developments would, in my opinion, have contributed to the usefulness of this otherwise excellent and mind-opening study.

Scott McGill's *Plagiarism in Latin Literature* (Cambridge – New York 2012), also reviewed in this volume, makes an illuminating companion to this book, shedding further light on the concepts of literary imitation and literary originality in the ancient world.

Seppo Heikkinen

Alison E. Cooley: *The Cambridge Manual of Latin Epigraphy.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2012. ISBN 978-0-521-84026-2 (Hb); 978-0-521-54954-7 (Pb). 531 pp. GBP 69.99 (Hb), 27.99 (Pb).

To judge from the reviews I have seen, this admirable book has been received with favour, and I can only join those who have had good things to say about it, for it is a most impressive achievement and among the introductions to Latin epigraphy (of which there is no shortage) this is surely one of the most, if not *the* most, informative one, and one which I think should be read from beginning to end by those wishing to be introduced to the subject. Here I must stress the need of reading the whole work, for although this book has a logical structure, being divided into chapters and sections, etc., it leaves at places the impression of being a rather loose narrative in which certain subjects seem to turn up whenever the author came to think about them. For instance, section 3. 2. 5, "Working with stemmata" (p. 360ff.), deals with inscriptions known only from early copies. The expression 'stemma' refers to the fact that inscriptions now lost are sometimes known from two or more early descriptions which may present variants in the text. These descriptions, when copied by later epigraphists, produced a textual tradition divided into 'stemmata' (*CIL* VI 1314, the inscription of Lutatius Catulus concerning the *tabularium*, not seen after the early 15th century, is cited as an example). However, this section is not at all only about stemmata, for the mention of Renaissance epigraphists leads the author to turn, as an afterthought of sorts, to the history of epigraphy in general from Cyriacus to Gruter (p. 362–70). Again, the chapter on "Dating inscriptions" (3. 4, p. 398ff.) contains much of the usual material on consular dating, etc., but also a few pages (p. 409–14) on Roman names, which thus do not receive a chapter or section of their own. Having discussed Roman names and their evolution, the author must have come to think of the fact that the same names could be used by several generations of the same family, and this again is illustrated by the inscriptions of the Lucilii Gamalae of Ostia (their inscriptions being cited as nos. 78–85). This is of great interest (cf. below on *CIL* XIV 375 and 376), but one would not have expected it to have been dealt with under the heading "Dating inscriptions". Section 2. 3 on "Epigraphy in society" begins with sub-section 2. 3. 1 "Monuments, not documents", which does not (as some readers might perhaps expect) deal with the archeological aspects of inscriptions (not a very prominent subject in this book in any case, although note p. 286ff. on the "production and design of inscriptions"), but rather with such aspects as the "subjectivity" (p. 227) of inscriptions – which of course were not meant to be objective 'documents' in the first place – or the role of inscriptions in illustrating everyday life and manners (cf., e. g., p. 226 on banquets). All this is most interesting and useful; however, this sub-section is followed by another (2. 3. 2, p.

228ff.), which deals with a quite different topic which one would not necessarily expect to find in a section on "Epigraphy in society", namely Christian epigraphy.

It must, however, be noted that saying this is not at all meant as a criticism, for this manner of presentation only adds to the charm of the book; and many subjects do have their own sections, and all the subjects dealt with in the book can in any case be accessed through the index. Of course, one might ask if the expression 'Manual' used in the title is the most appropriate one, for this book does not really remind one of manuals of the classic German type, which consist of chapters and sections and subsections, etc., all interspersed with passages in small print (often consisting of bibliographies). However, this is probably a question only a continental scholar might ask, for the proliferation in the last years of various 'handbooks' which often only seem collections of miscellaneous articles makes it clear that the concept 'manual' or 'handbook' is in the English-speaking world not seen in the same light as 'Handbuch' by (say) the editors of the *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*.

Having just mentioned bibliographies, this may be the right moment for me to point out that this book in fact does not include a bibliography of the type one finds in normal introductions to epigraphy (but there is a "Guide to *CIL* and other corpora" in 3. 1. 1, and a similar section, "Major corpora of Christian inscriptions" in 3. 1. 2). This 'omission' is in my view fully justified, as epigraphy as a discipline deals, as readers of this book soon find out, with so many different aspects of the ancient world that summing it all up in a bibliography or (as seems to be the case in many introductions to epigraphy) in several bibliographies is hardly worth the effort. Instead, it seems much more to the point to cite the relevant bibliography at the point when it is in fact relevant, and this is the *modus operandi* of the author. Moreover, she seems to have read absolutely *everything* that has something to do with Latin inscriptions, as a result of which the notes must contain hundreds, if not thousands of references to different publications, many of them of recent date and some of them most exotic (e.g., the articles cited on p. 322, n. 721; for an example of a bibliography which seems pretty exhaustive see, e.g., that on the erasure of Geta's names on p. 124f. n. 32). Of course the lack of a bibliography does have one drawback, for a bibliography offers the possibility of furnishing the items cited there with abbreviated titles, whereas in a book like this all bibliographical information (including names of publishers, etc.) must be offered in the notes (sometimes the same several lines of bibliographical information are repeated in successive notes, as, e.g., on p. 364 n. 70 and 71). The lack of a bibliography also means the lack of a list of abbreviations, which would (as observed by G. H. Renberg, *Mnemosyne* 67 [2014] 1053) have been useful for those who do not know what abbreviations such as "*ILLRP*" or "*RDGE*" mean. As for titles in languages other than English, for a book written in English this is most notable inasmuch as all foreign names and titles seem to have been rendered correctly.

This book has an interesting structure. Chapter 2 and 3 are of a more normal type, Ch. 2 presenting all the different categories of inscriptions and Ch. 3 explaining how to locate inscriptions and how to deal with them, but Ch. 1 is unusual, inasmuch as it is dedicated to the "Epigraphic culture in the Bay of Naples". This is a region clearly well known to the author, and the choice of this region allows her to say some very pertinent things about epigraphic culture in its various manifestations, especially as we can (I think) assume that we know about all the inscriptions that existed in Pompeii and the nearby cities in AD 79. There is, of course, the problem that roughly the same categories of inscriptions (minus the dipinti, etc.) also existed

elsewhere, which means that we find sections or passages on honorific and votive inscriptions, epitaphs, milestones, brick stamps, etc. both in Ch. 1 and in Ch. 2. However, this is smoothed out by the fact that the two chapters are structured, and the sections within these chapters are named, differently, and the choice of a limited region for the object of a survey was in any case a very good idea. And it is not after all the *same* inscriptions that are discussed in the two chapters.

In spite of this, many readers may well feel that the book in a way gets going for a second time at p. 117, the beginning of Ch. 2. This chapter starts with a most interesting section (2. 1) on "Defining epigraphy". This is followed by a very long section (2. 2) of almost a hundred pages – one wonders whether it should not have been divided into sub-sections – on "Epigraphic categorization". This section discusses all the various types of inscriptions, beginning with epitaphs (p. 128ff.); these are followed (p. 145ff.) by "'honorific' or 'cursus' inscriptions" (this seems rather vaguely formulated, as an 'honorific' inscription is of course not at all the same thing as a 'cursus' inscription), building inscriptions (p. 152ff., with milestones on p. 159ff.), "juridical epigraphy" (p. 168ff., with military diplomas being discussed on p. 172ff.), "religious inscriptions" (p. 178ff.; this section seems less informative than it could be, for it moves very quickly from the the most common – from the point of view of the average epigraphist – type of "religious" inscription, that on a votive altar, to more exotic subjects such as *defixiones*), *instrumentum domesticum* (p. 185ff.), etc.

Ch. 2 contains two further sections, another overview (2. 4, p. 250ff.) of the epigraphy of a particular area, this time of Tripolitania with subsections on the epigraphy of Lepcis Magna, in the "pre-desert interior" and in the army camp, and section 2. 5 (p. 285ff.) called "The life-cycle of inscriptions". In this section, the author describes the "production" of inscriptions and their "reception", with subsections on the production and design of inscriptions (2. 5. 1), on Language choice (2. 5. 2, on the use in inscriptions of other languages than Latin), on "Reading and viewing inscriptions" (2. 5. 3, with a quotation on p. 309 of *AE* 1989, 247 *[hunc] titulumque quicumque legerit aut lege[ntem] auscultarit*, although it must be said that this is an inscription not from "the Alps" – whatever that may mean – but from the city that produced Ovid, namely Sulmo), and, finally, on the "Afterlife of inscriptions". In this chapter, the author studies corrections, additions and alterations to, and erasures of, inscriptions (and note also p. 321 on the transportation of inscriptions from one place to another).

The third and final chapter, "A technical guide to Latin epigraphy" (p. 327ff.), contains useful instructions on how to find and use epigraphical publications and on the interpretation of inscriptions, including those displayed in museums, with a subsection on abbreviations in 3. 2. 4, p. 357ff., and on forgeries in 3. 3. 2, p. 383ff. At the end, there are two appendixes, one on imperial titles and another on the consuls (including suffects) between 298 BC and AD 541 (but here, too, the consuls of AD 207 are given in the order Maximus, Aper, which has apparently become traditional but which is incorrect, as the order used in inscriptions – also in the one cited p. 475 n. 84, now *AE* 2007, 1211 – and in the literary sources is always Aper, Maximus. Moreover, Aper's full name, as revealed by *RMM* 48, was *C. Septimius Severus Aper*, the nomenclature with *Severus* perhaps hinting at the explanation of the consul's position as *consul prior*).

The text is interspersed throughout with specimens of individual inscriptions equipped with photos, translations and comments and numbered from 1 to 90, and meant to illustrate the main text. In the beginning, I was extremely pleased to observe the text of inscription no. 1

(*CIL* X 1784 on p. 6ff.) having been furnished with commas, full stops, etc., which in my view are absolutely indispensable if one's aim is to help the reader to understand a text. However, in what follows the use of punctuation seems to become much more rare and there is no punctuation at all, e.g., in lengthy texts such as nos. 29 and 39 (a military diploma) and in that quoted on p. 137. Of course, one can turn to the translations for some help in the interpretation of the texts, but I feel that it is the duty of the epigraphist to present an epigraphical text in a format which contributes to the understanding of the text in question (e.g., *ipsis, liberis posterisque eorum civitatem dedit et con[u]bium cum uxoribus, quas tunc habuissent, cum est civitas iis data, aut, si qui caelibes essent, cum iis, quas postea duxissent, dumtaxat singuli singulas; a(nte) d(iem) XIIII k(alendas)* etc. in no. 39 would in my view be much clearer than the same litany without any punctuation).

As there will surely be several editions of this book, it may be of some use if I point out here some errors and offer observations on some details. As for errors, *aed(ilum)* (accusative) in no. 3 should of course be corrected to *aed(ilem)*, and in no. 17 I would prefer *aed(ilium) to aed(ilum)* (genitive). On p. 31, the 'fellow-townsmen' should of course be *municipes*, not "*municipi*", and in no. 6 (p. 34), the measures given for the inscription *CIL* X 1426 in honour of Nonius Balbus in EDR, 89 x 77 cm, seem closer to the truth than those given here, 8.8 x 7.65 cm (which would make this inscription tiny). As for other observations, in no. 5 (*AE* 1996, 424 a–b from Misenum), I am pretty sure that the passage on the right side beginning with *referente L. Tullio Eutycho* is in disorder and that the *et* before *L. Kaninius Hermes* has been added in despair by a stonecutter who has not understood the text (this disorder is reflected in the awkward translation); the original text must have run about as follows: *cum universi Augustales convenissent, referente L. Tullio Eutycho curatore perpet(uo): cum L. Kaninius Hermes*, etc. (this being the beginning of Eutychus' proposition). In no. 29 (*ILS* 5177), I think that *professus* in *inter Graecos poetas duos et L professus* should be rendered as 'performed' rather than as 'registered'. As for no. 78 (*CIL* XIV 375), the author accepts the interpretation of *bellum navale* as 'naval war' and translates *ob pol[l]icitationem belli navalis* as "on account of its promise for the naval war", although the Latin cannot mean anything else but "on account of its promise of a naval war", i.e. a *naumachia*; in no. 85 (*CIL* XIV 376), the text seems to have been copied from the Clauss-Slaby database without corrections, as we have here the same mistaken reading *L(ucio) Coilo* ("Lucius Coilus" in the translation) – instead of *Coilio* – as in the said database, and as the last line, with "*[3]*" indicating *lacunae*, reproduces the style used in the database. As for this last line, I have inspected the inscription in the Vatican and have a squeeze; in my opinion, the last line begins with *hic HS*, followed by uncertain numbers, and ends perhaps with *[---]vit*, the last line thus mentioning another benefaction of the honorand. In the translation, *extru[e]ntibus* – i. e. *exstru-* – in line 26 is rendered as "as they were building it", the participle being taken as a sort of *dativus incommodi*; this is obviously correct, and the problem of this passage has thus been solved, which is another merit of this delightful book.

Olli Salomies