

7645), No. 10 (= *P. Amh.* II 26), and No. 11 (= *P. Louvre Eg. inv.* 2329). Kramer sometimes proposes new readings and interpretations and often these are good. For example, Kramer offers the best solution so far given for the mysterious last sentence of *P. Mich.* 471 (p. 74). I think he is likely to be right if we take the text as it stands. The other option is to think that there is simply a mistake here, probably produced by the scribe. One place where Kramer offers a new reading is in No. 2 (*tab. Vindol.* II 310). On line eight (p. 55), he reads *Quotum*, and supports this with a Gallic name attested in La Graufesenque (Qutos). Furthermore, his interpretation of the problematic lines 11–14 of this tablet (p. 57) is better than the one in the original edition where the problem posed by the syntax is not addressed. In his commentary on No. 4 (*O. Bu Njem* 73, 77 and 79) Kramer offers detailed information on the foreign (Punic and Libyan) elements in the Bu Njem ostraca. Regarding No. 5 (*SB XXII* 15638, a list of soldiers' names), he suggests Egyptian influence in the devoicing of voiced stops, e.g., in the name *Petuceus* (= *Peducaeus*), with a reference to the fact that Coptic has no /b/, /d/ or /g/.

Curiously, the texts grouped in number six, the graffiti from Pompeii, seem to offer the least "Vulgar" linguistic material. Apart from a couple of ubiquitous misspellings (e.g., *Aephebus* for *Ephebus*, and *coponam* for *cauponam*) the language is mostly standard. What is vulgar is the topic rather than the language (e.g., a prostitute's advertisement).

Chapter 12, on the *Appendix Probi* (included as the only manuscript witness because of its importance) contains a good introduction to the manuscript where this intriguing document has been preserved. Probably because of special signs, the font has been changed in a considerable part of the Latin text resulting in an awkward appearance (the same thing happens sporadically elsewhere in the book, too).

As with most treatments on similar matters, the linguistic commentary presupposes the existence of "Vulgar Latin". This somewhat old-fashioned approach can, arguably, be justified by the long tradition of Vulgar Latin studies. For a scholar working on linguistic variation and change in Latin this volume does not offer much new information but, on the other hand, new information is not expected in a volume such as this. The aim has been to make this area of Latin studies more widely known and to offer a collection where those interested in the development of the Latin language can easily find important original documents accompanied by full linguistic commentaries and guidance to further literature. The volume undoubtedly serves this purpose very well.

*Hilla Halla-aho*

*Uchi Maius 2. Collana diretta da Mustapha Khanoussi e Attilio Mastino. Le iscrizioni.* A cura di ANTONIO IBBA. Con la collaborazione di MOHAMED ABID – ZEÏNEB BENZINA BEN ABDALLAH – CECILIA CAZZONA – PAOLA RUGGERI – DANIELA SANNA – RITA SANNA – ESMERALDA UGHI. Disegni di SALVATORE GANGA. Pubblicazioni del Centro di studi interdisciplinari sulle province romane dell'Università degli Studi di Sassari. Editrice Democratica Sarda, Sassari 2006. ISBN 88-6025-024-2. 754 pp. EUR 95.

*Semper aliquid novi Africa affert.* This well-known maxim came to my mind when I opened this truly colossal collection of Uchitan inscriptions the crop of which has greatly increased due to the archaeological excavations that have been carried out in Uchi Maius by the Tunisian

and Italian teams directed by Prof. Mustapha Khanoussi and Prof. Attilio Mastino. This Northern Tunisian site was found in 1882 and the first systematic corpus of its inscriptions appeared in 1908: A. Merlin, L. Poinssot, *Les inscriptions d'Uchi majus* [Notes et documents publiés par la Direction des Antiquités et Arts II], 1908 (this collection was later incorporated in *CIL* VIII). The collection made by Merlin and Poinssot included 182 inscriptions whereas the present work, *Uchi Maius 2*, published almost a century later, comprises no fewer than 557! In other words, the number of Uchitan inscriptions has tripled: an eloquent testimony of both the vitality of North African epigraphic material and the fruitfulness of systematic and large-scale archaeological excavations.

The number of inscriptions is large and the book is bulky, too: 754 densely filled pages. It falls into two main parts: an introduction (pp. 13–54) and the edition proper (pp. 55–678). The concordance, indices and bibliography (no fewer than 33 pages long!) conclude the book.

The introduction with numerous very clear and informative diagrams is very useful as it gives background information on the research done in Uchi, on the history and institutions of the town, and, especially, on the inscriptions found there.

The inscriptions are divided into six classes (p. 17): "sacre" (dedications to gods carved on statue bases and on architraves); "imperiali" (inscriptions dedicated to the emperors, carved both on statue bases and on architraves); "pubbliche" (mostly honorific inscriptions directed to the other persons than emperors); "funerarie pagane", "funerarie cristiane" and "incerta definizione". This traditional classification is widely employed in epigraphic corpora because of its usefulness to historians (all texts related to, let us say, the emperor Vespasian or the goddess Minerva can be found in one place). The drawback of this traditional division is that it groups together material that is socio-historically heterogeneous. The class "pubbliche", for example, incorporates not only inscriptions carved on statue bases that honour private persons and office-holders but also inscriptions carved on architraves where those persons record their own activities.

The introduction could have been a good place to group together dedicatory, honorific and building inscriptions and to analyse the common characteristics, syntactical structure and phraseology of each genre in a manner in which funerary inscriptions are dealt with. Instead of such an analysis there are only short statistics on the provenience or material of the inscriptions. Especially limited is the analysis in the section on "iscrizioni onorarie e evergetiche" (pp. 34–6). By contrast, the sections on pagan and Christian funerary inscriptions are excellent and very informative and reader gets a clear and detailed picture of the structure and phraseology of these inscriptions. The section on demography is very interesting, too, and rightly underlines how difficult it is to interpret the lifetimes recorded in the funerary inscriptions. Thus, for example, the almost total absence of infants from this record reflects the patterns of commemoration rather than the real demographic situation, i.e., low infant mortality rate.

Inscriptions are edited extremely carefully and systematically. If a given inscription is extant, there is 1) a description of the stone and the text, 2) a photograph (but see no. 438), 3) a drawing (sometimes also a copy of the text in capital letters), 4) the edited text itself, 5) an Italian translation of it and, finally, 6) the commentary. If the inscription is lost, the photograph and drawing are typically replaced by a copy of the text in capital letters (but see no. 284).

The first element, the description of the stone and carved letters, is always carried out in an extremely detailed and precise manner. A good illustration of this is no. 115. It is the shortest possible inscription, just one unidentifiable part of a letter ([---]+[---]) but the description of the

stone takes up a third of the page. Another example: a description and commentary of the no. 446 (it is carved on a ring and only reads *Generosa*) takes up an entire, densely written, page.

The quality of the photographs is quite good although some are rather dark; drawings are always very clear; the editing has been made with the utmost care and mistakes are extremely rare. The few examples I found are: p. 135: *A]rabic[o* the first bracket is misplaced; p. 150: *p[atr(iae)* pro *p[atriae*; p. 227: *Concordiae)* pro *C(oncordiae)*; p. 258: *l(ocus)* pro *l(ocus)*; p. 541: *Ma(anibus)* pro *M(anibus)*.

The translations are accurate (the only passage that seems somewhat freely done is related to no. 329: *boni fata fuere senis* is translated as "il destino ti ha reso un vecchio onesto" perhaps more accurate is "(that) was the destiny of a good old man".) The translations are systematically provided, even in the cases where the inscription contains nothing more than a name or the abbreviation *DMS*.

The commentaries are systematically and very competently written and contain a vast amount of very interesting and accurate information. I have only a few minor remarks on them. On p. 146 *gymnasia* is best understood as oil distributions in this context, see the standard work by Fagan, G. G., 1999, "Gifts of Gymnasia: a Test Case for Reading Quasi-technical Jargon in Latin Inscriptions", *ZPE* 124, 263–75, esp. 271. On p. 380, text no. 208 (*D. M. s. / Iulius / D[o]natus / [pi]us vix. / annis tot / H. s. e.*) is provided with a comment by J. Gascou: "l'avverbio indefinito *tot* sostituisce il numero degli anni, probabilmente perché si ignorava l'età del defunto. La sua attestazione su un epitafio non metrico sembrerebbe un unicum nel mondo romano...". In fact, there *are* further attestations of this adverb, even in Africa; see *ILAlg.* 2, 7282: *D(is) M(anibus) / Iulia Nam/familla / {annos to}/{t} vix(it) a(nnos) CX*. This latter text is a very interesting case, as it seems that the careless stone-cutter mechanically followed a manual of model inscriptions and carved first *annos tot*. Then he noticed his mistake and added *a(nnos) CX* without bothering to erase the earlier mistake. It might be that a similar explanation is applicable to no. 208 as well. Finally, nos. 61, 96, 106, 109 and 129 should be building inscriptions because of the letter size. On a more general level, it must be said that occasionally these commentaries also include material that could have been presented in the introduction or in the indices. No. 81, for example, runs [---] *IR C C I K* [---]. This fragment is followed by a commentary over half page long that includes, e.g., an essay on the duties of a *duovir*. On the other hand, every inscription that employs the common but erroneous form *anis* instead of the correct *annis* is systematically noted and provided with the same reference and comment. This and some similar cases might be superfluous because such phenomena are duly mentioned in the introduction (p. 50) and in the indices.

As a result of this systematic approach, an inscription that was presented in a half page in *CIL* may need well over ten pages in the present edition. This very ample form of the presentation makes it occasionally a cumbersome task to form a complete picture of a fragmentary inscription. Comparing line drawings and photographs with verbal descriptions on the one hand and with the edited text on the other, takes a lot of going back and forth (see especially no. 38). In a similar manner, the commentaries are often lengthy and very, very dense. Using footnotes and structuring their text would have made them easier to read. These are, of course, very minor points. The authors of this book have done an immense and extremely valuable work by collecting and presenting these inscriptions a very accurate manner. I was also very impressed by the cautiousness of the editors. After presenting a very carefully and thoughtfully reconstructed fragmentary text they still warn the reader about the hypothetical nature of the

reconstruction.

There are some instances, however, where the editors have accepted older readings perhaps too easily. Thus, for example, no. 1 follows the restoration presented in *CIL* VIII and reads: *L(ucius) Sollonius P(ublii) f(ilius) Arn(ensi) Lupus Marian[us et Karthagine (?) quo se] / contulit et in patria sua omn[ibus honoribus functus]*. Now, both restorations are highly hypothetical and the former seems unlikely: such details are very seldom mentioned in the building inscriptions. It is much more probable that *contulit* refers to payment of some sort, as is the case when this predicate is mentioned in building inscriptions. In the end of this same inscription there is another very hypothetical restoration: *[l(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)]*. This phrase is – quite naturally – common in honorific inscriptions carved on statue bases but rare in African building inscriptions (attested in less than one per cent of the cases). In a similar manner, in no. 82 the restoration *p. p.* is unnecessary: the project was paid for by a private person and there is no need to suppose that the community funded the erection of the stone (cf. for example, AE 1968, 599: *sacrarium sua pec(unia) fec(it) idemq(ue) ded(icavit). D(ecreto) d(ecurionum)*). In no. 88, the restoration *Caeci[lianus d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) fecit]* is hypothetical and *d(e)* is almost certainly wrong; this form of a funding supplement is attested almost exclusively during the first century AD. The contemporary variant is *s(ua) p(ecunia)*. Finally, in no. 262 (p. 438), the reading of *LOQL* as *{L}<T>(ibi) o(ssa) q(uiescant). L(evis tibi terra sit)* seems farfetched.

As for the readings offered by editors, the following restoration (p. 71) seems unlikely to me: *d(ono) d(edit) p(ecunia) p(rivata) fecit*. I have not been able to find any parallels to this and I wonder why a private builder would have expressed his contribution in such an ambiguous way? Usually private builders are quite keen to emphasize their role as benefactors but employing this abbreviation would have led most people to think that this project was publicly paid for as the standard way to read this abbreviation is *d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ecunia) p(ublica)*.

All in all, flaws are minimal in this nearly perfect book. The editor Antonio Ibba above all but also his team, M. Abid, Z. B. Ben Abdallah, C. Cazzona, P. Ruggeri, D. Sanna, R. Sanna, E. Ughi and S. Ganga have done a fantastic job with Uchitan inscriptions. The result of their immense efforts is an extremely reliable and accurate edition that supersedes all the previous ones and offers a great deal of very useful related information as well. It is a major contribution on African epigraphy.

*Ari Saastamoinen*

*Titulorum Pictorum Pompeianorum qui in CIL vol. IV collecti sunt: Imagines*. Recensuit, recognovit et contulit ANTONIO VARONE; schedas ad imprimendum composuit, in ordinem topographicum adduxit et indices struxit GRETE STEFANI. Studi della Soprintendenza archeologica di Pompei 29. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 2009. ISBN 978-88-8265-392-7. 544 pp., 48 Tav. EUR 250.

Ecco uno strumento di lavoro di grande importanza. Come si sa, nel IV volume del Corpus berlinese, dedicato alle iscrizioni parietali dell'area vesuviana, l'edizione dei testi non è accompagnata dalle fotografie che in rarissimi casi. Questo ponderoso volume colma una lacuna