern regelt» (38), während die Verfassung der römischen Antike als «Konzentrat der grundlegenden rechtlichen oder wenigstens rechtsähnlichen Regeln» aufzufassen sei, «die das Funktionieren des Gemeinwesens und die Stellung des einzelnen in diesem Gemeinwesen betreffen» (41). Der Erkenntnisgewinn langwieriger Überlegungen erschöpft sich hier nahe-