De novis libris iudicia

Collocazione museale sia stata sempre decisiva per il numero dato al testo. O forse mi sfugge il filo conduttore. Ancora, riguardo all’ordine del materiale, non si capisce bene perché il capitolo "Iscrizioni spurie e genuine poste tra le "falsae" da Maffei" (pp. 84–87) sia diventato una sezione autonoma. Inoltre, mi chiedo perché alcuni rilievi e pezzi architettonici siano pubblicati tra le iscrizioni (cf. 4–6, 10–13, 90), mentre altri sono riportati sotto il capitolo "Rilievi" (94–107).

Da un buon catalogo epigrafico si aspetterebbe una rigorosa struttura dove il materiale viene dato in modo conciso e corretto. Purtroppo, queste qualifiche non si verificano nel presente lavoro. In numerosi casi, il testo dato nel lemma non corrisponde a quanto si vede nella fotografia; l’uso dei segni diacritici lascia spesso a desiderare; i nomi di persona e anche i rapporti tra le persone ricordate nei singoli testi sono a volte spiegati molto male; gli indici, anche lacunosì, presentano molti errori, talvolta clamorosi, cosa che deriva dalla erronea interpretazione dei testi. Pare che le decine di sviste di questo genere avrebbero potuto essere facilmente evitate con una più accurata revisione del testo.

Nonostante questa critica, il lavoro della Modonesi, corredato da ottime fotografie, resta certamente un utile compagno per chiunque si occupi del materiale conservato nella preziosissima collezione veronese.

*Mika Kajava*


*Heikki Solin*


The book aims to collect all Jewish inscriptions from the city of Rome which can be dated before A.D. 700. Thus it updates and replaces much of J.B. Frey’s *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum* (1936) as well as other editions after Frey. The criteria for attributing the texts to Jews are simple. The vast majority of the material comes from Jewish catacombs. If inscriptions, which do not come from a catacomb, are included in the corpus, they use some Jewish terminology, symbols, formulae, names, or the language has words of Hebrew or Aramaic. These criteria are clear and well-defined.

The inscriptions published in *JIWE* 2 contain some new information, and Noy’s readings and interpretations differ occasionally from those of previous editors (e.g., nos. 204 and 292).
The entries are arranged as in the previous volume (JIWE I), the given text is followed by a critical commentary, a translation into an English-like language, and two different bibliographies, the first of which is comprised of previous editions and publications, and the second one tries to give further reading connected to that particular inscription or subject. This division is not always clear, and some omissions and overlapping can be found (for minor omissions, cf. no. 185 which is also published in IG XIV 1606; no. 197 also published in CIL X 948*, 25; no. 198 the beginning of which is also published in CIL X 948*, 33.). Sometimes Noy’s new readings seem strange, as in, e.g., no. 287 where he reads Ειπενατο, whereas from the picture provided by Frey (CIJ I 266) it is possible to read without any doubts Ειπενατο.

The language of the inscriptions is very interesting, as we already know from earlier corpora. It is good that Noy gives the texts as they are, and refrains from “correcting” the language. This is important, because the texts as such offer a great variety of registers, which makes it possible to study the linguistic interference scrupulously. The study of language as a general, universal system has shown that all languages, and all dialects, whether they be geographical or social, are equally ‘good’ as linguistic systems. All varieties of language are structured, complex, rule-governed systems which are wholly adequate for the needs of their users. It follows that non-standard varieties are not linguistically inferior, but they may be considered socially inferior. With texts like these, therefore, it is possible to study the non-standard language of the bi- or multilingual society of Jews in Rome, and the interference in the Jew’s use of language. Naturally the language of the Jews has been studied in the past by several scholars, but there is a lot of work still waiting to be done. Particularly interesting are the texts of the following type: (no. 204 Vigna Randanini) Esidorus eterus en irene quimesis su.; no. 199 (Monteverde) veritas amor anestase titulos; and no. 195 (Monteverde) λοκου Βεσουλες ανουρο ρεκεςητ κε’. There are also linguistic differences between the catacombs, which seem to reflect some topographical or perhaps social variation in the use of language.

The book is furnished with ample indexes which are of great help to readers.

Martti Leiwo


The large corpus of the Christian inscriptions of Rome (ICUR), edited in 10 volumes between 1922 and 1992, soon to be completed with the final 11th volume, has received a (key-word-in-context) computer concordance of the texts in Greek lettering at the hands of A.E. Felle. Because full indices will be published in the final volume, this book may have been intended as a reference work to identify the texts. Otherwise I cannot see the utility of a project like this.

Of a total of more than 45,000 inscriptions, as many as 3,859 are in Greek lettering (for comparison, the whole of Attica has less than 350 texts). The problem is that most of the texts in the ICUR remain in majuscules, without a Greek transcription or interpretation. Obviously, partly due to this reason, the Greek texts have not been edited properly for the