

freedman Arrius Alphius, C. Ricci reads in lines 2–5 *Desideri(um), frater Alphii, Arriae Fadilae ... liberti, libellum tibi misi* etc., speaking in the commentary of the "desiderio (r. 2) espresso da Arrius Alphius", but putting commas before *frater* and after *Alphii* must make some readers think that a brother of Alphius is somehow involved, which is of course not the case. Although the Latin found in this text contains some "vulgar" features, it would not in my view be possible to assume that Velius Fidus, wishing to say that he was sending a *libellum* containing the *desiderium* of the freedman, could have written *Desideri(um), frater, Alphii ... libellum tibi misi* (taking *desideri* as a genitive defining *libellum* would of course also be quite impossible). On the other hand, seeing that the reading of the inscription is *Desideri*, and that already in the correspondence of Fronto there are instances of the use of *signa*, there is no problem in interpreting *Desiderius* as Celsus' *signum*. At the beginning of the letter Fidus writes *Iubentio* (sic) *Celso collegae suo salutem*, but then addresses Celsus with *Desideri* (vocative) *frater*, just as Fronto (p. 188 v.d.H.) in a letter to Cornelius Repentinus starts with *Cornelio Repentino Fronto salutem*, but then goes on to address the man as *frater Contucci* (cf. my observations on this in C. Badel – C. Settapani [eds.], *Les Stratégies familiales dans l'Antiquité tardive* [Paris 2012] pp. 9f.).

But these are of course only minor matters, for this is a fine book which I have already used with profit. That it has been priced at € 49 means that even private individuals (and not only rich libraries) can buy it, and thus I am sure this book will be a great success.

Olli Salomies

Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum. Partim consilio et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae editum. Partim consilio et auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Berolinensis et Brandenburgensis editum. Vol. IV: Inscriptiones parietariae Pompeianae Herculanae Stabianae. Suppl. pars IV, fasc. I: Ad titulos pictos spectans. Ediderunt VOLKER WEBER – ANTONIO VARONE – ROBERTA MARCHIONNI – JANA KEPARTOVÁ. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin 2011. ISBN 978-3-11-018538-6. I–XVIII, pp. 1151–1555. EUR 199.95.

This is the first fascicle of the fourth part of the supplement to *CIL IV* (the Pompeian wall inscriptions). It contains the *tituli picti*, i.e. those texts that were painted on the wall with a brush. The original publication of these texts is in one of the following volumes: 1) volume *CIL IV*, edited by Karl Zangemeister in 1871 (nos. 1–1204, with corrigenda and addenda in 2881–3024), 2) the second supplement to *CIL IV*, edited by August Mau in 1909 (nos. 3341–3884 with addenda [and corrigenda] to Zangemeister and addenda to suppl. 2 in 6601–6696 and in 7022–7054), 3) the third supplement to *CIL IV*, edited by Matteo Della Corte, Volker Weber and Pio Ciprotti in 1952–1970 (nos. 7116–7996 and 9822–9986). For the problems of the final two fascicles of this last publication, see Heikki Solin's review (*Gnomon* 45 [1973] 258–77). The *tituli picti* of Herculaneum, originally edited by Ciprotti (10478–10490), have not been included in this supplement, but no reason is given for this.

In the present supplement, texts up to no. 7054 have been edited by Volker Weber, with occasional contributions by Antonio Varone and Peter Kruschwitz. Texts from no. 7116 onwards (those originally published in Della Corte's supplement) have been edited by Roberta Marchionni, Jana Keparťová and Antonio Varone.

The *tituli picti* or dipinti, as is well known, are mainly advertisements for local elections where two pairs of magistrates, the *duoviri iure dicundo* and the *aediles*, were elected annually. In addition, there are announcements for gladiatorial games by their sponsors. Occasionally other categories of private texts have been preserved as well, such as poetry (130, 2887 and 3407 in Greek), rental advertisements (138 and 1136), and even texts that in content come close to those usually attested in graffiti (in the *CIL* called *graphio scripta*). These latter are to appear in the second part of the supplement, *CIL* IV suppl. 4,2.

The majority of the *tituli picti* of Pompeii have been destroyed either because the plaster on which they were written has fallen off or because the writing itself has been subject to erosion ("Introduction", in A. Varone – G. Stefani, *Titulorum pictorum Pompeianorum qui in CIL vol. IV collecti sunt imagines*, 2009), and many of the inscriptions that were still visible and readable for Zangemeister and Mau no longer exist. Antonio Varone has made a major effort in trying to locate all those inscriptions that still exist on the basis of the (often vague) descriptions of the previous editors (see his notes in the *praefatio*). Exact information on the location (when found) is given in Varone – Stefani, *op. cit.* For that volume, Antonio Varone has also tracked down the existing photographs of the wall inscriptions preserved in Rome, Paris, Berlin, Florence and Naples.

For each entry, the supplement first gives a reference to the corrigenda of Zangemeister and Mau. After this there follows what must be regarded as a comprehensive bibliography of the inscription in subsequent scholarship. Because the material consists in the overwhelming majority of personal names advertised as candidates for the two offices, the research on the inscriptions concerns mainly the political and prosopographical history of the colony. These are most importantly P. Castrén, *Ordo populusque Pompeianus. Polity and Society in Roman Pompeii* (1983²); H. Mouritsen, *Elections, Magistrates and Municipal Élite. Studies in Pompeian Epigraphy* (1988) and C. Chiavia, *Programmata. Manifesti elettorali nella colonia romana di Pompei* (2002). The supplement diligently records different views about the identity of each candidate and what is known of his political activity. The result and benefit of this detailed work is that it will be possible for users of this supplement volume to track down and get an overview of the subsequent research history of each text. This, it needs to be stressed, is one of the main aims of the supplement, and in general this must be considered to be well achieved.

The volume is a genuine supplement in the sense that it does not give the text of the inscription. For the text the reader needs to consult the original publication as well as the corrigenda. The corrigenda by Zangemeister and Mau are often essential for the constitution of the text. In many cases this means that in addition to the *apographon* and possible interpretation/text in the original publication, the reader has to check the corrigenda at one or two places (sometimes even three) in order to see what there actually is in the text. In only very few instances does the supplement give the suggested correct reading. It would have been useful to give the text in those cases where significant progress has been made in interpretation since the publication of the original volume. At the very least, the supplement might have indicated those cases where the corrigenda contain corrections to the reading and are thus essential for the constitution of the text, and hence, the consultation of the notes in the supplement.

The bibliographical references are given in a list without any further information about what the publication actually says about the particular inscription (whether it contains a simple mention or offers something relevant for the interpretation).

The commentaries often contain lengthy expositions of interpretations presented in previous research. The problem is that they give too much space to highly improbable suggestions (often but not exclusively by M. Della Corte). The result is that truly relevant information for the constitution of the text and the most probable interpretation is not necessarily easy to find.

In 1048, for example, the supplement gives Della Corte's interpretation (*Marcus Epidius*) *Sabinus rogat: o copo Prime* without any comment about its impossibility (given that Zangemeister's text reads *Q P P iuvenem aed ovf drp Sabinus rog copo*). This text was treated by Mouritsen (*op. cit.* p. 22) as an example of Della Corte's inadequate methods. The presentation of the affair in the supplement is given too much space. Della Corte's thoughts could have been rejected in a short note instead of them now taking nearly half of what is said about the persons mentioned in the *programma*. Another example is text 679. The issue of possible references to Christians in Pompeii is given a clear and balanced treatment, but at the end a reference is appended to an exotic suggestion "Quasi exotica est interpretatio" after which the supplement cites an English translation of what the authors consider to be Aramaic written in Latin letters. The discussion of text 679 could surely do without this information. In text 221, after an adequate discussion of *cum sodales* that is without doubt an example of *cum* with the accusative, the supplement refers to E. Pulgram's (*Latin, Italic, Italian 600 B.C. to A.D. 1260* [1978], 233) speculation on the existence of a 2nd declension form *sodalus* that is nowhere attested (whence abl. **sodalis* → *sodales*). The reference is pointless and superfluous. The phenomenon of *cum* + accusative is well-known and attested in Latin, even in the present volume, e.g., *CIL* IV 275 and 698 *cum discentes*. One further example where an impossible suggestion is recorded but not refuted is in the handling of 3494, the famous cartoon-like combination of paintings and writing. In 3494h the odd form *orte* is discussed. F. Todd's suggestion in *CR* 53 (1939) 5–9 that this conceals the phrase *or(o) te* with a syncope of the final *o* in *oro* lacks all linguistic as well as contextual probability. The supplement does note that Väänänen's discussion of the phenomenon only has cases which are inside a word after the stressed syllable, but does not conclude that Todd's suggestion is implausible (or indeed impossible, cf. the original long vowel in first person singular verb ending!). Moreover, it is not mentioned in the supplement that *orte* is followed by *fellator*, a fact which makes the interpretation as *or(o) te* even more unlikely.

Text 2887 receives a disproportionate handling (one whole page) in view of its length and interpretation potential. The main part is taken up by various suggestions about the source and meaning of two expressions (*quintio* and *assidat ad asinum*). These speculations, of which especially those concerning the Greek origin of *quintio* are impossible, should not have received, in an epigraphical reference work like the present volume, the space and attention they now get.

Sometimes there are actual repetitions. In 538 the phonology of the text is discussed twice, first with reference to the relevant pages in Väänänen (*Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes*, 1966³) and at the latter part of the commentary referring to Myśliwiec, who had suggested Oscan influence. Similarly, in 813, the sense of the word *morator* is discussed twice, in both with a reference to *Ov. epist.* 19,70 (the other time this reference is given incorrectly as 18,70, found in *OLD* and *ThLL*) as a possible parallel for the meaning of *morator*.

In the commentary of 1101, where *Antistius* is to be understood in the place of the transmitted *Antiscius* (since Guarini), we find speculation on the possibility that the form *Antiscius* is phonologically motivated and reflects the later development of *-tius* and *-cius* to /tsius/ (for

some reason the phenomenon is called "iotacismus"). Here, however, the form must be a mere writing error. The palatalization and assimilation of *-ci-* and *-ti-* is a later phenomenon, first attested in the 2nd or 3rd century CE (as the commentary makes clear).

On the other hand, there are texts where the reader would have welcomed some more information on the possible interpretation(s), e.g., the latter part of the famous poem 1173 *quisquis ama valia peria qui nosci amare*. A similar case is 3494, where part of the texts accompanying the tavern scene is not discussed at all.

The style could have been more concise (cf., e.g., the lengthy formulation of an unproblematic identification of a candidate with a phrase like "ut/cum/non aliter ac X et Y non dubitabis candidatus quin fuerit / quin agatur de Z"). Some errors remain in the Latin (seemingly due to changes e.g. between an active and passive expression in the course of the editorial work), but in general they do not impede understanding.

In the following I offer a few critical notes on individual texts. These are inevitably haphazard and are not meant to be read as an overall negative evaluation on the commentaries.

One example of inaccuracy is no. 31, where Zangemeister gives the text C · CACOS. Weber criticizes, with right, Gordon's interpretation, which makes Cacos a Celtic cognomen but placed where a nomen is expected: "Quod legendum proponit Gordon, non facile accipies ob cognomen loco gentilicio positum et ob formulam notam *v(irum) b(onum)* in *b(onum) v(irum)* mutatam." The latter part of this, however, is not correct. Gordon says nothing about the formulas *bv* or *vb*. This must derive from Kiessling's suggested reading in the original publication, recorded but not accepted by Zangemeister: C · CACOBV. Castrén followed by Mouritsen and Chiavia understand C. *Cacos(ium)*. The supplement goes on to note "De *-o-* pro *-u-* vide Väänänen *Latin vulgaire* 28sq., de *-m* finali omissa vide ad tit. 20." But there is no omitted final *-m* in this name. If the interpretation as *Cacos(ium)* is correct, we have here an abbreviation, not a phonologically motivated dropping of the final *-m*. If this name is assumed to be the Celtic nomen *Cacusius*, a reference to A. Holder, *Alt-celtischer Sprachsatz* (1896–1922), s.v. would have been in order, and would have made understandable the note about writing *-o-* for *-u-* in *Cacos(ium)*.

In text 20 cited above there is no missing final *-m* either, but *Veidi* for *Veidium* (similarly *Popidi* for *Popidium* in 74). No. 20 refers to no. 3 for this phenomenon (*Veidi* for *Veidium*), and in text 3 (finally) the form *Mari* for *Marium* is treated as missing the whole of its final syllable and not only the final *-m*. A reference is also given to F. Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (1948³), 342, who considers such forms of names with root *-io*, if not as abbreviations like similar nominatives, as Oscan influence with reference to accusative forms *Gavi* for *Gavim* and *Popidi* for *Popidim*, similar, e.g., to the Oscan accusative *Pakim*. Hence, the *-m* is missing in *Veidi*, *Mari* etc. if we think it represents an Oscan-influenced accusative form *Veidim* etc., but this is not stated in the supplement.

In number 39 the reading *Vetur(ium)* instead of Zangemeister's *Velur(ium)* is suggested by P. Kruschwitz and H. Solin on the basis of Zangemeister's corrigenda on pp. 190, where he considers it possible to read the third letter as *t* instead of *l*. In dealing with this text, the supplement notes the following: "Neque Castren neque Mouritsen et eum sequens Chiavia vident in adn. p. 190 a Zangemeister inscriptiones 39 et 40 coniunctas repeti ita, ut P. Velurius aut P. Veturius una sola inscriptione, i.e. tit. 39, nominetur.", i.e., Castren, Mouritsen and Chiavia take Zangemeister's corrigenda on p. 190 to mean that not only one inscription mentions *P. Vetur(ium)*, but that both 39 and 40 do so. This would have been a perfect place to correct the

misunderstanding. What Zangemeister says on p. 190 ad n. 40: "Hanc [sc. inscriptionem n. 40, HH] cum illius n. 39 principio coniunctam infra exhibui", together with the apographon where the beginning of 39 and below the text of 40 are printed, seems to suggest clearly that only one *P. Vetur(ius)* is attested, the one in no. 39.

It is not an easy task to present highly formulaic material and phraseology full of abbreviations, characteristic of the electoral *programmata*, in a supplement volume like the present one. These difficulties are exemplified below.

For text no. 98, Zangemeister gives *Postu[mium] ... Iulius Polybius collega facit*, but notes that *fecit* has been read by others (except the *Acta* [below]). The supplement refers to Mouritsen, who prefers *fecit* because it is a *lectio difficilior*, while also recording different views about the interpretations of such perfect forms (post-electoral propaganda as suggested by R. Gründel, in *Acta of the Fifth International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy, Cambridge 8–23 September 1967* [1971], 225–7), but no parallel for the form *fecit* is given. Reference is only made to 1059 for the meaning of the verbs *rogare* and *facere*. No mention is made of the fact that 1059 has *facit*, the alternative reading in 98. (On the other hand, the commentary to 1059 refers to 98 for the perfect although 1059 does not have the perfect at all). The only text mentioned in the commentary to 98 is 1122, which is exceptional among those texts as it has the perfect form (*universi fecerunt*). To find parallels for 98, one has to check Gründel's article and his references.

In 3760, on the other hand, where *fecit* probably is to be read (*fac qui te fe[cit]*), reference is made (twice!) to 98 for the perfect and to 7942 "de vocibus fac similibusque adhortationibus, quae programmatibus adiunctae leguntur". There is no mention of the relative clause *qui te fe[cit]*, which is not attested in 98, 7942 nor in any of those texts given in 7942, and the reader is left wondering whether this is the only instance of such a relative clause and perfect combination. Furthermore, the commentary to 7942 only contains the comment "Nota inscriptiones e.g. *fac et ille te faciet* et similia supra tit. 7316. 7429. 7539 illustrantes viros Pompeianos inter se adiuvasse", which is not very informative given that the commentary of 7942 is the standard place of reference for such exhortations in the supplement.

Of the texts referred to in 7942, number 7316 has first the name of the candidate in the accusative (of which only *-ium* is preserved), followed by *ovf* and then *Iuli Philippe fac*. After this comes *et ille Polybium faciet*. The strangeness of this combination is not mentioned in the supplement. What is mentioned is the putative anacoluthon formed by the combination of *o(ro) v(os) f(aciatis)* and then only one name (*Iuli Philippe*) in the vocative. However, *ovf* was a phraseological element that does not (have to) agree syntactically with the rest of the text. This fact is rightly stressed in the commentary of 97, but there is no mention of that here.

In text 370 Zangemeister gives (on the basis of *Acta*, *Amicone* and *Annales*) P PAQ-VIVM VERVS^{CON}DIS. The new supplement records the interpretations *Verus condiscipulus* of Castrén following Guarini and *Verus condiscipulis vel -centibus* [should be *con discipulis*] etc. HH] of Kerpertová ("in sermone") and *condiscens* of Weber (Mouritsen has *verecundiss[-]* following another suggestion of Guarini). The commentary offers information about the preposition *cum* (the preposition only occurs in Kerpertová's suggestion) written in the form *con* citing Väänänen's (*op. cit.* p. 28) view that the form *con* belongs to later antiquity ("antiquitatis posterioris"). There is no reference to attestations of *con* in the letters of Claudius Terentianus from the early 2nd century; these are taken as probably archaizing by J. N. Adams, *The Vulgar Latin of the Letters of Claudius Terentianus* (1977), 9–10 with a reference to *CIL* IV 3935 *com*

sodalibus.

In the commentary of 2953 where the rare passive form *fruniscarus* (for *fruniscaris*) is attested there is no reference to J. N. Adams, *Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC – AD 600* (2007), 445–50, where an up-to-date discussion of the phenomenon is provided. For the text 7807 H. Solin (*Arctos* 43 [2009] 179–83) has, on the basis of the photograph published in A. Varone – G. Stefani, *op. cit.*, proposed restoring the first name as *[Pa]mphilus* (if not *[Herm]aphilus*) but there is no reference to this article. The same article by Solin offers new suggestions also for texts 7425, 9839 and 9895. For example, in 9839 the correction of *ferramenta perdensa furatus* to *ferramenta per geni[um] iuratus*, was proposed by Solin already in 1973 (*Gnomon* 45, 275), as mentioned in the supplement, but this reading has now been confirmed by his consultation of a better photograph. In the commentary of 2993y, which is a Latin text written in Greek letters, the supplement does not mention Solin's comments in his review of A. Varone – G. Stefani, *op. cit.*, in *Arctos* 44 [2010] 325, where it is pointed out that the traditionally given text form Ὅ[γ]ουστ- (supposedly for Αὐγούστ-) and Νηρ- (supposedly for Νερ-) are not likely to have existed in the original text.

Occasional inaccuracies, missing references, or material that is superfluous in one reviewer's eyes cannot be avoided in a massive work such as the present volume. Being the result of decades of scholarship, it is an impressive effort and a useful reference tool for future scholars. Above I have taken a rather critical view on certain of its features. The aim has been to provide readers of this supplement volume with information about the problems one may encounter in using it. However, the most important evaluation to be given is that in most cases the useful and relevant information is there and can be found, but that sometimes this may be difficult due to the problems described above.

Hilla Halla-aho

Supplementa Italica. Nuova serie 27 (*Terventum, Urvinum Hortense, Arna, Laus Pompeia*). A cura di GERARDO FRATIANNI – ENRICO ZUDDAS – LORENA ROSI BONCI – MARIA CARLA SPADONI – PAOLA TOMASI. Edizioni Quasar, Roma 2013 (2014). ISBN 978-88-7140-548-3. 344 pp. EUR 46.

Unless my memory fails me, about one new volume per year was promised when this marvellous series was started in 1981. In 2014, we should, then, in theory be arriving at vol. 33. However, clearly the editors were in the beginning a bit too optimistic, and although some might perhaps assume that the pace of publication has become slower in the last few years, for instance because of the economic situation in Italy, the fact is that even during the first decade between 1981 and 1990 only six volumes – vols. 1–6 – were published. The pace became faster in the 1990s, when altogether 12 volumes appeared between 1991 and 2000, but in the following decade between 2001 and 2010 the number of published volumes fell to seven. With two volumes published during the present decade, we have arrived at 27 published volumes. But even if this number is a bit lower than one would expect on the basis of what was initially promised, I do not think that anyone with a serious interest in epigraphy will complain, especially as the publication of this new volume in any case means good news for the epigraphical community.