

Chi prepara una concordanza simile, deve affrontare molteplici problemi, come il trattamento delle varianti grafiche che abbondano nelle iscrizioni cristiane, l'ordinamento delle abbreviazioni, ecc. Nel trattamento delle varianti grafiche, la soluzione adottata dall'autrice è stata intelligente: ogni forma non-standard viene segnalata esattamente com'è, ma seguita dalla grafia normativa, in parentesi tonde. Così si possono trovare le varianti grafiche, ma facilmente anche tutte le attestazioni di una parola specifica. L'ordine alfabetico segue, comunque, la forma grafica. Quindi, chi cerca delle frasi deve in ogni caso prendere in considerazione le varianti grafiche: ad esempio, sotto *die Veneris* viene menzionata un'iscrizione (p. 94), ma ci sono quattro casi di *die Beneris* (p. 93). La forma normativa può anche essere problematica. Ad esempio, nella frase (*re*)*quiescit in pace* (pp. 259, 263), troviamo molto spesso anche la forma in *-et*, che formalmente è il futuro. Nel libro, le varie grafie in *-et* sono state standardizzate in *quiescet*, ma con un punto esclamativo. Evidentemente viene inteso che il significato non possa in alcun caso essere quello del futuro. Per quanto riguarda le abbreviazioni, la soluzione adottata nella concordanza del *CIL VI* di Jory (1974-75) era l'ordine alfabetico, senza sciogliere le abbreviazioni. Qui, le abbreviazioni vengono sciolte. Ad esempio, per le diverse abbreviazioni delle parole *annus / mensis / dies* nelle espressioni dell'età (*a.*, *an.*, *m.*, *mens.*, ecc.), l'autrice ha preferito la soluzione seguente: le abbreviazioni vengono sciolte in modo coerente, preferendo il caso ablativo, se non è presente l'accusativo.

La consultazione dell'*Indice* è resa alquanto difficoltosa dalle poco chiare indicazioni delle fonti. Il numero dell'iscrizione (nelle *ICVR*) segue nell'ultima posizione della riga, o nella penultima, se l'iscrizione è datata; le colonne non sono diritte. Per una maggiore leggibilità, sarebbe stato utile stampare il numero dell'iscrizione ad es. in grassetto. Il maggiore difetto dell'opera è la concordanza greca (pp. 353-89). Le lettere greche sono state traslitterate, senza neanche fare la distinzione tra  $\epsilon$  /  $\eta$   $\epsilon$  o /  $\omega$ ; inoltre, l'ordine alfabetico è quello della lingua latina. Questo è dovuto ai limiti del programma EPIGLOSSA (vd. p. 13). Comunque, concordanze epigrafiche dei testi greci elaborate al computer si pubblicano ormai da alcuni anni. Fortunatamente, una concordanza delle epigrafi cristiane greche urbane esiste già, a cura di A. Felle, 1997.

Per concludere, una cosa ovvia, cioè, sarebbe molto utile pubblicare l'opera come CD-ROM, per facilitare le ricerche. Comunque, chi scrive ammette che raramente nelle biblioteche la consultazione di un CD-ROM è così facile come quella di un libro stampato.

*Kalle Korhonen*

ANNA MARIA ROSSI ALDROVANDI: *Corpus Titulorum Figulorum*. Manuali & Antologie. Cooperativa Libreria Universitaria Editrice Bologna, Bologna 1997. ISBN 88-8901-276-3. 287 pp. ITL 35.000.

The title of the book, especially for an epigraphically orientated reader, may appear somewhat misleading. Whatever the expectations, *Corpus Titulorum Figulorum* is a selection – not a *corpus* proper – of passages in literary and epigraphical texts of certain words related to *figulinae* and their products. The author has concentrated on seven terms

– *amphora, creta, fingere* (with derivatives *fict-, fig-*), *later, lucerna, tegula, vas* – and their derivatives (e.g. *vasarius, vasclarius, vasculum, vasclarius* from *vas*), and different kinds of variants (separately e.g. *feglina, ficeina, ficilina, ficlina, ficulina, figilina, figilinea, figina, figolina, figulina*). But one notes the absence of many central terms, as e. g. *bessalis, bipedalis, sesquipedalis, tessera, fornax, officina* and *officinator*, not to mention *dolium* or *doliaris*.

The presentation of the passages concerning each entry is divided into two main categories, literary texts (ordered alphabetically according to the authors) and inscriptions. The latter group is subdivided into "iscrizioni su pietra", *instrumentum*, and *variae*, with further subdivisions. In most cases, the scheme works well, but, e. g., the large number of brick stamp texts under the title word *figlina* (*lateres* p. 79-101, and *tegulae* p. 102-111) would be more usefully ordered according to different abbreviations (*f., fig., figl.*, etc.) and cases.

As such, the scheme of the work is quite interesting: for an epigraphist, a survey of the appearances of such terms as e. g. *figlinae* and *tegula* outside the usual brick stamp context is a highly acceptable tool. Unfortunately, the presentation of the brick stamp texts (I leave other categories aside here) is not very successful. Some examples may suffice:

#### 1. Bogus words:

P. 48: FICEINA (*CIL* X 8043,77 [= XV 2272 = XIV 4090,13!]) should be read *figlina* or *figlin. A(uli)*. – P. 74: FIGILINEA (*CIL* XV S. 431): the stamp reads *figilineis / C. Iuli Neicei*. Ablative ending *-eis* naturally from *figilina* and not from *\*figilinea*. – P. 74: FIGINA (*CIL* III 5764, XIV 4089,21 [= XV 2158!]): in both cases the abbreviation *fig.* is erroneously interpreted as *fig(ina)* without any reason. – P. 75: FIGLA (*CIL* XIV 4090,16 [= XV 1800!]): the fragment is defectively reported by Giorgi, *sched. Casanat.* XVI, and the second line reads FIGLAFILLIANAS. E.M. Steinby has proposed (*BCAR* 84 (1974-75) 77 n. 11; *ead.*, *Indici complementari ai bolli doliari urbani (CIL. XV, 1)* [Acta IRF 11], Roma 1987, 328) that the stamp might read *Fig. Publilianas*, which is quite probable. Another possibility is *Figl. Aemilianas* or the like. In any case, *Figla Fillianas* is wrong. – P. 75: FIGLARIS (*CIL* IX 6078,4 [= XV 1019 a.8!]): the interpretation *opus fig(lare)* is inconceivable. – P. 112: FIGLINEA (*AE* 1911, 209) is actually the same stamp as *CIL* XV S. 431 mentioned above under the heading FIGILINEA, this time under the heading *Vasa*, cited from another source with the spelling *figlineis*.

#### 2. Other notes:

The text of the brick stamps published in *CIL* XV.1 is usually faithfully quoted from *CIL*. Later completions and corrections (which are numerous and easily found, e. g., using Steinby, *Indici*) are not taken into consideration. The dating of the stamps is that proposed by Dressel, even if Steinby has thoroughly modified it in the *BCAR* article.

The division of the brick stamp texts into *lateres* and *tegulae* is quite misleading, which is clearly seen e. g. on p. 103ff. The author presents the urban stamps published by Mommsen in *CIL* X (*Tegulae Latinae*: X 8043.10, 11, 12, etc.) under the heading *Tegulae* with reference to *CIL* X only, but the very same stamps with reference to *CIL* XV (159, 166, 219 = S. 51 etc.) are also to be found under the heading *Lateres* (where

abbreviated words in the same stamp may have been opened in a different way, not without too many errors). The same procedure is applied to brick stamps published under heading *Tegulae* in other volumes of *CIL*, thus artificially multiplying the number of the stamps and unfoundedly suggesting their use in *lateres* or in *tegulae*.

Three different terms are taken under the same title word TEGULARIUS (p. 213f.): the substantive *tegularius*, the adiective *tegularius*, *-a*, *-um*, and the substantive *tegularium*, which should be clearly distinguished.

It is questionable if it is correct to include under the heading TEGULA such stamps that have the name of the *figlinae* in feminine but without the word *tegula* (e. g. *CIL* XV 53: *Caep[ioniana sc. tegula] Euchar[i] Isaur[icae]*).

The sources used for the collection are not clearly stated in the introductions. The mention of "*CIL, AE, CVarr., Callender ecc.*" seems to point to the almost total omission of other publications, at least when it comes to the brick stamps. Only a small minority of new stamps published after Bloch's *Supplement* have found their way into *AE*, which is not the principal point of reference. The author should at least have had a look at E. M. Steinby, *Appendice a CIL. XV, 1, Bull. Com.* 86 (1978-79), 55-88, and works mentioned there on p. 56, including e. g. *Lateres Signati Ostienses* with about one hundred *inedita*; Id., *Indici with Aggiunte, completamenti e correzioni a CIL. XV. 1* (p. 31-50). They cover most of the material up to 1987, but naturally several new stamps have been published in various monographies and articles after that.

All in all, the part concerning brick stamps is in need of thorough revision. One might ask if the work would be more useful and coherent if the number of the terms included were increased and the passages quoted were mostly from literary sources. The *instrumentum* could be treated quite differently, viz. concentrating on the analysis of different word-forms and abbreviations without presenting all their appearances in stamp texts.

Pekka Tuomisto

A. DAMSGAARD-MADSEN, *Grækenlands historie indtil 336 f.Kr.* Aarhus Universitetsforlag / Aarhus University Press, Århus 1997. ISBN 87-7288-650-1. 206 s. DKK 198.

This History of Greece, in Danish, is a brisk presentation of the subject. From the Preface one learns that this is, in fact, a second edition of a book originally published in 1993; some differences between the two editions are noted *ibid.* (It is possible that the book has a longer history, for on p. 40 the Cyrillic alphabet is illustrated by the abbreviation CCCP, familiar to the older generation but probably unidentifiable to the student of today.) On the cover, the name of the book is rendered simply as '*Grækenlands historie*', the specification '*indtil 336 f. Kr.*' (that is, to the founding of the League of Corinth) becoming evident only to those who open the first page. This is, then, another of those histories of Greece which end with the aftermath of Chaeronea. In older times, this procedure could be justified by the fact that after 338, Greek history was seen mainly as a sorry tale of decline and decay (see S. Alcock, *Graecia capta* [1993] 3 with a marvellous